


GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

CALL No. 891.05 / J.A.O.S
ACC. No. 24507

D.G.A. 79.
GIPN—S1—2D. G. Arch. N. D./57—27-9-58—1,00,000





JOURNAL

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

A330 v.7

891.05

~~24507~~

J. A. O. S.

SEVENTH VOLUME.

A330

158/07

~~A330~~

NEW HAVEN:

FOR THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

PRINTED BY E. HAYES, PRINTER TO YALE COLLEGE.

MDCCLXII.

1862

SOLD BY THE SOCIETY'S AGENTS:

NEW YORK: B. WESTERMANN & CO., 40 BROADWAY;

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO.; PARIS: BENJ. DUPRAT;

LEIPZIG: F. A. BROCKHAUS.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No. 24507

Date 15.10.55

Call No. 891.05, J.A.O.S.

COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
FOR THE YEARS 1860-63.

EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	New Haven.
WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,	"
JAMES HADLEY,	"
EZRA ABBOT,	Cambridge.
ARNOLD GUYOT,	Princeton.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1863, by the
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Connecticut.

CONTENTS

OF

SEVENTH VOLUME.

	Page.
ART. I.—ON THE KINGS OF MANDALA, AS COMMEMORATED IN AN INSCRIPTION NOW FIRST PRINTED IN THE ORIGINAL TONGUE. By FITZ-EDWARD HALL, D.C.L.	1
ART. II.—TWO INSCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE PARAMĀRA RULERS OF MĀLĀVA: the Sanskrit, with Translations and Remarks. By FITZ-EDWARD HALL, D.C.L.	24
ART. III.—REMARKS ON THE PHENICIAN INSCRIPTION OF SIDON. By Prof. WILLIAM W. TURNER.	48
ART. IV.—CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ORIGINAL SOURCES TO OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCIENCE OF MUSLIM TRADITION. By EDWARD E. SALISBURY.	60
ART. V.—MEMOIR ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE GYPSIES, AS NOW USED IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE. By A. G. PASPATI, A.M., M.D. Translated from the Greek by Rev. C. HAMLIN, D.D., Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. at Constantinople.	143
ART. VI.—EVIDENCES OF THE SCYTHIAN AFFINITIES OF THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES, CONDENSED AND ARRANGED FROM REV. R. CALDWELL'S COMPARATIVE DRAVIDIAN GRAMMAR. By Rev. EDWARD WEBB, Missionary of the A. B. C. F. M. in Southern India.	271
ART. VII.—ON LEPsius's STANDARD ALPHABET. By WILLIAM D. WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College.	299
ART. VIII.—THE ATHARVA-VEDA PRĀTIÇĀKHYA, OR ÇĀUNAKĪYĀ CATURĀDHYĀVIKĀ: Text, Translation, and Notes. By WILLIAM D. WHITNEY, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College.	336

APPENDIX.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY :

<i>Proceedings at New Haven, Oct. 17th and 18th, 1860.</i>	- - - - -	1
<i>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 22nd, 1861.</i>	- - - - -	ix
<i>Additions to the Library and Cabinet, May 1860—May 1861.</i>	- - - - -	xv
<i>Proceedings at New York, Oct. 16th and 17th, 1861.</i>	- - - - -	xliii
<i>Proceedings at Boston and Cambridge, May 21st, 1862.</i>	- - - - -	1
<i>Proceedings at Princeton, Oct. 15th and 16th, 1862.</i>	- - - - -	lv
<i>Additions to the Library and Cabinet, May 1861—Oct. 1862.</i>	- - - - -	lxi
<i>List of Members, Oct. 1862.</i>	- - - - -	lxvi

ARTICLE I.

ON THE KINGS OF MANDALA,
AS COMMEMORATED IN A SANSKRIT INSCRIPTION

NOW FIRST PRINTED IN THE ORIGINAL TONGUE.

BY FITZ-EDWARD HALL, D.C.L.

Presented to the Society October 17, 1860.

IN the fifteenth volume of the Asiatic Researches, pp. 437-443, an English rendering will be found, executed by Captain Fell, and published posthumously, of the record here presented in its own terms and translated anew. But Captain Fell, it should appear, had not seen the first, thirty-ninth, and forty-fourth stanzas, and that which follows the forty-eighth, agreeably to the numbering of the inscriptionist. As for the rest, his labors in connection with the monument under notice were manifestly cut short by his death. This inference is, indeed, fully authorized by the fact that his version of the original was left unaccompanied by any commentation; whereas a land-grant, forming part of the same paper with that version, is annotated in copious detail. Except for the circumstance of his untimely decease, many of the laxities with which his interpretation of the ensuing text is justly chargeable, as it stands, would also, perhaps, have undergone redress.

Sir Henry Sleeman, in the August number of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1837, has discoursed at length on the historical, or postmythical, princes of Mandala, on the basis of native documents. These documents, as might be anticipated, exhibit a liberal element of the incredible. They consist of two manuscript works in the Hindí language, of anonymous authorship. Copies of both are in my possession. One of them is considerably more specific than the other; and they are not seldom irreconcilable. As, however, we have to do so largely, in these accounts, with palpable fables, it matters little that they contradict each other. Solely with a view to bring forward a specimen of the manner in which the Hindus associate fact and

fiction, do I consent to dwell, for a few moments, on such a sorry substitute for sober chronicles.

According to my vouchers, the earliest among the modern rulers of Maṇḍala were Haihaya Rājputs, of the lineage of the thousand-armed Arjuna. A story is current—all circumstantiality discarded—that, in the days of Nizám Sháh, a copper-plate patent, emanating from one of them, and bearing the date of *Samvat* 201, or A. D. 143, was exhumed and deciphered. Their seats of government were Maṇipura, Champávati, and Mahishmatí; now known as Ratnapura, Lánjí, and Maṇḍala. This group of families having become extinct, the Gonds obtained the ascendant.

At the period when the Gonds predominated, the lord of Mahishmatí repaired to Amarakantaka for the purpose of ceremonial ablution. Attached to his train, in some ministerial quality, was one Yádava Ráya, a Kachhwáhá Rājput of Khándesh. Once, at midnight, while the rest of the camp slumbered, Yádava was doing duty as sentry. Suddenly there passed by, in the darkness, without speaking, two Gond men and a woman of the same race, as they were in seeming. And then came a monkey, bearing in his hand the feather of a peacock. This he threw down, and followed the wayfarers. Yádava's turn of watch having expired, he slept; when, in a vision, Narmadá, the impersonation of the river so-called, stood before him. The men and the woman whom he had taken for Gonds were not so, she informed him, but Ráma, Lakshmana, and Sítá; and the supposed ordinary monkey was Hanumat. Yádava's fortune was to be most propitious; for those sacrosanct beings rarely show themselves in the Iron Age. On his pressing Narmadá for more definite indications, she reminded him of the feather dropped by the monkey. Peacock-feathers are worn on the head by Gonds; and the omen which he had witnessed was significant. Accession to the headship of the Gonds was destined as his lot. He was to visit Gadhá, the chieftain of which place was a Gond. Him he should succeed eventually, by voluntary demission of power. A Bráhmaṇ of Rámanagara, cherisher of a perpetual fire, would aid him with counsel. Yádava, his end achieved, was to entertain this Bráhmaṇ as his premier.

In the course of a few days, Yádava resigned his place near his master and bent his steps to Gadhá. On conferring with the Bráhmaṇ who had been designated, he was advised to engage himself, as an attendant, to the King of Gadhá. This he did, and by and bye insinuated himself into the entire confidence of his new lord. Arrived at the dignity of treasurer, he was joined by his family from Khándesh. The King, who had but one child, and that a daughter, proposed to contract her to Yádava, a widower, on presumption. To this overture Yádava excepted, on

the ground of caste. Sarve Páthaka, the Bráhmaṇ before spoken of, was applied to for his opinion. It was favorable to the match, on condition that the couple should never eat together. To this condition the King signified his assent; and the nuptials were celebrated. Upon this, the King, who was well stricken in years, abdicated, retaining the revenues of five villages for his maintenance; and Yádava reigned in his stead. His enthronement is adjudged to the *Samvat* year 415, corresponding to A. D. 357. Sarve Páthaka was installed as prime minister; he and his employer solemnly obtesting Narmadá to their compact, and imprecating perdition, each on his own family, in the event of their descendants' ever being embroiled. By gradual extension, the kingdom expanded so as to skirt the river Hiran in one direction, and, in another, the Gaura. Yádava, after enjoying royalty for five years, died, and was succeeded by his son Mádhava. Several of Sarve Páthaka's progeny served the chiefs of Maṇḍala in course. To them the clan called Bhar Vájpeyí is said to trace its origin.

Karṇa, it is stated, founded the city of Karanbel. But of this I have very grave doubts. It is to be referred, much more probably, to a Karṇa of a different dynasty. Karanbel lies a few miles from Jubulpoor. I have explored its ruins. Madana Sinha is, further, mentioned as builder of the *Madana-mahal*, likewise near Jubulpoor. There is no reason why he may not have been so. The erections and conquests of other of the potentates in question are specified with some minuteness. The towns and fortresses enumerated have mostly, if not all, been verified. In subjugation, Sangráma was signally successful. A list is given of two and fifty strong-holds which he compelled to yield him obedience.

Durgávati, the lady especially commemorated in the following pages, was daughter of the Chandel chief of Mahobá. As queen regnant, her husband having demised, she ventured on a foray against Bhelsá. In reprisal for this incursion, A'saf Khán was sent, by the Emperor Akbar, to chastise her hardihood. At the time when she and her son were slain, the latter had advanced to his eighteenth year.¹

Having extracted from my manuscript materials about all that they contain of interest, I turn, for a single matter, to the historian Farishta. "Pending a very sharp engagement," says this writer, "the Queen was wounded in the eye by an arrow, and desisted from the conduct; and, with an extreme sense of honor as to being captured, resolving to die, she took a scimitar from her elephant-driver, and put an end to her existence."² A'saf Khán, after her death, moved on to attack the fort of Chorágarh,³ where her young son was in hiding. In the tumult of the assault, the heir apparent "perished beneath the hands and feet of the throng."

A lineal descendant of the magnates with whom this paper is concerned, having been found implicated in the mutinies, was, in the autumn of last year, exploded from before the mouth of a cannon, at Jubulpoor. This man left an only son. His family would, otherwise, have terminated with his own death. The miscreant had concerted a plan of smothering every Christian that should fall into his hands, by enclosing the head of the victim in a bag of powdered chillies. When apprehended, he had about his person a pious formula of commination, which may be reproduced in these words: "Close the mouth of the tale-bearers, chew up the back-biters, trample out the wicked, exterminatrix of *our* foes. Slay the English; reduce them to dust, Mother Chandí. Let not the enemies escape, *or their* children, destructive lady. Protect S'ankara; keep *thy* slave. Hearken to the cry of the humble. Victory to Mother Hálaká! Eat up the impure; delay not, Mother. This moment, speedily, devour *our* foes, O Kálíká."⁴

The inscription now to be given is incised on a stone which lies at Rámanagara, in Maṇḍala. As I have had no opportunity of inspecting the monument itself, I have had to be satisfied with fac-simile impressions, taken by rubbing.

INSCRIPTION.

श्रीगणेशाय नमः। श्रीसुन्दरत्रिविक्रमो जयति।

इत्यम्भावेन केनापि क्यविज्ञाताय विज्ञवे।

स्वमात्रेणोव कतिधा भवते भवते नमः॥१॥

यादवरायक्षितिभृद् बभूव गुणानीरधिर्गणदेशे।

सूनुर्माधवसिंहस्तस्य यतो ऽभूज् जगन्नाथः॥२॥

अजनि ततो रघुनाथस्तस्य सुतो रुद्रदेव इत्यासीत्।

तस्य च विहारिसिंहः सूनुर्नरसिंहदेव इति तस्य॥३॥

तनयो ऽस्य सूर्यभानुस्तस्य सुतो वासुदेव इत्यभवत्।

गोपालसाहिरस्मात् समजनि भूपालसाहिरतः॥४॥

तस्माद् गोपीनाथस्ततस्तु नृपरामचन्द्र इत्यासीत् ।
 सुरतानसिंहनामा सूनुरभूद् रामचन्द्रस्य ॥५॥
 हरिहरदेवस्तनयस्तस्याऽऽसति कृष्णैव इति तस्य ।
 अजनि जगत्सिंहो ऽस्माद् यस्मादभवन् महासिंहः ॥६॥
 तस्माद् दुर्जनमल्लो ऽभूद् यशःकर्णस्ततो ऽभवत् ।
 प्रतापादित्य इत्यस्माद् यशश्चन्द्रस्ततो ऽजनि ॥७॥
 तस्य मनोहरसिंहः सुतो ऽस्य गोविन्दसिंह इत्यासीत् ।
 अस्मात् तु रामचन्द्रस्तस्मात् कर्णो ऽथ रत्नसेनो ऽबः ॥८॥
 कमलनयन इत्यभूदमुष्मान्
 नरहरिदेवनृपस्तु तस्य सूनुः ।
 समजनि तनयो ऽस्य वीरसिंहस्
 त्रिभुवनरायमसूत यः सुपुत्रम् ॥९॥
 तस्मात् पृथ्वीराजस्ततो ऽभवद् भारतीचन्द्रः ।
 तनयो ऽस्य मदनसिंहस्ततस्त्वभूदुग्रसेन इति ॥१०॥
 रामसाहिः सुतो ऽस्याऽऽसीत् ताराचन्द्रस्ततो ऽभवत् ।
 अभूदुदयसिंहो ऽस्माद् भानुमित्राभिधस्ततः ॥११॥
 तस्य भवानीदासस्तनयस्तस्याऽथ शिवसिंहः ।
 हरिनारायणनामा सुतो ऽस्य तस्य तु सबलसिंहः ॥१२॥
 राजसिंहः सुतो ऽस्याऽऽसीद् दादीरायस्ततो ऽजनि ।
 गोरक्षदासः पुत्रो ऽस्याऽर्जुनसिंहमसूत यः ॥१३॥

आसीत् सूनुस्तस्य सङ्ग्रामसाहिरू

विद्विद्रूतूलस्तोमकल्पान्तवह्निः ।

विष्वग् व्याप्ते यत्प्रतापप्रकाशे

मध्याङ्गार्को विस्फुलिङ्गीबभूव ॥ १४ ॥

वज्रप्रायैः पर्वतप्रौढगाढैः

सुप्राकरैरम्बुभिश्चाञ्जयाणि ।

द्वापञ्चाशद् येन दुर्गाणि राज्ञा

निर्वृत्तानि क्षोणिचक्रं विज्ञित्य ॥ १५ ॥

दलपतिनृपतिर्बभूव तस्य

क्षितिपमणेस्तनयः पवित्रकीर्तिः ।

अभिलपति मुखानि यस्य कीर्तिं

चिरमुपगातुमियन्ति नागनाथः ॥ १६ ॥

वितरणवारिभिर्नियतमार्द्रकरस्य हरि-

स्मरणपरायणस्य शरणस्य वशीभवताम् ।

निरूपधिपालितप्रकृतिकस्य हि यस्य सदा

चरणरजो रजोगुणजुषो ऽपि जना जगृह्युः ॥ १७ ॥

अभ्यर्थिनां भाग्यसमृद्धिरेव

स्वहृदिपिणी पुण्यपरम्परैव ।

सौभाग्यसमीच वसुन्धराया

दुर्गावती तस्य बभूव पत्नी ॥ १८ ॥

पुरन्दरे भूवल्लयस्य तस्मिन्
अस्तं प्रयाते तनयं त्रिवर्षम् ।

श्रीवीरनारायणनामधेयं

दुर्गावती राज्यपदे ऽभ्यषिञ्चत् ॥ ११ ॥

अत्युच्चैः कनकालयैः परिलसन्निःसीमहेमाचला

सर्वत्रैव लुट्सुरत्ननिचयैर्निःसंख्यरत्नाकरा ।

उद्दामद्विर्द्वजैर्गणितस्वर्गेशदत्तावला

भूरन्येव कृताऽखिला त्रिभुवनप्रख्यातकीर्त्या यया ॥ २० ॥

तुरङ्गमातङ्गसुवर्णकोटिनिरत्नरोत्सर्गमयाङ्गिका या* ।

अशेषकीर्तिं किल कामधेनोर्यशोभिरुच्चैरधरीचकार ॥ २१ ॥

स्वयं समारुह्य गजं रणेषु

बलाञ्ज जयन्ती प्रबलान् विपत्तान् ।

सदा प्रजापालनसावधाना

सा लोकपालान् विफलीचकार ॥ २२ ॥

सदैव गृह्णन् स करेण राज्ञां

तदूर्जितं विश्वविसारि तेजः ।

विवेश तारुण्यमनन्तकीर्तिः

श्रीवीरनारायणनामधेयः ॥ २३ ॥

कालक्रमादकबरक्षितिपुरुहूतेन पार्थकल्पेन ।

प्रहितः कराय बलवान् आसफखानस्ततो राज्ञा ॥ २४ ॥

* The original has वाः, which I have not hesitated to alter.

अक्षौहिणीनिश्रितभूतलेन

याते रणे तेन महाभटेन ।

बलं विजित्याऽपि समस्तमस्य

दुर्गावती भीमपराक्रमेण ॥२५॥

संविद्धिता लक्षविपक्षवाणैः

स्वपाणिखड्गेन शिरः स्वकीयम् ।

ह्रिच्चा क्षणेन द्विरदे निषष्ठा

ऽभिनद् र्वेर्मण्डलमात्मजश्च ॥२६॥

दलपतिनृपतेरथाऽनुजन्मा

शरणमनाथजनस्य चन्द्रसाहिः ।

निधिरिव महसामखण्डदीपः

सकलकुलस्य यशोधनो ऽभिषिक्तः ॥२७॥

वस्त्राण्याकृष्य केशग्रहमपि तरवः कुर्वते काण्टकैः स्वैः

श्चासैर्यास्तान् दहन्ति द्रुतविवृतवपुर्दीप्तिदावान् प्रदर्श्य ।

नैष्ठुर्येणैव नित्यं दधति च वसितुं यास्वचः पादपानां

कान्तारे शत्रुकान्ताः कलहमिव सह स्यावरैर्यस्य चक्रुः

समजनि तनयो नृपस्य तस्य

॥२८॥

स्मरदहनादिव पाणमुखः सुकीर्तिः ।

निधिरिव महसामिहोर्जितानां

मधुकरसाहिरिति क्षमातलेन्द्रः ॥२९॥

प्रत्यग्रप्रौढगाढप्रलयजलधरध्वन्यधःकारिठक्का-

धावडुक्कारधाराबधिरितविधुतध्वस्तधीरोद्धतेन ।

येन प्रोद्दामधाम्ना भुजबलविक्रितैः शश्वदाशा दिगीशान्

अद्याऽपि स्पष्टमष्टौ जनगणरठितैस्तज्जयैर्लज्जयन्ति ॥३०॥

साधूनामभिलाषसिद्धिविभवः क्षात्रं समग्रं महः

शक्तिर्मूर्तिमती स्मरस्य भवनं कीर्तिः कुलस्योन्नतिः ।

सर्वस्वं सुकृतस्य कौशलमितिः* स्रष्टुर्गुणानां निधिर्

दोषाणामपथं सुतो ऽस्य नृपतेः श्रीप्रिमनारायणः ॥३१॥

प्रोन्माद्यद्विन्ध्यगन्धद्विरदधनघटाधोरसेनासहस्र-

प्रत्यग्रप्रौढधारावनमितविधुताशेषभूभृङ्गणस्य ।

यस्य प्रोद्यत्प्रतापप्रथमपरिचयप्रदुतभ्रष्टनिद्रा

नाऽद्याऽपि द्राग् विपक्षा जहति गिरिदरीः

सुन्दरीभिर्वियुक्ताः ॥३२॥

प्रौढ एव क्षितीशाः समरभुवि बलाद् बन्धनीया न वैरं

कीर्तिर्लोके ऽवदानैरविरतविक्रितैर्वर्धनीया न गर्वः ।

दातव्यं सर्वदैव द्रुतमभिलपितं याचकेभ्यो न पृष्टं

भूपानामेषधर्मः स्फुटमिह चरितं प्रेमसाहेः प्रमाणम् ॥३३॥

पूर्णानेककलातिथिः प्रतिपदारब्धोदयः सर्वदा-

ऽहोरात्रप्रथमानमासमहिमा सत्कृत्तपत्तक्रमः ।

* In the Sanskrit, the *visarga* is omitted: clearly by error of the engraver, or of his exemplar.

तस्माद्ब्रु इवाज्यरः समज्ञानि श्रीप्रेमसाहिप्रभोरू
नाम्ना श्रीकृद्वेश्वरः सुखयिता पूर्वप्रभावः सताम् ॥३४॥

स च पालयन् निखिलमेव जगन्
नितरामनाथमवति क्षितिपः ।

समवर्षणो ज्यतिशयेन धनः

पयसाऽभिपिञ्चति हि निम्नगतम् ॥३५॥

रम्यारामपरम्परापरिवृताः सौधालयैरुन्नताः

सम्पन्नप्रजया भृताः सकमलैः स्वच्छैः सरोभिर्युताः ।

येन व्यावतनैकधोषरुचिरा विघ्नग् विशालोर्वरा

विप्रेभ्यः स्मृतताम्रपट्टविधिभिर्यामाः कियन्तो ज्यतिताः ॥३६॥

सुस्थानैः स्वरभेदबोधकराणां सद्दामतालोचितं

सम्पूर्णश्रुतिधर्मरागरुचिरं तत्कण्ठतानाश्रितम् ।

सन्मार्गस्थितिचित्तदारि सुलभं यन् किन्नराणां महत्

साम्राज्यं निजमुद्धार सकलं सङ्गीतशास्त्रं च यः ॥३७॥

अचला निखिलाऽखिला नृपाला

कृद्वेशस्य मनुः करे ज्मुनैव ।

लिखिताः कनकैकभित्तमध्ये*

ननु पञ्चाशदिव द्विषा महान्तः ॥३८॥

* I have never before met with भित्त for भित्ति; and it may be a mistake. The dictionaries have only the latter, in the sense of 'wall.' Metrically considered, either will here answer, as being a trochee.

अभ्रूदूणीयस्यचले नु लक्ष्ये
 न विस्मयः कश्चन तेन विद्धे ।
 तिर्यक्परिज्ञिसगरं शरैर्यः
 स्थले स्थले क्येकपदे हिनत्ति ॥३१॥
 मृगयावसरे पदेन मृग्यन्
 अलघुव्यालकरालभालमेव ।
 अवधीदचिरेण यः शरेण
 प्रवलद्वीपिनमापतत्तमुच्चैः ॥४०॥

यस्योपरीयमिन्द्रोक्तिः ।

अयि वद विमनाः कुतो ऽसि जित्तो
 विबुधवरा विदितं न वः किमेतत् ।
 हृदयनरप्रतिर्येदप विप्रान्
 भुवि विदधानि शतक्रतून्नेकान् ॥४१॥
 अभवत् सुन्दरीदेवी राज्ञी तस्य महिपतेः ।
 सौभाग्यसदनं पुण्यसम्पदेव स्वत्रयिणी ॥४२॥
 दरिद्रदुःखौघनिदानवारिभिर्
 निरन्तरप्रस्तुतदानवारिभिः ।
 गजा घनाभा घनदानवारिभिर्
 यतः मदाऽऽताः ज्जिनिदानवारिभिः ॥४३॥
 अविशतमुत्तरोत्तरनिबन्ध्यवदानकृतैर्

मितमवकाशमेत्य भुवनेषु गतैर्धनताम् ।
 शरदिजशीतरश्मिशतसाध्यविकाशकरैरू
 जगति यदीयपेशलयशोभिरशोभितराम् ॥४४॥
 दीर्घिकारामकासारप्रमुखैर्भूरिदक्षिणैः ।
 पूर्तैर्नत्तैर्या धर्म निरन्तरमपालयत् ॥४५॥
 विज्ञोः शम्भोर्गणेशस्य दुर्गायास्तरणेश्च या ।
 व्यधित स्थापनमिदं विधाय विबुधालयम् ॥४६॥
 तस्याः स्तावाय* कः शक्तः शङ्करश्चिधरादयः ।
 सुपर्वाणो ऽपि महिताः प्रतिष्ठां प्रापिता यथा ॥४७॥
 तत्र नियुक्तैर्विप्रैरुपहारैरुत्सविर्धनैरमितैः ।
 या सुन्दरत्रिविक्रममुष्यान् देवान् सदाऽर्चयाञ्चक्रे ॥४८॥
 राजाज्ञया मृगावत्या श्यामया च मुरद्विपे ।
 नैकनैवेद्यसामग्री समनीयत नित्यशः ॥†॥
 कृदयेशमहोपालो जिगाय नितरां तथा ।
 शक्तिप्रकर्षः क्षमया चन्द्रश्चन्द्रिकया यथा ॥४९॥
 सुकीर्तिर्मीमांसाविवरणगुरोस्तर्कज्ञयिनः
 सुतेन ‡च्छन्दोऽङ्गप्रवचनपटोर्मण्डनकवेः ।

* For स्तावाय ; perhaps not by the intention of the versifier. स्तावाय is not required by prosody ; and it is exceedingly rare, if not wholly unauthorized.

† This couplet stands, on the stone, below the rest of the inscription, to the left hand. It has no number ; and I have assigned its place by conjecture.

‡ The stone has छन्दो°. But the author, with due regard to quantity, wrote as I have corrected.

तदीयादेशेन व्यरचि जयगोविन्दविडुषा

समासात् तद्वंशक्षितिपविषये वर्णानमिदम् ॥५०॥

सिंहसाहृदियारामभगीरथसमाह्वयैः ।

शिल्पिभिर्निर्मितमिदं निपुणैर्विबुधालयम् ॥५१॥

वेदनेत्ररुयेन्द्रब्दे ज्येष्ठे त्रिभुतिथौ शिते ।*

सदाशिवेन लिखितमुत्कीर्णं तैः सुशिल्पिभिः ॥५२॥

संवत् १७२४ वर्षे ज्येष्ठशुद्धे १२ शुक्रवारि ।

TRANSLATION.

Glory to the auspicious Gaṇes'a! The auspicious Trivikrama,⁵ the beautiful, bears sway.

1. Salutation to thee, Vishṇu, *who, though*, as if in thy entirety, manifoldly manifested, *art yet* assuredly unapprehended in any *thy* real nature⁶ whatsoever.

2. In the country of Gaḍhā⁷ was a monarch, Yádavarāya; a sea of virtuous qualities. His son *was* Mádhasvasinha; from whom sprang Jagannátha.

3. Of him was born Raghunátha. His son was Rudradeva; and his son was Vihárisinha. Narasinhadeva *was* his offspring.

4. His son *was* Súryabhānu; *and* his son *was* Vāsudeva. Of him was born Gopálasáhi; *and* of him, Bhúpálasáhi.

5. From him issued Gopínátha; and from him, King Rámachandra. The son of Rámachandra was Suratánasinha, so called.

6. Hariharadeva was his son. Kṛishṇadeva *was* his. Of him was born Jagatsinha; from whom originated Mahásinha.

7. Of him came Durjanamalla. From him sprang Yas'ah-karṇa; *and* from him, Pratápáditya. Of him was born Yas'as'chandra.

8. His son *was* Manoharasinha. Govindasinha was his; and from him *proceeded* Rámachandra; *and* from him, Karṇa: then, from him, Ratnasena.⁸

9. Of him came Kamalanayana; and his son *was* King Naraharideva. Of him a son was born, Vírasinha⁹; who procreated a duteous son, Tribhuvanarāya.

* Is जित, for 'white,' 'light,' allowable in place of सित? The former is by no means uncommon in inscriptions, even where, as in this, the first and last sibilants are carefully discriminated.

10. From him *was derived* Prithwírāja. From him sprang Bháratíchandra. His son *was* Madanasinha; and from him Ugrasena had his descent.

11. Rámasáhi *was* his son; *and* from him issued Táráchandra. Of him *was* born Udayasinha: of him, Bhánumitra, *as was* his name.

12. His son *was* Bhavánídása; *and* of him S'ivasinha *was the heir*. His son *was* denominated Harináráyana; *and his son was* Sabalasinha.

13. Rájaśinha *was* his son; *and* of him *was* born Dádírája.¹⁰ His son *was* Gorakshadása; *who* begat Arjunasinha.

14. His son *was* Sangrámasáhi; *an exterminating fire*¹¹ *to his foes, as if they had been* masses of cotton-wool: *on the radiance of whose grandeur being spread abroad, the midday sun became like a mere spark* :

15. By which king, when he had reduced the orb of the earth, two and fifty fastnesses were constructed; indestructible from *their* excellent fortifications—*which were* like adamant, *and possessed the firm strength of mountains—and because of their* water.

16. Of him, gem of princes, King Dalapati *was* the son; of unsullied glory: *to hymn forth whose fame the lord of serpents hoped that all his mouths would enduringly remain* :

17. To the dust of whose feet—*since his hand was* constantly moist with the water of bounty,¹² *and as he was* diligent in the remembrance of Hari, a refuge to those who were brought under *his* authority, *and a guileless guardian of his* dependants—even people infected with the quality of passion continually had recourse.

18. His consort *was* Durgávátí; *in sooth the increase of fortune to suppliants; accumulated holiness actually personified; the very bound of earth's prosperity.*

19. This Purandara¹³ of the circuit of the earth having demised, Durgávátí consecrated on the seat of royalty *their* son, of three years of age, the illustrious Víranáráyana, so called.

20. By whom, *Durgávátí*, of repute blazoned throughout the triple universe, the whole earth *was* rendered as it were another; by interminable glittering Hemáchalas,¹⁴ in its stately golden edifices; by seas¹⁵ untold, in its abundance of valuable jewels everywhere tossing about; by innumerable Indra's¹⁶ elephants, in its herds of spirited elephants:

21. Who, *Durgávátí*, with *her* daily occupation, which consisted in unceasing donations of millions of horses, elephants, and pieces of gold,¹⁷ depreciated, in semblance, by *her* exalted celebrity, the universal honor of Kámadhenu.¹⁸

22. Mounted on an elephant, in person, *and* by force overmastering, in many a battle, prepotent adversaries, ever studious for

the safeguard of *her* subjects, she superseded, to all appearance, the protectors of the regions.¹⁹

23. Appropriating, no less than the tribute of kings, their illustrious world-diffused splendor, he, the fortunate Viranarayana, as was his appellation, of renown illimitable, entered on adolescence.

24. Subsequently, *some* time having elapsed, A'saf Khan, with an army,²⁰ was deputed by King Akbar,²¹ Puruhuta²² of the earth, all but compeer of Partha,²³ for the purpose of levying a contribution.

25. At the close of an engagement, by this great warrior—a Bhima in prowess, whose armaments depressed the face of the earth—Durgavati, though she had vanquished his entire army,

26. Being vexed with countless hostile arrows, clove her own head, in an instant, with a sword in her hand, as she sat on *her* elephant; *whereupon* she penetrated the solar sphere, as *did* her son.²⁴

27. Then *was* inaugurated the younger brother of King Dalapati, Chandrasahi; an asylum to the lordless people; a treasury, so to speak, of magnificence; the inextinguishable irradiator of *his* whole race; opulent in glory:

28. Of the wives of whose antagonists the trees, with their thorns, snatched away the robes and laid hold of the tresses; while they, *the ladies*, exhibiting conflagrations in the sheen of their persons suddenly exposed, consumed them, *the trees*, with their sighs; and ever, from very wretchedness, they wore the bark of shrubs for clothing. *Thus*, in the forests, did they, in a manner, wage strife with things immovable.²⁵

29. Of this monarch a son was born, King²⁶ Madhukarasahi—as, of S'iva,²⁷ Shanmukha²⁸—of honorable note; as if a receptacle of noble greatness:

30. By the triumphs of whom—resistless in enterprise, *as* repelling²⁹ and destroying the impetuous and overweening, stricken deaf with the rushing torrent of the clamor of his drums, *enough* to drown the roar of huge compact cataclysmal rain-clouds newly come—achieved by the might of his arm, *and* applauded by multitudes of his lieges, the quarters, *responsive*, oftentimes, to this very day, manifestly cause shame to *their* eight presiding deities.

31. The son of this king *was* the fortunate Premanarayana; accomplishing, through his affluence, the desires of the pure; the collective lustre of the tribe of warriors; the incorporate energy of Smara; a domicile of good report; the exaltation of his family; the complete estate of virtue; the measure of creative cunning; a repository of merits; no path for reproach:³⁰

32. Of whom—humbling and routing a whole troop of chieftains, by the fresh dense surge of thousands of legions terrible

with serried phalanxes of most infuriate elephants redolent from the Vindhya—the adversaries, whose slumbers were straight-way broken when first they perceived *his* refulgent grandeur, do not even yet readily leave the caves of the mountains, *though* separated from their wives.

33. Kings indeed presumptuous should be rigorously coerced on the battle-field: *but one ought not to harbor animosity*. Fame should be enhanced by performing meritorious acts, unremittingly, among the people: *but one must not foster pride*. *Their* wishes should, at all times whatever, promptly be granted to petitioners: *but one must not wait to be entreated*.³¹ Such, obviously, is the duty of rulers in this world; *and for the justness of these maxims* the practice of Premasáhi is an argument.

34. Of him, the auspicious lord Premasáhi, was born another, the illustrious lord Hridaya, as he was called; a source of happiness to the pious, *and mighty like his forefathers*: as *arises* the year; teeming with lunar days of numerous moments; whose appearance commences with the first day of the moon's increase; ever augmented by months growing with nycthemera,³² alternating with light and dark fortnights.³³

35. Thoroughly defending the entire world, this monarch especially befriends the helpless; *as a cloud, rain equably as it may, yet irrigates most copiously* the low places with its water:

36. By which *king* have been assigned to Bráhmans, with the prescribed formalities of *grants on* plates of copper, sundry villages; begirt by lines of elegant gardens, rising with stuccoed dwelling-houses, inhabited by a substantial tenantry, provided with pellucid meres stocked with water-lilies, adorned with ample and frequent habitations of herdsmen, *and with spacious tillage*³⁴ round about:

37. Which *king* keeps up all his vast domain: where, from goodly mansions, may be recognized diversities of enunciation; *which is* eligible from its fine towns and palm-trees; delightful from attachment to the body of revealed and memorial law; independent of its border-lands; captivating the heart by the presence of proper roads; *and easy of attainment only by men* challenging admiration: and *he is likewise conversant in* the science of melody and the dance, *with its refinements*.³⁵

38. The whole earth and all potentates are enclosed in the hand of lord Hridaya. By the same were traced, midway on a golden wall, as it had been fifty immense elephants.

39. It has been no *matter of surprise* at all, that a minute stationary butt was transfixed by him, who, with *his* shafts, can sever, almost simultaneously, at quite distinct points, an arrow launched obliquely:

40. Who, at the time of the chase, hunting on foot, has, all of a sudden, slain, with *his* bolt, a tiger assaulting from aloft, of forefront fearful as an enormous serpent's, and formidable:

Regarding whom is this speech of Indra—*when he was thus bespoken* :

41. 'Prithee tell us, Jishnu,³⁶ why thou art dejected : ' What ! is it not known to you, worthy deities, that this King Hṛidaya makes, on the earth, of Brāhmans, many S'atakratus ?³⁷

42. Of this lord of earth the queen is Sundarī Devī ; the abode of prosperity, *as being*, in effect, the wealth of merit, embodied :

43. From whom are constantly obtained, by Brāhmans,³⁸ elephants, beauteous as dusky clouds, with the copious ichor of their frontal exudation ; *given* with the water of donation³⁹ ever at hand ; precluding, to the needy, the cause of clustering miseries :

44. *Who* shines, resplendent, throughout the world, with her fair fame ; earned, unceasingly, by endowments, in succession as ordained ; *which endowments*, finding, among the nations, straitened scope *for encomium*, reached to heaven ; giving forth such effulgence as a hundred autumnal moons would realize :

45. Who observes, without intermission, the *holy* ordinances, by innumerable conservatory liberalities,⁴⁰ *in the making* of reservoirs, gardens, ponds, and the like, entailing munificent gratuities :

46. Who, establishing this fane, has enshrined *therein* Vishṇu, S'ambhu, Gaṇes'a, Durgā, and Taraṇi.⁴¹

47. Who is there capable of *fitly* eulogizing her, by whom an abode has been provided to the adorable S'ankara,⁴² S'ridhara,⁴³ and others, deities as they are ?

48. Who, *the queen*, evermore pays worship to the gods—and to the comely Trivikrama as chief—in the Brāhmans whom she employs in it, and by *dispensing* good cheer, by keeping jubilees, and by *bestowing* unmeted riches.

— Moreover, by the command of the king, the youthful Mṛigāvatī⁴⁴ constantly brings various articles of food for oblation to Muradwit.⁴⁵

49. Surpassingly victorious is the lord King Hṛidaya, *and* pre-eminent in power by his clemency ; even as the moon, with *its* beams, *subdues* by the force of gentleness.

50. At his behest, the clerkly Jayagovinda—son of the learned Maṇḍana, of favorable repute, versed in the exegesis of the Mīmāṃsā, a master of dialectic, and proficient in expounding the sacred oracles and their supplements—has composed, in epitome, this account relating to the sovereigns of his lineage.

51. By dexterous artificers, named Sinhasāhi, Dayārāma, and Bhagīratha, this temple *was* constructed.

52. On the day of Vishṇu,⁴⁶ in the light fortnight of Jyeshṭha, in the year one thousand seven hundred and twenty-four, *this record* *was* transcribed by Sadās'iva, *and* engraven by these skillful artisans *aforesaid*.

Friday, the 12th day of the bright semi-lunation of Jyeshtha, in the year of *Samvat* 1724.

INDEX TO THE METRES IN THE FOREGOING INSCRIPTION.

1, 7, 11, 13, 42, 45, } 46, 47, —, 49, 51, 52. }	<i>Vaktra</i> . ⁴⁷
2, 4, 5, 6, 24.	<i>A'ryá.</i>
3, 8, 48.	<i>Giti.</i>
9, 16, 27, 29, 41.	<i>Pushpitágrá.</i>
10, 12.	<i>Upagíti.</i>
14, 15.	<i>S'álini.</i>
17, 44.	<i>Avitatha</i> . ⁴⁸
18.	<i>Priyá.</i>
19.	<i>S'ubhá.</i>
20, 31, 34, 36, 37.	<i>S'árdúlavikrídita.</i>
21, 39.	<i>Upendravajrá.</i>
22, 23.	<i>Dhriti.</i>
25.	<i>Varidhará.</i>
26.	<i>Smṛiti.</i>
28, 30, 32, 33.	<i>Sragdhará.</i>
35.	<i>Pramítákshará.</i>
38, 40.	<i>Aupachhandasika.</i>
43.	<i>Vans'astha.</i>
50.	<i>S'ikhariní.</i>

NOTES.

1. Durgávati underwent cremation some ten or twelve miles from Jubulpore, between the Maṇḍala road and the Nerbudda. Her tomb is much frequented as a place of pilgrimage. It is spoken of in Sir Henry Sleeman's Rambles and Recollections of an Indian Official.

2. Poona lithograph edition of Farishta, i. 481. This is the correct paging, and not 281, as is printed. I have collated four MSS. for the Persian of the passage under reference and its relative context; and I am unable to suggest a single reading, out of dozens, in supersession, at an improvement, of what I find in the lithograph. Evidently it was prepared with great care, if one may thus judge by synecdoche.

3. This is in the *pargana* of Gádarwára, District of Nursinghpoor, according to the prevailing official chorography of Central India.

4. For the original of this precious production, which runs as below, I am beholden to the kindness of my friend Major Erskine, Commissioner of the Saugor and Nerbudda Territories. The language is rustic Hindí, and that of a very crude order. Still the Sanskrit scholar, at least with the aid of my version, will scarcely fail to divine the source of many of its expressions.

मृद मुल उडन को चुगलों को चत्राद् खाद् ।

मृद उर् दुहन को शत्रुसंधारका ।

मार अंगरेज रेज कर देइ मात चंडी ।
 ब्रह्म नहीं बैरी बालब्रह्म संघारका ।
 शंकर की रक्षा कर दासप्रतिपाल कर ।
 दीन की पुकार सुन जाय मात हालका ।
 खाय ले मलेच्छन को केर नाहिं करो मात ।
 भच्छन कर ततच्छन ब्रेग प्रत्रन को कालिका ।

5. A title of Vishnu. Its import, according to the Purānas, is given in the dictionaries. For an explanation of the Vaidika Vishṇu's three steps, see a passage, cited from Durga A'chārya, in Dr. Muir's *Mataparīkshā*, Part the First, p. 105 of the Sanskrit. Also see Prof. Wilson's Translation of the *Rig-veda*, i. 53, 54.

6.—Such, or 'very essence,' *pāramārthikam sadrūpam*, appears to be the most preferable rendering of *itthambhāva*; a term which, among the grammarians, has served as a theme of most voluminous contention.

The various significations of *ittham*, and of its synonyme *tathā*, have not as yet, to my knowledge, received much consideration. The latter obviously implies 'seasonableness,' in this couplet:

कार्यात् कार्यानुमानं यच्च च तत् शेषवन् मतम् ।
 तथाविधनदीपूरान् मेघो वृष्टो यद्योपरि ॥

Shad-darśana-samuchchaya, *sl.* 21.

In fact, the precise shade of meaning borne by *tathā* seems frequently to depend entirely on the requirements of the context. But even the natural transition of its import from 'so' or 'thus' to 'conformably,' and thence to 'rightly,' 'well,' 'as desired,' may perhaps lead to a correct apprehension of the Bauddha *Tathāgata*, convertible with *Sugata*, or 'the departed in peace.' Cf. *Mirabar hoc si sic abieret*. Terent., Andr., I. ii. 4. If this explanation of *Tathāgata* be inadmissible, we may, by the analogy of other languages—as the Greek, in which *ὀρως* sometimes stands for *ἠαδιως*—take its element *tathā* to intend 'easily,' 'without impediment;' or, 'notoriously.' Another strictly derivative sense of which this particle is susceptible is 'for good and forever,' 'conclusively,' 'in perpetuity;' he passed away not to return. Or, 'just as he was;' that is to say, absolved from the necessity of renewing his earthly existence.

7. A region whose extent is not yet determined with any certainty, but which included more or less of the present District of Jubulpore. Four miles to the S. W. of the city so called lies what is now the village of Gadhá; a place which is supposed to have been, in former times, the capital of the kingdom mentioned in the text.

8. This name and the last, with the connective that couples them, are fused, by Captain Fell, into the portentous combination "Karnotha-ratnasena."

9. Sir W. H. Sleeman transposes Vīrasinha and his sire.

10. He is referred to in the *Baghela-vans'a-charita*, chapter iv. In his time Baber sat on the throne of Delhi.

- 11.** Literally, 'conflagration at the end of the world.'
- 12.** "Solemn donations are ratified by pouring water into the hand of the donee." Colebrooke's *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 259, foot-note.
- 13.** A name of Indra: 'the spoiler of the cities' of his foes.
- 14.** 'The golden mountain:' Meru.
- 15.** Represented, in order to secure an equivoque, by an epithet signifying 'mine of precious stones.'
- 16.** The original has *swargisa*, 'lord of paradise;' one of Indra's appellatives.
- 17.** *Suvarna*, in the Sanskrit; the name of a weight and of a coin. For its definition and value, see the *As. Res.* (8vo. edition), v. 93: also Prof. Wilson's *Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus* (second edition), i. 47, foot-note.
- 18.** The ever-beneficent cow of Hindu fable, who gratifies every desire.
- 19.** In the original there is an intention to palter with the expressions *prajā* and *loka*.
- 20.** This, and not 'powerful,' is, I think, here the designed sense of *balaván*, by a strain.
- 21.** In the Sanskrit, *Akabara*. Just before we also have, partly as being unavoidable, *A'sapha Khána*.
- 22.** A title of Indra: 'the much-invoked.'
- 23.** The same as Arjuna. *Pārtha* is the matronymic of *Prithá*.
- 24.** To entitle either the queen or the heir apparent to such a destination as he has assigned them, the poet may be suspected of having taken one of the liberties of his craft. S'rīdhara Swámin—while annotating the *Bhāgavata-purāna*, vi. 10, 33—cites the following apposite scripture, but without supplying means for its verification:

द्वित्रिमौ पुरुषौ लोके सूर्यमण्डलभेदिनौ ।

परिव्राज् योगयुक्तश्च रपो यो ऽभिमुखो हतः

'These two persons notoriously rend and enter the disk of the sun: the contemplative superannuated ascetic, and he that is slain in battle, affronting the foe.'

Captain Fell Englishes the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth stanzas in these words: "Upon a battle taking place, this illustrious warrior, who made the earth bend beneath his vast army, and who had ever defeated his foes by his dreadful valor, was slain by hundreds of thousands of his adversary's arrows. Durgávatí, who was mounted on an elephant, severed her own head with the scimitar she held in her hand: she reached the supreme spirit, pierced the sun's orb (obtained salvation)."

25. As following a different classification of natural objects, we should here say, but only as an approximate equivalent, 'inanimate.'

26. In the expansiveness of the original, 'the lord of the face of the earth.'

27. Word for word, 'the burner of Smara,' one of the names of the Hindu Eros, signifying 'remembrance.' The story of his destruction by Śīva's frontal eye cannot require repeating.

28. 'The six-faced:' Kārtikeya, the god of war.

29. *Vidhuta*; a very common, yet solecistic, form of the past participle, for *vidhūta*. In the thirty-second stanza it occurs again.

30. Many Hindu writers, particularly the later, greatly affect this species of delineation by similes. An extract from the description of the heroine of Subandhu's novelette may not unaptly be introduced as a longer specimen in the same style: 'As it were, a picture on the wall of versatile life, the rendezvous of the daintiness of the triple universe, the alchemical master-remedy of the archmagician Youth, the ideal of erotic conception, a lodgment of joyousness, Cupid's ensign in the conquest of the three spheres, the realization of fancy, the rebuke of Love, a magistrery to brace the senses, the fascinating energy of the Heart-agitator, the native pleasure-ground of beauty, chief chamber in the fane of good fortune, the fountain-head of pulchritude, the perfection of soul's attracting incantations, the sight-deluding quality of Passion the conjurer, Prajāpati's creation for the allurements of the threefold world.'

For the original, see my edition of the *Vāsavadattā*, in the Bibliotheca Indica; pp. 64-67. In the Sanskrit, every clause of this passage is accompanied by the quasific particle *iva*.

31. Thus far this stanza gestates with puns. Under my obstetrication into English, they have fallen still-born: no loss of consequence.

32. More scrupulously, 'hemeronyktia.'

33. The sense may be, 'taking its departure during the currency of the dark fortnight;' agreeably to the reckoning which obtains to the south of the Nerbudda.

34. *Urvarā*. Its resemblance to the *ἄγορρα*, 'fruitful plain,' of Homer and Hesiod may, or may not, be accidental.

35. The equivoques with which this stanza is studded are quite untranslatable; except a few at the end, which are printed in italics. What is meant, in the terminology of Hindu music, by *sthāna*, *dharma*, and *mārga*, I am at a loss to say. The last is, perhaps, 'mode.'

I understand, by the word *kinnara*, 'a man provoking admiration;' as the context should seem to exact this acceptation, the etymological: *kim* implying 'surprise,' favorable or otherwise. Kshira Swāmin and Lingaya Śūri, in their scholia on the *Amara-kos'a*, allege that 'a low man' is also imported by this compound. As designating the celestial songsters, I would suggest that 'or' interrogative rather represents its first member. Compare, on this theory, the kindred derivation of *vānara*, 'a monkey;' literally, 'whether a man?'

36. Being interpreted, 'the conqueror;' a name of Indra.

37. A hundred hippocasts are said to raise the mortal that offers them to the rank of Indra; who is, accordingly, agnominated *s'atakratu*. The drift of the text is, that Hṛidaya's favor for the priesthood was sig-

nalized by such munificent liberality as to enable Bráhmans, through the performance of meritorious ceremonies, to endanger the stability of the rank of Indra himself, the lord of heaven.

38. Analytically, 'Titan-foes of the earth;' and the foes of the Titans are the gods. The result is, 'terrestrial deities.'

39. See the note on the seventeenth stanza.

40. An explanation of this technicality will be seen in Colebrooke's Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, pp. 274 and 334.

41. S'tambhu is S'iva; Taraṇi is Súrya, or the sun.

42. Or 'the propitious:' a name of S'iva.

43. The possessor of S'ri;' that is to say, Vishṇu: S'ri, or Lakshmi, being his wife.

44. King Hridaya's daughter, probably. No mention of her is found elsewhere.

A note on this distich has been given above, after its original.

45. Or Murári, etc.; 'the enemy of Mura.' an epithet of Vishṇu, who slew a demon so called.

46. With the astrologers, this day is the next after that so called by the theologians: for, according to the *Padma-purána* and the *Brahmánda-purána*, the eleventh of the fortnight is the prime favorite of Vishnu, who is its regent. The second numeral of what I now read 12, at the end of the inscription, is very indistinct. To ensure certainty, it was, therefore, necessary to resort to computation. The result is, the satisfaction of knowing that 'the clerkly Jayagovinda' followed the astrologers. The date in the text answers to the fifth of June, A. D. 1667, N. S.

For convenience of reference, I subjoin a list of the tutelars of the days of the lunar fortnights; for both which they are the same.

1st. Fire.	9th. Gaurí.
2d. Brahmá.	10th. Yama.
3d. Gaurí.	11th. The <i>Vis'we deváh.</i>
4th. Gaṇe's'a.	12th. Vishṇu.
5th. The serpent tribe.	13th. Káma.
6th. Kártikeya.	14th. S'iva.
7th. The Sun.	15th. The Moon.
8th. S'iva.	

The *pitri-gaṇa*, or bands of manes, preside over the conjunction.

47. The heroic measure, according to its prescribed scheme, is strophic. Yet, as regards the adjacent pairs of its verses, all material deviations from the canons laid down in the *S'ruta-bodha*—such as, when the fourth syllable is long, of elongating, at pleasure, the fifth—are confined, usually, if not universally, to the third hemistich. This is the case, for instance, throughout this inscription. Thus: the first hemistich, conformably to the ancient rule, everywhere exhibiting an epitrite, in *s'l.* 1, 46, 47, 51, and 52, the third ends, after a long syllable, with a fourth pæon; in *s'l.* 13 and 45, with a dispondeë; and, in *s'l.* 49, with a cho-riamb.

While usage allows greater freedom to at least the third hemistich of the heroic measure, in its latter half, than is accorded by the *S'rutabodha*, it refuses to avail itself of much of the liberty which that work silently permits in the first halves of the distichs generally. The middle syllables are not found to be a pyrrhic in any of them; and the closing two, in the second and fourth, are never an iamb.

M. Lancereau's section on the *s'loka*, though correctly representing the intent of his author, does not, therefore, give an account of actual custom. See his *S'rutabodha*, p. 26.

I here cite a portion of Professor Wilson's first description of the *Anuṣṭubh* measure, from p. 436 of the last edition of his Sanskrit Grammar: "In its most regular form, the first foot is any one except a tribrach; the second may be a dactyl, a tribrach, cretic, or anapest: the other two syllables are indifferently long or short." But the first foot is also forbidden to be a dactyl; since it is the concurrence of two short syllables as the second and third that is to be avoided. Again, in the second and fourth quarters of the stanza, the second foot may not be a dactyl or a cretic, where an amphibrach or an antibacchic has preceded. Nor are the final two syllables arbitrary. The seventh is never short, in the first and third hemistichs, unless the fourth is so; and, in the second and last hemistichs, it is, under no circumstances, long. Other corrections of the description just cited, and integrations of it, may be gathered from what has been said above. Nor is it intimated, by Professor Wilson, that the hemistichs of the half *Anuṣṭubh* are not uniform.

It was, thus, ill-advised; in a German editor, to prefer the reading :

सुतं त्वमपि सम्राज्ञं सेव पु०मवाप्नुहि.

Three of my MSS. of the *S'ākuntala* have पू०; which is, for more than one reason, most undoubtedly to be accepted. See Professor Bohtlingk's *S'ākuntala*, pp. ५१, 214, and 289. I have in vain searched the whole of Kālidāsa's works for a similar license. Moreover, the older form is Pūru, not Puru. Professor Wilson says that "the first vowel of Puru is short." Translation of the *Ṛig-veda*, iii. 163, third foot-note. In the *Vishṇu-purāna* it is so; where, by the bye, Puru's brother is Ūru, not Uru, contrarily to the learned translator. But we find Pūru in the *Bhāgavata*, and also in the *Ṛig-veda*; as Professor Wilson afterwards discovered. He does not, however, remark on his former error.

48. The *Avitatha*, *Narkuṭaka*, and *Kokilaka* contain the same number and the same disposition of feet: only the first has no cæsuras; and these pauses, in the last two, differ. Yet Sundara Upādhyāya, in his commentary on the *Vṛitta-ratnākara*, the *Sugama-vṛitti*, says that the *Narkuṭaka* and *Kokilaka* are two names for one measure.

Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, ii. 148—has inadvertently considered the *Avitatha* and *Narkuṭaka* to be identical. The stanza which he prints is of the former metre, a "very uncommon" one, as he justly observes. In the *Veda-stuti*—*Bhāgavata-purāna*, x, latter section, eighty-seventh chapter—a number of instances of it are to be seen, with one stanza in *narkuṭaka* and one in *kokilaka*.

Saugor, March, 1858.

ARTICLE II.

TWO INSCRIPTIONS

PERTAINING TO THE

PARAMÁRA RULERS OF MÁLAVA:

THE SANSKRIT, WITH TRANSLATIONS AND REMARKS.

By FITZ-EDWARD HALL, D.C.L.

Presented to the Society October 17, 1860.

THOUGH the kings mentioned in the memorials¹ under notice have already been made known to the world, yet the statements which have been put forth concerning their connection and succession require to be rectified. Their names are subjoined. The comments which have been suggested with reference to them, as being by-matter, are added in the form of notes.

Bhoja Deva.
Udayáditya Deva.²
Naravarma Deva.
Yas'ovarman Deva.
Ajayavarman.³
Vindhyavarman.
Subhataavarman.
Arjunavarman Deva. A. D. 1211-1215.

Devapála Deva was reigning, as I have brought to light in another paper, in the year 1353 of our era, at Dhára. This city had been the royal seat of the last Bhoja, about three hundred years before; and likewise that of Yas'ovarman, in 1143. Jayavarman dates one edict from Vardhamánapura;⁴ and Arjuna publishes another at Mandapa.⁵ But these two places may have served only for temporary residence.⁶

The copper-plates containing the following inscriptions are deposited in the library of the Begum's school at Sehore in Bhopal, where I examined them in February of last year.

✓ INSCRIPTION No. I.

ओम् । नमः पुरुषार्थचूडामणये धर्माय ।

प्रतिबिम्बनिभाद् भूमेः कृत्वा साक्षात् प्रतिग्रहम् ।
 जगदाह्लादयन् दिश्याद् द्विजेन्द्रो मङ्गलानि वः ॥१॥
 जीयात् परश्रुरामो ऽसौ क्षत्रैः क्षुषं रणाहृतैः ।
 सन्ध्यार्कबिम्बमेवोर्वीदितुर्यस्यैति ताम्रताम् ॥२॥
 येन मन्दोदरीबाष्पवारिभिः शमितो मृधे ।
 प्राणेश्वरीवियोगाग्निः स रामः श्रेयसे ऽस्तु वः ॥३॥
 भूमिनाऽपि धृता मूर्ध्नि यत्पादाः स युधिष्ठिरः ।
 वंशाद्येनेन्दुना जीयात् स्वतुल्य इव निर्मितः ॥४॥
 परमारकुलोत्तंसः कंसजिन्महिमा नृपः ।
 श्रीभोजदेव इत्यासीन् ना सीरक्रान्तभूतलः ॥५॥
 यद्यशश्चन्द्रिकोद्योते दिगुत्सङ्गतरङ्गिते ।
 द्विषन्नृपयशःपुञ्जपुण्डरीकैर्निमीलितम् ॥६॥
 ततो ऽभूद्दयादित्यो नित्योत्साहैककौतुकी ।
 असाधारणवीरश्रीरश्रीहेतुर्विरोधिनाम् ॥७॥
 महाकलकल्पान्ते यस्योद्दामभिराश्रुगैः ।
 कति नोन्मूलितास्तुङ्गा भूभृतः कटकोल्बणाः ॥८॥
 तस्माच् क्षिन्नद्विषन्मर्मा नरवर्मा नराधिपः ॥
 धर्माभ्युद्धरणो धीमानभूत् सीमा महीभुजाम् ॥९॥

प्रतिप्रभातं विप्रेभ्यो दत्तैर्ग्रामपदैः स्वयम् ।
 अनेकपदतां निन्ये धर्मा येनैकपादपि ॥१०॥
 तस्याऽज्ञानि यशोवर्मा पुत्रः क्षत्रियशेखरः ।
 तस्मादज्ञयवर्माऽभूद् जयश्रीविश्रुतः सुतः ॥११॥
 तत्सूनुर्वीरमूर्धन्यो धन्योत्यत्तिरजायत ।
 गुर्जरौच्छेदनिर्बन्धी विन्ध्यवर्मा महाभुजः ॥१२॥
 धारयोद्धृतया सार्धं दधाति स्म त्रिधारताम् ।
 सांयुगीनस्य यस्याऽसिद्धातुं लोकत्रयीमिव ॥१३॥
 तस्याऽऽमुष्यायणाः पुत्रः सुत्रामश्रीरथाऽशिषत् ।
 भूपः सुभटवर्मेति धर्मे तिष्ठन् महीतलम् ॥१४॥
 यस्य ज्वलति दिग्जेतुः प्रतापस्तपनद्युतेः ।
 दावाग्निच्छन्नाऽध्याऽपि गर्जन् गुर्जरपत्तने ॥१५॥
 देवभूयं गते तस्मिन् नन्दनोऽर्जुनभूपतिः ।
 दोष्ता धत्ते ऽधुना धात्रीवल्लयं वल्लयं यथा ॥१६॥
 बाललीलादृवे यस्य जयसिंहे पलायिते ।
 दिक्पालहासव्याजेन यशो दिक्षु विज्ञम्भितम् ॥१७॥
 काव्यगान्धर्वसर्वस्वनिधिना येन साम्प्रतम् ।
 भारवतारणां देव्याश्चक्रे पुस्तकवीणयोः ॥१८॥
 येन त्रिविधवीरेण त्रिधा पल्लवितं यशः ।
 धवल्लवं दधुस्त्रीणि जगन्ति कथमन्यथा ॥१९॥

स एष नरनायकः सर्वाभ्युदयी पगाराप्रतिजागरणके
नर्मतोत्तरकूले ह्यथिणावरग्रामे पूर्वराजदत्तावशिष्टायां
भूमौ समस्तराजपुरुषान् ब्राह्मणोत्तरान् प्रति निवासि-
पट्टकिलजनपदादींश्च बोधयति ।

अस्तु वः संविदितं यथा श्रीमदमरेश्वरतीर्थावस्थितैर-
स्माभिर्द्विसप्तत्यधिकद्वादशशतसंवत्सरे भाद्रपदपौर्णमास्यां
चन्द्रोपरागपर्वणि रेवाकपिलयोः सङ्गमे स्नात्वा भगवन्तं
भवानीपतिमोङ्कारं लक्ष्मीपतिं चक्रस्वामिनं चाऽभ्यर्च्य
संसारस्याऽसारतां दृष्ट्वा । तथाहि ।

वाताभ्रविभ्रममिदं वसुधाधिपत्यम्

आपातमात्रमधुरो विषयोपभोगः ।

प्राणास्तृणायजलविन्दुसमा नराणां

धर्मः सखा परमहो परलोकयाने ॥

इति सर्वं विमृश्याऽदृष्टफलमङ्गीकृत्य मुक्तावस्थूस्था-
नविनिर्गताय वाजसनेयशाखाध्यायिने काश्यपगोत्राय
काश्यपावत्सारनैध्रुवेतित्रिप्रवराया ऽऽवसथिकदेल्हप्रपौ-
त्राय पण्डितसोमदेवपौत्राय पण्डितजैत्रसिंहपुत्राय पुरो-
हितपण्डितश्रीगोविन्दशर्मणे ब्राह्मणाय भूमिरियं च-
तुःकङ्कठविश्रुद्धा सवृक्षमालाकुला सहिरण्यभागभोगा
सोपरिकरघट्टादायलवणादायेत्यादिसर्वादायसमेता सनि-

धिनिक्षेपा मातापित्रोरात्मनश्च पुण्यशोभिवृद्धये चन्द्रा-
र्काणवृत्तिसमकालं यावत् प्रया भक्त्या शासनेनो-
दकपूर्वं प्रदत्ता ।

तन् मत्वा तन्निवासिपट्टकिलजनपदैर्यथादीयमानभागभो-
गकरहिरण्यादिकमाज्ञाविधेयैर्भूत्वा सर्वममुष्मै दातव्यम् ।

सामान्यं चैतत्पुण्यफलं बुधाऽस्मदंशजैरन्यैरपि भावि-
भोक्तृभिरस्मत्प्रदत्तधर्मादायो ज्यमनुमत्तव्यः पालनीयश्च ।

उक्तं च ।

बद्धभिर्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिः सगरादिभिः ।

यस्य यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य तदा फलम् ॥१॥

स्वदत्तां परदत्तां वा यो हरेत वसुन्धराम् ।

स विष्ठायां कृमिर्भूत्वा पितृभिः सह मज्जति ॥२॥

सर्वानेवं भाविनो भूमिपालान्

भूयो भूयो याचते रामचन्द्रः ।

सामान्यो ज्यं धर्मसेतुर्नराणां

काले काले पालनीयो भवद्भिः ॥३॥

इति कमलदलाम्बुबिन्दुलोलां

श्रियमनुचित्य मनुष्यजीवितं च ।

सकलमिदमुदाहृतं च बुधा

न हि पुरुषैः परकीर्तयो विलोप्याः ॥४॥ इति ।

संवत् १२७२ भाद्रपदसुदि १५ बुधे । दू । श्रीमु ३ ।
 रचितमिदं महासान्धि° राजासत्त्वखणसम्मतेन राज-
 गुरुणा मदानेन ।
 स्वहस्तो ज्यं महाराजश्रीमन्नुनवर्मदेवस्य ।
 उत्कीर्णं पं वाप्यदेवेन ।

TRANSLATION.

Om! Glory to Virtue, the frontlet-gem of the *four* human ends!⁷

1. May the Lord of the twice-born—gladdener of the world, from notoriously occupying the earth, in being as it were a shadow—bestow on you prosperity.⁸

2. May he, Paras'uráma, be exalted ; penetrated by the Kshatras slain, in strife, by whom, *in order to become* donor of the earth to *Bráhmans*, the disk of the rising and declining sun has permanently acquired a coppery hue.⁹

3. May Ráma—who, in battle, allayed, with the water of Mandodarí's tears, the fire of severance from the mistress of his life—be of *avail* for your welfare.

4. May Yudhishthira be triumphant : whose feet even Bhíma placed upon his head, and whom the founder of his race, the moon, framed, so to speak, in the similitude of himself, for *gentleness*.¹⁰

5. There was a sovereign, the auspicious Bhojadeva : the ornament of the Paramára lineage ; in glory, a Kansajit ;¹¹ a man whose ploughs overpassed the face of the earth ;¹²

6. The moonlight of whose fame having irradiated the undulating ridges of the quarters, the lilies of the abundant renown of hostile princes became closed.¹³

7. From him sprang Udayáditya ; whose sole delight was constant enterprise ; of peculiar felicity as a champion ; and a source of infelicity to *his* antagonists ;

8. By whose arrows, discharged in fierce destructive war, how many lofty monarchs, formidable with armies, were not extirpated !¹⁴

9. Of him was born King Naravarman : who clove the vital parts of *his* enemies ; sagacious in sustaining virtue ; the limit of princes ;¹⁵

10. Who, by shares¹⁶ of villages which he, every morning, himself bestowed upon Bráhmans, rendered Virtue, one-footed as it was, multipled.

11. Of him a son was born, Yas'ovarman, the frontlet of Kshatriyas. From him issued a son, Ajayavarman; renowned for *his* conquests and fortune.

12. Vindhyavarman was born as his son; at the head of heroes, of well-omened birth, zealous in the extinction of the Gurjaras,¹⁷ long-armed.

13. Of whom, skilled in warfare, the sword, with its edge up-raised,¹⁸ as if to deliver the three worlds, assumed a triple edge.

14. Subsequently, his high-born¹⁹ son, King Subhatavarman, affluent as Sutráman, persevering in religious duties, incited the earth to *their observance*:

15. Of whom, conqueror of the directions, of sun-like lustre, the splendor, as it were a forest-fire, even to this day blazes, resounding, in Pattana²⁰ of the Gurjaras.

16. He having attained apotheosis,²¹ *his* son, King Arjuna, now sustains, with *his* arm, the circuit of the earth, like a bracelet.²²

17. Whose celebrity—since Jayasinha²³ took to flight in the war of his juvenile diversions—as it had been the laughter of the custodians of the quarters, extended in *all* directions:

18. Who, a repository of the entire wealth of poesy and song, fitly relieved the goddess Saraswatí of the burthen of *her* volumes and *her* lute.

19. Who, possessing three descriptions of combatants,²⁴ spread abroad *his* renown as threefold. Else, how have the three worlds acquired *their* whiteness?²⁵

The same, a sovereign exalted above all, in respect of the land, remaining over and beyond that bestowed by former princes, in the village of Hathinávára, on the north bank of the Narmadá, in the district²⁶ of Pagará, gives notice to²⁷ all imperial officers, fō Bráhmans—the eminent,²⁸ to the local village head-men,²⁹ to *his* people, and to others,—

Be it known to you as follows: By us, sojourning at the holy station of the blessed Amares'wara,³⁰ after bathing at the junction³¹ of the Revá and Kapilá, at the sacred season of an eclipse of the moon, at its full in Bhádrapada, in the year twelve hundred and seventy-two, *and* after worshipping the adorable lord of Bhavání,³² Onkára,³³ the consort of Lakshmi, and the master of the discus;³⁴ considering the vanity of the world, as thus *set forth*:—

'Unstable as the storm-cloud is this *delusive* primacy of earth. Sweet for only the fleeting moment is the fruition of objects of sense. Like a water-drop on the tip of a spear of grass is the vital breath of men. Ah! virtue is the sole attendant on the journey of the other world:³⁵—

Reflecting on all this, *and* electing spiritual recompense; has, from *motives* of the greatest piety,³⁶ with preliminary *presentation* of water, been granted, by patent; for enhancement of the merit and renown of our mother, our father, and of ourself; for duration coexistent with the moon, the sun, the seas, and the earth; to the family priest, the learned and auspicious Govinda S'arman, a Bráhmaṇ; settled at the place called Muktvasthú;³⁷ student of the Vájasaneya subdivision of the *Veda*;³⁸ of the stock of Kas'yapa,³⁹ and of the three branches, Kás'yapa, A'vatsára, and Naidhruva; son of the learned Jaitrasinha, grandson of the learned Somadeva, *and* great grandson of Delha, maintainer of a perpetual fire;⁴⁰ this land; of which the four boundaries are defined;⁴¹ filled with fields containing trees;⁴² together with money-rent, share of produce, house-tax,⁴³ ferry-tolls, impost on salt, and all other the like dues; *and* with its hidden treasure and deposits.

Mindful hereof, the resident head man of this *village*, and our subjects *dwelling here*, being observant of our behests, will deliver to him, *Govinda S'arman*, all charges, as they fall to be paid; *namely*, share of produce, taxes, rent in cash, and so forth.

Moreover, knowing the requital of this meritorious act to be common, the coming occupants of our *title*, born in our line, or strangers, should admit and uphold this virtuous donation by us assigned.⁴⁴

And it has been said :

1. By numerous kings, Sagara and others, the earth has been enjoyed. Whosoever, *for custody*, at any time, has been the soil, his, at that time, has been the fruit of *even the previous bestowment* thereof.⁴⁵

2. He who resumes land, given by himself or given by another, transformed to a worm in ordure, grovels *there* with his ancestors.⁴⁶

3. Thus does Rámachandra again and again conjure all these *and* future protectors of the glebe: 'Universal to men is this bridge of good works, *liberality*, and to be guarded, by you, from age to age.'

4. Reckoning,⁴⁷ accordingly, good fortune and human life to be as uncertain as a bead of water on the petal of a lotos, and conscious⁴⁸ that all this is appositely propounded, of a surety it behoves not men to cut short the repute of others.

Done in the year 1272, on the fifteenth of the light fortnight of Bhádrapada, on Wednesday.⁴⁹

This *was* executed by Madana, the king's spiritual adviser, with the approbation of Rájásalakhana,⁵⁰ chief minister of peace and war.⁵¹

This is the autograph of the great king, the auspicious Arjunavarma Deva.

Engraved by Bápyadeva, clerk.

✓
INSCRIPTION No. II.⁵²

* * * * *

स एष नरनायकः सर्वाभ्युदयी सावइरिसोलेसम्बद्ध
उत्तरायणोग्रामे उभुवोसह समस्तराजपुरुषान् ब्राह्मणो-
त्तरान् प्रति निवासिपट्टकिलजनपदादींश्च बोधयति ।

अस्तु वः आषाढवदि १५ सोमे सोमवतीतीर्थे स्नात्वा
श्रीमदर्जुनवर्मदेवेन सुपुरोधसे पण्डितगोविन्दाय महा-
कालपुरमध्ये दण्डाधिपतिवासविग्रहमुदकपूर्वं प्रदत्तं
प्रतोलीप्रागारसीमापर्यन्तम् ।

संविदितं यथा श्रीभृगुकच्छसमावासितैरस्माभिः सप्त-
त्यधिकद्वादशशतसंवत्सरे वैशाखवदि अमावास्यायां
सूर्यग्रहणपर्वणि स्नात्वा भगवन्तं भवानीपतिमभ्यर्च्य
संसारस्याऽऽसारतां दृष्ट्वा ।

* * * * *

इति सर्वं विमृश्याऽदृष्टफलमङ्गीकृत्य मुक्तावस्थूस्था-
नविनिर्गताय वाजसनेयशाखाध्यायिने काश्यपगोत्राय
काश्यपावत्सारनैधुवेतित्रिप्रवराया ऽऽ वसथिकदेल्हप्रपौ-
त्राय पण्डितसोमदेवपौत्राय पण्डितजैत्रसिंहपुत्राय पुरो-
हितगोविन्दशर्मणि ब्राह्मणाय समस्तो ऽपि ग्रामश्चतुःक-
ङ्कठविशुद्धः सवृक्षमालाकुलः सहिरण्यभागभोगः सोप-
रिकरः सर्वादायसमेतः सनिधिनिक्षेपो मातापित्रोरात्म-

नश्च पुण्यशोभिवृद्धये चन्द्रार्कार्णवक्षितिसमकालं या-
वत् परया भक्त्या शासनेनोदकपूर्वं प्रदत्तः ।

तन् मत्वा तन्निवासिपट्टकिल्लजनपदैर्यथादीयमानभाग-
भोगकरहिरण्यादिकं देवत्राक्षणाभुक्तिवर्तमाज्ञाविधेयैर्भूत्वा
सर्वममुष्मै दातव्यम् ।

* * * * *

संवत् १२७० वैशाखवदि १५ सोमे । द्र। श्रीम् ३ ।

रचितमिदं महाराज्ञि० पं० श्रीबिल्हणसम्भतेन राज-
गुरुणा मदानेन ।

स्वहस्तो ज्यं महाराजश्रीमदर्जुनवर्मदेवस्य ।

उत्कीर्णं पण्डितब्राह्मणदेवेन ।

TRANSLATION.

* * * * *

This same sovereign, exalted over all, in respect of Ubhuvosa, ⁵³ in the village of Uttaráyana, appertaining to Sávaïrisole, ⁵⁴ advertises all royal officials, Bráhmans—the eminent, the resident village head-man, *his* people *generally*, and others.

Be it known to you as follows: After ablution at the holy station of Somavati, on Monday, the fifteenth *day* of the moon's wane in A'shádha, the auspicious Arjunavarma Deva did grant, with prior *presentation* of water, to the excellent family priest, the learned Govinda, a ground-plot for a temple ⁵⁵ to Daṇḍádhpati, ⁵⁶ extending as far as the boundary of the edifices ⁵⁷ on the main street, in the city of Mahákála. ⁵⁸

Likewise: by us; sojourning at the fortunate Bhrigukachchha, ⁵⁹ after bathing at the sacred season of a solar eclipse, at the change of the moon, in the dark fortnight of Vais'ákha, in the year twelve hundred and seventy; *and* after worshipping the divine consort of Bhaváni; considering the vanity of the world, *etc.*: * * * reflecting on all this, *and* electing spiritual reward; has, from *motives* of the greatest piety, with initiatory *gift* of water,

been granted, by patent; to augment the merit and good name of our mother, our father, and ourself; for duration coexistent with the moon, the sun, the seas, and the earth; to the domestic chaplain, the learned Govinda S'arman, Bráhmán; settled at the place called Muktvásthú; reader of the Vájasaneya *Vaidika* subdivision; of the stock of Kas'yapa, and of the three branches, Kás'yapa, A'vatsára, and Naidhruva; son of the learned Jaitrasinha, grandson of the learned⁶⁰ Somadeva, and great grandson of Delha, who maintained a perpetual fire; even the entire village *aforsaid*; of which the four boundaries are defined; filled with fields containing trees; together with money-rent and share of produce, with house-tax, including all dues, and with its hidden treasure and deposits.

Mindful hereof, the local head-man of this *village*, and our subjects *here abiding*, observant of our injunction, will disburse to him, *Govinda S'arman*, all charges, as they fall to be paid; *to-wit*, share of produce,⁶¹ taxes, rent in money, and the rest, the perquisites of the gods and of Bráhmans excepted.

* * * * *

Done in the year 1270, on Monday, the fifteenth *day* of the dark semi-lunation of Vais'ákha.

This *was* executed by Madana, the king's spiritual guide, with the acquiescence of the learned and fortunate Bilhana, chief minister of peace and war.

This *is* the sign manual of the great king, the auspicious Arjunavarma Deva.

Incised by Bápyadeva, clerk.

NOTES.

1. In the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1836, pp. 377 etc., is a land-grant of Arjunavarman, edited and translated by the late Mr. L. Wilkinson. In a subsequent volume, that for 1838, pp. 736 etc., this gentleman writes, pointing to that instrument: "I was about to add translations also of the other two inscriptions: but, finding that they both correspond, word for word, with that formerly sent to you, in all respects but the dates—which are later, the one only by three, and the other only by five years, than that of the former inscription—and that they both record grants by the same Rájá Arjuna, translations of them would be but an idle repetition." But the correspondence is not so close as is thus asserted. The two inscriptions referred to are those now published.

2. I now redeem the promise which I once made, to demonstrate that a mistake has been committed in throwing back Udayáditya to A.D. 618. Two facsimile copies of the Udaypur inscription, which I was at much pains in getting executed, have been of material aid to me towards arriving at a determination on this point.

The person for whom that wretched scrawl was indited calls himself a descendant of Udayāditya of Málava : but it is clear that, whether so or not, he knew nothing of Udayāditya's family. The word मूर्खोर्—rightly, मूर्खोर्—in the monument adverted to, is not the name of a king. Gondala is the first regal personage whom it notices. His son seems to be Gyátá ; for which पाता has been printed ; the vernacular corruption, perhaps, of ज्ञाता, nominative of ज्ञातृ. अरिबलमथन, if such be the true reading, is an epithet of the doubtful Gyátá, and, by no possibility, an appellation. Udayāditya is represented as son of the last ; and he is distinctly stated to have been ruling in *Samvat* 1116, or *S'aka* 981, i. e., A. D. 1059. For four hundred and forty-six years subsequently, it is alleged, the Yavanas had been in the ascendant : and this term brings us to *Samvat* 1562, *S'aka* 1447—which should be 1427—or the year 4607—not 4669, as printed—of the *Kali-yuga*, i. e., A. D. 1506 ; at which time the person at whose instance the inscription was written appears to have assumed some sort of authority. Six years later, in *S'rimukha*—an item wanting to Capt. Burt's copy—or A. D. 1513, he engaged in a pious transaction in honor of S'iva. His name was Sāgaravarman—metamorphosed, as printed, into योगेश्वरम्—commonly styled Chánddeva, or Chandra Deva. Nor is S'alivāhana given as son of Udayāditya.

More might be said on the present topic : but it is enough, if I have shown that we have here to do with a thing of no importance, abstracted from its liability to beget error. See the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1840, pp. 545 etc.

Professor Lassen, I am told, has accepted the inscription thus disposed of, as sufficient voucher for antedating Udayāditya some four hundred and fifty years. It is scarcely credible.

Udayāditya was, very likely, in power in A. D. 1059, however reluctantly we receive the word of such as Sāgaravarman, or his historicaster.

There is an inscription, still undeciphered, lying at Bhopal, in which occurs the name of Udayāditya. Its date is *Samvat* 1241, if I may rely on a blundering transcript of it. In another inscription, in the *Bijamandira*, a temple at the same place with the record just spoken of, an Udayāditya is mentioned, in a Sanskrit couplet, as having been king over Bhúpāla in the *S'aka* year 1108, or A. D. 1186. The words are these :

भूपाले भूमिपालो ज्यमुद्यादित्यपार्थिवः ।
तेनेदं निर्मितं स्थानं वसुपूर्णेश्वरैः प्राके ॥

3. Mr. Wilkinson quietly assumes Jayavarman and Ajayavarman to be identical ; though, in the inscriptions, each is said to have had a different successor : the former, Haris'chandra ; and the latter, Vindhyavarman. To reconcile the discrepancy resulting from this confusion, he resorts to the theory that Haris'chandra “ was only a prince of the royal family, and, as such, became possessed of an appanage, and not of the whole kingdom.” This view, he thinks, is countenanced by the title of महाकुमार being given to Haris'chandra. The same term, however, but dropped in the English version, is applied to his father, Lakshmiavarman ;

who, it should seem, if not himself a king, was the eldest son of one Mr. Wilkinson was unaware of this fact; not having seen, apparently, the relative inscriptions translated by Colebrooke.

Speaking of Yas'ovarman and Lakshmivarman, Colebrooke says, as touching the latter: "He did not become his successor: for Jayavarman is, in another inscription, named immediately after Yas'ovarman; and was reigning sovereign." *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 303. But Colebrooke was unacquainted with the after-history of the family to which they belonged.

As Lakshmivarman sat on the throne with his sire, it is reasonable to suppose that he was the first-born. His brother, Jayavarman, also speaks of himself as if a sovereign ruler. Lakshmivarman may have died while Haris'chandra was still a child, and Jayavarman have acted as regent on behalf of his nephew, to whom the government eventually devolved from him; if they did not administer it conjointly. Yet it is noticeable that Jayavarman granted away land, at one period, precisely as if he were the sole and substantive head of the state. Possibly the extreme youth of his ward prevented his being named at that time.

Lakshmivarman being mentioned, by his son, under the title of महाकुमार, and not as king, it may be that he deceased during the lifetime of Yas'ovarman. Haris'chandra designates himself in a similar manner, where he would certainly have called himself, without qualification, sovereign, had he laid claim to undivided power. His complete style, in fact, is that which his father used as prince regnant. Policy, or some other motive, may have dissuaded him from the style of full royalty, his hereditary right. It may, therefore, be conjectured that Jayavarman was still living in A. D. 1179.

The words in which Haris'chandra takes notice of his own accession are worthy of remark. Premising his ancestors, while he passes over his father, he mentions his uncle, and adds, of himself: *तस्मात् पुष्टतमप्रभोः प्रसादाद्वापुनित्राधिपत्यः*. In other words, he acknowledges that he had 'obtained his supreme rank by the favor of this, the very last, ruler.' Yet, notwithstanding this assertion, it will be observed that he does not unequivocally pretend to kingship. The delicacy of the distinction is truly Hindu.

If the phrase *पादानुध्यात* be designed to indicate the succession of a son to like dignity with his father's, a strain is put on it as regards its application to Jayavarman, provided he was not a usurper. Haris'chandra, in the body of his patent, does not say whose son he himself was: and, if he had done so, perhaps he could not have employed this formula with any more propriety; as I conceive that its strict tenor, in its most usual acceptation, is to mark connection between monarchs successively in actual possession.

Ajayavarman, being son of Yas'ovarman, must have been brother—presumably, younger brother—of Lakshmivarman and Jayavarman. His son, or grandson, came to the chief power; but how, remains to be discovered. Of offspring of Haris'chandra and Jayavarman we hear nothing.

Devadhara, entitled *rāja-putra*, or 'king's son,' is found as a subscribing witness to a donative instrument of Yas'ovarman. This is all that

can be said of him at present. It may be that he was simply a Rájput, and not of the issue of Yas'ovarman.

These speculations are founded, in part, on the presumption that the sons of Yas'ovarman were not independent masters of as many distinct territories.

See the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1836, pp. 377 etc.; and for 1838, pp. 736 etc.: also Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, ii. 297 etc.

Between Vindhavarman and Subhātavarman a King "Amushyáyana" is interposed by Mr. Wilkinson, who mistakes an epithet for a proper name. This and several other misinterpretations are copied, without correction, by Mr. A. K. Forbes, in his *Rás-málá*, i. 114, 208.

I am perplexed what to make of "Wullál, the King of Onjein," who is said to have been conquered by Kumárapála of Gujerat. Kumárapála's time was between A. D. 1142 and 1173. Can it be that Ballála—as I should spell the word—was another name of Jayavarman? See the *Rás-málá*, i. 184-187.

That Naravarman ruled as early as A. D. 1107, we have the evidence of an inscription on marble, seen by Col. Tod. Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, i. 223, 226.

4. श्रीवर्धमानपुरसमावसात् : "from his abode at the auspicious Vardhamánapura:" an improbable idiom. Miscell. Essays, ii. 307, 309. Colebrooke's facsimile of his original leads me to believe that the right reading is श्रीवर्धमानपुरसमावसात् ॐ : 'here, resident at the auspicious Vardhamánapura.' The ॐ is unmistakable; and, as the *ardhákára* was not to be expected, there wants nothing, to bring out my wording, but the stroke which converts á into o.

5. This is, probably, either the original, or the Sanskritized form, of the present Mándú. We have the same word, I presume, in Káthmándu, usually derived from Kásthāmandira. Whether *mandapa* ever means 'city,' I am unable to say. If it does, like *pattanā* and *nagara*, its synonyms, it has come to be an appellation. Compare πόλις in the vulgar Romaic's τήν πόλιν, Stambol, or Constantinople.

6. Mr. Wilkinson errs in understanding that Haris'chandra issues a patent "from his capital of Nilagiri." The document recites that Nilagiri was the district—*mandala*—in which the land alienated was situate.

7. According to Hindu conception, the purpose of life is fourfold: virtue, wealth, gratification of the senses, and final blessedness. I know of no warrant for considering the third, or काम, to imply "love of God," as Colebrooke explains it on one occasion. Digest of Hindu Law etc. (8vo. edition), ii. 382.

There is something peculiar in the salutations of nearly all the edicts, hitherto discovered, of the later rulers of Málava. In one of the grants published by Colebrooke, we find अत्रियो अयुद्यश्च, "auspicious victory and elevation." Another of them has अत्रियो अयुद्यश्च, 'auspiciousness, victory, and elevation.' Colebrooke seems silently to have departed, here, from his facsimile. See his Miscell. Essays, ii. 307, 308.

8. Mr. Wilkinson changes प्रतिबिम्बनिभाद् to प्रतिबिम्बतया. Imagining the couplet to be pregnant with puns, he translates it in three different ways. The true sense which would come in place of that which he ranks as principal is, however, defeated by reading प्रतिबिम्बतया; however we might then find something, in the verses, about eclipses of the moon; the writer of them being assumed to hold the rational opinions of Bháskara A'chárya concerning the cause of those phenomena. But it is impossible, on either lection, to extort from the passage anything applicable to the serpent S'esha.

The moon—but not here—is sometimes called द्विजेन्द्र or द्विजराज, 'chief of the twice-born.' Its primary emanation from the eye of Atri counts as birth the first; and its extraction from the sea of milk, into which it was cast, is its second birth.

The nineteen stanzas which commence my original are in every wise identical with as many at the beginning of the inscription translated by Mr. Wilkinson in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1836, pp. 377 etc. I write with a copy before me, in manuscript, taken from his facsimile.

✓ 9. Such is a literal rendering of the scarcely less awkward original. Warriors who fall in battle are supposed, by the Hindus, to reach Paradise through the sun.

Mr. Wilkinson, by two bold strokes, alters the Sanskrit entirely: and, after all, he entirely misapprehends the drift of his alteration. After correcting an obvious error of the press, लुपया for लुपया, his reading will run thus:

त्रीयात परशुरामो ऽसौ क्षत्रैः लुपया रपाहतैः ।
सन्ध्यार्कबिम्बमेयोर्वी दातुर्यस्येति ताम्रताम् ॥

His English of this is in these words: "May that Paras'uráma, who gave to the Bráhmans the whole earth, after it had become red as the setting sun, being drenched in the blood of the race of Kshatriyas prostrated in terrible conflicts, ever be praised." I should be disposed to substitute as follows: 'May he, Paras'uráma, be exalted; of whom, munificent, the earth—as measurable by the sun's disk throughout the turns of the day—worn by Kshatras slain in strife, assumed a coppery tint.'

10. Mr. Wilkinson turns the plurals धृताः and पादाः of the original into duals, धृतौ and पादौ. The latter are more nicely exact, in the article of grammar; but the former are held to be more respectful.

11. Kansajit, 'the conqueror of Kansa,' is Kṛishṇa. As none, however, but the initiated, will be likely to look into such a paper as the present, I may dispense with indications of this sort. Hence many of the historical allusions are also left unexplained.

12. With the latter line of this stanza Mr. Wilkinson takes something of a liberty, in transforming it to:

प्रभोजदेव श्यासीदासीमक्रान्तभूतलः

Bhøjadeva is thus made to have 'subjugated the face of the earth to its borders.' The old rendering of the above is: "He traversed the earth, in victory, even to its ocean limits."

13. The meaning is, that, since the influence of Bhoja reached to the ends of terrestrial space, all opposition vailed before him.

There is a species of lotos which shuts at night-fall.

In this couplet the earth is supposed to terminate in rugged declivities.

Mr. Wilkinson alters ययप्रान्दि कोयोत्ते to ययप्रान्दि कोदेति.

14. The second half of this couplet palters with several words, to this effect: 'how many towering mountains, impregnable from their escarpments, were not eradicated?'

15. Here, again, Mr. Wilkinson arbitrarily innovates, in putting भिन्न- for द्विन्न-, 'broken' for 'cleft.'

The 'limit of princes' denotes their ne plus ultra.

16. My authority for representing पद by 'share' is an inscription published by me in another volume of this Journal (vi. 542 etc.).

17. In the original, गूर्तर. And so the word seems to be written quite as often as गुर्तर. Still the latter alone is reputed correct.

18. The Sanskrit is here peculiar; the idiom employed being of very questionable purity.

19. This is the term which, as mentioned above, Mr. Wilkinson promotes to the name of a king. It is the adjective of अमुष्यायण, 'son of somebody,' an hidalgo, a eupatrid.

20. Or Analavata; vulgarly, Anhilwára. Without much demur, we should so understand the word; allowance being made for a fraudulent vaunt. But it would be just as permissible to render 'in the cities.' The ambiguity of the Sanskrit looks as if intentional.

According to Mr. Forbes, Subhatavarman contemplated an incursion into Gujerat, in the time of Bhíma II, but did not carry his design into execution. His son, it is said, was more successful. *Rás-málá*, i. 208.

Mr. Wilkinson, at the cost of sense and grammar, puts दावाग्निसुम्न for दावाग्निच्छन्ना.

21. This implies a death of happy hopes; absorption into deity, and hence identification with him.

22. The frivolous equivoques of the original appear sufficiently in the English, without the necessity of comment.

23. There is a difficulty here: but, with the aid of Mr. Forbes, it may, perhaps, be solved.

Jayasinha of Gujerat—taking for granted that he is intended—reigned in A. D. 1093–1142 or 1144; whereas A. D. 1210 and 1215 are among the ascertained regnal years of Arjunavarman. But Bhíma II, whose date is A. D. 1178–1214, is called, in one inscription, "a second Siddharája;" Siddharája having been the title of one of Jayasinha's ancestors. May not Bhíma have been popularly called "a second Jayasinha" also? If so, there was a taunting appositeness in Arjuna's choosing to give him this designation, dropping the qualification of "second;" since the real Jayasinha aggressed on Málava, took Dhárá by storm,

defeated Arjuna's predecessor, Yas'ovarman, and carried him captive to Analavata. *Rās-mālā*, i. 66, 113, 114, 208.

In the inscription which Mr. Forbes speaks of at p. 66, Jayasinha appears as conqueror of "Wurwurk, the lord of Oojein;" meaning Yas'ovarman. Does "Wurwurk," (partly owing to the printer), stand for Varmārka, 'the sun of Kshatriyas?' What Mr. Forbes writes at p. 116 has not passed unnoticed.

Col. Tod says that Siddharāja—his Siddharāya—took Naravarman prisoner, after seizing his capital. He adds that Siddharāja "ruled from *Samvat* 1150 to *Samvat* 1201." Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, i. 222. Greatly preferring to trust Mr. Forbes, I believe that Col. Tod has mixed up Naravarman with Yas'ovarman.

24. That is to say, elephantry, cavalry, and infantry. In ancient times, chariots were added as a fourth arm. They must have been disused long before the thirteenth century.

Mr. Wilkinson changes येन to तेन.

25. Renown, in the Hindu typology, is of a white color.

There is a play on the word धवलत्व, which means both 'whiteness' and 'purity,' 'fairness.'

These stanzas, which are in the *pathyāvakra* measure, are, even in Hindu estimation, of rather indifferent fabric. A number of their allusions, as being of commonplace occurrence, have been left unannotated. Alike in these verses and in the rest of the inscription, the engraver of the plate has here and there omitted a *visarga*, and has substituted the dental sibilant for the palatal. All errors of greater moment than these are specially pointed out.

26. *Pratijāgarāṇaka*, in the original. I have remarked, in a previous paper (see this Journal, vi. 531, n. 38), on the word *pattulā*, which I take to intend a canton or commune. That this term and *pratijāgarāṇaka* are synonymes, I am indisposed to believe without further proof; especially since the latter is used as if it were the subdivision of a kingdom, next inferior to the *mandala* or province. See the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1838, p. 737; and for 1836, p. 379.

Sir H. M. Elliot, discussing the antiquity of the word *pargana*, as a geographical technicality, says that it is found so employed "even on an inscription dated A. D. 1210, discovered at Piplianugur in Bhopal;" and he adds a reference to the second of the land-grants just indicated. Supplemental Glossary, p. 186. Had Sir Henry taken the trouble to turn back a leaf, he would have seen that Mr. Wilkinson's "pargana" was only meant as a substitute for the Sanskrit *pratijāgarāṇaka*.

27. I here take *prati* to be a preposition; though, as such, it is superfluous in its place in the sentence. It may be a distributive prefix; and, in that case, must not stand independent.

28. Colebrooke, in haste, twice renders *brāhmaṇottarān* by "Brāhmaṇas and others." Miscell. Essays, ii. 303, 309.

29. *Pattākila*, which, Colebrooke says, "is probably the *Pattāil* of the moderns." Miscell. Essays, ii. 303. Professor Wilson could scarcely

have remembered this observation, when he set down *paṭīl* as the original form of the word, and wrote of it as follows: "the term is principally current in the countries inhabited by, or subject to, the Marāṭhas, and appears to be an essential Marāṭhi word, being used as a respectful title in addressing one of that nation, or a Śūdra in general: it may be derived from *Pāt*, a water-course, the supply of water being fitly under the care of the chief person of the village; or from *Paṭ*, a register or roll (of the inhabitants, etc.) of the village." Glossary of Indian Terms, pp. 407, 408.

It is at least plausible to suppose that *pattakila* is a depravation, by metathesis, of *pattalika*. It may, then, be allied to *pattalā*, 'canton;' which, likely enough, besides being the same with *paṭala*, was also written *paṭālā*: as we have both *pattuna* and *paṭtana* for 'city.'

If this be tenable, the jurisdiction of the *pattakila* may have been wider formerly than it is at present; though a functionary of this sort sometimes has, even in our day, three or four villages under him. Accordingly, by the phrase '*pattakila* of such and such village' would be understood an officer holding certain authority over the shire of country in which it was comprehended.

Otherwise, if we connect *pattakila* with *paṭala*, 'the filing of suits,' it may have denoted the magistrate presiding over a court of primary instance.

There is still much to determine as to what is imported by *patta* and several of its real or apparent conjugates, when employed relatively to matters judicial.

30. This place has not been identified, any more than several others specified in this inscription and in that which follows. The phallus of Amares'wara lies to the west of Mount Parvanka, according to the 26th chapter of the *Revā-māhātmya*. Mount Paryanka is son of Vindhya, in mythology.

31. This junction is east of the Vaidūrya mountain, in Dharmāranya, at Siddhimanwantara. It lies to the north of the Revā, or Narmadā. The Kapilā takes its rise in the highlands of Khandesh, and disembogues opposite the temple of Onkāra-mandhātā, a little to the east of the "Churar." It arose from the water used at a sacrifice performed by King Vasudāna. Great is the merit of dying at the confluence of the Revā and Kapilā. Again:

रवातदेषु ये वृक्षाः पतिताः कालपर्यय ।
नर्मदातोयसंस्पृष्टास्त ऽपि यान्ति परां गतिम् ॥

That is to say, so efficacious is the holiness of the Narmadā, at all points throughout its length, that the very trees sprinkled by its spray are pronounced to be secure of future beatitude. *Revā-māhātmya*, chapters 1-15, et alibi.

32. This is S'iva.

33. In the original, the *anuswāra* is wanting over the last syllable of this word. Onkāra, or 'the syllable *Om*,' is, among the S'aivas, the sensible type of S'iva; among the Vaishnavas, of Vāsudeva or Vishṇu.

34. I suspect that the engraver had before him, in his written exemplar, चक्रवापि. He has cut चक्रस्वामिनं, which, though it cannot be called altogether inadmissible, is yet anomalous.

35. These verses I have translated in other inscriptions. Their metre is the *Vasantatilakā*.

36. Colebrooke mistakes this expression, पर्या भक्त्या, for पर्या भुक्त्या, "to be fully possessed." *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 308, 310.

37. This name and several others to follow are misprinted in the first inscription published by Mr. Wilkinson.

38. The white *Yajur-veda*.

39. There are three such, named from Naidhruva, Raibha, and S'andila. The first is here denoted.

40. *A'vasathika*. See Colebrooke's *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 305, foot-note 24.

41. *Chatuh-kankata-vis'uddha*. This expression is found, among other places, in one of the inscriptions published and translated by Colebrooke. But he forgets to translate it. *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 301, 305. The more common phrase is *chatur-aghata-vis'uddha*. *Kankata*, in the sense of 'boundary,' is not in any dictionary that I have been able to consult.

42. *Sa-vriksha-mālākula*. Colebrooke resolves this combination into *māla*, 'field,' and *kula*, 'abode.' He adds that "the passage may admit a different interpretation." The hint proposed by Col. Tod is little to the purpose. *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 305, 306.

In the note here cited, Colebrooke gives the Sanskrit word in question for 'field' correctly. But he considers *kula* to be annexed to it; thus lengthening it to *mālā*; for which there is no warrant. The last member of the compound is *ākula*, 'filled.' For this acceptation of the verb *kula* with the prefix *ā*, as it is omitted in Professor Westergaard's *Radices Sanscritæ*, see my edition of the *Vāsavadattā*, p. 249, first line, in the *Bibliotheca Indica* of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; and the *Das'a-rūpaka*, iii. 49.

43. "Superior taxes." Colebrooke's *Miscellaneous Essays*, ii. 312. Both renderings are tentative.

Mr. Wilkinson turns सोपरिकर into सोपस्कर.

44. Colebrooke calls a passage, almost word for word like this, a "stanza." *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 306; where he refers to another reading of it, at p. 313 *ibid*. Neither of them can be reduced to any prosodial measure.

The formula in the text has a number of shapes in prose: and it is not unusual to find something of the same kind in metre. One version runs thus:

तद्वंशजाः परमहीपतिवंप्रजा वा

पापादपेतमनसो भुवि भाविभूपाः ।

ये पालयन्ति मम धर्मिमं हि सर्वे

तेभ्यो मया विरचितो ऽञ्जलिरेव मूर्ध्नि ॥

'To all future kings on earth, sprung from my race, or descendants of other monarchs, with hearts free from wickedness, I clasp my hands to my head, *praying* that they will uphold this my virtuous deed.'

I quote the ensuing verses from Colebrooke's *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 311 :

अस्मत्कुलक्रममुदारमुदाहरद्भिर्
अन्यैश्च दानमिदमभ्यनुमोदनीयम् ।
लक्ष्म्यास्तद्विलयबुद्बुदतुन्दिलाया
दानं फलं पर्यग्राःपरिपालनं च ॥

"This donation ought to be approved by those who exemplify the hereditary liberality of our race, and by others. The flash of lightning from Lakshmi swoln with the raindrop, is gift ; and the fruit is preservation of another's fame."

This import, by the bye, cannot even be extorted from the Sanskrit. Colebrooke annotates : "I have here hazarded a conjectural emendation ; being unable to make sense of the text, as it stands. Perhaps the transcriber had erroneously written *tundalá* for *tundilá* ; and the engraver, by mistake, transformed it into the unmeaning *vandalá*, which the text exhibits. Lakshmi is here characterized as a thunder-cloud pregnant with fertilizing rain."

But the facsimile has, with tolerable distinctness: -चंचलाया. I therefore construe as follows : 'This donation—a gift of fortune, fugitive as is the lightning's flash, or as a bubble—and its fruit, and the preservation of another's fame, should be respected by those who exemplify the munificent practice of our family, and by others.'

45. These four stanzas have often before been translated, and by myself among others. The full intent of the first couplet is something more than I formerly apprehended.

46. A common addition to the above is in these words :

कृमियोनिं ततो गत्वा चापडलेष्वभिन्नायतं ।

'Then *he* is born in the insect tribe, and *subsequently* among out-castes.'

Similar denunciations are forthcoming in great variety. A selection of them is here presented :

विन्ध्याटवीष्वतोयासु शुष्ककोटरशायिनः ।
कृष्णाह्यो ऽभिन्नायन्तं भूमिदानापहारिणाः ॥

'Resumers of land-gifts are produced anew, in another birth, as black serpents, lying in arid hollows of trees, in the waterless wilds of the Vindhya.'

अन्यायेन हृता भूमिरन्यायेन तु हारिता ।
हरतो हारयतश्च दहत्यासप्तमं कुलम् ।

'Land appropriated inequitably, or inequitably caused to be appropriated, burns, to the seventh generation, the usurper and his agent.'

अराम्याणां सहस्रंश्च तडागानां शतैरपि ।
गवां कोटिप्रदानेन भूमिहर्ता न तुष्यति ।

‘Not by *laying out* thousands of gardens, nor even by *excavating* hundreds of reservoirs, nor by the donation of ten millions of cows, is happiness assured to the confiscator of land.’

Menace and the converse are, in some cases, propounded together :

प्रसूत्याऽसम्प्रदानेन दत्तस्याऽऽहरणं च ।
जन्मप्रभृति यद् दत्तं तत् सर्वं निष्फलं भवेत् ॥
कल्पकोटिसहस्राणि कल्पकोटिप्रदानानि च ।
निवमेद् ब्रह्मणो लोके भूमिदानं ददाति यः ॥

‘By withholding after promise, or by usurping what has been bestowed, all the *benefactions* conferred since one’s birth become ineffectual.

‘He, *on the other hand*, that grants away land will abide in the sphere of Brahmá myriads of millions of cycles, or thousands of millions.’

But it is the sacerdotal class in especial which the priests would ensure from dispossession :

न त्रिपं विषमित्याहुर्ब्रह्मस्वं विषमुच्यते ।
विषमेकाकिनं हन्ति ब्रह्मस्वं पुत्रपीत्रकम् ॥

‘Poison, it is said, is not *properly* poison ; but a Bráhma’s property, *wrongfully occupied*, is *justly* so denominated : for *ordinary* poison destroys but one ; whereas the property of a Bráhma, *illegally appropriated*, ruins one’s children and grandchildren, as well as one’s self.’

इह हि जलदलीलाच्चञ्चले नीवलोक्ये
तृणमिव लघुसारे सर्वसंसारसौख्ये ।
अपहरतु दुराग्राः प्रासनं ब्राह्मणानां
नरकगहनगर्तावर्तपातोत्सुको यः ॥

‘Trifling, in substance, as grass, is all the happiness of life, in this world of animation, transitory as the play of the clouds. *Sensible of this*, let that evil-minded *person* who longs to fall into the whirlpools of hell’s profound abysses deprive Bráhmans of *their* patents.’

The superior virtue of maintaining ancient assignments is thus insisted on :

साक्षाद् दानं निरायासं सायासं दीर्घपालनम् ।
अत एवर्षयः प्राहुर्दानाद् भूयो ऽनुपालनम् ॥

‘A gift outright involves no trouble ; but long guardianship is burdensome. Hence the sages have declared that protection, as *earning merit*, surpasses alienation.’

Finally, the praise and the meed of liberality in general are quaintly delivered in these three stanzas :

Ms. 3, 1348c

अग्नेरपत्यं प्रथमं सुवर्णं भूर्वेष्णावी सूर्यसुताश्च गावः ।
 लोकत्रयं तेन भवेच्च च दत्तं यः काञ्चनं गां च महीं च दद्यात् ॥
 यावन्ति सस्यमूलानि गोरुवापि च मर्वशः ।
 नरस्तावन्ति वर्षाणि सूर्यलोके महोयते ॥
 आस्फोटयन्ति पितरः प्रबलन्ति पितामहाः ।
 भूमिदां ऽस्मत्कुले ज्ञातः स्वकुलं तार्विष्यति ॥

‘Gold is the chief offspring of fire; the earth appertains to Vishnu; and milch cattle are progeny of the sun. He, therefore, who gives away gold, kine, and land, bestows *what will ensure him the benefit of the three worlds.*’

‘For years as many as the roots of the stalks of all crops, and as the hairs of all cattle, will that man be honored in the solar sphere.

‘His parents clap their hands, and his remoter progenitors augment in vigor, saying: “A giver of land has appeared in our family, and will work its redemption.”’

47. A portion of the stanza which here begins has been rendered by the Rev. Dr. Stevenson, and in a way which well exemplifies the sciolism of a certain section of Sanskrit scholars of the old school. His version is as follows: “Thus [departed he] who was nothing less than the friend of all (Vishṇu), contemplating the goddess of eloquence and prosperity, as she resembled a drop of pure water resting on the leaf of the lotus; and at the same time guarding the life of man.” *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, for April, 1842; No. iv, p. 154.* Dr. Stevenson’s original ended with सकलमि-, to which he must have mentally subjoined ऋ, in order to make out his “friend,” मित्र.

48. These verses likewise conclude one of the inscriptions published by Colebrooke. Where they have च बुद्ध्या he finds a difficulty in his original, on which he remarks: “चनुधा, in the text, is an evident mistake; it should undoubtedly be बहुधा.” *Miscellaneous Essays, ii. 313, foot-note.* This positiveness is a little unfortunate; as बहुधा sins against the metre, the *Pushpītāgrā*.

The inscription just now referred to is one of three, published in the original, with English versions, by Colebrooke, in his *Miscell. Essays, ii. 297-314.* Together with transcripts of these records, in the ordinary Devanāgarī, Colebrooke has given facsimile impressions of them. An examination of the latter has discovered that the learned decipherer has scarcely made them out with unflinching accuracy. The following corrections, supplementary to those which I have already noted, are confined to the more important errors, dependent on a wrong apprehension of characters. Hence I pass by the misrendering of तन्वन्तु etc., at pp. 302 and 309.

P. 300, l. 11. For समभूतिपयिक-, “inhabiting,” read समस्तविपयिक-. See lower down the inscription, at p. 301, l. 19. The village head-men and others, ‘throughout the entire realm,’ are addressed. Colebrooke’s

reading gives no sense. The case of the word which precedes the expression is not the genitive, but the locative of relation.

P. 300, l. 19. For समीकुश- substitute शमीकुश-. I remark this inadvertence, slight as it is, because Mr. Wilkinson, misled by the dental sibilant, puts समित्कुश-.

P. 301, l. 10. In lieu of -द्विविद्- the facsimile has -द्विवेद्-. Colebrooke says, in a note: "*Dwivid* is one who studies two *vedas*: as *Trivid*; one who studies three." It is not so: and, moreover, the word in the text does not end in a consonant. Had it so ended, its final *d* would have become *t*. Colebrooke was thinking of *dwivedin* and *trivedin*. *Dwiveda* is an unusual equivalent of the first.

At p. 308, l. 13-15, is a couplet, printed thus:

भ्रमत्संसारवल्गाग्रधारुधरामिमां श्रियम् ।
प्राप्य ये न द्युस्तेषां पश्चान्नापः परं फलम् ॥

"Having gained prosperity, which is the receptacle of the skips and bounds of a revolving world, whoever give not donations, repentance is their chief reward."

To this interpretation a note is appended: "*Valgāgra-dhāru-dhāru*: an allusion is probably intended to *Dhāru*, the seat of government of this dynasty. *Valga* signifies a leap; and *dhāru*, a horse's pace."

In order to bring out a very different result, we have only to restore the right reading, by putting चक्र for वल्ग, 'a wheel,' not "a leap." The translation will then run: 'Having gained prosperity, whose abode is the rim at the top of the wheel of the revolving world,' etc.

द्युस्तेषां is, of course, a printer's mistake for ददुस्तेषां; as द्युः, besides not being in the original, violates the measure of the verse, and is no word.

As for वल्ग for चक्र, Colebrooke had said, at p. 237: "the *Nūgarī* letters व and च" are "very liable to be confounded." He might have added व. On his reading चराचरगुरुं into वरावरगुरुं, I have remarked elsewhere. See this Journal, vi. 532.

49. The mystical letters and numeral which here follow, in the Sanskrit, I must leave even as I found them. They occur again in this paper. Colebrooke ventures no explanation of the first, which is in one of the inscriptions by him deciphered. *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 311. दू might stand for दूतक 'ambassador,' 'deputy'; but that does not help us: and there is a cyclical year entitled *S'rimukha*, which might be shortly represented by श्रिमु; but neither does this hint an admissible explanation, since the same abbreviation is found in both the inscriptions, though dating from different years.

50. Depraved from Rājāsakshana.

51. Expressed by an abbreviation of महासान्धिविग्रहिक. And so at the end of the next inscription as well.

52. The portions of this inscription which are identically common to it with the last are not repeated.

53. This word has no case-ending in the original. The place was, probably, a ward, or a precinct.

54. Perhaps this means 'the sixteen *villages* of Sávairi.' सोले closely approximates to the vernacular corruption of षोडश. For an aggregation of villages similar to that here surmised, see Colebrooke's *Miscell. Essays*, ii. 309.

55. I thus translate वासविग्रह, with submission to the amendment of others.

56. 'The primate of the mace;' S'iva.

57. So signify अगार and अगार; and so, on supposition, does प्रागार.

58. This is the city of Ujjayiní. Its temple of Mahákála has long been famous. Mention is made of it in the 103d chapter of the *Revá-máhátmya*.

59. This place is considered to be one with Bherá Ghát, on the Nerbudda, a few miles from Jubulpoor.

60. On the plate, पण्डित is abridged of its final letter. At the end of the inscription, the place of the same letter, in this word, is supplied by a vertical stroke.

61. Without hesitation, I have exchanged भेगभोग for भगभोग.

Saugor, Central India, October, 1858.

ARTICLE III.

REMARKS

ON THE

PHŒNICIAN INSCRIPTION OF SIDON.

BY PROF. WILLIAM W. TURNER.

Presented to the Society October 26, 1859.

SOON after the news reached this country that the sarcophagus of Ashmunezer, King of Sidon, had been brought to Paris and deposited in the Louvre through the munificence of a distinguished cultivator and patron of Oriental learning, a request was made to Prof. Henry, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, by some members of this Society, to procure, if possible, for the use of American scholars, a rubbing of the inscription on the lid, and also of that around the head of the sarcophagus. Prof. Henry addressed the Duc de Luynes on the subject, and the latter promptly and generously complied, sending to the Institution a carefully made rubbing of both inscriptions, and also a copy of his own memoir on the subject. The copies of these inscriptions which you see before you are tracings carefully made from these rubbings; and consequently they exhibit, in their exact proportions, each line as made by the ancient sculptor of this most venerable document. Upon its great philological and historical interest it is unnecessary here to enlarge; it is sufficient to say that it consists of twenty-two perfect lines of from forty to fifty-five letters each, and that the whole number of its characters exceeds one thousand. If viewed merely as an addition to the pure ancient language of the Old Testament, its importance will be evident from the fact that it is almost exactly equivalent in extent to the tenth chapter of Genesis, or to the one hundred and fourth Psalm.

My object in the remarks to which your attention is invited will be to show what is the present state of our knowledge of the contents of the inscription, and to whose learning and labors we are indebted for this knowledge.

By way of introduction to these remarks, I will here give, in a tabular form, the names of all the writers who have published a reading and interpretation of the inscription, arranged chronologically, as near as may be, according to the dates of their respective publications, placing opposite the name of each writer the names of those of his predecessors whose interpretations he had an opportunity to consult.

<i>Author.</i>	<i>Preliminary Translation.</i>	<i>Memoir.</i>	<i>Previous Interpreters consulted.</i>
*Salisbury.	May 31, 1855.	1855.	
*Turner.	May 31, 1855.	July 3, 1855.	
*Rödiger.		June 15, 1855.	
*Dietrich and Gildemeister.	} April 25, 1855.	July 1855.	
*Hitzig.		Sept. 1855.	Rödiger, Dietrich.
*Schlottmann.		End of Dec., 1855.	Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, De Luynes (prelim. transl.). In his supplementary remarks (dated Apr. 26, 1856) he makes use of the memoirs of De Luynes and Ewald.
De Luynes. Ewald.	Aug. 14, 1855.	Dec. 15, Jan. 19, 1855.	1855. Salisbury, Turner, Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig.
Bargès.	Feb. 1856.		1856.† Salisbury, Turner, Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, De Luynes, Ewald (?).
Munk.		April 6, 1856.	Salisbury, Turner, Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, De Luynes, Bargès (prelimin. transl.).
Levy.		End of Aug., 1856.	Salisbury, Turner, Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, Ewald, De Luynes. In his sup- plementary remarks (p. 59 etc.) he makes use of Munk's me- moir.

* From the copies furnished by the American missionaries.

† His memoir appears to have been published after that of Munk. See Munk, p. 27.

The first complete translation given to the world was a preliminary one, the concluding portion by myself, in a paper drawn up by Messrs. Salisbury and Gibbs, and printed in the *New Haven Daily Palladium* of May 31, 1855. This agrees in all essentials with the versions we afterwards published.

As regards the order of arrangement of the several versions, it should be remarked that, although that of Prof. Rödiger was printed some weeks before those of Prof. Salisbury and myself, yet I have placed the two American versions first, as containing traits in common which separate them from the efforts of European scholars, in consequence of our having exchanged views freely on the subject, with the intention of making a joint affair of the interpretation, before it was generously proposed by Prof. Salisbury that my paper should be given separately.

There is one feature which disadvantageously distinguishes our productions from all the rest; it is the erroneous value given almost throughout to the character \sphericalangle . We were led astray by Gesenius's alphabet in the *Monumenta*, Tab. 1, in which he has given it only the value of ? ,* although he had correctly read the character as ? in the third Athenian inscription (Tab. 10), being guided by the accompanying Greek.

A close examination of the legends which he cites in support of this value shows that it is nowhere certain. This error runs entirely through my reading, and ought to have been avoided by an inspection of the alphabet of Judas in his *Étude Démonstrative*, and of pp. 33-37 of that work, where he discusses the forms of the letter ? .

We also labored under a difficulty which was shared in by Messrs. Rödiger, Dietrich, Hitzig, and Schlottmann—that of having to work upon the copies of the inscription made in haste by the American missionaries; so that those who had before them the carefully reduced fac-simile furnished by the liberality of the Duc de Luynes after the monument reached Europe, enjoyed a great advantage over us.

THE INSCRIPTION AND THE COPIES OF IT.

The copies of the Inscription to which we have access for ascertaining its readings are the following:

Copies of the American Missionaries.—On the 3rd of April, 1855, the Secretary of the Albany Institute laid before a meeting of that body a copy of the inscription received from Dr. C. V. A. Van Dyck, a corresponding member of the Institute, and of this Society, then in Syria. This was promptly lithographed, and

* Gesenius has given (from a Cilician coin) Z as the earliest form of *Zain*. Between this and the somewhat oblique form Z (in Cilic. H) he thinks there is a decided difference, and so regards the latter as a *Yod* (p. 284), although he had seen *Zain* in a still more oblique position in Athen. 3.

published in Vol. iv, Part 1, of the Institute's Transactions. A faithful copy accompanies Prof. Rödiger's paper in the *Ztschr. der D. M. G.* The U. States Magazine of the 15th of April also published a copy made from Dr. Van Dyck's manuscript.

Another MS. copy was sent by Dr. H. A. De Forest, another member of the Syrian Mission, to Prof. Salisbury. This differs somewhat from the preceding (see Prof. Salisbury, p. 229), and generally on the side of correctness.

A third copy in MS. was sent by Dr. W. M. Thomson, also of the Syrian Mission, to Chev. Bunsen in London, who communicated it to Prof. Dietrich of Marburg. This, as published by Prof. D., is decidedly the worst copy of the whole. The fault would seem to be that of the engraver or other persons who reduced it: since it emanated from the same source as the rest. Dr. Thomson, in a letter to Prof. Salisbury, dated Oct. 5, 1855, says: "The copy from which all those sent to America, and most of those to Europe, so far as I know, were obtained, was taken by me."

The copies taken by the American missionaries were evidently made with a great deal of care, and compare favorably with many in the great work of Gesenius; yet, like all copies of unintelligible inscriptions, in which the eye and hand of the copyist are depended upon, they leave much to be desired in the way of perfect accuracy. Hence they are now entirely superseded by the

Copies from the Duc de Luynes.—The Duc de Luynes has published, in his memoir on the subject of the inscription, a beautifully engraved copy of it, made doubtless from a photograph, and from a careful examination of the stone itself. The same plate accompanies the memoir of Munk in the *Journal Asiatique*; and a lithographed fac-simile that of the Abbé Bargès. The copy appended to the memoir of Ewald was, as he informs us, prepared from a photograph received from the Duc de Luynes; the same, evidently (i. e. from the same negative), that was used by the Duke himself, it being of the same dimensions.

In addition to and above all these materials for our study of this interesting monument is the rubbing, furnished by the Duc de Luynes to the Smithsonian Institution, of the inscription on the breast, and also of that around the head of the sarcophagus, of which latter no fac-simile or engraving has yet appeared.

EXTERNAL CHARACTERS OF THE INSCRIPTION.

An examination and comparison of the two forms of the inscription, that on the breast and that around the head, show us that the former consists of twenty-two lines, and the latter of six perfect lines and the commencement of a seventh. Both are

written continuously, without separation of words, and without marks of interpunction or other sign of pause, except a space of over an inch in line 13, which divides the great inscription into two nearly equal parts, which, for convenience, I shall call Parts I and II. The lines are not perfectly straight, being more or less curved, especially towards the end of Part I. Those of Part II are straighter. The spaces between them are irregular, and the letters are by no means of uniform size, those in Part II being generally smaller than in Part I: thus the first ל of ללכוי in line 1 is $2\frac{1}{8}$ inches in length, while that of ללכ at the end of line 18 is less than $\frac{3}{4}$ of an inch. The difference in size begins immediately with Part II. The letters are also placed at variable distances apart, from half an inch to almost nothing, those in Part II being closer together than those in Part I.

In the size of its characters, and their distance apart, the head inscription agrees with the latter part of the breast inscription. The letters towards the close of the 6th line are pressed very closely together, as if for the purpose of bringing in the whole of the sentence which ends Part I. The 7th line contains only nine whole characters, which form the beginning of Part II; and it breaks off with an unfinished letter in the middle of a proper name (אשמינער).

All these facts lead us to conclude, with the Duc de Luynes, that the inscription was first written out with a free hand on the stone (without any drawing of lines or measuring of letters as in modern times), and that these traces were then followed by the artisan. As the first letters of the three first lines of the breast inscription (l. 1. 1-11; 2. 1-12; 3. 1-7), are cut thicker and rougher than the rest, it is evident that the sculptor began to cut three lines at once; but, his work being unsatisfactory, he was either made to continue his task more neatly or was exchanged for a more skillful workman.

From the differences in execution which have been pointed out between the two portions of the breast inscription, it would appear as if it had at first terminated with Part I, Part II being added subsequently. As for the inscription around the head, the general resemblance in the size and style of its characters to those of Part II of the breast inscription leads one to conclude that it was made after this latter; wherefore, it is difficult to say, but perhaps because it was thought desirable to mark indelibly both parts of the sarcophagus as the property of its tenant. It would appear that the original intention was to copy the whole of the breast inscription; but after a few letters of the second part had been engraved, it was concluded for some reason not to add it, perhaps because the ornamental line which runs round the outside of the sarcophagus, about midway of its height, would have made an ugly division of the inscription.


It is true that a different theory has been broached as to the connection between the two inscriptions. The Duc de Luynes having reported the existence of five discrepancies between them, four of which were errors of the head inscription, Prof. Ewald suggested that it was perhaps originally intended to engrave the entire inscription around the head of the sculptured image of the deceased, as if to represent it as proceeding from his mouth, but that the errors made in it caused it to be left unfinished, and the whole to be engraved over again on the breast. An examination, however, of the rubbing of the head inscription shows that three of these errors—viz: the omissions of a letter at the end of its second and fourth lines, and at the beginning of the sixth—have in reality no existence, the letters in question being found in their proper places. The mistake must have been caused by the circumstance that the rubbing from which the Duke drew up his description was not carried far enough; this is shown, too, by the reduced engraving of a portion of the head inscription, which he has given in the side view of the sarcophagus, where a blank appears in place of the initial letter of the sixth line. Of the two remaining discrepancies, one (ממלה for ממלכה, l. 11) is undoubtedly an error of the breast inscription, the other (כאימם for כאישם, l. 5) is considered to be an error of the head inscription.

Allowing this (though not perfectly certain) to be the case, the errors are balanced, and no conclusion is to be drawn from them as to the superiority or priority of the one inscription over the other.

In the breast inscription the forty-fifth character of the 6th line, a ל, was evidently omitted by mistake and afterwards inserted.

The fourth letter of the 7th line of the breast inscription has its shaft slightly curved (a defect exaggerated in Ewald's copy), and has consequently been read by several interpreters as ב. The head inscription, however, presents us with a well formed ג, the letter which the context requires.

In the breast inscription there is a space partly occupied by an irregular depression between the thirty-first and thirty-second letters of the 9th line. The Duc de Luynes correctly remarks that there probably existed here a little flaw in the surface of the marble, which was passed over by the engraver; for there is no trace of any intermediate letter, and in the corresponding portion of the head inscription there is neither intermediate letter nor space.

At the bottom of the large flaw in line 17th, the Duke has also observed that we have the word אשמן, at first written erroneously אממן, but with the tail of the first מ partially obliterated, so as to convert it into a ש: thus, .



So far we are led by a comparison of the inscriptions themselves, which shows us, among other facts, that ancient engravers were not immaculate, even in the execution of a monument of such importance as the present: so that modern scholarship is not to be denied the right of exercising a sound and sober discretion in occasionally correcting the readings they present.



On comparing with the rubbing of the breast inscription the copies of it that have been published, a variety of minor discrepancies are perceived. We will notice, however, only the most important.

In the printed copies the thirty-fourth letter of the 7th line is a \beth ; in the rubbing it is a perfectly plain ψ , the letter required. From this it is evident that the copy published by Ewald, which exhibits the same error, was not made exclusively from the photograph which he received from the Duc de Luynes.

Of the seventh letter of line 16th, at the beginning of the lamentable flaw made by the stroke of a pickaxe when the sarcophagus was exhumed, the copies present us only with the upper portion of a broken-off and almost perpendicular stroke; whereas in the inscription itself there are preserved both the upper portion of the descending shaft and the greater part of the hook of a η , making the letter perfectly certain. So, too, the printed copies represent the twenty-third letter of line 20th as entirely obliterated by a minor flaw, whereas the marble itself exhibits clearly the upper part of the letter η .

Before concluding these remarks on the external features of this inscription, I will call attention to one curious peculiarity in the forms of the Phœnician letters, which does not seem hitherto to have attracted especial attention: it is that, of those letters which have a well defined descending shaft, some turn, in descending, towards the right, and others towards the left, so that the whole alphabet may be divided into three portions:

 turned to the right;


 turned to the left;


 neutral.


If it were asked in which category it would be possible to include these last, I would answer that the \beth might be placed in the first, and the γ , η , and ψ in the second. The characters of the Marseilles inscription agree precisely with ours in this respect.

The origin and significance of this peculiarity it may be difficult to explain. But the degree of fidelity with which it is retained will probably serve as a valuable test in determining the comparative age and character of inscriptions. The mere perception of the fact will evidently be of great use in identifying imperfectly formed or mutilated characters, as is exemplified in the inscription under consideration, where two rather imperfectly formed \aleph 's (l. 16. 10, 15), were read by the American copyists, and most of the interpreters who followed them, as τ , and where the η of the word $\eta\lambda\eta$ in l. 2. 5; 14. 31; 15. 33 (made with an upturned hook, like the η of the Marseilles inscription) is read by Schlottmann as τ —mistakes which would not have been made, had the characteristic inclination of these several letters been duly observed.*

Although the inscription, as it has been remarked, was written on the marble without any attempt at perfect uniformity in the form and size of the letters, yet the work was done with such care and neatness, and the characteristic features of each letter were so well preserved, notwithstanding the slight variations in their forms, that there is no difficulty in distinguishing any of them, except in a few instances the δ and ρ . The characteristic differences of the three letters β , δ , and ρ , are well exhibited in the words $\delta\beta\tau$ (l. 2. 17-19), and $\rho\delta\beta\tau$ (6. 27-30), where it will be seen that, while the down stroke of the β curves strongly to the left, those of the δ and ρ are straight, and inclined in the same direction, but distinguished from each other by that of the ρ being much longer than that of the δ . From measuring a number of examples, it would appear that the normal length of the entire down stroke of the δ is about equal to twice the outer length of the loop; that is, that the portion below and clear of the loop is about one-half of the entire length, while in the ρ this lower part is half as long again. These proportions, however, have been frequently departed from, and in some instances so far as to be actually reversed; so that, for instance, the δ in 9. 20; 14. 33; 15. 38 has the proportions of a ρ , and the ρ in 16. 29 and 18. 14 is about the proper length of a δ . Here, of course, a satisfactory explanation of the context can alone decide between the two letters, and it is chiefly on this account that the proper reading of several passages (in lines 6, 19, 21), still remains undecided.

* The peculiarity of the Phœnician alphabet here referred to is fully illustrated in a MS. volume prepared by Mr. Turner, with his usual industry and thoroughness, in which different forms of the letters as presented by the inscription, to the number of three hundred and thirty-four in all, in exact fac-simile, are arranged together for comparison, under the head of the separate letters. The volume may be examined in the Library of the Society.

As has been remarked, the whole inscription is written without space or points to separate the words. Yet the correctness of our division of the words is confirmed by the observation of the Duc de Luynes, that, out of the twenty-two lines of the inscription, only four—viz: lines 5, 7, 9, 12—end in the middle of a word, while all the full lines of the head inscription end with a perfect word. In three instances—viz: lines 4, 6, 11—the conjunction *et* is placed at the end of a line, and in one instance—l. 21—at the beginning. Hence we may conjecture that it was regarded as an independent word.

READING AND TRANSLATION.

The following reading and translation of the inscription are the result of a selection made, to the best of my ability, and I trust without partiality or prejudice, from the views of all the writers enumerated.

*(Here insert Transcript and Translation.)**

The principle on which credit has been assigned to the several elucidators of the inscription must here be explained. By referring to the table before given, it will be observed that the entirely original interpreters of the inscription—that is, those who had no previously published lucubrations to consult—are Salisbury, Turner, Rödiger, Dietrich and Gildemeister, and De Luynes. In those portions of the inscription where they agree, the interpretation has been regarded as their common property, and no mark of authorship is attached; but where they differ in opinion, the initials attached indicate the author or authors of the reading or translation adopted. Where another interpretation is adopted as more satisfactory than that of either of the writers named, the initial of that author is attached to it by whom it was first given to the world.

It is by no means intended to abuse your patience by going into a discussion of the value of every rendering that has been

* We cannot too much regret that this important part of Mr. Turner's paper has been left a blank by his untimely death: his nice discernment would doubtless have helped us much to see where we stand as regards the interpretation of the inscription. The fragment which follows is, however, all that we have to indicate the conclusions to which a review of the whole ground had brought him. Being but the beginning of a critical discussion of the difficult passages, which our lamented associate designed to give us at a later meeting of the Society, it was not read by him when the previous part of the paper was presented. That Mr. Turner had carefully prepared the way for such a discussion appears from a volume in his own hand, found among his manuscripts, which exhibits in parallel lines the several interpretations of each line of the inscription; and from critical notes on each publication on the subject which had come out either in France or Germany. But it is not deemed just to his memory to submit to the public eye what he evidently regarded only as an apparatus for his own use.

suggested. A mere comparison of all the published interpretations will show that the true meaning of more than three-fourths of the inscription may be regarded as perfectly clear and certain. My observations will therefore be confined to the more plausible renderings of the difficult and doubtful portions, and in remarking on them I shall endeavor to be as concise as the nature of the topic will allow.

The repetition of the date of the king's death in numeral characters, after writing it out in full—the very practice resorted to for increased certainty in modern times—shows, as Dietrich well observes, that we have here, as in the Marseilles inscription, an illustration of the commercial experience and accurate business habits of the Phœnicians.

The first really difficult passage commences with the last end of the second line. The interpretation adopted is that of Gilde-meister, who renders: 'I was snatched away before my time (comp. *בְּלֹא עֵתָךְ* Eccl. vii. 17) among those who look for (length of) days; then was I laid to rest (*דָּבַמְתָּ* i. q. Heb. *נִדְבַמְתִּי*); without a son I was brought to silence (*אֶמְתָּ* i. q. Heb. *נִאֲלַמְתִּי*):' meaning that, while entertaining a reasonable expectation of a long life, he died prematurely without posterity. This interpretation, it is true, is not so simple as to carry instant conviction of its correctness; yet it consists of words and meanings authorized by Hebrew usage, and is grammatically constructed: taken altogether, it is the most satisfactory yet proposed. As for the word *הֹלָה*, it clearly denotes, says Dietrich, "something artificially dug or hollowed out; and as the sarcophagi in Phœnicia and Syria consist of a block of stone chiselled out, and a stone lid, it evidently means the stone trough which can thus be closed."

The word *קִנְמִי*, in line 4, has been variously explained; but the only interpretations which seem to require notice here are those which derive it from the Talmudic *קִנָּה*, and render 'my curse, imprecatory prohibition, or adjuration,' or which regard it as the Syriac *ܟܢܡܝ* 'I myself.' "The words *אֵחַ כָּל מַמְלָכָה*," says Munk, "evidently begin a new sentence, and can by no means be attached to what precedes, as several interpreters have thought, for it is perfectly evident that here, as in lines 6, 10, 11, 20, the word *מַמְלָכָה* is opposed to *אֵדָם*. This being the case, we must give up the idea of seeing in *קִנָּה* the Syriac word *ܟܢܡܝ* 'person,' and of translating *קִנְמִי* by 'my person, myself.'" The word *קִנְמִי* figures in the Mishna among different expressions used in making vows or oaths, and which, according to the statement of the Talmudists, were borrowed from the language of the heathen (Babyl. Talmud, tract Nedarim, fol. 10). Hence nothing is more

natural than to render קנמי by 'my adjuration,' the suffix showing that we have a substantive here. It was first suggested by Prof. Ewald that the word ממלכה is not to be taken precisely in the sense of the Hebrew ממלכה 'kingdom,' as it had been by preceding interpreters, but rather in that of 'magistracy,' i. e. 'magistrates.' This idea, that the word denotes a superior class of persons, in opposition to the common people, has been adopted by all the subsequent interpreters, who render variously 'royal persons' (Bargès), 'royal race' (Munk), 'nobility,' i. e. 'nobles' (Levy). Munk says: "The word ממלכה designates the 'royal family' or all those in authority, to whom are opposed the 'common people,' designated by the term אדם, just as אדם is opposed to שדים 'princes' (Ps. lxxxii. 7), and בְּנֵי אֱדָם to בְּנֵי אִישׁ (Ps. xlix. 3) and to אִישִׁים (Prov. viii. 4)."

The best explanation of the obscure passage after the words אל יבקש in line 5, appears decidedly to be that of Prof. Dietrich, who renders: 'nor seek with us treasures, as with us there are no treasures.' The expression בן בנו, i. q. Heb. בּוּנו 'by or with us,' corresponds precisely to the לָךְ 'to us' of line 18. The word מנח he renders 'treasures,' and derives it from the Heb. מנח 'to divide, apportion, allot;' whence מנח 'lot, fortune,' and מְנָחָה 'portion.' On this Munk observes: "The group בּוּמָנָח appears at first somewhat difficult, and has been variously interpreted. The most natural explanation, it seems to me, is that of M. Dietrich, adopted also by the Abbé Bargès. I had fixed upon it myself, before becoming acquainted with the translation of these two scholars, and M. Dérenbourg had arrived at the same solution. This concurrence of opinions seems to prove that there is more in it than a mere conjecture. Accordingly I read בן מנח, i. e. בּוּנו מְנָחִים, and render: 'let them not seek treasures by us.' The word מְנָחִים (plur. of מְנָחָה 'the weight of a mina') might be used to denote large quantities of silver or gold, treasures; just as in the Mishna מעוה (plur. of מעוה 'copper coin') is used for money in general. The ancient historians have recorded many facts which show that under certain circumstances tombs were rifled in the hope of finding treasures in them." This is fully elucidated by Dietrich, who has collected many interesting proofs of the fact, with specimens of similar adjurations in ancient epitaphs. כ is i. q. Heb. כּי 'for' (so the Duc de Luynes); אִי is a negative, i. q. Heb. אִין used with participles, and also אִי (so Dietrich), and שם pass. part. שָׁיָם (Dietrich), or act. שָׁם (Munk). As for the construction, comp. יֵאָזֵן אִישׁ שָׁם עַל לֵב 'and no man layeth it to heart' Is. lvii. 1.

The great difficulty in interpreting the first portion of line 6 is how to reconcile it with the similar passage in l. 20. If we read ואל יעמס נב משכב; considering נב as the elevated base of the sarcophagus with Dietrich, or the body deposited within it,

as suggested by myself, it is necessary to suppose an ellipsis of the particle 'or' or 'and' before the word עלה 'cover;' and if, with all the later interpreters, we regard ך [of נב] as a suffix, and render 'let them not lay upon me the cover of another resting-place,' then the passage in line 21, 'let them not lay upon me' or 'burden me,' is imperfect, and requires an ellipsis which, although adopted by several, is so violent as to be altogether inadmissible. The difficulty, however, can be removed by considering נב to be synonymous with עלה, which its etymology as given by Dietrich readily allows, and rendering it 'top' or 'roof.' We have, then, the following terms applied to the different parts of the tomb: קברה, the excavated sepulchre or burial vault; משכב, the couch, or entire coffin, as in 2 Chron. xvi. 14 (Schlottmann contends that it is the interior space in which the body is deposited); חלה, the hollowed part forming the trough or body of the sarcophagus;

* * * * * *

ARTICLE IV.

CONTRIBUTIONS

FROM ORIGINAL SOURCES

TO OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE
SCIENCE OF MUSLIM TRADITION.

BY EDWARD E. SALISBURY.

Presented to the Society Oct. 27, 1859.

