THE MYCENAEAN AND THE HISTORICAL GREEK COMPARATIVE
AND THEIR INDO-EUROPEAN BACKGROUND

The Mycenaean evidence often reveals more archaic forms than those in use in historical times from Homer onward. In the field of phonology, a welcome surprise was the discovery that the labiovelars still existed as an independent set. In morphology, the perfect participle active shows that Greek inherited a paradigm, in which the -τ- of the Classical paradigm is still absent. I have discussed this problem elsewhere. Today, I should like to investigate another formation which holds equal surprises for the linguist. I mean the comparative forms of adjectives.

In historical Greek an -ν- stem type, formed with -ον-, is found as a less frequent and clearly archaic variant beside the more frequent and living formation with -τερος. The comparative of μέγας is μεξιω (Att. μεξιων), κακός forms κακίων etc. But, beside the normal -ν- stem inflection μεξιων, μεξιωνα, μεξιωνος, μεξιων, plur. μεξιωνας, μεξιωνων, μεξιωνατ, etc., the archaic type also has some defective forms: μεξιω is found as the acc. sg. m.f. and nom-acc. pl. ntr., and μεξιων is used as the nom-acc. pl. m. f.

The historical method cannot account for these peculiar features of the comparative. In fact, this is one of the clearest cases where, without the help of the comparative method, we would know nothing about the nature and background of the Greek comparative. But a comparison of the Latin and Aryan formations throws bright light on the defective type. The Latin comparative suffix m. f. *-iōs/ntr. *-ios, and Sanskrit *-yās/-yas guarantee an Indo-European suffix -yōs/-yos, and it is clear that Greek -ω represents -ο(σ)-α, and -ων is derived from -ο(σ)-ες. The y of the Indo-European suffix -yōs- also explains the changes in the root-final consonant seen in μεξιων, from *meg-yo-, θασον from *thak-h-yo- etc.

Since comparison is so eminently successful in explaining the defective cases and the changes in the root, it is easy to understand that an explanation of the normal comparative suffix -ον- should also have been sought from that quarter. Now the Germanic languages do present something very similar to the Greek formation. There a comparative suffix -izan- is used. E.g.:

Gothic manags “many” : comp. m. nom. manag-iza, gen. manag-izin-s etc.
   fawai “few”    fawiza
   juggs “young”  jukiza
   hardus “hard”  hardiza.

Since -iza/-izin- must be traced to an earlier -isōn/-isen-, it seems reasonable to take -is- as the nil-grade form of the Indo-European comparative suffix -yos-, which thus
appears with an additional suffix -enj-on- in the Germanic comparative. On the other hand, such Greek comparatives as ἡδίων, καλλίων, βελτίων, are also traceable to -isön, and Thurneysen drew the conclusion that the Germanic and Greek type represented an Indo-European variant of the simpler -yos.¹

This doctrine is generally accepted today.² The new Mycenaean evidence is, however, sufficient to disprove it — once again a case where Mycenaean is of the greatest importance for the reconstruction of Indo-European.

The comparatives of “large”, “big” and “small” are well-known from three groups of tablets. First, they are used to qualify boys and girls in the Ak-tablets of Knossos (509, 610 etc.), typical phrases and spellings being:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>kowa mezo 1</td>
<td>1 bigger (older) girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5741</td>
<td>kowa mezo 1</td>
<td>1 smaller (younger) girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>kowa mezo 1</td>
<td>1 older boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>kowa mezo 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>kowa mezo 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>kowa mezo 4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782—3</td>
<td>mewijo 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the famous tripod-tablet, PY Ta 641, uses these adjectives to distinguish various types of dipa (in form, if not in meaning, Hom. δέπας). We have

\[
\begin{align*}
dipa & \text{ mezo[e]}^3 \\
dipa & \text{ mezo tiriowee} \\
dipa & \text{ mewijo} \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

A third group of tablets, from Pylos (Sh 733—744, with the exception of 736), describes parts of the corslet, called opawota (ntr. pl., “plates”?), as mezoa₂ and meujoa₂.

These data then supply the sg. nom. m. f. ntr. mezo; du. nom. m. ntr. mezo; pl. nom. m. f. mezo; pl. nom. ntr. mezoa₂; and sg. nom. m. f. ntr. meujo/mewijo; du. nom. m. f. meujo; pl. nom. m. f. meujo/mewijo; pl. nom. ntr. meujoa₂.

The Knossos-tablets further supply the forms aro₄α (ntr. pl.) and aro₄ε (fem. pl. ?), applied to textiles (KN Ld 571 etc.; L 735) and wheels (KN So 4430). Since the spelling indicates ἀγλοε, ἀγλοες, it is tempting to interpret them with Ventris (Documents s.v.) as “better” or “of better quality, class”, somehow connected with ἀγλεων.⁴ Particular importance attaches, in my view, to KN So 4437, where we read

\[\text{AMOTA pterewa aro}_4 \text{ jo temidwete ROTA ZE 5}\]

translated by Ventris as “wheels of elm-wood, of better class, with tyres” (Documents

---

¹ R. Thurneysen, KZ 33 [1895], 551 f., esp. 554.
² Cf. Brugmann, Grundriß² II 1, 550; Brugmann-Thumb, Griechische Grammatik², 1913, 245; Chantraine, Formation 437, Morphologie² 108 f.; Schwyzer I 536 f. (does not sound quite convinced); Streitberg, Urgermanische Grammatik, 1896, 212; Krause, Handbuch des Gotischen, 1953, 173.
³ The scribe's mistake for mezo, defended by Gallavotti-Sacconi, Inscriptiones Pyliae, 1961, 119.
⁴ In spite of theories, it is quite possible that the original form ἀγλοεν, now revealed by the tablets, was refashioned by the bards to ἀγλεων after ἄγελων etc. Cf. Lejeune, RPh 84 [1958], 209, and Mémoires de philologie mycénienne, 1958, 280 f., with a different, but to my mind improbable, explanation of aro₄jo; cp., however, BSL 54/2 [1959], 91: αγγοε. αγγοε < ἀγ-ιοτος, later ἀγεων.
He took arọjo to be a dual form, that is misspelt for arọ̣e. But if we accept the form arọ̣e as it stands, it is possible to interpret it as dolọ̀c̣, with the frequent spelling jo for o. This would be a genitive agreeing with pterewa, “of better quality elm-wood”, not with wheels, and would be an important addition to our knowledge of Mycenaean morphology.

