

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

OF THE

SANSKRIT Σ LND,

GREEK, LATIN, LITHUANIAN, GOTHIC GERMAN

AND SCLAVONIC LANGUAGES

BY

PROFESSOR I BOPP

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

EDWARD B EASTWICK FRS FSA MRAS

Y MERT OLL E OXY RD MEM R P E IATI S IET E PIAE A
MEAY Y T GZ M N RI \ AL IFTY A D P TH HILOL
O TY F LO D V H HARY MEM ER Y T E M WAS LI ER R
S IET Y PR FE R OF O ENT L LA G A E A D IB R N I
T E EAST IN IA L E E H BURY A TRA LAT R F
TIE ARTA Y N M ER HI JA IE PREM
S AR TH BA _ O B A THE OULI AN T
AN AR TH I ET ET Y

VOL I

SECOND EDITION

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

LONDON, 14, HENRIETTA STREET, COYLNT GARDEN AND

EDINBURGH, 20, SOUTH FRDERICK STREET

PARIS B DUPRAT

LEIPZIG F A BROCKHAUS

1856

LONDON

—
WILLIAM M WATTS, CROWN COURT TEMPLE BAR

THE CHAIRMAN, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN,

AND

THE DIRECTORS

OF THE

HONORABLE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

THE MUNIFICENT PATRONS OF INDIAN LITERATURE

THIS TRANSLATION OF A WORK

WHICH IRREFRAGABLY DEMONSTRATES THE COMMON ORIGIN

OF THE

LANGUAGES OF INDIA AND OF EUROPE,

IS WITH THEIR PERMISSION RESPECTFULLY INSERIBED

BY

MOST FAITHFUL AND OBEDIENT SERVANT

THE TRANSLATOR

PREFACE
IN THE
SECOND EDITION

✻

IN giving to the Public this Second Edition of the English Translation of Bopp's great work on Comparative Grammar, it is right to state that the version has been approved by Professor Bopp himself, and that it has been again very carefully compared with the original, so that numerous errors which, from the great length of the work were perhaps hardly to be avoided in a first edition have now been corrected. The appearance of the original, too, in parts, and at considerable intervals of time led to some inconsistencies in the translation in the mode of expressing the value of certain letters but care has been taken to rectify this defect, also in the present edition. The Table of Contents is altogether new, and will be found to be very much more copious than the German.

Those who wish for an Introductory Notice before commencing the study of the Grammar, or who mean to content themselves with a general notion of what has been achieved by the Author may refer to the "Edinburgh Review," No CXCII p 298 and the "Calcutta Review" No XLIV p 468. It will be there seen that this Work has created a new epoch in the science of Comparative Philology, and that it may be justly assigned a place in that department of study corresponding to that of 'Newton's Principia in Mathematics, Bacon's *Novum Organum* in Mental Science or Blumenbach in Physiology. The encomiums of the Reviewer have in fact been justified by

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

the adoption of the Work as a Lecture Book at Oxford, and by the extensive use which Rawlinson and other eminent scholars have made of it in their researches

It remains to be added, that while the Notes and Preface made by Professor Wilson, the former Editor, have been retained, I must be myself held responsible for the errors and defects, whatever they may be, of the present edition.

EDWARD B EASTWICK

HALFEBURY COLLEGE,
February, 1854

PREFACE
TO THE
FIRST EDITION



THE study of Comparative Philology has of late years been cultivated in Germany, especially, with remarkable ability and proportionate success. The labours of GRIMM, POTZ, BOPP, and other distinguished Scholar, have given a new character to this department of literature and have substituted for the vague conjectures suggested by external and often accidental coincidences elementary principles, based upon the prevailing analogies of articulate sounds and the grammatical structure of language.

But although the fact that a material advance has been made in the study of Comparative Philology is generally known, and some of the particulars have been communicated to the English public through a few works on Classical Literature, or in the pages of periodical criticism yet the full extent of the progress which has been effected and the steps by which it has been attained, are imperfectly appreciated in this country. The study of the German language is yet far from being extensively pursued and the results which the German Philologists have developed and the reasonings which have led to them being accessible to those only who can consult the original writers, are withheld from many individuals of education and learning to whom the affinities of cultivated speech are objects of interest and inquiry. Translations of the works, in which the information they would gladly seek

for, is conveyed, are necessary to bring within their reach the materials that have been accumulated by German industry and erudition, for the illustration of the history of human speech.

Influenced by these considerations, LORD FRANCIS EGERTON was some time since induced to propose the translation of a work which occupies a prominent place in the literature of Comparative Philology on the Continent—the *Vergleichende Grammatik* of Professor BOPP of Berlin. In this work a new and remarkable class of affinities has been systematically and elaborately investigated. Taking as his standard the Sanskrit language, Professor BOPP has traced the analogies which associate with it and with each other—the Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, and Slavonic tongues: and whatever may be thought of some of his arguments, he may be considered to have established beyond reasonable question a near relationship between the languages of nations separated by the intervention of centuries, and the distance of half the globe, by differences of physical formation and social institutions,—between the forms of speech current among the dark-complexioned natives of India and the fair-skinned races of ancient and modern Europe;—a relationship of which no suspicion existed fifty years ago, and which has been satisfactorily established only within a recent period, during which the Sanskrit language has been carefully studied, and the principles of alphabetical and syllabic modulation upon which its grammatical changes are founded, have been applied to its kindred forms of speech by the Philologists of Germany.

As the *Vergleichende Grammatik* of Professor BOPP is especially dedicated to a comprehensive comparison of languages, and exhibits, in some detail, the principles of the Sanskrit as the ground-work and connecting bond of the comparison, it was regarded as likely to offer most interest to the Philologists of this country, and to be one of

the most acceptable of its class to English students it was therefore selected as the subject of translation. The execution of the work was, however opposed by two considerations—the extent of the original, and the copiousness of the illustrations derived from the languages of the East—the Sanskrit and the Zend. A complete translation demanded more time than was compatible with Lord F. EGERTON'S other occupations and as he professed not a familiarity with Oriental Literature he was reluctant to render himself responsible for the correctness with which the orientalisms of the text required to be represented. This difficulty was perhaps, rather overrated, as the Grammar itself supplies all the knowledge that is needed and the examples drawn from the Sanskrit and Zend speak for themselves as intelligibly as those derived from Gothic and Slavonic. In order, however, that the publication might not be prevented by any embarrassment on this account, I offered my services in revising this portion of the work, and have hence the satisfaction of contributing, however humbly to the execution of a task which I consider likely to give a beneficial impulse to the study of Comparative Philology in Great Britain.

The difficulty arising from the extent of the original work and the consequent labour and time requisite for its translation was of a more serious description. This, however has been overcome by the ready co-operation of a gentleman, who adds a competent knowledge of German to eminent acquirements as an Oriental Scholar. Having mastered several of the spoken dialects of Western India and made himself acquainted with the sacred language of the Parsees during the period of his service under the Presidency of Bombay Lieutenant EASTWICK devoted part of a furlough, rendered necessary by failing health, to a residence in Germany where he acquired the additional qualifications enabling him to take a share in the transla-

tion of the *Vergleichende Grammatik*. He has accordingly translated all those portions of the *Comparative Grammar*, the rendering of which was incompatible with the leisure of the Noble Lord with whom the design originated, who has borne a share in its execution, and who has taken a warm and liberal interest in its completion.

The *Vergleichende Grammatik*, originally published in separate Parts, has not yet reached its termination. In his first plan the author comprised the affinities of Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and its Teutonic descendants. To these, after the conclusion of the First Part, he added the Slavonic. He has since extended his researches to the analogies of the Celtic and the Malay-Polynesian dialects, but has not yet incorporated the results with his general Grammar. The subjects already treated of are quite sufficient for the establishment of the principles of the comparison, and it is not proposed to follow him in his subsequent investigations. The first portions of the present Grammar comprise the doctrine of euphonic alphabetical changes, the comparative inflexions of Substantives and Adjectives, and the affinities of the Cardinal and Ordinal Numerals. The succeeding Parts contain the comparative formation and origin of the Pronouns and the Verbs. the latter subject is yet unfinished. The part of the translation now offered to the public stops with the chapter on the Numerals, but the remainder is completed, and will be published without delay.

With respect to the translation, I may venture to affirm, although pretending to a very slender acquaintance with German, that it has been made with great scrupulousness and care, and that it has required no ordinary pains to render in English, with fidelity and perspicuity, the not unfrequently difficult and obscure style of the original

H H WILSON

PREFACE



I CONTEMPLATE in this work a description of the comparative organization of the languages enumerated in the title page, comprehending all the features of their relationship and an inquiry into their physical and mechanical laws, and the origin of the forms which distinguish their grammatical relations. One point alone I shall leave untouched, the secret of the roots or the foundation of the nomenclature of the primary ideas. I shall not investigate, for example why the root *√* signifies "go" and not "stand" why the combination of sounds *stha* or *sta* signifies "stand" and not "go". I shall attempt apart from this, to follow out as it were the language in its stages of being and march of development yet in such a manner that those who are predetermined not to recognise, as explained, that which they maintain to be inexplicable may perhaps find less to offend them in this work than the avowal of such a general plan might lead them to expect. In the majority of cases the primary signification, and, with it the primary source of the grammatical forms, spontaneously present themselves to observation in consequence of the extension of our horizon of language and of the confronting of sisters of the same lingual stock separated for ages, but bearing indubitable features of their family connection. In the treatment indeed of our European tongues a new epoch could not fail to open upon us in the discovery of another region in the world of language namely the Sanskrit* of which it has been demonstrated, that in its

* *Sanskrita* signifies 'adorned completed perfect' in respect to language *classic*, and is thus adapted to denote the entire family or race. It is compounded of the elements *sam* "with" and *kṛita* (nom *kṛitas kṛita kṛitam*) "made" with the insertion of a euphonic *s* (§§ 18 96)

grammatical constitution, it stands in the most intimate relation to the Greek, the Latin, the Germanic, &c.; so that it has afforded, for the first time, a firm foundation for the comprehension of the grammatical connection between the two languages called the Classical, as well as of the relation of these two to the German, the Lithuanian, and Slavonic. Who could have dreamed a century ago that a language would be brought to us from the far East, which should accompany, *pari passu*, nay, sometimes surpass, the Greek in all those perfections of form which have been hitherto considered the exclusive property of the latter, and be adapted throughout to adjust the perennial strife between the Greek dialects, by enabling us to determine where each of them has preserved the purest and the oldest forms?

The relations of the ancient Indian languages to their European kindred are, in part, so palpable as to be obvious to every one who casts a glance at them, even from a distance in part, however, so concealed, so deeply implicated in the most secret passages of the organization of the language, that we are compelled to consider every language subjected to a comparison with it, as also the language itself, from new stations of observation, and to employ the highest powers of grammatical science and method in order to recognise and illustrate the original unity of the different grammars. The Semitic languages are of a more compact nature, and, putting out of sight lexicographical and syntactical features, extremely meagre in contrivance; they had little to part with, and of necessity have handed down to succeeding ages what they were endowed with at starting. The triconsonantal fabric of their roots (§ 107), which distinguishes this race from others, was already of itself sufficient to designate the parentage of every individual of the family. The family bond, on the other hand, which embraces the Indo-European race of languages, is not indeed less universal, but, in most of its bearings, of a quality infinitely more refined. The members of this race inherited, from the period of their earliest youth,

endowments of exceeding richness, and, with the capability (§ 108) the methods also, of a system of unlimited composition and agglutination. Possessing much, they were able to bear the loss of much and yet to retain their local life and by multiplied losses, alterations suppressions of sounds, conversions and displacements, the members of the common family are become scarcely recognisable to each other. It is at least a fact that the relation of the Greek to the Latin, the most obvious and palpable, though never quite overlooked, has been, down to our time grossly misunderstood and that the Roman tongue which, in a grammatical point of view, is associated with nothing but itself, or with what is of its own family, is even now usually regarded as a mixed language because in fact, it contains much which sounds heterogeneous to the Greek although the elements from which these forms arose are not foreign to the Greek and other sister languages as I have endeavoured partly to demonstrate in my "System of Conjugation" *

The close relationship between the Classical and Germanic languages has with the exception of mere comparative lists of words copious indeed, but destitute of principle and critical judgment remained, down to the period of the appearance of the Asiatic intermediary almost entirely unobserved, although the acquaintance of philologists with the Gothic dates now from a century and a half and that language is so perfect in its Grammar and so clear in its affinities, that had it been earlier submitted to a rigorous and systematic process of comparison and anatomical investigation the pervading relation

* Frankfort a M 1816 A translation of my English revision of this treatise ("Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit Greek Latin and Teutonic Languages in the 'Annals of Oriental Literature London 1820') by Dr. I. A. B. is to be found in the second and third number of the second annual issue of Seeboed's new Record of Philology and Pædagogical science. Grimm's masterly German Grammar was unfortunately unknown to me when I wrote the English revision and I could then make use only of Hickes and Fulda for the old German dialect

of itself, and, with it, of the entire Germanic stock, to the Greek and Roman, would necessarily have long since been unveiled, tracked through all its variations, and by this time been understood and recognised by every philologist* For what is more important, or can be more earnestly desired by the cultivator of the classical languages, than their comparison with our mother tongue in her oldest and most perfect form? Since the Sanskrit has appeared above our horizon, that element can no longer be excluded from a really profound investigation of any province of language related to it; a fact, however, which sometimes escapes the notice of the most approved and circumspect labourers in this department.† We need

* Rask has been the first to supply a comprehensive view of the close relationship between the Germanic and the Classical Languages, in his meritorious prize treatise "On the Thracian Tribe of Languages," completed in 1814 and published in 1818, from which Vater gives an extract in his Comparative Tables It cannot be alleged as a reproach against him that he did not profit by the Asiatic intermediary not then extensively known, but his deficiency in this respect shews itself the more sensibly, as we see throughout that he was in a condition to use it with intelligence Under that deficiency, however, he almost everywhere halts halfway towards the truth We have to thank him for the suggestion of the law of displacement of consonants, more acutely considered and fundamentally developed by Grimm (§ 87, and see Vater, § 12)

† We refer the reader to the very weighty judgment of W. von Humboldt on the indispensable necessity of the Sanskrit for the history and philosophy of language (*Indische Bibl* I 133) We may here borrow, also, from Grimm's preface to the second edition of his admirable Grammar, some words which are worthy of consideration (I vi) "As the too exalted position of the Latin and Greek serves not for all questions in German Grammar, where some words are of simpler and deeper sound, so however, according to A. W. Schlegel's excellent remark, the far more perfect Indian Grammar may, in these cases, supply the requisite corrections The dialect which history demonstrates to be the oldest and least corrupted must, in the end, present the most profound rules for the general exposition of the race, and thus lead us on to the reformation, without the entire subversion of the rules hitherto discovered, of the more recent modes of speech"

not fear that that practical and profound research in *utraque lingua* which is of most importance to the philologist can suffer prejudice by extension over too many languages, for the variety vanishes when the real identity is recognised and explained and the false light of discrepancy is excluded. It is one thing also, to learn a language, another to teach one, *z e* to describe its mechanism and organization. The learner may confine himself within the narrowest limits, and forbear to look beyond the language to be studied. the teacher's glance on the contrary, must pass beyond the confined limits of one or two members of a family and he must summon around him the representatives of the entire race in order to infuse life order, and organic mutual dependency into the mass of the languages spread before him. To attempt this appears to me the main requirement of the present period and past centuries have been accumulating materials for the task.

The Zend Grammar could only be recovered by the process of a severe regular etymology, calculated to bring back the unknown to the known the much to the little, for this remarkable language which in many respects reaches beyond and is an improvement on, the Sanskrit and makes its theory more attainable would appear to be no longer intelligible to the disciples of Zoroaster. Rishi, who had the opportunity to satisfy himself on this head says expressly (V d Hagen, p 33) that its forgotten lore has yet to be rediscovered. I am also able I believe to demonstrate that the Pehlvi translator (tom II pp 476 et seq) of the Zend Vocabulary, edited by Anquetil has frequently and entirely failed in conveying the grammatical sense of the Zend words which he translates. The work abounds with singular mistakes, and the distorted relation of Anquetil's French translation to the Zend expressions is usually to be ascribed to the mistakes in the Pehlvi interpretations of the Zend original. Almost all the oblique cases by degrees come to take rank as nominatives the number too, are sometimes mistaken. Further we find forms

of cases produced by the Pehlvi translator as verbal persons, and next these also confounded with each other, or translated by abstract nouns * Anquetil makes, as far as I know, no

* I give the Zend expressions according to the system of representation explained in § 30, annexing the original characters, which are exhibited in type for the first time in this book, and which were lately cut at the order of the Royal Society of Literature by R Gotzlig, according to the exemplar of the lithographed M.S of M Burnouf I give the Pehlvi words exactly according to Anquetil (II 435) 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ahmâhēm*, “*ἡμῶν*,” P *rouman* (cf p 502, *roman*, “*nos*”), A “*je*,” “*moi*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ahubya*, “*bons*” (with dual termination, § 215), P. *avaéh*, A “*bon*,” “*excellent*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *aété*, “*hi*,” “*u*,” P *var man*, “*is*,” A “*tu*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *anhēm*, “*I was*,” or also “*I am*,” P *dyanounad*, “*he is*,” A “*il est*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *anheus*, “*mundi*,” P *ahhé*, A “*le monde*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *avaéshanm*, “*horum*,” P *varmouschan*, “*u*,” A “*eux*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *baraiti*, “*fert*,” P *dadi ouneschné*, “*the carrying*” (*eschné*, in Pehlvi, forms abstract substantives), A “*il porte*,” “*il exécute*,” “*porter*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bis*, “*twice*,” P *dou*, “*two*,” A “*deux*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *berétebiô* (𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *baratibyô*, “*ferentibus*?” unquestionably a plural dative and ablative), P. *dadrouneschné*, “*the carrying*,” A “*porter*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *té*, “*tu*,” P *tou*, “*tu*,” A “*toi*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *tâcha*, “*eaque*” (neut § 231), P *zakedy*, A “*ce*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *jatô*, “*the smitten*” (cf Sansk *hatas* from *han*), P *maïtouned*, “*he smites*,” A. “*il frappe*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *janat*, “*he smote*,” P *maïtouneschné*, “*the smiting*,” A “*frappe*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *zanthra*, “*per genitorem*,” P *zarhounad*, “*gignit*,” A “*il engendre*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *štrî*, “*femina*,” P *vakad*, A “*femelle*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *štrîm*, “*feminam*,” P *vakad*, A “*femelle*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *štâranm*, “*stellanum*,” P *setaran*, A “*les étoiles*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *fra-dâtâr*, “*to the given*,” or “*especially given*,” P. *feraz dcheschné* (*nomen actionis*), A “*donner abondamment*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *gaéthananm*, “*mundorum*,” P *guehan* (cf 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀), A “*le monde*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *gâtûmcha*, “*locumque*,” P *gâh*, A “*heu*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *nars*, “*of the man*,” P *guebna hamat adlah*, A “*un homme*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *nara*, “*two men*,” P. *guebna hamat dou*, A “*deux hommes*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *nâr یشانanm*, “*feminarum*,” P *nâr-ik hamat sé*, A “*trois (ou plusieurs) femmes*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *thryanm*, “*trium*,” P *sevin*, A “*troisième*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vahmëmcha*, “*praclarumque*,” P *neaeschne*, “*adoratio*,” A “*je fais néaesch*,” 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vah-mâi*, “*praclaro*,” P *nâesch*, *konam*, “*adorationem facio*,” A “*je beus*

one in question cannot therefore be ascribed to any very late period. The necessity, indeed, of interpretation for the Zend must have been felt much sooner than for the Pehlvi, which remained much longer current among the Parsee tribes. It was therefore an admirable problem which had for its solution the bringing to light, in India, and, so to say, under the very eye of the Sanskrit, a sister language, no longer understood, and obscured by the rubbish of ages;—a problem of which the solution indeed has not hitherto been fully obtained, but beyond doubt will be. The first contribution to the knowledge of this language which can be relied on—that of Rask—namely, his treatise “On the age and authenticity of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta,” published in 1826, and made generally accessible by V. d. Hagen’s translation, deserves high honour as a first attempt. The Zend has to thank this able man (whose premature death we deeply deplore) for the more natural appearance which it has derived from his rectification of the value of its written characters. Of three words of different declensions he gives us the singular inflections, though with some sensible deficiencies, and those, too, just in the places where the Zend forms are of most interest, and where are some which display that independence of the Sanskrit which Rask claims, perhaps in too high a degree, for the Zend, a language we are, however, unwilling to receive as a mere dialect of the Sanskrit, and to which we are compelled to ascribe an independent existence, resembling that of the Latin as compared with the Greek, or the Old Northern with the Gothic. For the rest, I refer the reader to my review of Rask’s and Bohlen’s treatises on the Zend in the *Annual of Scientific Criticism* for December 1831, as also to an earlier work (March 1831) on the able labours of E. Burnouf in this newly-

self with having pointed out the possibility of another view of the construction, different from that which has been very profoundly discussed by Burnouf, and which is based on Nerosengh. The second passage signifies, “I call upon and magnify the stars, the moon, the sun, the eternal, self-created lights!”

opened field. My observations derived from the original texts edited by Burnouf in Paris, and by Olsenius in Hamburg already extend themselves in these publications, over all parts of the Zend Grammar and nothing therefore has remained for me here, but further to establish, to complete and to adjust the particulars in such a manner that the reader may be conducted on a course parallel with that of the known languages, with the greatest facility towards an acquaintance with the newly discovered sister tongue. In order to obviate the difficulty and the labour which attend the introduction of the learner to the Zend and Sanskrit—difficulty sufficient to deter many, and to harass any one—I have appended to the original characters the pronunciation, laid down on a consistent method, or in places where for reasons of space, one character alone is given it is the Roman. This method is also perhaps the best for the gradual introduction of the reader to the knowledge of the original characters.

As in this work the languages it embraces are treated for their own sakes as objects and not means of knowledge, and as I aim rather at giving a physiology of them than an introduction to their practical use it has been in my power to omit many particulars which contribute nothing to the character of the whole and I have gained thereby more space for the discussion of matters more important and more intimately incorporated with the vital spirit of the language. By this process and by the strict observance of a method which brings under one view all points mutually dependent and mutually explanatory, I have as I flatter myself succeeded in assembling under one group and in a reasonable space the leading incidents of many richly endowed languages or grand dialects of an extinct original stock. Special care has been bestowed throughout on the German. This care was indispensable to one who, following Grimm's admirable work aimed at applying to it the correction and adjustment that had become necessary in his theory of relations the discovery of new affinities, or the more precise definition of those discovered and to catch with greater truth at every step of grammatical progress, the

monitory voices of the Asiatic as well as the European sisterhood. It was necessary, also, to set aside many false appearances of affinity, as, for example, to deprive the *i* in the Lithuanian *geri* of its supposed connection with the *i* of Gothic, Greek, and Latin forms, such as *gōdar*, ἀγαθοί, *boni* (see p. 251, Note †, and compare Grimm I. 827. 11); and to disconnect the Latin *is* of *lupis* (*lupibus*) from the Greek *is* of λύκοις (λύκοι-σι). As concerns the method followed in treating the subject of Germanic grammar, it is that of deducing all from the Gothic as the guiding star of the German, and explaining the latter simultaneously with the older languages and the Lithuanian. At the close of each lecture on the cases, a tabular view is given of the results obtained, in which every thing naturally depends on the most accurate distinction of the terminations from the base, which ought not, as usually happens, to be put forward capriciously, so that a portion of the base is drawn into the inflection, by which the division becomes not merely useless, but injurious, as productive of positive error. Where there is no real termination none should be appended for appearance sake: thus, for example, we give, §. 148, p. 164, the nominatives χώρα, *terra*, *gība*, &c., as without inflection cf. §. 137. The division *gīb-a* would lead us to adopt the erroneous notion that *a* is the termination, whereas it is only the abbreviation of the *ō* (from the old *ā*, §. 69.) of the theme* In certain instances it is extraordi-

* The simple maxim laid down elsewhere by me, and deducible only from the Sanskrit, that the Gothic *ō* is the long of *a*, and thereby when shortened nothing but *a*, as the latter lengthened can only become *ō*, extends its influence over the whole grammar and construction of words, and explains, for example, how from *dags*, "day" (theme *DAGA*), may be derived, without change of vowel, *dōgs* (*DŌGA*), "daily", for this derivation is absolutely the same as when in Sanskrit *rajata*, "*argentus*," comes from *rājata*, "*argentum*," on which more hereafter. Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the Indian system of vowels, pure from consonantal and other altering influences, is of extraordinary importance for the elucidation of the German grammar. On it principally rests my own theory of vowel change, which differs materially from that of Grimm, and which I explain by mechanical laws, with some modifications of my earlier definitions,

narily difficult in languages not now thoroughly understood to hit on the right divisions, and to distinguish apparent terminations from true. I have never attempted to conceal these difficulties from the reader but always to remove them from his path.

The High German, especially in its oldest period (from the eighth to the eleventh century) I have only mentioned in the general description of forms when it contributes something of importance. The juxta-position of it in its three main periods with the Gothic, grammatically explained at the close of each chapter is sufficient, with a reference also to the treatise on sounds intended to prepare and facilitate my whole Grammar, after the model of my Sanskrit Grammar. Wherever in addition, explanatory remarks are necessary, they are given. The second part will thus begin with the comparative view of the Germanic declensions and I shall then proceed to the adjectives, in order to describe their formations of gender and degrees of comparison, from these to the pronouns.

As the peculiarities of inflection of the latter must have, for the most part, already been discussed in the doctrine of the universal formation of the cases, inasmuch as they are intimately connected and mutually illustrative, what will remain to be said on their behalf will claim the less space and the main compass of the second division will remain for the verb. To the formation and comparison of words it is my intention to devote a separate work which may be considered as a completion of its antecedent. In this latter the particles conjunctions and original prepositions will find their place being I consider partly offshoots of pronominal roots, and partly nasal roots of

tions, while with Grimm it has a dynamic signification. A comparison with the Greek and Latin vocalism without a steady reference to the Sanskrit is in my opinion, for the German more confusing than enlightening, as the Gothic is generally more original in its vocal system and at least more consistent than the Greek and Latin which latter spends its whole wealth of vowels although not without pervading rules in merely responding to a solitary Indian *a* (*septurus* for *septimas* *quatuor* for *chatur* *as* ϵ σ ρ ϵ *momordi* f r *mamarda*)

this class of words, and which will, therefore, be treated in this point of view among the pronominal adjectives } It is likely that a chasm in our literature, very prejudicial to inquiries of this kind, may be shortly filled up by a work ready for the press, and earnestly looked for by all friends of German and general philology, the Old High German Treasury of Graff. What we may expect from a work founded on a comprehensive examination of the MS. treasures of libraries national and foreign, as well as on a collection of printed materials, may be gathered from a survey of the amount contributed to knowledge in a specimen of the work, small, but happily selected, "The Old High German Prepositions"

- I refer the reader preliminarily to my two last treatises (Berlin, Ferd Dümmler) "On Certain Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions," and "On the Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words" Compare, also, C Gottl Schmidt's excellent tract "Quæst Gramm de Præpositionibus Græcis," and the review of the same, distinguished by acute observations, by A Benary, in the Berlin Annual (May 1830) If we take the adverbs of place in their relation to the prepositions—and a near relation does exist—we shall find in close connection with the subject a remarkable treatise of the minister W von Humboldt, "On the Affinity of the Adverbs of Place to the Prepositions in certain Languages" The Zend has many grammatical rules which were established without these discoveries, and have since been demonstrated by evidence of facts Among them it was a satisfaction to me to find a word, used in Sanskrit only as a preposition (*aa*, "from,") in the Zend a perfect and declinable pronoun (§ 172) Next we find *sa-cha*, "*isque*," which in Sanskrit is only a pronoun, in its Zend shape *𑀲𑀸𑀓𑀸𑀓* *ha-cha* (§ 53), often used as a preposition to signify "out of", the particle *𑀲𑀸* *cha*, "and," loses itself, like the cognate *que* in *absque*, in the general signification

"Remark—What in § 68 is said of the use of the *u* or *o* out of the older *a* is so far to be corrected according to my later conviction, that nothing but a retroactive influence is to be ascribed to the liquids, and the *u* and the *o*, in forms like *plintemu* (*mo*), *plintgu*, are to be exempted from the influence of the antecedent consonants."

† The arrangement thus announced, as intended, has undergone, as will be seen, considerable modification—*Editor*

COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR

CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS

SANSKRIT writing distinguishes the long from their corresponding short vowels by particular characters slightly differing from these latter in form. We distinguish the long vowel and the diphthongs ए e and ओ o which spring from *i* and *u* united with an antecedent *a* by a circumflex. The simple vowels are first the three original and common to all languages *a* *i* *u* short and long secondly a vowel *r* peculiar to the Sanskrit which I distinguish by *r* and its long sound by *r̄*. The short *r* (ऋ) is pronounced like the consonant *r* with a scarcely distinguishable *i* and in European texts is usually written *ri* the long *r̄* (ॠ) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an *r* with a long *i*. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin, and *r* presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable *ar* by suppression of the *a*. The long *r̄* (ॠ) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the *r* where according to the laws of the formation of cases a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened and in the conjugation and formation of words those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating ऋ *r̄* almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel अर् *ar* इर् *ir* उर् *ur* or after labials ऊर् *ur*. The last simple vowel of the Sanskrit writing belongs more to the grammarians [G Ed p 9] than to the language it is in character, as well as in pronunciation an union of an ल *l* with ऋ *r* (ऌ) or when lengthened with ॡ *r̄* (ॡ). We require no representative for this vowel, and shall not further advert to it.

2 Sanskrit possesses two kinds of diphthongs. In the one

a short *a* united with a following *i* becomes ए *é* (equivalent to the French *ai*), and with *u* becomes औ *ô* (equivalent to the French *au*), so that neither of the united elements is heard, but both melt into a third sound. In the second kind, a long *â* with a following *i* becomes ऐ *ai*, and with *u*, औ *au*, as in the German words *weise, baum*; so that the two elements form indeed one syllable, but are both audible. In order, however, to fix the observation on the greater weight of the *a* in this diphthong, we write âi for ऐ, and âu for औ. That in ए *é* and औ *ô* a short, in ऐ *âi* and औ *âu*, a long *a* is bound up, I infer from this, that where, in order to avoid a hiatus, the last element of a diphthong merges into its corresponding semi-vowel, out of ए *é* and औ *ô* proceed the sounds अय् *ay* and अव् *av* (with short *a*), but out of ऐ *âi* and औ *âu* proceed ây and âv. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding आ *â*, with an इ *i*, ई *î*, or उ *u*, ऊ *û* of a following word, be contracted, like the short *a*, into ए *é* and औ *ô*, but not into ऐ *âi* and औ *âu*, this, in my view, is to be understood as if the long *a*, before its combination with the initial vowel of the following word, had shortened itself. This should the less surprise us, as the long *a* before a dissimilar vowel of an appended inflexion or a suffix entirely disappears, and, for example, दादा *dadâ* with उस् *us* makes neither ददौस् *dadâus*, nor ददोस् *dadôs*, but ददुस् *dadus*. The opinion I have already expressed on [G. Ed p 3] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend, in which ञ्वा *âi* always stands in the place of the Sanskrit ऐ *âi*, and ञ्वा *âo* or ञ्वा *âu* for औ *âu*. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding *a* (short or long) with a following ए *é* or औ *ô*, becomes ऐ *âi* and औ *âu*, of which it is to be understood, that the short *a* contained in *é* and *ô* merges with the antecedent *a* into a long *a*, which then, with the *i* of the diphthong *é*, becomes *âi*, and with the *u* of *ô*, becomes *âu*. For example, भमैतत् *mamâitat*, from भम एतत् *mama êtat*, is to be understood

as if the diphthong ए é united its first element *a* with the preceding *a* into *ā*, and with this further united its last element (१) into ऐ *āi*

3 Among the simple vowels the old Indian alphabet is deficient in the designation of the Greek epsilon and omicron (*e* and *o*) whose sounds, if they existed when the Sanskrit was a living language yet could only have evolved themselves subsequently to the fixing of its written character out of the short *a* for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between *a e* and *ō*, if the sounds had been forthcoming * It is important here to observe that in the oldest Germanic dialect namely the Gothic the sounds and characters of the short *e* and *o* are also wanting and that either *a i* or *u* corresponds in that dialect to our German short *e* For example *falltha* ich falte I fold *giba* 'ich gebe

I give In the Zend the Sanskrit ए *a* remains usually *ā a* or has changed itself, according to certain [G Ed p 4] rules into ए *ē* Thus for example before a concluding *m* we always find ए *ē* compare the accusative ए^२७३३ *puthra m* filium with पुत्रं *putra m* and its genitive पुत्रा^२७३३ *puthra he* with पुत्रस्य *putra sya* In Greek the Sanskrit ए *a* becomes *α e* or *ο o* without presenting any certain rules for the choice on each occasion between these three vowels but the prevailing practice is, that in the terminations of nominal bases the Greek *ο* answers to the Indian ए *a* except in the vocatives where an *e* is substituted In the Latin besides *ū e* and *o u* also is employed in the terminations of nouns of the second declension and of the first person plural, as also in some adverbial suffixes to replace the Sanskrit ए *a*

4 As in the Greek the short Sanskrit *a* is oftener replaced by *e* or *o* than by a short *a* so the long ए *ā* is oftener re-

* Grimm Vol 1 p 594 with whom I entirely concur in this matter having long abandoned a contrary opinion which I maintained in 1819 in the Annals of Oriental Literature

presented by η or ω than by a long alpha and though in the Doric the long α has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an η , no similar trace of the long \bar{a} for ω is to be found दधामि *dadhāmi* "I place," becomes τίθημι, ददामि *dadāmi*, "I give," δίδωμι, the dual termination ताम् *tām* answers to την, and only in the imperative to των on the other hand, the आस् *ām* of the genitive plural is always represented by ων. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either η or ω stand for the Indian diphthongs ए \bar{e} or ओ \bar{o} , formed by इ i or an उ u following a long \bar{a} for the first, the Greek substitutes ci or oi (because for अ a , and also for α , c and o are the substitutes), and for the last, cu or ou . Thus, एमि *ēmi*, "I go," becomes $\hat{c}\mu$, पतेस् *patēs*, "thou mayest fall," πίπτοις, दे $i\acute{e}la$, "I know," οἶδα, गो *go*, mas fem "a bullock or heifer," βοῦ-ς. From this dropping of the i or u in the Indian diphthongs \acute{e} and \acute{o} it

[G Ed p 5] may happen that α , c , or o , answer to these diphthongs, thus, एकतरस् *ēkataras*, "one of two," becomes $\acute{e}k\acute{a}t\acute{c}p\acute{o}s$, देव $d\acute{e}va$, "brother-in-law," Latin, *leui* (nom देवा $d\acute{e}v\acute{a}$, accus. देवम् *devam-am*), becomes $\delta\acute{\alpha}\eta\rho$ (from $\delta\acute{\alpha}F\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\delta\acute{\alpha}iF\acute{\eta}\rho$), देवस् $d\acute{e}va-s$, "God," $\Theta\acute{c}\acute{o}s$, and the o in $\beta\acute{o}\acute{o}s$, $\beta\acute{o}i$, stands for $\beta\acute{o}u\acute{o}s$, $\beta\acute{o}u\acute{i}$, the u of which must have passed into F , and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin *bovis*, *bovi*, and the Indian गवि *gavi* (locative) from $g\acute{o}i$

5 In Latin we sometimes find the long e , which, however, may be shortened by the influence of the following consonant, arising from the mixture of a and i , as in the above-mentioned word *levis*, and in the subjunctive *amemus* of कामयेम *kāmayēma* from *kāmayā-īma*

6 If we inquire after the greater or less relative weight of the vowels of different quality, I have discovered, by

* The original has *devr*, but, as observed in p 1, in European texts it is usual to write ri for च्च, and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment it seems advisable, therefore, to express च्च by ri — Editor

various but sure appearances which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms that in Sanskrit अ *a* and आ *ā* are graver than the corresponding quantity of the vowel *i* and this discovery is of the utmost importance for every Treatise on special as well as comparative Grammar. It leads us in particular to important discoveries with respect to the Germanic modification of vowels. In Latin, also the *i* may be considered as lighter than *a* and generally takes the place of the latter when a root with an original *a* would otherwise be burthened with a reduplication of sound. Hence for example *abjicio* for *abjacio*, *tetigi* for *tetagi*. I am compelled by this view to retract an earlier conjecture that the *i* in *tetigi* was produced by a virtue of assimilation in the termination *i*. I have also to relieve myself from my former theory that the *e* in words like *inermis imberbis* instead of [G Ed p 6] *inarmis imbarbis* springs from a retrospective power of assimilation in the following *i* after the fashion of the modification of the vowel in German (Grimm p 80) and must place it in the same class with the *e* in such forms as *abjectus* and *tubicen*. The Latin radical *a* for instance is subject to a double alteration when the root is burthened with antecedent syllables or words it becomes *i* in open syllables but *e* if the vowel is pressed upon by a following consonant unattended by a vowel. Hence we have *tubicen abjectus* in contrast to *tubicinis abjicio* and *inermis imberbis* not *inirmis imbirbis* on the contrary, *inimicus insipidus* not *inemicus insepidus*. In connection with this stands the transition of the first or second declension into the third. As *us* is the masculine form for *a*, we ought to say *inermus imberbus* but *inermis imberbis* and other such forms owe their origin to the lesser weight of the *i*. With the displacement of the accent where it occurs this change of the vowel has nothing to do but the removal of the accent and the weakening of the vowel are nearly related and are both occasioned by the composition. In the Lithuanian we find similar appearances as for ex

ample, *pónas* "lord," at the end of compounds, is weakened into *ponis*, as *íótponis*, "councillor," Germ *rathsherr*."

7 Sanskrit Grammar gives no certain indication of the relative weight of the *u* with regard to the other original vowels. The *u* is a vowel too decided and full of character to allow of its being exchanged in this language, in relief of its weight, for any other letter. It is the most obstinate of all, and admits of no exclusion from a terminating syllable, in cases where *a* and *i* admit suppression. Nor will it retire

[G Ed. p 7] from a reduplicated syllable in cases where *a* allows itself to be weakened down to *i*. Thus in Latin we have *pupugi*, *tutudi*, while *a*, in cases of repetition, is reduced to *i* or *ě* (*tctigi*, *fefelli*, &c.) In the Gothic, also, the *u* may boast of its pertinacity: it remains firm as the terminating vowel of nominal bases where *a* and *i* have undergone suppression, and in no single case has it been extinguished or transmuted. No power, however, exists which will not yield at last to time, and thus in the High German, whose oldest records are nearly four centuries younger than Ulphilas, the *u* has, in many cases, given way, or become in declension similar to *i*.

8. If, in the matter of the relative dignity of the vowels, we cast a glance at another race of languages, we find in Arabic the *u* taking precedence in nobility, as having its place in the nominative, while the declension is governed by the change of the terminating vowel, *i*, on the contrary, shews itself to be the weakest vowel, by having its place in the genitive, the most dependent case of the Arabic, and one which cannot be separated from the governing word. *I*, also, is continually used in cases where the grammatical relation is expressed by a preposition. Compare, also, in the plural, the *ina* of the nominative with the termination *ina* of the oblique cases. *A* stands between the strong *u* and the weaker *i*, and under the threefold change of vowels has its place in the accusative, which admits of more freedom than the genitive. In the

oblique cases, however, of nouns, and in the two fold change of vowels it stands opposed to the *u* of the nominative, and in the dependent subjunctive of the verb to the *u* of the independent indicative.

9 Between the vowels and the consonants or at the close of the list of vowels, are commonly placed two signs, the sounds of which are rather to be considered as appendages to, or modifications of the preceding vowels, than as independent sounds, and take also no place in the alphabet of the Native Grammarians, inasmuch as they are considered neither as consonants nor vowels but rather as complements to the latter. The first, which we distinguish by *n* is called *Anuswāra*, "echo" and is in fact, a thick nasal echo which I think is best represented by the nasal *n* at the end of a French syllable. The weakness of its expression is discernible in the fact that it does not, like a consonant impede the euphonic influence of an *i* or *u* on a following *s*, (see Sanskrit Grammar R 101^b). It has its place before semi vowels (य् *y* र् *r* ल् *l* व् *v*) sibilants and *h* and we might thence term it the nasal of the two last lists of consonants, and assign its alphabetical place between them. A concluding म *m* followed by a consonant of the said two lists, passes into Anuswara for example तस्यम् *tasyām* in this becomes तस्यम् *tasyān* with the French nasal pronunciation of the *n* if such a word रात्रौ *rātrāu* in the night come after. In connection with the स् *s* of a verbal termination a radical न् *n* also passes into Anuswara as हंसि *hanṣi* thou killest from हन् *han*. Great confusion however has arisen from the circumstance that the Indian copyists allow themselves to express the unaltered concluding म् *m* as well as all the nasal alterations and, in the middle of words, each of the six nasal sounds (the proper Anuswara included), by Anuswara * I have

The practice is not unauthorized by rule. A final म् is convertible to Anuswara before any consonant (I An 8 3 23); and a medial न् or म् is convertible

endeavoured, in my Grammar, to remedy this confusion in the simple theory of Anuswâra. My predecessors in the treatment of Sanskrit Grammar make no distinction between the real and the supposititious Anuswâra. Colebrooke gives it, in [G Ed p 9] general, the pronunciation of *n*, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding ण् *n*, may be abbreviated into Anuswâra Forster expresses it by the *n* in the English word *plinth*, Carey and Yates by the English combination *ny*. Wilkins by *m*. All substitute it for the concluding ण् of grammatical terminations and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswâra into ण् or ण्, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write *abhavan* or *abhavang*, "I was," *dantan* or *dontang*, "a tooth," not *abhavam*, *dantam*. Colebrooke, on the other hand, expressing a Sanskrit inscription in Roman letters (Asiatic Transactions, Vol VII) gives the proper termination *m*, and before *t*, by a euphonic rule, *n*, but he maintains the original *m* before sibilants and half vowels where Anuswâra is due, as *viduishâm śīmad*, for विदुश्चाम् *viduishâm*. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write *n*, for the value of Anuswâra, in the place of *m* in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives *danan*, "a gift," for *dānam*, the second, *ahan* for *aham*, "I". A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly *m* instead of a spurious or representative Anuswâra at the end of words, and makes, for example, the infinitive termination in *tum*, not in *tun* or *tung*. He nevertheless, on this important point of grammar, retains the erroneous opinion, that the Anuswâra is a variable nasal, which, before vowels, must of necessity pass into *m* (Preface to the Bhag Gita, p. xv.), while the direct converse is the fact, that the concluding *m* is convertible to Anuswâra before any consonant except a semi-vowel or a nasal (Ib 8 3 24). Such are the rules. In practice, the mutation of the final ण् is constant that of the medial nasal is more variable, and in general the change occurs before the semi-vowels and sibilants — *Eaton*

the variable nasal, which under certain conditions, passes into the proper Anusvara but before vowels, necessarily retained both in writing and pronunciation. [G. L. p. 10] That Von Schlegel also still continues the original πm at the end of words as an euphonic alteration of the dead sound of Anusvara appears from his mode of printing Sanskrit text in which he makes no division between a concluding πr and the commencing vowel of the following word while he does make a division after τn and thereby shows that he admits a division after terminating letters which remain unaffected by the influence of the letters which follow. If however we write $\pi\tau \times \mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ *tim abrait* he said to them we must not write $\pi\tau \times \mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ *tim abrait* he said to her not $\alpha\tau\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ *timabrait* for the π of $\pi\tau$ *tim* is original and not as Von Schlegel thinks, gotten out of Anusvara. The conjecture of C. Lassen (Ind. Bibl. Book III p. 31) that the Anusvara is to be understood not as an after sound (*Nachlaut*) nor as an echo (*Nachhall*) but as a sound which regulates itself by that which follows—as it were the term *Nachlaut* with the accent on *laut**—appears to me highly improbable. Schlegel's *nasalis m labialis* would indeed be justified by this view and the imputation of error removed from the Indian Grammarians to whom we willingly concede a knowledge of the value of the Sanskrit signs of sound and whom we are unwilling to censure for designating a half so indistinctly in a language whose termi-

* This seems intended for an explanation of Lassen's has nothing like it. I have not found an etymological explanation of the term in any grammatical commentary but it may be doubted if the explanation of the text or that given by Lassen, be correct. Anusvara may indeed be termed *sequens sibilis* but by that is to be understood the final or closing sound of a syllable. Any other nasal may be used as the initial letter of a syllable, but the nasal Anusvara is exclusively an 'after sound' or final. It is not even equal to *h* ending as it were, with a following vowel like a final *n* or *m* as in *tin* or *timabrait*. It is the legitimate representative of either of the other nasals when those are absolutely terminal.

nating sounds are almost always governed by the following words. It is true the half sound owes its being to the mutability of a concluding *m*, but is not mutable itself, since it never has an independent existence of its own at the end of any word in the middle, however, of a radical syllable, as दम् *dam*, हिम् *hims*, it is susceptible of expulsion, but not of alteration

[G Ed p 11] That the Indian Grammarians, however, consider the *m* and not the *n* as the original but mutable letter in grammatical terminations, like अम् *am*, भ्याम् *bhyām*, &c, appears from the fact that they always write these terminations, where they give them separate, with the labial nasal, and not with Anuswâra. If it be objected that this is of no importance, as dependent on the caprice of the editor or copyist, we can adduce as a decisive proof of the just views of the Indian Grammarians in this respect, that when they range the declensions of words in the order of their terminating letters, the Pronouns इदम् *idam*, and किम् *kim*, in which they consider the *m* as primitive, are treated when the turn comes of the labial nasal *m*, and together with प्रीतिम् *prīṣām*, "quiet," from the root शम् *śam* (Laghu-Kaumudî, p 46)

10 The deadened nasal, which is expressed in the Lithuanian by particular signs over the vowel which it follows, appears to be identical with the Sanskrit Anuswâra, and we write it in the same manner with *ñ*. At the end of words it stands for the remainder of an ancient *m*, in the accusative singular for example, and the deadening of *n* before *s* into *ñ* presents

terminal, and in pronunciation retains their respective sounds, according to the initial consonant of the following word. Again, with regard to its relation to the semi-vowels and sibilants, it may be regarded as appropriate to them merely in as far as neither of the other nasals is so considered. In this sense Anuswâra may be termed a subsidiary or supplemental sound, being prefixed with most propriety to those letters which, not being classed under either of the five series of sounds, have no rightful claim to the nasals severally comprehended within each respective series.—*Editor*

a remarkable accordance with the Sanskrit rule of euphony before mentioned. From *laupsin-u*, "I praise, therefore comes *laupsinsu* 'I shall praise' as in Sanskrit *हस्यसि* *hansyāsi* 'I shall kill' from the root *हन्* *han*. In the Prakrit not only the *म्* but the *न्* at the end of words has always fallen into Anuswara without regard to the following letters. Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the *Sakuntalā* p. 70 भञ्ज which is certainly to be pronounced not *bhañam* but *bhaavan* for भञ्जन् *bhañan*. [G. Ed. p. 12.]

कुप *kudhan* for कुपन् *kutham* *

11 The second of the signs before mentioned is named Visarga which signifies abandonment. It expresses a breathing, which is never primitive but only appears at the end of words in the character of an euphonic alteration of *स* *s* and *र* *r*. These two letters (*s* *r*) are very mutable at the end of words, and are changed into Visarga before a pause or the deadened letters of the guttural and labial classes (§ 12). We write this sign *h* to distinguish it from the true *ह* *h*.

12 The proper consonants are classed in the Sanskrit alphabet according to the organs used in their pronunciation and form in this division five classes. A sixth is formed by the semi-vowels and a seventh by the sibilants and the *ह* *h*. In the first five ranks of these consonants the single letters are so arranged, that the first are the surd or hard consonants, the thin (*tenues*) and their aspirates, next the sonant or soft, the medials and their aspirates, each class being completed by its nasal. The nasals belong like the vowels and semi-vowels to the sonants, the sibilants to the surd or hard. Every thin and every medial letter has its corresponding aspirate. The aspirates are pronounced like their

No native scholar would read these as *bhañan* or *kudhan* as the text affirms, but *bhañam*, *kudham*, agreeably to the final *म्* represented by Anuswara — Editor

respective non-aspirates, with a clearly audible *h*, thus, for example, *त् th*, not like the English *th*, *क् kh*, not *f* or *ph*, and *ल् lh*, not like the Greek χ †. In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other, thus, *भर् bhan*, *धर् dhar*, (*भृ bhri*, *धृ dhri*, § 1) “to bear,” “to hold,” are perhaps originally identical *धृन् dhūma-s*,

[G. Ed p 13] “smoke,” is, in Latin, *fumu-s*. In Greek, *θάνω*, as well as *φίνω*, is related to *हन् han*, from *धन् dhan*, “to kill.” The Gothic *thluhan* is the German *stehen*, Old High German *uluhan*

13 The first class is that of the gutturals, and includes the letters *क् k*, *ख kh*, *ग g*, *घ gh*, *ङ n*. The nasal of this class is pronounced like the German *n* before gutturals, as in the words *sinken*, *enge*, so as to prepare for the following guttural. In the middle of words it is only found before gutturals, and, at the end, supplies the place of *म् m* when the following word begins with a guttural | We write it without the distinctive sign, as its guttural nature is easily recognised by the following consonant. The aspirates of this class are not of frequent use, either at the beginning or end of words. In some Greek words we find χ in the place of *ख kh* compare *ὄνυξ*, *ὄνυχος*, with *nakha*, “a nail,” *κόρυχη*, *κόρυχος*, with *śankha*, “shell,” *χαίνω*, *χαιῶ*, with *khan*, “to

The original here adds—“We designate the aspirate by a comma, as *t̄*, *d̄*, *b̄*” The use of such a mark is, however, unsightly, and appears likely to cause occasional perplexity and doubt. It seems therefore preferable to adhere to the usual mode of expressing the aspirated letters, as *dh*, *bh*, and the like. It is only necessary to remember that *th* and *ph* are the letters *t* and *p* with an aspiration, and not the *th* and *f* of the English alphabet—*Editor*

† A careful examination will perhaps shew that the several nasals of the Sanskrit alphabet are mere modifications of one sound, according to the manner in which that is affected by a succeeding letter, and that the modifications prevail equally in most languages, although it has not been thought necessary to provide them with distinct symbols —*Editor*

dig As regards the sonant aspirates the च *gh* of *gharma* heart (in Greek *θερμη*) has passed into the aspiration of another organ लघु *laghu* light has had aside the guttural in the Latin *levis* and in virtue of the *i* changed the *u* into *v* The guttural has kept its place in the German *leicht* the English *light* and the Old High German *liht*

14 The second class is that of the palatals and includes the sounds *ch* and *j* with their aspirates and nasal We write च *ch* छ *chh* ज् *j** झ् *jh** ञ *n* This class is an offshoot from the preceding and to be considered as a softening of it It is only found before vowels and weak consonants (semi vowels and nasals) and before strong consonants and at the end of a word generally retires into the class from which it springs Thus for example the base [G Ed p 14] वाच *vāch* speech voice (cf *voc*) makes in the uninflected nominative वाक् *vāk* in the instrumental and locative plurals वाग्भिस् *vāgbhis* वाग्नु *vāgnu* In the cognate languages we have to look for in the place of the letters of this class first, gutturals next labials on account of their mutual affinity thirdly the sounds of *t* as according to pronunciation the first element of the palatals is a *t* or *d* fourthly sibilants as being the last element in the letters of this class Compare पचामि *pachāmi* I cook (inf *paktum* part pass *pakta*) with *coquo* *πεπω* (*πεπτω* *πεπτω*, *πεσσω*) चतुर् *chatur* four nom चतुर्णम् *chatuṅras* with *quatuor* *τετταρες* *τεσσαρες* Gothic *fiduōr* Lithuanian *Ietturi* पञ्चन् *panchan* five (nom accus *pancha*), with *quinque* *πεντε* *πεμπτε* Gothic *fimf* Lithuanian *penki*, राजन् *rājan* king with *rex* *regis*, राजस *rājasa* nom *rājasa* silver (from *rāj* to shine) with *argentum* *ἄργυρος* जानु *jānu* knee with *genu* *γουν* With regard to the aspirates of this class, the *chh* as an initial letter in some words answers to *sc* *σκ* च्छ *chhund*

* The original has *g* and *g* but the appropriate symbols in English are *j* and its aspirate

mas, "we cleave," चिन्नमि *chhinadmi*, "I cleave," answers to the Latin *scindo*; छाया *chhâyâ*, "shadow," to the Greek σκιά. As the terminating letter of a root *chh* answers, in प्रश् *prachh*, "to ask," to the Gothic *h* in *frah*, "I or he asked," and to the German and Latin *g* in *frage*, *rogo*, in case that the latter, as I suspect, is a modification of *progo*. The nasal of this class, for which we require no distinctive sign, as it only precedes palatals, deviates but slightly from the sound of the guttural *n*, and is pronounced nearly like *ŋ*.

15 The third class is called that of the linguals or cerebrals, and embraces a peculiar kind of sounds of *t*, together with its [G Ed p 15] nasal, a kind not original, but which has developed itself from the ordinary class of *t* sounds. We distinguish them by a point under the letter, thus, ट् *t*, ट् *th*, ड् *d*, ड् *dh*, ण् *n*. In the Prâkrit this class has obtained great supremacy, and has frequently supplanted the ordinary *t*. We there find, for example, भोडु *bhōdu*, for भवतु *bhavatu*, "let it be," and पडम *padhama*, for प्रथम *prathama*, "the first." With regard to the nasal, the substitution of ण् for न् is nearly universal. The Indian Graminarians approach the Prâkrit nearer than the Sanskrit, when at the beginning of roots they use the same substitution. The practice, also, which we have condemned (§ 9.), of using Anuswâra for म् *m*, at the end of words, is more Prâkrit than Sanskrit. At the beginning of words these letters are seldom found in Sanskrit, but they are found as terminations to a certain number of roots, for example, अत् *at*, "to go." They are pronounced by bending back the tongue against the roof of the mouth, by which a hollow sound is expressed, as if from the head. The nasal of this class has sometimes overstepped the limits of its usual laws: it is found before vowels, which

* Here, also, it may be doubted if similar modifications of the dental sounds are not discoverable in languages which do not express them by separate symbols. The *t* of the Italian *tutto* is the Sanskrit ट् —Editor

is not the case with the nasals of the preceding classes yet never at the beginning of words

16 The fourth class embraces the dentals or the sounds which properly answer to the common *d* and *t* together with the common *n* which belongs to them ढ् *t* थ् *th* द् *d* ध् *dh* न् *n* Of the aspirates of this organ we have to remark, that थ् *th* in an etymological respect never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by *θ* but always like the natural *t* by τ On the other hand ध् *dh* does correspond to *θ* which also sometimes represents द् *d* Thus the imperative ending धिद्भि in Greek becomes *θι* मधु *madhu* honey wine is μεθυ दधामि *dadhāmi* I place τιθημι दुहितη *duhitār* [G Pd p 16] (दुहितη *duhitri* § 1) daughter θυγατηρ द्वार *duār* f and *duāra* neut (nom *duaram*) door θυρα देव *dēva* Lithuan *dievas* God Οεος With regard to the hard aspirate compare the terminations τε and τον with थ् *tha* and थस *thas* the former in the plural the second in the dual of the present and future στήσω with स्थास्यामि *sthāsyāmi* I shall stand οστέον with ἄσθη *asthi* bone in the Latin *rola* with रथ *ratha* carriage and in the Gothic the ending *t* in the second person singular of the preterite with *tha* for example *icais t* thou knewest with वेत्थ *vet tha* From the beginning of words in the Sanskrit this aspirate is nearly excluded

17 The interchange of *d* and *l* is well known Upon it among other instances is founded the relation of *lacryma* to δακρυ δακρυμα In Sanskrit also an apparently original द् *d* often corresponds to the *l* of cognate European languages for example दीप् *dīp* to light दीप *dīpa* lamp becomes λαμπω λαμπας देह *dēha* body Gothic *leik* On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our *lf*, Gothic *lif* in *elf zwolf* Gothic *lialif* to दशन् *dasan* δεκα As also the second consonant has undergone alteration and has migrated from the gutturals into the

labials, and as, moreover, the number "ten," taken alone, is, in Gothic, *taihun*, in German *zehn*, its origin from *lif* was deeply concealed, and even the Lithuanian *lika*, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further

[G Ed. p 17] support. With respect to the affinity of *λίκος* in *ἡλίκος*, &c, and of the Gothic *leiks* in *in'eleiks*, "like to whom?" to *दृशदिसा*, *Práki it fēsdisa*, "like," I refer the reader to my Treatise on the Pi-noun and its influence (Berlin, published by Dummler), and only remark, in addition, that by this analogy of *λίκος*, *leiks*, I was first led to that of *lif* to *δέκα*, while the Lithuanian *lika* had not yet attracted my observation.

18 The labial class comes next, namely, *प् p*, *फ् ph*, *ब् b*, *भ् bh*, *म् m*. The hard aspirate *ph* is among the rarer letters, the most usual words in which it occurs are, *फल phala*, "fruit," *फेन phēna*, "foam," and the forms which come from the root *फुल् phull*, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate *bh* belongs, together with *ध dh*, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, *φ* and *f* are the letters which most frequently correspond to this *भ bh*, especially at the beginning of words; for example, *भृ bhṛi*, "to bear," *fero*, *φέρω*, *भू bhū*, "to be," *fu-i*, *φύ-ω*. *भ bh* is also often represented by *b* in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The *f* of *fero* becomes *b* in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as *ber*, *brum*, *bruum*, in words like *saluber*, *candelabrum*, *manubrium*. Thus the *f* of *fu* appears as *b* in the forms *amabam*, *amabo*, which I have recognised as compounds, and which will be hereafter explained. The dative and ablative termination plural *भ्यस् bhyaś*, becomes *bus* in Latin. The nasal of this class, *म् m*, is subject, at the end of a word, to several alterations, and only remains fast before a pause, a

vowel or letters of its own class it otherwise governs itself according to the nature of the following letters and may pass in this manner into any of the four preceding nasals and weakens itself into the softened nasal sound [G Ed p 18] of the proper Anuswara if followed by a semi vowel a sibilant or ह h. M has also a full right to the name of a mutable nasal. It is however not befitting when in editions of a text otherwise conspicuous for accuracy we find म् though protected in its original condition by a pause or by the following letters written as Anuswara.

19 The semi vowels follow next य y र r ल l व v. We distinguish y by the sound of our German j or the English y in the word year. As the Latin j in English has the sound of a softened g so in Prakrit य y often passes into ज् j and in Greek upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of ζευγνυμι ζυγος &c to the root युञ् युज् to bind¹ and that of the verbs in αζω to the Indian verbs in अयामि ayāmi, for ζ is ds but the sound dsch is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian جوان jūdān young to the Sanskrit Theme युवान yuān Lat juvenis belongs to this place. By v we here designate the sound of the German v and English v. After consonants as त्वान् tuām thee this letter takes the pronunciation of the English w. The occasional hardening of the v into a guttural deserves mention here thus in Latin vic-si (vixi) victum spring from uv and in fact I recognise the Sanskrit causal भवयामि bhāv ayā mi

I make to be from the root भू bhū. The connection between fac-tus and fio is practically demonstrated. Refer back in the Old and Modern Greek to the occasional hardening of the Digamma into γ (cf C G Schmidt in the Berlin Jahrbuch 1831 p 613). The voice cannot dwell on य v or य् y and these two letters are therefore as in the Semitic languages excluded from the end of words [G Fd p 19] therefore the word दिव div Heaven forms its nominative which ought to be div (divs being forbidden see § 94)

from द्यो *dyô*. Nominal bases in *y* do not exist. *r* at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with *s*. In places where the concluding *s*, by favour of the following letter, is retained, *r* becomes *ś*, and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where *s* becomes *r*, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20 The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskrit works *l* often stands for *r*. We often, also, find in the cognate European languages *l* for *r*. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix *lent* (e.g. *opulens*), and of the Gothic *laud(a)-s* (see § 116), in *hvélauds*, "quantus," *svalauds*, "tantus," *samalauds*, "just so much," to the Sanskrit *वंत् vant* (in the strong case, § 119), in words like धनवन् *dhanavant*, "endowed with wealth," तवन् *tavant*, "so much," यवन् *yavant*, "how much." On the change between *v* and *r* is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German *pir-u-m's*, "we are" (sing. *pim*, भवामि *bhav-â-mi*), to भवामस् *bhav-â-mas*, as also that of *scir-u-més*, "we shriek," to श्रियामस् *śrî-ayâ-mas*, "we make to hear" (§ 109), as also that of *trusu*, "I fall," from the [G Ed p 20] root *trus*, to the Sanskrit ध्रुस् *dhrus*, "to fall," † and of the Cretan *τρε* "thee" from *τρε*, to the Sanskrit *tvâ*. The semi-vowel *l* is also exchanged with the nasals, thus, अन्यस् *anya-s*, "the other," becomes *alus* in Latin, and

† It is scarcely correct to say "often," as the instances are rare nor are they restricted to recent works. Menu has *uslika* for *asrika* — Ed

† Gumm (in p 46) assumes an adjective *lauds*, "great," which, as far as the Gothic at least is concerned, might be dispensed with, as it is of the greatest antiquity as a suffix, and does not appear alone as an adjective, even in the oldest periods

‡ *Dh*, according to § 16, = the Greek *θ*, and to the *θ*, according to § 87, corresponds the old High German *t*. The *u* of *trus*, from the old *a*, may be produced by the influence of the *r*, or of the dropped nasal

अन्तरम् *antara s* the other *alter*, वद् *vad* to speak answers to the Gothic *lath on* called ' invited, *ga lathôn*, called together आ *dhma* to blow answers to *flare* (§ 109) Compare also, *balbus* with *βαμβαιω*

21 The 1st class embraces the sibilants and *h* श् *s* ष् *sh* स *s* and ह् *h* The first sibilant is spoken with a slight aspiration and usually written by the English *sh* * It belongs to the palatal class and thence supplies the place of the third or proper स *s* when र् hard palatal च् *ch* or छ् *chh* follows for instance रामश् चरति *râmas charati* instead of रामस चरति *râmas charati* Ramas goes In its origin श् *s* appears to have sprung from *k* and in Greek and Latin we find *κ* and *c* regularly corresponding to the Sanskrit श् *s* The Gothic substitutes *h* in pursuance of the law of change of sound but the Lithuanian stands the nearest to the Sanskrit with reference to this letter and has in its stead a sibilant compound *sz*, pronounced like *sh* Compare *decem* δεκα Gothic *tathum* Lithuan *deszimtis* with दशन् *dasan* (nom दश *dasa*) canis κωι Gothic *hunds* Lithuan *s-uo* (gen *s uns*) with श्वन् *svan* (nom श्व *śud* gen श्वन् *śunas* κωις) ' dog " δακρυ *lacrima as-ara* f with अश्रु *asru* n 'tear, *equus* (= *ecvus*) Lith *as-ica* f मारु with अश्व *asua* (nom अश्व *asvas*) horse *s-aka* f with शाला *sâl hâ* bough The Lith *s uenta s* holy answers to the Zend *spenta* (§ 50) At the end of a word and in the middle before strong consonants श् *s* is not allowed although admitted as an euphonic substitute for र् concluding स *s* before an initial hard palatal Otherwise श् *s* usually falls back into the sound from which [G Ed p 21] it appears to have originated namely, *k* In some roots however श् *s* passes into ट *t*, for instance दृश् *dris* seeing and विश् *vis* a man of the third caste form in the uninflected nominative दृक् *drih* विट *vit* The second sibilant ष् *sh* is pronounced like our *sch* or *sh* in English and

* More usually *s* the *sh* is reserved for the cerebral sibilant —Editor

belongs to the lingual class It often steps, according to certain rules into the place of स् s, thus, for instance, after क् k, स् s never follows, but only ष sh; and the ξ, τ, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by क्ष ksh Compare दक्षिण dakṣhina, with dex-ter, δεξιός, Lithuanian dėszinė, "the right hand" Of the vowels, i, u, and rī, short or long, are averse from स् s, to which a and ā alone are inclined After the first-named vowels, स् s passes into ष sh, for instance, ननोषि tanōshi, instead of ननोसि tanōsi (extendis) As an initial, ष sh is extremely rare the Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change स् s into ष sh, from the first with a ष sh A word which really begins with ष sh is षष् shash, "six," to which the Lith szeszi, a plural nominative, answers most nearly, while other cognate languages indicate an original ordinary s At the end of a word, and in the middle before other strong consonants, such as ट् t, ठ् th, ष sh is not permitted, but in most roots passes into क् k, but with some into ट् t the number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, षट् shat

22 The third sibilant is the ordinary s of all languages, but which, at the end of Sanskrit words, holds a very insecure position, and by certain rules is subjected to transmutation into श् ś, ष sh, र् r, : ah or h Visarga (§ 11.), and u, and only remains unaltered before t and th We write, for example, सूनुस् नरति sūnus tarati, "the son passes over," but नरति सूनुः tarati [G Ed p 22] sūnuh, सूनुष् चरति sūnuś charati (it), सूनु भवति sūnu bhavati (est) This sensitiveness against a concluding स s can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division, as in the cognate languages the concluding s remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for r does not return into its original form Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, § 383-4) ρ everywhere stands for σ Τιμόθεορ ὁ Μιλήσιορ παραγινόμενορ λυμαίνε-ται τὰρ ἀκοὰρ τῶν νέων, &c The Sanskrit could not endure

* Cf Hartung, p 106

r before t The Latin protects the s usually at the end of words, but in the classical period generally sacrifices it when between two vowels to the r for instance *genus generis*, for *genesis*, a contrast to forms found in Varro and Festus such as *plusima*, *fædesum*, *meliosem majosibus* in which the s evinces its original existence in the history of the language (see § 127) The accusative form *arbosem* recorded by Festus is more startling for here r is the original form if as I can hardly doubt, *arbor arbos*, is related to the word of such frequent occurrence in the Zend Avesta 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *urvara* tree This expression is not wanting in the Sanskrit (उर्वरा *urvárâ*) but it signifies according to Wilson fruitful land and land in general

23 ह h belongs to the letters which in Sanskrit are never admitted at the end of words nor in the middle before strong consonants In these places it passes by certain rules into ट / ड d क / ओ ग् g In Greek we often find χ in the place of the Sanskrit ह h compare $\chi\alpha\iota\mu\omega\nu$ *hiems* with हिम *hima* snow rime $\chi\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ with ह्यमि *hrish* [G Ed p 23] $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ *gaudeo* $\chi\eta\iota$ with हंस *hansa* goose $\chi\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ *heri* with ह्यम् *hyas* yesterday $\acute{\omicron}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ with वह *vah* to transport We also find κ c for h compare $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$ *cor* Gothic *harto* with हृद् *hrud* (हृद् हृदय *hrudaya*) heart We sometimes but rarely find the spiritus asper substituted for h for instance, $\alpha\iota\rho\omega$ हरामि *harâmi* I take away The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes sz for h for instance *as-* I for अहम् *aham* *szirdis* f heart for हृद् *hrud* This letter stands sometimes in Sanskrit for a mutilation of other aspirated consonants of which the aspiration alone has been suppressed thus instead of the imperative ending धि *dhi* we generally find *hi* on which account the grammarians accept हि *hi* and not धि *dhi* as the original ending and assume that *hi* passes into *dhi* for euphonic reasons after consonants The root ग्रह *grah* to take is written in the Vedas ग्रम् *grabh* and answers thus more nearly to the German *greifen* and the Persian *griflan*

We give here a general view of the Sanscrit characters, with their respective values.

VOWELS

अ *a*, आ *ā*, इ *i*, ई *ī*, उ *u*, ऊ *ū*, ऋ *ṛ*, ॠ *ṝ*

ANUSWĀRA AND VISARGA

• *n*, : *ah*.

CONSONANTS

Gutturals	क <i>k</i> , ख <i>kh</i> , ग <i>g</i> , घ <i>gh</i> , ङ <i>ṅ</i>
Palatals	च <i>ch</i> , छ <i>chh</i> , ज <i>j</i> , झ <i>jh</i> , ञ <i>ṅ</i>
Linguals	ट <i>t</i> , ठ <i>th</i> , ड <i>d</i> , ढ <i>dh</i> , ण <i>ṇ</i>
Dentals	त <i>t</i> , थ <i>th</i> , द <i>d</i> , ध <i>dh</i> , न <i>n</i>
Labials	प <i>p</i> , फ <i>ph</i> , ब <i>b</i> , भ <i>bh</i> , म <i>m</i>
Semi-Vowels	य <i>y</i> , र <i>r</i> , ल <i>l</i> , व <i>v</i>
Sibilants and Aspirates,	श <i>ś</i> , ष <i>sh</i> , स <i>s</i> , ह <i>h</i> .

[G Ed p 24] The vowel characters given above are found only at the beginning of words, and in the middle or end of a word are supplied in the following manner अ *a* is left unexpressed, but is contained in every consonant which is not distinguished by a sign of rest (·) or connected with another vowel क *k* is thus read *ka*, and *k* by itself, or the absence of the *a*, is expressed by क् इ *i*, ई *ī*, are expressed by इ, ई, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates, for instance, कि *ki*, की *kī* For उ *u*, ऊ *ū*, ऋ *ṛ*, ॠ *ṝ*, the signs उ, ऊ, ऋ, ॠ, are placed under their consonants, as, कु *ku*, कू *kū*, कृ *kṛ*, कॄ *kṝ* For ए *e* and ऐ *āi*, ए and ऐ are placed over their consonants, as, के *ké*, कै *kāi* ओ *o* and औ *āu* are written by omission of the अ, which is here only a fulcrum, as, को *kó*, कौ *kāu* The consonants without vowels, instead of appearing in their entire shapes, and with the sign of rest, are usually written so that their distinctive sign is connected with the following consonant, for instance, for न्, स्, य्, we have न्, स्, य्, and thus *matsya* is written मत्स्य, not मत्स्य, for ज् + ज् we have ज्ञ, and for क् + घ् we have क्घ

25 The Sanskrit letters are divided into hard or surd and soft or sonorant. Surd are all the tenues with their corresponding aspirates, and in fact according to the order given above the first two letters in each of the first five rows also the three sibilants. Soft are the medials with their aspirates the ङ the nasals semi vowels and all vowels. Another division also appears to us convenient—that of the consonants into strong and weak in which the nasals and semi vowels come under the denomination of weak the remaining consonants under that of the strong. The weak consonants and vowels exercise no influence as initial letters of inflections and suffixes in the formation of words on the terminating [G Ed p 20] letters of a root while they themselves are compelled to accommodate themselves to a following strong consonant.

26 With regard to the vowels, it is of consequence to direct the observation to two affections of them of frequent occurrence in the development of forms of Sanskrit of which the one is called Guna or virtue the other Vriddhi increase or augmentation. My predecessors in grammatical inquiry have given no information as to the essence but have only expounded the effects of these vowel alterations and it was only in my critical labours upon Grimm's German Grammar* that I came upon the trace of the true nature and distinctive qualities of these affections as also of the law by which Guna is usually produced and governed and at the same time of its hitherto undetected existence in the Greek and Germanic and most conspicuously in the Gothic. My views in this particular have since derived remarkable confirmation from the Zend with relation to which I refer to § 2 in which as I flatter myself I have dealt successfully with an apparent contradiction to my explanation. Guna consists in prefixing short *a* and Vriddhi in prefixing a long one in both however the *a* melts into a diphthong with the primitive vowel

* Berlin Journal I cb 18.7 p 204

according to certain euphonic laws इ i, namely, and ई, melt with the अ a of Guna into ए é; उ u, ऊ ū, into ओ ó These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into अय ay and अव av; ऋ r̄ and ॠ r̄̄ become, in virtue of the action of Guna, अर ar, by that of Viddhi, अरि ar̄. As in Greek the [G Ed p 26] short Sanskrit a is frequently replaced by e, so we find the Guna here, when a radical i or u is prolonged by prefixing an e As in the Sanskrit the root इ i, "to go," forms, by the Guna modification, एमि émi (from a-imi), "I go," in contrast to मस mas, "we go," thus in Greek also we have εἶμι in contrast to ἴμεν As the root बुध् budh, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into बोध bódh (from baudh), for instance, बोधामि bódhāmi, "I know," so in the Greek* the root φϋγ (ἐφϋγοι), in the present becomes φεύγω In the Gothic, in the strong form of Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations, the radical vowel, strengthened by a in the singular of the preterite, stands in the same contrast to the i and u of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskrit Compare baug, "I bent," in contrast to bugum, "we bent," with the Sanskrit form of the same signification, singular बुभोज bubhōja, plural बुभुजिन्स bubhujimsa, of the root भुञ् bhuj, compare vait, "I know," in contrast with vitum, "we know," with the Sanskrit forms of the same signification, वेद vēda (from vaida), विदिम vidima, from the root विद् vid, "know," which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

27 We have, however, the Sanskrit Guna in yet another form in the Gothic a form which I have but lately discovered, but of which the historical connection with the Sanskrit modification appears to me not the less certain. I once thought that I had accounted in a different manner for the relation existing between *bauga*, "I bend," and its root

* Regarding Greek *oi* as Guna of *i*, see § 491, and as to Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian, see §§ 255 b) f), 741, 746

bug and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally in the present tense to the prevalent *i* of terminations a retro-active influence. It now however seems to me indisputable that Grimm's 8th and 9th conjugations of the [G Ed p 27] first class correspond to my first Sanskrit conjugation (r 326) so that the Guna *a* of the special tenses has been weakened to *i* while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of *a* just as in the 10th 11th and 12th conjugations according to Grimm's division the radical *a* which has remained in the preterite singular is in the present and other tenses weakened to *i* so that for instance *at* I and *he eat* corresponds to the root अट् *ad* 'to eat' but in the present, *ita* stands in place of the form अदि *admi* I eat *.

28 The Zend possesses besides the Sanskrit Guna which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskrit a vowel application peculiar to itself which likewise consists in *a* and which was first observed by M E Burnouf †. The vowels which admit this addition in the interior but not at the end of words are first the short *a* *i* *u* ṡ o 2dly the Guna diphthongs *æ* *ê* and ṡ ṡ . The two latter are the most usually befriended by this addition and *æ* takes it in all cases where the opportunity occurs both as an initial letter and even at the end of words wherever the dependent particle ञcha and is appended to it hence for example 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸 *nairē* *hominū* 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓 *āthre* 'ignū' but 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸 *narāēcha* *hominūque* 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓 *āthraēcha* *ignūque*. Also where an *ê* stands in two consecutive syllables an *a* is placed before each. Hence for instance 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓 *aetāēibyaḥ* from एतेभ्यस् *ētēbhyaḥ*. The only case in which ex

* It would be difficult to adduce a better instance of the phonetic deficiencies of our English alphabet than this sentence in which I am forced to translate the present and past tenses of *essen* by the same characters. What foreign student could guess or remember that the one is pronounced *eet* the other *ett*? The preterite *ate* is obsolete —Translator

† N Journ Asiat T III p 327

cepting at the actual end of the word, *ro é* remains without the preceding *sa*, as when it is produced by the influence of a *y*, out of *sa* or *śā*. We say, indeed, *ḥṛṣṭyāyā* [G. Ed p 28] *yaśbyō*, "quibus," from *येवस् येष्व्यो*, but not *ḥṛṣṭyāyā* *āyaśē*, but *ḥṛṣṭyāyā* *āyēśē*, "I glorify," from the Sanskrit root, which has been lost, for the verb *यश् याँ*, from which comes *यश् याँ*, "glory." Yet we find, for *यश् येश्*, "if" (cf *यदि yadi*), sometimes, though perhaps erroneously, also *यश् येश्*. The addition of the *sa* before *ḥ* is just as unlimited, but the occasion is far less frequent. Examples of it are, *ḥṣṭyā* *āśō*, "strength," from *शोश् ṣas*; *ḥṣṭyā* *lēñāōt*, "he made," from *कृ कृ*, according to the fifth class, for *अकृतोत् akṛōt*; *ḥṣṭyā* *māōt*, "he spoke," from *अब्रौत् abṛōt*, which would be the regular form, instead of *अब्रवीत् abravīt* (Gramm Crit r 352). We also find *ḥṣṭyā* *māōm*, "I spoke," for *अब्रौम् abṛōm*, which would be the form used were, in the Sanskrit adjunct tenses, as in the Greek, a mere nasal, and not *अम् am*, the suffix of the first person. The vowels *ā* and *ū* are much more sparing in their attraction of the *sa* now in question. They refuse it always at the beginning of words, and in the middle before two consonants, and if transferred from the end of a word to its middle, by an adventitious termination or word, they do not acquire the capacity of being wedded to an *sa*. We say, for example, *इहम् imēm*, "this" (accus), not *इहसम् aimēm*, *मिथुना*, "a pan," not *मिथुनासम् maithvana*, *गौरिभ्यो*, "montibus," not *गौरिभ्योसम् gauribhyō*. The *ū* also, according to set rules, very frequently abstains from the *sa*, for instance, *इवम् urunō*, (*animā*), not *इवसम् uraunō*, from *इवान् ivan*, on the contrary, *तवुना*, "young," from *तरुण taruna*. Where, however, the Sanskrit *ū* is replaced by *ō* (§ 32), an *sa* is placed before it, as well at the beginning as before two consonants, and in this case *ō* stands in this respect in the same category as *é* and

[G. Ed p. 29] *ḥ* *ō*. Compare *ḥṣṭyā* *raōch*, "light," with

हृच् *ruch* हृचान् *saochantanm* (*lucentum*) with शुचान् *suchyatām* अचोत् *aocta* 'he spoke with उक्ता *ukta* which I form by theory after the analogy of अक्षिप्त *akshipta* (Gram Crit r 389) leaving out the augment

29 In the Vriddhi modification the vowels इ *i* ई *ī* melt with the preceding आ *ā* into ऐ *ai*, उ *u* ऊ *ū* into औ *au* चृ *ri* च्रृ *ri* into चार् *dr* The simple vowel अ *a* as also the diphthongs ए *e* and ओ *o* which would produce the same effect by Guna as by Vriddhi—for *a+a* like *ā+a* makes *ā* *a+ē* like *ā+ē* makes *ai* *a+ō* like *ā+ō* makes *au*—are capable of only one higher modification and reserve this one for cases where grammatical laws demand the highest step namely Vriddhi and remain in the cases of Guna unaltered unless extraordinary grounds of exception occur It may be convenient here to give a connected summary of the results produced by Guna and Vriddhi

Primitive Vowels	अ <i>a</i>	आ <i>ā</i>	इ <i>i</i>	ई <i>ī</i>	उ <i>u</i>	ऊ <i>ū</i>	चृ <i>ri</i>
Guna			ए <i>ē</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>	ओ <i>ō</i>	औ <i>au</i>	चर <i>ar</i>
Vriddhi	आ <i>u</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>	औ <i>au</i>	औ <i>au</i>	चार् <i>dr</i> *	
Primitive Vowels	चृ <i>ri</i>	ए <i>ē</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>	ओ <i>ō</i>	औ <i>au</i>		
Guna	चर् <i>ar</i>						
Vriddhi	चार् <i>dr</i>	ऐ <i>ai</i>		औ <i>au</i>			

30 We now proceed to the exposition of the Zend writing which, like the Semitic proceeds from right to left and towards the comprehension of which Rask has contributed valuable corrections which give the language an appearance more natural and more in consonance with the Sanskrit than it assumed in the hands of former commentators Anquetil's pronunciation having admitted much that was heterogeneous especially in the vowels We follow the order of the Sanskrit

* According to original Grammars the Guna letters are *a e o* the Vriddhi *ā ai au*, the two first *a* and *u* being severally substituted for the vowel sounds of *ri lri* in combination with the semi vowels *r* and *l* as *ar al, ar, āl*—Editor

alphabet in giving the corresponding value of each letter in [G Ed p 30] the Zend The Sanskrit short ञ *a* has two, or rather three, representatives, the first is *ɔ*, which Anquetil pronounces as *a* or *e*, but Rask, certainly with truth, limits to *a* The second is *ɛ*, which Rask pronounces like the short *æ* of the Danish, or like the short German *a*, as in *Hande*, or as *a* in *cane* in English, and *e* in the French *apri*. I consider this *ɛ* as the shortest vowel, and write it *ě*. We often find it inserted between two consonants which form a double consonant in the Sanskrit, for instance, *दादरेश* *dadarēša* (pret redupl), for the Sanskrit *ददृश* *dadarśa*, "he" or "I saw," *ददमहि* *dadēmahī* (V S p 102), "we give," for the Vēda form *ददमसि* *dadmasi* This shortest *ě* is also always appended to an originally terminating *r*. Thus, for instance, *अन्तर* *antarě*, "between," *दत्तर* *dātārě*, "giver," "creator," *हवर्* *hvarě*, "sun," stand for the corresponding Sanskrit forms *अन्तर* *antar*, *दत्तर* *dātār*, *सुव* *suar*, "heaven" It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final *ɛ m*, and generally before a final *ɟ n*, and frequently before an intermediate vowelless *ɟ n*, the older ञ *a* becomes *ɛ ě* Compare, for instance, *पुत्र* *puthrě-m*, "filium" with *पुत्रम्* *putra-m*, *अह* *ah-ěn*, "they were," with *असन्* *asan*, *हेतव* *hētav*, *हेतव* *hēt-əm*, "the existing one," with *सन्तम्* *sant-am*, *प्र* *præ-sentem*, *अ* *ab-sentem* This retro-active influence of the nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin termination *m*, as, for instance, *slēm*, *slēmus* (Sanskrit *तिथेयम्* *tishthēyam*, *तिथेयम्* *tishthēma*)

31 Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a letter differing but little from the *ɛ ě* above discussed, but yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, *ɛ*, which Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish *æ* We find this letter usually in connection with a following *ɟ u*, and this vowel appears to admit, with the excep- [G Ed p 31] tion of the long *ɔ ā*, no vowel but this *ɛ* before it We write this *ɛ e* without the diacritic sign, inasmuch as we represent the *ɔ*, like the Sanskrit *ॠ*, by *é*. *Eu* *ɟ* corresponds etymo-

logically to the Sanskrit औ *o* or diphthong formed by अ *a* and उ *u*, thus for example the nominal bases in *u* which in the Sanskrit genitive by the influence of Gunā *i e* by the prefixing of a short *a* make *os* form in Zend 𑀓𑀭𑀮 *eus*. Compare for instance 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮𑀭 *paseus* with 𑀧𑀭𑀮𑀭 *pasōs* from *pasu pecus*. And yet the Sanskrit *o* does not universally become *eu* in Zend but often remains as it is and specially in cases where it arises out of the termination *as* by the solution of the *s* into *u*. According to its pronunciation 𑀭𑀮 *eu* would appear to be a diphthong and to form but one syllable as in our German words *heute Leute* &c. The long *a* (*ā*) is written 𑀓

32 Short and long *i* are represented as *ire* long and short *u* by special characters 𑀭𑀮 *i* 𑀭𑀮𑀮 *i* 𑀭𑀮𑀮𑀮 *u* 𑀭𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *u*. Anquetil however gives to the short *i* the pronunciation *e* and to the short *u* (*u*) that of *o*, while according to Rask only 𑀭𑀮 is pronounced as short *o**. This short *o* frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit उ *u* and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong औ *au* in particular we have generally the Zend 𑀭𑀮𑀮 *āo* we yet find sometimes also 𑀭𑀮𑀮 *āu* for instance 𑀭𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *gaus* *bos* is more frequent than 𑀭𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *gaos* for the Sanskrit गौ *gaus*.

33 The Sanskrit diphthong *ē* formed out of *a + i* is represented by 𑀭𑀮 which especially as a terminating letter is also written 𑀭𑀮 and which we as in Sanskrit represent by *e*. We must here however observe that the Sanskrit ऐ *ē* is not always preserved as 𑀭𑀮 *ē* in the Zend but is sometimes replaced by 𑀭𑀮 *ai* which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding 𑀭𑀮 *y* especially at the end of [G Ed p 32] words. The Viddhi diphthong ऐ *ai* (out of *ā + i*) is always represented by 𑀭𑀮 *āi*, *ā* either by the equivalent 𑀭𑀮—for which we often find 𑀭𑀮 substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above mentioned 𑀭𑀮 *eu* which according to rule before a terminating 𑀭𑀮 *s* replaces the Indian औ *o*.

* But see § 447 Note

so that a termination in $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{o}s$ * is unheard of in the Zend. For the Viddhi diphthong $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{au}$ (out of $\acute{a} + u$) we generally find \acute{ao} , for which there is a special character 𑀮𑀭 , more rarely $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{au}$. It would appear that $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{au}$, $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{ao}$, $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{au}$, and the $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{o}$ which replaces $\text{𑀮} \acute{e}$, should be pronounced as diphthongs, *i. e.* as monosyllables.

34. Anuswâra and Visarga do not exist in Zend, unless we admit the nasal specified in § 61 as answering to the sound of the Sanskrit Anuswâra. We proceed meanwhile, for the present, to the proper consonants. The first letter of the Sanskrit guttural class has divided itself into two characters bearing reference to different functions, 𑀮 and 𑀮 , of which the first, which we represent by *k*, only appears before vowels and $\text{𑀮} v$, the other, which we write *c*, precedes especially consonants, excepting $\text{𑀮} v$. Compare, for instance, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{o}$, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{a}$, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{at}$, (*quis, quæ, quid*), $\text{𑀮} k\acute{e}r\acute{e}t$, "once," $\text{𑀮} k\acute{ar}\acute{o}t$, "he made," $\text{𑀮} k\acute{v}$, "where," with $\text{𑀮} k\acute{o}$, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{a}$, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{im}$, $\text{𑀮} k\acute{ar}\acute{o}t$, and $\text{𑀮} k\acute{v}$ on the other hand, $\text{𑀮} c\acute{a}t\acute{h}$, "king," with $\text{𑀮} k\acute{sh}$ *ashtra*; $\text{𑀮} h\acute{c}$, "pouring out" (V S p 198), with $\text{𑀮} s\acute{ic}$ *h* (from $\text{𑀮} s\acute{ic}$) In what manner the pronunciation of this $\text{𑀮} c$ differs from that of the $\text{𑀮} k$ can indeed hardly be defined with certainty it is probably softer, weaker than that of the $\text{𑀮} k$, which latter is fenced in by no strong consonants. Rask selects for it the character *q*, without observing that this letter prefers only to precede consonants, and in this position [G Ed p 33] always corresponds to the Sanskrit $\text{𑀮} k$. Burnouf considers $\text{𑀮} c$ as an aspirate, and writes $\text{𑀮} t\acute{a}k\acute{m}\acute{a}h\acute{e}$. He writes, on the other hand, the letter 𑀮 , which Rask treats as an aspirate, with *q*. Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that $\text{𑀮} c$ is found before *r*, which, according to Burnouf's just

* $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{o}s$, according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the *u*-bases for the more common $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{e}us$, *e. g.* $\text{𑀮𑀭} \acute{b}\acute{a}z\acute{a}o\acute{s}$, "brachu"

remark generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however as insufficient, and think that ᳵ c stands before r , because as we have before remarked all consonants v excepted only admit before them that modification of the l sound which is expressed by ᳵ . It would be impossible for ᳶ r and the other letters of similar agency to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if ᳵ lh be not extant in Zend so that for instance the root ᳵ lh to dig sounds ᳶ lan in Zend. There are however some words in which ᳵ lh is represented by ᳶ . From ᳶ $lhara$ ass we find the accusative ᳶ $carem$ and we find also the ᳵ lh of ᳶ $sakhi$ friend replaced by c the accusative for instance ᳶ $sakhayam$ transformed into ᳶ $hacdim$. It may therefore remain a question whether ᳶ k or ᳶ c in respect of their sounds have the better right to be referred to ᳵ lh but this much is certain that ᳶ k before vowels and before v is only represented by ᳶ in Zend before other consonants only by ᳶ which latter we shall till better advised continue to render by c .

35 Anquetil ascribes to ᳶ the value of ᳶ and to both the pronunciation lh while Rask considers the latter alone by reason of the aspiration stroke which he recognises as aspirated and compares it to the Spanish x and the Arabic ح and our German ch . Burnouf renders [G Ed p 34] ᳶ by q and observes (l c p 345) that the Sanskrit syllable ᳶ sua becomes qa in Zend namely in ᳶ $suapna$ sleep written according to Burnouf $qafna$ and in ᳶ sua ($suus$) his. We are inclined to add to these examples ᳶ $khanha$ (nom) accus ᳶ $khanhrem$ from ᳶ $suasā$ sister (*soror*) ᳶ $suasāram$ (*sororem*) and ᳶ $khareno$ splendour as related to ᳶ $suar$ heaven and ᳶ sur to shine. We must however at the same time remark that ᳶ su does not universally become ᳶ lh and that ᳶ su in particular in an isolated position and with a possessive signification much oftener appears in the shape of ᳶ hu

or that of ح *hava*. We render ح by *kh*, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to خ , our *ch*, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian ح is pronounced, indeed, at present, without aspiration, like an Italian *c* before *a*, *o*, *u*, but its value in Arabic, and the choice of this letter, so powerfully aspirated in the Arabic to designate a special guttural sound, in true Persian words, seems to indicate an intrinsic stronger or milder aspiration. As ح *kh* is derived from the Sanskrit ह *su*, it was not applied to replace the क *k* before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either *u* or *v* (و) accompanies the Persian خ when the latter replaces at the beginning of a [G Ed p 35] word the Sanskrit ह *sw*. It is true that *v* is no longer sounded before long vowels, but it must originally have had its influence on the pronunciation, and cannot have been introduced into writing entirely without object, and for the mere employment of the copyist. Compare خدا *khudâ*, "God," with स्वदत्ता *swadatta*, "self-given," for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit r 608), खदाता *khadâta*, which Anquetil, or his Pârsî teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to خدا *khudâ*, while Neiroseugh properly translates it by स्वयन्दत्ता *swayandatta*. The Persian خدا *khudâ* is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend खदाता *khadâta*, so as to have its name based in the idea, "created by itself," while in its form it has been mutilated of one syllable. In Sanskrit we find both स्वभू *swabhû*, "self-existent," and also the more common स्वयम्भू *swayambhû*, as appellations of Brahma and Vishnu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

* This word comes from the root *dhâ*, "to place," not from *dâ*, "to give," see § 637

حدا *Ihuddā* and that its primal signification has thus been discovered through the Zend we are forced still to doubt. We will here only call to mind that the Germanic forms especially in the older dialects, in general approximate much more to the Sanskrit than to the modern Persian. *su* in particular in the Gothic either remains unaltered or becomes *sl* (§ 20). The pronominal syllable *sea* exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb *sa* (so) thus and with an instrumental form *slu* (wie) how. The neuter substantive *slus* (Theme *sr̥sa*) means *Tigenthum* property as in Sanskrit the neuter *sua*. I know of no certain form in which a Germanic *g* or *k* corresponds to a Sanskrit *ś* or a Persian *ح kh*. To return however to the [G Ed p 36] Persian *ح khu* = *ś sw* compare *خفتن khuftan* to sleep with *خواب swap* *ح خواب kh(u)āb* sleep with *خواب sudāpa* *ح خواب kh(u)āb* to sing with *خواران kh(u)āran* to sound with *خواران kh(u)āran* sister with *خواران kh(u)āran* Gothic *sustar* *خواران kh(u)āran* sun Zend *خواران kh(u)āran* with *خواران kh(u)āran* heaven. In some words *ح kh* corresponds to a Sanskrit *k* before *r* in which position the Zend loves an aspiration in the modern Persian, however a vowel intrudes between the guttural and the *r* thus *خرامیدن khurām idan* to proceed with pomp corresponds to the Sanskrit *क्रम kram* to go to step, and *خریدن khuridan* to buy to the Sanskrit equivalent root *क्री kri*. The Persian *ح kh* answers to the Sanskrit aspirated *क्ष kh* in the word *خار khar* ass (Sanskrit *खर khara*).

36 The guttural *ṅ* and its aspirate *ṅh* are represented by *g* and *gh*. The Sanskrit *घ gh* has however sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend at least *غره garemā* heart (*θερμη* and *Harme*) answers to the Sanskrit *घर्म gharma* on the other hand the *غره ghna* in *غره غره ghna* *غره ghna* victorious corresponds to the Sanskrit *घ्न ghna* at the end of compounds for instance in *घ्नघ्न satru ghna* enemy slayer. The Zend *غره غره ghna* properly signi-



fies, like the word so often used in the same sense 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vērēthra-zan*, "killer of Vritra," and proves a connection between the Zendish and Indian mythologies, which, however, in consequence of the obscuration of meanings in Zend, and the oblivion of the old Myths, now only exists in affinities of speech "Killer of Vritra" is one of the most usual titles of honour of the prince of the lesser gods, or Indra, who, from his slaughter of the dæmon Vritra, of the race of the Dā-
[G Ed p 37] nawas, bears this name

We shall discuss the nasals apart in § 60.

37. Of the Sanskrit palatals the Zend has only the *tenus*; namely 𐬀 *ch* (= च्), and the *media*, namely 𐬀𐬀 (= च्च) the aspirates are wanting, which is not surprising, as they are of rare occurrence in the Sanskrit The following are examples 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *charaiti*, "he goes," Sanskrit चरति *charati*; 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *chathuāraō*, "four" (nom pluri. masc.) Sanskrit चत्वारस् *chaturāras*, चत्वारो *chaturāro*; 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *aōjō*, "strength," Sanskrit औजस् *ōjas*, औजो *ōjō* It is, however, to be observed, that, while the Sanskrit *ch* remains, by rule, unaltered in Zend, the sonant *j* is often replaced by other letters, and first, by 𐬀 *z*; for instance, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *zāta*, "born," Sanskrit जात *jāta*; secondly, by 𐬀 *sh*, for instance, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shēnu*, "knee," Sanskrit जानु *jānu*

38 The modification of the sounds of *t*, peculiar to the Sanskrit, contained in the third row of consonants, is wanting in the Zend We pass, therefore, to the ordinary sounds of that letter, the dentals These are, 𐬀 *t* (त्), 𐬀𐬀 *th* (त्थ), 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *d* (द्ध) 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dh* (ध्), together with a 𐬀 (𐬀), peculiar to the Zend, of which more hereafter The 𐬀 *t* is like the guttural which we represent by 𐬀 (*g*), in this respect, that its position is almost limited to one preceding vowels Before *r* and *w*, and sometimes before 𐬀 *y*, in order to gratify the affection of the latter for an aspirate, the aspirated 𐬀𐬀 *th* steps in. Thus, for instance, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *thuanim* signifies "thee," while the nominative is written 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *tūm*, and the genitive 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *tava*, and the word 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ātar*, "fire," nom 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀

ātan s makes after rejection of the *a* which preceded *r* अतः
āthré igni अतः अथ्रत *ab igne* &c If however
 the *t* be protected by a preceding consonant excepting *n*
 the succeeding semi vowel is thereby de [G Ed p 38]
 prived of its retro active power We find for instance
 अवासा वास्रा not अवासा वासथ्रा garment vest
 but we have अवासा मन्थ्रा speech not अवासा मन्थ्रा
 from the root मन्थ man At the end of a word and which
 rarely occurs before strong consonants (§ 25) at the begin
 ning also and middle of a word the Sanskrit *t* (त) is re
 presented by a special letter namely by थ which we with
 Burnouf write *t* but formerly wrote with a simple *t* undotted
 below because no change is possible with *ϑ* or *ϕ* Rask
 represents it by *th* because he recognises the sign of aspira
 tion I am unable however to assent to the universal
 validity of this sign of Rask's and I incline to rejecting the
 aspirate, as in Sanskrit from the end of words We should
 also remember that the diphthong *e* is written *ϑ* as well
 as *ϕ* the last which prevails at the end of words with
 a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our *ϑ* from *ϕ*
 Before consonants for instance in the word थकशो
thaksho the sounding of *th* would be more precarious than
 that of *t* in case this *th* did not somewhat partake of a sibi
 lant sound I think however that *ϑ* *t* has merely a
 feebler pronunciation than *ϑ* *t* and is so to say the last
 breathing of *t* as in Sanskrit *s* and *r* at the end of words
 are diluted to Visarga (§ 11) and as *त* in Prakrit and
 also in Greek is at the end of words altogether suppressed

39 *ϑ* is the ordinary *d* द and *ϕ* according to Rask's
 just remark its aspirate *dh* This represents the Sanskrit
 ध *dh* for instance in the imperative ending *धु* The
 Zend moreover favours *ϕ* *dh* for *ϑ* *d* in the middle of
 words between two vowels We find for instance *दाता*
data given but दाता दाता *dadhāmi* Sanskrit दाता *dadāmi*
 I give and दाता दाता *mazda dhāta* [G Ed p 39]

दाक्षिण्यं *daikhya*, "land," "province", and the *r* of the personal terminations *मि* *mi* and *हि* *hi*, or *शि* *shi*, obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, *महि* *mahi*, not *मशि* *masi*, corresponds to the Veda termination *महि* *masi*, and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in *आ* *a*, *आह* *a-hé*, not *आह* *aihé*, stands for *आस्य* *a-sya*.

42 *y* sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following *a* or *á*, which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of *r*, and consequently effects their transmutation into *o* *é**, thus the bases of nouns in

* The expression of the text is 'außert umlautenden Einfluss.' It is hardly possible to render into English without circumlocution certain terms which the philologists of Germany have invented and adopted to express the various modifications of the Indo-Germanic vowel, such as, *Ablaut*, *Anslaut*, *Inlaut*, *Umlaut*. Whether these terms have in themselves the virtue of suggesting to a Teutonic ear the particular modification of the vowel to which they are respectively applied may be doubted; but if to the student and the teacher they answer the purpose of a *memoria technica*, their use is fully justified by the necessity of the case, and the practice of a language which possesses a singular and inexhaustible power of progress and adaptation to exigencies. In our language, it seems to us that the uncouthness of such compounds as Upsound, Off-sound, and In-sound, could hardly be compensated by any advantage to be derived from their use, and we therefore purpose, in the course of this work, where any of these terms occur in the original, to retain them in their German shape. Of these terms, *Ablaut* and *Umlaut* are those which chiefly, if not alone, are used by our author. *Inlaut* is, we believe, merely the Sanskrit *Guna*. The meaning of the two former, and their distinction from each other, may best be explained by the following extract from our author's excellent work the *Vocalismus*, p. 10

"I designate," he says, "by the term *Ablaut*, a change of the root vowel, which is distinguished from the *Umlaut* by the fact that it is not produced by the influence of the vowel of the termination; for *Umlaut* is a mere affection, disturbance (*Trübung*) of the primary sound, through which that sound becomes more homogeneous with the vowel of the termination, while in the *Ablaut*, without any recognised external cause, it makes room for another, and, in general, totally different sound, as in Gothic, *nima*, 'I take', *nam*, 'I took' I say, without any recognised external

யா *ya* form in the genitive யுய்யா *yé hé* instead of யுய்யா *ya hé* and with the verb the old Sanskrit ய *ya* or யா *yá* of the fourth and tenth classes in the present singular becomes யே *ye*. Compare அநாயா *átá payém*, அநாயா *átápayélu* அநாயா *átapayéuti* with the Sanskrit अनायामि *átápayāmi* अनायामि *atapayāmi* अनायति *átápayati*. In the last syllable யா *ya* before *ç m* according to rule becomes *ç i* and after the same analogy *çam* becomes *çum*. We find therefore for instance *çurim quartum* from *turiya* and *çurum tertiam partem çathrushum quartam partem* from *çathruva çathrusha*. This appearance is to be thus understood that the antecedent semi vowel after the suppression of the *a* passes into its corresponding vowel which however according to the rule of § 64 must be a long one. The *y** after its influence has transformed *a* into *e* is often itself suppressed thus we find *çrudāsaēm* I shewed from *çrudāsayam* which

ternal cause because I think I can shew that the *Ablaut* also is produced by the particular quality and condition of the termination. Whether however we seek for the radical vowel in the present or the preterite the change is equally one quite different from that of the Indian *Guna* or *Viddhi* and in this respect that it is a positive change while in Sanskrit the root vowel is not in fact changed but only receives an increment, and that increment always one and the same with which it diphthongizes itself as in Greek *i* and *u* with *λ ιτω φ υγω*. In respect of signification likewise there is a difference between the Indian *Guna* and *Vridhhi* and Germanic *Ablaut*, for the *Ablaut* has acquired for itself a signifiatory power for grammatical purposes even if as I conjecture it did not originally possess such the contrast between the present and the past seems to rest upon it and there are indications that the latter is expressed by this change. In Sanskrit *Guna* and *Vridhhi* present no indication of this signifiatory power but merely in the character of diphthongizing modifications accompany those inflections which do signify grammatical relations.

Further illustrations of these latter remarks are to be found in the Note 1 which Professor Bopp has appended to the above passage of the *Vocalismus* — *Trans*

* Cf p 963 Note.

according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिश् *dis'* The genitive termination स्य *syā* appears everywhere reduced into ह्य *hé* The semi-vowels य *y* and व *v* are generally suppressed after preceding consonants, and thus, also, the imperative ending सिवा *siva* gives up its *v*

43 In Sanskrit, य *y* is sometimes, for euphony, interposed between two vowels (Gram Crit. rr. 271. 310 311), but this does not uniformly occur In Zend, the interposition of *y* between *u*, *ī*, and a following *é*, seems to amount to a law Thus the Sanskrit ब्रुवे *bruvé*, "I say" (from ब्रू and वृ, Gram. Crit. 1 55), becomes, in Zend, *bruyé* (§ 63), and the neuter form द्वे *dué*, "two," after the vocalization of the *v* into *u*, takes the form *duyé*

44. We have already remarked (§ 30) with respect to *r*, that at the end of a word an *é* is always appended to it, for instance, *dātarié*, "Creator," "Giver," *hvaré*, "Sun," instead of *dātari*, *hvari* In the middle of a word, where an *h* is not introduced according to § 48, the union of *r* with a following consonant is mostly avoided, so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless *r* an *é* is appended thence, for instance, *dadaréša*, from *dadaríša*, "vidi," "vidit", or the *r* is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of *r* with two following consonants (Gram Crit. r 34^b) Hence, for instance, *áthra-
vanēm*, from the theme *átarvan*, which in the weak cases (§ 129) contracts itself into *áthurun* or *áthaurun*. (§ 28.) To this, also, pertains the fact that polysyllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in *ari*, at the beginning of compounded forms, transpose this syllable into *ra*, and thus *áthra*, "fire," stands instead of

𐬀𐬎𐬎 *athar** The combinations 𐬀𐬎𐬎 *ry* [G Ed p 43] 𐬀𐬎 *uri* are only permitted where *i* vowel follows and the combination 𐬀𐬎𐬎 *ars* only as a termination and in the middle of a word before *t* for instance 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *tihrya* the fourth 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *airya* strong 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *urian* soul 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *haurva* whole (?) 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *atars* fire (nominative) 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *nars* of a man 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *larsta* ploughed but 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *chathrus* four times for 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *chathurs* since here no *a* precedes the *rs*

45 It is worthy of remark that in the Zend the *l* is wanting as in Chinese the *r* while nevertheless it exists in the modern Persian and shews itself in words which are not of Semitic origin. The Sanskrit *v* has three representatives in the Zend 𐬀 » and 𐬎. The two first are so far distinguished from each other in their use that 𐬀 corresponds to the Sanskrit *v* only at the beginning and » only in the middle of words for instance 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *iaem* we = वयम् *ayam* 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *tava* (*tui*) = तव *tava*. This distinction as Rask justly assumes is only graphic 𐬎 which I with Burnouf render by *u* most frequently occurs after *th* so that » never accompanies an antecedent *th*. On the other hand we find » much oftener than 𐬎 after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the *dh* which according to § 39 stands for *d* (𐬀) is only followed by » while in original *dh* corresponding to a Sanskrit *v dh* only appears in conjunction with 𐬎. Thus 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *dadhu* do having created given from the root 𐬀𐬎𐬎 *dā*† answers to the Sanskrit nom 𐬀𐬎𐬎 *dadu*án while the accusative of frequent occurrence in the Vendidid 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *adhuanem* seems to be identical with the Sanskrit 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *adhuanam* *iam* (Vend Olsh p 18) After other consonants than

* By *Stumme* the author here evidently means the crude derivative words which serve as Stems or Bases to inflected words or those in combination with inflectional terminations, thus *athra* for *ithar* forms *athraia* *athraian* *m* not *atharia* *atharianam* &c.—*I ditor*

† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit *dā* see § 37

Ḡ *th* and Ḡ *dh*, Ḡ *w* appears not to be admitted, but only
 » *v*, on the other hand, Ḡ *w* much prevails between two *i*'s
 or *ṣ* *z* and *ṣṣ* *y*, in which position » *v* is not allowed
 [G Ed p 44] Thus we read in the Vendidad (Olsh p. 23),
 the nominatives *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *dhruvis*, "beggar," (?) and *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ*
dauiis, "a worshipper of Daêva." *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *dauiis* however,
 as derived from *daêva* through the suffix *ṣ* *z*, seems to me
 dubious, and I prefer the variation *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *daêuis*. Or is it
 between *é* and *z* also that Ḡ *w* only can be allowed? Another
 instance is, *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *auyô*, "aquis," as dative and ablative
 plural, an interesting form which long remained a mystery
 to me, but which I am now in condition to explain. It springs
 from the root *ṣṣ* *ap*, "water" in such a manner, that after
 suppression of the *p*,⁴ the Sanskrit termination *भ्यस्* *bhyas*,
 which elsewhere, in the Zend, appears only as *ṣṣṣṣ* *byô*,
 has weakened itself to *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *uyô*, and, according to § 41, has
 introduced an *ṣ* *z* into the base. Another instance in which
ṣ *bh* has weakened itself in the Zend into a semi-vowel,
 and obtained the form Ḡ *w* in virtue of its position between
 two *ṣ* *i*'s, is the very common preposition *ṣṣṣṣ* *auu*, for
 which, however, *ṣṣṣṣ* *aui* is sometimes substituted. It may
 be appropriate here to remark that *ṣ* *bh* appears in the
 Zend, in other company, in the enfeebled shape of » *v*
 We find, namely, the base *ṣṣ* *ubha*, "both," not only in the
 shape *ṣṣṣṣ* *uba*, but also in that of *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *aua* (§ 28), the
 neuter dual form of which I think I recognise in the Vend S
 p 88, where *ṣṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *ṣṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *ṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *aué* *ya'snô*
amêshê spëntê, can hardly signify any thing else than "*ambos*
† venerans Amschaspantos" (*non conniventes Sanctos*, see Nalus,
 vv 25, 26) Anquetil interprets (T 3, p. 472) *oué*, by "*tous*
deux" We have still another position to mention, in which
 [G Ed p 45] the semi-vowel Ḡ *w* appears, namely,
 before *ṣ* *i*, in which connection the softer *w* is more appo-

* Compare, in this respect, *ṣṣṣṣ* *abhna*, "cloud," for *ṣṣṣṣ* *ab-bhna*,
 "water-bearing," and the Zend *ṣṣṣṣṣṣṣṣṣ* *â-bêrêta*, nom "water-bearer"
 † Burnouf reads *aôu* (*i e* "over") and makes *ya'sne*, signify "reverence"

priate than the harder » *v* The only example of this case is the feminine suwra sword dagger, * in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit सुभ्रा *subhṛa* shining * As to the pronunciation of the œ *u* I think with Burnouf that it accords with the English *w* which also is akin to the Sanskrit व *v* after consonants Rask reverses the powers pronouncing the Zend œ as the English *v* and the letters h and » as the English *w*

46 I have not detected in the *v* and *w* a power of attraction similar to that which belongs to the y *y* as described in § 41 unless the term haurta all which often occurs as well as uipa is derived from the Sanskrit सर्व *sarva* all I have however already else where ascribed to the corresponding vowel u a power of attraction howbeit sparingly exerted in virtue of which for instance the base ataran priests in the weak cases (see § 129) after that an has contracted itself into un by the influence of this *u* also converts the *a* of the preceding syllable into *u* hence for instance in the dative ataruné for utaruné The Sanskrit तरुण *taruna* 'young' is in Zend turuna or tauruna (§ 28) and rasu thing riches [G Ed p 46] has by the influence of the concluding *u*, converted itself into vshu

47 Burnouf was the first to remark on the fact peculiar to the Zend that the semi vowels are fond of communicating an aspiration to a preceding consonant, and we (§ 40) have ascribed a similar influence to s and n and find ourselves compelled to assign the same also to the

* The accusative suwranm , appears in Olshausen, p 13 with the variation sufnanm (§ 40) Then we often find the instrumental suwrya for which, however we must read suwraya if *suwrya* be not derivable from a Theme suwri after the analogy of sundari , from sundara (Gramm Crit r 270)

labial nasal, by which, for instance, the feminine participle *जग्मुषी jagmushī* has changed itself to *जग्मुष्य jaghmūshī*. The dental medial is free from this influence, for we find *द्वद्वा dva*, "two," *द्वुद्रुव druc*, "a demon," (accus *द्वुद्रुव drūjem*), not *द्वुद्रुव dhruvc*, *द्वुद्रुव dhruvčm*. The guttural medial is, however, exposed to this influence, as in the abovementioned instance of *jaghmūshī*. We have, on the other hand, adduced, in § 38, a limitation of this appearance. The aspirating virtue of the *य y* is less potent than that of the *र r* and *व v*, and we find *y* often preceded by the un-aspirated *t*, for instance, in *द्वितीया bitya*, "the second," *द्वितीया thitya*, "the third" on the other hand, we have *मर्त्ये मर्त्ये mētye*, "death," Sansk *मृत्यु mṛtyu*.

48 In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before *r*, when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an *h* is usually placed, for instance *मर्त्या महका mahka*, "death," from the root *मर mar* (*मृ mṛ*), "to die", *केहपेम केहपेम keh pēm*, or *केहपेम केहपेम kēpēm*, "the body" (nom *केहपेम kehēps*), *वहिका वहिका vēhika*, or *वहिका वहिका vēhika*, "wolf," (*वृक vṛka*). The semi-vowel *y* also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an *h*, thus, *द्वितीया द्वितीया thwaha*, "through thee," corresponds to the Sanskrit *द्वितीया द्वितीया twayā*, and the word *द्वितीया द्वितीया csaha* (nom *द्वितीया द्वितीया csaha*)

[G Ed p 47] *csahyā* adduced by Rask, stands for *द्वितीया द्वितीया csaya* and comes from the root *चस् cs*, "to rule," (*लक्ष lsh*.)

