

lump-headed, stupid; *pollach*, lumpish, stupid (MacLeod). The *p* of *poll* changes to a *k* in O.N. *kollr*, a rounded top, crown of the head, head in general; *kollöttr*, Da. *kullet*, *kuldet*, a polled cow or sheep, an animal without horns. Sc. *coll* or *cow*, to poll or cut the hair. To *cow* the head, to poll the head, to reduce it to a smooth round ball. The same modification of the root is found in G. *kugel*, *kaul*, *kul*, *kulle*, a bowl or globular body, the combination of which with words signifying head, and with others signifying frog or toad, supplies designations of the tadpole, exactly corresponding to *polehead* and *tadpole* respectively in the sense above explained. Corresponding to *polehead* we find *kaulhaupt*, *kulhaupt* (Dieffenbach, Supplement), *kullkopf* (Idioticon v. Kur Hessen), while in *kaulpadde*, *kaulfrosch* (Sanders), *külpogg* (Danneil), the element signifying round headed is joined with a word signifying frog or toad, as in *tadpole*. The essential identity of G. *kaul* or *kül* and E. *poll* is evidenced by the fact that the tadpole in some parts of the Altmark is called *külpogg*, in others *pülpogg*. The same principle of nomenclature is exhibited in Fr. *chabot* (equivalent to Latin *capito*, bighead), the little fish called a bullhead or miller's thumb, also the little water vermin called a bullhead (Cot.). Another Fr. name for both animals is *têtard*, the tadpole being distinguished as *têtard de grenouille* (Trevoux), a complete translation of E. *tadpole*.

VII.—ON SOME OF THE SUFFIXES OF GREEK AND LATIN PREPOSITIONS. By T. HEWITT KEY, Esq.

THERE is no portion of the domain of language which gives more trouble to the Philologist than that of the Prepositions; and this chiefly because no class of words is more subject to corruption. I propose then on the present occasion to draw attention to them, and begin with a renewal of my protest against the speculations of Bopp and his followers, who have

thought that they found a solution of some of their difficulties in the theory that simple prepositions are the produce of a special class of roots, called by them pronominal. But the result of their labours is I think enough to discredit their theory. They tell us with truth that the chief duty of prepositions is to designate the relations of place,—the *whence*, the *where*, and the *whither*; and then they point out that the special office of the pronouns of the third person is to mark the *here* and the *there*, so that there is a natural connection, they contend, between the two classes of ideas. But here they ignore two of the three notions which prepositions represent, dealing indeed with the *where*, but leaving out of view the other notions of the *whence* and the *whither*. Perhaps however they would ask whether the Latin pronominal adverbs *inde*, *ibi*, and *eo* do not comprehend the three varieties of meaning; and of course such a question must be answered in the affirmative. But this admission will not serve their purpose, since the three adverbs so called add to the root of the pronoun certain case-endings, which are needed to represent the full idea; and these case-endings, having all the power of prepositions, claim to be treated as such, with the one exception, that their position rejects the term, so that they must be called post-positions. This however is altogether an idle distinction. But over and above this fatal difficulty, the theory that prepositions have their origin in pronominal roots finds its condemnation in the very facility with which Bopp assumes all conceivable changes of form, at the same time that he avoids all discussion of meanings. Thus, starting from a pronominal root *a* 'this,' he brings his reader to *a-ti* 'over' and *a-dhas* 'under' (§ 997); to *a-bhi* 'to' (§ 997) and *a-pa* 'from' (§ 1007); to the Greek *απο*, which denotes absence, and *παρα* for *a-παρα*, with the meaning of presence (§ 1009), to the Latin *re* and *pro* (§ 1009), two words which are as thoroughly opposite as can well be conceived; and certainly they have lost in their alleged descent from *a* all likeness to their parent; but this is a difficulty which he complacently surmounts on the theory, that the original *a* first produces a derivative *a-pa*, and

this again a second derivative *apara-*, which, decapitated, gives *para*, and by a second decapitation *ra*, which we may admit is something not unlike the Latin *re*. Similarly the S. pronoun *ana* (=Germ. *jener*, our *yon*) has for one of its children the Slav. *na* 'up,' and for another the Germ. *nie-der* 'down.'

And this extraordinary theory is built up to save us from the asserted impossibility of deducing prepositions from verbal roots; and yet one of Bopp's most enthusiastic disciples tells us in his lectures (1st Series, p. 221) that "the instrumental (in Chinese) is formed by the preposition *ÿ*, which preposition is an old root meaning *to use*;" and I have myself drawn attention to the fact, that the Skr. prep. *ni* 'down' appears in Chinese as a verb, meaning 'to descend;' while the Lith. *nu* of the same power is identical with the theme of the Greek verb *νεν-ω* 'lower.' It may be objected, that I have no right to import into a discussion about the Indo-European family of languages what is so utterly foreign to the stock as a Chinese verb. I might demur to this assumption, but there is no need to do so, for whether the Sanskrit *ni* and the Ch. *ni* be akin in blood or not, the logical difficulty vanishes as soon as it is admitted that there may be an affinity in meaning between a verb and preposition.

