

NEW COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF GREEK AND LATIN

Andrew L. Sihler

New York Oxford
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1995

PIE *w

182. PIE *w remained in L as 'consonantal u' (the graphic distinction between *v* and *u* develops only much later); and in G as *ϕ*, which was lost at an early period in Att.-Ion.

PIE *weyd-, *wid- 'see' > L *videō*, G *φιδεῖν*, *ιδεῖν* : Ved. *vid-*.

PIE *wek^w-, *wok^w- 'speak' > L *vōx* 'voice', G *φέπος*, *ἔπος* 'word' : Ved. *vācas-*.

PIE *woyko- 'settlement' > L *vīcus* 'district, village', G *φοῖκος*, *οἶκος* 'house-(hold)'. Ved. *vis-* 'tribe, homestead', *e*-grade Go. *weih*s 'country(side)'. (OE *wīc* 'village; villa' is a lw. from L; it survives in *baili-wick* and place names such as *War-wick* and *Sand-wich*.)

PIE *newos 'new' > L *novus*, G *νέ(φ)ος* : Ved. *nāva-*, *nāv(ī)yas-*, OCS *novŭ*, OE *nī(e)we* (< *new-*yo-*), NE *new*.

PIE *H₂ewi- 'sheep' > L *ovis*, G *ὄφις*, Hom. *ὄϊς* : Ved. *ávi-*, Luv. *ha-wi-*, OE *eow*, fem. *eowu*, NE *ewe*.

LATIN V

183. Loss of *w and the labial component of PIE *k^w took place in pre-historic times before *o*. This applies to all *k^w, but *w- in initial position is unaffected.

L *deus* 'god' < *dēos (57.2) < *deywos : Ved. *devá-*, Lith. *diēvas*, OPr. *deiws*.

L *deorsum* 'downwards', *seorsum* 'apart' < *dē-vorsom, sē-vorsom.

L *secundus* 'following' < *secondos < *sequondos (*sequor*).

L *cotīdiē* 'daily' < *k^wotitei diē (cf. *quot* 'how many').

L *colō* 'cultivate' < *qulō < *k^welō : L *inquilīnus* 'tenant', G *πόλος* 'plowed land' (if cognate. The semantics are fine, exactly paralleled by the development of NE *tillage*; but from *k^wolos we would expect rather *κύλος by 44).

L *so-* from **swo-*, **swe-* (42.2) in *somnus* 'dream' (219) and *sodālis*.

L *coquō* 'cook' from **quoquō* (42.4).

L *iecur* 'liver' < **iecor* < **iequor* < PIE **yek^wɾ(t)* : G ἥπαρ, Ved. *yakṛt*. (L *iecinoris*, *iocinoris* by leveling.)

In fact, this change is observed in relatively few of the words where it should be found. In the great majority, the *v* or *qu* was restored on the analogy of closely connected forms in which the *v* or *qu* was followed by a different vowel, and so was retained. Cf. NE *swore*, once pronounced *sore* but now with /w/ reimported from *swear*. (Contrast the isolated *sword*, which having lost its /w/ stayed that way.) Thus L *servos* 'slave' for *seros* after *servī*, *quod* for *cod* after *quī* within the same paradigm, and also the paradigmatically removed (but still semantically transparent) *quot* 'how many' for **col(e)*; but note that the semantically remote *cōtīdiē*, above, persists. The sometimes zigzag nature of the interaction between sound laws and analogy is demonstrated by **equos* 'horse' and **sequontor* 'they follow': these first became **ecos*, **secontor* per this sound law; having been restored to *equos*, *sequontor*, the later passage of -*o-* to -*u-* (71.6) resulted in *ecus*, *secuntur* by a much later sound law of the same character; and then finally these latter were once again refashioned into familiar *equus*, *sequuntur* by another round of leveling.

a. A single original paradigm underlies both L *deus*, *deī* and *dīvus*, *dīvī*, which result from leveling in opposite directions from a paradigm that looked something like:

