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IV.—PRO DOMO MEA.

PART I.

A. The Superlative—Ordinal Group.

1. Sauce for the Gander.1 For the past five years, and even earlier, I have been studying the lexical materials of the IE tongues on the theory that suffixation is the outgrowth of composition, but my cry has been a wilderness cry. Thanks to the minute phonetic and morphological researches of the past three decades a full and reasonably trustworthy body of lexical material has been accumulated and the time for its analytical treatment has arrived, if it is ever to arrive. No new method is involved, only the standard method of the historical lexicographer. Save for their wider reach (but see Prellwitz in BB. 22, 26 sq.; cf. also Wbch. s. vv. ποδήρης τειρω), my own studies proceed in the current fashion. With Schulze and Brugmann, I derive ἔκτος from *πέδ-γος (or πέδ-(i)-γός, § 7 a) =‘on foot going’: but -γός is only a morphological induction, not a word of record. I have never assumed a con-fax less susceptible to documentation. Brugmann’s -κύο-2 ‘lying’ in νεο-σαοί; his -ἐδ-‘receiver’ in ἡρεδ-; his en in τὸ δῶμα ‘das ist haus’ (Gr. 2, 2, § 185, 4)—whatever their indi-

1 As this homely phrase is used by Saintsbury in a literary matter, it may pass here and I notice it simply because Saintsbury is the only authority cited for it in the Oxford Dictionary, just as George Augustus Sala is the only authority cited for ‘neck and crop’ (A. J. P. XXII 232), of which my first interpretation was unquestionably the only correct one—in spite of the Dialect Dictionary. The intruder is slung out by the scruff of the neck and the slack of his breeches (croupe)—Tantae molis erat. B. L. G.

2 But -στύο- ‘standing’ seems even more likely in ἔπισσαι, μέτασσαι (cf. Skr. madhya-stha-s | mādhya-sthya-m), περισσός; and not less likely in νεοσαοί. It is by no means clear that madhya-māṭaḥ = medio-iacens. In the sole context in which it appears, ugrō madhya-māṭa iṣa (RV. 10. 97, 12) is better rendered by ut violens qui medium <hostium> frangit than by any previous attempt (-cir-: crnāti is extant in classical Sanskrit).
vidual probability, are only constructions. In his explanation of Skr. náva-gva- etc. as ('possessing) nine-cows’ Professor Bloomfield has replaced ‘gang’ by ‘cow’, though a root gu: gam ‘go’ may be justified by dru: dram ‘run’. The examples of 4 -gū ‘going’ in PW 3. seem quite indubitable. Professor Buck has found -déanos: Lat. daps in podános (Cl. Phil. 7, 421 1). Solmsen (KZ. 37, 20 1) explained domesticus (rusticus) as domi-stans (cf. also A. J. P. 34, 33), and is in part responsible for the primates tri-sthos tristhis ‘tertius’ (§ 3). Pedersen (Kelt. Gr. 2, 13) furnishes a rather long list of Celtic confixes. The confinal nature of Skr. -máya-s (in ánδρó-meos, cf. Brugmann-Thumb, Gr. Gram. 180) has never been so well stated as in the vocabulary to Lanman’s Sanskrit Reader. Note the reduced grade in áupa-mya- ‘substitution’.—On IE ḍkw(o)-face’ etc. (in deuvófs. Lat. atróx); and ánó- | önes- ‘face’ (in aiávís etc.) see Kretschmer and Wackernagel in Brugmann- Thumb, p. 193.

2. Method. For over two decades Brugmann’s treatises on Comparative Grammar have constituted the learner’s thesaurus of method. But that authority has his share of inconsistencies and artificialities: überhaupt gehen wir kaum fehl, wenn wir annehmen dass die ganze uridg. wortbildung durch keine anderne kräfte zustande gekommen ist als durch solche, die wir auch in jüngerer zeit und noch heute überall im sprachleben wirksam sehen (Gr. 2, 1, 16). Accordingly we are taught (after Schulze) that πélos contains -yos ‘iens’; and that in Lat. festivus (ib. 125) -ìvós = Skr. e’va-s ‘lauf, gang’. But contrast the following: der ursprung der aus uridg. zeit überkommenen formantien ist unklar. Von manchen, z. b. von -ìno- ist vermutet worden, dass sie so wie z. b. nhd. -heit einmal kompositionsglieder gewesen seien. Im prinzip ist dies nicht unwahrscheinlich, doch ist in keinem einzel- fall die annahme derartigen ursprungs zuverlässig zu begründen (Kvg. § 382). 1 But in Latin we actually have tenor