THE desire to know more of early Muslim history, especially as determined by the character and actions of Muḥammad, has naturally directed attention, of late years, to Muslim tradition as the most important source of knowledge on this subject, next to the *Kurân*; and the working of this mine, with such critical tact as Weil, Sprenger, and Muir have brought to the task, has led to very valuable results. Meanwhile, however, the system of tradition developed among the Muslims themselves into a special science, and constituting one of the main foundations of their faith and jurisprudence, has been, comparatively, little dwelt upon. It seems, indeed, to have been deliberately slighted, in the praiseworthy earnestness of criticism to avoid being led by it to erroneous conclusions. Yet, without surrendering our right of independent judgment upon the veraciousness of traditional statements, we may certainly profit by investigating the system within which they have been enshrined and handed down to us—even if it be regarded only as a manifestation of the genius and grade of scientific culture of the people to whom we are indebted for them; and as constituting an indispensable basis, whether well or ill laid, of actual doctrinal belief and legal decision in all Muslim countries—the source of multifarious laws, usages, and dogmas of the followers of Muḥammad, supplementary to the *Kurân*, like the Jewish *Mishna* in relation to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. With this view are offered for consideration the following contributions to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition, which have been gathered from original sources, either only in manuscript or so little accessible as to

be nearly equivalent to unpublished authorities—we say, contributions, because we do not pretend to have exhausted the subject.

The sources from which we have chiefly drawn are :

1. The *Ṣaḥīḥ* of 'al-Bukhārī, in MS., being the copy numbered 28 in the *Bibliothèque de M. le Bⁿ Silvestre de Sacy*, Tome 3^{me}; where, however, the notice of this manuscript erroneously represents it as containing only a portion of the work. The author died A. H. 256;
2. Muslim's preface to his collection of traditions, '*al-Musnad 'aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*', lithographed at Dehli. This author died A. H. 261;
3. A treatise on the principles of tradition by the Saiyid 'Alī 'aj-Jurjānī, lithographed at Dehli in 1849-50, and prefixed to an edition of 'at-Tarmidhī traditions, '*aj-Jāmi' 'aṣ-Ṣaḥīḥ*', also lithographed at Dehli. 'Aj-Jurjānī died A. H. 816;
4. An introductory explanation of some of the technical terms of the science of tradition by 'Abd 'al-Ḥakk, prefixed to an edition of *Mishkāt 'al-Maṣābiḥ* lithographed at Dehli in 1851-52. The author was associated with Sprenger in editing a Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Musalmans, which forms a part of the *Bibliotheca Indica* :

these we shall refer to, in our citations, by the letters B, M, J, and H, respectively.

Hāji Khalfah* defines the science of tradition to be the means of a discriminating knowledge of the sayings of the Prophet, together with his actions and his circumstances—وهو علم يعرف به أقوال النبي صلعم وأفعاله وأحواله—and divides it into two parts: 1. the science of the reporting of tradition—العلم برواية الحديث—which treats of the conditions under which a tradition is considered as reaching back to the Prophet, and 2. the science of the understanding of tradition—العلم بدراية الحديث—which treats of the meaning of a particular tradition, as ascertained by its language, by reference to the fixed principles of Muslim law, or by the analogy of known circumstances relating to the Prophet. The definitions and statements which we have here to present relate chiefly to the former part of the science.

The ultimate criterion of the quality of the report of any tradition is made up of the personal character and attainments of its reporters. It will be proper, then, to begin by distinguishing several grades of traditionists, as we find them stated in the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* etc., already referred to:†

1. the inquirer—

الطالِب وهو المبتدئ الراغب فيه

“the inquirer, that is, the beginner, the seeker after tradition”—

* *Lex.*, iii. 23, ed. Fluegel.

† p. 27.

a class represented in the early times of Islâm by followers of the Prophet ardently enthusiastic for the preservation of every memorial of him, who sometimes undertook long and perilous journeys for the sake of securing a single tradition, or of hearing it from the lips of a particular reporter: the class of pupils in tradition, of every age, who of course are not relied upon for any traditional statement; 2. the traditionist—

ثم المحدث وهو الاسناد الكامل وكذا الشيخ والامام بمعناه

“the traditionist, that is, the accomplished teacher, also called the shaikh and the imâm, with the same meaning”—

but whose teachings are at second hand, for the designation of this special title is more fully defined as follows.*

هو من يكون كتب وقرأ وسمع وروى ورحل الى المداين والقري وحصل اصولا وعلق فروعا من كتب المسانيد والعلل والتواريخ التي تقرب من الف تصنيف وقيل من تحمل الحديث رواية واعتنى به دراية

“he is one who has been a writer and reader of tradition, and has heard it and committed it to memory, journeying to cities and towns, and who has summed up principles, and noted special rules, from books of sustained tradition, of archaeology and of history, to the number of nearly a thousand; according to another definition, one who takes up tradition as reported, and is solicitous that it should be known;”

3. the magnate in learning—

ثم الخابط وهو الذي احاط علمه بمائة الف حديث متنا واسنادا واحوال رواية جرحا وتعديلا وتاريخا

“the magnate in learning, who is one whose knowledge embraces both the text (المتن) and the allegation of authority (الاسناد) of a hundred thousand traditions, together with the circumstances pertaining to reporters, constituting the ground for their rejection or approval, and their history”—

differing from the traditionist only in the extent of his acquisitions in the science; 4. the responsible teacher—

ثم للحجة وهو الذي احاط علمه بثلاثمائة الف حديث وقال الجزري رحمه الله الراوى ناقل للحديث بالاسناد ولحدث من تحمل بروايته واعتنى بدرايته والحافظ من روى ما يصل اليه ووعى ما يحتاج اليه

“the responsible teacher, that is, one whose knowledge embraces three hundred thousand traditions according to ‘aj-Jazari . . . , the reporter, the authoritative transmitter of tradition, while the traditionist is one who takes up tradition on its report, and is solicitous that it should

be known, and the memorist (الْحَافِظُ) is he who reports what reaches him, and keeps in mind whatever may be of use."

This highest class of traditionists is made up of those whose names may be properly given as authorities for tradition, and who are alone relied upon for what is called sound tradition, as distinguished from that which is fair and that which is weak.

The inquiry now arises, what are the necessary qualifications of the responsible teacher? They are, in brief, integrity (الْعَدَالَةُ) and retentiveness (الضَبْطُ). The first of these is thus defined by J. :*

فالعَدَالَةُ أَنْ يَكُونَ الرَّوِيُّ بَالِغًا مُسْلِمًا عَاقِلًا سَلِيمًا مِنْ أَسْبَابِ الْفُسْقِ
وَخَوَارِمِ الْمَرْوَةِ

"integrity consists in the reporter's being of full age, a Muslim, intelligent, and void of tendencies to impiety and the vagaries of opinion;"

and again :

وَلَا يَشْتَرَطُ الذَّكُورَةُ وَلَا الْحُرِّيَّةُ وَلَا الْعِلْمُ بِفِقْهِهِ وَغَيْرِهِ وَلَا الْبَصَرُ وَلَا الْعَدَدُ
وَيَعْرِفُ الْعَدَالَةَ بِتَنْصِيصِ عَدَلَيْنِ عَلَيْهَا أَوْ بِالْأَسْتَفَاضَةِ

"the being of the male sex is not made a condition, nor freedom, nor knowledge of the jurisprudence based upon tradition, or of any thing foreign to the subject, nor sight, nor the being one of many; and integrity is determined by the affirmation of two upright men, or by common rumor;"

and by H. as follows :†

وَالْعَدَالَةُ مَلَكَةٌ فِي الشَّخْصِ تَحْمِلُهُ عَلَى مِلَاذِمَةِ التَّقْوَى وَالْمَرْوَةِ وَالْمِرَادِ
بِالتَّقْوَى اجْتِنَابُ الْأَعْمَالِ السَّيِّئَةِ مِنَ الشَّرْكِ وَالْفُسْقِ وَالْبِدْعَةِ وَفِي الْاجْتِنَابِ
عَنِ الصَّغِيرَةِ خِلَافٌ وَالْمَخْتَارِ عَدَمُ اشْتِرَاطِهِ لِحُرُوجِهِ عَنِ الطَّاقَةِ إِلَّا الْأَصْرَارَ
عَلَيْهَا تَلَوْنُهُ كَبِيرَةٌ وَالْمِرَادُ بِالْمَرْوَةِ اتِّنَزَعُ عَنْ بَعْضِ الْخُسَايِيسِ وَالنَّقَايِصِ الَّتِي هِيَ
خِلَافٌ مَقْتَضَى الْهَيْمَةِ وَالْمَرْوَةِ مِثْلُ بَعْضِ الْمُبَاحَاتِ الدُّنْيَا كَالْأَكْلِ وَالشَّرْبِ فِي
السُّوقِ وَالْبُؤُولِ فِي الطَّرِيقِ وَأَمْتَالُ ذَلِكَ وَيَنْبَغِي أَنْ يَعْلَمَ أَنَّ عَدْلَ الرَّوَايَةِ
أَعْمٌ مِنْ عَدْلِ الشَّهَادَةِ فَإِنَّ عَدْلَ الشَّهَادَةِ مَخْصُوصٌ بِالْحُرِّ وَعَدْلَ الرَّوَايَةِ يَشْتَمِلُ
الْحُرَّ وَالْعَبْدَ

"integrity is an acquisition which impels the person possessing it to act with decision and manliness—meaning by 'decision' the turning away from the evil deeds of idolatry, impiety, and heresy (whether even a little fault must be avoided, is undetermined : it is preferable to regard this as not required, because exceeding the bounds of possibility; except that persistence in a small fault is inadmissible, because it constitutes a

great one), and meaning by 'manliness' exemption from certain grossnesses and vices which shock the sensibility and judgment, for example, certain acts of sensual license, such as eating and drinking in the market, making water in the highway, and the like: it is proper to be known, also, that integrity with reference to the reporting of tradition is less restricted than integrity in testimony; for integrity in testimony is predicable only of the free man, whereas integrity in the reporting of tradition may pertain to the slave as well as the free man."

Of the other qualifications we have the following definitions. J. says:*

والضبط أن يكون متيقظا حافظا غير مغفلا ولا ساه ولا شك في حالتي التحصيل والاداء فان حدث عن حفظه ينبغي أن يكون حافظا وأن حدث عن كتابه ينبغي أن يكون صابضا له وأن حدث بالنعنى ينبغي أن يكون عارفا بما يختل به المعنى

"retentiveness consists in the reporter's being observant and mindful, not heedless nor careless, nor dubious, whether in taking up tradition or in reciting it; for, if he gives out tradition by his memory, he must needs be mindful, and if he gives it out by his book, he must firmly hold to that, and if by the sense, he must know how to seize the sense;"

and also:

ويعرف الضبط بأن يعتبر روايته بروايات الثقات المعروفين بالضبط فان وافقهم غالبا وكانت محافته لهم نادرة عرف كونه صابضا ثبتا

"and retentiveness is determined upon comparison of one's report with the report of reliable authorities, known for their retentiveness; so that, if he agrees with them for the most part, and rarely disagrees, he is known to be certainly retentive;"

and H. says:†

والمراد بالضبط حفظ المسموع وتثبته من الغوات والاختلال بحيث يتمكن من استحضاره وهو قسمان ضبط الصدر وضبط الكتاب ف ضبط الصدر حفظ القلب ووعيه وضبط الكتاب بصيانتة عنده الى وقت الاداء

"retentiveness signifies the retaining of what has been heard, and its being held fast from escaping or growing faint, so that it can be called up: it consists of two parts: retentiveness by mind, and retentiveness by book; retentiveness by mind comes of committing to heart and keeping in memory, and retentiveness by book results from preserving it without change against the time for reciting it."

These qualifications of the reporter are more exactly defined by the following specifications of causes by which they are vitiated, drawn from H. First, as to integrity, we read:‡

* page 5.

† fol. 2, rect.

‡ fol. 2, rect. and vers.

أما أعدائه فوجوه الطعن المتعلقة بها خمس الأولى بالكذب والثاني باتهامه بالكذب والثالث بالفسق والرابع بالجهاشة والخامس بالبدعة والمراد بالكذب الراوى أنه ثبت كذبه في الحديث النبوى . . . أما باقرار الواضع أو بغير ذلك من انقرايين وحديث اطمعون بالكذب يسمى موضوعاً ومن ثبت عنه تعهد الكذب في الحديث وأن كان وقوعه في العزم مرة وأن تاب من ذلك لم يقبل حديثه ابداً بخلاف شاهد الزور إذا تاب فالمراد بالحديث الموضوع في اصطلاح تخذئين هذا لأنه ثبت كذبه وعلم ذلك في هذا الحديث بخصوصه والمسئلة ضنية والحكم بالوضع والافتراء بحكم الظن الغالب وليس الى القطع وايقنين بذلك سبيل فان الكذب قد يصدق وبهذا يندفع ما قيل في معرفة الواضع باقرار الواضع أنه يجوز أن يكون كاذباً في هذا الاقرار فإنه يعرف صدقه بغالب الظن ونولا ذلك لما ساع قتل ائمة ولا رجم اعترف بترس فاقيم واما اتهام اراوى بالكذب فبان يكون مشهوراً بالكذب ومعروفاً به في كلام الناس ولم يثبت كذبه في الحديث النبوى وفي حكمة رواية ما يخالف قواعد معلومة ضرورية في انشرح كذا قيل ويسمى هذا القسم متروكاً كما يقبل حديثه متروك وفلان متروك للحديث وهذا الرجل ان تاب وصحت توبته وظيرت امارات الصدق منه جاز سماع الحديث والذى يقع منه احياناً نادراً في كلامه غير الحديث النبوى فذلك غير مؤثر في تسمية حديثه بالموضوع والمتروك وان كنت معصية واما انفسق فالمراد به انفسق في العمل دون الاعتقاد فان ذلك داخل في البدعة واكثر ما يستعمل البدعة في الاعتقاد والكذب وان كان داخل في انفسق لكنهم عدوه اصلاً على حدة تكون الطعن به اشد واغلظ واما جينة اراوى فإنه ايضاً سبب للطعن في الحديث لأنه لم يعرف اسمه وذاته لم يعرف حائنه وأنه ثقة او غير ثقة كما يقول حدثني رجل او اخبرني شيخ ويسمى هذا مبيناً وحديث مبهم غير مقبول الا ان يكون صحيحاً لانهم عدول وان جاء مبهم بلفظ التعديل كما يقول اخبرني عدل او حدثني ثقة ففيه اختلاف والاصح أنه لا يقبل لأنه يجوز أن يكون عدلاً في اعتقاده لا في نفس الامر وان قل ذلك امام حاذق قبل واما ابدعة فالمراد بها اعتقاد امر محدث على خلاف ما عرف في الدين وما جاء من رسول الله . . . والحكاية بنوع شبيهة وتحويل لا بتبريق تحود وانذار فان ذلك كفر وحديث المبتدع مردود عند الجمهور وعند البعض ان كان متصفاً بصدق النتيجة وصيانة اللسان قبل وقال بعضهم ان دن منكر لا مر متواتر في انشرح وقد علم بالضرورة كونه من الدين فهو

مردود وأن لم يكن بهذه الصفة يقبل وأن كفره المخالفون مع وجود ضبط وورع وتقوى واحتياط وصيانة والمختار أنه ان كان داعياً الى بدعته ومزجاً له رت وأن لم يكن كذلك قبل الا ان يروى شيئاً يقوى به بدعته فهو مردود قطعاً وبالجملة الآية مختلفون في اخذ الحديث من اجل البدع والاهواء وارباب المذاهب الترابغة وقال صاحب جامع الاصول اخذ جماعة من ائمة الحديث من فرقة الخوارج والمنتسبين الى القدر والشييع والرفض وسائر اصحاب البدع والاهواء وقد احتاط جماعة اخرون وتورعوا من اخذ حديث من هذه الفرق وكل منهم نيات انتهي ولا شك ان اخذ الحديث من هذه الفرق يكون بعد التحري والاستصواب ومع ذلك الاحتياط في عدم الاخذ لانه قد ثبت ان هؤلاء الفرق كانوا يصنعون الاحاديث لترويج مذاهبهم وكانوا يقرون به بعد التوبة والرجوع والله اعلم

“As to integrity, there are five ways in which it is vitiated (وجه الضعن): 1. by falsehood; 2. by suspicion of falsehood; 3. by impiety; 4. by want of information; 5. by heresy.

“By falsehood on the part of the reporter (كذب الراوى) is meant his setting up some false statement of his as part of the tradition of the Prophet . . . either by affirmation as a deponent, or by some other such means; and the tradition of one dishonored by falsehood is called suppositious (موضوع). Whoever is proved to have purposely set up falsehood as part of tradition, although only once in his life, and notwithstanding repentance, is dishonored as a reporter of received tradition—wherein there is a difference between him and the repentant false witness. Such, then, is the signification of suppositious tradition, in the technical language of traditionists; for it consists in this, that one is known to have set up some falsehood of his, definitely, as part of the tradition of the Prophet. In case it is a question of opinion, and one is judged to have fabricated and falsified by the judgment of preponderating opinion, since that affords no means of decision and certainty, the falsifier is esteemed truthful. This is at variance with what is commonly said respecting knowledge derived from deposition, with the affirmation of a deponent, namely, that one may be false in such affirmation, and that preponderating opinion determines whether one is truthful; and, if such were not the principle [as regards testimony in court], how could it be lawful to put to death a man who affirms that he has committed murder, and not so to stone him who confesses fornication? Therefore, consider.

“With regard to suspicion of falsehood in the reporter (اتهام الراوى بالكذب), in case one is notorious for falsehood, and generally remarked upon for it (though he may not have actually set up any falsehood of his as part of the tradition of the Prophet), and there is derived from him the report of something which is at variance with the known and essential fundamental principles of law—the same is to be said as before [that

tradition from him is not to be received]; and this subdivision is called let-alone tradition (متروك), as when one says: 'a tradition let alone,' and 'Such a one's tradition is let alone.' If the man repents, and signs of his truthfulness appear, it is allowable to hear tradition from him.

"Occasional and infrequent falsehood in what one says, irrespective of the tradition of the Prophet, although it is a thing to be abhorred, does not operate to give the name of 'suppositious' or 'let-alone' to his tradition.

"By impiety (الفسق) is meant impiety in conduct, not that which respects belief; for the latter has to do with heresy, and the term heresy is most commonly applied to a corrupt faith; and, although falsehood enters into impiety, yet people count that as a separate principle, because its influence in dishonoring integrity is most potent and overpowering.

"Again, want of information respecting a reporter (جهالة الراوى) causes integrity to be vitiated, in the case of tradition, because, when one's name and personality are unknown, it is not ascertained what sort of a man he was, whether he was a reliable authority, or the contrary; as, for example, when it is said: 'a certain guarantee taught me as a tradition so and so,' or 'I learnt from a certain teacher so and so as a tradition.' Such a reporter is called doubtful (مبهم), and the tradition of a doubtful person is not to be received, unless he was a witness of the Prophet (صحابى)—for all witnesses had integrity. As to the case of a doubtful reporter's declaring the integrity of his authority in express terms—for instance, when one says: 'I learnt from a person of integrity so and so as a tradition,' or 'A reliable authority taught me as a tradition so and so,' there is difference of opinion—the soundest judgment is against receiving the tradition, because there may be the belief of integrity without its reality. If, however, such language is used by an eminent teacher possessed of nice discernment, the tradition is received.

"Heresy (البدعة) is the holding to some novelty of opinion, at variance with what is recognized as a part of religion, and has come down from the Prophet of God . . . and his Companions, by virtue of some figurative and allegorical interpretation, not in the way of absolute denial and repudiation—which is a species of infidelity; and the tradition of a heretic is most generally rejected. Some, indeed, receive it, if characterized by truthfulness of language and guarded phraseology. Others say that, if it contradicts something often repeated in the law, and which is known to be a necessary part of religion, it is to be rejected, and, if it has not this character, that it is to be received, however discredited by opposers, provided it be reported with retentiveness, in a religious spirit, in the way of confirmation of received doctrine, and in circumspect and guarded language. It is best to reject it, in case it leans towards a heresy of the reporter, and is to him a connecting link of argument, and otherwise to receive it; yet, if one reports something whereby his heresy is in fact strengthened, it is decisively to be rejected.

"To speak more generally, eminent teachers differ as to receiving the tradition of innovating and loose sects, and of leaders in heterodox

ways of thinking. Says the author of the *Jāmi' 'al-Uṣūl*:* 'A number of eminent teachers of tradition have taken from the Khawārij, and from those whose distinctive names refer to their doctrine of free will (القدر), their separation (الشيع), and their alienation (الرفض), as well as from all innovating and lax parties; while a number of others have been circumspect, and have warned against taking tradition from these parties. All have their motives.' Doubtless, tradition is taken from these parties deliberately and approvingly; yet should the practice be avoided, because it is established as a fact that these parties were once in the habit of fabricating traditions in order to give currency to their doctrines—which, indeed, used to be affirmed by themselves, after repentance and return to orthodoxy—God knows."

Next, as to retentiveness, we read as follows:†

واما وجوه الطعن المتعلقة بالضبط فهي ايضا خمسة احدها فرط الغفلة وثانيها كثرة الغلط وثالثها مخالفة الثقات ورابعها الوهم وخامسها سوء الحفظ اما فرط الغفلة وكثرة الغلط فمتقبران فالغفلة في الاسناد او الامتن تكون على والغلط في الاسماع والاداء ومخالفة الثقات في الاسناد او الامتن تكون على اتحاء متعددة تكون مؤمية للشذوذ وجعلها من وجوه الطعن المتعلقة بالضبط من جهة ان الباعث على مخالفة الثقات انما هو عدم الضبط والحفظ وعدم الصيانة عن التغيير والتبديل والطعن من جهة الوهم والنسيان اللذين اخطأ بهما وروى على سبيل التوهم ان حصل الاطلاع على ذلك بقرايين دأته على وجوه علل واسباب قاذحة كان الحديث معللا وهذا اعمص علوم الحديث وادقها ولا يقوم به الا من رزق فيها وحفظا واسعا ومعرفة تامة بمراتب الرواة واحوال الاسانيد وامنون كالمتقدمين من ارباب هذا الفن الى انتهى الى الدارقطني ويقال لم يات بعده مثله في هذا الامر والله اعلمر واما سوء الحفظ فقلوا ان المراد به ان لا يكون اصابته اغلب على خطايه وحفظه واتقانه اكثر من سهوه ونسيانه يعني ان كان خطاه ونسيانه اغلب او ساويا لصوابه واتقانه كان داخلا في سوء الحفظ فاعتد عليه صوابه واتقانه وكثرتها وسوء الحفظ ان كان لازم حاله في جميع الاوقات ومدة عمره لا يعتبر بحديثه وعند بعض الحديثين هذا ايضا داخل في الشان وان شرد سوء الحفظ لعارض مثل اختلال في المحافظة بسبب كبر سنه او ذهاب بصره او فوات كنبه فهذا يسمى مختلطا فما روى قبل

* A critical compend of the six great collections of Muslim tradition, with explanations of unusual terms, by 'Ibn 'Athir 'aj-Jazari, who died A. H. 606, on the basis of an earlier work of the same sort by Kazin 'al-'Abdari; see Hāji Khalifah's *Ler.*, iii. 33, and ii. 501.

† foll. 2, vers., and 3, rect.

الاختلاف والاختلال متميزا عما رواه بعد هذا الحال قبل وأن لم يتميؤ توقف
وأن أشتهه فكذلك وأن وجد لهذا القسم متابعات وشواهد ترقى من مرتبة
الرد إلى القبول والرحمان وهذا حكم احداث المستور والمندس والمرسل

“Again, there are five ways in which retentiveness is vitiated: 1. by excess of carelessness; 2. by great blundering; 3. by disagreement with reliable authorities; 4. by oversight; 5. by badness of memory.

“Excess of carelessness (فرط الغفلة) and great blundering (كثرة الغلط) are allied to one another, for carelessness is predicated of the oral statement (الاسماع) of tradition, as well as of the taking of it up; while blundering has respect to the oral statement and the recitation (الاداء) of it.

“Disagreement with reliable authorities (مخالفة الثقات), which respects either the allegation of authority or the text, and has various phases, promotes the violation of analogy (انشذون) in tradition; and the reason for its being set down as one of the ways in which retentiveness is vitiated, is that disagreement with reliable authorities arises only from the want of retentiveness and memory, together with lack of care to avoid changes and substitutions.

“With respect to that vitiation of retentiveness which is owing to the oversight (الوهم) and neglect (النسيان) whereby one commits error and reports fancifully, if the publication of a tradition in such fanciful form is accompanied with evidences of pretexts, or of originating grounds which impair its force, the tradition becomes simulated (معلل). Here is the most obscure and subtle part of the science of tradition, and no one masters it who is not possessed of intelligence and an ample memory, as well as a perfect knowledge of the several grades of reporters, and of the circumstances affecting the character of allegations of authority and texts, like the great masters of the science in former times, down to ‘ad-Dāraḳuṭni—since whose day, it is said, no one similarly proficient on this subject has appeared—God knows.

“As for badness of memory (سوء الحفظ), people say that by this is meant that one is not right more frequently than he goes astray, and that he does not remember and exactly know oftener than he lets slip and forgets: that is to say, if he is more habitually wrong and forgetful than right and exact, or equally so, that goes to constitute badness of memory; so that a reporter, to be relied upon, must be correct and exact in his knowledge, and possess these qualities in large measure. The tradition of one whose badness of memory is a constant circumstance of his condition, having pertained to him through his whole life, has no weight; and, in the opinion of some traditionists, such badness of memory enters into the idea of separate tradition (الانشاد). If badness of memory is due to some accidental circumstance, like diminution of the recollective faculty on account of one’s great age, or the failure of one’s sight, or the loss of one’s books, this constitutes what is called a confused tradition (مختلط); but what one reported before his tradition became confused, and his memory was impaired, being distinguished

from that reported subsequently, is to be received: without this discrimination, there is no reaching back to the Prophet by the report of one whose memory has thus failed him; so too, in case the distinction cannot be clearly made out. If there exist imitative (متابعات), or witnessing (شواهد), traditions which answer to that which is confused, it is thereby elevated from the grade of rejection to that of acceptance and prevalence; as is the case, also, with the tradition of a reporter who is of questionable character (المستور), or who disguises (المدنس), or who gives out tradition loosely (المرسل)."

The disqualifying defects in a reporter, which render him untrustworthy, are also summarily presented by J. in the following passage:*

في الجرح لا يقبل رواية من عرف بالتأخر في السماع والاسماع بالنوم والاشتغال أو من يحدث لا من أصل مصتحج أو يكثر سهوه إذا يحدث من أصل مصتحج أو كثرت الشواهد والمناكير في حديثه ومن غلط في حديثه فبين له الغلط فأصر ولم يرجع قبيل يسقط عدالته قال ابن الصلاح هذا إذا كان على وجه العناد وأما إذا كان على وجه التنقيب في البحث

"Respecting confutation (الجرح). The report of one who is known to have been in the habit of falling asleep, or of being absent-minded, in the hearing read to him, or in the oral statement, of tradition, is not to be received; nor that of one who teaches tradition from an uncorrected copy, or who is very careless when he teaches from a copy which has been corrected, or who reports many separate (الشواهد), or undetermined (المناكير) traditions: and whoever blunders in his tradition, and, after his blundering has been made manifest to him, holds on to it and does not abandon it, is said to have lost his integrity, provided, as 'Ibn 'as-Salâh says, he does so in the way of opposition, or of captiousness in discussion"—

to which the author adds the important remark that reliableness in a reporter was not, in his time, estimated strictly according to the specified conditions of it, as follows:†

فلا تذييل اعرض الناس في هذه الاعصار عن مجموع الشروط المذكورة واكتفوا من عدالة الراوي بان يكون مستورا ومن ضبطه بوجود سماعه • مثبتا بخط موثوق به وروايته من اصل مواقف لاصل شيعه وذلك لان الحديث الصحيح والحسن وغيرها قد جمعت في كتب الايئة فلا يذهب شيبى منه عن جمعهم وانقصد بالسماع بقاء انسلسته في الاستناد المخصوص بهذه الامة

“But, to cut the matter short, men in these times treat with slight all the specified conditions [of reliableness], and are satisfied, as regards a reporter’s integrity, with his being one whose integrity is neither proved nor disproved (مستور); and, as regards his retentiveness, with the fact that what he hears read to him as a teacher (سماعه) is set down in a handwriting which can be depended upon, and that his report is from an autograph corresponding to the autograph of his master—and this because the books of the eminent teachers include not only sound tradition, but also the fair, and that which is neither sound nor fair, so that all tradition whatever is gathered up; besides that the object of the teacher’s hearing tradition read to him is only to perpetuate the chain of connection in an allegation of authority which has currency in a particular school.”

In contrast with the laxness indicated in this last paragraph, there is even a religious importance attached to the character of the authorities for a tradition, in the following from M., which thus bears the impress of much earlier times:*

باب فى أن الاسناد من الدين

وحدثنا حسن بن الربيع نا حماد بن زيد عن ايوب وهشام عن محمد ح وحدثنا فضيل عن هشام قال وحدثنا محمد بن حسين عن هشام عن محمد بن سيرين قال ان هذا العلم دين فانظروا عمن تأخذون دينكم حدثنا ابو جعفر محمد بن الصباح نا اسماعيل بن زكريا عى عاصم الاحول عن ابن سيرين قال لم يكونوا يسألون عن الاسناد فلما وقعت الفتنة قالوا سمو لنا رجالكم فينظر الى اهل السنة فيؤخذ حديثهم وينظر الى اهل البدع فلا يؤخذ حديثهم حدثنا اسحاق بن ابراهيم الخنظلي انا عيسى وهو ابن يونس ثنا الازاعي عن سليمان بن موسى قال لقيت طأوسا فقلت حدثنى فلان كيت وكيت قال ان كان مليا فخذ عنه وحدثنا عبد الله بن عبد الرحمن اندارمى انا مروان يعنى ابن محمد الدمشقى نا سعيد بن عبد العزيز عن سليمان بن موسى قال قلت لطأوس ان فلانا حدثنى بكذا وكذا فقال ان كان صاحبك مليا فخذ عنه حدثنا نصر بن على الجهضمى نا الاصمعى عن ابن ابي الزناد عن ابيه قال ادركت بالمدينة مائة كلهم مأمون ما يؤخذ عنهم الحديث يقال ليس من اهله حدثنا محمد بن ابي عمر المكي نا سفيان ح وحدثنى ابو بكر بن خالد الباهلى واللفظ له قال سمعت سفيان بن عيينة عن مسعر قال سمعت سعد بن ابراهيم يقول لا يحدث عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الا اثقات وحدثنى محمد بن عبد الله بن قهزاذ من

أهل مرو قال سمعت عبدان ابن عثمان يقول سمعت عبد الله بن المبارك يقول الاسناد من الدين ولولا الاسناد لقال من شاء ما شاء وحدثني محمد بن عبد الله حدثني العباس ابن ابي رزمة قال سمعت عبد الله يقول بيننا وبين القوم القوايم يعنى الاسناد وقال محمد سمعت ابا اسحاق ابراهيم بن عيسى الطائغانى قال قلت لعبد الله بن المبارك يا ابا عند الرحمن الحديث الذى جاء ان من البر بعد البر ان تصلى لابويك مع صلوتك وتصوم لهما مع صومك قل فقال له عبد الله يا ابا اسحاق عمن هذا قل قلت له هذا من حديث شهاب بن خراش قل ثقة عمن قل قلت وعن الحجاج بن دينار قل ثقة عمن قل قلت قل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال يا ابا اسحاق ان بين الحجاج بن دينار وبين النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم مغاوز تنقطع فيها اعناق المطى ولكن ليس فى اصدقة اختلاف

“Chapter on the Allegation of Authority, as a Matter of Religion.”

“Hasan Bin ‘ar-Rabi’ tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by Hammād Bin Zaid, on the authority of ‘Aiyūb and Hishām, on the authority of Muḥammad, as follows’—and Fuḍhail tells us for a tradition, on the authority of a saying of Hishām, as follows—and Maklad Bin Ḥusain tells us for a tradition, on the authority of Hishām, on the authority of a saying of Muḥammad Bin Sīrīn: “This science is a religion: beware, then, on whose authority ye take up your religion.”’

“‘Abū-Ja’far Muḥammad Bin ‘as-Ṣabbāh tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘Ismā’il Bin Ṣakariyā, on the authority of ‘Āsim ‘al-‘Aḥwal, on the authority of a saying of ‘Ibn Sīrīn: “People were not accustomed to ask about the support; but after there came to be dissension among them, some said: ‘Name to us your guarantees (رجال),’ and so those who held to the orthodox traditional law were respected, and their tradition was taken up, while care was taken not to take up the tradition of heretics.”’

“‘Ishāḡ Bin ‘Ibrāhīm ‘al-Ḥanzalī tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘Īsa, the son of Yūnus, saying: “‘Al-‘Auzā’ī tells us for a tradition, on the authority of a saying of Sulaimān Bin Mūsa: ‘I met Ṭā’us, and said: “Such an one tells me for a tradition so and so;” said he: “If he is diligent to perform all the duties of religion, take up tradition on his authority.”’

“‘Abdallah Bin ‘Abd ‘ar-Raḥmān ‘ad-Dārimī tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by Marwān’—he means ‘Ibn Muḥammad ‘ad Dimashqī—saying: “We are informed by Sa’id Bin ‘Abd ‘al-‘Azīz, on the authority of a saying of Sulaimān Bin Mūsa: ‘I said to Ṭā’us: “Such an one tells me for a tradition so and so;” said he: “If thy teacher is diligent to perform all the duties of religion, take up tradition on his authority.”’

“Naṣr Bin ‘Alī ‘aj-Juḥḡhāmī tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘al-‘Aṣma’ī, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Abu-z-Zinād, on the

authority of a saying of his father: "I saw at Madinah a hundred persons, all believers, on whose authority tradition was not taken up—of whom it was said that they were not the people to transmit tradition."

"Muhammad Bin 'Abū-'Umar 'al-Makkī tells us for a tradition, saying: 'We are informed by Sufyān, as follows—and 'Abū-Bakr Bin Khal-lād 'al-Bāhili tells us for a tradition, in his own words, saying: "I heard Sufyān Bin 'Uvainah say on the authority of Mis'ar: 'I heard Sa'ad Bin 'Ibrāhīm say: "Only reliable authorities give out tradition which has the authority of the Messenger of God . . ."' .

"Muhammad Bin 'Abdallāh Bin Ḳuḥzādḥ, an inhabitant of Marv, tells us for a tradition, saying: 'I heard 'Abdallāh Bin 'al-Mubāarak say: "The allegation of authority is a matter of religion; and, were it not for this support, whoever pleased would say whatever he pleased."'

"Muhammad Bin 'Abdallāh tells us for a tradition, saying: 'It is told to me for a tradition by 'al-'Abbās 'Ibn 'Abū-Rizmah, saying: "I heard 'Abdallāh say: 'Between us and our enemies there are the standards'—meaning the allegation of authority."'

"Muhammad also says: 'I heard 'Abū-'Ishāḳ 'Ibrāhīm Bin 'Īsa 'at-Ṭalakāni say: "I said to 'Abdallāh Bin 'al-Mubāarak: 'O 'Abū 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān, what of the tradition handed down to us in the words: "It ever pertains to piety that thou shouldst pray for thy parents in thy prayer, and fast for them in thy fasting"?' Whereupon 'Abdallāh said to him: "O 'Abū-'Ishāḳ, on whose authority is this?" "to which," said he, "I replied: 'This is a tradition of Shihāb Bin Khirāsh;' said 'Abdallāh: 'A reliable authority—on whose authority does he give it?' to which I replied: 'It is on the authority of 'al-'Hajjāj Bin Dinār;' said 'Abdallāh: 'A reliable authority—on whose authority does he give it?' to which I replied: 'That of the Messenger of God . . .;' said 'Abdallāh: 'O 'Abū-'Ishāḳ, between 'al-'Hajjāj Bin Dinār and the Prophet . . . there are deserts in which the beast's supply of water fails him,* though no one disputes the truthfulness of that reporter.'"

This passage is followed, in Muslim's introduction, by a chapter of traditions disproving the authority of certain individual reporters. But even so early a writer as Muslim notices a laxness in the application of the principle of dependence upon reliable authorities alone, closing that chapter as follows:†

قال ابو الحسين مسلم بن الحجاج واشبهاء ما ذكرنا من كلام اهل انعلم في منتهى رواة الحديث واخباره عن معايهم كثير يضلوا الكتاب بذرة على استقصائه وفيما ذكرنا كفاية لمن تفهم وعقل مذهب القوم فيما قالوا من ذلك ويبتنوا وانما التزموا انفسهم الكشف عن معايب رواة الحديث ونقلوا الاخبار واقتنوا بذلك حين سئلوا لما فيه من عظيم الخطر ان الاخبار في امر الدين انما تاتى بتجليل او تحريم او امر او نهى او ترغيب او ترهيب

* i. e. The break in the connection of the tradition is too wide for safe transmission.

† page 20.

فإذا كان الراوى لها ليس بمعدن للصدق والامانة ثم اقدم على الرواية عنه من قد عرفه ولم يبين ما فيه نعيه ممن جهل معرفته كان أتما بفعله ذلك غاشا لعوام المسلمين اذ لا يؤمن على بعض من سمع تلك الاخبار ان يستعملها او يستعمل بعضها وعلها او اكثرها اذ ذيب لا اصل لها مع ان الاخبار الصدحاح من رواية انتقت واعل القناعة اكثر من ان يضطر الى نقل من ليس بثقة ولا مقتنع ولا احسب كثيرا ممن يعرج من اناس على ما وصفنا من هذه الاحاديث الضعف والاسانيد الخجولة ويعتد بروايتها بعد معرفته بما فيها من الوهن والضعف الا ان انذى بحمله على روايتها والاعتداد بها ارادة التثكير عند انعموان ولان يقال ما انتثر ما جمع فلان من الحديث وألف من العدد ومن ذهب في العلم هذا انذهب وسلك هذا التصريف فلا نصيب له فيه وكان بان يسمى جاهلا اولى من ان ينسب الى علم

“Says ‘Abu-l-Husain Muslim Bin ‘al-Hajjāj : Of remarks by traditionists respecting suspicious reporters of tradition, and of traditional statements by them with regard to the faults of such reporters, similar to those which we have cited, there are many, which it would take long to mention, in writing, even briefly. But what we have given is sufficient for one who is intelligent, and understands, from what people have said and plainly declared, their general way of thinking.

“Yet traditionists themselves do not consider it obligatory to expose the faults of reporters of tradition, and transmitters of traditional statements, and to pronounce decisions accordingly, except when they are inquired of in respect to something involving great risk. In case traditional statements refer to a matter of religion, whatever bearing they have is to convey permission or disapprobation, command or prohibition, incitement or restraint; so that, if their reporter is not a man of fixed veracity and trustworthiness, and if objection has been made to reporting on his authority, by some one acquainted with him, and if others, having no knowledge respecting him, are not informed of the state of the case, by one’s thus acting deceptively the generality of Muslims become involved in guilt—inasmuch as it is safe for no one who hears those traditional statements to use them, or any of them, because, perhaps, they or most of them are false and groundless; besides that sound traditional statements, coming from reliable reporters and persons possessed of a tranquil assurance of mind, are too numerous that there should be need of what is transmitted by reporters who are unreliable, or devoid of assurance. For myself, I think not much of those men who lay stress upon such weak traditions, and ignored supports, as we have described, and make account of reporting them, after they know their infirmity and weakness, for the mere reason that they are impelled to report them, and to make account of them, by the wish to appear to common people as multipliers of tradition, and for the sake of its being said: ‘How

many traditions has such an one collected' and 'How by the thousand does such a one count traditions?' Whoever proceeds on such grounds in the science, and acts thus, has no part in it, and is to be called ignorant rather than learned."

We may next consider certain stipulations respecting the modes of communicating tradition, by which additional guards to its purity are provided in the system which we aim to develop. This will throw light upon some expressions in the extracts already given, which may not have been fully understood by the reader, and naturally precedes the consideration of what relates to tradition itself. Here J. will be our first authority, whose third chapter reads thus:*

فى تحمّل الحديث

يصحّ التحمّل قبل الاسلام وكذا قبل البلوغ فان الحسن والحسين وابن عباس وابن ابي عمير تحمّلوا قبل البلوغ ولم ينزل يسمعون الصبيان واختلف فى الزمن الذى يصحّ فيه السماع من انصبى قيل خمس سنين وقيل يعتبر كل صغير بحاله فاذا فهم الخطاب وردّ الجواب صحّحنا سماعه وان كان دون خمس والا لم يصحّ ولتحمّل الحديث طرق الاول السماع من لفظ الشيخ اثنانى انقراءة عليه الثالث الاجازة ولها انواع اجازة معين معين كاجزتك كتاب البخارى او اجزت فلانا جميع ما اشتمل عليه فىرسى واجازة معين فى غير معين كاجزتك مسوعاتى او مروياتى واجازة العموم كاجزت للمسلمين او لمن ادرك زمانى والصحيح جواز الرواية بهذه الاقسام واجازة المعدوم كاجزت لمن يولد لفلان وانصحيح ائمنع ولو قال لفلان ومن يولد له او لك ولعقبك جاز كالوقف والاجازة للتفعل الذى لم يتميز صححة لانها اباحة للرواية والاباحة تصحّ للعاقل وغيره واجازة المجاز كاجزت لك ما اجيز لى ويستحبّ الاجازة اذا كان اخبير واجاز له من اهل العلم لانها توسع يحتاج اليه اهل العلم وينبغى للمجيز بالكتابة ان يتلقظ بها فان اقتصر على الكتابة صحّحت الرابع المناوئة واعلاها ما يقرن بالاجازة وذلك بان يدفع اليه اصل سماعه او فرعا مقابلا به ويقول هذا سماعى او روايتى عن فلان اجزت لك روايتك ثم يبيقيه فى يده تمليكها او ائى ان ينسخه ومنها ان يناول انصالب الشيخ سماعه فيتأمله وهو عارف متيقظ ثم يناوله انصالب

ويقول هو حديثي أو سمعني فارو عنى ويسمى هذا عرض ائناولة ونها اقسام اخر الخامس المكتوبة وهي ان يكتب مسموعه لغائب أو حاضر بخضته أو ياذن بكتبه له وهي اما مقترنة بالاجازة كان يكتب اجزت لك أو مجردة عنها وانصحيح جواز الرواية على انتقديبين السادس الاعلام وهو ان يعلم الشيخ الطالب ان هذا الكتاب روايته من غير ان يقول اروه عنى والاصح انه لا يجوز روايته لاحتمال ان يكون الشيخ قد عرف فيه خلافا فلا ياذن فيه السابغ الوجوداة من وجد يجد مؤلد وهو ان يقف على كتاب بخط شيخ فيه احاديث ليس له رواية عما فيها فله ان يقول وجدت او قرأت بخط فلان او في كتاب فلان بخطه حدثنا فلان ويسوق باقى الاسناد والمتن وقد استمر عليه العمل قديما وحديثا وهو من باب المرسل فيه شوب من الاتصال واعلم ان قوما شددوا فقالوا لا حجة الا فيما رواه حفضا وقيل يجوز من كتابه الا اذا خرج من يده وتساعل اخرون وقالوا يجوز الرواية من نسخ غير مقابلة باصونها والحق انه اذا اقام في التحمل والضببط والمقابلة مما تقدم جازت الرواية عنه وكذا ان غاب عنه الكتاب اذا كان الغالب سلامته من تغيير ولا سيما اذا كان ممن لا يخفى عليه تغييره غائبا

“ On the Taking up (التحمل) of Tradition.

“ Tradition may properly be taken up before a profession of islamism, and likewise before full age ; for ‘al-Hasan, ‘al-Husain, ‘Ibn ‘Abbās, and ‘Ibn Zubair took up tradition before they had reached maturity, and youths have ever been admitted to the hearing of tradition ; though there is difference of opinion as to the exact time when a youth may properly become a hearer—some saying that this may be at five years of age, and some, that the case of each young person is to be separately considered, and that, if he understands what is addressed to him, and how to answer, they approve of his becoming a hearer of tradition, although he be less than five years old, and, otherwise, that he can not properly be a hearer.

“ There are several ways of taking up tradition : 1. by hearing the oral communication of a master (السمع من لفظ الشيخ) ; 2. by reading to him (القرأة عليه) ; 3. by license (الاجازة)—of which there are several kinds : [a] license of a particular individual for something specific, as : ‘ I license thee for the book of ‘al-Bukhārī,’ or ‘ I license such an one for all that is in my table of contents ;’ [b] license of a particular individual in respect to something not specified, as : ‘ I license thee as to whatever I hear read to me,’ or ‘ . . . as to whatever is reported by me ;’ [c] license of people in general, as : ‘ I license Muslims,’ or, ‘ . . .

all my cotemporaries:—and in these forms tradition is properly allowed to be reported; [d] license of a person who does not exist, as: ‘I license whoever may be born to such a one’—which ought not to be admitted, though, if one says: ‘... such a one and whoever may be born to him,’ or ‘... thee and thy posterity,’ it is admissible, on the same principle as a permanent charitable bequest (الوقف); [e] license of a little child who is not marked by any maturity of mind; for maturity of mind constitutes a free permission to report, and the free permission of reporting holds good in respect to one who has not attained to years of intelligence as well as to one who has; [f] license as to what has been licensed, as: ‘I license thee as to whatever has been licensed to me:’ it is preferable, in the case of license, that both he who licenses and he who is licensed should be conversant with the science of tradition, because there is a looseness about this form of transmission, which requires to be controlled by persons so instructed: one who licenses by a writing does well to say off what he writes; yet, if he limits himself to the writing, that holds good; 4. by presentation (المناولة)—of which the highest sort [a] is that accompanied with license, which consists in the master’s handing to one either an autograph, or a copy therewith collated, of what he hears read to him, and saying: ‘This is what I hear read’ (or, ‘my report’), ‘on the authority of such a one, I license to thee the reporting of it;’ after which he leaves it in his hands, for his own, or until he can copy it; another sort of presentation [b] consists in the inquirer’s handing to the master that which he hears read to him, which the latter then dwells upon with discrimination and attention, and afterwards presents to the inquirer, saying: ‘It is my tradition’ (or, ‘what I hear read’), ‘so report on my authority’—this is called reverse presentation (عرض المناولة): and there are also other subdivisions; 5. by written communication (المكاتبة), which consists in the master’s writing in his own hand, or permitting to be written, that which he hears read to him, expressly for one who is absent, or for one who is present; and is either accompanied with license, as, for example, when one writes: ‘I license thee . . . ,’ or without this form—to report in either mode is admissible and proper; 6. by certification (الإعلام), which consists in the master’s making known to the inquirer that a certain book is his report of tradition, without saying: ‘Report it on my authority’—which is not an admissible reporting of it, according to the most proper view, since there is a possibility that the master may have recognized in the inquirer some pravity, in consequence of which he does not authorize him in respect to it; 7. by discovery (الوجادة)—a term of recent origin, from وجد وجد— which consists in one’s carefully reading some book in the handwriting of a master, which contains traditions, without receiving any report of of it other than is comprised in the traditions themselves, and then saying: ‘I have found’ (or, ‘I have read’) ‘in the handwriting of such an one’ (or, ‘in a book of such an one, in his handwriting’) ‘as follows: “we learn from such an one as tradition so and so”’—leaving the rest of the allegation of authority, and the text, at loose ends—a practice which has held its ground both in ancient and modern times, and

constitutes a sort of loosened tradition (المُرسل), with something in it of continuousness (الاتصال).

“Some persons, be it known, are strict, and say that no legal proof can be made out from tradition not reported by memory; while others say that reporting by one’s book is allowable, so long as one has it under his control. Others again are so lax as to say that one may report from copies not collated with their originals. The truth is that one becomes a reliable authority for tradition by the continued habit of taking it up, persevering effort at retention, and constant application to collating with an earlier text; and this, even if one’s book is not controlled, since the probability is that it is not varied from, especially if the reporter be one who would be likely to know of any alteration of it.”

The books of tradition show us a distinction of form which is supposed to refer to the mode of receiving traditional statements, in their use of the terms *أخبر* and *حدث*, the former being appropriated, as is believed, to the case of a teacher’s making an oral communication, and the latter to that of the pupil’s reading to him. On this distinctive use of the two terms we quote the following from the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* . . . :*

ومنهم من رأى التفرقة بين الصيغ بحسب افتراق التحمل فيخصون التحديث بما تلفظ به الشيخ والأخبار بما يقرأ عليه وهذا مذهب ابن جريج والأوزاعي والشافعي وابن وهب وجمهور أهل المشرق ثم أحدث أتباعهم تفصيلاً آخرًا فمن سمع وحده من لفظ الشيخ أفرد فقال حدثني ومن سمع من غيره جمع ومن قرأ بنفسه على الشيخ أفرد فقال أخبرني وهذا مستحسن وليس بواجب عندنا وإنما أرادوا التمييز بين أحوال التحمل

“There are some who think that there should be a difference in the form of reporting tradition, with reference to a distinction in the mode of taking it up, and accordingly appropriate the expression *حدث* to what the master gives out orally, and *أخبر* to what is read to him. Such was the doctrine of ‘Ibn Juraij, ‘al-‘Auzá’i, ‘ash-Sháfi’i, and ‘Ibn Wahab,† and of all the people of the West; and the later masters have originated another distinction, according to which whoever, himself alone, hears a master speak, uses the single number and says *حدثني*, and whoever hears as one of several uses the plural number, while he who

* p. 282.

† ‘Ibn Juraij died A. H. 150; ‘al-‘Auzá’i, one of the teachers of ‘Ibn Juraij, and a resident of Bairút, d. A. H. 151; ‘ash-Sháfi’i, a native of Gaza, who became a resident of Egypt, and the founder of a school of Muslim law, d. A. H. 204; ‘Ibn Wahab of Egypt d. A. H. 197. These dates are derived from the *Kitáb Tabakát ‘al-Hufáz* (v. 9, v. 20, vii. 36) ed. by Wüstenfeld under the title *Liber Classium Virorum qui Korani et Traditionum Cognit. excell.*, auct. Abu Abdalla Dahabio. In epit. coegit et contin. Anonymus . . . Gottinguæ, 1833-34: to which we shall refer hereafter, as we may have occasion, simply as the *Kitáb Tabakát*.

himself reads to a master says in the singular number *أخبرني*—which is approved, though not necessary in the opinion of those just referred to, who only meant to distinguish between modes of taking up tradition.”

A farther distinction of form in the reporting of tradition, which we find in the collections, is the use of *سمعت* instead of either *حدثني* or *أخبرني*. This is a comprehensive expression, denoting of itself simply the fact of hearing from a master, without indication of the mode; but the technical phraseology of Muslim traditionists distinguishes it, in an artificial manner, from both the other expressions. Such seems, at least, to be the import of the following words in Muslim's introduction: * *فيخبرون بالنزول*: “narrating on the ascending grade [by *سمعت*] if they proceed upwards, and on the descending grade [by *حدثني* or *أخبرني*] if they proceed downwards.”

In the extract from J. last given, it is stated that objection had been made by some to any reporting of tradition except by memory. We therefore present, here, from B., a statement of earlier opinion as to the propriety of reporting by the pupil's reading, and by the form called “presentation.” It is to be found in that book of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* which is entitled Book of the Science (كتاب العلم): †

باب القراءة والعرض على المحدث

ورأى الحسن والثوري ومالك القراءة جازية واحتج بعضهم في القراءة على العالم بحديث ضمام بن ثعلبة قال للذي صلى الله عليه وسلم الله امرك ان تصلى الصلاة قال نعم قال فهذه قراءة على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم اخبر ضمام قومه بذلك فجازوه واحتج مالك بالصك يقرأ على القوم فيقولون اشهدنا فلانا ويقرأ على امقرئ فيقول انقارى اقرانى فلان حدثنا محمد بن سلام ثنا محمد بن الحسن الواسطي عن عوف عن الحسن قال لا بأس بالقراءة على العالم وحدثنا عبيد الله بن موسى عن سفيان قال اذا قرأ على المحدث فلا بأس ان يقول حدثني وسمعت ابا عاصم يقول عن مالك وسفيان القراءة على العالم وقراءته سواء حدثنا عبد الله بن يوسف ثنا الثابت عن سعيد هو امقبرئ عن شريك بن عبد الله بن ابي نمر انه سمع انس بن مالك رضى الله عنه يقول بينما نحن جلوس مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في المسجد دخل رجل على جمل فاناخه في المسجد ثم عقله

* page 24.

† fol. 5, vers.

ثم قال لهم أيكم محمد والنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم منكنى بين ظهرانيهم فقلنا هذا الرجل الابيض المنتكى فقال له الرجل يا ابن عبد المطلب فقال له النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد اجبتك فقال الرجل للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم انى سايلك فشدد عليك في المسئلة فلا تجد على في نفسك فقال سل عما بدا لك فقال اسألك بربك ورب من قبلك الله ارسلك الى الناس كلهم فقال اللهم نعم قل انشدك بالله الله امرك ان نصلى الصلوات الخمس قال اللهم نعم قل انشدك بالله الله امرك ان نصوم هذا الشهر من السنة قال اللهم نعم قل انشدك بالله الله امرك ان تأخذ هذه الصدقة من اغنياينا فتقسمها على فقرائنا فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم اللهم نعم فقال الرجل امنت بما جيت به وانا رسول من وراعى من قومي وانا ضمَام بن نعلبة اخو بنى سعد بن بكر رواه موسى وعلى بن عبد الحميد عن سليمان عن ثابت عن انس عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بهذا

باب ما يذكر في المناولة وكتاب اهل العلم بانعلم الى البلدان

وقال انس نسخ عثمان امصاحف فبعث بها الى الافاق ورأى عبد الله بن عمر وجبى بن سعيد ومالك ذلك جايزا واحتج بعض اهل الحجاز في المناولة بحديث النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حيث كتب لأمير السرية كتابا وقال لا تقرأ حتى تبلغ مكان كذا وكذا فلما بلغ ذلك امدان قرأه على الناس واخبرهم بامر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حدثنا اسماعيل بن عبد الله حدثنى ابراهيم بن سعد عن صالح عن ابن شهاب عن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة بن مسعود ان عبد الله بن عباس رضى الله عنهما اخبره ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعث بكتابه رجلا وامره ان يدفعه الى عظيم الجرحين فدفعه عظيم البكرين الى كسرى فلما قرأه مزقه فحسبت ان ابن المسيب قال فدعا عليهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان يترقوا كل محرق حدثنا محمد بن مقاتل ابو الحسن انا عبد الله انا شعبة عن قتادة عن انس بن مالك رضى الله عنه قال كتب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كتابا او اراك ان يكتب فقيل له انهم لا يقرؤن كتابا الا محتوما فاتخذ خاتما من فضة نقشه محمد رسول الله كانى انظر الى بياضه فى يده فقلت لقتادة من قال نقشه محمد رسول الله قال انس

“Chapter on Reading to and Laying before the Teacher of Tradition.

“Al-Hasan, 'ath-Thauri, and Mâlik* regarded the reading of tradition as allowable; and some have alleged, in favor of reading to a well-informed teacher, a tradition of Dhimmâm Bin Tha'labah, who said to the Prophet . . . : ‘Hath God commanded thee that we should pray with the prescribed form of prayer?’ to which he replied: ‘Yes,’ and the other rejoined: ‘Then is this something to be read to the Prophet’—of which Dhimmâm informed his people, who accordingly regarded the incident as an authoritative guide. Mâlik adduces in proof the case of a judicial sentence which is read to people, who thereupon say: ‘We call such a one to witness,’ or which is read to one who causes it to be read, whereupon the reader says: ‘Such a one made me read.’

“Muhammad Bin Salâm tells us for a tradition, as told by Muḥammad Bin 'al-Ḥasan 'al-Wâsiṭi, on the authority of 'Auf, from 'al-Ḥasan: ‘There is no harm in reading to a well-informed teacher;’ and we are told by 'Ubadallâh Bin Mûsa, from Sufyân, as follows: ‘In case one reads to the teacher of tradition, there is no harm in his saying: “Such a one tells me for a tradition;”’ and I have heard from 'Abu-'Âsim, on the authority of Mâlik and Sufyân, the following: ‘Reading to a well-informed teacher and his reading are equivalent.’

“'Abdallâh Bin Yûsuf tells us for a tradition, as told by 'al-Laith, on the authority of Sa'id, namely 'al-Makbari, on the authority of Sharik Bin 'Abdallâh Bin 'Abû-Namir, that the latter heard 'Anas Bin Mâlik—to whom may God be gracious!—say: ‘While we were seated with the Prophet . . . in the mosque, a man entered upon a camel, which he made kneel within the mosque, and afterwards fettered, and then said: “Which of you is Muḥammad?”’—the Prophet being supported in the midst of the group—to which we replied: “This pure man who leans here.” Then the man said to him: “O son of 'Abd 'al-Mutallib—” and the Prophet . . . replied: “Be sure, I will answer thee;” upon which the man said to the Prophet . . . : “I have a question to ask thee, and I insist upon an answer; so be not adverse to me,” and the Prophet . . . said: “Ask about what thou wilt;” whereupon the man rejoined: “I ask thee, by thy Lord and the Lord of those before thee, hath God sent thee as a messenger to all men?” and the Prophet replied: “O God, yes;” the man said, again: “I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee that we should pray the five prayers?” and he replied: “O God, yes;” said the man: “I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee that we should fast this month of the year?” and he replied: “O God, yes;” said the man: “I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee to take this offering of alms from our rich men, and to divide it among our poor?” and the Prophet answered: “O God, yes.” Then the man said: “I trust in thy message, and will be a messenger to those who shall come after me, of my people—and I am Dhimmâm Bin Tha'labah, a brother of the tribe of Ša'ad Bin Bakr”—a

* 'Ath-Thauri, of Kûfah, died A. H. 169; Mâlik Bin 'Anas of Hirah, the founder of one of the schools of Muslim law, who is probably the Mâlik here mentioned, died A. H. 179. See *Kitâb Tabakât*, v. 40, 41.

tradition which is reported by Mûsa and 'Ali Bin 'Abd 'al-Hamid, on the authority of Sulaimân, on the authority of 'Anas, from the Prophet . . .

"To this add the following.

"Chapter of Statements respecting Presentation, and the Communication of the Science to the Provinces, by its Cultivators, in Writing.

"Says 'Anas: 'Uthmân caused the standard copies of the KURÂN to be written out, and sent them to the several quarters;' and 'Abdallâh Bin 'Umar, Yahya Bin Sa'id,* and Mâlik regarded this as a lawful mode of communication; moreover, some people of the HĪJÂZ allege, in favor of presentation, a tradition of the Prophet . . . to the effect that he wrote an order for the captain of a troop of horse, and said: 'Read not until thou reachest the place so and so,' and that, accordingly, after the man had reached that place, he read it to the troopers, and informed them of the order of the Prophet . . .'

"'Ismâ'il Bin 'Abdallâh tells us for a tradition, as told to him by 'Ibrahim Bin Sa'ad, on the authority of Sâlih, on the authority of 'Ibn Shihâb, on the authority of 'Ubaidallâh Bin 'Utbah Bin Mas'ûd, that 'Abdallâh Bin 'Abbâs—may God be gracious to them both!—told him that the Messenger of God . . . sent a written order of his to a certain man, and commanded him to remit it to the chief of 'al-Bahrain; whereupon the chief of 'al-Bahrain remitted it to the Emperor, who, after reading, tore it—in connection with which, as I think, 'Ibn 'al-Mas'ûb says: 'so the Messenger of God . . . gave it strictly in charge to his people that that they should tear every one who tears.'

"Muhammad Bin Mukâtil 'Abu-l-Hasan tells us for a tradition, as communicated by 'Abdallâh, as communicated by Shu'bah, on the authority of Kutâdah, on the authority of 'Anas Bin Mâlik—to whom may God be gracious!—the following: 'The Prophet of God . . . wrote, or had a mind to write, an order; whereupon it was said to him that the persons concerned would read no writing not sealed; and so, while I was looking at the paper in his hand, he grasped a silver seal, the inscription upon which was "Muhammad the Messenger of God." Said I to Kutâdah, on hearing this: "Who said that 'Muhammad the Messenger of God' was inscribed upon it?" 'to which he replied: "'Anas.'"

It will be perceived that the applicability of several of the traditions reported in the foregoing passage from the *Shâhîh*, to the particular points which they are intended to illustrate, depends upon their involving general principles which the example of the Prophet established; and, indeed, the whole of the Book of the Science appears to refer, not to that which is pre-eminently the science of the Muslims—namely, the system of tradition—alone, but to all departments of instruction, in general. The same sort of illustration from general principles is found, also, in another chapter of that book, entitled باب كتابة العلم i. e. Chapter on Committing the Science to Writing, which, being

* Yahya Bin Sa'id died A. H. 194, aged 80 years. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 77.

made up of reported instances of the Prophet's writing down what he wished to preserve for the instruction of others, is supposed to sanction the substitution of writing for oral statement by the teacher of tradition.

We will now cite a few other brief chapters from this same book of the *Ṣaḥīḥ*, for the sake of similar illustration of different points pertaining to the order of a school of tradition. The first to be cited relates to the age at which one may hear instruction in traditional science.*

باب منى يصح سماع انصبي الصغير

حدثنا اسمعيل حدثنى مالك عن ابن شيباب عن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة عن عبد الله بن عباس رضى الله عنهما قال اقبلت راكبا على حمار اثنان وانا يومئذ قد نحررت الاحتلام ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يصلى بمنى اثنى غير جدار فمرت بين يدي بعض انصف وارسلت الان ترتع ودخلت فى انصف فلم ينكر ذلك على احد حدثنا محمد بن يوسف ثنا ابو مسير حدثنى محمد بن حرب حدثنى ابيبيدى عن ابراهيم بن محمود بن الربيع رضى الله عنه قال عقلت من انصبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مائة مجتها فى وجهى وابن خمس سنين من دنو

“Chapter on the Propriety of a Stripling's Hearing Tradition.

“Tsmâ'il tells us, as told to him by Mâlik, on the authority of 'Ibn Shihâb, on the authority of 'U'badallâh Bin 'Abdallâh Bin 'U'ṭbah, from 'Abdallâh Bin 'Abbâs—may God be gracious to both!—that the latter said: “I arrived mounted upon a female ass, having at the time nearly reached manhood, while the Prophet . . . was praying from Mina to Ghair Jidâr; so I passed on in front of some of the train, having let my beast go at large with the words: “now mayst thou feed well,” and joined the train without any one's blaming me for so doing.

“Muhammad Bin Yûsuf tells us, as told by 'Abû-Mushir, as told to him by Muhammad Bin Harb, as told to him by 'az-Zubaidî, on the authority of 'az-Zuhri, from Maḥmûd Bin 'ar-Râbî—to whom may God be gracious!—that the latter said: “I paid to the Prophet . . . the forfeit for a drop of wine which trickled on my face from a cup, when I was a boy of five years.”†

The following refer to tokens of respect due to the teacher:‡

* fol. 6, rect.

† That is to say, even a boy of five years of age, being chargeable with disobedience to a law of the Prophet, might be made responsible for the transmission of tradition.

‡ fol. 7, rect.; fol. 8, rect.

باب من برك على ركبتيه عند الامام او احدث

حدثنا ابو اليمان انا شعيب عن الزهري اخبرني انس بن مالك رضى الله عنه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خرج فقام عبد الله بن حذافة قال من ابى فقال ابوك حذافة ثم اكثر ان يقول سلونى فبرك عمر على ركبتيه فقال رضيما بانله ربا وبلاسلام ديننا وبمحمد نبيا فسكت

“ Chapter about one's Kneeling before the 'Imâm, or the Teacher of Tradition.

“Abu-l-Yamân tells us, as communicated by Shu'aib, on the authority of 'az-Zuhri, as communicated to him by 'Anas Bin Mâlik—to whom may God be gracious!—that the Messenger of God . . . went out once upon a time, when he was accosted by 'Abdallâh Bin Hudhâfah, saying: 'Who was my father,' to which he replied: 'Thy father was Hudhâfah,' and then said several times: 'Question me;' whereupon 'Umar knelt down and said: 'We accept God for our Lord, Islâm for our religion, and Muḥammad for our prophet,' and was silent.”

باب الانصات لعلماء

حدثنا حجاج ثنا شعبة اخبرني على بن مدرك عن ابى زرعة بن عمرو عن جرير رضى الله عنه ان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم قال له فى حجة الوداع استنصت الناس فقال لا ترجعوا بعدى كفارا يضرب بعضكم رقاب بعض

“ Chapter on the Commanding of Silence by the Masters of the Science.

“Hajâj tells us, as told by Shu'bah, as communicated to him by 'Alî Bin Mudrik, on the authority of 'Abû-Zur'ah Bin 'Amrû, on the authority of Jarir—to whom may God be gracious!—that the Prophet of God . . . said to the latter, when giving his farewell testimony: 'Bid the men be silent,' after which he said: 'Become not infidels, again, after I am gone, by smiting each other's necks.'”

باب من سأل وهو قائم عائنا جالسا

حدثنا عثمان ثنا جرير عن منصور عن ابى وايل عن ابى موسى قال جاء رجل الى النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال يرسل الله ما اتقتل فى سبيل الله عز وجل فان احدنا يقاتل غضبا ويقاتل حمية فرفع اليه رأسه قال وما رفع اليه رأسه الا انه كان قائما فقال من قاتل لتكون كلمة الله فى العلبا فهو فى سبيل الله

“ Chapter on one's Making Inquiry, in a Standing Posture, of a Master of the Science Seated.

“'Uthmân tells us, as told by Jarir, on the authority of Mansûr, on the authority of 'Abû-Wâ'il, on the authority of 'Abû-Mûsa, that the latter

said: 'There came a man to the Prophet . . . and said: "O Messenger of God, what is it to fight in the way of God?—may He be magnified and glorified!—for one of us fights with anger and indignation;" whereupon he lifted his head to him' (says the relator: 'and the Prophet would not have lifted his head to him, unless the latter had been standing') 'and said: "Whoever fights in order that the word of God may be the supreme word, he is in the way of God."'"

Another chapter bears upon the question of the admissibility of women to the hearing of tradition, as follows:*

باب عظة الامام النساء وتعليمهن

حدثنا سليمان بن حرب ثنا شعبة عن ايوب قال سمعت عطاء قال سمعت ابن عباس رضي الله عنهما قال اشهد على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم او قال عطاء اشهد على ابن عباس ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خرج ومعه بلال فظن انه لم يسمع النساء فوعظهن وامرهن بالصدقة فجعلت المرأة تلقى انقرط والحنانم وبلال يأخذ في ضرف توبه وقال اسمعيل عن ايوب عن عطاء قال ابن عباس اشهد على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

* Chapter on the Warning and Instructing of Women by the 'Imâm.

"Salaimân Bin Harb tells us, as told by Shu'bah, on the authority of 'Aiyûb, who said that he had heard 'Aṭâ' say that he had heard 'Ibn 'Abbâs—may God be gracious to both!—say: 'I call the Prophet of God . . . to witness' (or, otherwise, that he had heard 'Aṭâ' say: 'I call 'Ibn 'Abbâs to witness') that the Prophet of God . . . went out, once upon a time, attended by Bilâl: now it was supposed that the Prophet did not cause women to hear his teachings; he took occasion, therefore, at this time, to warn the sex, and to bid them give alms; in consequence of which the women began to carry themselves haughtily, and Bilâl laid hold of the hem of the Prophet's garment.' Another form of the tradition is that 'Ismâ'il says on the authority of 'Aiyûb, on the authority of 'Aṭâ', that 'Ibn 'Abbâs said: 'I call the Prophet of God . . . to witness, etc.'"

This question touching the rights of women is settled by J. to the same effect, in a paragraph already quoted:†

ولا يشترط الذكورة ولا الحرية ولا العلم بفقهاء وغريبه ولا البصر ولا العدد

"The being of the male sex is not made a condition [of the responsible teacher], nor freedom, nor knowledge of the jurisprudence based upon tradition, or of any thing foreign to the subject, nor sight, nor the being one of many."

To pursue the subject of the transmission of tradition, after the foregoing exhibition of the qualifications of the reliable re-

* fol. 7, rect.

† See p. 63.

porter, the several ways of communication which are admissible, and the disposition required in the pupil, we have next to turn our attention to certain circumstances of form relative to tradition itself, in respect to which there are important distinctions involved in the science under consideration.

Every tradition (الحدِيث), or report (الرواية), consists of two parts: 1. the text (المتن), which J. defines in these words:*

“المتن هو انفاظ الحديث التي يتقوم بها المعاني of those words of the tradition by which sentiments are established,”

and H. as follows :†

“and the text is that with which the allegation of authority ends;”

and 2. the support (السند), defined by J. thus :‡

“the support is information of the way by which the text has come down,”

and by H. :§

“the support is the course of descent of the tradition, consisting of its guarantees, by whom it is reported.”

The term الاسناد is often used as synonymous with السند, though properly signifying “the action of supporting.” J. says:||

“the term الاسناد denotes the carrying up of tradition to its original enunciator;”

and H. says:¶

والاسناد بمعناه وقد يجيء بمعنى ذكر السند والحكاية عن طريق المتن “the term الاسناد has the same meaning [as السند], but is, also, indeed, used to signify the statement of the support, and the giving account of the way by which a text has come down.”

The text of a tradition consists either of a saying (القول), or of an action (الافعال), or of a confirmation (التقرير), of the Prophet; of which the last is involved in the two former, according to a definition of it which H. gives us: **

ومعنى التقرير انه فعل احد او قال شيئا في حضرته صلى الله عليه وسلم ولم ينكره ولم ينكره عن ذلك بل سكنت وقرّر

* page 1.
‡ page 1.

† fol. 1, rect.
¶ fol. 1, rect.

‡ page 1.
** fol. 1, rect.

§ fol. 1, rect.

“the term *التقرير* signifies that some one either did or said something in the presence of the Prophet . . . and that he did not blame him, nor forbid him to do or say that thing, but on the contrary was silent and confirmed it.”

What is to be understood by a saying, and by an action, of the Prophet, as constituting the substance of tradition, is set forth in the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* . . . in the following passage:*

وعلم الحديث علم تعرف به أقوال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأفعاله
أما أقواله عليه الصلوة والسلام فهي الكلام العربي فمن لم يعرف حال الكلام
العربي فهو يعجز عن هذا العلم وهو كونه حقيقة وكجازا وكناية وصرحا وعاما
وخاصا ومطلقا ومقيدا ومنطوقا ومنويا ونحو ذلك مع كونه على قانون
العربية الذي بينه النحاة بتفاصيله وعلى قواعد استعمال العرب وهو المعبر
يعلم اللغة وأما أفعاله عليه الصلوة والسلام فهي الأمور الصادرة عنه التي
أمرنا بتباعه فيها أو لا كالأفعال الصادرة عنه طبعا أو خاصة

“The science of tradition is that by which sayings and actions of the Prophet . . . are authenticated. As to his sayings . . . , they consist of discourse in the Arabic language; so that one who is not familiar with the genius of Arabic discourse can not attain to this science. What is said is something by itself or in its connection, metaphorical or literal, general or special, absolute or qualified, express or implied, and the like, in conformity with the rules of the Arabic language, as set forth distinctively by the grammarians, and with the principles of Arab usage, exhibited in the science of lexicography. As to his actions . . . , they are things of which he set the example, whether he commanded us to imitate him therein or not—for instance, actions which he exemplified out of natural impulse or in consequence of some individual peculiarity.”

This classification of the texts of tradition will facilitate the understanding of certain expressions in passages presently to be quoted from our authorities. With respect to the comparative weight of a tradition, however, its support, and not its text, is primarily considered: in other words, the Muslim man of the law receives or rejects tradition on external evidence, rather than internal. J. tells us expressly: †

أعلم أن متن الحديث نفسه لا يدخل في الاعتبار إلا نادرا بل يكتب
صفة من القوة والضعف وبين وبين بحسب أوصاف الرواة من أعدانة
والصبيح والحفظ وخلافها وبين ذلك بحسب الإسناد من الاتصال والانقطاع
والإرسال والاضتراب ونحوها فالحديث على هذا ينقسم إلى صحيح وحسن

* page 27.

† page 1.

وضعيف هذا اذا نظر الى ائمتن واما اذا نظر الى اوصاف الرواة فقبيل عمو ثقة عدل صابط او غير ثقة او منهم او مجهول او كذوب او نحو ذلك فيكون البحث عن الجرح والتعديل واذا نظر الى كيفية اخذهم وطرق تحماتهم الحديث كان البحث عن اوصاف الضالاب واذا بحث عن اسمائهم وانسابهم كان البحث عن تعيينهم وتشخيص ذواتهم فالقاصد مرتبة على اربعة ابواب

“Be it known that the text itself of a tradition is but rarely taken into account: on the contrary, a tradition is qualified as strong, or weak, or intermediate, with reference to the qualities of integrity, retentiveness, and good memory, and their opposites and intermediates, possessed by the reporters, as well as with reference to continuousness (الاتصال) or disseverance (الانقطاع), looseness (الارسال), instability (لاضطراب), and the like, in the support: on this ground, then, tradition is divided into sound (تحيح), fair (حسنى), and weak (ضعيف). When reference is made to the qualities of reporters, one is said to be reliable (ثقة), upright (عدل), retentive (صابط), or not reliable (غير ثقة), fanciful (متهم), ignored (مجهول), false (كذوب), and the like—giving rise to discussion in respect to confutation (الجرح) and approbation (التعديل). When the question is, how the reporters came to get a tradition, and by what ways they took it up, there arises discussion in respect to modes of pursuing inquiry. When their names and surnames are looked into, there is inquisition regarding their identification and individualization. Consequently, our propositions are arranged in four chapters.”

We proceed, therefore, to follow our authorities in their definitions of certain varieties of support to tradition, which constitute, together with distinctions in regard to the qualifications of the responsible teacher, the chief ground of the classification of tradition as sound, fair, or weak. From the definition of the science of tradition with which we began, and which is substantially repeated in our last quotation from the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* . . . , it is obvious that the ultimate design of what is called “the support” must be to attach the authority of Muhammad to some saying or action reported as his, or sanctioned by him; and here is to be observed, in the first place, that tradition is said to be carried back to the Prophet either positively or potentially, as in the following passage from H. :*

والرفع قد يكون صريحا وقد يكون حكما اما صريحا ففي انقولى كقول الصحابي سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول كذا او كقولته او قول غيره قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم او عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه

* fol. 1, rect.

وسلم انه قال كذا او في الفعلى كقول الصحابى رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فعل كذا او عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم انه فعل كذا او عن الصحابى او غيره مرفوعا او رفعه انه فعل كذا او في التقريرى ان يقول الصحابى او غيره فعل فلان او احد بحضرة النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم كذا ولا يذكر انكاره واما حكما فكاخبار الصحابى الذى لم يخبر عن اکتب المتقدمة ما لا مجال فيه للاجتهد عن الاحوال الماضية كاخبار الانبياء او الائمة كالملاحم والفتن واحوال يوم القيمة او عن ترتب ثواب مخصوص او عقاب مخصوص على فعل فانه لا سبيل اليه الا السماع عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم او يفعل الصحابى ما لا مجال للاجتهد فيه او يخبر الصحابى بانهم دنوا يفعلون كذا في زمان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم لان انظاخر اشاعه صلى الله عليه وسلم على ذلك ونزول الوحى به او يقولون او من السنة كذا لان انظاخر ان السنة سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال بعضهم انه يحتمل سنة الصحابة وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين فان السنة يطلق عليه

“The carrying back (الرفع) is either positive or potential.

“As to carrying back positively, that, in the case of a tradition of saying, is exemplified by this declaration of a witness of the Prophet: ‘I heard the Messenger of God . . . say so and so,’ or by his or another’s saying: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ (or, ‘It comes from the Messenger of God . . . that he said’) ‘so and so;’ or, in the case of a tradition of action, by the declaration of a witness of the Prophet: ‘I saw the Messenger of God . . . do so and so,’ or ‘It comes from the Messenger of God . . . that he did so and so,’ or by the expression: ‘It comes from a witness of the Prophet’ (or, ‘from some one else’), ‘as a tradition carried back’ (or, ‘which he carried back to the Prophet’), ‘that he did so and so;’ or, in the case of a tradition of confirmation, by the declaration of a witness of the Prophet, or of some one else, in the following words: ‘Such a one’ (or, ‘A certain person’) ‘did so and so in the presence of the Prophet, and there is no account of his blaming him.’

“As to carrying back potentially, that is exemplified by those statements of a witness of the Prophet which he makes independently of the authority of ancient books, and which cannot be ascribed to human caprice (الاجتهاد), respecting circumstances of past time, such as stories of the prophets or imams—their conflicts and trials, for instance—and respecting the terrors of the day of judgment, or the assignment to a certain action of a special reward, or a special punishment: for such information can have been obtained only by a hearing from the Prophet . . . The potential carrying back may, also, be exemplified by the doing, on the part of a witness of the Prophet, of something in which human

caprice could have had no concern; or by his telling that people did so and so in the time of the Prophet . . . or said so and so, inasmuch as it is obvious that the Prophet . . . must have given the suggestion, and that by divine inspiration; or by the expression: 'so and so is a part of the Sunnah,' for the Sunnah is plainly the traditional law of the Messenger of God . . . , though some persons say that the term may signify the traditional law of the Prophet's Companions and the traditional law of his orthodox successors, in which case Sunnah becomes a generic word."

When, therefore, the authority of the Prophet is either positively or potentially attached to a tradition, it is said to be carried back (مرفوع); otherwise, it is said to be stopped (موقوف). But the varieties of support to tradition respect not the last link, alone, in the chain of connection with the Prophet: in determining the quality of the support belonging to a particular tradition, the whole series of attestations through which it is handed down must also be considered. If all those which precede the last follow one another in uninterrupted succession, each reporter having derived the tradition immediately from him who is named next before him in the support, the tradition is said to be continuous (متصل): and this continuousness, combined with the carrying back to the Prophet, constitutes a sustained (مسند) tradition, that is, a tradition of which the support is perfect. Uninterruptedness of succession, however, is far from marking the descent of every tradition; and hence arise technical distinctions with reference to the several ways in which the want of it appears. The following passage from H. sets forth the more important of these distinctions:*

فإن لم يسقط راو من الرواة من الأئمة فالحديث متصل ويسمى علم السقوط اتصالاً وإن يسقط واحد أو أكثر فالحديث منقطع وهذا السقوط انقطاع والسقوط إما أن يكون من أول السند ويسمى معلقاً وهذا الاسقاط تعليقا والساقط قد يكون واحداً وقد يكون أكثر وقد يحذف تمام السند كما هو عادة المصنفين يقولون قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والتعليقات كثيرة في تراجم صحيح البخاري ولها حكم الاتصال لأنه التزم في هذا الكتاب أن لا يأتي إلا بالصحيح ولكنها ليست في مرتبة مسانيد إلا ما ذكر منها مسنداً في موضع آخر كتابه وقد يفرق فيها بأن ما ذكر بصيغة الجرم والمعلوم كقوله قال فلان دل على ثبوت أسنانه عنده فهو صحيح قطعاً وما ذكره بصيغة النمرى والمجهول كقبيل ويقال وذكر ففى حخته عنده كلام ولكنه لما أورده في

* fol. 1, rect. and vers.

هذا الكتاب كان له اصل ثابت ولهذا قالوا تعليقات البخارى متصلة
صححة وان كان السقوط من اخر السند فان كان بعد اتنابعي فالحديث
مرسل وهذا الفعل ارسال كقول التابعي قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
وقد يجيى عند احدثين المرسل والمنقطع بمعنى والاصطلاح الاول اشهر وحكم
المرسل المتوقف عند جمهور العلماء لانه لا يدري ان انساق ثقة او لا لان
التابعي قد يروى عن التابعي وفي اتنابعيين ثقات وغير ثقات وعند ابى
حنيفة ومالك المرسل مقبول مطلقا ولم يقولون انما ارسله لكمال الوثوق
والاعتماد لان الكلام فى الثقة ولو لم يكن عنده صحيجا لم يرسله ولم يقل قال
رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وعند الشافعي ان اعتضد بوجه اخر مرسل
او مسند وان كان ضعيفا قبل وعن احمد قولان وهذا كله اذا علم ان
عادة ذلك التابعي ان لا يرسل الا عن الثقات وان كانت عاداته ان يرسل
عن الثقات وعن غير الثقات فحكمه التوقف بالاتفاق كذا قيل وفيه تفصيل
ازيد من ذلك ذكره السخاوى فى شرح الاثنية وان كان السقوط من اثناء
الاسناد فان كان الساقط اثنين متواليا يسمى معصلا بفتح الصاد وان كان
واحدا او اكثر من غير موضع واحد يسمى منقطعاً وعلى هذا يكون
المنقطع قسمين من غير امتصل وقد يطلق المنقطع بمعنى غير امتصل مطلقا
شاملا بجميع الاقسام وبهذا المعنى يجعل مقسما ويعرف الانقطاع وسقوط
الراوى بمعرفة عدم املاقات بين الراوى والمروى عنه اما بعدم المعاصرة او
عدم الاجتماع والاجازة عنه بحكم علم التاريخ المبين لموايد الرواة ووفياتهم
وتعيين اوقات ضلبيهم وارتحالهم وبهذا صار علم التاريخ اصلا وعمدة عند
الحدثين ومن اقسام المنقطع امدنس بضم اميم وفتح الام امدسدة ويقال
لهذا الفعل التندليس ونفاعله ممدنس بكسر الام وصورته ان لا يسمى
الراوى شيخه الذى سمعه منه بل يروى عن فوفه بلفظ يوم السماع ولا
يقض كذبا كما يقول عن فلان وقول فلان والتندليس فى اللغة كتمان عيب
النسعة فى البيع وقد يقال انه مشتق من الدلس وهو اختلاط الظلام
واشتداده سمى به لاشتراكهما فى الحفاء قال الشيخ وحكم من ثبت عنه
التندليس انه لا يقبل منه الا اذا صرح بالتحديث قال التميمى التندليس
حرام عند الائمة روى عن وكيع انه قال لا يحل تدليس اثوب فكيف
بتدليس الحديث وبالغ شبعة فى ذمه وقد اختلف العلماء فى قبول رواية

أمدنس فذهب فريق من أهل الحديث والفقه إلى أن التدليس جرح وأن من عرف به لا يقبل حديثه مطلقاً وقيل يقبل وذهب الجمهور إلى قبول تدليس من عرف أنه لا يدنس إلا عن ثقة كابن عبيينة وإلى رد من كان يدنس عن الضعفاء وغيرهم حتى ينص على سماعه بقوله سمعت أو حدثنا أو أخبرنا والباعث على التدليس قد يكون لبعض الناس غرض فاسد مثل إخفاء السماع من الشيخ لصغر سنه أو عدم شهرته وجاؤه عند الناس والذي وقع من بعض الأكابر ليس لمثل هذا بل من جهة وثوقهم لصحة الحديث واستغناء بشهرة الحال قال الشمني يحتمل أن يكون قد سمع الحديث من جماعة من الثقات وعن ذلك الرجل فاستغنى بذكره عن ذكر أحدكم أو ذكر جميعهم لتحقيقه بصحة الحديث فيه كما يفعل المرسل وأن وقع في أسناد أو متن اختلاف من الرواة بتقديم وتأخير أو زيادة ونقصان أو ابدال أو مكان أو آخر أو متن مكان متن أو تصحيف في أسماء السند أو اجزاء المتن أو باختصار أو حذف أو مثل ذلك فالحديث مضطرب فإن أمكن الجمع فيها وألا فالتوقف وأن أدرج الراوي كلامه أو كلام غيره من صحابي أو تابعي مثلاً لغرض الأغراض كبيان اللغة أو تفسير للمعنى أو تقييد للمطلق أو نحو ذلك فالحديث مدرج

فصل تنبيه

وهذا المبحث يندرج إلى رواية الحديث ونقله بالمعنى وفيه اختلاف فالكثرون على أنه جائز ممن هو عالم بالعربية وماهر في أساليب الكلام وعارف بخواص التراكيب ومفهومات الحساب ليلاً يحظى بزيادة ونقصان وقيل جائز في مفردات الالفاظ دون المركبات وقيل جائز لمن استحضر الفاظه حتى يتمكن من التصرف فيه وقيل جائز لمن يحفظ معانى الحديث ونسى الفاظها للضرورة في تحصيل الأحكام وأما من استحضر الفاظه فلا يجوز له لعدم الضرورة وهذا الخلاف في الجواز وعدمه أما أولوية رواية اللفظ من غير تصرف فيها فتتفق عليه نقوله صلى الله عليه وسلم نضر الله امرأً سمى مقالتي فوعاها فأدأها كما سمع الحديث والنقل بالمعنى واقع في الكتب السنة وغيرها والعنعنة رواية الحديث بلفظ عن فلان عن فلان والمعنعن حديث روى بطريق العنعنة ويشترط في العنعنة المعاصرة عند مسلم واللقى عند

أبوخاري والأخذ عند قوم آخرين ومسلم رَدَّ على الفريقين أشدَّ الردِّ وبلغ فيه وعنونة أئدُنس غير مقبول وكَرَّ حديث مرفوع سندُه متصل فهو مسند هَذَا هو المشهور ائتمند عليه وبعضهم يسمي كل متصل مسنداً وأن كان موقوفاً او مقطوعاً وبعضهم يسمي مرفوع مسنداً وأن كان مرسلأ او معضلاً او منقطعاً

“If no one of the reporters has dropped out from the chain of connection, the tradition is continuous (متصل), and the absence of all dropping out (انسقوط) is called continuousness (اتصال). If one reporter has dropped out, or more, the tradition is dis severed (منقطع), and it is this dropping out which constitutes a dis severance (انقطاع).

“The dropping out may be [1] at the beginning of the support, and the tradition is then said to be given summarily (معلق), the letting drop being in this case called a summary statement (تعليق). Either one reporter or more may have dropped out; or the complement of the support may have been entirely left off, after the manner of those authors who say: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ Summary traditions are numerous in the chapters of the *Sahih* of ‘al-Bukhâri, and are accounted as if they had continuousness, because it is strenuously maintained that this book contains only sound tradition; yet do they not rank with sound traditions which are sustained (مسند), except those given as sustained in some other part of ‘al-Bukhâri’s book.

“A distinction, indeed, exists among these summary traditions, on the ground that such of them as are given with an appearance of conciseness, and as something well-known—for example, in the form: ‘Such a one says’—imply the stability of their support in the opinion of ‘al-Bukhâri, so that they are decisively sound; while in the case of such as are given in a form which indicates some defect, and that there is want of knowledge respecting them—for example: ‘It has been said,’ or ‘It is said,’ or ‘It is mentioned’—there may be a question as to ‘al-Bukhâri’s opinion of their soundness, although, inasmuch as he introduces them into that book, they are firmly based, and people, therefore, say that the summary traditions of ‘al-Bukhâri are continuous and sound.

“If the dropping out is [2] at the end of the support, then, in case it comes after a follower of the Prophet in the second degree (التابعي), the tradition is loosened (مرسل)—this participle being derived from the fourth form of the verb: as, for instance, the saying by a follower in the second degree: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ The terms ‘loosened’ and ‘dis severed’ are used, indeed, by teachers of the science as synonymous; but the technical meaning above given to the latter is the most generally received. By most of the doctors, loosened tradition is accounted as stopped, because no one can know whether the reporter who has dropped out was a reliable authority (ثقة) or not, since one follower in the second degree may report on the word of another, and among such followers of the Prophet there were both reliable and unreliable authorities. According to ‘Abû-Hant-

fah* and Mâlik, however, loosened tradition is generally to be received; and there are those who say that one lets a tradition go loose only because it is wholly indisputable and to be relied upon, since there can be no question except in regard to loosening by a reliable authority, and if, in the opinion of such a one, the tradition was not sound, he would not have let it go loose, and say: 'Said the Messenger of God . . .' The opinion of 'ash-Shâfi'i was that, provided it be helped out by some other form of it, either loosened or sustained, it is to be received, even though it be weak. From 'Aḥmad† we have two declarations of opinion, as follows: 'All this presupposes that the follower in the second degree is known to have been in the habit of letting tradition go loose only when supported by reliable authorities. If he was addicted to letting go loose in dependence upon both reliable and unreliable authorities, the tradition is by common consent adjudged to be stopped.' Such are the different views expressed. A fuller specification relative to the matter is presented by 'as-Sakhâwî in his commentary on the 'Alfiyah ‡

"If the dropping out is [3] in the midst of the support, then, in case two consecutive reporters have dropped out, the tradition is called straitened (معضل)—the participle being pronounced with *fath* on the *dhâd*; but, in case only one has dropped out, or more than one, not from the same place, it is called dissevered. Agreeably to this use of terms, dissevered tradition is a subdivision of that which is not continuous: the term 'dissevered' is, indeed, applied to tradition not continuous, in general, as comprehending all species of it; but in the sense here given to it, it becomes a special term.

"The fact of disseverance and of the dropping out of a reporter is ascertained by knowing that there was no concurrence between a certain reporter and one reported from, in consequence either of the want of contemporaneousness or of association, or of the fact that the former was not licensed by the latter, as proved by the science of history, which tells the dates of the births and deaths of reporters, and the special circumstances of the times of their inquiry after traditions and journeying in quest of them: so that history becomes a radical and fundamental science to the teachers of tradition.

"Another of the varieties of dissevered tradition is the disguised (المُدلس)—the participle being pronounced with *ḡhamm* on the *mîm*, and *fath* on the *lâm*, together with *tashdid*: the verbal noun being *مُدْلِسٌ*, and the active form of participle *مُدْلِسٌ*, with *kasr* on the *lâm*. Its form depends upon a reporter's not naming his master, from whom he heard the tradition, but reporting on the authority of some one superior to him, in terms which convey the idea of his having heard from this other person, without direct falsehood—as if, for example, he should say: 'On the authority of such a one, so and so,' or

* 'Abû-Hanîfah, the founder of a school of Muslim law, died A. H. 150-53. See *Kitâb Tab.*, v. 8.

† i. e. 'Aḥmad Bin Hanbal, the founder of one of the four great schools of Muslim law, who died A. H. 241. See *Kitâb Tab.*, viii. 18.

‡ i. e. the 'Alfiyah 'al-'Irâkî—a work on the principles of tradition. See *Hûjî Khalf. Lex.*, i. 416, 418. The commentator died A. H. 902.

'Such a one says so and so.' In common parlance, the term *انتدليس* has the signification of 'concealment of the defects of merchandise,' and is said to be derived from *الندس*, 'the involving in darkness, on purpose;' and the disguising of tradition is said to be called by this term because it partakes of the insidiousness involved in such concealment.

"Says the Shaikh:* 'It is not judged proper to receive tradition from any one who countenances disguising, except when he distinctly states by whom he was taught.' Says 'ash-Shumunni:† 'In the opinion of the eminent teachers, disguising is forbidden.' From Waki‡ it is reported that he said: 'Disguising in the case of clothes [offered for sale] is unlawful: how then must it be with disguising practised on tradition?' Shu'bah,§ also, was earnest in condemnation of it. But, as to the reception of the report of one who disguises, there is diversity of sentiment on the part of the doctors. Certain traditionists and jurisconsults think that disguising amounts to a confutation (*جرح*), and that the tradition of any one who is notorious for it is absolutely not to be received; others say that it may be received. Most persons, however, approve of receiving tradition which is disguised by one who is understood to have had, in all cases, good authority for what he disguised, such as 'Ibn 'Uyainah, and of rejecting the report of any one accustomed to disguise tradition which he was taught by weak authorities, or others not reliable, except when he expressly declares from whom he heard the tradition, using the words: 'I have heard,' or 'Such a one tells us for a tradition,' or 'Such a one informs us.'

"The inducement to disguising, in the case of some men, is certainly a corrupt motive, as, for example, to hide the fact of one's having heard a tradition from one's real master, on account of his youth, or his want of reputation and consequence among men. But the disguising practised by some of the great reporters cannot be ascribed to such a motive, and must, on the contrary, be owing to their assurance in respect to the soundness of a tradition, and to their thinking it enough that the circumstances of the case were generally known. Says 'ash-Shumunni: 'It may be that one has heard the tradition from several reliable authorities, on the word of that guarantee whom he names; so that he is content to mention the latter, without mentioning either one or all of the former, on account of that confidence in the matter with which the soundness of the tradition inspires him; which is like what the reporter does who lets a tradition go loose.'

"If it happens that there is disagreement among reporters, in respect either to a support or a text, in consequence of transposition, addition or curtailment, or substitution either of one reporter or of one text for another, or error as to the names belonging to the support, or as to the

* i. e. 'Abû-Hanifah.

† Probably Taki 'ad-Din 'ash-Shumunni, the teacher of 'as-Suyûti in tradition, who died A. H. 872. See *Hâji Khalîf. Lex.*, iv. 59, and vii. 614.

‡ A traditionist of Kûfah. He died A. H. 189. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 53.

§ An eminent traditionist and jurist of Baṣrah, who died A. H. 160. See *Kitâb Tab.*, v. 28.

parts of which the text consists, whether owing to compression, omission, or the like, the tradition becomes unstable (مضطرب). In case any one form of the tradition can be agreed upon, under such circumstances, it is well; otherwise, the tradition is stopped.

“If a reporter has interwoven a remark of his own, or of some witness of the Prophet, or follower in the second degree—designed, for instance, for some such purpose as to explain the common meanings of words, or to interpret the sense, or to limit a general expression, or the like—the tradition becomes involved (مدرج).

“Section of a Warning.

“The topic last suggested leads us to speak, also, of the reporting of a tradition, and its transmission, by the sense. In regard to this, there is difference of opinion. The great majority of persons think it allowable on the part of one so conversant with the Arabic language, skilled in the modes of discourse, and acquainted with the niceties of composition and the implied meanings of language, that he is not subject to err, either by adding to or taking from the sense. Others say that it is allowable as respects single words, not as respects phrases. Again, it is said by some to be allowable for one who recalls the words of the tradition, so that he is able to use discretion in the matter. It is also said that necessity in respect to making out judicial decisions renders it allowable for one who remembers the sentiments of tradition, but has forgotten the words in which they are expressed; while, on the other hand, one who remembers the words is not to be allowed to report by the sense, because there is no necessity. But does not all this difference of opinion respecting its admissibility and its inadmissibility amount to the principle that to report in the very words, without using any liberty, is the more proper way? Accordingly, on account of a saying of the Prophet . . . ‘God will assuredly cheer the face of him who hears my sentences, and retains them in memory, and recites them in the very words of tradition which he has heard,’ it is so agreed. Yet transmission by the sense occurs in the Six Books, as well as in other works.

“The term *العنعنة* signifies the reporting of tradition by the expression: ‘On the authority of such a one, on the authority of such a one,’ and what is called tradition on authority (*العنعين*) is that which is reported in this form. Muslim makes it a condition of reporting by the expression mentioned, that the two persons thus named were contemporaneous: ‘al-Bukhârî requires that they have met; and others say that one must have taken the tradition from the other; but Muslim is strenuous and persistent in rejecting the views of the two latter parties. The reporting by this expression of a tradition also disguised is inadmissible.

“Every tradition carried back to the Prophet, of which the support is continuous, is sustained (*مسند*): this is universally acknowledged and held to. But some persons call every continuous tradition sus-

ta'ned, although it be stopped, or fall short of the Prophet; and some call a tradition sustained which is carried back, even though it be loosened, or straitened, or dissevered."

Certain other technical distinctions, by which the weight of a tradition is affected, involving comparison between one tradition and another, in respect either to the text or the support, are presented in the following section, which is a continuation of the passage last cited from H. :*

فصل

ومن اقسام الحديث الشاذ والمُنكر والمعلل والشاذ في اللغة من تفرد من الجماعة وخرج منها وفي الاصطلاح ما روى مخالفا لما رواه الثقات فان لم يكن رواته ثقة فهو مردود وان كان ثقة فسيبيله الترجيح بمزيد حفظ وضبط او كثرة عدد ووجوه اخر من الترجيحات فالراجح يسمى محفوظا والمرجوح شاذا والمُنكر حديث رواه ضعيف مخالف لمن هو اضعف منه ومقابله المعروف فالمُنكر والمعروف كلا رويهما ضعيف واحدهما اضعف من الاخر وفي الشاذ والمُحفوظ قوى احدهما اقوى من الاخر والشاذ والمُنكر مرجوحان والمُحفوظ والمعروف راجحان وبعضهم لم يشترطوا في الشاذ والمُنكر قيد المخالفة لراوى اخر قويا كان او ضعيفا وقالوا الشاذ ما رواه الثقة وتفرد به ولا يوجد له اصل موافق ومعاضد له وهذا صادق على فرد ثقة صحيح وبعضهم لم يعتبروا الثقة ولا المخالفة وكذلك المُنكر لم يخصوه بالصورة المذكورة وسما حديث المطعون بفسق او فُرط غفلة وكثرة غلط منكر وهذه اصطلاحات لا مشاحة فيها والمعلل بفتح اللام اسناد فيه علل واسباب غامضة خفيفة قدحة في الصحة يتنبه لها الحدائق المهرة من اهل هذا الشأن كارسال في الموصول ووقف في المرفوع ونحو ذلك وقد يقتصر عبارة المعلل بكسر اللام عن اقامة الحجّة على دعواه كالتصير في نقد الدينار والدرهم واذا روى راو حديثا وروى راو اخر حديثا موافقا له يسمى هذا الحديث متابعا بصيغة اسم الفاعل وهذا معنى ما يقول المُحدثون تابعه فلان وكثيرا ما يقول البخاري في صحيحه ويقولون وله متابعات وامتابعة توجب التقوية والتأييد ولا يلزم ان يكون المتابع مساويا في المرتبة للاصل وان كان دونه يصلح

* fol. 2, rect.

للمتابعة والمتابعة قد تكون في نفس الراوى وقد تكون في شيخ فوفه
والاول اتم واكمل من الثانى لان النوعن في اول الاسناد اشر واغلب والمتابع
ان واقف الاصل في اللفظ والمعنى يقال مثله وان واقف في المعنى دون اللفظ
يقال نحوه ويشترط في المتابعة ان يكون الحديثان من صحابى واحد وان
كانا من صحابين يقال له شاهد كما يقال له شاهد من حديث أبى هريرة
ويقال له شهود ويشهد به حديث فلان وبعضهم يخصون المتابعة بالموافقة
في اللفظ والشاهد في المعنى سواء كان من صحابى واحد او من صحابين وقد
يطلق الشاهد والمتابع بمعنى واحد والامر في ذلك بين وتتمتع طرق الحديث
واسانيدها بقصد معرفة المتابع والشاهد يسمى الاعتبار

“ Section.

“Other subdivisions of tradition are the separate (الشاذ), the undetermined (المنكر), and the specious (العلل).

“The term الشاذ, in common parlance, signifies one who stands apart from the multitude, or comes out therefrom. In technical language, it denotes that which is reported at variance with the report of reliable authorities (الثقات). If, therefore, its reporters are not reliable, it is to be rejected; but, in case they are reliable, the method to be pursued in regard to it is to give the preference to whichever tradition has the greater degree of memory and retentiveness, or the larger number, on its side, or to choose between them according to other criteria of relative weight. That which preponderates, then, is called remembered tradition (محفوظ), and the one of inferior weight is called separate.

“Undetermined (المنكر) tradition is that which is reported by a weak reporter, at variance with one less weak than himself. Its correlate is recognized tradition (المعروف). Accordingly, both the undetermined and the recognized are reported by weak authorities, of whom one is weaker than the other; whereas the reporters of separate and of remembered tradition differ from each other in relative strength. Yet both the separate and the undetermined are overbalanced sorts of tradition, while the remembered and the recognized are two preponderating varieties. Some persons, however, do not make it a condition of separate and undetermined tradition, that one reporter differs to some extent from another, being either strong or weak, and say that the separate is that which a reliable authority reports alone, and for which is found no original that accords with it and gives it countenance; and that such tradition is trustworthy, inasmuch as it is upheld by a single sound reliable authority. Others, again, not taking into account either the existence of a reliable authority, or the fact of variance between two reporters, give a different definition of the undetermined from that

above stated, and call that tradition undetermined which comes from a reporter who is dishonored by some impiety, or by excess of carelessness and great blundering. The technical terms of which we here speak are used with freedom.

“Specious tradition (المعلل)—the participle being pronounced with *fath* on the *lâm*—is so named from the fact that certain hidden, subtle pretences and assumptions, injurious to its soundness, are involved in its support, which put upon their guard acute and skillful traditionists, in like manner as they are cautious of some loosening in the case of tradition [apparently] unbroken, and of some stoppage in that [which professes to be] carried back to the Prophet, and the like. The term is sufficiently explained by the use of *أُعلِلَ*—with *kasr* on the *lâm*—to signify the action of instituting a specious argument against one’s claim, after the manner of the money-changer who selects the better *dînâr*, or *dirham*.

“When one reporter has reported a tradition, and another reports a tradition answering thereto, the latter is called imitative tradition (متتابع)—the participle having the active form. This explains the saying of teachers of tradition: ‘Such a one imitates it;’ instead of which ‘al-Bukhârî and other teachers often use the expression: ‘There are imitations of it.’ Imitation serves for corroboration and helping out, though imitative tradition is not necessarily equal in grade to its original: it accords with the fact of imitation that it should be of inferior grade. A reporter may himself be imitated, or the imitation may be of a master above him in the chain of connection: the former case comes nearer to the ultimate aim and perfection of this sort of tradition than the latter, because the first part of a support is the most liable to be weak. If imitative tradition agrees with its original both in words and in meaning, it is said to be its like (متثل); if it agrees in meaning, but not in words, it is said to be its equivalent (محو). It is a condition of imitation, that both traditions be from one witness of the Prophet. In case they come from two witnesses, the imitated tradition is said to have testimony (شاهد) in its favor, as, for example, it is said: ‘It has testimony in its favor in the tradition of ‘Abû-Hurairah;’ another expression is: ‘It is testified to by so and so,’ or ‘The tradition of such a one bears testimony to it.’ Some persons, however, appropriate ‘imitation’ to an agreement in words, and use the term ‘attesting tradition’ (الشاهد) to signify accordance in meaning, whether the two traditions compared are from one witness of the Prophet or from two. Attesting tradition and the imitative are, indeed, loosely spoken of in one and the same sense; in which case the matter is to distinguish. To follow out the ways by which a tradition has come down, and the supports consisting thereof, in order to the recognition of imitative and attesting tradition, is called criticism (الاعتبار).”

The technical distinctions which have been stated and explained in these last extracts, together with the definitions pertaining to the qualifications of the responsible teacher, previously

given, lie at the foundation of the more comprehensive classification of tradition as sound, fair, and weak, which is itself recognized by the Muslims as the basis of all legal opinions derived from traditional sources. What then are sound, fair, and weak traditions? The following explanations from H. afford an answer to this inquiry:*

فصل

وأصل أقسام الحديث ثلاثة صحيح وحسن وضعيف فالصحيح اعلا مرتبة والضعيف ادنى والحسن متوسط وسائر الاقسام التي ذكرت داخلته في هذه الثلاثة فالصحيح ما يثبت بنقل عدل تامر الضبط غير معطل ولا شاذ فان كانت هذه الصفات على وجه الكمال والتنمام فهو الصحيح لذاته وان كان فيه نوع قصور ووجد ما يجبر ذلك القصور من كثرة الطرق فهو الصحيح لغيره وان لم يوجد فهو الحسن لذاته وما فقد فيه الشرايط المعبتره في الصحيح كلاً او بعضاً فهو الضعيف والضعيف ان تعدد طرقه والخبر ضعفه يسمى حسناً لغيره وظاهر كلامهم انه يجوز ان يكون جميع الصفات المذكورة في الصحيح ناقصاً في الحسن لكن التحقيق ان النقصان الذي اعتبر في الحسن انما هو تخفة الضبط وبقاى الصفات بحالها

فصل

الحديث الصحيح ان كان راويه واحداً يسمى غريباً وان كان اثنين يسمى عزيزاً وان كانوا اكثر يسمى مشهوراً ومستفيضاً وان بلغت روايته في الأكثره الى ان يستحيل العادة تواطئهم على الكذب يسمى متواتراً ويسمى الغريب فرداً ايضاً والمراد بكون راويه واحداً كونه كذلك ولو في موضع واحد من الاسناد لكنه يسمى فرداً نسبياً وان كان في كل موضع منه يسمى فرداً مطلقاً والمراد بكونيهما اثنين ان يكونا في كل موضع كذلك فان كان في موضع واحد مثلاً لم يكن الحديث عزيزاً بل غريباً وعلى هذا القياس معنى اعتبار الكثرة في المشهور ان يكون في كل موضع اكثر من اثنين وهذا معنى قولهم ان الاقل حاكم على الاكثر في هذا الفن فإيهم وعلم ما ذكر ان الغرابة لا تنافي الصحة ويجوز ان يكون الحديث صحيحاً غريباً بان يكون كل واحد من رجاله ثقة والغريب قد يقع بمعنى الشاذ اي شذوذاً

* fol. 2, rect., and fol. 3, rect.

هو من اقسام الطعن فى الحديث وهذا هو المراد من قول صاحب المصابيح من قوله هذا حديث غريب لما قل بطريف الطعن وبعض اناس يفسرون الشاذ بمفرد الراوى من غير اعتبار مخالفته للثقات كما سبق ويقولون صحح شاذ صحح غير شاذ فالشذوذ بهذا المعنى ايضا لا ينافى الصحة كالغربة والذى يذكر فى مقام الطعن هو مخالفة الثقات

فصل

للحديث الضعيف هو الذى فقد فيه الشرايط المعتبرة فى الصحة والحسن كلاً او بعضاً ويتسم راويه بشذوذ او نكارة او علة وبهذا الاعتبار يتعدد اقسام الضعيف ويكثر افراداً وتركيباً ومراتب الصحیح والحسن لذاتهما ولغيرهما ايضا يتفاوت المراتب والدرجات فى كمال الصفات المأخوذة فى مفهوميهما مع وجود الاشتراك فى اصل الصحة والحسن والقوم ضربوا مراتب الصحة وعينوها وذكروا امثلتها من الاسانيد وقولوا اسم العدالة والضبط يشتمل رجانها كليها ولكن بعضها فوق بعض واما اطلاق اصح الاسانيد على سند مخصوص على الاطلاق ففيه اختلاف فقال بعضهم اصح الاسانيد زين العابدين عن ابيه عن جدّه وقيل مالك عن نافع عن ابن عمر وقيل الزهري عن سالم عن ابن عمر والحق ان الحكم على اسناد مخصوص بالاصحّية على الاطلاق غير جائز الا ان فى الصحة مراتب عليا وعدة من الاسانيد يدخل فيها ولو قيد بقيد بان يقال اصحّ اسانيد البلد الفلانى او فى الباب الفلانى او فى المسئلة الفلانية يصحّ والله اعلم

فصل

من عادة الترمذى ان يقول فى جامعه حديث حسن صحح حديث غريب حسن حديث حسن غريب صحيح ولا شبهة فى جواز اجتماع الحسن والصحة بان يكون حسناً لذاته وصحياً لغيره وكذلك فى اجتماع الغربة والصحة كما اسلفنا واما اجتماع الغربة والحسن فيستشكلونه بان الترمذى اعتبر فى الحسن تعدد الطرق فكيف يكون غريباً وجيبيون بان اعتبار تعدد الطرق فى الحسن ليس على الاطلاق بل فى قسم منه وحيث حكم باجتماع الحسن والغربة المراد قسم اخر وقال بعضهم انه اشار بذلك الى اختلاف الطرق بان جاء فى بعض الطرق غريباً وفى بعضها حسناً وقيل

أولاً بمعنى أو بانه يشك ويتردد في أنه غريب أو حسن لعدم معرفته جزءاً وقيل المراد بالحسن ههنا ليس معناه الاصطلاحى بل اللغوى بمعنى ما يبيل إليه الطبع وهذا القول بعيد جداً

فصل

الاحتجاج فى الاحكام بالخبر الصحيح مجمع عليه وكذلك بالحسن لذاته عند عامة العلماء وهو ملحق بالصحيح فى باب الاحتجاج وان كان دونه فى المرتبة والحديث الضعيف الذى بلغ يتعدد الطرق مرتبة الحسن لغيره ايضاً مجتمع وما اشتهر من الحديث الضعيف معتبر فى فضائل الاعمال لا فى غيرها المراد مفرداته لا مجموعها لانه داخل فى الحسن لا فى الضعيف صرح به الأئمة وقيل بعضهم ان كان الضعيف من جهة سوء حفظ أو اختلاط أو تدليس مع وجود الصدق والديانة ينجبر بتعدد الطرق وان كان من جهة اتهام الكذب أو الشذوذ أو فحش الخطأ لا ينجبر بتعدد الطرق والحديث محكوم عليه بالضعف و معول به فى فضائل الاعمال وعلى مثل هذا ينبغي ان يحمل ما قيل لحوق الضعيف بالضعيف لا يفسد قوة والا فهذا القول ظاهر الفساد فتدبر

"Section.

"Traditions are generically distinguished as sound (صحيح), fair (حسن), and weak (ضعيف).

"Sound tradition is the highest in grade, the weak is the lowest, and the fair stands mid-way; and all the above mentioned subdivisions are comprehended under these three denominations.

"Now then, that tradition which is established by the transmission of an upright and perfectly retentive reporter, and which is not specious, nor separate, is sound. If it have all these qualities in completeness, it is intrinsically sound (الصحيح لذاته); but, if some sort of deficiency pertains to it, and this deficiency is found to be made up by multiplicity of ways in which the tradition has come down, then it is extrinsically sound (الصحيح لغيره). If its deficiency is not made up, it becomes intrinsically fair (الحسن لذاته). That tradition in which either all or some of the conditions noted as belonging to the sound are wanting, is weak. If a weak tradition has come down by a number of different ways, and its internal character is that which constitutes its weakness, it is called extrinsically fair (حسن لغيره). There is a way of talking which plainly implies that all the qualities above named as belonging to sound tradition may be deficient in the fair: the truth, however, is that the deficiency made account of in fair tradi-

tion consists only in a want of weight of retentiveness on the part of its reporters, while all the other qualities of the sound remain intact.

“ Section.

“ Sound tradition reported by one reporter is called unrelated tradition (غريب); if it come from two reporters, it is called rare tradition (عزيز); if its reporters are more in number, it is called notorious (مشهور) or wide-spread (مستفيض) tradition; if its reporters are so numerous that the supposition of an agreement to deceive is made absurd by the habitual repetition of it, it is called reiterated tradition (متواتر).

“ Unrelated tradition is also called unique (فرد), and what is meant by its being reported by one reporter is that it stands thus by itself: if, indeed, this is true of it as regards only one link in the support, it is called relatively unique (فرد نسبي); but if as regards every link pertaining thereto, it is called absolutely unique (فرد مطلق). The meaning of a tradition's being from two reporters is that it has two reporters at each link in its support: should this be true of it at only one point, the tradition is not rare, but unrelated. Multiplicity of reporters, as made account of in the case of notorious tradition, is to be understood after this analogy, to mean that there are more than two at each link in the support. Such is the signification of the common saying that the less overrules the more in respect to this species. Be, therefore, wary.

“ From what has been said one may know that the fact of a tradition being unrelated is not inconsistent with soundness, and that it is sound without affinity (مكتبج غريب), provided each of the guarantees making up its line of descent be a reliable authority. The term ‘unrelated’ is also used as synonymous with ‘separate,’ that is, separate by a want of analogy which constitutes one of the forms in which tradition is dishonored: such is the meaning of a remark made by the author of the *Masābih*,* namely: ‘As stated by him, this tradition is unrelated,’ for he would intimate that the tradition is dishonored. Some persons, however, as before said, explain the term ‘separate’ to mean tradition which has but one reporter, whether he be at variance with reliable authorities or not, and say: ‘sound and separate,’ or ‘sound not separate:’ in this sense, separateness, being nothing more than the fact that a tradition is unrelated, is not inconsistent with soundness. But that separateness which is intended to attach dishonor to a tradition, must be variance from reliable authorities.

“ Section.

“ Weak tradition is that in which either all or some of the conditions considered as requisite to soundness and fairness are wanting—of which, therefore, the reporter is marked by something of separateness, inde-

* i. e. *Masābih 'as-Sunnah*, a collection of traditions made by 'al-Baghawī, who died A. H. 516. The *Mishkāt 'al-Masābih* mentioned in our introductory remarks is a recension of this work. See *Hāji Khalf. Lex.*, v. 564, ff.

terminateness, or speciousness. This definition is, in effect, an enumeration of the subdivisions of weak tradition. It is more or less weak according as its characteristics exist singly or in combination.

“The degrees of sound and fair tradition, also—including both the intrinsically and the extrinsically sound and fair—vary according to the gradations and measures therein existing of completeness in respect to the qualities noted and assumed as belonging to the conception of the two respectively, there being in all a participation in the fundamental quality of soundness or fairness. Certain persons have noted down and distinguished the several degrees of soundness, and cited supports exemplifying them; and it is their declaration that uprightness and retentiveness are qualities possessed in common by all guarantees constituting supports of that character, though some such supports take precedence over others.

“With regard to what particular support should be viewed as absolutely the soundest, there is difference of opinion. Some say that the soundest of all supports is: ‘Zain ‘al-‘Âbidîn, on the authority of his father, on the authority of his grandfather;’ others that it is: ‘Mâlik, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Umar;’ others again give the preëminence to: ‘Az-Zuhri, on the authority of Sâlim, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Umar.’ But the truth is that to attribute to any particular support the quality of preëminent soundness, absolutely, is not allowable: we can only distinguish higher degrees of soundness from those which are lower, and a number of representative supports, taken together, from certain others. If a limitation is indicated, by saying that such is ‘the soundest tradition of the country so and so’ (or, ‘under such a head,’ or, ‘on such a topic,’) it is all right—God knows.

“Section.

“Among the expressions habitually used by ‘at-Tarmidhî in his *Jâmi‘*, are the following: ‘a fair and sound tradition,’ ‘an unrelated and fair tradition,’ and ‘a fair, unrelated and sound tradition.’ Now, there is no doubt that, inasmuch as a tradition may be fair, as viewed by itself, and at the same time sound, taken in connection with other traditions, fairness and soundness may be combined; so, too, the quality of being unrelated is compatible with soundness, as we have already stated. But the combination with fairness of the quality of being unrelated is found difficult to be understood, since ‘at-Tarmidhî considered multiplicity of ways of descent to be a characteristic of fair tradition; for how, then, can fair tradition be unrelated? To this it is replied, that the consideration of multiplicity of ways of descent as a characteristic of fair tradition is not absolute, but has reference to one subdivision of it, and that, wherever tradition is represented as combining fairness with the quality of being unrelated, another subdivision of fair tradition must be intended. Some persons, however, say that the author makes allusion, in that expression, to the descent of a tradition by various ways, it having come down unrelated by one way, and fair by another. It is also said that the conjunction ۛ [in the expression “unrelated and fair”] may be interpreted as equivalent to ۛ, denoting a doubt and indecision whether the tradition was unrelated, or fair, from the

want of definite knowledge. Another suggestion is that 'fair,' in the case referred to, has not its technical meaning, but its signification as used in common parlance, denoting that by which man is naturally attracted—which is very far-fetched.

"Section.

"It is universally agreed that, in judicial decisions, one may argue from a traditional statement (الخبير) which is sound; and most of the doctors allow of arguing, in like manner, from one which is intrinsically fair, and such tradition is actually coupled with the sound in argumentation, although its grade is inferior. Such weak tradition, also, as attains, by multiplicity of ways of descent, to the rank of extraneously fair, is used together with the other sorts. The widely received opinion that weak tradition is to be taken into account on the subject of the active virtues, though not on any other topic—meaning single traditions of this sort, not a combination of several, for otherwise they should be called fair, and not weak—is distinctly expressed by eminent teachers: and some of them say that, if a tradition is weak on account of defective memory, or confusion, or disguising, while yet the reporter was truthful and religious, it may be elevated in rank by multiplicity of ways of descent; but that, if it is weak on account of a falsifying indulgence of fancy, or separateness, or blamable error, it is not elevated by multiplicity of ways of descent, and is judged to be weak, and treated accordingly, even on the subject of the active virtues. Agreeably to some such explanation must, also, be understood the saying that the coupling of the weak with the weak hinders not force; otherwise, this saying is manifestly incorrect. Proceed, therefore, with care."

Another statement of the distinctive peculiarities of sound, fair, and weak tradition, as well as of the subordinate varieties included in each of these leading divisions, is presented in one of the chapters of J., which we here give entire, as follows:*

أبواب الأول

في أقسام الحديث وأنواعه وفيه ثلثة فصول

الفصل الأول

في الصحيح

هو ما اتصل سنده بنقل العدل الضابط عن مثله وسلم عن شذوذ وعلّة ونعى بالمتصل ما لم يكن مقضوعا بأى وجه كان وبالعدل من لم يكن مستور العدالة ولا بجزوها وبالضابط من يكون حافظا متيقضا وبالشذوذ ما يرويه الثقة مخالفا لرواية الناس وبالعلّة ما فيه أسباب خفية غامضة قاذحة وتنفقات

* pages 1-5.

درجات الصحيح بحسب قوة شروطه وضعفها وأول من صنف في الصحيح
 أنجود الامام البخارى ثم مسلم وكتابهما اصح الكتب بعد كتاب الله العزيز
 واما قول الشافعى رح ما اعلم شيئا بعد كتاب الله اصح من موطأ مالك فقبل
 وجود الكتابين واعلى اقسام الصحيح ما اتفقا عليه ثم ما انفرد به البخارى
 ثم ما انفرد به مسلم ثم ما كان على شرطهما وان لم يخرجاه ثم على شرط
 البخارى ثم على شرط مسلم ثم ما حكاه غيرهما من الايئة فهذه سبعة
 اقسام وما حذف سنده فيهما وهو كثير في تراجم البخارى قليل جدا في
 كتاب مسلم فا كان منه بصيغة الجزم نحو قال فلان وفعل وامر وروى وذكر
 معروفا فهو حكم بصحته وما روى من ذلك مجهولا فليس حكما بصحته
 ولكن ايراده في كتاب الصحيح مشعر بصحة اصله واما قول الحاكم اختيار
 البخارى ومسلم ان لا يذكر في كتابيهما الا ما رواه الصحابي المشهور عن
 رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وله راويان ثقتان فاكثر ثم يرويه عنه تابعي
 مشهور وله ايضا راويان ثقتان فاكثر ثم كذلك في كل درجة فقيه بحث قال
 الشيخ محى الدين النووى رح ليس ذلك من شرطهما لاجراهما احاديث
 ليس لها الا اسناد واحد منها حديث انما الاعمال بالنيات ونظايره في
 الصحيحين كثيرة قال ابن حبان تفرد بحديث انما الاعمال اهل المدينة
 وليس هو عند اهل العراق ولا عند اهل مكة واليمن ولا الشام ومصر وراويه
 هو يحيى بن سعيد القطان عن محمد بن ابراهيم عن علقمة عن عمر بن
 الخطاب رضه هكذا رواه البخارى ومسلم وابو داود والترمذى والنسائى
 وابن ماجه مع اختلاف في الرواة بعد يحيى يعرف بالرجاع الى هذه الصحاح

الفصل الثانى

فى الحسن

الترمذى هو ما لا يكون فى اسناده منهم ولا يكون شاذا ويروى من غير
 وجه نحوه للخطابى ما عرف مخرجه واشتهر رجاله وعليه مدار اكثر الحديث
 فالمنقطع ونحوه ما لم يعرف مخرجه وكذا المدلس اذا لم يبين بعض المتأخرين
 هو الذى فيه ضعف قريب محتمل ويصلح للعجل به ابن الصلاح هو قسمان
 احدهما ما لم يخل رجال اسناده عن مستور غير معقل فى رواية وقد روى
 مثله او نحوه من وجه اخر والثانى ما اشتهر راويه بالصدق والامانة وقصر

عن درجة رجال الصحيح حفظا واتقاناً بحيث لا يعدّ ما انفرد به منكراً ولا بدّ في القسمين من سلامتهما عن الشذوذ والتعليل قيل ما ذكره بعض المتأخرين بنى على أن معرفة المحسن موقوفة على معرفة الصحيح والضعيف لانه وسط بينهما فقولُه قريب أى قريب مخرجه الى الصحيح محتمل كذبه تكون رجاله مستورين والفرق بين حدى الصحيح والحسن ان شرايط الصحيح معتبرة في حد الحسن لكن العدالة في الصحيح ينبغي ان يكون ظاهرة والاتقان كمالا وليس ذلك شرطا في الحسن ومن ثم احتياج الى قيد قولنا ان يروى من غير وجه مثله او نحوه لينجبر به فالضعيف هو الذى بعد عن مخرج الصحيح مخرجه واحتمل الصدق والكذب او لا يحتمل الصدق اصلا كالموضوع وانما سمي حسنا لحسن الظن براويه ولو قيل الحسن هو مسند من قرب من درجة ائنفقة او مرسل ثقة وروى كلاهما من غير وجه وسلم عن شذوذ وعلة لكان اجمع الحدود واضبطها وابعدها عن التعقيد ونعى بالمسند ما اتصل اسناده الى منتهاه وبالثقة من جمع بين العدالة والضبط والتكثير في ثقة للشيوخ كما سيأتى بيانه في نوع المرسل والحسن حجة كالصحيح ولذلك ادرج في الصحيح قول ابن الصلاح تسمية محى السنة في المصاييح السنن بالحسان تساهل لان فيها التصحاح والحسان والضعاف وقول ائرمذى حديث حسن صحيح يريد به انه روى باسنادين احدهما يقتضى الصحة والاخر الحسن او المراد اللغوى وهو ما تميل اليه النفس و تستحسنه والحسن اذا روى من وجه اخر ترقى من الحسن الى الصحيح لقوته من الجهتين فيعتضد احدهما بالاخر ونعى بالترقى انه ملحق فى القوة بالصحيح لانه عينه واما الضعيف فللكذب راويه وفسقه لا ينجبر بتعدد طرقه كما فى حديث طلب العلم فريضة دل البيهقى هذا حديث مشهور بين الناس واسناده ضعيف وقد روى من اوجه كثيرة كلها ضعيف

الفصل الثالث

فى الضعيف

هو ما لم يجتمع فيه شروط الصحيح والحسن ويتفاوت درجاته فى الضعف بحسب بعده من شروط الصحة والحسن ويجوز عند العلماء ان تساهل فى اسانيد الضعيف دون موضوع من غير بيان ضعفه فى المواعظ والقصص

وفضائل الاعمال لا في صفات الله تعالى واحكام الحلال والحرام قيل كان من مذهب النسائي ان يخرج عن كل من لم يجمع على ترك له وابو داود كان يأخذ مأخذة ويخرج الضعيف اذا لم يجد في الباب غيره وبرحه على رأى الرجال وعن الشعبي ما حدثك عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم هؤلاء فخذ به وما قالوه برأيهم فائقه في الحش وقال الراى بمنزلة ائبنة اذا اضطرت اليها اكلتها وعن الشافعي رح مهما قلت من قول او اصلت من اصل فيه عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خلاف ما قلت فانقول ما قاله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو قولى وجعل يردده و هينا عدة عبارات منها ما يشترك فيه الاقسام الثلاثة اعنى الصحيح والحسن والضعيف ومنها ما يختص بالضعيف

فن الاول المسند هو ما اتصل سنده مرفوعا الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم والمتصل هو ما اتصل سنده سواء كان مرفوعا اليه صلى الله عليه وسلم او موقوفا والمرفوع هو ما اضيف الى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خاصة من قول او فعل او تقرير سواء كان متصلا او منقطعا فالمتصل قد يكون مرفوعا وغير مرفوع والمرفوع قد يكون متصلا وغير متصل والمسند متصل مرفوع والمعنعن هو ما يقال في سنده فلان عن فلان والصحيح انه متصل اذا امكن النقاء مع البراءة من التندليس وقد اودع في الصحيحين قل ابن الصلاح كثر في عصرنا وما قربه استعمال عن فى الاجازة واذا قيل فلان عن رجل عن فلان فالقرب انه منقطع وليس يرسل والمعلق ما حذف من مبدء اسناده واحد فاکثر مأخوذ من تعليق الجدار والطلاق لاشتراكهما فى قطع الاتصال فالحذف اما ان يكون فى اول الاسناد وهو المعلق او وسطه وهو المنقطع او فى اخره وهو المُرسل والبخارى اكثر من هذا النوع فى صحبه وليس بخارج من الصحيح لكون الحديث معروفا من جهة اثقات الذين علق عنهم او لكونه ذكره متصلا فى موضع اخر من كتابه والاخراد اما فرد عن جميع الرواة او من جهة نحو تفرد به اهل مكة فلا يضعف الا ان يراد به تفرد واحد منهم والمدرج هو ما ادرج فى الحديث من كلام بعض الرواة فيظن انه من الحديث او ادرج متنان باسنادين كرواية سعيد بن ابي مرير لا تباعصوا ولا تحاسدوا ولا تدابروا ولا تنافسوا ادرج ابن ابي مرير فيه ولا

تنافسوا من متن آخر او عند الراوى ظرف من متن واحد بسند شيخ هو غير سند المتن فيرويهما عنه بسند واحد فيصير الاسنادان اسنادا واحدا او يسمع حديثا واحدا من جماعة مختلفين فى سنده او متنه فيدرج روايتهم على الاتفاق ولا يذكر الاختلاف وتعد كل واحد من الثلثة حرام والمشهور ما شاع عند أهل الحديث خاصة بأن نقله رواة كثيرون نحو ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قنت شهرا يدعوا على جماعة او اشتهر عندهم وعند غيرهم نحو انما الاعمال بالنيات او عند غيرهم خاصة قال الامام احمد قوله للسائل حق وان جاء على فرس ويوم تحركم يوم صومكم يدوران فى الاسواق ولا اصل لهما فى الاعتبار والغريب والعزير قيل الغريب كحديث الرعى واشباهه من يجمع حديثه لعدالته وضبطه اذا تفرد عنهم بالحديث رجل يسمى غريبا فان رواه عنهم اثنان او ثلاثة يسمى عزيرا وان رواه جماعة يسمى مشهورا والافراد المضافة الى البلدان ليست بغريب والغريب اما صحيح كالأفراد المخرجة فى الصحيح او غير صحيح وهو الاغلب والغريب ايضا ما غريب اسنادا ومتنا وهو ما تفرد برواية متنه واحد واسنادا لا متنا كحديث يعرف متنه عن جماعة من الصحابة اذا تفرد بروايته واحد عن صحابى آخر ومنه قول الترمذى غريب من هذا الوجه ولا يوجد ما هو غريب متنا لا اسنادا الا اذا اشتهر الحديث الفرد فرواه عن تفرد به جماعة كثيرة فانه يصير غريبا مشهورا واما حديث انما الاعمال بالنيات فان اسناده متصف بالغرابة فى طرفه الاول متصف بالشهرة فى طرفه الآخر والمصحف قد يكون فى الراوى كحديث شعبة عن العوام بن مراحم بالراء والجيم صحفه يحيى بن معين فقال مزاحم بالراء والحاء المهملة وقد يكون فى الحديث كقوله صلى الله عليه وسلم من صام رمضان واتبعه ستا من شوال صحفه بعضهم فقال شيئا بالنشين الممخمة والمسلسل هو ما تتابع فيه رجال الاسناد الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عند روايته على حالة واحدة اما فى الراوى قولاً نحو سمعت فلانا يقول سمعت فلانا الى المنتهى او اخبرنا فلان والله قل اخبرنا فلان والله الى المنتهى او فعلا كحديث التشبيك باليد او قولاً وفعلاً كما فى حديث اللهم اعنى على ذكرك وشكرك وحسن عبادتك وفى رواية ابى داود واحمد والنسائى قال الراوى اخذ رسول الله صلى الله

عليه وسلم بيدي فقال انى لاحبك فقل اللهم اعنى الخ واما على صفة كحديث الفقهاء فقيه عن فقيه المتبايعان بأخبار ما لم يتفرقا واما فى الرواية كالمسلسل باتفاق أسماء الرواة وأسماء آباءهم أو كناههم أو انسابهم أو بلدانهم قال الامام النووى وأنا اروى ثلثة احاديث مسلسلة بالدمشقيين والاعتبار هو النظر فى حال الحديث هل تفرد به راويه أم لا وهل هو معروف أو لا والضرب الثانى ما يختص بالضعيف الموقوف وهو مطلقا ما روى عن الصحابى من قول أو فعل متصلا كان أو منقطعا وهو ليس بحجة على الاصح وقد يستعمل فى غير الصحابى مقيدا نحو وقفه معر على وهم ووقفه مالك على نافع وقول صحابى كنا نفعله فى زمن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم مرفوع لان الظاهر الاطلاع والتقرير وكذا كان اصحابه يقرعون بابه بالاظايم مرفوع فى المعنى وتفسير الصحابى موقوف وما كان من قبيل سبب النزول كقول جابر كانت اليهود تقول كذا فانزل الله سبحانه وتعالى كذا ونحوه مرفوع المقطوع ما جاء عن التابعين من اقوالهم وافعالهم موقوفا عليهم وليس بحجة المرسل قول التابعى قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كذا أو فعل كذا وهو المعروف فى الفقه واصوله وفيه خلاف وللشافعى رح تفصيل مذكور فى اصول الفقه المنقطع ما لم يتصل اسناده باى وجه كان سواء ترك ذكر الراوى من اول الاسناد أو وسطه أو آخره الا ان الغالب استعماله فى من دون التابعى عن الصحابى كمالك عن ابن عمر المعضل بفتح الضاد وهو ما سقط من سنده اثنان فصاعدا كقول مالك قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقول الشافعى قال ابن عمر كذا الشاذ والمنكر الشافعى رحمه الله الشاذ ما رواه الثقة بخالفا لما رواه الناس قال ابن الصلاح فيه تفصيل فا خالف مقرده احفظ منه واضبط فشاذ مردود وان لم يخالف احفظ منه وهو عدل ضابط فصحيح وان رواه غير ضابط لكن لا يبعد عن درجة الضابط فحسن وان بعد فنكر ويفهم من قوله احفظ واضبط على صيغة التفصيل ان المخالف ان كان مثله لا يكون مردودا وقد علم من هذا التقسيم ان المنكر ما هو المعدل ما فيه اسباب خفية غامضة قاذحة والظاهر السلامة ويستعان على ادراكها بتفرد الراوى ومخالفة غيره له مع قرأين تنبه العارف على ارسال فى الموصول أو وقف فى المرفوع أو دخول حديث فى حديث أو وهم بحديث يغلب على ظنه ذلك فيحكم به أو يتردد فيتوقف وكل ذلك مانع عن الحكم بصحة

ما وجد ذلك فيه وحديث يعلى بن عبيد عن الثوري عن عمرو بن دينار عن ابن عمر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم البيعان بالخيار اسناده متصل عن العدل الضابط وهو معطل وأمتن صحيح لأن عمرو بن دينار وضع موضع أخيه عبد الله بن دينار هكذا رواه الأئمة من أصحاب الثوري عنه فوهم يعلى وقد يطلق اسم العلة على الكذب والغفلة وسوء الحفظ ونحوها وبعضهم أطلقه على مخالفه لا يقدمه كإرسال ما وصله الثقة الضابط حتى قال من الصحيح ما هو صحيح معطل كما قال آخر من الصحيح ما هو صحيح شاذ ويدخل في هذا حديث يعلى بن عبيد البيعان بالخيار المندلس ما أخفى عيبه أما في الإسناد وهو أن يروى عن نقيب أو عاصره ما لم يسمعه منه على سبيل يوم أنه سمعه منه فمن حقه أن لا يقول حدثنا بل يقول قال فلان أو عن فلان ونحوه وربما لم يسقط المندلس شيخه لكن يسقط من بعده رجلا ضعيفا أو صغير السن بحسن الحديث بذلك كفعل الأعمش والثوري وغيرهما وهو مكروه جدا ودمه أكثر العلماء واختلف في قبول روايته والأصح التفصيل فما رواه بلفظ محتمل لم يبين فيه السماع فحكمه حكم المرسل وأنواعه وما رواه بلفظ مبين للاتصال كسمعت وأخبرنا وحدثنا وأشباها فهو محتج به وأما في الشيوخ وهو أن يروى عن شيخ حديثنا سمعه فيسميه أو يكتبه أو ينسبه أو يصفه بما لا يعرف به كيلا يعرف وأمره أخف لكن فيه تضييع للمروى عنه وتوعير بطريق معرفة حاله والكراهة بحسب الغرض الحامل عليه نحو أن يكون كثير الرواية عنه فلا يجب الاكثار من واحد على صورة واحدة وقد يحمله عليه كون شيخه الذي غير سمته غير ثقة أو أصغر منه أو غير ذلك المضطرب ما اختلفت الرواية فيه فأختلفت الروايتان أن ترحت أحدهما على الأخرى بوجه نحو أن يكون راييهما أحفظ وأكثر صحة للمروى عنه فالحكم للراجح فلا يكون حينئذ مضطربا وألا تضطرب المقلوب هو نحو حديث مشهور عن سالم جعل عن نافع ليصميم بذلك غريبا مرغوبا فيه وحديث البخاري حين قدم بغداد وأمتحان الشيوخ آياه بقلب الاسانيد مشهور الموضوع الخبر أما أن يجب تصديقه وهو ما نص الأئمة على صحته وأما أن يجب تكذيبه وهو ما نصوا على وضعه أو يتوقف فيه لاحتمال الصدق والكذب كسائر الاخبار ولا يحل

رواية الموضوع للعالم بحاله في اى معنى كان الا مقرونا ببيان الوضع ويعرف
 باقرار واضعه او ركاكة الفاظه او بالوقوف على غلط كما وقع لثابت ابن موسى
 الزاهد في حديث من كثرت صلواته بالليل حسن وجهه بالنهار قيل كان
 شيخ يحدث في جماعة فدخل رجل حسن الوجه فقال الشيخ في اثناء
 حديثه من كثرت الخ فوقه لثابت انه من الحديث فرواه والواضعون
 للحديث اصناف واعظمهم ضررا من انتسب الى الزهد فوضع احنسابا
 ووضعت الزنادقة ايضا جملا ثم نهضت جهابذة الحديث بكشف عوارها
 ومحو عارها والحمد لله وقد ذهبت الكرامية والطائفة المبتدعة الى جواز
 وضع الحديث فى الترغيب والترهيب ومنه ما روى عن ابي عصمة نوح
 ابن مريم انه قيل له من اين لك عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس فى فضائل القران
 سورة سورة فقال انى رأيت الناس قد اعرضوا عن القران واشتغلوا بفقده انى
 حنيفة ومغازى محمد بن اسحاق فوضعت هذه الاحاديث حسبة وقد
 اخطأ المفسرون فى ايداعها فى تفاسيرهم الا من عصمه الله وما اودعوا فيها
 انه قال صلى الله عليه وسلم حين قرأ ومناة الثالثة الاخرى تلك الغرائيف
 ائعلى وان شفاعتهم لترتجى ولقد اشبعنا القول فى ابضاله فى باب سجده
 التلاوة وكذا ما اوزره الاصوليون من قوله اذا روى عنى حديث فاعرضوه
 على كتاب الله فان وافقه فاقبلوه وان خالفه فردوه قال الخطابى وضعت الزنادقة
 ويدفعه قوله ص ائى قد اوتيت الكتاب وما يعدنه ويروى اوتيت الكتاب
 ومثله معه وقد صنف ابن الجوزى فى الموضوعات مجلدات قال ابن الصلاح
 اودع فيها كثيرا من الاحاديث الضعيفة مما لا دليل على وضعه وحققا ان
 يذكر فى الاحاديث الضعيفة وللشيخ الحسن بن محمد الصغانى الدرر
 الملتقط فى تبين الغلط

“CHAPTER FIRST.

