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TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

In this volume I have used, though sparingly, the terms suggested in the preface to volume II — re-formate (formate), ad-formate, transformate. These are applied to single words, as on p. 30, Rem. 1. When a word is modified by the analogy of another, it is said to be an ad-formate of it (p. 29, line 7 from the bottom, is an example). In its new shape it is transformed from the old, or a transformate of it (p. 44, footnote). Absolutely regarded, it is a re-formate (sometimes, where there can be no mistake, the simple word formate stands). Re-formation and transformation are used when not single words, but groups, come in question (as p. 90, line 6 from bottom); also when certain sound changes are exemplified by the words cited (as the suspendo ahtoso, p. 40). These terms may by ugly, but they are so very convenient that their ugliness will, it is hoped, be forgiven.

In such words as Pali, Prakrit, Gathic the quantity has not always been marked. It seemed needless to do so when this had been indicated often enough to ensure its being remembered.

The word polysyllable is used to include dissyllables, unless otherwise implied.
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I had hoped to get out this volume by Christmas last. The delay is due partly to the waste of time in sending proofs to and fro from Germany, and partly to the almost ceaseless pressure of other duties.

Mr. Conway's criticism and advice has been very useful all through, and I take the opportunity of thanking him for it.

W. H. D. Rouse.

Cheltenham, May 30, 1892.
CORRIGENDA TO VOLUME II.

page X line 1 for masculine read masculine
page 23 line 19 Classe Classes
page 30 line 14 from below for -iēn- read -iēn-, with stop.
page 35 line 5 for 116 read 116—
page 396 line 15 fīdōnt-ā read fīdōnt-ā
page 43 line 2) line live line
page 437 line 11 from below for novēji read novē-fī
page 443 line 12 dīl-ācī dīl-ācī
page 474 line 13 gędā- gędā
page 486 line 9 *sny-dāj *sny-dāj
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THE NUMERALS.  

§ 164. In the original Indo-Germanic language, the numerals 1 to 999 were expressed in one of three ways. Some were simple words, as *trib- 'three' (Skr. trि-); some were compounds, as


Budmann, Elements. III.
*dyō-dekī 'twelve' (Skr. dvā-daśa); and some were expressed by phrases, as *trejes ge yikmyi ge 'twenty-three' (Skr. trāyaś ca viṣatiś ca). Simple words existed only for the numbers 1 to 10, and 100.

We find in the second stage, when the various branches of the language had begun to develope on their own lines, simple words for 1000, as Skr. sa-hāsra-m, Gr. Lesb. χιλιον; but it is uncertain whether a corresponding form *ghesio- existed in the proethic period, or whether the phrase 'ten hundreds' (cp. Skr. daśa-śatiś f.) was the sole expression for this number. If the simple words for 1000 were not earlier than the second stage, the change was similar to one which took place in Greek, where Homer's δεκα-χιλιον '10,000' was replaced later by μύριον.

The word *dekī 'decem' played an important part in the Indo-Germanic decimal system. It is in the highest degree probable that the Indo-Germanic elements *ekmt- and *komt- which appear in the expressions for multiples of ten (Gr. Dor Ἰἱ-καὶ and

τριάκοντα, etc.), and the word *θντό-m 'centum', were connected with *δεκτοι, and came from *-δεκτο- *-δκομτο- and *δκντο-μ, syncope having taken place because the first syllable was unaccented (I § 310 p. 247); see Scherer Zur Gesch. der deutsch. Spr. 2 579, Bugge Bezz. Beitr. XIV 72.

We are in the dark as to the precise significance of the original Indo-Germanic words for 'two' and all the following numerals. Many conjectures have been put forward, some of them not at all amiss. It has been suggested, for example, that *ter- *tr-ι- 'three' may have been a name for the middle finger, connected with Skr. τάρ-μαν- 'top of the sacrificial pillar' Gr. τέρ-τοον 'end, point, top'; *penge 'five' has been compared with Goth. figgr-s 'finger' (cp. O.H.G. füst O.C.Sl. pešti 'fist' for *pfostit-s, II § 101 p. 306), [and the slang phrase for a fist, bunch of fives]; and *δεκτοι 'ten' with Gr. δέκομαι δέκομαι I receive"). But many others are certainly far from the mark, as Zehetmayr's, in the work cited on the first page.

Our attention will be given first to Cardinal Numbers, to Abstract Numerals — so far only as they are used along with adjectival cardinal numbers in ordinary reckoning — and to the Ordinals. The Abstract Numerals are derived from the Cardinals by the suffixes -ti- and -t- (-d-), which serve as secondary suffixes in other abstract forms besides these (see II § 99 p. 293, § 101 p. 306 f., § 128 p. 390). Some of them were used in the prothetic period along with ordinary numerals; instead of 'ten men', for instance, the expression 'a ten of men' served equally well. Sometimes they even drove the cardinals out of the field altogether; in Balto-Slavonic *δεκτοι is not represented, but only *δεκτοι-τ(ι)-, which appears in Lith. as diszint(ι)-, in Slav. as deset(τ)-. The Ordinal Numerals contain -το- and -μο-, suffixes used in comparison; a conjecture as to the origin of these has been given in II § 72 Rem. p. 167 and § 81 Rem. 1 p. 242.

1) Scherer, op. cit. p. 578: "It therefore seems most natural to regard the word as an ancient expression for both hands held out to receive something".
CARDINALS, ABSTRACT NUMERALS, AND ORDINALS.

§ 165. One. In the original language, one or more derivatives from a pronominal stem *oï- served to express 'one': cp. Gr. Ital. Kelt. Germ. Balto-Slav. *oï-no-s (Skr. has an enclitic ēna- with the meaning 'he'), Iran. Gr. *oï-mo-s, Skr. *oï-qa-.

Aryan. Skr. ē-ka-s. Avest. aô-va- oï-va-, O.Pers. ai-va-. Greek. oï-rô-ς oï-νι- 'ace, the number one on a die', oï-ναρ- τοι-ζ 'Iomo μονάς (Pollux VII 204), oï-νιςιν το μονάζιν κατά γλώτταν and oï-νώςιε μονήγη (Hesych.). Then there is the Homerice oï-τής 'of the same age, contemporary', which Wackernagel (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 280) derives from *oï-fe-ferq by syllabic dissimilation (I § 643 pp. 481 f.), whilst oï-ζ Cypr. oï-fe-ζ meant 'alone'.

Italic. Lat. oï-no-s oeno-s anu-s, Umbr. unu 'unum'. Osc. úin[i]tú 'unita'.

Remark. Many scholars connect ē-ka-ś with Lat. aequo-s and Gr. aës 'equal portion' (for *aës). If *oï- belongs to the stem o-, *oï- might be connected with the feminine stem o- (§ 409). But at the same time such forms as Lat. auri-s: Gr. oësara suggest the possibility of a similar vowel variation here. — See Hübschmann, Das idg. Vocalsystem pp. 190 f.

Old Irish. oe-n.

Germanic. Goth. dû-n-s O.H.G. ei-n O.Icel. ei-nn.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. v-ēna-s (ep. I § 666. 1 p. 526), Pruss. acc. ai-na-n. O.C.Sl. i-ni (ep. I § 84 p. 82, § 666. 3 p. 527), which in composition means 'one', as ino-rogi 'one-horned animal, unicorn'; elsewhere it has the meaning 'alter, alius'.

*sem- was another word for 'one' in the parent language. The idea originally conveyed by it was probably that of being together or united. This became the regular numeral in Armenian and Greek: Armen. mî (gen. miôj) for *sm-i (I § 560 p. 116); Gr. én- instead of *ēμ-, nom. masc. in the dialect of Gortyn én-c Att. éiç, fem. μλα for *sm-ia, μωρξ 'one-hoofed' for *sm-ωρξ (II § 160 pp. 479 f.). Compare Skr. sa-kî 'once' Gr. a-naç 'once' ἀπλός-ç 'single, simple', Lat. sim-plex, sin-gult.
$\text{§ 163.}$ Cardinals, Abstract Numerals, and Ordinals.

semel (see § 182), sem-per 'in one unbroken sequence, always', Goth. simul 'once, once upon a time'.

Isolated forms, of doubtful origin, are Hom. Gort. ἤς Lesb. Thess. ια (cp. Osthoff, Morph. Unt. IV 186 f.), and Slav. jedinů jediná, the regular word for 'one' in that language.

First. In all periods, from the prehistoric onwards, ordinals for this number were formed from the $\sqrt{\text{per}}$, which is seen in Gr. περάν περ-να πού etc. (Fick, Wörterb. I § 140 ff.), by means of the suffixes -ςο- (Ar., Gr., Slav.), -ςο- (Kal., Germ., Balt.), -τυμο- (Ar.) and -ιςο- (West-Germ. and Norse).

*περ-ςο-, *περ-ςο-. The former became O.C.Sl. при-ві, the latter is seen in Skr. पर्-ियā-स पर्-ियā-स (also पर्-िस ‘situated before’); Avest. pourviya- paoirya-; Gr. πορτο-ς. Dor. πορτο-ς for *πορο-ς, besides which we have forms without the extension -ςο- (cp. τορτ- ηξο-ς § 167), Dor. ποράν ‘formerly’ for *πορο-ς, and (with the suffix -ςο-) ποραν ‘recently’ for *πορο-ς, ια-ν. Cp. I § 306 p. 242, II § 63 p. 133, § 64 p. 134. Apparently we must assume a form *προ-ςο- for Goth. frāsja ‘lord’, O.H.G. frō ‘lord’ fraucoa (= Goth. *frāufo) ‘lady’; this *προ-ςο- will be related to *περ-ςο- in the same way as *προ-ςο- to *περ-ςο-.


*προ-ςο- is seen in Umbr. prumum promum ‘primum’: cp. Gr. πρόμος ‘front man, front warrior, leader, prince’ Goth. fram-aldra ‘advanced in age’. -ςο- also occurs in Lat. primus Pelign. prismu ‘primo’ or ‘primum (I § 570 p. 427, II § 72 p. 168), which, like prīs-cum and prīs-tīnum, is derived from a comparative form connected with prīs (II § 135 pp. 433 f.).


Alban. *i-parse* 'first' belongs to the same root as these words.

Words derived from other roots:
Skr. adga-s from ad-di-s 'beginning'; and later adi-má-s.
Armen. nak and arabia, the latter from araf 'foremost side, front, origin, beginning' (cp. verf-in 'last' from verf 'end', ver-in 'highest' from ver 'above', and the like).

O.Ir. cét-m, in composition cét-, Mod.Cymr. kyntaf, Gall. Cintu- in proper names, such as Cintu-gnátu-s ('primigenitus'); perhaps, as Thurneyse conjectures, this is connected with Goth. hindumist-s 'extreme, outermost', A.S. hindema 'last', since the ideas of 'first' and 'last' are easily interchanged. In Irish there is a further form cen-mád, used where larger numbers follow; here the termination -mád has come from sechtm-ad 'seventh' dechtm-ad 'tenth', where m is part of the stem.

§ 166. Two. 1) The stem is *dryo-* *dwoyo- (I § 117 p. 109); in composition and in some ordinary derivatives we have *dryi-, a form which recalls *tr-i- 'three' (cp. II § 13 p. 28) and *y-i- 'two' in fi-xarit etc. (§ 177). I find it impossible to agree with Bartholomae (Ar. Forsch. III 39), who conjecturally restores *dryë- *dwoi- *dryi- as the primitive base of this numeral.


Gr. dvo (used for both masc. and fem., like Lat. duó and Lith. dialectic dë, cp. also τδ ὀνομα § 426), dvo (which was perhaps originally the neuter, see § 293); dvo-dva for *dwo-. The Dor. and Later Att. dvoi Lesb. dvai or dvái. Thess. dvai are re-formates, apparently caused by dvai (dvai); the relation of ποιοi: πων made it seem natural to coin dvoi as dative to dvai. dvai cannot be derived from *dwojo- (cp. I § 180 pp. 117 f.); possibly it came from *dvojo-jo-, cp. Skr. dvé- -dhé 'double, twice' and §§ 297, 311.

---

Lat. duo, fem. duae (cp. §§ 285, 286), acc. duo, duōs, duās, dat. duō-bus, duā-bus. In Umbrian the inflexion is plural throughout: nom. masc. dur, acc. masc. fem. tuf, nom. acc. neut. tuva (cp. Lat. duā beside duo).

O.Ir. duō dō, older dān, and also dā (§ 285), fem. dī; O.Cymr. Mid.Bret. masc. dou.

Goth. tvaī, neut. tva, fem. tvōs; dat. tvāim, gen. tvaddjē (see § 311). The Germanic dialects show various re-formates among the cases, as O.H.G. zwēne, which are not yet satisfactorily explained; the latest discussion of them is by Kluge in Paul’s Grundriss I 403.

Lith. masc. dū for *duā, fem. dė for *de, see I § 184 p. 160, § 664. 3 p. 523. O.C.Sl. dva duva, fem. neut. dvė dūve.

*dym-. Examples of this base in composition are: Skr. dym-pād- Gr. δι-νομις Lat. bi-pēs A.S. twi-fēte ‘two-footed’, O.H.G. zwī-valt ‘two-fold’. In derivatives: *dym-go-: Skr. dmy-kā- ‘consisting of two’ Gr. δυσος- διρρός ‘two-fold’ for *drfn-go-ς, O.H.G. zwēhō ‘doubt’ A.S. twiġ ‘twig, branch’ (II § 86 p. 257). In Italic we find du- (as well as *dym-): Lat. du-plu-s du-plex du-centi (cp. § 180), Umbr. du-pursus ‘bipedibus’; this was a re-formation, developed possibly with the aid of quadru- (II § 34 p. 61).

Remark 1. Side by side with Lat. bi-, dym- is found twice in composition, dym-dēne and dym-cēnus (Paul. Fest.). This, like O.Lat. dux = bīs (§ 182), may have preserved an Idg. *dym- (cp. Ved. duṣi beside duṣ), or it may simply be a modification of bi- on the analogy of duo (and of dū-); I leave the matter undecided. In either case we may reject the view of Skutsch (De nominum Latinorum compositione, Nissae 1888, p. 35), who holds that bi- arose from the dym- which is preserved in these two compounds. On the other hand, I agree with this scholar in regarding dī- in late compounds (as dī-lōris) as borrowed from the Greek ἄ- (p. 36).

Armen. erku (gen. dat. erku-), of uncertain origin. Bugge (Beitr. zur etym. Erläuterung der arm. Spr., 41 f.) derives the word from *ku- = Idg. *duo(y), with er- prefixed on the analogy of erek ‘three’; a most daring suggestion. Fr. Müller would connect it with Suanian jēru Georgian ori ‘two’.

Second. For this numeral the different languages show very different forms.

Armen. erkr and erkr-ord (for *erkir-ord).

Remark 2. Perhaps erkir, like čorir 'fourth', was formed on the analogy of eri-r 'third'. The termination -ord, found in erkr-ord and all the numerals which follow, is very common in other words besides numerals: e.g. hanapaz-ord 'daily' from hanapaz 'always', parap-ord 'otiosus' from parap 'otium', ovs-ord 'hunter' from ovs 'hunt', lc-ord 'companion, cēgō' from loc 'yoke'. Petermann (Grammatica Linguae Armen. p. 182) and Bopp (Vergl. Gr. II ² 97 f.) offer very questionable conjectures as to its origin.

Gr. δεοντεος properly means 'removed to a distance from something, at a distance from it, coming after it in time or position' (δεονται is also found). It is etymologically connected with δύομαι and the Sanskrit adj. dū-rd- 'far off, afar', and did not belong to the numerals until Greek had become a separate language. Its similarity in sound with δύο certainly had something to do with this new use. See the Author, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 298 ff.

Lat. secundu-s, connected with sequor; see II § 69 p. 161.

O.Ir. aile (Mid. Cymr. Mod. Bret. eil) = Lat. aliu-s, and tânise, which is connected with imthānad 'change', though nothing further is known of its etymology.

Goth. an-far O.H.G. andar. Lith. aistra-s O.C.Sl. vūtor-i. Cp. II § 75 p. 198. It possibly may be analysed vūtori (cp. Skr. u-bhau), see § 285:

§ 167. Three. Idg. masc. neut. *tr-i-. The -i- was a suffix, as is proved by such forms, as Skr. tṛ-tlīya-s, Gr. Lesb. tēp-ro-ς.


Armen. erek-, gen. dat eri-, instr. eri-ve, see I § 263 p. 213.

Gr. trēiς Gortyn. trēes for *trēs-es, loc. trē-oi; Hipponax has τροκις, which was suggested by τροκιν (τρολα). The Boeot. trē-νοδα (beside trē-νος etc.), taken in conjunction with Lat. trē-centi, Lith. trē-čzia-s O.C.Sl. tro-tjǐ 'third' Lith. tre-žl 'three by three', seems to point to an old stem *tr-e- (*tr-o-).


Goth. *pri-m, O.H.G. *dri dat. *dri-m.


For the feminine there was a special form in the parent language, preserved only in Aryan and Celtic, *tisr- *tisr-: nom. Skr. *tisr-ás (for the weak form of the stem see § 320) Avest. *tišar-ā, O.Ir. *teoir O.Cymr. *teir (cp. I § 576 p. 431). It is conjectured that *tisr- came from *tri-sr- by dissimilation, and that its second part is identical with the second part of *sue-sor- 'sister'; see Bugge, Bezzenb. Beitr. XIV 75 f. Skr. cátasr-ás is a similar formation (see § 168).

Third. The Indo-Germanic languages have forms with *to-; those without the -i- of *tr-i- may be considered the oldest: Skr. *ty-tiya-s, Gr. Lesb. *tia-rez, Lat. *ter-tius Umbr. tertim 'tertium', Pruss. tīr-tī-s acc. tīr-tī-ne (tīr- = *ty-).

The following have *tr-i-. Avest. *pri-tiya- O.Pers. *ši-tiya-. Gr. Att. etc. *tio-tio-ς, and the Homeric *tio-aro-ς on the analogy of eínaro-ς δέκατο-ς, cp. πρωτο-ς for *proθ-aro-ς § 165 p. 5 and ἵδρομ-aro-ς § 171. Lat. *trit-avo-s, unless the true form of the word be *strit-avo-s, see II § 81 p. 246. Mod.Cymr. trydydd for *trit-tio- or for *ty-tio-, we cannot tell which. With different suffixes: Armen. *er-i-r (and err-ord for *erir-ord, cp. § 166 Rem. 2) and O.Ir. *ti-s, in composition tress- (see II § 81 p. 247).

For *tr-e- in Lith. *trėcžia-s for *tretžia-s and in O.C.Sl. tretži, see last page.

The last-named forms make it doubtful whether Goth. *přidja O.H.G. dritto are derived from *trit-tio-, or from *tre-tio- (according to I § 67.3 p. 57).

§ 168. Four. The Idg. stem masc. neut. *getuer- *getuer- had a variety of ablaut-forms; this was because there were several distinct weak-grade forms of the second syllable: *q(e)tur- *q(e)tur- *q(e)trq- *q(e)trq- *q(e)trq-. Cp. I § 155 p. 140, and J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 43 ff. and 138, Pluralbild. 191 f.; Wackernagel, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 288 ff.; XXVIII 136;

The nom. plur. masc. in the original language would be *getuor-es: Dor.-tētōsς Lat. quattuor Skr. catvār-as; neut. *getuor *getuor-ō: Skr. catvāri, Lat. quattuor, Goth. fiduōr, whose ō passed over into the masculine.


Armen. ĝor-ē, gen. ĝor-i-č, from *getuor- or *getur-, see I § 455 p. 336. Also Kār-, in Kār-a-sun 40’, probably from *(q)tēr-, see §§ 176, 178.

Gr. Dor. tētōsς, Late Ion. τίσσαςς Arcad. τίσσαςς-κοντα, Lesb. πίσσαςς Hom. πίσσαςς, Att. τέταρτος Hom. τίσσαςς Boeot. πίτταςς, dat. Hom. τέταρτω-ς. Cp. I § 166 p. 147. π- in πίσσαςς πίσσαςς πίτταςς can hardly have been taken over from *(π)τρα- (τραίνω) and *(π)τόν- (τόν-γάλεια), since these had dropped their π- in the proethic Greek period. More probably it came from πέντες. Two other forms are τεταρ- and *(π)τρα-. The former is seen in τέταρ-οι, τεταρ-κς ‘four times’, τεταρ-ές (beside τεταρτό-ς) and in most compounds, as τετρά-καλος ‘four-wheeled; the latter in τρά-πετα ‘table’ for *(π)τρά-πετα (beside ταφ- in τάφων = τετάφων, a word used by the comedian Amphis, and in ταρησόμων = τεταρησόμων, preserved by Hesychius 1). τέταρ- stands for *(τ)εττάρ- (*gettār-) and *(π)τρα-

1) Hesychius’ explanation, το τεττάριον, seems to be corrupt; read το τεταρησόμων. It is not at all probable that this word has preserved a form ταρ- belonging to Skr. ṭīṭṛya-s Pruss. tůr-ti-s ‘third’.
for *(ν)τρα- *(getur-), fast having been lost in proethnic Greek
(the Author, Gr. Gr.2 pp. 43, 71). τετρά-κοντα for getur-, see §§ 176, 178, 341. Τυρταῖο-ς, if Pott is right in adding this to the
list (ep. Τυρταῖο-ς), should be compared with Skr. tūr-ya-;
τυρ- instead of *πυρ- on the analogy of τεν-. With Homer's
τεσσαρά-βος-ς 'worth four oxen' compare another Homeric form, 
δικοσά-βος-ς (beside δικασά-κος-ς).

Lat. quattuor, quadru- (in composition), quadrā-ginta instead
of *quettuor, *quedru-, *quedra-, being assimilated to quartu-s
(see next page). quattuor, nom. pl. masc. and nom. acc. neut. (see
last page), dropped its inflexions because the following numerals
(quinque etc.) were not inflected. quadrā- stands for getur-,
see §§ 176, 178. -d- has taken the place of -t-, reminding us
of a similar change of the breathed to the voiced sound in
angulus for areklo-, septin-genti septua-ginta (I § 499 p. 366,
III § 177), Gr. ἕθομο-ς O.C.Sl. sedmi (§ 171). Umbr. petur-
pursus 'quadrupedibus', Osc. petora 'quattuor' (Fest.) and petiro-
pert 'quater'.

O.Ir. cethir (dat. cethrib), O.Cymr. petguar. Gall. Petru-
coriu-s and petor-ritum 'four-wheeled vehicle'.

Goth. fidvōr for *fidvōr- (6) like stiur 'steer, ox' for *stiur(a)-a
(I § 660. 6 p. 516, III § 194), dat. fidvōri-m, see § 169; fidur-
dōgs 'lasting four days' (fidur-? or fidur- instead of *fidaur-
because the second syllable was unaccented?). The t-sound
which appears in Gothic is not found elsewhere, except in A.S.
and O.Swed. compounds; e. g A.S. fyder-fête 'four-footed' for
A.S. feóner O.Icel. masc. fjórer neut. fýgor fjúgor point to a
form *kiukmor- *kiukur- before the great Sound-shifting (Laut-
verschiebung) in proethnic Germanic; for the change of -γυ-
to -μ- see I § 444 c p. 330. I assume that in *kietmor-, -μ-
was assimilated to the initial guttural (cp. *pempe Goth. fimf
for *pemoq, § 169 p. 14); then *kietur- followed suit, and
became *kiukur-. In Gothic, on the other hand, fidur-
held its ground, and fidvōr (instead of *fð(ζ)vōr) has been assimilated
to it.
Remark 1. I have discussed this -ty- in Morph. Unt. V 53 f. It has been differently explained by Kluge in Paul Braune's Beitr. VIII 517 ff., and in Paul's Grundriss I 403; but I do not feel convinced by his arguments.

Remark 2. Even in pr. Germ. this numeral was declined as an i-stem; e. g. O.H.G. finiin like Goth. fideiri-m. The same i-inflection is seen in the numerals 5 to 12, as Goth. fimfi-m O.H.G. finfin. The origin of this inflexion is doubtful; perhaps the i-forms are to be traced to more than one source. See on this subject the Author, Morph. Unt. V 53 ff.

Lith. keturi, stem ketur-ja-, but acc. ketur-ís, declined in the same way as the following numbers penkl szessl etc. Side by side with this is found ketveri (stem ketver-ja-), the distributive — used as a cardinal numeral with plural substantives —, whose termination -erl spread to the numerals which followed (penk-erl szess-erl etc.). The same suffix -ío- occurs in tre-fi, Avest. a-xtra-ya- 'occurring four times', Gr. δοῦοι δισσί-ς, and in many other numerals (cp. § 183). From ketver-í, -ío- passed over to the proper cardinal numeral, but the acc. keturis = Skr. cáturas Gr. πίουρας (common ground-form *getur-ús, § 333) was preserved by the aid of trís, and then the numerals which followed were declined precisely like keturi (cp. the Author, Morph. Unt. V 55 ff.).

O.C.Sl. četýr-o, gen. četýr-ú · acc. četýr-i, fem. nom. acc. četýr-i. Distributive četver-o.

We trace an original fem. of *getyer-, answering to *tiser- 'three' (§ 167 p. 8), in Skr. cátasr-as Avest. catar-ð (I § 558 p. 415) and Mod.Cymr. pedeir O.Ir. cetheoira catheora. These justify the conjecture that -yer- in *getyer- was a suffix of some kind.

Fourth. Skr. catur-thá-s and tûr-ya-s tur-lya-s, Avest. tásirá- (see p. 9).

Armen. ցու-ir ցուր-or ð for *ցուր-ðr and քար-or (cp. § 166 Rem. 2 p. 7).


Lat. quartu-s for *qty₂-to- (I § 306 p. 242), which no doubt became first *tyar-to-, and then quarto- through association with.

quattuor. Prencst. Quorta (Schneider, Dial. Ital. I no. 217) is so isolated that I cannot venture on the strength of it to assume *qtr-\text{-} to-aswellas*qtr-\text{-} to-for Italic; cp. Stolz, Lat. Gr. 2 p. 385. Osc. trutum ‘quartum’ trutas gen. ‘quartae’ (Bugge, Altital. Stud. 1878 p. 53 ff.) are formed from *qtr-\text{-}.

O.Ir. ceithramad formed after the analogy of sechtmad ‘seventh’ dechmad ‘tenth’.


Lith. ketvi\text{-}ta-s O.C.Sl. \text{-}tū ground-form *qetv\text{-} to.

§ 169. Five. Idg. *penek. This number, along with the numbers 6 to 10, was indeclinable in the original language, and also more or less in Aryan, Armenian, Greek, Italic, Keltic, and Germanic during the historical period. We may conjecture that it is a survival from the time when the attributive adjective needed no case-endings. For example, Ved. pā\text{\text{-}}nca kṛṣi\text{-}su, Gr. πέντε δεκατῶν, Lat. quinque virūrum, Goth. fimf hláibans. But it came to be declined more or less frequently in all the different branches of Indo-Germanic except Italic: Skr. gen. pa\text{\text{-}}ncā, Armen. gen. hngi-\text{-}s, Gr. Lesb. πέμπων, Mid.Ir. cōic m-bō ‘quinque vaccarum’, O.H.G. dat. fīnsin (inflected only where it followed the substantive). In Lithuanian alone penkl is invariably inflected from the earliest period at which we know the language (cp. last page). In Slavonic the adjectival numeral, along with those immediately following up to 10, had died out before the beginning of our record.

Skr. pā\text{\text{-}}nca, Avêst. panca.

Armen. hŋi, see I § 330 p. 265, § 455 p. 336.

Gr. πέντε. \text{-}n- is regular (I § 427 p. 312) in Lesb. πέμπων (see above), and in πέμπων φόρον, πέμπες πεμπάς; whilst in Lesb. πέμπων the \text{-}n-, and in πεντώφόρον πεντάς etc. the \text{-}n- was due to form-association. In compounds, besides πεντε- (e. g. πεντε-τάλαντο-ς) we find πεντα- (e. g. πεντα-χόσιος, πεντά-πεντα-ς), which is a re-formation following the model of τετρα-, ἵππα-, ἵππα-, ἵππα-.

Remark 1. Two stems are found; πεμπάς like Skr. pa\text{\text{-}}ncā-, and a ti-stem with the same meaning, Skr. penket-\text{-}s O.Icel. fimt O.C.Sl. pe\text{\text{-}}tī. The
first two words are ad-formants of δεκαί and δεκάδ- respectively; and considering how widely the suffix -ād- was used in Greek — μονάς, ἡνάς, δωάς, τριάς, τετράς, δεκάς, ἑδεκάς (cp. ἑδεκά-Thota) ἑπτάς, ἑδώδας; (cp. ἑδώδα-Thota) ἑκάς, ἑνάς, ἑγευμακτάς, ἑκατώτας, χιλάς, μυράς — it is extremely doubtful whether there is any immediate historical connexion between πενήδας and πενήδ-). For the -δ- of -αδ- see II § 123 p. 392 and III § 178.

Lat. quinque quiunque (for i, see Thurneysen in Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 501 f.), Umbr. pumpearias Osc. pumperias, equivalent to ‘quintilic’ or ‘quincuriae’, Osc. Púmpiaians ‘Pompeianus’. Pr. Ital. *kymeke, see I § 336 p. 267. quinca-, in quinca-plex etc., through association with quadr-.


Goth. fimf O.H.G. fimf finf (the u of O.H.G. funf is discussed below under the ordinal). Probably the second f is to be explained by supposing that *kymke became *pempe (cp. I § 444 Rem. 1 pp. 329 f.) as *kymyor- became *kuekyor- (III § 168 p. 11). The i-inflection, which we see in Goth. fimfim O.H.G. *finfin, is discussed in § 168 Rem. 2 p. 12.

Lith. penkt and penk-eršt, see § 168 p. 12.

In Slavonic, the cardinals 5 to 10 inclusive were represented by the abstract formation: pěči ‘fivefold character, the number five’ (= Skr. pavrtil-§ O.Icel. fimt) governing the gen. pl. of the thing. The old numerals were indeclinable, and this may have had something to do with their being dropped.


Fifth. Idg. *peq-tō- (which can be traced with certainty in Germanic, but nowhere else); and perhaps *peq-tō- too is proethnic (cp. *peqgē).

Skr. pavrtnās (following saptamās etc.) and pavrca-tha-s (cp. O.Ir. cōiced). Avest. puxdā- (for -ā-, cp. wuxda- I § 475 p. 351), according to von Fierlinger (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 194), comes from *peqto-: but why should it have u and not a? The u reminds us of Gr. παύμαθ Lat. pāgnus. Besides puxdāwe find the further form Avest. pavrtnāhē-m acc. ‘one-fifth’.

Remark 3. For -ord, see § 166 Rem. 2 p. 8. The -er- which precedes -ord in this and the succeeding numerals is still unexplained.

Gr. πέντε-ας, Gortyn. πέντε-ας (I § 427 a p. 312).

Lat. quintus Quinctius, Osc. Quintus 'Quinctius'. The ground-form may be either *penqto- or *penqto-. Bartholomae (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 503) conjectures that Lat. quint-, Osc. pont- were the regular forms, while the cardinals were responsible for -c- in quinc- and -p- in pomp-.

O.Ir. cōcéd O.Cymr. pimphet, see II § 81 p. 247.


Lith. penkta-s. O.C.Sl. pętū may stand for *penq-to- or *penq-to-.

§ 170. Six. Three forms may be restored with more or less probability. Iranian, Greek, and Keltic point to *syeks; Armenian and Baltic to *yeks; Sanskrit, Latin, Germanic, Baltic, and Albanian to *seks (Alban. įaspi, see G. Meyer, Alban. Stud. II 56 ff.). *syeks and *yeks would be parallel forms like *syelo- and yelo- 'draw' (Gr. ἔλευ Lat. sulcu-s; Lith. velčū) and other pairs of the same kind; see I § 589.3 pp. 445 f. *syeks and seks, again, recall such pairs as *sye- (Skr. svā- 'sau' etc.) and *se- (Avest. ḥē hōi, Lat. sē, Goth. si-k), *syesor- (Skr. svāsar- 'sister' etc.) and *sesor- (Lith. sesū O.C.Sl. sestra) and so forth; see I § 170 p. 150, § 184 p. 160 (and see II p. 441 footnote 2), § 187 p. 162.

Both in the prehistoric parent language, and in the historic period of Aryan, Armenian, Greek, Italic, Keltic and Germanic, this word was indeclinable. For example: Avest. xšvaš satāš 'with six hundred', Gr. εξ ημίας, Lat. sex mensibus, Goth. aftar dagans saths 'after six days'. But it was sometimes inflected,
as Skr. ्षुग्धस्य, Armen. gen. վեր-ը, Gr. ἕξας or ἕξατι (in an
inscr. of the fourth century A. D., C.I.G. no. 5128. 27 τοῖς ἕξας
βασιλείσχως) like τέρπας, Mid.Ir. gen. se m-bo 'sex vaccarum',
O.H.G. dat. sehsin (only used when the subst. precedes). The
Latin word, sex, was never declined; the Lithuanian, szess-, always.

Skr. ṣāś (ṣā, see I § 401 Rem. 2 p. 297); cp. ṣोḍा '16'
for *ṣaṭḍaṇa, like vōdhum for *vaṭḍhu-m (I § 404. 2 pp. 298 f.),
and ṣaṣṭhā-s 'sixth'. Avest. xvaaš, also xīṭva-, which latter is
regarded as standing for *xvāṣṭa-. Apparently it should be assumed
that there were two forms in proethnic Aryan, *ṣmaš and *saš,
which became *ṣmaś and saš by assimilation of the sibilant.
These would become quite regularly Avest. xīvaš (see Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. III 20) and Skr. ṣāś respectively.

Armen. վեր doubtless represents *yeš; see I § 560 Rem.
p. 417, § 589. 3 p. 446.

Gr. ἕξ for *syeks. For ἐκ ποποῦ, ἕγ ρακτέλων, ἕκ-πλευρο-γ
ἐκ-μπας-ς etc. see the Author's Gr. Gr. 2 p. 71. ἕξα- in ἕξα-κόσαι
and other compounds follows the type of τέρπα- ἐπτα- etc.

Lat. sex.

O.Ir. sē (cp. mór-feser 'magnus seviratus') Mod.Cymr. chwech
for *syeks, see I § 175 p. 154, § 517 p. 377, § 576 p. 432,
§ 657. 10 p. 510. The second s has been preserved in the Irish
sēs-ca 'sixty' and sēs-ed 'sixth'.

Goth. saiths O.H.G. sehs, ground-form *seks. Cp. p. 18
footnote 1.

Lith. szesž-l (cp. ketur-į § 168 p. 12) doubtless represents
*sesžt, as szesṣura-s represents *sesṣura-s (I § 587. 2 p. 442).
Pruss. wouscht-s uscht-ą 'sixth'; probably we have a borrowed
word in Lith. ūszes beside szesžios pl. 'childbed'. Slavonic has
the abstract, šestǐ: cp. Skr. ्षषष- ř (group of six tens, sixty')
O.Icel. settt. šestt brings us to *chestt at the first step back-
wards, and is doubtless one of the instances of ch- = s- (see
I § 588 Rem. 3 p. 444); this change has not yet been, satis-
factorily explained.

Sixth. The parent language may have had the word
*syek-to-s (*se-, *ye-): cp. Skr. ्षषष高雄 Avest. xīṭva- (see above),
Gr. ἕκτος, O.H.G. sehto O.Icel. setti setti, Lith. šeššto-s Pruss. weuscht-s O.C.Sl. šestū. And the -s- of Lat. sextu-s Umbr. sestentasiaru 'sextantariaum' Osc. Ξετᾶς, 'Sextius'; Goth. sathsta O.H.G. sehto (beside sehto) may have come from the cardinal. But it is uncertain whether or not pr. Idg. *sehto-s grew out of *seks-to-s by a purely phonetic change. Who can tell whether the -s of *seks was not an inflexional suffix? If so, it would not at first be found in the ordinal any more than (say) the -e of *pēvege 'five' in *pēvegto-s. Cp. I § 589 Rem. 2 p. 446.

Armen. vec-er-ord.

O.Ir. sessed Mod.Cymr. chweched. As to the supposed origin of this re-formation see Zimmer, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXX 214.

§ 171. Seven. Pr. Idg. *septēs; the accentuation is inferred from Skr. saptā, Gr. ἕπτα and Alban. šta-te (G. Meyer, Alban. Stud. II 65). Another form of the same stem, *septom-, is perhaps to be inferred from Gr. ἕβδομην κοῦν ἕβδομάς ἕβδομάς O.Ir. secht-moga (cp. *-dkom-t- beside *-dkom-t- § 164 pp. 2 f.), see § 178.

The word was originally indeclinable: examples are Ved. saptā sindhuṣu 'in septem fluminibus' Avest. hapta satāiś 'with seven hundred', Goth. sibin hláībans; and Gr. ἕπτα, Lat. septem, O.Ir. secht n- were never declined. Inflected forms are: Skr. dat. abl. saptā-bhyas; Armen. gen. evtan-כ, O.H.G. sibin-in (only used where the subst. precedes). In Lith. only the word is always inflected, septynil.

Skr. saptā, later sāpta, Avest. hapta; we may conjecture that the Skr. word was originally *saptām, but followed the lead of nāva and dāša; see I § 220 p. 193, § 230 p. 196.

Armen. evtn, see I § 330 p. 265, § 560 p. 416. The final -n must be explained in the same way as that of tasn (§ 174).

Gr. ἕπτα, which we may conjecture should have been *ēptēn, but took its present shape under the influence of ἕπτα and δέκα; see I § 226 p. 193, § 235 p. 198.

Lat. septem. In composition we find beside septem- the re-formation septu- septi-, like octu- octu-.

O.Ir. secht n- Mid.Cymr. seith; see I § 339 p. 269.
Goth. O.H.G. *sibun. For the retention of -n (on the analogy of the ordinal Goth. *sibunda O.H.G. *sibunto, unless indeed it came from an older form *sibun-i), see the Author, Morph. Unt. V 55 1). As to the loss of -t- — we assume *septyu to be the Idg. ground-form — we must certainly not ignore Ascoli’s theory that the parent language possessed two forms, one with -t- (*septyu), and one without (cp. Skr. aṣṭi- ‘eighty’ beside Idg. *auktōy) which was kept in Germanic (see Ascoli’s Krit. Stud. 101). But it is more natural to assume that there were two forms in prothetic Germanic, *septmu- ‘seventh’ which became *sepmo- and then *sebm-, and *septy, which became *seftum (this seems to be the form represented in the Salic Law by septum = seftum) and was then assimilated to *sebm- and became *sebun; cp. Pruss. sepma-s beside septma-s ‘seventh’ and pr. Balto-Slav. *ośmo- ‘eighth’ for *ośmuo- (§ 172). Sievers (Paul-Braune’s Beitr. V 119) and Osthoff (Morph. Unt. II 51 f.) think that the ṣ-form *septyu could become *sepu in pr. Germ. by a direct phonetic change; cp. also Noreen, Urgermansk judl. p. 108.

Lith. septyn-i, like devyn-i ‘nine’ in its ending, and similar to asztūn-i ‘eight’. It may be conjectured that these three forms once were *septin(-i) *devin(-i) — cp. the ordinals septū-ta-s devin-ta-s — and *asztū(u-n-i), and that their present shape is due to mutual assimilation. The long ū caused the lengthening of i to y; similarly the long vowel of trylika etc. caused the lengthening of the antepenult in vėnūlikę (p. 28), and that of Idg. *tri- caused the lengthening in *qetū- *pėvū- (§ 178); many other examples might be found. *septin-i septū-ta-s instead of *septin-i *septū-ta-s owe their n to *devin-i *devin-ta-s.

O.C.Sl. sedmě, an abstract noun, beside sedmě ‘seventh’, was shaped on the analogy of šestě: šestě etc. (II § 97 p. 290). The

1) If it is assumed that there were prothetic forms, *sibun-i *mīn-i *tēhun-i, ad-formates of *fīmī = Idg. *peṅge, it follows that O.K.G. sehs, which should have been *sīhēs, must be regarded as modelled upon the analogy of sehsa sehta. For on this assumption there must have been a pr. Germ. *sehs-i, which would then have become *sīhēs.
pr. Idg. abstract would doubtless be *septu-ti-s : Skr. saptati-ś (seventy), O.Iccl. sjāunād.

Seventh. Idg. *septimó- (perhaps *septimó- *sebāmō- may be inferred from Gr. ἱβδωμό- O.C.Sl. sēdmū; see I § 469 p. 345) and *septimō-. Possibly *septim-tó- may also be regarded as prothetic.

Skr. saptamā-s. Also saptātha-s Avest. haptāpa-.

Armen. esēn-er-ord.


Lat. septimn-s.

O.Ir. serhtmad Mid.Cymr. seithnet for *septym-e-tos-s, see II § 72 p. 168.

O.H.G. sibanto.

Pruss. septma-s seym-a-s. Lith. sēkma-s (sēkma-s), see I § 345 p. 271, § 377 p. 286; the ordinary word now is septimta-s (Lett. septitāis) instead of *septim-ta-s through assimilation to deviṇ-ta-s. O.C.Sl. sēdmū.

§ 172. Eight. Idg. *oktō *oktōy. -t- must have been something of the nature of a suffix, as aṣṭi-ti-ś 'eighty' seems to show; this word is unintelligible if regarded as a derivative from *oktōy (aṣṭāy).

Remark. It can hardly be a mere coincidence that the ending agrees with that of the nom. acc. du. masc. of o-stems (§ 285). *okt too, which we see in aṣṭi-ti-ś, may have been a dual, like *oḡi 'the two eyes' (§ 293). Perhaps the meaning may have been 'two sets of four' (cp. Mid.Cymr. den-naw 'eighteen', properly 'two nines', etc.) It must be admitted that in that case the numeral 'two' might have been expected before *oktōy, as in Lat. vi-gintī 'two tens', du-centī, and so forth. Still this might have dropped in course of time.

Uninflected in pr. Idg.: e.g. Avest. aṣṭa satāiś 'with eight hundred'; and Gr. ὀκτό, Lat. octō, O.Ir. ocht n- are always
indeclinable. Inflected forms are: Skr. instr. aṣṭā-bhīṣ, Armen. ut-i-ց, O.H.G. dat. ahtov-en (only used when the substantive precedes). Inflexion is regular only in Lithuanian, asztėnė.

Skr. aṣṭā aṣṭā, Avest. aṣṭa. In Skr. we find also aṣṭa, loc. aṣṭā-su etc., an ad-formate of saptā. Compounds with aṣṭa- (cp. Lat. octi-) had not a little to do with giving currency to this form.

Armen. ut, for *uvt, and that for *optō(y), whose p came from the numeral seven (cp. El. ᄃன); see Bugge, Beitr. zur etym. Erl. der arm. Spr. 43.

Gr. ὀκτός. The numeral seven gave its rough breathing to Heracl. ὀκτῶ, its n to El. ὀκτῶ, and its a to ὀκτα- in ὀκτα-κόσων (Lésb. ὀκτα-κόσων) ὀκτά-νος (beside ὀκτῶ-νος: Skr. aṣṭā-pad-). Bocot. ὀκτό is like ἕν, see §§ 166, 293.

Lat. octō. In composition octō- and octi- octu-, cp. Skr. aṣṭa- Avest. aṣṭa-. Osc. Úhtavis 'Octavius'.

O.Ir. ocht n- (see I § 517 p. 377) follows secht n-; for forms without the nasal see Stokes, Bezzemb. Beitr. XI 170. Mod.Cymr. wyth Mod.Bret. eiv for *okti, older *oktû *oktō:


Lith. asztū-n-1, cp. § 171 p. 18.

O.C.Sl. osmit (ordinal osmit) follows sedmi, see § 171 p. 18.
The original 1dg. abstract numeral is represented by Skr. aṣṭi-

 Eighth. 1dg. *oktōy-ḥ- or some such form. The mono-

forms follow the example of the numeral seven, as do Skr. navamā-s Umbr. nuvime (§ 173 p. 22).

Skr. aṣṭamā-s, Avest. aṣṭema-

Armen. ut-er-ord.

Gr. ὅγοος- for ὅγοοφο-ς (in Homer also ὅγοο-ἀτο-ς, like Ἐράφος-ἀτο-ς), cp. ὅγον-ντα, ὅγον-άς. -γό- for -γό- follows the -βό- of 'seven'. In all other points the history of ὅγοο(͚)ο-ς is obscure; see the Author, Morph. Ünt. 'V 36 ff., and below § 311.

Lat. octēs-o-s, Osc. Úhtavis 'Octavius'; the d is strange nor has it been satisfactorily explained even by the attempts
of Thurneysen and Meringer (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVIII 154, 232). Cp. the vulgar Latin octua-ginta, for *octov-a-, which is like Gr. ὀκτώ(μ). See the Author, loc. cit. O.Ir. ocht-mad, Mid. Cymr. wyth-net.

Goth. ahtu-da, O.H.G. ahto-do; O.Fris. ahtunda following sigunda niugunda.

Lith. ąszma-s (now growing obsolete), Pruss. acc. asma-n, O.CSl. osmu, pr. Balto-Slav. *oš(t)-mo-s. The Lith. has another word asztūita-s, an ad-formate of septiūta-s deviūta-s.

§ 173. Nine. Idg. *néy(ḫ) and *ēn(ḫ), the latter in Armenian and Greek. Also *ēn(y)n-, which is preserved in Gr. ἑν-ήξοντα (§ 178). The final was -η -n, not -γ -m, as we see from Gr. ἑν-ή-ξοντα, Lat. non-ā-ginta non-ū-s and Lith. deviū-ta-s (contrast desziū-ta-s ‘tenth’).

In Indo-Germanic, it was not inflected; e.g. Avest. naba satais ‘with nine hundred’; and in Greek, Latin, and Old Irish it is always indeclinable. Inflected forms: Skr. gen. navānām, Goth. gen. niun-ā, O.H.G. dat. niun-in (only when the substantive precedes). It is always declined in Lithuanian, devyn-ī.

Skr. nāva, Avest. nava.

Armen. inn, pl. innu-k or innun-k (cp. Osthoff, Morph. Unt. I 122), see I § 232 p. 197.

Gr. *ēn(α) preserved in Ion. ἑν-νεξες ἑνα-κόσιοι ἑνα-τρος Att. ἑνα-κόσιο ἑνα-τρος, Hom. ἑν-lexer like ἑν-ήξοντα (§ 178). Also ēnria, which should probably be explained with Wackernagel (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVIII 132 ff.) as *ēn refa ‘nine in all, a good nine’, this original meaning having been subsequently weakened; Heralc. ēnria, like ēkíro, following ētā. ἑν-ήξοντα ‘ninety’ preserves an original *ēn(y)n-, cp. § 178.

Lat. novem instead of *noven follows septem decem. -n is kept in nōn-ā-ginta nōn-ū-s. noun-dinu-m nōn-dinu-m, usually nīn-dinu-m. Umbr. nūvis ‘movies’.

O.Ir. nōi n-, Mod.Cymr. Corn. nāw. But whence came this a?

Goth. O.H.G. niun for *nīyun, I § 179 p. 156. O.Sax. nīgu A.S. niʒəu, where ʒ is a transition-sound or glide (cp. Jellinek, Paul-Braune’s Beitr. XIV 582). The ending -un is
to be explained in the same way as that of *sibun, for which see § 171 p. 18.

Lith. *devynt- instead of *navyni *novetí on the analogy of the initial de- of 'ten'; Pruss. newiists (‘ninth’) has been influenced by the Germanic form. For the termination of *devynt- see § 171 p. 18. deveti is the Idg. abstract *nevynt⋅ti-s : cp. Skr. navati-ś (‘ninety’), Avest. navaiti-ś (‘nine’ and ‘ninety’), O.Icel. niund.

Ninth. Idg. *nevynt-ō- or *nevynt-tō- (*navyn-ō- or *enyn-tō-), perhaps both.

Skr. navamā-s Avest. naoma- = *navema- (as ker'nam = ker'naun, I § 158 p. 141) O.Pers. navama- instead of *navamā-, following (Skr.) saptamā- dasamā-, cp. Umbr. nuvime.

Armen. inn-er-ord.

Lat. nōn-u-s for *noven-o-. If the dzenoine of the Duenos inscription means 'die noni', its ei makes some difficulty, although not for the reasons which Pauli suggests (Alttital. Stud. I 32 ff.). Umbr. nuvime 'nonum', where m is not original, but is like that of Lat. novem and Skr. navamā-s.

O.Ir. nō-mad, Mid.Cymr. nō-weet, re-formates like ocht-mad wyth-weet etc.


Lith. deviū-ta-s (Pruss. newiists, see above), O.C.Sl. devet-tū.


Skr. dāsā, Avest. dasa.

Armen. tasn. If the acc. mard ‘hominem’ is a regular development from *muṭo-m, in which case original final -m was
dropped, *tasnu like *eπεω is an ad-formate of in-n 'nine',
ep. I § 202 p. 169, § 651.2 Rem. p. 497. But it is
preferable to regard the ending of *tasnu as coming quite regularly
from *deko-ω, and mard as being a nominative used for the accusative (see § 212).

Gr. δέκα. Arcad. δεύ-δεκά (Bullet. de corresp. hellén., IV
1889 p. 281) like δέκας (see p. 24).

Lat. decem. -decim in an-decim etc. is due to the accentuation,
see I § 65 p. 53. Re-formates are decem-plu-s decem-ni-s decem-
unx etc. beside decem-plex etc. Umbr. desen-duf 'duodecim'
tekuries dequrier 'decuriis', Osc. dekmannyi-i-s 'decumanis'.

OIr. deich n- (indeclinable, since deich and dech are
meaningless variations in the mode of writing the same
sounds), O.Cymr. dec.

Goth. tahlun O.H.G. zehan. The final -n must be ex-
plained in the same way as that of sibun, see § 171 p. 18. We
should not have expected the -a- which is found in O.H.G. zehan
O.Sax. tehan; ep. O.H.G. zehanzo beside Goth. tahlunte(-hund)
§ 179. Possibly in words like drī-zehan, *-tehun became *-tehy
and then -tehan, and the a passed thence into *tühun etc. (cp.
O.H.G. Sigi-frid as contrasted with fridu). A different ex-
planation is given by Noreen, Arkiv III 26.

In Balto-Slavonic the only forms left are the two Idg. ab-
dezš-t- : ep. Skr. daśit- Gr. δεξαγ Goth. gen. pl. tahlunte (in
tahlunte-hund '100', see § 179) and Skr. daśat-ti (tenfold
caracter, group of ten', specialised to mean 'group of ten
tens, hundred') O.Icel. týnd. In early Lithuanian dëzsimt-
is still an inflected singular substantive and is followed by the
genitive; but now the inflexion is gone, and we have dëzsimt
(doubtless both acc. sing. = dëzšti and loc. sing. = dëzšto) and
dëzsimts dëzšimts (doubtless nom. pl. = dëzšte) ¹), although still

¹) The history of the plural form dęzsimts needs further investigation.
Has it been influenced by dąideszimts 'twenty' trisdezimts 'thirty' etc.? Or is it merely due to an idiom of the language which we find in the
old books, whereby the abstract noun is used like an adjective with the
governing the genitive plural. O.C.Sl. desetí is declined throughout as an i-stem; there is a parallel stem desét-, e.g. in jediná ná deseté (loc. sing.) 'eleven' = 'one upon ten'.

Tenth. Idg. *deku-to- (*deku-t-o-? see II § 81 Rem. 1 p. 242) and *dekuum-o-.
Skr. daśam-i, Avest. dusema-.
Armen. tusu-er-ord.
Gr. δεκαδ-ς. Lesb. Arcad. δεκόρ-ς (cp. Arcad. δέκα-δέκα),
whose o follows -κόρα -κόρο-ς, cp. §§ 176, 177.
Lat. decimu-s, Osc. dekmanyuíis 'decumanis'.
O.Ir. dechn-ad, Mid.Cymr. decu-et.
Lith. deszintas-ς, O.C.Sl. desetí.

§ 175. Eleven to Nineteen. When the units were added to multiples of ten in the parent language, both units and tens of the resulting number were independent in the sentence. The copula 'and' may have been generally used with them, as in the phrases Ved. ekā ca višatī ca acc. '21', trāyāś ca triṣāc ca '33', Gr. δέκα καὶ πέντεκορνα '52', Lat. quattuor et vigintī; but not always, as we infer from Ved. triṣātā trīn acc. '33', Gr. πέντεκορνα δέκα, Lat. vigintī quattuor etc. But in the cardinal numbers 11 to 19 there was a closer combination between the unit and the numeral 'ten' which followed it (see II § 16 pp. 31 f.). In the numbers 11 to 14 the unit was inflected, in 15 to 19 it was not; hence 15 to 19 readily became true compounds, whilst 11 to 14 may not have become compounds so soon, since their ending had first to become stereotyped.

Remark. There can be no doubt as to the reasons for this difference between the expressions for 11 to 19 and those for 21—29, 31—39 etc. The former group was more often used, for one thing; but the chief reason was that the words for 20 and the other multiples of ten were themselves compounds, and therefore it was less convenient to compound them again with other words.

name of the thing whose number is stated, and takes the case of it; as loc. deszinntias mēstos 'in decem uribus' (cp. Bezenberger, Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr. 178 f.)?
But the numbers 11 to 19 were not expressed in the parent language only by pairs of words in juxta-position, like Skr. द्वादशा Gr. δώδεκα. We are justified in regarding as original expressions like Gr. δέκα δέκα, δέκα τριῶν, Lat. decem duo, decem trecs. We may also believe that phrases of subtraction were used for the numbers immediately preceding twenty as well as for those immediately preceding thirty, forty and so forth; such, for example, as we find when the languages had begun to follow their own separate lines — Skr. śkonavishati-ś, anavishati-ś and ekān nā viśati-ś for 19, tryānāṣati-ś for 57, Gr. ἑνάκε δένυκα εἰκοσι ἑνενε ἑνή '19 years', μιᾶς δένυσα νεκταρίων νῖνε '39 ships', Lat. un-dē-viginti duo-dē-triginta, A.S. tiwā lēs twentig for 18, an lēs twentig for 19, H.G. dial. ains-min-zwanizch zuc-d-min-dreisich (Goth. 2 Cor. 11. 24 fivdor tiguev dinamna vanans to translate τεσσαράκοντα παρά μίαν).

Of the different modes of expressing the ordinals which we find, the Latin for 13th to 19th, tertius decimus etc., occurs in Armenian, Greek, and Germanic besides. We may therefore fairly regard this as original.

Aryan. Cardinals. 11 Skr. एका-दशा; the first part of which crystallises the form of the instr sing. masc. (Ved.) and nom. sing. fem.; the form thus chosen was suggested by द्वादशा, cp. Avest. aevan-dasa- etc. '11th' below. 12 Skr. द्वादशा dudra-dasa Avest. dwa-dasa. 13 Skr. trāyā-duśa. 14 Skr. cátor-daśa, showing now the stem without inflexion, cp. Avest. cañru-dasa- '14th'. 15 Skr. pāncia-duśa, Avest. panca-dasa. 16 Skr. sū-duśa. 17 Skr. saptá-duśa. 18 Skr. aṣṭā-duśa. 19 Skr. nava-duśa, also škonavishati-ś (eka-ūna-viśati-ś score too little by one, a score less one'), or simply āna-viśati-ś, and ekān (i. e. ekad) nā viśati-ś (cp. Delb., Altind. Synt. pp. 112, 543).

Ordinals. In Sanskrit all the numbers have both -daśā-s and -daśama-s, cp. Lat. -decim-us. 11th Skr. eka-daśā-s, Avest. aevan-dasa-, aev-duśa-, aevō-dasa-; aevu-dasu- may be like dva-dasa- = Skr. dva-daśi-, or is it the bare stem instead of a. case, as in īr-dasa- cañru-dasa-? cp. If § 25 p. 41.
12th Skr. dvaḍaśa-s (dvadaśama-s like duodecimn-s), Avest. dvudasa-. 13th Skr. tryoḍaśa-s, Avest. pridusa- with the bare stem instead of a case. 14th Skr. caturdaśa-s, Avest. caḥrudasa-, cp. the cardinal. 15th Skr. paṇcaḍaśa-s, Avest. pancadasa- and pancadasya-, the latter like tātiry- 'fourth' bitya- 'second'. 16th Skr. ṣoḍaśa-s, Avest. ṣevaṣlasa-, etc. Side by side with Skr. navadaśa-s (Avest. navadosa-) '19th' is found ekōṇaviṣa-s, anariṣa-s and ekāṇnaviṣa-s, cp. the ordinal.

Armenian. Ordinals. 11 me-tasan. 12 erko-tasan. 13 erek-tasan. 14 گرئک-tasan. 15 hnge-tasan. 16 veš-tasan. These are all inflected as i-stems; e. g. gen. dat. meṭasanič, instr. meṭasanieč (cp. ḫsan '20', gen. dat. ḫsanič). The numbers from 17 onwards have ev 'and', and inflect sometimes both parts, sometimes only tan (cp. air-ev-ji II § 28 p. 46). 17 evn-ev-tasn. 18 uṭ-ev-tasn. 19 inn-ev-tasn.

Ordinals. Two modes are used. tasn-erord (‘tenth’) may be followed by the ordinal of the unit, as tasnerord گوررد ‘decimus quartus’; or -er-ord may be simply added to the cardinal, as meṭasan-erord ‘11th’ گرئک-erord ‘14th’.

Greek. Cardinals. 11 ἑν-δέκα (ἐν- is nom. acc. neut.), Delph. δέκα εῖς. 12 δώδεκα (Hom. ὑμῖν-δέκα), Hom. ὑμῶ-καλ-δέκα, and in Att. and Dor. δέκα ὑμᾶ as well. 13 τρεῖς καὶ δέκα and (with the nom. τρεῖς crystallised) τρεῖς-καλ-δέκα\(^1\), Att. Dor. δέκα τρεῖς as well. 14 τέταρτος καὶ δέκα, τέταρτος-καλ-δέκα and δέκα τέταρτος, and so forth. As to the form of ἑν in ἑκ-δέκα beside ὑμῖν-δέκα beside ὑμῖν-δέκα see the Author’s Greek Grammar\(^2\) § 59 p. 71. In Attic δέκα ὑμᾶ, δέκα τρεῖς etc. were used when the substantive preceded; e. g. δραχμαί δέκα τρεῖς but τρεῖς καὶ δέκα δραχμαί (cp. Wackernagel, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXV pp. 284 f. and Philol. Anzeiger 1886 pp. 78 f.; Meisterhans, Gr. der att. Inscr.\(^2\) pp. 126 f.).

Ordinals. 11th ἐν-δέκατο-ς. 12th ὑμῖν-καλ-δέκατο-ς, epic ὑμῶ-καλ-δέκατο-ς;

---

1) If the by-form τρεῖς-καλ-δέκα is to be admitted (cp. Meisterhans, Gr. der att. Inscr.\(^2\) p. 126), it contains the acc. τρεῖς = *τρεῖς (Wheeler, Der gr. Nominalaccent 42) in a crystallised shape, or τρεῖς, the form it assumed in procthnic Greek before consonants (I § 204 p. 171).
Ion. δεκατος. From 13th onwards the usual mode of expression in classical Attic, followed consistently in the inscriptions, is τρεῖς καὶ δέκατος, τέταρτος καὶ δέκατος etc. Homer has τρισεκατοντάκτος ὡκτωκατάκτο, and Herodotus τεσσαρακικάκτος πεντεκατακτος, while we find ἑσπερίκατος in Boeotian.

Italic. Cardinals. The following is the ordinary Latin mode of expressing these. 11 un-decim, the first part of which we may conjecture to have come from more than one case-form (cp. un-de-viginti), cp. I § 633 p. 474, II § 38 p. 62. 12 duo-decim. 13 tredecim for *trez-decim (I § 594 p. 450); also tredecim, perhaps following trecenti. 14 quattuor-decim. 15 quindecim for *quinqu(é)-decim, see I § 633 p. 474. 16 sexdecim for *sezz-decim, see I § 594 p. 450. 17 septem-decim, see I § 207 p. 174. 18 duo-de-viginti. 19 un-de-viginti, cp. un-decim. Other expressions are interchanged with these, such as tres et decem, octo et decem; decem duo, decem novem; decem et annus, decem et duo.

Umbr. desen-duf acc. 'decem duo', see I § 207 p. 174.

Lat. Ordinals. 11th undecimus-s. 12th duodecimus-s. 13th tertius decimus, 14th quartus decimus etc., rarely decimus tertius etc. 18th duodecimos-s, rarely octavos decimus. 19th undevicésimus, rarely nonus decimus.

Old Irish. In the cardinals we have the form deac, dissyllabic in the older language, in the later contracted into dēc (Mod.Ir. déag). 11 een — deac, 12 dā — deac, 13 trī — deac etc., with the noun in between, as dā cath deac '12 battles'. deac dēc has nothing to do with deich n-; it was possibly a word meaning much the same as Skr. adhika- Goth. -lif Lith. -lika.

Ordinals. 11th oenmad — deac, 12th aile — deac etc.

Germanic. Cardinals. 11 and 12 contain -libi-. This is a noun stem connected with Goth. bi-leiban 'to remain' (√ leiwp-), Skr. limpāni 'I cleave, stick'), and it originally meant 'excess' or 'being inexess' — elf would then be 'one in addition', i.e. to ten; cp. below Lith. -lika from √ leiwp- and Skr. adhika- 'being
in excess' as used where 10 and its multiples are coupled with units, e. g. aṣṭādhikanavati-ś 'a ninety increased by eight' = '98'. Goth. aín-lif O.IHG. eín-lif, Goth. tvá-lif O.IHG. zwe-lif appear inflected under the same conditions and in the same way as the numbers 4 to 10, e. g. tválibi-m, zwelibin (O.Sax. elloben '11' nom., following tehan '12'). 13 O.IHG. drí-zehan, but also fone dien anderren drin zěnín (Graff, Ahd. Spr. V 628). 14 Goth. fulcór-tailhun, O.IHG. fior-zehan. 15 Goth. fimb-tailhun O.IHG. fimb-zehan. 16 O.IHG. sehs-zehan. 18 O.IHG. ahlo-zehan. 19 O.IHG. niim-zehan.

Ordinals. 11th (fem.) C.IHG. eínlif-to O.Icel. ellifte elliští. 12th (fem.) O.IHG. zweèlif-to O.Icel. tolitte tolští. The following ordinals began by being phrases of the same type as Lat. tertius decimus; but their first member crystallised, it would seem, in proethic Germanic, and they then conformed to the rules of stem-compounds. Goth. Luke 3.1 in jěra fimfsta-tailhundin 'ěn ěnu pentekásxěán'. O.IHG. drito-zehanto, fiordo-zehanto etc., and also with -a- (later -e-) as the final of the first member. Another series, derived from the cardinal, was used in later O.IHG., as fierzen-do sehszen-do. Icelandic has a corresponding series, fim(m)tan-de sextan-de etc.

Balto-Slavonic. Lithuanian. 11 vënā-lika, 12 drý-lika, 13 trý-lika, 14 keturió-lika, 15 penkió-lika, 16 šešiob-lika, 17 septynió-lika, 18 astānió-lika, 19 devynio-lika; 11th O.Lith. lek-ka-s, 12th O.Lith. antras lēkas, but the words now used have -likta-s, as 11th vënālikta-s, 12th devylikta-s. trý-lika, keturió-lika etc. contain forms of the neut. pl. in both parts (§ 338), and accordingly O.Lith. has the dat. -likams and instr. -likais. When the neuter dropped out of use in Lithuanian (§ 403), -ika was treated as a nom. sing. fem.; and then it was declined gen. -likos etc. This inflexion is seen in Old Lithuanian, and is still found in dialects of the language. -ika came from an adjective *lika-s 'remaining over, being in excess', a by-form of the O.Lith. lek-s just mentioned; and to this day lek-s is in regular use in the sense of 'remaining over singly, odd'. The root is leizi- (Lat. lingua Gr. lexíno). Cp. Goth. aín-lif above. In
vēnā'-lika and dey-lika the final of the first member has assimilated itself to the numerals immediately following, and become long; cp. Skr. ēkā-duṣa p. 25 and § 326. Cp. Bezzsenberger, Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr. 179 ff.; Kurschat, Gram. p. 269; the Author, Lit. Volkisieder p. 309, and in Techmer’s Internat. Ztschr. 1251 f.; Mahlow, Die langen Vocale 49; Joh. Schmidt, Pluralbild. 39, 42. — Slavonic. 11 jedinā na desetē (loc. sing. of stem deset-) = ‘one upon ten’, 12 dūva na desetē ‘two upon ten’ etc. Cp. Lett. win-pa-dsmit ‘11’ = ‘one over ten’ dic-pa-dsmit ‘12’ etc., and Gr. Thess. τά ἅρμι π’ λεί; (Collitz, Samml. der Gr. Dialektinschr., no. 345. 10). There are two types of ordinals. Sometimes only the unit takes the ordinal form, as osmyjā na desetē ‘the eighth upon ten’ = 18th; sometimes -ūnā was used to make a derivative from the expression for the cardinal number. In the latter case the unit might either show the form of the nom. acc., as petā-na-desetēnu ‘15th’; or be treated like the first member of a stem-compound, as peto-na-desetēnu, cp. II § 47 p. 86.

§ 176. Twenty to Ninety-nine.

The Indo-Germanic expressions for multiples of ten from 20 to 90 at first meant two, three, or the proper number of tens. Originally both parts of the phrase were inflected; both the unit (except the uninfl ected units 5 to 9, see §§ 169 ff.) and the word for a ten — a neuter *komt- *kunt- (for *δkomt- *δkunt-, see § 164 pp. 2 f.). ‘20’ was a dual, *mu (? ) kunt-i; the others plural, as ‘30’ *trē komt-ē. But these expressions for multiples of ten are not inflected in any language; in all of them the nom. acc. has become stereotyped. Some at least of the units in these phrases were stereotyped in the parent language itself. This is proved by *qetaj-komte (Gr. τετραχοντα Lat. quadrā-ginta Avest. cāpicar-sat- Armen. kai-a-sun) and *paenqē-komte (Gr. πεντά-ξοντα Skr. pāśca-sāt-), which were ad-formates of *trī-komte. It is doubtful whether *kunti and *komte had also become crystallised so soon.

These forms of the nom. acc. pl. (du.) neut. became in the Indo-Germanic period the foundation upon which were built singular abstract nouns (collectives) of the feminine gender, and
ordinals whose first member was the nom.-acc. form. The abstract nouns were ad-formates of the feminine *dekn-to- 'group of ten' 1); examples are Skr. trišita- 'group of 30', Gr. Boeot. fi-kto- Att. εικάς, O.Ir. fiche 'group of 20' gen. fìchet. The ordinals were derived from these by the suffixes -to- and -t-ymo-_. When these two groups of abstract nouns and ordinals sprang up, the expressions for the cardinal numerals, from which they were derived, had not yet fully become compounds. Thus *trikont- *triknyt'τρικοντας' and *triknyt'to- *triknyt'tymo- 'τρικοντας' may have stood related to *trī konta 'three tens' much in the same way as O.CSl. dīwadesetaī '20h' to dūsa desetī '20', and as Lat. quartadecumātī to quarta decima, Sacraviēnēs to sacra via etc. (II § 3 p. 5).

Remark 1. Perhaps the re-formates *geyf- and *pılgē- first appeared only in collectives and ordinals, in which there was a closer connection between the word for the unit and the word for the ten. This might explain certain pairs of forms, tereqos-korta and tereqos-korta in Greek, pana-sat- and pana-sat- in Avestic; and the difference between Avest. caḥwār-sat- and Skr. caṭātṛ-āt-. Gr. tereqos-korta would then be an ad-formate of tereqos-kos-; while tereqos-kos-, on the contrary, would have followed tereqos-korta.

The dual *knyt-i once had the weak stem in all its cases; hence come Avest. vi-saiti Armen. K-sat Gr. Fi-kat Lat. vi-ginti, hence also the collective with -knyt- : Gr. Fi-kakās el-xakās O.Ir. fi-che (O.Cymr. u-ceint Corn. u-gans). But the nom. acc. pl. was *komt-ā, whence Armen. -sun Gr. -kovta and the collectives Avest. pri-saqs O.Ir. -cha -ga. In cardinals and collectives of the tens from 30 upwards *knyt- is also found (Lat. -ginta and Skr. tri-āt- Avest. pri-sat- etc., Gr. τρικαντας). Two possible causes may be assigned for this. (1) Beside *komt-ā there may have once been weak cases with *knyt-, as loc. *knyt-su, or (2) the corresponding forms for the number 20 may have set the type. The ordinals had all of them doubtless *knyt- to begin with, as Gr. Boeot. fi-xaσtō- Skr. tri-ṣattamā-s Lat. tri-esimu-s.

1) Words were formed later on the same principle in Old Icelandic, in Lithuanian, and in Greek. Examples: O.Icel. trútag-tr 'xinās' prítag- 'teknās' etc.; Lith. deideszintis-e 'xinās' (e.g. po deideszintes metu, in Kretsci) from *del oxezinti '20'; Gr. εικάς dixenās etc.
Remark 2. Avest. viṣṣāta- is an ad-formate of *priṣṣaṭēna- (which
we may infer from priṣqa), which had itself taken the place of *priṣṣaṭēna-
In Greek, and doubtless in its progenetic period, -xevo- influenced the con-
ected ordinals in *xevō-zero. The change may have taken place in either
of two different ways; (1) *xevō-zero may have become *xevō-zero and then
-xevo-zero (cp. xevo-zero for *xevō-zero, I § 204 p. 171), or (2) *xevō-zero may
simply have taken over the o of -xevo. The o then spread backwards
to 20 and 10 (Ion. Att. xeiow-20 ekos, Arcad. xeiwor-20 δεξιος, and
forwards to 100 and its multiples (Arcad. xeiwor-100 and Ion. Att. -xos).

The old expressions for the cardinal numbers, consisting of
an adjective with a substantive, remained in Armenian,
Greek, and Latin, and in the Avestic word viṣaiti '20'. In
Aryan and in Keltic these were displaced by the group of
singular abstract nouns; the only Aryan forms which recall the
old type are Avest. viṣaiti, and indirectly Skr. viṣati-ḥ (see § 177).
But in Aryan these forms were themselves displaced in the
numbers from 60 to 90 by a second group of abstracts, such
as Skr. ḫaṣṭi-ḥ (see § 178). In Germanic and Balto-Slavonic,
both these expressions for the cardinal numerals and the singular
abstracts had disappeared before the historical period begins.
Their place was filled by other expressions which had really
and truly the same etymological factors, and the same meaning,
as the original Indo-Germanic expressions. Take for example
30, Goth. þreis tigjus Lith. try̆s dëssantys O.C.Sl. tri dešeti,
where the substantive was the Indo-Germanic word for a
group of ten, *dekĭnt- *dekĭnti, still used independently. 1
It is probable that *kŏmt- *kŏnt- became obscured quite early
in Germanic and Balto-Slavonic, as in the other languages,
and sank to the level of a suffix; and the new expressions
served to refresh somewhat the original meaning of the words.
But then the same thing happened again, and the new words

1) Germ. *teṣu- 'group of ten' must be derived from *dekĭnt- in
the following manner. In the instr. pl. *teṣŭ-mi and in instr. dual
form containing an u-suffix (in the expression for 20), -undur- became
*mum-, *mum-, and -um- successively. Thus we have tigum, which gave
the type for a new set of cases, Goth. tigjus etc. See §§ 379, 386. What
may be the relation of forms with u in the root-syllable (O.H.G. -zug O.Icel.
togr tugr) to *teṣu- still remains an open question. — For the masc. gender
of the word compare O.C.Sl. duša dešeti.
were themselves obscured and became suffixes. For example, in Mid.H.G. *dvē-ziec vier-ziec Mod.H.G. drei-ssig vier-zig the final part was and is a mere suffix, no less than was that of Gr. τριά-κοντα or that of Lat. tri-ginta at the beginning of the historical period of the classical languages. And in German [and English] these multiples of ten are used as adjectives agreeing in case with the substantive which follows, just as happened with the similar expressions which the Romans and the Greeks had inherited from the parent language: Mod.H.G. in vierzig wochen ‘in forty weeks’ as contrasted with O.H.G. feorzug wehhôn ‘tetrapa-xontaς ἔδομάδως’ and with Goth. dagē fidcôr tiguns ‘ημερῶν τέταρας δεκάδας’, just like Gr. τριάκοντα ἄνδρες instead of *τρία κόντα ἄνδρων, Lat. trīgintā virī instead of *trī contā virīm. However, in Germanic these new expressions with *tezu- held their ground only from 20 to 60, while the three others of the series — 70, 80, 90 — were displaced in proethnic Germanic by a new group formed on the analogy of an old expression for 100, Goth. talhunte-hund ‘δεκάδων δεκάς’. This change will be discussed in § 178.

In the parent language there never was any very close connexion between the words for the various multiples of ten and any intermediate units which might be used with them (in numbers such as 21, 22, 31 and so forth). The unit always remained an independent word. See § 175 p. 24. It was also independent in the differentiated idioms of the different languages. Sanskrit is the only noteworthy exception. Along with the old method of expression, Vedic itself contains feminine words like trāyas-trīṣat- ‘33’ cātus-trīṣat- ‘34’, which follow the analogy of trāyō-daśa ‘13’ cātur-daśa ‘14’. Later, these compound forms became the rule; and for other numbers besides 24, 34 etc. the bare stem was used in them; e.g. ekā-viṣati-ś ‘21’ (but on the other hand ēkādaśa), dvi-triṣat- ‘32’. Sanskrit always shows a marked preference for compound words (see II § 21 p. 37), and this new group only followed the general lines of the language.

Words formed on the principle of subtraction have been
already discussed (§ 175 p. 25). Examples are ēkōnatrišat-
ũatrišat- '29', paṅcōṇa satam '95', ēkān nā satām '99'.

§ 177. Twenty. The cardinal ended in *-kmti (Avest.
vī-saiti Gr. Fl-xarti), which was nom. acc. du. neut. of the stem
-kmt- (§ 294).

The first part was *yēj- (Gr. Heracl. Fēl-xarti 1) eis-xοςi), *yī-
(O.Ir. fī-che), *yim- or *yin- (Skr. vi-satī-ē), perhaps also *yī-
(Avest. vī-saiti, Gr. Fl-xarti with ἕ, Lat. vī-gintī, Armen. esan
for *gi-santi or *gi-santi). It would seem, then, that different
case-forms were used; but we cannot get anything like a clear
idea as to what the original method of expression was in
Indo-Germanic. It seems certain that all these variations of
*yēj- meant 'two', and it is natural to connect them with two
particles — (1) Skr. vi 'apart' vi-śu- vi-śva- 'on both sides, on
different sides' (cp. Avest. āρi-śva-) vi-tarā-m 'further' Goth.
vi-ŋra 'against, with- (in composition) Lat. vi-tr-icu-s (II § 75
p. 191); and (2) u in Skr. u-bhau O.CSl. vī-torū and in the
nom. acc. du. Skr. dvā-u. Then *y-i- 'two' will be like *tr-i-
'three' and *dyi- 'two' (§ 166 p. 6, § 311 Rem. 2). See the
Author, Morph. Unt. V 23ff., Bartholomae Stud. zur idg. Sprach-
gesch. I 74, and below §§ 285, 296.

The abstract ended in *-kmt-s (in the nom. sing.): Gr. Fī-xari
i-kāς eis-xashion O.Ir. fī-che. The ordinal ended in *-kmt'θo-
*-kmt'λμονο-: Gr. Boeot. Fī-xarō-c Lat. vi-cēsimu-s.

Aryan. Avest. visaiti. Skr. višati- is a singular ab-
stract noun formed from the nom. acc. du. in *-satī, after the
analogy of sāṣtī- '60', saptatī- '70' etc.: people said višatād
hārīnaṃ, and with the case of the latter word assimilated višatād
hāribhiṣ 'with 20 bay steeds' just as they said sāṣṭaḥ hārīnaṃ
and sāṣṭaḥ hāribhiṣ 'with 60 bay steeds'. The later višat- seems
to be merely an ad-formate of the numbers 30 to 50 trīṣāt- etc.,

1) Danielsson (Epigraphica, Upsala 1890, p. 33) would now regard
Heracl. Fēkorti as Flxorti influenced by the form of Att. εικονι, which he
takes to stand for ἐικονι. The diphthong of ει- has no real support
whatever in the other Indo-Germanic languages; still I can see no valid
reason for denying that it represents an original preethnic form.

Brugmann, Elements. III.
as on the other hand *višati-š was the type for trišati-š which was used in more recent times along with trištēt-. Avest. vi- may come from vi-; see the Author, Morph. Unt. V 27.

20th. Avest. višastema- instead of *višastema-, see § 176 Rem. 2. Skr. višati-tamā-s, derived from višati- (cp. šašti-tamā-s § 178), and višā-s like ekādaśā-s 'eleventh' etc.

Armenian. Esan probably for *gsan *gšan(t) with g- = y-, -s- = k-, -an- = -m-, see I § 232 p. 197. Esan, like the multiples of ten that followed it, received inflexion once more (as an i-stem), e.g. gen. dat. Esan-i-č; and later it was also declined in the singular. Ordinal Esan-erord.

Greek. Dor. Boeot. Fikar, and with εi Dor. Feikar Ion. Att. eixos. Hom. levwos. 20th Boeot. Fikastro-ς Att. elxournos. Abstract: Boeot. Fikas Thess. Ixas Att. eixas. The quantity of I in the first syllable has not been ascertained. -o- in place of -α- was due to the following multiples of tcn, its first source being the ending -xovta; see § 176 Rem. 2 p. 31. Hesychius has preserved another form ἵκαντιν (MS. iκάντιν) with the -v- of -xovta. The τ ἐπελυκτικόν may have been first added to ἵκοι when it was used as a dative, cp. inscr. ἀνδράσιν ἐν ἐκαί ἐκοιν (Maassen, De littera τ paragogica, 1881, p. 34).

Italic. vi-ginti. vicēsimu-s, rarely vīgēsimu-s. Whether vi- represents Idg. *vi- or *mei- is uncertain; we find veiginti in C.I.L. I 1194, later than 105 B.C. It is also doubtful why the final -i of -ginti is long; was an original -i- lengthened on the analogy of -a in trīgintā etc., or was -oi or -eī, the ending of the nom. acc. du. neut. of o-stems (see § 293), substituted for it? The -g- Thurneysen holds to be correct phonetically in septingenti nōngenti (quadringenī octingenti), and then to have extended itself by analogy into other numbers (I § 499 p. 366); in considering this question, we must not forget that a media ŋ seems also to be indicated by the -z- of Alban. -zet 'group of 20' (né-zét 'one score', dű-zét 'two score' etc.) — see G. Meyer, Abh. zu M. Hertz' 70. Geburtstag 1888, pp. 90 f., and compare the mediae in Lat. quadrus- § 168 ν. 11, Gr. ἕδομος-ς O.C.Sl. sedmi § 171 p. 19.
§§ 177, 178. Cardinals, Abstract Numerals, and Ordinals.

Old Irish. fi-che (gen. fichet dat. fichit) for *-knt-s (I § 243 p. 201, § 620 p. 467, § 634 pp. 474 f., § 657. 6 p. 500, § 685 p. 552); possibly fi- took the place of *yě- or *yē- after the analogy of tricha. O.Cymr. u-ceint Corn. u-gans, the u of which has not been explained; cp. Thurneysen in Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVI 310 footnote 2. 20th Mid.Ir. fichet-mad (inferred from cōicet-mad).

Germanic. Goth. tōdītīgus, dat. tōdīmtīgum. O.H.G. zwein-zug O.Sax. twēn-tig, the first part being a crystallised dative. 20th O.H.G. zweinzug-ōsto. As to tegu- for *deknt- see p. 31 footnote 1.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. originally *dvi dēszimti (dual), hence dvideszimti uninflected, and also a dialectic form dvidesziṃts through assimilation to trisdeszimts etc.; 20th O.Lith. antra-s deszimta-s, modern dvideszimta-s. O.C.Sl. děva desěti (dual, so desěť is masc.); 20th děvadesěšini děvadesěšini, and, following the fashion of stem-compounds, děvadesěšini (cp. pěto-na-desěšini § 175 p. 29).

§ 178. Multiples of Ten, from Thirty to Ninety.

Aryan. Traces of the old neuter plural phrases *trī komto etc. survive in the first components of Avest. caŋvar*-sat- and Skr. paṃca-sāt- Avest. pāṃca-sat-, since these followed the analogy of *trī- (see § 176 p. 29), and also in the first part of Skr. caṭavāri-sāt-, in which *caṭavāri- changed to caṭavāri- on the analogy of vī- and trī-. In proethmic Aryan the feminine singular abstract nouns displaced the old plural phrases, and in the same period these same forms, in the numbers from 60 to 90, were themselves displaced by abstract nouns derived from the units, Skr. saṣṭi- s Avest. xṣvaṣṭi-š ‘a group of six’ (i.e. six tens), and so forth.

In the second member of 30, 40, and 50 the weak stem *-knt- = Skr. -sāt- Avest. -sat- has levelled out the others; Skr. trī-sāt- caṭavāri-sāt- paṃca-sāt-, Avest. ṭri-sat- caŋvar*-sat- pāṃca-sat-; *-komt- is found only in Avest. ṭri-saq, an indeclinable word, which corresponds to O.Ir. nom. sing. tri-cha (cp. Ascoli, Krit. Stud. 100). In Avestic the acc. in -sat-em was
used for the nominative, as well, doubtless under the influence of the neuter sāte-m '100'; hence the word was declined as an o-stem, gen. pl. pṛisatunām, pāncāsata-gāya- 'space of 50 paces'. In Sanskrit the analogy of viṣati-ḥ gave rise to triṣati-ḥ, which was used along with triṣāt-ḥ.

With regard to the first member, the following are directly descended from Indo-Germanic forms: Avest. caṗwahr̥- from *getỵh̥- (cp. I § 306 p. 242) and Skr. pāncā- Avest. pānca- from *peneqē-, see § 176 p. 29. Whether Skr. triḥ- represents pre-Aryan *trim-, or is an ad-formate of vi-, is a doubtful point; Skr. cateqari- instead of *cateqari- must count as an ad-formate of this kind. Avest. caṗwahr̥-sat- was confused with compounds like atar̥-carana-; hence alongside of caṗru-māhyā- adj. 'every four months, connected with four months', and the like, were coined such compounds as caṗwahr̥-zavagra- 'four-footed'. This same caṗwahr̥-sat- may therefore have suggested pṛi-sat- instead of *pṛi-sat- or *pṛiṣat-, and pāncā-sat- (beside pāncā-sat-). But the pṛi- of the MSS. may be an incorrect mode of writing pṛi- or pṛi- (see the Author, Morph. Unt. V 27), and pāncā-sat- may be a genuine product of the time when *peneqē komtō was still spoken and had not yet been changed to *peneqē komtō (see § 176 Rem. 1).

60 Skr. śaṭṭī-ḥ Avest. xēvaṣṭi-ḥ. 70 Skr. saptāṭī-ḥ Avest. haptāṭī-ḥ — the a of the latter is due to that of aṣṭāṭī-; a is retained in haptāṭī-pant- 'seventy-fold'. 80 Skr. aṣṭī-ḥ (cp. § 172 Rem. p. 19), Avest. aṣṭāṭī-ḥ. 90 Skr. navāṭī-ḥ Avest. navavitā-ḥ. Skr. śaṭṭī-ḥ and Avest. navavitā-ḥ have not ceased to bear the more general sense of 'group of six', 'group of nine'.

Remark. We may assign a reason for the use of śaṭṭī-ḥ etc. in place of corresponding abstracts of the same kind as triḥ-śāt-ḥ. Such a use suggests that in proethnic Aryan higher numbers could be expressed by a sexagesimal notation, in which the word śaṭṭī-ḥ xēvaṣṭi-ḥ 'three-score' held the most prominent place. Even in historical times the ancient Persians had a remarkable liking for the number sixty and its multiples, as the Romans had for sexācientā and sessentā (see Cantor, Matheōmat. Beitr. zum Kulturleben der Völker, 1883, p. 361 f.). The original compound numeral for 60 was displaced by śaṭṭī-ḥ in proethnic Aryan, and corresponding expressions for the following tens established themselves later by analogy.
In the phrases Skr. *trisatá hárīnam, *gaśthā hárīnam 'with 30, 60 bay steeds' the cases were assimilated, giving *trisatá háribhiṣ, *gaśthā háribhiṣ: and a further assimilation of the first word to the number of the second produced Skr. pāncasadbhir vānaiṣ 'with 50 arrows', the numeral being now regarded as an adjective. The Avestic *pīsatanam banrīnān 'triginta fibrorum' is similar (cp. Lith. *deszmintisa méstosu p. 23 footnote 1, Lat. ducentī rītī § 180). It is improbable that the latter construction is immediately connected with the original neut. pl. phrases *tri komto 'three tens' etc.

Ordinals. Skr. *trisat-tamā-s caablāryāt-tamā-s pāncasad-tamā-s and *trisā-s caablāryā-s pāncasā-s like riśū-s (§ 177 p. 33). *gaśti-tamā-s saptatī-tamā-s aśiti-tamā-s navatī-tamā-s and *gaśṭā-s saptatī-s aśītā-s navatā-s (observe that ṭ distinguishes these from *gaśṭhā-s 'sixth' saptātha-s 'seventh', which have th); the last three are to be compared with -sata- '100th' (§ 179). In Avestic only *prisata- '30th' is actually found.

Armenian: -sun came from the stem *komt- (I § 79 p. 70), and is probably shortened for *-sounta. Sometimes we have -a-, the 'vowel of composition', (cp. II § 28 p. 45). 30 eresun for *eria-a-sun. 40 kar-a-sun; kar- probably stands for *qayf- (cp. arm-ukn 'elbow' = Skr. *īr-mā- Avest. ar-*ma-, I § 306 p. 241). 50 yi-sun, cp. I § 330 Rem. p. 265, and Bugge, Beitr. zur etym. Erläut. der armen. Sprache, p. 10; whether *peneq̣- or *peneqe- be the form contained in this word it is impossible to decide. 60 vəl-sun, cp. vēc 'six' and vēs-tasan '16'. 70 evtan-a-sun. 80 uē-sun. 90 ith-sun. The numerals in -sun remained for a long time indeclinable, and afterwards, like ṭesan '20' (§ 177 p. 34), became inflected; they were declined as t-stems, e.g. gen. dat. eresn-i-č; later they were declined in the singular as well.

Ordinals: eresn-erord karasen-erord etc.

Greek. *kōntra was indeclinable from preethnic Greek onwards. Occasional exceptions to this rule, such as τισσερακόνταν (inscr. of Chios), ῥημάκων (Hesiod), ῥημάκωνσι (Anthol.) are re-formates of a late period, and so are πέμπτον (§ 169 p. 13) and δέκα (§ 174 p. 22).
30. τριά-κοντα Ion. τριή-κοντα instead of *τριή-κοντα. *τριή-first gave place to *τριά-, since all nom. acc. pl. neut. took the termination -ά from consonant-stems (§§ 337 ff.); then ἄ was lengthened on the analogy of τετρά-κοντα and πεντή-κοντα. Similarly we have τριά-χας.


50. Att.-Dor. etc. πεντή-κοντα = Idg. *peko-ku-. Cp. § 176 p. 29. The -η- of this word passed on to the following multiples of ten, as in Latin the a of quadra-ginta passed on to quinquaginta sexa-ginta and the rest.

60. Att. Dor. etc. ἕξ-ή-κοντα, Cret. Φεξήκοντα.

70. Att. Ion. ἰδρου-ή-κοντα, Heracl. Delph. ἰδρεμιήκοντα. It is not clear how ἰδρου-ή- is to be explained (cp. ἰδρομιάς ἰδρομαχις and ἰδρομο-ς). Perhaps it contains an Idg. *septom- (cp. *-dkom-t- beside *-dkm-t-). Cp. § 171 p. 17, and the Author, Morph. Unt. V 36 ff. ἰδρεμιήκοντα seems to be a modification of ἰδρομιήκοντα due to the influence of ἑννήκοντα. Thus modified it gave rise itself to the Epidaurian ἰδρεμαίζος (p. 19).


90. Hom. ἐννήκοντα Oetean ἐννήκοντα for *ἐνῆ-ή- like Armen. inn-sun, cp.Hom. ἐν-ήμαρ; in the Homeric age the words used seem to have been ἐννήκοντα ἐνῆμαρ (the Author, op. cit. 41 ff. and 45). Att. Hom. ἐννήκοντα Heracl. ἐννήκοντα (cp. Heracl. ἐννία § 173 p. 21) for *ἐννε-ή-κοντα, from which we should infer an Idg. stem *enyn- *nyen-, to which it is possible to refer Lat. non-ā-gintā nōn-u-s and O.Ir. nōicht-ech 'of ninety years'. Cp. the Author, op. cit. 39 ff.

In the ordinals of the tens from 30 to 90 *-χαστο-ς became -χαστο-ς through assimilation to -κοντα in proethnic Greek (§ 176 Rem. 2 pp. 30 f.). τριάκοστο-ς, τετράκοστο-ς and τετταράκοστο-ς, πεντήκοστο-ς, ἰδρεμιήκοστο-ς, ὀγδοηκοστο-ς, ἐννήκοστο-ς.
Italic. No evidence is forthcoming except in Latin. *-ginta instead of *-gontā owed the change of its final to the analogy of o-stems (cp. § 342); *i- (earlier -e-) instead of -o- may be due either to the vowel gradation seen in different cases of the Idg. neut. pl. *koni-, or to the analogy of vi-gintā (§ 176 p. 30); as to -y- instead of -e-, the student may refer to § 177 p. 34. *tris is the old nom. acc. neut. *quadra- is the Idg. *getỵ-; its -a- passed on to the following tens, as the -η- of πεντε-κοντα did to ἵδε-κοντα and the rest. *quinq̣uā- (instead of *quinque-). *sex̣a-... *septuā- has been assimilated to octuā-, octuā- for *octuō-ā- (like Gr. οὐδε-η-κοντα) belongs to the popular language (cp. § 172 p. 21); the literary form is octō- (like Gr. οὗδω-κοντα). It is uncertain whether *non-ā- stands for pre-Italian *neyen-, like Gr. ἑν(η)ερ-η-κοντα, or for pre-Italic *neμη-, like Gr. ἐνη(η)ερ-η-κοντα (Hom. ἐνη(η)ερ-κοντα).

Ordinals. *trechesimus- (like vīchesimus-) and *tre-gēsimu-s. Only *gēsimu-s occurs in the rest of the series, quadrā-gēsimu-s etc.

Old Irish. *-cha -ga and -ca (see I § 514 pp. 375 f.) for *-koni-s, gen. *chat dat. *chit -chait. 30 *tris-cha with original short i, as Bret. tregont shows; *trecha would be the regular form; the word may have taken its present shape under the influence partly of tri 'tria', which is used before substantives as an independent word, partly of κέ- '20'. *tris- is the stem, in place of nom. acc. pl. neut. *trī-. 40 cethor-cha either for *cetura- (nom. acc. pl. neut., cp. Gr. τετταρά-κοντα) or for *cetru- (the stem, cp. Gall. Petru-corius and tri-cha); Mid.Ir. cethracha, which doubtless follows cethri 'four'. 50 cōica, perhaps by syllabic dissimilation (cp. Gall. Leucamnulus for *Lenc农业-camulus-, I § 643 p. 483); is the contained unit *pēgo- or *pēq̣e-? see the Author, Morph. Unt. V 33. 60 ses-ca. 70 sechtmo-ga -go, which may stand for *sechtum-u-cont- or for *sechtom-u-cont- (cp. cethorcha for *cetru-cont- [?] and O.Cymr. trimuñeint '30'). Cp. the Author, Morph. Unt. V 38. 80 oĉhtmo-ga is certainly an ad-formate of sechtmo-ga. 90 Mid.Ir. nocha or nocha, O.IR. perhaps *nōicha (cp. nōicht-ech 'of ninety years'); was *nō(ī)ca the older form (see I § 212 pp. 178 f. and
§ 513 p. 375) and did tri-cha cause the change from c to "ch, or was it *nō((i)ncha, where ch instead of c would shew that a vowel had dropped between n and cha? It remains a doubtful point whether the contained unit is *neyn- or *neyen- (cp. Gr. ἵν(τ)εν-ην-κοντα).

The Ordinals end in -mad, as 50th cōicet-mad cōicat-mad.

For expressions like tri deich '30', cōic deich '50' (cp. the Germanic and Balto-Slavonic) and dā fichit '40' tri fichit '60' (cp. Alban. dū-zēt, tre-zēt) see Stokes, Bezzenb, Beitr. XI 167 ff., and Pott, Die quin. und vig. Zählm. 99 ff.

Germanic. Goth. 30 prēis-tigjus, acc. prins-tiguns, gen. priē-tigirē. 40 pīdvōr-tigjus. 50 fimf-tigjus. 60 saihs-tigjus. O.H.G. dēri-zug (the spirant z is due to the preceding vowel, see I § 533 p. 390; yet on the analogy of zweīn-zug and the following tens the word came to have z = ts, as the spelling trēcīg etc. shews), fīor-zug, fimf-zug, sehzug sehszug (the latter a re-formate, ep. Lat. sescentī and sexcentī, § 180). As regards the origin of tigu- and -zug, see p. 31 footnote 1.

For 70, 80, and 90 we have in Gothic siṁuntē-hund ahtantē-
hund niṁnte-hund, which are mostly indeclinable, though once we find a gen. in -is. niṁnte-hundis; in Old High German of the oldest period, sibunzo ahtozō (-z- instead of -t- is a re-formation) niunzo (not actually found, but this is a mere accident); in Old Saxon ant-sibunta ant-ahtoda; and in Anglo-Saxon hund- seo-
fontiz hund-eahatiz hund-nizontiz. These were all ad-formates of an expression for 100, Goth. tathuntē-hund O.H.G. zehnzō A.S. hund-teontiz, which will be explained in § 179. Probably the Indo-Germanic expressions for 70, 80, and 90 which answered to Goth. prēis-tigjus etc. lost their original meanings in proethnic Germanic, and were then superseded by this new series which follows the analogy of tathuntē-hund. Yet in West Germanic there was a kind of reaction to the older type, and O.H.G. siḏunzo ahtozō niunzo during the ninth and succeeding centuries were gradually made to conform to the type of the preceding tens, and transformed into sibunzug ahtozug niunzug; and similarly, in Anglo-Saxon, *hund-seofonta became
§ 178. Cardinals, Abstract Numerals, and Ordinals.

*hund-seofontiʒ*, and the others of this set were changed in like manner. Cp. the Author, Morph. Unt. V 49 f.

The forms in *-zug* and *-zo* were still regarded as substantives in O.H.G., since they governed a genitive case as *feorzug wehhōnō, sibunzo wehhōnō*; the present type is in *vierzig wochen* 'in forty weeks', like Skr. *paścakudhibhir pāṇātiṣ* (§ 178 pp. 36 f).

No ordinals are found in Gothic. In O.H.G. we have *drīzugōsto* etc. like *zveinzugōsto*.

Balto-Slavonic.

Lithuanian. 30 trūs dēszimtys (stem deszimti-) and dēszimts (stem deszimt-), like O.C.Sl. četryri desęti beside četry dęscęte. Each word of the expression was declined independently (with the gen. pl. of the word whose number was to be expressed), as acc. trūs dēszimtis, gen. trįži dēszimtā. Similarly 10 kėtūrius dēszimtys (dēszimts), acc. kėtures dēszimtis, etc. These expressions are found in Old Lithuanian, and still survive as dialectic variants; but as a rule they became compounds, the unit coalescing with the ten. The accusative became the regular form in the first part, and in the second, -deszimts was crystallised in some dialects, as trūs-deszimts kėtures-deszimts etc.; whilst elsewhere (in the literary language) del-deszimt '20' set the type for the final member, and its -deszimt passed on to the rest of the series, as trūs-deszimt etc. Other kinds of change in the older language are discussed by Bezzenberger, Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr., 181 f. — Ordinals. Old Lithuanian has such phrases as penktu-s dėzimta-s (cp. antra-s dėzimta-s '20th'), and such compounds as penktu-dėzimtu-s, '50th'. The forms now used, trūs-dėzimta-s kėtures-dėzimta-s etc., have been modified by association with the cardinal. Forms with the 'vowel of composition', like kėtūri-dėzimta-s '40th' septyni-dėzimta-s '70th', are also said to occur. See Bezzenberger, op. cit. 185 f.; Schleicher, Lit. Gr. 151 f.

Slavonic. 30 tri desęti. 40 četryri desęti, and masc. četryre desęte. 50 peti desęti = petrač desętron, 60 šesti desęti etc. — The Ordinals end in *-u*, tridesęti, četyridesęti, petvidesęti,
etc.; sometimes they contain the 'vowel of composition' -o-, as sedmodesefinnu beside sednidesefinnu '70th'.

§ 179. Hundred. The 1dg. cardinal was *kempto-m for *dekempto-m (§ 164 pp. 2 f.) 'group of ten (sc. tens)', a neuter subst. governing the gen. pl. In this word 'tens' is understood, as it is in Skr. daśati-ś, which means both 'decas' and 'centum'. But in Goth. tauhunte-hund 'dēzdevar dēzic' the original expression seems to have been kept without abbreviation.

Skr. satā-m. Various constructions are found, — satēna hārīnām, satēṇa hāribhiṣ and satā hāribhiṣ 'with 100 bay steeds'; and the Veda has satā pūras as well as satā pūras '100 cities'. sata- in composition, as satā-patra-s 'having 100 wings', but also satān-aṭi-ś 'offering a hundred helps, giving help an hundred-fold', Avest. sate-m.


Gr. ἵκατωρ, which has become indeclinable and is used always as an adjective, as ἵκατωρ ἀγρόπασι. This is the sole form found in composition, ἵκατωρ having entirely disappeared; examples are ἵκατομι-βη ἵκατογ-χειρο-ς (ἵκατοστομο-ς may be derived from *ἵκατοστομο-ς, as laid down in I § 204 p. 171); — we even find such compounds as ἵκατοντα-χάρυο-ς (cp. Ἴκατοντά, Ἴκατοντάκας), following τριάκοντα-εἴνος and the like. Arcad. ἵκατος-βοια like Ion. Att. -κόσοι, cp. § 176 Rem. 2 p. 31. ἵ-κατόν is probably a confusion of two modes of expression, *ἀ-κατόν (cp. Skr. sa-hāsra-m 'one thousand') and *ἐν κατόν (cp. Alban. ne kint O.H.G. ein hunt 'one hundred'), which were used interchangeably like Skr. dōi-satā-m and dōe satē '200'.

Lat. centum, like ἵκατωρ, is crystallised and used as an adjective; but centi- (centu-) is found in compounds, as centi-mani-s. though we also have centum-pondium centum-peda etc. (cp. Skutsch, De nominum Lat. compositione, p. 37).

O.Ir. cēl, declined as a neuter-ō-stem. Also cōic fichti.

Goth. hund O.H.G. hunt n. only in 200 and the following hundreds; Goth. tva hunda O.H.G. zvei hunt etc., whence ein hunt, but only in late O.H.G. The word for hundred in
Gothic was *talhunāz-hund (sometimes distorted into *talhunat−
hund), in Anglo-Saxon *hund-tenilt instead of *-teōnta, in the
earliest Old High German zehanze (hunt being dropped), lit.
*tāxādon tāxāč; tālhunt− = tāxāč, common ground-form *dek-
md−, cp. Wheeler, Der griech. Nominalascent p. 38, and in
this work vol. I p. 199 footnote 1 and § 469.7 p. 346. I re-
gard this, as I have already said, as being the oldest Indo-
Germanic mode of designating a hundred, and I consider the
old Germanic expressions for 70, 80, and 90 to be re-formates
following the analogy of the number 100; Goth. sibuntē− being
equivalent to Gr. ἕνταξων, and niuntē− to Gr. ἑνταξων. See
and 268. O.H.G. zehanzo with a like zahan, see § 174 p. 23.
With regard to O.Sax. ant− in ant-sibunta, which is a distorted
form of *hund−, see the Author, op. cit. p. 142, and what is
said in § 352 of this volume on Norse Runic pri-taunta.

Lith. szįntas (which has become masculine, see § 403)
and O.C.Sl. šito are in living use as substantives. In šito the
š is strange; perhaps the word was borrowed (cp. the Author,
13 f.); we should expect *šęto, which seems to be represented
in tysęsta for *ty-šęt-ia; see § 181.

For the Ordinal, the original proethic expression has not
been clearly determined. Only two branches of the language
agree in a formation which could be regarded as proethnic: Skr.
-satā− Lith. szįntas.

Skr. shata-tamā-s Avest. satō-tamā− (for the -s− cp. II § 73
p. 178). Sanskrit has also šata− in composition, as ėkašatā-s
‘101°’.

Armen. hariur-ord, hariur-erord.
Gr. ἱκαρ-ορό− following τριχοστό− etc., cp. also ἱκατοντα−
-kapνο− on the last page.
Lat. cent-ēsimus following trīcēsimus− etc.
O.Ir. cēt-mad.
O.H.G. zehanzug-ōsto.
Lith. szįntas (szimtas-is); it is certainly wrong to assume
that this stands for *szimto-ta-s, as Bezzzenberger does, or for *szim-ta-s, with Pott and Schleicher. O.C.Sl. süt-ůnů.

§ 180. Two Hundred to Nine Hundred.

Cardinal and Abstract Series. The parent language had two methods of expressing these multiples of a hundred. The unit might be prefixed to *kmtō-m, both being in the same case and in the dual or plural number; as *dvaiktōj du. '200', *trī kmtā pl. '300' and so forth. This usage is found in Aryan, Irish, Germanic, and Balto-Slavonic. The other mode was to make a singular compound, whose first part was the stem of the unit; as *dvi-kmtō-m 'the state of being 200', tri-kmtō-m, etc. This appears in Aryan, Greek, and Latin.

Aryan. Skr. 200 dvē śatē and dvi-śatā-m, and later a re-formate dvīśatī f.1), 300 trīśi śatāni and tri-śatā-m trīśatī etc. Avest. 200 duve śaitē (for duve see Bartholomae, Handb. § 92), 500 panca sata, 900 navā sata.

Armenian. 200 erku hariu and erkeriu, 300 erekk-hariur, 400 čorekk-hariur etc.

Greek. A group of compounds formed with -kato- (so Dor. and Boeot., -katāc- Arcad., -kato- Ion. Att., as to the first o of which see § 176 Rem. 2 p. 31 and § 179 p. 42) was derived from the neuter abstract series by adding -iō-. For example, τετραχάτσο- 'connected with the state of being 400, consisting of 400' is derived from *tetroukato-ν 'the state of being 400'; cp. Skr. -ṣat-ya-, as ṣaṣtriṣacchātya-s 'consisting of 136' śatīn- (Ved.) 'forming a group of 100, hundredfold' (where -in- stands for from -iō- -en-, see II § 115 pp. 357 f.); and cp. also Goth. pūsundi O.C.Sl. týsētā '1000' (§ 181), which is probably to be derived from *tůsk-kmt-iō- 'containing many hundreds', and the same suffix -iō- in χιλι-ο- Skr. sahasr-eya- (§ 181). Hence the use of the singular, for example, in Thucydidus I 62 τήν διακοσίαν ῥημόν 'cavalry consisting of a group of 200' and Xenophon Cyr. IV 6 2 ῥημόν ἔχω διαχίλιαν κοσιονίαν. This series of

1) Kluge holds that these compounds in -śatī are original forms, of which the Greek and Latin words in -centi and -xtrōς are transformates (Paul's Grds., I 405). This view is untenable.
derivatives in -σον- then superseded constructions corresponding to Skr. dve śatē and dviśatā-m, which must have once existed in Greek, precisely as χιλιος has ousted *χισλον-ν, which answered to the Skr. sahāśra-m. 200 διάκοσιον; Ion. διηκόσιον instead of *δι-κόσιον by assimilation to 300 τριά-κόσιον Ion. τριηκόσιον. This latter form itself may have arisen from a blending of *τρι-κόσιον with *τριά κατά (Skr. tṛépi śatāni), the α being lengthened after the analogy of τριά-κοντα (cp. § 178 pp. 37 f.); or, as seems to me more probable, it was transformed from *τρι-κόσιον after the analogy of τριά-κοντα, as the Homeric πεντεκόσιον undoubtedly has been assimilated to πεντήκοντα. 400 τετρακόσιοι. 500 πεντακόσιοι instead of *πεντεκόσιοι, like πεντά-πηχυς etc., see § 169 p. 13. 600 εξακόσιοι, like ἕξ-πολις etc., see § 170 p. 16. 700 ἕξακόσιοι. 800 ἕξακόσιοι, like ἕξα-πολις etc., see § 172 p. 20. 900 ἑνακόσιοι. Cp. the Author, Morph. Unt. V 7 ff.

Italic. Only Latin has any examples. The neuter abstract series is represented by O.Lat. forms with -centum -gentum, ducentum 'a group of 200', etc. Their original character is seen most clearly when they govern the genitive case, in descriptions of weight and measure with aeris, aurī, frūmentī and the like, as argentī sescentum (Lucilius). And in one instance nōngentum is used as a crystallised adjective, precisely as centum is, C. I. L. IV 1136 locuntur balneum Venerium et nōngentum tabernae pergulae cenacula. ducentum became the plural adjective ducentis in very much the same way as Gr. *δικαιεῖλον ἀνδρῶν becomes δικαίου ανέος (Hom.), and Skr. pācascata vāṇānām becomes pāncāsabhir vāṇaiś, etc. (§ 178 pp. 36 f.). nōngentu-s 'belonging to 900' (Plin. XXXIII 2 § 31) is an instructive form; it is related to nōngentu-m as tri-viū-s 'connected with three ways' to tri-viū-m 'place where three ways meet'. du-centi like du-plex etc., § 166 p. 7. trē-centi, cp. § 167 p. 8. quadrin-genti instead of *quadrus-, following septi-gentī, quin-gentī (quincentum *Fest.) for *quinque-cento-. sescenti like miscēo for *mic-seced (I § 503 p. 369), and, once more assimilated to sex, sexcenti, cp. O.H.G. sehs-zug '60' instead of sehznug, which is
also found (§ 178 p. 40). septin-genti, octin-genti instead of *octi- or *octō-, following septin-genti. non-genti, and in Columella non-in-genti following septin-genti. The -g- and -c- have been discussed in § 177 p. 34, where we concluded that the sound represented by g is probably Idg. ţ; and that if the voiced character of the consonant is really so old, these Latin numerals are based upon proethic stem-compounds, *dui-ęntō- and so forth. Cp. the Author, op. cit. 3 ff.

Old Irish. 200 dú cēt, dat. dúi cētaib, 300 trí cēt etc.

Germanic. 200 Goth. tvo hunda (dat. teāim hundam) O.H.G. zwei hund, 300 Goth. þrija hunda O.H.G. thrīu hunt etc. O.H.G. also has such phrases as zwiro xehanzug 'twice 100', finstunt xehanzug 'five times 100', cp. Gr. δεκα-χίλιον.

Lith. 200 dū szimtū or dūszimtu, 300 trūs szimtai or trū(s)szimtai etc. In Bretken we find szimtas crystallised in the singular form: du szimts vyru '200 men', szëszë szimtas vyru '600 men' etc. O.C.Si. 200 dūvé sūtē, 300 tri sūta and so forth.

Ordinals.

Sanskrit. Here the words are associated with the neuter abstracts: 200th devātā-s and devātamatā-s, 300th triḥātā-s and triḥātamatā-s etc.

Armen. 200th erkeriu-erord etc.

Gr. διάκοσι-οστό-ς, τριάκοσι-οστό-ς etc. are re-formates like ἱκατ-οστό-ς, see § 179 p. 43.

Lat. ducent-ēsimu-s trecent-ēsimu-s and so forth (besides nōngentēsimu-s Priscian vouches for nōningentēsimu-s, which is like nōningentē, for which see above).

Remark. Priscian has preserved certain forms which do not occur elsewhere, namely duēsimus treēsimus quadrigēsimus quingēsimus sesēsimus septigēsimus octigēsimus nōngēsimus. These cannot be really an old series, simply for the reason that -cēsimu- must represent *-cent-+simu-, and -cent- (instead of -cento-) cannot have been really an old expression for 100. They look as though the names for the multiples of ten, *cēsimu-s and the rest, had been altered by the stem being substituted for the old case or quasi-case, the meaning of so many hundreds being given to the new word.