1 It is curious that dealers in suffixes in the orthodox way do not realize the liability even of semantically classified lists to prove misleading. In such lists even the earliest words, being insusceptible to historical treatment, may often be as incorrectly grouped as it would be incorrect to group Germ. messer with other instrument names in -er (see e. g. on the fu-n-dit type, § 29). An instance in point is Lat. cuspid-, grouped by Skutsch (Arch. 11, 582) as one of four Latin ex-
and tenus¹ ‘stretch, length’; in Sanskrit tān- (instr. advb. tānā | tanā) 1st ‘stretch, length’; 2d ‘posterity’, and tāna-m tānā- tānas- ‘posterity’; cf. OIr. tan ‘time,’ from *tanā (Fick-Stokes), a different word (pace Pedersen, I, c, I, 80; II, 14) from the prefix -tan- ‘place’ (Skr. sthāna-). Here our first business is to realize, and that as a primary act of Latin lexicography, that diutinus means ‘long-stretching, of the long ago’. It is a separate act of Sanskrit lexicography to explain nā-tanas as = ‘of the now, contemporary’. The convergence of these two acts on IE composita neither invalidates the independent rationale of each several explanation, nor certainly proves that symphysis of adverbs grouped with -teno- (-tnno-) had been consummated proethnically. Cf. Lat. protinus with Skr. prā-k-tanas ‘earlier’. There is no discoverable consistency in finding the same posterius in ādvātā-μεος Skr. go-mā-yas—or in horri-fer and furcht-bar-, but only an indecipherable suffix in diutinus and nūtanas. Neither in πείς or festivus is the evidence for composition stronger than it severally is in diutinus nūtanas. What the several languages teach us independently cannot be untaught, but is only confirmed, by their mutual agreement.

3. Credulous incredulity. a. My attempts, in accord with proved methods of finger-counting, to explain the IE numerals (AJPh. 31, 413 sq.; 33, 394 sq.) fell perfectly flat, though I presented illuminating information for etymologists. I refer particularly to the priority, according to the theory of numbers, of ordinals over cardinals, whereby “sextus” may be earlier than “sex” (I. s. c. 394). By the count with standing fingers we learn to understand the Italo-Celtic ordinals tri-sthos/tri-sthis (v. Solmsen ap. Brugmann, Gr. 2, I, 145). For “sextus” the IE primate was ksw- ἐξ(σ) -sthos (for Av. x- see § 4, d), with -sthos, as in tri-sthos, = ‘stans’. If, without phonetic loss, we transpose ksw-ἐκς- into ἕξ-ἐκ-² we reach the definition ‘co-ex-stans’, describing the position

amples of the suffix -id-. But cuspid- definitely means ‘spear-point’ (v. Thes. LL) and by that token is a compound of Sabine curi-s’spear’ + spid: Germ. spitze (as Stowasser divined—for the posterius).

¹Walde, who might consult Lane’s Latin Grammar (§ 1420) to advantage, omits to harmonize his articles on tenus and diutinus.