49 We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, *श्*, which we express by *ś* in Sanskrit, and *š* in Zend, is written *š* in the latter. Its exact pronunciation is scarcely ascertainable. Anquetil assigns it that of the ordinary *s*. It in general occurs in those positions in which the Sanskrit in corresponding words has its *श् ś*, thus, for instance, *दाśa*, "ten," *śata*, "hundred," *paśu*, "beast," are common to both languages. In this respect *š* has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit, that before several consonants,

namely *ɾ t ʒ k* and *ʃ n* as well at the beginning as in the middle of words—in the latter place however only after *ɾ a ɾ á* and *ʒ an*—it corresponds to the Sanskrit dental or ordinary *s* स Compare *ʒɾɾɾɾ starð* the stars with *staras* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ stadm* I praise with *stōm* *stōm* *ʒɾɾɾɾ asti* he is with *astu* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ astanm* *ossium* with *asthi* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ shanda* shoulder (?) with *shandha* *ʒɾɾɾɾ snā* to purify with *sna* to bathe We might infer from this circumstance that *s ɾ* was pronounced as a simple *s* yet it may have to do with a dialectical preference for the sound *sh* as happens with the German *s* in the Suabian dialect, and pretty universally at the beginning of words before *t* and *p* It is further to be remarked that *s ɾ* occurs also at the end of words after *ʒ an* The occasion for this presents itself in the nom sing masc of bases in *ɾɾ nt*

50 The semi vowel » *v* is regularly hardened into *ɾ p* after *ɾ s* hence for instance *ʒɾɾɾɾ spa canis* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ spanem canem* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ vispa* all [G Ed p 48] *ʒɾɾɾɾ aspa* horse corresponding to the Sanskrit *śva suā* *śvanm śuānam विश्व विश्वा वश्व asua* *ʒɾɾɾɾɾ spenta* holy is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit *śwanta* which must have originally been in use and which the Lithuanian *szanta s* indicates From the Zend *ʒɾɾɾɾ aspa* the transition is easy to the Greek *ἵππος* which is less obvious in the case of the Indian *asua*

51 For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant *ś sh* the Zend supplies two letters *ɾ* and *ɾɾ* The first according to Rask is pronounced like the ordinary *s* and therefore like the Sanskrit dental *s* स while *ɾɾ* has the sound of *ś = sh* and marks this by a stroke of aspiration We therefore write it *sh* * Rask observes that these two letters are often interchanged in MSS which he accounts for by the circumstance

It is in this Translation given *sh* without any mark *Sh* denotes the Sansk *ष*

that ω is used in the Pehlevi for sh , and that the Parsi copyists have been long better acquainted with the Pehlevi than the Zend. We find, also, in the Codex edited by Burnouf, ω almost everywhere corresponding to $\text{𐬀} sh$. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidâd, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects ω as well as 𐬀 corresponds to the Sanskrit $\text{𑖀} sh$, the principal position of ω is before strong consonants (§. 25.) and at the end of words, a position of much importance in the Zend, and which requires attention in the cases of other classes of letters. In this respect ω resembles, among the dentals, $\text{𐬀} t$, among the gutturals $\text{𐬀} c$, and among the nasals principally $\text{𐬀} n$. At the end of words, indeed, ωs corresponds to the Sanskrit $\text{𑖀} s$, but yet [G Ed p 49] only after such letters as, in the middle of a word, would, according to Rule 101⁽¹⁾ of my Sanskrit Grammar, change an original $\text{𑖀} s$ into $\text{𑖀} sh$, namely, after vowels other than a and \acute{a} , and after the consonants $\text{𐬀} c$ and $\text{𐬀} t$. Hence, for instance, the nominative $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} partis$, "Lord," $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} pasus$, "beast," $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} \acute{a}tais$, "fire," $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} drucs$, "dæmon," from the theme $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀} dru$. On the other hand, $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} barans$, "bearing," from $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} barant$.⁴ In the word $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} csias$, "six," it is true a terminating ωs stands after a , but it does not here replace a Sanskrit $\text{𑖀} s$, but the original $\text{𑖀} sh$ of $\text{𑖀𑖀} shash$. As evidence of the use of ωs for $\text{𑖀} sh$ before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀} ista$ (*ic istos*), corresponding to the Sanskrit $\text{𑖀𑖀} ishtha$. Other examples are $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} karsta$, "ploughed," for $\text{𑖀𑖀} krishita$. In the word $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} sayana$ "camp," ω stands irregularly for $\text{𐬀} s$, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskrit $\text{𑖀𑖀𑖀} sayana$ (cf. *śaētē*, §. 54). In the fem numeral

* I retain here the original t , since the theme of the word does not appear in use. $\text{𐬀} t$ must otherwise have been changed for $\text{𐬀} t$.

𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮 *tisarō* three (Olsh p 26) the 𑀭 might seem questionable for the Sanskrit form is 𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀮 *tisras* and according to § 53 becomes 𑀭 *h*. The 𑀮 however is here in a position (after 𑀲) in which the Sanskrit favours the conversion of 𑀮 *s* into 𑀮 *sh* and on this rests the Zend form 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮 *tisarō*. That it does not however stand as 𑀘𑀓𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *tisharo* as we might expect from § 52 is certainly not to be ascribed to the original existence of 𑀭 *a* for 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮𑀭𑀮 *tisaro* stands for 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *tisrō*.

52 𑀮𑀮 stands for the Sanskrit 𑀮 *sh* before vowels and the semi vowels 𑀮𑀮 *y* and 𑀮𑀮 *v*, compare 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *aetaēshanm* and 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *aetaēshva* with 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *etesham* *horum* and 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *eteshu* in *his*, 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *mashya* man with 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *manushya*. Yet 𑀮𑀮 *sh* does not unite itself with an antecedent 𑀮 *c* but for the Sanskrit 𑀮𑀮 *lsh* we find almost everywhere in Olshausen's text and without variation 𑀮𑀮 *cs* hence for instance 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *csathra* king Sanskrit 𑀮𑀮𑀮 *lshatra* a man of the warlike or royal caste. The word of frequent occurrence 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *cshnaōma* and the third person connected with it 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *cshnaōmayēti* we must on a double ground reject and prefer the variation given at p 33 since 𑀮 *s* here is prolonged as well by the preceding *c* as by the following *n*. It is however worthy of remark that the Sanskrit 𑀮𑀮 *lsh* in many Zend words abandons the guttural and appears as 𑀮𑀮 *sh*. For instance 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *dakshina* *dexter* becomes 𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *dashina* (Lithuan *desine* the right hand) and 𑀮𑀮𑀮 *akshu* "eye" becomes 𑀮𑀮𑀮 *ashu* which however seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrīhi).

53 𑀭 *h* is never in etymological respects the representative of the Sanskrit 𑀮 *h* but of the pure and dental sibilant 𑀮 *s*. Before vowels semi vowels and *m* in Zend this letter invariably becomes 𑀭 possibly because 𑀮𑀮 *sv* (§ 35) takes the shape 𑀮𑀮 *lh* while before *n* and such consonants as cannot unite with a preceding *h* (§ 49) it is to be looked for in the shape of 𑀮 *s*. The [G Ed p 51]

roots which begin with स् *sp* and स् *sph* have not yet been detected by me in the Zend, but I am convinced that स् *spnis*, for instance, "to touch," could not begin otherwise in Zend than with *sp* Compare, for instance

ZEND.	SANSKRIT
𐬀𐬀 <i>hâ</i> , "they,"	सा <i>sâ</i> .
𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hapla</i> , "seven,"	सप्त <i>sapta</i>
𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hakēret</i> , "once,"	सकृत् <i>sakrit</i>
𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>ah</i> , "thou art,"	असि <i>asi</i>
𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>ahmâi</i> , "to this,"	अस्मे <i>asmâi</i>
𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hvarē</i> , "sun,"	स्व <i>sva</i> , "heaven"
𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 <i>hva</i> , "his,"	स <i>sva</i>

The word 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *hizva*, "tongue," from 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *jhuva*, deserves mention, because the sibilant quality of the *z* is treated as *s*, and replaced by *h* (§ 59)

54 I do not remember to have met with an instance of the combination *hr*, the Sanskrit word सहस्र *sahasra*, "thousand," which might give occasion for it, has rejected the sibilant in the last syllable, and taken the shape 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *hazama* If, in the word 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *huska*, "dry," Sansk शुष्क *śushka*, *h* replaces the Sansk श् *ś*, we must remember that the Latin *siccus* indicates a Sansk स *s*, because *c* regularly answers to श् *ś* In many instances of Sanskrit roots beginning with स् *s*, the corresponding Zend form may be grounded on the change which is effected on an initial स् *s* by the influence of certain prepositions (Gram Crit r 80.)

[G Ed p 52] Thus I believe I have clearly ascertained the existence of the Sanskrit participle सिद्ध *siddha*, "perfected," in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shâistēm*, after the analogy of 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *nistâ*, "deceased," from 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vrth* (see § 99) Olshausen notifies (p 29) as variations of 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shâistēm* 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shâistēm*, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shâistēm*, and 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shâistēm* In all these forms, the long *a* presents a difficulty, for, according to § 28, सिध् *shudh* would give the form 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *shardh*, and thus, with the suffix *ta*,

instancé, अह्नि *ahni*, "thou art," अह्निभक्ष्णो *baesahni*, "thou givest," not अह्नि *ahni*, अह्निभक्ष्णो *baesanhi*

56b). The termination *as*, which in Sanskrit only before sonant consonants (§ 25) and अ, dissolves its स into उ *u*, and contracts the latter together with the preceding *a* into औ *ô* (compare the French *au*, from *al*). this ancient termination *as* appears in Zend, as also in Prâkrit and Pali, always under the shape of *ô*. On the other hand, the termination *âs*, which in Sanskrit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the *s*, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of ऽ *o* (for [G Ed p 54] *u*), and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,* that in Sanskrit the suppression of a terminating *s* after *â* had preceded the vocalization of this *s* into *u*. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an ऽ *n* precedes the *h* which springs out of the *s* of the syllable *âs*, or where, before the enclitic particle चा *cha*, the *s* above mentioned is changed into ऽ *ô*, together with these substantial representatives of the *s*, its evaporation into ऽ *o* is also retained, and the sibilant thus appears in a double form, albeit torpid and evanescent. To illustrate this by some examples, the Sanskrit मासु *mâs*, "luna" an uninflected nominative, for the *s* belongs to the root receives in Zend the form मासो *mâso*, in which *o* represents the Sanskrit *s*, मासश्चा *mâs'-cha*, "lunaque," gives us मासोश्चा *mâso'scha*, and, मासम् *mâsam*, "lunam," मसोश्चा *mâsoh'm*, so that in the two last examples the Sanskrit sibilant is represented by a vowel and a consonant. The analogy of *mâsoh'm*, "lunam," is followed in all similar instances, for example, for आस *âsa* "fuit," we find आसोश्चा *âsoh'ha*, and for आसाम् *âsâm*, "earum," आसोश्चा *âsohanm* †

* Observations, rule 78 of the Latin edition of Sanskrit Grammar

† Burnouf is of a different opinion as to the matter in question, for in the

57 Two sibilants remain to be mentioned namely ζ and ϵ of which the former was probably pronounced like the French z and may therefore be replaced [G Ed p 55] by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskrit $ह h$ for the most part which never corresponds to the Zend h . Compare for example

SANSKRIT	ZEND
अहम् <i>aham</i> I	𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎 <i>a ěm</i>
हस्त <i>hasta</i> hand	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>zasta</i>
सहस्र <i>sahasra</i> thousand	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>ha-ranra</i>
हन्ति <i>hanti</i> he strikes	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>zanti</i>
वहति <i>vahati</i> he carries	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>vazanti</i>
bears	
हि <i>hi</i> for	𐬀𐬎𐬎
जिह्वा <i>jihvā</i> tongue	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>hi va</i> (§ 53)
महात् <i>mahaṭ</i> great	𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>ma-δ</i> (from <i>mazas</i> acc. 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 <i>ma-ranhum</i>)

58 Sometimes ζz appears also in the place of the Sanskrit $ज j$ so that the sibilant portion of this letter pronounced *dsch* is alone represented and the *d* sound suppressed (see § 53). Thus $\zeta𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎$ *yaz* to adore answers to the Sanskrit $यज् *yaj*$ 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *zabsha* to please springs from the Sanskrit root $जुष् *jush*$ to please or gratify. Thirdly the Zend z represents also the Sanskrit $ग g$ which is easily accounted for by the relationship between g and j . The Indian $gō$ (accus. *gām*) *bos* and *terra* has in Zend as *al o* in Greek clothed itself in two forms the first

the *Nouveau Journ. Asiatique* tom. III p. 342 speaking of the relation of *maonho* to *maranho* without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, *maosh cī a lunague urī araosh-cha arboresque* "he says

In *māongho* there is perhaps this difference, that the *ng* does not replace the Sanskrit *s* for this letter has already become *o* in consequence of a change of frequent occurrence which we have lately noticed

signification has maintained itself in Zend, but in Greek has given way to the labial, and βούς and ἄερας *gáous*, or ἄερας *gáus*, correspond to the Sanskrit noun गौस् *gáus*

[G Ed p 56] For the signification "earth" the Greek has preserved the guttural, which in Zend is replaced by *r*. The nom εἰς *záo* supposes an Indian form गाम् *gám*, for गौस् *gáus*, in the accusative, εἰς *zanm* agrees, in respect of inflection, as closely as possible with गाम् *gám* and γῆν.

59 *zh* is of less frequent use, and was probably pronounced like the French *j* we write it *zh*. It is observable, that as the French *j* in many words corresponds to the Latin semi-vowel *j*, and derives from it its own developement, so also sometimes, in Zend, *zh* has arisen out of the Sanskrit य् *y*. Thus, for instance, यूयम् *yúyam*, "you," (*ios*), becomes εἰζεβζγϣ *yúzhēm*. Sometimes, also, *zh* has sprung from the sound of the English *j*, and corresponds to the Sanskrit ज् *j*, as in εἰζεβ *zhēnu*, Sanskrit नानु *jānu*, "knee" Finally, it stands as a terminating letter in some prefixes, in the place of the Sanskrit dental स् *s* after *r* and *u*, thus, εἰζεβζγϣ *nizhbarati*, "he carries out", εἰζεβζγϣ *duzh-úctēm*, "ill spoken" on the other hand, εἰζεβζγϣ *dus-matēm*, "ill thought"

60 We have still to elucidate the nasals, which we have postponed till now, because for them a knowledge of the system of the other sounds is indispensable. We must first of all mention a difference from the Sanskrit, that in Zend every organ has not its particular nasal, but that here, in respect of *n*, two main distinctions are established, and that these mainly depend on the circumstance whether *n* precedes a vowel or a consonant. In this manner *j* and *zh* are so contrasted, that the first finds its place chiefly before whole and half vowels, and also at the end of words, the latter only

[G Ed p 57] in the middle of strong consonants. We find, for instance, εἰζεβζγϣ *hanká arjēm*, "I glorify", εἰζεβζγϣ *pancha*, "five", εἰζεβζγϣ *búshyantēm* on the

other hand *avna* (nom) *man* *noit* not *barayen* they might bear *anya* the other Concerning the difference between *y* and *ay*—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that *ay* being always fenced in by strong consonants must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer *y* and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter

61 Still feebler and more undecided than *ay* perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anusvara, we conjecture to have been the nasal *ay* which is always involved with *va*, and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of *v* and *y*. We find this letter which we write *an* first before sibilants before *wh* like the Anusvara and before the aspirates *th* and *f* for instance *csayans regnans* *ucus csayanti* *zanhyamāna* a part of the middle future of the root *zan* 'to beget,' but as it seems to me with a passive signification (*qui nascetur* Vend S pp 23 and 103) *manthra* speech from the root *man* *janfnu* mouth probably from the Sanskrit *jap* to pray § 40 and with the nasal inserted Secondly, before a terminating *m* and *n*. We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination *am* is always changed to *ann* in Zend for instance *dadhanm* I gave Sanskrit *adadām* *pādhananm* *pedum* Sans *pādānām* and that the termination of the third person plural *an* provided the *a* do not pass into *ē* always appears as a double nasal *ann**

62 For the nasal which according to § 56 is placed as an euphonic addition before the *wh* which springs from *s* the Zend has two characters, *z* and *š* to both which

* The termination *ann* from *an* belongs to the potential, precativ and subjunctive

Anquetil assigns the sound *ng** We write them *n*, in order to avoid giving the appearance of a *g* preceded by a guttural *n* to this guttural, which is only a nasal precursor of the following *h* As to the difference in the use of these two letters, *z* always follows *a* and *áo*, *ś*, on the contrary, comes after *i* and *e*, for which the occasion is rare. For instance, in the relative plural nom. *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤𑎥 𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *gh'nhé*, "qui," and in the fem pron. genitives, as *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤𑎥 𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *anháo*, "huius," which often occurs, but as often without *z*, and with *z n*. *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤𑎥 𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *anháo* What phonetic difference existed between *z* and *ś* we cannot venture to pronounce. Anquetil as we have seen, assigns the same pronunciation to each; while Rask compares *ś* with the Sanskrit palatal *ञ n*, and illustrates its sound by that of the Spanish and Portuguese ñ

63 The labial nasal *ç m* does not differ from the Sanskrit *म्* it must, however, be remarked, that it sometimes takes the place of *b* At least the root *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *brú*, "speak," in Zend becomes *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *mrú*, as *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *maóm*, "I spoke," *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *mrabt*, "he spoke" in a similar manner is the Indian *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *mukha*, "mouth," related to the Latin *bucca*, and not [G Ed p 59] much otherwise the Latin *mare* to the Sanskrit *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *vâri*, "water" I consider, also, *multus* related to *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *bahula*, the Greek *πολύς*, and the Gothic *filu*

64 A concluding *ç m* operates in a double manner on a preceding vowel It weakens (see §. 30) the *α a* to *ξ ě*, and, on the other hand, lengthens the vowels *i* and *u*, thus, for instance, *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *partim*, "the Lord," *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *tanám*, "the body," from the bases *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *parti*, *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *tanu* In contradiction to this rule we find the vocative of frequent occurrence, *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *ashám*, "pure" Here, however, *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *áu*, as a diphthong, answers to the Sanskrit *𑎧𑎡𑎣𑎤* *áu*, the last element of which is not capable of further lengthening

* Bunnouf also writes the first of these *ng* I have done the same in my reviews in the Journal of Lit Crit

The form in question is a contraction of the theme 𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀 *ashavan*, with an irregular conversion of the concluding 𐬎 into 𐬎

65 We give here a complete summary of the Zend characters

Simple Vowels $\text{𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀}$ $\text{𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀}$

Diphthongs $\text{𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀}$ $\text{𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀}$

Gutturals 𐬀 𐬀 (before vowels and 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 (principally before consonants) 𐬀 𐬀 (from 𐬀 𐬀 before vowels and 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀

Palatals 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀

Dentals 𐬀 𐬀 (before vowels and 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 (before consonants and at the end of words) 𐬀 𐬀 (before whole and semi vowels) 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀

Labials 𐬀 𐬀 (the latter before vowels semi vowels nasals and 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀

Semi vowels 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 (the two [G Ed p 60] first initial the last medial) 𐬀 𐬀 (the last only after 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 (the first initial the last medial) 𐬀 𐬀

Sibilants and 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 (or like the French 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀

Nasals 𐬀 𐬀 (before vowels semi vowels and at the end of words) 𐬀 𐬀 (before strong consonants) 𐬀 𐬀 (before sibilants 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 and 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 (between 𐬀 𐬀 or 𐬀 𐬀 and 𐬀 𐬀 and between 𐬀 and 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀 (between 𐬀 𐬀 or 𐬀 𐬀 and 𐬀 𐬀) 𐬀 𐬀

Remark also the Compounds 𐬀 𐬀 for 𐬀 𐬀 *ah* and 𐬀 𐬀 for 𐬀 𐬀 *st*

66 We refrain from treating specially of the Greek Latin and Lithuanian systems of sounds but must here devote a closer consideration to the Germanic The Gothic 𐬀 which according to Grimm is always short answers

* L g 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 𐬀 *ha-anra* a thousand

have an example in which the Gothic Sanskrit *a* has become *i*

69 For the Sanskrit ञा *á* the Gothic which has no long *a* almost always substitutes *o* (§ 4) and this *o* in cases of abbreviation, falls back into the short *a*. Thus for instance in Grimm's first fem declension of the strong form the nom and accus sing *o* is softened to *a* whence *giba*, *gibó-s* (§ 118). Generally in the Gothic polysyllabic forms, the concluding ञा *á* is shortened to *a* and where *o* stands at the termination, an originally succeeding consonant has been dropped for instance, in the gen plur fem *o* stands for ञाम *ám*. Sometimes also in the Gothic *é* corresponds to the Sanskrit *á* as in the gen plur masc and neuter. In the Old High German the Gothic *o* either [G Ed p 62] remains *o* as in the gen plur, or divides itself into two short vowels and according to differences of origin into *oa*, *ua* or *uo* of which in the Middle High German *uo* prevails while in the Modern High German the two divided vowels are contracted into *u*. For the Gothic *é* = ञा *á* the Old Middle and Modern High German have preserved the old *a* except in the gen plural.

70 For ङी *i* and ङी *i* the Gothic has *i* and *ei* which latter as Grimm has sufficiently shewn is everywhere to be considered as long *i* and also in Old and Middle High German is so represented. We, together with Grimm as in the case of the other vowels designate its prolongation by *i* circumflex. In the Modern High German the long *i* appears mostly as *ei*. Compare for instance *mein* with the Gothic genitive *meina* and the Old and Middle High German *min*. Sometimes a short *i* is substituted, as in *lich* answering to the Gothic *lehs* like at the end of compounds. On the long *i*, in *uir* *nos* Gothic *reis* we can lay no stress as we match the dat sing *mir* also with the Gothic *mis*. It is scarcely worth remarking that we usually in writing designate the elongation of the *i* and other vowels by the addition of *u* *h*

71 While the original a has undergone many alterations in the Germanic languages, and has produced both i and u , I have been able to detect no other alterations in i and \acute{i} than that i is as often suppressed as a , but it never happens, unless some rare exceptions have escaped me, that i is replaced by a heavier vowel a or u . We may lay [G Ed p 63] it down as a rule, that final i has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin. Compare.

SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN	GOthic
परि <i>pari</i> ,	περί,	<i>pei</i> ,	<i>far</i> . (§ 82)
उपरि <i>upari</i> ,	ὑπέρ,	<i>super</i> ,	<i>ufan</i>
अस्ति <i>asti</i> ,	ἐστί,	<i>est</i> ,	<i>ist</i>
सन्ति <i>santi</i> ,	εἰστί,	<i>sunt</i> ,	<i>siñd</i>

72 Where a concluding i occurs in Gothic and Old High German it is always a mutilation of the German j (or y) together with the following vowel, so that j , after the suppression of this vowel, has vocalized itself. Thus the uninflected Gothic accus *hari*, "exercitum," is a mutilation of *hariya* † The Sanskrit would require *hariya-m*, and the Zend, after § 42., meeting the Germanic half way, *hari-m*. Before a concluding s also, in the Gothic, xi is usually suppressed, and the Gothic terminating syllable *is*, is mostly a weakening of *as*, § 67. In Old High German, and still more in Middle and Modern High German, the Gothic i has often degenerated into e , which, where it occurs in the accented syllable, is expressed in Grimm by e . We retain this character. We have also to observe of the Gothic, that, in the old text, i

* The Sanskrit पित्रु *pitru*, "father," probably stands for पितृ *pātri*, "ruler", and the European languages have adhered to the true original (Gramm Crit r 178, Annot).

† In the text *hariya*, but in order to shew more exactly the connection with the Sanscrit य y , vide § 68 l 12, and as the j is simply and universally pronounced y , the German j will be represented by y in this translation

at the beginning of a syllable is distinguished by two dots above which Grimm retains

73 As in Zend (§ 41) by the attractive force of *i*, *ê*, or *y* an *i* is introduced into the antecedent syllable so also in Old High German the corresponding sounds have obtained an assimilating power and frequently an [G Ed p 64] *a* of the preceding syllable is converted into *e*, without any power of prevention on the part of either a single or double consonant Thus for instance we find from *ast* branch the plural *estî* from *anst* grace the plural *enstî*, and from *vallu* 'I fall, the second and third persons *vellîs* *vellit* This law however has not prevailed the Old High German universally we find, for instance *arpi* *hereditas* not *erpi* *zahart*, *lacrymæ* not *zaheri*

74 In the Middle High German the *e* which springs from the older *i* has both retained and extended the power of modification and assimilation inasmuch as, with few limitations, (Grimm p 332,) not only every *a* by its retrospective action becomes *e* but generally, also *â* *u* and *o* are modified into *æ* *u* and *o* *ô* into *æ* and *uo* into *ue* Thus the plural *geste* *drate*, *bruche* *koche* *læne* *gruese* from *gast*, *drât* *bruch*, *koch*, *lôn* *gruo* On the other hand in the Old High German the *e* which has degenerated from *i* or *a* obtains no such power and we find in the genitive singular of the above words *gaste* *s* *drate*-*s* &c because the Old High German has already in the declension of the masculine *i* class reduced to *e* the *i* belonging to the class and which in Gothic remains unaltered

75 The *e* produced in Old and Middle High German by the modification of *a* is retained in the Modern High German in cases where the trace of the original vowel is either extinguished or scarcely felt as *Ende* *Engel*, *set* *en* *netzen* *nennen*, *brennen* Goth *andi*, *aggilus* *satyan* *natyan* *namnyan* *brannyan* Where, however the original vowel is distinctly opposed to the change we place *u* short or

[G Ed p 65] long, from short or long *u*, and in the same relation, *u* from *u*, *o* from *o*, *au* from *au*, for instance, *Bronde*, *Pfale*, *Dunste*, *Fluge*, *Koche*, *Tone*, *Baume*, from *Brand*, *Pfal*, &c

76 For $\text{उ}u$, $\text{ऊ}û$, the Gothic has *u*, which is generally short. Among the few examples cited by GRIMM, p. 11, of long *u*, we particularize the comparative $\text{सुतिसु}ó$, the essential part of which corresponds to the Sansk $\text{सु}suádu$, "sweet," (हृदु-स), and in which the long *u* may stand as a compensation for the absence of the *u(v)*, which becomes vocalized. In Old High German it seems to me that *púam*, "to dwell," and *trú'n*, "to trust," correspond to the Sanskrit roots $\text{भू}bhú$, "to be," $\text{ध्रु}dhrú$ "to stand fast" from which comes $\text{ध्रुव}dhruva$, "fast," "constant," "certain" (Gramm Crit r 51.) with the Guna form of which (§ 26) the Goth. *bauan*, *trauan*, is connected, cf $\text{भविष्यु}bhav-itum$, "to be," $\text{ध्रुविसु}dhrav-itum$, "to stand fast." The Middle High German continues the Gothic Old High German *û*, but the Modern High German substitutes *au*, whence *bauen*, *trauen*, *Taube* (Gothic *dûbô*).

77 As out of the Sanskrit $\text{उ}u$, in Zend, the sound of a short U^* has developed itself (§ 32), thus, also, the Gothic *u* shews itself, in the more recent dialects, oftener in the form of *o* than in its own. Thus have the Verbs in the Old and Middle High German (Grimm's 9th conjug) preserved a radical *u* in the plur of the pret., but replaced it by *o* in the passive part. Compare, for instance, *bugum*, "we bend," *bugans*, "bent," with Old High German *pukumês*, *pokanêr*, Middle High German *bugen*, *bogen*. The example adduced shews, also, the softening of the old *u* to *e*, in unaccented syllables, in Middle High German as in Modern High German, so that this unaccented *e* may represent all original vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, and we may lay it down as a rule, that all long and short vowels in the last syllable of poly

* Cf §. 447* Note.

syllabic words, are either worn away or softened down to a mute *e*

78 For the diphthongs *ए* (*a + i*) and *ओ* (*a + u*) the Gothic has *ai* and *au* which are also monosyllabic and were perhaps pronounced like *ए* *é* and *ओ* *ó*. Compare *baiaima* *ædificemus* with *भवेम bhavema* ' *simus* *sunau s* of *son* with its equivalent *सुनोस् sunô-s*. Where these Gothic diphthongs *ai* and *au* have maintained themselves unaltered in value they then appear in writing as *ê* and *ö*,* which must be considered as contractions of *a + i* and *a + u* as in the Latin *amêmus* from *amaimus* (§ 5) and as in the almost solitary case of *bôs* the long *o* of which is the result of a contraction of *a + u*, whose latter element appears again before vowels in the independent shape of *v* (*bovi bovm*) while the first element *û* in its degeneration, appears as *o* (§ 3). Compare

SANSKRIT	GOTHIC	OLD HIGH GERMAN
चरेम <i>charēma</i> (<i>camus</i>)	<i>farauma</i>	<i>ɹaremés</i>
चरेत् <i>chareta</i> (<i>entis</i>)	<i>farauth</i>	<i>varét</i>
तेभ्यस् <i>tibhyas</i> (<i>his</i>)	<i>thaim</i>	<i>dēm</i>

79 In like manner in all subjunctives and in the nominal declension in which the adjective bases in *a* take part an Old High German *ê* corresponds to the Sanskrit *ए* *é* and Gothic *ai*. The Middle High German [G Ed p 67] has shortened this *ê* as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (*ɹaren varét*). Besides this the Middle High German has in common with the Old High German

If however the Gothic diphthongs in question were not pronounced like their etymological equivalents *ए* *é* and *ओ* *ó* but, as Grimm conceives approximate to the Vriddhi change (§ 20) *ऐ* *ai* and *औ* *au* in such case the High German *ê* *ó* as opposed to the Gothic *ai* *au* are not merely continuations of these Gothic diphthongs but the pronunciation assigned by the Sanskrit to the union of *a* with *i* or *u* must have been first introduced into the Germanic under certain conditions, in the eighth century

preserved the diphthong *ê* where it stood in radical syllables under the protection of a following *u*, *r* (out of the older *s*), or *h* (*ch*), even in cases where one of these letters had been dropped, or where *u* had vocalized itself into *u* or *o*. (Grimm. pp. 90 343). Compare,

GOTHIC	OLD HIGH GERMAN	MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN
<i>aw</i> , " <i>arum</i> ,"	<i>êu in</i>	
* <i>snau s</i> , " <i>nur</i> ,"	<i>snêu</i> ,	<i>snê</i>
<i>maiz</i> , " <i>magis</i> ,"	<i>mêr</i> ,	<i>mê</i>
<i>laisyan</i> , " <i>docere</i> ,"	<i>lêian</i> .	<i>lêren</i>
<i>laih</i> , " <i>commodavit</i> ,"	<i>lêh</i>	<i>lêch</i>

In the Modern High German this *ê* is partly preserved, partly replaced, for instance, *mêr* (*mehr*), *Schnê* (*Schnee*), *Sêle* (Gothic *saiwala*), but *ich lieh*, *gedieh* (Grimm p. 983.)

80. As the *ê* for the Gothic *ai*, so the *ô* for *au*, in the Old and Middle High German, is favoured by certain consonants, and those which favour the *ô* are the more numerous. They consist of the dentals (according to the Sanskrit division, § 16.) *t*, *d*, *z*, together with their nasal and sibilant (*n*, *s*), further, the semi-vowel *r*, and *h*, which, as a termination in Middle High German, becomes *ch* (See Grimm, pp. 94. 345). The roots, which in the Gothic admit the Guna modification of the radical *u* by *a*, in the preterite singular, oppose to the Gothic *au*, in Middle and Old High German, a double form, namely, *ô* under the condition above mentioned, and next *ou*, § 34., in the absence [G. Ed p 68] of the letter which protects *ô*. For instance, Old High German *zôh*, Middle High German *zôch* (*traai*, *trant*) Gothic *tauht*, Sanskrit दुद्धे *dudôha* (*mulu*, *mulsi*), but *pou*, *bouc*, *flexi*, *flevit*, Gothic *laug*, Sanskrit बुभोज *bu-bhôja*. The Modern High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong *au*, either, like the Middle and Old High German, as *ô*, and in a more extended degree, and subject to the modification of § 75, or next, shortened to *o*,

the particulars of which will be explained under the verb or thirdly as *au* for instance *daupya* I baptize *hlaupa* I run or fourthly as *eu* § 83

81 As Ulfilas in proper names represents both *e* and *ai* by *ai* and likewise *o* and *au* by *au* (*Patrus, Galeilaa apaustaulus Paulus*) and *as* in the next place not every Gothic *ai* and *au* in the cognate dialects is represented in like manner but in some cases the Gothic *ai* is replaced in Old High German by a simple *i* or *e*, and *au* by *u* or *o* (§ 77) but in the others *ai* is replaced by *e* or (§ 80) by *ei* and *au* by *o* or (§ 81) *ou* therefore Grimm deduces from these facts a double value of the diphthongs *ai* and *au* one with the accent on the last element (*ai*, *au*) another with the accent on the *a* (*ai* *au*) We cannot however give implicit belief to this deduction of the acute author of the German system of sounds and prefer assuming an equal value in all cases of the Gothic *ai* and *au* although we might support Grimm's view by the fact that in Sanskrit *ए* *ऐ* *ओ* *औ* never replace his *ai* and *au* but everywhere where occasion occurs do replace *ai* and *au* We think however that the difference is rather phonetic than etymological. As concerns the *ai* and *au* in proper names it may be accounted for inasmuch as the Gothic was [G F I p 69] deficient in equivalents for these non primitive vowels which have degenerated from the original *ai* *au*. Could Ulfilas have looked back into the early ages of his language and have recognised the original identity of *e* and *o* with his *a* he would perhaps have used the latter as their substitutes. From his point of sight however he embraced the *ai* and *au* probably because these mixed diphthongs passed with him as weaker than the long *e* and *o*, *eiusdem generis* = (*आ* *अ*) It is important here to observe that in Greek also *ai* is felt as weaker than *η* and *ω* as is proved by the fact that *ai* does not attract the accent towards itself (*τυπτομαι* not *τυπτομαι*). The expression of the Greek *ai* and *au* by

the Gothic *ai* and *au* requires the less justification, because even if *ai* was pronounced like ए ई, and *au* like औ ओ, yet the written character presents these diphthongs as a still perceptible fusion of *a* with a following *i* or *u*.

82 As to the other statement, namely, that not every Gothic *ai* and *au* produces the same effect in the younger dialects, nor has the same foundation in the older Sanskrit, it might be sufficient to observe upon one feature of dialect peculiar to the Gothic, that *h* and *r* do not content themselves with a pure preceding *i*, but require it to be affected by Guna (§ 26.), thus, *ai* for *i*, and *au* for *u*, while other dialects exhibit the *i* and *u* before *h* and *r* in the same form as before every other consonant. The relation of the Gothic to their Sanskrit equivalents,

GOTHIC	SANSKRIT
<i>saihs</i> , "six,"	षष् <i>shash</i> ,
<i>taihun</i> , "ten,"	दशन् <i>daśan</i> ,
<i>faihu</i> , "cattle,"	पशु <i>paśu</i> ,
<i>svaihra</i> "father-in-law,"	श्वशुर <i>śvaśura</i> ,
<i>taihsvô</i> , "dextera,"	दक्षिणा <i>dakṣiṇā</i> ,
[G] <i>hantô</i> , "heart,"	हृद् <i>hrīd</i> (from <i>hard</i> § 1),
[Ed] <i>bairan</i> , "to bear,"	भर्तुम् <i>bhartum</i> ,
[P] <i>distaman</i> , "to tear,"	दरितुम् <i>dar-i-tum</i> ,
[70] <i>stairnô</i> , "stair,"	तारा <i>tāra</i> ,

is not so to be understood as though an *i* had been placed after the old *a*, but that, by the softening down of the *a* to *i* (§ 66), the forms *saihs*, *taihun*, had been produced, out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from *h* and *r* had produced *saihs*, *taihun*, *bairan*. The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage, for Old High German *sehs*, (Anglo-Saxon, "six,") and *tehan* or *tehun*, &c, rest upon an earlier Gothic *saihs*, *taihun*. Thus, *tohtar* rests on an earlier Gothic *duhtar*, for the Guna form *dauhtar*, Sanskrit दुहितृ *duhitā*, (दुहितृ *duhitri*, §. 1) "daughter." Where the

Sanskrit अ has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered that is not weakened to i the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong ai , since it is not the a before h and r which demands a subsequent addition but the i which demands a precedent one, compare *ahtau*, eight with अष्टौ *ashtau* *

83 The alterations to which the simple vowels have been subjected appear again in the simple elements of the diphthongs as well in the relation of the Gothic to the Sanskrit as in that of the younger Germanic dialects to the Gothic. Thus the a element of the diphthong ai i shews itself often in the Gothic and in certain places in a regular manner as i (§ 2ⁿ) and in the same places the a contained in æ ä ($a+i$) becomes i which with the second element of the diphthong generates a long i (written as ei § 70). The Gothic iu has either retained that form in Old High German or has altered sometimes one sometimes both of its constituents. Thus have arisen *io* *eo* [C Id p 71]. There is a greater distance to be passed in Otfriid's theory of the substitution of ia for iu which cannot fail to surprise as we know that a simple u never becomes a †. In Middle High German iu has either remained unaltered, or has been changed to ie which is as old as the latest Old High German as it is found in Notker. In Modern High German the substitution of ie for the old iu is that which princi-

* *Ahtau* = *isht* iu is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic au corresponds to the Sanskrit इदं id diphthong इः iu , on the other hand au often answers to अः $o = (a+u)$.

† There is yet another ia in Old High German namely that which Grimm (p 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction and formerly dissyllabic to which, therefore there is no counterpart diphthong in Gothic. The most important case will be discussed under the head of the verb, in preterites such as *hailt* I held Gothic *haihalt*. After this analogy *fiar* 'four' (according to Otfriid), arose out of the Gothic *fi lior* in this way that after the extrusion of the di the ℓ passed into its corresponding short vowel — Grimm p 103.

pally prevails, in which, however, the *e* is only visibly retained, for phonetically it is absorbed by the *i*. Compare *ich biete* with the Gothic *biuda*, *grosse* with *gula*. Besides this form, we also find *eu* in place of the old *iu* or still older *au*, in cases, namely, where *e* can be accounted for as the result of a no longer perceptible modification (Grimm, p. 523, § 75), compare *Leute* with the Gothic *laudans*, Old High German *luti*, "people", *Heu*, "hay," with Goth, *havi*, "grass" Usually, however, the Gothic has already acquired an *iu* in place of this *eu*, and the original *au* (which becomes *av* before vowels) is to be sought in the Sanskrit, for instance, *Neune*, "nine," Old High German *nuun*, Gothic *munans*, Sanskrit नवन् *navan* (as theme), *neu*, "new," Old High German *nuu* (indeclinable), Gothic *nivi-s*, Sanskrit नवस् *navas* This *e*, however, is difficult to account for, in as far as it is connected with the *Umlaut*, because it corresponds to an *i* in Middle and Old High German, and this vowel, of itself answering to an *i* or *y* in the following syllable, is capable of no alteration through the power of attraction Long *u* for *iu*, equivalent to a transposition of the diphthong, is found in *lugen*, "to lie," *trugen*, "to deceive," Middle High German *lugen*, *truugen*

[G Ed p 72] 84 Where the *a* element of the Sanskrit ओ *o* retains its existence in the Gothic, making *au* the equivalent of *o*, the Middle High German, and a part of the Old High German authorities, have *ou* in the place of *au*, although, as has been remarked in § 80, under the influence of certain consonants *o* prevails Compare Old High German *pouc*, Middle High German *bouc*, with the Gothic preterite *baug*, "*flexi*" The *o* of the High German *ou* has the same relation to the corresponding Gothic *a* in *au*, as the Greek *o* in βούς bears to the Sanskrit अ *a*, which undergoes a fusion with उ *u* in the ओ *o* of the cognate word गो *go* The oldest Old High German authorities (Gl Hiab Ker Is) have *au* for the *ou* of the later (Grimm p 99). and as.

under the conditions specified in § 80, they also exhibit *o* thus tells in favour of Grimm's assumption, that *au* in the Gothic and oldest High German was pronounced like our German *au* and thus not like the Sanskrit औ *o* (out of *a + u*). In this case in the Gothic *ai* also, both the letters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be only an etymological and not a phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit ऐ

85 In the Gothic diphthong *ai* the *a* alone is susceptible of alteration, and appears in High German softened down to *e* in the cases in which the *é* contracted from *ai* (§ 78), does not occur. In Modern High German, however *ei* in pronunciation = *ai*. Compare

GOthic	OLD HIGH GERMAN	MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN	MODERN HIGH GERMAN
<i>haita loco</i> "	<i>hei u</i>	<i>heize</i>	<i>heisse</i>
<i>skaida separo,</i>	<i>skeidu</i>	<i>scheide</i>	<i>scheide</i>

86 (1) Let us now consider the consonants preserving the Indian arrangement and thus examining [G Ed p 73] the gutturals first. Of these, the Gothic has merely the *tenuis* and the medial (*k g*) and Ulfilas in imitation of the Greek places the latter as a nasal before gutturals for instance *driglan*, 'to drink,' *briggjan* to bring *tuggô* tongue *yuggs* 'young,' *gaggs* a going (subst). For the compound *lv* the old writing has a special character, which we like Grimm render by *qt* although *q* does not appear elsewhere and *v* also combines with *g* so that *qt* (= *lv*) plainly bears the same relation to *gv* that *k* bears to *g* compare *siggjan* to sink with *siggjan* to read to sing. *H* also in Gothic, willingly combines with *v*, and for this combination also the original text has a special character compare *sahvan lehvian* with our *sehen lehen*. In respect to *h* by itself we have to observe that it often appears in relations in which the dentals place their *th* and the labials their *f*, so that in this case it takes the place of

kh, which is wanting in the Gothic. In this manner is *axh* related to *argum*, "we have," as *bauth* to *budum*, and *gaf* to *gêbum*. Probably the pronunciation of the Gothic *h* was not in all positions the same, but in terminations, and before *t* and *s*, if not generally before consonants, corresponded to our *ch*. The High German has *ch* as an aspirate of the *h* for this *tenuis*, however, either *h* or *c* stands in the older dialects, the use of which, in Middle High German, is so distinguished, that *c* stands as a terminating letter, and in the middle of words before *t*, and *ch* also stands for a double *h* (Grimm, p. 422.) This distinction reminds us of the use of the Zend 𐬀 *c* in contrast to 𐬀 *k*, as also of the 𐬀 *t* in contrast to 𐬀 *t* (§§ 34 38)

(2) The palatals and linguals are wanting in Gothic, as in Greek and Latin, the dentals are, in Gothic, *t*, *th*, *d*, [G Ed p 74] together with their nasal *n*. For *th* the Gothic alphabet has a special character. In the High German *z* (= *ts*) fills the place of the aspiration of the *t*, so that the breathing is replaced by the sibilant. By the side of this *z* in the Old High German, the old Gothic *th* also maintains its existence. There are two species of *z*, which, in Middle High German, do not agree with each other. In the one, *t* has the preponderance, in the other, *s*, and this latter is written by Isidor *zs*, and its reduplication *zss*, while the reduplication of the former he writes *tz*. In the Modern High German the second species has only retained the sibilant, but in writing is distinguished, though not universally, from *s* proper. Etymologically, both species of the Old and Middle High German *z* fall under the same head, and correspond to the Gothic *t*

(3) The labials are, in Gothic, *p*, *f*, *b*, with their nasal

* Our Modern High German *th* is, according to Grimm (p. 525), inorganic, and to be rejected. "It is, neither in pronunciation nor origin, properly aspirated, and nothing but a mere tenuis"

m The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskrit does all with a double aspiration a surd ($f = \text{क् } ph$) (see § 25) and a sonant which is written ι and comes nearer to the Sanskrit $\text{क् } bh$. In Modern High German we perceive no longer any phonetic difference between f and v but in Middle High German ι shows itself in this manner softer than f , in that, first at the end of words it is transformed into f , on the same principle by which, in such a position the medials are converted into tenues for instance, *wolf* not *woli*, but genitive *wolves* second that in the middle before surd consonants it becomes f hence *ziche* becomes *zicfste* *funic* becomes *funfste* *funfzic*. At the beginning of words f and ι in Middle High German seem of equal signification and their use in the MSS is precarious, [C Ed p 75] but ι preponderates (Grimm, pp 379 100). It is the same in Old High German yet Notker uses f as the original primarily existing breathing sound and ι as the softer or sonant aspiration, and therefore employs the latter in cases where the preceding word concludes with one of those letters which otherwise (§ 93) soften down a tenuis to its medial (Grimm pp 17, 136) for instance, *demo* ι *ter den waler* but not *des waler* but *des faler*. So far the rule is less stringent (observes Grimm) that in all cases f may stand for ι but the converse does not hold. Many Old High German authorities abandon altogether the imitative ι and write f for it constantly namely Kero, Otfrid, Tatian. The aspiration of the p is sometimes in Old High German also rendered by ph , but in general only at the beginning of words of foreign origin, *phorta* *phenning* in the middle and at the end occasionally, in true Germanic forms such as *werphan* *warph*, *urphum's* in Tatian, *limphan* in Otfrid and Tatian. According to Grimm, ph in many cases, has had the mere sound of f . In monumental inscriptions however which usually employ f the ph of many words had indisputably the sound of pf for example if Otfrid

writes *kuphar*, “*cuprum*,” *scepheri*, “*Creator*,” we are not to assume that these words were pronounced *kufar*, *sceferi*” (p. 132) In Middle High German the initial *ph* of foreign words of the Old High German has become *pf* (Grimm, p. 326) In the middle and at the end we find *pf*, first, always after *m*, *kampf*, “*pugna*,” *lampf*, “*vapor*,” *kriempfen*, “*contractere*,” in which case *p* is an euphonic appendage to *f*, in order to facilitate a union with *m*. Secondly, in compounds with the inseparable prefix *ent*, which, before the labial aspirates, lays aside its *t*, or, as seems to me the sounder supposition, converts that letter, by assimilation, into the labial tenuis Hence, for [G Ed p 76] instance, *enp-finden*, later and more harmonious *emp-finden*, for *ent-finden* Standing alone, nevertheless, it appears, in Middle High German, *vinden*, but *v* does not combine with *p*, for after the surd *p* (§ 25.) the surd aspirate is necessary (see Grimm, p. 398). Thirdly, after short vowels the labial aspirates are apt to be preceded by their tenuous; as well in the middle as at the end of words just as in Sanskrit (Gramm. Crit. r. 88) the palatal surd aspirate between a short and another vowel or semi-vowel is preceded by its tenuis, and, for instance, पृच्छति *prichchhati* is said for पृच्छति *prichhati* “*interogat*,” from the root पृच्छ *prichh* In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf*, *kropf*, *tropfe*, *klopfen*, *kripfen*, *kapfen* (Grimm, p. 398) In the same words we sometimes find *ff*, as *kaffen*, *schuffen* Here, also, *p* has assimilated itself to the following *f*; for *f*, even though it be the aspirate of *p*, is not pronounced like the Sanskrit पृ *ph*, that is, like *p* with a clearly perceptible *h*, but the sounds *p* and *h* are compounded into a third simple sound lying between the two, which is therefore capable of reduplication, as in Greek φ unites itself with θ, while *ph* + *th* would be impossible

(4) The Sanskrit semi-vowels are represented in Gothic by *j* (= *y*), *r*, *l*, *v*, the same in High German, only in Old High German Manuscripts the sound of the Indo-Gothic *v*

(our *w*) is most usually represented by *uu* in Middle High German by *vv* *y* (or *y*) in both is written *i*. We agree with Grimm in using *y* (or *y*) and *w* for all periods of the High German. After an initial consonant in Old High German the semi vowel *w* in most authorities is expressed by *u* for instance *zuelif* twelve Gothic *twalif*. As in the Sanskrit and Zend the semi vowels *y* and *v* often arise out of the corresponding vowels *i* and *u* so also in the [G Ed p 77] Germanic for instance Gothic *suntv* *ē*, '*filiorum* from the base *sunu*, with *u* affected by Guna (*iu* § 27). More usually, however in the Germanic the converse occurs namely, that *y* and *i* at terminations and before consonants have become vocalised (see § 73) and have only retained their original form before terminations beginning with a vowel for if for instance *thus* servant forms *thuis* in the genitive we know from the history of the word that this *v* has not sprung from the *u* of the nominative, but that *thuis* is a mutilation of *thuas* (§ 116) so that after the lapse of the *a* the preceding semi vowel has become a whole one. In like manner is *thui* maid servant a mutilation of the base *thuyō* (§ 120) whose nominative like the accusative probably was *thuya* for which however, in the accusative after the *v* had become vocalized *thuya* was substituted.

(c) Of the Sanskrit sibilants the Germanic has only the last namely the pure dental *ṣ* *s*. Out of this however springs another, peculiar at least in use to the Gothic which is written *z* and had probably a softer pronunciation than *s*. This *z* is most usually found between two vowels as an euphonic alteration of *s* but sometimes also between a vowel and *v* *l*, or *n* and between liquids (*l* *r* *n*) and a vowel *y* or *n* in some words also before *d* finally before the guttural medial in the single instance *agō* ashes everywhere thus before sonants and it must therefore itself be considered as a sonant sibilant (§ 20) while

s is the surd. It is remarkable, in a grammatical point of view, that a concluding s before the enclitic particles *ci* and *uh*, and before the passive addition *a*, passes into z, hence, for instance, *thizei* "cujus," from *thiz* "hujus," *thanzei* "quos," from *thans* "hos," *vileizuh* "visne" from *vileis* "vis," *hailaza* "vocaris," from *hailis* "vocas," or rather from its earlier form

[G Ed p 78.] *hailas*. The root *slép*, "to sleep," forms, by a reduplication, in the preterite, *saizlép*, "I or he slept." Other examples are, *izvris*, "vobis," "vos," *razn* "house," *tal yan*, "to teach," *marzyan*, "to provoke," *fairzna*, "hegel." The High German loves the softening of s into r, especially between two vowels (see § 22.), but this change has not established itself as a pervading law, and does not extend over all parts of the Grammar. For instance, in Old High German, the final s of several roots has changed itself into r before the preterite terminations which commence with a vowel, on the other hand, it has remained unaltered in the uninflected first and third pers sing. indicative, and also before the vowels of the present. For example, from the root *lus*, comes *lusu*, "I lose," *lós*, "I or he lost," *lurumés* "we lost." While in these cases the termination takes s under its protection, yet the s of the nominative singular, where it has not been altogether dropped, is everywhere softened down to r, and, on the other hand, the concluding s of the genitive has, down to our time, remained unaltered, and thus an organic difference has arisen between two cases originally distinguished by a similar suffix. For instance,

	GOthic	OLD HIGH GERMAN	MODERN HIGH GERMAN
Nominative .	<i>blind³-s,</i>	<i>plintê-i,</i>	<i>blinde-r</i>
Genitive .	<i>blindr-s,</i>	<i>plinte-s,</i>	<i>blinde-s</i>

87 The Germanic tongues exhibit, in respect of consonants, a remarkable law of displacement, which has been first recognised and developed with great ability by Grimm. According to this law, the Gothic, and the other dialects,

with the exception of the High German, in relation to the Greek Latin, and, with certain limits also [C Ed p 70] to the Sanskrit and Zend substitute aspirates for the original tenuis *h* for *k* *th* for *t* and *f* for *p* tenuis for medials *t* for *d* *p* for *b* and *k* for *g* finally medials for aspirates *g* for *χ* *d* for *θ* and *b* for *φ* The High German bears the same regular relation to the Gothic as the latter to the Greek and substitutes its aspirates for the Gothic tenuis and Greek medials its tenuis for the Gothic medials and Greek aspirates and its medials for the Gothic aspirates and Greek tenuis Yet the Gothic labial and guttural medial exhibits itself unaltered in most of the Old High German authorities as in the Middle and Modern High German for instance Gothic *biuga* *stecko*, Old High German *biuga* and *pink* Middle High German *biuge* Modern High German *biege* For the Gothic *f* the Old High German substitutes *i* especially as a first letter (§ 86 2) In the *t* sounds *z* in High German (= *ts*) replaces an aspirate The Gothic has no aspiration of the *k* and either replaces the Greek *κ* by the simple aspiration *h* in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskrit *ṛ h* or it falls to the level of the High German and in the middle or end of words, usually gives *g* instead of *k* the High German adhering, as regards the beginning of words to the Gothic practice and participating with that dialect in the use of the *h* We give here Grimm's table illustrating the law of these substitutions p 251

Greek	<i>P</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>Th</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>Ch</i>
Gothic	<i>I</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Th</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>D</i>		<i>K</i>	<i>G</i>
Old High German	<i>B(I)</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>Ch</i>	<i>K</i>

[G Ed p 80]

EXAMPLES *

SANSKRIT	GRIEK	LATIN	COPTIC	OLD HIGH GERM
पादस् <i>pāda-s</i> ,	πούς, ποδ-ός,	<i>pes, pedis,</i>	<i>fólus,</i>	<i>ruoz</i>
पञ्चन् <i>panchan,</i>	πέμπς,	<i>quinque,</i>	<i>simf,</i>	<i>unf</i>
पूर्ण <i>pūrṇa,</i>	πλέος,	<i>plenus,</i>	<i>fulls,</i>	<i>uol</i>
पितृ <i>pitri,</i>	πατήρ,	<i>pater,</i>	<i>fadrem †,</i>	<i>uatai</i>
उपरि <i>upari,</i>	ὑπέρ,	<i>super,</i>	<i>ufar,</i>	<i>ubar</i>
	κάναβις,	<i>cannabis,</i>	. .	<i>hanaf.</i>
भञ्ज <i>bhanj,</i>		<i>frangere,</i>	<i>brikan,</i>	<i>prichan.</i>
भुज् <i>bhuj,</i>		<i>frui, fructus,</i>	<i>brūkōn,</i>	<i>prākchōn.</i>
भ्रातृ <i>bhrātṛi</i>		<i>frater,</i>	<i>brōthar,</i>	<i>pruoder.</i>
भृ <i>bhri,</i>	φέρω,	<i>fero,</i>	<i>barra,</i>	<i>piru</i>
भ्रू <i>bhrū,</i>	ὄφρύς,			<i>praua</i>
कपाल <i>kapāla, m n ,</i>	κεφαλή,	<i>caput,</i>	<i>haubith,</i>	<i>houpit.</i>
त्वम् <i>twam (nom.),</i>	τύ,		<i>thu,</i>	<i>du.</i>
तम् <i>tam (acc),</i>	τόν,	<i>is-tum,</i>	<i>thana,</i>	<i>den</i>
त्रयस् <i>trayas (n pl),</i>	τρεις,	<i>tres,</i>	<i>threis,</i>	<i>drī.</i>
अन्तर <i>antara,</i>	ἄντρος,	<i>alter,</i>	<i>anhar,</i>	<i>andar</i>
दन्तम् <i>danta-m (acc),</i>	ὀδόντ-α,	<i>dentem,</i>	<i>thuntu-s,</i>	<i>zand.</i>
द्वौ <i>dwau (n du),</i>	δύο,	<i>duo,</i>	<i>ti ai,</i>	<i>zueñe</i>
दक्षिणा <i>dakshinā,</i>	δεξιά,	<i>dextra,</i>	<i>tahsuó,</i>	<i>zrasaua</i>
उद <i>uda,</i>	ὔδωρ,	<i>unda,</i>	<i>uabó,</i>	<i>uazar.</i>
दुहितृ <i>duhitri,</i>	θυγάτηρ,	. .	<i>dauhtar,</i>	<i>tohtar.</i>
द्वार <i>dwā,</i>	θύρα,	<i>fores,</i>	<i>daur,</i>	<i>tor.</i>
मधु <i>madhu,</i>	μέθυ,	<i>meto</i>
श्वन् <i>śwan,</i>	κύων,	<i>canis,</i>	<i>hunths,</i>	<i>hund.</i>
हृदय <i>hṛdaya,</i>	καρδία,	<i>cor,</i>	<i>harrtó,</i>	<i>herza</i>
अक्ष <i>aksha,</i>	ὄκος,	<i>oculus,</i>	<i>augó,</i>	<i>ouga</i>
अश्रु <i>ásru,</i>	δάκρυ,	<i>lacrima,</i>	<i>tagr m.,</i>	<i>zahai</i>
पशु <i>paśu,</i>		<i>pecus,</i>	<i>faihu,</i>	<i>vihu</i>

* The Sanskrit words here stand, where the termination is not separated from the base, or the case not indicated, in their crude or simple form (theme), of the verb, we give only the bare root

† "Parents"

AN FRIT	GREEK	LATIN	GOthic	OLD HIGH GER I
शसुर <i>shasura</i>	σκυρος,	<i>socer</i>	<i>siathra</i>	<i>suehur</i>
दशन् <i>dasan</i>	δέκα,	<i>decem</i>	<i>taihun</i>	<i>zēhan</i>
ज्ञानु <i>jñu</i>	γινωμι,	<i>gnoſco</i>	<i>kan</i>	<i>chan</i>
जाति <i>jāt</i> *	γενος,	<i>genus</i>	<i>luni</i>	<i>chuni</i>
जानु <i>jānu</i>	γενου	<i>genu</i>	<i>knuu</i>	<i>chuuu</i>
महत् <i>mahat</i>	μεγαλος	<i>magnus,</i>	<i>mihuls</i>	<i>mihil</i>
हंस <i>hansa</i>	χρη	<i>anser</i>	<i>gans</i>	<i>kans</i>
ह्यस् <i>hyas</i>	χθες	<i>heri</i>	<i>gistra</i>	<i>kistar</i>
लिह <i>lih</i>	λεγω	<i>lingo</i>	<i>laigō,</i>	<i>lêkôm</i>

88 The Lithuanian has left the consonants without displacement in their old situations, only, from its deficiency in aspirates, substituting simple tenues for the Sanskrit aspirated tenues and medials for the aspirated medials Compare,

LITHUANIAN	SANSKRIT
<i>rata s</i> 'wheel	रथस <i>ratha s</i> वाग्गो
<i>būsu</i> I would be,	भविष्यामि <i>bhaviṣhyāmi</i>
<i>ka s</i> who	कस् <i>ka s</i>
<i>dum</i> I give	ददामि <i>dadāmi</i> [G Ed p 8.]
<i>pats</i> 'husband	पतिस् <i>pati s</i>
<i>penkt</i> five	पञ्चन् <i>panchan</i>
<i>trys</i> three	त्रयस् <i>trayas</i> (n pl m)
<i>keturt</i> four "	चत्वारस् <i>chatvāras</i> (n pl m)
<i>keturtas</i> the fourth	चतुर्थस् <i>chaturtha s</i>
<i>s'al a f</i> bough,	सख्खा <i>sākhā</i>

Irregular deviations occur, as might be expected, in individual cases Thus, for instance, *naga s* "nail" (of the foot or finger) not *naka s* answers to the Sanskrit नखस् *nakhas* The Zend stands as we have before remarked, in the same rank in all essential respects, as the Sanskrit

* I rom j m to be born'

GOTHIC		ZENI	
<i>thu</i>	thou	𐌸𐌹𐌸	<i>thum</i>
<i>fid or</i>	(ind) four	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>chathu drô</i> (n pl m)
<i>fimf</i>		𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>pancha</i>
<i>fulls</i>	full	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>parenth</i> (n m)
<i>fadrein</i>	parents	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>paitar em</i> (<i>patrem</i>)
<i>faths</i>	master "	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>paiti s</i>
<i>fathu</i>	berst	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>pasu s</i>
<i>faryith</i>	he wanders	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>charaiti</i>
<i>fithu s</i>	foot	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>pidha</i> (§ 39)
<i>fraituth</i>	he ask "	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>per wairi</i>
<i>ufar</i>	over	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>upairi</i> (§ 11)
<i>af</i>	from "	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>apa</i>
<i>thai</i>	these	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>le</i>
<i>hwas</i>	who	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>lu</i> [C I d p 81]
<i>twei</i>	two	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>dra</i>
<i>taihun</i>	ten	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>dava</i>
<i>taihuro</i>	right hand	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰	<i>dashina dexter</i>

In the Sanskrit and Zend the sonant aspirates not the surd as in Greek (𐌸 *h* too is sonant see § 23) correspond according to rule to the Gothic medials as however in the Zend the *bh* is not found 𐌿 *b* answers to the Gothic *b*
Compare

GOTHIC	ZENI	SANSKRIT	
<i>aurith</i>	he carries	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>baraiti</i>	बिभर्ति <i>bibharti</i>
<i>rôthar</i>	brother	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>brdtarem</i> (acc)	भ्रातरम् <i>bhrâtaram</i> (acc)
<i>ai</i>	both	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>uba</i>	उभौ <i>ubhâu</i> (n acc 1 du)
<i>rukan</i>	to use		भुज् <i>bhuj</i> to eat
<i>e</i>	(prep)	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>abi</i> 𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>awei</i> , 𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>ablu</i>	
<i>audya</i>	middling	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>maidhya</i>	मध्य <i>madhya</i>
<i>indan</i>	bind	𐌿𐌶𐌰𐌹𐌸𐌰𐌺𐌰 <i>bandh</i>	बन्ध् <i>bandhi</i>

89 Violations of the law of displacement of sounds both by persistence in the same original sound or the substitution of irregular sounds are frequent in the middle and at the end of

words Thus, in the Old High German *vatar*, the *t* of the Greek $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ remains, in the Gothic *fadriem*, "parentes," *d* is substituted regularly for *th* The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of the Old High German *olpenta*, and the Gothic *ulbandus*, contrasted with the τ of $\epsilon\lambda\sigma\phi\alpha\nu\tau$ -, thus, also, the *t* of चतुर् *chatur*, "quatuor," has become *d* in the Gothic *fidvōi* instead of *th*, but in High German has entirely disappeared The *p* of the Sanskrit root स्वप् *swap*, (Latin *sopio*), "sleep," has been preserved in the Gothic *slépa*, and [G. Ed p 85] the Old High German *sláfu* stands in the Gothic category, but the Sanskrit root is more faithfully preserved in the Old High German in *in-suepyu* (*sopio*, see § 86 4.)

90 Nor have the inflexions or grammatical appendages everywhere submitted to the law of displacement, but have, in many instances, either remained faithful to the primary sound, or have, at least, rejected the particular change prescribed by § 87. Thus the Old High German has, in the third person, as well singular as plural, retained the original *t*, compare *hapét*, "he has," *hapént*, "they have," with *habet*, *habent* the Gothic, on the contrary, says *habaith*, *haband*, the first in accordance with the law, the last in violation of it, for *habanth* Thus, also, in the part pres, the *t* of the old languages has become, under the influence of the preceding *n*, not *th* but *d*, the *t* of the part. pass., however, is changed before the *s* of the nom into *th*, but before vowel termina-

It would be better to regard the phenomenon here discussed by assuming *d* as the proper character of the third person in Gothic, and viewing the Old High German *t* as the regular substitute for it The *d* has been retained in the Gothic passive also (*barr-a-da*), and the active form *barrith* is derivable from *barrid*, in that the Gothic prefers the aspirates to the medials at the end of a word The same is the case with the part pass, the suffix of which is, in Gothic, *da*, whence, in Old High German, in consequence of the second law for the permutation of sounds, comes *ta*, so that the old form recurs again, re-introduced by a fresh corruption

tions by an anomalous process into *d* after the same principle by which the *th* of the third person before the vowel increment of the passive is softened to *d* so that *da** instead of *tha* corresponds to the Greek $\tau\omicron$ of $\epsilon\tau\upsilon\tau\tau\epsilon\tau\omicron$ and to the Sanskrit πta of अभयत *abhayata*. The Old High German on the other hand has preserved the original *t* in both participles *hap'nter hap'eter* Gothic *habands* genitive *habandins* *habaiths* gen *habaidis*

91 Special notice is due to the fact, that in the middle of words under the protection of a preceding consonant the old consonant often remains without displacement sometimes because it chimes in well with the preceding sound sometimes because through regard for the preceding letters, alterations have been admitted other than those which the usual practice as to displacement would lead us to expect Mute consonants (§ 25) among which in [G Ed p 86] the Germanic the *h* must be reckoned, where it is to be pronounced like our *ch*, protect a succeeding original *t*. Thus अष्टौ *ashtāu* "eight" οκτω *octo* "is in Gothic *astau* in Old High German *altō* नक्तम *naktam* (adverbial accusative) "night" νυξ *nyx*, "nox" *noctis* is in Gothic *nahts* Old High German *nahit*. The liquids, on the other hand, like the vowels, which they approach nearest of all consonants, affect a *d* or *th* after themselves. From these euphonic causes for instance the feminine suffix फि ता *ti* in Sanskrit in Greek $\sigma\iota\varsigma$ as ποιησις , which designates abstract substantives, appears in Gothic in three forms, *ti*, *di* and *thi*. The original form *ti* shews itself after *f*, into which *p* and *b* mostly resolve themselves and also after *s* and *h* for instance *ansl(i)s* (§ 117) "grace" from the root *an* Old High German *unnan*, "to be gracious" with the insertion of an euphonic *s* *fralust(i)s* "loss" (from *lus* pres *liusa*) *mahl(i)s* "strength" (from *magan*) *fra gisl(i)s* "betrothment," (from *gib*, *gaf*) also *fragibts*, perhaps erroneously, as *b* has little

* *Da* is an abbreviation of *das* = दा in Sanskrit see § 400

affinity with *t* *ga-skast(i)s*, "creation," (from *skap-an*). The form *di* finds its place after vowels, but is able, where the vowel of the suffix falls away, *z. e.* in the nom. and accus. sing., to convert *d* into *th*, because *th* can, more easily than *d*, dispense with a following vowel, and is a favourite letter at the end of words and before consonants, though *d* also is tolerated in such a position. Hence the root *bud*, "to bid," (pres *bruda*, § 27.) forms, in the uninflected condition of the pret., *bauth*, in the plur. *bud-um*, and the nominal base, *mana-sê-di*, "world," (according to Grimm's well-founded interpretation, "seed, not seat, of man,") forms in the nom. and accus. *mana-sêths*, *mana-sêth*, or *mana-sêds*, *mana-sêd*, but in the dat. *mana-sêdar* not *-sêthar*. On the other hand, after liquids the suffix is usually *thi*, and after *n*, *di* the dental, however, once chosen, remains afterwards in every position, either without a vowel or before vowels, for instance, *gabaurths*, "birth," dat. *gabaurthar*, *gafaurds*, "gathering"

[G Ed p 87] (from *far-yan*, "to go"), gen. *gafaurdais* *gakunths*, "esteem," gen. *gakunthais*, *gamunds*, "memory," gen. *gamundais*, *gaqvumths*, "meeting," dat. *gaqvumthar*, dat. plur. *gaqvumthim*. From the union with *m*, *d* is excluded. On the whole, however, the law here discussed accords remarkably with a similar phenomenon in modern Persian, where the original *t* of grammatical terminations and suffixes is maintained only after mute consonants, but after vowels and liquids is changed into *d* hence, for instance, *qirif-tan*, "to take," *bas-tan*, "to bind," *dâsh-tan*, "to have," *pukh-tan*, "to cook" on the other hand, *dâ-dan*, "to give," *bur-dan*, "to bear," *âm-dan*, "to come" I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix *ti*, and all other suffixes originally commencing with *t*, from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this *t* entirely to the controul of the preceding letter. The Old High German, in the case of our suffix *ti*, as in that of other suffixes and terminations originally commencing with *t*, accords to the original *t* a

far more extensive prevalence than does the Gothic inasmuch as it retains that letter, not only when protected by *s*, *h*, and *f*, but also after vowels and liquids—after *m* an euphonic *f* is inserted—and the *t* is only after *l* changed into *d*. Hence for instance, *ans t*, ‘grace’ *hlouft*, ‘course’ *mah t* ‘might’, *vā t*, ‘seed’ *kipurt* ‘birth’ *iar t*, ‘journey’, *mun t* ‘protection’ *kuual t* ‘force’, *scult* *schuld* ‘guilt’ *chumft*, ‘arrival’.

92 The law of substitution shews the greatest pertinacity at the beginning of words, and I have found it everywhere observed in the relation of the Gothic to the Greek and Latin. On the other hand, in some roots which are either deficient or disfigured in the Old European languages but which are common to the Germanic and the Sanskrit the Gothic stands on the same footing with [G. Ed. p. 88] the Sanskrit especially in respect of initial medials. Thus, बन्ध् *bandh* ‘to bind’ is also *band* in Gothic not *pand* ग्रह *grah* in the Vedas ग्रभ् *grabh* ‘to take’ seize is *grip* (pres. *greipa* with Gunā § 27) not *krip* * to ग् *gā* and गम् *gam*, ‘to go’ correspond *gagga* ‘I go’ and *gati* ‘street’ दह् *dah* ‘to burn’ is in Old High German *dahan* (δαω) ‘to burn’ to light. I can detect however no instance in which Gothic tenues correspond to Sanskrit as initial letters.

93() We return now to the Sanskrit in order with relation to the most essential laws of sound to notice one adverted to in our theory of single letters where it was said of several concurrent consonants that they were tolerated neither at the end of words nor in the middle before strong consonants and how their places were supplied in such situations. It is besides to be observed that properly tenues alone can terminate a Sanskrit word but medials only before sonants (§ 25) may either be retained, if they originally terminate an inflective base or take the place of a tenuis

* The Latin *prehendo* is probably related to the Sanskrit root ग्रह *grāh* through the usual interchange between gutturals and labials.

or an aspirate, if these happen to precede sonants in a sentence. As examples, we select हरिन् *harit*, (*vidis*), "green," वेदविद् *veda-vid*, "skilled in the Vêda," धनलभ् *dhana-labh*, "acquiring wealth." These words are, according to § 91, without a nominative sign. We find, also, अस्ति हरिन् *asti harit*, "he is green," अस्ति वेदविन् *asti vedî-vit*, अस्ति धनलभ् *asti dhana-lap*, on the other hand, हरिद् अस्ति *harid asti*, वेदविद् अस्ति *vedavid asti*, धनलभ् अस्ति *dhana-lab asti*, also, हरिद् भवति *harid bhavati*, &c. With this Sanskrit law the Middle High

[G Ed p 89] German is very nearly in accordance, which indeed tolerates aspirates at the end of words, contrary to the custom of the Sanskrit, only with a conversion of the sonant *v* into the surd *f*, see § 86. 3, but, like the Sanskrit, and independent of the law of displacement explained in §. 87, supplies the place of medials at the end of words regularly by tenues. As, for example, in the genitives *tages*, *eides*, *uibes*, of which the nom. and accus. sing., deprived of the inflexion and the terminating vowel of the base, take the forms *tac*, (§ 86 1) *ei*, *wîp*. So also as to the verb, for instance, the roots *trag*, *lad*, *grab*, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers sing. pret, *truoc*, *luot*, *gruop*, plur. *truogen*, *luoden*, *gruoben*. Where, on the other hand, the tenuis or aspirate (*v* excepted) is radical, there no alteration of sound occurs in declension or in conjugation. For instance, *wort*, gen. *wortes*, not *wordes*, as in Sansk ददन् *dadat*, "the giver," gen ददन्स् *dadatas*, not ददद्स् *dadadas*, but विन् *vit*, "knowing," gen विद्स् *vidas*, from the base विद् *vid*. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts *d* at the end into *t*, and *g* into *c*, for instance, *wort*, *wordes*, *dac*, *dages*. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenues, but by aspirates. Hence *gaf*, "I gave," in contrast to *gêbum*, and the accusatives *hlaf*, *lauf*, *thuuf*, opposed to the nominatives *hlarbs*, *laubs*, *thuubs*, gen *hlarbis*, &c. The guttural and dental

medials (*g d*) are tolerated by the Gothic in terminations yet even in these in individual cases a preference appears for the terminating aspirates Compare *bauth* 'I or he offered' with *budum* 'we offered' from the root *bud* *haitad a nominatur* with *haitith* (§ 67) 'nominat, aih I have he has' with *aigum* 'we have

[G Ed p 90] 93^(b) In a sense also opposed to that of the above mentioned Sanskrit law we find in Old High German yet only in Nether an euphonic relation between terminating and initial letters of two words which come together (Grimm pp 130 138 181) As in Sanskrit the tenuis appears as an essential consonant fit for the conclusion of a sentence but exchangeable under the influence of a word following in a sentence for the medials, so with Nether the tenuis ranks as a true initial stands therefore at the beginning of a sentence and after strong consonants but after vowels and the weakest consonants the liquid is turned into a medial Thus for instance *ih pin* 'I am' but *ih ne bin* 'ter dag, the day' but *tes tages mit Iote* 'with God' but *minan got* 'my God'

91 Two consonants are no longer in the existing condition of the Sanskrit tolerated at the end of a word but the latter of the two is rejected This emasculation which must date from an epoch subsequent to the division of the language as this law is not recognised either by the Zend or by any of the European branches of the family has had in many respects a disadvantageous operation on the Grammar and has mutilated many forms of antiquity required by theory In the High German we may view as in some degree connected with this phenomenon the circumstance that roots with double liquids—*ll mm nn rr*—in forms which are indeclinable (and before the consonants of inflexions) reject the latter of the pair In the case also of terminations in double *h* or *t* one is rejected Hence for instance from *stihhu* (*pungo*) or *prittu* (*stringo*) the 1st and 3d pers pret *stah* or *prat* In Middle High German

in declensions in *ck*, *ff*, the last is rejected; for instance, *boc*, gen. *bockes*, *grif*, *griffes*. *tz* loses the *t*, for instance, *schaz*, *schalzes*

95 Between a final न् *n* and a succeeding *t* sound as which the palatals also must be reckoned, for च् *ch* is equivalent to *tsh* in the Sanskrit an euphonic sibilant is interposed, from the operation of the following *t*, and न्, by this sibilant, is converted, § 9, into Anuswâia, for instance, अभवन् *abhavans* *ta* *ta*, (*abhavans-ta*), "they were there" With this coincides the circumstance, that, in High German, between a radical *n* and the *t* of an affix, an *s*, in certain cases, is inserted, for instance, from the root *ann*, "to favour," comes, in Old High German, *an-s-t*, "thou favourest," *on-s-ta* or *onda*, "I favoured," *an-s-t*, "favour"; from *prann* comes *prun-s-t*, "ardour", from *chan* is derived *chun-s-t*, "knowledge," our German KUNST, in which, as in BRUNST and GUNST, (from *gonnen*, probably formed from the *ann* before noticed, and the preposite *g(e)*.) the euphonic *s* has stood fast The Gothic exhibits this phenomenon nowhere, perhaps, but in *an-s-ts* and *allbrun-s-ts* 'holocaustum' In Old High German we find still an *s* inserted after *r*, in the root *tan*, hence, *tar-s-t*, "thou darest," *tor-s-ta*, "I dared" (Cf. §. 616 2d Note.)

96 In Sanskrit the interposed euphonic *s* has extended itself further only among the prefixed prepositions, which generally enter into most intimate and facile connection with the following root In this manner the euphonic *s* steps in between the prepositions सम् *sam*, अवा *ava*, परि *pari*, प्रति *prati*, and certain words which begin with क् *h*. With this the Latin *s* between *ab* or *ob* and *c*, *q*, and *p*, remarkably accords*, [G. Ed p 92] which *s*, *ab* retains even in an isolated position, when the above-mentioned letters follow To this we also refer the *cosmittere* of Festus, instead of *committere*

* We scarcely think it necessary to defend ourselves for dividing, with Vossius, *ob-solesco*, rather than with Schneider (p 571) *obs-olesco*

(Schneider p 475) unless an original *smilto* for *mitto* is involved in this compound. In the Greek, ς shows an inclination for connection with τ θ and μ and precedes these letters as an euphonic link especially after short vowels in cases which require no special mention. In compounds like *σάκες παλός* I reckon the ς in opposition to the common theory as belonging to the base of the first member (§ 128). We have yet to consider a case of the interpolation of an euphonic labial which is common to the Old Latin and Germanic and serves to facilitate the union of the labial nasal with a dental. The Latin places *p* between *m* and *n* following *t* or *s* the Gothic and Old High German *f* between *m* and *t*. Thus *sumpsit* *prompsit* *dempst* *sumptus* *promptus* *demptus* Gothic *andanumfts* acceptance Old High German *chumft* arrival. In Greek we find also the interpolation of an euphonic β after μ , of a δ after ν of a θ after σ in order to facilitate the union of μ ν and σ with ρ and λ (*μσημβρια* *μμβλεται*, *αιδρος* *μασθλη*—see Buttman p 80), while the Modern Persian places an euphonic *d* between the vowel of a prefixed preposition and that of the following word as *be d ā* to him.

97 The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of ρ for ς . The alteration of the ν in the article in old inscriptions and in the prefixes *συν* *εν*, and *παλιν* seems analogous to the changes which, according to § 18 the terminating *m* in Sanskrit undergoes in all cases with reference to the letter which follows. [G Ed p 93]. The concluding ν in Greek is also generally a derivative from μ and corresponds to this letter which the Greek never admits as a termination in analogous forms of the Sanskrit Zend, and Latin. *N* frequently springs from a final ς thus for instance *μεν* (Doric *μες*) and the dual *των* answer to the Sanskrit personal terminations *म् mas* *थस thas* *त्स् tis*. I have found this explanation which I have given elsewhere of the origin of the ν from ς

subsequently confirmed by the Prâkrit, in which, in like manner, the concluding *s* of the instrumental termination plural भिस् *bhis* has passed into the dull *n* (Anuswâra, § 9), and हि. *hni* is said for *bhis*. An operation, which has a prejudicial effect on many Greek terminations, and disturbs the relation to cognate languages, is the suppression of the *t* sound at the end of words, where, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin it plays an essential part. In respect of the vowels, it is also worthy of notice, that in Sanskrit, but not in Zend, at the meeting of vowel terminations and commencements, a hiatus is guarded against, either by the fusion of the two vowels, or, in cases where the vowel has a cognate semi-vowel at its command, by its transition into this latter, provided the vowel following be unlike. We find, for instance, अस्तीदम् *astīdam*, “*est hoc*,” and अस्त्य् अयम् *asty ayam*, “*est hic*” For the sake of clearness, and because the junction of two vowels might too often give the appearance of two or more words to one, I write in my most recent text अस्ती 'दम्, in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the दम् *dam* is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write अस्ती~ 'दम्, in order directly [G Ed. p 94] at the close of the first word to shew that its final vowel has arisen out of a contraction, and that the following word participates in it.

98 We have now to consider the alterations in the middle of words, *i. e.* those of the final letters of the roots and nominal bases before grammatical endings, and we find, with respect to these, most life, strength, and consciousness in the Sanskrit, and this language is

* We cannot guide ourselves here by the original MSS, as these exhibit no separation of words, and entire verses are written together without interruption, as though they were only a series of senseless syllables, and not words of independent place and meaning. As we must depart from Indian practice, the more complete the more rational the separation

placed on the highest point of antiquity inasmuch as the signification of every radical portion is still so strongly felt that while it admits of moderate changes for the avoiding of harshness it never if we except some vowel elisions permits the radical sense to be obliterated, or rendered irrecongnisable by concessions too great or transitions too daring. Yet does the Sanskrit, more than any of its kindred afford a field for the conflict of unsociable consonants a conflict however which is honourably and strenuously maintained. The Vowels and weak consonants (§ 25) of grammatical endings and suffixes exert no influence over preceding consonants, but strong consonants if surd (§ 25) require a tenuis and if sonorant a medial before them. Thus *त् t* and *थ th* allow only of *क् k* not *ख kh* *ग् g* *घ gh* preceding them only *त् t* not *थ th* *द् d* *ध dh*, while on the other hand *थ dh* allows only *ग् g* not *क् k* *ख kh* *घ gh* only *द d* not *त् t* *थ th* *ध dh* only *ब b* not *प p* *फ ph* *भ bh* to precede it. The [G Ed p 90] roots and the nominal bases have to regulate their final letters by this law and the occasion frequently presents itself since in comparison with the cognate languages, a far greater proportion of the roots connect the personal terminations immediately with the root and also among the case terminations there are many which begin with consonants (भ्याम् *bhyām* भिस् *bhis* भ्यस् *bhyas* सु *su*). To cite instances the root *अद् ad* to eat forms *अस्मि admi* I eat but not *अद्मि admi* (for *s* is surd) nor *अद्मि ad mi* *अद्थ ad tha* but *अस्मि at si* *अस्मि at ti* *अस्म्य at tha* on the other hand in the imperative *अद्धि ad dhi* eat. The base *पद् pad* foot forms in the locative plural *पद्भ्युः pad bhyuḥ* not *पद्भ्युः pad bhyuḥ* on the other hand *महत् mahat* great forms in the instrumental plural *महद्भिः mahad bhis* not *महत्भिः mahat bhis*.

99 The Greek and Latin as they have come down to us have either altogether evaded this conflict of consonants or exhibit, in most cases with regard to the first of any two contiguous consonants a disposition to surrender it or

at least an indifference to its assistance towards the signification of the word, since they either abandon it altogether, or violently alter it, *ie* convey it beyond the limits of its proper organ. These two languages afford fewer occasions for harsh unions of consonants than the Sanskrit, principally because, with the exception of 'ΕΣ and 'ΙΔ in Greek, and *ES, FER, VEL, ED*, in Latin, as *ἔσ-τί, ἔσ-μέν, ἔσ-τέ, ἴδ-μεν, ἴσ-τε, est, estis, fer-t, fer-tis, vul-t, vul-tis*, no root, terminated by a consonant, joins on its personal terminations, or any of them, without the aid of a connecting vowel. The Greek perf pass. makes an exception, and requires euphonic alterations, which, in part, come within the natural limits recognised by the Sanskrit, and, in part, overstep them.

[G Ed p 96] The gutturals and labials remain on the ancient footing, and before *σ* and *τ* observe the Sanskrit law of sound cited in §. 98, according to which *κ-σ(ξ), κ-τ, π-σ, π-τ*, are applied to roots ending in *κ, γ, χ*, or *π, β, φ*, because the surd *σ* or *τ* suffers neither medials nor aspirates before it, hence *τέτριπ-σαι, τέτριπ-ται*, from *ΤΡΙΒ*, *τέτυκ-σαι, τέτυκ-ται*, from *ΤΥΧ*. The Greek, however, diverges from the Sanskrit in this, that *μ* does not leave the consonant which precedes it unaltered, but assimilates labials to itself, and converts the guttural, tenuis and aspirate into medials. For *τέτυμ-μαι, τέτριμ-μαι, πέπλεγ-μαι, τέτυγ-μαι*, we should, on Sanskrit principles, write (§ 98) *τέτυπ-μαι, τέτριβ-μαι, πεπλεκ-μαι, τετυχ-μαι*. The *t* sounds carry concession too far, and abandon the Sanskrit, or original principle, as regards the gutturals, inasmuch as *δ, θ*, and *ζ (δσ)*, instead of passing into *τ* before *σ* and *τ*, are extinguished before *σ*, and before *τ* and *μ* become *σ* (*πέπεισ-ται, πέπει-σαι, πέπεισ-μαι*, instead of *πέπειτ-ται, πέπειτ-σαι, πεπειθ-μαι*, or *πεπειδ-μαι*). The Greek declension affords occasion for the alteration of consonants only through the *ς* of the nominative and the dative plural termination in *σι*, and here the same principle holds good as in the case of the verb, and in the formation of words *kh* and *g* become, as in Sanskrit, *k* (*ξ=κ-ς*), and *b* and *ph* become *p*

The *t* sounds, on the other hand, contrary to the Sanskrit and in accordance with the enfeebled condition, in this respect, of the Greek, vanish entirely. We find *που-ς* for *ποτ-ς*, *πou-σι* for *ποτ-σι*, which latter naturally and originally must have stood for *ποδ-σ ποδ-σι*.

100 In Latin the principal occasion for the alteration of consonants presents itself before the *s* of the perfect and the *t* of the supine, or other verbal substantive or adjective (participles) beginning with *t* and it is in [G Ed p 97] accordance with the Sanskrit law cited § 99 and the original condition of the language that the sonant guttural passes before *s* and *t* into *c* the sonant labial into *p* as in *rec-si* (*rexi*) *rectum* from *reg scripsi, scriptum* from *scrib*. It is also in accordance with the Sanskrit that *h* as a sonant (§ 25) and incompatible with a tenuis becomes *c* before *s* and *t* compare *rec-si* (*rexi*) with the word of like signification *वृकशित्* *a vṛk shit*. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the *s* of the perfect tense (*mul-si* from *mule* and *mulg spars-i* from *sparg*) this accords with the Sanskrit law of sounds, by which of two terminating consonants of a nominal base the last vanishes before consonants of the case terminations. *D* ought to become *t* before *s*, and then the form so theoretically created *claut-si* from *claud*, would accord with the Sanskrit forms such as *वृतीकशित्* *a tūti-si* he tormented from *वृत्तु-तु-द* *tud*. Instead however of this the *d* allows itself to be extinguished, so, however that in compensation a short vowel of the root is made long as *di-ti-si* or which is less frequent the *d* assimilates itself to the following *s*, as *cess-i* from *ced*. With roots in *t* which are rarer assimilation usually takes place, as *con-cus-si* from *cul* on the other hand *mi-si* not *mis-si*, for *mit-si* from *mit* or *mitt*. *B*, *m*, and *r* also afford instances of assimilation in *jus-si*, *pres-si* *ges-si* *us-si**. A third resource for the avoidance

Compared with the Sanskrit in which *वृत्* *vṛh* signifies I turn the sibilant must here pass for the original form

of an union, very natural, but not endurable in this weakened state of the language, *ts*, is the suppression of the latter of these two letters, which is also compensated by the lengthening of a short radical vowel; thus,* *sēdi* from [G. Ed. p. 98] *sčd*, *iždi* from *viđ* I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from *sedui*, *vidui*, and I class them with forms like *fōdi* from *fōd*, *lēgi*, for *lec-si*, from *lēg*, *fugi*, for *fuc-si*, from *fūg*. To these probably also belong *cāui*, *fāvi*, *fōvi*, for *pāvi*, *vōvi*, from *cāv*, &c. A *cavui*, &c. is hardly conceivable, *cavi* could never have had such an origin. I conjecture forms such as *cau-si*, *fau-si*, after the analogy of *cautum*, *fautum*, or *moc-si* (*morī*), after the analogy of *vic-si*, *con-vic-si*. (§. 19) Possibly a *moc-si* form might derive probability from the adverb *mor*, since the latter is probably derived from *mov*, as *cito* is from another root of motion. The *c* of *fluc-si*, *struc-si*, (*fluxi*, &c.) *fluxum*, *structum*, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of *v*, and a *flu-vo*, *stru-vo*, be presupposed, with regard to which it is to be remembered, that, in Sanskrit also, *uv* often develops itself out of *उ u* before vowels (Gram. Crit. r. 50.^b), on which principle, out of *flu*, *stru*, before vowels, we might obtain *fluv*, *struv*, and thence before consonants *fluc*, *struc*. Thus, also, *fructus* out of *fruv-or* for *fiu-or*. In cases of *t* preceded by consonants, the suppression of *s* is the rule, and *ar-si* for *ard-i* an exception. *Prandi*, *frendi*, *pandi*, *verti*, &c, are in contrast to *ar-si* and other forms, like *mulsi* above mentioned, in their preserving the radical letter in preference to the auxiliary verb, and they accord in this with the Sanskrit rule of sound, by which the *s* of अतौत्सम् *atātut-sam*, अक्षौत्सम् *akṣhāut-sam*, &c, for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, अतौत्त *atātut-ta*, instead of अतौत्स *atātut-sta*. The perfects *sčdi*, *fždi*, are rendered doubtful by their short vowel, and in their origin probably belong to the reduplicated preterites, their first syllable having

* Cf. § 547, and for the whole § of §§ 547-579

perished in the lapse of time in other [C I 1 p 97] respects *fidit scidit* correspond to *tuludī pupūgi* not to speak of *teligi* the *i* of which latter is not original

101 The suffixes employed in the formation of words and beginning with *t* for the representation of which the supine may stand deserve special consideration in regard to the relations of sound generated by the conflict between *t* and the preceding consonant. According to the original law observed in the Sanskrit a radical *t* ought to remain unaltered before *tum* and *d* should pass into *t* as भेद्युम् *bhēdyum* "to cleave" from भिद् *bhid*. According to the degenerated practice of the Greek a radical *d* or *t* before *t* would become *s*. Of this second gradation we find a remnant in *comes tus comes tura* analogous to *est et tū* &c from *edo* we find however no *comes-tum comes tor* but in their place *comesum comesor*. We might question whether in *comesum* the *s* belonged to the root or to the suffix, whether the *d* of *ed* or the *t* of *tum* had been changed into *s*. The form *com estus* might argue the radicality of the *s*, but it is hard to suppose that the language should have jumped at once from *estus* to *esus* between which two an *essus* probably intervened analogous to *cessum fissum quassum* &c. while the *t* of *tum, tur* &c. assimilated itself to the preceding *s*. Out of *essum* has arisen *esum* by the suppression of an *s* probably the first for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed it is generally the first (*elmi* from *esmi* *ποσι* from *ποδσι*) possibly because as in § 100 an auxiliary verb is abandoned in preference to a letter of the main verb. After that the language had, through such forms as *ē-sum ca-sum diti sum fis-sum, quas-sum* habituated itself to an *s* in suffixes properly beginning with a *t*, *s* might easily insinuate itself into forms where it did not owe its origin to assimilation. *Cs (r)* is a [C I 1 p 100] favourite combination hence *fic sum nec sum* &c. for *fic tum nec tum*. The liquids *m* excepted cannot special incli

nation for a succeeding *s*, most of all the *r*, hence, *ter-sum*, *mer-sum*, *cur-sum*, *par-sum*, *ver-sum*, in contrast to *par-tum*, *tor-tum* there are also cases in which *r*, by a conversion into *s*, accommodates itself to *t*, as in *ges-tum*, *us-tum*, *tos-tum* This answers to the Sanskrit obligatory conversion of a concluding *r* into *s* before an initial *t*, as, भ्रातॄन्मां *bhrátas táyā mām*, "brother save me," instead of भ्रातॄन् *bhrátan* on the other hand, in the middle of words *r* remains unaltered before *t*, hence, for instance, भ्रातॄन् *bhrátan*, not भ्रातॄन् *bhrátan*, "to bear" *L* exhibits in the Latin the forms *fal-sum*, *pul-sum*, *vul-sum*, in contrast to *cul-tum*, *n* exhibits *ten-tum*, *can-tum*, opposed to *man-sum* The other forms in *n-sum*, except *cen-sum*, have been mulcted of a radical *d*, as *ton-sum*, *pen-sum*.

102. In the Germanic languages, *t* alone gives occasion for an euphonic conversion of a preceding radical consonant, for instance, in the 2d pers. sing. of the strong preterite, where, however, the *t* in the Old High German is retained only in a few verbs, which associate a present signification with the form of the preterite. In the weak preterites, also, which spring from these verbs, the auxiliary *t* where it remains unaltered, generates the same euphonic relations. We find in these forms the Germanic on the same footing as the Greek, in this respect, that it converts radical *t* sounds (*t*, *th*, *d*, and in Old and Middle High German *z* also) before a superadded *t* into *s*. Hence, for instance, in [G Ed p 101] Gothic *marmais-t* (*abscondisti*), for *marmait-t*, *far-fals-t* (*phycavisti*), for *far-falth-t*, *ana-baus-t* (*imperasti*), for *ana-baud-t* In Old and Middle High German *weis-t*, "thou knowest," for *weiz-t* The Gothic, in forming out of the root *vit*, in the weak preterite, *vis-sa* ("I knew"), instead of

* The obvious relationship of *torico* with *τέρομαι*, and *तृष्* *trish* from *तृष्* *trish*, argues the derivation of the latter *r* from *s* Upon that of *wo* from *उष्* *ush*, see § 97

vista, from *villa*, resembles, in respect of assimilation, the Latin forms mentioned in § 101, such as *quas sum* for *quas tum* from *quat tum*. The Old High German, however, which also adopts *weis-sa* but from *muoz* makes not *muos sa*, but *muo sa*, corresponds in the latter case, to such Latin forms, as *ca sum*, *clau sum*. The case is different in Old High German with those verbs of the first weak conjugation, which, having their syllables made long generally through two terminating consonants in the preterite apply the *t* of the auxiliary verb directly to the root. Here the transition of *t* into *s* does not occur, but *t*, *z*, and even *d*, remain unaltered and only when another consonant precedes them *t* and *d* are extinguished, *z* on the contrary remains, for instance, *leit ta duxi*, " *li neiz-ta*, AFFLIXI " *ar od ta*, VASTAVI, *wal ta*, VOLVI, *luh ta*, LUXI," for *luht ta hul ta* FLACAVI, for *huld ta*. Of double consonants one only is retained, and of *ch* or *ech* only *h* other consonantal combinations remain however, undisturbed, as *ran ta*, ' CUCURRI, for *rann ta wanh ta*, " VACILLAVI, for *wanch ta dah t* " TIXI, for *dacch ta*. The Middle High German follows essentially the same principles, only a simple radical *t* gives way before the auxiliary verb and thus *lei te* is opposed to the Old High German *leit ta*, on the other hand in roots in *ld* and *rd* the *d* may be maintained and the *t* of the auxiliary be surrendered—as *dulde* TOIHNAVI —unless we admit a division of *dul-de* and consider the *d* as a softened *t*. The change of *g* into *c* (§ 98) is natural but not universal for instance *anc te* VACTAVI " for *ang te*, but against this law *b* remains unaltered [G Ed p 102]. Before the formative suffixes beginning with *t** both in Gothic and High German, guttural and labial tenues and medials are changed into their aspirates, although the tenuis accord with a following *t*. Thus for instance in Gothic *rah tiv*

* With the exception of the High German passive part of the weaker firm which, in the adjunction of its *t* to the root follows the analogy of the pret. above described

“watch,” from *vak*, *sauh-t(i)s*, “sickness,” from *suk*; *mah-t(i)s*, “might,” from *mag*, *ga-skaf-t(i)s*, “creation,” from *skap*, *fiagyt-t(i)s*, “betrothment,” from *gib*, softened from *gab*; Old High German *suh*, *maht*, *li-skaf*, “creature,” *kift*, “gift” The dentals replace the aspirate *th* by the sibilant (*s*), as is the case in Gothic before the pers. character *t* of the preterite, as *th* cannot be combined with *t*. The formation of words, however, affords few examples of this kind. Under this head comes out *mast*, related to the Gothic *mats*, “food,” and *matyan*, “to eat.” In Gothic, the *s* of *blóstreis*, “worshipper,” springs from the *t* of *blótan*, “to worship.” *beist*, “leaven,” comes probably from *beit* (*bertan*, “to bite,” Grimm, ii p 208). The Zend accords, in this respect, with the Germanic, but still more with the Greek, in that it converts its *t* sounds into *σ*, not only before *ϕ* *t*, but also before *ϕ* *m*, for instance, *σφαστα* *vista*, “dead,” from the root *εστι* *vithi*, *σφαστα* *bastā*, “bound,” from *εσθη* *bandh*, with the nasal excluded; as in Modern Persian *استاد* *bastah*, from *بند* *band*; *ασμα* *aēśma*, “wood,” from *इम* *idhma*.

103 It is a violation of one of the most natural laws of sound, that, in Gothic, the medial *g* does not universally pass into *k* or *h* (= *ch*), before the personal character *t* of [G Ed p 103] the pret., but generally is retained, and we find, for instance, *θg-t*, “thou fearest,” *mag-t*, “thou canst|”, and yet, before other inflections formed with *t*, the *g* undergoes an euphonic transition into *h*, as for instance, *θh-ta*, “I feared,” *mah-ts*, “might.”

104 When in Sanskrit, according to §. 98, the aspiration of a medial undergoes a necessary suppression, it falls back, under certain conditions and according to special laws, upon the initial consonant of the root, yet only upon a medial, or throws itself onward on the initial consonant of

* Of the Slavonic and Lithuanian, § 457

| No other roots in *g* in this person are to be found in Ulfilas

the following suffix - We find for instance भाष्यामि *bhot syāmi* "I shall know" for वाभ्यामि *baulh syāmi* वेदभुत *vēda bhut*, knowing the vedas for बुभु *budh bud-dha* knowing for बुभुता *budhita* धोष्यामि *dhok syāmi* "I shall milk" for दोष्यामि *doḥ syāmi* दुग्ध *dug dha* milked for दुहता *dul ta* In Greek we find a remarkable relic of the first part of the transposition of the aspirate * in the necessary suppression of the aspirate in some roots which begin with *l* and end with an aspirate before σ τ , and μ letters which admit of no union with an aspirate and in its being thrown back on the initial letter by which process τ becomes θ Hence $\tau\rho\epsilon\psi\omega$ $\theta\rho\epsilon\text{-}\sigma\omega$ ($\theta\rho\epsilon\psi\omega$) $\theta\rho\epsilon\text{-}\tau\iota\rho$, $\theta\rho\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha$ $\tau\alpha\phi\iota$ $\theta\alpha\pi\tau\omega$ $\epsilon\tau\alpha\phi\eta\iota$, $\tau\epsilon\theta\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\iota$ $\tau\rho\iota\phi\omicron\varsigma$ $\theta\rho\upsilon\text{-}\tau\omega$ $\epsilon\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\eta\iota$ $\theta\rho\upsilon\mu\mu\alpha$ $\tau\rho\epsilon\chi\omega$ $\theta\rho\epsilon\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ $\theta\rho\iota\chi\epsilon$ $\tau\rho\iota\chi\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ $\theta\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ In the spirit of this transposition of the aspirate $\epsilon\chi$ obtains the spiritus asper when χ is obliged to merge in the tenuis ($\epsilon\chi\text{-}\omicron\varsigma$ $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$) †

* See J. L. Barnouf in the *Vatic Journal*, III 163 and Buttman pp. 77 78

† It is usual to explain this appearance by the supposition of two aspirations in the root of these forms, of which one only is supposed to appear in reference to the euhonic law which forbids the admission of two consecutive aspirate syllables. Thus one would be the last [C. F. L. p. 101] of the two and the other would only shew itself when the latter had been forced to merge in the tenuis. Opposed, however, to this explanation is the fact that on account of the inconvenience of accumulated aspirates the language has guarded itself in the original formation of its roots against the evil and has never admitted an aspirated consonant at once for the initial and final letter of a root. In Sanskrit, the collection of whose roots is complete there is no such instance. The forms, however, $\epsilon\theta$ $\epsilon\theta\eta$ $\tau\epsilon\theta$ $\phi\theta$ $\tau\epsilon\theta$ $\phi\theta\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\theta$ ϕ $\tau\alpha$ $\tau\epsilon\theta$, θ $\epsilon\theta\rho$ $\beta\theta\eta$ present a difficulty. The ϵ perhaps are eccentricities of usage which once habituated to the initial aspiration by its frequent application to supply the place of the terminating one began to assume its radicality and extended it wider than was legitimate. We might also say that since $\phi\theta$ (as $\chi\theta$) is so favourite a combination in Greek that it is even substituted for $\pi\theta$ and $\beta\theta$ —according to § 93, an original $\phi\theta$ ought to become $\pi\theta$ —on this ground the tendency to aspiration of the root remained unsatisfied by $\epsilon\tau\alpha\phi\theta\eta\nu$ &c. and as if the ϕ only existed out of reference to the θ the original terminating aspirate necessarily fell on the radical initial. This theory which seems to me sound would only leave $\tau\epsilon\theta$ θ $\tau\alpha$ to be explained.

OF THE ROOTS.

- [G Ed p 105] 105. There are in Sanskrit, and the languages which are akin to it, two classes of roots from the one, which is by far the more numerous, spring verbs, and nouns (substantives and adjectives) which stand in fraternal connection with the verbs, not in the relation of descent from them, not begotten by them, but sprung from the same shoot with them We term them, nevertheless, for the sake of distinction, and according to prevailing custom, Verbal Roots, and the verb, too, stands in close formal connection with them, because from many roots each person of the present is formed by simply adding the requisite personal termination. From the second class spring pronouns, all original prepositions, conjunctions, and particles we name them Pronominal Roots, because they all express a pronominal idea, which, in the prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, lies more or less concealed. No simple pronouns can be carried back, either according to their meaning or their form, to any thing more general, but their declension-theme (or inflective base) is at the same time their root. The Indian Grammarians, however, derive all words, the pronouns included, from verbal roots, although the majority of pronominal bases, even in a formal respect, are opposed to such a derivation, because they, for the most part, end with *a* one, indeed, consists simply of *a*. Among

[G Ed p 106] the verbal roots, however, there is not a single one in \tilde{a} , although long \tilde{a} , and all other vowels, \ddot{a} \ddot{u} excepted, occur among the final letters of the verbal roots Accidental external identity takes place between the verbal and pronominal roots, e g \ddot{z} signifies, as a verbal root, "to go," as a pronominal root, "he," "thus."

106. The verbal roots, like those of the pronouns, are

monosyllabic and the polysyllabic forms represented by the grammarians as roots contain either a reduplicate-syllable as जाग्रत् *ajāgrat* 'to wake' or a preposition which has grown up with the root as अवधीर् *ava dhīr* 'to despise' or they have sprung from a noun like कुमार *kumār* 'to play' which I derive from कुमार *kumāra* 'a boy'. Except the law of their being monosyllabic the Sanskrit roots are subjected to no further limitation and their one syllableness may present itself under all possible forms in the shortest and most extended as well as those of a middle degree. Thus free state of irrestriction was necessary as the language was to contain within the limits of one-syllableness the whole body of fundamental ideas. The simple vowels and consonants were not sufficient it was requisite to frame roots also where several consonants combined in inseparable unity became as it were simple sounds e.g. स्था *sthā* 'to stand' a root in which the age of the co-existence of the *s* and *th* is supported by the unanimous testimony of all the members of our race of languages. So also in स्कन् *skan* 'to go' (Lat. *scand o*) the age of the combination of consonants both in the beginning and ending of the root, is certified by the agreement of the Latin with the Sanskrit. The proposition that in the earliest period of language a simple vowel is sufficient to express a verbal idea is supported by the remarkable concurrence of [G Ed p 107] nearly all the individuals of the Sanskrit family of languages in expressing the idea 'to go' by the root :

107 The nature and peculiarity of the Sanskrit verbal roots explains itself still more by comparison with those of the Semitic languages. These require, as far as we trace back their antiquity three consonants which as I have already elsewhere shewn* express the fundamental

* Trans. of the Hist. Phil. Class. of the R. A. of Litt. of Berlin for the year 1874 p. 176 &c.

idea by themselves alone, without the aid of vowels; and although they may be momentarily compressed into one syllable, still, in this, the combination of the middle radical with the first or last cannot be recognised as original and belonging to the root, because it is only transitory, and chiefly depends on the mechanism of the construction of the word. Thus, in Hebrew, *kûtûl*, "slain," in the fem., on account of the addition *ûh* contracts itself to *ktûl* (*ktûl-ûh*), while *kôtêl*, "slaying," before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms *kôllûh*. Neither *ktûl*, therefore, nor *kôll*, can be regarded as the root, and just as little can it be looked for in *ktôl*, as the *status constructus* of the infinitive, for this is only a shortening of the absolute form *kâtôl*, produced by a natural tendency to pass hastily to the word governed by the infinitive, which, as it were, has grown to it. In the imperative *ktôl* the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskrit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of

[G Ed p 108] the word. By them, for example, is distinguished, in Arabic, *katala*, "he slew," from *kutula*, "he was slain", and in Hebrew, *kôtêl*, "slaying," from *kâtûl*, "slain". A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanskrit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus, which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express

The vowel with one or more consonants and sometimes without any consonant whatever belongs to the fundamental meaning it can be lengthened to the highest degree or raised by Gunā or Vriddhi and this lengthening or raising and more lately the retention of an original *a* opposed to its weakening to *i* or change to *u* (§§ 66 67) belongs not to the denoting of grammatical relations which require to be more clearly pointed out but as I imagine I can prove only to the mechanism the symmetry of construction

108 As the Semitic roots on account of their construction possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal moulding of the root of which they also make extensive use while the Sanskrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions so must it appear strange that F von Schlegel* while he [G Ed p 109] divides languages in general into two chief races of which the one denotes the secondary intentions of meaning by an internal alteration of the sound of the root by inflexion, the other always by the addition of a word which may by itself signify plurality past time what is to be in future or other relative ideas of that kind allots the Sanskrit and its sisters to the former race and the Semitic languages to the second There may indeed" he writes p 48 arise an appearance of inflexion when the annexed particles are melted down with the chief word so as to be no longer distinguishable but where in a language as in the Arabic and in all which are connected with it, the first and most important relations as those of the person to verbs are denoted by the addition of particles which have a meaning for themselves individually and the tendency to which suffixes shows itself deeply seated in the language it may there be safely assumed that the same may have

* In his work on the language and wisdom of the Indians

occurred in other positions, where the annexation of particles of a foreign nature no longer admits of such clear discrimination one may at least safely assume that the language, on the whole, belongs to this chief race, although in this single point, by admixture or artificial adorning, it has adopted another and a higher character" We must here preliminarily observe, that, in Sanskrit and the languages connected with it, the personal terminations of the verbs shew at least as great a similarity to isolated pronouns as in Arabic. How should any language, which expresses the pronominal relations of the verbs by syllables annexed either at the beginning or end of the word, in the choice of these syllables avoid, and not rather select, those which, in their isolated state, also express the corresponding

[G Ed p 110] pronominal ideas? By inflexion, F. von Schlegel understands the internal alteration of the sound of the root, or (p 35) the internal modification of the root, which he (p 48) opposes to addition from without But when from $\delta\omicron$ or $\delta\omega$, in Greek, comes $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\text{-}\mu\iota$, $\delta\acute{\omega}\text{-}\sigma\omega$, $\delta\omicron\text{-}\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, what are the forms $\mu\iota$, $\sigma\omega$, $\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, but palpable external additions to the root, which is not at all internally altered, or only in the quantity of the vowel? If, then, by inflexion, an internal modification of the root is to be understood, the Sanskrit and Greek &c have in that case except the reduplication, which is supplied by the elements of the root itself—scarce any inflexion at all to shew If, however, $\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ is an external modification of the root $\delta\omicron$, simply because it is combined with it, touches it, with it expresses a whole, then the idea of sea and continent may be represented as an internal modification of the sea, and *vice versa*. P 50, F von Schlegel remarks "In the Indian or Grecian language every root is truly that which the name says, and like a living germ, for since the ideas of relation are denoted by internal alteration, freer room is given for development, the fulness of which can be indefinitely

extended and is in fact often wondrously rich. All, however which in this manner proceeds from the simple root still retains the stamp of its relationship adheres to it and thus reciprocally bears and supports itself. I find however the inference not established for from the capability of expressing ideas of relation by internal alteration of the root, how can the capability be deduced of surrounding the (internally unalterable) root indefinitely, with foreign syllables externally added? What kind of stamp of relationship is there between $\mu\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ and the [G Ed p 111] roots to which these significative additions are appended? We therefore recognise in the inflexions of the Sanskrit family of languages no internal involutions of the root but elements of themselves significative and the tracing of the origin of which is the task of scientific grammar. But even if the origin of not a single one of these inflexions could be traced with certainty, still the principle of the formation of grammar by external addition, would not, for that reason, be the less certain because at the first glance in the majority of inflexions, one discovers at least so much, that they do not belong to the root but have been added from without. A W von Schlegel also who, in essential points, assents to the above mentioned division of languages * gives us to understand, with regard to the so-called

* Nevertheless in his work *Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales* p 14 &c he gives three classes viz *Les langues sans aucune structure grammaticale les langues qui emploient des affixes et les langues à inflexions*. Of the latter he says *Je pense cependant qu'il faut assigner le premier rang aux langues à inflexions. On pourroit les appeler les langues organiques parce qu'elles renferment un principe vivant de développement et d'accroissement et qu'elles ont seules si je puis m'exprimer ainsi une végétation abondante et féconde. Le merveilleux artifice de ces langues est de former une immense variété de mots et de marquer la liaison des idées que ces mots désignent, moyennant un assez petit nombre de syllabes qui considérées séparément n'ont point de signification*

inflections, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G Ed p. 112] regarded, *per se*, they have no meaning. In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or inflections have no meaning, at least in so far that they do not, any more than in Sanskrit, occur isolated in a completely similar state. In Arabic, for instance, *antum*, and not *tum*, is said for "ye", and in Sanskrit *ma*, *ta*, and not *mi*, *ti*, are the declinable bases of the first and third person, and *at-Ti*, "he eats," has the same relation to *TA-m*, "him," that in Gothic *IT-a*, "I eat," has to the monosyllabic *AT*, "I ate." The reason for weakening the *a* of the base to *i* is probably, in the different cases of the two sister languages, the same, viz the greater extent of the form of word with *i* (comp. §. 6.) If, then, the division of languages made by F von Schlegel is untenable, on the reasons on which it is founded, still there is much ingenuity in the thought of a natural history or classification of languages. We prefer, however, to present, with A. W. von Schlegel (l. c.), three classes, and distinguish them as follows: first, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the

fication, mais qui déterminent avec précision le sens du mot auquel elles sont jointes. En modifiant les lettres radicales, et en ajoutant aux racines des syllabes dérivatives, on forme de mots dérivés de diverses espèces, et des dérivés des dérivés. On compose des mots de plusieurs racines pour exprimer les idées complexes. Ensuite on déclina les substantifs, les adjectifs, et les pronoms, par genres, par nombres, et par cas, on conjugua les verbes par voix, par modes, par temps, par nombres, et par personnes, en employant de même des désinences et quelquefois des augmens qui, séparément, ne signifient rien. Cette méthode procure l'avantage d'énoncer en un seul mot l'idée principale, souvent déjà très-modifiée et très-complexe, avec tout son cortège d'idées accessoires et de relations variables.

main point can only be discovered from the position of the roots in the sentence* Secondly languages with monosyllabic roots which are capable of combination, and obtain their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone The chief principle of the formation of words, in this class, appears to me to lie in the combination of verbal and pronominal roots, which together represent [G Ed p 113] as it were body and soul (Comp § 100) To this class belongs the Sanskrit family of languages and moreover all other languages, so far as they are not comprehended under 1 and 3 and have maintained themselves in a condition which renders it possible to trace back their forms of words to the simplest elements Thirdly, languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single vehicles of the fundamental meaning This class comprehends merely the Semitic languages and produces its grammatical forms, not simply by combination, like the second class but by a mere internal modification of the roots We here gladly award to the Sanskrit family of languages a great superiority over the Semitic, which we do not, however, find in the use of inflexions as syllables *per se* devoid of meaning but in the copiousness of these grammatical additions which are really significative and connected with words used isolated in the judicious, ingenious selection and application of them, and the accurate and acute defining of various relations, which hereby becomes possible finally in the beautiful adjustment of these additions to a harmonious whole which bears the appearance of an organized body

109^a The Indian Grammarians divide the roots according to properties, (which extend only to the tenses which

We find this view of the Chinese admirably elucidated in W von Humboldt's talented pamphlet *Lettre à M Abel Remusat sur la nature des formes grammaticales en general et sur le genre de la langue chinoise*

I call the special tenses, and to the part pres.,) into ten classes, all of which we have re-discovered in the Zend also, and examples of which are given in the following paragraph.