The 1957 Pylos tablets, so promptly published by Miss M. Lang, brought a fourth comparative. Tablet Va 1323 reads: akọsone kaxo3̣e 32, which, as Miss Lang stated, means: ἀξιός κακίς “axles of inferior quality” or “damaged axles”.

As can be seen, the Mycenaean paradigm shows no trace of the historical -n-suffix. It remains, of course, possible to argue that, since the Mycenaean cases attested so far are identical with the defective cases, perhaps the other cases did show the -n-suffix even in the Mycenaean paradigm. This argument would be effectively answered if our interpretation of arọjo were confirmed by new tablets. But even on the evidence available at the present time we must emphasize that those who accept an Indo-European suffix -ISON- have never envisaged it as a defective paradigm, forming a suppletive system with -YOS-. On the contrary, they always imply that -ISON- supplied the full living paradigm, while -YOS- led a “defective”, though tenacious, existence in the case-forms specified above. And if the -ISON- type were inherited from Indo-European, it would be strange indeed if it had been confined to one sector of the paradigm only. On the strength of the Mycenaean evidence we must now take the next step and deny the existence of a variant -ISON- in Indo-European times.

As in the case of the perfect participle, our conclusion again poses two questions. First, how is the alleged suffix -ISON- to be explained? Secondly, how is the change in Greek from the -S- stem to the -N-stem-inflection to be accounted for?

We have already seen that the case for the assumption of an Indo-European comparative suffix -ISON- essentially rests on the Germanic evidence, and there the existence of this suffix is undeniable. But it is also a fact that in the Germanic languages the new suffix completely ousted the old suffix -YOS-. Furthermore, the Germanic adjective generally developed a system of “weak”, that is -N-stem, inflection which is used, according to certain syntactic rules, side by side with the “strong” forms. Apart from a number of specific cases, all adjectives have, in the positive, both weak and strong forms, and the same is true of the superlative. If the comparative fails to conform to this pattern, the explanation must be sought in certain defects of the strong inflection as inherited from Indo-European. Now it is clear that the comparative, like any other consonant-stem class, preserved the original ablaut variations within the paradigm. Thus, for instance, in the singular masc. we would have from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE m. nom.</th>
<th>-yōs</th>
<th>acc. -yos-n</th>
<th>gen. -yos-os</th>
<th>dat. (loc.) -yes-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>-jōs</td>
<td>-jəs</td>
<td>-jıs(s)</td>
<td>-jıs,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

that is a very peculiar and certainly intolerable paradigm. Even levelling of the suffix to -jōs- would not remedy this difficult situation. In these circumstances it is understandable that the speakers should have opted for the exclusive use of the weak and clear type in the comparative.

A similar type of -N-extension is also found in Lithuanian as a living formation. The regular comparative has the ending -ENIS (nom. m. sg.) which, as is shown by the

---

5 Cf. M. Lang, AJA 63 [1958], 191. The figure 32 (instead of 33) is Chadwick’s reading, now accepted by Miss Lang. On the reading kaxo3̣es see also Chadwick, JHS 79 [1959], 190; Lejeune, Mémoires 340; Heubeck, Glotta 39 [1961], 166, 168.
cognate languages, derives from an earlier -yes-. The type therefore shows a combination of the inherited comparative suffix with a nasal enlargement (originally -en-) and a final element which is probably the pronoun used in the definite inflection of adjectives.6 There is no trace of the -n-enlargement in Slavic and this suggests that the Baltic formation came into being under the influence of Germanic. But the old-type comparative, without the nasal enlargement, still survives in Lithuanian in the superlative: ger-idus-ias (ger-idus-is) “best”, with the Indo-European suffix -yös-, replaced the old superlative in -istos.7

We find then that the alleged external evidence is irrelevant. Now that the Greek evidence has disappeared from the Indo-European horizon, we must dismiss as unfounded the various recent theories operating with the conflation of -s- and -n-stems in Indo-European times.8

Returning to Greek, we should note that the theory of external connections was denied, even before the decipherment, by H. J. Seiler in his valuable dissertation on gradation in Greek.9 Naturally, he was also aware of the problems arising out of this conclusion. The main question is, of course, as has been pointed out above, the emergence of the -n-inflection in post-Mycenaean times. Seiler thought (o.c., 12 f.) that the original -s-inflection was particularly well-established and long-lived in the neuter plural (πλειω, ἕλασσω etc.). and therefore suggested that the innovation started in the neuter singular where the original -(y)os was in due course replaced by -ov (p. 14), because the latter was felt to be better suited as an adjectival ending than -os. This, as he saw, still leaves the question open as to what the model of the innovation was. He could only think of adjectives that, originally positive (e.g. ἀμείνων — ἀμείνων), came to be used as comparatives.

It seems to me that, although this approach is essentially correct, the point of departure is too narrow. There is no reason why we should assume that the neuter plural was any more frequent, and therefore better innervated, than (some of) the other caseforms, since we can see from Classical usage that the original forms in -o (acc. sg. m. f.) and -ovς survive just as tenaciously. We should rather emphasize the fact that in most comparatives of this type the formative element was very much obscured by the regular phonetic developments from consonant plus yod. A glance

6 See, e.g., J. Endzelenas, Baltų kalbų garsai ir formos, Vilnius 1957, 137 f.; J. Otrębski, Gramatyka języka litewskiego III, 1956, 127 f. A. Vaillant (BSL 51 [1956], XXI; Grammaire comparée II, 1958, 564 f.) starts from the neuter -jas (IE -yos) but forms like tusčenis, in contrast to tūčias from -t-jas, make it very doubtful, if not impossible, to start from -t-jasnis instead of -t-jasnis.