²To Kretschmer’s defense of ἕξ-(k)ςu I have added a great many examples in TAPA. 44, 107-113. Here add Skr. s[v-]arva-s: Eng. all.
of the second thumb plus (co-) the first hand (cf. áňga—“die zahl sechs”: aṅgū-śtha-s ‘thumb’). Av. puxda—‘5th’ is from puk(s)- stho-s, prius cognate with pug-nus, perhaps = πυξ (?) original sense ‘closer’, whence ‘fist’, but cf. Meister, Herodas, 749; πυξ ἀγαθός ‘a good fist’, as good whip = good driver; or ‘closer’ may have given ‘thumb’). When we consider the bristling phonetic group ksw- ēk(s)- sthos and the correspondency of my definition to the conditions of the finger count it passes the bounds of all permissible hesitation, exhibits a quite credulous incredulity, to disregard the propriety of the analysis. By no theory of probability could so many coincidences converge upon the curious primate ksw-ēk(s)- sthos. b. Again, the primate of Lat. octavus ‘8th’1 was ok<s>thāvos ‘tip-standing’: Skr. aṣṭā (dual) = ‘8’, replacing *aṣṭhānu2 ‘tip-standing two’, of the midfinger of the second (= right) hand in the count. Av. astām ‘sexturn,’ hap- lologic after the type of Lat. ex[sec]ta, has in -ṣtā- a grade form of -sthāvos, and this recurs in the hitherto riddlesome seps[st]uā-ginta (ordinals septuā- and nonā- are entirely con- formable to ἐβδομάκοντα ὀγδοάκοντα, and survive from the time of priority of the ordinals); cf. -sthu- in apa-ṣṭhu ‘perversion’. 1On ὅγ-δωος <ok-dw-ojos=‘tip-2-goes’ (cf. Av. aya=‘go, turn, time’) see A. J. Ph. 31, 422. How did Skr. āya- come to mean ‘four’? 2The loss of aspiration took place in *aṣṭi-s ‘80’ <ok<s>this ‘8th’ (decad), cf. aṣṭi-s =8+8; 8 × 8, noting ṣaṭhā-s ‘6th’: ṣaṭṭi-s ‘60’ (cf. the primate tri-sthi-s ‘3d’). The loss of aspiration occurred in -ṣt-hy- > -ṣt-y (A. J. Ph. 34, 15; 24, §62). Note pari-ṣṭhā = pari-ṣṭi-s ‘obsta ce’; ni-ṣṭhā—‘boundary’: ni-sthya-s ‘outlander’; apāṣṭhi- (comp. prius): -apāṣṭi-s ‘claw’ (l. s. c. §44; cf. aṣṭi-/aṣṭhi- ‘seed-corn’); praṣṭi-s (§4 d): praṣṭha-s ‘praestans’; āvi(s)- stya-s ‘offen- stehend’ (A. J. Ph. 33, 380); Skr. ā styā, in styāyate ‘to be stiff’, (from *sthīyāi-, infin.: √sthā : Av. dyāi : √dā-) +ayate [i.e. styāy-[ay]ate] = ‘ad standum venit’. Herein lies the whole history of the “root” st[h]āi: stī, styā as given e. g. by Prellwitz, s. v. stēap. It described the coming to stabili ty of a liquid, or even its forming drops (Lat. stīria; cf. also stālāskos): āγχί-στίνος = close-standing’, not ‘close- massed’. Skr. stha-yin- ‘stille stehend’ is, in fact, cited by Boisacq s. v. stēap (“demeurant coi”), but he fails to note A. J. Ph. 33, 378 sq. §§4, 5, 27, which is earlier than Bechtel’s definition of ‘close-massed’ in KZ., 45, 225 sq. If Boisacq is going to compare stāi: steyā styā stī with sthā in sthāyin (cf. l. s. c. §4) and with sthā in τημι common fairness demands a reference to my prior explanation of āγχί-στίνος. Wackernagel (al. Gr. 1, 235) actually finds -stya in prā-ṣṭi-s.
anu-ṣṭhū ‘statim’, su-ṣṭhū- ‘bene stans’ (cf. duḥ-stha- ‘male stans’), sā-ṣṭhāvan- ‘con-stans’; Av. prius stvi- ‘firmo’. c. But the ordinals (standing fingers) show, by fair construction, forms in -sthāto- and -sthāmo-s, allegro -sthāmō-/s(th)mō-. Skr. saptāthā-7th = Av. haptāthā- have an Indo-Iranian (IE ?) primate sep[s]thōto- (ά < ἀ as in dātra- Av. da-θra-: √dā), with -sthōto- shifted (under the influence of reduplicated st[h]i-[s]tha-, cf. Lat. steti ?) to -sthōto-; cf. -(s)tho- in Skr. catur[s]thā-s ‘4th’, Av. pux-ḍa- ‘5th’; and [s]-ṭaros in ṭrī-ṭaros (?). Further proof of th is given by Av. haptaiḍi- (aśtaid-) + vant ‘70-fold’. d. Also in Skr. saptamā-s ‘sep-timus’ aśtamā s ‘octavus’ we have -(s)ṭ(h)mō-s (s lost in ṭst kst; t for th as in aṣṭāu above1). Because aṣṭāu, dual to the original ordinal, became a cardinal the way was open to reserve ṭk-sthāmō-s (on which *dekkmōs ‘decimus’ was modeled?) for the ordinal.