[G. Ed p 114] We shall here give the characteristics of the Sanskrit classes, and compare with them those which correspond in the European sister languages

(1.) The first and sixth class add अ *a* to the root; and we reserve the discussion of the origin of this and other conjugational affixes for the disquisition on the verb. The point of difference between the first class of nearly 1000 roots (almost the half of the entire number) and the sixth class, which contains about 130 roots, lies in this, that the former raise the vowel of the root by Guna (§. 26), while the latter retain it pure, e, g बोधति *bódhati*, "he knows," from बुध् *budh* (1), तुदति *tudati*, "he vexes" (comp *tundti*) from तुद् *tud* (6) As अ *a* has no Guna,| no discrimination can take place through this vowel between the classes 1. and 6 but nearly all the roots which belong to either, having अ *a* as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, *c* (before nasals *o*, §. 3.) corresponds to the affix अ *a*, and *λείπο-ο-μεν*, † *φύγο-ο-μεν*, from *ΛΙΠ*, *ΦΥΓ* (*ἔλιπον*, *ἔφυγον*), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§. 26), while, e g. *θίγο-ο-μεν*, *θλίβο-ο-μεν*, &c, fall under the sixth class || In Latin we recognise, in the third conjugation,

* In Greek, the present (indic imper. and optat., the form of the Greek subjunct is wanting in Sanskrit) and imperfect correspond to them, beyond which certain conjugation-signs do not extend In German, the present of every mood corresponds

† The accent here distinguishes the 1st cl from the 6th e g. for *patati* did it belong to the 6th cl, we should have *patáti*

‡ We give the plural, because the singular, on account of abbreviation, makes the thing less perspicuous

|| Sanskrit long vowels admit Guna only when they occur at the end of the root, but in the beginning and middle remain without admixture of the अ *a*, so do short vowels before double consonants

which I would raise to the first, the cognateⁿ of the Sanskrit first and sixth class, since we regard the addition *i* as a weakening of the old *a* (§ 8) and *e g legimus* has the same relation to *λε, σ μει* that the genitive *ped is* has to *ποδ os* where the Sanskrit has likewise *a* (पद् [G Ed p 115] *pad-as*) In *leg u nt* from *leg-a nt* the old *a* through the influence of the liquid has become *u* (Comp § 66) In German all the primitive (strong) verbs with the exception of some remains of the fourth class (No 2) stand in clear connection with the Sanskrit first class which is here, for the first time laid down in its full extent* The *æ a* which is added to the root has in Gothic, before some personal terminations, remained unchanged before others according to § 67 and as in Latin been weakened to *i* so *hait a*, I am called *hait i s* *hait i th* 2d pers du *hait a ts* pl *hait a m*, *hait i th* *hait a nd* The radical vowels *i* and *u* keep the Guna addition as in Sanskrit only that the *a* which gives the Guna is here weakened to *i* (§ 27) which with *ñ* radical *i* is aggregated into a long *i* (written *ei* § 70) hence *keina* (= *kina* from *kina*) I germinate, from *हल* *bhuya* I bend from *BLG* Sanskrit *भृ* *bhuy* whence *भृन्* *bhugna* bent The diphthongs *ai au* as in Sanskrit *ए* and *औ* (§ 2) are incapable of any Guna as are *ɛ* (= *ए* § 69) and *a* The Sanskrit radical vowel *æ a* has however in Gothic experienced a threefold destiny It has either remained unaltered in the special tenses and is lengthened in the preterite except in reduplicate roots (*i e* to *o*, see § 69)—

* I have already, in my Review of Grimm's Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the *a* of forms like *haita, hutam, utama* &c does not belong to the personal termination but is identical with the *æ a* of the Sanskrit 1st and 6th classes but I was not then clear regarding the *Uuna* in the present in all roots with vowels capable of Guna (S c Ann Reg for Crit of Litt Book II 1 p 282 and 299)

† We may frequent mention of the Gothic alone as the true starting point and basis of German Grammar The application to the High German will hereafter present itself

thus, e.g. *far-i-th*, "he wanders," answers to चरति *charati* [G Ed p 116] (§ 14), and *fóri*, "he wandered," to चचर *chachâra*; or, secondly, the old *a* shews itself in the special tenses weakened to *i*, but retained in the monosyllabic singular of the preterite so that here the stronger *a* (§. 9) corresponds to the weaker *i* in the same way that, in the first case, the *ô* (= चि *ô*) does to the short *a*. The root चि *ad*, "to eat," in Gothic, according to §. 87., forms *AT*, hence, in the present, *ita*, in the sing pret., *at*, *as-t*, *at*. The third fate which befalls the *a* of the root in Gothic is a complete extirpation, and compensation by the weaker *i*, which is treated like an original *i*, existing in the Sanskrit, i.e. in the special tenses it receives Guna by *i*, and in the pret sing by *a* (§ 27), but in the pret pl. it is preserved pure. To this class belongs the *KIN*, "to germinate," mentioned above, pres *keima*, pret. sing *kain*, pl. *kin-um*. The corresponding Sanskrit root is क् चि *jan*, "to produce," "to be born" (see §. 87) the same relation, too, has *greipa*, *graiþ*, *gripum*, from *GRIP*, "to seize," to ग्रभ् *grabh* (Vêda form) on the other hand, *BIT*, "to bite,"* (*beita*, *bit*, *bitum*), has an original *i*, which exists in Sanskrit (comp भिद् *bhid*, "to cleave"), just so, *VIT*, "to know," Sanskrit विद् *vid*

(2) The fourth class of Sanskrit roots adds to them the syllable य *ya*, and herein agrees with the special tenses of the passive, and from the roots which belong to it spring chiefly neuter verbs, as e.g. नश्यति *naśyati*, "he perishes," Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable *ya* (weakened to *yi*), which is added to the root in the [G Ed p 117] special tenses, e.g. *vahs-ya* (Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *ucs-yann*, "crescebant," Vendidad S p 257), "cresco," *vahs-yi-th*, "crescit," pret. *vôhs*

* Occurs only with the prep *and*, and with the meaning "to scold," but corresponds to the Old High German root *BIZ*, "to bite"

(3) The second, third, and seventh classes add the personal termination direct to the root but in the cognate European languages to facilitate the conjugation, these classes have mainly passed over to the first class *e g ed i mus not ed mus* (as a remnant of the old construction *es t, es-tis*) Gothic *it a m*, Old High German *iz-a mēs* not *i- mēs* answering to the Sanskrit *अमस् ad-mas* The second class to which *अद् ad* belongs leaves the root without any characteristic addition with *Gunā* of the vowels capable of *Gunā* before light terminations, which must be hereafter explained, hence *e g* *एभिः ébhi* corresponding to *इमस् imas* from *इः* to *go* as in Greek *εἶμι* to *ἵμι* It contains not more than about seventy roots partly terminating in consonants, partly in vowels In this and the third-class the Greek exhibits roots almost entirely ending in vowels as the above mentioned *Ι ΔΑ, ΓΝΩ (γινώ-θι) ΔΩ ΣΤΑ, ΟΗ, ΦΥ (ἔφυι) ΔΥ &c* To the consonants the direct combination with the consonants of the termination has become too heavy, and *ΕΣ* alone (because of the facility of *σμ στ*) has remained in the Sanskrit second class, as the corresponding root in Latin Lithuanian and German Hence *अस्ति asti* *एस्ति est* Lithuan *esti est* Gothic and High German *ist* In the Latin there fall also to the second class *I DA SIA FLA PA* and *NA* and also *in quam* whence *QUA* weakened to *QUI* is the root which in Gothic, appears as *QUAT* weakened to *QUIT* with the recreation of a *T* *FER* and *IFL (IUL)* have preserved some persons of the ancient construction * [G Ed p 118] The third class is distinguished from the second by a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses and has maintained itself under this form in Greek also and Lithuanian In

* Five roots of the second class introduce in Sanskrit, between the consonants of the root and the personal termination, an *इ*, as *रोदिमि ród i mi* I weep from *रुद् rud* I can however, no longer believe that the *i* of the Latin third conjug is connected with this *इ*, as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the *अ* of the very copious first class

Sanskrit it comprehends about twenty roots, e.g. दाढमि *dadāmi*, दीदुमि, Lithuanian *dudu*; दधामि *dadhāmi*, तीथुमि (§ 16.), जजामि *jajanmi*, "I beget," comp. γί-γυ-ο-μαι. The seventh class, of about twenty-four roots, introduces, in the special tenses, a nasal into the root, which is extended before the light personal terminations to the syllable *na*; e.g. भिनमि *bhinadmi*, "I cleave," भिनमस् *bhinadmas*, "we cleave." The Latin has kept the weaker form of this nasalization, but has further added to the root the affix of the first class (p. 111 G. Ed.), hence *findo, find-i-mus*. From the Greek come to be here considered roots, like ΜΑΘ, ΛΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed *a*, and, like the Latin *find-i-mus*, is connected with the affix of the first class, thus, μανθ-άν-ο-μεν, λαμβ-άν-ο-μεν, θιγγ-άν-ο-μεν.

(4) The fifth class, of about thirty roots, has *nu*; and the eighth, with ten roots, which, excepting कृ *krī*, "to make," all terminate in न् *n* or ण् *ṇ*, has *u* for its characteristic addition. The *u*, however, of these two classes is lengthened before the light terminations by Guna, which, in the corresponding Greek appended syllables, *vu* and *v*, is supplied by lengthening the *v*, thus, e.g. δέικνυμι, δέικνυμεν, as in Sanskrit अदिपमि *āp-nō-mi*, "ad-*ip-is-cor*," आदिपमस् *āp-nu-mas*, "ad-*ip-is-mu*." An example of the eighth class is तन् *tan*, "to extend," whence तनोमि *tan-ō-mi* = तान-ō-मि, तनुमस् *tan-u-mas* = तान-ū-मस्. With the उ *u*, *v*, of the eighth class, is probably connected

[G. Ed. p. 119] the *v* in some Gothic strong verbs, where, however, it adheres so firmly to the root, that, in a German point of view, it must be regarded as a radical. Hence it is not dropped in the preterite, and receives, in the special tenses, like all strong verbs, the affix of the Sanskrit first class, e.g. *sahva*,* "I see," *sahv*, "I saw."

(5) The ninth class adds न् *nā* to the root, which syllable, before heavy terminations, instead of being shortened

* I now consider the *v* of *sahva* and similar verbs as purely euphonic, cf. § 86 and Latin forms like *cogno, inquo, stinguo*

to न ra replaces the heavy ञ a by the lighter ई i (§ 6) and is thus weakened to नी ni I g from मृद् *mrid* to crush (comp *mordeo*) comes मृद्नामि *mridnami* मृदनीमस् *mridnimas* In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in ἰημι (iāmi) ἰαμνυ e g δαμῖημι, δαμῖα μαι As α, ε, and ο are originally one formations like τεμιο μνυ belong to this class only th it they have wandered into the more modern ω conjugation at a remote period of antiquity for more lately ιω would not have become ω from ἰημι

(6) The tenth class adds अय *aya* to the root but is distinguished from the other classes in this further important point that this affix is not limited to the special tenses the final *a* of अय *aya* is peculiar to them but अय् *ay* extends with very few exceptions to all the other formations of the root All causals and many denominatives follow this class and indeed from every root a causal can be formed by the addition अय् *ay* which is always accompanied by Guna of the middle vowel of the root capable of Guna or by Vriddhi of every radical final vowel and of a middle *a* belonging to the root e g वेदयति *véd aya ti* he makes to know from वित् *vit* श्रावयति *śrāḍi aya ti* he makes to hear from श्रु *śru* We recognise in German the affix अय *aya* at least in two shapes in the one [G Ed p 1⁹⁰] the first *a* in the other the last is lost and in the latter case *y* has become *i* so that I have no longer any scruple in tracing back Grimm's first and third conjugation of the weak form to a common origin According to all probability however the verbs with the affix *ō* also (as Old High German *manōn* to mention to make to think,) belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb (The Old High German gives *ē* as the contraction of *a + i*, (see § 78) but retains its *ē* more firmly than the Gothic its *ai* which in several persons, sinks into a simple *a* Compare Gothic *haba habam haband* with Old High German *hapēm hapēmes hapent* Very remarkable however is the concurrence of the Prakrit with the Old High German and the Latin

of the 2d conj in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix अय *aya* to एँ Compare Sanskrit मानयामि *mānayāmi*, "I honour," Prākṛit माणेमि *mānēmi*,* Old High German, *var-manēm*, "I despise," Latin *monco*.

[G Ed. p 121]

SANSKRIT	PRĀKRIT	OLD HIGH GERMAN	LATIN
मानयामि <i>mānayāmi</i>	माणेमि <i>mānēmi</i>	<i>var-manēm</i>	<i>monco</i>
मानयसि <i>mānayasi</i>	माणेसि <i>mānēsī</i>	<i>manēs</i>	<i>monēs</i>
मानयति <i>mānayati</i>	माणेदि <i>mānēdi</i>	<i>manēt</i>	<i>monet</i>
मानयामस् <i>mānayāmas</i>	माणेम्ह <i>mānēmha</i>	<i>manēmes</i>	<i>monēmus</i>
मानयथ <i>mānayatha</i>	माणेथ <i>mānēdha</i>	<i>manēt</i>	<i>monētis</i>
मानयन्ति <i>mānayanti</i>	माणेन्ति <i>mānēnti</i>	<i>manēnt</i>	<i>monent</i>

In regard to those weak verbs, which have suppressed the first vowel of the Sanskrit अय *aya*, and give therefore *ya* as affix, we will here further recall attention to the forms *iga* (*ige*), which occasionally occur in Old High German and Anglo Saxon, whose connection with अय *aya* is to be traced thus, that the semi-vowel *y* has become hardened to *g*, (comp §. 19), and the preceding *a* weakened to *i*. In Greek, the cognate verbs to the Sanskrit of the tenth class are to

I am not at present able to adduce this verb from the edited texts it is, however, certain, that *mānayāmi* in this dialect can have no other sound but *mānēmi*. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, as *chintēmi*, "I think" (from *chintayāmi*), *nu údēmi* (from *nu údāyāmi*). In the plural the termination *mha* is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk *smas*, "we are") In the third pers pl, together with *mānenti* the forms *mānaanti* and *mānanti* are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanskrit a root *mān*, "to honour" more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from *māna*, "honour"; and this substantive itself a derivation from *man*, "to think," whence *ava man*, "to despise," as in Old High German *var-MAN* (by Otfred, *fir-MON*). The root, therefore, which is contained in *varmanēm* is identical with the Gothic *MAN* (*man*, "I mean," "I think," pl *munum* see § 66). To this class belongs, also, the Latin *monere*, as, "to make to think" (Old High German *manōn*), the radical *o* for *a* of which we explain by the principle of § 66 (see, also, §. 3), while the *i* of *memin-i* is a weakening of the original *a*, explained by § 6

which will be more closely considered hereafter. The Latin, in root and inflexion, most resembles the Old High German the Zend, however, in its *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *histāmi** (for *sistāmi*, see § 53), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *rathāstāo*, "warrior," which occurs so often in the Zend-Avesta, properly "chariot stander," with *o* for *s* as the sign of the nominative. How, then, in Old High German, comes from *STI* the extended form of the root *STANT*, whence the present *stantu*, "I stand," and preterite *stuont*, "I or he stood", for which the Gothic has *standa*, *stāth*?. We will here only preliminarily remark, that we have observed in Zend also, in some roots terminating in *ā*, an inclination to connect themselves with a *t*-sound. Thus we find, from *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *snā*, "to wash," "to purify," (Sansk *स्नान* *snā*, "to bathe,") whence *snāta*, "purified," in Vend S. p 233, frequently *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *fra-snādhayēn* "laurent", from *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *dā*, "to lay," (Sansk *धा* *dhā*, p 118 G Ed), we find *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *nidauthyann*, "deponant" (as Vendidād S pp 205 and 206, *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *roḥēz roḥāyē* *hushē zēmē nidauthyann*, "in succā terrā deponant") from the same root we find the imperative [G Ed p 123] form, *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ni-dā-thāma*, "deponamus" (Vend S p. 208, *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ḥzjāw ḥzjāwāyāz ḥzjāy* *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *kva naranm vītanann tanūm barāma Ahura mazda kva nidāthāma*, "Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus?") Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root *𐌆𐌆* *mā*, "to measure" (cf *μέτρον*), has connected itself with a *t*-sound, and forms, in Gothic, *MAT*, present *mita* (§. 109¹ 1). *𐌆𐌆𐌆* *gnā*, "to be acquainted with," "to know," *𐌆𐌆𐌆*, *GNA* (*gnarus*) Old High German *CHNĀ* (§ 87), whence *chnā-ta*, "I knew," annexing the auxiliary verb direct, as in Latin (*g*)*no-vi*. To

* I believe I may deduce this form from the 3d pers. pl *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *histēnti* (cf *ισταντι*) in the V S p 183. more on this head under the verb

the special form नानामि *janāmi* for नानामि *janā nā mi* may be long the Gothic root *LANN* Old High German *CHANN* (*lann chan* "I know" see § 94 *lunnum chunnum* "we know" see § 66) ध्मा¹ *dhmā* to blow alters itself in the special forms to धम् *dhām* Latin *PLA* according to the second class (§ 109 3) Old High German *PLA* (§§ 12 20) whence *plā ta* "faul" As in Sanskrit from the above-mentioned धम् *dhām* comes the nominal base धमनी *dhamanī* "a vein" so may the Gothic base *BLOTHA* (nom acc *blōth* "blood") come here also under consideration We pass on to roots in *i* and have to remark that the root mentioned at p 107 G Ed इ₁ to go is not unknown in German We find it in the Gothic imperative *hur-i* "come here" du *hur-yats* pl *hur-yith* I believe too that in the irregular preterite *iddya* "I went" the *i* alone can be assumed as the root In Zend occurs *इति* *eti* "he goes" (from *इति* *eti* according to §§ 23 41) Lithuan *eti* "to go with the prep *ut* to raise itself" hence *उच्चिता* *uchchirita* "raised high" compare *cre sco cre-ti* (see § 21) Old High German *SCRI* "to step with the addition of a *t*" as in the case of *mal* from *म* *mā* perhaps the Latin *gradior* as well as *cre sco* might be here included the Guna form of the vowel as in *इति* *ray-a ti* "he goes" being observed *इति* *smi* "to smile" Old High German *SMIL* *मो⁹ pri* "to love" Zend *इति* *fri* (§ 47) Gothic *friyō* "I love" (§ 57) compare *इति* *priya* "dear" *भो³ bhī* "to fear" *इति* *bibhē mi* "I fear" Lithuan *biyau* Gothic *fiya* "I hate" (*fiyais fiyath*), *fiyands* "foe" Old High German *vēm* or *fiēm* "I hate" the Greek *φειδομαι* answers to the Sanskrit reduplication of *bibhēmi* so that contrary to the common rule the aspirates have remained in the prefix, but in the base itself have become medials and this has left only *β* as the whole root, as in Sanskrit *दा दाम* "we give," for *दा दाम* *दा दाम* *दा दाम* Perhaps, also, [G Ed p 124] *ΦΙΔ* *φειδομαι* is to be referred to the roots in *i*, so that an

unorganic dental affix would be to be assumed $\text{𐌹𐌶}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$, "to lie," "to sleep," with irregular Guna in the middle, hence $\text{𐌹𐌶-𐌹𐌹} = \text{𐌹𐌶𐌹-𐌹𐌹}$ $\text{𐌹𐌶}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹𐌹}$, "to be ashamed". Old High German *IRU*, "to repent" (*hriu-u*, *hrou*, *hru-umés*, see p 115. G. Ed.) Of roots in *u*, $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *diu*, "to run," $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *drau-a-ti*, "he runs" may furnish, through the Guna form, the Greek δρά-σκω , δι-δρά-σκω , which appears hence to derive its *a* with suppression of the digamma. the μ of δρῖ-μω , however, might pass as a hardening of the 𐌹^{r} (§ 63), and δρῖ-μ-ο-μην , δρῖ-μ-ε-τε , &c., therefore represent most truly the forms *drau-á-mas*, *drau-a-tha* $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *plu*, "to go," "to swim," "to float" ($\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *plava*, "a ship"), Latin *FLU*. The Greek πλέω , πλώω is again not to be so regarded as if the old *v* had been corrupted to *c* or *o*, but πλέ(F)ω , πλο(F)ω supply the place of the Guna form in *plav-é* (of the middle voice), 3d pers *plav-a-té* the future πλέουσω , the *v* having the Guna (§ 26.), answers to $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *pló-shyé*, Lithuan *plauku*, "I swim," with a guttural added, as in Latin *flu-si* from *flu* (p 98. G Ed) Old High German *FLUZ*, "to flow," pre-supposes the Gothic *FLUT* (§ 87.), with the favorite dental addition, with which all final vowels are so commonly invested $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *siu*, "to hear," KAY (§§ 20, 21), Gothic *HLIU-MAN* (nominative *hluma*), "ear," as "hearer," with weakened Guna (§. 27.), with regard to the *ll* for *sr*, compare, also, *clunis* with $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *sróni*, *f*. "hip") Lithuan. *klausau*, "I hear" Perhaps *erudio*, as "to make hear," is to be referred to this class. the derivation from *e* and *iudis* is little satisfactory. Anquetil introduces a Zend *erodé*, *célebre*, ($\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *erodés*), which I have not yet found in the original text, but I meet with the causal form $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *śrávayāmi* (Sansk $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *śrávayāmi*), "I speak," "recite" (V S. p. 38) The Old High German, *scrirumés*, "we have exclaimed," gives *SCRIR* as the root, and rests probably on the form $\text{𐌹}^{\text{r}} \text{𐌹}$ *śráv* (§ 20), with a thinning of the *á* to *r* (§ 66); the present and sing. preterite, however, have lost the *r* (*scriu*

for *scriru* *scree* for *scree*) like the Greek κλησω, κικληκα &c. The Latin *clamo* however has the same relation to च्राव् *srāv* that *mare* has to चारि *lāri* water (§ 63) and ध्रुम् to द्रव् *drai* from द्रु *dru* to run ३७ *hu*⁵ to extol to glorify (अध्वरु *hunuda* 'he celebrated' V S p 39) is probably the root of the Greek υμιος (ὕμ(ε)ιος) which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from उद्व च्रु¹ 'to purify' *PURus*. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire which are both represented as pure चवन *parana* (with Guna and *ana* [G Ed p 100] as suffix) is the wind and the corresponding Gothic *FŌLA* (neut nom acc *fon* see § 116) is fire which in Sanskrit is called पावक *pāi-ala* with *Viddhi* and *ala* as suffix. The relation of *FŌLA* to चवन *parana* resembles that of the Latin *mālo* from *maolo* the loss of the syllable च *ia* is replaced by the lengthening of the *a* (§ 69). The Greek τῦρ and Old High German *VTURA* (nom acc. *iur*) the latter with weakened Guna (§ 27) and *ra* as suffix both fall to the root च्रु च² *bru* to speak Zend *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬀* *mru* (e.g. *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬀* *mraδ-m* I spoke V S p 123) the Greek *ρ(ε)ω* rests on the Guna form च्रवोमि *brai imi* and has as often happens lost the former of two initial consonants (cf also *ρ(ε)ω* *peuω* and *ruo* with च्रु *stru* to flow"). The Old High German *SPRAH* or *SPRAHII* (*sprithu* 'I speak' *sprah* I spoke) appears to have proceeded from च्रव् *brai* by hardening the च *v* (see § 19) and prefixing an *s* akin to the *p* च *bhu* to be Zend *𐬨𐬀* *bu* Lithuanian *BŪ* (future *būsu* I will be), Latin *FU* Greek ΦΥ. Probably also, *BY* in *πρεσβυ-ς*, *πρεσβυτης*, &c., is only another form of this root (cf § 18), so that *πρεσ* would have to be regarded as a preposition from *προ* (*pra*) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf § 96). Moreover the base *πρεσβυ* has a striking resemblance to च्रु *prabhu* (*excelsus augustus*) literally being before. In Old High German *pim* or *bim* corresponds to the

Sanskrit भवामि *bhavāmi*. more exact, however, is the correspondence in the plural of *pur-u-mēs*, *pur-u-t*, to *bhav-ā-mas*, "sumus," *bhav-a-tha*, "estis" (see §. 19.). To this class belongs, also, *PŪ*, "to dwell" (*pū-ta*, "I dwelt"), as the Sanskrit वस *vas* "to dwell," in German *VAS*, *WAS*, has become *seyn*. In Sanskrit, too, from भू *bhū*, "to be," comes the substantive *bhav-ana* "house," as place of being. The Gothic *baua*, "I build," may be regarded as the causal of the idea "to be," like the Latin *facio* (§ 19.). its conjugation answers also to भावयामि *bhāvayāmi*, "I make to be," which, in Piākrit, may sound *bhāvēmi*, *bhāvēsi*, *bhāvētī* (Gothic *baua*, *bauais*, *bauait*) See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskrit roots ending in diphthongs (र ई, ओ ऒ, ऐ औ, there are no roots in औ *au*) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in अ *ā*. We abstain from adducing examples of them, as they also offer little occasion for comparison.

(2.) Roots terminating with a consonant. We shall give [G Ed p 126] only a few examples, in which we compare roots with the same vowel, and proceed in the order, *a*, *i*, *u*. According to § 1 we do not allow the vowel अ *a* and आ *ā* to belong to the root. Long radical vowels before a final consonant are rare; and the majority of them are probably not original.

The most numerous class of roots ending with a consonant has a medial अ *a*. So वच्^{1 2} *vach*, Zend *vach* (अवच्छिद्य *abcta*, "dixit," Vend S. p 124), Greek ΕΠ for FEP (§. 14), Latin *VOC*, Old High German, *WAH*, *WAG* (*ki-wahu*, "mentionem facio," pret. *ki-wuoh* pl *ki-wuogumēs*). प्रच्छ⁶ *prachh*, Zend *pērēš*, Gothic *FRAH*, प्रेश्चामि *prichchāmi*, प्रेश्चामि *pērēšāmi*, *fraha* for *friha* (see § 52 and § 109^a. 1.), the Latin *ROG* (*rogo*, *interrogo*) appears to be abbreviated from *FROG* पत¹ *pat*, "to fall," "to fly," Zend *pat*, "to fly" (Vend S p 257 *patann* *uvāra* *ucsyann*, "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this

that in Greek *πιπτω πεταω πεταομαι πετομαι πτημι* &c belong to a common root ΠΕΤ Latin *PET* *peto im peto prapetes penna* by assimilation for *pet na* In Gothic *FATH*, or, with the vowel weakened, *FITH*, might be looked for To the latter corresponds according to § 87 Old High German *VED* in *ved aia* feather *वद्*^{1 10} *vad* to speak Latin *VAD* contained in *vas vad is* From *वद् vad* proceeds the abbreviated form *उद् ud* to which pertains ΥΔ (*υδω υδεω υδης*) The Old High German gives *WAZ* (*var wazu maledico*) with *z* for *d* according to § 87 and the vowel of the base lengthened as in *वादयामि vadayami* according to the tenth class *सद्*⁵ *sad* to sink with the prep *नि ni* to set oneself down Latin *SED SID, sido sedeo* Greek ΕΔ ΙΖ *εδος εδρα ιζομαι* Gothic *SAT* (§ 87) *sita* I sit (p 116 G Ed) *अन्*² *an* to blow to breathe *अनिल anila* wind Gothic *AN usana* I expire cf *ανεμος animus* *जन्*³ *jan* to beget Zend *जन् zan* (§ 58) *जजन्जन्ज* *zazdm* I beget Sanskrit *जजन्म jajanmi* Greek ΓΕΝ Latin *GEN* (*γινιομαι γενος gigno genus*) Gothic *KIN* 'to germinate (p 116 G Ed) *kun* gender (§ 66) *कर्*⁸ *kar* (*क कृ*) *e g कलेन karoti facit* this root in Zend follows the fifth class *e g* *करेनाबिति* (§ 41) *facit* *करेनावोति* *fecit* *करेनुइधि* *fac* Old High German *karan* or *garauan* to prepare Latin *creo cura* (cf *कुरु luru fac*) *ceremonia* and with *p* for *c* (§ 14), *paro* Greek *κρανω κρα-τος* with *π*, *πρασσω πρακ σω* [G Ed p 127] *πρᾶγμα* where the guttural appears to be a hardening of the *व* (§ 19) *e g* of *कुर्वन्ति kurlanti faciunt* (from *kur u-anti*) *वह*¹ *vah* to dive to carry Zend *वज*⁶ *vaz* (§ 57) Latin *VEH* Greek *ὄχος* wagon as bearer carrier for *φοχος* *अस*¹ *as* to breathe cf *spiro* according to §§ 50 and 22 *ग्रह*^{9 10} *grah* to take the original form occurring in the Vedas is *ग्रभ् grabh* To this the Zend form belongs according to the tenth class and

clearing dispersing separating, are kindred ones. The Gothic *SKAID* to separate if the relationship is certain, has a stiffened Guna so that *ai* appears to belong to the root. According to § 87 however the Gothic form should be *SKAIT* and the Old High German *SKEIZ* for *SKEID* विद्^2 *vid* to know Zend 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎 *vid* IA Gothic *VID* Old High German, *IZ* in the Latin *VID* and in εἶδω I see the seeing is regarded as something which makes to know and the conjugation of *video* is causal according to p 121 G Ed. Thus also another root signifying to know namely बुद् *budh* has in Zend gained the meaning to see * According to the tenth class and with the prep *ni* *VID* in Zend signifies to summon (𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *niraédhayémi* *in loco* see § 28) In Gothic *III* receives through the prep *in* the meaning 'to adore (*inveita* *inveit* *invitum*) दिश^8 *dis* to shew Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬎 *dis*¹⁰ hence 𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *fradaésayθ* thou shewest (Vend S p 123) Greek ΔIK , with Guna $\delta\epsilon\text{iknu}\mu$ according to the fifth class Latin *DIC* in *dico* as it were 'to point out,' and *dicis* (*dicis causa*) In Gothic the rule laid down in § 87 requires the form *TIII* and this root combined with *ga* signifies to announce (*ga teiha* *ga taih* *ga taihūm* for *ga tihum* according to § 82) On the other hand in *taihūs* sign the law for the transposition of letters is violated जीव^1 *jiv* life Lithuanian *gyva* *s* alive *gyvenū* I live, *gyvata* "life Gothic *QUIA*, nom *quis* alive, Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUI* as *bis* from *dus* (Sansk. द्विस *dwis*) *viginti* from *tuiginti* The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root Hence *e g* 𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 nom 𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 living (V S p 189) and 𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *hu jitayθ* *bonam vitam habentes* (l c p 222) from 𐬰𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *hu jiti* From *j* the root would become with Guna *jayumi* on which rests the Greek $\zeta\omega$ the *j* having

* Vide Cram Crit p 378

fallen out (§ 14.), but βίος also belongs to this root, and finds a medium of comparison with नृचुर्गु, in the Latin *vivo* Of roots with *u*, रुच¹ *ruch*, “to shine,” and रुद² *rud*, “to weep,” may serve as examples, the former, in Zend, is रुचु¹ *rauch*, (§§ 28 32), and follows the tenth class, e. g. रुचु¹ *raochayéiti*, “splendet” [G Ed p 129] In Latin correspond *LUC*, *luc-s*, *luceo* (§. 20.) and *RUD*. the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the *r* by *l*, and presents, for comparison, ΛΥΚ (ἀμφιλύκη, λυκόφως) and ΛΥΖ, to the former, λύχνος, λυχ-νέω, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, रुचु¹ *tafnu-s*, “burning,” has to the root रुचु¹ *tap* (§ 40) We must assign λευκός also, with Guna, to the root ΛΥΚ The Gothic gives *LUH* for *LUK*, according to §. 87, whence, with the original, or with weakened Guna (§§ 26, 27.), spring forms like *lauhmóni*, “lightning,” *lauhatyan*, “to lighten,” *luhath*, “light.” Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands *lukarn* (theme, *lukarna*, neut), “lamp,” rather isolated A root corresponding to रुद² *rud* is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to § 87, *RUZ*, “to weep” (*riuzu*, *rôz* for *rauz*, according to § 80, *ruzumês*) भूष¹ *bhúsh*, “to adorn,” is perhaps contained in the Latin *or-no*, with loss of the initial letter, as *amo* in relation to कामयामि *kâmayâmi*, “I love” With regard to the *r* for रु¹ *sh*, advert to the relation of *uro* to रुचु¹ *ush*, “to burn,” सेव¹ *sev*, “to honour,” मेधु¹ *médh*, “to think” (P) The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb it springs, however, from मेधस् *médhas* and मेधा *médhá*, “understanding,” unless it should be preferred to assume for these words a root *mudh*, which, however, the Grammarians do not exhibit The Gothic has, for comparison, *MIT*, whence *mitó*, “I think” the Greek furnishes an analogous word to *seu*, viz ΣΕΒ, σέβω (§ 4)

110 From the monosyllabic roots proceed nouns, substantive and adjective, by the annexation of syllables,

which we should not without examination regard as not, *per se* significative and as it were supernatural mystic beings to a passive belief in whose undiscoverable nature we are not willing to surrender ourselves. It is more natural to suppose that they have or had meaning and that the organism of language connects that which has a meaning with what is likewise significative. Why should not language denote accessory ideas by accessory words appended to the root? Language which possesses both sense and body infuses sense and imparts form to every word. The object of nouns is to represent [C. Ed. p. 130] persons or things to which that which the abstract root expresses adheres and hence it is most natural to look for pronouns in the elements used in the formation of words as the bearers of qualities, actions and conditions which the root expresses *in abstracto*. There appears too, in reality, as we shall develop in the chapter on the pronouns a complete* identity between the most important elements in the formation of words and some pronominal bases which are declined even in an isolated state. But it is not surprising that several of the elements of verbal formation in the class of independent words should not admit of more certain explanation for these affixes have their origin in the most obscure and early epoch of language and subsequently they have themselves lost all consciousness as to whence they have been taken on which account the appended suffix does not always keep equal pace with the alterations which in the course of time occur in the corresponding isolated word or it has been altered while the other remains unchanged. Still in individual cases we may remark the admirable exactitude with which the appended grammatical syllables have maintained them

* I direct attention preliminarily to my treatise 'On the Influence of Pronouns in the Formation of Words' (Berlin by F. Dümmler)

selves through thousands of years in an unaltered form, I say, we may remark this from the perfect accordance which exists between various individuals of the Sanskrit family of languages, although these languages have been removed, as it were, from each other's eyes since time immemorial, and every sister dialect has, since that removal, been left to its own fate and experience.

111. There are also pure radical words, *i. e.* those of which the theme, without suffix of derivation or personality, repre-

G Ed p 131] sents the naked root, which are then united in declension with the syllables which denote the relations of case. Except at the end of compounds, such radical words are, in Sanskrit, few in number, and are all feminine abstracts, as, भौ *bhī*, "fear," युध् *yudh*, "contest," मुद् *mud*, "joy." In Greek and Latin the pure root is the most rare form of the word, but it does not always appear as an abstract substantive. As, for instance, *e g* φλογ (φλόκ-ς), ὄπ (ὄπ-ς), νίψ (νίπ-ς), leg (*lec-s*), pac (*pac-s*), duc (*duc-s*), pel-lic (*pel-lec-s*). In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance, for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskrit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself, as, *e g.* धर्मविद् *dharma-vid*, "duty-knowing." In Latin, the use of these compounds is as frequent as in Sanskrit, only that, according to § 6., a radical *a* is weakened to *i* or *e*, thus, *carni-fic* (*fec-s*), *tubi-cin* (*cen*). An example in Greek is χερυιβ (for -νιπ from νιπ-τω) Sanskrit roots which end with short vowels,

as क्षिज् to conquer" are in compounds of this kind supported by the addition of a *t* which so much the more appears to be a simple phonetic affix without signification that these weakly-constructed roots appear to support themselves on an auxiliary *t* before the gerundial suffix *ya* also Thus e g क्षर्जित् *starga jit* "conquering the heaven" क्षर्जित् यत् *starga jit ya*, "by conquering" In Latin I find [G Ed p 13...] interesting analogies to these formations in *IT* and *STIT* from the roots *I* and *STA* the latter weakened to *STI* according to § 6 Thus *com it* (*com-es*) "goer with" *equ it* (*equ-er*) "goer on horseback", *al it* (*al-es*) "goer with wings" *super stit* (*stes*) "standing by" The German has in this way supported throughout with a *t* several roots terminating with a vowel and hence given to this letter the character of radicalism as above mentioned (p 123 G Ed) in *MAT* from मा *mā* to measure



FORMATION OF CASES

112.- The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, *i.e.* in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example, and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language, but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension requires the pure primary form, naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually [G Ed p 134] followed in composition, and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom and acc sing of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in

this point have applied to the cases furnished to them by the language and take the augmented *अस्मि* *asmat* or *अस्माद्* *asmad* from us *युष्मि* *yushmat* or *युष्माद्* *yushmad* from you as the starting point in the declension or as the primary form although in both pronominal forms only *अ* and *यु* belong to the base which however does not extend to the singular. That however in spite of this error the Indian Grammarians understand how to decline the pronouns and that they are not deficient in external rules for this purpose is a matter of course. That the interrogative in its declension resembles bases in *a* can not escape any one who holds the neuter *किम्* *kim* for the original indeclinable form of the word. Panini settles the matter here with a very laconic rule when he says (edit Cole p 969) *किम् क् kimah kah* *i e ka** is substituted for *kim*. If this strange method were to be followed in Latin and the neuter *quid* in like manner regarded as the theme then in order to get at the dative *cu i* (after the analogy of *fructui*) one would have to say *quidis cus* or '*quidi cus*'. In another place (p 825) Panini forms from *idam* this (which in like manner has the honour of passing for a base) and *kim* what? a copulative compound, and by *इदं किम् इदं किम्* *idankimôr iski* the Grammarian teaches that the putative bases in [G Ed p 130] the formations under discussion substitute for themselves the forms *i* and *ki*.

113 The Sanskrit and the languages akin to it, which in this respect have still kept upon the old footing distinguish, besides the two natural genders another—the neuter which the Indian Grammarians call *क्लिञ्ज* *i e eu* such which appears to be a peculiarity of the San

* He forms namely from *kim* regarded as a base *kim as*, which in reality does not occur, and which has for the sake of euphony here become *kimah*.

skrit, or most perfect family of languages. According to its original intention this gender had to represent inanimate nature, but it has not everywhere confined itself to these old limits. The language imparts life to what is inanimate, and, on the other hand, (according to the view then taken,) impairs the personality of what is by nature animate. The feminine in Sanskrit, both in the base and in the case-terminations, loves a luxurious fullness of form, and where it is distinguished from the other genders in the base or in the termination, it marks this distinction by broader, and more sonant vowels. The neuter, on the other hand, prefers the greatest conciseness, but distinguishes itself from the masculine, not in the base, but only, in the most conspicuous cases, in the nominative and its perfect counterpart the accusative, in the vocative also, when this is the same as the nominative.

114 Number, in Sanskrit and its sister languages, is distinguished, not by a particular affix denoting the number, but by the selection or modification of the case-syllable, so that, with the case-suffix, the number is at once known, *e g* *bhyam*, *bhyām*, and *bhyas* are cognate syllables, and, among other relations, express that of the dative, the first in the singular (only in the pronoun of the 2d person, तुभ्यं *tubhyam*, "to thee"), the second in the dual, the third in the plural. The dual, like the neuter, in course of time is the first to be lost with the weakening of the vitality [G. Ed p 136] of the view taken by the senses, or is more and more straitened in its use, and then replaced by the abstract plural expressive of infinite number. The Sanskrit possesses the dual most fully, both in the noun and in the verb, and employs it everywhere where its use could be expected. In the Zend, which otherwise approximates so closely to the Sanskrit, it is found very rarely in the verb, more frequently in the noun. The Pali has only as much left of it as the Latin, viz a remnant of it in two words, which signify "two"

and both in the Prakrit it is entirely wanting. Of the German languages only the eldest dialect the Gothic possesses it but merely in the verb while on the contrary in the Hebrew (speaking here of the Semitic languages) it is retained only in the noun in disadvantageous contrast with the Arabic which in many other respects also is a more perfect language and which maintains the dual in equal fulness in the verb also while in the Syriac it has been almost entirely lost in the noun as well as in the verb *

11. The case terminations express the reciprocal relations of nouns *i. e.* the relations of the persons spoken of to one another which principally and originally referred only to space, but from space were extended also to time and cause. According to their origin they are at least for the most part pronouns, as will be more clearly developed hereafter. Whence could the exponents of the relations of space which have grown up with the primary words into a whole have better been taken than from those words which express personality, with their inherent secondary idea of room of that which is nearer or more distant of that which is on this or that side? [G. Ed. p. 137.]

As also in verbs the personal terminations *i. e.* the pronominal suffixes—although in the course of time they are no longer recognised and felt to be that which by their demonstrable origin they imply and are—are replaced or if we may use the expression commented on by the isolated pronouns prefixed to the verb so in the more sunken insensible state of the language the spiritually dead case terminations are in their signification of space replaced supported or ex-

* Regarding the character the natural foundation and the finer gradations in the use of the dual and its diffusion into the different provinces of language we possess a talented inquiry by W. von Humboldt in the Transactions of the Academy for the year 1827, and some which have been published by Dummler.

plained by prepositions, and in their personal signification by the article

116. Before we describe the formation of cases in the order in which the Sanskrit Grammarians dispose them, it appears desirable to give the different final sounds of the nominal bases with which the case-suffixes unite themselves, as well as to point out the mode in which the cognate languages are in this respect related to one another. The three primary vowels (*a, i, u*) occur in Sanskrit, both short and long, at the end of nominal bases, thus, अ *a*, इ *i*, उ *u* आ *ā*, ई *ī*, ऊ *ū*. To the short *a*, always masculine or neuter, never feminine, *a*, corresponds in Zend and Lithuanian, and also in German, where, however, even in the Gothic (in Grimm's first strong declension), especially in substantives, it is only sparingly retained. In more modern dialects it is commonly supplanted by a more recent *u* or *e*. In Greek, the corresponding termination is the *o* of the second declension (e.g. in λόγος) and *o* was also the termination of the Latin noun in ancient times, but in the classic period, although sometimes retained, it was commonly changed to *u* in the nom and accus sing (of the second declension). An old *a*, however, is still left in *cola, gena, cidā*, at the end of compounds, where, however, from the want of other analogies, it is used in declension similarly to the feminine

[G Ed. p 138] originally long *a*, on which account the nominative is written, not *colas, genas, cidas*, but *cola*, &c. The Grecian masculines of the first declension in *ā-s*, with the *η-s* which has proceeded therefrom, must likewise, according to their origin, be compared with the Sanskrit masculine short *a*, to which, in regard of quality and preservation of the nominative sign, they have remained faithful, while the *o* of the second declension has preserved its old original brevity. Their identity with bases in *o* is excellently shewn by the genitive in *ov*, which does not at all

suit ι theme in α or η , and further from such compounds as $\mu\rho\omicron\pi\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\tau\rho\iota\beta\eta\varsigma$ in which the vowel that has been added to the roots $\Pi\Omega\Delta$ and TPIB supplies the place of the Sanskrit a in similar compounds for which in Greek o usually stands

117 To the short i which occurs in the three genders the same vowel corresponds in the cognate languages. In German it is to be looked for in Grimm's fourth strong declension which I shall make the second where however from the destructive alterations of time it becomes nearly as hard as the a of the first declension. In Latin i is interchanged with e hence *facile* for *facili* *mare* for *mar*i**; Sanskrit पितृ उदरि water. In Greek before vowels the i is generally weakened to the unorganic ϵ . The short u also shews itself in Sanskrit in the three genders as in Greek υ and u in Gothic where it distinguishes itself from the a and i in that it is retained as well before the s of the nominative as in the uninflected accusative. In Latin the corresponding letter is the u of the fourth declension.

118 The long vowels (\acute{a} \acute{i} \acute{u}) belong in Sanskrit principally to the feminine (see § 113) are never found in the neuter and occur in the masculine very rarely. In Zend the long final a has generally been shortened in polysyllabic words as it has in Gothic in which bases [G Ed p 139] in θ correspond (§ 69) to the Sanskrit feminine bases in \acute{a} and the θ in the uninflected nom and accus sing is shortened to a with the exception of the monosyllabic forms $s\theta$ she 'this Sanskrit $\text{सि स\acute{a}}$ Zend $h\acute{a}$ $h\theta$ which? Sanskrit and Zend $h\acute{a}$. The Latin also in the uninflected nom and voc has shortened the old feminine long a but the Lithuanian has in the nom maintained the original length. In Greek the Doric α approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit feminine $\text{सि } \acute{a}$ which the common dialect has sometimes preserved sometimes shortened sometimes transformed into η .

119. The long *ī* appears, in Sanskrit, most frequently as a characteristic addition in the formation of feminine bases, thus, the feminine base महती *mahatī* (*magna*) springs from महत् *mahat*. The same holds good in Zend. Moreover, the feminine character *ī* has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part pres. and fut. an *i* is added to the old participial suffix *ant*, and *ésant-i*, "the existing," *bú-sent-i*, "that that shall be," correspond to the Sanskrit सती *sat-ī* (for *asati* or *asanti*), भवन्ति *bhav-i-shyantī*. In Greek and Latin this feminine long *i* has become incapable of declension, and where it has still left traces, there a later unorganic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either α or δ , in Latin, *e*. Thus, $\eta\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ corresponds to the Sanskrit स्वादु *suádu-ī*, from खादु *suádu*, "sweet", $\epsilon\gamma\delta\alpha\rho\chi\eta\sigma\tau\rho\iota\alpha$, $\lambda\eta\sigma\tau\rho\iota\delta\text{-}\omicron\varsigma$, to the Sanskrit त्री *tri-ī*, $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\text{नि}\eta\text{नि}$ *janitrī*, "genitress," to which the Latin *genitri-ē-c-s*, *genitrē-c-is*, corresponds, while in the Greek $\gamma\epsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$, and similar formations, the old feminine *i* is forced back a syllable. This

[G Ed p 140] analogy is followed by $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha$, and substantive derivations, as $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, $\Lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$. In $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom. masc., shortened by a τ . In $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\alpha\iota\nu\alpha$, it is to be assumed that the proper primitive in ν or $\nu\tau$ has been lost, or that these are formations of a different kind, and correspond to the rather isolated word in Sanskrit इन्द्रियी *Indriyānī*, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इन्द्र *Indra*, is termed. The cases where the feminine *i* is solely represented by α are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in $\nu\tau$, where τ passes into σ . The preceding ν , however, is replaced by υ or ι , or the mere lengthening of the preceding vowel, or it is assimilated to the σ

hence, $\omicron\upsilon\sigma\text{-}\alpha$, $\epsilon\iota\sigma\text{-}\alpha$, $\epsilon\sigma\sigma\text{-}\alpha$, $\bar{\alpha}\sigma\text{-}\alpha$, $\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\text{-}\alpha$

for $\omicron\nu\tau\text{-}\alpha$, $\epsilon\nu\tau\text{-}\alpha$, $\epsilon\nu\tau\text{-}\alpha$, $\alpha\nu\tau\text{-}\alpha$, $\upsilon\nu\tau\text{-}\alpha$

* In Doric subsequent and original $\alpha\iota\sigma\text{-}\alpha$

To this analogy belong moreover, the feminine substantives like *θαλασσα βασιλισσα μελισσα* which J Grimm (II 328) very correctly in my opinion compares with forms like *χαρι εσσα μελιτο εσσα* and explains the double *σ* by gemination or assimilation. The feminine formations by a simple *α* instead of the original *ι* are most corrupt and relatively the most recent and herein the Greek is not supported by any of the cognate languages. The Latin its twin sister which otherwise runs parallel to it leaves in the part pres and other adjective bases terminating with a consonant the feminine undistinguished from the masculine through all the cases since it has no longer the power of declining the old *ι*.

120 The German too can no longer fully decline the old feminine *ι* and the Gothic by a foreign affix introduces it into the *δ* declension but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable *υθ* in the [G Ed p 141] uninflected nominative and vocative to *ι* in the adjective to *υα*. More commonly however the old bases in *ι* are introduced by the frequently employed affix of an *n* into the so-called weak declension and as *ι* in Gothic is denoted by *ei* so to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in *न्ति anti* and to the fem comparative bases in *ईयसी iyasi* correspond the forms *ndem izem* regarding the nominative of which refer to § 142.

121 The long *u* (*ū*) appears in Sanskrit rather seldom at the end of primary forms and is for the most part feminine. The words most in use are *वधू vadhu* a wife *भू bhū* earth *शूश्रू suasru* mother in law (*socrus*) *भ्रू bhru* eyebrow. To the latter corresponds *οφρυς* likewise with the long *υ* the declension of which however is not different from that of the short *υ* while in Sanskrit the long *u* is distinguished from the short feminine *u* in the same way as *ई* from *इ*. But few monosyllabic primary forms end in Sanskrit with diphthongs not any at all with *ए e* with *ऐ ai* (from *u + i* see § 2) only *रै rai* masc thing 'riches' in

the nom irregularly रास् *râ-s* for र् *râ-i-s*. In this is recognised the Latin *re-s*. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in *ē* should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit हे *âi*, for, in the first place, the Latin *ē* corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit ए *ê* (from *ǎ+i*), never to *âi*; secondly, the connection of the *ē* of the fifth declension with the originally long *a* of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic *η* does to the Doric *ᾱ*), for many words with the same meaning belong to the A and E declension; and, for example, a suffix which is employed for the formation of abstracts from adjectives is sounded as well *tiē* as *tia* (*plantie-s*, [G Ed p 142] *plantia, cantie-s, cantia*), and *iē-s*, and *ia*, in the formation of primitive and derivative words like *effigie-s, effigia, pauperie-s, pauperia* are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit ञि *yâ*, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek *ία*, Ionic *ίη*. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine *ē* and *a*. The most weighty is the *s* in the nom. sing and pl. *ē-s, ē-s* for *ē, ei*, as *musa, musæ (musai), κεφαλή, κεφαλαί*. As regards the *s* in the singular, it is, if the identity with the first declension be authentic, very remarkable, and forms like *species, canities*, seem to be true lingual patriarchs for the Sanskrit, like the Zend, Greek, Gothic, Lithuanian, exhibits the absence of the nominative sign in the corresponding feminine bases in *a*. I have, however, never considered as original the abandonment of the nominative sign, and the complete equalization with the primary form in सुप्त *sutâ*, "daughter," and similar words, although it has appeared to me as losing itself very deeply in far-distant ages. The Latin, however, in some other points of Grammar, shews greater antiquity than the Sanskrit and Greek, as, for example (to confine the present instance to the nominative case), participial nominatives, like *amans, legens*, are better and

older forms than the Sanskrit and Greek like तुदन् *tudan* λεγων *tiθεις* because they have preserved the nominative *s* together with the nasal and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms like 𑀧𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 *bāvans* being I cannot therefore find in the retention of the nominative sign in the fifth declension any decisive argument against its original identity with the first We will treat hereafter of the *s* of the nominative plural In the genitive singular the common form *ei* answers to *deae* (*deai*) the more rare however and better in *es* to *familias* Schneider searches but fortunately without [G Ed p 143] success, for genitives like *die-is* we require them as little perhaps as a *familia is* Let *dies* be written with Greek letters *διης* and then perhaps a *die is* will be as little required as a *δικη ος* Although a few bases of the third declension by rejecting a consonant or an entire syllable have passed into the fifth declension we will not therefore infer that all bases in *e* have arisen from such an abbreviation If *QUIET* after rejecting the *t* could be declined according to the fifth declension then must there necessarily have formerly been a fifth *ie* there must have been bases in *e* otherwise from *QUIET* could only have come *QUII* (*quies quis* like *cædes*) *ie* in spite of the rejection of the *t* it must have continued in the third declension The connection between *re s* and the abovementioned Sanskrit *रैराँ* is in my opinion to be arrived at through the irregular nominative *रास्* *rā s* and according to this *re s* would be supported on an old *a* it answers to *रास्* *ra s* as *रिँ* *ri bus* to *राभ्यस्* *ra bhya s* and as in Greek *γη* to the Sanskrit *गाम्* *gum* *terram* which in the remaining cases has *गो* *go* for its base In Lithuanian there are feminine primary forms in *e* (Rubig's third declension) which resemble the Greek *η* in the suppression of the singular nominative sign but in the nominative plural in *es* approach more closely the Latin in *e*

122. Primary forms in ओ *ó* are rare in Sanskrit the only ones known to me are द्यौ *dyó*, "heaven," and गो *gó* the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from दिव् *dir* (a radical word from दिव् *div*, "to shine") by the vocalization of the व् *v*, after which the vowel इ *i* becomes its semi-vowel य् *y*. In the accusative the *ó* bases change this diphthong into *á*. To the *á* thus obtained in द्याम् *dyá-m*,

[G Ed. p 144] गाम् *gá-m*, corresponds the Latin *e* of *dic-m*, the Greek η, Doric α, of γῆ-ν, γᾶ-ν the Latin *e*, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final *m* the original language requires *diē-m*. In Sanskrit, also, from दिव् *div*, "to shine," are derived appellations of day, as on the other side, in Latin, those for the heaven- *duum*, *sub duo*, *sub dio*

viz दिवा *divá*, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds, and also दिवस *divasa*, masc, and द्यु *dyu*, neuter (a contraction from *div*), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To द्यु *dyu* answers, after rejecting the *d* (as *viginti* for *dviginti*), the Latin *Ju* of *Ju-pter*, "heavens-lord or father" the oblique cases *Jov-is*, *Jov-i*, *Jov-em* answer better to the broader theme द्यौ *dyó*, whence the dative द्यवे *dyav-é*, and the locat द्यवि *dyav-i*. The *Djovis*, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian Ζεύς signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven" I form its relation to द्यौ *dyó* thus, that after dropping the ह् *d* the following semi-vowel य् *y* became ζ (§ 19) The oblique cases, on the contrary (Διός, Διί, &c), belong to the Sanskrit द्यु *dyu*, and must originally have had a digamma, proceeding by the natural law of sound from *u*, after which change the semi-vowel *y* must have become a vowel. Διός has the same relation to Διός, that, in Latin, *sub dio* has to *sub divo*

123 Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in *ó*, viz गो *gó*. It has several

meanings but the most common are bull,' as masculine and cow and earth' as feminine Both significations have in Zend, as in Greek divided themselves into two forms The Greek has preserved for the meaning 'earth' the old guttural With regard to the vowel $\gamma\hat{\eta}$ $\gamma\hat{a}$ follows the example of the Indian accusative where as has been already remarked गम् *gam* ($\gamma\eta\upsilon$) stands for $g\hat{b}-m$ [G Ed p 145] or *gav am* For the meaning ox the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—(for for $\text{ओ } \hat{o} = a \times u$ may very well be expected according to § 4, *ov*)—but has exchanged the guttural medials for labials as p 122 G Ed $\beta\hat{i}\beta\eta\mu\iota$ for $\text{ग } \hat{u}\hat{m}$ *jagum* The base BOY before vowels must originally have become BOF thus in the dative $\beta\hat{o}f \iota$ would answer to the Sanskrit locat गवि *gav i* and the Latin dative *bov i* but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped, and there is not as with the initial digamma the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here The Latin has, in the word *bo s* changed the vowels ($a + u$)—(which were originally of different kinds but have been united into a diphthong)—into a homogeneous mass (cf § 4) the nature of whose contraction however discloses itself before vowel inflexions since the *u* half of $B\bar{O}$ becomes *v* and the short *a* is resolved into the form of a short *o* thus *bov-i* answers to the Sanskrit locat गवि *gav i* The Zend for the meaning earth has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into *z* and gives in the nominative $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀} \hat{z}ao$ for $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀} \hat{z}as$ (§ 56) in the accusative $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀} \hat{z}anm$ (§ 61) I am not able to adduce other cases For the meaning ox the guttural has remained in Zend and the nominative is then $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} \hat{g}du s$ or $\text{𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀} \hat{g}do s$

124 I know only two words in Sanskrit which terminate in $\text{औ } \hat{au}$ —नी *ndu* ship and ग्लौ *glau* moon the former has navigated very far on the ocean of our wide province of

language, without, however, in Sanskrit, having arrived at a secure etymological haven I believe नौ *nāu* to be an abbreviation of *snau* (cf. ρέω, ρέω, *ruo*, with सु *sru*, p. 125 G. cd.),

[G Ed p 146] and that it therefore proceeds from the root स्नान् *snā*, "to bathe," which originally, perhaps, may also have meant "to swim," and with which वृत्, वृत्, *na-to*, appear to be connected नौ *nāu* would consequently be a radical word, and in regard to the vowel would stand for *nā*, according to the analogy of ददौ *dadāu* (*dedi, dedit*) for *dadā*, from *dadā-a*. As *a*, according to § 6, is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskrit Vriddhi-diphthong औ *āu* better than by *au*, while औ *ō* (from short *a+u*) is commonly represented by *ou* or *ov*. Hence नौस् *nāu-s* and *navi-s* correspond as exactly as possible, the *v* of *NAV*, however, like that of *BOY*, has maintained itself only before consonants, and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions, *vñ-cs*, *vā-cs*, are from *vāF-cs* (Sansk. नवस् *nāv-as*), as *βó-cs* from *βóF-cs*. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses *navi-s, navi-bus*, for *nau-s, nau-bus*. As the semi-vowel *v* is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19), we have here also, for *nau, nāv-am*, a sister form in our *Nachen*, Old High German *naccho*, "ship," gen. dat *nacchn*.

125. We pass over to the consonants. of these, *n, t, s*, and *r* appear in Sanskrit most frequently at the end of primary forms, all other consonants occur only in radical words, which are rare, and in some nominal bases of uncertain origin. We consider next the more rare or radical consonants. Of gutturals (*k, kh, g, gh*) we find none at

- Thus in German an *i* has been added to the above-mentioned गो *gō*, which, however, according to § 117, is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German, hence *chuo*, "cow," gen. *chuo*, where the *i* does not belong to the case designation, but to the here uninflected base

the end of the nominal bases most in use in Greek and Latin on the contrary they are of frequent occurrence, *c* is in Latin both radical and derivative [G Ed p 147] *g* only radical—*DUC TORAC EDAC LIG* In Greek, *κ, χ,* and *γ* are only radical or occur in words of unknown origin as *κΡΗΚ ΚΟΡΑΚ ΟΝΥΧ* (Sanskrit *nakha*), *κΑΟΓ* Of the palatals *ch* and *j* in Sanskrit occur most frequently in वाच *vach* speech voice (*ΙΟC ΟΠ*) राज् *raj* king the latter only at the end of compounds राज् *asry* blood' (*sanguis*) in Zend we have *dryj* *f* as name of an evil demon probably from the Sanskrit root *द्रुह* *druh* to hate Of the two classes of the *T* sound the first or lingual (*ṛ t &c*) is not used at the end of nominal bases and therefore the second dental or proper *T* class is so much the more frequently employed Still *ḍ d ḷ dh* occur only in radical words and therefore seldom च् *th* perhaps only in पथ् *path* as the secondary theme of पथिन् *pathin* way nom पथिन् *panthās* from पथन् *panthas* which I think I again recognise in the Latin *PONT pons* Other examples are अद् *ad* ending at the end of compounds and युध् *yudh* *f* strife The letter *t* is so much the more common that several of the most frequently employed suffixes end with it as that of the part pres in अत् *at* or अन् *ant* Greek and Latin *nt* The Greek besides *τ*, exhibits also *δ* and *θ* at the end of primary forms which are not radical still *ΚΟΡΥΟ* and *ΟΡΝΙΟ* appear to me to be properly compounds and to contain the roots *ΟΗ* *OE* (the vowel being dropped) as their last member and according to this *ΚΟΡΥΟ* would properly mean what is placed on the head so in Sanskrit शरद् *sarad* autumn rainy season which Grammarians explain by a suffix *ad* in my opinion means nothing but water giving and contains the root दा *dā* to give with *ā* suppressed *ΟΙΝΙΟ* finds in Greek itself no etymology the Sanskrit offers for its explanation अरुन् *arun* (according to the pronunciation of Bengal *aroni*), wood', and if *ορνι* is con [G Ld p 148]

nected therewith, we may refer to $\theta\acute{\omega}$, "to run," in respect to the θ "bird" therefore would derive its name from its going in the wood, while in Sanskrit, from its passage through the air, it is called, among other names, वृक्ष *vṛkṣa-ga*. Regarding the later origin of the δ in feminine bases in $i\delta$, an account is given in §. 119 ; that is to say, patronymics in $i\delta$ may be compared with Sanskrit ones in \acute{i} , e g भैमी *bhāmī*, "the daughter of Bhîma. Probably, too, the δ in feminine patronymics in $\alpha\delta$ is a later addition, they spring, like those in $i\delta$, not from their masculines, but directly from the primary word of the masculine, and, in my opinion, stand in sisterly, not in filial connection with them. In Latin, *d* appears as a more modern affix in the base *PECUD*, which the Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic terminate with *u* (Sans-Zend, *paśu*, Goth *faihu*) In Gothic, primary forms with a final *T*-sound are chiefly limited to the part pres, where the old *t* appears changed into *d*, which remains without extraneous addition there only, however, where the form stands substantively, otherwise, with the exception of the nominative, it is conducted by the affix *an* into a more current province of declension. The more modern German dialects under no circumstances leave the old *T*-sound without a foreign addition commixed with the base. In Lithuanian the participial suffix *ant*, in regard of the nom sing. *ans* for *ants*, rests exactly upon the Latin and Zend step, which extends beyond the Sanskrit, but in most of the remaining cases the Lithuanian cannot decline any more consonants, *i. e.* cannot unite them with pure case terminations, but transports them always, by a more modern affix, into a vowel-declension, and, indeed, to the participial suffix *ant* is added the [G Ed p 149] syllable *ia*, by the influence of which the *t* experiences the euphonic transformation into *ch* (= *tsch**) The nasal of this dental *T*-class, *viz.* the

This sound is expressed by *ca*, as in Mielcke's edition of Rulig's Grammar

proper *n* belongs to those consonants which occur most frequently at the end of nominal bases. In the German all the words of Grimm's weak declension like the Sanskrit and the masculine and feminine in Latin reject in the nominative the *n* of the base and thereby have a vowel termination. The Lithuanian presents the same appearance in the nominative but in most of the oblique cases adds to a base in *en* sometimes *ia* sometimes a simple *i*.

126 Primary forms with a final labial including the nasal (*m*) of this organ appear in Sanskrit only in naked roots as the last member of compounds and here too but seldom. In isolated use however we have अप् *ap* (probably from the root आप् *āp* to take in to comprehend) water which is used only in the plural in Zend however in the singular also*. In Greek and Latin also bases in *p b φ* are either evidently radical or of unknown origin with probably radical letters at the end or in Latin they have suppressed in the nominative a vowel belonging to the base and so as in [G Ed p 150] German the first and fourth strong declensions according to Grimm have only the appearance of a base terminating with a consonant. Of this kind is *plebs* from *plebis* to explain which it is not requisite to turn with Voss to the Greek *πληθος* one must keep to the Latin root *PLE*. The derivative *bis* *be*, I explain like *bis bundus bilis bam*

* The Latin adds an *a* to this old consonantal base and thus arises according to the frequent interchange of *p* with *qu* (cf *quinqve* with पञ्चन् *panchan*) *aqua* on the other hand *um nis* rests on the form *ap* as *somnus* for *sopnus* and *σ μ s* for *σ βvos* in analogy with a Sanskrit euphonic law (Gramm Crit r 58). The Sanskrit has from the same root another neuter *अपस्* *āpas* in which we recognise the Latin *æquor* which therefore would not proceed from *æquus* but is transferred from the waves or the mirror of the sea, to other things of a similar nature. In Greek *αφρ s* appears to belong to the same origin.

bo (*amabam, -bo*), as from the root *FU*, "to be," which, like *FER*, often changes the *B* in its middle into *F* (§. 18). Without appealing to the cognate languages, it is difficult, in Latin, to distinguish those bases which truly and originally terminate in a consonant from those which only appear to do so, for the declension in *i* has clearly operated on the consonantal declension, and introduced an *i* into different places in which it is impossible it could have stood originally. In the dative and ablative plural, the *i* of forms like *amantibus, vocibus*, admits of being explained as a conjunctive vowel, for facilitating the affix, it is, however, in my opinion, more correct to say that the bases *VOC, AMANT, &c.*, because they could not unite with *bus*, have, in the present state of the Latin language, been lengthened to *VOCI, AMANTI*; so that we ought to divide *voci-bus, amanti-bus*, just as at § 125. it was said of the Lithuanian, that in most cases it extends its participial bases in *ant* to *anchia* (euphonic for *antia*) This view of forms like *amanti-bus* is proved to be the more probable, in that in the genitive plural also before *um*, as before the *a* of neuters, an *i* frequently finds its place, without its being possible to say that in *amanti-um, amanti-a*, the *i* would be necessary to facilitate the annexation of the ending. On the other hand, *juveni-s, cani-s*, forming the genitives *canu-m, juven-um*, remind us of older bases in *n*; as in Sanskrit श्वन् *śvan*, "a dog" (abbreviated श्वन् *śvan*), and युवन् *yuvan*, "young" (abbreviated यून *yūn*), in Greek κύων, abbreviated [G Ed p 151] KYN, really close their theme with *n* The German resembles the Latin in this point, that for the convenience of declension it has added an *i* to several numerals, whose theme originally terminated with a consonant, thus, in Gothic, from *FIDVŌRI* (Sanskrit चतुर् *chatur*, in the strong cases § 129 चत्वारि *chatvār*) comes the dative *fidvōri-m* The themes सप्तन् *saptan*, "seven," नवन् *navan*, "nine," दशन् *daśan*, "ten," by the addition of an *i*,

in Old High German 'mould themselves to *SIBUNI NIUNI ZEHANI* which forms at the same time pass as masculine nominatives as these cases in Old High German have lost the case suffix *s*. The corresponding Gothic nominatives if they occurred would be *sibunet s niunet s taihunet s*. More on this point hereafter.

127 Of the semi vowels (*y r l v*) I have never found in Sanskrit *y* and *l* at the end of bases and *v* only in the word *द्वि* *du* before mentioned which contracts itself in several cases to *द्यो* *dyo* and *द्यु* *dyu*. On the other hand *r* occurs very frequently especially in words which are formed by the suffix *तर* *tar*,* to which in the cognate languages likewise correspond bases in *r*. Moreover *r* in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original *s* as in the comparative suffix *ior* (Sanskrit *ईयस* *iyas*) and further as an abbreviation of *ris* *re* as *l* for *lis* *le* or in the second declension as abbreviated from *rus* as in Gothic, *air* *man* for *var(a)s* belongs to bases in *a* (§ 116). In Greek *ΑΛ* appears as a consonantal base but in contrast with the [G Ed p 10^o] Sanskrit *सलिल* *salila* water *ἄλς* appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as *μεγαλς* from *μεγαλος*.

128 Of the Sanskrit sibilants the two first (*श s* *ष sh*) as also the *ह h* are found only in radical words and therefore seldom *स s* on the contrary concludes some very common suffixes used in the formation of words as *सम्* *as* which forms principally neuters e.g. *तेजस* *tjas* splendour strength from *तिर* *ty* to sharpen. The Greek appears to be without bases in *Σ* this however proceeds from the following reason that this sibilant between two

* Bases in *तर* *ar* in several cases and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds contract the syllable *तर* *ar* to *चृ* *ri* and this *चृ* *ri* is regarded by the Grammarians as their proper final sound (§ 1)

vowels, especially in the last syllable, is usually rejected, hence, neuters like μένος, γένος (from ΜΕΝΕΣ, ΓΕΝΕΣ, with change of the *c* into *o*), form in the genitive μένκος, γένκος, for μένσος, γένσος. The *ς* of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no *ς* in the nominative. In the dative plural, however, in the old epic language, the *Σ*, as it did not stand between two vowels, maintained itself, hence τούχσσι, ὄρεσσι, so likewise in compounds, like σακός-παλος, τελες-φόρος, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a *Σ* to the vowel of the base. In γήρας, γήρα-ος, for γήρασ-ος, after restoring the *Σ* of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskrit ऋश्रमास, "age," although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffixes terminating with *s* has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf. in the oblique cases of which *us* corresponds to the Sanskrit ऋश्र *ush* (euphonic for ऋश्र *us*) of the weakest cases (§ 130), still, in Lithuanian, on account of the above-noticed incapacity for the declension of the consonants, the old *us* is conducted, as in other similar cases, by the subsequent addition of *ua*, *a* or *i*, partly into the *a*, partly into the [G Ed p 153] *i* declension, and only the nominative and the vocative, which is the same with it, belong, in the singular, to the consonantal declension.

129. The Sanskrit and Zend have eight cases, viz. besides those which exist in Latin, an instrumental and a locative. These two cases exist also in Lithuanian, Ruhg calls the former the instrumental ablative, the latter the local ablative, in Lithuanian, however, the proper ablative which in Sanskrit expresses the relation "whence?" is wanting. With reference to the primary form, which in Sanskrit does not remain the same in all words, or

suffixes used in the formation of words through all the cases a division of the cases into strong and weak is desirable for this language. The strong cases are the nominative accusative and vocative of the three numbers with exception of the accusative plural which together with all the other cases is weak. Where a double or triple formation of the primary form exists there with surprising regularity the cases which have been designated as strong always exhibit the fullest form of the theme which from a comparison of languages is proved to be the original one while the other cases exhibit a weakened form of it which appears also in the beginning of compounds and hence is represented by the native Grammarians according to § 122 as the proper primary form. The present participles serve as an example. It forms the strong cases with the suffix *ant* but in the weak cases and in the beginning of compounds rejects *n* which is retained by the cognate European languages as also for the most part by Zend so that च्त् *at* is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to चन्त् *ant*. The root तुद् *tud* to vex *eg* exhibits in the participle mentioned the form तुद्न्त् *tudant* as the strong and original theme (cf. *tudent em*) and तुदत् *tudat* as the weak theme. Hence the masculine is declined

[C. Ld. I. 104]

		STRONG CASES		WEAK CASES	
Singular	Nom Voc	तुद्न्त्	<i>tudan</i>		
	Ace	ज्-न्त्	<i>tudantam</i>		
	Instr			तुदत्ता	<i>tudatā</i>
	Dat			तुदत्ते	<i>tudatē</i>
	Abl			तुदत्तम्	<i>tudatas</i>
	Gen			तुदत्तम्	<i>tudatas</i>
	Loc			तुदत्ति	<i>tudati</i>
Dual	Nom Acc Voc	तुदन्ती	<i>tudantīdu</i>		
	Instr Dat Abl			तुदत्तम्	<i>tud udibhyām</i>
	Gen Loc			तुदन्तीम्	<i>tudatōr</i>

	STRONG CASES.	WEAK CASES
Plural. Nom Voc . .	तुदन्तस् <i>tudantas</i>
Acc		तुदन्तस् <i>tudantas</i>
Instr.	.	तुदन्तस् <i>tudantibhis.</i>
Dat Abl	तुदन्तस् <i>tudantibhyas</i>
Gen.	तुदन्तम् <i>tudantām</i>
Loc	तुदन्तु <i>tudantsu</i>

130. Where three formations of the primary form pervade the declension of a word or a suffix, the weakest form of the theme there occurs in those weak cases whose terminations begin with a vowel, the middle form before those case-suffixes which commence with a consonant. This rule makes a division of the cases into strong, weaker or middle, and weakest, desirable (See Gramm Crit. i. 185.)

131. In suffixes used in the formation of words, which in Sanskrit separate into different forms, the Zend usually carries the strong form through all the cases, for instance, the part pres. retains the nasal in most of the cases, which in Sanskrit [G. Ed p 155] proceed from the weakened theme. Words, however, are not wanting which follow the theory of the Sanskrit gradations of form. Thus, the Sanskrit base अन् *śvan*, "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to शुन् *śun*, appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive *śūn-ō* over against the strong nominative and accusative *śpā*, *śpān-ēm*, Sanskrit वा *śvā*, अन् *śvanam* (§ 50). The base अप, "water," which, in Sanskrit, in the strong cases has a long *ā*, but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom *āfs* (§ 40), accus *āpēm*, on the other hand, *ap-ō*, "of the water," *ap-at*, "from the water," &c

* This word occurs in the Codex of the V S, edited by Burnouf, very frequently, and mostly with that quantity of the initial *a* which is required by the theory, so that where that is not the case it can only be imputed to an error in writing.

In the plural where the Zend very frequently makes the nominative and accusative the same confusion has for this reason crept in and the work ٻٻڙو *sunḍ* canes is found for ٻٻڙو *spāno* in the nominative and on the other hand the strong ٻٻو *āpō* in the nominative as well as in the accusative *

132 The Greek in the declension of κω has limited the strong form to the nom and voc sing in [G Ed p 156] some cognate words in ρ however in accordance with the Sanskrit it has given the accusative also the strong form in which the Gothic agrees with it Compare $\text{πατηρ πατερα πατερ πατρι}$ with $\text{पिता पितृ पितरं पितरं पितर पित्रि पित्री}$ (locat) and the Gothic *brōthar* as nom accus and vocat opposed to *brōthrs* of the brother *brōthir* to the brother with the Sanskrit $\text{भ्राता भ्रातारं भ्रातरं भ्रातरं भ्रात्रि भ्रात्रि}$ Accoring to the same principle in bases in *an* in Gothic the *a* in the genitive and dative sing is weakened to *i* (§ 140), while the nominative accus and vocat. retain the original *a*, *e g* *ahma ahmin s ahmin ahman ahma* from *AIIMAN* "spirit" (§ 140)

133 As regards the mode of combining the final vowels of the primary forms with case suffixes beginning with a vowel we must first draw attention to a phenomenon which is almost limited to the Sanskrit and the dialects which

* I have however found also ٻٻو *apō* in the accusative and am therefore in doubt whether in this word owing to the facile exchange of *a a* and *u ā* the confusion has not originated in mere graphical oversights The V S p 21 we find $\text{ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو}$ *āpo ianhus i alustāo ma-da dhatao ashaonis u jēsē* *aquas puras optimas ab Ormu do creatas mundas celebros* and $\text{ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو}$ *omnes aquas* On the other hand in the page following $\text{ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو ٻٻو}$ *imāo apas-cha zemās cha urardos cha āylēs* *has aquasque terra que arboresque celebros*

approximate most nearly to it, as Pâli and Prâkrit, through which, to avoid a hiatus, and to maintain pure the vowels of the base and of the termination, a euphonic *n* is introduced. This euphonic expedient cannot, in the extent in which it exists in Sanskrit, belong to the original state of the language, otherwise it would not be almost entirely lost in the cognate European dialects, and even in the Zend. We therefore regard it as a peculiarity of the dialect, which after the period of the division of languages, became the prevailing one in India, and has raised itself to be the universal written language in that country. It is necessary here to remark, that the Vêda language did not use the euphonic *n* so universally as the common Sanskrit, and together with एनं *ênâ*, इनं *inâ*, उनं *unâ*, occur also अयं *ayâ*, इयं *iyâ*, उयं *uyâ*. The euphonic *n* is most frequently employed by the neuter [G Ed p 157] gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine the latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination अम् *âm*, in which place it is introduced by the Zend also, although not as indispensably requisite. And it is remarkable, that precisely in this place in Old High German, and other Old German dialects, an *n* has been retained before the case-suffix, thus in Old High German, *ahô-n-ô*, "aquarum," from the feminine theme *AHÔ* (nom. *aha*). Besides the use of the euphonic *n*, there is further to be remarked, in Sanskrit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§ 26) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies

S I N G U L A R

NOMINATIVE

134 Bases, of the masculine and feminine genders, ending with a vowel have, in the Sanskrit family of languages, (under the limitation of § 137) *s* as nominative-suffix, which in Zend, after an *a* preceding it, always melts into *u*, and is then contracted with the *a* to *ô* (§ 2), while thus in Sanskrit

takes place only before sonant letters (§ 25)* Examples are given at § 118 I find the origin of this case designation in the pronominal base *sa* he this fem *sa sd*, and a convincing proof of this assertion is the fact that the said pronoun does not extend beyond the limits of the nom masc and fem but is replaced in the nom neuter and in the oblique cases of the masculine by *ta* and feminine *ta* regarding which more hereafter

135 The Gothic suppresses *a* and *i* before [G Ed p 138] fore the case suffix *s* except in monosyllabic bases where this suppression is impossible *Hva s* who? *is* he are used but *wulf s* 'wolf *gast s* stranger for *wulf a s gast a s* (cf *hosti s* according to § 87) In masculine substantive bases in *ja* (*ya*) however the final vowel is retained only weakened to *i* (§ 66) e g *hari i s* army If however as is generally the case the final syllable is preceded by a long syllable or by more than one the *i* (*yi*) is contracted to *ai* (= *i*, § 70) e g *ondai s* end *raginai s*, counsel for *andyi s* *raginyi s* This contraction extends also to the genitive which is in like manner denoted by *s* To the Gothic nominatives in *yi s* correspond the Lithuanian like *Atpiri toyi s* Saviour the *i* of which has likewise arisen from an elder *a* † I deduce this from the majority of the oblique cases, which agree with those of the *a* bases Where, however in Lithuanian a consonant precedes the final syllable *ya* which is the more common case there the *y* is changed into the vowel *ɨ* and the following *i* which had arisen from *a* is suppressed hence *yauniki i s* young man for *yauniki yi s* from *yauniki ya s* Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in *ya* †

E g सुतो मम *sub mama* 'filius meus सुतस् तय *sub tata*, *fi lius tuus* (§ 22)

† Through the influence of the *y* in accordance with a Zend law of euphony (§ 42)

Respecting the nom *e g* of Gothic bases in *ya* see p 1309 G Ed Remark

as *midz-s* "the middle" (man), for *midyē-s* from *midya-s*, Sanskrit मध्यस् *madhya-s*. The Zend also, in the *vocalization** of the syllable *ya*, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable *ya* before a final *ç* or *m* regularly to *z*, as also *va* to *z* *û* (§ 42)

136 The High German has, up to our time, preserved the old nominative sign in the changed form of *r*, nevertheless, as early as in the Old High German, in pronouns and adjectives only, with a vowel termination of the base.

[G Ed. p 159] The High German is, however, in this point, superior to the Gothic in fulness, that in its *a* bases to which belong all strong adjectives—it has not suppressed the vowel before the case-sign, but preserved it in the form of *e*, which, in Old High German—as it appears through the influence of the *r* is long, but only in polysyllabic, not in monosyllabic forms. Thus, *e g. plint-êr*, "cæcus," completes the Gothic *blind-s* for *blinda-s*, as to the Gothic *z-s*, "he," corresponds *z-r*, Middle and New High German *e-r*. The Old Northern has likewise *r* as the nominative sign, and, in fact, everywhere where, in Gothic, *s* stands. In the other dialects the nominative character is entirely lost.

137. Feminine Sanskrit bases in *stī*, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in *stī*, together with *stī*, "wife," like the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, have lost the old nominative sign (with the exception of the Latin *ē* bases, see §. 121), and give the pure base. The cognate languages do the same, the base having been weakened by the abbreviation of the final vowel. In Gothic, *ô* becomes *a* (§ 69), only *sô*, "this," and *hwô* "which?" remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend *hâ* and *kâ*, while in polysyllabic forms the

* I have used *vocalization* and *vocalize* to express the change of a semi-vowel to its corresponding vowel.—*Trans*

ω á is shortened In Zend 𐬀𐬀 also is shortened even in the monosyllabic 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *stri* "wife" see V S p 136 (by Olshausen) p 28 where we read 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *stri cha feminaque* whilst elsewhere the appended 𐬀𐬀 *cha* preserves the original length of the vowel Here, too the Zend nominatives in 𐬀 é deserve to be mentioned which seem very similar to the Greek in η, as 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *perenē plena* which in the Vendidad occurs very often in relation to 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *zdo* "earth" without my being able to remember that I have found another case from 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *perenē* But from the nom 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *lainē* "maid" (Sanskrit कन्या [G Ed p 160] *lanyā*) which is of frequent occurrence I find the accus 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *lanyam* (V S p 420) this furnishes the proof that the 𐬀 é in the nominative is generated by the euphonic influence of the suppressed 𐬀𐬀 y (§ 42) In 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bráturyē* "cousin" and 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *turyē* "a relation in the fourth degree" (V S p 380) the 𐬀𐬀 y has remained on the other hand in 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *nyákē* "grandmother" the dropping of a 𐬀𐬀 y must be again assumed We cannot here refrain from conjecturing that the *e* also of the Latin fifth declension as with very few exceptions it is everywhere preceded by an *i* is likewise produced from *ā* by the influence of this *i* so that the Latin here stands in reversed relation to the Greek where *i* rejects the combination with η and preserves the original α (σφια)

138 Bases of the masculine and feminine genders which terminate with a consonant lose in Sanskrit according to § 94 the nominative sign *s* and if two consonants terminate the base then according to the same law the latter of these also is lost Hence विभत् *bibhrat* for विभत् *bibhrat s* "the bearer" तुदन् *tudan* for तुदन् *tudant s* "the vexer" वाक् *vāk* (from वाच् *vāch f*) for वाच् *vāch sh* "speech" The Zend Greek and Latin in preserving the nominative sign after consonants stand in an older position than the Sanskrit Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *af s* (for *af s* § 40) "water"

ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *k' i ěs*, "body", ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *druc-s* (from the base *druj*), "a demon" The Latin and Greek, where the final consonant of the base will not combine with the *s* of the nominative, prefer abandoning a portion of the base, as *χάρις* for *χάριτ-ς*, comes for *comit-s* (cf § 6). The Latin, Æolic, and Lithuanian agree remarkably with the Zend in this point, [G Ed p 161] that *nt*, in combination with *s*, gives the form *ns*, thus *amans*, *τιθένς*, Lith. *sulans* (§ 10), correspond to the Zend ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *šrāvayanś*, "the speaking" (man).

139 A final *n* after a short vowel is, in Sanskrit, no favourite combination of sound, although one not prohibited. It is expelled from the theme in the first member of a compound, e.g. राजपुत्र *rāja-putra*, "king's son," for राजपुत्र *rajan-putra*, and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines, e.g. राजा *rājā*, "king," from राजन् *rājan*, m., नाम *nāma*, "name," from नामन् *nāman*, n, धनी *dhanī*, m, धनि *dhani*, n, from धनिन् *dhanin*, "rich" The Zend in this agrees exactly with the Sanskrit, but from the dislike to a long *a* at the end, which has been before mentioned, omits the lengthening of the vowel, e.g. ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *ashava*, "the pure" (man), from ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *ashavan*, m, ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *chashma*, "eye," from ⲙⲟⲩⲉⲛⲥ *chashman*, n The Latin follows the Sanskrit in the suppression of the *n* in the nominative, in the masculine, and feminine, but not in the neuter *sermo*, *sermon-is*, *actio*, *action-is*, but *nomen*, not *nome* or *nomo* The root *can* at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the *n*, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable, thus *tubi-cen*, *fidi-cen*, *os-cen* (see § 6) *Lien* is an abbreviation of *lienz-s*, hence the retention of the *n* is not surprising *Pecten* stands rather isolated In Sanskrit the naked roots also follow the principle of the rejection of *n*, हन् "slaying," "smiting;" nom हा *hā*, is, however, the only root in *n* which I have

met with so used *श्वन् suan* hound nom *श्वा suâ* which in the weakest cases contracts its theme to *शुन् sun* is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base *श्वन् suan* in the nominative by an unorganic addition to *cani* so *युवन् yuvan* young has become *juveni* (cf § 126). As regards the opposition [G Ed p 162] between *o* and *i*, by which in several words—as *homo, hominis arundo, arundinis*—the nominative is distinguished from the oblique cases, this *o* appears to me a stronger vowel* which compensates for the loss of the *n* and therefore is substituted for the weaker *i* according to the same principle by which in Sanskrit the nom *धनी dhanî* † comes from *धनिन् dhanin*, and in Lithuanian bases in *en* and *un* give in the nominative *u* (= *uo*) for *e oi u*. Thus from the bases *AKMEN*, stone *SZUN*, hound come the nominatives *akmu su* as in Sanskrit from the primary forms of the same signification *वश्मन् usman श्वन् suan* have arisen *वश्मा asmâ* and *श्वा suâ*. It does not follow that *hominis* has come from *homonis* ‡ because the old language had *hemo, hemonis*, for *homo hominis* but *mon* and *min* are cognate suffixes signifying the same and were originally one, and therefore may be simultaneously affixed to one and the same word.

140 The German language also rejects *i* final *n* of the base in the nominative and in the neuter, in the accu

* Although its quantity in the actual condition of the language is arbitrary still it appears to have been originally long and to imply a similar contrast to the Greek η ϵ σ ω ς . For the rest it has been already remarked that between short vowels also exists a difference of gravity (§ 6).

† In bases in *श्वन् an* the lengthening extends to all the strong cases with the exception of the vocat sing thus not merely *राजा rayâ rex* but also *राजानम् r jan am regem राजानम् rajanas reges*.

‡ I now prefer taking the *i* of *hominis* &c as the weakening of the *o* of *homo*. The relation resembles that of Gothic forms like *ahmin i ahm n* to the nom and acc *ahma ahman* which preserve the original vowel

sative also, like Sanskrit In Gothic, in the masculine and neuter where alone, in my opinion, the *n* has an old and original position—an *a* always precedes the *n* There are, that is to say, only bases in *an*, none in *in* and *un*, the latter termination is foreign to the Sanskrit also

[G Ed p 163] The *a*, however, is weakened to *i* in the genitive and dative (see § 132), while in Sanskrit, in these cases, as especially in the weakest cases (§ 130), it is entirely dropped* Among masculine bases in *an*, in Gothic, exist several words, in which *an* is the whole derivative-suffix, and which therefore correspond to the Sanskrit राजन् *rāj-an*, “king,” as “ruler” Thus *AH-AN*, “spirit,” as “thinker” (*ah-ya*, “I think”), *STAU-AN*, “Judge” (*stau-ya*, “I judge”), whence the nominatives *aha*, *staua*. There are also, as in Sanskrit, some masculine formations in *man*, as, *AHMAN*, “spirit,” nom *ahma*, with which perhaps the Sanskrit आत्मन् *ātman*, “soul,” nom आत्मा *ātmā*, is connected, in case this stands for *āh-man*, and comes from a lost root आह् *āh*, “to think,”† where it is to be remembered that also the root नह् *nah*, “to bind,” has, in several places, changed its *h* into *t*. The Gothic *MILH-MAN*, nom *milh-ma*, “cloud,” appears to have sprung from the Sanskrit root *mih*, by the addition of an *l*, whence, remarkably enough, by the suffix *a*, and by exchanging the ह् *h* for घ् *gh*, arises the nominal base मेघ *mēgha*, “cloud” In Latin *ming-o* answers to मिह् *mih*, and in Greek ὀ-μυχ-έω, the meaning is in the three languages the same

141 Neuter bases in *an*, after rejecting the *n*, lengthen, in Gothic, the preceding *a* to *ō*, in the nominative, accusa-

* In case two consonants do not precede the termination अन् *an*, e g आत्मन् *ātman-as*, not *ātman-as*, but नामन् *nāmn-as*, not *nāman-as*, “nominis”

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring आह् *āh*, “to speak,” as मन् *man*, “to think,” in Zend means also “to speak”, whence मन्थुन् *manthna*, “speech,” and in Gothic *MUN-THA*, nom *munths*, “mouth” (66)

tive and vocative which sound the same [G Ed p 164] so that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of the strong cases (§ 129) which the Sanskrit neuter obeys only in the nom accus and vocat. plural where for example चत्वारि *chatuâr* : four with a strong theme is opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिः *chaturbhis* (instr) चतुर्भ्यः *chaturbhyas* The *a* also of neuter bases in *an* is lengthened in the nominative accusative and vocative plural in Sanskrit and in Gothic and hence नामानि *nâmân* : Gothic *namôn a* run parallel to one another However in Gothic *namn a* also exists according to the theory of the Sanskrit weakest cases (§ 130) whence proceeds the plural genitive नामान् *nâmnâm* "nominum" while the Gothic *namôn ê* has permitted itself to be led astray by the example of the strong cases and would be better written *namn ê* or *namin ê*

142 In the feminine declension in German I can find no original bases in *n* as also in Sanskrit there exist no feminines in *an* or *in* but feminine bases are first formed by the addition of the usual feminine character ई, as राज्ञी *râjni* queen from राजन् *râjan* धनिनी *dhanini* the rich (fem) from धनिन् *dhanin* m n rich Gothic feminine substantive bases in *n* exhibit before this consonant either an *ô* (= ञा § 69) or *ei* these are genuine feminine final vowels to which the addition of *in n* can have been only subsequently made And already at § 120 a close connection of bases in *ein* (= *in*) with the Sanskrit in ई, and Lithuanian in *i* has been pointed out Most substantive bases in *ein* are feminine derivatives from masculine neuter adjective bases in *a* under the same relation excluding the modern *n* as in Sanskrit that of सुन्दरी *sundari* the fair (woman) from सुन्दर *sundara* m n beautiful Gothic substantive bases in *ein* for the most part raise the adjective whence they are derived to an abstract

[G Ed p 165.] *e g.* *MANAGEIN*, "crowd, nom *manager*, from the adjective base *MANAGA* (nominative masc. *manag-s*, neut *managa-ta*), *MIKILEIN*, nom. *mikilei*, "greatness," from *MIKILA* (*mikil-s*, *mikila-ta*), "great." As to feminine bases in *ón*, they have arisen from feminine bases in *ó*, and I have already observed that feminine adjective bases in *ón* as *BLINDŌN*, nom. *blindó*, gen. *blindón-s* must be derived, not from their masculine bases in *an*, but from the primitive feminine bases in *ó* (nom *a*, Grimm's strong adjectives) Substantive bases with the genitive feminine in *ón* presuppose older ones in *ó*, and correspond, where comparison is made with old languages connected in their bases, to Sanskrit feminines in *á*, Greek in *σ, η*, Latin in *a*, and in these old languages never lead to bases with a final *n* Thus, *TUGGŌN* (pronounced *tungón*), nom. *tuggó*, answers to the Latin *lingua*, and to the Sanskrit *𑖅𑖅𑖅 jhuvá*, (= *dschihwá*, see § 17.), and *DAURŌN*, nom *dauró*, to the Greek *θύρα*, *VIDŌVŌN*, nom *vidó*, "widow," to the Sanskrit *विधवा* *vidhavá*, "the without man" (from the prep. *वि* *vi* and *धवा* *dhava*, "man"), and the Latin *vidua*. It is true that, in *MITATHYŌN*, "measure," nom. *mitathyó*, the suffix *.thyón* completely answers to the Latin *tion*, *e g.* in *ACTION*, but here in Latin, too, the *on* is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of *ti-on* with the Sanskrit suffix *ति* *ti*, of the same import, and Greek *τις* (old *τις*), Gothic *ti*, *thu*, *di* (see § 91) And in Gothic, together with the base *MITATHYŌN* exists one signifying the same, *MITATHI*, nom *mitaths* In *RATHYŌN*, nom. *rathyó*, "account," a relationship with *RATION*, at least in respect of the suffix, is only a seeming one, for in Gothic the word is

[G Ed p 166] to be divided thus, *rath-yón* the *th* belongs, in the Gothic soil, to the root, whence the strong part *rath-an(a)-s* has been preserved The suffix *yón*, of *RATHYŌN* therefore corresponds to the Sanskrit *yá*, *e g.* in *विद्या* *vid-yá*, "knowledge." Of the same origin is *GA-RUN-YŌN*, nom *garunyó*, "inundation"

143 If a few members of a great family of languages have suffered a loss in one and the same place this may be accident and may be explained on the general ground that all sounds in all languages especially when final are subject to abrasion but the concurrence of so many languages in a loss in one and the same place points to relationship or to the high antiquity of such a loss, and in the case before us refers the rejection of an *n* of the base in the nominative to a period before the migration of languages and to the position of the original site of the human races which were afterwards separated. It is surprising therefore that the Greek in this respect shews no agreement with its sisters and in its *v* bases according to the measure of the preceding vowel abandons either merely the nominative sign or the *v* alone never both together. It is a question whether this is a remnant of the oldest period of language or whether the *v* bases carried away by the stream of analogies in the other consonantal declensions and by the example of their own oblique cases which do not permit the remembrance of the *v* to be lost again returned at a comparatively later period into the common and oldest path after they had experienced a similar loss to the Sanskrit Zend &c by which we should be conducted to nominative forms like *ευδαιμω ευδαιμο τερη τερε ταλᾱ, ταλα*? I do not venture to decide with positiveness on this point but the latter view appears to be the more probable. It here deserves to be [G Ed p 167] remarked that in German the *n* which in Gothic in the nominative is always suppressed has in more modern dialects made its way in many words from the oblique cases again into the nominative. So early as the Old High German this was the case and in fact in feminine bases in *în* (Gothic *ein* § 70) which in the nominative oppose to the Gothic *ei* the full base *in* as *guotlîhhin* glory (see Grimm p 628). In our New High

German the phenomenon is worthy of notice, that many original *n* bases of the masculine gender, through a confusion in the use of language, are, in the singular, treated as if they originally terminated in *na*; i. e. as if they belonged to Grimm's first strong declension. Hence the *n* makes its appearance in the nominative, and the genitive regains the sign *s*, which, indeed, in Gothic, is not wanting in the *n* bases, but in High German was withdrawn from them more than a thousand years since. Thus, *Brunnen*, *Brunnens*, is used instead of the Old High German *prunno*, *prunnin*, and the Gothic *brunna*, *brunnin-s*. In some words, together with the restored *n* there occurs in the nominative, also, the ancient form with *n* suppressed, as *Backe* or *Backen*, *Same* or *Samen*; but the genitive has in these words also introduced the *s* of the strong declension. Among neuters the word *Herz* deserves consideration. The base is, in Old High German, *HERZAN*, in Middle High German *HERZEN*, the nominatives are, *herza*, *herze*, the New German suppresses, together with the *n* of *Herzen*, the vowel also, as is done by many masculine *n* bases, as, e. g. *Bar* for *Bare*. As this is not a transition into the strong declension, but rather a greater weakening of the weak nominative, the form *Herzens*, therefore, in the genitive, for an uninflected *Herzen*, is sur-

[G Ed p 168]prising. With this assumed or newly-restored inflection *s* would be to be compared, in Greek, the nominative *s*, as of *δέλφί-ς*, *μέλα-ς*, and with the *n* of *Brunnen* for *Brunne*, the *v* of *δαίμων*, *τέρην*, in case, as is rendered probable by the cognate languages, these old forms have been obtained from still older, as *δέλφι*, *μέλα*, *δαίμω*, *τίρη*, by an unorganic retrograde step into the stronger declension *

* That, in Greek, the renunciation of a *v* of the base is not entirely unknown may be here shewn by an interesting example. Several cardinal numbers in Sanskrit conclude their base with ऋ *n*, ११७
panchan,

144 Bases in अर *ar* (चु *ri* § 1) in Sanskrit reject the *r* in the nominative and like those in न *n* lengthen the preceding vowel e.g. from पितर *pitár* father भ्रातर *bhrátar* brother मातर *mátar* mother दुहितर *duhitar* daughter come पिता *pitá* भ्राता *bhrátá* माता *mátá* दुहिता *duhitá* The lengthening of the *a* serves I believe, as a compensation for the rejected *r* As to the retention however through all the strong cases, excepting the vocative, of the long *a* of the agent which corresponds to Greek formations in *τηρ τωρ*, and to Latin in *tōr* this takes place because in all probability in these words तार *tár* and not तर *tar* is the original form of the suffix and this is also supported by the length of the suffix being retained in Greek and Latin through all the cases—*τηρ τωρ tōr* only [G Ed p 169] that in Latin a final *r* in polysyllabic words shortens an originally long vowel Compare

	SANSKRIT	GREEK	LATIN
Nom sing	दाता <i>dátá</i>	δοτηρ	<i>datōr</i>
Acc sing	दाताम् <i>dátám</i>	δοτήρ α	<i>dator em</i>
N A V dual	दातारौ <i>dátáru</i>	δοτήρ-ε	
Nom Voc pl	दातास् <i>dátás</i>	δοτήρ-ες	<i>dator es</i>

The Zend follows the analogy of the Sanskrit both in the rejection of the *r* in the nominative and in the length

panchan five *saptan* seven *ashtan* with *ashtau* eight " *naiān* nine *dasan* ten These numerals are indeed used adjectively when they are not governed by the gender of their substantive but display always a neuter form and indeed which is surprising in the nominative accusative and vocative sing terminations but in the other cases the suitable plural endings e.g. पञ्च राजानम् *pancha* (not *panchānas*) *rājānas* 'quinque reges' on the other hand पञ्चसु राजसु *panchasu rājasu* "in quinque regibus" To the neuter nominatives and accusative of the singular पञ्च *pancha* सप्त *sapta* नव *naiā* and दश *dasa*—which rest on the regular suppression of the *n*—answer the Greek *πντε επτ νν α δ α* with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflected nominative through all the cases



of the preceding *a* of the noun agent, in the same places as in the Sanskrit, with the exception of the nominative singular, where the long *a*, as always when final, is shortened, e g $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ *paita*, "father," $\delta\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ *dāta*, "giver," "Creator," acc $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$ *pantar-ēm*, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha$ *dītār-ēm*. In Lithuanian there are some interesting remains, but only of feminine bases in *er*, which drop this letter in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases extend the old *er* base by the later addition of an *r*. Thus *motė*, "wife," *duktė* "daughter," answer to the abovementioned $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}$ *mātā*, $\delta\acute{u}\eta\tau\acute{\alpha}$ *duhitā*, and, in the plural, *moter-es*, *dukter-es*, to $\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\varsigma$ *mātā-as*, $\delta\acute{u}\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma$ *duhitā-as*. In the genitive singular I regard the form *moter-s*, *dukter-s*, as the elder and more genuine, and *moteri-s*, *dukteri-s*, as corruptions belonging to the *r* bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic *r*, hence, *moter-ū*, *dukter-ū*, not *moteri-ū*, *dukteri-ū*. Besides the words just mentioned, the base *SESSER*, "sister," belongs to this place it answers to the Sanskrit $\sigma\upsilon\omega\sigma\alpha\tau\iota$ *swasar*, nom $\sigma\upsilon\omega\sigma\acute{\alpha}$ *suasā*, but distinguishes itself in the nominative from *mote* and *dukte*, in that the *e*, after the analogy of bases in *en*, passes into *ū*, thus *sessū*.

[G Ed p 170] 145. The German languages agree in their *r* bases (to which but a few words belong denoting affinity) with the Greek and Latin in this point, that, contrary to the analogy just described, they retain the *r* in the nominative. As $\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$, $\theta\upsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$, $\delta\alpha\acute{\eta}\rho$ (Sanskrit, $\delta\acute{e}\nu\alpha$ *dēvar*, $\delta\acute{e}\nu\acute{u}$ *dēvī*, nom $\delta\acute{e}\nu\acute{\alpha}$ *dēvā*), *frater*, *soror*, so in Gothic, *bróthar*, *svistar*, *dauhtar*, in Old High German, *vatar*, *pruodar*, *suestar*, *tohtar*. It is a question whether this *r* in the nominative is a remnant of the original language, or, after being anciently suppressed, whether it has not again made its way in the actual condition of the language from the oblique cases into the nominative. I think the latter more probable, for the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian are three witnesses

for the antiquity of the suppression of the *r* and the Greek words like *πατήρ μητήρ σωτήρ, ρήτωρ* exhibit something peculiar and surprising in the consonantal declension in that *p* and *s* not combining they have not rather preferred giving up the base-consonant than the case sign (as *παῖς ποῦς* &c) It would appear that the form *της* is of later origin for this reason that the *p* having given place to the nominative *s* the form *της*, whence *τηρ-ος* should come was by an error of language made to correspond to the *η-ς* of the first declension The want of a cognate form in Latin as in *lend* and Sanskrit, as also the in other respects cognate form and similarity of meaning with *पितृ* (*dr* *l-r* *तिर* and *तोर* speak at least plainly enough for the spuriousness and comparative youth of the nouns of agency in *της*

116 Masculine and feminine primary forms in *सम्* as in Sanskrit lengthen the *a* in the nominative singular They are for the most part compounded and contain as the 1st member a neuter substantive in *सम्* as *दुर्मनस्* *durmanas* evil minded from *दुस्* *dus* [G 11 p 11] (before sonant letters—§ 20—*दुर्* *dur*) and *मनस्* *manas* mind whence the nom masc and fem *दुर्मनस्* *durmands* neut *दुर्मानस्* *durmanas* A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in *δυσμενής ο η* opposed to *το δυσμενής* The *स्* *s* of *दुर्मानस्* *durmands* however belongs though unrecognised to the base and the nominative character is wanting according to § 91 In Greek, on the other hand the *ς* of *δυσμενής* has the appearance of an inflexion because the genitive &c is not *δυσμενέος* *ος* like the Sanskrit *दुर्मानस्* *as* but *δυσμενέος* If, however what was said at § 128 is admitted that the *ς* of *μενέος* belongs to the base and *μενέος* is abbreviated from *μενέσ-ος* then in the compound *δυσμενής* also and all similar adjectives *अ* *अ* belonging to the base must be recognised and the form *δυσμενέσος* must lie at the bottom of the genitive *δυσμενέος* In the

nominative, therefore, either the *s* belongs to the base, and then the agreement with दुर्मनास् *durmanās* would be complete, or the *s* of the base has been dropped before the case-sign *s*. The latter is, in my opinion, least probable, for the former is supported by the Latin also, where the forms which answer to the Sanskrit *as* bases are in the nom. masc. and fem. in like manner without the case-sign. Thus the Sanskrit comparative suffix is ईयस् *īyas* the last *a* but one of which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a dull nasal (Anuswāta, § 9)—in Latin, *īor*, with the *s* changed into *r*, which so frequently happens, and the nominative in both genders is without the case-sign the originally long *o*, however, is shortened by the influence of the final *r*. In the neuter *ūs* corresponds to the Sanskrit अस् *as*, because *u* is favourable to a final *s*, and prevents its transition into *r*, hence *gravius* has the same relation to the Sanskrit गरीयस् *garīyas* (irregular from गुरु *guru*, “heavy,”) as *lupus* to [G Ed p 172] वृकस् *vilas*, only that the *s* of the nominative character in the latter belongs in the former to the base. The final syllable *or*, though short, must nevertheless be held, in Latin, as graver than *ūs*, and hence *gravior* forms a similar antithesis to *gravius* that in Greek *δυσμενής* does to *δυσμενές*, and in Sanskrit दुर्मनास् *durmanās* to दुर्मनस् *durmanas*.

147 In Lithuanian a nominative, which stands quite isolated, *menū* (= *menuo*), “moon” and “month,” deserves here to be mentioned. It proceeds from the primary form *MENES**, and, in regard to the suppression of the final consonant and the transformation of the preceding vowel, has the same relation to it that, as above (§ 139), *akmū* has

* The relation of this to मास् *mās*, which signifies the same—from मास् *mās*, “to measure,” without a derivative suffix—is remarkable, for the interposed nasal syllable *ne* answers to the Sanskrit न *na* in roots of the seventh class (see p 118), and in this respect *MENES* bears the same relation to the Latin *MENSI* that *l c* भिनद्मि *bhinadm* does to *findo*

to *AA MPA sessu* to *SESSPR* in the oblique cases, also the *s* of the base again re-appears but receives as in the *er* and *en* bases an unorganic increase thus the genitive is *mencsu* whence *VJ VISA* is the theme, as *uiko lupi* from *II ILK I* nom *uikla s*

148 In neuters throughout the whole Sanskrit family of languages the nominative is identical with the accusative, which subject is treated of at § 15^o &c We here give a general view of the nominative formation and elect for the several terminations and gender of the primary forms both for these cases and for all others which suit our purpose the following examples Sanskrit पृक *urika* m wolf क *ka* who² दान *dāna* n gift " त *ta* n this जिह्वा *jihvā* f tongue " का *kā* which² पति *pati* m lord husband प्रीति *priti* f love पारि *pāri* n water भविष्यती *bhaviṣṭyanti* who is about to be सन् *sanu* m son [(*Id* | 1⁷³)] तनु *tanu* f body मधु *madhu* n 'honey wine " पत्नी *pātnī* f wife गो *gō* m f bullock cow गीन्दु *gīndu* f ship Of the consonantal declension we select only such final consonants as occur most frequently whether in single words or in entire classes of words पाच *pāci* f speech भ्रतृ *bhrātṛ* m the weakened form भ्रत *bhrat* (§ 129) m n bearing receiving from भर *bhar* (भृ *bhri*) cl 1 अत्मान् *ātman* m soul नाम्ना *nāman* n name भ्रातर *bhrātar* m brother " दुहितृ *dulutar* f daughter दातर *dātar* m giver " वचन *vachan* n speech Greek ΓΠΠΣ *ēnos* (§§ 14 129) for FFΠΠΣ *Fenos* Land *μαῖω εἶ* *uērlika* m wolf *ωῖ* *ka* m who² *αῖ* *dati* n datum *αῖ* *ta* n this, - *αῖ* *εῖ* *urā* f tongue *ωῖ* *kā* which²

* Masculines and f minines in the consonantal declension agree in all cases hence an example of one of the two genders is sufficient The only exception is the accusative plural of words denoting relationship in सर *ar* (चृ 114) which form this case from the abbreviated theme in चृ *ri*

𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *partu*, m (§ 41) "Lord," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀 *áfrítu*, f "blessing," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *vanti*, n "water," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *búshyavntí*,
 "who will be," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *paśu*, m "tame animal," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *tanu*,
 f. "body," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *madhu*, n. "wine," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *gō*, m f "bullock,"
 [G Ed p 174.] "cow"*; 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *vách*, f "speech," "voice" †,
 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *barant*, or 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *bariēnt*, weakened form 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌
barat, m n "bearing," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀 *aśman*, m "heaven," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀
nâman (also 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀 *nanman*), n "name," 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬀 *brátar*, †

It has been remarked at § 123 of the cognate nom 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *zâo*,
 "earth," accus 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *zanm*, that I have only met with these two cases
 The very common form 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *zēm*, which is found only in the other
 oblique cases, is nevertheless represented by Burnouf, in a very interesting
 article in the *Journal des Savans* (Aug 1832), which I only met with
 after that page had been printed, as belonging to the same theme
 I agree with him on this point at present, so much the rather as I believe
 I can account for the relationship of 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *zēmē*, "terra," (dat) 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌
zēmi, "in terra," &c to the Sanskrit 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *gavé*, 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *gavi* I do not doubt,
 that is to say, that, in accordance with what has been remarked at § 63
 and p 114, the Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *m* is to be regarded as nothing else than the
 hardening of the original *v* The Indian 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *gó*, before vowel terminations
gav, would consequently have made itself almost unintelligible in the
 meaning "earth," in Zend, by a double alteration, first by the transition
 of *g* to *z*, in which *j* must be assumed as the middle step—in which
e g 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *jam*, "to go," from 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *gam*, has remained, secondly by the
 hardening of the *v* to *m* Advert, also, to the Greek 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *δη*, for 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *γη*, in 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *δημήτηρ*;
 since 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *δ* and 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *z*, from 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *j* (= *dsch*), have so divided themselves in the
 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 whence they have sprung, that the Greek has retained the *T*-sound,

the nominative of this word, but it can originally be
 the Zend the vowels *ae* *ini* *queche* *pi* *ce*, and *ae* *aus*, from
 † I cannot quote *ae* *ini* *queche* *pi* *ce*, and *ae* *aus*, from
 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *vâc-s*, as palatals den above (§ 44) the nom 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌
 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *druy*, "an evil demon," what Anquetil, in his
druc s I have scarcely any *arlei, cri,* is the nomi-
 Vocabulary, writes *vâhksch* *hies* the denotes *ae* by *kh*, and
 native of the said base, *hies*—is rem
 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 by *sch* to the Sanskrit *s* required by § 44, as it
 † In the theme we *hies*, intent *MEN* *itarē*, must be the base
 is clear that 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *brátar*, not *hinnad* interposed
 word, 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌 *baratan* also occurs,

m brother " *ճուղճար* *dughdhar* f daughter, *ճարաց*
dâtar m giver, creator ' *Վախճ* *vachð* n (§ 56^b)
 word It is not requisite to give here examples in Greek
 and Latin from Lithuanian and Gothic we select the bases
 Lith *WILKA* Goth *IULFA* m wolf Lith *AA* Goth
HVA m who? Lith *GERA* n good *TA* n the
 Goth *DAURA*, n gate (Sanskrit *द्वार duâra* n) *THA*
 n this Lith *RANKA* f hand Goth, *GIBŌ* f gift
 (§ 69), *HI Ō* f which? Lith *PATI* m Lord * Goth
GASTI, m stranger *I*, m he n [G Ed p 170]
 "it Lith *AWI* f "sheep (Sansk *अवि avi* m cf *ovis*
द्वि) Goth *ANSTI* f mercy, Lith Goth *SUNU* m son
 Goth *HANDU*, f hand Lith *DARKU*, n ugly Goth
TAIHU, n berst' Lith *SUKANT* m † turning Goth
FIYAND m foe Lith *AKMEN* m stone Goth
AHMAN m spirit *NAMAN* n name *BRŌTHAR*
 m brother *DAUHTAR* Lith *DUKTER* f daughter

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
m	<i>vilas</i>	<i>vehrkō †</i>	<i>λυκος,</i>	<i>lupu s</i>	<i>willas</i>	<i>vulf's</i>
m	<i>las</i>	<i>lō †</i>			<i>las</i>	<i>hias</i>

* In the comp *veiss pati s* landlord isolated *pât-s* husband
 with *i* in the nominative suppressed as *i* the case in Gothic in all bases
 in *s* Compare the Zend *արամաթաթի* *i s pati* lord of the region

† These and other bases ending with a consonant are given only in
 those cases which have remained free from a subsequent vowel addition

‡ Before the enclitic particle *cha*, as well here as in all other forms the
 termination *as* which otherwise becomes *o* (§ 56^b) retains the same
 form which in Sanskrit also *अस as* assumes before *च cha* hence is said
արամաթաթի *ehrl asci a lupusque* " as in Sanskrit *वृक्षे च वृक्षश्चा*
 And the appended *cha* preserves the otherwise shortened final vowel
 in its original length hence *արամաթաթի* *juhâcha*, *linguaque*
արամաթաթի *bushyanticha futuraque* *արամաթաթի* *bratâcha*
fraterque Even without the *ար* at times the original length of the
 final vowel is found undiminished the principle of abbreviation, how
 ever remains adequately proved and I therefore observe it everywhere
 in the terminations

	SANSKRIT	ZFNÐ	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
n.	<i>dāna-m,</i>	<i>dātē-m,</i>	<i>δῶρο-ν,</i>	<i>donum,</i>	<i>gēra,</i>	<i>daur'.</i>
n.	<i>ta-t,</i>	<i>ta-t,</i>	<i>τό,</i>	<i>is-tu-d,</i>	<i>ta-i,</i>	<i>tha-ta</i>
f.	<i>jihvā,</i>	<i>hizva,</i>	<i>χώρα,</i>	<i>terra,</i>	<i>rankà,</i>	<i>giba</i>
f.	<i>kā,</i>	<i>kā,</i>	<i>hvú</i>
m	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>πόσι-ς,</i>	<i>hosti-s,</i>	<i>pati-s,</i>	<i>gast'-s.</i>
m.	<i>i-s,</i>	...	<i>i-s.</i>
f	<i>prāti-s,</i>	<i>āfrāti-s</i>	<i>πόρτι-ς,</i>	<i>siti-s,</i>	<i>au-i-s,</i>	<i>anst'-s</i>
n	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>ἴδρι,</i>	<i>mare,</i>
[G. Ed. p. 176]	n.	<i>i-d,</i>	...	<i>i-ta</i>
f.	<i>bhavishyantī,</i>	<i>bāshyanti*</i>	<i>būsentī,</i>
m.	<i>sānu-s,</i>	<i>paśu-s,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ς,</i>	<i>pecu-s,</i>	<i>sunū-s,</i>	<i>sunu-s</i>
f	<i>tanu-s,</i>	<i>tanu-s,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ς,</i>	<i>socru-s,</i>	.	<i>handu-s</i>
n.	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>μέθυ,</i>	<i>pecu,</i>	<i>darkū,</i>	<i>faihu</i>
f	<i>vadhū-s,</i>
m f	<i>gāu-s,†</i>	<i>gāu-s,‡</i>	<i>βοῦ-ς,</i>	<i>bō-s,</i>	.	.
f	<i>nāu-s,</i>	...	<i>ναῦ-ς,</i>
f	<i>vāk,</i>	<i>vāc-s,</i>	<i>ὄπ-ς,</i>	<i>voc-s,</i>	.	..
m	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	<i>φέρων,</i>	<i>feren-s,</i>	<i>sukan-s,</i>	<i>fiyand-s'</i>
m	<i>ātmā,</i>	<i>aśma,*</i>	<i>δαίμων,</i>	<i>sei mo',</i>	<i>akmū',</i>	<i>ahmā'.</i>
n.	<i>nāma',</i>	<i>nāma',</i>	<i>τάλαν,</i>	<i>nomen,</i>	..	<i>namō'.</i>
m	<i>bhrātā',</i>	<i>brātā',*</i>	<i>πατήρ,</i>	<i>frater,</i>	<i>bīōlhar</i>
f.	<i>duhitā',</i>	<i>dughdha,*</i>	<i>θυγάτηρ,</i>	<i>matr,</i>	<i>dukte',</i>	<i>dauhtan</i>
m.	<i>dātā,</i>	<i>dātā',*</i>	<i>δοτήρ,</i>	<i>dator,</i>	..	.
n.	<i>vachas,</i>	<i>vachō,</i>	<i>ἔπος,</i>	<i>opus,</i>

ACCUSATIVE

SINGULAR.

149 The character of the accusative is *m* in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin, in Greek *ν*, for the sake of euphony. In Lithuanian the old *m* has become still more weakened to

* See the marginal note marked (‡) on the foregoing page

† Irregularly for *ἰῆ gō-s.*

‡ Or *ωρεω qāos,* § 33

the dull re-echoing nasal which in Sanskrit is called Anu

[G Ed p 177] swara and which we in both languages express by *n* (§ 10). The German languages have so early as the Gothic even lost the accusative mark in substantives entirely but in pronouns of the 3d person, as also in adjective bases ending with a vowel which follow their declension they have hitherto retained it still only in the masculine the feminine nowhere exhibits an accusative character and is like its nominative devoid of inflexion. The Gothic gives *na* instead of the old *m* the High German with more correctness a simple *n* hence Gothic *blind na* 'caecum' Old High German *plinta n* Middle and Modern High German *blinde n*.