7 See Vaillant, l.c., XXI-XXIII, who, phonetically satisfactorily, derives -idus- from -ė-yōs-. I myself had thought of explaining -idus- as a blend between the alternating forms -jas- and -jōs (developing into -jaus?), see Kretschmer-Gedenkschrift II, 1958, 171 fn. 38. It is disheartening to see that Solmsen's lighthearted suggestion, thrown out in a review (IFA 15 [1904], 225 f.) and never elaborated, should still be favoured by some scholars (see, e.g., Endzelenas, l.c., and others mentioned by me, l.c.). But the suffix -euk is a Greek innovation and cannot provide an Indo-European basis -euk for the Lithuanian superlative, even if one ignored the semantic difficulties.

8 E.g., Friš, Archiv Orientální 21 [1953], 113, paralleling -LOW with Av. srayan-; Otrębski, Lingua Posnaniensis 3 [1951], 297; A. Erhart, Archiv Orientální 24 (1956), 441 (ετός heteroclysis).

9 Die primären griechischen Steigerungsformen, Diss. Zürich, 1950. The significance of the new Mycenaean data is shown by the fact that, although Seiler is strongly against the external connection, yet the traditional view is sufficiently impressive for him to admit (p. 20) that the -n-enlargement existed since Indo-European times. Now we see that the only area where -yös-was enlarged, was Germanic (Lithuanian being merely an „Ausstrahlungsgebiet”), and there the innovation presupposes the full functioning of the weak adjectives in the positive. But no one would assert that this, too, is of Indo-European date.
at such forms as\(^{10}\) μέλυς/*κάλλως πάσσως θάσσως βράσσως κρέσσως is sufficient to show that, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the suffix of the comparative was reduced to -ος/-ος, a type that was altogether foreign to the adjectival system. Although we now know that the perfect participle also had this peculiarity, there was a wide gap between the two types in that the latter was not comparative in meaning, and, from the formal point of view, its suffix was the clear morpheme ος, added to the stem without any alteration, and the feminine had a distinct form. Thus the only comparable formation that existed in the linguistic system was provided by the not very large group of words in -ος in the masculine and feminine, and the sizeable group of neuter words in -ος. But these words were all nouns and thus the "ties" were rather more irritating than helpful. The -ος-stem adjectives in -ος that were altogether foreign to the adjectival system.

Although we now know that the perfect participle also had this peculiarity, there was a wide gap between the two types in that the latter was not comparative in meaning, and, from the formal point of view, its suffix was the clear morpheme ος, added to the stem without any alteration, and the feminine had a distinct form. Thus the only comparable formation that existed in the linguistic system was provided by the not very large group of words in -ος in the masculine and feminine, and the sizeable group of neuter words in -ος. But these words were all nouns and thus the "ties" were rather more irritating than helpful. The -ος-stem adjectives in -ος suffered from a disability imposed by their differing vocalism.

There can be no doubt therefore that the position of the comparatives in -ος/-ος called for a better adjustment to the synchronous system. But it is worth noting that even the nouns were not quite without such alternations, nor quite immune to similar pressures. Thus, for instance, αἰών, although a normal -ος-stem in Classical times, has certain forms that suggest an earlier -ος-stem. The acc. αἰῶν (Aesch. Choeph. 350) and the adverb αἰῶς are generally regarded as based on *αἴων and *αιωνε of locative without ending, paralleled by αἰὼν from *αιων (the same case from *αιων).\(^{11}\)

The acc. of the word νυκτεόν appears in Homer as νυκτεόν (A 624, 641) or νυκτεόν (K 290, 326; Hymn. Cer. 210). The noun εἰκός has a frequent acc. εἰκώ (e.g. Aesch. Septem 559; Hdt. 7, 69; Plt. Tim. 37 d), and even a gen. sg. εἰκός (Eur. Hel. 77) and acc. pl. εἰκώς (Aristoph. Nub. 559; Eur. Troad. 1178). In the last case in particular an original -ος-stem *αιωνε would seem to be quite in order. But even if we do not believe that all such forms are the relics of earlier -ος-stems,\(^{12}\) they do reveal a close connection between -ος-stems and -ος-stems in the nominal inflection, and this is borne out by such well-known forms as Ἀστάρλαω, Ποσειδόδ etc. The close links between the two inflections would be easier to understand if there existed certain inherited variations. Thus, for instance, if *αιωνος- and *αιωνων- were both inherited, the complicated inflection of *αιωνος might, in the majority of case-forms, have given way to the perspicuous pattern of αἰών. But we can hardly pin-point any such doublts with any confidence.

These considerations make it clear that the reduced vitality of the animate -ος-stems in Greek — contrast for instance the proliferation of nouns of the type ἱος λαβος ἀρβος in Latin — is due to the fact that, their inflection being impaired by normal phonetic developments, they were largely transferred to the -τ-stems or -θ-stems. The choice of the new inflection was obviously determined by the particular connections in the semantic field that the individual words, or groups of words, had established. The perfect participle "decided" for the -τ-inflection because the present participle exercised a certain pull in that direction. The

---

\(^{10}\) See Seiler's list, p. 126.

\(^{11}\) Cf. Schwyzer I 514; Chantraine, Morphologie 63.72.

\(^{12}\) I must confess that the proliferation of such varied formations as *ἄγας- *ἄγας- *αιω- *αιω- *αιων- *αιων-, all of Indo-European date, strikes me as very unlikely for any synchronous state. Aryan certainly has *ἄγας, and Latin-Germanic *αἰων-; but Skt. *āgus can be secondary (as is certainly *āgy-ni), cp. mans- and manus- where Gmc. mans guarantees the Indo-European date of the former. Gk. αἰων could be the loc. of *αιων = αἰων (cf. Wackernagel-Debrunner, Ai. Gr. II 2, 478), and αἰῶν αἰῶς may be transformed from this, instead of representing *αιων and *αιων, very dubious locatives without -i; contrast πένως!
comparative, we must infer, changed to the \(-n\)-inflection because of models that exerted a more powerful attraction than any alternative group.