	With *w:		Without *w:
<i>gen.sg.</i>	*dēwī	<i>nom.sg.</i>	*dēos
<i>nom.pl.</i>	*dēwē	<i>acc.sg.</i>	*dēom
	<i>etc.</i>		<i>etc.</i>

Based on the shapes retaining *w, such as the gen. and nom.pl., newly created nom.sg. **dēwos*, acc.sg. **dēwom*, and the rest were created, yielding a uniform paradigm (*dīvus*, *dīvī*). Based on the shapes seen in the nom. and acc.sg., newly created nom.pl. **dēī* and the rest, yielded another uniform paradigm (*deus*, *deī*). (In an analogous case, NE *staff*, *staffs* and *stave*, *staves* evolved from the same original paradigm, with the difference that here the original alternation remains intact in *staff*, *staves*.)

184. LOSS OF PIE *w also occurs in L:

1. Initially before *r* and *l*. The majority of such sequences in L words arose within Italic, via such developments as Ital. **wlā-* from PIE **w_lH-*: PIE **w_lɾH₂d(-īk)-* 'root' > **w_lrād-īk-* > L *rādīx*, G ῥᾰδιξ : cf. **w_lɾH₂di-* (*i-*stem) in Go *waurts* 'plant, herb', OE *wyrt*, NE *wort* in plant names like *figwort*. —The G and L forms might equally well continue the full grade **w_lrēH₂d-* seen in Olc. *rōt* (borrowed in NE as *root*).

PIE **w_lH₂n-eH₂-*, *-*o-* 'wool' > **w_lānā* (106.2) > L *lāna*, G λήνος, Dor. λᾰνος : OE *wull*, Lith. *vilna*.

2. After the labials *p* or *f*, whether the latter is from **bb* or **dh*:

PIE **wer-* 'cover': **ap-weryō* 'uncover' > L *aperiō* : Ved. *apa-vṛ-*, Lith. *atveriu*.

PIE **op-wer-tlo-* lit. 'utensil for covering' > L *operculum* 'lid' (92).

¹ A later loss of *w between like vowels (184.3) resulted in nom.pl. **dēē*, whence the irregular form *dī* of classical L.

Future in *-bit*, imperfect in *-bat*, probably < **-bweti*, **-bwāt* respectively (**bhū-* 498, 501.3), though the details are obscure.

PIE **dbworom* 'dooryard' or the like > L *forum* 'public square, market' : OCS *dvorū* 'court' (cf. 147.1).

3. Sporadically between like vowels:

L *aetās* 'age' < **aywitāt-*; cf. L *aevum*, Go. *aiwins* 'for ever'.

L *lātrīna* beside *lavātrīna* 'privy; drain' orig. 'washing place' (*lavāre*); and perf. *lāvī* < **lawaway*.

L *dīs*, *dītis* 'rich' beside *dīves*, *dīvitis*.

OL (but also later writers such as Cicero) *sīs* for *sī vīs* 'if you will'.

a. A number of perfects, originally formed regularly in the *vī-* paradigm, are sometimes put under this rule: **moawway* (*μωεῶ*) > **moaway* > *mōvī* (525.3). Contraction of **moaway* to **mōway* would be proper and expected (88.3), but the loss of the *-w- between unlike vowels is suspect. Given the regular development of short vowels medially before *-w- to -u- (66.5), we can refine the interpretation of these forms: in all probability an intermediate stage in the development of *-a- to -u- was *-o-, thus **moawway* > **moowway*, whence regularly **mooway* and then **mōway*. (Of course, it is always possible that the medial vowel simply syncopated, and that the first syllable of the resulting **mooway* underwent the *nōnus* development, 61.2a)

185. PIE POSTCONSONANTAL *w IN LATIN.

1. Initial **dw-* > L *b-*:

PIE **dwis* 'twice', (combining form **dwī-*) > OL *duis* (Paul. Fest.) > L *bis*, *bi-* : G *δίς*, *δι-*, Ved. *dwis*, *dwi-*, OE *twi-* as in *twi-wyrdig* 'contradictory'.