I shall assume then that *av*, the stem of the Greek *ava*, meant 'ascent,' and also that the Greek *ev*, Latin *in*, had for its power the opposite idea of 'descent,' and so accounts for the meaning of *ev-εποι* 'those below,' and the Latin *imus* (*in-imus*) 'lowest.' As I give a preference to the monosyllabic *av* and *ev* over the forms *ava* and *evi*, so also to the monosyllabic forms *ob*, *sub*, *ab* of Latin over the corresponding *επι*, *ιπο*, *απο* of the Greek; and to the Greek *παρ* over *παρα*, as also to the Greek *εκ* over the Latin *ex*, and conversely to the Latin *am* (Germ. *um*), over the Greek *αμφι*.

But whence the additions which appear in the longer forms? whence the *ι* of *επι*, *επι*, and *αμφι*, the *ο* of *ιπο* and *απο*, the final *α* of *παρα*, the *ς* of *εξ*?

I would here first call attention to the fact that in the

Greek prepositions there prevails for the most part something like the principle of vowel-assimilation. In *ανα*, *κατα*, *παρα*, the two syllables have an identity of vowel; while in *μετα* and *περαν* the vowels, though different, are neighbours in the natural gamut *i e a o u*. In *ενι*, *επι*, *περι*, we have again neighbour-vowels of the weak order; and in *απο*, *υπο*, neighbour-vowels of the strong order. *Αντι* and *αμφι* are indeed exceptions; but I here fall back upon a principle, which I am not now asserting to serve the purpose of the moment, for it is already distinctly put forward in the paper (Proc. 5, 191) in which I first drew attention to the influence of vowel-assimilation in several languages. To the instances *νομο-* m. (n. *νομος*) and *νεμεσ-* n., from the verb *νεμ-* (p. 203), I appended this note: "Yet the interposition of a double consonant seems to stop the current of attraction. Thus we have *κλοπ-εως* but *κλεπτης*," whereas the forms *νομη*, *γονη*, might have suggested a form *κλοπτης*.

But if the law of vowel-assimilation has influenced the formation of these words, it is possible that the *a* in the suffix of the one set may be one in origin with *i* of *ενι*, *περι*, and with the *o* of *απο*, *υπο*.

Be this as it may, it behoves the philologer not to attempt the explanation of forms, until he has them before him in their fullest development. Now by the side of *αμφι* we have a variety *αμφις*; and so far from placing *αμφις* below *αμφι* in honour, because the former is limited to epic and lyrical use, I at once award it precedence, if only because poets are sure to retain old forms longer than other writers. But I place also no little reliance on the doctrine that greater fullness is itself an evidence of greater antiquity, for words wear away instead of the reverse. Hence I hold *μεχρις* and *αχρις* as more genuine than *μεχρι* and *αχρι*; and have little respect for the usual assumption that the *σ* in these words was added, *hiatus vitandi causa* or *metri gratia*, or due to poetical licence. In the case of *αμφις*, indeed, such pleas are not I believe put forward; but if they were, it would be enough in answer to point to *αμφισβητω*. The analogy of *αμφις* and *αμφι*, *αχρις* and *αχρι*, *μεχρις* and *μεχρι*, leads me to ask whether *ενι*, *επι*,

περι, may not have lost a *σ*; and as regards the last two I find an affirmative argument in the form *περι-σσειω*—*καλὰι δε περισσειοντο εθειραι*, *Il.* 19, 382 and 22, 315; in *επισ-σειω*, the only form known to Homer; and *επισ-σειω*, again the only form known to Homer; and none of them to be slighted because they are called poetical varieties. It must be admitted however that the augmented tenses of *σειω* often take a double *σ*, independently of any preposition. But the form *ἐπισ* (for *ἐπι*) receives further confirmation from the allied adverbs *οπισ-ω* and *οπισθεν*, for the *ω* of the former by itself constitutes a suffix, as it does in *αν-ω*, *κατ-ω*; and the Latin *e-o*, *retr-o*, with the notion of our ‘wards’ (‘backwards,’ etc.). *Οπισ* again in *οπισθεν* must be regarded as independent of what follows, whether the suffix be *θεν*, as commonly taught, or *εν* alone, for in the latter case the *θ* would be only an outgrowth from the preceding sibilant. For a form *ενς* I fail at first to find any sufficient Greek authority; but this defect will perhaps be made good in the sequel. At the same time, I request attention to our *neth-er* and *neath*, to the Germ. *nied-er*, and Norse *nid-r*, where we have what is akin to a dental *s*, viz. a dental aspirate or dental mute; and still more to the Slavonic prefix *niz*, and to the Slav. verb *niz-it* ‘to lower,’ which exhibit an absolute sibilant. Now all these words are proved to be derivatives from a root *εν* or *in* both by their meaning and by the varying forms of the Greek *επερθε* and *νερθε*.