Now in the Greek system of adjectives, \(-n\)-stems always figured in large numbers. And here a point of contact with the \(-s\)-stems was given in the dat. plur., after the \(-n\)-stem dat. \(-\sigma\sigma\) from \(-\eta-\sigma\) was refashioned to \(-\sigma\sigma\), since this now coincided with \(-\sigma\sigma\) from \(-\sigma-\sigma\) in the \(-s\)-stems\(^{13}\); note, e.g., \(\pi\iota\nu\nu/\pi\iota\sigma\sigma, \pi\epsilon\tau\omega\nu/\pi\epsilon\tau\sigma\sigma, -\varphi\omega\nu/-\varphi\tau\sigma\sigma\). If the type \(\gamma\lambda\omega\kappa\nu\) was more wide-spread, \(\gamma\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\) could easily yield to an analogical \(\gamma\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\). This would mean that it was first in the gen. pl. that the analogy worked: after the type \(-\sigma\sigma/-\sigma\nu \nu\) the comparative innovated \(\mu\acute{e}\xi\sigma\sigma \rightarrow \mu\acute{e}\xi\zeta\nu\nu\). From the plural, the innovation spread to the singular: \(\mu\acute{e}\xi\zeta\nu\nu \mu\acute{e}\xi\zeta\nu\nu\) replaced the opaque \(\mu\acute{e}\xi\zeta\nu\nu \mu\acute{e}\xi\zeta\nu\nu\).

Another point of contact seems to have been provided by certain positive adjectives that, because of their meaning, became comparatives. Seiler has referred to \(\acute{a}m\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu \acute{a}m\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) as one such possible case (o.c., 14). But this model seems to disappear when he later gives as his preference derivation from \(\acute{a}m\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) (p. 120). Since, however, neither privative compounds with comparatives are known in Greek\(^{14}\), nor is it acceptable now that \(\acute{a}m\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) was the comparative of \(\acute{a}m\nu\nu\nu\) "small", this interpretation will hardly fit the facts, so that \(\acute{a}m\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) as a positive \(-n\)-stem may still be allowed as a possible model\(^{15}\). Particularly strong is the case for \(\acute{a}\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) as a positive neuter, in the sense that the comparative \(\acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu \acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu\) and the adjective \(\acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu \acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu\) "helpful" (from \(\acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu \acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu\)) stood side by side and so \(\acute{a}d\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\) could change \(\acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu\) to \(\acute{a}\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\), whereafter \(\acute{a}d\rho\omega\nu\) became \(\acute{a}\epsilon\iota\nu\nu\nu\)\(^{16}\). The formation makes it advisable to regard \(\lambda\omega\nu\nu\) as presenting the refashioned form of a positive \(\lambda\acute{a}i\omega\nu\nu\nu\), and Hom. \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) may also be a positive neuter\(^{16}\), cf. \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu \Xi R R 382\).

\(^{13}\) This important "link" was noticed by Seiler, o. c., 12. It would be important to know the date at which the identity arose. From the phonetic point of view we can state that \(-\sigma\sigma\) would not have been reduced to \(-\sigma\sigma\) in Mycenaean times. But the morphological pattern \(-\sigma\sigma/-\sigma\sigma/-\sigma\sigma\) could have produced the result earlier. In the \(-n\)-stems, too, the date of the change from \(-\sigma\sigma\) to \(-\sigma\sigma\) is (as yet) unknown.

\(^{14}\) Hesychius' \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{s}\acute{a}v\sigma\sigma\nu\nu\) (Hesychii Alex. Lexicon, ed. K. Latte, I, 1953, 291), contrasting with \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \tav\acute{v}t\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) and \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu\). \(\tav\acute{v}t\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) and \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu\nu\) must be due to a late misinterpretation (by poets or grammarians) of \(\Psi 311\), facilitated by the existence of Hom. \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{f}\acute{e}\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\). It is certainly hazardous to use it as genuine evidence of a negative comparative (ba-

\(^{15}\) Hesychius' \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu\nu\) (Hesychii Alex. Lexicon, ed. K. Latte, I, 1953, 291), contrasting with \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \tav\acute{v}t\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) and \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu\). \(\tav\acute{v}t\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) and \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu\nu\) must be due to a late misinterpretation (by poets or grammarians) of \(\Psi 311\), facilitated by the existence of Hom. \(\acute{a}f\acute{r}e\acute{p}e\acute{r}e\nu\nu \cdot \acute{f}\acute{e}\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma\). It is certainly hazardous to use it as genuine evidence of a negative comparative (ba-

\(^{16}\) If, as I believe, there was a comparative \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu \cdot \chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) (= Skt. \(\text{hrast}i\nu\nu\nu\)), from which Hom. \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) and \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) are in some way transformed, then this produced \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) etc.

\(^{17}\) This item itself may be from an \(-o-\) stem and, since the diphthong \(-e\nu\) is rather dubious (Seiler 120), an original \(\text{amee-no-} \) "strong" (cf. Skt. \(\text{ama-} \) etc.) seems possible.

\(^{18}\) On this see Seiler 118 f.; Gallavotti, \(\text{Rivista di Filologia Classica} 35 [1957], 225 f\).