“Kinds and Species of Tradition, in Three Sections.

“SECTION FIRST.

“Sound Tradition.

“This is that of which the support is continuous, by the transmission of an upright and retentive reporter, on the authority of his like, and which is free from separateness and speciousness. We mean by ‘continuous’ that which is not, in any manner whatever, interrupted (مقطوع) ;

by 'upright,' one whose uprightness is neither doubtful nor dishonored; by 'retentive,' one who is vigilant to remember; our use of 'separateness' refers to that which a reliable authority reports at variance with the general report; and under 'speciousness' we allude to tradition in which certain hidden, subtle assumptions, injurious to its character, are involved. The degrees of sound tradition differ from one another in proportion to the strength or weakness of its conditions. 'Al-Bukhârî was the first to compose a book of sound tradition alone; the next was Muslim; and their two books are the most perfect of all books after the Glorious Book of God: as for the saying of 'ash-Shâfi'i—to whom may God be merciful!—"I know of no book, after the Book of God, more perfect than the *Muwatta'* of Mâlik,"* that was said before the existence of the books of 'al-Bukhârî and Muslim. Now, the highest subdivision of sound tradition is that which these two authors agree in bringing forward; the next is that which 'al-Bukhârî alone presents; then comes that which Muslim alone presents; then that which accords with the conditioning of the two, although not given out by both; then that which is in accordance with what 'al-Bukhârî stipulates; then that which accords with what Muslim stipulates; and last, that which other eminent teachers regard as sound—in all, seven subdivisions.

"With respect to traditions, found in the two books, of which the reports are abridged—numerous in the chapters of 'al-Bukhârî, and very few in Muslim's book—those of them which are given in an expressly concise form, for example: 'Such a one says' (or 'did,' or 'commands,' or 'reports,' or 'states,') '[so and so],' as being well known, are judged to be sound; but those which are given as if there were want of knowledge respecting them are not deemed sound, while yet their being brought forward in a book of sound tradition indicates the soundness of their originals.

"The saying of 'al-Hâkim,† that 'al-Bukhârî and Muslim chose to state, in their books, only those traditions which are reported by some well known witness of the Prophet, on the authority of the Messenger of God . . . , and handed down by two reliable authorities, and so continued on; and which are also reported by some well known follower of the Prophet in the second degree, on the authority of a witness, and so continued on; and of which the like of this is true at each stage,' has been made the subject of dispute. The master Muḥi 'ad-dîn 'an-Nawawî‡—to whom may God be merciful!—denies that such stipulations were made by the two authors, because they actually give out traditions with only one support, as, for example, the tradition: 'Ac-

* The *Muwatta'* of Mâlik Bin 'Anas is by some Arab authors supposed to have been the earliest book composed by a Muslim. Others give the preëminence to a collection of traditions made by 'Ibn Jurâij. See *Hâji Khalf. Lex.*, iii. 28.

† 'Abû-'Ahmad of Nisâpûr, surnamed the Great Judge ('al-Hâkim 'al-Kabîr), who is said to have been "preëminent in knowledge of the conditions of sound tradition," died A. H. 378. See *Kitâb Tab.*, xii. 59.

‡ 'An-Nawawî of Damascus, the author of several useful works on tradition and jurisprudence, and among others of a commentary on Muslim's collection of traditions, which is frequently cited on the margin of the Dehli edition of this work, died A. H. 676. See *Kitâb Tab.*, xx. 3.

tions are only according to intentions,* of the like of which many are to be found in the two *Ṣaḥīḥs*. 'Ibn Hibbān† says that the tradition: 'Actions are only according to intentions' belonged to the people of Madinah alone, and was not known among the inhabitants of 'Irāq, nor of Makkah, nor of Yaman, Syria, or Egypt, and that its reporter is Yahya Bin Sa'id 'al-Kaṭṭān, on the authority of Muḥammad Bin 'Ibrāhīm, on the authority of 'Alqamah, on the authority of 'Umar Bin 'al-Khaṭṭāb—to whom may God be gracious!—and it is thus handed down by 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim, as well as by 'Abū-Dāwud, 'at-Tarmidhī, 'an-Nasā'ī and 'Ibn Mājah, with some difference in respect to the reporters after Yahya, which may be ascertained by reference to the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of these authors.

“SECTION SECOND.

“Fair Tradition.

“According to 'at-Tarmidhī, this is that of which the support includes no suspected reporter, and which is not separate, and is equivalently reported in some other form. According to 'al-Khaṭṭābī,‡ it is that given out by a recognized traditionist, of which the guarantees are persons of reputation, and which forms the centre of a cluster of traditions; and so dissevered tradition, and the like, in the view of this teacher, is that given out by some one not recognized, as also the disguised, in case there is no explanation of it. According to certain of the moderns, it is that in which there is something of weakness, and which, while almost up to the mark, may be regarded diversely, and is at the same time of a practical character. According to 'Ibn 'aṣ-Ṣalāḥ,§ there are two subdivisions of it: first, that of which the support includes some guarantee who is questionable, though not convicted of

* This tradition, in the form “Actions are according to the intention,” is found in one of the chapters of the Book of the Faith of 'al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ*. The heading of the chapter is as follows:

باب ما جاء ان الاعمال بالنية والحسبة وكل امرئ ما نوى فدخل فيه الايمان
والوضوء والصلاة والركاة والحج والصوم والاحكام وقال قل كل يعمل على شاكلته
على نيته ونفقة الرجل على اهله يختسبها صدقة وقال صلى الله عليه وسلم
ونكن جهاد ونية

“Chapter of information that actions are according to the intention and purpose, and that every man is credited for that which he intends; so that intention comprehends both belief, purification, prayer, alms-giving, pilgrimage and fasting, and the subordinate requirements of law—as, indeed, it is said in the *Kurān* [xvii. 56] ‘Declare thou, that whoever performs required action in purpose, i. e. so far as intention goes, etc.; and a man's expenditure upon his people is there reckoned as alms-giving; and it was a saying of the Prophet: ‘... but a warring for the faith with an intention.’” See MS., fol. 5, rect.

† 'Ibn Hibbān of Samarkand, who was not only a jurist and traditionist, but also an astronomer, physician, etc., died A. H. 354. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xii. 30.

‡ Of Sabtah in North-W. Africa: he died A. H. 388. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xiii. 20.

§ By birth a Kurd, who became one of the most distinguished of the interpreters of the *Kurān*, and the traditionists and jurists of his time: he died A. H. 643. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xviii. 21.

carelessness in any report, and which is reported in the same words, or equivalently, by another way of descent; and second, that reported by a man of reputation for truthfulness and trustiness, though, in respect to memory and confidence of knowledge, of a grade below the guarantees of sound tradition—so that it is not accounted as that sort of tradition received on a single authority, which is undetermined—and both subdivisions must necessarily be clear of separateness and speciousness. All these different views have been expressed.

“The foundation of the statement of certain of the moderns is the principle that a knowledge of fair tradition depends upon a knowledge of the sound and the weak, because it stands midway between the two; their expression ‘almost up to the mark,’ therefore, means that it is almost equal to sound tradition as regards the person who gives it out; and that it ‘may be regarded diversely’ signifies the possibility of its falsity, on account of the doubt which there is in respect to the character of its guarantees.

“The boundary-line between the sound and the fair is marked by the circumstance that, while the conditions of sound tradition are reckoned in for the definition of the fair, yet uprightness must be manifest, and confidence of knowledge perfect, for sound tradition—which is not essential for the fair; and hence arises the necessity of that requisition signified by the words above used: ‘reported, in the same words or equivalently, by another way of descent,’ in order that one tradition may make good the other. Weak tradition, then, is that which is brought out by a reporter widely differing in character from one who brings out sound tradition, and which may be either true or false, or cannot be supposed unconditionally true, as, for example, suppositious tradition. The name of ‘fair’ is given to tradition only on account of the fairness of the reputation of its reporter; and if one should say that fair tradition is that which is sustained, given out by a reporter nearly equal in grade to the reliable authority, or that which a reliable authority lets go loose, being in either case reported also by another way of descent, and free from all separateness and speciousness—that would be the most comprehensive and exact, and the least involved, definition: by the expression ‘sustained’ we mean that of which the support is continuous to its end; and by ‘the reliable authority,’ one who unites uprightness and retentiveness—we say, indefinitely, ‘a reliable authority’ [in the expression: ‘that which a reliable authority lets go loose’], because our meaning, which we shall explain under the head of loosened tradition, is too well known to need specification.

“Fair tradition is legal proof, like the sound, and, so far as that goes, is ranked with the latter: says ‘Ibn ‘aṣ Ṣalāh: ‘There is a lack of strictness in Muḥī ‘as-sunnah’s designation of traditions as fair, in the *Ma-ṣābiḥ*, because among those so called are included both sound and fair and weak.’ But ‘at-Tarmidhi’s expression: ‘a fair and sound tradition’ signifies that it is reported with two supports, of which the one makes it to have the quality of soundness, and the other that of fairness; or else the meaning of ‘fair’ is that recognized in common parlance, namely, something towards which man’s sensitive nature is attracted, and which it esteems.

“The reporting of a fair tradition by some other way of descent may elevate it from the rank of the fair to that of the sound, for its strength lies in both aspects of it, and so the one way of descent may be helped out by the other: we mean by ‘elevation’ (الترقى) that a tradition partakes of the strength of sound tradition, not that it is intrinsically sound. As to weak tradition, inasmuch as the reporter of such is chargeable with either falseness or impiety, it cannot be strengthened by multiplicity of ways of descent, which is true, for example, of the tradition: ‘The investigation of science is a revealed requirement:’ this tradition, in the words of ‘al-Baihaqi, is one widely known among men, with a weak support—it is reported, indeed, by many ways of descent, every one of which is weak.

“SECTION THIRD.

“*Weak Tradition.*

“This is that which does not embrace the conditions of the sound and the fair. It varies in degrees of weakness in proportion as it is remote from the conditions of soundness and fairness. In the opinion of the doctors, a laxity respecting the supports of weak tradition, with the exception of the suppositious, is admissible, to the neglect of any declaration of its weakness, in the case of admonitions, narratives, and the active virtues, but not when the tradition has reference to the attributes of the Supreme God, or to judicial decisions with regard to the lawful and the forbidden. The practice of ‘an-Nasâ’i is said to have been to give out tradition on the authority of any one whom men had not agreed to abandon as a guide; ‘Abû-Dâwud was accustomed to take whatever offered, to give out weak tradition when he found no other under a particular head, and to ascribe to that a weight superior to the mere judgment of the guarantees; ‘ash-Sha’bi,* also, is said to have remarked: ‘Whatever these persons tell thee for a tradition, take it up; but cast away from thee what they say on their own judgment,’ and another saying of his is the following: ‘Opinion is carrion—when need requires, eat it;’ of ‘ash-Shâfi’i—to whom may God be merciful!—we are told that he said: ‘Whatever I declare as a saying of the Prophet . . . , or lay down as a principle, by the expression: “on the authority of the Messenger of God . . . ,” at variance with something otherwise said by me, the true saying is that of the Prophet . . . , which I hereby make my declaration, to the refutation of anything so said by me [to the contrary]’—of which there are numerous interpretations, some applying it to all three divisions of tradition, to wit, the sound, the fair, and the weak, and some restricting it to the weak.

“Now to the first kind of tradition pertain the following:

[1.] “The sustained (المسند), namely, that of which the support is continuous, being at the same time carried back to the Messenger of God. . . .

* ‘Ash-Sha’bi died A. H. 96. He reported traditions on the wars of the Prophet. “No man tells me a tradition without my remembering it,” was another of his sayings. See *Kitâb Tab.*, iii. 11.

[2.] “The continuous (المُتَّصِل), namely, that of which the support is continuous, whether it be carried back to the Prophet . . . or stopped.

[3.] “The carried back (المُرْفُوع), or that which is attributed to the Prophet . . . , as his in particular, of saying, or action, or confirmation, whether it be continuous or dissevered: so that continuous tradition may be either carried back or not carried back, and tradition which is carried back may be either continuous or not continuous; whereas sustained tradition is both continuous and carried back.

[4.] “Tradition on authority (المُعْتَمَد), namely, that which is supported by the expression: ‘Such a one says on the authority of such a one,’ which may be correctly viewed as continuous, in case the two persons can have met, and provided there be no disguising, of which examples are to be found in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of ‘al-Bukhārī as well as in that of Muslim. ‘Ibn ‘aṣ-Ṣalāḥ says: ‘In our time, and within a short period, there has been much use made of the expression “on the authority of,” in the act of license; but, when one says: “Such a one says on the authority of a certain guarantee, on the authority of such a one,” it is most likely that the tradition is dissevered, and that without being so much as a loosened tradition.’

[5.] “The summarily given (المُعْلَف), namely, that from which one reporter, or more, of the support, has been cut off at the beginning—the term being derived from the closing up of a wall, or the despatch of a writing of divorce, a cutting short of connection being implied in those two actions. There may be a cutting off either [a] at the beginning of the support, in which case the tradition is summarily given, or [b] in the middle, which makes it dissevered, or [c] at the end, whereby it becomes loosened. ‘Al-Bukhārī admits many traditions of this species into his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, nor is any summary tradition, contained in that book, out of place, because either the reliable authorities depended upon in the summary statement of it have caused it to be recognized, or else it is mentioned by the author, in some other part of his book, as a continuous tradition.

[6.] “Unique traditions (الأفراد). A tradition may be unique either as regards all reporters, or in a certain respect, as, for example, that the people of Makkah alone report it; unique tradition, therefore, is not weak, unless the term be used to signify that one single reporter gives it out.

[7.] “The involved (المُدْرَج), consisting of the words of some reporter interwoven with a tradition, so that they are believed to form a part of it. It may also happen that two texts, having two supports, are woven together, as in the case of the report of Sa‘īd Bin ‘Abū-Miryam: ‘Hate ye not one another, neither be envious one of another, nor turn the back upon one another, nor be rivals one of another,’ where the words: ‘nor be rivals one of another’ are interwoven by ‘Ibn ‘Abū-Miryam from another text; or else a reporter may lay hold of some text, at the end of a tradition, together with some master’s support which belongs to another text, and then report both texts on the authority of that master, with one support, the two supports being reduced to one; or else he may hear a single tradition from a number of persons, who differ in respect

either to its support or its text, and thereupon, by interweaving, make it appear that they all report harmoniously, not mentioning the disagreement—all which it is forbidden to do intentionally.

[8.] “The notorious (المشهور), namely, that which is particularly wide spread among traditionists, because of its being transmitted by many reporters, such as, for example, the tradition that ‘the Messenger of God . . . worshipped God for a month, in prayer at the head of a company;’ or which is well known both among traditionists and others, as, for example, the tradition: ‘Actions are not without intentions;’ or which is known particularly among others than traditionists: says the eminent teacher ‘Aḥmad: ‘That the Prophet said to an inquirer: “It is a duty, though one come mounted upon a horse,”* and: “The day of your slaying for sacrifice is the day on which you are to fast,” are traditions current in the market-place, though, when criticised, they are found to be without foundation.’

[9.] “The unrelated and the rare (الغريب والعزيز). Unrelated tradition is said to be the tradition, for example, of ‘az Zuhri, or of some such individual, being one whose uprightness and retentiveness suffice to secure a place for his tradition in collections. If a certain guarantee stands alone in giving a tradition, it is called unrelated; but if two or three, apart from others, report it, it is called rare; if reported by a number of persons, it is called notorious. Traditions unique as belonging to certain provinces are not unrelated. Unrelated tradition is either sound, like the unique traditions given out in ‘al-Bukhārī’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*, or not sound, the latter being most commonly the case. Again, unrelated tradition is such in respect either to the support or the text, namely, that of which only one person reports the text, or in respect to support and not text, as, for example, any tradition of which the text is recognized on the authority of several of the Companions of the Prophet, in case it is reported, on the authority of some other witness of the Prophet, by one person alone, to which ‘at-Tarmidhī refers in his expression: ‘unrelated by this way of descent.’ There is no such thing as a tradition unrelated in respect to text, without being so in respect to support, except when an [absolutely] unique tradition becomes notorious, so that many persons report it on the authority of him who alone vouches for it—whereby it is made a notorious unrelated tradition: as for the tradition: ‘Actions are only according to intentions,’ the first part of its support has the quality of being unrelated, while the last part of it is notorious.

[10.] “The wrongly told (المصكف), which may be such [a] in respect to the identity of a reporter, as, for example, a tradition of Shu‘bah on the authority of ‘al-‘Auwām Bin Murājim—with *rā’* and *jin*—which Yahya Bin Ma‘īn tells wrongly, saying: ‘Muzāḥim’—with *zāy* and *hā’*; or [b] in respect to the identity of a tradition, as, for example, in the case of the saying of the Prophet . . . ‘Whoever fasts in Ramaḍhān, and continues fasting for six days of the month Shawwāl,’ which some persons tell wrongly, using the expression ‘for some days’—*shai’an* for *sittan*.

* i. e., for all, high and low.

[11.] "The chain-wise (السلسل), namely, that of which the guaranties who make up its support, even back to the Prophet . . . , follow one another, in reporting it, on one and the same footing, whether this be a matter which [a] concerns the reporter himself, for example, the tradition being a saying: 'I heard such a one say: "I heard such a one say,"' and so on to the end, or: 'Such a one informs us, in the name of God, saying: "Such a one informs us, in the name of God,"' and so on to the end; or, the tradition being an action, like that in respect to folding the fingers together;* or, it being both a saying and an action, like the tradition: 'O God, it concerns me that I owe thee remembrance, and gratitude, and fair service,' which, as reported by 'Abû-Dâwud, 'Ahmad and 'an-Nasâ'i, runs thus, in the words of the reporter: 'The Messenger of God . . . took me by the hand, and said: "Truly I love thee; so then do thou say: 'O God, it concerns me, etc.'";' or, the tradition being dependent upon a qualification, like the jurists' tradition, told by jurist from jurist: 'Two persons who have bargained together with reference to a sale, are at liberty in regard to it so long as they have not parted from each other;† or whether it be a matter which [b] concerns the report, as in the case of a tradition which is chain-wise by virtue of coincidence in name, or surname, or genealogy, or national appellation, between reporters and their predecessors: says the eminent teacher 'an-Nawâ'i: 'I also report three traditions which are chain-wise through natives of Damascus.'

"Investigation of the state of a tradition, in order to ascertain whether its reporter stands alone with it or not, and whether it is recognized or not, is called criticism (الاعتبار).

"To the second kind of tradition, distinguished as the weak, pertain the following:

[1.] "The stopped (الموقوف), namely, in general, whatever is reported from a witness of the Prophet, being a tradition either of saying or action, whether continuous or dis severed. It is not legal proof, according to the soundest view. The term is also used in a restricted sense, with reference to others than a witness of the Prophet, as, for example, in the remark: 'It is stopped by Mu'ammâr at Hammâm,' and in the following: 'It is stopped by Mâlik at Nâfi.' A declaration by a witness of the Prophet in the words: 'We were accustomed to do so and so in the time of the Prophet . . . ' constitutes a tradition carried back, because the action, obviously, must have been noticed by the Prophet, and have received his confirmation; equally carried back, to all intents, is the tradition: 'His Companions were wont to knock upon his door with their nails.' Qurânic exposition by a witness of the Prophet is stopped tradition; but any tradition of a witness which is of the nature of a reason for a particular revelation, as, for example, the saying of Jâbir:

* One of the chapters of the Book of Prayer in 'al-Bukhârî's *Sahih* is entitled *باب تشبيك الأصابع في المسجد وغيره*, i. e. *Chapter on Folding the Fingers together in the Mosque and elsewhere*. See MS., fol. 22, rect.

† This tradition makes the forty-third chapter of the Book of Sales in 'al-Bukhârî's *Sahih*. See MS., fol. 86, rect.

'The Jews were wont to say so and so, whereupon the Glorious and Supreme God made a revelation so and so,' or the like, is carried back.

[2.] "The mutilated (المقتوع), which is whatever has come down from followers of the Prophet in the second degree, of their sayings and doings, being stopped at them. It is not legal proof.

[3.] "The loosened (الموسل), which consists in the saying by a follower of the Prophet in the second degree: 'The Messenger of God . . . said so and so' (or, 'did so and so'). This, according to both practice and theory in jurisprudence, is recognized tradition, while at the same time there is some difference of opinion with regard to it, and 'ash-Shâfi'i makes it the subject of a distinction which is stated in the '*Uşûl 'al-Fîkh*.

[4.] "The dis severed (المنقطع), namely, that of which the support is, anyway, not continuous, be it that a reporter is passed over either at the beginning of the support, or in the middle, or at the end of it; only that the term is commonly employed with reference to reporting on the authority of a witness of the Prophet, by one of a later age than a follower in the second degree, as, for example: 'Says Mâlik, on the authority of 'Umar.'

[5.] "The straitened (المعضل)—the participle being pronounced with *fath* on the *dhâd*—namely, that from the support of which two or more reporters have dropped out, as, for example, Mâlik's saying: 'Says the Messenger of God . . .,' and 'ash-Shâfi'i's saying: 'Says 'Ibn 'Umar so and so.'

[6.] "The separate and the undetermined (الشاذ والمنكمر). Says 'ash-Shâfi'i—to whom may God be merciful!—'Separate tradition is that which a reliable authority reports at variance with common report.' In the words of 'Ibn 'aṣ-Ṣalâḥ: 'There are several sorts of separate tradition: that from which varies some reporter who has better memory and more retentiveness than its single reporter, is rejected separate tradition; if no one of better memory differs from the single reporter, and the latter is upright and retentive, the tradition is sound; if he who reports the separate tradition is not retentive, yet not far from the rank of a retentive reporter, it is fair; if its reporter is far from being retentive, it is undetermined.' The discrimination of the words: 'some reporter who has better memory and more retentiveness' denotes that a tradition differed from is not rejected when equal as respects the grade of its reporter to that which differs from it. What undetermined tradition is, may be seen from the classification just quoted.

[7.] "The specious (المعلل), namely, that involving certain hidden, subtle assumptions, to its injury, which are evidently unauthorized. Such assumptions are discovered by the circumstance that a tradition has only one reporter, or is differed from, in connection with certain other things by which an intelligent person is put upon his guard against either a loosening in tradition which is [apparently] unbroken, or a stoppage in that which is [seemingly] carried back to the Prophet, or a confounding of one tradition with another, or an error on the part of some person deficient in accuracy—so that he is constrained not to think the tradition to be what it seems, and judges accordingly, or is embarrassed and

made undecided, inasmuch as all the circumstances referred to hinder the pronouncing of a tradition to be sound. The tradition of Ya'la Bin 'Uba'id, on the authority of 'ath-Thauri, on the authority of 'Amrū Bin Dinār, on the authority of 'Ibn 'Umar, on the authority of the Prophet... 'The seller and buyer are at liberty,' is supported continuously by the authority of an upright and retentive reporter, and the text is sound, while at the same time it is a specious tradition: for 'Amrū Bin Dinār has been put in the place of his brother 'Abdallah Bin Dinār—it is thus that the eminent teachers among the followers of 'ath-Thauri report it from him—so that Ya'la has fallen into an error. The term 'pretence' (ائعلاء) is, indeed, applied, in the general sense [of something unreliable], to falseness, carelessness, defect of memory, and the like; and some persons even use it to signify what it has no applicability to, and is not injurious to the soundness of a tradition, as, for example, the loosening of some tradition which virtually reaches to the Prophet by the report of a retentive, reliable authority, so that they go so far as to say: 'one department of sound tradition is the specious sound,' just as another says: 'one department of sound tradition is the separate sound,' including under this latter appellation the tradition of Ya'la Bin 'Uba'id: 'The seller and buyer are at liberty.'

[8.] "The disguised (ائندلس), of which the defect lies hidden, either [a] in the making up of its support, namely, that one reports on the authority of a person whom he had met, or whose contemporary he was, without having received instruction in tradition from him, in such a way as to lead to the supposition that he was instructed by him (for he ought not to say: 'Such a one tells us for a tradition,' but, instead of this: 'Such a one says,' or 'Such a one is responsible for the following,' or the like); and often it is not his master whom the dissembler drops out, but some weak guarantee, or one of immature age [farther on in the chain of connection], thereby giving a fair appearance to the tradition, as did, for example, 'al-'A'mash, 'ath-Thauri, and others—both which ways of reporting offend very much the sense of propriety, and are condemned by most of the doctors: there is, however, a difference of opinion with regard to the reception of a disguised report of tradition; and it is most correct to draw a distinction, that which is reported in language capable of being understood not to express an actual hearing of it being judged of in the same manner as tradition which is loosened, or of that sort,* while that which is reported in language clearly expressive of continuousness, as, for example: 'I have heard,' or 'Such a one informs us,' or 'Such a one tells us for a tradition,' or the like, is used as legal proof; or [b] in the designation of actual masters, namely, that one reports, on the authority of some master, a tradition which he did indeed hear from him, but gives him a name, or a surname, or a genealogy, or an appellative, by which he is not known, in order that he may not be recognized: to do this is a very light matter, and yet such a proceeding renders worthless whatever is reported on the authority of the person so disguised, causing difficulty, as it does, in the way of knowing his circumstances, and is more or less displeasing according to the mo-

* viz., by the character of the reporter.

tive which impels to it, be this either that reports on the authority of the disguised person abound (for it is not agreeable to multiply traditions from a single individual, in one and the same form), or that one is impelled to the disguise by the fact that his master, whose designation he alters, was not a reliable authority, or was younger than himself, or by some such consideration.

[9.] "The unstable (المضطرب), namely, that of which the report varies, without any preponderance in authority of one report over another, such as that the reporter of one had better memory, or more followers in respect to reporting tradition on his authority, than another, leading to a decision in favor of that which has the greater weight: in case a decision between differing reports is practicable, the tradition is not unstable; but instability arises where there is no preponderance.

[10.] "The reversed (المقلوب), namely, for example, a tradition, notorious on the authority of Sâlim, which is put down as authorized by Nâfi', in order that it may, for one's pleasure, become an unrelated tradition. The tradition about 'al-Bukhârî, when he came to Baghdâd, and the masters put him to trial by reversing supports, is well-known.*

[11.] "The suppositious (الموضوع), namely, hearsay (الخبير), whether it must be regarded as true, having been shown by eminent teachers to be correct, or whether it must be pronounced false, such teachers having shown it to be fictitious, or whether it be doubtful, on account of the possibility of either truth or falsehood in the case, like other rumors. Suppositious tradition must not be reported by one who is aware of its character, let it signify what it may, unless accompanied with a declaration of its suppositiousness. It may be known either by confession on the part of him who made it up, or by the want of sense in its phraseology, or by the discovery of some such error in it as that which Thâbit 'Ibn Mûsa 'az-Zâhid fell into respecting the tradition: 'Whoever prays much at night has a fair countenance by day:' a certain master, it is said, was giving out tradition in the midst of an assembly of people, when a man of fair countenance entered; whereupon the master said, on repeating his tradition: 'Whoever prays much, etc.,' which led Thâbit to think that these words were a part of the tradition, and he reported accordingly. Suppositious tradition may originate with several sorts of persons, most of whom make it up at some risk, like 'az-Zâhid, and therefore blameably. Entire traditions of a suppositious character were made up by the Zanâdiqah,† whose bad wares, and the disgrace of whose conduct, have been in later times successfully exposed by men skilled in the science, and brought to nought—to God be the praise! The Karrâmiyah,‡ and the 'Innovating Sect,' considered it lawful to make up tradition with regard to religious contemplation and the monastic life. This species of tradition is referred to in a report on the authority of 'Abû-'Usmah Nûh 'Ibn Miryam, namely, that he was asked: 'How is it that thou hast traditions on the authority of 'Ikrimah, on the authority of 'Ibn 'Abbâs, respecting the virtues of the KURÂN, chapter by

* See *Zeitschrift d. D. M. Gesellschaft*, iv. 6.

† A sect of dualists.

‡ A sect of anthropomorphists.

chapter?" to which he replied: 'I saw that men were diverted from the Kūrān, and busied themselves with the *Fik̄h* of 'Abū-Hanīfah, and the *Maghāzi* of Muhammad Bin 'Ishāk, and so I made up these traditions as a substitute: now commentators on the Kūrān, not prevented by the grace of God, have committed the error of bringing forward such traditions in their commentaries; and among others which they cite is the following, that the Prophet . . . when he had read the words: "and Manāh the third, the other,"* added: "As for those tender girls, there is no hope of their intercession," which we have enlarged upon, by way of refuting it, under the chapter headed "It is worship of God to read the Kūrān:" accordingly, whatever they who treat of the principles of Islām allege as having been said by the Prophet, in case I am referred to as authority for any tradition, confront it with the Book of God, and, if it agrees therewith, accept it; otherwise, reject it.' 'Al-Khattābī says: 'The Zanādikah made up tradition, notwithstanding the discountenance of that saying of the Prophet . . . "The Book, and that which is equivalent thereto" (or, as it is also reported, "and the like of it together with it"), was brought to me by divine inspiration.'" Ibn 'aj-Jauzī† composed volumes relative to supposititious traditions, wherein, as 'Ibn 'aṣ-Ṣalāh says, he brings forward many simply weak traditions, not proved to have been made up, for which the proper place would be among weak traditions. There is also a work by the master 'al-Ḥasan Bin Muhammad 'aṣ-Ṣaghghānī, entitled *The Choice Pearl on the Detection of Error* (الدر الملتقط في تبیین الغلط).‡

On comparing these definitions given of the several kinds and species of tradition by 'Abd 'al-Ḥaḳḳ and 'aj-Jurjānī, we find no radical disagreement between the two writers, notwithstanding the four centuries and a half which separated them from each other, but only some differences of form which seem not to require any comment. We may, therefore, proceed at once to another extract, which will be from Muslim's introduction to his *Ṣaḥīh*. We have not met with any classification of traditions by this author; but in the following passage he throws some additional light upon the received system of tradition, by a discussion of what constitutes soundness of report, arguing against a certain condition which some held to be essential to it. It may be well to remind the reader that Muslim lived about five centuries and a half before the earliest of the authorities last quoted from.§

* See Kur., liii. 20.

† See *Hāji Khalif. Lex.*, iii. 191.

‡ Died A. H. 597.

§ This passage is quoted from pp. 20-27.

باب ما تنصّح به رواية الرواة بعضهم عن بعض
والتنبيه على من غلط في ذلك

وقد تكلم بعض منخلى الحديث من اهل عصرنا في تصحيح الاسانيد
وسقيهما بقول لو اضربنا عن حكايته وذكر فساد صفحا لكان رأيا متينا
ومذهبا صحيحا ان الاعراض عن القول المطرح اخرى لامانته واحمال ذم
قائله واجدر ان لا يكون ذلك تنبيها للجهال عليه غير اننا لما تخوفنا من
شور العواقب واعتزاز الجهلة بمحدثات الامور واسراعهم الى اعتقاد خطاء
المخطئين والاقوال الساقطة عند العلماء رأينا انكشف عن فساد قوله ورد
مقالته بقدر ما يليق بها من الردّ اجرى عن الانام واحمد للعاقبة ان شاء
الله عز وجلّ وزعم الثقليل الذي افتحننا الكلام على الحكاية عن قوله والاخبار
عن سوء رويته ان كل اسناد لحديث فيه فلان عن فلان وقد احاط العلم
بانهما قد كانا في عصر واحد وجائز ان يكون الحديث الذي روى الراوى
عمن روى عنه قد سمعه منه وشافه به غير انه لا يعلم له منه سمعا ولم
تجد في شى من الروايات انهما انتقيا قطّ او تشافها بحديث ان الحجّة لا
تقوم عنده بكل خبر جاء هذا الجبى حتى يكون عنده العلم بانهما قد
اجتمعا من دهرٍ ما مرة فصاعد او تشافها بالحديث بينهما او يرد خبر فيه
بيان اجتماعهما او تلاقيهما مرة من دهرٍ ما فاقوما فان لم يكن عنده علم
ذلك ولم يأت رواية تخبر ان هذا الراوى عن صاحبه قد لقيه مرة وسمع منه
شياء لم يكن في نقله الخبر عن روى عنه علم ذلك والامر كما وصفنا حجة
وكان الخبر عنده موقوفا حتى يرد عليه سماعه منه لشي من الحديث قل
او كثر في رواية مثل ما ورد وهذا القول يرحمك الله في النّوع في الاسانيد
قول مخترع مستحدث غير مسبوق صاحبه اليه ولا مساعد له من اهل العلم
عليه وذلك ان القول الشايغ المتفق عليه بين اهل العلم بالاخبار والروايات
قد يما وحديثا ان كل رجل نقتة روى عن مثله حديثا وجائز ممكن له لقاءه
والسمع منه لكونهما جميعا كانا في عصر واحد وان لم يأت في خبر قطّ
انهما اجتمعا ولا تشافها بكلام فالرواية ثابتة والحجّة بها لازمة الا ان يكون
هناك دلالة بيّنة ان هذا الراوى لم يلق من روى عنه او لم يسمع منه شيئا

فاما والامر مبهم على الامكان الذى فسرنا فالرواية على السماع ابدا حتى تكون الدلالة التى بيننا فيقال لمخترع هذا انقول الذى وصفنا مقالته او للذات عنه قد اعطيت فى جملة قولك ان خبر الواحد الثقة عن الواحد الثقة حجة يلزم به العمل ثم ادخلت فيه الشرط بعد فقلت حتى يعلم انهما قد كانا التقيا مرة فصاعد او سمع منه شيئا فهل تجد هذا الشرط الذى اشترطته عن احد يلزم قوله والا فهلم دنيلا على ما زعمت فان ادعى قول احد من علماء السلف بما زعم من ادخال الشريعة فى تشبيات الخبر طولب به ولن يجد هو ولا غيره الى ايجاده سبيلا وان هو ادعى فيما زعم دليلا يحتج به قيل له وما ذاك الدليل فان قال قلته لاني وجدت رواية الاخبار قديما وحديثا يروى احدهم عن الآخر الحديث ولما يعاينه ولا سمع منه شيئا قط فلما رأيتهم استجازوا رواية الحديث بينهم هكذا على الارسال من غير سماع والمرسل من الروايات فى اصل قولنا وقول احد العلم بالاخبار ليس بحجة احتجت لما وصفت من العلة الى البحث عن سماع الراوى كل خبر عن راويه فاذا انا هجمت على سماعه منه لادنى شىء ثبت عندى بذلك جميع ما يروى عنه بعد فان عذب على معرفة ذلك اوقفت الخبر ولم يكن عندى موضع حجة لامكان الارسال فيه فيقال له فان كانت العلة فى تضعيفك للخبر وترك الاحتجاج به امكان الارسال فيه لزمك ان لا تثبت اسنادا معنا حتى ترى فيه السماع من اوله الى اخره وذلك ان الحديث الوارد علينا باسناد هشام بن عروة عن ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها فبيقين نعلم ان هشاما قد سمع من ابيه وان اياه قد سمع من عائشة رضى الله عنها كما نعلم ان عائشة قد سمعت من النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد يجوز اذا لم يقل هشام فى رواية يروىها عن ابيه سمعت او اخبرنى ان يكون بينه وبين ابيه فى تلك الرواية انسان اخر اخبره بها عن ابيه ولم يسمعها هو من ابيه لما احب ان يروىها مرسلا ولا يسندها الى من سمعها منه وكما يمكن ذلك فى هشام عن ابيه فهو ايضا ممكن فى ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها وكذلك كل اسناد لحديث ليس فيه ذكر سماع بعضهم من بعض وان كان قد عرف فى الجملة ان كل واحد منهم قد سمع من صاحبه سماعا كثيرا فجايز لكل واحد

منهم أن ينزل في بعض الرواية فيسمع من غيره عنه بعض احاديثه ثم يرسله عنه احياناً ولا يسمى من سمع منه وينشط احياناً فيسمى الرجل الذي حمل عنه الحديث ويترك الارسال وما قلنا من هذا موجود في الحديث مستفيض من فعل ثقات المحدثين واية اهل العلم وسند ذكر من رواياتهم على الجهة التي ذكرنا عدداً يستدل بها على اكثر منها ان شاء الله تعالى فمن ذلك ان ايوب السختياني وابن المبارك ووكيعا وابن نمير وجماعة غيرهم رواوا عن هشام ابن عروة عن ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها كنت اضيب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لحله والحرمه باثيب ما اجد فروى هذه الرواية بعينها الليث ابن سعد وداود الطستار وحميد بن الاسود ووعيب بن خالد وابو اسامة عن هشام قال اخبرني عثمان بن عروة عن عروة عن عائشة رضى الله عنها عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وروى هشام عن ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم اذا اعتكف يدين الى راسه فارجله وانا حايض فوراها بعينها مالك بن انس عن الزهري عن عروة عن عمرة عن عائشة رضى الله عنها عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وروى الزهري وصالح ابن ابي حسان عن ابي سلمة عن عائشة رضى الله عنها كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقبل وهو صائم فقال يحيى بن ابي كثير في هذا الخبر في القبلة اخبرني ابو سلمة بن عبد الرحمن ان عمر ابن عبد العزيز اخبره ان عروة اخبره ان عائشة رضى الله عنها اخبرته ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يقبلها وهو صائم وروى ابن عيينة وغيره عن عمرو بن دينار عن جابر رضى الله عنه قال اضعنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لحوم الخيل ونهانا عن لحوم الحمر الاهلية فرواه حماد بن زيد عن عمرو بن محمد بن علي عن جابر رضى الله عنه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهذا النحو في الروايات كثير يكثر تعداده وفيما ذكرنا منها كفاية لدوى الفهم فاذا كانت العلة عند من وصفنا قوله قبل في فساد الحديث وتوهينه اذا لم يعلم ان الراوى قد سمع من روى عنه شيئاً لمكان الارسال فيه لزمه ترك الاحتجاج في قيام قوله برواية من يعلم انه قد سمع من قد روى عنه الا في نفس الخبر الذي فيه ذكر السماع لما بيننا من قبل عن الائمة الذين نقلوا الاخبار انه

كانت لهم تارات يرسلون فيها الحديث ارسالا ولا يذكرون من سمعوه منه وتارات ينشطون فيها فيسندون الخبر على عبيئة ما سمعوا فيخبرون بانزول فيه ان نذلوا وبالصعود ان صعدا كما شرحنا ذلك عنهم وما علمنا احدا من ائمة السلف من يستعمل الاخبار ويتفقد حجة الاسانيد وسقمها مثل ايوب السخيتياني وابن عون ومالك بن انس وشعبة بن الحجاج ويحيى بن سعيد القطان وعبد الرحمن ابن مهدي ومن بعدهم من اهل الحديث فتشوا عن موضع السماع في الاسانيد كما ادعاه الذي وصفنا قوله من قبل وانما كان تفقد من تفقد منهم سماع رواية الحديث من روى عنهم اذا كان الراوي من عرف بالتدليس في الحديث وشهر به فحينئذ يبحثون عن سماعه في روايته ويتفقدون ذلك منه كي تنزاج عنهم علة التدليس فاما ابتغاء ذلك من غير مدس على الوجه الذي زعم من حكينا قوله فما سمعنا ذلك من سمينا ولم تسم من الائمة فن ذلك ان عبد الله بن يزيد الانصاري وقد رأى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد روى عن حذيفة وعن ابي مسعود الانصاري وعن كل واحد منهما حديثا يسنده ابي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وليس في روايته عنهما ذكر السماع منهما ولا حفظنا في شئ من الروايات ان عبد الله ابن يزيد شافه حذيفة وابا مسعود رضى الله عنهما بحديث اقط ولا وجدنا ذكر روايته ايتهما في رواية بعيننا ولم يسمع عن احد من اهل العلم من مضى ولا من ادركنا انه ضمن في حديثي الخبرين اللذين رواهما عبد الله ابن يزيد عن حذيفة وابي مسعود بتضع فيهما بل هما وما اشبههما عند من لا قينا من اهل العلم بالحديث من حجاج الاسانيد وقوتها يرون استعمال ما نقل بها والاحتجاج بما اتت من سنن واثار وهي في زعم من حكينا قوله من قبل واخيرة ميملة حتى نصيب سماع الراوي عن روى ونو ذهبنا نعد الاخبار الصحاح عند اهل العلم من يهن بزعم هذا الثقال وتخصيبنا لجزونا عن تقضى ذرحا واحصايتها كلها ولكننا احببنا ان نصب منها عددا يكون سمته من سكتنا عنه منها وهذا ابو عثمان النهدي وابو رافع انصايغ واما من ادرك الجاهلية وحبنا اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من البدرين علم جرّ ونقلنا عنهم الاخبار حتى نولا الى مثل

أبي هريرة وأبن عمر وذويهما قد أسند كل واحد منهما عن أبي بن كعب رضی الله عنه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً ولم يسمع في رواية بعينها أنهما عايناً أبياً أو سمعا منه شيئاً وأسند أبو عمرو الشيباني وهو من أدرك الجاهلية وكان في زمن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم رجلاً وأبو معمر عبد الله بن سنكبرة كل واحد منهما عن أبي مسعود الأنصاري عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وخبرين. وأسند عبيد بن عمير عن أم سلمة زوج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وعبيد ولد في زمن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وأسند قيس بن أبي حازم وقد أدرك زمن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم عن أبي مسعود الأنصاري عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وثلاثة أخبار وأسند عبد الرحمن بن أبي ليلى وقد حفظ عن عمر بن الخطاب وحكب علياً رضی الله عنهما عن أنس بن مالك عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسند ربيعة بن حراش عن عمران بن حصين عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثين وعن أبي بكر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وقد سمع ربيعة من علي بن أبي طالب رضی الله عنه وروى عنه وأسند نافع ابن جبيرة بن مطعم عن أبي شريح الخزازي عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسند النعمان بن أبي عياش عن أبي سعيد الخدري رضی الله عنه ثلاثة أحاديث عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وأسند عطاء ابن يزيد الديلمي عن تميم الداري عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسند سليمان بن يسار عن رافع ابن خديج عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسند حميد بن عبد الرحمن الحميري عن أبي هريرة عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أحاديث فكل هؤلاء أتباعين الذين نصبنا روايتهم عن الصحابة الذين سمعناهم لم يحفظ عنهم سماع علمناه منهم في رواية بعينها ولا أنهم لقوا في نفس خبر بعينه ولا أسانيد عند ذوي المعرفة بالأخبار والروايات من صحاح الأسانيد لا نعلمهم وقنوا منها شيئاً قط ولا التمسوا فيها سماع بعضهم من بعض إذا السماع لكل واحد منهم ممكن من صاحبه غير مستنكر لكونهم جميعاً كانوا في العصر الذي اتفقوا فيه وكان هذا القول الذي أحدثه القائل الذي حكيناه في توهين

الحديث بالغة التي وصف أقل من أن يعرج عليه وينار ذكره أن كان قولاً محدثاً وكلاماً خلفاً لم يقله أحد من أهل العلم سلف ويستنكرة من بعدهم خلف فلا حاجة بنا في رده بأكثر مما شرحنا أن كان قدر المقتاة وقايلها القدر الذي وصفناه والله المستعان على دفع ما خالف مذهب العلماء وعليه التكلان

“ Chapter on what constitutes Soundness in the Report of one Reporter on the Authority of Another, with Warning against such as have erred on the subject.

“One of our contemporaries, professing a knowledge of tradition, has argued respecting what constitutes sound and unsound reports, in language which it would be well judged, and perfectly reasonable, to avoid speaking of, and the viciousness of which might well be left unnoticed, since to disregard the language thus obtruded upon us would be another mode of getting rid of it, and of obscuring the remembrance of its author, beside that it were more suitable not to warn the ignorant against what they know nothing of, by calling attention to it. Yet, because we fear bad consequences, in the end, and that the ignorant may be deceived by certain novel injunctions, and may be induced to put confidence in the false views of errorists, and in sayings not maintained among the doctors, we have thought fit to expose the viciousness of our contemporary's language, and to refute his notion by a sufficiency of argument against it. This I propose to do, with no reliance upon man. Praise be to God for my success, if He, the Great and Glorious, wills it.

“The person whose language we design to speak of, and whose inconsiderateness we intend to set forth in the remarks which we have begun, imagines that, in the case of every support of a tradition in which occurs the expression ‘... such a one, on the authority of such a one,’ the two are known to have been of one and the same generation; whereas it is admissible that a tradition reported on the authority of any one was heard by the reporter from him, and was uttered to the reporter by him, though it be not known for certain that the one received tradition orally from the other, and though we find it not stated, in any report whatever, that the two ever met, or spoke tradition one to the other. In his opinion, no traditional statement (خبر) which has come down in the form referred to avails for the establishment of law, until one absolutely knows that the two reporters were together once or oftener in their life time, or communicated tradition orally one to the other, or until one gets hold of some traditional statement which distinctly recognizes that the two were together, or met, once, at least, in their life-time; so that, if one possesses no positive knowledge of the fact, and no report reaches him which implies that he who thus reports ‘on the authority of’ his alleged master did actually once meet him, and hear some tradition from him, the statement, as transmitted by such reporter, wants that authority in its favor which is constituted by a person, reported from, of whom such knowledge exists: whereas a tradition of the sort here described is

legal proof. Moreover, in his opinion, a traditional statement in the form referred to is stopped (موقوف), until, by some report which is like to that in question, one learns of the reporter's having heard more or less of tradition from him on whose authority he reports.

"Now, this language—may God mercifully preserve thee from defaming the supports of tradition!—is strange, innovating, without ground in the views of any earlier author, and not favored by any other traditionist: that is to say, the language universally accepted and current among those conversant with traditional statements and reports, both in ancient and modern times, is this, that every supporter of tradition, being a reliable authority, reports on the authority of his like, and that his having met the latter, and having received oral instruction in tradition from him, consequently upon the contemporaneousness of the two, is a thing to be admitted, which may or may not have been a fact, although one never gets hold of a traditional statement that the two were at any time together, or ever made any oral communication one to the other. A report is, therefore, established, and the legal proof which it involves is binding, unless it be clearly shown that the reporter, in a particular case of report 'on the authority of' another, did not meet him whose authority he alleges, or did not receive any oral instruction in tradition from him; so that, however uncertain the fact may be, on account of that possibility either way which we have set forth, yet the report forever rests on the basis of oral communication, until one has the demonstration to the contrary just spoken of.

"We say, then, in reply to him who has set on foot this talk of which we have presented the substance, or rather to put a stop to it: in all that thou sayest, thou grantest that the traditional statement of one reporter who is reliable, 'on the authority of' a reliable reporter, constitutes legal proof, and obligates conduct; and then thou bringest in a condition, and sayest 'so long as it is known that the two had met once or oftener, or that the one had received some oral instruction in tradition from the other;' but how dost thou ascertain this that thou conditionest to be a fact, on the authority of one whose word is binding? and if such ascertainment is wanting, what becomes of all evidence in favor of the notion thou hast taken up? Should he pretend that even a single one of the primitive doctors expressed himself in favor of his notion as to making a certain condition essential to the confirmation of that form of traditional statement which is in question, most certainly neither he nor any one else will be able to produce such an expression. But if he pretends that there is any argumentative proof of the correctness of his opinion, we reply to him by inquiring what that proof is. Should he say: 'I adopt this language because I have found reporters of traditional statements, both ancient and modern, reporting tradition one from another, in spite of the fact that the reporter had not seen him on whose authority he reports, and had not heard any tradition from him. For, after I saw that reporters allowed themselves to report tradition in such a loose manner (على الرسائل), without any oral communication—loose report, according to fundamental principles which we maintain in common with all who are conversant with traditional statements, not being legal proof—I felt it to be necessary, for the reason indicated, to investigat re-

specting the fact of a reporter's having heard whatever traditional statement he gives 'on the authority of' another. So, now, having ascertained that the former did receive the least oral instruction in tradition from the latter, I become satisfied of the validity of all that he reports on the latter's authority; but, if the knowledge of that fact fails me, I regard his statement as stopped (*أوقفت الخبر*), and the possibility of its being a loose report is, in my opinion, a reason for rejecting it as a vehicle of legal proof—should he say this, we reply as follows:

"If thou regardest a traditional statement as weak, and dost renounce making out legal proof by means of it, on account of the possibility of looseness in it, thou art necessitated not to consider a support 'on authority' (*استناد معنعن*) as stable until thou seest that oral communication extends from the beginning to the end of it. That is to say, in the case of a tradition which comes to us with the support of '... Hishâm Bin 'Urwah, on the authority of his father, on the authority of 'Â'ishah'—to whom may God be gracious!—we are assured that Hishâm heard tradition from his father, and that his father heard from 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—as we are assured that 'Â'ishah heard tradition from the Prophet...; and yet, since Hishâm does not say, in any report which he gives on his father's authority: 'I heard...,' or '... told me,' it is possible that, in the report just referred to as an example, there belongs between him and his father some other guarantee, by whom he was told it on his father's authority, and that he himself did not hear it from his father (he having chosen to give the report loosely, without referring it to him from whom he heard it); and, as that possibility exists in respect to Hishâm's reporting 'on the authority of' his father, so again it exists in respect to his father's reporting 'on the authority of' 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious! So must it be, also, with every support to a tradition in which there is no mention made of the reporters having heard it one from another; and, even if it be known, in general, that each one received much oral instruction in tradition from the person whose authority he alleges, still it may be true of each that, in some of his reporting, he even narrates on the ascending grade [by *سمعت*] without other hearing of the particular tradition than, on the authority of him whom he names, from another; and moreover it may be that he sometimes gave out tradition loosely, 'on the authority of' some individual mentioned, without naming him from whom he really heard it, and sometimes, to avoid looseness, was careful to name the guarantee from whom he actually took it up. Indeed, what we have here suggested is a fact as regards tradition, and has been notoriously practised by reliable traditionists and eminent teachers of the science. We will mention a number of instances of their reporting in the mode referred to—if it be the will of the Supreme God—to serve as examples. One of these is a report of 'as-Sikhtiyâni,* 'Ibn 'al-Mubâarak,†

* A traditionist of the city of Jurjân, near the southern end of the Caspian Sea who died A. H. 305. See *Kitâb Tab.*, x. 104.

† One of the most critical traditionists of his time: he died A. H. 181. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 30.

Wakī', Ibn Namir,* and several others, on the authority of Hishām 'Ibn 'Urwah, 'on the authority of' his father, on the authority of 'Ā'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—namely: 'I was in the habit of perfuming the Messenger of God . . . as well on common as on sacred days, with the most fragrant perfume I could find,' a report which is identically given out by 'al-Laith 'Ibn Sa'd,† Dā'ūd 'al-'Attār, Humaid Bin 'al-'Aswad, Wuhaib Bin Khâlîd, and 'Abū-'Usāmah,‡ on the authority of Hishām, as having said that he was told it by 'Uthmān Bin 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Ā'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . Another report by Hishām, 'on the authority of' his father, on the authority of 'Ā'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—is as follows: 'The Prophet . . . in the act of devotion was wont to lean his head towards me, for me to comb it, while I was in my monthly state,' which Mālik Bin 'Anas reports, identically, on the authority of 'az-Zuhri, on the authority of 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Amrah, on the authority of 'Ā'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . Again, it is reported by 'az-Zuhri and Šalih 'Ibn 'Abū-Hassān, on the authority of 'Abū-Salamah, 'on the authority' of 'Ā'ishah . . . that 'the Prophet . . . was accustomed to kiss while performing fast,' a traditional statement which Yahya Bin 'Abū-Kathir§ gives on the subject of kissing, as follows: 'Abū-Salamah Bin 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān told me, that he was told by 'Umar 'Ibn 'Abd 'al-'Aziz, that 'Urwah told him, that he was told by 'Ā'ishah . . . that the Prophet . . . was wont to kiss her while performing fast.' Again, it is reported by 'Ibn 'Uyainah|| and others, 'on the authority of' 'Amrū Bin Dinār, on the authority of Jābir—'to whom may God be gracious!—saying: 'The Prophet . . . gave us horseflesh for food, and forbade us to eat the flesh of tame asses,' which Hammād Bin Zaid¶ reports on the authority of 'Amrū and of Muhammad Bin 'Alī, on the authority of Jābir . . . on the authority of the Prophet . . . There are many other such reports, which it would take long to enumerate; those here mentioned are sufficient for the intelligent. Now, inasmuch as he whose language we have previously set forth, to the effect that a tradition is corrupt and weak in case it be not known for certain that the reporter heard any tradition from him on whose authority he reports, pretends that, on account of the possibility of looseness in a tradition, one is bound to make no use for legal argumentation of the report of a person of whom we are assured that he heard tradition from him on whose authority he reports, unless this assurance is conveyed in some traditional statement which itself expresses the fact of oral communication by one to the other—it appears from what we have shown of the practice of eminent teachers who have handed down traditional statements, that they sometimes give out a tradition loosely, without mentioning from whom they heard it, and

* Of Kūfah. 'Al-Bukhārī, Muslim, 'Ibn Dāwud, 'Ibn Mājah and others are said to have received traditions on his authority. He died A. H. 234. See *Kitāb Tab.*, viii. 26.

† A teacher of 'Ibn 'al-Mubārak in tradition, whose home was Egypt. He died A. H. 175. See *Kitāb Tab.*, v. 52.

‡ Of Kūfah: he died A. H. 201. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vi. 71.

§ Died A. H. 129. See *Kitāb Tab.*, iv. 20.

|| Of Kūfah, a very exact teacher of tradition, who died A. H. 193. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vi. 19.

¶ A traditionist of Baṣrah, who died A. H. 179. See *Kitāb Tab.*, v. 55.

sometimes are careful to support the statement in the form of something which they heard, narrating on the ascending grade, if they proceed upwards, and on the descending grade, if they proceed downwards, as we have made it plain that they did.* Moreover, we know of no eminent teacher of primitive times, accustomed to employ traditional statements, and to scrutinize supports with reference to their soundness or unsoundness, equal to 'as-Sikhtiyânî, 'Ibn 'Aun,† Mâlik Bin 'Anas, Shu'bah Bin 'al-Hajjâj, Yahya Bin Sa'id 'al-Kattân,‡ and 'Abd 'ar-Rahmân 'Ibn Mah-di,§ and the succeeding traditionists who have investigated the matter of the explicit mention of oral communication in the supports of tradition, contended for by him whose language we have set forth; and no one of these was ever wont to inquire whether the reporters of tradition did in fact receive oral instruction from those on whose authority they report, except when a reporter was known to disguise tradition (عرف بالتدليس), and noted for doing so. In that case, indeed, the inquiry was instituted whether the individual did report as he had heard, and careful consideration was given to this question, in order to avoid all complicity with disguising. But as to looking into the matter irrespectively of disguised tradition, in the way approved of by him whose language we have stated, we hear of no such thing being practised by those whom we have named, or by any other eminent teacher. 'Abdallâh Bin Yazîd 'al-'Anṣârî, who saw the Prophet . . . , for instance, reports 'on the authority of' Hudhaifah and of 'Abû-Mas'ûd 'al-'Anṣârî, and 'on the authority of' each one of the two, a tradition which he refers to the Prophet . . . , although, in reporting it on their authority, he makes no mention of having heard it from them, and we do not remember any report which makes it appear that 'Abdallâh 'Ibn Yazîd ever recited tradition as a pupil of Hudhaifah or of 'Abû-Mas'ûd—to both of whom may God be gracious!—nor have we found it explicitly mentioned, in any report, that he ever saw those two persons. No traditionist, either of past time or among ourselves, was ever heard to object to the two traditional statements just referred to, reported by 'Abdallâh 'Ibn Yazîd, on the authority of Hudhaifah and of 'Abû-Mas'ûd, as inherently weak; on the contrary, all persons conversant with tradition, whom we have met, regard these and whatever are like them as being sound and strong in their supports, and approve of using the information thereby transmitted, and of alleging as legal proof the rules (سنن) and reminiscences (تذکر) which they convey to us: and yet he whose language we have set forth imagines such statements to be wanting in solidity and precision, until we find out by investigation that the reporter did hear tradition from him on whose authority he reports.

"Were we to proceed to enumerate distinctly all the traditional statements, sound in the opinion of traditionists, which have come down to

* For explanation of the terms "ascending grade" and "descending grade," see p. 79.

† Of Baṣrah: he died A. H. 151. See *Kitâb Tab.*, iv. 55.

‡ This person is said to have been the leader of the people of 'Irâk in the science of tradition, and to have been deep in criticism respecting reliable authorities. He died A. H. 193. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 49.

§ A traditionist of Baṣrah, who died A. H. 193. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vii. 1.

us from those whom our author regards as feeble authorities, we should fail to accomplish the undertaking; but we have thought proper to call attention to a number of them, which may serve as a specimen for him whom we herewith make an end of replying to. For instance, 'Abû-'Uthmân 'an-Nahdî and 'Abû-Râfi' 'as Sâ'igh, who both lived in the days of ignorance, and also had intercourse with the Companions of the Messenger of God . . . who fought at Badr, and so on, and both of whom transmitted traditional statements on their authority, even to citing traditions told by men like 'Abû-Hurairah, 'Ibn 'Umar, and their friends, give out, each of them, a tradition as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Ubayy Bin Ka'b—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . although no one has heard, by any express report, that they two ever saw 'Ubayy or ever heard any tradition from him. Again, 'Abû-'Amrû 'ash-Shaibânî, who lived in the days of ignorance, and in the time of the Prophet . . . had grown to be a man, as well as 'Abû-Ma'mar 'Abdallâh Bin Sinhabarah, gives out two traditional statements as sustained, 'on the authority of? 'Abû-Mas'ûd 'al-'Ansarî, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Ubaid Bin 'Umayr, who was born in the time of the Prophet, gives out a tradition as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Umm Salamah, wife of the Prophet . . ., on the authority of the Prophet; and, again, Kaïs Bin 'Abû-Hâzim, a contemporary of the Prophet . . . gives out three traditional statements as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Abû-Mas'ûd 'al-'Ansarî, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Abd 'ar-Rahmân Bin 'Abû-Laila, who committed traditions to memory on the authority of 'Umar Bin 'al-Khaţţâb, and had intercourse with 'Alî—to both of whom may God be gracious!—gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Anas Bin Mâlik, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Rib'î Bin Hirâsh gives out two traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Imrân Bin Huşain, on the authority of the Prophet . . ., and one tradition 'on the authority of' 'Abû-Bakrah, on the authority of the Prophet . . ., although Rib'î heard tradition from 'Alî Bin 'Abû-Ṭalib—to whom may God be gracious!—and reports on his authority; and, again, Nâfi' Ibn Jubair Bin Muţ'am gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abû-Shuraih 'al-Khuzâ'i, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'an-Nu'mân Bin 'Abû-'Aiyâsh gives out three traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abû-Sa'îd 'al-Khudrî—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Ata' Ibn Yazîd 'ad-Daithî gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' Tamîm 'ad-Dârî, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Sulaimân Bin Ya'sar gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' Râfi' Ibn Khadij, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Humaid Bin 'Abd 'ar-Rahmân 'al-Ilmyari gives out traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abû-Hurairah, on the authority of the Prophet . . .

"Now, as for all these followers of the Prophet in the second degree, whose reporting 'on the authority of' Companions whom we have named is here noticed, there is no express memorial, so far as we know, in any report, of their having heard tradition from those whom they refer to as their authorities, nor, in any traditional statement itself, of their having ever met them; and yet the supports referred to are held to be sound by

those familiar with traditional statements and reports, who have never, to our knowledge, regarded any of them as weak, nor sought to make out in regard to them the fact of oral communication from one to another of the reporters, inasmuch as each one of them may possibly have heard tradition from his given authority, without any absurdity, because, living at the period they did, they were in habits of intercourse with the Companions.

“This new-fangled talk of our author which we have set forth, to the effect that tradition is rendered weak by the cause alleged, is too trifling to be long dwelt upon, or brought prominently into notice, forasmuch as it is an innovation, and a wrong-headed way of treating the subject, which no primitive traditionist ever gave expression to, and those of later times know nothing of. We therefore need not add anything by way of refutation of it, the opinion expressed having no more force than we have represented, either in itself or as advocated by our author. May God prosper the setting aside of whatever is opposed to the views of our doctors—in Him is my confidence!”

To these contributions to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition we add two extracts from H. and J., which introduce us to the collections of tradition in highest repute among the Muslims, and furnish some dates of importance in the history of the science, already, however, in part anticipated by notes on preceding pages. Our first extract is from H. :*

فصل

لما تفاوتت مراتب الصحيح والصحاح بعثها اصح من بعض فاعلم ان الذى تقرر عند جمهور محدثين ان صحيح البخارى مقدم على ساير الكتب المصنفة حتى قالوا اصح الكتب بعد كتاب الله صحيح البخارى وبعض المغاربة رجحوا صحيح المسلم على صحيح البخارى والجمهور يقولون ان هذا فيما يرجع الى حسن البيان وجودة الوضوح والترتيب ورعاية دقاييف الاشارات ومحاسن النكات فى الاسانيد وهذا خارج عن امحوت والكلام فى الصحة وانقوة وما يتعلق بها وليس كتاب يساوى صحيح البخارى فى هذا الباب بدليل كمال الصفات اننى اعتبرت فى الصحة فى رجائه وبعضهم توقف فى ترجيح احدهما على الآخر والحق هو الاول والحديث الذى اتفق البخارى ومسلم على تخريجه يسمى متفقاً عليه وقال الشيخ بشرط ان يكون عن صحابى واحد وقالوا مجموع الاحاديث المتفق عليها الثمان وثلاثماية وستة وعشرون وبالجملة ما اتفق عليه الشيخان مقدم على غيره ثم ما تفرد به

* fol. 3, rect. and vers.

البخارى ثم ما تفرد به مسلم ثم ما كان على شرط البخارى ومسلم ثم ما هو على شرط البخارى ثم ما هو على شرط مسلم ثم ما هو رواه من غيرهما من الائمة الذين التزموا الصحة وحكوه فالاقسام سبعة والمراد بشرط البخارى ومسلم ان يكون الرجال متصفين بالصفات التى يتصف بها رجال البخارى ومسلم من الضبط والعدالة وعدم الشذوذ والنكارة والغفلة وقيل المراد بشرط البخارى ومسلم رجال انفسهم والكلام فى هذا طويل ذكرناه فى مقدمة شرح سفر السعادة

فصل

الاحاديث الصحيحة لم تنحصر فى صحيح البخارى ومسلم ولم يستوعبا الصحاح كلها بل هما منحصران فى الصحاح والصحاح التى عندهما وعلى شرطهما ايضا لم يورداها فى كتابيهما فضلا عما عند غيرهما قال البخارى ما اوردت فى كتابى هذا الا ما صحّ ونقد تركت كثيرا من الصحاح وقال مسلم الذى اوردت فى هذا الكتاب من الاحاديث صحيح ولا اقول ان ما تركت ضعيف ولا بد ان يكون فى هذا الترك والاتبان وجه تخصيص الايراد والترك اما من جهة الصحة او من جهة مقاصد اخر والمحاكم ابو عبد الله النيسابورى صنف كتابا سماه المستدرک بمعنى ان ما تركه البخارى ومسلم من الصحاح اورده فى هذا الكتاب وتلافى واستدرك بعضها على شرط الشيخين وبعضها على شرط احدهما وبعضها على غير شرطهما وقال ان البخارى ومسلما لم يحكما بانه ليس احاديث صحيحة غير ما خرجاه فى هذين الكتابين وقال قد حدث فى عصرنا هذا فرقة من المبتدعة اطلوا السننهم بالطعن على ائمة الدين بان مجموع ما صحّ عندكم من الاحاديث لم يبلغ زهاء عشرة الاف ونقل عن البخارى انه قال حفظت من الصحاح مائة الف حديث ومن غير الصحاح مائة الف والظاهر والله اعلم انه يريد الصحيح على شرطه ومبلغ ما اورد فى هذا الكتاب مع التكرار سبعة الاف ومائتين وخمس وسبعون حديث وبعد حذف التكرار اربعة الاف ولقد صنف الآخرون من الائمة صحاحا مثل صحيح ابن حزيمة الذى يقال له امام الائمة وهو شيخ ابن حبان وقال ابن حبان فى مدحه ما رايت على وجه الارض احدا احسر فى صناعة السنن واحفظ للاحفاظ الصحيحة

منه كان السنن والاحاديث كلها نصب عينه ومثل صحيح ابن حبان تلميذ ابن حزيمة ثقة فاضل امام فهم وقال الحاكم كان ابن حبان من اوعية العلم واللغة والحديث والوعظ وكان من عقلاء الرجال ومثل صحيح الحاكم ابي عبد الله النيسابوري المحافظ الثقة المسمى بالمستدرک وقد تطرق في كتابه هذا التساهل واخذوا عليه وقالوا ابن حزيمة وابن حبان امکن واقوى من الحاكم واحسن والطف في الاسانيد والمتون ومثل المختارة للمحافظ ضياء الدين المقدسى وهو ايضا خرج صحاحا ليست في الصحيحين وقلوا كتابه احسن من المستدرک ومثل صحيح ابن عوانة وابن السكن والمنتقى لابن جارود وهذه الكتب كلها مختصة بالصحاح ولكن جماعة انتقدوا عليها تعصبا وانصافا وفوق كل ذى علم عليم والله اعلم

فصل

الكتب الستة المشهورة المقررة في الاسلام التى يقال لها الصحاح الست في صحيح البخارى وصحيح مسلم والجامع للترمذى والسنن لابى داود وسنن ابن ماجه وعند البعض الموضا بدل ابن ماجه وصاحب جامع الاصول اختار الموضا وفي هذه الكتب الاربعه اقسام من الاحاديث من الصحاح والحسان والضعاف وتسميتها بالصحاح الستة بطريق التغليب وسمى صاحب المصابيح احاديث غير الشيخين بالحسان وهو قريب من هذا الوجه قريب معنى اللغوى او هو اصطلاح جديد منه وقال بعضهم كتاب الدارمى احرى واليف يجعله سادس الكتب لان رجاله اقل ضعفا ووجود الاحاديث المنكرة والشاذة فيه نادر وله اسانيد عالية وثلاثياته اكثر من ثلاثيات البخارى وهذه اُمذكورات من الكتب اشهر الكتب وغيرها من الكتب كثيرة شهرة ولقد اورد السيوطى في كتاب جميع اللوامع من كتب كثيرة يتجاوز خمسين مشتملة على الصحاح والحسان والضعاف وقال ما اوردت فيها حديثا موسوما بالوضع اتفق المحدثون على تركه ورده والله اعلم وذكر صاحب المشكوة في ديباجة كتابه جماعة من الايمة المتقين وهم البخارى ومسلم والامام مالك والامام الشافعى والامام احمد بن حنبل والترمذى وابو داود والنسائى وابن ماجه والدارمى والدارقطنى والبيهقى ورزين واجمل في ذكر غيرهم وكتبنا احوالهم في كتاب مفرد مسمى بالاكمال بذكر اسماء الرجال ومن الله التوفيق وهو المستعان في المبداء والمنال

" Section.

" Since the grades of sound tradition differ one from another, and some sound traditions are sounder than others, be it known that the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of 'al-Bukhārī is established in the estimation of traditionists as superior to all other books of human authorship, so that, as they say, 'the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of 'al-Bukhārī is the most perfect of books, next to the Book of God.' Some of the people of the West, however, attach greater weight to Muslim's *Ṣaḥīḥ* than to that of 'al-Bukhārī; though every one says that this preference is based upon particulars relative to nicety of expression, together with the fullness of that collection, the arrangement, and the preservation, in the supports, of references to minute points and nice distinctive marks—all which is aside from the subject-matter, and has nothing to do with the question of the soundness and strength of a tradition, and points therewith connected, as regards which there is no book equal to the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of 'al-Bukhārī, since the guarantees whom he relies upon unite every quality taken into account with reference to soundness of tradition. Others, again, hesitate about preferring either of the two to the other. The true view is the first which we have stated.

" That tradition which both Muslim and 'al-Bukhārī give out is said to be agreed upon (متفق), 'provided,' as the Shaikh says, 'it be given on the authority of one and the same witness of the Prophet;' and the traditions thus agreed upon are said to amount, in number, to two thousand three hundred and twenty-six. To be brief, that which the two masters agree upon is preferred to all other tradition; next comes that which 'al-Bukhārī alone gives out; then, that which Muslim alone gives out; then, that which answers to the stipulation of both 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim; then, that which answers to the stipulation of 'al-Bukhārī alone; then, that which answers to the stipulation of Muslim alone; and lastly, that which is reported by other eminent teachers strenuous for soundness, and which they regard as sound. There are, therefore, seven subdivisions. The force of the expression: 'stipulation of 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim' is that the given guarantees of a tradition were characterized by those qualities which the guarantees relied upon by 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim possessed, namely, retentiveness, integrity, and freedom from separateness, indeterminateness, and carelessness. Another explanation of the expression: 'stipulation of 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim' is this, that it denotes an identity of the guarantees of a tradition with those whom they two rely upon. The discussion of this point has been drawn out to a great length: we have given an account of it in the introduction to the *Commentary on the Book of Felicity* (شرح سفر السعادة).

" Section.

" Sound traditions are not confined to the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim, nor are these two works all the *Ṣaḥīḥs*. On the contrary, these are two among the *Ṣaḥīḥs*; nor do their authors bring forward, in the two books, all those traditions which, in their opinion and according to their stipulation, are sound, to say nothing of such as are sound in the view of others than themselves. Says 'al-Bukhārī: 'I have brought forward, in this my book, nothing but sound tradition, and have also left

out many traditions which are sound;’ and Muslim says: ‘Whatever traditions I have brought forward in this book are sound, while I do not say that what I have left out is weak tradition.’ Yet, doubtless, in this leaving out and bringing forward there was that sort of particularization which belongs to those acts, either in respect to soundness or in respect to some other points kept in view. ‘Al-Ḥākim ‘Abū-‘Abdallāh ‘an-Nisāpūri composed a book which he called the *Repaired Ṣiḥḥ* (المستدرک), a name signifying that in this book were brought forward by him sound traditions which ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim had left out, mended and repaired, some according to the stipulation of both of the two masters, others according to the stipulation of one or other of the two, and others still according to other stipulation than theirs;* and this author says that ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim did not judge other traditions than those which they brought forward in their two books to be unsound,’ adding: ‘for all that this has been asserted, in our time, by a party of the “Innovating Sect,” who have protruded their tongues in reproach against the eminent teachers of religion, with the words: “All the traditions which are sound, in your view, do not come up to the number of ten thousand.”’ Moreover, ‘al-Bukhārī himself is reported to have said: ‘I have committed to memory one hundred thousand sound traditions, and two hundred thousand unsound’—and it is plain, and God knows, that he means to speak of that which is sound according to his own stipulation—whereas the sum total of what he has brought forward in his book, repetition included, is seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five traditions, and, exclusive of repetition, four thousand.

“*Ṣaḥīḥs* have been composed, also, by later eminent teachers, for example: the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of ‘Ibn Ḥazimah,† surnamed the ‘Imām of ‘Imāms, who was the master of ‘Ibn Ḥibbān, and in praise of whom ‘Ibn Ḥibbān says: ‘I have not seen, on the face of the earth, any one of nicer perception with regard to what constitutes a traditional law, or whose memory was more stored with sound memorials—all traditional laws and traditions were present to his mind;’ and the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of ‘Ibn Ḥibbān,‡ the pupil of ‘Ibn Ḥazimah, a reliable authority of superior qualifications, an eminent teacher of high intelligence, of whom ‘al-Ḥākim says: ‘Ibn Ḥibbān was a repository of learning, a living dictionary, a store-house of tradition and instruction in duty, and a man of genius;’ and that called the *Repaired Ṣaḥīḥ*, by ‘al-Ḥākim ‘Abū-‘Abdallāh ‘an-Nisāpūri, the memorizer, the reliable authority, whose book has, to its injury, that want of strict legitimacy which we have referred to, and to whom people have made the objection that ‘Ibn Ḥazimah and ‘Ibn Ḥibbān are of more weight and stronger than ‘al-Ḥākim, as well as more nice and elegantly discriminating in respect to supports and texts; and the *Selection from the Ṣaḥīḥ* (المختار),§ by the memorizer Dhīyā’ ‘ad-Dīn ‘al-Maḳḳāsi,¶ who also brought out sound traditions which are not in the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of

* A similar account of this book is given by Ḥāji Khalfah, v. 521, who puts the death of the author A. H. 405.

† Died A. H. 311. His *Ṣaḥīḥ* is mentioned by Ḥāji Khalfah, iv. 99.

‡ See *Ḥāji Khalf. Lex.*, iv. 99.

§ Mentioned by Ḥāji Khalfah, v. 440, who gives for the title of the work ‘*al-Mukhtārah fi ‘al-Ḥadīth*, and says that the author died A. H. 643.

'al-Bukhârî and Muslim, whose book is said to be more nice than the *Repaired Sahîh*; and the *Sahîh* of 'Abû-'Awânah and that of 'Ibn 'as-Sakan;* and the *Marrow of the Sahîh* (المنقى), by 'Ibn Jârûd.† All these books are designated as *Sahîhs*, though a certain set of persons discriminate with regard to them, as well in the spirit of strenuous purism as with impartial criticism—there is one who knows, superior to all instructed men—God knows.

“ Section.

“The six books, universally known and of established authority within the pale of Islâm, called the *Six Sahîhs*, are the *Sahîh* of 'al-Bukhârî, the *Sahîh* of Muslim, the *Jâmi'* of 'at-Tarmidhî, the *Sunan* of 'Abû-Dâwud, the *Sunan* of 'Ibn Mâjah,‡ and the *Muwatta'*—which last is by some put in the place of 'Ibn Mâjah's collection, and was preferred by the author of the *Jâmi'* 'al-Uṣûl. But these last named four books embrace traditions of more than one class, namely, both sound, fair, and weak: the *Six Sahîhs* are so named by way of ascribing to them a certain superiority; and the author of the *Maṣābiḥ* calls all traditions given out by others than the two masters fair, which is a derived form of expression, either allied to the usage of that term in common parlance, or being a new technical application of it on the part of the author. Some persons say that the book of 'ad-Dârimî§ is more worthy and suitable to be ranked as the sixth book, because fewer guarantees marked by any weakness are relied upon in it, and traditions undetermined, or separate, are rarely introduced, while it has some supports of a superior character, and its trebly supported traditions (ثلاثيات) are more numerous than those of 'al-Bukhârî.||

“These which we have mentioned are the most noted books of tradition; but others are in extensive repute. Indeed, 'as-Suyûtî, in the *Kitâb Jamî'* 'aj-Jawâmi', cites many books, to the number of more than forty, as containing both sound, fair, and weak traditions, and says: 'I have not brought out, as contained in either book, any tradition to which is attached the stigma of being made up, which traditionists have agreed to leave out and reject—God knows.' The author of the *Mishkât*, also, in the preface to his book, mentions a multitude of eminent teachers of tradition, of devout lives, namely: 'al-Bukhârî, Muslim, the eminent teacher Mâlik, the eminent teacher 'ash-Shâfi'i, the eminent teacher 'Ahmad Bin Hanbal, 'at-Tarmidhî, 'Abû-Dâwud, 'an-Nasâ'i, 'Ibn Mâjah, 'ad-Dârimî, 'ad-Dâraquṭni, 'al-Baihaqî, Razin, etc., about whom we have written in a special book entitled the *Complete Statement of the Names of the Guarantees of Tradition* (الاکمال بذكر أسماء الرجال)—depending upon God's providence, and asking His aid from first to last.”

* The *Sahîh* of 'Ibn 'as-Sakan, who died A. H. 353, is called by Hâjî Khalfah 'as-Sahîh 'al-Muntaka. See iv. 99, 100. The work of 'Abû-'Awânah here referred to appears to be an epitome of Muslim's *Musnad*, entitled *Mustakhrāj 'Abî 'Awânah*: the author died A. H. 316. See *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, v. 520.

† See *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, vi. 167.

‡ See *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, iii. 621. The author died A. H. 273.

§ Entitled *Musnad 'ad-Dârimî*. The author died A. H. 253. See *Kitâb Tab.*, ix. 17 and *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, v. 539.

|| There is another work by 'ad-Dârimî, entitled *Thalâthiyât 'ad-Dârimî*. See *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, ii. 492.

Our last extract is from J. :*

الباب الرابع
فى اسماء الرجال

الصحابى مسلم رأى النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال الاصوليون من طالت مجالسته والتابعى كل مسلم صحب صحابيا وقيل من لقيه وهو الاظهر والبحث عن تفاصيل الاسماء والكنى واللقاب والمراتب فى العلم والودع لهاتين المرتبتين وما بعدهما يقضى الى تصلويل توفى مالك بالمدينة سنة تسع وسبعين ومائة وولد سنة ثلث او احدى او اربع او سبع وتسعين وابو حنيفة ببغداد سنة خمسين ومائة وكان ابن سبعين والشافعى بمصر سنة اربع ومائتين وولد سنة خمسين ومائة واحمد بن حنبل ببغداد سنة احدى واربعين ومائتين وولد سنة اربع وستين ومائة والبخارى ولد يوم الجمعة لثلاث عشرة خلت من شوال سنة اربع وتسعين ومائة ومات ليلة الفطر سنة ست وخمسين ومائتين بقرية خرتنك من بخارا ومسلم مات بنيسابور سنة احدى وستين ومائتين وكان ابن خمس وخمسين وابو داود بالبصرة سنة سبع وسبعين ومائتين والترمذى مات بترمذ سنة تسع وسبعين ومائتين والنسائى سنة ثلث وثلثمائة والدارقطنى ببغداد سنة خمس وثمانين وثلثمائة وولد بها سنة ست وثلثمائة والحاكم بنيسابور سنة خمس واربع مائة وولد بها سنة احدى وعشرين وثلثمائة والبيهقى ولد سنة اربع وثلثين وثلث مائة ومات بنيسابور سنة ثمان وخمسين واربعماية تمت الرسالة

" Chapter Fourth.

" Names of Guarantees.

"The term 'witness' (الصحابى) denotes any Muslim who saw the Prophet . . . , or, as the professed teachers of the foundations of religion say, one who had long sittings with him ; and the term 'follower in the second degree' (التابعى) means any Muslim who was associated with, or, as is also said, who met, a witness. So much is most plain. But to look into all the distinctions of names, titles, epithets, and degrees, which belong to the science, and to apply them to these and the succeeding orders of reporters, would be a long affair.

“Mālik died at Madīnah in the year 179, and was born in 93, or 91, or 94, or 97. ‘Abū Ḥanīfah died at Baghdād in 150, aged seventy years. ‘Ash-Shāfi’ī died in Egypt in 204, and was born in 150. ‘Aḥmad Bin Ḥanbal died at Baghdād in 241, and was born in 164. ‘Al-Bukhārī was born on Friday, the 13th of Shauwāl, in the year 194, and died on the night of the festival succeeding Ramadhān, in the year 256, in the city of Khartank in Bukhārā. Muslim died at Nisābūr in 261, aged fifty-five years. ‘Abū-Dāwud died at ‘al-Basrah in 277. ‘At-Tarmidhī died at Tarmidh in 279. ‘An-Nasā’ī died in the year 303. ‘Ad-Dāra-kutnī died at Baghdād in 385, and was born there in 306. ‘Al-Ḥākīm died at Nisābūr in 405, and was born there in 321. ‘Al-Baihaqī was born in 334, and died at Nisābūr in 458.

“End of the treatise, etc.”

ARTICLE V.

MEMOIR

ON THE

LANGUAGE OF THE GYPSIES,
AS NOW USED IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

BY A. G. PASPATI, A. M., M. D.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GREEK BY REV. C. HAMLIN, D. D.,
MISSIONARY OF THE A. B. C. F. M. AT CONSTANTINOPLE.

Presented to the Society May 17th, 1860.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

The following memoir is a translation but in part. The learned author has written the whole of the Grammar and some other parts in English, which has needed very little correction. The original is written in so pure a Greek style, that any one who has studied the ancient Greek might read it, occasionally noticing an interesting change of meaning without a change of form, or the reverse. If all our Greek Professors should study the living Greek, in Greece, it would reanimate the dead language, and clothe it with a new power and beauty.

We are confident that this article will be acceptable to American scholars, both for its intrinsic merits and as a specimen of the present literature and learning of the Greeks.

C. H.

This memoir on the Language of the Gypsies will be divided into five sections, as follows: 1st. Introductory remarks on the history and present condition of the Gypsy race; 2nd. General explanation of the character and connections of their language, and a critical estimate of the works which have hitherto appeared upon the subject; 3rd. A vocabulary, with comparative etymologies from the Sanskrit and other languages; 4th. A comparison of the phonetical system of the Gypsy with that of the Sanskrit; 5th. A grammar of the language.

SECTION I.

HISTORY OF THE GYPSIES.

Most of the writings relating to the Gypsies have hitherto been unsatisfactory and obscure. In various ways, laborious and learned writers have endeavored to explain the origin and affinities of these nomadic, wandering people, who dwell or roam in the midst of us, but are generally regarded with aversion and disgust.

The leading subject of this memoir will be the language and origin of the Gypsies, and not their customs and history. A few preliminary notices, however, may help the reader to appreciate what we shall offer in regard to their language.

A valuable authority upon the Gypsies of Western Europe is the Englishman George Borrow. His work, "The Zincoli, or an Account of the Gypsies of Spain," exhibits from beginning to end a man thoroughly acquainted with this people, speaking their own language with such facility, and with such a knowledge of their habits and customs, that he was everywhere received as a veritable Gypsy. His vocabulary of the language is invaluable, although, as we shall see, his want of acquaintance with the Sanskrit prevented his carrying forward his most useful labors to the desired consummation.

In 1417,* in the reign of Sigismund, emperor of the Romans and king of Hungary, the Gypsies first appeared in Europe, to the number of about three thousand. They resided first in Moldavia, and thence spread through Transylvania and Hungary. A part, led by Ladislaus their chief, having obtained leave to settle upon the crown-lands, and living unmolested under the protection of the autocrat, gradually adopted the religion of the country which they inhabited. And, to the present time, such is the very common custom of this race: everywhere they adopt the common worship, caring little for its dogmas.

They received from Sigismund the privilege of having their own chief, but this was taken from them in 1609. In 1782, according to the census of that time, there were about 50,000 Gypsies in all Hungary, but their number afterwards diminished. In vain did Joseph II. endeavor to civilize them.

It is worthy of remark that in Hungary, according to the testimony of the Gypsies themselves, they have retained their original language in the highest degree of purity.

They are now found scattered over Europe, and through Russia, excepting the province of Petersburg, whence they were long since expelled. They also prefer the extended and fruitful

* Bataillard, as we shall presently see, gives an earlier date than this.

plains of Interior Russia, where they find abundant pasturage for their horses, to the trade in which they are so much addicted. But nowhere have they been so fortunate as in the province of Moscow, where many of them have magnificent dwellings, splendid carriages, and near relationship with highborn Russians, preserving that singular good fortune, the sweet voice of the maidens, peculiar to their uncultivated tribes, and highly esteemed by the Russians.

About the beginning of the fifteenth century, says a French historian, the Gypsies appeared in Paris, to the number of one hundred and thirty-two. The French looked upon them as most satanic witches, and persecuted them with such severity that they fled into Spain.

In Spain they are numerous, in certain large cities, having quarters called *Gitanerie*. The fertility of the soil, and the mildness of the climate, were both favorable to this roaming race. The most part took refuge in Andalusia, where they live to this day, no longer nomadic, but laboring in the cities and villages.

A celebrated law of Charles III., who deceased in 1788, introduced a healthy and saving amelioration into the life of the race, which had become intolerable from its addiction to theft and robbery. What the civil arm and the severest laws were powerless to do, this wise law speedily effected. Charles repealed the inhuman laws which had been published against the Gypsies, invited them to dwell fearlessly with the native Spaniards, and secured to them the privileges of education and of participation in civil offices. While he threatened to punish the Gypsies who did not conform to the law, he invited the Spaniards to forget their ancient hatred, and live with them under the laws and government, as children of the same country.

This law, as also the philanthropy of the monarch, had a great effect upon the Gypsies. They collected into cities and villages, abandoned their thievish life, and, forgetting past evils, gave themselves up to the common labors of civilized existence.

But this law, the like of which Europe had not then seen, had the fate of many other laws, in not attaining its immediate design, which was to make the Gypsies forget their language, and become Catholic Christians and faithful Spaniards. No such result followed, and they remain to this day, in Spain, as elsewhere, a distinct race, and having a language common to all the branches dispersed through the world.

They appeared in England about three centuries ago, where they were mercilessly persecuted. Most of them were hung as magicians and satanic witches. A few survivors concealed themselves in dens and caves, and came out only in the night to beg their food. As the rage of the bigoted masses softened down, the starved and naked Gypsies reappeared, and, spreading them-

selves according to their national custom, remained in different places and cities of England.

It is worthy of remark that the foggy and sunless climate of England has given to the Gypsies more muscular strength and beauty than their fellow-countrymen have elsewhere, and more even than the English have in a similar rank of life.

Every where the Gypsy race is strongly marked by similar traits and customs.

They are celebrated dealers in horses, they are famous horse-doctors, their old women are noted fortune-tellers, and the young women drive a very profitable business in singing love-songs, decent and indecent, in the streets and public places.

They have no principles, they serve no God but the God of gain and fraud, they conform to all religions. They excite the voluptuous passions of others, but they rarely fall themselves into the sins which they lead others into. A merciless death hangs over the woman who has illicit intercourse, whether with a Gypsy or a foreigner.

I have followed Borrow in his general description of the Gypsies of Europe. As regards those in Turkey and in the Wallachian provinces, or rather in all those countries formerly known under the denomination of Dacia, I must refer the reader to other authorities, who have treated the subject more at length, particularly as my remarks upon their dialect may be elucidated by their history and social position in these countries.

The latest writer on the Gypsies is J. A. Vaillant.* This author resided for many years in the Danubian provinces, and paid particular attention to the history of the numerous Gypsies scattered over those countries. In describing the origin of these people, whose emigrations he makes coeval with those of the ancient world, he launches himself into such an ocean of crude and undigested learning, he unites such wild theories with positive facts, he distorts ancient history in such an unphilosophical manner, that the reader never knows where he is, or whither he is drifting. With the exception of his valuable remarks on the noble efforts of the Hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia, to liberate from bondage and oppression so many Gypsies in those provinces, his work is of little value, either in a historical or a philological point of view. He appears to have studied these people for a long time,† and he would have bestowed an inestimable boon upon philology and ethnography, if, like Borrow, he had given us a vocabulary of the dialect of the Wallachian Gypsies, to which he appears to have paid little attention, though

* *Les Rômes—Histoire Vraie des Vrais Bohémiens*, par J. A. Vaillant, Fondateur du Collège Interne de Bucarest. Paris, 1857.

† "Je n'aurai point à regretter les dix-huit années que j'ai employées à la bible de leur science." p. 22.

he confesses that the foundation of their language is Sanskrit.* Though he confesses in another place that their language is the only criterion of their origin,† it appears strange that he has not based his work on this idea, by which their mysterious history would have been still farther elucidated.

Later writers on the social and political history of the Danubian provinces have followed Vaillant as an authority on the Gypsies, so numerous in those countries and in the provinces of Turkey south of the Danube. As no general persecutions ever took place against them, either on religious or political grounds, they have been suffered to live quietly in those provinces, and have multiplied to such a degree that they are superior in number to their fellow-countrymen in all the other states of Europe.

Those who are acquainted with the political state of Turkey are aware how difficult it is to give even an approximate estimate of its inhabitants. What confidence then can we give to Vaillant's statistics,‡ who makes the number of Gypsies residing in Wallachia 125,000, in Moldavia 137,000, Turkey 200,000, Transylvania and the Banat of Temeswar 140,000—total 602,000?§ According to the same author, the number of Gypsies scattered over Europe amounts to 837,000, so that nearly three fourths of all the Gypsies of Europe are to be found in Turkey and the provinces north of the Danube. Ubcini|| has followed Vaillant, with slight variations. Regnault¶ makes the Gypsy population of Wallachia and Moldavia 300,000, more numerous however in Moldavia than in Wallachia. He assigns 140,000 to Transylvania, Bucovina, and the Banat of Temeswar. All these numbers appear to me to be greatly exaggerated, and they may be owing in part to information from the Gypsies themselves, who by such mendacious accounts are inclined to give themselves importance and consideration in these provinces. Certain it is, that in Turkey proper, where the Gypsies are set down by Vaillant as 200,000, no census can be taken of them, even approximately; for a great part of the Gypsy population are continually roaming from plain to plain. Still, such information is valuable, as tending to show the great numbers of the Gypsy population in these countries, a fact remarked by travellers whose object has not been either the census or the history of this degraded people.

* "Mais il n'en est pas moins vrai, que, si la forme en varie, le fond en est toujours un partout, et pour tous, et ce fond est le Sanscrit." p. 13.

† "Leur langage, seul critérium de leur origine." p. 4.

‡ p. 481.

§ A late writer on Constantinople and Turkey, Louis Enault (Paris, 1855, p. 226), estimates the number of Gypsies in all the provinces of the Sultan at 214,000.

|| *Provinces d'Origine Roumaine. Univers Pittoresque.* Paris, 1856, p. 11.

¶ *Histoire Politique et Sociale des Principautés Danubiennes*, par M. Elias Regnault. Paris, 1855.

The Gypsies in the Danubian provinces are divided into three classes :*

1. The Laïesi, including artisans in works of wood and iron, musicians, exhibitors of bears, etc.

2. The Vatrari, employed in all the menial employments of the household. They are generally the servants of the servants. At times they have become head-cooks, coachmen, and *valets de chambre* of their wealthy masters.

3. The Netotsi, half savage, half naked, living by theft and rapine, feeding in times of want upon cats, dogs, and mice; they are the most degraded and debased of all the Gypsy population. This class, by their turbulent conduct and nocturnal depredations, have brought upon themselves dire persecution on the part of the local authorities, in which their more innocent fellow-countrymen have been in part sufferers. The Netotsi are of a darker hue, with short frizzled hair. Some are nearly black, and this difference of complexion may corroborate the statements of some authors, who make them the descendants of a separate immigration, and from a climate differing from that of the former two.

All the Gypsies in the Danubian provinces, like their fellow-countrymen in the rest of Europe, follow the religion of the people among whom they live. Here, as elsewhere, they seem indifferent to every external form of worship, and are considered by the Christian people in the same light as the Mohammedans view their Gypsy co-religionists in Turkey. The Turks, who are not particularly punctilious in the choice of their wives, often marry Gypsy women. Not so with the Christians, who have kept themselves aloof from family connections with the Gypsies, and will rarely have any intercourse with them. No Gypsy is ever permitted to enter into any of the sacerdotal offices of the Greek church.

A singular trait in the political history of the Gypsies residing in the Danubian provinces has been their state of bondage from time immemorial. Bataillard, † who has written on the Gypsies scattered over Europe, states that, from two charts discovered lately among the archives of the monastery of Tismana in Little Wallachia, it appears that they were to be found in Wallachia in the middle of the fourteenth century, and were then as now in a state of slavery. The long immunity from persecution enjoyed by the Wallachian Gypsies was probably owing to their state of slavery to the great landholders and the all-powerful monasteries, by whom their misdeeds were often concealed, and by whose power and influence, as interested masters, the iron rod of persecution was often arrested. As many of them passed to the

* Vaillant, p. 319.

† Nouvelles Recherches sur l'Apparition et la Dispersion des Bohémiens en Europe.

monasteries with landed property, on the death of charitable individuals, no doubt, from reverence to these asylums, such must have been protected in preference to those belonging to the state or to private proprietors, who at times suffered in the stormy periods of political disturbance.

Did these men subject themselves voluntarily to bondage? Were they driven to seek a shelter in slavery, to avoid ruthless persecution and impending death? Why did they not emigrate to other parts of Europe, where their countrymen are often suffered to roam, and in this manner avoid political and religious persecutions by flight and concealment? It is probably owing to a milder treatment on the part of the people among whom they came to dwell, and to the reports of heartless and bloody persecutions suffered by their countrymen in other provinces of Europe. Whatever the reasons may be which induced these despised people to subject themselves to bondage, in preference to a lawless and persecuted life, certain it is that in no part of Europe have they multiplied in such vast numbers as in these Danubian provinces.

Both in Wallachia and Moldavia a change has been lately effected in their condition. Alexander Ghika, Hospodar of Wallachia, and Stourja of Moldavia,* the former in 1837, and the latter in 1844, have both decreed the freedom of the Gypsies in their respective provinces, and this people, so long oppressed, enslaved in body and mind, will probably in a short time, as they rise in wealth and learning under the fostering hand of freedom, attain to some yet higher consideration.†

SECTION II.

LANGUAGE OF THE GYPSIES.

We come now to the principal subject of our memoir, the language of the Gypsies, which, with our present unsatisfactory knowledge of this people, is of paramount importance as a historical demonstration of their origin and nationality. The entire history of this race is in its idiom, and this point of comparative philology will, I hope, prove to the reader the inestimable advantages accruing to history from the comparative study of spoken idioms. It is wonderful that a race differing so widely from the races around them, so universally avoided, as foreign and barbarous, should have been so long in possession of indis-

* Vaillant, p. 435-442.

† The Gypsies are now allowed to intermarry with Wallachians, and such marriages are consecrated by the Church. Formerly the price of a Gypsy was 150 to 200 francs. Ami Boué, *Turquie d'Europe* (Paris, 1840), iii. 325.

putable proofs of their origin and fatherland. History has not traced their mysterious migration, or noted any sudden irruptions into more cultivated lands. It has marked, however, their notorious wickedness, their unconquerable propensity to roaming and pilfering, and their universal abhorrence of the customs and religion of the people amongst whom they roamed or dwelt.

Their origin has till of late been a mystery, and such it would have continued to be had not philologists undertaken the study of their spoken language, a study of extreme difficulty, owing to their long continued ignorance, and constant avoidance of a higher mental cultivation.

The study of the Gypsy language differs so widely from that of all other idioms, that the reader will excuse the following remarks upon the subject. Not only does it differ from that of other languages preserved both in writing and in the mouth of the people, but it is another thing, also, from the acquisition of unwritten dialects of savage tribes. In these latter, the language is one and the same, easily acquired by the laborious philologist who may mingle with the people, and from long colloquial usage fix their grammatical rules. But the Gypsies constantly avoid all who are foreign to their tribe, and, being universally abhorred, they shun intercourse, and suspect the most godlike benevolence shown to them. Acquainted as they are with the spoken language of the people among whom they dwell, they generally use it in the hearing of all, so that even here in Turkey, where they are so numerous, many do not even suspect the existence of any idiom peculiar to themselves.

Anotherly consideration, extremely important in the study of this idiom, is the intermixture of foreign terms, generally borrowed from the language of the surrounding people, at times remodelled to the Gypsy forms of speech, and at times so distorted as to bear a very distant resemblance to the original word. Sheer ignorance, and long separation from those of their own tribe, have induced many Gypsies here in Turkey to make use of exotic terms, while many in their own neighborhood were constantly using well known and pure Gypsy terms. In such cases the student is extremely embarrassed, unless some one kinder than the others may direct him to a more learned Gypsy for farther information. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that the student should possess a perfect acquaintance with the language of the people among whom they dwell, and particularly with the vulgar jargon, which can never be learned in dictionaries or books, words floating from mouth to mouth, extremely significant, and precisely of a stamp to please the low taste of a Gypsy in speaking to foreigners of similar education. This knowledge is of primary importance; otherwise he may introduce into his vocabulary, as vernacular terms, words which

have no connection with the Gypsy language.* In this manner alone can we obtain a vocabulary of their language free from all words of foreign idioms, and capable of affording a solid historical basis for farther philological researches. This observation has often occurred to me in the course of this memoir, and such is the importance of it that its full weight can be felt only by those who have had the courage to undertake such an ungrateful task. Even in the composition of every Gypsy vocabulary, there should be a well-defined demarcation between foreign words and those native to the Gypsies, as a guide to others. Borrow is an illustration of this. In his vocabulary he has added a vast number of Spanish words, some pure, some mutilated, and every reader cannot but be perplexed with such a heterogeneous mass of terms, Spanish and Gypsy, without any guide as to their origin or etymology. Of what use, I ask, can a Gypsy vocabulary be, but as a foundation-stone to the history of the Gypsies? And in the vocabulary of Borrow, how can the student separate from the Spanish jargon the vernacular Gypsy? Who should have undertaken a similar work but a man like Borrow, who, moved by love to his fellow-men, went among the Gypsies, like a harbinger of peace, learned and spoke their language, and was perfectly conversant with the Spanish and with their jargon?

Even after all the learned works on the history and language of the Gypsies which I shall presently mention, a vast amount of treasure still lies hidden in the remains of their idiom which are scattered over their settlements in Europe. A comparative vocabulary, that should exhibit all the pure indigenous words preserved among all the Gypsies of Europe, to the entire exclusion of every foreign word, is still a desideratum, and would be a most precious acquisition to comparative philology, upon which might be finally based the true and undisputable theory of the origin of this people. Even as their language is now presented, most of the vocabularies exhibit a striking uniformity in all those terms which can be compared with the Indian languages, and which by common consent belong to the Gypsies. This, certainly, is a great incitement to farther labors.

The attempt to christianize the Gypsies, and to elevate them from their half-brutish state, by translations of the Holy Scriptures and other Christian works into their own idiom, I consider as perfectly useless. For by whom are such translations to be made, and by whom read? Here in Turkey, Gypsies roaming over the vast plains of Bulgaria, and speaking a purer Gypsy dialect, often cannot understand those south of the Balkans,

* The perusal of the Vocabulary will convince the reader of the truth of this proposition, and of the necessity of having some acquaintance with the language of those nations with whom the Gypsies have come into contact on their way to Europe.

and near Constantinople. Plain translations into the languages of the people among whom they dwell, Christian benevolence, and Christian oblivion of their misdeeds, may supply the want: they hate us as heartily as we hate them; they pilfer and injure us, because we persecute and despise them.

Before proceeding to give an account of my own labors on the language of the Gypsies, as preliminary to the understanding of the Vocabulary, I will succinctly describe to the reader the labors of the many learned men who have up to this day paid particular attention to the study of this idiom. As the subject is little known, many, no doubt, will be surprised to learn how much has been already done in this field of literature.

Pott, who in his admirable work on the Gypsies has laboriously collected every thing that had been said on the subject up to the date of his labors (1844-5), may serve as a guide in the history of Gypsy literature.*

The first writer on the Gypsies was Bonaventura Vulcanius, professor of Greek literature in Leyden, where he died in 1614. In his small treatise "*De Nubianis Erronibus, quos Itali Cingaros appellat, eorumque Lingua*"—published in the body of a greater work on the language of the Goths, at Leyden, 1597—he gives about sixty-seven Gypsy words, without any derivation, or plausible clue to their etymology or relationship. Of course, before the study of the Hindu languages became common in Europe, no plausible account could have been given of their origin. Vulcanius makes the Gypsies come from Nubia, in doing which he appears to adopt the opinion of the famous Scaliger.

After Vulcanius, no historical or linguistic work of much importance appeared on the language of the Gypsies, till the great work of Grellmann: "*Die Zigeuner—Ein Historischer Versuch über die Lebensart und Verfassung, Sitten und Schicksale dieses Volks in Europa, nebst ihrem Ursprunge, von M. H. M. G. Grellmann;*" Dessau und Leipzig, 1783. An improved and enlarged edition of this work was published in 1787, and, about the same time, it was translated into French by Baron de Bock.† The work of Grellmann produced considerable impression at the time of its publication, and though as a work of comparative philology it is of little value now, still it can be usefully consulted for its historical observations, as the author has judiciously collected nearly every thing that was known of the Gypsies anterior to his time.‡ Indian literature, then so little known, has made his work of comparatively little value to us now.

* *Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien*, i. 3.

† *Oriental Collections* [by W. Ouseley], ii. 386.

‡ This author calculated the number of Gypsies in Europe as between 700,000 and 800,000, of whom 40,000 were in Spain, chiefly in the southern provinces.

In the *Archæologia*, or *Miscellaneous Tracts* relating to Antiquity, published by the Society of Antiquaries of London, vol. vii., London, 1785, are contained "Observations on the Language of the People commonly called Gypsies," in a letter to Sir Joseph Banks from Wm. Marsden. This learned author has made some observations on the relationship of the Gypsy language to the Hindustani, which had already been remarked by Ludolphus in 1691.* In this same work are contained the observations of Jacob Bryant on the Zingara or Gypsy language, transmitted to O. Salisbury Breerton, in a letter from the Rev. Dr. Douglas. Both these works contain a great number of Gypsy words. Pott however remarks that "the comparison with the Hindustani and Persian, etc., is weak."

In the work of Franz Carl Alter, "Ueber die Samskrd. Sprache," Wien, 1799, are contained some Gypsy words, extracted from Catherine's Comparative Dictionary.

"Zigeuner in Herodot, oder Neue Aufschlüsse über die Aeltere Zigeunergeschichte, aus Griechischen Schriftstellern, von Dr. Johann Gottfr. Hasse;" Königsburg, 1803. The author has been imitated in a still more unphilosophical spirit than his own by Vaillant, in his late work.

John Hoyland's "Historical Survey of the Customs etc. of the Gypsies;" York, 1816.† This author has made large use of the valuable work of Grellmann, adding also much of his own.

Another treatise, "On the Similitude between the Gypsy and Hindu Languages," in the *Transactions of the Lit. Soc. of Bombay*, 1819, was published by Irvine—"of no special value," according to Pott.

The next in order of time is the remarkable work of Anton Jaroslav Puchmayer—"Romani Chib, d. i., Grammatik und Wörterbuch der Zigeunersprache, nebst einigen Fabeln in derselben. Dazu als Anhang die Hantyrka oder die Czechische Diebesprache;" Prague, 1821. This work is extremely valuable, and Pott frequently refers to it. Though I have not seen the work, the quotations often found in Pott, and the frequent references to it, amply prove the value which he set upon the labors of this learned author. There is a striking similarity between his Gypsy terms and those in my Vocabulary, so that I am induced to believe that Wallachian Gypsies must have afforded him his principal information.

"Deutsch-Zigeunerisches Wörterbuch, von Dr. Ferd. Bischoff;" Ilmenau, 1827—a work often quoted by Pott.

* Pott, p. 6.

† The full title of this work is given in the *Penny Cyclopaedia*—"Historical Survey of the Customs, Habits, and Present State of the Gypsies, designed to develop the origin of this singular people, and to promote the amelioration of their condition."

"Travels in Hungary," by Bright. In this work are contained some views of the origin and language of the Gypsies. The orthography of Bright's Gypsy words differs widely from that of most other authors. Many of his Gypsy terms were collected in England, and comparisons are instituted between the forms of the language as spoken in Hungary, Spain, and England.

In the Transactions of the Royal As. Soc. of Great Britain and Ireland, vol. ii., London, 1830, is the following work: "Observations on the Oriental Origin of the Romnichal, or Tribe mis-called Gypsey and Bohemian. By Colonel John Staples Harriot, Bengal Infantry (read Dec. 5, 1829, and Jan. 2, 1830)." This work, according to Pott, is superior to every other one in English on the origin and language of the Gypsies. It gives a very plausible account of the progress of the Gypsies from India through Persia.

G. Louis Domeny de Rienzi's "De l'Origine des Tzengaris," in *Revue Encyclopédique*, Nov. 1832, p. 365-373; also his "Esquisse d'un Tableau Comparatif de la Langue Tzengare ou Bohémienne d'Europe, avec le Tzengare de l'Hindustan, et neuf Idiomes de l'Orient." Rienzi, as he himself confesses, was not profoundly versed in such philological studies. His work is not of much value.

"Geschichte der Zigeuner, ihrer Herkunft, Natur, und Art, von Dr. Theod. Tetzner;" Weimar und Ilmenau, 1835. It gives interesting notices on the Prussian mode of governing the Gypsies inhabiting that kingdom, and on the laws regulating their social position.

In 1835 was published at Erfurt, by Graffunder, "Ueber die Sprache der Zigeuner. Eine Grammatische Skizze." This work was reviewed in 1836 by the justly celebrated Bopp, in the *Jahrbücher der Wissenschaftlichen Kritik*, Nos. 38 and 39, and the relationship of the two idioms, Gypsy and Hindu, corroborated by the judicious remarks of this great Orientalist.* This work, together with that of Grellmann, forms the basis of the French work of Michel de Kogalnitchan, published at Berlin, 1837: "Esquisse sur l'Histoire, les Moeurs et la Langue des Cigains, suivie d'un recueil de sept cent mots Cigains."†

In 1841 was published the work of George Borrow: "The Zincali, or an Account of the Gypsies of Spain, with an Original Collection of their Songs and Poetry, and a Copious Dictionary of their Language;" London, in two volumes. Borrow, while in Spain as agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, translated a portion of the Scriptures into the dialect spoken by the

* *Bibliotheca Sanscrita*, by Friedrich Adelung, 1837, p. 67.—Pott, i. 22.

† Vaillant is mistaken in saying that the work was published at Jassy, in Moldavia (p. 11). Pott (p. 23) remarks of the work: "The collection of words is not worthy of much commendation."

Spanish Gypsies. His work is well known, and is valuable for the historical information which it gives respecting the Gypsies in general; but its principal value is in the description of the numerous Gypsies of Spain, and in the vocabulary, the richest which had appeared up to his day. He has drawn largely from Grellmann and Marsden. To this author I shall have occasion frequently to refer in the course of this memoir.

Besides the above works, written expressly on this subject, notices of the Gypsies and their language are to be found scattered in different works on ethnography and comparative philology. In Adelung's *Mithridates*, continued by Vater, are some notices of the Gypsies and their language.* In 1818 was published, at Frankfort, the work of Chr. Gottlieb von Arndt: "Ueber den Ursprung der Europäischen Sprachen." The author gives some notices of the Gypsies, and their probable origin from India and the central parts of Asia. He gives at the end of his work some words of their language, which I have inserted in notes: they seem to belong to the Danubian Gypsies.

In 1841 was published at Milan the work of Francisco Predazi: "Origine e Vicende dei Zingari, con Documenti intorno le Speciali loro Proprietà Fisiche e Morali, la loro Religione, le loro Usi e Costumi, le loro Arti, e le Attuali loro Condizioni Politiche e Civili in Asia, Africa, ed Europa, con un Saggio di Grammatica e di Vocabolario dell' Arcano loro Linguaggio." This author seems to have borrowed largely from Grellmann and Kogalnitchan, and to have had little personal acquaintance with the language, which he terms "linguaggio arcano."

The most important work on the Gypsies is undoubtedly the German one of Dr. A. F. Pott, published in two octavo volumes, the first in 1844, the second in 1845, in Halle—"Die Zigeuner in Europa und Asien." To this work was awarded by the Institute of Paris, in 1845, the premium of comparative philology, originally instituted by Volney. It is a work of high character, showing unwearied application, and the most profound scholarship, in every department connected with its subject. Its author has collected and compared every thing written up to his time on the language of the Gypsies, so that the reader has in a single view every thing that had been gathered by many learned authors. He appears to have studied the subject for a long time, and no difficulty or dryness seems for a moment to have abated the courage of this learned and indefatigable author. It is the Thesaurus of the Gypsy language, and other dialects, better able to repay so much labor, might be justly proud of a similar grammar. The work of Pott is principally directed to the language and to its grammatical construction; his notices of the

* *Bibliotheca Sanscrita*, by Friedrich Adelung, p. 67.

Gypsies and their peregrinations are scanty and meagre. He has paid particular attention to the relation of the Hindustani and other spoken dialects of India to the Gypsy language, using as a reference the excellent work of John Shakespear on the subject.* His references to the present spoken Persian are very frequent, and often extremely judicious. The second volume contains a vocabulary, in which are inserted all the words found in the various vocabularies of the Gypsy language drawn up by preceding authors. Borrow's entire vocabulary is inserted, but no effort is made to separate what appears to be Spanish from Gypsy. Pott has had, however, the precaution to mark with an asterisk every word undoubtedly Sanskrit, and those of doubtful origin with a cross—the rest are left for farther investigation. The first volume is far from possessing the interest of the second, for the Gypsy language in its grammatical construction has lost nearly every mark of its Sanskrit character, and varies extremely in the different provinces of Europe, ingrafting upon itself very intimately the spirit and analytical character of the language spoken by the people. In this manner, the construction offers less interest than the primitive signification of the words. In his grammar, Pott gives nearly every author's construction, with numerous quotations for the elucidation of the subject, which render the work extremely voluminous.

It was not till I had completed nearly the whole of my vocabulary that I obtained this work of Pott, and I consider it as a very fortunate circumstance that I had not by me such a guide from the beginning, for so masterly a hand must have kept me in the path which he had already trodden. Left to myself, with what scanty help I obtained from Borrow's vocabulary, I have searched and researched for myself, and have assiduously examined the relation of the Gypsy to the Sanskrit, setting aside every term which to me appeared of other than Gypsy origin. Subsequently, I have compared many of my derivations with Pott's. There is a striking similarity in both, with this difference, that I have given in many of my derivations more attention to the Sanskrit than Pott. An example the reader may see in the definition of *yak*, 'fire,' which Pott refers to the Sanskrit *agni*, 'fire,' Lat. *ignis*, Pol. *ogien*. I have referred it to the root *yaksh*, 'to sacrifice,' since nearly all words in Sanskrit having the consonant *ksh*, in passing into the Gypsy, lose the final *sh*, and exhibit pure *k*. The reader will see numerous examples of this in Section IV. There is a marked difference in our derivations of *tav*, 'thread,' which Pott leaves doubtful, giving the Sanskrit *sthawi* (a weaver)?—while I have attempted to show its connection with the Sanskrit root *tap*, 'to heat, to torment,' a connection which be-

comes extremely probable from the occurrence of a similar word in the Persian language. Similar differences in our derivations I shall point out in the notes to the Vocabulary.

Pott's work contains all the words of Borrow's vocabulary, which to me appears rather a blemish, as many of them are the purest Spanish. Nothing should enter into a Gypsy vocabulary but what can be proved or shown to be pure Gypsy. It is on this account that I have eschewed nearly all borrowed terms, Greek and Turkish, from my own, inserting merely a few, in order to show the manner in which such words are mutilated and distorted. Whether Pott himself had much personal acquaintance with the Gypsies, with their language and pronunciation, it is difficult to say. For nearly every thing he refers to others.

No work on the language of the Gypsies has appeared since the publication of this great work of Pott. Vaillant, before the publication of his work, had given to some of the French periodicals dissertations on the Gypsies, but they are historical and descriptive. In his large work, of which we have already spoken, and which contains everything scattered in his other treatises, he has at the end a few Gypsy words, which I have inserted in notes, and which, with slight variations, resemble those in my Vocabulary, coming as they do from the Danubian Gypsies. No confidence can be placed in his derivations, even when he tries to his utmost to arrive at something like truth, for he is as wild here as in his descriptions of the Gypsy peregrinations. I give the reader a specimen. "*Ma-garu*, 'âne,' mot à mot, 'longue oreille;' *kar-pu*, 'melon,' mot à mot, 'fruit de la terre;' *kol-pu*, 'tour, golfe,' mot à mot, 'rond terre;' *kris'tal*, 'cristal,' mot à mot, 'transparente et solide surface.'" Now *magára* is a Bulgarian word, signifying 'a donkey;' *karpu* is the Turkish *karpúz*—probably from the Greek *καρπός*, 'fruit'—a name now given to the watermelon by the Turks; *kolpu* is the Greek *κόλπος*, 'a harbor,' pronounced by the Turks *kiorfúz*; *kristal* is the Greek *κρυσταλλός*, 'glass, ice,' etc.

I come now to my own labors, a notice of which is necessary to the understanding of the Vocabulary, and of the few grammatical observations inserted in Section V. I have remarked already, how widely the acquisition of the Gypsy language differs from that of every other language. The reader therefore should perfectly understand it, in order to judge of the accuracy of the author's observations, and the truth of every point in dispute.

About four years ago, Mr. John P. Brown, the learned Orientalist, and dragoman of the American Embassy in Constantinople, gave me a short vocabulary of the Gypsy language, which he had collected in his excursions in the suburbs of Constantinople. Up to that time, I had given little attention to this idiom,

and knew not much of it, except what at times I met with in the course of my Sanskrit studies. Most of it had been collected from Moslem Gypsies, a few words being added by a Christian Gypsy. There was nothing in the vocabulary but the simple definitions in English. All the words, together with a few numerals, were about seventy. As the subject became extremely interesting to me, from the relationship so palpable in many words, I determined to continue the work, and to corroborate Mr. Brown's definitions by other Gypsies, adding whatever else I could obtain from other sources. After many months' assiduous labor, after repairing to different Gypsy haunts in Constantinople and its suburbs, and mingling with the people in search of more intelligent Gypsies, I collected about one hundred and fifty words, which I attempted to explain, unassisted by works on the subject. My observations were published, in the fall of 1857, in the excellent Greek periodical of Athens, the *New Pandora*. These studies, extremely imperfect, were praised by the learned editors, and kind words of commendation were forwarded to me by some friends and literati of Athens. All this was a farther incitement to proceed with my labors, and ever since I have been assiduously employed in collecting materials, in making acquaintance with Gypsies, and in awakening their interest for their native idiom. This has tended to flatter their vanity; and so I have been able to obtain abundant materials for a more perfect work: up to the present time they come forward with new words, frequently transmitting them to me by correspondence. These materials I kept scrupulously by me for future use, hoping to have occasion to add whatever I collected to a new edition of the Greek article. Precisely at this point of time, towards the latter part of last year, the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin, missionary of the A. B. C. F. M., offered to translate my little work into English, for the American Oriental Society. In this I acquiesced with all my heart, persuaded that this eminent and laborious friend of long years, perfectly conversant with the polished Greek of the present day, would make a faithful translation of the whole. I have reviewed the whole translation in company with Mr. Hamlin, and can testify to its accuracy.

In this manner has originated the present memoir, which is presented to the public enriched with all the additional materials collected by me since the first publication of my researches in Athens—additions which render it essentially a new work.

My first method of acquiring the language was to give a word to the Gypsies, either in Greek or Turkish, and to obtain from them the corresponding term in their language. This method, pursued for some time, is tiresome and extremely fallacious—for they may give you another word, in order to cover their ignorance, or this same word, with pronouns, in the plural, and often

united to a verb. This, at first, is extremely perplexing, and the student cannot properly understand his position, or feel any degree of confidence, until he has in some manner fathomed the depth and breadth of their brutal ignorance. They will do their best, particularly when incited to such uncouth and unknown martyrdom by the exhibition of money as a spur to their sluggish memory. They will torment themselves, look at heaven and earth, scratch their heads, or put their fingers upon their temples, to recall the lost term, which, according to their expression, is sticking at the tip of their tongue. I have frequently pitied the poor fellows, since they seemed so in earnest to satisfy my curiosity; and I have desisted from farther demands for a particular word, which they professed they knew, but could not possibly recall.

With the Moslem Gypsies I have had great difficulty, for they are fast losing their idiom, and few of the new generation know any thing of it.* The Christian Gypsies, however, still retain it, with an incongruous mixture of Greek and Turkish terms, and from them I have obtained nearly all the materials contained in this memoir. The profound hatred of the Moslem Gypsies, or rather their contempt of every thing pertaining to a Christian, inherited from the genuine Moslems, makes them shy, and very poor guides in such matters.

This process of collecting words from single individuals soon disheartened me, on account of its imperfections, and the great difficulty of obtaining by it even a scanty knowledge of Gypsy terms. I therefore, after numerous trials, resorted to dialogues, which succeeded admirably, and which I can recommend to any individual in similar circumstances. One can hardly keep pace with their volubility. Words flow as in a torrent, while the elements and combinations of which it consists can afterwards be arranged in a systematic manner by the student, and easily elucidated one by the other. I cannot but make this remark, and say how much trouble might have been saved, had I begun with this plan, which has cleared up wonderfully all my notions and views of this very interesting idiom. I have permitted my Gypsy masters to add whatever came into their heads, in the course of the dialogue. In this manner a rich treasure of knowledge resulted from our studies.

It was my good fortune, however, in prosecuting these studies, to make the acquaintance of a Greek Gypsy, Andrea George, living twenty miles distant from Constantinople. His amiable character had induced a Greek gentleman, some years ago, to

* They strive to show zeal in their new religion, and consider their vernacular idiom as partaking of christian heresy, and of course avoid speaking it as much as possible.

put him into a Greek school, where he went through the first elements of the Greek grammar. To this young man, to whom education has imparted feelings nobler than those of his fellow-countrymen, the subject became very attractive, and to his kindness I am greatly indebted for the help he has rendered me in the latter part of my studies. He has, in his short excursions to the neighboring villages, collected from different Gypsies, coming from the north of Turkey, many terms unknown to him, which he has given to me, and which I have examined and inserted in the Vocabulary. We have reviewed together all the Vocabulary, and all the dialogues, collected from different quarters, which have served as the basis of it. I have noted with the greatest accuracy his accents, and the sounds of his voice in the pronunciation of the various consonants, and I have every reason to put entire confidence in his information. It coincided with whatever I had previously collected from numerous sources, and which I continually submitted to his examination. He himself was often unable to give me the desired information except in the form of dialogue, and by degrees he was induced to write for me dialogues in his vernacular idiom. In this way he acquired for himself a great number of terms, ascertained my wants, and with kindness of heart entered into my views, and has even attempted to collect whatever of his native idiom is known among the Gypsies dwelling in the villages near Constantinople, or roaming in tents, and coming from the distant plains of Bulgaria and Servia. Having become extremely interested in these labors upon his own language, Andrea still continues his observations, and submits them to me, often demanding whether such a word should be pronounced in such a manner, and not in another. He asked me once, for example, whether the word for 'he sells' should be *biklél* or *biknél*: I told him that the latter was the proper form, and that he should always avoid *biklél*.

In this manner have been collected and arranged all the materials which enter into the Vocabulary. There is nothing borrowed from any work on the Gypsies, and I am warranted in saying that all the terms are in constant use among the Gypsies dwelling around Constantinople and in the Roumelian villages, up to the skirts of the Balkans. My long intercourse with them has rendered me somewhat familiar with their idiom, and in the present state of my knowledge I offer this Vocabulary as exhibiting the actual condition of their spoken language, the result of four years' constant application and study. It is my earnest hope that it may prove of some utility to students in ethnographical science, and in all those scientific and philosophical pursuits that have for their object to ascertain the true origin of tribes and nations.

In the definitions, I have often inserted quotations from my dialogues, as pronounced by the Gypsies, quotations which in numerous cases serve to illustrate the term under consideration. They are extremely important, and may serve as points of illustration to those who shall desire to make farther researches upon this interesting subject. The reader may put implicit confidence in their accuracy, for they have been repeatedly sifted and examined.

The object of this memoir is to demonstrate the relation of the Gypsy language to the Sanskrit; and in this part of my work, as I have said before, I was perfectly unassisted. What I have done I humbly submit to the public. Though persuaded of its near connection with the Sanskrit, more intimate than that of any other spoken language of Europe, I confess that I have not always succeeded in pointing out the relationship of Gypsy terms to the Sanskrit, even in cases where their structure would seem to bear an undeniable stamp of Hindu origin. But I feel no discouragement; and when I consider that our immortal Coray has been able by long and unwearied study to define and trace to the ancient language most of our pure modern Greek jargon, and thus to explain so many obscure passages in ancient Greek authors, what cannot we hope to effect by a similar process, when Sanskrit shall be better known, and its etymologies better defined? I have no doubt, as I have remarked in the Vocabulary, that, as the modern Greek has vastly elucidated the ancient, so the Gypsy, which is so closely related to the Sanskrit, will impart the same advantage to Sanskrit, when the relation of the two is fully established and universally acknowledged. It will then become evident that Sanskrit verbs, most of which remain unaltered in form in the Gypsy, but have different significations, may have originally possessed these significations. Coincidence of original meaning becomes undeniably apparent in the case of many adjectives and nouns.

As the language of the Gypsies has been thoroughly permeated by the spirit of the modern Greek and Turkish, as spoken in and around Constantinople, I have derived considerable assistance from both these languages, in elucidating many points under discussion. Pott himself often makes reference to modern Greek words, with a judgment and an accuracy worthy of all praise. The reader will see the opportunity for similar references in the course of the Vocabulary.

As to the orthography of the Gypsy language, it is well to inform the reader that I have adopted for the vowels that of the Italians, as the most perfect, and least liable to error: *a* should be pronounced as *a* in *far*—*e*, as in *met*—*i*, as in *pin*—*o*, as in *no*—*u*, as in *bull*. As to the consonants, I have retained the ordinary notation of orientalists, writing *ch* for the sound of those

letters in *child*, *chime*, Italian *cima*—*j*, which by common consent corresponds to the Sanskrit *j*, I have constantly written *j*—for example, *janáva*, 'I know' (written by others *djanáva*)—as better suited to English readers. The strongly aspirated Sanskrit palatal I write *chh*, the guttural *kh*, and the aspirate *h*. The Gypsies in these countries have no sound corresponding to that of the English *th* in *this*, *that*, Greek *ð*. The lingual and palatal sibilants of the Sanskrit I have represented by *sh* and *ç*; to both belongs very nearly the same pronunciation, that of the English *sh*, as in *shall*, *shore*.

There is such a softness in the pronunciation by the Gypsies of some consonants, that I am at a loss how to write them. The word *puró*, 'old,' is an example. It is not *puró*, nor *furó*, nor *phuró*, nor *pfuró*. I cannot pronounce it; the sound is like blowing from the mouth, as in blowing out a candle. As to writing or expressing it by Roman characters, there is a difficulty similar to that which Europeans experience when trying to represent the *ghain* of the Arabs. This word by some is written *puró*, by others *furó*; still, to me, all are wrong, and do not give the true pronunciation of the word. But I have preserved *furó*, generally adopted by others. The same difficulty occurs in the pronunciation of *mindó*, 'mine,' which at times is heard as though pronounced *minró*. I have pronounced it in both ways, in the hearing of Gypsies, and they have made no remark. But I could not pronounce it as they do themselves. Their manner is like an imperceptible breath, passing upon a word *mindró*, so gentle that both consonants are heard, while one is at a loss to say which predominates. It must be heard to be appreciated. So with their pronunciation of soft *k*—the Turkish *kef*—which at times appears like a pure *t*, particularly when in the middle of words. *Ukiaváva*, 'I mount, I hang,' at times appeared to me as though it should be written *utiaváva*, and at times *ukiaváva*; so gentle is the sound of *k* in similar cases, that with some Gypsies it is not heard at all. I have followed the more general usage, and have often been guided by the aorist in determining the proper orthography of the present of the verb. These delicacies in the pronunciation I have noted in the Vocabulary. Some Gypsies, and particularly the Moslem, pronounce the gently aspirated *p* as a pure *p*, saying always *puró*, 'an old man.' The reader will see farther notices of the pronunciation of the consonants in Section IV, where their mutation in passing from the Sanskrit to the Gypsy language is spoken of.

I have pointed out all the Persian words found in the idiom, as they are an important element in the history of the Gypsies. It is evident that a people using so many pure Persian words must have formerly had close connection with the Persian people. They could not have borrowed them from the Turks, who

make no use of these particular words. The reader will observe them in their proper place.

Less interest is attached to the Slavonic terms, for the Gypsies are still found scattered among the numerous Slavonic tribes of the banks of the Danube.

All Mr. Brown's terms are inserted in their proper places, and marked "Br.," to distinguish them from Borrow's, marked "Bor."

Mr. Hamlin's remarks upon the Armenian language I have inserted in notes, and marked "Tr."

SECTION III.

VOCABULARY.

A.

TO ABANDON—*mukáva*.—This is probably connected with the Sanskrit root *much*, 'to release, to let go.' The change of a palatal into a guttural, and *vice versâ*, is common in all languages. *Kamukáv tát*, 'I shall leave thee;' *nápalal mukélamun bizoraló*, 'afterwards it leaves me weak.'

TO BE ACQUAINTED WITH—*pincharáva*.—This seems to be a compound verb, formed from the Sr. root *char*, 'to go, to proceed,' and the particle *vi*, which, joined to the verb, imparts to it in the causative the meaning of 'to pass back and forth in one's mind, to consider, to meditate upon.' *Pincharáva* shows the addition of a euphonic *n* after *vi*, and the change of *v* into *p*, so common among the Gypsies. *Méya pincharávales*, 'I also am acquainted with him:'—though transitive in form, it has here a neuter signification.

AFAR—*dúr*; Bor., *dur*.—From the Sr. *dûra*, 'distant.' *Keti dúr isi chin ti Silivri?* 'how far is it to Silivria?' *Durál*, 'from a distance?' *durál allían?* 'have you come from a distance?'

AFFIRMATION—*vá*; Br., *nangar*; Bor., *unga*.—I think there is an error in the definition of Mr. Brown, as it seems to me impossible that such an affirmative particle should have the negative *na* in its first syllable. Still, it is valuable as tending to elucidate Borrow's word. *Va* is the Sr. indeclinable *vâi*, a particle of asseveration or confirmation. The Gypsies in these quarters know of no other particle, and will acknowledge no other, but most of the Moslem Gypsies use the Turkish or Greek. Borrow's form, although to appearance obscure, may be referred to a pure Sr. origin; namely, to the word *angá*, itself also an asseverative or assenting particle, 'yes, truly.'

ALL—*sarró*, *saró*, *sárrore*, *sávvore*, *sárvolo*; † Br., *sarvillee*; Bor., *saro*.—Almost unchanged from the Sr. *sarva*, 'all, the whole, entire.' As concerns the final syllables *lee* and *lo*, I do not know whence they come. *Te dikél sarré*, 'should he see all?' *sarré o manushé isi khokhavné*, 'all men are liars;' *sávvore o róm*, 'all the Gypsies;' *keti isánas sávvore?* 'how many were you all?' *sarvénghe te penésles*, 'to declare

* Armenian *dar*, *dara*, in composition; as *daratsainel*, 'to sound abroad.'—Tr.

† "Saré, 'tous.'" Vaillant, p. 456.

(lit. 'to say') it to all.' It is a very common word, and understood by all the Gypsies, wherever they are to be found.

ALMS—*lachipé*; Bor., *lachipén*.—This is an abstract noun, from *lachó*, 'good,' and the common suffix *pe* or *pen*; it signifies 'goodness, benevolence.' It is used, however, by the Gypsies, in the sense of 'alms.' They have followed in this respect the usage of the Greeks, who frequently, in the place of *ἐλεημοσύνη*, 'alms,' use the term *ψυχικόν*, 'contribution for the salvation of the soul.' Compare Turk. *sadaká*, 'alms,' lit. 'goodness, righteousness.' *Kamáva to lachipé mó chavó*, 'I desire thy happiness, my child.'

ALWAYS—*ghéles*.—Possibly connected with the Sanskrit *kála*, 'time.'

AND—*tá, té*.—This conjunction may be identified with the Sr. *tu*, in preference to *cha*, which is more usual among Sr. authors. The following colloquial phrases amply illustrate its signification. *Tá é chavén*, 'and the children;' *tá penéna*, 'and they say;' *tá ná penéna chachipés*, 'and they do not speak (say) the truth;' *tá isi kodróm but chiká*, 'and there is in the road much mud (muds).' In the following examples it can be rendered 'also': *teréla ta yek dúlon* (Gr. *δούλον*), 'he has also a servant;' *teréla ta khélia*, 'it has also figs;' *kamésa tá mól?* 'dost thou wish also wine?' This conjunction is frequently pronounced *te*, particularly when it is not at the beginning of a sentence.

ANVIL—*amúni*; Br., *ammunee*; Bor., *amiñi*.—From the Greek *ἄκμων*, 'anvil,' pronounced by us now *ἀμμόνιον* and *ἀμμόνι*.

APPLE—*papai, hapai*.—This term, like many other denominations of plants and fruits, is obscure, and difficult to be explained.

ARMFUL—*angáli*.—This is the Greek term *ἀγκάλια* and *ἀγκάλη*, meaning 'whatever can be held between the arms.' Cf. *ἀγκάλη χόστου* (Xenophon). *Yék angáli chár*, 'an *ἀγκάλη* of hay.'

To be ASHAMED—*lajáva*; Bor., *lacha*.—From the Sr. root *lajj*, 'to be shamefaced or ashamed.' This is the term to which the Gypsies of Spain attach so high an importance, (Bor., ch. vii.) meaning by it as a substantive 'the unblemished chastity of the unmarried female.' With the Gypsies in these countries the signification of the word is simply 'shame,' and they translate it by the Greek *ἐντροπή*, or the Turkish *'ayb*, 'shame.'—*Lachanó*, 'shameful.'

ASHES—*práhos*.—This is the Slav. *práh*, 'dust.' Among the Bulgarians, however, the term *pepál* is in common use for 'ashes,' from the ancient Slav. *pepél*, 'ashes;' Gr. *παιπάλη*, 'the very finest of flour,' and 'whatever is rubbed to extreme fineness.' *Kaló práhos*, 'black ashes;' *e bovéskori práhos*, 'the ashes of the baker;' *keti práhos kamésa?* 'how much ashes dost thou wish?' *keti práhos resélatut?* 'how much ashes suffices thee?'