O.Ir. and O.Germ. No forms preserved.
Lith. 200<sup>th</sup> <i>dusimtás-is</i> etc. O.C.Sl. 200<sup>th</sup> <i>dvosūtynï</i> (where the 'vowel of composition' has found its way into the word), 300<sup>th</sup> <i>trisūtynï</i>, and so forth.

§ 181. Thousand. The different languages do not agree in their modes of expressing a thousand; hence we cannot be sure how it was expressed in the parent language. See § 164 p.2.

*<i>gheslo</i>- is the form indicated by Skr. <i>sa-hásra-m</i> Avest. <i>ha-zanore-m</i>, Gr. Lesb. <i>χιλι-κοι</i> Dor. <i>χιλιοι</i> Ion. <i>χιλιοι</i> (I § 565 p. 423); Att. <i>χίλιοι</i> may come from Idg. *<i>ghžlo-</i>, see Thurneysen, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 353. Skr. <i>sa-hásram</i> 'one thousand' like Gr. <i>κ-κατών</i> 'one hundred', see § 179 p. 42; <i>sahasram pśinām</i> and <i>sahasram pśayas</i> '1000 bards', like <i>satam pśinām</i> and <i>satam pśayas</i>; and, with the number assimilated, <i>sahasrāṇy ādhivrathāṇi '1000 waggonsloads'</i> like <i>satā pārā</i>. In Greek, *<i>ἐννεάχελον</i> 'a group of 9000' and *<i>δεκαχελον</i> 'a group of 10,000' became plural adjectives: Hom. <i>ἐννεάχελοι</i>, <i>δεκάχελοι</i> (ep. § 180 p. 45), Idg. *<i>ghesl-ijō</i> 'consisting of 1000'; Skr. <i>sa-hasr-īya</i>- 'consisting of 1000, thousandfold', e.g. <i>sahasriyō</i> <i>bхаgās</i> 'a share consisting of a thousand, thousandfold share', Gr. <i>χίλιοι-χελοι</i>, like <i>ίππος</i> <i>δισχίλια</i> (see p. 44), and further <i>χίλιοι</i> <i>ἄνδρες</i> like <i>τριάκόσιοι</i> <i>ἀνδρεῖς</i> (see p. 45). Ordinals: Skr. <i>sahasra-tamā-s</i>, Gr. Att. <i>χιλι-οτό-ς</i>.

Armen. <i>hasar</i> is borrowed from the Iranian.

Lat. <i>milī</i> <i>milium</i> (meilia in Lucilius); it is often connected with Gr. <i>μύρων</i> (see L. Havet, Mém. de la Soc. de ling., III 415, and Thurneysen, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 353); but I do not consider that this connexion has, been proved: <i>milī-ēsimu-s</i> like <i>cent-ēsimu-s</i>.

O.Ir. <i>mile</i> (I do not know whether the ordinal <i>mil-mad</i> has been found) was probably borrowed from the Latin.

Goth. <i>pūsdndi</i> f., in one place neuter, (in tva <i>pūsundja</i> '2000'; but this form may be regarded as a nom. du. fem. in Idg. *<i>-ai</i>, see § 286), O.H.G. <i>dūsunt thūsunt</i> f. and n. Lith. <i>tūkstānti-s</i> gen. -<i>ceio</i> (Lett. <i>tūkstā-t-s</i>), ordinal <i>tukstanti-s-is</i>; O.C.Sl. <i>tysešta</i> <i>tvušta</i> f. for *<i>-entjā</i> *<i>-ontjā</i>, ordinal <i>tyseštin unimaginatable.

On the strength of the Frankish <i>thūs-chunde</i> <i>thius-chundes</i> (from
the dialect of the Salii, one of the three great branches of the Franke) O.Icel. þáskundred and West-Goth. thyu-phaltus
‘chiliarch, leader of a thousand’ (cp. þásundi-faþs in Wulfila), it
has been prettily suggested that this word, common to Germanic
and Balto-Slavonic, is a compound of an adjective *tús- and the
word for 100. *tús- would be a word connected with Skr. tavaþ-
‘strong, strength’ tvaþ-tama- ‘strongest’, showing the weak form
of the stem, cp. Skr. instr. bhiþ-á from bhiyás- ‘fear’. The
meaning of this compound would be ‘a group of many hundreds’;
see Scherer, Zur Gesch. der deutsch. Spr. 2 590, Bugge in Paul-
The -n- of the Lithuanian and Lettic words (cp. Pruss. tásinto-ns
acc. pl.) is enough to shew that some analogical transformation
must have affected them; perhaps they were associated with the
participle of the present (Lett.) tâkstu ‘I swell’. Cp. the Author,
Morph. Unt. V 10 f.

MULTIPLICATIVES AND DISTRIBUTIVES.

§ 182. Multiplicatives.

1. Numeral Adverbs and Adverbial expressions.
The parent language had adverbs ending in -s for twice,
thrice, and four times.

‘Twice’ *dùsi-s (*dùsi-s), cp. *dùsi- in composition and used
Gr. δίς. Lat. bis, O.Lat. duis also, see § 166 Rem. 1 p. 7. Goth.
tvis-var ‘twice’, and further O.H.G. zwís-k zwís-ki adj. ‘twofold’,
O.Icel. tvis-t-r ‘divided into two parts’ Engl. twis-t, i.e. a cord
or thread of two strands.

perhaps for *ters and this for *trís (I § 33 pp. 33 f.); beside
which we find trînu-s for *trís-no- (§ 183). O.Ir. tress- ‘third.
doubtless for *trís-to- (II § 81 p. 247). O.H.G. drîr-or O.Icel
pîrîs-var ‘thrice’, cp. zwir-or tvis-var above mentioned; O.H.G.
dris-k drîs-ki ‘ternus’.

‘Four times’. Skr. catûr for *caturś (I § 647. 7 pp. 493 f.)
Avest. caṇruś, cp. Skr. catur-daṣu as contrasted with Avest.
caṇru-duṣa etc. discussed by Wackernagel in Kuhn’s Ztschr.
XXV 283 f. Lat. quater, the ending transformed by association
with ter: cp. quaternu-s: ternu-s.

There seems to have been another mode of expression in
the parent language, to which are due the following: Skr. sa-kṛt
‘once, one time’ pāṁca kṛtvās ‘five times’, Lith. čėną karať
‘once’ dū’ kartaū ‘twice’ trės kartašūs ‘three times’. O.C.Sl. duťer-
kratę ‘twice’ petit kratű ‘five times’.

Uses peculiar to single languages:
Skr. ēkā-vāram ‘once’ tri-vāram ‘three times’ from vāra- ‘the right
moment for something, one’s turn’. Avest. biś-vāp ‘twice’ priś-
-vāş ‘three times’, neuters of forms with the suffix -yent- (cp. below,
under 2); priṣat-a-蓬em ‘30 times’ (suffix -yent-).

Gr. ἀ-πατ ‘once’; the second part is connected with πηγημι
‘I make fast, strengthen’ πἀσαις ‘‘peg’, and probably had at
first much the same meaning as another word belonging to the
same root, namely O.H.G. faht part, portion’ A.S. faec ‘space of
time, time’ (cp. Mid.H.G. xwi-vach, manec-vach.) ‘The adverbs
from ‘four times’ onwards end in -xšt or -xšt (Dor. -xst): xėrtām,
nevxšt etc. The same -xšt occurs in oů-xš polš-xšt; it was doubtless
a nom. acc. sing. neut. with the meaning ‘hoo’ (cp. Lith. sši-s
O.C.Sl. šti ‘hic’, § 409); cp. Osthoff, Morph. Unt. IV 241 f., and
the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 131.¹)

Lat. semel; Wackernagel, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 316, con-
jectures that this word comes from *sēn-mel’ and is connected
with Goth. mel ‘time’ (Mod.H.G. -mäl). The adverbs from ‘five
times’ onwards end in -iēns-iēs: quinquiēs sexiēs etc. (and totiēs
quotiēs). Umbr. nusis ‘novices’. Many conjectures have been
made as to the origin of this ending; the most likely of them
is Pott’s, connecting it with Skr. kiyant- ‘how great? how much?
how manifold?‘ iyant ‘so great, etc.’ (cp. the Author, Morph.

¹) If sšt were the interrogative pronoun *yĩ-, as is assumed by
Wackernagel (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXV 286 f.) and J. Schmidt (Pluralb. 352),
all the dialects but Thessalian must have had -śt in place of it. I there-
fore oppose this view. For Thess. xšt- see my Gr. Gr.¹ pp. 54 f.

Brugmann, Elements. III.
Unt. V 14). Thurneysen's view (Arch.สำคร Lat. Lexicogr., V 275 f.) as to -iens is probably to be accepted; he regards it as a proto-ethnic Italic transformation of *-ient, so that kiyat, the neuter of the Sanskrit form, would exactly correspond to it. Osc. petiro- -pert 'quater', cp. Lat. semper.

O.Ir. oen-fekt oenecht 'once' (fecht 'way, course'), fo dí 'twice', fo thrí 'thrice' etc.

Goth. dínamna sinfa 'once' tváim sinfam 'twice' etc. O.H.G. ēnēs (gen. ēnīs) 'once', drē-stunt fior-stunt etc. (stunta 'section of time'); also expressions with warb, as sibun warb (hwarba 'a turning round'); with spurt 'stadium', as drin spurtim; and with mal 'point of time', as xēinemno malē 'one time, once', zu. drin malēn 'thrice'. And see further: J. Grimm, D. Gr. III 231 ff., and Rumpelt, Die deutsch. Pron. und Zahlw. 167 ff.

Lithuanian has also a set of phrases with sëki-s 'blow, stroke', as penkis sëkiušis 'five times', cp. the Upper German schlag 'blow' = mal. O.C.Sl. has phrases with -s(č)di -šdi (from šid- 'to go'): dvašdi 'twice' trišdi 'thrice' etc. (cp. Leskien, Handbuch p. 95).

2. Adjectives.

With -ment- (II § 127 p. 404): Avest. visaiti-vant- 'twentyfold' prisaḏ-want- 'thirtyfold' xēwasti-vant- 'sixtyfold', Gr. xerōs, -ōro, a coin worth four xalmoï, for *xerō- -er-, of which xerōs is an ad-formate.

The following are etymologically connected: Gr. á-πλός, δι-πλός etc., ὑ-πλάτος, τρί-πλάτος and δι-πλάσιος, πτυ-πλάσιος etc., Lat. sim-plu-s du-plu-s tri-plu-s etc., Goth. dain-falp-s fidur-falp-s O.H.G. ein-falt ziei-falt dri-falt etc. These are related to Goth. faltan 'to fold' Skr. puṭa-s puṭa-m 'a fold' (cp. I p. 209 footnote 1), as Lat. sim-plex du-plex etc. to plectere -PLICARE (J. Schmidt, in Kuhn's Ztschr. XVI 430, gives an explanation which may, I believe, be reconciled with this, although at first sight it seems to be different); but the second r of Umbr. tri-brisine 'triplicate' (-br- for -pr- quite regular. I § 499 p. 366) as compared with tri-pler 'triples' du-pla 'duplas', has not been explained. Gr. πλάς- in á-πλός etc. we may conjecture to
be akin to πλαν-το-ς, and to have been early associated in the popular mind with -πλο-ς.\textsuperscript{1)}

There remain a large number of other formations answering to Modern German adjectives in -fach -fältig 'fold'. Of these a few examples may be given. Skr. cātur-vaya- 'fourfold', dāśa-gva- dāśa-gvīn- 'tenfold', tri-vārtu-ś tri-vīpt- 'threefold', Gr. ῥυ-φατο-ς ῥυ-φάσο-ς 'threefold': Lith. dve-li̇nka-s 'twofold' (li̇nki-s, gen. li̇nkie, 'a bending'), O.C.Sl. do̱-gubī -gubīni̇ Lith. dve-guba-s Pruss. dve-gubbu-s 'twofold' (O.C.Sl. gū(h)nqti 'to bend, incline, fold, move', Lett. gub-stu 'crouch, bow' Lith. guba 'stack, rick').

§ 183. Distributives. The oldest mode of expressing distributives was to repeat the numeral, as Skr. pāṇca-paṇca 'five each' (Rig-Veda III 55 18), ekā-ekā-s (ekāika-s) 'one each, one at a time', pārvas-pārvas pārva-pārva-s 'the first on each occasion' (cp. II § 53 p. 99), dvā-dvā-m 'two at a time, a pair', Armen. mi mi 'singuli' tām tām 'deni', Aesch. Pers. 981 μυρία μυρία πεμπαστάν = κατά μνείες πεμπαζόντα. Cp. Pott, Ztschr. der deutsch. morg. Ges., XII 458 ff., Doppelung pp. 156 ff.; Lobeck, Pathol. I 184; Winer, Gr. des neutest. Sprachidioms\textsuperscript{7} p. 234; Wölflin, Zur distributiven Gemination, Archiv für lat. Lex. II 323.

Adverbs: Skr. -sās, as ekā-hās 'singly, one after another' dvē-sās 'by twos, in pairs' stā-sās 'by hundreds': cp. Gr. ἕ-xaς 'by itself, apart, afar' dvē-ω-κας 'man by man'.

Adjectives with the suffix -no-: Lat. bīnus for *bis-no-, trīnus for *tris-no- and ter-nus, quater-nus, sēnus for *sexno-, etc. (cp. J. Baunack, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 257 ff.). O.Icel. has corresponding forms, tvænner brenner ferner pl. 'two, three, four at a time' for pr. Germ. *tvix-na- etc., compare Mid.H.G. zwirn m. 'thread of two strands' O.H.G. zwirnēn zwirnōn 'to twist'. Goth. tvēi-h-nāt 'two at a time, two each', perhaps by a fusing of two suffixes -go- and -no-. Lith. du̱vni̇ du. 'twins'.

\textsuperscript{1)} In the derivation of -πλο-ς from -πλο-ς by 'hyphaeresis' I have no belief whatever. Cp. the Author, Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss. 1889, pp. 51 and 52.
Lith., with the suffix -io-, tro-ji 'three at a time' ketver-i 'four at a time', and by ad-formation penk-eri szesz-eri etc. Cp. Avest. tārīga- 'fourth' a-xtārīya- 'to be spoken four times' (used of a certain prayer).

scheidung starker und schwacher Casus im Idg., Paul und Braune's Bei
abstufung im Alhind. und im Griech., Bezz. Beitr. X I ff. Strachan,
The Cases. The original language had seven cases: Nominative, Accusative, Genitive, Ablative, Dative, 


Armenian. Fr. Müller, Beitr. zur Declination des armenischen Nomens, 1864.


Locative, and Instrumental. It has always been the custom to define and arrange the whole mass of recorded forms under logia greca: Osservazioni sulla declinazione dei nomi con tema in s, Turins 1882. E. J. Haupt. De nominum in -es excunctum flexione Homeriaca, 1883. A. Torp. Den greske Nominallflexion, Christiania 1890 (published after this work had gone to press, and so not available for use).


these seven heads. But since meaning, and not form, is the basis of this classification, it often happens that forms etymologically distinct are grouped together, as in the Lat. gen. sing. *equus* and (O.Lat.) *equus*; whilst others which are really connected are separated, as in Skr. *mē* dat. and gen., or the bh-suffixes, which have one part, and that the most important, in common.

Details of case-usage will be found in the Syntax; this is the place only for a few general remarks. The Nominative implied that the noun idea was the central point of the action expressed by the verb. The Accusative brought the noun into some dependent relation to the verb, the exact relation being determined by the sense of the verb and noun in any given instance.


Works and Essays treating of single cases will be cited below.
(accusative of object, of result, and so forth). The Genitive expressed some relation between noun and noun, this also being determined by their sense (genitive of origin, of object, and so forth); it also attached a noun to a verb in such a way that only a part (greater or less) and not the whole of it was affected or mastered by the action of the verb; and thirdly, it formed adverbs of time and place. The Ablative denoted that the noun was the source from which the verbal action came. The Dative denoted that the noun was that for which the action of the verb held good, or to which it was directed. The Locative gave the sphere in which something was or some action took place, the goal of motion and the place where a moving thing comes to rest. Lastly, the Instrumental expressed that with which something was (accompaniment), or with which something was done (means).

The Vocative is traditionally classed with these as an eighth case. But this was merely a method of address, or call, standing outside the sentence as far as syntax was concerned, and therefore not properly a case at all.

Numbers. There were three numbers, Singular, Plural, and Dual. The Singular expressed unity, and this number served for both single and collective ideas. The Plural denoted a number of similar things, and was also used where the same thing had a variety of forms or phases (as Skr. mṛtyásas Gr. ἁθανάτων 'kinds of death'); it further denoted anything complicated, anything which consisted of parts or sections (e. g. Skr. Ved. dhāmānas Lith. dūmai 'smoke'). The Dual was used of two complementary things, commonly where by nature or convention they formed a pair. Further discussion of these points will be found in the Syntax.

Genders. Lastly, there were three Genders in the parent language, Masculine, Feminine, and Neuter. The gender depended not so much on what we call case-suffixes as on the stem of the word, and it has accordingly been discussed under Formative Suffixes; see especially II § 57 Rem. p. 106, § 145 p. 458. More will be said of this in the Syntax.
§ 185. The manner in which particular relations of case, number and gender were expressed was in most instances the same: the stem received an accretion sound of which brought with it some one of these meanings. But we cannot always tell exactly what the accretion was. In a certain number of forms, the point where the new part joined on to the old is quite clear, so that we may use a hyphen to divide the ending from the stem; e. g. in the nom. sing. *nāy-s (Skr. nāu-ś Gr. ναῦς) and *ekyō-s (Skr. ásva-s Lat. equo-s), in the nom. sing. neut. *jugo-m (Skr. yugā-m Lat. jugu-m), and in the loc. pl. *nāy-su (Skr. nāu-śu, cp. Gr. ναῦ-σι). In others it is a moot point how far we are justified in making a division: examples are the dat. sing. *ekyṓī (Gr. ἵππος, cp. Avest. haomaí dat. ‘the soma plant’) and in the nom. pl. *ekyṓs (Skr. ásvás, cp. Goth. suifōs ‘wolves’). These forms might, it is true, be analysed *ekyṓ-i and *ekyṓ-s, -ō- being explained as a lengthening of -o- (ablaut), and as a matter of fact the -i and the -s were no doubt regarded in the unreflecting consciousness of the speaker as exponents of the relation in which these words stood to their sentence, even though the length of the stem-vowel served as a further mark to distinguish these cases from others, as from the nom. and acc. sing. Still, there is no reason why they should not have come from *ekyṓái and *ekyṓáes by vowel-contraction (cp. I § 115 p. 107). If so, -ai and -es would have been the proper case-endings at a period earlier than that which came just before the gradual dissolution of the parent language.1)

But these accretions to the stem were not indispensable; case, gender, or number could be expressed by the stem alone. For example, *ekyā́ (Skr. ásvā Lat. equa) was nom. sing., cp. loc. pl. Skr. ásva-su; *me (Gr. με Goth. mi-k) was acc., cp. Lat. mi-hī Skr. má-hyam; *dhmēn and *dhmēn (Skr.

1) Johansson (Bezz. Beitr. XIV 156) refuses to allow the rules for vowel contraction in the prothetic language which were given in the passage of the first volume of this work cited above. I freely admit that if that paragraph were to be written over again, I should state most of these contractions with more reserve.
dháman, Gr. infin. ἑκάτερσι were loc. sing., cp. dat. sing. Skr. dháman-ē Gr. inf. ἑκάτον-ες; *pūrā (= Skr. purū O.Fris. fulu, cp. Gr. πολύ Gothic. filu) and *dusmenes (= Skr. durmanas Gr. δυσμένης) were nom. acc. neut., cp. nom. sing. masc. Skr. purā-ś Gr. πολύ-σ and acc. sing. masc. Skr. durmanas-am Gr. δυσμένε-α.

There was another mode of expressing these three relations. This was by giving to the ending of the stem a particular grade of Ablaut. For example *pōtēr (= Gr. πάτης Lat. pater) and *dusmenēs (= Skr. durmanas Gr. δυσμένης) were singular nominatives, marked as such partly by the ē (-tēr- ὀς- being one grade of the formative suffix) which is wanting to the other cases; *jenos (= Skr. jānas Gr. γένος) was distinguished as nom. acc. neut. partly by its o (the os-grade of the formative suffix), which at the same time showed that the form was a substantive, cp. Gr. γενός as contrasted with γενδές. In this instance, as in so many others, a difference which arose naturally from the working of what we call the Laws of Sound has been turned to account in distinguishing varieties of usage. The same remark holds good for some of the words whose form was distinguished by a special inflexional suffix. To take an example: in *pōtēr-nt and *pōtēr-es (= Skr. pūtār-am pūtār-as Gr. πατή-α πατή-ς), the acc. sing. and the nom. pl. were expressed partly by the inflexional suffix and partly by the ablaut-grade of the formative suffix -tēr-, which distinguished them from other cases with -tē- -tē -tēr-. In root-nouns, in the same way, this or that case was marked partly by ablaut-differences in the root-syllable (see II § 160 pp. 479 ff.). Cp. II § 7 pp. 15 f.

Thus it becomes clear that in treating of declension, case-suffixes are by no means all we have to do with. We must also take account the different shapes of the stem.

The chief relations of ablaut within the stems of words, so far as they affect declension — this we may call Case-Ablaut — have already been considered under the head of Stem-Formation. To this part of the Grammar we shall often have occasion to refer in what follows.
One special point must be mentioned. Forms which show strong-grade vocalism have been called Strong, and those with vocalism of the weak grade have been called Weak. On the same principle, we speak of Strong and Weak Cases; the Strong including the nom., acc. and voc. of all numbers (excepting the nom. and acc. sing. and du. neut., and perchance the acc. pl. masc. and fem. as well; see § 325), and the loc. sing.; while all the other cases are Weak.

But two cautions should be given.

1. This classification of the cases holds only for consonant-stems; e.g. Skr. ukṣaṇ- Goth. āuksan- 'ax', Skr. pītār- Gr. πατήρ- 'father'. It does not hold for stems in ū, such as Skr. sūnū- 'son'.

2. It holds good primarily only for the protoethic stage of Indo-Germanic. Sanskrit has kept these old distinctions between the cases fairly well; but in the other languages form-association and re-formation have changed and effaced them to a great extent: compare, for example, Greek πατέρων for the older πατρῶν.

Remark. In Sanskrit grammar, the Weak cases are subdivided into Middle and Weakest, according as the case-suffix begins with a consonant or a sonant; e.g. instr. pl. ukṣā-ḫiṣṭiḥ pītāḥ-ḫiṣṭiḥ and instr. sing. ukṣa- ṭīṭāḥ. Cp. I § 308 p. 245, §§ 311 f. pp. 247 ff.

Gender will of course be discussed in the following pages only in so far as it is expressed by peculiarities in the case-endings.

§ 186. One difficult question must not be entirely passed over in this place. How did the case-endings, as we are able to restore them for the end of the protoethic period, come to have the meaning which they had?

From the principles laid down in the first paragraphs of Volume I, we must assume that forms with a case-suffix, such as *ekuṣo-s *ekuṣo-m, are compounds which once were phrases. What the final of each word of this kind actually was, before it became the sign of a case and the type after which new words could be formed at will, we have not the means of discovering by etymological research; the forms which have been tras-
mitted from the parent language as fully developed cases do not
give enough evidence. Conjectures there are in plenty, not a
few of them reasonable enough to deserve mention here; prin-
ciples which can be seen in action during later times often
throw light upon what must have happened in times gone by.

In those cases which expressed some relation in space, the
inflection may have been generally a demonstrative with some
local meaning.

With regard to the \(-m\) of the acc. sing. (*ekyo-\(m\)), we must
remember that neuter forms which have it (as *jugo-\(m\)) serve
for the nominative as well. Thus \(-m\) can hardly have had a
proper accusative meaning to begin with. We may conjecture
that \(-m\) was first used with o-stems only; that where an o-stem
could have a form in \(-s\) (such as *ekyo-\(s\)), the \(m\)-form came to
be contrasted with this in some vague indeterminate way, its
meaning being narrowed to that of an accusative case: and that
afterwards \(-m\) was regarded as an accusative-suffix proper, and
used as such with other classes of stems. It is tempting to
identify this with the particle \(-m\) which appears in so many Cases,
especially in pronominal forms (as Skr. ah\(m\) 'ego' mad 'me').
See Gaedicke, Der Acc. in Veda, 17); Leskien, Ber. der sächs.
Ges. der Wiss. 1884, p. 101; Torp, Beitr. zur Lehre von den

Remark. In a similar way, the nominative \(-s\) became a sign of the
masculine. It certainly had nothing to do originally with the contrasting
of masculine and feminine, but was used indifferently with either; then in
the class of o-stems it was brought into contrast with the feminine, because
words of that class had corresponding feminines without \(s\) ending in \(-a\)
and \(-i\) (*ekyo-s 'horse': *ekyo, and *jigo-s 'wolf': *jigo). It is clear that to
the Greeks \(s\) denoted the masculine, because they added \(-\(s\) to old feminine
nominatives, such as *ved\(n\)a ('youth') when they were used to designate
male persons, as ved\(s\)a (§ 190 p. 67). Here \(-s\) came to denote the
masculine gender, as we are supposing that \(-m\) came to denote the accusa-
tive case, and the masc. ved\(s\)a bore the same relation to the 'feminino'
po\(s\)i-\(z\) po\(s\)i-\(z\) ved\(z\) as the acc. *po\(s\)i-\(z\) to the 'nominative' *po\(s\)i-\(z\).

The \(-\(z\) of the nom. pl. *to-\(z\) (== Gr. to-\(e\) Skr. te) cannot

1) Gaedicke's suggestion for the origin of this \(-m\) (p. 18) seems to
me improbable
be separated from the -i- which precedes so many plural case-
suffixes (Gr. ro-ων Skr. ṭē-ṣu, Goth. ḫā-ti-m O.C.Sl. tē-mi etc.).
Thus it is an obvious conjecture that this -i was at first a
sign of the plural, not of the nominative. J. Schmidt regards
*toj as arising from the juxta-position of the two pronominal
stems to- and i-: 'this' + 'that' = 'these, the (pl.)' (Kuhn's
Ztschr., XXV 6). If so, *eksojas(n) (= Skr. āsveṣu Gr. ἵππομα,
cep. O.C.Sl. vlūcčchā) and similar noun-forms were suggested by
the analogy of the pronouns.

Another element with a plural meaning was s. This is
most clearly seen in the bh-suffixes, as *-bhis beside *-bhi, *-bhos
beside *-bhō, Skr. -bhyaś beside -bhya (tū-bhya 'tibi') and the
m-suffixes which are connected with them. See §§ 367 and 379.
It may be assumed without hesitation that this s is the same
thing as the -es of the nominative plural (Gr. πόδ-ες). On the
other hand, it is a question whether -ns in the accusative
plural has this s or not (§ 325); -ns is usually looked upon as
the acc. sing. -m made plural by adding -s, but it has not been
explained why -ms was not kept, as it should have been, in
Lithuanian and Prussian (ep. Lith. dial. vilkuns Pruss. deiwans)
1). We may follow Torp in regarding the s of the Sanskrit pronouns
nas, vas etc. as the same plural suffix (see § 436).

In several of the dual cases, u is found (e. g. Skr. vykau
beside vykā). This may be regarded as having been an inde-
dependent word meaning 'both, two'. See § 285.

It has often been conjectured that bh in the bh-suffixes
above mentioned was something of the nature of a formative
suffix. It may be worth while comparing a similar change in
Middle High German, where in the gen. dat. sing. herzen (nom.
acc. herze) the -en, which was originally a formative suffix
(II § 114 p. 356), was changed to a case-ending. 1 This bh-
has been compared with the suffix -bho- treated in II § 78 pp. 216 ff.
But considering åμ-q̣t beside åμ-φω, whose second part cannot

1) The Prussian ending -mans for *-man-s (if this analysis is right)
cannot be brought in evidence, since there are special circumstances in
the case. See § 367.
be separated from Goth. bidi 'both', and remembering that bh-belonged specially to the suffix of the instrumental (sociative, comitative), we are forced to ask whether the dual *bhō̄i *bhō and these bh-suffixes should not all be derived from a root which had the sense of being paired or together. Cp. § 274.

Within the separate languages, adverbial words (postpositions and the like) often coalesced with fully formed cases so completely that they were absorbed into the case-ending. Examples are: Avest. loc. pl. vehrkaēš-a § 356, Gr. Ἀθήνας i. e. Ἀθήναις § 327, Lith. tanim-pi § 423, Goth. mi-k § 442. These processes, which are perfectly easy to recognise, support the following assumptions. (1) An adverb -e, perhaps connected with the Skr. postposition d, is to be seen in Skr. dat. ṣṭkāy-a and in the loc. Lith. ražkoj-e ražkos-e O.C.Sl. kamen-e, see §§ 246, 257, 264, 356. — (2) -su and -si in the loc. pl., e. g. Skr. vykṣi Gr. λίγος, are merely the loc. pl. -s with the particles u and i affixed to it, see § 356. — (3) There are similar affixes in the nom. sing. Osc. po 'qui' Lat. qui (ground-form *qo-i) and O.Pers. hauw Gr. ὕβ- (ο-ς) (ground-form *so-ς), see §§ 414 and 415. — (4) A particle *em *om *m was attracted to certain fully formed cases. This was most frequent amongst the pronouns, and was not confined to one case. Examples are: loc. sing. Skr. áśvāyām (§ 264), instr. sing. O.C.Sl. rākā (§ 276), instr. etc. Gr. ἄδο-γ = (§ 281), dat. instr. du. Skr. ṣṭkā-bhāyāṃ O.Ir. dūb n- (§ 296), nom. Skr. ahām O.C.Sl. azā (§ 439) Skr. vāy-āṃ (§ 441), acc. Skr. mām O.C.Sl. mē (§ 442). On page 60 we saw that it was natural to identify with this particle the -m of acc. nom. Skr. yugā-m = Lat. jugu-m.

Where an Indo-Germanic case shows no accretion of any kind in the form of a suffix, as *ekyā (§ 185 p. 57), we have no right whatever to assume that a suffix has dropped off. The cases of nouns sprang up when these were used in phrases along with other words. But it was not always necessary that the

1) The vocative singular of course had no suffix. This is implied in what was said in § 184, p. 56.
relation of a noun to its sentence should be definitely expressed. Sometimes it was clear from the context without further aid, and then the stem, as we call it, could appear alone. The more generally case-suffixes joined themselves to words by composition, the more sharply defined became the use of forms without any suffix; and in the end they became cases as clearly marked as those which had a suffix, this result being possibly hastened by their having special grades of ablaut (as *potēr Gr. ναρής).

It may sometimes, however, be the case that what appear to be forms without proper case-suffixes are only so in appearance. In Modern High German, certain names of places, such as Baden, Bergen, Hohenbuchten and Unterwalden are really dative forms, the case-suffix -n having been carried back to the nominative and retained in other cases as though it belonged to the stem. Something of this kind may have happened with the suffixless locatives in -en -yen -men (Skr. mūrdhān etc.). These may really contain a case-suffix -n (-en or the like) with a locative meaning; then the original stems will have been some shorter form (Gr. aîēn being related to aîfē- in much the same way as oîkē to oîkē-), these forms, really locatives, having been made the foundation of the other cases. Similarly, the -r of Skr. uṣār 'in the morning', and the other forms ṛ that kind, may have been a locative-suffix which eventually became part of the stem, as it is in Skr. gen. uṣār-ás Gr. loc. ḍρα- etc. See Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XIV 164 ff., and Bartholomae, ibid. XV 14 ff. and 25 ff.

§ 187. The case-endings of Masculine and Feminine Pronouns were in the parent language different from the corresponding endings of the noun; cp. e. g. nom. acc. neut. *to-d (= Skr. ṭā-d Gr. το) and nom. acc. neut. *nēmo-m (= Skr. nāma-m Lat. novo-m). These two systems of cases, the Noun and the Pronoun, influenced each other in the proethnic period; and all through the subsequent history of the languages analogical re-adjustments of this kind have gone on in a greater or less degree.

Thus there was a distinction between the declension of
noun and pronoun; but still greater was the distinction between personal pronouns and nouns. In tracing the history of separate languages, it may often be seen that case-endings pass from nouns, and from pronouns masculine and feminine, to personal pronouns; but the reverse is hardly to be found.

In the present division of this work, which deals with the formation of the cases of nouns, reference will be made to pronouns so far as their cases influenced those of nouns by analogy. Secondly, where in any case-form there was no original difference between noun and pronoun, the pronominal form is cited wherever a particular language has kept the original ending in a pronoun only, or where the original ending is seen to best advantage in a pronoun because it may have suffered less from phonetic change (e.g. Goth. þō beside jūka, § 338).

§ 188. The Functions of more than one case were often attached to one form. Thus in the proethnic language itself, there was in most classes of stems a single form for the genitive and ablative singular, as Skr. nāv-ās Gr. νῆ-άς 'of a ship' and 'from a ship'; and in all stems only one form for the dative and ablative plural, as Skr. nāv-bhyās Lat. nāv-ibus 'to ships' and 'from ships'; perhaps o-stems had no more than one form for the genitive and locative singular, as Lat. bellis (§ 239). This multiplicity of functions was especially common in personal pronouns, as we shall see.

In later periods this often came about by what is termed syncretism; several different case-forms, each with its own meaning, are replaced by one, which unites the meanings of them all. Thus the case which in Greek grammar is called the dative includes the meanings of dative, locative, and instrumental; but the forms which are classed as datives in Greek are some of them genuine datives, as ἐπί, some locatives, as ἔποτέ, ἐπί-οτ (ἐπίοτ in N.W. Greek, Boeotian, etc.), and some instrumental forms, as ἐπικατέ. Thus certain dative forms served as locative and instrumental, certain locatives as dative and instrumental, and certain instrumentals as dative and locative, each over and above its own proper sense. Similarly in Latin,
the case which is called ablative combined the meanings of ablative, locative, and instrumental; whilst the forms classed as ablative were some of them, as εὐγ(ο), true ablatives, some locative and instrumental forms, as homin-e. The origin of these syncretic or mixed cases lies almost entirely in the accidents of usage; we shall accordingly leave to the Syntax a detailed discussion of syncretic cases and kindred questions. But looking at the cases historically we must begin with the Indo-Germanic case-system, and discuss each form in the separate languages with reference to this. Thus we call Greek ἔγ-ι 'locative', although the same form served as dative and instrumental besides.

As the singular form Skr. नान-ās Gr. ἐγ-ὸς was both genitive and ablative in the protoethic language, so there were instrumentals in -βάς, as Gr. ἔνα-ψι, which served alike for singular and plural, both then and later; see §§ 274, 281, 379. The nom. acc. neut. too, in the protoethic stage, seems often to have had the same formation for singular and plural; see §§ 223, 337, 340, 342.

§ 189. The subject of Case Formation is not confined to cases proper, but includes adverbs as well. The history of Adverbs in their special uses will be set forth in the Syntax. We are here concerned with their form; and we shall discuss them after the following fashion.

There are two classes of adverbial words. One consists of words which once were ordinary cases, but became isolated and thus crystallised; as Gr. Ἀθ-ήνας, οἰκς, ἄμα, τοῖ, Lat. meritō, modo, bene, facile, multum. Sometimes these are the sole evidence for a case-formation in some language or dialect; thus in Greek the old ablative in -οδ only survives in crystallised adverbial forms (§ 241). Then, but not otherwise, do they concern us here. The second class embraces words which never belonged to a regular paradigm; they were isolated words, used in such phrases as their meaning suited, but having no more than one or two other words at most connected with them closely enough to form such a grammatical group as we call a Paradigm. Most of them were built up on some pronominal
stem, as Gr. ἀ-ρός ἄ-ρός, Lat. in-tus, Skr. kú-tas. However, these were often associated in meaning with the cases of certain complete systems, and raised to the rank of true cases; thus this same *-tos became a widely used abl.-gen. suffix in Sanskrit, Armenian, and Greek (§ 244). The suffixes of adverbs of this second class are accordingly included in the discussion which here follows, so far as they were in this way attached to any case-system.

This part of our subject also includes Infinitives. We shall see in the Syntax how these forms, originally living cases, came to be used as they are. Here Infinitives belonging to any of the separate languages must be cited at least when they represent cases which have dropped out of living use in that particular language, as (Ir. δέμεν-ai (§§ 245, 251) and δέμεν (§§ 256, 257).

THE CASES.¹)

Nominative Singular Masculine and Feminine.²)

§ 190. I. Stems without any Case-suffix used as Nom. Sing. Masc. and Fem.

1. α-stems. Pr.Idg. *ekyâ 'mare'. Skr. āsvâ 'mare'; Avest. hâna O.Pers. haina 'hostile host'. Gr. χώρα 'land'. Lat. agus; Umbr. muta mutu 'multa', Osc. touto 'civitas' (I § 105 pp. 98 f.,

1) One or two kinds of Indo-Germanic inflexion — e. g. that represented by Skr. (dhiyâ-)dhâs, dat. -dhâ — are themselves rare, and teach us nothing of the case-suffixes which cannot be learnt from the others. To avoid excessive detail, I have either passed these over entirely, or only just touched upon them by the way.

In order to present before the student a complete paradigm of the cases of a given word, it has often been necessary to fill up gaps in the tradition by making certain forms after the analogy of other words. In a work like the present, I hold this to be not merely allowable but necessary.

§ 190. Nominative Singular Masculine and Feminine.


Avestic. Forms in -é, as kainiké 'girl, virgin' ber-xdē 'blessed' and Prussian forms in -ai, such as mensai 'flesh, meat' (Lith. mėsā) show a pronominal ending; see § 414. Compare also § 202.

Greek. Masculines like neáviā-ς 'young man' πενερης-ς 'beggar' were originally feminine, and received their -ς through being assimilated to such nominatives as έδω-ς (II § 79 pp. 229 f., § 80 pp. 239 f., § 157 p. 472); cp. the corresponding re-formation in the gen. sing., § 229. But the form without -ς remained in use as a vocative, as Εφοιαί, αἰαφέρης, cp. O.Ir. voc. pl. firu = *μιρός beside nom. pl. fir = *μιροῖ (§ 314). This suggests the simplest mode of explaining masculine nominatives in -ά like Hecoct. Καλλία, δίανόμοντια and Leucad. Φιλοκλήδα (cp. Megar. Ῥόου Ἀοῦδας, § 229); these may be called vocatives used as nominatives. Cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 117, and J. Schmidt, Pluralbildung 354. As regards such feminines as Ῥάλια 'daring' μέρμανα 'care', see the Author op. cit. p. 102. Masculine forms like ἰπνότα = ἰπνότης 'charioteer' will be explained in § 202.

Some curious masculine nominatives have been preserved in Italic. These are Latin hosticapas (hostium captor) and *paricidas beside scriba agricola etc., and Oscan Katal 'Caha' Maq]as 'Mara' Tanas 'Tana' beside Santia 'Xanthia, Zavthla'. The record is too scanty to enable us to decide whether these were imitations of the Greek forms in -α-ς or independent of them.

Old High German shows traces of a few, but only a few of these nominatives in Idg. -ā: e.g. buoz, hwil 'while'; most of them, however, are abstracts in -ungō-, as samanunc 'assembly, gathering', cp. also sux 'this, that (f.), she' like Skr. siyā syā. See I § 661. 1 and 2, pp. 516 ff. The common
forms in -a, as *geβa 'gift' *sipp(e)u 'kinsman', are accusatives used as nominatives (§ 213).


Aryan. In Sanskrit, these stems occasionally followed the analogy of stems in -i- -i- (II § 109 p. 334): ḫykt-ṣ 'she-wolf' napti-ṣ 'grand-daughter, daughter'. Similarly in O.Pers. we have harawatiṣ (i.e. -i-ṣ) 'Arachosia' as compared with Avest. haraxwaiti Skr. sárasvati.

Greek has lost the forms in -i-. Those which actually occur have -a -a, as ἁρώνωσα 'ferens' for *φεσοντ-α, πόντ-ια 'lady', ὄντοςα 'truth' for *όλαξις-αί; these I hold to be reformates following the accusatives in -iav -iav § 216).

Remark. J. Schmidt (in Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 291 and 309, Pluralb. 59 f.) sees in the Greek -a -a the original ending of the nom. sing. of

1) The strong-grade form of the suffix of which -i- was the weak grade in the Indo-Germanic declension is hard to determine, as I have already said (II § 109 p. 333), adding that -i- seemed to me the most probable. But in numerous instances -i- forms are found amongst the cases, — in Greek, Italic, Germanic, Balto-Slavonic, and possibly Keltic (gen. sing. insc., § 230); hence it is perhaps more correct to place the variation between -i- and -i- in the prothetic period. There is, however, another possibility. -i- as well as -i- might become -i- in unaccented syllables, so that perhaps our i- *i-class is to be split up into two original classes. Then the i- *i-class would be parallel to the i- *o-class (Lith. mėdis gen. mėdžio). But in that case we should have to postulate two distinct declensions in -i-; one varying between -i- and -i-, the other having invariably -i-. I leave others to investigate these difficult questions more closely. Johansson has tried, but comes to no certain conclusion whatever (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 398 ff.).
these stems, and believes that the -i of the other languages arose from a contraction of *-ia-. Against this view, see my Gr. Gr. Vol. II 59.

Such words as these were often associated with stems in -ia (οικία), and -u -u gave way to -i -i; e. g. ἤργος 'companion' instead of ἤτοια for *ἤτω-ia, fem. of *ἤτω-ος, Att. ἀληθεία (Ion. ἀληθεί) beside ἀληθεία, and so on. Cp. in O.H.G. herzohinna instead of the older herzohin (see below).

Latin, too, has lost the -i. In facie-s panperie-s, -iē- has spread from the other cases, and -s has been added through assimilation to re-quiē-s diē-s re-s. avia (from avo-s) is perhaps like māter-ia beside māter-īē-s (cp. II § 109 p. 333, and the footnote on the last page). As regards the fem. suā-ī-s (Skr. svādv-ī) see II § 109 p. 334: was suā-ī-s the result of a form *suāvīm for *suādyīm (cp. § 216)?

Germanic. O.H.G. herzohinna instead of herzohin, O.Sax. thiwa instead of thiwi, and similar forms were produced by an assimilation to the nominative of ūa-stems (as O.H.G. sipp(a) = Goth. sibja 'kin', see § 190 p. 68).

Lith. žemė Lett. žene Pruss. semme O.C.Sl. zemīja 'earth' pr. Balt.-Slav. *zem-iē arose by the intrusion of -iē- from the other cases.

§ 192. 3. All polysyllabic n- and r-stems show the formative suffix in the 3rd or 4th (strong) grade, which contrasted the nominative with the other cases, and so connected the difference in ablaut with a difference in case; e. g. Gr. ποιμήν παρί smo as against ποιμέν-α παρίŋ-α, and so on. We have to postulate even for the protoethic language pairs of forms, some ending in -ēn -ōn and -ēr -ōr, others simply in -ē -ō in both classes of stems. The cause assigned has been the varying conditions of sentence position, -n and -r being supposed to disappear before certain consonants. But this theory is far from certain, in spite of Meringer's arguments (Zeitschr. für österr. Gymn. 1888, p. 137), especially in view of Johansson's new theory of the origin of n-stems and some of those in -r (Bezz.
Nominative Singular Masculine and Feminine. § 192.

Beitr. XIV 163 ff.) which has been mentioned already on page 63 of this volume.

\[ \textit{a. n-stems.} \]

Forms in Idg. -n. Pr.Idg. \*\textit{h}ywōn 'dog'. Armen. ʂun 'dog' akn (gen. akan) 'eye' anjn (gen. anjin for \*-en-os) 'soul' I § 651.1 p. 497. Gr. \textit{xwv}w 'dog' πουτυ 'herdsman'. It is a question whether Lat. pectenlienflamenare old \textit{n}-nominatives or not; see II § 114 p. 352. O.H.G. gomo A.S. guma m. 'man', and doubtless Norse Run. Haringa for \*-\textit{on}; Goth. tugō O.Icel. tunga f. 'tongue' for \*-\textit{on} (Goth. raþjō = Lat. radiō), O.H.G. zunga A.S. tunge f. for \*-\textit{on} (I § 659.5 p. 513, § 661.4 p. 510, and II § 115 pp. 361 f.).\textsuperscript{1)} Lith. dial. szyn (beside szū) 'dog' O.C.Sl. kam'a 'stone' (I § 92 pp. 86 f., § 663.1 p. 521, and § 665.2 p. 524).

Forms without -n. Pr.Idg. \*\textit{h}ywō 'dog'. Skr. śed śūva?) Avest. spā 'dog', O.Pers. xšuyārsha 'Xerxes' (xšaya- 'ruler' and uršan- 'mas'). Dubious relics of this kind are seen in Gr. εἰκων αἴσθων beside εἰκων 'image' αἴθων 'nightingale', and so forth; the genitives belonging to these nominatives, εἰκος αἴθους etc., would then be ad-formates of the class Αἰρό Αἴροις (G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.\textsuperscript{2} pp. 315 f.). Lat. homō homo, Umbr. karu 'pars' = Lat. carō, tribūsiu i.e. *tri-prikšo 'triplicitas' (abl. tribirisine).\textsuperscript{3)} O.Ir.

1) Kluge (Paul's Grundr. I 366) equates O.H.G. -o A.S. -e with pr. Germ. \*-ön, and O.H.G. -o A.S. -e with pr. Germ. \*-ën, admitting at the same time that the phonetics of this are 'strange'. Possibly he was driven to postulate these changes by the μν. O.H.G. geda A.S. giefe; for Osthoff's hypothesis that \*-ę- had become \*-ē- in prophonic Germanic — a hypothesis which offered a possible explanation of these forms (sunt-ia for \*-ę-ia and hence geda) — has too slight a foundation to build upon. I hope to settle the question of geda giefe in a different way (§ 213), and so I am content with the equation O.H.G. -o A.S. -e = pr. Germ. \*-ën, O.H.G. -o A.S. -e = pr. Germ. \*-ön.

2) The accentuation of the Vedio šīd du. šūrānāu (the texts have šud šūrānu with the udatta) is to be restored not only on the authority of Gr. xwv, but from the accent of šūn- as šūn- etc., šūn- being\textsuperscript{2} related to šūn- as yān- to yārān-. In both words the accent, which in the weak cases fell upon the suffix (orig. *šuñ-ās like Gr. μν-ος, and *yūn-ās) was changed on the analogy of the strong cases.

3) See also the Author, Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1890, p. 207.
cu Mod.Cymr. ci 'dog' (for a disyllabic *knō through the intermediate stage of *knū), O.Ir. esc-ung 'eel' air-mitiiu 'honour' = Lat. mentiō (I § 657. 2 and 3, p. 507); Gall. Frontu Alingu. Goth. guma 'man' should doubtless be derived from *gumē (not *gumō) on account of O.Icel. gume gunni. Lith. szū 'dog' akmă 'stone'.

In the following words we have re-formates in place of original *-jō(n) *-ē(n), the suffix having been levelled down to the weak form of it: Skr. arcē (stem arcē- 'beaming') Avest. kaini (stem kainīn-'girl'), Gr. ἄλητω 'bellyfish, dolphin'), Goth. managei (stem manageiin-'crowd'). See II § 115 pp. 358 ff.

In several languages there were re-formations following the analogy of nominatives in -s. Avestic: e.g. ver'fra-jā 'victorious' beside -ja = Skr. vytra-hā (note that an old nom. *-ghū-s would necessarily have become *-jā); cp. Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I 31, Handbuch § 215 Anm. 2, § 220. Greek: e.g. Lac. ἀρσης = ἀρσῆ 'male', ἄλητος beside ἄλητω (cp. II § 115 p. 359). Lat. sanguis for *sanguinis 'instead of sanguen. Osc. últiuf 'usio, usus' and statif 'statio, statua', for *-ius and *ins according to II § 115 pp. 359 f. O.Ir. āru 'kidney' doubtless for *-ōns, menne 'mens' for *-ens; see II § 114 pp. 352 f., § 117 pp. 373 f. Similar re-formations of r-stems are described on the next page.

b. r-stems.

Forms in Idg. -r. Pr. Idg. *matēr 'mother', *dōtōr 'giver'. Armen. mair 'mother'. Gr. μητέρ, ἰώρη. Lat. mater, soror dator; Umbr. Iu-pater 'Juppiter' ař-fertur 'infertor, flamen', Osc. ensur 'censor'. O.Ir. māthīf 'mother', siur 'sister' (I § 657. 6 p. 509). In Germanic, with *ēr-, O.Icel. modir modir, and probably O.H.G. nuoter; also Goth. fađar 'father' if Streitberg is right in holding that pr. Germ. -ēr became -ar in Gothic, as -ēz -ēz became -ai -au (cp. § 263 Rem.).

1) Streitberg, D. germ. Compar. auf -ōr, pp. 22 f. This law would enable us to explain Goth. adv. þar as compared with O.H.G. dār, un-accented dēr, as follows. Starting from pr. Germ. *þēr, we should have
of Goth. *sristār A.S. sweostor 'soror', Goth. brūþar A.S. brūðor O.H.G. bruadar 'brother' (Gr. θεάω) is doubtful. These may have come from -ōr, or perhaps they were accusative or vocative forms; cp. II § 122 pp. 381 f.

Remark 1. In any case, A.S. mōðor dohtor O.Swed. foþur mōpor are re-formates. I take this opportunity to call attention to a question which appears to me to need more thorough investigation. How far did Idg. -ēr- in unaccented final syllables become -or-; and where -or- seems to correspond to Idg. -er-, ought we not sometimes to assume that it came from -or- (or -or-)? See the Author, Curt. Stud. IX 374 and 376; Paul in his Beitr. VI 246 f. and 253 f.; J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 197 f.; Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 361.


Remark 2. Joh. Schmidt and other scholars assume that -r was dropped in Balto-Slavonic (Schmidt, in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 22, Pluralbild. 193 f.). I am still unable to regard this as proved. Cp. I § 663 Rem: pp. 521 f.

Re-formation in the separate languages gave rise to Avest. atar-ē 'fire' (II § 122 p. 383), Gr. μάκαρ-ς instead of μάκαρ 'blessed'. There were similar re-formations in the n-stems, for which see last page.

§ 193. 4. Polysyllabic s-stems show in the formative suffix the same case-ablaut as do stems in n and r; but it would appear that in the prothetic speech the -s of the formative suffix was never missing. The ending in s-stems will then be -ēs as opposed to -ēn -ē, ēr ē in the others.

Pr. Idg. *dus-meneōs 'ill-disposed'. Skr. durmanās, 'dejected, troubled', Avest. dusmanā 'thinking evil', O.Pers. aspar-āna (doubtless connected with Skr. cānas- n. 'pleasure'), Skr. yuśās 'glorious' (I § 649. 7 p. 496). Gr. δυσμενής 'ill-

Goth. þar (cp. also jāinar altēr) and O.H.G. der as equivalents. The form þar would then have driven the accented *þēr from the field in Gothic. O.H.G. gen. unsēr follows irinēr § 455.
disposed, hostile' νεφός 'false, deceitful'. Lat. pūbes pūber, dē-gener (with -r for -s from the other cases).

Pr. Idg. *aµsōs 'dawn'. Skr. uṣās. Gr. Hom. η̱ς Att. ἐος. Lat. honōs hōnor (with -r from the other cases).

Pr. Idg. comp. *oīk(ī)īs 'quicker'. Avest. āsyyā. Lat. oecior (-r from the other cases). O.Ir. sínna 'older' māo mó 'larger'. For Skr. dēyās dēyān instead of *dēyās and O.C.Sl. služdij 'sweeter' instead of *sladija, see II § 135 p. 430.

Pr. Idg. part. perf. act. *yēidūs or *yidūs 'knowing'. Avest. vidērā. Gr. ἵδως. By re-formation, Skr. rid-vās vid-vān instead of *-vās, Lith. dā-veis 'having given' mīr-ės 'dead' instead of -ės and O.C.Sl. da-vá mīr-ů instead of *-va *-a (or *ve *-u, *-ť *-i). Along with these the parent language seems to have had a nominative in *-u: Skr. Ved. ridūs Avest. vīdūs, with which may be classed O.C.Sl. mūrů. See II § 136 pp. 439 ff.

Remark. It remains doubtful whether the proethnic language had nominatives without x belonging to stems in dental explosives, as well as the above. See § 198 p. 79.

§ 194. II. Forms with -s as the sign of the Nominative.

1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *ydgo-s 'wolf'. Skr. yṣka-s, Avest. vēhrkō (vēhrkas-ca 'lupusque'), O.Pers. kāra 'people, host' (see I § 556. 3 pp. 411 f., § 558. 4 p. 415, § 646. 3 pp. 490 f., and Bartholomae in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 572 f.). Armen. gail, marā 'homo' = Skr. mṛtā-s (I § 651 p. 497). Gr. λίκος. Lat. lup-u-s; equo-s, vir for *vir(o)-s, satur for *satur(o)-s, morti-fer and -fer-s (the latter being a re-formate), ager for *agr(o)-s; Umbr. pihaz 'piatus' Ikuvins 'Iguvinus', ager 'ager' katel 'catulus', O.C.Sl. húrž 'hortus' Půmpaianus 'Pompeianus', famel 'famulus'; see I § 655. 5 and 9, pp. 505 and 508 (the conditions of syncopation in Latin have not yet been properly made out, cp. mors for mort(i)-s and the like. § 195). O.Ir. fer 'man' for *giro-s, aile 'alius' for *ul(i)j(o)-s (I § 34 p. 34, § 139 Rem. p. 125, § 657. 3, 5 and 10. pp. 508 and 509 f.), Gall. tarvo-s 'bull', Andecamulo-s.
Goth. *vilfs, vair ‘man’ for *gir(a)-z, O.H.G. wolf, acchar ‘tilled land’ = Goth. *akrs (I § 660.6 p. 5163), § 661.2 and 5, pp. 517 and 519), cp. also Goth. hve-s O.H.G. hve-r ‘who?’; in the Salic Law focola = *fogla-(z) ‘bird’, Norse Run. daga-r ‘day’ = O.Icel. dag-r Goth. dag-s; Goth. harji-s ‘host’ for *harja-z, which became *hari-s and took j afresh from the oblique cases (I § 660 Rem. 3 p. 515; Kauffmann, Paul-Braune’s Beitr. XII 539; Streitberg ibid. XIV 181). Lith. vilka-s; for the loss of -a- in the last syllable, see I § 664.2 pp. 522 f. On O.C.Sl. vilků, see below.

Stems in -jo- sometimes made their nom. sing. in -is -is (-i- -j- are weak-grade forms of -jo-), and the corresponding acc. sing. masc. and neut. in -im (§§ 212, 227). O.Lat. ali-s Corneli-s beside aliu-s Cornelius, Osc. Pakis ‘Pacius’. Goth. un-nuts ‘useless’ for *nuni-z, hairdei-s ‘herdsman’; A.S. secg ‘man’ instead of pr. Germ. *saz-i-z. Lith. žōdi-s ‘word’ mōji-s ‘sign’ gaidys-s ‘cock’ beside vėja-s ‘wind’ svėczia-s ‘guest’ and the like. We should doubtless class here O.C.Sl. krajž ’rim, edge’, and konji ‘horse’ instead of *konj, the n having been softened (palatalised) on the analogy of the genitive and other cases. Cp. II § 63 p. 122, and Streitberg, as cited, 166 ff.

Remark 1. The student will observe that in Slavonic there is nothing to represent the nominative in *-jo-s (as Lith. vėja-s Lat. aliu-s). This ending would regularly become *-ie, which has the look of a vocative; and this is perhaps the reason for its absence. Cp. § 201 Rem. 2.

Remark 2. Perhaps such i-stems as Skr. sārāthi-s ‘charioteer’ Avest. māzdayaunī-s ‘belonging to the worshippers of Mazda’ Lat. decemjungi-s (II § 93 p. 284) were originally io-stems.

O.C.Sl. vilků is an accusative form, which took the place of *vliko. The nom. and acc. in -io-, -i-, and -u-stems

1) Braune (Goth. Gr. § 78 Anm. 2) has a different theory of *the phonetic law affecting Goth. rair. This view has recently received the support of W. Schulze (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIX 271), who explains stiu-r as a dissyllable. But this explanation is unsupported by the evidence (see Osthoff Paul-Braune’s Beitr. XIII 454 f.), and furthermore it is opposed by the form fidrōr for *fidvōr-(y)z (§ 320), whilst akrs, which, Braune himself holds to be dissyllabic (§ 27), should not have been brought in evidence at all. I therefore keep to my own explanation, as above cited.
came eventually to be the same, *-i-s and *-i-m becoming -i, and
*-*u-s and *-*u-m becoming -ū; and this appears to have caused
the substitution of vlükii for *vlükko. There may have been
another factor in the change. If the -o (standing doubtless for
*-o-d) which we find as the ending of the nom. acc. nout. of
adjectival stems in -o- appeared in this language before the
nom. sing. masc. *-o(s) had given place to -ū, the nom. masc.
and the nom. acc. neut. must both have come to end in -o;
and the wish to keep the two genders distinct may have been
an additional reason for substituting -ū for -o in the nom. masc.;
ep. § 227. Another explanation of -ū, by no means convincing,
is given by Kozlovskij in the Archiv für slav. Phil. X 657.

§ 195. 2. i-stems. Pr.Idg. *oysi-s 'sheep'. Skr. avi-ś;
Avest. aši-ś 'snake, dragon', O.Pers. siyati-ś 'place of pleasure,
dwelling-place' (= Lat. quiēs, gen. quietis). Armen. sirt 'heart'
= Lith. szirdi-s, iš 'viper' = Skr. ahi-ś (I § 651 p. 497). Gr.
ēpe-ς 'snake, dragon'. Lat. ovi-s, turri-s; acer for *acri-s, and
by the side of it a re-formate acri-s, mors = Skr. mṛti-ś 'death' —
this syncope of -i- is common in the final syllables of
ti-stems (its conditions have not been fully made out, nor have
those of syncope in o-stems, as has been pointed out in § 194,
p. 73); Umbr. pacer 'pacatus, propitius', Osc. ceus 'civis' aedil
aedilis', see I § 33 pp. 33 f., § 633 pp. 472 f., § 655.5
and 9, p. 503 and pp. 504 f. O.Ir. faith 'vates' for *uati-s
(I § 657.5 and 10, pp. 508 ff.); Gall. rati-s 'fern' = Ir. raith.
Goth. ans-t-s 'favour' barur 'son' for bur(t)-s (like vatr § 194
p. 73), O.H.G. ans 'favour' chumi 'approach, coming' = Goth.
quum-s, O.H.G. wini 'friend', but Frīdu-wini Lieb-wini (I § 660.1
p. 514, § 661.2 and 5, pp. 517 and 519); Norse Run. gasti-r
'guest' = O.Icel. gest-r Goth. gast-s. Lith. nakti-s O.C Sl.
nošt 'night' (I § 665.4 p. 525).

Observe Skr. vē-ś 'bird' beside vi-ś Lat. avi-s, and these
root-nouns of corresponding structure — Avest. yao-ś 'league,
confederate, friendly, allied' gao-ś 'crying aloud'. And perhaps
we should add Lat. ei-s t-s eis-dem beside t-s = Goth. i-s; see
§ 416.

In Iranian there are by-forms in -au-š (with corresponding acc. sing. -āvam and nom. acc. pl. -āvas), such as Avest. bāzu-š, O.Pers. dāhyau-š *neighbourhood*; these we may conjecture to be re-formates containing the loc. sing. in -āu; see § 261. For Avest. per-ṇau beside per-ṇayu-s and the like, see Bartholomae Ar. Forsch. I 38 and J. Schmidt Pluralbild. 76 ff.


Nominatives formed in the same way from stems in -ēn-, -ēn, -ēr, and -ēr (II § 312 pp. 250 f., II § 160 pp. 485 f.). Skr. jā-š *being* for *gā-s, gō-śd-š *winning cattle*, Avest. xā *spring, source* (cp. acc. Ved. kīmām § 217), Skr. pār *stronghold* for *pā-s, gār *praise* for *gā-s. No doubt Gr. ἀμο-βρῶς, χρῶς are further examples.
§ 198. 5. Stems whose suffix ends in an explosive.

a. The Suffixes -t- -tat- -tāt-. Skr. viśva-ji-t 'gaining everything by victory' sarvāt-tät 'completeness' (I § 647.7 pp. 493 f.), Avest. haurva-tās 'wholeness, a being in good condition (I § 473.2 p. 349). Gr. ἡγε 'hired labourer' for *ēhe-τ-ς, νι-ε 'night' for *nuke-τ-ς, ὀλο-τς 'wholeness, completeness'. Lat. com-es (gen. com-i-t-is) nox (gen. noc-i-t-is), novi-tās, juven-tās. O.Ir. cing (gen. cinged) 'hero, warrior' = Gall. *Cinges (stem Cinget-), O.Ir. dītiu 'youth' for *(j)ovētās(ς) = Lat. juventās.

In Germanic, such forms as Goth. naht-s 'night' mēnōfs 'month' O.H.G. naht mānōd are re-formates, since -ts became -ss (-s) in proethnic Germanic (I § 527 p. 382). They may have been due to an attempt to restore the stem, which had been preserved in the other cases; cp. Goth. instr. pl. friōnd-am beside tīgum, § 379. As regards nominatives like O.H.G. nefo for *nefo(d), see p. 79.

The Suffix -nt-. Pr.Idg. -nt-s, -nt-s1), as *bhrghont-s, possibly *bhrghent-s (see II § 125 Rem. 2 pp. 395 f.) 'prominent high'. Skr. bhān Avest. ber-⺁ς (I § 647.7 pp. 493 f.; Bartholomae, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 501 ff. and 517); Skr. dādat 'giving' for *dodat-s Avest. stavas 'praising' for *stavat-s. Gr. ἄες 'blowing' = Skr. ṛavas, common ground-form *yents-s, ὀδούς 'tooth'; as to -own in φέρων and the like, see below. Lat. ferēns, dēns, stāns = Gr. ὀνός; Umbr. zeref serse 'sedens' (I § 655.9 p. 504). O.Ir. care·cara 'friend' (gen. carat), cp. tri·cha 'group of 30' (gen. tri·chat) = Avest. ἱρ-⺁ς (I § 657.10 pp. 509 f.). *Lith. večės 'vehens' dial. vežans vežus, Pruss. sidans sidons 'sitting'; O.C.Sl. veži 'vehens', in the first instance for *vēzuns, according to I § 84 p. 80. § 92 pp. 86 f., § 219 pp. 186 f.

In Sanskrit, īyān 'tantus' kiyān 'quantus' are re-formates which followed certain words of kindred meaning, such as tad-

1) An error must be corrected in II § 125, p. 395. In that place, following the traditional view, I wrongly allowed myself to regard *-ς as an original nominative ending as well as *-ο-ς. This correction I have already made in my Greek Grammar, 3 p. 109.
Nominaive Singular Masculine and Feminine.

\(-\text{van} \ '\text{one who is as thou art}' \) (see below). In Avestic participles, besides \(-\text{qs} \ (\text{*-ants}) \) and \(-\text{as} \ (\text{*-ats}) \), we find \(-\ddot{o} = \text{Ar. *-as}, \) which is the commonest ending of such participles as concern us here; e.g. \text{per*so} \ 'asking' \ \text{hištō} \ 'standing'. Bartholomae (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 557 ff.) considers this formation in the light of Vedic forms like \text{pra-mynd-\textit{s}} \ beside \text{pra-mynnd} \ 'destroying' \ \text{visvan-\textit{inva-\textit{s}} \ 'penetrating everything' \ beside \text{inva}, and assumes that a certain number of adjectival compounds in \text{Idg. *-\textit{d}-\textit{s}}, used like participles, were brought into close relation with the corresponding verbs, the result being that true participles in \(-\text{nt-} \) took the ending of these adjectives through association with them. The analogy seems to have gone further; and, in Avestic, nominatives in \(-\ddot{\text{o}}\) were formed even from stems in \(-\text{vant-}, \) as \text{par*na-vó} \ 'furnished with a feather' (see Geldner, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXX 515).

Greek has forms like \text{φέων} \ 'bearing' \ \text{ιδών} \ 'seeing', besides those in \(-\text{o}\ddot{\text{c}} \) (for \text{*-on-\textit{c}}). Now \(-\text{on-} \) can come neither from \text{*-ont-s} \ nor \text{*-ont-} \ nor from \text{*-ont}, and for \text{*-on} \ as an Idg. ending in \text{nt-stems} \ there is no further evidence that can be trusted.\textsuperscript{1}) I therefore offer the following conjecture as to its origin. I suggest that there were two influences at work. (1) The relation of the masc. \text{ιδινων} \ \text{πινων}, \ and similar forms, to the neuter in \(-\text{nv}, \ \text{ιδιον} \ \text{πινων}, \) caused a masc. \(-\text{nv} \) to spring up in connexion with \(-\text{nv} \) (for \text{*-onv}), beginning with participles used strictly as nouns, e.g. \text{μέλινν} \ 'future' \ \text{ικων} \ 'willing'. (2) The relation of the vocative to the nominative in \text{χινων, \ δανων} \ and the like, voc. \text{χινων} \ \text{δανων}, gave rise to substantival nominatives like \text{γέων} \ (voc. \text{γεων} \ for \text{*-onv}).

In Germanic, forms like Goth. \text{friōnd-s} \ \text{O.H.G. friunt} \ 'friend' are re-formates of the same kind as Goth. \text{mēnōps} \ \text{O.H.G. mūnōd}; see last page. Similarly, Pruss. \text{dilant-s} \ 'working' and Lett. \text{augāt-s} \ 'growing', for \text{*-ant(i)-s}.

The Suffix \text{-\textit{ment-}. Skr. \text{tei-\textit{vās} -\textit{vān} Avest. \text{pićā-\textit{vās} one like thee}, Skr. \text{āma-\textit{vās} -\textit{vān} 'pressing on mightily, powerful' for}}

\textsuperscript{1}) Lith. \text{sidum} \ and Lett. \text{sidu} (J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 392) cannot be quoted as proving that Idg. had this ending.
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*-vāns, but Avest. ama-vā for *-vās. Pr. Ar. *-vāns in *tva-
-vāns, we may conjecture, took the place of *-vās under the
influence of -vant-am -vant-as; but pr. Ar. *-yās, which was
preserved in Avest. ama-vā, belongs to the suffix -yes- -yos.
Cp. II § 127 p. 405, § 136 p. 441, § 208. Gr. στροφέ-ις ‘wailing,
lamentable’ for *-fenv-ς.

Remark 1. Bartholomae (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 499 ff., 518 f.)
postulates Idg. *-yēns-s; in which I cannot follow him. It may be remarked
in passing that, granted pr. Ar. nom. *-vās, the change of -rant- to -rant-
stems (Skr. ṭk-ant- and ṭk-ant- ‘singing’ Avest. ama-ant- and ama-ant-,
and so forth) is more easily explained than it is on Bartholomae’s theory,
pp. 540 f.: -vās had another form -vā, its sentence doublet, and this
resembled the ending of stems in -van- (§ 391). Cp. the reverse process in
Ved. varyāt-ā from the nom. varyā (stem varyāvān-) ‘width, distance’.

Suffixes in -d, pr. Idg. nominative ending -ts. Skr. ṣarāt
‘autumn’, stem ṣarād-. Gr. φυγάς ‘fugitive’, stem φυγάδ-, ἄσις
‘shield’, stem ἀσιδ-. Lat. lapis, stem lapid-, palās stem palād-.

All these examples ended in pr. Idg. -ts. But we have also
certain forms, especially in Germanic, which seem unquestionably
to point to a proetnic nominative singular without s. Such are
Goth. mēna O.H.G. mano, and doubtless Lith. mēnā for *mēnoς
beside Goth. mēnoς O.H.G. manōd (II § 123 pp. 393 f.),
O.H.G. nefo for pr. Germ. *nēfōς beside Lat. nepōs (see loc.
cit.), A.S. hæle for pr. Germ. *χαλέβ beside hæled (loc. cit.),
erroneously traced back to pr. Germ. *tan(t)-s) beside Skr.
dān Gr. ἄδοις. Other examples are given by Kluge, Paul’s
Grundr. I 390 f. Here there are two possibilities between
which I do not feel able to decide at present. There may
have been double forms from the very first, one with s and
one without; this view may be supported by the ablaut in
*χαλέβ (in consideration of this, Kluge op. cit. p. 385 even
postulates an Idg. nom. *pōd beside acc. *pōd-ις). Or s may
have disappeared when the words were used in this or that
environment in the sentence (cp. the disappearance of s in such
sound-groups as st-, I § 589. 3 pp. 445 f., § 645 p. 490). And
Remark 2. If -u in O.H.G. *wennu is the direct and regular representative of pr. Germ. *-ēt = Idg. *-o(d) (§ 241), the -o of māno nefo must have arisen by an assimilation of these words to the nominative ending of u-stems, such as *gomo.

b. Suffixos in -k and -g. Skr. usīk- (stem usīj-) 'demanding', Avest. usirš (stem usij-) a kind of demon; for Skr. spāt 'spy' and the like see I § 401 Rem. 2 p. 297, § 404 Rem. 3 p. 299. Gr. μεγας (stem μεγας-) 'girl' φαλάγγας (stem φαλάγγα) 'phalanx'. Lat. senex (stem senex-) bibax (stem bibac-). O.Ir. airc 'princeps' for *ariak-s, gen. airc, ail 'rock, stone' for *alek-s, gen. ailech, nathir 'water-snake' gen. nathrach; Gall. eso = Mid.Ir. eu (gen. iach) 'salmon' (I § 657. 10 pp. 509 f.).

§ 199. Perhaps all Root-Nouns had -s in the proto-ethnic language (cp. § 197). Examples:

Pr. Idg. *nāy-s 'navis': Skr. nāy-ς Gr. ναῦς. *d(ī)jēs-s 'heaven, daylight': Skr. d(ī)yās-ς, Gr. ζεύς, O.H.G. Zio for *t(ī)es(z) (Streitberg, Die germ. Comp. auf -ōs-, 18). *gōy-s 'ox, cow': Skr. gōy-ς Avest. gau-ς, Gr. βοῦς, O.Ir. bó (I § 657. 10 pp. 509 f.). I leave it an open question whether Gr. Ζης, Lat. diēs and Gr. Dor. βός, Lat. bōs O.H.G. kuo O.Sax. kō) were framed on the model of the acc. sing. (§ 221), or whether they represent proto-ethnic sentence doublets *d(ī)jēs and *gōs. See II § 160 p. 481 f., and Streitberg op. cit. 12. In composition we have Skr. -gu-s, as su-gu-ς 'having fine cattle', inflected as a u-stem, e.g. nom. pl. su-gāvas du. su-gāt.

*ūqo-s 'voice, speech': Skr. vāk Avest. vāx-ς, Gr. ὕψ, Lat. vox. *rēk-s (v-rēg-) 'ruler, king': Skr. rāt (like spāt § 198), Lat. rēx O.Ir. rē (gen. rīg, Gall. nom. Dummo-rēc); Goth. rēk-s (nom. pl. rēk-s) instead of *reiks (I § 527 p. 381) is doubtless borrowed from the Keltic. Avest. bār-s 'height, high' (gen. bār-zō ber-zō), O.Ir. bē (gen. breg) 'mountain', Goth. baurgy-s 'stronghold, fort, town' (gen. baurgy-s) instead of the regular *baurgy, from v-bherg-. Skr. āpās Avest. apaqš

1) A.S. cē O.Icel. kýr must be added to this list, if in these û stands for yo. But op. II § 160 p. 482.
for pr. Ar. *apānekk-š 'turned backwards' (I § 647.7 pp. 493 f.; Bartholomae, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 501 ff. und 517 f.). Avest. af-š (stem ap-) 'water', Skr. stūp (stem stubh-) 'roaring'.

We may doubtless add *mūs-s 'mouse', which became *mūs in the proethnic stage (§ 356 Rem.): Gr. μῦς Lat. mūs (II § 160 p. 485).

The Greek χόρων 'earth' (cp. Skr. khūm-, II § 160 p. 482) may be an ad-formate of τραγών and the like; χάν χήρ 'goose' and μήρ 'month' are undoubtedly re-formates, taking the place of *χανός *χάς and Iom. etc. μειχ for *μηρός respectively (II § 132 p. 415; § 160 p. 485); similarly φάρ 'thief' χήφ 'hedgehog' on the analogy of δόρων δόροφ etc.

For the ground-form of Skr. pāτ Gr. Dor. πος πός (Hom. τρι-πος) Att. πος Lat. pās 'foot', see § 198 p. 79: were there once parallel forms *pād (*pād) and *pōt-s (*pōt-s)? or in pōs has not yet been satisfactorily explained.

1) Vocative Singular Masculine and Feminine.

§ 200. No special vocative forms are found in the Indo-Germanic languages except for singular nouns masculine or feminine. From the proethnic period onwards, the nominative has served for the vocative in the plural and dual, whilst in the neuter gender the form used for nominative and accusative has been used for the vocative in all three numbers.

Genuine singular vocatives naturally enough had no case-sign at all; see § 184 p. 56. In the proethnic language the accent was thrown back to the first syllable of the word, as *māter 'mother' = Skr. mātār Gr. ματήσ; this remains a general rule in Sanskrit, but in no other language. But the forms had a word-accent of their own only when they stood first in a clause: In any other position it is probable that they were often _-elictic_, which is the rule in Sanskrit; e. g.

idāu indra ṣrṇahi 'Hear this, Indra!' See I § 669 p. 534, and § 672 p. 538.

In all other branches of the language but the Aryan this practice of accenting the first syllable underwent many changes. Sometimes it was overborne by special rules in special languages. Thus in Greek and Latin certain changes were necessary in order that words should conform to the trisyllabic law; hence Gr. Ἀγάμεμνον instead of *Ἀγαμέμνων, Lat. altumne, amplissumne instead of *alumne, amplissumne (I § 676 p. 541, § 681 p. 548). Or the accent followed that of other cases from the same stem; thus Gr. δαίμων instead of *δαίμων follows δαίμων (intelligent) δαίμωνος etc., αὐτοκράτωρ instead of *αὐτοκράτωρ follows αὐτοκρατόρος (having unlimited power) αὐτοκρατόρος etc., διογένης instead of *διόγενες follows διογής ('born of a god') διογενός etc. Elsewhere other factors less easy to detect may have been at work, as in the accentuation of the Lithuanian vocative — e.g. vīlkē ('wolf'), naktē ('night').

But even in the singular the parent language would seem to have sometimes used the nominative form as a mode of address: compare, for example, Skr. Ved. (Rig-V. I. 2. 5), vāyav indraś ca cētathāḥ 'Vāyu and Indra, ye take care', Gr. Hom. (Γ 276) Zeū πάτερ . . . Ἡλιός υ . . . , νίμης μὰρτυρολ ἐστε. And in most languages the forms of the nominative usurped more and more the place of the vocative; sometimes the prothetic vocative form belonging to some class of stems died out completely before the date of the oldest extant specimens of a given language. This happened in Latin to the vocative of a-stems. The genuine vocative forms are most faithfully preserved in Sanskrit. Yet even there in certain monosyllabic stems the vocative was regularly expressed by the nominative form, although accented as a vocative would be; e.g. diyaū-ṣ, written dyāuṣ (nom. diyaū-ṣ),2 as contrasted with Gr. Zeū; bhū-ṣ ('earth'),

1) Bessebenberger's conjectures given in the essay cited in the footnote on the last page seem to me highly uncertain.

2) For this accentuation, see Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Sprachg., I 82 f.
but Gr. ἰχθῦς (fish). Perhaps we may follow Collitz (Bezz. Beitr. X 32) in recognising the Idg. vocative of gāud-š in the voc. -gō, only found in composition (e. g. bhārī-gō).

Remark. In Sanskrit, the rules regulating the accent of the vocative singular held good for plural and dual nominative forms when these were used as vocatives (e. g. the sing. dīyau-ś just cited); e. g. pītāras (nom. pītāras 'fathers'). There is no reason why this should not be regarded as a genuine prothetic tradition, although it is true that no such practice can be proved for any European language: in Attic ἀνέτες, for example, might have been expected, since we have ὁ πάτερ.

§ 201. 1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *yīge. Skr. yṣka; Avest. vehrka, O.Pers. martiya 'homo' (I § 649.1 p. 495). Gr. λευκός beside ἄδελφος 'brother', δουμόνος 'wonderful one'. Lat. lupe puere, filiae and filii from ōliu-s (cp. below); Umbr. Tēsre, Fisiove. O.Ir. fr for *yire, maicc 'son' for *makyse, cēlī 'comrade' doubtless for *cēlīs (I § 657.3 p. 500). Goth. vulf, haidrī 'herdsman', O.H.G. wolf. Lith. vilkė, žūdi (žūdi-s 'word') gaidy (gaidū-s 'cock'), cp. below; O.C.Sl. vičē.


It cannot be proved that in the Latin vocatives from ō-stems -š is contracted from -ie. Probably we have here the weak-grade -i-, as we certainly have in Lith. voc. gaidy and in the Italic nominatives in -is -i-s. Cp. II § 63 p. 122, III § 194 p. 74, and Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 201.

In Lithuanian the ending -ai is also found. This occurs in names of men, as tēvai 'father' Jūnai 'Johannes' (cp. Bezzengerber in his Beiträge, XV 299). Can it be that -i is the same particle as we see in pronominal nominatives in -oš (§ 414)? Avest. voc. hæmû: nom. ḫwōi (§ 202) points to this conclusion. Brückner (Archiv für slav. Phil. III 276) compares the emphasising -ai in tas-aš tokš-aš gražus-ai, and the like.

For O.C.Sl. junčiće beside nom. junčič 'young bull', etc., see I § 147 p. 134. ō-stems whose nominative did not end in -e
-ži, had the ending of u-stems in the vocative (§ 203), as kraji (nom. kraji 'border') maži (nom. maži 'man').

Remark 2. The following may be suggested as a conceivable reason for the latter change of inflexion. Nominatives such as kraji konži are parallel to the Lith. maži-s žodi-s and to the Lat. alti-s. Can there have been nominatives in *-je = Idg. *-jo-s in O.C.Sl., corresponding to Lithuanian nominatives like vėjo-s ('wind') svečia-s ('guest'), and to alti-s and the like in Latin? Then the vocative in *-je will have been transformed in order to avoid confusion with the nominative which had the same ending, while this nominative afterwards took the ending of that class of nouns whose nominative ended in -(i)ži-s. Cp. § 194 p. 74.

§ 202. 2. a-stems. Pr. Idg. *ēkā, cp. II § 59 pp. 108 f. Skr. ámba 'mother' doubtless belongs here; for the Ar. voc. in *-aj (Skr. -z Avest. -y) see below. Gr. Hom. nýmphi 'nymph'; -ā is more commonly kept in masculine words, as δέσποινα 'master' συβόρα 'swineherd'. O.C.Sl. rako. And probably we must place in this class Lith. ranka, and with -a dropped, mòtyn from nom. mòtyna 'mother', Máriuk from nom. Mariukà, and the like; see I § 664 p. 522, and J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 382.

In Aryan the common ending was *-aj: Skr. ásvē Avest. haŋŋ. The origin of this ending is uncertain. I think it most probable that a deictic particle has attached itself to this case, — the same deictic -i which is found in the nom. sing. in -aj, Avest. āvōi berxā Pruss. stai mensai (see § 190 p. 67, § 414). Cp. Lith. ėvai § 201.

Remark 1. Bopp (Vergl. Gr. I 1 297) and J. Schmidt (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 381 f.) compare Skr. ásvē with Gr. ἄνδροι. Others assume a re-formation on the analogy of i-stems (Skr. ácē).

Another fact may have had something to do with the practically complete disuse of -a in the vocative of Aryan a-stems. In Aryan, Idg. -a and -e both became -a; hence the same form represented both *ēkā f. and *ēkā m.

In Greek, such forms as Ἐκυσία αἰναρίη, which were properly nominative, came to be regarded as vocative in contradistinction to nominatives with s, Ἐκυσίας aἰναρίης, and were used as such. See § 190 p. 67.

Masc. vocatives in -ā were sometimes used as nominatives, e.g. ἰπποτά 'horse-driver', Ὀμόρα; cp. the Lat. vocative Jū-piter Jupiter (§ 210), which also passed current as a nominative. See

Remark 2. Other explanations, to my mind not convincing, of ἱμερᾶ are given by Fick and Bezzengerber in Bezz. Beitr. III 159 and 174, and by Johannson in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXX 426. J. Schmidt (Pluralb. 401 ff.) assents to my view, provided that there was at least one stem which originally had -a in both nom. and voc. properly without the action of form-association; otherwise he thinks the explanation impossible. This indispensable stem he sees in ἑκέωνα, originally, as he thinks, a neuter substantive meaning 'wide-eye'; ἑκέωνα Ζεὺς would then mean 'wide-eye heaven', the meaning being afterwards changed to 'wide-seer Zeus'. This ingenious explanation of ἑκέωνα is probably right; but the Lat. Jupiter proves that it is wrong to suppose that the nominative use of vocatives like ἵππος must have begun with this particular word. The reverse should rather be assumed; it is more likely that the change of meaning in ἑκέωνα Ζεὺς to 'wide-seer Zeus' was made easier by a previous use of vocatives like νεπελγεφέρε, μοτίρα and so forth before Ζεὺς as though they were nominative; the same thing preserved the ending of ἑκέωνα before Ζεὺς from being inflected in any way, whilst ἑκέωνα before Ζεὺς was doubtless preserved by the analogy of the masc. accusative in -a, as ἄδων-α.

From Στρεψιμάδης in Attic we have the voc. Στρεψιμάδης on the analogy of vocatives of es-stems like Ἑκπατζ (§ 209). Cp. in the gen. sing. -άδου instead of -άδον (§ 229).

Italic. Lat. equus is a nominative form. Perhaps the reason why the vocative in Idg. *-a was dropped in Latin is that *-a became -e, and thus -a-stems had the same ending as those in -o- (I § 97. 3 p. 91). Again, Umbr. Tubia (a goddess) must be a nominative form if the instrumental -e of Umbrian, e.g. in pure 'igne', represents Idg. *-a; see § 274.

Whether the Irish tuath is a true vocative, representing tōth, or a nominative, cannot be determined.

Goth. giba O.H.G. geba are nom. or acc.; see § 190 p. 67.

§ 203. 3. i- and u-stems. The ending varied. Sometimes it was *-oิ or *-eи and *-oη or *-eη, sometimes */-i and */-u.

a. *

b. O.Ir. *aith may represent either of the two ground-forms (see I § 657. 1 and 4, pp. 507 f.).
b. *-om or *-ey: Skr. sánō; Lith. sūna, O.C.Sl. synu. *-u: Avest. bāzē: Gr. πῶς, Goth. sunu, O.H.G. sītu sito. And we should follow Wackernagel (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIV 301 ff.) in referring Gr. ἵππος to *hippo, and comparing it with Skr. dśvayō (nom. dśvayū-ś ‘craving horses’). As regards ἵππος and so forth see § 261.

For Avestic heteroclite forms in -ō, as raśnuvō (stem raśnu- ‘righteousness, justice’), see Bartholomae Ar. Forsch. I 56 f.

In Gothic -au is common beside -u. But the MSS. show a peculiar liability to confuse u and au in all the singular cases, which points to a transition from ā to ē (āu); hence it is not safe to infer a vocative form -āu = *-ou or *-ey. Cp. Leo Meyer, Got. Spr. p. 574; Leskien, Die Decl. im Slav.-Lit. und Germ. 76; Braune, Got. Gr. 3 p. 44.

§ 204. 4. i-ē-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). The forms to be considered are Skr. bṛhati Avest. barenti, Gr. φθονοῦ, Goth. frējōndi, which are hardly enough to enable us to restore the proethnic form. Ar. -i from nom. -i, as in a-stems -a is the voc. ending from nom. -ā. O.C.Sl. zemljā from nom. zemljja like rako: rakā.

§ 205. 5. i-ī-stems and ā- u-y-stems. The proethnic type is perhaps represented by Gr. ἱζοῦ Hom. Θέτι and O.C.Sl. sekrē; O.H.G. sū and swigrar (for *sekrā) may also be genuine vocatives.

Ved. nādi (nādi-ś ‘river’) and śvāṣru, like bṛhati (§ 204). In monosyllabic stems the nominative was regularly used as vocative, e. g. dhi-ś, bhi-ś (§ 290 p. 82).


In the Avesta, where -m is written instead of -n, the reason is probably to be found in sentence-position and varying surroundings (cp. Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XV 40 and Stud. zur idg. Sprachgesch. I 72). Examples: pri-zafem (pri-zafan- ‘having three mouths’), aφραον instead of aφραομ (I § 158 p. 141) = Skr. 'āravas 'fire-priest'.
In Greek we find -ον only in barytone stems; and even its these the nominative form may be used, as it must be in stems which are oxytone. Nor do we ever meet with *εν but always *ην, the ending of the nominative.

The Lithuanian vocative is the nominative form, ses 'dog', pėnus 'hord-boy'; also szunys pėmenė, declined as i-stems.


Whether the Germanic forms are really vocative and not nominative, as Lat. dātor, soror and O.Ir. siur were, cannot be decided. As to the Germanic forms, cp. § 192 b. with Rem. 1 pp. 71 f.

§ 208. 8. Stems ending in an explosive.


Avest. berzā from the nom. sing. in -ο; see § 198 pp. 77 f.

Greek. Like γεφον we have Ἀλαρ, from nom. Άλας for *Alfav-ς. Hom. Πολυδάμας was formed from the nom. Πολυ-δάμας (for *-δαμαντ-ς) on the model of αἰναρίτη: αἰναρίτη; and the like.

Goth. frījōnd O.H.G. friunt as though they were o-stems, cp. nom. frījōnds friunt § 198 p. 78.

Stems made with the suffix -uṇt-. In Aryan, the vocative of these stems like the nominative has -uṇ- in place of -uṇt-. Skr. Ved. āna-vas Avest. ama-vō (this form is not actually found, but it is to be inferred on the strength of dreuō = druvō for *drug-vō, from Gāthic drug-vant- 'deceitful', see I § 453 p. 335). It was not until a later period that -uṇ drove out -vas in Sanskrit. Cp. § 198 p. 78, and also II § 127 p. 405, § 136 p. 441, Bartholomae Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 519 and 53 f. In Greek, fevr-stems had no special form for the vocative, but the nominative was used.

As regards the other explosive stems; in Sanskrit it is impossible to say whether the forms in question are vocative
or not, since they may equally well be regarded as nominative. Examples are: māṛu (wind-god) pūru-kṛt 'rich in deeds' akṛta-ruk 'possessing uninterrupted brilliancy'. Iranian apparently offers us no forms which can pass for vocatives; the nominative is used instead, e. g. in Yasna 33. 8 haurcatās ('safety, weal'). Turning to the European languages, we find no language but Greek that has clearly marked vocative forms, and even Greek has only one or two: āva for *āva-k (*āva-r) from āvāx 'lord', yıva for *yıva-k beside acc. yıva-x-a 'woman'. The following may really belong to i-stems: paī (paī-, paīd- 'child') and τυραννί (tyrannid- 'royalty').

§ 209. 9. s-stems.


Stem *dusos- 'dawn': Skr. uṣas. The Gr. ἦσοί like udoī, followed the feminines in -o- -o-.


§ 210. 10. Pr. Idg. *d(e)jeu 'heaven': Gr. Zeū, Lat. Jū-piter Juppiter (used also as nom.); but in Sanskrit we find dyaū-š dyaun-š, the nominative form, dyaun-š having taken the accent of a vocative. Cp. Gr. ἴχθος as contrasted with Skr. bhū-š § 205. For Skr. -gō from nom. saū-š, see § 200 p. 83.

**Accusative Singular Masculine and Feminine.**

§ 211. In the parent language there was only one suffix for this case, the suffix -m, consonant or sonant as the case might require (cp. I § 645. 2 p. 489).

---

1) For bhūṣ bhagoṣ, which do not belong here, see Bartholomae, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 531.

2) Lindfors, Dissert, de accusativo Latinorum, Lund. 1841. Gae-dieke, Der Accusativ im Veda, 1880.
To illustrate:

-\text{-m} in pr. Idg. *\text{y}l\text{qo}-\text{m} 'lupum': Skr. \text{vyka}-\text{m}, Gr. λύκον (I § 652. 3 p. 498), Lat. lupu-\text{-m}, O.Ir. fer n- 'virum' (I § 657. 5 and 8, pp. 508 f.), Goth. \text{vulf} for pr. Germ. *\text{yulfa}-\text{n}, but also \text{plau-}\text{a} = Skr. \text{tā-}\text{m} 'the, that' with pr. Idg. -\text{n} retained (I § 214 p. 182, § 659. 5 p. 513, § 660. 1 p. 514, III § 417)\text{1)}, Lith. \text{vilka}, but also dialectic \text{ta-}\text{n} = Skr. \text{tā-}\text{m} and the like (I § 218 p. 185), O.C.Sl. \text{vilkiū} (I § 219 p. 187).

-\text{n} in pr. Idg. *\text{bheront-}\text{n} 'ferentem': Gr. φερόντ-\text{α} (I § 233 pp. 197 f.), Lat. \text{ferent-}\text{em} (I § 238 p. 199), O.Ir. \text{carit-} n- (I § 243 p. 201, § 657. 5 and 8, pp. 508 f.), Goth. \text{tunja}-\text{u} 'dantem' for pr. Germ. *\text{un} (I § 214 p. 182, § 244 p. 202, § 659. 5 p. 513), Lith. \text{žežantu-}\text{i} 'vehenem' (I § 249 p. 204), O.C.Sl. \text{kamen-}\text{y}. As to Ar. -\text{am}, e.g. in Skr. \text{bhārant-}\text{am}, where we should expect \text{-n}, and as to Cypr. ȧ(v)ơρα(v)-r-\text{av} Thess. xíov-\text{av} as contrasted with Att. ἄραρ-\text{α} xíov-\text{α}, see I § 231 Rem. p. 196, § 646. 2 p. 490\text{3)}, and the Author's Gr. Gr.\text{2} pp. 118 f. For Umbro-Samnite -\text{om} instead of (Lat.) -\text{em}, see § 218.

Wheeler (Der griech. Nominalaccent, 20 f.) conjectures that there was -\text{ni} as well as -\text{m}, which he sees in Skr. \text{pār-}\text{α} 'forth, further, beyond, over' = \text{tiy. π\text{-}\text{α} 'ultra', and in other adverbial words.

§ 212. 1. \text{o-stems}. Pr. Idg. *\text{y}l\text{qo}-\text{m}. Skr. \text{vyka}-\text{m}: Avêst. \text{vehrke-}\text{m}, O.Pers. \text{kara-}\text{m} 'people, host'. Gr. λύκον-\text{ν}. Lat. lupu-\text{m}, equo-\text{m}; Umbr. populom puplu puplu 'populum',

\text{1)} In the first volume of this work *\text{wulf} *\text{yastî} *\text{sunni} were assumed as forms of the last stage of the preethnic period in Germanic. Perhaps we should rather say *\text{wulf} *\text{yastî} *\text{suny}, with a nasalised vowel. The reason is that Runic inscriptions show forms like \text{hora}, \text{staina} etc., but where pr. Germ. -\text{a} had no nasal following, it has already dropped. See Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 359.

\text{2)} In vol. I § 219 p. 186 and § 865. 2 p. 525 I have erred in stating that -\text{e} is the regular form assumed by Idg. -\text{n}. It should be -\text{i}. As regards materre 'matrem' see § 218 p. 95.

\text{3)} Another reason for discarding pr. Ar. *-\text{n} - *-\text{n} may have been a fear of confusion with the instrumental, which would come to be the same in form with the accusative in those systems of declension which had no ablaut.
Osc. húrtum 'hortum' taçqů 'taurum'. O.Ir. fer n- 'virum' (I § 34 p. 34), aile n- 'alium' (cp. aile nom. § 194). Goth. vulf, O.H.G. wulf; Norse Run. stáine = Goth. stáin 'stone'; Goth. pan-a O.H.G. de-n 'the, that' with the sign of the acc. retained (§ 417). Lith. vilka (dial. ta-n 'the, that', etc.), O.C.Sl. užka.

Jo-stems in the accusative, as in the nom. and voc. sing. (§§ 194, 201), sometimes show the weak-grade form -i- instead of -jo-. Lat. Cornēm, Umbr. Fisium 'Fisium'. Goth. hafdī? Lith. kūdī, gādī, O.C.Sl. krajī, konjī, the latter instead of *konī with n palatalised on the analogy of the genitive and other cases.

Armenian z gail, z mard (z is a prefix) I now regard with Osthoff as nominative forms on account of tən 'ten'; 1) see § 174 pp. 22 f. In the same way, the accusative of all stems in this language is doubtless really a nominative form.

§ 213. 2. a-stems. Pr. Idg. *ekwa-m. Skr. dvām; Avest. hānəm O.Pers. hainā-m. Gr. κούα-ν. Lat. aqua-m (I § 655. 4 p. 503); Umbr. totam tota Osc. totam 'civitatem' Osc. viam via 'viam'. Gall. loga-n 'tumulum'. Lith. raską, O.C.Sl. rąką.

O.Ir. tuairt n- is ambiguous.

Remark 1. This points to a palatal vowel in the ending, and the case may originally have ended in *-i-m *-u or *-i-m. In any case the gen. tuairthe took its ending from stems in -iē- and -i- -iē- (soilse and inse; see § 229). It is conceivable, then, that tuairt n- has been re-formed on the analogy of insi n-, which perhaps contains Idg. *-im, whose by-form, too, insi n-, matches with soilse n- (§ 216). But there is a more likely hypothesis, which Thurneyser suggests. In many stems, amongst which are these very stems in -iē- and -i- -iē-, the dative and accusative (leaving aside the n- of the latter) came to have the same form; this may have caused the dative tuairth to pass for an accusative as well, whilst the like ending of tuairthe and soilse inse (which was doubtless older) gave a further stimulus to the process. This view is supported by acc. mnai n- besides dat. mnai. It seems certain that soilse n-, nai n- ('novam') do not stand for *-iān, but took their ending from insi n-, which may be compared with Gr. mörvān and Lith. ėmęč (§ 216).

In Germanic, some would trace -a-m in such adverbs as Goth. gu-leikō O.H.G. gi-lihko 'similar, like'; see Osthoff, Kuhn’s

Zitschr. XXIII 90 ff., Morph. Unt. I 271. But there are other explanations of these adverbs more likely to be true; see §§ 275, 276. In Gothic, the case in actual use, *giba, was really a nominative form 1); as genuine accusatives may be given pó f. 'the, that', hvō f. 'which?', dinō-hun f. 'any one' (cp. hveilō-hun 'lasting an hour'). Perhaps the nominative *giba came to be used as accusative just because these two cases assumed the same form in pó etc.; as in Russian the fem. nom. in -a was used instead of the acc. in -u (O.C.Sl. -q) because nominative and accusative singular were identical in other classes (Vetter, Zur Gesch. der nom. Decl. im Russ., 45 f.).

O.H.G. *geba A.S. *giefe pre-suppose *gebe. None of the explanations hitherto offered seems to me satisfactory. I conjecture that Idg. *-jē is hidden in the ending of O.H.G. gutanne (later gutinnu) A.S. gýdenne 'goddess' O.H.G. sunte 'sin' (later suntæa suntia). Of this *-jē the weak form -e- is found in O.West.Ger. Vatei-ms 'Vatviabus', and perhaps in O.H.G. digēm dat. pl. 'prayers' etc., see § 382. These forms, gutinne and so on, will then have the ending *-ē-m which is contained in Lith. žemę O.C.Sl. zemľa, and possibly in Lat. faciam Mid.Ir. insi n- (§ 216), and geba giefe are ad-formates of these. For -e in gutinne cp. Braune, Ahd. Gr. § 58 Anm. 1, and § 209 Rem. 3. The genitive singular shows a similar instance of form association, § 229; so also the nominative plural, § 315.

Remark 2. West-Germ. *-ā may stand for pr. Germ. unaccented ē only if the vowel came to be the final sound of the word through the West Germanic loss of the consonant (cp. also the 1st. and 3rd. sing. O.H.G. solbōta). We have ē, not ā, in O.H.G. chīminnerōdēs etc.; see Klinge in Paul's Grundr. I 863. And compare what is said above, p. 70 footnote 1.

§ 214. 3. i-stems. Pr. Idg. *omi-m. Skr. āpi-m; Avest. aši-m, O.Pers. šiyati-m 'dwelling-place'. Gr. ἕως-ν. Lat. turrim;

1) Burghauser (Germ. Nominallex. 21) conjectures that pr. Goth. *geba* first lost its nasal on the analogy of *sulfa* *anati* *sumu*, and then became *giba* quite regularly. This must surely fall to the ground, since we have to assume nasalised forms in proethnic Gothic for these words too: they will be *sulfa* *anati* *sumu* (or *sulfa* *anati* *sumu*). See p. 89 footnote 1.

Armen. (z) sirt is a nom. form, like (z) gail and (z) zard §§ 212, 215.

In Latin i-stems and consonant stems were fused into one class (II § 93 p. 281, III § 396); which caused the ending -i-m to give way to -em = Idg. *-ης, except in a few survivals of the old type (besides turri-m there are e. g. siti-m, tussi-m, resti-m): e. g. ovem, mentem through assimilation to comit-em nav-em and so forth (I § 33 Rem. 1 p. 33).


Avest. nasâun 'corpse' i. e. nasâvem, cp. the nom. -âu-š (§ 196 p. 76), probably a re-formate containing the loc. sing. in -au, see § 261. O.Pers. dahyôn (beside dahyum), which was influenced by association with the nom. dahyân-š, at least to begin with, as in Greek râν-ν follows râν-ς, etc. (§ 221).

Armen. (z) zard is ncm., like (z) gail and (z) sirt; §§ 212, 214.

Greek. Hom. εἰσ药业(F)ν 'broad' instead of νῦν-ν on the analogy of the acc. pl. εἰσ药业(F)-ας.

§ 216. 5. i- šem-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). Three endings are met with: (1) -i-m: Skr. bhât-m, Avest. barenti-m O.Pers. harauvatim i. e. -im 'Arachosis' (= Skr. sâraspati-m); Gr. πολιν-ν; and perhaps Mid.Ir. inis n-. (2) -i-im -i-ης: Gr. πόνην-αν, φέρονταν φόντακ-αν (cp. below). (3) -i-em: Lith. lemę O.C.Sl. zemličq; and we must doubtless add O.H.G. gutinne A.S. zydenne (§ 213). — Lat. faciem and Mid.Ir. insi n-, Brîgî n- may belong to either (2) or (3); then Ir. -i n- = *-iim = Gr. -iav, or it may = *-iim (i = e). Lat. suâvem
must have been preceded by *svāvi-ṃ; was this for *svāvi-m? Cp. socrūm § 217.

We may fairly suppose that two forms only came down from the parent language, -i-m and -(i)i-ṃ, the first where a sonant began the following word, the second before a consonant (cp. 3. pl. opt. *s-ō̆i-ṭ = O.Lat. sient beside *s-ī- in sīnus and *s-ō̆i- in sīs). Possibly this -(i)i-ṃ gave rise to -(i)i-ṃs in the acc. pl. (§ 328). In the same way, stems in -ī- -iī- have sometimes -ī-m (Gr. κή-ν) and sometimes -iī-ṃ (Skr. dhīyam) in the acc. sing., see § 217. In Greek -iīṃ -iīs became -iav -iav, -ν being added on the analogy of -īν -iav = -ē-m -d-ṃ etc. And as we assumed in § 191 (p. 68), -iav -iav called into existence nominatives in -ua -ka, where such are found in place of those in *-ī.

The third ending -ië-m arose because -ië- forced its way in from other cases. An acc. in -ië-m sprang up by the side of the gen. in -iës and so on, because ā-stems had acc. -iā-m beside gen. -iā-s.

Goth. frijōndja (nom. frijōndi) is a re-formate following sibja 'kindship' (nom. sibja) and giba, cp. gen. frijōndjōs like sibjōs gibōs, frijōndjāi like sibjāi gibāi. Thus the relation of O.H.G. gutinne and Goth. frijōndja is similar to the relation of Gr. ἀληθέαν to ἀληθεῖαν (gen. ἀληθείας), and of Lith. žemę (nom. žemę) to vėžačiaq (nom. vešanti). Cp. p. 68 footnote 1.

§ 217. 6. -ī- and -ū- ā-ṃ-stems and stems in -ē, -ē, -ō. In pr. Idg. -ē in -ā-m before a sonant, -ē-ṃ -uṃ-ṃ before a consonant in the following word.

1. -ē-m -ē-m. Skr. Ved. tanā-m Avest. tanā-m 'body' (beside Skr. tanūv-am Avest. tan(u)vēm), Avest. berzai-līm 'having great insight'. Gr. ἀναφypse-ν, ὀφθαλμο-ν vēxē-ν. Lat. vi-m (I § 655. 4 p. 503), Umbr. sim 'suem' (I § 57 p. 46); Lat. socrūm, too, may quite regularly stand for *socrū-m cp. § 197 p. 76. O.H.G. O.Icel. sō 'sow'. O.C.Sl. ljubъ 'love' in the phrase ljubъ dējati (teoriti) 'to commit adultery' may belong here.
Remark. I should offer this explanation of ḫūby with greater confidence, but that the masculine nominatives kʌmy and plʌmy (stem kʌmʌn- 'stone', plʌmʌn- 'flame') are used for the accusative as well, where there can certainly be no question of original neuters in *-on. In Russian, svekry is found as an accusative (Vetter, Zur Gesch. der nom. Decl. im Russ., 67); but this may be explained like stara and similar forms used as accusatives (ibid. 45).

2. -ɨ-ɭ-ɭ -ʊɰ-ɭ. Skr. dhiy-am ‘thought’ bhruv-am ‘eyebrow’, Ved. nadiy-am ‘river’ tanu-am Avest. tan(ʊ)v-ɨm ‘body’ (beside Skr. tanū-m Avest. tanā-m), O.Pers. (h)izuv-am ‘tongue’ (see Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XIV 245 f.). Gr. ἰχθύα (Theocr.) ὄφωια (Oppian) and the like; these certainly reproduce the type of formation which we are discussing, but they may be later ad-formates of ἰχθύας ὄφωιας, as Hom. ἵππα follows ἵππες (§ 215). Lat. su-em. Lith. švū-ɨ ‘fish’; O.CSl. krūv-i ‘blood’ (ep. nom. O.Pol. kry § 197 p. 76), svekrūv-ɨ ‘sacrum’ (beside svekrūv-e, the genitive form, cp. mater-e § 218).

A similar double formation should be assumed to have originally belonged to stems ending in long sonant liquids and nasals (II § 160. 4 pp. 485 f.). Skr. giv-am ‘praise’ for *gr̥-ɨ (cp. gīh Rig-V. X 99. 11 in Lounman, Noun-Inflexion p. 488), pur-am ‘stronghold’ for *pul-ɨ; but jd-m ‘being’ for * ḫē-m, similarly khd-m ‘source’ gō-ʃd-m ‘winning cattle’. It is easy to see why in the first set of instances the form in -m (*gə-m, *pul-m) gave way, and in the others the form in -ɨ (*gr̥n-ɨ).

§ 218. 7. n- and r-stems.

Pr. Idg. *k(w)un-ɨ. Skr. śvān-am; Avest. ōspān-em (sometimes the stem takes a weak form, following some of its other cases, as arš-em beside aršān-em ‘male, man’), O.Pers. asmān-am ‘heaven’. Gr. xwv-α (instead of *xwv-α, following xwv-öc etc.), tēktor-α ‘carpenter’, pōmēv-α ‘herdsman’. Lat. homin-em homōn-em, edōn-em; carn-em follows carn-is etc. O.Ir. coin n-, arain n-. Lith. švūn-ɨ (like Gr. xwv-α), ėkmen-ɨ; O.CSl. kamen-ı.

Pr. Idg. *matér-ɨ *dōtora-ɨ. Skr. mātār-am dātār-am, Avest. mātār-em dātār-em, O.Pers. frā-mātār-am ‘ruler’; in Avestic the stems may take the weak form on the analogy of other of their cases, māp-em dāp-em, atrēm with t instead of
§ 218. Accusative Singular Masculine and Feminine.

Following ἄταρ- (Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 132 f.). Gr. μὴτρι-ά (Nom. ἡγερ-ά following ἕγερ-ός etc. beside ἑγερ-ε-α), ἠδρο-ά. Lat. mātr-em (like Avest. mābr-em), datēr-em. OIr. māthir u-. Lith. mōter-į, O.C.Sl. maiter-į.

Armen. (z) akn and (z) maer, (z) dustr are doubtless nominative forms; see § 212 p. 90.

For Greek Thess. κτον-αυ Cypr. κτον-αυ see § 211 p. 89.

In these, as in the other consonant stems, Umbr.-Samnite has not -em as we should expect, but -om, the ending of stems in -o-: Osci. medicatin-om 'indicationem', Umbr. ars-fertur-o 'infertorem, flaminem' uhtur-u 'auctorem'. The student should observe that the two classes of stems have a like ending in the gen. pl. (§§ 344 ff.) and in the gen. sing. (§ 239), and that the early loss of o in the ending -o-o (I § 655.5 p. 503) caused them both to coincide to some extent even in the form of the nom. sing. (Umbr. *patro(m): pater = katu(m): katel).

The Germanic forms are obscure: Goth. guman, raþjon 'rationem', broðar, O.H.G. gomon gomun, sungän 'tongue' (for the formative suffix cp. Streitberg Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 218 f.), muoter, bruodar, A.S. guman, brōðor beside A.S. dur-u 'door' (ground-form *dhur-ŋ).

Remark. The O.Icel. aeo. foðor foður does not help us to a decision.

There are three possible explanations. (1) We start from *ŋ = pr. Germ. -m. Then in Gothic, where we find forms like maþ-b, -u must have been dropped in words of three or more syllables. This might be granted without more ado for West Germanic languages (cp. Kahle, Zur Entw. der cons. Decl. im Germ. pp. 3 f., Burghauser, Germ. Nominalflexion pp. 21 f.). But what of Goth. uðandu = Gr. ἱλεντ-α? — (2) Besides the ordinary forms *k(u)mon-ŋ, *mater-ŋ, there may once have been forms with -ŋ *k(u)mon-m, *mater-m, used before a sonant, which developed quite regularly into those which we find in Germanic. Cp. I § 192 p. 164, § 645. 2 p. 489, and Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 385. — (3) If it could be proved that Goth. friþond O.H.G. friunt, Goth. mēndōp O.H.G. mēndōd, Goth. veiðōd once ended in -o-m, the question would arise whether the prehistoric ground-forms were not *guman-a-ŋ etc. (cp. above, the Umbr.-Samn. -o-ŋ).

For Old Church Slavonic kamen-į, mater-į see p. 89 footnote 2. I follow Scholvin in regarding as genitive forms the variants mater-e, svekrūv-e (§ 217); see 'Scholvin, Die Decl.

§ 219. 8. Stems ending in Explosives.

Pr. Idg. *bhughont-ṃ. Skr. bhūhant-am, Avest. ber'zant-em. Gr. χρηματ-α. Lat. ferent-em. O.Ir. carit n-. Goth. tuną-u A.S. tōd 'deutem'; Goth. ulband-u 'camel' = Gr. ἄλεγαρ-α? Lith. vėžant-ą, O.C.Sl. veząštį instead of *veząštį, š having come from the other cases which had -jo- (cp. veząštė § 321, veząštì § 101 p. 68).


Skr. karāa-am 'autumn'. Gr. πυγά-α 'fugitive'. Lat. lapid-em. O.Ir. druind n- 'Druind'. A.S. knit-u 'nit, egg of a louse or small insect'. Pr. Idg. *pod-ṃ 'foot': Skr. pdd-am Avest. pad-em, O.Pers. pati-pat-am ('to one's place'); Gr. πόδ-α; Lat. ped-em; Goth. feō-u.


Skr. āp-am Avest. āp-em 'water'. Gr. κλωπ-α 'thief'. Lat. dap-em.