OL *DVENOS* (6th/7th century BC); *DVONORO* gen.pl. (3rd century BC, showing the change of **we* to *wo*; and see 237.1) whence L *bonus* 'good'. (Prior history unknown.)

L *bellum* 'war', OL *DVELLOM*; SC de Bacch. *DVELONAI* 'Bellonae' (a goddess). None of the etymologies proposed are satisfactory, but the OL forms make the development clear even so. The doublet *duellum* is disyllabic in Plaut; but as an archaistic form employed by later poets it is trisyllabic. This might be either the result of folk etym. from *duo* or a regular development.

2. Medial **dw* > *w*:

PIE **swēH, du-* 'sweet' > Ital. **swādwi-* > L *suāvis* : G *ἡδύς*, Ved. *svādú-*, NE *sweet*.

PIE **m̥l̥du-* 'soft' > Ital. **mol̥dwi-* > **molwi-* > L *mollis* (see 3, next) : G *βλαδύς*, Ved. *m̥rdú-*.

a. The development of PItal **gw* everywhere agrees with **g^w*; **χw* likewise agrees with **χ^w* (154.2): **mag-welō* 'prefer' > *māwolō* > **māolō* (183) > *mālō* (88.3).

PIE **mreǵhu-i-* 'brief' (much remodeled, 350) > **breχwi-* > *breviis*.

3. Intervocalic **lw* > *ll*, as in *mollis* above and PIE **solwo-* 'all, whole' > OL *sollum* 'osce "totum"' (Fest.), L *sollers* (stem *soll-ert-*) 'skillful' ('possessing the whole of an art') : O *sullus* n.pl.masc. 'omnes', G *ὄλος* (Hom. *οὔλος*, 190.1), Ved. *sárva-*.

a. L. *mollis* might show *-ll-* < **-ld-*, as in *sallō* 'salt' (223.1); but that would mean the loss of **-w-* from the resulting **mollwis*, which would be unexampled.

b. L. *lv* comes from a variety of sources, chiefly the syncope of an intervening vowel: *salvus* 'healthy' < **salowos*, and (perh.) *salvō* 'loosen' (**se-luō* < **se-lewō*). Others result from formerly more complex clusters: *belvus* 'tawny' < **bellwos* < **gbelwos* = Lith. *gelsvas* a horse-color term ('palomino'? 'Isabella?').

In imperial times the cluster often appears as *lb* in inscriptions, as for example *SALBVS* 'healthy'.

4. Following a stressed vowel **rw* > L *rru*, PRom. **rr*. (Examples below.) The lengthening of a consonant before a glide or resonant is widely encountered in phonology, and is found in a number of IE languages. In West Gmc., all consonants except **r* preceded by a stressed short vowel and followed by **y* lengthened. Thus PGmc. **satyana* 'caus. of 'sit' > PWGmc. **sattyan* > OE *settan*, OHG *sezzen*, OS *settian*. Somewhat differently, in Skt. there was evidently no difference in pronunciation between the medial clusters of Ved. *cit-rá-* 'shining' (root *cit-* plus suff. *-ra-*) and *pat-tra-* 'wing' (lit. 'flying implement', root *pat-* plus suffix *-tra-*). Some Skt. mss distinguish between morphological *-tr-* and *-trr-*, but not a few write all with one *r*, or all with two, or write both indifferently.

Such lengthening of consonants is far from rare in epigraphic L. It occurs before various consonants (so *DEFVNCCTO*, *AVGVSSTI*) but is mostly found before a resonant, as *PVBBLICO*, *IANNVARIO*, *ACQVA*, *FILLIVS*, *LICINNIANVS*. That these spellings genuinely represent pronunciation is supported by Romance forms, particularly Italian: *acqua* 'water' as above, *pozzo* 'well' < PRom. **putt'yu-* < L *puteus*; *sappia* 'he might know' < L *sapiat* (subj. of *sapiō*); *rabbia* 'rage' < **rabia*.