But if it be established as the more genuine suffix of these prepositions, it remains to ask what was its power; and I venture to answer that it was in origin a comparativel affix, such as we are familiar with in the Latin adverb *magis*, which all hold to have superseded a fuller *magius*. But the compression of two vowels into one should have led to a long vowel as the result; and accordingly we find this quantity in the word as used by Terence (*Hec.* 2, 2, 7; cf. Wagner’s note): “*Quod tú si ídem facerés magís in rém et uostram et nostrám ’sset.*” Precisely in the same way *prius*, though written with five letters, seems habitually to have had a monosyllabic pronunciation in the old writers, as Plautus

(Curc. 5, 2, 70); Pacuvius (167 R.); Accius (428 R.); and Terence always, I believe, except when it constitutes the last foot in a senarius: "Prius prôditurum tē tuam uitam ét prius . . . (Haut. 3, 1, 70; add 2, 2, 8). So *priusquam* has the pronunciation *prisquam* in Plaut. Glor. 3, 1, 115; Enn. Tr. 15 and 235 V.; Pacuv. 191 and 325 R.; Ter. Andr. 2, 1, 11; Hec. 3, 1, 7, and 13. Further, this assumed compression of *prius* to *pris* is in agreement with two facts—first, the disappearance of the *u* from the adjectives *pristinus* (*t* excrecent) and *priscus*. Nay, *pridem* itself has probably grown out of an older *prisdem*. If it be said rather from *praedem*, it will be found in the sequel that such an explanation leads to the same result. Secondly, we have what is perfectly parallel in the Greek $\pi\rho\upsilon$, from an old $\pi\rho\iota\upsilon$ of comparativel form. And again, as in Latin we find first *magis* and then *magis*, so $\pi\rho\iota\upsilon$ exists in Homer, though superseded by $\pi\rho\iota\upsilon$ in later writers. This theory moreover brings into one the so-called conjunctions *priusquam* of the one language, and $\pi\rho\upsilon \eta$ of the other; for not many will dispute the identity of η and *quam* in blood as well as in meaning.

Other examples of corrupted comparatives in *is* are, as I believe, *satis*, meaning 'rather full and so enough,' *nimis* 'overmuch;' and I now add *potis*. This word in old Latin writers is often a neuter adjective, as it well might be if growing out of an older *potios* (*potior*, *potius*). On the other hand, the form *pote*, though it has at first view the appearance of a mere neuter, like *triste*, is for the same class of writers m. or f. as well as neuter; and indeed Donatus (ad Ter. Ad. 2, 3, 11) illustrates the variety *potis*, *pote*, by what for him was a thoroughly parallel case, *magis*, *mage*. There is yet another point in which they agree. We have just seen an example in Terence of *magis* with a long final syllable. So for *potis*, Plautus (St. 5, 7, 5) exhibits the line: "Satis 'asse nobis nōn magis potis est quam fungo ímber," for so the MSS., the editors vying with each other in the correction of the supposed false quantity, Ritschl inserting *hoc* before *potis*, Guyet changing *est* to *sunt*, and an old editor *fungo*

imber to *fungus imbri*. Yet another happy result flows from the theory that *potis* is a comparative, in that it accounts for the form *potestas*, and so for its likeness to *maiestas*, which is naturally deduced from a form *maios* (*maior*). Power and greatness avail not against other power and greatness until superior to them, so that the comparativel idea is in these words essential for their meaning. Thus *magister* and *minister* also are clearly comparatives in form, no less so than *dexter* and *sinister*.