For Greek Cypr. ἄνδρι(ν)τρα and βρούκαν i. e. βρακ-αν (Meister, Gr. Dial. II 231 f.), see § 211 p. 89.

For Umbrian capirs-o 'capidem' curnac-o 'cornicem' see § 218 p. 95.

Germanic. It is doubtful how we should explain Goth. frijōnd O.H.G. friunt A.S. freōnd, Goth. mēnōp O.H.G. mānōd 'month', Goth. vieźvōd 'witness' (cp. Gr. κίδω-α, II § 133 p. 440).

Remark. Are these forms like those of o-stems, and was the pr. Germ. ending *-a-n? Or pr. Germ. *-m = Idg. -ṃ? See § 218
Rem. p. 95. We can hardly find support for ground-forms in *-mt-m (like *miater-m, above) used before sonants only, as Kluge seems to assume (Paul's Grundr. I 385). If there had been such forms, *-mtm would have become *-mm, cp. tįgym §§ 379. 2 and 387.

Goth. bairýg 'stronghold' brust 'breast' (gen. sing. bairýg-s brust-s) may have had the inflexion of i-stems, cp. the dat. pl. bairýgi-m brusti-m.

§ 220. 9. s-stems.


Skr. uṇas-am (uṇas-am) Avest. uṇāvē-em, Gr. ἵοο for ἴο(α)-α 'auroram' (perhaps ἴοα was the real Homeric form); Lat. hōneī-em (for the length of vowel in the format -s suffix, see Π § 133 pp. 423 f.).

The nominative in -ēs -ēs occasionally a re-formation of the accusative in Aryan, Greek, and Latin. Skr. uṇam Avest. uṇam are formed on the model of -sthā-s: -sthā-m, Avest. raṇa-p-stā : -stam and the like. See § 391, and Collitz in Bezz. Beitr. X 24 f. with the works cited in that place. Att. Σωκράτης instead of Σωκράτης (cp. § 272), Cypr. ἄπειρην instead of ἄπειρη, Lesb. ἀμορήλην, Boeot. Διογένεων etc. (G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.² p. 321; R. Meister, Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss. 1889 pp. 93 f.) on the analogy of νεῶν-ζ: νεῶν-ν etc.; analogy has produced the opposite effect in Herod. ἰσνορία Γύνα, which are treated as if they were sa-stems; cp. § 395. Lat. plēbēm famem (plēbēi famē) from plēbēs famēs on the model of acie-m : aciēs.

Pr.Idg. comparative *oik(ο)jós-ṇ. Skr. dhiyás-am (for the nasalised formative suffix, cp. Π § 135 p. 430), in post-Vedic Sanskrit sometimes -iyas-am following the other cases (cp. nom. pl. § 322), Avest. asyāvē-em. Gr. ἵο-ζα for *-io(a)α. Lat. ociōr-em.

Pr.Idg. part. perf. act. *weid-yos-ṇ. Skr. vidvēs-am (for nasalised formative suffix see Π Π § 136 p. 441), and sometimes -uś-ām, where the weak form of the formative suffix has ousted the strong (cp. nom./pl. § 322); Avest. vidvēs-em. Lith. mirus-i O.C.Sl. mirūsi (doubtless for *mirūch-į, according to
I § 588. 2 p. 443), the weak formative suffix having taken the
place of the strong, unless these forms are to be characterised
as an extension of -yes- by -io- (cp. II § 136 pp. 441 f.).
For Gr. sidék-α see II § 136 p. 440.

Pr. Idg. *most-η. Skr. mós-ām. Lat. mūr-em. Further,
O.H.G. A.S. O.Icel. mós (cp. dat. pl. másum) and O.C.Sl.
myst may possibly be regular descendants of the proethnic
form. Gr. múv instead of *μψ-α follows σο-ν and the like; see
II § 160 p. 485.

O.Pers. acc. nāh-am 'nose', Lat. nār-em, A.S. nos-u 'nose'.

§ 221. 10. Monosyllabic Stems in -i- -u- -m-.
Pr. Idg. *ney-η 'ship': Skr. nāv-am, Hom. νῆ-α (Att.
ναῦν is a re-formate following ναῦ-ζ), Lat. nāv-em.

In many instances, the stem-final was dropped before the
case-ending -m in the parent language itself. Pr. Idg. *góm,
stem *gøy- 'head of cattle': Skr. gām Avest. gám, Hom. Dor.
gōv, Umbr. bum 'bovem', O.Sax. kō O.H.G. kuo chuo (A.S. cū
O.Icel kū for *kūð? see p. 80 footnote). I leave it an open
question whether Avest. gāum, i.e. gāvem, and Lat. bovem are re-
formates in these several languages, or whether there ever was
a proethnic form *goy-η used before consonants. Att. bōv is
certainly a re-formate, and follows bōv-ζ. Pr. Idg. *d(i)jēm,
stem *d(i)jei- 'heaven, daylight': Skr. dyām diyām, Gr. ζήv,
Lat. diem; while alongside of these we find Jov-em, and (with
the weak form of the stem substituted for the strong) Skr. div-
am Gr. Δι-α; Gr. ζήv became the starting point for a new
series of forms, ζήvα ζηνός ζηνί, just as *τι-ν 'quem?' = Idg.
*qi-m gave rise to τίνα τίνος etc. (cp. § 314 Rem. 2; Osthoff,
Morph. Unt. IV 235 f.; Collitz, Bezz. Beitr. X 49; a new
but not convincing explanation is offered by Johansson, ibid.
XVI 158). In a similar way it would seem that O.Ir. boín n-
(dat. loc. sing. and nom. acc. du. boin) was founded upon a
form boín = Lat. bovem, aided (as Thurneysen points out to
me) by the analogy of coin, from nom. sing. cū 'dog'.
§ 222,223. Nominative and Accusative Singular Neuter.

rdm (also rdy-am), Lat. rem. Skr. kṣām Avest. zām 'earth' beside Gr. χθόν-α instead of *χθομ-α. See II § 160 pp. 481 ff.

Nominative and Accusative Singular Neuter.¹)

§ 223. From the earliest stage of Indo-Germanic which concerns us, the bare stem has served for the nominative and accusative singular neuter. An exception must be made of stems in -o-, which use for these cases the stem with -m added, the same form which does duty for the accusative singular masculine. A conjecture has already been offered as to the origin of this twofold function of forms with -m (§ 186 p. 60).

The pronominal ending -d (§ 417) spread to nominal adjectives, but apparently only when they were o-stems (§ 227). This is not proethnic, but belongs to the period of separate growth, and particularly to the Germanic and Balto-Slavonic branches.

§ 223. I. Stems without any Suffix used as nom. and acc. sing. neut.

1. i-stems. Pr. Idg. *oqi 'eye'. Skr. dkṣi 'eye' śāci 'pure'; Avest. ar'zahi the name of the western ka'شعر or region of the world, būri = Skr. bhūri 'multum'. Gr. ἄθροι 'clever, knowing'. Lat. mare leve, Umbr. sakre 'sacre, hostia' (I § 33 p. 33). O.Ir. muir n-, where, as in mid n- (see 2), n- is added on the analogy of the same cases of stems in -o- and -n.-²) O.H.G. méri 'mare', a unique survival in West-Germanic; Goth. fōn 'fire' doubtless for *fōn-i (heteroclite gen. funinis); adj. Goth. ga-mān 'commune' hrāin 'purum'.

2. u-stems. Pr. Idg. *medhu 'sweetness'. Skr. mādhu 'sweetness, honey' svādā 'suave' (for such forms as Ved. āpurā beside purā see below), Avest. madu 'honey' pouru =


²) Cp. Avest. rohu-m beside rohu 'bonum'. Similarly in mediæval Greek, neut. πολυ-ν, γεφυρα-ν etc. by assimilation to -o-ν.
Skr. puru ‘multum’; Aveṣt. vohum beside vohu ‘bonum’ on the analogy of stems in -o-. Gr. μίθυ ‘intoxicating drink, wine’ ῥόπτρις ‘suave’. Lat. pecu genu (for pecū and the like see below). O.Ir. μιθ- n- ‘mead, wine’ with n- affixed (cp. mui̇r n-under 1). Goth. faihu ‘money’ filu ‘multum’, O.H.G. fihu filo ‘cattle’ filo filu ‘multum’ (these are almost the only survivals in O.H.G.).¹) Lith. gražū ‘beautiful’ saldu ‘sweet’, Pruss. pecku ‘cattle’ = Goth. faihu (cp. I § 467.2 p. 343); O.C.Sl. medū ‘honey’, whose form probably belongs here, although it became masculine in prehistoric times (cp. nom. acc. synū ‘son’).


We likewise find the ending *-ōn *-ōn, as in the nom. sing. masc. and fem. (§ 192 pp. 69 f.) and in the nom. and acc. pl. neut. (§ 340), in Germanic and Slavonic. *-ōn: Goth. namō and O.H.G. O.Sax. namo and A.S. nama ‘name’ (which have become masculine), Goth. hātō O.Icel. hjarta ‘heart’. *-ēn: O.H.G. herza O.Sax. herta ‘heart’ A.S. eāre ‘ear’; O.C.Sl. imē ‘name’, and perhaps Pruss. semen ‘seed, sowing’ (O.C.Sl. sēme). If we are to assume that any of such Germanic and Lithuanian masculines as Goth. stōma ‘stuff; ‘substance’ Lith. stōmū ‘stature’ (II § 117 p. 375), and of Lithuanian feminines such as derme ‘agreement, bargain’ (Skr. dhārman- n.) gūsmē ‘song’, were originally neuter, we should have not only *-ōn *-ēn but *-ō *-ē, as in the masc. fem. How the formations in *-ō(n) *-ē(n) which

served as nom. sing. masc. fem. came to do duty for the neuter is a doubtful point. We may refer to J. Schmidt’s theories (Pluralb. 82 ff. and 117 ff.), remarking at the same time that this *-en is identical in form with the loc. sing. in *-en (§§ 256, 257; similarly Skr. nom. acc. dhāma: loc. ēdama, § 257 c.); nor should it be forgotten that Johansson believes -u to have originally been a locative suffix (§ 186 p. 63).

Another formation is used for the nom. acc. sing. neut. in Vedic Sanskrit, adjectives ending in -ā; e.g. purā in purā vāsu ‘much goods’. This lengthening of the -u was merely rhythmical (Lanman, Noun Inflection p. 406; J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 50 f.). Wackernagel (Das Dehnungsgesetz der griech. Compp., pp. 12 ff.) gives reason for holding this lengthening to be prothetic; hence we must regard the Latin by-forms in -a, pecū verū genū cornū, as being of the same kind. The latter forms may, however, be called plural, as J. Schmidt does call them (Pluralb. pp. 49 f., 58; cp. § 339 below). But one very doubtful question remains. It is quite conceivable that the neuter plural in -i grew out of a collective singular feminine (II § 109 pp. 332 ff.). Was there really, as Schmidt believes, an original neuter plural in -ā as well, which arose in the same way from singular feminine forms in -ā? But no such forms as these singular feminines in -ā seem to have existed at all in the prothetic language; and the series of neuter plurals in -ā may be nothing more than a re-formation on the analogy of those in -ī. And if the variation between -u and -ā — which, as we saw, is a question of rhythm — was to be found in the prothetic stage, we have the result that there were neuter forms in -ā which were at once singular and plural.

Along with dhāma we find such forms as dhāma in the Vedas (Lanman, p. 531). This lengthening, like the last, is probably due to rhythm. If, as we must assume, this too is of prothetic origin, the parent language had -ā beside -u as it had -ā beside -u. Now these forms in -ā are plural as well as singular in Vedic. Thus the following question arises. Does the plural dhāma, as Schmidt supposes (pp. 82 ff.), represent an
Idg. *dhēmō, i.e. a form like the nom. sing. masc. fem. (Lat. sermō etc.), being thus related to Avest. dāmūṇ (§ 340) as Lat. sermō to Gr. ἄκουω? Is it not more likely that the original form was *dhēmū, forms in -ū being made on the analogy of those in -ī; or, it may be, because the relation of -ē (in the plural) to -ī (in the singular) caused a series of singular byforms in -ū to be used for the plural as well?

Remark 1. It seems to me that we are not yet in a position to answer this question. It would be decided in favour of dhamā = *dhēmē, if it could really be proved that Gr. η ἰδέμη, ι δέμη, ι ἐπι-ἀντιμή, Cret. gen. fεροε (fεροες) and the like were once neuters in -α (cp. ηδυμα, λεμα, ειμα). This would be the same analogical change of stem which is seen in O,Pers. tuμā f. ‘family’ as contrasted with Skr. tōkman- n. and Avest. tαναμn. n. (II § 117 Rem. 2 p. 369); cp. also Pol. gen. brzemięc instead of brzemieniec from nom. brzemięc ‘burden’ on the analogy of pola : pole (Baudouin de Courtenay, Kuhn-Schl. Beitr. VI 61).

Remark 2. Vedic neuter singular forms in -i -u and -a (= *-u) are also used for the plural, but almost always in conjunction with a nom. acc. pl. neut.: e.g. bhāri ... dūnā ‘abundant food’, yōjanā purā ‘many yojanas’ (a measure of distance), priyā nāma ‘dear names’. See Schmidt, op. cit. 276 ff. According to this scholar, the usage began at a stage in the prothetic language when qualifying words, unless indeed they were o-stems, were added to the nouns which they qualified without being inflected, precisely as happens in the case of numeral adjectives like *peugā ‘five’: yōjanā purā will then be the same in principle as páśca kṛṣṇās (§ 169 p. 13). The use of a bare stem for the plural, he continues, must have spread from adjectives to substantives: purā dhamā (dhamān), which is correct, suggesting dhamā purāṇi, which is not. But a simpler explanation would be possible if there were parallel groups of forms in the singular: -a -u (and -i) alongside of -u -a (and -i). Then we should have (1) -a -u (and -i) used for both numbers in prothetic Aryan, and consequently (2) the short vowels used for both alike.

m-stem. *sem ‘unum’: Gr. έν, Lat. sem-per ‘in one unbroken sequence, always’ (II § 160 p. 479).

Remark 3. It is not certain whether Gr. ὁδ ‘house’ belongs here. Solmsen (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 329) and Schmidt (Plur. 222) postulate an Idg. *dōn, with a variant *dō related to it as *k(w)ū = Skr. .END is to *k(u) = Gr. έν. A different view is taken by Bartholomae (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 497). One more explanation may be mentioned, due to I know not whom, by which ὁδ is identified with Germ. *to ‘to’, a by-form of -o. According to this conjecture, ἁμέρεσον ὁδ = ἀμέρεσον ὁ, but the meaning of phrases of this kind together with the resemblance of ὁδ to ὁδος gave ὁδ itself the meaning of ‘house’.
§ 224. I. r-stems.

a. No language but Sanskrit has any certain examples of neuter forms from noun-stems in -er- -ter- (II § 119 pp. 376 ff.); examples are sthāṭ ‘standing’ Ved. sthāṭur (I § 285 p. 228). Probably we have here a Sanskrit re-formation, as we certainly have in the nom. acc. pl. in -ṇi (§ 341); see Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar § 375. In Greek it is doubtless a mere accident that no such forms are found as ἀ-πάτος from masc. ἀ-πάτως. Possibly ἵρος ‘heart’ is an example in point.

b. There is a special group of neuter words in -r which have had a heteroclitic system of declension from the proethnic period onwards; e.g. Skr. ādhar gen. ādhūn-as. These show all kinds of different forms, very difficult to explain. In Aryan we find -ar, as Skr. ādhar, Avest. karśvar, the name of the seven divisions of the earth. But besides this we find in Sanskrit words with two other endings: (1) yākṛt ‘liver’ gen. yākn-ūs (Avest. yākar, Gr. ἱγάρ Lat. jecur), sākṛt ‘dirt, stercus’ gen. sākn-ūs; (2) āsṛk (āsṛg) ‘blood’ gen. āsn-ūs (Gr. ἅρπ Lat. assir asser). Armenian albeur ‘source, spring’ gen. alber (Gr. φιάρ for *φηγαρ, gen. φιάτορ for *φηγαρος). Greek -αρ and more rarely -ωρ, as odharp and ὦδωρ ‘water’ (O.H.G. waggar); and perhaps we should add -αρ, ἵρος ‘heart’. Lat. -er and -ur, as über and jecur. Old High German -ar: waggar (Gr. ὦδωρ), tenar (which has become masc.) ‘flat of the hand’ (Gr. ἱγαρ). Balto-Slavonic: possibly Lith. vundū undū (m.) O.C.Sl. voda (f.) ‘water’ and Lith. kekē (f.) ‘bunch of grapes’, which may be related to Gr. ὦδωρ and Lat. ciger as Lith. sesū motë O.C.Sl. mati to Lat. soror mater (§ 192).

How this great variety of forms came about it is impossible to say with anything like confidence. All that can be done at present is to offer conjectures more or less uncertain.

A few points may be mentioned which it is of the first importance to bear in mind.

1. A comparison of the vowel gradation in Gr. Ἰαμαῖς; Ἰαμαῖς, πίσον; πίσον—from makes it probable that Gr. -αρ came from Idg. -r, and not from -αρ; and this suits Lat. fœnīr femnīr. Lat. ūber may contain Idg. -*er; but according to I § 97.3 p. 91 it may also come from *ūber, and -αρ, along with Avest. -αρ Gr. -αρ Ο.H.G. -αρ, may represent Idg. -*f.

O.Icel. ædr 'vein' lífr 'liver' do not go far to prove that the Idg. ending was -*er.

Aryan -αρ (Skr. ádhvar) may be either -*er or -*ar (op. Gr. ἤρ O.H.G. wazgar).

2. But on the other hand it seems natural to place Gr. ὀδογε O.H.G. wazgar Lith. vauš kežė on the same level as Gr. geōrges O.H.G. burudar Lith. sroš mokė (§ 192 pp. 69 ff.), in which case we should have *-o(γ) -*er as the Idg. endings. There may have been -*r along with these (Gr. ováρ), as -*y along with -*ūn -*an (§ 223.3 p. 100). If O.C.Sl. rouda (f.) was originally a neuter in *-o(γ), we may connect Schmidt Skr. sānīt f. 'half-year, season, year' and Avest. hama 'in summer' directly with O.H.G. sumar A.S. sumor 'summer'; the pr. Idg. form will then be *symo(γ), i.e. Skr. sānīt will be like dātā 'dator' (further examples for this Ar. -ā are given by Schmidt Plur. pp. 212 ff., but they are less certain).

3. In discussing the nom. acc. sing. neut. in -ου -εν and -η, we drew attention to the same endings in the loc. sing. (pp. 100 f.). Here too the locative enters into the question. Johansson and Bartholomae regard the -η of these neuter forms as simply and solely a locative suffix, a view which is indeed supported by Gr. νυκτα 'by night' (Avest. hama 'in summer') and other words of the same kind. Compare too Ved. śdhar 'at the udder' (Lanman, Noun-Inflection 488) Avest. zefar 'in the mouth'. Idg. forms with -er (Skr. adhar Lat. ūber?) are naturally compared with ēn Lat. supr, Idg. loc. *pefer (§§ 236, 238). Bartholomae assumes that the parent language had locative forms with -r and- with -n, like Skr. adhar and ēn, used indifferently with the same meaning. "The first consequence was that r-locatives sprang up in n-stems, and n-locatives in r-stems, in addition to the ordinary locative of each class. But this new locative could not fail to produce a transformation of other cases of the stem; and thus it is often hardly possible to decide whether any given forms come from original nasal or liquid stems. In any case, this apparent variety of stems here as elsewhere is not original" (p. 42).

4. For Gr. Ἰαμαῖς Lat. iecur the Idg. ending -*er might be assumed on the strength of Skr. yākty. Schmidt adds to our list Armon. leord 'liver' on account of its ὅ = t, and he would connect Skr. ὅκτα and Lat. mūs-(N)eord, postulating for the latter an old form *scerd or *scord (final -t for -f). Still, this comparison is very doubtful; the Skr. word seems rather to belong to Gr. νίνας-ας. But we may follow Schmidt in tracing Gr. Ἰαμαῖς Epic Ιαμαῖς (siam) back to *Ιαμαῖς, and Lat. asser to *nasse, on the strength of Skr. ἱήρ (asīr).
§ 225. 5. Stems ending in Explosives.

Participial *nt-stems. 1) The original ending was *nt or *-yt. But it is not clear how participles of each particular tense stem ended in the original language. In Aryan, *at = -yt came to be the regular ending; it is original (e.g.) in Skr. dādat (pr. Idg. *dē-ḥ-tyt from √dō- ‘dare’). Cp. Bartholomae, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIX 552, 554. Conversely, in Greek *-o-τ, the equivalent of *-yt, was dropped, whilst *-αν(τ) = -yt held its ground; e.g. Dor. Acol. πᾶν ‘totum’ for *kυ-ύτ (§ II 126 p. 398), δαυ-νάύ from δαυ-νη-μ, and the like, whence the aorist gives e.g. πέφαρν instead of *πεφά(τ). Along with this series, Greek has the ending -ον(τ) = Lith. -q. Lat. neut. -ensis for pr. Ital. *-ent (see pp. 106 f.) may represent not only Idg. *-yt or *-yt but Idg. *-e-nt, which is actually contained in Lith. dūsę ‘dūsor’ (cp. below, footnote 1).


1) In the light of Schmidt’s shewing (Plur. 422 ff.), I see that I was right in my former representation of the ablaut in the Idg. case system of *nt-stems (II § 125 p. 395); I should not have given up this view, as I did in my Gr. Gr. p. 108, in favour of that of Bartholomae, who holds that in participial forms with a thematic vowel preceding, the original suffix was always *nt- with consonant n (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIX 544 ff.). But I still think, Schmidt notwithstanding, that the thematic vowel in the participle was sometimes -o- and sometimes -e-. I hold to the belief that Lith. dūsęs represents an original *dū-sē-nt- (Skr. dāyānt-), until Schmidt, who explains the form as an aorist participle, has shown this view can be justified by usage. This he tries to do on page 427 of his work, but dūsine is not, as he imagines, an optative form; rather, as tur-iū : tur- -i-mē shews, it contains the weak grade of the suffix -o-, and so it is a future indicative. Hence his attempt is quite unsatisfactory.
gent-stems have the same rules as nt-participles. Skr. ámavat Avest. ama-vap from ama-vant- ‘acting with violence, powerful’ (cp. Bartholomae, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 544). Gr. χαριέν from χαρ(α-)τρ- ‘graceful’; σχισιν in Ap. Rhod. following the masc. in -όες (see the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 119). For neut. τὰς τέως, formed like Skr. Ved. neut. gnd-vas ‘rich in women or wives’ (perhaps also like κύτ-νας, see Bartholomae Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 536), see II § 127 p. 405.

Remark 1. J. Schmidt is mistaken in his explanation of τὰς as being for *ra-far (Plur. 356 ff.). See Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 17 f. Schmidt imagines that Idg. -t becomes -; in Greek; but see § 241 Rem. 1.

Other Stems ending in Explosives.


Greek. μέλι ‘honey’ for *μελῖτ, gen. μελίτις, Latin mel perhaps for *mel(ī)l (gen. mellis for *meld-es according to I § 369 p. 280) and this for *melit, doubtless also O.Ir. nil ‘honey’ (stem meli-) for *melit; see W. Meyer, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVIII 171; J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 248 f. Gr. γάλα ‘milk’ for *γαλακτ-, gen. γάλακτ-ος, Lat. lac for *lact, gen. lact-is (Varro’s lact is doubtless the grammarian’s own invention). Gr. χυρό ‘heart’ for *χρόδ (II § 160 p. 479), Lat. cor for *cord, gen. cord-is. Gr. ὑπό-θαν adv. ‘looking from under’ for *θαν; perhaps deo ‘hither’ for *δε-φον or *δεν-φον (II § 163 p. 493, and the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 116). Lat. allec hallex (beside m. f. allex hallex), gen. (h)allec-is. Umbr. tu-plak *δικρον χύλον vel δίκρανον’ according to Bütcheler, Umbrica p. 154.

Latin adjectival stems ending in explosives show the form of the masculine, not only classes of words like ferens bi-dēns, but also bi-pēs audax princeps and so forth. The forms in -ns may be regarded as genuine neuters with pr. Ital. -ns for -nt, and so may quōtiēns: Skr. kiya ‘how much, how far’. 
This view is proposed by L. Hurneysen (Archiv für lat. Lex., V 575 f.), who holds that bi-pès audax etc. were used for the neuter simply because in n-stems there was a confluence of neuter and masculine.

Remark 2. In Kuhn's Zeitschr., XXIV 42 f., I offered a conjecture with which J. Schmidt agrees (Phur. 89, 403). I suggested that in such phrases as ferrum biđīnas, the second word may have been originally a substantive masculine or feminine (cp. downus retus), which in becoming an adjective did not adopt the neuter form when used as neuter, but retained its own. J. Schmidt (pp. 87 f.) supports this hypothesis by a reference to the same kind of thing in the Ved., where the verb forms as rākṣo-hā 'killing the Rakshas' dvi-pād 'bipes' (neut. dvi-pād) ṣata-su-s 'gaining hundred-fold wealth', which are masculine, are used for the neuter as well. May not both causes have worked together to develop the regular Latin usage — both the change of -nt to -ns, and some such idiom as that suggested here?

Old Irish. traiγ 'foot' for *traγet or *traγit, cp. dat. pl. traiγth-ib.

Old Church Slavonic. telc 'calf' (gen. telc-e) is probably not a real but an apparent example; its nom. acc. seems to be an original n-stem, see § 244.

§ 226. 6. n-stems.

a. Pr. Idg. *meṇos 'mind'. Skr. mūnas; Avest. mund, O.Pers. rauta 'stream' = Skr. sroṣṭas (cp. O.Pers. kāru § 194. 1 p. 73). Gr. μενος: an exceptional form showing -s; instead of -ς (e perhaps from the other cases) is τέμενος on an Inscr. of Megalopolis (Le Bas-Foucart no. 331. 31 and 42). Lat. opus, genus; Umbr. meīs mīrs 'ins, its' for *med(o)s (I § 633 p. 474), cp. Lat. modes-tu-s. O.Ir. tech teg 'house' = Gr. στέγος, τέγος 'roof' (cp. fer for *μερο-, § 194. 1 p. 73), transformed to tech n-, a re-formation like muir n- § 223 p. 99; Gall. Odvŏ-d-μαγας = O.Ir. mag n. 'plain'. O.H.G. lamb 'lamb' A.S. hrōw 'corpse' (cp. next page). Lith. ākus 'ica-hold', which like all similar forms has become an o-stem (cp. § 403); O.C.Sl. sło-ro 'word' = Skr. śrāvas Gr. κλέος 'report, fame'.

1) Whilst this volume was in the press, I received Wiedemann's work Das litauische Präteritum, in which (I 14) he assumes that O.C.Sl. -o does not come from *-os, which he says became -u, but that it answers to the Greek -σ-β. His arguments do not convince me.
Lat. aev instead of older *a(i)-os ( = Skr. áyas ‘metal, bronze’), on the analogy of aer-is etc., see II § 132 p. 418.

For Germanic see II § 132 pp. 419 ff. We find two forms for the nom. acc. sing. neuter, one the old ending *-os (cp. the Finnic loan-words lammas mailas = O.H.G. lamb malz), the other *-iz = *-es, as in A.S. lemb (beside lomb) = lammi Lex Sal., and possibly in (masc.) forms with a short root-syllable like O.H.G. sigi A.S. sig ‘victory’ (cp. II § 132 p. 421). This *-es instead of *-os doubtless came from the other cases of the substantive, not from adjectives (cp. Gr. ἀμφίς), compare Gr. τεθερες above (conversely, -os alone in Lat. tempor-is etc. II § 132 pp. 418 ff.). Another factor in the change from s-stem to i-stem (O.H.G. gen. siges etc., like quites) was perhaps an instr. pl. in -im(m) for *-es-mi (§ 387). Cp. Michels, Zum Wechsel des Nominalgeschl. I 13 ff.


The difference of the vowels in the final syllable of προτείς ἰπόδης: ὀμιρῆς ἰπόδης here, as elsewhere, doubtless went with some difference in the word-accent; compare Skr. ἰπάς ‘work’ ἰπέθας ‘enn’ty’: ἰπάς ‘active’ ἰπέθας ‘without enmity’.

Vedic Sanskrit has some forms in -as instead of -as, as ἰπέθα-νυατάς ‘having room for gods’. These were probably a re-formation following the analogy of a group of forms used for the neuter mentioned in § 225 Rem. 2, of which satu-sāds is an example (cp. Lau, Noun Infl. 560; J. Schmidt, Plur. 182 ff.).


In Greek, this formation may be represented by ΠΛΟΣ (πλος or πλως?) in the sense of πλέον, found in one Arcadian
inscription. Meister transliterates the word πλῶς, and derives this from *πλῶ-μος (Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1889 pp. 89 f.). But see Danielsson’s Epigraphica, Upsala 1890, pp. 51 sqq.

In Old Latin we meet with phrases like posterior bellum. There are two alternatives, and the choice is doubtful. The r of the other cases may have taken the place of -s in the nom. neut. in -ōs, as it did in the nom. masc. in *-ōs; or this posterior may be the masculine form.

Along with the forms in *-iōs were used others in *-iś, which served as adverbs. This formation is earlier than the time when the branches of the language began to develop on their own account. Gr. πρῶτο- ‘earlier’ in Cret. πρῶτο-γνύς Thess. πρῶτο-βύς beside Ion. πρώτο-βύς (see II § 135 p. 433, and the Author in Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1889 pp. 53 f.). Lat. magis, nimis; Ose. mais ‘magis’ = Goth. mēs. Goth. mins O.H.G. mēn ‘less’ for *mēsin-ix, Goth. cairis O.H.G. wiris ‘worse’ for *wiris-ix. See II § 135 pp. 428 ff. Johansson (De der. verb. contr. 177) and Streitberg (Die germ. Comp. auf -ōs-, 30) would place here Lat. plās, which they derive from *plōjs (for ơ ep. Arc. P.ōs above); plās is differently explained by the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 96 footnote 2, and Danielsson, Epigraphica p. 52.


§ 227. II. The ending -ō-m in o-stems.


*i-m beside *-jo-m: Umbr. tertim tertii ‘tertiun’ Ose -medicim ‘magisterium’. See § 194 p. 74, § 212 pp. 89, 90.
In Baltic, the only traces of *-o-m which are now left are one or two examples from Prussian (see last page, and Pauli in Kuhn-Schleicher's Beitr. VII 201 f.). Substantival stems have become masculine in Lithuanian and Lettic; e.g. Lith. lunka-s = Pruss. lunka-n O.C.Sl. lyko 'bark, inner bark' (§ 403). Neuter forms of the Lithuanian adjectives, such as gēra 'good' (cp. grašū 'beautiful' § 223.2 p. 100), can only be used under certain conditions. These cannot be explained as standing for -q = -o-m, since dialects which change the -q of the acc. sing. masc. into -u have gēra, like the others, and not *geru. Bopp assumed that gēra has been re-modelled on the analogy of grašū (Vergl. Gr. I 3 p. 321), which would be a re-formation the reverse of that which gives us Avest. neut. vohum instead of vohu (§ 223.2 p. 99). But a more obvious suggestion is that the ending -a comes from the pronominal ending *-o-d (§ 406).

Remark. Some, however, of the Lithuanian "neuters" in -a are in all probability really abstract feminine substantives; e.g. sxmlėn sxaltė means 'there is cold to-day', not 'it is cold' (sxaltd: sxaltė-s = gdā 'yellowness': gēla-s 'yellow', II § 158 p. 474).

In Slavonic this neuter *-o-m (*-u) is perhaps as hopelessly lost.

It is not quite clear how we are to regard forms such as ůgo 'iugum' novo 'novum', whose ending cannot represent *-om. It is natural to suppose that adjectives of this kind have taken over -o from the pronouns, cp. to 'that' = Skr. tá-d. Thus it is possible that -o first obtained foothold in adjectives, and was then extended to substantives by association with substantives in -o = *-os (e.g. slovo = Gr. xλεFος § 226).

But it is quite possible that polje 'field' has a different origin. The ending of this word may come from *-je-n *-jo-n according to the principles laid down in Vol. I § 219 p. 187 (and compare Leskien Handb. 2 p. 19); for the gen. pl. poliž kraft see § 345. polje would be related to a supposed *igī as the acc. pl. masc. kraję to vlęky (§ 326). Still, it is also possible to assume an older *poljo parallel to ůgo. I
prefer the latter view, since we have the acc. sing. masc. krājis konji with the suffix -(i)i- instead of -jo- (§ 212 p. 90), and consequently we should expect a neuter polji (cp. p. 109 Osc. neut. medicim).

**Genitive (-Ablative) Singular.**

§ 228. Two suffixes have been transmitted from the parent language to its several branches, -es -os -s and -sjo (-so).

1. It is probable that -es -os and -s were ablaut-variants of one suffix. In the separate branches of Indo-Germanic, even in historical times, may be observed a variation between -es and -os, as Lat. aer-is and aer-us; this seems to depend upon a difference of proethnic accentuation, similar to that in Skr.

---

tudat-ás ‘tudentis’ pad-ás ‘pedis’ (Idg. -é) in contrast with bhárat-as ‘ferentis’ jánas-as ‘generis’ (Idg. -os), just as the two forms of the suffix of the 1st. pl. act., *-mes and *-mos, may be explained as arising from two several modes of accentuation which are exemplified in Skr. i-más ‘imus’ and bhára-mas ‘ferimus’. See I § 311 ff. pp. 247 ff.

Idg. -es is found in Italic, Germanic, and Balto-Slavonic,1) -os in Greek, Italic, Keltic (and possibly Germanic). Aryan -as may of course represent either Idg. -es or -os; we have not enough evidence from the historical period to shew how far the various forms are to be referred to this or that. No theory can be based upon forms which have a palatal instead of a guttural, like Skr. vāc-ás ‘vocis’ (ep. I § 445 p. 331), since it is always possible to suppose that the palatal is due to analogy.

Where -os drove -es out of the field (in Greek, that is, and Keltic), there may have been an instinctive desire to make some clearer distinction between the genitive singular and the nominative plural in -es (§ 313); for where all ablaut-variations in the stem disappeared, the two cases would become identical in form. The same desire after clearness may have had a different effect in Latin, by helping to drive out -ës from the nom. pl., replacing it by *-eës -ës, the ending of i-stems (see § 319).

-es is perhaps the same element which is found in such particles as Gr. ἄψ Lat. abs. It is most commonly seen in i- and u-stems. More rarely it is added to consonant stems; as Skr. dán Gr. ἔει(-νήγ) for *dem-s, O.Ir. an-me for *men-s (§ 234). It may be contain’d in -ás and -iës, the endings of stems in -a- and -ë- (§§ 229, 230); but it is also possible that in these the stem-final has been contracted with -es -os.

Genitive forms in -es os -s were also used for the ablative in the parent language and later; thus Skr. nār-ás Gr. νη-ές

1) πες in πεισ-γν-ς πειε-βε-ς is possibly a relic of the form -es in Greek. It may have been a by-form of πες-ος Skr. pur-ás. See II p. 433 Footnote 1.
νεος means 'of a ship' and 'from a ship'. It can no longer be determined how this double use arose.

2. -sio is found with noun-stems, but only those in -o-. It is the proper form of the genitive of these stems in Aryan, Armenian (but cp. § 239), and Greek as we have them; cp. also Lycian -hā -h, Messapian -hī -hē -h, Venetian -h (Deecke, Bezz. Beitr. XII 153). It belonged originally to the pronouns, whence it spread to noun stems; see Beufey Über die idg. Endungen des Gen. Sing. 22 ff., and Leskien, Die Decl. 37 f.

In the Latin and Keltic noun we find the ending -ī (-ēi? -ēi?) This will be discussed in § 239 b. The question is — does it represent the old nominal genitive ending which gave way to the pronominal ending -o-sio -o-sio? To this no decisive answer can be given, since another possibility has to be taken into account. In other points than this a close connexion may be observed between Italic and Keltic (the latest contribution to this subject is that of Von Bracke, in his Beiträge zur Kenntniss der vorhistorischen Entwicklung unseres Sprachstammes, 1888, pp. 31 ff.) It is therefore possible that this -ī is an Italo-Keltic formation, beginning at some period later than the break-up of the parent speech.

In Germanic we have -so, which we may assume, with even more confidence than in the case of -sio, to have been borrowed from the pronouns.

In Balto-Slavonic, noun stems in -o- have a form which we cannot but take to be the Indo-Germanic ablative in -ōd: Lith. vilko O.C.Sl. vilka 'lupi' (§ 241). Beside these there are also pronominal endings: Pruss. ste-se ste-sei (nom. ste-s 'that') O.C.Sl. če-so če-so (nom. če-to 'quid'). The reason why the ablative did the work of genitive and ablative both was that forms in Idg. -es -s (O.C.Sl. mater-e 'matris' noši 'noctis') had originally both these functions. The same reason produced the opposite effect in Greek, where the genitive in -sio had the meaning of an ablative as well as its own.

All this makes it probable, that when the parent speech...
branched off in different directions, the genitive singular of noun stems in -o- was not represented by any one invariable formation. Even then the pronominal ending had begun to pass over to nouns, although perhaps not to the same extent in all districts of the Indo-Germanic area. It is just possible that Italic and Keltic *-i (-eíc∗-oí) was the ending with which the pronominal ending came into conflict. Then the latter will have been wholly driven out of the noun system in Italic and Keltic, where -i won the day; in Balto-Slavonic, both disappeared together. Cp. § 239, d. In Germanic, *-so passed over to the nouns, which is in all probability a peculiarity of the Germanic branch; cp. § 239, a. If the “genitives” Goth. meina þeina þeina O.H.G. mīn etc. are ablative forms like the similar forms in Lithuanian, māno kēnō (§ 452), then before *-so passed on to noun stems there may have been a period in Germanic, as there was in Balto-Slavonic, when the ablative in *-ōd *-ōd had, at least to some extent, the function of the genitive besides its own.

§ 229. I. The Endings -s -os -s (cp. § 228 pp. 111 f.).


Idg. -ōs, if it carried the word-accent, was circumflexed: cp. Gr. trμῆς ‘honoris’ Lith. mergōs ‘puellae’ (I § 671 p. 536).

Sanskrit. gnds-pāti-ḥ ‘husband of a divine wife’ (stem gnd-) is a dubious survival of this formation; it may be a re-formate following jās-pāti-ḥ (§ 233) and nouns in -as-pati-ḥ (cp. II § 24 pp. 39 f.). The same may be said of Avest. vairyād (stem vairya- f. ‘desirable’), since it may have come from *vairyaḥyād by syllabic dissimilation (cp. I § 643 p. 482). The regular endings were Skr. -ayās Avest. -ayā (= -ajās) O.Pers. -aya (= -ajās), as Skr. ásvayās ‘equae’ Avest. haṇuyād ‘of a hostile army’ O.Pers. tavmāyā ‘of a family’. -iās came from stems in -i- -ja- (Skr. bhahyās, dēvyās dēvyās, § 230), as did
the dative Skr. -āyaī Avest. -āyāi instead of -āi (§ 247); the Avest. -āyā and -āyāi have -ā- instead of -ā- doubtless because the instr. in -āyā = Skr. -āyā had the short vowel (§ 276). The starting point for these re-formations was the loc. sing.; in pr. Ar. the loc. sing. of ā-stems ended in *-ājā, and that of ē-stems in *-jā (see § 264). Another factor in transforming the old genitive singular in *-ās was probably a desire to distinguish its form from that of the nom. acc. pl. (Skr. āśvas), which was the same.

Remark 1. With the re-formation áśvā-yās following byḥat-yās, compare gen. pl. āśvā-nām following the n-stems, § 345; Umbr. porta-in portet following hab-ia ‘habent’ fah-ia ‘fascit’; Ose. cen-tum ‘censere’ following ez-tum ‘esse’; O.Sax. 1st. 2nd. and 3rd. pl. secun-tum instead of secun-tum following mer-tum sūk-tum (Danielsson, Stud. Gram. p. 53; the Author, Morph. Unt. III 45, 89 f.); Lat. gen. viā-ī following eqū (see the following page).

Remark 2. A different view of Skr. -āyās etc. is taken by J. Schmidt (Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 381 ff.), who assumes that the endings have come from oj-stems. First, he thinks, were formed the gen. *-āj-ās and dat. *-āj-ā. Then these forms gave way to *-ājās *-ājā for one of two reasons: either they were influenced by stems in -ē-, which made byḥat-yās byḥat-yāi; or there was a contamination of two pairs of original forms, gen. *-ājas and *-ās together producing Ar. *-ājās, and dat. *-ājī and *-āī producing Ar. *-ājī, each with the quantity of the ā-stem ending. The a of the penultimate, he continues, was kept short in Avestic, whilst in Sanskrit and Old Persian the long vowel of the strong cases crept into the weak. Two remarks may be offered on this. First, the forms here assumed as types are questionable enough in themselves; and secondly, not to dwell upon that, we may well ask why the instr. Skr. áśvāyā did not become *āśvāyā if the -ā- of the penultimate came from the strong cases. It cannot be shown that this alleged re-formation was earlier than the time when the pronominal -āyā had invaded the instrumental (the same form is seen in Avest. hāspnāya).

In Sanskrit, the Brāhmanas give us examples of the dative in -āyāi in place of a genitive, as yājyāyāi ‘of the sacrificial formula’; cp. strīyāi used as gen. § 230. This reformation seems hardly likely to be due to syntax alone.

In Greek, ā-stems which had become masculine took the ending of stems in -o- (§ 239); cp. the nom. sing. in -a- § 190. Hom. (Aeol.) Ἀρειάδας Bocot. Τελέσταξ like Ep. Ἅλος. Lesb.
and Dor. contract to -α. Ion. -εω for *-γο, and -εω is contracted to -ω; also -ευ == -ευ, see the Author Gr. Gr.\textsuperscript{2} p. 39. Arcad. and Cypr. -αυ, which is doubtless to be read -άυ. Att. -ου may have either of two origins. It may be the ου of ἰπποῦ taken over bodily; or else -άο became -εω (regular), and -εω was transformed to -εο on the analogy of ἰππος, when this was the genitive; lastly -εο would become -ου.

In Arcadian -αυ passed into feminine stems, as ζημιαυ in contrast to Att. ζημιας, from η ζημία 'loss, punishment'. On the other hand, the fem. ending -ας returns to masc. stems in Megarian and Thessalian, as Ἁραιας, Νίκλας as opposed to Att. -λω; this re-formation was due to the fact that genitive and nominative had each the same ending (the gen. -α contracted from -αο), cp. § 190 p. 67.

Att. Καλλιάδους (nom. -άδηςς) follows the analogy of the genitive of stems in -ες-, as Σωκράτους. Cp. voc. Σκρηφιάδες § 202 p. 85. The Rhodian genitive of proper nouns of this kind, Σκυμάδες for example, followed naturally enough from the nom. in -ης borrowed from the Ionic dialect; a nom. Σκυμάδης has been found in Rhodes (C.I.G. 2534). As to ευ for εο cp. I § 603 pp. 456 f.

In Latin the ending -ατ, as in viat, was early framed on the analogy of the genitive of stems in -o- (equi and the like). It may be conjectured that -ατ first found place in masculine α-stems, whence it afterwards spread to the feminine; cp. Arcad. -αυ mentioned above, which was first masculine and then feminine too. Whether the ordinary classical forms scribae, equae etc. come from this -ατ by regular phonetic change, untouched by side influences, or whether the analogy of the loc.-dat. -ae had anything to do with it, is hard to say; especially as in the forms which are found on inscriptions (as Lavarnai C.I.L. I no. 47) we have no means of determining the quantity of the two sounds which make up -αι, or of knowing whether they made one syllable or two.

Old Irish tuaithe seems to have taken over the ending of stems in -ia- and in -ī- -iē- (soillse and inse).
Remark 3. The gen. Erce (nom. Erce) appears on an Ogam inscription as Ercias (Stokes, Bezz. Beitr. XI 151, cp. p. 79). This points to *-iedades as the older shape of the -e of tuwite and soillle; and then inse (i-je-stem) would be parallel, and be a form like Goth. frijōndós from nom. frijōndi (§ 230). Still, Ercias proves nothing unless we assume masculines in -a, as Stokes does. But in an Ogam inscription lately found in Wales (see Arch. Camb., 2nd Series VI no. 23), there is the genitive Avittoriges, whose y is perhaps meant to express the sound of j (Latinised nom. Avitoria). What is to be said of this? It is worth considering whether -e may not have been regularly kept in pre-Keltic *-ēs (elsewhere in Keltic ē becomes i), especially as -the (-tha), the suffix of the 2nd person sing., seems to answer to Skr. -thās = Gr. Dor. -θε. This would make it probable that Keltic also had the Idg. gen. -iēs (i-je-stems), and inse must be compared with the Lat. gen. faciēs. These questions have been suggested by certain communications which I have received from Thurneysen; I leave them for others to decide. D’Arbois de Jubainville is I believe mistaken in his view of the matter (Mém. III 80).

O.H.G. gebo A.S. giefe, O.H.G. sippe (sippea) A.S. sibbe (ep. nom. Goth. sibja 'kindred'), probably with the ending pr. Germ. *-ēz, i.e. sippe sibbe is an ad-formate of gutinne güdenne (with Idg. *-iēs, § 230), and carried gebo giefe along with it. The stem was changed to an a-stem without i in Old High German, before *-iēz became -e (cp. Braune Ahd. Gramm. § 58 Anm. 1, § 200 Anm. 3). The acc. sing. (§ 213 p. 91) and the nom. pl. (§ 315) were modified by analogy in the same way.

Quite early in O.H.G. the dative form gebu gebo is sometimes found instead of gebo, and in the tenth century it gets the upper hand.

Old Church Slavonic ruķy 'of a hand' and dušc 'of a soul' pre-suppose a ground-form with *-ans or *-ons; cp. the same form in the acc. pl., where the original ending was *-ans. See I § 219 p. 187. Scherer and many others have assumed that the gen. sing. ruķy really is this acc. pl. form; it is said that because the acc. pl. took the place of the nom. pl. in *-ēs, therefore it also took the place of the gen. sing., which had the same form. This is hard to believe. In any case there was a connexion between this -y-č and the ending of the gen. sing. fem. in the pronominal form točq (nom. ta f. 'this') — see
§ 420; but it remains uncertain whether this ending properly belonged to pronouns alone, and only spread to nouns afterwards.


Along with these are forms which follow the iā-class: Gr. φιλονάς, norviās; Lat. materiae (nom. materieās and materieā); Goth. friōndjōs (like sibjōs, nom. sibja 'kinship'); Lith. vežancjōs, marciōs (nom. marci 'bride'). Whether O.Ir. insē, Brigit contain Idg. *-īōs or *-īās is uncertain; see § 229 Rem. 3 on the last page.

In Sanskrit, the Brähmana language has the dative in place of the genitive, as striaī instead of striaīs (nom. strī 'woman'). Cp. yajjāyāi § 229 p. 115. In Avestic forms are occasionally found which have been influenced by the analogy of stems in -ī- -iī- and in -i-: e.g. harāiβjō (haraitā, the name of a mountain range).

In Latin we have -īē beside -īēs, faciēī, aciēī — a reformation of the same kind as viāt (§ 229). Further, we find -īē, faciē, progenitī, luxurīt; -iē : iēr = -ae : -aē (cp. § 248). Lastly -īē, down to the classical period, as faciē — probably the dat.-loc. form (§§ 248, 265).

The Irish genitive inseo (i.e. ins'ō) is framed on the model of an i-stem. Cp. dat. inis § 248.

Old Church Slavonic zemiję and vezajętę like dušę (§ 229).

§ 231. 3. i-stems.* Here we have two types, -ei-s -oi-s and -i-es -i-os -ii-es -ii-os. Of these the former certainly and the latter most probably is proethnic. But at the same time it is not clear how the two types were originally distributed.

a. -ei-s and -oi-s. Which of these was used in a given word would be originally determined, as we may conjecture, by the accent of the word: say, *mytēi-s 'mentis', *óyoi-s 'ovis'. Ar. *-ai-ē ( = *-eis or *-oīs?): Skr. āvē-ē; Avest. aēdī-ē, O.Pers. fraartai-ē 'of Phaorites'. Gr. Pamphyl. Νιγοπόλεις
Genitive (-Ablative) Singular.

(= Att. Neōnλεκτος), if correctly preserved, is the only form of this kind in Greek. Umbr. punes ‘poscae’ ocrer ‘oëris, montis’, Osc. Herentateis ‘Veneris, Volupiae’; pointing to pr. Ital. *-ej-s. Germanic has only fem. substantives: Goth. anstāis for *-ojs, O.H.G. esti A.S. èsto for *-ejs, or for *-iē-es (b.) or *-ej-ēs (cp. Hom. πολεσ), like the loc. esti perhaps for *-ez-i (§ 260). Lith. naktės, O.C.Sl. noštī, common ground-form *-ej-s or *-ojs?

b. -i-es -i-os, -iū-ēs -iū-ōs. Skr. -y-as -y-ás beside -ē-ś in the masc. and neut., as āryas, ariyās ‘of a pious man’. In Avestic there are a few examples of the ending -yōis, as jainyōis (stem jaini- ‘woman’, cp. Bartholomae Ar. Forsch. III 64). But this may well have arisen by contamination of -ōis and *-yas; cp. Goth. kinnāus ‘of a cheek’ i. e. *kinyāys (§ 232) Armen. srti, perhaps for *-iēs or *-iōs (cp. zarđu § 232). In all dialects of Greek except Ionic and Attic the only type is ōγος, χίλος, which formation is also found in Ionic beside that with pr. Gr. *-ej-os which will be described anon (cp. nom. pl. ōγος § 317); πολες may be referred to the nom. πολίς (§ 233). It is a question whether Toranias, found in an Irish Ogam inscription, belongs here; cp. Errias § 229 Rem. 3 p. 117. The ending of German masc. i-stems, Goth. gastis O.H.G. gastes O.Icel. gests, need not have been borrowed entirely from stems in -o-. A pr. Germ. *-i-az or *-i-iz must have become *-iz, and this could easily have become perfectly assimilated to *-e-s(o) (§ 239), especially if the historic form of the “dative” of these i-stems was originally a genēno i-case (§ 260).

This second formation seems to be related to the first as Skr. māṁ-as to O.Ir. anme ‘nominis’ (for *-mens), Avest. hamaqestr-ō ‘of an antagonist’ to sāstar-ś ‘of a ruler’, Gr. ἄρχο-ς to Avest. nar-ś ‘of a man’, Skr. dīr-ās to dūḥ-ś ‘of

1) Of course it is a question whether this form belongs to a stem with -tāti- or with -tāt- for its suffix (see II § 102 p. 310). It belongs here in any case, since the -efs of all consonant-stems came from those in -i-. It so happens that no genitive from an undoubted original i-stem has been preserved.
heaven', Gr. *bhos in Bós-epoch for *gu-os to Skr. gō-ś 'bovis'. But even if it be proethnic, it is possible that in one or other branch of the original language it is partly due to the analogy of ī- ī-stems with the Idg. ending *-ī-s *-ī-os. For Greek, in particular, this suggestion can hardly be rejected, in view of the other cases of the paradigm in dialects where the formation is found.

c. Feminine forms in Sanskrit have -yās as well as -ēś, c. g. āvyāś. This is a re-formation on the lines of the ī- ī-class (§ 230), and it becomes more and more common in the course of the history of this language. We find a corresponding dat in -yāi (§ 249) and loc. in -yām (§ 260). The point of contact between these two classes of stems was the instr. sing., āvyā: bhātyā (§ 278); hence the re-formation arose. Avest. vay-ō, contrast Skr. vē-ś (vē- 'avis'), is a re-formate; the stem is monosyllabic, which had something to do with the change. Compare (1) gen. pl. vay-am, āram-am 'trium' (§ 348), with the strong stem, and (2) as monosyllabic stems, gen. sing. Ved. nār-as (following nār-i): Avest. nar-ś (§ 235), Ved. gāv-as (following gāv-i): gō-ś (§ 238).

Skr. pātyur 'of a husband' and jānyur 'of a wife' follow the form of pītūr mātūr (§ 235); cp. dat. pāty-ē like pīt-ē (§ 249), instr. pīty-ā like pītā (§ 278). See Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXV 289 f.

Attic ὧρας, ὀνήμας, πόλις (the last, which in found in Homer and Theognis too, comes from the stem πολι- nom. πολ-ς, a by-form of the stem πολι- nom. πολ-ς). These cannot rank as regular developments from proethnic Greek forms in *-εως for *-εϊ-ος, because -ος is uncontracted. Possibly -ε(τ)-ος was affected by the analogy of -ε(τ)-ος in u-stems (J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 301 f.). Cp. ὧρη § 266, ὐρις § 317, ὐρεῖν § 348.

The loc. πόλις (§ 260) gave rise to Hom. πόλις; and by quantitative metathesis (I § 611 p. 462) -ος became -εως, the Attic variant, as πόλις, ὤρεως.

In Latin, no example of the Umbro-Samnitic and pro-
ethnic Italic ending -eis can be found. The forms ending in -is -us which are found (as ovis, partis, partus) are due to the same confusion of i-stems with consonant stems which we saw in ovem, § 214 p. 92. We are not justified by the known laws of sound in assuming that ovis stands for *oijis and answers to Skr. áyās (Froehde, Bezz. Beitr. XIV 114).

In Old Irish, substantives have -o -a, as fātho faththa, which is to be referred in the first instance to *-ós, because of Iracattos (or Ercacattos) and Swellallos, which occur in Ogam inscriptions. The formation is not clear.

Remark. It is quite possible that the ending came from n-stems (§ 232), as in Old Icelandic the -or of n-stems passed over to masc. stems in -i- (e.g. pular from nom. pulr 'speaker, orator'). But one can see no sufficient cause for such a process at so early a stage; on the other hand, it is certain that the gen. pl. bithe n- was built on the analogy of fārhe n- (§ 349). A ground-form *-e(i)-os, a transformation of *-eis, would satisfy the phonetic conditions; but it is in itself hardly probable (in spite of d’Arbois de Jubainville, Mém. VI 54). That *-eis could become -ős in the regular course of sound-change must be said to be out of the question.

§ 232. 4. n-stems. Pr. Idg. -ey-s -oy-s and -e-es -e-os -uy-es -uy-os, answering to the i-stem types (§ 231). It is true that -ey-s, which is here assumed to be a by-form of -oy-s, cannot be definitely shewn to have existed, but it is fairly inferred from the analogy of stems in -i- (Osc. castros: Herentatefs).

a. -ey-s and -oy-s, the one belonging to original forms accented like *sānēy-s 'filiu', the other (say) to *médhoys-s 'mellis'. Ar. *-ay-s (= *-ey-s or *-oy-s?); Skr. sānō-ś; Avest. bàzēu-š bazao-ś, O.Pers. kārau-ś 'Cyri'. Lat. manūs; Umbr. trīfōr 'tribus', Osc. castros 'fundī'; arguing from the analogy of the Umbr. Osc. *-eis in i-stems, we may derive Ital. *-ous from *-ey-s (I § 65 p. 52). O.Ir. betho -a, Ogam inscr. Trenaluos, Brúscos (doubtless with o) for Idg. *-eys or *-ous; in the -u of Trenagusu, Nettasagru on Ogam inscriptions from Wales (Stokes, Bezz. Beitr. XI 145) Thurneysen conjectures a dialectic transformation of *-ős. Goth. sunāus, O.H.G. frīdō frido 'of peace', O.Icel. sonar pr. Norse *sunōr, pr. Germ. *-eys = Idg.
-*ou-s. Lith. sānaus O.C.Sl. synu, common ground-form -*eu-s or -*ou-s?

b. -*u-es -*u-os, -*u-er -*u-os. Skr. -v-as -uv-as beside -ō- in the masculine and neuter, as paśa-ās ‘pecoris’ mādhva-ās maśīc-ās ‘mellis’. Similarly in Avest. -v-ō beside -ōu -apos, as xradiw-ō (zradu- ‘will, power, intent’) = Skr. krātv-ās. Armen. zardu, perhaps for -*u-er -*u-os (cp. srti § 231 p. 119). Greek Ion. γαλατός for *γαλατ-ος (from nom. γαλατόν ‘genu’, cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.² § 70 b. Rem. p. 100), γέρνος (from nom. γέρν-γ ‘chin’ = Skr. hānu-ŋ). Lat. senātus O.Lat. senātusos, cornuis, Faîse. senātavo (-s dropped) may have come from either of two groups of forms (1) from -*u-er -*u-os or -*u-es -*u-os, or (2) from -*e-u-er -*e-u-os or -*ou-er -*ou-os; cp. dat. senātuv- § 250. In Germanic are found a few forms in -un- for -nu-(I § 180 p. 158): Goth. mans O.H.G. man ‘of a man’ for *mannix *manu-iz or *mannaz *manu-az = Skr. *mānu-as (assumed by-form of mānu-ōś) 1); Goth. kinnāus ‘of a cheek’, a composite form arising from contamination of *kinaus = Skr. hānōś and *kinniz *kinniz = Gr. γέννος (cp. Avest. jainyōis § 231 p. 119), whence by analogy comes the nom. kinnu-s instead of *kinnus = Skr. hānu-ŋ etc.

Here, as with the i-stems (cp. § 231 pp. 119 f.), it is doubtful how far the second type represents an original formation. The analogy of a- nu-stems, which had the pr.Idg. ending -nu-os -nu-os, may have acted in some instances.

c. Sanskrit. The feminine has a further ending -vās, as dhēṇu-ās from dhēṇa- ‘milch cow’ (so also dat. -vai, loc. -vām), parallel to the -yās in feminine i-stems (§ 231 p. 120). Compare § 279. Avest. bāṣānū with the same āu as the nom. sing. etc., see § 261.

Greek. Adjectives and some substantives have -ε(φ)-ος, as ἤδεός, Ion. Att. ἐκχεος, ἀστεος (ἀστυ n. ‘city’), Boeot. πάττος.

1) A different explanation of Goth. mans manās mannan etc. — which, however, does not convince me — is given by Bezzenberger in the Deutsche Literaturzeitung 1890 p. 14. He assumes two forms of the stem, man- and manan-.
for *fastevos (I § 64 p. 51), Cret. vičos (vě-v-'son'). Also Att. πηχεως, ἀσεως on the analogy of ὁρεως πόλεως (§ 231 p. 120).

Latin has from its earliest stage another set of forms such as quaeest sunt. Later on the other cases were often formed as though from o-stems, and in the end this declension absorbed all u-stems. It seems to me a dubious point whether the genitive in -i was first suggested by the change of -os to -us in the nominative of o-stems (cp. dēnsu-s torru-s declined as o-stems, whilst Gr. δαυις Skr. tyṣu- is are stems in -u-, Osthoff, Morph. Unt. IV 78).

§ 233. 5. i- i̯- and u- u̯- stems and stems in -i̯, ı̯, ulary. Pr. Idg. -i̯-es -i̯-os, -u̯-es -u̯-os, e.g. *bhruγ-es -os (nom. *bhru-s 'brow'). Skr. dhiy-ās 'of thought', Ved. nadiy-ās 'of a river', bhruv-ās, Ved. śvaśrūv-ās 'socrus', Avest. tan(u)-vō 'of a body'. There is a second group of forms with the sign of the feminine, Skr. dhiyās nadiyās bhruvās śvaśrūvās (like the dat. in -ai and loc. in -ām); this is analogous to what we see in fem. stems in -i- and -u- (§ 231 p. 120, § 232 last page). The point of contact with i- i̯-stems where this series of forms began was the instr. sing., dhiy-ā as compared with dēviyā and so forth; see § 280. Gr. κοσ, pōλiocos from nom. pāli-ς (cp. § 231 p. 119), vōς 'suis', ὕφεως, νίκως (from nom. νέκςς). Lat. suis socrius (also socrius as though a u-stem); it is not probable that vōs came from *vij-ēs by simple phonetic change (the view of Stolz, Lat. Gr.² p. 337); it is better to explain vōs by proportional analogy, as being related to nom. vōs acc. vim as diēs faciēs (gen.): diēs (nom.): diem. O.Icel. gen. sýr 'suis' doubtless for *sā-iz (cp. gen. pl. sāa), having taken sā- instead of sān- from cases whose suffix began with a consonant. Another explanation of Lat. vōs O.Icel. sýr will be given in the next paragraph. O.C.Sl. krūv-e 'of blood', vrbvrubv-e 'socrus'.

Stems ending in a long sonant liquid or nasal (II § 160. 4 pp. 485 f.) are treated in a similar way. Skr. gir-ās 'of praise' = *grr-ēs -os, pur-ās 'of a stronghold' = *pll-ēs -os, gō-ṣāy-ās.
Genitive (-Ablative) Singular. §§ 233,234.

(nom. ḥō-ṣd-s ‘gaining cattle’) for *-swn-es -os. If an old independent gen. jās be contained in jds-pāti-ṣ ‘master of the house or family’, this would be a formation with -s for the sign of the genitive; and we should then perhaps compare Lat. vis O.Icel. sýr directly with jās.

§ 234. 6. Stems ending in a Nasal. Most of these have -es -os. -s is seen in Irish neuters formed with -en- and -men-, in Avest. xeunog ‘of the sun’, and in the root-noun *dem- ‘domus’.

Remark. Polysyllabic en-stems thus show the genitive in -es only in one branch of the Indo-Germanic languages. This is not really so strange as it might seem; we have but to remember in how many languages -ns was bound to change in accordance with their phonetic laws, and how easy it was for the forms thus changed to be sacrificed to the feeling for uniformity which causes case-systems to be levelled down to one type. — J. Schmidt (Pluralb. 100) thinks that Avest. ayašs is a genitive in -ns; which is not very probable, because of the long vowel in the last syllable (*yaš = -yan). I believe the form to be a locative singular used for other cases (§ 257). Bartholomae is more likely to be right in calling the Vedic phrase trīr ahaun(n) ‘thrice in the day’ a genitive (Stud. zur idg. Sprachg. I 104).


Armen. akan (nom. akn ‘eye’), elin (nom. eln ‘stag’), like O.C.Sl. jelen-e ‘of a stag’ Gr. ᾠδήν-ος. The original weak stem is seen in aṁ ‘of a man’, like Avest. aršn-ō.

Greek xwv-ōς, ᾧν-ōς, and with the strong stem tëxov-ōς, πομίν-ως, ἄγων-ως, πενθήν-ως.
Lat. *carn-is, and, with the strong stem, *homin-is *homin-us, *edōn-is, Sab. *nerin-is (II § 115 p. 360); the old ending -es occurs in *Apolones 'Apollinis', C.I.L. vol. I no. 187. In Umbro-Samnite all consonantal stems took the ending of i-stems in the genitive, doubtless owing to a confluence of the nom. and gen. sing. in a certain number of words. So here we find the -eis of i-stems: Umbr. nommer 'nominis', Osc. carnis 'partis'.

O.Ir. con 'canis' for *cun-os, and similarly dércn (nom. dérucc 'acorn'), áran (nom. áru 'kidney'), toimten (nom. toimtiu 'opinion'); in Ogam inscriptions Segamón-as, Inission-as. On the other hand, neuter n-stems show in Old Irish the ending *-en-s (*-ens *-ēs -e, cp. I § 657.6 p. 509), as imbe (nom. imb n- 'butter'), anme (nom. ainm n- 'name'); *-en-s: *-n-es *-n-os = *-ē-s: *-ē-es *-ē-os, see § 231 p. 119.

Goth. gumin-s O.H.G. gomen gomin 'of a man' (as to -en-in see Bremer, Ztschr. für deutsche Phil., XXII 249 f.), Goth. tuggn-s O.H.G. zungn 'of a tongue' (cp. § 218 p. 95). With the weak stem Goth. managein-s 'of a crowd' (II § 115 p. 362). It cannot be determined to what extent *-is = Idg. *-es was the ending, and whether such an ending as *-az = Idg. *-os was or was not used along with it.

Lith. *suvn-s, and, with the strong stem, akmen-s, besides other examples; -s stands for *-es according to vol. I § 664.2 p. 522. O.Csl. *dūn-e 'of a day' (II § 114 p. 356), and, with the strong stem, kamen-e, with other examples; -e is for *-es according to I § 665.4 p. 525.


§ 235. 7. Stems with suffixes in -r. Most of these have -es -os, along with which -s is found in Aryan, and as it would seem in Germanic too.

Skr. regularly has -ur, as mātur dātur, probably for *-ly-s,
see I § 288 p. 230); in Avestic, to correspond, we find *ner's for *ner-s, stem n-ar- 'man'. With the strong stem and -s, Avest. nar-s, sástar-s 'of a ruler', ep. åtar-car-s 'of him who produces fire'. Two Sanskrit words have been supposed to contain a genitive of this latter kind — Ved. mātar-īśvan- 'he who is lord over his mother', by Bartholomae (Bezz. Beitr. XIII 92), and Ved. suār (sūvar) 'of light' for *suyar-s (I § 647. 7 pp. 493 f.) according to the conjecture of J. Schmidt (Pluralb. 223). The usual Avestic type is weak stem + -as -ā, as brāthr-ā 'fratris', hamāestr-ā 'of an opponent'; similarly in O.Pers. piša 'patris' (I § 558. 4 p. 415). Avest. sástar-š : hamāestr-ā = Skr. dvē-셔 : dvē-as and the like, see § 231 p. 119. The re-formate nār-ās 'of a man' is due partly to its being from a monosyllabic stem n-ar-; cp. § 231 p. 120.

Armen. maur 'matris' for *mātr-es or *mātr-os, kéir 'sororis' for *syeš-es or *syeš-os (I § 360 p. 276, § 561 p. 417). But dster 'of a daughter' has the strong stem, like Gr. Hom. évανεργ-ας beside évανεργ-ας.

Gr. μητέρ-ός; Homer uses forms such as μητέρος πατέρος ἀνέρος as well, which follow the strong cases (cp. Skr. nār-as following nār-i, § 231 p. 120). ὅρως-ός instead of *ἀρως-ός follows ὅρως-α, and ὅρη-ός instead of *ἀρη-ός follows ὅρη-γ.

Lat. patr-is patr-us, mātr-is, frātr-is; datr-īs instead of *datr-īs follows the nominative. In Umbro-Samnitic these stems have borrowed -ēis from the i-stems (cp. § 234 p. 125): Umbr. matrer Osc. maatreis 'matris'.

O.Ir. māthar for *mātr-os or *māter-os (I § 77 p. 67).

Goth. brōbr-s fadr-s, O.Icel. brōdr feār; the "mutated" vowel in the latter forms points to original *-tr-es. Secondly, A.S. brōdr fēadur, O.Icel. fōdr fōdur, whose ending, like Skr. -ur, may be derived from *-r-s. Thirdly, A.S. fēder O.H.G. fēter have taken -er from the strong cases, like Gr. Hom. πατέρ-ός.

1) In this view of the forms in -ur I follow Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 110. Others are mentioned by Collitz in Bezzengerser's Beiträge X 10; but they all have less to recommend them than this.
Other forms of the same kind as these last are Lith. moteř-s and O.C.Sl. mater-e.

§ 236. 8. Stems ending in Explosives. These regularly have -es -os.

Remark. There is no trustworthy ground for adding -s as another ending of these stems. In Vāj.-Śph. 20. 2 the form vidyōt is used as an ablative (= vidyō̱-as); and this is supposed to represent *vidyōτ-s by J. Schmidt (Plur. 223), see however Weber, Kuhn-Schl. Beitr. III 389, Böhtlingk and Roth’s Sanskrit Dict. s. v., Lanman, Noun-Inflection 468, Bartholomaeus, Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 77. The Latin genitive nox (XII Tables) is supposed by Stolz, Lat. Gr. 2 337, to contain this ending.


In Germanic, genitives of this kind are on the whole
rare; most of those which occur belong to monosyllabic stems. We may cite as further examples the following: Goth. *naht-s O.H.G. naht A.S. niht O.Icel. nēt-r 'of night' for pr. Germ. *naht-iz = Lat. noct-is; Goth. baurgy-s O.H.G. burg A.S. byrge 'of a stronghold, city' for *burz-iz = Avest. berz-ō (barz-ō) 'alti' O.Ir. breg (*brig-os) 'of a mountain'; Goth. vaht-s 'of a thing'; A.S. bec 'of a book' for *bök-iz. Paul, in his Beiträge VI 550, has put forth a conjecture which is worth considering although quite uncertain. He suggests that the Idg. ending *-es has been preserved by the acute accent in such forms as O.H.G. nahhtes adv. 'by night, of a night.' The e of *-es would then be due to the influence of the o-stem ending (§ 239; and cp. Kluge, Paul’s Grundr. I 354, 361, 385).

For O.C.Sl. telēčť from nom. acc. telē č‘ařčt’, see § 244.

§ 237. 9. Stems in -s. The regular ending is -es -os.

Remark. Here, as in the preceding class (see § 236 Rem.), there are only uncertain traces of -s. The Vedic gen. uḥśas 'of dawn', which we took to represent *uḥs-ās), is regarded by J. Schmidt as standing for *uḥs-ās, and in the same way he refers ḍhas Rig.-V. VI. 3. 1 to *qḥas-o (Plur. 223). Against this explanation, see Bartholomae Stud. zur idg. Spr. 77 ff., and cp. § 356 Rem. below.

a. Pr. Idg. *mēnes-es -os 'of a mind'; *mēnes-os according to § 228 pp. 111 f.; for the ablaut grade of the formative suffix, see II § 132 p. 413. Skr. mānas-as, durmānas-as; Avest. mananah-dī duśmananah-dī. Gr. Ion. μένε-ος Att. μένους; Ion. ἰομενε-ος Att. ἰομενεοῦς, Lat. gener-is, Vener-is Vener-us; dēgner-is; tempor-is with o- from the nom. acc. sing. neut. (II § 132 pp. 418 f.) O.Ir. tīges (nom. tech teg 'house') = Gr. στέγος τίγες. Goth. hatis 'of. hatred', see below. O.C.Sl. sloves-o 'of a word' = Skr. śrāvas-as.

The other forms have a weak grade of formative suffix; as *mēn-s-es -os 'mensis': Gr. Lesb. μῆν-ος Att. μήν-ος, Lat. mēn-is, O.Ir. mēs. Cp. II § 132 p. 415.

Grecian Att. Σωκράτου beside Σωκράτως and the like, following πολέμου, cp. acc. Σωκράτην instead of Σωκράτη § 220

p. 97, dat. Σωφάρη § 272. Also Lesb. Ὑγένη on the model of stems in ά, like voc. γίνε (§ 209), acc. γένη (§ 220), dat. γένη (§ 272).

Gothic. hatis is once found, Ephes. 2. 3 barna hatis 'τεχνα ὅργης' in Ambr. B., whilst Ambr. A. has barna hatiē. The forms hatis-is, agis-is (agis 'fear') etc. follow the o-stems. So also O.H.G. ahir-es (ahir 'ear of corn'); beside which are found kalbes (cp. Kelbeeris-bach) lambes, which were made on the model of wort-e-s after the nom. acc. kalb lamb etc. had come, in the regular course of sound-change, to belong apparently to the same class as wort.

Perhaps Goth. lambis and like forms are to be classed with hatis. Because these words, like neuter o-stems, made their gen. sing. in -is, they came to be declined like them in other cases: nom. lamb etc. (Michels, Zum Wechsel des Nominalgeschlechts, I 17). To this one other factor may have contributed; namely, the practice of representing es-stems in composition by a corresponding form in -o- (Goth. hráiva-, Norse Run. hleva- = κλεο-, see Burg, Runeninschr. 19, O.West.Germ. requa-, cp. II § 12 p. 28, § 40 Rem. 5 pp. 73 f.).

Old Church Slavonic. slova beside sloves-e, a reformation like O.H.G. kalbes, see II § 132 p. 422.

b. The gen. sing. belonging to the nom. in Idg. *-ūs has this ending. Skr. uś-as Gr. ηοῦς for *ηό(ο)-oς 'of dawn'. Lat. honōr-is with o taken from the nom., like datōr-is § 235 p. 126.


Pr. Idg. comparative *ōkis-es -os 'ocious' (cp. II § 135 p. 429): Skr. dēyās-as Avest. āṣaoh-ō, Lat. ocıōr-is (like honōr-is, in b. above). In Greek we have ηόνον-ος with -en-. O.C.Sl. slađša, extended by the suffix -jo-.


Brugmann, Elements. III.
f. Root-Nouns. Skr. nas-ás 'of a nose', Lat. nār-is. Skr. ās-ás Avest. āevā- ā- 'oris', Lat. or-is. Skr. māţ-ás (inferred from the nom. pl. māţ-ās) Gr. μῦς (instead of the strictly regular *μῦς, see II § 160 p. 485) Lat. mūr-is 'of a mouse'.

§ 238. 10. Lastly, the genitive of certain root-nouns whose root ends in ū or ī may be cited.

Skr. nāv-ās Gr. νῆ-ός νῦς (I § 611 p. 462) Lat. nāv-is 'of a ship'.

Skr. rāy-ās from rā-s 'goods, wealth', Lat. rē (cp. dat. rē) a re-formate like faciē; § 230 p. 118.

Skr. div-ās dyō-ś, Gr. Δή-ός, Lat. Jov-is, from nom. Skr. dyāū-ś 'daylight', Zeū; O.H.G. Zios perhaps for *d(ī)eu-s = Skr. dyō-ś (cp. nom. Zio § 199 p. 80) and A.S. Tiwes = *di(ī)eu-ēs. Skr. gō-ś, and in the Veda gāv-ās as well, Avest. gēu-ś gau-ś, Gr. βο(fare)ός and a by-form βος in Βός-νος-ός for *gy-ōs, Lat. bov-is, O.Ir. bō (later bō) for *bōu-os, from *geu- *gau- 'head of cattle'; O.H.G. kuo, and possibly A.S. eg (p. 80 footnote 1) from a form of the stem to be inferred from the acc. sing. and perhaps from the nom. sing. too (H.G. kuo- A.S. cu-), see § 199 p. 80, § 221 p. 98. Skr. div-ās Gr. Δή-ός Βος-: Skr. dyō-ś gō-ś = Avest. hamaēstr-ō : sāstar-ś, see § 231 pp. 119 f. Later re-formates are Lat. Jov-is A.S. Tiw-es Ved. gāv-ās Gr. βο(fare)-ός Lat. bov-is O.Ir. bō, cp. Avest. vay-ō and like forms p. 120.

§ 239. II. Formation of the Genitive in ō-stems (cp. § 228 pp. 113 f.).

a. The Pronominal Endings -sio and -so. Pr.Idg. *mī̄s-sio 'lup' (had nouns *e-sio beside *o-sio, as pronouns had? see §§ 418, 450). Skr. vṛka-sya; Avest. vēhrka-ke, (Gāthic vēhrka-hyā (I § 125 p. 115), O.Pers. kāra-hyā 'of a people, host'. Armen. gailo-y (I § 561 p. 417); the ending -ay in proper names, as Trdatay (nom. Trdāt) Maremay (nom. Mariam) is perhaps the Iran. -a-hyā borrowed; however, it is not quite certain that Armen. -o-ay have the origin here suggested; see below. Gr. Hom. lēvōso; and, side by side with
this kind, forms like Ἀιόλου are shown by the metre to be necessary (the MSS. have Ἀιόλω), Hom. Πηνελέω (nom. Πηνελέως) for *-γος (I § 611 p. 462), Ion. Att. λίκου, Dor. λίκως.

Armen. -oy may or may not be one of these endings. What makes it uncertain is this. The ablative -oy can be referred to *-o-tos (cp. Skr. mukha-tās), and it might then be assumed that the ablative form was used as genitive owing to the relation between pairs of forms like abl. i zardu: gen. zardu. Cp. § 244 p. 142.

In the Cyprian dialect of Greek occurs the ending -ow, as ἀγνύων = Att. ἀγνῦον. It is usual to connect this with Arcad. τω-ντι 'huius', in which case the ending will have been borrowed from the pronoun. But there are difficulties in the way of this view. Some assume that the ending -or which is found in some parts of Thessaly (e. g. χρόνοι, ροῖ) comes from -oo. This is hardly likely; it is far more probable that these were locatives used in the genitive sense (§ 263); see below, b.

*-e-so *-o-so in Germanic. Examples of its use with pronouns are Goth. pi-s 'of this' hui-s 'of which?' (§ 419). It doubtless did not pass on to the noun until the independent growth of Germanic had begun. The position of the word accent in the pronominal forms, *þe-so, *χεῖσο, explains the breathed s (O.H.G. wulTes O.Icel. ulf-s) and the e (not i) of the ending -es in West Germanic (the i of Goth. -is did not arise until Gothic had split off and become independent). In Goth. and O.H.G. *-e-so, Goth. vulfs O.H.G. wolfes. Old Norse *-o-so, Norse Run. Gōdgaas O.Icel. ulfs (beside þess 'of the, of this'). In the oldest documents of A.S., and still later dialectically, we find -aes = *-o-so, as ðæges 'of a day', elsewhere -es = *-e-so, ðæges; so also in pronouns, ðæs and ðæs.

b. Latin and Keltic -i. Lat. lupē. The oldest specimens of the language have -i; later we find both -i and -ei, but the latter may be nothing more than another mode of writing the sound of -i, as it is in veiros (I § 41 p 38). The ending -i in io-stems dates back to the prehistoric period; e. g. fili (nom. filiu-s), so also Falisc. -i, as Cēst 'Caesii'
Genitive (-Ablative) Singular. § 239.

(Deecke, Die Fal., p. 264). The ending -it is later, and due to -i- passing into the genitive from the other cases; it first appeared in adjectives, afterwards in substantives. O.Ir. fir 'viri', maicc 'filii', Irish Ogam inscr. maqi (-i?) = maicc, Gall. Ategnati (nom. Ategnato-s), and like forms. io-stems: O.Ir. céll 'socii' for *-i(i)n. In Umbro-Samnitic o-stems show the ending -eís: Umbr. popler 'populi', Osc. sakarakleís 'sacelli'.

Two considerations make it not improbable a priori that this noun-genitive is a locative formation. These are (1) that in pronouns the Idg. locative in -i (-e-i -o-i) is used from the proethnic stage onwards not only as a locative, but as a genitive (Skr. mē Gr. μεί etc., see § 447), and in particular the genitives Lat. istius Osc. eiseis can be shewn to be transformations of original forms in e-i (§ 419); (2) Thessal. χρόνοι is a locative (see last page). It is quite permissible to refer Kelt. -i, i.e. -i, to *-eī, especially as examples of Gall. -i (-ī), for *-aī, have been preserved (§ 247). This may perhaps explain the phonetic difficulties of the Latin forms. filī, a genitive in function, is locative in form, the suffix being Idg. -ī (-i- is the weak grade form of -io- -iō-, as in the voc. filī and elsewhere, see § 201 p. 83); this formation would give an easy explanation of Lith. -yje in šodijje (nom. šodi-i-s 'word'). At the same time proethnic Latin had *lupei in use, and the -eī of this, by association with filī, became -ί earlier than the same change took place elsewhere in the language; hence it is that -i is the regular mode of writing this termination in the earliest records of Latin. But in the Umbro-Samnitic branch -eī was kept, although it was extended, as it was in pronouns, by adding -s, and thus became -eís (op. O.Lat. gen. mī-s ti-s § 447); the result was that there was a confluence of o- and i-stems here (op. Lottner, Kuhn-Schleicher's Beitr. II 311 f.).

Remark. Not much stress must be laid on the form Zextoi 'Sekti' found in a Faliscan inscription (Deecke, Die Fal., p. 180). In the two other proper names found in this inscription, Voltio 'Voltius' and Folocce 'Folocius', s has dropped; and the same may have happened to Zextoi. *Zextois would be parallel to Ceises 'Caesii' Caliteneis 'Calitenii'. Or it
is quite conceivable that -oś is formed on the analogy of the -oś in a-stems, as Volsci 'Voltoae', in the same way as Lat. equorum follows the analogy of equorum (§ 345), and loc. pl. Lat. Sabell. -oś follows -oś (§ 337). Lastly, there is the possibility that the engraver has made a mistake.

c. Lith. vūko, O.C.Sl. vūka, doubtless an ablative form (§ 241). Side by side with this occur the following pronominal forms, Pruss. ste-sse O.C.Sl. ēe-so (§ 418).

Ablative Singular.1)

§ 240. This case had no form proper to itself in the parent language, except with o-stems. In these the ablative ended in -ōd and -ođ; in other stems the genitive and ablative had the same ending (§ 228 pp. 112 f.).

-ōd and -ođ are related in the same way as -e-sjo and o-sjo in the genitive singular, -ei and -ośi in the locative singular, and -e and -o in the instrumental singular. Probably the e-vowel was originally used where the syllable carried the chief word accent (I § 311 pp. 248 f.). Oxytone ablative adverbs of the parent language ending in -ōd (lat. faciīnum, cp. Skr. apākād 'from afar' from āpāka- 'distant') kept the e-vowel and its accent down to the time when the languages had begun to develop independently, just as in Greek we find the loc. adv. ἄμαξετι beside ἄμαξος, in Armenian the instr. adv. ardare-t 'ākədəs.'

beside the living instrumental ardaro- from the stem ardraro-
'just, right' (cp. J. Schmidt, Festgruss an Böhtlingk, pp. 100 ff.).
But the case was different where the forms were not adverbs.
Then -ed and -ōd may have become independent of the
difference in accent, which was originally the condition of the
double form, even before the parent language split up at all.

In such pronominal forms as Skr. má-d 'a me', -d is the
ablative suffix; so it is possible to analyse thus — *ugə-d,
and to regard -e as the third form of the strong grade (I § 311
p. 247). (Note that Johansson calls the formation in -ed -ōd
an instrumental in -e -o to which a further suffix -d has been
added, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 136.) But it is also possible that
-ed -ōd first came about by contraction of the stem-final -e -o
with -ed, whatever that may have been; and that -ed and
-d were parallel forms bearing much the same relation to one
another as -es -os and -s in the genitive singular (I § 115 p. 108).

The ablative of o-stems, as a noun-case proper, is fertile
in Aryan and Italic; and also in Germanic and Balto-Slavonic,
if Goth. vulfa and Lith. vilko O.C.Sl. vlaka are really ablative
forms. In Greek the only forms which preserve it are adverbs.
In Armenian and Keltic it seems to have vanished utterly at
the beginning of the historical period.

In Avestic and in Italic, the ablatives in -ed -ōd which
belonged to stems in -o- gave rise by analogy to d-ablative
in the other stems. This made it possible to make a distinction
in form between the genitive and ablative of these stems,
which had come down from the original language having the
same suffix (-es -os -s).

In some languages the ablative -tos, which belonged to
adverbs, made its way into the noun system and became a
fertile case suffix. This happened in Sanskrit, Armenian, and
Greek, perhaps also in Slavonic. Cp. § 189 p. 66.

§ 241. I. Original ablatives of o-stems ending
in -ed -ōd.

Pr.Idg. *ugəd (*ugəd) from *ugə- 'wolf', *jugəd
(*ju-gōd) from *jugō- 'yoke', cp. § 240. Skr. vṛkād yugād,
Avest. *vəhrkaḥ* O.Pers. *kāra* (I § 649.6 p. 496) from *kāra-* 'people, host'. The ending -ōd (not -ōd) is indicated by Avest. *paskāḥ* 'behind, along after' with k as compared with instr. *pascā* = Skr. *pascā* with c, which therefore contains the Idg. ending -e (§ 275). Greek: pronominal adverbs, Locr. ὦ ὦνοι Cret. ὦ ὦνοι 'unde'. Latin: old inscr. *Gnaivōd* meritorōd, in the later language *Gnaevō meritorō lupō jugō*, and many adverbs in -ū; Umbr. *piacculo* 'piaculō' *somo* 'summo', Osc. *sakarakiūd* 'sacello'; -ēd in Italic only occurs in adverbs (cp. § 240), Lat. older inscr. *facilumēd* i.e. *facillumēd*, later *facillumē rectē* Falisc. *rectōd*, Umbr. *rehte* 'rectē' Osc. *amprufīd* 'improve' (ē becoming ō as in *līgūd* 'legē' *līcitūd* 'licetō*). The following Germanic words may quite regularly represent ablative forms (see below): Goth. *vuflu juka*, O.Icel. *ulfe ulē*, O.H.G. *wōlfu* -o; and possibly we should class along with these ablatives Goth. *meina* O.H.G. mīn 'mine, my' (from the poss. *meina*), which is genitive in use; see § 452. Lith. *vilko* O.C.Sl. *vīčka*, see below.

In Avestic occurs -āda as well as -āp, as *xāpra-*n. 'lordship'; this word was produced by accretion of the postposition a = Skr. a, cp. the loc. pl. in -āv-a § 356. -āp has been superseded by the ending of consonant stems (§ 242) in *yimaŋ* (yima-, a proper name), cp. Skr. *yamadd*.

Two explanations are possible of Greek adverbs of manner, such as ῥῶς 'thus' (cp. Skr. ēdd 'thus'), ὦ-ἀς, ὦς, ὦνως ὦνως, ἅλως, after the analogy of which were built up similar adverbs from stems which had another final than -ο-, as ἀμφεφρῶς, ἀμφεφρ(ό)ος, σαφῆς-ως σαφῆς. They may be ablatives of the kind which we are now discussing, or they may be the instr. sing. in Idg. -ō (§ 275). It is hard to choose between these, since the meaning may be explained equally well on either supposition. If it were necessary to regard the -ō which appears in some of these forms as derived from Idg. -d, it could only be ablative. But it has never yet been proved that in any word -ο represents original -t -d. In all probability, -ο is a later addition, identical with the -s of āps Lat. abs -āps beside āps, O.Pers.
abi-š beside abiy 'to', pati-š beside patiy 'against' (cp. § 228 p. 112). See the Author, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 74 ff., XXVII 417; G. Meyer, Gr. Gr.² 294; Osthoff, Morph. Unt. II 53 ff., IV 243.

Remark 1. I have hitherto been hostile to the view of Curtius (Stud. X 218 ff.) that in proethnic Greek *oúrov (*oúred) became oúrw; before r- and σ-, and that this form then came to be used regularly, no matter what sound followed. My reasons were as follows. (1) oúrw was usual before vowels, but before consonants oúrw. (2) When -τ (-τ) and r- come together in Greek, -rr- is the result, not -στ-, as σαττόν. Such words as ἀπαντο-τ ἑτε are no exceptions, since the sounds heard in these words would be -ττ- or something of the kind, even in the pre-Greek period (I §-469.4 p. 345, § 490 p. 364), and I did not venture to derive (say) τας τα' from pr. Idg. *tōt' tōd, i.e. tōd tōd. (3) *oúrov σα would become *oúromos, as *πανσασθαμ becomes πόσασθαμ, and it seems to me incredible that this would be regarded as oúrw + σα; since σα for the living language was a lengthened s and nothing more.

But now Joh. Schmidt takes up the cudgels again for Curtius (Pluralb. 352 f.); and I must once more urge, against this theory, that so far the change of -τ (-τ) to -ς has not been made credible in any single instance. For Schmidt's own opinion — that Hom. της is derived regularly from *τασας, and so coincides with Skr. tāeat — is indefensible; see § 225 Rem. 1 p. 106. I do not deny that it is possible that this *tōt' tōd, or its like, once existed in the parent language, and that τας may be derived from it. But my own hypothesis, still seems to me to have far greater probability: namely, that we have here an adverbial sign -ς, which came down from the original language in certain forms, and in Greek overstepped its original limits. Schmidt himself admits the high antiquity of this -ς e.g. in ἀμφοτ-ς, which (following Fick, Wörterb. I² 10) he compares with O.Pers. abi-š. For our present purpose, it is all one whether this -ς is called, as Schmidt calls it, a neuter formative suffix, or compared, as it is in the text, with the sign of the gen.-abl. case. Yet another attempt to explain this -ς has been recently made by Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Sprachgesch., I 75 ff.

It is doubtful whether Gr. ἐς Lat. ex is one of the forms which contain this adverbial -ς, because it is possible that ἐς and ἐς, wherever they occur, are simply short forms of ἐς and ex made necessary by the sounds which happen to come next them (op. the Author's Gr.² Gr.)

1) Schmidt says that in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 74 I have "passed over in silence the carefully considered view of Curtius". He has not observed that my essay is earlier than that of Curtius, since it appeared as early as May 1877 (it was the Habilitationschrift for my appointment as Privatdocent). Schmidt says that "no one has yet assailed it": here he is wrong again, for I have indicated its weak point. n Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 417.
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pp. 71, 219). But in any case I am firmly convinced that the analogy of \( x^2 \) gave rise to \( x^2 \) (\( x^2 \)) as a by-form of \( x \). Schmidt contests this point too; but how he can say, as he does on page 358, that I have not explained why there is a difference in meaning between \( x^2 \) and \( x^3 \), or how he can speak as if I had given as the origin of \( x^2 \) beside \( x \) simply and solely the analogy of the relation between \( x^2 \) and \( x \), is a mystery to me; for in the very passage which he cites (Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1883, pp. 190, 194 f.) I have expressly said that \( x^2 \) was coined as the opposite to \( x^2 \) as used with verbs of motion, to which definition only \( x \) with the accusative answers. The form of \( x \) was affected in only one of its meanings, just as Skr. pad-, for example, makes the genitive padhr when it means 'husband', but not when it means 'lord' (§ 231 p. 120); and cp. Gk. révados : révados § 190 p. 67, and Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 412. \( x^2 \) may have been formed on the analogy of \( x^2 \), even if \( x^2 \) had already its sentence-doublet \( x^2 \) in use by its side; and the use of the pair of forms, \( x^2 \) and \( x^3 \) was not regulated by the use of \( x^2 \); \( x^3 \), because the newly coined \( x^2 \) meant something different from \( x \) with the dative.

Goth. ulfa O.Icel. ulfe ulfí may be derived, without violating any ascertained law of sound-change, not only from the abl. in *-ed, but from the loc. in *-of (§ 263), the instr. in *-e (§ 275), or the dat. in *-e(\( \ddot{a} \)) (§ 246); the Icelandic form may also be a dative in *-ð(\( \ddot{a} \)) (§ 246); and lastly O.H.G. ulfsu may be instr. in -d (§ 275). In these, and in other cases of the same kind, it must not be forgotten that a form may have had more than one origin, since as sound-change goes on, there is often a confluence of several inflected forms into one. But we can hardly doubt that a more thorough examination of the Syntax will often narrow the limits of choice, and shew that a given form has not so many different origins as we imagined.

Gothic adverbs in -ba, as \( \ddot{u} \ddot{i}a-ba \) 'evil, ill' hardy-ba 'hard, very' if they belong to the same group as Skr. sthāla-bhā-s 'huge, massive' and the like (II § 78 pp. 216 ff.), are either abl. sing. or instr. sing. (§ 275). But it is a question whether -ba be not a particle (= Gr. \( \varphi \phi \) 'how, as', cp. Höfner's Ztschr. II 204, Fick's Wörterb. I 8 686), added to the acc. sing. neut. used adverbially, and meaning 'somewhat, \( \varphi \varphi \) or something of the kind.

The following pronominal forms are ablative: Goth. hvam- ma 'to whom' hvamem\( \ddot{a} \), 'to each' (*-nd) and O.H.G. hvemu

(*)-ôd); Skr. kâsmâd); the Gothic form may also be regarded as an Idg. dat. in *-ë(ā) (§ 246). Cp. § 423.

The Balto-Slavonic forms vilko and vlûka have the meaning of a genitive as well as an ablative; see § 228 p. 113, § 239 p. 133. The derivation of Lith. vilko (-a in some dialects, Lett. -a) from Idg. *ulqôd is not without its difficulties. -ô makes us hesitate; -â would have been expected (I § 92 p. 86). But there is no cogent reason for deriving it from *ulqôd, which would at once satisfy the known phonetic laws; and the last word has not yet been said on the representation of Idg. o in Baltic. As we have also instances like tvorô : tveriû, žolê : želû, it seems best to put the matter provisionally thus: there is a confluence of Idg. o and Idg. â in Lithuanian and Lettic, under certain conditions unknown.

Remark 2. Bezzengerber's assumption (Bezz. Beitr. IX 248 f.), that Lettic genitives such as tô beside tô (= Lith. tô), tilto beside tilta (= Lith. tilto) contain an Idg. ablative in -ôd, is doubtless right. Leskien calls my attention to a double formation in the Lithuanian dialect of Velâna, which should be compared with this: namely tu', katrû beside d'nu.

§ 242. II. Extended Use of the d-ablative in Avestic and Italic.

1. Avestic. vehrkañ beside instr. vehrka dat. vehrkañi became the model, in prehistoric times, for the ablatives barentyañ haenayañ from the stems which make instr. barentya haenaya dat. barentyañi haenayaii. Now these same stems had gen. *barentyañ *haenayañ (which appear in the historical language as barentya haenayá); accordingly, in connexion with the genitives *sûn-ah âmaâr-ah *ber'zat-ah *manasyñ-ah (in the historical language sûn-ô maâr-ô etc.) sprang up the ablativeañ sûna maârañ ber'zatan manasyñañ; in the same way bâxvañ and bâxañ were formed beside *bâxv-ah (bâxv-ô) and bâxao-ô, and açoñ beside açoñ-ô. Cp. Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I 74 f.

1) For -u in káemû, op. § 198 Rem. 2 p. 80.
In these forms too we find -d-a instead of -p; cp. § 241 p. 135.

Remark. It is not clear whether these analogical formations existed in Old Persian. In this language both -d and -a (-h) dropped (I § 649 p. 498); thus if there ever were such re-formations in -d, they could not be distinguished from gen.-abl. forms in -a. tazmáyā (taumā- 'family'), which is used as an ablative, may be derived from either *-gāyā or *-dyāyās, as far as form goes. The two forms were only distinguished in i- and u-stems, which made the gen. in -aśi and -aus; but in these stems no forms occur which could decide the question.

§ 243. 2. In Italic it is probable that at least the beginning of the spread of the d-suffix dates from the pro-ethnic period.

-

-ad: Lat. old inscr. praïdād sententiād, later praēdā sen-
tentiā; Umbr. tota 'civitate', Osc. toutad 'civitate' suvad 'sua'.
-

-jēd (in Lat. and Umbr. this -jēd and the ending -jē of the instr. etc. have run together; see § 277): Lat. faciē, Umbr. uhtretie 'auctoritate', and similarly Lat. rē Umbr. ri 're' re-
-

-per 'pro re'.
-

-rād: Lat. marīd (it is true that the authority for this form is the Columna Rostrata, but the word is correctly formed) mari omni (-ei in the inscr. forms omnei

partei is merely a way of writing the sound of i, as it is in

veipos I § 41 p. 38); Umbr. puni poni pone 'posca' Osc.

slaagīd 'loco, regione' Pelign. fertilid 'fertilis'. It would seem

that -rād spread from i-stems to consonant-stems in proethnic

Italic: Lat. e. g. air-rād coventiōn-īd best-rād portiōn-ī, corpus,

Falis. op-rād 'ope', Umbr. peī-rād pers-i 'pede', Osc. praesent-īd

'praesente'.

This re-formation in -ad -ēd -rād sprang up in the same way as the Latin gen. pl. -ārum on the analogy of -ārum (§ 345), and the Sanskrit nom. acc. pl. neut. -mni -āni on the analogy of -āni (§ 339). At the same time, another circumstance seems to have aided this development: the ablative and instrumental had already run together. In o-stems the ablative was used for abl. and instr., e. g. Lat. cum fīliō Osc. com prēvatād 'cum privato (reo)'; and in consonantal stems the instrumental was used for instr. and abl., e. g. Lat.
(Gnaevōd) patre pregnātus, Umbr. pure (in pure-to) 'ab igne' (cp. below). But in the plural also, instrumental and ablative had run together, and this may have had some influence — how much we cannot tell — upon the use of the singular. Suppose then that the -ōd of o-stems had added the function of the instrumental to its own (the genuine instr. in -ō can no longer be traced except in adverbs, Lat. modō and the like, § 275); it was a natural step to a new group of forms in -ād -ēd -ēd beside the original instrumentals in -ā -ē -r (§§ 276, 277, 278), the new forms being used for both ablative and instrumental. This hypothesis agrees well with the fact that in a-stems as well as in o-stems the genuine instrumental is not found except in adverbial forms (§ 276). It was also all the easier for this re-formation in -d to spread, because in the plural, as well as in the singular, there were distinct forms for the genitive and the ablative (abl.-instr.).

In consonant stems, during the historical period, there was a struggle for the mastery between the abl.-instr. re-formation in -ēd and the instrumental (also used for abl.) in (Lat. Umbr.) -ē. In Latin, the forms in -ē grew gradually rarer, and gave place to those in -e (e.g. instead of airēd we find later only aere); but -e itself quite early came to be used with i-stems, as ove parte from the stems ovi- parti- (cp. acc. ovem following ped-em § 214 p. 92 and gen. ovis following ped-is § 231 p. 121). By degrees one or other of these two endings became regular for certain groups of nouns. But neither in consonant stems nor in i-stems did the exceptions quite disappear; and the rules laid down by Caesar and other grammarians only shew how impossible it is to get at the facts of a living language by studying the books of theorists. In Umbrian, at the date to which the existing monuments belong, the ending -ē, which was also a locative suffix (§ 269), was the more common of the two; -e.g. nomne 'nomine' curnae answering to the Latin 'cornice'. In Oscean, on the other hand, beside praesentid there are forms in -ōd. nig-ud 'lege' tangin-úd tangin-ud 'sententia, consulto'. This
is the ending of o-stems, which has spread further; clearly because the two stems already agreed in the acc. sing. (-om) and gen. sing. (-eis). (See § 218 p. 95, § 231 pp. 118 f., § 239 pp. 131 f.).

Remark. It can hardly be that Latin consonant stems ever had an ablative ending -ōd (which, if it ever existed, must have been a contamination of -ōd and -ē). dictatored on the Col. Rostr., may be a false archaism (but as to the language of this inscription reference may now be made to Wülflin, Sitzungsber. der k. bayer. Akad., 1890 pp. 283 ff.); and the length of the -ē in poetry (Bücheler-Windekilde Grundr. der lat. Decl. 97) may be due to metrical reasons.

As regards n-stems, there are wide differences in the Italic languages. Lat. -ūd: magistrātūd, later magistrātū. But Umbr.-Samn. has the ending of i-stems: Umbr. trefi 'tribu' fratrēcate 'magisterio', Osc. castrīd 'fundō' from the stem whose the genitive is castrōs. Or did a become i under certain conditions in proethnic Umbro-Samnitic? It is doubtful how we are to regard Umbr. maronato beside maronatei 'magistratu' (see Bücheler, Umbr. pp. 173 sq.).

One more point remains to be noted. In Umbrian, fully formed ablatives, both singular and plural, often have -tu -ta -to affixed to them: as akru-tu 'ab agro' pure-to 'ab igne' vapersus-to 'a sellis'. A -tu -ta is also affixed in the imperative plural. Both are equally obscure.

§ 244. III. The Adverbial Ending -tos used as a Suffix of the Ablative Case (cp. § 189 pp. 65, 66).

Sanskrit. Adverbs like tā-tās 'thence' i-tās 'hence' gave the type first of all for noun forms such as mukha-tās from mukhā-m 'mouth' (cp. Lat. coeli-tus from coelu-m). Now pronominal adverbs in -tos could be used as an ordinary case, e.g. taddā ḫaśhād 'from this sixth part'; hence nominal adverbs such as mukha-tās became part of the case system, and were used as ablatives. In Epic poetry they have become exactly parallel to the ordinary ablative, and could be used for singular and plural alike, as their adverbial origin would have led us to expect: e.g. gurur garṛyān pīṭīḍ māṭīras ca
'the teacher is more honourable than father or mother', bhayaq daṣṭribhyaḥ satrutāḥ 'fear of snakes, of enemies'. In Prākrit the use of this ablative formation (-dō -du = Skr. -tō) spread still more widely; see Lassen, Inst. linguæ Pracr. pp. 302 sq.

Armenian. Examples of the ablative from stems in i, u, and consonants are: i srtē (srti- 'heart'), i zardē (zardu- 'ornament'), y akanē (akan- 'eye'), i maure (maur- 'mother'. The ending of these according to Hübschmann (Armen. Stud. I 89) comes from *-a-tos by an intermediate stage of *-ey (I § 483 p. 357). In the same way, the -oy of o-stems, as i gailōy, may contain *-tos, -oy being for *-o-tos. Further, the genitive gailōy may have the same origin (cp. Gr. -θεν used as a genitive, Rem. 2 below). However, it is possible to derive -oy from *-o-siō, and so the uncertainty does not at once disappear. Cp. § 239 p. 131.

The Greek gen.-abl. ὀνοματος corresponds to the Sanskrit nāma-tas; but it was attracted to the stem ὀνομα-στα- (ὄνομαστα, ὀνομάστων), which contains the formative suffix -στα-, and together with it formed a system of τ-cases. See II § 82 p. 250. οὐδαρος οὐδαρος σελατος etc. are genitives of the same kind, see II § 114 p. 350, § 116 p. 365. It also seems that the feminine stem ἔ-μιρ- (Skr. dā-mī-, II § 97 p. 289) was produced through a false analysis of ἔμιρ-ς; see Fick, Bezz. Beitr. XII 7, Danielsson, Gramm. und etym. Stud. I 51. There are 10 nominal adverbs in -τος, no such form as (say) ἦστο-τος 'divinitus'; the explanation is that when -τος had become a case suffix, and was regularly used for that purpose, adverbs in -τος gave place to a new series in -θεν (Θεό-Θεν).

Remark 1. J. Schmidt gives an explanation of the τ-cases of ὀνομα which seems to me very unlikely (Pluralb. 187 ff.). He denies altogether the connexion of these with the suffix -τος and the Ἰdg. to-extension of neuter n-stems. He believes that the nom. acc. sing. ὀνομα = Skr. nāma, and *φιέω (the older form of φιέων) = Skr. bhārat eventually came to have the same ending; and that hence ὀνοματος ὀνοματις etc. were coined on the analogy of *φιέωτος.

Balto-Slavonic. Slavonic neuters in -e, gen. -ete, as telē 'calf', may belong to this class. -t- did not originally belong to
the inflexion of these words, as is shewn by certain parallel forms such as Russ. telen-ok 'calf' = O.C.Sl. *telenišči, mladen-
toć 'youth, minor' (Pruss. malden-iki-s 'child') as compared with mladeć 'child'. We should have to assume that *-tos made its way into the case system, and that the result was a series of t-forms, at some period when there were parallel genitives in *-es and *-os. As the ending *-es became regular for the genitive, *telēto(s) was transformed to *telēte(s). Cp. also Pruss. smunen-t-s 'human being', acc. pl. smunen-t-ins beside smünen-
isku, dat. 'human'.

Remark 2. In Greek, after the analogy of ablatival adverbs with -τερ (−τερ), as εἰς-τερ νῦν-τερ πό-τερ, ablatival adverbs were formed from nouns, e.g. ἔπο-τερ, ζω-τερ, εὐρ-τερ; and these drove the older series in -τος (−τος−τος) out of use (see last page). But these noun-adverbs never became exactly equivalent to the corresponding cases (the contrary is not proved by Hom. ἐς οἰκοποτόμεν, ἀπὸ Τροπότερ). But the pronouns μιθεῦς, σίθε, τίθε, which were formed on the same analogy, were doubtless fully incorporated into the case system; for in Homer they are used not only as ablatives, but as genitives, e.g. B 28 νῦν ἔθανεν ἔθες ἄκε, v 42 Ἀοὶ τί καὶ τήν γιορ καλεῖ, Aesch. Pers. 218 καὶ τε καὶ τίνηρ καὶ τιθεῖ.

Dative Singular.1)

§ 245. The suffix of this case was a diphthong consisting of some short vowel followed by i. With consonant stems it appears as -i in Sanskrit, as -au in Greek (infinitives, as ἱδμετερ-au, and we may conjecture in some adverbs with the ending -au, as παρα-au beside loc. παρα- instr. παρα- gen. παρα-), as -i in O.C.Sl. (synov-i = Skr. sánāv-i, -i standing for *-e, cp. I § 84 p. 82, and to the works there cited, add Jagić, Archiv für slav. Phil X 191). From these we restore *-az (or *-ez? see I § 109 pp. 100 ff.) as the proethic suffix. It is

not quite so certain that -t in Lat. *patr-t represents this dative
§ 249). It is also doubtful whether the Irish dat.-loc.-instr. forms, such as coin 'cani', are datives in *
§ 251); perhaps they are all locatives in origin (cp. Gr. xuv-t). Lastly, it is uncertain how we should regard the Lith.

Stems in o, a, and ė in the preethnic period had the
endings *-ēi (*-ēi), *-ai, *-ie, contracted from -o+a (e+a),
-a+a (or -a+a), -e+a (cp. I pp. 106 f.). In a-stems and
ē-stems dat. and loc. sing. had run together even then
§§ 264, 265).

Not all of the forms in Greek, Italic, Keltic, and
Germanic which are classed as singular datives in the grams
are really dative. In both form and use there has been confusion with the locative, instrumental, or ablative.
Hence great complications have arisen (cp. § 188); and many
points in the history of the Indo-Germanic dative, locative,
and instrumental forms in these languages remain dark for
the present. When this is so, care will be taken that as
complete a list as possible shall be given of all the possible
ways in which any given form may be explained.

§ 246. 1. o-stems. Pr.Idg. *u:gōh1), and doubtless
*-ē(i) also, as in the abl. sing. there were both *
-ōd and *
-ēd, in the loc. sing. *
-ai and *
-ēi, in the instr. sing. both *

1) I do not consider it proved that a presumed *
w:gō could become
*u:gō in Idg. Lat. lupa cannot be derived from such a form as *
w:gō, if only for the reason that the Lat. dative -ō always remained long. I assume a loss of -i only for -ēi (and that perhaps only at the end of a sentence or clause); where the reason was that the two vowels of this diphthong were closely connected (cp. I § 645.1 p. 489). But I do not deny that i may have dropped in ēi as well in the parent language. These sounds may have been differently treated at different periods, or when their position in a word was different. See I § 150 pp. 187 f.
Dative Singular.

*če (§§ 240, 263, 275). Skr. -ai in the infinitive, e.g. the infin. in -dhyāi, as bhāra-dhyāi, from the stem -dhyā- (this ending is also pronominal, as tāsmāi dat. of 'this'); Avest. -ai regularly, as vēhrōi. Sanskrit and Avestic have another ending -a = Idg. *-e(ī), as Skr. sakhyā from sakhyā-m 'friendship' Avest. aša from aša-m 'what is just, justice'; see Bartholomae, Bez. Beitr. XV 221 ff., J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 234 f. For Skr. vṛkāya see below. Gr. ἦνος; -ov later on (in Attic in the second century B.C. or thereabouts) became -o, Thess. -ov (I § 84 p. 84, § 132 p. 120); for the forms in -o used in several dialects for the dative, see § 247. O.Lat. Numasiōi inscr., populōi Rōmānōi mentioned by Marius Victorinus; later on -i became -ī, lupō jūgo (I § 136 p. 123); Oec. Abellānūi 'Abellano', Umbr. Tefre Tefri Tefrei 'Tefro (deo)', cp. below. O.H.G. wolfe. O.Icel. ulfe ulfi, cp. below. Pruss. wīrāi 'verbo' with -ai = -ī, for *-i; Lith. vilkui, cp. below.

In Sanskrit, nouns usually have -āya, as vṛkāya. Bartholomae (Handb. p. 95, Ar. Forsch. II 169, III 63) regards this as the old dative extended by -a, a byform of the postposition ā, cp. Avest. fradaipai ā 'for assistance'. He conjectures that the same -a is contained in the locative ending Avest. -hva O.Pers. -uv-á, although of course an original ā may be contained here (§ 356); and it may be the same as the affix -e in such locatives as Lith. raškoj-e O.C.Sl. kamen-e (§§ 257, 264)1), cp. § 186 p. 62.

Umbro-Samnitic. Two things are possible. (1) It may be that in pr. Ital. -i became -ōi before consonants (cp. Ital. 1)

---

1) Bartholomae (loc. cit.) takes a to be a 'proclitic' by-form of ā in Avest. verbal compounds, such as a-sār-. In exactly the same way, Wackernagel now holds that ē- in ē-pēloē ē-xillōw is the weak grade' of ā- in ō-pēloō (Das Dehnungsgesetz, Basel 1889, p. 50). If so, ē- in ēšūw and words like it might belong to the same class. Are we then to postulate that this prefix in Idg. had four forms, ē: e and ő: o? That would doubtless mean ē ē and ő ő, i.e. four strong-grade forms; for e and o could hardly be the weak grades of ē and ő.