4. a. The superlatives in-sthos-sthētos, -sthēmos, -sthāvos. The indocile agnosticism that has put aside the startling coincidences of ksw-ek(s)-sthos and ṭk-(s)sthāvo-s has never been downgraded to a refutation of my definition of the type of Skr. māṁh-i-ṣṭha-s as ‘in-dando stans’, i. e. a ‘steady giver’ (AJPh. 31, 409 sq.). Being satisfied by the purely glotto-gonic and entirely fanciful guess that in Skr. i-ṣṭha- -is- is a reduction of the comparative -(i)yas-,2 certain stalwart phoneticians disqualify the Skr. aspirate th—not to be banished from the Avestan ordinals, however—and complete their mucilaginate (I find one myself, or rather a syncretism, in the

1 Fractionals in -tomo-s are also to be admitted, see Fay in AJPh. 31, 404, §§ 2-3; IF. 33, 356. The process of suffixation was furthered all the more by the co-existence of -tomo- and -sthēmo-, the latter being well attested in the superlatives (-[s]thēmo- ‘standing’ in leg-i-tumus finitus marī-tumus?). As for septem, it is a back formation from sep[s]thēmo-s, (after decem: decimos). The numbers 5 and 10 in the finger count were, cardinals, meaning ‘hand’ (or thumb or fist) and something like ‘end’.

2 In the comparatives, (i-)yes- alternated with (i-)yen-, both = ‘going’; and both were combined, like -sthō- in the superlative, with locative prioria (see AJPh. 31, 423 sq.). Just as pr-y-yes- in Lat. prior = (‘fore-)going’, so does -ṭeros in ṭrīṭeros (l. c. 407). He who admits IE or pre-Greek -yo- ‘iens’ in πετός may refuse to define an IE confix, but -i-yes i-yen [attested in lēv-ae: Skr. āyānam : *īyes-; Skr. āyas-e ‘ire’, l. c. 425] and -tero- are at least as real as -yo- ‘iens’. 
compv. suffix -is-en-, AJPh. 31, 425, §§ 58, 60) by adding -to-\textemdash to -is-. Unfortunately, the very minuteness of the classification of Grassmann's index (RV. Wbch.) kept me from finding for my first paper unmistakable evidence of my contents, as follows: mainhan\-

\textit{e}s-\textit{th}a\textemdash "freigiebig, eigentlich im geben (loc. von einem mainhana- \textit{cf. mainhânā \textquoteright{endowment'} . . .) stehend (\textit{sth}ā)"; vandane-\textit{sth}a\textemdash 'bei der lobpreisung (vandane loc. von 2 vandana-) weilend (um sie zu hören) [-\textit{sth}ā von \textit{sth}ā]'; vaks\textit{ane-\textit{sth}a\textemdash (of the sacrificial flames) = \textquoteleft{engaged in sacrificing'}: vāks\textit{ana-m \textquoteleft{erfrischung'}, vaks\textit{ānā\textquoteleft{darbringung}' (cf. Sāyana's definition, vahn\textit{nāu sīhītāh} = \textquoteleft{devoted to vahni'} [here = nom. act. \textquoteleft{sacrificium'}]); karma\textit{nī-\textit{sth}a\textemdash [karma-ni\textit{sth}ā- is absurd; cf. adhvare-\textit{sth}ā\textemdash \textquoteleft{insacrifício stans'}] = in ritu (or in opere) stans. The priora in -ana are all locatives of action nouns (i. e. infinitives) in -ana- (Gothic frā-xī\textsubscript{ī}-nē \textquoteleft{discere'}, cf. acc. āyana-m (ichā-

\textit{mānās, RV. 3, 33, 7 = ire cupientes})\textemdash in gradation with īē\textsubscript{ī}-a\textemdash and the Germanic type of Gothic \textit{itan} (< *edono-m).\textsuperscript{1} There may be an agnosticism adequate to the rejection of the testimony of the three examples as interpreted by Grassmann and