But after all it may be objected to my line of argument, that while I am dealing specially with Greek prepositions, my illustrations of the comparativel suffix *is* have been drawn exclusively from the Latin language. I meet the difficulty by pointing to such Greek forms as *μεγιστος βελτιστος*, holding with others, as I have elsewhere stated, that superlatives are habitually deduced from comparatives; and in this case I believe the final *ος* to be none other than the so-called definite article, the *τ* being an outgrowth from the *σ*, although *τος* itself would be no bad representative of the same article. We should thus have what is precisely parallel to the French *le meilleur*. This theory on the logical side seems quite satisfactory, for among the many 'better,' that which stands out *κατ' εἶοχην* as best, seems entitled to be called 'the better.' It is true that *βελτιον-* is the comparativel form which stands by the side of the superlative *βελτιστος*, but as we have seen on the one hand a theoretic comparative *πριον* reduced to *πριν*, so the Greek language is familiar with the interchange of *ν* and *σ*, and especially before a *τ*, as *σωφρον-*, *σωφροσ-υνη*, *φαν* of *φαινω* and *φασμα*, *σβεν-νυμι* and *ασβεστος*. But the argument as to form admitted, the next question is, how far the assumption that *ισ* of *επισ*, etc., is of comparativel origin, fits into the theory as regards meaning. I point then first to the fact that prepositions are most prone to the taking of such suffixes. *Aft* with us has *aft-er* by its side, *nigh* has *nigher* contracted into *near*, *up over*, *in under* (which has preserved the original meaning of downwards). So in German we find *auf* and *über*, *ein* and the ordinary *unter*, *ent* inseparable and *unter* inseparable,

mit (our *with*) and *wider* (cf. E. *with-stand* and G. *wider-stehen*), etc. Again, in Latin there are seen *sub* and *super*, as well as *subter*; the ordinary *in* and the ordinary *inter*; and coexisting with these, a second *in* or *an* = *ava* and a kindred *inter* corresponding to the inseparable. German *unter*; also *prope* and *propter*; *prae* and *praeter*; *re*(*red*) and *ret-r-o*; *por* and *por-r-o*; *con* and *cont-r-a*, etc. Another point to be noticed is that such comparatival suffixes often lose the distinct meaning of a comparative; and this for the simple reason that in their very nature, at least when used in connection with the idea of rest, prepositions are comparative. *Above* in any case has the notion of greater height, and yet in its form does not say so, for we have here but a compound preposition *ab-ove*, like *ab-aft*, where the *ove* is one with our *up* and the German *auf*. Thus *over*, though a comparative in form, in meaning is one with *above*. A natural result of this state of things is that the comparatives, when they thus drop the distinctive idea of a comparative and so become synonyms with the simple preposition, soon supersede the latter. *Nigh* is now-a-days seldom heard, except from the mouth of a rustic; and so completely has its own comparative *near* driven it out of the field and usurped its function, that we have been led to form a second comparative *near-er*. *Aft* also has been abandoned to nautical uses, and *after* supplies its place; but again without any especial comparatival power, for it is never used to signify 'further aft.' Nay, an hypertrophy so to say of the comparatival prepositions is not of rare occurrence. On a former occasion I had to deal with the preposition *post*, which in my contention was a corruption from an older but still preserved form *pos*, which again was a decapitated variety of a theoretic *opos*, and so a comparative from the simple preposition *ob* (= *εν-ι*) 'after.' But from this *post*, although already a comparative, a second comparative was deduced, viz. *post-erus*; and, to cap the matter, yet a third, *post-er-ior*. Nay, even the superlative *postrēmus* must be regarded as a compression from *post-er-is-mus* (witness the sb. *remus* from *resmus*), in other words, a superlative derived from a triple comparative (*o*)*p-ost-er-is*. As I have

thus been brought back to the preposition *pos*, I would take this opportunity of adding to my former remarks on the subject. It may be recollected that I quoted a direct comparative from *pos* in the form *pos-erus*, or, what is all but the same, taken from an Inscription (6561 Henzen): “lib(ertis) libertabus posrisq. (= posterisque) eorum.” I now give from another Inscription (Gruter 251, 2): “M(arcus) . . . M(arci) f(ilius) Posimus,” which has hitherto been interpreted as = *Ποσιμος*, a word given indeed by L. and S., but marked dubious; nor does it seem suitable as a cognomen, if the translation ‘drinkable’ be correct. As an equivalent of *Postumus*, it is all we could desire; and then we have the complete series, *pos*, *poserus*, *posimus*. Hence I am brought to the conclusion that *αμφις*, to take that as the representative of the class of prepositional words in *ις*, is a comparative. But this led me to ask myself whether the Latin possessed a corresponding offshoot from the preposition *am* ‘round;’ and I think I find one in the noun *anfractus*, or, as it is better written, *amfractus*. As *am* is itself an inseparable preposition, it was scarcely to be expected that a derivative from it should appear in any other shape than as an inseparable prefix. Now the usual derivation, alike in modern and ancient writers, connects this word with *frango*. Thus, besides Varro, as quoted below, Freund has “vom ungebräuchlichen *anfringo*;” but this is surely unsatisfactory, although we do talk of breaking the rapidity of a descent by a zigzag. Unfortunately for such a theory, a zigzag is not the meaning of *anfractus*; and Freund should have told us what power he would assign to the prefix in his assumed verb *anfringo*. In such an inquiry we should first ascertain, if possible, what the precise meaning of the word whose derivation we are seeking may be. Now, Cicero (N. D. 2, 47) uses the word of the sun’s orbit: “cum aetas tua septenos octiens solis anfractus reditusque conuerterit;” and the same seems to be the meaning of his phrase (leg. 2, 19): “in annuis anfractibus (al. amfractibus).” A circuit is the sense of the term in Cæsar’s (b. g. 7, 46, 1): “murus . . . recta regione si nullus amfractus (so Nipp. w. MSS.) intercederet.” Varro