To ASK—*pucháva*.—From the Sr. root *prachh*, 'to ask, to inquire, to desire to know.' The liquid *r* has been dropped, as in other similar examples (Section IV). This verb is at times pronounced *pacháva* and *pecháva*. *Sóske puchésa mánder?* 'why dost thou ask (from) me?' *kapucháv léstar*, 'I shall ask (from) him;' *tá té pucháv léstar*, 'and that I may ask (from) him.'

* *Práhos* (aréna), and again, *pracos*, "staub." Pott, ii. 361.

Ass—*khér*; Br., *kher*; Bor., *gel, guel, jeroro*—fem. *kherní*; Bor., *jeni, jerini*.—The Sr. *hara*, from the root *hri*, ‘to bring, to bear,’ signifies ‘bearer,’ and secondly ‘the ass,’ as the Turks call the ass *merkeb*, from the Arabic root *rakaba*, ‘to bear.’ Thus *hara* signifies ‘beast of burden’ in general, and, by secondary meaning, ‘the ass,’ which, through all the East, is the burden-bearer in domestic works. This term is also written *khara*: compare Zend *khora* and Pers. *kher*, ‘an ass.’ My term *kherní* is ‘the female ass.’ Those of Borrow are of different provinces, but all of the same origin. *Sigó khér*, ‘a swift ass;’ *tumari kherékoro i zén chorghiá*, ‘your ass’s saddle they have stolen;’ *teréla pánj khér*, ‘he has (owns) five asses.’

To AWAKE—*jangáva*.—The Sr. root *jágrí* is ‘to awake, to be awake or watchful.’ We shall see in the next Section that the *r* of the Sanskrit, particularly when in composition with other consonants, is frequently dropped, as in this case. *Jangaváva*, the passive form, is ‘to be awaked;’ *jangavódó*, ‘he is awake.’ It corresponds to the Turkish *oyanik*, ‘awake, a man of talent;’ Gr. ἔξυπρος. *Janganilióm* (pass. aorist), ‘I have awaked;’ *janganiló*, ‘he is awaked.’

AXE—*tovér, tovél*.—This word is pronounced in both ways by many Gypsies, for the liquids are often commutable. It is a pure Persian word, *taber* and *taver*, ‘the two-edged axe used in felling wood.’ *Toverékoro*, ‘one who uses an axe,’ or ‘one who makes and sells axes.’ The Turkish is *battuji*.

B.

BACK—*dumó*.—This is a frequently used term among all the Gypsies, for the hinder part of the trunk, extending from the neck to the *os sacrum*. The Greeks now call the body *κοῦλον* or *κοῦλ*, diminutive of *κοῦλός*, ‘the trunk of a tree.’ May not, then, *dumo* be compared with Sr. *druma*, ‘a tree,’ which, by dropping the liquid *r*, has become *dumó*? To me this origin appears very probable, particularly upon comparing it with *dudúm*, ‘a gourd,’ in which the same word *druma* appears to exist.

BAD—*górko*.—This is the usual adjective used in opposition to *luchó*, ‘good.’ *Górko manúsh*, ‘a bad man;’ *orashái maréla e górke chavén*, ‘the master beats the bad children;’ *gorkipé*, ‘badness, wickedness.’

BALD—*pakó*.—The Sr. verb *pach* means ‘to mature, by cooking or ripening;’ and derivatives from it signify ‘maturity, suppuration,’ and even ‘gray hairs,’ as the maturity of age. The Sr. word *páka* has all these significations, and the same term is by the Gypsies referred to baldness, as an attribute of grey hairs and old age. *Pakó isi, ná teréla bál*, ‘he is bald, (and) has no hair.’

TO BAPTIZE—*boláva*.—This word of the Christian Gypsies, which, like all the rest of this class, is of peculiar interest, seems to belong to the Sr. *bul*, of the 10th class, ‘to sink, to dive and emerge again.’

In embracing Christianity, the Gypsies must have been at a loss, at times, to express by appropriate terms the new order of things which they constantly saw before them. They have done, in this matter, what other nations in embracing Christianity had done before them. The Slavonians call the cross *krést*, undoubtedly from the Greek

χριστός; and say *krestáyu*, 'I baptize,' analogous with the English "I christen," i. e. 'I baptize, I make one a Christian.' Have not most of the nations who received the blessed tidings of Christianity from the Greeks adopted also Greek terms? But whenever words were found in the idiom of the Gypsies capable of expressing the new idea, they would naturally be adopted by them. We shall see another example in the name of the cross. *Βαπτίζω*, the transitive of *βάπτω*, meant originally 'to color by dyeing.' The word to this very day is used for 'dyeing, painting, besmearing the face with rouge,' etc.: it is a neuter and transitive verb. As color was transmitted to cloth by immersing it in water, the word very naturally came to mean 'to immerse in water.' What difficulty then had the Gypsies in giving to this act of Christianity the word which corresponded to the Greek? Those Gypsies unacquainted with the word use *vaptizáva*, 'I baptize,' the Greek *βαπτίζω*. *Boláva e chavés*, 'I baptize the child;' *bolipé*, 'baptism;' *bolavdó*, 'baptized;' *bibolavdó*, 'not baptized.'

BAREFOOTED—*pirnangó*.—A compound word, *pir*, *piró*, 'foot,' and *nangó*, 'naked,' literally 'naked-footed.' In another part of the Vocabulary, I treat of the etymology of *piró*, *pirnó*, the Gypsy terms for 'foot.'

BARLEY—*jov*.—This is the Persian *jav*, 'barley,' which the Gypsies have borrowed directly from the Persians. Sr. *yava*, 'barley.' The Persian form of this term is undoubtedly from the Sanskrit, as the Persian language very generally changes the Sr. *y* into *j*: compare *jugh*, 'yoke,' Sr. *yuga*; *javan*, 'young man,' Sr. *yuvan*.

BASKET—*kóshnika*; Br., *sevlia*; Bor., *cornicha*.—This is a Bulgarian word, from the Slavonic *kosh'* and *kósnitza*, 'a basket.' The origin of Mr. Brown's term is unknown to me.

BATH—*tattó*, *bágnia*; Bor., *tati*.—Borrow defines this word "fever," Sp. *calentura*. Although it has not the signification of 'bath' in his vocabulary, yet the meaning which he gives may serve to elucidate my own. From the Sr. root *tap*, 'to heat, to burn,' is formed the part. *tapta*, 'hot, burning,' and this, by the customary change of *p* to *t*, becomes *tatta*, just as the Italians pronounce the Latin *aptus* "atto." The Arabs, from the word *hamma*, 'to heat,' have formed *hammám*, 'bath,' and *humma*, 'fever.' This word, as well as *rat*, *ratti*, 'blood,' should be written with *tt*, *tattó*. Some Gypsies use the word *bágnia*, It. *bagno*, a common word in these countries for 'bath.'

BEAN—*bópi*.—A Bulgarian word, *bop*, 'a bean,' but particularly the species called the Egyptian: Gr. *κouxula*, Turk. *baklá*.—Pl. *bópia*.

BEAR—*richini*.—As numerous Gypsies in Roumelia and the Danubian provinces gain their livelihood by exhibiting bears in the streets and public places, it is natural to suppose that this term would be a common one among them all. To me it appears related to the Sr. *riksha*, 'a bear,' and hence to the Gr. *ἄρκτος*, Lat. *ursus*. Should this derivation be found to be true, it will be one of the rare examples of the change of *ksh* into *ch*, as I shall have occasion to show in the following Section.

TO BEAT—*maráva*.—This verb seems to be of the same root with the verb *meráva*, 'I die.' In order to distinguish it from *meráva*, it is

always pronounced *maráva*, and the aor. *marginíom*. It means also 'to pound, to grind, to bruise.' *O rashái maréla e chavén*, 'the teacher beats the children;' *marétala?* 'does he beat her?'

BEAUTIFUL—*sukár*; Br., *shuká*; Bor., *jucal*.—These words are from the Sr. *sukara*, compounded of the prefix *su*, 'well,' Gr. *εῦ*, and the adjective *kara*, 'making,' Gr. *ποιός*, from the root *kri* (Lat. *creo*), 'to do, to make.' *Kara*, in Sanskrit as well as in Persian composite words, indicates action; as *sukara*, 'the well-doer, the generous bestower,' and hence 'whoever is beautiful in soul or body.' To Mr. Brown's word, *shuká*, a final *r* should be added; in Borrow's, the final *r* is changed to *l*. The fem. *jucali* is the Sr. *sukarâ*. The Gypsies form all feminine nouns in *i*, as we shall see in speaking of the nouns (Section V).

BECAUSE—*sostár*.—Appears to be the pronoun *so*, with the ablative particle *tar* (lit. 'from which'), 'on account of;' precisely as the Greek *διότι*, composed of the prep. *διὰ*, and the rel. pron. *ὅτι*; also *ὅθεν*, rel. pron. and the ablat. *θεν*. *Sostár isás kelipé*, 'because there was a dance.'

TO BEGET—*benáva*.—This term, like its cognate *ben*, 'birth,' I have not been able to refer to any Sr. root, with any degree of satisfaction. The term is common to both sexes, in man and animals. *I romní benéla*, 'the woman begets,' i. e. 'produces, brings forth;' *gurumni amari benghiás yék moskäre* (Gr. *μοσχάριον*), 'our cow has brought forth a calf;' *i chukli benghiás pánj rukoné*, 'the bitch has begotten (brought forth) five whelps.'

BEHIND—*palál*.—This evidently is the Sr. *para*, 'distant, remote, after.' Here, as in many other adverbs of location, the term is in the ablative form, a very favorite one with the Gypsies. According to the formation of other similar adverbs, it would be, in its simple form, *pal*: as *avry*, 'out,' *avryál*, 'from the outside,' Gr. *ἔσωθεν*; *andryál*, and *andrál*, 'from the inner side.' It is often to be heard united with the comparative particle *po*, as *popalál*, 'still more backwards.' *Lávales palál*, 'I take it back;' *palalutnó*, 'the next in order, the second;' *polaléste*, 'farther back;' *napalál*, 'afterwards;' *kána chinésa bar, na palalutné ghén*, 'when thou throwest a stone, the afterwards (i. e. 'the consequences') consider;' *pehióm palál*, 'I fell behind,' i. e. 'I followed him.'

TO BELIEVE—*pakiáva*.—This verb I refer to the Sr. root *paksh*, 'to take a part or side.' *Pakiáva ki aneká isi*, 'I believe that it is so;' *na pakiáva ki muló*, 'I do not believe that he died.'*

BELLOWS—*pishót*; Br., *pishata*.—Mr. Brown's word is in the plural form.

BELLY—*bor*; Bor., *pos, po*.—This is one of the many terms of the Gypsy language, the derivation of which is not clear to me. *Terávas dúk mé poriáti*, 'I had pain in my belly.'

* Pott (ii. 346) writes the word *patáv*, and derives it from the Sr. *prati + i*, 'confidere.' The Gypsies here pronounce it as I have written it. I have frequently heard it. The difference, however, may have been occasioned by the pronunciation of the consonant *t*, which with the Gypsies is often a soft *k*. A similar commutation is often to be heard among the Greeks, particularly in the island of Lesbos (Mitelene).

BETWEEN—*maskaré*.—This term comes from the Sr. *madhya*, 'middle, intermediate,' Lat. *medius*, Gr. *μέσος*, Slav. *mězdyu*, 'between.' *Maskaré to dúi kër*, 'between the two houses;' *maskaré to dúi drom*, and *maskaré dúi droménde*, 'between two roads;' *maskaré dúi manushénde*, 'between two men;' *maskarál*, 'from between,' Lat. *ex medio, de medio*, Mod. Gr. *ἀπὸ τῆν μέσων*.

BIRD—*chirikló*; Bor., *chiriclo*.—The Sr. *chiri*, 'a parrot,' is the only word to which can be referred this Gypsy term. Probably the term had also the more general signification in the Sanskrit, for we have in the present spoken language of the Hindus *chiriya*, for 'birds' in general. The signification of this word among the Gypsies is extremely vague; it is applied to all the feathered tribe. I have heard it used of quails, partridges, pigeons, etc. Never have I been able to ascertain any term for particular species of birds or fishes. The Gypsies call them by their Greek or Turkish names.

BIRTH—*ben*.—See to BEGET.

BITCH—*chukli*.—This is the fem. of *chukél*, 'dog,' by the addition of *i*, the usual affix of Gypsy feminine nouns. The *e* of the final syllable is always rejected: *chukél*, *chuk(e)li*. *Amari chukli*, 'our bitch;' *katár kinghián ti chukliá?* 'whence didst thou buy thy bitch?'

TO BITE—*dantúva*, *dantiláva*.—Both these verbs are in use; they have been formed directly from the Sr. noun *danta*, 'tooth' (see **TOOTH**). The second, *dantiláva*, is a compound verb, formed of *danta* and the verb *láva*, 'I take,' both of which are separately explained in the present vocabulary. Unlike its mother tongue, the Gypsy language is not generally fond of compound words. *Ta o chukél danghiántes*, 'and the dog bit him.'

BITTER—*kerkó*.—This is the Slav. *górkie*, 'bitter,' in general use among the Bulgarians, from whom the Gypsies have received it. It is a common term among all the nations that speak the various dialects of the Slavonic.

BLACK—*kaló* (fem. *kali*);* Br., *caló*; Bor., *caló*, *callardo*, *caloro*.—These terms are derived from the Sr. *kála*, 'black, of a dark color.' The second of Borrow is a Spanish form. Compare the Slav. *kaléne*, 'color, dye.' The reader will observe that the Turkish Gypsies have preserved many words of their mother tongue pure from all foreign intermixture. *Isi kali*, 'she is black;' *kalé romá*, 'black men;' *kaló* is used for 'a negro;' *kali*, for 'a negro woman;' *kaló manró*, 'black bread.'

BLACKSMITH—*mastér*; Br., *masteros*.—*Mastér* is a word very generally used by all classes of people in Constantinople, from the vulgar Italian *maestro*, to designate 'a chief workman,' or artist of any profession: Turk. and Persian *ustad*. Many Gypsies, in place of this term, use their own *shustiréskoro*, 'iron-worker' (see **IRON**).

BLIND—*koró*.†—Compare the Sr. *giri*, 'a certain disease of the eyes;' *girikána*, 'one blind from the disease *giri*.' This word is used at times by the Gypsies as an imprecation: *o devél te koró keréلمان*, 'may God reduce thee to blindness?'

* *Calí*, 'noir et beau.' Vaillant, p. 179.

† Armenian *goir*, 'blind.'—Ta.

- BLIND MAN**—*tam-manúsh*.—I give here this second word for 'blind,' as it is applicable only to the human race, whilst the former, *koró*, is used, as in other languages, for inanimate objects. It is a compound word. *Tam* is from the Sr. root *tam*, 'to be senseless, to be dark.' The derivatives of this root signify 'blindness, bodily or mental, gloom, perplexity,' etc.
- BLOOD**—*ratt*; * *Bor.*, *ruti*, *arati*.—From the Sr. root *ranj*, 'to color, to dye' (Pers. *renk*), comes the participle *rakta*, 'colored, dyed, red,' neut. *raktam*, 'blood.' In the above Gypsy terms, the *k* of the Sr. is changed to *t*, for the sake of euphony; like the Italian *prattico* from the Latin *practicus*. *Dukháva bút e rátt*, 'he likes much to bleed' (lit. 'he likes blood').
- TO BOIL**—*taviáva*, *tapiáva*.—By the transmutation of the labial *p* into its cognate *v*, this Gypsy verb is easily referred to the Sr. root *tap*, 'to heat, to burn,' and, in the Gypsy language, 'to boil,' as an effect of fire.
- BONE**—*kókkalo*.—This term is common to all the Gypsies. I have never been able to ascertain any other denomination for bone, even among the Moslem Gypsies. It is the common Greek *κόκκαλον*, derived from *κόκκος*, 'the kernel of fruit;' *κοκκαλιάζω* is 'to become hard,' and is a very common term among the Greeks now.†
- BOSOM**—*kolín*.—I leave to others to determine whether this word can be referred to Sr. *kola*, signifying, among other things, 'the bosom, the lap, embrace.' The names of parts of the body in the Gypsy language are often extremely difficult and dubious.
- BOWEL**—*bukó*; *Bor.*, *porias*.—*Bukó* may be referred to the Sr. *bukka* and *búkkka*, both meaning 'the heart,' in the same way as the Greeks called *σπλάγγνον* every internal organ of the body, and often, to this day, the common people call the stomach and the bowels *καρδιά*. Borrow has the Sr. *puritat*, 'an entrail, a gut,' which seems in fact to furnish the proper etymology of the word used by the Gypsies of Spain.
- BOY-CHILD**—*chavó*; † *Br.*, *schago*; *Bor.*, *chavo*, pl. *chai*.—
- GIRL**—*cháí*; *Br.*, *schay*; *Bor.*, *chavory*.—The Sanskrit has more than one term to which the above words can be referred: *tuch*, *tuj*, and *toka*, 'progeny, children,' *çáva* or *çávaka*, 'the new born of any animal.' The Gypsy word I have always heard pronounced *chavó*. Some of the Moslem Gypsies reject the *v*, and pronounce *chaó*. *Mo chavó*, 'my child;' *dúí chavén teráva*, 'I have two children;' *rovéla ani khurdó chavó*, 'he cries like a little child;' *o rashái maréla e górke chavén, e laché chavén na marélalen*, 'the teacher beats the bad children, the good children he does not beat;' *te chavénghe*, 'to thy children;' *astarghióm e chavés*, 'I caught the child;' *e chavéskoro náv só isi?* 'what is the child's name?' *tú e chavén*, 'and the boys' (acc. case); *teréla chavén?* 'has he (or she) children?' *mí cháí*, 'my girl;' *teréla yék márs, yék cháí*, 'he has one boy (and) one girl.'

* Armenian *ariune*, 'blood.'—TR.

† This term should always be written with double *x*—*κόκκαλον*.

‡ " *T-chai*, 'jeune homme.' " Vaillant, p. 457.

- BRAIN**—*goti*.—Used by the Gypsies for 'brain' and 'mind.' *Terávales me gotiáte*, 'I keep it in my mind,' i. e. 'I remember it.' It may be referred to Sr. *goda*, 'the brain,' or to *godhi*, 'the forehead.' From this word is formed *gotiavér*, 'having a brain, intelligent.' 'Brain' for 'intelligence' is very common also among the Greeks. *"Έχει μυελόν*, 'he is wise,' lit., 'he has brain.' *Mi goti*, 'my mind;' *até alló amaré gotiáte*, 'there came to our mind,' i. e. 'we were reminded;' *té n'avésa me gotiáte*, 'should I not bring to my mind.'
- BRAVE**—*múrs*.—This term is often used as equivalent to the common Greek *πάλληξ* and *παλληκάριον*, 'a brave, one endowed with courage;' Turk. *yigit*, Pers. *pehlivan*. The Gypsy term probably originates from the Sr. *mri*, 'to die,' and its participle *mrita*, 'dead, mortal,' Gr. *βροτός*, *θνητός*, of which we shall speak in elucidating the verb *meráva*, 'to die,' so common in all the Indo-European languages. Compare Slav. *muzz*, 'a man, a male.' The Gypsies frequently use the term for the male sex, whenever they intend to indicate manliness and courage in the person spoken of. It properly signifies a person of courage, but who makes no ostentatious parade of it. It is used also for 'boy:' *teráva dúi chavén*, *yék chái*, *yék múrs*, 'I have two children, a girl (and) a boy.'
- BREAD**—*manró*, *mandó*, *marnó*, *marly*; Br., *marú*; Bor., *marno*, *jumeri*, *tató*.—Cognate with the Sr. *marára*, 'granary or storehouse,' where all kinds of produce, and whatever is used for food in general, are kept. Borrow's *tato* is evidently the Sr. *tapta*, participle of *tap*, 'to heat, to burn,' and consequently signifies that which is heated or cooked, as the Lat. *panis biscocutus*, Fr. *biscuit*, Gr. *ἄστος δίψυκος*, i. e. 'bread subjected to two fires.' *Manró khandi kháva*, 'a little bread I eat;' *kaló manró*, 'black bread;' *manréskoro*, 'a baker,' or 'one who sells bread.'
- TO BREAK**—*pangáva*.—Sr. *bhañj*, 'to break.' *Panghióla*, 'it broke,' aor. of the mid. voice; *panghiováva*, 'I have been broken.'
- BREAST**—*chuché*, *chuchi*; Bor., *chucha*.—From the Sr. *chuchi*, 'breast,' (Gr. *μαστός*); *chuchuka*, 'a nipple.' *Chuchi dávales*, 'I give it the breast;' *piéla chuchi*, 'it drinks the breast;' *ná léla chuchi*, 'it does not take the breast;' *chuchia dukéna*, 'the breasts pain.'
- BRIDGE**—*çurt*.—From the Sr. root *par* or *pri*, 'to pass over, to go to the other side.' The Greek, from *περῶ*, *περῶω*, has *περάτης*, 'one who passes to the other side,' and *πέρα*, 'on the other side.' Compare Zend *peretus*, 'bridge.'
- TO BRING**—*anáva*.—Perhaps from the Sr. root *ni*, 'to lead,' with the prefix *á*, 'hither, to.' It is extremely common among the Gypsies. Its aorist is *anghióm*, 'I brought;' fut. *kanáv*, 'I shall bring.' *Katár anghián te romniá?* 'whence didst thou bring thy wife?' *so anghián?* 'what didst thou bring?'
- BROAD**—*bugló*.—This adjective, of which the derivation is unknown to me, means 'broad, wide, expanded;' fem. *bugli*. *Bugló dróm*, 'wide road.' It serves to form the verb *bugliováva*, 'to expand, to stretch, to put out clothes to dry,' probably from the custom of stretching clothes on the ground to dry them. *Bugliarghióm e yismata*, 'I have spread the linen (to dry).' *Bugliováva* means also 'to widen, to scatter;' Gr. *σχορνίζω*.

BROTHER—*pral, plal*; * *Bor., plan, plano*.—

SISTER—*pen*; *Bor., plani*.—Except for the first of these forms, one would hardly believe them to be the Sr. *bhràtri*, the correlative of so many Asiatic and European synonymes: in the Zend *bràtar*; Pers. *berader*; Lat. *frater*; Gr. *φάτωρ*; Goth. *brothar*; Germ. *bruder*; Eng. *brother*; Slav. *brash*; Russ. *brat*; Bulg. *vrat*. The Turkish Gypsies have fortunately preserved the word nearly like its archetype, to which we can thus refer the three forms of Borrow, which are undoubtedly from *bhràtri*, metamorphosed according to the natural interchanges of letters. *Plal* approaches the Lithuanian *brolis*, 'brother' (Bopp). *Pen* and *plani* are from the same Sr. original. The Hindus use another word, *svasri*, 'sister,' Lat. *soror*. *Amaré peniá*, 'our sister' (acc. case); *te praléskoro náv?* 'thy brother's name?' *keti pralén terésa?* 'how many brothers hast thou?' *me praléskoro keréste*, 'in my brother's house.'

BUCK—*búzos*.—Related to the Sr. *paçu*, 'an animal in general, a beast, a goat.' A diminutive form of this term is *buznó, buzni*, 'a she-goat.' *Chungali buzni*, 'a good-for-nothing she-goat;' *buznoró, 'kid,' ker-ghias dúi buznoré*, 'she had (lit. 'begat') two kids.'

BULGARIAN—*dás*.—This appellation is given by the Gypsies to the numerous Bulgarians living among them, or coming from Bulgaria in the summer season to till the lands of the Greek and Turkish landholders. The Bulgarians are found in vast numbers on the lands of Roumelia. They are called *Βούλγαροι* by the Greeks, *Bulghár* by the Turks, and *Bulgar* by themselves. To them this appellation *dás* is utterly unknown. It is, however, extremely interesting, as being, perhaps, a reminiscence of the words *Dacia, Dacian*. *Dashái*, pl. of *dás*; *dasni*, 'a Bulgarian woman;' *dasoró* (pl. *dasoré*), 'a young Bulgarian;' *dasnióri*, 'a young Bulgarian girl;' *dasikanó*, adj., 'Bulgarian;' *dasikaní chip*, 'the Bulgarian language;' *dasikanés*, 'in a Bulgarian manner'—*Bouλγαριστι*.

TO BURN—*tapiána, tapiónava*.—In speaking of *BATH*, I have referred to the Sr. verb *tap*, 'to burn, to be hot.' It is only here and in *taviávu*, 'I boil,' that we meet it as a verb, used as *tap* is in Sanskrit.

BUSINESS—*puti, buti*.—This term, in frequent use among all the Gypsies, I have rendered by the term 'business' in English, in preference to any other. It is the Greek *δουλεία*, 'service, work, business;' the use of which may be illustrated by a few colloquial expressions: thus we frequently say, *έχω δουλειαν πολλήν*, 'I have a great deal of business;' *εις τίνος δουλειαν είσαι?* 'in whose service art thou?' The Gypsy word seems to be related to Sr. *bhāti*, primarily 'being, existence,' but ordinarily meaning 'prosperity, success, power:' the Gypsies have made it mean 'work, labor,' as what is necessary to the enjoyment and preservation of one's life, or the acquisition of wealth and pleasure. *Bhukti*, 'eating, possession, fruition,' from *bhuj*, 'to eat,' does not appear to me to have any connection with this Gypsy term. *Sik-lilián nevé putiá?* 'hast thou learnt (any) new business?' *kapichanáv tút tí pólin (πόλιν) yék putiáti*, 'I shall send thee to the city for (one)

* "*Prales*, 'frères.'" Vaillant, p. 456.

business; ' *teráva bút putiá*, 'I have much business.' *Puti* (pl. *putiá*) is also applied to the implements of work. *Déman me putiá*, 'give me my implements.' *Butiákoró*, 'a day-laborer.'*

To BUY—*kináva*.—This verb I refer to the Sr. root *krí* (pres. *krinámi*), 'to buy, to barter, to exchange.' It is a striking example of the unquestionable relation of the Gypsy and Sanskrit idioms.† The *r* has been lost, as in many other like cases (see Section IV). With *vi* prefixed, *krí* means 'to sell;' so also among the Gypsies, *bikináva* or *biknáva* means 'to sell.' *Kinghióm yék grást*, 'I bought a horse;' *kárin kinghián té chuklés?* 'when didst thou buy thy dog?' *isás léskoro, méya kinghiómles*, 'it was his, and I bought it.'

C.

CABBAGE—*shah*; Bor., *chaja*, *resis*.—This may possibly be the Sr. *śákha*. 'plant,' limited by the Gypsies to signify 'cabbage,' in like manner as by the modern Greeks the ancient term *λάχανον*, 'vegetable.' This conjecture is strengthened by the analogy of Borrow's term *resis*, which we shall have occasion to explain in speaking of VINEYARD: applied in former times to savory substances in general, it has come to be limited exclusively to the vine by the Gypsies of Turkey, and to the cabbage by those of Spain.

CACARE—*khiáva*, *khlíáva*.—The verb is pronounced in both these ways. Fut. *kamakhlíáv*, 'I shall void, *cacabo*;' *khlendó* and *khendó*, 'cacatus;' *khlenghióm*, 'I have voided.' The origin of this term is unknown to me.

CANE—*ran*.—Of uncertain etymology.

CARRIAGE—*vordón*.—This term is intimately related to *beró*, 'a sailing vessel,' which we shall note in defining SHIP. Both seem to belong to the Sr. root *bhri*, 'to carry, to bear.' *Vordón* I have heard used at times for 'a pack-horse.'

To be CHEATED—*khokhávniováva*.—Compound verb, from *khokhavnó*, 'a liar, one cheated,' and *aváva*. *Te dikél sarré o manúsh nána khokhávniovél*, 'were he to see all (i. e. 'every thing'), a man would not be cheated.' For a clear understanding of these compound verbs, the reader must examine the explanation of the component parts of the verb, in their respective places. *Khokhávniovéلمان*, 'he cheated me.'

CHEESE—*kerál*.—The Sr. *kshira* is defined 'water, milk,' and from it is derived this Gypsy term. The compound consonant *ksh*, as we shall have occasion to show in the next Section, is constantly changed to the simple *k*. *Kotór kerál*, 'a little cheese;' *ké o yavér kerásales kerál*, 'and the remainder (i. e. 'milk') we make cheese.'

To CHEW—*chamkeráva*.—This is a compound verb, composed of *cham*—Sr. *cham*, 'to eat, to drink, to take any thing into the mouth as food'—and the Gypsy verb *keráva*, 'I make, I do,' from the Sr. *krí*, 'to make,' which we shall explain in speaking of the verb to MAKE.

CHICKEN—*chavri*.—This is the usual Turkish *yavrá* or *yavri*, 'the young of any animal;' Gr. *νεοσσός*.

* Pott proposes *vritti* as a probable origin of this term.

† The Armenian *kunél*, by change of *r* to *n*, may be from this root.—TR.

- CHILD**—*rakló*; fem. *rakli*, ‘a female child, a daughter.’—This term, though frequently confounded with *chavó*, ‘a boy, a child,’ means properly ‘the little one,’ τὸ μικρὸν of the Greeks. *Teréla panjé raklén*, ‘she has five children;’ *yavré raklénja*, ‘with other children.’ It is used often for ‘the child at the the breast, the babe;’ Gr. μωρὸν.
- CHRISTMAS**—*khrístuné*.—Although I have made particular inquiries after terms of a religious character in the native Gypsy language, I must confess that very few are to be found. I have noted in other parts of the Vocabulary such as are of pure Sr. origin. The rest are from the Greek. Christmas, in modern Greek, is called τὰ χριστόγεννα (Χριστοῦ γέννησις), i. e. ‘Christ’s birth,’ from which has been formed this Gypsy word, with the accent on the final syllable.
- CHURCH**—*karghíri*; Bor., *cangri*.—These two words are of European origin, from the Gr. ἐκκλησία, and κυριακὸς οἶκος; Germ. *kirche*, Eng. *kirck* and *church*, are from the latter. The Latin nations have preferred ἐκκλησία; It. *chiesa*, Fr. *église*.*
- CLEAN**—*shuchó*, *shuzó*.—The Sr. adjective *suchi*, from the root *such*, ‘to be pure or clean,’ means ‘white, pure,’ etc. All the numerous derivatives from this verb have the same idea of cleanliness, physical or mental. By some Gypsies the word is pronounced *shuzó*; *shuchó*, however, is the more common pronunciation. *Shuchipé*, ‘cleanliness,’ is formed by the addition of the usual particle *pé*. *Shuchi romní*, ‘a clean woman;’ *shuchó chavó*, ‘a clean child.’
- TO CLEANSE**—*kosháva*, *gosháva*.—The signification of this term is ‘to make clean, either by rubbing, washing, or sponging.’ The Greeks now use the word σπογγίζω, ‘I clean,’ from σπόγγος, ‘a sponge.’ Its etymology is obscure. Aor. *koshlióm*, ‘I made clean, I cleansed.’
- CLOTHING**—*páta*; Bor., *plata*.—This term I derive from the Sr. *paťa*, *pați*, *pața*, etc., all meaning ‘cloth, colored cloth, a garment.’ The Gypsies of Spain, for euphony’s sake, have inserted an *l* in the first syllable. The word, pronounced *patané* by some Gypsies, is by them applied to the bands and various pieces of cloth with which babes are swathed.
- COAL**—*angár*; Br., *anga*; Bor., *langar*.—This is the unchanged Sr. *angára*, ‘coal.’ Borrow adds an initial *l* by mistake; or, more probably, it is a fragment of the article *el*, which the Spanish Gypsies have universally adopted. The Gypsy language suffers what many others do, sometimes cutting off from, and sometimes adding to, the most common words: as *Nízos* (the name of the island), pronounced now *Áξια*; εἰς τὴν πόλιν (‘to the city’), Turk. *Stamboul*; European *Salonica* for *Thessalonica*; Eng. *dropsy* for *hydropsy* (ὕδρωψ). *Angaréskoro*, ‘a collier, one who sells coals.’
- COCK**—*basnó*, *bashnó*; Bor., *basnó*.—This word, though apparently more changed than many others, I am inclined to refer to the Sr. *pakshin*, ‘fowl, bird,’ from *paksha*, ‘wing, feather.’ The interchange of the consonants is natural. *O bashnó kaléskoro isi?* ‘the cock, whose is it?’ *e basnéskoro*, ‘of the cock;’ *e basnéngoro*, ‘of the cocks.’

* The Armenian word for church is *yegeghetzi*, which is ἐκκλησία, transformed to accord with Armenian rules of euphony, and shows us how strangely a word can be modified in passing from one tongue to another.—Tr.

COLD—*shil, shilaló*; Bor., *jil, jir, gris*.—These terms are derived from the common Sr. *çita*, ‘cold, frozen.’ Borrow’s form *gris* is, I think, a mistake; for it seems connected with the Sr. *grishma*, which signifies ‘heat, the hot season of the year.’ In comparing words of the Gypsy language with the corresponding Sr. adjectives in *ta*, we see that they often change this final syllable to *l*; thus *çatam*, ‘hundred,’ becomes *shel* and *shevel*; *sita*, ‘grain,’ becomes *jil*; and this word *çita, shil. Shilaló*, ‘frigid;’ *shil but*, ‘very cold;’ *shilaló palvál*, ‘cold wind.’

To feel **COLD**—*shilaliouvána*.—Verb compounded of *shilaló*, ‘cold,’ and *avána*, ‘to come, to be’ (Section V).

COLT—*kurí, furí*; Br., *kuree*; Bor., *saullo*.—May not the first words be related to the Sr. *kuráha*, ‘a light bay horse with black legs?’

COMB—*kangli*.—There are two Sr. words to which this term can be referred: *kankata*, ‘a comb, an instrument for cleaning the hair,’ and *kankála*, ‘a skeleton.’ I am inclined to give the preference to the latter, as more natural, and more congenial to the commutation of consonants observed in the formation of the Gypsy language.

To **COMB**—*ghantáva*.*—This verb seems to have no relation to *kangli*, ‘a comb,’ but may be connected with Sr. *kañta, kantaka*, ‘a thorn, goad,’ etc. *Ghantáva mó sheró*, ‘I comb my head;’ *ghantávaman*, ‘I comb myself;’ Gr. *κτενίζομαι*.

To **COME**—*avána*.—Aor. *avghióm* and *allióm*. *Ich allióm te dikáv tut*, ‘yesterday I came to see thee;’ *nashkián t’ allián*, ‘they left and came;’ *sóske allé?* ‘why have they come?’ *allióm katár ki lén*, ‘I came from the river;’ *kána kamavés?* ‘when wilt thou come?’ *but lachés, avána*, ‘very well, I am coming;’ *t’avéla tó dát, te penés mánghe*, ‘should thy father come, let me know it’ (i. e. ‘thou shouldst tell it to me’).

To **CONCEAL**—*garáva*.—It is difficult to refer this verb to any known Sr. root, without violating the common rules of Gypsy derivation. *Garávaman*, ‘I hide myself;’ *κρύπτομαι*; *garávtut*, ‘hide thyself;’ *garaticanó manúsh*, ‘a hidden man’ (i. e. ‘a mysterious person’), *μυστικός*.

To **COOK**—*pekáva*.—Sr. *pach*, ‘to mature by cooking or ripening, to boil, to dress.’ Pers. *pukhten*, ‘to cook;’ *pukhtie*, ‘cooked, matured;’ Slav. *pekú*, ‘I cook,’ which has changed the Sr. palatal *ch* into the guttural *k*, like the Gypsy. This verb is extremely common, and well known to all the Gypsies. *Pekiló*, ‘baked, cooked’ (3d pers. aor. pass.); *pekó*, ‘cooked;’ Sr. *pakva*, ‘cooked, matured.’

COOL—*sudró*.—Evidently the Pers. *serd*, ‘cold, frigid.’ It is often applied to water, to express its freshness. *Sudró pani*, ‘cool water;’ *sudró tut*, ‘cold milk.’ It is often confounded with *shilaló*, ‘cold.’

To **COVER**—*ucharáva*.—The close coincidence of form between this word and the Sr. *uchcharámi*, ‘I arise, go up,’ leads me to conjecture their relationship, notwithstanding the difference of meaning. Mid. voice: *ucharávaman*, ‘I cover myself;’ *ucharávaman e papolmaténja* (Gr. *παιπλώματα*), ‘I cover myself with quilts;’ part. *uchardó*, ‘covered;’ *biuchardó*, ‘uncovered,’ pronounced often *buchardó*; as bu-

* Pronounced *gantáva*, with a Gr. *γ* (*γαυτάβα*).

chardó isi o amáksi (Gr. ἀμάξι), 'the carriage was uncovered.' *Uchar-ghíóm* (aor.), 'I have covered.'

COUGH—*has*; Bor., *pichiscas*.—

TO COUGH—*hasáva*.—From the Sr. root *kás*, 'to cough.' The change of the guttural *k* into the aspirate *h* is observable in other Gypsy words, as we shall have occasion frequently to notice in the course of this memoir. Many Gypsies pronounce the noun as though it were written with a Greek χ . Their pronunciation of the aspirate *h* is so feeble at times as to be scarcely heard. Borrow derives his term from Sr. *vikshava*, 'cough.' But *hasáva*, 'I cough much.'

TO COUNT—*ghenáva*; Bor., *ginar*, *jinar*.—The Sr. verb *gan* means 'to count, to reckon up by number, to calculate.' Though applied to calculations of a higher order by the Hindus, it is now by the Gypsies confined solely to counting. Many of them can count no higher than ten in their vernacular tongue. The word is frequently used in the sense of considering or reflecting. *Palatuné ghén*, 'consider the consequences' (lit. 'the afterward things'). So also the Greeks: μέτρα τὰ ὀστερά σου.

Cow—see ox.

CREPITUS VENTRIS—*khán*.—Of doubtful etymology.

CROSS—*tarshúl*, *trushúl*; Bor., *trijul*.—All the religious terms of the Gypsies are of peculiar interest. Unfortunately for their history, they have few such which are vernacular, and, like the Persians and Turks, have borrowed nearly all from the people among whom they live, and whose religion they have embraced. This, however, is a singular exception. It seems to be related to the Sr. *triçúla*, 'a trident, a three-pointed pike or spear, especially the weapon of Siva.' To many Gypsies this word is entirely unknown, and in its place they use the Greek σταυρός: *keráva mo stavrós*, 'I make my cross, I cross myself.'

TO CRY OUT—*basháva*.—This Gypsy verb may be referred to Sr. *vás*, 'to sound, to cry as a bird, to call,' etc. These definitions go to prove that the verb was applied by the Hindus to all those sounds of animals expressed by the Lat. *ululare*. So, too, with the Gypsies, who use it in a very general sense, and apply it not only to quadrupeds, but to birds also. *O basno bashéla*, 'the cock crows;' *bashéla o chukél*, 'the dog barks.'

CURSE—*armán*.—This is an imprecation very much in use among the Gypsies. I will endeavor to explain it by the usages of the natives, both Greeks and Turks. *Arman* and *arma* signify in Sanskrit 'disease of the eyes, and consequent blindness.' The Turks, among their imprecations, frequently make use of the phrases *kiór ol*, 'mayest thou become blind;' *kiór olsún*, 'may he become blind.' The Greeks very often exclaim to one another *τίφλα*, 'blindness;' *νά τυφλωθῆς*, 'mayest thou become blind.' In a similar manner, as I conceive, this Sr. word in the mouth of the Gypsies became a word of imprecation, having the same signification with the Greek and Turkish terms. They know nothing of the primary Sr. signification of *arman*, and, when asked the meaning of the term, they answer "it is a βλασφημία, 'a curse.'" The phrase *Ma déman armán*, 'do not give me a curse,' is extremely

common among them all, and they use it as we use the phrase "do not revile me." *Armán dáva* is 'to curse.' But it is rarely used in any other form than the one given above, precisely as the Greeks never use the term *τύφλα* save as an imprecation.

To CUT—*chináva*; Bor., *chinelar*, *achinelar*.—The Gypsies use this word indifferently, either for cutting in the ordinary sense of the word, or for reaping. Borrow also defines the word *chinelar* "to cut, to reap."

The Sr. *chhid*, 'to cut, to divide,' inserts an *n* before its final radical, like all verbs of the same conjugation: *chhinna*, from this root, is 'divided, cut.' The Gypsies have rejected the final radical consonant, and in its place have preserved the characteristic *n* of the conjugation. Borrow's addition of an initial *a* to *chinelar* is a pleonasm frequently found in his vocabulary. *Chináva*, and, in the passive form, *chiniováva*, is used frequently in the sense of 'I am tired.' Among the ancient Greeks, the word *κόπτω* had this signification: *ἄνθρωπος τὸν ἀναβάτην κόπτει* (Xen.), and *κόπος*, 'pain, labor,' evidently prove it. Compare Mod. Greek *ἐκόπην*, *ἐκόπηκα*, 'I am tired;' *τὸ ὀδόντι με κόπτει*, 'the tooth pains me.' The Turks use the passive, *kesilmek*, 'to be cut' (act. *kesmek*), for 'to be tired or wearied.' So that the Gypsies have imitated the usages of their neighbors. *Chiniováva kána piráva*, 'I get tired when I walk;' *kána shunávales moghí chindó*, 'when I hear him my heart (is) afflicted' (lit. 'cut'): *chinghióm*, aor.

To CUT with a knife, to WHITTLE—*choláva*.—The Sr. root *chhur* we shall have occasion to explain in speaking of *churi*, 'knife,' to which it has doubtless given origin, as well as to this verb *choláva*. It is singular that the liquid *r* should have been retained in the noun, and changed to *l* in the verb.

D.

DAY—*divés*, *ghivés*; Br., *ghives*; Bor., *chibes*.—Related to the Sr. *div*,* denoting 'heaven, day.' From *divés* comes *disiló*, 'the day breaks.' *Khandí divés*, 'few days;' *divéséskoro*, 'wages for a day's work;' *saró divés*, 'every day;' *keti divés?* 'how many days?' *Ghivés* is more general among the Moslem Gypsies.

DEAF—*kasukón*; Bor., *cajuco*.—This is a common word, well known and familiar to all the Gypsies. I am unable to give it any satisfactory Sr. derivation, though it seems to be related to that idiom.

DEATH—*moló*, *meripé*; Bor., *meripen*.—This is evidently from the Sr. root *mri*, 'to die,' which we find in nearly all the European languages, living and dead. *Moló* is the Sr. *māra*, 'death, murder,' by the change of *r* to *l*. The ultimate *pe*, *pen* is the customary particle forming abstract nouns, numerous examples of which are to be met with in our Vocabulary. For farther elucidation of this term, see TO DIE.

DEEP—*khór*.—This term derives itself from the Sr. root *khur*,† 'to cut, to scratch, to dig.' *Khor chin ti puv*, 'deep into the earth.'

TO DEPART—*nasháva*; Bor., *najabar*, *najar*.—This verb I refer to the root *nac*, 'to disappear, to cease to be, to perish.' *Nashíá t' allíá*,

* Armenian *div*.—TR.

† Armenian *khór*, *khortn*.—TR.

'they left and came;' *kána kanashés?* 'when wilt thou depart?' but *nashéla*, 'it goes swiftly' (of a horse); *nash améndar, oléndar*, 'depart from us, from them:' part. *nastó*, 'departed.'

DEVIL—*bénk*; Br., *benk*; Bor., *bengue, bengui*.—*Bengó isi*, or *bengósi*, 'he is a devil;' *ja túke bénke*, 'go thou also to the devil,' an imprecation; *bengaló manúsh*, 'a devilish man,' i. e. 'a cunning man.'

To DIE—*meráva*.—We have in other parts of our Vocabulary terms which are connected with this verb, as *moló*, 'dead, death,' *meripé*, 'death,' *merdó*, 'sick' (Bor.), *murtaráva*, 'I murder.' We have occasion, in defining these terms, to speak of the Sr. root *mri*, 'to die,' which is to be found in a great many languages, bearing intimate relation to the Sanskrit. It was naturally to be expected that a word which has retained its place in so many languages, having more or less affinity to the Sanskrit, should also be preserved in the Gypsy. In speaking of *meripé*, 'death,' we have noticed some of the affinities of this verb among the Indo-European languages. The reader may be pleased to see the word running with slight variations through so many languages. The Zend has *mere*, 'to die,' and the transitive *merec*, 'to kill.' Pers. *merden*, 'to die,' *merd*, 'a man,' corresponding to the English use of the word *mortal*, 'one liable to death, a man.' With the Sr. part. *mrita* corresponds the Gr. *βροτός*, and with *amrita*, *ἀμβροτός*, 'immortal,' and *ἀμβροσία*, 'the food of immortals.' The Albanians, from the Gr. *βροτός*, have formed their verb *βρας*, 'to die,' while they have retained the original in a purer form in *υόβρη*, 'death.' The Lat. *morió* has no need of explanation. The Gr. *μαρτύω* has even to this day the same signification among the modern Greeks that it had among their fathers: it is applied to the death of plants, and to the wasting of life by long disease, the *μαρτύωσις* of the ancient Greeks. The European languages, Latin and German, have retained the word, particularly in its transitive form, to *murder*. Slav. *umýráyu*, 'I die,' and *moriú*, 'to kill.*' *Mulótár*, 'after dying.'

To DIG—*khatáva*.—The Sr. verbal root *khan* is 'to dig, to delve.' *Khanámi*, 'I dig,' would be in the Gypsy language *khanáva*, instead of *khatáva*. But the Gypsies, as we shall have hereafter occasion to demonstrate, instead of borrowing directly from the original root, have made use of participles as roots, and from thence have formed many of their verbs. We have an example in *dúk*, 'pain,' *dukáva*, 'to be in pain.' So here the part. *khâta*, 'dug, excavated,' has served as the root of *khatáva*, 'I dig.' *Kón khatélen?* 'who digs (i. e. 'cultivates') them?'

DIRT—*mel*.—

DIRTY—*melaló*.—Compare the Sr. noun *mala*, 'dirt, filth, sediment,' and the same as an adjective, 'dirty, filthy.' The Sr. adjective *malina* may have given origin to the Gypsy adj. *melaló*, by the mutation of *n* to *l*. It appears to me, however, to be a regular Gypsy formation from *mel*, 'dirt,' by the addition of *lo*, which is a common adject-

* The Arm. language has *mer-nil*, 'to die;' *mertzoonel*, 'to murder;' *maril*, 'to faint away;' *mah*, 'death;' *mahganatsou*, 'mortal;' *anmah*, 'immortal.'—Tr.

tive termination among the Gypsies. As whiteness is a symbol of purity, so is blackness associated with whatever is filthy and unclean. This word, which has also the signification of 'black' in Sr., is undoubtedly related, then, with the Gr. *μέλας*, 'black,' and *μέλανιον*, 'ink.' To the same origin I refer another Gypsy word, *mulanó*, 'dark,' from the Sr. adj. *malina*. Borrow has *mulani*, 'sad.' *Te tikné isi melalé*, 'thy children are dirty.'

To become DIRTY—*meláliováva*.—A compound verb, of the mid. voice, compounded of *melaló*, 'dirty,' and *aváva* (see Section V). *Melalióm*, 'I have been dirtied.'

DOOR—*dar*, *vudár*; Bor., *burda*.—The derivation of both these terms is very evident. The Sr. *dvára*, 'door, gate, passage,' appears in both ancient and modern languages: Zend *dvara*, Pers. *der*, Gr. *θύρα*, Goth. *daur*, Eng. *door*.* *Puradvára*, composed of *dvára* and *pura*, 'city,' is the same as our *πέλη*, 'gate, city-gate.' I refer Borrow's word to this compound, which in the mouth of the Gypsies has lost its last syllable. If this etymology be correct, we may here find the derivation of the Latin *porta*. This term is by some Gypsies pronounced *dal*, by the natural commutation of the liquids. *Kon déla o vutár?* 'who knocks at the door?' *bánd o vutár*, 'shut the door;' *dúí dar teréla*, 'it has two doors.'

DOWN, BELOW—*telé*, *felé*; Bor., *ostelis*, *osteli*.—This word, common also to the Slavonic (*doly*, 'down'), I refer to the Sr. *tala*, 'deep, a low place, the foundation of any thing.' With it is connected, probably, the Latin *tellus*, 'earth.' The *telé* of the Gypsies is the regular locative case of *tala*—*tale*. The analogy is manifest. In Borrow these forms seem to have an initial euphonic syllable, foreign to the original word.

DREAM—*sunnó*.—Compare Sr. *svapna*, Gr. *ὑπνος*, Lat. *sopnus*, *somnus*, 'sleep;' Lat. *sopnium*, *somnium*, Gr. *ἐνύπνιον*, 'dream,' lit. 'in sleep' (*ἐν ὑπνῳ*); Slav. *sónie*, 'dream, from *son*', 'sleep.' In the same manner, by the rejection of the radical *p*, has been formed the Gypsy *sunnó*, which, like the Latin *somnium* from *sopnium*, was probably at first *supnó*. *Me sunnéste*, 'in my dream.'

To DRESS—*uryaváva*.—In order to make intelligible the meaning of this verb, it is well to say that it is used precisely as the Greeks use their *στολιζουαι*, 'I adorn myself, I put on clean clothes, or fine clothes.' It has also the signification of 'changing clothes,' and often simple 'dressing,' as to dress for a ball or party, etc. To me it seems related to the Sr. adj. *árya*, 'of a good family, apposite, proper:' unless it be rather connected with the root *urnu*, 'to cover, envelop, dress.' *Uryoipé*, 'raiment;' *uryanghiás tút*, 'thou hast dressed thyself.' Some Gypsies say *uryáva*, 'I dress.'

To DRINK—*piáva*; † Bor., *piyar*, *tapillar*.—Two Sr. roots exist, intimately related to each other, to which these Gypsy terms can be referred; namely, *pá* and *pí*, 'to drink, to nourish.' Borrow has *pita*,

* Armenian *toor*.—Tr.

† "*Napitel*, 'à boire'" (probably *tapilél*). Vaillant, p. 369. "*Tepau*, *piav*, *piave*, *pi*." Arndt, p. 391.

'drink,' related to the Sr. *p̄tta*, Lat. *potum*, Gr. *ποτὸν*. Slav. *pijú*, 'I drink.' *Piliás akhiá mol*, 'he drank that wine;' *án te piás*, 'bring (i. e. 'come'), let us drink;' *khandí mól piáva*, 'a little wine I drink.'

DRUNK, INTOXICATED—*mattó*; Bor., *mato*.—From the Sr. root *mad*, 'to be merry, intoxicated, excited, or mad,' part. *matta*, 'intoxicated.' We find this word in the Latin: Pliny calls the white vine (*Brionia alba*) *madon*, and Plautus the intoxicated *madulsa*; and although these terms are derived by the lexicographers from *mádeo*, still I think they should rather be referred to the Sr. *mad*. Gr. *μαρτα* and *μαρτη*, 'levity, folly,' properly originate from this Sr. root. *Mattó*, coming evidently from the Sr. *matta*, should be written with *tt*. *Mattó isi*, 'he is drunken,' pronounced in an abbreviated form *mattósi*.

To become **DRUNK**—*máttiováva*.—A compound verb, from *mattó*, 'drunken,' and *aváva*. The form is the usual mid. voice. *Mattilióm* (aor.), 'I became intoxicated;' *mattiovéna*, 'they became intoxicated.'

DRY, EMACIATED—*shukó*; Bor., *juco*, fem. *juqui*.—From the Sr. verbal root *gush*, 'to dry,' is formed the adj. *gushka*, 'dry, slim, emaciated.' Compare Slav. *suhii*, 'dry,' *súshka*, 'dry land,' in distinction from the sea; Lat. *siccus*. *Shukó manró*, 'dry bread,' denoting bread without any other food; *shukó manró na khalióla*, 'bread alone cannot be eaten;' *shukó manúsh*, 'an emaciated man;' *shuki romní*, 'a lean woman.'

To **DRY**—*shukiaráva*, *shúkiováva*.—Of these two terms, the former is transitive, 'to dry, to expose any thing to the sun or fire to be dried;' the latter is a middle verb, 'to become dry' (Gr. *στεγνόμεμαι*), as with other verbs of this formation (Section V). *Shukilióm*, 'I have become dry;' *kashukiovél* (fut.), 'he will be dried.'

DUNG—*goshnó*.—There seems to exist, in the first syllable of this term, the Sr. *go*, 'a cow;' compare modern Greek *βουτιά*, 'the dung of the bovine species,' to which may be referred another Gypsy term, *buñista*, 'dung.' *Goshné*, 'dungs,' corresponds to *κόπρος*, *κόπροι*, *κόπρανον*, *κόπρανα*, 'excrements.'

DOG—*chukél*; Br., *rikono*; Bor., *chuquel*.—For the explanation of *rikono*, see **WHELP**. The other two are perhaps from the Sr. *jukuța* and *jakuța*, 'dog.' *Kon diniás amaré chuklés?* 'who struck our dog?'

DWARFISH, SMALL—*khurdó*; Bor., *chirdó*.—Both these terms are referable to the Sr. *krit*, 'to cut off,' whence the Lat. *curtus*,† It. *corto*, Fr. *court*, Germ. *kurz*. Our *κυρτός*, which is of the same derivation with the Lat. *curtus*, signifies generally 'humpbacked.' I think also that our *κυρτός*, *κυρσίον*, *κυρτίς* are of the same origin. *Khurdó* is applied to a child at the breast, to a young man, etc. *Kaméla te pandrevél khurdó*, 'he wished to be married young' (*pandrevél* = *ἐπανδρεύομαι*); *khurdó chavó*, 'a young child;' *khurdé machorenghe*, 'to the small fish?' *khurdó* is properly 'small in body or mind.'

* Pott, under *groñi*, has "Poln. *gnoy*, Walach. *gunoin*, 'mist;' *gréngro gurum-niakro grojjo*, 'perde, kuhmist.'"

† Armenian *kodrodé*, by transposition of *r* and *d*.—Ta.

E.

EAR—*kann*; Br., *kana*; Bor., *cani*.—The Sr. *karna*, ‘ear.’

EARLY—*ráno*.—This is a Slavonic term, *ránv* (adv.), ‘early, very early.’

The Gr. ἄρῃσιος and ἄρῃσιος of the New Testament are always translated by this term. *Ráno ráno* is frequently to be heard in the mouth of the Gypsies. The Greeks often say in a similar way, *πρωὶ πρωὶ*, ‘very early.’ Turk. *chapúk chapúk*, ‘quickly.’ *Káde* (κάδε) *ráno*, ‘every morning.’

EARTH—*puv, phuv, pfuv*.^{*}—This is the Sr. *bhú*, ‘the earth.’ Many Gypsies pronounce it *bhu*, others *fu*. To the pronunciation of this word are applicable the observations which I have already made in the preceding Section (p. 162). *Puvéskeró*, ‘of the earth;’ *chin ti puv*, ‘to the ground.’

TO EAT—*kháva*.—This is the common Sr. root *khád*, ‘to eat.’ *Isi te khás manró khandí?* ‘can (lit. ‘is there’) I eat a little bread?’ *dikáva ka terés onghi te khas*, ‘I see that thou hast appetite (lit. ‘heart’) to eat;’ *shukó manró ná khalióla*, ‘dry bread is not to be eaten;’ *khalióla* is the mid. form of *khalióvava*. *Khasói*, ‘food,’ is applied to whatever is eaten with bread; Gr. ἄρτος, Turk. *katék*: *arakéla manró, khasói te khésa*, ‘there is found bread (and) food for thee to eat;’ *ta na khávas*, ‘and should I not eat;’ *khandí khásales*, ‘a little we eat (of) it;’ *te khén e chavé gudló tut*, ‘that the children may drink (lit. ‘eat’) sweet milk.’

EGG—*vanró*; Bor., *anró*.—The Sr. neuter noun *anḍa* means ‘an egg,’ also ‘a testicle.’ It has both these significations among the Gypsies. In this they have followed not only the usage of their mother tongue, but that of the Turks and Greeks: cf. Turk. *yumurta*, ‘an egg; a testicle;’ Gr. ἄνδρον (anc. ἄνδρ), ‘an egg, a testicle.’ The Gypsies of Turkey have added an initial *v* to their noun. This word I have sometimes heard pronounced *vantó*. The pronunciation of the dental consonant in it resembles that of *do* and *ro* in *mindó*, *minró*, ‘mine,’ of which we have already spoken in the former Section (p. 162).

EMACIATED—See DRY.

EMPTY—*chuchó*.—Referable to the Sr. adj. *tuchha*, ‘void, empty.’ It is often used by the Gypsies for ‘a dull man, an empty mind;’ compare Turk. *bosh*, ‘empty.’ The Greeks also, borrowing this Turkish term, say ἄνθρωπος μίσημιος, ‘a good-for-nothing man.’

EXCOMMUNICATION—*kalipé*.—This abstract noun is formed from *kaló*, ‘black,’ by the addition of the usual particle *pe*. I have noted the word merely to show its peculiar use among the Gypsies, and because of its interest as a religious term. Excommunication is frequently resorted to in order to induce thieves to give up stolen property; although but rarely in the case of Gypsy delinquents, on account of their irreligion.

EXTINGUISHER—*vréhtúla*.—This is a Greek term, βραχτοῦλα. By the Gypsy blacksmiths it is applied to small pieces of old straw carpet,

* “*Bhu, ebhu*, ‘terre.’” Vaillant, p. 33; “*pou*” do., p. 395; “*o bhu*, ‘la terre.’” do., p. 457. “*Pu, bu, pube, epebu*.” Arndt, p. 357.

soaked in water, which is then sprinkled over the charcoal fire, in order to extinguish it. This term is nowhere to be found in the dictionaries of our language, to my knowledge, although it is of a regular formation. It is in use among some of the Greek blacksmiths, but is principally to be heard among the Gypsies.

EYE—*yak*;* Br., *yaka*; Bor., *quia*.—The final *a* of Mr. Brown's form is the characteristic vowel of the plural. *Yak* is evidently from the Sr. *akshi*, *aksha*, 'eye,' which is cognate with the words used to denote 'eye' in many of the Indo-European languages. The Latin *oculus* implies an ancient form *ocus*, of which it is a diminutive. The Slavonic has preserved this unchanged, in *oko*, 'eye;' Germ. *auge*; Eng. *eye*. The initial *y* of this term is a euphonic prefix: so, in Greek, we say often *yéma* for *αἷμα*, 'blood.' *Mono yak*, 'my eye;' *perdilé me yaká*, 'my eyes were full (of tears);' *dikéla man to yaká*, 'he looked me in the eyes;' *bandáva me yaká*, 'I close my eyes.†

EYE-BROW—*pov*.—This may be referred to the Sr. *bhrá*, 'an eye-brow,' which appears in so many cognate languages, more or less altered: Zend *brvat*; Pers. *ibru*; Slav. *brov*; Gr. *ὄφρυς*; Eng. *brow*, etc. The rejection of the liquid *r*, when united to other consonants, is extremely common with the Gypsies (see Section IV). *Makavdé pová*, 'painted eye-brows.'

F.

TO FALL—*peráva*.—This is the Sr. *pat*, 'to move downwards, to fall, to descend.' Aor. *pelíom*, 'I have fallen.' It is a very common word among all the Gypsies. *O yek pelótar*, 'the one after falling;' *per te devléste*, 'fall on thy back' (lit. 'on thy God'); *piló* and *peló*, 'fallen;' *piló isóm*, 'I am fallen,' 'I fell.' The change of *t* to *r* we have noticed above.

FAT—*parvardó*.—From the Sr. root *vardh*, 'to increase,' with the prefix *pra* or *pari*; *pravridhá*, 'increased.' *Parvardó mas*, 'fat meat.'

FATHER—*dát*;‡ Br., *dat*; Bor., *bato*, *batu*.—*Dat* corresponds to the Sr. *táta*, *tata*, 'father,'§ while *bato*, *batu* probably come from the Sr. *pitá*, 'father,' which has correlatives in nearly all the ancient and modern European languages, modified according to the spirit of each language: Pers. *beder*, Gr. *πατήρ*, Lat. *pater*, Germ. *vater*, Eng. *father*. *Até isi tó dát?* 'is thy father here?' *lákoro dat*, 'her father;' *nró dát*, *tó dát*, 'my father, thy father.'

FATHER-IN-LAW—*shastró*, *sastró*.—

MOTHER-IN-LAW—*shasúí*, *sashúí*.—Both these terms may be easily connected with the well known Sr. words *gvaçura*, 'father-in-law,' and *gvaçru*, 'mother-in-law,' which have passed into the Latin *socerus* and Greek *ἐξυφός*: compare Germ. *schwäher* and *schwiegervater*.

* "*Jak*, 'œil.'" Vaillant, p. 359. "*Jakch*, 'auge.'" Arndt, p. 374.

† The Armenian *achk* is from the same root, accommodated to the favorite sounds of the language, which indulges freely in transposition of letters and interchange of similar sounds.—Tr.

‡ "*Tat*, 'pere.'" Vaillant, p. 481.

§ It is found in many languages, as Eng. *daddy*, Welsh *tad*, Irish *taid*, Russian *tatra*, etc.—Tr.

FEAR—*dar*; Bor., *dar*, *dal*.—

TO FEAR, to be AFRAID—*daráva*; Bor., *darabar*, *darapar*.—These definitions are all referable to the Sr. verbal root *dri*, *dar*, 'to respect, venerate, dread,' whence comes *dara*, 'fear, terror.'

FEVER—*trésca*.—This is a Bulgarian word for 'fever,' particularly the intermittent autumnal fever, so prevalent in the great valley of the Danube. It is related to the Slavonic *tryasú*, 'I shake, I move.' Both Greeks and Bulgarians, in speaking of intermittent fevers, give them this denomination. Gr. *ῥέγου* and *ῥεγουστω*. The Gypsies have followed the usage of their neighbors, and apply this word solely to intermittent fevers. Borrow's term for 'fever' we have already explained (see BATH).

FIG—*kheli*.—

FIG-TREE—*khelin*.—Of doubtful etymology. *Teréla te khelia*, 'it has also figs.'

FILE—*verni*.—Of origin unknown to me: pl. *vernía*. *Keténge kinghián oká verni?* 'for how much didst thou buy that file?' *jovénge*, 'for six' ('pieces of money' understood).*

TO FILL—*peráva*.—From the Sanskrit root *par*, *prí*, 'to fill.'

FINGER—*angúst*, *angrúst*; Br., *wass*; Bor., *angusti*.—See RING. Mr. Brown's *wass* is a mistake for 'hand.'

TO FINISH—*resáva*.—This is one of the many Gypsy words whose derivation is to me doubtful. The proper meaning of the word, as used by the Gypsies, is 'to finish business, work, a day's labor:' *resavghióm mi puti*, 'I have finished my business.' It is often used impersonally: as *reséla*, 'it is enough;' *reséla man, tut, les*, 'it is enough for me, thee, him;' *na reséla*, 'it is not enough.' It is used also in the sense of 'arriving, reaching:' *nasti resavghiómles*, 'I could not reach him;' *avdivés resavghióm*, 'today I have arrived;' *kamaresél?* 'will he arrive?'

FIRE—*yak*; † Br., *yak*; Bor., *yaque*.—This word, at first, might seem to be from the Turkish verb *yakmak*, 'to burn,' imp. *yak*, 'burn thou.' But it is my opinion that in the genuine Gypsy language we have no Turkish words. I am not unaware of the general corrupt use of Turkish words among the Gypsies, whether Christian or Moslem, as well as among uneducated Greeks and Armenians. But if the word be Turkish, how did the Gypsies of Spain get it unchanged? They have neither known the Turks, nor had their fathers, in passing through Europe, the slightest intercourse with them. I think, then, that this word *yak* is from the Sr. root *yaksh*, and its derivative and synonym *yaj*, both meaning 'to sacrifice, to offer in worship.' ‡ *Tebeshás bashé ti yak*, 'let us sit near the fire;' *murtaráva i yak*, 'I quench (lit. 'I murder') the fire;' *murtár i yak*, 'quench the fire.'

FIRST—*avkós*.—This word, which I translate 'first,' seems to be related to *atiá*, 'here,' with the particle *ka*, expressing presence, time. It

* Pott writes the word *yerni*, 'lima, file.'

† "Iag, 'feu'" Vaillant, p. 480. "Jag, jak, jago, 'fieber.'" Arndt, p. 357.

‡ See what has been already said respecting this word, in Section II (p. 156).

may be translated 'this one,' and, in an emphatic tone, 'the first.' There is some analogy between this Gypsy term and the Slavonic, which has made its number one 'edyn', from the Sr. *ádyo*, 'first, initial.' *Avkós anglé*, 'the foremost.'

FISH—*machó*; Br., *maichó*; Bor., *macho*.—This is the Sr. *matsya*, 'fish.' *Machoró*, 'a small fish;' *khurdé machorénghe lon chivéla*, 'to the small fish he throws salt;' *machéskoro*, 'a fisherman;' *londé maché*, 'salted fish.'

FIST—*domúk*; Br., *domuk*.—A term well known to all the Gypsies.

FLAX—*vus*.—This probably originates from the same root as *bus*, 'straw.'

While the one name was applied to straw, the other was given to flax. The Sr. has *busha* and *busa*, 'chaff.' It is well to remark that flax is a very important branch of trade with many Gypsies, in the neighborhood of populous cities.

FLEA—*pushúm*: pl. *pushumá*.—But *pushumá terávas akhiá ratt*, 'many fleas I had this night.'

FLOUR—*varó*; Bor., *roi*.—This term may be referred to the root *bhri*, 'to nourish, to cherish, to maintain;' *bhara*, 'one who cherishes, upholds, supports,' etc. *Sóske ná terávas varó*, 'because we had not flour;' *déman khandí varó*, 'give me a little flour.'

FLY—*makiá*; Bor., *macha*.—These terms are referable to the Sr. *makshiká*, 'a fly.' Bopp derives from this term the Latin *musca*, and the Old German *mucca*, 'a gnat, a mosquito.'

FOOL—*deniló*; Bor., *dinelo*, *ninelo*.—The Sr. adjective *dina* is defined 'poor, distressed, frightened.' By the addition of *lo* the Gypsies have formed this word, applied now to those who are either extravagant in their speech and actions, or suffering under alienation of mind. Here in Turkey, it is translated constantly by the Turkish *deli*, 'a fool,' Gr. *λωλός*, 'fool, lunatic.' The second word of Borrow has merely changed the initial *d* into *n*. Borrow, in the etymology of the word *dinelo*, gives the Pers. *diwanah* (*divane*), a word common also among the Turks. This has no connection with the above mentioned word, being from *div*, Sr. *deva*, 'a god,' by the addition of the usual Pers. suffix *áne*, meaning 'one in the power of a god or demon;' the *δαιμόνιος* of the Greek, the *δαιμονισμέρος* ('enraged') of the present Greeks. *Piliás akhiá mol ta deniló*, 'he drank that wine and (became) a fool,' i. e. 'was intoxicated.' From *deniló* is formed *denilónána*, 'I become a fool:' *méya pilióm ta denilióm*, 'I also drank and became a fool.'

FOOT—*piró*, *pindó*, *pinró*, *pinró*;* Br., *peera*; Bor., *pinro*, *pindro*.—The Sr. usually employs the words *pád* and *páda*, from the root *pad*, 'to go, to move,' whence our *πόδες*, *ποδός*, Lat. *pedis*.† The above Gypsy words have no relation to this Sr. root, but appear to come from the verb *par*, 'to pass, to traverse.' Of the four forms which I have given, the first appears to me to be most in use among all the Gypsies. Mr. Brown's *peera* is probably a plural form. *Pindó* is often pronounced *pinró*, like *mindó*, *minró*, 'mine' (see p. 162).

* " *Geroi, pir*, 'fuss.'" Arndt, p. 382.

† Armenian *vod*.—T.E.

Jáva ti Silivri grastésa, tá ná pindéntza, 'I go to Silivria with a horse (i. e. 'on horseback') and not with the feet' (i. e. 'on foot'); *me piré dukénaman*, 'my feet pain me?' *piripé*, 'gait,' applied particularly to the horse: *pirindós*, 'going on foot'; *pirindós kajés? kamajáv grastésa*, 'art thou going on foot? I shall go with a horse' (i. e. 'on horseback').

FOREIGN—*peryúl*.—This term seems to have originated from the Persian *perghiúl*, 'a stranger, a foreigner.' *Peryulicanó tan*, 'a foreign country' (lit. 'place').

FOREST—*vesh*.*—This is the Pers. *bishe*, 'a wood, a forest.' By some Gypsies it is used for 'mountain,' probably on account of the mountains of Roumelia being so thickly wooded.†

FORWARDS—*anglé*; Bor., *anglal*.—The Sr. adjective *agra*, 'chief, principal, first,' corresponds with *ἄριστος*, so often used by the Greek writers: *agre* is its locative case, frequently used as an adverb, signifying 'in front, in the forefront.' By the usual change of *r* into *l*, and by the interposition of a euphonic *n*, it has become *anglé*. Adj. *anglutnó*, 'the first, the one foremost.' *Anglé isás mindí*, 'formerly it was mine (mea);' *pó anglé*, 'still more forwards;' *anglál*, 'from the front' (Borrow's form): *anglál to kér*, 'from the front of the house,' or 'from the house in front;' *anglál mánde*, 'in front of me, before me;' *anglál to pashá*, 'before the pasha;' Gr. ἐνώπιον τοῦ πασῶ. This ablative form is now mostly used for *anglé*. *Anglál devléste*, or *anglál to devél*, 'before God, in the presence of God.'

FRIEND—*parnavó*.‡—This term is not very common among the Gypsies here. It is related to the Sr. root *pri*, 'to please, to delight, to be pleased or satisfied.' This root has given to the Gothic *frijô*, 'I love,' and *frijonds*, 'loving;' to the Slavonic *priyáte'ie*, 'loved, pleased;' to the Greek *φιλῶ*, *φίλος*. The participle *πρίνα*, 'pleased, satisfied,' may have given origin to this Gypsy term, by the addition of the final syllable *vo*, common in forming Gypsy adjectives. *Jáva ti pólin (πόλιν) te dikáv me parnavés*, 'I go to the city to see my friend;' *isí mó parnavó*, 'he is my friend;' *po lachés ta terésales parnavó*, 'it is better that thou shouldst have him a friend' (i. e. 'friendly'); *ta te penés sarné parnavénghe t' avén*, 'tell all the friends to come.' From this is formed the abstract *parnavoipé*, 'friendship;' *kér mánghe aká parnavoipé*, 'do me this friendship' (i. e. 'favor').

FROG—*zámpa*.—I do not know the derivation of this word, which, however, appears to me to be of Slavonic origin.

FROM—*katár*.—Ablative part. *tar*. From the rel. pronoun *kón*. *Katár ti hindovi*, 'from India;' *katár ti pólin (πόλιν) aváva*, 'from the city I come;' *katár to sastó*, 'from the right' (i. e. 'side'); *katár ti drák keréna mol*, 'from the grape they make wine.'

* "Vesh, 'forét.'" Vaillant, p. 457.

† Pott writes the word *weesh*, *vesz*, *wash*, more in harmony with *bishe*. I have heard the word pronounced *vest*, though rarely.

‡ "Trei, 'pries' ang paní om. 'je suis votre ami, votre frère.'" Vaillant, p. 391. This is extremely corrupt. It should probably stand thus: *tiró pries'som, pral som*.

FULL—*perdó*; **BOR.**, *perdó*.—From the Sr. root *prî*, ‘to fill,’ is formed the participle *pârta*, ‘full, filled, complete.’ There is a striking resemblance between the Spanish and Turkish Gypsy words, whenever they can be traced to their proper Sr. root.

TO BECOME FULL—*pértiováva*.—A compound verb, of the mid. voice, composed of *perdó*, ‘full,’ and *aváva*, ‘I come.’ *Perdilé me yaká*, ‘my eyes have become full (of tears);’ Greek *γερμαζουμαι*, from *γέμω*, ‘I fill.’

G.

GAIT—*piripé*.—From *piró*, ‘a foot,’ by the addition of the particle *pe*. It is applied to horses and donkeys, especially to the former, which are valued according to the smoothness of their gait, so much esteemed by the Turks. *Piripé* is mostly applied to that pace of the horse called amble; Pers. *rahvan*, ‘easily moving on a road.’ *Piripé teréla? teréla*, ‘has it a good gait? it has;’ *amaré grastéskoro piripé nanái lachó*, ‘our horse’s gait is not good.’

GARLIC—*sir*; **BOR.**, *sar*.—This word is probably of Persian origin, from *sir*, ‘garlic, allium.’ The present Hindustani word is *seer*, ‘garlic,’ as given by Borrow in his vocabulary.

GIRDLE—*kiustik*.—This is a Persian word, *kiustek*, meaning generally ‘the fetters put to the feet of horses,’ as in the stables of the East. *Kiustek*, as it signifies ‘something that binds, a tie,’ has been applied by the Gypsies to the girdle, as a fastening.

GIRL—See **BOY**.

TO GIVE—*dáva*; **BOR.**, *dinar*.—This is evidently from the Sr. *dâ*,* ‘to give,’ which is extremely common in all the Indo-European languages, ancient and modern. This verb is irregular in its conjugation: imp. *dé*, ‘give thou;’ *déman*, ‘give to me;’ aor. *dinióm*, ‘I gave,’ which approaches more nearly to Borrow’s form. *Dáva* has also another signification, ‘to beat, to strike, to knock,’ extremely common among all the Gypsies, taken probably from the colloquial usages of the Greeks. *Kón déla o vutár?* ‘who knocks at the door?’ instead of *maréla*, ‘strikes;’ *diniómles tí pak*, ‘I struck it on the wing;’ *diniás e castésa amaré chuklés*, ‘he struck with a stick (i. e. ‘wood’) our dog;’ *o manísh diniáspes e yek barésa*, ‘the man was struck with a stone;’ *kon diniás te romniú?* ‘who struck thy wife?’ *Dinó*, part., ‘given, struck, flogged.’

TO GO—*jáva*.—This verb I refer to the Sr. *gá*, ‘to go, to move.’ It is universal among the Gypsies, and used as the Greeks use their *πάγω*, and the Turks *gitmek*. Aorist, *ghelióm*, ‘I went,’ pronounced at times *gherghióm*: *kárin kajés*, or *kamajés?* ‘where wilt thou go?’ *ghelióm tó gáv*, ‘I went to the village;’ *gheló avrí*, ‘he went out;’ *jéla po górkes*, ‘he goes worse;’ *jél’ avéla*, ‘he goes (and) comes;’ Gr. *ἰπταται ἔρχεται*, Turk. *ghidér ghelír*, meaning to go continually to and fro. At times *jáva* is used in a transitive sense: *gherghióm giv tó vasiáv*, ‘I went (i. e. ‘I carried’) wheat to the mill;’ *ghelián tí pólin* (πόλις)? *ghelióm*, ‘didst thou go to the city? I went;’ *jáva te dikáv*, ‘I go to see.’

* Armenian *dal*.—Tr.

To go out—niglaváva.—A compound verb, formed of the Sr. root *kram*, 'to go, to walk, to step,' joined to *nir*, 'out.' Aor. *niglistinióm* and *niglistilióm*, 'I went out.' The Sr. *kram* is a favorite word with the Gypsies, and, joined to prepositions, it is frequently to be heard among them. *Niglistinióm avri*, 'I went out,' Gr. ἐξβαίρω ἔξω; *kamaniglaváv*, 'I shall go out,' imp. *niglav*, 'go thou out.'

GOD—devél;* Br., *devél*; Bor., *debél, ostebel, umdebel*.—These terms have a striking similarity, and are derived from the Sr. *deva*, 'a god,' Lat. *deus*, Gr. θεός. In regard to the first syllables of Borrow's terms, *os-debel* and *um-debel*, I think they are Spanish articles. He says that the *um* of the third word is probably (the *óm*) the ineffable and mysterious name of the Hindu Godhead. Mr. Borrow remarks in his glossary that the word was pronounced by a christian Gypsy *o-del, o-dand*, and *o-devel*. The *o* in this case is the Greek article, which the Moslem Gypsies generally reject. In this, the Gypsies have imitated the Greeks, who never pronounce the name of God without the article, ὁ θεός. This term, among the Gypsies, when used as an invocation, admits the pronoun at the end of the word, contrary to the general usages of their language: *devlám*, 'my God,' more usually they say *madél, mo devél*. *Dúk e devlés*, 'love God?' *devlés* instead of *devlés*, a clipped form of the acc. of nouns in *el*. *Achéu devlésa*, 'rest ye with God,' a common form of salutation; *ja devlésa*, 'go thou with God.' There is a peculiar use of this term which has always appeared to me very curious: *pehióm opré me devléste*, 'I fell upon my back' (lit. 'upon my God'); *per te devléste*, 'fall on thy back'; *per devlikanés*, 'fall on thy back.' *Devlikanó*, adj., 'godly,' Lat. *divinus*: *devlikanó manúsh*, 'a godly man'; *devlikani romni*, 'a godly woman.'

GOOD—lachó; Br., *lachó*; Bor., *lachó, fendó*.—The origin of this word is quite unknown to me. It is extremely common among all the Gypsies, and well known in Roumelia and Wallachia. *Lachó divés*, 'good day, good morning'; *lachó manúsh*, 'a good man'; *lachi romni*, 'a good woman'; *lache romnia*, 'good women'; *lachó mas*, 'good meat'; *lachó grast*, 'good horse'; *lachsés*, adv., 'well'; *po lachsés*, 'better.' The Moslem Gypsies make use of Turk. *dahi*, 'more,' to form the comparative degree (Section V): *dahi lachsés*, 'better.'

GOLD—sornakái, gálpea; Bor., *sonacai*.—*Gálpea* I cannot explain. The Sr. *kanaka*, 'gold,' to which Borrow refers, appears to me an improbable, not to say an impossible, derivation. The derivation of *sornakái* may be sought in the Sr. word *sánasi*, 'gold.'

GOULD—dudúm.†—This term is applied to all the species of this plant, common in these countries, and very generally used by all classes of people. The only Sr. word with which I am able to compare it is *dudruma*, 'a green onion.' As to the rejection of the liquid *r*, we have occasion to note numerous examples of it in the course of the Vocabulary.

GRAIN, WHEAT—giv, iv; Bor., *gi, guy, jil*.—These terms, and our σίτος, 'wheat, corn,' I refer to the Sr. *sítá* and *sítya*, both having the signifi-

* "O dél, 'le dieu,'" Vaillant, p. 457. "Devél." Arndt, p. 174.

† Armenian *tutum*, 'squash, vegetable, marrow.'—Tr.

cation of the above. *Sitá* also denotes 'the furrow made by the plow,' as well as 'the goddess of fruits;' *sitya*, 'grain,' and, in general, 'every kind of cereal product,' and 'rice.' The Gypsy forms are made by cutting off the final syllable *ta*, which the Greek has preserved. The Slavonic, which has preserved many archetypal Sanskrit words in their utmost purity, has *zito* and *zeta*, signifying 'all kinds of cereal products.' This term is very frequently pronounced *iv*.

GRAPE—*drak*; Bor., *dracay*, *traquias*, *mollati*.—These are evidently derived from the Sr. *drákshá*, 'grape.' The third word of Borrow I refer to *mol*, 'wine.' Though this term, *molati*, is unknown to the Gypsies near Constantinople, Vaillant has marked it as common among those on the banks of the Danube, writing it *moleti*. The Sr. word is *madhutá*, 'sweetness,' not found, however, in the great dictionary of Wilson. *Draká laché isi*, 'the grapes are good;' *keréla drak*, 'it makes (i. e. 'produces') grape' ('grapes'); *i drak khénala*, 'the grape (grapes), they eat them;' *katár i drak keréna mol*, 'from the grapes they make wine.'

GRASS—*char*; Bor., *char*.—

To GRAZE—*charáva*.—The Sr. verb *char*, 'to go, to eat,' is applied also to the grazing of cattle. The Gypsy word *char* is applied principally to hay, and the verb itself to the feeding of animals, by hay or other vegetable substances; it corresponds to the Greek *χοιτάζειν*, which at first was applied to feeding animals with hay (*χόσιος*), and by degrees came to mean also the taking of food by man; hence our *χοιταλνο*, 'I am satiated.' Borrow defines *char* as 'grass, yerba.'

GREAT—*baró*.—This adjective seems to be related to the Sr. *bhara*, 'much, excessive.' *Mo kér isi baró*, 'my house is great;' *baró manúsh*, 'a great man.'

GREEK—*balamó*; Bor., *paillo*.—These two terms, which appear to be related, I am totally unable to explain. It is extremely difficult to give plausible explanations of all the terms which the Gypsies have given to the neighboring nations. Here in Turkey, with the exception of a few names, which I have noted in the Vocabulary as peculiar to them, they use the same terms as the Greeks and Turks. Pl. *balamé*, 'Greeks;' *balamanó gáv*, 'a Greek village;' *balamni*, 'a Greek woman;' pl. *balamnia*; *balamanés*, adv. form, i. q. *Γραικιστί*: *balamanés janés?* 'dost thou know Greek?'

To GRIND—*pisháva*.—From the Sr. verbal root *pish*, 'to grind, to pound, to bruise, to powder,' Lat. *pinsere*. With the Gypsies this word is used merely for grinding corn in mills, or between two large circular stones. *Giv gherghióm to vasiáv, kamapishávles*, 'wheat I have carried to the mill; I shall grind it.'

GUARD—*arakáv*; Bor., *aracate*.—

To GUARD—*arakáva*; Bor., *aracatear*.—Both these terms can with perfect propriety be referred to the Sr. root *raksh*, 'to guard, to protect.' The initial *a*, so constant in all these forms, may be explained as an inorganic prefix. It may be, however, that the *a* is the remnant of a preposition. The Gypsies have dropped the final sibilant of the Sr. root, a proceeding upon which we shall have occasion to remark in the next Section. This term has often the signification of

'waiting.' *Ta arakavél khandi divés*, 'to wait a few days'—*arakavél* is here in the middle voice; *arakiována, arakavghíóm*, 'I have guarded;' *arakáv*, 'wait thou.'

Gypsy—*róm*.—All the various denominations for this strange race common among foreigners are to the Gypsies themselves totally unknown. It is still more to be wondered at that foreigners should never have adopted the appellation by which they call themselves, and which is common to them wherever they live, whether in Asia or Europe. Before I proceed to the explanation of this term, I will give the various names by which they are known among foreigners in various parts of the world.* The German *zigeuner*, Russian *zigari, zigani*, Persian and Turkish *zengi* and *chingené*, and *ἀποτγγανοί* of the Greeks,† seem to come from one and the same original, which Borrow makes to be "*zincali*, the black men of Zend or Ind:" a derivation of no value. Another class of words seem to belong to the term *ἀγύπτιος*, 'Egyptian,' they having been formerly supposed to originate from Egypt. This word has been corrupted by us into *γύπται, γύφται*, a term which we now very frequently apply to dirty and ragged people. The Bulgarians call them *gupti*, the Spaniards *gitanos* (properly *gipitanos*), and their haunts in the cities of Spain *gitaneria*. The English *gypsy* is from the same root. The Greeks also have another term, *κατζίβελος*, more in use in Roumelia. The French call them *Bohémiens*, probably from their having come to France from Bohemia, as they also have been called Germans and Flemish from their coming from those countries. All these terms are known to the Gypsies, but are never used by them; never will a Gypsy call a fellow-countryman *ἀποτγγανόν* or *κατζίβελόν*; here, as in other parts of the world, they scrupulously avoid all the usual foreign terms. The derivation of the Turkish *chingené* and its correspondents in other languages is still a desideratum, and probably much time will pass before its etymology will be fully explained.

As to the term *rom*, it has a double signification—being used for man in general, and likewise for a man of their own race as distinct from one of other descent; *romní*, in like manner, means 'woman.' *Róm* is also used for 'husband,' and *romní* for 'wife.' *Romanó* (fem. *romaní*) is the adjective form. This term, it appears to me, can be referred to the Sr. *râma*, a name of the god Vishnu, and of three of his incarnations. By the Gypsies it may have been given to their tribe as worshipping in an especial manner this god. *Kárin ísi to rom?* 'where is thy husband?' *chori romní*, 'a poor woman;' *lachí romní*, 'a good woman;' *sávore o róm*, 'all the men;' *romaní chap*, 'the Gypsy language;' *kón diviás amaré romá*, 'who struck our men?' *i romní léskeri íst phuri*, 'his wife is old;' *me praléskero romní*, 'my

* Vaillant (p. 4) gives sixty-eight various denominations of these people, which are mostly varieties of those which I note.

† Alessio da Somavera, who published his "Tesoro della Lingua Greca Volgare" in Paris, 1709, gives the following terms, which are still in use: *ἀτζιγκάνα*, 'zingana, zingara;' *ἀτζιγκαπαρίν*, 'bottega di zingano;' *ἀτζιγκανίζω, ἀτζιγκαπεύω, ἀτζιγκανώνω*, 'zinganare;' *ἀτζιγκάνικα*, 'da zingano;' *ἀτζιγκανόπουλον*, 'zingarino;' *ἀτζιγκανός*, 'zingano, zingaro.'

brother's wife;' *e yavrésoro romni*, 'the wife of the other;' *o dát romniákori*, 'the father of the wife' (i. e. 'father-in-law'); *dikáva e romés*, 'I see the man;' *romanó lát*, 'a Gypsy word:' pl. *romá* 'men;' *romnia* 'women;' *khorakhanó róm*, 'a Moslem Gypsy;' *balamánó róm*, 'a Greek Gypsy.'

The Gypsies themselves call *malkóch* a tribe of their own countrymen, who continually roam from village to village, particularly in Asia, working in brass and iron, and who, on the score of religion, are always of the profession of the village where for the time they work. Should a child be born whilst in a Greek village, it is baptized, and in the next circumcised. They travel to Jerusalem, and there become *hadjis*, 'pilgrims.' They are industrious, and are considered by their fellow-countrymen as wealthy. I have never been able to ascertain any other denominations peculiar to their tribes, though I have repeatedly questioned Gypsies from various parts of Turkey.

GYPSY TENT—*katúna*.—This term is applied by the Gypsies in general to the black and dirty tents used by their nomadic fellow-countrymen in their roaming expeditions. They bear no resemblance to the ordinary tents used by Mohammedans in their wars or military expeditions. These Gypsy tents are formed by a pole raised from the ground, of rather more than the height of a man, and supported at its two ends by other poles. Over this horizontal pole is thrown the covering, blacked by the soot and smoke of the fires, and under this frail covering squat the family, with a host of naked and loathsome offspring. So frail and light is this tent, that many of them are placed upon a single horse, and so transported from place to place. *Katúna* has no relation to any of the terms for 'tent' belonging to the countries in which the Gypsies live. I refer it to the Sr. *kañin*, 'matted, screened,' from *kata*, 'a mat, a twist of straw or grass,' 'a screen of the same.' Pl. *katunés*. *Katunénggoro róm*, 'a Gypsy of the tents,' as distinguished from those living in villages and never roaming; *katunéngheri romni*, 'a Gypsy woman of the tents.'

II.

HABITATION—*bashipé*; Bor., *bestipén*.—

TO INHABIT—*basháva*; Bor., *bestelar*.—These words are doubtless connected with the Sr. roots *vas*, 'to dwell, to inhabit,' and *viç*, 'to enter, to settle, to sit.' *Bistó som*, 'I am sitting.' *Bashipé* is from this verb, by the change of *i* into *a*, and the addition of the usual particle *pé*, which we have already explained. *Kamabeshés otiá but divés?* 'wilt thou stay there many days?' *bashéla bashé mánde*, 'he resides near me.' Borrow defines *bestipén* as meaning 'wealth, riches.' Let the reader remember that the Latin *possideo*, 'to possess,' and *possessio*, express the idea of 'sitting, residing upon' what is our own, and, in course of time, the property itself. So that we can with perfect propriety translate *bestipén* 'possession.'

HAIL—*kukudi*.—This is a Greek term, *κωνκοτίδιον*, diminutive form of *κόκκος*, 'a grain, any small body.' It is applied by the Greeks to small pustules on the human body, and to the kernels of fruits; Lat.

- acinus*. In this latter case, the word is written *κοίκοιτιζον* and *κοι-κοιτιζιον*. The Gypsies accent this word on the final syllable, differing much from the universal pronunciation of the Greeks themselves.*
- HAIR**—*bal*; Br., *bala*; Bor., *bal*.—The Sr. *bála*, to which I have referred in speaking of **FOOT**, is applied by the Gypsies exclusively to the hair of the head. Compare the Lat. *pilus*, Fr. *poil*.† *Pakó isí, ná teréla bál*, ‘he is bald, (and) has no hair:’ plur. *balá*, rarely used; Mr. BROWN’S word is in the plur. form.
- HALF**—*yekpásh*; Bor., *pas, pasque, majara*.—My own term for ‘half’ is a compound, having the well known Sr. numeral *eka*, ‘one,’ prefixed to a word corresponding to Borrow’s *pas*. The latter part may be referred to the Sr. *paksha*, ‘a side, a half.’ The Gypsies of Turkey, unlike those of Spain, constantly join it with *yék*, ‘one,’ like the English ‘one half, a half.’ It is found in the terms *yekpasharátti*, ‘midnight,’ *yekpashdivés*, ‘noon.’ The third term given by Borrow is related to Sr. *madhya*, ‘middle.’
- HAMMER**—*sivri*; Br., *sivree*; Bor., *casto*.—The etymology of this term is unknown to me. *Casto* appears to be from the Sr. *kash*, ‘to strike, to torment,’ part. *kashá*, ‘the striker, the instrument of striking.’
- HAND**—*vást*;‡ Br., *domuk*; Bor., *chova, bas* (plur. *bastes*).—The Sr. *hasta* signifies ‘hand.’ Borrow explains *chova* as derived from *char-pata*, ‘the palm with the fingers open.’ This explanation is extremely improbable. *Bas, bastes*, are evidently related to the above Sr. *hasta*, and not, as Borrow indicates, to the Persian *bazu*, as that is from the Sr. *báhu*, ‘arm.’ Mr. Brown’s term, *domuk*, is ‘fist.’ *Té shukiovél mó vást*, ‘let my hand become dry’ (i. e. ‘paralyzed’); *bi-vásténggoro*, ‘without hands’ (i. e. ‘workmen’).
- HANDFUL**—*burnék*.—This appears to be the Persian *burnuk*, or *burenk*, ‘res acquisita, reposita, thesaurus’ (Vullers, Lex. Pers.). It is a very common term among the Gypsies.
- HARE**—*shoshói*.—Sr. *çaga*. ‘a hare, a rabbit.’ This is one of the many words which the Gypsies have inherited directly from their Hindu ancestors, and has no connection with the names generally given to this animal by the other Indo-European nations.
- HARLOT**—*lubní, nublí*; Br., *lobnee*; Bor., *lumi, lumiaka*.—The Sr. adjective *lobhiní*, from *lobha*, ‘appetite, lust, desire,’ signifies ‘the desirer, the enamored,’ and generally, ‘one given to illicit passions.’
- TO HAVE**—*teráva*; Bor., *terelar*.—Following the analogy of formation of Gypsy verbs, it is most natural to refer this word to the Sr. verbal root *tri* or *tar*, ‘to pass over, to cross,’ also ‘to prevail over, to preserve.’ Its signification, however, connects it rather with *dhrí, dhar*, ‘to hold, to keep.’ *O devél teréla lénke*, ‘God has (i. e. ‘care’) of them;’ from the Greek *ἔχει δ’ αὐτοῦς*, i. e. *φρονιζει*; *teráva te penáv*

* The Armenian word *gargood* is nearer this Gypsy sound of *kukudí*, and all these forms probably have a Sanskrit origin. The Greek words introduced into the Armenian are but slightly changed except in the gutturals.—Tz.

† It is a singular coincidence that the Armenian word *hair* is, in orthography and pronunciation, precisely the English word *hair*.—Tz.

‡ “*Wast, was, hand.*” Arndt, p. 382.

túke, 'I have (i. e. 'I intend') to speak to thee;' *teráva dúi chavén*, 'I have two children;' *teráva yék grást*, 'I have a horse.'

HEAD—*sheró*, *shoró*; * Bor., *joro*.—I refer these words to the Sr. *çiras*, 'head.' *Mé sheréste*, 'in my head' (i. e. 'mind'); *továva mó shoró*, 'I wash my head;' *gheraló shoró*, 'a scabby head.'

HEALTHY—*shastó*; Br., *sastó*.—I refer this word to the vulgar Sr. *çasta*, 'fortunate, commendable, excellent.' part. of the verbal root *ças*, 'to bless, to wish good to, to confer a benediction.' It is very natural to pass from this meaning to that of health. To many Gypsies the term is unknown, and in its stead they use the Turkish *sağh*, 'healthy, strong, entire.' *Shastó manúsh*, 'a robust man;' but *shastó*, 'very healthy.' *Shasto* means also 'the right hand,' precisely as the Turks use the above *sağh* for 'the right side:' *katakó shastó teréla vés te rúk*, 'on the right it has a mountain and trees.'

TO HEAR—*shunáva*; Bor., *junar*.—From the Sr. root *çru*, 'to hear,' present *çriçnomi*, which has been changed by the Gypsies into *shunáva*, by throwing out the semivowel *r* of the root. A similar example of the rejection of *r* we shall presently see in *shingh*, 'horn.' Aor. *shunghióm*, 'I have heard:' *shunghióm tí pólin (πόλιν) kamajés*, 'I have heard that thou wilt go to the city;' *té ná shunél*, *só té penén léske*, 'and not to hear what they may say to him;' *na shunél*, 'he does not hear' (i. e. 'he is deaf').

HEART—*oghi*, *onghi*.—For want of a better derivation, I am inclined to refer this Gypsy term to the Sr. *anga*, 'a limb, member.' *Kaméla m' oghi te lav*, 'my heart desires to take;' *dikáva ká terésa oghi te khás*, 'I see that thou hast heart (i. e. 'appetite') to eat;' *oghéske*, 'for the soul,' i. e. 'alms,' also 'religious austerities for the salvation of the soul.'

HEAT—*tattipé*.—Formed from the adjective *tattó*, 'warm,' Sr. *tapta*, by the addition of the usual particle *pe*. In the place of this word I have frequently heard *tabioipé*, from the same Sr. root *tap*, 'to heat.'

HEAVY—*baró*.—We shall have occasion to notice a similar word, in speaking of STONE. The Sr. *bhára*, 'burden, weight' (Gr. βάρος), has in this term been changed into an adjective by the Gypsies.

HEEL—*kfúr*, *khúr*.—This belongs to the Sr. *khura*, 'a hoof, a horse's hoof, the foot of a bedstead;' with no other Sr. term can it be so reasonably identified. The pronunciation is very peculiar, nor do the above consonants accurately indicate it.

HEN—*kainí*, *kagni*, *kainá*; Br., *kahnee*; Bor., *cani*.—I derive this term from the Sr. *hansa*, 'goose,' fem. *hansi*, whence our *çín*, cutting off the final *s*, Eng. *goose*, Lat. *anser*, cutting off the initial consonant, Germ. *gans* and *hahn*, Slav. *gus'* and *gonsi*. Another Gypsy term, *gustó*, 'goose,' referred to by Borrow, confirms this derivation. A Gypsy woman told me that *kainá* means 'hen,' and *papína*, 'goose.' But I suspect that the latter is our common *πάπια*, 'a duck.' †

HERE—*até*, *avatiá*.—The relation of these terms to the Sr. is not perfectly clear. *Até* may be related to *atro*, 'in this place, here,' which,

* "*Scheró*, *tscheró*, *cheru*, 'kopf.'" Aindt, p. 382.

† Geese in Rumania are an article of extensive traffic with the Gypsies.

like many other Sr. words, in passing into the Gypsy idiom, has dropped its *r* (Section IV). The second term, also a common one, may have been formed in a manner similar to *divés, avdivés*; it is more emphatic. Zend. *avadha*, 'here,' from the Sr. *ava*, is probably intimately related to *avatiá*. *Até isi tó dát?* 'is thy father here?' *na isómos até*, 'I was not here.' *Attár*, 'from here,' *ἔδώθην*, is a corruption of *atiatár*, or *atetár*:—*tár* is the usual particle forming the ablative cases of Gypsy nouns, the Gr. *θεν*; see Grammar, Section V.

TO HOLD—*astaráva*.—This verb I refer to the Sr. root *stri*, 'to spread, to strew.' The initial *a* of the Gypsy verb is an addition often observed in Gypsy words, and common also to the Turks, who can never pronounce a word beginning with *st* without adding a vowel.* *As-tardó*, 'held, seized;' *astardiló*, 'he was taken;' *nasti astarghiómles*, 'I could not seize him;' *kána astarghiánles?* 'where didst thou take it?'

HOLE—*kháv*.—We have already explained the verb *khatára*, 'to dig.' From the same Sr. root *khan* comes *khani*, 'a mine;' it is applied however to whatever is dug, or excavated. *Kháv* has been formed by the change of the final *n* into *v*.

HONEY—*avghín*.—This appears to be a Persian word, *abgin*, 'a bee,' and *abgin khané*, 'apiarium, alveare' (Vullers, Lex. Pers.). It is singular that the Gypsies should have abandoned the ordinary Sr. *madhu*, 'honey,' and adopted this new and foreign term.

HORN—*shingh*; Bor., *singe, sungalo*.—Comp. the Sr. *çringa*, 'a horn.' The Gypsies have rejected the liquid *r* in many syllables containing it. The pronunciation of this liquid, in many cases, resembles that of the French at Paris, where the *r* is often a dead letter to a foreign ear, and at times appears like a liquid *l*. Borrow defines *sungalo* 'a he-goat,' evidently analogous to the Sr. *çringina*, 'a ram,' literally 'horned.'

HORSE—*grást*; † Br., *gras*; Bor., *gras, gra*.—

MARE—*grastni*; Br., *grasnee*; Bor., *grani*.—These terms I derive from the Sr. verbal root *gras*, 'to eat, to feed.' This conjecture of mine may be confirmed by an example from the Greek—*φορβύς*, 'mare, cow,' from *φείβω*, 'to nourish, to feed, to graze.' For the formation of the fem. *grastni* by the suffix *ni*, see Section V. *Lachó grást*, 'a good horse;' *aklé grástésa allían?* *aklésa*, 'with that horse didst thou come? with that (horse)'; *lachó grást isi*, 'it is a good horse;' *teréla deshé grastén*, 'he has (i. e. 'owns') ten horses.' *Grástéskoro*, 'of the horse,' or 'horseman,' also *grastanó*, *ἵππικὸς*, *grái* among the Wallachian Gypsies; *grastoró*, 'a small horse.' The reader, in perusing my remarks on the formation of feminine nouns (Section V), will be convinced of the correctness of writing this word with a final *t*, which has been omitted in both Mr. Brown's and Mr. Borrow's terms.

HOUSE—*ker*; † Br., *kerr*; Bor., *quer*.—This term may be related to the Sr. *agára* or *ágára*, 'house, residence.' The change of *gh* to *k* is confirmed by *agosto*, changed to *querosto*, 'the month of August' (Bor.).

* See the definition of number six.

† "Grei, 'cheval.'" Vaillant, p. 363.

‡ "Ker, 'maison.'" Vaillant, p. 363.

Keráva nevó kër, 'I am making a new house;' *ich isómas mé pralés-koro keréste*, 'yesterday I was in my brother's house;' *tó tát tó kër isi?* 'is thy father in the house?' *baró kër*, 'a large house;' *tapiló o kër*, 'the house was burnt;' *mó kër isi baró*, 'my house is large;' *mokavdó kër*, 'painted house;' *kaléskoro isi o ker?* 'whose is the house?' *mé praléskoro kër*, 'the house of my brother;' *isóm tó kër*, 'I am in the house,' or *keréste*, 'in the house.'

HOW MANY—*kebór*.—*Kebór chavén terésa?* 'how many children hast thou?'

HOW MUCH—*keti*.—Compare Sr. *kati*, 'how many, how much,' a word related to *ka*, the interrogative pronoun. This term has the same uses and significations as the Sr. term. *Keti divés terésa trésca?* 'how many days hast thou the intermittent fever?' *keti isánas sáv-vore?* 'how many were you all?' *keti bérsk kerghián tó rashái?* 'how many years didst thou make with the teacher' (i. e. 'pass in school')? *keti chavén teréla?* 'how many children has he' (or 'she')? *keti ber-shénggoro isi*, 'how old is he' (i. e. 'of how many years')? *keti lové dinían?* 'how much money didst thou give?' This word is often used in the quantitative case; as *keténghe liliánles?* 'for how much didst thou take (i. e. 'buy') it?' *bishénghe*, 'for twenty.'

TO BE HUNGRY—*bokáliováva*.—Compare the Sr. verb *bhuj*, 'to eat, to enjoy,' *bubhukshu*, 'wishing to eat, hungry.' *Bokaló*, 'hungry:' *bokaló isóm*, 'I am hungry.' The verb is formed from this adjective and the verb *aváva*, and is in constant use in this form. *Te bokalí-vela arakéla manró*, 'and should he be hungry, he finds bread.'

I.

TO INCREASE—*bariováva*.—A verb in the mid. voice, from *baró*, 'great,' and *aváva*. *Só keréna te chavén? bariovávales*, 'how are thy children? I am increasing them' (i. e. 'I am rearing them'); *barióna o rúk*, 'the trees grow' (i. e. 'increase').

INFANT, YOUNG—*tiknó*.—This term is used often, like *chavó*, 'a child,' and *rakló*, 'a young one.' *Keti tiknén teréla?* 'how many children has he' (or 'she')? *tá e tikné isi melalé*, 'and the children are dirty:' here the word is used without reference to a mother or a father. *Penghiás yek tiknés*, 'she begat a young one;' in the same manner a Greek may say *ἐγέννησε ἕνα μικρόν*. *Muló o yek tiknó*, 'the one child died;' *achilé o dúi*, 'the two remained.' Fem. *tikní*: *tiknía terésa?* 'hast thou female children?'

TO INHABIT—See HABITATION.

INVALID—*naisváli*; Br., *nashvalli*; Bor., *merdo*.—The first two terms are composed of the negative *na* and *vali*, the meaning of which we shall examine. The *s* is euphonic. The Sr. *bala* means 'power, strength, an army;' compare also the Slav. *velii*, and *velikie*, 'strong, powerful.' The etymology of this term is elucidated by the Lat. *debilis*, 'invalid,' formed by the neg. *de* and the word *bala*, 'strength.' Borrow's word, *merdo*, is from the Sr. part. *mṛita*, 'dead, mortal:' among the Gypsies, as with us in the term *ματαιόμενος*, it means 'emaciated, wasting.' Our *ἀσθενής* and *ἀσθενής*, and the Slav. *ne-mozénie*, from the neg. *ne* and *mogú*, 'to be strong,' have the same

formation with the Gypsy *naisváli*. Mr. Brown's term should be written with one *l*. To many Gypsies this term is totally unknown, and in its stead they use *namporemé*, a Greek word, composed of the neg. *na* and *ἐμπορῶ*, 'I can, I am able.' *Nampórema*, 'sickness' (*δὲν ἐμπορῶ*, 'I am unwell'). They have adopted the word from the Greeks, using *ἀνεμπορῶν*, instead of *ἀσθένεια*. Such incongruous combinations of terms from different languages, often remarked even in cultivated European languages, are entirely excusable among the ignorant Gypsies. *Me isómas namporemé*, 'I was sick.'

IRON—*shastír, shastrí*; Br., *sastír*; Bor., *sas*.—The Sr. *çastra* signifies 'a weapon made of iron,' and 'iron' itself; it is from the root *ças*, 'to wound, to kill.' *Keréla shastír*, 'he makes (i. e. 'he works') iron'; *shastiréskoro*, 'a worker in iron'; *to shastír*, 'in iron' (i. e. 'in prison').

ITCH—*ghér*; Bor., *guel*.—

ITCHY—*gheraló*.—The Sr. noun *gara* is 'poisonous drink, a poison, sickness, disease'; *garala*, from the same root, is 'venom' in general, and appears to have given origin to *gheraló*. In the word given by Borrow, *guel*, we observe the transmutation of the liquid *r* into *l*. That this general name should have been applied by the Gypsies to a special disease, naturally affords a presumption that the disease was a common one among them, or among the people with whom they had intercourse. Such is the case with the Gypsies, and with the common people of the countries where they have passed, or among whom they have settled. Vermin, scabby heads, loathsome rashes, and the itch, are the usual companions of poverty, filth, and ignorance. It is no wonder, then, that they should have applied the term 'poison' to this particular disease. It is well to remark that the common people of the East, like other people of similar education elsewhere, attribute most of their diseases to internal poisoning, remnants of former medical theories. Borrow defines *garipé*, another similar word, as meaning 'scab.' In this sense *gheraló* is used by some Gypsies, as *mo shoró gheraló*, 'my scabby head.' This is properly a Greek expression—*ψώρα*, itch; *ψωριασμένος*, 'one affected with loathsome cutaneous eruptions.' *Ghér*, pronounced *jél*, I have heard applied to the small pox by some Gypsies. It is from the same base as *ghér*.

J.

JEW—*jut*.—This is from the Turks, who call these people *jehud* and *chifut*, by way of contempt. *Yahudi* is also another term in use among the Turks, corresponding to the Greek *Ἰουδαῖος*. The Greeks now always call them *Ἰβραῖοι* (pron. *Ἰβραῖοι*). Pl. *jutné*, 'Jews'; *jutní*, 'a Jewish woman'; *jutanó*, 'Jewish'; *jutoró*, 'a young Jew'; *jutmíori*, 'a young Jewish girl'; *brakerésa jutanés?* 'dost thou speak the Jewish language?'

K.

TO KICK—*lahtdáva*.—The Gr. *λακτιζω* can hardly have given origin to this Gypsy verb, as it has become altogether obsolete among the people, and in its stead we use *κλωτζῶ*, 'I kick.' Only the educated of our nation make use of *λακτιζω*. The Persian has *leked zeden*, 'to kick,

calcitrare,' to which this Gypsy verb can be referred: many Gypsy words are intimately related to the present Persian. I know of no Sr. word to which the Persian can be referred. The verb is a compound one: *dáva*, 'I give,' serves to form also some other verbs.

KING—*tahkár, taakár*;* Bor., *crallis*.—My word resembles the Pers. *khatkiar*, 'king, ruler,' with transposition of the initial consonants, or more probably with rejection of the initial *kh*, which is pronounced so gently by the Gypsies as often not to be heard at all. Even in pronouncing *tahkár*, the *h* is so gently aspirated as to be virtually omitted, and in fact many Gypsies pronounce the word as I have written it in the second form. The Sr. *chakrvat*, 'an emperor,' may bear relation to this term, as perhaps also to the Persian. *Crallis* is the Slav. *kral*, 'a king,' so common among the nations that speak the Slavonic dialects. The absence of a well defined root in all these definitions evidently goes to prove that the Gypsies, in leaving their country, and coming among people under regular regal power, had no appropriate word to express the idea of a king, as he appeared to them in their gradual peregrinations westward. Their word *rájan* we shall meet in 'nobleman.' *Takaréskoro*, 'of the king;' *takarní*, 'queen.'

KISS—*chumí, chám*; Bor., *chupendi*.—

To **KISS**—*chumídáva*.—We have here a word easily referable to the Sr. root *chumb*, 'to kiss.' The final *b* has been dropped by the Gypsies, precisely as the Greeks pronounce the Ital. *ampula, ampola*, 'a small flask,' *ἀμouλα*. *Lióm tutár yek cham*, 'I have taken from thee a kiss' (i. e. 'I have kissed thee'). *Chumídáva* is compounded of *chum* and the verb *dáva*, 'to give.'

KNEE—*kóch*.—Gr. *κόχιον* and *κόχι*, generally applied to warts, often to small bones, and at times to bones in general. The Greeks say *πονοῦν τὰ κόχιά μου*, 'my knees pain me.' By the Gypsies the term has been applied exclusively to the knees. Plur. *kochá*, 'knees.' It is a term well known to all Gypsies, and probably comes from the Slav. *kost*, 'bone.' *Me kochá dukénaman*, 'my knees pain me.'

KNIFE—*churí*; Bor., *chuló, chori*.—From the Sr. root *chhur*, 'to eat, scindere, secare.' Borrow's first term is formed by a commutation of the liquids, so common in all languages. *Bari churí*, 'a large knife.'

L.

LAME—*pankó, pangó*.—

To **LAME**—*pangheráva*.—We find in the Sanskrit *pangu*, 'lame, crippled, one who has lost his legs.' *Pangheráva*, 'to lame, to make one lame,' is a compound verb, formed from *pangó* and the verb *keráva*, 'to make.' *K* before *n* is constantly changed to *gh*; the form is properly *pan-keráva*. Of *pangó* united to the verb *aváva* is formed another verb, *panghiováva*, in the middle form, often heard among the Gypsies: 'I have become lame;' *χωκaiνωμαι*. *Panklióm mo pindó*, 'I have lamed my foot.'

* This word has a close resemblance to the Armenian word for 'king,' *takanór*, derived from *tak*, 'crown.'—Tr.

TO LAUGH—*asáva*.—Compare Sr. *has*, ‘to laugh.’ I shall have occasion to show in the following Section that the Gypsies commute the Sr. gutturals for soft aspirates, and reject these latter in many words.

In hearing them pronounce such aspirated words, one doubts whether the word should be written with or without an aspirate. *So asésa?* ‘why dost thou laugh?’

LEAF—*patrin*; Bor., *paroji*.—The Sr. *patra* signifies ‘a leaf,’ and, as in our language, ‘any thing light, like a leaf;’ it means also ‘wing.’ From this are probably derived Slav. *peró*, ‘wing,’ Germ. *feder*, Eng. *feather*.* Borrow’s form is much changed from the original, and indicates what I have said above, that the Gypsies of Turkey have preserved their language in greater purity than their fellow-tribes in the West. This term is used at times for ‘branch.’

TO LEARN—*shikliováva*.—A verb in the middle voice, compounded of *shikló*, ‘instructed,’ and *aváva*. We have the Sr. root *çiksh*, ‘to learn, to acquire knowledge;’ *çikshá*, ‘learning, or the acquisition of knowledge.’ I have never heard the verb excepting in this middle form. Like *μαρθάνω*, it is at times neuter, and at times transitive: ‘I myself learn, I study,’ and ‘I make others learn, I instruct.’ *Kamáva ta shikliováv katár allé*, ‘I wish to learn whence came;’ *akaná kaména te shiklión* (for *shikliována*), ‘now they wish to learn;’ *tá ná isánas oté ta shikliové*, ‘and thou wast not there to learn;’ *kárin shikliló* (3rd p. aor.), ‘where did he learn’ (i. e. ‘study’)?

LEATHER—*mortí*; Bor., *morchas*.†—The Sr. *múrti*, from which originate these two terms, is defined to mean ‘matter, substance, solidity, any definite shape or image.’ Here, by the Gypsies, the word is often applied to sheepskins before undergoing the operation of tanning, *προβέα, προβιά*. *Mortiákoro*, ‘a worker in leather.’

LIE—*khohaimpé*; Bor., *jojana*.—Connected with the Sr. *kuhaka*, ‘deceiver, hypocrite,’ *kuhaná*, ‘hypocrisy.’ *Khohavnó*, ‘a liar, one who deceives,’ pronounced often *khohanó*. I have no doubt that *khohaimpé* is formed from *khohanó*, *khohanipé* having been corrupted into *khohaimpé*; since all the abstract nouns ending in *pe* are formed from adjectives or participles. From this adj. *khohavnó* is formed *khohávniováva*, ‘to be cheated, to be deceived.’ *Chachipanés o manúsh kayék far nána khohávniovél*, ‘in truth man would never be deceived.’

LIGHT—*lokó*.—From the Sr. *laghu*, ‘light;’ Gr. *ελαχός*.

LINEN—*yismata*.—Used always in the plural form. It designates that part of dress which can be subjected to washing; Eng. *linen*, It. *biancheria*, Gr. *ἀσπρόρουχα*, ‘white garments.’ *Tovdé yismata*, ‘washed clothes.’

LIP—*vúst*; Br., *usha*.—This is the Sr. *oshtha*, ‘lip.’ We shall explain the term *múí*, ‘mouth,’ in its proper place. Respecting the addition of *v* at the beginning of words, the reader will see in Section IV.

LITTLE—*khandí*.—The Sanskrit word *khandá* signifies ‘a part, a portion, a fragment.’ That the Gypsy term means properly ‘a portion

* Armenian *pedúr*.—Tr.

† Armenian *márte*.—Tr.

or part,' there is no doubt, and the transmutation of the word 'portion, fragment' into an adverb, 'little,' is corroborated by both the Greek and Turkish languages. *Κόμμα*, from *κόπτω*, and its diminutive *κομματίον*, are universally used by the Greeks of the present day in the sense of 'little;' as *δός με κομματίον*, 'give me a little.' The Turks say *bir parchá su ver*, 'give me a little water' (lit. 'give me a piece of water'). *Khandisi*, often to be heard, is *khandi-isi*, 'a little (it) is,' used for 'it is not enough.' *Khandi* is used also as an adjective, Lat. *parvus*, Gr. *ὀλίγος*. *Déman khandi pani*, 'give me a little water;' *chikhandi*, 'in a little while,' Gr. *ἐντός ὀλίγου* (*καιῶν* understood); *khandi varó*, 'a little flour;' *khandi piásales*, *khandi khásales*, *o yavér kerásales kerál*, 'a little we drink, a little we eat, (and) the rest we make (into) cheese;' *khandi achiló te meráv*, 'I came near dying' (i. e. 'little was wanting'); *khandi divés*, 'few days.'

TO LIVE—*živána*.—This is undoubtedly related to the Sr. root *jiv*, 'to live,' which is to be traced in some of the Indo-European languages, and particularly in the Slavonic (*žývū*, 'I live'), which has preserved so many of the Sr. roots in their utmost purity. It is used also in the sense of 'inhabit,' similar to the usage of the word in other languages: *ἐξῆσα ἐν Ἐυρώπῃ*, 'I lived in Europe, j'ai vécu en Europe.'

TO LOSE—*nashavána*; Bor., *najabar*.—There seems to be an intimate connection between this Gypsy verb and *nashána*, 'to depart.' Both have their origin from the Sr. root *naç*, 'to destroy, to annihilate, to lose.' Borrow's *najipen*, 'loss, perdition,' is from the same.

LOUSE—*juv*.—We have seen, in speaking of BARLEY, the transmutation of the Sr. *y* into *j*: *yava*, Gypsy *juv*, 'barley.' We might with perfect reason seek the origin of this term in a Sr. word having a similar initial consonant, viz. *yúka*, 'a louse.' Plur. *juvá*, 'lice.'

III.

TO MAKE—*keráva*; Bor., *querar*, *querelar*.—This is the well known Sr. root *kri* or *kar*, 'to make, to do,' which can easily be traced through the Persian, Greek, Latin, and other cognate European languages: comp. Pers. *kerden* (Sr. inf. *kartum*), 'to make, to do;' Gr. *κράϊνω*, whose ancient signification was 'to do, to accomplish;' Lat. *creo*, 'to create.' The Gypsies of Spain, like those here in Turkey, have preserved the pure sound of the initial radical consonant. Some Gypsies here pronounce the word as though written *gheráva*. The signification which I have given above is the most general, both in the Danubian provinces and in Turkey. The word has, however, another, contracted from the colloquial usages of the Turks, who employ their verb *yapmak*, 'to make, to do,' in the sense also of 'building:' *yaþý yapárym*, 'I am building.' The Greeks also, in imitation of the Turks, frequently join to their verb *κάννω*, 'I do,' the Turkish *yaþý*, saying *ιαπί κάννω*, 'I am making a building.' Though the Sr. verb has an extraordinary latitude of meaning, and though it may reasonably be applied to any verb expressive of action, still I am inclined to think that many of its definitions among the Gypsies of Turkey should be elucidated and explained by the colloquial usages of the Greeks and Turks, with whom they are constantly associated. Gypsies in Turkey

never hear any other language, Turkish or Greek, but the most vulgar and corrupted, for they are debarred from polite society, which they themselves also avoid. *Keráva nevó kër*, 'I am making a new house;' *lachés kamakerén*, 'they will do well,' pronounced by others *kamkerén*, or *kakerén* (see Section V); *so keréna te chavé?* 'what are doing thy children' (i. e. 'how are thy children')? *só te keráv?* 'what can I do?' *ti và xáuw*; *so kerghián?* 'what hadst thou done?' *ker túya yavréske*, 'do thou also to others?' *tu kerghiánles?* 'didst thou do it?' *so kerés?* 'how art thou?' a usual salutation: Gr. *τι χάυεις?*

MAN—*manúsh*; * Br., *manush*; Bor., *manu*, *manus*, *maru*, *marupé*.—From the Sr. *manusha* and *manushya*, 'man, a human being,' *manushí*, 'woman, the companion of man:' among the Gypsies, *romní* is now in general use in the latter sense. It comes from the root *man*, 'to think, reason, examine.' In Borrow's third form the *n* is changed to *r*; in his fourth appears the terminal *pe*, elsewhere *pen*: *marupe*, 'mankind,' *ἀνθρωπότης*. *Amaré manushénghere*, 'of our men;' *shastó manúsh*, 'a robust man;' *isámas penínda manúsh*, 'we were fifty men;' *sarré o manúsh*, 'all the men,' and 'all men;' *manushénghe*, 'to the men.'

MARE.—See HORSE.

MARKET-PLACE—*fóros*; Bor., *foros*, *foro*.—This term reminds us of the Latin *forum*, which signified anciently 'the market-place,' and was afterwards given to certain cities, as the Turks call many towns from the market fairs held there. Among us the term *φόρος*, 'a duty, impost,' comes from the Sr. *bhára*, 'a weight, burden.' Borrow defines his two words 'city,' Sp. *ciudad*. The Sr. *pura* and *purí* both mean 'city,' preserved in the names of many Indian cities, as Hastinapoor, Singapoor, etc. By a customary change of *p* to *f* comes the present Gypsy term, which the Gypsies here sometimes use for 'city,' but more often for 'market-place.'

MARRIAGE—*biáv*, *piáv*.—This is of Sanskrit origin, though it has a Persian form, like some other words, as *deryáv*, 'sea,' *vasiáv*, 'mill.' The Sr. root *vah*, 'to carry, to bear' (L. *veho*, Gr. *ἔχω*), means also 'to marry, *ducere uxorem*.' When joined with the preposition *vi* it has constantly the signification of 'marrying,' as in *viváha*, 'marriage,' *viváhita*, 'married.' Very probably these words have given origin to *biáv*. It is a common term, and, united to *keráva*, 'to make,' it means 'to marry, to celebrate a marriage.' *Kamakerés biáv?* 'wilt thou make marriage' (i. e. 'art thou to be married')? *te pralésoro biavesti*, 'at the marriage of thy brother;' *tumaró biáv isi?* 'is it thy marriage;' *kána kamovél o biáv?* 'when will the marriage be?'

MEAT—*mas*; Bor., *maas*, *mang*.—The origin of these terms is clear. I refer them to *ámisha*, 'meat, food, anything eaten with bread;' compare Slav. *mast*, signifying 'fat,' which the Bulgarians have changed to *méso*, understanding by it 'meat;' Goth. *mats*, Eng. *meat*, † Albanian *mishe*, *misht*. *Kḗας* and Lat. *caro* are connected with another Sr. word, *kravya*, denoting for the most part 'the flesh of

* "Manusch, rom, gadshe, 'mensch.'" Arndt, p. 375.

† Armenian *mis*.—TR.

wild animals.' Besides the above *ámisha*, there is another term, *mánsa*, 'flesh, food,' from which originates Lat. *mensa*, signifying sometimes 'the table,' and sometimes 'the food upon the table.' To this I refer the Eng. *mess*, *mess-mate*. So *keréna? mas biknéna*, 'what are they doing? they sell meat;' *maséskoro*, 'a butcher;' *londé masá*, 'salted meat;' *avdivés mas khása*, 'to-day we eat meat' (not a day of fasting).

MILK—*tut, sut*; Br., *sout*; Bor., *chuti*.—This word Mr. Brown designates as Turkish *sud*, 'milk.' But the comparison of the three terms gives a better explanation of their etymology. In the definition of BREAST, we have spoken of the Sr. root *chush*, 'to suck.' Derived from that root, the present terms signify properly 'what is sucked from the breasts.' I may add that there is no known Turkish word in the vocabulary of Borrow. *Gudló tut*, 'sweet milk; *sudró tut*, 'cold milk.'

MILL—*vasiáv*.—A Persian word, which, like many others derived from that language, has been preserved almost unaltered: *asya*, 'a mill-stone,' anciently, and more properly, *asyab*, or *asyav*, to which the Gypsies have only added an initial *v*. All the Persian dictionaries of an older date write the word *asyab*, and such was probably the pronunciation of the Persians when the Gypsies passed through their country. *Ghiv gherghióm to vasiáv*, 'I have carried grain to the mill.'

MISERABLE—*chungaló*.—This adjective, applied to persons in distress as an expression of commiseration, corresponds to the Turk. *zavál* and the Gr. *κακώμοσος*. It is extremely common among the Gypsies. Fem. *chungali*. Though apparently of Hindu origin, I have not been able to refer it to any Sr. word. *Chungali rakli*, 'the miserable daughter.'

MONEY—*lové*.—This term is mostly used by the Gypsies in the plural number: *lové*, 'money' in general. They make use, like the natives, of *pará*, and *ghrush*, the Turk. piastre. *Me lové liné*, 'my money they have taken;' *keti lovén dinián?* 'how much money hadst thou given?' *linián te lovén?* 'hadst thou taken thy money?' *keti lovén teréla?* 'how much money has he?' or, 'how much is he worth?'

MONTH—*chon, masék*; Bor., *chono*.—We shall speak of *chon* in speaking of MOON. The Gypsies, like many other nations, use the same word for 'moon' and 'month.' Compare Gr. *μήνη*, anc. 'the moon, the half moon;' *μήν*, 'month;' Lat. *mensis*. *Chon* is used by the Moslem Gypsies, imitating their coreligionists the Turks, who say *ay*, 'moon, month.' *Masék*, the second term, is from the Sr. *māsika*, 'monthly, relating or belonging to a month;' it is in very common use among the Christian Gypsies. Compare Slav. *mesiač*, 'a month.' In this word appears plainly the tendency of the Gypsies to make use of adjective forms, instead of substantive. Similar examples we see in MOUSE, WELL, etc. *Keti masekengoro isi?* 'of how many months is she' (i. e. 'pregnant')? *yek masekéstár nápalal*, 'after a month.'

MOON—*chon* ;* Br., *chon* ; Bor., *chimutra, astra*.—The derivation of these words is a little obscure, as the difference between the two first and Borrow's is considerable. Mine and Mr. Brown's are derived from the Sr. *chandra*, 'moon.' The second word of Borrow, *astra*, is a name given to the moon precisely as we often call the moon *ἀστὴρ τῆς νυκτός*, 'star of night.'

MOTHER—*dái, dé* ; Br., *dy* ; Bor., *day, chinday*.—*Dy*, pronounced *dái*, is a child's pet term for its mother, as Borrow testifies in his vocabulary, under the word *day*, remarking that this word, sometimes applied by children to their mother, signifies 'nurse.' *Dais* is used by the Christian inhabitants of these countries, sometimes for 'father,' mostly however for 'uncle' and 'benefactor.' The derivation of this word is very obscure, and that it has any relation to the common Sr. *mātri*, 'mother,' does not appear to me probable. It is pronounced *dái* and *tái*. *Mi dái*, 'my mother ;' *me dáiakori lové*, 'my mother's money ;' *tí tái isi keréste*, 'thy mother is in the house.'

MOTHER-IN-LAW—See FATHER-IN-LAW.

TO MOUNT—*ukliáva*.—This verb may be referred to the Sr. root *kram*, 'to go, to walk, to step,' with the preposition *ut*, 'up.' *Oklístó*, 'mounted.' this term is applied to a young man who has been presented to his future bride, and has gone to her house. The Greeks have the same term, *ἀνεβασμένος*, 'gone up,' i. e., to the house of the bride.

MOUSE—*mishákos, mushó*.—Derived evidently from the Sr. *músha, múshaka, múshiká*, 'mouse, rat,' from the root *músh*, 'to steal.' We find this word in many languages : Gr. *μῦς, μυῖσκος* ; Lat. *mus, muris* ; Slav. *mish* ; Germ. *maus* ; Eng. *mouse*.† *Ker mushó*, 'house-rat.' here the term approaches nearer to the Sr. *músha*.

MOUTH—*múí*.—Compare the Sr. *mukha*, 'mouth.' The final guttural *kh* has been dropped, as in *nái*, 'nail,' from *nakha*. From this term *múí*, by the addition of *al*, is formed the adverb *muyál* or *muyíál*, 'on the face, in front, from the front.' *Pelióm muyál*, 'I fell on the face.'

MUCH—*but* ;‡ Br., *bout* ; Bor., *bus, baribu*.—This may possibly be referred to the Sr. *puru*, 'much.' The common and most usual words in a language are frequently most metamorphosed. *But* is used as an adjective and an adverb. *But manushé*, 'many men ;' *but chavé*, 'many children ;' *but romnía*, 'many women ;' *but lové*, 'much money ;' *but dukélanan*, 'it pains me much ;' *but nashéla*, 'it goes well ;' *but lachés*, 'very well ;' *but vuchés*, 'very high.' At times it is heard as *butló*, 'much.'

Mucus of the nose—*lim*.—This word is extremely common among the Gypsies. I refer it to the Sr. *lip*, 'to anoint, to smear,' whence *limpa*, 'smearing, anointing.'

MUD—*chik, chiká* ; Bor., *chique*.—The only Sr. word to which I am able to refer this term is *chikíla*, 'mud, mire,' from the root *chik*, 'to obstruct.' Borrow defines *chique* as 'earth, ground,' a natural transi-

* "O-tchanda, 'la lune.'" Vaillant, p. 457. "Tschon, schon, tschemut, mrascha, 'mond.'" Arndt, p. 366.

† Armenian *moog*.—Tr.

‡ "But, 'longtemps.'" Vaillant, p. 363.

tion of meaning of the word. *Isi ko drom but chiká*, 'there is in the road much mud.'

TO MURDER—*murdaráva*.—We have often had occasion to refer to the Sr. root *mri*, 'to die,' whence comes this transitive, precisely as the Germ. *morden*, Eng. *murder*, Fr. *meurtre*. *Murdaráva tut*, 'I murder thee,' a common expression in the mouth of a person intending to strike another; *murdarghiómles*, 'I have murdered him;' aor. *nápalal murdarghiáles*, 'afterwards he murdered him.' This verb is used also of the killing of animals. When applied to fire, it signifies 'to quench:' *murdaráva i yak*, 'I quench the fire;' *murdár i yák*, 'quench the fire.'

MUSKET—*puđinó*; Bor., *púšca*.—Both these terms are Slavonic, from the verb *pushtáyu*, 'to send, to throw out, emittere.' I have spoken to many Gypsies about the word *púšca*, which they constantly avoid, as foreign to their idiom. *Púšca* is known only to the Bulgarians, who use it in common with the Russians. *Mo puđinó isi inglis*, 'my musket (gun) is English.'

N.

NAIL, FINGER-NAIL—*nái*; Bor., *ungla*.—Borrow's word is from the Latin *ungula*,* 'hoof,' from the common *unguis*, 'nail.' The Spanish is *uña*. My own term is from the Sr. *nakha*, 'nail.' Borrow has in his vocabulary another term, *turra*, 'nail,' unknown to me.

NAKED—*nangó*.—This is easily referable to the Sr. *nagna*, 'naked.'

NAME—*nav*; † Bor., *nao*.—There is hardly an Indo-European word that is so general in its occurrence. Compare Zend *nâman*, ‡ Pers. *nam*, Lat. *nomen*, Gr. *ὄνομα*, Goth. *namu*, Slav. *nma*, Bulg. *ime*. The final syllable of *nâman* has been changed into a simple *v* by the Gypsies of Turkey, whilst those of Spain have changed the whole syllable into *o*. This change of *m* into *v* we shall have occasion to observe in other words. *E chavéskoro nav*, 'the child's name;' *e pashéskoro náv*, 'the pasha's name.'

NAVEL—*pol*.—The usual term among the Hindus for 'navel' is *nâbhi* or *nâbhîla*. It has given birth to Pers. *naf*, Germ. *nabel*, Eng. *navel*. As to this Gypsy word, I am unable to give any satisfactory account of it, unless we suppose that the first syllable *nâ* has been thrown off by the Gypsies from the second term *nâbhîla*.

NEAR—*bashé*, *pashé*; Bor., *sumpacel*.—Concerning the etymology of this term I can form no probable conjecture. *Bashé to len*, 'near the river;' *bashé túte*, 'near thee;' *kaléste bashé dulevésa* (Gr. *δοῦλεῖσα*)! 'near whom workest thou?' *bashé to bahtzé* (Turk. *baghche*), 'near the garden;' *bashé mánde, tuménde, lénde*, 'near us, you, them;' *bashál*, 'from near.' *Sumpacel*, Borrow's word, is a phrase common among the Gypsies, formed of *sun*, imperative of *sunáva*, 'to hear,' and *bashál*. It is an order to 'go and be attentive,' lit. 'hear from near.' I have frequently heard it. Pott has fallen into the same error as Borrow, in considering it a simple term. *Ja ta sun pashál*, 'go and hear from near.'

* Armenian *ungunk*.—Tr.

† "Nam, 'nom.'" Vaillant, p. 180.

‡ Arm. *anun*.—Tr.

NEEDLE—See to SEW.

NEGATION—*na, nanái, nasti, ma* ; Br., *nee* ; Bor., *na, nanái, nasti, ne*.—

There are few words in all the range of the Gypsy language so clear and well defined as these terms. *Na* is the Sr. *na*, a particle of negation. *Na*, in Gypsy colloquial usage, is employed principally with verbs: as *na janáva*, 'I do not know;' *na kamáva*, 'I do not wish;' *na isámas oté*, 'I was not here;' *na pakiáva*, 'I do not believe;' *na dikliómles*, 'I did not see him;' *nái, isi tindó*, 'no, it is thine.' They never say *nanái dikliómles*, or *nanái janáva*. In the subjunctive, *na* is inserted between *te* and the verb; as *te na dikáv*, 'that I may not see;' *te na jav*, 'that I may not go;' *te na khél*, 'that he may not eat.' It is to be observed in adjectives: as *naisvali*, 'invalid;' *naisukár*, 'not handsome;' *namporemé*, 'sick.' *Nanáí* is properly used to express negation joined to the third person of the auxiliary verb *isóm*, 'I am,' which is always understood: it means properly 'it is not.' It has evidently taken the place of the following *nasti*, which by the Gypsies is applied to other usages. *Nanáí* is a reduplication of *na*. *Nanáí mindó*, 'it is not mine;' *nanái lachó*, 'it is not good;' *nanái but phuró*, 'he is not very old;' *ta na kamnióvél nanái lachés*, 'not to perspire is not well;' *nanái palvál*, 'there is no wind;' *nanái khoháimpé*, 'it is not a lie.' *Nasti* is evidently the Sr. *násti*, 'it is not,' from *na* and *asti*, the 3d pers. sing. of the verb *as*, 'to be,' Gr. *ἔστι*. The Persian has a similar phrase, *nist*, composed of the neg. *ne* and *est*, 'is.' So also the Slav. *niest*, 'non est,' used in this form. *Násti* is defined by Wilson 'non-existence, not so, it is not.' The Gypsies, however, have given this definition to *nanái*, and have reserved *nasti* to express impossibility or difficulty. Having lost all traces of its proper signification, it is now applied by them to all persons indistinctly, and to all numbers, whilst the similar phrase in Persian retains its proper signification. *Nasti astarghiómles*, 'I could not seize him;' *nasti kerávales*, 'I cannot do it;' *amén nasti kerásales*, 'we cannot do it;' *nasti sováva*, 'I cannot sleep;' *nasti piráva*, 'I cannot walk'—and in a similar manner with all the persons and tenses of a verb. It is never used except with verbs, and the inflection of the verb itself shows the person speaking. *Ma* is a particle which, like the Gr. *μή*, is always prefixed to the imperative. It is the Sr. *má*, a prohibitive and negative particle, chiefly prefixed to verbs in the imp. mood: as *má kuru*, 'do not do.' With the Gypsies, though heard sometimes alone, as the modern Gr. *μή*, 'don't,' it supposes a verb which by the speaker is not uttered. *Ma ker túya*, 'do thou not also;' *ma déman armán*, 'do not curse me;' *ma kush*, 'do not revile;' *ma vrakér*, 'do not talk;' *ma ja*, 'do not go;' *ma dik*, 'do not look;' *ma sun*, 'do not hear;' *ma kha*, 'do not eat;' *ma le*, 'do not take;' *ma pi*, 'do not drink.' With the exception of this negative particle, there is a striking similarity between mine and Borrow's terms.