Brugmann, Elements. III.
-dī and -a(i in a-stems, § 247), and that o(i became the regular ending in Umbr.-Samm. If so, Umbr. -e -i -ei is related to Osc. -uí as the instr. pl. Umbr. -es -ir -eir is to Osc. -úis (§ 380). (2) Or -o(i became Umbr. -e -i -ei Osc. -úi in the Umbr.-Samm. period, and not before; in which connexion it should be remembered that ú may be read as ò or ò. It is probable that the Umbr. dative ending did not become identical with the locative ending which answered to Osc. ei, since the loc. is consistently written -e -e, e.g. uze onse 'in umero' (§ 263).

For the Irish fuir, used as a dative, see § 275.

Germanic. O.H.G. wolfe O.Icol. ule uhl for *wulfai, -ui for -o(i -e(i, as in a-stems -a(i comes from -dī (§ 247). But it is possible to explain the O.Icol. form, along with Goth. vulfa, as a dative by deriving it from an Idg. -e for -e(i. ule and vulfa may also be the ablative in *-ed (§ 241 p. 135) or the instr. in *-e (§ 275); wolfe and ulfe, and doubtless Goth. vulfa, may be loc. in *-o(i as well (§ 263).

Goth. hvamma dat. of 'who' blindamma dat. of 'blind' (cp. hvammis dat. 'each') may contain the Idg. dative ending -e(i) (cp. Skr. kśmēi); but they may also be ablative like O.H.G. hvem od sintum (§ 241 pp. 137 f.).

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. -ui in vilkui arose (1) either at the end of a clause or sentence and when a sonant was the next sound following (cp. vilkais = Idg. *yilgais § 380), or (2) in accordance with Leskien's Law of Shortening, stated in vol. I § 664. 3 pp. 523 f.

The O.C.Sl. dative vilku (pronouns also have -u, as tomu) cannot be derived from anything but pr. Slav. *-ou so far as we can tell from what is at present known of sound change in Slavonic. I do not know what to make of this form.¹ It recalls the adverbs tu 'there' onu-de 'here'.

§ 247. 2. a-stems. Pr. Idg. *ekyai. Skr. Ved. suv-apattyā from suv-apatyād 'a woman who has fair offspring'; but

¹) Wiedemann derives this -u from Idg. -ū (Das litau. Präteritum I 47). How this is to be supported I do not see.
cp. below. Gr. χωρῷ; the -ι of -αι dropped later on, just as did that of -αε (§ 246, last page). O.Lat. Matītā, later equae; Umbr. tute tote 'civitati' Osc. delīvai 'divae'. O.Ir. mnāi from nom. ben; tuaith, *-αι becoming first *-αι and then *-ι (-ι in soiilli was previously *-i); it is worth remarking that -ι is found even in Gallic, Belyxamu from nom. Belisama (cp. § 239 p. 132). Goth. gibāi A.S. zīfe, and cp. the pron. Goth. þīzi dat. fem. of 'this' as contrasted with Skr. tāsyāi (cp. § 263 Rem.). Lith. raņkai O.C.Sl. račė (I § 84 p. 82, § 664. 4 p. 524, § 665. 3 p. 525).

Aryan. The usual ending is Skr. -ayāi, Avest. -ayāi, as āsvayāi hāṇayāi, a re-formation of the same kind as the gen. sing. Skr. -ayās Avest. -ayā, see § 229 p. 115, § 264. The shorter ending -ai is only found in ḫa-stems. In Avest. -yai, gaebyai from gaebya- f. 'earthly', there need be no scruple whatever in assuming that -yayāi has been shortened by dissimilation; and the only question is whether in Vedic suvopatyaiai, -yai has not been shortened from -yayāi in the same way (see I § 643 p. 482, and J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 383); cp. also gen. loc. du. yōśi beside yāyōśi etc. in § 307 and § 422. But in any case the old ending -αi was kept by pronouns: Skr. kāsyāi Avest. kahyai (§ 425).

In Greek we find -αι in place of -α as we find -α, the locative ending, in place of -όν. This -α is found in Boeot. (-οτ, -ύ, see I § 80 p. 72), Arcad.-Cypr., Elean, and N.-W. Greek; -αι is certain for Bocotian (Πλαύκαι, Ἀκατίγη, see I § 96 p. 90), and so it was doubtless found in the other dialects which had -α instead of -ωτ; it should be remembered that -αι may represent either -αι or -αι, as far as the letters go. In proethnic Greek, o-stems had -οί (Idg. dat. form) for dat. and instr., and -οῖ (Idg. loc. form) for locative; but a-stems had -ai (Idg. dat. and loc.) for both dative and locative (the ending of the instr. was doubtless the Idg. form in -α, see § 276). -οι and -ai became -οῖ and -ai in pr. Greek before words beginning with a consonant (I § 611 p. 461); and thus in o-stems the dat. (-instr.) form became sometimes
identical with the locative, whilst the a-stems developed a form which seemed to be of the same kind as the Idg. locative in -oᵶ, and this accordingly absorbed the special locative uses. By this time the boundary line between dat. (-instr.) and loc. was partly obliterated in o-stems, and in a-stems the state of things was much the same. After this both classes of stems moved on side by side in the same direction: in one group of dialects, as Ion.-Att., -o and -a absorbed -ο and -ά in the declensions, so that these survived only in adverbs and certain fossil forms (e.g. οἶκος, ἕκκεν-γενής); while elsewhere, as in Boeotian, -ο and -ά gained the day.

Italic. O.Lat. Matātā for pr. Ital. -āi, which answers to -ēi in Numasisīi. Whether Menervāi and similar forms of the oldest inscriptions have preserved this diphthong it is impossible to decide, because -AI may be differently read. -āi -aē, the regular ending in classical Latin (e.g. equae), is the anticonsonantal form of proethnic Italic (I § 612 p. 462), and was also the ending of the locative (§ 264). This form -āi has become the regular ending in Umbr.-Sann. also; and here too it is impossible to trace any distinction in form between dative and the locative (see § 264).

Ennius has terrāt as a dative (cp. -āt gen., § 229 p. 116); apparently in consequence of the use of the same form in -ē (īē-stems) for both genitive and dative (§ 230 p. 118, § 248).

§ 248. 3. i- ā-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). Pr. Idg. *bhṛghṛt- (ō)īē, and doubtless -ōōē at the same time, 'celesae' (cp. the locative § 265). Skr. brhatyā, Avest. bērentyāī. Lat. facē, Umbr. kvestretīe 'quaesturae' (and therefore O.Lat. rē...
Umbr. *ri 'rei') can be explained as coming from Idg. *-'(i)ē₁, cp. § 265; a second form is *facii (as in the gen. sing., § 230 p. 118), whose -i₁ may be from pr. Ital. *-(i)ē₁ for *-(i)jeᵝ₁, just as -aᵝ in a-stems came from -aᵝ (§ 247, last page); for the third form *facii₂ see below. Mid.Ir. *Brigti, īnisi; -i for *-i, and this for *-(i)jeᵝ₁ or *-(i)jeᵝ; the form may also be regarded as locative (§ 265) or instrumental (§ 277). Lith. žemei O.C.Sl. žemlji for *-jeᵝ₁ (I § 68 p. 60, § 147 p. 181), and this for *-jeᵝ₁, just as in a-stems *-aᵝ comes from -aᵝ (§ 247 pp. 147 f.).

Italic. Side by side with Lat. faciei 'and facii is the form facii₂, which has got the ending -i from consonant stems, perhaps following res (cp. Skr. rāy-ē). Are we to regard Ose. Kerri Pelign. Cerri 'Cereri' as the dative of a similar stem?

O.Ir. īnis beside īnisi is an i-stem form (§§ 260, 278), like the gen. sing. īnseo (§ 230 p. 118).

Goth. frijōndjai could no doubt be derived from *-jeᵝ₁ (cp. anstai § 260); but it must surely be a āa-stem form like other cases, e.g. gen. frijōndjōs. Greek Att. φεω'ραγ ἀληθεια and Lith. vėžanczai₂ must certainly be assumed to be āa-forms. Cp. p. 68 footnote 1.

§ 249. 4. i-stems. Different endings are found in different branches of the language: -eᵝ-ai, -(i)ᵝ-ai, -i. But how these are historically related is not clear; nor is it clear how matters stood in the parent language. Probably -iᵝ-ai : -iᵝ-ai = -men-ai : -mun-ai (§ 251).

Aryan. Skr. ávay-ē Avast. ašaya-ça ašē (cp. Bartholomea, Handb. § 93 p. 40, § 224 p. 89); in the infinitive, Skr. pi-tāyē 'to drink' Avast. ker*-tē (II § 100 p. 298), etc. 'Some exceptional forms have -iᵝ-ai: Skr. pāty-ē 'husband' (dat.) Avast. paipyaš(-ca) 'lord, ruler' (dat.), an irregularity which must be explained along with the irregular Skr. instr. pātya loc. pātyau gen. pātyur; see § 231 p. 120, §§ 260, 278.
In Ved. and Avest. are feminines with -ī: Ved. āūti from āūti- 'help' Avest. fra-mrūiti 'for recitation', obviously the instr. form (§ 278). Bartholomae fixes pr. Aryan as the period in which this form got a dative meaning (Bezz. Beitr. XV 245 f.); but it appears to have had this meaning, as well as that of the instr., in the parent language. O.C.Sl. -ī in nōsti, pāti (pātī m. 'way') cannot be explained without violence in any other way than by referring it to this -ī; the same may be said of O.Lith. vēsz-paty (stem vēsz-pati- 'lord'). Again, we must doubtless see Idg. -ī in such forms as Lesb. Boeot. Dor. Ion. βῶτὶ πόλι (cp. §§ 266, 278), which are used for the dative amongst other things; besides which Lat. ovī and O.Ir. faith may have the same (see below).

In Sanskrit there are feminine forms in -yāī, ṛvyāī, a re-formation like gen. ṛvyās (§ 231 p. 120), loc. ṛvyām (§ 260). Compare § 278.

Lastly, we may perhaps add Avest. mrūitī āraē-ca instead of mrūitē ārayās-ca, and the like (Geldner, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 226 ff.).

Remark. (1) Did this ending arise by syllable dissimilation before words beginning with a sonant (-oī for -aieī)? (2) Or was it a re-formation on the model of consonant stems, dating from some period when there were nouns declined both as consonant stems and as i-stems, such as abstract nouns in -āūti- II § 102 p. 309 (cp. Lat. gen. ov-is mort-is § 231 p. 121, Lith. gen. krūt-ē §§ 348, 402, and the like)? (3) Or lastly, is Bartholomae right in explaining the forms as locative (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVIII 21, Bezz. Beitr. XV 241)? Cp. § 260 Rem.

In Greek, there are no examples of real datives of i-stems. For Lesb. etc. βῶτι see above.

Italic. In explaining the forms called dative according to the traditional classification of the grammars, consonant stems and i-stems must be considered together, since no line can now be drawn between them in this respect in any Italic dialect. Latin from the earliest period has -ei -ē, as ovei ovē from the stem ovē-, patrei patrē from the stem patrē. Also -e (quantity doubtful) in the oldest remains of Latin; but amongst the examples found — Salūte patre etc. — there is
none which can with certainty be referred to an i-stem. Umbr. -e, more rarely -i: "Tarsinate "Tadinati" (stem. Tarsi-nati-) patr-e 'patri', Marti 'Marti' Iuvi-p. 'Iovi patri'. Osc. -ei, as Herentatei 'Veneri, Volupiae', Diuv-ei 'Jovi'; but not a word amongst them which can be certainly regarded as an i-stem (for Herentatei cp. p. 119, footnote).

Of these endings the Osc. -ei is the least obscure. It is the locative ending of the i-declension, derived from Idg. *-e(i) (§ 260) or *-e(i)-i (§ 266) — the spelling 'Ἀπελλόους-ης 'Apollini' does not prove that the e of -ei is long. -ei passed on to consonant stems in the same way as -eis in the gen. matri-eis (§ 235 p. 126) etc. Umbr. -e -i may be identified with Osc. -ei; and considering the similar genitive formation in the two dialects (Umbr. matrier = Osc. matrieis) this view is in itself the most probable, although it is possible that -e in karne 'carni' nomn-e 'nomini' etc. may come from *-ai, the dative suffix (for the phonetics of this cp. the loc. sate 'in sancta' §§ 247, 264), and -e in ocre-m ocre 'in ocre' from the loc. *-e (§ 260). And Latin -ei -i may be the same ending as Osc. -ei. But if infinitives such as ag-i da-r-i are datives like Skr. -aj-e ji-ś-ē (II § 162 p. 490), and the 2nd. pl. imper. legimin-i answers to the Gr. inf. λαγήμεν-α (II § 117 p. 373), then patr-i, su-i, socru-i cannot be separated from Skr. pitr-ē, bhruv-ē, śvaśrūv-ē. They would then be datives in Idg. *-ai.1) Now comes the question whether -i has a different origin in ove and patrī. Is it the locative of an i-stem in ove, the dative in patrī; or was ove an ad-formate of patrī as were the gen. sing. ov-is of patr-is and the acc. sing. ov-em of patr-em (§ 231 p. 121)? There is another possibility; -i in ove may be the same as -i in Skr. att, see p. 150. O.Lat. -e

1) I prefer to keep to the view that Lat. ai in final syllables under certain conditions became i, Torp's protest notwithstanding (Torp, Beitr. zur Lehre von den geschloßenen Pronomen, 1888, pp. 15 ff.). At the same time, I admit that Osthoff's statement of the phonetic laws upon which this depends may perhaps be incorrect (see Zur Gesch. des Perf., 198 ff.).
may be regarded as Idg. -ği, the ending of the locative in i-stems; a view which is supported by the adverb peregre (stem peregrī-); see § 260.

O.Ir. fáith, if it is the dative, can be compared only with Skr. āti (see p. 150). Cp. §§ 260, 278.

Lith. fem. nākezial nākezei certainly has not the Idg. dative -i-a; but here we have a re-formation after the analogy of -iá-stems, e. g. valdžiai valdžei from nom. valdžiā valdžē 'government' (§ 247 p. 147), in the same way as the masc. vāgiūi (nom. vāgi-s 'thief') followed the model of a stem in -jo-. O.Lith. vēsz-patī beside Skr. āti, similarly O.C.Sl. nošti pati, see p. 150.

§ 250. 5. u-stems. Of these much the same may be said as of i-stems, see § 249. The endings are -eu-a; -(u)u-a;

Remark. No probability can be made out for the theory that the Idg. instr. in -u could be used as a dative even in the parent language. As to the dative use of Lat. manū ātī O.Ir. biūth, see §§ 261, 279.


Lat. manū (inscr. senātuei) for *-eu-a; (pr. Ital. *-ou-a; see I § 65 p. 52, § 172.1 p. 152) or for *-y-a; (see I § 170 p. 149). Cp. senatu-is § 232 p. 122, man-um § 349.

Lith. sūnui doubtless follows vilkui (§ 246 p. 146), as the loc. pl. sūnasė follows vilkūsė (§ 326, Rem., and § 360). O.C.Sl. synov-ī with -ou- for -eu- (I § 68 p. 59) = Skr. sāndv-ē.

§ 251. Nasal Stems.

Stems with n-suffixes have usually the weak grade form. But the men- and yen-stems from which infinitives are made
seem to have had strong-grade forms even in the proethnic period: Skr. ḍḍ-man-े Skr. ḍṛ-µev-ai Lat. 2. pl. imper. da-min-ı, Skr. vid-mán-े Skr. ḍṛ-µev-ai, Skr. ḍa-vān-े Gr. Cypr. ḍò-fév-ai Att. ḍòvai, Avest. vid-vān-öi Gr. cidd-rév-ai; see II § 116 p. 363, § 117 pp. 366, 367, 371, 373, and for the accent, Wheeler Der grieche. Nominalaccent pp. 57, 58. Compare the Idg. strong-grade stem in -esi-ai (i-stems) and -esi-ai (u-stems), §§ 249 and 250; and -esi-ai in es-stems (§ 254). Observe also that these are just the endings which are found in infinitives: Skr. pi-tāy-े Avest. ker-tō, Skr. śṛō-tav-ē, bhiy-ās-ē dōk-ās-ē. The strong stem may have come from the locative, which was also sometimes used for the infinitive; e.g. Gr. ḍōev Skr. ṣājān-ī, Lat. vīver-ē.

Pr. Idg. *kun-āi 'cani', *vid-mén-āi 'for learning'.

Skr. sān-ẹ (for the accent, see p. 70 footnote 2), Avest. sān-ē. Skr. tākōn-ē Avest. taśn-ē (tākōn- taśan- 'sculptor, carpenter'). Skr. āśman-ē Avest. asman-ē (āśman- asman- 'stone, heaven'). Skr. Inf. vid-mán-ē 'for learning, for knowing', da-vān-ë 'for giving', see above. Sometimes the strong stem took the place of the weak, even at a later period, e.g. Ved. aryamān-ë beside the earlier aryamp-ē (aryamān- 'friend, comrade'), and similarly Avest. airya-main-ē (airya-man- 'tractable'), also Avest. urvān-ë beside urun-ë (urvan- 'soul'). Cp. § 234 p. 124.

In Greek, datives of this kind survived only as infinitives. Inf. in -µev-ai, Epic and Lesbian, as ḍu-nevai ḍevnųmevai, II § 117 p. 371. Inf. in -fév-ai is more general (II § 116 p. 363): Cypr. ḍò-fév-ai (accent uncertain) Att. ḍōvai, also ḍēvai for *i-févai, āŋ̣vai for *āŋ̣-févai: from these -vai was detached, as though it were the inflexional ending, and this, spreading most widely in Ion.-Att., ended by usurping the place of -µev(aw); thus arose e.g. ḍō-ñvai didō-ñvai teďáv-ñvai; elvai Arcad. ḣnvai is not for *ēvñai, but elµev yµev (for *ē-µev) has been transformed at one step into elvai ḣnvai through the analogy of this set of forms. eiddvanai is doubtless equivalent to Avest. vid-vān-öi, but the perfect ending -ivai may in some words
belong to Idg. -en-stems, say in *sévāi cp. sévōn (the Author, Morph. Unt. III 19 ff.; Johansson, De der. verb. contr., 202 sq.)¹).

Lat. carn-ē, and, with the strong stem, homin-ē edōn-ē mentiōn-ē. The 2nd. pl. imperative in -mini, as sequimini, was doubtless an infinitival dative; see II § 117 p. 373. It is not at all probable that Umbr. karn-ē ‘carni’ and the like have this formation; see § 249 p. 151.

O.Ir. coin ‘cani’ may come from *cun-ai, and similarly ārain (āru) ‘kidney’ etc. But the same forms may be explained as locatives (§ 269).

Lith. sūn-iui follows the analogy of stems in -io- and -i- (§ 246 pp. 145 ff., § 249 p. 152), and so do ākmen-iui etc. Whether O.C.Sl. kamen-i contains the dative suffix -aij (cp. synov-i § 250 p. 152) or the ending of i-stems (§ 249 pp. 149, 151), is not clear.

It so happens that no example of the dative of any root-noun in -m has been preserved in Aryan. We are justified in inferring that there were such forms as Skr. gm-ē jm-ē Avest. z’m-ē from Skr. kṣam- Avest. zam- ‘earth’, Avest. xim-ē from xam- ‘winter’ cp. Lat hiem-ē; see II § 160 pp. 482 ff.

§ 252. 7. r-stems. Pr.Idg. *mātr-dai ‘matri’, *dōtr-aij ‘datori’. Skr. mātr-ē ddtr-ē, Avest. maḥr-ē daḥr-ē. Lat. mātr-ē datōr-ē (-ōr- comes from the nom. sing.); it is not very probable that Umbr. ar-fertur-ē ‘infertori, flaminī’ belongs to the same class, see § 249 p. 151. O.Ir. māθir may be derived either from *mātr-aij or from *māter-aij; and it may also be explained as locative (§ 269). O.C.Sl. mater-i is obscure just as kamen-i is; see § 251, above.

Lith. móter-iui móter-ei follows the analogy of -ia-stems (§ 247 p. 147).

§ 253. 8. Stems ending in Explosives.

Pr.Idg. *bhṛghṛt-aij ‘celso’. Skr. bhṛhat-ē, Avest. ber’zaitē and (with the strong stem) ber’zantē; Skr. bhār’tē ‘ferenti’.

¹) The same dative suffix is found in φεσά-ai (-ai = Skr. -dē-i) according to Bartholomae’s convincing explanation (Rhein. Mus. XLV 151 ff.).
§ 253, 254. Dative Singular.

Lat. rudent-i feren-t-prae-sent-i — but it is not certain far this -ent- was directly derived from Idg. -ṣt- (II § 125 pp. 395 f., III p. 105 footnote 1). O.Ir. carit ‘amico’ dat. and loc. (§ 269). O.C.Sl. teči-t (from teč neut. ‘calf’, cp. § 244 pp. 142 f.) like kamen-i, see § 251, last page.

Skr. sarvāt-ē ‘to or for completeness’, Avest. hauryatāi-ē ‘to or for safety’. Lat. novitāt-ī, juventūt-ī. O.Ir. bethid (from beothu ‘life’) dat. and loc. (§ 269).

Skr. sarād-ē ‘to or for autumn’, Avest. armae-śāidē from armae-śād- ‘sitting still’. Lat. lapid-ī. O.Ir. druid ‘to or for a Druid’ dat. and loc. (§ 269). Skr. pad-ē Lat. ped-ī.


§ 254. 9. Stems in -s.


For Skr. infinitives like bhūyās-ē dohās-ē see II § 132 pp. 412 f. and III § 251 p. 153. And doubtless the following forms, with an original weak grade of the es-suffix, have the same formation: Skr. jiś ‘for victory’, Gr. γράψα ‘to write’ (one of the forms connected with the o-aorist) and Lat. dāre fer-rē, see II § 162 p. 490, and the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 116. An original weak stem is also contained in Lat. mōns-ī O.Ir. (dat. and loc.) mīs, Idg. *mē-ns-ai (II § 192 p. 415).

For O.Ir. taig (nom. tech teg ‘house’), see § 259 p. 159.
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§ 255. 10. Stems in -i, -ii, -a, -nu, and in -i, -j, and Root-Nouns in -u and -i.

Pr. Idg. -ii-ai -wu-a'i, e. g. *bhrwya-ai from nom. *bhrus 'brow'. Skr. dhīy-ē 'to or for meditation' Ved. nādiy-ē 'to a river'; bhruv-ē, Ved. śvaśrūvē 'socrui', Avest. tanūyē i. e. -nu-ē 'to a body'. Also, with the feminine marked by the ending, Skr. dhīy-āt nādiy-āt bhruv-āt śvaśrūv-āi, cp. § 233 p. 123, § 280. Lat. su-ē, socru-ē, cp. § 197 p. 76; vē may be contracted from *vii-ē. O.C.Sl. kruv-ī 'sanguini', svekrūv-ī 'socrui'.


Skr. nāv-ē 'navi', Lat. nāv-ē. Skr. rāj-ē from nom. rā-ś 'property, riches', Lat. rē. Skr. dīv-ē (nom. dyaū-ś 'daylight'). Lat. Jov-ē Diov-ē. Skr. gāv-ē Avest. gau-ē, Lat. bov-ē; the ground-form was *guy-āi *gu-āi, and the barytone Skr. word is an ad-formate of gāv-ī like the gen. gāv-as (§ 238 p. 130), cp. II § 160 p. 482; O.Ir. boin (dat. and loc.) is an ad-formate of coin, see § 221 p. 98.

Locative Singular.1)

§ 256. There are two pro-ethnic formations.

1. In certain consonantal stems, and in i- and u-stems, the stem by itself was used for the locative. In such locatives forms

the formative suffix had an e-grade vowel; sometimes the first strong grade -e- (as Hom. δο-μεν), and sometimes the third, -ε- (as Cret. δο-μην). Forms with the third strong grade became indistinguishable from those of the nom. sing. masc. fem. and the nom. acc. sing. neuter: compare e.g. δο-μην with πον-μην O.C.Sl. i-меч (§ 223 p. 100). As a matter of fact, both these formations are doubtless the same, and the only difference is in their use in the sentence.

2. The second is a commoner formation, found in all stems. It had the case-ending -i, which seems to have been the same as the -i in the loc. pl. -s-i (Gr. -σι); see § 356. This -i once had a more general local meaning, as is shown by the personal pronouns which contain it, § 447; cp. § 239 p. 132 and § 424.

-i added to o- and a-stems contracted with their final into the diphthongs -οι -ει and -αι. Elsewhere the sound remained a vowel, forming a separate syllable; this happened in Aryan (-i), Greek (-i), and Italic (Lat. Umbr. -a), now and then in Germanic (A.S. hnyte, § 272), and perhaps in Keltic (Gall. -rīgi, see § 271); in the two last branches it has left behind many traces in the numerous umlaut ("mutated") forms, i.e. those with modified vowels. In Balto-Slavonic it can be seen only in the diphthongs of o- and a-stems.

Along with -i we have -i in Greek and Sanskrit, Hom. παρίγ-ι and the like (Hartel, Hóm. Stud. I 2 56 ff.), Ved. vaktār-ī and the like (Lamman; Noun Inflection 411, 426). Wackernagel, however, looks upon this as a rhythmic lengthening which dates from the parent language itself (Das Dehnungsgesetz der gr. Compp., 12 ff.).

In stems which show ablaut variation in their cases, the strong stem is found before -i (-i) from the proto-indo-european period onwards. Thus it is natural to suppose that -i was added to

forms which were used for the locative even without it; cp. e.g. Skr. mārdhān- i beside (mārđh-n- i and) mārdhān. But it must not be forgotten that this theory is not absolutely borne out by i- and u-stems. In these stems, -ei- i and -eu- i are pro-ethnic endings; but we cannot say for certain that there were parallel endings -ei and -eu, although we do find -eį and -eų (§§ 260 Rem. and 264 Rem.). Nor is it clear whether such forms as Skr. mārđh-n- i Gr. ἀφώ-, Gr. παρζ- I Goth. fadr, Skr. div-i Gr. Αῦφ- i are older than Skr. mārdhān- i Gr. πομεβ-, Skr. pitār- i Gr. παρζο-, Skr. dyāv-i; or whether they are really later (even then they may be proethnic), and followed other cases which had a weak grade of vowel, e.g. the dative singular. These questions I content myself with suggesting.

Remark. Bartholomae (Besz. Beitr. XV 23) attempts to establish an Idg. locative suffix -i beside i, e.g. in Skr. māh- n- 'immediately'. But the forms concerned are only adverbs. Cp. § 358.

§ 257. 1. Stems without any case-suffix used as 
Locative Singular.


Forms in -en. Ved. mārdhān (mārdh-ān- 'point, head'), udān (ud-ān- 'water'), kārman (kār-man- 'work, action') and the like; O.Pers. xšupa-vā 'or at night' i.e. xšapən-vā (stem xšapan-), see Bartholomae Handb. § 35 Rem. p. 22. Gr. aıl(f)όν adv. 'always', from aıl(f)όν 'space of time, eternity'; in the same group we place the infinitives in -μεν, found in Homer and in many dialects of Greek, such as ὄμεν ἰδμεν ἔμεν (Cret. El. ἔμεν, N.W. Greek ἠμεν), which served as the model for ὄρμεν, ἀγεμεν, ἀζέμεν, ἐκαμεν. O.C.Sl. kamen-ε (stem kamen- 'stone') probably has the same obscure -e which occurs in the Lith. loc. sing. raukoj-e žėmoj-e etc. (§§ 264, 265), cp. § 186 p. 62, § 246 p. 145 and § 409. A different explanation of kamen-ε is offered by F. Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 307.


Lastly, we place here O.Ir. toimte beside toimtin (Zeuss-Ebel p. 266), nom. toimtin ‘cogitatio’ (Thurneysen, Bezz. Beitr. VIII 269); -e stands doubtless for *-ion, and that for *-iôn.

§ 258. 2. r-stems. Two groups of words fall in this section. (1) A few forms which stand upon the border line between an adverb unconnected with any declined noun, and the case of a noun; as Skr. āhar-dīvi ‘day by day’, Avest. zemūv ‘in the earth’, which are naturally associated with non-nominal forms such as Skr. antār ‘inside, inwards’ (beside antāri-kṣa-) Lat. inter, Gr. ἐνερ Lat. super. Gr. νυκτοφι ‘by night’, perhaps containing -f, and Skr. mukhar ‘in an instant’, containing -fr (cp. Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XV 18, 23). (2) Secondly, certain living cases, as Skr. matār-i dattār-i Avest. mātāri datairi Gr. μαρτι‘, if they are really extensions of loc. *mäter *dōter; see § 256, last page. Cp. further § 186 pp. 62 f., § 224 Rem. p. 104.

§ 259. 3. s-stems.

W. Schulze (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 546) cites Skr. sa-divas ‘at once’ pūrvē-dyūṣ ‘on the day before, early in the morning’, and with the latter he connects Lat. dius (noctū diusque). Another form is doubtless śv-ās ‘to-morrow’ (cp. Avest. stā-ra- adj. ‘belonging to the morning’; Geldner, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 253, 261). Gr. Dor. aítē ‘always’ beside acc. aitē for *aito(a)-a (II § 183 p. 423). Lat. penes beside penus -oris (II § 132 p. 419). Also O.Ir. dat.-loc. sing. of neut. es-stems, as taig Mid.Ir. tig, from nom. tech teg ‘house’ (Thurneysen, Bezz. Beitr. VIII 269). Lastly, Slav. slones-e, with affixed -e like kamen-e, see § 257 pp. 158 f.

§ 260. 4. i-stems. Pr.Idg. had parallel endings, -i and -e with -i dropped (I § 645 p. 489).

Skr. has only *-e. Skr. Ved. ávā, agnā (agni-š ‘fire’); the variants ávau, agnau, which in the later language were used exclusively, took their -au from u-stems, as sūnau (§ 261). pātyau (pāti-š ‘husband’) took the place of pātāu
owing to the influence of pάτυέ pάτυά (see § 231 p. 120, § 249 p. 149), just as Goth. kinnάu instead of *kindu got -mn- = *mn- by analogy (§ 261). Avest. aša, O.Pers. ahi-
frāsta (ahi-frāstit—'punishment by the sword').

In Greek -ει or -ε was extended by the loc. suffix -ι, and became -ει_ι or -ει_ι, whence Hom. πόλιν Att. πόλη from the stem πόλιν. Cp. acc. sing. Ζήν-α built up on Ζήν § 221 p. 98, gen. Ἡμε_ιο and acc. Ἡμε_αι built up on *Ημειε and *Ημειε = Dor. Ἡμειε §§ 443, 450. πόλη suggested πόλης πόλης and other cases of the same kind (cp. § 231 p. 120).

The Old Latin "dative" in -e, as Salāte patre, and the adverb peregre may possibly have this Idg. -ε; but -e may also be Idg. *-i, the loc. suffix of consonant stems (cp. rār-e, Corthāgin-e), taken over by i-stems. The ending -ει may be contained in the Osc. "dative" in -εί, as Herentatei 'Veneri, Volupiae', and in the Umbr. in -e -i, as Tarsinate 'Tadinati' Marti 'Marti' (§ 249 pp. 151 f.); but -εί may be derived from -ει_ι (§ 266). Lat. ovē peregrē too, and the like, may contain Idg. -ει, as we saw on pp. 151 f. In the same passage it is mentioned that it is quite possible for the -e of Umbr. ocre-m ocre 'in ocre' to be the locative ending *-ε (cp. Sab. Flusare 'in Florali').

O.Ir. faith used as a locative (cp. neut. muir 'in mari') may have been either *yatει or *yatε originally. Cp. § 249 pp. 151 f., and § 278. Perhaps Gall. Ucute belongs to the same class (Bezz. Beitr. XI 131, 153).

Goth. guma 'for coming', for *kume? If so, the confluence of this case with the "dative" of o-stems (vulfsa, see § 241 p. 137, § 246 p. 146) was merely one of form, and did not extend to use. (In § 231, page 119, we saw that the ending of the gen. sing. of masc. i-stems need not depend entirely upon borrowing from stems in -o-). However, great doubts as to the correctness of this explanation are suggested by O.H.G. chume beside wolfe.

Goth. anstāi ('favour', dat.) may come from -ει, and Streitberg sees the same ending in O.H.G. enstī; he assumes
that the first change of pr. Germ. -ēi in West-Germ. was to *-ēi (cp. § 263 Rem. pp. 165 f.), just as he derives Goth. sunāu O.H.G. suniu from the same ground-form *-ēi. But other views of ensati and suniu are not excluded (see the Rem. below, § 261 and Rem., §§ 266, 267, 278); and in anstāi and sunāu it is at least possible that a is due to the gen. sing. (anstāis sunāus) — cp. A.S. guman as contrasted with Goth. gumin § 269, and the like.

Old Lithuanian had an infinitive in -tē, which still survives in some parts: e.g. dēk-tē trans. and intrans. ‘to burn’ (beside nom. dektī-s, seen in ugnā-dektī-s f. ‘stinging cold’, cp. II § 100 pp. 304 ff.). This doubtless comes from *-tēi : *-ēi became first *-ēi (I § 615 p. 465) and then -ē (I § 68 p. 60). There is another series of infinitive forms ending in -tē, which are added to cognate verbs to express an intensive meaning, as dektē dēga ‘it burns up clear’: -tē may be derived from *-tē according to I § 664.3 pp. 523 f. Thus both the Idg. endings -ēi and -ē were kept in use together, but they were differentiated in use. With dektē we may possibly compare the adverbial form sēnātē ‘at the side’ (beside nom. sēnātī-s ‘side’). As to Lith. nakti at, see § 264. Slav. -i in the loc. of i-stems, as O.C.Sl. noštī, žiti (žiti ‘life’), and in the infinitive, as žiti ‘to live’ (Lith. gū-tē gū-ti ‘to revive, become well’) may be derived either from *-ēi (*-ēi, *-ē, *-i, I § 68 p. 60) or from *-ē (I § 76 p. 66).

Remark. We have already several times assumed a change of -ēi (before consonants) to -ēi in the European languages, in O.C. Herentatēl Umbr. Tarėinote Lat. peregrī, Lith. dēkūtē O.C.Sl. noštī, and cp. Streitberg’s explanation of O.H.G. ensiti. Now since in men-stems, -meu and -men are both prothetic locative endings, it is at least a fair question to ask whether -ēi was not really -ēi, and not -ēi, in Indo-Germanic. Bartholomae would regard Avestic infin. like mrūūtē as forms of this kind with -ēi, see § 249 p. 150. The same question must be asked with regard to u-stems (§ 261 Rem.). Cp. § 236 p. 158.

§ 261. 5. u-stems. Pr. Idg. -ēy, *sānēy ‘in filio’.

Skr. sānāu. Avest. bāzau (O.Pers. babīrau stem babīru- ‘Babylon’, cp. the Remark, below). It may be conjectured
that this ending -\textit{au} served as a foundation for the Iranian nom. sing. in -\textit{au-}, acc. sing. in -\textit{av-um}, gen. sing. in -\textit{au-}, nom. acc. pl. in -\textit{av-as}, as Avest. \textit{ba\text{"a}zau-}\textit{s} O.Pers. \textit{dahyau-}\textit{s} etc. (§ 196 p. 76, § 215 p. 92, § 232 p. 122, § 318).

Greek. Perhaps we should place here the locative of nouns in -\textit{e\text{"u}s}, as \textit{ippe\text{"u}s} \textit{kaly\text{"u}s}, whose connexion with Skr. adjectives such as \textit{asvayu-}\textit{s} ‘desiring horses’ \textit{dsvayu-}\textit{s} ‘reverencing the gods’ Wackernagel tries to make probable, without having fully mastered the phonetic difficulties (see II § 105 p. 319 and the Author’s Gr. Gr.² p. 100). Supposing the existence of pr. Gr. *\textit{hippe}(/\text{"u})\text{"u} = Skr. \textit{asvaydu}, it might have been extended to *\textit{hippe}(/\text{"u})\text{"u}-\textit{i}, as in \textit{poli\text{"u}} Idg. *-*\text{"e} or *-*\text{"e} was extended by -\text{"i}, whence arose -\text{"i}-\text{"i} in the Greek form (§ 260 p. 160). And as \textit{poli\text{"u}} gave rise to the forms \textit{p\text{"o}lho\text{"u}} etc., so: *\textit{ippe}\text{"u}f-\text{"i} gave rise to *\textit{ippe}\text{"u}f-\text{"o}s *\textit{ippe}\text{"u}f-\text{"o}s etc. (cp. above Avest. \textit{ba\text{"a}zau-}\text{"u} etc. following the loc. \textit{ba\text{"a}zau}). 

-\text{"e} was everywhere contracted into -\text{"e}-, whence \textit{ippe}\text{"u}f-\text{"i} \textit{ippe}\text{"u}f-\text{"o}s etc.¹) Why this re-formation was confined to nouns in -\text{"e} were and did not affect stems like \textit{\text{"e}x\text{"e}v-}\text{"e}s and \textit{\text{"e}dv-}\text{"e}s, I must admit that I do not know. But the corresponding re-formation in -\text{"e} stems did not affect all words any more than this did. \textit{poli\text{"u}} is the only word in which it appears; but the reason for the limitation is quite obscure. As to the re-formed nom. sing. \textit{\text{"e}r\text{"e}r\text{"e}s} and its like, see Meister, Gr. Dial. II 110, 272; Zum el., arkad., und kypr. Dial. 40 f.; Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XV 178.

Lat. adv. \textit{noctu} (cp. Skr. \textit{aktu} ‘by night’) and Umbr. \textit{manup-} e ‘in \textit{manu}’ must be placed here; so must doubtless the forms, used as datives, Lat. \textit{manu} \textit{as\text{"a} Umbr. trifo ‘tribui’}. *-*\text{"e}s in pr. Italic became *-*\text{"e}s before consonants, and this became -\text{"o}s (I § 65 p. 52, § 612 p. 462). On \textit{manu} \textit{as\text{"a} § 279 may also be compared.

Gall. \textit{Tarauvov (Taranou)} from \textit{Taranu- ‘god of thunder’

¹) The adjectives in -\text{"e}(f)-\text{"o}-\text{"e} may have been formed directly from the old locative, e. g. -\text{"o}-\text{"e} for *-*\text{"e}-\text{"o}-\text{"e}s and the like (II § 63 Rem. 2 p. 128; Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XV 179).
(cp. Taramu-cuo-), where toc -oy comes from *-ey, *-ēy (I § 66 p. 56). The same ground-form may be assumed for O.Ir. biuth.

Goth. sundu may come from -ēy, and according to Streitberg so may O.H.G. suniu sitiu, Norse Run. Kunimmu(n)diu O.Icel. syni 'to a son'. But there are other possibilities; see § 260 p. 161.

O.C.Sl. synu for *-ēy through the intermediate stages *-ey -oy (I § 68 p. 59, § 615 p. 465). For Lith. sūnūjė see § 264.

It may be that this same case-ending lurks in many adverbial forms: e.g. in Gr. ἄνω 'without' O.C.Sl. věnu 'forth, out' (both of these have -ey, the form assumed by -ēy before consonants) beside Goth. īnu O.H.G. ānu 'without' (cp. the Author, Gr. Gr. 2 p. 218). Bartholomae (Bezz. Beitr. XV 16) connects ἄνω with Skr. sanu-tār, but he too regards it as the loc. of a u-stem.

Remark. In the European languages, we have often assumed a change of -ey (before consonants) to -ey, as in Lat. noctū Umb. manu-ve, Gall. Tārovovv, O.H.G. suniu O.Icel. syni, O.C.Sl. synu (Gr. ἄνω). Here, as with i-stems (§ 260, Rem.) the question arises whether there was not a preethnic ending -ey with short -e. Bartholomae, loc. cit., cites, in support of this, Avest. perīvā O.Pers. babirānuv (Skr. Ved. -sānā proves nothing), to which we add Avest. avahav-a gātās-a (Caland. Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXX 599 f.; Jackson, Am. Or. Soc. Proceed., 1889, p. cxxv).

§ 262. 6. All remaining stems.

Avest. đom from the stem đom- 'house', Idg. *dēm. According to a conjecture of Bartholomae’s in Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 497 f., there is a similar locative formation contained in the adverbs Skr. kam Avest. kām, whose ground-meaning he would have to be ‘at pleasure, for one’s pleasure’ (cp. Skr. kām-ā-s ‘desire’).

Skr. parat adv. ‘last year’ beside Gr. πέρας O.Icel. fjord fjord adv. ‘last year’ O.Ir. onn-urid ‘ab anno priore’. Is parat due to a confusion of *per-uti and *per-yet? In II § 4 p. 9 we connected the word with Gr. Fētov; but it must be admitted
that this hypothesis is not quite free from doubt. Cp. Feist; Grundriss dcr got. Etym., pp. 30 f.

1- *i- and *u- us-stems, in addition to *i- *i and *uy- i (§ 268), have -i and -u: Skr. Ved. gāurī, from gāuṛ-ī 'the cow of the species Bos Gaurus', camā from camā-ś 'dish, platter'. It is very unsafe to assume this formation for Greek and Latin merely on the strength of Gr. Aeol. Dor. Ion. pólt and Lat. vī; for pólt need not come from pólt-ū, but may come from pólt-ū (§ 249 p. 150), and vī may be explained as being for *vi-li (§ 268). Nor need we postulate *svekry to explain the existence of svekrūs-e; see § 268.

Remark. Bartholomae (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 583) conjectures that gāurī camā were coined beside the loc. pl. gāurī-śu camā-śu the relation between them being suggested by vṛkā : vṛkā-śu.

In Irish, locatives without -i might be looked for in cathir beside cathraig (nom. cathir 'town'), bethu beside bethaid (bethu 'life'), and similar words; cp. toimte § 257 p. 159, taig § 259 p. 159, biuth § 261 p. 160. However, many of these short "datives" were doubtless first made from words whose nom. and dat. had run together, such as athir 'father'. Datives like toimtiu (beside toimte toimtin, see Zeuss-Ebel p. 266) give special support to this theory, because they can be explained on no other.

§ 268. II. Locative Forms with the suffix -i.

1. o-stems. Pr.Idg. *uhi-ō-ī 'in lupo', and also -ē-ī, as *jugē-ī, cp. § 240 p. 133. Perhaps this formation served for the genitive too even in Idg., see § 239 p. 132.

Skr. vṛkā. Avest. vehrkā, O.Pers. pārsaiy (pārsa- 'Persian, Persia'); with the postposition ā (or its unaccented by-form a, see § 246 p. 145) Avest. zastay-ā 'in manu' (cp. § 208 for O.Pers. dastay-ā).

Gr. Att. oînov 'at home', Ἰαθ.μοῖ. Since in Attic the only remaining examples of forms in -oî are adverbs (compare the pronominal adverbs pôi, oî and so forth), similar adverbs were made from other stems, as Kραυν-oi from Ἰ Kραυνα. But in Boeot., Arcad.-Cypr., Elean, and N.W. Greek, -oî did not
cease to be a living case-ending, and it became completely confused with the dative in orig. -oǐ (§ 247 pp. 147 f.). In Thessalian the loc. in -o was used for the genitive as well (see § 239 p. 131), for which the use of μοί oί instead of a possessive genitive is primarily responsible (§ 447). The ending -o is never a case-ending in any Greek dialect, but it is only found in adverbs; as Att. oίξει, aίει aίει (with instr. αίει, § 275) beside Lat. aevō-m, àμαχεί beside ãμαχο-ς, Cret. ἄμπελεi etc., cp. the pronouns Dor. πεί ὁπεί and others.

In Italic, -eį is clear in Osc. mūnīñeį tereį 'in communi terra' comenei 'in comitio'. Latin has the locative only in adverbs, which had doubtless orig. -eį, e.g. belī, domī, spelt sometimes with -ei in early Latin; the explanation of -e, as in die quinte, is doubtful. As regards Umbr. uze onse 'in umero', cp. § 246 p. 146. Falisc. Zextoi 'Sexti' is a very dubious relic of Idg. -oį, see § 239 Rem. pp. 132 f.

O.Ir. cinn 'at the end, after' (nom. cenn 'point, head, end') for *kyenneį or *kyennei (Gall. Penno-).

Germanic. -eį, pr. Germ. -eį -ę (I § 67.2 pp. 57 f.), is seen in A.S. dægi (dæg 'day'), and, with -i dropped, hüm (hüm 'home'), and in O.Swed. dægfi O.Icel. dege (cp. the pronouns bi, hvi), and doubtless, as Kögel says, in O.H.G. adverbs like nidari, heimi beside nidare, heime (Kögel, Ztschr. für deutsch. Alt., 1884, pp. 118 f.). -oį is seen in O.H.G. tage, wolfe A.S. dæge, O.Icel. ulfe, ulfį, and doubtless Goth. daga vulfa (cp. Rem.); though ulfe, vulfa may be dative in -ę(i) (§ 246 p. 146), ablative in -ad (§ 241 p. 135), or instr. in -e (§ 275), and the West-Germ. and O.Icel. forms may also be the dative in -oį (§ 246 p. 146).

Remark. It has been proposed to derive Goth. daga from *dagai. Hitherto, in view of Goth. gīðai (I § 659.3 p. 512), I have felt disinclined to believe that in words of more than one syllable -oį became -o in pro-ethnic Gothic — a theory, by the way, which is by no means adequately supported even by the distinction between -oį with the acute and with the circumflex (Hanssen, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 612 ff.; Sievers, Paul's Grundr. I 403). But Streitberg (Germ. Comp. auf -ōs, pp. 22 ff.) has made it probable
that the shortening of the long vowels in pr. Germ. -eɪ -eɪ -eɪ -eɪ took place not in pr. Germ., but only in the separate dialects of Germanic. If this be so, the theory in question is not barred by gībōi for pr. Germ. -ōj. It must be admitted that Streitberg's view is not certain; for O.H.G. enel unun O.Icel. fundi syth may contain Idg. -ei -ey (not -ēi -eī), see § 260 Rem., § 261 Rem. It is quite possible to explain Goth. ba̱rdi (3rd. sing. opt.) as re-formation of *ba̱dra following the other persons.

Lith. -ė, now only adverbial, name 'at home'; more widely used in O.Lith., as dēvē-p 'with God' (spelt dieviej). If O.Lith. spellings like dieveie paneie (Bezenberger, Zur Gesch. der lit. Spr., 133) are meant to express the sounds -eje, and not -ēje, they must contain the ending -eį, to which has been affixed the same -e as ranēkoj-e has (§ 264). -ė may be the same as the first part of -ej-e (see I § 68 pp. 59 f.); but it may represent Idg. -oį (I § 84 p. 81). How to dispose of the ordinary ending in modern literary Lithuanian, -e (as viltė), is a doubtful question. Leskien (Decl. p. 47) and Brückner (Arch. für slav. Phil. III 277) conjecture that earlier -ė was changed to -e on the analogy of -je, which I cannot agree with. We shall return to viltė in § 424. At present all įo-stems have -yje, the same ending as those in -i- (§ 264); thus we have not only šodyje, gaidyjė from the nom. šodi-s 'word', gaidy-s 'cock', but also svetįjė from nom. svečzia-s. In forms of the same kind as this last, -yje is comparatively late; in O.Lith. krauieie and krauie are the forms which come from krauja-s 'blood', and so forth. We have already offered a conjecture (§ 239 p. 132) that šodyje is the transformation of an original locative in -i (cp. Lat. full used as gen. sing.).

O.C.Sl. vlūčė for *zlgoj. But it is not clear why the ending is -ė, and not -i as it is in the nom. pl. vlūci = Gr. λύνω. Little is gained by assuming that vlūčė is an ad-formate of the fem. rącė (§ 247 p. 147, § 264). Compare I § 84 pp. 81 f., and to the authorities cited in Rem. 3 add Jagić, Arch. für slav. Phil. X 191.

264. 2. a-stems. Even in proethnic Idg., locative and dative had become the same in form (§ 247 pp. 146 f.). Pr. Idg. *ekµaǐ. Skr. dsvāy-ām O.Pers. arbiray-ā, stem
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Proethnic Aryan had *-ā iz with the postposition a. This ending remained in O.Pers., whilst in Sanskrit a further affix *em was added to it (see § 186 p. 62), as in bhātīyān (§ 265). In Avestic the a of the penultimate was shortened after the analogy of the instrumental ending -aya, whence haēnaya (cp. § 229 p. 115). The fusion of the particle a with this case in pr. Aryan distinguished it from the dative in -ā; and we may follow-Streitberg in assuming that in the same period the resemblance between *aśyājā and *bhṛyyū(ā)jā (Avest. ber'zantya O.Pers. haraavatīn Skr. bhātīyān) caused a-stems to acquire the endings gen. -ājas um. -āva, see § 221 p. 115, § 247 p. 147.

In proethnic Greek -ā became -ā before consonants (Ὀρίζων - Ὁρίζων), but remained unchanged before sonants and at the end of a sentence. For further details see § 247 pp. 147 f.

In Umbr. totem-e 'in civitate' (beside tote), L. Havet equates -en with the Skr. ending -ayām (Mém. de la soc. de ling., II 391 foll.). But Bücheler Umbr. p. 185 has a more satisfactory explanation of it. He holds that totem = tote + en 'in' (I § 209 p. 177); and to this he says -e(n) was added again, by assimilation to words in which -e(n) remained a distinct syllable, e.g. manuv-e 'in manu'. Cp. Prākrit tumām instead of tum 'thou' (Skr. tedām) following ahām T; Lith. dial. jūke-sis 'they mock', because -si and -s are both used for this part of the verb (thus it is a contamination of jūkēsi and jūkes); Skr. Ved. 3rd. pl. mid. dudukhrirē instead of dudukhrē after the analogy of jagmērē; and other instances of the same kind which -hāvā dācēd everywhere (morph.

Unt. III 61 n.).

Lith. rañkoj-e like ėmēj-e (§ 265) and perhaps dēcej-
(§ 263 p. 166) with the same particle of uncertain origin which is in the loc. pl. raṅkos-e (§ 356) and in the O.C.Sl. loc. sing. kamen-e, possibly the -a of Skr. dat. vīkāya-a (§ 186 p. 62, § 246 p. 145, § 257 p. 158, § 409). raṅkoje žēmēje were incorrectly analysed, and the ending was imagined to be -je; hence such re-formations as naktyje (nakti-s ‘night’) and sūnījē (sūnī-s ‘son’). These forms lost their -e before vowels in prehistoric times, and thus arose raṅkoj raṅko, žēmē, nakty, sūnu.

§ 265. 3. i- że-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). Locative and dative had become identical in form in protothic Indo-Germanic (§ 248 pp. 148 f.). Pr. Idg. *hṛghnt(ī)žē and -ī(ī)žē ‘in celsa’. Avest. barentya, O.Pers. harauvatiya ‘in Arachosis’ (as to the nom. harauvatiš see § 191 p. 68); Skr. brhatyām with the particle *-em (cp. áṣṭāyām § 264 pp. 166 f., O.C.Sl. instr. tojā § 276), so also we have Avest. -yam beside -ya (Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 104). Lat. facēs, cp. § 248 pp. 148 f. Mid.Ir. Brigit insi; -i for *-i-, and this for *-ī(ī)žē or *-ī(ī)žē, cp. loc. cit. Lith. žemėj-e žemė, cp. § 264; O.C.Sl. zemlji, cp. § 248 p. 149.

In protothic Aryan the dat.-loc. forms *-iā and *-ia were differentiated in use: *-iā was appropriated to the dative, *-ia to the locative. The loc. use of *-ia was natural, because -a was the loc. ending of i-stems (§ 260 pp. 161 f.), and other loc. forms had the postposition a tacked on to them; while -ia recalled the dative ending of a- and o-stems (§ 246 p. 145, § 247 pp. 146 f.).

Lith. vėšanczioj-e follows the ja-stems; so probably Goth. frijōndžai (cp. § 248 p. 149).

§ 266. 4. i-stems. -ei-i beside -ē(i) (§ 260 pp. 161 ff.), cp. dat. -ei-ai § 249 p. 149.

In the Veda, a few forms in -ayi, on the analogy of sūnāvi, have been restored by conjecture in place of the -au of the texts, which violates the metre: e. g. ajāyi (ajī-s ‘contest’). See Lauman, Noun Inflection pp. 387 f. As regards the fem. ávyām, see § 231 p. 120, § 278 pp. 181 f.
Greek Hom. πότει προλει, Att. ποτει πόλει; it must not be forgotten that (1) Att. ἐ and ει expressed the same sound by the beginning of the fourth century B.C. (the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 36), and so (2) we cannot tell whether ει was not meant to express the old formation in -ηι -ηι (§ 260 p. 159). Ion. Dor. Lesb. Boeot -ηι, as βασις, can hardly be contracted from -ηι (cp. μι), but contain the Idg. ending -ηι, see § 249 pp. 149 f., § 278. Cypr. προλει doubtless follows βασιλεις, as gen. Τιμωρφος follows βασιλεις; cp. Stolz, Ztschr. f. üst. Gymn. 1889, p. 748; Meister, Zum el. ark. und kypr. Dial., 37.

-ει-ι is perhaps contained in Osc. Herentateif Lat. ovi, see § 249 p. 150, § 260 p. 160.


For Lith. naktyje naktį, see § 264 p. 168.


Ved. -əv-i, sūnāv-i, rarer than -əu. For the fem. dhēnvām see § 232 p. 122, § 279.


O.H.G. suniu sitiu Norse Run. Knimun(n)diu O.Icel. syni may belong to the same group (pr. Germ. *-ευ-ι *-ευ-ι, see I § 67. § p. 57); another possible explanation is given in § 260 p. 161. A non-original formation in -ευ-ι is Goth. mann O.H.G. man A.S. men(n) for *manni earlier *many-i, which follows the analogy of the gen. Goth. mans etc. for *many-iz or *many-az (see § 232 b p. 122). Cp. above, Gr. δούτι δορί.

For Lith. sūntējė sunuĩ see § 264 p. 168. — Did the õ of dialectic forms in -άγε -ά, as danguoje Wirnuo. come from the loc.pl. in -άσε (§ 357)? Other suggestions are offered

§ 268. 6. i- i̯- and u- u̯- stems; stems in -f, -j, -g.

The ending is -i-i̯, -u-u̯ (beside -i, -a, see § 262 p. 164). Skr. dhiy-i bhruv-i, Ved. śvaśrūv-i. Also, with the fem. endings, dhiyām bhruvām śvaśrūvām, see § 233 p. 123, § 280. Gr. xu' u'i ὅψαυτδ νίκε (nom. νίκυ-ς). Lat. su-e and perhaps vi for *vi̯-i (§ 262 p. 164). O.C.Sl. svekrův-e may have once been *svekrův-i, and -i have given place to -e (cp. kamen-e etc., § 257 p. 158). The forms svekrův-i krův-i follow the analogy of i-stems, § 260 p. 161.

Similarly, Skr. gir-i pur-i gō-ṣau-i; see § 255 p. 156.


Skr. mārdhān-i mārdhān-i, āśman-i; the forms with a weak stem are very rare in Vedic (see Lanman, Noun Inf. 535). Avest. Gāthic cašmain I from stem cašman- 'eye'; asn-i from asan- 'day' like Skr. āhn-i.

Gr. νομέν-ι, ἀγών-ι χρυσ-ι (Skr. šūn-i); and with other strong grade forms by analogy, τέκτον-ι, πένθησ-ι, ἀγὼν-ι.

Lat. homin-e Carthagin-e, carn-e; with other strong grade forms substituted, edōn-e mentione. Umbr. menzn-e 'mense', cp. nom. acc. neut. sakre 'sacre' for *sakri. In Lat. and Umbr., locative and instrumental forms had become identical, see § 274.

In Irish there was bound to be a confluence of loc. and dat., as coin (Gr. χρύσ-ι), òrain, see § 251 p. 154.

Goth. guman auhsin (Skr. ukṣāṇ-i), O.H.G. gomen gomin. In Anglo-Saxon and Norse, this case has taken -an- = Idg. -on- from the other cases: A.S. guman, Norse Run. -halabud 'socio' O.Icel. guma; along with this, there are traces in Norse of -in- = Idg. -en-; see Noreen, Paul's Grundr. T 494. Goth. gōdein (nom. gōdei 'kindness'), cp. Gr. ἀγῶν-ι. Goth. tuggōn rafjōn like Gr. ἀγων-ι Lat. ration-e.
Lith. *suun-yjē* akmen-yjē follow the analogy of *i*-stems (§ 266 p. 169).


Gr. Hom. μητέρ-ι ἀνέγοι Hom. Att. μητρ-ι ἀνδρ-ι. ἐβρεο-ι follows δούρεο-α etc., ἄρηο-ι follows ἄρηο. ἐφάρεο-ι belonged originally to the same set of forms as ἐφάρεο, as Skr. dātar-i belongs to dātār-am. Cp. II § 120 p. 379.

Lat. matr-e; datör-e with -ēr- following the nom. sing.

O.Ir. mthin for *mater-ī* or *matr-ī*, which is dative too; see § 252 p. 154.

Goth. faivre = Gr. narōi. O.Icel. módr A.S. mēder O.H.G. mudder = Gr. μητρ-ί.

Lith. moter-yjē and O.C.Sl. mater-i are modelled upon the *i*-stems (§ 260 p. 161, § 266 p. 169).

§ 271. 9. Stems ending in an Explosive. How far there was originally a strong stem in these, analogous to the endings -en-i -er-i, is not clear. In another place we have conjecturally restored such forms as *dēnt-i* 'in dente' *mēg-i* 'in vocē' (II pp. 395, 480), cp. § 262 pp. 163 f., on Skr. par-ut.

Skr. bhayat-ī; Avest. astvaiti astvainī from ast-vain- 'having bones'. Gr. ἰδόντ-ι πέρον-ι, in which the original form of the stem has been changed. Lat. rudent-e ferent-e praesent-e, where it is doubtful how far -ent- is derived directly from -ent- (II § 125 pp. 395 f., and footnote 1 on p. 105 cf. this volume). O.Ir. carit, also dative, see § 253 p. 155. Goth. friōnd O.H.G. friunt; A.S. tōd (= Gr. ὀλόντ-ι) with the *i*-mutation, nom. tōd.
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Skr. הדד-י ‘in autumn’. Gr. φυάδ-ι. Lat. lapid-e. O.Ir. druid, also dative, see § 253 p. 155. Skr. pad-i O.Pers. nipad-ی i.e. nipad-ی ‘on the foot, at once’, Gr. νόδ-ι, Lat. ped-e, A.S. fēt for *fōt-ι. A.S. hnyte for *hnut-i (nom. hnut-ι ‘nut’), in which the locative ending has not ceased to be a separate syllable, because the stem-syllable is short (I § 661.2 pp. 517 f.).

Skr. ष-ι, stem ष- ‘desiring’. Gr. μέρα-ι, ὀρν-ι ὀρνυ-ι. Lat. bibāc-e. Skr. ष-ι Gr. ὀν-ι Lat. vōc-e, see Π § 160 p. 480. Skr. -raś-i, Lat. rēg-e, Goth. reik. O.H.G. buoh A.S. bēc (with i-mutation) ‘libro’. O.Ir. nathraig (nom. nathir ‘water-snake’), rēg ‘regi’ are also dative; but we cannot say that Gall. -rigi, in proper names, contains a loc. in -ι, because for all we know the dative ending -ai may have become -ι (-ι) in some Gallic dialects (cp. Βηλησάμι § 247 p. 147).

Skr. ap-i Avest. aipya- i.e. aipi + the postposition a, stem ap- ‘water’. Gr. κλωσ-ι. Lat. dap-e

§ 272. 10. Stems in -s.


In Attic, beside Ἀκραῖα there are found a few examples of -κράιη following the model of η-stems (cp. acc.-κράην gen. -κράου, § 220 p. 97, § 237 p. 128). It must of course be remembered that there was a confluence of η and ι in Attic as early as the 4th century B.C. (see the Author’s
Gr. Gr.² p. 36). This fact may have done a great deal to help the constant spread of the forms -κοινή -κοινον (Meisterhans, Gr. der att. Inschr.² pp. 105 ff.). Lesb. Ἐσορίνη too follows the α-stems, see § 237 p. 129.

b. Pr. Idg. comparative *δικ(ι)σε-ι in oeciore': Skr. ἀσιας-ι, Lat. oeci-or-e (-iós- from the nom. sing.). In Greek, with the suffix -ιεν-, ἡδον-ι.


c. Root Nouns. Skr. ἀς-ι Lat. ēr-e. Skr. μαζ-ι (inferred from nom. pl. μάζ-ας), Gr. μαζ instead of *μαζ-ι, which would have been the regular form (see II § 160 p. 485), Lat. mār-e, A.S. mīfs.

§ 273. 11. Certain Root Nouns.


Instrumental Singular.¹)

§ 274. There are two distinct methods of forming the Instrumental.

1. All noun-stems from the proethnic period onwards have had a suffix, whose original form may have been -α or -ε, but which, is a vexed question. In considering what form to

restore as original, the following have to be taken into account: Skr. gerund prati-bhidya-a ‘with splitting’ (§ 278), Gr. πτολ-α παρ-α ἄμ-α and the like (§ 280), Lat. ped-e Umbr. pure ‘igne’ (Iguvine Tables, I. b. 20). In the present state of the question I consider -α the more likely of the two.

Remark. -α is supported by Osthoff, Zur Gesch. des Perf., 574 ff.; -α by J. Schmidt, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 292 ff., Pluralb. 41 f. Schmidt thinks that he has proved that the Idg. form of the suffix was -e and not -α; but here he makes a mistake. He says that the Idg. feminine formative suffix -ə- arose by contraction of the ending of o-stems with a certain α which forms feminine stems. He infers that -e -ō, the instr. ending of o-stems, cannot contain a case suffix -α. But this supposed feminine α is an entirely imaginary quantity. And even supposing that -α in πόνρα-α is the same as the sound-group from which comes -i in Skr. ṁatun-, which I deny (see § 191 p. 68, and Morph. Unt. V 29), even then, before refusing to admit an instr. suffix -α, a scholar would have to prove that the α of -α represents Idg. α and not α. By far the simplest explanation of the above named Greek adverbs πεδ-α παρ-α μετ-α is to suppose them to be instrumental (πεδα = Mid.H.G. bei-according to Bagge, Paul-Braune’s Beitr. XII 419 f.); and if Dor. κεφαλ like πόντα, are to be classed with the instr. Att. πόντα ταῦτα (§ 276), which has more to say for itself then Schmidt’s view that they are nom.-acc. pl. neut. (Pluralb., pp. 40 f.), then κεφαλ will too will be instrumental. No hesitation need be felt in deriving Lat. ped-e from *ped-a; it is quite possible phonetically (see I § 97 p. 91). There would be more cause for doubt in deriving Umbr. -e from *-α, because of words in which α has not been weakened, as tu-plak (see § 225 p. 106): procinerent *procinerint prehabia ‘praebitabat’. But these forms prove nothing for final -α. No other examples are found which can explain the treatment of pr. Ital. unaccented final *-α; but it is important to notice that *-α becomes -e, in ere ‘is’ = Skr. ḫa Idg. *ṛh-so (§ 413) and in este for *esto, *estod = Lat. ēstum (§ 417). When we remember, too, that *-i becomes -e when final, but not otherwise, as in the nom. acc. neut. sakre and in ote (Osc. avi), we see that there is no need to hesitate in assuming that *-α became -e in Umbr., and that περα comes from *pura. This is not the only instance of special laws affecting the vowels of final syllables in Umbrian; others are the fluctuation between o (u) and α (I § 105 p. 98), and between α and e in ocar pacer, from the stems cēri- pacer-.

Perhaps Keltic may throw some light on the question. As far as I can see, -e in Gall. ara- unde- ote- may come from i, notwithstanding ambi-. What is the relation of the O.Ir. proclitic ar and ad- α- to air and oith-? Are we to gather that pretonic -e has become -α (*ara- *ata-)?

With the final -o and -e of o-stems this ending became
§ 274. Instrumental Singular.

-ō or -ē in the parent language; with the ending of -a-stems it, contracted to -a, with that of -ē-stems to -ē. i- and u-stems show -i and -u; Osthoff (Morph. Unt. II 139 f., Perf. 573) explains these as due to "proportional analogy", following the endings -ō -ē, -a; that is, that given -o -ē: -ō -ē, and a : a.

it was natural to suppose that i and -u would have -i and -u for the corresponding ending.

2. Secondly, the suffixes *-bhi and *-mi are used for the instrumental of nouns in various Idg. languages; *-bhi in Armenian and Greek, *-mi in Aryan, Balto-Slavonic, and doubtless in Germanic; besides which one example of each is found in Keltic. The same suffixes are used in pronouns. They are connected etymologically with other bh- and m-suffixes which from the proethnic period onwards have formed various cases of nouns and pronouns in all three numbers. Examples are: Skr. dat.-abl.-instr. dual āsva-bhyām

dat.-abl. pl. āsva-bhyas instr. pl. āsva-bhiś from āsva- 'equa',
dat. tu-bhyam 'tibi' asmā-bhyam 'nobis', O.C.Sl. dat.-instr. dual paṭi-ma dat. pl. paṭi-mi instr. pl. paṭi-mi from paṭi 'way' (instr. sing. paṭi-mi), dat. loc. te-bō instr. to-bōjā from ty 'thou'.

A number of words contain elements which remind us of the suffixes with bh, but have nothing to do with forming cases; and I would offer the conjecture that the two groups are etymologically connected. The -qi in a-qi svaratī-qi is the same as in āmu-qi, and with this are connected āmu-qo

Lat. am-bō Skr. u-bhāū Goth. bai, and perhaps Skr. sa-bhād 'assembly, place of assembly, court' Goth. si-b-ja 'kin', Gr. qī-lo-ζ and some other words. Cp. Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XIII 122 f. Since bh belonged specially to the instrumental, whose original meaning was sociative and comitative, one would be inclined to suggest that the original meaning of this root was that of being paired or together (this has been put forward already, § 186 pp. 61 f.). There will have been parallel forms *bho- and *bhi-, related somewhat in the same way as *go- and *gi- (§ 410). Then bh spread from the instrumental to other cases, as in pronouns
-ṣm- (e.g. Skr. tásmin) and -ṣ- (e.g. Skr. táṣyās) spread from one case to the others which show them (§§ 424, 425). The m-suffixes, -mi etc., are to be set down to another root. It may be conjectured that in the parent language these two elements came in contact at some point, and had some use in common, which made them influence each other in form. But what the exact forms and uses of each were to begin with can no longer be made out. Generally speaking, the bh-forms are preferred in Aryan, Armenian, Greek, Italic, and Keltic, and the m-forms in Germanic, Baltic, and Slavonic. For a general discussion of these suffixes the following references may be given: Sievers, Paul-Braune’s Beitr. IV 391; Bartholomae, Handb. der altiran. Dial. p. 68 footnote 1; the Author, Techmer’s Internat. Zeitschr. für allgem. Sprachwiss., I 241 f.; Henry, Mém. de la Soc. de ling., VI 102 ff.; Strachan, Bezz. Beitr. XIV 174 f.

§ 275. I. Instrumental forms with the Suffix -α (-e).

1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *μαγό 'with a wolf'; and side by side with -o is -e, as *juge 'with a yoke'; cp. § 240 p. 133. Skr. Ved. *yeka, Avest. vehra O.Pers. *vara 'with a people or host'. In Greek only adverbs are left: -o, the pronominal πω in oω πω etc. (O.Sax. ēow 'how, in what degree'), whilst it is doubtful whether any adverbs like oύτω xalāζ fall in this class, and if so, which of them (see § 241 p. 135); -e, Tarent. aieγ beside loc. aieι' (§ 263 p. 165) 1), and in adverbs from pronoun-steins such as Læc. νη-νοκα (cp. Att. νω-νοε), Gort. η νη (cp. Goth. ēnē 'with which, for how much, perhaps'), Cret. Heracl. Cypr. Att. η 'if' beside η (loc.) ει 'if' 2). In Latin, certain adverbs come into this class, as quo

1) The old grammarians accent the word wrongly αεγ, on the analogy of aei.

2) In Attic, i is contained in αυ and αυ for αυ, whilst αυ became υ(α)υ. However, αυ may possibly have become υ after πι and like words, cp. υπερ beside απερ for -ερ (the Author, Gr. Gr. 3 § 10 p. 27).
(cp. Umbr. sei-podruk-pei 'utroque' ulo ulu 'illo, illuc') cito modo, bene male; and it seems best to add are are in are-bam are-facio (facit are), suë- in suë-bam -suë-facio and the like (Wiedemann, Beitr. zur altbulg. Conj. 125 f., and Bartholomae, Bozz. Beitr. XII 91). O.Ir. fiur for *fiur, celiu, see below. O.H.G. tagu, later tago; from words with a long initial syllable regular forms are only occasionally met with, e.g. hös (I § 661.2 pp. 517 f.), for they usually have the ending of forms with a short initial syllable as woldi wolfo (cp. gebi : wīs : erdu § 276); ś is kept in O.Sax. hwō 'how'; in Gothic we find -e, hwā = Gr. Lac. πυ-νος; see below. Lith. vilku, cp. gerū-fi: beside gerū, I § 664.3 pp. 523 f. In Slavonic, the instr. in -ē is contained in comparatives in -ē-fi, as O.C.Sl. novē-fi (II § 135 p. 437) and in the first part of the periphrastic imperfect, as nesē-achū from nēs-ti 'to carry' (see Wiedemann, loc. cit.).

In Aryan, the ending Idg. -ē (not -ō) seems to be vouched for by...Skr. paśca 'behind' Avest. pasca 'after, afterwards' with c, as compared with the abl. Avest. paskāp 'behind, afterwards' with k (I § 445 p. 331); the latter form therefore has Idg. -ō (§ 241 pp. 134 f.).

In Sanskrit the ending -ēna as vykēna is commoner than -ā in the Veda, and is universal in the classical language; This is a re-formation following the pronouns, see § 421. Vedic has also -ēna instead of -ēna, as sārīgena, tēna, which is probably due to the influence of the older instrumental formation in -a, as vyka (J. Schmidt, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 292; Wackernagel, Das Dehnungsgesetz der gr. Compp., 13).

Keltic. Forms like fiur celiu (Gall. e.g. Aliasgni) must be instrumental. This is proved by the way in which they are used. Without a preposition, they always have the instrumental meaning (for even with comparatives they are doubtless instr. and not abl.).

Remark. fiur has often been taken for a dative in orig. -ōj. This assumption can hardly be made good, because the dat. of ō-stems, Brugmann, Elementa. III. 12
tuath, must be derived from *tewātā, whether we choose to regard this form as dative or locative (§ 249 p. 147, § 264 p. 167), and -ātā must have been intermediate between this ground-form and the form actually found (op. I p. Footnote 1). I make this observation on account of what is said by Strachan, Bezz. Beitr. XIII 131.

Germanic. O.H.G. *tagu may also be explained as abl. in -ōd (§ 241 pp. 134 f.). *demu is certainly ablative, see § 423.

Goth. *vulfa may be considered an instr., in Idg. -ō or -ē, without-doing violence to any phonetic law. But it may also be abl. in -ōd (§ 241 pp. 134 f.), dat. in -ē(j) (§ 246 p. 146), or loc. in -oį (§ 263 p. 165). Cp. *paemama, which may be taken for either abl. in -ōd (cp. Skr. tāsmād) or dat. in -ē(j) (cp. Skr. tāsmā); see § 423.

Should we add to this class Goth. adverbs like ubila-bu (see § 241 p. 137)?

Streitberg (Die germ. Comp. auf -ōz-, p. 37) explains such adverbs as Goth. ga-leikō O.H.G. gi-lihho 'similar, like' and Goth. svarē 'in vain' as being forms in *-ōm and *-ēm, that is -ō and -ē + the particle *em. But ga-leikō gi-lihho may also come from Idg. -am; see § 276 p. 180. A third explanation was mentioned in § 218 p. 90. Views by no means to be adopted are set forth by Mahlow, Die langen Vocale 54, 131, and Hanssen, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 614.

Lithuanian. In dialects and in O.Lith. is found also vilkumī, an extension of vilkū by -mi like tū-mi, § 421.

§ 276. 2. a-stems. Pr. Idg. *e̱kāu 'with a mare'. Skr. Ved. áśvā, Avest. haena; see below. Greek Cypr. āsā 'ex voto' and the like, see below; all other examples are adverbs (from nouns or pronouns): Ion. Att. ἀρχύτης ἀλόγη (Att. λαόγνη) πάντη πνη, Ἄλλα ἀν-πα, Dor. κρυφᾶ ταντὰ δ-τε; the adverbial crystallisation is clearly shown in the re-formate πάντη (cp. Κρυκῶνοι § 263 p. 164)1); cp. below. O.H.G. gebu,

1) J. Schmidt's conjecture (Pluralb. 40) that πάντη is a nom. acc. pl. neut. is opposed to the meaning of the word, which cannot be separated from πνη, πάντη and so forth.
later gebo; with -u dropped after a long initial syllable seīs ('manner, wise'), and with the ending assimilated to gebu we have erāu ('earth') stāhtu ('kind, species') etc.; cp. tāgu : hūs : wolfsu § 275 p. 177; O.Icel. drotningo ('queen') fōðr ('feather'), cp. Noreen, Paul’s Grundr. I 491. On Lith. rankū O.C.Sl. rākā, see below.

Aryan. In Vedic -ayā is found with nouns, but more rarely than -ā, e.g. āsvayā; and this became universal in the later language. In Avestic haŋnya is far commoner than hoena. -ayā came from the pronouns (tāyā, see § 422), and was doubtless intended to avoid the same ending in the instr. and nom. sing. Cp. O.C.Sl. rakojq (beside rākā), also an adformate of the pronouns (tojā); see below.

Remark 1. There is a group of Sanskrit adverial forms from o-stems, ending in -ayā, as ṛṭayā 'rightly' (stem ṛḍā-) seapnayā 'in a dream' (seāpna-). Perhaps these are modelled upon the pronominal adverb ayā 'in this way'. See J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 212 ff., where however only these adverbs which are built up on adjective stems, as ṛṭayā, are so explained. Another explanation is offered by Bartholomae in Bezz. Beitr. XV 20 f. Cp. § 279 Rem.

Greek. In Cyprian the old form in -ā seems to have remained in use as an ordinary case, and the dative forms in -āx (-ā) seem to have lacked the instrumental meaning (Meister, Gr. Dial. II 295 f.). In the other dialects, instrumental uses had all passed over to the dative form, and the instr. form in -ā survived only as fossilised in adverbs. But in time these very adverbs in -ā, and the dative in -ā, ran together into one form. In Attic inscriptions of the classical period they have almost always the ending of the dative, as ἰδιά, ἵ, and similarly in Gortynian ἃ, ἅλλα. Forms in -ā are related to these in the same way as e.g. adv. οἴκος to adv. κύκλῳ, adv. Πλαταιάοι to adv. Πλαταιαῖς (the Author, Gr. Gr.2 p. 210). Later on -ā and -ā ran together in the regular course of things, see I § 132 p. 120. In Homer λάθετη πάντη, the true instrumental, are still used; which is proved by the fact that in thesis before vowels ἦ is always shortened, but ἦ as a rule is not (J. Schmidt, Plur. 40).
Instrumental Singular. §§ 276, 277.

Remark 2. In Attic, ρ and η represented different sounds even as late as the Christian era; but ε was written sometimes instead of η (the Author, Gr. Gr. 2 p. 36). Now adverbs like ἐνεργεῖ, κοινωνία, ποντικῆ are sometimes written with ε (Meisterhans, Gr. der att. Inschr. 2 p. 114); which proves beyond a doubt that the iota adscript in η is right, and therefore that the form is dative.

Whether any of the Latin adverbs in -a, such as ha-c úna recta destra, are instrumental cannot be made out. fruēstrā contrā may possibly be so, but the short vowel must then be due to analogy (I § 655.2 pp. 502 f.) 1).

Lith. rankū (for *rankā, the original long vowel kept in gerā-ja beside gerā 'cum bona') is pronounced in some dialects runiku, in Lettice rāku, which gives *rankān or *rankānum as the Baltic ground-form. This is confirmed by O.C.Sl. rāku a form rare, it is true, in the remains of O.C.Sl. but also found in West-Slavonic, and therefore proethnic in that branch of the language. The usual instr. of O.C.Sl. is rākoja an adformate of pronouns like toja (§ 422), cp. Skr. āsvaya: following tāya. Afterwards the analogy of rākoja suggested nōšļja and materļja (§§ 278, 282). The difference between Skr. āsvā tāya āsvaya and O.C.Sl. rākā Lith. rankū O.C.Sl. toja rākoja is merely that the latter group have another affix *em, which we saw in the Skr. locative ending -yam §§ 264, 265 pp. 167 f.; cp. § 186 p. 62. It still remains a question whether the instr. ending -ām is also represented by adverbs such as Skr. uttarām 'further' Gr. ἀντίθεν Lat. palam perperam and Goth. ga-leikō O.H.G. gi-lihho (cp. § 275 p. 178).

In Lith. there is a re-formation with -mi, as kalbūni (kalbā 'speech'), duonomi (dūna 'bread'), according to Mikuckij (Kuhn-Schleicher's Beitr. I 240 f.), cp. willūni § 275 p. 178.

§ 277. 3. 1- jē-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). Pr.Idg. *bhṛghya *(i)je. Skr. bhavayā dēviyā, Avest. barentya. Lat. facē Umbr. uhtretie 'auctoritate', but these may be regarded

1) O.Ir. echtar 'extra' (Mid.Cymr. eithyr) has often been derived from *ekhtrā (cp. briathar I § 634 p. 473). But more probably it had the same ending as etcr. -or because of -cht-, see Thurneysen, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVI 311 footnote 1.
as ablative, see § 243 p. 139. Mid.Ir. *insi (-i for *-iš, and a step further back *-iže), but this may be dat. (§ 248 p. 149) or loc. (§ 265 p. 168). Lith. *žemė, see below.

Vedic has a few examples with -i (-i), on the analogy of i-stems (§ 278), as śāmi (śāmī) from nom. śāmi 'work'. A few scattered examples of the same kind are found in Avestic: azī, stem azyā- azī- 'cow'.

O.H.G. kuninginnu following sipp(ō)n Ġebu, see § 276 pp. 178 f.

Lith. *žemė, O.C.Sl. zemlję (*-jem as in the acc. sing., see § 216 p. 92) zemljęja are to be explained in the same way as rūkū, rākā rākoja § 276, preceding page. Be it observed, also, that in Lith. dialectic -i instead of -e points to an older *-ēn with just as much certainty as rūkū instead of rūkū points to *rankān.

§ 278. 4. i-stems. Pr.Idg. *ovyē from *ovy-ī-s 'ovis', which seems to have been used as a dative even then, see § 249 p. 150. Skr. Ved. matti from matti-ṣ 'mind, spirit, devotion'; Avest. ašī. It is more probable that Lcsb. Boeot. Dor. Ion. bāṣāl, polī have Idg. -i, than that they come from -u (loc.), see § 266 p. 169. Lat. turrit, Umbr. poni puni pone 'poea', but these may be ablative in pr. Ital. -ūd (§ 243 p. 139); cp. pronominal adverb qui from qui-s (§ 421). O.Ir. fáith for *máth, see below. O.H.G. eneti, steti (stat 'place'), see below. Lith. dial. aki, see below.

Aryan. Only the Veda has -i in feminines; this is shortened to -i before a vowel or at the end of a 'pādā' (see Laumman, Noun Infl. 380 f.). Side by side with -i -i the following endings are found in Sanskrit:

1. -yā 1) in Vedic both masc. and fem., later almost exclusively fem. It is probable that this ending is the weak i-stem + instr. suffix -ā (§ 280), cp. krātva-ā = Avest. Gāthic xraṇvo-ā (§ 279), and was not borrowed from (fem.)

1) Possibly O.Pers. āpiyā, Beh. I 95, is such a form. The passage is mutilated, and the form may be loc. sing.
7- jē-stems (brhatyā). But since the same ending -yā is found in fem. r- jē-stems, it was gradually restricted to feminines among the i-stems; and the point of contact thus gained between these two classes of stems doubtless suggested the further step of coining gen. ávyās dat. ávyāi loc. ávyām (§ 231 p. 120, § 249 p. 150, § 266 p. 168); compare the re-formates dhiy-ās dhiy-āt dhiy-ām beside dhiy-ā (§ 280). The only masc. in yā which held its ground in later Sanskrit is pātyā, which was preserved by the dat. pātye see § 231 p. 120, § 249 p. 149.

2. -y-ā in "gerunds" from verbs compounded with a prefix; as prati-bhid-y-ā (orig. 'with splitting'): Germ. *biti- 'bite, bit' O.Sax. biti O.H.G. bij; a-gam-y-ā ('with approaching'): Germ. *kumi- 'a coming' O.Sax. kumi O.H.G. chumi; a-ga-ty-ā ('with approaching') beside gd-ti-§ Gr. βά-μ-ς. When this formation was produced, consonantal stems must still have had -a, not yet changed to -ā (§ 280). It is therefore very closely connected with (1) -y-ā; -ā being kept because the ordinary case meaning had sunk out of sight in these verbal nouns (on the same principle, old case-endings remain in the Greek infinitives dō-μεν § 257 p. 158 and dō-μεν-μ § 251 p. 135). In the Veda, gerunds often end in -yā as well as -ya; the reason being not so much the analogy of the living instrumental case, as that of gerunds in -tvā (§ 279).

3. -inda, ḍvinda. This formation is due to the analogy of n-stems (cp. § 393). Even in the Veda, it is the commonest instr. for the masc.-neut., and is found in a few feminine words; in later Sanskrit it is the regular ending of the masc.-neut. instrumental.

Old Irish faith is probably instrumental, simply because has the form without a preposition only the instr. meaning (cp. § 275 p. 177). But as far as form goes, it might be locative, cp. § 260 p. 160.

Old High German feminines, such as enstī (enست 'favour'), which may be loc. in orig. *ēi or *ēi- (§ 260 pp. 160 f., § 266 p. 169), may also be the instr. in -ī. -ī is regular only
in words whose first syllable is short, as steti; although most forms with a long first syllable, as ensti, have -i too, yet a few remain in which development has been regular, as anst (mit dinera anst 'with thy favour'). Compare von Bahder, Die Verbalabstracta, pp. 19 f.; Osthoff, Paul-Braune's Beitr., VIII 262. -i is found in a very few masculine words, as quidi ('law-suit'); see Kögel, Über das Keron. Gloss. p. 158, and Osthoff, loc. cit. The usual masc. ending is -iu, which follows the ūo-stems (hirtiu hirtu), e.g. gastiu gastu; cp. the pronoun hiu in hiu-tu 'to-day' beside Goth. hi-mna as compared with diu from the stem dia- (II § 4 p. 10, III §§ 409, 421).

In Lithuanian, the original formation is perhaps represented by dialectic forms such as aki from aki-s 'eye'. Elsewhere the ending is -mi, as nakti-mi aki-mi (§ 282); compare the pronoun mani beside manimi § 449. In Slavonic, the datives pați noštì are specimens of the old type, if we were right in conjecturing that they are instrumental (§ 249 p. 150); compare pron. instr. či (Mod.Slov. 'if' Czech. 'whether') beside či-to 'quid' (§ 421). With instr. meaning we have masc. pați-mi (§ 282), fem. noštijq noštijq, the latter of which is an ad-formate of rašoq (§ 276 p. 180).

§ 279. 5. u-stems. Pr.Idg. *sūnā from *sūnu-s 'son'. Avest. bāzu. Lat. mana, in which there has been a confluence of the instr. and the ablative in -ad (§ 243 p. 141). O.Ir. biuth.

Aryan. In both branches of Aryan we meet with a formation which is modelled upon consonant stems. Vedic: fem. and masc.-neut.: hānva hānuv-a (hānu- f. 'jawbone') krātv-a krātuv-a (krātu- m. 'strength, will, understanding'), mādhva-a (mādhuv- n. 'sweetness'). Of the same kind are instr. from masc. tu-stems which are used as gerunds, e.g. šru-tvād orig. 'with the hearing', see II § 108 p. 327. In Avestic, we find not only bāzu but bāev-ā, Gāthic xraṇu-ā.

In later Sanskrit the ending -vā, like -ya in i-stems, is confined to the feminine and the gerunds; and corresponding to the re-formates āvyās āvyāi āvyām in i-stems there is
a similar set of u-forms, as dhēnvās dhēnvai dhēnevūm from dhēnu- 'milch cow' (§ 232 p 122, § 250 p. 152, § 267 p. 169); compare the re-formates bhruv-ās bhruv-āt bhruv-ām beside bhruv-ā (§ 280). An ending -unā, produced by the analogy of u-stems (§ 393), is the only one used with masculine and neuter words in later Sanskrit, e.g. sūnunā. Even in the Veda this is by far the commonest ending for masc. and neut. instr.

Remark. As regards the Aryan adverbs in -uyā, as Skr. ṛṣuyā Avest. ąsuyā(-ca) 'quickly' (from ṛṣu- ąsu- 'quick'), the student may consult J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 213. Perhaps, as he suggests, these are ad-formates of amuyā 'in that wise'. A different view is taken by Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XV 21. Cp. § 276 Rem. 1.

Germanic. Perhaps we should place here O.Icel. suffixless datives which have suffered a u-modification or "umlaut" of the root vowel, as vond from nom. vondr 'branch'. O.H.G. instr. in -iu -u, as sittiu situ, are really locative forms (§ 267 p. 169) which have added the instrumental meaning to their own through being associated with the instr. sing. of i-stems (gastiu gastu, (see § 278 p. 183).

§ 280. 6. All remaining Stems.

Aryan. In Sanskrit the regular ending is -a, the stem having usually the same weak form as the dative singular. This -a came originally from stems in -o-, also the source of the ending of the nom.-acc. dual, -au -a (§ 289). Why the original short -a (cp. -bhidya-a) was altered cannot be made out. However, it is not by any means clear whether the Iranian endings Avest. -ā O.Pers. ā- represent pr.Ar. -a or *-a; if the latter, the change of -a to -ā will be proethnic Aryan; cp. I § 21 p. 25, § 649 p. 495. A consideration of the Sanskrit gerund in -ya would incline one to believe that it is only in Sanskrit that this ending was borrowed from o-stems.

Skr. sūn-a áśman-a Avest. sūn-a asman-a; on Ved. pṛnā from pṛmán- 'love', bhūnd from bhūmán- 'plenty, crowd' see Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 205 f. Skr. mātr-ā ddātr-ā Avest. māpr-ā dāpr-ā. Skr. bhāt-ā

In Greek stems such as we are now discussing, locative forms took over the instrumental uses. Only fossil instr. forms survive in certain adverbs, as πες-ā āμ-ā; see § 274 p. 174. There were sufficient reasons for the disuse of such instrumental forms. The accusative singular masc. fem. had come to have the same ending -α (≡ -η); and besides, the original difference in stem between these two cases had disappeared long before in proethnic Greek. πες-ā, used in Aeolic and Doric with the same meaning as μες-ā, meant originally 'with one's foot' = 'at one's foot, immediately behind or with one', cp. Armen. het yet 'behind, after, with' from the same root-noun. παρ-ā beside dat. παρ-ai gen. abl. παρ-ος and loc. πη-ι. āμ-α from εἰς for *sem-s 'unus', cp. Dor. ṛµµ which follows the analogy of instr. adverbs from a-stems (§ 276 p. 178). *fes-α in ἐνεχα ἐνεχα 'on account of' (for ἐν fesa, I § 166 p. 146) and in ἐκα-ιγο-ς 'working at one's own will, with unhamppered judgement' beside O.Pers. loc. vas-iy 'mæk, very', properly 'in choice or liking, at pleasure' (unless we are to read vasaïy, loc. from a stem vasa- = Skr. vāṣa-). Cp. Osthoff, Zur Gesch. der Perf., 334 ff. and 574 ff.

Italic. In Latin the ending is -e; there has been a confluence of the instr. and the locative in Idg. *-i: carn-e homin-e, matr-e datór-e, fereit-e prae-sent-e, gener-e õcîr-e, su-e, nav-e, bov-e. These forms added the ablative function to their own, and are consequently called ablative in the
grammars; cp. § 243 pp. 140 ff. Umbrian too seems to possess the instr. with the ending -e, see § 274 with the Rem. p. 174.

From Keltic no undoubted examples can be cited. But it must be observed, that if the Idg. ending was really -e and not -a, there is no phonetic difficulty in regarding as instr. the forms which we have already explained as dat. or loc. (§§ 251 ff. and 269 ff.), e. g. coin, māthir, carīt.

Neither can any certain examples be found in Germanic. But, as in Keltic, some or all of the forms which we regarded as loc. in *-i may be instrumental too: all, if *-e was the Idg. ending (for *-e became *-i in proethnic Germanic, see I § 67.4 p. 58), some at least, if it was *-a. Examples of such possible instrumentals are Goth. frijōnd O.H.G. friunt.

§ 281. II. Instrumental Forms with the Suffix -bhi or -mi. A general account of these suffixes has been given already, in § 274 pp. 175 ff.

a. The Suffix -bhi.

Armenian. -b, becoming -v after a vowel (I § 485 p. 358), cp. instr. pl. -bę -vê § 379. o-stems: gailo-v from nom. gail 'wolf', cp. Gr. ἡλώ. Proper names have -a-v, as Trdata-v, compare what is said on the gen. Trdatav in § 239 p. 130. i-stems: srti-v from nom. sırt 'heart'. u-stems: xardu for xardu-v (cp. instr. pl. xarduë for xardu-vê) from nom. xard 'adornment'. akamb from nom. akn 'eye', -amb = *-ẹ-bhi, cp. Ir. annimm annaimm below. mar-b from mair 'mother', dster-b from dustr 'daughter'.

Old Irish. Neuter n-stems have *-bhi, as an-nimm an-naimm, if we are to take *-my-bhi as the ground-form (I § 243 p. 201, § 520 p. 378, § 657.1 p. 506); cp. -b n- and -b in the instr. dual and plural (§§ 296 and 379). But the ground-form may be *-my-mi; cp. what is said in § 379 on the Avestic instr. sing. namēn.

Greek. Beside -γι we find -γιν (as ο-γιν beside ο-γι, § 449), which may represent an Idg. *-bhi-m (§ 186 p. 62; Leskien, Ber. der sächs. Ges. de Wiss., 1884, p. 102; and
the Author’s Gr. Gr.² p. 134).  o-stems:  Ἰε-φι(v).  a-stems:  ἄγιλη-φι(v).  es-stems:  ὀρσα-φι(v).  i- i-ı-stems:  ἱ-φι.  κατή-φι(v) is a re-formate like  ἀγόντε-εσι,  ἀτύληθον-όφι another like  ἀγόντε-ας (§ 360). Then there are the adverbs  ενδη-φι(v),  νόσφι(v),  ληστ-φι-ς, the last extended by the same -ς which is seen in  ἀμ-φι-ς (§ 241 pp. 135 f.);  ἀμ-φι-ς too must be added to the list.

Such of these forms as are not adverbs were living cases in the language of Homer and his imitators, but now here else. They were used for the instrumental, locative, or ablative; and no difference at all was felt between them and the other forms which were used for these cases, as is clear from phrases like  ἀμ’ ἣσι φανομενηθη. Now and then Homer has them in the sense of dative or genitive; but this was because they had by that time become archaisms, and the linguistic instinct of those who then used them could not clearly distinguish the meanings which they might legitimately have. To extend their applicability thus was an easy matter. In their instrumental use they were associated with the instr. Ἰππον χόρα, etc., which might also be dative; and in their ablative use with the abl. Ἰππον χόρας, etc., which might be genitive (cp. ἰμε-ἴσι used as gen., § 244 Rem. 2 p. 143). How these forms came to be used for instrumental, locative, and ablative (no distinction is made between -φι and -φι as case-suffixes) is uncertain. The φι-cases could be either singular or plural; e.g.  Ἐ 474 παρὰ ὑπὸφι ‘beside the ships’, et saepe (for details see Kühner, Ausf. Gr. I² pp. 380 f.). So, too, in Gallic, -bo is used in the sense of Lat. -bos -bus, and in Germanic -m for *-mi (or *-mo) can be used for the plural, on which matter see § 367; and be it remembered that σ-φι(γ) is not restricted to one number. It appears that in Indo-Germanic itself the instr. -bhi, -mi, and the corresponding suffix of the dat.-abl., were not yet completely pluralised by the addition of -ς.

§ 282.  b. The Suffix -mi.

Sanskrit and Germanic afford but scanty materials for tracing this suffix. Skr. sanā-mi adv. ‘from olden days’.
from *sāna-* ‘old’, formed like O.C.Sl. te-mi from to- ‘the, that’; with the stem final cp. instr. pl. sānē-bhiš (§ 380). In Germanic -mi is conjectured to be the suffix of O.H.G. zi houbitan Mod.H.G. zu haupten, O.Icel. at hofðum, A.S. miolcum beside miolc dat. of miolc ‘milk’ (see Kluge, Paul’s Grundr I 386); a safer example is O.Icel. þei-m A.S. dæ-m (§ 421). Of Irish words, annimn may possibly contain -mi, see § 281 p. 186.

Remark. -mi is said to be the suffix of the Latin pronominal adverbs īlim, interim, istim istic-е, ĭn-е and so forth; the orig. ending is supposed to be *-e-mi (cp. Armen. ardare-е adv. beside ardare-е, pp. 183 f.), which became *-imi -im. But all this is thoroughly uncertain.

-mi is a living case suffix only in Balto-Slavonic, where from the proethnic Balto-Slavonic period onwards it has made the instr. sing. of i- and u-stems. Lith. nakti-mi (dialect. nakti, see § 278 p. 183), O.C.Sl. masc. paţi-mi (while feminine words have the re-formation -įją following -įją, as noštįją noštįją, see § 276 p. 180). Lith. sānu-mi, O.C.Sl. synomī for *synū-mi, which by a mere chance is not actually found (1 § 52 p. 44). In the proethnic stage of Balto-Slav. the ending -i-mi was borrowed from i-stems by stems in n, r, and s (the same thing happened to the corresponding endings of the dual and plural m-cases, § 402): Lith. akmen-imī O.C.Sl. kamen-imī; Lith. mōter-imī, but Slav., instead of *mater-įmi, has mater-įją mater-įją, just as it has noštįją noštįją instead of *noštīmi for the feminine (see above); Lith. debes-imī (cp. II § 132 p. 422) O.C.Sl. slaves-īmi. In Slavonic -mi is found with o-stems as well, as viūko-mi, also viūki-mi on the analogy of u-stems (cp. Vetter, Zur Gesch. der nom. Decl. im Russ., pp. 22 f.); ziūlo-dėjimī (beside -dėjemī) with the old weak grade form of the suffix -io-, see § 368. Compare further Lith. dial. vilkumi and kalbuni, § 275 p. 178, § 276 p. 180.
Nominative and Accusative Dual Masculine and Feminine.¹)

§ 283. The Indo-Germanic system of dual cases was probably fuller than any of those which have been preserved in separate offshoots of the original language. It is true, there is reason to believe that there was only one form for the nominative, accusative, and vocative dual in each class of stems: but it is improbable that there were no more than two besides — one for dative, ablative, and instrumental, and one for genitive and locative. For one thing, the genitive and locative have different forms in Avestic (gen. -ā, loc. -ō); but if there were no other reason, it would be improbable simply because in the different languages we find the same meaning given to endings which can neither be connected phonetically, nor be so manipulated as to suggest that one of them is original, and one due to analogy. No single ground-form can be given for these endings of the dat. (abl.) instr.: Skr. -bhāyam Avest. -byām, Avest. -byāt, O.Ir. -d n- (in dih n-), Lith. -m (after which something must have dropped) and O.C.Sl. -ma, even if we disregard the different initial of the suffix, now bh and now m, and take off the suffix *sm (see § 296). So we are drawn to conjecture that there was originally a different ending for the dat. (abl.) and the instr. But here we meet:

with a fresh difficulty. It is always possible that a given case had different endings in different stems, one of which was kept in one language, another in another. Thus we are as far from certainty as ever.

Remark. Following Benfey (Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss., XIX 142 ff.), Mahlow and Meringer assume that Sanskrit has inherited from the parent language a special dual vocative in -a (Mahlow, Die langen Voc. 130; Meringer, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVIII 233). Meringer thinks that Gr. δῶ 'may be an example of this formation. I believe that these forms must be otherwise explained; see § 289 Rem., § 298.

We shall see anon (§§ 285 and 311) that some dual forms have the look of singular cases, and that the dual idea is conveyed not by the case ending, but by the part of the word immediately preceding it, that is, by the stem.

A fairly large variety of dual noun forms may be seen in the oldest stages of Aryan, Greek, and Irish; and the dual is still living in some Lithuanian dialects, and in some Slavonic languages. Very few traces, if any, are to be found in Armenian, Italic, or Germanic, even in the earliest remains of these languages. In Italic and Germanic, the only words which can be so regarded are a few dual inflexions of the words two and both, and several noun forms which are explained, more or less hypothetically, as dual cases (see Danielsson's essay cited in the footnote to the preceding page, Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 384, and Bartholomae, Stu.l. zur idg. Sprachgesch. I 61). Of Armenian words, erku 'two' and ut 'eight' (ep. Skr. dvā uṣṭā) may perhaps have dual endings which have undergone only regular change (ep. § 166 p 7, § 172 p. 20). 1)

§ 284. Let us now turn to a special consideration of the nominative and accusative masculine and feminine. The first thing to notice is that this form, like the nom. pl.,

1) The gradual decay of the dual, and the way in which it is absorbed into the plural, can be best traced in Lithuanian and Slavonic. But this very instructive piece of study cannot be gone into here. For the Lithuanian, see Brückner, Archiv für slav. Phil., III 262 ff.; for Polish, Baudouin de Courtenay, Kuhn-Schl. Beitr., VI 63 ff.
could be used for the vocative; and when it was so used, like the nom. pl., the first syllable carried the accent in Sanskrit. Op. § 200 pp. 82, 83.

Five prothetic types of formation may be distinguished, each belonging to a special stem or stems. (I) -ōµ -ō in o-stems: (II) -a in a-stems: (III) -i in i- i-stems: (IV) -i and -a in i- and u-stems: (V) -e in consonant stems, stems in -i- -i-, and stems in -u- -uµ.-

§ 285. I. Masculine o-stems have the endings -ōµ and -ō, *uµqōµ *uµqō. Different explanations are given of these doublet forms.

Remark. Osthoff (Morph. Unt. IV 259), supported by Torp (Beitr. zur Lehre von den geschlechtslosen Pronomen, pp. 46 f.), holds that -ō was the original case-ending (-ō for -o + e, the ending of Gr. παρε-., or merely the suffix o lengthened, compare the -i and -u of stems in -i- and -i-, § 288); -ōµ he believes to be this -ō + a particle a. Both these endings, the older -ō and the later -ōµ, he regards as having originated during the separate growth of separate languages; the former being used in Vedio by preference before consonants, and the latter before sonants, merely because it was easier to pronounce them so. Quite another view is taken by Meringer (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVIII 217 ff.). Taking his stand upon the use of -a and -au in Vedio (see I § 645 p. 498), he assumes that the original case ending was -ōµ, which became -ō before consonants in the parent language. Perhaps both these explanations may be combined as follows. We may suppose u to have really been an independent particle which became attached to the case ending -ō; but that the historical -ō (Skr. which we have -a Gr. -ω etc.) is not directly descended from the unextended -ō which became -ōµ in the* manner suggested, but is the shape assumed by -ōµ before consonants, as Meringer holds (-ō for -ōµ like -e for -ē, see § 246 pp. 144 f.). u may be compared with u 'two' in *y-i- *y-ō- (seen in Lat. vi-ginis etc., see § 177, and Morph. Unt. V 28 ff.) and Skr. ḍhā (both') (op. Goth. me);¹ and then we might compare e. g. *i-σ-µ (= Skr. tā) with Lith. tā-du, the dual of tā the, that'. If the prothetic ending of the gen. dual of o-stems was *-oµs or *-oµg (Skr. -ōj O.C.Sl. -u), the same u might be contained in the

¹) If the u- of u-ūdhā once meant 'two' or something of the kind, it is natural to connect the first part of Gr. ḍμ-ye. Lat. am-bō with Goth. on Assar Lith. an-tru-s, and to compare as follows: Skr. u-ūdhā: Gr. ḍμ-ye. = vē-torū: Goth. on Assar.
genitive and we might regard -s as the singular genitive suffix. The Avestic loc. dual in *-ā = Idg. *-ος or *-ες would be a form without any case suffix, just like, say, Gr. loc. δό-μέν beside nom. το-μέν. Compare Meringer, as cited, p. 283, and § 311 of this volume. We must, however, be careful not to infer from these facts that all dual cases were once formed by adding singular case endings to a dual stem. To explain such suffixes as O.C.Sl. -ma Skr. -ध्याम as originally belonging to the singular would be an arbitrary assumption. It is quite likely that the cases of the dual are formed upon more than one principle.

Aryan. Skr. Ved. vṛkāu vṛka; in the later language only vṛkau, although the ending -ā is kept in compounds, as ddev-dāṣa 'duodecim'. Avest. vēhrka (-au cannot be found, see Bartholomae in Bezz. Beitr. IX 307); O.Pers. gauṣa from gauṣa- 'ear'.

In Armenian, erku 'two' and ut 'octo' may be isolated examples of this case ending; see § 283, page 190.

Greek λύω, ὑεω; on ὑεω see § 293 pp. 197 f.

Latin has no dual form left except ambō, octō, duo (I § 655.2 p. 502). Umbr. dur 'duo' has the plural flexion throughout; cp. § 166 p. 7.

Both endings are shewn in Irish. O.Ir. dau dō, older dau, O.Cymr. Mid. Bret. dou 'two' = Skr. dva, and O.Ir. da (before substantives) = Skr. dvā (I § 90 p. 85). In the un-accented final syllables of other dual words no trace can be found of the two endings side by side. O.Ir. has da fer, whose origin is not quite clear (one would expect *da fiur like the instr. sing. fiur = *yirō); the form looks like a nom. sing. It is true that there was a confluence of the nom. dual and the nom. plural in i- and u-stems and r-stems (faith, bith, see § 288; mathir, see § 289); but it seems to me not at all probable that the form of the nom. sing. was used for the dual in masc. o-stems simply on this analogy. I may be allowed to suggest that the -ō of *dyō in *dyō yirō prevented *yirō from becoming *yirē, or changed it by backward assimilation, so that the phrase became *dyē yīrē and then dē fer; while, conversely, in the feminine, dē was assimilated forwards to the ending of the substantive (§ 286). Thus the nom. sing. and nom. acc. dual came to have the same form in
o-stems, which had happened before in all other stems in the regular course of phonetic change; and it was in this way that the sing. masc. tenē ('fire') and the sing. neut. diliged, tech, ainm came by the dual meaning which they have (as in da thene, and so forth).

It is a question whether Gall. verco-breto, cited by Stokes, Bezz. Beitr. XI 142, 152, is to be translated ‘the two judges’, and to be regarded as an instance of the old dual formation. See Ernault, Mém. de la Soc. de ling., VI 158 ff.

Germanic. The only clear survivals of this dual form are O.Icel. tvau ‘two’ (which has become neut., see Streitberg Die germ. Compar. auf -ō- p. 33) = Skr. dvāu, tottogo ‘twenty’ = *tō-tugu = Skr. dved, and Goth. ahtāu O.H.G. ahto = Skr. aṣṭa. Kluge, in Paul-Braune’s Beitr. VIII 506 ff., conjectures that a few Germanic substantival forms contain Idg. -ū, as A.S. (nom. acc. sing.) nosu ‘nose’ (gen. nosa), compare Paul’s Grundr. I 334 and 609; this change from dual to singular, if correctly assumed, should be compared with the change of the Skr. dual forms nās-ā rōdas-ī to fem. sing. Bartholomae would explain Goth. bajō-ōs ‘both’ as a dual derived from *bajō pō ‘both these’ (Stud. zur idg. Sprachgesch., I 61).

Balto-Slavonic shows only Idg. *-ū: Lith. vilkū, gerū-ju beside gerū (I § 664.3 p. 528), O.C.Sl. vlīka.

§ 286. II. a-stems had pr.Idg. *-ai, *skvai. The formative suffix appears as -ā-, which may be compared with that of the pronominal nom. sing. in -āi (§ 414), and the voc. sing. in -ā (I § 318 p. 257, II § 59 p. 108). The case suffix is apparently the same as in the ending -ōj of neuter o-stems (§ 293), and this cannot be separated from -i in the neuter 'kṣi-ī ‘two tens’ (§ 294). This -i has become part of the stem in Avest. dvās-ibya O.C.Sl. dved-ma, Skr. dvāya-ūś O.C.Sl. dvaj-ū (see §§ 297 and 311).

Aryan. Skr. dāvṛ, Avest. āuṣṇ. In Avestic there are a few scattered examples with -a, the masculine ending; see Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. IX 303. Skr. aṣṭau aṣṭ 'eight' is also used for the feminine, in all periods.
Greek. χῶμαι, used for the nom. pl., seems to represent the Idg. dual, and to have been misunderstood and regarded as a plural owing to the ending -α in the nom. pl. masculine; see the Author, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXVII 199 ff. 1) But the dual forms Att. χῶμε, νομέα follow the analogy of the masc. in -ω; Homer has no duals in -α except those coming from masculine a-stems.

The Latin equae, duae (cp. Ved. duvē), like Gr. χῶμαι, seem to represent the Idg. dual ending -αι; see the Author, loc. cit.

Old Irish tuairt, and beside it dū ‘duae’ = Skr. dvē, see I § 657. 4 p. 508. dū, instead of *dai *dae, has been assimilated to ātōt (cp. § 285 p. 192).

Germanic. A dubious survival of this formation is Goth. tva pāsunja ‘two thousand’, which is usually regarded as neut. pl. (on -α for pr. Goth. -αi, see § 263 Rem. pp. 165 f.). Compare Noreen on Norse Run. pāi-α, in Paul’s Grundr. I 501 f.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. ranki, gerē-i beside geri, see I § 664. 3 p. 523. O.C.Sl. rācē, but zmijī (zmijā ‘snake’) with *-ī for *-iēi, earlier *-iōi, Idg. *-iōi, see I § 100 p. 95.

§ 287. III. i- iē-stems (cp. footnote 1 on page 68) probably had pr. Idg. -i-, *bhyghyti-, which may be explained like -αι in a-stems, and derived from -i-.

This may be legitimately regarded as the ground-form of Skr. bhāt-i, Avest. Gāthic bārent-i, O.Ir. inis, Lith. ėmi (I § 664. 3 p. 523).

In Vedic Sanskrit these forms were assimilated to r- iū-stems (§ 291), whence bhātyaun, the only form used in the later language (cp. nom. pl. bhātyaun § 316).

1) Something just like this has happened in Polish. When the dual number fell out of use, the loc. dual ręku ‘in both hands’ (§ 311) was regarded as loc. sing. masc. by mistake, so that there arose phrases like w mojim ręku ‘in my hand’. See Baudoisin de Courtenay, Kuhn-Schleicher’s Beitr. VI 77, 81.

Gr. ἴππεια follows the ī-stems (§ 286). So also O.C.Sl. zemljii (§ 286), but zemljii may be a transformation of *zemī with Idg. -ī, cp. nom. sing. vezqīti instead of *vezqīti § 191 p. 68.

§ 288. IV. i- and u-stems had pr. Idg. -ī and -ū, *ōmite and *sānū. If Idg. -ōī is an extension of -ō (§ 285 Rem. p. 191), it is natural to assume that this -ō and the above -ī -ū were related in the same way as the corresponding endings of the instr. sing.; cp. § 274 pp. 174 ff., Osthoff, Morph. Unt. II 192 ff., and J. Schmidt, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 291 f.

Skr. ārī, Avest. aḵi. O.Ir. faith for *yatī. Lith. naktį (I § 664. 3 p. 523), O.C.Sl. nōštī.