(l. 1. 7, 2, page 300, Speng.), dealing with a poetic phrase, *terrarum amfracta reuisum*, says: "Amfractum est flexum ab origine duplici dictum, ab ambitu et frangendo; ab eo leges iubent in directo pedum viii esse, in amfracto (so all the best MSS.) xvi, id est in flexu." See also Gai. Dig. 8, 3, 8. Pliny's use of the word (11, 124) is again clear: "Dedit (natura) ramosa (cornua) capreis, conuoluta in amfractum arietum generi." But the word is used not only of physical windings, but also of roundabout explanations, as in Cic. Div. 2, 127; and here we are reminded of a similar use of *circumitio* in Terence (Andr. 1, 2, 31), and of *ambages*, as found in Plaut., Ter., Liv., Hor., etc. But this word *ambages* all seem agreed in deducing from *am* (*amb*) and *ago*. Why then not treat *amfractus* as a compression of *amber-actus*. But to remove all doubt on this head, I refer to words given in the Umbrian Inscriptions, as printed by Aufrecht and Kirchoff: Ib 21, *ampr-ehetu* = *amb-ito* (cf. A. K. p. 142, 11); Ib 20, *apr-etu* the same; VIb 56, also 63 and 64, *ambr-etuto* = *amb-eunto* (142, l. 22); Ib 20, *ampr-efus* = *amb-iverit* (p. 146, l. 10); VIb 56, *ambr-efurent* = *amb-iverint* (p. 145, l. 23. This lengthened form, which in my view is a comparative, the German editors speak of as merely "verstärkte Form." But if the Umbrian possessed such a comparative in *ambr*, I may perhaps safely assume such an origin for *anfr-actus*; and thus the Latin possessed an exact equivalent to the comparativ *αμφίς* of the sister tongue.

So much for prepositions which end in *ας*. I have next to consider those which end in *α*. In these, as I have already said, the law of vowel-assimilation seems to have influenced the form; but *δια* stands out as an exception, having a weak vowel in the first syllable. Now this preposition is substantially one with the Latin *dis*, which in some compounds, as *divido*, is written without an *s*; also one with the Germ. *zer*, the Norse *tor*, and our obsolete *to*, in *to-rend*, *to-break*, etc.; whence again the sibilant *s* or its representative *r* has disappeared. But this little family is no doubt akin to the numeral *duo*, *δύω*, *two*; for we ourselves say 'cleave in *two*,' with the same meaning. Indeed, as the idea of union stands in immediate connection

with the first in the series of numerals, so division has a natural affinity for the second. I therefore assume that, just as the Greek adverb *δὶς* represents an older *δυ-ις*, the equivalent of our *twice*, so *δια* must have superseded a fuller *δυνα*, which again may well have been a corruption of a form *δυφα*, *δυχα*, or *δυγα*. In this I am following the same line of theory by which I claimed for *θυγατερ*- a pronunciation *thuyater*, and so contended for its consanguinity with the Latin *filia*, pronounced *fiya*. This assumption, that a Greek γ between vowels took at times the sound of a y, as is so frequently the case in the provincial dialects of England and Germany, has its parallel in the dialectic *ολιος* by the side of *ολυγος*, and the Latin *puleium* by the side of *pulegium*, and *maior* as representing a more regular *magior*. But in the theoretic forms *δυφα*, *δυχα*, *δυγα*, we have no longer an intermixture of weak and strong vowels.

To proceed then with the prepositions which end in *a*, I first again appeal to the doctrine that longer forms should claim precedence in the eyes of a philologer, and so give a preference to *παραι*, *μεται*, *διαι*, over *παρα*, *μετα*, *δια*; and *καται*, as seen in the sb. *καταιβατης*, over *κατα*. Of the forms *ιπαι*, *απαι*, I shall speak presently.