\(^{19}\) Brugmann, \(\text{Grundrie\ss} 2 \) II 1, 557; Schwyzer, l.c., as against Leumann, l.c., 2 f. Leumann also argues (p. 2, 5) that \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) may only be understood as \(-o-\) stem derivatives and thus show that \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu \cdot \chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) the neuter forms of the comparative, were felt to be \(-o-\) stem forms. But if we bear in mind the old paradigm \(\text{melow}/\text{melo-ajmelo-ajmelo-ajmelo-} \) etc. it is clear that the stem was \(\text{meio-} \), without being an \(-o-\) stem, and factitives were naturally based on this stem. The same applies to such comparatives as \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu \cdot \chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) etc., which do not prove an \(-o-\) stem, not even a reinterpretation, but as rather late blends between the old type and the new type are based on the stem of the old type. Kerschensteiner's contention (\(\text{MSS 15} [1959], 39-64\)) that \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) is from \(\chi\acute{e}\nu\nu\nu\) is misguided.
A further problem, connected with the origins of the Greek comparative, is the variation between -(j)oc and -io, exemplified by μέξιων-ἡδιόν. This is certainly the result of the Indo-European rules of syllabication, according to which, after light syllables (ending in short vowel plus one consonant, e.g. ψετ-, μεγ- or in a long vowel, e.g. πλη-) the suffix was -yos, whereas after heavy syllables (with a long vowel plus a consonant, or a short vowel followed by two consonants) the same suffix appeared as -yos.20 The distribution is well illustrated by Homeric βάςσων βάσσων κρέσσων,21 μάλλον μάσσων μέξιων23 ὀλίζων πλεκὼν on the one hand, ἀσχων ἄγιων κεράδων ἄγιων on the other.22 But it is easy to understand that there should have been a growing tendency to replace the obscure final -ov by the clear form -io. Thus θάstdioν is later replaced by ταχίων, first in the Hippocratic Corpus; for Hom. πάσσων we find the hapax παχίων in Aratus, but other speakers may have used it before him. In both cases the innovation has the additional merit of restoring the general form of the adjective. In some cases the replacement occurred at a much earlier date. Thus Hom. καλλίων is refashioned from the regular and expected *κάλλων, or rather *κάλλως, but the ntr. κάλλος survives as the noun κάλλος.23 Similarly, instead of *κάςσων, the comparative of κακός is κακίων, and here the innovation seems to be of Mycenaean date since κα-ζο-ε can hardly be κάζος but, at the most, καλος; if, however, Lejeune's interpretation of Myc. z as representing both ζ and σ is correct, the Myc. κασσοε represents the expected comparative from *κακ-γο(s)-es.

This interpretation of -io presupposes that the inherited -yos- has a short i. But one of the peculiarities of Attic Greek is that i is always long, in contrast to the other dialects and Homer, where i is short; note, e.g., Ἀττ. ηδίων, βέλτιων etc.24 However, in view of the dialect distribution, Attic long i can, prima facie, hardly be taken as an inherited feature. It is therefore surprising to see that Seiler decides that the long vowel is of Indo-European date, on the grounds that there is no phonetic development that could account for the lengthening. For, he says, “if Attic lengthened, why had Homer not done it before?”25 But surely Attic is the one dialect for which lengthening in the comparative is in fact reliably attested: in contrast to Ionic etc. μέξιον κρέσσων etc., Attic (and our Atticized Homer) has μεξίων, κρέεττων etc. There can be no doubt therefore that the lengthening of ηδίων to ηδιόν is an Attic

20 For the Sievers-law, reformulated by Edgerton, see Language 19 [1943], 83—124, and quite recently, Lindeman, NTS 20 [1965], 38—108.
21 Hom. κρέσσων μεξίων show Atticization in their vocalism.
22 Only ήδιον and ἀσών are at variance with the rule.
23 Cf. Seiler 68 f. But there is no need to assume that *κάλλος (he posits *κάλλων, p. 70) became a positive. The comparative in -yos- was originally an "intensive" (Benveniste, Noms d'agent et noms d'action en i-e, 1948, 115 f.; N. Berg, NTS 18 [1958], 202—30, esp. 214 f., 216) or "elative", and thus the neuter could indicate a quality. (For a different view, see Otrebski, Lingua Posnaniensis 3 [1951], 299). We must now also ask whether the peculiar noun βήσσα/βήσσα, instead of representing *βαδαγια/βαδαθ (Schwyzer, RhM 81 [1932], 193 f.), is not transformed from the neuter comparative βάςσος from βαδίς, this form supplying Hesychius' βάςσος- ὁδετέρως ἥ βήσσα. Vey's suggestions (BSL 81 [1965], 101 f.) are very unlikely.
24 See for the facts Seiler 15 f.
25 Seiler 17.
innovation, causally connected with that seen in *μειων νκελττων*. The explanation is perhaps to be sought along the lines indicated by Kuryłowicz. Since within the Attic system the suffix -αινων of the comparative was in many frequently used forms preceded by a long vowel (*μειων νκελττων θαττων μαλλων etc.), the pattern "long vowel plus -αινων" was transferred to *-ινων* which thus became *-ινων*.

The new Mycenaean data can thus be seen to have a revolutionizing effect on our views of the origin and development of the comparative. But, as usual, the new evidence not only settles outstanding problems, it also raises new ones. One of the most unexpected revelations of the tablets was the form of the comparative *μειων* which appears as *μευζο* and *μευζω*. According to the old explanation, due to Osthoff, *μειων* replaced an earlier *μειενων* (surviving in *μαιενων*) under the influence of *πλειων*; *μειων* itself was built on a neuter noun *μει-νο-ν* "diminution" from the root *μει-* "to diminish", from which we have the positive μινύς "small"; Lat. minuo, minor minimus; Germanic *minus* in O. Engl. minne "mean, vile", and the comparative *μινυώτα*; superlative *μινωύτα*.

We can now certainly state that the comparative *μειενων*, constructed purely for the sake of *μαιενων*, is a fiction. But the connection of *μειων* with the words just mentioned seems so clear that the Mycenaean evidence is a challenge rather than a disproof. But so far the Mycenaean forms have not been clarified. Chantraine suggested that *μευζω* should be read as *μειενων*, which would save the root *μει*- but leaves the offending *-ινων* unexplained. Even so, the alternant spellings *μευζο*/*μευζω* are irreconcilable with *μειενων*, they guarantee the reading *μευζό*.

Now derivatives of the root *μει-μι-* are attested in Greek, besides the adjective μινύς already referred to, in the forms μειων μειστος and μικρός. For μικρός

---

28 For the Indo-Europeanizing explanation, see the earlier literature quoted by Schwyzer I 537*, Seiler 17.20; Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Ai. Gr.* II 2, 443 f. But the "external" evidence, i.e. the Sanskrit type *वाणस-, नवियास*-( replacing Vedic *नविया-*) is itself an innovation, see Pisani, *Grammatica dell'antico indiano*, Rome 1935—3, 299. The i is lengthened from i in order to prevent its consonantalization to y, and is paralleled by *-iy- from *-iya* (see Wackernagel-Debrunner, o. c., 441 f., esp. 442 g); note in particular the ordinals *turiya*- *tritiya-* etc. from *tur* (fia)- etc. Of more recent Indo-Europeanizing theories, I note A. Erhart, *Archiv Orientální* 24 [1956], 439 (:-iyaos from Proto-IE Ai-Ajos).