NEW—*nevó* ; Bor., *nebo, nebel, ternoró*.—With the exception of *ternoró*, all these words are from the Sr. adj. *nava*, with which correspond the Gr. *νέος*, Lat. *novus*, Slav. *nov'ie*, 'new, young,' and many other similar words in the present spoken languages of Europe. *Nebel* of Borrow has been formed from the primitive Sr. in a way similar to the Lat.

novellus from *novus*. *Ternoró* will be explained under YOUNG MAN. *Nevó ker*, 'new house;' *nevó gav*, 'new village;' *nevé yismata*, 'new clothes.'

NIGHT—*rat*, *ratti*, *aratti*; Br., *rakilo*; Bor., *rachi*.—The Gr. $\nu\delta\varsigma$, Lat. *nox*, Slav. *nocht*, correspond with Sr. *nakta*, 'night.' These terms have left no traces in the Gypsy language, which has preserved the more usual Sr. *rátri*, 'night.' By the assimilation of *r* to *t*, so common in modern languages, it has become *rat*, 'night,' and *ratti*, 'in the night-time,' Lat. *nocte*. Mr. Brown's *rakilo* is the 3d pers. aor. passive, 'it is getting dark.' *Ratti* seems to be a remnant of a locative case. This term is sometimes pronounced with an initial *a*, *aratti*. This initial *a* is less common here than among the Gypsies of Spain. *Yek rat*, 'one night;' *yekpasharát*, 'midnight;' *saró rat*, 'every night.'

NO ONE—*kayék jenó*.—This term, extremely common among the Gypsies, is composed of two words, the relation of which to the Sanskrit is extremely evident. The latter word is never used alone. *Kayék* seems to be the Sr. *ekáika*, 'singly, one by one,' from *eka*, 'one,' repeated. Like the Gr. $\kappa\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, from $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, 'no one,' so likewise this word among the Gypsies is at times affirmative, and at times negative. Negat.—*kayék jenó na janéla man*, 'no one knows me;' *nastí dúlavéna* (Gr. $\delta\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega$, 'to work') *kayék jenó*, 'no one can work.' Affirm.—*te kamniové kayék jenó lachés isi*, 'for one to persevere is a good thing.' *Kayék* alone signifies 'no one,' Fr. *aucun, personne*: *kayéke*, 'to no one:' *kayéke manushe*, 'to no man,' Gr. $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\theta\omega\pi\omicron\tau\omicron\nu$; *kapenáv túke yek lav, ta na penésles kayéske*, 'I will tell thee a word, but thou shouldst not tell it to any one.' This term, in receiving the particle *ke*, is pronounced *kayékske* and *kayékke*; the latter is the proper mode. *Kayék* is joined to other terms: as *kayék far*, 'sometimes, never;' *po kayék far*, 'oftentimes.' *Jenó* is evidently the Sr. *jana*, 'man,' individually or collectively, 'mankind,' from the root *jan*, 'to be born;' compare Pers. *jins*, Lat. *genus*, Gr. $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, etc. I have never heard it used except in connection with *kayék*.

NOBLEMAN—*rái*.—The peculiar circumstances in which the Gypsies are placed in these countries have made all foreign words of this category of little use to them. The common terms among them for persons ennobled, either by wealth, education, or political authority, are pure Turkish. Even the lowest order of the Greeks rarely use any but the Turkish terms, as *agha*, *efendi*, *pasha*, and the like. $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$, etc., are totally unknown to them. I once asked an illiterate Bulgarian, what 'famous' meant in their language. He gave me the word *chorbadji*, i. e. 'the magistrate of a small rural district.' The Gypsies, however, have retained this word *rái*, referable to the Sr. *rájan*, 'a king, a monarch, a prince.' It is applied particularly to those persons of their clan who are set over them by the local Turkish authorities, as collectors of the capitation-tax and other duties due to the government. It is also given to the head men of their corporations. Those foreign to their tribe are called by their usual Turkish titles. This term is not known to all. The wife of the *rái* is called *ráni*, Sr. *rájñi*, so common to this day for the wives of the

Rajas and other native rulers of Hindustan. *E rayèskoro chavó*, 'the child of the Rái;' *dikáva e rayés*, 'I see the nobleman.'

NOSE—*nak*; Br., *nak*; Bor., *naqui, pavi*.—The first three of these words are derived from the Sr. *nas*, 'nose,' *násiká*, 'nostril.' Some Gypsies use the word *rutuni* for 'nose;' it is the Gr. ῥωθόνιον, dim. of ῥώθων, 'nostril.' To a great many of them *nak* is unknown. The *pavi* of Borrow is unknown to me.

TO NOURISH—*parvaráva*.—This is the verb of which the word *parvardó*, given above for **ΕΑΤ**, is properly a participle. Perhaps a more plausible etymology than is there proposed for it may be found in the Sr. root *bhri*, 'to bear, sustain, nourish,' with the prefix *pari* or *pra*.

NOW—*akaná, okaná*; Bor., *ocana, acana*.—This term, common and well known to all the Gypsies, both in Spain and Turkey, I compare with the Sr. *akshna*, 'time;' the Sr. *ksh* being constantly changed by the Gypsies to *k*. There is another cognate Sr. term, *kshana*, 'a moment.' By the prefixion of an *a*, as in *avdivés*, 'this day, to-day,' the word would signify 'this moment,' resembling the Gr. ῥῶρα, 'this hour, now.'

NUMBERS.—

ONE—*yek*; Br., *yak*; Bor., *icque, iesque, ies*.—From the Sr. *eka*, 'one.' The Pers. has the same form, in *yek*, 'one.' In the Greek, the word *eka* is to be found in *ἐκάτερος*, a comparative form of *eka*, Sr. *ekatara*—ἐκάστος, ἐκάστοτε.

TWO—*dúi*;* Br., *duy*; Bor., *dui*.—From Sr. *dvi*, 'two,' with which correspond the synonymous arithmetical terms of Europe, as Pers. *du*, Gr. *δύω*, Lat. *duo*.

THREE—*tri, trin*; Br. *triu*; Bor., *trin*.—From the Sr. *tri*, 'three.' *Trin* is the Sr. neuter *trīni*. Both these terms are used. The Pali has *tinñi*, 'three' (Essai sur le Pali, p. 92).

FOUR—*ishtár*; Br., *ushtár*; Bor., *estar*.—The Sr. *chatur* is here changed more than the preceding terms.

FIVE—*panch*; Br., *pandji*; Bor., *panche*.—Sr. *pancha*, 'five.' This Gypsy word is nearer the original than the corresponding term of any other language, and in Spain and Turkey it has been preserved almost unchanged.

SIX—*shov*; Br., *sho*; Bor., *job*.—Sr. *shash*, 'six.' The Greek has laid aside the initial *sh*, the Latin has preserved it: *ἕξ, sex*, 'six.' Slav. *shesht*.†

SEVEN—*eftá*; Br., *efta*; Bor., *efta*.—From the Sr. *sapta*, 'seven.' Here also the Greek has laid aside the initial *s* of the Sr. At first sight one would think this word to be our *ἑπτὰ*, commonly pronounced *ἑφτά*. So too the Persian *heft*. The *eftá* of the Gypsies presents the natural change of *p* into *f*, to euphonize with *t*, a change daily heard among us, as vulgar rather than classical, but regular among the Persians. The ancient Greeks made a similar change, saying *ἑβδομος, ἑβδομήκοντα*, instead of *ἑπτομος, ἑπτομήκοντα* (Bopp). Compare Zend *haptan*, 'seven,' changing the initial *s* to *h*, whence the Pers. *heft*, as above.

* "*Dúi, 'deux'*" Vaillant, p. 379.

† The Armenian has *vesh*, and, in combination, *vesh*: as *veshdasan*, 'sixteen.'—TR.

EIGHT—*ohtó* ; Br., *ohtó* ; Bor., *ostor*, *ottolojo*.—Sr. *ashṭa*, 'eight.' Compare Zend *ashtan*, Pers. *hesht*, Gr. ὀκτώ, Lat. *octo*, Germ. *acht*.

NINE—*iniya* ; Br., *iniya* ; Bor., *enia*.—Sr. *nava*, 'nine.' In Greek we have prefixed the vowel *e* for the sake of euphony, and the Gypsies *i*.

TEN—*desh* ; Br., *desh* ; Bor., *deque*.—Sr. *daça*. The Gypsies of Turkey have preserved the original word better than those of Spain, who approach nearer the languages of Europe ; Gr. δέκα, Lat. *decem*,* Slav. *desyat*.

ELEVEN—*desh-i-yek* ; Bor., *esden-y-yesque*.

TWELVE—*desh-i-dúi* ; Bor., *esden-y-duis*.

THIRTEEN—*desh-i-tri* ; Bor., *esden-y-trin*.

FOURTEEN—*desh-i-ishtar* ; Bor., *esden-y-ostar*.

FIFTEEN—*desh-i-panch* ; Bor., *esden-y-panche*.

SIXTEEN—*desh-i-shov* ; Bor., *esden-y-jobe*.

SEVENTEEN—*desh-i-efṭá* ; Bor., *esden-y-estar*.

EIGHTEEN—*desh-i-ohtó* ; Bor., *esden-y-ostor*.

NINETEEN—*desh-i-inia* ; Bor., *esden-y-esñe*.

Mr. Brown has omitted the above numbers.

TWENTY—*bish* ; Br., *bish* ; Bor., *bis*.—The form of this number, from the Sr. *vinçati*, resembles the Pers. *bist*, which preserves the final consonant *t*.

THIRTY—*tránda* ; Br., *otrenta* ; Bor., *trianda*.

FORTY—*saránda* ; Br., *saranda* ; Bor., *estardi*.

FIFTY—*penínda* ; Br., *paninda* ; Bor., *pancherdi*.

SIXTY—*shovardéri* ; Br., *showar* ; Bor., *joberdi*.

SEVENTY—*eftavardéri* ; Br., *eftawardesh* ; Bor., *esterdi*.

EIGHTY—*ohtovardéri* ; Br., *ohtowardesh* ; Bor., *ostordi*.

NINETY—*iniyavardéri* ; Br., *iniyavardesh* ; Bor., *esnerdi*.

In Mr. Brown's term for 'sixty,' *showar*, the final *desh* has been omitted by mistake.

The first three terms of Mr. Brown and myself, and the first of Borrow, are the common forms of our Modern Greek numbers, used by the common people,† which the Gypsies in passing through or residing here have adopted, while they have rejected the others. The remainder are formed regularly from the numerals with the addition of *desh*, 'ten.' In my glossary the *sh* of *desh* is changed into *ri* ; in Borrow's the final *desh* is changed into *di*.

HUNDRED—*shil*, *shel* ; Br., *shevel* ; Bor., *gres*.—The first two are related to the Sr. *çata*, 'hundred ;' the origin of *gres* is unknown to me.

TWO HUNDRED—*du shél*.

THREE HUNDRED—*tri shél*.

THOUSAND—*mília* ; Bor., *milan*.—From the Lat. *mille*. This is foreign to the Sr. *sahasra*, 'thousand.‡

I have not given the Sr. numerals, as the reader can easily obtain them from the ordinary Sr. grammars.

* Armenian *dása*, and in composition *dasán* ; as *medasan*, *megdasan*.—TR.

† For those unacquainted with the Modern Greek, it may be well to say that these numerals have been modified as follows: *επιάκοντα* we call *επιάντα* ; *τεσσαράκοντα*, *σαράντα* ; *πεντήκοντα*, *πενήντα* ; *εξήκοντα*, *εξήντα*, etc.

‡ Armenian *hasar* or *hazar*, of Sr. origin.—TR.

The Gypsy numerals, when joined to nouns in the accusative case, receive a final *e*; *deshé grastén teráva*, 'I have ten horses;' *shelé bakré teréla*, 'a hundred sheep he has (owns).'

NUT—*akhór, akór*.—

NUT-TREE—*akhorin, akorin*.—The Pers. *kerdu* has relation with the Gr. *κάρυον* and *καρόδιον*, 'a nut.' The Sr. term to which it may most probably be referred is *akóta*, 'the betel-nut-tree' (Areca faufel, or catechu). It is here used for the fruit of the great walnut tree (*Corylus avellana*), so common in every part of Turkey.

○.

OLD—*phuró, phurú, puró, furó*; Br., *pooree*; Bor., *puró*.—This is a pure Sr. word, *pura*, 'former, more ancient.' By the addition of *pe* is formed *puripé*, 'old age.' *O phuró kaméla ta dikéna to phuripé*, 'the old man desires that they should see (i. e. 'nurse') him in his old age.' Fem. *puri*: *i romní léskeri isti puri*, 'his wife is old.'

OLD, ANCIENT—*puranó*.—From the Sr. adj. *purána*, 'old, ancient.' Among the Gypsies it has also the signification of 'old in age,' like the preceding *purú*. It is frequently to be heard, and is often interchanged with the preceding term.

To grow OLD—*phuriováva*.—A compound verb, from *phuró*, 'old,' and *aváva*: lit. 'to become old;' Gr. *γηστῶω*, Lat. *senesco*. *Te phurióla te dikénales e chavé*, 'when he becomes old, the children should nurse (lit. 'see') him.'

OPPOSITE—*mamúi*.—A compound word, from the poss. pronoun *ma*, *mo*, 'my,' and *múi*, 'mouth.' Similar expressions are common in many languages: compare Pers. *ru-be-ru*, 'opposite,' lit. 'face to face;' Fr. *en face*; It. *in faccia*. *Kon isti mamúi mánde?* 'who is opposite me?' *mamúi to gáv*, 'opposite the village.' *Mamuyál*, 'from the opposite side,' is formed like other similar adverbs, by the addition of *al*: *mamuyál aváva*, 'I come from the opposite side;' *pelióm mamuyál*, 'I fell on my face.'

ONION—*purúm*.—A very common word among all the Gypsies: plur. *purumá*.

OTHER—*yavér*; Bor., *aver, avél*.—This term can be referred to the Sr. *apara*, 'other.' The *p* has been changed to *v*, and the semivowel prefixed to the initial *a*, as in many other Gypsy words. *Mu ker túya yavréske*, 'do not thou also to others;' *yavréske*, a clipped form of *yaveréske*; *e yavréske ro mní*, 'and the other's wife;' *te penás améya e yavréske t' avéna*, 'that we also may communicate (lit. 'say') it to others, in order that they may come;' *diklióm e yavrés*, 'I saw the other (one).'

OVEN—*bov*.—This term is applied to the furnace, to lime-kilns, and to the oven for baking bread. Its origin is not clear. *E bovéske ro na pekéla mo manró*, 'the baker does not bake my bread;' *e bovéske ro na délaman manró*, 'the baker does not give me bread.'

OVER the water.—*perdál, predál*.—This is used precisely as the Greeks use *πίνα* and *πίπας*, 'in another place, between which and the speaker there is a sheet of water.' *Perdál* is in the ablative form of adverbs. It is not solely confined to this signification. *Jáva perdál*, 'I go on

the other side.' It supposes another term *perd*, which may be referred to the Sr. *paradeça*, 'a foreign country,' from which has been elegantly formed the Gr. *παράδεισος*, Pers. *ferdus*, and all the cognate terms of the European languages. *Perdál tan*, 'a place on the farther side.'

OUT—*avri*; Bor., *abri*.—Probably derived from the Sr. *bahis* and *bahir*, 'out, outside.' By transposition of letters it becomes *avri*. *Dikáva avri prágmata* (*νήγυαρα*), 'I see strange things;' *avriál*, 'from the outside, out of:' *avriál to ker nastótar*, 'after they departed out of the house;' *avrutnó*, 'a foreigner,' Gr. *ἕξωτεινός*: *avrutnó manúsh*, 'a foreigner, a stranger, a man not of the Gypsy race.'

Ox—*gurúv*, *guri*; Br., *ghuree*; Bor., *gorbi*.—

COW—*gurumní*, *gurumní*; Br., *ghurumnee*.—The Sr. *go* or *gáu* signifies 'the ox kind in general;' this is preserved in the Gr. *γάλακ(τος)*, Lat. *lac*, *lactis*, anciently denoting 'the milk of the cow.' We have also in Sanskrit *gaura*, *gaurí*, signifying 'a buffalo.' This Gypsy term has suffered alterations for which it is difficult now to account. The feminine is pronounced as I have written it. It is regularly formed, by the addition of *ní*, the common termination of feminine nouns. *Kapucháv léstar te kaméla te kinél gurumní*, 'I shall ask him if he wishes to buy a cow;' *i gurumní isí mindí*, 'the cow is mine;' *parvardí gurumní*, 'fat cow.'

P.

PAIN—*duk*;* Bor., *duquipen*, *duga*, *dua*.—

TO BE IN PAIN—*dukáva*.—These terms are from the Sr. *duhka*, 'pain, sorrow, affliction.' The first term given by Borrow is formed by the addition to the noun of the suffix *pen*: he defines it 'grief.' *Duk teráva*, 'I have pain;' *dukélanan*, 'it pains me;' *dukéna lákari chuchia*, 'her breasts pain.' This verb at times means 'to be in love:' hence *dukhaipé*, 'love;' *dukhaní*, 'a mistress;' *dukéla m'oghí*, 'my heart loves;' *duk e devlés te oghésa*, 'love God with thy heart.'

TO PAINT—*makáva*.—Possibly from the Sr. *maksh*, 'to fill, to mix, to combine.' This term is applied by the Gypsies to the painting of houses, the smearing of women's faces with rouge or other colors—a practice extremely common among the young women—the painting of the eyebrows and eyelashes with black, and the like. *Makavdó*, part., 'painted, besmeared:' *mo ker isí makavdó*, 'my house is painted;' *makavdó pová*, 'painted eyebrows;' *bimakavdó*, 'not painted.'

PANTALOON—*dimí*, *dimish*: plur. *dimnia* and *dimia*.—*Dimia isí buglé*, 'the pantaloons are large;' *dimialó*, 'wearing pantaloons, braccatus;' *bidimnialó*, 'without pantaloons.'

PAPER—*lir*, *lil*; Bor., *li*.—The Sr. *likh* means generally 'to write, to draw;' *likha*, 'one who writes,' or 'what is written,' and hence, 'what is written upon,' as paper, iron or stone tablets, etc. The Gypsies of

* Armenian *dukhrootiane*, root *dukhr*. The Armenian language loves to increase the guttural sound, and often changes *h*, and even *k*, into the strongly aspirated guttural *kh*; and, what is more singular, it generally changes the liquid *l* of foreign languages into the deep guttural *ghad* or *gh*; e. g. *χαζαρος*, *ghazaros*.—Tz.

- Turkey have corrupted the word by adding an *r*, and changing it at times to *l*. In Spain they have cut off the final syllable, or, more properly, it is changed to an *i*, and blended with the foregoing one: compare Sr. *mukha*, Gypsy *mui*. Compare Slav. *list*, 'leaf, page.' This term is also used in the sense of 'epistle': *picharáva lil*, 'I send a letter.'
- PARTNER—*amál*.—A Persian word, *hemaI*, 'companion,' Mod. Greek *σύντροφος*. Though used as 'companion' is in English, it is more generally applied to those who work together, as partners in business. *Torghióm man amál*, 'I have taken a partner.'
- TO PASS—*nakáva*.—Evidently related to the Sr. *naksh*, 'to approach, to arrive at.'
- PASSOVER—*patranki*; Bor., *pachandra*, *ciria*.—This is undoubtedly a corruption of the Gr. *πάσχα* or *πασχαλία*, 'Easter.' The word cannot be Bulgarian, as this people have retained unchanged the Gr. term *páskha*. The second word given by Borrow, *ciria*, may have originated from the Greek *κύριος* or *κυριακή*, 'Sunday,' 'the Lord's day.' The Greeks very frequently call Easter *λαμπρό*, 'glorious, resplendent.'
- PEAR—*ambról*.—
- PEAR-TREE—*ambrolin*.—This is a Persian word, from *emrud*, and *enbrut*, 'a pear,' from which comes the Turkish *armud*, 'a pear.' Names of trees terminate in *in*. The reader will see a few other examples in this Vocabulary.
- PERSPIRATION—*kamlioipé*, *kamnioipé*.—This appears to me to be of pure Sr. origin. I have noted both forms of the word, since they are equally common. *Kamlióim*, 'I have perspired,' supposes a present *kamáva*, which, however, I have never heard: for it is used *kamló isom*, 'I am perspiring,' from *kamlo*, 'perspiring, in perspiration,' and *kamniováva*, *kamliováva*, from the same and *aváva*.
- PIASTRE—*astaló*.—We have met with another word in the Vocabulary, *lové*, 'money,' in use among the Gypsies. This is frequently used for 'piastres' in the plural, as is the Turk. *ghrush* in the singular. I know of no clue to the etymology of the term, unless it can be referred to Pers. *astar*, 'pondus quoddam indefinitum et varians, quum hic decem, illic sex drachmarum cum semisse ponderi aequet. Vox e Gr. *στατήρ* corrupta esse videtur' (Vullers, Lex. Pers.). It does not resemble any of the terms used by the natives here. Plur. *astalé*: *keti astalé terésa te désman*, 'how many piastres hast thou to give me' (i. e. 'owest thou')? *yek astaló*, 'one piastre'; *eftá astalé*, 'seven piastres.'
- TO PIERCE—*chinkeráva*, *chingheráva*.—This word signifies 'to perforate, to cut through, to pierce with a sharp sword.' It is a compound verb, made up of *chin* and *keráva*, 'to do.' *Chin* I refer to Sr. *chhid*, 'to divide, to cut, to split.' Aor. *chingherghióm*, 'I have pierced, I have wounded.'
- PIT—*gúva*, *khar*.—The first of these terms can be referred to the Sr. *gupti*, from *gup*, 'to hide,' meaning 'hiding, a hole in the ground, a cavern.' As to the other word, *khar*, I leave to others to say whether it can be referred to *khan*, 'to dig,' a verb which has given sundry words to the present Gypsy language (see WELL). *Bashé to bahzéz* (Turk. *baghché*, 'garden') *isi yek khar*, 'near the garden is a pit.'

PITY—*bezéh*.—This is a Persian word, *beze*, ‘crimen, peccatum, injuria, violentia’ (Vullers, Lex. Pers.). It is used by the Gypsies as the Greeks use their *ἔλεος*, ‘pity, commiseration.’ *Bezéh chorénghé*, ‘pity to the poor;’ Gr. *ἔλεος εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς*; i. e. ‘the poor are to be pitied.’ The plural, *bezéha*, is very rarely to be heard.

PLACE—*tan*.—From the root *sthâ*, ‘to stand,’ Gr. *ἵστημι*, Lat. *sto, sisto*, comes the noun *sthâna*, which is so frequent in the Persian language, as *stan*: compare *gulistan*, ‘a place of roses;’ *hindistan*, ‘the place of the Hindus,’ etc. It is natural that a term so common in so many languages should have left traces of its existence in the Gypsy language. Among the Gypsies it has precisely the same signification as among the Hindus. *Kamajân me taneste*, ‘I shall go to my (native) place;’ so *penéna to tan?* ‘what do they call thy place?’ In this sense *tan* is more generally used than *gáv*, ‘village.’ *Peryulikanó tan*, ‘a foreign place (land).’

PLATE—*charó*.—I refer this term to *charu*, from the root *char*, ‘to eat,’ signifying ‘an oblation of rice, barley, and pulse, boiled with butter and milk for presentation to the gods or manes; and the vessel in which such an oblation is prepared.’ The word *charó* is now used for plates of wood, metal, or clay, in which the Gypsies eat, but more commonly an ordinary plate of red clay, in which poor people take their food. Plur. *charé*: *aklé taneste keréna charé*, ‘in that place they make plates;’ *khór charé*, ‘deep plates;’ *charéskoro*, ‘a plate-maker.’

TO PLAY (on instruments of music)—*keláva, gheláva*.—This I refer to the Sr. *kal*, ‘to sound, to throw or cast;’ *kalatâ*, from this root, is ‘melody, music.’ The consonant *k* is often changed to *gh*.

PLUM—*kiláv*.—

PLUM-TREE—*kilavin*.—The origin of these terms is to me unknown. Plur. *kilavá*, ‘plums.’

POMEGRANATE—*daráv*.—

POMEGRANATE-TREE—*daravin*; Bor., *meligrana*.—This word appears to be connected with the Sr. *dârava*, ‘wooden, made of wood,’ Lat. *ligneus*, from the word *dâru*, ‘wood, timber.’ Borrow’s *meligrana* is connected with the Ital. *melagranata* and the Spanish *granada*.

POOR—*choró*.—Connected with the Sr. *chivara*, ‘the tattered dress of a Buddha mendicant, or of any mendicant.’ Bopp defines it “*vestis pannosa*.” It may be connected also with another Sr. term, *chira*, ‘a rag, an old and torn cloth.’ So *kamakerén e choré?* ‘what will the poor do?’ *choripé*, ‘poverty;’ but *chitáva choripé*, ‘I suffer (lit. ‘I draw’) much poverty;’ *me choriákeri*, ‘of me the poor (woman).’ The word is applied to a poor man and to professional beggars by the Gypsies here in Turkey. Fem. *chori*; dim. *chororó*, ‘a beggar boy.’ *Choró* I have heard used for ‘an orphan.’

TO PRAISE—*asharáva*.—This transitive verb I refer to the Sr. root *arch*, ‘to worship, to honor or treat with respect, to praise.’ Pass. *asharávaman*, ‘I praise myself;’ *ἔπαινοῦμαι*; *asharghiómmán*, ‘I have praised myself;’ so *asharéstut*, ‘why dost thou boast’ (lit. ‘praise thyself’)? *ashardó*, ‘praised;’ *ashardó isóm*, ‘I am praised.’

PREGNANT—*kamni*; Br., *kamnee*; Bor., *cambri*.—Related to the Sr. *garbhini*, 'a pregnant woman,' from *garbha*, 'an embryo, a child.' *Teréla chavén?* *na, isi kamni*, 'has she children? no, she is pregnant.'

PRIEST—*rashái*; Bor., *erajay*, *arajay*.—Borrow defines these terms "friar, frayle" (Span.). By the Gypsies of Turkey the name is given to the ordinary priests in the churches, and is an equivalent of the *παιπᾶς* of their coreligionists the Greeks. They often also apply the term to the *διδάσκαλος* of the Greeks, following in this respect the usages of the Christian inhabitants of Turkey, among whom, till a few years ago, the priest was always the teacher (*διδάσκαλος*) of the village, and was called indiscriminately by the inhabitants both "priest" and "teacher," *παιπᾶς* and *διδάσκαλος*. I am not aware of any word among the Gypsies for the order of monks as distinct from this denomination of *rashái*. *Rashani*, 'the wife of the *rashái*.' As priests are frequently married in the villages, the term of course is given to the priest's wife; Gr. *παιπαδία*.

No Sanskrit term can have given origin to this word but *rishi*, 'a saint, a sanctified personage,' and I accept it, on account of the similarity of sound, and of the idea of sanctity attached to the term both by Hindus and Gypsies.

PROP—*pikaló*.—A long stick, used in loading pack-horses; it supports the weight of one side before the other is loaded.

PUDENDUM VIRILE—*kar*.—I know of no satisfactory derivation of this term, which however appears to me of Hindu origin.

PUDENDUM MULIEBRE—*minch*.—This term does not appear connected with the Sr. *madana*. It appears to be related to terms such as *mingo*, *bulxo*, *μύρμι*; this latter often implying carnal connection. Compare Sr. *migr*, 'to mix, to mingle,' *mih*, 'to sprinkle,' *effundere*, *praesertim mingere*. It is proper here to remark that in all languages such terms have usually been difficult of derivation, owing to the indelicacy of the subject, and because they have been altered and distorted according to the unchecked inclination of the most vulgar of the people.

Q.

QUICK, QUICKLY—*sigó*; Bor., *singo*.*—This term may be referred to the Sr. *sanga*, 'meeting, encountering, joining, uniting,' if it does not rather come from *çighra*, 'swift, quick.' It is used at times for 'often.' *Dikésales sigó*, 'dost thou see him often?' *sigó ker*, 'a quick ass;' *sigó sigó*, 'very quickly.'

R.

It RAINS—*déla*.—This term is the 3d pers. sing. of the pres. tense. It is difficult to find a Gypsy who can give the first person of the verb. According to the formation of the Gypsy verb, which I shall explain in Section V, *déla* is the 3d pers. sing. pres., *désa*, 2d pers., *dáva*, 1st pers., 'I rain.' *Dáva* I refer to the Sr. *und* or *ud*, 'to wet, to moisten, to be or become wet.' From this verb comes *uda*, 'water,' compare

* "*Sigo*, 'vite.'" Vaillant, p. 357.

the Gr. ὕδωρ, ὕδωρ, and Slav. voda, 'water.' The Latin unda has preserved the *n* of the root. The Gypsies have cut off the initial syllable of the Sr. root. *Kamáva te del*, 'I wish it would rain;' *but déla avdivés*, 'it rains much today.'

RAIN—*brishindó*, *burshin*; Bor., *brijindel*.—Comp. Sr. *prish*, 'to sprinkle, to pour out water;' also *vrish*, 'to sprinkle, to pour out, to rain.' In the Gypsy, *b* has taken the place of the Sr. initial. Borrow explains *brijindel* by the Sr. *purana* (*púraṇa*), which, though meaning sometimes 'rain,' is generally used for 'perfection, a work well wrought out,' etc. *But brishindó*, 'much rain.' *Burshin* is less frequently used.

RAISIN—*porik*, *porikin*.—The same confusion exists among the Gypsies as to the signification of this word as among the Greeks, from whom undoubtedly the Gypsies have borrowed it. Ὀπώρα, in ancient Greek, designated that time of the year in which fruit ripened, from July to November; ὀπωρικὸς, 'autumnal' and 'matured;' ὀπωρικόν and ἠπωρικόν we now call the fruits themselves, applying the term particularly to esculent fruits growing on trees, and these trees, formerly called ἔλαια κάρπιμα, we now call ἔυλοκαρπια, in order to distinguish them from trees giving no fruit. Πωρικόν is a very vague term, and the Gypsies very rarely can agree to what fruit or particular tree the word *porikin* should be applied. I have heard it applied to plums, to plum-trees themselves, and very often to raisins and figs. *Porikin* is similar in formation to *kilavin*, 'plum-tree,' and *ambrolin*, 'pear-tree.'

RED—*loló*; Bor., *lolo*, *lole*.—Compare Sr. *lohita*, 'red, reddish, blood.' The Gypsies have preserved the first syllable, which they have doubled. Borrow defines the word in his vocabulary 'tomato,' the well known vegetable called by us *τομάτα*. The rejection of whole syllables is common in many languages.

TO REJOICE—*loshániováva*.—A verb in the middle voice, composed of *loshanó*, 'rejoicing,' *χαίόμενος*, and *aváva*. It is a very common verb among the Gypsies. I refer it to Sr. *lush*, 'to adorn, to decorate.' This verb I have never heard excepting in the middle form. *Loshanoipé*, 'joy.'

TO REST—*acháva*.—This I refer to the Sr. root *ach*, 'to go to or towards, to worship.' *Ach devlésa*, 'rest thou with God,' addressed to persons departing; *achardó isi*, 'he has remained.'

TO REVILE—*kusháva*.—This may be connected with the Sr. *kuṣa*, 'wicked, depraved, mad, inebriate,'* resembling the Gr. *κακός*, which has given origin to *κακίζω*, 'to revile one as a bad man.' *Ma kush*, 'do not revile.'

RICH—*baravaló*.—This may be referred to Sr. *prabala*, 'strong, powerful.' *Isi kilavdó, ta but baravaló*, 'he is fat, and very rich.'

TO RIDICULE—*prasáva*.—This is a compound term, composed of the prep. *pra* and *has*, which we have defined: see to LAUGH. It is rare in the Gypsy language to meet with verbs united to prepositions. Even in modern Greek there has always been a tendency among the

* Armenian *kesh*, 'bad, wicked.'—Tr.

more uncultivated of the people to strike off all those prepositions which vary the primary signification of the verb. The same remark is also applicable to the Bulgarians, as regards their mother Slavonic.

RING, FINGER-RING—*angrusti, angustri*.—The form is Persian, though it has been borrowed from the Sr. *anguri* or *anguli*, 'a finger, a toe;' *angushṭa*, 'the thumb;' Pers. *engiushṭ*, 'finger;' *engiushṭer* and *engiushṭeri*, 'finger-ring.'

RIPE—*mulanó*.—

TO RIPEN, to become RIPE—*mulanokeráva*.—Of doubtful etymology.

RIVER—*len*; Bor., *len*.*—This is one of many Gypsy words whose derivation, at first sight, is not so palpable as that of many others. But it may plausibly be referred to the Sr. root *li* or *ri*, 'to dissolve, to flow.' *Bashé to len*, 'near the river;' *sigó len*, 'a swift river.'

ROAD—*drom*; Bor., *dron, drun*.—Some light may be thrown on the derivation of this word by the Gr. *δρόμω*; *δρόμος*, 'a road.' This Gr. term has its origin from the Sr. *dram*, 'to go, to move;' and probably the same Sr. root has given origin to these Gypsy words. *Bugló drom*, 'a wide road.'

ROD—*rubli*.—Applied to represent the common Gr. *ῥαβδίον*, dim. of *ῥάβδος*, 'a rod,' and denoting something larger and stouter than the *ran*, 'switch, cane.' Of its origin I know nothing.

ROOT—*korin*.—A Bulgarian word, very common among the Gypsies: Bulg. *kóren*, 'root;' Slav. *kóren'*, 'root.' *E rukéskero korini*, 'the root of the tree.' This term is by some Gypsies used for the 'bark,' corresponding to the Slav. *korá*, 'bark;' Gr. *φλοιός*.

ROPE—*sheló*.—Compare Sr. *çulla*, 'a cord, a rope, a string,' and its cognate *çulva*, of the same signification.

RUSSIAN—*moskovis*.—The ordinary term used by the Turks, *moskov*, 'a Russian;' Gr. *μόσκοβος*. The Greeks also often call them *ῥώσσους*.

S.

SACK—*kisi*.—Probably the Turkish *kiesé*, 'sack, bag.'

SADDLE—*zen*.—A Persian word, *zen*, 'a saddle,' often written *zen-i-asp*, 'saddle of the horse.' This term, as used by the Gypsies, is properly 'a saddle upon which a person can ride;' for 'a pack-saddle,' they have adopted the Turkish *semer*, as have the Greeks, *σαμάκι*. *Chorghiá tumaré kheréskoro i zén*, 'they have stolen your ass's saddle.'

SALT—*lon*; Bor., *lon*.—These two identical words I refer to the Sr. *lavana*, 'salt, mineral and marine.' Hence, as with us, it signifies 'salted, well seasoned or flavored, any fluid containing salt.'

TO SALT—*londaráva*.—From the above *lon*. It is a transitive verb. *Londarghióm*, 'I have salted.'

TO be SATED—*chalióvava*.—A compound verb, formed of *chal* and *aváva*. *Chal* appears to me to be the verb *char*, 'to go, to graze,' which I have had occasion to explain in speaking of TO GRAZE. As *char* by the Gypsies is used for 'grass,' and for 'the grazing of animals,' it came very naturally to correspond, in course of time, to the *χορμίω* and *χογραίω* of the Greeks. United to the usual *aváva*, like

* "*Lom*, 'ruisseau.'" Vaillant, p 364.

most of the middle verbs of the Gypsy idiom, it has become *chariováva*, and, by the commutation of the liquids, *chaliováva*. These words literally mean 'I have grazed.' *Ta kháva khandi chaliováva*, 'and though I eat little, I am sated;' *chaliovéla*, 'he is satiated.'

TO SAY—*benáva*, *penáva*; Bor., *penar*.—There are two Sr. verbal roots to which this verb may be referred: *bhan*, 'to say, to speak,' and *pan*, 'to praise:' the former of them is much more likely to be the original of the Gypsy term. The 3d pers. of the present, *benéna*, is used frequently as an impersonal: 'it is said, they say;' Gr. *λέγουν, λέγεται*. *Benéna ki o takár kamuló*, 'they say that the king has died;' *so kamésa te penés mánghe?* 'what dost thou wish to say to me?' *na penéna chachipés*, 'they do not speak the truth;' *na penghiómles*, 'I did not say it;' *ma pén*, 'do not say' (i. e. 'speak'); *penghióm yavréske t' avén*, 'I told the others to come.' This term is generally pronounced *benáva*, very rarely *penáva*.

TO SCRATCH—*khanjováva*, *khandiováva*.—This verb can be referred to the Sr. *kandú*, 'itching, scratching.' It is in the middle voice, and means 'I scratch myself.' The neuter is *khanjáva*, 'I scratch.' By some Gypsies the word is pronounced *khandiováva*, approaching nearer to the Sr. form. The change of *k* into *kh* is common.

SCYTHE—*fárkia*.—This term appears to belong to the Wallachians, from whom the Gypsies have borrowed it. As the language spoken in Wallachia and Moldavia is a corrupted Latin, springing from the language of the Roman legions settled in those parts by the Roman emperors, *falx*, 'a sickle,' may have given origin to this term, with commutation of the liquids. Compare also Pers. *evrak*, 'falx foenaria.' The Latin origin appears to me the more probable. Some Gypsies, instead of this word, use *kosa*, the Bulgarian word for 'scythe.'

SEA—*deryáv*, *mára*; Br., *daráv*; Bor., *loria*.—This is a Persian term, *derya* and *deryab*, very usual also among the Turks. It signifies 'a sea,' and at times 'a river,' or 'any great collection of water.' By the change of *d* into *l* has been formed Borrow's word. My second term, *mára*, I have repeatedly heard from Moslem Gypsies. It is the Sr. *vári*, 'water,' Slav. *móre*, Lat. *mare*. Though *derya* is usual among the Turks, it is never to be heard except in a high flown style, very rarely in conversation; and certainly it can never have come to the ears of the rude Gypsy, who hears only the usual term of the people, *deniz*, 'sea.' *Mára* may have been learned from the Slavonic nations, and the Bulgarians particularly, who still make use of it: *móre*, 'sea.'

SECRETLY—*choryál*.—Formed from *chor*, 'a thief, a robber,' and in the ablative form, like many other adverbs. Secresy and robbery are always intimately united: compare *κλεψίνοος, κλεψίφρων*, Mod. Gr. *κλεψιάτα*, 'secretly;' Fr. *furtivement*. *Choryál diniómles*, 'I struck him secretly.'

TO SEE—*dikáva*, *dikháva*; Bor., *dicar*, *diar*.—I know of no Sr. verb to which this term may be so reasonably referred as to *driç*, 'to see, to behold,' Gr. *δέχομαι*. We have had occasion to notice in many instances the omission of an *r*, and the conversion of the Sr. sibilant *ç* into the guttural *k*. The second form of Borrow, *diar*, resembles the pronunciation of many Turkish Gypsies, who give the word as though

written *dikháva*, and *diháva*, *diáva*. In fact, the aspirate *h* is so gentle as to be scarcely heard. This pronunciation of the guttural *k*, or rather its mutation into a soft aspirate, cannot be attributed to any local usage of the Gypsies, acquired from the natives, as it is prevalent only in the Asiatic provinces of Turkey, in the west of Asia Minor. *Dikiniló*, 'he appeared;' *dikióla*, 'it appears;' *dúí manushé diklióm*, 'two men I saw;' *te na dikáv*, 'that I may not see;' *diklióm-la yek divés*, 'I saw her one day;' *dikáva léskere chavén*, 'I see his children.'

TO SELL—see to BUY.

SERPENT—*sapp*.—The Sr. *sarpa*, 'a snake, a serpent,' from the root *srip*, 'to glide, to creep.*' The Gypsies have assimilated the *r* to the following *p*, as in many other like cases (see Section IV). The term is extremely common in all the cognate dialects of the Sr.: compare Lat. *serpens*, It. *serpe*, Fr. *serpent*, Gr. ἔρπης and ἔρπω, by the aspiration of the initial *s*, so common among the Greeks. "Οφίς is probably derived from Sr. *ahi*, 'a snake,' by the commutation of the aspirates (Bopp).

TO SEW—*siváva*.—

NEEDLE—*sív*; Bor., *jutia*.—Both these terms have a common origin, from the Sr. root *syú*, *siv*, 'to sew,' Lat. *suere*, Slav. *shiyu*. Compare also Sr. *súchi*, 'needle,' from a cognate root *súch*, 'to sew.'

TO SHAVE—*munláva*; Bor., *palabear*.—The origin of this word is very clear; it comes from the Sr. root *mund*, 'to grind, to cut the hair, to shave.' Its derivatives have all a similar meaning: as *munḍaka*, 'a barber;' *munḍana*, 'the act of shaving.' Borrow's term, *palabear*, is derived from *palyula* in his vocabulary. This is the Sr. *palyul*, 'to eat, to purify.' But the word appears to me of Spanish origin.

SHEEP—*bakró*, *bakrichó*; Br., *bakroo*; Bor., *bracuñi*, *bacria*.—I have placed here Borrow's second term, although he defines it 'a goat:' it appears to be a word of the same origin. The Hindus call the goat *bukka*. Compare also Germ. *bock*, Eng. *buck*, Fr. *bouc*. *Bakri*, 'ewe;' *bakrichó*, 'lamb,' dim. form, instead of *bakroró*. *Allé bakré*, 'sheep have come;' *teréla shelé bakré*, 'he has (owns) a hundred sheep.'

SHIP—*beró*; Br., *ghamee*; Bor., *bero*, *berdo*.—*Beró* seems to be naturally related to the root *bhrí*, 'to uphold, to support, to cherish.' Borrow's *berdó* I refer to another cognate word, *bhartri*, 'a supporter, a holder.' This derivation is corroborated by *vordón* or *bordón*, 'a carriage,' which is referable to the same word. Mr. Brown's *ghamee* is the Turk. *gemí*, 'a vessel, a ship.' *Beréskoro*, 'a seaman,' *νούτης*, Turk. *gemichi*.

SHOE—*triák*.—I have nothing satisfactory to propose for the derivation of this singular term, which does not resemble any of the words usually applied by the people of these countries to shoes. The Mod. Gr. *παπούτσια* is from the Pers. *papush* and *pabuj*, 'shoes;' *τσαρούτσια* is from the Turk. *charuk*, 'shoes formed of a piece of thick leather, fastened to the foot by strong thongs of the same material,' worn by farmers and shepherds. Plur. *triakú* and *triakhá*: *lákoro pral keréla triakhá*, 'her brother makes shoes.'

* Armenian *zeral*, 'to creep.'—Tr.

SHOOT (of a vine)—*vicha*.—This is a Bulgarian word, coming from Slav. *vich*, ‘a twig, a switch.’ It is not a very common word. The Greeks also say *βίτσα*, but more commonly *βέγυα*, from the Italian *verga*, Lat. *virga*. ‘*E manukléri vicha*, ‘the shoot of the stump.’

SHOULDER—*vikó*, *pikó*.—Of origin unknown to me.

TO SHUT—*bandava*.—This is the well known Sr. root *bandh*, ‘to bind, to tie,’ which corresponds with many terms in the cognate languages: Pers. *bend*, ‘a bond,’ *bend kerden*, ‘to bind;’ Germ. *bunden*, *band*; Fr. *bande*; Eng. *band*, *to bind*, *bondage*, *bonds*, etc. Among the Gypsies this verb has the signification also of ‘tying,’ as both are intimately related: thus, *band o vutár*, ‘shut the door;’ *bandela pi kori*, ‘he ties his neck’ (i. e. ‘his neckkerchief’); *bandava mi kori*, ‘I tie my neckkerchief;’ *bandloipé*, ‘band;’ *bandloipé me móste*, ‘a band to my mouth.’ Aor. *bandlióm*, ‘I have shut, or tied;’ *bandlióm mo grast*, ‘I have tied my horse.’

SIEVE—*rësheto*.—A common word, borrowed from the Bulgarian, who pronounce it *riséto*.

TO SIGH—*acharava*.—This word I have not been able to refer to any corresponding Sr. term. It means ‘to groan, to lament, to sigh deeply.’ Aor. *acharghióm* and *akiarghióm*. *Saró divés acharéla*, ‘all day (long) he sighs.’

SILVER—*rup*; Bor., *paquilli*, *plubi*, *pomi*.—This term is evidently from the Sr. *rúpya*, ‘worked silver, silver and gold.’ Our common word *ἀσίμωρον*, used now for *ἄργυρος*, ‘silver,’ which some regard as derived from *σημα*, ‘a stamp, a sign,’ is cognate with the Pers. *sim*, ‘silver,’ and ‘silver coin.’ The reader must not confound *rup* with the common Turk. *rub*, derived from the Arabic *rub*, ‘fourth.’ The three forms of Borrow I do not know how to explain. The second, however, may be the Sp. *plomo*, ‘lead,’ which Borrow may have written by mistake. I do not agree with him as to its derivation from *rapi*. The Sr. word has given name to the common Hindu coin of the present day, commonly written “rupee.” *Rupocanáó*, ‘made of silver, argenteus.’ No doubt, also, the Russian *ruble* has an intimate connection with this Sr. term.

SIMILAR. LIKE—*sar*.—*manúsh sar char*, ‘man (is) like grass;’ *sar lubudi* (Gr. *λουλόδιον*, ‘flower’) *e puvíak-vri*, ‘like the flower of the earth;’ *sar tut*, ‘like thee;’ *sar lubni*, ‘like a strumpet.’

SONG—*ghili*.—

TO SING—*ghiliava*, *ghiliovava*; Bor., *guillabar*.—The Sr. root *grí* is ‘to sound, to speak, to sing;’ from it comes *gir*, ‘a song.’ *Ghiliava* is derived from this root, by the commutation of *r* for *l*, in accordance with all the Gypsy verbs derived from Sr. verbal roots ending in *ri* or *ri*. Borrow’s term corresponds with the one used in Turkey. He has another in his vocabulary, *labeledar*, ‘cantar, hablar,’ which he refers to the Sr. *lap*, ‘to speak, to utter.’ It appears to me to be connected rather with the Sp. *hablar*, ‘to speak.’ *Ghiliovava* is in the middle voice, formed from *ghiló*, ‘song,’ and the usual *avava*.

These terms are extremely common among all the Gypsies of Turkey, and particularly among their women, who gain their livelihood by roaming in the streets, and singing every kind of lascivious and

erotic song. *Ghilimpé*, 'an instrument of music;' *i ghiliá e devléskero*, 'the songs of God.'

SISTER—See BROTHER.

SLEEP—*lindr*.—This is evidently the Sr. *nídrá*, 'sleep, sleepiness, sloth.' From this noun is formed an adj. *lindraló*, 'sleepy;' *bilindraló*, 'sleepless;' *na isóm lindraló*, 'I am not sleepy.' Here we see the commutation of the liquids *n* and *l*, so common among the Gypsies and Greeks.

TO SLEEP—*sováva*;* Bor., *sobelar*, *sornar*.—Comp. the Sr. *svap*, 'to sleep,' *svapna*, 'sleep,' with which correspond Gr. *ύπνος*, Lat. *sopnus*, *somnus*. The final radical of the Sr. root has been changed into the kindred *v*. *Sottisóm*, 'I am asleep' (for *sottó isóm*). *Sottó*, 'asleep,' is the Sr. part. *supta*, 'sleeping, asleep;' *sottó 'si i likhnari* (Gr. *λυχνάριον*), 'the lamp is quenched' (lit. 'asleep'). This phrase I have heard from Gypsies residing near Constantinople. It is taken from the Greeks, who call *λυχνάριον άκοιμητον* the lamp that is kept burning night and day before the household images. *Nu sováva*, 'I am not sleeping.'

SLIM—*sannó*.—Compare the Sr. part. *sanna*, 'shrunk, diminished,' from the verbal root *sad*, 'to wane, to perish gradually.' *Léskeri i ronní isi sanní*, 'his wife is slim.'

SLOWLY—*parés*.—This seems to originate from the Sr. *para*, whose definitions are exceedingly numerous and varied. I have often heard it used in this sense. As it is an adverb, it supposes an adj. *paró*, 'slow.' *Parés parés*, 'slowly;' *parés ker*, 'work slowly.'

TO SNEEZE—*chiktáva*.—This, like many other similar verbs, is a compound, made up of *chik*, 'a sneeze,' and *dáva*, 'I give.' Compare Sr. *chikká*, *chikkána*, 'sneezing.' The verb *dáva*, 'I give,' is frequently joined to nouns. Some of these are never used in their simple form, and are extremely rare, even in the mouth of other Gypsies. An example of the usage of the simple and compound verb we have in *tapáva*, 'to strike,' which is also frequently used in the compound form, *tap dáva*, 'I give a stroke, I strike.' Aor. *chiktinióm*, from *dinióm*, aor. of *dáva*.

SNOW—*iv*, *bió*; Bor., *bifi*, *give*.—From the Sr. *hima*, 'snow,' is derived our *χιών*, *χειμα*, Lat. *hiems*, Slav. *zima*, 'winter.' *Iv* is a regular formation; *h* is dropped, and *m* changed to *v* (see Section IV).

SOIL—*poshik*.—This is one of many terms which, in want of a better definition, I refer conjecturally to the root *push*, 'to cherish or nurture, to rear or bring up.' This definition might have been given to the soil, as the ultimate source of nutrition.

SON-IN-LAW—*jamutró*.—The Sr. possesses two cognate terms, with which this word closely coincides: *yámátri* and *jámátri*, 'a daughter's husband.'

TO SPEAK—*vrakeráva*.—A compound verb, *vra* and *keráva*, 'to make.' *Bhraṇ*, *braṇ*, and *vraṇ*, are cognate Sr. verbs, signifying 'to sound;' but I prefer as the origin of this Gypsy verb the root *brú*, 'to speak, to say,' which is to be met with in many European languages. The

* "*Sováko*, 'il dort.'" Vaillant, p. 363. "*Passjuval*, 'schlafen.'" Arndt, p. 391.

word is a very common one among all the Gypsies, particularly when they wish to impose silence. *Mu vrakér*, 'do not speak' (i. e. 'be silent'), Gr. *σιώω*; *na vrakeráva*, 'I do not talk;' *ta i romnía ka dukéna but ta vrakeréna*, 'and the women that love to talk much.*'

To SPIN—*katáva*.—This Gypsy verb cannot easily be referred to a satisfactory Sr. original. But compare Sr. *krit*, 'to cut,' also 'to spin,' and its derivative *kartana*, 'cutting, spinning.'

To SPIT—*chungárva*.—I know of no Sr. root to which this Gypsy word may with propriety be referred. It means 'to spit upon, to revile.' Among the common people in these countries, spitting upon one another is an act of contempt and reviling. *Chungartinióm*, aor. pass., 'I was spit upon,' i. e. 'I was insulted;' *chungér*, 'spittle, phlegm,' and whatever else is ejected from the mouth.

SPONSOR—*kirvó*.—This is a term common to all the Gypsies, who certainly cannot have brought it from India. The Greek *ἀνδοχος*, 'godfather, sponsor,' designates one who undertakes to execute something, a guarantee. May it not then be allowable to refer this term to the Sr. *kurvat*, 'doing, acting, an agent,' from *kri*, 'to make, to do?' *Kirví*, 'god-mother;' *mo kirvó isi but baravaló*, 'my godfather is very rich.'

SPOON—*róyi, rói*.—The origin of this term is unknown to me.

STAKE—*kiló*.—Compare Sr. *kila*, 'a stake, a pin, a bolt,' etc. This term by the Gypsies is used for poles set up around a field, upon which is formed the fence; also, for the poles set up around the threshing floors; and again, for poles stuck deep into the ground, to which horses are fastened while grazing. *Bandlióm mo grastés to kiló*, 'I have tied my horse to the stake.' Compare Slav. *kol*, 'stake, pike.'

TO STAND—*terghiováva, tertiováva*.—This is a verb in the middle voice, in common use among the Gypsies. Aor. *tertinilióm*, and by some pronounced *terghinilióm*. Like the Greek *στέχωμαι*, it is always used in the passive voice. *Terghiovávu* supposes *teráva* as the active voice, which we have referred above (see to HAVE) to the Sr. *dhri*, 'to have, to hold, to keep.' *Atiá terghiováva*, 'here I stand;' *édō stéxoumai*.

STAR—*chergheni*; † Br., *tcherhinee*; Bor., *cherdillas, trebene*.—Compare Sr. *tará*, 'star, planet, constellation,' probably from the Vedic *stárá*, by throwing off the initial *s*. From this is our *αστήρ* and *αστρον*, Lat. *aster, astrum*. ‡ *Cherdillas*, and *cherdino*, found in another place in Borrow's glossary, I conjecture to be of Spanish origin.

TO STEAL—*choráva, choláva*.§—

THIEF—*chor*; Bor., *chor, choro*.—These terms, so similar to each other, are referable to the Sr. root *chur*, 'to steal, to rob.' According to Bopp, this root gives origin to the Lat. *fur* and Gr. *φύρ*. From it

* Pott writes the word "*Rakkeraf*, 'sprechen, reden.'" Nearly all the authors on the Gypsies write the word in a similar manner. The word is pronounced by the Gypsies here as I have written it, and I have heard it very often with the initial *v* strongly marked.

† "*Tchearen*, 'astres'" Vaillant, p. 457. "*Tschergeny, zehene*, 'stern.'" Arndt, p. 366.

‡ The Armenian *asdegh* is evidently of the same origin, as that language often changes *r* and *l* to the guttural *gh*.—T. B.

§ "*Tchordel*, 'tu volés'" (write *tchorél*, 'il vole'). Vaillant, p. 369.

comes *chaura*, 'a thief, a robber, a pilferer,' whence the above *chor* and *choro*. At times, instead of *chor*, the Gypsies use *chornó* and *churnó*, 'a thief.' *Chordicanó*, 'stolen;' *kon chorghíales?* 'who stole it?' *astarghióm e chorés*, 'I have taken the thief.'

STEEL—*abekín*.—This term, ordinarily meaning 'steel,' is very often applied to the steel and flint used generally in Turkey for striking fire, and which people always carry with them for lighting their tobacco-pipes. It is difficult to refer it to any known Sr. term. I bring to the memory of the reader the Pers. *abgine*, 'vitrum, crystallum,' a name given to substances similar to the flint, and so, perhaps, in course of time to the steel itself, which constituted a necessary accompaniment of these instruments. In this manner the word may have come to be applied to steel in general.*

TO STEP—*ukiaváva*, *uktiaváva*.—This verb is derived from the Sr. *kram*, 'to go, to walk, to step,' with some preposition prefixed. It is used also for 'stamping, trampling,' etc.

IT SINKS—*kándela*.—Of doubtful etymology. *Kandiniko*, 'stinking.'

STONE—*bar*; Bor., *bar*.—Compare Sr. *bhāra*, 'weight, burden.' It is possible that the Gypsies gave this name to 'stone,' as being preëminently heavy. It is very well known to all of them. *Diniāles yek baré barésa*, 'he struck him with a large stone;' *ov isás ta chivghías o bar*, 'it was he who threw the stone;' *baréskoro*, 'a stone-cutter, a worker in stones.'

STRAW—*bus*.—Referable to the Sr. *busa*, 'chaff.' Compare FLAX.

TO STRIKE—*topáva*, *tap-dáva*.—*Tap* is not a very usual word among the Gypsies, and when used, it is mostly joined to *dáva*, 'I give;' *tap dáva*, 'I give a blow, I strike.' *Tap déla*, 'it beats' (i. e., the pulse). Both *tap* and *tapáva* seem to be related to the Sr. *tup*, 'to injure, to hurt, to kill,' which has passed into Greek, as *τύπτω*. It may be well to remark that *tap*, 'to heat, to torment,' may possibly have given origin to this verb.

STRONG—*zoroló*.—This is a word of Persian origin, very common among the Gypsies, from *zor*, 'strength, vigor.' It is very usual with the Turks also, who have formed from it adjectives of their own: *zorlu*, 'strong,' instead of the Pers. *zormend* or *zordar*, 'having strength.' *Bizoraló*, 'weak;' but *zoroló isóm*, 'I am very strong.†

STUMP of a vine—*manukló*, *manikló*.—Applied to the vine in vineyards, before the plant has shot out the sprouts upon which the grapes are produced. It is like the trunk of a tree. *E manukliéri vicha kerela drak*, 'the shoots of the stump make (i. e. 'produce') grapes.'

SUMMER—*nilái*.—Of doubtful etymology.

SUN—*kam*; † Br., *cam*; Bor., *cam*, *can*.—The similarity of these words makes their common derivation plain. The usual name of the sun

* All the derivations of Pott are as unsatisfactory as mine. They may serve as a guide to others.

† Armenian *zoravor*, 'strong;' *zoranal*, 'to grow strong;' *zorutiune*, 'strength.'—

TR. † "O-čam, 'le soleil.'" Vaillant, p. 457. "Kam, cham, okam, 'sonne.'" Arndt, p. 366.

among the Hindus was *sûrya*, from the root *sur*, 'to shine.' The above *kam*, *can* seems related to the Sr. root *kan*, 'to shine;' compare Lat. *candeo*, whence also *candela*, *candidus*, 'white;' like our *σελήνη*, 'moon,' from *σελάω*, 'to shine,' and Mod. Gr. *φεγγάσιον*, 'moon,' from *φέγγω*, 'to shine.'*

SUNDAY—*kurkó*; Bor., *culco*, *curque*.—See CHURCH.

SWEET—*gudló*; Br., *goodlu*; Bor., *busni*.—Concerning these terms I have nothing satisfactory to propose. *Gudló tut*, 'sweet milk.'

SWINE—*baló*, *balichó*; Br., *baleetcho*; Bor., *balicho*.—Compare the Sr. adjective *balin*, 'strong, powerful,' and, as substantive, among other meanings, 'swine.' *Balichó* is a diminutive form, probably from the language of the Turks, as the word, according to the general formation of the Gypsy diminutives, would be *baloró*. *Parvardó baló*, 'a fat pig.'

WORD—*hantó*; Bor., *estuché*.—Neither of these words appears to me to have any clear relation to Sr. roots. In want of anything better, I propose for *hantó* (at times *khanló*), the common Sr. *han*, 'to hurt or kill.' The final syllable *lo* is the regular adjective form of many Gypsy nouns. Borrow's *estuché* may be related to the Italian *stocco*, 'a small sword.' We have seen another Italian word in Borrow's vocabulary, viz. *meligrana*.

T.

TAIL—*pori*.—I know of no Sr. word to which this term can be traced.

TO TAKE, TO GET—*lára*; Bor., *lillar*.—Undoubtedly related to the Sr. *lá*, 'to take, to obtain.' This verb I formerly considered as referable to Sr. *labh*, 'to take, to seize,' from which originates the Gr. *λαβύρω*, *λαβύρω*; but its indicative present should in that case be *laráva*, and its aorist *lavghióm*. *Kamalél yek grast*, 'he will take (i. e. 'buy') a horse;' *liniómles panjénghe*, 'I bought it for five' (i. e. 'pieces of money'). Borrow's form *lillar* does not appear to be connected with *lára*.

TALL—*vuchó*, *uchó*; Br., *utchó*; Bor., *saste*.—This word is the Sr. *uch-cha*, 'high, tall.' Probably Borrow's *saste*, 'high, tall,' is related to the Sr. *çasta*, 'fortunate, excellent, great.' This term is by nearly all the Gypsies pronounced *vuchó*: *uchó* is in use only among a few of the Moslems. *Vuchó manúsh*, 'a tall man;' *vuchó ruk*, 'a tall tree; adv. *vuchés*, 'highly;' *po vuchés*, 'more highly.'

TEAR—*ásfa*.—The Sr. *váshpa*, written also *váspa*, 'vapor, tear,' by dropping its initial consonant, and converting the *p* of the last syllable into its cognate *f*, has formed the present *asfa*.

TENT—*sahriz*; Br., *serka*.—Words of origin unknown to me.

TESTICLE—*peló*.—I have inserted another word in the Vocabulary, used for 'testicle' (see EGG). *Peló* (pl. *pelé*) may be referred to the Sr. *pela*, 'a testicle.'

THIEF—See to STEAL.

* Armenian *loosin*, 'moon,' from *loosnil*, 'to shine.'—T_R.

THIRST—*trush, trust*.—

To THIRST—*taráva*.—These terms have a common origin, from the Sr *trish*, 'to thirst.' From this root have originated the Germ. *durst*, Eng. *thirst*. As thirst implies the idea of want of water and dryness, it is consequently natural to suppose that from the same Sr. root have sprung the Gr. *τέσσομαι* and *τεσθαίω*, 'to dry.' The Sr. semi-vowel *r* is rarely lost in the European languages; it is, in fact, the most constant of all the Sr. consonants. *Trushaló*, 'thirsty;' *trushalo sóm*, 'I am thirsty.'

To become THIRSTY.—*trushálováva*.—A verb in the middle form, composed of the above *trushaló*, 'thirsty,' and *aváva*. The Gypsies are extremely fond of these compound verbs, and neglect the simple, as in this case. The same is true of the Greeks. The Moslem Gypsies make use of *teráva*, and, though they understand *trushalováva*, will not employ it.

THIS—*avaká, avká*.—There is a great confusion in the use of this demonstrative pronoun. Even among the Gypsies themselves, one hears the word continually varied, without any apparent reason: *avaká*, 'this;' *avakhá* (or *akhá*) *isi minró*, 'this is mine;' *avaklia* (or *aklá*) *resá*, 'these vineyards;' *akhiá mol*, 'this wine;' *okhiá romni*, 'this woman;' *oklé manushénghere*, 'of these men.' Both masculine and neuter have the same termination. *Avakhá manúsh*, 'this man;' *avakhá chavó*, 'this child.' It is difficult to say to which of the Sr. pronouns this term should be referred.

THREAD—*tav*.—This word appears to be of pure Sr. origin. The root *tap*, 'to heat, to vex, to torment,' we have noticed in this Vocabulary, as the parent stock of many words among the Gypsies here in Turkey. It appears also in the Pers. *tabiden* and *taften*, 'to burn, to vex, to torment.' To this verb properly belongs *tab*, 'curvatura funis, comae' (Vullers), and *risman taften*, 'to weave,' *charkh risman-i-tav*, 'an instrument for weaving.' All these terms imply the idea of tormenting, as is the case with any filament when it is twisted into thread, or rather tormented into this new form. In Greek, *κλωστή*, from *κλώθω*, 'to twist, to weave,' is used now very generally for *νήυα*, 'thread.' So too in Latin, *torquere*, 'to twist, to torment,' gave origin to *torques*, 'a chain worn round the neck.' From *στρέφω*, 'to turn, to whirl,' came the *στροφή* of the ancient Greek physicians, by which they indicated violent shooting pains in the bowels, the *tormina* of the Romans. In this way I conceive that the Gypsy word *tav* was either borrowed from the Persians, or formed directly from the Sr. root from which the Persians have taken their own *tabiden*. The Persians have also *tav*, 'thread,' and *tabdi*, 'torquens funem,' which the Turkish translator (Vullers s. v.) explains by *ip ve iptik bukiji*, 'a weaver of thread or rope.'

THROAT—*kurló*.—A very indefinite word: it signifies 'the back of the mouth,' and frequently 'the neck,' particularly its front part. To me it appears to be the Bulgarian *gurló*, 'throat, pharynx.' *T' astar-ghiorél mo chip me kurléste*, 'may my tongue be bound (lit. 'held') in my throat.'

To THROW—*chiváva, chitáva*.—Compare Sr. *kship*, 'to throw or cast,' part. *kshipta*, 'thrown, despatched,' which seems to have given origin

to this Gypsy verb, which retains the same signification as the Sr. original. By the usual change of the consonants, this participle becomes *kshitto* or *chitto*, and hence the verb *chitára*. Aor. *chivghióm*: *chivghióm yek bar*, 'I threw a stone;' *kána chivésa bar*, 'when thou throwest (a) stone;' *chivdiló o bar*, 'the stone was thrown;' *chivghián bar, dik nápalal*, 'thou hast thrown (a) stone, look behind'—a common proverb, 'consider the consequences of thy actions.'

TILL—*chin*.—This term is common to all the Gypsies, wherever they are to be found. *Keti dur isi* (pronounced *dursi*) *chin ti Silivri?* 'how far is it to Silivria?' *chin ti puu*, 'to the ground;' Gr. *ἕως εἰς τῆν γῆν*; *chin vuchés*, 'on high.'

TIME, TIMES—*far, var*.—Corresponds to the Gr. *φορὰ*, as *πολλὰς φορὰς*, *ὀλίγας φορὰς*, used now in the place of *πολλῶν φορῶν*, *ὀλίγων φορῶν*. The word is pronounced indifferently *far* and *var*, and in this the Gypsies imitate their neighbors the Greeks, who say *φορὰ* and *βολὴ*. *Yek far*, 'one time, once;' *kayék far*, 'sometimes' and 'never;' like the Gr. *καμύταν φορῶν*, which has both these significations. This term is the Pers. *bar*, which has often the meaning of the Lat. *vicis*, Turk. *defa*, 'turn;' compare Pers. *yek bar*, 'one time, once.' Vullers derives it from Sr. *bhâra*, from the root *bhri*, Gr. *φέρω*, whence *φορὰ*. But compare Sr. *vâra*, 'a turn, a successive time.' *Ke yavér far diviás man*, 'and at other times he struck me;' *po kayék far*, 'at times, sometimes;' *duvár, trivár, panjvâr*, 'twice, thrice, five times.'

To be **TIRED**—*chiniováva*.—See to **CUT**.

TOBACCO-PIPE—*chukni*.—This is a common term for the long tobacco-pipes, used in the Levant by all the inhabitants indiscriminately. *An i chukni*, 'bring the tobacco-pipe.' The usual term among the Turks is *chibuk*, Gr. *τσιμπούκιον*.

TODAY—*avdivés, aplivés*;* Bor., *achibes*.—We have in this term the Sr. *divá*,† which I have had occasion to mention in explaining the term *divés*, 'day, morning.' The initial *a, av* may be the Sr. dem. pron. *sa*, which has rejected, like many Greek words, the Sr. *s* at its beginning. The formation of this adverb may be explained by the Gr. *σήμερον, τήμερον*, 'this day;' *τῆτες, τ-έτος*, 'this year;' *τώρα*, 'this hour, now.' *Avdivés aváva*, 'today I am coming.'

TOGETHER—*eketané*.—This appears to me a pure Sr. term, coming from *eka*, 'one.' Compare Lat. *una*, 'together, in company;' Pers. *yekser*, 'together, at the same time.' Here is an example of a purer preservation of this Sr. numeral than we have in the term *yik*, 'one.' The Gypsies always pronounce it as I have written it. *Achái chor eketané*, 'and other thieves together;' *eketané améntza*, 'together with us;' *eketané e chavéntza*, 'together with the children.‡

TOMB—*mermóri, nmemóri*.—Of modern Greek origin. *Μνημόσιον* and *μνημοσίον* are diminutive forms of *μνήμα*, 'a tomb.' The ancients

* " *Abdés, odés*, 'aujourd'hui.'" Vaillant, p. 456.

† Armenian *div*, 'day.'—Tr.

‡ Pott writes the word *kettene, kêtâne, keteny, catané, catanar, catañar*, 'to assemble.' In speaking of its etymology he says: "der Ursprung höchst zweifelhaft." It is certainly clearer, as pronounced in these countries. Similar comparisons may serve to illustrate many other passages.

also had their diminutive, *μνημάτιον*. In the use of terms of this class, the Gypsies have always adopted those of the new faith which they have embraced. The Moslem Gypsies say *mezár*, 'a tomb,' from Turk. *mezar*.

TOMORROW—*takhiára*.—I have nothing to propose for this term. *Po takhiára*, 'day after tomorrow;' *takhiára aváva*, 'tomorrow I am coming;' *takhiára kamovés otía?* 'tomorrow wilt thou be there?' *takhiára kamajél*, 'tomorrow he will go.'

TONGS—*ksillábi*, *ksillávi*.—I have noted this word, which is of the purest Greek, though nowadays no Greek understands it, and it could not have been lately borrowed from the Greeks, since they make no use of it, nor is it to be found in any of the modern Greek glossaries. *Πυράγμα* was anciently the name of the instrument by which heated or burning substances were seized, also *λαβίς*, from *λαβαίνω*, *λαμβάνω*. *Λεβίδα* we now call the long-handled and extremely shallow spoon used in administering the communion. *Λαβή* and *λαβίς*, with *συσυλλαβή* and *συσλλαβίς*, or *ξυσλλαβή* and *ξυσλλαβίς*—is an instrument for seizing anything. These latter terms are not in use now among the common people, but the existence of such a Greek term in the language of the Gypsies certainly proves the employment of it among the Greeks at the period of their irruption into these countries. It may be well to remark that the proper term for tongs, *πυράγμα*, is nearly forgotten, and that the Greeks now use the Turkish *mashá*, 'tongs.' The term *ksillábi* is peculiar to the Gypsy blacksmiths. In other cases they use the Turkish *mashá*. The presence of the compound consonant *ks* amply proves the word to be foreign, as this consonant never occurs in pure Gypsy words.

TONGUE—*chip*; Bor., *chipe*, *chipi*.—From the Sr. *jihvá*, 'tongue,' *j* being changed to *ch*, as is common in many languages. *Románi chip*, 'the Gypsy language;' *me chipéste*, 'on my tongue.' *Chip*, 'tongue,' as in many other idioms, is used both for 'tongue' and 'language.'

TOOTH—*dánt*; Br., *danda*; Bor., *dani*.—From the Sr. *dat* or *danta*, 'tooth.'

TREE—*ruk*.—This Gypsy word bears no relation to the Sr. *dru*, with which are connected the synonymous terms in so many other Indo-European languages, but may be referred to the root *ruh*, 'to grow from seed, to grow as a tree,' by the changing of the aspirate, *h*, into a guttural, *k*. From this root come *ruhvan*, 'a tree,' precisely as the Greeks applied the term *φύλον* to trees and plants in general, and *rúksha*, 'a tree in general.*' Plur. *ruká*: *opré to ruká*, 'upon the trees;' *vuchó ruk*, 'a high tree.'

TROUGH (wooden)—*kopána*.—A Bulgarian word, *kopánka*, from the Slav. *kopáin*, 'I dig,' precisely as the corresponding Gr. term, *σκάπτω*, comes from *σκάπτω*, 'I dig.'

TRUGH—*chachipé*; Bor., *chachipe*.—We have the following derivation by Borrow: "This word, which the English Gypsies pronounce

* In their *Essai sur le Pali*, Burnouf and Lassen compare the Pali *roukkha*, 'a tree,' to the Sr. *vriksha*, 'a tree.' Both the Pali and Gypsy appear to me to be from the above *rúksha*. The same form, *roukko*, 'a tree,' is found in the *Prákrit*. *Ibid.*, p. 159.

tsatsipé, seems to be a compound of the Sr. *sat*, which signifies 'true,' and the word of Sanskrit origin *chipé*, 'a tongue.' *Chachipé* therefore is literally 'a true tongue.'" This is one of Borrow's random derivations. He has said elsewhere in his vocabulary that *pen* is a particle frequently used in the Gypsy language in the formation of nouns: e. g. *chungalipen*, 'ugliness,' from *chungaló*, 'ugly.' Here, however, the final *pe* or *pen* is this very particle, common to the Gypsies of Spain with those here in Turkey, as we have already seen in the course of this memoir. The rest of the word is probably the Sr. *satya*, 'true, sincere, honest.' From *chachipé* is formed the adj. *chachipanó*, 'true,' and the adv. *chachipanés*, 'truly:' *chachipé isi*, 'it is true,' lit. 'it is a truth,' like the Gr. ἀληθῆς εἶναι, for ἀληθῆς εἶναι.

TRK—*khorakhái*.—The Turks, who call themselves *osmanly* and *othmanly*, as descendants from the house of Othman, would be surprised to hear such a name applied to them. Their language, however, they call *turk*. The Greeks always call them τοῦρκους. Borrow defines the Gypsy term, written by him *corajay*, as follows: "The Moors, *los moros*, probably derived from the word *kurrek*, a term of execration and contempt too frequently employed by the common Moors in their discourse." The similarity of the two terms, as employed here and in Spain, amply proves the necessity of looking for another origin than that which has been advanced by Borrow. *Khorakhái* is both singular and plural. *Khorakhanó*, 'Turkish;' *khorakhani*, *khorakhni*, 'a Turkish woman;' *khorakhnia*, 'Turkish women;' *khorakhanó gav*, 'a Turkish village;' *khorakhani chip*, 'the Turkish language;' *khorakhanés janésa?* 'dost thou know Turkish?' *khorakhniori*, 'a young Turkish woman;' *khorakhané rom*, 'Turkish Gypsies,' i. e. 'Gypsies of the Mohammedan religion.'

U.

UGLY, NOT BEAUTIFUL—*nasukár*; Bor., *chungaló*.—For *chungaló* see MISERABLE. My own term is from *sukár*, 'beautiful,' with the negative particle *ná*. See NEGATION and BEAUTIFUL.

UNFORTUNATE—*bahtaló*.—This originates from a Persian term, *bakht*,* 'fortune, luck,' to which the Gypsies have given the form of their vernacular idiom, precisely as we have observed in other words borrowed by them. So the Greeks have made, from the Turkish *zavál*, ζαβάλο, ζαβάλος, and ζαβάλισσα, 'miserable.' Though *bahtaló*, from *bakht*, 'good fortune,' would properly indicate prosperity and happiness, still it is given to men and animals as a term of affection and hearty commiseration. *O bahtaló peló ti puv*, 'the unfortunate (i. e. 'bird') fell to the ground.'

UP—*opré*; Bor., *aupré*, *opre*.—From the Sr. *upari*, 'above, up, up above,' compare Gr. ὑπέρ, Lat. *super*, Germ. *ober*, Eng. *over*.† *Opretár tut* (*tar*, abl. particle), 'from the rest of the milk;' *besghiom opré to amáksi* (Gr. ἀνάξι), 'I sat upon the carriage;' *opré to ruká*, 'upon the trees;' *opré to bar*, 'upon the stone;' *opré ti puv*, 'upon the ground

* Armenian *pakht* or *paht*, 'fortune;' *pakhtavor*, 'fortunate.'—TR.

† Armenian *veri*, *ver*, *verd*.—TE.

(earth); *oprál* and *opryál*, 'from above:' *oprál pelióm*, 'I fell from on high.'

URINE—*mutér*.—

TO VOID URINE—*mutráva*; Bor., *mutrar*, *muclar*.—These terms bear the stamp of undisputed descent from the Sr. *mútra*, 'urine.' Borrow's *muclar* is probably a corruption of the original *mutrar*, although I have not met elsewhere the change of *trar* into *clar*.

V.

VILLAGE—*gav*; Bor., *gao*.—Compare Sr. *gráma*, 'village,' which has lost the liquid *r*, and changed the final *m* into *v*, a change which we have already observed elsewhere (see NAME), and shall have occasion fully to prove, in speaking of the commutation of the consonants. The Gypsy word is often applied to denote 'one's native town' or 'home,' *νατρίς*, just as the Greeks use *νατρίον*, and the Turks *kióy*, for their native place. *Mo gav*, 'my village,' is to be understood as 'my native town;' *ghelióm to gav*, 'I went to the village;' *gavudnó*, 'a villager;' *mo gavudnó*, 'one of my village;' *túya kamovés to gáv?* 'wilt thou also be in the village?' *te gavéskoro manushé isi but górke*, 'of thy village the men are very bad.'

VINEGAR—*shut*; Br., *shutt*; Bor., *juter*, *juti*.—Compare Sr. *ḡaṭa*, 'sour, astringent.' It is worthy of remark, that this term by some Gypsies is pronounced *shutkó*, and applied to 'vinegar,' although it properly means 'sour.' From this noun, by the addition of *lo*, has been formed *shuiló*, 'sour;' *shuiló mol*, 'sour wine:' it is pronounced also *shudló*: *shudló tut*, 'sour milk,' the Turkish *yaghurt*.

VINEYARD—*res*, *rez*; Bor., *eresia*.—Compare Sr. *ras*, 'gustare, amare;' the noun *rasa* has also the definition of 'grape,' though its general signification is 'taste of any kind.' Persian *bagh rez*, 'a vineyard.' By the Gypsies this term is applied particularly to the vine. *Keréna resá*, 'they make (i. e. 'plant') vineyards;' *kaléskoro isi e resá?* 'whose are the vineyards?'

VOMITING—*chartimpé*, *chattimpé*.—

TO VOMIT—*chartáva*, *chattáva*.—Compare Sr. *chhard*, 'to vomit, to be sick.' The Gypsies, in pronouncing *chartáva*, give such a slight sound to the *r* that it is scarcely heard, or even, at times, is not heard at all. Many Gypsies contend that it contains no *r*, and pronounce always *chattáva*. *Chartimpé* is the Sr. *chhardí*, 'vomiting,' by the addition of the common *pe* or *pen*, which we have already noticed.

W.

TO WALK—*piráva*; Bor., *pirar*.—Compare *piro*, 'foot,' which I have referred above to the Sr. *prí* or *par*, to pass.' *But pirél*, 'he walks fast;' *kapiráv*, 'I shall walk.'

WALLACHIAN—*vlákhia*.—The Greek *βλάχος*, a denomination given to the inhabitants of Wallachia and Moldavia. *Vlakhina*, 'a Wallachian woman.'

WARM—*tattó*.—This word I have explained in speaking of BATH. I notice it here merely to add that the Gypsies use it in this sense also, apart from its signification of 'bath.'

TO WASH—*toávava*.—This verb may be referred to the Sr. verbal root *dháv*, ‘to cleanse, to be clean or pure.’ Aor. *tovióm* and *toughióm*: *tovióm mo shoró keraló*, ‘I have washed my scabby head;’ *toávaman* (mid. voice), ‘I wash myself,’ used for the Gr. *νίπτουμαι, λούομαι, πλύουμαι*: *so kerés? toávaman*, ‘what art thou doing? I am washing myself;’ *toávava me yismata*, ‘I wash my linen;’ *tovdó*, ‘washed;’ *tovdé yismata*, ‘washed linen.’

WATER—*paní, pai*;* Br., *pagnee*; Bor., *pani*.—The Sr. adj. *pántiya*, from *pá*, ‘to drink,’ signifies ‘anything fit to drink, potable,’ and consequently ‘water.’ Water is also termed *páya*, from the same root *pá*. *Déman khandí pani*, ‘give me a little water;’ *sudró pani*, ‘cool water.’

TO WATER—*panidáva*.—A compound verb, from the above and *dáva*, ‘I give.’ The verb has been formed in imitation of the Greeks and Turks: the former often say *δίδω νερόν*, instead of *ποιτίζω*; the Turks, *şu veririm*, for *ichirmek*.

TO WEEP—*rováva*; Bor., *orobar*.—Both these words I am inclined to refer to the Sr. verbal root *ru*, ‘to cry, to make a noise, to yell, to shriek.’ Compare *viráva*, ‘sound, noise;’ *virávin*, ‘shouting, weeping, crying.’ Weeping with howling and yelling, amongst barbarous people, is an ordinary phenomenon, on all occasions where the exhibition of sorrow is necessary or official. The initial *o* in Borrow is euphonic. *O raktó rovéla*, ‘the child cries;’ *saró divés rovéla*, ‘all day he cries.’

WEIGHT—*vária*.—This term, usual among the Gypsy blacksmiths, is applied to the hammer which beats the heated iron. It is from the Gr. *βάρος*, ‘weight,’ from which comes *βαρῶ*, ‘to strike.’

WELL—*khanink, khaink*; Bor., *putar*.—These words differ so much from each other that they cannot be referred to the same origin. My own are from the Sr. *khan*, ‘to dig, to delve,’ whence the Gr. *χάλω*. From this archetypal root *khan* probably comes the Lat. *canalis*, and also *cuniculus*, denoting ‘the hare’ and ‘a mine’ (Bopp). Compare from the same root the Sr. adj. *khanaka*, ‘whatever pertains to digging, and to making canals and wells,’ whence the present *khanink* and *khaink*, denoting ‘whatever is dug,’ and consequently ‘a well.’ The use of an adjective for a substantive is extremely common. Borrow’s *putar* I regard as Spanish, or rather as from the Lat. *puteus*, and not, as he explains it, as from *pátala*.

WELL—*lachés*.—An adverb, from *lachó*, ‘good.’ *Lachés isi*, ‘it is well;’ *po lachés*, ‘better;’ *po lachés isóm*, ‘I am better;’ *nanái but lachés*, ‘it is not very well;’ *po lachés te jas*, ‘it is better for thee to go.’

WHAT—*so*.—This term, the neuter of the interrogative pronoun *kon*, is used precisely as the Eng. ‘what.’ The following phrases will explain it: *so terésa?* ‘what hast thou’ (i. e. ‘what is the matter with thee?’) *so kamésa?* ‘what dost thou wish?’

WHEEL—*asán*.—Compare Sr. *aru*, ‘the spoke or radius of a wheel.’ The change of *r* into *s* is extremely common, not only in Sr., but in many other languages.

* “*Pany, panio, ‘wasser.’*” Arndt, p. 357.

- WHELP**—*rukono*.—This term is used for the young of dogs; Gr. σκύ-
νος, Mod. Gr. σκυλάκιον. It seems to me to be related to the Sr. *ruh*,
'to grow, to be produced or become manifest, to be born.' *I chukli*
penghiás panj rukoné, 'the bitch has produced five whelps.'
- WHEN**—*kánna*.—Compare Sr. *kadá*, 'when.' *Kánna kanashés?* 'when
wilt thou go?' *kánna kamuló?* 'when will he die?' *kánna kinghián-*
les? 'when didst thou buy it?' *kánna kamabiél?* 'when will she be
delivered' (i. e., 'of a child')?
- WHENCE**—*katár*.—Intimately related to the pron. *kon* and *ka*, 'who'
and 'which.' The final *tar* is the ablative particle (see Section V).
Katár alló amaré manúsh? 'whence came our men?' *katár avésa?*
'whence comest thou?' *katár anghian te romniá?* 'whence didst
thou bring thy wife?' *katár allian?* 'whence hast thou come?'
- WHERE**—*kárin*.—Also related to the interrogative pron. *kon*, 'who.'
Kárin kamajés? 'where wilt thou go?' *kárin isi to rom?* 'where is
thy husband?' *kárin jésa?* 'where art thou going?' It is used at
times as the Italians use their *ove*: *takhiára kamováv ti pólin* (Gr.
πόλις) *kárin ta isi to dat*, 'tomorrow I shall go to the city, where also
thy father is.'
- WHITE**—*parno*; Bor., *parno*, *parne*.—The origin of this term, so com-
mon among all the Gypsies, is extremely obscure. Borrow defines
parno "blanco, Sr. *panđu*." This term, *panđu*, well known in the
history of India as the name of the founder of the Pandava race,
means also 'white, yellow, jaundice.' I see no relation between the
Sr. and Gypsy terms. *Parnó manró*, 'white bread; o *yék kaló*, o
yék parno, 'the one black, the other white.'
- WHO**—*kon*.—This is evidently the Sr. *ka*, neut. *kim*, which, with slight
variations, is found in most of the Indo-European languages. *Kon*
diniás e chukél? 'who struck the dog?' *kaléskoro isi o ker?* 'whose
is the house?' *kaléste bashé?* 'near whom?' *ta kalés?* 'and whom?'
These examples show that the oblique cases of this pronoun are ex-
tremely irregular, and are far from resembling the declination of the
Sr. *kim*. To *kon* is related the relative *ka* and *ke*, which is ex-
tremely common with the Gypsies, and used as the Italians use their
che, and the Mod. Gr. their *ποι*, relative pronouns that have lost both
gender and number. A few illustrations will give the reader a clear
idea of this pronoun; *ki ov ka isi*, 'and he who is;' *ta i romniá ka*
dukhéna, 'and the women that love;' *sávore ka kamél*, 'all that he
desired;' *oká gorkipé ka na kamésa te kerén túke*, 'whatever evil that
thou dost not desire they should do to thee;' *lachó o manúsh ka ka-*
madél tut, 'happy (good) the man who will give thee.'
- WHY**—*sóske*.—Related to *so*, 'what,' the neuter of the interr. pron., with
the particle *ke*, of which we shall speak in treating of the cases (Sec-
tion V). *Sóske allian?* 'why did they come?' *sóske puchésa?* 'why
dost thou ask?' *sóske isánas otiá?* 'why were ye there?'
- WIDOW**—*picli*.—This appears to be a corrupted form of the Sr. *vidhavá*,
'a widow.' It is found more or less altered in many cognate dialects:
compare Pers. *beva*, 'widow,' Lat. *vidua*, Germ. *wittwe*, Eng. *widow*.
- WIFE**—*romni*; Br., *milomnee*; Bor., *romi*.—For the explanation of
these terms, see GYPSY. Mr. Brown's *milomnee* should be written

mi romni, 'my wife.' So gentle is the pronunciation of the liquids, that whoever is not somewhat conversant with the idiom easily falls into such mistakes.

WIFE'S BROTHER—*saló*.—

WIFE'S SISTER—*sali*.—This term may be referred to the Sr. *çálin*, 'belonging to a house, domestic,' from *çála*, 'a house.' We have in Eng. *domestic*, and Fr. *domestique*, 'a servant,' while the term *domesticus* is properly 'any one belonging to a house.' The Gypsies, who are in the habit of living together in such numbers, must naturally have been inclined to give such names to members of a family.

WIND—*palvál*.—This is used for the Gr. *ἀνεμος*, which at present is mostly applied to mean 'a strong wind, a gale.' It is difficult to give any satisfactory etymology of it, although it appears to be of Hindu origin. *Teréla palvál*, 'it has (i. e. 'there is') wind;' *palvál but*, 'strong wind.' The word is often used for 'the atmosphere, air:' *ti palvál vuchés*, 'high in the air.'

WINE—*mol* ;* Br., *mol* ; Bor., *mol*.—The similarity of these terms makes their etymology plain. Borrow says the word *mol* is "a pure Persian word." It is true the Persian word for wine is *mol*, but the Persians and Gypsies both derive it from the Sr. *madhu*, Gr. *μέθυ* and *μέλι*, 'an intoxicating drink,' Lat. *mel*, Lithuan. *madus*, Slav. *med*, and Bulg. *met*. *Kamésa te mol?* 'dost thou wish wine also?' *shudló mol*, 'sour wine.'

WING—*pak*.—Compare Sr. *paksha*, 'a wing.' The Gypsies give this denomination indifferently either to the wing or to feathers, like the Gr. *πτερόν*, 'feather, wing.' Plur. *paká*. *Te sas charés* (Turk. *charé*) *te terél pak o manúsh*, 'if it were possible that man should have wings;' *ta diniómles ti pak*, 'and I struck it on the wing.'

WINTER—*vent*.—I have spoken of the term *iv*, 'snow,' elsewhere, as from the *hima* of the Hindus. The Sr. adj. *himavant* is 'cold, freezing, chilly, frosty.' As in the word *iv*, 'snow,' the initial aspirate was dropped, so in this word the vowel also, and the word thus mutilated is now in use among all the Gypsies.

TO WISH—*kamáva* ; Bor., *camelar*.—This verb is the Sr. *kam*, 'to desire, to love;' *kâma* is the Cupid of the Latins, the *ἔρως* of the Greeks. This verb among the Gypsies is used whenever they intend to express desire, wish, or love, in perfect accordance with the definitions generally given to the Sr. root. Borrow defines *camelar* 'to love, Sp. *amar*.' I have placed it with my own word, as it is evidently the same verb, proceeding from the same original. In treating of the derivation of the tenses, I shall have occasion to speak of this verb, as an auxiliary forming the future. It is there that its signification becomes extremely clear. *So kamésa?* 'what dost thou wish?' *akaná kaména te shiklovén*, 'now they wish to learn;' *kamáva te desman*, 'I wish thee to give me;' *kamávales: so kamakerés les?* 'I wish him' (i. e. 'I have need of him'): 'what art thou to do with him?' *advivés kamáva te jav to réz*, 'today I wish to go to the vineyard;' *ka na kamésa te kerén túke*, 'which thou dost not wish that they should do to thee.'

WITHIN—*andré*; Bor., *andre, enre*.—This is evidently from the Sr. *antar*, ‘in, within, between.’ In compound words its signification is ‘internal, interior.’ But *andré ti puw*, ‘deep into the earth’ (lit. ‘much within’); *jáva andré*, ‘I go in, I enter;’ *andrál*, ‘from within,’ *ἔσωθεν: andrál akata ti pólin* (Gr. πόλις), ‘from within the city;’ Mod. Gr. ἀπὸ μέσα ἀπὸ τὴν πόλιν.

WITHOUT—*bi*.—This negative particle is extremely common, and corresponds to the Sr. *vi*, a preposition signifying separation or disjunction. The Slavonic is extremely fond of this particle, to which it has added a *z*, forming *bez*; as *glas*, ‘voice, echo;’ *bezglásn’iy*, ‘without a voice, mute;’ *bog*, ‘God;’ *bezbozn’iy*, ‘atheist, ἄθεος.’ It exists in the Persian *bi*, ‘without,’ generally corresponding to the Lat. *sine*, and denoting absence or want: as, *bi ab*, ‘without water;’ *bi edeb*, ‘without civility, uncultivated.’ We have noticed it among the Gypsy verbs: see to *SELL*, *biknáva*. It is used with adjectives: as *uchardó*, ‘covered;’ *buchardó* (*bi-uchardó*), ‘uncovered;’ *namporemé*, ‘sick;’ *binamporemé*, ‘healthy;’ *bimakavdó*, ‘not painted;’ *bizoraló*, ‘not strong;’ *bilindraló*, ‘not sleeping;’ *bibahtaló*, ‘not fortunate.’ When *bi* is united to nouns and pronouns, these are constantly in the genitive case of both numbers: as *bi sheréskoro*, ‘without a head’ (i. e. ‘a fool’); *bi lovéskoro*, ‘without salt;’ *bi maséskoro*, ‘without meat;’ *bi lovénghoro*, ‘without money;’ *bi gotiáskoro*, ‘without mind;’ *bi balaménghoro*, ‘without Greeks;’ *bi khorakhénghoro*, ‘without Turks;’ *bi vasténghoro*, ‘without hands’ (i. e. ‘workmen’). With pronouns: *bi mángoro*, ‘without me;’ *bi oléskoro*, ‘without him;’ *bi lákeri, aménghoro, tuménghoro*, ‘without her, us, you.’

WOLF—*ruv*; Bor., *orior, aruje, luey*.—The first two terms seem to be related to the Sr. verbal root *ru*, which I have noticed in speaking of the verb to *WEEP*. This verb, among the Hindus, gives origin to two names of animals, in imitation of their sounds: *ruru*, ‘a sort of deer,’ and *ruvathu*, ‘sound, noise, a cock.’ I see no difficulty in supposing that the Gypsies may have applied it to the wolf, an animal remarkable for howling, which is one of the most common significations of the verb *ru*. The third form of Borrow, *luey*, seems to be of Spanish origin: compare *lobo*, ‘a wolf.’

WOMAN—*romni*; Br., *rumenee*.—See *GYPSY*.

WOOD—*kasht, kash*; Bor., *casian*.—Related to the Sr. *káshta*, ‘wood.’ Borrow’s *casian* may correspond to the adj. *káshtin*, ‘woody.’ *Kast* is used for ‘a stick;’ *diniásman kastésa*, ‘he struck me with a stick.’ This word is sometimes pronounced without the final *t*, as *kash*, and most of the Greek Gypsies pronounce it *kas*.

WOOL—*posóm*.—In want of a better derivation, I propose for this word the Sr. verbal root *push*, ‘to cherish, to nurture.’

WORD—*lav*.—Compare Sr. *lap*, ‘to speak, to utter;’ *lapana*, ‘the mouth, talking.’ I have not observed in the Gypsy language any other traces of this Sr. verb, which has given to the Indo-European languages so many terms. As the Hindus have denominated the mouth *lapana*, as the instrument of talking, so also have the Persians their *leb*, the Romans *labium, labrum*, and the Greeks *λίλος* and *λαλέω*, by the change of *p* to *l*. *Lav*, plur. *lavá*, is well known to all the Gypsies. *Kape-náv túke yek lav*, ‘I will tell thee a word;’ *lav romané*, ‘Gypsy words.’

WORM—*kermó*; Bor., *cremen*.—Compare Sr. *krimi*, written also *krimi* and *krami*, ‘worm, insect.’ It has also the signification of the Gr. *ἐλμυς*, which is applied exclusively to intestinal worms. By some Gypsies the word is pronounced *ghermó*.

TO WRITE—*grafáva*.—I have noted this word merely to show the manner in which the Gypsies have introduced Gr. words into their idiom, by giving them a Gypsy form. *Grafáva* (Gr. *γράφω*), ‘I write;’ aor. *grafghióm* (*έγραφα*), ‘I have written.’ It would be useless to note the numerous instances of such words which the Gypsies have borrowed from the Greeks. Their origin is generally very evident. Some are distorted, because borrowed from terms which the Greeks themselves have corrupted: so *dialezáva*, ‘I select,’ from *διαλέγω*, pronounced by us often *διαλέζω*. They have adopted another form of verbs similar to those in use among the people with whom they intermingle: thus *kholiteráva*, ‘I am angry,’ lit. ‘I have bile,’ from the Gr. *χολή* and their own verb *teráva*, ‘to have;’ also *kholiázava*, ‘I am angry,’ Gr. *χολιάζομαι*, ‘to be angry;’ hence *kholiniakoro*, ‘angry.’ *Kholiteráva* is common among them.

Y.

YEAR—*bersh*; Bor., *berji*.—Both these words are from Sr. *varsha*, ‘rain, the rainy season, year,’ from the root *vrish*, ‘to be wet, to moisten.’ The term was first applied to the rains, then to the season in which the rains were prevalent, and in course of time to the year itself. This use of ‘rainy season’ for ‘year’ is corroborated by the usage of the Anglo-Saxons and other northern nations, who reckoned by winters instead of years. Both, of course, were struck by circumstances peculiar to their own climate. *Keti bershénghoro isi?* ‘of how many years (i. e. ‘how old’) is he?’ *keti bersh kerghián to rashái?* ‘how many years was he (lit. ‘did he make’) with the teacher (priest)?’

YESTERDAY—*yich*; Bor., *callicaste*.—I leave to philologists to determine whether this term bears any relation to the Sr. *hyas*, ‘yesterday.’ *Yich penghiás mánghe*, ‘yesterday was said to me;’ *yichavér*, ‘day before yesterday,’ composed of *yich* and *avér*, *yavér*, ‘other,’ which latter term I have explained in its proper place: *yichavér o kurkó*, ‘day before yesterday, (which was) Sunday;’ *pyichavér*, with the comparative part. *po*, ‘two days before yesterday,’ Gr. *ἀντιπροχθες*.

YET, STILL—*achái*.—*Achái but kamadikés*, ‘yet more thou wilt see;’ *achái chor eketané*, ‘and other thieves together;’ *achái palál*, ‘still more backwards:’ for this phrase another, *po polaléste*, is frequently used; *achái lav romané*, ‘still more Gypsy words.’

YOUNG—*ternó*, *yernó*; Br., *yernee*; Bor., *dernó*.—This is the Sr. *taruna*, ‘young.’ It is often pronounced *yernó*, or rather, the pronunciation of *t* so much resembles that of *y* that to all purposes it can be written with this semivowel. The Sr. *yuvan*, ‘young,’ which is found in many Indo-European languages, I have not been able to detect in the Gypsy idiom. A diminutive form of *ternó* is *ternoró*, ‘a youngster.’ *Ternó* is principally used in opposition to *phuró* or *puró*, ‘old.’

SECTION IV.

COMPARATIVE PHONOLOGY OF THE GYPSY LANGUAGE.

1. VOWELS.

These are five: *a, e, i, o, u*. The union of many vowels is rarely to be met with in the Gypsy language. Of diphthongs there are almost none. In verbs of the middle voice occurs the combination *io*, resulting from the blending of *o* and *a*: as *mat-tó-aváva, mattiováva*. So also in the formation of abstract nouns: *parnavó, parnavoipé*, 'friendship;' *bandló, bandloipé*, 'band.' The reader cannot but have observed the rarity of other combinations of a like character in the Vocabulary. Terms such as *nái*, 'nail,' *múí*, 'mouth,' are not diphthongs: the vowel of the final syllable has merely dropped its aspirate. The distinction of the vowels into long and short is difficult to be determined. So, too, in modern Greek, where in most cases such distinctions are of no practical value: *o* and *ω* have a similar sound; only the accent seems at times to occasion a prolongation of the sound of a vowel. It is for this reason that I have noted with accuracy all the accents upon the Gypsy vowels.

A.—This vowel, which represents the Sr. *a* and *á*, seems to have but one simple sound.

A is retained unaltered in many words: as Sr. *manusha*, 'man;*' G. *manúsh*; Sr. *angára*, 'coal,' G. *angár*; Sr. *nakha*, 'nail,' G. *nái*.

It is frequently changed to *e*: as Sr. *daçan*, 'ten,' G. *desh*; Sr. *rasa*, 'taste,' G. *rés*, 'grape;'; Sr. *nava*, 'new,' G. *nevó*; Sr. *hara*, 'ass,' G. *kher*; Sr. *tala*, 'ground,' G. *tele*, 'down;'; Sr. *taru-ña*, 'young,' G. *ternó*.

The Gypsies of Spain are fond of adding an initial *a* to words beginning with *r*: as *eresia* (Turk. Gyp. *rés*), 'vineyard;'; *arashai* (T. G. *rashái*), 'priest;'; *orobar* (T. G. *rováva*), 'to weep,' etc. Here in Turkey, I have noted this initial *a* in *arakáva*, 'to guard,' and in *aratti*, 'tonight.' Both, however, may justly be referred to Sr. words which have this initial *a* as an actual component member.

The final *a* of the Sr. adjectives and participles is invariably changed to *o*, and strongly accented: as Sr. *kála*, 'black,' G. *kaló*; Sr. *uchcha*, 'high,' G. *uchó*; Sr. *matta*, 'glad,' G. *mattó*, 'drunk;'; Sr. *tapta*, 'burning,' G. *tattó*, 'warm;'; Sr. *sanna*, 'slim,' G. *sannó*; Sr. *křitta*, 'cut,' G. *khurdó*, 'small;'; Sr. *çushka*, 'dry,' G. *shukó*; Sr. *púrta*, 'full,' G. *perdó*; Sr. *purána*, 'old,' G. *pura-nó*; Sr. *mřita*, 'mortal,' G. *merdó*, 'sick.'

* When both Sanskrit and Gypsy terms have the same signification, I have noted only that of the Sanskrit. In other cases I write both.

Also in other words it is changed to *o*: as Sr. *shash*, 'six,' G. *shov*; Sr. *çaca*, 'rabbit,' G. *shoshói*.

E.—*E* is more constant: as Sr. *deva*, 'God,' G. *devél*; Sr. *eka*, 'one,' G. *yek*.

I.—*I* and *ni* are the most usual terminations of Gypsy feminine nouns: *chukél*, 'dog,' *chuk(e)lí*, 'bitch,' *devél*, 'God,' *dev(e)lí*, 'goddess,' *grast*, 'horse,' *grastní*, 'mare,' *rom*, 'Gypsy,' *romní*, 'Gypsy woman,' *kher*, 'ass,' *kherní*, 'she-ass,' *manúsh*, 'man,' *manushní*, 'woman,' *gurúv*, 'ox,' *gurumní*, 'cow,'* *plal*, 'brother,' *planí*, 'sister.†

In numerous Gypsy words the *i* and *î* of the Sanskrit remain unchanged: as Sr. *dvi*, 'two,' G. *dúí*; Sr. *tri*, 'three,' G. *tri*; Sr. *râtri*, 'night,' G. *arattí*, 'tonight,' Sr. *gîlî*, 'sound,' G. *ghîlî*, 'song,' Sr. *chhurî*, 'knife,' G. *churî*; Sr. *pânîya*, 'potable,' G. *paní*, 'water.'

The Sr. vowel *r*, or *ri*, undergoes many changes, which are of much importance in the study of the Gypsy language, and in the explanation and philosophical analysis of the verbs, and also extremely interesting. *Ri* is changed to *ri* in Sr. *riksha*, 'bear,' G. *richinî*:—to *ro* in Sr. *jâmâtri*, 'son-in-law,' G. *jamutró*:—to *ru* in Sr. *triçûla*, 'trident,' G. *trushúl*, *turshúl*.

In the verbal roots, *ri* or *rî* is changed to *ar* or *er* in Sr. *dri*, 'to be afraid,' G. *daráva*; Sr. *mri*, 'to die,' G. *meráva*: Sr. *kri*, 'to make,' G. *keráva*; Sr. *prî*, 'to fill,' G. *peráva*:—to *îl* in Sr. *grî*, 'to sound,' G. *ghîlîáva*.

O.—No precise rules can be given as to the pronunciation of this vowel, for it is often left to the option of the speaker to use either the *o* or the *u* in a great number of words. With the exception of the final *o*, the common characteristic of the masculine gender among the Gypsies, this vowel usually corresponds with the Sr. *u* and *û*: as Sr. *mûrti*, 'matter,' G. *mortí*, 'leather,' Sr. *dûra*, 'distant,' G. *dur*; Sr. *bhû*, 'earth,' G. *phuv*.

It also represents the Sr. *a*: as Sr. *chandra*, 'moon,' G. *chon*; Sr. *madhu*, 'sweet,' G. *mol*, 'honey':—or the Sr. *o*: as Sr. *lobhinî*, 'desirous,' G. *lubní*, *lobní*, 'harlot,' Sr. *loha*, 'red,' G. *loló*:—or the Sr. *i*: as Sr. *krimî*, 'worm,' G. *kermó*.

The final *o* of nouns, adjectives, and participles is changed to *i*, whenever abstract substantives are formed by the addition of the particle *pe* or *pen*: as *kaló*, 'black,' *kalípe*, 'blackness, excommu-

* Pronounced also *gurumní*.

† I have heard Gypsies, extremely ignorant of their language, making no distinction between the masculine and feminine of adjectives, saying *kalî* (fem.) for *kalo* (masc.), 'black,' *ternî* for *terno*. These were all Moslem Gypsies, speaking the Turkish, in which language the adjectives, as in English, have a single termination for both genders. Those in the habit of frequently speaking their language never make such blunders; they are extremely attentive to all their generic terminations.

nication; *mattó*, 'drunk,' *mattipé*, 'drunkenness;' *tattó*, 'warm,' *tattipé*, 'heat;' *moló*, 'dead,' *meripé*, 'death;' *phuró*, 'old,' *phuripé*, 'old age;' *lachó*, 'good,' *lachipé*, 'goodness, alms;' *piró*, 'foot,' *piripé*, 'gait;' *shuchó*, 'clean,' *shuchipé*, 'cleanliness.'

This rule suffers exception: as in *kamló*, 'perspiring,' *kamlioipé*, 'perspiration;' *bandló*, 'bound,' *bandlioipé*, 'band;' *parnavó*, 'friend,' *parnavoipé*, 'friendship;' *loshanó*, 'rejoicing,' *loshanoipé*, 'joy;' *tattó*, 'warm,' *tabioipé*, 'heat.'

U.—This vowel is extremely common; it is a favorite sound with all the Gypsies, whether Moslem or Christian. It is often pronounced *o*. It represents the Sr. *o* in Sr. *go*, 'ox,' G. *gurív*; Sr. *lobhinú*, 'desiring,' G. *lubnú*:—the Sr. *u* in Sr. *manusha*, 'man,' G. *manúsh*; Sr. *sukara*, 'benevolent,' G. *sukár*, 'beautiful;' Sr. *pura*, 'former,' G. *phuró*, 'old;' Sr. *uchcha*, 'high,' G. *uchó*; Sr. *pangu*, 'lame,' G. *pankó*.

2. CONSONANTS.

K.—Very common in the Gypsy language. It is often the unaltered representative of the Sanskrit *k*: as in Sr. *kála*, 'black,' G. *kaló*; Sr. *kun*, 'to shine,' G. *kan*, *kam*, 'sun;' Sr. *káshtha*, 'wood,' G. *kasht*; Sr. *kṛi*, 'to make,' G. *keráva*; Sr. *kṛimi*, 'worm,' G. *kermó*.

It is changed into *f* in *kurí*, 'a colt,' pronounced frequently *furí*; or to *gh*, in Sr. *kal*, 'to sound,' G. *gheláva*, 'to play on instruments.'

It is assimilated to the following consonant, as in Sr. *rakta*, 'red,' G. *ratt*, 'blood.'

It frequently becomes a very gentle aspirate: as in Sr. *kása*, 'cough,' G. *has*; Sr. *kuh*, 'to surprise,' G. *hohaimpé*, *khohaimpé*, 'a lie;' Sr. *kṛitta*, 'cut,' G. *hirdó*, 'dwarfish;' Sr. *kaṇḍ*, 'to itch,' G. *handiováva*, *hanjiováva*, 'to scratch.'

Ksh.—This compound consonant of the Sanskrit is very constant in its transformation, and may serve as a clue to the true etymology of many Gypsy words. It does not appear in the proper Gypsy language, and the Gypsies never employ it except in *ksilábi*, 'tongs.' In speaking Greek, they pronounce ξ as the Greeks do. This consonant generally becomes a simple *k*: as in Sr. *drákshá*, 'grapes,' G. *drak*; Sr. *aksha*, 'eye,' G. *yak*; Sr. *yaksh*, 'to sacrifice,' G. *yak*, 'fire;' Sr. *rúksha*, 'tree,' G. *ruk*; Sr. *makshiká*, 'fly,' G. *makiá*; Sr. *áraksh*, 'to preserve,' G. *arakáv*, 'guard;' Sr. *çiksh*, 'to learn,' G. *shikáva*; Sr. *kshâra*, 'milk,' G. *kerál*, 'cheese;' Sr. *akshṇa*, 'time,' G. *akaná*, 'now;' Sr. *naksh*, 'to go,' G. *nakáva*, 'to pass;' Sr. *maksh*, 'to mix,' G. *makáva*, 'to paint;' Sr. *paksha*, 'wing,' G. *pak*.

If my etymology of *bashno*, 'a cock,' as from *pakshin*, be true, then this would be an exception to the above rule.

Kh.—This Sanskrit consonant often retains in the Gypsy its strong aspirated sound, like that of the *kh* of the Arabs and Turks: as in Sr. *khanaka*, 'digging,' G. *khaínk*, 'well;' Sr. *khañ-din*, 'divided,' G. *khandí*, 'a little;' Sr. *khan*, 'to dig,' G. *khatáva*; Sr. *khaní*, 'a mine,' G. *kháv*, 'a hole;' Sr. *khád*, 'to eat,' G. *kháva*.

It is at times dopped, or very gently aspirated: as in Sr. *nakha*, 'nail,' G. *nái*; Sr. *çákha*, 'vegetable,' G. *shah*, 'cabbage;' Sr. *mukha*, 'mouth,' G. *múi*.

It is changed to *k* in Sr. *duhkha*, 'pain,' G. *duk*.

G.—This retains generally its proper Sanskrit sound: as in Sr. *gan*, 'to count,' G. *ghenáva*; Sr. *gara*, 'poison,' G. *gher*, 'itch;' Sr. *gras*, 'to eat,' G. *grast*, 'horse;' Sr. *angára*, 'coal,' G. *angár*.

It is changed to *k* in *agára*, 'house,' G. *ker*.

Ch.—Is generally retained unchanged: as in Sr. *char*, 'to eat,' G. *charáva*, 'to graze;' Sr. *chush*, 'to suck,' G. *chuché*, 'breast;' Sr. *chumb*, 'to kiss,' G. *chumí*, 'kiss;' Sr. *chik*, 'to obstruct,' G. *chik*, 'mud.'

It is changed to its cognate guttural *k* in Sr. *much*, 'to release,' G. *mukáva*; Sr. *pach*, 'to cook,' G. *pekáva*. It becomes simple *s* in Sr. *chush*, 'to suck,' G. *sut*, 'milk;' Sr. *chatur*, 'four,' G. *ishtúr*.

Chh.—This consonant is pronounced like simple *ch*: as Sr. *chhinna*, 'divided,' G. *chináva*, 'to cut;' Sr. *chhurí*, 'knife,' G. *churí*; Sr. *chhard*, 'to vomit,' G. *chattáva*; Sr. *tuchchha*, 'empty,' G. *chuchó*.

J.—This letter retains its genuine Sanskrit sound: as in Sr. *jñá*, 'to know,' G. *janáva*; Sr. *jív*, 'to live,' G. *jiváva*; Sr. *jámátri*, 'son-in-law,' G. *jamutró*.

T, Th, D.—These consonants are pronounced like *t* and *d*: as in Sr. *pata*, 'cloth,' G. *páta*, 'garment;' Sr. *káshtha*, 'wood,' G. *kasht*; Sr. *mund*, 'to shave,' G. *muntáva*; Sr. *añda*, 'egg,' G. *vantó*; Sr. *khañdin*, 'divided,' G. *khandí*, 'little.'

N.—This nasal, also, is not distinguished from the common dental *n*: Sr. *gan*, 'to count,' G. *ghenáva*; Sr. *purána*, 'old,' G. *puranó*.

T.—When at the end of a word, this consonant is often dropped: as in *grast*, 'a horse,' also frequently pronounced *gras* and *gra*; *kasht*, 'wood,' also *kash*; *vast*, 'hand,' also *vas*. It is distinctly heard, however, when the following word begins with a vowel: as *tachógrast isí*, 'it is a good horse.' When preceded by *r*, it is pronounced like a pure *d*, as in Sr. *púrta*, 'full,' G. *perdó*. At times it is changed to *f*, as in Sr. *tala*, 'earth,' G. *telé* and *felé*, 'downwards.'

D.—This has the sound of the Latin *d*: as Sr. *dram*, 'to go,' G. *drom*, 'road;' Sr. *dárava*, 'wooden,' G. *daravin*, 'pomegranate;' Sr. *dína*, 'distressed,' G. *deniló*, 'fool.'

It is changed into *gh* in Sr. *díva*, 'day,' G. *ghivés*.

Dh.—This Sanskrit consonant I have not been able to hear among the Gypsies. Whenever it occurs in terms of Sanskrit derivation, it is invariably changed to *d* or *t*: as in Sr. *bandh*, 'to tie,' G. *bandáva*; Sr. *dhāv*, 'to cleanse,' G. *továva*, 'to wash'; Sr. *dhṛita*, 'held,' G. *tertiováva*, 'to stand.'

N.—Is perfectly similar to the Latin *n*.

P.—This consonant usually has the sound of *p*: as in Sr. *pánīya*, 'potable,' G. *paní*, 'water'; Sr. *patrin*, 'winged,' G. *pat-rín*, 'feather.'

It is frequently changed to *f*: as in Sr. *par*, 'to precede,' G. *juró*, 'old man'; Sr. *pura*, 'city,' G. *forós*, 'market-place'; Sr. *vāshpa*, 'tear,' G. *ásfa*.

Or at times to *v*: as in Sr. *apara*, 'other,' G. *yavér*; Sr. *lapa*, 'word,' G. *lav*.

Or it is assimilated to the consonant following it: as in Sr. *tapta*, 'warm,' G. *tattó*; Sr. *supta*, 'asleep,' G. *sottó*; Sr. *svapna*, 'sleep,' G. *sannó*, 'dream.'

It is changed to *b*: as in Sr. *páka*, 'grey-haired,' G. *bakó*, 'bald'; Sr. *piśh*, 'to inhabit,' G. *bisháva*; Sr. *prish*, 'to sprinkle,' G. *bur-shín*, 'rain.'

B.—Has the sound of the Latin *b*: as Sr. *bála*, 'hairs,' G. *bal*; Sr. *balín*, 'strong,' G. *baló*, 'hog'; Sr. *bala*, 'strength,' G. *naisbali*, 'weak'; Sr. *bul*, 'to plunge,' G. *boláva*, 'to baptize.'

Bh.—*Bh* is not a Gypsy sound. In the words of Sanskrit origin containing it it is sometimes changed to *p*: as in Sr. *bhrátri*, 'brother,' G. *pra*, *pral*; Sr. *bhú*, 'earth,' G. *puv*; Sr. *bhara*, 'much,' G. *paró*, 'great'; Sr. *bhāti*, 'dignity,' G. *pulí*, 'business.'

It becomes *b* in Sr. *lobhinú*, 'desirous,' G. *lubní*, 'strumpet'; Sr. *bhañj*, 'to break,' G. *bangáva*.

M.—*M* is mostly pronounced like the Latin *m*. In a few words it is changed to *v*: as Sr. *gráma*, 'a village,' G. *gav*; Sr. *náman*, 'name,' G. *nav*; Sr. *híma*, 'snow,' G. *iv*.

Y.—Is frequently unchanged: as Sr. *yaksh*, 'to sacrifice,' G. *yak*, 'fire.'

It is frequently added to words beginning with a vowel: as Sr. *aksha*, 'eye,' G. *yak*; Sr. *eka*, 'one,' G. *yek*; Sr. *apara*, 'other,' G. *yavér*.

R.—The Gypsy *r* often corresponds to the Sanskrit *r*: as in Sr. *rúpya*, 'silver,' G. *rup*; Sr. *rasa*, 'taste,' G. *res*, 'vineyard.'

It is frequently changed to *l*: as in Sr. *dvāra*, 'door,' G. *dal*; Sr. *chur*, 'to steal,' G. *choláva*; Sr. *agre*, 'forwards,' G. *anglé*; Sr. *gír*, 'sound,' G. *ghílí*, 'song'; Sr. *bhrátri*, 'brother,' G. *plal*; Sr. *māra*, 'death,' G. *moló*; also in Sr. *krama*, 'to go,' united with various prepositions: as *niklaváva*, 'to go out,' *uklaváva*, 'to mount.'

In combinations of *r* with another consonant, the *r* is often dropped: as in Sr. *çringa*, 'horn,' G. *shingh*; Sr. *prachh*, 'to ask,' G. *pucháva*; Sr. *çru*, 'to hear,' G. *shunáva*; Sr. *çvaçrú*, 'mother-in-law,' G. *shasú*; Sr. *bhrú*, 'eyebrow,' G. *pov*; Sr. *gráma*, 'village,' G. *gav*; Sr. *krinámi*, 'I buy,' G. *kináva*.

It is also often assimilated to the consonant following it: as in Sr. *karna*, 'ear,' G. *kann*; Sr. *sarva*, 'all,' G. *savó*; Sr. *sarpa*, 'serpent,' G. *sapp*; Sr. *chhard*, 'to vomit,' G. *chatáva*.

Or to the consonant preceding it: as in Sr. *rátri*, 'night,' G. *arattí*, 'tonight.'

L.—Requires no remark.

V.—*V* in many words is preserved unchanged, having in the Gypsy the sound of the Latin *v* and Gr. β : as Sr. *deva*, 'god,' G. *devél*; Sr. *nava*, 'new,' G. *nevó*; Sr. *vái*, 'verily,' G. *va*, 'yes.'

It is changed to *p* in Sr. *vicharámi*, 'I deliberate,' G. *pincharáva*, 'to be acquainted.'

It is frequently prefixed to Sanskrit words beginning with vowels: as Sr. *uchcha*, 'high,' G. *vuchó*; Sr. *añda*, 'egg,' G. *vantó*; Sr. *oshtha*, 'mouth,' G. *vust*, 'lip,' Pers. *asiav*, 'mill,' G. *vasiáv*.

Or it is changed to *b*: as in Sr. *vinçati*, 'twenty,' G. *bish*; Sr. *varsha*, 'year,' G. *bersh*; Sr. *vaç*, 'to sound,' G. *basháva*, 'to cry out,' Sr. *vi*, 'without,' G. *bi*.

It is dropped at the beginning of *váshpa*, 'tear,' G. *úsfa*.

It is omitted, or, with *a*, becomes *o*, in Sr. *lavana*, 'salt,' G. *lon*; Sr. *svap*, 'to sleep,' G. *sováva*; Sr. *çvaçura*, 'father-in-law,' G. *shastró*; Sr. *çvaçrú*, 'mother-in-law,' G. *shasú*.

ç, Sh.—Both these Sanskrit sibilants are represented by the Gypsy *sh*, pronounced as in *shall*, *shore*.

Those Gypsies who live mostly among the Greeks, however, particularly in Roumelia, frequently pronounce this consonant like the Greeks, as σ : but the Moslem Gypsies give it its proper sound, on account of their familiarity with the Turkish, where the consonant *sh* is extremely common. It is important to bear this in mind. *Shastó*, 'healthy,' I have heard pronounced very often *sastó*. The modern Greeks experience considerable difficulty in pronouncing this *sh*, excepting those inhabiting the Epirus, particularly the villages near Joannina, who give it its proper sound.

Instances are Sr. *çasta*, 'healthy,' G. *shastó*; Sr. *çru*, 'to hear,' G. *shunáva*; Sr. *çringa*, 'horn,' G. *shingh*; Sr. *çastra*, 'iron,' G. *shastrí*; Sr. *çita*, 'cold,' G. *shil*, *shilaló*; Sr. *çulla*, 'cord,' G. *sheló*, 'rope,' Sr. *trichála*, 'trident,' G. *turshál*, 'cross,' Sr. *çaça*, 'rabbit,' G. *shoshói*.

ç is changed to *k* in Sr. *driç*, 'to see,' G. *dikava*.

sh is dropped before *k* in Sr. *çushka*, 'dry,' G. *shukó*.

S.—This consonant needs no explanation or comparison.

H.—*H* is changed to *k* in Sr. *hansa*, 'goose,' G. *kainá*, 'hen.'

It is dropped in Sr. *has*, 'to laugh,' G. *asáva*.

At times it is commutable with *v*: as in Sr. *hasta*, 'hand,' G. *vast*; Sr. *hima*, 'snow,' G. *biv*, *viv*.

SECTION V.

GRAMMAR.

The following remarks on the grammar of the Gypsy language are the results of my studies up to the present time, being drawn from my numerous notes and manuscript dialogues. The reader can see an illustration of them in the numerous colloquial phrases scattered through the Vocabulary.

ARTICLE.

The ancient Hindus had no article, and to their demonstrative pronouns correspond the articles of the cognate European languages, which have become separate parts of speech. It was natural, then, that the Gypsies, following the example of other analytical languages, should also acquire an article. In Spain, the article of the Gitanos is the Spanish: here, there is evident the influence of the Greek article; for the Moslem Gypsies use their article very sparingly, since the Turkish, which they mostly employ, possesses no article, properly speaking. The Gypsy article is *o* for the nom. and voc. sing. of the masc. and neut. genders, and *e* for the oblique cases of the singular and for the whole plural. The fem. form is *i* throughout. The *e* of the plural is at times pronounced like *o*.

<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>		
	Masc. and Neut.	Fem.		Masc. and Neut.	Fem.
Nom.	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	Nom.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>
Acc.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	Acc.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>
Gen.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	Gen.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>
Voc.	<i>o</i>	<i>i</i>	Voc.	<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>

Whoever is acquainted with the variations of the Greek article in the mouth of the common people, cannot be astonished by the indefinite character of the Gypsy article. Some Greeks say *τις ἀνθρώποι* for *τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*, *τις γυναῖκες* for *τὰς γυναῖκας*, *ἡ γυναῖκες* for *αἱ γυναῖκες*, etc. I am certain that whoever should attempt to investigate the Greek article, as heard in the mouth of the illiterate among our countrymen, would be extremely embarrassed in forming a clear idea of its nature, without referring to the ancient language. How then can we look for accuracy and exactitude from the mouth of this ignorant people, who have

not the least idea of anything more perfect than what they constantly use in their every day conversation?

Nous.

The Gypsy noun ends either in a vowel or a consonant.

Nouns ending in Vowels.

A few end in *a*: as *vrehŧŧŧla*, 'an extinguisher;' *ásja*, 'tear;' *makiá*, 'fly;' *vária*, 'weight;' *gúva*, 'pit;' *katúna*, 'Gypsy tent.'

Those ending in *o* are numerous, and are all of the masculine and neuter genders: as *manró*, 'bread;' *bukó*, 'bowel;' *chavó*, 'child;' *moló*, 'death;' *sunnó*, 'dream;' *charó*, 'plate;' *gosnó*, 'dung;' *kurkó*, 'Sunday;' *machó*, 'fish;' *koró*, 'bracelet;' *parnavó*, 'friend;' *rakló*, 'boy.'

Nouns in *i* are less numerous, and are of the masc. and fem. genders.

Masculine nouns in *i* are *nái*, 'nail;' *nilái*, 'summer;' *múí*, 'mouth;' *richiní*, 'bear;' *shoshói*, 'rabbit;' *kanglí*, 'comb;' *rái*, 'nobleman;' *angustri*, 'finger-ring;' *rashái*, 'priest;' *churí*, 'knife;' *amuní*, 'anvil;' *gotí*, 'brain.'

Feminine nouns in *i* are of two classes: 1, those formed from the masculine by the addition of *ni*: as *gurúv*, 'ox;' *guruvní*, 'cow;' *grast*, 'horse;' *grastní*, 'mare;' *kher*, 'ass;' *kherní*, 'she-ass;' *manúsh*, 'man;' *manushní*, 'woman;' *rái*, 'nobleman;' *raní*, 'nobleman's wife;' *rashái*, 'priest;' *rashaní*, 'priest's wife:' 2, those which are naturally feminine; as *dái*, 'mother;' *sali*, 'wife's sister;' *shashái*, 'mother-in-law;' *chái*, 'girl;' *kamní*, 'pregnant;' *nublí*, 'strumpet.'

There are other feminine nouns, formed from the noun by simply adding the ending *i*: as *chukél*, 'dog;' *chukeli*, *chuklí*, 'bitch;' *develí*, 'god;' *develí*, *devlí*, 'goddess.' As regards such feminine nouns as *romní*, 'woman,' from *rom*, 'a Gypsy, a man,' *dasní*, 'a Bulgarian woman,' from *das*, 'a Bulgarian,' I am inclined to think that they are properly feminine adjectives, from the masculines ending in *ano*: thus *rom*, *romanó*, fem. *romaní*, *romní*; *dás*, 'Bulgarian,' *dasanó*, 'of a Bulgarian,' *βουλγαρικός*, *dasaní*, *dasní*, 'a Bulgarian woman;' *grást*, 'horse,' *grastanó*, 'of a horse,' *ἵππος*, *grastaní*, *grastní*, *ἵππις*, i. e. 'mare;' *manúsh*, 'man,' *manushanó*, 'humanus,' *manushaní*, *manushní*, 'humana, woman.' This termination of *i* or *ni* for the fem. nouns has one exception, viz. *pén*, 'sister.'

Nouns terminating in Consonants.

These are by far the greatest number. The final consonants are *g*, *gh*, *k*, *l*, *m*, *n*, *p*, *r*, *s*, *sh*, *t*, *v*.

Nouns in *g* are *beng*, 'devil:'—in *gh*, *shingh*, 'horn:'—in *k*, *yak*, 'fire;' *drak*, 'grape;' *pak*, 'wing;' *chik*, 'mud;' *nak*, 'nose;' *poshik*, 'soil;' *khalink*, 'well:'—in *l*, *prál*, 'brother;' *kerál*, 'cheese;' *turshúl*, 'cross;' *chukél*, 'dog;' *devél*, 'God:'—in *m*, *rom*, 'Gypsy;' *lim*, 'mucus of the nose;' *drom*, 'road;' *kam*, 'sun:'—in *n*, *armán*, 'curse;' *kann*, 'ear;' *patrín*, 'leaf;' *chon*, 'moon;' *tan*, 'place;' *len*, 'river:'—in *p*, *rup*, 'silver;' *supp*, 'serpent;' *chip*, 'tongue:'—in *r*, *kher*, 'ass;' *ker*, 'house;' *angár*, 'coal;' *mutér*, 'urine;' *lindr*, 'sleep;' *gher*, 'itch:'—in *s*, *murs*, 'brave;' *divés*, 'day;' *vus*, 'flax;' *mas*, 'meat;' *res*, 'vineyard:'—in *sh*, *manúsh*, 'man;' *trush*, 'thirst;' *bersh*, 'year:'—in *t*, *ratt*, 'blood;' *purt*, 'bridge;' *dat*, 'father;' *grast*, 'horse;' *vast*, 'hand;' *shut*, 'vinegar;' *vent*, 'winter:'—in *v*, *puv*, 'earth;' *pov*, 'eye-brow;' *giv*, 'grain;' *arakáv*, 'guard;' *suv*, 'needle;' *gurív*, 'ox;' *gav*, 'village;' *nav*, 'name;' *lav*, 'word.'

The Gypsy noun has no dual number. Its declension I shall attempt in the following remarks to make as plain as possible.

Declension of masculines in *o*:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom. <i>o chavó</i> , 'the child,'	<i>e chavé</i> , 'the children,'
Acc. <i>e chavés</i> , 'the child,'	<i>e chavén</i> , 'the children,'
Gen. <i>e chavéskoro</i> , 'of the child,'	<i>e chavénghoro</i> , 'of the children,'
Voc. <i>o chavó</i> , 'O child!'	<i>o chavále</i> , 'O children!'

Of masculines in *i*:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom. <i>o rái</i> , 'the nobleman,'	<i>e rayé</i> , 'the noblemen,'
Acc. <i>e rayés</i> , 'the nobleman,'	<i>e rayén</i> , 'the noblemen,'
Gen. <i>e rayéskoro</i> , 'of the nobleman,'	<i>e rayénghoro</i> , 'of the noblemen,'
Voc. <i>o rái</i> , 'O nobleman!'	<i>o rayále</i> , 'O noblemen!'

Of masculines ending in consonants:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom. <i>o pral</i> , 'the brother,'	<i>e pralé</i> , 'the brothers,'
Acc. <i>e pralés</i> , 'the brother,'	<i>e pralén</i> , 'the brothers,'
Gen. <i>e praléskoro</i> , 'of the brother,'	<i>e pralénghoro</i> , 'of the brothers,'
Voc. <i>o pral</i> , 'O brother!'	<i>o pralále</i> , 'O brothers!'
Nom. <i>o drak</i> , 'the grape,'	<i>e draká</i> , 'the grapes,'
Acc. <i>e drakés</i> , 'the grape,'	<i>e draká</i> , 'the grapes,'
Gen. <i>e drakéskoro</i> , 'of the grape,'	<i>e drakénghoro</i> , 'of the grapes,'
Voc. <i>o drak</i> , 'O grape!'	<i>o drakále</i> , 'O grapes!'

Declension of feminine nouns:

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom. <i>i dái</i> , 'the mother,'	<i>e daia</i> , 'the mothers,'
Acc. <i>e daia</i> , 'the mother,'	<i>e daia</i> , 'the mothers,'
Gen. <i>e daiakori</i> , 'of the mother,'	<i>e daianghoro</i> , 'of the mothers,'
Voc. <i>e dáia</i> , 'O mother!'	<i>e daiale</i> , 'O mothers!'

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>i rakli,</i> 'the girl,'		<i>e rakliá,</i> 'the girls,'
Acc.	<i>e rakliá,</i> 'the girl,'		<i>e rakliá,</i> 'the girls,'
Gen.	<i>e rakliákori,</i> 'of the girl,'		<i>e rakliénghoro,</i> 'of the girls,'
Voc.	<i>e rakliá,</i> 'O girl!'		<i>e rakliále,</i> 'O girls!'

The above examples are sufficient to show the reader the general declension of Gypsy nouns; but before I make any remarks upon the cases, it may be proper to bring forward an example from Pott's work, in order farther to elucidate the subject. I take an example from Puchmayer as found in Pott (i. 196):

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>cziriklo,</i>		<i>czirikle,</i>
Acc.	<i>czirikles,</i>		<i>cziriklen,</i>
Voc.	<i>czirikleja,</i>		<i>cziriklale,</i>
Dat. 1,	_____ *		_____ *
Dat. 2,	<i>czirikleske,</i>		<i>cziriklenge,</i>
Abl.	<i>cziriklestar,</i>		<i>cziriklendar,</i>
Soc.	<i>czirikleha,</i>		<i>cziriklenğa,</i>
Gen.	<i>czirikleskero,</i>		<i>cziriklengero.</i>

These forms are identical with those found among the Gypsies of these countries. I decline a noun as pronounced here, following in the cases the order of the above author:

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>o raktó,</i> 'the child,'		<i>e rakté,</i> 'the children,'
Acc.	<i>e raktés,</i> 'the child,'		<i>e raktén,</i> 'the children,'
Voc.	<i>e raktó,</i> 'O child!'		<i>e raktále,</i> 'O children!'
Dat. 1,	<i>e raktéste,</i> 'in the child,'		<i>e rakténde,</i> 'in the children,'
Dat. 2,	<i>e raktéske,</i> 'to the child,'		<i>e rakténge,</i> 'to the children,'
Abl.	<i>e raktéstar,</i> 'from the child,'		<i>e rakténdar,</i> 'from the children,'
Soc.	<i>e raktéssa,</i> 'with the child,'		<i>e rakténtza,</i> 'with the children,'
Gen.	<i>e raktéskoro,</i> 'of the child,'		<i>e rakténghoro,</i> 'of the children.'

To the reader, at first sight, such a declension must appear wonderfully rich and expressive, and so much the more, as it is in the mouth of a people who have no intellectual cultivation, and who would naturally simplify their language to the utmost. But all this richness, which even the Sanskrit does not possess, is owing merely to the union of particles with the noun in its simplest form; for the Gypsy noun has properly only four cases; nominative, accusative, genitive, and vocative; while to the accusative are joined all these particles, which are similar in both numbers, and cannot be properly considered as forming cases. Before proceeding to speak of the formation of each case separately, I shall analyze a noun, in order to illustrate and make plain the combination of which I have spoken:

* These cases, omitted by Puchmayer, are *cziriklesté* in the singular, and *cziriklende* in the plural.

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>o raktló,</i>		<i>e raktlé,</i>
Acc.	<i>e raktlés,</i>		<i>e raktlén,</i>
Dat. 1,	<i>e raktlés-te,</i>		<i>e raktlén-te,</i>
Dat. 2,	<i>e raktlés-ke,</i>		<i>e raktlén-ke,</i>
Abl.	<i>e raktlés-tar,</i>		<i>e raktlén-tar,</i>
Soc.	<i>e raktlés-sa,</i>		<i>e raktlén-sa,</i>
Gen.	<i>e raktlés-koro,</i>		<i>e raktlén-koro.</i>

The occurrence of the liquid *n* in the plural varies considerably the pronunciation of the following consonants, thus:

Dat. 1,	<i>raktlén-te</i>	is pronounced	<i>raktlén-de,</i>
Dat. 2,	<i>raktlén-ke</i>	“	<i>raktlén-ge,</i>
Abl.	<i>raktlén-tar</i>	“	<i>raktlén-dar,</i>
Soc.	<i>raktlén-sa</i>	“	<i>raktlén-tza,</i>
Gen.	<i>raktlén-koro</i>	“	<i>raktlén-ghoro.</i>

In this manner the declension of the Gypsy noun becomes extremely clear, and can be reduced to very simple elements. There is no more reason for calling *raktléndar* a case than for giving the name of cases to all those adverbs in Greek which are formed by the ablative particle *σεν*, or to such Latin words as *mecum*, *tecum*, which correspond with the so-called social case of the above Gypsy nouns.

The same mode of declension which is followed by nouns ending in *o* holds good also as regards feminine nouns ending in *i*, and the appended particles are not less distinct and clear. As an instance, I give the forms of declension of *romní*, ‘woman:’

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>i romní,</i>		<i>i romnía,</i>
Acc.	<i>i romníá,</i>		<i>i romnía,</i>
Dat. 1,	<i>i romníá-te,</i>		<i>i romnían-te (romníande),</i>
Dat. 2,	<i>i romníá-ke,</i>		<i>i romnían-ke (romníanghe),</i>
Abl.	<i>i romníá-tar,</i>		<i>i romnían-tar (romníandar),</i>
Soc.	<i>i romníá-sa,</i>		<i>i romnían-sa (romníantza),</i>
Gen.	<i>i romníá-kori,</i>		<i>i romnían-koro (romníanghoro).</i>

This comparison of the declension of masculine and feminine nouns is interesting, as it demonstrates two particulars in the history of the Gypsy noun. First, were it not for the so-called social case of the plural, we should have been at a loss to know whether the final syllable of the singular case was a *sa*, or a simple *a* united to the accusative, since all nouns without distinction have this termination: thus *grast*, ‘horse,’ *grastéssa*, ‘with a horse’ (‘on horseback’); *rái*, ‘a nobleman,’ *rayéssa*, ‘with a nobleman:’ plur. *grasténtza*, ‘with horses;’ *rayéntza*, ‘with noblemen.’ In the feminine gender the case is clear, since Gypsies say *raktí*, ‘a female child,’ acc. *raktíá*; soc. sing. *raktíá-sa*, ‘with the female child.’ This evidently proves the addition of the

syllable *sa* to the accusative, which we shall presently consider. As to the plural social, the fact is palpably evident: thus *piró*, *piréntza*, 'with feet;' *chavó*, *chavéntza*, 'with children.'