150 Primary forms terminating with a consonant prefix to the case sign *m* a short vowel as otherwise the combination would be, in most cases impossible thus in Sanskrit *am* in Zend and Latin *em* appears as the accusative termination* of the Greek *av*, which must originally have existed the *v* is in the present condition of the language lost examples are given in § 157.

151 Monosyllabic words in *i* *ú* and *áu* in Sanskrit like consonantal bases, give *am* in place of the mere *m* as the accusative termination probably in order in this way to become polysyllabic. Thus *भी bhī* fear and *नी nī* ship form not *bhī m* and *nī m* as the Greek *vav v* would

* I from the bases *द्रुज् druj* and *वृचि vāch* I find besides *द्रेज्म द्रुजम्* *द्रेज्म* *वृचिम्* in the V S also frequently *द्रुजम्* *वृचिम्* and if these forms are genuine which I scarcely doubt they are to be thus explained—that the vowel which stands before *m* is only a means of conjunction for appending the *m*, for this purpose how ever the Zend uses besides the *ε* mentioned at § 30 not unfrequently *ai*, e.g. for *दालमहि दालमहि* *da lemah* occurs also *दालमहि* *dadimahi* and many similar forms, as *उसमहि* *us mahi* answering to the Sanskrit *उसम्* *usmas* (in the Vedas *उसमि* *usmasi*), we will

[G Ed p 178] lead us to expect, but भियम् *bhiy-am*, नावम् *nāv-am*. With this agree the Greek themes in *cu*, since these give ϵ - α , from cF - α , for eu - ν , e. g. βασιλῆ(ς) α , for βασιλ ϵ ν - ν . It is, however, wrong to regard the Latin *em* as the true, originally sole accusative termination, and for *lupu-m*, *hora-m*, *fructu-m*, *diem*, to seek out an older form *lupo-em*, *hora-em*, *fructu-em*, *die-em*. That the simple nasal suffices to characterize the accusative, and that a precursory vowel was only added out of other necessary reasons, is proved by the history of our entire family of languages, and would be adequately established, without Sanskrit and Zend, by the Greek, Lithuanian, and Gothic. The Latin *em* in the accusative third declension is of a double kind in one case the *e* belongs to the base, and stands, as in innumerable cases, for *i*; so that *e-m*, of *igne-m* (Sanskrit अग्निम् *agni-m*), corresponds to the Indian *i-m*, Zend *i̯-m*, Greek *i-v*, Lithuanian *i-n*, Gothic *i-na* (from *ina*, "him"), but in the *em* of consonantal bases the *e* answers to the Indian *a*, to which it corresponds in many other cases also.

152 The Sanskrit and Zend neuter bases in *a*, and those akin to them in Greek and Latin, as well as the two natural genders, give a nasal as the sign of the accusative, and introduce into the nominative also this character, which is less personal, less animated, and is hence appropriated to the accusative as well as to the nominative in the neuter hence, Sansk. शयनम् *śayana-m*, Zend ḡḡḡḡḡḡḡḡ *śayanē-m*, "a bed", so in Latin and Greek, *donu-m*, δῶρο-*v*. All other bases, with but few exceptions, in Latin, remain in the nominative and accusative without any case character, and give the naked base, which in Latin, however, replaces a final *i* by the cognate *e*, thus, *marē* for *mar*i** corre-

[G Ed p 179] sponds to the Sanskrit वारि *vāri*, "water", the Greek, like the Sanskrit and Zend, leaves the *i* unchanged ἰδρι-ς, ἰδρι, as in Sanskrit शुचिस् *śuchis*, शुचि *śuchi*. The following are examples of neuter *u* bases, which supply the

place both of nominative and accusative in Sanskrit मधु *madhu* honey wine अश्रु *asru* tear सद्दु *saddu* sweet in Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *rōhu* wealth (Sanskrit पशु *pasu*) in Greek μεθυ *methu* ἡδύ *hēdu* in Latin pecu genu The length of this *u* is unorganic, and has probably passed into the nominative accusative and vocative from the oblique cases where the length is to be explained from the suppressed case terminations. With regard to the fact that final *u* is always long in Latin there is perhaps a reason always at hand for this length in the ablative, for example the length of the originally short *u* is explicable as a compensation for the case sign which has been dropped by which too the *o* of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the *u* of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat pl *u bus*. The Σ in Greek words like γενος μειος ευγενες, has been already explained at § 128 as belonging to the base the same is the case with the Latin *e* in neuters like *genus corpus gratius* it is the other form of the *r* of the oblique cases like *gener is corpor-is gratior is* (see § 127) and *corpus* appears akin-to the Sanskrit neuter of the same meaning अणुन् *anun* *gen* अणुस *anush* as (see § 19) and would consequently have an *r* too much or the Sanskrit has lost one.* The Σ also of neuter bases in T, in τετυφος τερας does not seem to me to be the case sign but an exchange with T which is not admissible at the end but is either rejected (μελι παραμα) or exchanged [G Ed p 180] for a cognate Σ as προς from προτι Sanskrit प्रति *prati* †

* Compare in this respect *brachium* βραχων, with अश्रु *asru* 'arm', *frango*, ριγγυμι with भङ्गिम् *bhanyami* I break भङ्ग्यसि *bhanyas* we break.

† With this view which I have already developed in my treatise *On some Demonstrative Bases and their connection with various Propositions and Conjunctions* (Berlin by Dummler), pp 4—6 corresponds as to the essential points what Hartung has since said on this subject

In Latin it is to be regarded as inconsistent with the spirit of the language, that most adjective bases ending with a consonant retain the nominative sign *s* of the two natural genders in the neuter, and in this gender extend it also to the accusative, as if it belonged to the base, as *capac-s felic-s, soler(t)s, aman(t)s*. In general, in Latin, in consonantal bases, the perception of the distinction of gender is very much blunted, as, contrary to the principle followed by the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Gothic, the feminine is no longer distinguished from the masculine.

153 In Gothic substantives, as well neuter as masculine, the case sign *m* is wanting, and hence neuter bases in *a* stand on the same footing with the *i, u,* and consonantal bases of the cognate languages in that, in the nominative and accusative, they are devoid of all inflexion. Compare, with regard to the form of this case, *daur(a)* with *दासम् dwâram*, which has the same meaning. In Gothic there

[G Ed p 181] substantive bases in *ya*, by suppression of the *a* in the nominative and accusative singular (cf § 135), gain in these cases the semblance of *i* bases, *e.g.* from the base *REIKYA*, "rich" (Sanskrit *राज्य राज्यā*, likewise neuter), comes, in the case mentioned, *reiki*, answering to the Sanskrit *राज्यम् राज्यā-m*. The want of neuter *i* bases

subject in his valuable work on "On the Cases," p 152, &c, where also the ρ of *ἥπαρ* and *ὕδωρ* is explained as coming from *T*, through the intervention of Σ . The Sanskrit, however, appears to attribute a different origin to the ρ of these forms. To *यकृतं yakrit* "liver" (likewise neuter), corresponds both *jecur* and *ἥπαρ*, through the common interchange between *h* and *p* both owe to it then ρ , as *ἥπαρ-os* does its τ "*ἥπαρ-os* should be *ἥπαρ-os*, Sanskrit *यकृतम् yakrit-as*. But the Sanskrit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the *i*, but then irregularly substitutes *न् n* for *त् t*, *e.g.* gen *यकृतम् yakn-as* for *यकृतम् yakanas*. With regard to the ρ of *ὕδωρ*, compare *उद्द्र ūdra*, "water," in *समुद्द्र sam-udra*, "sea"

in German is the less surprising that in the cognate Sanskrit Zend and Greek the corresponding termination in the neuter is not very common. Of neuter *u* roots the substantive declension has preserved only the single *PAIHU* 'beast'. In Lithuanian the neuter in substantives is entirely lost, and has left traces only in pronouns and adjectives, where the latter relate to pronouns. Adjective bases in *u* in this case have their nominative and accusative singular in accordance with the cognate languages, without case sign *e y darku* 'ugly' corresponds as nominative and accusative neuter to the masculine nominative *darku s* 'accusative *darku n*'. This analogy, however, is followed in Lithuanian by the adjective bases in *a* also, and thus *gera* 'good' corresponds as nominative and accusative to the masculine forms *gera s* *gera n** which are provided with the sign of the case.

[G Ed p 182] 154 It is a question whether the *m* as the sign of the nominative and accusative neuter (it is excluded from the vocative in Sanskrit and Zend) was originally limited simply to the *a* bases and was not joined to the

* The *e* of neuter forms like *dide* 'great' from the base *DIDYA*—nom. masc. *didi s* for *didya s* as § 135 * *yauniki s* 'youngling'—I explain through the euphonic influence of the suppressed *y*. As also the feminine originally long *a* is changed into *e* by the same influence, so is the nominative and accusative neuter in such words identical with the nominative feminine which is likewise according to § 137, devoid of inflexion, and *dide* therefore signifies also 'magna' and answers, as feminine very remarkably to the Zend nominatives explained at § 137 as *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬌𐬀* *perenē* *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬌𐬀* *braturjē*. In this sense are to be regarded also the feminine substantives in Ruhig's third declension, as far as they terminate in the nominative in *e* as *giesme*, 'song'. As no masculine forms in *is* correspond to them, the discovery of the true nature of these words becomes more difficult, for the lost *y* or *i* has been preserved only in the genitive plural where *giesmy u* is to be taken like *rank u* from *rank i* *e* the final vowel of the bases is suppressed before the termination, or has been melted down with it.

i and *u* bases also, so that, in Sanskrit, for *vāri* we had originally *vāri-m*, for *madhu*, *madhu-m*? I should not wish to deny the original existence of such forms, for why should the *a* bases alone have felt the necessity of not leaving the nominative and accusative neuter without a sign of relation or of personalty? It is more probable that the *a* bases adhered only the more firmly to the termination once assumed, because they are by far the most numerous, and could thus present a stronger opposition to the destructive influence of time by means of the greater force of their analogies, in the same way as the verb substantive, in like manner, on account of its frequent use, has allowed the old inflexion to pass less into oblivion, and in German has continued to our time several of the progeny of the oldest period, as, for instance, the nasal, as characteristic of the 1st person in *bi-n*, Old High German *pi-m* Sans भवामि *bhavā-mi*. In Sanskrit, one example of an *m* as the nominative and accusative sign of an *i* base is not wanting, although it stands quite isolated, and indeed this form occurs in the pronominal declension, which everywhere remains longest true to the traditions of bygone ages. I mean the interrogative form क्वम् *kv-m*, "what?" from the base क्व *kv*, which may perhaps, in Sanskrit, have produced a *kv-t*, which is contained in the Latin *qui-d*, and which I recognise again, also, in the enclitic चित् *chit*, weakened from क्वत् *kv-t*. Otherwise *i* or *u*-bases of pronouns in the nominative accusative neuter do not occur, for अमु *amu*, "that" (mān), substitutes अद् *adas*, and इ *i*, "this," combines with [G Ed p 183] दम् *dam* (इदम् *idam*, "this"). Concerning the original procedure of consonantal bases in the nominative and accusative neuters no explanation is afforded by the pronominal declension, as all primary forms of pronouns terminate in vowels, and, indeed, for the most part, in *a*.

155 Pronominal bases in *a* in Sanskrit give *t*, in Zend *t*, as the inflexion of the nominative and accusative neuter. The

Gothic gives, as in the accusative masculine *na* for *m* or *n* so here *ta* for simple *t* and transfers these like other peculiarities of the pronominal declension as in the other German dialects also to the adjective *a* bases *e g blinda ta cœcum midya ta medium* The High German gives in the older period *z* instead of the Gothic *t* (§ 87) in the most modern period *s* The pronominal base *I* (later *E*) follows in German as in Latin the analogy of the old *a* bases and the Latin gives as in the old ablative *d* instead of *t* The Greek must abandon all *T* sounds at the end of words the difference of the pronominal from the common *o* declension consists therefore in this respect merely in the absence of all inflexion From this difference, however and the testimony of the cognate languages, it is perceived that *to* was originally sounded *τοτ* or *τοδ* for a *τον* would have remained unaltered as in the masculine accusative Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter inflexion *τ* in *ὄττι* so that we ought to divide *στ τι* and therefore the double *τ* in this form would no more have a mere metrical foundation than the double *σ* (§ 128) in *ὄσσ σι* (Buttmann p 85)

156 We find the origin of the neuter case sign *t* in the pronominal base *π ta* he thus (Greek *TO* Goth *THA*, &c) and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this that *π ta t* it thus stands in regard to the base in the same contrast with *स sa* he *सा सा* she, as *t* as the neuter case sign does to [G Ed p 181] the nominative *s* of masculine and feminine nouns (§ 134) The *m* of the accusative also is I doubt not of pronominal origin and it is remarkable that the compound pronouns *i ma* this and *a mu* that occur just as little as *ta* in the nominative masculine and feminine but the Sanskrit substitutes for the base *amu* in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form *asû* the *s* of which therefore stands in the same relation to the *m* of *अमुम् amu m* 'illum *अमुम् amu shya illus* and other oblique cases, as among

the case-terminations, the sign of the masculine feminine nominative to the *m* of the accusative and neuter nominative. Moreover, in Zend is used $\text{इमं } imat$, "this," (n) (nom accus), but not $imō$, "this" (m), but $\text{अयम् } aēm$ (from $\text{अयम् } ayam$), and $\text{इमं } im$ (from $\text{इयम् } iyam$), "this" (f) Observe in Greek the pronominal base MI, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to $\text{म } ma$ (in the compounded base $\text{इम } i-ma$) that $\text{किम् } ki-m$ "what?" has to $\text{कस् } ka-s$ "who?" The Gothic neut termination *ta* answers, in respect to the transposition of sound (§. 87), to the Latin *d* (*id, istud*) this Latin *d*, however, seems to me a descent from the older *t*, as, e.g., the *b* of *āb* has proceeded from the *p* of the cognate $\text{अप } apa$, $\text{ἀπό } apo$, and in Zend the *d* of $\text{इदम् } i-dēm$, "him," is clearly only a weakening of the *t* of $\text{त } ta$, $\text{तस् } tas$ |

[G Ed p 185] 157. To the Sanskrit *ta-t*, mentioned above, Zend *ta-t*, Greek $\text{τό } to$, &c, corresponds a Lithuanian *tai*, "the," as the nominative and accusative singular. I do not believe, however, that the *i* which is here incorporated in the base *TA*

* The *ā* of *ā-dēm* is the preposition corresponding to the Sansk *ā*

† See my treatise "On the Origin of the Cases" in the Trans of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826 As *T* in Greek easily becomes Σ (but a final Σ has in many parts of Grammar become ν), Hartung founds on this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neuters in ν (*m*) with those in *t* We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the *m*, on account of the origin which we ascribe to this case-sign, is as little surprising in the nominative of the neuter as in the accusative of the more animated genders, and besides, a greater antiquity is proved to belong to the neuter *m*, through the Sanskrit and Zend, than probably the ν sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older Σ , as $\text{μεν } \mu es$ ($\text{मस् } mas$), and in the dual $\text{των } ton$ for $\text{तस् } tas$, $\text{तस् } tas$ What is wanting in the Greek, viz a neuter inflexion *s*, appears, however, to be possessed by the Sanskrit, and I am inclined to divide the form $\text{अदस् } adas$, "that" (nom accus) into *a-da-s*, and to explain it as a corruption of *a-da-t* (cf Gramm. Crit Addend to r 299), but to regard the syllable *da* as weakened from *ta*, as in the Zend $\text{इदम् } i-dēm$, "him" We shall recur to this when treating of the pronouns

is any way connected with the neuter *t, d* of the cognate languages I should rather turn to a relationship with the *i* demonstrative in the Greek (*ουτοσι κεινοσι*) and to the इत् *it* which is in like manner used enclitically in the Veda—*ἰ* petrified neuter which is no longer conscious of any gender or case and hence, in several cases, combining with masculine pronouns of the third person * This इत् *it* is consequently the sister form of the Latin *id* and Gothic *i ta* which in the Greek *κεινοσι* has perhaps only from necessity, dropped the *τ* or *δ* and which already ere I was acquainted with the Veda dialect I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत् *chēt* (from *cha + it*) if and नेत् *net* (*na + it*) [G Ed p 186]

The words mentioned at § 148 form in the accusative

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m	<i>urika m</i>	<i>uehrke-m,</i>	<i>λυκο ν</i>	<i>lupu-m</i>	<i>wilka-n</i>	<i>wulf</i>
m	<i>ka m</i>	<i>ke m</i>			<i>ka-n</i>	<i>hwa-na</i>
n	<i>dāna m</i>	<i>dāle-m,</i>	<i>δῶρο ι</i>	<i>donu m</i>	<i>gera,</i>	<i>daur</i>
n	<i>ta t</i>	<i>ta t</i>	<i>το</i>	<i>is tu-d</i>	<i>ta ι,</i>	<i>tha ta</i>
f	<i>jihua-m</i>	<i>hi-wa nm</i>	<i>χωρα ν</i>	<i>terram</i>	<i>ranka n</i>	<i>giba</i>
f	<i>hā m</i>	<i>ka-nm</i>				<i>hiδ †</i>

* Examples are given by Rosen in his Veda Specimen pp 24 25 which though short are in the highest degree interesting for Sanskrit and comparative Grammar as सइत् *sait* he तमिन् *tamit* him तयिन् *tajbit* of these two तस्मिन् *tasmāt* 'to him अस्मिन् *asmāt* to this (m) The Zend combines in the same way *we* or *u* with the interrogative *kasē* and *kasī*, who ? occur frequently Perhaps only one of the two modes of writing is correct Cf Gramm Crit Addend to r 270

† One would expect *hiδ-na*, or with abbreviation of the base *hwa na*, which would be the same as the masculine With regard to the lost case termination it may be observed that, in general the feminines are less constant in handing down the old inflexions A charge which is incurred by the Sanskrit in the nominative since it gives *ka* for *kā s** (§ 137) is incurred by the Gothic (for in this manner the corruption spreads) in the accusative also

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
m.	<i>pati-m,</i>	<i>paui-m,</i>	<i>πόσι-ν,</i>	<i>hostem,</i>	<i>páti-n,</i>	<i>gast.</i>
m.	<i>i-na.</i>
f.	<i>prítī-m,</i>	<i>áfrítī-m,</i>	<i>πόρτι-ν,</i>	<i>siti-m,</i>	<i>úwi-n,</i>	<i>anst.</i>
n	<i>váti,</i>	<i>vairi,</i>	<i>ἴδρι,</i>	<i>mare,</i>
n	<i>i-d,</i>	. . .	<i>i-ta.</i>
f	<i>bhavishyantīm, bhūshyanti-m,</i> [†]	. . .
[G. Ed. p. 187]	^m <i>sūnu-m,</i>	<i>paśū-m,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ν,</i>	<i>pecu-m,</i>	<i>sunu-n,</i>	<i>sunu</i>
f	<i>tanu-m,</i>	<i>tanū-m,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ν,</i>	<i>socru-m,</i>	. . .	<i>handu</i>
n	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>μέθυ,</i>	<i>pecu,</i>	<i>daikū,</i>	<i>faihu.</i>
f	<i>vadhū-m,</i>
m f	<i>gā-m, †</i>	<i>ga-nm, †</i>	<i>βού-ν,</i>	<i>boi-ēm,</i>
f.	<i>nāv-am,</i>	<i>ναύ-ν,</i>
f.	<i>vāch-am,</i>	<i>vāch-ēm,</i>	<i>ὄπ-α,</i>	<i>voc-em,</i>

† The feminine participial bases in *i*, mentioned at § 119, remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular in all other cases, to the old *i* is further added a more modern *a*, and the declension then follows *RANKA* exactly, only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the *i*, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§ 137.), the added *a* becomes, or may become, *e* in the latter case the *i* is suppressed, as *ι ε ροϋσϋσθ* *kamē* for *kamyē* (§ 42). Thus, from *suhanti*, “the turning” (f), *sukusi*, “the having turned” (f), and *suksenti*, “the about to turn,” Mielcke gives the accusatives *suhanczen* (see p 138, Note) or *suhanczian*, *sukusen*, and *suksenczen* or *suksenczian*. And even if, according to Ruhig (by Mielcke, pp 3, 4), the *i* before *a*, *e*, *o*, *u* is scarcely heard, it must not therefore, in this case, as well as in those there enumerated, be the less regarded as etymologically present, and it was originally pronounced so as to be fully audible. From the feminine, where the *i*, as Sanskrit grammar shows, has an original position, this vowel appears to have made its way, in Lithuanian participial bases, into the oblique cases of the masculine, and to be here invested with a short masculine *a*. The accusative *suhanti-n*, “the turning” (masc), is therefore to be regarded in the same light as *yaunikhri-n*, from the theme *YAUNIKYA*, *i e* it stands for *suhantyn-n* from *suhantya-ñ*, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like *ϵϛϛϛϛ* *tūri m* for *tūryčm* (§ 42), and to the Gothic, like *han* from the base *HARYA* (§. 135)

† See § 122

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m	<i>bharant am</i>	<i>barent em</i>	φεροιτα	<i>ferent em</i>		<i>fiyand</i>
m	<i>ātman am</i>	<i>asman ěm,</i>	δαιμονα	<i>sermon em,</i>		<i>ahman</i>
n	<i>nāma</i>	<i>nāma,</i>	ταλαν	<i>nomen</i>		<i>namō</i>
m	<i>bhratar am,</i>	<i>bratar em</i>	πατερα	<i>fratr em</i>		<i>brōthar</i>
f	<i>duhitar am</i>	<i>dughdhar em</i>	θυγατερα,	<i>matr em,</i>		<i>dauhtar</i>
m	<i>dātur-am</i>	<i>datār em</i>	δοτηρ α	<i>dator em</i>		
n	<i>vachas</i>	<i>vacho *</i>	επος	<i>opus,</i>		†

INSTRUMENTAL DATIVE

158 The instrumental is denoted in Sanskrit by चि द्, and this inflexion is in my opinion च [G Ed p 188] lengthening of the pronominal base च a and identical with the preposition चि द् towards up to which springs from this pronoun and appears only as a prefix. The Zend *d* appears still more decidedly in its pronominal nature in the compound mentioned at § 156 Note * 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *d dem* *hīm* this (m) fem 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *d-danm*. As a case sign *a* generally appears abbreviated (see p 163 Note †), even where this termination has been melted into one with a preceding *a* of the base so that in this case the primary form and the instrumental are completely similar e.g. 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *zāsha* voluntarily 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *a āsha* involuntarily (V S p 12) 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *skyaothna*, *actione* often occur, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ana* through this (m) 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *paiti bereta* *allevato* † The long *d* appears in the instrumental only in monosyllabic bases in *a* thus 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *lha* *proprio* (V S p 46) from the base 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *lha* (Sanskrit *सुा* § 30) In Sanskrit a euphonic न n is added to bases ending with short vowels in the masc.

See § 50^b

† Cf Gramm Crit r 638 Rem This interesting instrumental form was not known by Rash when he published his work on the Zend and it was not easy to discover it on account of its discrepancy from the Sanskrit and the many other forms with final *a*

and neut genders, a final अ *a*, however, is, as in several other cases, changed into ए *é*; and the आ *á* of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base, as वृक्षेण *vríkṣē-n-a*, but अग्निना *agnī-n-á*, वारिणा *vāri-n-á*, सूनुना *sūnu-n-á*, मधुना *madhu-n-á*, from वृक्ष *vríkṣa*, &c The Vêdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic *n*, as स्वप्नाय *swapnāy-á* for स्वप्नेन *swapnē-n-a* from स्वप्न *suapna*, m “sleep” (see § 133), उरुया *uru-y-á* for उरुणा *uru-n-a*, from उरु *uru*, “great,” with a euphonic य *y* (§ 43), प्रबाहया *prabāhaya-á*, from प्रबाहु *prabāhu*, from बाहु *bāhu*, “arm,” with the preposition [G. Ed p 189] प्र *pra* The Vêda-form स्वप्नाय *swapnāyá*, finds analogies in the common dialect in मया *mayá*, “through me,” and त्वया *twayá*, “through thee,” from the bases *ma* and *tua*, the *a* of which in this case, as in the loc, passes into *é* And from पति *pati*, m “Lord,” and सखि *sakhī*, m “friend,” the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of न् *n*, viz. पत्या *paty-á*, सख्या *sakhy-á* Femines never admit a euphonic *n*, but *á*, as before some other vowel terminations, passes into ए *é*, that is to say, *i* is blended with it, and it is shortened to अ *a*; hence, जिह्वया *jihway-á* (from *jihvé + á*). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit

159 As *é* in Gothic, according to § 69, just like *ø*, represents आ *á*, so the forms *thé*, *hwé*, which Grimm (pp 790 and 798) regards as instrumentals, from the demonstrative base *THA* and the interrogative *HVA*, correspond very remarkably to the Zend instrumentals, as *khá* from the base *kha* We must, however, place also *své* in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved besides *své* from *SVA* is also,

* The original has “Stammen gen masc und fem ,” but genitives of nouns in *a* do not take a euphonic *n*, nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augment in the instrumental here is no doubt some typographic error — *Editor*

in respect of its base akin to $\omega\zeta$ *lhd* from *lha* (§ 30)* The meaning of *sié* is *as* ($\omega\zeta$) and the *sí* which has arisen in High German from *sta* or *sié* means both *as* and *so* &c The case relations however which are expressed by *as* and *so* are genuine instrumentals † [C Ed p 100] The Anglo Saxon form for *sié* is *sié* in which the colouring of the Zend $\omega\zeta$ *lhd* is most truly preserved The Gothic *sta* *so* is according to its form only the abbreviation of *sié* as *a* is the short equivalent both of *é* and of *í* through this abbreviation however *sta* has become identical with its theme just as $\omega\mu$ *ana* in Zend is according to § 155 not distinguished from its theme

160 †As the dative in Gothic and in Old High German very frequently expresses the instrumental relation and the termination also of the dative is identical with the Sanskrit Zend instrumental character, shortened only, as in polysyllabic words in Zend it may be proper here to describe at the same time the formation of the German dative In *a* bases it is in Gothic as in Zend identical with the theme and from *I ULFA* comes *ulfa* as $\omega\gamma\omega\zeta\zeta$ *tehrka* from *I LIIRKA* Moreover there are some other remarkable datives which have preserved their due length and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals *thé* *ie* *sié* which have been already explained viz *hiammé h*, *hiam yammé h* 'cuque and *ainummé hun ulli* for *ainammé-*

* Grimm's conjectures regarding the forms *sta* and *sié* (III 43) appear to me untenable and an explanation of these forms without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend is impossible More regarding this at the pronouns

† If *as* is regarded as 'through which means in which manner or way' and 'so as' 'through this means, in this way' it is certain that among the eight cases of the Sanskrit language there is none which would be adapted in the relative and demonstrative to express 'as' and 'so'

‡ The German dat sing is according to § 336 Rem 3 to be everywhere identified with the Sanskrit dative and so too the dat pl the *m* of which approaches as closely to the Sansk *bhyas* I am *bus*, Lith *mus* as the instrumental termination *bi* is, Lith *mis*

hun (§ 66)* Bases in *i* reject this vowel before the case-sign, hence *gast'-a* for *gasti-a* on the other hand, in the *u* bases the termination is suppressed, and the base-vowel receives the Guna hence *sunau*, which will have been pronounced originally *su-nāv-a*, so that, after suppressing the termination, the *v* has again returned to its original vowel nature The form *sunav-a* would answer to the Vêda form प्रबहवः *pra-bâhav-â*. In Zend, the bases which terminate with i and u , both in the instrumental and before most [G Ed p 191] of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend S. p 169, ब्रधवः *bâzav-a*, "bracho," as analogous to प्रबहवः *pra-bâhav-â* (§ 57), on the other hand, p 408, जन्तु *zanthua* from *zantu*, "the slaying," "killing" From पान्सु *pan'snu*, "dust," we find, l c p-229, the form पान्सु *pan'snû*, which Anquetil translates by "*par cette poussiere*", and if the reading is correct, then *pan'snû*, in regard of the suppressed termination (compensation for which is made by lengthening the base vowel), would answer to the Gothic *sunau*

161 Bases ending with a consonant have lost, in German, the dative character hence, in Gothic, *fiyand*, *ahmin*, *brôthr* (§ 132), for *fiyand-a*, *ahmin-a*, *brôthr-a* † All feminines, too, must be pronounced to have lost the dative sign, paradoxical as it may appear to assert that the Gothic *gibai*, "dono," and *thizai*, "huic," *izai*, "ei," do not contain any dative inflexion, while we formerly believed the *ai* of *gibai* to be connected with the Sanskrit feminine dative

* Here the appended particle has preserved the original length of the termination, as is the case in Zend in all instrumentals, if they are combined with चा *cha*, "and"

† The Old High German form *fatere* (for *fatera*), "*patri*," proceeds, as do the genitive *fatere-s*, and the accusative *fatera-n*, from a theme *FATERA*, extended by *a* The accusative *fatera-n*, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of *FATERA*

character *दे* *di*. But as we have recognised in the masculine and neuter dative the Indo-Zend instrumental we could not except from the most urgent necessity betake ourselves to the Sanskrit dative for explanation of the Gothic feminine dative. This necessity however, does not exist for *e g hietai albae* from *HI EITŌ* from *HI EIPA* may be deduced from the instrumental *इणु सुँल्य-ँ*, *albi* from *अँल सुँलँ* by suppressing the termination, and changing the semi vowel to a vowel in the same manner as above *sunau* from *sunav-a* [G Ed p 10.] or as the fem *handau*, *manu*, from *handav-a*. Analogous with *sunau*, *handau* are also the dative feminine *i* bases and *e g anstai*, *gratiæ* has the same relation to its theme *ANSTI* that *handau* has to *HANDU*.

162 In Old High German the forms *diu huu* correspond to the Gothic instrumentals *thé hê* but authorities differ as to the mode of writing them,* regarding which we shall say more under the pronouns. The form *huu* also, from a demonstrative base *HI* has been preserved in the compound *huulu* for *huu tagu* on this day, to day (see Grimm p 794) although the meaning is here properly locative. The Gothic has for it the dative *himma daga*. This termination *u* has maintained itself also in substantive and adjective bases masc neut in *a* and *i* although it is only sparingly used and principally after the preposition *mit* (see Graff l c pp 110 111) *mit uortu* with a word from *WORTA* *mit cuatu* 'with good, from *CUATA* *mit kaslu* 'with a guest from *KASTI*. It is here important to remark that the instrumental in Sanskrit very frequently expresses *per se* the sociative relation. We cannot, however for this reason look upon this *u* case as generically different from the common dative which we have already remarked is likewise of instrumental origin.

* With reference to their use with various prepositions we refer our readers to Graff's excellent treatise 'The Old High German Prepositions' p 181, &c

and meaning. we rather regard the *u** as a corruption [G Ed. p. 193] (although one of very ancient date) of *u*, just as in the neuter plural of pronouns and adjectives a *u* corresponds to the short *a* of the Gothic and the older cognate languages. In Lithuanian the *a* bases form their instrumental in *ù*, which is long, and in which the final vowel of the base has been melted down. That this *ù*, also, has arisen from a long *a*, and thus, *e.g.* *dieuù* is akin to the Zend 𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *daēva*, “*deo*,” for 𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *daēvá*, appears to me the less doubtful, as also in the plural *dieuais* answers very surprisingly to 𑀓𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *daēvāis*, देवेभ्य *dēvāis*. Moreover, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian *ù* corresponds to the Sanskrit 𑀓𑀭 *á*, *e.g.* in the plural genitive. In feminine *a* bases, also, in Lithuanian, the vowel of the base is melted down with that of the termination, but its quality is not changed, as, *e.g.* *rankà* “*manu*,” from *RANKĀ*. In all other bases *mi* stands as the termination, to which the plural instrumental termination *mis* has the same relation as, in Latin, *bis* to *bi* (*voBIS*, *tiBI*), and, according to § 63, I do not doubt that in both numbers the *m* has arisen from *b*.

163. The bases given in § 148. form, in the instrumental and in the Gothic, in the dative,

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
m	<i>viké-n-a</i> ,	<i>vēhrka</i> ,	<i>wilkù</i> ,	<i>vulfa</i>
f	<i>jihway-á</i>	<i>hizvay-a</i> ,	<i>rankà</i> ,	<i>giba</i>
m	<i>paty-á</i> ,	<i>parthy-a</i> ,	<i>pati-mi</i> ,	<i>gast'-a</i>

* Contrary to Grimm's opinion, I cannot let the instrumental *u* pass as long, even not to notice its derivation from a short *a*, for, first, it appears, according to Notker, in the pronominal forms *du*, &c without a circumflex (other instrumentals of the kind do not occur in his works); secondly, like the short *a*, it is exchanged for *o* (§ 77), hence, *wio*, *weo*, with *wiu*, *wio-ih*, *huo-ih*, “*quahs*” (properly, “similar to whom”), thirdly, the length of this *u* cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms *thé*, *hvé*, *své*, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf § 137)

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN	GOthic	
f	<i>prity á</i>	<i>áfrithy a</i>	<i>avi mi</i>	<i>anstai</i>	[G Ed p 101]
f	<i>bhaviṣhyantī á,</i>	<i>búshyainty a</i>			
m	<i>sunu n á</i>	<i>pasv-a</i>	<i>sunu mi</i>	<i>sunau-</i>	
f	<i>tanv-á</i>	<i>tanv-a</i>		<i>handau</i>	
f	<i>radhw á</i>				
m f	<i>gav-á</i>	<i>gai a</i>			
f	<i>nív-á,</i>				
f	<i>rách-a</i>	<i>rách a</i>			
m	<i>bharat á</i>	<i>barent a</i>		<i>fiyand</i>	
m	<i>átman-á</i>	<i>asman-a</i>		<i>ahmin</i>	
n	<i>náman á</i>	<i>náman-a</i>		<i>namin</i>	
m	<i>bhrátr á</i>	<i>bráthr-a</i>		<i>bróthr</i>	
f	<i>duhitr a</i>	<i>dughdher a</i>		<i>dauhtr</i>	
m	<i>dátr-á</i>	<i>dáthr a</i>			
n	<i>ráchas-á</i>	<i>racanh a</i>			

161 In Sanskrit and Zend *á* is the sign of the dative which I have scarce any doubt originally belongs to the demonstrative base *é* whence the nom *अयम् ayam* (from *e + am*) this which however as it appears is itself only an extension of the base *á* from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (*a smai a smát a smin &c*) and regarding which it is to be observed that the common *a* bases also in Sanskrit in many cases extend this vowel to *é* by the admixture of an *i* (§ 2) The dative sign consequently would in its origin be most intimately connected with the case which as (§ 160) was explained denotes in German both the dative and instrumental relation and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification *

* *E g* Vend S p 45 *Haomo a i anáititís dadháiti esato iuthrum,* He(m) gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring The lithographed Codex however, gives the form *a i anáititís* as three word *á i á*

[G Ed p 195] We have here further to remark, that in the pronoun of the 2d person the affix भ्यम् *bhyam* (from *bhi + am*) in तुभ्यम् *tu-bhyam*, "to thee," stands in evident relationship to the instrumental भिस् *bhis* in the plural. The feminine bases in *â*, *î*, *û*, and, at will also, those in *i* and *u*, prolong in Sanskrit the dative termination ए *ê* to ऐ *âi*, with the final *â* of the base an *i* is blended; hence निह्वयै *nihvây-âi* from निह्व-*âi*. On the other hand, इ *i* and उ *u* receive the Guna augment before ए *ê*, but not before the broader ऐ *âi*, as सूनावे *sûnav-ê* from *sûnu*. In Zend, feminine *â* and *î*-bases, like the Sanskrit, have *âi* for their termination however, *hizvây-âi* is not used, but *hizvay-âi*, from the base *hizvâ*, as long vowels in the penultimate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in *ai* have, in combination with the particle चा *cha*, preserved the Sanskrit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form *ay-aê-cha* (see § 28), e g. *karstayaêcha*, "and on account of the ploughing," "in order to plough" (Vend. S p 198),

[G Ed p 196] from *karste*. Without *cha*, however, the form *ê* is almost the sole one that occurs, e g. *kharêteê*, "in order to eat," from *lharêti*. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from *ay-ê*, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding *a* has become *ê* (§ 31). Forms like *âfrîte* or *âfrîte*, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

azî zânâti bis. Such separations in the middle of a word are, however, in this Codex, quite common. I entertain no doubt of the correctness of the length of the *a*, both of *zâ* and *nâi*, and I anticipate a variety *azîzanaitibis* or—*bis*. Probably also *csâêtô* is to be read for *csutô*. Anquetil translates "O Hom, donnez à la femme, qui n'a pas encore engendré, beaucoup d'enfans brillans." We will return to this passage hereafter, and we will here further remark that, at the same page of the Vend S, the inst. *aêbis* also occurs in the sense of 'to them'

* Cf. p 286 Note †

rest on errors in writing.* Bases in *u* may take Guna e.g. 𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬵𐬀 *van hav ê* from 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *vanhu* pure or not as 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *rathv ê* from 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *ratu* great loud The form without Guna is the more common A euphonic 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 also is found interposed between the base and the termination (§ 43) e.g. 𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 *tanu-y ê* *corpori*

165 Bases in 𐬵𐬀 *a* add to the case-sign 𐬀 also an 𐬵𐬀 *a* but from 𐬀 𐬀 (= *a + i*) and *a* is formed 𐬵𐬀 *aya*, and this with the *a* of the base gives *āya* thus 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vrīkāya* Hence may have arisen by suppressing the final *a* the Zendian 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vehrkāt* after which the preceding semi vowel must return to its vowel nature It might however be assumed that the Zend has never added an *a* to the dative 𐬀 and that this is a later appearance in Sanskrit which arose after the division of languages for from *a + e* is formed quite regularly *ai* (§ 2) The Sanskrit forms also from the particle 𐬀𐬀 *sma* which is added to pronouns of the 3d person the dative 𐬀𐬀 *smāi*, and thus e.g. 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *hasmāi* to whom? answers to the Zend 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 *lahmai* The Sanskrit, in this case abstains from adding the 𐬵𐬀 *a* which is elsewhere appended to the dative 𐬀 since 𐬀𐬀 *sma* already encumbered with the preceding principal pronoun cannot admit any superfluity in its termination and for this reason gives up its radical 𐬵𐬀 *a* before the termination 𐬀𐬀 *in* in the locative case also and forms *sm in* for *smēn*

166 The particle 𐬀𐬀 *sma* mentioned in the preceding section which introduces itself between the base and the termination not only in the singular but (and thus in fact occurs in pronouns of the two first persons) in the plural also if not separated from both—as I have first attempted to show

* 𐬵𐬀𐬀𐬀 *afrite* is undoubtedly incorrect however 𐬵𐬀 *e* is often found erroneously for 𐬵𐬀 *e* in other forms also

in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, *sma*, according to § 53, has been changed to *hma*, and also in Prâkrit and Pâli, in the plural of the two first persons, the *s* has become *h*, and besides, by transposition of the two consonants, the syllable *hma* has been altered to *mha*, e.g. Prâkrit अहं *amhê*, “we” (ἄμμες), Pâli अहं *amhâkam*, Zend 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 *ahmâkēm*, ἡμῶν. From the Prâkrit-Pâli *mha* we arrive at the Gothic *nsa* in *u-nsa-ra*, ἡμῶν, *u-nsi-s*,* “nobis,” “nos.” In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pâli and Prâkrit, and on the other hand, by the change of *m* into *n*, for more facile combination with the following *s*, it rests on a more modern stage. We cannot, therefore, any longer assume the *ns* of *uns*, “nos,” to be

[G Ed p 198] the common accusative termination, as we have formerly done in unison with Grimm† cf. *vulfa-ns*, *gasti-ns*, *sunu-ns* and thence allow it, as though it had become a property of the base, to enter into some other cases, and connect it with new case-terminations. To this is opposed; also, the 2d person, where *izvis* (*i-zvi-s*) stands in the accusative, and yet in essentials the two persons are identical in their declension, *uns*, “nobis,” “nos,” stands, therefore, for *unsi-s* (from *unsa-s*), and this has *s* as the case-suffix, and *u-nsa* (weakened from *u-nsi*) as the compound base. And we

* The *a* being changed into *i*, according to r 67

† I 813 “*unsara* appears to be derived from the accusative *uns*, as also the dative *unsi-s*, which, with *izvis*, preserves a parallel sound to the dative singular.” Cf I 813 34

cannot also any longer regard the *u* of *unsa-ra nostri* &c as the vocalized *v* of *weis* we although the *i* of *izvara vestri*" &c can be nothing else than the vocalized *y* of *yus* your for in Sanskrit also the syllable यु *yu* of *yāyam* ye (§ 43) goes through all the oblique cases while in the 1st person the व् *v* of *vayam* we is limited to the nominative but the oblique cases combine a base वा *a* with the particle स्म *sma* This *a* then in Gothic through the influence of the following liquid has become *u* hence *unsa ra* &c for *ans ara* (§ 66)

167 As in Zend the Sanskrit possessive स्म *sma* shews itself* in very different forms in juxta position with different letters so I believe I can point out the particle स्म *sma* in Gothic at least under four forms namely as *nsa zva gla* and *mma* The first has been already discussed the second—*zva* and in a weakened form *vi*—occurs in the pronoun of the 2d person in the place where the 1st has *nsa* (*nsi*) and while in the cognate Asiatic languages (Sanskrit Zend Pali Prakrit) as also in Greek and Lithuanian the two pronouns run quite [G Ed p 199] parallel in the plural since they both exhibit the interposed particle under discussion either in its original form or similarly modified in Gothic a discrepancy has arisen between the two persons in that the syllable *sma* has in them been doubly transformed The form *zva* from *sma* rests first on the not surprising change of the *s* into *z* (§ 86 5) secondly on the very common change of *m* and *v* (§ 63)

168 From the Gothic downwards the particle *sma* has been still further corrupted in the German dialects in the pronoun of the 2d person by the expulsion of the sibilant The Old High German *i wa r* has nearly the same relation to the Gothic *i zva ra* that the Homeric genitive *τοῖο* has

* See Ann of Lit Crit March 1831 p 36 &c

to the Sanskrit तस्य *tasya*, which is older than the Homeric form Compare, without intervention of the Gothic, the Old High German *i-ua-r*, *i-u*, *i-wi-h*, with the Sanskrit *yu-shmâ-kam*, *yu-shma-bhyam*, *yu-shmâ-n*, and with the Lithuanian *yû-sû*, *yû-mus*, *yû-s* thus it would be regarded as settled, that the *w* or *u* belongs to the base, but is not the corrupted remainder of a far-extended intermediate pronoun, and it would be incorrect to divide *iu-ai*, *iu-ih*, *iu*, for *i-ua-r*, &c I, too, formerly entertained that erroneous opinion. A repeated examination, and the enlarged views since then obtained through the Zend, Prâkrit, and Pâli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable *zva* has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (*e-ue-r* from *i-zva-ra*, *e-u-ih* from *i-zvi-s*, Old High German *i-ur-h*) on the other hand, the *u* of the base *yu* (यु *yu*), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High [G Ed p 200] German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual*, and the Gothic *i zva-ra*, Old High German *i-ua-r*, &c., stand for *yu-zva-ra*, *yu-wa-r* The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the *u*, which in Anglo-Saxon has become *o*, through all the oblique cases *iu-we-r*, *eo-ve-r*, "*vestri*," &c If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskrit and New German forms be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that *euer* and युष्मिन् *yushmîkam* are connected, and, indeed, in such wise, that the *u* of *euer* has nothing

* So much the more remarkable is the *u*, which is still retained in the North Friesian dialect (Grimm, p 814), where, *e g yu nhe-r*, *yu-nh*, in regard to the base, distinguishes itself advantageously from the Gothic *i-ggva-ia*, *i-ngvi-s*.

in common with the *u* of $\text{यु } yu$ but finds its origin in the *m* of the syllable $\text{स्म } sma$

169 The distinction of the dual and plural in the oblique cases of the two first persons is not organic in German, for the two plural numbers are distinguished originally only by the case-terminations. These however in our pronouns are in Gothic the same and the difference between the two plural numbers appears to lie in the base— $ugka\ ra$ * $\nu\acute{o}w\ unsa-ra$ $\eta\mu\acute{o}\nu\ igq\ a-ra$ $\sigma\phi\acute{o}\nu\ i\zeta\iota\alpha\ ra$ $\nu\mu\acute{o}\nu$. But from a more close analysis of the forms in the two plural numbers and from the light afforded us by the cognate Asiatic languages it appears that the proper base is also identical in the two plural numbers and it is only the particle *sma* combined with it which has become doubly corrupted and then the one form has become fixed in the dual the other in the plural. The former comes nearest to [G Ed p 201] the Prakrit Pali form $\text{म्ह } mha$ and between $u\ nsa\ ra$ and $u\ gka\ ra$ (= $u\ nka\ ra$) an intervening $u\ nha\ ra$ or $u\ mha\ ra$ must be assumed. At least I do not think that the old *s* became *k* at one spring but that the latter is a hardened form of an earlier *h* which has remained in the Prakrit and Pali, as in the singular nominative the *k* of ik has been developed from the *h* of $\text{अहम् } aham$. The second person gives in Gothic, qu (= kv § 86 1) for *k* while the other dialects leave the guttural the same form in both persons. Old High German $u\ ncha\ r$, $i\ ncha\ r$. Old Slavonic $u\ nke-r$, $i\ nke\ r$. Anglo Saxon $u\ nce-r$ $i\ nce-r$. It would consequently appear proved that the dual and plural of the two first persons are not organically or originally different but be long as distortions and mutilations of different kinds to one and the same original form and that therefore these two pronouns have preserved the old dual just as little as

* It must not be overlooked that here *g* before *k* only represents the nasal answering to *k* (§ 86 1)

the other pronouns and all substantive and adjective declensions

170 The fourth form in which स्म *sma* appears in Gothic is that which I first remarked, and which I have brought forward already in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (p. 16) What I have there said, that the datives singular, like *thamma*, *imma*, have arisen, by assimilation, from *thasma*, *i-sma*, I have since found remarkably confirmed by the Grammar of the Old Prussian published by Vater, a language which is nearly connected with the Lithuanian and Gothic, since here all pronouns of the third person have *smu* in the dative. Compare, e.g. *antar-smu* with the Gothic *anthara-mma*, "to the other" *ka-smu* with the Gothic *hva-mma*, "to whom?" We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun स्म *sma* similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation,

[G Ed p 202] since we deduced the Æolic forms ἄ-μμ-ες, ὕ-μμ-ες, &c, from ἄ-σμε-ες, ὕ-σμε-ες, to which the common forms ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, have the same relation that the Old High German *de-mu* has to the Gothic *tha-mma*, only that ἡμεῖς, ὑμεῖς, in respect to the termination εῖς, are more perfect than the Æolic forms, since they have not lost the vowel of the particle *σμε*, but have contracted *με-ες* to *μεῖς*.

171. The Gothic datives in *mma* are, as follows from § 160, by origin, instrumentals, although the particle *sma* in Sanskrit has not made its way into these cases, and e.g. त्ना *tēna*, "through him," not *tasmēna*, or, according to the Zend principle (§. 158), *tasma* (for *tasmā*), is used, I say, according to the Zend principle, for though in this

* The difference between the forms *thé*, *lvé*, explained at § 159, and the datives *tha-mma*, *hva-mma*, consists first in this, that the latter express the case relation by the affixed particle, the former in the main base, secondly, in this, that *thamma*, *hvamma*, for *thammé*, *hvammé*, on account of their being polysyllabic, have not preserved the original length of the termination (cf § 137)

language *hma* has entered into the instrumental masculine and neuter this case in the base *ta* could only be *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺* *tahma* or *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺* *tahmá* (from *ta hma á*) In the feminine as we can sufficiently prove the appended pronoun really occurs in the instrumental and while *e g* from the masculine and neuter base *𑀮𑀺* *ana* this (m) this (n) we have found the instrumental of the same sound *𑀮𑀺* *ana* not *anahma* from the demonstrative base *𑀮𑀺* *a* occurs rather often the feminine instrumental *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺* *ahmy a* from the fem base *𑀮𑀺* *ahmi* increased by the appended pronoun

172 The Sanskrit appended pronoun [G Ed p 203] स्म *sma* should, in the feminine form either स्मा *smd* or स्मि *smi* on the latter is based the Zend form *𑀮𑀺* *ahmi* mentioned at § 171 But in Sanskrit the feminine form स्मि *smi* has been preserved only in such a mutilated condition * that before my acquaintance with the Zend I could not recognise it From *ta smi* must come the dative *ta smy-ái* the gen and ablative *ta smy-ás* and the locative *ta smy-ám* These forms, by rejecting the *m* have become abbreviated to तस्यै *ta sy ái* तस्य *ta sy ás* तस्य *ta sy ám*, and the same is the case with the feminine pronoun *smi* in all similar compounds so that the forms mentioned appear to have proceeded from the masculine and neuter genitive *tasya* by the annexation of new case terminations This opinion was the more to be relied on that in Gothic also the feminine forms *thi zos hujus*"

* The Zend too has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine *𑀮𑀺* as in the instr *𑀮𑀺* *ahmy a* but in the genitive dative and ablative has gone even farther than the Sanskrit in the demolition of this word and has therein rejected not only the *m* but also the *𑀮𑀺* The feminine *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺* *a nh áo* (§ 56) '*hujus* for *𑀮𑀺* *ahmy áo* often occurs and for it also *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀮𑀺* *ainh ao* in which the *𑀮𑀺* is to use the expression a reflection of the lost *𑀮𑀺* *y* (§ 41) From another demonstrative base we find the dative *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀮𑀺* *ava nh ai* and more than once the ablative *𑀮𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀮𑀺* *ava nh ái* for *ava hmy ai* *ava lmy ái*

thi-zai, “*huic*,” might be deduced from the masculine genitive *thi*s, by the addition of the terminations *ós* and *ai*, and as, too, in Lithuanian, the whole of the oblique cases singular of the 1st and 2d person stand in close connection with the Sanskrit-Zend genitives मम *mama*, मज्ज् *mana*, तव *tava*, तव्य *tava*, and have the same as base. After discovering the Zend feminine pronominal forms in *hmy-a* in the instrumental and locative in the latter for *hmy-anm* the above-mentioned forms in Sanskrit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of *ta-smý-ár*, &c, as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, *thizós*, *thizai*, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into *thi-zó-s*, *thi-zai*. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun *smá* must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base *SMŌ* = स्म *smá*, as *BLINDŌ*, nom. *blindá*, “*cæca*,” from *BLINDA*, m n (nom *blind'-s*, *blinda-ta*) *SMŌ*, however, by the loss of the *m*, as experienced by the Sanskrit in the feminine, has become *SŌ*, but the *s*, on account of its position between two vowels (according to §. 86. 5.), has become *z*. Therefore, *thi-zó-s* has only *s* as case-sign, and the dative *thi-zai*, like *gibai* in § 161, is without case character. With the masculine and neuter genitive *thi-s*, therefore, *thi-zó-s*, *thi-zai*, have nothing in common but the demonstrative theme *THA*, and the weakening of its *a* to *i* (§ 66)

173 Gothic adjective bases in *a* (Grimm's strong adjectives) which follow the pronominal declension, differ from it, however, in this point, that they do not weaken the final *a* of the base before the appended pronoun to *i*, but extend it to *ai*, and form the feminine dative from the simple theme, according to the analogy of the substantives † hence *blindai-zó-s*, *blindai*, not *blindi-zó-s*, *blindi-zai*

* Cf § 356 Rem 3 p 501 last line but seven

† With respect to the extension of the *a* to *ai*, compare the gen pl and Sanskrit forms, as *té-bhyas*, “*us*,” *téshám*, “*eorum*,” for *ta-bhyas*, *ta sám*

171 The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hma* also into the second and probably into the first person too we find repeatedly in the locative, 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *thwa hm* : instead of the Sanskrit [G Fd p 200] त्वयि *tway* : and hence deduce in the 1st person *ma hm* *l* which we cannot quote as occurring The Prakrit in this respect follows the analogy of the Zend and in the 2d person gives the form 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *tuma sm* : "in thee" or with assimilation 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *tumami* with 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *tumē* (from *tuma* :) and 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *ta* : and 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *mama sm* : or 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *mama mmi* in me together with the simple 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *maē* and 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *mai* * Ought not therefore in German also in the singular of the two first persons a remnant of the pronominal syllable *sma* to be looked for? The *s* in the Gothic *mi s* "to me" *thu s* "to thee" and *si s* "to himself" appears to me in no other way intelligible for in our Indo-European family of languages there exists no *s* as the suffix of the instrumental or dative Of similar origin is the *s* in the plural *u ni s nobis* "nos" : *-ri s* "obis" "vos" and its appearance in two otherwise differently denoted cases cannot therefore be surprising because this *s* is neither the dative nor accusative character, but belongs to a syllable which could be declined through all cases but is here deprived of all case sign In *u ni s* : *-ri s* therefore the Sanskrit 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *sma* is doubly contracted once as the base and next as the apparent case suffix I am inclined also to affirm of the above mentioned Prakrit forms *tu ma sm* : "in thee" and *ma ma sm* : "in me" that they doubly contain the pronominal syllable *sma* and that the middle syllable has dropped a preceding *s* For there is no more favourite and facile combination in our class of languages than of a pronoun with a pronoun and what is omitted by one dialect in this respect is often afterwards supplied by another more modern dialect

See *Œt as sur le Pali* by F. Burnouf and Lassen pp 143 170



[G. Ed p. 206.] 175. The *h* in the Gothic accusatives *mi-h*, *thu-h*, *si-h* (*me*, *te*, *se*), may be deduced, as above, in *u-gla-ra*, *vōiv*, &c, from *s*, by the hardening of an intervening *h*, so that *mi-s* is altered to *mi-h*, and thence to *mi-l*, and therefore, in the singular, as also in the plural, the dative and accusative of the two first persons are, in their origin, identical. In Old High German and Anglo-Saxon our particle appears in the accusative singular and plural in the same form. Old High German *mi-h* "me," *di-h*, "thee," *u-nsi-h*, "us," *i-wi-h*, "you", Anglo-Saxon *me-c*, "me," *u-si-c*, "us," *the-c*, "thee," *eo-vi-c*, "you". on the other hand, in the dative singular the old *s* of the syllable *sma* has become *r* in the High German, but has disappeared in the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon. Old High German *mi-r*, *di-r*, Old Saxon *mi*, *thu*, Anglo-Saxon *me*, *the*.

176. In Lithuanian *smā* appears in the same form as in the middle of the above-mentioned (§ 171) *Prâkit* forms, namely, with *s* dropped, as *ma*, and indeed, first, in the dative and locative sing of the pronouns of the 3d person and adjectives, and, secondly, in the genitive dual of the two first persons. We cannot, however, refer to this the *m*, which the latter in some cases have in common with the substantive declension. The pronominal base *TA*, and the adjective base *GERA*, form, in the dative, *tū-mui*, "to thee," *gerū-mui*, "to the good" (shortened *tām*, *gerām*), and in the locative *ta-mè*, *gera-mè*, and if *-mui* and *-mè* are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive *a* bases, it is easily seen that *mui* and *mè* have sprung from *ma*. The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, *mu-mû*, *yu-mû*, according to the analogy of *ponû*, "of the two lords."

* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle *smā* in the locative interrogative form *ka-mmè*, "where"? Sansk कस्मिन् *ka-smin*,
"in

177 Lithuanian substantives have *i* for [G Ed p 207] the dative character but *i* bases have *ei** a final *a* before this *i* passes into *u* hence *wilku i* Although we must refuse a place in the locative to the dative *i* of the Greek and Latin still this Lithuanian dative character appears connected with the Indo Zend *é* so that only the last element of this diphthong which has grown out of *a+i* has been left For the Lithuanian has besides* the dative also a real locative which indeed in the *a* bases corresponds exactly with the Sanskrit and Zend

178 The nominal bases Sanskrit Zend and Lithuanian explained at § 148 excepting the neuters ending with *i* vowel and pronouns to the full declension of which we shall return hereafter form in the dative

	SAN KRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN
m	<i>rikaya</i>	<i>rehrakai</i>	<i>wilku i</i>
f	<i>jihway ai</i>	<i>hizway ai</i>	<i>ranka i</i>
m	<i>paty e †</i>	<i>paite é † †</i>	<i>paich ei</i>
f	<i>pritay e</i>	<i>afrite e</i>	<i>auu ei</i>
f	<i>bhavishtyanti-ai</i>	<i>bushyainty-ai</i>	
m	<i>sūnav é,</i>	<i>pasv-e</i>	<i>sunu i</i>

in whom which according to the common declension would be कस्मै *kasmé* (from *kasma i*) Compare the Gothic *hiamma* to whom? for *hiasma*

* The form *auu* with *auie* appears to admit of being explained as arising from the commixture of the final vowel of the *a* bases

† The form पतये *patyé* is with respect to its want of Guna irregular and should be पतये *patayé*

‡ In combination with *cha* we find in V S p 473 पाथ्ये-धा *paithyē-dha* and hence deduce for the instrumental (p 193 G Ed) the form *paithya* while according to § 47 also *paithya* might be expected From पाथ्ये *paithya* friend I find in V S p 16^o the instrumental पाथ्ये *paithya* with Guna after the analogy of the *bā* *ava* mentioned at § 160

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUANIAN.
f.	<i>tanav-é,</i>	<i>tanu-y-é,</i> *	.
f	<i>vadhv-âi,</i>	.	.
m. f	<i>gav-é,</i>	<i>gav-é,</i>	..
f.	<i>nâv-é,</i>	.	.
f	<i>vâch-é,</i>	<i>vâch-é,</i>	..
m.	<i>bharat-é,</i>	<i>barënt-é,</i>	.
m	<i>âtman-é,</i>	<i>ašman-é,</i>	.
n	<i>nâmn-é †</i>	<i>nâman-é,</i>	.
m.	<i>bhrâti-é,</i>	<i>brâthr-é,</i>	.
f.	<i>dūhitr-é,</i>	<i>dughdhēr-é, †</i>	.
m.	<i>dâti-e,</i>	<i>dâthr-é,</i>	.
n.	<i>vachas-é, †</i>	<i>vachanh-é,</i>	.

* I give 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *tanuyé* with euphonic *y*, because I have found this form frequently, which, however, cannot, for this reason, be considered as peculiar to the feminine, and, instead of it, also *tanvê* and *tanavé* may be regarded as equally correct Cf § 43, where, however, it is necessary to observe, that the insertion of a euphonic 𐬎 *y* between *u* and *é* is not everywhere necessary, and, for instance, in the dative is the more rare form

† The 𐬀 *ê* in 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêrê*, and in the instr 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *dughdhêra*, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants I deduce these forms from the plural genitive 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *dughdhēr anm*, for 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *dughdhn-aum*

‡ Respecting 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *nâmnê*, for 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *nâmanê*, and so in the instrumental 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *nâmnâ*, for 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *nâmanâ*, see § 140 In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the *a* in the weakest cases (§ 130), but examples of its retention, *e g* in the compound 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *aocô-nâman*, whence the genitive 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *aocô-nâmanô* (Vend S p 4, and frequently) I consider the initial *a* in this compound as the negation, without euphonic *n*, for in all probability it means “having untold (countless) names” Similar compounds precede, viz 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *hazam ô-ghaôshahê baêvarê-chashmanô*, “of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed” Cf Anquetil II 82 In words in *van*, on the other hand, 𐬀 *a* is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the 𐬀 *v* becomes 𐬀 *u* or 𐬀 *o* Regarding the addition of the 𐬀 *z* in 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬭𐬀 *nâmanê*, see § 41

ABLATIVI

179 The Ablative in Sanskrit has πt [G Ed p 209] for its character regarding the origin of which there can no longer be any uncertainty as soon as the influence of pronouns on the formation of cases has been recognised as we are conducted at once to the demonstrative base ta which already in the neuter nominative and accusative has assumed the nature of a case sign and which we shall subsequently under the verb see receiving the function of a personal termination. This ablative character however has remained only in bases in πa which is lengthened before it, a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians who have been followed by the English to represent $\pi a t$ as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed that in $\pi a t$ the a of the base has been melted down with the t of the termination *

180 M E Burnouff† has been the first [G Ed p 110] to bring home the ablative character to a class of words in Zend which had lost it in Sanskrit and whence it can be satisfactorily inferred that a simple t and not at is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in u of which hereafter. As regards bases in a which in Sanskrit alone have preserved the ablative we have to observe that in

* I have drawn attention already in the first (German) edition of my Sanskrit Grammar to the arbitrary and unfounded nature of this assumption (§§ 156 and 264) and I have deduced from the ablatives of the pronouns of the two first persons (mat $tva t$) that either at with short a or more correctly, a simple t must be regarded as the ablative termination. This view I supported in the Latin edition of my Grammar on the ground that in old Latin also a simple d appears as the suffix of the ablative. But since then the justness of my opinion regarding the Sanskrit ablative has been still more emphatically confirmed by the Zend language because the Zend stands in a closer and more evident connection with the Sanskrit than does the Latin.

† Nouveau Journal Asiatique 18 9 tom III 311

Zend also the short vowel is lengthened, and thus 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vēhiká-t* answers to वृक्रीक् *vriká-t*. Bases in 𐬀 𐬀 have 𐬀 -t in the ablative, whence may be inferred in Sanskrit ablatives like पतेर् *paté-t*, प्रितेर् *príté-t* (§ 33.), which, by adding Guna to the final vowel, would agree with genitives in 𐬀 -s. The Zend-Avesta, as far as it is hitherto edited, nevertheless offers but few examples of such ablative forms in 𐬀 -t. I owe the first perception of them to the word 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *âfiûôit*, "benedictione," in a passage of the Vendidad,* explained elsewhere, which recurs frequently. Examples of masculine bases are perhaps 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *zaratustrôit*, "institutione zaratustricu" (V. S. p. 86), although otherwise 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ragi*, which I have not elsewhere met with, is a masculine the adjective base *zaratustri*, however, belongs to the three genders. From 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *gauri*, "mountain," [G Ed p. 211] occurs the ablative 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *garôit* in the Yescht-Sâde.† Bases in 𐬀 have 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ao-it*‡ in the ablative||, and in no class of words, with the exception of

* See Gramm Crit add ad r. 156

† What Anquetil III. 170 Rem. 4, writes *guerôed* can be nothing else than the ablative 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *garôit*, for Anquetil generally expresses 𐬀 by *gu*, 𐬀 by *e*, 𐬀 by *ôe*, and 𐬀 by *d*. The nominal base 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *gauri*, however, is treated in Zend as if *gari* was the original form, and the 𐬀 which precedes the 𐬀 was produced by the final 𐬀 , as remarked by M. Burnouf in the article quoted at p. 173, and confirmed by the genitive 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *garôis*. That, however, which is remarked by M. Burnouf, l. c. with respect to the genitive, and of which the Vend. S. p. 64 affords frequent proof in the genitive 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *patôis*, must also be extended to the ablative in 𐬀 -t, and the 𐬀 , which, according to § 41, is added through the final 𐬀 𐬀 of the base, is dropped again before this termination.

‡ For this we also find 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *cut*, e. g. 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *manycut* from *manyu*.

|| Interchanges of 𐬀 𐬀 and 𐬀 𐬀 are particularly common, owing to the slight difference of these letters. Thus, e. g. for 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mraôt*, "he spoke," occurs very frequently 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mraot*, the former, however, is, as we can satisfactorily prove, the right reading, for, first, it is supported by

that in *a* does the ablative more frequently occur although these words are in number but five or six the ablative use of which is very frequent e.g. *հոփասացալ ձձոնհոտ* *creatione* from *ձձոնհու* in a passage explained elsewhere* *հոփասա առհո՛ւ* ' *mundo* from *առհու*, *հոփասառ տանո՛ւ* *corpore* from *տանու* Bases ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the [G. L. I p 212] ablative *հ* *t* without the intervention of another letter as the accusative is to annex *m* without an intermediate letter and they have *at* as their termination numerous examples of which occur e.g. *հասնա առ at* *aquâ* *հանճա միւր at* *igne* *հասնահարառ շաշման at* *oculo* *հասնացալ ձձոնհան at* *nuso* *հասլուց druj at* *dæmone* *հասալիւս at* *loco* (cf *licus* according to § 21) Owing to the facile interchange of the *a* with *u* *հաս մտ* is sometimes erroneously written for *հաս at* thus Vendidid S p 338 *հասրալսարփնաւ սաճհան մտ* for *հասրալսարփնաւ սաճհան at* *lucente* Bases in *u* sometimes follow the

by the Sanskrit form *अभ्रौ* *abrot*, for which the irregular form *अभ्रान्* *abrañt* is used and secondly, it answers to the 1st per *mraom* (V S p 123) thirdly, the Sanskrit *अशु* *is* in Zend never represented by *հաս* *ao* but by *փ* *ó*, before which according to § 28 another *a* is placed hence *փհաս ao* on the other hand *հաս ao* represents *u* in accordance with § 32 and § 28 If then *ասնալ* *pasu* formed in the ablative *հոփասնալ* *pasat* this would conduct us to a Sanskrit *अशु* *pasu t* while from the ablatives *հոփհրոճնալ* *fritoi t* *հոփհրասրալ* *aratusroi t* *հոփհարալ* *garoi t* and from the analogy in other respects with the genitive the Guna form *अशु* *pa o t* must be deduced Moreover in the Zend S the ablative form *հոփհաս աճ t* actually occurs for at p 102 (*արաստ հոփհասալ* *հոփհասալ* *hacha tanleat t mananh at* ' from pure spirit) occurs *tanleat* the ablative of *tanlu* and the *է* *e* preceding the *a* is an error in orthography and *տանհո՛ւ* is the form intended p 945 occurs *հոփհասալ* *arhuot* ' *mundo* from *anhu*

* Gramm Crit § 640 ann 2

consonantal declension in having *𐬀𐬎 at* as the ablative termination instead of a mere *t*, just as in the genitive, besides a simple *s*, they exhibit also an *ō* (from *as*, § 56^b), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *tanaot*, "corpore," occurs also *tanv-at* (Vend S. p. 492)* Feminine bases in *𐬀𐬎 ā* and *𐬀𐬎 ī* have *𐬀𐬎 at* in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination *𐬀𐬎 ds*, whence, in the Zend *𐬀𐬎 𐬀𐬎*, *eg 𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *dahmay-āt*, "praecleara," from *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *dahmā*, *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *urvaray-āt*) "arbore," from *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *urvarā*, *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *baiēthry-āt*, "genitrice," from *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *baiēthri* † The feminine bases also in *u*, and perhaps also those in *i*, may share this feminine termination *𐬀𐬎 at*, thus, from *zantu*, "begetting," comes the ablative *zanthu-āt* (cf Gramm Crit. §. 610. Rem 2.) Although, then, the ablative has been sufficiently shewn to belong to all declensions in Zend, and the ablative relation is also, for the most part, denoted by the actual ablative, still the genitive not unfrequently occurs in the place of the ablative, and even adjectives in the genitive in construction with substantives in the ablative. Thus we read, Vend S. p. 479, *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *hacha avanhāt* ‡ *visat yat māzdayasñōis*, "ex hac terrā quidem mazdayasnicā"

* Buinouf writes *tanavat*, probably according to another Codex. I hold both forms to be correct, the rather as in the genitive, also, both *tanv-ō* and *tanav-ō* occur, and in general, before all terminations beginning with a vowel, both the simple form and that with Guna are possible.

† Vendidad Sâde, p. 436 *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎* *Yatha vehrkō chathwarē-jangi ō mshdarēdaryāt baiēthryat hacha puthrēm*, "As a wolf, a four-footed animal, tears a child from its mother." This sentence is also important as an example of the intensive form (cf Gramm Crit § 363). The Codex, however, divides incorrectly *mshdarē daryāt*

‡ Regarding this form, see p. 172 Rem.

181 The Old Roman corresponds with the Zend in regard to the designation of the ablative and in those two memorials of the language that on the *Columna rostrata* and the *S C de Bacchanalibus* which are the most important inscriptions that remain all ablatives end with *d* so that it is surprising that the ablative force of this letter could be overlooked and that the empty name of a paragogic *d* could be held satisfactory. Bases ending with a consonant use *ed* as ablative suffix as in the accusative they have *em* instead of a simple *m* hence forms like *praesent ed dictator ed* answer to the Zend *saôchant at ôthr at* (*lucente igne*) while *navale-d* præda d mallo d mari d senatu d* like the above mentioned Zend forms *garô t monte* *tanab t corpore* &c and in Sanskrit *rikâ t lupô* have a simple *T* sound to denote the ablative. The Oscan also takes the ablative sign *d* through all declensions as appears from the remark in the inscription of Bantia *e g dolu d* [G Ed p 214] *mallu-d cum prælatu d touta d præsentu d* † It may be preliminarily observed that in the 3d person of the imperative old Latin and Oscan forms like *es tod es tud*—for *es-to* and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Vedic forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Panini *e g* *iva t* which signifies both *ivat* and *ite*” but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf *ivito* as 3d and 2d person)

182 In classical Latinity a kind of petrified ablative form appears to be contained in the appended pronoun *me* which may be transferred from the 1st person to the others also and answers to the Sanskrit ablative *mat* from me. But it is possible also that *m t* may have

* The *e* here belongs to the base which alternates between *e* and *i*

† See O Muller's *Inscriptions* p 36

dropped an initial *s*, and may stand for *smet*, and so belong to the appended pronoun स्म *sma*, explained in § 165 &c, corresponding with its ablative *smât*, to which it stands in the same relation that *memor* (for *mesmor*) does to स्मृ *smri* from *smari*, § 1 “to remember” The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for स्म *sma*, as has been shewn, unites itself to all persons, though it must itself be regarded as a pronoun of the 3d person.* The conjunction *sed*, too, is certainly nothing but the ablative of the reflexive, and *sed* occurs twice in the *S. C. de Bacch.* as an evident pronoun, and, in fact, governed by *inter*, [G Ed. p 215] whence it may be assumed that *inter* can be used in construction with the ablative, or also that, in the old languages, the accusative is the same with the ablative the latter view is confirmed by the accusative use of *ted* and *med* in Plautus

† 183. In Sanskrit the ablative expresses distance from a place, the relation “whence,” and this is the true, original destination of this case, to which the Latin remained constant in the names of towns. From the relation “whence,” however, the ablative is, in Sanskrit, transferred to the causal relation also, since that on account of which any thing is done is regarded as the place whence an action proceeds. In this manner the confines of the ablative and instrumental touch one another, and तेन *tēna* (§ 158) and तस्मात् *tasmât*, may both express “on account of which” In adverbial use the ablative spreads still further, and in some words denotes relations, which are otherwise foreign to the ablative. In Greek, adverbs in $\omega\varsigma$ may be looked upon as sister forms of the Sanskrit ablative, so that $\omega\varsigma$, from bases in *o*, would have the same relation to the Sanskrit

* The reduplication in *me-mor*, from *me-smor*, would be of the kind used in Sanskrit, e g *pasparśa*, “he touched,” of which hereafter

† Cf the Gothic ablatives in *ô*, adduced in § 294 Rem 1 p 384

सम् *d t* from bases in *a* that *e g* διδωσι has to εδιδε *dadd t*
 Thus ομῶς may be akin to the Sanskrit समी *samī t*
 from the sidular both in termination and in base In
 Greek the transition of the *T* sounds into *ς* was requisite if
 indeed they were not to be entirely suppressed* and in
 § 152 we have seen neuter bases in *τ* in the uninflected
 cases preserve their final letter from being entirely lost by
 changing it into *ς* We deduce therefore [G Ed p 216]
 adverbs like ομῶς οὐτως ως from ομῶ τ οὐτω-τ ω-τ or
 ομῶ-δ &c. and this is the only way of bringing these forma-
 tions into comparison with the cognate languages and it is
 not to be believed that the Greek has created for this ad-
 verbial relation an entirely peculiar form any more than
 other case terminations can be shewn to be peculiar to the
 Greek alone The relation in adverbs in ως is the same as
 that of Latin ablative forms like *hoc modo quo modo raro*
perpetuo In bases ending with a consonant ος for οτ might
 be expected as the termination in accordance with Zend
 ablatives like चश्मन्श्चक्षुश्च चश्मन् *chashman at oculo* but then
 the ablative adverbial termination would be identical with
 that of the genitive this and the preponderating analogy
 of adverbs from *o* bases may have introduced forms like
 σωφρον ως which with respect to their termination may be
 compared with Zend feminine ablatives like बर्धन्यश्च *barthry at*
 We must also with reference to the irre-
 gular length of this adverbial termination, advert to the
 Attic genitives in ως for ος †

* As in *υρω* together with *ουρω ε* ᾤδε, φ ω and adverbs from
 prepositions— ξω τ ω, κατο &c It is here desirable to remark, that in
 Sanskrit, also the ablative termination occurs in adverbs from prepositions
 as अधस्तात् *adhastat* '(from) beneath, पुरस्तात् *purastāt*, '(from) before
 &c (Gram Crit § 602 p 279)

† In compounds remains of ablative forms may exist with the original
T sound retained We will therefore observe, that in Αφροδιτη the first
 member

THE GENITIVE

[G Ed p 217] 184 In no case do the different members of the Sanskrit family of languages agree so fully as in the genitive singular, only that in Latin the two first declensions, together with the fifth, as well as the two first persons of the pronouns, have lost their old termination, and have replaced it by that of the old locative. The Sanskrit terminations of the genitive are स् *s*, स्य *syā*, अस् *as*, and आस् *ās* the three first are common to the three genders as is

member has a genuine ablative meaning, and as the division ἀφρο-δίτη admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with ἀφροδ-ίτη. In Sanskrit, अभ्रादिनी *abhrādītā* would mean "the female who proceeded from a cloud," for *abnrā-t* must become *abhrād* before *itā* (§ 93.); and in neuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix *ta* has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage *ιτη* in ἀφροδ-ίτη, might be a remnant, and this compound might mean, therefore, "She who arose, who sprang, from foam." The only difficulty here is the short vowel of *od* for *ωδ*. As regards the Sanskrit, here also the *s* of the ablative may in most declensions rest on an exchange with an older *t* (cf p 184 G ed Note), and, as the Zend gives us every reason to expect Sanskrit ablatives like *jihvāy-āt*, *prītē-t*, *sūnō-t*, *bhavishyanty-āt*, *ātman at*, so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms *jihvāy-ās*, *prītē-s*, &c, where they have an ablative meaning, to the exchange of *t* with *s*, which is more or less in vogue according to the variety of dialects, particularly as it is known, also, that, *vice versā*, according to certain laws, स् *s* passes into त् *t* (Gramm. Crit § 100). Consequently the identity between the genitive and ablative, in most declensions, would be only external, and the two cases would vary in their history, so that, e g *jihvāy-ās* would be, in one sense, viz in that of *linguæ*, independent and original, and in another, that of *linguâ*, a corruption of *jihvāy āt*. At the time when Sanskrit and Zend were separated from one another, the retention of the original *t* must have been the prevailing inclination, and, together with it, may also its change into *s* have arisen, as the Zend also uses, at times, the genitive form with an ablative meaning (e g Vend S p 177)

principally confined to the consonantal bases * and hence has the same relation to *s* that in the accusative *am* has to *m* and in the Zend ablative *at* has to *t*

185 Before the genitive sign स् *s* the [C. I.] p. 118] vowels इ *i* and उ *u* take Guna and the Zend and in a more limited degree also the Lithuanian and Gothic share this augment. All *u* bases for example in Lithuanian and Gothic prefix an *a* to their final vowel hence the Lithuanian *sunau s* and Gothic *sunau s* correspond to the Sanskrit सुनोम *sunôṣ* (*filii*) from *sunauṣ* (§ 2). In the *i* bases in Gothic Guna is restricted to the feminines thus *anstai s gratiæ* answers to प्रीतिः *pritiḥ s*. Respecting Lithuanian genitives of *i* bases see § 193. The High German has from the earliest period dropped the genitive sign in all feminines in consonantal bases (§§ 125 127) the sign of the genitive is wanting in the other genders also.

186 The form which the Sanskrit genitive termination after consonants assumes as it were of necessity (§ 94) viz *as* for *s* has in Greek in the form *os* passed over also to the vowels *i* and *u* and diphthongs terminating in *u* and genitives like *πορτιος* *εχθουος* which would be in accordance with § 185 are unheard of but *πορτιος* *εχθουος* answer like *ποδος* to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases as *पदम्* *padas* *पदिस* *padis* *वचस* *vachas* *वचिस* *vachis*. The Latin on the other hand answers more to the other sister languages, but is without Guna so *hostis* is like the Gothic genitive *gasti s*. In the *u* bases (fourth declension) the lengthening of the *u* may replace the Guna or more correctly this class of words followed the Greek or consonantal principle and the vowel dropped before *s* was compensated for by

* Besides this it occurs only in monosyllabic bases in ईः ऊः ऐः औः *ai* and *au* e.g. *रायस* *rayas* *रेतिस* *retis* *नदिस* *ndis* *नदिस* *ndis* and in neuters in इः and उः which by the assumption of an euphonic न् *n* assimilate to the consonantal declension in most cases

lengthening the *u* The *S. C. de Bacch.* gives the genitive *senatu-os* in Grecian garb Otherwise the termination *us* of consonantal bases is better derived from the Sanskrit अस् [G Ed p 219] *as* than from the Greek *os*, because the old Sanskrit *a* in other places in Latin has been weakened to *u*, as frequently happens in Gothic (§§ 66. 67).

187. With regard to the *senatu-os* just mentioned, it is important to remark, that, in Zend also, the *u* bases, instead of annexing a simple *s* in the genitive, as 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *mainyēu-s*, "of the spirit," from *mainyu*, may, after the manner of consonantal bases, add 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *danhv-ō*, or 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *danhav-ō*, for *danheu-s* "loci," from 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *danhu* This kind of genitive occurs very frequently as a substitute for the locative, as also for the ablative (Vend. S p. 177), more rarely with a genuine genitive meaning "

188 Bases in अ *a*, and pronouns of the third person, of which only *omu* ends with a vowel other than *a*, have, in Sanskrit, the more full genitive sign स्य *sya*, hence, e. g. 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *vikā-sya*, "lupi," 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *ta-sya*, "hujus," &c, 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *amu-shya*,

* It might be assumed that as $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ clearly stands for $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, $\beta\omicron\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for $\beta\omicron\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\nu\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ for $\nu\acute{\alpha}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, (§ 124), so also $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ would stand for $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, and that $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, therefore, should be compared with the Zend genitives with Guna, as 𑀓𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀲𑀳 *danhav-ō* The ϵ , therefore, in $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ would not be a corrupted *v* of the base, but the Guna vowel foreign to the base, but the *v* of the base, which, according to the original law of sound, must become *F* before vowels, is, like all other digammas in the actual condition of the language, suppressed The ϵ is certainly a very heterogeneous vowel to the *v*, and the corruption of the latter to ϵ , in the middle of a word, would be a greater violation of the old relations of sound than the rejection of a *v* sound between two vowels The corruption of $\acute{\imath}$ to $\acute{\epsilon}$ is less surprising, and occurs also in Old High German (§ 72) In Greek, also, a consonant γ is wanting, but cannot have been originally deficient, and therefore the question might be mooted whether also $\pi\acute{\omicron}\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, $\sigma\iota\acute{\nu}\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ may not stand for *pole-gōs*, *sinape-gos*

illius (§ 21) In Zend this termination [G Ed p 270] appears in the form of *hē* (§ 42) hence *e g* $\mu\sigma\mu\sigma\eta\sigma\eta$ *chirkahē lupi* $\mu\sigma\mu\sigma\eta\sigma\eta$ *turyē-hē quartū* for *turya hē*

189 In Greek and Latin we have already in another place pointed out a remnant of the genitive termination $\sigma\eta$ *sya* and in fact precisely in places where it might be most expected. As bases in σ *a* correspond to the Greek bases in σ and as σ in Greek at the furthest extremity of words between two vowels is generally dislodged I do not entertain the smallest doubt that the old epic genitive termination in $\iota\sigma$ is an abbreviation of $\sigma\iota\sigma$ and that *e g* in $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma$ = $\tau\sigma\eta$ *ta sya* the first σ belongs to the base and only $\iota\sigma$ to the case sign. As regards however the loss of the σ in $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma$ the Greek Grammar supplies us with another $\sigma\iota\sigma$ where a Σ is lost, the necessary and original existence of which no one can doubt $\epsilon\delta\iota\delta\sigma\sigma\omicron$ and the ancient position of the Σ in the second person testify for $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\iota\sigma\omicron$ instead of $\delta\iota\delta\sigma\iota\sigma$ as for $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\sigma\sigma\omicron$ instead of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ just as the Indian $\tau\sigma\eta$ *ta sya* for $\tau\sigma$ - $\sigma\iota\sigma$ instead of $\tau\omicron\iota\sigma$. In the common language the ι also has been dropped after the σ and the σ of the termination which has remained has been contracted with that of the base to $\omicron\upsilon$ hence $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ from $\tau\sigma$ - σ . The Homeric form $\alpha\sigma$ ($\text{Boreao A}\mu\iota\alpha\sigma$) belongs likewise to this place and stands for $\alpha\iota\sigma$ and thus for $\alpha\sigma\iota\sigma$ (§ 116). The Latin has transposed our $\sigma\eta$ *sya* to *jus* with the change which is so frequent of the old *a* before the final *s* to *u* (cf $\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu$ *lupu s y* $\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu\mu$ *yunymas jungimus*) hence *hu jus cu jus e-jus, illius* for *illi jus* &c. I cannot however believe that the ι of the second declension is an abbreviation of $\sigma\iota\sigma$ of which the ι alone has been retained * for it is clear that *lupi* and [G Ed p 271] *lupa* from *lupa* rest on the same principle, and if *lupi* proceeds from $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omicron\iota\sigma$ whence can *lupa* be derived as the corresponding Greek feminines nowhere exhibit an $\alpha\iota\sigma$ or $\eta\iota\sigma$?

* Hartung's Cases p 211

190 In Lithuanian the genitives of the *a* bases differ remarkably from those of the other declensions, and denote the case by *o*, in which vowel, at the same time, the final vowel of the base is contained, thus, *vilkō*, "lupi," for *vilkā-s*. It is probable that this *o* (*ō*) has arisen from *a-s*, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§ 56^b.) In old Slavonic, also, *o* occurs, answering to the Sanskrit *as*, and *nebo*, gen. *nebesē*, corresponds to the Sanskrit नभस् *nabhas*. That, however, the Lithuanian has left the syllable *as* in the nominative unaltered, but in the genitive has contracted it to *o*, may induce the remark, that like corruptions do not always find entrance in like places, if they have not raised themselves to a pervading law. In this manner, in Gothic, the old *a* has remained in the interrogative base *HVA* in the nominative (*hvas*), but in the genitive *hvi-s* the weakening to *i* has taken place; so that here, as in Lithuanian, only the more worthy powerful nominative has preserved the older more powerful form, and an unorganic difference has found its way into the two cases, which ought to be similar.

191. The Gothic has no more than the Lithuanian preserved a remnant of the more full genitive termination *syā*, and the Gothic *a* bases, in this case, resemble the *i* bases, because *a* before final *s* has, according to § 67, become weakened to *i*, thus *vulfi-s* for *vulfa-s*; as also in Old Saxon the corresponding declension exhibits *a-s* together with *e-s*, although more rarely, thus, *daga-s*, "of the day,"

[G Ed p 222.] answering to the Gothic *dagi-s*. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple *s* for case-sign, hence, *ahmin-s*, *fiyand-s*, *brōthr-s* (§ 132) The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an *a*, more lately an *i*, preceded this *s* *ahmin-as*, *fiyand-as*, *brōthr-as*,— which, as in the nominative of the *a* bases (*vulfi-s* for *vulfa-s*), has been suppressed. The Zend exhibits in the *r* roots an agreement with the Gothic, and forms, *e g* *𐬀𐬀𐬎*, *nar-s*, "of

the man" not *nara* probably on account of the nature of the *r* bordering, on that of a vowel and of its facile combination with *s*.*

19^o Feminines in Sanskrit have a fuller genitive termination in bases ending with a vowel, viz *ds* for simple *s* (see § 113) and in fact so that the [G 11 p 223] short ending bases in *ṛ* and *ṛu* may use at will either simple *s* or *ds* and in the end of *प्रियं priyaḥ* and *पतिर* also *प्रिया priyaḥ* is a *ṛu* *tanu-ds* occur. The long vowels *ṛā* *ṛī* *ṛū* † have always *ds* hence *सुखी सुखीन् ds* *मित्रं मित्रान् ds* *वृद्धं वृद्धान् ds*. This termination *ds* is in *Zend* according to § 17^o sounded *ts* hence *बाह्यन् ds* *बाह्यन् ds*. In bases in *ṛ* and *ṛu* I have not met

Hence I do not see the genitives *अज्ञानं जनानां* *दण्डं दण्डानां* *दण्डं दण्डानां* *दण्डं दण्डानां* which cannot be derived from the Sanskrit alone on account of the elsewhere occurring euphonic interchange of *s* and *r* *भार्यं ds* *भार्यान् ds* and similar forms well though *s* and *r* are and the *s* is probably for *ṛ* through the influence of the liquid and accented to *ṛ* this would have lost the genitive *s*. The same is the case with the numeral adverb *पञ्चमं ds* *पञ्चमं ds* for which the *Zend* by transposition of the *r* give *अज्ञानं जनानां* (41). The *Indic Grammar* also, in the genitives and *ṛ* *ṛu* *ṛu* *ṛu* on the absence of the genitive *s* *n* (*La hu kaumudi* p. 3). As I never see the Visarga in *भार्यं ds* (from the stem *भार्य* *ṛ* *ṛ* or *भार्य* *ṛ* *ṛ* see § 1) may evidently stand as well for *s* as for *r*; in such doubtful cases it is of no consequence to which *s* the Indian Grammarians incline when arguments are not found in the Sanskrit itself or in the cognate languages which either confirm or refute their statements. And it is impossible if the Visarga in *भार्यं ds* and *पञ्चमं ds* that the preceding *ṛ* can be in a transposition of the final letter of the base (*पञ्च उञ्*) for this cannot be both retained in the form of *r* and yet changed into *u* (cf Colbrook § 6, Item)

† Only the few monosyllabic words make an exception (*Crumm* (rit 100))

with this termination, together with $\alpha\sigma\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\omega$ *áfrító-s*, $\alpha\sigma\zeta\mu\rho$ *taneu-s*, or $\phi\gg\mu\rho$ *tanv-ó*, $\phi\gg\mu\rho$ *tanv-ó*, I find no $\epsilon\alpha\sigma\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\omega$ *áfrítthy-áo*, $\epsilon\alpha\gg\mu\rho$ *tanv-áo*. The cognate European languages exhibit no stronger termination in the feminine than in the masculine and neuter; the Gothic, however, shews a disposition to greater fulness in the feminine genitive, inasmuch as the \acute{o} bases preserve this vowel in contradistinction to the nominative and accusative; but the ϵ bases, as has been shewn above, attach Guna to this vowel, while the masculines do not strengthen it at all. Compare *gibó-s* with the uninflected and base-abbreviated nominative and accusative *giba*, and *anstar-s* with *gasti-s*. Respecting the pronominal and adjective genitives, as *thi-zó-s*, *blindar-zó-s*, see § 172. The Greek, also, in its feminine first declension preserves the original vowel length in words which have weakened the nominative and accusative— $\sigma\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, Μούσης , [G Ed. p 224] opposed to $\acute{\sigma}\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}$, $\sigma\phi\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu$, $\mu\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}\nu$ * In Latin, also, $\bar{a}-s$, with the original length of the base *escās*, *teriās*, &c stands opposed to *escā*, *escā-m*. It cannot be supposed that these genitives are borrowed from the Greek, they are exactly what might be expected to belong to a language that has *s* for the genitive character. That, however, this form, which no doubt extended originally to all *a* bases, gradually disappeared, leaving nothing but a few remains, and that the language availed itself of other helps, is in accordance with the usual fate of languages which continually lose more and more of their old hereditary possessions.

193. The Lithuanian, in its genitive *rank-ós* for *rankâ-s*,

* The Attic termination $\omega\varsigma$ is, perhaps, a perfect transmission of the Sanskrit $\acute{a}\varsigma$, so that forms like $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ answer to $\text{प्रीत्य}\acute{a}\varsigma$ *prīty áś*. Although the Greek $\omega\varsigma$ is not limited to the feminine, it is nevertheless excluded from the neuter ($\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$), and the preponderating number of ϵ bases are feminine

resembles the Gothic, and in some other cases also replaces the feminine \bar{a} by \bar{a} long or short o . It is doubtful how the genitives of i bases like *auies* are to be regarded. As they are, for the most part feminine and the few masculines may have followed the analogy of the prevailing gender the division *auies* might be made and this might be derived through the assimilative force of the i from *auis* (cf p 174 note*) which would answer to the Sanskrit genitives like $\text{प्रियं प्रियं प्रियं}$ *prity is*. If however it be compared with प्रियं प्रियं *pritēs* and the \bar{e} of *auies* be looked upon as Guna of the i (§ 26) then the reading *auies* for *auies* is objectionable. Ruhig indeed in his Glossary frequently leaves out the i and gives *ugnēs* of the fire for *ugnies* but in other cases also an i is suppressed before the e generated by its influence (p 174 note*) and e.g. all feminine bases in $i\bar{u}$ have in the genitive *es* for $i\bar{e}s$ or $y\bar{e}s$ as *giesmes* for *giesmyēs* from *GIESMYĀ* (see p 169 note). Therefore the division *auies* might also be made and it might be assumed that the i bases have in some cases, experienced an extension of the base similar to those which were explained in the note p 174 (cf § 120). This view appears to me the most correct especially as in the vocative also *auie* answers to *giesme* for *giesmye* or *giesmie*.

194 As regards the origin of the form through which in the genitive the thing designated is personified with the secondary notion of the relation of space the language, in this case returns back to the same pronoun whence in § 134 the nominative was derived. And there is a pronoun for the fuller termination also viz *स्य sya* which occurs only in the Vedas (cf § 55) and the s of which is replaced in the oblique cases likewise as in the neuter by t (Gramm Crit § 268) so that *स्य sya* stands in the same relation to त्वं त्या m and त्वं त्या t that *स sa* does to तम ta m तत ta t . It is evident therefore that in *स्य sya* त् त्या the bases *स sa* त ta are contained with the vowel suppressed and united

with the relative base πya Here follows a general view of the genitive formation

	SANSKRIT	SLAV	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m.	<i>vika-sya,</i>	<i>věhi ku-hě,</i>	<i>λύκο-ιο,</i>	. . .	<i>wilkō,</i>	<i>wulfi-s.</i>
m	<i>ka-sya,</i>	<i>ka-hě,</i>	. . .	<i>cu-gus,</i>	<i>kō,</i>	<i>hvi-s</i>
f	<i>gihūdy-ās,</i>	<i>hizvay-āo,</i>	<i>χώρῶ-ς,</i>	<i>ter rā-s,</i>	<i>rankā-s,</i>	<i>gabō-s.</i>
m	<i>patē-s,</i>	<i>patōi-s,</i>	. .	<i>hosti-s,</i>	. .	† <i>gasti-s.</i>
	<i>paty-us,</i>	. .	<i>πόσι-ος,</i>
f	<i>prīti-s,</i>	<i>āfrīlōi-s,</i>	. .	<i>siti-s,</i>	. .	† <i>anstai-s.</i>
	<i>prīty-ās,</i>	. .	<i>φύσε-ως,</i>
f.	<i>bhavishyanty-ās,</i>	<i>būshyanty āo,</i>	ṽ.
m.	<i>sūnō-s,</i>	<i>pašeu-s,</i>	<i>sunau-s,</i>	<i>sunau-s.</i>
	. .	<i>pašv-ō,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ-ος,</i>
[G. Id	f. <i>tanō-s,</i>	<i>taneu-s,</i>	. .	<i>soci ū-s,</i>	<i>handau-s.</i>
p. 226]	<i>tanv-ās,</i>	<i>tanv-ō,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ος,</i>
f	<i>radhu-ās,</i>
m f.	<i>gō-s,</i>	<i>geu-s,</i>	<i>βο(F)-ός,</i>	<i>bov-is,</i>
f.	<i>nāv-as,</i>	. .	<i>vā(F)-ός,</i>
f	<i>vāch-as,</i>	<i>vāch-ō, †</i>	<i>ὄπ-ός,</i>	<i>voc-is,</i>
m	<i>bharat-as,</i>	<i>barēnt-ō, §</i>	<i>φέρωντ-ος,</i>	<i>ferent-is,</i>	. .	<i>fiyand-is.</i>
m	<i>ātman-as,</i>	<i>aśman-ō, †</i>	<i>δαίμων-ος,</i>	<i>ser mon-is,</i>	<i>ākmen-s,</i>	<i>ahmin-s</i>
n	<i>nāmn-as,</i>	<i>nāman-ō, †</i>	<i>τάλαν-ος,</i>	<i>nomn-is,</i>	. .	<i>namn-s.</i>

• The meanings will be found in § 148

† See § 193

‡ See p 163 Note †

§ And $\beta\rho\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\varsigma$ *baratō* also may occur, according to the analogy of $\beta\rho\upsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\varsigma$ *bērēzatō*, "splendens," V S p 87, and *passim* The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted For $\beta\rho\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\varsigma$ *barantō*, also $\beta\rho\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\varsigma$ *barantō*, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older αa or ϵi In some participles, as in $\omega\gamma\gamma\upsilon\lambda\omega\delta$ *fyuyānō* (nom), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture ($\omega\gamma\gamma\upsilon\lambda\omega\delta$ *vai'tiya*) ϵi never occurs

|| Vide § 251 p 302, Note †

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC.
m	<i>bhr̥t̥tur</i>	<i>brāt̥tar s*</i>	πατρ-ος	<i>fratr̥ is</i>		<i>brothr-s</i>
f	<i>dul̥tur</i>	<i>dughdhar s †</i>	θυγατρ-ος	<i>matr̥ is</i>	<i>duḡtler s</i>	<i>dauht̥r-s</i>
m	<i>dāt̥tur</i>	<i>dāt̥tar s</i>	δοτήρ-ος	<i>dator̥ is</i>		
n	<i>vachas as</i>	<i>vachanh s ‡</i>	ἔπε(σ)ος	<i>oper̥ is</i>		

THE LOCATIVE

195 This case has in Sanskrit and Zend § 1 for its character and in Greek and Latin || has received the function of the dative yet has not suffered its locative [G Ed p 27] * signification to be lost hence Δωδῶνι, Μαραθῶνι, Σαλαμῖνι ἀγρῶ οἶκοι χαμαὶ and transferred to time τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτὶ So in Sanskrit दिवसे *divasē* 'in the day' निशित्ति *nisit̥ti* 'in the night'

196 With *wa* of the base preceding it the locative § 1 passes into *va ē* (§ 2) exactly as in Zend but here also *oi* stands for *ē* (§ 33) so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives *ἐμοί* and *σοί* in which *ι* has not yet become subscribed or been replaced by the extinction of the base vowel To the forms mentioned answers *मध्यं* *madhyā* 'in the middle' One must be careful not to regard this and similar phenomena as shewing a more intimate connexion between Greek and Zend

197 In Lithuanian which language possesses a proper locative bases in *a* correspond in this case in a remarkable manner with the Sanskrit and Zend since they con-

* It would be better to read *brothr̥ o* after the analogy of *dithr̥ creatoris* (Burnouf *Yaçna*, p 363, Note)

† The gen of *dughdar* is probably *dughder o* (see p 194 Note †)

‡ See p 163 Note †

§ Few cases admit of being more abundantly quoted in Zend than the locative with which, nevertheless Rask appears to have been unacquainted at the time of publishing his treatise, as he does not give it in any of his three paradigms

|| I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskrit dative rather than to the locative, see p 192, G Ed Note †

tract this *a* with the old locative *i*, which appears pure nowhere any more, to *ê*, hence, *dieuê*, "in God," from *DIEWA*, answers to देवे *dêiê*, श्रुषुमाश *daêvê*. The bases which terminate with other vowels employ, however, in Lithuanian, without exception, *ye* as the locative termination, without any accent upon the *e*, a circumstance which must not be overlooked. This *e* is, perhaps, only an unorganic echo, which has occasioned the change of the old locative *i* into *y*, as, in Zend, the plural locative termination *su*, by adding an *a*, appears, for the most part, in the form of स्रुषु [G Ed p 228] *shva*, or स्रुषु *hva*. To the Lithuanian *ye* answers also, in old Slavonic, a locative termination *ye*, for which several declensions have the original pure *i*, so that *nebes-i*, "in Heaven," and *imen-i*, "in the name," agree most strictly with the Sanskrit नभसि *nabhas-i* and नामनि *nâman-i*, from नभस् *nabhas*, नामन् *nâman*.

198 Masculine bases in *i* and *u*, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, वी *âu*, before which इ *i* and उ *u* are dropped, but in पति *pati*, "lord," and सखि *sakhi*, "friend," the *i* has remained in its euphonic change to य *y* hence, पतये *paty-âu* सख्यै *sakhy-âu*. If we consider the vocalization of the *s* to *u*, shewn in § 56^b, and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, औ *âu* has proceeded from आस् *âs* (§ 206), moreover, the circumstance that in the Vêdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायास् *dakshinâyâs*, "in dexterâ," for दक्षिणायाम् *dakshinâyâm*, Pânini VII 1. 39), and, finally, the fact that, in Zend, masculines in *i* and *u* likewise employ genitive terminations with a locative signification, we shall be much disposed to recognise in this औ *âu*, from आस् *âs*, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199 In *u* bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination ष *ô* (from अस् *as*), while, in a genitive meaning, the form अस् *eu-s* is more common, thus we read, in the Vend S p 337., अस्तामि *aêtaimi* अन्वो यत् अस्तामि, "in

hoc mundo quidem existente This Zend termination *o* (from *u + u*) has the same relation to the Sanskrit *du* that a short *a* has to a long *a* and the two locative terminations are distinguished only by the quantity of the first member of the diphthong. On the other hand we find in the feminine base *tanu* “body” *tanu* often the genuine locative form *tanu* and we do not doubt that in Sanskrit also originally the *u* bases of the [G Id p 290] three genders admitted in the locative the termination *u* (सुवि *sumi*-*u* तन्वि *tanu* *u* मध्वि *madhu*-*u* or मधुनि *madhu* *u* *u*) bases in *u* employ in the locative the usual genitive termination *u* thus in the Vend S p 231 *ahmi namānē yat mā-dayasnois* in *haec terra quidem mā dayasnica* which Anquetil renders by *dans le pays des mā-deiesnans*. In pronouns also though they have a locative the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning e.g. Vend S p 16 *ainhē risē* in this way or place (cf. the feminine form *ainhao* § 172 Note.)

200 From the Zend and Sanskrit we have already been compelled to acknowledge a connexion between the genitive and locative and as we have seen the locative replaced by the genitive so must we in Latin recognise a replacing of the genitive by the locative. Through the formal agreement of the corresponding Latin and Sanskrit termination and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (*Romæ Corinthi humi*) not in the third or in the plural (*ruri* not *rurus*) M Prof Rosen was first induced to characterize the Latin genitive of the two first declensions as borrowed from the old locative a view the correctness of which I do not doubt and which I have already corroborated elsewhere by the genitives of the two first persons, in which *metui* agree most surprisingly with मवि *mayi* (from *mē* *i* § 2) in me त्ववि *tuayī* (from *tuē* *i*) Or ought perhaps a double inflexion *i* to be assumed as the sign of both a genitive and

a locative dative? Should *Romæ* (from *Romæ*), *Corinthi*, be on one occasion genitives and on another locatives, and [G Ed. p 230.] in their different meaning be also of different origin? And where, then, would the origin of the genitive *Romæ* be found, as that of the locative has been found already? Should *mei, tu*, be compared, not with मयि *mayi*, त्वयि *twayi*, μοί, τοί, but with मम *mama*, तव *tava*, μου, του; Goth *meina, theina*? As the cases, like their substitutes the prepositions, pass easily from one relation of space to another, and, to use the expression, the highest become the lowest, nothing appears to me more probable, than that, after the first declension had lost its *ā-s*, then the dative, according to its origin a locative, necessarily became substituted for the genitive also. In the second declension the form *o-i*, which belongs to the dative locative, corresponding to the Greek ω, οι and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as *populoi Romano*) has become doubly altered either the vowel of the base alone, or only that [G Ed p 231] of the termination, has been left, and the first form has fixed itself in the dative, and the latter in the

‘ The assumption that a rejected *s* lies at the base of the genitives in *i, æ* (*a-i*) appears to me inadmissible, because in all other parts of Grammar—numerous as the forms with a final *s* otherwise are—this letter has in Roman defied all the assaults of time, and appears everywhere where the cognate languages lead us to expect it no *terræ* for *terras* (acc pl), no *lupi* for *lupos*, no *amæ* for *amas*, &c. The question is not here that of an occasional suppression of the *s* in old poets, before a consonant in the word following. The genitives in *e-s* and *æ-s* occurring in inscriptions (*provincie-s, suæ-s*, see Struve, p 7) appear to be different modes of writing one and the same form, which corresponds to the Greek η-s for *ā-s*, and I would not therefore derive the common genitive *suæ*—older form *suar*—from *suæs* with the *s* dropped. The genitives in *us*, given by Hartung (p 161) from inscriptions in Orelli (*nomin-us, exercitu-us, Castor-us, &c*), I am not surprised at, for this reason, that generally *us* is, in Latin, a favourite termination for अस् *as*, hence *nomin-us* has the same relation to नामस् *nāmn-as*, that *nomin-i-bus* has to नामभ्यस् *nāma'-bhyas*, and *lupus* to वृकस् *vṛika-s*

gentive which is therefore similar to the nom plural, where in like manner *Romani* stands for *Romanoi*. But the dative is not universally represented in Latin by a locative termination for in the pronouns of the two first persons *mihi* answers to मद्मम् *ma-hyam* from *ma bhyaṃ* and *tibi* to तुभ्यम् *tu bhyaṃ* as however the league between the dative and locative had been once concluded this truly dative termination occurs with a locative meaning (*tibi ubi*) while *vice versa* in Sanskrit the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative which latter however is most usually expressed by the genitive so that the proper dative is for the most part applied to denote the causal relation

201 Pronouns of the 3d person have in Sanskrit इन् *in* instead of *i* in the locative and the ञ् *a* of the appended pronoun स्म *sma* is elided (see § 165) hence तस्मिन् *tasm in* in him कस्मिन् *ksm in* in whom? This *n* which seems to me to be of later origin as it were an *νεφελακουστικον* does not extend to the two first persons and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third hence अहम् *ahmi* in this. As to the origin of the *i* signifying the place or time of continuance it is easily discovered as soon as *i* is found as the root of a demonstrative which however like the true form of all other pronominal roots has escaped the Indian Grammarians

202 Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have in Sanskrit a peculiar locative termination viz आम् *am* in which also the feminines in short *i* and *u* may at will participate (cf § 192) while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long ई *i* and ऊ *u* for आम् *am* admit also the common इ *i* hence भियाम् *bhuy am* or भियि *bhuy i* in fear from भी *bhi** In Zend this term [G Ld p 932]

* Perhaps the termination *am* is a corruption of the feminine genitive termination *ās* (cf § 198 दक्षिणायाम *dakṣiṇāy as* for *dakṣiṇājam*) where it should be observed that in Prakrit, as in Greek, a final *s* has frequently become a nasal

nation *ām* has become abbreviated to *a* (cf. § 211), hence, *yahmy-a*, “in which,” from *yahmi* (cf. §. 172). This termination appears, however, in Zend. to be less diffused than in Sanskrit, and not to be applicable to feminines in *ṣ i* and *ṣ u*. The form *tanvi* is clearly more genuine than the Sanskrit *tanū*, although from the earliest period, also, *tanvām* may have existed.

203 We here give a general view of the locative, and of the cases akin to it in Greek and Latin (see § 148).

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	HITHUAN
m	<i>vikhé,*</i>	<i>vīhrkē,*</i>	λύκω,	<i>lup'ī,</i>	<i>vilkī</i>
f.	<i>jihvāy-ām,</i>	<i>hizvay-a,</i>	χώρα,	<i>terra-i,</i>	<i>ranko-ye.</i>
m	<i>paty-āu,†</i>	. . .	πόσι-ι,	<i>host'ī,</i>	<i>gāti-ye</i>
f.	<i>prū'-āu,‡</i>	. . .	πόρτι-ι,	<i>sil'ī,</i>	<i>au-ye.</i>
f.	<i>bhavishyanty-ām, būshyanty a,</i>
m	<i>sūn'-āu,</i>	. . .	ἰχθύ-ι,	<i>pecu-ī,</i>	<i>sunu-ye</i>
f.	<i>tan'-āu,§</i>	<i>tanu-i,</i>	πίτυ-ι,	<i>soeia-ī,</i>	. . .
n.	<i>madhu-n-i,</i>	. . .	μέθυ-ι,
f	<i>vadhv-ām,</i>
m.f	<i>gar-i,</i>	<i>gar-i,</i>	βο(F)-ί,	<i>boi-ī,</i>	. . .
f	<i>nār-i,</i>	. . .	νᾶ(F)-ί,
m	<i>bharat-i,</i>	<i>barēnt-i,</i>	φέρωντ-ι,	<i>ferent-ī,</i>	. . .
m	<i>ātman-i,</i>	<i>ašmain-i,</i>	δαίμον-ι,	<i>seimon-ī,</i>	. . .
n.	<i>nāmn-i,</i>	<i>nāmain-i,</i>	τάλαν-ι,	<i>nomin-ī,</i>	. . .
m	<i>bhrātā-i,</i>	<i>bhāthr-i? </i>	πατρ-ί,	<i>fratr-ī,</i>	. . .
f.	<i>duhitar-i,</i>	<i>dughdhēr-i? </i>	θυγατρ-ί,	<i>matr-ī,</i>	. . .
m	<i>dātar-i,</i>	<i>dāthr-i? </i>	δοτήρ-ι,	<i>datōr-ī,</i>	. . .
n.	<i>vachas-i,</i>	<i>vacanh-i,</i>	ἔπε(σ)-ι,	<i>oper-ī,</i>	. . .

* See § 196 † See § 198 ‡ Or *prīty-ām* § Or *tanu-ām*

|| The rejection of the *a* preceding the *i* in the theme seems to me more probable than its retention. The *i* of the termination is guaranteed by the other consonantal declension, which in this case we can abundantly enough exemplify (Regarding *dughdhēr-i*, see p 194, Note †) That in Sanskrit *bhīātā-i*, *duhitar-i*, *dātā-i*, are used instead of *bhīātī*, &c is contrary

VOCATIVE

204 The vocative in the Sanskrit family of languages has either no case sign at all or is identical with the nominative the former is the principle the latter the practical corruption and is limited in Sanskrit to monosyllabic bases terminating in a vowel hence भीस् *bhis* fear! as κίς A final *a* of the nominal [G Ed p 234] bases remains in Sanskrit and Zend, unchanged, in Lithuanian it is weakened to *e* and the Greek and Latin also in the uninflected vocative of the corresponding declension prefer a short *e* to *o* or *u* which under the protection of the terminations appears as the final letter of the base We must avoid seeing in *λυκε lype* case terminations these forms have the same relation to वृक *vr̥ka* that *πεντε quinque* have to पञ्च *pancha* and the old *a* which appears in *λυκος* as *o* in *lupus* as *u* has assumed the form of *e* without any letter following it In Zend the consonantal bases when they have *s* in the nominative retain it in the vocative also thus in the present participle we have frequently found the form of the nominative in the sense of the vocative

205 Bases in *i* and *u* have in Sanskrit Guna neuters however have also the pure vowel on the other hand

to the theory of the weakest cases (§ 130) to which in other respects the locative belongs As however bases in अर् *ar* (अृ *ri*) with respect to the rejection and lengthening of the *a* have a very great agreement with bases in *an* it must here be further remarked, that these too in the locative do not strictly follow the suppression of the *a* in the weakest cases which is conditionally prescribed in § 140 but optionally retain the *a* or reject it so that with *namn i* also *nāman i* is used With *brātar i* however exists no *blratr i* and the form *pitr i* given at § 10² is an oversight the Greek *πατρ* may therefore with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative *ptr e*

polysyllabic feminines in \acute{e} and \acute{u} shorten this final vowel, while a final $-a\acute{t}$ \acute{u} , by the commixture of an i , becomes \acute{e} (§ 2) The language, however, both by producing and shortening the final vowel, clearly aims at one and the same end, only by opposite ways, and this end, in fact, is a certain emphasis in the address To the Guna form $\text{सुनो } \acute{o}$, from $a+u$, correspond remarkably the Gothic and Lithuanian, as *sunau*, *sunaũ*, resembling the Sanskrit $\text{सूनो } súnó$,* Gothic feminine bases in i do not occur in [G Ed p 235] Ulfilas in the vocative as, however, they, in other respects, run parallel to the u bases, the vocative *anstar*, from *ANSTI*, might be expected as an analogous form to *handau* The Lithuanian i bases in the vocative extend their theme in the same manner as in the genitive (§ 193), so that, properly, there is no vocative of this class of words, and *auie* answers to *zuáke*, *giesme* (Ruhg's third declension), for *zuákrie*, *giesmye* † Masculine bases, in Gothic, in i , like the masculine and neuter a bases, have lost their final vowel in the vocative, just as in the accusative and nominative, hence *vulf**, *daur**, *gast*' In bases in n the Gothic shares with the Latin the suppression of the final consonant, which has passed over from the nominative to the vocative, while only the Sanskrit and Zend again introduce

* The Zend can at will attach Guna to a final $\gt u$, or not; and we find both $\text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \textit{mamyó}$ and $\text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \textit{mamyu}$ as the vocative of $\text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \textit{mamyu}$, "spirit" On the other hand, we have found a final $\text{𐬀} i$ only, without Guna; and indeed frequently $\text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \textit{partu}$, "lord" So Vend S p 456, $\text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \text{𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀} \text{𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬀} \textit{ušihusta namánó-partu}$, "Arise, lord of the place!" The $\text{𐬀} i$ between the preposition and the verb serves as a conjunctive vowel, to assist the juncture of the words (cf. § 150 Note)

† It follows from this, and from § 193, that (§ 177) I have incorrectly assumed *ei* as the termination in the dative For *áwi-ei*, the division should be made thus, *áwie-i*, and this is analogous with *zuáke-i*, *giesme-i*, for *zuákrie-i*, *giesmye-i*

into the vocative the nasal which had been dropped in the nominative. Adjectives in German with respect to the vocative have departed from the old path and retain the case sign of the nominative hence Gothic *blind's* blind! In Old Northern substantives also follow this irregular use of the nominative sign. The Greek has preserved a tolerable number of its vocatives pure from the nominative sign and in some classes of words uses the bare base or that abbreviation of it which the laws of euphony or effeminacy rendered requisite hence *ταλαν* opposed to *ταλας* *χαριεν* for *χαριειτ* opposed to *χαριεις* *παί* for *παιδ* opposed to *παίς*. In guttural and labial bases the language has not got free of the nominative sign in the vocative because *κς* and *πς* (*ξ ψ*) are very favourite combinations to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the [G Ed p 236] vocative *αια* together with *ἄναξ* is remarkable and has that sound which might be expected from a theme *ἄιακτ* to which, in its uninflected state neither *κτ* nor conveniently even the *κ* could be left. For the rest it is easy to imagine (says Buttmann p 180) that particularly such things as are not usually addressed prefer when they happen to be addressed to retain the form of the nominative as *ὦ ποῦς*! * The Latin has followed still further the road of corruption in the vocative which was prepared by the Greek and employs in its place the nominative universally except in the masculine second declension. The substantive bases mentioned in § 148 form in the vocative

* To this circumstance may also the re-introduction of the case sign in the neuter be owing while the Sanskrit employs the bare base. Moreover this fact also may have co-operated towards the Greek more easily freeing itself in the vocative from the bare primary form because it appears at the beginning of compounds much more rarely than in Sanskrit (See § 112)

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	HEBREW	GOTHIC
m.	<i>vikā,</i>	<i>vēhka,</i>	<i>λύκε,</i>	<i>lūpe,</i>	<i>wille,</i>	<i>vulf'</i>
n.	<i>dāna,</i>	<i>dāta,</i>	<i>δῶρο-ν,</i>	<i>donu-m,</i>	.	<i>dauī'.</i>
f.	<i>jihvā,</i>	<i>hizvā?</i>	<i>χώρα,</i>	<i>terra,</i>	<i>ṛanka,</i>	<i>giba?</i>
m.	<i>pātē,</i>	<i>paiti,</i>	<i>πόσι,</i>	<i>hosti-s,</i>	.. .	<i>gast'.</i>
f.	<i>prītē,</i>	<i>āfiīti,</i>	<i>πόρτι,</i>	<i>siti-s,</i>
n.	<i>vāri,</i>	<i>vairi,</i>	<i>ἴδρι,</i>	<i>mare,</i>
f.	<i>bhaviṣhyanti,</i>	<i>būshyanti,</i>
m.	<i>sunō,</i>	<i>paśu,</i>	<i>ἰχθύ,</i>	<i>pecu-s,</i>	<i>sunau,</i>	<i>sunau</i>
f.	<i>tanō,</i>	<i>tanu,</i>	<i>πίτυ,</i>	<i>sociu-s,</i>		<i>handau</i>
[G. Ed p 237.] n.	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>madhu,</i>	<i>μέθυ,</i>	<i>pecu,</i>	.	.
f.	<i>vadhū,</i>	
m. f	<i>gāu-s,</i>	<i>gāu-s,</i>	<i>βοῦ,</i>	<i>bo-s,</i>	..	.
f	<i>nāu-s,</i>	..	<i>ναῦ,</i>
f	<i>vāc,</i>	<i>vāc-s?</i>	<i>ὄπ-s,</i>	<i>voi-s,</i>	.	.
m	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	<i>φέρων,</i>	<i>feren-s,</i>	<i>sukan-s,</i>	<i>fiyand.</i>
m.	<i>ātman,</i>	<i>aśman,</i>	<i>δαίμων,</i>	<i>sermo',</i>	<i>ākmū',</i>	<i>ahma'.</i>
n.	<i>nāman,</i>	<i>nāman,</i>	<i>τάλαν,</i>	<i>nomen,</i>	.	<i>namō'.</i>
m	<i>brātār,</i>	<i>brātārē,'</i>	<i>πάτερ,</i>	<i>frater,</i>	<i>brōthar</i>
f	<i>duhitar,</i>	<i>dughdharē,*</i>	<i>θύγατερ,</i>	<i>mater,</i>	<i>mote,</i>	<i>dauhtar</i>
m	<i>dātār,</i>	<i>dātāre,</i>	<i>δοτήρ,</i>	<i>dator,</i>
n	<i>vachas,</i>	<i>vachō,</i>	<i>ἔπος,†</i>	<i>opus,</i>

DUAL

NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.