Skr. sānī, Avest. bāzu, beside bāzv-ā which follows the consonant stems (§ 289). O.Ir. bith. Lith. sānu for *sānū (I § 664. 3 p. 523), O.C.Sl. syny.

In Greek nothing is to be found but re-formations which follow the consonant stems (§ 289). i-stems: Att. inscr. álpēi with -ē for *-ē(ĩ)-ē, MSS. pólei and póleis ( pólei-ῆς), the latter of which should be compared with póleos, which apparently remained uncontracted (§ 231 p. 120). u-stems: Hom. ποίχε(ĩ)-e ῥαχῆ(ĩ)-e, Att. inscr. viēi.

§ 289. V. All other stems had pr. Idg. -ē preceded by the strong stem, as *poitē-ē = Gr. nātē-ē. This type remained in Greek and Irish, and there are a few questionable traces of it in Sanskrit, Germanic, and Lithuanian.

Remark 1. In the Vedas, instead of -ā, which must be assumed for the idg. ending of o-stems, we often meet with the shortened termination -a; and mātāra-pitarāu (instead of mātārā-pitarā) is cited from later Sanskrit. See Benfey, Sāmāvāda p. Lxiii; Abhandl. der Götts. Ges. der Wiss., XIX 142 ff.; Mahlow, Die l. Voc. 180; Lammann, Nom.-Inf. p. 342. It is quite possible (cp. Osthoff Morph. Unt. I 226 f.) that this -a was the -ā = Gr. -ē which belonged originally to consonant stems only; that it was kept in certain instances, and was then, by a mistake, extended to other stems; and in particular, by a reminiscence of the vocative singular in -a, was used for the vocative; e. g. R.-V. I 151 4 osūra. I have no belief in the view held by Meringer (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVIII 233) that
there was an Idg. dual voc. in *-o = Skr. -a; Meringer would even call
Gr. ão an example of this! But compare what he says on pp. 230 f.
A dual form *kunīn-e is conjecturally restored by E. Brate as the
origin of Old Swedish kun 'two women' (Bezz. Beitr. XIII 42 f).
J. Schmidt (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVI 360) believes that he has found
this suffix -e in Lithuanian dialectic participial forms such as iesz-gērus
instead of iesz-gērusiu (iesz-geriu 'I drink up'). But in my opinion it is
quite possible, in spite of Schmidt's assurance to the contrary, that here
-iu has become -e regularly.

In Sanskrit, -au, -ā, the ending of o-stems, was borrowed
in the prehistoric period by consonant stems, just as the instr.
sing. -ā spread from o-stems to consonant stems (§ 280 p. 184).
It is impossible to make out whether the Iranian endings of
consonant stems, Avest. -ā O.Pers. -ā, represent pr. Iran. *-ā
= Skr. -a, or pr. Iran. *-a = Gr. -e — whether, for example,
Avest. nav-ā = Skr. nār-ā or Gr. ανίρ-τ. If the former, the ending
of o-stems became universal in the proethnic stage of
Aryan. The same doubt meets us in considering the endings of

§ 280. 1. n-stems. Pr. Idg. *k(u)yon-e. Gr. ξύν-e instead
of *ξυν- *νον-τ, and similarly νύν-α ξύν-ες have adopted the
weak stem; τέχνον-τ, ποιμέν-τ, ναυν-τ. Mid.Ir. ράιν, τράιν.
Skr. śdān-āu -ā, Avest. span-ā. Lith. szūn-iū ūkmen-iū follow-
ning the io-stems, O.C.Sl. kamen-i following the i-stems.

2. r-stems. Pr. Idg. *matēr-e, *dātor-e. Gr. μητέρ-e,
δάτορ-e; δάρ-e (Hom. has also ἀνέφ-e) like ἀνέφ-a § 218
pp. 94 f., ὄρη-e following ὄρη. Mid.Ir. māthr, Mid.Ir. siōr
(cp. II § 120 p. 379); — Skr. mātār-āu -ā dātār-āu -ā;
Avest. mātar-a and by re-formation mātr-a, dātār-a. Lith.
moter-i O.C.Sl. mater-i follow the i-stems.

Lith. vešančiu(du) O.C.Sl. večsta following the io-flexion.
Gr. γυναδ-τ, μειρακ-τ. O.Ir. druid 'Druids' rig 'kings'.

4. s-stems.
Pr. Idg. *dus-menēs-e. Gr. ὑμεῖν, to be explained in
the same way as τοῖς σχέλε (§ 294). — Skr. dūrmanas-āu -ā,
Avest. dušmanaw-h-a.
§ 290—293. Nominative and Accusative Dual Neuter.

Pr. Idg. compar. *dh(i)jōs-e, modified by analogy in all languages. Skr. dhiyās-āu -ā like the acc. dhiyās-am (§ 220 p. 97), Avest. asyānōh-ā instead of *asyānōh-ā, cp. acc. sing. asyānōh-em (loc. cit.). O.C.Sl. slažđa, declined as a ĵo-stem. Gr. ἰδόν-ε with the formative suffix -jen-.

Pr. Idg. part. perf. act. *yeiduos-e, modified by analogy in all languages. Skr. vidvās-āu -ā like acc. sing. vidvās-am (§ 220 pp. 97 f.). Lith. mirusiu(-du) O.C.Sl. miruša, declined as ĵo-stems. Gr. ἴδων-ε with the formative suffix -yet-.

§ 291. 5. Stems in -ī, -iē, -a-μυ, and certain Root Nouns.

Gr. xi-ε, Ὄηφ-ε οὐ-ε; Skr. dhiyā-āu -ā, bhrūv-āu -ā.

Gr. νῆς (inferred, but not actually found) for *rēf-ε; Skr. ndv-āu -ā. Pr. Idg. *gow-ε: Gr. βό-ε; Skr. gdw-āu -ā; O.Ir. boin following coin (§ 290 p. 196), cp. § 221 pp. 98.

Nominative and Accusative Dual Neuter.¹)

§ 292. o-stems had -οί, and doubtless -οί also; consonant stems had -i or -ī, and i-stems had -i. It is a doubtful point whether or no -y was the original suffix for all stems; see § 294.

Consonant stems which admitted of vowel gradation had always a weak grade of stem.

§ 293. 1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. -οί and doubtless -εί also; for the difference between these cp. § 240 p. 133.

Skr. yugē, δω; Avest. xšaŋrē from nom. acc. sing. xšaŋre-m 'lordship, realm'. Skr. aśčau aṣčā may always be neuter.

The Greek ἕτε- 'two', in ἕτε-χαρι εἶ-χοσ 'two tens', is probably the dual of a stem *γο-; according to a guess of Thurneysen's, we should recognise the same *γεί in the u- of O.Cymr. μ-ceint (Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVI 310). I add another guess, that δύο (beside δῶ) is the old neuter, and is the form assumed by *δυω when the next word began with a sonant;

¹) References are given in the footnote on page 189.
perhaps Lac. Ἰοκ comes from *Ἰας in the same way, cp. Att. Ἰας, which seems to point to *Ἰας (§ 312). Cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 79 footnote 1, p. 124; Morph. Unt. V 23 ff. Similarly we find Boeot. ὂρις beside ὂριος in the other Greek dialects. Elsewhere in Greek the masc. ending -ος has taken the place of the neuter, as τοῦ ὄριος like τοῦ ὑμῶν.

Lat. vī-gintē may contain in both parts the neuter ending *-ei or *-oī. See the Author, Morph. Unt. V 22 f., 24, and below, § 294 of this volume. The masc. forms duo ambō octō, like Gr. ὁμώ, are used for the neuter as well as masculine.

There seems to be no trace left in Irish of this formation. dā, the masc. form, is used with neuter substantives; but when so used -n is added, as dā n-gruad 'duae genae', which can hardly be due to any cause except the analogy of the nom. acc. sing. neuter (cp. Windisch, Paul-Braune's Beitr. IV 223). dliged is probably a singular form used as dual, see § 285 p. 193 (sing. dliged n- 'law').

Germanic examples are doubtless to be recognised in the following neuter words: O.Sax. tue Ā.S. tūā = O.C.Sl. dve Idg. *duoī, while Goth. tuā, as well as masc. tvāi and fem. tvōs, is plural in form. But it is possible to regard tvāi as the neuter form, turned into a masculine by association with þāi etc.

O.C.Sl. iže = Idg. *jūgoī, from ĭgo 'iugum' (I § 84 pp. 81 f.). Also poli (from polje 'field') for *-jei, earlier *-ioi (I § 84 pp. 80 and 82).

§ 294. 2. Consonant stems. The case-suffix -i with the weak stem is found in Idg. *kup-ti 'two tens' (§ 176 pp. 29 f.): Gr. θεῖ-νατι, Armen. ᵐzd for *yī-santī just as beren 'they carry' = Skr. bhārantī (§ 177 p. 34), Avest. vīsaiti, but Skr. viśati-ś, which arose as follows: *viśati became indeclinable, and was then attracted by the analogy of īṣāḥ-ś '60' etc., and became fem. sing.

Elsewhere the Sanskrit consonantal and u-stems regularly show not -i but -ī, as dhāmaṇī dhāmanī, ḫyhat-ī, mānasī dīśyasī vidūṣī, mādhaṇī (mādhunī, see § 393). Now Old
Church Slavonic has -i (side by side with the commoner -e), as *imen-i sloves-i. Putting this and that together, we may allow ourselves to believe that -i as well as -i was used for a suffix of the nom. acc. dual neuter in the parent language. If so, it is not necessary to derive the final -i of *vīgūti from -e or -o (see § 293, last page). But can -i in Skr. and O.C.Sl. have been borrowed from the case-system of i-stems? (see § 295).

The Avesta seems to give us but one form, vīsaiti, which belongs to this class.

Just so in Greek the only trace of the formation is fil-ērē. In all other instances, -e has been borrowed from masc. and fem. nouns, just as neuter o-stems borrowed -ω from the masculine (§ 293 p. 198). Att. inscr. skēlerī for *skēler(α)-e; MS. forms in -ēe, as γένες, found in Attic writers, are a re-formation following those words in which -e has not been contracted. Compare the adoption of e by the neuter ὁσον § 295. γένη in phrases like γένη δύο is the plural, as is ἀστη in ἀστη δύο (§ 295).

Irish. ainm and tech, like diliged (§ 293), are probably singular forms used for the dual; see § 285 p. 193.

Remark. J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 52, would apparently derive ainm from *on-μn-i; against which there is a great deal to be said. Nor should we admit Stokes's derivation from a pr. Kelt. *an-mēn-e (Bexx. Beitr. XI 166).

Old Church Slavonic -ē, borrowed from o-stems (§ 293, last page): *imen-ē, sloves-ē. Also -i, whose origin has just been discussed.

§ 295. 3. i- and u-stems.

In i-stems the prothetic Idg. termination was -i. Skr. akṣi Avest. aṣi 'the eyes', sūcī from stem sūcī- 'pure, clean'. O.C.Sl. oṣi (oko 'eye') and uṣi (uco 'ear'); Lith. aksi aksi, which have become feminine. If there was an Idg. *yī-kmī 'twenty', *yī was nom. acc. dual neut. of the stem *yī- (§ 177 p. 33). Re-formates: Skr. sūcin-i (§ 393) and Gr. Ὠσας 'the eyes' for *ōkm-ē (other cases are Ὠσον Ὠσονι, with plural endings).
This Idg. -ę was doubtless a contraction of the stem-final -i- with the case-ending -i (or -ę).
Ved. mādhv-ę is either (1) the regular descendant of the Idg. ground-form, or (2) *mādhv-i re-formed, -i having been replaced by the ending of i-stems; cp. § 294. Gr. ἀστη in phrases like ἀστη δύο is really plural, cp. γένη § 294.

**Dative, Ablative, and Instrumental Dual.**

§ 296. The different languages have such diverse modes of formation that it is impossible to restore the Indo-Germanic flexion with any certainty. Compare § 283, page 189. Skr. -bhyām, and -bhiyām very rarely in the Vedas. The Avesta has one example of -byqm, in the word bhrvād-byqm from the stem bhrvād- ‘eyebrow’, elsewhere -bya, Gāthic -byā, with the variant -ę (the difference is merely phonetic, and quite regular see I § 125 p. 115, § 481 p. 355). O.Ir. gives dīb n- (from dā ‘duo’), for *d(γ)ō-bēn, for whose suffix more than one ground-form is possible, for instance *-bēm or *-bhēn. O.CSl. -ma, the -a of which (= pr. Slav. -a) must represent Idg. -a or -ą, and may have lost a final -s. Lith. -m, after which something must have dropped; if the last syllable is accented, the form has the incisive accent when it is dative, and the gliding accent when instrumental (I § 691 pp. 558 ff., and II § 90 p. 274 with the footnote); e. g. abēm vilkaṁ ‘to both wolves’, but sū abēm vilkaṁ ‘with both wolves’, dat. naktim instr. naktiṁ. This variation of accent — given by Kurschat, though nothing definite is known as to how widely it is recognised in the Lithuanian dialects — has come in through association of these forms with the corresponding plural cases (e. g. dat. naktims instr. naktiṁs); and in the same way other dual forms have been assimilated to the plural in this language.

The affix *em may have become attached to Skr. -bhyām Avest. -byqm and O.Ir. -b n-, cp. Skr. tū-bhyām beside tū-bhya

1) References are given in the footnote on p. 189
Avest. Gāth. taibya 'tibi', and the like, § 186 p. 62. The agreement of Aryan with Keltic in having bh- seems to make it certain that initial bh- is older than the Balto-Slav. initial m- (cp. § 274 pp. 175 f.). But be it observed that the -m of Goth. tvai-m O.H.G. zvei-m may possibly represent the old dual suffix (although there can be no mistake about the plural suffix in O.Icel. tvei-nr), and perhaps *vi-m, implied in Skr. vi-dati- '20', is another dual case belonging to this class, so that we should have to compare O.H.G. zvein-sug, with a crystallised dative dual for its first part (§ 177 p. 35).

-b n- seems to have disappeared from Irish, except in dib n-; elsewhere we find -b, as in the plural (§ 380), cp. in dib n-narib deac 'duodecim horis' instead of *narib n-deac. The reason why -b n- gave place to -b is that some of the dual endings had been worn down into the same sounds as the plural (Windisch, Paul-Braune's Beitr. IV 225 f.). Compare § 297.

For the Greek endings -ουν -ον -αν etc. see § 312.

§ 297. 1. o-stems. Skr. ṣvka-bhıyam, yugā-bhıyam, dēd-bhıyam, pronom. tā-bhıyam; Avest. vəhrkae-ibya vəhrkae-oč, dvea-ibya: no pronominal forms found. O.Ir. feraib may be derived from pr. Kelt. *uiro-bhín, cp. § 296; dib n- (once written deib) for *dyo-bhín, with i in the first syllable because of the word's being proclitic. Lith. dat. vilkâ-m instr. vilka-m, O.C.Sl. vilko-ma iго-ma (on zilo-děš-mа see § 368), but Lith. dat. dve-m instr. dve-m dat. te-m(-dveм) instr. tē-m(-dveм). O.C.Sl. dve-mа tē-mа.

The stem-final -oč- or -eč- is certainly original here in the numeral 'two' and in pronouns, as it is in the gen. loc. dual, e. g. Skr. də́y-oč tāy-oč O.C.Sl. droj-u toj-u (§ 311). I conjecture that it was also used in the dat. abl. instr. of substantives — we actually find it in Avest. vəhrkae-ibya — and that this stem in -oč -eč was the ending of the acc. dual neuter of the word, which similarly belonged to both nouns and pronouns originally. Cp. e. g. O.C.Sl. dve-mа : dve (§ 293 pp. 197 f.), and Skr. akṣī-bhıyam O.C.Sl. oči-mа beside akṣī
oci (§ 300). In Sanskrit the diphthong (*vrkē-bhyām) was exchanged for the ending of the nom. acc. masc., *vrka = Gr. λιξω (cp. Bartholomae, Kuhn’s Ztschr. XXIX 582 and Bezz. Beitr. XV 38, where Avest. nāxha-bya is taken to be another such form); in the European languages the dual was influenced by the corresponding cases of the plural: O.Ir. feraib like dat. pl. feraib for *yriro-bis (cp. § 296 p. 201, § 380), Lith. vilká-m like dat. pl. vilká-ms, O.Csl. vilkō-ma like dat. pl. vilkō-mit.

Remark 1. Meringer’s assumption that this dual form ended in Idg. ‘u-(bhyām?)’ or ‘ou-(bhyām?)’ I hold to be unfounded (Meringer, Zeitschr. für d. österr. Gymn., 1889, p. 1017). The forms of the dual cases, as I have already insisted in § 285 Rem., page 192, need not all be of the same kind.

Remark 2. The way in which the form of the nom. acc. dual becomes a base for the other dual cases is well illustrated by what happens in the Lithuanian dialects, as described by Brückner, Archiv für slav. Phil., III 308 ff.

§ 298. 2. -a-stems. -a- was the stem-final in pr.Idg. Skr. ásva-bhyām dvā-bhyām, pron. tá-bhyām. O.Ir. tuathaib, and, with the length of the stem-final kept, mnáib from ben, gen. mná, ‘woman’ (cp. § 296 p. 201, § 381). Lith. rańko-m (dat. mergó-m instr. mergó-m from mergâ ‘girl’), pron. dat. tó-m(-dēm) instr. tó-m(-dēm), O.Csl. rańka-ma.

Is it possible that the numeral two originally had no special feminine form in -a-? O.Ir. diib n-, Lith. dvē-m dvē-m, O.Csl. dvē-ma are both masc. and fem., and so are the gen. loc. O.Csl. dvoj-u Skr. dvāy-oś (cp. too Lith. dvējā used for the feminine). Compare § 311 p. 209. Skr. dvē-bhyām would in that case be an Aryan-re-formate. The fem. use of O.Csl. tē-ma may be a consequence of that of the pl. tē-mi tē-mi, and of the fact that toju, gen. loc. du., could be used from early times to express all genders (§§ 310 and 311).


In Balto-Slavonic we find -iē instead of -i- (cp. dat. instr. pl. §§ 370, 382): Lith. ėmē-m (dat. katē-m instr. katē-m
§ 299—303. Dative, Ablative, and Instrumental Dual.

from *katē* 'cat'), O.C.Sl. *zemlja-ma*. Following stems in *-ja*:
Lith. dat. *vešancziō-m(-dvēm)* instr. *vešancziō-m(-dvēm)*, O.C.Sl. *vezašta-ma*.


With neuter *i*-stems it would appear that as far back as
pr. Idg. the form of the nom. acc. dual in *-i* was used for the
stem in this form: Skr. *akṣī-bhyām* O.C.Sl. *oci-ma* beside *akṣī
oci* 'the two eyes', and so also O.C.Sl. *ušī-ma* from *ušī* 'the
two ears' (cp. Osthoff, Morph. Unt. II 132 f.; J. Schmidt,
Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVI 17). of *o*-stems, O.C.Sl. *dvē-ma*, for
example, bears the same relation to *dvē*; see § 297 p. 201.


O.Ir. *bethaib* like instr. pl. *bethaib* (cp. § 296 p. 201,
§ 383).

§ 302. 6. Stems ending in *-n* and *-r*.

The stem was weak in pr. Idg., as it was in the same
cases of the plural (§§ 373, 374, 384, 385). It remains weak
ner'-bya (nom. nar-a = Gr. *avē-ru*).

In Irish and Balto-Slavonic, these cases of the dual, like
the same cases in the plural, have taken the forms of the
vowel-declensions (§§ 356.2 and 402). O.Ir. *cnaib* *fiadnaib*,
*szon-i-m* akmen-i-m moter-i-m instr. *szon-i-n* akmen-i-n
*moter-i-n*; O.C.Sl. *kamen-i-ma* mater-i-ma.

§ 303. 7. Stems ending in an Explosive. These
had the weak stem in pr. Idg., as also, in the corresponding
bṛ'zad-bya ber'zap-bya and (with a change to the strong
stem) bṛ'zūn-bya; for the stem-final see the sections just
cited, and § 356.2. Avest. *broad-byaqu*, as has been said
already (§ 296), is the only form with *-byaun* in the Avesta.
O.Ir. caït-iô and O.C.Sl. telėt-i-na (from telę n. 'call', cp. § 225 p. 107, § 244 pp. 142 f.), may be understood by referring to § 302.

§ 304. 8. Stems in -s.
Aryan. Skr. mânō-bhyām should regularly be *manad-bhyām, but it has been influenced by the nom. acc. sing. mānō ('mind, thought'), like the pl. mānō-bhiṣ; see § 356.2. Hence durmano-bhyām and the compar. dāṭyō-bhyām from nom. sing. masc. dur-manas dāṭyān neut. dur-manō dāṭyō. Similarly, havir-bhyām cākṣur-bhyām have been affected by the nom. acc. sing. havir (haivi) 'libation' cākṣur (cākṣu) 'eye', and have -rbh- instead of the strictly regular -dbh- (I §§ 591 p. 448). But the regular -d- is found in the part. perf. act. vidvād-bhyām like vidvād-bhiṣ, only in these the formative suffix is strong, and the weak -us- is gone; see I §§ 591 p. 448, II §§ 136 pp. 440 f.). Other regular forms are Avest. snāpiṣ-bya from snāpiṣ n. 'sword', and the part. perf. act. vidāz-bya to be inferred from vidāṣ-biṣ. No form from any es-stem is found; but reasoning from the pl. manē-biṣ, which is built up on the form of the nom. acc. sing. neut. in -ē (in the Gāthās manē), we may venture to restore *manē-bya *dāṣyē-bya (see §§ 376, 387).

O.Ir. tigō (tech n. 'house' for *(s)tegos) perhaps for *teges-o-bi-, cp. instr. pl. § 387.

Balto-Slavonic again shows a change to the i-flexion (cp. §§ 302, 303): Lith. dat. debes-i-m instr. debes-i-m (nom. sing. debes-i-s 'cloud', II § 132 p. 422), O.C.Sl. sloves-i-ma.

§ 305. 9. i- ji-, a- us-stems and Root Nouns in -y.
Skr. dhi-bhyām bhra-bhyām (similarly par-bhyām ghr-bhyām, see II § 160.4 pp. 485 f.). In Old Church Slavonic the corresponding form of svekry and the like is not recorded. Skr. nāu-bhyām, gō-bhyām.
§ 306. With these cases as with the others, it is difficult to make out what forms the parent language had. It is probable that the two cases were not expressed by one form, but that they were regularly distinguished.

First of all will be given the facts gathered from each branch of the parent speech; this will be followed in § 311 by an examination of the previous history of the recorded forms, as far as it can be made out. Lastly, in § 312 the Greek forms for the genitive, locative, and other cases of the dual will be described.

§ 307. Sanskrit. Both cases have the same ending, -oṣ = pr. Ar. *-auṣ.

Stems in -o- and -a- end in -ayōṣ, e.g. vṛkayeṣ from vṛka-s ‘wolf’, yugayeṣ from yugā-m ‘yoke’, abhayeṣ from abhā ‘mare’. Side by side with this formation are Ved. ēnōṣ (also ēnayōṣ) from ēna- ‘he’ and avōṣ from avā- ‘this’, as in O.CSl. vlūku from vlūko- (§ 310).

Remark. No trustworthy evidence for the shorter formation is to be got from Ved. yōṣ besides yāyōṣ from yā- ‘qui’, nīnīyōṣ from nīnī- ‘inside, hidden’; pastīyōṣ from pastīya- n. ‘habitation, lodging’; pātīyōṣ from pātiya- n. ‘pressing-stone’. In all these -ay- may have dropped out by syllabic-dissimilation (I § 643 p. 482), as -au- seems to have done in sugapatyōṣ § 247 p. 147.

1- ē-stems: bhātyoṣ.
1- and u-stems: āvyoṣ, sūnvoṣ.

Consonant stems (with the weak form of the stem): sūn-oṣ (for the accent see p. 70 footnote 2), rājun-oṣ from rājan- ‘king’, mātr-oṣ dātṛ-oṣ, bhātoṣ, mānas-oṣ dīyas-oṣ vidūṣ-oṣ.
dhiyoṣ bhruvoṣ, navoṣ, gavoṣ (op. gen. sing. Ved. gavo- as § 231 p. 120).

§ 308. Iranian.

In the Ævesta, the genitive dual ends in -ā -ās(-ca) = pr. Ar. *-as, the loc. dual in -ā, which may be derived

1) For references on this subject, see the footnote on page 189.
regularly from either pr. Ar. *-as or pr. Ar. *-ay (cp. Bartholomae in Bezz. Beitr. IX 208, 312 f., XIII 88).

Stems in -o- and -a- have gen. -ayā, as in Sanskrit both stems have -ayīś (§ 307): vehrkayā from vehrka- m. 'wolf', haṃnayā from haṃnā- f. 'hostile host', and similarly in pronouns yā from yā-, aṣtayā from aṣṭa-, ayā from a-. This case is found without the syllable -ay- in Dvandva phrases, e. g. fraitiḍ bāṣatastāḍ ‘of F. and B.’, a pair of brothers (stem fraitira- and bāṣatastira-); fraitiḍ: vehrkayā = Skr. ēnōś: ēnayōś. Of the locative ending -aś, examples are only found with o-stems: vehrkayō, ubayō from uba 'both'.

u-stems: gen. bāzv-ā loc. bāzv-ō.

n- and r-stems: gen. sūn-ā, nar-ā; the strong stem of nar-ā is not original.

nt-stems: gen. berzant-ā, with non-original strong stem.

tāt-stems: gen. amarṭat-ā from amarṭa-tāt- (I § 643 p. 482) 'genius of immortality'. g-stem: hvarz-ā from hvarz- i.e. hu-varz- ‘doing good’.

Old Persian. Spiegel and Osthoff regard dastayā (from dasta- 'hand') and duvarayā (from duvara- 'door, gate, court') as loc. dual. They may of course be regarded, if we please, as loc. sing. with the postposition ā, dastay-ā = Avest. zastay-ā (§ 263 p. 164); this notwithstanding Osthoff's objections set forth in Morph. Unt. II 100 f.

§ 309. In Irish the genitive dual has a special form. Several classes of stems furnish no examples earlier than Middle Irish.

i-stems: fatho fatha. u-stems: betho -a. n-stems: con, āran.
r-stems: māthar. nt-stems: carat. es-stems: tíse. bō 'of two kine'.

The "aspiration" of the initial of a following word (I § 658. 1 pp. 510 f.) has no very strong support in Old Irish; in Middle Irish, the practice varies apparently without reason, and sounds are sometimes aspirated, sometimes left alone.
The original ending of the formation therefore still remains to be discovered. In some instances the gen. loc. dual seems to have been affected by the analogy of the genitive singular. Compare further Ascoli, Note Irlandesi p. 32.

§ 310. Lithuanian dialects use a form in -ms with the meaning of a gen. dual, as žodiu-ms sunu-ms dukteré-ms tā-dui-ms ('of both'), fem. anė-dvi-ms ('of those two'). See Geitler, Lit. Stud. 56, Beitr. zur lit. Dialektologie 38; and Brückner, Arch. für slav. Phil. III 309 f. With Brückner, we must regard the form as an extension of the dat. instr. in -m by the gen. sing. -s; compare these genitive forms built up on mu-m ju-m: — mumä juma (the ending doubtless assimilated to mana tava = mäno tävo) and O.Lith. mumu jumu (-u, gen. pl.), cp. § 458.


§ 311. We may now take a general view of the forms which have been given in the last four sections, for the purpose of comparison. At two points we are on firm ground: (1) Skr. -ōṣ: O.C Sl. -u; and (2) the i-diphthong before the suffix in o-stems, as Skr. tāy-ōṣ, Avest. aṣtay-ā uḥay-ō: O.C Sl. toj-u.

1. The proethnic ending of the genitive dual may have been *-o-u-s or *-e-u-s, consisting of the ending of the o-stems, the y of the nom. acc. masc. in -ōu (Idg. *duou = Skr. deva), and -s, the suffix of the genitive singular (§ 228. pp. 111 f.). The Avestic locative ending -ə, if derived from Idg. *-ou or *-eũ 1), would be the dual stem without any case-

1) It may be that this case is to be recognised in the Sanskrit word *dvád-paś 'within our (two) doors, at home with us', which is inferred from dvārā by Bartholomae Bezz. Beitr. XV 198 f.
suffix, to be compared with singular locatives like Skr. kārman Cr. ḍōmev (§ 285 Rem. p. 191). Some form of this kind might be used to explain -oF- in the Greek ὕγος(φ)-ο-ς ἔγος(φ)-η'-ξοντα, although there are other possible explanations of it (the Author, Morph. Unt. V 86 ff.).¹ O.C.Sl. vůiku as a genitive may be derived from *-oys *-eys, and as a locative from *-owy *-ey. These prothetic endings spread beyond their own proper sphere in two directions: they passed (1) into the a-class (O.C.Sl. růku, certainly not containing Idg. *-ovy, cp. gen. pl. růků like vlůků); and (2) into the consonant, i-, and u-classes (Skr. rājny-oṣ āvy-oṣ etc., O.C.Sl. kamen-u paṭiṇu etc.). The absence of -s final from the original form of O.C.Sl. loc. růku is established, as Leskien points out to me, by Lith. pusiau 'half, in twain' (beside the subst. pusē 'half'), cp. O.C.Sl. mešdu 'between', lit. 'within the bounds', loc. dual of mešda 'middle, boundary'.

Remark 1. Danielsson, starting from this assumed pr.Idg. *-oys (*-eys), has made an attempt to show how certain nouns in Italic have been absorbed into the u-class (Paul's Altitual. Stud., III 187 ff.). He supposes that e.g. the gen. cornūs was originally a genitive dual from the stem corno- = Goth. haumna-, and gen. monūs the same case of: a stem man-(men-ceps); it would then be possible to see original locatives of the dual in cornū manu. Similarly Kluge (Paul-Braune's Beitr. VIII 509) identifies the A.S. gen. sing. nosa (nom. nos 'nose') with the Skr. gen. loc. dual nose-oṣ; if this were correct, *-oys and not *-eys must have been the original ending. These and other like conjectures and comparisons, ingenious though they be, are not to be trusted, as any one may see; the n-flexion of such stems can be always explained in other ways.

As regards Avest. a = pr. Ar. *-aš, two questions offer themselves for consideration. (1) Was it properly the ending of a-stems, which spread at some later period to those in -o-? (2) does its a-vowel represent the Idg. -o of the nom. acc. masc. of o-stems (Avest. vəhrka)? Osthoff's conjecture (Morph.

¹) This would offer a possible means of connecting ṣeṣekos directly with ṣaω, by deriving both from *ṣeṣ. All the same, I hold fast to my own explanation of the ordinal as by far the more probable (§ 166 p. 8).
Unt. II 93) that Avest. -ayā is a re-formation of *-ayaos on the analogy of the gen. sing. haenayā (§ 229 p. 114) I cannot accept. O.Pers. -ay-ā, locative in meaning, if indeed we are to allow the form at all (§ 308), is also obscure. It is quite possible to compare -ayā with the Avest. gen. -ayā.

2. The i-diphthong of Skr. dvāy-ōḥ tāy-ōḥ etc. is without doubt connected with that of Avest. dvē-ī́hā Lith. dvē-m O.C.Sl. dvē-ma (§ 297 p. 201). Not only these languages, but apparently Germanic and Baltic, have it in this same case; for there are certain forms which seem to have taken a plural case-ending instead of the dual, but to have kept the dual type in the stem to which the suffixes were attached. These forms are Goth. tvaddźě O.Icel. tveggja O.H.G. zweijo 'duorum' O.Icel. beggja 'amborum' (for the treatment of -i̯ between sonants in these Germanic forms see I § 142 p. 127), and Lith. dvējā abējā (cp. Skr. uhāy-ōḥ O.C.Sl. oboj-u); the Lith. words were doubtless previously *dvaj-ū *ubaj-ū or *dvejt-ū *abez-ū, which became dvēj-ū abēj-ū because influenced by the analogy of dvē-m dvē-m. This same original i-diphthong of the dual is doubtless to be traced in O.Sax. twe-ns from *dwoj- no- (cp. Meringer as cited, p. 235), in Gr. dwoi from *dwoj-jo-, and in Skr. dvē-dhā 'twofold, on two occasions'.

It is very probable indeed that the i-diphthong of the gen. loc. was used with ā-stems in the parent language itself; and it is therefore hard to make out whether these did not have -ai- (cp. nom. dual fem. *taj), so that it would be necessary to derive e. g. the O.C.Sl. masc. toju from *tojou(s), but the fem. toju from *tojou(s), cp. Gr. xópar beside θνον (§ 312). It may also be asked whether Skr. tay- in the masculine may not represent Idg. *tei- (cp. Att. δεῖς and the rest, § 293 pp. 197 f.).

Remark 2. If Idg. o in open syllables became ā in pr.Ar. (I § 78 p. 69), the masc. Skr. *tāyās, not tāyās, would answer to O.C.Sl. toju. Then what would tāyās be: the feminine form, with Idg. *ui- (cp. § 422 Rem., on the instr. sing. Skr. tāyāḥ O.C.Sl. toju) or a masc. form with Brugmann, Elements. III.
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§ 311, 312

*-*ej? Compare Meringer, Zeitschr. für österr. Gymn. 1889, pp. 1017 ff. Meringer’s conjecture, that the stem *dyē- in Skr. deipad- etc. was once closely connected with the nom. dual fem. *dyōj neut. *dyoj and with Skr. dēyayōj etc., seems to me improbable, because the i-diphthong was most certainly not peculiar to the word seco, nor can it be shewn that it first appeared in this word, and afterwards spread to all other stems. On *dyē-, see § 166 p. 7, § 177 p. 33.

Keltic genitives such as dā, fer, tuaith and so forth (§ 309 pp. 206 ff.), remain obscure.


Hom. -on, Att. -on (contracted from -ων), found in all stems but the α-class, ἵππων ἵππων from ἴππο-, ποδῶν ποδῶν from ποδ- etc. A variant found on Attic inscriptions is -οι, for -ον, as ἦνοννοι, and similarly in inscr. from Argos, as τοι ἰανύχου. Elean -οις, ὄνοις, αὐτοῖς (for this -φ see I § 653 p. 500). Attic α-stems have -ων, κόραν.


No doubt the relation of ἵππων-ν ἵππων to νοῦν σφών-ν, νοῦν σφών (nom. νοῦ σφώ) is the same as that of Avest. vēhrka-ībya to Skr. vēka-bhyam. Then we have in Greek the same diphthong (-ei- beside -oi-) is seen in Att. ἰανών as we saw in the dat. abl.: instr. and gen. loc. of the other languages, which we regarded as identical with the ending of the nom. acc. neuter (§§ 297 and 311). If the fem. Skr. tāyōj O.C.Sl. taj comes from Idg. *taj-ous (§ 311, last page), ἱόραν for *χοραν-ν would be parallel to it. In considering these comparisons, it should be borne in mind that apparently forms are found in Greek which retain the endings -οι (-ei) and -οι, for the nom. acc. neuter of o-stems and the nom. acc. of α-stems; see § 286 p. 194 and § 293 pp. 197 f.
Elean -eis is without doubt a late reformation following the dative plural, which in this dialect has -ες in place of -ας, as ἄγνωρ-οι (§§ 360, 361). The change perhaps belongs to a time when -ας had become -ες, so as to cause confusion between this case and the loc.-dat. singular in -ας (§ 263 pp. 164 f.). Similarly the Polish loc. dual dēnu 'duobus' ohn 'ambobus' were changed into dēnuch obnuch by adding the -ch of the loc. plural, trzēch 'tribus' etc. (Baudouin de Courtenay. Kuhn-Schleicher's Beitr. VI 79 f.).

The doublets -o-ν and *-o-ν recall Lesb. ἄμο-ν ἔμο-ν and ἄμο-ν ἔμο-ν (compare too Gort. ὀ-μι), also σ-نزل and σ-نزل, τοῖ-ον and τοῖ-ον. But how are we to proceed? Does -ν-ν represent a pr. Idg. dual case-ending, say *-μιν(ν), which Greek alone retained; or is it a special Greek formation? This question has not yet been answered. In any case one hypothesis deserves mention. According to this, some dual suffix, which began with a consonant, but of which nothing further is known, gave place to the plural locative suffix -ο -ον; hence arose *τοῖ-ον like δυό-ον, *τοῖ-ον(ν) like O.Icel. trei-ν (compare too gen. Goth. træddm-ἐ Lith. deę-ν § 311 p. 209); -σ- dropped according to rule (I § 564 p. 420), but in the corresponding plural forms it was preserved, or restored, by the analogy of φύλακ-σ(ν) and the like. This hypothesis certainly does not explain why the final nasal is differently treated in dual and plural. Of course κόρων might be a late formation following the analogy τπνος: κόρων. Of νοῖν something more will be said in § 458.

-Nominaive Plural Masculine and Feminine.1)

§ 313. Consonantal stems, and those in -ι- and -ή-, had in the parent language the case-suffix -ες, which was perhaps

originally only a sign of the plural (§ 186 p. 60). There is no reason why we should not see the same suffix in -ōs, -ūs, and -īs, the Idg. endings of the o-, a-, and i- iē-classes respectively; see I § 115 pp. 107 ff., II § 185 p. 57.

o-stems have in Aryan, beside pr. Ar. -ūs = Idg. -ōs, pr. Ar. -ūsas, which we may conjecture to be an Aryan re-formation.

Armenian has -ē for the case-sign, e. g. dster-ē 'daughters', undoubtedly the same as -ē in the suffix of the instr. plural, -bē -vē; compare the terminations of the 1st. and 2nd. plural present of verbs, -mē and -yē. Buge (Beitr. zur etym. Erl. der arm. Spr., 43 f.) explains -ē as follows. He supposes that the particle u attached itself to the inflexional -s (cp. Gr. náv-n Skr. bhárat-n etc.), making *-su, pronounced *-sy before sonants; *-s-y became ē, as initial sy-doos (I § 560 pp. 416 f.), and ē was then adopted universally. The hypothesis at least deserves consideration.

The nom. plural, like the nom. dual (§ 284 pp. 190 f.), served in all periods for the vocative, and in Sanskrit both numbers when so used were accented upon the first syllable (§ 200 p. 83).


Remark 1. There is no sure foundation for an Idg. -ēs beside -ūs (cp. abl. sing. -ēd: ēd and the like, § 240 p. 183). Lat. magistrēs is doubtless an ad-formate of the ē-class, and O.H.G. sciofta -a of the a-class; see below p. 214.

1. Aryan. Pr. Ar. -ūsas beside -as: Skr. Ved. vṛkāsas (Pāli -ase); Avest. vehrkaṣoḥ O.Pers. bagaha 'gods'. Outside of the Aryan languages no credible proof has been given of
the existence of this ending. We are accordingly drawn to conjecture, with Bopp (Vergl. Gr. 13 450), that the Idg. suffix -as has been extended by the -us of the consonant-class.

Remark 2. It is a very common thing to find a second case-suffix added to a fully formed case. The most obvious comparison is that of Pāli nom. pl. kuṇḍāygo beside kuṇḍāni = Skr. kumbhaka 'maidens': from rattiyo (sing. ratti) and radhuyyo (sing. radhu) it was imagined that -yo was a nom. pl. suffix, and this was used to extend kuṇḍāni. In § 312 p. 211 we noticed El. ṭāl-az; Pol. ṭaw-č, či. Again, nom. pl. masc. O.Icel. þei-r 'the, these' (Runic þai-ki) = Goth. þaii Gr. τοῖς has taken -r (for -z) from substantives. Gr. acc. Zeir-α (§ 221 p. 98). Gen. Dor. ūro-ι, § 450. Lith. instr. tē-m. Mod.H.G. den-en in place of den, and the like (the Author, Morph. Unt. III 70). Examples from Russian are collected by Vetter zur Gesch. der nom. Decl. im Russ. pp. 36, 37.

Since Scherer, it has often been maintained that O.Sax. dougos A.S. dégas contain a suffix which answers to Skr. -āsas; see, for example, Mahlow Die i. Voo. 128, W. Schulze in Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVIII 273. But this cannot be proved. It would be preferable to assume this suffix for O.Fris. dougar (see Müller, Paul-Braune’s Beitr. VII 505), but the ending of dougar may equally well be derived from *-ōs (cp. O. H. G. ir I § 661. 5 p. 519).

To say that forms corresponding to the Skr. -āsas are to be found in the O.Ir. plurals in -a from the pret. pass. in -s, such as do-breθa (sing. Jo-

- breathe, II § 79 p. 232) is conjecture run wild. To support it we should at least need to show -us used side by side with -a.

If, in spite of all considerations to the contrary, Skr. -āsas should prove to be prothetic, I would connect Idg. *-ōs, in Skr. yēkās etc., with Skr. -āsas in the following manner: I would assume a pr. Idg. termination *-ōs side by side with *-ōsas or *-ōsas (ep. the gen. sing. -s beside -es -os), whose -as would in all languages be treated just like Idg. -s (cp. § 356 Rem.).

In Avestic, -a (Gāth. -a), as vakva, is very common beside -ā and -āvoh. The form is also used for the acc. plural. Its origin is doubtful.

Remark 3. Since Bopp, scholars have usually regarded this -a as the ending of the nom. acc. neuter. J. Schmidt, who agrees, compares Gr. τας sita from ὅ sita, Lat. locas from loci-s, etc. (Pluralb. 7 f.). Osthoff’s view has at least as much in its favour (Morph. Unt. II 93 f.). He regards these forms as dual (cp. nom. dual Gr. xwēs: Lat. equas used for the plural, § 313). On this view, forms in -a from consonantal stems, as narr-a ‘man’ uac-a ‘voices’, can be understood at once; Bopp’s explanation makes it necessary to suppose that -a spread to these stems from the nom. pl. vakva.

1) The conjecture offered in this place — that Skr. -āsas was first used with ā-stems — can hardly be right (cp. § 315).
Whether O.Pers. forms like martiyā (see above) are to be compared with Avest. -ā (Skr. -as), or with Avest. -a, cannot be decided.

Old Irish. The form in *-ōs, which became -u (I § 657.6 p. 509) held its ground only in the vocative use, and its place in the nominative was taken by the pronominal ending *-oī (see below, under 2); cp. Gr. voc.-nom. Equiā beside Equiā-ζ § 190 p. 67. The confusion in form of the nom. in -ōs, used for the voc., and the acc. plural (§ 326) caused the acc. pl. of other stems to be used as a vocative, e.g. cairteā acc. voc. beside nom. curit (§ 334).

Old-High German. I regard wulfa -a and hirte 'herdsman' (io-stem) as adformates of feminine forms like *gebā -a and sume (§ 315).

2. In five groups of languages the pronominal ending *-ōs has spread to nouns (the reverse is found in Umbro-Samnitic, as Osc. pūs 'qui'): these are —

Greek. λίκος like τοῖς.

Latin. O.Lat. poploc, pilunnve, later populi, l upt (I § 81 p. 74). An ending found on inscriptions of the sixth and seventh century of the city, in Plautus, and elsewhere, — -ēs (-eis -ēs), as magistres — is taken from the i-class (§ 317). It was suggested by variant forms in the pronouns, quēs (stem qui-) and qui (stem quo-), heis and ēs. Also Falisc. magistreis.

Remark 4. deivos, in the Duenos inscription, has been repeatedly explained as nom. plural (the latest attempt is by Conway, in the American Journ. of Phil., X 452). It is more likely to be locative plural, see § 357.

Old Irish. fir 'viri', eich 'equi', cēli 'companions' (io-stems) for *-ir; Gallic retains -oi, Tanolaliknoi. See I § 82 p. 77, § 657.4 p. 508.

Germanic. This ending has been borrowed by adjectives only: Goth. blīndāi O.H.G. blīnte pl. of 'blind' (I § 661.6 p. 520); Goth. blīndāi doubtless for the regular *blīnda on the analogy of the monosyllabic pāi (§ 263 Rem. pp. 165 f.).

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. vilkai, gerē and gerē-ji, beside
which we have *bē, see I § 84 pp. 80 f., § 664. 3 p. 523, § 671 p. 536, II § 406, Morph. Unt. V 57 footnote 1. O.C.Sl. věiči, novi 'novi', ti (I § 84 p. 82).


Sanskrit. The Veda has not only -as but -āsas, āsūsās, as with the o-class (§ 314). It is much rarer with a- them with o-stems, and in Iranian it is never found with a-stems at all; hence it would seem to have spread from o-stems to those in -a-. Now and then -āsas from an a-stem has the meaning of the accusative (Lanman, Noun Inf. p. 363); the reason being that in this class nom. and acc. have always had the same ending, -as.

Greek and Latin have -oij both in nouns and pronouns: Gr. χοίρα, rai, Lat. equae, istae (O.Lat. inscr. tabellae datae and the like). Those forms are probably not a re-formation following the -oij of the o-class, but the Idg. dual, whose value was changed to match them with -oij; see § 286 p. 194.

Old High German gebo -a and sippe sippea sippia -a (iä-stem) took their ending, we may conjecture, from the i- iē-class (as gutinne, gutinnā -a), which had *-iēs as their original ending (§ 316). Before *-iā (*-iā) = pr. West Germ. *-iēs became -e (Braune, Ahd. Gr. § 58 Anm. 1), -a (-a) spread to a-stems which had no -i-, and afterwards was restored from these to the i-stems again (cp. Braune, op. cit. § 209 Anm. 3). There is the same form-transference in the accusative singular, § 213 p. 91, and in the genitive singular, § 229 p. 117. In Anglo-Saxon levelling took place in the opposite
direction, and *zydenna* was due to the analogy of *zięfa sibba = Goth. gībōs sibjōs*. The Idg. ending -as is preserved in pronouns, *deo dio = Skr. tyās*.

Old Church Slavonic *raký* and *zmijē* (*zmija 'snake') are accusative plural (§ 327). The use of this form was perhaps caused by the fact that the old form of the nom. pl. *ronkās*, when the -s dropped (I § 588.7 p. 445) became identical with the nom. sing. (*ronka*); and it was helped on by the singular nominative and accusative having so frequently the same form (in Russian, the masc. acc. in -y is found used as nom. from the 13th or 14th century onwards).

§ 316. 3. *ī*- *ē*-stems (cp. p. 68, footnote 1). The Pr. Idg. form was doubtless *bhṛghyati(i)ēs*. Lat. facies. It is doubtful whether O.Ir. *insi* is of this class (-ī for *-iūn(s) with -ī for -e), see § 229 Rem. 3 p. 117. O.H.G. *gutinne*, later *innā -a*, see § 315. Lith. zemēs.

In Aryan there has been a twofold re-formation. (1) Skr. Ved. *bhṛatiḥ* Avest. *barentiš*, with a weak stem, like the acc. pl. (§ 328), whence arose a symmetrical group *bhṛatiḥ : bhṛatiṃ* matching with *āśvā : āśvān*: nom. acc. āśvās. (2) Skr. *bhṛatyās* Ved. *-ayas* (only *bhṛatyās* in post-Vedic Sanskrit) and Avest. *barentyō, daṇvyō* (read *daṇvyō*) 'she-devils', following the *ī*- *iē*-class (§ 328), cp. nom. acc. dual Skr. *bhṛatyāu* § 287 p. 194. Once in the Avesta occurs *-yā, bāminyā 'lucidae', certainly not the direct representative of pre-Aryan *-iēs*, but following the *iā*-class (§ 315).

Greek too has the formation which follows the *iā*-class, *φίλονοι*; and so have Germanic — Goth. *friōnādōs* A.S. *zydenna* (see § 315) — and Lithuanian, *vėžanciōs*. Compare p. 68, footnote 1.

Old Church Slavonic. *zemljē vezāštē* are accusative forms like *raký zmijē* (§ 315).

Lat. oves turrēs trēs, Umbr. punetes 'pontes' pacrer 'propitii', -ēs for *-ē(j)ēs I § 134 p. 121. O.Ir. fāithi, trī, see below. Goth. ansteis ḫrēs, O.H.G. ensti drī (I § 142 pp. 125 f.). O.C.Sl. paṭi j-e paṭi j-e m. (I § 68 p. 60, § 146 p. 131).

Aryan. Isolated examples of -ī-as are found. Ved. ary- ās (ārī- 'active, eager, pious'), ep. acc. pl. and gen. sing. ary- ās; also vyāt-ās (M.Bh.) from vyāti- 'rain', Avest. fravašyō beside fravāšayō, female genii.

The ending contained in Armenian sirtk is doubtful (ep. § 313 p. 212).

Greek. All dialects have *-ēj-ēs in τοῦτω; (see above), but Heracl. acc. τοῖς (§ 330) is used for the nom. and acc. both. Substantives, except in Attic, have -ēς, ὠρινες βάντες, on the analogy of i- iī-stems such as πόλες (§ 323), ep. the gen. sing. ὄμος § 231 p. 119. As regards Hom. πόλες see § 260 p. 160.

Italic. Lat. has -is beside -ēs, ovis ovis, which I regard as the form of the acc. pl. (§ 330). The use of -ēs and -is together was natural when once -ēs had found its way into the accusative plural on the analogy of ped-ēs, and was used along with -is for the accusative. The explanation of Osc. aśilis 'aediles', with -is = -is, is uncertain, owing to the scanty remains of the language.

Old Irish. trī (Cymr. trī) may be derived from *trej(j)ēs by supposing that -ee- became -ē- in protoethic Keltic; *trēs thus formed would become regularly trī (I § 74 p. 64); or we might assume that *-ees became *-ēs, *-īs, *-ēs and lastly -i. I think it not so probable that the ending contained in it is *-īj-ēs, or that the form should be the accusative plural.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. naktys trīs may be derived from *-iēj(e)s, as sūnas from *-um(e)s; but whence came these assumed endings? They can hardly be original: Did Ĩ and u come from the other cases of the plural, and take the place of e and a (for *-ume(e)s would have become -um(e)s, I § 68 p. 59)? O.C.Sl. nošti (fem.) is the form of the acc. pl., like fem. rāky § 315 p. 216.
§ 318. 5. *-n-stems. Pr. Idg. *sūney- es. Skr. sanāv-as, Avest. hāzāv-ā. Gr. Ion. πηξέες ἱδέες; Att. πηξέες ἱδέες. Lat. manūs can be explained as *manu- (es) (-es for -es- according to I § 65 p. 52); but see below. O.Ir. nòg-i (nòg 'servant'), O.Corn. lichou 'swamps', Gall. Lugores; *-ey-es first became *-ey-es according to I § 66 p. 56, and then Irish *-o(gh)i(gh), British -ou. Goth. sunjus O.Icel. synner synir for pr. Germ. *-iuy-iz (I § 179 p. 156, § 660.1 p. 516). O.C.Sl. synergy (I § 68 pp. 59 f).


It is a question what termination we are to see in Armenian zardē (cp. § 313 p. 212).

Lat. manūs (see above) may also be the form of the accusative plural. This use of the accusative would have resulted from the relation between nom. ovēs : acc. ovēs, nom. pedēs : acc. pedēs. manūs in Plautus is shortened metrically, like canēs and similar words (§ 319).


Lith. sūnūs like naktys, see § 317, last page.

§ 319. 6. Nasal stems.


1) The syncope of the e of the final syllable would be later than the contraction of the two e 's in *ovē(i)-es (§ 317).

Avestic has also -a instead of -ō, žafné-a 'nights', see § 314 p. 213.

Latin. With this as with all the classes which follow, the old ending *-ēs gave place to -ēs (the ending of i-stems, § 317) before the Latin tradition begins: can-ēs homin-ēs edōn-ēs. This gave the means of distinguishing nom. pl. from gen. sing., but caused confusion with the acc. pl., but perhaps -ēs = *-ēs(ī) and -ēs = *-ēs were still distinct at the time when this change of ending took place. Survivals of Idg. -ēs are seen in quattuor and perhaps foris (§ 320). Plautine-scansions like canēs turbinēs are due to metrical shortening, as also is manīs, § 318 (see A. Spengel, Reformvorschläge zur Metrik der lyr. Versarten bei Plautus, 309 ff.); original *-ēs must needs have become -ēs, as it did in the genitive singular.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. žvin-yu, following the i-flexion (§ 317), beside žvūn-s. Similarly O.C.Sl. kamen-ije -ije (kamen-e is not found) and dūn-ije -ije beside dūn-e.

b. m-stems. Skr. kṣām-ās from kṣam- 'earth'; Gr. should have χθόν-ες instead of *χθου-ες (I § 204 p. 172), but it is hardly likely that the form ever occurs. Avest. zim-a from ayā 'winter frost' (weak stem instead of strong, and -a instead of -ō, § 314 p. 213), Gr. χίων-ες 'falls of snow' instead of *χωυ-ες (I § 204 p. 172), Lat. hiem-ēs (-ēs instead of -ēs, see above). Compare II § 160 pp. 482 f.
§ 320. 7. *r*-stems. Pr. Idg. *matér-es, *dótor-es, *getyor-es ‘quattuor’. Skr. matár-as dátár-as, Avest. mātar-ō dātār-ō; Skr. catvār-ḥ Avest. čaḥvār-ḥ; the feminine of this is Skr. cātaśr-as Avest. catavar-ō, with non-original weak stem like Skr. tisr-ās f. ‘three’; that the weak stem is not original is clear from Avest. tišar-ō and O.Ir. teoir, cetheoiria cetneora (with -a following inna etc.); see § 167 pp. 8 f."


Avest. nar-ā beside nar-ō ‘ānēr-ες’ and the like, see § 314 p. 213.

Italic. Perhaps Lat. foris f. ‘door’, since the word may really be a nom. pl. from for-̣, like O.H.G. turi above. In any other case it will be needful to assume that a singular for-is was coined at some period to correspond to the plural for-ēs, on the analogy of ovēs: ovis. mātr-ēs datōr-ēs follow the i-class, see § 319 p. 219.

Remark. Beside frater frater in Umbrian, fraterēr is found once, Tab. V, b 16. It should hardly be compared with Gr. φιλέρς-ς (beside φιλέρς: φιλάρς) dōrēs (II § 120 p. 379), although the word, in Umbrian as in Greek, bears only the sense of ‘comrades’. The reasons

1) The change of stem from strong to weak in the nominative was due to the absence of singular and dual cases, so that the nominative was the only case which had the strong stem at all.
for not allowing this form are: (1) In line 11 we read _frater_, with the fifth letter erased. It was doubtless _e_; and if so it seems that we have here a mistake made twice, and only corrected once. (2) Along with this nominative the gen. _fratrem_ and dat. _fratrus_ are in use. But a stem _frater_—would doubtless have been carried through all the cases, as are those in -_tör (_ars-fertür_ -'flamen'). Nor do I see any means of supporting the view that an older Umbr. nom. pl. _frater_ has lengthened its _e_ in order to draw a line between nom. pl. and nom. sing. (Bücheler, Umbr. pp. 180 and 191). I therefore consider _frater_ to be nothing but an oversight. The form _frater_ may be explained as _frater-(ē)s_ (cp. Lat. _frater-ēs_), compare _ager_ for _agr(o)-ē_, I § 655.9 p. 506.


Old Church Slavonic _materi_ follows the _i_-class (§ 317 p. 217).

§ 321. 8. Stems ending in an Explosive.


The _nt_-participles in Lithuanian show a double formation. One group of dialects has _vęşantys_ after the analogy of _i_-stems (cp. dial. _äkmens_ beside _äkmens_ and the lik_.); the other group (High Lithuanian) has _vešq_, which can hardly be anything else but the form of the nom. acc. neuter (cp. § 225 p. 105, and § 342); but how it came to be so used is still unknown (cp. Joh. Schmidt in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVI 362 f., and Pluralb. 162 f.).


Skr. āp-as Avest. āp-ō 'waters'. Gr. κλων-ες 'thieves'.

Avestic also has -a instead of -ō, as vāc-a beside vāc-ō, see § 314 p. 214.

Lat. -ēs, ferentēs lapidēs pedēs bibacēs vocēs rēgēs dapēs, following the i-class, see § 319 p. 219.

§ 322. 9. s-stems.


Pr. Idg. comparative *ōk(t)ios-ēs 'ociores'. Skr. dāśyā-ās, for the nasalised formative suffix see II § 135 p. 430; in the post-Vedic language rarely -īyas-ās, like the acc. sing. -īyas-am § 220 p. 97. Gr. ἵνδους for *-io(ś)-ες; with the weak stem, Hom. πλες Cret. πλές for *πληγο-ες (II § 135 pp. 429 and 432). O.C.Sl. sľuđiše perhaps for *-iče, earlier *-is-ēs according to I § 588.2 p. 443; ī may also have come from -si-, with -i- from the cases which had -io-, cp. vezašte § 321 p. 221.

Pr. Idg. part. perf. act. *meiđyos-ēs. Skr. vīdās-ās (for ṛ, see II § 136 p. 441); in the Veda and later we sometimes
meet with the weak formative suffix -uš-as, viduš-as (cp. acc. sing. § 220 p. 97); Avest. vidavah-ō. O.C.Sl. mirūše, to be explained in the same way as slazdiše, above; and compare the acc. sing. mūriši (§ 220 p. 97). In regard to Gr. eidoř-ς, see II § 136 p. 440. Lith. mirę following vešä (§ 321 p. 221), compare the nom. sing. mirēs : vežäs (II § 136 p. 441, III § 193 p. 73); a dialectic variant is -usų, like -antys.

Pr. Idg. *mūs-ęs ‘mures’: Skr. mūś-as; Gr. μῦ-ς and μῦ-ς, the latter following stems in -ā- -αν- (II § 160 p. 485); A.S. mīs O.Icel. mīs-s.

Latin. -ēs, degener-ēs honor-ēs mēns-ēs, ōciōr-ēs, mūr-ēs, following the i-class, see § 319 p. 219.

§ 323. 10. i- i- and ā- um- stems, and stems ending in -u, -ū, -ū.

Pr. Idg. *i-ı-s, *um-ı-s, e.g. *bhrum-ıs (nom. sing. *bhrū-s ‘brow’). Skr. dhiy-as ‘thoughts, meditations’ Ved. nādhy-as ‘rivers’, bhrum-ıs Ved. śrvārvas ‘mothers-in-law’. In Avestic *-i-ı-s is represented by certain forms of ti- jı-stems, which follow the analogy of this class, e.g. daevyō i.e. daeviy-ō (§ 316 p. 216); and *-um-ı-s by tan(u)v-ı ‘bodies’. Gr. xı-ı-s pōli-ı-s (from pōli-ı-s), ῥυμ-ı-s ti-ı-s νέμι-ı-s (from νέμ-ı-s).

Lat. su-ı-s, with i-flexion, see § 319 p. 219; vēs (beside vērēs), to be explained like the gen. sing. vēs § 233 p. 123. O.Icel. sýr ‘sues’ like gen. sing. sýr, see § 233 p. 123. O.C.Sl. krūv-i f., svekrūv-i f. following the i-class (§ 317 p. 217).

Skr. gīr-ı-s ‘songs of praise’ = *gīr-ı-s, pūras ‘strongholds’ = *ph-ı-s, gātān-ı-s pl. ‘gaining kins’ = *-spn-ı-s. Compare II § 160. 4 pp. 485 f.

§ 324. Certain Root Nouns in -m and -i.

Pr. Idg. *nāv-ı-s ‘naves’: Skr. nāv-ı-s, Gr. nα-ς, να-ς nā-ı-s (I § 610 p. 461); Lat. nāv-ı-s follows the i-class, see § 319 p. 219.

Pr. Idg. *gīv-ı-s: Skr. gīv-ı-s, Gr. ἰδ-ς, and perhaps Mid.Ir. bai (ai and oí are confused in Middle Irish);
Lat. *dóv-és like *náv-és; O.H.G. *kwo A.S. *cg O.Icel. *kvr are re-formates, see § 199 p. 80, § 221 p. 98, § 238 p. 130.


**Accusative Plural Masculine and Feminine.**

§ 325. The general ending in the parent language for this case was -ns. The view which assumes -ms as the ending is opposed by what we find in Baltic; see § 186, page 61.

1. -ns was pronounced -ursal after stems ending with a consonant. From *vrs come Ar. *-as, Armen. -s, Gr. -ac, Lat. -ēs Umbr. -f, Goth. -uns, Lith. -is. [See I § 224 p. 192, § 232 p. 197, § 233 p. 197, § 238 p. 200, § 244 p. 202, § 249 p. 204; as to Armen. -s for *a(n)s, see further I § 202 p. 169, § 651.3 p. 497; for Umbr. -f, I § 209 p. 177 and Duvau's essay (see footnote 1); as regards Lith. -is for *-ės, I § 664.3 p. 523.

O.Ir. shows the ending -a, as con-a 'canes' aithra. The ending is -as in Gallic, Lingon-as Bitwing-as (it is true we know the forms only as Roman authors have preserved them), and Windisch (Paul-Braune's Beitr., IV 215) would have it that -a has come from the a-class. But so long as the history of y in Irish has not been made clear in all points, we shall have to regard -a provisionally as directly representing *-us. Perhaps *-us, becoming first *-ons, passed very early into *-ertos *-ūs; for in tracing the suffix of the acc. pl. of o-stems, -n (§ 326), we come to *-ūs at the first step, and this brings

---

us to *-ūs and lastly to *-ōns, which points to a very early loss of the nasal. Cf. Lat. pedēs for *-ens as contrasted with ēnsi-s (earlier ēnsi-s), I § 208 p. 175.

Stems that show vowel gradation, such as Skr. ukuṣṭān-Goth. aukhusan- 'ox', have generally a weak stem in Sanskrit, and a strong stem in Greek. As to which of the two reproduces the older form, probability is on the side of Sanskrit (cp. catār-as = Lith. kėtur-is Gr. Aeol. μενορ-ας); but the matter is still an open question. Since ṣ in Aryan and Greek became an aw (I § 226 p. 193), it must be provisionally assumed that Ar. -as is regular only in such forms as Skr. tākṣṣ- as bhārat-as bhūv-as, and spread thence to ukuṣṭ- as byḥat- as etc.

2. Whether or not o-, i-, and u-stems had -o-ns, i-ns, and -u-ns respectively in pr. Idg., is uncertain; not that Lith. gerūs-ius makes it so (see § 326), but because of Skr. -ās -ān, -īr -īn, -ūr -ūn, whose long vowel we must doubtless regard as belonging to the proethnic period of Aryan at the latest (§ 327).

Remark. If we take Idg. -ōns as our starting point (cp. Hassen in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 615, and Bremer, Berl. phil. Wochenschr. 1887 p. 502), we should have to assume a shortening of the vowel for the European languages, according to the principles laid down in I §§ 611 ff. -ōns would be related to -us as abl. sing. -ōd to the -d of Skr. mā-d 'a me' (§ 240 p. 134): -ins -ōns might be regarded as an Aryan re-formation following -ōns — Skr. śrī śṛṇ and Avest. šrajš in r-stems certainly are an Aryan re-formation; or if they were held to be original, -ōns would bear the same relation to -ins -ōns as the instr. sing. Skr. cṛṣa to Skr. mati Avest. bāxu (§§ 274 ff.), or as the nom. acc. dual Skr. cṛṣa to devi sund (§§ 284 ff.) But it is quite possible to regard the Aryan forms with a long vowel as an Aryan analogical formation: it may be supposed that *-ōns followed the nom. pl. in -ās, being influenced by the fem. acc. nom. pl. -ās, and that the long vowel thus produced in o-stems influenced those in -ī- and -u-, and finally those in -r-. Compare Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Sprachg., I 37 f.

3. a-stems had pr. Idg. -ās, as in the nominative plural. J. Schmidt's theory that this ending came from -ūns (sep. I § 220 p. 188) is unsafe enough.
§ 326. 1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *u̱lgo-ns (*u̱lqéns? see § 325). Skr. vskin vskin for *-āns (see I § 647.7 p. 494); vskin, before s-, as we must assume with Whitney, is simply -ān s- with parasitic t serving as a transition sound, or glide). Avest. vehrka vehrka(-ca), cp. below. Armen gail-s. Gr. Cret. kíwoς Dor. Bocot. -ow Ion. Att. Dor. -ow Lesb. -ow, with the variant (pr. Greek and onwards) -oc for -ow, see I § 204 p. 171, § 205 p. 172. Lat. lupōs (I § 208 p. 175); Umbra. aurof 'apros' Osc. rēhūss 'fines' (I § 209 p. 177). O.Ir. fīru, tēnti 'socios' (I § 212 pp. 178 f., § 657.6 and 10, pp. 509, 510, III § 325 p. 224); also inna (the article, from *sen+-to-), for *-dēs, earlier *-tōs, when used before an accented syllable (cp. inna n- § 429). Goth. uulfans O.Icel. ulfa. Pruss. deiwans 'Aeos', O.C.Sl. velék, kraje from kraje 'edge, rim' (I § 84 p. 80, § 219.4 p. 187, § 665.4 p. 525).

Aryan. Seeing that Avestic a represents nasalised o both long and short (I § 21 p. 24, § 200 pp. 168 f.), it is impossible to say whether *-āns or *-āns is to be assumed as the parent form. An attempt will be made in § 330, Remark, page 231, to shew that it is more likely to have been *-āns.

The Avestic variants vehrka Gāth. vehrka are to be explained like the same forms used for the nominative plural, see § 304 p. 213. We further find Avest. -ā, e.g. amesā 'immortalis', which we conjecture to be the nom. form (= Skr. amftās, § 314 p. 212); its use as an accusative grew up from the use of acc.-nom. vehrka (cp. Skr. acc. fem. -āsas, § 315 p. 215); yet be it observed that the nom. acc. pl. neuter also had variants -ā and -a (§ 338).

The Old Persian mārtiyā 'homines' cannot be accurately estimated. In this dialect, sounds are most inadequately represented in writing; it should be noted in particular that nasalised vowels are not distinguished from others in writing (I § 200 p. 168). Moreover, the record of Old Persian is too

1) Compare the Author, Litau. Volkal. und März., 289; Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr., I 36 f. The conjecture offered in vol. I of this work, § 557.1 p. 412, cannot hold water.
 scanty to give any satisfactory knowledge of the laws for final syllables. Compare what is said in § 314, p. 214, on nom. pl. *martiyā.

In West-Germanic the nominative did duty as accusative: O.H.G. taga -a O.Sax. dagos A.S. dāgæ (§ 314 pp. 212, 214). The same is true of the other classes of stems, and in some degree of all Germanic languages. The cause of this syncretism may have been that from a very early period acc. and nom. pl. had been represented by the same form in ā- and ī- ā-stems (§§ 327, 328).

Lith. vilkūs (dial. vikūns), gerūs-ius (dial. geruns-ius) and gerūs, tā's and tūs (cp. instr. sing. fem. tā and tā, on which variation of accent Bezzmenberger offers a conjecture which deserves consideration, Bezz. Beitr. X 204); similarly Lett. vilkus and tōs (ō = ū with the 'lengthened' or 'drawled' accent). It cannot be shewn that the Lith.-Lettic group āns (Idg. *ōns) became High Lith. ūs; and to take as a starting point Lith.-Lettic *-āns *-ōns = Idg. *-ōns is out of the question, because Idg. *-ōns becomes -āns (I § 615 p. 465). I therefore assume that the ā ā of the ending *-āns *-ōns (for the shortening to Lith. -ā(n)s see I § 664. 3 p. 523) came from other cases, first of all from the loc. plural in -āsū -āsē (Lett. -ās).

Remark. Before going on it may be well to follow out this matter to the end. In the locative plural, then, the old ending *-ānus *-ēsū = O.C.Sl. -ēchū Skr. -ēṣu (see § 357) was transformed to -ēsū by proportional analogy, to match *-āmū -ēmū in the ā-class and *-īmū -ēmū in the ī- ī-class, and similarly *-ēmū = O.C.Sl. -ēchū Skr. -ēṣu (i-stems) became -ēmū (naktū-su -ē); compare loc. pl. Ital. ēs following ēs (§ 337), Lat. ēstūrum, ēquārum following ēstārum, ēquārum (§ 345), Gr. dual νίμπα (instead of νίμπας) following ἵκω (§ 286 p. 184). This change was very old, as we know from Lett. ās -ēs (beside ēs -ēs). The adoption of ē ē into the acc. pl. was all the easier because there was a close similarity of meaning between the acc. pl. with -ūs affixed (e.g. nomūs-nā 'homewards') and the loc. pl., and the fem. accusative endings -ēs -ēs (-ēsū-na -ēs-nā) had always had a long vowel. Once the re-formation *-āns was established, its influence was felt in three ways. (1) A dialectic

1) Lith. ščiū-lika dvį-lika seem also to have been assimilated to try-lika, keturiō-lika and the rest (compounds with the nom. acc. pl. neuter as first member) by proportional analogy. See § 175 pp. 28 f.
loc. vīkunās appeared, which followed the acc. vīkunās vīkunā-na. (2) The confluence of o- and u-stems in acc. and gen. plural (acc. dangūs 'caela', -us = Goth. -usās etc.; gen. dangūt for *dangūtā § 349) produced the re-formates dangūs-nā and dangūsā. (3) An intrusive n appeared 'n the acc. of pronominal ő-stems with Lith.-Lett. -ūs (-ōs) = Idg. -ūs (§ 327): O.Lith. and dial. pirmarius-es (Mod.High Lith. -ūs-es) 'has primas'.

The loc. pl. Lith. -yse Lett. -ēs at once suggests the conjecture that in Lith.-Lett. not only *-ūnā (o-stems), but *-ūnās (i-stems), and it may be also *-ūnās (u-stems) lengthened the vowel. No direct evidence for prehistoric *-ūnā *-ūnās is forthcoming.


1. As to Vedic -āsas beside -ās (aravagamāsas from aravagamā- 'expectant, offering oneself'), see § 315 p. 215.

O.H.G. gebā -a and sippe sippea sippia -a are to be explained in the same way as the same forms when used for the nom., see § 315 p. 215. Compare gutinne -innā -a § 328.

Lith. rankūs never contained a nasal, which is proved by the use of this form in those modern dialects which show -uns as the o-stem ending.1) -ans-es occurs only in pronouns; it is a re-formation, see (2) below, and § 326 Rem. p. 227.

2. In the following branches, Idg. -ūs was driven out by some form with -us, through assimilation to the other classes of stems. It is doubtful whether this first took the shape of *-ūns, and the ā was then shortened according to I §§ 611 ff., or whether the ending became *-ūns at once.


1) Moreover, if *-ans were the parent ending, the Lettlo form must have been *rākās.
§§ 327,328. Accusative Plural Masculine and Feminine. 229

Italic. Umbr. villaf 'vitulas', Osc. viass 'vias' (I § 209 p. 177). Since there is no question that these forms come from *-ans, the equation Lat. equās = Skr. ásvās (see preceding page) is at least doubtful (see I § 208 p. 175).

Old Irish. tuatha, mná may be derived from either *-ās or *-ans (I § 212 pp. 178 f., § 657. 6 and 10, pp. 509 f.). Gall. artvass 'gravestones' (see Stokes, Bezz. Beitr. XI 115) would be decisive in favour of *-ans, if ☢, the last symbol in the word, is really to be read as ss.

Balto-Slavonic. Pruss. gennans 'mulieres' like masc. deiwancs; the similarity here caused the formation of nom. pl. gennai after the analogy of the masc. -ai (unless indeed the masc. ending -ai instead of -ās is simply due to carelessness on the part of the translator; see Brückner, Archiv für slav. Phil., IV 28). O.Lith. and dial. pirmans-es, see above. O.C.Sl. -ąky zmiję (zmija 'snake') for pr.Slav. *-ńus (I § 219 pp. 185 f., § 615 p. 465); if the re-formation is later than the confluence of Idg. a and o, the endings -y -ę were always like those of the masc. vlūky and kraję.

§ 328. 3. ĭ- ĭe-stems (cp. p. 68, footnote). The original ending is not clear.

Skr. byhatīs Avest. barentiš, with rare variants -iyas -yās) and Avest. -yō, as with the ĭ- ĭi-class (§ 329).

O.H.G. gutinne, later -ā -a, and Lith. šemēs-nā (‘into the countries’) šemēs certainly have original -īs, like the nom. pl. gutinne and šemēs (§ 316 p. 216). In Lat. faciēs is the same ending, unless it be -ns like Umbr. iovie(f) ‘juniores’, which seems to have developed out of an old abstract noun (as Lat. prō-genie-s, II § 111 p. 339): a different explanation may be found in Boahtel’s paper, Bezz. Beitr. VII 4 ff.

Gr. qerōvouš, Goth. frijōndjōus, Lith. vešanc̣iōs, and perhaps O.C.Sl. zemījęc following the ĭa-class.

O.Ir. insi is ambiguous.

Remark. If we were right in assuming *-(i)ja as a protoethnic variant of *-im in the acc. sing. (§ 216 p. 93), there may have been Idg. *-(i)ja in the plural. From this might be derived Lat. faciēs, Umbr.
§ 328. 4. *i- and *a- uy-stems and stems in "f and "b.
Pr. Idg. *-i-yas *-uy-ys, e.g. *bhrūya-ys (nom. sing. *bhrū-s 'eyebrow'). Skr. dhiy-as Véd. nadiy-as, bhrūv-as Véd. śnaśrūva-as. Gr. ηικας σύλλας (from πόλις-ς), ὄφρεις ἱκνύας νέκνας (from νέκας-ς); Herod. πόλις from πόλις-ς following the i-class (§ 330), Hom. Herod. Att. ὄφρεν ἱκνώς following the u-class (§ 331). Lat. su-ès; véś (beside vēres) like nom. pl. vēs (§ 323 p. 223). Lith. švū-is = ᵃcnynas.
O.Icl. sýr is the nom. form ʼi (§ 323 p. 223). O.C Sl. krū-i seekrū-i follow the i-class (§ 330).
Skr. gír-as 'hymns' = *gýr-ys, púr-as 'strongholds' = *phú-ys, gū-šūn-as pl. 'gaining cattle' = *-syn-ys. Compare II § 160.4 pp. 485 ff.


Aryan. In Sanskrit, answering to -en and -ān, the endings of masc. i- and u-stems, feminines have -ī (avī) and -ū (dhenāś), which are re-formations following āśās (§ 327 and bhātīś (§ 328); but in Avestic both genders

1) There seems to have been no Avestic variant in -i, as there was no variant -u beside -ū in u-stems. See Bartholomae, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIX 486 f.
show the endings -ūs and -uś (fem. uṣṭīṣ 'riches', varśnūs 'heights').

Remark. Skr. -īr, -īr, -īr from i-, u-, and r-stems, for earlier *-ūnē, *-ūnē, *-pūnē. In vol. I of this work, § 647. 7. p. 494, it was conjectured that -ū was due to the influence of the i- u- and r-sounds, in spite of the preceding nasal; we assumed that a nasal, coming before -ū when it did not stand at the end of a clause, and following a long sonant, was reduced to a mere nasalising of the sonant earlier than when it followed a short sonant, namely in proeathlic Aryan (op. I § 199 Rem. p. 187). Now -ē in Avest. uerqē cannot be separated from the ending of Skr. ṣīr; so the Avestic form must be derived from *uīrūnē, and not *uīrū. On the same reasoning Avest. aētē and bāzūē, if they have or ever had a nasal sound in the last syllable, come from *-ūnē and *-ūnē, not *-ūnē *-uīnē. This would prove that these various classes had a long vowel in the acc. plural in pr. Aryan.

But Avest. -īs and -uś in fem. i- and u-stems may be phonetically identified with Skr. -īś and -ūś in the same stems, and it is possible to assume that -ē first belonged to these endings -īs and -ūs, whence in pr. Aryan it spread to the masculine forms (ending with -ēs); cp. Bartholomae, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIX 483 ff., and Stud. zur idg. Spr., I 87 ff. In that case we should have no proof that the Skr. -īr -īr -īr -īr had a long sonant as early as the proeathlic Aryan period. But considering that Skr. fem. mātīṣ has in Avestic the nasalised mātermē answering to it), it becomes more probable that the Avestic fem. endings -īs -uś also contained a nasal, and that the Skr. fem. -īś -ūś -pūś are Sanskrit re-formations. But if these endings -īs -uś are not so old as pr. Aryan, pr. Ar. -nē could not have obtained its ē by analogy; and then our supposition that ē is phonetic and nothing more gains in probability.

If then we are to postulate for proeathlic Aryan *-ūnē *-ūnē, or, to write the sounds more exactly, *-uṣ *-uṣ, the o-stems too most certainly had a long vowel at this period, and their ending was *-aṇā.

Skr. aryās like nom. aryās, see § 317 p. 217. Avest. garayō 'hills' is clearly nom., like the acc. gataş-ō § 331 (compare further Th. Baunack, Stud. auf dem Gebiet des Gr. etc., I 456 footnote 1).

Greek. Hom. pòsas Lesb. κτηνιας following the i- i̯- class (§ 329). Att. τρεῖς ὀφεῖς βάσις are nom. So too the

1) R.-V. X 352 mātīn does not come into consideration in this place, because it is joined with masculine substantives in apposition, something like an adjective: mātīn sinthum pāreṣās 'motherly streams and hills'. The form has often suggested wrong inferences.
Latin forms in -ēs, as turrēs, and those of West Germanic like O.H.G. gesti ensti drī. See § 317 pp. 216 f.


Vedic also shows -v-as (m. and f.), as paśu-ās 'pecora', and in Avestic there is -v-ī to correspond, e. g. pašu-ī, as in the nom. plural, see § 318 p. 218. Avest. gātav-ō 'places, seats, thrones' is a clear nom., like garav-ō just above (§ 330); and so also Avest. daṅhav-ō = O.Pers. dahyāv-a, see § 318 p. 218.

Greek. Hom. γλυκάς Herod. πίθευς, a re-formation following the nom. in -ēs. Att. γείζς πίθευς are nom. (§ 318 p. 218) like ὦρες (§ 330).

Umbr. kastruvuf castruo 'fundos' from kastru- (cp. Osc. castro, § 232 p. 121) following o-stems, perhaps because of the nom. acc. pl. neut. in -ūva -uo and the gen. pl. in *-umom.


§ 332. 7. n-stems. Pr.Idg. *kun-ys or *k(u)mon-ys 'dogs'. Skr. kūn-ās, in Veda ukūn-ās with a variant formation ukūn-ās and the like; Avest. xšafn-ō 'nights', urvan-ō and urvān-ō 'souls', spān-ō (also -a instead of -ō, see § 314 p. 213). Armen. aken-s akun-s. Gr. νύν-ας ἄγαν-ας, τέκτον-ας ποιήκ-ας, ἀγων-ας, πευδήν-ας. Lat. carrōs, homin-ēs, edōn-ēs; Umbr. man-f 'manus' beside Lat. man-capēs (see Duvaux, Mém. de la Soc. de ling., VI 226). O.Ir. con-a
Arn-a, see § 325 p. 224. O.Icel. qrn-u 'eagles' bjorn-u 'bears' (owing to this form and to the dat. instr. pl., § 384, these nouns came to be declined as u-stems) beside nom. sing. O.H.G. arno bero (O.Icel. Are O.Swed. Bjarí survive as proper names); with these we should probably compare Goth. aūsuns, since the form aūsuns, recorded in 1st Cor. 9. 9, seems to need emendation, see I p. 203, footnote. 1) Lith. szun-is dūmen-is.

Greek. Cret. -avɔ as well as -aç, e.g. xapto-r-an (Att. xpetrro-vaç), a re-formation caused by the existence of doublets -avɔ and -aç in a-stems (§ 327 p. 228).


O.C.Slav. kamen-i following the i-class (§ 330 p. 230).


Aryan. In pr.Aryan the analogy of stems in -o-, -i-, and -u- caused the ending *-uñas to be used with r-stems, Skr. -fr -fḥ and Avest. -erās (monosyllabic), whose pro-

1) If we read aūsuns (cp. Bernhardt Vulfta p. LVII, Braune Got. Gr. § 80 Anm. 1, § 108 Anm. 1), this must be regarded as a re-formate following a form *aūsum = ukep-mi (see § 384). But even though this instrumental formation must once have existed, it can hardly have lasted out the pr. Germ. period, but it will doubtless have given way to a new one with -n- inserted; see loc. cit.

pitaras, found in the Maha-Bhārata (12924) is a reformate due to the likeness of nom. and acc. pl. in other stems.


West-Germanic. O.H.G. muotær faterā -a and the like, O.Sax. wintār A.S. winter etc., are nom., see § 320 pp. 220 f.

Balto-Slavonic. High Lith. mōteres following i-je-stems; and so too we have in the dialects nom. pl. mōter-ės (beside mōter-s), instr. sing. mōter-e (beside mōter-imt), and the like. O.C.Sl. materi follows i-stems, § 330 p. 230.

§ 334. 9. Stems ending in an Explosive.


Avestic has also -ǝ as voc-ǝ ‘voices’, see § 314 p. 218.


§ 335. 10. s-stems.

Pr. Idg. *dus-menes-ǝs: Skr. durmanas-as, Avest dušmanah-ǝ; Gr. Ion. ἡυμενεῖς (Att. ἡυμενεῖς is nom. in form, § 322 p. 222); Lat. dēgener-ēs. — Skr. udás-as, Lat. honor-ēs.


Pr. Idg. compar. *ōkis-ǝs or *ōk(i)ōs-ǝs. Skr. dāṣyas-ǝs. Gr. Hom. πλέας (Cret. πλανει like καργόν-ας § 332 p. 233) for *πηγα-ας (II § 135 pp. 429 and 432); Att. ἤδεια is nom. (§ 322 p. 222). Lat. òcior-ēs. O.C.Sl. słađit-s, as if from *a jō-stem (§ 326).


Gr. Hom. βά-ας, Lat. bōv-ēs; in Skr., the regular form is gās, beside which occur gāvas in the Rig-Veda (the text has gās, which will not scan), and gās-as in the Tāttirīya Brāhmaṇa. I hold it probable that Skr. gās Avest. gā and
Gr. ἑξα (Theocr.) do not represent an Idg. *gōs, but are re-
formates in these languages following the acc. sing. (Skr.
gām etc., § 221 p. 98), like Att. ἐξαν following ἐξαν: and this
in spite of W. Schulze, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 429, and
Meringer, Zeitschr. für öst. Gymn., 1889, p. 1019; compare the
footnote on page 428 of volume II. On Mid.Ir. bū Thurneysen
says: “If the nom. bai comes from *boi, which would stand for
*boy-es” — see § 324 p. 223 — “bū = *būs may have been
formed on the analogy of *mogoyes : mogus (moga : mogu)
Skr. rāy-ās and rāy-as ‘goods, treasures’, Avest. rāy-ō;
also Skr. rās following rām; Lat. rēs for *rē(ī)-ēs -ēns?

Nominative and Accusative Plural Neuter. 1)

§ 337. The ending as shown in consonant stems is -o =
Skr. -i Gr. -α (I § 110 p. 105, Morph. Unt. V 52 ff.) The
Idg. endings -i and -ū (i- and u-stems) might also be analysed
into -i+o and -u+o.

The o-stem ending -α is identified, rightly in all
probability, with -α in the nom. sing. fem. 2); then such a word
as *jugā (= Lat. jūgā) would originally mean, if we may
coin a word, ‘yokedom’ or something of the sort. Compare
II § 158 pp. 473 ff. In favour of this view much evidence
may be adduced; for example, the use of the singular of the
predicative verb with a nom. pl. neuter as subject, an idiom
which is as old as the parent language: e. g. R.-V. I 162 8

1) L. Havet, La désinence des pluriels neutres, Mém. de la Soc. de
lingu. IV 275 f. V. Henry, Le nominatif-accusatif pluriel neutre dans les
langues indo-europ., Le Muséon VI 558 ff. J. Schmidt, Die Plural-
des nom.-acc. plur. der ας-Stämme, Ar. Forsch. II 105 ff. W. Meyer,
Die Schicksale des lat. Neutrum im Roman., 1883.

2) In addition to J. Schmidt, Pluralb. p. 10 footnote 1; see
Windisch, Curtius’ Stud. II 265; de Saussure, Mém. sur le syst. prim.,
p. 92; Johansson, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXX 400; und Hanssen, Com-
mentationes in honorem Guilelmi Studemund, 1889 pp. 116 f.
sārvā ta... astu 'omnia haec sunt', Hom. i 438 ἐρευνεῖν ἔρρευν 
μηλα. If the o-class got its neuter plural thus from stems in 
-a-, it would be possible that the i-class got its neuter plural 
with the ending -t from the nominative singular of i- 
-ī-stems (Π § 109 p. 332).

Before the use of this form as a plural case, which was 
soon followed by a re-formation of the gen. into *jugōn 
'iugorum', and the loc. into *jugois(u) 'jegis', and so forth, 
there must have been a real neuter plural having -o in the 
nominative and accusative.

In consonant stems, along with the forms in -o, there is 
used the bare stem, with a formative suffix of the 3rd. or 4th. 
strong grade as its case-sign, e.g. *dhēmon = Avest. 
damān from the stem *dhēmen-. This *dhēmon in formation resembles 
a nom.-acc. neuter singular of which we have an example in 
Goth. namō 'nomen' for *-mōn (§ 223 p. 100), and the nom. 
sing. masc. fem. Gr τερμον Goth. tuggō and the like (§ 192 
p. 70). Hence J. Schmidt assumes that this neuter plural 
series, like the last, was once a series of feminine collective 
nouns.

It is a fair conjecture that -o at first belonged to some 
one group of consonant stems, and that it afterwards spread 
to others. Between Avest. dāmān and Skr. dhāman-ī Avest. 
ašaon-ī there was, we may suppose, much the same relation 
as between certain variant forms of the locative singular, Skr. 
mudhrān and mudhrān-ī mudhrān-ī (§ 256 pp. 156 ff.); and in 
the parent language there will have been not only -ōn (-ēn) 
and -ūn-ō (-ēn-ō) but also forms with a weak grade of stem.

Skr. Ved. yugd; Avest. xšāpra O.Pers. hamaana 'battles'. 
Lat. jugā; Umbr. veskla vesklu 'vascula' supa sopā 'supina' 
Osc. teremenniu 'termina' comono 'comitia' (I § 105 pp. 98 f.). 
O.Ir. trī chēt '300' = Ved. trī sati, trāth 'hours' nert 'powers' 
and the like, cp. next page; Gall. perhaps suirte. Goth. 
juka, pō 'the, those' (I § 659.1 p. 512, § 660.2 p. 515);
O.H.G. *wört* 'verba', whence *joh* instead of *johhu* (-u retained in cunnun cunnun 'families', especially in East Frankish, beside cunnij), O.Sax. A.S. *fatu* 'casks' (I § 661 p. 518). Lith. keturió-lika '14' penkió-lika '15' (§ 175 p. 28), Pruss. slayo 'sleighs' from sing. slaya-n sleigh, sledge' warte 'door' (-o = -a as in the nom. sing. fem. e. g. mergo = Lith. mergà 'girl'); O.C.Sl. iga.

Aryan. A Sanskrit variant ending is -ani, yugáni, found in Vedic, and exclusively used in the post-Vedic language. It is a re-formation following námán-i 'nomina'. So too Avest. Gaít, vispaŋg (vispa- 'all') yan yam (ya-, pronoun) have for their model *-an, the n-stem ending, as haxmboŋ námán-am (§ 340); the same re-formation is said to be found in Vedic Sanskrit, e. g. tářéśi patanagán 'winged flames' R. V. IV 4 2 (Ludwig, Rig-Veda IV 313; Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 157, Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 73). The point of contact which was the beginning of these changes is the similar ending of the plural, Skr. Ved. námá Avest. náma (§ 340) and Skr. Ved. yugá Avest. xará.

Another termination found in Avestic is -á, the ending of es-stems (§ 342), as vispa. There are also forms in -áiš, as vispáiš, which like náméš (§ 340) seem to be really instrumental (§§ 379, 380), although it has not yet been made clear how they came to be used for the nominative (cp. Bartholomae, Stud. I 75).

Greek. -á, ἄγα, follows consonantal stems. It is very unsafe to say that -á has been kept in adverbs like κρυφόν Dor. κρυφά; see § 274 Rem. p. 174. But I conjecture that we have a real instance of -á in enί-γόθες 'just for this, on purpose' (Buttmann compared the word with enί γάθες, Lexil. I 46). Another piece of evidence for the old ending -á is found in phrases like ἀδεινάδα εὐτί 'it is impossible'; see J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 32 ff., and § 158 of the vol. II of the present work, pp. 473 ff.

In Old Irish the usual ending is -á, as aligéda, which is explained very reasonably by Windisch (Paul-Braune's Beitr.
IV 214 f. and zo1) as a re-formation following the nom. and acc. plural of a-stems (§ 315 p. 215, § 327 p. 229); we must follow Thurneysen in looking for the point of contact in the article, where inna represents both *sen-dās and *sen-dā (§ 428).

Lithuanian. Besides the forms already given, piktā in taī piktā ‘haec mala (sunt)’ and the like may belong to this place. The plural form must necessarily have run into one with the singular (Idg. *-o-dā).


Aryan. A Sanskrit variant is tāi -āni, tāṇi šucīni, madhūni purāni, found in Vedic and exclusively used in later Sanskrit; compare -āni § 338. In the Avesta we might expect to find forms in *-in *-ān, *-i *-u, parallel to vispēm (§ 338); and since the Avestic language had no means of writing nasalised i- and u-vowels, it is quite possible that such forms are really there, though disguised by being written with -i and -u (Bartholomae, Stud. I 73 f.).

In Greek there are re-formations with the suffix -ē: τοῖα, ἰδνα; Hom. γοῦνa Lesb. γώνα for *γοῦν-α Hom. Att. ἵδον, Att. ἀγη νήμαs (for the contraction see Wackernagel, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXV 972).

Italic. Re-formations with the o-stem ending; Lat. trīa maria, genua cornua; Umbr. tria ‘tria’ triiu-per trio-per ‘ter’, bervu ‘veru’ vatuva vatuvi vatuio (meaning unknown).

In Old Irish *-iā -e (cp. the Italic) was perhaps the regular ending of substantives, māre ‘maria’.
Remark. "Three formations are found. (1) Without any termination, mind rind (the latter was perhaps originally a neuter u-stem, to judge from rendain). (2) With -ē: mūre. (3) With -a (esp. in Mid.Ir.): mora, renne.

It is unfortunate that all three agree with some plural form of the two chief neuter classes, the o- and s-stems. The ending -a is certainly due to the analogy of the o-class, and mōra is a direct imitation of dligoda. mind may represent an old form with -i, like tri; but it may equally well be an ad-formate of o-stems, cp. dliged beside the later dligeda.

-ē may be either *-ē or *-iē, and also a re-formation following the s-class (§ 349). I should prefer to regard -ē as the genuine ending of neuter i-stems". Thurneysen.

Adjecti...s have dropped the neuter form altogether; for the nom. acc. the masc.-fem. form is used, g. mathi (math 'good').

Germanic. Goth. prija O.H.G. driu follows the o-class (§ 338). Of the same kind is perhaps Goth. kniv-a O.H.G. kneo 'knees' (J. Schmidt, Plur. 49). O.H.G. fhīu 'pecora', if there was such a word (see Braune, Ahd. Gr. p. 171), admits of different explanations.

§ 340. 3. n-stems, cp. § 337. "
a. -ōn (-ēn): Avest. dāmnā nāmān, hāzmēn̄ (hazman-'friendship'). In Sanskrit, such a form as pataśādn would be indirect evidence for pr.Ar. -ān; see § 338 p. 238.

Ved. dhāma nāma, Avest. dāma show a pr.Ar. -mā, whether from Idg. *-mō (*-mē) or Idg. *-mū (cp. *vauses- 'four' in § 341) is a doubtful matter; if from Idg. *-mō (*-mē), then pr.Ar. *dhāma: *dhāman as Lat. termō: Gr. τέμπος. See § 223 pp. 101 f.

Remark 1. - O.H.G. herza and auga (§ 223 p. 100) are used now and then for the plural. The plural use of these words is certainly not old, but, as in the case of feho, arose because singular-and plural had run into one in the o-class, e. g. wort.

b. -n-ō -ōn-ō (-ēn-ō) remain only in Sanskrit and Germanic: Skr. dhāman-ī dhān-ī, Goth. haırtōn-a O.H.G. Upper-G. herzon 'hearts' (O.H.G. Frank. herzun; cp. Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 218 ff.) with the o-stem ending taken in place of ā = Idg. -ē. Weaker forms of
stem are seen in Avest. nāmēn-i (e = Ar. a, see I § 94 Rem. p. 89, and Bartholomae Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 76 f.) ašaon-i, 'sacra, pia', Gr. πίθος-α ἁγιός-α, and with the -α of o-stems Avest. daṇman-α 'eyes' (like manaḥ-α § 343), Lat. nomin-α, Goth. namn-α O.H.G. Upper-G. herzon O.C.Sl. imen-α.

O.Ir. annann 'nomina' may have lost -α = Idg. -a, or -α, the o-stem ending; but its double n, which recals that of gobā 'father' gen. gobann (Gall. Gobannitio, Old British place-name Gobannium), has not yet been explained.

Remark 2. Thurneysen throws out the question whether gobānn- was not originally *gobānn- and the nom. gobā modelled upon it; and whether annann- may not be a transformation of *anaun- = *anānn-, n having been restored to it. Compare Skr. bhūniṇī instead of bhūnd, Gr. ἀφρίς instead of *ἀφρός and the like (II § 117 Rem. 1 p. 366, III § 361, Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 205 f.).

Avest. nāmēnīs is the instr. form, like vīśpāiś (§ 338), see § 379.

§ 342. 4. r-stems. *getyōr-α 'tēttara' may be the form from which come Skr. catvār-ι Lat. quattuor Goth. fideōr, but the last two may come from *getyōr, cp. § 168 pp. 10 and 11; perhaps we should add to this list Osc. petora (quantity of o unknown). Weaker forms of the stem are seen in Gr. Dor. tētora-α Ion. τέτοη-α Att. τέταρτα-α Boeot. πέταρ-α Lesb. πίσου-α, Osc. petiro-perτ (petiru-perτ); this Osc. word has the o-stem ending. O.Ir. cethir is doubtless the masc. form; the word which follows suffers 'aspiration' (cethir chēt '400') after the fashion of real neuter forms, as trī chēt etc. (compare the feminine gender marked by "aspiration" after the nom. sing. of fem. i-stems, e. g. sūl chairech 'oculus ovis', following the rule of a-stems). It is also conceivable that the neuter trī caused *getrī to be coined, and that from this comes cethir.

Idg. *getyōr- is represented in Gr. Dor. tētora-κορτα 'forty' etc., see § 176 p. 29 and § 178 pp. 35 ff.

A Sanskrit re-formation, following -āni -iṇi -āni, is -pri,
e.g. bhartīṇi from bhartār- 'upholder, upholding'. Compare § 224 a pp. 102 f.

§ 342. 5. Stems ending in an Explosive.

a. nt-stems.

(α) -nt: Avest. mūḏdāvānu pl. 'possessed of reward' aṣmanāvā pl. 'containing verses', -ān -q = pr. Ar. *-ānt(ə). Perhaps another example is Lith. vešq, which is used for the nom. pl. masc., see § 321 p. 221; it should be remembered that, according to I § 615 p. 465, Idg. *-ōnt and *-ōnt would necessarily run into one if the practice of shortening vowels is older than the loss of the -t.

(β) -nt-. Skr. R.-V. ghrḍavānt-i ('fatty') sānti (‘being’), in later portions of the Vedas and in the post-Vedic language ghrḍavānt-i sānt-i bhānt-i, post-Vedic dādant-i beside dādat-i ('giving'). Gr. xapiōv-α qeōv-α. Lat. silent-a with the ending of o-stems, ferent-ia following the i-class, like ferentium § 352. O.C.Sl. vezqšta as though from a io-stem.

The Aryan endings -ānt -ānt-i may have lengthened the vowel on the analogy of -ān -ān-i and -ās -ās-i. We may provisionally regard this lengthening as derived from the parent language, and in that case sānti may be regarded as = *sāti. Compare *getuχ- *punoχ- following *trī ‘tria’, § 176 p. 29.


b. Skr. praty-ānc-i ‘retroversa’. Avest. ast-i ‘ossa’. From the time of the Brāhmaṇas we meet with Sanskrit forms with a nasal in the penult, where there should have strictly been none, as tri-vṛnti from tri-vṛt- ‘threefold’, -huni from -hun- ‘offering’, -bhājī from -bhāj- ‘sharing, having a share’, hṛṇi from ḫṛṇ- ‘heart’. The same thing is seen in s-stems, and here even the Rig-Veda has it: māṇiši hariṣi āyūṣi (§ 343). The nasal first appeared in nt-stems, which had the ending -nti, and in dīvyāṣi and vidvāṣi, although even here it was not earlier than the proethnic period of Sanskrit (II § 135
p. 430, § 136 p. 441). From these it spread by analogy (perhaps even in dādantī the n is due to a similar cause), and produced a feeling that there was some natural connexion between -i and a preceding nasal. Last of all, it came about that no -i was to be found at all without a nasal (compare -āni -mi -āni -inī), with the single exception of catvārī. In considering the intrusion of a nasal into mānūṣi it must be remembered that this alone of all cases of the word had its suffix in the form -ās.

Remark. A new explanation of the nasal in mānūṣi is given by J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 155 ff., 236. It is very far-fetched indeed, and is anything but convincing.

Gr. πήνη-α, ρυγά-α, ἀσπαγ-α.

Lat. capit-α, cord-α with the -α (≡ *-i) of o-stems, adjectives teret-ia discord-ia audāc-ia victīc-ia following the i-class.

§ 343. 3. s-stems.

b. *-ōs-α, quite regularly changed in a unique Gāthic form, Y. 32. 14, varcāh(-cā) (cp. Skr. vārcaśi), according to Bartholomae’s happy conjecture (Ar. Forsch. II 105 ff.). There is a nasal due to analogy in Skr. mānāṣi; and the nasal is also analogical in the comparative dhiyāṣi and participle visvāṣi, although here it is not restricted to the neuter plural (see § 342). Gr. ḫā-lw for *-10(α)-x, notwithstanding ḫā-lwς = *-10(α)-ς? And is there a genuine prothetic -īs- in Lat. octor-α (-α from the o-stems)? Weaker stems are seen in Gr. Ion. mīn-α; Att. mēn and (with the -a of o-stems) Avest. asp-α (i.e. *-as-α), as manah-α (like daṇman-α § 340 p. 241), Lat. gerar-α, Goth. agis-α ‘fòsp’ O.H.G. keblir (A.S. cealfra) ‘calves’1) (these Germanic words likewise form the rest of their cases after the o-type, cp. Lat. holērōrum from holēr-α, and the like).

1) O.H.G. keblir for *kèlbir, A.S. cealfra for *celibora.
O.C.Sl. sloves-ą. Whether O.Ir. tige comes from *(s)teges-ą or *(s)teges-ą cannot be made out.

Skr. harṣi from harṣ- 'libation', āyuṣi from āyuṣ- 'life-power'. Gr. Hom. ῥηπα-κ Att. ῥηῖ.(α)

Genitive Plural. 1)

§ 344. The suffix of this case was probably *(s)-ām. To this view, which I share with Osthoff and others, I shall adhere until some tenable hypothesis has been found on which -ā in O.C.Sl. mater-ā sloves-ā etc. may be regarded as naturally representing Idg. *(s)-ām. The question of the origin of this assumed *(s)-ām may be left alone (see Leskien, Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1884, p. 104).

-ām was contracted with the stem-final of the o-class into -ām or -ēm according as that was -o- or -e- (ep. § 240 p. 133). These two forms are kept distinct in Germanic; 2) elsewhere -ām has become the only ending. In Aryan, Greek, Italic, Germanic, and Baltic the o-stem ending spreads to consonant stems and to those in -i- -ii-, -u- -uy-, -i- and -u-; conversely, in Slavonic, *(s)-ām = -ā spreads to stems in -o- in -u-, and in -i- -i-. With the adoption of -ā as the regular ending in Slavonic compare the universal use in Greek of -ā in the nom. acc. pl. neuter (§§ 337 ff.). The spread of *(s)-ām (-ēm) may have begun in the parent language; and varieties


2) Deecke (Bezz. Beitr. XII 340) says that Lyc. -he answers to Goth. -sē in -zē.
of dialect during the same period may have had something to do with the fact that -öm held its ground so firmly in Balto-Slavonic that afterwards, when Slavonic had begun its independent course, it is found without a rival.

Italic and Keltic have little importance in this controversy. Pr. Lat. -öm pr. Ir. *-óu may quite well have come from either Idg. *-om or Idg. *-ôm; for both languages shortened a long vowel before -m in prehistoric times. Again, in Umbro-Samnitic and Gallic -öm the quantity of o is unknown. It is possible, then, that Slavonic -i = Idg. *-ôm does not stand alone.

The proethnic ending of α- and τ- ḫ-stems cannot be made out with any certainty. Osthoff (Morph. Unt. II 126) conjectures -ām in both classes. In any case, both will have had -m as the final sound, as all other stems had.

Now as regards the distribution of -öm and -êm in Germanic, it appears that in proethnic Germanic only o-stems showed both endings, while all other stems had -öm alone. In North and West (Germanic -êm gave way, only a few traces being left of it (see § 345); while in Gothic -êm became the regular ending for o-stems, and furthermore found its way into other stems as well, e. g. gaste m. anstê f. (i-stems), reik-e m. baûrgê f., sunicê m., gumānê m. etc.; -ê = *-ôm in Gothic was retained only for certain feminine classes, e. g. gibô sibjô frijôndjô tuggônê.

The Armenian ending -c (gen., loc., dat., and abl.) has not been properly explained: examples are gaiôc, șrtić, xarduç, akanç, març, asterç and șteruç. Bugge (Beitr. zur etym. Erl. der armen. Spr., 47 f.) conjectures that -c represents the Idg. locative ending -si with the postposition en, thus șrtić = -i-ši + en. But if that were so the nasal of -en must have been kept; so it is preferable to compare Lith. -c (as rañkoj-e rañkos-e, § 264 pp. 167 f.) or Ar. -d (Avest. loc. pl. in -hv-ď, § 356).

Consonant stems that admitted of gradation, as *poter-
'pater', had their weak form in this case from the parent language onwards.
§ 345. 1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *μιχόμ 'luporum', *jugém 'iugorum', cp. § 240 pp. 133 f. In Aryan comparatively few instances remain (cp. Hanusz, Sitzungsb. der Wiener Ak. 1885 pp. 7 f.; Kartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 47 f., 97, 117 ff.): Skr. Ved. यकाम, deवम 'deorum'; Avest. vēhrkām. Gr. λυκοῖ; on Dor. qilēv (Att. qilēv) see the Author, Gr. Gr. 2 p. 128. In Latin, -om -um, but comparatively rare: deum, fabrum, modium, inscr. Romanum; Umbr. pihaklu 'piaculorum' proseceo 'prosectorum', Osc. Nūvlanúm 'Nolanorum', Volsc. Velestrum 'Veliternorum'; it is not certain that the ending -om in the Italic languages was Idg. *-ōm, see § 344. O.Ir. fer n-, cēle n- 'sociorum' for *-ijom (cp. I § 139 pp. 124 f.), Ogam inscr. maqa (before Mailugnī) 'filiorum'; it is not certain that the Celtic ending -om is Idg. *-ōm, see § 344. Goth. wulfē, hairdē 'of herdsman' with *-ēm, O.H.G. wolfo hirteo, also O.Sax. -o A.S. -a O.Icel. -a for *-ōm; *-ēm is still seen in West-Germ. in O.Sax. kindu, Hrodbertinga and the like (Kögel, Paul-Braune's Beitr., XIV 114) and in O.Sax. āsa O.Fris. āse 'of us', and also according to Kögel, loc. cit., in place-names which end with -inga etc., where it was no longer regarded as a genitive. Lith. vilkū (I § 92 p. 86).

Aryan. Usually -anām: Skr. vēkaṇam devaṇām, the solo ending in post-Vedic language; Avest. vēhrkanām (a shortening of -ā in the penult is indicated by the dissyllabic form γ'νακαm i.e. γ'νακαm 'of murderers'). 1), O.Pers. bagonām 'deorum'. The same ending, borrowed from n-stems, is shown by those in -ā- (§ 346), and it seems that these are the stems which first used the formation in Aryan, perhaps to distinguish the gen. plural from the acc. singular. The forms *atma-bhiś *atma-bhias *atma-su made it natural to analyse *atmanām into *atma-nām; on which type were moulded such genitives as *sainā-nām (Skr. sēnānām) instead of *sainām in connexion with *sainā-bhiś etc. This view (cp. Hanusz as cited, p. 11)

1) This shortening may be compared with that in ākānām acc. sing. fem. from ākāna-, ātārem-ca beside ātārem, and the like.
is supported by the following genitives which belong to the special Sanskrit period: bhṛu-ṇām beside bhṛu-bhiṣ, gō-ṇām beside gō-bhiṣ, ny-ṇām catasṛ-ṇām beside ny-bhiṣ catasṛ-bhiṣ, catur-ṇām beside catuṛ-bhiṣ, Śaṇṇām = *ṣaṭ-ṇām beside Śaṭbhiṣ; and it is also supported by the similar re-formation in West-Germanic: (O.H.G.) gebō-no (Goth. gibō) beside gibō-m following sungōn-o beside sungōm (§ 346). Compare further § 229 Rem. 1 p. 115.

Italic. In Latin the common form from the earliest times has been -ōrum, as lupōrum, istōrum, C.I.L. no. 32 duonoro = bonōrum, a re-formation following -ārum (§ 346). Osc. Safinim ‘Safinorum, Samnitiium’ Aisernim ‘Aescerniiorum’ (but Kluvatiium ‘Cluatiorum’), a re-formation following the nom. and acc. sing. with f, see II § 63 p. 122, III § 194 p. 74, § 212 p. 90, and Streitberg in Paul-Br. Beitr. XIV 189, 198; cp. below, O.CSl. kraji.

Balto-Slavonic. O.CSl. vīktī follows the analogy of consonant stems, see § 344. Instead of kraji we should have expected *kraje, to represent Idg. *-jēm (cp. § 227 pp. 110 f.). Either -ū was borrowed from vīktī, and then *kraji became kraji, or else perhaps the ending was *-im, a re-formation following the nom. acc. sing. kraji with original *-is *-im (§ 194 pp. 74 f., § 212 p. 90), cp. Osc. Safinim above. If the second alternative is true, pāṭja must have borrowed its -i from kraji, in order to distinguish the genitive from the nom. pāṭje. — For the sake of clearness -ovi, the u-stem ending (§ 349), was adopted in most of the Slavonic languages in place of the -ū in o-stems; and -ovi afterwards spread over most other stems, to all of them in Lower Sorbian.

Remark. Lett. tū tēvūr (ō = ū with the gesamt or drawled accent) makes it necessary to ask whether the law laid down in I § 22 p. 36, stating that *-ōm became *-ūm, held good only for words of more than one syllable. It is also possible to assume that ū (ū) was borrowed from the accusative (tēs) and the locative (tūs), precisely as the analogy of schis- and the like gave rise to a form schim beside schom ‘hule’ (Lith. aziām). The latter supposition has more in its favour.
§ 346. 2. à-stems. The proethnic ending is uncertain; see § 344 p. 245.

Pr. Aryan -àm is perhaps preserved in a few Avestic genitives, as vanqmi 'of trees' (and compare the pronoun kám). -ánám was in existence in proethnic Aryan: Skr. ásvánám; Avest. hačnanaqr (for *-ánám), O.Pers. pāravazanānām ('populous', gen. pl.). As regards the origin of this ending, see § 345, page 246.

Gr. *-ά(a)ον, following the pronominal declension (Hom. τάων = Skr. tásām § 429). Hom. τέαων, Boeot. δεκάων, Thess. -έων and -έν, Dor. Lesb. -έν, Ion. -έων Att. -άν. Att. adj. φιλών instead of φιλῶν (Ion. φιλίων Dor. φιλᾶρ) by analogy of the masc. φιλῶν, cp. fem. ταύτων in contrast with Dor. Lesb. ταυτάν.

Italic has the same re-formation: Lat. equārum; Umbr. hapinaru (meaning uncertain) pracatarum 'munitorum', Oec. egmagum 'rorum'. Lat. masculines like agricolum omnigenum in the poets perhaps have not really the ending which gave place to -ārum, but are re-formates, suggested by Gangaridum Aeneadam and so forth.

O.Ir. tuath n-, ban n-, soillse n-, cp. fer n- cēle n-(§ 345).