In literary L, on the evidence of early poetry, in such clusters the syllable boundary retracted, so that in *patris* the first syllable was *pa-* and the second was *-tris* (see 247d, 81.6a). However, there is evidence that prior to this development, **r* lengthened before a following **w*.

PIE **k^werwor-* 'four' has complicated and puzzling ablaut, but the old neut. pl. **k^werwōr* > Ital. **k^watrwōr* > L *quattuor* (trisyllabic; *-a-* in L is unexplained). PRom. attests only **quattor*.

Similarly, all Romance reflexes of L *futuere* 'fuck' point to PRom. **futtere*, those of L *batuere* 'beat' to **battere*. This relates to the development of **rw* as follows. A few forms would have been accented on the second syllable: *futuere*, *futuimus*. But very frequently occurring were those accented on other syllables, such that **tu* > **rw* > *trw*: **fútrwō*, **fútrwit*, **fútrwont*, **fútrwī*. In the kind of L underlying the written language, the stems *futu-*, *batu-* and the like were generalized, and the stems **futrw-* and **battrw-* disappeared; since *quattuor* < **quátrwōr* had only one form, there was no opportunity for leveling along the lines of *futuō* and *batuō*. However, in the kind of L underlying PRom., the stems **futrw-*, **battrw-* were generalized, becoming PRom. **futr-*, **batt-*, just like PRom. **quatr-*, above.

a. L *mortuus* 'dead', OCS *mr̥tū* point to **mr̥w-*, and shows that **r* following a consonant does not lengthen before **w*; in Romance (for example It. *morto*) the *-w-* is lost, as it is after *-r-*.

b. Since initial **dw-* > L *b-* (1, above), we would expect L *p-* from **rw-*. However, etymologies supporting such a development are few and doubtful. The best is L *paries* 'wall' (of a house): Lith. *tveris* 'fence in', *tvorà* 'palisade', in which the semantics are no better than suggestive.

186. **THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN *v*.** A variety of consistent evidence points to [w] as the pronunciation of L *v*. This phonetic value obtained into the early imperial period, on the evidence of borrowings into Germanic languages (in initial position, PGmc. **wīna*¹, whence OE *wīn*, NE *wine*, from L *vīnum*; in medial position, PGmc. **parwaz* from L *pavō*, whence OE *pea*, NE *peacock*, NHG *Pfau*). In the early centuries AD the pronunciation changed to one with more friction. But as late as the 5th century AD the grammarian Consentius attests to the persistence of the value [w], or at any rate that is assumed to be the pronunciation which he disparages as *exilius* ('too thin'). Meantime, intervocalic *-b-* also became a fricative, hence the frequent confusion in spelling between *v* and *b* in late inscriptions and in mss.

In some languages, such as High German, [w] underwent an unconditioned change to some kind of fricative. In Romance, however, [w] remained a glide after *k* and *s*, hence It. *quando* 'when', *soave* 'sweet, gentle' (L *quandō*, *suāvis*). In some IE languages, similarly, the development of [w] to [v] was general but not universal; among present-day IE languages this is true of Latvian and many of the Indic vernaculars.

GREEK *ϕ*

187. **The letter *ϕ* (*ϕαυ*)¹ is of frequent occurrence in inscriptions of most G dialects except for Attic-Ionic and Lesbian. It disappeared first in consonant clusters, where it is preserved only in the earliest inscriptions of a few dialects; next between vowels; and lastly in initial position before a vowel, where it survived in some dialects as late as the 2nd century BC, and even to the present day in the isolated relic of Laconian (Lacedaemonian) known as Tsakonian.**

The chronology just recited is based on epigraphic evidence. In Attic, where the letter was lost much earlier, relative chronology deduced from