206 These three cases have, in Sanskrit, in the masculine and feminine, the termination *-āi āu*, which probably arose from *आस् ās* by vocalization of the *s* (cf §§ 56^b. and 198), and is therefore only a stronger form of the plural termination *as*. The dual, both in the cases mentioned and in the others, prefers the broadest terminations, because it is based on a more precise intention than the indefinite

* See § 44

† See § 128

bulary (p. 456), writes *naerekeriáo*, and renders by "*deux femmes*," can be nothing else than $\xi\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\gamma$ *náurikay-áo*, from the base $\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\gamma$ *náuriká*. The form $\xi\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\gamma$ *náurikayáo* is, however, evidently more genuine than $\xi\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\gamma$ *náuriké*, as, according to the Sanskrit principle (§ 213.), from a feminine base must have been formed *náuriká*. From $\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *bázu*, Rask cites the form $\xi\omega\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *bázváo*, "aims," without remarking that it is a dual it clearly belongs, however, to this number, which was to be expected referring to the aims, and $\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *bázu* forms, in the nominative plural, $\psi\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *bázvó* or $\psi\gamma\sigma\omega\omega\omega$ *bázavó*. Still, in the edited parts of the Zend-Avesta, examples are wanting of *bázváo*, regarding the genuineness of which, however, I have no doubt.

208 In the Vêda dialect, the termination $\text{अी} \acute{a}u$ occurs frequently abbreviated to *á*, so that the last element of the diphthong is suppressed. Several examples of this abbreviated form occur in Rosen's "Specimen", as, $\text{अश्विन} \acute{a}śvin-á$, "the two *Áśvins*," from *áśvin*, and $\text{नर} \acute{n}ar-á$, "two [G Ed p 240] men," which can be derived both from *nar*

replacing the dual in all cases by the plural. Thus we read, l c p 211, *haurvatát-ó* and *amēřēt-áś-cha* as accusative, and with the fullest and perhaps sole correct reading of the theme. We will, however, not dwell on this point any longer here, but only remark, that *haurvatát* is very frequently abbreviated to *haurvat*, and the *á* of *amēřētát* is often found shortened, whence, p 104, $\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *haurvatbya*, $\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *amēřētatbya*, (see § 38), $\omega\sigma\sigma\omega\gamma\sigma\gamma\sigma\omega\omega$ *amēřētata bya* is a palpable error. Undoubtedly, in the passage before us, for *hurváoścha*, must be read either *haurvatáoścha*, or *haurvatátáoścha*, or *haurvatatáoścha*. Compare l c p 91, $\omega\gamma\sigma\sigma\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega\omega$ *hadívatatús-cha* with the termination $\omega\omega\omega$ *ús* for $\omega\omega\omega$ *ús* (cf. § 33), but incorrectly ψ *ó* for ψ *ó*. The two twin gems are feminine, and mean apparently, "Entireness" and "Immortality". The forms preceding them, therefore, *tói* and *ubál*, are likewise feminine, the former for $\text{ते} \acute{t}é$ (§ 33.), the latter for $\text{उभे} \acute{u}bhé$ (cf § 28). We must also regard the dual form mentioned at §. 45 of the so-called *Amschaspants* not as neuter, but as feminine.

(*ṭṛṛi*) and from *nara* but which more probably comes from *nar*. In Zend the abbreviated termination from *du* is likewise employed, and in fact more copiously than the fuller termination and we rejoice to see in the Heaven of Ormuzd also the twin pair called Indian and celebrated for their youthful beauty. We read namely in Vend S p 313 $\mu\alpha\alpha\zeta\omega\zeta\omega\zeta$ $\psi\mu\alpha\alpha\zeta\omega\zeta$ $\alpha\pi\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\alpha$ *aspinā cha yaianō ya-* (*midha*), *Asimusque juvenes teneramur* which Anquetil renders by *je fais Jezehn a l'excellent toujours (subsistant)*. The Sanskrit $\alpha\sigma\pi\alpha$ *aspinā* however can in Zend give nothing but *aspinā* or *aspinā* (§ 30) the former we owe here to the protecting particle $\alpha\pi$ *cha* (see p 173 Note † G Ed). The plural *yaian-ō* (from *yaianas*) referring to the dual *aspinā* is worthy of remark however (if the reading be correct) as it furnishes a new proof that in the received condition of the Zend, the dual was *nar* being lost the verb being for the most part found in the plural when referring to nouns in the dual form.

209 From the Vedā termination *ā* and the short *a** which frequently stands for it in Zend the transition is easy to the Greek *e* as this vowel at the end of words is a favourite representative of the old *ā* and as above in the vocative (§ 201) $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\epsilon$ stood for $\tau\upsilon\kappa\alpha$ *irika* $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\omega\epsilon\lambda\eta$ *ehrīā* so here also $\alpha\iota\delta\theta\alpha$ (with euphonic *o*) corresponds to the above mentioned Vedā $\eta\alpha$ *narā* and Zend $\alpha\mu\alpha\mu$ *nar a*. Although according to § 1, ω also very frequently stands for α still we must avoid regarding $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$ as the analogous form to $\tau\upsilon\kappa\alpha$ *irika* or $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\omega\epsilon\lambda\eta$ *ehrīā* (see § 211). That however, the Lithuanian dual *u* of masculine [C 11 p 211] bases in *a* (in the nominative) is connected with the Vedā and Zend dual termination spoken of *e* has proceeded from *u* I

* Thus, Vendidad Side p 23 $\mu\alpha\alpha\mu\theta\omega\zeta\epsilon\zeta\alpha$ $\mu\alpha\alpha\mu\mu\mu\mu$ *tauriat amereta*, "the two Haurvats and Amertats", p 130 and frequently $\alpha\mu\alpha\mu$ *dia nara* "two men". Cf Gramm Crit Ald to r 137

have the less doubt, because in the other declensions the Lithuanian dual also agrees in this case most strictly with the Sanskrit, and the Lithuanian *u* or *û* (*uo*) is, in some other places, equally the representative of an old *á* (sec § 162), compare, *dūmi*, or *dūdu*, "I give," with दासि *dadāmi*, *dūsu*, "I will give," with दास्यामि *dāsyāmi*. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in *a* sound in the dual *û*, thus *tû* = तौ *tā*, *hû* = हौ. We hold, therefore, the Vêda form वृकौ *vikā*, the Zend *vřhikā*, and the Lithuanian *wilkū*, as identical in principle. We are, at least, much more inclined to this view of the matter than to the assumption that the *u* of *wilkū* is the last portion of the Sanskrit diphthong औ *áu*, and that *wilkū* belongs to the form वृकौ *vikāu*. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter *u*, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable thus *wilkū*, opposed to *wilkū*, in which respect may be compared पातरु opposed to पाτηρ, and § 205.

210 Masculine and feminine bases in *i* and *u* suppress, in Sanskrit, the dual case termination औ *áu*, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form, thus, पति *patí*, from पति *pati*, सूनू *sūnū*, from सूनू *sūnu*. The *bāzv-āo*, "arms," (from *bāzu*) mentioned in § 207., is advantageously distinguished from these abbreviated forms. The curtailed form is not, however, wanting in Zend also, and is even the one most in use. From *mainyu*, "spirit," we frequently find the dual *mainyū* on the other hand, for *ěřezū*, "two [G Ed p 242] fingers," we meet with the shortened form *ěřezu*, which is identical with the theme (Vend S p 318, *dva ěřezu*).

211 The Lithuanian, in its *i* and *u* bases, rests on the above-mentioned Sanskrit principle of the suppression of the termination and lengthening of the final vowel hence, *auì*, "two sheep" (fem), answers to अवी *avī*, from अवि *avi*; and *sunū*, "two sons," to सूनू *sūnū*. On this principle rests

also the Greek dual of the two first declensions. If it be not desired entirely to remove the ω of $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$ from a Grecian soil and banish it completely to India it may be allowed to seek its origin not in the long a of वृका *vrīkā* but in the short o of the base as the first declension has a long α in the dual because its bases terminate with α , although in the common dialect this letter is very frequently represented by η . Or may it perhaps have happened that in the dual α of the first declension an i subscribed has been lost, and thus $\tau\alpha$ for $\tau\alpha i$ would correspond to the Sanskrit ते *tē* (from $tā + i$ or i)². Be that as it may still the dual has always the quality α because it is comprehended in the base and the ω of $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$ may be regarded as merely the lengthening of the o of $\lambda\upsilon\kappa o$ for it must be assumed that if the Sanskrit a bases had preserved the short α in Greek and वृकस *vrīka s* had become $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha s$ then the dual too would be $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\alpha$, and not $\lambda\upsilon\kappa\omega$.

212 Neuters have in the Sanskrit dual for the termination of the cases under discussion not औ *au* but ५ as in the plural they have not *as* but short i (इ). A final स a of the base with this इ i passes into ए $ē$ (§ 2) hence शते *sate* two hundred from शतई *sata i* [G Ed I 243] other vowels interpose a euphonic n hence तलुनी *talu n i* two pātes. In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in the a bases as for example we frequently find सतै *satē* (§ 11) answering to the Sanskrit शते *satē* and दुयै *duyē* सतै *sa-tē* two thousand (§ 43) for द्वे सहस्रे *duē sahasrē*.

213 The Greek has renounced a termination distinguishing the neuter from the two natural genders but the Sanskrit appears to have extended the neuter i mentioned above also to the feminine a bases. But the coincidence of the feminine form जिह्वे *jihvē* two tongues from जिह्वी *jihvī* with the neuter दाने *dānē* two gifts is as the Zend instructs us only external and the two forms

meet in quite different ways, and have such a relation to one another, that in *dānē*, from *dāna* + *i*, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained, - but in *𐬨𐬀 jihuē* the masculine-feminine termination *āu* (from *ās*, § 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form *𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀*, *nāirikay-āo*, "two women" I believe, that is to say, that *𐬨𐬀 jihuē* has arisen or been corrupted from *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 jihuway-āu** in such a manner, that after the termination has been dropped, the preceding semi-vowel has returned to its vowel nature, and has become a diphthong with the *ū* of the base (see § 2. and cf. p. 121 G. ed). The dual *jihwē*, therefore, like the Gothic singular dative *gībar* (§ 161.) would have only an apparent termination, *i e.* an extension of the base which originally accompanied the real case termination. In Zend, however, the abbreviated feminine dual form in *𐬎 ē* likewise occurs (§ 207. Note†), and is, indeed, the prevalent one, but it is

[G. Ed p 244] remarkable, and a fair and powerful confirmation of my assertion, that even this abbreviated form in *𐬎 ē*, where the appended particle *𐬎𐬀 cha* stands beside it, has preserved the case sign *ś*, and, as above, *𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *amēretat-āos-cha*, "the two Amēttats," so we find, Vend. S p 58, *𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *amēshes-cha śpēntē*, "and two Amshaspants" ("non-conniventesque sanctos," cf *𐬎𐬎𐬀 amisha* and *Nalus V 25, 26* and see § 50) | The form *𐬎𐬎 ēs* is to be deduced from the full form *𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 ay-āos*, so that, after dropping the *𐬎𐬀 āo*, the preceding *ay* must have been contracted to *ē*, just as (p 121

* Cf the dual genitive and locative *𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 jihuway-ās*

† The MS has here *𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 amēšēsha*, but *ē* frequently occurs -- in the place of *𐬎*, although, as it appears, through an error Cf I c p 38, *𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀 𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *aurē yašnō amēšē śpēntē*, and see § 51



	SANSKRIT	ZLND	GRIEK	ITHIR ANIAN
[G. Ed p 246]	m. <i>vīkáu,</i> <i>vīkā,</i>	<i>vēhrkáo,</i> <i>vēhrká,*</i>	. . <i>λύκω,</i>	. N. <i>uilkū,</i> V. <i>uilkū.</i>
n.	<i>dānē,</i>	<i>dātē,</i>	<i>δώρω,</i>	.
f.	<i>hēzvay-āo,</i>
	<i>jihvē,</i>	<i>hivvē,</i>	<i>χώρᾱ,</i>	N. <i>rānkī,</i> V. <i>rānkī</i>
[G. Ed p 247]	m. <i>paī,</i>	<i>pauī?</i>	<i>πόσι-c,</i>	N. <i>paī,</i> V. <i>pāi</i>
f.	<i>piī,</i>	<i>āfrīī?</i>	<i>πόρτι-c,</i>	N. <i>auī,</i> N. <i>āwi.</i>
n.	<i>vīvī-ī,</i>	<i>ἰδρι-c,</i>	.

* While consonantal bases occur in the dual both with a long and a short *a*, the *a* bases, contrary to the practice otherwise adopted of shortening a final *ā*, exhibit in the nom. acc. dual, for the most part, the original long vowel. I deduce this, among other words, from the so-called *Amshaspants*, which, together with the feminine form noticed at § 207 Note †, are found also as masculine, e.g. Vend S pp 14 30, 31, &c. *αμσρησασ* *μσασρησασ* *ἡμσρησασ* *μσρησασ* *amīshā spēntā hūcsathrā hudāonhō āylēšē*, "I glorify the two Amshaspants (non connentesque sanctos) the good rulers, who created good." If *amēsha spēntā* and *hūcsathrā* were plural forms, the final *a* would be short, or at least appear much more frequently short than long; while, on the contrary, these repeatedly recurring expressions, if I mistake not, have everywhere a long *a*, and only in the vocative a short *a* (Vend S p 67 Cf § 209). That the epithet *hudāonhō* is in the plural cannot incur doubt, from the dual nature of the *Amshasp* (cf §. 208.) this resembles, to a certain degree, the use of adjective genitives referring to a substantive in the ablative, which was mentioned in § 180. We find, also, the forms *amēshāo spēntāo* (Vend S p 313), which indeed might also be feminine plural forms, but shew themselves only as masculine duals, in the same meaning as the so frequent *amēshā spēntā*. We find also, frequently, *σπηνιστᾱσ* *αμσρησασ* *spēnistā manyū,* "the two most holy spirits" (p 80), through which the dual form in *ā* of bases in *a* is likewise confirmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, Whether generally only two *Amshaspants* are to be assumed? whether the genitive plural (*amēshanamm spēntanamm*), and sometimes also the accusative plural, is only the representative of the dual, which is very uncertain and shaken in its use? whether under the name *Amshaspants*, perhaps, we should always understand the Genii *Haurovat* (*Khordad*) and *Ameštāt*

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LITHUANIAN
* f	<i>bhāiṣhyanty-āu, bīṣhyantī</i>			
m	<i>sūnū</i>	<i>pasu</i>	<i>ιχθυ-ε</i>	N <i>sūnū</i> V <i>sūnu</i>
f	<i>tanū</i>	<i>tanū</i>	<i>πιτυ ε</i>	
m	<i>madhū n r</i>		<i>μεθυ-ε</i>	
f	<i>radhw-āu</i>			
m f	<i>qav āu *</i>		<i>βο(F) ε</i>	
f	<i>nav-āu</i>		<i>νᾶ(F) ε</i>	
f	<i>radh āu</i>	<i>radh to</i>		

Amertat and whether these two Genū according to the principle of the Sanskrit copulative compounds have the dual termination for this reason alone that they are usually found together and are together two? whether in fine these two twin genū are identical with the Indian Aswinen which were referred in § 203 to the Zend Avesta? The reply to all these queries lies beyond the aim of this book. We will here only notice that Vend 5 pp 80 and 492 the Genū *Haurvat* and *Amertat* although each is in the dual still are, together named *اسرئوژدو* *aspenista mainyu mazda ter hi &c* the two most holy spirits the great strong. As Genū and natural object of great indefinite number where they are praised often have the word *uspa* 'all', before them it would be important to shew whether all *Amsaspants* are never mentioned and the utter incompatibility of the *Amsā* with the word *uspa* would then testify the impassable duality of these Genū. If they are identical with the celestial physicians the Indian Aswinen then 'Entireness and Immortality' would be no unsuitable names for them. In Panini we find (p 803) the expressions *मतरापितरौ* *matarā pitarāu* and *पितरामतरौ* *pitara mutarā* marked as peculiar to the Vedas. They signify the parents but, literally they probably mean two mothers two fathers and two fathers two mothers. For the first member of the compound can here scarcely be aught but the abbreviated dual *pitara, m tarā* and if this is the case we should here have an analogy to the conjectured signification of *haurvat a* and *am r tat a*.

* Bases in *औ* form the strong cases (§ 199) from *औ* *āu* those in *अन्* *an* and nouns of the agent in *तर* *tar*, lengthen in those cases, with the exception of the vocative singular, the last vowel but one (see § 144)

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	HEBREW
	<i>vāch-ā</i> ,*	<i>vāch-a</i> ,	<i>ὄπι-ε</i> ,	.
[G Ed p 248.]	m. <i>bharant-āu</i> ,	<i>barant-āo</i> ,	.	.
	<i>bharant-ā</i> ,	<i>burant-a</i> ,	<i>φίροιτ-ε</i> .	..
m.	<i>ātman-āu</i> ,	<i>ašman-āo</i> ,
	<i>ātman-ā</i> ,	<i>ašman-a</i> ,	<i>δαίμον-ε</i> ,	N. V. <i>ákmén-u</i>
n.	<i>nāmn-ī</i> ,	. . .	<i>τάλαν-ε</i> ,	
m	<i>bhrātar-āu</i> ,	<i>brātar-āo</i> ,	.	.
	<i>bhrātar-ā</i>	<i>brātar-a</i> ,	<i>πατίρ-ε</i> ,	
f	<i>duhitar-āu</i> ,	<i>dughdhar-āo</i> ,	.	.
	<i>duhitar-ā</i> ,	<i>dughdhar-a</i> ,	<i>θυγατίρ-ε</i> ,	.
m.	<i>dātār-āu</i> ,†	<i>dātār-ao</i> ,
	<i>dātār-ā</i> ,	<i>dātār-a</i> ,	<i>δοτήρ-ε</i> ,	...
n	<i>vachas-ī</i> ,	. . .	<i>ἴπε(σ)-ε</i> ,	.

INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE.

215. These three cases have in the Sanskrit and Zend dual a common termination; while in Greek the genitive has joined itself to the dative, and borrowed its termination from it. It is in Sanskrit *भ्याम् bhyām*, which in Zend has been abbreviated to *bya*. Connected with the same is, first, the termination *भ्यम् bhyam*, which, in the pronoun of the two first persons, denotes the dative singular and plural, but in the singular of the first person has become abbreviated to *ह्यम् hyam* (§ 23). This abbreviation appears, however, [G Ed p 249] to be very ancient, as the Latin agrees

* The Vêda duals in *ā* are as yet only cited in bases in *a*, *n*, and *av* (ऋ, § 1), however, the Zend leads us to expect their extension to the other consonantal declensions, as also the circumstance that, in other parts of grammar, in the Vêdas *ā* is occasionally found for *āu*, and other diphthongs, e g *नाभा nābhā*, as locative for *नाभौ nābhāu*, from *नाभि nābhi*. "navel"

† See the marginal note marked (), p 229.

remarkably with it, and *mi hi* corresponds to मयम् *ma hyam* as *tu bi* does to तुभ्यम् *tu bhyam*. In the second place भ्यम् *bhyas* which expresses the dative and ablative plural is pronounced in Zend *byθ* (§ 56^b) in Latin *bus* suppressing the *y* and with the usual change of *as* into *us*. The Lithuanian has *mus* for *bus* in the dative plural (§ 63) this more complete form has however remained only in the pronoun of the two first persons where *mu mus nobis* * *tu mus vobis* are used as well as *mu m s tu m s* while in all other words we find simply *ms* as the sign of the dative—*uilla ms* &c. In the dual dative the Lithuanian has only the *m* of the Sanskrit termination भ्याम् *bhyām* as *uilla m*. Thus *m* is however not the final letter of *bhyām* but the initial labial *b* in a nasal form (§ 63)* to *mi* at least it appears improper to regard this dual termination otherwise than that of the cognate plural case, and I have no doubt of the identity of the *m* of *uilla-m* λυκοι^v with that of *uilla ms* (for *uilla mus*) λυκοι^s. According to this explanation therefore the German plural dative corresponds to the Lithuanian dual dative *uifsa m gasti m sunu m †*

216 A third form related to the dual termination भ्याम् *bhyām* is भिस् *bhis* as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend *bi*

* On the facile transition of *ι* into *m* (cf p 114) rests also, I doubt not the connexion of the termination युवाम् *yuvām* 'ye two' *uivām* we two with the common termination *ām* before vowels *ai* which in the pronouns spoken of has stiffened into *am* and in this form has remained even before consonants. Whether the case is the same with the verbal third dual person ताम् *tām* shall be discussed hereafter.

† Cf Grimm, I 8 8 17 where the identity of the Lithuanian German inflection *m* with the *b* (*bh* of the older languages) was first shown. When however Grimm l c, says of the Lithuanian that only the pronouns and adjectives have *ms* in the dative plural the substantives simply *m* this is perhaps a mistake or the plural is named instead of the dual for Ruhg gives *ponams* 'dominus, alius oculus &c

(also भिस *bis*), has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablative,* which must together supply the place of the instrumental, while in Lithuanian, with the exchange of the labial medial for the nasal of this organ (§ 63.), *mis* is the property of the instrumental alone, so that *puli-mis* answers to पतिभिस् *pali-bhis*, पुलिभिस *puli-bis*

217 I have already elsewhere affirmed, that the Greek termination $\phi\iota$, $\phi\iota\nu$, is to be referred to this place,† and what is there said may be introduced here also. If $\phi\iota\nu$, and not $\phi\iota$, be assumed to be the elder of the two forms, we may offer the conjecture that it has arisen from $\phi\iota\varsigma$, following the analogy of the change of $\mu\varsigma$ into $\mu\nu$ in the 1st person plural, which corresponds to the Sanskrit *mas* and Latin *mus*, $\phi\iota\varsigma$ would correspond to the Sanskrit *bhis* and Latin *bis*, in *nobis*, *vobis*. Perhaps, also, there originally existed a difference between $\phi\iota$ and $\phi\iota\nu$ (which we find used indifferently for the singular and plural), in that the former may have belonged to the singular, the latter to the plural, and they may have had the same relation to one another that, in Latin, *bi* has to *bis* in *tibi* and *vobis*; and that, in Lithuanian, *mi* has to *mis* in *akimi*, “through the eye,” and *akimis*, “through the eyes.” It has escaped notice that the terminations $\phi\iota$ and $\phi\iota\nu$ belong principally to the dative their locative and instrumental use αυτόφι , θύρηφι , βίηφι is explained by the fact, that the common dative also has assumed the sign of these relations. The strict genitive use of the termination $\phi\iota$, $\phi\iota\nu$, may perhaps be altogether denied; for if prepositions, which are elsewhere used in construction with the

* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (*no-bis*, *vo-bis*), where *bis* supplies the place of the *bis* which proceeds from भिस *bhis*

† Trans Berlin Academy, 1826. Comparison of Sanskrit with its cognate languages, by Prof Bopp. Essay III. p 81

‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskrit instrumental termination *bhis* has been, in Pîâkîit, corrupted to हिं *han*

genitive occur also with the case in $\phi\iota$ $\phi\iota\nu$, we are not compelled on this account to regard the latter as the genitive or representative of the genitive. In general all prepositions, which are used in construction with the genitive would according to the sense be better used with an ablative or a locative if these cases were particularly represented in Greek. The suffix $\thetaεν$ also of genuine ablative signification expressing separation from a place is incorrectly considered to represent the genitive termination where the latter in the common dialect, has received the sign of the lost ablative. In $\delta\sigmaσε$ $\deltaακρυοφιν$ $\pi\mu\pi\lambdaαντο$ $\deltaακρυοφιν$ would in Sanskrit be rendered by अश्रुभिः *asrubhis* the relation is entirely instrumental and is not changed because the verb mentioned is more usually though less suitably used with the genitive. The same is the case with $\delta\sigmaσε$ $\deltaακρυοφιν$ $τερσαιτο$. In $\text{Ιλιοφι κλυτα τειχεα}$ it is not requisite to make Ιλιοφι governed by τειχεα but it may be regarded as locative *to Ilium*. And in Od XII 45 ($\text{πολυς δ' αμφοστροφιν θις ανδρων πυθομενων}$) there is no necessity to look upon οστροφιν as the genitive for it can be aptly rendered by *ossibus*. I know no passages besides where a genitive meaning could be given to forms in $\phi\iota$ and $\phi\iota\nu$. To the accusative likewise the form $\phi\iota$ $\phi\iota\nu$ is foreign and according to its origin does not suit it nor does it appear in the train of prepositions which elsewhere occur with the accusative with the single exception of $\epsilonς$ $\text{\acute{\epsilon}\nuνηφιν}$ in Hesiod (cf Buttmanu p 205). As to the opinion [G Fd p 25^o] of the old Grammarians that $\phi\iota$ $\phi\iota\nu$ may stand also in the nominative and vocative and as to the Impropriety of the ι subscribed before this termination in the dative singular of the first declension we refer the reader to what Buttmanu (p 205) has rightly objected on this head.

218 The neuters in Σ mentioned in § 128 are nearly the only ones from bases ending with a consonant which occur in combination with $\phi\iota$ $\phi\iota\nu$ in forms like $\delta\chiεσ\phi\iota$

ὄρσσο-φιν, στήθεσσο-φιν, which have been misunderstood, because the Σ dropped before vowel terminations was not recognised as the property of the base. Of the other consonants, ν is the only one, and ΚΟΤΥΛΗΔΟΝ the only ν base, which occurs in combination with φιν, and since Ν does not combine with Φ so readily as Σ, it assumes an auxiliary vowel ο—κοτυληδόν-ο-φιν after the analogy of compound words like κυν-ο-θαρσής. This example is followed, without the necessity for it however, by δάκρυ δακρυόφιν, while ναύ-φιν, in an older point of view, resembles exactly the Sanskrit नौभिस् *nāubhis*; for in compounds, also, the base ΝΑΥ keeps free from the conjunctive vowel ο, on which account ναύσταθμον may be compared with Sanskrit compounds like नौस्थ *nāu-stha*, “standing (being) in the ship”

219. But to return to the Sanskrit dual termination भ्याम् *bhyām*, it is further to be remarked, that before it a final स् *a* is lengthened, hence, वृकाभ्याम् *vṛkābhyaām* for वृकभ्याम् *vṛkabhyām*. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस् *bhis*; and that hence, from वृक *vṛka* also *vṛkā-bhis* would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to वृकैस् *vṛkaiś*, which is easily derived from *vṛkābhis* by rejecting the *bh*, for ऐ *ai* is, according [G. Ed p 253] to §. 2, = *á + i*. This opinion, which I have before expressed,* I can now support by new arguments. In the first place, which did not then occur to me in discussing this question, the pronouns of the two first persons really form from their appended pronoun स् *sma*, *smá-bhis*, hence अस्माभिस् *asmábhis*, युष्माभिस् *yushmábhis*, which forms stand in the same relation to the वृकाभिस् *vṛkā-bhis*, assumed by me, that the accusatives अस्मान् *asmán*, युष्मान् *yushmán*, do to वकान् *vṛkán*, “*lupos.*” Secondly, the opinion

* Trans. Berlin Academy, 1826. Comparison of Sanskrit with its cognate languages, by Prof Bopp. Essay III p. 79

which I arrived at theoretically has since then been so far practically established by the Veda dialect that in it from a final ष a not *ā bhis* but *ē bhis* has been formed according to the analogy of the dative and ablative as वक्रेभ्यस् *vrīkēbhyaś* hence ऋषिभिस *ṛṣibhis* per equos from षष्ठा *ṣṣṭā* In the common dialect the pronominal form एभिस् *ē bhis* per hos answers to this Veda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base ष a which generally plays the chief part in the declension of इदम् *idam* Though then on one side from the pronoun ष a springs the form एभिस् *e bhis* on the other side from षस्मा *ṣmā* and युष्म *yushmā* proceed the forms षस्माभिस् *ṣmābhis* युष्माभिस् *yushmābhis*, and though the Veda dialect in its substantive and adjective bases in a attaches itself to the former form still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated *āis* to be based on an *e bhis** as that could never lead to *āis* Perhaps however *ābhis* might become *ēbhis* either through the assimilative force of the *i* of *bhis* or through analogy to [G Ed p 254] the dative *e-bhyaś* the *ē* of which may in like manner owe its origin to the re active influence of the ष y †

220 The Prakrit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Veda dialect, and changed into ए *ē* the *ā* of

* From *ebhis* would come after rejecting the *bl* not *āis* but *ayis* for *ē = a+i* cannot be combined with a following *i* into a diphthong or as it is itself already a diphthong into a triphthong

† I do not regard the Veda ऋषेस *nady is*, for नदीभिस् *nādī bhis* as an abbreviation of *nādī bhis* (for after rejecting the *bh*, from *nād + is* would be formed *nādīs*) but as a very common instrumental, for which an extension of the base *nād* to *nādyā* is to be assumed On the other hand the Zend pronominal instrumental *dīs* mentioned by Burnouf (Nouv Journ Asiat III 310) may here be considered which occurs frequently in the Jzeshne and is probably an abbreviation of *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 dibis* or *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 dibis* from a base *dī* the accusative of which *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 dem* him is often found with *i* unlengthened contrary to § 64 The connection of the base *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 dī* with *𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 tā* cannot on this account be disputed

asmā-bhis, *yushmā-bhis*, as also, in the locative plural, that of *asmāsu*, *yushmāsu*, hence अहेहि *amhē-hin*, तुहेहि *tumhē-hin*, अहेसु *amhēsū*, तुहेसु *tumhēsū*. Moreover, in Piākṛit, all other *a* bases, as well pronouns as substantives and adjectives, terminate the instrumental plural with एहि *e-hin*, and thus कुसुमेहि *kusumē-hin*, “*floribus*,” (from *kusuma*,) answers to the Vēda कुसुमेभिस् *kusumē-bhis*. Before, however, the forms in एभिस् *ē-bhis*, एहि *ē-hin*, had arisen, from अभिस् *ābhis*, by the change of *ā* into *ē*, *ā*s must have proceeded by means of rejection and contraction from that most early form. This form exists also in the oldest hymns of the Vēdas, together with that in एभिस् *ēbhis* thus, in Rosen, p 11, यजेस् *yajāns*. pp 15 and 21 अकैस् *akāis*. In Zend the abbreviated form *āis* is the only one that occurs, which it does, indeed, extremely often.

221 Before the dual termination अद्वा *bya* the Zend, in [G Ed p 255] its *a* bases, differs from the Sanskrit in the same way as the Zend and Piākṛit do before the termination भिस् *bhis*, हिं *hin*, it employs, namely, *ē* for *ā* but from *vērkaē-bya*, according to §§ 28 41. comes *vērkaēbya*. Thus, in the Vendīdād, अद्वाअद्वाअद्वा *haēbya pādhaēbya*, “*sus pedibus*,” = स्वाम्याम् पादाभ्याम् *suābhyaṃ pādābhyaṃ*, अद्वाअद्वाअद्वा *zastāēbya* (हस्ताभ्याम्) “*manibus*” But in this case, also, the diphthong ए *ē* is supplied by *ōi* (§ 33), e g अद्वाअद्वा *ubōi-bya*, “*ambobus*” (Vend S p. 305) If in this form the lost nasal be restored, and it be assumed (of which I have no doubt) that the Greek dual termination *iv* is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *bhyaṃ*,* then the Homeric forms like ὄμοι-*iv* are to be compared with the अद्वाअद्वा *ubōi-bya*

* By rejecting the labial, as in वृकैस् *vrikāis* from वृकाभिस् *vrikābhis*, and by contracting the याम् *yām* to *iv*, as when, in Sanskrit, for *yāshita*, *ishita* is said, from *yaj*, “to sacrifice,” and in Zend *ḥz im*, “*haec*,” for *ḥz yam* (see, also, § 42)

above mentioned where therefore the first *i* would fall to the base which it lengthens the other to the termination. The third declension by its forms like *δαιμοι οιν*, might give rise to the conjecture that *οιν* and not *ιν* is the true termination the latter however is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where *η* and not *οιν* is attached to the final vowel of the base (*Μουσα η*, *λογο-η*). In the third therefore we explain the *ο* before *ιν* in the same manner as § 218 before *φιν* (*κοτυληδον-ο φιν*) viz as a conjunctive vowel which has made its way from the bases which necessarily have it *i e* from those terminating in a consonant into those which might dispense with it (into the bases in *i* and *υ*) as in general in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone and have shewn the way to the vowels *i* and *υ*. It might however not [G Ed p 206] have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel *ο* to make its appearance between consonants and the termination as *δαιμοι ιν* could very easily be uttered but the *ο* of *δαιμοι οιν* comes evidently from a time when the *ιν* was still preceded by the consonant which the corresponding Sanskrit termination *bhādm* leads us to expect, in all probability a *φ* thus *δαιμοι ο ιν* from *οαιμοι ο φιν** We should have therefore here a different *φιν* from that which in § 217 we endeavoured to explain from *φης* *भिः* *bhis* the nasal in the dual (*φ*)*η* stands quite regularly for its predecessor *m* as in general at the end of words. In order to present to our

* The conjunctive vowel *ο* therefore before the dual termination *η* has an *οη* in exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix *οη* which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit *भ्यः* *bhyat*. *οη* must therefore have been originally pronounced *οηη*, and the conjunctive vowel which the digamma made requisite or desirable before consonantal bases and which from thence has extended itself to the whole third declension has remained also after the digamma has been dropped, and thus *πυρ-ο-οηη* answers to *πυρ η* from *τρηρ* on the other hand, *τρηρ οηη* to *τρηρ* (*τρηρ*)

view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu$ be considered as the first person singular and third person plural, in one case from $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\mu$, in the other from $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu\tau$

222. If the dual termination $\iota\nu$ be explained as a contraction of $bhyám$, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination $\iota\nu$, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident ($\eta\acute{\mu}'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{\upsilon}\mu'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\sigma\phi'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, together with $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\text{-}\sigma\iota$). The Greek, however, in this respect, is guided or misled by the Sanskrit, or, more correctly, the distinction of the plural dative of the pronouns of one gender is very ancient, and the Sanskrit has in them भ्यम् $bhyám$ as termination (अस्मभ्यम् $asma-bhyám$, "nobis," युष्मभ्यम् $yushma-bhyám$, (G Ed p 257) "vobis"), opposed to the भ्यस् $bhyas$ of all other words. From this $bhyám$, then, we arrive at $\iota\nu$ quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination $bhyám$ (cf § 42) As, however, भ्यम् $bhyám$, and its abbreviated form भ्यम् $hyám$, according to § 215, has also its place in the singular dative of the pronouns of one gender, but occurs nowhere else, as, moreover, the Latin also, in the pronouns referred to, has maintained a genuine dative termination, and to the common i , which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination bi or hi (for bhi) (§ 200), we can, therefore, in the singular $\iota\nu$ also of $\acute{\epsilon}\mu'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\tau\epsilon\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\tau'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\sigma\phi'\text{-}\acute{\iota}\nu$, see nothing else than an abbreviation of भ्यम् $bhyám$, a form which the Latin and Greek have shared in such a manner, that the former has retained the beginning and the latter the end. In the i both coincide * The occasional accu-

* A short time since, Max Schmidt, in his excellent treatise "Commentatio de Pionomine Græco et Latino" (p 77), endeavoured to connect the termination $\iota\nu$ here treated of with the Sanskrit in a different way, by designating it as the sister form of the pronominal locative termination

sative use of this termination in Theocritus is to be explained from its original signification being no longer felt and the exchange of its *i* with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand we have in *μi* and *νi* real accusatives and should therefore divide them *μi*, *νi* and not assume with Buttmann (p. 296) a connection between this form and the dative *τι*.

227 As to the origin of the *ελο* suffixes [C. El. p. 2. 8.] *भिन्* *bhi* + *भ्यन्* *bhy-am* *भ्यान्* *bhy am* and *भ्यन्* *bhy as* which begin with *भ्य* *bhy* (from *भि* *bhi*) we must notice first their connection with the preposition *अभि* *abhi* to to wards against (whence *अभिपत्य* *abhi tas* at cf. *apud*). However in *abhi* itself *bhi* is clearly in like manner the termination and the demonstrative *अ* the theme so that this preposition in respect to its termination is to be regarded as a sister form to the Latin *ti* *bi* *si* *bi* *i* *bi*, *u* *bi*,* just as another preposition which springs from the pronominal base *a* *वि* *adhi* over finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives like *ε-θι*, *αλλο-θι* *ουραιο* *θι* (§ 16). I related to the suffix *धु* *dhi* is *ध* *dha* which has been retained in the common dialect only in the abbreviation *हा* in *ह* *hi* here and in the preposition *सा* *ha* "with" but in the *Udā* dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion and in the *Zend* also is found in several pro-

mination *इ* *ta* (§ 201). In this view similar forms would be contracted exclusive of the length of the Greek *i*, which according to my explanation may pass as compensation for the *a* which has been dropped. Still I lay less stress on the difference of quantity than on this, that it is precisely the pronouns of one gender in the Sanskrit which exhibit in the locative not *in* but the common *i* (§ 201). But I attach still more weight to what has been said above in support of my opinion.

* In Prakrit the termination *इ* *hu* which is connected with *भि* *hi* (cf. § 211) unites *al o* with other pronominal bases for the formation of locative adverbs as *तद्* *ta hu* there *कद्* *ka hu* "where."

nominal bases with a locative signification, e g अवाधा *ava-dha*, "here." In the Greek, compare $\theta\alpha$ of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha$, opposed to $\theta\epsilon\nu$, from $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\epsilon\nu$, $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\nu$, &c, from धस् *dhas*, for तस् *tas*, in अधस् *a-dhas*, "beneath" in which formations ध् *dh* stands as a permutation of *t*, and occurs in this way, also, in some other formations* Therefore *dha*, *dhu*, are to be derived from the demonstrative base त *ta*, but it is more difficult to trace the origin of the भि *bhi* of अभि *abhi* (Greek $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$) I suspect that an initial consonant has been [G Ed p 259] dropped. As in Greek, also, $\phi\acute{\iota}\nu$ is used for $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\nu$, and as in Sanskrit वंशति *vinśati* "twenty," is clearly an abbreviation of द्वांशति *dvīśati*, and in Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bīs*, "twice," 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bitya*, "the second," is used for 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dvīs*, (Sanskrit द्वस् *duis*), 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *dvitya* (Sanskrit द्वतीय *dvitīya*), so भि *bhi* may be identical with the pronominal base स्व *sua* or सस् *su* whence the Greek $\sigma\phi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\phi\acute{\iota}\nu$, &c, and so indeed, that after the *s* has been dropped, the following semi-vowel has been strengthened or hardened, just as in the Zend 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bīs*, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *bitya*, and the Latin *bis*, *bi* The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ् *bh*, as, in Prākṛit (§. 166), स्म *sma* has become स्महा *smha*, and, (which comes still closer to the case before us), in Greek for $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\nu$ is found also $\psi\acute{\iota}\nu$ And, in Sanskrit, that भ् *bh* should spring from *b + h* is not entirely unknown, and in this way is to be explained the relation of भूयस् *bhūyas*, "more," to बहु *bahu*, "much," the *a* being rejected (Gramm. Crit r 251 Rem)

224 The following will serve as a general view of the dual termination under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Lithuanian —

* Among others, in the 2d person plural of the middle ध्वे *dhué* and ध्वम् *dhuam* for त्वे *tué*, त्वम् *tuam*

SANSKRIT	ZENIT	GREEK	LITHUANIAN
m irikā bhyaḥ	{ ehrkaēt lya or } { ehrkoi-bya }	λυκοι-ι	wilka m
f jihvā bhyaḥ	hi-rā bya	χωρα ι,	ranko-m
m pati-bhyaḥ	paiti lya	ποσι-ο-ι	pai m
f tanu bhyaḥ	tanu-bya	τιτυ-ο ι	
f eṣṭ bhyaḥ	vāch e bya	ό-ο ι	
m bharaḍ bhyaḥ	bharaḥ -lya	φερωντ-ο ι	
m ātma bhyaḥ	ātma bya	δαιμοι ο ι	

1011107

I deduce this form principally from the b. $\rho\lambda\omega\tau$ root "light" which often occurs in the terminations beginning with *b* and always interposes *ε* e conjunctive vowel — $\mu\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ root *ε λ σ* $\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ root *ε λ σ*. We find also $\mu\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ ϵ of each *ε* (Zenit Sp 13) *Bhav* in *ṣ* interpose *ε* e those in *ṣ* t, when a vowel precede that letter conjoin the termination direct ($\mu\lambda\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ ϵ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ or *r lāt* *bya*, according to § 70) on the other hand the *ṣ* t of $\rho\lambda\omega$ nt is rejected thus $\nu\sigma\tau\omega$ ϵ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *ber n lya*, *splen'enti'* is with *j* contrary to ϵ $\tau\omega$. The form $\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brat lya* : *super lya*, also deserves notice because in this solitary word the case termination appears unreduced (ϵ $\tau\omega$). The *ṣ* however as often as this word occurs, always divides the termination from the *l* ue ($\nu\sigma\tau\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ twice $\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brat lya m* 1p 3 l and 3 2 $\rho\lambda\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega$ *barrat lya m*, probably for *brat lya m* so that it would seem that $\rho\lambda\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brat* is the allative singular of a theme, $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brā* (Sans *brā*). I have not found this word in any other case it is not likely however, that any thing but $\rho\lambda\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brat* or $\rho\lambda\omega$ $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brant* is its theme in the latter case it would be a partial form and would demonstrate that instead of the last consonant of *nt* the last but one also may be rejected. Or are we to regard *brat lya m* as a form of that singular kind that unites with the termination of the allative singular that of the dual and thus $\tau\epsilon\sigma$ *brū* would still be the theme?

† *ṣ* in Sanskrit and Zenit is rejected before case terminations beginning with a consonant thus in Greek $\rho\mu\sigma\iota$ and in Gothic *atma m*

become *o* or *aa* as before the appended particles *cha* and *chit*, the Greek exhibits *es* under the restriction of § 228 the Latin *es** with unorganic length of quantity through the influence of the *s*, the Lithuanian has *es* in bases in *r* but elsewhere simple *s*. Thus the words दुहितरस *duhitar as* मृगमल्ल १११ *dughdhar as cha* θυγατερ *es dukter es matr es* correspond with one another

227 The *a* of the termination is melted [G Id p १७१] down with a preceding *च* *a* of the base to *ā* thus वरिक्त *vrīkta* from *vrīka + as* corresponds to the Gothic *vulfōs* from *IULTAAs* (§ 69). In this concretion only however with the vowel of the base the Gothic has preserved the full termination but elsewhere both with vowel and consonantal bases the *s* alone of the old *as* is left as in general the termination *as* in Gothic polysyllabic forms has everywhere been weakened to *is* or *s* (cf §§ 13, 191) hence *sunju s ahman s* for *suniv as ahman as*. And *च* *ā* too is contracted with the termination *as* to *ās* hence *जिहुās* for *jihuā as*. It cannot however be shewn with certainty from what has been just said that the Gothic *gibōs*, from *GIBŌ* has simple *s* or *as* (contracted with the base vowel to *o = ā*) for its case designation

228 The masculine pronominal bases in *a* refuse in Sanskrit Zend and Gothic the full nominative designation and in place of it extend the base by the addition of *an* *i* which according to § 2 with the *a* of the base forms *ए ऌ †* for which in Zend is used *𐬀 𐬁* or *𐬂 𐬃*

* Vide § 797 p 10, 8

† As *च* *a* is lengthened in many other cases to *ए ऌ* and with this the case terminations are then first conjoined there is good ground to assume that in *ते* *ते* and similar forms no case designation at all is contained and that the pronouns as purely words of personality find themselves sufficiently personified in this case through themselves alone as in the singular *sa* is said for *sas* in Sanskrit as in Gothic and in Greek for *s* while in Latin with *is te* also *ipse* and *ill* are robbed of the nominative sign. This opinion is remarkably confirmed by the fact that *अमी* *ami* (Grimm

hence, Sanskrit ते *tē*, Zend 𐬔𐬀 *tē*, Gothic *thai*, "this," [G Ed p 263] answering to the feminine form 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *tīs*, 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *tāo* (§ 56^b), *thōs*. To this corresponds, in Greek, τοί (Doric for οί). In Greek and Latin, however, this *i*, which practically replaces the termination *as* (*cs*, *ēs*), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in *o* (= *अ a*, § 116), but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it, hence, λύκοι, χῶραι, for *λυκο-cs*, *χωρα-cs*, *lupi* (from *lupoi*), *terræ* (from *terrai*), for *lupo-es*, *terra-es*. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§ 121), has preserved the old termination, hence, *rēs* from *rē-ēs*, as, in Sanskrit *jihvās* from *jihvā-as*. The Lithuanian has fixed narrower restrictions than the Greek and Latin on the misuse of the pronominal inflexion under discussion, οί, to speak more correctly, want of inflexion it gives, indeed, *wilkai*=λύκοι, *lupi*, but not *rankai*, but *rankos*. Honour, therefore, to the Gothic! that in this respect it has not overstepped by one hair the old Sanskrit-Zend limits, for that the adjective *a* bases, as they in general follow the pronominal declension, give also *ai* for *ūs* (*blindai* "cæci") is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229 In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination 𐬀𐬀 *āo* also (from 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ās*, § 207) occurs with a plural signification, thus, frequently, 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *vāchi-āo*, "voices," 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀

Crit § 271) shews itself clearly through most of the oblique cases, as *amī-byas*, "ills," *amī-shām*, "illorum," to be the naked theme. The form which occurs in the Zend-Avesta 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *višpay-as-cha*, "omnesque" (V S p 49), considered as a contraction of *višpay-as-cha* (cf § 244), leads to the conjecture, that to ते *tē*, and similar uninflected forms, the termination *as* also might attach itself, thus, तयस् *tay-as*. In Zend, the pronominal form in *ē* occurs, for the most part, in the accusative plural, and thus the abovementioned *višpay-as-cha* I c stands probably as accusative, although, according to Anquetil's inaccurate translation, it might be regarded as the nominative.

raoch-do "lucet" which forms cannot be regarded perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in *d* for I believe [C Ed p 64] I can guarantee that there exists no such base as *awawb* *áčhá* and *awabab* *raochá*. The form *đwzaw donhó* in a bases as *đwzawđwz* *čhrádonho* *lufi* and *lupos* rests on that in the Vedas but which only occurs in the nominative *asas* (5 36) e.g. *stomásas* "sons of praise" for *stomás* from *stoma*.*

230 Bases in *i* and *u* have in Sanskrit Guná hence *patay-as* *sunay-as* for *paty as sunu-as*. The Gothic also has preserved this Guná but in its weakened form *i* (§ 27) which before *u* becomes *y* hence, *sunyu s* sons (for *sunu s* from *sunau s*) a form which would be unintelligible without the Guná theory which has been shewn to belong to the German. In *i* bases the Guná *i* is melted down with that of the base to long *i* (written *ei* § 70) hence *gastei s* *anstei s* from *GASII ANSII* (cf p 100) The Zend employs Guná or not at pleasure hence *paty-o* or *patay ó* † *pasau ó*, or *pasau ó*

231 Neuters have in Zend as in the cognate European languages a short *a* for their termi [C Ed p 65] nation‡ perhaps the remains of the full *as* which belongs to the natural genders after the *s* which is too per-

* This form is, in my opinion to be so regarded as that for greater emphasis, the termination *as* has been a second time appended to the termination which had become concrete with the base.

† The *i* which according to § 41 is blended with the base remains in spite of the *a* preceding the *y*.

‡ Simple as this point is I have nevertheless found it very difficult to come to a firm conclusion regarding it although from the first I have directed my attention towards it. Burnouf has already (Nouv Journ Asiat. III 309 310) given the plural neuter form, and instituted comparisons with the Gothic and Greek. &c. But from forms like *Iu mata bene cogitata*, "*lucta beie dcta*" it cannot be perceived what the neuter plural termination properly is because setting out with the Sanskrit we are tempted to assume that the true termination in these forms has

sonal for the dead speechless gender, has been dropped.

[G Ed p 266] This *a* remains, then, in the accusative. The masculine and feminine have, in the same case, generally likewise *as* (Zend ψ \acute{o} , $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha$ *aīcha*) The following are examples. $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ *ashavan-a*, "priva," $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha\alpha$ *bēřezant-a*, "splendentia," $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha\psi$ *vāch-a*, "verba," $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha$ *nar-a*, "homines," $\alpha\sigma\alpha\alpha$ *ast-a*, "ossa" In nominal bases in *a* the termination is melted down with the vowel of the base the \acute{o} so produced has, however, in the received condition of the language, according to a

has been dropped, and its loss either compensated by lengthening the final vowel, or not We must therefore direct our attention to bases with a different termination than *a*, especially to such as terminate with a consonant The examination of this subject is, however, much embarrassed, in that the Zend, without regard to the gender of the singular, is prone, contrary to natural expectation, to make every noun neuter in the plural, an inclination which goes so far, that the numerous class of *a* bases have hereby entirely lost the masculine nominative, and but sparingly exhibit the masculine accusative When, *e g mashya*, "human being," is, in the plural nominative, likewise, *mashya* (with *cha*, *mashyā-cha*), here I am nevertheless convinced that this plural *mashya*, or *mashyā*, is not an abbreviation of *mashyān* from *mashyās* (§ 56^b), as in no other part of Zend Grammar α *a* or $\alpha\alpha$ *ā* stands for $\alpha\alpha\alpha$ *ās* I am persuaded that this form belongs to the neuter The replacing, however, of the plural masculine by neuters rests upon a deep internal feeling of the language, for in the plural number it is clear that gender and personality are far in the back ground. The personality of the individual is lost in the abstract infinite and inanimate plurality, and so far we can but praise the Zend for its evitiation of gender in the plural We must blame it, however, in this point, that it does not, in all places, bring the adjectives or pronouns into concord with the substantives to which they refer, and that in this respect it exhibits a downright confusion of gender, and a disorder which has very much impeded the inquiry into this subject Thus, *e g vīspa anaghra-ī aochāo* (not *raoch-ā*), "all lights which have had no beginning", *tisarō* (fem) *šata* or *thrayō* (masc) *šata*, "three hundred", *chathwārō* (masc) *šata* "four hundred" In general the numbers "three" and "four" appear to have lost the neuter, hence, also, *thrayō csafn-a*, "three nights," *chathwārō csafn-a*, "four nights" in Vend S p 237, on the other hand, stands *tā nar a yā*, "those persons who . . ." I divide thus *nar-a* although

principle often quoted been again shortened and remains only in monosyllabic bases and before annexed particles. The Gothic and Zend in this respect stand [G Ed p 267] very remarkably upon one and the same footing for *thō hacc* is used (for *thū* § 69) from *THAa hūθ quæ* for *HFAa*, but *daura* from *DAURA* as in Zend *awō tō hœc awr yd quæ* opposed to *awr agha peccata* from *agha*. It cannot therefore be said of the Gothic that the *a* of the base has been dropped before that of the term.

although the form might also belong to a theme *nara* which also occurs but much less frequently than *nar* whence also elsewhere the masculine *nar u tai cha*, and those persons. From the theme *ich* 'word speech' we find frequently *īch a* (also erroneously as it appears, *īch a*), e.g. Vend S p 34 *awr awr yd quæ awr yd quæ awr yd quæ awr yd quæ* *īchā humata hucta hūarīsta, "verba bene cogitata bene dicta bene peracta"*. From *awr awr yd quæ* *ashāan* 'pure' occurs very often the neuter plural *ashāana a* however the theme *ashāan* sometimes too although very rarely extends itself unorganically to *ashāana* this form proves less (though it be incorrect) that the neuter *ashāan a* should be derived from the unorganic extremely rare *ashāana*, than from the genuine and most common *ashāan* in the weak cases *ashāun* or *ashāon*. Participial forms too in *nt* are very common in the neuter plural and I have never found any ground for assuming that the Zend like the Pāli and Old High German has extended the old participial theme by a vowel addition. In the Vend S p 119 we find an accusative *agha awr yd quæ a peccata corruptentia* (?). Anquetil renders both expressions together by *la corruption du cœur* (II 22) but probably *awr yd quæ* stands for *-cūra* and means literally 'the destroying' (cf *fr̥ ksh̥* intrins. 'to be ruined'). So much is certain that *awr* is a preposition (p 49) and *tar* is the suffix used in the formation of the word (§ 144) which is in the strong cases *tar* and from this example it follows as also from *ashāan a* that where there are more forms of the theme than one the Zend like the Sanskrit (see Gramm Crit. r 185 c) forms the nominative accusative and vocative plural from the stronger theme. I refrain from adducing other examples for the remarkable and not to have been expected proposition that the Zend in variance from the Sanskrit forms its plural neuters according to the principle of the Latin *nomin a* Greek τ λαν Gothic *namon a* or *namn a*.

nation, for it could not be dropped, because the base-vowel and termination have been, from the first, concrete. The old length of quantity might, however, be weakened thus is the fate of long vowels especially at the end of words. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Greek $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ and the Latin *dona*, that the *a* entirely belongs to the termination, This *a* is an old inheritance of the oldest date, from the time when the second declension, to use the expression, terminated its bases with \tilde{a} . This \tilde{a} has since then become, in Greek, *o* or *c* (§ 204.), in Latin, *u*, *o*, or *e*, and has maintained its ancient quality only in the plural neuter, and the \bar{a} , which has grown out of $\tilde{a} + \tilde{a}$, has become shortened. This \tilde{a} , however, in contrast with its offspring \check{o} , \check{e} , \check{u} , may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, thus if $\delta\omega\rho\sigma$ or $\delta\omega\rho\sigma$, *donö*, *doně*, stood as the plural neuter.

232 Bases in *i* and *u* may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and *u* may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel thus we read in the Vend S pp 46 and 48, $\mathfrak{g}ar\mathfrak{a}$, "hills," from $\mathfrak{g}ar\mathfrak{i}$ (see p 196, Note †) on the other hand, p 313, $\mathfrak{g}ar\mathfrak{i}s$ (fem). That which Anquetil (II 268) renders by "*une action qui empêche de passer le pont, le péché contre-nature,*" is uns in the original (p 119), $\mathfrak{a}gha\ \mathfrak{an}\mathfrak{a}p\mathfrak{e}r\mathfrak{e}t\mathfrak{h}a\ \mathfrak{s}k\mathfrak{y}a\mathfrak{o}t\mathfrak{h}n\mathfrak{a}\ \mathfrak{y}\mathfrak{a}\ \mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{a}r\mathfrak{o}\text{-}v\mathfrak{a}r\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}y\mathfrak{a}$, [G Ed p 268] *i e* "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which . . .", and here it is evident that *anápērētha* stands for *anápērēthw-a*, for *pērētū* means actually "bridge"

* Burnouf's MS divides thus, *anā pērētha*, which is following Olshausen (p 6), but with the various reading *anápērētha*. I have no ground for assuming that in Zend there exists a preposition *aná*, "without," so that *aná pērētha* might mean "without a bridge", and that *pērētū* would, in the singular instrumental, form *pērēthua* or *pērētava*. I suppose, therefore, that *pērētū* may be conjoined with the preposition *á*, and then the negative *an* have been prefixed.

But a final u may also be retained, in the form of a semi vowel either pure or with Guna the latter form I recognise in *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *yātata* (Vend S p 120 in Olshausen p. 7) which can only be the plural accusative of *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *yātu* for it stands with *𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *agha peccata* and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of *yātu* in the accusative singular *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *yātumentem* the magician *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* lifted with magic (according to Anquetil *magicien*) I render therefore *agha yātata* literally by the sins of sorcery (Anquetil *la magie très mauvaise*) and in Anquetil's Vocabulary is (p 167) *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *yāthium* the regular plural genitive of our base *yātu*, which means therefore "of the sorceries", while Anquetil fruitily gives it the meaning of the derivative (*magiciens*) and according to his custom takes this oblique case for a nominative An example of a neuter plural form without Guna is at V S p 122 *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *hinda* the Indies with *haptihendu* the seven Indus (Anq II p 270) It has the epithet *us astara* (up-starr'd²) in opposition to *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *dous astarem hendum* to the ill starr'd (?) [G Ed p 969] The Indies An example in which the suppressed termination in a u base is replaced by lengthening the final vowel is the very frequently occurring *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *vohu* goods from *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *vōhu*

233 The interrogative base *li* (cf *quis quid*) which in Sanskrit forms only the singular nominative accusative (neuter) *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *li-m* but is elsewhere replaced by *la* whence in Zend *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *la t* what this base the use of which is very limited forms in Zend the plural neuter *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *ky a* and

* V S p 311 *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *lyā aē vacā ya hēti gīthā iā t r i s ā n r ta* (erroneously *tris āmrut i*) What are the words which are thrice said in the prayers (songs)? The masculine forms *aē* and *lyōi* can here according to Note at § 231, occasion no difficulty So also V S p 80 *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬭𐬀* *kyā* before

and after *s* and *n* the preceding vowel is lengthened, hence वचिंस *vachīnsi* नमिन्सि *namānsi*. Into relation with this *i* might be brought the neuter inflexion of *quæ* (*quai*) and *hæ-c* (*hauc*) which stand in Latin very isolated *quæ* is however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit क्विन्सि *kvīnsi* while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual क्वे *kvē* from *ka + i* (§ 212). Since however the antiquity of this dual termination is supported by the Zend the plural form *lanis* stands on the other side isolated and its age is thereby rendered doubtful as moreover the Latin in the verb also has introduced a termination originally dual into the plural* [G Ed p 271] we cannot avoid recognising in the Latin plural *quæ* a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual क्वे *kvē*.

23b We give here a general view of the formation of the plural nominative and of the vocative identical with it and the neuter accusative

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUANIAN	GOthic
m	<i>vīkas</i>	<i>vīhrkāonhō</i> †	<i>λυκοι</i>	<i>lup i</i>	<i>wilkai</i>	<i>vulfos</i>
m	<i>tē</i>	<i>tē</i>	<i>τοι</i>	<i>is tē</i>	<i>tie †</i>	<i>thai</i>
n	<i>dāna n i</i>	<i>dāna</i>	<i>δῶρα</i>	<i>dona</i>		<i>daura</i>
f	<i>jihvas</i>	<i>hī-liao</i>	<i>χῶραι</i>	<i>terrae</i>	<i>ranl os</i>	<i>gibos</i>

* The termination *is* answers to चस् *thas* Greek *ov* from *r s* not to च *tha* or ण *ta* Greek *τε*. With respect to the otherwise remarkable declension of *quæ* and of *hauc* which is akin to it I would refer preliminarily to my treatise On the Influence of Pronouns in the formation of Words (by F Dummiler), p 2

† See § 229

‡ This form belongs not to the base *TA* (= ण *ta*) whence in the singular *ta s* and nearly all the other cases but to *TIA* whence through the influence of the *s* *tie* has been developed (cf p 171 Note* and § 193) and whence in the dative dual and plural *tie m ti ms*. The nominative plural *l* however without a case termination. The original form *TIA* corresponds to the Veda ण *tya* mentioned in § 194 while the base स्य *syā* (च *shya* see § 5.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of *SZIE*, and in the plural nominative likewise without inflexion

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
f	<i>tās,</i>	<i>tāo,</i>	<i>ταί,</i>	<i>is-tae,</i>	<i>tes,</i>	<i>thōs</i>
m	<i>patay-as,</i>	<i>party-ō,</i> †	<i>πόσι-ες,</i>	<i>host-ēs,</i> ‡	. . .	<i>gaster-s</i>
f	<i>prīlay-as,</i>	<i>āfi ity-ō,</i> ‡	<i>πόρτι-ες,</i>	<i>mess-ēs,</i> ‡	<i>ūny-s,</i>	<i>anster-s</i>
n	<i>vāi-n-i,</i>	<i>vai-a,</i>	<i>ἴδρι-α,</i>	<i>marī-a,</i>
n.	. . .	<i>ky-a,</i> ‡	<i>vy-a</i>
[G f	<i>bhavishyant-as,</i>	<i>būshyanty-ō,</i> ‡
Ed. m	<i>sūnav-as,</i>	<i>pašv-ō,</i> ‡	<i>ἰχθύ-ες,</i>	<i>pecū-s,</i>	<i>sūnu-s,</i>	<i>sunyu-s</i>
p. f.	<i>tanav-as,</i>	<i>tanv-ō,</i>	<i>πίτυ-ες,</i>	<i>socrū-s,</i>	.	<i>handyu-s</i>
p. n	<i>madhū-n-i,</i>	<i>madhv-a,</i>	<i>μέθυ-α,</i>	<i>pecu-a,</i>
272. f.	<i>vadhū-as,</i>
m.f	<i>gāv-as,</i>	<i>geu-s,</i> §	<i>βό(F)-ες,</i>	<i>bov-ēs,</i> ‡	.	.

is *szie* From the pronominal declension the form *ie* (from *ia*) has found its way into the declension of the adjective also so that the base *GERA*, "good," forms several cases from *GERIE*, viz dat du *gerie-m* for *gera-m*, dat pl *gerie-ms* for *gera-ms*, and nom pl *geri* for *gerai* This *geri* appears to stand in most complete agreement with the Latin nominatives of the corresponding declension (*bonī, lupī*), but the difference between the two languages is this, that the *i* of *bom* (for *bono-i*) belongs to the termination, while *geri* is void of termination, and stands for *gerie* (analogous with *tie*), but this latter for *gerie-i* (cf *γαυνικη-ι*)

‡ See p. 163, Note †

† See p 1078

‡ To this *ky-a*, from *ka-a*, corresponds surprisingly the Latin *qui-a* (*quianam, quiane*), if, as I scarce doubt, it is a plural neuter, as *quod* is a singular neuter (cf Max Schmidt "De *gron Græco et Latino*," p 34) In the meaning "that," *quā* is clearly shewn to be an accusative the meaning "because" is less apt for this case, and would be better expressed by an instrumental or an ablative, but in the singular *quod* we must be content to see the idea "because" expressed by an accusative On the other hand, *quo*, among other meanings, signifies "whither," a genuine accusative signification in Sanskrit grammar Without the support of *quod* we might conjecture that an instrumental singular had been preserved in *quia*, after the analogy of *παρτι-α* *party-a*, for *partī*

§ We might expect *gav-ō, gavaś-cha*, "bovesque;" but we read *μαξου* *geus* in the Vend S p 253, L 9, in combination with the pronominal neuters *μαρο tā*, "illa," *μαγυ γά*, "quæ," which, according to §. 231 Note, cannot surprise us.

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
f	<i>nāi as</i>		ια(F) ες			
f	<i>vāch as</i>	<i>vāch o *</i>	ὄπ ες	<i>loces †</i>		
m	<i>bharant us</i>	<i>barēnt θ *</i>	φεροντ ες	<i>ferent es †</i>		<i>fiyand s</i>
m	<i>almān-as</i>	<i>asman θ</i>	δαιμοι ες	<i>sermon es †</i>		<i>ahman s</i>
n	<i>nāmān i</i>	<i>nāman a</i>	ταλαι α	<i>nomina</i>		<i>namθn a</i>
m	<i>bhratar as</i>	<i>br itar θ *</i>	πατερ ες	<i>fratr-es †</i>		‡
f	<i>dūhtar as</i>	<i>dughdhar θ *</i>	θυγατερ ες	<i>matr es † dugter es</i>		
m	<i>datur as</i>	<i>datār θ *</i>	δοτηρ ες	<i>dator es †</i>		
n	<i>vachāns i</i>	<i>vachanh a §</i>	ἔπε(σ) α	<i>oper-a</i>		

THE ACCUSATIVE

236 The bases which end with a short vowel annex *n* in Sanskrit and lengthen the final vowel of the base hence वचिन् *vachān* पतिन् *patin* सनन् *sunun* &c We might imagine this *n* to be related to the *m* of the singular accusative as in the verb the termination वानि *āni* (1st pers sing imperative) has clearly proceeded from वामि *āmi* The cognate dialects speak however in favour of Grimm's acute conjecture that the Sanskrit *n* is in the accusative plural masculine, an abbreviation of *ns* || which has remained entire in the Gothic—*ulfa ns gast ns sunu ns*—but has been divided in the other sister languages since the Sanskrit according to § 91 has given up the latter of the two con-

* See p 163 Note †

† See Note † in preceding page

‡ The Gothic *r* bases annex in the plural a *u* and can therefore be contrasted no further with the cognate languages *BRŌTH IR* becomes *BRŌTHRU* whence *brothryu s*, &c according to the analogy of *sunyu-s*

§ Or वाच्येन *vachēna* Thus we read Vend S p 1-7 *u menha* which I think must be regarded as accusative of *nimō* (नमस *namas* adoration) and as governed by *ब्रह्मेण* *brēthra*, 'from him who brings from him offering

|| The Old-Prussian too exhibits in the acc pl *ns e g t i a ns par p s* Respecting the *veda* termination *nr*, from *ns* see § 617 Remark

sonants, and has lengthened, as it appears, in compensation for this, the final vowel of the base , while the Greek

[G Ed. p 274] *λύκους* has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the *υ* to volatilize to *υ †* In fact, *λυκο-υς* has the same relation to *λυκους* that *τύπτουσι* has to *τύπτονσι*, from

[G Ed p 275] *τύπτοντι ‡* For *πόσι-ας*, *ἰχθύ-ας*, we could not, however, expect a *πόσι-υς*, *ἰχθύ-υς*, as the Greek makes the *ι* and *υ* bases in all parts similar to the bases which terminate with a consonant, which, in Sanskrit, have *as* for a termination, hence *पदम् padas = πόδας* and even in the most vigorous period of the language *ns* could not have attached itself to a consonant preceding. This *as* for *ns* may be compared with

~ Thus *vrhán* for *vrhans*, as, *विद्वांस् vidváns*, whence the accusative *विद्वांसम् vidváns-am*, in the uninflected nominative *विद्वान् vidvān*, (“*sapiens*”)

† As the *υ* also passes into *ι* (*τιθείς* for *τιθέυς*, Æolic *τύψαις*, *μέλαις* for *τυψαν(τ)ς*, *μελαυς*), Hartung (l c p 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the *ι* in Æolic accusative forms like *νόμοις*, *τοῖς στρατηγοῖς*, &c As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like *μεγάλαις*, *ποιμῖλαις*, *τείμαις*, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the *α* preceding the *ι*, we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and specially feminine declension had originally accusatives in *υς*, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an *ns*, nor does the Sanskrit exhibit an *n* (see § 287, and cf Rask in Vater’s Tables of Comparison, p 62)

‡ It cannot be said that *τύπτουσι* proceeded from *τύπτονται*, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the *τύπτοντι* before us answers to all the requirements of Greek Grammar, as to that of the whole base, since *ο-ντι* corresponds to the Sansk *anti*, Zend *ēnti*, Goth *nt’*, and from the singular *τι* (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than *ντι* can be expected But to arrive at *ουσι* from *οντι* it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as *ονται*, for that *οντι* can become *ουσι* is proved by the circumstance that the latter has actually arisen from it, by the very usual transition of T into Σ, and the not rare vocalization of the N to Y, as also in Sanskrit, in all probability, *उस् us* has arisen from *nt* (cf p 172, Note*), of which more hereafter But if in the dative plural, indeed, *ου-σι* has arisen from *οντ-σι*, not from *ον-σι* (*λέουσι* not *δαίμουσι*),

the Ionic *αται ατο* for *νται, ντο* a form which has extended from the places where the vocalization of the *ν* was necessary to those also where *ι* might be added (*πεπιθатаι τετραφαται* then, also *πεπανάται, κελιάται* &c for *πεπώνται κελίνται*) This comparison with the 3d person plural appears to me the more in point as in my opinion the *η* in the presupposed forms like चकस *crilans* चतिसु *patius* लुकोऽ has the same object that it has in the 3d person plural viz. allusion to plurality by extending (nasalizing) the syllable preceding the sign of personality The introduction of a nasal is an admixture which is least of all foreign and comes nearest to the mere lengthening of an already existing vowel.

237 Feminine bases with a final vowel follow in Sanskrit the analogy of consonantal bases but with the suppression of the *α** thus *s* for *as* or *ns* they may perhaps too never have had *ns* for else hence would have arisen as in the masculine a simple *n* to the [G Ed p 27c]

we must remember that the abandonment of the *η* before case terminations beginning with a consonant is a very old and therefore pre-Greek phenomenon which is not to be accounted for in the Greek and wherefore no compensation is to be required for the *ν* which has been dropped But even if it were so we must still be satisfied if the demand for compensation for a lost *ν* remains unfulfilled in several places of grammar for there are two kinds of euphonic alteration in all languages the one which has acquired the force of a general law makes its appearance under a similar form on each similar occasion while the other only irregularly and occasionally shews itself

* Monosyllabic bases only have preserved the *α* as the case sign in the singular nominative (§ 137), hence स्त्रियम् *stri-j-as* *feminae* भूयस *bhu-as* "terras from स्त्री *stri* भू *bhū* There is scarce a doubt that this form originally extended to polysyllabic bases also, for besides the Greek the Zend also partly evinces this (§ 238) as also the circumstance that in the actual condition of the Sanskrit language the accusative plural shews, in general, an inclination to weaken itself and thus contrast itself more submissively with the imperious nominative (§ 190)

feminine gender, too, the well-sounding Ionic *a* is more suitable than *n*. In general, the Sanskrit feminines in other parts of grammar cast off the *n*, which is annexed by masculines and neuters (§. 133). Moreover, the Gothic also, in feminine *ō* bases, gives no *ns*, but it appears that *thōs* = त्वाँ *tās* (*east, has*) is a pure dative from the ancestral house, and when the feminine *i* and *u* bases in Gothic, by forms like *i-ns, u-ns*, assimilate themselves to the masculines, this may be regarded as a disguise of gender, or a deviation caused by the example of the masculines. The consonant bases follow the example of the Indian, but have lost the *a*, as in the nominative (§ 227), hence, *fiyand-s, ahman-s*, for *fiyand-as, ahman-as*

238. Feminines with a short final vowel lengthen it, to compensate, as it appears, for the suppression of the *a*, thus *prīti-s* is formed from *prīty-as*, and *tanū-s* from *tanw-as*. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in *îs, ûs*, which, however, are not restricted to the feminine, and stand at the same time, in the nominative, for *i-es, u-es*. The Zend, like the Greek, follows in its *i* and *u* bases the analogy of the consonantal terminations, hence, *partay-ō* (*party-as-cha*), *pašav-ō* (*pašv-as-cha*, or, with Guna, *partay-ō, pašav-ō*). In feminine bases in *i, u*, occur at times also the forms *î-s, û-s*, corresponding to the Sanskrit, as, *gavrî-s*, "montes" (Vendidâd S p 313), *ëřëžû-s*, "rectas," *tafnû-s*, "uertes," *pëřëtû-s*, "pontes"

239. Masculine bases in *a*, where they are not replaced by the neuter (§ 231 Note), have, in the accusative, *an* (cf § 61), as, *uzman*, "hos," often occurs, *mazistan*, "marimos" (Vend S p 65). The sibilant is retained before the [G Ed p 277] particle *cha*, and these forms can be copiously quoted, as, *amëshans-cha*, "non-

commentesque ἄνθρωποις *manthrans cha* 'sermonesque
 ἄνθρωπων *aësmans cha* *lignaque*, ἄνθρωποις *tryans cha* *agricolasque* The form ἄνθρωποις *athau*
run ans-cha presbyterosque (V S p 65) is remarkable as
 there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme *athauruna*
 and this form would accordingly shew that consonantal bases
 also could assume the inflexion *ns* with an unavoidable
 auxiliary vowel however unless indeed we are to suppose
 that in the perverted feeling of the language it has been
 introduced by the preponderating analogy of the *a* bases
 More important therefore than this ἄνθρωποις *at iaur-*
unans cha are the accusatives ἄνθρωποις *nūreus* *homines*
 and ἄνθρωποις *streus* *stellas* which occur very frequently,
 while from ἄνθρωποις *dtar* *fire* we have found not ἄνθρωποις
dtir eus but ἄνθρωποις *dtir θ* in which it is to be remarked
 that *dtar* distinguishes itself from other words in *r* in this
 point also that it forms in the nominative singular not
 ἄνθρωποις *dtā* but ἄνθρωποις *dturs* But how is the termination *eus*
 to be explained? I believe in no other way but from ἄνθρωποις
ans by changing the *n* into a vowel as in [G Ld p 278]
 λογους, after which according to § 31 the *a* has be-
 come *ε* the sibilant however which after *a* and *an*
 is *as* must after *u* appear as *us* We actually find too
 in the V S p 311 ἄνθρωποις *nēr ans* in the sense of a dative

* I formerly thought I could, through forms of this kind quote the
 introduction of a euphonic *s* in 7end according to the analogy of § 05
 But if this introduction cannot be proved by cases, in which no ground
 exists for the assumption of an original sibilant, preserved merely by the
 particle ἄνθρωποις (cf §§ 56^b 207 2 8) then the above examples are the
 more important in order to supply a fresh proof that *ns* is the original
 designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a
 vowel The superlative ἄνθρωποις *tell ra-anstima* (of which
 hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participial nominative Other
 cases which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic *s* after
n, have been nowhere met with by me

دَردِ اَهرِ اَشاهِ اَنو، وَاذِ اَهرِ اَشاهِ اَنو، دَردِ اَهرِ اَشاهِ اَنو، دَردِ اَهرِ اَشاهِ اَنو *dārdi at nēran's mazdā ahurā ashaonō,* &c. "da quidem hominibus, magne Ahure puris."

240 As *a* in Sanskrit occurs the most often of all letters as the termination of masculine bases, and we cannot mistake, in the history of our family of languages, the disposition in the sunken state of a language to introduce, by an unorganic addition, the more inconvenient consonantal declension into that of the vowels, I cannot therefore think that it admits of any doubt, that the New Persian plural termination *ân*, which is restricted to the designation of animate creatures, is identical with the Sanskrit अान् *ân* in the masculine plural accusative thus, مردان *maidân*, "homines," answers to मर्त्यान् *martyân*, "mortales," "homines"

241. If, then, the termination ان *ân*, applied to animate beings, belongs to a living being in the old language, the inanimate neuter will be fitted to give us information regarding that New Persian plural termination which is appended to the appellations of inanimate objects. A suffix, in the formation of words which is peculiarly the property of the neuter, is अस *as* (§ 128), which is still more frequently used in Zend than in Sanskrit. In the plural, these Zend neuters form *anha* or *ēnha* (§§ 56^a 235.), and with this *ha* is evidently connected the lengthened ह *há* in New Persian, thus, روز *roz-há*, "days," answers to the Zend राओह *raochanha*, "lights". Many New Persian words have been compared with New German words,

[G Ed p 279] and often, too, correctly; but, except through the medium of the Sanskrit and Zend, it could not have been conjectured that our "Wörter" is, in respect to its termination, related to the New Persian *há*. As, however, the High German has, from its earliest period, repeatedly changed *s* into *r*, and *a* into *i* (later *e*), I have no

* Thus in Spanish the whole plural has the termination of the Latin accusative

doubt the *er*—Middle and New High German *er*—which makes its appearance in the plural in many Old High German neuters is identical with the Sanskrit neuter suffix *अस्* as e.g. *husir* houses *chalpir* 'calves' (cf Grimm, pp 622 and 631) *

212 Here follows a general view of the accusative formation

SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
m <i>erikā n</i>	<i>erika n</i>	λυκο υς,	<i>lupo s</i>	<i>uilkū s</i>	<i>vulfa ns</i>
n <i>dānā n i</i>	<i>dāta</i>	δῶρα,	<i>dona</i>		<i>daura</i>
f <i>jihvā s</i>	<i>hizvā o</i>	χωρα ς	<i>terrū s</i>	<i>ranka s</i>	<i>gibō-s</i>
f <i>tā s</i>	<i>tā-o</i>	τα-ς	<i>is-tā s,</i>	<i>ta s</i>	<i>thō s</i>
m <i>pātī n</i>	<i>paitī o †</i>	ποσι ας,	<i>host es</i>		<i>gasti ns</i>
f <i>bhūy as</i>	<i>āfrīty o †</i>	πορτι ας	<i>mess -es</i>		
f <i>prīti s</i>	<i>ufrīti s</i>	πορτι ς		<i>āvoj-s</i>	<i>ansli ns</i>
n <i>vāri n i</i>	<i>vār a,</i>	ἰῶρι α,	<i>marī a,</i>		
n	<i>hya</i>				<i>uj-a</i>
f <i>bhavishyanti s</i>	<i>būshyainti s †</i>			[G Ed p 280]	
m <i>sūnu n,</i>	<i>pasv-ō †</i>	ιχθυ-ας	<i>pecū s</i>	<i>sunū s,</i>	<i>sunu ns</i>
f <i>bhuv-as</i>	<i>tanv-ō †</i>	πιτυ ας			
f <i>tanū s</i>	<i>tanū s</i>	πιτυ-ς,	<i>socrū s,</i>		<i>handu ns</i>
m <i>madhū n i</i>	<i>madhi a †</i>	μεθυ-α	<i>pecu-a,</i>		

* This *er* however is treated in declension as if the theme originally terminated in *a* and would thus in Sanskrit be *asa*. Hence compared with the dative *hūsuru m* (from *husira m* 6 168) the nom accus *husir* appears an abbreviation. But the relation of our *er* to the Sanskrit *as* is not thereby disturbed, because in general most of the original consonantal terminations in High German have received unorganic vowel additions. Cf pp 148 and 191 G Ed Note. More regarding this hereafter.

† See p 175 G Ed Note †

‡ This form is further confirmed by *անյարօփարթ* **pesō tamā* from *peso tanu* which signifies the hind part of the body (§ 199) but is also used in the sense of blow on the hinder part of the body and in this manner it occurs in the 16th Fargard of the Vend. *արատ զարտջևս անյարօփարթ արչյանանայ աճևս սցէլանայ յանյարթս* *anhāt (anhāt?)*

	SANSKRIT	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	LITHUAN	GOTHIC.
f.	<i>vadhá-s,</i>
m. f.	<i>gá-s,*</i>	<i>gáu-s,</i>	<i>βό(F)-ας,</i>	<i>bov-ēs,</i>
f.	<i>náv-as.</i>	. . .	<i>νά(F)-ας,</i>
f.	<i>vách-as,</i>	<i>vách-ó,†</i>	<i>ὄπ-ας,</i>	<i>voc-ēs,</i>
m.	<i>bhai at-as,‡</i>	<i>bai ěnt-ó,†</i>	<i>φέρωντ-ας,</i>	<i>ferent-ēs,</i>	<i>fiyand-s.</i>
m	<i>átman-as,</i>	<i>aśman-ó,†</i>	<i>δαίμων-ας,</i>	<i>sermon-ēs,</i>	<i>ahman-s.</i>
n.	<i>námán-i,</i>	<i>náman-a,</i>	<i>τάλαν-α,</i>	<i>nomín-a,</i>	<i>namón-a.</i>
m.	<i>bhrátṛī-n,§</i>	<i>bráthr-eus?</i>	<i>πατέρ-ας,</i>	<i>fratr-es,</i>
f.	<i>duhitṛī-n,§</i>	<i>dughdhēr-eus?</i>	<i>θυγατέρ-ας,</i>	<i>matr-es,</i>	<i>duyter-īs,</i>	. . .
m.	<i>dátṛī-n,§</i>	<i>dáthr-eus?</i>	<i>δοτήρ-ας,</i>	<i>datōr-ēs,</i>
n.	<i>vacháns-i,</i>	<i>vachanh-a,</i>	<i>ἔπε(σ)-α,</i>	<i>oper-a,</i>

THE INSTRUMENTAL.

[G Ed p 281] 243 The formation of this case, and what is connected with it, has been already explained in §§. 215 224 , it is therefore sufficient to give here a comparison of the forms which correspond to one another in the cognate languages,

hacha skyaóthná-varěza atha buvanti pěšó-tanva, “*hac pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inflata*” (Anquetil, *Celui qui commet cette action sera coupable du tanafour*) In regard to the *anápěretha*, mentioned at § 232, it is further to be noticed that the *Ḡ th* can only be occasioned by a *ó w* that has been dropped (§ 47), for the theme of the concluding substantive is *ἡρεῖθ pěrětu*, not *pěrěthu* (Vend S pp. 313 and 362, twice)

* Irregularly from a theme *गि gá* (§ 122), for *गवस gav-as* The Zend *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 gáus* (also *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 gáos*), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskrit form *गौ gáu*, so that in respect of the strong and weak cases (§ 129), the relation in this word is distorted In the nominative, for instance, we should expect *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 gáus*, and in the accusative *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 geus*, rather than *vice versa*

† See p 163, Note †

‡ See § 129

§ See §. 127. Note and §. 249. Note †

frequency, but the middle step *i-bus* is wanting; yet the language has scarcely made the spring from *a-bus* at once to *ī-s*, but *a-bus* has weakened the *a* of the base to *ī*, which, to compensate for the *bu* which has been dropped, has been lengthened, thus *terrī-s* from *terrī-bus*, for *terra-bus*, as [G. Ed p 283.] *mālo* from *māvolo* Compare,

SANSKRIT.	ZEND	LATIN	LITHUANIAN.
m <i>vikē-bhyas</i> ,	<i>īhṛkaēi-byó</i> ,	<i>lupē-s</i> .	<i>uilkā-m(u)s</i> *
f <i>jhuā-bhyas</i> ,	<i>hizūā-byó</i> ,	<i>terrī-s</i> ,	<i>rānko-m(u)s</i>
m <i>pati-bhyas</i> ,	<i>pati-byó</i> ,	<i>hosti-bus</i> ,	. . †
f. <i>prīti-bhyas</i> ,	<i>āfrīti-byó</i> ,	<i>messi-bus</i> ,	<i>auī-m(u)s</i> .
m <i>bharīshyantī-bhyas</i> ,	<i>būshyantī-byó</i> ,
m. <i>sūnū-bhyas</i> ,	<i>paśu-byó</i> ,	<i>pecu-bus</i> , ‡	<i>sunu-m(u)s</i> ,
f. <i>īāg-bhyas</i> ,	<i>īāh-e-byó</i> ,	<i>roc-i-bus</i>
m <i>bharād-bhyas</i> ,	<i>barēn-byó</i> , §	<i>ferent-i-bus</i> ,	. . .
m. <i>ātma'-bhyas</i> ,	<i>aśma'-byó</i> ,	<i>sermon-i-bus</i> ,	. .
m. <i>bhrātri-bhyas</i> ,	<i>brātar-ē-byó</i> ,	<i>fratr-i-bus</i> ,	.

THE GENITIVE.

245. The genitive plural in Sanskrit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination अम *ām*, in the Zend *anm*, according to § 61. The Greek *ων* bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that *έδίδων* does to *अददाम* (§§ 4. 10) The Latin has, as usual,

* See § 215

† The masculine *i* bases pass in the plural, by an unorganic increment, into a different declension. And in the dual and dative singular, also, *PATI* had to be given up (Mielcke, p 35, Rem 1)

‡ I have selected the masculine base *PECU*, which occurs only in a few cases, on account of its connection with *𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬀 paśu*, and I have carried it through all the cases, and think, therefore, that I may here also give the original *u-bus* for the corruption *i-bus*

§ See § 224 Note *, p 241

preserved the labial final nasal in its original form but by its influence has shortened the preceding vowel, hence *ped um* (= *pad am*) the *u* of which supplies the place of a short *a* as in *lupum* = वृकम् *ṛikam* λυκοι * [C Ed p 91] The German like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal. In Gothic however the *an d* which has been left, shows itself under two forms and thereby an unorganic difference has been introduced between the feminine genitive termination and that of the masculine neuter since the fuller *d* has remained only to the feminine *ō* and *n* bases.

216 Bases ending with a vowel with the exception partly necessary and partly arbitrary of monosyllables place in Sanskrit a euphonic *n* between the termination and the base the final vowel of which if short is lengthened. This interposition appears to be pristine since the Zend partakes of it although in a more limited degree for instance in all bases in *ā a* and *ā d* hence *εξυμνησεν* *ṛika n-ann* *εξυμνωσεν* *jihā n ann*. To the latter correspond very remarkably the genitives (which occur in Old High German Old Saxon and Anglo Saxon in the

* Regarding the termination *i um* in consonantal bases and *vice versa* respecting *um* in places where *i um* may have been expected we refer the reader to § 1-6. In adjectives the feminine character mentioned in § 112 may have had its effect and may have passed over from the feminine to the other genders, according to the analogy of the Lithuanian (p 14 Note * § 167) thus the *i* of *ferenti um* reminds us of the Sanskrit feminine *भारती bhāranti*. The same is the case with the *i* of the neuter form *ferenti-a* it is bequeathed by the deceased feminine then *ε Ι Δ* *RELATI*. On the other hand contrary to the opinion preferred in § 1-6, we must now regard the *i* before *lus* (e.g. *τοσ ι lus*) as a conjunctive vowel like the *ε e* in the 7th *ι ε by*. Here it is to be observed that those consonantal bases, which admit neither *i a* nor *i um*, must nevertheless proceed before *lus* to announce an *i*. In the chapter upon the adjectives we shall recur to the feminine character *i* and then treat also of the *i* for *e* in the singular ablative of the common dialect.

corresponding class of words) in *ô-n-ô*, *e-n-a*; hence, Old High German *lepô-n-ô*, Old Saxon *gebô-n-ô*, Anglo-Saxon *gife-n-a*.

247 We find the bases in short and long *i*, in Zend, if [G Ed p 285] polysyllabic, only with euphonic *n* on the other hand the monosyllabic *i* bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure, thus, *thry anm* or *thray-anm*, "trium," from *thri*, *vay-anm*, "avium," from *vi*. Bases in *y* or *u* admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic *n*, but I find from the masculine 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *paśu* only *paśv-anm* on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *tanu*, "body," 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎 *naśu*, "corpse" (cf *νέκυς* according to § 21), hitherto only *u-n-anm*. With Guna 𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎 *paśav-anm* would serve as a prototype for the Gothic *suniv-ê* with Guna weakened (§. 27).

248 Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskrit, साम् *sām** for आम् *ām*, and thus may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that *ām* would properly be only the termination of the termination, and the *s* connected with the genitive singular would be the chief person. If this is the case, the abbreviation of this termination in substantives and adjectives must still be recognised as very ancient, for the Gothic, which in the plural nominative restricts itself so rigorously to the old limits (§. 228), gives to the sibilant, in the genitive also, no wider scope, hence *thi-zê* (§. 86 5) = *te-shām* (for *tê-sām*, according to § 21) "horum", *thi-zo* = *tâ-sâm*, "harum." Here the *a*, like the *ô* of the base *TIA*, *THÔ*, appears weakened to *i* (§ 66) on the other hand, the adjective *a* and *ô* bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have *ai-zê*, *ai-zô*, and *blindai-zê*, "cæcorum" (for *binda-zê*), answers exactly to the Sanskrit तेषाम् *te-śhām*

* Cf Old Prussian *son*, e g. in *stei-son*, "τῶν."

(from *ta sām*) from the base πta The High German has changed the old sibilant to r as in many other places hence in Old High German *de-rō* for *thi sē* and *thi zō* of which termination only the r has remained [G Ed p 286] to us To the Latin in like manner belongs *rum* for *sum* (§ 27) hence *istorum istorum* *

249 We give here a general view of the formation of the genitive

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	GREEK	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOTHIC
m	<i>iri ā n-am</i>	<i>iehrka n anm</i>	λυκ ωι,	<i>lupo-rum</i>	<i>vilks ā</i>	<i>vulf ē</i>
m n	<i>te shām</i>	<i>taē shanm,</i>	τ ων	<i>isto rum,</i>	<i>i ā</i>	<i>thi ē</i>
f	<i>jihudā n am</i>	<i>hi.va n aum</i>	χωρα ων	<i>terrā rum</i>	<i>rank ā</i>	<i>keþþ n ō †</i>

* This *rum*, however, has, like the property of the plural nominative (§ 28) "found its way or returned from the pronominal declension into the entire second, first and fifth declension, which is originally identical with the latter (§§ 121 and 137) The transplanting of the *rum* termination into the declensions mentioned was the easier as all pronouns in the genitive plural belong to the second and first declension Forms, however remain especially in the old languages, which evince that the language was not always equally favourable to the bringing back the termination *rum* (*deum socium amphorum drachmum agricolum &c*) On the other hand, the termination *rum* appears also to have attempted to fix itself in consonantal bases with *e* as conjunctive vowel if at least the forms furnished by Varro and Charis—*boverum Joverum lapiderum regerum nucerum* (Hartung p 255)—are to be regarded as correct and do not perhaps stand for *bovo-rum* &c as also in Zend the base *go* may extend itself to *gata* The Latin *rum* and Sanskrit *sām* lead us to expect the Greek $\sigma\omega\nu$ this is not met with however even in the pronoun so that the Greek in this respect stands in the strongest opposition to the Latin The forms in $\alpha\omega\nu \epsilon\omega\nu$ (*e g a τ ω αυτ ων αγρ ων αγρο ω*) point however to a consonant that has been dropped It is a question, therefore whether universally a Σ (cf § 128) or as the Sanskrit and Zend lead us to expect only in pronouns a Σ but in other words of the first and second declension an N has been dropped as in $\mu\iota\zeta\omega$ from $\mu\zeta\upsilon\alpha$ According to this $\lambdaυκ\omega\nu$ would be to be derived from $\lambda\kappa\omicron\nu\omega\nu \chi\omega\rho\alpha\omega\nu$ from $\chi\omega\rho\alpha\nu\omega\nu$ but $\tau\omega\nu$ from $\tau\omicron\sigma\omega\nu$ $\tau\omega\nu$ from $\tau\omicron\sigma\omega\nu$

† Old High German, see § 246

	SANSKRIT.	ZEND	GREEK.	LATIN	LITHUAN	GOthic
f.	<i>tâ-sâm</i> ,	<i>â-onhanm</i> ,	<i>τά-ων</i> ,	<i>istâ-rum</i> ,	<i>t'-û</i> ,	<i>thu-zô</i> .
[G Ed p 287.] m. n.	<i>tray-â-nâm</i> ,	<i>thray-anm</i> ,	<i>τρι-ῶν</i> ,	<i>tri-um</i> ,	<i>tri-û</i> ,	<i>thry-ê</i>
f	<i>prîtî-n-âm</i> ,	<i>âfrîti-n-anm</i> ,	<i>πορτίων</i> ,	<i>messi-um</i> ,	<i>awi-î</i> ,	<i>anst'-e</i>
m.	<i>sûnû-n-âm</i> ,	<i>pasv-anm</i> ,	<i>ἰχθύ-ων</i> ,	<i>pecu-um</i> ,	<i>sun'-û</i> ,	<i>sunu-ê</i>
f.	<i>tanû-n-âm</i> ,	<i>tanu-n-anm</i> ,	<i>πιτύ-ων</i> ,	<i>socru-um</i> ,	<i>handiv-ê</i> .
m. f.	<i>gav-âm</i> ,	<i>gav-anm</i> ,	<i>βο(F)ῶν</i> ,	<i>bov-um</i> ,
f.	<i>nâ-ûâm</i> ,	<i>να(F)-ῶν</i> ,
f	<i>vâch-âm</i> ,	<i>vâch-anm</i> ,	<i>ὄπ-ῶν</i> ,	<i>voc-um</i> ,
m. n.	<i>bharat-âm</i> ,	<i>barënt-anm</i> , †	<i>φρόντ-ων</i> ,	<i>ferenti-um</i> ,	<i>fiyand-ê</i> .
m.	<i>âtman-âm</i> ,	<i>ašman-anm</i> ,	<i>δαίμόν-ων</i> ,	<i>sermon-um</i> ,	<i>akmen-û</i> ,	<i>ahman-ê</i> .
m.	<i>bhrâtîrî-n-âm</i> ,	<i>biâthr-anm</i> , ‡	<i>πατέρ-ων</i> ,	<i>fratr-um</i> ,

* This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit अिसाम् *â-sâm* "harum," "earum" (§ 56^b), from *स्र* *tâ*, *tâonhanm* would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, *स्रस्रस्रस्रस्र* *al-tanhanm* not *aêtâonhanm*, as might be expected from *स्रस्रस्र* *etâ-sâm*.

† Or, also, *स्रस्रस्रस्रस्र* *barantanm*, as in the Vendidad Sâde, p 131, *स्रस्रस्रस्रस्र* *šaochantanm*, "lucentum" on the other hand, also, frequently *šaochantanm*.

‡ This and the following genitives from bases in *ar* are clearly more genuine, and are more nearly allied therefore to the cognate European languages than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, which, in this case, has shortened *ar* to *रि*, and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From *स्र* *nar* frequently occurs *nar-anm*, with retention of the *a*, on account of the base being monosyllabic. On the other hand, *âthr-anm* from *âtar*, "fire," and *स्रस्रस्र* *tisr-anm* "trium," fem for the Sanskrit *तिस्रि* *tisri-n-âm* (Gramm. Crit r 255). From *स्र* *dughdhar*, we find the form *dughdhër-anm* (cf p 208, G Ed Note †) the Codex has, however, *दुग्धस्र* (p 472, L 2). In general, in this word the readings *dughdhar* (*blinda-zê*), are interchanged in various passages the former, however, common.

LOCATIVE

250 The character of the plural locative [G Ed p 203] is in Sanskrit सु सु which is subject to be changed into पु रु (§ 21) for which in Zend is found शु shu (§ 57) while from सु सु according to § 53 has been formed वु hu The more usual form for shu and hu (for which also occur shu and hu) is however शुशु sha sha which leads to a Sanskrit ससा This appears to me to be the original form of the termination for nothing is more common in Sanskrit than that the syllables य ita and य ya should free themselves from the r vowel, and then change the semi vowel into a vowel as उर ulra is said for rakra (see also § 12) The supposition therefore of the Indian abbreviation of the termination is far more probable than that of a Zend extension of it by a lately-added a especially as in no other case does a similar aftergrowth admit of being established But if स सा is the original form of the termination it is then identical with the reflexive possessive base स सा of which more hereafter * The same relation which in Latin si bi has to su bi (which might be conjectured from su i) or that ti bi has to tu bi Sanskrit तुभ्यम् tu bhyaṃ the Greek dative locative termination σι (σι) has to the Sanskrit सु सु †

Therefore in Zend the locative शुशुशु *trishu* is identical with शुशुशु *trishca* the third part since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part

† Regarding the termination w of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see § 20 From the Tohe form *ιμμοι* quoted by Hartung (1860) from Apoll I cannot infer that ι is an abbreviation of σ ι if it were so the ι al oin ημ would not adhere so firmly It appears to me more suitable, therefore to accord to the common declension an influence upon the transformation of the form of inflexion peculiar to the pronouns without gender but of the highest antiquity, an influence which has penetrated further in σφ σι for σφ ι

[G. Ed p. 289] 251. The bases in ञ *a* add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an *i*; but from *a + i* is formed *ए* *é* (§. 2), to which the Greek *οι* corresponds; hence, लुको-सि = वृकेषु *viké-shu*. Hence the *i* in Greek has also passed over to the bases in *α-*, *η-*, either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskrit the ञ *a* remains pure; hence, गृहवासु *gṛhā-su*, with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as Πλαταιᾶσιν, Ὀλυμπιάσιν, Ἀθήνησιν (Buttmann, §. 116. R. 7. and Hartung, p. 461.)

252. Like the Gothic, the Lithuanian has an unorganic difference between the terminations which mark the case in the masculine and feminine in the genitive plural the first has the sound of *se*, and the latter of *sa*, with the original and more powerful *a*, which, in the masculine, has softened into *e*. The ending *sa* is plainly from the *swa*, assumed above (p. 267, l. 7.) to be the original form, from which it is made by rejecting the semi-vowel.

253. Here follows a general view of the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian plural locatives, with the Greek datives

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUAN	GREEK
	m. <i>viké-shu</i> ,	<i>vēhrkaé-shva</i> ,	<i>ullū-se</i> ,	λύκοι-σι
[G. Ed p. 290]	f. <i>gṛhā-su</i> ,	<i>hizvā-hva</i> ,	<i>ranko-sa</i> ,	Ὀλυμπιάσιν, χώραι-σι.
	f. <i>prīti-shu</i> ,	<i>āfrīti-shva</i> ,†	<i>āwi-sa</i> ,	πόρτι-σι
	m. <i>sānu-shu</i> ,	<i>paśu-shva</i> ,	<i>dangū-se</i> ,	ἰχθύ-σι.
	m. f. <i>go-shu</i> ,	βου-σί.
	f. <i>nau-shu</i> ,	ναυ-σί.

* The common termination *ois*, *aīs* (*oi-s*, *ai-s*), formed by curtailing *οι-σι*, *αι-σι*, and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskrit curtailed instrumental ending ऐस् *āis* (§. 219), which had before required consideration, because the Greek dative is also used as the instrumental

† I have no authority for the locative of the Zend bases in *z*, but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in *u*, which can be referred to in copious instances

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	LITHUAN	GREEK
f	<i>īdh shu</i>	<i>īdē-sīa?</i>		οι σι
m n	<i>bharat su</i>	<i>brātar e shīa?</i>		φερου σι
m	<i>ātma su</i>	<i>asma -hva *</i>		δαιμο-σι
m	<i>bhrātri shu</i>			πατρα σι †
n	<i>īachas su</i>	<i>īachō hva †</i>		ἔπεσ σι

* Thus in the Vend Sade p 499 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺 *ushahīa* from 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺 *ushan* and p 500 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 *damahīa*, from 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺 *dāman*

† The *a* in this form is not as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel but rests on a transposition as $\delta\rho\alpha$ ν for $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$, and in Sanskrit दृश्यामि *draśhyāmi* 'I will see' for दृश्यामि *dark hyāmi* (Sansk Gramm § 34^b) thus πατρ σι (compare τρ σι) for παταρσ (compare τσαρσ) which by preserving the original vowel agrees with the Sanskrit base *ptar* better than παρρα *patēpes* &c The same applies to the dative αρν σι since the theme of ρνος has *a* as appears from the cognate word $\rho\eta$, αρην *arrēn*, rejected a vowel between the ρ and ν which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an *a*, and removed from its place The whole *REN* appears to be a transposition of *Ner* Sanskrit नर *nar* (नृन्) 'a man, for $\rho\eta\nu$ properly means "male sheep" The *a* of ρ $\sigma\iota$ is therefore etymologically identical with that of ανδρ σι (comp Kühner's complete Greek Grammar § 981 Rem 2) It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the *a* of ν $\sigma\iota$ it is either the older and stronger form for the of εισ or this word must have had, besides its three themes (YIO, YI YIEY) a fourth YIAT from which came $\nu\alpha\sigma$ as $\gamma\alpha\sigma\iota$ from γονατ the more prevailing co theme of γονυ which latter agrees with जानु *janu*

‡ In the Vendidad Sade p 499 we find the analogous plural locatives 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺 *uzirohīa* and 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺 *esapohīa* Anquetil translates the former by 'au lever du sol il' and the latter by 'à la nuit' It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺 *as* (§ 56^b) Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺 *ar*, and the interchange of 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺 *esapar* with 𑀘𑀓𑀭𑀺𑀢𑀺 *esapo* is a similar case to that in Sanskrit, where अहन् *ahan* "day" forms some cases from अहस् *ahas* (from which अहो *aho* in अहोभिस् *ahobhis* &c), and together with

[G Ed p 291.] "Remark From the bases in ΕΣ, to which in the dative $\sigma\sigma\iota$ (= अह् *as-su*) properly belongs, this form appears to have imparted itself to other bases terminating

[G Ed p 292] differently, in which, for this case, an extension of the original theme by $\epsilon\varsigma$ is to be adopted, which, in its origin, is identical with the abovementioned (§. 241) plural increase to the base by $\iota\tau$ (from *is* and *this*, from *us*), in Old High German forms, as *hūsir*, "houses," *chalpīri* "calves," which are the plural themes, with which the nominative, accusative, and vocative are identical, and from which, in the dative, by the addition of the ending for that case, arises *hūsirum*, *chalpīrium*, as, in Greek, $\kappaύνοσ\sigma\iota$, $\nuκκύοσ\sigma\iota$, $πάντοσ\sigma\iota$, $γυναικός\sigma\iota$, $πολίτῶσ\sigma\iota$, and others, from the unorganically increased themes ΚΥΝΕΣ , ΝΕΚΥΕΣ , &c., according to the analogy of ἘΠΕΣ From the doubled Σ one may then be rejected (ἀνάκτοσιν , πολίτῃσι , μήνοσσι), or the doubling of a Σ by itself be employed, as, for example, $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\upsilon\text{-}\sigma\sigma\iota$, for $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\upsilon\text{-}\sigma\iota$. This,

with the theme अहस् exists another, अह *ahan*. The anomaly of the Sanskrit "day" appears, in Zend, to have passed completely over to "night," as this latter word has also a theme in *n*, namely 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀 *csapan*, of which the genitive pl 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀𐬀 *csafnanm*—analogous with अह्नाम् *ahnām*, "dierum" (§ 40 relative to 𐬀 for 𐬀 p)—is found in connection with the feminine numeral 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *tisānm*, "trīnm" (Vend S p 246), for we read, l c § 163, *aśnanmcha* (= अह्नाच *ahnāncha*), *csafananmcha* (read *csafnanmcha*), "of days and nights" In Sanskrit, by the suffix अ *a*, the form अह्ना *ahna*, derivative, but equal in its meaning, has arisen out of अहन् *ahan*, which, however, occurs only in compounds (as पूर्वाह्ण *pūrvāhṇa*, "the early part of the day"), and in the adverbial dative अह्नाय *ahnāya*, "soon," "immediately," which, therefore, it is not necessary to deduce from the root 𐬫𐬀 *hnu*, with the *a* privative. The Zend, however, whose night-nomenclature, in this respect also, is not outstripped by the Sanskrit, produces, as it appears, by a similar mutation, 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀 *csafna* from 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀 *csapan*, whence we find the locative 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀 *csafnē*, which might also be taken for the dative of 𐬫𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬭𐬀𐬀 *csapan*,

in most important particulars is adopted by Thiersch § 128 for the development of the forms in εσαι only that he with draws from the neuter βῆ es described in § 128 as ΒΕΛΕΣ the Σ which belongs to them and by a supposition proved to be erroneous ΒΕΛΕ is made the theme and he divides forms like ὄχεσφι into ὄχε σφι instead of ὄχεσ φι and, by assimilation derives ὄχεσαι from ὄχε σφι while as I believe I have proved the forms ὄχεσ φι and ὄχεσαι rest on entirely different case suffixes (§ 218) and have only the base ΟΥΕΣ in common with one another. An assimilation, however may be remarked in γουνασσι from γουνασσι so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second not the reverse. In δεπασσι we shall leave it undecided whether the first Σ be primitive, and ΔΕΠΑΣ the theme (comp γῆρας § 128) or whether it has arisen out of τ and so ΔΕΠΑΣ with ΤΕΡΑΤ ΚΕΡΑΤ belong to one class. If,

csapan but that it is preceded (V S p 163) by the unequivocal adjective locative 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯, *naēmē* (from 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯, *naēma* half) Compare also I c § 149 where 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯 *ithra ašnē ithra*, *csafnē* probably means in this day in the night with the locative adverb 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯 *ithra* 'here' in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯 *csafna* the plural of the same noun *csafna* might also be assigned which occurs I c §§ 330 331 and in several places elsewhere 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯 *thrayo csafna* 'three night' 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯 *csas csafna* six night 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯 *nana csafna* nine night if here *csafna* be not (as in § 231 Note † it was considered to be) rather to be taken for the plural of 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯 *csapan*, as neuter since as has been before observed the Zend uses the gender of the substantive with great laxity especially in the plural. For the frequently occurring ablative 𑀓𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀯 *csaparāt* however we cannot assume another theme *csapara* but we must if the reading be correct admit that feminine consonantal roots in the ablative adopt also the broader ending *āt* for *at*.

however, in all these forms, we allow only $\sigma\iota$ or $\sigma\iota\nu$ to be the case-suffix, and all that precedes it is referred to the true or unorganic increase of the base, it can therewith not be denied that not even to Homer himself, in forms like $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$, not to mention unorganic forms like $\acute{\kappa}\acute{\upsilon}\nu\sigma\sigma\iota$, did the entire $\sigma\sigma\iota$ present

[G Ed p 293] itself as pertaining to that which marked the case, for in the feeling of the speaker $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$ could present itself, during that period of the language, only as what it is, namely, as $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\text{-}\sigma\iota$, while $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma\sigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\iota$, plural $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\alpha$ and not $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\sigma\sigma\sigma$, &c., were used in declension. But different from what has been here adopted is the assumption of Hartung (p 260, ff.) and Kuhner (l. c. §. 255. R. 8), in the most material points following Greg. Cor. *Æol.* § 35., relative to the production of the Greek plural datives. Kuhner says (l. c) "The character of the dative plural is $\epsilon\varsigma$ (character of the plural) and ι or $\iota\nu$ (character of the dative singular), therefore, $\sigma\sigma\iota(\nu)$ " I, however, think $\epsilon\varsigma$ not the character of number, but of the nominative plural, and connected with the nominative singular through its Σ a union of the plural nominative suffix with the singular dative is, to me, not to be imagined. If it were so, how could neuter nouns, to which $\epsilon\varsigma$ in the nominative is quite foreign, arrive, in the dative, at their identity of form with the natural sexes? It further deserves to be remarked, that, in Prâkrit, the locative ending $\text{सु } su$ frequently assumes an Anuswâra, and so adapts itself, by the form $\text{सुं } sun$, for su , to the Greek, $\sigma\iota\nu$, for $\sigma\iota$

254. After laying down the laws of the formation of a single case, it may serve to facilitate the general survey if examples are adduced of the most important classes of words in their connected declension. We pass over here from the Sanskrit, and go to the other languages in their order, according as they have, in the particular cases, most truly preserved their original form, and where one or other of them has departed entirely from the original

principle of formation or by an unorganic increase to the base has entered the province of another declension we there in the place in question exclude it from the comparison

MASCULINE BASES IN *a*, GREEK IN *o* LATIN IN *u o*

SINGULAR

Nominative	Sanskrit <i>vrika s</i> Lithuanian <i>wilka s</i> Zend <i>vehrk o</i> with <i>cha</i> <i>vehrkas cha</i> Greek $\lambdaυκο ς$ Latin <i>lupu s</i> Gothic <i>vulf s</i> *
Accusative	Sanskrit <i>vrika m</i> Lithua [G Ed p 294] nian <i>wilka n</i> Zend <i>vehrke-m</i> Greek $\lambdaυκο ι$ Latin <i>lupu-m</i> Gothic <i>vulf</i>
Instrumental	Sanskrit <i>vrike na</i> Zend <i>vehrka</i> Gothic Dat <i>vulfa</i> Lithuanian Instr <i>wilku</i>
Dative	Sanskrit <i>vrikāya</i> Zend <i>vehrkāi</i> Lithuanian <i>wilku</i>
Ablative	Sanskrit <i>vrika t</i> Zend <i>vehrkā t</i> Latin <i>lup o(d)</i> (see § 181)
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>vrika sua</i> Greek $\lambdaυκο-(σ)ιοϚ$ Zend <i>vehrka hé</i> Gothic <i>vulfi s</i> Lithuanian <i>wilko</i>

* The meaning is in all these languages the same and so is the theme in its first origin. The connection of the Lithuan *wilkas* with *vrikas* rests on the very usual interchange of the semi vowels *r* and *l* and this latter goes through the whole of the European sister languages. The Gothic *vulfs* shows moreover the equally common interchange of gutturals and labials and follows the rule for the alteration of letters (Asp for Tenuis see § 87). In Latin the same thing takes place with regard to the supply of the guttural by the corresponding labial but *lupus* is further altered through the loss of the initial letter *V* as is the Greek $\lambdaυκο ς$ it may however be assumed that this *ι* is introduced into the middle of the word in being vocalized into *u*. While therefore in Lithuanian in *wilkas* *l* and *k* are united they are in Greek separated by

† M Reimnitz whose pamphlet *The System of Greek Declension* (Potsdam 1831) had not been seen by me before I completed the preceding Part of this book unfolds (l c p 122 passim) the same views concerning

Locative,	Sanskrit <i>vriké</i> (from <i>vrika + i</i>), Zend <i>v̄hriké</i> [G. Ed p 295] (<i>maidhyá</i> , § 196), Lithuanian <i>uilké</i> , Greek Dat. <i>λόρω</i> (<i>οἴροι</i> § 195.) Latin Gen <i>lup' -ī</i>
Vocative,	Sanskrit <i>vrika</i> , Zend <i>v̄hrika</i> , Lithuanian <i>willé</i> , Greek <i>λόρε</i> , Latin <i>lupe</i> , Gothic <i>vulf</i> *

DUAL

Nom Acc.Voc	Sanskrit <i>vrikáu</i> , Vedic <i>vriká</i> , Zend <i>v̄hrkáu</i> , Lith. Nom. <i>uilkù</i> , Voc. <i>uilkù</i> , Greek <i>λόρω</i>
Instl Dat Abl	Sanskrit <i>vriká-bhyám</i> , Zend <i>v̄hrkaú-bya</i> , Greek Dat Gen <i>λόρω-ω</i> , Lithuanian Dat <i>uilkà-m</i> (see § 215)
Gen Loc	Sansk <i>vrikay-ós</i> , Zend <i>v̄hrikay-ó</i> (see Rcm. 1), Lithuanian <i>uilkù</i>

PLURAL

Nom. Voc.	Sanskrit <i>vrikás</i> , Gothic <i>vulfós</i> .*
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>vriká-n</i> , Zend <i>v̄hrka-n</i> , Goth <i>vulfa-ns</i> , Greek <i>λόρω-ς</i> (from <i>λόρω-ις</i> , §. 236.), Lithuanian <i>uilkùs</i> , Latin <i>lupō-s</i>

the Greek *οιο* and its connection with the Sanskrit *a-sya* which I have, without being aware of his concurrence, brought forward in § 189 I have, however, in this respect, already stated my views in my pamphlet "On the Demonstrative and the Origin of Case" (in the Transactions of the Hist Phil Class of the Academy of Science of Berlin for the year 1826, p 100 Here I have only further to observe, that the Greek adj *δημόσιος*, from the root *ΔΗΜΟ*, is, in the suffix by which it is formed, probably connected with the genitive ending in the text; and is therefore remarkable with reference to the preservation of the *s*, which is lost in *δήμοιο* With regard to the origin of *δημόσιος* from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin *cujus*, *a*, *um*, and the identity of the Sanskrit suffix of words like *मनुष्य* *manushya*, "man," as a derivative from *Manu*, with the genitive ending *य* *shya* for *स्य* *sya*, as in *अमुष्य* *amu-shya*, "illius"

* With reference to the Zend, see § 231 Note †; and with regard to the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian forms *λόροι*, *lupi*, *willai*, see § 228

Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>vriḍā is*</i> (from <i>vriḍā bhūḥ</i>) Veda <i>irihé bhūḥ</i> Zend <i>vehrhā-is</i> Lithuanian <i>uilka is</i> Prakrit <i>dece-hin</i> (from <i>dēva</i> God see § 220) Greek <i>θεο φη</i> † Gothic Dat Instr <i>uulfa m</i> (§ 215)
Dat Abl	Sanskrit <i>irihé bhūyas</i> Zend [G Ed p 296] <i>vehrhaei byθ</i> Latin <i>lupi s</i> (<i>amicibus</i> § 244) Lithuanian <i>uilka m(u)s</i> (§ 215)
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>irihā nām</i> Zend <i>vehrka nānā</i> Greek <i>λυκ ω</i> Lithuanian <i>nilk u</i> Gothic <i>wulf ē</i> Latin <i>lupo rum</i> (§ 218)

* I take the liberty, in order to separate the base and the termination to divide the diphthongs as above in *λυκ s* therefore one must here pronounce *vehrhāis* and in Lithuanian *uilkais* not as trisyllables, but as dissyllables

† I have remarked at § 217 but only as a conjecture that the ending *φ v* in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit *भिसु* *bhis* and the thence derived Prakrit *ह्रि* *hin* and the Latin *bis* in *nobis* *vobis* and I will not advance more than a conjecture here also in comparing *θεο φη* with *dēce hin*. Thus only is certain that with the syllable *भि* *bhi* which in Sanskrit lies at the bottom of the case forms *भिसु* *bhis* *भ्यम्* *bhyam* and *भ्याम्* *bhyām*, as their common root (see § 215 passim) the Greek *φ* and *φ v* is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M Ag Bernary (*Berl Ann July 1833 p 51*) that *φ v* might be formed from the ending *भ्यम्* *bhyām* (§ 222) by the contraction of *यया* into *i* (as in *ημ v μ τ ω* &c § 222). The third possible supposition would be the derivation from the usual dative ablative plural termination *भ्यस्* *bhyas* again with the corruption of *s* to *v* as in the 1st person plural *μ v* from *μ s* and in the 2d and 3d person *τ v* from *τ s* *तस्* *tas*. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination *भ्याम्* *bhyām* (§ 215) and the changing thus number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer however to consider *φ* (*φ v*) as from one of the multifarious terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions therefore from *भिसु* *bhis* or *भ्यम्* *bhyas*

Locative, Sanskrit *nikê-shu*, Zend *vêhrkaê-shva*, Lithuanian *willkûse*, Greek Dat. *λύκοι-σι*

NEUTER BASES IN *a*, GREEK *o*, LATIN *u*, *o*.