Goth. gībō, A.S. giefa; in O.H.G. we only find in Otfrid a few instances of -o, as aleibo 'of remnants'. West-Germanic shows a re-formation on the lines of n-stems, O.H.G. gebōno O.Sax. gebōno A.S. ziefena, caused by the likeness of the dat. gebōn O.Sax. gē Benton A.S. ziefun to xungōm tungen tunzun (nom. pl. xungēn and so forth). So also A.S. cū-na 'of cows' beside cū-a (dat. cū-m), like Skr. gō-nām (instr. gō-bhiṣ). Compare § 345 pp. 246 f.

Lith. rańkū ėdēia (nom. pl. ėdēios 'rack'), O.C.Sl. rākī zmišē (zmijsa 'snake'), cp. vīlkū, vīkō krajt § 345 p. 247.

§ 347. 3. i- ie-stems (cp. p. 68 footnote 1). The proethnic ending is uncertain, most likely -(i)ām, compare Irish, Germanic, Balto-Slavonic.

Skr. Ved. bhātinām, -ānām, Avest. barentinām (the
quantity of the Avest. $i$ and $u$ is uncertain), an Aryan re-formation which must be connected with the parallels (Skr.) *byhati : áśvā, *byhati-$śu$ : áśväṣu etc., cp. §§ 345, 346. Gr. *prēvōsōn Hom. *povāson following the ā-stems (§ 346). Lat. faciōrum, like -ōrum (§ 345), is due to the analogy of -ārum. O.Ir. insē n- (cp. soiliše n- § 346). Goth. frijōndjō, O.H.G. *gutinnōno (kuninginno is isolated), cp. the ā-stems, Goth. *sibjō O.H.G. *sippēno, § 346; perhaps we may add O.H.G. *digino 'of prayers' (cp. dat. instr. pl. digi-m § 382). Lith. ėmini vežanczių, O.C.Sl. zemži vезо, cp. ėdzių zmižį § 346.


Aryan. Avest. vay-am byay-am (Ved. vīnām trīṇām) with strong stem like gen. sing. vay-ā, see § 231 p. 120, and compare nar-am = Ved. narām § 351. Considering that Avest. vayānum is a transformation of vayām on the analogy of -ā-stems, we may infer from Skr. trayāṇām an older *tray-am, and the same form is indirect evidence for *kavyām = Avest. kaoyam, and the like.

Skr. ávinām Ved. trīṇām Avest. ašīnaṃ, like -ānām, see § 345 p. 246. The first formed in pr.Aryan was perhaps

1) Similarly the Lith. gen. trijū, because of its agreement with the -ū of -ā-stems (as kēturiū), called forth the dialectic loc. trijū instead of triū.
*-i-nām beside *-i-bhiś and similar cases; and i was lengthened partly through the influence of -anām, but partly, no doubt, through that of the nom. acc. pl. neuter (§ 339 p. 239); in considering Avest. āzhīm, as with bastunam (§ 349), it must be remembered that the quantity of the Avest. i and u is uncertain. In Vedic arose the further ending -ṃ, analogous to -um, as sārīm from sāri-ś ‘shining’, and in a similar way -um and -ṃ beside -i-nām and -i-nam (§§ 349, 351), see Bartholomae in Bezz. Beitr. XV 208, and his Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 47 ff., 97 ff.

Greek has -ōn in substantives in all dialects but Attic, as βάσιον (voltoν may come from πόλις, see § 354); τρων is Attic too. Att. βάσιον ὄψεων with e from the strong stem, and with the accent of βάσιος βάσεως, see § 231 p. 120; compare βάσιος instead of βάσις (§ 360).

In Latin, -ium has spread widely amongst consonant stems, particularly nt-participles (see below). The resulting pairs of forms, and an uncertainty as to certain other stems, reaching back to the pre-Italic period, by which we have (say) civitāt-um along with civitāt-ium (II § 102 p. 310), combined to produce a few instances of -um in original i-stems, which ought to have -ium; e.g. apum vātum beside api-um vāti-um. -iōrum, instead of -ium, in neuter genitives like vectīgaliōrum anciliōrum was called forth by -ia in the nom. acc.

O.Ir. fathē n-, as far as its form goes, might be derived from *-e(i)ēm without difficulty: but I see no sufficient ground for doing it. trī n- ‘trium’, has not been developed by sound-change merely; it has been assimilated to the nom. acc. trī (cp. above, O.H.G. dīēo, and § 345 p. 247 on Osc. Ṣāfinim).

Goth. masc. gastā ‘of guests’ follows vulfs (cp. gasti gasta: vulfs vulfa); the fem. ansē is doubtless chiefly due to baurgē (O.H.G. burg-o) beside baurgi-m (O.H.G. burgi-n) and the like (cp. Lat. apum instead of api-um, Lith. krūtē instead of krūza;). The fem., as nóteinō (nom. sing. nótein-s ‘reviling, blasphemy’), follows managein-ō (nom. sing. managei ‘crowd’), which caused the coining of nom. pl. nóteinōs on the analogy
of gibōs; once we meet with a dat. pl. -ōm, unkauireinōm 'in all unburdensomeness' (dat. pl.), a mistranslation of ēn παντὶ ἄβαρη (ὑμῖν ἐμαντὸν ἔτηρησα), Π Cor. 11. 9, on the analogy of gibōm.

As to Lith. krūtū from krūt-ı-s and the like, see § 402. O.C.Sl. paščī is may be derived from either *-i-j-om or *-e-i-j-om (cp. p. 247), compare paščihe § 317 p. 217 and synov-ū § 349.

§ 349. 5. u-stems. Pr. Idg. -(u)yōm, *sūn(u)yōm 'filiorum', see § 344. Avest. yādīo-am from yātu- 'magician', and the like. Gr. Hom. γονέων δούρων for *γοντ-ων *δοῦρ-ων. Lat. manuum (also contracted, passūm currūm etc.), more likely from *-(u)yōm than from *-ey-ōm (through the intermediate stage *-ou-ōm). Goth. manne (instead of -ō, § 344) O.H.G. O.Sax. manno = *many-ōm. Lith. sūnū for *sūnyū like ssū for *szyū (I § 184 p. 160).

Aryan. Skr, sūnūnam, Avest, bāsunam, O.Pers. parīnem 'multorum' (op. Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XIII 70) daḥyunam 'regionum', to be explained like -ēnām (§ 343). The Vedas have also -ām, dasyām from dasy-ū 'unbeliever', like -ōm; see § 348.

Greek. ἡδέων and πίδεων (accented to match πίδεων), with strong stem, following ἡδές etc., cp. Att. βάσεων § 348.

Old Irish. biθe n-, a re-formation following i-stems. It is not allowable to derive the ending from *-ey-ōm (as Windisch does, Paul-Braune's Beitr. IV 250), since -ey- would have become -ou- (I § 66 p. 56).

Germanic. Goth. suni-ē following sunjus (*suniu-iz). Similarly perhaps O.H.G. siteo, cuniu 'of the knees' for *-eiy-(n), and on account of the likeness to gesteo we have the nom. acc. siti and dat. siti-m following the i-flexion.

O.C.Sl. synov-ū, following nom. synov-e.


Latin. Rarely -ium, following i-stems; as carn-ium.

Balto-Slavonic. Lith. akmen-ũ was the starting point for other formations of the type of o-stems, akmen-ũ etc. (the Author, Lit. Volksl. und März., 301). High Lith. has only szun-ũ akmen-ũ, following i-stems. So also O.C.Sl. dźn-ỹfỹ-ỹfỹ, beside dźn-ũ.


Skr. dur-埇 (d- instead of dh-, see I § 480 p. 354) O.H.G. dur-o O.Icel. dur-a Lith. dūr-埇 and dūr-埇, Schleicher Lit. Gr. 188) 'of doors'.

Aryan. Special Skr. re-formations are mātām, dātām jātām, more rarely with -gām; uṇām uṇām 'uṇāv'; catasgām catasgām f. caturgām m. 'ṭrittōv' see § 345
p. 247. In Veda we also find nṝṃ, like -im, see § 348 p. 250. Avest. tiṣranām instead of tiṣraṃ (which is also used), like vyanām, § 348 p. 249.

Old Irish, in addition to the old formation, has -thre n-, brāthre n-, brāithre n-, a re-formation following the i-declension, cp. brāithrib like faithib § 385. The fem. teor-a n- ('three') ceitheor-a n- ('four') follows inna n- (§ 429); see Winusch in Paul-Br. Beitr. IV 224.

Balto-Slavonic. High Lith. moter-ỉu following the i-declension, so also O.C.Sl. dūšter-ỉu, isolated in O.C.Sl.

§ 352. 8. Stems ending in an Explosive.


Skr. sārād-ām 'of autumnis'. Gr. quvaδ-οῖν. Lat. lapid-um. O.Ir. druad n- 'druidum'. Goth. tathunt-ē (instead of -ē, § 344) in tathunte-hund '100', O.H.G. zehanzo '100' = Gr. sεχάδ-οῖν, see § 179 p. 43; in Norse, too, there may once have been a word *tehunta-hund.1) Skr. pad-ām, Gr. nοδ-οῖν, Lat. ped-um, O.H.G. fuag-ō O.Icel. fot-a 'pedum'.

1) This would explain the unexpected a-vowel in Norse Run. þr怡-antua and O.Icel. þattan þrettánda etc. The form *tehunta-hund may have been wrongly analysed into *tehun-tahund; indeed, the analogical form tathuntehund shows that tathuntehund was misunderstood in Gothic. This mistake once made, its a might pass over to the numbers 13 and so forth, taking the place of their e; even as happened when o spread from -xor as in Greek, § 176 Rem. 2 p. 31. In this case Noreen (Arkiv för nord. filol. III 26, Paul's Grundr. I 508) would be
Skr. uṣṭi-ām (desirous). Gr. μερόκ-ων, ὄρνυ-ων ὀρυγ-ων. Lat. meretric-um, and with -ium meretric-ium felic-ium

right in assuming *-tāhund = Goth. tāhund for Norse, but wrong in assuming an old ablaut e : ę in the first syllable of *dekyn.

After the discussion of the Numerals in this volume (pp. 1—52) was finished, appeared J. Schmidt's work Die Urheimath der Indogermanen und das europ. Zahlensystem (Berlin 1890). In this work he discusses Goth. taikuntēhund O.H.G. zehanzo and all connected with them on wholly different principles. He analyses taikun-tēhund, and explains the West-Germanic expressions by a—supposed Goth. *hund taikuntē隻 'tenfold hundred', which he believes to have been levelled with taikun-tēhund in different directions. I cannot here thrash out this interesting question; but I would say that in my opinion the view suggested above (pp. 40 ff.) well bears comparison with Schmidt's. Schmidt (p. 39) sees three main difficulties in it. (1) That the second part of O.Sax. ant-ēsibunda cannot be gen. pl., or it must have ended in -o. — This statement is disproved by the genitives friunda kinda etc. (§ 355 p. 248). (2) That O.H.G. zehanzo Goth. taikuntē do not answer to Skr. daikāt-ām Gr. δεκα- -ων. — This statement could only be justified were it proved that the interchange of tenuis and media in the parent language never took place at all, or that the argument could not be used here. To this change I drew attention in Morph. Unt. V 18; compare § 177 p. 34, above. It is well known, and attested by many examples at the present day. The assertion (p. 27 of Schmidt's work) that the inflexion of which ἀκά; -άδο; instead of *-οταγ is an example sprang from the analogy of Ἑλλά; -άδο; and the like, is a mere assertion, nothing more. (3) That Skr. ṛatām etc., which I compare with hund in taikuntē-hund, never means ἀκά; , the abstract of 'ten', in any language. — This is very natural, since my assumption is that taikuntē-hund ἀκάδων ἀκά is the very phrase which has been abbreviated into Skr. ṛatā-m etc. 'a group of ten (tens)' etc. Nor is Schmidt the right person to lay stress on a 'difficulty' which is inseparable from his own explanation; he assumes a form tēhunda = *dekyno-, of which not a trace can be found in any other Indo-Germanic language; Vṛddhi in derivatives is not-Germanic, although it is Aryan. Which is the simpler of the two explanations? One supposes an immediate connexion between Goth. taikuntē-hund O.Sax. ant-ēsibunda O.H.G. zehanzo, each of them containing a genitive of the same kind as Goth. frijōndō O.Sax. friunda O.H.G. frijunto; the other — Schmidt's — treats the Gothic and West Germanic expressions as quite different in principle, and has to regard the ending of O.Sax. ant-ēsibunda as distinct from that of O.H.G. zehanzo. No one can hesitate to allow that the first is simpler; which of them is correct, or whether another be correct and these both wrong, may be left for decision by further investigation of those who know the facts.

Skr. ap-ām Avest. ap-ām 'aquarium'. Gr. κλωτ-ῶν. Lat. dap-um, prīncip-um (also -ium).

§ 353. 9. Stems in -s.


Skr. nās-ām, Lat. honōr-um (II § 133 p. 423).


*mēs-ōm 'of mice': Skr. mās-ām (nom. pl. mās-as is found), Gr. μῆa-ōn instead of *mēa-ōn (§ 160 p. 485), Lat. mēr-um (and -ium), O.H.G. mēs-o O.Icel. mās-a.

§ 354. 10. i- -i- and u- uy-stems, and stems ending in -ī, -ī, -ū.

Pr. Idg. *-ū-ōm, *-uy-ōm (§ 344), e.g. *bhruy-ōm (nom. sing. *bhrūs 'brow'). Skr. dhīy-ām bhīv-ām, also dhīnām bhīvām, and only nādīnām sābrūmām (§ 345 pp. 246 f.). Gr. xu-oūn, ú-ōn õrprōn, nóli-ōn from nóli-ç, νεκό-ōn from νέκι-ç. Lat. su-um (and -ium), soecrū-um O.Icel. sū-a 'suum' (ep. § 233
Locative Plural. §354—356.


— Skr. gāv-āṁ, also gō-nāṁ (§ 345 p. 247), Gr. βο-άω, Lat. bon-um bōn Umbr. buo, Mid.Ir. bō n- for *bod(y)-āṁ (once buo in O.Ir., but perhaps by a mistake in writing), O.Icel. hā-a O.H.G. huo, cp. II § 160 p. 482.
— Skr. rāy-āṁ Avest. rāy-ṇu, Lat. rērum like faciērum § 347 p. 249.

Locative Plural.1)

§356. 1. The Suffix of the Locative Plural. An Idg. ending -su is indicated for this case by Aryan and Balto-Slavonic, Skr. -su Avest. -ha, O.Lith. -su O.CSl. -cha. As regards Gr. μεταξέω, which is generally adduced as an argument for the same ending, see the Remark on the next page. That Gr. -σα is also original is probable on account of the Avest. loc. pl. haf-ši and tanu-ši (Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XIII 84 f.); and compare Buge's explanation of Armen. -v as being for *-si (above, page 245). It is also very probable that -s was used as well as -su and si. If so, these two will be extensions of -s, the proper case-suffix, by

accretion of adverbial particles: -u, perhaps meaning 'there', may have been the same as the -u of Skr. mukh-u and similar words (see § 256 Rem. p. 158) and that of Gr. od(οκ) and the like (see § 415); -i perhaps means 'here', and may have been the same as -i in the loc. sing. (§ 256 p. 157) and in the Lat. nom. sing. quo-i quī (§ 414). See Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 177.

-s has been kept, unextended in the following instances.
(1) Lat. dēvōs Corniscus, C.I.L. I no. 814, and with d instead of ọ Lat. Sabell. -ōs (§§ 357, 358).1) (2) Gr. ἵππος, which also represents the Idg. instr. pl. in -ōs (§ 380); the effect of ἵππος on the one hand and φυλακ-ας etc. on the other was to prevent the loss of -α in ἵππος, βάλλω, φρατζ φρατζ etc., or perhaps we may say to restore it; -α- should have dropped according to Gr. § 564 p. 420; similarly in later times Att. δόρος, which should properly have become *δώρος, was kept safe by φυλακ-ας etc. (§ 362). It is not so certain that Lat. oloses lupus Osce. Nuvlanūs, beside Lat. Sabell. loc. -ōs, represent Idg. loc. -ōs as well as instr. -ōs. (3) -s is represented in Baltic, and not -u alone; it is true, this cannot be supported by such forms as Lith. rańko-s szirδ-s Lett. rạḳa-s sịrḍt-s, as if these had always ended with -s, but it may be considered fairly proved by O.Lith. -se -sa beside -su. It would be as wrong to suppose that rańkose is rańkosu transformed on the analogy of rańkoje, loc. sing., as to suppose that *φυλακ-ας became φυλακ-ας on the analogy of the loc. sing.

1) Schmidt (Pluralb. 50) assumes that Lat. dēvōs represents *-ānu; this is opposed by the fact that -ōs is found in Sabellian. I cannot allow even after the attempt of V. Henry (Mém., VI 377) that a loss of -u has been proved either for prehistoric Latin or for protothic Italic. Schmidt regards as two other plural locatives *āminus and commune (from manu-). But how this is to be reconciled with the meaning I cannot see. We must surely derive these from adjective stems *āminus- con-minu- or *mūn- (from -man-, the shorter form of manu-). Cp. ad-versus. Can it be that they were originally acc. sing. neuter, *ā-minu *ad-versu, afterwards extended by -s like Gr. εδεύτε μεσθ-γας έγ-γιν-; Compare further Bréal-Bailly, Dict. étym. lat. 2, s. v. commune.
Locative Plural. § 336.

γόλες: the real explanation is that an original *rankús (cp. dēvās), like original *rankā₂, had the particle -e attached (see § 264 pp. 167 f.); in the actually found forms raŋkos rākās -e has been lost again, just as *-āj-e was shortened, producing raŋkoj' (raŋku) rākā. O.Lith. -su (as namūsā 'at home'), if its -a be not merely a mistake for -e in the spelling, has been transformed from -se in connexion with the forms ending with -sua (namūs-nā 'homewards', acc. pl. with the postposition -na); conversely, -sne follows -se.

Remark. A further piece of evidence in support of -s may perhaps be found in the forms Skr. Ved. mānas (beside mānas-an) Avest. manohr from Ar. menēn- n., and the like (§ 364). -s-, and not -as-, in these forms is shown to be Idg. by Skr. āsi Avest. ahi = Gr. ι for *s(2)ι, 'thou art' from √cs-. See Häussermann, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 329; Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr., I 20 ff., 55 f., 67 f. The thinning of ss to s was doubtless prothetic when final, but not otherwise (all languages have -s for Idg. *-ss, even Skr., as a-ghau 2nd sing. pret. 'thou art' = *a-ghos + s, see Bartholomae, op. cit. 21 f.); and the origin of *menēn *menēsi was that n and i were affixed to *menes = menēs-s; similarly *esı 'thou art' = *cs (for cs-s) + i. Of the examples by which Bartholomae seeks to prove a change of Idg. -ss- to -s-, apparently the only ones which are correct are such as allow of an explanation like this. If the view here suggested is right, such forms as Gr. ήνεσι Lat. gestā need not be due to re-formation. Skr. mānas-su Gr. μενασ-α κα-α have been formed on the analogy of stems which ended in some other consonant than s; and there is nothing to prevent our believing them to be prothetic themselves.

But it is most unsafe to try to support the assumption of the loc. pl. -s by reference to Gr. ἀγούς beside ἀγῶν; see J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXV 39, and the Author, Morph. Unt. III 69. The same may be said of adverbs in -s, as Gr. παζ ρχυφ ἁμας Lat. max rix O.Ir. nu οι μο- μοσ- 'max' (for *muoka) Skr. harāk hiruk (-k for *-kā), notwithstanding Skr. muoka Gr. μισκός. The -s of these adverbs seems more likely to be the same as that of in ἀμπλις Lat. cis Avest. us (ud + s) O.Pers. abā etc., which we are hardly justified in regarding as a plural locative suffix. muakā - mukā-s-u moreover prove nothing, because the particle u attaches itself to other forms besides plural locatives. Nor can any stress be laid on Boeot. ῥεῖ γορίς (γορίαν); Collitz Gr. Dialektinschr. no. 391.5; probably we should read with Fick γορίς = γορῖ-α.

How -s- -s-u and -s-i were distributed in the parent language (for we can hardly suppose that every word formed
three distinct locatives, all of which were used together) can no longer be made out. The general preference for -su and -si rather than -s is explained by the fact that these s-forms often were exactly the same as the nominative singular.

In Iranian the postposition ā (or its unaccented by-form a, see § 246 p. 145) attached itself to locative plurals in -su: in Old Persian there is no other ending but -sr-ā -srā, while Avestic has -he-ā -sr-ā along with -hē -ṣū. Compare Skr. Ved. nadiśo ā 'in the streams' mārtiṣo ā 'among mortals' and the like; also pr. Ar. *aṣyāj-ā 'in equa' § 264 p. 167.

In Armenian we find -e, as in the gen., dat., and abl.; Bugge sees Idg. *-si in -e, see § 344 p. 245.

Greek, -συν beside -α like -γυν beside -γυν. Compare § 186 p. 62, § 281 pp. 186 f., and the Author, Gr. Gr.2 § 64 Anm. 3 p. 80.

In Keltic and Germanic the locative plural had fallen out of living use before the date of the earliest remains of those languages. Whether it survives in adverbs, still remains to be discovered (on O.Ir. mō 'mox' see the Remark above). As regards alleged locatives like O.H.G. Ōtingas see § 357.

2. The Form of the Stem. This was weak, from the prothetic period onwards, in consonant stems which had gradation.

In Aryan, the loc. pl. and cases with a bh-suffix (Skr. śhīya, -bhīṣ, -bhīyān) often show the form of the nominative singular instead of the stem. The occurrence of such groups of words as (Skr.) dhāma : dhāma-su -bhīyas etc., āśā : āśā-su -bhīyas etc., bhātī : bhātī-ṣu -bhīyas etc. suggested some necessary connexion between the form of what are called the "Middle Cases" with that of the nominative singular; hence Skr. māṇāh-su māṇā-bhīyas -bhīṣ -bhīyān following māṇāh māṇā instead of māṇassu (mānasi) *māṇat-bhīyas etc., hārīḥ-ṣu havir-bhīyas following havīr havīr instead of hārīṣu *havīḍbhīyas, Avest. ravō-hu instead of ravahu following ravō, O.Pers. ruca-bhīṣ from ruca, Avest. berzāp-byō instead of berzadbyō following berzāp (§§ 303 f. pp. 203 f., §§ 364, 367.
Locative Plural. §§ 356, 357.


In Balto-Slavonic, the loc. plural along with the other middle cases was attracted into the i-declension, as Lith. akmen-
ysė, earlier *-i-se, O.C.Sl. kamen-i-chů, like akmen-i-ms kamen-
i-mi, akmen-i-mis kamen-i-mi, sing. akmen-i-mi kamen-i-mi, dual akmen-i-m -i-mi kamen-i-ma. See § 402. But we still find O.Slav. poljachů (O.Czech Poldů) poljamů poljami from poljan-
(see I § 535. 3 p. 440, II § 115 p. 362, III §§ 361, 357, 404), with which we should perhaps compare Lith. dial. žmogu
(oj = ó) from nom. sing. žmă (Fortunatov, Bezz. Beitr. III 72).

§ 357. 1. o-stems. Pr. Idg. *yój-oj-s -su -si 'in
lupis'; the stem-final -oj- is borrowed from the pronoun (§ 430). Skr. viśā-sū; Avest. vērōka-sū -sv-ua, O.Pers.
mācišnu-a 'in Medis'. Armen. gailoč, if -c is Idg. *-si (§ 344
p. 245); if so, -o- has displaced *-oj- on the analogy of
gailo-čk. Gr. lóxox-č -α: -α in Attic gave way gradually
before -c from 450 B.C. onwards. O.C.Sl. bluččů (I § 462
p. 338).

Italic. It is a question whether Lat. lupis O.Lat. oloes
illis', Umbr. vestles vesclīr 'vasculis' alfer 'albis' Osc.
Nuvlanúis 'Nolauis' nesimos 'proximis'; and so forth,
represent the Idg. locative and instrumental, or instrumental
only; see § 356 p. 257. On the analogy of -ās (ā-stems) was
coined a loc. pl. series in -ōs, instead of -ōj-s, which seems to
be as early as the proethnic stage of Italic (cp. Lat. -ōrum
following -ārum § 345 p. 247, and Lith. -ūsu Lett. -ās
following -ūsu -ās, see below): O.Lat. (Dvenos inscription)
deicōs 'deis';1) Marruc. aios Mars. esos 'deis'.

1) It should be mentioned that the latest discussion of the Dvenos
inscription, by R. S. Conway (Am. Journ. Phil. X 452, 458), explains
deicōs as nom. pl. (cp. Umbr.-Samm. -ās). — Written after the above had
been printed.
Remark. It is doubtful whether we are to agree with Kögel in regarding as locative plural the West Germanic place-names in -ős, as O.H.G. Ötingas (assumed to = *Auđinga-su 'among the sons of Ötv'). See Kögel, Zeitschr. für d. Alt. XXVIII 110 ff., Paul-Brauno's Beitr. XIV 115 ff. Henning (Deutsche Lit.-Zeit. 1888 p. 16) and Behaghel (Paul's Grundr. I 609) regard -ős as the Latin accusative ending (ad Ötingas). If Kögel is right, the -ős of -ős is far more likely to be an analogical transformation of Idg. -oś-, as we have just assumed the -o- of Armenian. guric to be, than the pr. Idg. ending of noun-stems for this case, which must then be assumed to have been exchanged for the -oś- of pronouns in Aryan etc., but at no earlier period: observe O.C.Sl. těčů Lith. tūsė; těččūčų vilkūsė in contrast with dat. tēmu tūmu: tēkūme vilkūm. Compare further Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 387.

Baltic. Lith. vilkūsė -ė (-sa) -ūs Lett. vīlķās on the analogy of the *-a-su -se of a-stems, like Lat. deirās following deovās (see above). Lith. dial. vikūnas following the acc. pl. vikūnas-na. See § 326 Rem. pp. 227 f.


Greek. Ion. Att. réμπη Att. Lesb. ῥαμπη are reformations on the lines of -oω. To banish from the text of Homer and other authors all forms in -ηδ, which happens never to occur on inscriptions, and to replace them with others in -οες except only where -ηδ can be read, is a rather arbitrary fiat of modern critics. They may be explained as a transformation of *-aος -ης by, analogy; and perhaps -ης was still used in the age of Homer.

Latin. Besides dévās, are we to cite forās 'outside, out of doors' (forās 'out, outwards' is acc.), and aliās alterās (sc. vicibus or occasiōnibus)?

§ 359. 3. i- iē-stems (ep. p. 68, footnote). Pr. Idg. probably *bhīṇhwyti-s -su -si. Skr. bhāti-śu Avest. hawanti-su -swa. Lith. žemē-su -se O.C.Sl. žemlu-chū with -čū instead of -t-
Gr. ηερονοσι, -ηςι -αισι on the lines of iα-stems (cp. the footnote on page 68). So too Lith. νακτεςίου-σι -σε -ο- σ O.C.Sl. νεζηστα-χιθ.

§ 360. 4. i- and u-stems.


Pr. Idg. *σաւι-ς -σί -σί. Skr. σαւί-ς, Avest. βαζ-ς, βαζ-α. Uncertain: Armen. զարդրշ; see § 344 p. 245. Gr. γοրιո-σι, cp. below. O.C.Sl. συη-σι (not found, but this is a mere accident).

Greek. ὄρι-αι became ὄριοι (Hom. Αττ. Αρκαδ.) by association with ὄρεσι (όρι-ς) ὄρεσιν. So: *πηγερι-αί ἄγω-αί became πηγερι-αί ἄγω-αί by association with πήγεςις etc. -ς-Α became only in γοριόν for *-γερι-αί = Skr. -γου-ς, see § 261 p. 162; but later on there were coined sporadically such forms as τοκίοι following ἄγω, like nom. pl. τοκίς instead of τοκίοι following ἄγω.

Hom. ὄσοι (άι-ς) and πελέκαισι πολέσαι (πέλεκ-ς πολύ-ς) owe their ας to the poetic use of doublets like ἔπεσαι and ἐπισε σide by side.

The es-stem ending -εσι -εσι was adopted not only by all consonant stems and by i- i- and u- u-stems, but by stems in -i- and -u- in the Acolic dialects (in Homeric too), in N. W. Greek, and in parts of the Dorian areas; e.g. Hom. δι-εσι, ις-εσι Lesb. διακεί-εσι Hom. ταχέ-εσι. But again, the o-stem ending -ος -ος spread in like manner in N. W. Greek and in certain divisions of the Peloponnese; e.g. ταξιος -ος πολέ-ος (= πόλεσι); ταξιος: ταξιος = καλος: καλος. Each of these new departures started from the consonant stems, and originated in a wish to have the same stem-ending for the locative plural as for the other cases: e.g. γεφορεςι-εσι -εσι instead of pr. Gr. (Cret.) γεφορει (Ion. Att. γεφορει Lesb. *γεφορει etc.), following γεφορσι-ες etc.

Lith. νακτυ-ς -σε -γ-ς Lett. νακτι-ς and Lith. σνα-ς -σε -ά-ς. *-ί-ς *-ί-ς became *-ι-ς *-ί-ς by association
with *-a-su, and *-i-su then became -a-su by association with stems in -o-. See § 326 Rem. pp. 227 f.


Greek. ἠφα-σι instead of ἀφα-σι with r from the other cases. πλε-σι φαι-σι ἀχμε-σι πομε-σι ἀγι-σι have taken o, i, or o instead of a from the other cases, cp. ἀφα-σι ἦθε-σι § 360 p. 262. On the analogy of φαι-σι : φαινες, ἀχμε-σι : ἀχμονες was coined κυαί instead of *κω-σι (*κω-σι) beside κυνίς. With -εσι: Hom. ἧγεμόν-εσι λιμεν-εσι κύρ-εσι Megar. λαγόν-εσι etc. With -ος: N.-W. Gr. μεγόν-ος ἀγών-ος El. ἀγών-ος, etc.; see § 360 p. 262.

Lith. šum-y-su -sė akmen-y-su -sė and O.C.Sl. kamen-čču, following the i-class; see § 356 p. 260.


Lith. moter-γ-su -sė and O.C.Sl. mater-čči following the i-class; see § 356 p. 260.

§ 363. 7. Stems ending in an Explosive.

§§ 363, 364. 

νικάσαις Att. ἱλώσει βάλλοντι νέκροις. The old ending -άσιν = *-at-si *-γι-ς is still seen in Heracl. πρώσσοντι-ςοι ἵντ-άσι, which took the place of *πρώσσοντιςοι *άσιν (cp. Skr. sat-su = *s-γι-ς), the stem of πρώσσοντ-ες ἵντ-ες etc. having been substituted for the proper stem in these latter forms; compare ἄρωσι instead of *άρω-ς, § 361, last page. νῆσοι (Theogn.) from νῆσος 'I am sober' instead of νήσος, with o from νῆσον-ες etc., compare χαρέ-ασι following χαρέ-εντ-ες (below). With -σαι: Hom. ἄξονόντ-εςοι Lēsb. χερόντ-εςοι Hom. N.W. (gr. πάντεςοι. With -οις: N.-W. Gr. ἄγγελλόντ-οις ὄντος, and the like, see § 360, last page. O.C.Sl. telet-čiá following the i-flexion, cp. § 244 pp. 142 f. — Lith. vėžantį-čiu -se O.C.Sl. vezašti-čiá, as though a jo-stem. 

Skr. āpa-rat-su (āpa-vant- 'watery'), Gr. χαρέ-ασι instead of *-far-ς (cp. νῆσος, above); see II § 127 p. 404. 

Avest. nafšu = pr. Ar. *napt-su from Ar. napat- napt- 'descendant'; see I § 471 p. 348. 


Skr. ap-su 'in waters'. Gr. κλωψί (γύπ-εσι). 

§ 364. 8. s-stems. 

§§ 364, 365. **Locative Plural.**

Skr. haniṣ-ṣu (haniṣ-ṣu, see below) like mānas-ṣu. (tr. dēnaś Hom. dēnaś-ṣu.

Comparative *dikis -isu -isi, -is-su -is-si 'in ocioribus'.

Skr. dīyās-su (ādīyāḥ-su, see below). O.C.Sl. slapōtiči-clu as though a jo-stem.

Remark. Gr. *dikōn nēkan are not for *-eoa-ṣu, but have a jen-suffix, like Cret. nēda-ṣu (§ 361 p. 263). The weak cases seem never to have had -eoa- in Greek; see II § 135 Rem. p. 429. Hence we find no *dikōn like ἰνεω-ṣi; and, although nēvōn-eaoi μνήμ-οι do occur, we never see. *nēdō-eom -oic like ἰνεω-ςι. -οις and ἰνεω-ςι.

Part. perf. act. *mejūdus -usu -usi. -us-su -us-si. Everywhere we meet with re-formations. Skr. vīdvātsu has t from vīdvād-bhyās etc., where -dbh- comes regularly from *-2bh-, see II § 136 p. 441.1) Gr. eidoai doubtless belongs to a yet-stem, and so stands for *-for-ṣi (II § 136 p. 440), cp. N.W.Gr. γεγονόρ-ος. Lith. mirušiā-su -se O.C.Sl. mirūši-clu, as though a jo-stem.

Gr. mūco (preserved by Herodian, and in the Batrachomyomachia 260), with variant μύο, by re-formation; see II § 160 p. 485. O.C.Sl. myšči-clu following the i-declension. Skr. mūś-ṣu not found.


Greek. -eooi: Hom. ἐπε-εσσ ὀμνεφε-εσσ Lcsb. ἐπε-εσσ, Hom. ἐπε-εσσ; -oς: N.-W. Gr. ἐπε-ος Messen. εὐσεβε-ος, see § 360 p. 262. -eooi was of course taken from forms like ἐπεω-ς; and it was not until -eoo had become naturalised in other consonant stems that such a word as ἐπεω-ς could be coined.

§ 365. 9. i- -i- and a- uu-stems, stems in -f, -l, and -g.

Pr.Idg. -i-s -su -si, -u-s -su -si; e.g. *bhrā-s -su -si from nom. *bhrā-s 'brow'. Skr. dhī-ṣu nadi-ṣu, bhrā-ṣu

1) In writing this passage I was under the mistake of supposing that *-eoa-ṣu would regularly become -eoa-su. Against this see Bartholomae, Stud. zur Idg. Spr., I 9 ff.
§ 365—367.

Dative-Ablative Plural.

śvastrā-śu. Gr. xī-oi nōli-oi (from nōli-s), ἀγγε-oi ὦ-oi nēki-oi (from nēki-s) with ἐ- ὦ following xī-es etc. It is possible that where we now read nēkwasā ἀγγεsā nēkwaśā forms ending in -sā once stood in the text of Homer. -sā: Hom. ὀν-σα vēkwaśā, see § 360 p. 262. Lith. šve-ysu -sė O.C.Sl. krūv- -i-chū (not actually found) following the i-flexion; but svekrūv- -a-chū follows the a-flexion (cp. gen. pl. svekrūvū : raikū).

Skr. gūr-śū, pūr-śū, gō-śū-sū (the last not actually found) like nom. sing. gūr etc., see § 197 p. 76 above.

§ 366. 10. Pr.Idg. *nāu-s -su -si 'in navibus': Skr. nāu- śū Gr. rau-oi; Homer uses the re-formate νη-στ, like νης, following νη-ως etc. (I § 611 p. 462), but he also has the regular form in the compound rauσ-κλυτός. Skr. gō-śu, Gr. βο-ως.

Hom. vy-esa vēsā, βό-εσσ Boeot. βού-εσσ, N.-W. Gr. βό- -ως; see § 360 p. 263.

Dative-Ablative Plural.1)

§ 367. 1. The Suffix. Since both the Aryan forms in -bhjas and the Latin in -bus are used for dative and ablative alike, we must suppose that this twofold function is as old as the parent language. Then the use of the genitive plural with ablative sense in Greek and Balto-Slavonic is a later development, due to the use of the singular genitive in -es -os -s with this sense, which was also proethnically. We need hardly find a difficulty in the initial of the dative plural suffix in Balto-Slavonic, which is m- and not bh- (Lith. -mus O.C.Sl. -mū). As the bh- suffix had both meanings, we may fairly infer the same of the m-suffix.

The endings which have to be compared in order to restore the Indo-Germanic suffix are the following: Skr. -bhyaśas (-bhyaśas frequently in Vedic) Avest. -byā = pr. Ar. *-bhijas (*-bijas); Lat. -bos -bus Osc. -fs -ss Umbr. -s = pr. Ital. *-fōs *-bhos; 1) Gall. -bo; 2) O.Lith. -mus, modern -ms, Pruss. -maus -mas, O.C.Sl. -mi. On the variation between -bh- and -ms- see §274 pp. 175 f. We have no right to assume that the i which follows the initial of the suffix in Aryan has been dropped in the other languages, and to derive (say) Ital. *-fōs from *-fjōs. Whence comes the i of -bhyaśas, or of -bhya -bhyaṃ -bhyaṃ, is an obscure point.

Gall. -bo is related to Lat. -bo-s as Skr. -bhya (tu-bhya 'tibi') to -bhya-s, and as instr. *-bhi (sing. and pl. in Greek. elsewhere only sing., §274 p. 175, §281 pp. 186 f.) to Skr. -bhi-ś. This suggests the question whether the wide-spread Lith. -m found along with -mus, and Lett. -m (e.g. Lith. raško-m Lett. rākā-m beside Lith. raško-mus -ms) does not represent a form *-mo without s, like Gall. -bo. 3) This view seems to be supported by an instr. pl. -mi instead of -mis, found in the Godlewa district of Lithuanian and in Lettic folk-songs (e.g. Godl. nakti-mi = nakti-mis, Lett. kājā-mi = Lith. kājo-mis); see §379. Then again the -m of the Germ. "dative" plural has to be considered. It is conceivable that O.W.Germ. -ms and Norse -mr (§379) represent an instr. suffix *-mis; only it must perhaps be granted that *-ms sometimes came

1) It should be mentioned that the Umbr.-Osc. ending might without irregularity be derived from *-fōs = Skr. -biṣ (instr. pl.).

2) Only found in one inscription, which is wrongly denied to be Keltic by d’Arbois de Jubainville (Rev. Celt. XI 249). — We are not justified in seeing this Gall. -bo in O.Ir. na-b, as Windisch does (Paul-Braume’s Beitr. IV 221). In this there has doubtless been merely loss of the palatal sound, first taking place before non-palatals, as dīnab yēbolīb. (Thurneysen.)

3) In Lit. Volks. und Märch., pp. 297 f., I explained raškom, with Brückner, as the dual form used in the plural. This is unquestionably possible; compare the Russian instr. dual in -ma with plural meaning (Vetter, Zur Gesch. der nom. Decl. im Russ., 50 f.).
from a dative in *-mos. But no one has proved the existence of any sound-law by which the -m of all Germanic dialects — even in O.Icel. we find e.g. *pri-m beside *pri-mr 'tribus', and others — could be derived from *-mz (there is no manner of need to derive the Goth. 1st. pl. *batra-m from *-mz). I therefore conjecture that Germanic, like Baltic, inherited from the parent speech a plural *-mi (ep. sing. O.H.G. *zi houbiutan A.S. *de-w-m § 282 p. 188), and perhaps *-mo as well. It follows that the pluralising of bh- and m-suffixes by adding -s was not complete in the parent language.

Remark. It is perhaps allowable to analyse Pruss. -mans into *-mōs + s (*-mōs beside *-mo like Skr. bhyum : bhyas, Gr. ἄπας : ἅπα), notwithstanding, amnis 'people' gimsenin 'birth', on the strength of mensē mensō 'flesh, meat'. This word answers to Goth. mīms-, and there is no reason to suppose that it was a Slavonic loan-word (męso); doubtless in mensē mensō m became n by dissimilation, and the same process might change *-mans to -mans. *-mōs might be compared with O.C.Sl. -mī. But doubts are suggested by Lith. -mus -mūs, which cannot be derived from *-mans (on the acc. Lith. dēkūs: Pruss. deivein see § 326 p. 227); and the question arises whether -mos in Prussian (e.g. nom.-mas 'nobis') were not the older form. Pruss. -mas and Lith. -mus might be connected with original *-mōs, and -mans may really be due to association with the acc. pl. in -ans. Lith. -mus, with O.C.Sl. -mī, may however be derived from Idg. *-mūs. Ergo, non liquet. Compare further Osthoff, Morph. Unt. II 31 f.; Leskien, Ber. der sächs. Ges. der Wiss., 1884, pp. 101 f.

Armenian has -c, as in the gen. and loc., see § 344 p. 245. In Greek the form ceased to be used at all; its dative meaning was expressed by the locative and instrumental, and its ablative meaning, as already stated, by the genitive. Old Irish dropped it in favour of the instrumental.

2. Form of the Stem. This was weak, right down from the proto-Indo-Germanic period, in consonant stems which admitted of gradation, as *poter- 'pater'.

Aryan often shows the nom. sing. form where the stem should be, as Skr. māndo-bhyas Avest. manē-byō. See on this point § 356 pp. 259 f.

In Latin and Oscan consonant stems show the i-stem ending, as Lat. mātr-ibus ferent-ibus like ori-bus tri-bus.
Osr. lig-is 'legibus'. But Umbr. -us in fratrus uset-us etc. seems to have been taken from u-stems (beru-s 'verub a').

As regards the stem in Germanic see § 379.2.

In Balto-Slavonic the i-stem ending has become the regular one, as it did in the other m-cases and in the locative plural; e.g. Lith. akmen-i-ms O.C.Sl. kamen-i-mu. But we still find O.Slav. poljamu = *poljam-i-mu, see § 356 p. 260.


Latin forms in -ibus from o-stems, as amīcibus suibus (see Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundr. pp. 126 f.) are later re-formates instead of the forms in -is (§ 380). But the pronouns tē-bus ‘eis’ (cp. Skr. ṇ-bhyas), variant tī-bus (i-stem like quit-bus), and hī-bus ‘his’, may be regarded as proethnic.

Remark. In O.C.Sl., jo-stems show not only -je-mu but -tun -ji-mu, as zulotzi-mu, and similarly instr. sing. zulotzi-mu dat. instr. dual -ji-mu. We may regard i (after sonants -i-) as the weak grade of the suffix -jo- (cp. O.H.G. hirti-m § 380), the i of ylagoljistmi as taken from the other cases, and occasional forms like stražije (nom. pl.) ‘watchers’ as later re-formates on the lines of the i-declension. Thus -dje-mu: -djemu Lith. ga'idiδ-mu (ga'idiδ-s 'cock') = O.H.G. hirti: Goth. hirdja. This would make it easier to see why so many masc. neut. consonant stems became jo-stems in Balto-Slavonic; for example, part. gen. Lith. vežančejo O.C.Sl. reža 'vehentis', O.C.Sl. datelji 'dator'. That is to say, if there was an -i- in the m-cases of jo-stems in pr.Balt.-Slav., their ending was the same as that of consonant stems, which already formed these cases after the model of stems in -i- (§ 402); it was easy enough, for example, to form cases from *yekont-i-jo when there was a form *yekont-i-m-. Another point remains to be investigated. What was the cause of the very common transfer of i-stems to the jo-class in older Lithuanian (as kryš-ti-s II § 100 p. 306): may not forms analogous to O.H.G. hirti: have helped the change, and not merely the similar ending of the nom. acc. singular?

§ 369. 2. a-stems. Pr. Idg. *ekma-bh- (-m-). Skr. āsva-bhyas, Avest. haemā-bhyā. Lat. equā-bus; -ā-bus was more widely spread in the oldest Latin (e. g. manībus dextrābus),
but used later only to distinguish genders (as *filiis and *filiābus), and in the re-formates duibus ambābus (plural suffix instead of dual). Gall. *avamavaδο, used attributively with ματρίδο 'matribus'. (Goth. *gībo-*m O.H.G. gebō-*m, see § 367 pp. 267 f., § 381). Lith. raško-*mus -ms, O.C.Sl. ražka-mi.

§ 370. 3. *-je-stems (cp. p. 68, footnote). Pr.Idg. *bhigdyti-*bh- (-m-). Skr. bhrati-bhyan, Avest. barenti-byō. (O.H.G. digi-m 'to prayers', see § 367 pp. 267 f. and § 382). With -je- instead of -i-: Lat. faciē-bus, Umbr. iovies for *iē-fs beside the acc. pl. iovī(f) § 328 p. 229. So also Lith. kėmė-mus -ms, O.C.Sl. zemlja-mi; but others have jā-flexion (cp. footnote on p. 68), Lith. vėžanczio-ms, O.C.Sl. vėžašta-mi.

§ 371. 4. i-stems. Pr.Idg. *owī-bh- (-m-). Skr. āvī-bhyan, Avest. ašī-byō. Lat. tri-bus ovi-bus turri-bus; Umbr. tris 'tribus' avis aves aestiv 'avibus', Osc. luisari-fs (Bücheler, Rhein. Mus. XLIV 328), cp. teremn-iss 'terminibus' § 373; the vowel of the last syllable was long in Umbrian; would this be "compensatory lengthening", or the analogy of the accusative plural? (Goth. anṣti-m O.H.G. enstī-m, see § 367 pp. 267 f., § 383). Lith. nakti-mus -i-ms, O.C.Sl. noštī-mi.

§ 372. 5. u-stems. Pr.Idg. *sunu-bh- (-m-). Skr. sūnī-bhyan, Avest. bāsu-byō. Lat. manu-bus mani-bus laci-bus, see I § 49 pp. 41 f. and Bücheler-Windekilde pp. 124 f.; Umbr. beru-s "verubus". (Goth. sunu-m, see § 367 pp. 267 f., § 383). Lithf. sunu-mus -u-ms, O.C.Sl. synomi for *syni-mi, which by some chance is never found, nor is *syni-mi (§ 282 p. 189).

§ 373. 6. u-stems. Pr.Idg. *k(u)wē-bh- (-m-), possibly assimilated *k(u)wēn-bh-, see I § 222 p. 190. Skr. śvā-bhyan āśma-bhyan, Avest. dāma-byō and draomē-byō (draoman- 'assault, onset') with -ē- from the es-stems (manē-byō, § 376) by reason of the identical loc. ending in the two classes (dāmohu = *dāmahu like manahu, § 361 p. 263). Lat. homin-i-bus Osc. teremn-i-ss 'terminibus', but Umbr. karn-u-s
'carnibus', homon-*us 'hominibus', see § 367, p. 268. Lith. sun-i-mus akmen-i-mus -i-ums, O.C.Sl. kamen-i-mü following i-flexion, but O.C.Sl. keeps *poljamit for *poljān-
-mā (I § 219 pp. 185 f.), see § 367 p. 269.

§ 374. r-stems. Pr. Idg. *mātṝ-bh- *dātṝ-bh-
(-m-). Skr. māṭy-bhyaś dāṭy-bhyaś, Avest. māṭer'-byō dāṭer'-byō. Lat. mātr-i-bus datōr-i-bus, Umbr. fratr-u-s fratr-u-s 'fratribus' ner-u-s 'proceribus'. Gall. mātre-bo (mātrəbo) 'matri-
bus'; it is not certain whether *re- = Idg. *ṛ- (-re- instead of O.Kelt. -ri- I § 298 p. 236, as in vergo-brētu-s beside O.Ir. breth f. 'sentence, judgement' = Idg. *bhṛ-tā), or if the word once was *mātr-i-bo, and has changed to mātrebo under the influence of i-stems; cp. O.Ir. instr. māthrēb māthrib § 385. (Goth. brōfru-m, O.I.H.G. muoterum, see § 367 pp. 267 f., § 385). Lith. motor-i-mus -i-ums O.C.Sl. mater-i-mū, following the i-class.

§ 375. 8. Stems ending in an Explosive.

Pr. Idg. *bhṛghyd-dh- (-nt-m-), from the stem *bhṛghouth-Skr. bhṛṣid-bhyaś; Avest. ber'zad-byō, ber'zaubyō 'with sub-
stitution of the strong stem, and ber'zaopyō with the nom.
acc. sing. in place of the stem (§ 356 p. 259). Lat. ferent-
i-bus, Umbr. anēt-u-s 'agentibus', see § 367 p. 268. (Goth. friōnd-a-m tunp-u-m etc., see § 386.) Lith. vešantē-ms (pro-
nominal ending), O.C.Sl. vezqšte-mū like a 1o-stem; Lith.
dant-i-ms 'dantibus', O.C.Sl. telčt-i-mū (see § 244 pp. 142 f.).

Skr. Vṛd. nāḍbhyas for *nabād-bhyaś from nāpāt-
'descendant', cp. Avest. loc. nafšu § 363 p. 264. (Goth. tigum
'decadibus' for pr. Germ. *tezun(d)-m-, see § 388).


Skr. vāg-bhyaś 'vocibus', Avest. vāyēbyō from a base not
found elsewhere, vāc(a)h-, or it may contain the nom. vāxē
instead of the stem (§ 356 p. 259), Lat. vōc-i-bus following the
i-declension. Skr. viḍ-bhyaś Avest. viḍi-byō pr. Ar. *uṣ-bhyas
from viś- uṣ- 'clan, village community' (I § 404 p. 299), but
contrariwise Skr. dig-bhyaś (stem dīṣ- 'direction') instead of

*dīdhyas follows dīkṣā and dīk (§ 356 p. 259). Lat. lēg-i-bus Ose. lēg-i-s 'legibus' following the i-class.

Skr. aḍbhyaś Avest. aieycō from the stem ap- 'water', see I § 328 p. 265.


Skr. suḍḍbhyaś Avest. hūḍābyō (stem su-dās- hū-dāh- 'giving richly'), instead of *suḍḍabh- *hūḍāzb-, following the nom. suḍḍ hūḍā (§ 356 p. 259). But there are some regular forms, as Ved. māḍbhyaś (later māḥbhyaś) from māṣ 'mensis', and uṣḍḍbhyaś (later uṣḍḍbhyaś) from uṣās- 'dawn'. Lat. menē-i-bus, cp. O.Ir. mēs-i-b § 387.

Skr. haviṛ-bhyas instead of *havidiḥbhyaś (cp. viprūḍbhyaś from vipruṣ- 'drop, crumb') following the nom. haviṛ 'libation'; but Avest. snaiṛiḥ-byō is regular (inferred from snaiṛiḥ-byu § 304 p. 204).

Comparative. Pr. Idg. *ōkiz-bh- (-is-m-). Skr. aśiyo-bhyas like māṇō-bhyas. Lat. ściör-i-bus like an i-stem. O.C.Sl. slaščīše-mū like a įo-stem.


Lat. mār-i-bus and O.C.Sl. myšt-mū declined in the i-class, pr. Idg. *māz-bh- *mās-m-.

§ 377. 10. i- -ī- and ą- -u-stems, and stems in ṭ, ṭh, ṣ.

Pr. Idg. -i-bh- -a-bh-, -i-m- -a-m-. Skr. dhī-bhyas uṣṭi-bhyas, bhūṛ-bhyas śvaṛū-bhyas. Lat. sū-bus, also sū-bus, doubtless because of sūt-ī etc. (cp. Gr. ἕκτον § 365 pp. 265 f.)
and su-i-bus. (O.Icel. sæ-m, see § 388.) Lith. šuv-l-m In.CSl. krūv-l-mū in the i-class, but svekrūva-mū in the a-class (cp. svekrūva-chū § 365 p. 266).

Skr. gīr-bhyās, pār-bhyās, gō-śa-bhyās (the last not actually found) for *gr-bh- etc., like nom. sing. gīr etc., see § 197 p. 76.


Instrumental Plural.¹)

§ 379. 1. The Suffix. Stems in -o- had for their ending -ōs, which may perhaps be analysed -o-ā-ōs (I § 150 p. 136); on O.CSl. -y see § 380. The other classes show the following endings: Skr. -bhīṣ Avest. -bīṣ O.Pers. -bīṣ = pr. Ar. *-bhiṣ; Armen. -bE -rE (which Buge conjectures to be *-bhis-y, as he supposes -E in the nom. pl. to be *-(e)s-y, see § 313 p. 212); Gr. -qī -qēν; O.Ir. -b = pr.Kelt. *-bis (-i- has left its mark in the palatal vowel of the preceding syllable, and -s in the usual absence of any spirant as the initial of the following word, see I § 576 p. 432, § 658.1 p. 510; Windisch, Paul-Brauno’s Beitr. IV 221); Germ. *-mīz (O.Icel. -mr, as pri-mr § 383, O.West-Germ. Vaiwī-ms § 382) and *-mī; Lith. -mīc dial. -mī, O.CSl. -mī. Lith. dial. pl. -mī beside sing. -m (see the Author, Lit. Volksl. und Märch., p. 297) and Lett. -mī (§ 367 pp. 267 f.) point to *-mī; similarly, Lett. wītā-mīs ‘here and there’ from wītā ‘place’ (Bielenstein, Die lett. Spr., II 34) doubtless points to *-mīs.²) Consequently

¹) Compare the footnotes on pp. 173, 236, and 266.

²) The area over which the Lith. pl. -mī extends has yet to be determined. It seems to be as early as Breton, in the form annumī, see Bezzenberger Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr., 149. The ending cannot be the same as the sing. -mī, because the sing. suffix always wîpearas -n in Godewa. It is not probable that -mī and the Lett. pl. -mī have lost -s through being used before spirants, and that the forms thus produced became the only ones. Lett. -mī, if Lettic alone be taken into account, might as a last resort be regarded as the singular form; compare obīs vāle ‘with both hands’, in Bielenstein II 23, also singular in form. But it may not be separated from the Lith. pl. -mī. Lastly, as to the

Brugmann, Elemaetz. III.
Lith. *-mis will represent an older *-mēs, and O.C.Sl. *-mi an older *-mē or *-mis. It follows that we may regard as proethmic *-bhi(s) and *-mi(s), perhaps also the same forms with a long -i, *-bhi(s) *-mē(s). If -mi and -mē were both proethmic, the different quantity has been turned to account in Baltic, and possibly in Slavonic (that is, if -mi never had an -s) to distinguish singular and plural. On the whole question compare § 367 pp. 267 f.

The Avesta contains plural instrumentals in -īs from consonant stems, as nāmēn-īs aśaon-īs savarhat-īs (savarhat- 'useful'), which, like the instr. in -dīs and sporadically those in -bīs, are used sometimes as nom. acc. neuter. No trustworthy evidence of these forms has been found in other languages; Bartholomae’s comparison of Gr. ἄγω ἄλαγος ἀρομάτος is very dubious; compare further Curtius Grundr. § 650, and Strachan in Bezz. Beitr. XIV 176. So long as this is the case, and their extended use has not been explained, we must hesitate to regard them as being original instrumental forms, tempting though it may be to suppose that this -īs is related to the ending -ōs = -o+*a-īs as the abl. -d of Skr. ma-d to -ōd = -o+*a-ī (§ 240 pp. 133 f.). See Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XV 16 f., Stud. zur idg. Spr., 1 75 f. Perhaps Bartholomae’s comparison of the instrumental sing. nāmēn-ī takes us a step further. For this suggests the obvious conjecture that nāmēn-īs nāmēn-ī (ē = Ar. a) are instead of *nāma-mēs *nāma-mī (cp. Skr. sanē-mi § 282 pp. 187 f., and also O.Ir. amnimm § 281 p. 186); when the m-suffixes were in course of dying out, m might easily be replaced by n taken from the other cases, and then nāmēnīs might be regarded as containing a suffix -īs.

2. Form of the Stem. The remarks made in § 367.2 (pp. 268 f. above) apply here.

quantity of i in Lett. -mi -mīs, the Lith. pl. *-mi = *-mi and O.C.Sl. *-mi support the view that the vowel was once long, and gives no countenance to a supposed exception to regular rule, whereby original short i should be kept in popular poetry against the recognised laws affecting final syllables.
In Old Irish the consonant-stem ending -ib was borrowed by some of the i-stems and some of those in -o- or -ã-. The forms were related to mnaib just as Lat. homin-i-bus mātr-i-bus etc. to equa-bus.

Germanic. The suffix of consonant stems was *-mi(s), not *-ymi(s) or *-omy(s) as assumed by Kluge and others; which we are doubtless to infer from tignum for *teγmud-mi = Skr. daśād-bhiṣ (§ 386).1) The -um of (goth. A.S. O.Sax. fēt-um, Goth. mēnōp-um etc. arose from A.S. earnum (§ 384), Goth. brōbrum (§ 385), sunum (§ 383); and the spread of this -um, along with the -a-m of o-stems (Goth. frijōnd-am reik-am) and the -i-m of i-stems (Goth. baurgy-im) was due to the same desire after uniformity of stem which produced qerōvε-εσει -ατ to take the place of qerōvε (§ 360 p. 262). -am was naturally suggested by the analogy of the gen. pl.: e.g. frijōndē: rulfē.


1) The comparison of tignum with Skr. daśād-bhiṣ, which has lately found another champion in J. Schmidt (Urheimath der Indog., pp. 25 f.), is not to my mind convincing; for *deśu was an adjective and not an abstract substantive. Schmidt cites a passage from a Lithuanian tale, in which he translates lex trijus deγuṣiā stukčiā 'of three nines of pieces', and says the phrase illustrates the transition from the adj. 'ten' to the subst. 'ten'. This is not to be admitted, because the expression is something quite strange to Lithuanian; and the context, which refers to a superstitious belief, should first itself have been explained. Schmidt scores a point against us in remarking that no Germanic i-stem has lost this explosive in the dat.-instr. pl. as I assume. This is true enough: but neither is there any other form in -um from a nasal stem which Schmidt can place by the side of his tignum = daśād-bhiṣ. From this, then, no conclusion can be drawn which could be decisive for one or other of these two explanations. My view has the support of Kluge (Paul's Grundr., I 404).

An isolated form is seen in O.C.Sl. vlūky, kraji (kraji 'border') with -jē for *-jy (I § 60 p. 47). The same ending occurs with consonant stems, but only in the neuter, as inmen-y § 384; which suggests a conjecture that in o-stems also it was originally peculiar to the neuter. We are still in the dark as to the origin of this -y. So far as we can tell from the Slavonic sound-laws discovered thus far, it cannot be compared with the Idg. ending *-ōjs, notwithstanding W. Schulze's paper in Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 421, and the new discussion of Wiedemann, Das litau. Pract., p. 47. We may conjecture that *-ōjs would become first *-ōjē and then an -ē or -i.

Remark. I should like to throw out the question whether the adverbial ending -y, as in maly 'little', is the *-a of the acc. pl. of n-stems (§ 339 p. 259), so that maly originally meant 'pauesa'. If such adverbs as this became equivalent in use to those in -mi (cp. Miklosich, IV 712), -y might come to be added to the instr. pl. It would then have crept into the regular case-system just as the adv. ending *-tos did in Sanskrit and Armenian (§ 24 f., pp. 141 f.). If *-ōjē finally became *-ē or *-i, a desire to differentiate once again cases which had run together in form may have caused -y to become the regular ending.
§ 381. 2. a-stems. Pr. ldg. *ekya-bhīṣ (mī) (-mī). Skr.钻a-bhīṣ, Avest. haṇa-bhīṣ. (Gr. ἀγκρήτης and so forth only in the singular.) O.Ir. muṇīb tvaith-ib. Goth. gībō-m, O.N.G. gebo-m. Lith. raikos-mis dial. -mi, O.C.Sl. raika-mi.

Gr. χειροκτόνος, Lat. mǐnis Umbr. anseriates asceriater 'observatis' Osc. Diumapais ('nymphis') are re-formates on the model of -ois, the o-stem ending.

§ 382. 3. i- jī-stems (cp. footnote to page 68). Pr. ldg. *bhīgyhūtī-bhīṣ (-mī). Skr. bhūti-bhīṣ, Avest. barenti-bhīṣ. O.Ir. insib. O.West-Germ. insib. Vates-mis Asti-mis beside the Latinised forms Vatic-ibus Alsi-ibus in the period shortly after the commencement of our era (Much, Zeitscr. für deutsch. Alt. XXXI 354 sl.); perhaps examples may be found in some of the O.N.G. i-abstracts, such as digī-m 'to prayers', cp. the gen. pl. § 347 p. 249. With -jī-: Lith. žemė-mis dial. -mi, O.C.Sl. zemļā-mi.

Gr. γεγορῶς, Goth. frijamjō-m O.H.G. kuninginnō-m. Lith. kežanrozio-mis -mi O.C.Sl. režąsta-mi as if a-stems (cp. footnote on page 68).

§ 383. 4. i- and u-stems.


Remark. In Irish we are struck with the almost universal 'breaking' or 'infection' of the vowel of the stem, as fēdaib mögaib; since *sidu-bhīṣ would have become fiduīb fidūb or something of that kind. Breaking has been caused either by the influence of o-stems or by a coincidence of *-a and *-o in unaccented syllables.

§ 384. 5. u-stems. Pr. ldg. *k(u)myu-bhīṣ (mī) or *k(u)myu-bhīṣ (mī) I § 222 p. 190 (-mī). Skr. śu-bhīṣ uśma-bhīṣ.
Avest. dāma-biš, dāmen-biš like draome-byō § 373 p. 270.
Armen. akam-bk. Gr. xorulθdov-ō-qt instead of *xorulθdo-qt
*xorulθda-qt like μεν-σι, instead of μεν-α *μεν-α (§ 361 p. 263). O.Ir. con-ib, fidu-ib (fidu ‘witness’), toimien-ib, see § 379 p. 275. A.S. oxnum O.Icel. yxnum (‘oxen’) A.S. earnum O.Icel. qrunum (‘eagles’) O.Icel. bjørnum (‘bears’): here -u- was borrowed from the gen. pl. and acc. pl., but -um came from -ym- (earlier -ym-), cp. § 332 p. 233; thus the principle is the same as gave rise to Gr. ἄριστος, earlier *āroa-
-us (§ 361 p. 263). This shows that there once was in Germanic an instr. in -uni from a nom. in -an-iz, like Armen. akam-bk anjam-bk from akun-k anjin-k, Gr. qou-oi from φεῖνες and so forth. Lith. szū-ims akmen-ims dial. -mi, O.C.Sl. kamen-į-mi as though an i-stem, O.Slav. polia-mi like polja-
-mi § 373 p. 271; O.C.Sl. neut. imen-y like igy § 380 p. 276.
Germanic. Goth. gunam = *guman-mi, like tuggōm manageim O.H.G. sungōm menigōn for *-ón-mi *-in-mi; O.H.G. gomōn a re-formate like gomōno § 350 p. 252. The old ending is seen varied in another way in Goth. aithsnam (‘oxen’) abnān (‘men’), neut. vatnam (nom. acc. vatna), cp. gen. aihsně : vulfs; similarly frijōndam because of frijōndō, see § 379 p. 275.

§ 385. 6. r-stems. Pr. ldg. *matr-bhī(s) *dātr-bhī(s)
(-mī(s)). Skr. māṭ-bhiṣ dāṭ-bhiṣ, Avest. māter-biṣ dater-biṣ (inferred from the dat. plural). Armen. mar-bk dater-bk. O.Ir. máthri-ib mahthrīb is just as ambiguous as Gall. μάρθεζο, see § 374 p. 271. Goth. brōprum, O.H.G. muoterum. Lith. moter-i-ims -mi, O.C.Sl. mater-i-mi following the i-class.

§ 386. 7. Stems ending in an Explosive.
Pr. ldg. *bhṛgḥyad-bhī(s) (-y-mī(s)). Skr. brhād-bhiṣ; Avest. berzad-biṣ, with strong stem berzandbiṣ, and with the nom. acc. sing. neut. form in place of the stem berzāp-biṣ (§ 356 pp. 250 f.). O.Ir. cairti-b, see § 379 p. 275. Goth. frijōndum O.H.G. friunt-un, Goth. tunp-un A.S. tōd-un O.Icel. tómn-un (cp. Skr. dad-bhiṣ, Lith. dant-i-ims -i-mi), see § 379 p. 275.
Lith. *vešancei* (O.C.Sl. vesqšti as through *jo*-stems; O.C.Sl. telq-y (telq u. 'call', see § 244 pp. 142 f.) like *įgy* § 380 p. 276.


Skr. vāy-bhiś from vāc- 'voc'. As to Skr. viḍbhiś -rāḍbhiś and digbhiś, see § 375 p. 271. Avest. māx-biś (māx-'great') instead of *maž-biś following the dat. sing. maz-ōi etc. Besides Avest. viś-byō Skr. viḍ-bhiś we find O.Pers. riṇibiś (as we should read, not viṇaibīś), but we know too little of the language to pronounce upon it. Goth. reikam, but baūrg-im, see § 379 p. 275.

Skr. adbhīś from ap- 'water' like adbhūs § 375 p. 272.

§ 387. 8. s-stems. Pr. Idg. *menek*-bhiś(s) (-es-miš(s)).


---

1) There never was a form paḍbhiś from pad-, see Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. XV 3 ff.
A.S. O.Icel. mís-un O.C.Sl. myši-mi from *mús- 'mouse', see § 376 p. 272, § 379 p. 275.

§ 388. 9. Į- ī- and u- un-stems, stems in -f, -l, -ū.

Skr. dhū-bhiṣ núdī-bhiṣ bhrū-bhiṣ śvaśrū-bhiṣ. (Gr. sing. l-φ.) O.Icel. sū-m (sows). Lith. šūv-i-mis dial. -mi, O.C.Sl. krūr-i-mi after the system of i-stems, but svekrūv-a-mi like a stem in -a- (cp. svekrūv-a-chū § 365 p. 266). Compare § 377 pp. 272 f.

Skr. gūr-bhiṣ, pūr-bhiṣ, gō-ša-bhiṣ (the last not found), for *gūr-bh- etc., like the nom. sing. gūr etc., see § 197 p. 74.


The Influence of Analogy as seen in the Transformation of whole Case-Systems in the separate languages (Metaplastic series).

§ 390. In the foregoing paragraphs (§§ 190 to 389) the history of each single case has been traced through the separate languages of our group; and in so doing we have often come across cases, or even whole systems of cases, which have been affected by metaplasm. But it was impossible to present a sufficiently wide survey of such forms when they were not single cases, but groups; and a large number of them have not been mentioned at all. Our next task then is to collect and supplement these examples. Still, we must give up the idea of giving a complete list; mention will be made only of what is remarkable or characteristic.

Remark 1. A more exhaustive study would show, particularly if it dealt with later or quite modern periods, how often similar

1) Compare, for example, Torp, die Flexion des Pali, Christiania 1881; Vetter, Zur Gesch. der nomin. Decl. im Russ., Lpz. 1883; Baudouin
causes have produced exactly the same effects in different languages for example, the disuse of the consonant flexion and the adoption of vowel flexion instead. It is true always, as it is true here, that where we can trace certain principles acting in later periods, we may use these as our guides in dealing with prehistoric times.

Remark 2. The mutations of form which we are now to discuss arose chiefly from proportional analogy; that is, the likeness of two forms of a form-system caused others, hitherto unlike, to be assimilated to each other. To suppose (as certain scholars do) that all arose in this way, and could arise in no other, is wrong: one out of many proofs that this is a mistake is Ar. napāt- 'descendant', which takes the flexion of kinship names such as bhṛtār- 'brother', e.g. Skr. nāpiṅ- bhyas beside nā(h)ā-bhyas, Avest. napāt-ram beside napāt-ram: the two case-groups had had no point of contact before this assimilation took place. Compare the general remarks on the principles involved, by the Author, Liter. Centrallbl. 1880 p. 944; Paul, Principia 95; Wackernagel, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXV 289 f.; Wheeler, Analysis (Ithaca, N. Y. 1887) pp. 9 ff.; Bartholomae, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIX 524 ff.; Michels, Zum Wechsel des Nominalgeschlechts, I (1889) pp. 10 f.; Bojunga, Die Entwicklung der nhd. Substantivflexion, pp. 1 ff.

Lastly, we shall give a few systems of declension for which no certain connexion has been proved with any Indo-Germanic case-system.

§ 391. I. In proethnic Aryan sprang up a new type of inflexion, in which weak and strong cases of āra- stems, with the suffix -in-, were united into one case-group with cases from i-stems, the latter dropping those of their weak cases which had a formative suffix beginning in a consonant, and the nom. acc. sing. neuter. The model for these groups was found in such as vártman-ē: vártma-bhyas vártma. Non-neuter stems then evolved a nom. sing. in -ē on the model of áśmā. Compare Skr. arci- 'shining, beaming': arci- arci- arci-am arci-ē arci-bhyas, Avest. kainēn- 'girl': kainē kainēn-em kainēn-ē kainē-byē, O.Pers. vihēn- 'belonging to a clan, native': vihē-biē; the nom. acc. sing. neut. in -ē is not actually found in Iranian. In Sanskrit, nom. acc. pl. neut. arci-ī, following vártmani, was added to the list. The pr. Ar. nom. sing. in -iā -iēā is

perhaps preserved in Skr. *kanyā (kanyā) Avest. kaine (-e = -ya) 'girl, maiden', which kept its a-flexion because it was feminine (cp. below, Skr. yōḍā and the like). Compare II § 115 pp. 357 ff.; Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 210 ff.; Zubaty, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXXI 51 f.

In the same period began the transfer of consonant stems to the o-class, caused by both having the same onlind in the acc. sing. (-am), gen. pl. (-am), and possibly the instr. sing. and the nom. acc. dual (-a and -au -a § 280 p. 184, § 289 p. 196); this went still further in Avestic. Examples: Skr. pāda-a-s pādas Avest. pādar-iba beside the acc. pād-am pād-em 'pedem', Skr. Ved. pāṣaṇ-a-s beside acc. pāṣaṇ-am (the name of a god), dānt-a-s beside acc. dānt-am 'tooth', āśnaiṣ beside instr. sing. āśn-a, stem āśan- 'stone', Avest. ātaraiṣ beside acc. ātar-em 'fire'. More examples from the Avesta are given by Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I 94 f., and in his Handbuch, pp. 100 f. In India, this process made great strides in the popular dialects, and had a great deal to do with the loss of consonant declensions in this group; see Lassen, Inst. Ling. Praec., pp. 314 ff.; E. Kuhn, Beitr. zur Pali Gr., pp. 67 ff.

Again, in Aryan were formed from *uṣās = Skr. uṣās 'dawn' (s-stem) the acc. sing. *uṣām = Skr. uṣām Avest. usam and acc. pl. *uṣās = Skr. uṣās Avest. uṣā, on the analogy of stems with a in the root (cp. e. g. Skr. sthā-m sthās). Similarly, we find Skr. jardm jardyai from jarás- 'age', and others. Compare further Skr. acc. yōḍām dual yōḍā from nom. yōḍa 'maiden', which is an n-stem (pl. yōḍan-as), following the stem āśna-; O.Pers. tauma- 'family' beside Avest. tauxmā-, and the like, II § 114 Rem. 1 p. 348, § 117 Rem. 2 p. 369; but conversely the Avest. nom. sing. sōpra-pā 'guardian of the land' (pr.Ar. -pās and -pā, I § 556.3 p. 411), because it had the same ending as the nom. sing. of n-stems, was the origin of the nom. pl. -pān-ō.

Similarly, vant-stems changed into van-stems (e. g. Skr. fḵ-vant- and fḵ-van- 'singing' Avest. ama-vant- and ama-van- 'powerful' (see Bartholomae Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIX 540 f.)
because the pr. Ar. nominative ending *-vás had a variant *-vā, a sentence-doublet. See § 198 pp. 78 f. Again, we have Ved. vidédu-as from nom. sing. vídevás vídevān 'knowing' because of a prehistoric *víded, a sentence doublet of *vídeds (§ 193 p. 73), and others of the same sort.

The pr. Ar. ending *-uš in the nom. sing. (§ 193 p. 73) drew some cases of the perf. part. act. over to the u-flexion; e.g. Skr. pérú-m from pérúš 'pressing through' jigyú-bhíš from jigyúdiš 'victorious', Avest. jagaurú-m from jagaurúš 'watchful'.

The Aryan napát- 'descendant' became gradually more and more completely assimilated in flexion to other names of kindred, such as bhrátar- 'brother', see § 390 Rem. 2; with this change compare Skr. gen. sing. pátyur 'of a husband' (páti-) jányur 'of a wife' (jáni-), following bhrátur mátur etc.

§ 392. In Sanskrit, i- iê-stems, u- úy-stems, and feminine i- and u-stems followed the track of i- iê-stems in some of their cases. Sing. gen. dhiyás nadiyás bhréas śvaśrúvds, dat. dhiyāi etc., loc. dhiyām etc.; and devás áyáí dêyām, dhēvás dhēnvāi dhēvām. See §§ 231—233, 249—250, 255, 266—268. The cause of these re-formations was that the instr. sing. had the same formation in these classes, as dhiyā 'áyā like deviá byhatyd (nom. devi byhatt). Compare further the acc. pl. ávēś dhēnvēś like byhatts (§§ 330—331) and the gen. pl. dhēnām bhrānām nadiṇām śvaśrūnam like byhatīndām -īnām (§ 354). Thus, by proportional analogy, fem. i- and u-stems kept in these cases a sign of their gender.

Remark. I give only the i- iê-stems as the model for this formation because I do not consider it has been proved that the pre-Aryan period possessed u- úy-stems made on the same lines. A different account is given by J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 54 ff.

§ 393. A large number of Sanskrit i-, u-, and r-stems inserted between stem and inflexion an -n-, which came from Indo-Germanic u-stems. The u-stems had brought about in proethnic Indo-Germanic a transformation of the gen. pl. of á-, o-, and i- iê-stems and of the nom. acc. pl. neuter of o-stems, which then spread to the i-, u-, and r-stems: 87
pr. Ar. -ānām and -īnām (ī-ā-stems), then -ānām (i-stems),
-ānām, Skr. -prām (§§ 345—349, 351); Skr. -āni -iṇī -āni
-ṇī, Avest. -ṇog (§§ 338—339, 341). Then again, Sanskrit
i- and u-stems along with their instr. sing. in -yā and -va
adopted another in -ina and -una, herein following the type
of forms from īen- and yen-stems, as the masc. neut. arcaña
neut. dyun-ā. This was all the more natural because from an
early period there had been some few pairs of stems, parallel
and having the same meaning, one in -ī- or -u- and one in
-īen- or -yen-; e.g. dyun- and dyun- (vāvan-). There was a
reason why the u-ending should gradually take the place of
-yā -va in the masculine and neuter instrumental (the
change is not complete in Vedic, where there is variation
still; see §§ 278—279 pp. 181 ff.). The reason was that -yā
and -va, viewed in connexion with forms like āyās -yāi
-āṃ dēvās -vāi -vām, was taken to belong to the feminine
(cp. § 392); and -ina -una were welcome as distinguishing
the masculine and neuter from them. The -u- spread still
further in the cases of the neuter, and here it included
r-stems, as sing. gen. abl. śucin-as cāru-as dhatu-as, dat.
śucin-i etc., loc. śucin-i etc., dual nom. acc. śucin-i etc., gen.
loc. śucin-oṣi etc.; this formation is the regular one for
i- and u-stems in classical Sanskrit. The reason for this
mutation of form is to be found in the nom. acc. singular
and plural: on noticing the parallelism of śuci cāru (dhatu)
śucinī cāruni (dhatuyi) and (e.g.) arcī arcinī, vārtma vārtmāni,
what more natural than to supplement instr. neut. śucinā
cārunā (dhatuyā) by the other cases enumerated, on the
analogy of arcin-as vārtman-as etc.? Thus in this instance
the u-flexion becomes a sign of the neuter. Compare J.
Hanusz, Über das allmäßige Umsichtigreifen der u-Declination
im Altindischen, Vienna 1885.

§ 304. II. Armenian. A characteristic of this language
is the disappearance of the special neuter case-forms and of
the feminine declensions (such as nn, gen. nnuo-y, 'daughter-
in-law" beside Skr. snaśā). How these losses came about is not clear; and no less obscure are many heteroclite forms, and mutations of stem running through whole case-systems: e. g.
(1) heteroclites: nom. ὄκρ 'little' gen. ὄκυ pl. nom. ὄκυς-ε; (2) Stems changed: ἀμίς 'month' ἑυ 'fire' are declined in the o-class, contrast Gr. μηρ(ν)- and πηρ.

§ 395. III. Greek. (1) In ἰ- ἰε-stems, ἰα- takes the place of ἰε- (ep. the footnote on p. 68), as gen. δης Ion. δης (nom. δηα), μης (nom. μηα) in contrast with Lith. dêvës; this change in later times went further, and caused the nom. acc. sing. to be assimilated to ἰα-stems, ἰαδφα instead of *ἰαφα etc. (II § 109 p. 333, III § 191 p. 69). (2) We see new paradigms like ὄνομα ὄνοματας etc., ἢπαρ ἢπαρας etc. (II § 82 p. 250, § 144 p. 350, § 116 pp. 364 f., § 117 p. 370, III § 244 p. 142); and a wider application of the r- and of the ἰ- and ἵ-flexion, the history of which is not yet fully cleared up, e. g. τιφατ- beside τιφας τεφάνων, γέλων- beside γέλας γελᾶσσαι (II § 134 p. 425) following ἅγνας -άν-ας, ἤφεα- beside ἤφας ἤφιαν, ἤφη-beside ἤφης ἤφι-ρ, ἤφη-beside ἤφης ἤφι-ρ. (3) In the comparative, ἰαν-cases find favour at the expense of those with ἰε-, as ἱδίον (II § 135 pp. 420 f.). (4) yes- and γε-cases are combined to make up the system of the perfect participle active (II § 136 pp. 439 f.; 443 f.). (5) In ἰαν-stems, the weak form -ίν- becomes the only one, as ἰηλχίν-, and there are new singular nominatives in -ίς and -ίν (II § 115 p. 359). (6) The declension λει -ονς instead of *λειονς, following φέρων -ονς, and the rest (II § 114 p. 350; compare III § 198 p. 78). (7) Cases from masc. es-stems are made like α-stem cases, and vice versa, — due to the nom. sing. (-ες : -άς): as Att. Νικατίην -νικαίν (Νικατίς), Lesb. Ἐρεμότης -η -ην -ε (Ἐρεμοτής), like Ὀθεάς etc.; and for the opposite process Att. Στρενάδους Στρεπαδες (Στρεπαδάς), Ion. διπότει (διποτάς) (see § 209 p. 82; § 220 p. 97, § 229 pp. 115 f., § 237 pp. 128 f.); and the Lesb. Bocot. Dor. feminines in -ω -π -φ (Ἀτω) take the inflexion -ω -π -φ -ω under the influence of the same
a-flexion (-ā -āς -ā -āv). (8) μέγας and μεγάννι beside the neut. μέγα (whether this be from *megā or *megān), following ἰδων-σ ἰδων-ν: ἰδων, ἰδων-σ ἰδων-ν: ἰδων.

The class of feminines in -ā -āi mentioned just above show very many varieties of flexion (voc. Ἀτροῆ, acc. Cret. Ἀτρεών). They are regarded by some as being originally ἰ-STEMS. Hitherto nothing has been found outside the Greek language with which they may be connected. Compare Danielsson, Om de grekiska substantiverna med nominativändelsen -ā, Upsala univ. årsskrift 1883; J. Schmidt, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 374 ff.

§ 396. IV. Italic. 1) A characteristic of this branch is the mixing and confusion of consonantal with ș-stems. This was caused by ancient doublet stems, as noct- nocti- civitati- civitati- (II § 102 pp. 308 ff.). Beginning in proethnic Italic, this confusion went on in Latin for centuries after the Christian era. Examples: i-stem forms are abl. sing. Lat. āir-īd bov-ī praesent-ī Umbr. peř-ī pers-ī 'pede' Osc. praesent-id 'praesente', dat. abl. pl. Lat. ferent-ibus Osc. lig-īs 'legibus', Lat. nom. ferent-ēs ferent-īa gen. ferent-iun, num. carn-i-s beside caro, juven-i-s, loc. Osc. Diūv-eī (ep. § 249 p. 151), gen. Osc. maatr-eīs Umbr. mattr-er 'matris'; while from consonant stems we have Lat. acc. ovem gen. ovīs abl. ovē beside nom. ovī-s, gen. opum vatum beside api-um vāti-um. See II § 93 p. 281, and III §§ 211 ff. under the separate cases. In Latin, abl. -ī gen. -iun nom. acc. -iā were most favoured by adjectives, but even in adjectives there was a good deal of irregularity. A clear résumé of the most important facts is given in the Latin Grammar of Schweizer-Sidler and Surber, 12 pp. 105 ff.

§ 397. Lat. vetus (acc. veter-em). An ATTRIUTE of mass. and fem. substantives, was originally a neuter substantive (II § 132 p. 417). A new explanation is given by Thurneyssen, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXX 485 f., but to my mind not convincing. Compare Venus (Venerem) 'f., originally neuter, 'charm of love'.

1) Åsbóth, Die Umwandlung der Themen im Lat., Gött. 1875.
There are a number of metaplastic forms which follow the es-stems; e.g. su-er-is su-er-e beside su-em, bow-er-um beside bow-em, lapid-er-um nuc-er-um and others, recalling ans-er- and the spread of -es- in Germanic (II § 132 pp. 419 ff.).

Remark 1. Perhaps the following is the explanation of ans-er-. There may have been in pr. Lat. both *hans- and *hunes- used together (op. II § 132 pp. 412 f., § 160 p. 485), and the acc. (h)anser-em may have been made through the influence of (say) a gen. *(h)ans-is and an acc. *(h)uner-em. -er- may easily have spread to other words before the declension of anser was fixed as we have it.

The endings -örum and -örum may have helped to make -er- a favourite suffix in the gen. plural, as it was (bocerum etc.).

The plurals spēr-ēs vīr-ēs (perhaps pre-Italic s-stems; see II § 134 p. 424; Kretschmer, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIX 170; J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 385) were coined for the sing. spēs eīs, because the plural nominatives which belonged to these, spēs eīs, need not be plural, as far as form went, and so often failed to convey a clear meaning (op. Osthoff, M. U. IV 238 f.). The heteroclite flexion was supported by flōs flōr-ēs (stem flōs-), and other like forms.

jēcur, jecinor-is instead of *jecin-is, iter, itiner-is instead of *itin-is. Compare II § 114 pp. 346 f., and p. 352.

No sufficiently clear explanation has yet been found of the origin of sēdēs -is, pūbēs -is (es-stem in the nom. sing.), as contrasted with Cerēs cer-īs, pūbēs -er-īs.

Remark 2. The accusatives plēbēm fāsum, ad-formates of aicem, should be noted; see § 220 p. 97. Further, if the Vedic genitives sūna ēkān have really lost a gen. suffix -a (see § 237 Rem. p. 128), the question must needs be asked — is the -is of gen. pūbis for *-ēa-? Lastly, it must be remembered that the word sēdēs apparently contaminates two stems, sēdēs- and sēdī- (the Author, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXIV 44, J. Schmidt, Plur. 148). Compare also Thurneysen, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXX 483; he opposes, and rightly, Schmidt’s hypothesis that -īōs comes from *-ēa-īōs, but he can hardly be right in his own conjecture that in proethnic Indo-Germanic es-stems had an acc. in -ēm which had grown up in the same way as *h(ī)ēm grew out of *h(ī)ēy in (see § 221 p. 98).

By degrees the whole σ-declension was absorbed into the o-declension; see § 232 p. 123.
§ 397. V. In Irish, bh- cases from consonant stems followed the analogy of the vowel inflexion in prehistoric times. much as happened in Italic (§ 367 pp. 268 f., § 396 p. 286). Compare § 302 p. 203, § 379.2 pp. 274 f. The original type is still preserved only in the instr. sing. anminn, in which it is indeed not certain whether the ending be *-my-bhi or *-my-mi (§ 281 p. 186). It is also uncertain how we are to regard Gall. dat. pl. märpe-bó (§ 374 p. 271).

Adjectival and substantival i-stems became separated, in as much as the gen. sing. of the adjectives took the form of o-stems; e. g. masc. neut. maith "boni" fem. maithe 'bonae', following mairb mairbe from marb 'dead'. Adjectival u-stems had a tendency to pass into the i-declension; their plural was declined in this fashion throughout, and the change was doubtless completed even in Old Irish. Just how it came about has yet to be investigated.

We saw that the "dative" cathir beside cathraig was doubtless due to the analogy of athir (§ 262 p. 164); but these guttural stems in their turn influenced the names of kindred, so that we find e. g. pl. nasal-athraig 'high fathers, patriarchs' instead of -athir.

§ 399. VI. In the pre-dialect period of Germanic, a new type of declension arose by the levelling of ien-stems down to the weak form -ín-; e. g. Goth. gamáin O.H.G. gimeinī 'community' (cp. Lat. commánid). The nom. sing. pr. Germ. *-in follows the model of *tunogōn. Compare II § 115 pp. 361 f.; Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 221 ff. This ien-class perhaps absorbed old iź-stems in West Germanic, by reason of their having some endings in common, e. g. the dat. digi-m gen. digino (see § 347 p. 249, § 382 p. 277) as compared with gimeinīm gimeinīno.

In the same period the i- iź-stems had not only cases with -i- (Goth. nom. sing. -i etc.), but doubtless cases with -iź- also. Gothic dropped these entirely, replacing them by forms with -iā-, as marī 'girl' máujois etc. like Gr. ἱδεῖα
§ 399. Metaplastic Systems of Declension.

łydač etc. (cp. footnote on p. 68). On the other hand, the łą-cases were sometimes kept in West Germanic; e.g. O.H.G. sing. acc. gen. kuniūgume -a pl. nom. acc. -ā, and it is only here that the old dat. instr. pl. in -i-m seems to survive. Compare the fluctuation between -łą- and -ā- in Latin, as intemperītēs -iem -iē, but gen. dat. sing. -iae, pl. -iae -iarum etc.

Root Nouns ending in a consonant, and nouns of more than one syllable ending in an explosive, have in all dialects their old consonantal flexion intermixed with o-, u-, or i-cases; as Goth. frijōnd-a-m beside nom. pl. frijōnd-s 'friends', A.S. O.Sax. fōt-u-m O.H.G. fūaz-u-m (and O.Sax. fōot-i-u O.H.G. fūaz-i-m) beside nom. pl. A.S. fēt O.H.G. foaz 'feet', Goth. baūrg-i-m beside nom. pl. baūrg-s 'fortresses, cities'. Sometimes words of this kind will be absorbed entirely into some vowel declension, as Goth. fōt-u-s, whose inflexion in the historic period cannot be in any way distinguished from that of sunu-s. A great many facts bearing on this point are collected by Kahle, Zur Entwickelung der consonantischen Declination, Berlin 1887. The point of contact with the o-class was the gen. pl., as Goth. frijōnd-ē O.H.G. friumt-o, and perhaps the acc. sing. (see § 219 pp. 96 f.), and in West Germanic the gen. sing. in -es as well; contact with the u-class took place in the acc. sing. and pl. in -u(n) -ums, as Goth. fōt-u fōl-ums. But the origin of i-cases which dated from the oldest period is doubtless to be sought in the fact that certain nouns had always shown double forms of the formative suffix, -i- and -t- (perhaps Goth. baūrgi- is also an original variant of baūrg-, cp. Gall. brigi- in Brigiani etc.); besides which, in later times different cases had come to possess the same ending as i-stems had for those cases; then came in O.H.G. the transfer of u-stems to the i-class, which did not except even those u-cases which were themselves due to analogy. The earliest change — as early as preothnic Germanic — was the transfer of nom. sing. and dat. instr. pl. of consonant stem into the vowel class, which was caused by a desire to restore the agreement of the stem with the other cases after it had become disguised by phonetic
change; compare, for example, Goth. frijond-s instead of *frijode, reik-s instead of *reiks, tuŋh-um instead of *tum for *tun(d)-mi *tumm(i) (ep. tigum ‘decadibus’ for *tecum(d)-mi, § 379 p. 275). The pr. Germ. re-formation of the instr. pl. in -um(i) on the analogy of -un (acc. sing.) and -uns (acc. pl.) was natural enough because r-stems had both -ru-m(i) (= r-mi) and -r-uns in their case-system. The systems of cases which were produced on the lines here indicated, which had consonant-cases and vowel-cases intermixed, sometimes reacted upon systems consisting wholly of vowel-cases and caused consonant-cases to appear amongst them: Goth. gen. pl. asti (stem ansti-) following baing-e naht-e, O.H.G. gen. dat. sing. anst (beside esti) following naht; more of the same kind may be found in Anglo-Saxon, as gat ‘goat’ etc. Compare Lith. gen. pl. krut-a beside krut-s and the like, § 402.

Far fewer metaplastic cases are to be found in polysyllabic n- and r-stems; examples are Goth. auhsun-a-m following auhsun-e : vuls-e vulfa-m (ep. Lith. dial. akmena auksena following akmen-a § 350 p. 252), brofrus following brofru-m : sumu-m sumjus.

The nom. sing. Goth. mēna O.H.G. mano and O.H.G. nefe, which came from forms ending in *-ēt (§ 198 p. 79) drew all the other cases into the n-class. The same kind of thing may be seen in Pali; see E. Kuhn, Beitr. zur Pali-Gr. 69, Torp. Die Flexion des Pali p. 25: for example, the nom. sing. maru = Skr. marut brought all the cases of this stem into the n-class (nom. pl. maru).

§ 400. Adjectives combine forms from i- and jo-stems. Hence the inflexion of Goth. masc. fem. hrāins neut. hrāin, masc. gen. hrāinis acc. hrāinjana dat. hrāinjamma etc. The nom. sing. fem. neuter and gen. sing. masculine are distinct i-forms, and hrāinjana and the rest distinct jo-forms. The amalgamation of these two stems was due to the fact that in the nom. (acc.) sing. masc. jo-stems like un-nutja- ‘useless’ had the weak form of the suffix, and the ending *-i-s (*-i-m
in the acc.), coincided with that of i-stems. In West Germanic the āo-declension absorbs the other.

Side by side with the preethnic Germanic system of adj. i-stems developed the adj. u-stems, as Goth. kauru-s = Skr. gurā-ś. In the feminine, *kurja-ā *kurjā- became Goth. kaurja-(II § 110 pp. 334 f.), and a masc.-neut. *kurja- = Goth. kaurja-was formed as part of the same system (cp. bērusjōs II § 110 p. 338). Following the masc. nom. kraiins acc. krainjana and neut. krain we have the group kaurus kaurjana kauru, and as kraiins could be used for the feminine, kaurus now came to be used in the same way instead of *kauriai, unless indeed this use is preethnic (cp. II § 110 pp. 334 f.). These stems too are declined in West-Germanic according to the āo-class.


§ 402. VII. Balto-Slavonic. Here too it is remarkable how the consonant declension has been absorbed into the vocalic. Even in the earliest records of the language this change may be seen already far advanced. Russian, for example, has been for centuries without a single case of the old consonant declension, with the exception of the s-stem nom. acc. in -o, and the n-stem nom. acc. in -ja (O.C.Sl. -ę). And certain Lithuanian dialects in their present state have scarcely any consonantal forms left.

With a few scattered exceptions, the loc. pl., and the cases with m-suffixes, from consonant stems, were inflected as i-stems in preethnic Balto-Slavonic: e.g. Lith. akmen-y-sę (earlier *i-se) O.C.Sl. kamen-y-chę, akmen-i-mi kamen-y-mi, -i-mi -i-mę -i-ma, -i-mis -i-mę, -i-mis -i-mę. Here, as in so many other re-formations (cp. for example § 360 p. 262), something is
certainly due to the desire to keep the stem final distinct, and
the change of consonant stems to i-stems was suggested by the
occurrence of certain words which had had consonant stems and
i-stems as variants from an early period, such as Lith. deszimt-
O.C.Sl. desęt- beside deszinti- desęti- 'decas', Lith. nakt- (gen.
pl. O.Lith. and in the modern dialect of Godlowa nakt-nil) beside
nakti- 'nox' (II § 101 p. 306, § 123 p. 390). Starting from
these cases, the i-flexion next found its way into others, and
sometimes it included all of them, its progress being aided
by the identity of ending of the two classes in the acc.
sing., which was regular, and in Baltic in the acc. plural too
(Lith. -i -is, O.C.Sl. -i), e.g. Lith. dant-i-s 'tooth' O.C.Sl.
jelen-f 'stag' (II § 93 pp. 283 f.) Since there were a certain
number of nouns which made some of their cases from a
consonant-stem and some from an i-stem, it sometimes
happened that these caused old i-stems to form consonantal
cases; e.g. Lith. dial. gen. pl. krūti pašastė from krūti-s
'mother's breast' pašasti-s 'armpit' (cp. also Bezzenerberger,
Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr., 143 f.), O.C.Sl. nom. pl. pečat-e
from pečat- 'signet, seal' (II § 123 Rem. 3 p. 394). Compare
Goth. gen. pl. anst-i from the stem ansti, and the like, § 399 p.
290.

The -je- of t- jė-stems is often interchanged with -iė-, and
this is especially common in adjectives and participles; e.g.
acc. Lith. vežanciţą O.C.Sl. veząstą from nom. Litl. vežaneti
O.C.Sl. veząsti (cp. the footnote on page 68). In connexion
with these sprang up, in the masculine and neuter, cases ex-
tended by -jo-, if the stem ended in a consonant, as gen.
vežancio O.C.Sl. veząsta from nom. vežąs vezę, mirusio miruša
from mirus miru, O.C.Sl. slašdša from slašdij (n. slašde).
Compare § 368 Rem. p. 269.

§ 403. The first characteristic of Lithuanian which should
be mentioned here is the loss of all neuter substantives, most
of which became masculine: e.g. lunka-s 'bast, inner bark'
= Pruss. lunka-n O.C.Sl. lyko; aki-s f. 'eye' = Skr. ákši;
medu-s m. 'honey' = Pruss. meddo Gr. μύεν; semuš (now
only used in pl.) m. ‘seed’ = O.C.Sl. seme; Lat. semen; vandā undā m. ‘water’ = Goth. ratō Gr. ὕδωρ; debes-īs (gen. pl. still debes-ū) m. f. ‘cloud’ = O.C.Sl. nebo. In a certain number of words gender may have changed because the ending of the nom. acc. neuter was the same as in masculine words. This is the case with sāmā vandā m., following akmā and words like it (§ 223 p. 100, § 224 p. 103), as O.H.G. namo sāmo became masc. (like namū n.) by the influence of masculines that had the same ending. Certain masculine words with nom. -as, gen. -ā, correspond to Idg. neuters in -as : mēnas ‘moon’ beside mēnes-io etc. (II § 132 p. 415), aklus ‘ice-hole’ = O.C.Sl. oku, and others (W. Meyer, Die Schicksale des lat. Neutr. 31; J. Schmidt, Plur. 195). Another is perhaps medās beside Skr. mādhuṇ (by-form of mādhu) Gr. μεθών-θύρα. It is a reasonable conjecture that the stock of neuter words first began to thin in this way, and that afterwards the similarity of inflexion in most of the oblique cases affected the nom. acc. even when they differed in masc. and neut., and replaced the neuter form by one which was masculine or feminine.

The agreement of the dat. sing., nom. acc. dual, acc. gen. pl. daŋgui dangu dangū dangūs dangū (u-stem) with vīlkui vīlkū vīlkūs vīlkū (o-stem) produced the re-formates dangūs-nā and loc. dangūsē (§ 326 pp. 227 f.). This change from u- to o-declension was carried further in dialects: e.g. sūnai sūnām sūnaits (cp. Brückner, Arch. für slav. Phil. III 252 f.; the Author, Lit. Volksal. und Märch. 300). In the same way Lettic u-stems came to form their plural in the o-declension.

r-stems, which had a nom. sing. in -ē, followed the analogy of 1- jē-stems, which has the same ending; e.g. intē ‘brother’s wife’ (Skr. yātar-) gen. intēs. See II § 122 Rem. p. 383. Similarly perhaps is to be explained kekē -ēs ‘dove’, as being originally a neuter *kekē(r) (cp. Lat. cicer), see § 224 p. 103.

§ 404. In Slavonic, nomina agentis in -tel- (Idg. -ter-) have kept to the old consonantal declension only in the nom. and gen. plural, and not consistently even there; e.g. datel-e (also
datelje with ū from the other cases which have -jū- and īdatel-ū; on the analogy of datel-ū we then have instr. datel-y in the o-declension. Otherwise they are io-stems, nom. sing. telij and so forth. Cases like dateljumū may be regarded as the original forms answering to forms like kamen-ū-mū §§ 402), which are responsible for the change from consonant to io-stem. See § 368 Rem. p. 269.

The relation between telę and gen. telęte seems to have been much the same as between Gr. ὅνωμα and ὅνωμαρες. See § 244 pp. 142 f.

From graždan-e ‘burgthers, citizens’ gen. graždan-ū (II § 115 p. 362), was formed in O.C.Sl. the acc. instr. graždany following vāłky, like the instr. dately. In the older remains of several Slavonic languages occur plural dat. instr. loc. forms in -jamū -jamī -jachū (O.Czech Polás), still retaining the old inflexion, in place of O.C.Sl. -janimū -jany -janichū; see vol. I § 585 p. 441, III § 356 p. 260, § 367 p. 269. The singular of these nouns is extended by -ino-, as graždanaimū.

In fem. ā- uš-stems, the similarity between the ending of gen. svekruž-ū and that of rukū produced forms like svekruž-amū -ami -achū, following rakamū etc. voda f. ‘water’ was doubtless originally a neuter in -ō(r), see § 224 p. 103.

The ending -o, nom. acc. sing. of neuter es- and o-stems, caused a confusion of forms between these two classes, and in particular made es-stems pass into the o-class, as gen. slova instead of sloves-e from slovo = Gr. σλέος, délēs-e instead of dēla from dēlo ‘work’. This has made the o-declension disappear from modern Slavonic languages, all but a few traces. The declension of the Russian words ēudo ‘wonder’ nebo ‘heaven’ should be noticed: sing. ēudo gen. ēuda etc. like selō, but pl. ēudesa gen. ēudesū etc. like sela, that is, they are like O.H.G. kālō pl. kālīr (§ 401).

Similarly, ū and o-stems became mixed owing to their like endings in the nom. acc. sing.; and thus all ū-stems have some o-cases, as gen. syna instead of synū, from synū ‘son’ = Lith.

sunti-s; the reverse is rarer, e.g. dltugu instead of dltuga, from dltugu 'duty' = Goth. duług-s. In most of the modern Slavonic languages the u-stems have in this way been almost entirely absorbed into the more numerous o-class.

[Tables of Noun Declension to illustrate §§ 190—404 are given below, pp. 296—319.]

Case- endings transferred from Pronouns to Adjectives.

§ 405. From the proethnic period downwards, there has never been any hard and fast line of demarcation between masculine and feminine pronouns in -o, as *to- 'this, the' (which had in some of their cases different endings from nouns), and nominal adjectives with o-stems.

To what extent pronominal endings had spread in the parent language cannot now be made out. Two questions have to be answered. First, was the pronominal inflexion used in any of the forms of certain adjectives, purely nominal in origin, such as Skr. vîśa- 'each' sârca- 'all' Lat. sōlum O.C.Sl. vîst 'omnis'; and if so, in which? And secondly, where adjectives had formative suffixes which were used with both pronouns and nouns, how far were they declined after the noun system? For example, although the parent forms of Skr. an-yâ-s (Gr. āllo-ς Lat. al-ius-s etc. must have belonged to the pronominal declension (we may conjecture that an-yâ-s is simply anâ- + ya-, as tya- is ta- + ya-, see § 409), it is wholly doubtful how the comparative of *to- 'quis' formed with -tero- was then declined (Skr. katarâ-s Gr. pótepe-ς etc.)

§ 406. It is certain at any rate that neither in Greek nor in Irish has the pronoun declension spread beyond the area it filled in the parent language. Indeed, in these languages the pronouns actually lost the greater number of their proper inflexions.

[Continued on page 320.1]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>गौि</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veo. स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>गौि [nom.?]</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. म. स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>स्त्रोतस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>[a gauï ]</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς (?)</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>योकेस्</td>
<td>शेख्रेस्</td>
<td>लेको-ς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) When any of the forms here given under a certain heading belong in form to a different plane, and are here placed according to their meaning e.g., accusative used for the nominative, they are enclosed in square brackets [ ].