The second consideration, which is extremely important, is that though in the accusative plural of feminine nouns no final *n* exists, it is to be found in all the compound cases of the plural: a fact which to me amply demonstrates the former presence of this liquid in the accusative plural, although the Gypsies have later entirely abandoned its pronunciation.

I will now proceed to consider more in detail the formation of the different cases, taking them up in their order.

Accusative singular.—This case, in the singular of nouns ending in *o*, is *es*: thus *parnavó*, 'friend,' acc. *parnavés*; *machó*, 'fish,' *machés*; *sunnó*, 'dream,' *sunnés*; *manró*, 'bread,' is often used unchanged: as *khandí manró kháva*, 'I eat a little bread.' Feminine nouns in *i* form the acc. in *a*, with the accent on this vowel: as *romní*, 'woman,' acc. *romniú*; *butí*, 'business,' *butiá*; *nublí*, 'strumpet,' *nubliá*. Nouns in *a* generally have the same form in the accusative: as *ásfa*, 'a tear,' acc. *ásfa*; *katúna*, 'a Gypsy tent,' acc. *katúna*. To me, however, such words, which are few, are properly nouns forming the accusative in *as* or *es*, judging from their genitives etc.: as *katunéskoro*, 'of the tent;' a form of this character presupposes an accusative *katúnas* or *katúnes*, of which, in ordinary usage, the final *s* has been dropped. Nouns ending in consonants, by far the most numerous, form their accusative by the addition of *es*: thus *pral*, 'brother,' acc. *pralés*; *tan*, 'place,' *tanés*; *dat*, 'father,' *datés*; *gar*, 'village,' *garés*. In nouns ending in *el* and *er*, as *devél*, 'God,' *chukél*, 'dog,' *tovér*, 'axe,' etc., the final syllable drops its vowel: thus *devél*, acc. *devlés*; *chukél*, *chuklés*; *tovér*, *tovrés*.

Nouns ending in *k*, as *pak*, 'wing,' *yak*, 'fire,' are generally pronounced in the accusative with the vowel *a*: as *paká*, acc., 'the wing,' *yakú*, 'the eye.' The regular accusative form, with its final *s*, is observed in the genitive *pakéskoro*, 'of the wing,' *yakéskoro*, 'of the fire.'

Taking the compound cases, so uniform in their formation, as a guide, it appears to me not implausible to lay down the general rule that the accusative singular of all Gypsy nouns of the masculine gender ends in *s*, and of the feminine in *a*.

Vocative singular.—This case, of which few Gypsies can give any account, is formed, in nouns ending in *o*, by changing this vowel to *e*: as *choró*, *choré*, 'O poor man!' ὦ πτωχέ; *chavó*, *chavé*, 'O boy!' In the feminine it is formed by adding *a* to *i*: as *dái*, *dáia*, 'O mother!' In nouns ending in consonants this case is formed by the addition of *e*: as *manúsh*, *manúshe*, 'O man!' *dat*, *dáte*, 'O father!'

Nominative plural.—In this case, the forms are nearly the same with those just given. The nominative of nouns ending in *o* is formed by changing this vowel into *e*: as *chavó*, ‘child,’ *chavé*, ‘children;’ *charó*, *charé*, ‘plates;’ *rakló*, *raklé*, ‘boys;’ *bakró*, *bakré*, ‘sheep.’

Nouns in *i*, whether masculine or feminine, form the nominative plural by the addition of *a*: as *raklí*, *raklía*, ‘girls;’ *romní*, *romnía*, ‘women;’ *rái*, *ráia*, ‘noblemen;’ *rashái*, *rasháia*, ‘priests.’

Nouns in *k*, by the addition of *a*: as *yak*, *yaká*, ‘eyes;’ *pak*, *paká*, ‘wings;’ *ruk*, *ruká*, ‘trees:’—also those in *v*: as *pov*, *pová*, ‘eyebrows.’

Nouns ending in other consonants, by adding *e*: as *grast*, *grasté*, ‘horses;’ *manúsh*, *manushé*, ‘men;’ *pral*, *pralé*, ‘brothers.’ This vowel is, however, often interchanged with *a*: as *romé* or *romá*, ‘Gypsies.’

Accusative plural.—This case, of which I have already had occasion to speak, is formed, in nouns ending in *o*, by changing this vowel to *en*: as *chavó*, *chavén*, ‘children;’ *bukó*, *bukén*, ‘bowels;’ *parnavó*, *parnavén*, ‘friends.’

In feminine nouns in *i*, it is formed by the addition of *a*: as *romní*, *romnía*, ‘women;’ *chái*, *cháia*, ‘girls;’ *nublí*, *nublía*, ‘harlots.’ The same vowel is added also to masculine nouns ending in *i*: as *rashái*, *rasháia*, ‘priests;’ *múí*, *múia*, ‘mouths;’ *nái*, *náia*, ‘nails:’—also to nouns ending in *k* and *v*: as *pak*, *paká*, ‘wings;’ *drak*, *draká*, ‘grapes;’ *triák*, *triaká*, ‘shoes;’ *pov*, *pová*, ‘eyebrows;’ *gav*, *gavá*, ‘villages.’

In all the numerous class of nouns ending in other consonants, this case is formed by the addition of *en*: as *grast*, *grastén*, ‘horses;’ *pral*, *pralén*, ‘brothers;’ *shingh*, *shinghén*, ‘horns.’

Vocative plural.—This case is formed, in nouns ending in *o*, by the change of the final vowel to *ále*: as *choró*, *chorále*, ‘O poor men!’ *chavó*, *chavále*, ‘O children!’ In nouns ending in consonants the same formation is observed: as *rom*, *romiále* or *romále*, ‘O Gypsies!’ *manúsh*, *manushále*, ‘O men!’ Likewise in feminine nouns in *i*: as *raklí*, *raklíále*, ‘O girls!’ and also with masculine nouns in *i*: as *rashái*, *rashále*, ‘O priests!’

The reader must not suppose that there is to be found in the Gypsy the uniformity observed in many other languages, where grammatical usages are more constant, and where even the language of the most ignorant has always had persons of more refinement speaking it. On the contrary, among the Gypsies there is such a difference in pronunciation, and such tendency to alter the vowels in these case-endings, that the subject at times becomes extremely difficult and embarrassing.

There are remnants of the locative case of the Sanskrit, but the case itself does not exist as an independent one: its place is supplied, as in most European languages, by a particle: the rem-

nants referred to are *rattí*, *arattí*, 'by night;' *telé*, 'under, below;' *anglé*, 'forwards.'

Genitive, singular and plural.—The genitive is formed by the addition of *koro*, in both numbers and genders: as *richiní*, *richinés-koro*, 'of a bear;' *sunnó*, *sunnés-koro*, 'of a dream;' *pak*, *pakés-koro*, 'of the wing;' *richinénghoro*, 'of bears;' *sunnénghoro*, 'of dreams;' *pukénghoro*, 'of wings.' In the feminine, *dái*, *daiákori*, 'of the mother;'^{*} *chorí*, *choriákori*, 'of the poor woman;' plur. *daiúnghori*,† 'of the mothers;' *choriánghori*, 'of the poor women.'

This termination, which is no other than the Sanskrit word *kara* (Gr. *ποιος*, Lat. *faciens*), from the root *kri*, 'to make,' serves also to form a great variety of nouns, in a way similar to the Greek and Latin terms mentioned. Thus *charó*, 'plate,' *charés-koro*, 'of a plate,' and 'a plate-maker;' *shastrí*, 'iron,' *shastirés-koro*, 'of iron,' and 'a worker in iron;' *butí*, 'business,' *butiákoro*, 'of the business,' and 'a business man, a craftsman;' *bar*, 'stone,' *barés-koro*, 'of a stone,' and 'a stone-cutter;' *mas*, 'meat,' *masés-koro*, 'of the meat,' and 'butcher;' *angár*, 'coal,' *angarés-koro*, 'of the coal,' and 'a collier.' All these terms, and many other similar ones, serve as genitive cases, and are used also frequently as adjectives: thus *katúna*, 'Gypsy tent,' *katunés-koro róm*, 'a Gypsy of the tent,' i. e. *σκιπτρης*; *katunéskeri romní*, 'a Gypsy woman of the tent.' Like all other adjectives, these nouns take the usual feminine termination in *i*: as *butiákori*, 'a craftswoman;' *maséskori*, 'a butcher's wife;' *machéskori*, 'a female dealing in fish.' In the declension, also, the final *o* of the genitive masculine constantly becomes *i* in the feminine: as *rání*, 'the nobleman's wife,' gen. *raniákori*, and never *raniákoro*.

The confusion resulting from the identity of these terms is somewhat avoided by the use of the masculine article *o*: *o katunés-koro*, 'the tent-maker,' *e katunés-koro*, 'of the tent;' *o masés-koro*, 'the butcher,' *e masés-koro chavó*, 'the child of the butcher.'

There is no other genitive throughout the Gypsy language than that formed by the termination *koro*: we shall meet it in both adjectives and pronouns, constant and invariable, demonstrating amply that the genitive case is properly a possessive, which in course of time lost entirely this signification.

I come now to consider the other four so-called cases, the first and second dative, the social, and the ablative; and as they are common to the nouns and pronouns, what I offer now is equally applicable to both. As I differ in my view of them from all who have written on the subject before me, it is just to lay before the reader the reasons which have convinced me, and have brought me to an independent conclusion.

* Pronounced often *dákori* and *dákeri*.

† Also *daiúngHERE*.

Grellmann appears first to have studied the formation of the cases of the Gypsy noun, and all subsequent writers have more or less imitated him. I have remarked, in speaking of the noun, that it has properly only two cases, the nominative and the accusative, from which latter is formed the genitive, by the addition of *koro*, both in the singular and plural, and both in the masculine and feminine. I have given also the cases of other authors, called dative first and second, social, and ablative. The two datives end in *te* and *ke* respectively, the social in *sa*, and the ablative in *tar*; in the plural, they end usually in *de*, *ghe*, *tza*, and *dar*, owing to the preceding liquid *n*, which, though lost at present in the accusative, has been tenaciously preserved in the compounds. The social and ablative are well understood, but the difference between the two datives is not well defined in the grammars of this idiom. The dative ending in *te* means, according to what I have been able to ascertain, 'in, within:' as *me sunnéste*, 'in my dream;' *me tanéste*, 'in my town;' *teráva me sheréste*, 'I have in my head;' *me gotiúte*, 'in my brain;' *me praléskoro keréste*, 'in the house of my brother;' *terávas duk me boriáti*, 'I had pain in my belly;' *te praléskoro biavéste*, 'in the marriage of thy brother.' This is often heard inverted: as *ti pak*, 'in the wing,' for *pakéste*; *ti biáv*, 'in the marriage,' for *biavéste*; *ti ker*, for *keréste*, 'in the house.' These examples fully elucidate the meaning of the particle *te*, joined to the noun.

The second dative, ending in *ke*, means 'to, towards:' as *ma pen yavréske*, 'do not say (it) to another;' *machénghe lon chivéla*, 'he throws salt to the fish;' *oghéske*, 'to the soul,' or 'for the soul.' The Gypsies, as in the former case, seem to be abandoning this form, and make use of *ko* and *ke* before the noun. Still the regular form is extremely common in the pronouns, where less license can be taken, and where the meaning of these forms may be still farther explained and clearly understood. Examples of similar inversions we have in modern Greek, where *ἰδῶθην*, *ἐκείθεν* have been abandoned for *ἀπ' ἰδῶ*, *ἀπ' ἐκεῖ*, and the like; and in some parts of Greece, as the Ionian islands, for *ἀπ' ἰδῶθην*, *ἀπ' ἐκεῖθεν*, a usage found existing among the Greeks of Homer's time.

In the pronouns, the particle *ke* is never placed before the term to be expressed, as is the case often in nouns: thus *pen mánghe* (for *mán-ke*), 'say to me;' *yavréske*, 'to another;' *aménghe*, 'to us;' *tuménghe*, 'to you;' *túke*, 'to thee;' *léske*, 'to him;' *láke*, 'to her;' *lénghe*, 'to them.' This particle is also often joined to numerals: as *keténghe kinghián les?* *jovénghe*, 'for how much didst thou buy it? for six;' *bishénghe*, 'for twenty;' and so with all the numerals.

The above examples prove the signification which this particle imparts to Gypsy words, and, though less in use than the other particle *te*, it is still extremely clear and definite.

The social case, formed by the addition of *sa* (probably the Sr. *saha*, 'with, together with'), is simple in its construction, and very plain in its signification, both in the singular and plural. It denotes junction, union, and accompaniment, and is united to both nouns and pronouns: as *jáva grastéssa*, 'I go with a horse' (i. e. 'on horseback'); *pindéntza*, 'with the feet' (i. e. 'on foot'); *yavré rakléntza*, 'with other children'; *romniása*, 'with the woman'; *romniántza*, 'with the women.' In the pronouns it is universally found: as *mántza*, 'with me,' Lat. *mecum*; *túsa*, 'with thee'; *améntza*, *tuméntza*, *léntza*, 'with us, with you, with them.'

The ablative, formed by the addition of *tar* (probably the Sr. *tas*, which has the same signification, and a somewhat similar use), is found also constantly in both numbers and genders, and in both nouns and pronouns. That it is a particle, independent of the noun, is amply demonstrated by its use in verbs and participles, whenever action from a place is intended to be expressed: thus *nastótar*, 'after he departed' (*nastó*, part., 'departed, gone'); *tapi-lótar*, 'after it was buried'; *alliátar*, 'after he came'; *kamulótar*, 'after dying'; *pelótar*, 'after falling.' So also in *sostár*, 'because,' formed evidently of *so*—the neut. of *kón*, 'who'—and *tar*; and in the local adverbs, as *até*, 'here,' *attár*, 'from here.' These examples cannot be made to support the opinion of those writers who would make this a case. On such principles we should be compelled to regard as cases all those combinations with particles which impart the idea of direction of action to the noun, or indicate its relation to another object, whether animate or inanimate.

Such are the considerations which have induced me to exclude from the declension of the noun all these forms, which are not cases in the proper sense of the word, and to limit that appellation to the nominative, accusative, genitive, and vocative alone.

Diminutive nouns are formed by the addition of *oro*, and are frequently to be heard among all the Gypsies: thus *grast*, 'horse,' *grastoró*, 'a small horse, a young horse'; *chavó*, *chavoró*, 'a young child'; *das*, *dasoró*, 'a young Bulgarian'; *jul*, *jutoró*, 'a young Jew'; *ternó*, *ternoró*, 'a youngster. The fem. of these diminutives is regular: as *chavori*, 'a young female child'; *dasori*, *jutori*, *ternori*, etc. They are declined like other nouns in *o* and *i*.

Another class of diminutives ends in *tzo*: as *baló*, 'hog,' *balítzó*, 'a young pig'; *bakró*, *bakritzó*, 'a lamb.'

ADJECTIVES.

Adjectives end in *o*, plural *e*, and correspond in their declension to nouns in *o*. There are some exceptions to this rule: as *sukár*, 'beautiful'; *naisukár*, 'ugly'; *naisváli*, 'invalid'; *kasukóv*, 'deaf'; *namporemé*, 'sick.'

All adjectives ending in *o* and in consonants are masculine or neuter. The feminine is formed by changing *o* to *i*: as *kaló*, 'black,' *kalí romní*, 'black woman;,' *melaló*, 'dirty,' *melalí cháí*, 'dirty girl.'

The feminine of the above mentioned adjectives not ending in *o* is formed by adding *i*, often with some variations of the final syllable: as *sukár*, 'beautiful,' fem. *sukaróri* or *sukarí*; *naisválí* serves for both genders; *kasukón*, fem. *kasukóni*, 'deaf woman.'

The other adjectives not ending in vowels are declined like nouns ending in the corresponding consonants.

When adjectives are used otherwise than attributively, they are thus declined like nouns; but when in combination with substantives, these latter receive the case-terminations, and the adjectives then change their *o* into *e*: as *e kaléskero*, 'of the black (man),' *e kalé manushéskoro*, 'of the black man;,' *melalén chavén* (acc.) is pronounced *melalé chavén*, 'the dirty children.' I think, however, we may come nearer the truth in assuming that the adjectives, in the accusative of both genders, drop the final *s* and *n* in pronunciation.

The comparative degree of the adjective is extremely variable. It is mostly formed by adding to the positive the particle *po*, which appears to me to be the Greek *πλέον*, pronounced by us at present *πώ*: as *po lachó*, 'better;,' *po kaló*, 'blacker;,' *po vuchó*, 'higher.' What inclines me to believe that this is our *πώ* for *πλέον* is the fact that the Moslem Gypsies, less acquainted with the Greek, adopt the corresponding Turkish word *daha*, which the Turks universally use to form their comparative degree: thus *daha ey*, 'better.' They are not acquainted with the particle *po*, and only a few use it, who mingle with their fellow-countrymen the Christian Gypsies. *Po* is not confined to the pure adjective, but is also used in the adverbial form: as *po lachés*, 'better,' Gr. *κάλιον*, Lat. *melius*; *po vuchés*, 'higher,' *ὑψηλότερον*, *altius*.

Though this is the most constant form of the comparative, and though the Gypsies have in this respect imitated their neighbors, who have lost in great part the ancient forms of the comparative, and have substituted in its stead the *πλέον*, the Gypsy language has preserved traces of the ancient comparative of the Sr. in *tara*, the *τερος* of the Greeks, and which in Persian is regular and extremely common. The Latin has not preserved so universally as the Greek this original ending of comparison, although it evidently exists in such terms as *exter*, *inter*, *alter*, etc.

The Sr. *tara* is evidently to be recognized in such words as *me baredér* (*baro*, 'great'), 'my superior;,' *me uchédér* (*uchó*, 'high'), 'one higher than me,' *ὑψηλότερος* *ἐμοῦ*. In this form the word is at times to be heard, though it is necessary to remark that it is not common, and that the Gypsies prefer saying *me po lachó*, *me po uchó*. At times, like other ignorant people, they

join the particle *po* to the comparative: as *po kalodér*, 'blacker,' lit. 'more blacker;' *po parnodér*, 'more whiter.' In this they have every day imitators, among the Greeks particularly, who say *πὺ ἐπιλότερος*, *πὺ μεγαλήτερος*, for simple *ἐπιλότερος* and *μεγαλήτερος*. This form of the comparative is, I am sorry to say, fast going out of use. One may hear Gypsies discourse for a long time without suspecting its existence.

As to the superlative, I know of none. Gypsies experience the same difficulty as the common Greeks, when they attempt to express such an idea: thus *lachó*, 'good;' *po lachó*, 'better;' *o po lachó*, 'the best;' *o po kaló*, 'the blackest;' Gr. *καλός*, *πὺ καλός*, *ὁ πὺ καλός*, 'the best.'

From the adjectives are formed adverbs, as numerous as the adjectives, and here the Gypsies experience no difficulty. All these terms, extremely common among them, are formed by changing the final *o* into *es*. They are simple and very expressive: thus *lachó*, 'good;' *lachés*, 'well;' *shuchó*, 'clean,' *shuchés*, 'in a clean manner;' *romanó*, *romanés*, 'in a Gypsy manner;' *dasanó*, *dasanés*, 'in a Bulgarian manner.' These latter forms correspond to the Greek *ἀτζιγκανιστι*, *βουλγαριστι*.

To these adverbs is prefixed the comparative particle *po*: as *po vuchés*, 'higher, *altius*;' *po lachés*, 'better;' *po kalés*, 'blacker.' Also to the proper adverbs of place: as *po anglál*, 'farther ahead;' *po nápalal*, 'still more backwards;' *po andré*, 'farther inwards;' *po avri*, 'farther outwards.'

The Moslem Gypsies use precisely the same expression, substituting the Turkish *daha* for *po*, as we have already remarked, in treating of the formation of the comparative: thus *daha vuchés*, *daha lachés*.

PRONOUNS.

Personal.

1st Person.

	Sing.		Plur.
Nom.	<i>me</i> , 'I,'		<i>amén</i> , 'we,'
Acc.	<i>man</i> , 'me,'		<i>amán</i> , 'us,'
Gen.	{ <i>me</i> , <i>míndó</i> , <i>mínró</i> , <i>má nghero</i> , }	'of me,'	{ <i>amaró</i> , <i>amánghoro</i> , }

2d Person.

	Sing.		Plur.
Nom.	<i>tu</i> , 'thou,'		<i>tumén</i> , 'ye,'
Acc.	<i>tut</i> , 'thee,'		<i>tumén</i> , 'you,'
Gen.	{ <i>te</i> , <i>tindó</i> , <i>tinró</i> , }	'of thee,'	{ <i>tumaró</i> , <i>tuménghoro</i> , }

		3d Person, <i>masc.</i>			
		<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
		Nom. <i>ov</i> , 'he,'		<i>ol</i> , 'they,'	
		Acc. <i>les</i> , 'him,'		<i>len</i> , 'them,'	
		Gen. <i>léskero</i> , 'of him,'		<i>lénghero</i> , 'of them.'	
		3d Person, <i>fem.</i>			
		<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
		Nom. <i>ov</i> , 'she,'		<i>o</i> , 'they,'	
		Acc. <i>la</i> , 'her,'		<i>len</i> , 'them,'	
		Gen. <i>lákero</i> , 'of her.'		<i>lénghero</i> , 'of them.'	
Possessive.					
		1st Person.			
		<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
<i>masc. and neut.</i>		<i>fem.</i>			
Nom. <i>mo</i> ,		<i>mí</i> ,		<i>me</i> , 'my,'	
Acc. <i>mo</i> ,		<i>mí</i> ,		<i>amaró</i> , 'our,'	
Gen. <i>me</i> ,		<i>me</i> ,		<i>amaré</i> , 'our,'	
				<i>amarénghoro</i> , 'of our.'	
		2d Person.			
		<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
<i>masc. and neut.</i>		<i>fem.</i>			
Nom. <i>to</i> ,		<i>tí</i> ,		<i>te</i> , 'thy,'	
Acc. <i>to</i> ,		<i>tí</i> ,		<i>tumaró</i> , 'your,'	
Gen. <i>te</i> ,		<i>te</i> ,		<i>tumaré</i> , 'your,'	
				<i>tumarénghoro</i> , 'of your.'	
		3d Person.			
		<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>	
<i>masc.</i>		<i>fem.</i>			
<i>léskero</i> , { 'of him,		<i>lákero</i> , { 'of her,		<i>léskere</i> , 'of his,'	
} his,'		} her,'		<i>olénghero</i> , { 'of them,	
				} their.'	

Whenever the possessive pronoun is used substantively, *mo* becomes *míndó* or *mínró*; *to* becomes *tíndó* or *tínró*. The reader has already seen numerous illustrations of this general usage in the Vocabulary. All the pronouns are declined like nouns in *o* and *i*.

There is another form of the possessive pronoun, which is not common among the Gypsies in these countries, viz. *pes* and *pi*. The first is never used except with the 3d person of the passive verb, and corresponds to the usual *les*, 'him'; the second, *pi*, is a form often found in the place of *léskero*, 'of him, his.' To many Gypsies this latter is entirely unknown.

The perusal of the above pronouns illustrates the general usage of many languages, where the genitive of the personal pronoun seems to form most of the possessives, varied according to their union with the substantive. Compare Gr. *ἐγὼ*, gen. *ἐμοῦ*; *ἐμὸς*, *μὸς*, *ἡμέτερος*, etc.

Before comparing these pronouns with those in the Sanskrit, I shall elucidate the use of them by familiar colloquial phrases,

by which their meaning and proper employment may be more perfectly understood. The same particles which we have so frequently met in studying the nouns, forming a kind of cases, will be observed also with these pronouns. The reader can easily understand them by simply referring to what we have said on the subject there.

1st Person.—*Kon déla o vutár?* ‘who knocks at the door?’ *me isóm*, ‘it is I,’ *éyō éiu*; *me nastí keráva*, ‘I cannot do;’ *kon isí?* *me*, ‘who is it? I.’ *Kayék jenó na janéla man*, ‘no one knows me;’ *te des man*, ‘that thou shouldst give me;’ *de man*, ‘give me;’ *ma de man*, ‘do not give me;’ *ma kus man*, ‘do not revile me;’ *mukéla man*, ‘it leaves me.’ *Me praléskero keréste*, ‘in the house of my brother;’ *me grastéskoro i zen*, ‘my horse’s saddle;’ *bi mánggoro*, ‘without me.’ *Amén isámas otiá*, ‘we were there.’ *Na dukél’ amán*, ‘he does not love us.’ *Amaró manúsh*, ‘our man;’ *amaré manushé*, ‘our men;’ *amarí chip*, ‘our language;’ *diniás amaré chuklés*, ‘he struck our dog;’ *gurumní amari*, ‘our cow;’ *amaré gotiáte*, ‘in our mind;’ *kon diniás amaré peniá?* ‘who struck our sister?’

2d Person.—*Tu ghellián ti pólin?* ‘didst thou go to the city?’ *tu kerghiánles?* ‘didst thou make it?’ *tu nastí kerésa*, ‘thou canst not do it.’ *Na reséla tut*, ‘it does not suffice thee;’ *murdaráva tut*, ‘I kill thee;’ *allióm ta dikáv tut*, ‘I have come to see thee.’ *Te gavéskoro manushé*, ‘the men of thy village;’ *te praléskoro nav?* ‘the name of thy brother?’ *Nanáí tindó*, ‘it is not thine;’ *isí tindó*, ‘it is thine.’ *Tumén so penása?* ‘what do ye say?’ *Tumaró biáv isí?* ‘is it your marriage?’ *tumaré kheréskoro*, ‘of your ass.’

3d Person, masculine.—*Ki ov ki isás otiá*, ‘and he who was there;’ *méya, túya, ki ov*, ‘and I, and thou, and he.’ *Kamáva les*, ‘I want him;’ *astarghióm les*, ‘I seized him;’ *dikáva les*, ‘I see him.’ *I romní léskoro*, ‘his wife;’ *léskoro dat*, ‘his father;’ *anglé isás oléskoro*, ‘formerly it was his;’ *isí oléskoro*, ‘it is his.’ *Ol manushé*, ‘those men.’ This pronoun is rarely used, and in its stead the Gypsies employ *aklá, akiú*, ‘these,’ which we have noticed in the Vocabulary. *Na maréla len*, ‘he does not beat them;’ *dikióm len*, ‘I saw them;’ *na picharáv len*, ‘I do not know them.’ *Lénghero vasiáv*, ‘their mill;’ *lénghero lové*, ‘their money.’

3d Person, feminine.—*Ol romní*, ‘that woman;’ *ol gurumní*, ‘that cow.’ *Diklióm la yek divés*, ‘I saw her one day;’ *bighán la*, ‘he sold her;’ *marélala*, ‘he beats her.’ *Lákero pral keréla shastrí*, ‘her brother makes iron;’ *lákeri dat*, ‘her father;’ *lákeri moskári* (Gr. *μοσχάρι*), ‘her calf;’ *lákeri chuchía*, ‘her breasts.’ The plural is similar to the plural of the 3d person masculine.

Possessives.—These are extremely regular. *Mo dat*, ‘my father;’ *mo sheró*, ‘my head;’ *mi dáu*, ‘my mother;’ *mi pen*, ‘my sister.’ *To rom*, ‘thy husband;’ *ti romní*, ‘thy wife;’ *ti gurumní*,

'thy cow.' *Kaléskero isí o ker?* 'whose is the house?' *isí mindó* or *minró*, 'it is mine.' No Gypsy says *isí mo*. The plural does not differ from the declension of adjectives in *o*. *Me lové*, 'my money;' *me yísmata*, 'my linen;' *te tikné isí melalé*, 'thy children are dirty;' *so keréna te chavé?* 'how are thy children?' *Lénghero* is used both for the masculine and feminine of the 3d person: *lénghero chavé*, 'of these (women) the children;' *lénghero lové*, 'of these (men) the money.' Though these pronouns are pronounced without an initial vowel, it appears to me, judging from the nominative *ov*, *o*, that they should be written *ólénghero*, *ólákero*.

There is a particular form of the 1st and 2d personal pronouns, extremely common among all the Gypsies, and which cannot but strike a person in conversation with them. This form is *méya*, 'I also;' *túya*, 'thou also;' *améya*, *tuméya*, 'we, ye also.' *Méya pincharúvales*, 'I also am acquainted with him;' *isás léskoro*, *méya kinghióm les*, 'it was his, and I bought it;' *túya kamovés ti gav*, 'and thou wilt be in the village;' *améya, tuméya ki ol t' avén*, 'and we, and ye, and they should come.'

Relative.

The declension of the relative pronoun, which we have already noticed in the Vocabulary, is as follows:

	Sing., masc.	fem.	neut.	Plur.
Nom.	<i>kon</i> ,	<i>kayá</i> ,	<i>so</i> ,	<i>so</i> ,
Acc.	<i>kalés</i> ,	<i>kalé</i> ,	<i>kalés</i> ,	<i>kalén</i> ,
Gen.	<i>kaléskoro</i> ,	<i>kaléskeri</i> ,	<i>kaléskoro</i> ,	<i>kalénghero</i> .

It is extremely difficult to obtain an exact statement of this pronoun; even with all my endeavors, I do not know whether I have set down the proper forms. The feminine *kayá* is rarely heard, and the masculine is often substituted in its place. Both Turks and Greeks have corrupted their relative pronouns. The latter rarely use anything else but their *ti*, for *tis*, *ti*, *tiyes*, *tiya*, etc. Of course, the Gypsies are no better than their neighbors. It is for this reason that I have not written the feminine and neuter of the plural, as I have been particular in the course of this memoir not to give to the public aught but what I am confident is true.

All the foregoing pronouns are found united to those particles which we have noticed in speaking of the cases of nouns. They corroborate what I have already advanced, that the so-called cases of the Gypsy noun are particles united to the accusative, varying according to the characteristic final consonants *s* or *n*.

For farther illustration of this subject, I shall follow the same plan which I have adopted in other parts of this memoir. *Behéla bashé mánde, tuménde, lénde*, 'he lives near me, you, them;'

me jáva túsa, 'I go with thee;' *mánja*, 'with me;' *nash améndar*, 'depart from us;' *oléndar*, 'from them;' *nasháva tuméndar*, 'I depart from you;' *penéna mánghe*, 'they say to me;' *sóske puché-sa mándar?* 'why dost thou ask me?' *so kapenés mánghe?* 'what wilt thou say to me?' *kapucháv léstar*, 'I shall ask him;' *o devél teréla lénghe*, 'God has (care) of them;' *kaléste pashé?* 'near whom?' *bi mángoro nasti kerésa*, 'without me thou canst not do;' *sarnénghe ta penés les, ke tumarénghe, k' amarénghe, sarné parnavénghe*, 'tell it to all, and to your, and to our, and to all the friends;' *penghiá mánghe mi tái*, 'said to me my mother;' *te penáv túke*, 'that I may speak to thee;' *dikináló láke*, 'appeared to her;' *te jivél túke*, 'may it live to thee' (a form of salutation when an animal is bought), Gr. *vá σοῦ ζῴου*; *andré lénde*, 'within them.'

The following is the complete declension of the personal pronoun, with its particles.

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>me</i> , 'I,'	<i>amén</i> , 'we,'
Acc.	<i>man</i> , 'me,'	<i>amán</i> , 'us,'
Dat. 1,	<i>mánde</i> (<i>mán-te</i>), 'in me,'	<i>aménde</i> (<i>amén-te</i>), 'in us,'
Dat. 2,	<i>mánghe</i> (<i>mán-ke</i>), 'to me,'	<i>aménghe</i> (<i>amén-ke</i>), 'to us,'
Abl.	<i>mándar</i> (<i>mán-tar</i>), 'from me,'	<i>améndar</i> (<i>amén-tar</i>), 'from us,'
Soc.	<i>mánja</i> (<i>mán-sa</i>), 'with me,'	<i>aménja</i> (<i>amén-sa</i>), 'with us,'
Gen.	<i>mánghoro</i> (<i>mán-koro</i>), 'of me,'	<i>améngghoro</i> (<i>amén-koro</i>), 'of us.'

The genitive, of both singular and plural, is never used except in connection with *bi*, 'without:' *bi mángghoro*, *bi améngghoro*, 'without me, without us.'

	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Nom.	<i>tu</i> , 'thou,'	<i>tumén</i> , 'ye,'
Acc.	<i>tut</i> , 'thee,'	<i>tumén</i> , 'you,'
Dat. 1,	<i>tútte</i> , 'in thee,'	<i>tuménde</i> , 'in you,'
Dat. 2,	<i>túke</i> , 'to thee,'	<i>tuménghe</i> , 'to you,'
Abl.	<i>tútar</i> , 'from thee,'	<i>tuméndar</i> , 'from you,'
Soc.	<i>túsa</i> , 'with thee,'	<i>tuménja</i> , 'with you,'
Gen.	— *	<i>tuméngghoro</i> , 'of you.'

In a similar way are declined all the other pronouns. The reader has had frequent occasions to observe the cases of the relative *kon*, 'who,' in the Vocabulary.

Though the Gypsies are fond of placing these particles before the noun—as *tí len*, 'in the river,' for *lenéste*; *tí ker*, 'in the house,' for *keréste*—and though the ablative particle *tar* is found united to indeclinables as often as to nouns, still, in the cases of pronouns, these particles seem to be constant, and so tenacious, that a Gypsy will laugh at your ignorance, if he should ever hear you saying *te man* instead of *mánde*, *ko man* instead of *mánghe*.

* Unknown to me.

VERB.

The Gypsy verbs may be classified in two methods :

1st, Verbs Simple and Verbs Compound ;

2d, Verbs Neuter, Active, Middle, and Passive.

Simple verbs are those in which the Gypsy verb is the simple Sanskrit root : as *dikáva*, 'I see ;' *shunáva*, 'I hear ;' *asáva*, 'I laugh.'

Compound verbs are made up of a primitive word in combination with a verb, such as *keráva*, 'I do,' *aváva*, 'I come,' *dáva*, 'I give.' I have spoken of these verbs in the Vocabulary (see to CHEW), and have shown that the usage corresponds with that of the Persians. *Keráva*, 'I do,' the *kerden* of the Persians (Sr. *kri*), united to the primitive word, serves to form active verbs : as *chamkeráva*, 'I chew,' i. e. 'I make chewing ;' *vrakeráva*, 'I talk,' i. e. 'I make speech.' This form of the compound verb is not so common among the Gypsies as among the Persians or the Turks, for the Gypsies have another form of transitive verbs which they prefer, as more congenial to their language : at least, so it appears to me from their conversation. In fact, the reader will observe that in the Vocabulary, in a long list of verbs, there occur few compound ones. By many Gypsies these verbs are never used, since they prefer the other form of the transitive verb, of which I shall presently speak. The second verb, *aváva*, 'to come,' the *ameden* of the Persians, is extremely common, and serves to form a long list of passive verbs, by combination with adjectives and participles : as *phuriováva*, 'to become old,' Gr. *γηράσκω*, Lat. *senesco* ; *bariováva*, 'to become great ;' *bukaliováva*, 'to become hungry ;' *khokhavniováva*, 'to be cheated ;' *mattiováva*, 'to become intoxicated ;' *shukiováva*, 'to become dry ;' *melaliováva*, 'to become dirty.' So natural and easy is this form to the Gypsies, that they are constantly using it, and with very little variation. *Aváva*, in combination with the adjective or participle, possesses the signification of the Latin *fieri*, 'to become,' and, of course, no other form but an adjective or a participle is ever united to it. The final vowel of the adjective or participle and the initial *a* of the verb are blended in such a manner that they produce *io* : as *mattó-aváva*, *mattiováva*. This pronunciation is very constant. The reader has seen frequent examples of such compound verbs in the Vocabulary, and will have remarked their signification in the numerous colloquial phrases given under the various verbs.

I do not refer to this class of verbs those which are formed with the auxiliary *ísóm*, 'to be,' and more rarely with *teráva*, 'to have,' since these do not differ from similar verbs in other languages.

Neuter verbs are very common, and are formed directly from the Sanskrit root, without any alteration. They are in fact the

Sanskrit verb itself, with its active present, of which the final syllable *mi* is simply changed into *va*: as *charáva*, 'I graze,' Sr. *charámi*; *asáva*, 'I laugh,' Sr. *hasámi*.

Active verbs.—Besides those formed by the addition of *keráva* to the root, and which are naturally active, the Gypsies form another and very numerous class, whose characteristic sign is the penultimate *ra*: as *taparáva*, 'I heat,' Gr. *θεγειρω*. This formation is so natural, and so usual, that a Gypsy is never at a loss to understand it, or instantly to form it, even were it from a Turkish or Greek root. To his mind it always conveys the idea of a transitive action, precisely as we say *ἀγαπῶ*, 'I love,' *ἀγαπῶ*, 'I induce love, I make one love.'

These transitive verbs must not be confounded with such neuter verbs as have the penultimate in *ra*, and which originate from a root ending in *r*: as *choráva*, 'I steal,' *daráva*, 'I fear,' *teráva*, 'I have,' *mutráva*, 'I void urine.' Verbs of this class are of four syllables, while nearly all the Gypsy neuter verbs have three, and a few only two: as *dáva*, 'I give,' *láva*, 'I take.'

These verbs are formed by the addition of *aráva* to the primitive root: as *murderáva*, 'I murder;' *taparáva*, 'I cause to burn;' *muntaráva*, 'I shave one.' *Tapáva*, 'I heat,' is a striking example of the variation of the Gypsy verb: Sr. *tap*, 'to torment, to heat;' G. *tapáva*, 'I feel warm;' *taparáva*, 'I cause to burn;' *tattiováva*, 'I become hot.'

Middle verbs.—These are extremely simple, formed by the addition to the verb of the accusative cases of the personal pronouns, precisely as the Europeans form their verbs of a similar signification: thus Fr. *je me lave*; It. *io mi lavo*.

Passive verbs.—These are rarely used by the Gypsies, who prefer the active voice, and instead of saying "I was beaten," adopt the expression "one has beaten me." On this account, the passive voice is extremely difficult to describe, and such are the circumlocutions to which the Gypsies have recourse whenever they desire to express a passive idea, that one wonders at the ambiguity and vagueness of their language. Often they differ so much that the hearer doubts whether he has understood them. In a long discourse, the hearer may not meet with a single passive form. Even after satisfying himself that a verb is passive, upon pronouncing it in the hearing of other Gypsies he may meet with contradictions, or his hearers may be unable to understand him. In such cases, a Gypsy may tell you that such an expression is not Gypsy, and that the speaker has no knowledge of his language. In fact, I have written many paradigms of passive verbs formerly, and, upon examining them, I have found that they were at variance with sound grammatical principles. For a long time I thought the Gypsies had no passive voice. Still not despairing, I have made the paradigm of the passive

verb, and have finally satisfied myself as to the truth of its grammatical construction.

The reader will see this passive form in the following pages. At times the middle voice is used, with the accusative pronouns constantly joined to the verb. At times the compound form is used for the passive, and the verb which is united is evidently *aváva*. It is united to the Sanskrit root, and not to adjectives and participles, as in the more common compound verbs.

These observations will be better elucidated by paradigms of the verb, after giving which, I shall proceed to speak of the formation of the tenses. I hope that this course, which I have followed in my studies on the subject, will be of service to the reader, assisting him to form a clear understanding of the various forms and significations of the Gypsy verb, and of its intimate relationship to the Sanskrit.

Of the auxiliary verbs *teráva*, 'I have,' and *isóm*, 'I am,' I have little to say. The first is rarely used to form such verbs as we see in modern European languages. Its use is mainly restricted to express the idea of possession: as *teráva duk*, 'I have pain,' i. e. 'I am in pain.' *Isóm* forms a perfect passive, which I shall note in its proper place.

ISOM, 'I am.'

Present.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>isóm</i> , 'I am,'	1. <i>isámas</i> , 'we are,'
2. <i>isán</i> , 'thou art,'	2. <i>isána</i> , 'ye are,'
3. <i>isi</i> , 'he is,'	3. <i>isi</i> , 'they are.'

Imperfect.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>isómas</i> , 'I was,'	1. <i>isámas</i> , 'we were,'
2. <i>isánas</i> , 'thou wast,'	2. <i>isánas</i> , 'ye were,'
3. <i>isás</i> , 'he was,'	3. <i>isás</i> , 'they were.'

Future.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>kamováv</i> , 'I shall be,' etc.	1. <i>kamovása</i> , 'we shall be,' etc.
2. <i>kamovéš</i> ,	2. <i>kamovéna</i> ,
3. <i>kamovéł</i> ,	3. <i>kamovéna</i> .

These are all the tenses used: I have never been able to obtain any knowledge of any other forms.

CHINÁVA, 'I cut.'

CHORÁVA, 'I steal.'

Present.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>
1. <i>chináva</i> , 'I cut,' etc.	<i>choráva</i> , 'I steal,' etc.
2. <i>chinésa</i> ,	<i>chorésa</i> ,
3. <i>chinéla</i> ,	<i>choréla</i> ,

Plur.

1. *chinásas,*
2. *chinéna,*
3. *chinéna.*

Plur.

- chorásas,*
- choréna,*
- choréna.*

Imperfect.

Sing.

1. *chinávas,* 'I was cutting,' etc.
2. *chinésas,*
3. *chinélas,*

Sing.

- chóravas,* 'I was stealing,' etc.
- chorésas,*
- chorélas,*

Plur.

1. *chinásas,*
2. *chinénas,*
3. *chinénas.*

Plur.

- chorásas,*
- chorénas,*
- chorénas.*

Aorist.

Sing.

1. *chinghióm,* 'I cut,' etc.
2. *chinghián,*
3. *chinghiás,*

Sing.

- chorghióm,* 'I stole,' etc.
- chorghián,*
- chorghiás,*

Plur.

1. *chinghiámas,*
2. *chinghián,*
3. *chinghiá.*

Plur.

- chorghiámas,*
- chorghián,*
- chorghiá.*

Future.

Sing.

1. *kamachináva,* 'I shall cut,' etc.
2. *kamachinéna,*
3. *kamachinéla,*

Sing.

- kamachoráva,* 'I shall steal,' etc.
- kamachorésa,*
- kamachoréla,*

Plur.

1. *kamachinása,*
2. *kamachinéna,*
3. *kamachinéna.*

Plur.

- kamachorása,*
- kamachoréna,*
- kamachoréna.*

Imperative.

Sing.

2. *chín,* 'cut thou,'
3. *me chinél,* 'let him cut,'

Sing.

- chor,* 'steal thou,'
- me chorél,* 'let him steal.'

Plur.

2. *chinén,* 'steal ye,'
3. *me chinén,* 'let them steal.'

Plur.

- chorén,* 'cut ye,'
- me chorén,* 'let them cut.'

Subjunctive.

Present.

Sing.

1. *te chináva,* 'that I may cut,' etc.
2. *te chinésa,*
2. *te chinéla,*

Sing.

- te choráva,* 'that I may steal,' etc.
- te chorésa,*
- te choréla,*

Plur.

1. *te chinása,*
2. *te chinéna,*
3. *te chinéna.*

Plur.

- te chorása,*
- te choréna,*
- te choréna.*

*Imperfect.**Sing.*

1. *te chinávas,* 'that I might cut,' etc.
2. *te chinésas,*
3. *te chinélas,*

Sing.

- te chorávas,* 'that I might steal,' etc.
- te chorésas,*
- te chorélas,*

Plur.

1. *te chinásas,*
2. *te chinénas,*
3. *te chinénas.*

Plur.

- te chorásas,*
- te chorénas,*
- te chorénas.*

Participle.

chinavdó, 'cut.'

choravdó, 'stolen.'

Verbs ending in vowels :

DÁVA, 'I give.'

LÁVA, 'I take.'

*Indicative.**Present.**Sing.*

1. *dáva,* 'I give,' etc.
2. *désa,*
3. *déla,*

Sing.

- láva,* 'I take,' etc.
- lésa,*
- léla,*

Plur.

1. *dása,*
2. *déna,*
3. *déna.*

Plur.

- lása,*
- léna,*
- léna.*

*Imperfect.**Sing.*

1. *dávas,* 'I was giving,' etc.
2. *désas,*
3. *délas,*

Sing.

- lávas,* 'I was taking,' etc.
- lésas,*
- lélas,*

Plur.

1. *dásas,*
2. *dénas,*
3. *dénas.*

Plur.

- lásas,*
- lénas,*
- lénas.*

*Aorist.**Sing.*

1. *dinióm,* 'I gave,' etc.
2. *dinián,*
3. *diniás,*

Sing.

- linióm,* 'I took,' etc.
- linián,*
- liniás,*

Plur.

1. *diniámas,*
2. *dinián,*
3. *diniá.*

Plur.

- liniámas,*
- linián,*
- liniá.*

Future.

Sing.

1. *kamadáva*, 'I shall give,' etc.
2. *kamadésa*,
3. *kamadéla*,

Plur.

1. *kamadása*,
2. *kamadéna*,
3. *kamadéna*.

Sing.

1. *kamaláva*, 'I shall take,' etc.
2. *kamalésa*,
3. *kamaléla*,

Plur.

1. *kamalása*,
2. *kamaléna*,
3. *kamaléna*.

Imperative.

Sing.

2. *de*, 'give thou,'
3. *me del*, 'let him give,'

Plur.

2. *den*, 'give ye,'
3. *me den*, 'let them give.'

Sing.

2. *le*, 'take thou,'
3. *me lel*, 'let him take,'

Plur.

2. *len*, 'take ye,'
3. *me len*, 'let them take.'

Subjunctive.

Present.

Sing.

1. *te dáva*, 'that I may give,' etc.

Sing.

1. *te láva*, 'that I may take,' etc.

Imperfect.

Sing.

1. *te dávas*, 'that I might give,' etc.

Sing.

1. *te lávas*, 'that I might take,' etc.

Participle.

dinó, 'given.'

liniló, 'taken.'

All the simple verbs are declined in the same manner. There is some difference in the aorist, which we shall note in speaking of the formation of the aorist. In verbs compounded with *keráva*, 'I make,' *dáva*, 'I give,' the root suffers no alteration in the various inflections: as *cham-keráva*, 'I chew;' *cham-kerghám*, 'I chewed;' *chumi-dáva*, 'I kiss;' *chumi-dinióm*, 'I kissed.'

Compound verbs, as *mattióváva*, 'to become intoxicated,' *shukiováva*, 'to become dry,' present no difficulty in their inflection, for they differ in no respect from the above paradigms. The aorist of *aváva*, which alone is inflected, is *allióm*: *mattillióm*, 'I became intoxicated;' *shukillióm*, 'I became dry.'

Verbs of the Middle Voice.

The conjugation of these verbs is very simple, and differs in nowise from the above, except in the pronouns, which form the essential character of this class of verbs.

Indicative.

Present.

<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>
1. <i>chináva man</i> , 'I cut myself,'		<i>továva man</i> , 'I wash myself,' etc.
2. <i>chinésa tut</i> , 'thou cuttest thyself,'		<i>tovésa tut</i> ,
3. <i>chinéla pes</i> , 'he cuts himself,'		<i>tovéla pes</i> ,
<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>chinása 'men</i> , 'we cut ourselves,'		<i>tovása 'men</i> ,
2. <i>chinéna túmen</i> , 'ye cut yourselves,'		<i>tovéna túmen</i> ,
3. <i>chinéna pes</i> , 'they cut themselves.'		<i>tovéna pes</i> .

Imperfect.

<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>
1. <i>chinávas man</i> , 'I was cutting myself,' etc.		<i>továvas man</i> , 'I was washing myself,' etc.
2. <i>chinésas tut</i> ,		<i>tovésas tut</i> ,
3. <i>chinélas pes</i> ,		<i>tovélas pes</i> ,
<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>chinásas 'men</i> ,		<i>továsas 'men</i> ,
2. <i>chinénas túmen</i> ,		<i>tovénas túmen</i> ,
3. <i>chinénas pes</i> .		<i>tovénas pes</i> .

Aorist.

<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>
1. <i>chinghióm man</i> , 'I cut myself,' etc.		<i>tovghióm man</i> , 'I washed myself,' etc.
2. <i>chinghián tut</i> ,		<i>tovghián tut</i> ,
3. <i>chinghiás pes</i> ,		<i>tovghiás pes</i> ,
<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>chinghiám 'men</i> ,*		<i>tovghiám 'men</i> ,
2. <i>chinghián túmen</i> ,		<i>tovghián túmen</i> ,
3. <i>chinghiá pes</i> .		<i>tovghiá pes</i> .

Future.

<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>
1. <i>kamachináva man</i> , 'I shall cut myself,' etc.		<i>kamatováva man</i> , 'I shall wash myself,' etc.
2. <i>kamachinésa tut</i> ,		<i>kamatovésa tut</i> ,
3. <i>kamachinéla pes</i> ,		<i>kamatovéla pes</i> ,
<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1. <i>kamachinása 'men</i> ,		<i>kamatovása 'men</i> ,
2. <i>kamachinéna túmen</i> ,		<i>kamatovéna túmen</i> ,
3. <i>kamachinéna pes</i> .		<i>kamatovéna pes</i> .

Imperative.

2. <i>chin tut</i> , 'cut thyself,'		<i>tov tut</i> , 'wash thyself.'
3. <i>me chinél pes</i> , 'let him cut himself.'		<i>me tovél pes</i> , 'let him wash himself.'

* Properly *chinghiámas 'men*.

*Subjunctive.**Present.*

1. *te chináva man*, 'that I may cut myself,' etc. *te továva man*, 'that I may wash myself,' etc.

Imperfect.

1. *te chinávas man*, 'that I might cut myself,' etc. *te továvas man*, 'that I might wash myself,' etc.

*Passive voice.**Indicative.**Present.*

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Sing.</i> | | <i>Sing.</i> |
| 1. <i>chinávava man</i> , 'I am cut,' etc. | | <i>chorávava man</i> , 'I am stolen,' etc. |
| 2. <i>chinávésa tut</i> , | | <i>chorávésa tut</i> , |
| 3. <i>chinávéla pes</i> , | | <i>choravéla pes</i> , |
| <i>Plur.</i> | | <i>Plur.</i> |
| 1. <i>chinávása 'men</i> , | | <i>choráváva 'men</i> , |
| 2. <i>chinavéna túmen</i> , | | <i>choravéna túmen</i> , |
| 3. <i>chinavéna pes</i> . | | <i>choravéna pes</i> . |

Imperfect.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Sing.</i> | | <i>Sing.</i> |
| 1. <i>chinávavas man</i> , 'I was being cut,' etc. | | <i>chorávavas man</i> , 'I was being stolen,' etc. |
| 2. <i>chinávésas tut</i> , | | <i>choravésas tut</i> , |
| 3. <i>chinavélas pes</i> , | | <i>choravélas pes</i> , |
| <i>Plur.</i> | | <i>Plur.</i> |
| 1. <i>chinávásas 'men</i> , | | <i>choravásas 'man</i> , |
| 2. <i>chinavénas túmen</i> , | | <i>choravénas túmen</i> , |
| 3. <i>chinavénas pes</i> . | | <i>choravénas pes</i> . |

Aorist.

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <i>Sing.</i> | | <i>Sing.</i> |
| 1. <i>chintillíom</i> ,* 'I was cut,' etc. | | <i>chortillíom</i> , 'I was stolen,' etc. |
| 2. <i>chintillían</i> , | | <i>chortillían</i> , |
| 3. <i>chintilló</i> , | | <i>chortilló</i> , |
| <i>Plur.</i> | | <i>Plur.</i> |
| 1. <i>chintillámas</i> , | | <i>chortillámas</i> , |
| 2. <i>chintillían</i> , | | <i>chortillían</i> , |
| 3. <i>chintillía</i> . | | <i>chortillía</i> . |

Future.

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>Sing.</i> | | <i>Sing.</i> |
| 1. <i>kamachinávava man</i> , 'I shall be cut,' etc. | | <i>kamachorávava man</i> , 'I shall be stolen,' etc. |
| 2. <i>kamachinávésa tut</i> , | | <i>kamachoravésa tut</i> , |
| 3. <i>kamachinavéla pes</i> , | | <i>kamachoravéla pes</i> , |

* The first person of this tense has a very marked liquid sound of the *ll*. The 3d, *chintilló*, is a simple *l* always.

Plur.

1. *kamachinávása 'men,*
2. *kamachinávéna túmen,*
3. *kamachinávéna pes.*

Plur.

- kamachorávása 'men,*
- kamachorávéna túmen,*
- kamachorávéna pes.*

*Perfect.**Sing.*

1. *chinavdó isóm,* 'I have been cut,' etc.
2. *chinavdó isán,*
3. *chinavdó isi,*

Sing.

- choravdó isóm,* 'I have been stolen,' etc.
- choravdó isán,*
- choravdó isi,*

Plur.

1. *chinavdó isám,*
2. *chinavdó isán,*
3. *chinavdó isi.*

Plur.

- choravdó isám,*
- choravdó isán,*
- choravdó isi.*

For the imperative I have no certain data: the subjunctive is usually employed in its place.

*Subjunctive.**Present.*

1. *te chináváva man,* 'that I may be cut,' etc.
- te choráváva man,* 'that I may be stolen,' etc.

Imperfect.

1. *te chinávása man,* 'that I might be cut,' etc.
- te chorávása man,* 'that I might be stolen,' etc.

The pronunciation of the different persons of the verb used by the Gypsies is very peculiar. They are very prone to clip off the final vowel of the tenses: thus, instead of *chináva*, they say *chináv*; for *choráva*, *choráv*, etc.; in the 2d and 3d persons, likewise, for *chinésa*, *chinés*; *chinéla*, *chinél*. So also with the future, which, more than the other tenses, loses its terminal vowel. In fact, very few Gypsies pronounce it in full, and prefer the word as though written *kachináv*, *kachoráv*, or *kamachináv*, *kamachoráv*. So also with the aorist, which, in the 1st person plural, instead of *chorghúamas*, *chinghúamas*, is commonly pronounced *chorghúám*, *chinghúám*. Many Gypsies are aware of this, and they tell you that *chivél* for *chivéla*, *chorél* for *choréla*, is vulgar. In this manner are clipped all their verbs. In general, the verb retains its final vowel whenever it is at the end of a sentence. In their songs the final vowel is generally pronounced. I make these remarks, that the reader may the better understand many of the colloquial phrases, where I have written the words as ordinarily pronounced. To make a paradigm of a verb in this clipped form would be preposterous, and would exhibit a want of judgment in an author, who should take as a standard the constant fluctuations of colloquial use.

TENSES.—*Present*.—This invariably ends, in the first person, in *va*: as *siváva*, ‘I sew;’ *charáva*, ‘I graze;’ *kamáva*, ‘I wish;’ *keráva*, ‘I make.’ It corresponds with the present active of the Sanskrit, for we have seen, in speaking of the commutation of the consonants, that the *m* of the Sanskrit is frequently changed by the Gypsies to *v*: compare *charáva*, ‘I graze,’ with Sr. *charámi*; *keráva*, ‘I make,’ with Sr. *karomi*, etc. The 2d person singular, ending in *esa*, resembles the corresponding person of the Sanskrit, which ends in *si*: compare *charésa*, ‘thou grazezt,’ Sr. *charasi*; *kerésa*, ‘thou makest,’ Sr. *karoshi*. But the 3d persons singular and plural bear no relation to the corresponding Sanskrit forms.

Imperfect.—The Gypsy language has no augment of any kind in any of its verbs. This tense is a mere imitation of the present, to which it adds a final *s*. It is always pronounced as I have written it, without any clipping of consonants or vowels.

Aorist.—This is of very frequent use, as it expresses action which, among more cultivated nations, belongs to the perfect, pluperfect, and aorist. By this tense is expressed past action, whatever its state or relation to other subjects, or its state of completion with reference to the time expressed. It is formed by adding to the root the syllable *ghióm* or *kióm*, whenever the root ends in a consonant: as *chináva*, aor. *chinghióm*, ‘I cut;’ *sováva*, aor. *sovghióm*, ‘I slept;’ *penáva*, aor. *penghióm*, ‘I said;’ *bisáva*, aor. *bisghióm*, ‘I inhabited;’ *basháva*, aor. *bashghióm*, ‘I cried;’ *chiváva*, aor. *chivghióm*, ‘I threw;’ *shunáva*, aor. *shunghióm* or *shinghióm*, ‘I heard;’ *meráva*, aor. *merghióm*, ‘I died.’

Verbs whose roots end in vowels form the aorist in *lióm* or *nióm*:* as *láva*, aor. *linióm*, *lióm*, or *lilíóm*, ‘I took;’ *dáva*, aor. *dinióm*, ‘I gave;’ *jáva*, aor. *ghellióm*, ‘I went;’ *aváva*, aor. *allióm*, ‘I came.’

Verbs whose penultimate is *ka* form the aorist in a similar manner: as *dikáva*, aor. *diklióm*, ‘I saw;’ *chikáva*, aor. *chiklióm*, ‘I muddied;’ *pekáva*, aor. *peklióm*, ‘I cooked;’ *nakáva*, aor. *naklióm*, ‘I passed;’ *makáva*, aor. *maklióm*, ‘I painted.’

The passives, and such compound verbs as have *aváva* for their compound verbal element, never can have any other aorist than that of *aváva*, viz. *allióm*. They are always easily distinguished, and form a very prominent part in every Gypsy’s conversation: thus *kindiló* is the 3d pers. sing. aor. of the pass. *kinaváva man*, ‘I am bought,’ *kindillióm*, ‘I was bought;’ *liniló*, ‘it was taken,’ from *laváva man*, ‘I am taken,’ *linihóm*, ‘I was taken.’ These forms, *liniló*, *kindiló*, and the like, are used as passive impersonals, and at times, united to the auxiliary verb *isóm*, they form a distinct tense, or rather, enforce the original meaning of the aorist itself.

* So also, exceptionally, *bandáva*, aor. *bandlióm*, ‘I tied.’

Future.—The formation of this tense is extremely interesting, for it originates from another verb, *kamáva*, ‘I wish,’ Sr. *kam*, which we have already explained in the Vocabulary. It is prefixed to the Gypsy verb without any intermediate term, and it then forms the future. There are three modes of uniting it with the verb. A Gypsy can say *kamajáva*, *kamjáva*, or *kajáva*, ‘I will go;’ *kamakeráva*, *kamkeráva*, or *kakeráva*, ‘I will make.’ I have heard these various forms used indifferently, and I have put similar questions to different Gypsies, and the word has been pronounced in these various forms. However, the first form, *kamakeráva*, is rarely used: they prefer *kamkeráva*, following their usual habit of clipping the vowels in their conversation. This form of the future is of altogether modern origin. The Modern Greek has also lost the ancient form, and has adopted the auxiliary *θέλω*, corrupted to *θά*: as *θά υπάγω*, ‘I will go.’ We say now more generally *θέλω υπάγειν*, though the common people still cling to the *θά*. *Kam* is added to itself to express future wish: as *kamkamáv*, ‘I shall wish;’ precisely as we now say *θά θέλω*. I do not think that the Gypsies have imitated their neighbors the Greeks in the formation of this tense: they have followed the general analytical spirit, which has so extensively pervaded modern languages. The English makes large use of *will*, *shall*, *would*, *should*, in the formation of its futures.

Imperative.—This mood exhibits in most cases a striking similarity to the primitive Sanskrit root. Were not the different formations of the Gypsy verb so very clear, it would have been extremely easy to recognize the root in the simple form of the imperative: thus *keráva*, ‘I make,’ imp. *ker*; *shunáva*, ‘I hear,’ imp. *shun*; *dikáva*, ‘I see,’ imp. *dik*; *jáva*, ‘I go,’ imp. *ja*; *kusháva*, ‘I revile,’ imp. *kush*; *dáva*, ‘I give,’ imp. *de*; *láva*, ‘I take,’ imp. *la* or *le*. In the compound verbs, the imperative is formed solely from the second verb: as *vrakeráva*, ‘I speak,’ imp. *vraker*; *chumidáva*, ‘I kiss,’ imp. *chumidé*. In the transitive verbs, the formation follows the same rule as in the simple neuter verbs, by rejecting the final syllable *ava*: as *taparáva*, ‘I make warm,’ imp. *tapár*; *murdaráva*, ‘I murder,’ imp. *murdár*. As for the imperative of the passive, I have always heard the subjunctive used in its stead.

Subjunctive.—This mood represents both the subjunctive and the infinitive, and the usage of it becomes very clear after obtaining a little knowledge of the language. There is no vestige of the Sanskrit infinitive, and the Gypsies, like the Greeks and modern Slavonians, make use of the indicative mood. The Greeks use their particle *νά*, the ancient *να*; and the Slavonians *úko* and *da*. This latter was in use among the ancient Slavonic nations, in the optative and imperative moods, precisely as the particle *να* of the Greeks was an optative, and in

course of time lost its initial *ε*, and became the *να* of our modern Greek, so common now in the language that it is constantly to be heard wherever the modern Greek is spoken. To us, and to the Bulgarians, the subjunctive of the Gypsies is perfectly intelligible and extremely natural, but to others this is not the case. *Te* is the particle always prefixed, and it is never pronounced *ta*; but, whenever the verb begins with a vowel, *te* drops its own. A few examples will fully illustrate the subject: *allíom te dikáv*, 'I have come to see,' i. e. 'in order that I may see;' *pen lénghe t' avén*, 'tell them to come;' Gr. *εἰπὲ αὐτοὺς νὰ ἔλθωσι*, 'that they come.' Again, it is used as a pure optative mood: thus *te jivél tíke*, 'may it live to thee;' Gr. *ἵνα ζήσῃ*, or *νὰ ζήσῃ*: the whole phrase naturally would be *εὐχομαι ἵνα ζήσῃ*, 'I pray that it may live;' *kamáva te shikliováva*, 'I wish to learn.' In this example, the subjunctive is evidently a pure infinitive.

I have heard at times the Gypsies using the infinitive as a noun, as the modern Greeks do: *τὸ νὰ βλέπω, τὸ νὰ ἔβλεπα*.

The aorist is sometimes used in the subjunctive with the particle *te*; more generally the imperfect is employed.

The subjunctive used as infinitive is not altogether devoid of expression, for it possesses number and person, which the ancient infinitives had not. At times it is extremely clear and definite, far more so than the ancient. This form of the infinitive is known both to the Christian and Moslem Gypsies. These latter, many of whom know not a word of Greek or Bulgarian, could not have borrowed it from the Turkish, which has a proper and regular infinitive, and whose verb in richness and variety is not surpassed by that of any language, ancient or modern. Besides this, the Gypsy verb makes but a poor comparison with the various complex moods and tenses of the Turkish verb. To me it appears probable that the natural bent of the human mind, and its progress towards simplicity of expression, have operated with equal force upon the spirit of the Gypsy as upon that of other modern languages, in which such a striking similarity exists in the various forms of their verbal expression.

Participle.—This is not so clear or so well defined as the other parts of the Gypsy verb. Some participles are pure Sanskrit words. Others are formed from the Gypsy verb itself, in a manner altogether peculiar to this idiom. In the first class belong such terms as Sr. *tapta*, 'heated,' G. *tattó*; Sr. *supta*, 'asleep,' G. *suttó* or *sottó*; Sr. *púrta*, 'full,' G. *perdó*. To the second class belong a great number formed from the Gypsy verbs, pronounced in various ways by different Gypsies, and not always familiar to them all. They seem to take their origin, at times, from individuals who have more or less knowledge of their idiom. The same remark applies to the modern Greek, where one may hear, as participles of *λέγω*, *λεγάμενος*, *λεγόμενος*, and *λεγμένος*.

The following is a list of those Gypsy participles which have appeared to me to be correct, and which I have frequently heard used: *siváva*, 'I sew,' part. *sivdó*, 'sewn,' *charáva*, 'I eat,' part. *charavdó*; *asáva*, 'I laugh,' part. *asavdó*; *dáva*, 'I give,' part. *dínó*; *janáva*, 'I know,' part. *jandó*; *chináva*, 'I cut,' part. *chindó* or *chinavdó*; *keráva*, 'I make,' part. *kerdó*; *piáva*, 'I drink,' part. *piló*; *mutráva*, 'I void urine,' part. *muterdó*; *nasháva*, 'I depart,' part. *nashtó*; *chumidáva*, 'I kiss,' part. *chumidinó*; *daráva*, 'I fear,' part. *daravdó*; *shunáva*, 'I hear,' part. *shundó*; *bisháva*, 'I inhabit,' part. *bishtó*; *mundáva*, 'I shave,' part. *mundavdó*; *piráva*, 'I walk,' part. *pirdó*; *astaráva*, 'I hold,' part. *astardó*; *jáva*, 'I go,' part. *jadló*; *mukáva*, 'I let go,' part. *mukavdó*; *basháva*, 'I cry out,' part. *bashtó*; *chiváva*, 'I throw,' part. *chivdó*; *pekáva*, 'I cook,' part. *pekó*; *továva*, 'I wash,' part. *tovdó*; *maráva*, 'I strike,' part. *maravdó*; *resáva*, 'I finish,' part. *resavdó*; *makáva*, 'I paint,' part. *makavdó*.

From this list the reader can see the great variety of the participles existing in the idiom of the Gypsies. Those formed from simple neuter verbs, as *makáva*, *makavdó*, 'painted,' *resáva*, *resavdó*, 'finished,' are of pure Gypsy formation; whilst *pekó*, 'cooked,' is related to Sr. *pakva*, 'baked, heated, cooked,' etc. I have in the course of the Vocabulary noticed such participles as are of indisputable Sanskrit origin.

The reader will observe in the paradigms of the active verb that I have noted the participles *chinavdó* and *choravdó*. These participles have a passive signification, and as such they are constantly used by the Gypsies. As to the proper active participles, I confess that I know of none; the Gypsies seem to make no use of such forms, but in their stead employ the verb, as the modern Greeks constantly do. The Turks, however, are extremely fond of the participle, and are using it constantly.

This want of active participles is another proof of my assertion, that whilst both Greeks and Turks have given many expressions to the Gypsies, they have not influenced their grammatical system, which has followed those natural principles by the operation of which languages of older date have been moulded into their present form, each one by itself, and independent of the others. This holds good with the Gypsy, and if I have remarked in the course of this memoir that the Gypsy language has been thoroughly permeated by the Greek and Turkish languages, it still appears to me true that it has been formed, as to its fundamental principles, independently of both. So also the Modern Greek, which, though constantly imitating the Turkish, has never had any connection with it in its elementary and grammatical forms, for both languages are essentially distinct from each other.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF GYPSY WORDS.*

- abchin*, steel.
achái, yet.
acharáva, to sigh.
acháva, to rest; *achardó*, remained.
achibes, Bor., to-day.
achinelar, Bor., to cut.
akaná, now.
akata (s. within).
akhór, *akór*, nut; *akhorín*, *akorín*, nut-tree.
akiarghióm, sighed.
aklá, *akhiá*, this.
allóm (s. come), came (cf. 261).
anáksi (s. up), carriage.
anál, partner.
ambró, pear; *ambroín*, pear-tree.
amúni (Bor., *amiñi*), anvil.
anáva, to bring.
andré, within; *andrál* (*andryál*), from within; cf. behind.
angáli, armful.
angár, coal; *angaréskoró*, collier.
anglé, forwards; *anglutnó*, foremost; *anglál*, from the front.
angúst, *angrúst*, finger.
angustri, *angrusti*, ring.
anro, Bor., egg.
apdivés, to-day.
aquia, Bor., eye.
arajay, Bor., priest.
arakáv (Bor., *aracate*), guard; *arakáva* (Bor., *arakatear*), to guard.
arati, Bor., blood.
arattí, night.
armán, curse.
arije, Bor., wolf.
asín, wheel.
asíva, to laugh.
ásfa, tear.
asharáva, to praise.
astaló, piastre.
astaráva, to hold.
astra, Bor., moon.
até, here; *attár*, hence.
avaká, *avká*, *avakhá*, *avakliá*, this.
avatiá, here.
avára, to come.
avdivés, to-day.
aver, *avel*, Bor., other.
arghin, honey.
arkós, first. [eigner.
avri, out; *avriál*, from out; *avrutnó*, for-
- bandáva*, to shut, to tie; *bandloipé*, band.
bangáva (234), = *pagáva*.
bar, stone; *baréskoró*, stone-cutter.
baravaló, rich.
baribu, Bor., much.
baró, great; *barédér* (246), comp.; *bariováva* (s. increase).
baró, heavy.
bas, Bor., hand.
basháva, to cry out.
bashé, near; *bashál*, from near.
bashipé, habitation.
basnó, *bashnó*, cock.
bato, *batu*, Bor., father.
ben, birth.
benáva, to beget.
benáva, to say.
benk (Bor., *benque*), devil; *beng* (238); *ben-galó*, devilish. [scaman.
beró (Bor., *bero*, *berdó*), ship; *beréskoró*, [possess.
bersh (Bor., *berji*), year. [possess.
besháva (s. habitation), to inhabit, sit.
bestipen, Bor., habitation; *bestelar*, Bor., to inhabit.
bezéh, pity.
bi, without.
biáv, marriage.
biáva (s. when), to be delivered.
bighián (249), he sold.
bikináva, *biknáva* (s. buy), to sell.
bish, Bor., *bis*, (s. numbers) twenty.
bisháva (234), *bisáva* (261), = *besháva*.
bistó (s. habitation), seated.
biv (Bor., *bíft*), snow. [hungry.
bokaló, hungry; *bokalióváva*, to become
boláva, to baptize; *bolipé*, baptism.
bópi, bean.
bor, belly.
bordón (s. ship), = *vordón*.
bov, oven; *bovéskero*, baker.
bracuñi, Bor., sheep.
brakeráva (s. Jew), for *vrakeráva*.
brishundó (Bor., *brijindel*), rain.
bucharadó (s. cover), uncovered.
bugló, broad; *buglióváva*, to spread out.
bukó, bowel.
bunista, dung.
burda, Bor., door.
burnék, handful.
burshin, rain.
bus, straw.
bus, Bor., much.
busni, Bor., sweet.
but, *butló*, much.
buti, business; *butiakoró*, day-laborer.
buznó, *buzni* (s. buck), she-goat; *buznoró*, [kid.
búzos, buck.
- cajuco*, Bor., deaf.
callicaste, Bor., yesterday.
calo, *callardo*, *caloró*, Bor., black.
cambri, Bor., pregnant.

* Added by the Committee of Publication, as an important, and almost indispensable, appendix to Dr. Paspatis's article.

cangri, Bor., church.
cani, Bor., hen.
casian, Bor., wood.
casto, Bor., hammer.
chachipe, truth; *chachipanó*, true.
cháti (s. boy), girl.
chaja, Bor., cabbage.
chaliováva, to be sated.
cham, kiss.
chamkeráva, to chew.
chao, boy.
char, grass; *charáva*, to graze.
charés (s. wing), possible.
charó, plate; *charéskoro*, plate-maker.
chartáva, to vomit; *chartimpé*, vomiting.
chattáva, to vomit; *chattimpé*, vomiting.
chawó, boy-child.
chawory (s. boy), Bor., girl.
chavri, chicken.
chergheni (Bor., *cherdillas*), star.
chibes, Bor., day.
chik, *chiká*, mud; *chikáva* (261), to muddy.
chikhandi (s. little), in a little while.
chiktáva, to sneeze.
chimutra, Bor., moon.
chin, till.
chináva (Bor., *chinetar*), to cut.
chinday, Bor., mother.
chiniováva, to be tired.
chinkeráva, *chingheráva*, to pierce.
chip, tongue.
chirdo, Bor., dwarfish, small.
chirikló, bird.
chináva, *chitáva*, to throw (also s. poor).
choláva, to steal.
choláva (s. cut), to whittle.
chon, moon, month.
choráva, to steal; *chor*, *chornó*, *churnó*, thief; *chordikanó*, stolen.
chori, Bor., knife.
choró, poor; *choripé*, poverty.
choryál, secretly.
chova, Bor., hand.
chuché, *chuchi*, breast.
chuchó, empty.
chukél, dog; *chuklí*, bitch.
chukni, tobacco-pipe. [to kiss.
chumi (Bor., *chupendi*), kiss; *chumidáva*,
chungaló, miserable.
chungárea, to spit; *chungér*, spittle.
churi (Bor., *chulo*), knife.
churnó (s. steal), thief.
chuti, Bor., milk.
ciria, Bor., passover.
cornicha, Bor., basket.
crallis, Bor., king.
cremen, Bor., worm.
culco, *curque*, Bor., Sunday.

dáha (246), more,
dái, mother.
dal, door.
dal, Bor., fear.
dant (Bor., *dani*), tooth.
dantáva, *dantiláva*, to bite.
dar, door.
dar, fear; *daráva* (Bor., *darabar*, *darañar*),
to fear. [ate-tree.
daráv, pomegranate; *daravin*, pomegran-
das, Bulgarian; *dasikanó*, adj.

dat, father.
dáva, to give; *de*, imper.
de, mother.
debél, Bor., god.
déla, it rains.
deniló, fool; *deniliováva*, to become a fool.
dernó, Bor., young.
deryáv, sea.
desh (s. numbers), ten. [godly.
devél, god; *devli* (231), goddess; *devlikanó*,
dialezáva (s. write), to select.
diar, *dicar*, Bor., to see.
dikáva, *dikháva* (*diháva*, *diáva*), to see.
dimi, *dimish*, pantaloons; *dimialó*, wearing
dinar, Bor., to give. [pantaloons.
dinelo, Bor., fool.
dinó (257), given.
disiló, day breaks.
divés, day; *diveséskoro*, day's wages.
domúk, fist.
drak, grape.
drom (Bor., *dron*, *drun*), road.
dua, *duga*, Bor., pain.
audúm, gourd.
dui (s. numbers), two.
duk, pain; *dukáva*, to be in pain, to love;
dukhaipé, love; *dukhani*, mistress.
duleváva (s. near), to work.
dumó, back.
duqupen, Bor., pain.
dur, afar; *durál*, from afar.

eftá (s. numbers), seven; *eftavardéri*, sev-
eketuné, together. [enty.
enre, Bor., within.
erajay, Bor., priest.
eresiá, Bor., vineyard.
estuché, Bor., sword.

far, time, times.
fárkia, scythe.
felé, down.
fendo, Bor., good.
fóros, market-place.
furi, colt.
furó, old.

gálpea, gold.
gao, Bor., village.
garáva, to conceal; *garatikanó*, mysterious.
garipé (s. itch), Bor., scab.
gav, village; *gavudnó*, villager.
gel, Bor., ass.
ghamee, Br., ship.
ghantáva, to comb.
gheláva, to play (in music).
ghéles, always.
ghelióm, *gherghiom* (s. go), went; cf. 261.
ghenáva, to count.
gher, itch; *gheraló*, itchy.
gheráva, to make.
ghermó, worm.
ghili (*ghiló*), song; *ghilidáva*, *ghiliováva*, to
sing; *ghilimpé*, instrument of music.
ghivés, day.
ginar, Bor., to count.
giv (Bor., *gi*), grain, wheat.
give, Bor., snow.
gorbi, Bor., ox.
górko, bad.

gosháva, to cleanse.
goshnó, dung (*gosnó*, 237).
gotí, brain; *gotiavér*, intelligent.
grafáva, to write.
grast (Bor., *gras*, *gra*), horse; *grastní*
 (Bor., *grani*), mare; *grastanó* (*grái*),
 adj.; *grastésoro*, horseman.
gris, Bor., cold.
gudló, sweet.
guel, Bor., ass; itch.
guillabar, Bor., to sing.
guráv, *guri*, ox; *gurumní*, *gurumní*, cow.
gustó (s. hen), Bor., goose.
gúva, pit.
guy, Bor., grain, wheat.

handiováva (232), — *khandiováva*.
hanló, sword.
hapat, apple.
has, cough; *hasáva*, to cough.
hindoví (s. from), India.
hirdó (232), — *khurdó*.
hohaimpé (232), — *khohaimpé*.

ich (s. come), — *yich*.
íníya (s. numbers), nine; *iníyavardéri*,
ishtár (s. numbers), four. [ninety].
iv, snow.
iv, grain, wheat.

jamutró, son-in-law.
janáva (s. negation), to know.
jangáva, to awake.
jáva, to go; *jadló* (264), part.
jel (s. itch), small-pox.
jení, Bor., ass.
jenó: *kayék jenó*, no one.
jeroro, Bor., ass; *jerini*, fem.
jil, *jir*, Bor., cold.
jil, Bor., grain, wheat.
jinar, Bor., to count.
živáva, to live.
jojana, Bor., lie.
joro, Bor., head.
jov, barley.
jov (s. file), six.
jucal, Bor., beautiful.
juco, Bor., dry.
juneri, Bor., bread.
junar, Bor., to hear.
jut, Jew; *jutanó*, Jewish.
juter, *juli*, Bor., vinegar.
jutia (s. sew), Bor., needle.
juv, louse.

ka, who, which.
káde (s. early), every.
kainí, *kagní*, *kainá*, hen.
kalipé, excommunication.
kaló, black.
kam (Bor., *cam*, *can*), sun.
kamáva (Bor., *camelar*), to wish.
kamlióipé, *kamnioipé*, perspiration; *kam-
 ló*, perspiring; *kamniováva*, *kamliováva*,
 to perspire.
kamní, pregnant.
kándela, it stinks; *kandiníko*, stinking.
kanglí, comb.
kann, ear.

kánna, when.
kar, pudendum virile.
karghíri, church.
kárin, where.
kasht, *kash*, *kast*, *kas*, wood.
kasukóv, deaf.
katár, from.
katár, whence.
katáva, to spin.
katína, Gypsy tent.
kayék jenó, no one.
ke, who, which.
kebór, how many.
keláva, to play (in music).
kelipé (s. because), dance.
ker, house.
kerál, cheese.
kevaló (s. wash), — *gheraló*.
keráva, to make.
kerkó, bitter.
kermó, worm.
ketí, how much.
kfur, heel.
khan, crepitus ventris.
khandí, little.
khanink, *khaink*, well. [jáva, neut.
khanjováva, *khandiováva*, to scratch; *khan-
 khandó*, sword.
khar, pit.
khasói (s. eat), food.
khatáva, to dig.
kháva, to eat.
khéli, fig; *khélin*, fig-tree. [part.
khíáva, *khliáva*, cacare; *khendó*, *khlendó*,
khohaimpé, lie; *khohavnó*, *khohanó*, liar;
khohavniováva, to be deceived.
khokhavniováva, to be cheated.
kholiteráva, *kholiazáva* (s. write), to be an-
 gry; *kholiniakoro*, angry.
khór, deep.
khorakhái, Turk; *khorakhanó*, Turkish.
khristuné, Christmas.
khur, heel.
khurdó, dwarfish, small.
kiláv, plum; *kilavin*, plum-tree.
kilavdó (s. rich), fat.
kiló, stake.
kináva, to buy.
kiróv, sponsor; *kirvi*, god-mother.
kisi, sack.
kiustik, girdle.
koch, knee.
kókkalo, bone.
kolin, bosom.
kon, who.
kopána, trough.
korí (s. shut), neck.
korin, root.
koró, blind.
koró (237), bracelet.
kosháva, to cleanse.
kóshnika, basket.
kotór (s. cheese), little.
ksillábi, *ksillávi*, tongs.
kukudí, hail.
kurí, colt.
kurkó, Sunday.
kurló, throat.
kusháva, to revile (also *kus*, 249).

labelar, Bor., to sing.
lacheló (s. ashamed), shameful.
lachel, well.
luchipé, alms.
lacho, good.
luktúra, to kick.
lájána, to be ashamed.
langar, Bor., coal.
lar, word.
lára, to take, get.
len, river.
li, Bor., paper.
likhári (s. sleep), lamp.
lllar, Bor., to take, get.
lin, mucus.
lindr, sleep; *lindraló*, sleepy.
linaló (257), taken.
lr, *tl*, paper.
lokó, light.
loló, red.
lon, salt; *lonlaráva*, to salt.
loria, Bor., sea.
loshanovóca, to rejoice; *loshanó*, rejoice-
loré, money. [ing; *loshanopé*, joy.
lubú (lobní, 231), harlot.
lucy, Bor., wolf.
luludí (s. similar), flower.
lumi, *lumiaka*, Bor., harlot.

na, negation.
nacha, Bor., fly.
nachó, fish; *nachéskoro*, fisherman.
najara, Bor., half.
nakáva, to paint.
makidá, fly.
malkech, a Gypsy tribe. [posite side.
manú, opposite; *manuyál*, from the op-
manj, Bor., meat.
manró, *mandó*, bread; *manréskoro*, baker.
manukló, *manukló*, stump (of vine).
manúsh (Bor., *manu*, *manus*), man; *ma-
 nushmi* (231), woman; *manushanó* (237),
mará, sea. [human.
marávt, to beat.
marvó, *marvy*, bread.
maru, Bor., man; *marupe*, mankind.
mas, meat; *maséskoro*, butcher.
masék, mouth.
marshu, tongs. [tween.
maskaré, between; *maskarál*, from be-
masér, blacksmith. [drunk.
mató, drunk; *mattonára*, to become
mal, dirt; *maluló*, dirty; *malatovára*, to
 become dirty.
matigrána, Bor., pomegranate-tree.
merára, to die.
merló (s. die), Bor., sick; see also *invalid*.
meripé, death.
meruári, tomb.
mília, Bor., *mílan* (s. numbers), thousand.
mínch, pudendum muliebre.
moshúkos, mouse.
munóvra, tomb.
mol, wine.
molubi, Bor., grape. [worker in leather.
moló, death. [worker in leather.
morti (Bor., *morrhás*), leather; *mortiáskoro*,
moskire (s. beget), calf.
móste (s. shut), from *mú*.

moskovis, Russian.
muclar, Bor., to void urine.
mú, mouth; *muyál*, *mutiyál*, in front.
muáva, to abandon.
mulánó, ripe; *mulanokeráva*, to ripen.
mulánó (s. dirty), dark.
mulótar (s. die, also 245), after dying.
mutára (*mundáva*, 264), to shave; *mut-
 aráva* (253).
murdaráva, to murder.
murs, brave, male, boy.
mutaráva (s. die), to murder.
mushó, mouse. [void urine.
mutér, urine; *mutráva* (Bor., *mutrar*), to
 na, negation.
ná, nail.
násváli (*násváli*, 234), invalid.
násvukár (s. negation), not handsome.
najubar, *najar*, Bor., to depart; to lose;
nak, no-e. [aujpen, loss.
nakáva, to pass.
namporené, invalid; *namporéma*, sickness.
namál, negation.
nangó, naked.
nao, Bor., name.
nupalál (s. behind), afterwards.
nápu, Bor., nose.
nasháva, to depart.
nasharáva, to lose.
nastí, negation.
nastó, departed.
nasukár, ugly.
nau, name.
ne, negation.
nevó (Bor., *nebo*, *nebel*), new.
niglavára (*niklavára*, 234), to go out.
nílú, summer.
ninglo, Bor., fool.
nublí, harlot.

oghí, heart; *oghéske*, alms. [eighty.
ohtó (s. numbers), eight; *ohtovardéri*,
okaná, now.
okhidá, this.
oklistó, mounted.
oghí, heart.
opré, up; *oprál*, *opryál*, from above.
orioz, Bor., wolf.
orobar, Bor., to weep.
ostébel, Bor., god.
ostelis, *osteli*, Bor., down.
oté (s. negation), for *até*.
otidá (s. why), there.

parhanitra, Bor., passover.
pachára, to ask.
pai, water.
páillo, Bor., Greek.
pak, wing.
pakúva, to believe.
pakó, bald.
palubear, Bor., to shave.
pálú, behind; *palalúú*, second.
palvél, wind.
panch (s. numbers), five.
pangára, to break.
pangharáva, to lame; *pangharáva*, to be-
 come lame.

pani, water: *panidáva*, to water.
pankó, *pangó*, lame.
papai, apple.
papinu (s. hen), goose.
paquilli, Bor., silver.
parés, slowly.
parnavó, friend; *parnavoipé*, friendship.
parnó, white.
paró (234), = *baró*.
paroji, Bor., leaf.
parvaráva, to nourish.
parvaró, fat.
pas, *pasque*, Bor., half.
pashé, near.
páta, clothing.
patranki, passover.
patrin, leaf, feather.
pavi, Bor., nose.
pecháva, to ask.
pekáva, to cook; *pekiló*, *pekó*, cooked.
pelión, fell; *pelótar*, after falling.
peló, testicle.
pen (s. brother), sister.
penáva (Bor., *penar*), to say; also for *benáva* (s. infant).
peninda (s. numbers), fifty.
peráva, to fall.
peráva, to fill.
perdál, over (the water).
perdó, full; *percionista*, to become full.
peryul, *peryulikanó*, foreign.
pfur, *plow*, earth. [old].
pluró, *plouró*, old; *plurioráva*, to grow
pláv, marriage.
páva, to drink. [ra (s. paper).
pichaváva (s. business), to send; *pichará*-
pichasca, Bor., cough.
pikaló, prop.
pikó, shoulder.
piló, *peló*, fallen; *piló* (263), drunk.
pincharáva, to be acquainted with.
pinó, *pinró*, foot.
píráva (Bor., *pírar*), to walk.
pírindós, on foot.
píripé, gait.
pírnanugi, barefooted.
píró, *pírnó*, foot.
pishava, to grind.
pishot, bellows.
píthi, widow.
piyar, Bor., to drink; *píta*, drink.
plál (Bor., *plán*, *plano*), brother.
plata, Bor., clothing.
plubi, Bor., silver.
po (s. behind), more.
pol, navel.
polalíste (s. behind), farther back.
pomi, Bor., -silver.
pori, tail.
porias, Bor., bowel.
porik, *porikin*, rail-in.
pos, *pó*, Bor., belly.
postok, soil.
posón, wool.
pró, eye-brow.
ponchávur (s. yesterday).
práhos, ashes.
pral, brother; *pra* (234).
prásáva, to ridicule.

predál, over (the water).
pucháva, to ask.
puđinó, musket.
purano, old (ancient).
puró, old; *puripé*, old age.
put, bridge.
purim, onion.
pusca, Bor., musket.
pushóm, flea.
putar, Bor., well.
puti, business.
per, earth.

quer, Bor., house.
querar, *querelar*, Bor., to make.
querosto (s. house), Bor., August.

rachi, Bor., night.
rái, nobleman.
rakiló (s. night), it is growing dark.
rakló, *rakli*, child.
ran, cane.
rání, nobleman's wife.
ráno, early.
rashá, priest; *rashaní*, prie-t's wife.
rat, *rattí*, night.
ratt (Bor., *rati*), blood.
res, *rez*, vineyard.
resáva, to finish, suffice.
reshoto, sieve.
resis, Bor., cabbage.
richini, bear.
rói, spoon.
roí, Bor., flour.
rona, *romni*, *romano*, Gypsy.
romní (Bor., *romi*), wife.
rováva, to weep.
róyl, spoon.
rubli, rod.
ruk, trec.
rukono, whelp.
rup, silver; *ruporano*, of silver.
rutáni, nose.
ruv, wolf.

sahriz, tent.
saló, wife's brother; *sali*, wife's sister.
sanoó, slim.
sannó (234), = *sumno*.
sapp, serpent.
sar, similar, like.
sar, Bor., garlic.
saranda (s. number-), forty.
saro, Bor., all.
sarvo, *sárvore*, *sarvo* (251), all.
sarvo, *sárvolo*, all.
sas, Bor., iron.
sashóí, mother-in-law.
sash, Bor., tall.
sartó (s. from and 235), healthy, right.
sastro, father-in-law.
saullo, Bor., colt.
sávore, *sarvo* (235), all.
senec, pack-saddle.
serka, Br., tent.
shlu, Br., basket.
shuh, cabbage. [-mith.
shustir, *shustir*, iron; *shustiréskoro*, black-
shusto, healthy, right.

shastró, father-in-law.
shasúí, mother-in-law.
shel (s. numbers), hundred.
sheló, rope.
sheró, head.
shével (s. cold), hundred.
shikóva (232), to learn; *shikló*, learned;
shikliováva, to learn.
shil (s. numbers), hundred.
shil, *shilaló*, cold; *shilaliováva*, to feel cold.
shingh, horn.
shoró, head.
shoshói, hare.
shov (s. numbers), six.
shovárdéri (s. numbers), sixty.
shuchó, *shuzó*, clean.
shukó, dry, emaciated; *shukiováva* (252),
to become dry; *shukiaráva*, *shukiaváva*,
shunáva, to hear. [to dry.
shut, *shutkó*, vinegar; *shulló*, *shudló*, sour.
sigó, quick.
singe, Bor., horn.
singo, Bor., quick.
sir, garlic.
siváva, to sew.
sivri, hammer.
so, what.
sobelar, *sornar*, Bor., to sleep.
somnakái (Bor., *sonacái*), gold.
sóske, why.
sostár, because.
sottó (s. sleep), asleep.
sováva, to sleep.
stavros, cross.
sudró, cool.
sukár, beautiful.
sumpacel, Bor., near.
sunáva (s. near), — *shunáva*.
sungalo, Bor., horned.
sunnó, dream.
sut, milk.
suttó (263), — *sottó*.
svv (s. sew), needle.
ta, *te*, and.
tabioipé, heat.
tahkár, *taakár*, king; *takarní*, queen.
tái (251), — *dái*.
takhiára, tomorrow.
tam-manúsh, blind man.
tan, place.
taparáva (253), to heat.
tapáva, *tap-dáva*, to strike. [feel warm.
tapiáva, to boil, to burn; *tapáva* (253), to
tapúlar, Bor., to drink.
tapiováva, to burn.
taráva, to thirst.
tarshúl, cross.
tato, Bor., bread.
tattipé, heat. [hot.
tattó, warm; *tattiováva* (253), to become
tattó (Bor., *tati*), bath.
tav, thread.
taviáva, to boil.
te, and.

telé, down.
teráva (Bor., *terelar*), to have.
terghiováva, *tertiováva*, to stand.
ternó, young; *ternoro*, Bor., new.
liknó, infant, young.
továva, *toáva*, to wash.
tovér, *tovel*, axe; *toveréskoro*, axe-maker.
trándá (s. numbers), thirty.
traquias, Bor., grape.
trebene, Bor., star.
trésca, fever.
tri, *trin* (s. numbers), three.
triák, shoe.
trijul, Bor., cross.
trush, *trust*, thirst; *trushaló*, thirsty;
trushaliováva, to become thirsty.
trushúl, cross.
terra, Bor., nail.
turshúl (231), cross.
tut, milk.

ucharáva, to cover.
uchó, tall; *uchedér* (246), one taller.
ukiaváva, *uktiaváva*, to step.
uktiára, *uklaváva* (234), to mount.
umdebel, Bor., god.
unga, Bor., affirmation.
ungla, Bor., nail.
uryáva, *uryaváva*, to dress.
uryoipé, dress.

vá, affirmation.
vanró, *vantó*, egg.
vaptizáva, to baptize.
var, time, times.
vária, weight.
varó, flour.
vasiár, mill.
vast (*vas*, 233), hand.
vent, winter.
verni, file.
vesh, *ves* (s. healthy), forest.
vicha, shoot.
vikó, shoulder.
viv (236), — *bi*.
viákhiá, Wallachian.
vordón, carriage.
vrakeráva, to speak.
vrehtúla, extinguisher.
vuchó, tall.
vudár, *outár*, door.
vus, flax.
vust, lip.
yak, fire.
yak, eye.
yavér, other.
yek (s. numbers), one.
yekpásh, half.
yernó, young. [terday.
yich, yesterday; *yichavér*, day before yes-
yismata, linen.

zámpa, frog.
zen, saddle.
zoruló, strong.