Further, as the Greek *παραι* in its diphthong has what usually appears in Latin as *ae*, we may safely assent to the identification of *παραι* with *prae*. But *prae* itself had a fuller form, viz. *praed*, as seen in the compounds *praed-opto* and *praed-opio*. For these verbs we have, on the evidence of Fest. p. 205, l. 13, of Müller's ed.: "*praedotient praedobtant*," where with reason the editor regards *praedotient* as an error for *praedopiont*, although *praedo(p)tiunt* has been suggested by Ritschl (opusc. 2, 564, note). But this is a secondary point, as our business is with the prefix in the form of *praed*. Now a thick mute at the end of a Latin word seems to have been a thin letter in pronunciation (cf. *ab*, *ob*, *sub*, with *απο*, *επι*, *υπο*); and accordingly we find a *t* in the derived *praet-er*, a form which in Greek would be represented by *παραιτερ*. This reminds one of the numerous Greek comparatives, for which I may take as a type *οψιαι-*

τερος. Some of these comparatives Buttmann (§ 65, 4) claims as formations from a positive in *αιος*, viz. *γεραιτερος* and *παλαιτερος*; but as regards the latter, the simple *παλαιος* is itself deduced from a so-called adv. *παλαι*, which must go with the family of *παραι*, *καται*, etc. Nay *παλαι* is probably nothing more than a variety of *παραι*, and so an analogue of *prae*, which, as used of time, has much the same meaning as *παλαι*. But as regards *οψιατερος*, I cannot but regard it as a corruption of the still preserved *οψιστερος*, the *σ* being dropped, as is so often the case before a *τ*, and then leading to a modified sound of the preceding vowel, as in the Fr. *fenêtre* from *fenestra*, *être* from an obsolete *estre* (=Ital. *essere*); and, again, this *τ* in *οψιστερος*, and like forms, I believe to be an outgrowth from the *σ*, precisely as in the old French infinitive just quoted; and indeed Buttmann himself (in *Anm.* 6) draws attention to the fact that Ionic and Doric comparatives in *εστερος* habitually stand by the side of Attic comparatives in *αιτερος*. The Latin has forms all but identical in *sinister*, *magister*, *minister*, and the Greek, too, exhibits many forms with an *ι* in place of an *ε*, as *αριστερος*, *λαλισταρος*. All such forms I believe to contain two representatives of the comparativ suffix, first *ισ* with an excrement *τ*, and, secondly, *ερ*. I am thus brought to the view that *praeter* is but a compression of a form *par-est-er* or perhaps for the Lat. *por-ester*, it being the habit of this language to have an *ο* where Greek and other kindred languages have an *α*. Indeed *por*, which is the root syllable of *pro* (*por-o*) and *por-ro* and so corresponds with all accuracy to the English *for*, is preserved in the compound *por-rigo*, and save the assimilation of the liquid in *pol-liceor* and *pol-ligo*, 'I lay out (a corpse).' On the other hand, the simpler *παραι* and *prae* will have grown out of some such forms as *παρεστ* and *παραιτ* cut down to *παραι*, and *pores-t* cut down to *praet* or *praed*. Nay, in *praesto*, which I would divide as *praest-o*, and in the modern *presto* the original *s* has been preserved; and the same holds true of *prist-inus*. Nay, *γεραιος*, from which Buttmann deduces *γεραιτερος*, I would deal with in the same way. L. and S. attach to *γεραιος* in the paren-

thesis usually given to derivation, the word *γερων*, and assign as the meaning 'old, with notion of dignity, like *signor*.' I see no reason then why the word *γερων* should not be itself a comparative, like *πλεων*, for the *τ* of the oblique cases may well be excrescent, like that of *λεων*, *λεοντος*, compared with the Latin *leo*, *leonis*. Before I pass from the Greek prepositions in *α*, and the fuller forms, *παραι*, *δαι*, etc., which I have thus treated as standing for *παραις*, *δαις*, and so as virtually comparatives, I would notice that the Latin *dis*, as well as the German *zer* and Norse *tor*, has preserved the consonant which forms so essential a part of the comparativel suffix. I take next the Greek prep. *προς*, the identity of which with *προ* is to a great degree concealed by the apparent variety of their meanings, for unhappily the real power of *προς* for practical purposes is too often subordinate to that of the case-endings which happen at the time to be attached to its noun, so that, with a genitive, it seems to need the translation 'from,' with an accusative that of 'towards.' But the meaning of 'before' is more truly preserved in *μαρτοροι προς θεων*; and it exists unmistakably in *προσ-ω* and *προσθ-εν*. But the disappearance of the idea of 'before' from the ordinary uses of *προς* has no doubt been aided by the existence of the non-ambiguous form *προ*, in which the meaning of 'before' holds its own. Further, of the two varieties, *προς* and *προ*, the fuller form of course claims our preference, and so we have another example of the loss of the comparativel *σ*, corresponding to what we have seen in *παραι* as standing for *παραις*. Nay, *παραι*, *παρα*, *προς*, *προ*, are all four but varieties of the same word, the fullest form of which is seen in *παρος*; while *παροιτερος* is one with the Latin *praeter*, though the latter has happened to have its use limited to a preposition; and *παροιθεν* I should be inclined to regard as shortened from *παροισθ-εν*, and *προτι* (*ποτι*) from *προστ-ι*. But if *προ* has grown out of a fuller *προς*, there is nothing violent in the assumption that *υπο* and *απο* have superseded lost varieties, *υπος*, *απος*, especially as this theory would account for the duplicate forms *υπαι*, *απαι*. Indeed, in the Latin *pomoerium*, *pomeridianus*, we have another

example of the comparativel suffix dispensing with its sibilant.