SINGULAR

Nom. Acc Sanskrit *dâna-m*, Zend *dâtê-m*, Latin *donu-m*,
Greek *δῶρο-ν*, Lithuanian *géra*, Gothic *daur'*.
Vocative, Sanskrit *dâna*, Zend *dâta*, Gothic *daur'*.
The rest as the masculine

DUAL

Nom. Acc. Voc Sanskrit *dâné* (from *dâna + î*), Zend *dâtê*.
The rest as the masculine.

[G Ed p 297]

PLURAL

Nom. Acc Voc Sanskrit *dânâ-n-i*, Vêdic *dânâ*, Zend *dâta*, Latin *donâ*, Greek *δῶρα*, Gothic *dauwa*.
The rest as the masculine

“Remark 1 —The Zend system of declension has received some valuable additions from the treatises published by Burnouf since the appearance of the First Part of this book, which I must lay before my readers.* First a dual case, viz the genitive-locative, which I imagined to be lost in the Zend, as I had searched for it alone in vain, and could supply all the other dual endings in tolerable copiousness. M Burnouf supplies this (*Yasna, Notes et éclaircissements*, p cxxii) by the expressions 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀 𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀 *ubôyô anhvô* which are to be twice found in V S p 312, and on both occasions are rendered by Anquetil, whose

* First, a review of this Part in the *Journal des Savans*, which refers particularly to the Zend, then the First Part of the First Volume of a Commentary on the Yaçna, lastly, a disquisition in the *Nouveau Journal Asiatique*, “*Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasichta, et sur quelques superlatifs en Zend*”

translation is in this place particularly confused *dans ce monde*. This translation might lead us astray so much the more easily that अन्वो *anho* according to § 187 might also be the singular genitive which frequently occurs with a locative meaning. We await the elucidation which Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation will give of this passage but for the present content ourselves with the inferences deduced by Burnouf अभयौ *uboyô* according to that authority corresponds with the Sanskrit अभयात् *ubhayos* (*amborum in ambobus*) with *ô* for *a* probably according to Burnouf's acute conjecture through the influence of the preceding *b* and with the loss of the concluding *s*. I am the more inclined to assent to Burnouf's opinion regarding the origin of the first *ô* of अभयौ *ubôyô* as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case in which अयो *ayo* not अयौ *ôyo* actually occurs because that is to say no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the *a*—I mean the form अस्तयौ *zastayô* (= Sanskrit *hastayos*) in the hands from अस्ता *zasta* [G F d p 98] in a passage of the Jzschine which has perhaps not yet been examined by M Burnouf (V S p 351) $\text{अश्वी द्रुयं द्यानमस्तयो}$ *kathâ ashâi druyim dyanm -astayo* * which Anquetil (p 192) translates by *Comment moi pur mettraï je le main sur le Daroudj?* It appears however that अश्वी *ashâi* can as little be a nominative as अस्तयौ *zastayô* a singular accusative and I believe I am not wrong in the following literal translation. How can I give the (Demon) Drudj into the hands of the pure (into the power)?"

Remark 2—In the instrumental singular M Burnouf admits the termination *ana* in bases in *a* (Yaçna p 98 passim) with *n* introduced for the sake of euphony

* The Codex has faultily अश्वी *ashâi* and द्रुयं *druyem*

according to the analogy of the Sanskrit *एना* (§. 158.). He rests this, among other forms, on that of *मज्जमन्* *maésmana*, “*uriné*,” a word which had often attracted my attention, and from which I, in like manner, would have deduced instrumentals in *a-na* if I had not differed from Burnouf in the etymology of the same, as I make its theme terminate in *n*; and this word, which I remember to have seen only in the instrumental, I derive from the Sanskrit root *मिह्* *mih*, “*mingere*,” by a suffix *मन्* *man*, according to the analogy of *बर्हश्मन्* *barěśman*, from *वृह्* *vih*, “*to grow*,” whose instrumental *बर्हश्मन्* *barěśmana*, analogous with *मज्जमन्* *maésmana*, occurs very frequently. M. Burnouf appears, on the other hand, to adopt a suffix *ma* in the word *maésmana*, in which we think we cannot agree with him as long as we cannot supply any cases which must indubitably belong to a theme in *a*. If, further, some words, which in their theme terminate in *अ* *as* (ॡ, Sanskrit *अस्* *as*), adopt *ana* in the instrumental form M. Burnouf quotes, p. 100 note, *मज्जमन्* *mazana*, *स्रयान्* *śrayana*, and *रान्हान्* *ranhana*; still, in my opinion, bases in *a* may be assigned as the origin of these forms, and they can be divided *maza-na*, &c., only in as far as such forms have been already proved to belong to undoubted bases in *a*. But now we prefer dividing them *mazan-a*, so that the letter *s*, with which these themes originally terminate, is interchanged with a nasal, just as,

[G Ed p 299] in Sanskrit, the words *यकन्* *yaknt*, *शकन्* *śaknt* change their *t* for *n* in the weak cases, and may substitute *यकन्* *yakan*, *शकन्* *śakan*, or as, in more remote analogy, the Greek, in the first person plural, has formed *μεν* from *μες* (*मस्* *mas*, “*mus*”) Besides this, M. Burnouf cites also the interrogative instrumental *कान्* *kana*, “*with what?*” which is the only word that brings to my mind somewhat of conviction, and had struck my attention before, in passages like *प्रयान् कान् यज्जान्* *kana yazna yazané*, “*with*

what offering shall I sacrifice? (V S p 181) I have not however ventured to draw a grammatical deduction from this form because the pronominal bases are prone to unite with one another and because I believed I might assume that the same pronoun which is contained in *अन ana* and *एन éna* forms also the last element of *अना lana* if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved as has also occurred in the Sanskrit *अन ana* and *एन éna* in but a few cases For the rest, the Greek *κεῖνος* also appears connected with this *अना lana* if it is looked upon as a theme with which the instrumental must agree in sound for *κεῖνος*, if not directly of interrogative meaning is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp *कश्चन kashchana* who ever) Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in *a n a* especially as also the bases in *i* and *u* (in which the Sanskrit in the masculine and neuter likewise introduces a euphonic *n*) in the Zend in words which we have noticed have dispensed with a similar insertion (§ 160) In another place (*Journal des Savans*) M Bui nouf deduces the frequently occurring instrumental *अशयदा ashaydá* with purity from the masculine theme *अशा asha* and there would be accordingly *अशया ashaya* in instrumental form at present standing alone in the Zend which I hesitate to acknowledge although it would be analogous to the Vedic form mentioned in § 158 *सुपना suapnayá* if one derives this with the Indian grammarians from a theme *सुप्ना suapna* But if instrumental forms of this kind in the Vedas or in the Zend are not to be produced in other undoubted instances as in the case of adjectives in construction with masculine or neuter substantives nothing prevents the assumption that the form *सुपना suapnayá* belongs to a feminine theme *सुपना suapná* especially as the suffix *न na* occurs also in other abstracts in the feminine form *ना ná* and therefore *सुपना suapnayá*

may be explained according to the analogy of *तृणैर्निश्चि* *trish-*
 [G Ed p 300] *nayá*, "with thirst" In every case I think
 I may deduce the Zend *ashaya* from a feminine
 theme *ashá*, as the Zend in general, in the substantive,
 passes readily from one sex to the other, and, for example,
 with a masculine base *mant'ra*, "a speech," occurs,
 also, a feminine *mant'rá*

"Remark 3 For the genitive termination *hé* there
 also exists, as Burnouf has most satisfactorily proved, a
 form nearer to the Sanskrit *sya*, viz *hyá*, which,
 although rather rare in comparison with the more
 corrupt form *há*, is still sufficiently frequent in some
 chapters of the *Izeschne* to satisfy one perfectly of its
 signification, according to the proofs given by Burnouf
 I too had remarked words with the ending *hyá*,
 but in passages where Anquetil's translation was little
 adapted to bring to light the genitive nature of the same,
 which, besides, was very much obscured through its usual
 representative *hé*, and was, moreover, concealed from
 me under the appearance of an instrumental form.
 However, the termination *hyá*—for which is sometimes
 found, also, *khyá* approaches so very near to the
 Sanskrit *sya*, and agrees with it so precisely according
 to rule, as far as the unorganic lengthening of the *a*, that
 a single passage, with the accurate translation of Nerio-
 singh, who, in the passages hitherto edited, follows the
 original word by word, would have led us to it Such a
 passage is given, although with a different aim, by Bur-
 nouf in his *Yaçna* (Notes, p ८३३), which we here annex,
 as it is interesting in other respects, also, for grammar
kašná zanthuá patá ashahyá paourivyó kašná kheng štrencha dát adhráněm Ne-
 riosingh translates this passage word for word, only that
 he renders *kašná*, "which man?" (here properly not more

than ' who for the idea of मनु is lost in the general signification of the whole) not by का ना *lo nā* but simply by को *lo* as follows को जनने पिता पुत्रस्य प्रथम क सस्य ताराकानाञ्च ददौ पदवीम् *lo jananeh pitā putrasya prathamān** (किल सदव्यापारवद कश् चक्रे *hila sadvyāpa* [G Ed p 301] *rātian las chakré i e boni originem quis fecit?*) *lah suryasya tārakanuncha dadāu padavim* (किल मार्गन् तेय को ददौ *hila morgan teshan hō dadau i e iam ipsius quis dedit?*) We translate from the Zend *Quis (qualis vir) creatione pater est puritatis (or puri) primus? quis (qualis vir) soli stellisque dedit viam?* The Zend expression *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* † *zanthuā* for which in the lithographed codex p 351 is erroneously given *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *zanthā* is plainly the instrumental of *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *zantu* which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskrit infinitive *जन्तुम् jantum* as the latter is feminine and to which I have in another place referred the ablative *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *zanthuāt* (Gramm Crit p 253) This form is besides remarkable on this account viz that it is identical with the Sanskrit instrumental gerund which from *जन् jan* without a conjunctive vowel and without the euphonic suppression of the न *n* would sound *जन्त्वा jantuā* With regard however to the length of the concluding *a* of the Zend form which is preserved contrary to the prevailing rule (see §§ 118 158 and 160 p 191 G Fd where however *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *janthua* is to be read for *zanthua*) I do not attach any particular importance to that because in the chapter from which this passage is taken *a* originally short is repeatedly to be found lengthened The Sanskrit *जनने jananeh* with which Neriosingh translates the Zend instrumental case must be considered as an ablative as this case often enters the department of the instrumental and is also capable of expressing

* Perhaps the adverb *प्रथम prathamān primum* is a corruption for *प्रथम prathamān primus*, which answers to the original, and is to be expected from the sense

† Vide as to *𐬵𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *zanthuā*, p 1244 G ed

the preposition "through" (for example, Nal. XII 89.) Considered as a genitive, जननेः *jananêh* would not correspond with 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *zanthuâ*, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮 *zantu* could only be 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanteus*, or, also, 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthuô*, or 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthuô* (see § 187.), but in no case 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthwâ*. Add to this, also, that जननि *janani* is feminine, like the Zend 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zantu*, and पुण्यस्य *punyasya*, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of जननेः *jananêh* than, in Zend, 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *ashahyâ* could pass as the epithet of 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthwâ*. I will, however, as concerns the Zend, lay no great stress on this circumstance, since in it the genders of the substantive are constantly changing. M Burnouf, who looks upon जननेः *jananêh* as a genitive, and refers पुण्यस्य *punyasya* to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the पुण्यस्य *punyasya*, which does not agree with the gender of जननि *janani*, but he confirms, however, the reading expressly by the addition of a [G. Ed p 302] *sic*. His translation runs, "*Quel est le premier père de la creation pure² qui a montré leur route au soleil et aux astres*" I look with anxiety for M Burnouf's further explanation of this passage, but expect from him rather information of value in other respects, than to find that he has succeeded in making the forms जननेः *jananêh* and 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthwâ* pass for genitives. Anquetil's traditional interpretation sounds, in this place, very strange, but does not contradict my apprehension of 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *zanthwâ* he makes the genitive 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *ashahyâ* pass for the nominative, and does not, therefore, throw any light on the meaning of the termination 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *hyâ*, for, in the presumption that it was right, 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮 *ashahyâ* might, perhaps, have next been taken for an instrumental, and perhaps have been translated "father with purity" His translation is as follows "*Quel est le premier père pur² qui a engendré ? qui a donné*

* In other places (V S p 385) Anquetil renders (p 137) the words
𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀯𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮𑀮

de lui même les astres qui ne sont pas à deux faces? The sun is here quite left out of the question and it must be acknowledged that as far as relates to etymology it is very much obscured in this passage we might identify with reference to the form of ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ *kheng* this expression with the reflexive pronoun ལྷ་མོ་ *kha* (as in *kha dāta* created of it elf which is often said of the star, as of self created lights) and consider it as the epithet of ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ *stren cha* so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit सान् *sān*. It is here to be remarked that in some chapters of the *Izeschine* ལྷ་མོ་ *ng* is repeatedly found instead of a simple nasal and indeed without regard to the organ of the following initial letter. So we read in the V S p 391 ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dushacsathreng** ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dusshyaōthreng* ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dushdaēng*. Anquetil indeed renders these expressions as singular nominative^s *ce roi mechant, qui fait le mal attaché a la mauvaise loi* but they together with [G I d p 203] ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dushachanhō* ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dushmananhō* refer to the plural ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *dregualō* and I have no doubt of their accusative nature the whole passage however like many others in the *Izeschine* can be explained only with the help of Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation. We can but regret that the in other respects highly valuable elaborate exactitude of Burnouf's excellent Commentary leaves us no hope that he will come very soon to the elucidation of this and other passages regarding which I am most curious. But to return to our ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ *kheng*

ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *patā as'ahyā* rightly by *père de la pureté* his translation is however little calculated to throw light on the connection of the passage referred to

* The lithographic MS has ལྷམའི་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ་ *du a csathreng* as two words the *a* is however clearly only a conjunctive vowel, to unite the prefix ལྷ་མོ་ *dush* more conveniently with the following ལྷ་མོ་ *cs*

the kh makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptation for the sun, for which, commonly, հարօ *hvarē* is found (the Sanskrit सुव *suvar*, "heaven,"), as kh is used very frequently for hw (see § 35), but we might here expect to find հարօ *kharē*, and may suppose that the ng has arisen out of n , and this letter out of r , as these liquids are easily interchanged, as is shewn in Sanskrit, by the connection of अह्न *ahan*, "day," with अह्न *ahar*, and, in the Zend, that of շամաստ *csapan*, "night," with շամաստ *csapar* (I write it thus, and not հշամաստ *csaparē*, designedly, see § 44) At all events I take կիսիս *kheng* to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base հար *hvar* may have entirely lost its r , and that it may be կիսիս *kheng* for հիսիս *khem*, the accusative of a base հիս *lha* սրիսիսիս *stien-cha*, also, according to my opinion, is the accusative, and not, as one might expect from the Sanskrit translation, the genitive plural, which more frequently occurs in the form հիսիսիս *stūranm* Although, from this, իսիս *stren* might easily be formed by contraction and combination with իս *cha*, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in սրիսիսիս *stiencha*, a secondary form of սիսիս *streus*, explained in § 239, so that the nasal, here vocalized to u , is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp § 239), especially as, in other places also, սիս *dā* is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given In the Zend expression, հիսիսիսիս *adhūānēm*, the Sanskrit अध्वानम् *adhūānam* cannot fail to be observed (comp § 45), but in the lithographed MS we have instead of this, հիսիսիսիս *advānēm*, which is easily seen to be an error This false reading appears, nevertheless, to be an ancient one, and widely diffused, and upon this is founded Anquetil's, or rather his Pâisî teacher's, interpretation, which is strangely at variance with Neriosingh's exposition, "*qui* [G Ed. p 304.] *ne sont pas a deux faces*," so that ս *a* is

taken for the well known primitive particle $\alpha\upsilon\alpha$ *dia* as the number two and the last portion finds in the Sanskrit $\text{द्विद्वि} \text{dnana}$ 'countenance' its corresponding syllable

FEMININE BASES IN *d* GOTHIC *ð* (§ 118)

Nominative	Sanskrit <i>dhará</i> * Greek $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$, Lithuanian <i>ranka</i> Zend <i>hizta</i> Gothic <i>giba</i> Latin <i>terra</i>
Accusative	Sansk. <i>dhará m</i> Latin <i>terram</i> Zend <i>hizta nm</i> Greek $\chi\omega\rho\acute{\alpha} \nu$ Lith <i>ranka n</i> Goth <i>giba</i>
Instrumental	Sanskrit <i>dharay á</i> Zend <i>hi-ray-a</i> Gothic Dät Instr <i>giba</i> (§ 161) Lithuanian <i>ranka</i>
Dative	Sansk. <i>dharáy-áti</i> Zend <i>hi ray-áti</i> Lith <i>ranka i</i>
Ablative	Zend <i>hi-ray áti</i> Latin <i>terra(d)</i>
Genitive	Sanskrit <i>dharáy-ás</i> Zend <i>hi-ray do</i> Greek $\chi\omega\rho\alpha \varsigma$ Latin <i>terrā s</i> Lithuanian <i>ranko s</i> Gothic <i>gibó s</i>
Locative	Sanskrit <i>dharay-ām</i> (§ 202) Zend <i>hizray-a</i> Lithuanian <i>ranko ye</i> (§ 19)
Vocative	Sanskrit <i>dharé</i> Zend <i>hizé</i> (?) Greek $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$, Latin <i>terra</i> Lithuanian <i>ranka</i> Gothic <i>giba</i> (?)

DUAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>dharé</i> Zend <i>hi í</i> (§ 213) Lithuanian Nom <i>ranki</i> Voc <i>ránki</i>
Instr Dät Abl	Sanskrit <i>dhará bhytm</i> Zend <i>hizi i bya</i> † Greek Dät Gen $\chi\omega\rho\alpha \nu$ Lith Dät <i>ranko-m</i> (§ 215)
Gen Loc	Sanskrit <i>dharay ós</i> [G Ed p 300]

* Means 'earth' and is probably connected with the Greek $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$ as aspirates are easily interchanged (Buttmann § 16 Rem 1) The root is $\text{धृ} \text{dhri}$ ($\text{धृ} \text{dhr}$ § 1) to hold carry whence also $\text{धृति} \text{dhriti}$ which by reason of the long vowel of its root, approaches nearer the Greek $\chi\omega\rho\alpha$ (§ 4) altho' h it does not signify earth.

† Without being able to quote this case in Zend bases in *d* I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form since I can prove by other cognate case terminations 1 That the *d* is not shortened and 2 also that an *i* is not introduced into the theme by the assimilative power of the termination hence *e g* in the instr pl $\text{मृदु} \text{mṛdu}$ *ginābis* (V S p 308) from $\text{मृदु} \text{mṛdu}$ *gendā* 'woman' ($\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\eta$)

FEMININE BASES IN *i*.⁷

SINGULAR

Nominative,	Sanskrit <i>prīti-s</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti-s</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ς</i> , Latin <i>turri-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>aui-s</i> , Gothic <i>anst'-s</i>
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>prīti-m</i> , Latin <i>turri-m</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti-m</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ν</i> , Lithuanian <i>āui-n</i> , Gothic <i>anst'</i> .
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>prīty-ā</i> , Zend <i>āfrīthy-a</i> , Gothic Dat Instr. <i>anstai</i> (without case suffix, see §. 161)
Dative,	Sanskrit <i>prītay-ē</i> (or <i>prīty-āi</i> , §. 161), Zend <i>āfrīte-ē</i> †
Ablative,	Zend <i>āfrīti-t</i> , Latin <i>turri-(d)</i>
Genitive,	Sanskrit <i>prīte-s</i> (or only with the feminine termination <i>prīty-ās</i>), Gothic <i>anstai-s</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti-s</i> , Greek <i>πόρι-ος</i> , <i>φύσ-ως</i> , Lat <i>turri-s</i>
Locative,	Sanskrit <i>prīti-āu</i> , (or with the feminine termi- nation only <i>prīty-ām</i>)
Vocative,	Sanskrit <i>prīte</i> , Zend <i>āfrīti</i> , Greek <i>πόρι</i>

DUAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *prīti*, Zend *āfrīti(?)*, Lithuanian Nom
[G Ed. p 306] *aui*, Voc *āui*.

* It may be sufficient to give here the cases of a Sanskrit masculine in *i*, which differ from the feminine paradigma from *agni*, "fire," comes the instrumental singular *agni-n-ā*—whilst from *pati*, "master," comes *paty-a*, and from *sakhi*, "friend," *sakhy-ā* (see § 158)—and in the accus plural *अग्नीन् agni-n*

† Differing from what is stated in § 164 p 196 G Ed, it is now my opinion that the *ē* in *āfrīte* does not represent the *a* of the original form *āfrītayē*, but is the contraction of *a* and *y*, as, for instance, in the Pīakūt *चिन्तेमि chintēmi*, from *चिन्तयामि chintayāmi* *ē* is here a weaker form of *é=ए*, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p 218, Note †

Instr Dat Abl Sanskrit *priti-bhūdām* Zend *āfriti bya* Greek
Gen Dat *πορτι ο ιν* Lithuanian Dat *awi m*
(§ 215)

Gen Loc Sanskrit *prity us* Zend *āfrithy ō(?)* (see p 276
Rem 1)

PLURAL

Nom Voc Sanskrit *pritay as* Zend *āfrithy ō* (with *cha*
and *āfrithy as cha*) Greek *πορτι ες* Latin
*turr es** Gothic *anstei s* Lithuanian *ány s*

Accusative Sanskrit *priti s* Zend *āfriti s* Greek *πορτι ς*
Gothic *ansti ns* Lithuanian *awy s*

Instrumental Sanskrit *priti bhū* Zend *āfriti bis* Lithuanian
awi mis Gothic Dat Instr *ansti m* (§ 215)

Dat Abl Sanskrit *priti bhyas* Zend *āfriti byo* Latin *tur
ri bus* Lithuanian *awi m(u)s* (§ 215)

Genitive Sanskrit *priti n ām* Zend *āfriti n anm* Latin
turri um Greek *πορτι ωι* Lithuanian *awi u*
Gothic *anst ē*

Locative Sanskrit *priti shu* Zend *āfriti shva* (or *āfriti
shu*) Lithuanian *awi sa* Greek Dat *πορτι σι*

NFUTEP BASES IN 1

SINGULAR

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri* Zend *vairi* Greek *ἴρι* Latin
mare

The rest like the masculine

DUAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri n i*

The rest like the masculine

PLURAL

Nom Acc Voc Sanskrit *vāri n i* Zend [G Ed p 307]
vār a Greek *ἴρι α* Latin *marī a* Gothic
thry a (from *THRI* three)

The rest like the masculine

* Vide p 1078 G ed as to *turrē s* and similar forms



MASCULINE BASES IN *u*

SINGULAR

Nominative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-s</i> , Gothic <i>sunu-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunù-s</i> , Zend <i>paśu-s</i> , Latin <i>pecu-s</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-s</i> .
Accusative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-m</i> , Latin <i>pecu-m</i> , Zend <i>paśù-m</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-v</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-n</i> , Gothic <i>sunu</i>
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-n-ā</i> (<i>Vêda prabāhu-ā</i> , from <i>prabāhu</i> , §. 158.), Zend <i>paśi-u</i> , Gothic Dat. Instr. <i>sunau</i>
Dative,	Sanskrit <i>sūnar-ā</i> , Zend <i>paśi-ē</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-i</i>
Ablative,	Zend <i>paśāb-t</i> , Latin <i>pecu-(d)</i>
Genitive,	Sanskrit <i>sūnō-s</i> (from <i>sunau-s</i>), Gothic <i>sunau-s</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunau-s</i> , Zend <i>paśeu-s</i> or <i>paśv-ō</i> (from <i>paśi-aś</i>), Latin <i>pecū-s</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-ος</i> .
Locative,	Sanskrit <i>sūn'-āu</i> .
Vocative	Sanskrit <i>sūnō</i> (from <i>sunau</i>), Gothic <i>sunau</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunau</i> , Zend <i>paśu</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ</i> .

DUAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>sūnū</i> , Zend <i>paśū</i> , Lithuanian Nom. <i>sunū</i> , Voc. <i>sūnu</i> .
Instr. Dat. Abl	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-bhyām</i> , Zend <i>paśu-biya</i> , Greek <i>βοτρυ-ο-iv</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-m</i> (§. 215)
Gen Loc.	Sanskrit <i>sūn-ōs</i> , Zend <i>paśv-ō</i> (see p. 276. [G Ed p 308] Rem 1)

PLURAL

Nom Voc.	Sanskrit <i>sūnav-as</i> , Greek <i>βότρυ-ες</i> , Zend <i>paśi-ō</i> (with <i>cha</i> , <i>paśvas-cha</i>), Latin <i>pecū-s</i> , Gothic <i>sunju-s</i> (for <i>suniu-s</i> , from <i>sunau-s</i> , § 230.), Lithuanian <i>sūnu-s</i>
Instrumental,	Sanskrit <i>sūnu-bhis</i> , Zend <i>paśu-bīs</i> , Lithuanian <i>sunu-mis</i> , Gothic Dat. Instr. <i>sunu-m</i> (§ 215).

Genitive	Sanskrit <i>sunu n am</i> Zend <i>pasv-aum</i> Latin <i>pecu um</i> Greek <i>βοτρυ-ων</i> Gothic <i>sunw é</i> Lithuanian <i>sun u</i>
Locative	Sanskrit <i>sunu shu</i> Zend <i>pasu shu</i> (or <i>pasu shu</i>) Lithuanian <i>sunu se</i> Greek Ditt <i>βοτρυ σι</i>

Remark—Feminine bases in *u* in Sanskrit differ in declension from the masculine exactly as p 303 G Γd प्राति प्रीति f differs from अग्नि *agni* m

NEUTER BASES IN *u*

SINGULAR

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>madhu</i> Zend <i>madhu</i> Greek <i>μεθυ</i> Latin <i>pecu</i> Gothic <i>faihu</i> The rest like the masculine
-------------	---

DUAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>madhu n i</i> The rest like the masculine
-------------	--

PLURAL

Nom Acc Voc	Sanskrit <i>madhū n i</i> Zend <i>madhu-a</i> Greek <i>μεθυ α</i> Latin <i>pecu a</i> The rest like the masculine
-------------	--

FEMININE BASES IN *i* [G Ed p 309]

SINGULAR

	Sanskrit			Zend	
Nom	<i>nāri</i>	woman	<i>bhi s</i>	<i>scar</i>	<i>nāri</i> woman
Accus	<i>nāri m</i>		<i>bhiy am</i>		<i>nāri m</i>
Insti	<i>nāry ā</i>		<i>bhiy-ā</i>		<i>nāry a</i>
Ditt	<i>nāry-āi</i>		<i>bhiy é</i> or <i>bhiy-āi</i>		<i>nāry āi</i>
Abl	<i>nāry ās</i>		<i>bhiy as</i> or <i>bhiy ās</i>		<i>nāry āt</i>
Gen	<i>nāry ās</i>		<i>bhiy as</i> or <i>bhiy ās</i>		<i>nāry-āo</i>
Loc	<i>nāry-ām</i>		<i>bhiy i</i> or <i>bhiy-ām</i>		<i>nāry a</i>
Voc	<i>nāri</i>		<i>bhi s</i>		<i>nāri</i>

	DUAI		Zend
	Sanskrit		
N A V.	<i>nâry-âu,</i>	<i>bhîy-âu,</i>	<i>nâri</i> (see § 213, p 227)
I. D Ab	<i>nârî-bhyâm,</i>	<i>bhî-bhyâm,</i>	<i>nâri-bya.</i>
Loc	<i>nâry-ôs,</i>	<i>bhîy-ôs,</i>	<i>nâriy-ô?</i>
	PIURAI		
N. V.	<i>nâry-âs,</i>	<i>bhîy-as,</i>	<i>nâriy-âo</i>
Accus	<i>nârî-s,</i>	<i>bhîy-as,</i>	<i>nâri-s</i>
Instr.	<i>nârî-bhis,</i>	<i>bhî-bhis,</i>	<i>nâri-bîs</i>
D. Abl	<i>nârî-bhyas,</i>	<i>bhî-bhyas,</i>	<i>nâri-byô</i>
Gen	<i>nârî-n-âm,</i>	<i>bhîy-âm,</i>	<i>nâri-n-anm.</i>
Loc.	<i>nârî-shu,</i>	<i>bhî-shu,</i>	<i>nâri-shva</i> or <i>-shu.</i>

“ Remark By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in *î*, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek [G Ed p 310] *κίς*, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom *bhî-s*, *κί-ς*, Gen. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ός*, Loc Dat. *bhîy-i*, *κί-ί*, Acc. *strî-m*, † *κί-ν*, Voc. *bhî-s*, *κί-ς*. Plural Nom. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ες*, Gen. *bhîy-âm* *κί-ων*, Loc. Dat. *bhî-shu*, *κί-σί*, Acc *bhîy-as*, *κί-ας*, Voc. *bhîy-as*, *κί-ς*. I consider, however, this coincidence as accidental, but, nevertheless, an accidental coincidence of that nature, that can only occur in languages which were originally really one and undoubtedly the terminations, whose common sound appears so startling, are historically connected. As far, however, as concerns the theme, I believe, with Kuhner (§ 287), that the *î* of *κί* was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the *ι*. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume

* O₁ *bhî-n-âm* Further, the longer case-terminations, which belong to the feminine (see § 164), are added at will to the monosyllabic feminines in *î*, *û*, for example, together with *bhîyê*, *bhîurê*, also *bhîyâi*, *bhîurâi*

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in *î*, with the termination *am*, *strîy-am*

that *KIF* is the true theme and that the nominative was originally *κίς*, for if *κίος* *κίη* in the form in which they have been received be analogous to *Δίος* *Δίη*, from *Δίφος* *Δίφι* still to establish a theme *KIF* a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to *Δίφι* from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this that which of itself is alone sufficient proof the cognate Sanskrit word *दिव* *div* heaven (§ 122) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme *KIF* is however wanting for the long *i* could as in the Sanskrit *भी* *bhi* and like the long *υ* in *οφρυς* be also the real final letter of the base only that the long *i* in the Sanskrit except in compounds (for example *गताभी* *gata bhi* m f void of fear *मलयी* m f water drinking see Gramm Crit §§ 169 170) concludes only the feminine theme. We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek *κίς* in another way through the Sanskrit and we find this as it appears to me through a like masculine base which approximates closely to the *κίς* as well in form as in meaning namely in *कीट* *kīta* Nom *कीटस्य* *kītas* insect worm which would lead us to expect in the Greek *κίτος* Acc *κίτοι* to which *κίς* *κίη* bear the same relation as *μεγας* *μεγαν* to the to be presupposed *μεγαλος*, *μεγαλοι*. I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme *MEΓAT* although the Sanskrit *महत्* *mahat* great might support it but *महत्* *mahat* is a participial form and its full and original form [G Ed p 311] (§ 129) is *महन्* *mahant* Nom masc *महान्* *mahān* which would correspond to the Greek *μεγαν*.

FEMININE BASES IN *á* *ū*

SINGULAR

	Sanskrit		Greek
Nom	<i>ιadhú s</i>	wife <i>bhrú s</i>	eye brow <i>οφρις</i>
Accus	<i>ιadhú m</i>	<i>bhruv am,</i>	<i>οφρυι</i>
Instr	<i>ιadhū á</i>	<i>bhruv á</i>	
Dat	<i>ιadhū-ái</i>	<i>bhruv-ε</i> (or <i>ái</i>)	

		SINGULAR,		
		Sanskrit		Greek
Abl.	<i>vadhū-ās,</i>	<i>bhīuv-as</i> (οι -ās),		..*
Gen.	<i>vadhū-ās,</i>	<i>bhīuv-as</i> (οι -ās),		ὀφρῦ-ος
Loc.	<i>vadhū-ām,</i>	<i>bhīuv-i</i> (οι -ām),		ὀφρῦ-ι
Voc	<i>vadhū,</i>	<i>bhīū-s,</i>		ὀφρῦ̄.
DUAL				
N. Ac V	<i>vādhw-āu,</i>	<i>bhīuv-āu,</i>		ὀφρῦ-ς
I D Ab.	<i>vadhū-bhīām</i>	<i>bhīū-bhīām.</i>		ὀφρῦ-ο-ιν.
G L.	<i>vadhū-ōs,</i>	<i>bhīuv-ōs,</i>		..
PLURAL				
N. V	<i>vadhū-as,</i>	<i>bhīuv-as,</i>		ὀφρῦ-ες
Accus.	<i>vadhū-s,</i>	<i>bhīuv-as,</i>		ὀφρῦ-ας
Instr.	<i>vadhū-bhis,</i>	<i>bhīū-bhis,</i>		
D. Abl	<i>vadhū-bhyas,</i>	<i>bhīū-bhyas,</i>		
Gen.	<i>vadhū-n-ām,</i>	<i>bhīuv-ām</i> (or <i>bhīū-n-ām</i>),		ὀφρῦ-ων.
Loc	<i>vadhū-shu,</i>	<i>bhīū-shu,</i>		ὀφρῦ-σι

Remark The identity of ν *bhīū* and 'ΟΦΡΥ^ς is [G Ed p 312] sufficient proof that the length of the *υ* is organic (comp. §. 121), and it is not necessary, therefore, to suppose a theme ΟΦΡΥF (comp. Kühner §. 289) so as to consider ὀφρῦς as coming from ὀφρυFς, and the long *υ* as a compensation for the rejected *F*, as perhaps μέλας from μέλαυς. That, however, *F* originally stood for example, ὀφρῦFος—before the terminations now commencing with a vowel, though at a time when the language had not a Grecian form is shewn by the Sanskrit *bhīuv-as*, by which, at the same time, the shortening of the *υ* in this case is justified, for the Sanskrit

* The *ο* in ὀφρῦς is based on the peculiar disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to words which originally commenced with a consonant, to which I have already drawn attention in another place, and by which, among other things, the relation of ὄνυξ, ὄνομα, to नखस् *nakha-s*, नाम *nāma*, is shewn.

changes that is to say in polysyllables as well *v* as *û* before vowel terminations into a simple *v* but in monosyllables in order to avoid commencing with two consonants or to gain a polysyllabic form the semi vowel has its corresponding short vowel placed before it and thus is formed उव *uv* (*uv*) as well from *u* as from *u* is under a similar condition इव from *i* and *i* hence the two opposite forms for example *radhw a* (not *radhuw-as*) women and *bhruv-as* (not *bhriv-as*) the eyebrows as above *bhiv as* (not *bhiv as*) opposed to *nâry-as* (*nâriy as*) In the dative plural the short *v* of *oφpu σι* for *oφpû σι* may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the *v* before vowel terminations

BASES IN *au* (आँ) *

SINGULAR

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Greek</i>
Nominative	<i>nâu s</i>	<i>vaû s</i>
Accusative	<i>nai am</i>	<i>vaû i</i>
Genitive	<i>nai as</i>	<i>ia(F)-os</i>
Locative	<i>nai i</i>	<i>ia(F) i</i>
Vocative	<i>nâu s</i>	<i>iaû s</i>

DUAL

[G Ed p. 313]

Nom Acc Voc	<i>nai au</i>	<i>ia(F) e</i>
Instr Dit Abl	<i>nâu bhyâm</i>	<i>ia(F) o u</i>

PLURAL

Nominative	<i>nai-as</i>	<i>ia(F) es</i>
Accusative	<i>nâi as</i>	<i>ia(F) as</i>
Genitive	<i>nâi am</i>	<i>va(F)âi</i>
Locative	<i>nâu shu</i>	Dat <i>ia v σι</i>
Vocative	<i>nâi-as</i>	<i>ia(F) es</i>

Remark—I find no sufficient grounds with Kulner (l c § 293) to suppose that the base of the nominatives

* I give only the cases retained in the Greek

in *avṣ*, *evṣ*, *ovṣ*, originally terminated in *F*, so that in the case before us it would be requisite to suppose a theme *NAF* for even if the vocalization of *F* to *v*, in order to facilitate the junction with a consonant following, did not surprise us (forms like *vaFṣ*, *vaFṣi*, could never occur),—still, on the other hand, the transition of the sound *v* into its corresponding semi-vowel, in order to avoid the hiatus, is far more regular, and is required in the Sanskrit according to the common rules of euphony. We will not therefore differ from the Indian grammarians, by the assumption of a theme *नाव् nāv* for *नौ nāu*, and *गव् gav* for *गो gó* (*bos*), although, if there were adequate reasons for it, the practice of the Indian grammarians would not restrain us from laying down *गव् gav* and *नाव् nāv* in the Sanskrit as the true themes, which maintained themselves in this form only before vowel terminations, but before consonants have allowed the *v* to pass into a *u*, according to the analogy of the anomalous *दिव् div*, “heaven”, whence, for example, the instrumental plural *द्युभिस् dyu-bhis* for *दिव्भिस् div-bhis*, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. § 208). The Latin *navis* cannot compel us to lay down a theme *nāv* for the Sanskrit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic *v*, as *śuan*, “dog,” lengthened to *cani*; and therefore it exhibits in its declension nowhere *u*, but universally *v*.

[G Ed. p 314] BASES TERMINATING WITH A CONSONANT.

	SINGULAR			
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i> .
Thema,	<i>VĀCH,</i>	<i>VĀCH,</i>	<i>VŪC,</i>	ῬΠ
Nom.	<i>vāk,</i>	<i>vāc-s,</i>	<i>voc-s,</i>	ὄπ-ς.
Accus	<i>vāch-am,</i>	<i>vāch-ēm</i>	<i>voc-em,</i>	ὄπ-α.
Instr	<i>vāch-ā,</i>	<i>vāch-a,</i>	.	..
Dative,	<i>vāch-ē,</i>	<i>vāch-ē.</i>	.	. *

* See Locative

		SINGULAR			
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin		Greek
Ablat	*	<i>vāch-at</i>	<i>voc-e(d)</i>		
Gen	<i>vāch as</i>	<i>vāch ō †</i>	<i>voc-is</i>		οπ-ος
Loc	<i>vāch †</i>	<i>vāch †</i>	D <i>voc †</i>	D	οπ †
Voc	<i>vā</i>	<i>vāc-s ?</i>	<i>voc s</i>		ὄπ ς
DUAL					
N Acc V	<i>vāch āu</i>	<i>vāch-āo</i>			
	or <i>vāch ā †</i>	<i>vāch a</i>			ὄπ α
I D Abl	<i>vāg bhyaṃ</i>			D G	οπ ο-ῆ
G L	<i>vāch-ōs</i>	<i>vāch ō ?</i>			
PLURAL					
N V	<i>vāch as</i>	<i>vāch ō †</i>	<i>voc es</i>		ὄπ ςς
Accus	<i>vāch-as</i>	<i>vāch o †</i>	<i>voc-es</i>		ὄπ ας
Instr	<i>vāg bhū</i>				
D Abl	<i>vāg bhyaṃ</i>		' <i>voc † bus</i>		
Gen	<i>vāch ām</i>	<i>vāch-anm</i>	<i>voc um</i>		
Loc	<i>vāc-shu</i>	<i>vāc shīa ?</i>		D	οπ σι

† Remark 1.—I leave the terminations in [G Ed p 315] the Zend which commence with *b* unnoticed, since contrary to my former opinion (§ 224 Note *) I look on the *ε* in forms like *ῥαοχέβις* *raochēbis* no longer as a conjunctive vowel and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme *ῥαοχ* *raoch* but assume that *ῥαοχέβις* *raochēbis* and similar forms have proceeded from bases in *ῥβ* (from *as* § 56^b) so that I look upon the *ε* as a corruption of the *ο* and to the form *ῥαοχέβυθ* *raochēbyθ* I place as anterior a lost form *ῥαοχθ* *raochθ byθ* &c. In a similar way

* Like the Genitive

† With *cha* and *vāchas-cha*

‡ See p 330 Note *

§ M Burnouf who has induced me by his excellent pamphlet cited at p 276 on the *Valista* (in the separate impression p 16 and following) to rectify my former views leaves p 18 note the question still undecided whether forms like *ῥαοχέβις* *ma-ebis* *ῥαοχέβις* *ma-ebis*
ῥαοχέβις

[G Ed. p 316] I find, in the Pīāhūt (Urvasi, by Lenz, p. 40.), अचरिहं *achharīhun* for अचरिहं *achharōhun* (Sanskrit *apsarōbhū*), and if this form is genuine, then the ξ *e*, in forms like 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *raochēbis*, appears to stand for 𑂔𑂗 *ē*, as generally many interchanges between ξ *e* and 𑂔𑂗 *ē* occur, although in the case before us the ξ *e* is very constantly written, and 𑂔𑂗 *ē* has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find 𑂔𑂗 *ye* for 𑂔𑂗 *yō*, "which," 𑂔𑂗 *ke* for 𑂔𑂗 *kō*, "who" and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also 𑂔𑂗 *ve* for 𑂔𑂗 *vō*, and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person 𑂔𑂗 *ne* for 𑂔𑂗 *nō*, then we see the change of the 𑂔𑂗 *ō* with ξ *e* is sufficiently ascertained, although it appears to be restricted to the end of words of a monosyllabic form, and in these the practice of writing the 𑂔𑂗 *ō* is the prevailing one, while before termi-

𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *vachēbis*, 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *raochēbis*, have so arisen from the bases 𑂔𑂗𑂢 *mazō*, &c, that the 𑂔𑂗 *ō* (𑂔𑂗 *as*) is suppressed, and ξ *e* then introduced as conjunctive vowel, or whether, before the *ō* (from *as*) only, the *s* has been rejected, and the preceding *a* with an epenthetic *i* united with an *e*. In the former case I should not have been entirely wrong, from the analogy of *raoch-e-bis*, to deduce forms like *vāch-e-bis*. I consider, however, the last view as the right one, only that I prefer letting the *ō* from the pre-supposed original form, *manō-bis*, *raochō bis*, be changed in its whole force into ξ *e*, rather than reduce it into its elements, and mix the first of the said elements (*a*) with a conjoined *i* for the derivation of *manēbis* from *manūbis* from *manabis*, for *manasbis*, would extend to the Sanskrit form *मनोभिः* *manōbhīḥ*, which originally may have been *manarbhīḥ* (*manas-bhīḥ* was never possible). But I believe that in the Zend the form *ēbis* really preceded the form *ōbis*. M. Burnouf, in his review in the *Journal des Savans* (in the separate impression, pp 30, 31), calls attention to a form 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *vāghzēbyō*, for which is once found, in the Vend Sāde, pp 69 and 70, 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *vāghzēbyō* once 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *vāghzēbyō*, and once 𑂔𑂗𑂢𑂰 *vāghzēbyō*, which,

nations beginning with *b* as yet no *o* has been pointed out so that *b* appears to be as repugnant to a preceding *ʿ* as favourable to a following *o* if the conjecture of Burnouf mentioned at p 29^m G Ed is well founded On this point I was not yet clearly informed when at §§ 221 and 212 I inconsiderately imagined I could deduce *tachā bya tacl b-bis* from *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* (from *tacha*) Instead of this should be read *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬀 𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬀𐬎𐬀* and besides this in the locative singular *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* for *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* since the nasal to be prefixed to the *h* according to § 26^t falls away when the vowel which follows the *h* is *i* which has been already indicated in the paragraph quoted but since then fully proved by Bur- [G Ed p 317] nouf Besides there really occurs also in one passage (where unfortunately the lithographed MS is faulty and is therefore

which with the conjunctive vowel *ē* (see 4 30) introduced in different ways plainly represent one and the same word and have proceeded from *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *tāgh llyc* which itself never occurs. Although these forms which had struck me likewise clearly belong to a theme which means discourse and is connected with our *tal* I would still rather not, with Burnouf derive it from *tach* so that the nominative of this *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* raised to a secondary theme would be contained therein We dare not without further authority attribute to the Zend such a malformation although it leaves its superlatives in *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *tama* from the masculine nominative instead of from the theme But Anquetil, in his Glossary gives a form *tah/seng* ¹, "*parce utile* which we ought probably to read *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *tacsant* (as dative) if not with long *a* *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *tacantē* This latter form would belong to a theme *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ta o* (*tacsas*) from which in the dative pl., *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *tāgh llyo* (*glē hly¹* &c) might proceed for *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀* *tac¹*, as with *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ma ebis* *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *manē s* occur also *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *ma bis* *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *man¹ s* for the *as* of *𐬔𐬀𐬎𐬌𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *tac o* must as Burnouf has shown in contact with *l* become *eb¹*

impossible for me to use) the locative *vachahi*, that is to say, in the Vend S p 173, where, for *manahéché vachahéché*, is to be read *manahichá vachahichá*. In a Grammar, the lost acquaintance with which is again to be restored, oversights of this kind will, I trust, be excused in the first labourers; and if, for example, Rask gives to the word *partí* the genitive *partós*, while, according to §. 180. p 196, Note †, *patós* is to be written, still the form *partós* was, in its time, instructive in the main, and first taught me that the Sanskrit genitive termination *é-s* corresponds to the form *ós* in the Zend. If, too, Rask has incorporated in his scheme of declensions the ablative *partít* (for *patít*), this was indeed a new error, but also a new advantage for the Zend Grammar in its then state, and brought to light a new and important fact, which I believe I was the first to discover, namely this, that bases in *z* form their ablative in *ít*, for which the proofs in the Zend-Avesta, as much as I have of it, are neither numerous nor easily found. I make this remark because M Burnouf, as it appears to me, speaks too unfavourably of such theoretic formations. As far as I am concerned, I believe I may assert that my communications regarding Zēnd Grammar are founded on careful reflection. I could not, however, perfectly conclude my considerations, and I am very ready to complete and adjust them through those of M. Burnouf. For in this book also, in regard to Zend Grammar, one must carefully distinguish the disquisitions given in the text from the general comparison added at the end of each rule regarding case. In the former I give only those Zend forms which I have seen, and I thence deduce theoretic laws. In the latter I seek to make the deductions from the inquiries pursued in the text evident in one select example. I am perfectly sure of the prevailing majority of the forms given in the tables, and can produce abundant examples

of them I have marked some as questionable and shewn the limits of the probability of others in notes and if an error has crept into the forms spoken of and by me believed to be correct it will give me pleasure to be able hereafter supplementarily to correct it. The form *αχανη* was however only in a measure a theoretic formation and I should not have ventured to [G Id p 318] exhibit it if I had not observed in other words of the same declension *ι ε* in other bases terminating with a consonant, the locative which has entirely escaped Rask.

Remark 2 — One might consider the *ο* of *οποιν* instead of a conjunctive vowel as has been stated above (see § 221) as a property of the base *ι ε* as an unorganic extension of it, or in other words regard it as a transition from the third to the second declension a declension which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination *οι* of the whole third declension (*τοσιο-ι βοτρο-ι δαιμό-ι* like *λυκο-ι*) and to all cases in the formation of words and arrangement of the same where we have represented an *ο* foreign to the proper base as conjunctive vowel. According to this forms like *μελιτοεις μελιτοπωλης μισιολογια βοτροεις βοτροοδωρος* would be under the presupposition of the bases *ΜΕΛΙΤΟ ΙΥΣΙΟ ΒΟΤΡΥΟ* to be divided into *μελιτο-εις* and would lead us to expect the nominatives *μελιτο-ν* &c which are not to be found. The statement here given has thus in its favour that similar cases occur also in cognate dialects since in general that declension which is the most in vogue and most used is prone in certain cases to receive into itself the other declensions which annex to their original base the final letters of the bases of the declension more in use. The origin of *οποιν* from *ΟΠΙΟ* of *φεροντων* from *ΦΕΡΟΝΤΙΟ* was as it were the first commencement of the disease which came to its full development in the Pali, since in this language which otherwise closely resembles the Sanskrit the bases which end with consonants are declined

in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an unorganic *a* (=Greek *o*), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second, and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root चर् char, "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base चरन् charant, or its corruption चरन् charat (see § 129), partly from the augmented theme चरन्त charanta, and in part also [G Ed p 319] arbitrarily from चरन् charant or चरन्त charanta, as follows (see Clough's Pâli Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p 112 et seq)

	SINGULAR	
Th	CHARANT,	CHARANTA, CHARAT.
Nom.	charan,*	charantô,
Acc	charant-am,†	
Instr.	.	charantê-n-a, charat-â.
Dat	like the Genitive,	
Abl.	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{charanta-smâ,} \\ \text{or charanta-mhâ,‡} \end{array} \right\} \text{charat-â §}$	

* The final न् *n* is, as in the Piâkrit (§ 10), transmuted into the Anuswâra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by *n*

† It might also be divided thus, *charanta-m* and deduced from *charanta*

‡ Transposed, and with *h* for *s* (comp § 166) These forms are derived from the medial pronoun *sma* mentioned in § 166, which, in the Pâli also, has forced its way into the usual declension. The *t*, which was to have been expected, is, as generally happens at the end of a word, suppressed

§ *Charatâ* is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but

		SINGULAR	
Th	<i>CHARANT</i>	<i>CHARANTA</i>	<i>CHARAT</i>
Gen		<i>charanta ssa</i>	<i>charat ó</i>
Loc		{ <i>charanté</i> or <i>charanta smin</i> } or <i>charanta mhi</i>	<i>charat i</i>
Voc	{ <i>charan</i> or <i>chara</i> * } or <i>chará</i>		
		PLURAL	[G Ed p 320]
Nom		<i>charanta †</i>	
Acc		<i>charanté</i>	
Inst		{ <i>charantebhi</i> or <i>charantehu</i> }	
Dat	like the Genitive		
Abl	like the Instrumental		
Gen			<i>charat am</i>
Loc		<i>charant¹ su</i>	
Voc	<i>charantó</i>	<i>charantá</i>	

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pali one would have expected for instance from *φέρων* a genitive *φεροντου* dative *φεροντω* and in the plural indeed *φεροντων* from

but is in reality corrupted from *charat at* analogous with Zend forms like *ap at* (in § 180) the suppressed *t* is replaced by the lengthening of the preceding vowel as in *achara* 'he went' from *acharat* (Clough p 106)

* If this form really belongs to a theme in *nt* as I believe it has sprung from the original form *charan* by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp Burnouf and Lassen p 39) and in *chará* this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with *charanta* also *charanto* from the original theme *charant* as for example *gunaranto* is used with *gunarantá* the virtuous the former from *gunarant* the latter from *gunaranta*

in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an unorganic *a* (=Greek *o*), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second, and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root च् char, "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base चरन् charant, or its corruption चरन् charat (see § 129), partly from the augmented theme चरन्त charanta, and in part also [G Ed p 319] arbitrarily from चरन् charant or चरन्त charanta, as follows (see Clough's Pâli Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p 112 et seq)

	SINGULAR		
Th	CHARANT,	CHARANTA,	CHARAT
Nom.	charan,*	charantô,	. .
Acc	charant-am,†	. .	.
Instr.	.	charantê-n-a,	charat-û.
Dat	like the Genitive,		
Abl.	{ charanta-smâ, or charanta-mhâ,‡		} charat-â §

* The final न् *n* is, as in the Prâkrit (§ 10), transmuted into the Anuswâra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by *n*

† It might also be divided thus, *charanta-m* and deduced from *charanta*

‡ Transposed, and with *h* for *s* (comp § 166) These forms are derived from the medial pronoun *sma* mentioned in § 166, which, in the Pâli also, has forced its way into the usual declension. The *t*, which was to have been expected, is, as generally happens at the end of a word, suppressed

§ *Charatû* is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but

		SINGULAR	
Th	<i>CHARANI</i>	<i>CHARANTA</i>	<i>CHARAT</i>
Gen		<i>charanta ssa</i>	<i>charat ô</i>
Loc		{ <i>charantê</i> or <i>charanta smin</i> } or <i>charanta mhi</i>	<i>charat i</i>
Voc	{ <i>charan</i> or <i>chara</i> * } or <i>charô</i>		
		PLURAL [G Ed p 320]	
Nom		<i>charantâ †</i>	
Acc		<i>charantê</i>	
Instr		{ <i>charantêbbhi</i> or <i>charantehi</i> }	
Dat	like the Genitive		
Abl	like the Instrumental		
Gen			<i>charat am</i>
Loc		<i>charant³ su</i>	
Voc	<i>charantô</i>	<i>charantâ</i>	

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pali one would have expected for instance from $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$ a genitive $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$ dative $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\tau\iota$ and in the plural indeed $\phi\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\tau\omega\nu$ from

but is in reality corrupted from *charat-at* analogous with Zend forms like *ap-at* (in § 160) the suppressed *t* is replaced by the lengthened *o* of the preceding vowel as in *achar³*, he went from *acharat* (Clough, p 106)

If the form really belongs to a theme in *nt* as I believe it has sprung from the original form *charan* by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp Burnouf and Lassen p 69) and in *chara* this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with *charant³* also *charant³* from the original theme *charant* as for example, *gunant³* is used with *gunant³* the virtuous the former from *gunarant* the latter from *gunaranta*

ΦΕΡONT, but φερωντοι, φερωντους, φερωντοις, from ΦΕΡONTO. In this manner the form φερόντων in the dual, which has been lost in Pâli, would be clearly explained as derived from ΦΕΡONTO, but even when standing isolated, φερόντων may be justly referred to a theme ΦΕΡONTO, as the first commencement of a corruption which was further pursued in the Pâli, and I prefer this view of the matter now to that laid down at §. 221. Both views, however, concur so far, and thus much of my opinion may be looked on as proved, that in φερόντων, and all other dative-genitive forms of the third declension, the o belongs neither to the original theme, which lies at the root of all the other cases, nor to the true case-suffix.

	[G Ed p 321]				
	SINGULAR				
	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Gothic</i>
N.	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	<i>feren-s,</i>	φέρων,	<i>fiyand-s</i> *
Ac	<i>bharant-am,</i>	<i>barēnt-ēm,</i>	<i>ferent-em,</i>	φέρωντ-α(v),	<i>fiyand.</i>
Ins.	<i>bharat-ā,</i>	<i>barēnt-a,</i>	D I <i>fiyand</i>
D	<i>bharat-ē,</i>	<i>barēnt-ē,</i>	see Locat,	see Loc.	see Dat.
Ab.	see Gen.	<i>barant-at,</i>	<i>ferent-e(d),</i>
G.	<i>bharat-as,</i>	<i>barēnt-ō,†</i>	<i>ferent-is,</i>	φέρωντ-ος,	<i>fiyand-is †</i>
L	<i>bharat-i,</i>	<i>barēnt-i,</i>	D. <i>ferent-i,</i>	D φέρωντ-ι,	. . .
V.	<i>bharan,</i>	<i>baran-s,</i>	<i>feren-s,</i>	φέρων,	<i>fiyand</i>

* *Ferend*, "foe," as "hatei," see § 125 p 138

† See p 210 Note §, with *cha*, *barēntas-cha* ("ferentisque")

‡ I imagined, p 210, that I must, in this case, which before was not proved to exist in *ND* bases, set down *fiyand-s* as a mutilation of *fiyand-is* from *fiyand-as*, according to the analogy of other bases terminating with a consonant (*ahmin-s*, *brôthr-s*, § 191), Grimm has (I. 1017.) conjectured *fruyôndis* or *fruyônds* from *fruyônds*. Since this, owing to the very valuable additions made by Massmann to our Gothic authorities, the genitive *nasyandis* of *Nasyand* ("preserver, "preserving") has come to light (see his Glossary, p 153), by analogy with which I form *fiyand-is*.

DUAL.

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>
N Ac Voc	<i>bharant áu</i> Vedic <i>bharant á*</i>	<i>barant do</i> or <i>baranta</i>	<i>φεροντ ε</i>
I D Abl	<i>bharad bhyám</i>	<i>baran bya †</i>	<i>φεροντο-n ‡</i>
Gen Loc	<i>bharat ós</i>	<i>barat ó?</i> (p 276 R 1)	

FLURAL

[G Ed p 3^o]

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Gothic</i>
N V	<i>bharant as</i>	<i>barēnt ó §</i>	<i>ferent-es</i>	<i>φεροντ ες</i>	<i>fiyand s</i>
Acc	<i>bharat as</i>	<i>barent o §</i>	<i>ferent es</i>	<i>φεροντ ας</i>	<i>fiyand s </i>
Instr	<i>bharad bhís</i>	<i>baran bís ¶</i>			
D Ab	<i>bharad bhyas</i>	<i>baran byo ¶</i>	<i>ferent i bus</i>		**
Gen	<i>bharat ám</i>	<i>barent anm ††ferenti um</i>		<i>φεροντ ω¹</i>	<i>fiyand e ††</i>
Loc	<i>bharat su</i>	§§		<i>φερου-σι</i>	[C Ed p 3 ^o 3]

* See p 230, Note *

† Or *barenbya* See p 241 Note and p 210 Note §

See p 299 Rem 2

§ *Barentas cha* 'ferentesque' See p 210 Note §

|| This form which owing to an oversight is omitted in p 260 is found at Matth 5 44, and agrees with *fruyonds amicos* (*amantes*) Matth 5 47 as generally with the declension of a root terminating with a consonant Comp Grimm (I 1017)

¶ See p 241 Note * and p 210 Note §

** The Gothic dative which I would have used also as the instrumental (§ 243) does not occur in roots ending in *nd*

†† Or *barant-anm* * See p 266 Note †

‡‡ This case certainly cannot be proved in bases in *nd* but may however, be correctly deduced from the other bases ending with a consonant, and from the elder sister dialects See § 245

§§ I conjecture a transition into the *a* declension (comp p 299 Rem. 2) by suppressing the *nt* thus perhaps, *baratshu a* (or *shu* or *shu* § 250) as Vend S p 304 *dragrāśu* (read *shū*) for *dragrat sū*, from *dragrat* in the strong cases (§ 129) *dragrant* on the supposition that the reading is correct except the false *s* See § 57

	SINGULAR				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N	<i>âtma'</i> ,	<i>ašma'</i> ,	<i>sermo'</i> ,	<i>δαίμων</i> ,	<i>ahma</i> .
Acc	<i>âtman-am</i> ,	<i>ašman-əm</i> ,	<i>sermon-em</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ε</i> (v),	<i>ahma</i>
Inst	<i>âtman-ā</i> ,	<i>ašman-a</i> ,		.. D I	<i>ahma</i> (§ 132)
Dat	<i>âtman-ī</i> ,	<i>ašman-i</i> ,	see Loc	see Loc	.. Dative
Abl	see Gen	<i>ašman-at</i> ,	<i>sermon-(d)</i> ,	..	
Gen	<i>âtman-as</i> ,	<i>ašman-ō</i> ,	<i>sermon-ō</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ος</i> ,	<i>ahman-ō</i> (§ 132)
Loc	<i>âtman-i</i> ,	<i>ašman-i</i> ,	D. <i>sermon-i</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ι</i> ,	
Voc	<i>âtman</i> ,	<i>ašman</i> .	<i>sermō</i> ,	<i>δαίμων</i> ,	<i>ahmā</i>

	PLURAL		
	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek
N Acc Voc	<i>âtman-au</i> ,	<i>ašman-āu</i> , or <i>ašman-a</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ε</i>
	Vêda. <i>âtman-a</i> ,		
Inst. D Ab.	<i>âtma'-bhyam</i> ,	<i>ašma'-hya</i> ,	D G <i>δαιμόνο-ν</i> †
Gen. Loc	<i>âtman-ōs</i> ,	<i>ašman-ō</i> ? (p 276, R 1).	..

	PLURAL				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N V	<i>âtman-as</i> ,	<i>ašman-ō</i> ,*	<i>sermon-ēs</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ες</i> ,	<i>ahman-ō</i>
Ac.	<i>âtman-as</i> ,	<i>ašman-ō</i> ,*	<i>sermon-ēs</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ας</i> ,	<i>ahman-ō</i>
Inst	<i>âtma'-bhis</i> ,	<i>ašma'-bis</i> ,		(<i>δαιμόνο-φι</i>),	D I <i>ahma'-ni</i> ‡
D Ab.	<i>âtma'-bhyas</i> ,	<i>ašma'-byō</i> ,	<i>sermon-i-bus</i> ,
Gen.	<i>âtman-ām</i> ,	<i>ašman-ām</i> ,	<i>sermon-um</i> ,	<i>δαίμων-ων</i> ,	<i>ahman-ā</i>
Loc	<i>âtma'-su</i> ,	<i>ašma'-hva</i> ,		<i>δαίμων-σι</i> ,	..

[G Ed p 324]

	SINGULAR				
	Sanskrit	Zend	Latin	Greek	Gothic
N.	<i>brātā</i> ,	<i>brāta</i> ,	<i>frater</i> ,	<i>πατήρ</i> ,	<i>brōthar</i>
Ac.	<i>bhī ātar-am</i> ,	<i>bī ātar-əm</i> , §	<i>fratī-ēm</i> ,	<i>πατέρ-α</i> (v),	<i>brōthar</i>

* *Ašmanas-cha*, "calique" † See p 299, Rem 2 ‡ See p 241, Note †§ Also *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀* *bī āthī-ēm* might be expected, as Vend Sāde, p 377, *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀* *patrem* (*pathī-ēm*?), contrary to the theory of the strong cases (§ 129), for *patar-ēm*

SINGULAR.

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Gothic</i>
In	<i>bhrutr á</i>	<i>bráthr a</i>			D Inst <i>brothr</i> (see § 132)
D	<i>bhrátr é</i>	<i>bráthr e,</i>	see Loc	see Loc	
Ab	see Gen	<i>bráthr at</i>	<i>fratr e(d)</i>		
G	<i>bhrátur</i>	<i>bráthr ó*</i>	<i>fratr is</i>	<i>πατρ-ος</i>	<i>bróthr s</i> (see § 132)
L.	<i>bhratar i</i>	<i>brúthr i †</i>	D <i>fratr i</i>	<i>πατρ i</i>	
V	<i>bhrátar</i>	<i>bratar ‡</i>	<i>frater</i>	<i>πατερ</i>	<i>brothar</i>

DUAL

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>	
N Acc Voc	<i>bhrutar au Ved</i>	<i>bhrátar a</i>	<i>bratar-áo</i> or <i>brátar a,</i>	<i>πατερ ε</i>
Inst D Ab	<i>bhrátri bhyám</i>		<i>bratar-e bya</i>	<i>πατερο u</i>
Gen Loc	<i>bhratr os</i>		<i>brúthr-o(?)</i>	

PLURAL §

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Latin</i>	<i>Greek</i>
Nom Voc	<i>bhrutar aṣ</i>	<i>bratar ó </i>	<i>fratr es</i>	<i>πατερ-ες</i>
Accus	<i>bhrátri n ¶</i>	<i>bráthr eus? **</i>	<i>fratr es</i>	<i>πατερ ας</i>
Inst	<i>bhrátri bhis</i>	<i>brátar ē bis</i>		[G Ed p 32ω]
Dat Abl	<i>bhrátri bhyas</i>	<i>bratar ē-byó</i>	<i>fratr i bus,</i>	
Genitive	<i>bhrutri n am</i>	<i>bráthr anm, ††</i>	<i>fratr um</i>	<i>πατερ ων</i>
Locative	<i>bhrutri shu</i>			<i>πατρα σι</i>

* Vide § 194 p 211 l 1 Note

† See p 216 Note ||

‡ See § 44

§ For the Gothic which is here wanting see p 253 Note †

|| *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀* *brátaras cha, fratres ꝑue*

¶ See § 17 Note

** Perhaps also *bráthr ó bráthras cha* (*fratresque*) according to the analogy of *áthr o ignes* from *atar* See § 239

†† See p 266 Note †

		SINGULAR			
		<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Latin</i>
N. A V.	<i>manas,</i>	<i>manó.*</i>		<i>μένος,</i>	<i>genus.</i>
Instr	<i>manas-ā,</i>	<i>mananh-a,†</i>	
Dat	<i>manas-ē,</i>	<i>mananh-ē,</i>		see Loc.	see Loc
Abl	see Gen.	<i>mananh-at,</i>		.	<i>gener-e(d)</i>
Gen.	<i>manas-as,</i>	<i>mananh-ō (mananhaś-cha),</i>		<i>μένε(σ)-ος,</i>	<i>gener-is.</i>
Loc.	<i>manas-i,</i>	<i>manah-i,(see p 316, G ed.)</i>	D	<i>μένε(σ)-ι,</i>	<i>gener-i</i>

* *Manas-cha*, “*mensque*,” “*mentemque*”

† M Burnouf remarks, in his review (in the separate impression, p. 11), that in this class of words the instrumental ending is generally long I, in like manner, had remarked forms enough of this kind with a long *ā*, but in passages where also many *a*'s, originally short, appear to be lengthened at the termination, and which, therefore, I was not willing to bring into account moreover, the cases could not be included, where, through the particle *cha*, a preceding *ā* is preserved in its original length After deducting these two classes from forms in *anhā*, the computation might perhaps turn out in favour of the short *a* given above I have, however, as yet not applied any closer reckoning it would, however, surprise me if, on more exact calculation, but still in departure from the fate of other polysyllabic words ending with a shortened *a*, the advantage in this particular case should incline to the side of those words which retain the long vowel, which I would then gladly restore No one will deny that the collation of MSS is of great importance in deciding many grammatical and orthographical questions, although I believe I may assert that even a single lithographed MS opens a rich field to inquiries and important grammatical observations for although it is very full of errors, it nevertheless shews no systematic opposition to what is correct, and many expressions, passages, and turns recur so frequently, that, taken together, they can in a measure supply the place of a comparison of other MSS For the rest I had at my command the edition of Olshausen of the three first chapters and part of the fourth of the Vendidad, with the various readings attached to it, so that, through these means, I was not left entirely destitute of MSS

	* DUAL		[G Ed p 326]
	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek
N Ac V	<i>manas i</i>		<i>μειε(σ) ε</i>
I D Ab	<i>manō bhyaḥ</i>	<i>mane bya</i> (p 316 G ed)	D G <i>μειε(σ)ο ιν*</i>
G L	<i>manas ōs</i>	<i>mananḥ o</i> (²) (p 297 G ed)	

	PLURAL			
	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek	Latin
N Ac V	<i>manas-ī</i>	<i>mananḥ a</i> †	<i>μειε(σ) α</i>	<i>gener a</i>
Instr	<i>mano bhīḥ</i>	<i>mane-bis</i>	(<i>μειεσ φιν</i>)	
Dat Abl	<i>manō bhyaḥ</i>	<i>mane-byō</i>	see Loc	<i>gener ī bus</i>
Genitive	<i>manas am</i>	<i>mananḥ am</i>	<i>μειε(σ) ων</i>	<i>gener um</i>
Locative	<i>manas su</i>	<i>mano hīa</i>	<i>μειεσ σι</i>	

	SINGULAR MASCULINE AND FEMININE		[G Ed p 327]
	Sanskrit	Zend	Greek
Nom	<i>durmanās</i>	<i>dushmanāo</i> (§ 56 ^b)	<i>δυσμειης</i> (§ 146)
Accus	<i>durmanas-am</i>	<i>dushmananḥ em</i>	<i>δυσμειε(σ) α(ν)</i>
Voc	<i>durmanas</i>		<i>δυσμειες</i>

The rest like the simple word

	DUAL		
N Ac V	<i>durmanas du</i>	} <i>dushmananḥ a</i> (²)	<i>δυσμειε(σ) ε</i>
Vedī	<i>durmanas a, †</i>		

The rest like the simple word

	PLURAL		
N Voc	<i>durmanas as</i>	<i>dushmananḥ ō</i> (<i>as cha</i>)	<i>δυσμειε(σ) ες</i>
Accus	<i>durmanas as</i>	<i>dushmananḥ o</i> (<i>is cha</i>)	<i>δυσμειε(σ) ας</i>

The rest like the simple word

* See p 299 Rem 2

† See p 245 Note † It was however from an oversight that I as was observed at p 233 Note § read in the Vendidad Sade, p 127 *𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀲 nemanha* it should be *𑀭𑀮𑀲𑀭𑀮𑀲 nemanha* and may also be considered the instrumental singular then we should have in this passage which recurs three times the instrumental in *𑀭𑀮𑀲 anha* in both editions three times with a short *a*

‡ See p 330 Note *

SINGULAR, NEUTER

	<i>Sanskrit</i>	<i>Zend</i>	<i>Greek</i>
Nom Ac. V	<i>durmanas,</i>	<i>dushmanó (as'cha),</i>	<i>δυσμνός</i>
	The rest like the simple word		

“Remark. It was remarked in §. 152 (comp § 146.), that the Σ in forms like $\acute{\mu}\acute{\nu}\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$, $\acute{\kappa}\acute{\upsilon}\gamma\acute{\nu}\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, belongs to the base, and is not the nominative character, and that the Σ in forms like $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$ has come from τ , and in like manner belongs to the theme. M Reimnitz, who, in (p. 54, &c) his pamphlet mentioned at p 294, G ed, agrees with this view, first given in my treatise “On some Demonstrative Bases,” wishes to look upon the Σ in the masculine $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$ as belonging to the base, and arising out of τ , in which I cannot agree with him, as I, according to the view generally taken, consider the final letters of $\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$ as marks of the nominative, before

[G Ed p 328] which the final letter of the base is suppressed on account of the incompatible association of $\tau\sigma$ (comp § 99), and replaced by lengthening the preceding vowel, as, for example, in $\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ for $\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\nu\varsigma$. The Sanskrit has a few bases in n which, differing from the ruling principle (see § 139.), run parallel in the nominative to the Greek $\acute{\mu}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, thus, *panthás*, “the way,” from *panthan*, accusative *panthán-am*. Only in this *panthás* the lengthening of the a can be less regarded as a compensation for the rejected n than in the Greek, because it extends also to the other full cases (§. 129), with the exception of the vocative, but perhaps the lengthening of the a has originally taken place only in the nominative, and has thence imparted itself, when the reason of this prolongation was no longer perceived, to those cases which otherwise stood upon an equal footing with the nominative. Thus one says महान् *mahán*, “great” (from the theme *mahant*, properly a participle present from मह् *mah*, “to grow”), with the vowel of the concluding syllable lengthened, according to the analogy of the Greek form, as λέγων. The Sanskrit word, however, retains the long vowel

also in the other strong cases (*mahāntam magnum mahāntas magni* "mahāntāu, μεγαλω) with the exception of the vocative while the usual participles present leave the *a* short in all the strong cases. In most exact accordance however with the Greek participle present stand the Sanskrit possessive adjectives which are formed by the suffix *ant* (Greek ειτ for *Feit* in *μελιτοεις* and others) and *ant* (in the weak cases *at* *mat*). These lengthen that is to say the *a* only in the nominative singular so for example *dhanatān dītes* * (from *dhana* "riches") *dhanatant am dhanavant āu dhanatant as* as *λεων λεγοντα, λεγοντω λεγοντες*

OLD SLAVONIC DECLENSION † [G Γd | 39]

25. Before we enter upon the province of Slavonic Grammar we must endeavour to explain its system of sounds and although it is not requisite to specify all the minutæ of the subject we must nevertheless bring into notice those parts which are indispensable to the understanding of the Grammar. It is therefore our principal object in the following remarks to exhibit the connection of the Old Slavonic sounds with those of the elder languages of which they are either the true trans-

* If as has been remarked in another place the suffix *ant* has maintained itself in the Latin in the form *lent* (as *opulents*) it would not be surprising if the weak form *at* without the interchange of *t* with *l* but with the weakening of the *a* to *i* had its representative in the Latin *dītes* which stands in the same relation to *dhanatāt* by passing over the middle syllable as *malo* to *marolo*

† It is stated by Professor Bopp in the preface to the second published portion of this Grammar commencing with the formation of cases in general that it had not occurred to him to direct his attention at an earlier period to the Slavonic tongues having subsequently considered the subject he found sufficient reason to include them in the same family of languages, and accordingly devotes to its principles of declension the supplementary section which follows — *Editor*

missions, or corruptions more or less vitiated. We give therefore, for the first time, a history of the Slavonic sounds, in which, however, as is natural, as far as their value is concerned, we have nothing new to bring forward, and in this respect follow only the teaching of native grammarians.

(a) The Old Sanskrit अ *a* has so far experienced, in the Slavonic, an exactly similar fate to that which has befallen it in the Greek, that it is most frequently supplied by *e* or *o* (*e, o*), which are always short it very rarely remains *a*. In the interior of the bases, also, *e* and *o* are interchanged as in Greek, and as, for example, $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is related to $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$, so, in the Old Slavonic, is *brod*, "ferry," to *bredŭ*, "I wade through," *voz*, "carriage," to *vezŭ*, "I ride in a carriage." And as, in the Greek, the vocative $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\epsilon$ is related to the theme $\Lambda\text{ΟΓΟ}$, so is, in the Old Slavonic, *rabe*, "O slave," to *rabo*, nominative *rab*, "a slave." The *o* has more weight than *e*, but *a* more than *o*; and hence *a* corresponds most frequently to a Sanskrit \acute{a} , so that, for instance, in the Old Slavonic, forms in *a* answer to the feminine bases in $\text{अ} \acute{a}$ (comp. *vdova*, "widow," with $\text{विधवा} \text{vidhavá}$), which, in the vocative, is in like manner abbreviated to *o* (*vdovo !*), as above *o* to *e*. As final vowel, also, of the first member of a compound, *a* is weakened to *o*, for instance, *vodo-pad*, "waterfall," *vodo-pož*, "water-drinker," for *voda-*, just as in the Greek Μουσο-τραφής , Μουσο-φίλης , and similar compounds, which [G Ed p 330] have shortened the feminine α or η to o . Even if, therefore, *a* is in the Old Slavonic a short vowel, I nevertheless regard it, in respect to grammar, as the long *o*, so that in this the Old Slavonic stands in a reversed relation to the Gothic, in which *a* has shewn itself to us as the short of \acute{o} , and, in case of abbreviation, \acute{o} would become *a*, exactly as in the Old Slavonic *a* becomes *o*.

(b) — $\text{ऌ} \text{r}$ and $\text{ड} \text{r}$ both appear in the Old Slavonic as *r*, and the difference of the quantity is removed, at least I

do not find that a longer or shorter *i* is anywhere spoken of Let *schuti* I live be compared with *नीयामि jūdmi sila* virtue with *शील sila* and on the other hand *vidyati* to see with the root *विद् vid* to know to the Guna form of which *वेद्मि vėdmı* the Old Slavonic *vyemy* (abbreviated from *vyedmy* infin *vyes t* for *vyed ti*) I know assimilates itself, so that *vid* and *vyed* in the Slavonic appear as two different roots The short *इ i* however, appears frequently in the Old Slavonic also in the corruption to *e* (*e*) as in the Greek and the Old High German (§ 72) that is to say the bases in *i* shew in several cases *e* for *i* and the numeral three (*त्रि tri*) appears frequently in composition in the form *tre, e g treputye, truum* So also *pūte shesti ye* *οδοροπια* from *PŪTI* (§ 260) The *i* is also very frequently *suppressed *e g* in the 3d person plural *dadyat* they give Sanskrit *ददति dadati sut* they are Sanskrit *सन्ति santi* Where *i* forms a diphthong with a vowel preceding it it is marked in the old writing with a short mark which we retain, *e g boi strife*

- (c) — *у u* and *ю u* have in the Old Slavonic in the forms which are retained most correctly both become *y †* In this manner for instance *by* (infin *by ti*) answers to *भ*

* The suppression here noticed of final *i* refers to Dobrowsky's incorrect orthography In point of fact, however the final *i* in Old Slavonic has either been retained unaltered or has become *i y e g* that which Dobrowsky here writes *da lyat* they give *sūt* they are should be corrected to *ДАУАТЬ, dadanty tA TI su ty* Regarding the nasalized vowels see § 783 Remark

† We express, as in Polish the *yery* or dull *i* by *y* as like the Greek *v* where it is original it supplies the place of the old short or long *u* It is pronounced in Russian according to Reiff (by Cretsch II p 666) as in the French *oui*, spoken very short and monosyllabically according to Heym nearly like *u* in union with a very short *i* (Heym p 6) This does not however remain the same in all positions of this letter (Reiff l c) and it sounds after consonants other than labials like a dull thick *i* (*i sourd et étouffé*)

bhâ, "to be," *svekry*, "mother-in-law," to $\text{भृश्वसि } \acute{u}$; *myshy*, "mouse," to $\text{भूष } m\acute{u}sha$; *syn*, "son," to $\text{भूषु } s\acute{u}nu$, *chetyri*, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$, with $\text{चतुर् } chatu\acute{r}$ (in the theme), nominative masculine $\text{चतुर् } chatu\acute{r}as$. The instances of *y* for $\text{उ } u$ are, nevertheless, more rare than those where *y* corresponds to the long $\text{ऊ } \acute{u}$; for the short *u*, as in the Old High German (§. 70.), has for the most part [G Ed p 331] become *o*, and thus, for example, *snocha*, "daughter-in-law," answers to $\text{सुषा } snush\acute{a}$, *oba*, "both," to $\text{उभा } ubh\acute{a}$ (Vêdic form), Zend $\text{وبه } ub\acute{h}$. Hence, also, the old *u* declension has, in many cases, become similar to the *o* declension, which, according to (*a*), has arisen from $\text{अ } a$, and, on the other side, *o* may also, but only in substantives, participate in those forms which belong only to the genuine *u* declension whence it is easily perceived that the genius of the language could not everywhere distinguish further the two kinds of *o*, in their history, indeed, far separated from one another, but phonetically identical.

- (*d*)—Unorganic *y*, i e *y* as representative of original vowels other than $\text{उ } u$ or $\text{ऊ } \acute{u}$, is not uncommon in the grammar, that is to say, the personal termination *my* (1st person plural), like the Latin *mus*, has arisen from the more ancient *mas*; and if the bases in *a* (for $\text{आ } \acute{a}$) have *y* in the nominative plural (*vdovy*, "viduæ"), still the *y* here is so much the less to be looked upon as a case termination, as no account could be given of *y* in this sense, and with bases in *ya* the *a* of the base is also really retained (*volya*, "voluntates"). But as the *y* exerts the force of an *Umlaut* on an *o* succeeding it, by which that vowel is changed to an *e*, so I think that to an *i* following the *o*, without the intervention of another letter, the force of a reactive *Umlaut* must be ascribed, even if this force is not everywhere exerted, and that some *y*'s must be declared to be the *Umlauts* of *o* that is to say, as soon as so much has been re-

cognised in the Old Slavonic adjectives that their bases all end either in *o* or *yo* (changed by the *Umlaut* to *ye*) and are thus sister forms to the Greek like ΑΓΑΘΟ ΑΓΙΟ and of the Sanskrit as श्वेत *suḷta* white दिव्य *divya* heavenly —so soon I say, as the abbreviation of the base in the masculine nominative has been recognised (*noi notus* for *noio*) then will it be no longer said with Dobrowsky (p 318) that the definite adjectives are derived from the primitives (indefinite) by annexing according to the measure of the final letter of the primitive either *yi* or *u* * If however I may trust that I have obtained an accurate knowledge of the organization of the Old Slavonic grammar on any point it is on this that the affix in the nominative singular of definite adjectives consists not in *yi* or *u* but in *z* as a mutilation of *yo* from *ya* (य *ya*) and in the feminine of *ya* from *yá* [G Ed p 332] (या *yá*) This also appears to me subject to no manner of doubt that if for example the compound word *svyatyi* comes from the word *svyato* holy its acknowledged theme, the *y* is a euphonic product from *o* through the influence of the *z* which is added to it This *z* has in some cases in which it has been dropped still in a degree in its euphonic operation left its reflection and thereby the proof of its former existence Thus for instance *sviaty-m per sanctum* from the older *svyatyĭm* *sviaty ch sanctorum* and *in sanctis* from *svyatyi ch* corresponds to the indefinite forms *svyato m sviatye ch* (for *sviato-ch*) † At times through the said pronominal syllable *z* the preceding *o* may be changed at will into *y*

* Dobr also himself p 493 considers simple *z* or *u* as the definitive adjunct but in considering as he there does *blagy* as the confluence of *blag* and *u* he appears to look upon the *y* as having arisen from the *z* of the suffix and not to acknowledge in it the final vowel of the simple adjective root

† In the oldest MSS according to Dobr p 50^o the more full forms *y ch, ym y m* occur in the plural for *ym ych, ym*

or not thus the interrogative exhibits the forms *kyí*, “*quis*?” (Dobr. 500 and 343.), *kyzm*, “*per quem*?” *kyích*, “*in quibus, quorum*?” *kyīm*, “*quibus*?” *kyīmi*, “*per quos*” with *koř*, *koīm*, *koích*, *koīmi*. The possessive pronouns allow no euphonic reaction at all to the demonstrative *i*, which forms the last member of them, and they always retain their radical *o*, e. g. *moř*, “*meus*,” *moīm*, “*per meum*,” not *myř*, *myīm*. As to the definite form of the adjective bases in *yo*, which Dobrowsky forms through the addition of *ř*, I have not the slightest doubt that here, also, a simple *i* is the defining element, for the first *i* is clearly the vocalization of the *y* of the primitive base; so that therefore, for example, *sinř* “the blue,” is to be divided, not into *sin-ř*, but into *sin-i-ř*. The primitive adjective is sounded in the nominative which is deprived of all inflection and of the last vowel of the base *siny*, the *y* of which appears as *i* in the nominative plural masculine, just as in the definite pronoun, *sin*, “*cærulei*,” *sinu*, *oi* “*cærulei*.” In order, however, here fully to explain the nature and origin of the definite declension, and not hereafter to be compelled to repeat what is already settled, it may be stated that its pronominal defining addition is identical with the Sanskrit relative base *ya*, which is most correctly preserved in the Lithuanian, in which language **ya* signifies “he” (*ya-m*, “to him,” *ya-mē*, “in him”) The nominative *ys*, “he” (for *yas*), has given the *y* an assimilating influence, as is the case with all bases in *ya* (§. 135.) The feminine, also, *is* is pronounced in the nominative, through assimilation, *yi* for *ya*, but the genitive *yos*, and all the other cases, are easily perceived through the declension of *rankà*, “hand,” and *giesme*, “song,”

[G Ed p 333] from *GIESMYA* (p. 169, Note) The

* Written *ja* in the text This passage furnishes a good reason for writing the Germanic *j* by *y*, as has been done throughout this translation

Old Slavonic has, in all the masculine bases ending with a vowel, suppressed this vowel in the nominative and accusative and since the vowel has dropped from the Sanskrit-Lithuanian base $\pi ya ya$ —which according to (a) makes one expect yo in the Old Slavonic from which, according to (n) must be formed ye^* —the y must be changed into a vowel, hence, i , he, him,' which must, therefore on no account be placed together with the Latin Gothic is from the base i . In the nominative singular masculine, however this Slavonic pronoun occurs in all the three genders, not isolated but in union with the particle *sche* which has preserved to it the old relative meaning i *sche* means as well "qui as quem ya *sche*, *quæ'* $yû$ *sche* *quam*", and ye *sche* *quod*. Now as i means he, ya , she and ye , it I could not imagine how one could create the definitive adjective forms $svyaty$ i $svyata$ ya $svyato$ e (for $svyatoye$) accusative $svyaty$, i $svyatû-yû$ $svyato$ e in their opposition to the indefinites $svyat(\bar{o})$ $svyata$, $svyato$, differently from Dobrowsky (p 493) and perhaps other grammarians before him have done, namely by the addition of the pronoun here under discussion † for this pronominal suffix supplies the place of the article of other languages and the Lithuanian language uses the same pronoun

* Hence in the genitive $ye-go$ dative ye $mû$ loc ye m the e of which Dobrowsky wrongly ascribes to flexion because he everywhere seeks the base in the nominative. However the base ye has not fully maintained itself before all terminations beginning with a consonant but become in like manner shortened to i : in i m *per eum* and us i m *per eos* i ch *eorum* in us for ye m &c

† What Grimm (by Wuk p xl) remarks against this declaration has not convinced me least of all can I for the above reasons concede to him that the i of $svyaty$ has any thing to do with the a of *blin la* the blind (from *blindan* § 110) so that $svyaty$ would belong to the indefinite declension and on the other hand, $svyat$ contrary to the Slavonic Grammarians would be to be removed from the indefinite into the definite forms

for the same object, *i. e.* equally in the emphatic, or, as it is also termed, definite declension of the adjective, and certainly so, that, through all cases, both the adjective which precedes and the pronoun which concludes are declined, while, in the Slavonic, in most cases the pronoun only is provided with the inflexions of case, but in some

[G. Ed p 331] it has utterly disappeared, and in others is still to be recognised in the *y* for *o* mentioned above

(e.) The Sanskrit diphthong ए ई I have found always rendered, in the Old Slavonic, by *ye*, in similar forms, so that after weakening the ए ई, to compensate for this, the semi-vowel *y* has made its appearance, to which, in this union, a particular legitimacy would be, according to (c), to be ascribed. Let *pyena*, "foam," be compared with पहेन *phēna*, *svet* "light," with सवेत *śvēta*; *vemj*, "I know," with वेमि *vēdmī*. The most important cases in the grammar with *ye* corresponding to ए ई are the dual case forms of the feminine and neuter, and those of the imperative, in accordance with the Sanskrit potential of the first conjugation.

(f) The Sanskrit diphthong औ *ō* (from *a+u*) is represented in the Old Slavonic by *û* (*g*),* so that the first

* Although this vowel may at times be pronounced short, still this much, at least, is certain, that, according to its origin and its definition, it is long. In Bohemian it appears in two forms, as *au* and *u* the former is pronounced *ou*, but the writing points to an older and different pronunciation, in which the *a* was accurately preserved in its place the *u* is pronounced short, whence, however, it cannot be deduced that this short *u* perhaps corresponds to the Sanskrit उ and Greek υ, and that *au* is its intensive or Guna, but, on the contrary, only the *u* retained in the *au* corresponds to the Sanskrit उ *u*, and the *u* which stands alone in Bohemian is a weakening of the *au*, so that, from this, the concluding element *u* alone is left etymologically, that is to say, the Bohemian *ou*, as also *u*, answers to the Sanskrit औ *ō*, and also to the Slavonic *û* (*g*), only that the former is phonetically more exact, and without the loss brought about by time. Hence, also, *usta* (written *vsta*) "ora" corresponds to the Sanskrit औष्ठ *ōshṭha*, "the lip" more complete, however, is *austne*, "by word

element of the Indian diphthong has assimilated itself to the second and in conjunction with it presents a similar long vowel as in the Greek α (*ov*) two heterogeneous vowels according to pronunciation have united themselves in a similar measure. As according to (a) the Indian short *a* has in the Slavonic mostly become short *o* we must consider the first element in the diphthong \acute{u} also (so we write the α) to be *o* and it becomes visible too in this form when \acute{u} is resolved before vowels into *oi* (compare $\beta o(F)os$ from B8 [G Ed p 335] § 123) while the Indian $\text{जो } \theta$ becomes *av* before a vowel ($\text{गवि } gav\acute{i} = \beta oFi$ from गो *go*). Now as in the Sanskrit $\text{उ } u$ $\text{ऊ } u$ rise to θ through Guna (§ 26) and *sto shyām* appears as the future of *stu* so in the Old Slavonic in like manner *y* (*cy*) is interchanged with *u* so that *bu* in *bū du* I shall be must pass as the Guna form of *by* (in *byti* to be) but if a class of nouns which in the nominative accusative terminate in a consonant or in *yerr* (see *l*) exhibit in many oblique cases the syllable *ov* before vowel-endings this *ov* must neither be considered with Dobrowsky for an augment added to the base nor can it be deduced from forms like *synov* from a son (Sanskrit $\text{सूनवे } sunav\acute{e}$ from *sunu*) *synov-ě* sons ($\text{सूनवसु } sunav\acute{a}su$) that *syn* in the nominative-accusative is an abbreviation of *synū* and that therefore the *yerr* when it is added to the form *syn* is a representative or weak remainder of \acute{u} but it is clear from (c) that *syn filius filium* if its final vowel in its most genuine form had remained to it would sound *syny*, from which *synov* is the Guna intensive the *oi* of which has arisen from *u* through the influence

of mouth and even for *esta* is to be found *austa* (Dobr Bohm Lehrg p 4) *rūka* corresponds to the Lithuanian *ranka* "hand" and *hus* to the Sanskrit $\text{हंस } kansa$ goose for which according to p 319 *rauka* *hausā* was to have been expected. A distinction must here according to § 783 Remark q v, be made between $\text{oy } i$, and $\text{y } un$

of the vowel following it, but has remained in the genitive plural also, after the ending has been dropped. Let *synov*, "*filiorum*," be compared with the Gothic *sunw-ê* (§. 247) As, in the Sanskrit, the substantive bases in *u* adopt the Guna form of the *u* before the vowels of the derivative suffix, so it is very remarkable that, in the Old Slavonic bases in *y*, also, this vowel appears before certain derivative suffixes in its Guna form, e. g. *domov-it* from *dom* (*DOMY*), "house", *binov-at*, "debtor," from *byn* (*BYNY*).^{*} Derivative substantives and adjectives in *ov*, *ev* (theme *ovo*, *evo*, the latter for *yovo*, see *n*), correspond to the Sanskrit in अव *ava*; as पान्दव *pāṇḍav-a* (nominative *as*), "descendant of Pāṇḍu", अर्तव *ártava*, "seasonable," from ऋतु *ritu*, "season" so, in Old Slavonic, *Adamov*, "Adamite," from *Adam* (*ADAMY*), *zarev* for *zaryev*, "kingly," from *zar* (theme *ZARYY*). For these formations, therefore, we must not, with Dobrowsky (322, 323), assume a suffix *ov* or *ev*, but we must look upon the *o* alone, which, in the nominative, is suppressed, as the derivative suffix (*ADAMOV-O*, *ZAREV-O*). Through the Viddhi increase (§ 29.) the Old Slavonic *y* becomes *av*, because *a*, according to (*a*), usually corresponds to आ *á* hence, from the root *by*, "to be," comes the causal *baviti* (infinitive), as in the

[G Ed p 336] Sanskrit भावयितुम् *bhāvayitum*. But though *staviti* occurs as the causal of *sta*, this form may have arisen in the perverted feeling of the language as an irregularly analogous word to *baviti* In order, then, still more to establish, by a few other examples, the representation of the Indian ओ *ô* or अव *av* by the Slavonic *ú*, we find *úst*, "mouth," correspond to ओष्ठ *ôshtha*, "lip", *shúī* "sinister" (theme *SHUYO*), to सव्य *savya*, *búdití*, "to awake" a causal, whose primitive *bdyeti* has entirely

* Dobrowsky supports himself in these cases by calling *ov* a prefix (p 329)

lost the vowel of the root—to बोधयिषुम् *bōdhayitum* also to awake from बुध् *budh* to know Thus *gubiti* is the causal of *gyb nŭ* (1 P) and *stŭditi* of *styd nŭ* (Dobr 360 361) while *ŭyesiti* is the causal of *ŭsyeti* (see *e*) as in the Sanskrit वेशयिषुम् *ŭśayitum* 'to cause to enter' from विश *ŭs* to go in

- (g)—As the nasals* easily resolve themselves into *u* so the second element of the diphthong *ŭ* sometimes also supplies the place of a nasal in the cognate languages *e g rŭka* a hand Lithuanian *ranka* *pŭty* a way Sanskrit पथिन् *panthŭs* id Latin *pons* *goluby* a dove *columba* *gŭsy* a goose" हंस *hansa* The Polish has preserved the old nasal in *golamb* a dove *gansie* a gosling *ganstor* a gander and in many similar cases Hereby the *ŭ* in the accusative of bases in *a* (from आ *ŭ*) which are for the most part feminine is remarkably explained compare *ŭdovŭ* from *ŭdovŭa* a widow with विधवाम् *vidhavŭm* *ŭduam* Therefore *ŭdovŭ* is to be derived from *ŭdovo-m* for *ŭdovŭa m* (see *a*) so that the *a* which is weakened to an *o* is contracted with the nasal mark of the case to *ŭ* This view is further supported by the consideration that in Polish also the corresponding feminine declension marks the final vowel of the base with the same sign which in the middle of a word expresses a nasal which is governed according to the organ of the following letter but at the end probably through a corruption of sound is said to have an equal value with a ringing *h* This nasalizing mark recurs also in the Polish verb and indeed exactly in such a place where one had to expect a nasal *i e* in the 1st person singular and 3d person plural and thus in Bandtke's second and third conjugation the so marked ę *e g* in *piekę* I bake supplies the place of the *am* of the first conjugation as *czytam* I read

* Cf § 763 Remark

The Old Slavonic has, however, excepting some anomalous remains of an older formation, *û* in all the conjugations, and, according to what has been said, it admits of no doubt, that in the second part of this diphthong (*o + ŭ*) the personal character *m*, and in the first part of the diphthong the conjunctive vowel, is retained. When therefore, in the 1st person, an *o* corresponds to the *e* (*c*) of *nes-e-shu*, "thou carriest," *nes-e-t*, "he carries"

[G Ed p. 337.] for *nesû* is for *nes-o-ŭ* for *nes-o-m* from *nes-e-m* it must be assumed that the conjunctive vowel *e*, before its confluence with the *ŭ*, which has arisen out of *m*, has passed into *o*; as in Greek *ou* arises by the contraction of *ε* and *ο*, though the transition of *ε* into *ο* and *ο* into *υ*. The same relation is to be found in the Old Slavonic in the 3d person plural, where, corresponding to *nes-e-m*, "we carry," *nes-e-te*, "ye carry" (comp *λέγ-ε-τε*), the form *nesent* is expected, but in place of it occurs *nesût* in surprising accord with the Greek *λέγουσι* for *λέγονσι* from *λέγοντι*. The Polish has, like the Bohemian, relinquished the character of the 3d person in the plural, as well as for the most part in the singular, but everywhere retains, in the first, the old and more powerful *a* (ꙗ), and marks this with the diacritical sign mentioned above, which, in the middle of a word, supplies the place of a nasal function, thus, *sa*, "they are," corresponds to the Sanskrit *सन्ति* *santi*, Slavonic *sûti*. The Bohemian has also, in many conjugations, retained the old conjunctive vowel *a* in the 3d person plural, but, like the Slavonic, permitted the *n* to dissolve into a *u*, therefore, in *vezau*, "vehunt" (*wez-e-me*, "vehimus," *wez-e-te*, "vehitis"), the *u* answers to the *n* of *वहन्ति* *vahanti*, "vehunt," and the *u* which, in Bohemian, is united with an *a*, is essentially different from that which stands alone, for the latter answers to the Old Slavonic diphthong *û* (*z*), but the former only to the latter portion of the *û*, which, in the Old Slavonic, never stands alone, at least never occurs as *ŭ*, but as *y* (*ι*)

If, then through what has been said the vocalization of the *m* or *n* which is of such frequent occurrence in the Slavonic has been shewn with sufficient clearness it is remarkable that conversely also the latter portion of the *ú* (*y*) has occasionally been hardened into a nasal and thus *budu* I will be is in Polish *bendę* (written *będe*)

(*h*)—In certain cases an old *á* (आ) unorganically supplies the place of the Slavonic *ú*, *ı* *e* in the instrumental of pronouns without gender and all feminines thus *vdoy u* through the widow answers to विधवा *vidha vay á* and *toboy u* through thee to त्वया *tway á* Denominatives also in *úyú* (1st per pres) in the Old Slavonic correspond to the Sanskrit in आयामि *áyāmi* as शब्दयामि *śabdáyāmi* I sound from शब्द *śabda* a sound चिरयामि *chiráyāmi* I hesitate from चिर *chira* long thus in the Slavonic, *zielúyú* I greet, I kiss, from *ziel* (*ZILLO*) “healthy *ıdoyúyú* from *ıdova*, widow (*Dobr* p 372) Finally words in *ún* (*ŪNO*) answer as it appears to the Sanskrit participles of the middle voice, in *ána* as युज्याय *yunyāna* uniting from युज् *yuj* so in the Old Slavonic, *perún* (*PERŪNO*) *Deus* [G Ed p 338] *tonans* from the root *per* to shake *byegún*, runner (*BŸEGŪNO*) from *BŸEG* “to run (*Dobr* p 289)

(*i*)—There are in the Slavonic alphabet two marks which by some are called *litteræ aphonæ* but by Gretsch semi vowels, I mean the so-called soft *yer** and the hard *yerr* The former is represented by Gretsch as half *ı* and by his translator Reiff (47) as answering to the tones mouilles of French (compare Kopitar p 5) and thus *schal*^b “sympathy and *ogon*^b fire are in respect to the soft *yer* compared with the pronunciation of *travail* and *cicogne* Thus *yer*, therefore denotes a tone

* In the original *yer* pronounced however, *yerr* and hence *y* has been substituted for *j* in all that follows —*E litor*

which is rather to be called a *y* than an *i**; and it may be said that in *schal*^b and *oĝon*^b one hears quite as much of a *y* as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a consonant preceding it. Hence we mark it with a *y*, and write the above words *schaly*, *oĝony*, Old Slavonic *oĝny*. In the words, too, which end with it in the uninflected nominative and accusative singular, it occurs in several oblique cases as a distinct proper *y*, e g in *zaryya*, “*regis*,” *zaryu*, “*regi*,” from *zary*, “*rex*,” “*regem*.” On the consonant which precedes it this *yer* has an influence which renders its pronunciation more mild, because its sound is somewhat broken by the *y*, which throws back its sound. Etymologically the *yer* corresponds either to a final *i* of the cognate languages, as in *yesty*, “he is” (अस्ति *astī*, *ĉorī*, Lithuanian *esti*), *kosty*, “bones” (अस्थि *asthi*), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a *y* (य *y*), from which a vowel has dropped, for the theme of *sinj*, “*cæruleus*,” concludes neither with *i* nor with *y*, but with *yo* (euphonicallly *ye*, see *n*), whose final vowel, suppressed in the nominative and accusative masculine, appears, however, in the feminine *sinja*, in its extension to *a*, while the neuter *sine* for *sinje* has rejected the *y*.

- (*k*) The hard *yerr* is represented by Gretsck as a semi *o*, but by Reiff, more correctly in my opinion, it is compared to the French silent *e* and the Hebrew *schva* it is therefore, to use the expression, equivalent to “nothing”, and one cannot perceive of what vowel the small, still perhaps remaining vowel part of it is the residue. Consonants preceding it have a stronger and free pronunciation, [G. Ed. p 339] and Kopitar (p 5) tells us that they are pronounced before it sharp, and without echo, and that it is for this reason called the hard *yerr*, and not on account of its own pronunciation. We require, therefore, in the

In the Carniolan dialect this sound has mostly disappeared, but where it has remained it is also written by a *y*, as, *kony*, “horse”

Roman character, no substitute for this mark and Dobrowsky also omits it at the end of words. Etymologically however this *yerr* always represents a suppressed mute vowel only not always an *o* nor as Grimm conjectures (in his valuable Preface to Wuk's Slavian Grammar p. xxxiv) a *u*. Rather each of the three short fundamental vowels—*a* (as represented also by *o e*) *i u* (for which may stand *y, o*),—is very frequently dropped at the end of words and although the *i* is seldom entirely suppressed more generally throwing back its sound as *y* nevertheless the vowel suppressed after the *m* of *rabo m per serum* and in Russian replaced by *yerr* is clearly, as we gather from the Lithuanian an *i*.

(l)—I* believe I may assert that in the whole extent of the structure of the Slavonic language at least in all the conditions of its noun and verb not a single final consonant occurs after which some termination which through the cognate languages can be pointed out as beginning with a vowel has not been dropped. Thus the base *NBBS cælum* forms in the genitive plural likewise *nebes*, but the vanished termination is in Sanskrit चाम् *ām* (नभसाम *nabhasām cælorum*) Greek ων (*veφe(σ)ων*) Latin *um* Gothic *e*. The real final consonants however which in the truly preserved elder dialects of the Indo European family stand as the foundation of the word have utterly disappeared in Slavonic polysyllables *e g* from चस् *as* *es* is formed, in the nominative plural *e* (*é*) and *synov è* answers to forms like सुनवस् *sunav as* *βορπυ es*.

(m)—As far as regards the writing of those consonants which in the Slavonic alphabet properly correspond to the Roman we express the sound of the French *j* (*zivjete* in the Carmolan *sh*) as in Zend (§ 65) by *sch* that of our German *sch* (= *च*) by *sh* as in Sanskrit

* Cf § 783 Remark.

and also as, in Sanskrit, the *tsch* by *ch*: for the sound of the Greek ζ (=ds) we retain ζ, and use *z* for the sound of our German *z* (=ls) for *χ* we write *ch*. In regard to etymology, it is important to call attention to the relation of this letter to sibilants, by means of which *snocha*, "daughter-in-law," corresponds to the Sanskrit स्नुषा *snushā*. *Ch* also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into *s*

[G Ed. p 340] (Dobr. pp 39, 41), and in some cases into *sh* (Dobr 41). Finally, in preterites like *dach*, "I gave," *dachom*, "we gave," the *ch* returns to the *s* (स् s, Σ) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a *t* follows it, hence, *daste*, "ye gave," *dasta*, "ye two" and "they two gave."* As the vowels exercise a multifarious influence in the transformation of gutturals preceding them, we will further remark that the *ch* under discussion maintains itself in the 3d person plural before *û*, but before *a* appears as *sh*, hence, *dasha* or *dachû*, "they gave"

(n)—[For the semi-vowel *y* (य y) the Cyrillic alphabet gives the Greek ι, excepting in the cases for which the inventor of the character has provided by particular letters set together according to their value, which, at the same time, express the *y* with the following vowel, that is to say, *ya* is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel *ya*, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For *ye*, also,

* Dobrowsky has, however, as *t* appears to me, not perceived the irrefragable connection between the *ch* of *dach* and the *s* of *daste*, for he considers the *ch* and *ste*, &c as personal terminations (pp 264 383, 397), and hence he nowhere informs us that *ch* before *t* passes into *s*. More on this subject when we come to the verb

† The vowels mentioned here, preceded by *y*, are, with the exception of *ye*, and *yě*, nasalised vowels (see § 783 Remark), and hence *pyaty*, "five," must be pronounced *pany* (in the original character ПАНЬ)

Cyril has provided by a simple sign and *yŕ* is expressed by an *o* in conjunction with an *i*. But *y* often appears in Slavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare *yesmy* 'I am' *yam* (for *yadmy*) 'I eat' *pyaty* 'five' *desyaty*, 'ten' *yedin* 'one' with the corresponding Sanskrit forms *asmī* *admi* *panchan* *daśan* *adī* (*primus*). An *o* which follows is in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§ 137 and p 174 Note*), changed into *e* through the influence of a *y* preceding it. In like manner in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian the *y* after it has assimilated a vowel following it has often itself disappeared and has left behind only its effect and thereby the proof of its former existence*.

* Dobrowsky does not express himself with sufficient clearness regarding this form when he says (cap II § 111) that *o* after *y* and liquid consonants is changed into *e*. According to this, one would believe that besides *y* certain other consonants had the power of changing an *o* following them into *e*. Dobrowsky understands—which however as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under *consonæ liquidæ*, those which in consequence of a following *yer* (*y*) have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation while he calls the consonants without *yer* *consonæ solidæ*' (comp I c p 267) so that no consonant is by nature and of itself alone liquid but receives this quality through a following *yer* (a *y* without a vowel). Thus in Dobrowsky's second masculine declension, the consonants *r* *ch*, and *z* in *-ary*, 'king' *vrachy*, 'physician' and *knyaziy* 'prince' are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form *zarem* *bračem* *knyazem*, Dobrowsky ascribes the *e* for *o* to the influence of a liquid consonant while according to my opinion the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming *o* into *e* but for *-arem* &c *aryem* must originally have stood. And as in this form the *y* is the full semi vowel not entirely without a vowel sound and therefore not the expression of the *yer* without a vowel which softens the consonant preceding it—as in the abbreviated nominative *zary*—so the *r* also in *-aryem*, was not liquid and has not according to my opinion become liquid after the dropping of the semi vowel, at least I find it nowhere stated

[G Ed. p 341] 256. We must now, in order to be able to compare the true case-suffixes of the Old Slavonic with those of the cognate languages, first of all endeavour to ascertain the final letter of the kinds of base which occur, as they have for the most part been rubbed off in the singular nominative, whence it has appeared as if these letters, where they again present themselves in the oblique cases, either belonged to the case termination, or were an addition equally foreign to the base and to the termination, which has been termed "augment" by Dobrowsky. After becoming

[G Ed p 342] acquainted with the true base, the case terminations assume, in many points, an entirely different shape from what Dobrowsky has represented (p 160), with whom we cannot concede to the neuter a nominative termination *o* or *e*, but perhaps the advantage of having preserved, in preference to the masculine, the final vowel of the theme in this case. For the practical use of the language, and to keep simply within the limits of the Slavonic language, all might, notwithstanding, be assumed as inflexion which is usually represented as such. It is not, however, here our object to consider those syllables as supplying the place of grammatical relations which present themselves to the feeling of the speaker as such, but only those which may be so traced through the history of the language, and which, for thousands of years, have subsisted as Grammatical forms.

257. To the masculine and neuter bases in α correspond, in the Old Slavonic, as well as in Greek, bases in *o*, which vowel has disappeared in the nominative and

stated that the *r* and other consonants, in forms like *zarcm*, *knyazcm*, *golubem*, *lebedem*, are differently pronounced from what they are in *prom*, *vožom*, *lobom*, *adom*, of Dobrowsky's first masc declension. The difference in the two classes of words is only this, that the former have a *y* for the last letter but one of their theme, which, by the power of assimilation, has changed the following *o* into *e*, which *e*, after the *y* has been dropped, does not again become *o*.