ARTICLE VI.

~~~~~

EVIDENCES OF THE  
SCYTHIAN AFFINITIES  
OF THE DRAVIDIAN LANGUAGES,

CONDENSED AND ARRANGED FROM

REV. R. CALDWELL'S COMPARATIVE DRAVIDIAN GRAMMAR.

BY REV. EDWARD WEBB,  
MISSIONARY OF THE A. B. C. F. M. IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

Presented to the Society October 16th, 1861.

*Extract from Mr. Webb's Letter accompanying the following Article.*

Indian Ocean, May 21st, 1861.

... "The remarks you make on the affiliation of the Dravidian languages have led me to examine somewhat more attentively the arguments and proofs adduced by Mr. Caldwell, in his Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages, in confirmation of the Scythian affinities of those idioms. As a result of that investigation, I became better satisfied with their general correctness, and assured that, were they collected and presented in combination, their weight and importance would be acknowledged by those interested in these investigations. The force of Mr. Caldwell's proofs is greatly diminished by their being thinly scattered through his entire work. His first object being, not to prove a Scythian affinity, but to compare the idioms one with another, the notices of an extra-Dravidian relationship occur, as it were, incidentally.

My work, in this paper, has been to collect, combine, and condense the proofs rather lavishly strewn over the treatise. I have generally, though not uniformly, used the words of the author; yet my plan of epitomizing and condensing as much as possible would seldom allow me to quote more than a sentence or two in a place word for word. Only here and there have I introduced a suggestion from other sources, and always either in confirmation or in amplification of the author's thought. When a paragraph of considerable length has been introduced verbatim, it has been included within quotation marks; in other cases it has not been thought necessary to encumber the page with them." ...

THE term Dráviḍa has been adopted from the Sanskrit. It properly denotes the Tamil country only. The Brahmans of that country are called "Dráviḍa Brahmans." Its original meaning, according to Sanskrit lexicons, is 'a man of an out-cast tribe, descended from a degraded Kshatriya.' It was applied by the Sanskrit geographers to the aborigines of the extreme south, prior to the introduction among them of Brahmanical civilization. It has recently been employed to designate the cluster of idioms spoken by more than thirty millions of people inhabiting the southern portion of the Indian peninsula. In this little group of dialects, the author of the treatise from which the present abstract is made enumerates nine, which are distinct and well defined. Among these, five have written characters and a cultivated literature: they are the *Tamil*, *Telugu*, *Canarese*, *Malayálam*, and *Tulu*. These idioms differ one from another in their written characters, in their vocables and inflectional forms, and in their literary culture. They differ so essentially that a person acquainted with but one is unable to understand either of the others. They cannot, therefore, be regarded as provincial dialects of a single language, but are to be considered and treated as distinct, though affiliated. They are said to be affiliated because of the large number of roots of primary importance, and the essential and distinctive grammatical characteristics, which they all possess in common. They are on this account regarded as having had a common origin, and as forming a distinct family of tongues.

The term "Scythian" was first employed by Professor Rask to designate that group of tongues which comprises the Finnish, Turkish, Mongolian, Tungusian, and Samoiedic families. This great kingdom of speech, as it has been termed, includes all those languages spoken in Asia or Europe (excepting only the Chinese) which are not embraced in the other two great divisions, the Aryan and Semitic. They have by some been designated the "Tartar," by others the "Finnish," "Ural-Altai," "Mongolian," and "Turanian." The objection to these terms is that, having been often used to designate one or more species, to the exclusion of the rest, they cannot properly be employed as common designations of the genus. But the term "Scythian," having been used in the classics in a vague, undefined sense, to denote generally the barbarous tribes of unknown origin that inhabited the northern part of Europe and Asia, seems to be appropriate, convenient, and available.

Mr. Caldwell claims, for the Dravidian idioms, "not merely a general relationship to the whole Scythian group, but also a position in that group which is independent of its other members, as a distinct family or genus; or, at least, as a distinct sub-genus of tongues." He regards it as most nearly allied to

the Finnish or Ugrian family, with special affinities to the Ostiak. This connection seems to be radical, though remote, and established by particulars of primary importance.

Mr. Caldwell has arrived at his conclusions by a comparison of the Dravidian dialects—of which he has a thorough and accurate scientific and practical knowledge—with the grammars and vocabularies of the group in which he classes them. He acknowledges that a great diversity exists among the members of this group; so great, indeed, that, while the Indo-European idioms form only one family or genus, of which the ten families classified under that term are but species, in the Scythian family five or six authenticated genera have been enumerated, each of which includes as many species as are contained in the solitary Indo-European genus, besides twenty or thirty isolated languages, which have up to this time resisted every effort to classify them.

Notwithstanding this diversity, however, the generic characteristics of the Scythian group are very strongly marked, and incapable of being mistaken. The Ugrian and Turkish families, for instance, can be proved by their grammatical structure and vital spirit to be cognate, with as much certainty as the Gothic and the Sanskrit, or the Zend and the Greek.

I. The history of the Dravidian people is not unfavorable to the hypothesis of the Scythian relationship of their languages.

There is sufficient evidence that the Drâviḍas lived in the Indian peninsula long prior to the commencement of history, and before the Sanskrit-speaking race had made their way over the snow-capped mountains which separated their ancestral home from the plains of the Ganges, Nerbudda, and Cavery. The Drâviḍas were doubtless the earliest inhabitants of India; or, at least, the first to enter from the northwest and cross the Indus. There is no evidence from Sanskrit authors—and they are our only authority on this point—that the Dravidians ever had any relations with the primitive Aryans but those of a peaceable and friendly character; and this could not have been true, had they followed that race into India. There is evidence that the Brahmans crossed the Vindhya mountains and entered the Dekhan and Southern India, not as conquerors, but as colonists; as priests and instructors, not as soldiers. The kings of the Pandiyas, Cholas, Calingas, and other Dravidians, appear to have been simply Dravidian chieftains, dignified by the new Brahman priests with Aryan titles. At the time when these events were taking place—some 500 years, perhaps, before the Christian era—the Dravidians were destitute of a written language, and unacquainted with the higher arts of life; but, from an examination of their language, it appears that they had acquired at least the elements of civilization. By a reference to the vocabulary of the early Tamilians, for instance, we gather, by our author's aid, the following items of information:



“They had ‘kings,’ who dwelt in ‘fortified houses,’ and ruled over small ‘districts of country;’ they were without books, but they had ‘minstrels’ who recited ‘songs’ at ‘festivals;’ they were without hereditary priests and idols, and appear to have had no idea of heaven or hell, of the soul or sin; but they acknowledged the existence of God, whom they styled *ko* or ‘king,’ a realistic title which is unknown to orthodox Hinduism; they erected to his honor a temple, which they called *ko-il*, ‘God’s house.’ They were acquainted with all the ordinary ‘metals,’ with the exception of tin and zinc; with the ‘planets’ which were ordinarily known to the ancients, excepting Mercury and Saturn. They had numerals up to a ‘hundred,’ some of them to a ‘thousand;’ but were ignorant of the higher denominations, a *lakh* and a *crore*; they had ‘medicines,’ but no medical science, and no doctors; ‘hamlets’ and ‘towns,’ but no cities; ‘canoes,’ ‘boats,’ and even ‘ships’—*i. e.* small ‘decked’ coasting vessels—but no foreign commerce; and no word expressive of the geographical idea of island, or continent. They were well acquainted with ‘agriculture,’ and delighted in ‘war.’ They understood ‘cotton-weaving’ and ‘dyeing.’ They had no acquaintance with painting, sculpture, architecture, astronomy, astrology, philosophy, or grammar. Their only words for the mind were ‘diaphragm,’ ‘the inner parts,’ or ‘interior;’ they had a word for ‘thought,’ but no word distinct from this for memory, judgment, conscience, or will; to express the will, they would have been obliged to describe it as ‘that which in the inner parts says, *I am going to do so and so.*’” But although there existed among them these elements of civilization previous to the arrival of the Brahmans, in intellectual, social, and political standing they were centuries behind this priestly race. They soon, however, rose in the social scale, and formed communities and states in the Dekhan rivalling those of the Aryans in the north.

II. The absence of physiological evidence to the contrary. It is acknowledged that, while in some instances physiology has contributed much to the discovery of the affiliations of races, in the effort to prove the Scythian relationship of the Dravidians it renders no aid; but seems, so far as the study has been pursued, to be utterly at fault. The Dravidians might, on the ground of physical characteristics only, as well be classed with the Caucasians, or would readily admit of being affiliated with the Indo-Europeans; for no essential difference is observed between the heads and features of the Dravidians and those of the Brahmans; and, in fact, the Dravidian type of head will even bear to be directly compared with the European, with more definite marks of suppleness and subtlety in the former, and of straight-forward moral and mental energy in the latter.

It is not safe, however, in the presence of the strong lingual

evidences to be adduced, to draw any conclusion on this ground adverse to their Mongolian or Scythian origin; for a similar change has passed upon the features of the Mohammedans of India, who are all, without doubt, of Tatar-Mongolian extraction: with the exception of a somewhat greater breadth of face and head, and a more olive complexion, they do not differ physiologically from the Hindus, properly so called. A change appears to have passed over them, similar to that which is observed in the Osmanli Turks since they settled in Europe, which has transformed them from Tatars into Europeans.

It may farther be suggested in this connection, that possibly the distinctive Mongolian type, the absence of which is acknowledged in the Dravidians, has been developed in the course of time, since the period when the plains of India were first colonized by the progenitors of their race.

III. Evidence derived from religious usages. In proving the origin and relationship of any people, the evidence gathered from their religious usages is always more satisfactory and reliable than that which is founded on physiological comparisons. The religions of the ancient Indo-European nations and those of the old Scythians of Upper Asia present many essential points of difference. In Shamanism—so is termed the superstition which prevails among the Ugrians of Siberia and elsewhere, and which was the religion of the whole Tatar race before Buddhism and Mohammedanism were disseminated among them—there was nothing which resembled the three prominent characteristics of the religion of the Indo-European family: viz., the doctrine of metempsychosis; the worship of the elements of nature, or of a pantheon of heroes and heroines; and the maintenance of a distinct and generally hereditary order of priests.

Shamanism acknowledges the existence of a Supreme Being, but no worship is rendered to him; nor are the objects of worship an inferior order of gods or heroes, but wicked and cruel spirits or demons. Any one who pleases may at any time officiate as priest, though ordinarily the father of the family, or the head-man of the hamlet or community, fills that office. Bloody sacrifices are offered with wild dances: the officiating priest or magician meanwhile exciting himself to frenzy, professes to have ascertained the mind of the propitiated demon, and, when the ceremonies are over, communicates it to those who consult him. Such is Shamanism, and the demonolatry practiced in India by the more primitive Dravidian tribes is not only similar to this, but the very same. The Brahmans by whom the Aryan civilization and superstition was grafted on the ruder Dravidian stock labored assiduously to extirpate their religion, and in this they were generally successful: yet is it still possible to discriminate between the doctrines and practices introduced by them and the

older religion of the people. Many vestiges of the primitive superstitions still remain, and in some districts they prevail extensively, especially among the Shânârs, and other rude and less Aryanized tribes, inhabiting the provinces in the extreme south of the peninsula. So far as yet appears, every religious usage of the Dravidians which is not of Brahmanical origin is either identical with Shamanism, or closely allied to it.

IV. Evidence furnished by the Behistun tablets. Before proceeding to the proofs derived from direct linguistic analysis, we notice an incidental evidence of the Scythian relationship of the Dravidian tongues. The famous inscriptions on the tablets at Behistun, in Beluchistan, which record the political autobiography of Darius Hystaspes, in the old Persian, Babylonian, Scythian, and Medo-Persian languages, have recently been translated. The translation of the Scythic portion enables us to compare the Dravidian idioms with a fully developed copious language of the Scythian family, as spoken in the fifth century B. C. The principal points of resemblance between the Dravidian dialects and the language of the tablets are: 1. The use of the cerebral class of consonants, *t*, *d*, *n*, which are indigenous to the Dravidian languages. 2. The use of the same consonant as a surd when initial and when doubled, and as a sonant when single and medial. 3. The employment in both of similar suffixes for the genitive and the dative cases of nouns, and the accusative of pronouns. 4. The use of a similar word for the numeral 'one' (the only numeral which occurs in letters in the tablets), and the uniform employment in both of the same suffix to express the ordinal numbers. 5. The pronoun of the second person singular is exactly the same in the tablets as in the Dravidian languages. The plural, unfortunately, does not occur. 6. The use of a relative participle. Perhaps this is the most remarkable characteristic of every unaltered dialect of the Scythian family. 7. The analogous etymons in the tablets are: *nan*, 'to say,' corresponding to the Dravidian *an* or *en*; *uri*, 'make known,' Dravidian *urai*; *pori*, 'to go,' Dravidian *pô*; *ko*, 'a king,' Dravidian *kô*. From the discovery of these analogies, Mr. Caldwell concludes that "the Dravidian race, though resident in India from a period long prior to the commencement of history, originated in the central tracts of Asia, the seed-plot of nations (and languages); and that from thence, after parting company with the rest of the Ugro-Turanian horde, and leaving a colony in Beluchistan, they entered India by way of the Indus."

V. Evidence from grammatical analysis.

1. The laws of sound. The phonetic laws which govern the Dravidian languages contribute to determine the question of their affiliation.

*a. Vowels.* The only point of resemblance noticed under this head is what is termed "the harmonic sequence of vowels," which appears in all the languages of the Scythian group, and in the phonetic systems of at least two of the Dravidian languages. The law of harmonic sequence is that a given vowel occurring in one syllable requires a vowel of the same class in the following syllables of the same word, and the vowels of such syllables are altered accordingly. In Telugu, the range of this law, although restricted to the two vowels *i* and *u*, appears to be identical with that of the Scythian law; *u* being changed into *i*, and *i* into *u*, according to the nature of the accompanying vowel. In some cases, the vowels of the appended particles are changed through the attraction of the roots to which they are suffixed; in other instances, the vowel of one of the suffixed particles draws that of the root and that of its other appendages also into harmony with itself: e. g. *kalugu*, 'to be able,' from which is formed with perfect regularity the aorist first pers. sing. *kalugu-du-nu*; but the preterit first person is *kaligi-ti-ni*, where the change of the two final vowels of the root *kalugu* to *kaligi*, and of the personal termination *nu* to *ni*, is effected by the particle *ti*, which is the characteristic of the tense; for in the inflexion of Telugu words the most influential particles are those which indicate the time.

*b. Consonants.* One distinctive peculiarity of the Dravidian consonants is the convertibility of surds and sonants. There are four surd letters which are thus convertible; they are *k*, *t*, *ʈ*, *p*: *k* is convertible into its related sonant *g*; *t* into *d*; *ʈ* into *ḍ*; and *p* into *b*. They are said to be convertible, because they are pronounced as surds at the beginning of words, and whenever they are doubled; and they are always pronounced as sonants when single and mediate. A sonant cannot commence a word, neither is a surd admissible in the middle except when doubled. In Tamil, and partly in Malayalam, one set of consonants serves for both purposes, and the change is made in the pronunciation alone. This peculiarity is not found in any of the Indo-European languages; but the resemblances which are found to exist between it and the laws of sound which prevail in some of the languages of the Scythian family amounts to identity. In the Finnish and Lappish there is a clearly marked distinction between surds and sonants: a sonant never commences a word in either tongue. The same remark has been already made of the Scythic version of the Behistun tablets.

The Tamil differs from the other Dravidian dialects in refusing to combine the surd lingual *t* with the lingual nasal *ṅ*, changing it in such a combination into its corresponding sonant *d*. This is in accordance with a general law of sound in that language, which is, that nasals will not combine with surds, but with sonants only.

A similar rule respecting the coalescing of nasals with sonants only is found in the Finnish, and may be attributed to that delicacy of ear which both Finns and Tamilians appear to possess.

Much use is made in the Dravidian languages—as also, in truth, in all the languages of India—of a class of letters which have been termed by some “cerebrals,” by others, more correctly, “linguals.” They are *t*, *d*, *n*.

Mr. Norris, in his paper on the language of the Scythic tablets, says that Castrén, a Finlander, in his Ostiak grammar, uses distinct characters for the lingual and dental *d* and *t*, observing that similar sounds occur in the Lappish and Finnish tongues; and this argument has been employed in favor of the Scythian relationship of the Dravidian languages.

It has been replied, however, that, as this class of letters are used to a far greater extent in the Sanskrit and northern vernaculars of India than in those languages which are acknowledged to be Scythian, the conclusion would rather be that the Dravidian languages were Indo-European in their origin.

Mr. Caldwell attempts to prove that these letters were borrowed from the Dravidian languages by the Sanskrit after the arrival of the Aryan race in India; his reasons are: 1. That these consonants are not found in any of the primitive languages which are related to the Sanskrit. There is no case of these sounds in the Aryan family of tongues west of the Indus. 2. These consonants are essential component elements of a large number of primitive Dravidian roots, and are often necessary for the discrimination of one root from another; whereas, in most cases, their use in the Sanskrit is merely euphonic. 3. Those consonants which the Tamil has borrowed from the Sanskrit have been greatly modified to accord with its own laws of sound. It systematically softens down every harsh sound which it adopts; hence it seems improbable that a series of harsh, ringing sounds, like *t*, *d*, *n*, should have been adopted without change, and used in the expression of a large number of its most essential roots. 4. Though the Telugu has been more exposed to Sanskrit influences than the Tamil, yet larger use is made of these sounds in Tamil than in Telugu.

*c. Dialectic interchange of consonants.* Only two interchanges common to the Dravidian and Scythian families are specified.

1. A change of *l* to *r*. A similar interchange between these letters takes place in the languages of Central Asia; *l* in the Manchu is converted into *r* in the Mongolian. It should, however, be remarked that, though this change is not infrequent, the evident tendency, especially in Tamil, is the reverse of this, or from *r* to *l*.

2. The change of the peculiar vocalic lingual *r* to *d* and *l*. This interchange brings to view a very important dialectic law,

which is, that the same consonant which is *r* in Tamil is generally *d* in Telugu, and always *l* in Canarese: e. g. the numeral seven is in Tamil *éru*, in Telugu *édu*, and in Canarese *élu*. It thus appears that *l* and *d* are as intimately allied as *d* and *r*. This is a point of some importance in the question under consideration; for a similar interchange is also characteristic of the Ugrian family of languages: the same word is written with *t* or *d* in the Ostiak, and with *l* in the Magyar and Finnish.

*d. Principles of syllabication.* The chief peculiarity of the Dravidian system of syllabication is its extreme simplicity, and its dislike of compound or concurrent consonants. Double or treble consonants at the beginning of a word or syllable, like *str* in *strength*, are altogether inadmissible. In such positions only one consonant is allowed. If, in the middle of a word of several syllables, one syllable ends with a consonant, and the succeeding one begins with another and different consonant, the concurrent letters must be euphonicly assimilated, or they must be separated by a vowel. At the conclusion of a word, double and treble consonants are as inadmissible as at the beginning. Words must end either with a *vowel* (as they do invariably in Telugu and Canarese), or in one of the nasals or semi-vowels. Whenever vowels are concurrent in Tamil, Canarese, and Malayalam, the consonants *v* and *y* are used to prevent hiatus. In Telugu the letter *n* is used in the same way, and for the same purpose. These principles of syllabication differ widely from those of the Indo-European tongues. But they correspond in many respects to the system of the Scythian group. In all the particulars specified above, they accord precisely with the Finnish, the Hungarian, and other languages of the Ugrian family. The same law is observable in the language of the Behistun tablets: e. g. the word *Sparta* occurs with an initial *i*—thus, *Isparta*—just as it would be written at the present day in Magyar, or in Tamil.

2. *Roots.* The manner in which languages deal with their roots is strongly illustrative of their essential spirit and distinctive character. It is chiefly with reference to their differences in this particular that the languages of Europe and Asia admit of being arranged into classes. The class which embraces both the Indo-European and Scythian groups of tongues has been termed by grammarians *agglutinative*. In this class, grammatical relations are expressed by affixes or suffixes appended to the root or compounded with it. These agglutinated particles have in the Indo-European languages been gradually melted down into inflections, and sometimes even blended with the root. But in the Scythian group every root and particle of every compound word has not only maintained its original position, but

held fast its separate individuality. The two families agree in original construction, but differ in development.

The Dravidian languages differ from the Sanskrit and Greek, and accord with the languages of the Scythian group, in this particular. The root always stands out in distinct relief, unobscured, unabsorbed, though followed by a large family of auxiliary suffixes. This distinctness and prominence which the root assumes in every word is a chief characteristic of the Dravidian languages, as of all the Scythian group. When roots receive formative or inflectional additions, they sustain no internal change. Both the vowels and consonants, one or more, of which the root is composed, remain unalterable. They sustain no change or modification on the addition of signs of gender, number, and case, or of person, tense, and mood; these are successively agglutinated to the root, not welded into combination with it. All this is as true of the Dravidian roots as of those of the Scythic family generally. Whatever be the length or weight of the additions made to them, they persistently continue unchanged; appearing as fully and as faithfully in the oblique cases as in the nominative; in the preterit and future as in the present or imperative.

To this general rule there are, however, some euphonic, and a few real, exceptions. Among the latter is noticed one, which singularly enough is a Scythian, as well as a Dravidian exception. The long vowels of the roots of the personal pronouns and numerals are shortened. In the Scythian version of the Behistun tablets, while the nominative of the pronoun of the 2d person is *nî*, 'thou,' as in the Dravidian languages, the possessive case is *nî*, 'thy,' and the accusative *nîn*, 'thee.' Corresponding in quantity are the Dravidian oblique cases: e. g. Telugu and Tulu have *nînu*, 'thee;' High Tamil *nîn*, 'thy,' and *nînai*, 'thee.'

It may just be remarked in this connection, that the Dravidian languages differ from those of the Aryan family, and accord with those of the Scythian family, in generally using the crude root of the verb, without any addition, as the imperative singular.

3. Nouns.—*a. Gender.* The laws of gender in the Dravidian languages are *sui generis*, yet accord more closely with those of the Scythian than with those of the Indo-European family. In all the Aryan languages, not only is gender attributed to words as well as objects, but words implying inanimate objects, and abstract ideas, are said to possess sexual distinctions, and to be male or female, according to their form, and are consequently fitted, not with neuter, but with masculine and feminine case-terminations, and with pronouns of corresponding genders. This remark applies also to the Semitic languages. On the other hand, in the Manchu, Mongolian, Turkish, and Finnish

family of tongues, no nouns whatever, not even those which denote human beings, are regarded as in themselves masculine or feminine, but they are considered to be destitute of gender. They have inherently no mark of gender, nor is that idea involved in any of the case-terminations; but, wherever it is necessary to distinguish the sex, some word equivalent to "male" or "female," "he" or "she," is prefixed.

In like manner all primitive Dravidian nouns are destitute of gender, and sex is distinguished by suffixed fragments of pronouns, so that every word in which the idea of gender is expressed is treated as a divisible or compound word, and in the poetical dialect the ordinary suffixes of gender or rationality are generally discarded, and all nouns, as far as possible, are treated as abstract neuters. Even *Devu* (Sanskrit *deva*, masc.), a crude noun, destitute of gender, is regarded as more classical than the corresponding masculine noun used for *God* in modern and colloquial Tamil.

But in many important respects the Dravidian laws of gender differ from those of the other Scythian tongues: e. g. the distinction between rational and irrational is regarded as more momentous and essential than that between male and female, and, in the plural, this is the only distinction provided for. Not only all nouns, but even pronouns and verbs, are epicene in the plural.

The Telugu language, which is said to be spoken by fourteen millions of the Hindus, has actually no feminine singular even, but uses in the place of it the singular of the neuter: this rule applies to goddesses and queens as well as to ordinary women; but in the plural they are honored, as in the other dialects, with the rational suffixes which are applied to men, gods, and demons. Some of the rude aborigines on the Nilagiri hills employ in such cases the masculine instead of the neuter, reminding us of the use in Old Hebrew of the pronoun *hû* to signify both 'he' and 'she.'

This law of gender peculiar to the Dravidian tongues is the result of grammatical culture, and is decidedly more philosophical, though not so imaginative, as that of the Indo-European and Semitic tongues.

*b. Number.* In the primitive Indo-European tongues the plural is carefully distinguished from the singular. Number is always clearly denoted by inflectional terminations. In the Scythian languages, number is generally left indefinite, so that the connection alone determines whether a noun is singular or plural. In this respect, the Dravidian languages differ from the Indo-European, and accord remarkably with those of the Scythian stock. Poets and peasants, the most faithful guardians of antique forms of speech in all countries, very rarely pluralize



the neuter of Dravidian words. This rule is adhered to with especial strictness by the Tamil, which in this, as in many other particulars, exhibits most faithfully the primitive condition of the Dravidian languages. Even when a neuter noun is pluralized, the verb is very rarely pluralized to correspond. In fact, the Tamil verb contains no third person plural for the future or aorist: in this particular the verb is more decidedly Scythian than the noun.

In this connection must be noticed another point of difference between the Indo-European and Scythian languages. In the former, the signs of plurality and case are so blended that each inflection in the plural includes the two-fold idea of number and of case. The plural has a different set of case-terminations from the singular, by the use of which the complex idea of plurality and case-relation is indicated. There is no inflection for any case as such, irrespective of number, nor for number as such, irrespective of case. Moreover, there is no apparent connection between the case-terminations of the singular and those which are used in and constitute the plural. But, in the Scythian family, plurality is expressed by a sign of plurality common to all the cases, which is affixed directly to the singular, or crude form of the noun. To this sign of plurality are added the case-terminations, which are fixed and unalterable, expressing the idea of case, and nothing more, and are the same in the plural as in the singular.

In the Dravidian languages, a singular simplicity and rigidity of structure characterizes the particles of plurality, as will appear from a comparison of the declensions of the Hungarian noun *ház*, 'house,' and the Tamil noun *manai*, having the same meaning.

*Declension of Hungarian noun HÁZ.*

| <i>Singular.</i>     | <i>Plural.</i>     |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| Nom. <i>ház,</i>     | <i>ház-ak.</i>     |
| Gen. <i>ház-nak,</i> | <i>ház-ak-nak.</i> |
| Dat. <i>ház-nak,</i> | <i>ház-ak-nak.</i> |
| Acc. <i>ház-at,</i>  | <i>ház-ak-at.</i>  |

*Declension of Tamil noun MANAI.*

| <i>Singular.</i>                 | <i>Plural.</i>              |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Nom. <i>manai,</i>               | <i>manai-gal.</i>           |
| Acc. <i>manai-(y)-ai,</i>        | <i>manai-gal-ai.</i>        |
| Inst. <i>manai-(y)-âl,</i>       | <i>manai-gal-âl.</i>        |
| Conj. <i>manai-(y)-ôđu,</i>      | <i>manai-gal-ôđu.</i>       |
| Dat. <i>manai-kku,</i>           | <i>manai-gal-(u)-kku.</i>   |
| Abl. <i>manai-(y)-illirundu,</i> | <i>manai-gal-illirundu.</i> |
| Gen. <i>manai-(y)-in,</i>        | <i>manai-gal-in.</i>        |
| Loc. <i>manai-(y)-idattil,</i>   | <i>manai-gal-idattil.</i>   |
| Voc. <i>manai-(y)-ê,</i>         | <i>manai-gal-ê.</i>         |

The Dravidian languages possess, in addition to a neuter pluralizing particle, which was originally restricted exclusively to neuter nouns, a sign of the plural which is appropriated only to rational or personal nouns, and which is common to both masculine and feminine. In the nouns, pronouns, and verbs of these languages, the primitive form of this epicene pluralizing particle is *ar*. In Tamil and Malayâlam, there is still another particle of plurality applicable to rational beings, viz. *mâr* or *mar*. This seems to be related to some of the pluralizing particles of certain Scythian languages; in Turkish it is *lar* or *ler*, which is inserted, as in the Dravidian languages, between the crude noun and each of the case-terminations. Mongolian nouns which end with a vowel are pluralized by the addition of *nar* or *ner*. How remarkable is the resemblance to the Dravidian *mar*, both in the final *ar* and in the prefixed nasal! The Dravidian *mar* may be allied to, and perhaps the original of, the high Asian *nar*. In the Scythian tongues *n* is often elided, and the same peculiarity characterizes the Dravidian family; for *mar* has been softened into *ar*; and if both forms continued to be occasionally used, *mar*, the older of the two, would naturally and regularly acquire a honorific signification—and this we find to be the fact.

This particle is sometimes isolated from the noun which it pluralizes in a peculiarly Scythian manner: e. g. *tây-tagappan-mâr*, 'mothers and fathers,' in which both 'mother' and 'father' are in the singular, and *mâr* is appended separately to qualify both. In modern Tamil, *mâr* is appended to nouns signifying priests, kings, and parents, as a plural of honor, like the Hungarian *mek*.

The plural suffix of neuter nouns was originally and essentially *gal* or *kal*; it is indeed very generally, though perhaps improperly, used at the present day as a plural suffix of rational nouns and pronouns. In modern Canarese we have *galu*; farther north its shape is more considerably modified. In Telugu it is *lu*, *l* in Telugu corresponding to the lingual *l* of other dialects; *lu* therefore accords with the final syllable of the Canarese *galu*, the only difference being the omission of the initial *ga*. Thus, in colloquial Tamil, *avargal*, 'they,' is softened into *avâl*.

The letters *k* and *g* are dropped in a similar way in many of the Scythian languages. It is not uncommon to find one portion of a much used suffix in one language or dialect of a family, and another portion of it in another member of the same family; accordingly, in Gond, a Dravidian hill-dialect, we find that the plural neuter is formed by the addition of *k* alone: e. g. *nâi*, 'dog;' *nâi-k*, 'dogs;' in Tamil it is *nây-gal*, 'dogs.' The letter *k* is also sometimes found interchangeable with *t*: e. g. in Gond *amat*, 'we,' and *imat*, 'you.' Compare now with these Dravid-

ian forms the Magyar and Lappish plural in *k* or *ak*, also the *t* by which *k* is displaced in almost all the other dialects of the Finnish family, and the reappearance of *l* and *t* in the Ostiak plural suffix *ll*. Observe also the plural *k* in the Turkish *îdum*, 'I was;' *îduk*, 'we were.' On the other hand, *t* is the sign of the plural in Mongolian, which in the Kalmuk is softened into *d*.

c. *Case*. It has been already remarked that, in both the Indo-European and Scythian families, case-relations of nouns are expressed by means of post-positions, or auxiliary words; the difference between them being that, in the former, these have been in process of time converted into technical case-signs or inflectional terminations, which have been so welded into combination with the roots as to render it in many cases impossible to distinguish between the root and its suffix; whereas, in the Scythian family, these post-positions, or auxiliary words, appended to express the reciprocal relations of the noun to the other parts of the sentence, have rigidly held fast their individual and separate existence.

Another particular in which the case-formations of the two families of language differ has been alluded to. The languages of the Indo-European family appear to have been used from the beginning on the principle of expressing the case-relations of the singular by one set of forms, and those of the plural by another. On the other hand, in all the languages of the Scythian group, the same case-signs are employed, without alteration, both in the singular and in the plural. In the singular they are appended directly to the nominative, which is identical with the base; in the plural they are appended, not to the nominative or base, but to the particle of pluralization which is suffixed to the base. The only exception of importance is that, in some of the Scythian tongues, especially in the languages of the Finnish family, the included vowel of the case-sign differs in the two numbers, being generally *a* in the singular, and *e* in the plural. In both these particulars the Dravidian languages differ from those of the Indo-European family, and are in perfect accordance with the Scythian tongues. As in the Scythian languages generally, so in the Dravidian, there is but one declension, properly so called.

Note, that the use of *v* and *y* to prevent hiatus between concurrent vowels (before alluded to) extends in its application to the concurrence of the case-signs and roots, when the former begin and the latter end with a vowel: e. g. *nadu-v-il*, 'in the middle,' *vari-y-il*, 'in the way.' Compare this with the use of *v* for a similar purpose in Magyar: e. g. *lô*, 'a horse,' and *at*, the sign of the objective case when united, appear not as *lô-at*, but as *lô-v-at*, precisely as would be the case in Tamil.

*Accusative case-signs*. The only sign in Tamil is *ai*; in Mala-

yâlam it is *ê*; the Canarese accusative is *am* and *an*, then *annu* and *anna*, and *nu*; in Telugu it is *nu* or *ni*; when preceded by *i* it is *ni*, when by any other vowel it is *nu*: e. g. *inti-ni*, 'domum;' *bidda-nu*, 'puerum.' In the Finnish tongues, the greater number of singular accusatives are formed by suffixing *en* or *an*; in the Wotiak, by adding *â* to the root: e. g. *ton*, 'thou,' *ton-â*, 'thee;' the Turkish accusative is *î* or *yî*; the Mongolian, *î* after a consonant. The Turkish *î* is doubtless a softened form of the oriental accusative case-sign *nî*, from which it has been derived. So in the Kalmuk pronouns we find *bida*, 'we,' *bida-nî*, 'us;' *na-mâi*, 'me,' and *dzi-mâi*, 'thee.' Ascending farther and farther towards the source of the Scythian tongues, we find in the tablets at Behistun that the accusative singular of the pronoun *nî* is *nin*, 'thee;' compare this with the Tulu (a Dravidian dialect), where it is *nin-u*, 'thee,' and observe how close is the resemblance.

The consonants *m* and *n* are extensively used as accusative case-signs in the Indo-European languages also. In this instance we must conclude that both languages have retained a relic of their original oneness. There are reasons, however, for connecting the Dravidian case-sign with the Scythian rather than with the Indo-European family.

*The Instrumental, or 3d case.* The sign of this case in Tamil and Malayâlam is *âl*, probably from *kâl*, 'a channel,' which has lost its initial *k*; as the plural sign *kal* in Tamil has become *lv*, by corruption from *kal-u*. Another mode of forming this case in the Dravidian languages is by means of the preterit verbal participle of the verb "to take," suffixed to the accusative of any noun: e. g. *vâl-ai(k)kondu*, 'having taken a knife.' This has arisen from the repugnance of the Dravidian (as of all Scythian, and in contradistinction to the Indo-European) languages to continue to make use of any inflectional form after it has ceased to express its original meaning, and has become a mere technical sign. In such cases, a word or phrase is often adopted, which has a distinct meaning of its own. The frequent use of *kondu* in the place of *âl* or *kâl* is an illustration of this practice.

*The Conjunctive case.* This is sometimes called in Dravidian grammar "the social ablative." The fundamental sign of this case in all the Dravidian languages is *udan*, meaning 'with,' or 'together with'—in the conjunctive, and not the instrumental, sense of the word 'with.' The Sanskrit and the other languages of that family are destitute of this case, while most of the Scythian tongues have a regularly formed conjunctive case, like the Dravidian languages. *Den*, the conjunctive case-sign of the Kalmuk, may be compared with the Tamil *udan*.

*The Dative.* In all the dialects of the Dravidian family, in the rudest as well as in the most polished, there is but one suffix

of the dative, which takes the forms *ku*, *ki*, *ka*, or *ge*: the guttural *k*, or its sonant *g*, is the essential part of this suffix. In the primitive Indo-European tongues we discover no trace of any such dative suffix or case-sign; but on turning to the Scythian family, interesting analogies meet us at every step. In Oriental Turkish, the forms of this suffix are *ke*, *ka*, *ge*, *ga*, etc. In Osmanli Turkish it is *eh* or *yeh*; the initial *k* or *g* having been softened into *y*, and then discarded altogether. A softening of the guttural in this case-sign, precisely similar, is observed in the Malayâlam. In the Finnish family, the Turko-Dravidian dative reappears. In the Irtish and Surgutish dialects of the Ostiak it is *ga*. We learn from the Scythian tablets that a dative suffix almost identical with the Dravidian, Turkish, and Ostiak was used by the oldest Scythian dialects of Central Asia of which any remains are extant. The dative case-sign there used is *ikki* or *ikka*. In composition, the Tamil *ku* becomes *akku* or *ukku*, and in Malayâlam, *kka* and *ikka*. Compare the cuneiform Scythian *nî-ikka* or *nî-ikki*, 'to thee,' with the Malayâlam *nani-kka*, and the Telugu *nî-ku*.

*Ablative of motion.* No Scythian analogies are observed in this case.

*The Genitive, or 6th case.* This case is formed in various ways, and by means of various suffixes, in the Dravidian languages. The personal pronouns in Tamil form their genitive by shortening the included vowel of the root: e. g. *nî* or *nîn*, 'thou;' *nîn*, 'thy;' *nâm*, 'we;' *nām*, 'our.' In the Behistun tablets we find *nî*, 'thou,' and *nî*, the enclitic possessive. Of all genitive case-signs, *in* is that which is most frequently used for both numbers and all genders.

In Sanskrit, and in other members of the Aryan family, distinct traces are recognized of the use of a genitival particle, in which the consonant *n* is the most essential element. But in the languages of the Scythian stock, we find a large number of still more important analogies with the Dravidian genitival suffixes *in* and *ni*: e. g. Manchu and Mongolian *mi-ni*, 'of me;' Mongolian *chi-ni*, and Manchu *si-ni*, 'of thee.' In Finnish, the suffix universally employed is *n*: as *kudo*, 'house,' *kudon*, 'of a house.' In Mordwin, the genitive plural suffix is *nen*. The Lapish genitive singular takes *n* or *en*. In the Tatar or High Asian families, as in the Behistun tablets, the prevailing form of the genitive is *nen*, which systematically alternates with the simple suffix *un* or *in*. In Oriental Turkish, it is *nîng*, *nîn*, *nîng*, or *nîn*. In Ottoman Turkish, it is *un* in the plural, and *un* or *nun* in the singular. In Mongolian, it is *û* after *n*, *ûn* after any other consonant, and *yîn* after a vowel: compare the Mongolian *kôl-ûn*, 'of a foot,' with the Tamil *kâl-in*, 'of a foot.' The Kalmuk and Tibetan genitives are formed by suffixing *i* or *yîn*. Other analogies are traced, but these may suffice.

Another essential suffix of the genitive in the Dravidian languages is *a*. Though little used in the Tamil, yet, when all the Dravidian idioms are taken into consideration, it is perhaps more largely employed than any other suffix of the genitive; on which account it is placed first in the list of case-signs by Tamil grammarians—a proof of the accuracy of the Tamil classification. There is no direct Scythian analogy for this suffix. Its affinities appear to be rather with the Indo-European. In the later Teutonic dialects, however, a genitive case-sign in *a* becomes exceedingly common, and is found in the plural as well as the singular: e. g., in the Frisian and Icelandic. This resemblance between the possessives of some of the Teutonic vernaculars and that of the Dravidian languages is deserving of notice.

To the signs of the locative and vocative no analogies are traced.

It has only to be farther noted under this particular that, as in the Hungarian and some other Scythian tongues, so in the Dravidian, two or more case-signs are occasionally compounded or united in one word.

4. Numerals. Not the smallest trace of resemblance has been discovered between the Dravidian numerals and those of any Indo-European language, with the single exception of the Telugu *oka*, 'one,' as compared with the Sanskrit *eka*—in which instance the Sanskrit itself has in all probability inherited a Scythian numeral, as the numeral one in several other members of the Aryan family is evidently derived from a different base. When therefore we find, with this abnormal exception, no resemblance in the Dravidian numerals to those of the Indo-European tongues, we are led to the conclusion that the Dravidian languages must be derived from some other source. On the other hand, a comparison of the Dravidian numerals with those of the Scythian tongues appears to establish the fact of the existence of Scythian, and especially of Ugrian and Finnish analogies. It cannot properly be urged as an objection that in respect to most of the numerals no such resemblance is observed; for the same objection could be urged against the classification of many of those languages which are claimed and allowed to be of Scythian affinities. Thus it cannot be doubted that the Magyar and Finnish are sister tongues, essentially and very closely allied, yet with respect to four numerals—viz. 7, 8, 9, and 10—no distinct trace of resemblance between them survives, and it is only in the case of the numerals 1, 2, and 4 that it can be said, without hesitation, that the same root was used in both languages.

*The numeral one.* Two forms of the cardinal numeral 'one' are found in the Dravidian languages, which appear, however, to be remotely allied: viz. *oru* and *oka*. The basis of the first

and most commonly used form is *or*, which is its adjectival form, and the representative of the crude root. If the *k* in the second form, which is used only in the Telugu, be radical, as is most probable, then the crude adjectival form from which it was derived may have been *kor*; if so, we may at once conclude that *kor* was the original form of the Tamil-Canarese *or*, for there are several instances of the disappearance of an initial *k*, as we have before shown, while it could not have been prefixed to *or* if it had not originally stood before it. If this supposition be allowed, it is easy to see how *kor* and *oka* are allied, by the corruption of both from a common root. *Kor*, *or*, and *oka* would naturally and regularly be derived from the root *okor*, which corresponds to the Samoiede *okur*. This supposition receives a beautiful illustration and confirmation from the form which the numeral assumes in the Behistun tablets; which, be it remembered, are the oldest extant specimens of the language of the ancient Scythians. The word there employed for 'one' is *kir*, and the numeral adjective derived from it is *irra* or *ra*. Here, then, we have a word for 'one' discovered in the very fountain of ancient Scythian forms, containing both *k* and *r*; and a derived numeral adjective, from which the *k* has been softened off.\* It is interesting also to notice, in passing, that the numeral adjective *ra* of the tables is identical with *ra*, the same numeral adjective of the Ku, a Dravidian dialect. The Caucasian numerals for 'one' exhibit a close resemblance to the Dravidian: they are *ar*, *arti*, *erthi*. As in the Dravidian *or*, 'one,' and *ir*, 'two,' so in these dialects, *r* forms an essential part of both.

*The numeral four.* It is evident from a comparison of all the Dravidian dialects that the primitive form of this numeral was *nál* or *nal*. In the entire family of the Indo-European languages, there is not a word signifying 'four' which in the smallest degree resembles the Dravidian *nál*. But, in this instance, Finnish and Ugrian affinities are more than usually distinct; the resemblance amounts to identity, and cannot have been accidental. In Cheremiss 'four' is *níl*; in the Mordwin, *nile* and *nílen*; in Vogul, *níla*; in Ostiak, *níl*, *nel*, *njedla*, *nieda*; in Finnish proper, *nelja*; in Lappish, *nielj*, *nelje*, *nellá*; in Magyar, *négy*. The root of all these numerals is evidently *níl* or *nel*, the analogy of which to the Dravidian *nál* or *nal* is very remarkable. In the Telugu, the word for fourteen is *pat-náji*, where the *l* of *nál*

---

\* The direct derivation of the Telugu *oka*, 'one,' from the Sanskrit *eka*, seems improbable, since that language has borrowed, and occasionally uses, the Sanskrit numeral *eka*, in addition to its own *oka*, and never confounds the two. Telugu grammarians regard them as altogether independent one of another. Moreover, words closely analogous to *oka* are used in all the Finnish languages, which cannot be supposed to have borrowed them from the Sanskrit. Thus the numeral 'one' is in Wotiak *og*; in Vogul, *ak*; in Magyar, *egy*; in Lappish, *akt*; in Finnish, *yzi* (*yk-si*); in Samoiede, *okur*.

is softened down, as in the Ostiak, Lappish, and others just quoted. The resemblance between the Dravidian 'one' and 'four,' and the corresponding numerals in the Ugrian languages is so complete, that we may justly regard them as identical.

It is a characteristic of the Scythian languages that they use for 'eight' and 'nine' compounds which signify 'ten minus two' and 'ten minus one.' In some instances an uncompounded word is used for 'eight,' but 'nine' is always compounded as we have stated. The Dravidian word for 'nine' is formed in this way; and the same seems to be a rational explanation of the Telugu word *enimidi*, 'eight.'

5. Pronouns. Much light is thrown by the pronouns on the relationships of languages. In some instances, the pronouns, and especially that of the first person, constitute the only appreciable point of contact.

*a. Pronoun of the first person singular.* The form of this pronoun in colloquial Tamil is *nān*; in Malayālam, *nyān*; in Canarese, *nānu*; in Tulu, *yān*; in Telugu, *nēnu*. From a comparison of the different forms in use, we are led to regard the Tamil *nān* as the best existing representative of the old Dravidian nominative of this pronoun, and *nā* as the primitive unmodified root. The final *n* seems to be merely a sign of number, or perhaps only a euphonic formative.

There seems to be reason to conclude that the Dravidian *na* and the old Indo-European *ma* are allied, and, if so, that the former has been derived from the latter.

An examination of this pronoun in the Scythian group of tongues brings to light some very interesting analogies between the forms which it assumes in them and that which it takes in the Dravidian languages. The nominative, as well as the oblique cases, of the first personal pronoun in all existing languages of the Scythian group is derived from a base in *ma*, and not unfrequently comes into perfect accordance with the Dravidian, by changing into *na*. This *ma* is in most existing Scythian vernaculars nasalized into *man*. In Oriental Turkish, this pronoun takes the form of *men*; in Turkoman, *mān*; in Khivan, *mām*; in Ottoman Turkish, *ben* (*m* degraded to *b*); in Finnish proper, *minä*; in Lappish, *mon*; in Ostiak, *ma*, plural *men*; in the Samoïede dialects, *man*, *mani*; in Mongolian and Manchu it is *bi*, evidently corrupted from *mi*, like the Ottoman *ben* from *men*; the Magyar has *én* in the singular, and *mi* in the plural. It thus appears that the true representative of this pronoun in the Scythian tongues is *ma*, and that as *ma* has been generally euphonised into *man* in the western families of that group, so it evinces in the eastern stems a tendency to change into *na*.

The initial and radical *m* is occasionally converted into *n* in the Indo-European languages, and a similar change from *m* to *n*



is apparent in the Scythian tongues, so that this nasal has become distinctive of the first personal pronoun in those languages, just as it has in the Dravidian family.

It would thus appear that the various forms of the pronoun of the first person singular, *ma*, *na*, and the High Asian *nga*, are identical, and that this word was the common property of mankind, prior to the separation of the Indo-European tribes from the rest of the Japhetic family.

*b. Pronoun of the second person singular.* In Tamil, *nî* is invariably used as the isolated nominative, though *nîn*, corresponding by rule to *nân* (the pronoun of the first person), was, without doubt, the primitive form; for the final *n*, though totally lost in the nominative, is invariably retained in the oblique cases. In the personal termination of the verb, this pronoun is represented by the suffixes *ây*, *ai*, or *î*, from each of which both the initial and final *n* have disappeared; of these two *n*'s, the former appears to be essential, and the latter euphonic. There is some doubt as to the included vowel, but authority preponderates in favor of *i*. As in Tamil, so in Canarese and Malayâlam, *nî* is regarded as the crude base of this pronoun, although in Canarese the nominative is *nîn*, and in Malayâlam the oblique cases are *nan* and *nân*. The Telugu nominative is *nî-vu*, the *vu* being only euphonic. In the personal terminations of the verb, the Telugu rejects every portion of the pronominal root, and employs only the euphonic suffix *vu* or *vi*.

As the result of this comparison of the Dravidian dialects, we conclude that the primitive form of this pronoun was *nî*, but the only essential part of the pronoun appears to be the initial *n*; just as, in the Indo-European languages, *t* is the essential part of the corresponding pronoun; with a preference for the vowel *i* by the former, and *u* by the latter.

The relationship of this pronoun, unlike that of the pronoun of the first person, which has both Japhetic and Scythian affinities, is distinctly and specifically Scythian.

Throughout the Scythian as well as the Indo-European group, the most prevalent form of this pronoun in the singular is that which comes from the consonant *t*, with a preference for its phonetic equivalent *s*; which, however, is generally euphonized by the addition of a final nasal, usually the consonant *n*, as in the pronoun of the first person: e. g., *tu*, *so*, Turkish *siu*; Samoiède *tan*; Lappish *don*. The only other consonant form used in any family of either of these groups is that which is formed from the consonant *n*, of which the cuneiform Scythian and the Dravidian *nî* is the best representative. No connexion can be traced between these roots, nor is there a change in any instance from one form into the other. The Magyar has *te*, the Armenian *tu*, the Mongolian *chi* or *dzi* (notice here the progress of *t* towards

the softer form *s*); the Finnish dialects *se, sina, sia, sie*. It is evident that there is no resemblance whatever between any of these pronouns and the Dravidian *nî*, which is doubtless an ultimate underived pronominal root. And it thus appears that there are two Japhetic bases of the pronoun of the second person, as well as two of the first.

There are traces more or less distinct, in various languages of the Scythian group, of the existence of a pronoun of the second person identical with, or evidently allied to, the Dravidian *nî*, while there are none in any members of the Aryan family. The most ancient, remarkable, and decisive is the pronoun used in the Scythian tablets at Behistun; this is *nî*, precisely as in the Dravidian idioms. In the Ugro-Ostiak, 'thou' is *nen*, 'you' is *nen*; in other Ostiak dialects we find *num* and *nyn*; in Vogul, *net, ny, nan*; plural, *nen* and *non*.

This form of the pronoun of the second person appears in the possessive compounds, and in the personal verbal terminations of some languages: thus, in the Ostiak, *ime-n*, 'thy wife.' So, in another of the Finnish dialects, we find *kery-n*, 'thou hast done;' so in Turkish, *bâbâ-n*, 'thy father;' *bâbâ-nûz*, 'your father;' and *îdu-n*, 'thou wast.' More remarkable than all these is the Chinese *nî*, which is identical with the Dravidian-Behistun-Scythian pronoun. Compare also the *nî* of the Horpa, a dialect of the Tibetan, and also the *ninna* of the Australian dialects.

It is very evident that the affinities of the Dravidian *nî* are wholly Scythian, and this contributes largely to the establishment of the Scythian relationship of the Dravidian family.

*c. The plurals of these pronouns.* These are generally formed in the Dravidian dialects by the addition of the pluralizing particle *m*: e. g., in Tamil, *nâm*, 'we,' and *nir*, 'you,' instead of the more regular *nîm*; and, in the colloquial dialect, *nâng-gal*, 'we,' and *nîng-gal*, 'you,' for *nâm-gal* and *nîm-gal*; a double plural has thus crept into use, similar to that which has obtained in the Turkish, where *ben*, 'I,' is regularly pluralized into *biz*, 'we;' *sen*, 'thou,' into *siz*, 'you;' which are then pluralized again by the addition of *ler*, the ordinary suffix of plurality; thus *biz-ler*, 'we,' *siz-ler*, 'you.'

In several of the languages of the Scythian family we discover traces of the use of *m* as a sign of the plural; we can, however, scarcely expect to find there a sign of plurality perfectly corresponding to that of the Dravidian, for in those languages the personal pronouns are generally pluralized by a change of the final vowel, and not by any change or addition of consonants.

In all the Dravidian dialects, excepting the Canarese, there are in constant use two plurals of the pronouns of the first person, of which one denotes not only the party of the speaker, but also the party addressed, and may be called the "plural in-

clusive;" the other excludes the party addressed, and includes only the party of the speaker, and may be called the "plural exclusive." This idiom is a distinctly Scythian one; there is no trace of it in the Sanskrit, or in any of the languages of the Aryan family; but it is found everywhere in Central Asia.

*d. Demonstrative pronouns.* The Dravidian languages, like most if not all other primitive uncompounded tongues, are destitute of pronouns of the third person, properly so called, and use instead demonstrative bases signifying 'this' or 'that,' with the addition of suffixes of gender and number. Four such bases are recognized in one or other of the Dravidian dialects, each of which is a pure vowel: viz. *a*, the remote, *i*, the proximate, and *u*, the medial demonstrative; also *ē*, which is used as a demonstrative only in the Ku dialect. The first two only are in common use. The suffixes which are annexed to these for the purpose of forming the gender are *d* for the neuter singular, *an* for the masculine, and *al* for the feminine. When these demonstrative bases are simply prefixed to substantives, they convey the signification of the demonstrative adjectives 'that' and 'this.'

The Magyar demonstratives are somewhat in accordance with the Dravidian *a* and *i*: e. g., *az*, 'that;' *ez*, 'this;' but in most of the languages of the Scythian family no resemblance whatever is observed.

6. The Verb. The structure of the Dravidian verb has already been partially treated of in noticing the roots; a few farther statements only will be added.

The verb has but one conjugation; class differences do indeed exist, but they are not of sufficient importance to constitute different conjugations. The Dravidian verb is remarkable for the simplicity of its structure, having but four moods—the indicative, infinitive, imperative, and negative—and but three tenses—the past, present, and aorist. The modifications of thought indicated in other languages by the various moods and tenses are expressed in these by means of suffixed particles and auxiliary verbs. In these respects it resembles, though it does not equal, the simplicity of the ancient Scythian verb. It is more rarely compounded than the Indo-European verb, and the compound of a verb with a preposition, so common in the latter, is especially rare in the former. Though compound verbs are not unknown in the Dravidian languages, their use is not in harmony with the purer idiom, and when the component elements of such compounds are examined, it will be observed that the principle on which they are compounded differs widely from that of the Aryan tongues. The same remark applies to all the Scythian languages.

*a. Causals.* In the Dravidian dialects, there is a class of verbs termed causals. They have been classed with transitives

by both European and native grammarians; they differ, however, from transitives, as well as from intransitives, both in signification and form. They differ also from what have been termed causals in the Indo-European languages. These latter govern two accusatives, one the object of the causation, the other that of the action caused; e. g., 'I caused him to build the house' (*domum*); whereas Dravidian causals govern the one accusative only, that of the object, leaving the person to be understood, as if we should say 'I caused to build the house:' or else the person is put in the instrumental, 'I caused the house to be built by him.' Tamil idiom, and the analogy of the other Dravidian dialects, in contradistinction to the Aryan, requires that causals should be formed, not from neuter or intransitive verbs, but from transitives alone.

In all these particulars, these verbs not only differ from those of the Indo-European languages, but resemble closely the Turkish and other members of the Scythian stock. If, for example, we should take the transitive verb 'to send,' which would be regarded as a causal in the Indo-European languages, and desire to express the idea of 'causing to send,' i. e., of causing one person to send another, it would be impossible, by any modification of structure, to get a single Indo-European verb to express the idea; but it would be necessary to make use of a phrase, as in English. Whereas, in the Dravidian languages, as in the languages of the Scythian family generally, there is a form of the verb which will express the entire idea; e. g., *anuppu-vi*, which is formed from *anuppu*, 'to send,' by the addition of the particle *vi*. So, in Turkish, *sev-dur*, 'to cause to love,' from *sev*, 'to love.'

*b. The negative.* This is rather a mood or voice than a conjugation, and is expressed by means of inflectional additions or changes. In the Indo-European family, negation is usually expressed by means of a separate particle, used adverbially; whereas, in the Scythian family, every verb has a negative voice or mood, as well as an affirmative. This voice or mood is generally formed by the insertion of a particle of negation between the theme and the pronominal suffix; and this mode of forming the negative is as distinctive of the Dravidian as of the Turkish and Finnish. The Dravidian sign of negation inserted between the theme of the verb and the personal suffixes is *a*, probably derived from *al*, the isolated particle of negation in the oldest Tamil dialect. The widely extended affinities of this particle are deserving of a notice. The Finnish prohibitive is *älä*; the Ostiak, *ilä*. And we find a similar prohibitive even in the Hebrew *al* and Chaldee *lā*.

In Gond, one of the Dravidian dialects, the prohibitive particle *minni* is used. This particle is not suffixed, but prefixed to

the verb, like the Latin *noli*. It closely resembles *inni*, the prohibitive particle of the Behistun tablets.

*c. The preterite tense.* The manner in which a language forms its preterite constitutes one of the most distinctive features in its grammatical character, and one which contributes to the determination of the question of its relationship. In the primitive Indo-European languages, this tense was generally formed by reduplicating the first syllable of the root or verbal theme; but this reduplication has in many instances been so softened and euphonized, that it has dwindled into the mere use of a different vowel in the preterite from that which forms part of the root.

The letter *d* is the older and more characteristic sign of the Dravidian preterite. It has many interesting affinities with corresponding signs of past time in various Indo-European and Scythian languages. It evidently has an anterior, though remote, connexion with *t* or *ta*, the ordinary suffix of the Indo-European passive participle; for in Sanskrit, this participle, though distinctively passive, has occasionally, when connected with neuter verbs, a preterite signification: e. g., *gatas*, 'one who went.' But though there is probably an ultimate connexion between the two, the use of the preterite suffix *d* is too essential a characteristic of the Dravidian languages, and that of *t* too rare an exception in Sanskrit, to admit of the supposition that the former borrowed it from the latter.

It is notable, however, how very generally the preterite is formed in the Turkish and Ugrian tongues, as in the Dravidian, by suffixing *d*: e. g., Turkish, *sever-im*, 'I love;' *sever-d-im*, 'I loved.' In Finnish, the preterite is regularly formed by suffixing *t*. So also in Hungarian: e. g., from the root *le*, 'to become,' is formed the past participle *le-tt*, and *le-tt-em*, 'I have become.' In Turkish, Finnish, and Hungarian, this particle is no way connected, as in the Sanskrit, with the passive participle, but is a distinctive sign of past time, and of that alone, and it is suffixed to all indicatives, whether active, neuter, or passive—in the latter case, in addition to the sign of passivity. In this particular, therefore, the analogy between the Dravidian preterite and the Turko-Ugrian is closer than the Indo-European analogies which have been referred to.

*d. The pronominal signs.* These, in the Dravidian languages, are always suffixed, not prefixed, as in the modern Indo-European vernaculars. Still another peculiarity is this, that the personal terminations are annexed, not directly to the root, as in the Aryan tongues, but to the tense participles; so that every pure Dravidian verb is, by Tamil grammarians, arranged in the following order: 1st. the root; 2d. the medial particle, which is the sign of tense; 3d. the variation, i. e., the pronom-

inal termination. In the Indo-European languages we meet with no instance of a formation of this kind; but it is an essential element in the family likeness by which the Dravidian family is pervaded. It is also distinctive of the Turkish and other tongues of the Scythian group: e. g., in the Turkish *ól-úr-sen*, 'thou art,' *ól* is the root, *ólúr* the present participle, and *sen* the pronominal termination of the second person: in Tamil *á-n-áý*, 'thou hast become,' *á* is the root, *n* the tense-sign, and *áý* the personal termination.

*e. The Relative Participle.* It is a marked peculiarity of all the Dravidian idioms, that they have no relative pronoun whatever, and that its place is supplied by a part of the verb called the relative participle. This partakes of the nature of an adjective, and is invariably followed by a noun. Like the adjective, it undergoes no alteration on account of the number or gender of the related noun; but, in that it is a verb as well as an adjective, it governs the preceding noun, like any other participle of the verb to which it belongs.

The suffix most generally used by the Dravidians to form their relative participles is *a*, which is appended to the verbal participle or gerund. In this way the verbal becomes converted into a relative participle: e. g., from *ódugir*, 'running,' comes *ódugir-a*, 'that runs'—and so for the other tenses. This *a* seems to have been originally the possessive case-sign, containing the signification 'possessed of,' 'which has.'

In the Scythian languages, a relative participle is used instead of a relative pronoun, as in the Dravidian tongues; and the existence of a family likeness in so remarkable a particular is a strong proof of relationship. The particle used for forming the relative participle is in both groups identical with the sign of the possessive case used in the languages respectively; and farther, this sign is appended, as in Tamil or Canarese, to the verbal participle: e. g., in Manchu, from *ara*, the root, comes *aracha*, the past verbal participle, and from this is formed the relative participle *aracha-ngge*, 'which wrote.' The Scythian tablets, as also the Mongolian, have relative suffixes, appended and used as in the Dravidian languages.

In the Turkish and Finnish, and some other languages of the Scythian group, we find the existence of a relative pronoun, as well as of a relative participle, but this is foreign to the grammatical structure of those languages, and has evidently been borrowed from the usage of languages of the Indo-European stock.

7. Glossarial affinities. Very many Dravidian words exhibit a near relationship to words found in some of the languages of the Scythian, particularly to those of the Finnish dialects. These are clearer, more direct, and of a more essential character

than any observed correspondences with words in the Indo-European or Semitic languages. It is, moreover, to be particularly noted that many of those words in which affinities have been observed are of a primary character, and almost vital necessity. (For a list of these words see Caldwell, pp. 476-489.)

“How remarkable that the closest and most distinct affinities to the speech of the Dravidians of intertropical India should be those that are discovered in the languages of the Finns and Lapps of northern Europe, and of the Ostiaks and other Ugrians of Siberia! How remarkable that the Pre-Aryan inhabitants of the Dekhan should be proved by their language alone, in the silence of history, in the absence of all ordinary probabilities, to be allied to the tribes that appear to have overspread Europe before the arrival of the Goths and the Pelasgi, and even before the arrival of the Celts! What a confirmation of the statement that ‘God hath made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell upon the face of the whole earth!’”

---

#### NOTE BY THE COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

We cannot refrain from offering here a few remarks upon the subject of the preceding paper, particularly as Mr. Webb states himself to have been urged to its preparation by our, in part unfavorable, criticisms upon Mr. Caldwell's work. While fully acknowledging the merits of the latter as regards its proper subject, the comparison with one another of the Dravidian languages, we ventured to express our doubts as to the conclusiveness of its author's argument to prove the affiliation of those languages with the Scythian stock. And this chiefly for the reason that, as he himself acknowledges, he is master of only one of the terms of the comparison, having no familiar acquaintance with any of the Scythian dialects, much less a comprehensive knowledge of them, in their history and mutual relations. This objection has been urged, with much force, against Müller's parallel reasonings upon the same subject, in his *Letter on the Turanian Languages*. To compare, for the purpose of establishing a relationship which is at best a remote one, languages of which one has not a knowledge both extensive and penetrating, so as to be able to distinguish ancient from modern, fundamental from accidental, and the like, cannot but be an uncertain and unsatisfactory process. If the comparative grammar of the Scythian languages had been worked out with the same thoroughness with that of the Indo-European, such an undertaking would be vastly more feasible. But this is very far from being the case as yet. Moreover, the dialects of the Scythian family are remarkable for their great discordance with one another, for the slenderness of the ties which connect them, and the immense variety of elements and forms which they exhibit; hence the facility of going astray in an incautious ramble through such a wilderness of lexical and gram-

matical materials is extreme, and a careful comparative study of the different idioms, and a wary determination and selection of features among them which can be pronounced of general occurrence, and genuinely ancient, ought to precede any detailed comparison with another family of languages. Here, however, Mr. Caldwell's philological method is at fault; it is fairly open to criticism throughout as superficial, venturesome, and credulous. He is much too ready to accept coincidences of any kind, degree, or origin, as evidences of historical connection. He even catches, as lawful matter of comparison, at the degenerate forms of the modern Persian, and the dialectic peculiarities of present Teutonic vernaculars! His whole parallelism of Dravidian words and forms with Indo-European and Semitic, for the purpose of proving an ultimate connection of the former with the two latter also, contains the merest assonances and chance coincidences, of no account as historical evidence. We should have expected sound philological method, if anywhere, in the comparison of Dravidian and Sanskrit, considering the accessibility of the material, and the position of the author as an Indian philologist: but of the Sanskrit words compared, at least four-fifths would at once be recognized by a Sanskrit scholar as not ancient or genuine constituents of the language. Nor is Mr. Caldwell more accurate in his characterization of the primitive religion of the Indo-European race: of the three distinguishing features laid down by him as belonging to it (see p. 275, above), the first, metempsychosis, is so far from being original that it does not even appear in the oldest form of the Hindu religion, the Vedic; the third, a priestly order, is equally absent from the Vedic, as from the other primitive forms of the religion of the family; while the second, worship of the powers of Nature, is common to the Indo-European with other ancient forms of faith. It is not too much to say, we think, that all that part of Mr. Caldwell's work which concerns the comparison of the Dravidian race with any other than the Scythian is so nearly destitute of scientific value that its omission would have been a gain rather than a loss. That much of the comparison with the Scythian also is of the same character, we can hardly doubt; yet here the mass and variety of the collected evidence is so considerable, and the chance that it may contain items of genuine and decisive value so good, that—considering the interest of the question, and the rarity of Mr. Caldwell's work—we were very ready to admit into the Journal, for more general and convenient examination, Mr. Webb's condensed and compacted sketch of the comparison; and would merely add here a few words farther of comment and criticism.

How far the so-called Scythian of the Mesopotamian and Persian monuments is entitled to be employed as a medial term in this comparison will be for the present a doubtful question among scholars, who have not yet generally accepted with confidence the results of the few investigators who claim to have made the remarkable discovery of an ancient Ugrian language and civilization—although it must be confessed that those investigations inspire the most lively hope that a light as welcome as unexpected is here to be shed on the remote history of the Scythic race. It can hardly be otherwise than in a linguistic way, however, at any rate, that this dialect should help in settling the question of



Dravidian and Scythian affiliation; since the place of the people speaking it is too uncertain to justify us in regarding them as a local intermediary between Ugría and India, or as marking a line of emigration from the former to the latter.\*

The phonetic correspondences pointed out by Mr. Caldwell are for the most part too universal in their character, too readily explainable by ordinary physiological processes, to be of weight as evidences of special affiliation: there is hardly one to which abundant analogies might not be pointed out in languages confessedly not of Scythian stock. Even the appearance in Southern India of the peculiar Scythian law of harmonic sequence of vowels, in a sporadic and partial manner, we should not be inclined to lay much stress upon, considering the naturalness of the phenomenon, and the evident possibility of its independent development, at least to the extent shown, in languages not historically connected with the Scythian.

Among the numerous special coincidences of form industriously assembled and recorded by Mr. Caldwell, while there are unquestionably some which a profounder examination would show to be fallacious, others have a look of genuineness which is very prepossessing. Whether these are in such numbers, and of such character, as entirely to exclude the possibility of explaining them as casual resemblances, such as may be found by careful search between any two groups of languages on the earth's surface, we should think would have to be reserved for farther investigation and more careful sifting to determine.

The most cogent arguments in favor of the relationship of the Dravidian and Scythian languages which the comparison instituted between them brings to light are, in our view, the correspondences of general form and spirit, apprehension of grammatical relations and treatment of linguistic materials, which they undeniably present. And if the science of comparative philology is strong enough to pronounce with confidence that such correspondences as are here displayed cannot be the result of analogous qualities of race, equal grade of capacity and culture, then the whole question is settled. But we are not certain that she has yet so far mastered the immense field of human speech as to be able to do this, and certainly there are few men living who are entitled to be accepted as her mouth-pieces in making the decision. We shall prefer, then, to consider the question of Dravidian affiliation as one not yet authoritatively settled, while giving Mr. Caldwell full credit for contributing most essentially to its final settlement, by such a thorough genetical and comparative exhibition of the Dravidian idioms as few groups of kindred languages, out of the Indo-European family, have yet received.

---

\* Mr. Webb, apparently from a misapprehension of the meaning of an ambiguous expression once employed by Mr. Caldwell, places Behistun in Beluchistan; it is in fact in western Media, not very far from the Mesopotamian valley.

## ARTICLE VII.

---

# ON LEPSIUS'S STANDARD ALPHABET;\*

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,  
PROFESSOR OF SANSEKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

---

Presented to the Society October 17th, 1861.

---

MORE than once, within no long time past, inquiries have been addressed to us by those to whom the subject was one of practical importance, respecting the "Standard Alphabet" of Prof. Lepsius of Berlin: whether its method was so thorough, its results so correctly deduced, and the system of signs for sounds proposed by it so unexceptionable, that it deserved to be implicitly accepted, and should be made the absolute foundation of the reduction of new languages to a written form, and even allowed to supersede systems of orthography already for some time in use. We have therefore thought that it might be well to bring the matter before the Society at one of its meetings, when it was hoped that there would be those present who had had occasion to consider the orthographical question practically, and to make experience of its difficulties, and when, accordingly, a comparison of opinions might lead to more enlightened conclusions respecting it than are within the reach of a single inquirer. It would have been highly proper if this Society, which maintains so intimate scholarly relations with so large a body of missionaries, scattered over every part of the heathen world, had at the outset given an express examination to Prof. Lepsius's proposed system, and formally sanctioned it, if found worthy of formal

---

\* Standard Alphabet for reducing Unwritten Languages and Foreign Graphic Systems to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters. By Dr. R. Lepsius, etc. London: 1855. 8vo. pp. ix, 73. This is a translation of *Das Allgemeine Linguistische Alphabet. Grundsätze der Uebertragung fremder Schriftsysteme und bisher noch ungeschriebener Sprachen in europäische Buchstaben.* Von R. Lepsius, etc. Berlin: 1855. 8vo. pp. 64.

Since the final revision and preparation for the press of the present Article was completed (Dec. 1861), we have received two additional contributions, of very high importance and interest, made by Prof. Lepsius to the same general subject with that of the work here treated of, in the form of communications to the Berlin Academy on the Phonetic Relations and Transcription of the Chinese and Tibetan Languages, and on the Spoken Alphabet of the Arabic and its Transcription. In both of them reference is made to a second edition of the Standard Alphabet, as in course of

sanction, or else offered criticisms and suggested amendments affecting it. So much might have been regarded as due to the importance of the work, the character of its author, and the auspices under which it was put forth: it having received the express approval of the Berlin Academy, one of the most eminent bodies of learned men, both philologists and physiologists, in the world, and been farther endorsed and recommended by several of the principal English and continental Missionary Societies; as well as, at a later date, by our own American Board. How extensive an actual trial and application the new alphabet has had, and what have been the results of such a practical testing of its merits, we are not fully informed: that it has been substituted at one important mission, at least—that to the Zulus in South Africa—for the alphabet formerly employed, is certain: and it is precisely from that quarter that one remonstrance or expression of dissent has been received. But such remonstrances are by no means to be taken as certain evidence of serious imperfection in a proposed orthographical system. It is a matter of common remark how extremely conservative we are in the matter of the spelling of our own language; what worshippers of the letter as well as of the word; how obstinately unwilling to write a vocable otherwise than as we have been taught to believe was the true traditional way of writing it: and the same tendency to hold fast that which is written does not quit us on foreign soil, and in dealing with strange tongues. Hence a general uniformity of orthographical method is hardly to be hoped for; the end which we may aim to attain is the providing of something like a uniform method for languages still to be reduced to writing, and a norm to which such alterations of existing orthographies as may be found practicable shall be made to conform.

If the missionaries and emissaries sent out to unlettered countries, and destined to be the first introducers there of modes of writing, had from the beginning been only Italians and Germans, the orthographical question would have worn a far less intricate

---

**preparation.** We greatly regret that we could not have made this the basis of our examination of Prof. Lepsius's system, and had almost decided to cancel our Article, or withhold it until we could take due note of any modifications of his views which their republication should exhibit. But, in view of the fact that our criticism has already (in the Proceedings of the Society for Oct. 1861) been announced as to be published in the present number of the Journal, and considering the uncertainty of the time of appearance of the new work, and that the first edition has been very extensively circulated, in its two versions, among missionaries and others, into whose hands the second may never come, we have concluded not to stop the printer. Such changes or fuller expositions of Prof. Lepsius's views as are brought to light in the two papers referred to will be set forth in marginal notes to this article, and should the revised Standard Alphabet, on its appearance, seem to call for yet farther attention, in justice to its author, we shall make it the subject of a separate treatment.

and pressing phase than now belongs to it. Unfortunately—in this respect unfortunately—they have been, in much the greater part, men to whom was native the English language, a language whose phonetical and orthographical system is more frightfully corrupt and confused than that of any other known form of human speech; men to whom, accordingly, it seemed not unnatural to write all kinds of sounds almost all kinds of ways; who lacked a distinct conception that each single sign was originally meant to have a single sound, and each single sound a separate and invariable sign, and that, in the history of writing, certain sounds and no others originally belonged to the characters of our own alphabet. Hence, in part, the confusion, to remedy which so much effort has been expended, and with only partial success. But there is also another, and a more deeply seated cause. Our written system is a scanty, and a rigid and non-elastic thing, compared with our spoken systems. The European alphabet, as it may well enough be called now, was invented—or, rather, modified into nearly its present form—to suit the Latin language at a certain stage of its development. Now phonetical systems grow, both by alteration and by extension; a still scantier system of characters would have answered the purposes of the Latin at a considerably earlier period in its history; but there is not one of the daughters of the Latin which is not both pinched and distorted in the tight and ill-fitting orthographical dress of the mother-tongue. More than this, some languages, or whole families of languages, offer sounds which Latin organs never formed; and these, too, must have their representatives in a general scheme. And yet once more, sounds, occurring in languages either nearly akin with one another or of altogether diverse descent, which to a dull ear, or on brief and imperfect acquaintance, appear quite the same, are yet found, after an intimate familiarity formed with them, to be distinguished by slight differences of quality, dependent upon slightly varying positions of the mouth-organs in their utterance. From these various causes arises the necessity of eking out an imperfect scheme of written characters, in order to make it represent sufficiently a greater number of sounds. This is evidently a thing which cannot be done upon principles commanding universal assent, by the application of rules admitting of distinct statement and impregnable demonstration: it is one into which considerations of history, of usage, of practical convenience, must enter, and which therefore cannot but be differently solved by different people, according to the variations of individual preference: given a system of sounds to be represented, and a system of signs by modified forms of which the representation must be made, and ten different laborers will produce ten different alphabets, each, perhaps, having its advantages, and such that between two or three of them any one may find it hard to

select the best. In order, then, to produce an alphabet for general use, two things, of quite diverse character, are requisite: first, a thorough acquaintance with all matters pertaining to the system of articulate sounds and their established representatives—including an understanding of the physiology of the voice and the mode of production of spoken sounds, an acquaintance with the origin and history of alphabets and the primitive and now prevailing values of the characters composing them, and a familiarity with many tongues, of varying type—and second, such prominence before the eyes of the world, such acknowledged weight as an authority, such support from those for whose sake the work is done, as shall give that work at once a general currency, and recognition as a conventional standard. This second requisite is apt to receive less acknowledgment than it deserves; but it must be evident on a slight consideration that where, in the nature of the case, actual completeness cannot possibly be attained, nor universal satisfaction given, it will be better to accept *in toto* a system which has been and is likely to be accepted by a great many others, than either to alter it considerably, to suit our own ideas, or to take another system, which may be more to our mind, but which will probably be known to and noticed by only a few. And it appears to us that the Standard Alphabet of Prof. Lepsius may at least be claimed to unite and embody these different requisites in a higher degree than any other which has hitherto been put forth.

In the first place, as regards its vogue and acceptance. The name itself of Lepsius is sufficient to attract a high degree of attention and favor to anything to which it is attached. Wherever throughout the world there are scholars, there he is known as one of the foremost scholars of the age, distinguished alike in philology, in archæology, and in history. This work of his, moreover, was brought out under most favorable auspices. It was formally discussed and accepted, before publication, at a convention in London of men representing the most important interests to be affected by such a work. It has since been endorsed by the authorized representatives of four English societies, one French, three German, and one American, as we are informed in the Advertisement prefixed to the book as it lies in our hands: what other associations may since have followed their example, we do not know. This general acceptance, while it is a telling testimony in favor of the work itself, furnishes also a powerful reason why we should incline to take the most favorable view possible of it, even overlooking defects of not too serious a character which it may be found to contain, for the sake of securing a uniformity long desired, and now more hopefully in prospect than ever before. Of course, however, if the new system prove false in its fundamental principles, imperfect in its execution, or

cumbersome in use, no weight of authority should prevail on us to give it our endorsement. Let us therefore inquire more particularly into our author's qualifications for the task he undertook, and examine critically his method and its results.

That Lepsius, before he threw himself especially into the study of Egyptian antiquity, had distinguished himself by philological and palæographical researches exhibiting great learning and great acuteness, is well known to all students of language. That since that time he has devoted much attention to phonology is less known, but not less true. In the year 1853, he exhibited to the writer at Berlin the nearly-completed manuscript of an extended work on phonetics, and explained its general plan and execution. That work has never yet been published, but the one before us may be regarded as founded upon it, perhaps in part excerpted from it. How wide is the basis of observation and comparison upon which its system has been founded is evidenced by the series of more than fifty languages—half of them African, the rest Asiatic, Polynesian, and American—to which, at the close of the little manual, the standard alphabet is applied. We thus have the fullest assurance that we are not solicited to accept the results of a hasty and half-digested, or of a narrow and one-sided, series of investigations; and we cannot help entering upon their examination with no small degree of prepossession in their favor.

A principal distinctive peculiarity claimed to belong to the Standard Alphabet of our author is that it is founded on a physiological basis. The exposition of this basis is, for the sake of brevity, omitted in the treatise; we are left to judge it from the results it yields, in the classification and arrangement of the sounds of the spoken alphabet offered, and in the selection of the signs allotted to them. The claim means, doubtless, that the alphabet is to be looked upon as underlaid by a correct analysis and description of the whole system of articulate sounds, or as involving an accurate determination of the manner in which each is produced, both absolutely, and relatively to others. This is, of course, a prime requisite, without which no alphabet-maker can be anything but a bungler. It does not necessarily imply, however, a knowledge of the anatomy of the vocal organs, a detailed understanding of the construction and action of the parts of the throat which are concerned in the production of sound—although this subject is a highly interesting and curious one, and well repays study. For the organs employed in giving individual and articulate form to the material—unintonated or intonated breath—furnished by the lungs to the mouth for the purposes of speech, are sufficiently within the reach of conscious observation to enable any one who has trained himself to watch their operations to describe and explain, with sufficient minuteness,

the mode of production of the sounds which he utters. There is also another requisite, hardly less fundamental, and which, though not put prominently forward by Prof. Lepsius, is a distinguishing characteristic of his work: one must be thoroughly acquainted with the history, original significance, and various applications of the characters out of which the alphabet is to be constructed. With these two—a thorough comprehension of the sounds for which signs are to be provided, and a complete knowledge of the signs to be employed to represent them—one may hope for a valuable result to his labors: the lack of either would be equally fatal to success.

As we cannot in all points approve and accept the physiological basis upon which our author's alphabet is constructed, we propose to offer here some criticisms upon it, although they may affect only here and there, and in a subordinate degree, the practical result of his work, or the system of signs selected to compose the written alphabet.

In the first place, we object to the division of the spoken alphabet, in a physiological discussion, into the two distinct classes of vowels and consonants. This is a convenient practical classification, but it possesses only a superficial correctness. Even common usage is compelled to bridge over the gulf apparently assumed to exist between the two, by the admission of a class of "semivowels"—that is to say, of sounds which are half vowel and half consonant. In fact, vowel and consonant are only the opposite poles of a continuous line of progression, the successive steps of which are marked by the degrees of approximation of the mouth organs toward a complete closure. All sounds pronounced with more than a certain degree of openness have the quality which we call vocal, and are, to our apprehension, decidedly vowels; all, on the other hand, which have more than a certain degree of closeness possess the consonantal quality only, and are as distinctly consonants. But there is between these two degrees a neutral territory, so to speak; there are degrees of closure producing sounds which, without change of quality, may have the value either of consonants or of vowels. On this neutral ground stand the semivowels, the nasals, and even, in one or two exceptional cases, the sibilants. We cannot sanction, then, a theoretical system which makes the distinction of vowel and consonant absolute and fundamental, which holds the two classes apart from one another, and adopts for them two different methods of classification and arrangement: the unity which belongs to the alphabet as a whole, as a single concordant system, is thus, in our opinion, quite broken up or obscured. In seeking for a principle of arrangement under which to marshal the whole alphabet, we would adopt the same on which is founded the distinction of vowel and consonant, but we would apply it in a

different manner. The ground of distinction is virtually the antithesis of material and form, and the preponderance of the one or of the other. The material is the stream of breath, unintonated or intonated, furnished by the lungs, or by the lungs and larynx, to the mouth organs: the form consists in the modifying action of the latter, converting the material into the greatly varied products which constitute the system of articulate sounds. Now the vowel *a* ("Italian *a*," as in *car*, *father*) is pure material: if the mouth be opened wide, all its organs retained inactive, and the intonated breath suffered to stream forth unimpeded and unmodified, this vowel sound is the result. *A*, then, with this its original and proper value, has a right in theory to stand, as in practice it so generally does stand, at the head of the alphabet. On the other hand, the forming element, the approach and modifying influence of the mouth organs, may be suffered to extinguish the material, as it were, by complete closure, and entire stoppage of the emission of breath, as in the production of the letters we call mutes: these, then, constitute the extreme limit of the alphabet on the consonantal side, as *a* on the vowel side; and between the perfectly open *a* and the entirely close *k*, *t*, *p*,\* must admit of being arranged the whole system of spoken sounds. And not only do all the other sounds lie between these two extremes, but we shall even find that they arrange themselves approximately along lines joining the two, or drawn from the one point *a* to the three *k*, *t*, *p*, respectively. That is to say, there are lines of progression from the neutral openness of *a* towards closure at three different points in the mouth—one produced by a contact of the upper surface of the tongue with the palate in the back part of the mouth, another by contact of the tip of the tongue with the roof of the mouth directly behind and at the base of the upper teeth, the third by contact of the lips with one another; and different degrees of approximation along these lines give rise to the other sounds of the alphabet. On the line of palatal closure, the closest position capable of producing a sound which shall possess a vowel quality gives the vowel *i* (as short and long in *pin*, *pique*). In like manner, on the line of labial closure, the closest producible vowel is *u* (as short and long in *full*, *rule*). The line of lingual closure produces no vowels. These two vowels, *i* and *u*, the farthest removed from *a* in their respective directions, are, with *a*, the most primitive and the most universally occurring of all the vowels: and manifestly for


---

\* Of course, the consonantal limit may consist, in any given language, of as many different members as there are mutes in that language, or points in the mouth at which complete closure is allowed to take place: for the sake of brevity and simplicity, however, we shall here take notice only of those three which are met with in almost every language, and which in a majority of languages, probably, are the only ones found to occur—namely the palatal, lingual, and labial mutes.



the reason that, in the development of the system of articulations, those sounds were first struck out and employed for purposes of speech which were most broadly and markedly distinguished from one another: the more nicely shaded sounds, the intermediate vowels, as also most of the fricative consonants, are the growth of a later time, the product of a longer training of both voice and ear. Between *a* and *i* on the one hand, and *a* and *u* on the other, the two vowels of intermediate position, *e* (short and long in *then, they*) and *o* (long in *note*: the English has no short *o*, except in the pronunciation, frequent in this country, but unacknowledged by the orthoepists, of a few words, as *home, stone, none*), have been first struck out, and, either in their long or short forms, or both, are present in almost all languages; and finally, a few tongues, our own among the number, have developed between *a* and *e* the sound of *a* in *hat*, and between *a* and *o* the sound of *a* in *all*, usually called by us the "short or flat *a*" and the "broad *a*" respectively. These last are written by our author with an underlined *e* and *o*: thus, e, o—a method of transcription to which, as we conceive, no valid objection can be made, and for which we are perfectly willing to relinquish the signs which we have ourselves been hitherto accustomed to use for the sounds in question.

Prof. Lepsius constructs the usual triangle or pyramid of vowels, in the same form as that in which we have here stated it, viz :



but, as we cannot but think, without any due explanation of why they should be thus arranged. Indeed, his treatment of the vowel system is more unsatisfactory and open to criticism than any other part of his work. In the first place, he quits here altogether the physiological basis upon which he professes himself to stand, and, instead of giving us any account of the mode of formation of *a*, *i*, *u*, their relations to one another, and the reasons of their prominence in the history of language, he suffers himself to be seduced into drawing out a fantastic analogy between the vowel sounds and the colors, which has not the slightest substantial ground, neither teaches nor illustrates anything, and can only stand in the way of a clear and objective view of the actual phonetic relations of the subject. "There are three primary vowels," he tells us, "as there are three primary colors," and "the other vowels are formed between these three, as all colors between red, yellow, and blue"! And so onward, through his whole discussion of the vowels, we have nothing in the way of description and illustration other than what is afforded by the drawing out of this fanciful parallel: in place of a physical defi-

dition of any vowel sound, we are referred to the combination of colors which it may be imagined to represent. We submit that this is not merely a leaving out of sight one's physiological basis, but a trampling it under foot and rejecting it for a foundation of cloud; that it is a backsliding into the old reprehensible method in phonetics, of describing and naming things from subjective comparison, instead of from actual analysis and determination of character; and that the whole color analogy is quite unworthy of a place in our author's phonetic manual. Again—and doubtless as a consequence, in the main, of thus leaving out of account the physical mode of production of the vowels—our author appears to misapprehend the relation in which the German *ü* (French *u*) and the German *ö* (French *eu*) stand to the rest of the vowel system. He speaks of *ü* as standing "between" *i* and *u*, and of *ö* as standing "between" *e* and *o*, in the same manner as *e* has between *a* and *i*; and the reason why, between *a* and *i*, language has developed two vowels, *e* and *é* (*a* in *fat*), while between *i* and *u* it shows but one, is, in his apprehension, that "the distance between *a* and *i* is greater than that between *i* and *u*." But, in fact, the two cases are of entirely diverse character. From *a* to *i* is a line of direct progression, a process of gradual approximation of the organs, in which there are theoretically an infinite number of different points, or degrees of closure, each of them giving a different vowel sound—just as there are between the key-note and the fourth an infinite number of possible musical tones, distinguished from one another by minute differences of pitch; although the natural scale makes use of but two of them, the second and the third, as the spoken alphabet of but two of the vowels intermediate between *a* and *i*, viz. *e* and *é*. But between *i* and *u*, as being produced by approximation of the organs at two distinct points in the mouth, there is no line of continuous progression, except by going from either of them back to the neutral point *a*, and thence taking a new start in the direction of the other. It is plain, then, that *ü* cannot be a vowel intermediate between *i* and *u*, in the same sense as *e* between *i* and *a*; it is rather a vowel combined of *i* and *u*, or in the pronunciation of which the position of the lips is that in which *u* is uttered, and, at the same time, the position of the tongue is that in which *i* is uttered. It is quite possible to describe this sound, usually so difficult to be learned by those in whose mother-tongues it does not occur, and to make its acquirement a matter comparatively easy, by laying down this rule: fix the tongue to say *i* (as in *pique*, *machine*), and pronounce that letter; and then, without moving the tongue, fix the lips to say *u* (in *rule*): the combination gives the required sound. To define and teach *ö* is by no means so easy, because the positions assumed by the tongue and lips respectively in its utterance are

less distinct and marked, and so are harder to maintain by conscious effort: there is also less persistent uniformity in its pronunciation than in that of *ü*: while the French *u* and German *ü* are absolutely identical in character, a slight difference is generally acknowledged between the French *eu* and German *ö*; both are, without doubt, combinations of a medial palatal with a medial labial approach of the organs, but the degrees of approximation are very slightly different in the two; indeed, French orthoepists also recognize differences in the quality of their *eu* in different classes of words. We can hardly trust ourselves to pronounce a decided opinion upon matters of so delicate distinction between sounds not native in our own mouth; but we do not think that the differences of quality referred to are greater than subsist between the short and the long *i* in German or English (in *kinn*, *ihn*, or *pin*, *pique*), or between the short *i* of the German and English (which is a little more open than the long *i*) on the one hand, and that of the French (which has precisely the same quality as the English, German, and French long *i*) on the other, or that they call for different characters to represent them. And that there is any like combination of the positions of *e* and *o* (*a* in *fat* and *a* in *all*), forming a third vowel of the same class—as is assumed by our author, in order to fill up his system—we do not at all believe; his *o* may be omitted as superfluous.

Prof. Lepsius proposes to write these two combined vowels, vowels of double position, or palato-labial vowels, as we may call them, in a manner analogous to that adopted in German, but with the double point, or diæresis, written below instead of above the letter, in order to leave room above for marks of quantity, accent, nasalization, and the like. This consideration is well worthy of being taken into account; yet we would suggest that, as most fonts of type contain *ö* and *ü*, and not the reversed forms, it be allowed to employ either without incurring the blame of violating the system. In practice, both forms are about equally serviceable, as it is not usual in continuous text to mark accent and quantity; nor could any ambiguity arise from the license, as the two dots are not elsewhere employed as diacritical signs in the alphabet proposed.

In like manner as the separation of *ö* into two sounds (*o* and *ȯ*), and yet more into three (*o*, *ȯ*, and *ö*), seems to us superfluous, so does also that of *e* into *e* and *ė*, and of *o* into *o* and *ȯ*.\* Our author, indeed, is inconsistent with himself as regards them: now he gives both (p. 26 [24]);† now he gives only one, and at one time only the simple forms, at another (p. 29 [26]) only the dotted.

\* A single dot beneath the vowel is meant to indicate a closer utterance.

† We cite first, in all references to the Standard Alphabet, the page of the English version, adding in brackets the corresponding page of the German original.

In his list of the vowels with illustrative examples (pp. 47, 48 [42, 43]) he includes both, but virtually admits the uselessness of the distinction, by being forced to leave one of the two forms without an example, or else to illustrate it by setting up as discordant the pronunciation of the English *e* in *men* and the German in *wenn*, between which we defy the keenest living ear to detect a difference of quality. We are thus able to dispense with all those signs which have a twofold diacritical mark below—a great advantage, since they could not but be found very cumbersome in practical use.

The vowel usually known in English as "short *u*" (the *u* of *but*, *current*, and the like; the *o* of *son*) is one of the hardest matters with which the constructor of a phonetic alphabet is called upon to deal. Its distinctive character is the absence of character; it is the neutral, the indefinite, the uncharacterized vowel, a product of the intonation of the breath alone, with the lips just parted to give it exit. It differs from *α*, in that for the utterance of the latter the mouth is opened with the honest design and effort to give forth a sound, while for that of the other it is indolently left as nearly shut as may be: both are alike free from any consciously modifying and individualizing action of the mouth organs. The opinion referred to by our author (p. 26 [24]) as held by "some scholars," that the other vowel sounds issued forth and grew into individuality from this one, seems to us to lack even the semblance of a basis. We know of no historical evidence supporting it, nor can we regard it as called for by, or consistent with, sound theory. When an untaught race begin to learn to paint, they do not use neutral tints, but the brightest and most startling colors. The beginnings of speech were attended with hearty effort and labor; the most strongly characterized and broadly distinguished sounds composed its first alphabet; it no more began its vowel system with the neutral vowel than its consonant system with sibilants and spirants. The vowel in question comes in rather by the corruption of other vowels, by the process of slighting them, and robbing them of their distinctive qualities. It can hardly be said to appear at all in the best style of German pronunciation; in French it occurs only as the lightest and briefest possible succedaneum of an *e* which is to be made as nearly mute as may be, or as nasalized in the combination *un*; the English is the only modern European language, so far as is known to us, which elevates it to an entire equality with the other vowels, allows it in accented as well as unaccented syllables, and gives it both a short and a long value (as in *hut*, *hurt*). It is also found extensively in the languages of India, as the result of the dimming of an original short *α*, and it abounds in the idioms of the aborigines of this continent, the general pronunciation of whose vowels, except in

accented syllables, is peculiarly dull and indistinct. The practical question is, what sign shall we choose to represent it? the *u* which to the English apprehension is its most natural sign, the *e* to which alone it belongs in French and German, or the *a* out of which it has generally grown in countries farther east? Our author decides for the second, and writes it as an *e* with a little circle beneath as diacritical point: thus, *ɛ*. This will answer well enough; we have no such objections to urge to the sign as should lead us to reject it entirely; yet we confess that we should ourselves have rather chosen the *a* as a basis, for the reason that there is a nearer relationship between *a* and the sound in question than between the latter and *e*. *E* is a palatal vowel: *a* is neither palatal nor labial, but is, like the neutral vowel, uncharacterized; only in the one case the mouth organs have been by a conscious effort removed, that they may not affect the uttered stream of intonated breath, while in the other, though they contribute nothing by conscious action to the production of the sound, yet, by being left in the way of the breath's free passage, they dim and dull it, producing this grunting sound, the most ungraceful of the whole vowel system—or only less ungraceful than the nasalized form which it assumes in the French *un*.

There are some other points in the scheme of vowel-signs and examples given by our author (pp. 47, 48 [42, 43]), besides those we have already noticed above, which seem to us open to criticism. The English vowel sounds, the special difficulty of which Prof. Lepsius alludes to in another place (p. 25 [23], note), are not always well placed and properly paralleled. The designation of the diphthongs and nasal sounds is also in various instances defective in point of consistency with the rest of the alphabet. To represent, for example, the English *oi* in *join* by a simple *oi*, while the first constituent of the compound is not the sound to which the system assigns *o* for a sign, but that represented by *ō*, is an undesirable inaccuracy. So also the French nasal sound in *bien*, *vin*, cannot properly be written with *ē*, as our author proposes, since the vowel sound which receives the nasal quality is that to which *ē* has been before assigned as representative.

We come now to the consonants. And, having already expressed ourselves as not entirely satisfied with our author's general treatment of them—as a class altogether separate from the vowels, and requiring a diverse method of arrangement—we will here first proceed to set forth our own ideas as to how both classes may and should be presented in one harmonious and concordant system.

As has been remarked above, *i* and *u* are the two vowels of closest possible position on the side of the palate and of the lips respectively. In them we are on the very borders of the consonantal territory; so that even *i* and *u* themselves, when com-

ing before an opener vowel, as *a*, in the same syllable, take on a character no longer purely vocal, and become the "semivowels" *y* and *w*. That the latter are not at all closer in position than their corresponding vowels, we are not prepared to maintain: indeed, it is certain that they are sometimes made so, else we could not utter the syllables *ye*, *woo*: but it is questionable whether they have this greater degree of closeness except when it becomes necessary to distinguish them from a following *i* and *u*; and, at any rate, the difference between them and *i* and *u* respectively is not greater than between long and short *i*, long and short *u*, as pronounced by English and Germans; it is so insignificant that some languages, as the Latin, have no more thought of distinguishing by a different character *y* from *i*, and *w* from *u*, than *i* from *ĩ*, and *u* from *ũ*. It is practically more convenient, however, to have separate signs for the consonantal values of these two vowels, and the great majority of orthographers will agree with our author in adopting such. With *y* and *w* are to be classed, as semivowels, *r* and *l*. In these sounds we begin, at last, the lingual series. We have already noticed that the lingual approximation of the organs, or that of the tip of the tongue to the fore part of the roof of the mouth, gives rise to no vowels proper. The modifying action seems too far from the throat to act with effect upon the stream of intonated breath. It is to be observed that in the production of the labial series of vowels the approach of the lips is not solely the immediate, but in part also the mediate producing cause, by the action which it accompanies and facilitates at the base of the tongue. For it is possible, by a violent effort to change the position of the tongue at its root, to pronounce a pretty clear *a*, even with the lips in the position in which *u* is ordinarily uttered; and, on the other hand, one may bring forth, by a like effort, the whole series of labial vowels, with the lips and teeth held immovably in the position in which one naturally pronounces *i*. But if the lingual position produces no sounds which are solely or prevailingly vocal in their character, its semivowels have in many languages the value of vowels, and it is also much more fertile of consonants than either of the others. Thus, in the rank now under consideration, we have, instead of one semivowel only, two different ones; which, however, are very closely allied, most frequently pass into one another, and in etymology, as is well known to all students of historical philology, hardly count together for more than one letter. They are described by Prof. Lepsius (p. 30 [27]) as both "formed by a contact, which is vibrating in *r*, and partial in *l*." This is not altogether satisfactory: for, as any one who speaks English can perceive, vibration is not necessarily characteristic of *r*; that sound may be uttered as smoothly over the tip of the tongue as any other; and what a "partial contact" is, as distinct from a

near approximation of the organs, such as is universally characteristic of fricative sounds, it is not easy to see. The real definition, if we are not mistaken, is this: *r* and *l* are both breaches of the close position in which a *t* or *d* is produced; in the *r*, the breach is made at the tip of the tongue; in the *l*, it takes place at the sides, the tip remaining in contact with the palate.\* Both may be formed at many different positions along the roof of the mouth: wherever a *d* can be uttered, there it can be broken into an *r* and an *l*. In English, as in Sanskrit, the *r* is ordinarily uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate, and is not vibrated or trilled, as it hardly admits of being in that position: in languages which have developed a "cerebral" series, *r* is properly placed at the head of that rank; where there is none such, it may well enough be left with *l*, in the lingual series. There is also another *l*—not referred to, we believe, by Prof. Lepsius, but forming an important constituent of more than one modern alphabet—which possesses a markedly palatal character, and stands in intimate relations with *y*. It has the distinctive and indispensable characteristic of an *l*, that it is produced by an opening at the sides of the tongue; but the intervening closure is made by the middle surface, and not by the tip, of the tongue: it is the breach of such a *d* as is formed by pressing the flat of the tongue against the roof of the mouth, well within the dome of the palate.

From *y* and *w* respectively, a very slight additional degree of closure gives us the full stoppage of the breath represented by *k* and *p*. And if there is any reason why our author should have arranged the vowels in the triangular method adopted by him, there is precisely the same reason why he should have prolonged the sides of his triangle to their natural terminations in the mutes. If we may follow down the line of progression from *a* to *e*, from *e* to *i*, from *i* to *u*, why not keep on in the same direction, from *u* to *y*, and from *y* to *k*? and why not, in like manner, from *a* to *p*, instead of stopping short at *u*? If the triangle be thus completed, *t* will properly enough occupy the middle of its base, as belonging in the same rank with *k* and *p*, and as being produced by closure of the organs at a point between the labial and the palatal. But before we proceed to construct the triangle, it is necessary to take account of two matters which have not yet been considered. First, though the aperture of the mouth be closed by contact at the three points referred to, there is still a way for the exit of the breath, namely through the nostrils, and the permission of its escape in this way gives rise to a distinct class of sounds, called nasals. There may be, or must be, in any language, as many sounds of this class as there are mutes;

\* In his paper on the Arabic (p. 140), Prof. Lepsius explicitly speaks of the *l* as thus formed.

each letter of complete closure has its corresponding nasal: so to *p*, *t*, *k* correspond *m*, *n*, and the English *ng* (in *sing*; or *n* in *anger*, *ink*). Observation shows us, however, that hardly any language gives to the palatal nasal the same value, as an independent constituent of the alphabet, as to the other two: it is employed only in a subordinate capacity, either solely before a palatal mute, or also at the end of a syllable, where a palatal mute has in pronunciation been lost after it, as in English and German. Hence it has no sign allotted to it in the Latin alphabet, and one must be devised and applied to its designation. Our author chooses *n* with a dot above as diacritical point: thus, *ṅ*—which seems unobjectionable, if not found to be inconsistent with other signs to be adopted later. The second point to be noticed is that the close positions in which *k*, *t*, *p* are uttered give rise, not to those letters only, but also to another set, *g*, *d*, *b*. Prof. Lepsius distinguishes the two classes by calling the latter “soft,” the former “strong” or “sharp”—terms which he prefers, apparently, to the more natural and usual correlative of “soft,” viz. “hard.” This whole nomenclature seems to us exceedingly objectionable, as founded on fanciful analogy rather than on physical analysis. The terms hard and soft, once so usual, have of late become in good degree banished from phonetical works, and their re-introduction by our author is a regrettable step in a backward direction. Much as we dislike the color analogy, already spoken of, we would almost as lief see *a*, *i*, *u*, *ü*, etc., habitually called in our author's pages the red, the yellow, the blue, and the green vowel, etc., respectively, as to find *p* and *b*, and *s* and *z*, entitled the strong and the soft mute or sibilant. The use of these terms by our author, however, depends in great part upon an actual defect in his physiological analysis of the sounds to which they are applied: he has no clear, penetrating, and ever-present appreciation of the difference between what he calls the strong and the soft letters. This defect is something rather characteristically German: it is really amazing how some of the most able physiologists and philologists of that nation have blundered over the simple and seemingly obvious distinction between an *s* and a *z*, an *f* and a *v*, a *p* and a *b*, etc. Thus, to cite but an instance or two, the really eminent physiologist Johannes Müller can see no difference between a *p* and a *b* except a difference in regard to the force of utterance; and the noted grammarian Becker can find nothing better to say of them than that the one, the soft, is naturally fitted to stand at the beginning of a syllable, and the other, the hard, at its end: that is to say, that *but* is a correct and normal compound of sounds, while *tub* is something topsy-turvy, an infraction of the order of nature, and ought not, we suppose, to be uttered—as, by most Germans, it cannot be. The more usual way of settling the difficulty is



to assume what is implied in the names "hard" and "soft": that *s* differs from *z* in being pronounced with a greater effort of the organs; that it is a hard or strong utterance, while *z* is weak or soft: and this is utterly erroneous, for either can, without alteration of its distinctive character, be pronounced with any required degree of force—with the gentlest possible emission of breath, such as hardly yields an audible sound, or with the most violent expulsion of which the organs are capable—and in ordinary use they do not at all differ from one another in this respect. Our author should have allowed himself to be instructed as regards the point in question by the Hindu grammarians, to whom he finds just occasion to refer more than once as distinguished for their skill in phonetic analysis, and capable of becoming our guides to the understanding of the sounds of our own languages (p. 15 [14]): none of them, so far as we know, fails to define correctly the difference between "hard" and "soft" letters. He himself comes very near the true explanation once or twice, as where he notices (p. 27 [24]) that all the soft fricative consonants include in themselves an intonated sound, or vowel: such a sound is, indeed, included in them, as well as in the soft explosives, and it is precisely this that makes them soft, for "soft" differs from "hard" solely in being uttered with intonated breath, instead of unintonated; that is to say, with sound, instead of breath alone. It may seem a contradiction to speak of a mute letter—for instance, a *b*—as uttered with intonated breath; but the difficulty is only an apparent one. Intonated breath, as any one may readily convince himself by experiment, can be forced up into the mouth even when closed, until the cavity of the mouth is filled with the air so expelled. Thus, with the lips compressed, and no exit permitted through the nose, one may make a sound, in which, even without the closure broken, the ear will recognize a *b* quality, and which will last until the cheeks are fully distended, perhaps a second or two: time enough, though short, to utter a dozen *b*'s in. The syllable *pa* differs from *ba*, then, in this: in the former case, the intonation of the breath, the expulsion of sound, begins the instant that the labial contact is broken; in the latter case, it begins the instant before: *apa* differs from *aba* in that, in the one, the breath loses its sonant quality during the instant of closure represented by *p*; in the other, there is no cessation of intonation from beginning to end of the utterance. In the fricative or continuous letters, as *s*, *z*, or *f*, *v*, the case is yet more conspicuously clear; and no one, we are confident, can fail to convince himself by a very little trial that the only difference between any such pair of sounds lies in the difference of the material which is furnished from the lungs and throat to that position of the mouth organs which is characteristic of both. The only proper names, then, by which the two classes of sounds should be distinguished are intonated and unintonated, vocal and

aspirate, sonant and surd, or the like, and such terms ought to be substituted throughout for our author's "soft" and "strong," to the rigorous exclusion of the latter.\*

\* In his papers on the Chinese and Tibetan and on the Arabic, Prof. Lepsius recognizes the difference in respect to intonation between the two classes of sounds here in question, and more usually calls them by names which are measurably free from the objections we have urged against "soft" and "strong." But in the latter paper (pp. 106-10), after an elaborate discussion of the phonetic relations of the two classes, he comes anew to the conclusion, which we cannot but deem an erroneous one, that, while intonation does indeed constitute a usual distinction between strong and soft sounds, it is not, after all, the primary and fundamental one: this being, rather, the difference in strength of the emitted breath. Without entering into a detailed analysis of his argument, which would necessarily occupy several pages, we would point out that there are two circumstances by the misinterpretation of which he seems to be especially led astray. The first is, that there is actually a less emission of breath in the production of the intonated than in that of the unintonated letters. If there is no intonation, if the vocal cords remain relaxed, the whole aperture of the larynx is left open for the escape of breath, and the lungs may in a very brief moment be entirely emptied of their content; if there is intonation, the aperture is almost closed by the elevation and approximation of the membranous valves the vibration of whose edges produces the tone; a mere slit is left for the passage of the breath, and this cannot be completely expelled from the lungs until after a prolonged utterance of sound. Thus, other things being equal, a surd letter will cause a greater expenditure of breath than a sonant; but it is, we are sure, a direct reversal of the true relation of things to make the diminution of the column of breath the primary, and the intonation the secondary and subordinate circumstance. We understand Prof. Lepsius, by his scale of *maxima* and *minima*, to admit that more breath may be expended in the violent utterance of a sonant than in the gentle utterance of a surd; yet to hold that the strength of utterance is the main thing, because, through the whole scale of degrees of force, the surd sound would employ more breath than the sonant of corresponding strength. Is not this very much as if one were to say that the essential physical difference between male and female lies in the inferior strength of the latter; since, though a man of *minimum* power may be weaker than a woman of *maximum* power, yet a *maximum* man is stronger than a *maximum* woman, and a *minimum* man than a *minimum* woman? If we may increase and diminish the force of utterance of either a surd or a sonant letter, and to a marked degree, without alteration of their distinctive character, then it seems clear that force of utterance cannot be their distinguishing characteristic: while, on the other hand, if it be true, as we confidently maintain, that the element of intonation cannot possibly be introduced into an *f*, for instance, without immediately and necessarily converting it into a *v*, nor the element of intonation taken away from a *v* without at once making an *f* of it, we cannot hesitate to regard the presence or absence of intonation as determining absolutely the distinctive character of the sounds in question.

The other circumstance to which we regard Prof. Lepsius as giving a false value is that in whispering we are able, to a certain extent, to make audible the distinction between surd and sonant. In whispering, the place of tone is taken by a rustling of the breath through the larynx—we presume, between the edges of the vocal cords, which are approximated, but not sufficiently so, nor with tension enough, to produce actual sonant vibration, although approaching this in proportion to the effort which is made to attain loudness and distinctness. It may be compared to the first hoarse rush of steam through an imperfect steam whistle, approaching, and finally passing over into, clear sound. There is enough of resonance in it to make all the vowels and semivowels distinctly audible, and it can in some measure perform the same office for the sonant consonants: yet very imperfectly; it requires a labored effort at distinctness of utterance, and the close attention of an ear not too far removed, to distinguish a whispered *saza* and *fava* from *zasa* and *vafa*. We cannot see that the possibility of this partial substitution of an imperfect for a perfect intonation militates at all against the theory which regards intonation as the essential distinction of the sonant letter from the surd.

We would construct as follows the complete tableau of the principal sounds thus far treated of :

|             |   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |   |           |
|-------------|---|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| Vowels,     | { | $\begin{array}{c} \phantom{i} \phantom{e} \phantom{o} \\ \phantom{i} \phantom{e} \phantom{o} \\ i \phantom{e} \phantom{o} \\ \phantom{i} \phantom{e} \phantom{o} \\ \phantom{i} \phantom{e} \phantom{o} \end{array}$                                                             | } |           |
| Semivowels, |   | $\begin{array}{c} y \phantom{r} \phantom{l} \phantom{w} \\ \phantom{y} \phantom{r} \phantom{l} \phantom{w} \\ \phantom{y} \phantom{r} \phantom{l} \phantom{w} \\ \phantom{y} \phantom{r} \phantom{l} \phantom{w} \\ \phantom{y} \phantom{r} \phantom{l} \phantom{w} \end{array}$ |   | } Sonant. |
| Nasals,     |   | $\begin{array}{c} \dot{n} \phantom{n} \phantom{m} \\ \phantom{\dot{n}} \phantom{n} \phantom{m} \\ \phantom{\dot{n}} \phantom{n} \phantom{m} \\ \phantom{\dot{n}} \phantom{n} \phantom{m} \\ \phantom{\dot{n}} \phantom{n} \phantom{m} \end{array}$                               |   |           |
| Mutes,      | { | $\begin{array}{c} g \phantom{d} \phantom{b} \\ \phantom{g} \phantom{d} \phantom{b} \\ k \phantom{t} \phantom{p} \\ \phantom{k} \phantom{t} \phantom{p} \\ \phantom{k} \phantom{t} \phantom{p} \end{array}$                                                                       | } | } Surd.   |

The nasals create a little difficulty in the arrangement of the alphabet, inasmuch as they introduce an element which has no part in the formation of the other letters, and, while in position of the mouth organs they are close, like the mutes, they are nevertheless, in virtue of the freedom of the passage which they unclose, quite open letters, having many important analogies with the semivowels and vowels. Thus, both *n* and *m* are sometimes used as vowels, like *r* and *l*. For this reason we place them next the semivowels, between these and the mutes. Again—and this is perhaps the most marked common characteristic which unites them into one class—the vowels, semi-vowels, and nasals have all together but one corresponding surd, the letter *h*. This letter our author refers to a new class which he sets up, and calls the “faucal”: he describes it as produced “behind the guttural point, immediately at the larynx” (p. 39 [34]). We cannot quite agree with this treatment of the *h*, which seems to imply that it has a characteristic position of its own, or is pronounced with the mouth organs fixed in a certain way, which we think is plainly not the case. Our European *h*, although in great part of guttural origin, has become a mere breathing, and is always uttered in the same position with the next following letter, which letter can be no other than a vowel, semivowel, or nasal. The *h* which precedes an *ī*, as in the word *he*, is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the organs which belongs to the *ī*, or through the close palatal position; before *ū*, as in *hoot*, it is uttered through the close labial position; the same is true of the *h* which precedes the semivowels *y* and *w*, as in the words *hue* (*hyū*) and *when* (*hwēn*); and the Greek rough breathing before *ϕ* was doubtless of like character. That is to say, in the production of the vowels, semivowels, and nasals, the approximation of the organs is not so close that the utterance through them of unintonated breath can give sounds individually characterized, and capable of being employed as independent members of the alphabetic system: all their positions together add but a single surd to the alphabet, the simple breathing or aspiration *h*. In the rest of the system, on the other hand, each position of the mouth organs adds to the alphabet two sounds, produced by the emission, the one of intonated breath, the other of unintonated.

And this distinction seems to us to draw through the system a more marked line of separation, to divide it into two classes more decidedly different from one another, than that between vowels and consonants. If we were to separate the alphabet into two great classes, it would be rather here than there.

In proceeding to fill in the other classes of sounds which help to make up the complete alphabetic system, we may commence with the sibilants. The sibilant most universally found to occur, and the oldest and only primitive one in our family of languages, is the lingual *s*. This is, like *r*, a breach, made at the tip of the tongue, of the position of closure in which *t* is pronounced: the breach is a less open one, and the material expelled through it is the unintonated breath. Hence the so frequent historical transition of *s* into *r*; and hence even, in the Sanskrit, the prevailing phonetic relation of *s* and *r* as corresponding surd and sonant. The *s*, however, has its precise sonant correlative in *z*, which is pronounced with exactly the same position and degree of closure, and differs only in the material expelled, which is intonated. The other common sibilant is that which in our language is written, though a simple sound, with the compound sign *sh*. Prof. Lepsius does not expressly define it, yet we gather from what he says of it on page 45 [40], and from his classing it as "dental," that he would describe it in a manner with which we could not agree. The most instructive and decisive experiment which one can try in his own mouth upon the sibilants, is to apply the tip of the tongue to the roof of the mouth in front, just behind the upper teeth, uttering an *s* there, and then to pass the tip slowly backward along the palate, continuing the sibilant sound. It will be perceived that, for a brief space, the resulting sound is clearly such as we should call an *s*, but that, as soon as the tongue passes the ridge at which the dome of the palate rather abruptly rises, the sibilant assumes the character of an *sh*, and maintains it, with unimportant change of quality, as far back as the tongue can reach in the mouth. The ridge referred to forms the dividing line between the region where *s* and that where *sh* is uttered, and this difference of region constitutes the essential distinction between the two sounds. The tip of the tongue is not necessary to the formation of either: its upper flat surface, applied in front of the ridge, is used by some persons in their ordinary utterance of *s*; while the usual *sh* is always produced by that part of the organ, applied within the dome: the *sh* sound, slightly different in quality from this, which is brought forth by turning the tip of the tongue back into the dome of the palate, is the Sanskrit "cerebral" *sh*—a distinct cerebral, like all the other letters of its class, and not identical with our *sh*, although so nearly akin with it. The position of the *sh* and its corresponding sonant *zh* (*z* in *azure*: the French *j*) is thus between the palatal and the

lingual letters, but very decidedly more akin with the former. The term "dental" is an incorrect one as applied to it, since not only are the teeth not at all concerned in its production, but it is even originated at a point quite distant from them. We have carefully avoided the use of the term dental throughout, because we think it a misnomer, even as allotted to *s*, *z*, *d*, and *t*. By long and careful trial, we have convinced ourselves that the close approach and contact which give origin to these sounds are not upon the teeth themselves, but immediately at their base and behind them. Even though the tip of the tongue touch the teeth in the utterance of *t* and *d*, the determining contact is upon the gum: the only sound producible between the tongue and the teeth themselves is that of *th*; the teeth are not tight enough to make a mute closure.

In his selection of a sign for this pair of sibilants, our author has not been quite so happy as usual. After rejecting the *s* with a *spiritus asper* above it (thus:  $\text{š}$ ), because the latter has a value of its own, which would not belong to it as thus used, he adopts as diacritical mark the usual sign of a short vowel, which is liable to precisely the same objection, and writes  $\text{š}$ ,  $\text{ž}$ . We should have chosen *s'*, for just the analogy on account of which our author rejects it—because we regard the sound as properly palatal, and think it identical with the Sanskrit palatal sibilant. A dotted *s*, or  $\text{š}$ , would also have pleased us better than the sign adopted, as being more easily written, and not suggesting a value which it does not possess. Still, the point is one of inferior consequence, and we should not think of seriously quarreling with the method of representation proposed by Prof. Lepsius.\*

The sounds of the English *ch* in *church*, and *j* and *g* in *judge*, are represented in our author's system by  $\text{čš}$  and  $\text{dž}$ , as being evidently compound sounds, containing as their final elements the surd and sonant sibilants just treated. These signs, however, include a slight inaccuracy, which we presume did not escape the notice of Prof. Lepsius, but was neglected by him as of insignificant importance. The *t* and *d*, namely, which form the first constituents of the compounds, are not the ordinary *t* and *d*, as uttered close behind the teeth, and with the tip of the tongue: they are brought forth within the dome of the palate, and by the flat of the tongue—that is to say, by a contact of the same organs, and at the same point, where a near approximation gives the *sh* sound. We properly require, then, some diacritical point to distinguish them from the common linguals, from which they differ quite as much, and in very nearly the same way, as the

---

\* In his later papers, we observe that he substitutes an angular mark, like a circumflex inverted, for the circular one: thus,  $\text{š}$ —following, apparently, the Slavonian usage to which he refers on page 35 [31].

Semitic sounds written by our author with a line beneath (*t̄* and *d̄*)—perhaps still more nearly as the Sanskrit palatals (according to his understanding of their character), which he represents by *k'*, *g'*. The inaccuracy, it is true, is in great measure excused by the practical inconvenience of adding a second diacritical mark to the compounds, and by the awkwardness of introducing two new characters into alphabets which know the sounds represented by them only in these combinations; yet we should be inclined to draw from it an argument in favor of a yet simpler mode of representation. Considering the peculiar intimacy with which the elements of the sounds in question are combined—such that some orthoepists still persist in regarding them as simple, and that more than one language, elsewhere very careful to make its vowels long before double consonants, does not allow them to constitute position—we should not be unwilling to turn to account in their representation the otherwise useless *c* and *j* of the Latin alphabet. To write *c* for the sound *ch*, and to retain *j* with its English value would, indeed, involve the inconsistency of writing compound sounds with simple signs; but this inconsistency may be set off against the inaccuracy of writing *t̄s*, *d̄z*; and if we are dealing with a matter so knotty as to compel us at any rate to a violation of our system, is it not better to err on the side of practical convenience?\*

The labial series has no sibilants; for its pair of fricatives, surd and sonant, expressed in our author's system by *f* and *v*, with their English values, so lack the hissing quality which distinguishes the lingual, palatal, and cerebral sibilants, that it seems preferable to put them into another class; which, for lack of a better name at hand, we will call the "spirants." Of these two, the *f* is more universally found, and of earlier development—which is apt to be the case, as between surd and sonant letters of the same organic position. In their ordinary pronunciation, the upper teeth are placed directly upon the lower lip, and the breath, unintonated or intonated, forced out between them. They would be most accurately described, then, as dento-labials. The German utterance of these sounds, however (and the same thing is claimed by some for the Latin *f*), brings the teeth much less distinctly into action: the German *f* and *v* (*w*) are almost purely lip sounds, crowded in upon the labial series between *w* and *p*, *b*.

---

\* The later papers of our author, already more than once referred to, show that he appreciates the force of this argument, and that the second edition of his Standard Alphabet will permit the use of *c* and *j* to represent the compound sounds here in question—yet with the addition to them of the same diacritical mark which he finally adopts for the *sh* and *zh* sounds: thus, *č*, *ǰ*. These signs are quite an improvement, in our view, on the *t̄s* and *d̄z* which they replace, yet we hardly appreciate the necessity of writing with diacritical points characters not elsewhere employed in the alphabet.

The spirants of the lingual series are the two sounds, surd and sonant, of the English *th*, as instanced in the two words *thin* and *this*. They are properly dento-linguals, being, unlike the other letters commonly called "dental," actually produced between the tongue and the upper teeth. What part of either shall be used is a matter of indifference: the same sound is originated, whether the tip of the tongue be set against the inner surface of the teeth (only not so as to form a contact upon the gums), or whether its tip or any part of its upper surface be applied under the points of the teeth. For foreigners, who are wont to find great difficulty in catching and imitating this sound, it is a method infallibly attended with success to seize the end of the tongue between the teeth, and hold it firmly there, while the breath is forced out over it.

Before examining the characters adopted by Prof. Lepsius for the lingual spirants, it will be well to consider the rules which, at the outset of his treatment of the consonants (pp. 31-2 [28]), he lays down as necessary to be followed in the work of fitting signs and sounds to each other. The first two of these rules—that every simple sound is to be represented by a simple sign, and that different sounds are not to be expressed by one and the same sign—are of obvious propriety, and their generally binding character will, we are sure, be universally assented to—yet even to the first of these we have been ready above to admit a single exception (or rather, to replace by it an exception admitted by our author himself to the second), in a peculiar case, and in order to gain what seemed to us an important practical advantage. The third rule is to the effect that those European characters which have a different value in the principal European alphabets are not to be admitted into a general alphabet. This shuts out from all employment such letters as *c*, *j*, *x*. To such a rule we are very loth to yield assent. With so scanty an alphabet as the Latin for material to make our system of characters of, it is very hard to have any part of it ruled out of use in advance, unless for more cogent reasons than can be urged in favor of this rule. The multiplication of diacritical points, the introduction among the familiar letters of our alphabet of others of a discordant form and style, like the Greek, are both very inconvenient and very distasteful, and if they can possibly be avoided, wholly or partly, by a judicious use of Roman letters which would otherwise be left idle, practical good sense would seem to teach us so to avoid them. The value of the signs composing the general alphabet must, of course, be learned by every person who is to use it: not a single language possesses all its characters in the signification it attributes to them; it is but a small matter to add one or two more to the list of those which each person must teach himself to apply in a different way from that to which he has

been accustomed, or to adopt one or two convenient signs which in their assigned value must be learned by a majority instead of a minority, or a larger instead of a smaller majority, of those who use the alphabet. In fact, Prof. Lepsius himself furnishes a sufficient argument against his own rule, by palpably violating it in more than one instance: we will not insist upon the circumstance that he presumes to write the vowels and diphthongs by characters used according to their Italian values, while the English language, and in a less degree the French, gives them in many cases a quite different signification: but he also adopts *w* for the labial semivowel, in spite of the more usual value of the sonant spirant (*v*), which it has in other languages than English; he takes *y* for the palatal semivowel, although it is vowel, vowel and semivowel combined, and diphthong, one or all, in the principal languages of Europe: he represents the deeper palatal of the Semitic languages by *q*, which has not that value in a single European language; nor is his use of *v* and *z* free from similar objections. In every one of these cases, we heartily approve of the choice which he has made; but we do not approve of his cutting himself and us off from other such convenient adaptations, by the peremptory action of a rule which he observes so imperfectly. The fourth rule runs as follows: Explosive letters are not to be used to express fricative sounds, and *vice versa*. That is to say, for instance, *c*, of which the original sound was that of *k*, an explosive, or full mute, must not be used as a base upon which to form a character to represent the fricative, or continuable, sound of the German *ch*; *t* must not be altered to express the *th* sound, and so on. It is difficult to see why this should be made a peremptory rule, the binding force of which is not to be set aside by any opposing considerations. On the contrary, since the spirants, for example, historically develop themselves in numerous instances from the mutes, there would seem to be a peculiar propriety in developing their representative signs also from those of the mutes—if practical considerations be found to favor rather than oppose such a process. Our author's last two rules, we think, might better have been stated as important leading principles, not to be set aside without good and sufficient reasons.

But to return to the lingual spirants.—For the surd *th* sound, as heard in *thin*, *throw*, *path*, Prof. Lepsius adopts the Greek  $\vartheta$  as representative: not without reluctance, for he feels the great undesirableness of introducing foreign characters into the Latin alphabet, and also allows that the primitive sound of  $\vartheta$  was not fricative, like our *th*, but an aspirated *t*, or a *t* with an *h* closely following it. He is restrained, however, by his fourth rule from accepting any diacritically distinguished form of our explosives *t* and *d* to indicate the fricative spirants. We, on the other



hand, do not see why, if the rule is a good one, it ought not to hold good in dealing with the Greek as well as with the Latin alphabet, and we should have decidedly preferred to see our author devise some modification of *t* and *d*, of a different kind from those assumed to represent the "cerebral" and "palatal" *t* and *d*—for instance, a *t* and *d* with a stroke drawn through them—to stand for the sounds in question. But there are objections yet more powerful to his manner of dealing with the sonant sound, the *th* of *this*, *though*, *with*. Recurring to his erroneous explanation of the difference between surd and sonant letters, and regarding the sonant as a weaker or softer utterance of the surd, he proposes to mark the former with the same Greek letter  $\vartheta$ , only writing a *spiritus lenis* above it to indicate its gentler pronunciation. Here, for the first time, we must positively decline to accept his proposal. It is hard enough to have to borrow a Greek letter for the surd sound; but to take the same sign for the sonant also, while everywhere hitherto surd and sonant have had different characters, and then to mark their difference by a sign which is founded upon and implies a false theory—this is more than we can possibly consent to do. Far better were it to follow the course for which our author himself expresses a preference, but, from an underestimate of the difficulties attending the other course, does not venture to adopt: namely, to take the Greek  $\delta$  for the sonant character. If we must accept  $\vartheta$ , let us by all means have  $\delta$  also, in its Modern Greek value: that is even a less violation of the proprieties of the Ancient Greek than to set the smooth breathing over a consonant, and with a value in no way belonging to it.\*

The two sounds of the German *ch*—the one following *a*, and the labial vowels *o*, *u*, the other following the vowels of palatal position, *e*, *i*, *ü*, *ö*, and those compounds of which the final element is palatal, as *ei*, *eu*—are allotted by Prof. Lepsius to the guttural and palatal classes respectively. The distinction between the two in respect to mode of formation is sufficiently clear: each is a rough *h*, as we may call it, rasped through the organs with the least possible change from the position of the preceding vowel. If the vowel is a palatal one, uttered between the upper surface of the tongue and the roof of the mouth, the succeeding *ch* is of the same character; it is produced by an expulsion of unintonated breath through the same position made a little more close: or it may even be by a more violent expulsion through the unchanged position, a throwing out of more breath than can pass the organs without audible friction. The *ch* after *a*, *o*, *u* is brought forth farther back, at the deepest point in the

---

\* We note that Prof. Lepsius has himself later definitively adopted  $\delta$  and  $\gamma$  as signs for the dental and palatal sonant spirants.

throat, as it seems to us, where the organs can be so approximated as to yield a fricative sound, or at the point where the familiar and ungraceful operation of clearing the throat, or hawking, is performed. The former of the two, we think, approaches decidedly more nearly than the other to the point at which *k* and *g* are produced, and it is to be reckoned as of the same class with them. Prof. Lepsius calls *k* and *g* "gutturals," according to a very generally received nomenclature, and he ranks with them the deeper *ch* sound. We have all along avoided the use of the term guttural, as applied to the series in which the two mutes referred to belong, because it seems to us to suggest and imply a point farther back in the mouth than that at which they are actually produced. We entirely agree with our author (p. 40 [36]) in locating the place of utterance of *k* upon the soft palate, close upon where it joins the hard palate: their junction seems to be the line of division between lingual and palatal mutes, and behind it, even with the tip of the tongue, one produces a sound which is rather a *k* than a *t*. But the anterior part of the soft palate is hardly entitled to be called "guttural", or regarded as generating "guttural" letters: that term should rather be reserved for the deeper place of origin of the other *ch*; at or very near which is also produced, if our author's description be correct, the Semitic *koph* (Arabic ك, Hebrew פ), very properly written by him with *q*, its graphic, though not its phonetic, equivalent in the European alphabet.

To represent the *ch* sounds, our author proposes to make use of the Greek letter *χ*, writing the deeper or guttural sound with the simple character, *χ*, and the higher or palatal with the same character accented, or *χ̂*. Precisely the same objections lie against this expedient as against the adoption of *ϑ*, already treated of; and for our own part, at least, we should have preferred to take another course. There is a Latin letter still left unemployed in our author's proposed alphabet, which, although its usual signification is quite different from the sound now sought to be represented, has that signification in at least one of the principal languages of Europe, the Spanish; and which, moreover, is the graphic correspondent in Latin of the Greek *χ*: we mean the letter *α*. Prof. Lepsius has considered the question of applying this letter to signify the *ch* sounds, and he rejects it, pronouncing it (p. 33 [30]) "altogether improper" for such a use. It is true that there are considerations of weight against it, of which we are by no means sure that they will not with many or with most judges have a preponderating influence, and cause the rejection of our proposal: but, in our own apprehension, they are all overborne by the signal advantage of taking a proper Latin sign, and turning to account all the characters of the Latin alphabet. The two points of connection between the sound and the sign

which are furnished by the Spanish value of the latter, and by its graphic relation to *x*, we are ready to accept as sufficient, scanty though they are. It were, in fact, a great pity to come so near to adopting *x*, and yet not quite take it. If our author's proposal is followed, we shall, whenever his character is to be written as a capital, use the Latin *X*: why not accept the other form also—calling it, if we choose, latinizing our *x*, in order to adapt it to being written and printed with the other Latin letters?

The sonant corresponding to the surd *ch* sound is comparatively rare, and, if we are not mistaken, chiefly restricted to the deeper or guttural pronunciation: the palatal would pass too readily into *y* to be easily kept distinct from that semivowel. If the surd is to be written with *x*, we should unhesitatingly take *γ* for the sonant, as is half proposed by our author; the *χ* which he finally decides to adopt is to be rejected, like *θ*, and for the same reason.\* If *x* should be accepted as the sign of the surd, it would be necessary, probably, to devise some modification of *γ* for the sonant.

We have, then, the following, as a more complete scheme of a developed alphabet than was the skeleton formerly given: it contains the consonantal sounds most widely met with, including all those found in the English spoken alphabet:

|        |                 |                                                                                                                                                                                      |          |           |             |                |             |                |
|--------|-----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Sonant | {               | $\begin{array}{cccccc} & & a & & & \\ & & e & e & o & \\ & e & \ddot{o} & & o & \\ i & & \underbrace{\quad\quad\quad} & & & u \\ & & \underbrace{\quad\quad\quad} & & & \end{array}$ |          |           |             |                |             | } Vowels.      |
| Surd   |                 | h                                                                                                                                                                                    | <i>y</i> | <i>n̄</i> | <i>r, l</i> | <i>n</i>       | <i>w</i>    | } Semivowels.  |
| Sonant | <i>z̄</i>       | <i>z</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Sibilants.   |
| Surd   | <i>š</i>        | <i>s</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Nasals.      |
| Sonant | <i>γ</i>        | <i>δ</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Aspirations. |
| Surd   | <i>χ</i>        | <i>θ</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Spirants.    |
| Sonant | <i>g</i>        | <i>d</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Mutes.       |
| Surd   | <i>k</i>        | <i>t</i>                                                                                                                                                                             |          |           |             |                |             | } Compound.    |
| Sonant | <i>j</i>        |                                                                                                                                                                                      |          |           |             |                | } Compound. |                |
| Surd   | <i>c</i>        |                                                                                                                                                                                      |          |           |             |                | } Compound. |                |
|        | Palatal Series. | Lingual Series.                                                                                                                                                                      |          |           |             | Labial Series. |             |                |

Some things in this scheme require explanation, since it is not in all points so theoretically exact as the simpler one before presented. The vowels of double position, *ü* and *ö*, are placed

\* See the preceding note.

where they stand for the sake of convenience, and not as belonging in any manner to the lingual series: this is indicated by the line drawn below them, from which the lingual series is to be regarded as commencing. For the same reason, the neutral vowel is given a position under the *a*, with which, as explained above, it has the nearest relation. The labial spirants might suitably enough be set somewhat to the left, and the lingual spirants somewhat to the right, of the places allotted to them respectively, since each pair brings in a new organ, the teeth, intermediate in position between the lips and tongue. For a like reason, the palatal sibilants are entitled to a position farther to the right: they might, in a yet more fully expanded scheme, be set in an independent column. That the labial and lingual spirants are letters of closer position than the sibilants, and therefore to be placed between these and the mutes, is very clear. In their production, the teeth are actually in contact with the lip and with the tongue respectively, and it is only because the teeth are too open among themselves to be capable of making a close position that the resulting sounds are fricative, and not explosive. This is not the case with the *ch* sounds, which we have put in the same rank; these have, in many respects, closer analogies with the sibilants than with the spirants, and would be quite as properly ranked with the former; yet, as they lack the full measure of sibilation, are certainly somewhat closer in position than their nearest relatives among the sibilants, the *sh* sounds, and have historical analogies with the spirants—coming, in great part, from *kh*, as *ʒ* from *th*, and *f* from *ph*—we have ventured to give them the place they occupy in the scheme.

The alphabet, as thus drawn out, by no means includes all the sounds which our author treats, and for which he provides representatives. Some languages present whole series of consonantal sounds differing from those we have thus far considered. In most cases, however, they admit of being arranged without difficulty within the same general alphabetic frame-work. Thus, the series representing the Arabic ط, ص, ض would come in just at the left of the common lingual series, being uttered, according to our author's description of them,\* by applying the flat of the tongue, instead of its tip, to the same part of the palate where the tip produces the lingual letters, and being also, by general acknowledgment, uttered with greater effort, or stress of enunciation: they are very suitably represented in our author's system by the ordinary lingual letters, *t*, *d*, *s*, *z*, with an underscored line: thus, *ṭ*, *ḍ*, *ṣ*, *ẓ*. The Sanskrit so-called "cerebrals" would come next in order to the left; they have been already referred

---

\* See his special paper on the Arabic for a more penetrating investigation of these sounds, leading to somewhat different views respecting their character.

to, as uttered by turning back the tip of the tongue within the dome of the palate: Prof. Lepsius represents them in the usual manner, by lingual letters dotted beneath: thus, *ṭ*, *ḍ*, *ṣ*, *ṇ*. To the left of these, again, would have to be ranged the letters of the Sanskrit series usually called the "palatal," if our author's view of them, as simple sounds, be accepted as the true one. They are now pronounced like the English *ch* and *j*, and are more usually regarded as having had that signification from the beginning. It is not the proper place here to enter into a discussion of this difficult point: we will only say that the considerations adduced by our author in opposition to the common view, though very weighty, do not appear to us entirely convincing; and that we cannot regard the mutes of the series in question as differing from the English *ch* and *j* in such a manner and degree as to require other representatives than the signs already provided for those sounds. As for the sibilant of the class, we have already expressed our belief in its virtual identity with our English *sh*. Prof. Lepsius adopts the acute accent as sign of the peculiar palatal quality inherent in these letters, and writes the mutes, sibilant, and nasal as follows: *ḳ́*, *ǵ̣*, *ṣ̣́*, *ṇ̣́*. To the two last, as representing the palatal *ch* sound of the German, and the English *n* in *inch*, *hinge* (if the latter is worth expressing by a peculiar character at all), we have no objection—except that, as already explained, we would substitute *x'* for *ṣ̣́*—the other two we do not think well chosen, even allowing the correctness of our author's explanation of their quality: for sounds produced by pressing the broad middle of the tongue against the middle of the hard palate (p. 42 [38]) would not have anything of that quality which we represent by *k*, *g*, but would be distinctly a kind of *t*, *d*: no letter produced farther forward than the soft palate can be entitled to use *k* or *g* as its representative. The difference between our alleged "palatal" pronunciation of *k* before *e*, *i*, and our "guttural" before *a*, *o*, *u*, is exceedingly slight, and by no means such as would be made in any alphabet the foundation of a distinction of classes and characters: the only way to establish a valid distinction between a palatal and a guttural *k* and *g* in the Sanskrit system would be to regard the latter class as uttered at the deep guttural position of our author's *g* (Semitic *koph*), and the former as corresponding to our customary *k*, *g*.

Finally, Prof. Lepsius gives us a class of "faucal" sounds, which has not, so far as we know, been recognized by any other author as a distinct and connected series. As constructed by him, it has a very regular and normal look, comprising a pair of fricatives and a pair of explosives, each pair being composed, as elsewhere, of a "soft" and a "strong" sound; inasmuch that the series seems quite analogous to the lingual *s*, *z*, *t*, *d*, or to the

labial *f*, *v*, *p*, *b*. But the analogy turns out, on closer examination, to be only apparent, and there are such weak points in the construction of the class as forbid us to accept it and place it parallel with those already received into the general alphabetic scheme. The first member of the series is the common aspiration *h*. Of this we have already sufficiently spoken, showing why we cannot regard it as "faucal": it is faucal in no other sense than as all voice, intonated or unintonated, must of course come through the fauces; and so, if there is no modifying action on the part of the mouth organs, the sound produced might, in a negative way, be styled a throat-sound, or a faucal, or a laryngal. But the *h* is plainly no member of a faucal series in the sense in which the other sounds we have been considering are members of a palatal series, a lingual series, and so on—namely, as having received a distinctive character by the action of the organ from which it derives its name; it is simple unintonated material, breath uncharacterized, or insufficiently characterized. The next member of the series is the Greek smooth breathing. This is regarded by Prof. Lepsius as a consonant, which necessarily and invariably precedes and ushers in a vowel not immediately preceded by any other consonant; he defines it as consisting in a slight explosion produced by the opening of the throat for the effort of utterance. Now we are quite unable to convince ourselves that there is any such thing as this alleged smooth breathing, having a positive and necessary existence. It is, indeed, possible to shut the throat and open it again before a vowel with an audible click (and yet the click will hardly be audible unless the following vowel is whispered only, instead of being intonated, or unless between it and the click a little emission of unintonated breath be suffered to intervene); but it is equally possible to substitute for the click a very slight open breathing, an infinitesimal *h*; and not less so, again, to commence the vowel without any prefix whatever which the nicest ear can remark. Why should it be necessary to close the throat as a preliminary to articulate speech? cannot one pass in the very midst of a breath from simple breathing to intonation and articulation? and are the vocal cords so sluggishly obedient to the will, that their approach to the vibratory position and the expulsion of the breath in the effort of speaking may not be made truly simultaneous? We can credit either of these things only when our own mouth bears witness to our own ears of their truth; and this we have been thus far unable to make it do. Our author assumes that this consonant comes in wherever we suppose ourselves to be pronouncing two vowels in succession, but uncombined, as in "the English *go 'over*." This is the same thing as to say that it is identical with the hiatus: but, if we can trust our own organs, this is a case where the closing

and reopening of the throat would not take place, but, instead of it, merely an instant of silence, an actual hiatus of sound. We can hardly believe that the use of the *spiritus lenis* by the Greeks was owing to their having noticed, and desiring to represent, the sound which our author defines: in our view, it was employed rather by way of antithesis to the *spiritus asper*: just as we, sometimes, for more marked distinction from a negative quantity, write a positive quantity with a *plus* sign, setting +1, instead of simply 1, over against -1. The use of the Semitic *aleph* is sufficiently explained by the syllabic character of the alphabet, and does not necessarily imply any recognition of the smooth breathing as a member of the spoken system of sounds. Our author even sets down the Sanscrit ऋ as representing this breathing; but we do not understand upon what ground; for the sign stands distinctly for *a*, and for nothing else; and we are not aware that the Hindu grammarians themselves—acute and hair-splitting as they were in catching and noting the finest shades of sound, and much as they would have been delighted with, and have made the most of, just such a nicety as this—ever took any notice of a smooth breathing. It has not, to our apprehension, any claim to be recognized as a distinct element in the spoken system, and as requiring a sign for its representation.

Of that most difficult and puzzling sound, the Semitic *ain* (Ar. ع, Heb. א), which is the third in our author's faucal class, we shall not venture to speak, as we must confess ourselves unable either to utter or to describe it. So much as this we seem to see, that the definition given by Prof. Lepsius is not entirely satisfactory. He makes it a "hard" sound, corresponding to the *spiritus lenis* as "soft." According to the general meaning of the terms hard and soft, as used by our author, this would signify that the *spiritus lenis* was sonant, and this its corresponding surd—which is, of course, impossible. If, on the other hand, it mean that the *ain* is produced by an actually more violent and audible unclosing of the throat before a vowel, we do not see how this is to be brought into accordance with the descriptions of it given by the grammars.

The Semitic strong *h* (Ar. ح, Heb. ח), our author's fourth faucal, has more claim to the title, probably, than any of the others, as an *h* which, instead of being left in the condition of uncharacterized breath, is, by some degree of approach at the deep guttural point, made slightly fricative, although not to the degree of the *χ*-sound, with which it is most nearly allied in character.\*

---

\* See the article of Prof. Lepsius on the Arabic, p. 127 etc., for a reexamination and more careful description, of the "faucal" sounds.

We have thus gone over nearly the whole of our author's system, turning our chief attention, as was natural, to those points in which we could not agree with him, and making our criticisms upon them with entire freedom, while at the same time cherishing the highest respect for the work as a whole, and deeming it in many important regards superior to any other of the kind with which we are acquainted. In no other, to our seeming, are learning and practical good sense—the want of either of which is equally fatal to the success of such a work as is here undertaken—united in the same degree. With Prof. Lepsius's view of the general method in which the standard alphabet is to be constructed we are fully agreed; it is to be by the employment of the Latin alphabet to the farthest possible extent, and by the application of diacritical signs to the most suitable bases to fill up its deficiencies; rather than, as some have proposed, by the introduction of italics and capitals among the ordinary "roman" letters; or, according to the method of others, by turning letters topsy-turvy or wrong side before, by cutting away parts of characters, manufacturing arbitrary signs for sounds, and the like, forming compounds even more offensive to the eye than that artificial and incongruous *pot-pourri* of characters, the Russian alphabet. As has been seen above, we only wish that he had gone yet farther in the carrying out of this principle, doing without Greek characters altogether, and pressing into active service the three anomalous letters *c*, *j*, and *x*, as well as *q*. We heartily approve, also, of Prof. Lepsius's moderation in the distinction of sounds and the setting up of signs for them. To compose a complete universal alphabet, offering a sign for every shade of sound which human lips utter, however slightly differentiated, and requiring the use of that sign for that sound in all cases without exception, forms no part of his plan. Even if the execution of such a work be allowed to be possible, the resulting alphabet would be lifted far out of the domain of practical availability, in which our author desires it to rest. The varieties of possible pronunciation are well-nigh infinite, and the signs of a general alphabet must be allowed to cover and designate each a certain territory, as we may call it, of articulation, rather than a single point. It might be laid down as a general rule, that no two modes of pronunciation of a sound require to be distinguished by separate signs, unless they may and do coexist as independent sounds in the same spoken system. Thus, for instance, notwithstanding the difference in mode of pronunciation between the English and the German *f* and *v* (*w*), they are not to be regarded as demanding different signs: it must belong to the description of the methods of utterance of each language to point out their distinction. And yet farther, if a language were found to lack the more usual and normal



pronunciation of a letter or a series of letters, and to substitute for it one of those modes of utterance which are indicated in the general alphabet by a diacritical mark, it would yet be superfluous to use, in writing that language, the diacritical point. If, for example—for no actual instance now occurs to us—the Arabic had no *t*, *d*, *s*, *z* but ط, ص, ض, ظ, which are written in our author's system with the underscored line, it would be proper, in transcribing the language, to use for them the simple lingual letters, it being left for description to explain their peculiarity of utterance. Careful and detailed description must necessarily accompany any and every application of an alphabet to a new language, and even when that has done its utmost, there will remain much which only oral instruction can impart, much that cannot be learned but by long practice and familiar usage, and probably even much that can never be perfectly acquired by one to whom the language is not native.

It is evident that adherence to a uniform standard of orthography is not in all cases to the same degree requisite and necessary. The adoption of one alphabetic system throughout is most to be insisted upon where independent laborers are reducing to writing, for practical use, the same or nearly kindred idioms. Here, a diversity of characters employed leads to a confusion of which the consequences may be long and keenly felt. Where languages are quite independent of one another, minor inconsistencies in the mode of writing them are of comparatively small account, since, in the acquisition of a new language, whether for practical or scientific purposes, its phonetic and orthographic systems must receive an amount of attention and study in which such little incongruities will almost entirely disappear. In isolated articles, essays, and treatises, in the making up of empirical alphabets for collectors of vocabularies, and the like, greater freedom may very properly be allowed: convenience of writing and printing, conformity with the previous usages of those for whose information or practical employment the alphabet is devised, leading to its greater intelligibility, or accuracy of application—these and other like considerations rise to an importance which authorizes and justifies deviation from strict theory. It may be well here to review and classify the Standard Alphabet in a summary manner, with reference to the greater or less authority and availability of its signs.