In treating *pos* of the Latin, and *προς* of the Greek, as having a comparativel suffix, I have assumed that the *i* of the ordinary comparativel suffix (*ios, ior*) has been lost, just as in the cases of *αμφις*, *περισ-*, *επισ-*, *πριν*, and *pris-* of *pristinus*, *priscus*, and *prius* as pronounced, I assumed the loss of the second vowel. To these may be added the Attic *πλειν* for *πλεον*, a form which at once accounts for the ordinary superlative *πλειστος*; and I have already appealed to the evidence of several parallel cases as *magis*. I have now on the other hand to back my theory by quoting, as others before me have done, clear instances of comparatives which have lost the *i*, and for this purpose I call as witnesses *πλεον* by the side of *πλε-ιον*, *minor* and *minus* (for *minior*), *secus* (= *sēquius*) so often followed by a *quam*, *plus* or *plous*, which represents *πλεον* (*πλεος*) rather than *πλειον*, *primores* for *primiores*, and, if I am right in my theory as to this word, *γερων*. Perhaps too, after what has been said of the tendency of prepositions to take comparativel suffixes, I may include with the adverb *ενδ-ον* from *εν*, as used in *ενδον γεγραπται*, = *infra*, which on this theory would stand for *ενδ-ιον* with an excrement *δ*.

But I have yet other examples of this loss in existing Greek words of the prepositional class: I mean *περαν* (*περην*) and *αντην*.¹ Of the two suffixes employed in Sanskrit for the formation of comparatives, viz. *tara* (I should say *ara*) and *iyān* or *iyāns*, the former corresponds to what is seen in *βελτ-ερο-*, the latter to what is seen in *βελτ-ιον-*, so that it may be assumed that the *o* of the latter form has superseded a long vowel. This is parallel to the case of *ρήτορες* compared as to suffix with *tutōres*, so that the *αν* and *ην* of the Greek words just quoted has its explanation on the theory that here again we have comparativel suffixes. This argument is perhaps strengthened by the consideration

¹ These are commonly regarded as cases of nouns, as is also *αντι*; but I am still inclined to adhere to the view in the text, because I do not see what part such case-endings would have to play.

that *περαιος*, which is so closely connected with *περᾶ*, has itself a suffix identical with that of *παλαιος* and *γεραιος*, which seem to have originated in comparativel forms. It may be noted that the Latin possesses a representative of the Greek *περαν* in *peren-die*. But in dealing with *περᾶν* (*περην*) 'beyond,' I am brought to that second preposition *παρα*, signifying 'over,' which I hold to be wholly unconnected with the ordinary *παρα*, signifying 'nearness.' The *παρα* 'over' I find in many compounds, as *παρα-πηδαω* 'leap over,' *παρα-φημι* 'talk over,' *παρα-βαινω* 'transgress;' but for full details I must refer to the essay itself, especially p. 113. It will be there seen that I hold this *παρα* to be decapitated from *ἵπ-απα*, and so akin to *ἵπερ*, and ultimately deduced from *ἵπ* of *ἵπο*, just as I hold the German equivalent *rer* to have superseded a fuller *über*, which is but a comparative of *auf*, as our own *over* is of *up*; and again the Latin *per* is but a shortened form of *super*. The prepositions which in the old Latin language had a final *ad*, but afterwards dropped this *d*, leaving the final vowel long, as *extrad*, *intrad*, *suprad*, *infrad*, *ultrad*, *citrad*, *contrad*, also claim our attention. Ritschl, in his recent essay on the final *d*, holds them to be ablatives, but he does not show how this case-ending is suited to the idea. I would suggest then that the suffix may have grown out of a preceding *an*, and so be a comparative suffix like that in *περ-αν*, as here assumed. *Ultrad*, for example, may have originated in *ultran*, throwing out an excrescent *d*; or the letter *n* may have passed directly into a *d*, for the two letters are convertible, as in *merced-* (nom. *merces*) by the side of *mercen-arius* or *mercenarius*. This theory would account for the adjectives *extran-eus* and *interan-eus*. So much for disyllabic prepositions, for *pros* and *pro* and *dis* seem to have been disyllabic in origin.

