

be that so far language does not admit of this reduction. As far back as we can go the two movements remain, the one as distinct as the other. But contained in both nominal and verbal stems there has been a unity, which seems to indicate that they arose out of one original form. Concerning this point a great deal of controversy has arisen, and the end is not yet. Those who follow the Science of Language most closely, and to whom philology is purely formal and historical, insist that there is no reason to suppose that any root form which we have is original and indivisible; *e. g.*, Brugmann says: "Strictly speaking we are never sure in the case of a suffix which has come down to us from the Indo-Germanic parent language, whether it ever existed as an independent word, exactly in the same shape as we extract it from the body of the word, or whether it originally consisted of elements which passed into this shape by a regular phonetic change. It is theoretically correct when we say that the root of a word is found after we have removed all formative syllables from it. But in the first place, we do not know what shape Indo-Germanic words had toward the end of the root period, and this applies especially to the fact that we are unable to say whether the language at this stage possessed only monosyllabic, or only polysyllabic, or words of both categories. Secondly, the analysis of elements which were directly annexed to the ends of roots is of a most doubtful nature. And, lastly, we are unable to determine what phonetic changes inflexional compounds had undergone from the beginning up to the dissolution of the primitive community. Hence, it must not be supposed that the roots which we in ordinary practice, abstract from words are at all to be relied upon, as representing the word forms of the root period. We are utterly unable to understand, *e. g.*, whether the complex *a. n. z.* represents a unitary word of the root period, or whether it is to be resolved into *a. n. z.*, that is, whether *z* was a suffix and thus originally an independent element. Such being the state of things, we shall retain the terms root and suffix in this work for such part of the word as 'seq' and 'e,' 'tal,' 'sequetai.' . . .

"We do not, however, assert that the elements to which we give these names ever existed as independent words. We merely indicate by means of hyphens (-) what was probably felt at any particular period as the nucleus (so to speak) of the whole system of word

¹ Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages, Morphology, Pt. I, pp. 13-18.