29 J. Kuryłowicz, *L'apophonie en indo-européen*, Wrocław 1956, 275 f. But I am inclined to think that the explanation, which must apply to other categories as well, is quite different.


31 The terse judgment of the decipherers, *Documents 400*.

32 Cf. J. Chadwick, *TPS* 1954, 6. I do not think that Hesychius' *μεγάλων κλάσον* can be utilized.


34 Izvestija Akademii Nauk, Otdelenije literature i jazyka, 14/3 [1955], 271.

35 The word has been discussed recently by G. Liebert (*Die ie. Personalpronomina und die Laryngaltheorie*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 52/7 [1957], 35 f., esp. 37) on laryngealist assumptions, and by H. Rosen (*Lingua* 7 [1958], 398*) who thinks of *μευζό* from a *μου- "winzig" in μυς etc.*
Seiler has suggested that -κρός might have been taken over from the opposite μυχός (o.c., 115). But this leaves out of account Doric and Boeotian μικός and the names Μικνός Μικνάλλος Μικόλος Μικνόν etc.34 These clearly show that the adjective “small” started as *μικός, and the influence of μυχός merely added -ρ, even that not in all dialects; μικός is an expressive variant of *μικός, comparable to Lat. lippus from *lipos etc.35 The form *μικός itself, with its long i, is hardly due to an Indo-European long-diphthong root *mēi-/mi-, which does not appear in μινις etc., but is rather from με-ικ-, an “age-group” derivative36 from *miyo-,37 formed directly from *mēi-/mi-.38 The comparative from this adjective is expected with the full-grade of the root, that is to say, we must posit an early *mēi-yōς.

The question now is how the early *meyyōs and Myc. mewyōs can be reconciled. It will be recalled in this connection that a similar intrusive w has already caused some heartssearching in philologist quarters. I am thinking, of course, of Myc. perusinuwo “of last year” which flies in the face of all our notions about the temporal suffix -inos. But here the happy intuition of M. Lejeune has cleared up the Mycenaean “anomaly”: perusino- was transformed to perusinuwo under the influence of the comparative newo- “new”.39 It is more than somewhat tempting to look for a similar explanation of the intrusive w in mewyōs.

If we survey the field of suitable adjectives in the Greek system, it is impossible not to think of the comparative πλείων which has always been linked with μείων. However, the gradation of πολύς presents a thorny problem for the philologist. The Sanskrit puru- “much”, comp. prāyas “mostly”, and Avestan pouru- “much, many”, comp. frāyāh- “plus”, superl. fraēśam “plurimum” establish an Aryan prā-yas-/pra-īsta-, which, on the face of it, could be equated with Gk. πλείων/πλείστος, if πλείων, instead of *πλέων (with shortening from *plē-yōs) was transformed, say, after πλείστος. On the other hand, Lat. plús can hardly be traced directly to an Indo-European neuter *plē-yōs. To complicate matters, Greek possesses some strange forms such as Hom. nom. pl. πλεές, acc. πλέας, Lesb. (inscr.) πλέα(ς), Cretan πλές πλά(ς)ς πλίαςιν πλά, Attic πλέιν ᾗ. This set has been interpreted as representing an archaic type, based on *plē-is, that is *pléis-es gave πλέες etc.40 But even if an adverbial *plē-is had to be acknowledged as the source of Att. πλείν,41 it would still be impossible to accept such a suffix for the normal paradigm of the comparative. Although in Indo-European times there may have been a regular alternation between

---

34 For the names, compare also Leumann, Glotta 32 [1953], 219 with fn. 2 (on the adjective μικόλος), 222 (Μικρός etc.).
35 This was suggested as an alternative by Boisacq o.c., 638. A further expressive -ικό-, that is -ικ-, appears in μικυχός and Lacon. μυχυχόδομός, see Schwyzzer I 498.
36 On these see Chantraine’s recent study in Études sur le vocabulaire grec, Paris 1956, 97 f., and my comments in JHS 78 [1958], 147 f. Note in particular the semantic field of the only Homeric appellative adjectives παρθενικ and ἀφραυνικός.
37 An adjective *miyo- would also give an easy explanation of Lat. nimius. Lat. mica is either a derivative like μικός or borrowed from it.
38 A derivative *μι-αγ-/*μι-α- “diminution, impairing”, restricted to the religious sphere, could account for μικός, μιανω, etc.
39 First proposed in RPh 29 [1955], 154, and now generally accepted.
40 E.g., Brugmann, Grundrisse II 1, 554.
41 Cf. Lat. mag-is. O. Irish litu, however, is very doubtful (see Thurneysen, Grammar of Old Irish, 1946, 230), and can be from *plē-yōs. But the very fact that πλέιν ᾗ is confined to ordinary, everyday, Attic speech (comedy etc.), makes it very unlikely that it should go back to such an extraordinary formation, of which there is no further trace at all in the Greek system. It is much more likely to be an “umgangsprochlich” transformation of the common neuter πλείων, reduced to πλέιν, see Szemerényi, Syncope, 264 f.
-yős/-yos-θ/-yos-os etc. (a faint trace of which may survive in Lithuanian -(j)es-nis), in Greek the -o-grade was generalized already in Mycenaean times. For the same reason, earlier attempts to operate with $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-(j)es-ec etc., must now be ruled out.

In view of these difficulties, it is no wonder that two alternative explanations should have gained support in recent years. One view tries to explain the Greek peculiarities by assuming that the normal comparative neuter πλέον, felt by the speakers to be an -o-stem form, gave rise to the plural πλέα, which again was felt to be a consonantal plural, producing in its turn πλέες πλέασ etc. But, although the Attic forms $\epsilon\chi\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu\ (296 B.C.)$ and $\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha\ (396 B.C.)$ are quoted as instances illustrating such a transfer, the fact is that, even if they were correct and reliable, which they are not, they would be too late and too isolated to prove anything for Homer and earlier times. The greatest difficulty is, however, the repeated switch from consonantal to thematic and then back to consonantal inflection, which, as far as I can see, remains an ad hoc assumption without evidence.