But there still remain, especially in the Latin vocabulary, several monosyllabic forms of greater length, standing by simpler forms, as *abs* (or *as* of *as-port-o*), *obs* (or *os* of *os-tendo* for *obs-tendo*), *subs* (or *sus* of *sus-tollo*, *sus-pendo*, *sus-cito*, for *subs-tollo*, etc.), *ex*, *trans*, by the side of *ab*, *ob*, *sub*, *ec* (*ec-fodio*, *ec-fero*), *tran* (*trado*, *traicio*, *tram-es*). The last of these,

tran, is in fact a corruption from *pran* (=περαν), where the letterchange is, as I have elsewhere said, precisely parallel to what is seen in *tranquillus*, that is *pranquillus*, for *planquillus*, a double diminutive from *plancus*, which is itself a diminutive from *planus*. But what is the *s* which alone distinguishes the longer from the shorter forms first enumerated? In the case of *ex*, I think it just possible that the *s* may be excrescent, for there is a close affinity between an *s* and a guttural. Thus our word *frog* has a byform *frox* in A.-Saxon. But the *g* also interchanges with a sibilant, and then the sibilant might take an excrescent *k*-sound, so as to give us the A.-Saxon variety *frosc*. This theory receives support from the Greek εσχάτος, which is but a derivative from εκ. Similarly *trans* may possibly have an excrescent letter for its final, just as the Greek χην appears in German as *gans*. And the same theory may account for *eis*, that is *evs*, as compared with *en*. On the other side, the *s* in *ex*, *trans*, and *eis* may also be due to the same cause as in the other little words, *abs*, *obs*, *subs*; for as regards these the outgrowth of an *s* is altogether inadmissible, and a theory which at once accounts for all the forms has the strongest claim to our support. My own belief then is that all six words contain in the *s* a comparativel suffix shortened from *is*. But if *eis* (ευσ) represents an older and fuller *ev-is*, I arrive at the very form which was anticipated in the first part of this paper as that from which *evi* was corrupted.

The prepositions *cis* and *uls* have also a sibilant, which calls for explanation. I would suggest then with some confidence, that they are contractions of *citis* and *ultis* or *ulis*, two words which I regard as byforms of the *citer* and *ulter*, which have given origin to *citra*, *ultra*, etc.

But I have yet other words in which the comparativel suffix *is* has lost its vowel, as, first, οψε 'late,' which may well have been compressed from a fuller σπισ-ε, so as to be akin, as indeed its meaning asserts, to σπισ-ω and σπισθ-εν. So too αψ 'back,' probably represents a fuller απ-is, so as to be one with απο, which the preceding theory grew out of an older απ-ος. Again abundant evidence

to the same effect is supplied by modern languages. Thus the French gives us *moins* in place of the Latin *minus*, the Gothic *mins* or *minz* 'minus,' *vairs* 'pejus,' *seips* 'amplius,' another *seips*, 'tardius posterius,' *suns* 'statim' or 'ocius,' *anaks* 'subito' (taken from Grimm's D. G. 3, 589, 590). The Norse again has many examples of the vowel lost before the *r* of such comparativel adverbs, which in that language corresponds to the Gothic sibilant, as *miðr* 'minus,' *betr* 'melius,' *verr* 'pejus,' *heldr* 'potius,' *fyrr* 'prius,' and nine others (*ibid.* 593). Grimm also treats as comparatives the Latin *mox*, which he is inclined to connect with *ocius*, and *vix*, for which however he finds no satisfactory origin; but here I may safely suggest *μorys* (see L. and S. under *μoryos*).

There yet remain a few prepositions which perhaps ought to be brought under the same head with those which have been examined above, as *ante* and *poste* from *antid* and *postid*. Possibly *pōn-e* too may have in its first syllable a byform of *pōs* (whence *post*), and the *e* may be the ghost of a second comparativel suffix, as standing for *is*; cf. *magis*, *mage*. The same may be true of the final in *sin-e*; and the case would be strengthened if we could rely on the French *sans* as representing a form of the old rustic language of Italy.

VIII.—A PARTIAL ATTEMPT TO RECONCILE THE LAWS OF LATIN RHYTHM WITH THOSE OF MODERN LANGUAGES. By T. HEWITT KEY, ESQ.

SOME fifteen years ago (1855, May 25), I read before the Society a paper on Greek accentuation, in which incidentally I was led to say not a little on the principles of Latin accent. Again, in my Latin Grammar (see ed. of 1862, §§ 22-29; 835, 6; 1138, 9; 1199, 1391, 1404.1, 1465, with addendum of p. 456), I ventured to introduce more or less direct references to this subject, which in most treatises of the kind is wholly ignored. Two English scholars since that period have dealt with the subject of Greek accentuation,—Professor Chandler of Oxford, and less formally the late Public Orator of Cambridge; but the work of the former, however