¹ The name by which this letter is usually known, *διγάμμα*, is a result of the disappearance of both [w] and the letter for writing it (even as the symbol for 'six' in the G system of numerals) from the dialects in which are transmitted the bulk of our G texts. Names of G letters that are descriptive, like 'simple *ε*' and 'big *ο*', are all late. In the case of 'double *γάμμα*', the name reflects ignorance as well as lateness—if our sources had known its real name, they presumably would have used it rather than the makeshift *διγάμμα*. The Roman grammarian Cassiodorus, quoting (a little obtrusely, on the face of it) a lost passage in Varro, gives the name of the letter as *να*, which is manifestly a garble for *ναυ*, that is to say G **ϕαυ*. (Cassiodorus 7.148.)

the ordering of sound laws necessary to account for the attested forms (particularly Attic Reversion, 55) seems to require a different sequence for the loss of *f* in different positions. Att. *κόρη* 'girl' from *κόρφᾱ* next to *νέᾱ* 'new' *f.* < *νεφᾱ*, requires that in the history of Attic, at least, *f* had dropped intervocalically BEFORE PG **ā* > *η*, whereas *ρf* > *ρ(ρ)* only AFTER that change. However, as remarked in 55, a different interpretation of the same facts is consistent with the possibility that the loss of *f* in consonant clusters in Att. was in fact earlier than its loss intervocalically.

a. G *f* stood for [w], similar to NE *w* and L *v*. In later inscriptions it is often represented as *β*, for example Elean *βοικιαρ* (< **woykiās*) = Att. *οικιάς* gen.sg. 'dwelling', *βεκατεροι* = *φεκατεροι*, Att. *ἐκάτερος* (**swē*-) 'each of two'. This spelling points to a fricative pronunciation, [v] or [β]. But, contrary to the usual observations on this point, such a change of original [w] would not, all by itself, have affected the spelling. Indeed, it could not have. The confusion of *f*- and *β*- in inscriptions requires that original *f*- and *β*- FELL TOGETHER; the actual change might be in either sound, or in both. (The coalescence of [b] and [w] is commonplace; it is observed also in the histories of some Romance languages, and in Indic.) Had nothing but the pronunciation of *f*- changed, speakers of such dialects would necessarily have gone right on using the letter *f*- exactly as they had always used it. As a parallel, the change of L [w] to Romance [v], and a like change in the history of High German, had no effect on orthography—nor would we expect it to.

The case is different with manuscript sources such as Hesychius, where *f* is replaced by *ρ* and *γ* as well as *β*: *ρ* and *γ* are nothing but scribal blunders resulting from unfamiliarity with the letter *f* in the source documents, and some cases of Hesychian *β* doubtless are too.

The ultimate extinction of most dialects retaining *f* makes the matter of its later pronunciation hypothetical, but in Tsakonian [v] is the current pronunciation: Tsak. [vannē] 'lamb' (formally akin to Att. *ἀρνίον* 'sheepskin' < *φαρν*- < **wrn*-).

188. In a number of forms, PIE **w* in initial position is reflected as G spiritus asper.

PIE **wid-tor*- 'knower' (the zero grade of the root is unexpected) > G *ἰστωρ* 'wise man'; but **w*- does not become spiritus asper in the numerous other forms traceable to *f(σ)ιδ*-.¹

PIE **wespero*- 'evening' > G *ἕσπερος*, *ἑσπέρᾱ* and derivatives : L *vesper*.

PIE **wes*- 'clothe' > G *ἔννυμι* (**wes-nēw*-), fut. *ἔσ(σ)ω*; Att. *εἶμα* 'garb' = Dor. *φῆμα* = Lesb. *φέμμα* (= Ved. *vās-man*- 'a cloth') and other derivatives : L *vestis* 'garb', Go. *wasti*, Hitt. *wa-aš-še-iz-zi* 'clothes', Ved. *vas*-.