The other view seeks the solution to the Latin and Greek problems in the Indo-European past, and assumes that an Indo-European neuter noun $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-os “abundance, large quantity” gave Lat. plús, which was later, by fusion with $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-is, reinterpreted as a comparative, while the root $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-itself appears in Hom. πλέ(素质)ες πλέας etc., which again, originally, were not comparative forms. But one cannot help wondering how the assumed $\pi\lambda\epsilon$- would fit into the early Greek inflectional system, and according to what pattern it would produce the required

---

42 J. Schmidt, KZ 26 (1883), 381. Even more antiquated is Thurneysen’s “positive” $\pi\lambda\epsilon$os, reinterpreted as a comparative (KZ 33 [1895], 555).
43 Leumann, MH 2 [1945], 1 f.; Homerische Wörter, 1950, 293 fn. 53. This is accepted by his pupils, cf. Seiler 113; J. Egli, Heteroklisie 76.
44 See Egli 77 f. But Schwzyzer I 539 has already pointed out that these forms cannot be used. A look into Dittenberger’s Sylloge (3rd ed., no. 921, fn. 5) shows that the alleged $\epsilon\chi\theta\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ is a vox nihil. The damaged word was seen by A. Wilhelm (in 1916!) to represent the name ‘Extharion’ (in full: ‘Aglorion’ ‘Extharion Θεβαῖος, which leaves no doubts about the inappropriateness of an adverbial phrase), see IG II—III ed. minor I, 1916, p. 666, no. 713, 3—5, 1.12. The other word, μετον, is of course well attested, both in literature and in inscriptions, but it is very doubtful whether it can be the neuter of the comparative μετον as some ancient scholiasts would have us believe. The fact that in the inscription referred to by Egli, recording the law of the Demotionid phratia of 396 B.C, and obviously in the living language, too, it is coupled with nκιον, the latter being the major sacrifice, suggests that μετον is a similar formation (both patterned on λεγειν), so that the latter derives from μειον; for the contraction, note Δεξελείη (Lysias 33, 3) beside Δεξελείης (normalized Attic Δεξελείης) in Sylloge, no. 921, 1.64. If that is the case, we may retain the suggested connection on the basis of a μειο(ο)-ειον.
45 This chronological consideration might be ignored for the Cretan and Lesbian forms. But there one might ask whether the innovation did not start with the gen. πλεόνων, reduced by haplogly to πλέων, on which πλέες πλέας πλέα was built. This would have the advantage that πλέον is the gen. pl. of all three genders, so that from it both πλέες and πλέα can be formed. For a similar haplogly, again in Cretan, compare νεότας “official body of young men”, with gen. νεότας and acc. νεότα, obviously from νεότατος, νεότατα, see Schwzyzer I 263, 528;
C. D. Buck, Greek Dialects, 1955, 76.
46 E. Benveniste, Origines de la formation des noms en i.e., 1935, 54, followed by, e.g., L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language, 1954, 254; T. Burrow, The Sanskrit Language, 1955, 180; J. Manessy-Guitton, Word 19 [1963], 38. But a Hom. πλέος (according to Benveniste and Palmer from $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-os) does not exist. There is an Ionic πλέος = Hom. πλέος, but this is identical with Att. πλέος, and goes back to πληροϲ, probably $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-οϲ, see Schwzyzer I 472. The form πλέον of our Homer-text at ν 355: ειδόνων δε πλέον ποδόνον, πλείνε δε και αληθί, is an early metathetic form of πλείον, that is πλήν, cf. πλείν in the line, but with the introduction of the short thematic vowel, characteristic of Ionic. But the manuscript variant πλέον seems preferable. Be this as it may, the form πλέον certainly cannot be traced to an IE $\pi\lambda\epsilon$-o-. Cf. Chantraine, Gram. hom. 11; R. Woest, η ν ι ε βοκαλ βει Ηομερ. Diss. Ζυρίχ 1948, 65 f.
forms πλέες πλέας. Are we to assume a singular *πλό(ς)? But that would surely be a mere duplication of πολός, and, although an alternation *πλευ-/*πλυ- is imaginable for Indo-European, Greek would surely have eliminated it by Mycenaean times, unless the difference was sufficient to warrant two distinct words.

One might be inclined to save the theory by assuming that the adjective *πλευ- (or *πολέω), continued by Greek πολός, formed its comparative and superlative from the stem *πλευ-, thus producing *πλευγός and *πλευστός. The former would readily account for Lat. plus since the neuter *πλευγός would lose its intervocalic y in pre-historic times47 and *πλευς would become *πλους which would eventually result in plus. Even the superlative would — with the appropriate Latin changes in the suffix — yield the attested ploirume or pluruma48. Classical πλευστός. As for Greek, the primitive forms *πλευγός *πλευστός would regularly result in πλείων πλείστος and, what is even more important for our present purposes, early πλέον would give a satisfactory explanation of the transformation of *μεγγός to Myc. meýjós.

But there are several considerations that speak against this attempt to save the plev- theory. First of all, we should not light-heartedly brush aside the Aryan evidence which requires IE *pleyōs and *ple-īstos (or *pla-īstos?). For these formations are in full accord with the structural rules, according to which the comparative is based on the root, not on the stem of the positive. Hence *pleyōs from *pleH- is the expected basis for the comparative of the positive *plH- u- in πολός /paru- /pou-:49 Nor can we ignore the Latin pleores in the Carmen Fratrum Arvalium; it is quite unwarranted to disrupt the unity of the comparative formation by assuming that pleores and plus represent entirely different types.50 This is just as unfounded for Greek and there is no reason why we should believe that a "comparative" *πλεύζες co-existed with inherited *πλην(ή)πος. If Miss M. Lang is right in thinking that PY Wr 1327 pereito offers πλειοστός,51 then we have evidence showing that *πλευστός at any rate is out of the question.