P r e s e n t type implies that a given form, as far as its case-ending goes, may be counted the regular descendant of the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Irish</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>O.H.G.</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>O.C.Sl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lupus; füll</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk, gōli</td>
<td>sulk; kraje</td>
<td>sulk; vōri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupus-m; Cor- nál-leu</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk; gōli; gōla; sulk; kraje</td>
<td>sulk; vōri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jupan-un</td>
<td>dilged</td>
<td>ferk</td>
<td>wort 'vōri'</td>
<td>vēk</td>
<td>ikō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lup, füll, ep. mi</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liep(d), reka- te(d)</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupu Numa- zīdi</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beli</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv modo, are, fiur</td>
<td>be'wereshwith</td>
<td>wolfa O.Sax.</td>
<td>sulk; gērū-*ja</td>
<td>nepē-* in nepē-ji</td>
<td>sulk; gērū-*ja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luv(d)</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siai</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dū</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sert</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupōs</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jūga</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wort</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēum, lůp- rum</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupis(†), derēs [sera]</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lupis, derēs</td>
<td>sert</td>
<td>wolfe</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
<td>sulk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indo-Germanic prothetic forms. Prepositional endings transferred in noun stems after the end of the prothetic period, are marked with a dagger †.
### 2. a-Stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>ekham</em> 'mare':</td>
<td>डेना</td>
<td>हानिन्द 'host'</td>
<td>χα ην 'land'</td>
<td><em>equa</em></td>
<td><em>equa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>voc.</th>
<th><em>ekham</em></th>
<th>डेना</th>
<th>हानिन्द</th>
<th>χα ην</th>
<th><em>equa</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td><em>ekha-ae</em></td>
<td>डेन-म</td>
<td>हानिन्दम</td>
<td>χα ην-ε</td>
<td><em>equa-</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td><em>ekha</em></td>
<td>डेनिन्द, देन-स(?)</td>
<td>हानिन्दय</td>
<td>χα ην-ε, राविद</td>
<td><em>equa-um</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| abl. | *ekha* | डेनिन्द | हानिन्दय | *equa* | *equa* |
| dat. | *ekha* | डेनिन्द | हानिन्दय | *equa* | *equa* |
| loc. | *ekha* | डेनिन्द-म | हानिन्दय | *equa* | *equa* |
| instr. | *ekha* | डेन-य, देनिन्द | हानिन्द, देनिन्दय | *equa* | *equa* |

| Dual. nom.-acc. | *ekha* | डेन- | हानिन्द | χα ην | *equa* |
| gen. etc. | dat. abl. instr. | डेन- | हानिन्द- | हानिन्द- | gen. etc. |
| gen.? loc.? | gen. loc. | हानिन्द | हानिन्द | *equa* |

| Plur. nom. | *ekhais* | डेनिन्द, डेनिन्द | हानिन्द (हान- | χα ην | *equa* |
| acc. | *ekhais* | डेनिन्द | हानिन्द (हान- | χα ην | *equa* |
| gen. | *ekhais* | हानिन्द- | हानिन्द- | *equa* | *equa* |
| loc. | *ekhais-ae* | डेन-क | हानिन्द- | χα ην | *equa* |
| dat-abl. | *ekhais-ae* | डेन- | हानिन्द- | χα ην | *equa* |
| instr. | *ekhais* | डेन- | हानिन्द- | χα ην | *equa* | *equa* | *equa* | *equa* |

*equa* [equa*]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teto 'airitas'</td>
<td>tuath 'people', bren 'woman'</td>
<td>giba 'gift'</td>
<td>buog 'improvement' [gebo 'gift']</td>
<td>raukä 'hand'</td>
<td>rafka 'hand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbr. [Turns]</td>
<td>tuath(?), bren(?)</td>
<td>gibo</td>
<td>[gebo]</td>
<td>ranukä, mọtyn 'mother'</td>
<td>rako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tātām</td>
<td>tuath n- man n-</td>
<td>gibo, pā'thla'</td>
<td>gebo</td>
<td>rakoq</td>
<td>rako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tātan</td>
<td>tuath na nā</td>
<td>gibo</td>
<td>gebo [gebu]</td>
<td>rako, rako 'of a sled'</td>
<td>rako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tātad</td>
<td>tuath na nā</td>
<td>gibo</td>
<td>gebo [gebu]</td>
<td>raikos</td>
<td>raikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dōnai 'dine'</td>
<td>tuath</td>
<td>gībā</td>
<td>[gebo gebo]</td>
<td>raikai</td>
<td>raikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vīt 'in vin'</td>
<td>tuath</td>
<td>gībā</td>
<td>[gebo gebo]</td>
<td>raikos-e</td>
<td>raikos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tuath]</td>
<td>[gībā]</td>
<td>gebo gebo</td>
<td>ranukā</td>
<td>raik, ḩaikqā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuath, di</td>
<td>hūsuntja(?)</td>
<td>ranukāger, jirajqā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. tuathaib mān(ī)</td>
<td>gen. tuath ban</td>
<td>dat. instr. ran-</td>
<td>dat. instr. rako</td>
<td>gen. loc. rako</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totna</td>
<td>tuath na nā</td>
<td>gibō</td>
<td>gebo-a, kebo</td>
<td>raikos</td>
<td>[raiky dufq]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tīsn 'vin'</td>
<td>tuath-(?) man(?)</td>
<td>gibō</td>
<td>gebo-a, kebo</td>
<td>ranukā, ran-</td>
<td>raiky dufq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totnam</td>
<td>tuath n- ban n-</td>
<td>gibō</td>
<td>gebo, ulebo</td>
<td>ranukā</td>
<td>rako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tuithiib mān(ī)]</td>
<td>[gibo]</td>
<td>[gebo]</td>
<td>rako, en-</td>
<td>-serqā-chū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Diumpa]</td>
<td>tuath-ib mān(ī)</td>
<td>gibō</td>
<td>gebo</td>
<td>rako</td>
<td>rako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diumpa</td>
<td>tuath-ib mān(ī)</td>
<td>gibō</td>
<td>gebo</td>
<td>rako-</td>
<td>-mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tables of

#### 3. i- Stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sing. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मि 'columbia'</td>
<td>धर्मि</td>
<td>धर्मिति 'columbia'</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voe.</td>
<td>धर्मि</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aoc.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gen. ein.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dat. abl.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>धर्मिति</td>
<td>[facie-x]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē 'inā' nē 'en'</td>
<td>frijāngi 'friend'</td>
<td>gutia gutina</td>
<td>rāęinta 'heaven' šē-reqūei 'heaven' zemīla 'earth'</td>
<td>zemīle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē n- (f)</td>
<td>frijāngi</td>
<td>gutina n-</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē (f)</td>
<td>frijāngōs</td>
<td>gutina n-</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē</td>
<td>frijāngō</td>
<td>[gutīnu]</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē</td>
<td>frijāngō</td>
<td>[gutīnu]</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē (f)</td>
<td>[frijāngō]</td>
<td>gutīnu</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq (t-ča) zemīla (t-ča)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē (f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. inēb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē (f)</td>
<td>frijāngō</td>
<td>gutina</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>[ezqēlq zemīla]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inē</td>
<td>frijāngō</td>
<td>gutina</td>
<td>rēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inēb n-</td>
<td>frijāngō</td>
<td>gutīna, -inrēānecia šēnē</td>
<td>ezqēlq zemīla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[inēb]</td>
<td>[frijāngō-m]</td>
<td>[gutīnam, di- rēāneciuš-nd gi-m]</td>
<td>ezqēlq-či zemīla-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[inēb]</td>
<td>frijāngō-m (f)</td>
<td>gutīnam (f), di- rēāneciuš-nd ezqēlq-mu zemīl-mu gi-m (f)</td>
<td>ezqēlq-či zemīla-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inēb</td>
<td>frijāngō-m</td>
<td>gutīnam, di- rēāneciuš-mu gi-m (f)</td>
<td>ezqēlq-mu zemīla-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. -Stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sg. nom.</th>
<th>Pr. Ind.</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestio</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ṣoṣ- 'cris';</td>
<td>*dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, 'make'</td>
<td>sīrī 'heart'</td>
<td>ἑπι '- 'make'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- -iḥ</td>
<td>ṣrī</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>sīrī (nom.)</td>
<td>ἐροι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>sīrī</td>
<td>ἑροι, 'clever'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- -iḥ</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, jāmī-ḥ, oṣ-ḥ</td>
<td>ari-ti (?)</td>
<td>ἑροι-ος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- -iḥ</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ</td>
<td>ı sīrī</td>
<td>ἑροι-ος, νόμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- iḥ</td>
<td>dvī</td>
<td>ažī, muṭi-ti</td>
<td>ndi-ος,nόμος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>ṣa-ti</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
<td>ἑροι-ος</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dual. nom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr. Ind.</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestio</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>*dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>aṣ-ı</td>
<td>ἑροι-ος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- iḥ</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ, ṣa-ti-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, jāmī-ḥ, oṣ-ḥ</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- iḥ</td>
<td>dvī</td>
<td>ažī, muṭi-ti</td>
<td>ndi-ος, νόμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>ṣa-ti</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plur. nom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr. Ind.</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestio</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>*dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, fra-ti-ḥ</td>
<td>aṣ-ı-τι</td>
<td>ἑροι-ος, της-τι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ, ṣa-ti-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, jāmī-ḥ, oṣ-ḥ</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- iḥ</td>
<td>dvī-ḥ, ṣa-ti-ḥ</td>
<td>ažī-ḥ, jāmī-ḥ, oṣ-ḥ</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ- iḥ</td>
<td>dvī</td>
<td>ažī, muṭi-ti</td>
<td>ndi-ος, της-τι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*ṣoṣ-</td>
<td>ṣa-ti</td>
<td>ažī</td>
<td>ari-ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri-s</td>
<td>fáith 'ratae'</td>
<td>ansat 'favour'</td>
<td>ansat 'favour'</td>
<td>nakti-s 'night'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[turris]</td>
<td>fáith(?)</td>
<td>fáith(?)</td>
<td>ansat</td>
<td>ansat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri-m, oem</td>
<td>fáith u-</td>
<td>ansat</td>
<td>ansat</td>
<td>naktí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urae</td>
<td>munir(m-)</td>
<td>kuri</td>
<td>kuri</td>
<td>noští</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri, Os. -eis</td>
<td>fáitho -n</td>
<td>ansatí -a,</td>
<td>ansatí (?)</td>
<td>ansatí (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>guest</td>
<td>guest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'of a guest'</td>
<td>'of a guest'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naktí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri(?)</td>
<td>fáith</td>
<td>[ansatí, , gásta]</td>
<td>ansatí</td>
<td>kuri(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nočanot, noči</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oes turri(?)</td>
<td>munir fáith</td>
<td>ansatí</td>
<td>ansatí</td>
<td>dekét,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naktí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ansatí</td>
<td>kuri(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turri gat, oes</td>
<td>fáith</td>
<td>[ansatí], gásta</td>
<td>ansatí</td>
<td>kuri(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fáith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sing. nom.</td>
<td>*sūnens- 'son':</td>
<td>sūnens-</td>
<td>bāzān- 'arm'</td>
<td>sard 'ornament'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāsau</td>
<td>sard [nom.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noe.</td>
<td>*sūnau:</td>
<td>sūnau-</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>[x sard]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. *medhānu</td>
<td>medhānu</td>
<td>mađhu</td>
<td>mađhu</td>
<td>mađhu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.-</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu, śvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu, śvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu, śvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu, śvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*sūnau-</td>
<td>sūnau</td>
<td>bāzān-</td>
<td>sardu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>O.H.G.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -s</td>
<td>bith 'world'</td>
<td>moh -s</td>
<td>sith -o'custom</td>
<td>moh -s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(moh -s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -m</td>
<td>bith m-</td>
<td>moh</td>
<td>sith -o</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reek</td>
<td>mid (m-)</td>
<td>sihu</td>
<td>sith -o</td>
<td>ynoth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -r, quor</td>
<td>betho -r</td>
<td>moh d -r</td>
<td>sith -o</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -i</td>
<td>moh -i</td>
<td>moh -i</td>
<td>sith -i</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh</td>
<td>bith</td>
<td>moh</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh</td>
<td>bith</td>
<td>moh</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh</td>
<td>bith</td>
<td>moh</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. betha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dat. moh-ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. betha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gen. moh-ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -a(F)</td>
<td>moh -a</td>
<td>moh -a</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -x</td>
<td>bith</td>
<td>moh -x</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moh -m</td>
<td>bith -m</td>
<td>moh -m</td>
<td>sith</td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[moh -n]</td>
<td>betha -n</td>
<td>[sith]</td>
<td></td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[moh -i]</td>
<td>moh -i</td>
<td>moh -i</td>
<td></td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[moh -s]</td>
<td>betha -s</td>
<td>moh -s</td>
<td></td>
<td>moh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brugmann, Elementa III.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(k)u(m)’dug’</em></td>
<td>u’d</td>
<td>s’pā</td>
<td>a’khn ‘eye’</td>
<td>a’khn ‘soul’</td>
<td>koi, ποθήκ’ ‘herdsman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vec. <em>(k)u(m)n; -en(?)</em></td>
<td>u’dn</td>
<td>b’ri-safeh</td>
<td>a’khn, anj’n</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>koi [ποθήκ’]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. *(k)u(m)m; -en; m. *dheng ‘or’ <em>disease</em></td>
<td>u’dm</td>
<td>s’pā’sm</td>
<td>[s a’khn]</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>koi, τέκτον’-<em>, ποθήκ’-</em> *θέα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. <em>(k)u(m)-ss; ss</em></td>
<td>u’d-as</td>
<td>s’nh-o’</td>
<td>a’khn, a’Nj’in, a’Nn ‘of a man’</td>
<td>kov-’s</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. <em>(k)u(m)-ss</em></td>
<td>u’d-as</td>
<td>s’nh’</td>
<td>y a’khn, y a’nj’in kov-’’s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. *(k)u(m)-s; *mnd-s; ‘for’ ‘knowing’</td>
<td>u’d-s, v’mdn-’s</td>
<td>s’nh-’s</td>
<td>a’khn, a’Nj’in</td>
<td>I’mn’-’s [κοιν’, ποθήκ’-’]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. *(k)u(m)-s; mnd-‘</td>
<td>m’r’dn-’</td>
<td>c’sm’q-</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>d’mn’ d’mns’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *(k)u(m)-s; *mnd-‘</td>
<td>m’r’dn-’</td>
<td>c’sm’q’ns’; a’N-’</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>p’hr’-ns, κων’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr. <em>(k)u(m)-a; -a</em></td>
<td>s’nh-</td>
<td>s’nh-</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>– [κοιν’, ποθήκ’]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td><em>(k)w(m)-en; -en</em></td>
<td>d’dn-ns</td>
<td>s’nh’-</td>
<td>a’khn, ποθηκ’-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. <em>(k)w(m)-en; -en</em></td>
<td>d’dn-ns</td>
<td>s’nh’</td>
<td>a’khn, ποθηκ’-</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. etc.</td>
<td>dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>d’dn-ns</td>
<td>s’nh’</td>
<td>g. etc. kont-, ποθηκ’-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td><em>(k)w(m)-en</em>; -en*</td>
<td>d’dn-as</td>
<td>s’nh-as</td>
<td>ab’nhd a’khn, a’Nj’in a’khn, τέκτον’-’; ποθήκ’-’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc. <em>(k)w(m)-en; -en</em></td>
<td>d’dn-as, k’dn-as</td>
<td>s’nh-as, urm’-</td>
<td>a’khn, a’Nj’in, a’Nn</td>
<td>kov-’ns, τέκτον’-’; ποθήκ’-’; ποθήκ’-’; δέκι-*; ποθήκ’-’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. <em>(k)w(m)-m</em></td>
<td>d’dn-m</td>
<td>s’nh-m</td>
<td>a’khn</td>
<td>κων’-ns, ποθηκ’-’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. <em>(k)w(m)-en</em>; -en*</td>
<td>v’d-n’</td>
<td>d’dn-n’; d’dn-as</td>
<td>a’khn</td>
<td>δέκι-*; ποθηκ’-’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. abl. <em>(k)w(m)-en</em>; -en*</td>
<td>v’d-n’</td>
<td>d’dn-n’; d’dn-as</td>
<td>a’khn</td>
<td>[κοιν’ etc.], kont’-</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Latin | Irish | Gothic | O.H.G. | Lithuanian | O.O.Sl.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>homo - o, isen</td>
<td>oí, drú 'knead'</td>
<td>goemo 'man', lopus 'tongue'</td>
<td>xwam 'dog'</td>
<td>kamy 'stone'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>caín n, dróin</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td>kemen, íi 'day'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>caín n, dróin</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td>kemen, íi 'day'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homo, carm</td>
<td>gumin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td>gumen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homo, carm</td>
<td>gumin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td>xwam 'dog', akmen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td>xwam 'dog', akmen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domen</td>
<td>goemin</td>
<td>gomen-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains a list of words along with their translations in different languages, such as Irish, Gothic, O.H.G., Lithuanian, and O.O.Sl.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing. nom.</td>
<td>माता, दाॅता</td>
<td>माता, दाॅता</td>
<td>मात्र, दाॅत्र</td>
<td>मातρ, दाॅत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voo.</td>
<td>मातर, दाॅतर</td>
<td>मातर, दाॅतर</td>
<td>मातर, दाॅतर</td>
<td>मातर, दाॅतर</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>मात्र, दाॅत्र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र, दाॅत्र</td>
<td>मात्र, दाॅत्र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. etc.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
<td>मात्र-र, दाॅत्र-र</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>O.H.G.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māter, dāter</td>
<td>māthir, siur</td>
<td>brōgar 'brother'</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>motė &quot;mātē 'wife', moti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-em, dātr-em</td>
<td>māthir n-em</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-is -us, dātr-is</td>
<td>māthir (?), gen. mōder</td>
<td>brōgar-us</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mater-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, mater-e</td>
<td>māthir, siur</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-i, dātr-i</td>
<td>māthir</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, dātr-e</td>
<td>māthir</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, dātr-e (māthir ?)</td>
<td>māthir, siur</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, dātr-e</td>
<td>brōjar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, dātr-e</td>
<td>brōjar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-e, dātr-e</td>
<td>brōjar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quattur</td>
<td>cēthir</td>
<td>fidōr</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mater-i, mater-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-em, dātr-em</td>
<td>māthir mēthir-em</td>
<td>brōgar-em</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>motē-māter-em, mater-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-is -us, dātr-is</td>
<td>māthir (?), gen. mōder</td>
<td>brōgar-us</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mater-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-i, dātr-i</td>
<td>māthir</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātr-i, dātr-i</td>
<td>māthir</td>
<td>brōgar</td>
<td>mōter-i, mater-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table provides a comparison of terms from Latin, Irish, Gothic, O.H.G., Lithuanian, and O.C.I. in various cases.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-थोिन्तु</td>
<td>धर्मन्त</td>
<td>धर्मन्त</td>
<td>प्रेम 'bearing', दशी 'blowing'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त</td>
<td>धर्मन्त</td>
<td>धर्मन्त</td>
<td>प्रेम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-ध</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-ध</td>
<td>प्रेम-ध</td>
<td>प्रेम, प्रेम</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-ध</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-ध</td>
<td>प्रेम-ध</td>
<td>प्रेम-ध</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. etc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>ferenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स-स</td>
<td>ferenti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-म</td>
<td>प्रेम-म</td>
<td>प्रेम-म</td>
<td>ferenti-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>ferenti-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>प्रेम-स</td>
<td>ferenti-um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>धर्मन्त-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
<td>प्रेम-वित्ति</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *Sanskrit* is the ancient Indian language used in ancient Sanskrit literature.
- *Avestic* is a language of ancient Iran, which influenced Sanskrit.
- *Greek* is part of the classical Greek language used in ancient Greece.
- *Latin* is the language of ancient Rome and the Latin script.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>care care 'friend'</td>
<td>frijönt-s 'friend'</td>
<td>friuunt 'friend', ann vežg'vrehens', dant-i-s 'tooth'</td>
<td>eži y'vrehens'; neut. eži</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[care cara]</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carit n-</td>
<td>frijönt, tunþ-w'den-tem'</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td>ežänit' dant-i-s</td>
<td>ežqlit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carat</td>
<td>frijönt-e</td>
<td>friuunt-e</td>
<td>ežänscalo</td>
<td>ežqlitia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carit</td>
<td>[frijönt]</td>
<td>[friuunt]</td>
<td>ežänsciam</td>
<td>ežqilitu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carit</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td>ežänsciam</td>
<td>ežqilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(carit)</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td>ežänsciu</td>
<td>ežqiliemti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carit</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td>ežänsciu-du</td>
<td>ežqilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. caritib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dat. ežänsciu-du-ein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. carat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inst. ežänsciu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carit</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt</td>
<td>orų, ežiunt-yu</td>
<td>ežqilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cairten</td>
<td>[frijönt]tunþ-unse [friuunt]</td>
<td>ežänsciu, dant-i-s</td>
<td>ežqilit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ežqilitia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carat n-</td>
<td>frijönt</td>
<td>friuunt-o</td>
<td>ežänsciu, dant-i-i</td>
<td>ežqilit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cairteb]</td>
<td>[frijönt-am]</td>
<td>[friuuntam]</td>
<td>ežänsciu-st -ar,</td>
<td>ežqilitbšt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dant-i-st -et</td>
<td>ežqilitbšt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cairteb]</td>
<td>frijönt-a-m (F)</td>
<td>friuunt-am (F)</td>
<td>ežänsciu, dant-h-ma</td>
<td>ežqilitemš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cairteš</td>
<td>frijönt-a-m, tunþ-um, op. sigum</td>
<td>friuunt-um e-mi</td>
<td>ežänsciušte, dant-i-ežqilit, neut. telęt-y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. *-Stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pr. Tąg.</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing. nom.</td>
<td>neut. *mənə- 'mind';</td>
<td>mānas</td>
<td>mano- man-</td>
<td>ἄριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc. *mənə-mənə- 'ill disposed';</td>
<td>durmanas</td>
<td>dharmam-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut. *mənə-mənə-</td>
<td>durmanas</td>
<td>dharmam-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>masc. *mənə-mənə-</td>
<td>durmanas</td>
<td>dharmam</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>masc. *mənə-mənə-</td>
<td>durmanas</td>
<td>dharmam-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut. *mənə-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmamānaḥ-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i. *mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manahā-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(–f)</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>neut. *mənə-i? -i?</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc. *mənə-mənə-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmamānaḥ-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>og-i</td>
<td>*mənə-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>neut. *mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>masc. *mənəs-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmamānaḥ-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut. *mənəs-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmam</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>masc. *mənəs-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmamānaḥ-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neut. *mənəs-</td>
<td>durmanas-</td>
<td>dharmamānaḥ-</td>
<td>δυσμενής</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-i. *mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(–f)</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*mənəs-</td>
<td>mānas-</td>
<td>manah-</td>
<td>πίνους -ος, πρα-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>O.H.G.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>O.C.Sl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genus</td>
<td><em>teo (n) ‘house’</em></td>
<td><em>walt ‘sail’</em></td>
<td><em>debes</em></td>
<td><em>slova</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[dagon ydæs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagon-em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-ia</td>
<td>lige, mis</td>
<td>knibes, ep.</td>
<td>debes-ës ‘of a cloud’</td>
<td>sloves-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-us, mëna-ia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelbirë-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mis-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td>debes-ë</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td>debes-ë</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-i,</td>
<td>lige, mis</td>
<td>kolburë kolbe</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-i,</td>
<td>lige,</td>
<td>kolburë kolbe</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-e,</td>
<td>lige,</td>
<td>kolburë kolbe</td>
<td>debes-yjë</td>
<td>sloves-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-e,</td>
<td>lige,</td>
<td>kolburë kolbe</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-a</td>
<td>lige</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dagon-ës</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-um,</td>
<td>lige,</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-ës ‘of a cloud’</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëna-sët</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[generibus]</td>
<td>lige</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-yu ‘of a cloud’</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[generibus]</td>
<td>lige</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-lus</td>
<td>[ligib]</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tigibi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-lus</td>
<td>[tigibi]</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tigibi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gener-lus</td>
<td>[tigibi]</td>
<td>kolburë</td>
<td>debes-lis</td>
<td>sloves-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tigibi]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tables of 10. Ἰς- and γε- Stems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*ἰὸς(ἰος)οις 'savior':</td>
<td>ἱὸς -ος, Avest. ā-śyā</td>
<td>ἱον, 'savior'</td>
<td>Scior</td>
<td>slāddī 'savior'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc. *ἰὸς(ἰος)οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις, -γον</td>
<td>ἱὸν</td>
<td>Scior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neut. *ἰὸς(ἰος)οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις</td>
<td>ἱον</td>
<td>Scius</td>
<td>slāide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *ἰὸς-οις -ος:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ος</td>
<td>ἱον-ος</td>
<td>Scior-ια</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. *ἰὸς-οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ε</td>
<td>[Scion</td>
<td>Scior-ι</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. *ἰὸς(ἰος)-οις -ινι:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ινι</td>
<td>ἱον-ιν</td>
<td>Scior-e</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom. *ἰὸς(ἰος)οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ου -ου</td>
<td>Scion-ε</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>*ἰὸς(ἰος)οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ε</td>
<td>Scion-ε</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. oth.</td>
<td>dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>gen. loc. ἱὸςοις-σ</td>
<td>gen. etc. Scion</td>
<td>dat. instr. slāddōmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plur. nom.</td>
<td>*ἰὸς(ἰος)οις-οις:</td>
<td>ἱὸςοις-ε</td>
<td>Scion-ε</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aco. *ἰος οις or ἱος(ἰος)οις:</td>
<td>ἱος-οις:</td>
<td>[Scion], n λν-α, Scior-εν</td>
<td>slāddūq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *ἰος-οις:</td>
<td>ἱος-οις-ος</td>
<td>Scion-ος</td>
<td>Scior-ος</td>
<td>slāddūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. *ἰος-οις-οις:</td>
<td>ἱος-οις-ος</td>
<td>Scion</td>
<td>Scior-οις</td>
<td>slāddūkki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. Idg.</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Avesta</td>
<td>Greek.</td>
<td>Lithuanian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mayeudo (*māyot-)</td>
<td>videntis -du</td>
<td>videnti</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miręs 'dead' O.C.S.I. m. n. mir-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus</td>
<td>videntis -un</td>
<td>videntikam</td>
<td>oúdeun</td>
<td>miru-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ya</td>
<td>videnti-äm</td>
<td>videntikam</td>
<td>oúdeia</td>
<td>miru-us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-e</td>
<td>videnti</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ak. mir-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-e-ae</td>
<td>videnti-ae</td>
<td>videntē-ō</td>
<td>oúdeisi</td>
<td>miru-usi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-e-ū</td>
<td>videnti-ū</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-e</td>
<td>videnti-e</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-e</td>
<td>videnti-a</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ia</td>
<td>videnti-a</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-a</td>
<td>videnti-a</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mēyeus-ā</td>
<td>videnti-ā</td>
<td>videntē</td>
<td>oúdei</td>
<td>miru-ūs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhrūs</em></td>
<td>bhrū-ś</td>
<td>dhi-ś'hought'</td>
<td>ὑς 'fortress'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>*bhrū?:</td>
<td>[bhrūf], dhrū</td>
<td>[dhiif], udī</td>
<td>[pūr]</td>
<td>ἵ 'yah'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*bhrū-m:</td>
<td>sanū-m</td>
<td>Avent. ber'oi, op. ṣā-m</td>
<td>dhi-m</td>
<td>pūr-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bhrūg-qi:</td>
<td>bhrūs-om</td>
<td>dhiy-om</td>
<td>pūr-am</td>
<td>ὑς (ὁ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-ōj:</td>
<td>bhrūs-ē</td>
<td>dhiy-ē</td>
<td>pur-ē</td>
<td>[ἐ̇ς]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-ō:</td>
<td>bhrūs-ı, sanū</td>
<td>dhiy-ı, pārē</td>
<td>pur-ı</td>
<td>[ἐ̇ς]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-ō (ṣf):</td>
<td>bhrūs-ā</td>
<td>dhiy-ā</td>
<td>pur-ā</td>
<td>[ἐ̇ς]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*bhrū-g:</td>
<td>bhrūs-ā</td>
<td>dhiy-ā</td>
<td>pur-ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>bhrū</td>
<td>bhrū</td>
<td>bhrū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *bhrūg-es-oř:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-ōp?:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>ὑς-ο̣</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>bhrūs</em>:</td>
<td>bhrūs-ās</td>
<td>dhiy-ās</td>
<td>pūr-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-qi:</td>
<td>bhrūs-ās</td>
<td>dhiy-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>*bhrūg-ō:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>dhiy-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>*bhrū-ō:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>dhi-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.abl.</td>
<td>*bhrū-ō:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>dhi-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>*bhrū-ō:</td>
<td>bhrū-ō</td>
<td>dhi-ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νι-ε 'woman'</td>
<td>sii-ε</td>
<td>vi-ε</td>
<td>sy-ε 'woman'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέρα</td>
<td>[sii]</td>
<td>[erv]</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι-ε</td>
<td>su-εm</td>
<td>vi-em</td>
<td>si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι-ε</td>
<td>su-εv</td>
<td>vi-ev</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι-ε</td>
<td>su-ε</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ου]</td>
<td>su-ε</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ου], η-ε</td>
<td>su-ε</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ου], η-ε</td>
<td>su-ε</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ου], η-ε</td>
<td>su-ε</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>sir-ε</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| gen. ous. ου-ε | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
| [ου] | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
| [ου] | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
| [ου] | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
| [ου] | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
| [ου] | su-ε | vi | sir-ε | sir-ε | krūs-ε |
12. The Stems *nāy- 'ship', *gru- 'gou- 'head of cattle'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*nāy-a 'ship':</td>
<td>nāy-ā</td>
<td>nāy-ā</td>
<td>nāy-ā</td>
<td>nāy-ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aco. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abl. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual. nom.</td>
<td>*nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aco.</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen &amp; etc. dat. abl. instr.</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc. *nāy-ṛ:</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
<td>nāy-ṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gāy-a</em></td>
<td>gāy-ā</td>
<td>gā-α</td>
<td>hō-α</td>
<td>hō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gāy</em></td>
<td>gāy, Avest. gāmu</td>
<td>gā-μ</td>
<td>hō-μ</td>
<td>hō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-es</em></td>
<td>gōī, gāi</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-as</em></td>
<td>gōī, gāi</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-ai</em> (gen.)</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-l</em></td>
<td>gō-λ</td>
<td>hō-λ</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-ś</em> (nom.)</td>
<td>gō-ś</td>
<td>hō-ś</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-a</em> (gen.)</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-ś</em> (acc.)</td>
<td>gō-ś</td>
<td>hō-ś</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-at</em></td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-as</em></td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-a</em> (gen.)</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-l</em></td>
<td>gō-λ</td>
<td>hō-λ</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-ś</em> (nom.)</td>
<td>gō-ś</td>
<td>hō-ś</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-a</em> (gen.)</td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-as</em></td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-ś</em> (acc.)</td>
<td>gō-ś</td>
<td>hō-ś</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>g(u)y-at</em></td>
<td>gō-ε</td>
<td>hō-ε</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>kuo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table lists formations for the noun declension in various ancient languages.
- The entries include forms for the nominative, accusative, genitive, and instrumental cases.
- The languages listed are Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Irish, and Old Indo-European (O.I.H.O.).
- The forms are given in their respective scripts for each language.
- The table provides a systematic overview of how the noun declension is handled across these languages.
In Latin, Slavonic, and Aryan, side by side with pronouns strictly so called, are found a number of derivatives from pronouns, and adjectives derived from nouns, forming their cases as pronouns do. Take as examples Lat. ā-nus al-ter u-ter sōl-u s tōt-u-s, although the genitive singular of these words — the only case which concerns us in them — had the noun ending as well, as gen. sōlī Lāciī, dat. nūlō āsuiī, dat. nihi solae (for the gen. in -ē ep. § 419). O.C.Sl. tvojī ‘thy’ ta-kū ‘talis’ tolikū ‘tantus’ mūnogū ‘multus’ drugū ‘alis’; Skr. ka-tarā-s ‘uter’ superl. ka-tamā-s, ēka-s ‘unus’ Avest. ae-va ‘unus’, Skr. viśva-s Avest. viśpa- Skr. sūrva- ‘all’ dāksīya-s ‘right, of the right hand, southerly’ madhyamā-s ‘midmost’ Avest. adbā-tema- ‘deepest’ (a-bda- properly ‘footless’); but the Aryan words of this class also have the noun flexion, some of them often, others rarely, as R.-V. dat. viśväya beside viśvasmāi, Avest. gen. viśpanām beside viśpaēṣm.

But in Germanic, Lithuanian, and Armenian we see the inflexion of pronouns applied to any adjective at will.

In Germanic grammar this kind of adjectival flexion 1) is called the Strong Declension, as opposed to what is called the Weak, the latter of which has arisen by the transfer of stems to the n-class; examples are Goth. nom. pl. blindāī like pāi (ep. § 314 p. 214), beside which is blindans like gumans. The former is the older, and is the rule when the adjective is used predicatively or as an attribute without an accompanying article; the latter arose when the stems were made substantivés by means of the suffix -en-, and it is used after the article and mostly where the adjective has the value of a substantive (see II § 114 p. 353). Declined like pronouns: Goth. masc. blindam-ma midjamma hrāinjamma hardjamma (nom. blind-s midji-s hrāin-s hardu-s) following āamma, also blindāi following pāi,

blindáise following *páizē (pizē is used instead of this), blindáim following páim, neut. blindat-a following baat-a (also, with noun-inflection, blind, like hráin hardu), fem. blindáiszōs following *páiszōs (pizōs is the form used), blindáizō following *páizō (the form used is pizō); O.H.G. blintemun blinte blintero blintēm, blintōz, blintera blintero. As regards such variations as blindáizē: pizē see §§ 420, 429. The acc. blindan-a (O.H.G. blintan) follows the noun declension in its suffix -an, but the particle -a affixed to it assimilates the ending to the pronouns, cp. ūan-a (§ 417). In O.H.G. other forms were drawn into the circle of attraction, blintēr like jener (§ 414), blintiu like diu. There is some strangeness in Goth. dat. sing. fem. blindāi like gibāi beside pizāi; but O.H.G. blintēru O.Icel. blindre are pronominal forms, and doubtless fairly reproduce those used in proethnic Germanic.

In Lithuanian, where the endings peculiar to pronouns are found only in the masculine (neuter), it results that adjectives differ from nouns only in this gender. Masc. sing. gerām geramē, pl. gerēms, dual gerēm gerēm, like tam tamē, tēms, tēm(-dvēm) tēm(-dvēm). The nom. pl. is gerī for *gerē (cp. gerē-ji) as against tē anē (the latter accented like the subst. vilkaį), where the difference in accent is remarkable, cp. the dual masc. gerū fem. gerī as contrasted with tā-du tē-dui; the accentuation of *gerē is proved to be older by Gr. toī, kaloī (I § 671 p. 536); on this difference in accent, see Bezenberger in his Beiträge X 204. We should add the neut. sing. gēra for *a-d following *ta(-d) = Pruss. s-ta (§ 227 p. 110), and the neut. pl. geraī following tāt, e.g. tāt geraī 'haec bona (sunt)', see § 428; usually these adjective forms in -ai are used as adverbs. From saldu-s 'sweet': saldēiam saldēms like tuszceiam tuszctēms (nom. sing. tuszcias-s 'empty'), by association with the fem. saldi saldēs (II § 110 p. 334); cp. Goth. masc. hardu-s pl. hardjāi beside fem. pl. hardjōs. The reason why the nom. pl. masc. is saldu, and not saldi, like tusztē, is that at the time we are now describing, when the case-endings spread from pronouns to adjectives, the
Pronouns.

§ 406, 407.

pronominal nom. pl. masc. suffix -oč had already driven out the original ending *-oš from all noun stems (§ 314 pp. 214 f.), and thus *-oš was not regarded as a special ending of the pronouns.

In Armenian the pronominal endings -um (dat. loc.) and -mē (abl. sing.) could be used with any adjective, as surbun (surb 'holy') following orum ('which') aillum ('other'). (In Mod.E.Arm. -um extends to substantives, as mardum, cp. Lett. grēkam in the following Remark.) Compare Hübschmann, Ztschr. der deutsch. morg. Ges. XXXVI 123 ff.

Remark. The application of the endings of the pronomina to adjectives must be kept distinct from other examples of these endings transferred to nouns in general, such as Skr. svākṣa mārêma following tēns, Pali loc. lōkasmē (instead of lōkē) following tassimē, abl. lōkasmē (instead of lōkē) following tassimē, Gr. ἶση, λαλητ, Lat. mēnādrmum bonārum following istārum, O.C.Sl. rjačož növočož following tjoč. Of course we cannot know whether the adjectives were not sometimes or always the first to adopt this inflexion in these instances, as elsewhere, and then passed it on to substantives. This was certainly the case in the Lettis dat. instr. sing. grēkam dat. instr. pl. grēkām (grēk-s 'sin') following the adj. labām labām (lab-s 'good') and the pronoun tam īcū (ta-s 'that').

PRONOUNS.1)

§ 407. The main difference between Pronouns and the great majority of Nouns is that they are formed from peculiar roots, which are called Pronominal Roots. But they also have

1) Many of the works and essays cited in the footnote to page 52, and under the various noun-cases, include a discussion of pronominal forms. We may add here, as dealing with the whole subject of Pronouns, the following.

many peculiarities of inflexion, which are accordingly named the Pronominal Declension.

These peculiarities are of three kinds.

1. The Case Ending is usually different from that of the nouns. Compare, for example, the nom. acc. sing. neut. Skr. tier-d Lat. istor-à as contrasted with jumà-m jumà-m. In particular, it is far more common with pronouns than with nouns to give the function of some distinct case to an uninflected form, such as Skr. mà Gr. μέ 'me' (cp. § 185 pp. 57 f.).


Works treating specially of pronouns with gender distinguished, or of personal pronouns, will be cited in notes to § 408 and § 435. 21
These differences in flexion were clearly more or less connected with a certain vagueness which is seen in the cases of pronouns. Pronominal forms were not originally so minutely subdivided or so clearly defined as were the cases of the noun. It was only the constant endeavour to express similar uses by similar forms which brought about the more complete agreement of pronouns with nouns, as we see it in the historical development of different languages.

2. A number of cases from pronoun stems have always been extended by certain suffixes which were placed before the case-ending, to aid in distinguishing the cases. In these the case-ending is sometimes one peculiar to pronouns, and sometimes it is common to them with nouns. The most important of the elements thus interwoven into the cases of pronouns are -sm- and -śi- -s-. Examples: Skr. loc. tá-sm-in abl. tá-sm-ād (cp. vykād), although the acc. is tá-m 'that' (cp. vyka-n), Avest. abl. yā-sm-ap, but nom. yā-s 'vos'; dat. Skr. tá-sy-āi Goth. pi-z-āi (cp. Ved. suvapatyāi Goth. gibāi), but acc. Skr. tā-m Goth. pō f. 'the, this, that' (cp. Skr. āsvā-m).

How these particles got into the words can generally be seen without difficulty. We shall explain the forms in detail in the succeeding paragraphs. Such a word as "insertion" cannot properly be used of any them.

3. Cases of pronouns, more frequently than nouns, attract certain particles which become affixed to them (cp. § 186 p. 62). For example: *-em *-om *-m in Skr. īd-ām 'id, hoc' im-ām 'eum, hunc', vay-ām 'vos'; -u in the nom.-sing. O.Pers. ka-nw Gr. *o-u 'that yonder' (in oū-roc); -i in the nom. sing. Lat. go-i guì, O.Sax. A.S. sē 'that' for *so-ī, and others. If we turn to recorded languages, we find actually used such affixes as Gr. -t in ouros-t, Lat. -ce (-c) in his-ce, with a deictic or emphatic meaning. Just so must the former affixes have once had their own proper meaning, although we are now in the dark as to what it originally was. After their ground-meaning became weakened and obscured they became
no more and no less than case-suffixes; the stock example is

Remark. It may be pointed out in passing that the principle
exemplified in the attaching of these affixes, deictic, emphatic, and
so forth, to words is well suited to throw light on the origin of the
prothetic Indo-Germanic case-forms. The principles on which the older
cases were built up must be the same as those which we can trace in
these later forms. The formation of cases is not something which took
place once for all at a definite point in the protohistoric period; it has
always been going on afresh, although to a much smaller extent in
historical times than in prehistoric. At this very day we can see the
beginnings of inflected cases, as Mod.H.G. heimat-wärs 'home-wards',
stadt-wärs 'town-wards', thal-wärs 'vale-wards', and the like.

Pronouns are usually classified thus: those with
distinguishable Gender (Demonstrative, Relative etc.), and
those without distinguishable Gender, or Personal Pronouns.
We discuss Possessive Pronouns along with the Personal
Pronouns (§§ 450 ff.), because the two are so closely connected,
especially in the forms of the genitive case.

Pronouns in which the Gender in distinguished.1)

§ 408. A number of these pronouns did not form all
their cases in the original language from the same stem, but
filled up certain gaps from others: for example, *so- and *to-

1) Add to the works cited in the footnote to pages 322 f.:
	Scherer, Zur Gesch. d. deutsch. Spr. 9 pp. 460 ff. Leo Meyer,
	Vergleich. Gramm. I, 377 ff. Steinthal, De pronomine relativo etc.,
	1847. Windisch, Untersuch. üb. d. Ursprung des Relativpron. in den
	Fragen über die pronomina indefin. und interrog., Hoefer's Zeitschr. f. d.
	d. l. I 193 ff., 276.

I. H. Hall, The Declension of the Definite Article in the Cypr. Inscr.,
Transactions of the Amer. Phil. Assoc. XI (1880) pp. 51 ff. Schanz,
Novae commentat. Platoniceae [βαρό und βαρῶν u. dgl., ὑπερ und ὑπῶ etc.] 1871.
Lotttner, *e and verwandte Pronominalbildungen, Kuhn's
Zeitschr. V 396 f. Savelsberg, Das [griech.] pronomien relat., aus dem
interrog. entstanden, Kuhn's Zeitschr. VIII 408 ff. Lotttner, Der griech.
Relativstamm, ibid. IX 320. Kratz, Quaestiones Homericae I: De pro-
together made up the cases of 'this, the' (Gr. nom. ὁ gen. ὅ etc.). In the separate languages these heteroclite forms were levelled down and assimilated more or less, so that the groups became more homogeneous. These levellings, together with the composition of simple original pronoun stems with each other or with deictic and other particles, produced a large number of analogical forms in the different branches of Indo-Germanic; and pronoun forms as we have them are


often separated from their Indo-Germanic prototype by one long line of re-formations due to analogy.

It is impossible within the limits of this work to describe with any degree of completeness all these analogical formations in the various languages of our group. We can only give a general summary of the stems which are found in several languages, and which are therefore to be regarded as protothic, subjoining their most important inflexions.

1. Etymology and Morphology of Pronouns with Gender.

§ 409. Demonstratives.

The Stems *so- *sā- and *to- *tā-. In the parent language the s-stem probably made only the nom. sing. masc. and fem., and the t-stem all other cases. By degrees one or other invaded the other’s ground; examples are Ved. loc. sāsmin instead of tāsmin, Gr. nom. oi ai instead of roi rai, and conversely Lith. nom. tā-s tā instead of *so(-s) *sā. Aryan: nom. sing. masc. Skr. sā sā-s Avest. hō fem. Skr. ṣd Avest. ḫā; acc. sing. masc. Skr. tā-m Avest. te-m fem. Skr. tā-m Avest. tam. Armen. -d, a demonstrative affix, beside Idg. *to-, e. g. tēr-ā ‘the master, this master’, da ‘this’ do-in ‘the same’; d-, for t-, is doubtless strictly regular only after r and n (cp. I § 483 p. 357), as in du ‘thou’ (§ 440). Gr. ὅ ὅ; τό- τό-v. O.Lat. sa-psa ‘ipse’, also *so- in ip-se ip-sa (§ 413); *to- in topper = *todd per, and tam; in Italic the stem *e-so- (e- as in, Skr. a-sātā Gr. ἐ- αἰ Ore. e-ko- ‘hic’ Lat. e-quitām Osc. e-tanto ‘tanta’) combined with *to- and formed *e-ς-το- as in Baltic *ko- + *to- made *k-ko- (Lith. sxtäi Pruss. s-ta-s), whence Umen. estu ‘istum’, with which Lat. isto- is closely connected, if not identical.1) O.Ir. so a demonstrative

1) No satisfactory explanation has been suggested for ὅ- in ὅστρ. Since, however, ε- is doubtless the same stem as the pronominal stem *e- which is shortly to be described (see next page), it is quite possible that ὅ- in ὅστε is the stem of ὅς ‘he’. This stem has also been identified with the locative suffix -i, in ποτἠνος etc.; and if this is correct, the
particle meaning 'here', Gall. so-sin nemeton 'hoc sacellum';
the stem to- is found in ua-d 'ab eo' ua-di 'ab ea' ua-di-d 'ab eis' and others like them, and in the article in-d for *sen+to-
(cp. Windisch, Revue Celt. V 462; *to- doubtless became do-
in syllables coming just before the accent, cp. vol. I p. 510,
and Thurneysen, Rev. Celt. VI 321, footnote 1). Goth. sa so
'this, the' m. f. O.Sax. A.S. se m. 'the, this' O.H.G. de-se m.
'this'; Goth. pana O.H.G. den acc. m. 'this, the'. Lith. tį
O.C.Sl. tū 'the, this' m., Lith. tį̄ O.C.Sl. tą 'the, this' f.
The Stems *sjo- *sjā- and *tjo- *tįā- (also found
with -į̄- instead of -į̄-). In Aryan, they were distributed
among the cases in the same way as *so- *to-. Skr. nom. syd
syd acc. tyā-m tyā-m nom. acc. tyā-d, O.Pers. nom. hyā hyā
acc. tyā-m tyā-m. O.Ir. co-se 'ad hoc, adhuc' re-siu 'hitherto'.
neut. diu, nom. pl. fem. deo dio. Whether the -jo- of *s-jo-
*t-jo- be called the same as the suffix of comparison -jo,-
discussed in II § 63 pp. 182 f. (*t-jo-: *to- = Skr. an-ya- : anā-),
or identified with the demonstrative pronoun stem *jo-
(pp. 331 f.), compounded here with other stems, it all comes
to the same thing. Compare also the nom. sing. fem. in -į
Goth. s-i O.Ir. s-t 'ea' (II § 110 p. 339), perhaps connected
with Sophocles' τ (cp. the Author, Ein Problem der hom. Textkr.,
125 ff.; Meister, Gr. Dial. II 281), beside which we have the
fem. *s in Skr. iy-ām etc. (p. 332); — here the same thing
looked at from different points of view, and occurring at
different stages of the growth of language, might be called
variously a suffix or part of a compound word.1)

---

1) Whether -jo- in the Indo-Germanic languages (see II § 63
pp. 122 ff.) is always identical with the pronoun *jo- I leave an entirely
open question. For the present I assume merely a resemblance between
the pronoun and the -jo- of comparison.
The Stem *o/- *a-. Aryan: dat. sing. masc. Skr. a-smāī Avest. a-hmāī dat. abl. pl. fem. Skr. a-bhyās Avest. a-bhyā. O.Ir. ē 'he' see § 414, gen. ai ae 'eius' see § 418. Germ. gen. sing. Goth. i-s O.H.G. e-s: cp. Skr. a-syā. Elsewhere it is not found as part of a living case-system. Greek loc. ε-ι (in clauses expressing a wish or a condition) and instr. (Heracl. Cret. etc.) ἦ ἂν, ἐλ-τα 'then'. The same loc. *e-ι is doubtless contained in Idg. *eij-so *eij-sa, meaning 'this hero' or something to that effect, acc. *eij-to-m etc.: Skr. e-śā e-śā Avest. aś-śa aś-śa, acc. e-tā-m aś-te-m, Umbr.-Osc. *eij-xo- (the -x of the nom. sing. masc. fem. was carried through all the cases), Umbr. ere 'is' for *e-řo (§ 274 Rem. p. 174), eru-ku 'cum eo' ēra-k abl. 'ea' Osc. eisūd 'eo' eixois 'eis' eisa-k eisa-c abl. 'ea'. The bare stem, e, may be contained in Lat. e-quidem and other words of the same sort; in the loc. O.C.Sl. kamen-e and the like, see p. 327 with the footnote; and in the augment, as Gr. ἐ-περον; compare loc. *te § 424 p. 349.

The Stem *eno- *ena-. *ono- *ona-. Ar. ana- 'this, that, he': instr. sing. Skr. anēna anāyā Avest. ana. Lith. anas 'that' fem. anā, O.C.Sl. onā 'that, he' fem. ona. Also, doubtless, the Armenian article -n, e. g. tēr-n 'the lord' beside no-in 'the same', and in-kn 'ipse', for *eno-.

The Stem *a*-yo- *a*-yā-. Ar. ava- 'that, that yonder': Skr. gen. dual avā, nom. pl. Avest. avā avā O.Pers. avari avari (cp. Bartholomae, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIX 498). O.C.Sl. ovo 'this'. Wackernagel conjectures that this same stem is contained in Lat. e-lim (ibid., XXVIII 139), with which should be connected Umbr. ulo ulo 'ulluc'.

The Stems *xo- *ki- *kio-.

*ko-. Gr. loc. ἐ-xe- 'there' xēvo-ς Dor. xēvo-ς 'that' (cp. II § 67 Rem. p. 150, Prrellwitz, Bezz. Beitr. XV 154 ff.). Osc. e-kas 'hae' e-cu-c neut. 'hoc'; of Latin forms we may doubtless add ce in ce-do ã-ce ã-c (cp. Osc. ce-bnust); e- in ἐ-κεί e-kas as in Osc. e-tanto 'tanta' etc., p. 327. O.Icel. hann 'he' hon 'she', O.Sax. hē hie O.H.G. hē her 'he', unless the last-named were made from the stem hi- on the analogy.
of thē etc. (§ 414). Also Lith. szēn and szē ‘hither’ may belong to this same group; but it is just as likely that they come from *szen *sje (I § 147 p. 131) and belong to the stem szia- (see below), being made on the analogy of the forms tēn tb. 1).

*ki-. In Greek, we may conjecture that this form is to be seen in the of oî-ki, pollá-ki and other words; see § 182 p. 49. Lat. ci-ter ci-trā, Umbr. ści-mu ‘ad citima, retro’. O.Ir. cē ‘on this side’. Goth. hī-mma ‘to this’. Lith. szē-s O.C.Sl. si ‘this’. Cp. also Alban. si-viēt ‘in this year’.

Whether the Armenian affix -s, as tēr-s ‘the lord, this lord’, belongs to *ko- or *ki-, cannot be decided.

*kiō- (compare *tio- beside *to-, above) may also be an old form: Gr. σήμερον Att. τήμερον adv. ‘to-day’ for *ki(o)--μερο-ν (known phonetic laws give no justification for deriving this from *tio-); O.H.G. instr. hiu-tu O.Sax. hiu-diga ‘on this day, to-day’; gen. sing. Lith. sziō O.C.Sl. sego instead of *sego following si. Compare also the fem. formation A.S. hi Lith. szi O.C.Sl. si for *ki, like O.Ir. sī Goth. si (see p. 328).

A contamination of *ko- and *to- produced Balt. *k-to-, represented by Lith. sztái ‘see here’ (its opposite is antái ‘see there’ from anō-s ‘that yonder’) and Pruss. s-ta-s. sz-ta-: ta- = sz-ia-: ja-). Lith. sztā-s is a re-formate of later date, following szī-s. In a similar way arose in Oscar, by contamination of ekso- and eso- (eseī ęso etc.) a stem ekso- (exac ‘hac’ etc.), a form which sprang up during the period of separate dialects (for pr. Umbr.-Sann. *ekso- would have become *eks-o- *eso-, cp. nom. sing. medīs ‘meddiś’).

Remark 1. If there was in pr. Idg. a variation between tenues and tenues aspiratae analogous to the variation of mediae and mediae aspiratae (I § 469. 8 pp. 346 f.) in favour of which view might be adduced Gr. πλατε-ι beside πλάθανα-ν Skr. pṛthā-ḥ, Gr. πέτας-το-ς Lat. quær-το-s beside Skr. caur-thā-s, Gr. πέρο-ς πνέο-ς beside Skr. pāth- pāṇthā-, Gr. ἐπη-ν

1) Conversely, Lith. tel-p beside toł-p ‘so’ was modelled after szel-p i.e. szl-p (neut. pl., see § 428).

2) The suggestion that s in s-ta-s is the same as s in Lat. īste (I p. 425 footnote 2) in less probable.
beside Skr. दृश्यृ-m etc. — the Lat. pronoun ho- (hi-&) could be added in this place. It would be derived from *oplevel-. But then the question would arise whether we should not derive Goth. hi- from *ội-, Gr. o- in είν in nouns from *εο, and other words from similar forms.

The Stem *i- *ei- (*i-o- *ei-o-). Aryan: neut. Skr. i-द (adv.), i-d-am with the particle -ām affixed, Avest. i-p- (adv.), acc. sing. masc. Skr. i-m-ām Avest. imem O.Pers. īmām also with the particle -ām; the association of this accusative form with ītā-m āetā-m etc. suggested a number of analogical forms: fem. Skr. imā-m Avest. īmām O.Pers. īmām, neut. Skr. īmā-d Avest. īmāb O.Pers. īma, pl. Skr. īmā Avest. īmā O.Pers. īmāy etc. In Greek there are only isolated forms: acc. ἵν 'eum' ἴν for *αὐ ἴν (σκρ. σμα), ἴν for *νφ ἴν (*νφ = νυ), see Thumb, in Flecceisen's Jahrh. 1887 pp. 641 ff.; adv. (instr.) ἴνα, used in relative sentences (§ 410), instead of ἵνα (§ 421), which took its rough breathing from the relative ὅ- as Lith. į-s instead of *i-s took its initial from ja- (see below). Lat. i-s i-d, eō ea-m, Umbr. eam 'eam' eaf 'ena' Oso. io-κ 'ea', Ital. eo- ea- for *ejo- *eja- (I § 184 p. 121); on Lat. it its beside et ēts see Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 499 f. Whether O.Ir. eō 'it' should be added to the list will remain doubtful so long as its ending is not explained.®) Goth. i-s O.H.G. i-r 'he', Goth. ija 'eam'; and doubtless Goth. jāin-s and O.H.G. jenēr 'that yonder', although the construction of their stems is not quite clear (cp. I § 123 p. 113, Holthausen in Paul-Braune's Beitr. XI 552 f., Singer ibid. XII 211, Lidén in the Arkiv f. nord. fil. III 242 f., Johansson in Bezz. Beitr. XVI 154 ff., who gives references to other works on the subject). In Balto-Slavonic we have *iō- in the gen. Lith. jō O.C.Sl. jēgo

1) A ground-form iō- might be inferred from eō-eon-eon 'the very same', but that there is no nasal in eō-on (used with the meaning of Lat. 'id cat'). The inserted pronoun (pronomens inflexum) -d- (i-d-?), used for all genders and numbers — if we are right in placing it here — causes aspiration, and therefore ended in a vowel originally. A ground-form *iō is hardly possible, since before -n (for -o) the i would have been preserved. (Based on Thurneysen.)
'eius' etc. beside nom. Lith. ji-s O.C.Sl. –ji (in dobrū-fj and the like, but i in i-še 'qui') instead of *i-s (= Lat. i-s) with j- from the other cases; cp. I § 84 Rem. 1 p. 80; Streitberg, Paul-Braune's Beitr. XIV 195 f.; J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 43.

Remark 2. The pronoun *ja (declined) was affixed to inflected adjectives in Balto-Slavonic; and out of this grew what is called the 'definite adjective', as Lith. gerdas-is O.C.Sl. dobrū-fj dobrūjį 'the good (man, etc.)' (I § 84 p. 80). Form-association brought about a variety of changes in the case-systems of these words. See Leskien, Decl. pp. 151 ff.

*i, a fem. of *i-s, is preserved in Skr. iy-dm Avest. ʃm i.e. iy-em and in Lith. jį instead of *i, earlier *t, as jį-st stands instead of *i-s; perhaps also in Cypr. i ν 'm'ν' (Meister, Gr. Dial. II 281), with the particle -m.¹) Compare *ki beside *ki-s, on the last page.

§ 410. The Relative. From the proethnic period *jo- has been used for the relative pronoun. Skr. yd-s ya-d yd, Avest. yō ya-p yā. Gr. ἵ- τ ἰ. Connected with it are adverbs like Goth. ja-bai Lith. jēi jēi 'if', and derivative adjectives such as Gr. ὁ-το 'qualis' ὁν-το 'quantus' O.C.Sl. jākū 'qualis' jelikū 'quantus'. There can be no doubt that this *jo- is the same as the anaphoric *jo- and *i- discussed in § 409 above. The identity of these is made clear in Gr. ἰα for *i-na (see above), for ἰα : ἵ = Lith. (j)į-s : jō. Thus *jo- came to be used as a relative in the proethnic language without losing its purely anaphoric value. The chief reason why the anaphoric use survived in Balto-Slavonic was doubtless the association in use with nom. *i-s acc. *i-m (Lith. j-i-s j-i O.C.Sl. j-i), which were always demonstrative. Whether the Goth. relative particle ei in sa-ei etc. is Idg. *i, the instr. of *i-s (§ 421), or *e-i, the loc. of *o- (p. 329), I leave undecided.

The relative use of *go and *to- in several languages came in later. See the Syntax.

---

¹) Mid.IR. i was coined beside it because of other pairs of forms — it and itz, int and sint. (Based on Thurneysem.)
§ 411. Interrogative and Indefinite Pronouns. The stems *qo- *qi- *qu-, from the proto-ethnic stage onwards, had an interrogative meaning with the acute accent, and were indefinite when unaccented. The use of these pronouns for the relative, as was but now remarked (§ 410), is later in origin.

*qo- *qā-. Skr. kā-s kā, Avest. kō kā. Gr. gen. Hom. ré-o Att. rov = Avest. ca-hyā, and such adverbs as nov nov, Dor. nā Att. ni. Lat. quo-d quā, Umbr. poe poi `qui' paf-s 'quas' Osc. pod `quod' paam `quam'. O.Ir. cia Mod.Cymr. puay 'who? what?' for *kwe-i (§ 414), O.Ir. ca-ch O.Cymr. pau-p quivis'. Goth. hva-s hva, gen. hvi-s Ó.H.G. hve-s. Lith. kā-s O.C.Sl. kū-to 'who?' Uninflected *qs 'how' (indefinite 'somehow', and 'as also' = 'and'): Skr. Avest. ca Gr. re Lat. que Goth. hā.

*qi-. Aryan: neut. Skr. ci-d Avest. cīp O.Pers. ciy generalising particle 'any', masc. Avest. ci-s O.Pers. ciś-ciy; Skr. kī-m 'what?' nā-ki-s 'no one' with k- instead of ç- taken from ka-, see I § 448 Rem. p. 333. Gr. xī-xi. Lat. qui-s qui-d, Umbr. ave-pis 'si quis' pis-i 'quos' Osc. pi-s 'qui' pi-d 'quid'; Lat. quem doubtless instead of *quim = Osc. pim by analogy of oveum: ovi-s (§ 214 p. 92), and similarly en instead of im, and used side by side with it, from i-s (J. Schmidt explains differently, Plur. p. 62 footnote 1). O.Ir. ce ci 'which?' may belong to this stem, or it may be cia (*cē) shortened by a pretonic position. Germ. hvi- perhaps in Goth. hvi-leiks A.S. hui-lec 'how constituted?' O.C.Sl. di-to 'quid?'

*qu-. Skr. kū-tra Avest. ku-tra 'where? whither?', Skr. kū-tas 'whence?' We may suggest that this is the root of O.C.Sl. -gda for *k(t)u-dā in tū-gda 'then' and other words (Kozlovsky, Arch. für slav. Ph. X 658). There is great doubt whether it has anything to do with Lith. ku-r 'where, whither' and Lat. ali-cubi Umbr. pu-fe Osc. pu-f 'ubi?'.

Remark. The etymology of Armen. o 'who?' i 'what?' and Lat. u-bi u-ter has so far not been explained. Bugge (Beitr. zur etym. Eräl. der arm. Spr., 28 f.) would postulate Idg. *go- *gi-, as by-forms of *go- *qi-. But by this nothing would be gained as far as Armenian is concerned, since *go- would have become ko-, op. koc 'cow' etc. I § 456 p. 335,
2. Cases of Pronouns in which Gender is Distinguished.

§ 413. In the preceding pages it has often been pointed out how many inflexions pass from pronouns to nouns. This, as we have seen, happened in some instances as early as the proethnic period. *Vice versa*, case endings sometimes pass from nouns to pronouns. This happens particularly in Greek and Keltic. In the historical period of these languages very few pronouns remain which show the special suffixes which they had in the parent language.

It is certain that in some of their cases pronouns varied in their endings, sometimes having the same ending as a noun, and sometimes a different one. Take as examples nom. sing. *so* (Skr. *sā*) beside *go-s* (Skr. *kā-s*), abl. sing. *tesmōd* (Skr. *tāsmād*) beside *tōd* (Skr. *tād*). In such instances we have no right to assume that the pronominal ending was once exclusively used, and that the noun ending only came in by analogy. On the contrary, as we shall see, it can be made probable that in many cases the ending was originally the same in both noun and pronoun, and that the varying inflexion belongs to a later date. It seems, for instance, that in *tōd* : *uļgōd* (Skr. *tād* : *uļkād*) the agreement is original, while *tesmōd* (Skr. *tāsmād*) is *tōd* transformed by association with the locative *tesme* *tesmin* (Lith. *tamē* Skr. *tāsmin*); see § 424 p. 349.

We may now consider the special pronominal endings in detail. The acc. sing. masc. fem. and the acc. pl. masc. fem. may be passed over, since in these cases nouns and pronouns always had the same endings. All that is needed is a note
upon Goth. bable 'the, that', which will be found in \$ 412
Rem. On O.Ir. acc. pl. masc. ima op. \$ 326 p. 226 and
p. 355 footnote 1.

Nominative Singular Masculine and Feminine.

\$ 413. Side by side with masc. forms in -os as *go-s
'who?' (= Skr. kā-s, O.Ir. ne-ch for *ne-kyo-s, Goth. hōs, 
Lith. kā-s) was *so 'this, that': Skr. sā, Avest. ha and aŋ-sa
= Skr. e-sā (Jackson, Am. Or. Soc. Proc. 1886 p. cxxvi),
Gr. ē, Goth. sa, probably also Lat. ip-se for *-so, iste instead of
*isse for *is-so and the like (I \$ 81 pp. 72, \$ 568 p. 425),
Umbr. ere 'is' = *ei-so Skr. e-sā (op. \$ 409 p. 329). 
Perhaps even in the parent language there was a form
*so-s: cp. Skr. sā-s Gr. ὅς (ἡ ἡ ὁ and the like) Lat.
ip-su-s beside ip-se. The fem. was *sā: Skr. sā Gr. ἡ Lat.
ip-sā Goth. só.

\$ 414. There were forms from o- and ē- stems ending 
in -e doubts -e and -o, in which ἦ was a deictic element, which
we may conjecture to be the same as ἦ in the loc. sing. and
pl., see \$ 256 p. 157, \$ 356 pp. 256 f. Compare too the Lith.
masc. vocative in -oi, as tēnai, and the Skr. fem. voc. in -ē,
as dāvē (\$ 201, 202 pp. 83 f.).

1. The stem o-. Skr. ay(-ām) Avest. aem i. e. ay(-em)
'this', cp. Skr. va-ay(-ām) 'oneself' and va-ay(-ām) 'we' \$ 441.
To this stem probably belong O.Ir. ἢ 'he' for *e- (but cp.
\$ 416), and perhaps Gr. ὅς = ἦς e-ν with the particle -m
(e-ν: Skr. ay-ām = Boeot. τóv-ν Ἡδημ. τοῦ-ν-γ: Skr. tiv-ām
τοῦ-άμ), with which are connected ῥωτείρες etc., later analogical
I 46 ff.).

The stem *go- (interrog. and indef.). Lat. qui, O.Lat.
(Dvenos-inscr.) qui Osc. poi 'qui'; but Umbr. poei poi poe is a
dissyllable, and so doubtless a compound of *poi with -si -i
(cp. nom. pl. pur-i pur-e etc.). O.Ir. cia (for *cē) Mod.Cymr.
acci; cp. the frequent occurrence of "initial aspiration" (I § 658.1 pp. 510 f.) in cia chruth 'how?' properly 'what (is) the kind?' and in Mod.Cymr. pwy bynnac 'whosoever (bynnaс)'.

Lat. *hī-c for *hōi-ce, like quot.

O.Sax. A.S. sæ 'this, that, the', identical with the indeclinable Goth. sē, which is an unaccented affix in O.H.G. de-se 'this' (gen. des-se) Norse Run. sa-si 'this' (fem. su-si neut. þat-si). O.Sax. O.H.G. thē this A.S. þē instead of sæ by association with the stem to- (cp. Lith. tā-s instead of Idg. *so *so-s and the like). Further, O.Sax. hē hie O.H.G. hé, cp. § 409 p. 327. O.H.G. jenē-r was made by adding to -ē the nom. sign -r = *-ēx (cp. ir e-r = Goth. i-s) — this explanation of -ēr makes it possible to see why it was not shortened to -er, cp. muoter for pr.Germ. *mōder § 192 p. 71; — from this analogy came blinter, see § 406 p. 321; as to unsēr gen. unseres beside blinter gen. blintes see § 455. A different explanation of jenēr is given by J ohannesson in Bezz. Beitr. XVI 121 ff., where other older explanations are cited and criticised. O.H.G. der, her are not shortened forms of *dēr, *hēr. Two origins are possible. (1) To de, he = thē, hē, which arose in a position where they had no accent (though afterwards they could be used with the accent too) was added the nom. -r (cp. O.H.G. de-se as contrasted with A.S. de-s 'this'). (2) Or der took the place of *dar = Lith. tā-s, taking e from the gen. des etc., as did the acc. de-n. The latter view is favoured by hucer wer (acc. we-n) beside Goth. haus.

Lith. tasai 'this' is doubtless for tas+i-sai, not tas+i-ai (cp. Bezzlenberger, Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr., 174).

2. Feminine forms ending in Idg. *-aĩ, as the nom. acc. pl. neuter (§ 428). Avest. āwōi 'tua' xwāc(-ca) f. 'one's own' (Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 173), which suggested noun forms like ber'xāĩ f. 'blessed' (§ 190 p. 67). Perhaps this -aĩ is the same as the Ar. ending for the voc. sing. of a-stems (Skr. dēv), see § 202 p. 84. Lat. hae-c, quae beside

st qua, aliqua, Osc. paī pas. Another form of this class is probably Pruss. stai beside sta f. 'the, this' (Lith. tā tū-jī) quasi quot f. 'which', whence we have substantival forms by analogy, mensai 'meat' (Lith. mēsā) deinvitiscai 'blessedness' among others (J. Schmidt has a different explanation, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 389 ff.).

§ 415. Forms with the particle -u, doubtless the same as appears in the loc. pl. -s-u (§ 356 p. 257). Idg. *so-ū in Skr. sū O.Pers. havō Gr. oō-roč. Skr. a-sād (for its a- see § 409 p. 327) and Avest. hau are remarkable, being used for both masc. and fem.; conversely O.Pers. havō is used for both genders; the obvious conclusion to draw is that in the first pair the Idg. fem. *sa-ū is used instead of *so-ū, and in the latter group *so-ū is used instead of *sa-ū, cp. O.Pers. fem. iyam = Skr. iyām used for the masc. However, the masc. a-sāū hāu along with Ved. masc. aū may be derived from an Idg. *sū beside *so (Bartholomae, Bezz. Beitr. IX 310, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIX 498, cp. also Wackernagel, E. Kuhn's Litteraturblatt, III 55, and Johansson in Bezz. Beitr. XVI 129), and O.Pers. havō from an Idg. *sa-ū with the same grade of ablaut as is shown by the Idg. fem. *ga-ī (§ 414) (cp. Wackernagel, Das Dehnungsgezet, p. 65). Gr. aś-ṛṇ may be derived from either *sāṛ- or *sāṛ- (I § 611 p. 461), and oō-roč might also be connected with Avest. hāu and derived from *sō-ū.

Avest. masc. avōu beside avam i. e. avem 'that yonder' is like hāu, see Bartholomae, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXIX 498.

Remark. With the relation between *so : *sū compare these other pairs of pronouns: nom. *gā(h)ō : *gā(h)ō I' § 489, loc. *te : *ti 'there' etc. § 424, acc. *me, *mē, *mē, *mē : *mē, *mē, *mē: 'me, thee, himself' § 442, nom. dual *me : *mē 'we two' *iū : *iū 'ye two' § 457, nom. *iū : *iū 'thou' § 440. The difference of quantity in these pairs of forms was of the same kind as that which is found in other final syllables and syllables which have some resemblance to finals; e. g. *me : *mē 'or' (Gr. *fē in *fē Lat. -se: Skr. se), *pro : *prō (Gr. πρὸ Skr. prā: Gr. πρό-πρό Skr. prā-prā), *num : mū (Skr. mū Gr. πο: Skr. mū O.H.G. mū). On these forms we may now refer to Wackernagel, Das Dehnungsreg. pp. 5 ff.

§ 416. The relation between Skr. nom. vā-j and vi-j 'avis' and like pairs (§ 195 p. 75) suggests that Lat.cis is
and eis-dem (Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundr. p. 28), beside i-s = Goth. i-s, is to be derived from an original strong-grade nominative *ei-s, which may also be the source of O.Ir. i (cp. § 414 p. 335). But it is quite conceivable that eis is a contamination of *e-i (§ 414) and i-s, cp. O.H.G. jenê-r p. 336.

Remark. It seems to me a very dubious supposition that eis, which occurs three times in C.I. no. 198, is each time a blunder (Danielsson, Stud. Gram. p. 23). It is preferable to regard eis-dem as a contamination of idem = *i-odem, and isdem (restored on the analogy of i-e). But this view is needless, if there was a form eis ie.

Nominative and Accusative Singular Neuter.

§ 417. The mark of these cases is -d, answering to -m in nominal o-stems (as *jugo-m 'jugum'), and to a suffixless stem in the other classes of nouns (as *peku 'pecu'); e.g. *to-d 'that' *qu-o-d *qi-d 'what'. Skr. tâ-d Avest. ta-p O.Pers. ai-ta = Avest. aep-tap; Skr. ci-d Avest. ci-p O.Pers. ciy 'any, at all'. Gr. to pod-απ-ς (II § 32 p. 56) Thess. ποξυ for *pode xi; the particle *Fio-d in Gr. ώτί οπως and the like was probably the neuter of *syo- 'suus' (the Author, Gr. Gr.² pp. 184, 231) and not the abl. sing. like Skr. mâd (§ 474), cp. Avest. ma-p 'meum'; rî rî = Skr. ci-d. Lat. is-tud quo-d qui-d, Umbr. este 'istud' for *es-to(d) (cp. § 274 Rem. p. 174) piř-i píř-s-i 'quid, quodcunque', Osc. po-d 'quod' pi-d pi-d 'quid'. O.Ir. ce ci 'quid' in ced cid 'what' (is) for ce ed ci ed; whether ed 'it' is connected with Lat. i-d, is doubtful, see § 409 pp. 331 f. Goth. hva, ūa-t-a i-t-a with -a for -ō, as is shown by hvorjatō-h 'each' and other similar forms, O.H.G. da-z e-z, cp. the Remark. Pruss. x-ta, ka, O.C.Sl. to, je = Skr. yā-d and ēt-to (-to is a particle), ni-ēt-ze 'nihil'; in Lith. *tâ = *to-d was driven out of the field by the neut. pl. *tai (§ 428), see J. Schmidt, Plur. pp. 228 f.; but the d-ending remained in adjectives like gēra, to which it had spread before this happened (§ 227 p. 110).

Remark. Hitherto the final vowel of Goth. pata etc. has been explained as an affixed particle, like that in acc. masc. ūama = Skr. tā-m. But Johansson (Bezz. Beitr. XVI 129, 161) sees in Goth. -a a fuller form
of the suffix -d (ablaut *-udh- : -*yd-), and equates *pata with Skr. taddā, Lith. tadda, ita with Skr. idā and the like. He sees another grade (-de) of the same suffix in Gr. ἔοι, ἔο-πει Lat. ide-m. But he will not allow that Goth. panis is an acc. with -m; he makes it the same as *pana-in *pana-māls 'further, still', and derives it from *tonā. This last derivation does not convince me in the slightest degree; for the form in question is masculine, and there is nothing in its use to suggest a derivation from any such adverb. The accepted explanation of *pan-a has in my opinion no difficulties at all. O.H.G. des, with e instead of a taken from the other cases, may be the unextended form, which keeps the nasal like the preposition in — Gr. in and the particle Goth. an — Gr. ãr Lat. an. Johansson's explanation of *pata is less objectionable in itself. But *pata cannot be separated from *pana; and unless *pana is merely a re-formate moulded after *pata when *pata had come to be regarded as a simple uncompounded word — which there is nothing to shew — we must adhere to the old explanation of *pata. O.H.G. duw3 is doubtless the unextended form, which kept the final dental, as it should do, before a vowel initial in the following word, just as des kept its -n.

Re-formations in the separate languages with the -m of noun-stems in -o-. Skr. ki-m (cp. Gaedieke, Acc. in Veda pp. 6, 16) Pali tam Avest. ke-m yi-m aom. Gr. rēvō- instead of rēvō. Lat. ipsu-m Umbr. esom-e 'in hoc'. Another is doubtless O.Ir. (s)a n-, neuter of the article and relative pronoun.

Genitive Singular.

§ 416. In the Masc. Neut. there are two endings, which passed very early into the noun-system: *-sjo and *-so, see § 228 pp. 113 f., § 239 pp. 130 f.

*-sjo-. Skr. tā-sya Avest. as-tahe; Skr. a-syā Avest. ahe aňhe (ňh taken from the fem. aňbā = Skr. asyds, cp. § 420); Gāthic ahyā ašyā (I § 558.3 p. 415); O.Pers. ava-hyā Avest. avaňhe (ňh as in aňhe); Skr. amāşya. Armen. oroy from or 'which'; but cp. § 239 p. 131. Gr. Hom. ro-ño Att. ro vô = *to-sjo; Homa téo Att. ro vô = Avest. cahyā, common ground-form *qe-sjo. O.Ir. aí ae, unaccented ā a (with "aspiration" of the following initial) 'eius', I would suggest for *e-sjo, cp. Skr. a-syā Goth. i-s O.H.G. e-s.3) Lastly *sjo is probably the suffix of

1) To avoid separating things which are really closely connected, I may add here a few general remarks upon Irish possessives of the third person. These will be based upon Stokes's Celtic Declension.
Pronouns with Gender: Gen. Sing. § 418.

Pruss. *te-ssei *tei-sei *tei-se *tei-sī (stei- has been taken from the gen. pl. stei-son) of this, of the', aina-ssei 'of one, of a', although the uncertainty of the spelling makes it impossible to draw a certain conclusion (cp. Leskien, Decl. 113 f.).

*-so. Goth. *pi-s O.H.G. de-s = *tẹ-so, A.S. dæ-s (beside de-s) = *tō-so (cp. Gr. τέο beside ποῦ); Goth. i-s O.H.G. neut. ea-s. Compare § 239 p. 131. O.C.Sl. cě-so = Goth. hēi-s Č.H.G. hve-s, cē-so (beside cē-to 'quid'). There is no need that I can see to assume that Greek had *-so (as well as *-sjo), Johansson notwithstanding (De der. verb. contr., p. 215).

In the separate languages there were frequent levellings between pronominal forms of the gen. sing. and the gen. pl. O.Ir. ai 'eorum' = *esjöm following ai 'eius' = *esji; Lat. cuium following cuius, see footnote on preceding page; Pruss. steisei instead of stesseei following steison, see above; Goth. pīsa instead of *pāisa (cp. A.S. dāra O.Icel. þeira) following pīs; Avest. aštəsham, instead of aštəsəm following aštəsə, § 429. This suggests a conjecture that *-so in Goth.

(pp. 104 f.), and upon communications which I have received from Thurneysen. The above named forms ai ae ā a can be used for the feminine ("ætrī"), but then ā a do not cause aspiration, and so they are doubtless connected with Skr. asyās. Further, ai ae are the accented gen. pl. (and dual) 'eorum, earum' the unaccented being ā n-, ā n-. In explaining these forms we have to consider (1) the sing. masc. fem. Mid.Cymr. Corn. y Bret. e (pl. Mid.Cymr. eu Bret. ēo = pr. Brit. *eu? § 438); (2) the Irish substantival word for 'that which belongs to him, or them' (all genders): ai aē, acc. pl. masc. aii, dat. pl. aiih, with which is doubtless connected Mid.Cymr. eidaw 'that which is his', eidd 'that poss. which is hers', eidxn 'that which is theirs'; also used along with the pronoun: ai-aii 'suos' Cymr. y eidaw 'his own' (mas.). A conjecture may be offered that *esjō and *esjās, in proethic insular Celtic, when in pre-tonic position became *oxjō *esjōs (cp. Ir. as- cēsi de- 'ex' I § 66 p. 55), and the a- passed from these to the accented forms. The gen. pl. which grew out of these forms, *osjōm = O.Ir. ai aē, ā n- a n-, may be compared with Lat. quaum (Charisius) following cuius, which took the place of quōrum or quīnum (Cato) (compare Hom. ἄντελε beside ἑυρίο § 454), but the subst. ai ae is naturally compared with Lat. cuius-a 'belonging to whom' which comes from the gen. cuius (§ 419). The substantival acc. pl. aii shows that this stem had i-flexion.
§ 418, 419. Pronouns with Gender: Gen. Sing.

§ 419. Some of the Armenian pronouns have r as the genitive suffix, which is certainly to be connected with the genitive r- in the personal pronouns me-r 'noster' je-r 'vestri' in-r 'suí' (§ 455): oir from o 'who'; nor-in from no-in 'the same', and others. Compare further O.Icel. vár O.H.G. unsär § 455.

The much-discussed Italic forms 1) contain a locative in -e-i; and this formation may be suggested as an explanation of the gen. sing. of noun stems in o (§ 239 pp. 131 f.). The loc. in -e-i was used in pr. Ital. for loc., dat., or gen., as the form *me-i *me-i in the personal pronoun had been used right on from the parent language (§ 447); we may suggest that *te-i when used for the genitive had at first only the possessive meaning, and did not come till later to be quite coextensive with this case. Compare Thess. loc. rok and xora used as gen. A desire to mark off the genitive from the other cases led to different results in different dialects of Italic. In Latin an association with the gen. in -us (homin-us) produced such forms as istus-ei, eius eius i.e. eei-us (cp. loc. dat. eei ei); but the gen. suffix -s was added in Umbr. erer irer Osc. eisaeis eisaeis 'eius' and the like (cp. subst. Umbr. popler Osc. sakarakleia), the latter of which are exactly parallel to O.Lat. gen. me-s ti-s instead of me sei (§ 447). The re-formates istus eius were used for the feminine as well, but istae utrae and like forms are also found, as in Umbr. erar 'eius'. The order -ei (*iestei) survived in composition beside -ei-us (istus), as istmodi (cp. qui-qui-modi, below); but neutrí, in neutrí generis etc., has doubtless borrowed -i from the nouns (similarly Lith. masc. tō fem. tūs).

The genitives quoius hoius, cuius huius must be discussed in connexion with quoiei quois hoi-ce, cui hui-c and Osc. pieis-um 'cuiuspiam' piei 'cui', not forgetting Osc. poizad abl. 'qua' pullass adv. 'qua' Umbr. pora abl. 'qua'. As far back as proethnic Italic a fossil case of the stem *qo-, say *kvo or *kvoj, was used instead of the inflected pronoun as an interrogative or relative particle, the case which it was intended to represent being made clear by an inflected demonstrative pronoun which was used with it; cp. Lith. dial. tūs cėcorius, kūr iszvālino jō dūkteri 'the prince, where he has freed his daughter' = 'whose daughter he has freed' (the Author, Lit. Volksl. p. 305). Thus Lat. quoiei = qo + eei, to which was later added quoius as a distinctly marked genitive (though quoi-quo-modi cui-cui-modi remain unchanged), Osc. poizad = pō + eizad (eizos- 'is'), pullad = pō + ollad (cp. Lat. ollae), Umbr. pora doubtless = pō + orā (orēr 'illius') rather than pō + orā (orēr 'eius' = Osc. eizeis). Osc. piei (gen. pieis- in the comp. pieis-um 'cuiuspiam') is doubtless derived from a combination of the adverb *pi = Lat. quē from the stem *qi- (§ 421) with e(ē)ei, although it might possibly have come into existence by attraction of pi- to the o-class. On the analogy of qui quius the Lat. hoi-ce hoi-us were made, like the nom. pl. hēs following quēs (§ 427); the similarity once existing between these stems in the nom. sing. (quē and hē-c(e), § 414. p. 336) may have helped in this result.

Remark. The Lat. adj. quoius- cuius 'belonging to whom', to judge from its meaning, seems to have arisen from the possessive genitive quoius, which looked like an adjective; if so, it has an exact parallel in Avest. ēn- 'noster', formed from the genitive ēnē = Skr. man; see the end of § 454.

1) The same idiom is found in Modern Greek, as mēros eimi o erēman. pōi tov eida, beside pōi eida, 'that is the man whom I saw'; in Keltic; and in High German.

2) Osc. pulius, in Zvetadin, Inser. It. inf. no. 108, seems to be one of this group of forms (I would derive it from *pō + eida-); but the meaning of the passage in which it occurs is obscure.
Old Irish has also *-i as in nouns, ind athatur 'of a father' for *sen-it, like Lat. isti-moti Gr. Thess. rei.

Lithuanian. With noun flexion, tů, j̄o etc. Old Church Slavonic to-go je-go, etc., a re-formation which has not yet been satisfactorily explained, see Leskien, Decl. 109 ff.

§ 420. Feminines belonging to o-stems had in the parent language the masculine stem with the ending *-sjās for the genitive singular. Arbor. -asyās: Skr. tāsyās asyās, Avest. aētañhā aiihā. O.Pers. ahyāyā instead of *ahyā, following taumāyā (§ 229 p. 114), just as Pali asa = Skr. asyās was extended to āsāya on the analogy of κανναύα; ending exactly as a noun, Avest. aṣtāyā (following haŋnayā) beside aṣtāiñhā. Skr. amū-ṣyās like amū-ṣya. O.Ir. aí ae for *e-sjās, see p. 339 footnote. Pruss. s-tessias stessies stesses steises (ei on the analogy of masc. steissi, § 418 p. 340). Germanic *-sjās and *-sās. A.S. ãere = pr. Germ. *pôisjôs, Goth. pizōs and blindāizôs (§ 406 p. 321), O.H.G. dera, O.Icel. þeirar = pr. Germ. *pôisôs. This ãœ has come from the gen. pl., where it spread from the masc. to the fem. (§ 429). But the loss of i in Goth. pizōs etc. is to be explained like the same loss in the masc., see § 418 p. 340. As regards -s- becoming -z-, see Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 347.

This Idg. feminine formation in *-sjās was produced under the influence of the masc. in *-sjō. Either there was once a fem. *tās like *ekyās, which was transformed to *tesjās by association with *tesjō; or else *tesjō at first served for all genders, and afterwards the feminine was distinguished by the transformation *tesjās. From the gen. in *-sjās, sj (s) spread to the dative and locative in the preethnic period; see § 425.

O.C.Sl. tojê contains the -ê of duše, standing for *-ons or *-ons. See § 229 pp. 117 f. Since the dat. loc. toji borrowed the sounds -øj- from the instr. tojā = Skr. tāyā (§ 425), tojê itself may have followed the same analogy.

Endings the same as those of nouns. Greek ἄης, Latin illae beside illiōs etc., Umbr. erar 'eius'. Old Irish
Pronouns with Gender: Instr. Sing. §§ 420, 421.

inna for *sen-tás, cachá cechoá, nachá, cp. mna § 229 p. 114. Lith. tōs.

Instrumental Singular.

§ 421. A suffix proper to pronouns was -na, the same (we may suggest) as the ending of certain adverbs; for instance, Skr. cañá Goth. -huñ O.H.G. -gin 'any', Skr. hiná 'then', Lat. pōne superne, Goth. þan 'then' Lith. tēn 'there'. Examples: Avest. ka-na O.Pers. tyā-nā aniya-nā, Skr. ké-na tē-na ē-na; the latter, like Skr. sanē-mi O.C.Sl. tē-mi (see below), have doubtless the same diaphthong which is seen in the nom. sing. Lat. qo-i qui etc. (see § 422 Rem.), and they also remind one of Skr. ē-va Ved. ē-va ē-va 'so' Goth. hvāi-va 'how'. With Skr. kēnā: Avest. ka-nā cp. Lith. gen. kēnū : kenū (kanū) § 451 pp. 391 f. -ēna was borrowed by the nouns, whence vēkēna etc., see § 275 p. 177. Gr. ἵνα, cp. § 409 p. 331. A lost form *ci-na (nom. ci-ē) seems to have suggested the making of the Avestic acc. cicim.

Forms from o-stems ending in *-oī-mi. Skr. sanē-mi 'from of yore'. A.S. ðei-m O.Icel. þei-m beside subst. A.S. miolcum (as in the pl., Goth. þi-m beside subst. vulfa-m). O.C.Sl. tē-mi ji-mi. Compare the Pruss. sen main 'cum meo' = 'mecum' (see §§ 449, 452), which is doubtless not to be derived from Idg. *moj-mi (cp. Avest. ma-Gr. ἱαύ- 'meus'), but belongs to the stem maia-, and has undergone a contraction like the gen. maini (beside stessei stessei aiassesi), and the nom. maia = O.C.Sl. mojf; however, I leave it undecided whether *maia-m(i) became main in the natural course of things, or by association with maia-smu maia-n became first *maia-m(i), and then main (cp. tuaiasmu beside tuaiasmu). Compare § 282 pp. 187 f. Armenian: with -v for *-bhi oro-v, from or 'which', following the subst., gašlo-v; similarly i-v 'with or through what?' from i 'what?' like subst. šrti-v, see § 231 p. 186.

There also seem to have been in the parent language, and to have come down from it, an instrumental series from o-
and i-stems made noun-fashion, ending in -ə -e and -i. Avest. tà ya ana. Gr. πώ (où-nów), Lac. πη-νώκα. Lat. quō-modo, quō 'whither', Umbr. sei-podruh-pei 'utroque'; Lat. quō 'how' from qui-s. O.Ir. cách (gen. cáic) O.Cymr. pau-p 'quivis, each' no doubt = *qō-gos, properly 'where who, how who, somewhere or somehow someone' as Thurneysen conjectures; neuch neoch for *ne-gō, cossind 'with that' for *con sen-tu. A.S. hwō 'how' O.H.G. diu, hiu-tu 'to-day' (§ 409 p. 330), Goth. hwē 'with which' þē 'by so much': hī (beside Goth. hi-mna) in O.H.G. hi-naht 'this night'. Lith. tū 'with that, at once' jū 'by that, by so much': the suffix -mi was added to this series, and produced tà-mi kā-mi, just as in nouns -u-mi (vilkumi) was produced in some dialects, see § 275 p. 178; Pruss. s-tu ku. Mod.Slov. či 'if' Czech či 'whether' = Lat. quī, and with -mī added O.C.Sl. či-mī used as instr. to či-to. According to this analogy, the particle *ā, Ved. ā (also seen in ā-dhā- 'such as this') Gr. -ά in ouros-τ Umbr. pors-ei nom. pl. 'qui', may be the instr. to Lat. i-s; if so, the nasal in Ved. āṃ Gr. ouros-tv is the particle -m.

§ 422. a-stems had -ajā. Skr. tāya Avest. aet-taya, Skr. aya Avest. ayā aya. O.C.Sl. tojā (with the particle -m), compare O.Lith. taja, in modern dialects taţ (J. Schmidt, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 386 f.); for a different explanation of taţ see Brückner, Arch. slav. Phil. VI 272

In Aryan, this ending spread into the noun-system: Skr. ásvaya instead of ásva, Avest. hāmaya instead of huṣhā: similarly O.C.Sl. rakojā instead of rakoč. In Lithuanian we find, vice versa, the pronoun assimilated to the noun, tā following ranka; and similarly Gr. ἅ Dor. ravrā and doubtless Lat. hā-c etc. See § 276 pp. 178 ff. It is uncertain whether Ved. tyā instead of tyāya and Avest. yā ka beside aetaya have followed the noun type, or whether tyā and yā are due to syllabic dissimilation, and ka to the analogy of ya (compare similar changes in § 247 p. 147, § 307 Rem. p. 205).

Skr. amūya beside amūhyas follows the lead of -aya.

Remark. Schmidt (Kühn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 386) analyses Skr. ayā thus — ay-ā; and derives it from the stem i-; he then assumes that ayā : asyaṣ first suggested the formation of tāya. This commends itself to me as little as his view (ibid., p. 292) that e-na also comes from i-, and that it was the relation of en-a : asyaṣ that produced tāna beside tādya. There is a much safer way of regarding these. Schmidt himself tells us (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXV 3 f.), and I believe it to be true, that -i- in certain plural forms (Goth. ḫ-ī- in O.C.Sl. tě-mi Skr. tē-ḥiḥ, Gr. tο-ί-να, O.C.Sl. tē-chiū Skr. tē-ṣu) is the same as -i in the nom. plural (Gr. το-ι Skr. tē etc.); and further, we have concluded that the i-diphthongs in oblique cases of the dual, as O.C.Sl. tē-na Skr. tāy-ōṣ, contain the same -i as the nom. acc. dual neuter and feminine (Idg. *ta-ī and *ta-ī); see § 297 pp. 201 f., § 311 pp. 209 f. If these assumptions are correct, we can hardly go wrong in connecting the diphthong of Skr. e-na tē-na and sam-e-ni O.C.Sl. tē-mī with that in the nom. sing. masc., e.g. Skr. ay(ē-ū) Lat. go-i quī Osc. poi etc., and similarly the i of Skr. ayā tāyā O.C.Sl. tāq with that of the nom. sing. fem., as Avest. pa-ī Lat. quaes (§ 414 p. 336). It is true that Skr. ayā might be derived from the stem *ejā- (Lat. eō- Goth. ēō-); but there is no reason to separate it from tāyā etc.

Ablative, Dative, and Locative Singular.

§ 423. In the masc.-neut., the stem is often extended by -sm-; the same particle which appears, without any inflexional ending, in the acc. Avest. ahma Lesb. ēμε (§§ 436, 443).


In Germanic and Balto-Slavonic there is another series which has -m- instead of -sm-. O.H.G. demu ēwemu. Lith. dat. tāmu tām loc. tamim-pi tami tamë tām, O.C.Sl. dat. tomu loc. tomī; Lith. szimē beside sziamē from szē-s. These forms
have certainly dropped s on the analogy of the cases whose suffix began with m: cp. O.H.G. pl. dé-m, sing. pl. A.S. dé-m O.Icel. þei-m, Lith. pl. tē-ns dual tēm-dvēm tēm-dvēm O.C.Sl. sing. tē-mī pl. tē-mū tē-mi dual tē-ma. For a different explanation of O.H.G. -m-, see Kluge, Paul's Grundr. I 347.

As regards the case suffixes; that of the locative was a special pronominal ending. This case had the endings -sēmin and -sēmi, cp. Gr. ἅμμιν ἅμμιν and ἅμμι ἁμμι § 448. -sēmin: Skr. tāsmīn, Lith. tāmîn in tāmîn-pī, although it is true that -mpī may have come from the gen. pl., in which case we must analyse the word tāmi-mpī (see Brückner, Arch. Slav. Phil., III 279 f.; Osthoff, Morph. Unt. II 9). 1) *sēmi in Avest. -tahmī Gr. ὧ-ρίμ. Lith. tāmī O.C.Sl. tāmī may be explained as having either -(s)mīn or -(s)mī; if the former, Lith. tāmī should be written tāmī. O.Lith. jamīje like diewje. O.Lith. Mod.Lith. tāmē, whence tānē, has the same ending as loc. vīlkē; a conjecture as to the origin of tāmē is given in § 424, pp. 349 f.

The ablative and dative, on the other hand, originally had the same suffix as the nouns. Skr. tāsmād āsmāi Avest. -tahmāp -tahmāi like ofkād vehrkāp vehrkāi. Armen. y umē like y akanē, cp. § 244 p. 142; what may have been the ending of um we can hardly now hope to ascertain. Umbr. esmi-k esmei esme like Tefri Tefrei Tefrec Tefre deo, cp. § 246 pp. 145 f.; in pusme it is a question whether the particle -e -ei (cp. pur-e 'quid') has not become attached to the ending. Goth. hramma; here -a, to judge from hvammē-h 'to each', came first from *-ē, but it may represent the abl. *-ēd or the dat. *-ē(j); O.H.G. hremu seems to be an abl. in *-ēd, cp. § 241 pp. 137 f., § 246 p. 146.

1) The form tāmī-pī does not prevent our explaining tāmin-pī as tāmin + pī. Both forms, tāmī and *tāmin, may originally have existed side by side. Or *tāmin may have become tāmī, and after the uncomounded word had thus changed, -pi may have been added again. This can be paralleled by tāmī-pī, which does not come from tāmē-pī, but after tāmē had become tāmī, -pī was added again to the new word.
Lith. tāmui (shortened to tām) O.C.Sl. tomu like viłkui vluki; Pruss. stemu like walδniku 'regi'.

§ 424. Side by side with the forms cited in the last section is a series without -sm-.

Ablative. Skr. ḍd ḍd yād Avest. āp, all adverbs. Gr. ἐὸν 'unde'. Lat. istō quō, Osc. eisūd 'eo'. Lith. tō. The abl. *tōd 'thence, then' is said, doubtless correctly, to be the ending of the imperative Skr. bhāra-tād Gr. quē-tâw Lat. fer-tō and similar forms (Gaedicke, Acc. im Veda 225; Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 179 f.). — An Italic re-formate is Lat. *quid from qui-s in ab aliquë etc. (Bücheler-Windekilde, Grundr. 121 f.), cp. muri(d) § 243 p. 139.

Dative. Gr. ἑ. Lat. istō mittō beside istī etc. A late re-formate is Lith. dialectic mirusiu-jnu = High Lith. mirusiām-jām, part. pret. of mir-ti 'to die' (Geitler, Beitr. lit. Dialektologie, 27).

Locative. Gr. Att. neī Dor. neī, ἕ-keī. Lat. hei-c hī-c, Osc. eisef 'in eo' alttref 'in altero'. Goth. þei O.Icel. þi = Gr. reī-st, O.Icel. hvā = Gr. neī; see Bechtel, Zeitschr. deutsch. Alt. XXIX 366 f. A loc. from the stem o- may be contained in Gr. ei ei-ta (beside ἕ instr. in Heraclean etc., see the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 225) and in Skr. े-ṣa- ἕ-ta- Osc. ei-zo-, see § 409 p. 329.

Certain forms used for the dative are really locatives of the same kind: Osc. altrei 'alteri' piei 'cui', Lat. istei istī, eei ei (also spelt ei, like dat. abl. pl. eic beside eis eis), quoiei quoi cui, the latter for quō (or *quoi) + eei (see § 419 p. 342); Lat. hei-ce hui-c is a re-formate following quoi cui. These same forms, as we assumed in § 419, once had the meaning of a genitive as well (cp. Idg. *mo-i loc. dat. gen. § 447), and, as genitives, were extended in Latin by -us, whilst in Umbro-Samnitic -ēi became -ēis by analogical transformation. The use of istī etc. for the feminine was doubtless due to the likeness between the ending -ei -ē and that of mī mihi tihi sibi, used for all genders, and of the dative of i-stems; the endings of both sets were considered to have the same character.

A comparison of the forms cited in this section with those containing -sm- (§ 423) makes it probable that it was only the locative which had two original formations. In the locative there will have been parallel endings -smin -smi (Skr. tāsmin Avest. -tahmi) and -i (Gr. νο-i); later on, but before the end of the prothetic period, -sm- spread to the ablative and dative, which hitherto had had the same endings as nouns. Ablative adverbs like Skr. ḫad are older than this change; and being adverbs they were not affected by intrusion of -sm-. But such forms as Lat. istō(d) and Greek ῥο may or may not be original; it is possible that they were produced by some tendency of a later date which brought them again under the influence of the noun system.

This -sm- is usually identified (and doubtless rightly so) with the particle Skr. sma, which follows pronouns by way of emphasising them: e.g. tāsya sma. Now it will be seen anon (§ 449.2) that Gr. Lesh. ámuś Avest. hma probably consist of *ys- + sme, i.e. the ground-form of Goth. uns with a particle *sme added; and that from this combination were produced the forms for which it is usual to assume the stem *ysme- *ysmo- (Gr. ámu- Skr. asma-). Thus this particle must have originally been added to a fully formed case of the pronouns which distinguish genders as well as to those already cited; this case will be the locative. And there is nothing to bar our starting from *te- + sme, and calling the first of these a locative. Compare Lith. tė 'there!' O.C.Sl. te 'and' beside *te-i (*to-i?); Lat. ce in ce-do Osc. ce in ce-bnust (-bnust 'venerit') Lith. seè 'hence' (but cp. § 409 p. 330) beside Gr. ἐ-κει ἐει-νο-γ; Lith. nė Goth. ni 'Skr. nā 'not' beside *ne-i in Lith. nei nē-ka-s Avest. nae-ciš Lat. nei nē; Lith. be, a particle which denotes duration of an action, beside bei 'and'; O.C.Sl. kūde beside kūdē 'where'; and the like.1) *te

1) Besides *te, *kr, *ne the parent language had also *r, *k, *n- (Gr. το 'there!' Dor. ῥο-νο- 'isto, ille'; Dor. κο-νο-; 'ille'; Skr. nā O.Ir. ni); the variation in quantity has parallels, *mē: me 'me' etc. See on this matter see § 415 Rem. p. 337.
and *tse-ż were parallel locatives like Gr. δόμε and νομίνε, see §§ 256 ff. pp. 156 ff. The ending of *tesme meets us still in Baltic, in Lith. tamę (geramię), which has taken the place of *tesme, because, by association with case-suffixes whose first sound was m-, s was dropped, and -a- gave place to -a-; cp. Pruss. ste-suni as contrasted with Lith. támui, § 423 p. 346. On the analogy of támui: tamę the form vilkė, as I believe, was produced beside vilkui, and the same principle acting in the opposite way produced O.Lith. jamije on the analogy of dievię; cp. § 263 p. 166. Idg. had *tesmi(n) = Skr. tásmin etc. beside *tesme, as it had *yssmi(n) = Lesb. ámmur ámuu beside *yssme. Perhaps there were originally two variants *sm-i and *sm-e, both extensions of *sem-, which would make it unnecessary to assume that *tesmi(n) was formed from *tesme.

Remark. The above comparisons are based on the belief that those scholars who hold that Lith. tamę and vilkė come from *tamen and *vilkęn have not proved their case. In such forms as geramen-je -je (Arch. slav. Phil. IV 592, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 285, Bezz. Beitr. X 312, and elsewhere), which are made the chief ground for assuming -en, it is strange above all things that the second part has not the pronominal form, as would have been expected (-jamę -jam), but a noun ending, like jamije amszimaje etc. (Bezz., Zur Gesch. lit. Spr. 154, 168). Hence Leskien suggests that an earlier *geramejew(e) was shortened to *geramej, and to this was added -je, which was regarded as the locative ending in the nouns; when -je was added -m became n. No argument can be based upon the spelling of those words with -je instead of -je; it might be a re-formation following noun-locatives in -ę. Nor is the alleged -en proved by East Lith. forms in -ę, as miskęli ‘in the wood’. It is possible phonetically to derive -i from -en, but there is no need for this; rather the reverse, since there has hitherto been found no such form as an E.Lith. -im-p(i) for -sm-p(i) -en-p(i); no *dēvim-p(i), but only dēsp-p(i). See Leskien, Ber. sächs. Ges. Wiss., 1884 pp. 36 f. Besides the explanation suggested by Leskien, that miskęli comes from miskę, there is another which should be considered — that miskęli followed the analogy of tami (with Idg. *smi), as miskę that of tamę.

But suppose the supporters of the theory here criticised were really to make out a decent case for their *tamen *geramen and *vilkęn,¹) there would be little to change in the general principle. I would all the same

1) Is Pruss. schismun, Ench. 89, anything more than a piece of carelessness?
§ 425. In a‐stems we find sometimes complete agreement with nouns, sometimes the genitive -si- or -s- before the case ending (§ 420). We begin with the latter kind.

1. The Ablative and Genitive had the same form from the Idg. period onwards, e. g. Skr. gen. abl. táśyās, see § 420. Re‐formations: Avest. anhāhp avanīhāhp yōnahād‐a (beside gen. anhā etc.), like barentyāhp haṃnayaḥ, see § 242 p. 138.


Locative. Skr. kāsyām asyām, cp. āsvāyām; Avest. kañño anhē with -ē = pr.Ar. -iā (I § 125 p. 115) and īh from the gen.abl. (kañhō), cp. Avest. haṃnaya O.Pers. arbirāyā § 264 pp. 166 f. These pronoun cases were influenced by such forms as Skr. bhātyām Avest. barentyā: kāsyām kañño: kāsyās kañhō and kāsyāi kahyāi = bhātyām barentyā: bhātyās barentyā and bhātyāi barentyā. Goth. pizāi like gibāi.

Sanskrit. Re‐formates: amūṣyaṃ amūṣyāi amūṣyām.

2. Forms without -si- or -s-.

Ablative like the genitive, Gr. rēγ etc. In Italic, a re‐formation in -ād: Lat. istā(d) ha‐c, Umbr. era‐k 'ea' Osc. ekad 'hac' eiza‐c eisa‐k 'ea', like Lat. equā(d) § 243 p. 139.

Dative. Gr. rēγ Dor. rā like χῳρα. Lat. istae illae (beside istē ilt) like equae; Umbr. -e Osc. -ai are not found. O.Ir. -ind for *sen‐ti like tuaith. Lith. tāi like rañkai; Slav. toji besides sniži rače has taken -oj‐ from the instr. tojā,
just as gen. tojē is probably *ty transformed in the same way (§ 420 p. 343).

Locative: always ends in -aΔ like the dative. Gr. Boeot. rai rai, Arcad. etc. rai like Boeot. ἀλαγατ, see § 247 pp. 146 ff., § 264 p. 167. Osc. ejiai 'in ea' like viai 'in via'. O.Ir. issind f. 'in the, that' == *in sen-ti, like tuaith. Lith. toj-e like raškoj-e, see § 264 pp. 167 f.; O.CSl. toji like dat. toji, see above. —

If the fem. gen.-abl. in -sjās was really, as our view assumes, produced by association with the masc.-naut. gen. in -sjo, then -sj- -s- spread from the gen.-abl. to the dat. and loc.: beside *tesjās was formed *tesjāj following *ekuaj: *ekuās (§ 420 p. 343). In a similar way were made Lith. mānei (mān), Pruss. mennei, O.CSl. minē in connexion with the gen. Lith. manē (manēs), O.CSl. mene (§ 445).

Cases of the Dual.

§ 426. The Case-Suffixes peculiar to the Dual were originally, and always continued to be, the same in Pronouns as in Nouns.

Nom. Acc. In Greek the fem. rai was turned into a plural (§ 286 p. 194), and in its stead was used the masc. rai; e.g. rai oveia, cp. Gr. owe Lat. duo Lith. dial. du used for masc. and fem. alike.


In Greek, rov is used for fem. as well as masc., like rai, see § 312 pp. 210 f.

Nominaive Plural Masculine and Feminine.

§ 427. o-stems had -oi, as against -ōs in the nouns. On the presumable origin of -a here, see § 186 pp. 60 f. Skr. tē imē, Avest. tē toī, imē, O.Pers. imay. Gr. rov oī.

Lat. iste he quī. O.Ir. ind = *sen-ti. Goth. þāi, O.H.G. dē dia die; Norse Run. þai-r O.Icel. þei-r took their -r (= pr. Germ. -r) from the nouns. Lith. tĕ Pruss. stei quai qui (see J. Schmidt, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 391), O.C.Sl. ti. In five branches of the Indo-Germanic parent stock, as we have seen in § 314 p. 214, this pronominal -obeing has passed over to the noun system.

On the other hand, -o sometimes passed from nouns to pronouns. Osc. pūs Umbr. pur-e pur-i ‘qui’, Osc. pūturús-pid ‘utrique’, Umbr. erw-out ‘idem’. Also in Armenian, or in ‘which’ nor-ka ‘they’ no-inl ‘the same’, if Bugge is right in explaining the -ā as -s+u (see § 313 p. 212).

Remark. As regards Ir. ć (Cymr. -cwy in lucuyt-cwy, Corn. Bret. y) Thurneysen holds it to be possible that the word is the masc. sing. ē (§ 414 pp. 335 L.), and that its use for the plural was due to the analogy of the interrogative. However, it must be considered whether there was not in Idg. a form *-ē-i used for the plural. Seeing that -o-i and -e-i are both found in the nom. sing. (§ 414 p. 335), the same variation may be expected in the plural (comparo *me-i ‘we’ § 441). Moreover, Pruss. gen. pl. stei-sen seems to pre-suppose a nom. *stei, for we are not justified in deriving its ei from an Idg. oj (see Braune, Kuhn-Schleicher’s Beitr., VIII 95). As to the Irish plural variants iat eat and siet seat: in Old Irish these are found only in oleat-som ‘say they’ beside the singular olec-som ‘says he’, and similarly, we may conjecture, catect corret ‘what are’ beside sing. cate cote ‘what is’. These have the ending of the 3rd. pl. of the verb (cp. Ital. eglino); later on, iat siet ‘were detached and began an independent existence. See Zeusza-Ebel Gramm. Celt. p. 372; Schuchardt, Zeitschr. rom. Phil., IV 158.

Nom. pl. quēs from quī-s, like opē-s. Hence also hēs heis beside hē, which in their turn produced such plurals as magistēs. See § 314 p. 214.


Skr. amās, following imās.
Nominative and Accusative Plural Neuter.

§ 428. o-stems have two endings, -ā and -ā́i, corresponding to -ā and -ā́ in the nom. sing. of a-stems (§ 414 p. 336). Examples of -ā (which is also found in nouns) are: Skr. Ved. tā Avest. tā (Skr. tānī Avest. yqn yqm and yā see § 338 p. 238), Gr. tā in īnī-τάδε-ς (tā, see p. 238), Lat. ista, sī quā Umbr. eu 'ca', O.Ir. inna for *sen-tā (-ā possibly borrowed from na = *sna, see p. 355 footnote), Goth. ā O.H.G. diu (= Skr. Ved. tyā), O.C.Sl. ta. The following are examples of -ā́i: Lat. quae, hae-que hae-c, istae-c. A.S. dā O.Icel. þē and O.H.G. Up. G. dei, which is perhaps a shortened form of *dei-u, itself a re-formate which has taken -u from diu (but compare the dual zwei beside A.S. tweā O.Sax. twē for *dyōi, § 293 p. 198). Lith. ta ̃ the, that which has taken the place of the singular neuter *tā = *to-ā (§ 417 p. 338), Pruss. kai 'what'. Others of the same kind would seem to be the adverbs Lith. kai̇ kaī-p 'how' Pruss. kai̇-gi kaī-gi 'how' (this spelling does not justify our deriving the ending from orig. -ā́i, cp. maim instead of mainm and like forms), and further Gr. xai and O.C.Sl. cē, which also meant originally 'how, as' (the Author, Gr. Gr. 2 § 35 Anm. p. 54, § 201 p. 223); also Lith. s_ei̇-p 'so' = sziar-p, following which the language coined tei̇p in place of tāi̇p.

This formation in -ā́i has not been proved for Aryan. (On the supposed Avestic nom. acc. pl. neut. vastrāi in J. Schmidt's Pluralb. pp. 232 f., see Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr., I 75). Thus it would be possible to start from Idg. -ā́i; this being shortened to -ā́i in the European languages. But it is hardly permissible to separate this formation from the similar one in the nom. sing. fem.; and since for the latter -ā́i is proved by Aryan to be original, we must assume Idg. -ā́i for the other as well.

The i-stem *ti̇- went along with the nouns. Avest. cī. Greek Meg. mé `quaem?' and enclitic Ion. σαν Att. τρα (see
Genitive Plural.

§ 429. The o-stem ending was pr. Idg. *-oij-sóm, with a variant, as we may suggest, *-ei-sóm (cp. Pruss. steison § 427 Rem. p. 353); on the quantity of the vowel in the final syllable, cp. § 344 pp. 244 f. -oij and ei, which precede the ending -sóm, were the endings of the nom. pl. masc. Skr. teṣām ṣām Avest. ae-toṣām uṣām, Avest. avaṇēṣān O.Pers. avaṣām; with the isolated Avest. ae-toṣāhm, influenced by the gen. sing. ae-tahe, as Goth. piēzē instead of *pāizē has been influenced by πίς. A.S. dara O.Icel. þeira; Goth. gives piēzē, but the diphthong remains in blīndūizē which was modelled on the now lost *pāizē (§ 406 p. 321), O.H.G. dero. Pruss. steison, O.C.Sl. tečē; Lithuanian once had this formation, as we may assume from mūsā jūsā, see § 456.

On O.Ir. aí ae and a n- a n- see p. 339 footnote.

With the noun ending. Avest. kām. Gr. τῶν. Lat. eum, Umbr. eom ero 'eorum' from the stem ero:- and Lat. eōrūm istōrūm etc. must be placed in the same class, because the ending -ōrum (common to nouns and pronouns) was coined to match with -ārum at a time when -ārum was the ending of nouns and pronouns alike, see § 345 p. 247. O.Ir. inna n-doubtless for *sen-tān = *tōm, beside fer n-1) Lith. tū.

The Idg. a-stem ending was *-ā-sóm. Skr. tāsām āsām Avest. avāhām; on this analogy, Skr. amāṣām.

1) Thurneysen writes: "I should prefer to derive the gen. pl. masc. and neut. inna n- from *-dān for *tōm, cp. aco. pl. masc. inna , from *-dās for *tōs. For the pronouns it is necessary to assume that accented and unaccented forms have become confused; and I imagine that in the pre-tonic *sen-do-, the rather strong secondary accent was conditioned by the ending which the word once had. If the ending consisted of long vowel + consonant, it was rather more strongly accented; otherwise the stronger accent fell upon the first element of the word; cp. the Spanish article, sing. el, but pl. los. It is also possible that the neut. pl. comes from na (= *sna) by analogy".
Gr. Hom. ῥῶν Att. ῥῶν Dor. ῥῶ. Lat. istorum, Osc. eizaxun-c 'earum'. In Germanic and Slavonic the forms have been influenced by the masc.-neut.: A.S. ðæra O.Icel. þeira; Goth. bižō first for *pižō following bižōs (but blindáizō has not been changed) like masc. πιζέ following piš (but blindáizē), similarly O.I.H.G. dero like sing. dera; O.C.Sl. tēchů; cp. Att. τοῦτον fem. as well as masc., but Dor. τοῦτον, § 346 p. 248.

We see that in the classical languages nouns have borrowed the pronominal ending (§ 346 p. 248). The reverse process gives us pronouns with the noun ending in Avestic kām like vanām, Old Irish inna n- like masc. inna n- (of course the fem. form might also be explained as coming from *-āsōm), and Lithuanian tū like ruokū.

The i-stem *qi-: Lat. quīnum, like ovium, beside quōrum.

Locative, Dative-Ablative, and Instrumental Plural.

§ 430. The Suffixes were the same as in the Nouns.

The ending -o-j in the nom. plural masc. of pronouns seems to show that the ending of the Locative of o-stems, -o-s (-su -s), Skr. tēṣu etc., was once in the parent language confined to pronouns, whence it passed into the noun system; see § 186 pp. 60 f., § 357 p. 260. Armen. oro-ç no-ç-a, with -o- instead of -o-s, following gaiolo-c, see l. c.

Skr. tā-su from fem. *tā- like āsva-su etc. But in Slavonic the form of the masc.-neut., tēchů, did duty for the fem. as well, just as happened in the gen. pl. (§ 429).

Gr. τί-σι is either related to τί-ζ as ὅψι-σι to ὅψι-γ, or else it was coined in connexion with τίν-τι to pair with τίξρο-τι: τίξρο-σι etc. (cp. § 361 p. 263, on κυοί).

§ 431. In the Dative-Ablative there seems to have been a difference between noun stems and pronouns before the first separation of the Indo-Germanic peoples. The o-stems if pronouns had -o-i- (Pruss. shows -e-i-, as in stei-son, § 429), and if nouns, had -o-. This distinction was kept in Balto-Slavonic, and possibly in Germanic (that is to say, if Germ. -m
is something more than a mere instrumental suffix, see § 367 pp. 267 f.). Skr. té-bhyas Avest. taēbyō, whence vēkē-bhyas vehrkaēbyō. Lat. hi-bus, i-bus = Skr. ē-bhyās. On the above supposition, we should add Goth. pāi-m O.H.G. dē-m, beside vulfa-m volfum. Lith. tē-ms O.C.Sl. tē-mū, beside vilkā-ms vilūko-mū, Pruss. s-tei-mans beside waika-mmans 'to the boys, or retainers'. Compare § 368 p. 269.

Skr. tā-bhyas Avest. avā-byō, Lat. ea-bus, Lith. tō-ms like Skr. āśvā-bhyas Avest. haṇā-byō Lat. equā-bus, Lith. rańko-ms. But the masc.-neut. Goth. pāi-m O.H.G. dē-m and O.C.Sl. tē-mū were used for the fem. as well.

Lat. qui-bus like ovi-bus, Goth. O.H.G. i-m like ansi-ti-m ensti-m.

§ 432. In the Instrumental of o-stems there are two distinct suffixes, as was the case with nouns.

1. The ending -ōis in exact agreement with the nouns: Skr. tālī Avest. tāś, Gr. rol'ī, Lat. hīs eis oloes ('illis') Umbr. esus-co 'cum eis' Osc. eizois 'eis', Lith. taīs. Compare § 380 p. 275.


1) The form tō ib, given by Stokes in the paradigm of ð (Celt. Deel. 103), does not exist. Stokes has taken the ending of Mid.Ir. dōnafib ān aib-to be an independent word. The origin of this, as Thurneysen informs me, is as follows. In Middle Irish, the component parts of O.Ir. dōnafib-ði — -ði is a particle — became so completely one, that the
O.Ir. cosmaib, Lith. to-mls as with nouns. Masc. form used for fem.: Goth. pāi-m O.II.G. dē-m, O.CSl. tē-mi. — Goth. O.H.G. i-m like anstī-m enstī-m.

[Tables of Pronoun Declension to illustrate §§ 412—432 are given below, pp. 360—363.]

Personal Pronouns which do not distinguish Gender, with their Possessives.¹)

§ 433. As in the Pronouns which distinguish masculine and feminine, so here, a single paradigm includes forms from dative ending could be added to its final -i: hence donafrō-b, or by the usual substitution of dona k- for O.Ir. donaib, dona hīb. Thus ū has about as much right to an independent existence as ινα, in Greek ἵνα.

¹) To the references given in the footnote to page 322 add the following:


stems etymologically distinct; e. g. Skr. nom. rājām 'we' acc. asmān 'us'.

With this class of personal pronouns, far more commonly than elsewhere, we find forms having no recognisable case-suffix used with the meaning of some special case, e. g. Gr. ἰμε ιμε used as an accusative; and forms which combine the meanings of more than one case, as *mo-i *me-i (Skr. ṁe mē, and so forth), which can express the meaning of locative, dative, or genitive. This poverty of inflexions shows that this class of pronouns keeps up the usage of a high antiquity. But when the languages had started each on its separate course, all manner of inflexional distinctions were made anew in this group of pronouns, and it was more closely assimilated to the other pronouns and the nouns. Thus the form of these pronouns was run into the mould sometimes of a masculine case-form, sometimes of a feminine, but at the same time no special gender was implied in the re-modelled words. 1) Examples are (1) where the case-ending is masculine: Skr. acc. asmān following tān, āśvān (§ 443. 2), Gr. gen. ἰμε-ιο following ῥο-ιο ἵππο-ιο (§ 450); (2) where it is feminine: Skr. loc. asmā-su following tá-su, āśva-su (§ 448), O.C.Sl. instr. mūnojā following tojā, rakojā (§ 449).