* Dialectically the older *α* has, in certain cases, maintained itself, as in

accusative singular so the corresponding *a* has disappeared in Gothic except in the neuter (as Gothic *blinda ta cœcum* in contrast with *blind s cœcus*) it has also maintained itself frequently in the beginning of compounds in the Gothic and Old Greek where according to the oldest principle the naked theme is required, as *nov novus* appears in many compounds as *noio (noio-grad new town)* but is then not to be considered as the neuter *noio novum* but as the common theme [G Ed p 343] of the masculine and neuter, in which as yet no difference of sex is pointed out The clearest proof that the class of nouns under discussion corresponds to the Indian Lithuanian and Gothic nouns in *a* is afforded by their feminine bases in *a* (for $\text{यः } d$), so that to the form *rab* (for *рабо*) servant corresponds a feminine *raba* a maid that is to say all Old Slavonic primitive adjectives *ie* those with an indefinite declension correspond to the Sanskrit in *a s u, a m* Greek $\omicron \varsigma \eta(\alpha) \omicron$ Latin *u s a u m* much as one might be led astray by outward appearance to seek in the adjectives which in the nominative masculine end in *y* (*yer*), and in the neuter in *e* as *sinj, cœruleus s,je, cœruleum*, an analogy to Latin adjectives like *miti s mite*

258 But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned and in similarly constituted substantives as *knjažy* prince *more* the sea bases of such a nature as without the euphonic form mentioned at § 255 (*n*), must have terminated in *yo* whence *ye* and hence, in the nominative masculine—according to the suppression of the final vowel of the base *y* in this case—and in the neuter *e* retaining the vowel and dropping the *y* These bases therefore correspond to the Indian in $\text{य } ya$ the Greek and Latin in the Carniolan before all inflections beginning with *m* in the three numbers as *posla m* through the domestic *posla ma* the two domestics This word appears to be identical with $\text{पुत्र } putra$ son Persian *pisar* son, ‘boy young man and to owe its meaning to familiar address

io, *iu* (ǎryio-s, ǎryio-v, *sociu-s*, *præliu-m*), that is to say, *serdze* (nominative and accusative neuter), "heart," corresponds to the Sanskrit हृदयम् *hṛdaya-m*, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Slavonic bases in *ya* correspond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in या *yā* Greek *ια*, Latin *ia*), and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination *y* and neuter *e*, as *synya*, "cærulea," to *syny*, "cæruleus," and *sine*, "cæruleum"

[G. Ed. p 344] When an *i* or other vowel precedes the last *y* but one of the base, the *y* in the nominative, and accusative masculine is changed into the vowel *ĩ*, as, *nyetiĩ*, "nepos et sorore" (Dobrowsky, p 282) The corresponding feminine form is *rya*, and the neuter *ye*, the *y* of which has arisen from *i* of the form *rye*, which is to be supposed the original, after dropping the last *y* but one. To the Sanskrit सव्यस् *savya-s*, सव्या *savyā*, सव्यम् *savya-m* (*sinister, a, um*), correspond thus *shāu*, *shāya*, *shāu* (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285)

259 The Old Slavonic masculine and neuter bases in *yo*,* with their feminines in *ya*, are, according to their origin, of four kinds 1 Those in which, as in *SHŪYO*=सव्य *savya*, both the semi-vowel and the vowel following, from the earliest period of the language, belong to the base of the word, and this case is perhaps the most rare. 2 Such as originally end in *i*, to which an unorganic *o* has been added; as, in the Lithuanian, the bases in *i*, in many cases, change into the declension in *ia* (*ie*) (§. 193. and p 174, Note⁴) To this class belongs *MORYO*, nom. *more*, "the sea," the *e* of which therefore differs widely from

* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonic law contained in § 255 (*n*) unregarded, and I give *SERDZYO* as the theme of *serdze* ("heart," nom acc), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonic law, *i e* without inflection, as in the Sanskrit *vāch* is laid down as the theme, although *ch* cannot stand at the end of a word, but passes into *h*, as in the nominative *vāh*, which is properly identical with the theme

the *mare* in Latin corrupted from *marī* so that the Slavonic *y* which again makes its appearance in the genitive *morya* dative *moryŭ* corresponds to the Latin *e* spoken of. The Latin word must however in order to be classed with the Slavonic be pronounced in the nominative *maria m*. Neuter bases in *i* without an unorganic augment are entirely wanting in the Slavonic [G Ed p 345]. Among the masculines of this class of words *cheryy*, a worm (theme *CHERYŬO*), answers to the Sanskrit कर्म *krime* and the Latin *VERMI* Old High German *WURMI*, and *žyaly* (ŽYATYO) *gener* to the Sanskrit जाति *jati* feminine *familia* *genus* from जन् *jan* to be born*. The third kind of bases in *yo* is that where the unorganic *y* precedes a final *o* according to the euphonic disposition mentioned in § 255 (n). So *gusy* (GŪSYO) corresponds to the Indian हंस *hansa* goose (§ 255 g). In the fourth place there exist among bases in *yo* the words in which the *y* as well as the following vowel is an unorganic addition. Thus nouns of agency in *TARYO* correspond to the Sanskrit in तर् *tar* (तृ *tri* in the strong cases तर् *tār*) to the Latin in *tor*, and to the Greek in τῆρ *τῶρ* hence the nominatives *my tary schi tary* and *žlatary* (Dobrowsky p 295) and with *y* for *a* *pas tyry*, shepherd. Of this kind also are the nouns of agency in *TEI ŬO* the *l* of which is clearly an interchange with *r* (§ 20) so that this suffix also conforms itself to the Sanskrit तर् *tar* hence the nominatives *blago dyetely*, *beneficus*, *pye tely* a cock from the root *pye* 'to sing' *schately* 'messor' *spas i tely*, 'salvator †

* ζ frequently answers to the Sanskrit ज् *j* and for example ज्ञा *jna* to know is in the Slavonic *zna* (infinitive *znati*)

† But see p 379 Note § 647

‡ As these words stand in analogy with the infinitive in *ti* in so far that their suffix begins with a like consonant, Dobrowsky (pp 292 293) derives them from the infinitive and allows them simply *elj* as suffix (as also simple *ary* for *ta y*) as it has been the custom to derive also in the Latin, *tor* and *turus* from the supine. However it is certain the

260 To the Sanskrit feminine bases in ऋ *ā* correspond as has been already remarked, Old Slavonic in *a*. To [G. Ed p 346] this class of words, however, belong also some masculines, particularly proper names, which are then declined entirely as feminines, as in Latin *nauta, calicola, &c.* (§ 116.), on which we will not here dwell further. Among the bases in *i* there are, in Old Slavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines as in Lithuanian—which Dobrowsky, p 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with *i*, but the former with *yo*, and in part with *yy*, (§. 263). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree, and, *gosty*, “guest,” from *GOSTI* (Gothic *GASTI*, Latin *HOSTI*) agrees with *knyaży*, “prince,” from *KNYAŻYO*, and *vrachy*, “medicus,” from *VRACHYY*. The masculine bases originally ending with *n* there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by *i*, *KAMEN*, “stone” (Sanskrit अश्मन् *aśman*), is extended to *KAMENI*, and then follows *GOSTI*.

261 To the Sanskrit feminine bases in इ *i* correspond numerous Old Slavonic bases of a similar termination (Dobrowsky, decl. fem. iv.), that is to say, the Slavonic agrees with the Sanskrit in the formation of feminine ab-

the suffixes *TOR*, *TURU* and the Slavonic *TARYO*, *TELYO*, used to borrow then *t* not at first from another syllable of formation so commencing. They form primitive words from the roots themselves, and not derivatives from other words.

Thus, also, *PŪTI*, “a way” (Sanskrit पथिन् *pathin*), and *LYŪDI*, pl. *num*, nom *lyūdy-e*, “people,” Gothic *LAUDI*, nom *lauths*, “a person,” the *au* of which, according to § 255 (*f*), is represented by *ū* (*g*), and, according to § 255. (*m*), has gained a prefixed *y* *GOSPODI*, “a master” (comp पति *pati*, Lithuan *PATI* and Gothic *FADI*) is in fact irregular, as it passes into several kinds of theme in its declension.

tracts in *TI*, as *PA MYA TI* memory nom *pamyaty* from the root *MAN*, as in Sanskrit मति *matī* (for *mantī*) spirit" meaning from मन् *man* to think * (compare *memini*) These words weaken, indeed, in [G Ld p 347] the nominative and accusative their *i* to *yer* but in no case overstep their original base by an unorganic addition and hence they must not on any account, be looked upon as of the same base with the majority of masculines terminating similarly in the nominative and accusative singular. But Dobrowsky's third feminine declension is of a mixed nature (*zerkovy* a church) in this we recognise some words which have by Guna changed a Sanskrit final ऊ *u* to *ov*, and from this form several cases as from a base ending with a consonant—e g *zerkove* genitive singular and nominative plural—but so that the *o* is suppressed before vowel terminations. In some cases the theme extends itself by an unorganic *i* in others by *a* and also before these extensions of the base the *o* of the syllable *ov* is suppressed† e g *zerkuyū* per ecclesiam *zerlū*, ecclesia *zerkūvī* ecclesiarum *zerlīa m* ecclesius, *zerkva ch* in ecclesius *zerkīa mī* per ecclesias. The dative locative *zerkū* is doubtful as this case could have no other sound than *zerkū* whether it come from *ZERKOV* or from *ZERKVI*

* Dobrowsky (p 350) imputes in my opinion wrongly the *n* of *po mjanu*, I remember and some similar bases to derivation instead of supposing that the radical *n* is suppressed before *t* in analogy with the Sanskrit, and as in Greek τσις from ΤΑΝ Sanskrit तन्तिस् *tanti-s** a line (as extended) for तन्तिस् *tanti s*

† The example given by Dobrowsky *zerkovy* a church nevertheless does not apply to monosyllables as *krivy* blood (Sanskrit कृष्य *kravya* neuter 'flesh'), nor to those polysyllables in which two consonants precede the syllable *ov* for *yatriach* and *trich* would be equally impracticable (comp Gretsck by Reiff p 163) *brovj* eyebrow also appears to form all its cases from a theme *BROVI* an extension of the Sanskrit ब्रुवती *bhruvati* feminine by the addition of *i* with a Guna of the ऊ *u*. The nominative plural is hence *brovi* (Dobrowsky p 110) not *brove*.

Some words of this class have, in the nominative, *y*, and [G Ed p 348] thus *svekry* agrees with सवकृषुः *śvaśrū-s*, "socrus" (§ 255 c.), others have, at will, *ovy* or *vi*, with *o* suppressed, hence *zerkovy* or *zerkvi*.

262. Among bases in *u* (Greek *υ*) of the cognate languages, only masculines have maintained themselves in the Old Slavonic. They, like the bases in *o*, suppress their final vowel in the nominative and accusative, but in the remaining cases this letter shews itself either with Guna changed to *ov* or *ú* (§. 255. f.), or without Guna, as *o* (§ 255. c.), and in the latter form it appears also in the beginning of compound words as a naked theme. Hence it is more probable, that anciently for *syn*, "*filus*," "*filium*," stood *syno* rather than *syny* (§. 255 c).^{*} With this similar conformation of theme of the old bases in *a* and *u*, it is not surprising that two kinds of bases, which in their origin are widely different, run very much into one another in the Slavonic declension, and that, in the more modern dialects, these two declensions, which were originally so strictly separate, have fallen almost entirely into one.

263 As in the *o* bases which have arisen from अ *a*, a *y* preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we, in § 258, have represented as purely euphonic, the same phenomenon makes its appearance also in the *y* bases, by means of which their Guna form is articulated *ev* (for *yev*) instead

* We term this class of words, nevertheless, bases in *y*, for although their final letter never occurs as *y*, still, according to § 225 (c), *y* is the most legitimate, even if it be the most rare, representative of the Sanskrit उ *u*. But should it be wished to call them bases in *o*, they would not be distinguished from the order of words, which, according to § 257, bear this name with more right. The term *u* bases would be appropriate only so far as here, under the *u*, might be understood, not the Old Slavonic у (etymologically = ओ *ó*), but the Sanskrit उ *u* or the Latin *u* of the fourth declension, which, in the Old Slavonic, has no real existence

of *ov** If however with Dobrowsky we di- [G Ed p 349]
 vide the Old Slavonic masculines—with the exception of the
 bases in *z* § 260—into two declensions and in doing this de-
 sire as is natural to ground the division on the final letters of
 the bases we must place *knyazŷy* prince (nominative) of
 Dobrowsky's second declension in the first and by the side
 of *rab* a servant on the other hand the words *syn*
 son and *dom* a house of Dobrowsky's first masculine
 declension must be transferred to the second declension
 as mutilated *y* forms Of the paradigm here given by
 Dobrowsky *vrachŷy* 'medicus' adheres most strictly to the
 true *y* declension and according to § 250 (n) opposes
ev to the *ov* of *SĪNI* On the other hand words inflected
 like *zaryŷy* a king (nominative) clearly form the nomi-
 native and genitive plural from bases in *z*, hence *zaryŷe*
 kings *zarŷi*, of kings from *ZARI* as *gostŷyŷe* ho-
 spites" and *gostŷi* hospitum from *GOSTI* In the dative
 plural and instrumental singular the form *-are m* is doubt-
 ful in this and other words also of obscure origin it re-
 mains uncertain whether the more contracted theme in *z*
 or the more extended in *yy* is the older, but it is certain
 that several old *z* bases have migrated into this declension
 by an unorganic addition for instance *ognŷy* fire (nom)
 dative *ognev-z* from *OGNĪY* agrees with the Sanskrit अग्नि
agni Latin *IGNI* Lithuanian *UGNI* † It [G Ed p 350]

* Without Guna the final of the base is pronounced *e* for *ye* from *yo*
 (§ 205 n) and hence in the cases without Guna the *yy* bases are just
 as little to be distinguished in their inflection from the *yo* bases as, in
 the instrumental singular *syno-m* (from the theme *SĪNI*) from *rabo-m*
 (theme *RABO*) In the beginning of compound words, also the *yy* bases
 end like those in *yo* with *e* for *ye*

† As regards words inflected like *mratiŷi*, the only proof which could
 bring them under the head of the *y* bases is the vocative sing *mrav ju*
 that they however, although they have borrowed this case from the *y*
 declension, originally belong to the *o* declension is proved by their
 feminine in *z/ya* and neuter in *z/ye* or *y* (Dobrowsky p 282)

heaven, Sanskrit नभस् *nabhas* In the [G Ed p 301] nominative accusative and vocative they relinquish the concluding *s* (according to § 255 l) and afterwards strengthen the *e* to *o* (§ 255 a) We cannot therefore any longer compare the *o* of *nebo* with the Sanskrit Zendian *o* which has arisen out of *a+u* As in this abbreviation of *es* to *o* the neuter *es* bases in the cases mentioned become similar to the *o* bases it is then—on account of the influence of these cases and because the nominative principally gives the tone in the declension and shews in the oblique cases as inflection that which is in itself deficient—it is then we say not surprising if the original *o* bases at times admit an *es* in the oblique cases particularly when we consider the original great extension of these neuter bases terminating in *s* (compare § 241) which induces the conjecture that many words now declined as *o* bases were originally domiciled in the bases in *es* On the other hand Dobrowsky proves that there is no admixture of *es* in the thoroughly legitimate adjective *o* bases It is also clear from § 255 (l) that the bases in *yat** in the uninflected cases must lay aside the *i* and follow *σῶμα* not महत् *mahat* (*magnum*) and *caput*

265 Of the class of words in *r* mentioned in § 144 two feminine words have remained in the Old Slavonic which derive most of their cases from the genuine *r* bases but in others increase the original base by an unorganic *i* or also by *ya* (compare the Lithuanian in § 111) in the nominative singular however in accordance with the Sanskrit and Lithuanian they suppress the *r* These are *mati* mother and *dshchi* daughter, in the latter only occurs the increase of the base by *ya* (in the nominative accusative and dative plural) the declension of the former springs [G Ed p 307]

* They are all derivatives from names of animals, and denote the young of the animal mentioned

partly from *MATER*, e. g. *mater-e*, “*matris*,” and *matres* ($\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\text{-}\epsilon\varsigma$), partly from *MATERI*, e. g. *matery*, “*matrem*.”

266 “In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs *s* and *m*, with the exception of the bases in *a*, which present in the diphthong \acute{u} (*g*), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to *o*, (see §. 255. *g*.), hence *vodú*, “*aquam*,” from *vodo-ü*. The instrumental has, in the feminine, and the pronouns which have no gender preserved the genuine Sanskrit inflection, but it is to be remarked of the feminine bases in *i* that they change this vowel before the termination \acute{u} , (for *d*, see §. 255 *h*.), not into simple *y*, but into *iy*, so that in this respect the Old Slavonic agrees more closely with the Páli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final *i* before all the vowel endings into *iy*, than with the Sanskrit. Hence, let *kostiy-ú*, from *KOSTI*, “*bones*,” be compared with the Páli $\text{प्रीति} \text{prítīy-ú}$ (from *príti*, “*joy*”), for the Sanskrit $\text{प्रिय} \text{prīty-á}$. Masculines and neuter have *m†* for their instrumental ending, and this is, I have no doubt, an abbreviation of the Lithuanian *mi*, and comes therefore from *bi* (§. 215).

267 The dative has, in the singular, a common ending with the locative, and, in fact, the Old Sanskrit *i* (§. 195.), hence, *imen-i*, “*in nomine*,” and “*nomini*,” *synov-i*, “*filio*,” *brachev-i*, “*medico*,” from *SYNY* and *BRACHYY* (§. 263.), with Guna †. If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding *ov* [G. Ed p 353] becomes \acute{u} , and *ev* (from *yov*) becomes $y\acute{u}$, hence, also, *synú*, “*filio*,” with *synov-i*, and *zaryú*, “*regi*,” with

+ Cf § 783¹

† For *m*, according to Dobrowsky, we should read МБ *my*.

‡ Hence I am now disposed, contrary to § 177, to assume for the Lithuanian a common origin for the two cases, although in their received condition they are externally separated from one another, as is the case in Old Slavonic, also, in several classes of words

the *y* bases but prefer however the abbreviated form *ú* hence *rabú* from *RABO* more rarely *raboi* : The *o* bases of the adjectives, and of these there are in the masculine and neuter only *o* bases, and those of neuter substantives have alone the uninflected form in *ú* hence *e g* *blagú bono* masc neut. *sinýú caruleo* masc neut *slouú verbo moryú mari* not *blagov-i sinev-i slouov-i morci* : In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in *ú* extends itself also to the genitive and locative hence *domú*, of the house to and in the house but in the dative is also found *domoi* : and in the locative *domye* * The pronouns of the 3d person masculine and neuter—with exception of the reflexive—have in the dative in like manner the uninflected *ú* for the form *mú* in *to mú* to this," is clearly from the Sanskrit appended pronoun स्मा *sma* (§ 165 &c) which has extended itself in the cognate European languages so much and under such different forms, and thus in the Old Slavonic, would necessarily give the base *SMO* from which after dropping the *s*, would come the dative *mú* as *rabú* from *RABO*

268 While the *o* bases as has been shown above, have borrowed their dative from the *y* declension the *y* bases appear in the locative to have intruded on the *o* class for *synye* answers to *rabye* from *RABO* from *RABA* (§ 255 a) but the *ye* of *rabye* is according to § 255 (e) clearly from the Sanskrit य इ of यके, *wiké* from यक, *wika* and answers to the Lithuanian *wilke* from [G Ed p 304] *WILKA* (§ 197) As however in Lithuanian, from *SUNU* comes *sunu ye* so may also the Old Slavonic *synye* require

* Masculine names of inanimate things all follow the declension of *dom* (theme *DO MI*) although very few among them according to their origin fall into the class of the old *u i e* of the Latin fourth declension but for the most part correspond to Sanskrit bases in स्मा



to be divided into *syn'-ye* : and this is rendered the more probable, as the feminine *a* bases, also, have in the locative *ye* for *a-ye*; hence *vod'-ye*, "in aqua," from *VODA*, answers to the Lithuanian *rañko-ye* (for *ranka-ye*) from *ranka*.* In bases in *z*, masculine and feminine, it might appear doubtful whether *z*, with which they end in the dative and locative e g. *pãtz*, "in the way," *kostz*, "in the bone" is to be ascribed to the theme or to the inflection as, however, in the genitive, (to which belongs an *z*, though not through any inflection), they have just the same sound, and otherwise never entirely give up the *z* of the base, except in the instrumental plural, it is more natural to consider the forms *pãtz*, *kostz*, uninflected, just like *domã*, "in the house." We may also look upon the *z* in the dative and locative of those bases, which have *y* as the last letter but one, as nothing else than the vocalization of this *y*, the *i*, therefore, of *knyaçz*, *mori*, *brachz*, *volz*, represents nothing else than the *y* of the masculine bases *KNYAÇYO*, *VRACHYY*, and of the neuter *MORYO*, and feminine *VOLYO*.

269. In the genitive the terminations *as*, *os*, *zs*, which, in the cognate languages, are joined to bases ending with a consonant, must, according to §. 255. (*l*), drop the *s*, but the [G Ed p 355] vowel appears as *e* in all the bases ending with a consonant (§§. 260 264) hence *imen-e*, "of the name,"

* It must be allowed that here occurs the very weighty objection, that the feminine form *rankoye* in the Lithuanian, and *vodye* in the Slavonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskrit *आयाम्* *âyâm* in *जिह्वायाम्* *jihvâyâm* (§ 202); so that, after dropping the *m*, as in the Zend (§ 202), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the euphonic influence of the *y*, become *e*. As the bases in *z* in the Lithuanian, down to a few exceptions, are feminine, so might also *awyz* from *awiz-s*, "a sheep," be divided into *awyz-e*, and compared with *मत्याम्* *matyâm*, from *matz* or *भियाम्* *bhizâm* from *bhiz* (comp in § 266 *kosty-ã*, for *kosty-ã*, from *KOSTI*)

answers to नामनाम *nāman as nomin is*, небс-е of the heaven to नभसम् *nabhas as* ιαφε(σ)-ος *muler e to mali is* ματρος The pronominal forms also follow this analogy *men e*, "mei," *teb e* *tui seb e*, *sui* because in the oblique singular cases *MEN TLB SEB* are their themes We recognise the fuller Sanskrit genitive ending स्य *syā* in the pronominal genitive termination *go* as *to go* = तस्य *ta syā* (§ 188) This comparison might alone be sufficient in place of all proof but over and above is to be remarked the easily adopted hardening of the semi vowel *y* to *g* (comp p 121 G ed) and in the Prakrit to ञ् (*ṅ*) (§ 19), finally let the high degree of improbability be considered that the Slavonic should have formed an entirely new genitive termination, foreign to all the cognate languages Now, if the *g* of the termination *go* is taken for a hardening from *y* (य *y*) then the Old Slavonic has preserved exactly as much as the Greek of the termination *syā* and *go* answers to the Greek *io* and *to-go*, *hujus* to the Greek *το-ιο* As however, in Slavonic the sibilants are easily interchanged with gutturals (see § 255 *m*) one might also conjecture the *g* of *go* to be a corruption of the Sanskrit *ṣ* and the semi vowel of स्य *syā* which had been lost This conjecture cannot entirely be put aside, but in any case even in this supposition the termination *go* remains connected with स्य *syā* and *io* As however in the Old Slavonic *g* is elsewhere exchanged only with *ζ* and *sch* (Dobr p 11) but not with *s* in my opinion the derivation of *g* from *y* (य *y*) is to be preferred to that from *s*

270 The substantive and adjective (indefinite) *o* bases in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form have lost the genitive termination *go* but for it in compensation for the lost termination they have retained the old *a* of the base instead of according to § 255 (*a*) weakening it to *o*, hence *raba serui noia* (= Sanskrit *naiā syā*) *noia* Now, although the *y* bases

knjačyc Bases in *yy* change their *y* by Guna to *ú* (§ 255 *f*) in analogy with § 205 hence *vrachyú*—more commonly with *y* suppressed *vrachú*—*medice!* from *VRACHYŸY* On the other hand *y* bases without *y* for their penultimate letter commonly omit the Guna and weaken their final vowel like the *o* bases to *e* hence *syni* oh son! more rarely *synú* (Dobr p 470), = Gothic *sunau* Lithuanian *sunau* Sanskrit *sunó* from *sunau*

DUAL

273 By preserving a dual the Old Slavonic surpasses the Gothic in which this number is lost in the noun it exceeds in the same the Lithuanian in the more true retention of the terminations and it is richer than the Greek by one case The agreement with the Sanskrit and Zend is not to be mistaken let the comparison be made

	SANSKRIT	ZEND	OLD SLAVONIC
N Acc. V m	<i>ubhá</i> (ambo Vedic)	<i>ubá</i>	<i>oba</i>
f n	<i>ubhé,</i>	<i>ubé</i>	<i>obye</i> (§ 255 n)
I D Ab m f n	<i>ubhá-bhydám</i>	<i>ubóu bya</i>	I D <i>obye ma</i> (§ 215)*
G L m f n	<i>ubhay-ós</i>	<i>ubóy ó</i>	<i>oboy ú †</i>

* The *ye* which precedes the termination *ma* may be compared with the Sanskrit *é* in plural forms as *युकेभ्यम्* *erikébbhyis ye ma*, however occurs in the Old Slavonic only in *di ye ma* 'duobu. per duos and some pronouns The usual form of substantive *o* bases before this ending is that with an unchanged *o*, as *sto ma* from *sto* a hundred and the final *a* of feminine substantives also remains unchanged as *dýeta ma* from *DŸEVA*, a girl

† The form *ú* for the Sanskrit ending *ós*, is according to § 255 (*f*) and (*l*), necessary the Zend certainly approaches the Old Slavonic in casting away the *s* voluntarily The *oy* which precedes the termination *u*, clearly corresponds to the Sanskrit *अय्* *ay* (see § 255) and the
Zend

[G Ed p 358] The Sanskrit *ubhê*, as neuter, comes, according to § 212, from the theme *ubha*, in union with the case-suffix *î*, and the feminine *ubhê* is an abbreviation of *ubhay-âu*, and is therefore without a case termination (§. 212) The Old Slavonic, which runs parallel to the Sanskrit in both genders, and, according to § 255 (*l*), opposes *ye* to the Indian 'रê, no longer recognises the origin of this *ye*, and regards it entirely as a case-suffix before which the final vowel of the theme appears to be suppressed Therefore, also, neuter bases ending in a consonant make *ye* their termination, if the *imenye*, "two names," given by Dobrowsky, p 513, actually occurs, and is not a theoretic formation. In feminines, however, the termination *ye* extends, exactly as in Sanskrit, only to bases in *a* (for Sanskrit *â*, §. 255 *a*), but in such a manner, that those with *y* as the last letter but one in the theme reject the termination *ye*, and vocalize the *y* of the theme, hence *dyevye*, "two girls," from *dyeva*, but *steži*, "two steps," from *STEŽYA*. The feminine bases in *i*, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§. 210 211., as *patî*, "two sons," from पति *pati*, [G Ed p 359] *avî*, "two sheep," from *AWI*, only that, according to § 255. *b*), the *i* in the Slavonic is not lengthened, as *dlanî* from *DLANI* (nominative singular

Zend *ôy* or *ay* (see p 277), but that occurs only in *dvoy-û*=Sanskrit *duvay-ôs*, "of two," "in two" m f n, and in *toy-û*=Sanskrit *tay-ôs*, "of these two," m f n The genitives and locatives of the two first persons also rest on this principle, only retaining the older *a*—*nayû*, *vânû* For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination *û*, as *st'-û* (Sanskrit *shatay-ôs*) from *STO*, "a hundred," *djev-û* from *DYEVA*, "a girl", and thus occurs, also, together with *dvoyû*, the syncopated form *dvû* Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final *s*, still the *û* mentioned in § 225 may be identical with the Slavonic *û*, as in the Zend, also, in this termination the *s* is often dropped

dlany) *cola manus* On the other hand the masculine *y* bases do not follow this principle but suppress the final vowel before the case suffix *a*, hence *syn n* two sons from *SYNY*

PLURAL.

271 In the plural, the masculine nominative termination *e* (*c*) for the most part answers to the Greek *ες*, and according to a universal rule of sounds omits the *s* (§ 255 1) hence *synoi e* the sons *ⲛⲏⲏⲏ sinav as* compare *βου-ες lamē e* the stones for *ⲛⲏⲏⲏ asmán-as* (§ 21) compare *δαιμον-ες gosty e* guests" (theme *GOSPI*) for the Gothic *gastei s* and Greek forms like *ποσι ες* The bases in *o* take as in Lithuanian do the corresponding bases in *a* *i* as their termination (see § 228) but before this reject the *o* of the base, hence *rab i* servants for *rabu i* (comp *λυκο-ι*) as in Latin *lup i* for *lupo i* Neuters have *a* for their ending like the cognate dialects with the exception of the Sanskrit with *i* for *a* nevertheless *slava i* *ⲗⲓⲃⲏ* from *SLOVO*—as *δῶρα* from *ΔΩΡΟ*—answers to Vedic forms like *vaná* woods from *vana* and the same thing obtains which § 231 p 267 G ed has been said of Gothic Greek and Latin regarding the relation of the *a* of the termination to the *o* of the theme As regards the bases ending in a consonant, let *imen a* names be compared with the Latin *nomina* and Gothic *namon a* *nebes a* the heavens, with *ⲓⲉⲫⲉ(σ) α* and *ⲗⲓⲃⲏⲏ a* calves, with Greek forms like *σωματ α* Gemines with the exception of the class of words in *ov* mentioned at § 261 have lost the nominative ending hence *ⲗⲟⲗⲏⲏ i* *voluntates* is the same as the theme and the nominative singular and [G Ed p 360] from *ⲗⲟⲨⲒ* bones" (Sanskrit *asthi* neuter) comes the nominative singular *kosly* and the plural like the theme.

275 The accusative plural is in feminine and neuter nouns the same as the nominative and therefore in the former

mostly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in *i*, hence *gosti* for the Gothic *gasti-ns*. Bases in *o*, without *y* preceding, like *RABO*, change this *o* into *y*, as *raby*, “*servos*”, at least I cannot believe that this *y* is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the *o* of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. § 271) as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel (*o*) of the base into *u*, hence *wilkù-s*, “*lupos*,” answering to the Gothic *vulfa-ns* and Sanskrit *mikù-n*. But if the Old Slavonic bases in *y*, of animate creatures, form *ovyy* in the accusative plural, and thus *synovy*, “*filios*,” answers to the Lithuanian *sunù-s* (from *SUNU*), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit *sunu-ns*, सूनुन् *sînú-n*, prove that the Slavonic form is unorganic, and formed from an augmented theme *SYNOI O*, according to the analogy of *raby*. Bases in *yy* in this case follow bases in *yo* (from *ya*, §. 255. *a*), which, preserving the old *a* sound, give *ya*, as in the genitive singular (see § 270), hence *vrachya*, “*medicos*,” like *knyačya*, “*principes*” but forms, also, like *doschdcvy*, analogous with *synovy*, occur, following the euphonic rule, § 255. (*u*.)

276. The view here given is the more incontrovertible, as in the dative, also, *synovo-m*, “*filius*” (compare *rabo-m*), is clearly formed from a theme *SYNOTO*, increased by *o*, corresponding to the Lithuanian *sunu-ms*. This dative suffix *m*, for the Lithuanian *ms* (from *mus*, § 215.), according

[G Ed p 361] to § 255. (*l*), extends itself over all classes of words, and appears to be attached by a conjunctive vowel *e* to bases terminating with a consonant, but, in fact, it is to be considered that these, in the cases mentioned as also in the locative (see § 279), pass over into the *i* declension, as a final *i*, before the signs of case *m* and *ch*, becomes *e* and a similar metaplasm occurs in the Lithuanian, and indeed, to a

much greater extent (§ 125 *sub finem*, comp § 126) hence *imene m imene ch* from *IMENI* from *IMEN* names, as *koste m koste ch* from *KOSTI*, bones

277 Less general is the instrumental ending *mi*, answering subject to the loss required by § 250 (1) to the Lithuanian *mis* Sanskrit *bhis* and Zend *bis*. This termination *mi* is, however in masculine and neuter nouns for the most part lost (comp Dobr pp 473 and 477) and is preserved principally and indeed without exception in feminines as well as in a few masculine bases a final *i* of the base is however suppressed before the termination *mi*. Let *kost mi* be compared with अस्थिभिस् *asthi bhis* from अस्थि *asthi* 'bone' *vidoa mi* with विधवाभिस् *vidharā bhis* from विधवा *vidharā* a widow. The instrumentals *raby synoy* are like the accusatives of similar sound uninflected (§ 275) the *i* of *knyažī vrachī* is the vocalization of the *y* of the bases *KYNAŽYO VRACHYY* after the loss of the final vowel, and the *y* of neuters terminating in a consonant, like *imeny per nomina* is to be explained by a transition into the *o* declension and is therefore analogous to *raby slavy* similarly to the *o* of the Greek dual forms like *δαίμοσιον* (p 318 G ed Rem 2)

278 Dobrowsky (p 461) represents *ov y u ei, en, yat* and *es* as plural genitive terminations but in reality the suffix of this case has entirely disappeared and in bases in *o u* and *y*, has also carried away those final vowels with it while bases in *i* double that vowel hence *rab* [G Ed p 362] *servorum* from *RABO* *rod aquarum* from *IODA syn filiorum* from *SYNY* *kostu ossuum* from *KOSTI* *imen* 'nominum' from *IMEN* *nebes caelorum* from *NEBES*. The *n* and *s* of *imen, nebes* would without the former protection of *i* following termination have been dropped as in Slavonic we have only a second generation of final consonants while the former with the exception of a few monosyllabic forms has according to § 255 (1) disappeared

279. The termination of the locative plural is *ch* throughout all classes of words, and has been already, at § 255 (*m*) recognised as identical with the Indian सु *su*, and therefore, also, with the Greek σι· compare, also, the Zend 𑀓𑀭 *kha*, for the Sanskrit *sua*, in §. 35 Before this *ch*, *o* passes into *ye*, exactly as the corresponding Sanskrit अ *a* into ए *é* (see §. 255 *e*), hence *rabye-ch*, “in servis,” answers to वृक्षेषु *vṛkṣēshu*, “in lupis” Bases in *yo* and those in *yy* follow their analogy suppress, however, before this *ye*, their preceding *y*, as in similar cases, hence *knyačye-ch*, “in principibus;” not *knyačyy-ch* from *KNYAČYO*. A final *a* remains unchanged, hence *vdova-ch*, “in viduis,” answers to the Sanskrit *vidhāvā-su*. For bases in *i*, and consonants, see § 276

280. For an easier survey of the results obtained for the Old Slavonic case-formation, we give here, in order to bring under one point of view all the kinds of theme existing in Old Slavonic, and to render their comparison with one another easy, the complete declension of the bases *RABO*, m “a servant,” *KNYAČYO*, m. “a prince,” *SLOVO*, n “a word,” *MORYO*, n. “a sea” (Dobr. p 476, §. 11.), *VODA*, f. “water,” *VOLYA*, f “will,” *GOSTI*, m “a guest,” *KOSTI*, f “a bone,” *SYNY*, m “a son,” *DOMY*, m. “a house,” *VRACHYY*, m. “a physician,” *KAMEN*, m.

[G Ed p 363] “a stone,” *IMEN*, n “a name,” *MATER*, f. “a mother,” *NEBES*, n “heaven,” *TELYAT*, n. “a calf”* In

* The above examples are arranged according to their final letters, with the observation, however, that *o* represents an original short *a*, and hence precedes the *a* for Sanskrit *á* (§ 225 *a*). All bases in *t* have a *y* before the preceding *a*, this semi-vowel is, however, readily suppressed after sibilants, hence *ovcha* for *ovchya*, Dobr p 475, and hence, also, from *lzyo* come (nom *lze*) the genitive, dative, and nominative accusative plural *lza*, *lzá*, for *lzya*, *lzyú* If in bases in *yo*, m n, and in feminines in *ya*, an *i* precedes the semi-vowel, this involves some apparent variations

those forms of the following table in which a part of the word is not separated from the rest thereby showing itself to be the inflection we recognise no inflection at all i. e. no case-suffix but we see therein only the bare base of the word either complete or abbreviated, or also a modification of the base through the alteration of the final letter occasioned by the termination which has been dropped (compare § 271) In some cases which we present in the notes base and termination have however been contracted into one letter by which a division is rendered impossible With respect to the dual which cannot be proved to belong to all the words here given as specimens, we refer to § 273

variations in the declension which require no particular explanation here (cc in *Dob r mirarŭ* m p 469 *laduya* f p 148, and *uchenye* n p 474 With regard to *ary* a King see § 263)

[G Ed. p 364]

SINGULAR.

THEME.	NOM.	ACCUS	INSTR.	DATIVI	GEN	LOC	VOC
<i>RABO</i> , m ¹	<i>rab'</i> ,	<i>rab'</i> ,	<i>rabo-my</i> ,	<i>rabû</i> , ¹⁸	<i>raba</i> , ²¹	<i>rabye</i> , ²⁵	<i>rabe</i>
<i>KNYAÇYO</i> m ²	<i>knyaçy'</i> ,	<i>knyaçy'</i> ,	<i>knyaçe-my</i> ,	<i>knyaçyû</i> ,	<i>knyaçya</i> , ²¹	<i>knyaçi</i> ,	<i>knyasche</i>
<i>SLOVO</i> , n ³	<i>slovo</i> ,	<i>slovo</i> ,	<i>slovo-my</i> ,	<i>slovû</i> ,	<i>slova</i> , ²¹	<i>šlovye</i> , ²⁵	
<i>MORYO</i> , n ²	<i>more</i> ,	<i>more</i> ,	<i>more-my</i> ,	<i>moryû</i> ,	<i>morya</i> , ²¹	<i>mori</i> ,	
<i>VODA</i> , f ⁴	<i>voda</i> ,	<i>vodû</i> , ¹⁵	<i>vodoy-û</i> , ¹⁶	<i>vod'-ye</i> , ¹⁹	<i>vody</i> , ²²	<i>vod'-ye</i> , ²⁵	<i>vodo</i> .
<i>VOLYA</i> , f ⁴	<i>volya</i> ,	<i>vol'yû</i> , ¹⁵	<i>vol'ey-û</i> , ¹⁶	<i>voli</i> ,	<i>vol'ya</i> ,	<i>voli</i> ,	<i>vole</i>
<i>GOSTI</i> , m ⁵	<i>gosty</i> ,	<i>gosty</i> ,	<i>goste-my</i> , ¹⁷	<i>gosti</i> , ²⁰	<i>gosti</i> ,	<i>gosti</i> , ²⁰	<i>gosti</i> ?
<i>KOSTI</i> , f ⁵	<i>kosty</i> ,	<i>kosty</i> ,	<i>kosty-û</i> , ¹⁶	<i>kosti</i> , ²⁰	<i>kosti</i> ,	<i>kosti</i> , ²⁰	<i>kosti</i>
<i>SYNY</i> , m ⁶	<i>syn'</i> ,	<i>syn'</i> ,	<i>syno-my</i> , ¹⁷	<i>synov-i</i> ,	<i>syna</i> , ²¹	<i>synye</i> , ²⁵	<i>synû</i> ²⁵
<i>DOMY</i> , m ⁷	<i>dom'</i> ,	<i>dom'</i> ,	<i>domo-my</i> ,	<i>domov-i</i> ,	<i>domû</i> ,	<i>domû</i> ,	<i>dome</i>
<i>VRACHYY</i> , m ⁸	<i>vrachy'</i> ,	<i>vrachy'</i> ,	<i>vrache-my</i> ,	<i>vrachev-i</i> ,	<i>vrachya</i> , ²³	<i>vrachi</i> ,	<i>vrachyû</i>
<i>KAMEN</i> , m ⁹	<i>kamy'</i> , ¹⁴	. . .	<i>kamene-my</i> ,	<i>kamen-i</i> ,	<i>kamen-e</i> , ²⁴	<i>kamen-i</i> ,	. .
<i>IMEN</i> , n ¹⁰	<i>mya</i> ,	<i>mya</i> ,	<i>imene-my</i> ,	<i>imcn-i</i> ,	<i>imcn-e</i> , ²⁴	<i>imen-i</i> ,	
<i>MATER</i> , f. ¹¹	<i>mati</i> ,	. . .	<i>mater-my</i> ,	<i>mater-i</i> ,	<i>mater-e</i> , ²⁴	<i>mater-i</i> ,	
<i>NEBES</i> , n ¹²	<i>nebo</i> ,	<i>nebo</i> ,	<i>nebesc-my</i> ,	<i>nebcs-i</i> ,	<i>nebcs-e</i> , ²⁴	<i>nebcs-i</i> ,	.
<i>TELYAT</i> , n ¹³	<i>telya</i> ,	<i>telya</i>	<i>telyate-my</i> ,	<i>telyat-i</i> ,	<i>telyat e</i> , ²⁴	<i>telyat-i</i> ,	.

¹ Comp. p 273, &c ² See §§ 258 259 ³ Comp pp 275, 276 ⁴ Comp p 285

⁵ Comp p 286 ⁶ Comp p 288 ⁷ See p 337, Note ⁸ See § 263

⁹ Comp p 304 The cases wanting come from *KAMENI* (see § 260), whence also, *kamene-m*, *kamene-čh* (§ 266.); and whence, also, might be derived the dative and locative *kamen-i*, which I prefer, however, deriving from the original theme, just as in *MATER*

¹⁰ Comp § 139 ¹¹ See §. 265. and comp p 305 ¹² Comp p. 306 and § 147

¹³ See § 264 ¹⁴ Dobr p 287. ¹⁵ See § 266

¹⁶ Comp Sanskrit *jihway-ā*, &c See § 266. ¹⁷ Comp Lith *pati-mi*, *sunu-mi*

¹⁸ Or *rabov*, § 267 ¹⁹ See § 268

²⁰ The *i* may also be ascribed to the mark of case, and the dropping of the final letter of the base may be assumed; but in the genitive of the same sound, the *i* clearly belongs to the theme

²¹ See § 270 ²² See § 271.

²³ More commonly *vracha*, and in the vocative, *vrachû* See p 347, Note.

²⁴ See § 269. ²⁵ See § 268 ²⁶ Or *sync*

PLURAL

[G Ed p 363]

NO I VOC ¹	ACCUS ²	INSTR ⁵	DATIVE ⁶	GEN	LOCATIVE ⁸
<i>rab i</i>	<i>r b_j</i>	<i>rab_j</i>	<i>rabo-m</i>	<i>rab</i>	<i>rabje-cl</i>
<i>kn_j ζ</i>	<i>knyazja</i>	<i>knyazī</i>	<i>knyazē m</i>	<i>knyazj</i>	<i>kn_j ζe cl</i>
<i>slov</i>	<i>slova</i>	<i>lovy</i>	<i>slovo m</i>	<i>slov</i>	<i>slovje-ch</i>
<i>morya</i>	<i>morya</i>	<i>morj</i>	<i>more-m</i>	<i>moryj</i>	<i>morye cl</i>
<i>vody²</i>	<i>voly</i>	<i>v da mī</i>	<i>voda m</i>	<i>vod</i>	<i>voda ch</i>
<i>vol_j</i>	<i>volja</i>	<i>volja m</i>	<i>volja m</i>	<i>volyj</i>	<i>volja-cl</i>
<i>gostj e</i>	<i>gost</i>	<i>gost mī</i>	<i>goste-m</i>	<i>g st'ī</i>	<i>go te ch</i>
<i>ko i</i>	<i>k sti</i>	<i>kost mī</i>	<i>koste m</i>	<i>k st'ī</i>	<i>koste ch</i>
<i>s_jrov e</i>	<i>s_jnovy⁴</i>	<i>s_jnovy⁴</i>	<i>synovo-m⁴</i>	<i>s_jnov</i>	<i>sy orje cl⁴</i>
<i>d_mov e</i>	<i>dom_j</i>	<i>dom_j</i>	<i>domo-m</i>	<i>domov</i>	<i>dome-ch</i>
<i>vrachev e</i>	<i>vrachja</i>	<i>vrachi</i>	<i>vrache-m</i> <i>lamene-m</i>	<i>vrachev</i>	<i>vrache cl</i> <i>lamene-cl</i>
<i>imen a</i>	<i>imen a</i>	<i>i en_j</i>	<i>imene-m</i>	<i>imen</i>	<i>imene-ch</i>
<i>mater e</i>		<i>mater mī</i>	<i>matere-m</i>		
<i>nebes a</i>	<i>nebes a</i>	<i>nebesy</i>	<i>nebe e-m</i>	<i>nebes</i>	<i>nebesje-cl⁹</i>
<i>telyat a</i>	<i>telyat a</i>	<i>telyaty</i>	<i>telyate-m</i>	<i>telyat</i>	<i>telyate ch</i>

¹ See § 274

See § 271

³ See § 270⁴ From *SI NOVO* see § 275 In the locative occur also *synovo ch* and *synove ch*⁵ See § 277⁶ See § 276⁷ See § 278⁸ See 279One would expect *nebesē ch* but in this case *ech* and *ječh* are frequently interchanged with one another and the form *ječh* appears to agree better with the preceding *s* (comp Dobrowsky p 477)

ADJECTIVES

[G Ed p 366] 281. The declension of the adjective is not distinct from that of the substantive, and if some inflected forms, which in the Sanskrit and Zend belong only to the pronouns, have, in the cognate languages, emerged from the circle of the pronouns, and extended themselves further, they have not remained with the adjectives alone, but have extended themselves to the substantives also. As regards the Greek, Latin, and Slavonic, we have already explained at §§. 228 248. and 274. what has been introduced from pronominal declension in those languages into general declension we will here only further remark that the appended syllable *sma*, in §. 165 &c., which, in Sanskrit, characterises only the pronominal declension, may in the Pâli be combined also, in several cases, with masculine and neuter substantive and adjective bases, and indeed with all bases in *a*, *i*, and *u*, including those which, originally terminating in a consonant, pass by augment or apocope into the vowel declension, thus the ablative and locative singular of *kêsa*, "hair," is either simply *kêsâ* (from *kêsât*, see p 300), *kêsé*, or combined with *sma* or its variation *mha*, *kêsa-smâ*, *kêsa-mhâ*, *kêsa-smu*, *kêsa-mhu*. In the Lithuanian, this syllable, after dropping the *s*, has, in the dative and locative singular, passed over to the adjective declension, without imparting itself to that of the substantive, and without giving to the adjective the licence of renouncing this appended syllable, as, *gêram*, "bono," *geramé*, "in bono." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention,

to explain the agreement of the Gothic full adjective dative as *blindamma* (from *blindasma* § 170) with [G Ed p 367] pronominal datives like *thamma* to this *imma* to him but the examination of the Old Slavonic declension, in which the indefinite adjectives remove themselves from all admixture of the pronominal declension and run entirely parallel to the German strong substantive not to the weak has led me to the, to me very important discovery that Grimms strong and Ludas abstract declension form of adjectives diverges in not less than nine points from the strong substantives (i.e. those which terminate in the theme in a vowel) and approaches to the pronominal declension for no other reason than because like the definite adjectives in the Slavonic and Lithuanian they are compounded with a pronoun, which naturally follows its own declension. As then the definite (so I now name the strong) adjectives are defined or personified by a pronoun incorporated with them it is natural that this form of declension should be avoided where the function of the inherent pronoun is discharged by a word which simply precedes it thus we say *guter* or *der gute* not *der guter* which would be opposed to the genius of our language for it still lies in our perception that in *guter* a pronoun is contained as we perceive pronouns in *im am beim* although the pronoun is here no longer present in its original form but has only left behind its case termination. In comprehending however the definite adjective declension the science of Grammar which in many other points had raised itself far above the empirical perception of the language was here still left far behind it and we felt, in forms like *guter gutem gute* more than we recognised namely a pronoun which still operated in spirit although it was no longer bodily present. How acute in this respect our perception is is proved by the fact that we place the definite form of the adjective beside the *ein* when deprived [G Ed 1 368]

of its definitive pronominal element, but, in the oblique cases, beside the definite *aines*, *ainem*, *ainen*, the indefinite. *ein grosses*, *aines grossen* (not *grosses*), *ainem grossen* (not *grossen*). In the accusative, *grossen* is at the same time definite and indefinite, but in the former case it is a bare theme, and therefore identical with the indefinite genitive and dative, which is likewise devoid of inflection, but in the latter case the *n* evidently belongs to the inflection

282 The pronominal base, which in Lithuanian and Old Slavonic forms the definite declension, is, in its original form, *ya* (= Sanskrit य *ya*, "which"), and has, in the Lithuanian, maintained itself in this form in several cases (see below). In the Old Slavonic, according to §. 255. (a.), *yo* must be formed from *ya*, and from *yo* again, according to § 255. (n), *ye* or *e* but the monosyllabic nature of the form has preserved it from the suppression of the *y*, which usually takes place in polysyllabic words. In some cases, however, the *y* has vocalized itself to *i* after the vowel has been dropped. It signifies in both languages "he"; but in Old Slavonic has preserved, in union with *sche*, the old relative meaning (*i-sche*, "which"). The complete declension of this pronoun is as follows

SINGULAR.

	LITHUANIAN		OLD SLAVONIC	
Nominative,	m <i>ys</i>	f. <i>yi</i> ,	m <i>i,</i> [*]	f. <i>ya,</i> [*] n <i>ye</i> [*]
Accusative,	m <i>yn</i> ,	f <i>yen</i> ,	m <i>i,</i>	f <i>yû,</i> n <i>ye.</i>
Instrumental,	m <i>yû,</i>	f. <i>yè,</i>	m n <i>im.</i>	f <i>yeyû,</i>
Dative,	m <i>yám,</i>	f <i>yei,</i>	m. n <i>yemû,</i>	f <i>yei,</i>
Genitive,	m <i>yo,</i>	f <i>yós,</i>	m. n <i>yego,</i>	f. <i>yeyo,</i>
Locative,	m <i>yamè,</i>	f <i>yoyè,</i>	m n <i>yem,</i>	f <i>yei,</i>

* Occurs only as the relative in union with *sche*

PLURAL

		LITHUANIAN		OLD SLAVONIC	
Nominative,	m	<i>yie (yi),</i>	f <i>yos</i>	m	i* f n <i>ya*</i>
Accusative	m	<i>yūs</i>	f <i>yēs</i>	m	f n <i>ya</i>
Instrumental	m	<i>yēs</i>	f <i>yomīs</i>	m	f n <i>imī</i>
Dative	m	<i>yīems</i>	f <i>yōms</i>	m	f n <i>im</i>
Genitive	m f	<i>yu</i>		m	f n <i>ich</i>
Locative	m	<i>yusè,</i>	f <i>yosa</i>	m	f n <i>ich</i>

DUAL

[G Ed p 369]

		LITHUANIAN		OLD SLAVONIC	
Nominative	m	<i>yu (yu)</i>	f <i>yi</i>		
Accusative	m	<i>yun</i>	f <i>yin</i>		
Dative	m	<i>yīem</i>	f <i>yōm</i>	Instr Dat	m f n <i>yīma</i>
Genitive	m f	<i>yū</i>		Gen Loc	m f n <i>yeyu</i>

283 The Lithuanian unites in its definite declension the pronoun cited—which according to Ruhig (Mielcke p 52) signifies the same as the Greek article—with the adjective to be rendered definite so that both the latter and the pronoun preserve their full terminations through all the cases only the pronoun in some cases loses its *y* and the terminations of the adjective are in some cases somewhat shortened *Geras* good will serve as an example

MASCULINE

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
Nominative	<i>gérasis</i> †	<i>ger yu</i>	<i>gerieyi</i>
Accusative	<i>geranyan</i>	<i>geruyun</i>	<i>gerūsus</i>
Instrumental,	<i>geruyu</i>		<i>geraisēs</i>
Dative	<i>geramyam</i>	<i>giriemsiom</i> ‡	<i>geriemsims</i>
Genitive	<i>geroyo</i>		<i>gerūyu</i>
Locative	<i>geramyame</i>		<i>gerūsuse</i>
Vocative	<i>gerasis</i>	<i>geruyu</i>	<i>gerieyi</i>

* See Note on preceding page

† Or *gerassis* by assimilation from *gerasyis* as in the Prakrit *y* frequently assimilates itself to a preceding *s* as *tassa huyus* for तस्य *tasya*

‡ The *s* of the adjective is here not in its place and appears to be borrowed from the plural

FEMININE.

	SINGULAR	DUAL	PLURAL
Nominative,	<i>geroyi,</i>	<i>gerieyi,</i>	<i>gerosos,</i>
Accusative,	<i>geranyen,</i>	<i>geriyin,</i>	<i>gerases.</i>
Instrumental,	<i>geraje,</i> -	<i>geromsomis</i>
Dative,	<i>geraiyer,</i>	<i>gerómsom,*</i>	<i>geromsoms.</i>
Genitive,	<i>gerosiés,</i>	<i>gerúyá,</i>	<i>gerúyú.</i>
Locative,	<i>geroyoye,</i>	<i>gerososa.</i>
Vocative,	<i>geroyi,</i>	<i>geriyí,</i>	<i>gerosos</i>

[G Ed p 370] 284 The Old Slavonic, differing from the Lithuanian, declines only in some cases the adjective together with the appended pronoun, but in most cases the latter alone. While, however, in the Lithuanian the appended pronoun has lost its *y* only in some cases, in the Old Slavonic that pronoun has lost, in many more, not only the *y* but also its vowel, and therefore the whole base. Thus the termination alone is left. For more convenient comparison we insert here, over against one another, the indefinite and definite declension *svyat* (theme *SVYATO*), "holy," may serve for example

SINGULAR

MASCULINE

FEMININE

	<i>Indef.</i>	<i>Def</i>	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>
Nominative,	<i>svyat,</i>	<i>svyaty-í,¹</i>	<i>svyata</i>	<i>svyata-yu.</i>
Accusative,	<i>svyat,</i>	<i>svyaty-í,¹</i>	<i>svyatú,</i>	<i>svyatú-yú</i>
Instrumental,	<i>svyatom,</i>	<i>svyaty-m,¹</i>	<i>svyatoyú,</i>	<i>svyato-yú³</i>
Dative,	<i>svyatú,</i>	<i>svyato-mú,</i>	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-í.⁴</i>
Genitive,	<i>svyata,</i>	<i>svyata-go,</i>	<i>svyaty,</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>
Locative,	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-m,²</i>	<i>svyatye,</i>	<i>svyato-í.⁴</i>

* See Note † on preceding page

¹ See § 255 *d* ² Or *svaty-m*, in which, as in the Lithuanian, the adjective is inflected at the same time

³ The indefinite and definite forms are here the same, for this reason, that *svyato-veyú*, as the latter must originally have been written, has dropped the syllable *ye*. The adjective base *svyata* has weakened its *o* to *a* before the pronominal addition (§ 255 *a*), just as in the dative and locative *svyato-í*, where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible

⁴ Or *svaty-í* Comp Note 2

PI URAL

	MASCULINE		FEMININE	
	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>
Nominative	<i>svyati</i>	<i>svyati i</i>	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty ya</i>
Accusative	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>	<i>svyaty</i>	<i>svyaty-ya</i>
Instrumental	<i>svyaty,</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> ⁵	<i>svyata-mi</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> ⁷
Dative	<i>svyatom</i>	<i>svyaty imi</i> ⁵	<i>svyata-m</i>	<i>svyaty im</i> ⁷
Genitive,	<i>svyat</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i>	<i>svyat</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i>
Locative	<i>svyatyech</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i> ⁵	<i>svyata ch</i>	<i>svyaty ich</i> ⁷

SINGULAR

PI URAL

	NEUTER			
	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>	<i>Indef</i>	<i>Def</i>
Nom Accu	<i>svyato</i>	<i>svyato-e</i>	<i>svyata</i>	<i>svyata ya</i>

The rest like the masculine

⁵ I give those forms which according to Dobrowsky (p 302) occur in the oldest MSS in place of the more ordinary forms which have *i* at the end of the pronominal base *svyaty mi svyat, m svyaty ch*

⁶ Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative we must nevertheless in my opinion separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find however the reason of their agreement in this that the Sanskrit which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Slavonic in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant Sanskrit *sām* Gothic *zē* (for *zē* § 248) Thus *s* then has in Old Slavonic become *ch* just like that of the locative characteristic *su su* (§ 249) The nasal of *sām* *sum* must according to rule be lost (§ 255 *l*) the vowel however has contrary to rule followed it as also in the ordinary declension the termination *ām* has entirely disappeared (§ 248) and the same relation which *men nominum* has to the Gothic *naman ē tye-ch horum* has to *thi e* This *tye-ch* however answers as genitive to the Sanskrit *तेषाम् tē śhām*, and as locative to *तेषु tē shu*, *ye* being used in both cases for *ē* according to § 255 (*e*)

⁷ See Notes 5 and 6 The identity with the masculine and neuter forms arises from this, that the grave *a* of the feminine adjective base is changed into the lighter *o*, and this again as in the masculine neuter is converted according to § 225 (*d*, into *y*

equal footing with Grimm's strong declension of substantives & *e* they maintain themselves without an unorganic consonantal augment in the genuine original limits of their base

286 As the feminine where it is not identical as in adjective bases in *i* in the Sanskrit Greek and Latin with the theme of the masculine and neuter, is always in the Indo-European family of languages made to diverge through an extension or an addition to the end it is important for German Grammar to remark—and I have already called attention to this point in another place—that the feminine of the German indefinite adjective in variance from the principle which has been [G Ed p 373] just given has not arisen from its masculine but from an older form of the feminine *eg* the primitive feminine *BLINDA* m n “blind” has extended itself in the indefinite to *BLINDAN* and the primitive feminine *BLINDŌ* to *BLINDŌN* one must not therefore derive the latter although it is the feminine of *BLINDAN* m from this as it is entirely foreign to the Indo-European family of languages to derive a feminine base through the lengthening of the last letter but one of the masculine and neuter. As far as regards the declension of *BLINDAN* m it follows precisely that of *AHMAN* (p 322 G ed) and *BLINDAN* n, that of *NAMAN* (p 176 G ed & c) the fem *BLINDŌN* differs from the masculine only by a more regular inflection since its *ō* remains everywhere unchanged while *a* in the genitive and dative singular is according to § 132 weakened to *i* therefore—

	MASCULINE		NEUTER		FEMININE	
Theme	<i>BLINDAN</i>		<i>BLINDAN</i>		<i>BLINDŌN</i>	
	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N V	<i>blinda</i> ¹	<i>blindan</i> s	<i>blindō</i> ²	<i>blindōn-a</i> ²	<i>blindō,</i>	<i>blindōn</i> s
Acc	<i>blindan</i>	<i>blindan</i> s,	<i>blindō</i> ²	<i>blindon a</i> ²	<i>blindōn</i>	<i>blindon</i> s
Dat	<i>blindin</i> ¹	<i>blinda</i> m	<i>blindin</i> ¹	<i>blinda</i> m	<i>blindon</i>	<i>blindō-m</i>
Gen	<i>blindin</i> s ¹	<i>blindan</i> ē	<i>blindin</i> s ¹	<i>blindon</i> ē ²	<i>blindōn</i> s	<i>blindōn</i> ō ³

¹ See § 140² See § 141³ See § 24b

287. In order, then, to examine the definite declension of adjectives in Gothic, we will, in the first place, for the purpose of bringing into view their agreement and discrepancy with substantives and simple pronouns, place by the side of each other the declension of the definite *BLINDA* m. n. and *BLINDŌ* f., and that of *VULFA* m., "wolf," *DAURA* n., "a gate," *GIBŌ* f., a gift," and the interrogative [G Ed p 374] *HVA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVŌ* f., further, that of *MIDYA* m. n. (*medius*), *MIDYŌ* f., by that of *HARYA* m., "an army," *BADYA* n., "a bed," *KUNTHYŌ* f., "news," and *HVARYA* m. n., "who?" "what?" *HVARYŌ* f.

MASCULINE.

	SINGULAR			PLURAL		
N.	<i>vulf's</i> ,	<i>blind's</i> ,	<i>hva-s</i> , ¹	<i>vulfós</i> , ²	<i>blindai</i> ,	<i>hai</i> , ³
A.	<i>vulf'</i> ,	<i>blindana</i> ,	<i>hva-na</i> ,	<i>vulfa-ns</i> ,	<i>blindans</i> ,	<i>hva-ns</i>
D	<i>vulfa</i> , ⁴	<i>blindamma</i> ,	<i>hva-mma</i> , ⁵	<i>vulfa-m</i> ,	<i>blindaim</i> ,	<i>hva-m</i>
G	<i>vulfi-s</i> ,	<i>blindis</i> ,	<i>hvi-s</i> ,	<i>vulf'-é</i> ,	<i>blindaizé</i> ,	<i>hvi-zé</i> .
V.	<i>vulf'</i> ,	<i>blind's</i> ,	...	<i>vulfós</i> ,	<i>blindai</i> ,
N	<i>haryi-s</i> , ⁶	<i>midyis</i> , ⁷	<i>hvaryi-s</i> ,	<i>haryós</i> ²	<i>midyai</i> ,	<i>hvaryai</i> . ³
A	<i>hari</i> , ⁸	<i>midyana</i> ,	<i>hvarya-na</i> ,	<i>harya-ns</i> ,	<i>midyans</i> ,	<i>hvarya-ns</i>
D	<i>harya</i>	<i>midyamma</i> ,	<i>hvarya-mma</i> ,	<i>harya-m</i> ,	<i>midyaim</i> ,	<i>hvaryai-m</i>
G	<i>haryi-s</i> ,	<i>midyis</i> ,	<i>hvaryi-s</i> ,	<i>hary-é</i> ,	<i>midyaizé</i> ,	<i>hvaryaizé</i>
V	<i>hari</i> ,	<i>midyis</i> ,	<i>haryós</i> ,	<i>midyai</i> ,	..

¹ See § 135² See § 228³ See §. 171⁴ See § 227⁵ See § 160⁶ From *harya-s*, see § 135

⁷ The nominative in adjective bases in *ya* does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared, and I have here formed it by analogy with *haryis* and *hvaryis*. Grimm gives *midis* (I 170). If, I c, the form *yis* is considered as unorganic, and, in regard to *midis*, if its analogy with *hardus* is remembered, then Grimm is wrong in taking *MIDI* for the theme, as in reality *HARDU* is the theme of *hardus*. The true theme *MIDYA* occurs, however, in the comp *midya-sveipans*, "deluge," and

NEUTR

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
N A V <i>daur</i>	<i>blindata</i> ⁹	<i>hva</i> ⁹	<i>daura</i>	<i>blinda</i> <i>hið</i>
	The rest like the masculine			
N A V <i>badi</i>	<i>midyata</i> ⁹	<i>hvarya ta</i>	<i>badya</i>	<i>midya</i> <i>hvarya</i>
	The rest like the masculine			

FEMININE

[G Ed p 375]

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
N <i>giba</i>	<i>b'indu</i>	<i>hvo</i>	<i>gibðs</i> ²	<i>blindos</i> <i>hiðs</i> ²
A <i>giba</i>	<i>blinda</i>	<i>hið</i> ¹¹	<i>gibð s</i>	<i>blindðs</i> <i>hvð-s</i>
D <i>gibai</i> ¹²	<i>blindai</i> ¹	<i>hvi ai</i> ¹³	<i>gibð m</i>	<i>blindaim</i> <i>hvi m</i>
G <i>gibð s</i>	<i>blindai ðs</i> ¹³	<i>hvið s</i> ¹³	<i>gib ð</i>	<i>blindai o</i> <i>hvi zð</i>
V <i>giba</i>	<i>blinda?</i>		<i>gibðs</i>	<i>blindðs</i>
N <i>kunthi</i> ¹⁴	<i>midya</i>	<i>hvarya</i>	<i>kunthyðs</i> ²	<i>midyðs</i> ² <i>hvaryos</i> ²
A <i>kunthya</i>	<i>midya</i>	<i>hvarya</i>	<i>kunthyo-s</i>	<i>midyðs</i> <i>hvaryð s</i>
D <i>kunthjai</i> ¹²	<i>midyai</i> ¹²	<i>hvaryai</i> ¹²	<i>kunthyð m</i>	<i>midyom</i> <i>hvaryð m</i>
G <i>kunthyð-s</i>	<i>midyaizos</i>	<i>hvaryai os</i> ¹³	<i>kunthy ð</i>	<i>midy ð</i> <i>hvary o</i>
V <i>kunthi</i>	<i>midya</i>		<i>kunthyðs</i>	<i>midyðs</i> <i>hvaryðs</i>

answers to the Sanskrit मध्य *madhya* Formed from *midya* as theme *midyas* would be clearly more organic than *mid s* Adjective bases which could be referred to *hardu s* as *u* base do not exist but only substantive as *GASTI* nom *gasts*

⁸ Compare Zend forms like *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 tur m*, *quartum* from *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀* *tūrya* (§ 42)

⁹ *Hia* with suppressed termination for *hiata* Old High German *huaz* see §§ 150 156 for *blindata* also *blind* and so for *midyata* also *mid*

¹⁰ The form *hvo* which like some others of this pronoun cannot be shewn to occur is by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from *thð* "hæc" Grimm here finds as also in the accusative singular the *o* in opposition to the *a* of *blinda* surprising the reason of the deviation however is fixed by §§ 69 137 231

¹¹ See p 173 Note †

¹² See § 161

¹³ § 172

¹⁴ For *kunthya*, from *kunthyo* by suppression of the final vowel of the base which again appears in the accusative but shortened to *a* (see § 69) but here also the final vowel can be dropped, hence *kunthi* as accusative Luc 1 77

If, then, it is asked which pronoun is contained in the German definite adjective, I answer, the same which, in Slavonic

[G Ed p 376] and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative *ya* (य *ya*). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Slavonic, does not occur isolated in its inflected state, but it is not uncommon in the history of languages, that a word has been lost in regard to its isolated use, and has been preserved only in composition with other words. It should be observed, too, that a demonstrative *i* base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskrit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely, but in Sanskrit, except the neuter nominative accusative *idam*, "this," has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as इति *i-ti*, इत्य *it tham*, "so," इत्य *iy-at*, "so much," इति इति *i-dīśa*, "such" The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base *ya* from this comes, in my opinion, the affirmative particle *ya*, as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (*i-tu*, तथा *tu-thā*, "so," οὕτως), and further *yabai*, "if," analogous with *ibai*, "whether," *ibaini*, "lest", as also, in Sanskrit, यदि *yadi*, "if," comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek *ei* the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Prâkrit, in the 3d person singular present, *ai*, e g भ्रमन् *bhamai*, "he wanders" (Uivasi by Lenz, p 63), has to the more usual अदि *adi*, for the Sanskrit अति *ati* In Prâkrit, too, जा *ja* (l. c p. 63 on *j* for *y*, see § 19.), really occurs for *yadi*; so that in this conjunction, as in the 3d person of the present λέγει from λέγει(τι), the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Prâkrit If, however, in *ei* the Sanskrit य *y* has disappeared, as in the Æolic ἕμμες=Sanskrit *yushmé*, it appears as *h* in ὅς, which has nothing to do with the article ὁ, ἡ, where *h* falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in ὅς it runs through all the cases, as

in Sanskrit the य् *y* of यस् *ya s* To this [G Ed p 37] यस् *yas os* in regard to the rough breathing bears the same relation as *υμεις* to युष्मे *yushmē* ἄλλω ἄγιοις to यन् *yaj* to worship to sacrifice यन्त्र *yanya* to be worshipped, *υσμιν* to युष् *yudh* to strive युष्म *yudhma* strife (comp Pott pp 236 252) But to return to the Gothic *JA* let us further observe *yah** and also, with *h* enclitic of which hereafter and *yu* now *ie* at this time" already (comp Latin *jam*) It also clearly forms the last portion of *hvar-yis* (for *yas*) as in the Slavonic this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others and for example is contained in *ky i* who? although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination

288 In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base *JA* shews itself most plainly in bases in *u* Of these indeed there are but a few, which we annex below † but a *ya* shews itself in all the cases and these in *blinds* differ from the substantive declension to such an extent that before the *y* the *u* of the adjective is suppressed as in Sanskrit before the comparative and superlative suffixes *iyas ishtha* e.g. *laghuyas* more light *laghushtha* most light, for *laghu iyas laghu-ishtha* from *laghu* and as even in Gothic, *hard izd*, more hard (according to

* The *h* may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise *yag yan* and *yas* and in conjunction with *thē* *yattl ē* or (see Massmann's Gloss)

† *Aggvus*, narrow *aglus* heavy *glaggvus* industrious *hardus*, 'hard' *manvus* ready *thaurus*, dry, *thlaqvus* tender, *sesthus*, late *filus* much and probably *hnasqvus* 'tender' Some occur only as adverbs as *glagguu ba* industriously In addition to the adverb *filu* much since Grimm treated this subject the genitive *filaus* has been found (*filaus mais* 'for much more' see Massmann's Gloss) which is the more gratifying as the adjective *u* bases had not yet been adduced in this case

[G Ed. p. 378.] Massmann, p. 48), for *hardv-izô* from *HARDU*. Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine *thaur's-yana*, "*siccum*," *manv'-yana*, "*paratum*", the accusative singular neuter *manv'-yata*, the dative plural *hnasqv'-yaim* are adduceable, if Grimm, as I doubt not, is right in ascribing to this word, which is not to be met with in any other case, a nominative *hnasqvus** Finally, also, the accusative plural masculine *unmanv'-yans*, ἀπαρ-σκειάστους (2 C. 9. 4), although, in this case, *blindans* is not different from *vulfans*. These examples, then, although few, furnish powerful proof, because, in the cases to be met with, they represent an entire class of words viz. the definite adjective in *u* in such a manner, that not a single variety of form occurs. It may be proper to annex here the complete definite declension of *MANVU*, as it is either to be met with, or, according to the difference of cases, is, with more or less confidence, to be expected.

MASCULINE.

FEMININE.

	SINGULAR.	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
N.	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	(<i>manv'-yai</i>),	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	(<i>manv'-yós</i>).
Ac	<i>manv'-ya-na</i> ,	<i>manv'-ya-ns</i> ,	(<i>manv'-ya</i>),	(<i>manv'-yós</i>),
D	(<i>manv'-ya-mma</i>),	<i>manv'-yai-m</i> ,	(<i>manv'-yai</i>),	(<i>manv'-yaim</i>).
G.	<i>manvu-s</i> ,	(<i>manv'-yazé</i>),	(<i>manv'-yazós</i>),	(<i>manv'-yazó</i>

[G Ed p. 379]

NEUTER.

SINGULAR

PLURAL

Nom Accus. *manv'-ya-ta*, † (*manv'-ya*)

* I am the more inclined to agree with him, as a few other adjective bases in *vu* occur. Perhaps a euphonic influence of the *v* on the vowel which follows it is also at work, as at times one finds in the Prâkrit a final *a* changed through the influence of a preceding *ṅ n*, *ṛ r*, or *ḷ l*, to *u*. So Urvasi, p 72, *âlu*, *tâlu*, *âvananu*, for *kâla*, *tâla*, *âvanana*, p 71, *manôharu* for *mânôhara*.

† Without inflection and pronom. *manvu*, as *swâdu*, *îdú*, Lithuanian *darkù*

Remark 1 — Grimm finds (I 721) the identity of the feminine with the masculine remarkable since he as it appears looks upon *s* as an originally mere masculine termination (comp I c 824 825 2 2) That however the feminine has equal claim to *s* as the nominative character and that it is entirely without inflection where this is wanting I think I have shewn in §§ 134 137 Adjective bases in *i* which in the Gothic as in the Lithuanian and Slavonic are wanting end in the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin in the nominative of both genders in *is* and only the neuter is devoid of inflection compare सुविष suchi *s* m f clear suchī n with ἰδρις ἰδρις *facili s facile* Adjectives in *u* in Sanskrit frequently leave in like manner the feminine base undistinguished from the masculine and neuter and then end according to § 234 in the nominative in *us* so *pāndu-s* m f agrees with *manvu s* above and the neuter *pāndu* with *manvu* If two consonants do not precede the final *u* as in *pāndu* the feminine base may except in compound words be lengthened by an *i* which is particularly characteristic of this gender and thus सुदु सुदु the sweet (theme and nominative) answers to the Greek word ἡδέια which is lengthened by an unorganic *a* (§ 119) for ἡδία, and *suādu s* answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic *manvus* In the Sanskrit also a short *u* in the feminine base may be lengthened and thus the feminine of तनु *tanu* thin is either *tanu* or *tanū* whence the nominative *tanū s* and *tanuḥ* as substantive means the slender woman The Lithuanian has adjective bases in *u* as *szwiesu s* m light clear (compare सुता *sueta* white) which nevertheless in several cases replace the *u* by *a* as *szwiesam dangui* to the bright heaven in some too they prefix an *i* to the *a* the assimilating power of which changes the *a* into *e* (comp p 169 Note) as *szwiesiems dangums* to the bright heavens The feminine is in the nominative *szwiesi* the

[G Ed p. 380] final *i* of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit ई in *svádvī*. In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic *a* also is added to the Lithuanian *i*, as it has been in ἡδicia: this *ia*, however, becomes either by euphony, *e* (comp p 174, Note *), e. g. accus. *szwiesen*, accus plural *szwiesès*; or it happens, and that, indeed, in the majority of cases that the *i* is entirely suppressed, so that *SZWIESA* passes as the theme, as *szwiesès rankòs*, "of the bright hand" (gen. *szwiesai rankai* (dat.) The *i* of *ia*, however, appears, as with the participles, to have communicated itself from the feminine to the masculine,

"Remark 2. With the accusative *manvyana* which has been cited, the conjectured dative *manvyamma* is least doubtful. That Grimm should suggest forms like *hardvamma*, *hardv-ana*, arises from his regarding *amma*, *ana*, as the dative and accusative terminations of the pronoun and adjective, while, in fact, the terminations are simply *mma* and *na*. When, therefore, *HARDU*, in the dative and accusative, without annexing a pronoun, follows nevertheless the pronominal declension, the cases mentioned must be written *hardu-mma*, *hardu-na*, analogous with *tha-mma*, *tha-na*, *i-mma*, *i-na*. If, however, contrary to all expectation, forms like *hardvamma*, *hardvana*, shew themselves, they must be deduced from *hardu-ya-mma*, *hardu-ya-na*, so that after suppressing the *y*, the preceding *u*, in the place in which it would be left, has passed into *v*. With regard to *blindamma*, *blindana*, *blindata*, it is doubtful whether they ought to be divided *blind'-(y)amma*, *blind'-(y)ana*, *blind'-(y)ata*, as analogous with *manv(u)-yamma*, *manv(u)-yana*, *manv(u)-yata*, or *blinda-(ya)mma*, &c I have therefore left them, as also the corresponding forms from *MIDYA*, undivided. If the division *blinda-mma*, &c is made, nothing is left of the pronoun, as in the Old Sclavonic dative *siyato-mú*, and as in our expressions like *beim*, *am*, *im*, except the case-termination, and the adjective base

has preserved its *a*. If however the division *blind' amma* &c is made to which I now give the preference and which is also adopted by Grimm though from a different point of view then the pronoun has only lost its *y* as in some cases of the Lithuanian definite *eg* in *gerus us* for *gerūs yus* (see p 353) and with respect to the *y* which has been dropped and the vowel which is left *blind'-amma* would have the same relation to *blind'-yamma* as *midums* ' the middle man (theme *MIDUMA*) to its Sanskrit cognate form of the same import मध्यम *madhyama* whose relation to *MIDUMA* I thus trace—the latter has softened the first *a* to *i* and has changed the middle *a* through the influence of the liquid into *u* and both, however have according to § 66 suppressed the semi vowel

“Remark 3—Although in the accusative plural masculine *blindans* is not different from *vulfans* and the simple word *BLINDA* could not form ought but [G Ed p 381] *blinda ns*, nevertheless the word *manu yans* mentioned above which is of the highest importance for the Grammar as well as the circumstance that where any inflections peculiar to the pronoun admonish us of the existence of an inherent pronoun in the definite adjective, this inheritance really exists—these two reasons I say speak in favour of dividing, thus *blind'-ans*, and of deducing it from *blind'-yans*. Just in the same manner the dative *blindaim*, both through the *aim* which occurs elsewhere only in pronouns as through the word *hnasqv-yaim* mentioned above declares itself to be an abbreviation of *blind yaim* but *blindai* proves itself only by its pronominal inflection (compare *thai hva*, Sanskrit ते तै के कै) to be an abbreviation of *blind'-ya*

Remark 4—In the Sanskrit in some cases an *i* blends itself with the final *a* which with the *a* of the base becomes *é* hence the instrumental plural of the Veda dialect and of the Prakrit अस्मिन् *asmi bhis* from *asua* कुसुमेस्मिन् *kusumé hin* from *kusuma*. To this *é* answers the *ai* in

Gothic pronominal datives like *hvar-m*, “*quibus*,” *tha-im*, “*his*”; as the German dative, in accordance with its origin, is identical with the old instrumental. We were, however, compelled, before we had a reason for seeking the pronoun *YA* in the Gothic definite adjective, to give to the extension of the base in German a wider expansion by an *z* which means nothing, than it has in the Sanskrit; while we have now every reason, where, in Gothic definites, an *z* unsubstantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to recognise in the *z* a remnant of the pronominal base *YA*, either as a vocalization of the *y*, which so often occurs in the Slavonic (see p. 354), or the *z* may be considered as an alteration of the *a* of *YA*, as in the Lithuanian *geras-iz* for *geras-yis*, (p. 353). The latter view pleases me the better because it accords more closely with *blind'-amma*, *blind'-ana*, &c., from *blind'-yamma*, *blind'-yana*. The vowel, then, which in *blind'-amma*, &c., maintains itself in its original form, appears, in this view, as *z* in the feminine singular genitive *blindarizós* which is to be divided *blindarizós* from *blindar-yizós*, and this *yizós* is analogous with *hvizós*, *thizós*, from *hvarzós*, *tharzós*, = Sanskrit *lasyás*, *tasyás* (§. 172). We must not require *blindó-izós* because *BLINDŌ* is the feminine adjective base for there is a reason for the thinning of the *ó*, in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and *a* is the short of *ó* (§. 69). For the rest, let it be considered, that in the Slavonic the graver feminine *a* before its union with the pronoun is weakened to the lighter masculine *o* (p. 354, Note 3.), and that a diphthong *oi* in the Gothic [G Ed p 382] is never admissible, on which account *salbó*, “I anoint,” in the subjunctive suppresses the *z*, which belongs to this mood (*salbós*, *salbó*, for *salbóis*, *salbói*). In the feminine dative one should expect *blindarizar* for *blindar*, which is simple, and answers to *gibar*, while the remaining German dialects are, in this case, compounded in the very

same manner in Old High German the genitive is *plintera* and the dative *plinteru** In the genitive plural masculine and neuter the *ai* in *blindai ze* might be substantiated through the Sanskrit ॠ \acute{e} of the pronominal genitive as ॠ५१५ *teshām horum*, and therefore the division *blindai ze* or *blind (y)ai ze* should be made as however the monosyllabic pronominal bases in which one would rather expect a firm adherence to the old diphthong (comp § 137) do not retain it and *thi se horum hvi zē quorum* as weakened forms of *tha zē hva ze*, are used and in the feminine *thi zō hvi zō*, for *thō zo*, *hū zō*, = Sanskrit *tā sam kā sam* I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the *ai** in *blindai zē* m n and *blindai zō* f than by the Sanskrit \acute{e} of *te sham* m n (f *tu sām*) which moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form *blindai zō* and I do it in fact, by the pronominal base ॠA , so that *blindai zē* *blindai zō* is the division to be made according to the analogy of *blindai zos*

“Remark 5 —The nominative masculine and feminine has kept itself free, in Gothic from union with the old relative base and has remained resting upon the original as received from the Sanskrit, Greek and Latin The masculine *blinds* also through the very characteristic and animated *s* (see § 134) has cause to feel itself personified and defined determinately enough Even if *blinds* could be looked upon as an abbreviation of *blindais* (comp *althais* ‘old,’ from the base ALTHYA according to Massmann) or of *blindais* to which the Old High German *plinter* would give authority I should still believe that neither the one nor the other has existed in Gothic as even the *u* bases

* The Gothic *ai* would lead us to expect \acute{e} and this, too is given by Grimm As, however with Kero the doubling of the vowel, and with Nother the circumflex is wanting I adopt in preference a shortening of the *e* or leave the quantity undecided

like *manvu-s* above, which, in the oblique cases, shew so clearly the pronominal base *YA*, have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German, however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative, which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declension in the nominative masculine, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. *Plintêr* (the length of the *ê* is here rendered certain) is contracted from *plinta-ir* (for *plinta-yri*), for the Old High German *ê* corresponds, according to §. 78., to the Gothic *ai*. In the feminine, therefore, the form *plintyu*, which occurs in the chief number of strict Old High German authorities, and those which, as Grimm remarks, are the oldest of all, has good substantiation, and corresponds very fitly to the masculine *plintêr*, and in the nominative and accusative plural and neuter the form *plint-yu*, with regard to the retaining the *y* of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic *blind-a* for *blind-ya*. The form *plintyu*, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like *dyyu*, "the" (f.), *syu*, "she," *desyu* (*de-syu*), "this"* (f.), and to the instrumental masculine and neuter *dyyu* (in the interrogative *huru*), where all authorities concur in retaining the *i* or *y*, while in the adjective, Otfrið, and, as Grimm remarks, here and there Isidore and Tatian, have *u* for *yu*. For explanation,

* As in the Old High German *i* and *j* (*y*) are not distinguished in writing, it remains uncertain in many, if not in all cases, in what places of the memorials which have come down to us the sound *j*, and in what that of *i* is intended; as even where the Gothic has a *j*, it may become *i* in the Old High German. If, however, in the analogous adjective forms like *plintyu* one reads *j*, which is supported by the Gothic (p 362), we must, in my opinion, leave it in the above forms also. Grimm writes *du*, *su*, but *desyu*, and expresses, p 791, his opinion regarding the *i*

however of the pronominal forms which have been mentioned it is important to consider that in the Sanskrit the pronominal base *ta* or the *sa* which supplies its place in the nominative masculine and feminine unites itself with the relative base *य ya* by which the first pronoun loses its vowel Compare then—

SANSKRIT	OLD HIGH GERM	OLD SCLAVONIC	
स्या <i>syá</i> (= <i>syā</i>)	<i>hæc</i>	<i>syu dyu</i>	<i>ta ya</i>
त्साम् <i>tyám</i>	<i>hanc</i>	<i>dya</i>	<i>tu yu</i>
त्वे <i>tyé</i>	<i>hi</i>	<i>dye</i>	<i>ti i</i>
त्साम् <i>tyás</i>	<i>hæ has</i>	<i>dýb</i>	<i>ty ya</i>
त्सामि <i>tyam</i>	<i>hæc</i>	<i>dýu</i>	<i>ta-ya</i>

Here then in a manner as remarkable as convincing the relation is proved in which the Old High German forms mentioned stand to the Gothic *so tho that* [G Ed p 384] *thós thó* one must first transpose these into *syu thyo* &c before they can pass as original forms for the Old High German Our mother tongue however in the east before us obtains more explanation through the Slavonic where the demonstrative base *TO* may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases in several however which we have partly given above it occurs also in union with *YO* It is most probable that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form *dyu* (*d yu*) and from the dative plural where together with *dém* occurs also *dyém* (*diém*) and in Notker always *dien* *According to this I deduce the forms *der des demu* &c from *dýer dýes* (for *dýis*) *dýemu* (from *dýamu*) so that after suppression of the vowel following the *y* that letter has vocalized itself first to *i* and thence to *e* According to this therefore *des* and the Gothic genitive

thu-s, would be, in their origin, just as different as in the accusative feminine *dya* and *thó*. In the neuter, on the other hand, *daz* for *djaz*, as Gothic *blind'atu* for *blind-yata*—the vowel of the base *DYD* is left, and the semi-vowel, which above had become *t* (from *ɾ*) has disappeared. Further support of my views regarding the difference of bases in the Gothic *tha-na* and the Old High German *de-n* (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative *des'ir*, which I explain as compounded, and as, in fact, a combination of the Sanskrit ऋत्या, mentioned at p 383 G. ed, for *taya*, and ऋत्या for *sa-ya*, the latter of which has a full declension in the Old Slavonic, also, as a simple word. *Des'ir* stands, therefore, for *dya-sar* (*e=ai*), and our Modern German *dieser* rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above *des'ir*, namely, upon *dya-s'ir* or *du-s'ir*, referred to which the Isidorean *dhva-sa*, mentioned by Grimm (I. 795.), at least in respect of the first syllable, no longer appears strange, for *dhva* from *dhva* for *dhya*,* answers admirably to the Sanskrit ऋत्या, and the final syllable *sa* answers to the Sanskrit-Gothic nominative form *sa* (Greek *δ*), which has not the sign of case.

“Remark 6. The adjective bases which from their first origin end in *ya*, as *MIDYA*=Sanskrit *madhya*, are less favourable to the retention of the *y* of the definite pronoun, for to the feminine or plural neuter *plint'-yu* for *plinta-yu* a *midy'-yu* would be analogous, which, on account of the diffi-

[G Ed p 385] culty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but may have originally existed in the form *midya-yu*, or *mid-ya-ya*; for the masculine nominative *midyér* is from *midya-u* for *midya-yar*, as, in Gothic, the feminine genitive-form *midyazós* from *midya-yizós*. If, however, according to this, even *hvar-yazós* (from *hvar-yayizós*) be used, and analogous

* *D*, *th*, and *dh* are interchanged according to different authorities

forms in several other cases so that the base JA is therein doubled we must recollect that in the Lithuanian also the base JA besides its composition with adjectives combines itself also with itself for stronger personification and indeed in such a manner that it is then doubly declined as jis sai (for jis-jai^*) he jo-yo of him &c

289 The participle present has in Gothic preserved only the nominative singular masculine of the definite declension *e g gibands* giving which may be deduced as well from a theme *GIBAND* according to the analogy of *fiyand s* (see p 164) as from *GIBANDA* according to the analogy of *ulf s* (§ 135) The Pali (see p 300) and Old High German support the assumption of a theme *GIBANDA* as an extension of the original *GIBAND* whence then by a new addition the indefinite theme *GIBANDIN* has arisen as above *BLINDAN* from *BIINDA* and it is very probable that all unorganic *n* bases have been preceded by an older with a vowel termination for as all bases which terminate in a consonant (*nd r* and *n* § 125) are in their declension with the exception of the nominative *nd s* alike obtuse [G Ed p 386] so it would not be necessary for *GIBAND* in order to belong in the indefinite adjective to a weak theme or one with a blunted declension to extend itself to *gibandan* (compare p 302) unless for the sake of the nominative *gibanda* (see § 110)

290 In the Pali no feminine theme *charanti* has been formed from the unorganic theme *charanta* mentioned at p 319 G ed

* Ruhig (by Mielke 1 68) wrongly gives *ai* as the emphatic adjunct as the doubling of the *s* in *tassai, s issai, yissai* is clearly to be explained through the assimilative power of the *y* (see p 333 Note †) The termination *ai* answers to the neuter *tai* mentioned at § 157, for *tai* which latter is contained in the compound *tat tai* (comp *koh tai tol tai*) After two consonants however the *y* is entirely dropped hence *e g kurs-ai* not *urs sai*

for the masculine and neuter form *charanta* has arisen from the necessity of passing from a class of declensions terminating in a consonant into one more convenient, terminating with a vowel in the theme. The Sanskrit, however, forms from bases terminating in a consonant the feminine theme by the addition of a vowel (*i*, see § 119.); e. g. from *charant m*, comes *charanti*, and there was therefore no reason in the Pâli to give also to the more recent form *charanta* a feminine theme *charanti*. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pali, for it has produced no feminine base *GIBANDŌ* from the presupposed *GIBANDA*, and therefore, also, the indefinite *GIBANDAN* has no feminine, *GIBANDŌN*, nom *gibandō*, answering to it (as *BLINDŌN* to *BLINDAN*); but the feminine form *gibandei* (*ei=i*, § 70.), which has arisen from the old theme *GIBAND*, in analogy with the Sanskrit *charanti*, has become *GIBANDEIN*, by the later addition of an *n*. Hence, according to §. 142, in the nominative *gibandei* must have arisen. It is not, however, right to regard this nominative as a production of the more recent theme, but as a transmission from the ancient period of the language, for it answers to the feminine Sanskrit nominative *charanti* (§. 137.), and to Lithuanian forms like *sukanti*, “the turning,” for which a theme *sukanti* is nowise admissible. In Latin, bases in *r* or *i*, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant, thus *FERENTI* from *FERENT* (compare §. 119 *genitri(-i-s)*) and this feminine *r*, as is the case in Lithuanian, as well with the participles (see p. 174, Note) as [G Ed p 387] with the adjective bases in *u* (p 363), has in some cases no longer remembered its original destination, and been imparted to the other genders. Hence the ablatives in *i* (for *r-d*), genitive plural in *-um*, neuter plural in *-a* (*ferenti(d)*, *ferenti-um*, *ferenti-a*), and hence is explained, what must otherwise appear very surprising, that the

participles, when standing as substantives, freely take this *z*, which is introduced into them from the feminine adjective (*infante sapiente*)

“Remark —In the *yu* of *lepantyu* the Old High German feminine of *lepantër*, I recognise the regular defining element as above in *plintyu*, answering to the masculine *plintër*. On account of the participial feminines in *yu* therefore it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in *yër*, according to the analogy of *midyër midyu midyaz* partly as *lepentër* and *lepantaz*, incline, in none of their cases, to the declension of *midyër midyaz* and also as the derivative indefinite base in *an* has sprung from *ALPANTA* and not from *KLPANTYA* therefore in *lepanto* (= Gothic *gibanda*) *f n lepanta* (= Gothic *gibandō*) This only is peculiar to the Old High German participle present, in relation to other adjectives that in its uninflected adverbial state it retains the defining pronominal base *YA* in its contraction to *z*, therefore *lepantiz* “giving,” not *lepant*, like *plint*. It is however, to be observed, that there is far more frequent occasion to use this form divested of case terminations in the participle present, than in all other adjectives, as the definite form in *nds* in Gothic, in the nominative singular masculine corresponds to it and as it may be assumed that here the *z* supplies the place of the case termination which has been laid aside, so that it is very often arbitrary whether the definite form of the participle or the uninflected form in *z* be given. So in Grimm’s hymns (II 2) *sustollens* is rendered by the uninflected *uspurrentiz* and *baptizans* by *taufantër* although the reverse might just as well occur or both participles might stand in the same form whether that of the nominative or adverbial. As regards the Old Saxon forms mentioned by Grimm namely *slāpandyes* or *slāpandeas dormientis gnornondyê mærentes buandyum*, “habitantibus” they should in my opinion be rather adduced in

proof of the proposition, that the participle present has, in the dialect mentioned, preserved the defining element more truly than other adjectives; and that those forms have maintained themselves in the degree of the Gothic [G Ed p 388] forms like *manvyana*, mentioned at p 362, than that a theme in *ya* belonged to the Old High German participle present before its conjunction with the pronominal syllable."

DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

291. The comparative is expressed in Sanskrit by the suffix *tara*, feminine *tarā*, and the superlative by *tama*, feminine *tamā*, which are added to the common masculine and neuter theme of the positive, e g. *punya-tara*, *punya-tama*, from *punya*, "pure", *śuchi-tara*, *śuchi-tama*, from *śuchi*, "clean", *balavat-tara*, *balavat-tama*, from *balavat*, "strong" In the Zend, through a perversion of the language *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀 tara* and *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀 tēma* unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine, e g *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 huskótara* (Vend S p 383) from *huska*, nominative masculine *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀 huskō*, "dry", *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 śpēntōtēma* from *śpēnta*, "holy", *𐬵𐬀𐬯𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 vērēthāzanistēma* (Vend S p 43) from *vērēthāzant*, nom. *vērēthrazanī*, "victorious" (literally, "Vritra-slaying")¹ According to my opinion *𐬵𐬀 tara* owes

¹ The participle present *zant*, the nominative of which I recognise in *𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 vērēthā-zanī*, rests on the analogy of the frequently-occurring *𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 upa-zōit*, "let him strike", since, in fact, the root *zan* (Sanskrit *हन् han*) suppresses its final vowel, and has treated the *a* which remains according to the analogy of the conjugation vowel of the first and sixth class (see p 104) The Sanskrit radical *हन् han*, "slaying," which appears in *वृत्रहन् Vritra-han*, "Vritra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form *jan*, the nominative of which is *𐬵𐬀𐬵𐬀 jāo* (Vend S p 43),

its origin to the root तृ *tri* (*tar* § 1) to [G Ed p 389] step beyond to place beyond (e g over a river) hence also the substantive *tara* a float In the Latin, as Lisch has acutely remarked, with this root are connected the preposition *trans* and also *terminus* as that which is overstepped and probably also *tra* in *in tra re penetra re* The superlative suffix I derive with Grimm (III 583) from that of the comparative although I assume no theoretic necessity that the superlative must have been developed through the degree of the comparative But *tama*, as a primitive presents no satisfactory etymology I formerly thought of the base तन् *tan* to extend whence also *τατος* could be explained but then तन् *tama* would be no regular formation and I now prefer recognising in it an abbreviation of *tarama* partly because the superlative suffix इष्ट *ishtha* may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative *iyas* through the suffix *tha* which in the Greek, is contained in the form of *το* as well in *ιστος* as in *τατος* for *ταπος* or *ταποτος* In this manner therefore is formed *τατος* and तन् *tama* s they both contain the same primitive abbreviated in a similar manner but have taken a different derivative suffix as in *πεντατος* contrasted with पञ्चम *panchama* the fifth the vowel however is more truly retained in the derivative *τατος* than in its base *τεπος* In Latin तन् *tama* s has become *timus* (*optimus intimus extimus ultimus*) and by the exchange of the *t* with *s* which is more usual in Greek than in Latin *simus* hence

p 43) and is analogous to the Sanskrit *panthas* from *panthan* mentioned at p 308 More usually however *ao* in Zend nominatives stands in the place of the Sanskrit *an* of the suffix *tant* and *tans* so that in Zend the sign of the nominative has taken the place of the Indian *n* the said sign being *o* for *s* according to § 56 In *𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀* *ādo* from *𐬀𐬀𐬀* *āns* the Zend *o* may also be looked upon as belonging to the base (comp Burnouf's Yaena Notes p cxxviii &c)

maximus (*mac-simus*) for *mag-simus* However, the *simus* is generally preceded by the syllable *is*, which we will hereafter explain.

292. As in comparatives a relation between two, and in [G Ed p 390] superlatives a relation between many, lies at the bottom, it is natural that their suffixes should also be transferred to other words, whose chief notion is individualized through that of duality or plurality thus they appear in pronouns, and कानरस् *katara-s* is "which of two persons?" and कानमस् *katama-s*, "which of more than two persons?" एकानरस् *êkataras* is "one of two persons," and êkatama-s, "one of more than two" It is hardly necessary to call attention to similar forms in Greek, as πότερος (for κότερος), ἐκάτερος. In ἐκάστος the superlative suffix (στος for ιστος) presents a different modification from that in êkatama-s, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix *tara* is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of *TERU* (*ter, teru-m*), and in Gothic in that of *THARA*, hence *uter, neuter, alter*, Gothic, *hva-thar*,* "which of two persons?" Old High German, [G Ed p 391] *huedar*, which has remained to us in the adverb *weder*, as an abbreviation of the Middle High Ger-

* The Gothic resembles the Latin in withdrawing the sign of the nominative from its masculine bases in *ra*, as the latter does from its corresponding bases in *ru* Hence, above, *hvathar* for *hvathar(a)s*, as *alter* for *alterus*, so also *vair*, "man," = Latin *vir* for *viru-s* This suppression has, however, not extended itself universally in both languages In the Gothic, as it appears, the *s* is protected by the two preceding consonants, hence *akrs*, "a field" (comp Grimm, p 599), still the adjective nominatives *gaw s*, "mournful" (theme *Gaura*, comp Sanskrit श्लो *ghôra*, "terrible"), and *svêrs*, "honoured," occur, where this cause is wanting, where, however, the preceding long vowel and the diphthong *au* may have operated In *vair*, indeed, a diphthong precedes, but the *a* is here first introduced through the euphonic law 82 If, in Latin, in adjective bases in *ri*, only the masculine has predominantly given up the *s*, with the preceding

man combined with a particle of negation *neueder Anthar* also our *anderer*, belongs here and answers to the Sanskrit अन्तरम् *antara s* whose initial syllable is the same which in अन्य *anya alius* has united itself with the relative base य *ya* From this अन्य *anya* comes *anyatara alter* If however अन्तर *antara* means in general the other the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after passing over this thing, so is also the Latin *ceterus* to be considered, from *ce* as demonstrative base (compare *ci s ci-tra*) and so also in Sanskrit, *itara*, the other comes from the demonstrative base *i* as in Latin the adverb *iterum* from the same base * In our German also *wieder* is the comparative suffix and the whole rests perhaps on a pre existing Old High German word *hwa dar* or *hwyadar*, with a change of the interrogative meaning into the demonstrative as in *weder ent weder* The *wie* in *wieder* therefore should be regarded as p 370 *die* in *dieser* and herein we may refer to the Isidoric *dhea sa*

293 In prepositions also it cannot be surprising if one finds them invested with a comparative or superlative suffix or if some of them occur merely with a comparative termination For at the bottom of all genuine prepositions

preceding *i* while *e g* the feminine *acris* might have permitted its *is* to have been removed, just as well as the masculine, I can find the reason of this firm adherence of the feminine to the termination *is* only in the circumstance that the vowel *i* particularly agrees with that gender, as it is in Sanskrit (although long) according to § 119, the true vowel of formation for the feminine base In Gothic, the supposition of the nominative sign *s* is universal in bases in *sa* and *si* in order that as the final vowel of the base is suppressed, two *s* should not meet at the end of the word, hence *e g* the nominative *drus* 'a fall from *DRUSA garuns*, 'a market from *GARUNSI* †

* I have traced back the comparative nature of this adverb which Voss derives from *iter* 'the journey' for the first time in my Review of Forster's Sanskrit Grammar in the *Heidelb Jahrb* 1818 i p 479

at least in their original sense, there exists a relation between [G Ed. p 392] two opposite directions thus, "over," "from," "before," "to," have the relations "under," "in," "to-wards," "from," as their counter-poles and points of comparison, as the right is opposed to the left, and is always expressed in Latin, also, with the comparative suffix, *dexter* (दक्षिण *dakshina*), *sinister*. As, however, the comparative nature of these formations is no longer recognised in the present condition of the Latin, the suffix *ter* admits of the further addition of the customary *ior* (*dexterior*, *sinisterior*, like *exterior*, *interior*); while the superlative *timus* has affixed itself to the core of the word (*dextimus* or *-tumus*, *sinistimus*). The prepositions which, in Latin, contain a comparative suffix, are *inter*, *præter*, *propter*, the adverbially-used *subter*, and probably, also, *obiter* (compare *audacter*, *pariter*) * To *inter* answers the Sanskrit अन्तरं *antar*, "among," "between", for which, however, a primitive *an* is wanting, as in Sanskrit the relation "in" is always expressed by the locative Notwithstanding this, *antar*, in regard to its suffix, is an analogous word to अतिरं *prâtar*, "in the morning," from the preposition [G Ed p 393] *pra*, "before,"† with a lengthened *a*, as in the

* I was of opinion, when I first treated this subject (Heddelb Jahrb 1818 p 480), that *ob-ter* must be so divided, and *ter* looked upon as the vowel of conjunction As, however, the preposition *ob* is connected with the Sanskrit अभि *abhi*, "to," "towards," the division *obi-ter* might also be made, and the original form of the preposition recognised in *obi* observe the Sanskrit derivative अभितस् *abhi-tas*, "near," from *abhi* with the suffix *tas* The common idea, however, that *obiter* is compounded of *ob* and *ite* cannot entirely be disproved, partly as then *obiter* would be a similar compound to *obviam*

† Comp *nî*, *parî*, *prâti*, for *n*, &c in certain compounds Formations which do not quite follow the usual track, and are rendered intelligible by numerous analogies, are nevertheless frequently misunderstood by the Indian Grammarians Thus Wilson, according to native authorities, derives अन्तरं *antar* from *anta*, "end," with *ra*, "to arrive at," and the analogous

Greek $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{\iota}$ from $\pi\rho\omicron$ For the relation under the Sanskrit has the preposition $\text{अधस् } adhas$ which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base $\text{अ } a^1$ from which also come $\text{अधर } a dhara$ and $\text{अधम } a dhama$ the under one or the most under to which *inferus* and *infimus* are akin as *fumus* to $\text{धूमस् } dhuma s$ smoke and with a nasal prefixed as in $\text{अधुस् } adhu$ in relation to $\text{अभि } abhi$ and in $\text{अधुष् } adhu$ answering to $\text{उभौ } ubhāu$ Old Sclavonic *oba* The suffixes $\text{धर } dhara$ and $\text{धम } dhama$ are in my opinion only slightly-corrupted forms of the *tara* and *tama* mentioned in § 291 as also in $\text{प्रथम } prathama$ the first in from *pra* before" the *T* sound of the suffix is somewhat differently transposed The suffix *adhas* of *adhas* beneath," however has exactly the same relation to *tas* in $\text{अधस् } atas$ from here as *dhara dhama* have to *tara tama* and therefore *adhas* as a modification of *atas* is in respect to its suffix a cognate form of *subtus intus* The usual intention of the suffix $\text{तस् } tas$ like that of the Latin *tus* is to express distance from a place In this also the Greek $\theta\epsilon\iota$ (from $\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ comp § 217) corresponds with it which in regard to its *T* sound rests on the form $\text{धस् } dhas$ in $\text{अधस् } adhas$ (§ 16) as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Sclavonic suffix *dū* which only occurs in pronouns and expresses the same relation as $\text{तस् } tas$ $\theta\epsilon\iota$ *tus e g oio ūdu* hence "• *ono ūdu* thence The form *dū* however, corresponds to the euphonic alteration which a final *as* in the Sanskrit must suffer before [G Ed p 394] sonant letters (§ 25) viz that into \acute{o} (see § 250 *f*) which in *Zend* has become fixed (§ 26^b)

analogous word *pratar* from *pra*, with *at* to go A relation, nevertheless between *anta* 'end and *antar*, among cannot perhaps be denied as they agree in the idea of room They are however, if they are related sister forms, and the latter is not an offshoot of the former

* The demonstrative base *OIO* answers remarkably to the Zend $\text{अथा } ata$ with *o* for *a* according to § 250 (*a*)

“Remark Dobrowsky p. 451 gives *údú* as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix *údye*, which forms adverbs of place, as *kúdye*, “where?” *onúdye*, “there.” As, however, the definitive pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, *údú*, *údye*, and forms, with *sche*, *údúsche*, *údyesche*, for *yúdú*, &c; and as this pronoun is, in general, so frequently compounded with other adverbs, there is every reason to assume that it is also contained in *ovo-údú*, *ono-údú*, *on'-údye*, *t'-údye*, and others. But how is the *ú* itself in *u-dú*, *yú-dye*, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point, but as, according to §. 255 (g), in the last element of the diphthong *ú* a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, *yudú*, *yúdye*, might be regarded as corruptions of *yondú*, *yondye*, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin *inde*, *unde*, from *I, U*. *Yúdye*, *yúdyú*, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative *yú*, which would again conduct us to a nasal (§ 266.) this accusative would then stand as theme to the derivative adverb, as our preposition *hinter*, Old High German *hinter*, has arisen from *hin*, a petrified accusative, on which the Gothic *hana-dag*, “this day,” “to day,” throws light. Before the suffix *dye*, however, elder form *de*, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as *gdye*, “where?” (more anciently *kde*, with the final vowel of the base *KO* suppressed), *zdye* (older *sde*), “here”, *ıdyesche*, “where” (relative). As *e* (e), according to § 255 (b), frequently stands as the corruption of an older *ı*, I recognise in the suffix *de* the Sanskrit धि *dhı*, from अधि *adhı*, “over,” “upon” “towards,” (from the demonstrative base *a*), which, in Greek, is far more widely diffused in the form of $\theta\iota$ ($\pi\acute{o}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\theta\iota$)”

294 In German, even more than in Latin, the prepositions shew themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskrit अन्तरं *antar*, Latin *inter*, mentioned above (at p. 392, G ed), corresponds our *unter*, Gothic

undar with *u* for the old *a* according to § 66 * If however the in my opinion incontrovertible original identity of the latter with the two former is recognised [G Ed p 39.] one must not, with Grimm (III 260) derive *undar* from the preposition *und* as far as &c., by a suffix *ar* and so again divide the *dar* for *undar* † as transmitted from an ancient period of the language was already formed before the existence of a German dialect and the abovementioned preposition has only to dispose itself according to the relations of sound mentioned in §§ 66 91 The matter is different with the Old High German *aftar* "after" for the primitive language, or languages transmit to us only *अप्य अपा अपो* "from", to which in the spirit of *अन्तर* *antar* *inter* *subter* &c the old comparative suffix has first united itself upon German ground In Gothic *aftra* means "again" which I look upon as an abbreviation of *afstara* as in Latin *extra* *intra* *contra* and others, as feminine adjectives from *extera* &c In regard to the termination however *aftra* and similar forms in *tra* *thra* appear to me as datives i e original instrumentals (§ 160), as also in the Sanskrit, this case occurs as an adverb *e g* in *अन्तरैः antarāḥ* "between" Perhaps also the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs in *tra* although they have a locative meaning like *यत्र yatra* "where" are to be regarded as instrumental forms according to the principle of the Zend language (§ 158) and of the gerund in *य ya* (Gramm Crit § 638 Rem) so that their *tra* would be to be derived from *तरा tarā* compare forms like *मनुष्याः manushya trā* *inter homines* (Gramm Crit

Regarding *dar* and *tar* for *thar*, see § 91

† Grimm however also at II 121 &c, divides *broth ar*, *tat ar* ("brother father") although the many analogous words denoting relationship in the German and the cognate languages clearly prove the *T* sound to belong to the derivative suffix (see Gramm Crit § 178 Rem)

§. 252. suff. *ti* ū). As *aftra* is related to *afstar*, so is the Gothic *vitlra*, "against," to the Old High German *wida*, our *wider*, the primitive of which is supplied by the Sanskrit through its

[G. Ed p. 396] inseparable preposition *fā* *ti*, which expresses separation, distraction, e.g. in *visrip*, "to go from one another," "to disperse." Exactly similar is the Sanskrit *fā* *ni*, to which I was the first to prove the meaning "below" to belong,* and whence comes the adjective *नीच* *nīcha*, "low" (Gramm. Crit §. 111), the base of our *nider*, Old High Ger-

[G. Ed p 397] *man ni-dar*. † From *hin-dar*, Old High German *hin-tar*, comes our *hin-ter* which has already been discussed (p 391, G. ed. compare Grimm III 177. c) In the Old High German *sun-dar*, Gothic *sun-drô*, "seorsim," afterwards a preposition, our *southern*, *dar* is, in like manner, clearly the comparative suffix, and the base appears to me, in spite of the difference of signi-

* It is usual to attribute to it the meaning "in," "into," which cannot in any way be supported .

† Grimm assents to my opinion, which has been already expressed in another place, regarding the relationship of *fā* *ni* and *nidar* (III 258, 259) he wishes, however, to divide thus *nid-ar*, and to suppose a Gothic verb *nithan*, *nath*, *nēthun*, to which the Old High German *gnādi* (our *Gnade*) may belong Does, however, *gnāda* really signify *humilitas*? It appears that only the meaning *gratia* can be proved to belong to it, and this is also given by Grimm, I 617 and II 235 *gratia*, *humanitas*, where he divides *hi-nā-da*, which appears to me correct, and according to which *nā* would be the root, and *da* the derivative suffix, as in the etymologically clear *hi-uā-da*, "afflatus," to which the Sanskrit gives *वा* *ua*, "to blow," as root, the Gothic gives *vô* (§ 69) (*vaua*, *vauô*) To *gnā-da*, indeed, the Sanskrit supplies no root *nā*, but perhaps *nam*, "to bend oneself," the *m* of which, according to the laws of euphony, is suppressed before *t*, which does not produce Guna, as *nata*, "bent," *nati*, "bending," with the preposition *sam*, *san-nati*, which Wilson explains by "reverence," "obeisance," "reverential salutation" As the Gothic inseparable preposition *ga*, Old High German *gi* or *hi*, is, as Grimm first acutely remarked, identical with the Sanskrit *sam*, *gnā-da* has much the same formation with *san-na-ti* it would, however, still better agree with the feminine

passive

fiction related to the Sanskrit सम् *sam* with (compare Gothic *samath* "together with" Old High German *samant*) and the *u* therefore is from *a* according to § 66. The Latin *con tra* however is nearly just as much opposed in meaning to its primitive *cum* and as *cum* (compare *सु*) belongs in like manner to सम् *sam* so *sundar sundra* and *contra* would be in a double respect sister forms. Observe also the Gothic *samath* Old High German *samant*, "together with" the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit *समन्त* *samanta* (from *sam + anta* an end) the ablative of which, *samantit* is also the adverb *samantatas* mean "everywhere." Perhaps, too in all other Old High German adverbs in *nt* (Grimm III 211) the said *anta* is contained for the meaning "end" cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time and like *Mitte*, "mid"

passive participle *san na ti*. Be that as it may, so much is certain that there is no necessity for a hypothetical Gothic base *nith* or *nith* either for the substantive *gnada* or for the preposition *ni'te* as they can be fully set at rest by the existence of a Sanskrit primitive *सुनि* below and the comparative suffix *dar*, which frequently occurs in prepositions. And as the circumstances that genuine original prepositions never come from verbs, but are connected with pronouns. I must with regard to its etymology keep back every veil from our *nidar*. Grimm wishes also to divide the Gothic preposition *ittri* Old High German *itidar*, into *itl ra* *itl-ar* and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition *itid*, English *with* Old Slavonic *itid*, Old Norman *itih* Swedish *eid* Danish *ted* which mean "with" and according to appearance, are wanting in the Gothic and High German. If, however one considers the easy and frequent interchange of *r* *l* and *m* (पारि *itrid* "water," = *mare* *β*, or = मृतस *mrilas* *mortuus*) one would rather recognise, in the above prepositions, dialectic variations of sound from the Gothic *nith* which is of the same import with them (= the *सुनि* *सुनि mat*), and which, in most of the dialects mentioned maintains itself equally with the other forms, as it often occurs, in the history of languages that the true form of a word is equally preserved with a corruption of it.