The single insuperable weakness of the plev- theory is, however, that it cannot account for the very facts that it was devised to explain. Familiarity with Greek

47 This is certainly the explanation of minor minus, which is not based on the positive məsə. minus, inexplicably reinterpreted as a comparative neuter, but presents the "regular" comparative *minu-yos, built, according to the later pattern, on the positive stem, not on the root. This became *minu-os/*minu-os, and later *minuós/*minuos, eventually losing its w before ð: minór/minus. The latter could of course also result from a syncopated *minuos.

48 Both these forms show inverse spelling for spoken à.

49 For the primitive form of the positive, cf. F. B. J. Kuiper, Mededelingen Nederlandse Academie, 18/11 [1955], 23 (with unlikely surmises on the nature of the laryngeal p. 24). Lindeman, Studio Linguistica 16 [1963], 8, derives the Greek comparative from IE *pleyō-, assimilated from *pleH- ñ-y-, an altogether unlikely theory.

50 In my view, plus derives from *pleyōs which was at the stage *pleóos influenced by minus (see above, fn. 47), and *pleus became plous, plüs. The superlative, starting as *pleúsamos, attested by Festus' pleisma, changed after plous to plousamos, or after plus to plurimus. As to the late change of eu to ou, note, in addition to the inscription of the Ardea dish: NEVEN DEIYO „novem deum", the new altar inscriptions discovered by M. Guarducci, two of which have NEUNA FATA „Nonae Fatae“ and NEUNA DONO „Nonae donum"; see E. Vetter, Handbuch der italienischen Dialekte I, 1953, 332 f.; IF 62 [1955], 1 f. All these inscriptions are from the 3rd c. B.C. Another late example of the change is brūma which derives from breuma, that is to say post-syncope breuma, and not an Ur-form *breghu-mā. It is, in my view, also implied by, e.g., accūsāre, which presupposes the stages -kouas - keusā - kousā. One might almost say that there was a persistent tendency to change eu to ou from about the seventh century down to the third.

51 AJA 62 [1958], 191.
dialect history would have warned that the Cretan forms πλίας πιλασι cannot be based on earlier πλεόρ, for the simple reason that ε is not raised to i before an α if the lost consonant was a F.\textsuperscript{62} And it will be important to bear in mind that the Cretan forms only admit s or y as the lost consonant.

Thus we find that, instead of throwing light on *mewyοs, it is the form πλειων itself that needs some explanation. We must regard as established that the original forms were comp. *pleγος|pleγος and superl. *pleιςτος (or *plειςτος).\textsuperscript{63} The long vowel of early *πλειως|πλεος was shortened everywhere, in Attic with lengthening of a following short vowel. Hence in Attic-Ionic the early paradigm was πλέως/πλέω α or πλέω (if -oa contracted before shortening) etc. But in all other dialects the shortening produced nom. πλέος/πλέος, acc. πλεοα|πλεος, gen. πλεος, dat. πλεοι; nom. pl. πλέος/πλεοα, acc. πλεοα|πλεοα, gen. πλεων, dat. πλεοσι. It will be seen that, unlike most comparative paradigms, this one presented a surfeit of vowels in hiatus sequence. It can be expected therefore that in a word so frequently used this will be remedied either by early contraction or by hyphaeresis. The latter seems to be the explanation of Homeric πλε(ο)ες πλε(ο)ας, and of Lesb. πλεας, Cret. πλες etc. This hyphaeresis is paralleled by the form δαμεγγος found in several dialects for and from δαμεγγος, and Ionic Τειχοσεις from Τειχος, the ethnic of the place-name Τειχοσοσσα from Τειχος(—ι)οςας. The reduction of -οε- to -ε- is parallel to that of -εοε- to -ε- here proposed.\textsuperscript{64} At the same time we should bear in mind the alternative possibility already mentioned (fn. 45): contraction of a form like πλέων to πλεων could naturally lead to the metaplastic forms πλες πλεας etc. Most likely the short forms are due to both factors.\textsuperscript{65}

But apart from certain case-forms,\textsuperscript{66} a complete -w-inflection was built up and the last remaining problem concerning πλειων is its diphthong ει. As is known, in Attic it appears only before long vowels, say πλειως πλεω, but never in πλεον. The diphthong may be due to πλειως but also to the opposite μελον which has it in all dialects.\textsuperscript{57} And this raises even more acutely the question where Myc. mewjοs got its w from. Although a *plewjoς can now be safely ruled out, the principle remains valid: some word in its semantic field must have had the ending -wοs. There are two possible candidates. First the Indo-European adjective *newο-, with the comparative *newyoς (cf. Skt. navyak-, Goth. niwus-, Lithu. naujus-), was no doubt inherited as such from Indo-European, although in Classical times only the new type νεω-τετος is found. Secondly, IE *γυυων “young”, attested by Skt. γυνα and Lat. iuuenis,\textsuperscript{58} had the comparative *yewyoς as is shown by Skt. yaviyas- and O. Irish ο, Welsh iau (from *yew-); the corresponding Greek form was Myc. *(h)ewjoς or *zewjoς. It seems to me that probably both adjectives, but especially *hewjoς, were instrumental in reshaping the original *meyyoς to the Mycenaean form mewjoς.

\textsuperscript{62} Cp. Buck, Greek Dialects 22, § 9.7.
\textsuperscript{63} We can ignore here the problem how πλειως can be reconciled with the Indo-European form as exhibited by Av. fraekam. Cp. Seiler 114; Werner 82; but also Kuryłowicz, Études indo-européennes I, Kraków 1935, 37.
\textsuperscript{64} Cf. G. H. Mahlow, Neue Wege durch die griechische Sprache und Dichtung, 1936, 32; Schwyzer I 252 f. On Τειχοσοσσα see W. Rugge, RE a.v., and on its location, L. Robert, RPh 84 [1958], 50 f.; on δαμεγγος, F. Bader, Les composés grecs du type de demiourgos, 1955, 169.
\textsuperscript{65} In case the change is later, haplogy must be considered, see fn. 45.
\textsuperscript{66} The only possible trace of the neuter πλιος is the Arcadian ΠΑΟΙΟΣ.
\textsuperscript{57} Seiler 115.
\textsuperscript{58} And also by Greek as will be shown elsewhere.