\textsuperscript{1} For noun and adverb priora with -\textit{sth}o- see AJPh. 31, 13 sq. with especial note of the possible haplology (but cf. tānas = tān, § 2) in the types represented by Skr. cāv[as]-i-\textit{sth}a- \textquoteleft{mightiest}: cāvās- \textquoteleft{might', pre-Avest. aoj[as]-i-\textit{sta}: aoj\textit{as- \textquoteleft{might'} (but, as adjective, felt to belong to aoj\textit{as- \textquoteleft{mighty'}), kpra\textsubscript{ī}[es]-i-\textit{ṣ}a\textsubscript{ros} \textquoteleft{in power standing'}). Those scholars who, because of krē\textsubscript{ō}ṇa\textsubscript{v}, generalize about the IE grade of the prius, would do well to consider Aelol. krē\textit{ros} for krā\textit{ros}. Skr. tēk\textit{ṣ}i\textunderscore \textit{ṣ}has owes its \textquoteleft{very remarkable e'} (KZ. 43, 377) to tēj[as]-i-\textit{ṣ}has.- Those who seek the etymology of bēl\textsubscript{ī}na\textsubscript{m} and ā\textit{me}\textsubscript{ī}nu\textsubscript{m} must look for infinitives in bēl\textsubscript{ī}-\textit{ti} (\textit{rti as in Av. \textit{ṛ}ū\textit{ti \textquoteleft{dare'}, Skr. \滗t\textit{ti \textquoteleft{to aid'}; common in Balto-Slavic) and ā\textit{mēnu}- (\textit{mīn as in \textit{nīm} etc.). The adverb (locative) priora could not be more transparent than they are in āγχι\textsubscript{σ}o\textsubscript{v}, Skr. nēd\textsubscript{i}-\textit{ṣ}has (§ 4, e). The analysis of OHG \textit{furisto \textquoteleft{princes'} as \textit{fur\textemdash to} is no more permissible than a like analysis of āγχι\textsubscript{σ}o\textsubscript{v}. As āγχι\textsubscript{σ}o\textsubscript{v} = \textquoteleft{prope-\textit{stas'} so IE prr\textmdash i\textemdash \textit{sth}o\textsubscript{s} = \textquoteleft{praee-\textit{stas'} Rightly inverted, Brugmann's elaborate refutation of J. Schmidt's analysis of \textit{e}k\textsubscript{a}(\textsubscript{e})\textsubscript{-\textit{ṣ}as} (Gr. Gram,\textsuperscript{4} p. 298, Anm.) turns to a defence not only of Schmidt's explanation, also, of a like derivation of the superlative. The \textquoteleft{analogy' between \textit{ek\textsubscript{a}ra\textsubscript{ơ}}\textsubscript{ς} and the superlatives is due to their common derivation from adverb priora + \textit{sth}\textsubscript{o\textemdash \textquoteleft{standing'}). On the non-superlatives Lat. lan\textsubscript{i\textemdash \textit{sta} l\textsubscript{ā}r\textsubscript{a}n\textsubscript{īs} (\textit{sthā\textemdash}) and Av. hā\textsubscript{v\textemdash i\textemdash \textit{ṣ}t\textsubscript{a} see AJPh. 34, 40 §. 100; 41, § 102; on rē\textsubscript{ē}[\textsubscript{e}]\textsubscript{-\textit{ṣ}a\textsubscript{t}a l. c. § 81. There is no escaping formal identity between Skr. \textit{vaya\textsubscript{h\textemdash \textit{sth}a\textsubscript{s}} and Lat. \textit{robus\textsubscript{s\textemdash \textit{st}us} (\textit{vāy\textsubscript{ās} = \textquoteleft{robus'}).
Sāyana, but it were a rampant, unmeasured, unreasoned agnosticism, however much the definition of māmhaṇe-sthā by ‘indando stans’ entails the like definition for māmhi-ṣṭhas, of prehistoric type.