It is certain that in several cases the pronouns we and you had a singular ending (not, however, as we may conjecture, without expressing the plural by some sign; see § 436, with Rem. 2). But in the end their collective meaning, and their frequent use in apposition or predication with forms having a plural inflexion, caused them to take a plural ending themselves;

Gaidoz, Des pronoms infixes, Revue Celt. VI 88 ff., VII 81.
Buggle, Die Formen der geschlechtslosen persönlichen Pronomina in den germ. Spr., Kuhn's Zeitschr. IV 241 ff.
Brückner, Arch. für slav. Phil. IV 1 ff.

1) No confidence can be placed in the unique Skr. Ved. fem. yujāndhi instead of yujāndha in Vāj.-Śgh. 1. 13 and 11. 47. See Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. V 204.

[Continued on page 364.]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. o-Stems.</th>
<th>Pr. Idg.-</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestic</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sing. nom.</strong></td>
<td><em>so-stā</em></td>
<td>ad ad</td>
<td>ag-ka hāw</td>
<td>or</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>go-ya</em></td>
<td><em>ga-stā</em></td>
<td>ad s</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>or</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*go-ya *go-ya</td>
<td><em>ga-stā</em></td>
<td>ad s</td>
<td>hō</td>
<td>or</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
<td><em>p.</em>-sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc.</strong></td>
<td><em>rō-mi</em></td>
<td>tā m</td>
<td>ag-te-la</td>
<td>ter</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tu</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>re-ō</em></td>
<td><em>re-ā</em></td>
<td>tā d</td>
<td>la-hō</td>
<td>ter</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tu</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.</strong></td>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tā aya</td>
<td>ag-tañe ca-</td>
<td>oray</td>
<td><em>rai-</em> tō</td>
<td><em>rai-</em> tō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tā aya</td>
<td>ag-tañe ca-</td>
<td>oray</td>
<td><em>rai-</em> tō</td>
<td><em>rai-</em> tō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr.</strong></td>
<td>*go-nya <em>go-nya</em></td>
<td>bōna</td>
<td>bōna</td>
<td>bōna</td>
<td><em>m.</em>-nu</td>
<td><em>m.</em>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>rōj-mi</em></td>
<td><em>rōj-mi</em></td>
<td>tā</td>
<td>tā</td>
<td>tā</td>
<td><em>m.</em>-nu</td>
<td><em>m.</em>-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>abl.</strong></td>
<td><em>tād</em></td>
<td>tād</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>y ona</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tēmōd</em></td>
<td><em>tēmōd</em></td>
<td>tād</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>y ona</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat.</strong></td>
<td><em>tēsōd</em></td>
<td>tēsōd</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>y ona</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tēsōd</em></td>
<td>tēsōd</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>y ona</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loc.</strong></td>
<td><em>tēsōd</em></td>
<td>tēsōd</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>orum</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tēsōd</em></td>
<td>tēsōd</td>
<td>ag-tanād</td>
<td>orum</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td><em>tā</em>-tā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plur. nom.</strong></td>
<td><em>re-ō</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>rē</td>
<td>tē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rōj and <em>-ō</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>rē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc.</strong></td>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>rē</td>
<td>tē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>rē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.</strong></td>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*la-ṣa <em>la-ṣa</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr.</strong></td>
<td><em>tē-ō</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tē-ō</em></td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Forms later than the Proto-Hittite period, which have only their use to justify the place which they fill in the paradigm, are enclosed in square brackets [ ]. * Spaced type denotes that the form contains an ending which may not be considered as directly representing the idg. form. A dagger † is prefixed to such forms as have passed from the pronominal.
### Pronouns with Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-re</td>
<td><em>ne-eh</em>&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>neh-</em></td>
<td><em>heo-</em>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>bā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>bā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>[bā-]</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. <em>e</em>-ēn</td>
<td><em>e(na)</em></td>
<td><em>nā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>tē A.S. nā</em></td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><em>sā-</em>&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

[to the noun system in one of the separate branches of the language. For want of room these tables do not include the Dual cases (cf. § 429 p. 385).]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr. Idg.</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Avestic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sing. nom. | तखः | हु | τάκ, Dor. Χ | ἰπ-σα
| | तुः | रसि | τέ-ν, Dor. τα-ν | γουνε |
| Acc. | ताम् | तुम् | τεταμ, Dor. τα-μ | लατο-μ |
| Gen. | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | तस्तν, τάν
<p>| Abl. | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | τάντα(ό) |
| Dat. | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | तάτας |
| Also सत्: | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | तάτας |
| Loc. | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | बोοτ. τα- τά |
| Instr. | तस्तकः तस्तकः | तस्तकः | τέτας, Dor. τα-ς | ἑ- ς |
| Plur. nom. | तकः | तल् | τας | [τας] |
| Abl. | तकः | तल्ल | τας, τας, τας | [τά-σα] |
| Gen. | तक-सम् | तक-सम् | τα-σοκ, τα-σοκ | τα-σα, τα-σα |
| Loc. | तक-म् | तक-म् | τα-σοκ, τα-σοκ, τα-σοκ | [τα-σα] |
| Dat. | तक-सो | तक-सो | τα-σοκ, τα-σοκ | [τα-σα] |
| Instr. | तक-सो | तक-सो | τα-σοκ | [τα-σα] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>umb.-sann.</th>
<th>irish</th>
<th>gothic</th>
<th>O.H.G.</th>
<th>lith.</th>
<th>O.C.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oso. io-e</td>
<td>ind</td>
<td>sō</td>
<td>diu</td>
<td>tā</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. pas pai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>普鲁士.光</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. paam</td>
<td>in a-</td>
<td>þō</td>
<td>des dīs</td>
<td>tōq</td>
<td>tōq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ai e, iūna</td>
<td>þōs</td>
<td>dēro, A.B. dēro</td>
<td>tōq, op. Pruss.</td>
<td>tōq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. ōeō-e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tōs</td>
<td>tōq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ind</td>
<td>þōdī</td>
<td>dēro dēro</td>
<td>Pruss. s-tessici</td>
<td>tōq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lith. tōī</td>
<td>tōq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. a]iina</td>
<td>iisind</td>
<td>þōdī</td>
<td>dēro dēro</td>
<td></td>
<td>tōj-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O.Lith. tōja</td>
<td>tōja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. pas</td>
<td>inna</td>
<td>þōs</td>
<td>deo dīo</td>
<td>tōs</td>
<td>[ly]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. okas</td>
<td>inna</td>
<td>þōs</td>
<td>deo dīo</td>
<td>tōs tōs</td>
<td>tōy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oso. tzaun</td>
<td>tina-a</td>
<td>þōs</td>
<td>dēro</td>
<td>tōū</td>
<td>tē-chū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cosnaiō</td>
<td>Mūn</td>
<td>dēm</td>
<td>tō-mis</td>
<td>tō-mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. g. in Ion.-Att. ἤμεας takes the place of *ἡμε = Lesb. ἄμες (cp. ἴμες).

By the pluralised ending, the forms of we and you were carried away from those of I and thou; but the two pairs were brought in touch again by the action of analogy. For example, *ṛđ ‘thou’, has influenced duḥ ‘you’ in Armenian, and tumhe ‘you’ in Pali (compare Ved. guśme). See § 437.

In the parent language, these pronouns had few points of contact with the other pronouns or the nouns, and formed a little world by themselves. Thus their history is more instructive than that of other classes of words, if we wish to observe the working of association, and the kaleidoscopic changes which its influence produces. This will be clear even in spite of the cut and dried form of presentment made necessary by the plan of the present work, in which the historical method, that is, the true scientific method, has to give place to lists and catalogues with little more than hints to explain them.

1. Etymology of the Pronouns; the Formation of the Stem.

§ 434. The pronoun I shows the following forms.

1. Nom. *eği- and *eg- (for the variants ġh : ġ see I § 469. 8 pp. 346 f.). Skr. ahám Avest. axem. Armen. es is obscure; we cannot say whether it should be derived from *eği- or *eg-.

1) From *eği- one would have expected *ex, cp. हिस्म: Skr. देहेस I § 410 p. 301. *ex may have become es before a breathed initial in the following word; but certainly we have to face the question why this sandhi-form has become universal in this particular word, and not in the ex, for example. Idg. *ef- one would expect to become *ec to begin with (I § 409 p. 301). But there may have been s as well as c in Armenian, as we find s beside j = ġh, a point which needs closer investigation (cp. Von Fierlinger, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 479). Anyhow the laws of Armenian which touch this matter must be more exactly worked out before it is safe to venture on taking the step which Bartholomae takes. He derives es from an Idg. *eḫ, which he believes to be the form assumed by *eḫ at the end of a sentence (Rezz. Beitr. XIII 54). I do not believe
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Gr. ἕγω. Lat. ego. Goth. ik O.H.G. ikha from *eǵ-, but Norse Run. 'ga ('ga) beside ’ka from *eǵh-; in West-Germ. also *īk (A.S. ic Mod.H.G. Frank. aich), which is incomprehensible unless it be a mere lengthening on the analogy of *pā. O.Lith. ėsartz Mod.Lith. ėsätz Lett. ės Pruss. ės ės, with the sibilant changed from voiced to breathed at the end of a sentence and before a breathed initial in the following word (it must be mentioned in this connexion that Pruss. ės represents the sounds ė and ė both); the reason why ė- became ā- in Mod.Lith. ėsz Pruss. ės is obscure. O.C.Sl. ėsī ėsū Mod.Slov. ėa point to an older *ēsū (I § 76 p. 66): here ė has been lengthened on the analogy of y in ty, as the vowel of West-Germ. *īk was lengthened by association with *pā.

The consonant of *eǵh- is found again in the dat. Skr. māhyam, Lat. mihi. Umbr. mehe, Armen. inj (for *emēgḥ-). The forms appear to have been made up thus: ė + ġh- and me + ġh- (emē + ġh-). But perhaps the dative once began with *eǵh-, and its initial was afterwards changed on the analogy of the other oblique cases.

2. *emē- *emō-, *me- *mo-. It cannot be determined whether *emē- was the original form, and *me- is an ablaut weakening of it (cp. *teye- *teyo- *tēye- *tēyo-, § 435); or whether *emē- is a combination of the pronominal stems ė- and me- (cp. Gr. ė-xeė Lat. e-quivem and the like, § 409 pp. 327 ff., and what is said on *eǵh- above, subdivision 1). Skr. mē Avest. mē O.Pers. māyī; gen. Skr. māma perhaps instead of *ama, see § 450. Armen. gen. im for *emē; *me-in meē 'we' (§ 437.1, a). Gr. ėμοῖ and μοῖ. Lat. mi. O.Ir. mē. Goth. mi-k O.H.G. mi-h. Lith. mańę, O.C.Sl. mę.

§ 435. The pronoun thou shows the following stems, all closely connected together:

that any such form for the nominative of this pronoun, without any vowel following the palatal stop, can be proved for the parent language; see § 439.
Etymology of the Pronouns: their Stem. § 435.


4. *tu *tū, nom. and acc., Skr. tuv(-ām) Gr. συ etc., see §§ 440, 442.

Similar variants are found of the reflexive stem, § 438: *seqe-, *sye-, *se-, but there is no *si- among the cases to be parallel to *tī (Torp, Beitr. zur Lehre von den geschl. Pr. 14, conjectures that this grade of the stem is the prefix Skr. su- etc. 'good', but it is more likely that su- contains the suffix -u- of ṣu₃- and the like). There is an ablaut-connexion between *teye- *seqe-: *tye- *sye-: *tī. But the relation of *te- *se- to these forms is doubtful.

Remark. In view of doublets like ḍ- ḍi = *af-zi and Latin ser (§ 170 p. 16, above), it might be assumed that y was dropped by *tse- *seqe- in the parent language when these stems were used in the neighbourhood of some particular sound or sounds in a sentence. Whether this happened to them when used as enotics, as I have followed Waackernagel in assuming above (vol. I § 187 p. 162) is doubtful. Torp's objection (op. cit., p. 10) that there is no y in Avest. tāy, which is accented, but that y is found in Skr. tā ṣ, which is not, is easily met by assuming that the original relations were upset by analogy; besides, it is possible that the form Skr. tā came to be used without the accent at some period when the law under which y dropped was no longer effective. Torp (pp. 5, 9, 12) and Johansson (Berz. Beitr. XV 313 f., XVI-163) think that *teue and *seqe, which were weakened by some ablaut process to *teye *sye, were compounds consisting of *te *se + *ye (Torp identifies *se with the stem of Skr. vas Lat. vōs, just as he connects *ne in the gen. O.C.Sl. me-ne Avest. mē-na with Skr. nas Lat. nōs); and that these unextended ground-forms are still forthcoming in Skr. tē Prāskr. sē etc., as representing *te- *to- *se- *so-. This view would be supported by Gr. σ-ς, if it could be proved that its σ- is an ablaut-grade of the se- in O.C.Sl. sē-bē Lat. si-bē etc.; but this is hardly likely ever to be proved.
§ 436. The pronoun we shows the following stems:


2. *ne- *no-, *ne-s- *no-s-; the s is probably the same as the sign of the plural found in nouns, since it only appears in the plural of the pronoun (and of *ye-s- *yo-s- 'you')—and never in the dual. Skr. nas, Avest. nō. Lat. nōs. O.Ir. ni; on sni see Rem. 2, below. Goth. uns = *ye. O.C.Sl. nasū. Also in the dual: Skr. nāu, Gr. νού, O.Ir. nāthar, Goth. ugg = *g-ke (cp. mi-k), O.C.Sl. na; the ā- of Skr. ãvām may come from *g, and its -vam may have been borrowed from yuvām = yā + am, see § 457.

Further, we have *y-sme, or rather *ys-sme (cp. Rem. 2), which contains the same particle which we noticed in Skr. tā-smād etc., § 424 p. 349. Skr. asmān Avest. ahma, Gr. Lesb. ἀμ η. Att. ἴμας.

The pronoun you shows the following stems:


Thurneysen is doubtless right in assuming *usme, *us-sme (cp. Rem. 2) parallel to *ysme, *ys-sme in the first person (Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 175). Hence come Lesb. ūmēs Att. ἴμας, also Skr. yūsmān Avest. yūsmai-byā, which have taken y- from being associated with the nom. Skr. yūyām Avest. yūš (cp. O.Dan. vos(s) beside os(s) 'us' following the nom. vṛ 'we').

Remark 1. Since Avest. yūšna- is always written with a, perhaps more weight should be given to the fact that the vowel is written long here than in other instances: a was borrowed from the nom. yūš yušm. The relation of the variant xáma- to yūšna is obscure (cp. Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. III 19 f.).

Remark 2. There is more to be said for taking *ys-sme and *us-sme than for taking *y-sme and *u-sme to be the ground-forms; for
Skr. *i dém in and the like (§§ 423 f. pp. 346 ff.) prove that -sme implied no particular number, and the forms of *ne- and *me- which are not compounded with it seem to have once had -s, the plural sign, added to them in all other instances when they were not dual but plural. It is therefore incorrect to say that forms like Avest. ahmu Lesh. ə spəs had no plural sign; they did have one, but it came before -sme, and the acc. *gasme was simply *gs = Goth. acc. unis + a particle *sme. Compare what is said above on deriving Lith. tamę from an Idg. loc. *te-sme (§ 424 p. 350).

3. There may have been a close connexion in origin between Gr. dual συς 'you two', O.Ir. si (-b in old enclitic position) = Cymr. chwii for *s-mes, and Goth. iz-vis. They all have s, which seems to represent another distinct stem.

Remark 3. In O.Icel. ygr yðrar, & has taken the place of π (κ): one of the two κ's in *airik *airar became & by dissimilation, as in fredinn instead of frerinn and the like (see Buggo, Kuhn's Ztschr. IV 252). From these words we get a Goth.-Norse *ismi-, which may have been a transformation of *s-mi- *e-me- on the analogy of *psi-, which is found in West-Germanic, and forms a constant variant of *iz- (Lith. jas). But another view is far more probable. Proesthnic Germanic had the doublets *με(s) and *e-me(s). To both was prefixed the particle e, seen in Gr. ἓ-xi, Skr. a-dyab 'to-day' a-sū 'that yonder', Lat. e-quinem Umbr. e-tantu 'tanta' and like words (§ 409 pp. 322 ff.), and perhaps in Lat. e-nos in the Song of the Arval Brethren (cp. § 437.1, α). Then the relation between *c-me- (West-German., O.H.G. in A.S. eow etc.) and *e-e-me- (Goth.-Norse) was the same as that between Umbr. e-tantu and e-a-tu 'istum' (compare Lat. istum).

On this view, the parts of the words preceding *me(s) had nothing to do with expressing the meaning of the 2nd person; and this would make it not far-fetched to connect σ-ψ with σ-ψν, (cp. Wackernagel, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVIII 189 f.).

Torp's theory (cp. cit., 35) that *ismi- is *ίσι + me-, is quite as mistaken on phonetic grounds as his assumption that in West-Germanic the τ of Goth. ίσι, becoming ρ, disappeared first in the gen. O.H.G. iner & O.Sax. istrar by dissimilation, and then the acc. O.H.G. *irwth became *iswth on their analogy.

As regards the Keltic form, it would certainly be possible to hold that s- in pr. Keltic was detached from the ending of the 2nd person plural of the verb, and then was tacked on to the pronoun (Torp, p. 40); the only thing is that we do not know whether this personal ending was *trw in Keltic at all (cp. Lat. legitis). The s- of Ir. s-mi has not been found in the British dialects of Keltic. It may come from the frequent combination of the word with is, ismí being supplied by the speakers to consist of is+mí, just as in Mid.Ir. the nom. să instead of ə grew out of isá isă 'est is' = is ə, and perhaps at the same time out of olsé 'inquit'
§ 437. In the various languages, the stems of these pronouns suffered many changes by assimilation of one to the other. Some of these have been already touched upon. We subjoin a conspectus of the whole.

1. *We* assimilated to *I, you* to *thou*.

a. *We* assimilated to *I*. Pali *mayaṃ* instead of Skr. *vayām*. Armen. *meč*; from this nominative, *m*- passed into the other cases, driving out *n*- e.g. instr. *me-nč*, just as in Lith. e.g. dat. *νμ-μς* became *nu-mus* on the analogy of *mės* (see below). Mod.Gr. *ημετς* instead of *ημείς*. Lat. *enōs* (Arval Song), instead of *nōs*, follows *ego* (Stolz Lat. Gr. 2 p. 346), unless *e*- is a prefixed particle (like *e-quitem* etc.). Lith. *mės* O.C.Sl. *my* (whence Lith. has *m*- in the dual too, *mė-du*). In Baltic the *m*- passed first from nom. to acc.: Lith. *mūs* Pruss. *mans* (but O.C.Sl. *ny* unchanged); then *m*- spread to the other cases in Lithuanian, *mūs* mūms mūmis mūsiję, but Pruss. *nounsou* *noumans* are unchanged (O.C.Sl. *nasū* *nami* *nami*).

Remark 1. *m*- in O.Icel. *m vér* instead of *vér*, and in H.G. dial. *mir *mer* instead of *vér*, comes from the final consonant of the verb which preceded. The dental of O.Icel. *hér dér* and H.G. *dir *der* *vos* has the same origin.

b. *You* assimilated to *thou*. Pali *tunke* instead of Ved. *yuṣmē*. Armen. *duèle* (but *j*- remained in the other cases; in the 1st person, on the other hand, *n*- was displaced by the *m*- of the nom.). Mod.Gr. *εστς* following *ευ* (with *ε*- on the analogy of *εγω*).

Remark 2. The reverse change — *I* and *thou* following *we* and *you* — can only be found in the case endings: e.g. Pali gen. *mamāṃ* instead of *mama tasa* following *ahākāmya tumahākāya*, Avest. dat. *tahīyā* following *yāmāyō* (§ 445), Mid.H.G. gen. *mīnér dīner* instead of *mīn dīn* following *unser innir*.

2. *I* assimilated to *thou, we* to *you*, and vice versa.

manže doubtless has a instead of e (cp. O.C.Sl. mene) on the analogy of tavže (a different explanation is offered by Brückner, Archiv IV 17). West-Germ. *ti T O.C.Sl. (j)asū with long vowel on the analogy of *ti, see § 434 p. 365.

b. Thou assimilated to I. Mod. Gr. ἵοι following ἱοι. Perhaps Umbr. tiom follows *miom (vice versa, we have French mon following ton), see § 442. Cymr. dy follows my (n-).

c. We assimilated to you. Skr. dual āvām may have taken -vam from yuv-ām, as we would conjecture; see § 436 p. 367. Gr. Dor. ἄμετς Att. ἠμείς has taken the rough breathing from ἄμετς ἠμείς. O.Ir. s-ní beside ní perhaps follows *s-mé-, see § 436 pp. 368 f. In Baltic, the ú of jū- was borrowed: Pruss. nou-son nou-mans (ou = ú) following iou-son iou-mans (cp. O.C.Sl. na-sū na-mūi), Lith. mū-sū mū-ms etc. (with m- instead of n-, see under 1. a above), following jū-sū jū-ms etc. Lith. mēs instead of *mēs doubtless follows jūs.

d. You assimilated to we. Skr. yuv-ām takes its y- from vay-ām. Armen. jēz jer etc. take e from mex mer etc., in place of u. O.H.G. ir A.S. žē O.Icel. ēr following wir we vēr (Goth. jūs), and similarly in the dual A.S. žit O.Icel. it following wit vit (Goth. *ju-t). Again, Goth. ıggis O.Icel. ykkr H.G. ink enk A.S. inc follow Goth. uggis O.Icel. okkr A.S. unc: parallel to the acc. ugg = *u-ke (§ 436 p. 367) there may once have been *u-κ(ε), in which u- is the weak grade of *ye-; this would become *ink- *inku-, because the relation of uns- : izε- (West-Germ. iu- ) suggested that i- was the characteristic of the second person (cp. Torp, op. cit., p. 49; Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 144).

§ 438. The Reflexive Stems were *seye- *seye- *se-., connected in the same way as *teye- *tve- *te-, see § 435 p. 366.

1. *seye- *seyo-. Avest. ḍava- 'own'. Armen. gen. in-ir, cp. vol. I § 560 p. 416. Gr. ἔκ ἵν, ἐδιν. Lat. suo-s suo-s, Osc. suveis gen. 'sui'. It is not certain whether we ought to add Mid.Cymr. eu Bret. ho 'you', plural of y e 'eius' (footnote
on pp. 339 f.), Kelt. *swo- for *sweo- according to I § 66 p. 56, thus the stems which represent the singular and the other numbers would be just the reverse of what is seen in the French representatives of suus and illorum; it would be also possible to connect en and ho with Ar. ava- O.C.Sl. ová (§ 409 p. 329); or again, to regard them as dual genitives of y e answering to Skr. ayā (cp. Bavar. dual eg and enk used for the plural as equivalent to Mod.H.G. ihr and euch). Lith. savē savas.

2. *svo-* *swo-. Skr. svā-s Avest. Gāthic hwa- O.Pers. uva-

'sown' (I § 558. 3 p. 414). Armen. in-kn 'ipse', gen. in-

kean. Gr. ἡ, ἦ. Umbr. svesu 'suum'. O.Ir. fēin fodein 'self'.

Goth. sēs (gen. sēsis) 'own'. Pruss. swais O.C.Sl. svojī

'suus, own'.

3. *se-. Prakr. sē, Avest. hē sē O.Pers. šaiy; the

variation h- ś- in Iranian depended upon the final sound of the

word preceding (cp. I § 556. 1 p. 410), but by levelling

one or other form came to be used generally, the Gāthā
dialect discarding the forms with ś-, and Old Persian those

with h-. Gr. ἥ oī for *ne *sou beside fē for? Lat. sē sībi,

Umbr. se-so 'sibi' Osc. sīfei 'sibi'. Goth. si-k O.H.G. si-h.

Pruss. sebbē O.C.Sl. sebč 'sībī'.

No sufficient explanation has been given of the etymology

of Gr. σφω σφη(ν) etc. This stem seems to have started from

σφη(ν) (with the case-suffix -ν -μν); σφη(ν) being associated

with ἐμν ἀμν and the like, produced σφε σφω, etc. to

match ἐμε ἐμε, ἐμω etc. See the Author, Kuhn's Zeitschr.

XXVII 399 f., Gr. Gr.² p. 134; Waekernagel, Kuhn's Zeitschr.

XXVIII 139 ff.; and the present volume, § 435 Rem.

p. 366, § 436 Rem. 3 e 368.

The Reflexive shared in the analogical changes described

in § 437. Sometimes it affected other stems; for example, the

reflexive and the pronoun of the 2nd person together caused

changes in the forms of the 1st person, as Lith. manē, which

took α from tācē and savē. Or again, it was itself subject

to change on the analogy of the other pronouns; e.g. Gr. Lesb.
Personal Pronouns: the Nominaive.

§§ 438, 439.

ἀγεῖ ἀγεῖ (if indeed these forms are to be allowed at all, on which matter see Wackernagel as cited above, p. 141), which took ἰ- from ἀμμί ἀμμί.

2. Personal Pronouns: their Cases.¹)

a. I and thou, the plurals we and ye, the Reflexive, and their Possessives.

Nominative.

§ 439. I. The proethnic form may be conjecturally restored *ēg(h)o and *ēg(h)ō (cp. *so and *sō, § 415 p. 337), sometimes extended by the particle -m.


In Old Irish the acc. form does duty for the nom. in singular and plural; sing. we me-see 'I' (§ 442), cp. pl. ni and si-si si-b, which have driven out the old Idg. nominatives *mej and *jās (§§ 441, 443). Be it observed that in the second person tū tū- *tu stand for both nom. and acc. (§ 440, below).

¹) In this chapter the forms belonging to the separate languages, and those which are probably to be assumed for the parent language, are less easily taken in at a glance than has been the case in the two previous (chapters pp. 66 ff., 334 ff.). We therefore call special attention to the reference tables at the end.
§ 440. Thou. Pr.Idg. *tu and *tō (cp. § 415 Rem. p. 337), also with the particle -m.

1. *tu. Skr. tū (which, like tā, has become a mere particle, see Osthoff, Morph. Unt. IV 268). Gr. Dor. το, Att. στ (σ- from the other cases, where it comes from τυ-, I § 166 p. 147). O.Ir. tu-ssu tu-ssu.1) O.Icel. du do O.H.G. du (Goth. Ḟu-k acc., see § 442).


In the following instances, the original quantity cannot be determined. Avest. tā. Armen. du (d- doubtless when -n and -r preceded, then fixed as the type, see Bartholomae Lit. Centr. 1890 col. 321, and cp. -d 'the' § 409 p. 327). O.Ir. tā, which might be orig. *tū, because monosyllables bearing the accent, if they ended in a short vowel, lengthened it (Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXXI 91), cp. nē for *me § 442. Goth. þu (cp. þu-s þu-k with ū). Lith. tū.

With the m-particle: Skr. tvaṃ = tā-ṃ, tvāṃ = tu-ṃ, Avest. Gāthic tṛṃ later Avest. tām O.Pers. tātam (read tvaṃ) all three = Ved. tvaṃ; Gr. Hom. τὸν-γ Boeot. τοῦν Lac. τοῦ-γ (quantity of ὅν in the last two is uncertain). The ending of the particle has obvious resemblance to the ending of the 1st person (cp. Skr. akām and Gr. ἅγων), and thus J. Schmidt, perhaps correctly, explains Skr. tvaṃ Hom. τὸν-γ etc. as later formations following the analogy of the first person; this is supported by the fact that the Aryan

1) -sū -so (after palatal vowels -sīn -sē) is 'the "particula augens" of the 2nd person, as -s in (after palatal vowels -sc) is that of the 1st person, in mae-sec 'I'. Both particles are suffixed to these persons of the verb, but they are not found in verbs and pronouns only. They were certainly cases of pronouns or adverbs, and connected with -sīn and -sōm, cp. Gall. sosin 'of this'. As regards the relation of -sō -se and -sū -sūm to the various persons, Thurneysen writes: "It seems to me quite possible that -sū in verbs was originally the pronoun -sū (this is supported by the British dialects), e. g. do-bir-sīn for *do-beres-tu *do-beresu, and that -sū then became confused with the deictic particle -sū. The result of this may have been that -sā -sē were appropriated to the 1st person, as in Italian sì = ibi and vos caused the use of ci for 'us'."
forms for 'you' which have -am took this element only on the analogy of vay-ám (§ 441).

The form *tū is also used for the accusative in three branches of Indo-Germanic, see § 442.

On Osc. tiium tiú 'tu', see § 442.

§ 441. We and you.

Idg. *me-i 'we'; the kindred of this form is doubtful. As with *jū-s 'you', so with *me-i, it is uncertain whether we should compare it with singular or plural forms. Is *me-i to be classed with *e-i 'he' *go-i 'who' (§ 414 pp. 335 f.), or with plural forms like *to-i 'those' (§ 427 pp. 352 f.); does *jū-s contain the -s of the nom. sing. (cp. e. g. Gr. ὑπός) or the plural sign s? Skr. vay-ám Avest. vaem i. e. vayem O.Pers. vayam. Goth. veis Norse Run. vîr O.Swed. vi(r) for *mei-s with -s on the analogy of (Goth.) jüs. Evidence for a ground-form *me-s (cp. dual Goth. vi-t), perhaps also a re-formate following the 2nd person, (vice versa, Skr. yū-ý-ám follows va-y-ám), is found in O.H.G. wir O.Icel. vër, and further in Armen. mek Lith. mês (see below).

Idg. *jū-s 'you' (is this the singular or plural -s? see above). Avest. yūś, also yūś-em with -em following vaem i. e. vayem (why -em was added to just this sentence-doublet *yūś, I § 646.3 p. 491, and not to yūś, is obscure); Skr. yūyām follows vayām. Goth. jūs; beside this, A.S. ge gē, O.Sax. gi ge, O.H.G. ir, O.Icel. ær following we we, wi we, wir, vër (as in the dual A.S. gi-t O.Icel. i-t follow wi-t vi-t, § 457): first *jū-z became *je-z, and afterwards in O.H.G. and Norse, the initial ĵ- itself was changed, perhaps by the influence of iucēr and yäcar etc. Lith. jūs Pruss. ious.

Armen. mek and duk, whose initial is borrowed from the pronouns I and thou (§ 437.1 p. 369), doubtless took the place of *vek or *gek (I § 162 p. 145), and *juk. On the -k, see § 313 p. 212. *vek would answer to O.H.G. wir.

Greek. Leab. ἐμε-ς ἐμε-ς Dor. ἐμε-ς ἐμε-ς are re-formates following the other cases, acc. Leab. ἐμε ἐμε
etc. In Ion.-Att., *ημες *ημες became ἡμες ἡμες on the analogy of such forms as σαφεις, because of the resemblance between ἡμεν ἡμεν: σαφεν: so also σαφες beside σαφεν.

Lat. nos vos (Pelign. vos 'vos' is dubious, see Bugge, Altital. Stud. 75) are the acc. form = Avest. nd vā. So also O.Ir. ni si-si, = Skr. nas vas. See § 443.

Lith. mės Pruss. mes (beside jūs ious) doubtless stands for *yes (§ 437. 1, a. p. 369, and 2, c. p. 370) = O.H.G. wir. O.C.Sl. my vy are probably the acc. ny vy (my has m-through being confused with a formation answering to the Baltic), and were used for the nom. because rāky was so used (§ 315 p. 216, ny vy : namī vamī namī vamī = rāky : rākamū rākami). At least this is more probable than that there was a nom. *jūs = Lith. jūs, which on the analogy of the other cases became *mūs = the vy of our texts, and then this became my (cp. Lith. mū-ms, Pruss. nou-mans following jū-ms iou-mans, § 437. 2, c. p. 370).

**Accusative.**


1. *eme *me, *tye *te, *sye *se and perhaps *sye. Armen. *>&, _AMD probably for *eme-ghe *tyme-ghe, see below. Gr. ημε μή, Cret. ρε (in Hesychius, where it is incorrectly written τε) Ion. Att. οε Dor. τέ, ἐτ, Hom. έ (≈ Idg. *sye?); Cypr. μέ-ν, and ἦμεν on a late metrical inscription (214 A.D.) which doubtless has not the particle -m of Skr. mām etc., but the sign of the accusative. O.Ir. me-sse (on -sse see p. 373 footnote 1) and mē, with non-original lengthening of e (cp. what it is said of τα § 440 p. 373), which were also used for the nominative (§ 439 p. 372); unaccented *me e. g. in fri-m 'contra me'; unaccented *te cannot be inferred with any certainty from fri-t (beside friut) and the like, see the Remark on page 377. Goth. mi-k si-k, O.H.G. mi-h di-h si-h,
O.Icel. mi-k þi-k si-k, -k = Gr. -γε in ἐμε-γε and the like; on Goth. þu-k, see page 377.

Armenian. is doubtless for *ims (I § 202 p. 169) instead of *inj, the form which might have been expected, as we have in the dat. inj beside ἐκς. Since nom. and acc. ran together in nouns and in pronouns which distinguish gender, it is not too bold to conjecture that -s has come from the nom. es (op. § 434 p. 364). Then the *-j -z of the acc. is doubtless the particle *γε = Skr. ha (cp. I § 410 p. 301), so z is is like Gr. ἐμε-γε and Ζ ἐκς like Gr. σε γε O.Icel. þi-k. The -j -z of the dative I compare with the endings of Lat. mi-hi Skr. má-hyam (§ 446).

2. *mē, *muē *tuē, *sē. Skr. mā tvā, Avest. mā ᾱuā. Lat. mē tē sē; the old Lat. acc. mēd tēd sēd are doubtless really ablatives (§ 444); these must first have been used for the accusative because -d dropped before consonants (cp. sē-grego beside sēd-ítio), and thus the forms in the accusative and ablative became to some extent identical (abl. mē and acc. mē), whilst the instinct of the speaker could not distinguish between them; see Osthoff, Perf. 127 f., and Stolz, Lat. Gr.² pp. 345 f. A less probable theory is supported by M. Müller (Fleckeisen’s Jahrb. cxiii 702 f.) and Torp (op. cit., 10). These scholars hold that the acc. mēd etc. belong to a period when the ablative suffix -d of the personal pronouns was less restricted in its use than it afterwards came to be, and that the acc. mēd is therefore a very old form.

With the m-particle, Ἰdg. *mēm etc. Skr. mām tvām. Avest. mām ᾱuām O.Pers. mām ᾱuām (i. e. ᾱuām, I § 473.2 p. 349). O.C.Sl. mē tē sē, Pruss. mien tien sien sin (ie and i represent a closed ņ). But Lith. has manē tavē savē instead of *mē *tē *sē (the vowel shortened according to I § 664.3 p. 523) following the genitive (see § 450), for such original accusatives as *temēm *seymēm are hardly to be thought of; the dialectic mani tavē savē (Kurschat, Gramm. pp. 234 f.; Bezz. in his Beiträge X 310) follow the i-declension on the analogy of manyjē manimi etc. (§ 448).
*tú* as an accusative: Gr. Dor. το, O.Ir. tu tu-su-u (on the particle -su see p. 373 footnote) friut 'contra te' for *fri(th)-tu*, Goth. pu-k (= Gr. nom. σε γε).

Remark. One observation may be made in connexion with friut. There has been in Irish a vast deal of levelling in phrases consisting of a preposition with a personal pronoun. The different pronouns, the different cases (acc. and dat.), and the different prepositions have influenced each other. Thus, *u* in liuum beside liem, liem 'through me' (*le-* is the preposition as accented, pre-tonic it is *la-*) and in friuum beside frīum 'against me' (*fri-*) seems to have been taken from the 2nd person; perhaps before the law which affects final vowels had come in, these had formed an ending *-mu* following *-tu* (op. gen. mo *mu* following do du § 450). Now since the acc. and dat. of the pronoun *I* (originally *-*me and *-*nol *-*me) had early run into the same form, and since in the pronouns *me* and *you* the forms *-nu* and *-o* (for *nes* and *-es*-*ne*-*es*) were from the very first acc. and dat. both, it can hardly cause surprise that we find dom dam = *do-mu* instead of *doim = *do mi* 'to me' (do with the dat.), which would have been expected. In producing liuum friuum and the like, however, another word may have had some influence — occum 'with me' (the preposition is occ(u)-), op. occu: friut torut (lar 'trans') innum (imb 'circum'), and others. (This is Thurmeysen's suggestion.)

Umbro-Samnitic. Umbr. tiom teio tio tiu 'te' and Osc. siom 'se' are doubtless nom. acc. neut. of the possessive. This would be quite certain if Bücheler should prove to be right in regarding Osc. tiium and tiú as nom. (tu'); his theory is attacked by Bugge, Altit. Stud. 32 f. We shall meet again with possessives representing personal pronouns, in other languages (see below, § 452). It remains a question whether tiom siom are to be regarded as ad-formates of *miom = Lat. meum-m* (the Author, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 403 f.), or whether beside Ital. *mejo-* there were original stems *tejo-* *sejo-*, which the Umbro-Samnitic branch preserved along with tovo-sovo- (Torp, op. cit. p. 28).

§ 443. We and you, and the plural forms of the Reflexive. Two distinct expressions for 'nos' 'vos' may claim to be considered original:

1. Forms from *ne- *no- and from *ye- *yo- ending in -s (§ 436 p. 367), in three different grades of ablaut. These
forms had at first no special accusative meaning, as their wider use in different branches of Indo-Germanic clearly shews. Their use for the nominative, however, is doubtless later than the break-up of the parent speech, and belongs to the special Latin and Keltic periods, see § 441 p. 375.

a. Avest. nā vā = pr. Ar. *nās *vās. Lat. nōs vōs, also nom.; this nom. use may have begun in proethnic Latin, when the nom. pl. of noun o-stems still ended in *-ōs and their accusative ending *-ons had become *-ōs too. Cp. also O.C.Sl. gen. loc. nāsū vāstā for *nās-sū *vās-sū (§ 448).

b. Skr. nās vās, Avest. nō vō, also used as dat. and gen. O.Ir. ni s-ni ‘nos’, si-si ‘vos’ (when originally enclitic, these have become -n and -b), Cymr. Corn. Bret. ni ny ‘nos’, Cymr. chwi Corn. why Mid.Bret. hui ‘vos’ doubtless for pr. Kelt. *nes and *s-yes, cp. § 436.3 with Rem. 3, pp. 368 f.; these forms are also used as nom. Goth. iezis O.Icel. yðr ‘vos’ pr.Germ. *i-x-yiz = *e-s-yes, cp. ibid. These forms are also used as dative, like O.H.G. iu A.S. ēow for *i-ygiz = *e-yes. The last syllable of Goth. iezis retained i under the influence of mis sis or perhaps because of an accentuation iezis.

c. Goth. ūns, O.Swed. ūs ᾖs for *yōs; these forms are also used for the dative, like the corresponding O.H.G. ūns A.S. ē. On the analogy of iezis yðr and also of the dative mis etc., were produced the acc.-dat. Goth. ūnīs O.Icel. ūs, whilst the acc. O.H.G. ūnīh A.S. ǭs (like īnīh elec) followed the analogy of mīh mec etc. (cp. Armen. x jex ‘vos’ following x Rēz ‘tē’).

The Balto-Slavonic accusatives come from the forms *nōs *yōs, which followed the analogy of the acc. plural of nouns and of pronouns with gender. That *nōs *yōs were proethnic in the Balto-Slavonic branch is proved by O.C.Sl. nasū vāstā etc. (§ 448). Prussian māns ‘nos’, for *nāms at the first step backwards (it follows the nom. mes), and wāms ‘vos’. Similarly, Old Church Slavonic ny vy, like
rāky vūky (§ 326 p. 226, § 327 p. 229); like rāky, these forms (with a change of ny to my) are also used for the nom., see § 441 p. 375; they were also used for the dative, because of the acc. dat. dual na and va (§ 457). Lithuanian jūs ‘vos’ beside nom. jūs following sūnas: sūnus, also dial. gen. jūs-đūjūs following sūnus; on the analogy of jūs, a form for ‘us’ answering to the Pruss. mans was transformed into mūs (§ 437. 2, c p. 370).

2. Pr. Idg. *ys-sme *us-sme, differing from the formation described under 1. c. only in having a particle *sme added to it. See § 436 with Rem. 2 pp. 367 f. Gr. Lesb. ἅμα ἅμα Boeot. ἀμε ἀμε Boeot. ὅμε ὅμε Dor. ὅμε; with the ending pluralised Ion. Att. ἦμας ἦμας, ἥμες ἥμας (cp. nom. ἦμες ἦμες) and ἦμας ἦμας (cp. nom. Dor. ἦμες ἦμες). Avest. ahma; Skr. asmān yuṣmān following the acc. plural of o-stems. Since Avest. ahma can be derived, if need be, from pr. Ar. *asmana, the question arises whether there was not an assimilation to ma tvā in pr. Aryan (cp. abl. Skr. asmād: mad); or there may even have been pr. Idg. doublets *y(s)smē *y(s)smē, *u(s)sme *u(s)smē.

Distinct from all accusative forms hitherto cited are Armen. x mez ‘nos’ x jex ‘vos’. These are modelled after *x in-j (x is) ‘me’ and x ēs-x ‘te’, like as O.H.G. unsih iuweih after mih di-h.

Reflexive. Gr. σφέας σφάς beside σφε like ἦμας beside ἅμα. Armen. iureans.

Ablative.

§ 444. Ablative Forms with -d in Aryan and Italic.

Skr. mad tvād, Avest. maḥ śrvaḥ, O.Pers: ma and reflexive ša (§ 438. 3 p. 371). Lat. mē(d) tē(d) sē(d); Umbr. sei-pordhpei separatim utroque’ se-pse ‘singillatim’ (cp. Lat. acc. se-pse ‘sees, semet’). Lat. sē-d conjunction, = O.Pers. ša. It is doubtful whether there were Idg. doublets *med and *mēd etc., or whether in pr. Italic *mē-d etc. lengthened the vowel (ē) on 93
the analogy of the accusative, impelled also by the other ablative forms which had a long vowel followed by \(-d\) (\(-\ddot{a}d\), \(-\ddot{a}d\), \(-\ddot{a}d\)): Lat. \(s\ddot{a}d\) kept clear of these influences by its isolation in point of meaning. There is the same doubt in Avest. \(m\ddot{a}bya\) : \(m\ddot{a}-\ddot{v}ya\) § 445 p. 381.

Skr. \(asm\ddot{a}d\) \(yu\ddot{s}m\ddot{a}d\), Avest. \(ah\ddot{n}a\) \(yu\ddot{s}m\ddot{a}h\) \(x\ddot{s}m\ddot{a}h\). These might be considered Idg. if it were certain that the post-Homeric \(\dot{\eta}m\ddot{e}\ddot{d}\ddot{a}m\ddot{a}t\ddot{o}-s\) \(\ddot{\delta}m\ddot{e}\ddot{d}\ddot{a}m\ddot{a}t\ddot{o}-s\) ‘born in our or your land’ are anything more than mere adformates of \(\ddot{\delta}l\ddot{l}o\ddot{d}-\ddot{a}m\ddot{o}-c\) and the like (II § 32 p. 56).

We seem to be justified in inferring from Skr. \(m\ddot{a}d-\ddot{d}y\ddot{a}s\) ‘my’ \(asm\ddot{a}d-\ddot{d}y\ddot{a}s\) ‘our’ \(m\ddot{a}-\ddot{t}ak\ddot{h}i-\ddot{s}\) ‘my comrade’ a\(d\) the like (Whitney, Skr. Gr. §§ 494, 1098) that the \(-d\)-formation had originally a wider signification. The \(-d\) has often been identified with \(-d\) in the nom. acc. sing. neut., of pronouns with gender (Lat. \(\textit{quo-}d\) qui\(-d\)).

The following are obscure: Armen. abl. \(y\) \(\textit{inen}\) (perhaps \(\textit{in\ddot{e}n}\) and instr. \(\textit{inev}\) instead of \(\textit{*in\ddot{e}n\textit{*inev}\) following \(\textit{inj}\), as Lat. \(\textit{t\ddot{e}n}\)); Osc. \(k\ddot{u}m\ddot{b}\ddot{e}n\ddot{e}d\) have \(n\) instead of \(m\) because of \(-\textit{entu}-s\) \(\textit{venio}\), cp. I §§ 207, 208 pp. 174 f.) \(i\) \(\textit{\ddot{e}n}\) and \(i\) \(\textit{menf}\) \(i\) \(\textit{j\ddot{e}nf}\) (for \(-f\), cp. the loc. \(i\) \(\textit{tel\ddot{e}v}\) abl. \(i\) \(\textit{tel\ddot{e}v\ddot{a}}\) gen. dat. \(\textit{knof}\) abl. \(i\) \(\textit{knof}\)). Compare Torp, op. cit., 27.

Forms with adverbial suffixes (cp. § 244 pp. 141 ff.). Skr. \(m\ddot{a}-\ddot{t}\ddot{as}\) \(t\ddot{v}\ddot{a}-\ddot{t}\ddot{as}\) \(a\ddot{s}m\ddot{a}-\ddot{t}\ddot{as}\) \(y\ddot{u}\ddot{s}m\ddot{a}-\ddot{t}\ddot{as}\), compare above, \(m\ddot{a}-\ddot{d}y\ddot{a}-s\) etc. Gr. \(\ddot{\epsilon}\ddot{m\ddot{e}-}\ddot{t}\ddot{e}-\ddot{t}\ddot{e}-\ddot{t}\ddot{e}v\) \(\ddot{e}-\ddot{t}\ddot{e}v\), used also for the gen., because there was a confusion of gen. and abl. elsewhere (§ 244 Rem. 2 p. 143).

Dative.

§ 445. Skr. \(m\ddot{a}h\ddot{y}a\), Ved. this and \(m\ddot{a}h\ddot{ya},\) Armen. \(\textit{inj}\) for \(\textit{*in\ddot{e}j} = \textit{*em\ddot{e}gh}-\) and Lat. \(\textit{mi\ddot{e}}\) Umbr. \(\textit{mehe}\) point to an Idg. ground-form with \(\textit{*e}(\ddot{e})\textit{megh-}\), where \(\ddot{g}\ddot{h}\) (the same as \(\ddot{g}\ddot{h}\) in the nom., Skr. \(\textit{ah\ddot{a}m}\) etc.) took the place which \(\ddot{b}\ddot{h}\) held in the \(\ddot{b}\ddot{h}\)-suffix of ‘tibi’. The case-ending of the Idg. form cannot be made out, because assimilation has taken place with
the ending of the bh-suffixes. Avest. maibya mārya (for the a of this form, see below) maibya show a still more thorough-going assimilation to the 2nd person.

Skr. tū-bhyam, asmā-bhyam, yuṣmā-bhyam, in Vedic also forms -bhya. Avest. taibya taibya, ahmaibya, yuṣmaibya xśmaibya xśmā-vya yuṣmaoyā (= *-a-vyā, I § 160 p. 144), hva-vya. First as regards the stem: Avest. taibya seems to be more ancient than Skr. tū-bhya(m), cp. Umbr. te-fe O.C.Sl. te-bé; tibhya(m) may have got u from tvām tvām tvād, cp. Goth. ūus following ūu-k (ēu). The a of hva-vya xśmā-vya, and mā-vya mentioned above, is uncertain. It may be an Iranian re-formation instead of a (cp. acc. mām mā, and possibly ahma = pr. Ar. *asma § 443.2 p. 379, ahmākem); or there may have been doublets for 'mihi', 'tibi', 'sibi' in pr. Idg., one with e and the other with i, and these may have occasioned a variation in quantity in the forms of ahma-yuṣma-; but which, can no longer be made out. The same doubt meets us in Lat. se-d se-(d), § 444 pp. 379 f. The suffixes Ved. -bhya Avest. -byā are to be compared with Gall. -bo § 367 p. 267. Skr. -bhya has the m-particle. Avest. -byā was first produced in *ahmaoyā and *yuṣmaoyā, to mark these cases as plural (it is true that these particular forms are not found in the Gāthā dialect), and on this analogy maibya taibya (cp. § 437 Rem. 2 p. 369).

Very closely connected are Lat. ti-bei ti-bi si-bei si-bi (it is simplest to explain i in the first syllable as due to the use of the word without an accent, cp. plicō igitur and the like I § 65 Rems 2 p. 53, § 679 p. 546); Umbr. te-fe te-fe 'tibi' Osc. sifei Pelign. sifei and Pruss. te-bbei se-bbei; Lith. tāvės-šavėi (Schleicher in Kuhn-Schl. Beitr. I 238, mānėi Leskien-Brugmann Lit. Volksl. p. 49 n. 83) with -ar- instead of -eb- following the gen. tavė savė. These forms show after -bh- the ending of the Idg. loc. dat. gen. *mej *t(w)ej *s(w)ej (§ 447), and that of the Ital. loc. dat. of pronominal o-stems with gender, as Osc. alttref 'in altero' altrei 'alteri' (§ 424 p. 348). Difficulties are suggested by the variety
of the forms found in Lithuanian dialects: we have not only 
-ei, but manė tavė savė (cp. Bezenberger, in his Beitr. XV 
301) like namė (§ 263 p. 166), mėñi távi sāvi like mi ti si 
(§ 447, but compare Bezenberger as cited), and further mān 
mė, táv tāu, sāv sāu. Even in the oldest Lithuanian these 
datives, which were originally locative as well, underwent 
certain changes due to their locative use on the analogy of 
the locative of substantives. O.Lith. taveic like dieveic, 
modern tavyje like naktyje etc. (cp. § 263 p. 166, § 448). 
O.C.Sl. dat. loc. te-bė se-bė, where -bė cannot be derived from 
*-bhej, may be of the same class as *moj *t(y)oį *s(y)oį, the 
doublets of *mej etc. (see § 447), cp. loc. vilčė = *ušqoį 
§ 263 p. 166; on their relation to the instrumental, tobojį 
soboja, see § 449. We might therefore call *tebżej and *tebojį 
a compromise between a form like the Avestic taibyā and 
those shorter loc. dat. forms in -eį and -oį. It is also quite 
possible that the parent language had at the same time 
*meγhej *meghoj (Lat. mihe) and *te-bjo *se-bjo or like forms 
(Avest. taibyā hwa-vya), and that these were assimilated in 
different directions by the various languages: Skr. máhyam 
instead of *mahę following tābhyam, Lat. tībei instead of 
*tebie, or the like, following mihej etc.

Lat. nōbęs vōbęs¹) cannot be derived from such ground-
forms as *nōz-bh- *yōz-bh-, since -zḥ- would have become 
-sp-. In any case -bęs was coined as plural complement to -bę 
on the analogy of the endings of isti: istiš. Either the forms 
were new-cast to match with the plural nōs vōs, or they 
are dual forms (orig. nō-b- vō-b-) which have received the 
mark of the plural in the suffix only (cp. § 458).

Pruss. mennei Lith. māñei (māñi etc.) O.C.Sl. mīñe with 
-ñ- following the gen. Lith. manė O.C.Sl. mene (§ 450). 
Pruss. nou-mans nou-mas iou-mans iou-mas Lith. mū̃-ms 
jū̃-ms, O.C.Sl. na-mū va-mū with the noun-suffix of the

¹) Pelign. wos 'vōbęs' for *wō-fa is doubtful; Bugżę, Altit. 
Stud. 75, 77.
dative plural (§ 367 pp. 267 f.). One reason why these forms, like the instr. O.C.Sl. namā vami, had no s before the case-suffix, while there was one in the gen. and loc. pr. Balt.-Slav. *nōs-sōm *yōs-sōm and *nōs-su *yōs-su (§ 448), was that the corresponding dual cases had none (Lith. mum jum O.C.Sl. nāma vama, § 458), and they influenced the form of these; -s in -sm- could not properly have been dropped (I § 585. 2 p. 301). In Baltic, *jū- came from the nom. and drove out *yō-, and then in Lithuanian the analogy of the u-stems came in, as with jūs and jumis; for the other changes in the stem see § 437. 1, a and 2, c, pp. 369 f. Lith. mū-mis, mu-mis served as the foundation for the dialectic locative mūmyse instr. mūmim(s) acc. mūmis, cp. dual gen. mūmu etc. § 458.

§ 446. Armen. īnj is to be connected with Skr. máhyam Lat. mihi, as we saw in § 445 p. 380. Its ending spread to the other pronouns, whence ēz ‘tibi’ mēz ‘nobis’ jēz ‘vobis’ (for the interchange of -j : -z see I § 410 p. 301), the reverse of what took place with Avest. naibyā, which follows taibyā. Reflexive: sing. īn-r plur. īurenca, like the gen., see § 455.

The Germanic forms with -s Goth. mis īus (doubtless for *bis following puk, cp. Skr. tū-bhyam § 445 p. 381) sīs, O.H.G. mir dir, A.S. me mē de dē (for the phonetics, see Sievers Ags. Gr. 2 § 121, Behaghel Germania XXXI 381), O.Icel. mēr pēr sēr, are all doubtless ad-formates of *nes ‘nobis’ *yēs ‘vobis’; outside of the Germanic dialects these are represented only by Skr. nas vas, Avest. nō vō, and by O.Ir. -n -b for *nes *s-yes (e. g. uain ‘a nobis’ naib ‘a vobis’), and the latter, *yes, is contained in other Germanic words, Goth. īxīs O.H.G. īu A.S. ēow, while *nes is only represented by Goth. uns, which comes from *ys, an Idg. doublet of *nes (§ 448 p. 378). Perhaps the form first produced was sīs (plural and singular), which was followed by mis and *bis. Compare Gr. iμ ἵν following ἄμμυρ § 448.

The Possessive used for the Personal Pronoun: Avest.
ahmaï, related to Gr loc. ἀμμὸν as Skr. tāṃmaĩ to ādmin; see §§ 448, 452.

Locative.

§ 447. Forms in -i, which had at the same time the function of the dative and of the possessive genitive: *mēji *t(y)eĩ *s(y)eĩ, *mōi *t(y)oĩ *s(y)oĩ. These are very closely connected with pr. Ital. *alt(e)reĩ, which was loc., dat., and gen. all at once (see § 419 pp. 341 f., § 424 p. 348). They may be fairly derived from the possessive stems *mo- etc. (cp. § 452).

Skr. loc. Ved. mē tvē, dat. gen. mē tē Prāskr. se (sē in Vedic also? a very questionable point, see Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr. I 114), Avest. loc. pōvi, dat. gen. mē mōi, tē tōi, hē hōi šē (§ 438.3. p. 371), O.Pers. dat. gen. maivy dat. taivy. Skr. mē tē in Vedic are probably used for the accusative also (Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. V 205 f.); this wider use may be due to the wider use of nas vas and nāv vām; compare Lith. mī tī (p. 385), and Gr. τίν ἐν (p. 387); all used for the accusative.

Gr. loc. dat. ἐμὸl mōi, σεi for *tFou beside pr. Gr. τοι (now a particle), Foi oi oi (we may conjecture, for pr. Gr. *σFou and *σνι, although there are no certain grounds for believing in the latter, cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.² p. 184), Hom. has these and also τοι i.e. *σσFou. These datives are found often in the poets with the sense of a possessive genitive, as β 50 ἦρεξ μοι ‘matri meae’ like Skr. mē gīrāh ‘hymni mei’, σ 68 qānev δε ὦ τι εἴψες σμοµν.

Lat. mī dat. beside mīhī, used as a possessive genitive in mī filī, anime mī, mī domina, mī hospitēs and the like; the so-called vocative mī is always derived from *me(i)jes (the latest supporter of this is. Thurneysen, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXX 500), but this cannot be supported by what is known of the phonetic laws. The gen. mī and *tē served as bases for the O.Lat. gen. mīs tīs, which were formed by adding -s or -es on on to them (cp. istsūs = *istēs + os § 419 p. 341,
and Dor. ἑύς instead of ἑύο (§ 450). To the same group belongs sei st, now a conjunction. Umbrian gives us se-so 'sibi', since its final portion must surely be an affixed particle (cp. the Irish "particulae augentes" or intensive particles, -su -sa -som). And further, two other forms from the same dialect, sve-su and sve-so, in which sve- is certainly a poss. gen., may contain the same particle -so as se-so 'sibi' does, or we may assume for them an inflected stem sve-so-, with Bücheler (Bücheler takes sve-su in I b 45, II a 44 as 'suum', and svesso in VII b 1 as abl. 'suo'); if the latter be correct, we have a combination of the poss. gen. with so- 'suus' (O.Lat. su-m sa-m sōs), cp. Lat. suo sibi gladio hunc iungulo, O.C.Sl. pisuchq svoja si rëch scribebant suam linguam and the like (the Author, Ein Problem der Hom. Textkr., 132 ff.).

O.Ir. -m -t, e. g. uaim 'a me' uait 'a te'.

Lith. dat. and acc. unaccented mi ti si (in the first instance for *mė etc., according to I § 664.3 p. 529), e. g. saugė-k-mi 'preserve me' suka-si suka-s 'so' and 'sibi torquet'; and compare Pruss. -si, e. g. (sien) grūk–si 'they fall into sin' (reflexive), beside -sin = sien (-si = *-ei?). Its use for the accusative is secondary, cp. Ved. acc. mē tē on page 384, and Gr. acc. τίν είν on pages 386-7. (It is not permissible to assume that the acc. Lith. mi comes from *me = Gr. με). O.C.Sl. unaccented mi ti si, dat. and possessive (the so-called "possessive dative"), as drugū mi 'philos mou'.

Other locative forms in -i:

Skr. Ved. asmē yuṣmē, also used for dat. and gen. (cp. Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. V 296 f.), doubtless represent the Idg. ground-forms. Further, Skr. māyi teāyi beside Ved. mē teē, which are due to a desire to mark the forms more distinctly as locative, and so to distinguish them from the dat. gen. (acc.) mē tē; māy–i: instr. māyā following dhīy–i: dhīy-d, and the like (Wackernagel, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVIII 138).

O.C.Sl. wīnē tebē sebē, see § 445 p. 382.
§ 448. Lith. manįjė tavyjė savyjė like instr. manimi etc. following the i-class.¹) Compare § 445 p. 382.

Skr. asmásu yuṣmásu, instead of asmé yuṣmé, were made in connexion with the instr. asmá-bhiṣ yuṣmá-bhiṣ on the analogy of āśva-su : āśva-bhiṣ. Instead of these, Pali and Prakrit have amhesu tumhesu on the analogy of pronouns with gender and of noun-stems in -o-.

O.C.Sl. nasū vasū, O.Lith. and modern dialects mūsū jūsū (as to mū- jā- instead of pr. Balt.-Slav. *nū- *u-, see § 437. 1, a and 2. c, pp. 369 f.), come from pr. Balt.-Slav. *nōs-su *yōs-su, as the gen. O.C.Sl. nasū vasū Pruss. nossin iouson Lith. mūsū jūsū from *nōs-sōm *yōs-sōm. We may conjecture that *nōs *nōs in pr. Balt.-Slav., besides being acc. (§ 443. 1, a p. 378), were also gen. (cp. Skr. acc. gen. nas vas), and then on the analogy of Pruss. stei-son O.C.Sl. tē-chū added the ending -sōm, in the same way as Gr. ἐμε, used for the genitive, was extended to *ἐμε-σο ἐμείο (§ 450). Skr. me, once locative, to māy-i (§ 447), and Lat. *istē in its genitive use to *istē-os istīus (§ 449 p. 388); there are others of the same kind. The new genitive formation then produced a locative on the analogy of O.C.Sl. tē-chū. The Lithuanian locative forms suffered many changes, since as the case-system developed they lost their distinctness, and by that time the locative of nouns helped them no whit: O.Lith. musūie iusūie (cp. sūnįjė), later mūsųjė jāsųjė (cp. manųjė etc.), mūsimė jūsimė (cp. szimė), mūsūse jūsūse (: mūsū = vilkęse : vilkū).

Greek, with its endings -tv -t and -tv, stands quite by itself. Dor. ἐμεν ἐμεν τίν τίν, Tarent. ἐμε-νη τం-ν (cp. ἐγνω-ν), Hom. τίν for *τεφίν, Gort. fίν, Boeot. fίν for *σεφίν.

¹) This re-formation is not, as is often stated, due to any assimilation of mānei to dkei; for the latter is dkei, cp. § 249 p. 152. But O.Lith. manįjė tavyjė, if ever there were such forms (Leskien Decl. 141, Bezenberger Beitr. zur Gesch. der lit. Spr. 161) may have been māčē alongside of mānei on the analogy of žmėjė : žmėi; cp. Brückner, Arch. slav. Phil. IV 17
§ 448.  

Personal Pronouns: the Locative.  

Lesb. ἂμμιν ὑμμ, Dor. ἂμν ὑμν ἂμιν ὑμν ἂμιν, Ion. Att. ἂμιν ὑμν ὑμν ὑμν, Hom. also ἂμιν ὑμμ; the retrograde accent in these forms (except the Lesbian) is a substitute for enclisis (I § 676 pp. 544 ff.). Without ἂ, Lesb. Hom. ἂμμ ὑμμ. It is natural to suppose that there is a connexion with the forms examined in §§ 423 f. pp. 346 ff., as Skr. τάσμιν Avest. aṭahmī Gr. ὁ-τίμ. The relation of *γς(*mi *γς(*min *μι(*mi *μι(*min = ἂμμ ἂμμ ὑμμ ὑμμ to *γς(*me *μι(*me = ἂμμ ὑμμ is the same as that of ἂς(*me = Avest. aṭahmī Skr. τάσμιν to *τας(*me = Lith. tanē (instead of *τας(*me); and further, ἂμμ is to Avest. ahmāi as Skr. τάσμιν to τάσμι. Since it is only in -smin that proof has so far been shown for -in as an Idg. locative suffix, 1) I hold ἂμμ ὑμμ to be older than ἂμν τίν Flv. The analogy of ἂμμ : ἂμ suggested ἂμν beside ἂμ, and so with the others. Perhaps α-φίν, used for both sing. and pl., helped in this; viewed in conjunction with ἂμμ it would be analysed as σφ-ιν (§ 438 p. 371, § 449), that is to say if its association with ἂμμ ὑμμ was earlier than the existence of ἂμν τίν Flv; cp. pr. Germ. *hīz 'tibi' on the analogy of *izvīz 'vobis' (§ 446 p. 383), and § 437 Rem. 2 p. 369. But this does not explain the τ of ἂμν τίν etc.

Remark. One possibility — not the only one — is that the deictic particle -ίν became attached to *ἀμ (op. σφροτ-ίν beside σφροτ-ί). Cp. Dor. ἂς-τ τας-τ, and Cypr. ἂ-*μ (Meister, Gr. Dial. II 211) which may be regarded as ἂτ. Then the difference in the meaning of *ἀμν and *ἀμν*ἀμ will have faded away afterwards.

The forms τίν and ἂμν are also found with the meaning of the acc., which seems to have come about from the analogy of μίν νόν (and cp. χάρων βάσων etc.). Compare too Ved. мē τē and Lith. mi ti si as accusatives, § 447 pp. 384 f.

With plural ending added: Lesb. ἀμψεπρ, similar to ὁπ᾽-α
§ 449.

The Instrumental.

§ 449. Skr. मया tvāya, Ved. these and tvā tūvā. The history of मया tvāya is doubtful. They may have been formed in connexion with मद tvām on the analogy of ध्वया: ध्वम (cp. asmāsu beside asmābhiṣ following ध्वास्यu: ध्वाबhiṣ, § 448 p. 386); or perhaps they come from the possessive stems *mejo- *tvejo- (cp. Lat. meus O.C.Sl. tvojī). Ved. yuṣmd-datta- 'given by you' like tēd-datta-; by adding to *asmā yuṣmd the instr. pl. suffix we have asmā-bhiṣ yuṣmd-bhiṣ. Skr. tvā yuṣmd may be derived from the possessive stems *tmo- *(j)u(s)mọ-, like tvē etc., § 447 p. 384. In Avestic, personal pronouns dropped the instrumental case (Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. II 127).

Armen. ime-v (instead of *ime-v following inj? cp. § 444 p. 380). 科技股份 reflexive sing. iuṛ-v. Gr. σ-ηθv and σ-οθ. On the case-suffixes see § 281 pp. 186 f., on the stem, § 436 Rem. 3 p. 368. From ὁπ᾽ was formed a plural ὁπ᾽-α, as Skr. yuṣmd-bhiṣ from yuṣmd, and others.

Lith. manimi tavimi savimi following the i-class, like the loc. manyjē etc., § 448 p. 386; in dialects also mani tavi savi like akt (§ 278 pp. 181, 183). O.C.Sl. mūnojā tobójā sobojā were made beside the loc. dat. mānē tebē sobē (§ 445 p. 382) to match with rakojā : račē. Lith. mu-mis mu-mi, ju-mis ju-mi O.C.Sl. na-ni va-ni like dat. mū-ms jū-ms na-mū va-mū, § 445 pp. 382 f.

Pruss. sen maim 'meicum' is properly 'cum meo' (§ 421 p. 344), cp. gen. maiši § 452.

The Genitive, and the Possessive Adjectives.

§ 450. From the original language and onwards there has been a very close connexion between the genitive case of pronouns and their possessives. The possessives were for the most part built up on forms which were used with a genitive meaning; and here all will be treated together.
I. Idg. *eme *teye *seye, the bare stem, like acc. sing. Gr. ἐμὲ etc. Beside *eme there was another stem *me-ne, whose ending recalls Skr. ca-ná Avest. ka-na (§ 421 p. 344) and the like; compare Torp’s hypothesis mentioned already, § 435 Rem. page 366.

Armen. im. Avest. ma-na O.Pers. ma-na; Cymr. my n-; Lith. manė (instead of *me-nė on the analogy of tavė savė) Pruss. *me-ne (inferred from dat. menei), O.C.Sl. me-ne.

Skr. tāva Avest. tava (the Avest. possessive hava- comes from pr. Ar. *sava, § 451); Armen. Ko, which doubtless began originally with t- (d-), but took ḫ- = *ty- from the other cases, — in other respects the word is treated like nor ‘new’ (II § 75 p. 192); Mid.Cymr. teu (pr. British *tou), O.Ir. du du first from *tou *tō with accent (on the variants do- and t-, do-māthir and co-t-māthir, see vol. I p. 551); Lith. tavė savė, O.C.Sl. tebe sebe instead of *tovė *sove on the combined analogy of tebe sebe and mene.

Sanskrit māma is either ma reduplicated (cp. tvā-tvam and the like, II § 54 p. 100), in which case we must assume Idg. *me as well as *eme (cp. Avest. ma-, § 451); or it was *ama = Armen. im transformed by the analogy of ma mé. Compare the Author, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 401; Torp. op. cit. 20 f.; Wackernagel, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVIII 138.

In Greek the genitives were extended by -σος, *ἐμε-σος etc., which served to keep them distinct from the accusative. ἐμὲσο ἐμεῦ ἐμεῦ μεν μου, σιὸ σίο αὐ συ οὐ, εἴο ἐς εῖ σε. Then again -ς was added, producing such genitives as Dor. ἐμεσὸς ἐμεὺς, τέσσ' τινς.

The formation of these Greek genitives seems to throw light on Armenian Ko-y, gen. Kooy, 'tuus'. It is possible that the kernel of this is Ko, explained above; this would be extended to *Ko-y, and from this would grow out the possessive Kooy in exactly the same way as the possessive ino- was made from *imo- (§ 451). But it is also possible to regard the kernel of this word as being the gen. *tuo-sio, i.e. the gen. of the
possessive which had taken the place of the original substantival genitive (§ 452).

Latin mei tui sui and Lithuanian mano tavo sawo (also accented mano tavo sawo) are obscure. We cannot tell whether they are direct transformations of the pr. Idg. gen. of substantival personal pronouns, or whether they were originally gen. of the possessive pronouns (Lat. meum etc., Lith. mana-s etc.) which at a late period took the place of these; Lat. nostrē vestrē are undoubtedly possessives.

In Celtic the pronouns of the 1st and 2nd persons influenced each other's form. In Irish we see no nu following do du (cp. O.Ir. frium following friut § 442 Rem. p. 377), and similarly in Mid.Cymr. neu following teu. On the other hand it may be conjectured that Cymr. dy (pre-tonic) follows my (n-), cp. Bret. da and ma (but Corn. de and ove).

In Balto-Slavonic, genitives of this class were the foundation for re-modelled forms in the other cases: Lith. manę mąni manyę manimę, tavę etc., Pruss. dat. mennei, O.C.Sl. mënę munoja. Compare Prkr. acc. mamam loc. mamammi abl. mamdů from the gen. máma, O.C.Sl. dat. česomu loc. česomi (beside čemš) from the gen. česo 'cuius'.

§ 451. The genitives mentioned in § 450 were inflected as o-stems to form possessive pronouns.

*eme- *me- *mene: Avest. ma-, Armen. im gen. imoy,1) Gr. ἐμό-, Lith. māna-s (with a in the first syllable on the analogy of tāva-s sāva-s).

*teye- *seye: with the variants *tye- *seye-2) *se-. Avest. hava-; Skr. tvā-s svā-s Avest. pva- hva- O.Pers. uva-.

1) Whether the nom. im is an unchanged iōn = Idg. *eme, as in Old Saxon the gen. pl. dēa iou were used unchanged for the nom. sing. of the possessive (§ 455), or whether iōn once had a nominative sign, is a question which cannot be decided.

2) *seye doubtless in *syē-sor- 'sister' and *syē-kuro- 'father-in-law'. Are we justified, on the strength of Mid.H.G. sawa-ger, in assuming *seyē as a variant of *syē for Idg., like Skr. māl beside Gr. μ and the like?
Armen. ko- = *tyo- in koy 'tuns', see § 452. (Gri. τεός ióς; sós Fóς δ-ς; pronominal flexion is clear in the adv. *fēd in ἄττι δαμας etc. (§ 417 p. 338), ep. pron. flexion in Aryan, as Ved. svá-smin Avest. ma-p naub-hmī. Lat. toco-s tuo-s sovo-s suvo-s, Umbr. tover 'tui' Oec. tuvai dat. 'tua' Oec. soveis 'sui'; O.Lat. su-m sīs sa-m and perhaps Umbr. so- in sve-su (§ 447 p. 385). Lith. tāca-s sāva-s.

Another class of possessives is formed with secondary suffixes, from genitives or from other forms:

Skr. måma-ka-s māmakā-s tavakā-s (the two last are Vriddhī derivatives, cp. II § 60 pp. 112 f.) from måma táva, see II § 86 p. 257. mad-tya-s tvad-tyu-s from mad tvād (cp. § 444 p. 380), see II § 63 p. 133.

Two explanations are possible of Latin meus for *mejo-s (on mūs = meis and the like see Thurneysen, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 500), Pruss. mais, acc. pl. maia-us, twois swais, O.C.Sl. mojī trojī svojī. They may contain the suffix -jo-, like O.C.Sl. naśi vaśī for *naśo- *uās-jo- (see II § 63 pp. 132 f.); or, as is assumed by Lidén (Ark. nord. fil. III 242) and Johansson (Bezz. Beitr. XIV 171, XVI 135), the possessives *mej *moj (§ 447 pp. 384 ff.) were attracted to the o-class and became *mejo- *mojo-. On the last view, compare O.H.G. Frank. un-sa- O.Sax. ās-ā Pruss. nous-a- 'our' and the like, § 454. I leave the matter undecided.

O.Ir. mui 'mine' (all genders), *tui (Mid.Ir. taǐ) 'thine' (all genders) are modelled upon ai ae 'his', used for all genders (p. 339, footnote). In this statement I follow Thurneysen.

As before, two origins are possible for Gothic mein-s þein-s sein-s O.H.G. mīn dīn sīn, and I leave the question open. They may have the Suffix -nu- (II § 68 p. 158), or, as Lidén assumes (loc. cit.), they may be the possessive *mej etc. + the suffix -nu- (cp. Skr. purā-ya- 'former' and the like II § 66 pp. 142 ff.). In favour of the former view might be adduced Lith. kēnō 'whose' from a form kēna- 'belonging to whom?', which seems to contain -ēna-, a suffix very closely related to -ino- (II § 68 p. 160). But some dialects show
kenô (kanô) (the Author, Lit. Volksl. 304), which resembles the variation of Skr. kēna and Avest. kana (§ 421 p. 344); cp. Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 158.

§ 452. We have often noticed that instead of 'ego, 'tu', and so forth the equivalents of 'meum', 'tuum', etc. were used, substituting for the idea of personality the more concrete expression denoting what belongs to the person and makes up his environment. Thus we find Umbr. tiom 'te' § 442 p. 377, Pruss. sen main 'meecum' § 449 p. 388, Avest. ahmair 'nobis' § 446 pp. 383 f., and perhaps Gr. Lesb. āμμου 'nobis' § 448 p. 387. Such expressions as these came the more naturally because there were forms which could be regarded as either a subst. personal pronoun or a neuter possessive used as a subst.; for example, loc. Skr. tē ē (cp. svē 'in suō').

Thus it may be seen how the genitive of the possessive often came to be used instead of the gen. of the personal pronouns. Gr. τεσό τεω τοσο του from τεω-το-τον, and with -σ added (cp. ἕμενο-ς § 450 p. 389) Dor. τεω-ς ἐμευ-ς Boeot. τεω-ς της (the Author, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 407 f., 414 ff.). Pruss. maus tewasei. Possibly of this sort are Armen. ᾠο, the kernel of ἁο 'tuus', and Lat. met tuī sui Lith. māno tāvo sāvo (see § 450 pp. 389 f.). The suggested derivation of these Lith. forms from māna- 'meum' etc. is supported by kēnô 'whose', if it is derived from a poss. adj. kēna- (§ 451, above).

A case of the possessive may also be expected in Goth. meinā peina seina O.H.G. min din sin. But which case is it?

Remark. Bezzenberger's view is that meinā is ablative (Unters. über die got. Adv., 7); its ground-form would then be *minōd or *minēd, and it would answer to Lith. māno, cp. § 228 p. 114, § 241 p. 135. Dr. K. Bojunga holds it to be the nom. acc. pl. neuter (cp. Skr. asmāka-m). Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 163 f., explains meinā as *mei-nā, which

1) However, it is still unknown in what way the adj. Skr. rta- and Avest. hūw-'own my, thy, his' came to be used for the subst. pronoun, whence we have rdu hūo 'he himself' and 'she herself'. This use must surely be a secondary development. We might believe that the Indo- Avest. reflexive pronoun subst. (Gr. ἓ Lat. se etc.) adopted the inflexion of the possessive, and in this way got a nominative case.
he calls "a loc.-instr. case with the meaning by or with me, or something of the kind; or, more precisely, a locative (mei-moi-mi), strengthened by an u-suffix (= usmi : umni-u, or, vice versa, jmdn : jmndi)"; compare his view of unsara, in the volume cited above, pages 133 ff.

§ 458. On Armen. iur 'su', see § 455.

Lith. manęs tavęs savęs, beside manę tovę savę, are still an unsolved problem; they recall O.C.Sl. toće rąky duće (§ 229 pp. 117 ff., § 420 p. 343). There is another group, manęs tavęs savęs, which look like an extension of manę etc. by -s similar to Gr. ἐμιος-ς (§ 450 p. 389), or a kind of compromise between manę and manęs etc.; another is manęs ľaveś savęs, coined for the benefit of manimę manyę etc. Cp. Brückner, Arch. slav. Phil. IV 11 ff.

Lastly, the student must be reminded that forms like Skr. mę, locative in form, were originally possessives, and are still used as such in the separate languages; they may also be called possessive genitive. See § 447 pp. 384 ff.

§ 454. II. If the acc. *ęsme (= Gr. ἡμιος) was a combination of the acc. *ęs (= Goth. uns) with the particle *ęsne (§ 448. 2 p. 379), we might expect *ęsme to be sometimes used for the genitive, considering that Skr. nas can be so used. Then the Greek *δμιος-το *δμιος-το, later with plural suffix δμιοιοι *δμιοιοι (Hom. ἡμειοι ὡμειον ἡμειόν ὡμειόων, Att. ἡμιῶν ὡμιῶν, Dor. ἡμειόν ὡμειόν ἡμιῶν ὡμιῶν) bear the same relation to Idg. gen. *ęsme as ἰμιος-το to Idg. gen. *eme. On the analogy of these genitives in -τον was formed ἑμειόν ἑμιῶν. We add as further examples the possessives Avest. āh(ma- Lesb. āmmọ-ς ῆμιος-ς Dor. ἡμι¬ς, ἓμι¬ς, and Avest. ma- Gr. ἡμι¬ς.

A certain amount of support for this view may be had from the Balto-Slavonic and some Germanic forms. As has already been said (§ 448 p. 386), O.C.Sl. nostu vostu Pruss. nouson iouson Lith. mūs įjūsī have doubtless been built up on *nōs *yōs used for the genitive. These passed into the o-class, and gave rise to the poss. adj. Pruss. nou-a-ious-o- (masc. dat. nouesmu acc. iouon, fem. nom. nouoa iouoa etc.) and Lith. mūsás-is įjūs-is fem. mūso-ji įjūs-ji,
whilst O.C.Sl. *nasi, for *nas-jo- *nas-jo-, have the suffix -jo. Similarly we have poss. adj. W.Germ. unsa- ‘our’ from uns = *ys, e.g. Frank. gen. unses, and O.Sax. *asa O.Fris. *use gen. pl. (§ 345 p. 246) like Lat. nostrum beside nostri, and again on this analogy iwa- ‘your’; Germ. uns-era- beside unsa- like Gr. ημε-τερο-ς beside ἄμο-ς (§ 455).

The origin of Avest. na- ‘our’ was as follows. The possessive genitive nō = Skr. nas, when dependent upon a nom. sing. masc., was regarded as the nom. of an adj. stem in -o- (such as ma- ‘meus’) and was then declined in other cases on this supposition. Cp. Lat. cuius-s ‘belonging to whom’ from cuius § 419 p. 342.

§ 455. An r-suffix is seen in the gen. O.Icel. vār ‘our’ for *yēr, beside Goth. veis ‘we’, and O.H.G. unsēr iuwer. We may conjecture that this is the same element which is seen in Armenian pronouns with gender (§ 419 p. 341), and which we find here in personal pronouns: sing. iur ‘sui’, with plural inflexion added iureang, and mer ‘nostri’ jer ‘vestri’. Perhaps r in these is the same as in adverbs like Goth. hēr ‘here’ par ‘there’ (cp. p. 71 footnote), so that the original meaning of *yēr will be ‘by, beside us’ or something of the kind, and its use for the genitive might be compared with that of Skr. loc. mē and the like (see Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 123 ff., especially pp. 134 and 143). The reason why -ēr in O.H.G. unsēr iuwer was never shortened (as it was in fater for pr. Germ. *fader) is that these forms, which, like O.Sax. gen. pl. āsa iwa (§ 454), were also used directly for the nom. sing. of the possessive adjective, fell under the influence of forms like jenēr blintēr, whose -ēr came from *-oj-x (§ 414 p. 336); observe the different origin of the endings in unēr and unserēr. Armen. iur mer jer are also poss. adj., gen. iuroy meroy jeroy (cp. § 450 p. 389), and O.Icel. vār-r ‘noster’ from the gen. vār.

With a comparative suffix Gr. ημε-τερο-ς ημε-τερο-ς and reflexive ομε-τερο-ς (used for both plural and singular) and Lat. nos-ter ves-ter (voster doubtless simply on the analogy of

*noster*, Umb. *vestra* abl. ‘vestra’, cp. II § 75 pp. 193, 195, § 129 p. 450. And as *μετέρησα* can hardly be distinguished in sense from *μετέρι* (the Author, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 403, 410, cp. *νεῖρ* § 452 p. 392), so *nostē* *vestrē* along with the pluralised *nostrum* *vestrum* (first doubtless in phrases like *multī nostrum*) became the gen. of *nōs vōs*. The same *-tero-* is seen in the O.Ir. dual *nā-thar* and other words, § 459.

Remark. The different vowel in *noster* and *vester* is doubtless original. (If Ose. *nistrus*, Zvet. no. 129. 2, is to be explained with Bugge as *nostros* not so according to Bächeler, see I § 65 p. 54 — it must come from *nestro-*, and that must be regarded as an adformate of *vestro-*. Perhaps the difference in O.Ir. gen. 1st person *nā-thar* beside 2nd person *se-thar* (*se-* = *s-mē-*) is similar, compare § 457 on Skr. *nāu* = *wān*.

These forms with *(e)ro-* will serve to shew that the second comparative suffix *(e)ro-* (II § 75 pp. 188 ff.) is to be seen in the following forms. O.Ir. gen. *ar* *n-* and *far* *n-* with the gen. pl. ending like Lat. *nostrum*, used for the possessive; *ar* *n-* probably (according to Torp, as cited, p. 41) for *esro-* = *es-ro-* (with *(e)ro-* for *-er-* cp. *mir* for *mēnor-*, I § 574 p. 430) with the vowel of the first syllable weakened to *a* in proclitic position (explained differently by Thurneysen, see vol. II § 75 p. 196 footnote); and *far* *n-* similarly either for *s-mē-ro-* or for *s-mē-ro-*, — if the latter it must have been originally dual like *se-thar* ‘vester’ (pl.), see § 459. Goth. *unsur* *izvar*, O.Icel. *yd(e)ar-r*, O.H.G. with strong ending *unserēr* *iuwerēr*, compare the gen. of the person. pron., Goth. *unsera* *izvara* O.Icel. *yd(e)ar*, like Goth. *meina* beside *mein-s*, O.Icel. *min* beside *min-n* (§ 452 with the Rem. pp. 392 f.); since *izvar* *iuwerēr* cannot be derived from *es- -mē-ro-* *s-mē-ro-*, they were either dual at first, as O.Ir. *far* *n-* may have been, or else they are simply due to the analogy of *unsar* *unserēr*.

These forms with *(e)ro-* and the subst. O.Icel. *vār* O.H.G. *unaer* seem to be related in much the same way as Gr. *ἀνεσ-ς* Lat. *superu-s* and *νεῖρ* *s-uper*, or the like (II § 75 pp. 188 ff., III § 258 p. 159)².
§ 456. A formative suffix -aka- is shown in the Aryan genitives: Skr. asmākam, Ved. also asmāka yuṣmāka doubtless following māma tāva (conversely, Pali mamoṁ tāvam follow anhākaṁ tumhākaṁ); -Avest. ahmākem yuṣmākem xsmākem O.Pers. amāxam (on this -x- see Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I 79). Connected with these are the possessives Skr. asmāka-s yuṣmāka-s, Avest. ahmāka- yuṣmāka- xsmāka-. The forms in -akam can hardly be anything but the nom. acc. sing. neuter, although the reason why this form was pitched upon is still unexplained; cp. yuudāku, used for the gen. dual, beside the adj. yuudāku-∅ (§§ 458, 459).—Cp. II § 36 pp. 257 f., § 89 p. 272 f.; Benfey, Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss. XIX 4, 46; the Author, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXVII 400 ff.; Torp, op. cit. p. 31. A different view — but one which if I may say so, smacks too much of the old “glottogonic” school — is taken by Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 139 f.

Remark. It is quite possible that asmākam was originally adverbial, with some meaning like ‘on our side, by us’. Then the attributive use with nouns, e.g. asmākā gāyatrā ‘our song’, was the same as in tā imē vidūrag lōkāḥ Čat. Brāh. 1. 4. 1. 23 ‘these are the far-sundered (lit. far apart, adv.) worlds’, Gr. ὃ ποῦ χαῖρετας etc. (see Goedicke, Acc. in Veda 233; Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. V 72, 203; Paul, Princ. 314). The use of māma tāva Avest. manā tāva would also have had something to do with this idiom.

For the possessive, Sanskrit has also asmad-īya-s yuṣmad-īya-s, cp. mad-īya-s tead-īya-s § 451 p. 391.

b. The Dual of we and you and of the Reflexive, together with their several Possessives.

Nominative and Accusative.

§ 457. The main characteristic of the dual cases was the absence of the s of the forms used for the plural, Skr. na-s va-s etc.

Answering to the plural nom. *ye-ī ‘we’ the dual had *ye *yē (cp. *me *mē Gr. με Skr. ma and the like, § 415 Rem. p. 337). *ye: Goth. O.Icel. vi-t A.S. wi-t, Lith. dial. vė-du fem. vė-dvī, but in H.Lith. mū-du -dvī (vė-du was orig. only
§ 455. Personal Pronouns: the Gen., and the Poss. Adj

nostēr', Umbr. vestrā abl. 'vestra', cp. II §§ 75 pp. 193, 195, § 194 p. 450. And as ēmeterōv can hardly be distinguished in from ēmēr (the Author, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXVII 403, 410 cp. teō § 452 p. 392), so nostē vestrē along with the pluralised nostrum vestrum (first doubtless in phrases like multī nostrum) became the gen. of nōs vōs. The same -tero- is seen in the O.Ir. dual na-thar and other words, § 459.

Remark. The different vowel in noster and vester is doubtless original. (If Ose. nisstrus, Zvet. no. 129.2, is to be explained with Buge as 'nostros' not so according to Bücheler, see I § 65 p. 54 — it must come from *nestrō-, and that must be regarded as an adformate of vestrō-. Perhaps the difference in O.Ir. gen. 1st person na-thar beside 2nd person se-thar (se- = *s-ye-) is similar, compare § 457 on Skr. nān: nam.

These forms with -(e)ro- will serve to show that the second comparative suffix -(e)ro- (II § 75 pp. 188 ff.) is to be seen in the following forms. O.Ir. gen. ar n- and far n- with the gen. pl. ending like Lat. nostrum, used for the possessive; ar n- probably (according to Torp, as cited, p. 41) for *esro- = *ys-ro- (with -r- for -sr- cp. mēr for *mēnsr-, I § 574 p. 430) with the vowel of the first syllable weakened to a in proclitic position (explained differently by Thurneysen, see vol. II § 75 p. 196 footnote); and far n- similarly either for *s-yes-ro- or for *s-ye-ro-, — if the latter it must have been originally dual like seθar 'vester' (pl.), see § 459. Goth. unsar izvār, O.Icel. yd(e)ar-r, O.H.G. with strong ending unserēr iuwerēr, compare the gen. of the person, pron., Goth. unsara izvāra O.Icel. yd(e)ar, like Goth. meina beside mein-s, O.Icel. mēn beside min-n (§ 452 with the Rem. pp. 392 f.); since izvār iuwerēr cannot be derived from *es-yes-ro- *e-yes-ro-, they were either dual at first, as O.Ir. far n- may have been, or else they are simply due to the analogy of unsar unserēr.

These forms with -(e)ro- and the subst. O.Icel. var O.H.G. unser seem to be related in much the same way as Gr. ēmeterō-; Lat. superus and veñgro super, or the like (II § 75 pp. 188 ff., III § 258 p. 153).
§ 456. A formative suffix -aka- is shown in the Aryan genitives: Skr. asmdakam yuṣmākam, Ved. also asmāka yuṣmāka doubtless following māma tāva (conversely, Pali manuyu tavān follow anākaṃtu tumhakam); Avest. ahmākem yuṣmākem xṣmākem O.Pers. amāxam (on this -x- see Bartholomae, Ar. Forsch. I 79). Connected with these are the possessives Skr. asmāka-s yuṣmāka-s, Avest. ahmāka- yuṣmāka- xṣmāka-. The forms in -akam can hardly be anything but the nom. acc. sing. neuter, although the reason why this form was pitched upon is still unexplained; cp. yuvāku, used for the gen. dual, beside the adj. yuvāku- (§§ 458, 459). Cp. II § 36 pp. 257 f., § 89 p. 272 f.; Benfey, Abh. der Gött. Ges. der Wiss. XIX 4, 46; the Author, Kuhn’s Zeit-schr. XXVII 400 ff.; Torp, op. cit. p. 31. A different view — but one which if I may say so, smacks too much of the old “glottogonic” school — is taken by Johansson, Bezz. Beitr. XVI 139 f.

Remark. It is quite possible that asmdakam was originally adverbial like ‘on our side, by us’. Then the attributive use with nouns, e.g. asmdakq gāyairdhy ‘our song’, was the same as in tā ime vīduraṁ lokāḥ Čat. Brāh. I. 4. 1. 23 ‘these are the far-sundered (lit. far apart, adv.) worlds’, Gr. ἐρ χέρες etc. (see Goedicke, Acc. in Veda 233; Delbrück, Synt. Forsch. V 72, 203; Paul, Princ. 314). The use of māna tāva Avest. mana tava would also have had something to do with this idiom.

For the possessive, Sanskrit has also asmad-ṭya-s yuṣmad-ṭya-s, cp. mad-ṭya-s tvad-ṭya-s § 451 p. 391.

b. The Dual of we and you and of the Reflexive, together with their several Possessives.

Nominaive and Accusative.

§ 457. The main characteristic of the dual cases was the absence of the s of the forms used for the plural, Skr. na-s va-s etc.

Answering to the plural nom. *me-i ‘we’ the dual had *me *me (cp. *me *mè Gr. με Skr. ma and the like, § 415 Rem. p. 337). *me: Goth. O.Icel. vi-t A.S. wi-t, Lith. dial. vė-du fem. vė-dvi, but in H.Lith. mū-du -dvī (vė-du was orig. only
nom., mū-du only acc.; in one set of dialects mūdu was entirely levelled out, and vēdu in the other); Lith. -du and Goth. -t must both have been connected with the numeral tveo (Goth. tvaí), but the manner in which the Goth. form was shortened to -t is not clear. *uē: O.C.Sl. vē, Skr. Ved. vām with the particle -m.

Answering to the plural nom. *jūs 'you' the dual had *ju *jū (cp. *tu tu 'thou' and the like, § 415 Rem. p. 337). *ju: Lith. jū-du (also used as acc.), Goth. *ju-t (by an accident, not actually found), instead of which in other dialects we find A.S. āt O.Sax. āt H.G. Bavar. e.g O.Icel. it influenced by wēt wēt (cp. § 441 p. 374). *jū: Skr. yuvām = yū + am.

In place of the plural acc. etc. Skr. nas Lat. nōs etc. the following forms appear in the dual: Skr. enclitic nāu, acc. gen. dat. like nas; Gr. νό acc. nom., beside which in Homer is νο- perhaps with the deictic -i (cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.2 p. 132); O.C.Sl. na acc. dat. Thus there was in Idg. an enclitic *nō (*nō), which in Greek, accented, took the place of the nom. as well, just as the plural Lat. nōs came to be used for the nominative too. And as the plural had *us (Goth. uns) besides *nōs, so the dual had *u beside *nō, in acc. Goth. uŋ-k A.S. un-c with the particle -k like mi-k. Another form which must doubtless be added to the list is Skr. Ved. avām; which may be derived from α- = *u, by assuming that it was extended on the analogy of yuvām, cp. below.

In place of the plural acc. etc. Skr. vas Lat. vōs etc. the following forms appear: Skr. enclitic vānt (with the m-particle) acc. gen. dat. like nas; O.C.Sl. va acc. dat. nom. (its use for the nom. is not original). Does the contrast between Skr. nāu: vām indicate that the ground-form of the 2nd person was *uē, not *uō? (cp. § 455 Rem. p. 395). Answering to *u (Goth. uŋ-k) there may have been a *u in Germanic, acc. *u-ke, which could become A.S. inc etc. by analogical change, see § 437. 2, d p. 370.

Skr. Ved. 1st person nom. avām acc. avām, 2nd person nom. yuvām acc. yuvām; in later Sanskrit the acc. forms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Aramaic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>O.T. Greek</th>
<th>Gothic O.H.G.</th>
<th>R.U.</th>
<th>Pron.</th>
<th>O.C.G.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>מָן</td>
<td>מִן</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גָּדֹל</td>
<td>גָּדֹל</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>צַלְמָה</td>
<td>צַלְמָה</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְתוֹלְק</td>
<td>מְתוֹלְק</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>מָסָרָה</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
<td>µν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nom., mū-du only acc.; in one set of dialects mūdu was entirely levelled out, and vēdu in the other); Lith. -du and Goth. -t must both have been connected with the numeral two (Goth. tvāi), but the manner in which the Goth. form was shortened to -t is not clear. *yē: O.C.Sl. vē, Skr. Ved. vām with the particle -m.

Answering to the plural nom. *jās ‘you’ the dual had *ju *jū (cp. *tu tā ‘thou’ and the like, § 415 Rem. p. 337). *ju: Lith. jū-du (also used as acc.), Goth. *ju-t (by an accident, not actually found), instead of which in other dialects we find A.S. git O.Sax. git H.G. Bavar. eg O.Icel. it influenced by wit vit (cp. § 441 p. 374). *jū: Skr. yuvām = yū + am.

In place of the plural acc. etc. Skr. nas Lat. nōs etc. the following forms appear in the dual: Skr. enclitic nāu, acc. gen. dat. like nas; Gr. νό acc. nom., beside which in Homer is νος, perhaps with the deictic -ι (cp. the Author, Gr. Gr.2 p. 132); O.C.Sl. na acc. dat. Thus there was in Idg. an enclitic *nō (*nōδ), which in Greek, accented, took the place of the nom. as well, just as the plural Lat. nōs came to be used for the nominative too. And as the plural had *γε (Goth. uns) beside *nōs, so the dual had *γ beside *nō, in acc. Goth. ug-k A.S. un-c with the particle -k like mi-k. Another form which must doubtless be added to the list is Skr. Ved. āvām; which may be derived from a- = *g, by assuming that it was extended on the analogy of yuvām, cp. below.

In place of the plural acc. etc. Skr. vās Lat. vōs etc. the following forms appear: Skr. enclitic vam (with the m-particle) acc. gen. dat. like vās; O.C.Sl. vā acc. dat. nom. (its use for the nom. is not original). Does the contrast between Skr. nāu : vām indicate that the ground-form of the 2nd person was *yē, not *yē? (cp. § 455 Rem. p. 395). Answering to *γ (Goth. ug-κ) there may have been a *u in Germanic, acc. *u-κ, which could become A.S. inc etc. by analoglical change, see § 437.2, d p. 370.

Skr. Ved. 1st person nom. āvām acc. āvām, 2nd person nom. yuvām acc. yuvām; in later Sanskrit the acc. forms
### Tables showing the Inflection of Personal and Reflexive Pronouns.

(Supplement to §§ 489–489.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ṛya(k)-(e)m</td>
<td>aḥām</td>
<td>aśem</td>
<td>rs</td>
<td>γαυρον</td>
<td>ago</td>
<td>Osk. tilum</td>
<td>mēm-eas</td>
<td>tīn iēs</td>
<td>iēs</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>arū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tu-tū</td>
<td>tiudām</td>
<td>teši</td>
<td>ṭu</td>
<td>τοῦ ῥόπον</td>
<td>tū</td>
<td>tu-tām</td>
<td>mēm-eas</td>
<td>tīn iēs</td>
<td>iēs</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>arū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A.\textsuperscript{1} Nominative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acc. 1</th>
<th>mā mām, [mā]</th>
<th>mā mām</th>
<th>ῥε ῥε</th>
<th>mē (mē)</th>
<th>mē (mē)</th>
<th>tī fī</th>
<th>tī (fī)</th>
<th>tī (fī)</th>
<th>tū (fī)</th>
<th>tū (fī)</th>
<th>tū (fī)</th>
<th>tū (fī)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Umbr. tiom</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. siem</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abl. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abl. 1</th>
<th>see-d, 'maid'</th>
<th>see-d, 'maid'</th>
<th>see-d, 'maid'</th>
<th>see-d, 'maid'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Umbr. sēr-pēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dat. 1</th>
<th>mey-o-, 'mei'</th>
<th>mey-o-, 'mei'</th>
<th>mey-o-, 'mei'</th>
<th>mey-o-, 'mei'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Umbr. te'y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Loc. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loc. 1</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. sēl-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Umbr. a-sō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instr. 1</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. sēl-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen. 1</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. sēl-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plur. 1</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. sēl-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acc. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acc. 2</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
<th>mey 'mey'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>Osk. sēl-f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td>tiū (fī)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. 1</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. 1</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. 1</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 1</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
<td>yu'us</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Paste text from the several languages which belong to the same class where they stand only by right of usage, and in form belong to another, are enclosed in square brackets [ ].
could be used for the nom. too. Avest. acc. *avā. Probably the nom. *yuvām had (in pr. Ar.) produced an acc. *yuvām on the analogy of *tvām *tvām : *tvām *tvām. An acc. *yuvā, following *tvā *tvā, is indicated by Avest. *avā. Cp. abl. *yuvād following *tvād *tvād. And then, apparently to get similar forms for the 1st person, there were formed *avām Skr. *avām Avest. *avā (cp. abl. *avād), the kernel for these being *a- = *ā; *a- = *ā : *u- in Goth. u-g-k, as *ia- : *i-. Similarly in the plural, but by the opposite attraction, Skr. yā-yām follows vāy-ām, see § 458.

Distinct from all the forms hitherto mentioned is Gr. ὑπό 'you two', Hom. ὑπό (like νοῦς above). A conjecture on its origin is given in § 436 Rem. 3 page 368.

Reflexive: Hom. acc. ὑπότε, a kind of dualisation of ὑπό by intrusion of ο, like ὑπόν following ὑπόν.

The Remaining Cases, and the Possessives.

§ 456. Aryan. There is nothing of the dual in the case ending of any of the following forms: Ablative Skr. Ved. *avād *yuvād: cp. teidd. Instrumental *yuvā in Ved. *yuvā-datta-s: cp. teidd-datta-s *yuvā-datta-s. Genitive Avest. *yuvākem, like *yuvākem, but Skr. Ved. *yuvāku *yuvāku with the adj. *yuvāku as contrasted with *yuvākam with the adj. *yuvākem-s: this aku-formation and the use of the adjective *yuvāku- suggest that there may be some close connexion between these and *yuvāy- *yuvāy- *tvāy-s and the like (cp. § 456 p. 396, and the references there given). On the other hand, dual inflexion is seen in gen. loc. avāyog *yuvāyog (beside which Vedic has *yuvōs), to be explained as we have explained ēnōs : ēnayōs (§ 307 p. 205), or else as being derived straight from *yū, the form from which yuvām comes (cp. sūnā : sūν-β); and in dat.-abl. instr. avā-bhyām yuvā-bhyām besides yuvā-bhyam (cp. J. Schmidt, Pluralb. 20).

Greek. Hom. νόον ὑπόν Att. νοῦν ὑπόν. Cp. τόσ-ív § 312 p. 211. Does νόον come from *νο-σίν? It is also
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Abl. 1</th>
<th>Abl. 2</th>
<th>Dat. 1</th>
<th>Dat. 2</th>
<th>Instr. 1</th>
<th>Instr. 2</th>
<th>Gen. 1</th>
<th>Gen. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 1</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
<td>u u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Forms from the several languages which belong to the place where they stand only by right of usage, and in form belong to another, are enclosed in square brackets [ ].

2. Spaced Type denotes that a form may be considered as regularly descended from the form of the parent language.
could be used for the nom. too. Avest. acc. *ava. Probably the nom. *yuvaš had (in pr. Ar.) produced an acc. yuvaš on the analogy of tuvaš tvām : tuvaš tvām. An acc. *yuvā, following tuva tvā, is indicated by Avest. avā. Cp. abl. yuvaš following tuvaš tvād. And then, apparently to get similar forms for the 1st person, there were formed avām Skr. avām Avest. arā (cp. abl. avād), the kernel for these being a- = *ə ; a- = *ə : *y- in Goth. ug-k, as *ja- : *ju-. Similarly in the plural; but by the opposite attraction, Skr. yu-ū, yu-ū follows av-ūm, see § 458.

Distinct from all the forms hitherto mentioned is Gr. σοφή 'you two', Hom. σφών (like νοῦ-σ above). A conjecture on its origin is given in § 436 Rem. 3 page 368.

Reflexive: Hom. acc. σφωτε, a kind of dualisation of σφί by intrusion of ο, like σφων following σφί.

The Remaining Cases, and the Possessives.

§ 456. Aryan. There is nothing of the dual in the case ending of any of the following forms: Ablative Skr. Ved. avād yuvida : cp. tvād. Instrumental yuvā in Ved. yuva-du-ta-s : cp. tuva-du-ta-s yuṣmā-du-ta-s. Genitive Avest. yuvākem, like yuṣmākem, but Skr. Ved. yuvākū yuvākūš with the adj. yuvaškem, as contrasted with yuṣmākem with the adj. yuṣmākūš : this aku-formation and the use of the adjective yuvākūš suggest that there may be some close connexion between these and yuvāyūš yuvāyūš tvāyū-s and the like (cp. § 456 p. 396, and the references there given). On the other hand, dual inflexion is seen in gen. loc. avāyōš yuvāyōš (beside which Vedī has yuvōš), to be explained as we have explained enōš : ēnayōš (§ 307 p. 205), or else as being derived straight from *yū, the form from which yuvaš comes (cp. sānd : sūne-dī); and in dat-abl. instr. avā-bhyām yuvā-bhyām beside yuva-bhyām (cp. J. Schmidt, Plur. 20).

Greek. Hom. νοῦρ φρονέν Att. νοῦν φρονέν. Cp. τοῦν
§ 312 p. 211. Does νοῦν come from *νο-σίν? It is also
possible that υοιν like εμιν was modelled upon ιμυιν, and being associated with τοιν ἵπποιν came to have the same functions.

Lat. nō-bīs vō-bīs may be regarded as old dual cases (cf. O.C Sl. na-ma, va-ma) whose suffix has been pluralised by association with the type of ēstis, see § 445 p. 382. This is not the only instance of a form passing into the plural system when the dual has died out: a parallel is Bav. eg enk used for the plural. Much the same thing is seen in Norse dialects; see Johansson, Kuhn's Zeitschr. XXX 551. Compare the Latin dual duae, equae used for the plural, § 286 p. 194, § 315 p. 215.1)

O.Ir. gen. nāthar nār Mid.Ir. fathar sar, see § 459.

Germanic. Round about the form *un-ke = Goth. ugg (§ 457), whose k was regarded as parallel to the s of uns and so lumped together with the stem, were produced Goth. ukgis ukgara following unsis unsara, O.Sax. gen. unkero gen. pl. of the possessive like ūsa, dat. unk for *unkiś like in for *iγγις, O.H.G. gen. unkēr following unsēr. Similarly in the 2nd person Goth. iγγīs iγgara (-kē- following -sv- in iγvis iγpara) O.Sax. inkt. A.S. acc. uncīt incit, beside dat. unc inc, with -it following the nom. wīt zīt.

Balto-Slavonic. O.C Sl. na-ma va-ma like rąka-ma, but nā-fu va-fu as contrasted with rąku tofu. Lithuanian shows a multitude of forms distributed among the different dialects. Dat. instr. mu-m ju-m beside mū-du jū-du (§ 457 pp. 396 f.), as in the plural mū-mu jū-mu and mu-muš ju-muš; also mum-dvēm jum-dvēm. Then mum and jum served as a kernel for the gen. O.Lith. mumu jumu with the -ā of the gen. plural (cp. gen. dual dvēmu, Brückner, Arch. slav. Phil., III 310), and for the dat. mumēm; there are also gen. múna jūma (used as the poss. gen.), which are found in districts where móno tāvo have regularly become móna tāva, and therefore are without doubt modelled after them. Elsewhere

1) So now Bartholomae, Stud. zur iāg. Spr., I 7.
the case-system is filled up by a form: made up of ve-, mu-, or ju- -du, but not always in the same way. High Lith. gen. mı-đeįį jų-đeįį dat. instr. mı-đeįį jų-đeįį loc. mı-đeįį jų-đeįį. But in other parts the structure of ve-du mı-du and jų-du became so much obscured, that they came under the influence of su- as though they were vėd-u etc.: hence gen. vėdums mıđums, jųdums (cp. su-ns § 310 p. 207), dat. instr. vėdum mıđum, jųdum; so too we find in the same neighbourhoods gen. tādums dat. instr. tādum from nom. tā-du (beside tā-s 'the, that').

§ 459. Possessives. Skr. Ved. yuvāku-, Gr. Hom. κρατ-τε疴-ς κφό-τε疴-ς, cp. गनेत्यो-ऽ. O.Ir. nā-thar and nār in cechtar nāthar, cechtar nār 'each of us two', which we may conjecture to be gen. pl. like ar n- (§ 455 p. 395); nār for *nā-. So too the O.Ir. se-thar — sēthar(-si) Wb. 1b is glossed, accentuated 'vestram', plural — which is connected with *s-te-, must originally have been dual, as is still Mid.Ir. nechtar fathar 'one of you two' (fathar is doubtless a transformation of sēthar on the analogy of far), and possibly Mid.Ir. ser in indala-ser 'one of you two' and the possessive genitive far n- (cp. loc. cit.). Gothic ikgar (ugkar not found, but may be assumed from gen. ukgara), O.Icel. okkar-r ykkar-r, O.Sax. gen. pl. unkero.
possible that *tvāv like *ēmuñ was modelled upon *āmuñ, and being associated with roīn īnpōn came to have the same functions.

Lat. nō-bīs vō-bīs may be regarded as old dual cases (cp. O.C.Sl. na-ma, va-ma) whose suffix has been pluralised by association with the type of īsīs, see § 445 p. 382. This is not the only instance of a form passing into the plural system when the dual has died out: a parallel is Bavar. eg enk used for the plural. Much the same thing is seen in Norse dialects; see Johansson, Kuhn’s Zeitschr. XXX 551. Compare the Latin dual duae, equae used for the plural, § 286 p. 194, § 315 p. 215.¹)

O.Ir. gen. nāthar nār Mid.Ir. fathar sar, see § 459.

Germanic. Round about the form *un-ke = Goth. ukē (§ 457), whose k was regarded as parallel to the s of uns and so lumped together with the stem, were produced Goth. uggis uggara following unsis unsara, O.Sax. gen. unker gen. pl. of the possessive like āsə, dat. unk for *unkiz like in for *īggis, O.H.G. gen. unker following unsēr. Similarly in the 2nd person Goth. iggis iggar (−ky− following −ev− in īvis īsvara) O.Sax. ink. A.S. acc. uncit incit, beside dat. unc inc, with −it following the nom. wit zīt.

Balto-Slavonic. O.C.Sl. na-ma va-ma like rāka-ma, but nā-ju va-ju as contrasted with rāku toju. Lithuanian shows a multitude of forms distributed among the different dialects. Dat. instr. mu-m ju-m beside mū-du ju-du (§ 457 pp. 396 f.), as in the plural mū-μs jū-μs and mū-μs jū-μs; also mūm-devēn jum-dvēm. Then mūm and jum served as a kernel for the gen. O.Lith. mumu jumu with the −a of the gen. plural (cp. gen. dual dvēmu, Brückner, Arch. slav. Phil., III 310), and for the dat. mumēm; there are also gen. mūma jūma (used as the poss. gen.), which are found in districts where māno tāvo have regularly become māna tāva, and therefore are without doubt modelled after them. Elsewhere

¹) So now Bartholomae, Stud. zur idg. Spr., I 7.
the case-system is filled up by a form: made up of ve-, mu-, or ju-+-du, but not always in the same way. High Lith. gen. mù-dvėjā ju-duvējā dat. instr. mù-dvēm ju-duvēm loc. mùdvēse ju-duvēse. But in other parts the structure of ve-du mú-du and ju-du became so much obscured, that they came under the influence of sūnu as though they were vēd-u etc.: hence gen. vēdums múdums, jūdums (cp. sūnu-ms § 310 p. 207), dat. instr. vēdum múdum, jūdum; so too we find in the same neighbourhoods gen. tādums dat. instr. tādum from nom. tā-du (beside tā-s 'the, that').

§ 459. Possessives. Skr. Ved. yuvāku-ṣ. Gr. Hom. ἰῃ-τερό-ς οὑῳ-τερό-ς, cp. ἰῃ-τερό-ς. O.Ir. nā-thar and nā-r in cechtar nāthar, cechtar nār 'each of us two', which we may conjecture to be gen. pl. like ar n- (§ 455 p. 395); nā- for *nō-. So too the O.Ir. se-thar — sethar(-si) Wb. 1b is glossed. accentuated 'vestram', plural — which is connected with *s-ye-, must originally have been dual, as is still Mid.Ir. mechtar fathar 'one of you two' (fathar is doubtless a transformation of sethar on the analogy of far), and possibly Mid.Ir. sar in indala-sar 'one of you two' and the possessive genitive far n- (cp. loc. cit.). Gothic iggar (ngkara not found, but may be assumed from gen. ugkara), O.Icel. okkar-r ykkar-r, O.Sax. gen. pl. unkero.
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