(compare *inmitten*, "in the midst") and *Anfang*, "beginning," it attaches itself first to the prepositional ideas therefore *hinont*, "this side," *enont*, "that side," would be the same as "at this end," "at that end." With regard to the comparative forms there is, further, the Old High German *for-dar*, *fur-dir* ("porro," "amplius"), our *fu-der* to be mentioned, whence *der vordere*, *vorderste*

[G Ed. p 398] "Remark 1 As we have endeavoured above to explain the Gothic *af-tra* and *vithra* as datives, I believe I can with still more confidence present the forms in *thi ó* or *taró* as remarkable remains of ablatives Their meaning corresponds most exactly to that of the Sanskrit ablative, which expresses the withdrawing from a place, and to that of the Greek adverbs in *θεν*, thus *hva-thró*, "whence?" *tha-thró*, "thence," *yam-thró*, "hence," *alya-thró*, "from another quarter," *inna-thi ó*, "from within," *uta-thi ó*, "from without," *af-taró*, "from behind," *dala-thi ó*, "from under," and some others, but only from pronouns, and, what is nearly the same, prepositions I might, therefore, derive *dalathi ó*, not from *dal*, "a valley," but suppose a connection with the Sanskrit अधर *adhara*, "the under person," with aphæresis of the *a* and the very common exchange of the *r* with *l* (§ 20) Perhaps, however, on the contrary, *thal* is so named from the notion of the part below. As to the ablative forms in *taró*, *thró*, the *ó* corresponds to the Sanskrit *át* (§ 179), with *ó*, according to rule, for *अत्* *á* (§. 69), and apocope of the *t*, so that *ó* has the same relation to the to-be-presupposed *ót* that in Greek *οὔτω* has to *οὔτως*, from *οὔτωτ* (§ 183 Note * p 201) Many other Gothic adverbs in *ó*, as *sintevnó*, "always," *snumundó*, "hastily," *spí antó*, "suddenly," *thridyó*, "thurdly," &c, might then, although an ablative meaning does not appear more plainly in them than in the Latin *perpetuo*, *cito*, *subito*, *tertio*, and others, be rather considered as ablatives than as neuter accusatives of indefinite (Grimm's weak) forms, so that *thridyó* would

answer to the Sanskrit ablative *trityāṅt* while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in *a* by an unorganic *n* thus *THRIDYAN* nom *thridya*. It must be further observed that all unorganic adjective bases in *an* are, in general only used where the adjective is rendered definite through a pronoun preceding it that therefore the forms in *θ* which pass for adverbial, are, for the very reason that no pronoun precedes them better assigned to the definite (strong) declension than to the indefinite, especially as most of them are only remains of an old adjective, which is no longer preserved in other cases and according to their formation belong to a period where the indefinite adjective declension had not yet received the unorganic addition of an *n*. As to the translation of *τουναντιοι* 2 Cor 11 7 by *thata undaneithθ* here of course *andaneithθ* is the neuter accusative, but the inducement for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article and *τουναντιον* could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor 11 17 where Castiglione takes *thata andarairthθ* for the [G Ed p 399] nominative but Grimm for the adverbial accusative as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text where *το* does not belong to *αυτικα* but to *ελαφρον*. In my opinion however it can in no case be inferred from these passages that the adverbs in *θ* without an article preceding them belong to the same category. Moreover also *andaneithθ* and *andarairthθ* do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As then *thrθ* has shewn itself to us to be an abbreviation of *thrθt* it is a question whether the suppression of the *t* by a universal law of sound was requisite as in Greek and in the Prakrit all *T* sounds are rejected from the end of words or changed into *Σ*. It is certain that the *T* sounds (*t th, d*) which in the actual condition of the Gothic are finals as far as we can follow their etymology had originally a vowel after them, so that

they are final sounds of a second generation, comparable in that respect to the Slavonic final consonants (§. 255. *l*). This holds good, for example, with regard to *th*, *d*, in the 3d person singular and plural, and the 2d person plural = Sanskrit ति *ti*, अति *anti*, थ *tha* or ता *ta*; and I explain the *th* or *d*, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix थ *dha* (ह *ha*), which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in *tra*, and the ablatives in *tas*, occur also with accusative meaning, *i. e.* expressing the direction to a place (see *tatra* in my Glossary) The Sanskrit suffix थ *dha* appears, in common language, abbreviated to *ha*, and is found, indeed, only in *i-ha*, "here," from the pronominal base *i* and सः *sa-ha*—in the Vedic dialect and Zend *sa-dha* which I derive from the pronominal base *sa*. It ought, according to its origin, and consistently with the usual destination of the suffix *dha*, to mean "here or there" it has, however, become a preposition, which expresses "with." The adverb सः *sha*, "here," is, in Zend, सः *idha*,* and fre-

[G. Ed p 400] quently occurs in combination with स *na*, "not", so that सः *naédha*† means "nor," answering to नः *nóit*, "neither" (literally "not it," from *na + it*, § 33) From सः *ava* and सः *aéta*, "this" (*mas*), comes सः *ava*

* Vend Sâde, p 368 several times सः *idha vachô framrava*, "*hæc hic verba enuntia*," which Anquetil translates by "*en prononçant bien ces paroles*" In the same page also occurs repeatedly सः *adha*, with the same meaning, from the demonstrative base *a*, as in the Vêda's अथ *adha* (Rosen's Sp p 10), without perceptible meaning

† *a + i* makes *é*, according to § 2, and from *nédha* is formed, by § 28, *naédha*

avadha and अवधा *avā dha* (Vend S p 164) To the Zend Vedic suffix *dha* corresponds most exactly the Greek $\theta\alpha$, in $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\alpha$ and $\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\text{-}\theta\alpha$ here Perhaps $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\alpha$ and अध *dha*, इह *ihā* are with regard to their base identical $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\theta\alpha$ therefore, is for $\acute{\iota}\nu\theta\alpha$ from $\acute{\iota}\theta\alpha$ (comp *in, inde*), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant and thus $\alpha\mu\phi\acute{\iota}$ answers to अभि *abhi* $\acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\omega$ to उभि *ubhāu* Old Slavonic *oba* but $\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha$ in the triple compound $\epsilon\iota\text{-}\tau\text{-}\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha$ is completely the Zend अवधा *avadha* whose theme *ava* has been contracted in the Greek to $\alpha\upsilon$ (compare $\alpha\upsilon\theta\iota$ and $\alpha\upsilon\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$, the latter being combined with the article) but in the Old Slavonic it is more correctly preserved in the form of *OVO** To the word इहस *ihasya* of this place which is derived from इह *ihā* through the suffix स *tya* corresponds the Greek $\kappa\iota\theta\alpha\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ with σ from τ compare, with regard to the suffix the Latin *propitius* from *prope*, and, in the Gothic, *frama thya* a foreigner through which the preposition *fram* shews itself to be an abbreviation of *frama* As in the Sanskrit the suffix स *tya* belongs only to local adverbs and prepositions so might also the Gothic *ni thysis* 'cousin (for *ni thyas* § 135) as *propinquus* or one who stands somewhat lower in relationship than a brother &c † be derived from the [G Ed p 401]

* Before my acquaintance with the Zend and deeper examination of the Slavonic, I believed I could make out the Greek base $\alpha\upsilon$ to agree with the Sanskrit *amu* 'ille' by casting out the *m* (as *κοπος* with *कुमारा*) now, however अव *ava* and *OVO* have clearly nearer claims to take the Greek forms between them

† Terms of relationship often express the relation of which they are the representatives very remotely but ingeniously Thus नप्त *naptri* a grandson is I have no doubt compounded of *na* 'not' and *patri* father and 'not father' is regarded as a possessive compound, 'not having as father' is relation to the grandfather who is not the father of the grandson In Latin it would be difficult to find the etymology of *nepos* (*nepot*)—and the same may be said of our word *neffe*—without the aid of the word *later*, which is fully preserved from the Sanskrit In the

ancient preposition *ni*, mentioned at p 382, from which, in Sanskrit, *niṭya* actually comes, but differently related, and with a signification answering less to the meaning of the preposition, namely, *sempiternus*. In consideration of the aspirates in Greek being easily interchanged, and, e.g. in the Doric, ὈPNIX is said for ὈPNIO, one may also recognise in the syllable *χο*, in forms like *παντα-χό-θεν*, *παντα-χό-σε*, *πολλαχόσε*, and others, a cognate form of the suffix *θα*, *dha*, or of the corrupted $\text{ἧ} ha$ (comp. § 23) At the bottom of these forms lies, in my opinion, as the theme, the plural neuter, which need not be wondered at, as *πάντα* and *πολλά* are also used as first members of compounds (*πολλά-σημος*, *παντά-μορφος*). *Πανταχο* might, in the identity of its suffix with *θα*, *dha*, or *ha*, mean "everywhere", whence may then be said *πανταχό-σε*, "from everywhere," &c, as we combine our locative adverbs *wo* and *da* with *her* and *hin* (*woher*, *wohin*), and in Greek, also, ἐκκίθι, ἐκείσε, ἐκείθεν, which might literally mean *in illic*, *versus illic*, *ab illic*, as ἐκκί is a local adverb Forms in *χο*, however, are in a measure raised to themes capable of declension, though only for adverbs, and develop, also, case-forms, as *πανταχοῦ*, *πανταχοῖ* (old locative and dative), *πανταχῆ* The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning *αχ* or even *αχο*, in which case we should have to divide *παντ-αχό-θεν*, &c. But as the *χο* under discussion has arisen from *θα*, *dha*, I think I recognise in the *χι* of ἧχι a corruption of the suffix *θι*, from $\text{ἧ} dha$, in which respect might be compared ἄγχι, as a sister form to

meaning of *Neffe* the negation of the relationship of father points to the uncle The Indian Grammarians, according to Wilson, see in *naptri* the negation, but not the father, but the root *pat*, "to fall," and a Unâdi suffix *tri*

अधि *adhi* to towards with *a* nasal introduced As a third form in which the Vedic Zend suffix *dha* appears in Greek I notice *σε* with *σ* for *θ* *υ* *dhi* as *μεσος* from मय *madhya* midst the *y* of which has assimilated itself in the form *μεσος*, to the *σ* The suffix *σε* however in that it is altered from its original intention to denote rest in a place to the expression of motion to a place answers to the Gothic *th* or *d* whence we set out in this examination in forms like *hva th πο-σε*, whither? also *hva d*—John xiii 3 *hva d gaggis ποῦ υπα ρεις*—*γαιν-d εκει σε* *αγα th ἄλλο σε* To the Zend *idha* Greek *ενθα* corresponds *ι-th* which however contrary to the original intention of the form does not mean thither but is used as a conjunction— but if then (1 Cor vii 7) To this class also belongs *ath* which only occurs in combination with *than*—*ath than* but like *ith-than* and it has [G Ed p 402] the Vedic Zend *a dha* as prototype (§ 399) *I had* in combination with the relative particle *ei* which is probably connected with *ya* has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and *thad-ei* may be cited as where and whither The *d* in these forms answering to the Greek *θ* agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§ 87) and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare *bauth bu dum* (§ 91)—so that the Gothic *T* sound of the suffix under discussion after it has in one direction diverged from the Greek, has in another again approached it

“Remark 2—As we have above recognised ablatives in the formations in *thrd tarθ* so we find in this comparative suffix also a remnant of the Sanskrit locative in which however as in the adverbs in *th d* the expression of repose in a place is changed into that of motion to a place—in *hidré** hither Mark xi 3 Luke xiv 21 *hva dré* whither? John vii 35 On the other hand *γαινdré* *α*

* Vide § 991

tually occurs with a locative meaning, *thareī leik, ȝaindié galisand sik arans*, 'ἄπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκκί συναχθήσονται οἱ ἀετοί.' Compare these forms with the Sanskrit, as, *adharcī*, "in the lower," and the Lithuanian *wilkė* (§ 197.). That, however, the Gothic *ē*, which in the genitive plural masculine and neuter answers to the Sanskrit अद् *á* (§ 69), moreover corresponds to ए *ē*, is proved by preterites like *nēmum*, 'we took,' answering to the singular *nam*, as, in Sanskrit, नेमि *nēmima*, 'we bent ourselves,' answers to ननम *nanama* or ननमि *nanāma*, 'I bent myself'."

295 The superlative suffix तम *tama* occurs in the Gothic also in the form of *TUMAN*, nominative *tuma*, or, with *d* for *t* in prepositional derivations, either simply or in combination with the common superlative suffix *ISTA*, thus, *af-tuma*, "posterus," *af-tumists*, "postremus," *hū-dumists*, "extremus" If one considers the Indian suffix तम *tama*, to have suffered apocope of the *a*—as in Latin, also, *timus* appears abbreviated to *tim* in adverbs like *virī-tim*, *calerva-tim*, which I have already, in another place (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818 p 480), explained, together with forms like *legi-timus*, as superlatives—one may look for that *tam* in the Gothic cor-

[G Ed p 403] rupted to *tana*, after the analogy of the accusative masculine of pronouns, like *tha-na* = तन् *tam*, τόν, *hva-na* = कम् *ka-m*, "whom?", and accordingly regard the prepositional derivations in *tana*, *dana*, as superlative forms, thus, Gothic *af-tana*, "behind", *hūdana*, πέραν, Old High German *ni-dana*, "under" (compare our *hie-nieden*, "here below" As, however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations in *ana* without a preceding *t* sound (Grimm III. 203, &c), it is a question whether *innana* "within," *ūzana* "abroad," *foiana* shortened to *foina* "from the beginning," *ferrana* "πρόρρωθεν," *rāmāna* "from a distance," *hōhana* "ὑψόθεν," *heimina* "οἰκοθεν," have lost a *t* or a *d* preceding the *a*, or if they are formed after those in *tana*, *dana*, in the notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of *ana*; or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle

The preposition *obar* over Gothic *ufar* which answers to the Sanskrit उपरि *upari* Greek *υπερ*, has in the same manner an adverb *obana* above corresponding to it

296 In the Sanskrit the appellations of the quarters of the heavens come from prepositions in combination with the root अञ्च *anch* to go, thus the east is denoted as that which is before by प्राञ्च *prānch* from प्रा *pra* before the west as that which is over against it by प्रत्यञ्च *pratyanch* from प्रति *prati* opposite the south as that below by अवाञ्च *avānch* from अव *ava* below, and its opposite pole, the north as that above is called उदञ्च *udanch* from उ *ut* up Now it is remarkable that in German the names of the quarters of the world shew themselves through their terminations Old High German *tar* and *tana* or as they so frequently occur in prepositions *dar* *dana* to be derivations from prepositions though the nature of their origin has become obscure The custom of the language disposes of the forms in *r* and *na* in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm III 205) the latter the direction whence which however was not perhaps the original intention of the terminations both which seem adapted to express the same direction the former comparatively with a glance at [G Ed p 404] that which is opposite the latter superlatively in relation to all the quarters of the globe as p 376 एकतर *ēkatara* one of two persons but एकतम *ēkatama* one of many persons The west may perhaps be most satisfactorily explained and in fact as being etymologically pointed out to be that which lies over against the east as in Sanskrit For this object we betake ourselves to the prepositional base *wi* mentioned at p 382, whence the comparative *wi dar* We do not however require to deduce *ues-tar**

* By writing *ue* Grimm marks the corruption of the *e* from *i* in which I readily agree with him



“towards the west,” *wes-tana*,” from the west,” from the derivative *widar*, but we may keep to its base *wi*, with the assumption of a euphonic *s*, as in the Sanskrit, also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain combinations, and before consonants which are disposed to have an *s* before them, assume this letter, *e. g.* *pratiśhkaśa* for *pratikaśa*; and as in Latin *abs, os* (for *obs*), from *ab, ob* (§ 96). But if it were preferred to deduce *westar, westana*, from the derivative *widar*, it would then be necessary to force the *d* of derivation into the base, and, according to §. 102., change it into *s*. The east is more difficult of explanation than the west

Old High German *ôs-tar*, “towards the east,” *ôs-tana*, “from the east,” for several prepositions start up together that would gladly sustain this quarter of the heavens. It is not necessary that the preposition after which the east is named should elsewhere, also, be received as a German preposition; for in this appellation a preposition might have incorporated itself, which, except in this case, is foreign to the practice of the German language

[G Ed p 405] It may therefore be allowable for us, first of all, to turn to a preposition which, in the Indian language, is prefixed to the south, and, in the German, may have changed its position to the east, the more so, as, with prepositions, the principal point is always where one stands, and the direction to which one is turned, and one may, with perfect justice, turn that which is at the bottom to the uppermost, or to the front. In Zend, *ava*, which in Sanskrit signifies “below,” exists as a pronoun, and means “this”, and as this pronoun is also proper to the Slavonic (*OVO*, nom *ov*), and occurs in Greek as *αὐ*, (*αὐ-θι, αὐτός*, see p 387), it need not surprise us to find an obsolete remnant of this base in German, and that the east is taken as the side opposed to the west. Here it may be necessary to observe, that in Sanskrit the preposition *ava*, in like manner, annexes a euphonic *s*, from

was therefore by suppressing the last *a* but one would arise (as in Greek $\alpha\upsilon$) *aus* (different from our *aus* Old High German *u* Gothic *ut* in Sanskrit उत् *ut* 'up') and hence according to § 60 *ur* the old northern form is *austr austan*. The Latin *austrer* might then—to which Grimm has already alluded (Wiener Jahrb B 29 p 77)—be placed with more confidence beside the Old High German as a sister form and led back by the hand of our comparative suffix to the preposition which in Sanskrit has given its name to the south, bold as it at the first glance might appear if we declared *austrer* and आन्चि *anchi* (*au + anch*) "outhern" to be related. The derivations from *hauru* or आव certainly deserve less notice. As however the juxtaposition of *austrer* with the Latin *austrer* and the Indian preposition *ata* *avis* is most suitable we refrain from giving other prepositional modes in which one might arrive at the appellation of the east in German. As the most natural point of departure we cannot place it in so subordinate a position to the west as to mark it out as "not west (*austrar* from *a* [G 12 p 402] *ustrar*)". We turn now to the south in Old High German *sundar* "towards the south *sundana* from the south," the connection of which with the *sunder* *sundir* mentioned at p 387 is not to be mistaken. The south therefore appeared to our ancestors as the remote distance and the reason for the appellation of this quarter of the heavens being clearly in allusion to अग्र is a new guarantee for the prepositional derivation of the names for east and west as also for the fact that the designation of the north too, has subjected itself to a preposition although it is still more veiled in obscurity than that of the three sister appellations. We cannot however omit calling attention to the Sanskrit preposition निः *ni* which signifies "out without" and before sonant letters to which *d* belongs (§ 25) according to a universal law of euphony appears

in the form of *nir*, which it is also usual to represent as the original form

297 In the Old Slavonic the Indo-Greek comparative suffix occurs in *itoryi*, "the second" (in), in which the definitive pronoun is contained (p 352): *itory-i*, then, is formed from *vtoro-i* (§ 255 d), in which the cardinal number *dwa* is melted down to *v*, corresponding in this respect to the Zend *b* in *b-yarē*, "two years," but singular, with *b* as a hardened form from *v*. To the Sanskrit *कतारा* *katara*, "which of two?" (Gothic *hva-thar*) and *कतारा* *ya-tara*, "which of both," corresponds etymologically, the Old Slavonic *ko-tory-i* (as definitive), older *ko-tery-i* and *ye-ter*, feminine *ye-tera* (*ye-τρα*), neuter *ye-tero*. The origin of these two pronouns is, however, forgotten, together with their comparative meaning, for *kotoryi* means "who?" and *yeter*, "some one" (compare p 352). Dobrowsky (p 343), however, in which he is [G Ed p 407] clearly wrong, divides the suffix into *ot-or*, for although the interrogative base *KO* may lay aside its *o*, and combine with the demonstrative base *to* (*hto*, "quis?" Dobr p 342), still it is more in accordance with the history of language to divide *ko-toryi* than *kot-oryi* or *koto-ryi*, as the formation *or* would there stand quite isolated, and besides this the pronoun *i*, "he," from *yo*, does not occur in combination with the demonstrative base *to*, and yet *ye-ter* is said

298 A small number of comparatives are formed in Sanskrit by *ईयस्* *īyas*, and the corresponding superlative by *इश्वस्* *ishtha*, in which *ishtha*, as has been already remarked (p 389), we recognise a derivation from *īyas* in its contraction to *ish* (compare *ish ta*, "offered," from *yaj*), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly *श्वा* *tha*, through which, also, the ordinal numbers *चतुर्थस्* *chatu-r-thas* (*τέταρτος*), and *षष्ठस्* *shash-thas* (*ἕκτος*), are formed, for the notion of the superlative lies very close to the ordinal

numbers above two as that of order does to the superlatives and hence the suffix तम *tama* occurs in ordinal numbers e.g. विसातमम् *visati tama s* the twentieth wherefore मा in forms like पंचमम् *pancha ma s* the fifth may be held to be an abbreviation of *tama*. To the form *ish* contracted from *iyas*—euphonic for *is*—in Greek and Zend *is* corresponds the Latin *is* in the superlatives in *is simus* which I deduce through assimilation from *is-timus* (comp § 101) the simple *is* however which viewed from Latin is a contraction of *ios* (§ 22) appears in the simple form in the adverb *mag is* which may be compared with μέγισ in μέγιστος. In the strong cases (§ 129) the Indian comparative shews a broader form than the *iyas* above namely a long *ā* and a nasal preceding the *s* thus श्रांस *iyāns* (see § 9) This form however [G Ed p 408] ever may originally have been current in all the cases, as the strong form in general (§ 129) as is probable through the pervading long *ō* in Latin *iōris iōri*, &c if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin *o* as compensation for the rejected nasal compare the old accusative *mel iosem* mentioned in § 22, with Sanskrit forms like श्रांसम् *gar iyāns am* (*graviorem*) The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted form from *iyas* may be the cause why the form of the positive is exposed to great reductions before it so that not only final vowels are rejected as generally before Taddhita suffixes* beginning with a vowel but whole suffixes together with the vowel preceding them are suppressed (Gramm Crit § 252) e.g. from मतिमत *i ati mat* intelligent from *mat* understanding comes *mat iyās* from *balat* strong (gifted with strength,

* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself

from *bala + vat*), *bal-îyas*, from *kshipra*, "quick" (from the base *kship*, "to throw"), comes *kshêp-îyas*, from *kshudra*, "insignificant," *kshêd-îyas*, from *tîpra*, "satisfied," *trap-îyas*, since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend *vaêdistā*; which Burnouf (*Valûsta*, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from *vidvas* (*vidvô*, § 56^b., Sanskrit *vidvas*), "knowing." With respect to *trapîyas*, from *tîpra*, let it be observed that *ar*, as Guna of *i*, is easily transposed to *ra* (*Gramm Crit* § 34^b). compare the Greek *ἔδρακον* for *ἔδαρκον*, *πατράσι* for *παταρσι* (see p 290, G ed). In a similar manner M. Ag Benary explains the connection of *varîyas* with *uru* "great," with which he rightly compares the Greek *κύρις* (*Berl. Jahrb.* 1834. I.

[G Ed p 409] pp. 230, 231). But *varîyas* might also come from *vava*, "excellent," and *uru* might be an abbreviation of *varu*, which easily runs into one To the superlative *वर्षिष्ठा* *varishtha*, which does not only mean *latissimus* but also *optimus*, the Greek *ἄριστος* (therefore *Φάριστος*) is without doubt akin, the connection of which with *κύρις* one could scarcely have conjectured without the Sanskrit. Remarkable, too, is the concurrence of the Greek with the Sanskrit in this point, that the former, like the latter, before the gradation suffix under discussion, disburthens itself of other more weighty suffixes (compare Burnouf's *Valûsta*, p 28); thus, *ἔχθιστος*, *ἀσχιςτος*, *οἰκτιςτος*, *κύδιστος*, *μήκιστος*, *ἀλγιστος*, from *ἐχθρος*, &c, exactly as above *kshêpishthas* and others from *kshipra*, and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in *μήκιστος*, *μᾶσσον*, from *μακρός*, on which principle also rests the Guna in analogous Sanskrit forms—namely, as a compensation for the suppression of the suffix. The case is the same with the lengthened vowel in forms like *θᾶσσον*, *ᾶσσον*, where Buttman (§ 67 Rem. 3 N. 1) assumes that

the comparative *i* has fallen back and united itself with the *α* (*α*) while in my opinion a different account is to be given of what has become of the *i* in forms like *θασσων*, *βρασσων* (§ 300) The formation of *μεγιστος* from *μεγας*, from *μεγαλο* *ς*, is similar to the origin in Sanskrit of *बहिष्ठा* *bahishtha* from *bahula* much from *bahu* much comes *भृगुष्ठा* *bhūgishtha* and *μεγιστος* in relation to *ΜΕΓΑΛΟ* has lost as much as *bahishtha* compared with *bahula* only that the Sanskrit positive base is compensated for the loss of *ula* by the addition of a nasal which therefore as Ag Benary (I c) has very correctly remarked rests on the same principle with the Guna in *kshēpishtha* &c *

Remark —It will then also be necessary [G Ed p 410] —as Burnouf (Γαζητ p 131) first pointed out but afterwards (Valista p 25) in my opinion wrongly retracted—to explain the *ε* *é* of *sreyas* better, *śreshtha* the best as coming from the *i* of *sri* fortune by Guna instead of the common view, in which I formerly concurred of substituting a useless *sra* as positive and hence by contraction with *yas ishtha* forming *sreyas sreshtha* From *sri* comes the derivative *sri mat* fortunate from which I deduce *sre yas sre shtha*, by the prescribed removal of the suffix † although one might

* The Guna, however in the gradation forms under discussion might also be accounted for in a different way namely by bringing it into connection with the *ṽ*riddhi which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes especially in patronymics as *देवसूतं* *devaswata*, from *देवसूत* *devasuat* On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes *yas ishtha* which has given rise to the suppression of the suffix of the positive base the initial vowel also of the same would accordingly be raised by the weaker Guna instead of by the *ṽ*riddhi as usual (§ 26) Be that how it may one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel lengthening in *μηκτος θσσν* and others and that of Sanskrit forms like *kshēpiyas*, *kshēpishtha*

† If there existed, as in Zend, a *sriya*, one might hence also derive the above gradations

expect in the superlative *śray-ishtha*, euphonic for *śrē-ishtha*, and on this ground it is that Burnouf takes his objection. But as in Greek *ἑκα-στος, ὀπό-στος* (see p 376), in spite of the want of the *i* of *ιστος*, are nevertheless nothing else than superlative forms, I do not see why, in certain cases, in Sanskrit, also, the suppression of an *i* may not hold good. This happens, moreover, in *sthé-shtha* from *sthi-ra*, "fast," *śphé-ṣhtha* from *sphi-ra*, "swollen," and *pré-shtha* from *priy-a*, "dear." In the latter case, after removing the suffix *a*, the preceding *y*, also, must retire, since *priy* is only a euphonic alteration of *prī* (Gramm Crit § 51). As to the derivation, however, of the meanings *melior*, *optimus*, from a positive with the meaning "fortunate," it may be further remarked, that, in Sanskrit, "fortune" and "splendour" are generally the fundamental notions for that which is good and excellent, hence, *bhagavat*, "the honourable," "the [G Ed. p 411] excellent," properly, "the man gifted with fortune", for our *besserer*, *bester*, also Gothic *bat-iza*, *bat-ists*, are associated with a Sanskrit root denoting fortune (*bhad*, whence *bhadra*, "fortunate," "excellent"), which Pott was acute enough first to remark (Etymol Inquiries, p 245), who collates also *bōtjan*, "to use." The old *d* gives, according to § 87, in the Gothic *t*, and the Sanskrit *bh* becomes *b*. It might appear too daring if we made an attempt to refer *melior* also to this root, but cognate words often assume the most estranged form through doubled transitions of sound, which, although doubled, are usual. It is very common for *d* to become *l* (§ 17), and also between labial medials and the nasal of this organ there prevails no unfrequent exchange (comp § 63). If, also, the Greek *βελτίων, βέλτιστος*, should belong to this class, and the *τ* be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in *βέλ-τερος, βέλ-τατος*, *βελ* would then give the middle step between *भद् bhad* and *mel*. The ideal positive of *βελτίων*, namely *ἀγαθός*, might be connected with *अग्धा agádha*, "deep," with which, also, the Gothic *gōths* (theme

gula) is to be compared with *θ* according to rule for $\alpha \acute{\alpha}$ (§ 69), and medials for Greek aspirates according to § 87

299 From the strong theme $\xi\alpha\iota\mu$ *iyáns* mentioned at § 298 comes the nominative *iyán* with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through § 94. The vocative has a short *a* and sounds *iyán*. To *iyán* answers the Greek $\iota\omega\nu$ and to the vocative *íyan* answers $\iota\omicron\nu$, to the neuter *íyas* (N A V) identical with the weak theme corresponds the Latin *ius* (§ 22). The Greek however cannot become repossessed of the *s* which is abandoned in Sanskrit in the nominative and vocative masculine for legitimate reasons since it declines its comparative as though its theme terminated from the first with *i*: hence accusative $\iota\omicron\iota\ \alpha$ for the Sanskrit $\xi\epsilon\gamma\alpha\sigma\mu$ *iyáns am* Latin *ior em* ($\iota\omicron\sigma\ em$ § 22) genitive $\iota\omicron\iota\ \omicron\varsigma$ for *iyas as ior is*. However one might as Pott has already I believe noticed somewhere reduce the contracted forms like $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\iota\omega$ $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to an original $\iota\omicron\sigma\alpha\ \iota\omicron\sigma\epsilon\varsigma\ \iota\omicron\sigma\alpha\varsigma$, corresponding to *iyánsam iyánsi* (neuter plural) *iyáns as íyas as* the σ of which as is so common between two vowels would be rejected*. On the other hand *v* except in [G Ed p 412] comparatives on the presupposition that the contracted forms have rejected an *v* and not σ is suppressed only in a few isolated words ($\text{Ἀπολλῶ Ποσειδῶ εἰκὼ ἀηδοῦς}$ and a few others) which however the theoretic derivation of the comparative Σ renders very embarrassing. We would therefore prefer giving up this and assuming that while the Sanskrit in the work *ie* in the majority of cases has abandoned the former consonant of *is* the Greek which was still less favourable to the *vs*, has given up the latter as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest as it were pre-Grecian period forms like $\beta\epsilon\lambda\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$. It is however remarkable that while all other European sister lan-

* Comp p 320 G ed

guages have only preserved the last element of the comparative *ns*—the Latin in the form of *r*—and while the Sanskrit also shews more indulgence for the *s* than for the *n*, the Greek alone has preserved the nasal, so that in the comparative it differs in this respect from all the other languages. Without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend it would be hardly possible to adduce from the European sister languages a cognate termination to the Greek $\tau\omega\nu$, $\tau\omicron\nu$, or if $\tau\omicron r$ and $\tau\omega\nu$ should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,* than that after the Greek ν the prototype of the Latin r , namely σ , has originally existed.

300 In Zend, the superlatives in 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ista* are more numerous than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, and require no authentication. With regard to their theory, Burnouf has rendered important service, by his excellent [G. Ed. p 413] treatise on the Vahista, and his remarks are also useful to us in Sanskrit Grammar. In form 𐬀𐬀𐬀 *ista* stands nearer to the Greek $\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ than the Indian *ishtha*, and is completely identical with the Gothic *ista*, nom, *ist'-s* (§ 135.), as the Zend frequently exhibits *t* for the Sanskrit aspirates. The comparative form which belongs to *ista* is much more rare, but perhaps only on account of the want of occasion for its appearance in the authorities which have been handed down to us, in which, also, the form in *tara* can only scantily be cited. An example of the comparative under discussion is the feminine 𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀𐬀 *mas'yêhî*, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere* drawn attention † It springs from the positive base

* Comp § 20

† Berl Jahrb. 1831 I p 372 I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *y* of the Sanskrit *iyasî* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *hê*, from स्य *syâ*, after which the *i* must have passed into *y*. Still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf,

𑀧𑀯𑀭𑀸𑀓 *masas* great (*masd masah masanh* §§ 56 56^b) and confirms like other Zend forms the theory which holds good for the Sanskrit, that other suffixes fall away before the exponents of the comparative and superlative relation under discussion. If *yēhi* is compared with the Sanskrit feminine base *iyasi* the loss of the *i* shews itself and then the *a* has through the power of assimilation of the *y* (§ 12), become *é* and *s* has according to § 53 become *h*. In the loss of the *i* the Zend coincides with the Sanskrit forms like *sré-yas* mentioned at p 397 with which also, *bhū yas* more and *jyā yas* older, agree. Greek comparatives with a doubled *σ* before *ων* as *κρσισων βρασσωι, ελασσωι*, are based on this which according to a law of euphony very universally followed in Prakrit have assimilated the *y* to the preceding consonant as elsewhere *ἄλλος* [G Ld p 414] from *αλγος* Gothic *alya* Latin *alius* Sanskrit *anya*, are explained (Demonstrative Bases p 20). In Prakrit in the assimilations which are extremely common in this dialect the weaker consonant assimilates itself to the stronger whether this precedes or follows it, thus *anna* the other from *anya* corresponds to the Greek *ἄλλος* the Sanskrit *tasya hujus* becomes *tassa bhavishyati* he will be becomes *bhavissati** *divya* heavenly, *divia* from

is simpler and closer at hand, although the other cannot be shewn to be impossible, for it is certain that if the *y* of *iyas* had disappeared in Zend it would fall to the turn of the preceding *i* to become *y*.

* Comp *σσομαι* from *σγομαι*, with *ἐπιίμι* *syāmi*, in composition with attributive verbs. It may be allowed here preliminarily to mention another interesting Prakrit form of the future which consists in this that the Sanskrit *s* passes into *h*, but the syllable *ya* is contracted to *i* herein agreeing with the Latin *i* in *eris, erit, amabis amabit* &c as *karishis* thou wilt make, from *karishyasi sah himi* I will endure from *sahishyamī* instead of the medial form *sahishyē* (Urvashi, by I enz. p 63)

which it is clear that *v* is stronger than *y*, as it also is more powerful than *r*, hence *sauva* from *sarua*, "everyone" It is remarkable that the *i* also of *iti* "thus" assimilates itself to the following *t*, hence, *iti*, which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form *yōn*, establish the assimilation from *ῶν* As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into σ (*κρίσ-σων*, *βράσ-σων*, *βάσ-σων*, *μάσ-σων*, *ἐλάσ-σων*, &c.), to which the *y* has assimilated, the transition of τ , δ , θ , into σ need least of all surprise us (see § 99), but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Slavonic may be noticed, in which, besides what has been remarked in § 255 (*m*), *y*, *i*, and *e* which latter comes very near the vowel combined with a *y*, and is frequently the remainder of the syllable *ye* exert an influence on a guttural preceding them, similar

[G Ed p 415] to that which the comparative *y* or *i* produces in Greek Before the *i*, namely, of the nominative plural, and before *ye* in the dative and locative singular, as before *i* and *ye* of the imperative, *ch* becomes *s*, e g. *gryes-i* from *gryech*, as *θάσ-σων* from *θάσ-γων*, from *ταχ-*, *g* becomes ζ , e g. *πρῦζι* from *πρῦg*, as *μῑζων*, *ὀλῑζων*, from *μῑζγων*, *ὀλῑζγων*, from *μεγ-*, *ὀλιγ-*; *k* becomes *ch*, while in Greek κ is modified in the same way as χ On account of the contracted nature of the ζ (= $\delta\sigma$) no assimilation takes place after it, but the *y* entirely disappears, or, in *μῑζων*, is pressed into the interior of the word (comp §. 119), as in *ἀμῑνων*, *χῑρων*, which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit *अधर अधारा*, "the under (m)," consequently with aphæresis of the *ā* (comp §. 401). With the superlative *μέγιστος* compare the Zend *मथουζμαθ mazista*, where ζ *z*, according to § 57, answers to the Sanskrit *h* of *महन् mahat*, "great", while in the above *मथουζμαθ mašyéhâ*, as in the positive *माθασ* (euphonicallly *masô*), *s* stands irregularly for *z*, as if the Zend, by its permutation of consonants in this word, would vie with the Greek, but

we find Vend S p 211 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀢𑀺 *mazyo* with ~ which I hold to be a neuter comparative thus 𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀓𑀢𑀺 *mazyo* 𑀲𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀢𑀺 *vidiao* the more (literally greater) wise

301 As in the Latin comparative a suffix has raised itself to universal currency which in Sanskrit and Greek is only sparingly applied but was perhaps originally similarly with the form in *tara* τεροϛ in universal use so the German the Slavonic and Lithuanian in their degrees of comparison everywhere attach themselves to the more rare forms in Sanskrit and Greek and indeed in the Gothic the suffix of the comparative shews itself in the same shortened form in which it appears in the Sanskrit Zend Greek and Latin in its combination with the superlative suffix (see § 298 p 395 &c) namely as *is* and this most plainly in adverbs like *mais*, more whose con [G Ed p 416] nection with comparatives in the Sanskrit &c I first pointed out in the Berl Jahrb (May 1827 p 742) We must divide therefore thus *ma-is* and this word as well in the base as in the termination is identical with the Latin *magis* (comp μεγιστος p 402) whence it is clear that the Gothic form has lost a guttural (compare *maior* and *magior*) which in *mihils* great—which has weakened the old *a* to *i*—appears according to the rule for the removal of letters (§ 87) as *I Mais* therefore far as it seems to be separated from it, is in base and formation related to the Zend *maz-yō* (from *maz-yas*) which we have become acquainted with above (p 415 G ed) in the sense of more

Remark—There are some other comparative adverbs in *is* of which the first time I treated of this subject I was not in possession and which Grimm has since (III 589 &c) represented as analogous to *mais* He has however afterwards I c p 88 agreed with Fulda in viewing *hauhis* αιωτερον as the genitive of the positive *hauhis* high Yet *hauhis* stands in exactly the same relation to *hauhi-a* the higher that *mais* does to *mai-a* *major*

Compared with the Zend *maz-yô* and Greek *μείζων*, one might believe the *z* in *maiza* belonged to the positive base, particularly as the Old High German adds a second comparative suffix to its adverb *mêr*, answering to the Gothic *mar* (*mêrno*, 'major') because in *mêr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Rihtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p 89, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *potius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rehtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rehtôr*. The comparative *ga-rihtôza*, 'justior,' which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *rihtiza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ôza*, for, together with the comparative adverb *frumôzô*, 'at first' (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumists*. Perhaps, however, the genius of the Old High German language has allowed itself to be deceived through the identity of the comparative suffix *is* with the genitive termination *i-s*, and taking some obsolete comparatives, which have been transmitted to it

[G Ed p 417] for genitives, left them the *s*, which, in evident comparatives, must pass into *r*, but is also still retained as *s* in *wis*, 'pejus.' I prefer to consider, also, *allis*, 'omnino,' as a comparative, in order entirely to exclude the Gothic apparent genitive adverbs from the class of adjectives. In the Old High German, together with *alles*, 'omnino,' exists *alles*, 'alter,' which, according to its origin, is an essentially different word—through assimilation from *alyes*, as above (p 414 G ed.) ἄλλος in which the comparative termination, in the Latin *ali-ter* and similar adverbs, is to be observed. The probability that these forms, which, to use the expression, are clothed as genitives, are, by their origin, comparatives, is still further increased thereby, that together with *emes*,

semel' and *alteres aliter*, there occur also forms in the guise of superlatives, namely *einest onca* (see Griff, p 329) and *anderest ngun*. Some comparative adverbs of this sort omit in Gothic the *s* of *is* thus *min s* less (compare *minor minus* for *minor minus*) perhaps *vair s*, worse which is rused anew into *vairisiza peþir* and may be connected with the Sanskrit *atara posterus* as above $\chi\epsilon\rho\omega\iota$ was compared with $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ *atthara seith s amplius* (from *seithu* 'lite'), and probably also *sunt statim* and *anal s subito* "

302 The comparative-suffix *is* required in Gothic where the consonant *s* is no longer capable of declension* an unorganic addition or otherwise the sibilant would have been necessarily suppressed. The language however preserved this letter as its meaning was still too powerfully perceived by the favourite addition *an* which we have seen above though without the same urgent necessity joined to participial bases in *nd* in their adjective state (§ 289). As then *s* comes to be inserted between two [G Ld p 418] vowels it must by § 96 (5) be changed into *z* hence the modern theme *MAI/IA* from the original *MAIS*, which has remained unaltered in the adverb. The nominative masculine and neuter are according to §§ 110 111 *maia mat o*. On the other hand the feminine base does not develop itself from the masculine and neuter base *MAI/IA*—as in general from the unorganic bases in *an* of the indefinite adjectives

* A base in *s* as the above-mentioned *maia*, would not be distinguished from the theme in all the cases of the singular as also in the nonnominative and accusative plural as of final double *s* the latter must be rejected (compare *drus* 'fall' for *drus s* from *drusa s* § 29? 1st Note). In the nominative and genitive singular, therefore the form *maia-s* must have become *maiz* just as, in the nominative and accusative plural, where *ahman s* comes from the theme *ahman*. The Latin singular is in bases ending in a consonant without exception devoid of inflection and so is the accusative in substantives of every kind.

no feminines arise but to the original feminine base in *i'*, which exists in the Sanskrit and Zend, an *n* is added, as in the participle present, thus *MAIZEIN* (*ei = i'*, § 70.), from *mais + ein*, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, *𐬨𐬀𐬯𐬭𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀* *mašyēhi'*, and Sanskrit forms like *गरियसि* *garīyas-i'*, from *garīyas*. The nominative *maizei* may then, according to § 142., be deduced from *MAIZEIN*, or may be viewed as a continuation of the form in Zend and Sanskrit which, in the nominative, is identical with the theme (§ 137), in which respect again the participle present (§ 290) is to be compared. These two kinds of feminines, namely, of the said participle and the comparative, stand in Gothic very isolated, but the ground of their peculiarity, which Jacob Grimm, III. 566, calls still undiscovered (compare I 756), appears to me, through what has been said, to be completely disclosed, and I have already declared my opinion [G Ed p 419] in this sense before * The Old High German

* Beil Jahrb May 1827, p 743, &c Perhaps Grimm had not yet, in the passage quoted above, become acquainted with my review of the two first parts of his Grammar, since he afterwards (II. 650.) agrees with my view of the matter I find, however, the comparison of the transition of the Gothic *s* into *z* with that of the Indian *स् s* into *ष् sh* inadmissible, as the two transitions rest upon euphonic laws which are entirely distinct, of which the one, which obtains in the Gothic (§ 86 5), is just as foreign to the Sanskrit, as the Sanskrit (§ 21 and Gramm Crit 101ⁿ) is to the Gothic It is further to be observed, that, on account of the difference of these laws, the Sanskrit *ष् sh* remains also in the superlative, where the Gothic has always *st*, not *zt* In respect to Greek, it may here be further remarked, that Grimm, I c p 651, in that language, also, admits an original *s* in the comparative, which he, however, does not look for after the *ν* of *ων*, as appears from § 299, but before it, so that he wishes to divide thus *μείζων*, as an abbreviation of *μεγίζων*, and regards the *ζ* not as a corruption of the *γ*, as Buttman also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic *ma-iza*. The Greek *ων, ον*, would, according to this, appear identical with the unorganic Gothic *an* in *MAIZAN*, while we have assigned it, in § 299, a legitimate foundation, by tracing it back to the Sanskrit *āns*

has brought its feminine comparatives into the more usual path, and gives, as corresponding to the Gothic *minni-er* the lesser (fem) not *minniri* but *minnira*. The Gothic sibilant however was in the High German comparatives in the earliest period transmuted into *r* whence in this respect *minnira* *minnira* has more resemblance to the Latin *minor* than to the Gothic *minni-a* *minnizer*.

303 The comparative suffix in the Gothic, besides *is* *is* *an* exhibits also the form *ōs* *ō-* *an* it is however more rare, but in the Old High German has become so current that there are more comparatives in it in *ōro* (nominative masculine) *ōra* (nominative feminine and neuter) than in *iro* *ira* or *ero*, *era*. The few forms in *ŌZAN* which can be adduced in Gothic are *svinthō-a* *fortior* (nominative masculine), *frōdoza*, *prudēntior* *frumō-a* *prior* *hlasōza* *hilarior*, *garahitō-a* *justior* *framaldrō-a* *protektor* *ætate*, *usdaudo-a*, *solicitor* *unsukunthōza*, "*inclarior* (Massmann p 17) and the ad verbs *sniumundos* *σπουδαιότερος*, and *alyaleikōs* *ετερως*. How then is the *ō* in these forms to be explained contrasted with the *i* of *IS IZAN*? I believe only as coming from the long *a* of the Sanskrit strong themes *iyans* or *yans* (§§ 299 300) with *ō* according to rule for *यि* *ā* (§ 69). If one starts from the latter [G Ed p 420] form which, in the Zend, is the only one that can be adduced then beside the nasal which is lost also in the Latin and in the weak cases in the Sanskrit *yāns* has lost in the Gothic either the *ā* or the *y* (= *j*) which when the *ā* is suppressed must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic *ōs* *ō-* and still more the Old High German *ōr* correspond, therefore exactly to the Latin *ōr* in *minor* *minor is* for *minor*. There is reason to assume that in the Gothic originally *y* and *ō* existed in juxta position to one another, and that for *minnira* the lesser was used *minnyō-a* and for *frōdo a* the more intelligent *frōdyō-a*.

The forms which have lost the *y* are represented in Latin by *minor*, *minus*, and *plus*, and those with *ô* suppressed by *mag-is*. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in *ŌSTA*, nom. *ôst'-s*, corresponding to the comparatives in *ôs*, *ôz*, because this degree in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin always springs from the form of the comparative, contracted to *is*, *ish*. It is, however, quite regular, that, to the *frumôza*, "*prior*," corresponds a *frumists*, "*primus*," not *frumôsts*. To the remaining comparatives in *ôza* the superlative is not yet adduced, but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with *ô*, after their fashion, and thus, in the Old High German, *ôst* usually stands in the superlative, where the comparative has *ôr*. The Gothic furnishes two examples of this confusion of the use of language, in *laswôsts*, "*infirmissimus*" (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and *ar môsts*, "*miserimus*" (1 Cor. xv. 19).

304 In the rejection of the final vowel of the positive base before the suffixes of intensity the German agrees with the cognate languages, hence *sut'-iza*, from *SUTU**, "sweet", [G Ed p 421] *hard'-iza*, from *HARDU*, "hard", *seith-s* (*thana-seiths*, "*amplus*"), from *SEITHU*, "late", as in the Greek *ἡδίωv* from ἩΔΥ, and in the Sanskrit *laghîyas* from *laghu*, "light." *Ya* is also rejected, hence *spêd'-iza*, from *SPEDYA*, "late" (see p 358, Note 7), *reik'-iza*, from *REIKYA*, "rich". One could not therefore regard the *ô*, in forms like *frôdôza*, as merely a lengthening of the *a* in *FRŌDA* (§. 69), as it would be completely contrary to the principle of these formations, not only not to suppress the final vowel of the positive base, but even to lengthen it. The explanation of the comparative *ô* given at §. 303 remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.

* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskrit *suâdu-s* and Greek *ἡδύ-s* lead us to expect a final *u*.

305 In the Old Slavonic according to Dobrowsky p 332
 &c the comparative is formed in three ways namely

(1) By masculine *u* feminine *shu*, neuter *yee* as *únu*,
 the better (m) *únu* the better (f), *únyee* the best
 (n) from a positive which has been lost as *batiza melior*
 and *αμειων* and it is perhaps connected in its base with
 the latter so that *α μην* have become *ο* (§ 255 a.) but *μ, υ*
 as frequently occurs with *n* and this *u* with the preceding
ο has become *ú (y)** *Mnĩ* the lesser (m), fem *menshu*
 neuter *mnyei* spring in like manner from a positive which
 has been lost *Bolu* the greater fem *bolshu* neuter *bolye*
 may be compared with the Sanskrit *baliyān* the stronger
 (p 396) fem *baliyasi*, neuter *baliyas* † Γοι [G Ed p 42°]
bolu is also used *bolyei* and all the remaining comparatives
 which belong to this class have *yei* for *ĩ* and thus answer
 better to the neuter form *yee* If as appears to be the case the
 form *yei* is the genuine one, then *ye* answers to the Sanskrit
yas of *ju yas*, *bhũ yas*, *vr̥ yas* &c (§ 300) and the loss of the
v is explained by § 255 (l) the final *i* of *ye-i* however is the
 definitive pronoun (§ 284) for comparatives always follow
 in the masculine and neuter the definite declension In the
 feminine in *shu* it is easy to recognise the Sanskrit *si* of *iyas i*
oi yas i and herewith also the Gothic *ei* (oblique theme *LLIN*

The *a* in *αμειων* appears to me to be privative so that *μειων* would
 seem to be a sister form to the Latin *minor* Gothic *minni* a Slavonic
mnu and *αμειων* would properly signify 'the not lesser the not
 more trifling' Perhaps this word is also inherent in *omnis* so that *ο*
 for *a* would be the negation which in Latin appears as *in*, where it
 may be observed that in Sanskrit *a sakrit* literally 'not once' has taken
 the representation of the meaning several times

† The positive *ielĩ* with *v* for *b* and *e* for *o* occurs only in this de-
 finite form (Dobr p 390) the primitive and indefinite form must be *iel*
 With respect to the stronger *ο* corresponding to the weaker letter *e*
 (§ 200 a) *bolu* in the positive answers to the manner in which vowels
 are strengthened in Sanskrit as mentioned at § 298

p 418 G ed), that is to say, *bol-shi*, "the greater (fem.)," corresponds to the Sanskrit बलियसि *balīyasī*, "the stronger (f)," and *menshi*, "the lesser," to the Gothic *minn-izei*. While, therefore, the Slavonic masculine and neuter have lost the *s* of the Sanskrit *yas*, the feminine has lost the *ya* of *yas-ī**. This feminine *shi*, also, in departure from (2) and (3), keeps free from the definite pronoun. There are some comparative adverbs in *e*, as the abbreviation of *ye* (§. 255. n.), which in like manner dispense with the definite pronoun, thus, *úně*, "better", *bole*, "greater" in Serbian MSS *únye*, *bolye*, [G Ed p 423.] *pache*, "more," probably related to *παχύς*, *πάσσων*, so that (which is very obscure) the final vowel of *pache* for *pach-ye*, for reasons which have been given before, is, in fact, identical with the Greek *σο* of *πάσ-σον*, for *πασ-γον*. The *ch* of *pache* may, according to p 415 G ed., be regarded as a modification of *k*, as the first *σ* of *πάσσων* has developed itself from *χ*. Thus the *ζ* of *dolž-ye*, "longer" (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the *g* of *dolg*, *dolga*, *dolgo* (*longus*, *a*, *um*), answers remarkably to the Greek *ζ* in *μείζων*, *ὀλίζων*, for *μείγων*, *ὀλίγων*. That, however, the positive *dolg* is connected with the Greek *δολιχός* needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskrit दीर्घस् *dīrgha-s*, of the same meaning, in which the frequently-occurring interchange between *r* and *l* is

* It may be proper here to call remembrance to the past gerund, properly a participle, which in the strong cases *váns*, nom masc *ván* for *vans*, fem *ushi*, neuter *vat* (for *vas*), corresponds to the Sanskrit of the reduplicated preterite in *vas*. The Old Slavonic has here, in the nominative masculine, where the *s* should stand at the end, lost this letter, according to § 255 (l), as *by-v*, "qui fuit," but *by-ushi*, "quæ fuit", and in the masculine also, in preference to the comparative, the *s* again appears in the oblique cases, because there, in the Sanskrit, after the *s* follow terminations beginning with a vowel, so in *iek-sh*, "eum qui dixit," the *sh* corresponds to the Sanskrit *váns-am*, as *ru ud-váns-am*, "eum qui plorat"

to be noticed (§ 20) The *i* of *δολιχος* however shews itself by the evidence of the Slavonic and Sanskrit to be an organic addition Let *garyec pejus* be compared with the Sanskrit *gariyas* "gracius from *guru*, heavy"—according to Burnouf's correct remark from *garu* as this adjective is pronounced in Pali—through the assimilating influence of the final *u* to which the kindred Greek *βαρυς* has permitted no euphonic reaction

(2) The second by far the most prevalent form of the Old Slavonic comparative is nominative masculine *shu*, feminine *shaya* neuter *shee* The *i* of *shu* is the definitive pronoun which in the feminine is *ya* and in the neuter *e* for *ye* (§§ 282 284) After the loss then of this pronoun there remains *shu sha she*, and these are abbreviations of *shyo shya shye* as we have seen p 33² G ed., the adjective base *SIN* \ddot{I} *O* (nominative *siny*) before its union with the defining *i* contracted to *sin* (*sin* *i* neuter *sine* *e* for *sinye* *ye*) The definite feminine of *SIN* \ddot{I} *O* is *sinya* *ya* and as to the feminine comparatives not being *shya* *ya* but *sha* *ya* this rests on the special ground that sibilants glide free themselves from a following *y* especially [G Ed p 4⁰⁴] before *a* (Dobrowsky p 12) so in the feminine nominatives *dúsha súsha chasha* for *súsyá* &c. (Dobr p 279) The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskrit *यस* *yas* and Zend *yas* (p 101) is therefore to be taken thus that the *ya* which precedes the sibilant is suppressed, as in the above feminines in *shu* but for it at the end is added an unorganic \ddot{I} *O* which corresponds to the Gothic Lithuanian \ddot{I} *A* in the themes *NIU* \ddot{I} *A* *NAU* \ddot{I} *A* new answering to *नव* *nava* *NOIU* *NEO* Slavonic *NOI* *O* This adjunct \ddot{I} *O* has preserved the comparative sibilant in the masculine and neuter which in the first formation must yield to the euphonic law § 255 (1) Examples of this second formation are, *un shu* the better (*m*) feminine

ûn-shaya, neuter *ûn-shee*, *pûst-shiř* from *pûst*, theme *PÛSTO*, "desert" Hence it is clear that the final vowel of the positive base is rejected, as in all the cognate languages, however difficult the combination of the *t* with *sh*. Even whole suffixes are rejected, in accordance with § 298, as, *glûb-shiř* from *glûbok*, "deep" (definite, *glûbok-y-ř*), *sladshiř* from *sladok*, "sweet."*

(3) Masculine *yeřshiř*, feminine *yeřshaya*, neuter *yeřshee*; but after *sch*, *sh*, and *ch*, *ař* stands for *yeř* and this *ař* evidently stands only euphonomically for *yař*, since the said sibilants, as [G Ed p 425] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following *y* hence *blasch-ařshiř*, "the better" (masculine), from *blag* (theme *BLAGO*), "good,"† since *g*, through the influence of the *y* following, gives way to a sibilant, which has subsequently absorbed the *y*, compare *ôliř-won*, for *ôli-g-won*, *ôli-g-won* (p 402) so *tish-aishiř*, from *tich* (theme *TICHO*), "still,"‡ as in the Greek *θάσ-σων* from *ταχύς*. As example of the form

- I hold *ho*, whence in the nom masc *h*, for the suffix of the positive base, but the preceding *o* for the final vowel of the lost primitive, and this *o* corresponds either to a Sanskrit *a*, according to § 255 (a), or to an *u*, according to § 255 (c), for example, *tano-h*, "thin," theme *TANOKO*, corresponds to the Sanskrit *tanu-s*, "thin," Greek *τανν*, and *slado-h* to the Sanskrit *swâdu-s*, "sweet," with exchange of the *v* for *l*, according to § 20 Thus the above *slad-shiř* shews itself to be originally identical, as well in the suffix of the positive as of the other degrees with the Greek *ήδ-ίων* and Gothic *sut iza* (§ 304), far as the external difference may separate them, and to the Slavonic is due, as to the truer preservation of the fundamental word, the preference above the Greek and Gothic, although, on account of the unexpected transition of the *v* into *l*, the origin of the Slavonic word is more difficult to recognise

† Dobrowsky says (p 334) from *blagyn* (this is the definite, see § 284) it is, however, evident that the comparative has not arisen from the adjective compounded with a pronoun, but from the simple indefinite one

‡ Compare the Sanskrit adverb *tishnîm*, "still, silent," and refer to § 205 (m)

with *yei yun yeishu* junior from *yun* may serve
 Whence comes then the *yei* or *ai* (for *yai*) which distin-
 guishes this formation from the second? It might be sup-
 posed that to the first formation in *yei* where for example
 also *yun yei* the younger (in) occurs that of the
 second has also been added as in Old High German
mêraro the greater (masculine) and in Gothic probably
rairsra the worse (p. 105) are raised twice to the com-
 parative degree and as in Persian the superlatives *in t rin*
 in my opinion contain as their last element the compara-
 tive 𐎠𐎡𐎢 *iyâi* which forms in the nominative masculine
iyân and from this could be easily contracted to *in*. In
 Persian the comparative is formed through *ter* as *behter*
 the better whence *behterin* 'the best'. Now it deserves
 remark that in Old Slavonic the formation before us fre-
 quently occurs with a superlative meaning while in the
 more modern dialects the superlative relation is expressed
 through the comparative with *na* more prefixed (pro-
 bably from *maï* = Gothic *mais* according to § 225 l). The
 only objection to this mode of explanation [C F] 1 4 6
 is this that the element of the first formation *ye i* has not
 once had aside the definitive pronoun *i* which is foreign
 to the comparative so that therefore in *yun yei shu* the
 said pronoun would be contained twice. There is how-
 ever another way of explaining this *yeishu* or (*y*)*aishu*
 namely as an exact transmission of the Sanskrit *iyas* or *yas*,
 from which the second formation has only preserved the
 sibilant but the third together with this letter may have
 retained also that which preceded. Still even in this method
 the *i* of *yei* (*y*)*ai* is embarrassing if it be not assumed that
 it owes its origin to a transposition of the *i* of *iya*.

306 As to the remark made at p. 100 that among the
 European languages the Greek only has preserved the
 𐎠𐎡𐎢 which the Sanskrit shows in the strong cases of the
 comparative suffix *iyâus* I must here admit a limitation in

favour of the Lithuanian, which, exceeding in this point the Greek, continues not only the nasal, but also the comparative sibilant through all the cases. For an example, *gerésnis*, "the better" (\bar{m}), may serve, with which we would compare the-Sanskrit *garíyánsam*, "*gravioem*" (nominative *garíyán*). It may be, but it is not of much consequence to us, that *gerésnis* and *garíyáns* (strong theme) are also connected in the positive base, so that, as according to p. 398, in Greek and Gothic goodness is measured by depth, in Lithuanian it is measured by weight. The Sanskrit comparative under discussion means, also, not only "heavier," or "very heavy," but also, according to Wilson, "highly venerable." In order, however, to analyze the Lithuanian *gerésnis*, we must observe that *gerésnis* stands for *gerésmas*, and the theme is clearly *GERÉSNIA*, hence genitive *gerésnio*, dative *gerésniam*, as *géro*, *gerám*, from *géra-s*.

[G Ed p 427] The termination *ia*, therefore for which *ya* might be expected, the *y* of which, as it appears for the avoiding of a great accumulation of consonants, has been resolved into *i* corresponds to the unorganic addition which we, p 411, have observed in Slavonic comparatives. We have now *geresn* remaining, which I regard as a metathesis from *gerens*,† through which we come very near the Sanskrit *garíyáns*. But we come still nearer to it through the observation, that, in Lithuanian, *e* is often produced by the euphonic influence of \acute{a} preceding *y* or *i* (§ 193). We believe, therefore, that here also we may explain *gerésn* as from *geryasn* (*geriyans*), and further recall attention to the Zend 𑀀𑀂𑀇𑀃𑀓𑀉𑀌 *mašyéhí* (§. 300)

* In the Lith. comparative adverbs like *daugiaus*, "more," *mašaus*, "less," I regard the *u* as the vocalization of the *n*, thus *daugiaus* from *daugians*, where *ians*=Skr. *iyáns* of the strong cases

† This has been already alluded to by Grimm (III 635, Note *), who has, however, given the preference to another explanation, by which *esnis* is similarly arrived at with the Latin *issimus*

The emphasis upon the *e* of *geresnis* may be attributable to the original length in the Sanskrit strong theme *gariyans*. Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian even to the present day continues to use the Sanskrit comparative suffix *yāns* or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend *yāns*.

307 The Lithuanian superlative suffix is only another modification of the comparative. The nasal that is to say which in the latter is transposed is in the superlative left in its original place. It is however as often happens resolved into *u** and to the *s* which ends the theme in the Sanskrit which in Lithuanian is not declinable (§ 128) is added *ia*. Hence *GERAUSIA* the nominative of which however in departure from *geresnis* has dropped not the *a* but the *i* thus *gerausa*; gen *gerausio* and in the feminine *gerausa* *gerausios* in which forms [G Ed p 428] contrary to the principle which is very generally followed in the comparative and elsewhere the *i* has exercised no euphonic influence.

Remark — With respect to the Sanskrit gradation suffixes *tara tama* I have further to add that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition *उत् ut* hence *ut tara* the higher *ut tama* the highest as above (§ 295) *af tama* and in Latin *ex timus in timus*. I think however I recognise the base of *ut tara ut tama* in the Greek *υς* of *ὑς τερος υς τατος* with the unorganic spir *asp* as in *εκατερος*, corresponding to the Sanskrit *ekatara s* and with *σ* from *τ* (compare § 99) in which it is to be remarked that also in the Zend for *ut tara ut tama* according to § 102 *us tara us tema* might be expected.

* Comp § 255 (*g*) in addition to which it may be here further remarked, that in all probability the *u* also in Gothic conjunctives like *haitau haitaujan*, is of nasal origin.

NUMERALS.

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

308. I. In the designation of the number *one* great difference prevails among the Indo-European languages, which springs from this, that this number is expressed by pronouns of the 3d person, whose original abundance affords satisfactory explanation regarding the multiplicity of expressions for *one*. The Sanskrit *éka*, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek *ἐκάτερος*, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base *é*, of which hereafter, with the interrogative base *ka*, which also, in combination with *api*, "also" (nom masc. *kó'pi*), signifies "whoever", and even without this *api*, if an interrogative expression precedes, as Bhagavad-Gîtâ, II 21, कथं स पुरुषः पार्थ कश्चातयति हन्ति कम् *kathan sa purushah Pârtha kan ghâtayati hanti kam*, "How can this person, O Pârtha, cause one to be slain, (or)slay one?" The Zend *āva* [G Ed p 429] *āva*, is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs *éva*, "also," "only," &c, and *évam*, "so," of which the latter is an accusative, and the former, perhaps, an instrumental, according to the principle of the Zend language (§ 158.) The Gothic *ain*'-s, theme *AINA*, our *emer*, is based on the Sanskrit defective pronoun *éna* (§. 72) whence, among others, comes the accusative masculine *éna-m*, "this" To this pronominal base belongs, perhaps, also the Old Latin *oinos*, which occurs in the Scipionian epitaphs, from which the more modern *únus* may be deduced, through the usual transition of the old *ō* into *u*, which latter is lengthened to make up for the *i* suppressed Still *únus* shews, also, a surprising resemblance to the Sanskrit *úna*-s, which properly means "less," and is prefixed to the higher numerals in order to express diminution by one, as, *únavimshati*, "undeviginti," *únatvīnshat*, "undetrīginta" This *únas* could

not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of *ūnus* or more anciently *unus*. The Greek EN is founded it is highly probable in like manner on the demonstrative base एन *ena* and has lost its final vowel as the Gothic *AINA* in the masculine nominative *ains* with respect to the *e* for *é* compare *εκατερος*. On the other hand *οἷος*, *unicus* if it has arisen from *οἷος* compare *οἶμος*) as *μειζω* from *μειζοια* has retained the Indian diphthong more truly and has also preserved the final vowel of एन *éna*. If *οἷος* the number one in dice really has its name from the idea of unity one might refer this word to the demonstrative base अना *ana* Slavonic *ONO* (nominative *on* 'that') which also plays a part in the formation of words where *οιη* corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *aná* (feminine of the masculine and neuter *anu*) if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in *ana* as *μονη* to *mána*. The Old Slavonic *yedni* one is clearly connected with the Sanskrit चादि *ādi* the first with *y* which has been prefixed according to § 255 (n) on the other hand in the Lithuanian *uena* s [G Ed p 430] if it is connected with the Gothic *AINA* and Sanskrit एन *ena* an *unor*, *unic* *w* has been prefixed. In regard to the *ie* for *é* compare also *wies te* knowledge with वेदि *vedni* I know.

Remark —The German has some remarkable expressions in which the number *one* lies very much concealed as to its form, and partly too as to its idea they are in Gothic *haihs* one eyed *hanfs* one handed *hallts* lame and *halbs* half. In all these words the number one is expressed by *ha*, and in this syllable I recognise a corruption of the abovementioned Sanskrit क *ka* for एक *éka* one which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§ 87). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend *ha* of *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺* *ha kerit* once (Sanskrit सकृत् *sakrit*) as the Zend *h*

thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan*, *trayô-daśan*—cuphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *deszint's* as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and *δέκα* resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *ze* in *onze*, *douze*, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika*, *dwy-lika*, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—*as*, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from *एकादशन्* *ekā-daśan*, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek *ἑνδέκα*, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, *δῶδεκα* is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dwā-daśa*

also, the number ten, in compounds like *on-ze*, *dou-ze*, *trei ze*, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable *ze* to be akin, or originally identical with *dix*, if it were not historically certain that *onze*, *douze*, &c., have arisen from *undecim*, *duodecim*, and that therefore *ze* is a corruption of *decim*, as *dix* is a less vitiated form of *decem*. If, then, *onze*, *douze*, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our *eif* and *zuolf*, in which, perhaps, as in *onze* and *douze*, a connection with *ein* and *zwei* may be recognised, but none with *zehn*; and in the English eleven, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not *dreif*, *vierf*, or similar forms in *f*, but *dreizehn*, *vierzehn*, &c., in which *zehn* is just as unaltered as the *drei* and *vier*, this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying *and* was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while *τρίδεκα*, *δώδεκα*, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of *τρισκαίδεκα* (for *τρίδεκα*) is "thrice and ten," and the numeral adverb *τρίς*, instead of the bare theme *τρι*, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα*, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit *chatur-dāśan*, not *chatur-dāśan* (*chatur-dāśan*). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number

[G. Ed. p. 451.] simple number must be regulated.* The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Slavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition *na*, "over"; e. g. in Old Slavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, *chetyri-na-desyaty*, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are *yedinyi-na-desyaty*, "the first over ten," *vtoryi-na-desyaty*, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which *weenpazmit* signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the *d(e)s* of *desmit*, "ten," to *z*, and overleaping the *e*. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older *lika* being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkrit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this

* Grimm's view is certainly much more natural, "ten and one over, two over." Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies "and over, or more;" and not an exponent of the idea "to leave," "to remain." It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Slavonic. J. Grimm, in his "History of the German Language," p. 246, agrees with my explanation of *eilf*, *zwölf*, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.

(ω for δ , according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as υ (F) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ from $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), for $\delta\delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ could not be uttered. In Latin, *duodecim* has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said *unze*, *deuze*, *troize*, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our *elf* (*elf*) and *zwölf*, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with *daśan*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$, and *zehn*. If, however, the older *LIBI*, *lif*, and Lithuanian *lika*, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root *lik*, and in Gothic *lif* or *lib* (Gothic *af-lifnan*, "*relinqui, superesse*," *laibós*, "*reliquiæ*"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\omega$ ($\Delta\Pi\Pi$). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our *lif* and the Lithuanian *lika*, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from *likli*, "*linqui, remanere*," the former from *leiban*, "*manere*." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds *lika* for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative *lika* (from *likù* s. *liekmi*); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding

“twelve,” answers to the abovementioned Prâkṛit चारह *bâraha*, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form द्वादश *dvâdaśa*, without heeding the form of the simple *do*, “two,” and *das*, “ten.” It may be proper here to quote all the Hindûstânî compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskrit words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindûstânî.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

HINDÛSTÂNÎ.		SANSKRIT, NOMINATIVE.	
<i>ék</i>	1, <i>igâ-rah</i> , - 11,	<i>ékâdaśa</i>	11.
<i>do</i>	2, <i>bâ-rah</i> 12,	<i>dvâdaśa</i>	12.
<i>tîn</i>	3, <i>têrah</i> 13,	<i>trayôdaśa</i>	13.
<i>châr</i>	4, <i>chau-dah</i> 14,*	<i>chaturdaśa</i>	14.
<i>pânch</i>	5, <i>pand-rah</i> 15,	<i>pañchâdaśa</i>	15.
<i>chhah</i>	6, <i>sô-lah</i> 16,†	<i>ṣhōḍaśa</i>	16.
<i>sât</i>	7, <i>sat-rah</i> 17,	<i>saptadaśa</i>	17.
<i>âth</i>	8, <i>aṭhâ-rah</i> 18,	<i>aṣṭâdaśa</i>	18.
<i>nau</i>	9, <i>unnâs</i> 19,	<i>ânaviṅśati</i> (“ <i>undeviginti</i> ”) 19.	
<i>das</i>	10, <i>bîs</i> 20,	<i>viṅśati</i> 20.	

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by शत *śati*, शत *śat* or त *ti*; in Zend by 𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬎 *śaiti*, 𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬎 *śata*, or 𐬯 *ti*; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskrit, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

* The retention of the *d* is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with *r*, although in the Hindûstânî corruption this is no longer present. The Bengâlî has assimilated the *r* to the following *d*, hence *châuddo*; but, as a general rule, the Bengâlî in these compounds changes the *d* into *r*, and in all cases suppresses the Hindûstânî *h*; as *égâro*, “eleven,” *bâro*, “twelve,” *têro*, “thirteen.”

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its *l* for the *r* found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German *lika*, *lif*. The Bengâlî is *shôlo*.

subject,* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of *Urvasi* (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह *daha*—approaching closely to the Gothic *taihun*—but at the end of the compounds under notice *raha*: *r* and *l*, however, are, according to §. 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, चारह *čāraha*, “twelve,” from द्वादश *dwādaśa*, and अठारह *aṭhāraha*, “eighteen,” from अष्टादश *aṣṭādaśa*, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this cate- [G. Ed. p. 452.] gory, have an *r* for *d*, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the *d* for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this *raha* we should be led to the root *rah*, “to leave,” which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstānī grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced *das*.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes *rah*,‡ and, for example, *bārah*,

* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and *Histor. Philol. Trans. of the Academy for the year 1833*, p. 178, &c.

† The *a* of *rah* has been weakened in the cognate languages to *i*: hence *linguo*, Lithuanian *likù*, Greek *λείπω* (*ἐλιπον*), Gothic *af-lif-na*. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§ 20. 23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian *lakù*, “I lick,” with the Sanskrit root *lih*, “to lick.” Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin *linguo*, Greek *λείπω*, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Skt. root *rich*, from *rikh*, “to leave.”

‡ The text has *des* and *reh*, but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstānī numerals which follow.—*Translator*.

in Lithuanian and Slavonic, already containe simple *deszimt's*, *deszimtis*, Old Slavonic *desyu* regard, however, to the ten being expressed abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in c also—as in Lithuanian *dvideszimti* (or *tis*), *trysdeszimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sla *tyridesyaty*, “forty,”* *pyatydesyaty*, “fifty”—I do not

[G. Ed. p. 455.] this as a more true retention of form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and former in the feminine plural, e.g. *keturios deszimti*; *penkios deszimtis*, “fifty”; in which it is su *deszimtis*, also, does not stand in the plural. This method in this numeral category is of com; recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the compound, and gives, in the numbers under (sixty does not occur), *tigus*, masculine, as the e for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, number also, with regular plural terminations: 1 accusatives *tvanstiguns*, *thrinstiguns*, *fidvortigus*, 2 genitive *thrijetigvé*. The substantive *tigus*, h the etymological quaver to *taihun*, and *LIBI*: it to the former essentially, the aspirate having medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the *a*, which, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned i superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials *ginta*, contrasted with the Greek *κατι, κοντα*, which better to *δέκα*. *Tigu-s* may be identical with skrit ordinal *daśa*, nominative masculine *daśa-* occurs only in compounds, as *dvādaśa-s*, “the To this *daśa-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in its *u*, as *fōtu-s* to *pāda-s*, “a foot.” In the seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by th

* Twenty and thirty do not occur.

in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in *विंशति* *viṅśati*, *ῥῶσῶσῶσῶσῶ* *vīśaiti*, *εἴκατι*, *εἴκοσι*, *viginti*, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the *d* of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce *bis* from *dwis*, and *bi* from *dwi*, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of *विंशति* *viṅśati*, the Prâkrit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the *d* in the number twelve also (*vâraha* for *dwârcha*). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indô-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the *ze* of *douze* is therefore identical with the Sanskrit *śa* of *विंशति* *viṅśati*. The Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word *daśati* to be melted down to the derivation suffix *ti*, and this *ti* corresponds to the French *te* of *trente*, *quarante*, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, *षष्टि* *ṣaṣṭi* (*ti* -uphonic for *ti*), *ῥῶσῶσῶσῶσῶ* *cvasti*. To the *śati* of *विंशति* *viṅśati* *ῥῶσῶσῶσῶ* *vīśati*, regularly corresponds the Doric *κατι* of *εἴκατι*, while in the Latin *ginti* the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in *ginta* = *κοῦτα* of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the *ni* of *viṅśati*,

substantive *téhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *téhundi-s*); hence *sibun-téhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-téhund*, "eighty," *niun-téhund*, "ninety." The *é* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N*, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "decimus." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zēhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntéhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend *śata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative *शतम् śatam*, *᠑᠑᠙᠐᠕᠗ śatēm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the Zend *᠑᠑᠙᠐᠕᠗ śata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primi- [G. Ed. p 456] tive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek *κατόν* (*ἑκατόν* is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szimta-s* (masculine), Old Slavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA*, *HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, as *tva-hūnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zuei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the corresponding words

* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *śata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.

ORDINAL NUMBERS.

321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are [G. Ed. p. 458.] almost unanimous in their designation of *the first*, which idea none of the languages here treated of derives from the corresponding cardinal number: Sanskrit प्रथमस् *prathama-s* (nom), Zend 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *frathēmō* (§. 56^b), Latin *primu-s*, Lithuanian *prima-s*, Gothic *frum'-s* (for *frūma-s*, §. 135.), or indefinite *fruma* (theme *FRUMAN*, §. 140.), or, with newly-added superlative suffix, *frumist'-s*, Old High German *éristēr*, usually indefinite *éristo* (from the adverb *ēr*, “before”), Greek πρῶτος, Old Slavonic *pervyjŭ*. प्रथम *prathama*, from the preposition *pra*, has been already discussed (p. 393 G. ed.); so the Greek πρῶτος is derived from the corresponding preposition πρὸ, the lengthening of which to πρῶ accords with the Sanskrit *prā* in *prātar*, “in the morning” (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix *TO* is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *tama* or *thama*, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चतुर्थेस् *chatur-tha-s*, “the fourth,” and षष्ठेस् *ṣaṣṭh-tha-s*, “the sixth,” as also in Latin in the form of *TU* in *quartus*, *quintus*, *sextus*, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δεύτερος, ἔβδομος, and ὀγδοός. In Lithuanian the corresponding *TA* of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with *septintas*, *asztuntas*, occur also *sėkmas*, *ąszmas*, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तमस् *saptama-s*, अष्टमस् *aṣṭama-s*, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix *tama* or *thama* has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चमस् *pañchama-s*, नवमस् *navama-s*, and दशमस् *daśama-s*, partake, which therefore complete, by their suffix, the *tha* of *chaturtha*, so that both united present the perfect word. The Zend agrees herein with the Sanskrit, only that its 𐬨𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *haptithō* agrees more with *septintas* than with सप्तमस् *saptama-s* and *septimu-s*; and

triṅśat, *chatvāriṅśat*, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin *ginti*, *ginta*, *centum*, and in the Gothic *HUNDA*, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, *chatvāriṅśat* shews its relation to the neuter *chatuāri* (see §. 312.); as also *τρια*, *τεσσαρα* in *τριάκοντα*, *τεσσαράκοντα*, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in *τριᾶ*, and originally, also, in *τεσσαρα*, as* the Ionic *τεσσαρήκοντα*, Doric *τετρώκοντα*,* Latin *quadraginta*, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskrit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long *i* of the Zend *vīśaiti*, as in the long *a* of पञ्चाशत् *pañchāśat*, ἑξήκοντα *pañchāśatēm* from *pañchan* (§. 318.), and to which again the length of *πεντήκοντα*, *quinquaginta*, runs parallel. The Zend *chathuarē*, in *μρμωξλωδβωρ chathwarēśata*, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 390), is likewise stronger than *cha-thru-śata*, which might have been expected from §. 312. As *μρμω śata* is a neuter, to which, in Greek, *κατον* or *κοντον* would correspond, *κοντα* therefore, and the Latin *ginta*, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of *τριᾶ* and *τεσσαρα* is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in *ἐξήκοντα*, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that *ἐξη*, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare *ἐξά-κεις*, *ἐξαπλοῦς*, and the remarks on *πάντα* and *πολλά*, p. 401, G. ed.

* The *ω* for *ᾶ* is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the *ρ*, *τερω* answers to *τετρα* in *τετράκεις*, *τετραπλοῦς*, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.

[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus*, as in Sanskrit *viṅśatitama-s*, *triṅśattama-s*.* In Latin, however, the termination *nti* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *ē*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit *इश्व* *ishtha*, in the ordinal numbers like *εἰκοστός, τριακοστός*, with the loss of the *ι* of *ιστος*, as in *ἑκαστος, πόστος*. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the *τι, σι*, and *ντα* of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German *drī-zugōsto*, "the thirtieth," *fior-zugōsto*, "the fortieth": but in the numbers from four to nineteen the *TAN* or *DAN*, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§. 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in *चतुर्थस् chaturtha-s*, *τέταρτο-s*, *quartu-s*, *ketwir-la-s*. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—*vierter*, "fourth," *fünfter*, "fifth," &c.; hence, Gothic *FIMFTAN*, nom. masc. *fimfta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base *द्वि* *dwi* "two" (p. 424), and from the *त्रि* *tri*, "three," contracted to *त्रि* *tri*, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix *तृया*; hence *dwi-tṛya-s*, *tri-tṛya-s*. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin *ter-*

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of *ἐκάδα-s*, "the eleventh"; hence, also, *viṅśa*, *triṅśa*, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like *fimftataihunda*, "the fifteenth," the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or *fimfta* is here the regular abbreviation of the theme *FIMFTAN*, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Berl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.

that also पञ्चमं *puḡ-dhó*, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian *penk-ta-s*. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, πενταος for πεντος ; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, *basta* from *bandhi*), and irregularly changed the *a* to *u*, as in "ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख *nakha*, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दशमं *daśama*, दशमं *daśēma*, and of all the derivational suffix only the *a* is left, before which the *a* of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादश *duā-daśa*, द्वादश *dvadaśa*, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दश *chaturdaśa*, चतुर्दश *chathrudāśa*, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its *undecimus*, *duodecimus*, not *undecus*, *duodecus*; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in *lf*: hence, *tertius decimus* for the lost *tredecimus*, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend *daśa* is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms *octav-us*, ὄγδο(F)-ος , where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὄγδομος , *octomus*. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix *simu-s* (from *timu-s* = तमस् *tama-s*); thus *vicesimus* or *vige-*

answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek *δύτερος*, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend *bitya*, only that it has lost also the *i* of the Sanskrit *dvi-tīya*, in regard to which we have, in §. 297., adverted to the Zend *εῷωδδ* *b-yūrē**, "two years."

323. We give here a general view of the ordinal numbers in the feminine nominative singular, since in this case the agreement of all the languages strikes the eye more than in the nominative masculine. The Gothic forms which do not occur we give in parentheses, formed theoretically, and according to the Old High German.

[G. Ed. p. 463.]

NOMINATIVE FEMININE.

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GR. DOR.	LATIN.	GOthic.	LITHUANIAN.	OLD SLAVONIC.
<i>prathamā,</i>	<i>frathēma,</i> ¹	<i>πρώτῃ.</i>	<i>prima,</i>	<i>fruma,</i>	<i>pirmà,</i>	<i>perva-ya.</i>
<i>dwitīyā,</i>	<i>bitya,</i>	<i>δευτέρῃ,</i>	<i>altera,</i>	<i>anthara,</i>	<i>antrà,</i>	<i>vtora-ya.</i>
<i>trītiyā,</i>	<i>thritya,</i>	<i>τρίτῃ,</i>	<i>tertia,</i>	<i>thridyó,</i>	<i>trėchià,</i>	<i>treči-ya.</i>
<i>chaturthā,</i> ²	<i>tūrya,</i>	<i>τετάρτῃ,</i>	<i>quarta,</i>	<i>(fidvórdó),</i>	<i>ketwirtà,</i>	<i>chetverta-ya.</i>
<i>panchamā,</i>	<i>puḡdha,</i>	<i>πέμπτῃ,</i>	<i>quinta,</i>	<i>fmstó,</i>	<i>penktà,</i>	<i>pyata-ya.</i> ³
<i>ṣaṣṭhā,</i>	<i>cstvā,</i> ⁴	<i>ἕκτῃ,</i>	<i>sexta,</i>	<i>saihsstó,</i>	<i>szėszta,</i>	<i>shesta-ya.</i>
<i>saptamā,</i>	<i>haptatha,</i>	<i>ἑβδόμῃ,</i>	<i>septima,</i>	<i>(sibundó),</i>	<i>sėkma,</i>	<i>sedma-ya.</i>
<i>aṣṭamā,</i>	<i>astēma,</i>	<i>ὀγδόῃ,</i>	<i>octava,</i>	<i>ahtudó,</i>	<i>ászma,</i>	<i>osma-ya.</i>
<i>navamā,</i>	<i>nāuma,</i>	<i>ἐννάτῃ,</i>	<i>nona,</i>	<i>niundó,</i>	<i>dewintà,</i> ⁵	<i>devyata-ya.</i> ⁵
<i>daśamā,</i>	<i>daśma,</i>	<i>δεκάτῃ,</i>	<i>decima,</i>	<i>taihundó,</i>	<i>deszimtà,</i>	<i>desyata-ya.</i>
<i>ēkādaśā,</i>	<i>aēvandaśa,</i> ⁶	<i>ἐνδεκάτῃ,</i>	<i>undecima,</i>	<i>(ainlistó),</i>	<i>wiėnólikta,</i>	<i>yedina-ya-na-desyaty.</i>
<i>viñśati-tamā,</i>	<i>vīsaitilēma</i> ?	<i>εἰκοστῃ,</i>	<i>vicesima,</i>	...	<i>dvidėszimtà,</i>	<i>vtoraya-na-desyaty.</i>

* We should read thus §. 297. for *byarē*, as accusative singular (see Olshausen, Vend. S. 43).

¹ More usually *paoirya*, masc. *paoiryó*, by which the Slavonic *pervyj*, *pervaya*, is, as it were, prepared.

² Also *turīyā*, masc. *turīya-s*, on which is based the Zend *tūrya*, masc. *tūiryó*. The suppression of the syllable *cha* might announce the looser connection of the same with the remaining portion of the word and thereby support the conjecture expressed at §. 311.

³ The *t* of *pyataya*, masc. *pyatyī*, has nothing in common with the *t* of the cardinal number *pyaty*; the proper primitive is *pya* (see p. 430 Note †), whence *PYATI* by the suffix *TI*, and *PYATO*, fem. *PYATA*, by the suffix *TO*, fem. *TA* (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to *shestayā* in relation to *shesty*, &c.

⁴ By transposition and syncope from *cvasta*, as must be expected from the cardinal number *εῷωδδ* *cvas*.

⁵ Regarding the *d* for *n*, see §. 317.

⁶ See §. 319, Note *, p. 435.

tius, as also in the Old Slavonic *treljī*, fem. *treljya*, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the *tyī* of *chetvertjī* and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with *तीय तीया* might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च *tha*, TO, TU of चतुर्वे *chaturtha*, τέταρτος, *quartus*, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective *chetvero*, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that *chetvertjī*, *shestyī*, have to *chaturtha-s*, *ṣhaṣṭha-s*, *sedmyī*, *osmyī*, have to सप्तम *saptama*, अष्टम *aṣṭama*; and *percyī*, "the first," to पूर्व *pūrva*, "the former;" which expressions, in Slavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base YO (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the *i* of the suffix *tīya*, and abbreviated *dvi* to *bi*; hence *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺* *bitya*, *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀓𑀲𑀺* *thritya*, in which it is to be remarked that the *y*, which is thus by syncope united with the *t* at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend *tya* corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle *i*, the Gothic *DYAN* (from *dya*, §. 285.) in *THRIDYAN*, nom. masc. *thridya*, the *y* of which in the Old High German *dritto*, has assimilated itself to the preceding *t*, in analogy with the Prākṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like *θάσσων*, *κρείσσων*, *κρείττων*, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with *διττός*, *τριττός* (*δισσός*, *τρισσός*), which are evidently, in [G. Id. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German *dritto* has to the Gothic *thriyda*. Regarding *tvaddyē*, "duorum," see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun *anthar* (see p. 377), Old High German *andar*, Middle High German *ander*. Our *zweiter*, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Slavonic *vtoryī* (see §. 297.)

The Greek forms in *κίς* like *τετράκις*, *πεντάκις*, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but *κίς* answers to the Sanskrit *śas* (§. 21.), the *a* being weakened to *i*; this *śas*, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as *śataśas*, "by hundreds," *sahasraśas*, "by thousands," *bahuśas*, "of many kinds," *gaṇaśas*, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but *e.g.* *śataśas* is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in *ἐκατοντάκις* the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like *quingies*, *sexies*, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in *s* like *duis*, *δίς*, nor with

[G. Ed. p. 465.] those in *κίς* (*śas*), by suppression of the guttural; but as *toties*, *quoties*, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced *quotiens*, *totiens*, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, *τιθείς* is more genuine than *τιθείς* (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in *ens*, *es*, into conjunction with the Sanskrit suffix *vant* (in the weak cases *vat*), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, *vañs*, *e.g.* *chvañs*, "how much," for *chivañs*. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base *ki*, and the demonstrative base *i*, laid aside the *v*; hence *kiy-ant*, *iy-ant*—weak form *kiyat*, *iyat*—nominative masculine *kiyān*, *iyān*; this *ant* for *vant* answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine *εις*), *e.g.* in *μελιτόεις*, and also to the Latin *ens*, in *totiens*, *quotiens*, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in *nt*, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide *toti-ens* *quoti-ens*, or *tot-iens*, *quot-iens*? In the former case *tot*, *quot*, would have preserved, in this combination, the *i*

“Remark.—As the old *a* of the preposition π *pra* has been weakened to *i*—as in *quinque*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamā*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition $\pi\rho\acute{o}$. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the *i* belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, ‘before’; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, ‘by, before,’ as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamā* that the Latin [G. Ed. p. 464.] and Lithuanian do: the *u* of *fru* has arisen from *a* through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition *fram*, ‘before, by,’ &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian *pirm*, the superlative *m* is contained. On π *pra* is based, also, *faur*, ‘before,’ with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas “twice,” “thrice,” “four times,” have been already discussed (p. 435, G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:—

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	OLD NORTHERN.
<i>dwis</i> ,	<i>bis</i> ,	$\delta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$,	<i>bis</i> ,	<i>tvis-var</i> (p. 436 G. ed.).
<i>tris</i> ,	<i>thris</i> ,	$\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$,	<i>ter</i> ,	<i>thris-var</i> .
<i>chatur</i> ,*	<i>chathrus</i> ,	<i>quater</i> ,

* According to §. 94. for *chatur*s.

also, the number ten, in compounds like *on-ze*, *dou-ze*, *trei-ze*, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable *ze* to be akin, or originally identical with *dix*, if it were not historically certain that *onze*, *douze*, &c., have arisen from *undecim*, *duodecim*, and that therefore *ze* is a corruption of *decim*, as *dix* is a less vitiated form of *decem*. If, then, *onze*, *douze*, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our *eilf* and *zuölf*, in which, perhaps, as in *onze* and *douze*, a connection with *ein* and *zwei* may be recognised, but none with *zehn*; and in the English *eieven*, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our *using* for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not *dreilf*, *vierlf*, or similar forms in *lf*, but *dreizehn*, *vierzehn*, &c., in which *zehn* is just as unaltered as the *drei* and *vier*, this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying *and* was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while *ἐνδεκα*, *δῶδεκα*, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of *τρισκαίδεκα* (for *τρῖδεκα*) is "thrice and ten," and the numeral adverb *τρίς*, instead of the bare theme *τρι*, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the *τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα*, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit *chatur-dāśan*, not *chatvāras-dāśan* (*chatvārś-dāśan*). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number

thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan*, *trayó-daśan*—cuphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *deszimt's* as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and *δέκα* resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *ze* in *onze*, *douze*, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika*, *dwy-lika*, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—ās, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from *एकादशन्* *éká-daśan*,

[G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek *ένδεκα*, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, *δῶδεκα* is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dwá-daśa*

(ω for $\acute{\alpha}$, according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as υ (F) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ from $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tau\alpha\rho\epsilon\varsigma$), for $\delta\delta\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha$ could not be uttered. In Latin, *duodecim* has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said *unze*, *deuze*, *troize*, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our *elf* (*elf*) and *zwölf*, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with *daśan*, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha$, and *zehn*. If, however, the older *LIBI*, *lif*, and Lithuanian *lika*, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root *lik*, and in Gothic *lif* or *lib* (Gothic *af-lifnan*, "*relinqui, superesse*," *laibós*, "*reliquiæ*"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\omega$ ($\Delta\Pi\Pi$). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our *lif* and the Lithuanian *lika*, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Rulig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from *likti*, "*linqui, remanere*," the former from *leiban*, "*manere*." Ruhig, according to Mielecke, p. 58, holds *lika* for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative *lika* (from *likù* s. *liekmi*); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding

[G. Ed. p. 451.] simple number must be regulated.”* The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Slavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition *na*, “over”; e. g. in Old Slavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, *chetyri-na-desyaty*, “four over ten.” The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are *yedinyĭ-na-desyaty*, “the first over ten,” *vtoryĭ-na-desyaty*, “the second over ten.” In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which *weenpazmit* signifies “eleven,” as it appears to me, with contraction of the *d(e)s* of *desmit*, “ten,” to *z*, and overleaping the *e*. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older *lika* being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkrit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this

* Grimm’s view is certainly much more natural, “ten and one over, two over.” Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies “and over, or more,” and not an exponent of the idea “to leave,” “to remain.” It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Slavonic. J. Grimm, in his “History of the German Language,” p. 246, agrees with my explanation of *eilf*, *zwölf*, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.

subject,* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of *Urvasi* (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह *daha*—approaching closely to the Gothic *taihun*—but at the end of the compounds under notice *raha*: *r* and *l*, however, are, according to §. 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, बारह *vāraha*, “twelve,” from द्वादश *dwādaśa*, and अठ्ठारह *aṭṭhāraha*, “eighteen,” from अष्टादश *aṣṭādaśa*, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this cate-

[G. Ed. p. 452.]
 gory, have an *r* for *d*, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the *d* for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this *raha* we should be led to the root *rah*, “to leave,” which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstānī grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced *das*.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes *rah*,§ and, for example, *bārah*,

* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and *Histor. Philol. Trans.* of the Academy for the year 1833, p. 178, &c.

† The *a* of *rah* has been weakened in the cognate languages to *i*: hence *linquo*, Lithuanian *likù*, Greek *λείπω* (*ἔλιπον*), Gothic *af-lif-na*. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§ 20. 23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian *lakù*, “I lick,” with the Sanskrit root *lih*, “to lick.” Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin *linquo*, Greek *λείπω*, Gothic *af-lif-na*, to the Skt. root *rich*, from *rik*, “to leave.”

‡ The text has *des* and *reh*, but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstānī numerals which follow.—*Translator*.

“twelve,” answers to the abovementioned Prâkṛit चारह *bâraha*, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskr̥it original form द्वादश *dvâdaśa*, without heeding the form of the simple *do*, “two,” and *das*, “ten.” It may be proper here to quote all the Hindûstânî compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskr̥it words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindûstânî.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

HINDÛSTÂNÎ.		SANSKR̥IT, NOMINATIVE.	
<i>ék</i>	1, <i>igâ-rah</i> , - 11,	<i>ékâdaśa</i>	11.
<i>do</i>	2, <i>bâ-rah</i> 12,	<i>dvâdaśa</i>	12.
<i>tîn</i>	3, <i>têrah</i> 13,	<i>trayôdaśa</i>	13.
<i>châr</i>	4, <i>chau-dah</i> 14,*	<i>chaturdaśa</i>	14.
<i>pâñch</i>	5, <i>pand-rah</i> 15,	<i>pañchâdaśa</i>	15.
<i>chhah</i>	6, <i>sô-lah</i> 16,†	<i>ṣhōḍaśa</i>	16.
<i>sât</i>	7, <i>sat-rah</i> 17,	<i>saptadaśa</i>	17.
<i>âth</i>	8, <i>athâ-rah</i> 18,	<i>aṣṭâdaśa</i>	18.
<i>nau</i>	9, <i>unnîs</i> 19,	<i>ânnavîṣati</i> (“ <i>undeviginti</i> ”) 19.	
<i>das</i>	10, <i>bîs</i> 20,	<i>viṣati</i> 20.	

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskr̥it by शत *śati*, शत् *śat* or ति *ti*; in Zend by 𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬎 *śaiti*, 𐬯𐬀𐬎𐬎 *śata*, or 𐬯𐬀 *ti*; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskr̥it, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

* The retention of the *d* is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with *r*, although in the Hindûstânî corruption this is no longer present. The Bengâlî has assimilated the *r* to the following *d*, hence *châuddo*; but, as a general rule, the Bengâlî in these compounds changes the *d* into *r*, and in all cases suppresses the Hindûstânî *h*; as *égâro*, “eleven,” *bâro*, “twelve,” *têro*, “thirteen.”

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its *l* for the *r* found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German *lika*, *lif*. The Bengâlî is *shôlo*.

dependent upon it. Occasionally, too, one finds these numerals in Sanskrit used adjectively, with plural endings. Compare, [G. Ed. p. 454.]

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.
20, विंशति <i>viñśati</i> ,	𐬑𐬀𐬯𐬎𐬎𐬱𐬭𐬀 <i>viśaiti</i> ,	είκати,	<i>viginti</i> ,
30, त्रिंशत् <i>triñśat</i> ,	𐬑𐬀𐬯𐬎𐬎𐬱𐬭𐬀𐬰𐬀 <i>thriśata</i> ,	τριάκοντα,	<i>triginta</i> .
40, चत्वारिंशत् <i>chathvariñśat</i> ,	<i>chathvariśata</i> ,	τεσσαράκοντα,	<i>quadraginta</i> .
50, पञ्चशत <i>pañchśat</i> ,	<i>pañchśata</i> ,	πεντήκοντα,	<i>quinguginta</i> .
60, शशष्टि,	<i>csvasti</i> ,	ἑξήκοντα,	<i>sexaginta</i> .
70, सप्तति,	<i>hapštiti</i> ,	ἑβδομήκοντα,†	<i>septuaginta</i> .
80, अष्टि, ~	ὀγδοήκοντα,	<i>octoginta</i> .
90, नावति,	<i>navaiti</i> ,	ἐνενήκοντα,	<i>nonaginta</i> .
100, शता-m,	<i>šate-m</i> ,	ἑ-κατό-ν,	<i>centu-m</i> .

"Remark.—I hold *śuti*, *śat*, *śata*, *ti*, to be abbreviations of *daśati*, *daśat*, *daśata*, and therefore derivations from *daśan*, "ten," by a suffix *ti*, *ta*, or *t*: the former is,

* The numerals in *śata*, answering to the Sanskrit forms in *śat*, are neuters, and occur, like the forms in *ti*, very frequently in the 6th and 12th Fargard of the Vendidad, but only in the accusative singular, in which *śatē* might also belong to a theme *śat*. That, however, *śata* is the theme and the neuter form is clear from Vend S. p. 270. (in the 7th Fargard), where *pañcha śatē* (*pañchāśatē*), "fifty," stands as nominative. From *csvasti*, "sixty," *hapštiti*, "seventy," and *navaiti*, "ninety," we find the accusative *csvastim*, *hapštīm*, *navaitim*: on the other hand, in the 12th Fargard, occurs several times *viśaiti* (also written *viśati* and *viśati*) as accusative of *viśaiti*, which perhaps is a dual neuter form (two decades), and according to this would stand for *viśaiti* (§. 210.). But if the final vowel is retained in its original form it is a singular neuter. It is, however, remarkable, that only this final *i*, and no other, is again found in the cognate Latin and Greek forms.

† This and the following number are renovated forms, in which the first member proceeds unorganically from the ordinal number. We might have expected *ἑπτήκοντα*, *ὀκτώκοντα*, for the latter Ion. *ὀγδώκοντα*. In *ἐνενήκοντα* the two *ν* are separated from each other: the epic form *ἐννήκοντα* is more genuine.

in Lithuanian and Slavonic, already containe simple *deszimt's*, *deszimtis*, Old Slavonic *desya* regard, however, to the ten being expressed abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in c also—as in Lithuanian *dvideszimti* (or *tis*), *trysdészimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sla *tyridesyaty*, “forty,”* *pyatydesyaty*, “fifty”—I do not [G. Ed. p. 455.] this as a more true retention of form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and former in the feminine plural, e.g. *keturios deszimti penkios deszimtis*, “fifty”; in which it is su *deszimtis*, also, does not stand in the plural. This method in this numeral category is of com; recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the compound, and gives, in the numbers under (sixty does not occur), *tigus*, masculine, as the e for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, number also, with regular plural terminations: 1 accusatives *tvanstiguns*, *thrinstiguns*, *fidvórtiguns*, 2 genitive *thriyétiguvé*. The substantive *tigus*, h the etymological quaver to *taihun*, and *LIBI*: it to the former essentially, the aspirate having medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the *a*, which, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned i superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials *ginta*, contrasted with the Greek *κατι, κοντα*, which better to *δέκα*. *Tigu-s* may be identical with skrit ordinal *daśa*, nominative masculine *daśa-* occurs only in compounds, as *dvádaśa-s*, “the To this *daśa-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in its *u*, as *fótu-s* to *páda-s*, “a foot.” In the seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by th

* Twenty and thirty do not occur.

substantive *têhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *têhundi-s*); hence *sibun-têhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-têhund*, "eighty," *niun-têhund*, "ninety." The *é* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N*, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "decimus." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zêhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntêhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend *śata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative *शतम् śatam*, *𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 śatēm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the Zend *𐬰𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎 śata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primitive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek *κατόν* (*ékaton* is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szimta-s* (masculine), Old Slavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA*, *HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, as *tva-hūnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zuei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also *शति śati*, *शत् śat*, and the corresponding words

* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *śata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.

in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in *विंशति* *viṅśati*, *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺* *vīśaiti*, *είκατι*, *είκοσι*, *viginti*, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the *d* of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce *bis* from *dwis*, and *bi* from *dwi*, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of *विंशति* *viṅśati*, the Prākṛit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the *d* in the number twelve also (*vāraha* for *dvārcha*). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indo-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the *ze* of *douze* is therefore identical with the Sanskrit *śa* of *विंशति* *viṅśati*. The Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word *daśati* to be melted down to the derivation suffix *ti*, and this *ti* corresponds to the French *te* of *trente*, *quarante*, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺* *śaṣṭi* (a *ti* -uphonic for *ti*), *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺* *cvasti*. To the *śati* of *विंशति* *viṅśati* *𑀧𑀲𑀭𑀸𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺𑀢𑀺* *vīśaiti*, regularly corresponds the Doric *κατι* of *είκατι*, while in the Latin *ginti* the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in *ginta* = *κοῦτα* of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the *ni* of *viṅśati*,

triṅśat, *chatvāriṅśat*, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin *ginti*, *ginta*, *centum*, and in the Gothic *HUNDA*, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, *chatvāriṅśat* shews its relation to the neuter *chatuāri* (see §. 312.); as also *τρια*, *τεσσαρα* in *τριάκοντα*, *τεσσαράκοντα*, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in *τριᾶ*, and originally, also, in *τεσσαρα*, as* the Ionic *τεσσαρήκοντα*, Doric *τετρώκοντα*,* Latin *quadraginta*, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskrit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long *i* of the Zend *vīśaiti*, as in the long *a* of पञ्चाशत् *pañchāśat*, *ἑξήκοντα* *hexēkōnta* *panchāśatēm* from *panchan* (§. 318.), and to which again the length of *πεντήκοντα*, *quinquaginta*, runs parallel. The Zend *chathuarē*, in *ἑξήκοντα* *chathwarēśata*, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 380), is likewise stronger than *cha-thru-śata*, which might have been expected from §. 312. As *ῥω* *śata* is a neuter, to which, in Greek, *κατον* or *κοντον* would correspond, *κοντα* therefore, and the Latin *ginta*, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of *τριᾶ* and *τεσσαρα* is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in *ἑξήκοντα*, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that *ἑξη*, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare *ἑξά-κις*, *ἑξαπλοῦς*, and the remarks on *πάντα* and *πολλά*, p. 401, G. ed.

* The *ω* for *ᾶ* is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the *ρ*, *τετρω* answers to *τετρα* in *τετράκις*, *τετραπλοῦς*, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.

ORDINAL NUMBERS.

321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are [G. Ed. p. 458.] almost unanimous in their designation of the *first*, which idea none of the languages here treated of derives from the corresponding cardinal number : Sanskrit प्रथमस् *prathama-s* (nom), Zend 𐬑𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *frathëmô* (§. 56^b.), Latin *primu-s*. Lithuanian *prima-s*, Gothic *frum'-s* (for *frūma-s*, §. 135.), or indefinite *fruma* (theme *FRUMAN*, §. 140.), or, * with newly-added superlative suffix, *frumist'-s*, Old High German *éristēr*, usually indefinite *éristo* (from the adverb *ēr*, “before”), Greek πρῶτος, Old Slavonic *pervyĭ*. प्रथम *prathamā*, from the preposition *pra*, has been already discussed (p. 393 G. ed.); so the Greek πρῶτος is derived from the corresponding preposition *πρό*, the lengthening of which to *πρω* accords with the Sanskrit *prā* in *prātar*, “in the morning” (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix TO is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit *tama* or *thama*, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चतुर्थस् *chatur-tha-s*, “the fourth,” and षष्ठस् *ṣaṣṭh-tha-s*, “the sixth,” as also in Latin in the form of *TU* in *quartus*, *quintus*, *sextus*, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δεύτερος, ἑβδόμος, and ὀγδοός. In Lithuanian the corresponding *TA* of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with *septintas*, *aszluntas*, occur also *sėkmas*, *ászmas*, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तमस् *saptama-s*, अष्टमस् *aṣṭama-s*, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix *tama* or *thama* has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चमस् *pañchama-s*, नवमस् *navama-s*, and दशमस् *daśama-s*, partake, which therefore complete, by their suffix, the *tha* of *chaturtha*, so that both united present the perfect word. The Zend agrees herein with the Sanskrit, only that its 𐬑𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀𐬎𐬀 *haptathō* agrees more with *septintas* than with सप्तमस् *saptama-s* and *septimu-s*; and

that also पञ्चम pug-dhó, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian *penk-ta-s*. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, ὄγδοος for ὄκτοος; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, *basta* from *bandhi*), and irregularly changed the *a* to *u*, as in ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख *nakha*, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in * Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दशम *daśama*, दशमं *daśema*, and of all the derivational suffix only the *a* is left, before which the *a* of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादश *duv-daśa*, द्वादशं *dvadaśa*, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दश *chaturdaśa*, चतुर्दशं *chathrudaśa*, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its *undecimus*, *duodecimus*, not *undecus*, *duodecus*; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in *lif*: hence, *tertius decimus* for the lost *tredecimus*, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend *daśa* is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms *octav-us*, ὄγδο(F)-ος, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὄγδομος, *octomus*. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix *simu-s* (from *timu-s* = तमस् *tama-s*); thus *vicesimus* or *vige-*

[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus*, as in Sanskrit *viñśatitama-s, triñśattama-s*.* In Latin, however, the termination *ni* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *ē*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit *इष्ट* *iṣṭha*, in the ordinal numbers like *εἰκοστός, τριακοστός*, with the loss of the *ι* of *ιστος*, as in *ἑκαστός, πόστος*. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the *τι, σι,* and *ντα* of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German *drî-zugôsto*, “the thirtieth,” *for-zugôsto*, “the fortieth”: but in the numbers from four to nineteen the *TAN* or *DAN*, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§. 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in *चतुर्थस्* *chaturtha-s, τέταρτο-s, quartu-s, ketwir-la-s*. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—*vierter*, “fourth,” *fünfter*, “fifth,” &c.; hence, Gothic *FIMFTAN*, nom. masc. *fmfta*.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base *द्वि* *dwi* “two” (p. 424), and from the *त्रि* *tri*, “three,” contracted to *तृ* *tri*, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix *तृया*; hence *dwi-tṛiya-s, tri-tṛiya-s*. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin *ter-*

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of *ekādāśa-s*, “the eleventh”; hence, also, *viñśa, triñś-a*, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like *fmftataihunda*, “the fifteenth,” the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or *fmfta* is here the regular abbreviation of the theme *FIMFTAN*, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Berl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.

fius, as also in the Old Slavonic *trelji*, fem. *tretiya*, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the *tyi* of *chetvertyi* and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with तीय *tīya* might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च *tha*, TO, TU of चतुर्थे *chaturtha*, τέταρτος, *quartus*, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective *chetvero*, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that *chetvertyi*, *shestyi*, have to *chaturtha-s*, *shashtha-s*, *sedmyi*, *osmyi*, have to सप्तम *saptama*, अष्टम *aṣṭama*; and *perryi*, "the first," to पूर्व *pūrva*, "the former;" which expressions, in Slavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base YO (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the *i* of the suffix *tīya*, and abbreviated *dvi* to *bi*; hence बिल्या *bilya*, थ्रिल्या *thrilya*, in which it is to be remarked that the *y*, which is thus by syncope united with the *t* at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend *tya* corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle *i*, the Gothic *DYAN* (from *dya*, §. 285.) in *THRIDYAN*, nom. masc. *thridya*, the *y* of which in the Old High German *drillo*, has assimilated itself to the preceding *t*, in analogy with the Prākṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρείττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριττός (*disśós*, *trisśós*), which are evidently, in [G. Id. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German *drillo* has to the Gothic *thriyda*. Regarding *tvaddyé*, "duorum," see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun *anhar* (see p. 377), Old High German *andar*, Middle High German *ander*. Our *zweiter*, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Slavonic *vtoryi* (see §. 297.)

answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek *δύοτερος*, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend *bitya*, only that it has lost also the *i* of the Sanskrit *dvi-tīya*, in regard to which we have, in §. 297., adverted to the Zend *𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎* *b-yāre**, “two years.”

323. We give here a general view of the ordinal numbers in the feminine nominative singular, since in this case the agreement of all the languages strikes the eye more than in the nominative masculine. The Gothic forms which do not occur we give in parentheses, formed theoretically, and according to the Old High German.

[G. Ed. p. 463.]

NOMINATIVE FEMININE.

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GR. DOR.	LATIN.	GOthic.	LITHUANIAN.	OLD SCLAVONIC.
<i>prathamā,</i>	<i>frathēma,</i> ¹	<i>πρώτᾱ.</i>	<i>prima,</i>	<i>fruma,</i>	<i>pirmà,</i>	<i>perva-ya.</i>
<i>dwitīyā,</i>	<i>bitya,</i>	<i>δευτέρᾱ,</i>	<i>altera,</i>	<i>anthara,</i>	<i>antrà,</i>	<i>vtora-ya.</i>
<i>trivīyā,</i>	<i>thritya,</i>	<i>τρίτᾱ,</i>	<i>tertia,</i>	<i>thridyó,</i>	<i>trėchid,</i>	<i>trėti-ya.</i>
<i>chaturthā,</i> ²	<i>tūrya,</i>	<i>τετάρτᾱ,</i>	<i>quarta,</i>	(<i>fidvórdó</i>),	<i>ketwirtà,</i>	<i>chetverta-ya.</i>
<i>panchamā,</i>	<i>puḡdha,</i>	<i>πέμπτᾱ,</i>	<i>quinta,</i>	<i>fimstó,</i>	<i>penktà,</i>	<i>pyata-ya.</i> ³
<i>ṣhaṣṭhā,</i>	<i>cstvā,</i> ⁴	<i>ἕκτᾱ,</i>	<i>sexta,</i>	<i>saihtó,</i>	<i>szėsztà,</i>	<i>shesta-ya.</i>
<i>saptamā,</i>	<i>haptatha,</i>	<i>ἑβδόμᾱ,</i>	<i>septima,</i>	(<i>sibundó</i>),	<i>sėkma,</i>	<i>sedma-ya.</i>
<i>aṣṭamā,</i>	<i>astēma,</i>	<i>ὀγδόᾱ,</i>	<i>octava,</i>	<i>ahtudó,</i>	<i>ászma,</i>	<i>osma-ya.</i>
<i>navamā,</i>	<i>nāuma,</i>	<i>ἐνάτᾱ,</i>	<i>nona,</i>	<i>niundó,</i>	<i>dewintà,</i> ⁵	<i>devyata-ya.</i> ⁵
<i>daśamā,</i>	<i>daśēma,</i>	<i>δεκάτᾱ,</i>	<i>decima,</i>	<i>taihundó,</i>	<i>dcszimtà,</i>	<i>desyata-ya.</i>
<i>ekādaśā,</i>	<i>aēvandaśa,</i> ⁶	<i>ἐνδεκάτᾱ,</i>	<i>undecima,</i>	(<i>ainlisló</i>),	<i>wienólikta,</i>	<i>yedina-ya-na-dcsyaty.</i>
<i>viñśati-tamā,</i>	<i>vīśaitilēma</i> ?	<i>εἰκοστᾱ,</i>	<i>vicesima,</i>	<i>dvidcszimtà,</i>	<i>vtoraya-na-dcsyaty.</i>

* We should read thus §. 297. for *byarē*, as accusative singular (see Olshausen, Vend. S. 43).

¹ More usually *paoirya*, masc. *paoiryó*, by which the Slavonic *pervyi*, *pervaya*, is, as it were, prepared.

² Also *turīyā*, masc. *turīya-s*, on which is based the Zend *tūrya*, masc. *tūryó*. The suppression of the syllable *cha* might announce the looser connection of the same with the remaining portion of the word and thereby support the conjecture expressed at §. 311.

³ The *t* of *pyataya*, masc. *pyatyī*, has nothing in common with the *t* of the cardinal number *pyaty*; the proper primitive is *pya* (see p. 430 Note †), whence *PYATI* by the suffix *TI*, and *PYATO*, fem. *PYATA*, by the suffix *TO*, fem. *TA* (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to *shestayā* in relation to *shesty*, &c.

⁴ By transposition and syncope from *cvasta*, as must be expected from the cardinal number *𐬀𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎𐬎* *cvas*.

⁵ Regarding the *d* for *n*, see §. 317.

⁶ See §. 319, Note *, p. 435.

“Remark.—As the old *a* of the preposition π *pra* has been weakened to *i*—as in *quinque*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamā*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition $\pi\rho\acute{o}$. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the *i* belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, ‘before’; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, ‘by, before,’ as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamā* that the Latin [G. Ed. p. 464.] and Lithuanian do: the *u* of *fru* has arisen from *a* through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition *fram*, ‘before, by,’ &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian *pirm*, the superlative *m* is contained. On π *pra* is based, also, *faur*, ‘before,’ with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas “twice,” “thrice,” “four times,” have been already discussed (p. 435, G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:—

SANSKRIT.	ZEND.	GREEK.	LATIN.	OLD NORTHERN.
<i>dwis</i> ,	<i>bis</i> ,	$\delta\acute{\iota}\varsigma$,	<i>bis</i> ,	<i>twis-var</i> (p. 436 G. ed.).
<i>tris</i> ,	<i>thris</i> ,	$\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$,	<i>ter</i> ,	<i>thris-var</i> .
<i>chatur</i> *,	<i>chathrus</i> ,	<i>quater</i> ,

* According to §. 94. for *chatur*.

The Greek forms in *κίς* like *τετράκις*, *πεντάκις*, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but *κίς* answers to the Sanskrit *śas* (§. 21.), the *a* being weakened to *i*; this *śas*, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as *śataśas*, "by hundreds," *śahasśas*, "by thousands," *bahuśas*, "of many kinds," *gaṇaśas*, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but *e.g.* *śataśas* is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in *ἐκατοντάκις* the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like *quingies*, *sexies*, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in *s* like *duis*, *δύς*, nor with

[G. Ed. p. 465.] those in *κίς* (*śas*), by suppression of the guttural; but as *toties*, *quoties*, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced *quotiens*, *totiens*, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, *τιθέυς* is more genuine than *τιθείς* (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in *ens*, *es*, into conjunction with the Sanskrit suffix *vant* (in the weak cases *vat*), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, *vans*, *e.g.* *chvans*, "how much," for *chivans*. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base *ki*, and the demonstrative base *i*, laid aside the *v*; hence *kiy-ant*, *iy-ant*—weak form *kiyat*, *iyat*—nominative masculine *kiyān*, *iyān*; this *ant* for *vant* answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine *εις*), *e.g.* in *μελιτόεις*, and also to the Latin *ens*, in *totiens*, *quotiens*, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in *nt*, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide *toti-ens* *quoti-ens*, or *tot-i-ens*, *quot-i-ens*? In the former case *tot*, *quot*, would have preserved, in this combination, the *i*

which belongs to them, for they are based on the Sanskrit *तति tati*, "so much," *कति kati*, "how much";* and the *ens* in *toti-ens* would, according to that, express the "time," and *toti*, "so much." In the division *tot-i-ens*, however, we should have to assume that in *i-ens*, the abovementioned demonstrative *इयन्त् iyant*, "so much," is contained, but in such wise, that only the meaning of the suffix is still perceived. Under this supposition *quingu-ies* [G. Ed. p. 466.] would, accordingly, express "five-somuch" (times); in the former case, however, the *i*, as *quingui-es*, *octi-es*, would have to pass as representative of the *e* and *o* of *quinque*, *octo*, and that of *sexies* as a conjunctive vowel, or as an accommodation to the prevailing analogy. In any case, however, the identity of the suffix *ens*, *es*, with the Sanskrit *ant*, from *vant*, is highly probable. The Sanskrit expresses the idea "times" from five upwards by *kṛitvas*; as, *पञ्चकृत्वस् panchakṛitvas*, "five times." This *kṛitvas* comes from *kṛit*, "making," which in *sakṛit*, "once," is sufficient of itself: the annexed *vas*, however, might, by exchange of the *t* for *s* (compare §. 156. Note *), have arisen from *vat*, which should be given above as the weak theme for *vant*; as, *tāvat*, "so much," *yāvat*, "how much" (rel.). With *kṛit* from *kart* (§. 1.) is clearly connected the Lithuanian *karta-s*, "time," a masculine substantive, which, like the defining number, is put in the accusative, in order to make up for the adverbs under discussion; e.g. *wienai kartai*, "once," *dù kartù*, "twice" (accusative *du*), *tris kartùs*, "three times." In Old Slavonic the corresponding *krat* or *kraty* is not declined, and the former appears to be an abbrevia-

* These are neuters, which, in common with the numerals *पञ्चन् panchan*, "five," &c. (§. 313.), have, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative, a singular form; in the other cases, plural terminations; while in Latin *quot*, *tot*, like *quinque*, &c., *ſc̄* become completely indeclinable.

tion of the latter, for it cannot be brought into direct comparison with the Sanskrit कृत् *krī* on account of §. 255. (l.): *kraty*, however, is to be deduced from कृत्वस् *krītwas*, by suppression of the *v*. With regard to the *y* for *as* compare §. 271.

325. Through the suffix धा *dha* the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in χα, which, therefore, have altered the *T* sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organ in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNIΘ, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 407.]

द्विधा <i>dwi-dhā</i> ,	* δί-χα.
त्रिधा <i>tri-dhā</i> ,	τρί-χα.
चतुर्धा <i>chatur-dhā</i> ,	τέτρα-χα.
पञ्चधा <i>pancha-dhā</i> ,	πέντα-χα.

* "Divided into two parts," Sav. V. 103.