\footnote{I foresee the objection that i- and u- roots show guna in the comparative and superlative, while the infinitive is weak, e.g. budhi-. Thus yādhīyāṃs- ‘magis bellator’ seems to belong to yādha- ‘bellator’, not to yūdha- ‘bellator; proelium’ (cf. Yudh-i-ṣṭhira-s = ‘In-proelio firmus’). This is because the vocalism of root-nouns has been violently modified by the accent which, as regards the weakest cases, passed from a floating to a fixed condition (see AJPh. 31, 410, § 19). But we do have conjugated Av. darṣṣōḍi (dat.) : Skr. drç-ē, to which Skr. *yodh-i : yudh-i would correspond. It is impossible to determine whether Av. aēśē ‘petere’ (= Skr. ēṣe) is locative to an ò-stem or dative in -ai (cf. Lat. dōcī, agī : Skr. āje ‘agerē’) to a consonant stem, but whether we can or not, as long as we have the synonym pair Av. varṣāi : Gothic varzi ‘laborare’ we are entitled to analyze the prius of aēś-i-sta- ‘pententissimus’ as a locative infinitive.\footnote{Boisacq’s pietas Osthoffiana has made him accept the most recherché explanation of loīṣados. The denial of authenticity to the equation o-th = Skr. sth (see e.g. Güntert, IF. 27. 18; Brugmann-Thumb § 238) is quite footless. The truth is that o-th varies with ot (loīṣados but féṣanos) under accentual conditions rather analogous to those for Verner’s law (p : d). The rule, analogical cases excluded, would seem to be (1) initial o-th- (but not in verbs, where reduplication and ṣ-aorist forms produced deaspiration, e.g. in ṭeṣmι ṭeṇō ṭeṭक्ला ṭeṇγῳ) before the accent and (2) -aθ- after an accent. (1) oθένοσ ‘stamina’ (<*ṣθένοσ, like ṭō ḍāṇos, assimilated to μένοσ, its synonym, cf. ONorse stınnr ap. Streitberg, Urgerm. Gr. 114): Skr. sthāman- ‘oθένοσ’. [It reveals a touching confidence in paper phonetics and morphology to start from *ṣgwh-εno-s- for Whitney correctly divined that Skr. ṭṣagḥ (gh) was only an aspect of ṭsah (ṣh; on ṛh [gh see § 4d].) (2) Only etymological tone-deafness can separate the posteriora in pāṣṇa | pāṣḍhav (♀pāṣṭhav like Skr. nīṭṣṭha-, § 3 b; cf. κī-ṇo-s : κī-ṇatī) and in the Sanskrit names of the aīdōia aṇa-sthā- uṛā-sthā (AJPh. 34, 24, §§ 63-64). The accentual, and rhythmic conditions of loīṣados recur in oṣdaḥ ṣṭhit (o-th < lsth), see also Brugmann-Thumb, 117 b; of pāṣṇa in prō-ṣṭhav etc. (AJPh. 33. 379); cf. Menēsṇhas Menēsṇh, but analogical Menésthēs (AJPh. I. c. § 82). Note} b. Greek proof of -sth-. Skr. dé-ṣṭhā-s ‘giving-most’ is of the same analysis as māmhi-ṣṭha-s, being dative of the action noun in ācīr-dā- ‘hope-fulfilment’ (lit. ‘giving’), -infin. *de (? -oi < oi as often Gr. o < ς) : \(\sqrt{dā} :: Av. ṛōi : \sqrt{pā} :: Skr. (pra-)mē : \sqrt{mā} ; \) or locative to a noun like lexical Skr. da-m ‘giving, gift’, khā-m ( : \(\sqrt{khā} \) ‘a digging’) ‘hole’. In Homer the hapax loī-ṣōthos—also loīṣḥṇoṣ, loīṣḥḥṇ (a)—represents the same type.
was the ‘slowest’ or last in a race, and his prize was the λοιπήριον/λοιπῆρια (s)thāwos:: Lat. Octavius: octavus, § 3b), cf. ἄρωστήρα ‘first-prize’. The prius λοιπ- belongs to a root-noun (s)lo-m (or slā-) < √slēy-, found in Skr. lēна-s ‘stecken-geblieben’¹: Lat. lēnis, OBulg. lēnǔ ‘träge’, Lettic lēns ‘faul’. Lat. limus ‘mud’ limax ‘snail’ will contain the same root. Also cf. Eng. slow, if from a primate slai-woz (so Skeat). The derived verbal sense here was perhaps something like ‘to muddle along’ (see also § 30¹). c. Greek -τατος from -στατος. In Sāyana’s definition cited above, vahnāu sthitas = ‘to-sacrifice devoted’, Skr. sthitas is typically employed. Before the emergence of -τατος IE primates of words like ἀπέρτατος lit. ‘superstet’ (= supra stans) had lost s in the combination rst (prst). Association with the primate of ἀπέρτερος (§ 4, a) confirmed and extended the loss of s and suppressed all traces of the aspiration.² But -ε-στατος perhaps survived in the vulgar forms ὑφο-φαγα-στατος (φαγ-ε- like Skr. inf. budh-i cf. aor. pār-i-ṣṭha-s) ἀρσαγε-ι-στατος κλεπτίστατος λαλίστατος (?λαλίστερος and πτωχίστερος