PIE **wes-ti*- 'abode' (from **wes*- 'spend the night, abide'—perhaps; determining the makeup of **wes-ti*- is complicated by the sheer number of PIE roots **wes*- of very diverse meaning) > G *ἑστία* 'hearth' (and derivatives) : L *Vesta* 'goddess of hearths' (cf. *Ἑστία*, Ion. *Ἰστίη*).

¹ Owing to its unsuitable meaning—its early attestations mean 'inquire, seek', and only much later 'recount, explain'—the family of *ιστορέω* has been ably argued to continue a different root, **H₂ey-* 'seek', with spiritus asper imported from *ἰστωρ* by folk etymology.

PIE **wek-* 'desire' > G ἐκών (old participle) 'willing': Ved *vas-* 'be willing be obedient' (Ved. *vāvasānā-* perf.midd.ppl. 'willing'), Hitt. *ú-e-ik-zi* 'asks
PIE **wedb-* (**wed-* before nasals) 'take home; marry (a woman)' > G ἔδωκε
pl. 'wedding gifts' (to the bride): Ved. *vadbū-* 'bride'.

There is general agreement that this phenomenon is not comparable to the twofold G word-initial reflexes of PIE **γ* (191).¹ A few scholars have entertained the idea that laryngeals might account for the developments of PIE **w* in G, but the problems with such an approach are obvious. For one thing, it could not account for both *i-* and (*f*)*i-* from the same PIE root **wid-*; for another, more is to be gained by tracing certain prothetic vowels (90) to PIE **Hw-* clusters.

Nearly all cases of PIE **w*- appearing as spiritus asper in G are followed by -σ- (as can be verified by the above citations). It is unlikely to be nothing but a coincidence, but hitherto no phonetic mechanism has been advanced which plausibly explains how *b* might develop from *w*- in such a position. As for the few exceptions, they have more or less plausible ad hoc explanations. The suggestion that the isolated ἐκών 'willing' was influenced by folk-etymology involving the reflexive pron. ἑ < **swē* is a reasonable guess. Less plausible, in fact verging on the far-fetched, is the idea that the development of ἔδωκε was similarly influenced by ἠδύς 'sweet, pleasant'. (However, the Greeks themselves seem to have thought that there was an etymological connection between these two words, so the idea cannot be dismissed outright.) —A contrary case is the smooth breathing of ἄστυ 'town' < *φαστυ*, a word of vexed etymology but whose *f-* is attested. Among the suggestions made as to details of its form are contamination by its antonym ἀγρός 'country(side)', and loss by dissimilation of the *f-* in *φαστροφος* (ἀστροφός) 'townsman', whence ἄστυ by back formation.

189. Whatever the exact details of relative chronology, *f* was lost in Attic-Ionic at such an early date that there are scant traces of it even in the earliest inscriptions. But Homeric prosody furnishes ample evidence of its former existence. Words which originally began with *f-* frequently (1) make position, (2) prevent elision, (3) prevent shortening of a preceding diphthong or long vowel. To be sure, such words often fail to show these traits, and, conversely, the absence of elision or of vowel shortening is not confined to cases where a *f-* once was pronounced. But it is especially in the prevention of elision where this is otherwise to be expected, as in Ἀτρείδης τε ἄναξ—though the word is without etymology, FANAE 'prince' is widely attested in dialect inscriptions, and now of course in Myc.—that the proportion of effectiveness is overwhelming. The correlations of historical *f-* with the other two effects, if not so striking, are statistically significant.

The *f* had no doubt disappeared from the spoken Ionic before the time of the final constitution of our Homeric text, hence the discrepancies. But the text still reflects in very large measure the habits of prosody of a period when the *f* was still pronounced.

¹ For example, the development of **wid-* 'know' to *ισ-* in one form (and its derivatives) but not in other reflexes of the root is quite unlike the behavior of **γ*-. There are no instances of a root in **γ*- sometimes giving *ζ-* and sometimes giving *β-*.