σθένοσ but ὀ-στηνε-δοννατει, στερεός | στερρός (s)Kṣirā-s, ep: ir as in λεφός: iṣirā-s), σταυρός. The rule is splendidly confirmed by ὀστέον: Skr. āsthī-, as for θ/τ by πλάθανον but πλατός, and for χ: κ by σκολίος: Skr. vskhal ‘errare’, cf. ἀσχέλος: σχολῆ ‘otium’ (s)Kṣira ‘errare’.

¹It is curious that Homer’s λοῖδος was made so by slipping in the mud, cf. colloquial ‘stick-in-the-mud’.

²But even -τερο- [not always compv.; add κυκλο-τερής to the materials in AJPh. 31, 405] may have had to compete with -στερο-, cf. Skr. Yudh-i-sthiras (§ 4, b). Evidence for -στερο- seems at least to be furnished by a compact semantic group, the names for the left hand: Lat. sin-ister: Skr. sān-i-ṣṭhas vsan- ‘to win’, OHG. winistar ‘links’ (s)wiven- ‘to win’), ἀρι-στερός (s) of ἀριστα ‘I win’; the same locative ἀρι- in ἀριστος, like φερ-ι-στος: φερ-); cf. the differently graded Av. vairya-stāra (not a double comp. = vairya-s-tāra) and, more particularly, Skr. savya-ṣṭhār- ‘left-fighter’ (v. AJPh. 34, 34), though savyā- means ‘dexter’ as well as ‘sinner’ and originally (1 surmise) meant ‘driver’ (s)ṣūtā-s), but was expanded to match rāheṣṭhā- (Av. radār-ṣīr-). Except in savya-ṣṭha(r)- all these words for left have the same general meaning, and three of them distinctly mean ‘the winner’. Their semantic identity and different derivation point to lapse of the real name of the left hand rather than to augural orientation. As the Greeks called dread night ἐβρότον so their ancestors replaced “left” by “in me-rendo stans”; and the character of the left hand as a “(bad) provider” is but a little shifted in Lat. sinistra and laeva for ‘furax, fur’.
like ἀριστερός) ἀλαξονιστατος. d. Similarly Skr. (IE) -tam-a has come in part (§ 3, d) from -sthm̩mo-, a midform between -sth̩mo- and allegro -sthmo/-smo-, the latter in dial. Lat. pri-smos, Osc. pu-stmo/-po-smo, ' postremus' (=" po-ste po-stero-"; not po-te etc., a current division without reason, cf. πρό-οθος ὀνι-οθος, Skr. pa-styā- [for -sthyā- § 3, b]: Lat. po-sticus; po(s) = Balto-Slavic po/po-s). We have s-survivals in Skr. su-ra-bhi-ṣṭama-s tuvi-ṣṭamas (avoiding वी-ष्ट; while tavā[s]-stamas: tavās-tara-s reveals a common condition precedent to [s]ṭhm-mo-s. In Av. vouru-rafo-stomā-s-o may reveal -as-. In Skr. nédi-ṣṭhatamas (Av. draējī-ṣṭo-ṭa-ma-) -ṣṭhatamas may be a remaking of -ṣthamas, or a superlative of -sthō- cf. Av. aogaz-dastoma- hu-dāstoma- (suffix -stōma- or -tōma-), whence perhaps, by false abstraction, pre-Iran. sudās- (Skr. sudā- <s> tara- after sudā-stama-). In the Latin augural words sini-stumus and solli-stumus, also, st may be original; sin-i-stumus (cf. on sinister § 4, c.) Skr. sān-i-ṣṭha- 'most winning';1 solli-stumus = 'in salute stans' (Solli2 <stw-i, loc. to sali-[ber] <slā-). For Osc. -Umbr. nes(s)imo- I see a syncopated development from a primate ne-sd-i-sthmmo-: Av. nazdi-ṣṭā-; and to the interplay between -sthēmo- and sth̩mo/-sthmo/-smo- we owe the Italo-Celtic compromise ending -(s)samo- (for the facts see Pedersen, Kelt. Gr. 2, 122), though we may also reckon with dissimilation of t- st- to t- ss- in potissimus, laetissimus apertissimus etc. The primate of proximus was prōk-3

1 Dextimus is as likely to be modelled on sini-stumus as vice versa. Or dextimus is from a Latin primate *dextrostmmos > dex[tes]timos (haplology of ex[sec]ta). A noun stem dexti- (see KZ. 42, 124; 45, 133) to match dextro- is not to be thought of, but dextimus might come from a primate dex[-s]timos-: deξ-η-τεψ.

2 On Latin (Italic) il from -lw-I hold the position of Hirt, IF. 22, 66; cf. on fulvus with v after flavus AJPh. 30, 135. An Italic primate malw[o-] would give Lat. nom. acc. malōs malōm but *mallō etc.; cf. also malignus (l<Il by the law of manilla): Osc. malo-: orig. (s)mal-w[o like par-wo-‘ small’; cf. OBulg. melīū-kū-‘ small’, extended from a primate melu-.

3 Or IE prox (~ pro ∷ περίς ∷ περι, cf. δέκ δέκ παρέξ) may have to be admitted. To the alternation pro/prox we owe Av. fra-x-śni ʿnoscere’ fra-x-śṭāte ‘pro stat’ whence, by misdivision, the root varieties xśnā- xśtā (cf. fra-x-śtī). The root x-śnū- ʿsatisfy’ meant ʿerfüllen’ and belongs with Skr. akṣnō-te ʿ(erfüllen, anhäufen’, native sources in PW1+2; cf. Av. xśnāv- ʿerfüllung’). Y. 48, 12). This moribund verb
with negative prefix nis- meant 'entfrachten, ἀνοικεῖν', euphemistic for 'detesticulāri'. The root was (s)νέυ- in νέο νέον 'onero' I heap up' and akē- Av. xē- = ex (IE eƣhs/ghs-, see AJPh. 34, 37; on prefixal e- Brugmann, Gr. 2. 2, § 640, ann.). If I rightly read Gr. Ir. Phil. 1, §§ 54-55 Bartholomae would be the last to question gh/gh (cf. also Wiedemann, Lit. Gr. § 43; Hirt, BB. 24, 318 sq.). In Avestan, xīnu- = ekπιμπλήμα, snu- = πιμπλήμα. For isolated eƣhs- in Indo-Iranian cf. Lat. pono (po-as in poste, § 4 d.), aufero au fugio. To variation of -k with -k we owe xē in Gothic ḫāzās (s-aor.), cf. Lith. pra-nokti ap. Walde2, 507. In fra-pixistam we have a contamination of pikto- and πίκτο- (see Walde, s. v. pingo). In xēvaš '6' x = IE k (§ 3, a). There remains for Bartholomae's parasitic x- before ś only the evidence of Gothic xśmā- 'vos, voster', with x- by anticipation from k in gen. xśmākəm, unless this be a shortened form, quasi [q]x-śmākəm: Gothic ingis 'vos (duos'). [Av. s < ḫs but xē < ḫs-s.]

1 Is Latin pessum from pessu- + m, (1) added after the domum type or (2) = (e)m as in Umbr. Acersoni-em? In the Brāhmaṇas loc. pl. -patsu, instr. -pādhis (with ḫ) are found.

2 Lat. supemus is from super-s[t]mo-s > *supēmos, sup < r>ēmus (suprā etc.). Likewise ex-t<r>emus from exter(o)-s[th]mo-s.

3 Originally, in πρό-repos (§ 4, a), the comparison lay solely in προ-; and Lat. ex-terus never genuinely became a comparative. As it spread by irradiation, -tero- 'advancing' lost its definite sense and served merely to convert adverb priora like ex- into adjectives. As such priora lent themselves to "comparison" (πρό-repos, pos-terus) or "contrast" (ex-terus X ἐν-repos; ci-tra X ul-tra). These functions were transposed from the priora to the posterius.—Observe Skr. agrē-tvāri (fem.) 'praefestinas, praeiens', with posterius from the tv form of the root t(w)er 'to advance'.
-sthōn-. An IE monosyllable sthān ‘standing’ (gen. sthēnōs; ἀ-στήν-ες: διαστήματος) is attested in the Gothic “weak declension” forms, nom. sinista ‘eldest’ (Skr. sān-i-stha- ‘most winning’ cf. AJPh. 31, 424*) smalista ‘smallest’, acc. sinistan smalistan, cf. Skr. acc. parame-sthīn-am ‘in summo stantem’ tri-sthīn-am ‘in tribus <sedibus> stantem’, aṣṭīn- ‘8-fold’. In Sanskrit the vocalism of the weak cases has pervaded the paradigm. The composition of nedi-sthīn- is betrayed—if not recognized —by Böhtlingk’s definition, “nächststehend”; cf. nedi-sthā- “ganz in der nahe stehend” (PW*). Perso-Greek μεγιστάνεις (LXX) need not be modelled on ἐυνάνεις.
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(To be Continued.)