First, as regards the vowels. Here the most important and imperative rule is, that the five vowel sounds of almost universal occurrence, illustrated by the English words *far*, *prey*, *pique*, *note*, *rule*, should be written by the characters *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, which originally and properly belong to them, and by no other; in other words, that the vowels should receive the "Italian" sound. No alphabet, under any circumstances whatever, is to be toler-

ated, if it neglect this rule. The same rule implies and requires that the diphthongal sound which we call "long *i*" (as in *pine*, *aisle*, *buy*) should be represented by the digraph *ai*, and the diphthong *ou* (as in *house*, *how*) by *au*. It is much less easy to lay down peremptory rules for the other five vowel sounds which most frequently call for representation. But the vowels of double position, the German *ü* (French *u*) and *ö* (French *eu*), can hardly be better written than with the two dots, either above or below, and we should think that a virtual unanimity as regards them might be pretty easily established. The neutral vowel (in English *but*, *burn*) will occasion much greater difficulty, and probably no sign can be suggested for it which will not encounter strong opposition in many quarters. Our author's proposal will seem a strange one to most of those who come to it from English usages, and we have ourselves not been able to assent to it without some misgivings: but we have had nothing preferable to suggest, unless to transfer the diacritical point from *e* to *a*, writing *a*. The vowels intermediate between *a* and *e* and *a* and *o* respectively, represented in the English words *cat* and *call*, are also hard subjects for unanimity of treatment: and the more so, as they vary more in quality, in different languages, than the others. As said above, we should be very willing to see our author's signs generally adopted as their representatives. As the sign of long quantity, our author, with entire reason, prefers the horizontal line above the vowel (thus,  $\bar{a}$ ): the circumflex ( $\hat{a}$ ) is also available for this purpose: but the use of the acute accent ( $\acute{a}$ ) to denote the length of a vowel, which has most unfortunately become very prevalent among the English, is contrary to all analogy, and unsupported by any consideration of fitness, convenience, or neatness of appearance, and it ought to be summarily suppressed. The only customary and available sign of short quantity is the concave line above the vowel ( $\check{a}$ ). Whether it be necessary or desirable to distinguish long and short quantity in writing must be determined for each language by itself: it can hardly ever be advisable, we should think, to employ the diacritical marks of both classes in the same system. To indicate the nasalization of a vowel, by the expulsion through the nose of part of the breath by which it is uttered, Prof. Lepsius employs the Greek circumflex above it (as  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{o}$ ,  $\bar{u}$ ), a very suitable sign: where this is for practical reasons not available, a postposed superior *n* (as  $a^n$ ,  $o^n$ ,  $u^n$ ) is a very good substitute.

Secondly, as regards the consonants. We feel confident that almost no one to whom English is native will find any difficulty in assenting to our author's adoption of the signs *k*, *g*, *t*, *d*, *p*, *b*, *f*, *v*, *s*, *z*, *h*, *m*, *n*, *y*, *w*, *r*, *l* to represent the values which those letters have in the English words *kick*, *gig*, *tit*, *did*, *pap*, *bib*, *fife*, *valve*, *sauce*, *zeal*, *hat*, *mum*, *nun*, *ye*, *woo*, *rare*, *lull*: and the larger

and more important part of the consonantal system is thus disposed of at a blow. Of the remaining members of the system, those which most press for uniformity of representation, being of widest occurrence, are the palatal nasal and sibilants, the English *ng* in *singing*, *sh* in *she*, and *z* in *azure*. With our views of the connected nature of these sounds, we should prefer to see them distinguished from the lingual *n*, *s*, *z* by the same diacritical sign, a dot or an accent; yet this is not a point which needs to be pressed, and, as above remarked, we should have no difficulty in accepting our author's proposals. Next in consequence are the lingual spirants, the English *th* in *thin* and in *this*. To those who are unwilling to adopt our author's *ʒ* and *ʃ*, the linguals with affixed rough breathing—as *t'*, *d'*—might seem natural and convenient substitutes: evidently, if a *t* is made the basis of the surd sound, a *d* should be that of the sonant. So also with the palatal spirants: if *x* and *γ* be rejected, and if *α* be deemed inadmissible, a *k'* and a *g'* would not be unsuited to take their places. The compounds *ch* and *j*, most accurately represented by the prefixion of a diacritically distinguished *t* and *d* to the signs adopted for the palatal sibilants *sh* and *zh*, may have the diacritical distinction omitted, as by our author, or they may, as exceptional cases, be written by *c* and *j*.

Although the use of compounds with *h* to represent simple sounds is a violation of strict theory, and discordant with the rules by which it is desirable to be governed in the construction of an alphabet, yet there may be cases where practical considerations shall justify the employment of the whole series of such compounds, *sh*, *zh*, *th*, *dh*, *kh*, *gh*, *ch*.

Cases beyond these will be of so exceptional and isolated occurrence that they may, with less danger of serious inconvenience, be left to the good judgment and enlightened insight of those who are called upon to construct alphabetic systems for practical use. No slight responsibility, however, rests upon him who first puts into written characters a virgin tongue, since it is impossible to say of how many individuals and generations the convenience depends upon his work. There can be no better preparation for this than a thorough physical comprehension of the sounds of one's own native speech, and a correct understanding of the history of the signs with which it is written; and a searching and intelligible analysis of the English spoken alphabet must be the most valuable phonetical assistant to any one who, having the English for his mother tongue, is required to study the phonetic system of another language, whether for description or for reduction to a written form.

## ARTICLE VIII.

# THE ATHARVA-VEDA PRÂTIÇĀKHYA,

OR

## ÇĀUNAKĪYĀ CATURĀDHYĀYIKĀ:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,  
PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society May 21st, 1862.

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE distinctive title of the work here published is *Çaunakiyā caturādhyāyikā*, 'Çaunaka's Treatise in Four Chapters.' We have for it, however, only the authority of the signatures to the different portions of the manuscript containing the treatise; no reference to the latter by name has yet been discovered, so far as I am aware, in any other work of the Sanskrit literature. As regards the gender of the word, whether feminine or neuter, there is some question. In the signature to the first section (*pāda*) of the first chapter (*adhyāya*), it is styled *caturādhyāyikā*, as also at the close of the first chapter. With this accords, farther, the name, *caturādhyāyī-bhāṣhya*, given to the commentary in the signature of chapter IV, section 1. and at the close of the whole work. The neuter form, and the ascription to Çaunaka, are found only in the final signature, which reads as follows (unamended): *iti çaunakiyamcaturādhyāyike caturthaḥ pādaḥ: caturādhyāyibhāṣhya samāptaḥ*.\* The treatise was first brought to light, and its character determined, by Roth (see the Preface to his *Nirukta*, p. xlvi). It was recognized by him as being what is indicated by our title, a *Prātiçākhyā* to a text of the Atharva-Veda. That it has any inherent right to be called *the Prātiçākhyā* to *the Atharva-Veda* is not, of course, claimed for it; but, considering the extreme improbability that any other like phonetic treatise, belonging to any of the other schools of that Veda, will ever be brought to light, the title of Atharva-Veda *Prātiçākhyā* finds a sufficient justification in its convenience, and in its analogy with the names given to the

\* Weber (*Cat. Berl. MSS.*, p. 87; *Ind. Literaturgeschichte*, p. 146) calls the treatise *caturādhyāyikā*; and Müller (*Hist. Anc. Sansk. Lit.*, p. 135, etc.) styles it *caturādhyāyikā*—each by a different emendation of the name given in the manuscript: I do not see the necessity of departing from the authority of the latter.

other kindred treatises by their respective editors, Regnier, Weber, and Müller.\* Any special investigation of the questions of the authorship and date of our treatise, its relation to the other Prātiçākhyas and to the present received text of the Atharva-Veda, and the like, is reserved for the commentary and the additional notes: it will be sufficient to say here, in a general way, that it concerns itself with that part of the Atharvan text which is comprised in its first eighteen books, and with that alone, and that it covers the whole ground which the comparison of the other treatises shows us to be necessary to the completeness of a Prātiçākhyā, differing from any of them not more than they differ from one another.

The manuscript authority upon which the present edition is founded is a single codex (Chambers collection, No. 143; Weber, No. 361), belonging to the Royal Library of Berlin, a copy of which was made by me in the winter of 1852-3; it contains, besides the text of the Prātiçākhyā, a commentary upon it, by an author not named, which styles itself simply *caturādhyāyī-bhāṣhyā*, 'Commentary to the Four-chaptered Treatise,' as already noticed above. It is briefly described in Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit Manuscripts (p. 87-8). The signature at the end is as follows (with one or two obvious emendations): *çrīr astu : lekhakapāṭhakayoḥ çubham bhavatu : çricandīkāyāi namaḥ : çrī-rāmah : samvat 1714 varshe jyāishkhaçuddha 9 dine samāptalikhitam pustakam*. The date corresponds to May, 1656; but it must, as in many other cases, be doubtful whether this is the date of the manuscript in our possession, or of the one from which this was copied; in the present instance, the latter supposition may be regarded as decidedly the more probable. Most unfortunately, considering the extreme rarity of the work, the manuscript is a very poor one. Not only is it every where excessively incorrect, often beyond the possibility of successful emendation; it is also defective, exhibiting *lacunae* at several points. Some may be of opinion, then, that the publication of the Prātiçākhyā upon its authority alone is premature, and should not have been undertaken. This would certainly be the case, were any other copies of the work known to be in existence: to neglect to procure their collation before proceeding to publish would be altogether inexcusable. But, so far as is hitherto known, the Berlin codex is unique. No public or private library in Europe, nor any in India accessible to Europeans, has been shown to possess a duplicate of it. For assistance in procuring a second copy, I made application some years since to Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, then of Benares, whose knowledge, experience, and public and private position made him the person of all others most likely to be of service in such a way; and he was kind enough to interest himself zealously in my behalf in searching for the work: but entirely without success; while he collected for me a mass of valuable materials respecting

\* Prātiçākhyā du Rig-Véda. Par M. Ad. Regnier, etc. Published in the Journal Asiatique, Ve série, Tomes vii-xii, Paris, 1856-58.—Das Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhyam. Published by Prof. Albrecht Weber, in his Indische Studien, Vol. iv, Berlin, 1858.—Müller's edition of the Rig-Veda Prātiçākhyā includes only the first six chapters, one third of the whole, and forms part of his text-edition of the Rig-Veda itself, which also remains a fragment.

the other Prâtiçâkhyas, for that of the Atharva-Veda nothing could be found. Considering, then, the faintness of the hope that additional manuscripts would later be obtainable, and considering the peculiar interest of this class of works—well attested by the triple publications, within a few years past, of Regnier, Weber, and Müller—and the desirableness of placing as speedily as possible before the eyes of scholars the whole material furnished by them, in order to the greater force and conclusiveness of the results which some are already hastening to draw from them for the literary history of India, it has seemed best to publish the treatise without farther delay. Several circumstances deserve to be noted as supporting this decision, by diminishing the disadvantages arising from the scantiness and poorness of the manuscript material. In the first place, as regards the *lacunae*, they are, with two exceptions, of insignificant importance, and do not either cause the loss of a rule or render its interpretation doubtful: while, in the two instances (both occurring in chapter III) in which one or more rules are lost, the loss at least lies within the limits of a certain definite subject, and, though much to be regretted, is of no great extent or essential consequence. As concerns, again, the corruption of the readings, it is to be observed that the commentary is generally full enough to establish the true version of the rules, and yet, at the same time, too poor and scanty to render its own restoration important. The general method of the commentator is as follows: he first states the rule, then restates it in the baldest possible paraphrase, merely supplying the lacking copula, and adding the specifications, if any, of which the presence is inferrible from previous rules; next follow the illustrative citations; and finally, the rule is given once more, along with the one next following, which is euphonicly combined with it, and of which the paraphrase and illustration then follow in their turn. As an example, I cite here in full rule i. 7, with its commentary, beginning from the final repetition of the next preceding rule:

स्पर्शाः प्रथमोत्रमा न चवर्गः। न चवर्गः पयो भवति। चङ्गकजाः। न चवर्गः प्रथ-  
मान्तानि तृती°

Thus we have everywhere (unless, as is sometimes the case, a few words have dropped out from the copy) a threefold repetition of each rule, and its true form is almost always restorable from their comparison, notwithstanding the corruptions of the manuscript. If, now, the commentary were as full and elaborate as those of the other known Prâtiçâkhyas, it would have been alike trying and unsatisfactory either to endeavor to edit it, or to disregard it: while, as the case actually stands, it has itself attempted so little that we care comparatively little to know precisely what it says. Wherever its usual meagre method is followed, accordingly, little attention will be found paid to it in the notes. Nor has it seemed to me otherwise than a needless labor to notice, except in special cases, the corrupt readings of the manuscript—and this the more especially, as my distance from the original renders it impossible to test by a renewed collation the accuracy of my copy.\*

\* Prof. Weber has had the kindness to verify for me, during the progress of publication, sundry passages, of special importance or of doubtful reading, which I took the liberty of submitting to him.

The citations from the Atharvan text are also given in their correct form, without farther remark; since, whatever the disguise under which the manuscript may present them, it has generally been not difficult for one familiar with the Atharvan, and in possession of a verbal index to its text, to trace them out and restore their true readings. There are a few notable instances in which the commentator abandons his customary reticence, and dispreads himself upon the subject with which he is dealing: and in such cases the attempt is made to follow him as closely as the manuscript will allow. Much more frequently than he ventures to speak in his own person, he cites the *dicta* of other authorities; occasionally referring to them by name; more often introducing his quotations by a simple *apara āha*, 'another has said;' and very frequently making extracts without any introduction whatever, as if of matter which might lawfully be woven in as an integral part of his own comment. The work, if it be a single work, from which these anonymous citations are made, is written in the common *śloka*, and is seemingly of the same general character with our treatise itself, or a kind of metrical Prātiçākhyā to the Atharva-Veda; wearing, however, more the aspect of a commentary than does the metrical Prātiçākhyā to the Rig-Veda.

What has here been said of the commentary applies only to that part of it which ends with the third section of the fourth chapter: the concluding section, on the *krama-pāṭha*, is of an entirely different character, as will be explained at the place.

While thus but imperfectly aided by the native commentator, I have enjoyed one compensating advantage over those who have undertaken hitherto the publication of works of this class, in that I have been able to avail myself of the results of their labors. Had it not been for their efficient help, much in the present treatise might have remained obscure, of which the explanation has now been satisfactorily made out; and I desire here to make a general acknowledgment of my indebtedness to them, which I shall have occasion to repeat hereafter in particular cases. I have thought it incumbent upon me to refer, under every rule, or in connection with every subject treated of, in the work here published, to the corresponding portions of the other Prātiçākhyās, giving a briefer or more detailed statement of the harmonies and discrepancies of doctrine which they contain. To the Rig-Veda Prātiçākhyā reference is made primarily by chapter (*patala*) and verse (*śloka*),\* the number of the rule cited being then also added, according to the enumeration of both Regnier and Müller; the latter (in the first six chapters only) in Roman figures, the former in Arabic. The Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyā is cited from Weber's edition, already referred to, and according to his enumeration of its rules. For my ability to include in the conspectus of phonetic doctrines the Tāittiriya Prātiçākhyā of Kārttikeya, I have to thank Prof. Hall, as above acknowledged; the excellent manuscripts of the text and of the text and commentary (*tribhāshyaratna*) which he procured for me will be made, I trust, to help the publication of that

\* In the first chapter, of which the verses are numbered differently by Müller and Regnier, the former counting in the ten prefixed introductory verses, the reference is according to Regnier: to find the corresponding verse in Müller, add ten to the number given.

treatise in the course of the next year, either by myself or by some one else. The mode of reference to the Tâittiriya Prâtiçâkhyâ which has hitherto been usual I have abandoned. The work is divided into twenty-four chapters (*adhyaïya*), which are classed together in two sections (*praçna*), each of twelve chapters: and Roth—as also Weber, following his example—has cited it by section and chapter, omitting any enumeration and specification of the rules into which each chapter is divided. But the *praçna* division is of as little account as the corresponding division of the Rik Prâtiçâkhyâ into three sections (*adhyaïya*); and there appears to be no good reason why this treatise should not be cited, like those pertaining to the Rik, the White Yajus, and the Atharvan, by chapter and rule simply; as I have done. To Pânini's grammar (in Böhtlingk's edition) reference is also frequently made—in all cases, it is hoped, where the comparison would be of any particular interest. The special relation exhibited by our treatise in many points to the system of general grammar whereof Pânini is the authoritative exponent would perhaps have justified a more detailed comparison; but I have both feared to be led too far, and distrusted my ability to draw out the correspondences of the two in a perfectly satisfactory manner. To determine in full the relations of Pânini and the Prâtiçâkhyâs, when the latter shall have been all made public, will be an important and a highly repaying task for some one more versed than I am in the intricacies of the Paninean system.

The peculiar method, so commonly adopted in our treatise (e. g. i. 64, 65, 85), of applying a rule to the series of passages or words to which it refers, by mentioning only one of them and including the rest in an "etc." (*âdi*) which is to be filled out elsewhere—or the familiarly known *gana*-method of Pânini—and the remissness of the commentator, whose duty it was to fill out the *ganâs*, but who has almost always failed to do so, have rendered necessary on the part of the editor a more careful examination of the Atharvan text, and comparison of it with the Prâtiçâkhyâ, than has been called for or attempted in connection with any other of the kindred treatises. It has been necessary to construct, as it were, an independent Prâtiçâkhyâ upon the text, and to compare it with that one which has been handed down to us by the Hindu tradition, in order to test the completeness of the latter, fill up its deficiencies, and note its redundancies. The results of the comparison, as scattered through the notes upon the rules, will be summed up in the additional notes, to which are also relegated other matters which would otherwise call for attention in this introduction. In examining and excerpting the text, full account has been taken of the nineteenth book, and of those parts of the twentieth which are not extracted bodily and without variation from the Rig-Veda. References are made, of course, to the published text of the Atharva-Veda;\* if a phrase or word occurs more than once in the text, the first instance of its occurrence is given, with an "e. g." prefixed.

Readings of the manuscript which it is thought desirable to give are generally referred by numbers to the bottom of the page.

---

\* Atharva-Veda Sanhitâ, herausgegeben von R. Roth und W. D. Whitney. Erster Band. Text. Berlin, 1856. roy. 8vo.



The occurrence, here and there in the notes, of emendations of the published text of the Atharvan calls for a few words of explanation here. The work of constructing the text was, by the compelling force of circumstances, so divided between the two editors that the collation of the manuscripts, the writing out of a text, and the preparation of a critical apparatus, fell to myself, while Prof. Roth undertook the final revision of the text, and the carrying of it through the press after my return to this country. Such being the case, and free communication being impossible, occasional misconceptions and errors could not well be avoided. Moreover, the condition of the Atharvan as handed down by the tradition was such as to impose upon the editors as a duty what in the case of any of the other Vedas would have been an almost inexcusable liberty—namely, the emendation of the text-readings in many places. In so treating such a text, it is not easy to hit the precise mean between too much and too little; and while most of the alterations made were palpably and imperatively called for, and while many others would have to be made in translating, there are also a few cases in which a closer adherence to the manuscript authorities might have been preferable. Farther, in the matter of modes of orthography, where the usage of the manuscripts was varying and inconsistent, our choice was not always such as more mature study and reflection justify. Whenever cases of any of these kinds are brought up in connection with the rules and illustrations of the *Prātiçākhyā*, I am free to suggest what appears to me a preferable reading or usage. In referring to the manuscripts of the Atharvan, I make use of the following abbreviations (which are also those employed in the margin of the edited text, in books xix and xx): 1st, *sanhitā* MSS.: "B." is the Berlin MS. (Ch. 115, Weber 338), containing books xi–xx; "P." is the Paris MS. (D. 204, 205), and contains the whole text, and books vii–x repeated; "M." and "W." are manuscripts of the Bodleian library at Oxford, M. in the Mill collection, and W. in the Wilson: M. is a copy of the same original, by the same hand, and in the same form, as P., and it lacks the part of the text which is found double in the other: W. lacks book xviii; "E." is the East India House manuscript, Nos. 682 and 760; "H." is in the same library, No. 1137, and contains only books i–vi; "I." is the Polier MS., in the British Museum: a copy made from it for Col. Martin is also to be found in the East India House library, Nos. (I believe) 901 and 2142. 2nd, *pada* MSS. These are all in the Berlin library. "Bp." is Ch. 8 (Weber 332) for books i–ix, and Ch. 108 (Weber 335) for books x–xviii: these are two independent manuscripts, but are included under one designation for convenience's sake, as complementing one another. "Bp.<sup>2</sup>" is Ch. 117 (Weber 331) for book i, and Ch. 109, 107 (Weber 333, 334) for book v, and books vi–ix: the two latter are accidentally separated parts of the same manuscript, and stand also in very close relationship, as respects their original, with Bp. (Ch. 8): the other is independent. Of book xix there is no *pada*-text to be found, and probably none was ever in existence: and the *pada* MSS. of book xx are only extracts from the Rik *pada*-text.

The mode of transcription of Sanskrit words is the same with that which has been hitherto followed in this Journal.

# ATHARVA-VEDA PRÂTIÇĀKHYA.

## CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS:—SECTION I. 1-2, introductory, scope of the treatise; 3-9, sounds which may occur as finals; 10-13, aspirates, nasals, surds, and sonants; 14-17, description of accents; 18-28, description and classification of sounds according to their place and organ of production; 29-36, do. according to the degree of approximation of the organs; 37-39, the *r* and *l* vowels; 40-41, diphthongs.

SECTION II. 42, *visarjanīya*; 43-48, *abhinidhāna*; 49-50, conjunction of consonants; 51-54, quantity of syllables; 55-58, division into syllables; 59-62, quantity of vowels.

SECTION III. 63-66, abnormal alterations and interchanges of sounds; 67-72, occurrence of nasalized vowels; 73-81, *pragṛhya* vowels; 82, treatment in *pada*-text of *pragṛhya* vowels followed by *iva*; 83-91, occurrence of long nasalized vowels in the interior of a word.

SECTION IV. 92, definition of *upadhā*; 93, what makes a syllable; 94, only an unaspirated consonant allowed before an aspirated; 95, mode of application of rules respecting conversion of sounds; 96, special case of accent; 97, special cases of omission of *pluti* before *iti*; 98, conjunction of consonants; 99, *yama*; 100, *ndsikya*; 101-104, *svarabhakti* and *sphoṭana* and their effect; 105, cases of *pluti*.

चतुर्णां पदज्ञातानां नामाख्यातोपसर्गनिपातानां सन्ध्य-  
पद्यौ गुणौ प्रातिज्ञम् ॥१॥

1. Of the four kinds of words—viz. noun, verb, preposition, and particle—the qualities exhibited in euphonic combination and in the state of disconnected vocables are here made the subject of treatment.

Here is clearly set forth the main object of such a treatise as we are accustomed to call a *prâtiçākhyā*: it is to establish the relations of the combined and the disjoined forms of the text to which it belongs, or of the *sanhitā*-text and the *pada*-text: *sandhyapadyāu* might have been directly translated 'in the *sanhitā* and *pada* texts respectively.' The ultimate end to be attained is the utterance of the sacred text (*çākhā*, 'branch' of the Veda), held and taught by the school, in precisely the form in which the school receives and teaches it. The general material of the text must, of course, be assumed to be known, before it can be made the subject of rules: it is accordingly assumed in its simplest and most material-like form, in the state of *padas* or separate words, each

having the form it would wear if uttered alone, compounds being also divided into their constituent parts, and many affixes and inflectional endings separated from their themes; and the Prātiçākhyā teaches how to put together correctly this analyzed text. An essential part of such a treatise is also its analysis, description, and classification of the sounds of the spoken alphabet, as leading to correctness of utterance, and as underlying and explaining the complicated system of phonetic changes which the treatise has to inculcate. These two subjects—a theoretical system of phonetics, and the rules, general and particular, by which *pada*-text is converted into *sanhitā*—are the only ones which are found to be fully treated in all the Prātiçākhyās; although none of the treatises confines itself to them alone. Thus, our own work gives in its fourth chapter the rules for the construction of the *pada*-text itself, as does also the Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyā; and likewise, in the final section of that chapter (which is, however, evidently a later appendix to the work), a brief statement of the method of forming the *krama*-text, of which it has also taken account in more than one of the rules of its earlier portions: and the Prātiçākhyās of the Rik and the Vājasaneyi have corresponding sections. Nor are the instances infrequent in which it more or less arbitrarily oversteps the limits it has marked out for itself, and deals with matters which lie properly beyond its scope, as will be pointed out in the notes. A summary exhibition of these irregularities, and a comparative analysis of the other Prātiçākhyās, will be presented in an additional note.

As the Prātiçākhyā deals with words chiefly as phonetic combinations, and not as significant parts of speech (as *Wörter*, 'vocables,' not *Worte*, 'words'), their grammatical character is unessential, and the distinction of the four classes made in the rule is rather gratuitous: the names of the classes do not often occur in the sequel, although our treatise is notably more free than any other of its class in availing itself of grammatical distinctions in the statement of its rules. For a fuller exhibition of the fourfold classification of words as parts of speech, see Rik Pr. xii. 5-9, and Vāj. Pr. viii. 52-57.

In illustration of the term *sandhya*, the commentator says: "words that end thus and thus take such and such forms before words that begin so and so." To illustrate *padya*, he cites rule 8, below—a by no means well-chosen example. To show how it is that the treatise has to do only with the qualities of words as exhibited in *sanhitā* and *pada*, he cites an instance of what must be done by a general grammarian in explanation of a derivative form, as follows: *sandhyapadyāv iti kim artham: līḍham ity atra ho-dha-tvam: paracaturthatvam: (MS. padaca°) shtunā-shtu-tvam: dho-dhe-lopo dīrghatvam iti vāiyākaraṇena vaktavyam: 'why is it said "the qualities in sanhitā and pada"?' Because the general grammarian must say, in explanation of līḍha, "here applies the rule ho dhaḥ (Pān. viii. 2. 31), that for the change of the following letter into its aspirated sonant, the rule shtunā shtuḥ (Pān. viii. 4. 41), the rule dho dhe loḥ (Pān. viii. 3. 13), and that for the lengthening of the vowel." These rules teach the formation of the participle līḍha from the root līh, through the following series of changes: līh-ta, līḥ-ta, līḥ-dha, līḥ-dha, lī-dha, līḍha; and they are for the*

most part taken directly from Pāṇini, or at least correspond precisely with his rules; only, in the second case, *paracaturthalvam* takes the place of Pān. viii. 2. 40, *jhashas tathor dho dhah*; and, in the last case, *dirghatvam* stands for *ḍhralope pūrvasya dirgho nah* (Pān. vi. 3. 111). Whether the commentator thus deviates arbitrarily or through carelessness from the letter of the great grammarian's rules, or whether he cites from some other authority, anterior to or independent of Pāṇini, and with whom the latter agrees only in part, is a question of which the solution need not be attempted here: while the former supposition may appear the more probable, the other, in the present state of our knowledge respecting the relations between Pāṇini and the Prâtiçākhyas and their commentators, is not to be summarily rejected as impossible.

## एवमिद्वेति च विभाषाप्राप्तं सामान्ये ॥२॥

2. Farther, that respecting which general grammar allows diversity of usage is made subject of treatment, to the effect of determining the usage in this *çākḥā*.

This is a broadly periphrastic translation of the rule, which reads more literally: "thus and thus it is here"—to this effect, also, that which is allowed to be diversely treated in the general language (is made the subject of the rules of the treatise). The commentator's exposition is as follows: *evam iha iti ca: asyām çākḥâyām tat prâtiñnam manyante. yaro 'nunâsike 'nunâsiko ve 'ti vibhâshâprâptaṁ sāmānye: kiṁ sāmānyam: vyākaraṇam: vakshyati: uttamā uttameshṅ itī*: "thus it is here:" in these words also: i. e., in this *çākḥā* they regard this as matter of precept: by the rule (Pān. viii. 4. 45) "the letters from *y* to *s* may or may not be made nasal before a nasal," a choice of usage is allowed in general grammar—*sāmānyā* means *vyākaraṇa*, 'grammar'—but the Prâtiçākhyā is going to say (ii. 5) "mutes other than nasals become nasals before nasals." The rule is somewhat obscure and difficult of construction, and the commentary not unequivocal, substituting, as before, an illustration in place of a real exposition of its meaning, but I am persuaded that it is fairly rendered by the translation above given. Müller, having occasion to refer to it, gives it somewhat differently, as follows (p. xii): "what by the grammatical text books is left free, that is here thus and thus: so says the Prâtiçākhyā." But this leaves the *ca* unexplained, and supposes the *iti* to be in another place, making the rule to read rather *evam iha vibhâshâprâptaṁ sāmānyā iti*; nor does it accord with the commentator's exposition. It seems necessary, in order to account for the *ca*, to bring down *prâtiñnam* as general predicate from the preceding rule; and the *iti* must be understood as pointing out that the Prâtiçākhyā says *evam iha*, 'so and so is proper here,' respecting any matter which the rules of grammar leave doubtful.

The rule is properly neither an addition to, nor a limitation of, the one which precedes it, but rather a specification of a particularly important matter among those included in the other; for the Prâtiçākhyā does not overstep the limits of its subject as already laid down, in order to determine points of derivation, form, etc., which general grammar

may have left unsettled; nor does it restrict itself within those limits to matters respecting which general usage is allowed to vary: it does not at all imply or base itself upon the general science of grammar and its text book, but is an independent and a complete treatise as regards its own subject.

Of which *śākhā* of the Atharva-Veda this work is the Prātiçākhyā, it gives us itself no information whatever, nor does it even let us know that it belongs to the Atharvan. The name by which it is called, however, leads us to suppose that it was produced in the school of the *Çānanākās*, which is mentioned in the Caranavyūha among those of the Atharvan (see Weber's Indische Studien, iii. 277-8). Its relation to the only text of the Atharvan known to be now in existence will be made the subject of an additional note.

### पदान्त्यः पद्यः ॥३॥

3. A letter capable of occurring at the end of a word is called *padya*.

This is simply a definition of the term *padya*, which, in this sense, is peculiar to the present treatise; it is not found at all in either of the Yajur-Veda Prātiçākhyas, or in Pāṇini, and in the Rik Prātiçākhyā it means 'member of a compound word.' The term signifies, by its etymology, 'belonging to a *pada*, or disjoined word' (in the technical sense), and it is evidently applied specifically to the last letter of such a word as being the one which is most especially affected by the resolution of *sanhiā* into *pada*.

As instances, the commentary cites a series of four words, ending respectively in guttural, lingual, dental, and labial mutes, which he gives also repeatedly under other rules; viz. *godhuk* (p. *go-dhuk*: e. g. vii. 73. 6), *virāt* (p. *vi-rāt*: e. g. viii. 9. 8), *dṛshat* (ii. 31. 1), *trishṭup* (p. *tri-stup*: e. g. viii. 9. 20).

### अनुकारः स्वरः पद्यः ॥४॥

4. Any vowel, excepting *l*, may occur as final.

The Rik Prātiçākhyā treats of possible final letters in xii. 1, and excepts the long *ṛ*-vowel, as well as *l*, from their number. The latter is also excluded by the introductory verse 9 to the first chapter, as given by Müller (p. x). The Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyā also pays attention to the same subject, in i. 85-89, and its rule respecting the vowels (i. 87) precisely agrees with ours. It farther specifies, however (i. 88), that *ṛ* is found only at the end of the first member of a compound, which is equally true as regards the Atharvan text.

The illustrations brought forward by the commentator are *brahma* (e. g. i. 19. 4), *śālā* (ix. 3. 17), *ntlā* (not found in AV.), *dadhi* (in *dadhi-vān*, xviii. 4. 17), *kumārī* (x. 8. 27), *madhu* (e. g. i. 34. 2), *vāyū* (only in *indravāyū*, iii. 20. 6), *karṭṛ* (no such case in AV., nor any case of this word as member of a compound: take instead *pitṛ-bhīḥ*, e. g. vi. 63. 3; *pitṛ-lokam*, xviii. 4. 64), *cakshate* (e. g. ix. 10. 26), *asyāi* (e. g. ii. 36. 1), *vāyo* (e. g. ii. 20. 1), *tāu* (e. g. iii. 24. 7).

## लकारविसर्जनीयौ च ॥५॥

### 5. Also *l* and *visarjanîya*.

The instances given by the commentator are *bâl* (e. g. i. 3. 1), and *vrkshah* (e. g. iv. 7. 5). The word *bâl*, an onomatopoeic exclamation, is the only one in the Atharvan ending in *l*—excepting the similar words *çal* and *phal*, in xx. 135. 2, 3, a part of the text of which our treatise takes no account. Both the other Prâtiçâkhyas (R. Pr. xii. 1; V. Pr. i. 86) omit *l* from the number of possible finals, no word in their texts, apparently, ending with it.

## स्पर्शाः प्रथमोत्तमाः ॥६॥

### 6. Of the mutes, the first and last of each series.

That is to say, the unaspirated surds and the nasals, or *k*, *t*, *p*, and *n*, *ṅ*, *ṇ*, *m*; *c* and *ñ* being excepted by the next following rule. In speaking of the mutes, our treatise follows the same method with that of the other Prâtiçâkhyas, calling the surd, the surd aspirate, the sonant, the sonant aspirate, and the nasal, of each series or *varga*, the “first,” “second,” “third,” “fourth,” and “last” of that series respectively. The Vâj. Pr. alone also calls the nasal by the name “fifth.”

The commentator gives no instances under this rule: they may be added, as follows: *pratyak* (e. g. iv. 18. 2), *vashat* (e. g. i. 11. 1), *yat* (e. g. i. 2. 3), *tri-stup* (e. g. viii. 9. 20); *arvân* (e. g. iii. 2. 3), *brahmanvatim* (vi. 108. 2), *asmân* (e. g. i. 1. 4), *teshâm* (e. g. i. 1. 1). The guttural nasal, *ñ*, appears only as final of masculine nominatives singular of derivatives of the root *añc*; the lingual, *ṅ*, only in a few instances, at the end of the first member of a compound, where, by a specific rule (iv. 99), it is left in the *pada* in its *sanhitâ* form (the Vâj. Pr. [i. 88] expressly notices this as true of its text): *t* is found almost only as euphonic substitute of a final *c*, *j*, *sh*, or *ç* (*viç-bhyaḥ*, iii. 3. 3: in the onomatopoeic *phat* [iv. 18. 3], it doubtless stands for either *sh* or *c*; *bat* [xiii. 2. 29], the only other like case, is doubtful): *k* and *p* are also comparatively rare, and especially the latter.

The Vâj. Pr. (i. 85) gives the same rule, comprising with it also the one here next following. The Rik Pr. (xii. 1) forbids only to the aspirates a place as finals; but the phonetic rules of its fourth chapter imply the occurrence only of surds at the end of a word: see the note to rule 8, below.

## न चवर्गः ॥७॥

### 7. Excepting the palatal series.

The commentator mentions all the palatal mutes, *c*, *ch*, *j*, *jh*, *ñ*, as excluded from the final position by this rule; but it properly applies only to *c* and *ñ*, the others being disposed of already by rule 6. The Vâj. Pr. (i. 85) specifies *c* and *ñ*: the Rik Pr. (xii. 1) speaks, like our rule, of the whole class.

It does not belong to the Prātiçākhyā, of course, to explain into what an original palatal is converted when it would occur as a final.

प्रथमान्तानि तृतीयान्तानीति शौनकस्य प्रतिज्ञानं न  
वृत्तिः ॥ ८ ॥

8. That the words thus declared to end in first mutes end rather in thirds is Çāunaka's precept, but not authorized usage.

That is to say, Çāunaka prescribes that those words which, as noted in rule 6 above, and as implied throughout the rest of the treatise, have for their final letters the unaspirated surd, must be pronounced with the unaspirated sonant instead: but, although the sage to whom the treatise is ascribed, or from whom the school to which it belongs derives its name, is thus honored by the citation of his opinion, the binding authority of the latter is denied. With regard to the question whether a final mute is surd or sonant, opinions seem to have been somewhat divided among the Hindu grammarians. Pāṇini (viii. 4. 56) does not decide the point, but permits either pronunciation. The Rik Pr. (i. 3, r. 15, 16, xvi, xvii) cites Gārgya as holding the sonant utterance, and Çakatāyana the surd: it itself declares itself for neither, and at another place (xii. 1), as already noted, treats both surd and sonant as allowable: its phonetic rules, however (iv. 1), being constructed to apply only to the surd final. If the Rik Pr. were actually, as it claims to be, the work of Çāunaka, the rule of our treatise now under consideration would lead us to expect it to favor unequivocally the sonant pronunciation. The Vāj. Pr., as we have seen above (under r. 6), teaches the surd pronunciation. The Tāitt. Pr., liberal as it usually is in citing the varying opinions of the grammarians on controverted topics, takes no notice whatever of this point; but its rules (viii. 1 etc.), like those of all the other treatises, imply that the final mute, if not nasal, is surd.

It would seem from this that the sound which a sonant mute assumed when final in Sanskrit (for that an original surd, when final, should have tended to take on a sonant character is very hard to believe) wavered somewhat upon the limit between a surd and a sonant pronunciation: but that it verged decidedly upon the surd is indicated by the great preponderance of authority upon that side, and by the unanimous employment of the surd in the written literature.

In his exposition of this rule, the commentator first gives a bald paraphrase of it: *prathamāntāni padāni tṛtīyāntāni 'i çāunakasyā 'cāryasya pratijñānam bhavati: na tu vṛtīḥ*; adding as instances the words already given (see under r. 3), *godhuk, virāt, drśhat, trisṭup*; he then, without any preface, cites two or three lines from his metrical authority, which need a good deal of emendation to be brought into a translatable shape, but of which the meaning appears to be nearly as follows: "mutes other than nasals, standing *in pausa*, are to be regarded as firsts: a word ending in a first may be considered as ending in a third, but must in no case be actually so read (compare Uvāta to

R. Pr. iii. 8, r. 13, cc), owing to the non-exhibition of authoritative usage in its favor" (MS. *māvasānānikān sparçān padyān [ādyān?] ananunāsikān : prathamān ṛtīyān [prathamāntām ṛtīyāntām?] vidyāt na tu paṭhet kva cit : vṛtter ananudarçanāt*).

## अधिस्पर्शं च ॥१॥

### 9. Also *adhisparçam*.

The meaning and scope of this rule are exceedingly obscure, and the commentator so signally fails to throw any light upon it, that we can hardly help concluding that he did not understand it himself. His exposition, without any amendment, is as follows: *adhisparçā ca pratijñā [jādīn mā'vasitān sparçān padyān anunāsikān : ṛtīyān çaunakamatāt] nam bhavati : na nu vṛtīḥ : kim adhisparçā nama : vakshyati : yakāraṁ-vakārayor leçavṛtīr adhisparçam çakatāyanasya ...\** I have to thank Prof. Weber for the highly probable suggestion, made in a private communication, that the words *jādīn* to *matāt*, or those enclosed in brackets, have strayed into the commentary, out of place; so that the true reading is *adhisparçam ca pratijñānam bhavati : na tu vṛtīḥ : 'adhisparçam* also is a *dictum* of Çaunaka, but not authoritative usage.' The interpolated words form part of a verse, and are apparently identical or akin in signification with the verses cited under the preceding rule: a restatement of the same thing, in slightly different terms, and so, we may conclude, by a different authority. To explain what *adhisparçā* means here, the commentator simply cites rule ii. 24, in which the same word occurs again: a rule which informs us of the opinion of Çakatāyana, that final *y* and *v*, the result of euphonic processes, are not omitted altogether, but imperfectly uttered *as regards the contact (adhisparçam)*, the tongue and lips, in their pronunciation, not making the partial contact (i. 30) which is characteristic of the semivowels. But how can the use of *adhisparçam* in that rule, as an adverb, give a hint of its meaning here, where it seems to be treated as a noun? Are we to understand that it is taken as the name of that peculiar utterance of *y* and *v*, and that our rule means to say that the mode of utterance in question is also a teaching of Çaunaka, but not authoritative? This is scarcely credible: it does not appear hereafter that Çaunaka had anything to do with that utterance, which is sufficiently put down by the positive rules of the treatise against it, nor would its mention here, in a passage treating of *padyas*, be otherwise than impertinent. Or is *adhisparçā* to be interpreted as the name of a slighted or imperfect utterance, and did Çaunaka teach such an utterance as belonging to a final mute, which wavered, as it were, between sonant and surd? This appears somewhat more plausible, but not sufficiently so to be accepted as at all satisfactory: there is no question of a difference of contact of the

\* Here, as also in the citation of the rule ii. 5, under rule 2 above, the whole series of illustrative citations from the Atharvan text, as given by the commentary under the rules themselves, are rehearsed: I have omitted them as superfluous.



organs (*sparṣa*) in such a case, and it is one to which the prescription of *abhinihāna* (i. 45) applies.\*

## द्वितीयचतुर्थाः सोष्माणः ॥ १० ॥

10. The second and fourth of each series are aspirates.

The term *ūshman*, literally 'heat, hot vapor, steam,' is in the grammatical language applied to designate all those sounds which are produced by a rush of unintonated breath through an open position of the mouth organs, or whose utterance has a certain similarity to the escape of steam through a pipe: they are the sibilants and aspirations or breathings (see below, i. 31). In the term *soshman*, 'aspirated mute,' and in its correlative *anūshman*, 'unaspirated mute' (i. 94), *ūshman* is to be understood not in this specific sense, but in that of 'rush of air, expulsion of unintonated breath.' To this rule correspond Rik Pr. i. 3 (r. 13, xiv) and Vāj. Pr. i. 54, the latter being also verbally coincident with it. The Tāitt. Pr. has nothing analogous, and does not employ the terms *soshman* and *anūshman*.

The commentator merely adds the list of surd and sonant aspirates to his paraphrase of the rule, citing no examples. For the sonant palatal aspirate, *jh*, the Atharvan text affords no example. He next cites a verse from his metrical authority: *sasthānāir ūshmaḥiḥ ṛktās ṛṭṭiyāḥ prathamāḥ ca ye: caturthāḥ ca dvitīyāḥ ca sampadyanta iti sthitiḥ*; 'thirds and firsts, when closely combined with *flatus* of position corresponding to their own, become fourths and seconds: that is the way.' The most natural rendering of *sasthānāir ūshmaḥiḥ* would be 'with their corresponding *ūshmans* or spirants;' but this is hardly to be tolerated, since it would give us, for example, *ts* and *ds*, instead of *th* and *dh*, as the dental aspirates. This view is distinctly put forth, however, as regards the surd aspirates, by another authority which the commentator proceeds to cite at considerable length: the first portion, which alone bears upon the subject of our rule, is as follows: "another has said, 'the fourths are formed with *h*.'" (now begin the *śloka*) "some knowing ones have said that there are five 'first' mutes; of these, by the successive accretion of secondary qualities (*guṇa*), there takes place a conversion into others. They are known as 'seconds' when combined with the qualities of *jihvāmūṭiya*, *ḥ*, *sh*, *s*, and *upadhāntiya*. The same, when uttered with intonation, are known as 'thirds;' and these, with the second spirant, are known as 'fourths.' When the 'firsts' are pronounced with intonation, and through the nose, they are called 'fifth' mutes. Thus are noted the qualities of the letters." The remaining verses of the quoted passage treat of the combination and doubling of consonants, and I am unable in all points to restore and translate them.

\* I add Weber's conjecture: "possibly—'as regards contact also' the view of Čaunaka is only a *pratijñānam*, and not *vṛtti*; that is, when the *padya*s enter into *sandhi*, they are to be converted into *ṛṭṭiyas* before nasals (e.g. *tad me*, not *tan me*): but this is only *pratijñānam*, not *vṛtti*." I cannot regard this as the true explanation, since we have no doctrine of Čaunaka's, to the effect implied, anywhere stated, and since *sparṣa* is not, so far as I am aware, ever used of the contact or concurrence of one sound with another.

## उत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ११ ॥

11. The last in each series is nasal.

The term *anunâsika* in this treatise means simply 'uttered through the nose,' and is applied to any sound in the production of which the nose bears a part: see rule 27, below. In ii. 35, it is used of the *l* into which a nasal is converted before an *l*: in all other cases of its occurrence, it designates a nasalized vowel, or what is ordinarily known as the independent and necessary *anusvâra*. Our treatise stands alone among the Prâtiçâkhyas in ignoring any such constituent of the alphabet as the *anusvâra*, acknowledging only nasal consonants and nasal vowels. For a comprehensive statement of the teachings of the other treatises respecting nasal sounds, see Roth, Zur Litteratur und Geschichte des Weda, pp. 68-82.

The Rik Pr. (i. 3, r. 14, xv) and Vâj. Pr. (i. 89) describe the nasal mutes as *anunâsika*; as does also the Tâitt. Pr. (ii. 30), including with them the *anusvâra*.

## श्वासो ऽघोषेष्वनुप्रदानः । नादो घोषवत्स्वरेषु ॥ १२।१३ ॥

12. In the surd consonants, the emission is breath;

13. In the sonant consonants and the vowels, it is sound.

In this case and the one next following, two or three rules are stated and explained together by the commentator; that the division and enumeration is to be made as here given, is attested by the statement at the close of the section respecting the number of rules contained in it.

The Prâtiçâkhyâ here lays down with entire correctness the distinction between surd and sonant sounds, which consists in the different nature of the material furnished in the two classes to the mouth organs by the lungs and throat: in the one class it is mere breath, simple unintonated air; in the other class, it is breath made sonant by the vocal chords on its passage through the throat, and thus converted into sound. The same thing is taught by two of the other treatises: see Rik Pr. xiii. 2 (r. 4, 5), and Tâitt. Pr. ii. 8, 10: the Vâj. Pr. gives no corresponding definition, nor does it use the terms *aghosha* and *ghoshavant*, but adopts instead of them the arbitrary and meaningless designations *jit* and *mud* for the surds, *dhi* for the sonants (i. 50-53). No one of the treatises confuses itself with that false distinction of "hard" or "strong," and "soft" or "weak," which has been the bane of so much of our modern phonology.

The word *anupradâna* means 'a giving along forth, a continuous emission,' and hence, 'that which is given forth, emitted material:' compare Tâitt. Pr. xxiii. 2, where *anupradâna*, 'emitted material,' is mentioned first among the circumstances which determine the distinctive character of a sound. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 2) uses instead *prakṛti*, 'material.'

Our commentator gives the full list of the sonant letters: the vowels in their three forms, short, long, and protracted (*pluta*), the sonant

mutes, the semivowels, *h*, and, by way of examples of the sonant *yamas* (see below, i. 99), those of *g* and *gh*.<sup>1</sup> He then cites again a verse from his metrical authority, as follows: *vyāñjanāṃ ghoshavatsamjñam antasthā haḥ parāu yamāu: trayas trayas ca vargāntyā aghoshah ṣesha ucyate*; 'the consonants termed sonant are the semivowels, *h*, the two latter *yamas*, and the three last of each class of mutes: the rest are called surd.' There is one striking anomaly in this classification; namely, the inclusion among the sonants of *h*, which in our pronunciation is a surd of surds. The Sanskrit *h* is, as is well known, the etymological descendant, in almost all cases, of a guttural sonant aspirate, *gh*: are we then to assume that it retained, down to the time of establishment of the phonetic system of the language, something of its sonant guttural pronunciation, and was rather an Arabic *ghain* than our simple aspiration? or would it be allowable to suppose that, while in actual utterance a pure *h*, it was yet able, by a reminiscence of its former value, to exercise the phonetic influence of a sonant letter? The question is not an easy one to decide; for, while the latter supposition is of doubtful admissibility, it is equally hard to see how the *h* should have retained any sonancy without retaining at the same time more of a guttural character than it manifests in its euphonic combinations. The Prāticākhya which treats most fully of the *h* is that belonging to the Tāittiriya Saṅhitā: we read there (ii. 4-6) that, while sound is produced in a closed throat, and simple breath in an open one, the *h*-tone is uttered in an intermediate condition; and (ii. 9) that this *h*-tone is the emitted material in the consonant *h*, and in "fourth" mutes, or sonant aspirates. I confess myself unable to derive any distinct idea from this description, knowing no intermediate utterance between breath and sound, excepting the stridulous tone of the loud whisper, which I cannot bring into any connection with an *h*. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 2, r. 6) declares both breath and sound to be present in the sonant aspirates and in *h*, which could not possibly be true of the latter, unless it were composed, like the former, of two separate parts, a sonant and a surd: and this is impossible. The Tāitt. Pr., in another place (ii. 46, 47), after defining *h* as a throat sound, adds that, in the opinion of some, it is uttered in the same position of the organs with the following vowel; which so accurately describes the mode of pronunciation of our own *h* that we cannot but regard it as an important indication that the Sanskrit *h* also was a pure surd aspiration.

समानयमे ऽक्षरमुच्चैरुदात्तम् । नीचैरनुदात्तम् । आक्षिप्तं  
स्वरितम् ॥ १४ । १५ । १६ ॥

14. In a given key, a syllable uttered in a high tone is called acute;

15. One uttered in a low tone is called grave;

<sup>1</sup> MS. गघ, so that, but for the following verse, it would be very doubtful what was meant.

16. One carried from the high to the low tone is called circumflex.

The word *samânayame* signifies literally 'on the same pitch:' *yama* has this sense once in the Rik Pr. (xiii. 17), and several times in the Tâitt. Pr. (xv. 9, xix. 3, etc.). The specification which it conveys is omitted in all the other treatises, probably as being too obvious to require statement. The meaning evidently is that the acute and grave pronunciations are bound to no absolute or fixed tones, but that, wherever one's voice is pitched, a higher tone of utterance gives the acute, a lower the grave. Our treatise, the Vâj. Pr. (i. 108, 109), the Tâitt. Pr. (i. 38, 39), and Pânini (i. 2. 29, 30) precisely accord in their description of the *udâtta* and *anudâtta* accents: the Rik Pr. (iii. 1) tries to be more profound, describing the cause rather than the nature of their difference, and succeeds in being obscure: its definition of them, as spoken "with tension and relaxation respectively," would teach us little about them but for the help of the other authorities. As regards the *svarita*, the definitions virtually correspond, though different in form: the Tâitt. Pr. (i. 40) and Pânini call it a *samâhâra*, or 'combination,' of the other two; the Vâj. Pr. (i. 110) says that a syllable possessing both the other tones is *svarita*; the Rik Pr. (iii. 2), that a syllable is *svarita* into which the two other tones enter together. The term *âkshipta*, used in the definition of our treatise, is difficult of explanation. It corresponds with the term *âkshêpa*, by which in the Rik Pr. (iii. 1) the accent in question is characterized, and which Regnier translates "addition," Müller "a clinging to, continuance, persistence (*anhaltten*)," and Roth (Preface to Nirukta, p. lvii) nearly the same (*aushalten*, 'persistence, perseverance'); while Weber (p. 133) renders our *âkshiptam* "slurred, drawled (*geschleift*)." Regnier's translation is supported by the analogy of the corresponding expressions in the other treatises, nor would it imply too great an ellipsis in the connection in which it stands in his text; but to understand the participle here in a corresponding sense, as meaning 'exhibiting the addition of the other two to each other,' could hardly be tolerated. Uvâta's commentary explains *âkshêpa* by *tiryaggamana*, which would admit of being rendered 'a passing through, or across, from one to the other;' and I have accordingly translated *âkshipta* as having the sense of 'thrown, transferred, or carried from one to the other of the two already mentioned.'

The words *udâtta* and *anudâtta* mean literally 'elevated' and 'not elevated'—that is to say, above the average pitch of the voice. *Svarita* is more difficult to understand, and has received many different explanations, none of which has been satisfactorily established. I have myself formerly (Journ. Am. Or. Soc., v. 204) ventured the suggestion that it might come from *svara*, 'vowel,' and mean 'vocalized, exhibiting a conversion of semivowel into vowel,' as would be necessary, in order to the full enunciation of the double tone, in the great majority of the syllables which exhibit it: but I am far from confident that this is the true explanation. The accent is once called in the Tâitt. Pr. (xix. 3) *dviyama*, 'of double tone or pitch.' The three Sanskrit accents, *udâtta*, *anudâtta*, and *svarita*, so precisely correspond in phonetic character

with what we are accustomed to call acute, grave, and circumflex, that it has not seemed to me worth while to avoid the use of these terms in treating of them.

The commentator gives only a paraphrase, and no explanation, of these rules, which he states and treats together, as I have done. As illustrations of the accents, he cites *amāvāsyā'* (e. g. vii. 79. 2) and *kanyā'* (e. g. i. 14. 2), both circumflex on the final syllable, and the words *prā' mā' ca roha*, which are not found in the Atharvan: but the reading is probably corrupt, and the phrase meant may be *prajā'm ca róha* (xiii. 1. 34); this would furnish instances of the *udatta* and *anudatta*—although, indeed, not better than a thousand other phrases which might have been selected.

## स्वरितस्यादितो मात्रार्धमुदात्तम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Half the measure of a circumflex, at its commencement, is acute.

Our treatise, with which the Váj. Pr. (i. 126) precisely agrees, contents itself with this description of the *svarita* or circumflex, and we must commend their moderation. The other two treatises give way more or less to the characteristic Hindu predilection for hair-splitting in matters unessential, and try to define more particularly the degree of elevation of the higher portion, and the degree of depression of the lower. Thus the Rik Pr. (iii. 2, 3) describes the higher portion—which it allows to be either a half-mora or half the whole quantity of the syllable—as higher than *udatta* or acute, while the after portion is indeed *anudatta* or grave, yet has the *udatta* pitch. The Tãitt. Pr. (i. 46) notices the doctrine held by our treatise as that of some teachers, and also remarks (i. 47) that some regard the whole syllable as a slide or continuous descent from the higher to the lower pitch. Its own doctrine (i. 41–45) is that, when the *svarita* follows an *udatta*, its first half-mora only is higher than *udatta*, its remaining portion being either the same as *udatta*, or lower, or the same as *anudatta*.

We have in this part of the work only the general description of the accents: a more detailed treatment of them, as they arise and as they affect one another in the combinations of the continuous text, is given in the third section of the third chapter (iii. 55 etc.).

The commentator merely cites, as offering instances of the circumflex accent, the following words: *amāvāsyā'* (e. g. vii. 79. 2), *kanyā'* (e. g. i. 14. 2), *dhānyām* (e. g. iii. 24. 2), *ácāryāḥ* (e. g. xi. 5. 3), *rājanyāḥ* (e. g. v. 17. 9), *nyāk* (vi. 91. 2), *kvā* (e. g. ix. 9. 4), *svāḥ* (e. g. ii. 5. 2): they all appear again, as instances of the *jātya* or original *svarita*, under iii. 57.

## मुखे विशेषाः करणस्य ॥ १८ ॥

18. In the mouth there are differences of producing organ.

This rule is simply introductory to those that follow, respecting the place and mode of production of the different sounds of the spoken

alphabet. As regards each of these, two circumstances are to be considered: the *sthāna*, or 'position,' and the *karana*, or 'producer.' The distinction between the two is laid down by the commentator twice over, in identical phrase, under rules 19 and 25: *kim punaḥ sthānam: kiṁ karaṇam: . . . yad upakramyate tat sthānam: yeno 'pakramyate tat karaṇam*; 'what, again, is "position," and what "organ"?' that is position to which approach is made; that is organ by which approach is made.' The Tāitt. Pr. has a similar definition in its text (ii. 31-34): "in case of the vowels, that is position to which there is approximation; that is organ which makes the approximation: in the case of the other letters, that is position upon which contact is made; that is organ by which one makes the contact." That is to say; two organs are always concerned in the production of a sound, and by their contact or approximation the sound receives its character: of these, the more immovable one is called the *sthāna*, or place of production, and it is from this that the sound derives its class designation; the more movable or active one is called the *karana*, or instrument of production. The *sthāna* does not require to be stated, since it is implied in the very name of the sound; but, lest it should chance to be erroneously imagined that all the sounds are produced by one and the same organ at the places indicated, we are expressly taught the contrary in this rule, and the treatise goes on to specify the different organs.\*

### काव्यानामधरकाठः ॥ ११ ॥

19. Of the throat-sounds, the lower part of the throat is the producing organ.

That is to say, as the commentator goes on to explain, the upper part of the throat, as place of production, is approached by the lower part of the throat, as instrument of production. As the sounds constituting the class, he mentions *a*, in its short, long, and protracted values, *h*, and the *visarjanīya*. The same sounds are defined as *kanṭhya* by the Rik Pr. (i. 8, r. 38-40, xxxix-xli), which also notices that some call *h* and *visarjanīya* "chest-sounds" (*urasya*). The Vāj. Pr. (i. 71) declares them formed in the throat, but (i. 84) by the middle of the jaw as organ—a strange description, and not very creditable to the accuracy of observation of its author. The Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 46) reckons only *h* and *visarjanīya* as throat-sounds, and then adds (ii. 47, 48) that some regard *h* as having the same position with the following vowel, and *visarjanīya* as having the same position with the preceding vowel. This latter is the most significant hint which any of the Prātiçākhyas afford us respecting the phonetic value of the rather problematical *visarjanīya*, indicating it as a mere uncharacterized breathing, a final *h*. There is an obvious propriety in detaching these two aspirations and *a* from the following class of "gutturals," *k* etc., in which the Paninean scheme (under Pān.

\* The meaning *i* under the title *karana* in the Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon—viz. "Aussprache, Articulation"—is accordingly to be struck out: Weber's translation of the word, also—"Hervorbringungsweise, 'method of production'"—is both inaccurate and peculiarly cumbersome and unwieldy.

i. 1. 9) ranks them, as they receive no modifying action from any of the mouth organs: and the authority who called the aspirations chest-sounds may also be commended for his acuteness, since in their production it may even be said that the throat has no part: it is only, like the mouth, the avenue by which the breath expelled from the chest finds exit.

The commentator quotes a verse again, of which the general drift is clear, although I have not succeeded in restoring its readings so as to translate it with closeness. It speaks of the diphthongs as also containing an element of throat-sound, and says that they, as well as the nasal mutes, are declared to have a twofold position.

### त्रिह्रामूलीयानां ह्रनुमूलम् ॥ २० ॥

20. Of the gutturals, the base of the jaw is the producing organ.

The name *jihvāmūliya*, by which the class of sounds here spoken of is called, means 'formed at the base of the tongue.' I retain for them, however, the brief and familiar appellation of "gutturals." They are stated by the commentary to be the *r* vowels, short, long, and protracted, the guttural mutes *k*, *kh*, *g*, *gh*, *ñ*, the *jihvāmūliya* spirant, or that modification of *visarjantya* which is exhibited before the surd gutturals *k* and *kh* (intimated by him by means of an illustrative instance, *puruṣaḥ khaṇati*: the phrase is a fabricated one, not occurring in the Atharvan text), and the vowel *l̥* (also intimated by an example, *kl̥ptaḥ* [x. 10. 23]). Precisely the same series of sounds is stated by the Rik Pr. (i. 8, r. 41, xlii) to constitute the class of *jihvāmūliyas*. The Vāj. Pr. declares the same, with the exception of the *l̥*-vowel, to be formed at the base of the tongue (i. 65) by the base of the jaw (i. 83). The Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 35, 44) includes in the class only the guttural mutes and spirant, and reverses the relation of position and organ, making the jaw the former, and the tongue the latter. This is evidently the more natural way of defining the mode of production of the class, and the more analogous with the method of our own treatise elsewhere, as in the cases of the throat-letters, palatals, and labials, the lower and more mobile of the two organs concerned being taken as the producer. But the usage of naming the class from the *sthāna* seems to have required that the *jihvāmūla* be declared the *sthāna*, and not the *karana*, of the sounds of which the well established name was *jihvāmūliya*. By *hanumūla*, 'root or base of the jaw,' must be here understood, it should seem, the posterior edge of the hard palate, which might well enough be regarded as the base of the upper jaw, or of the bony structure in which the upper teeth are set. It is, in fact, by a contact produced at this point between the roof of the mouth and the nearest part of the upper surface of the tongue that our own gutturals, *k* and *g*, are uttered. That the *r*-vowel should be included by the Prāciṅkhyas among the guttural sounds, instead of among the linguals, where its euphonic value so distinctly places it, and where it is arranged in the Pāinean scheme, is very strange, and would point to a guttural pronunciation of the *r* in certain localities or among certain classes; a guttural *r* is a well recognized constituent of many modern alphabets. The definition of the

l-vowel as a guttural by part of the authorities is probably explainable by its occurrence only in the root *kly*, after a guttural, where it might naturally enough be so far assimilated as to take on something of a guttural character, being removed to a point considerably posterior to that in which the common *l* is uttered. The Vâj. Pr. (i. 69) and the Paninean scheme make it dental. The *jihvâmûliya* spirant and its compeer, the *upadhântiya* or labial spirant, are nowhere expressly mentioned in our treatise, but are apparently necessarily implied in ii. 40, and are regarded by the commentator as forming part of the alphabet which the work contemplates. It does not seem probable that they were important modifications of the neutral breathing, the *visarjaniya*.

The commentator again closes his exposition with a verse, which, with some doubtful emendations, reads as follows: *jihvâmûlam rvarnasya kavargasya ca bhâshyate; yac<sup>1</sup> cai<sup>2</sup> va jihvâmûliya lvarnaç ce<sup>2</sup> 'ti ie smrtâh<sup>2</sup>*: 'the root of the tongue is declared the organ of the *r*-vowels and the *k*-series; also the spirant which is *jihvâmûliya*, and the *l*-vowels are so explained.'

## तात्त्व्यानां मध्यजिह्वम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. Of the palatals, the middle of the tongue is the producing organ.

The sounds composing this class are stated by the commentator to be *e*, *âi*, *y*, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*, *jh*, *ñ*, and the vowel *i*, in its short, long, and protracted values. In this enumeration, he follows the order of the half verse which he goes on to quote, as follows: *tâlv âiyaçacavargânâm ivarnasya ca bhâshyate*: 'the palate is explained to be the place of production of *âi*, *y*, *ç*, the *c*-series, and the *i*-vowels.' The same sounds are specified by the Rik Pr. (i. 9, r. 42, xliii) as palatals, and are described by the Vâj. Pr. (i. 66, 79) as formed upon the palate, by the middle of the tongue, precisely as by our treatise. The Tâitt. Pr. (ii. 36) furnishes the same definition of the *c*-series and (ii. 44) of *ç*, but holds (ii. 40) that *y* is formed upon the palate by the middle and end of the tongue; and, as in other cases, it does not include any vowels in the class.

The ancient Sanskrit *c* and *j* can hardly have been so distinctly compound sounds as our *ch* and *j* (in *church*, *judge*), or they would have been analyzed and described as such by the phonetists. At the same time, their inability to stand as finals, the euphonic conversion of *t* and following *ç* into *ch*, the Prakritic origin of *c* and *j* from *ty* and *dy*, etc., are too powerful indications to be overlooked of their close kindred with our sounds, and deviation from strict simplicity of nature. That the *ç* was our *sh*, or something only infinitesimally differing from it, we see no good reason to doubt: and certainly, those who hold to the English *ch* and *j* pronunciation for the mutes cannot possibly avoid accepting the *sh* pronunciation for the sibilant.

It has already been noticed above (under r. 10) that one of the palatal mutes, *jh*, does not once occur in the Atharvan text.

<sup>1</sup> *yac*.

<sup>2</sup> *lvarnasye 'ti sa smrtâh*.



## मूर्धन्यानां जिह्वायं प्रतिवेष्टितम् ॥२२॥

22. Of the linguals, the tip of the tongue, rolled back, is the producing organ.

The sounds composing this class are *sh*, and the *t* series, or *t*, *th*, *d*, *dh*, *n*; so says the commentator, and fortifies his assertion by adding the half verse *mūrdhasthānaṁ śhakārasya tavargasya tathā matam*. They are known in all the Prātiçākhyas by the same name (R. Pr. i. 9, r. 43, xlv; V. Pr. i. 67, 78; T. Pr. ii. 37, 44), and the Vāj. Pr. and Tāitt. Pr. describe them in the same manner with our treatise, even to using the same verb to express the action of reverting or rolling back the tip of the tongue into the highest part of the mouth cavity. The semivowel and vowel *r* are in the Paninean scheme, and in our customary classification of the Sanskrit alphabet, also reckoned as linguals; and, as the euphonic laws of the language show, with entire propriety, since it is in no inconsiderable measure under the assimilating influence of the *r* that the others have come into the alphabet, or won their present degree of extension in the spoken system of sounds. The only letter of nearly corresponding position in our modern European alphabets is the *r*, which in English, at least, is ordinarily pronounced smoothly over the tip of the tongue within the dome of the palate, although not at a point so far back as would seem to be indicated by the term *mūrdhan*. This word means literally 'head, *caput*,' and hence an exact translation of its derivative *mūrdhanya* would be 'capital,' and this would be the proper name by which to call the class, if the term had not in English another well recognized meaning as applied to letters. Müller (p. xviii) holds *mūrdhan* to be used directly in the sense of 'dome of the palate' (*Gaumendach*), and Weber (p. 108) accepts the same meaning for *çiras*, but it seems to me exceedingly doubtful whether words which mean so distinctly 'head,' as usually employed, can, without limiting addition, be taken as signifying a certain region in the mouth: especially when we see the Vāj. Pr. (i. 30) once use *bhrūmadhya*, 'the middle of the brows,' in a corresponding sense, and the Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 3) mention the mouth (*mukha*) along with the "head" (*çiras*) among the organs which give form to sound. *Mūrdhan* must be taken to mean 'dome of the palate' indirectly, if at all, in so far as that is the highest point in "the head" which the tongue is capable of reaching. Müller proposes "cacuminal" as a name for the class; a far from unsuitable term, but one which has not found acceptance, perhaps as being rather cacophonous. The name employed by Bopp and many other later grammarians, "lingual," seems as free from objection as any other. "Cerebral" does injustice to the Hindu grammarians, and obtrudes offensively a false and absurd theory.

## षकारस्य द्रोणिका ॥२३॥

23. Of *sh*, the trough-shaped tongue is the producing organ.

Our treatise is the only one which singles out *sh* from among the other lingual letters, to make it the subject of a special description.

Both the commentator and his metrical authority regard the *sh* as included in the class which the last rule describes: we are to regard this, then, only as a specification which so far modifies the description already given. It is very possibly a later interpolation in the text of our treatise. The commentary, as usual, offers no explanation of the word *dronikâ*, which does not occur elsewhere in the grammatical language. It is a derivative from *drona*, 'wooden tub or trough,' and is explained in the Böhltlingk-Roth lexicon as "the tongue bent together in the form of a trough," which is undoubtedly the true rendering. It can hardly be claimed that this rule adds to the distinctness of our apprehension of the character of this sibilant, which is clearly enough exhibited by its relation to the other lingual sounds: it is not our *sh*—which is rather, as above noticed, the palatal ç—but such a sibilant as is formed by reverting the tip of the tongue into the dome of the palate; much more nearly resembling our *sh* than our *s*, because uttered at nearly the same point with the former, only with the tip, instead of the broad upper surface, of the tongue: an *s* can only be produced pretty close behind the upper teeth.

As an instance of this sibilant, the commentator cites the phrase *shad âhuh çitân shad u mâsah* (viii. 9. 17).

दन्त्यानां जिह्वाग्रं प्रस्तीर्णम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. Of the dentals, the tip of the tongue thrust forward is the producing organ.

The commentator makes this class include *l, s, t, th, d, dh,* and *n*, citing again a quarter verse to the same effect: *dantâ<sup>1</sup> lasatavargânâm*. The Vâj. Pr. adds the *l*-vowel to the class, which it defines (i. 69, 76) as formed at the teeth by the tip of the tongue. The Rik Pr. (i. 9, 10, r. 44, 45, xlv, xlv) composes the class of *l, s,* and *r*, besides the *t*-series, and calls them *dantamûliyâs*, 'letters of the roots of the teeth.' The Tâitt. Pr. (ii. 38, 42, 44) defines the same letters, except *r*, as formed *dantamûleshu*, 'at the roots of the teeth,' the *t*-series and *s* by the tip of the tongue, and *l* by its middle part. The description of the two latter authorities is undoubtedly the more accurate, since the contact by which our "dentals" are produced is not upon the teeth themselves, but just at their base or behind them: between the tip of the tongue and the teeth, where no close contact is possible, are brought forth the English *th* sounds. What makes in all cases the peculiar character of an *l* is that in its production the tongue is in contact with the roof of the mouth in front, but open at the sides. The Tâitt. Pr., then, in defining the *l* as produced by the middle of the tongue, doubtless refers to the part where the escape of the breath takes place, while the others are thinking only of the part by which the contact is made.

आध्यानामधरौष्ठम्<sup>२</sup> ॥ २५ ॥

25. Of the labials, the lower lip is producing organ.

<sup>1</sup> *dantydâ*.

<sup>2</sup> *-oshîhyam*; as also in more than one instance in what follows.

That is to say, as in the case of the throat sounds (r. 19, above) the upper surface of the throat was regarded as the passive organ, or position, and the under surface as the active organ, or producer, so here the upper lip is passive organ, and the lower lip active: or, as the commentary phrases it, "the upper lip, the position (*sthāna*), is approached by the lower lip, the producer (*karana*)."<sup>1</sup> The labials are, according to the commentator, the diphthongs *o* and *āu*, in the normal and the protracted form, the *p*-series, or *p*, *ph*, *b*, *bh*, *m*, the *upadhmaniya* spirant (which is not named, but indicated by an example, *purushaḥ pibati*: the phrase is not found in the Atharvan), and the vowel *u*, short, long, and protracted. That the semivowel *v* is omitted here is doubtless the fault of the copyist only, since the sound is not provided with a place elsewhere. The verses cited from the metrical treatise are as follows: *sandhyakshareshu varṇeshu varṇāntam oshthyaṃ ucyate: upadhmaniyaṃ ukāro vaḥ pavargas tathā matāḥ*:<sup>1</sup> 'in the diphthongal sounds, the final sound is called labial; the *upadhmaniya*, *u*, *v*, and the *p*-series are also so considered.' The Rik. Pr. (i. 10, r. 47, xlvi) agrees with our treatise; the Vāj. Pr. (i. 70, 80, 81) also defines the same sounds as produced upon the lip, and by the lip,\* but then adds farther that in the utterance of *v* the tips of the teeth are employed: the same specification as to the *v* is made by the Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 43: its commentator explaining that in the utterance of that letter the points of the upper teeth are placed on the edge of the lower lip); and the latter treatise also, as in other cases, omits the vowels and diphthongs from the class. The descriptions of *v* given by the two Prātiçākhyas of the Yajur Veda, as well as that offered in the Paninean scheme (which declares its organs of utterance to be the teeth and lips), leave no room to doubt that at their period the *v* had already generally lost its original and proper value as English *w*—as which alone it has any right to be called a semivowel, and to rank with *y*—and, doubtless passing through the intermediate stage of the German *w*, had acquired the precise pronunciation of the English *v*. Whether the silence of the Rik and Atharvan Prātiçākhyas on this point is due to their prior date, or to a local or scholastic difference in their utterance of the *v*, or to the fact that, in view of the exclusively labial euphonic character of the sound they were willing to overlook the peculiarity of utterance distinguishing it from the other labials, I would not undertake to decide: but should consider the first supposition the least possible, and the second the most probable, of the three.

## नासिक्यानां नासिका ॥ २६ ॥

26. Of the nose-sounds, the nose is producing organ.

The commentary paraphrases *nāsikyāḥ* by *nāsikāsthānā varṇāḥ*,

<sup>1</sup> *pavargaḥ ca tathā matāḥ*.

\* Weber misunderstands rule 80, *samānasthānakaraṇā nāsikyāvūshīhyāḥ*, to signify that the nasals and labials have the same *sthāna* and *karana* with one another: the meaning evidently is that, in each of these two classes of sounds, *sthāna* and *karana* are the same organ: in the one case, they are both the nose; in the other, both are the lips.

'sounds which have the nose as their place of production,' and cites, without farther explanation, as instances, *brahma* (e. g. i. 19. 4), *payâñsi* (e. g. i. 9. 3), कं खं गं घं, and *n, ñ, n, m*: that is to say, the *nâsikya* (see below, i. 100), *anusvâra*, the *yamas* (see below, i. 99), and the nasal mutes. A verse from the metrical authority follows, sustaining this exposition: *nâsikye nâsikâ sthânam tathâ 'nusvâra ucyate: yamâ vargotlamâç câ 'pi yatho 'ktañ câi 'va te matâh*; 'in the case of *nâsikya*, as likewise of *anusvâra*, the nose is called the place of production; the *yamas*, and the finals of the several mute series are also understood to be as explained.' But there are grave objections to be made to this exposition. In the first place, the nasal mutes have been expressly declared above (i. 11) to be *anunâsika*, and the *anunâsikâs* are the subject, not of this rule, but of the next. Again, this treatise, as already noticed, acknowledges no *anusvâra*, and regards such syllables as the second of *payâñsi* to contain nasalized or *anunâsika* vowels, which also fall under the next rule. We can hardly doubt that the commentator has here allowed himself to be misled by the authority on which he relies, and which may have treated the nasals in a manner essentially different from that of our treatise. The sounds to which the rule is meant to apply must be merely the *nâsikya* and the *yamas*. This conclusion is supported by the authority of the Rik Pr., which (i. 10, r. 48, xlix) gives the name of nose-sounds (*nâsikya*) to the *nâsikya*, *yamas*, and *anusvâra*;\* and also by that of the Vâj. Pr., which (i. 74) declares the same sounds to be formed in the nose, and pronounces (i. 80) their place and organ of production to be the same, only specifying farther (i. 82) that the *yamas* are uttered "with the root of the nose." The doctrine of the Tâitt. Pr. (ii. 49-51) is less definite and distinct: it states that the nose-sounds are uttered with the nose, or else with the nose and mouth both, when their organ varies according to the *varga* or mute series to which they belong.

### अनुनासिकानां मुखनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. Of the nasalized sounds, the mouth and nose together are the producing organs.

The commentator explains *anunâsikâh* by *anunâsikâsthânâ varnâh*, 'sounds which have for their place of production the *anunâsika*.' I know of no other case in which *anunâsika* is treated as the name of any part or organ in the mouth, and cannot but regard this paraphrase as an unintelligent and mechanical continuance of the same mode of explication which has been correctly applied to the class appellations in the preceding rules. Without any statement of what sounds are to be considered as referred to in this rule, the commentary cites the following illustrative instances: *dve ca me viñçatiç ca* (v. 15. 2); *tisraç ca me triñçac ca* (v. 15. 3); *catastraç ca me catvârîñçac ca* (v. 15. 4); *pumân*

\* The commentary of one of Müller's manuscripts (see p. xix), by a noteworthy agreement in misinterpretation with our own, tries to bring in the nasal mutes also as belonging to the class.

*pūmsah* (e. g. iii. 6. 1); *tatra pūmsuwanam* (vi. 11. 1): they are cases, wanting both in brevity and variety, of the nasalized vowels only. But, besides the nasal vowels, the rule must be intended to describe the character of the nasal semivowel *l* (ii. 35), and of the nasal mutes (i. 11). In the production of all these sounds, the mouth bears a part not less essential than the nose: each of them requires a given position of the mouth organs, to which the expulsion of the breath, in part or in whole, through the nose, then communicates a nasal quality.

The corresponding definition of the Rik Pr., "a nasal sound is produced by the mouth and nose together," does not occur until the latter portion of that treatise (xiii. 6, r. 20). The Vāj. Pr. (i. 75) gives an equivalent explanation; the Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 52) says, with equal justice, "nasal quality is communicated by the unclosing of the nose"—of course, in any given position of the mouth organs.

A verse is again cited by the commentator, as follows: *mukhanāsike ye varṇā ucyante te 'nunāsikāḥ: samānāsyaprayatnā ye te savarṇā iti smṛtāḥ*; 'the sounds uttered in the mouth and nose together are called nasalized. Those produced by a like effort of the mouth are styled similar.' The term *savarṇa*, 'similar,' applied to sounds differing in quantity only, and not in quality, is used but once in our treatise (iii. 42), and is not defined by it: the cited definition is almost the same with that of Pāṇini (i. 1. 9): that of the Vāj. Pr. (i. 43) is more explicit: the other treatises, like our own, employ the word without taking the trouble to explain it.

रेफस्य दन्तमूलानि ॥ २८ ॥

28. Of *r*, the roots of the teeth are the producing organs.

By the 'roots of the teeth' must be understood, doubtless, the bases of the upper front teeth, at which, according to the Rik Pr. (i. 9-10) and the Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 38, 42), the whole class called in our treatise simply "dentals" (see rule 24, above) is produced. It seems strange to find them here called the *karana*, instead of the *sthāna*, of *r*, and we are almost ready to assume a break in the *anuvṛtti* of the term *karana*, and supply *sthāna* in place of it; and the more especially, as the cited verse favors the substitution: *rephasya dantamūlāni pratyag vā tebhya ishyate: iti sthānāni varṇānām kīrtitāni yathākramam*; 'of *r*, the place is taught to be the roots of the teeth, or a point close to them: thus have the places of the sounds been set forth in order.' The commentator farther adds: *apara āha: hanumūleshu rephasya dantamūleshu vā punah: pratyag vā dantamūlebhyo mārḍhanya iti cā 'pare*; 'another has said: "the place of *r* is at the roots of the jaw, or, again, at the roots of the teeth, or close behind the roots of the teeth: others say that it is a lingual.'" A considerable difference of opinion among the Hindu phonetists respecting the position of the *r* is indicated by these citations and by the teachings of the different phonetic treatises. The Rik Pr., as we have seen (under rule 24), includes it with the other dentals, as *dantamūliya*, but adds (i. 10, r. 46, xlvii) that some regard it as gingival. The Vāj. Pr. defines it as produced at the roots of the

teeth (i. 68), by the tip of the tongue (i. 77); the Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 41), by the tip and middle of the tongue, at a point close behind the roots of the teeth: the Paninean scheme alone reckons it as *mūrikhanya*, 'lingual.' The separation of *ṛ* and *r* from one another, and of both from the lingual class, is the strangest and least defensible feature in the alphabetic classification of the Prāticākhyas. By its effect in the euphonic system of the language, *r* is clearly a lingual, and can hardly be supposed to have been uttered otherwise than as our smooth English *r* is uttered, with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate, to the lingual position. In this position, however, it cannot be vibrated or trilled; and it is possible that in the laborious and somewhat artificial pronunciation of the Vedic schools it was, for greater distinctness, thrown farther forward in the mouth, to the teeth or near them.

As instances of the *r*, the commentator cites *śaradaḥ purūciḥ* (ii. 13. 3), *punā raktam vāsaḥ* (not in AV.), *punā rūpāni* (i. 24. 4), *jaghnu rākshānsi* (iv. 37. 1), *agni rākshānsi* (viii. 3. 26), *agni rakshaḥ* (xii. 3. 43).

स्पृष्टं स्पर्शानां करणम् ॥२९॥

29. In the case of the mutes, the organ forms a contact.

From this contact (*sparṣa*) of the organ with the place of production, the mutes (*sparṣa*) derive their name.

The Rik Pr. (xiii. 3, r. 9) gives the same definition, with the addition that the organ is also *asthitam*, 'not stationary.' The Tāitt. Pr. (in ii. 33, 34, cited above, under i. 18) implies a contact in the case of all sounds excepting vowels and spirants (ii. 45), not laying down any distinction between the complete contact of the mutes, and the imperfect one of the semivowels.

The commentator cites a verse which establishes a noteworthy exception to this rule: *svaramadhye dadhāu yatra piḍanaṁ tatra varjayet: mṛduprayatnāv uccāryāv idā miḍham nidarṣanam*; 'where *d* and *ḍh* occur between two vowels, there one must avoid a close contact; they are to be uttered with a gentle effort: instances are *idā* (v. 12. 8) and *miḍham* (*puru-miḍham*, iv. 29. 4).' This corresponds, if it does not coincide, with the conversion of these letters in a like case into a lingual *l*, unaspirated and aspirated, usual in the Rik and in some schools of the White Yajus, and taught by the Rik Pr. in i. 11, 12 (r. 51, 52, iii, liii), as resting upon the authority of Vedamitra, and by the Vāj. Pr. in iv. 143 as the doctrine of some teachers. Our verse does not indeed point out that the relaxation of the contact takes place at the sides of the tongue, and that the resulting sound is hence of the nature of an *l*; but this is altogether probable.

इषत्स्पृष्टमन्तःस्थानाम् ॥३०॥

30. In the case of the semivowels, it is partially in contact.

That is to say, the organs are so nearly approximated that their position may be called an imperfect contact. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 3, r. 10)

calls it *duhspr̥ṣṭam*, 'imperfectly or hardly in contact.' The Tāitt. Pr., as just remarked, does not distinguish the degree of contact of the semivowels from that of the mutes.

The name by which the semivowels *y*, *r*, *l*, *v* are called—namely *antaḥsthā*, 'intermediate, standing between'—is generally explained as indicating that the sounds in question, in the arrangement of the alphabet, stand between the mutes and the spirants. The Böhlingk-Koth lexicon, however (*sub verbo*), defines it to mean 'occurring only in the interior of a sentence, never at its end.' This latter interpretation is exceedingly unsatisfactory: in the first place, the definition would be as true of the spirants and aspirates as of the semivowels; in the second place, it would not be true of the *l*; in the third place, no letter could be called *antaḥsthā* in this sense which could occur at the beginning of a sentence, as all the semivowels do. But the other explanation also seems too indefinite and indistinctive. Is it not more likely that these sounds were named "intermediate" in reference to the mode of their formation, as being neither by a complete contact, like the full mutes, nor by an open position, like the vowels? The name *antaḥsthā* would then be virtually accordant with our own "semivowel."

### उष्मणां विवृतं च ॥३१॥

31. In the case of the spirants, it is also open.

The final *ca* of the rule indicates, according to the commentator, that *ishatspr̥ṣṭam* is also to be inferred from the preceding rule: in the formation of the spirants (*ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *h* are specified by the commentary as constituting the class), the organ is both in partial contact and open—a rather awkward way of saying, apparently, that its position is neither very close nor very open. The Tāitt. Pr. (ii. 44, 45) declares that the spirants, in their order, are uttered in the positions of the mutes, but with the middle part of the producing organ opened. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 3, r. 11) includes the vowels, *anusvāra*, and the spirants together, as produced without contact, and with the organ stationary.

In the absence of a *varṇasamāmnāya*, 'list of spoken sounds,' or 'alphabet,' such as the other Prātiçākhyas give (Rik Pr., introductory verse, and i. 1, 2; Vāj. Pr. viii. 1-31; Tāitt. Pr. i. 1-10), it is not easy to assure ourselves how many spirants the treatise acknowledges, and in what order it would assume them to stand. As we have already seen, the commentary accepts the *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya*, which are nowhere expressly mentioned in the text, but of which the existence seems necessarily implied in ii. 40. The class of spirants is then probably composed of *h* (*visarjanīya*), *h*, *ḥk* (*jihvāmūliya*), *ç*, *sh*, *s*, and *hp* (*upadhmanīya*). The Rik Pr. (i. 2, r. 10, xi) includes in the class these seven, along with *anusvāra*; the Vāj. Pr. (viii. 22), only *ç*, *sh*, *s*, *h*; the Tāitt. Pr. (i. 9), the seven of our treatise, with the exception of *visarjanīya*.

### स्वराणां च ॥३२॥

32. In the case of the vowels also, it is open.

The commentator understands, and doubtless correctly, that *vivṛtam* only, and not *ishatsprshītam* also, is implied in this rule by inference from the preceding. He adds the whole list of vowels, both simple vowels and diphthongs, in their short, long, and protracted (*pluta*) form.

The Rik Prātiçākhyā's doctrine respecting the vowels was cited under the last rule. The Tāitt. Pr., in its rules ii. 31, 32 (cited above, under i. 18), implies that in the utterance of the vowels the organs only approximate, and do not touch one another.

एके स्पृष्टम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Some consider it as forming a contact.

That is, the commentator says, some maintain that in the utterance of the vowels the organs are in contact; others, that they remain open. The former opinion is too obviously and grossly incorrect, one would think, to be worth quoting. No one of the other treatises favors it in any degree.

एकारौकारयोर्विवृततमम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. In the case of *e* and *o*, it is very widely open.

The word *eke*, 'some,' is no longer in force, but this and the two following rules are more detailed explanations of our treatise itself under its own rule 32. For the pronunciation of the Sanskrit *e* and *o*, see below, under rule 40.

The commentator cites, as instances of these diphthongs, *eke taranti* (vi. 122. 2), *oko asya* (v. 22. 5).

ततो ज्याकारस्य ॥ ३५ ॥

35. And even more so, in the case of *ā*.

The *a*-sound ("Italian *a*," as in *father*) is unquestionably the most open of all the sounds of the alphabet, the only one in the utterance of which all the mouth organs are removed, so far as is possible, from the path of the intonated breath, which is thus suffered to stream forth wholly unimpeded and unmodified.

संवृतो ञ्कारः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. The *a* is obscured.

The modes of utterance of the short *a*, of the *r*-vowel, and of the diphthongs *e* and *o*, taught by the Prātiçākhyas, are matters of special interest in their phonetical systems, as helping to characterize the period in the history of the language represented by these treatises. Neither of the sounds in question has fully retained, down to their time, that value which general considerations, and the euphonic system of the Sanskrit language, show to have been the original and proper one. As regards the short *a*, it was no longer generally spoken with the full



openness of *á*, or as its correspondent short sound. See what Weber says upon the subject, under Váj. Pr. i. 72—which rule, like the final one of Pāṇini's grammar (viii. 4. 68), prescribes that the short *a* is to be treated throughout as if coincident in quality with long *á*—a prescription which implies, of course, that in actual pronunciation it was different. Whatever degradation from its pure open quality the *a* had suffered must have been, it seems to me, in the direction of the neutral vowel (English “short *u*,” in *but, son, blood*), which has so generally taken its place in the modern pronunciation of India, rather than toward an *e* or *o*, as suggested by Weber. The term *saṁvṛta*, ‘covered up, enveloped, obscured’ (antithesis of *vivṛta*, ‘opened’), very well expresses the quality of this neutral sound, which differs from *a* only in not having the mouth freely opened for its utterance, and which does not, like *e* and *o*, call for a placing in position of any of the mouth organs. The Tāitt. Pr. does not separate *a* from *á*, but says of both (ii. 12) that they are to be spoken “with the lips and jaws not too much approximated, and not too widely parted”—a description too indefinite to derive any distinct idea from. The Rik Pr. also fails to note any difference of quality between the long and short values of this vowel. But it is very doubtful whether we are to regard the silence of these two treatises upon the point in question as any evidence that they are of notably earlier date than the others, as Weber seems inclined to do: their peculiarity is much more likely to be due to a local or a scholastic difference of pronunciation, or they may have simply disregarded, as of little account, the discordance of quality between *a* and *á*.

The commentary gives, as furnishing instances of short *a*, the words *aṣvaḥ* (e. g. ii. 30. 5), *ajāḥ* (e. g. iv. 14. 1), and *agniḥ* (e. g. i. 7. 4).

### संस्पृष्टरेफमृवणम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. The *r*-vowels are combined with an *r*.

In the grammatical language of our treatise and of the Tāitt. Pr. *varṇa* appended to the name of a short vowel causes it to include also the long and protracted (*pluta*) vowels of the same quality: it is a designation of the quality, without distinction of quantity. The Tāitt. Pr. (i. 20) gives a special rule establishing the usage. Thus *rvarṇa* means *rkāra*, *ṛkāra*, and *ṛskāra*.

The commentator gives no explanation of this rule: he simply repeats it with an added *bhavati*, and then cites a couple of phrases containing the *r*, viz.: *idam pitr̥bhyaḥ pra bharaṁi barhiḥ* (xviii. 4. 51), and *putr̥air̥ bhr̥tr̥bhīr̥ aditiḥ* (vi. 4. 1). But he next proceeds to quote from his metrical authority a few verses which are more to the point; they read as follows, with the exception of the first and last lines, which are corrupt: . . .<sup>1</sup> *rvarṇe svaramātrā yā tasyā madhye rdhamātrayā: rep̥ho bhavati saṁspr̥sh̥to yathā ngulyā nakhaḥ tathā: sūtre manir̥ ive 'tye tṛṇe krimir̥ ive 'ti ca: . . .*<sup>2</sup> ‘an *r* is combined with a half-mora

<sup>1</sup> *rvarṇasya madhye yugapac ca canorah.*

<sup>2</sup> *anena mātrasyādhāyāḥ praśleshe ū ubhayar̥ api.*

in the middle of the vowel mora in the  $r$ -vowel, just as a nail is with the finger; like a pearl on a string, some say; like a worm in grass, say others.' With this accords quite nearly the doctrine of the Rik Pr., which says (xiii. 14) that  $r$  forms part of the  $r$ -vowel, and is found in the middle of it. Neither treatise attempts to define what constitutes the remainder of the vowel. In the analogous rule (iv. 145) of the Vâj. Pr., that remainder is (if the rule is in this point correctly interpreted by Weber, which is doubtful; my own manuscript of the commentary is too corrupt just here to be made anything of) declared to be of the character of  $a$ ; so that, according to Weber,  $r = \frac{a}{4} + \frac{r}{2} + \frac{a}{4}$ . The Tâitt. Pr. does not, any more than the Rik Pr. in the earlier and more genuine part of its text, take any notice of the presence of heterogeneous elements in the  $r$  and  $l$  vowels; it only says (ii. 18) that in their utterance the jaws are somewhat closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue brought near to the parts immediately above and behind the row of teeth. The etymological and euphonic character of the sound in question is simply that of a vocal  $r$ , an  $r$  which is employed with the value of a vowel, as  $r$  has been and is employed in other languages in different parts of the earth; and there seems no good reason for regarding it as having originally deviated in mode of pronunciation from the semivowel  $r$ . But it is clear that, at the time of the Prâtiçâkhyas, the Hindus had begun to find that difficulty in its utterance and use as a vowel which caused its entire disappearance in the later forms of the language, and has made of it in the mouth of the modern Brahmans the syllables  $ri$  and  $ri$ . If I may judge from experiments made in my own mouth, the bringing of the  $r$  far enough forward in the mouth to be trilled would render very natural, and almost unavoidable, the slipping in, before and after it, of a fragment of the neutral vowel, our  $u$  in *but*, the "obscure (*samvṛta*)  $a$ " of our treatise: of this character, it can hardly be doubted, would be what elements the sound contained which were not  $r$ .

## दीर्घप्लुतयोः पूर्वा मात्रा ॥३८॥

38. Of the long and protracted forms of the vowel, the first mora is so combined.

The commentary paraphrases thus: *dirghaplutayos tu pûrvâ matrâ saṁspr̥sh̥tarepham ṛvarṇam bhavati*; which is a palpable blunder for *saṁspr̥sh̥tarephâ bhavati*: i. e. if the vowel is extended so as to occupy two or three moras, the  $r$ -element which it contains is not prolonged, but is found only in the first mora: the whole remainder of the sound is composed of the other element. The Rik Pr. says in like manner (xiii. 14) that the  $r$  is found only in the former half of long  $\hat{r}$ , and is either shorter or of the same length with that which enters into  $r$ .

Two instances of the long  $\hat{r}$  are given by the commentator as illustrations: they are *karîṣṇ akshasva* (x. 1. 14), and *pitṛ̥n̄r̄ upe 'mam* (xviii. 4. 40).

## सत्कार्मुवणम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39. The *l*-vowels are combined with *l*.

This doubtless means what is more clearly and unequivocally stated by the Rik Pr. (xiii. 14, r. 35): that when, in such combinations as those which have just been described, *l* takes the place of *r*, the result is the *l*-vowel. The other two treatises, as we have seen above, treat the two vowels together, in the same rules. The use of the term *lvarṇa* in the rule would seem to imply the possible occurrence of the long and protracted forms of the vowel, which are, on the other hand, impliedly denied in rule 4 above; they are also ignored by the Tāitt. Pr., as they are by the Rik Pr. in its proper text (i. 1, r. 1); while the prefixed introductory verses to the latter treatise, and the Vāj. Pr. (viii. 7), acknowledge them.

The commentator cites, as instances of this vowel, *pañcadaṣena kṛptāh* (viii. 9. 15), and *sinivāly acikṛpat* (vi. 11. 3): the Rik. Pr. (xiii. 14, r. 35) notices the fact that the *l* occurs nowhere excepting in the root *kṛp*. He then adds a verse from his metrical authority: *ṛvarṇe ca ṛvarṇe<sup>1</sup> laḥ praḥliṣṭaḥ ca yadā tayoh : l l iti tad ichanti prayogaṃ tadvido janāh*; the general meaning is clear enough, but the verse needs amending to be made translatable.

## संध्यक्षराणि संस्पृष्टवर्णान्येकवर्णवद्वृत्तिः ॥ ४० ॥

40. The diphthongs are composed of combined vowels; their treatment is that of a simple vowel.

The term *sandhyakshara* means literally 'syllable of combination;' it is the usual name for a diphthong in all the treatises excepting the Tāitt. Pr. The correlative *samānākshara*, 'homogeneous syllable,' is but rarely used, as indicating the simple vowels, when it is necessary to distinguish them from the diphthongs (in our treatise, only in iii. 42). The diphthongs are vowel sounds which, though not simple and homogeneous, yet form but a single syllable, and are treated as if they were simple sounds. They are *e*, *o*, *āi*, *āu*. The two former would be more properly written *ai*, *au*, since the euphonic processes of the language clearly show these to have been their original values, each containing a short *a* as its first element, followed by an *i* or an *u* respectively. That they should be so readily composable of *a* and *i*, *a* and *u*, in the accidental and momentary combinations of the phrase, and especially, that they should be so regularly resolvable into the same sounds, if they did not actually contain those sounds, is not to be credited. The same evidence proves the other two to be made up of long *ā*, with *i* or *u* following. The mutual relation of *e* (*ai*) and *āi* must have been nearly that of our *I* and *aye*. In the Prakrit languages, however, *e* and *o* have gained the pronunciation of the *e* in *they* and *o* in *note*; they have become sounds intermediate between, instead of made up of, *a* and *i* and *a* and *u*; and they have acquired short values as well as long. As *e* and *o* they are likewise pronounced in the usage of the modern Brahmins. But even at the

<sup>1</sup> *lvarṇo*.

period of the Prātiçākhyas, and in the phonetic systems of the Vedic schools, they no longer had uniformly their original value. From the present rule, indeed, no such inference could be drawn; but the one which next follows establishes a distinction in value between them and *âi*, *âu*. The Rik Pr. (xiii. 15, r. 38) predicates doubleness of position of all the four, and goes on (r. 39) to cite Çakatāyana to the effect that *a* forms half of each, and *i* and *u* the remaining half: but it adds (r. 40) that *e* and *o*, by reason of the fusion of their parts, have not a sound in which the separate components are distinct. This might, however, be fairly enough said of our own *ai* and *au* (in *pine*, *house*). The Vâj. Pr. (i. 73) defines only *âi* and *âu* as composed of two different elements (the commentary explains them to be  $\frac{1}{2}a + 1\frac{1}{2}e$  and  $\frac{1}{2}a + 1\frac{1}{2}o$  respectively), and directs them (iv. 142) to be treated as simple sounds, without seeing any reason for giving the same precept as to *e* and *o*. The Tâitt. Pr. is not less explicit: it says of *o* (ii. 13, 14) that in its enunciation the jaws are to be neither too nearly approached nor too widely sundered, while the lips are to be closer than in *a*; of *e* (ii. 15-17), that the lips are to be somewhat protracted, the jaws pretty closely approached, and the middle part and end of the tongue in contact with the upper rows of teeth (*jambhân*); and finally (ii. 23), that in *e*, as in *i*, the middle of the tongue is brought near the palate. More distinctive descriptions of our *e* and *o* could hardly be given: there is evidently no thought at all of the combination of two phonetic elements into one in them. On the other hand, *âi* and *âu* are defined with equal clearness (ii. 26-29) as containing each the half of an *a* (which some held to be of closer position than the ordinary *a*), followed by one and a half times *i* and *u* in the two cases respectively.

नैकारौकारयोः स्थानविधौ ॥४१॥

41. Not so, however, with *âi* and *âu*, in a rule of position.

The commentator's paraphrase is *âikârâukârayoḥ sthânavidhâne êkavarṇavad vṛttir na bhavati*. What the meaning and value of the rule is, is not altogether clear: I can see no other application of it than to forbid the inclusion of *âi* among the palatals only, and of *âu* among the labials only, since they are both throat-sounds as well. By implication, then, *e* and *o* would admit of being ranked as merely palatal and labial; but the commentary to rule 19, above, treated these, as well as the others, as of double position, and as containing an element of throat-sound.

A verse is added in the commentary, as follows: *âikârâukârayoḥ câ 'pi pûrvâ mâtrâ parâ ca yâ: ardhmâtrâ tayor madhye saṁsprṣṭa iti smṛtâh*. The last *pâda* is corrupt, and I am too uncertain of the scope of the verse to venture to amend it: perhaps the meaning is that, while the beginning and end of *âi*, for instance, are clearly *a* and *i*, a mora in the middle of the sound is of a mixed character.

This rule ends the first section of the first chapter: the signature is *caturâdhyâyikâyâm prathamasyâ 'dhyâyasya prathamah pâdah: sûtra 41: êkacatvâriṅcat*. This is the only case in which the number of rules reckoned is assured by being expressed in words as well as in figures.

## विसर्जनीयो ऽभिनिष्ठानः ॥ ४२ ॥

### 42. *Visarjanīya* is *abhinishtāna*.

The commentator vouchsafes no explanation of the rule, but merely paraphrases it, as follows: *visarjanīyo varṇah: abhinishtāno bhavati*; and adds, as instances of *visarjanīya*, *agnih* (e. g. i. 7. 4) and *vṛkshah* (e. g. iv. 7. 5). The term *abhinishtāna* does not form part of the grammatical language of the Prātiçākhyas or of Pāṇini: among the former, it occurs only in this place: a rule of the latter (viii. 3. 86) determines its derivation and orthography, and the instances given in the commentary show its equivalence with *visarjanīya*; the Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon also refers (*sub verbo*) to several vocabularies which contain the word, giving it the same meaning. More significant is its occurrence several times in the *grhya-sūtras* (as cited in the lexica of Böhtlingk-Roth and Goldstücker), also with the signification *visarga*.\* It looks as if it had belonged to an earlier grammatical terminology than that of our treatises, and had been retained merely as a reminiscence of something formerly current: its introduction into our text is otherwise quite unexplained, and, so far as can be seen, without significance. Probably it is an ancient name of *visarjanīya* or *visarga*, crowded out of use by the latter terms. The Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon gives it, with reference to this passage, the meaning "an expiring or vanishing sound (*ein verklingender Laut*)," but this is merely a conjecture, and by no means so well supported by the etymology of the word (which would suggest rather 'a sounding forth, a resonance') as to be placed beyond the reach of question. Pāṇini's rule must be taken as conclusive respecting the derivation and form favored in his time, or by his school; but the analogy of the words *abhinidhāna*, *abhinishta*, *abhinihata*, *abhinipāta* cannot but suggest *abhinishtāna* as the true form, coming from the root *sthā* with the prefixes *abhi* and *ni*. This would not, however, relieve the obscurity investing the primitive meaning and application of the term; an obscurity which also attaches, in some measure, to the word *visarjanīya* and its more modern representative *visarga*.

## व्यञ्जनविधारणामभिनिष्ठानः पीडितः सन्नतरो हीन- श्वासनादः ॥ ४३ ॥

43. The holding apart of a consonant is *abhinidhāna*; it is pinched, quite weakened, lacking breath and sound.

\* That the word ever means 'a sound of the alphabet in general,' as stated in both the lexicons, seems to me very doubtful: I have not access to all the authorities referred to by Böhtlingk-Roth, but the commentary to Pāṇini, *abhinishtāno varṇah*, does not necessarily imply any thing of the kind, but may rather mean 'an *abhinishtāna* letter'; while, in the citation given by Goldstücker as an instance of the general meaning, it evidently signifies *visarga*: *dirghābhinishtānantam*, '(a name) ending in a long vowel or in *visarga*.' If the other cases relied on are not less equivocal than these, the general definition 'sound' must be rejected.

We have here one of those subtleties of phonetic analysis which are such marked characteristics of the Hindu science. In order to any satisfactory understanding of it, we must call in to our aid theoretical considerations, as the dark and scanty expositions of the grammatical treatises and their commentators are insufficient. The phenomenon forming the subject of the rule evidently is or includes a defective pronunciation or indistinctness of utterance, and the two next rules teach us that it affects a mute which is followed by another mute, and one which stands as final. In what does the peculiarity of utterance of such a letter in such a position consist? A mute is a sound produced by a complete closure of the organs of articulation in some defined position, entirely cutting off the escape of breath through the mouth; and it is by the breaking of the closure with the utterance of a following open sound that the mute is itself made audible. In speaking a *p*, for instance, so long as the lips are kept compressed, there is no audible sound; but as soon as the contact is severed with the expulsion of either unintonated or intonated breath, in the passing of the voice to the utterance of some other sound, the *p* is clearly heard. A sonant mute, as a *b*, is less absolutely a dumb letter before the breach of the contact, because it includes an expulsion of resonant breath from the throat into the cavity of the mouth during the closure of the organs, and this resonance is sufficient to indicate imperfectly the character of the contact. A nasal mute, as *m*, is yet less dependent upon the explosion for its distinctness of utterance, since it implies a free flow of sonant breath through the nose, and so is continuous and even quasi-vocalic in its nature; yet even the nasals, and still more the sonants, are explosive letters, and do not have a perfect utterance unless the contact is broken. A following vowel, of course, discovers them most completely; yet any open and continuable letter, as a semivowel or a sibilant, answers the same purpose, and in the syllables *pya*, *psa*, for instance, we feel that *p* is fairly enunciated. If, however, one mute letter follows another, the explosion of the former cannot properly occur; the organs are supposed to pass from one position of complete contact to another, without any intervening open sound: the former mute is imperfectly uttered. A like thing takes place when a mute is final, or when there is no following open sound to break the contact with: we then have only that very imperfect hint of its pronunciation which is given by the formation of the contact upon the preceding open sound. We are accustomed, indeed, in order to give distinctness to a final mute, to unclosure the organs again after making the contact, thus whispering after it, as it were, a bit of a vowel; and the absence of this unclosure is remarked by phonetists as a peculiarity of the pronunciation of some dialects of spoken Chinese, rendering their final mutes almost inaudible: it is hardly possible, too, to make one mute follow another so closely that there shall not slip out, in the transfer of the organs from one contact to the other, a bit of breath or sound, which greatly helps to make the former of the two audible: and of both these inorganic or involuntary additions or insertions we shall see hereafter that the Hindu theory takes note: but they do not wholly remedy the theoretic imperfection of the utterance. That the indistinct pronunciation thus described is the *abhinidhāna* of

the Hindu theory, or at least the central and most important fact of those comprehended under that name, seems to me tolerably certain, although it must be confessed that there are difficulties attending such an explanation: none, I think, that may not be done away by supposing that the Hindus had not made a complete physical analysis of the phenomenon, and hence that their descriptions of it partake of vagueness and inconsistency; and also, that they have brought together under the name *abhinidhāna* things not entirely accordant, although analogous, in character. The difficulty of the subject is sufficiently attested by the doubtful and discordant views taken of it by those who have had occasion hitherto to examine it, as Müller, Regnier, Weber, Goldstücker (s. v. *abhinidhāna*). An alternate view to which I have myself been somewhat attracted is that by the *abhinidhāna* is meant the instant of silence which intervenes between the closure of the organs for the first mute, and their opening for the second: that the Hindu theory regards, in the word *āpta*, for example, the utterance of the *p* as complete by the closure of the lips upon the preceding *ā*, and that of the *t* as complete by the unclosure of the tongue before the following *a*, while the brief interval of suspended utterance separating the two acts is *abhinidhāna*. This, better than anything else, would give meaning to the first word of our rule, "a holding apart of the consonants," and would accord well enough with the rest of the description, translating the last term 'deprived of both breath and sound.' Fatal objections, however, to this explanation are: the treatment of the phenomenon as something affecting the former consonant, not interposed after it; the difficulty of assuming any such interval of silence in the case of a concurrence with sonant and nasal mutes; and the non-applicability of the theory to the case of a final consonant. The term *vyūñjanavidhāraṇam* must therefore be understood as used simply in antithesis to the *saṃyuktam* of rule 49: whereas, in other cases of concurrence of consonants, there is actual combination, with partial assimilation of the latter to the former (rule 50), here each is held apart from the other as distinct. This, it is true, applies only to the concurrence of consonants, and not to a final; but it is allowable to regard as contemplated in a general description or designation of a phonetic phenomenon its principal case only, although not to adopt an explanation of the phenomenon itself which should shut out any of the cases included by it. If I am not mistaken, the term *abhinidhāna* has also a similar meaning. Etymologically, and by its use in other than grammatical senses, it should signify, as a neuter noun, simply 'a setting down against' the following letter, as distinguished from an actual combination with it. That it is used in our treatise as a masculine is somewhat surprising, but cannot be regarded as an error of the manuscript. The word seems to be taken almost in the sense of *abhinihita*, as denoting the sound affected by the process rather than the process itself, and so to be attracted to the gender of *varṇaḥ* or *sparṇaḥ*: the explanations which follow it in the rule, it will be noticed, apply rather to the altered letter than to the alteration. The *Rik Pr.* (vi. 5, r. 17, cccxciii) treats the word as neuter, and defines it clearly as a process: *saṃdhāraṇam saṃvaraṇam ca vācaḥ*, 'a repressing and obscuring (holding together and covering up) of the voice.'

Our own commentary, as is its wont in difficult cases, leaves us here altogether without valuable aid. It simply paraphrases the rule, adds the *dicta* of a couple of other authorities, and closes with a verse; as follows: *vyañjanavidhāraṇam abhinidhāno bhavati: pīḍitaḥ ca ṣvāsanā-dābhyām: apara āha: vyañjanavidhāraṇam abhinipāto mātro japano bhavati pīḍitaḥ ca ṣvāsanādābhyām: apara āha: vyañjanavidhāraṇam abhinipāto mātro japane gurutā bhavati: antahpade padānte vā pīḍitaḥ sanna eva tu: avakṛṣṭatara sthānād avasannataraḥ ca saḥ: hīnoḥ ca ṣvāsanādābhyāṃ yo yatrartho bhīdhīyate.* I will not attempt to translate the passage, as I could do so but in part, and as it seems incapable of throwing any valuable light upon the subject in hand. The most noteworthy circumstance about it is its presentation of *abhinipāta*, 'a falling down against,' as a synonym of *abhinidhāna*.

## स्पर्शस्य स्पर्शे ऽभिनिधानः ॥ ४४ ॥

44. A mute suffers *abhinidhāna* before a mute.

The phraseology of the rule would be the same, if *abhinidhāna* were here intended to be taken adjectively, as conjectured above, and if it were meant to say that 'a mute before another mute becomes *abhinidhāna*.' The commentary merely cites as instances the three words *brhadbhiḥ*, *samidbhiḥ*, *marudbhiḥ*, of which only the last is found in the Atharvan (p. *marut-bhiḥ*, e. g. ii. 29. 4).

The cases in which *abhinidhāna* alone ensues (only accompanied in part by duplication, according to iii. 28 etc.) are those in which a mute is followed by another mute (and, if itself non-nasal, then by another non-nasal) of the same or a succeeding series. Followed by a mute of a preceding series, it suffers also the intervention of *sphotana*, by ii. 38; if followed by a nasal, a *yama* is interposed, by i. 99. In an additional note at the end of the work will be presented a conspectus of all the consonantal combinations occurring in the Atharva-Veda, with an exhibition of the forms assumed by them according to the phonetic rules of our treatise.

The Rik Pr. (vi. 5, r. 17, cccxciii) pronounces not only the mutes, but also the semivowels, except *r*, to suffer *abhinidhāna* when followed by mutes. This would, however, in the Atharvan text, add only the groups *lk*, *lg*, *lp*, *lph*, *lb*, *lm*, and *vn* to those which by our own treatise admit the modification, so that the extension of the rule is meant virtually to include merely the *l*, a letter which our rule 46 shows to be regarded as especially liable to *abhinidhāna*. The *l* requires so marked a contact of the tongue at its tip that the omission of the breach of that contact by a following open letter may well enough have been felt by the Hindu phonetists as needing to be looked upon as *abhinidhāna*.

## पदान्तावग्रहयोश्च ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Also at the end of a word, or of the first member of a compound.

The commentator paraphrases as follows: *padānte avograhe ca spar-*



*gasya sparṣe parataḥ: abhinidhāno bhavati*: but it is clear that the specification *sparṣe parataḥ*, 'before a following mute,' has no business here: that case is included in the preceding rule, and the present precept applies to the pronunciation of a final as a final, without any reference to what may follow it. This appears partly from the nature of the case, partly from the analogy of the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (vi. 5, r. 18, cccxciv), and partly from the cited illustrations of the commentator himself: the words given by him under the preceding rule would be cases of *avagraha* in the *pada*-text, and, of those which he presents under this, the last two are instances of *avagraha* before vowels. His citations are *tān: vah: yah: devānām* (xi. 1. 5), *ap su* (e. g. i. 6. 2), *sālāṅkātān-iva* (ii. 27. 5), and *khalvān-iva* (ii. 31. 1).

The rule of the Rik Pr., already referred to, *api cā 'vasāne*, 'also in *pausa*,' is coincident in meaning with our own. The Tāitt. Pr. takes no notice whatever of the doctrine of *abhinidhāna*, nor does the Vāj. Pr. directly. The latter, however, presents a couple of rules which are worthy of remark, as having to do with the same general subject. In i. 90, 91, it teaches that when a final mute stands either in *pausa* or before a following word, there takes place a release or separation of the organs of production, the passive and the active organ, or *sthāna* and *karana*; that is to say, the contact is dissolved (Weber, and Goldstücker following him, have failed to apprehend the true meaning of the phenomenon described). This dissolution of the contact, in the case of the mute in *pausa*, is what was referred to above as taking place in our ordinary pronunciation after a final contact-letter, in order to make the mute more distinctly audible: as occurring before another word, it is analogous with the *spātana* of our treatise (ii. 38), and the *dhrūva* of the Rik Pr. (vi. 11), although having a different sphere of occurrence from both of them, as they from one another: it is a formal release of the organs of articulation from the position belonging to the close of one word, before they take up that belonging to the beginning of another, in order to the more distinct separation of the two independent members of the sentence.

## लकारस्योष्मसु ॥ ४६ ॥

46. *L* suffers *abhinidhāna* before spirants.

The only spirants before which *l* is found actually to occur in the Atharva-Veda are *ç* and *h*: the commentary cites instances of both, as follows: *çatabalçā vi roha* (vi. 30. 2); *sa gamishyati balhikān* (v. 22. 9); *balho pāma* (vi. 16. 2); nor are the combinations to be met with in the text in any other words than those here quoted. The rule and its comment, are of particular interest as settling authoritatively the reading of the word *balhika*, 'of Balkh,' which, owing to the customary carelessness of the scribes, in not distinguishing *lh* from *hl* (our own manuscripts vary between the two), has often been read and explained as *bahlika*.

*L* is also noted by the Rik Pr. (vi. 6, r. 20, cccxcvi) as suffering *abhinidhāna* before spirants, according to the Çākala doctrine, which is not that of the treatise itself. By the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 16) it is regarded as to

be treated in the same manner as *r* in a like position. *R* before a spirant suffers *svārabhakti*, or the insertion of a vowel-fragment, according to all the other Prātiçākhyas (see below, rule 101); and the treatment of the Vāj. Pr. is virtually, though not formally, the same. The doctrine, then, of the Vāj. Pr., in admitting a *svārabhakti* between *l* and a spirant, would differ little from that presented in the Rik Pr.—which (by vi. 11) would admit a *dhruva*, or (by vi. 13, r. 47, cccxxii) even a *svārabhakti*, after the *abhiniḍhāna* of the *l*—except by omission of the *abhiniḍhāna*, of which, as already remarked, it nowhere takes any notice; but our own treatise, by prescribing *abhiniḍhāna*, and not allowing even *sphoṭana* after it, differs quite notably from the others. I must confess myself unable to explain why either *l* before a spirant, or the nasals before *h*, as taught in the next rule, should suffer or be regarded as suffering the obscuring process of *abhiniḍhāna*.

### उणानानां ह्कारि ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Also the guttural, palatal, and dental nasals before *h*.

The instances cited by the commentary, in illustration of this rule, are as follows: *pratyāñ hi* (iv. 19. 7); *gañ hi* (a fabricated case: the lingual nasal never occurs before *h* in the Atharvan text); *krimāñ hantu* (ii. 32. 1); *amāñ hetih* (vi. 29. 1).

The only consonants ever found to precede *h* in the Atharva-Veda are *r*, *l*, *ñ*, and *n*. The first case, *rh*, is one of *svārabhakti* (i. 101); the second, *lh*, falls under the preceding rule; the other two are provided for by this rule, which is moreover, like many others in the treatise, cast in a theoretical form, or made more general than the requirements of the text justify. Since, according to the theory of this Prātiçākhyā (see ii. 9), no nasal ever occurs immediately before a sibilant, rules 46 and 47 might have been cast together into the form: "the nasals and *l* suffer *abhiniḍhāna* before the spirants."

The cases which this rule contemplates are in the Rik Pr. (vi. 7, r. 23, cccxcix) included in a much more general precept of the Çākalas, viz., that all the mutes except *m*, when final and followed by initial spirants or *y*, *r*, and *v*, suffer *abhiniḍhāna*.

### आस्थापितं च ॥ ४८ ॥

48. *Abhiniḍhāna* is also called *āsthāpita*.

I translate in obedience to the commentator, who says: *āsthāpita-samjñāç ca bhavati: abhiniḍhānaç ca: etāny evo 'dāharāṇāni*; 'it both receives the name *āsthāpita* and *abhiniḍhāna*: the instances are those already given.' Unfortunately, this alternative title for the phenomenon which we have found so obscure does not notably help our comprehension of it: the word admits of being translated, in accordance with the explanation of *abhiniḍhāna* offered above, 'made to stand up to, or against;' but it may also be rendered 'stopped,' that is, 'silenced,' and so may favor another theory of the phenomenon.

## अतो ज्यत्संयुक्तम् ॥ ४९ ॥

49. Any other combination of consonants is conjunct.

That is to say, all other combinations of consonants than those specified in rules 44-47 as accompanied with *abhinidhāna* are simply *saṁyukta*, 'yoked together, conjoined;' the precise nature of such conjunction being defined by the next rule. The commentator says: *ataḥ anye vyañjanasāndhayah saṁyuktā bhavanti: anye abhinidhānāt padānta-sparśah*:<sup>1</sup> *antahsthoshmasu padādishu*<sup>2</sup> *ca saṁyujyunte*: 'other combinations of consonants than these are conjunct; other final mutes than *abhinidhāna*, before semivowels and sibilants commencing a word, are conjoined with them;' and then, instead of citing from the text any actual cases, he goes on to put the series of words with which we are already acquainted, *godhuk, virāt, dṛshat, trishṭup* (see rules 3, 8), in lengthy and tedious succession, before *yāti, vayati, rathe, çete, shande, and sāye*. This by no means exhausts all the possible cases to which the name *saṁyukta* applies; nor has there been any restriction of *abhinidhāna* to cases of contact between a final and an initial, as the commentator's language would seem to imply.

This rule has the appearance of restricting the term *saṁyoga* to such combinations of consonants as are not accompanied with *abhinidhāna*. But such is not its meaning, at least as regards the general usage of the treatise: *saṁyoga* is employed everywhere in the more general sense expressly attributed to it by a later rule of this chapter (i. 98).

Nothing is to be found in the other Prātiçākhyas corresponding to this rule and the one next following.

## पूर्वद्वयस्य मात्रार्थं समानकरणं परम् ॥ ५० ॥

50. The latter half-measure of the first constituent has the same organ of production with the second constituent.

The term *pūrvārūpa* is not elsewhere found in our treatise with this meaning, although it occurs twice in a like sense in the Rik Pr. (ii. 12, iii. 7). The construction of the rule is also irregular, and its ellipsis of *pararūpeṇa* or *pareṇa* at the end (*pareṇa* is added by the commentator in his paraphrase) is bolder and more obscure than is usual elsewhere. These anomalies may be owing to the fact that the rule is taken in its present form and extent from some other treatise, and a metrical one. Weber (p. 127) has noted that it forms a half-*çloka*, and it is actually cited as such by the commentator, along with the other half-verse, as follows: *pūrvārūpasya mātrārddham samānakaraṇam param: pratyayena bhavet kāryam etat saṁyuktam ishyate*; 'the latter half-measure of the first element must be made to have the same organ of production with the succeeding element; such a combination is regarded as conjunct.' We can hardly help, however, both here and in the rule, assuming a different meaning for *karana* from that which it

<sup>1</sup> *padāntāt sparśah.*

<sup>2</sup> *padābhidhishu.*

has elsewhere in our treatise, and usually also in the other kindred works, and translating it rather 'mode of production' than 'organ;' and this is an additional indication of the foreign origin of the rule itself. The only instances given by the commentator are such as do not show any difference of organ between the two constituents of the conjunction: they are *vatsāu virājah* (viii. 9. 1), *stomā āsan* (xiv. 1. 8), and *ayam vaste* (xiii. 1. 16). Of the accuracy of the physical observations which could discover any actual assimilation of the first element of these and other similar combinations, in its final portion, to the latter, I find it hard to say much in praise: I am unable to discover that any part of the *t* in *vatsāu* becomes an *s*, or any part of the *s* in *vaste* a *t*, any more than the *s* and *t* respectively become converted in part into the following vowels *āu* and *e*.

### ऋस्वं लघुसंयोगे ॥५१॥

51. A syllable containing a short vowel, excepting before a conjunction of consonants, is light.

The distinction of syllables, as regards their metrical value, is properly into light (*laghu*) and heavy (*guru*); long (*dirgha*) and short (*hrasva*) are terms to be used of vowels only. The neuter gender of the terms in the rule is to be explained by their agreement with *aksharam*, 'syllable,' understood.

The Rik Pr. (xviii. 19, r. 37) and the Tāitt. Pr. (xxii. 15) have rules closely agreeing with this. The former also adds (xviii. 20, r. 42, 43) that a short vowel with a consonant makes a light syllable, but without a consonant one still lighter—an unpractical and useless distinction. The Vāj. Pr. has no passage corresponding to our rules 51–54, but remarks, rather out of place, in iv. 105, that vowels which precede a conjunction of consonants or a final consonant, or which stand in *pausa*, are of double quantity; a loose and inaccurate statement, as compared with those of the other treatises, since it is the value of the syllable, and not the quantity of the vowels, that is increased in the cases mentioned.

The commentator gives as illustrations the indifferent words *dadhi* and *madhu*, which we have had already (under i. 4), and shall meet with many times more.

### गुर्वन्यत् ॥५२॥

52. Any other is heavy.

That is, as the commentator goes on to explain, those syllables are heavy which contain a short vowel before a group of consonants, or a long vowel, or a protracted (*pluta*) vowel. As instances of the first case, he gives *takshati* (*takshati*, ix. 10. 21) and *rakshati* (e. g. viii. 9. 13); of the second, *çālāḥ* (viii. 6. 10); of the third, *bhūyās idāṁ* (ix. 6. 18).

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. i. 4 (r. 20, 21, xxi, xxii) and xviii. 19 (r. 36, 37), Tāitt. Pr. xxii. 14, Vāj. Pr.

iv. 105. The Rik Pr. farther adds (xviii. 20, r. 40, 41) that, while a long vowel is heavy, it is yet heavier if accompanied by a consonant.

### अनुनासिकं च ॥५३॥

53. Also a syllable containing a nasalized vowel.

The commentator's illustrative citations are the same which he has already once given us, under rule 27; it is unnecessary to repeat them here.

The other treatises have the same rule (R. Pr. i. 4, r. 21, xxii, and xviii. 19, r. 38; T. Pr. xxii. 14), but with the difference that the former, admitting the *anusvāra* as a separate constituent of the alphabet, declares a vowel followed by *anusvāra* to be heavy.

### पदान्ते च ॥५४॥

54. And at the end of a word.

The commentator simply paraphrases the rule, and adds one of his staple lists of illustrations, viz. *godhuk* etc. (see under i. 3). The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 105, cited under r. 51, above) holds a like doctrine. The Tāitt. Pr. (xxii. 14, 15) restricts the heaviness to such final syllables as end with a consonant, as our own commentator would seem to do by the instances he cites. It is not meant, of course, that in the combinations of the phrase the final syllables of words are heavy, but in the disjoined or *pada*-text, where each final is followed by a pause, or at the end of a verse or phrase. The Rik Pr. makes no mention of this case.

### परस्य स्वरस्य व्यञ्जनानि ॥५५॥

55. Consonants belong to the following vowel.

This and the three succeeding rules concern the division of words into syllables, and the assignment of the consonants they contain to the proper vowels. It is a matter of pretty pure theory; the only practical bearing it can have must be in determining whether such and such a consonant shall receive one or another accent, as being that of the preceding or of the following vowel: and this itself must be almost un-mixed theory, since it can hardly be claimed that even sonant consonants share at all in accentuation: certainly they do not do so consciously. The teachings of the different Prāticākhyas are very nearly accordant upon the subject, and this general introductory rule is equivalently stated by all (R. Pr. i. 5, r. 23, xxiv, and xviii. 17, r. 32; V. Pr. i. 100; T. Pr. xxi. 2).

The commentator gives as instances again *dadhi* and *madhu*, which are to be divided *da·dhi* and *ma·dhu*.

### संयोगादि पूर्वस्य ॥५६॥

56. The first consonant of a group belongs to the preceding vowel.

The commentator here does his work very unsatisfactorily: he fabricates his illustrations, instead of drawing them from the Atharvan text, giving *atra sati*, *ādravati*, *pradravati*, and he does not note for us the fact that, in the combinations which he presents, the former consonant is to be doubled, by iii. 28, and then inform us to which of the two products of duplication the precept of the rule applies. In the Rik Pr. (i. 5, r. 25, xxvi; also xviii. 18, r. 34), the name *saṁyogādi* belongs to the second letter, as being the first of the original combination or *saṁyoga*, while the one preceding it is specifically the product of the duplication (*kramaja*): and the treatise allows it to be counted either with the preceding or following syllable: thus, either *at·tra* or *att·ra*. The Vāj. Pr. (i. 102) calls the first consonant of the group as it stands after duplication *saṁyogādi*, and unites it with the former syllable: and in the same sense, probably, the term is to be understood in our own treatise and in the Tāitt. Pr. (xxi. 4): we are to write and divide *at·tra sati*, *ād·dravati*, *prad·dravati*.

The commentary adds: *apara āha: hasayamaṁ pūrvosye 'ti*, of which the meaning is obscure and the pertinence questionable. If it has to do with the disposition of the *yama*, it ought to come in under rule 58 or 104.

पद्यं च ॥५७॥

57. As does also a final consonant.

The commentary offers once more *godkuḥ* etc. (as under i. 3).

The equivalent rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. xviii. 17 (r. 32), Vāj. Pr. i. 101, and Tāitt. Pr. xxi. 3.

रेफहकारक्रमजं च ॥५८॥

58. And one generated by *krama* after *r* and *h*.

The commentator offers no explanation of the rule, merely adding to it, in his paraphrase, the words *pūrvasvarasyā bhavati*, and proceeding at once to give his illustrations. These are the same which appear again under iii. 31, and also, in part, under i. 100: they are for the most part words which do not occur in the Atharvan text, and, being much corrupted, are in more than one case of doubtful reading. A comparison of the illustrations under some of Pāṇini's rules (viii. 3. 26, 27; 4. 46) is of important use in restoring their true form. They are *arkah*, *arcc* (so under Pān. viii. 4. 46; MS. *artha*, *arcco*), *varṭah* (MS. *garte*, *varṭo*), *bhargah* (MS. *bhagnah*, *bhagah*: found in AV. only at xix. 37. 1), *prāhnaḥ*, *pūrvāhnaḥ*, *aparāhnaḥ* (ix. 6. 46), *apa hmalayati* (MS. *apa brahma layati*, *apa hyalati*), *vi hmalayati* (MS. under iii. 31 *vi hyalati*), *apa hnute* (omitted under i. 100), *vi hnute* (omitted here), and *brahma* (e. g. i. 19. 4). In all these words, the consonant following the *r* or the *h* is doubled, by iii. 31, and the former of the two, which is regarded as the one that owes its existence to the *krama*, or duplication, is to be reckoned as belonging to the preceding syllable. Thus we are to read and

divide *ark·kaḥ*, *arc·cā*, *vart·taḥ*, *bharg·gaḥ*, *prāhṇ·naḥ*, *pūrv·vāhṇ·naḥ*, *aparāhṇ·naḥ*, *apahm·malayati*, *apahn·nute*, *brahm·ma*.

The rule i. 104 of the Vāj. Pr. corresponds in meaning with this, although more general in its form; the Tāitt. Pr. (xxi. 5) teaches that a consonant not combined immediately with a vowel belongs to the preceding syllable, which would leave only the final member of any group to be attached to the following vowel: there are some exceptions made, which need not be noticed here. In the Rik Pr., the simple and frequent case of a consonant doubled after an *r* does not seem to be provided for at all: its rule (i. 5, r. 26, xxvii) is constructed only for a case in which the consonant following the *r* is itself succeeded by another: one is tempted there to reject the commentator's interpretation, and understand the rule to mean "two consonants are reckoned as belonging to the preceding vowel, when there is duplication of the second of a group:" this would make it accord with our own.

एकमात्रो ऋस्वः ॥ ५९ ॥

59. A short vowel is of a single mora.

The commentator gives us again, as instances, *dadhi* and *madhu*.

The word translated 'mora' is *mātrā*, 'measure,' a term common in this sense to all the Prātiçākhyas. It is the fundamental measure, which cannot itself be defined by anything else. Only the Rik Pr. (xiii. 20) attempts to fix the length of the short, long, and protracted vowels, by comparing them with the cries of certain birds.

The corresponding definitions of the other treatises are Rik Pr. i. 6 (r. 27, xxviii); Vāj. Pr. i. 55, 56; Tāitt. Pr. i. 33.

व्यञ्जनानि च ॥ ६० ॥

60. The consonants are of the same length.

The commentator's illustrative instances are again *dadhi* and *madhu*. All the other treatises (R. Pr. i. 7, r. 34, xxxv; V. Pr. i. 59; T. Pr. i. 37) agree in assigning but half a mora as the length of a consonant.

द्विमात्रो दीर्घः ॥ ६१ ॥

61. A long vowel has two moras.

The commentator's instance is *çālā* (ix. 3. 17).

There is no discordance among the Prātiçākhyas upon this point: compare Rik Pr. i. 6 (r. 29, xxx); Vāj. Pr. i. 57; Tāitt. Pr. i. 35.

त्रिमात्रः प्लुतः ॥ ६२ ॥

62. A protracted vowel has three moras.

The instance cited is *idāsm* (ix. 6. 18). All the cases of protracted vowels which the Atharvan text contains are rehearsed below, in rule 105.

Compare the accordant rules of the other treatises in Rik Pr. i. 6 (r. 30, xxxi); Vāj. Pr. i. 58; Tāitt. Pr. i. 36.

With this rule ends the second section of the first chapter. The signature in the manuscript is *prathamasya dvitīyaḥ pādaḥ* : 62.

षट्पुरसोरुकारो ज्त्यस्य दशदाशयोरदेशश्च मूर्धन्यः  
॥ ६३ ॥

63. The final of *shash* and *puras* becomes *u* before *daça* and *dāça* respectively, with substitution of a lingual for the following initial.

That is to say, *shash* before *daça* becomes *sho*, and the *daça* becomes *daça*, making the compound *shoḍaça*; and *puras* with *dāça*, in like manner, forms *purodāça*. The commentator cites from the text the words themselves merely, viz.: *shoḍaçam* (iii. 29. 1), *purodāçāu* (e. g. ix. 6. 12). Neither of the words is analyzed, or restored to its theoretically regular form, by the *pada*-text; and our treatise, accordingly, according to its own programme, has nothing to do with them: and the same is true of the words referred to in the three following rules.

These two words, with others of somewhat analogous character, are treated in the Vāj. Pr., iii. 39–46.

कृपे रेफस्य लकारः ॥ ६४ ॥

64. In the root *kṛp*, *l* is substituted for *r*.

The whole commentary upon this rule is lost, and only its repetition before the next rule remains. Apparently, the copyist has carelessly skipped from the repetition of the rule in the commentator's paraphrase to that with which, as usual, the whole exposition closes. The loss is of very insignificant consequence: the missing passage would probably have afforded us some instances from the Atharvan text of verbal forms or derivatives of the root *kṛp* or *kalp*, which are frequent there. The rule may be taken as the assertion of an opinion that the original form of this root is *karp*; an opinion rendered plausible by the derivative noun *kṛp* (see the next rule), and by the analogy of the root *kar*, of which the other seems to be a secondary form. With it corresponds Pānini's rule viii. 2. 18; none of the other Prâtiçākhyas offers anything equivalent. If our treatise has set itself to note the words in which a *l* appears in the place of a more original *r*, it should not pass over the words in which the root *car* becomes *cal*, as *avicācala*, *puñçcali*, etc., *glaha* and *glahana*, which are hardly to be separated from the root *grah*, *udumbala* (viii. 6. 17), etc.

न कृपादीनाम् ॥ ६५ ॥

65. Not, however, in the words *kṛpā* etc.



This is the first instance in our treatise of a rule stated in this form, the words or phrases to which the precept contained in the rule refers being conceived to form a series, or *gaṇa*, of which the first only is given in the rule, and the others comprehended in an *et cetera*. The form of statement is characteristic of the Atharva Prātiçākhyā and of Pāṇini, and of them only: the Vāj. Pr. employs it but once (v. 38), the others not at all (R. Pr. iv. 39, where, for convenience's sake, a list is thus referred to in one verse which is given in full in the next, furnishes but an accidental and insignificant analogy). It would seem to be the business of a commentator to give the list in full, but the author of our commentary evidently does not think so, for he very seldom, if the *gaṇa* have any extent, presents us more than specimens from it. Here, he gives *krpā pāvaka* (xviii. 4. 59), and *krpāt svah*<sup>1</sup> (vii. 14. 2: the reading doubtless is a corrupt one, and should be *krpā svah*, as is read by both the Sāma and Yajur-Vedas, in their corresponding verses); also *krpanah* (*krpanāh*, xi. 8. 28), and its derivative *kārpanyam* (not found in AV.). If these two words, which come from altogether another root, actually belong to the *gaṇa*, it should contain also *krpamānasya* (v. 19. 13) and *akrpran* (xviii. 3. 23).

With this and the preceding and following rules are to be compared Pān. viii. 2. 18, and the *vārtikas* upon it.

लकारस्य रेफः पादमङ्गुलिमित्येवमादीनाम् ॥ ६६ ॥

66. In *pādām aṅgulim* etc., *r* is substituted for *l*.

The instances given by the commentary as coming under this rule are *çacre pādām aṅgurim* (iv. 18. 6 and v. 31. 11), *sahamûrân anu dāha* (v. 29. 11), *yāhi mayûraromabhiḥ* (vii. 117. 1), and *açvasya vārah parushasya vārah* (x. 4. 2). The *gaṇa* should also include *pañcāṅguriḥ* (iv. 6. 4), *svaṅguriḥ* (vii. 46. 2), *anaṅgureḥ* (viii. 6. 22), and perhaps *tiryā* (for *tilyā*, from *tilā*: iv. 7. 3): *aṅgurim* also occurs again in xx. 136. 13. As counter-instances, to show the necessity of constructing a *gaṇa*, of a limited number of instances, the commentator cites *aṅgulibhyo nakhebhyaḥ* (ii. 33. 6), and *bālās te prokshantiḥ santu* (x. 9. 3).

It is not in accordance with the usage of our treatise elsewhere to give, in citing a word or phrase in a rule, another form than that which it actually has in the text: we should have expected here पादमङ्गुलिम्. The form *ity evam ādi*, instead of simply *ādi*, is found once more, in ii. 29.

नकारमकारयोर्लीपि पूर्वस्यानुनासिकः ॥ ६७ ॥

67. In case of the loss of a *n* or *m*, the preceding sound becomes nasalized.

The cases of elision of *n* and *m* are taught below, in ii. 32-34, which see for illustrations. The commentator offers here only the words

<sup>1</sup> *krpasvih*.

*viñçatiḥ* (e. g. v. 15. 2) and *payānsi* (e. g. i. 9. 3)—which are very ill chosen, since, though each offers an example of a nasalized vowel, neither exhibits an elision of an original nasal mute, according to any rules contained in this treatise.

Corresponding rules to this and the following one of our treatise are offered by the other Prâtiçākhyas: see Rik Pr. iv. 35 (r. 79, cxcix); Vāj. Pr. iii. 129, iv. 3; Tâitt. Pr. xv. 1: there are some differences of application, but chiefly dependent upon the different modes of treatment of the nasal mutes adopted by the different authorities, which will be explained in their place.

### यरोष्मायत्तौ च ॥ ६८ ॥

68. Also in case of their conversion into *y*, *r*, or a spirant.

The instances given by the commentary are as follows: *rathāñ iva* (v. 13. 6), *sālārrkāñ iva* (ii. 27. 5), *khālāñ iva* (e. g. ii. 31. 1)—in all these cases, the final *n* is first, by ii. 27, converted into the spirant *visarjanīya*, the latter then changed, by ii. 41, into *y*, and this finally, by ii. 21, dropped altogether; so that we have the successive steps *rathān iva*, *rathāñ iva*, *rathāñy iva*, *rathāñ iva*—farther, *ṛtūñr ṛtubhīh* (not found in AV.), *ṛtūñr ut sṛjate vaçi* (vi. 36. 2), *mo shu pavīñr abhi* (v. 11. 7: the commentator repeats the first word in its *pada* form, *mo iti*, at the end of the citation), and *dasyūñr uta bodhi* (iv. 32. 6)—in these instances, the final *n*, by rule ii. 29, becomes *r*, and, the preceding vowel being nasalized, *ṛtūn ut* is converted into *ṛtūñr ut*.

As the *n* must always be converted into the spirant *visarjanīya* before it becomes *y*, it seems superfluous to make separate mention of the latter in the rule. The commentator apparently feels this objection, and ventures for once a defence, as follows: *ūshmano grahañāt siddhe punar-grahaṇena kim: nityatvam na syāt: ṛtūñr ut sṛjate vaçi*; 'when the matter is made certain by the use of the term *ūshman*, why any farther mention? it is because this does not apply to all cases, as is shown by the instance *ṛtūñr ut sṛjate vaçi*.' I do not see the point of this defence: it does, indeed, explain the mention of *r* in the rule, but it has nothing to do with that of *y*.

### अनुनासिकस्य च पूर्वैकदेशे ॥ ६९ ॥

69. And in case of the combination of a nasalized vowel with a preceding vowel.

The only cases cited by the commentary are those of the combination of the initial vowel of *añçā* with a preceding final vowel, by simple fusion or by the elision of the initial *a*; they are: *ubhāv upāñçu* (*pada upa-añçu*) *prathamā pibāva* (iv. 32. 7), *somasya 'ñço* (vii. 81. 3), and *ye vṛihayo yuvā nirupyante 'ñçavaḥ* (ix. 6. 14).

Compare Rik Pr. xiii. 10 (r. 26), Vāj. Pr. iv. 51, Tâitt. Pr. x. 11.

### पुरुष आ वभूवां इत्यवसाने ॥ ७० ॥

70. In the passage *puruṣu ā babhūvāñ*, the vowel is nasal before the pause.

The passage referred to is x. 2. 28: *sarvâ dīṣaḥ puruṣha ā babhūvāñ*, where, in a case of doubt and questioning, the final *a* of *babhūva* is both protracted and nasalized. The *pada*-text reads simply *puruṣah: ā: babhū-āñ*: and there would be no call for such a rule as that given here, but for the requirements of the *krama*-text, in which *babhūva*, as the last word in a verse, must suffer *parihāra* (iv. 117), or repetition with *iti* interposed, and in which it might be made a question whether the nasality of the vowel should or should not be preserved before the *iti*. This rule teaches us that the nasal quality is lost before the *iti*, as rule 97, below, teaches also with respect to the protraction; and the same things are taught once more by iv. 120, 121. The three last *kramapadas* of the verse will be, then: *puruṣa ā babhūvāñ: ā babhūvāñ: babhūve 'ti babhūvāñ*.

ऋवणस्य रेफात्परं यत् ॥ ७१ ॥

71. Of the *r*-vowels, the part following the *r* receives the nasal quality.

We have seen above, in rules 37 and 38, that the *r*-vowel is regarded as composed of a piece of a *r*, with a fragment of vowel sound preceding and following it, and that, when it is long or protracted, the *r*-quality is found only in the first mora. Here we learn that, when such a vowel is nasalized, the nasal quality does not affect the *r*, but only the part of a vowel which follows it. Any one may perceive, however, upon trying the experiment, that there is no physical difficulty in the way of nasalizing the *r* itself, supposing the *r*-vowel to be properly accordant in pronunciation with that letter throughout.

The commentator cites *bhūmīṣṭīham acyutaṁ pōrayiṣṭu* (v. 28. 14), *ṛṣha pratnān* (vi. 136. 2), and *janān ṛṣhantam* (xii. 2. 9). The instances, as in many other cases, are wanting in variety and in completeness: as an example of the long vowel nasalized, we may take *piṣṭr upe 'mam*, already cited under rule 38: no case of the protracted vowel nasalized occurs in the text.

The other treatises offer nothing corresponding to this rule.

उकारस्येतावपृक्तस्य ॥ ७२ ॥

72. *U* is nasalized when standing alone, before *iti*.

In the *pada*-text of the Atharvan, as in those of the other Vedas, the particle *u* is always written *ūñ iti*. In this rule, its nasality in such a situation is noticed: in the rule next succeeding are taught its long quantity and its exemption from conversion into a semivowel before the following vowel.

The term *apṛkta* means 'uncombined with any other letter:' it is said also of the particles *ā* and *o* (= *ā + u*) in rules i. 79, iv. 113, below.

दीर्घः प्रगृह्यश्च ॥ ७३ ॥

73. In the same situation it is also long, and *pragṛhya*.

The term *pragr̥hya* means, by implication, that the vowel to which it applies is not liable to the ordinary changes of *sandhi*, viz. fusion with, or conversion into a semivowel before, a following vowel. I say, by implication: for only in the Tāitt. Pr. (which uses, however, not *pragr̥hya*, but the related term *pragraha*) does the pronouncing a vowel *pragr̥hya* exempt it from change; all the other treatises find it necessary to teach by a specific rule (see iii. 33, below, and the quotations there given) that the vowels declared to be *pragr̥hya* are not subject to euphonic alteration. The whole proceeding is somewhat analogous with that by which the Rik Pr. teaches the conversion of *visarjanīya* into *r*; first rehearsing all the cases in which the conversion takes place, and pronouncing their *visarjanīya* to be *rephin* or *riphīta*, and then finally declaring the *riphīta visarjanīya* convertible into *r*. The word *pragr̥hya* is explained by Böhtingk-Roth to mean literally "to be held apart, or isolated," i. e., from the combinations of *sandhi*.

Any satisfactory reason why the particle *u* should be treated in this peculiar manner by the framers of the *pada*-text is not readily apparent. There are but few cases in our text in which it assumes a long form in *sanhitā* (viz. eight instances: they are given under iii. 4), so that it can hardly be said to exhibit any special tendency to protraction; it nowhere assumes a nasal quality in the combined text; and it has hardly a trace of a proper *pragr̥hya* character: if, indeed, it be preceded by an uncombined vowel and followed by another vowel, it remains uncombined with the latter (by iii. 36, which see: only three such cases occur in our text); but, on the other hand, if preceded by a consonant, it combines regularly with a following vowel (of this also there are only four cases in AV.: see ii. 37). It seems as if the protraction must have been made in order to give the word more substance as an independent *pada* in the disjoined text, it being the only instance of a single short vowel possessing such a value; and as if the nasalization and addition of *iti* were intended to mark it more distinctly as an exceptional case, requiring a different treatment in the *sanhitā*-text. Pāṇini (i. 1. 17, 18) allows it to be read either *u* or *ūñ*.

The treatise now goes on to detail the other cases of *pragr̥hya* final vowels.

इकारोकारौ च सप्तम्यर्थे ॥ ७४ ॥

74. Final *ī* and *ū* are also *pragr̥hya*, in a form having a locative sense.

The instances cited by the commentator are *āshtrī padam kṛṇute agnidhāne* (vi. 27. 3: the Rig-Veda, in the corresponding passage, has the proper locative form, *āshtryām*), *ato jātāso dhārayanta urvī* (xviii. 1. 32), *mahī no vātāḥ* (xviii. 1. 39), and *tanū daksham ā suvatām* (iv. 25. 5). This last, however, is a doubtful case, since the word *tanū* may quite as plausibly, or more so, be taken as nominative dual, 'their very selves.' A more unequivocal case of *ū* is *māyū* in xviii. 4. 4, and it is the only one which I have noted in the text. There is also a single case of a locative in *ī* not given by the commentary: it is *abhīhruti*, in

vi. 3. 3. As counter examples, of final *î* and *û* in other than a locative sense, and therefore not *pragr̥hya*, the commentator offers *dhiti vā ye* (vii. 1. 1), *tasyā 'mū sarvā* (xiii. 4. 28). Of cases analogous with the former of these, where the *î* represents an instrumental case, there are several others in the text, as vii. 48. 1, 77. 1; ix. 9. 8.

The *pada*-text carefully notes these locatives in *î* and *û* as *pragr̥hya*, in the usual manner, by writing an *iti* after them: thus, *āshtri iti*, *urvi iti*, *tanū iti*, etc. The commentator, in citing the several passages, under this and the following rules, always repeats at the end of each citation the *pragr̥hya* word, in its *pada* form, or with *iti* appended: I have omitted such repetitions, as unnecessary here.

A corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. is found in i. 18 (r. 72, lxxiii): also in Pāṇini, i. 1. 19. The Vāj. Pr. notes no such cases as those to which this rule applies: and the Tāitt. Pr., instead of classifying and defining the *pragr̥hya* terminations according to their grammatical values, describes them all in an entirely empirical way (in iv. 1-54), by their position and surroundings, whence its rules do not generally admit of detailed comparison with those of the other treatises.

## द्विवचनान्तौ ॥ ७५ ॥

75. The same vowels, *î* and *û*, are *pragr̥hya* as dual terminations.

The commentator's illustrations are *kena pārshni ābhṛte* (x. 2. 1), *indravāyū ubhāu* (iii. 20. 6), *ubhāv indragñi ā bharatām* (v. 7. 6).

Corresponding rules are Rik Pr. i. 18 (r. 71, lxxii) and Vāj. Pr. i. 93; both of them include also the cases noted by our treatise in the next following rule.

## एकारश्च ॥ ७६ ॥

76. As is also *e*.

The commentator cites *atrā dadhete* (v. 1. 3), *rodhacakre vāvṛdhete* (v. 1. 5), *saṁ pitarāv ṛtviye* (xiv. 2. 37).

## अस्मे युष्मे त्वे मे इति चोदात्ताः ॥ ७७ ॥

77. Also the words *asme*, *yushme*, *twē*, and *me*, when accented.

The specification "when accented" is, of course, meant only for the two latter of the words named, as the others would never occur otherwise than accented. Of the four, *yushmé* and *mē* never occur in the Atharvan text: *tvé* is found once, in a Rik passage (AV. v. 2. 3 = RV. x. 120. 3), and also, according to the manuscripts, in viii. 9. 9, twice repeated, and each time written in the *pada*-text *tvé iti*, as a *pragr̥hya*: but the accent and the addition of *iti* are hardly to be regarded otherwise than as a blunder of the tradition, since the word is evidently the enclitic or accentless *tva* of the Vedic language: no forms of this enclitic pronoun are found elsewhere in the Atharvan. The fourth, *asmé*,

is also hardly an Atharvan word. It is found in three Rik passages, viz. iv. 21. 1 (RV. vi. 28. 1), xviii. 1. 3 (RV. x. 10. 3), 42 (RV. x. 17. 8): in another passage (iv. 31. 3), where the Rik (x. 84. 3) reads *asmé*, all the Atharvan manuscripts have *asmâ'i*, which has been altered to *asmé* in the edition, in obedience to the requirement of the sense, and the authority of the Rik reading. Another precisely similar case is xix. 40. 4 (RV. i. 46. 6). The only passage where the Atharvan gives *asmé* independently is v. 1. 3, where all the manuscripts except P. and M. (copies of the same original, by the same scribe) agree in reading it (pada *asmé iti*): here also, however, the edition reads *asmâ'i*.

The commentator cites no instances, but says *nigame yushmadbhyâ vibhakter ittvam ishyati: yushmâkam: asmâkam: tvam aham iti prâpte: asme yushme tve me iti ca vibhaktiyâdeçah kriyate.*

The Rik Pr. (i. 19, r. 73, 74, lxxiv, lxxv) notes *asme, yushme, tve*, and *amî* as *pragr̥hya*: the third, *tve*, when accented, and not a member of a compound word. The Vâj. Pr. (i. 96, 97) notes *asme, tve*, and *me*, the latter when accented. *Asme* and *tve* are dealt with in Tâitt. Pr. iv. 9, 10.

## अमी बहुवचनम् ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Also *amî*, as plural.

The examples cited by the commentator are *amî ye yudham* (vi. 103. 3), *amî ye vivratâh* (iii. 8. 5), and *amî açacre* (not found in AV.). To explain the addition of the specification "as plural," he gives a counter-example, *çamy atra*, which is plainly one of his own fabrication; nor can I find that the text contains anything which should render that addition necessary. The Vâj. Pr. says (i. 98) "*amî*, when a word by itself;" the other treatises (R. Pr. i. 19, r. 73, lxxiv; Tâitt. Pr. iv. 12) see no reason for appending any such limitations.

## निपातो ऽपृतो जनाकारः ॥ ७९ ॥

79. Also a particle consisting of an uncombined vowel, unless it be *â*.

This rule is meant to apply solely to the particle *o*, composed of *â* and *u*, which is found in two passages of the text, viz. *o cit sakhâyam* (xviii. 1. 1) and *çrâtam havir o shu* (vii. 72. 2), both of which are cited by the commentator: the *pada-text* writes the *o* in the usual manner of a *pragr̥hya*, viz. *ó iti*. To explain the addition of "unless it be *â*" to the rule, the commentator cites *punar e'hi vâcaspate* (i. 1. 2), where the *pada-text* reads, of course, *â': ihî*.

The form of this rule is not a little strange: why *o* should thus be made an exception from the next rule, and why, when there is no other particle, except *â*, composed of a single vowel, it should be treated as if one of a class, it is very difficult to see: we cannot help suspecting here the influence of the general grammar: compare Pân. i. 1. 14, the virtual correspondence of which with our rule is as close as possible. The Rik Pr. (i. 18, r. 69, lxx) has a similar precept.

## अकारान्तश्च ॥ ८० ॥

80. Also one ending with *o*.

That is to say, as we must infer from the preceding rule, and as the commentator fills out the ellipsis, a *nipāta* or 'particle,' having *o* for its final. This is a strangely inaccurate description: it was bad enough to have the *upasarga* or preposition *ā* treated as a *nipāta* by the last rule, when combined with *u*: but here we have nouns, verbs, prepositions, and particles all confounded together under the same name. The particles, it is true, greatly preponderate in number and in frequency: thus we have *atho* (about 130 times in the whole Atharvan text), *mo* (15 times), *no* (12 times), *uto* (7 times), and *iho*, *yado*, *aṅgo*, *evo*, *dosho* (once each); but of prepositions we have *o* and *upo* (twice each), and *pro* (once); of verbs, *vidmo*, *datto*, *atto* (once each); and of nouns (pronouns), *teno* (twice), *yo*, and *so* (once each). In the form of the rule is perhaps to be seen again the influence of the general grammar: compare Pān. i. 1. 15. The other treatises are not open to the same criticism: the Rik Pr. (i. 18, r. 70, lxxi) declares *pragr̥hya* a final *o*, except of the first member of a compound; and the Vāj. Pr. (i. 94, iv. 89) constructs its rule in very nearly the same manner.

As regards the actual *pragr̥hya* character of these words, there are, among the nearly 200 instances of their occurrence, but 11 cases in which they stand otherwise than before a consonant or an initial *a*, and so have an opportunity to exhibit that character distinctly. These cases are: before *ā*, xx. 127. 13; before *i*, vi. 14. 3, xiv. 2. 4, xx. 130. 17, 18; before *u*, xi. 6. 7, xii. 1. 7, 9; before *e*, ii. 9. 1, vii. 56. 5, ix. 8. 7. In xx. 130. 19, and only there, an initial *a* is absorbed by such a final *o*; on the other hand, in iv. 9. 3, the metre shows that such an absorption of an initial *a* must be made in reading, though it be not so written. In *teno* (ix. 1. 20) and *yo* (xi. 4. 9), the metre shows that the combined particle *u* must be separated from the final of the original word, and that the two must be read *téna u* and *yá' u*.

The examples given by the commentary are *dosho gāya* (vi. 1. 1), *aigo nv aryaman* (vi. 60. 2), *atto havīṅshi* (xviii. 3. 44), and *datto asma-bhyam* (xviii. 3. 14).

## आमल्लितं चेतावनार्षि ॥ ८१ ॥

81. Also a vocative ending in the same letter, before an *iti* not belonging to the text.

Literally, 'before an *iti* not coming from the *ṛshis*,' or authors of the hymns: that is to say, before the *iti* by which, as already remarked, a *pragr̥hya* word is followed in the *pada*-text. The vocatives in *o*, from themes in *u*, are not in a single instance treated as *pragr̥hyas* in the *sanhitā* of the Atharvan, but are always euphonicly combined with the following vowel.\* In the *pada*-text, however, they are invariably

\* The cases are not numerous in which such a vocative occurs elsewhere than in *pausa*, before a consonant, or before an *a*; they are as follows: before *ā*, v. 13. 5;

written as if they were *pragr̥hyas*, with the usual *iti* annexed. The object of this rule, then, is to teach that they are exempt from euphonic combination only in the *pada*-text, while in other situations they are to be treated according to the general euphonic rules (iii. 40, ii. 21). The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 89) has a rule corresponding with that of our treatise; it, however, seems to be inconsistent with a previous rule (i. 94), which teaches that a final *o* is *pragr̥hya* in general, and not before the *iti* of the *pada*-text alone. The usage of the *sanhitā*-text is in accordance with the later rule, and not with the earlier, so far as I can judge from the passages which correspond with those of the Atharvan referred to in the marginal note: I am surprised that Weber has not taken any notice of this discordance between the text and the Prātiçākhyā. The Tāitt. Pr. (iv. 6) says that *o* is *pragraha* when it is not the product of *sandhi*, and is followed by *a* or a consonant—which is a rather absurd way of saying that it is not *pragraha* at all in *sanhitā*; since before a consonant its *pragr̥hya* character could not, and before *a* need not, appear. The Rik Pr., after declaring the *o* of the vocative *pragr̥hya* (i. 18, r. 68, lxix), is obliged later (ii. 27, r. 52, clvii) to except it from the rule that *pragr̥hyas* are exempt from euphonic change, and to place it under the control of rules previously given for its combination with succeeding vowels. Finally, Pāṇini (i. 1. 16) gives a rule precisely corresponding to ours, but gives it upon the authority of Çākalya. This whole state of things is something very peculiar. Why, when the *o* of *vāyo* is really no more exempt from change than the *e* of *agne*, should it be regarded by all the *pada*-texts as a *pragr̥hya*, causing so much trouble to the different treatises to explain its treatment?

The commentator cites, as examples of the rule, *tvayy udite pre* "rate *citrabhāno* : *citrabhāno iti* (iv. 25. 3), *yuvaṁ vāyo savitā* : *vāyo iti* (iv. 25. 3), and *manyō vajrin* : *manyō iti* (iv. 32. 6). As counter-examples, to show that the vowel is unchangeable only before the *iti* of the *pada*-text, he gives *vāya útaye* (iv. 25. 6), *manya iditā* (iv. 31. 4), and *babhra ā me çṛnuta* (v. 13. 5).

आर्त्नी इवादिध्रिवादितिः<sup>1</sup> परः ॥ ८२ ॥

82. In *ārtñi iva* etc., the *iti* follows the *iva*.

This is a rule which concerns only the writing of the *pada*-text itself, and so, as dealing with a matter lying outside of the proper sphere of a Prātiçākhyā, is extra-judicial, and has no correspondent in either of the other treatises. It grows out of the difficulty, in a few special cases, of combining two methods of writing usual in the *pada*-text. This text, in all the Vedas, always combines the enclitic particle *iva*, 'as if, like,' with the word to which it is attached, as if forming a compound with it, giving up often, in favor of this combination, the division which

before *i*, vii. 4. 1; before *ī*, iv. 31. 4; before *u*, vi. 68. 1, vii. 26. 8 (*bis*); before *ū*, iv. 25. 6. In iv. 32. 1, the final *o* absorbs a following initial *a*; everywhere else, it and the following *a* both remain unchanged.

<sup>1</sup> वादिति परः



would otherwise be made of a preceding compound: thus, *uda-dhim* (iv. 15. 6), but *udadheh-iva* (i. 3. 8). When, now, the *iva* happens to follow a *pragṛhya* word, like *ārtni*, which ought to be followed in the *pada*-text by *iti*, in order to bring to light its *pragṛhya* quality, what is to be done? shall we separate the two parts of the compound word—a thing unheard of elsewhere—and introduce the *iti* between them, writing *ārtni iti 'vā* "*rtni-iva?*" or shall we allow the *iti* to lose its proper function, but still be retained at the end of the compound, in order to call attention to the *pragṛhya* quality of the first member of the latter, and write *ārtni ive 'ty ārtni-iva?* The second of these two alternatives is the one adopted by all the *pada*-texts, and the one which our rule here teaches us to choose. The Atharvan text offers but four such cases, which, for once, are all cited by the commentator; they are as follows: *ārtni ive 'ty ārtni-iva* (i. 1. 3); *gharmadughe ive 'ti gharmadughe-iva* (iv. 22. 4); *nṛpati ive 'ti nṛpati-iva* (viii. 4. 6); *yame ive 'ti yame-iva* (xviii. 3. 38).\*

### अनुनासिको ऽन्तःपदे कृस्वः ॥ ८३ ॥

83. A nasalized vowel occurring in the interior of a word is short.

Here we have the general fact laid down, and in the following rules, to the end of the section, are stated the exceptions to it. The Rik Pr., in one of its later books (xiii. 7–10), treats the same subject, and the commentator is at much pains (see Regnier's note to r. 22) to explain its introduction into the Prātiçākhyā, into whose proper province such a matter does not enter. Our own commentator seldom troubles himself about little inconsistencies and redundancies of this kind, which are exhibited by all the treatises; they aid in the general purpose of a Prātiçākhyā, which is to preserve the traditional text of the school from corruption. Thus, the Tāitt. Pr. presents (xvi. 1–31) a complete conspectus of all the nasalized vowels, short and long, found in its text in the interior of a word, and again (xiii. 8–14), a detailed exhibition of all cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal, *n*.

The commentator cites a third time the whole series of instances given above, under rule 27, and repeated by him under rule 53.

### दीर्घो नपुंसकबहुवचने ॥ ८४ ॥

84. In neuters plural it is long.

The commentator gives, as examples, *parūnshi yasya sambhārāḥ* (ix. 6. 1), *yajūnshi hotrā brūmaḥ* (xi. 6. 14), *atto havīnshi* (xviii. 3. 44).

An equivalent rule is found in the Rik Pr. (xiii. 7, r. 22), which farther specifies that the theme ends in a spirant, and that the long vowel precedes the terminations *si* and *shi*. The Tāitt. Pr., ignoring all help

\* I have given the words here in the full form in which the *pada*-text presents them: our commentator, in his citations, leaves off the repetition of the compound, writing simply *ārtni ive 'ti*, etc.

from grammatical categories in the construction of its rule, as is its custom, says (xvi. 14) that *â*, *î*, and *û* are nasal before *si* and *shi* at the end of a word.

## पांसुमांसादीनाम् ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Also in *pânsu*, *mânsa*, etc.

The commentator cites *pânsûn akshebhyaḥ* (vii. 109. 2), *mânsam mânsena* (iv. 12. 4), *çânçayena* (vi. 129. 1 [should be *çânçapena*? the manuscripts blunder somewhat over the word, but W. E. and H. read distinctly *çânçapena*]), and *çilâ bhûmir açmâ pânsuḥ* (xii. 1. 26). To the words thus instanced I have only to add *pânsure* (vii. 26. 4), which may perhaps be regarded as virtually included in *pânsu*.

The form of this rule is quite peculiar, in that it cites two words, instead of one, as heading of the *gaṇa*.

## हनिगम्योः सनि ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Also in a desiderative form from the roots *han* and *gam*.

Of desiderative forms from the root *han* the text furnishes us *jighâṅsati* (e. g. iv. 18. 3) and *jighâṅsan* (vi. 99. 2). From *gam* we have no such forms, unless, in xii. 4. 29, 30, we are to amend *yadâ sthâma jighâṅsati* into *jigâṅsati*, which would very much improve the sense, if I am not mistaken. Could we trust implicitly to the Prâtiçâkhyâ to include in its rules no forms not actually to be found in the Atharvan text, this passage would be a sufficient warrant for making the alteration suggested: but that is not the case, as the very next rule, for instance, notably shows. The reason why these two roots are thus put together as the subject of such a grammatical precept may be to be sought in the general grammar; compare the equivalent rule in Pâṇini (vi. 4. 16), which offers also the same technical term, *san*, for a desiderative form.

The commentary offers as examples the word *jighâṅsati* (e. g. iv. 18. 3), and the passage spoken of above, *yadâ sthâma jighâṅsati*; and, although our manuscript here reads, like those of the text, *jighâṅsati*, the absence of any other citation or fabricated illustration of desiderative forms from *gam* gives a degree of color to the conjecture that our commentator may have meant to give *jigâṅsati*.

## शान्मान्दानाम् ॥ ८७ ॥

87. As also from the roots *çân*, *mân*, and *dân*.

Of these three roots, only *mân* offers in the Atharvan text any forms falling under this rule. The commentator cites one of them, *mîmâṅsa-mânâḥ* (ix. 1. 3): the others are *mîmâṅsamâṅsya* (ix. 6. 24), *mîmâṅsitasya* (ix. 6. 24), and *amîmâṅsanta* (xii. 4. 42). The form *mânsta* (xi. 2. 8), as not being of desiderative origin, does not properly belong here, but, if genuine, should be included under rule 85: it may be a corrupted reading for *maṅsta*; we have the corresponding second per-

son, *mansthās*, in ix. 5. 4, and there also a part of the manuscripts (P. W. I.) read *mānsthāh*. For *śān* and *dān* the commentator evidently had no genuine instances at command, and he fabricates *ṣiśān-sati*, *dīdān-sati*. Here also it is a suspicious circumstance that a rule of the general grammar (Pān. iii. 1. 6) groups these three roots together: although, it is true, for a different purpose from that which calls forth our rule.

### वस्वन्तस्य पञ्चपद्याम् ॥ ८८ ॥

88. Also in a strong case from a theme in *vañs*.

The strong cases (*pañcapadī*, 'five words or forms') are the masculine nominatives singular, dual, and plural, and the accusatives singular and dual. The suffix *vañs* is that which forms the perfect active participle: it is called in Pānini by the same name as here, *vasu*. The commentary cites as instances *pareyivānsam* (xviii. 1. 49), *praviṣivānsam* (iv. 23. 1), *uttasthivānsaḥ* (vi. 93. 1), and *papivānsaḥ* (vii. 97. 3).

### इयसश्च ॥ ८९ ॥

89. As also from a theme in *īyañs*.

That is to say, in a strong case of a comparative of the ancient formation, or that produced by adding the primary suffix *īyañs* to the, generally gunated, root. The commentator gives as examples *ṣreyān*, *ṣreyāñsāu*, *ṣreyāñsaḥ*; but the only strong case of this word occurring in the Atharvan text is *ṣreyānsam* (xv. 10. 2).

### विदेश्च ॥ ९० ॥

90. As also from the root *vid*.

There are two damaging objections to be made to this rule: in the first place, it ought to be brought in, if at all, after rule 88, in order that *vasvantasya* as well as *pañcapadyām* may be implied in it by inference from its predecessor; and in the second place, there is no need of any such precept at all, since there is no good reason why *vidvān*, the word to which it alone applies, should not be considered a *vasvanta*, and therefore regarded as disposed of by rule 88. The Hindu theory, indeed, does not regard *vidvān* as a perfect participle, and Pānini (vii. 1. 36) is obliged to teach that in it the perfect participial suffix is substituted for that of the present participle; and probably it is out of this circumstance that the introduction of the rule here in question has proceeded: yet, the substitution having been made, *vidvān* would have to be deemed and taken for a *vasvanta*, one would think, even by the Hindu theory itself.

The commentator gives all the strong forms of *vidvān*, of which only a part, however, are to be found in the Atharvan, and then winds up with an actual citation; as follows: *vidvān* (e. g. ii. 1. 2), *vidvāñsāu*, *vidvāñsaḥ*, *vidvāñsam* (e. g. ix. 9. 4), *vidvāñsāu*; *vidvāñsam vrātyam* (e. g. xv. 2. 1).

## पुंसश्च ॥ ११ ॥

91. As also from *pumañs*.

The commentary instances the five cases of *pumañs* to which the name *pañcapadî* belongs; only one of those to which the rule actually applies occurs in our text: *pumân* (e. g. i. 8. 1), *pumânśâu*, *pumânśah*, *pumânśam* (e. g. iii. 23. 3), *pumânśâu*. Then he adds a counter-example, to show that the rule is meant for the strong cases alone: *pumñi vâi reto bhavati* (vi. 11. 2).

Here ends the third section of the first chapter: the signature in the manuscript is *prathamasya tṛtīyah pâdah*: 91.

## वर्णादल्त्यात्पूर्व उपधा ॥ १२ ॥

92. A sound preceding a final sound is called its *upadhâ*.

This is simply a definition of the term *upadhâ*, and, to illustrate the rule, the commentator cites the two later rules, *nâmyupadhasya repah* (ii. 42) and *âkâropadhasya lopah* (ii. 55), in which the term is employed. The Vâj. Pr. (i. 35) has precisely the same definition. In the Rik Pr. the word has a more general use, as 'preceding letter or word' (*upa-dhâ*, 'a setting against or next to'): it is probably on account of this less restricted signification current in some schools that the two treatises first spoken of deem it necessary to limit the term by a specific definition. The Tâitt. Pr. does not employ it at all.

## स्वरो ऽक्षरम् ॥ १३ ॥

93. A vowel is a syllable.

The precise scope of this rule it is not easy to determine; it seems to be rather a general and theoretic doctrine than a precept which enters in any active and practical manner into the system of rules of our treatise. The Vâj. Pr. and Rik Pr. have similar rules, and that of the former (i. 99) is expressed in identical terms with our own; it receives an easier interpretation than ours by being placed at the head of the rules for syllabication, which correspond to our rules 55-58, above. The Rik Pr. (xviii. 17, r. 31) states more fully that a vowel, whether pure, or combined with *anusvâra*, or combined with consonants, is a syllable; as also (i. 4, r. 19, xx) that both the short and the long vowels are syllables; making the former declaration an introduction to the rules for syllabication and quantity, and the latter, to the briefer treatment of the same subjects in the first chapter. We may perhaps regard our rule as a virtual precept that the accentuation, which in later rules (iii. 55 etc.) is taught especially of the vowels, extends its sway over the whole syllable: or, on the other hand, that the accents, which in rules 14-16 above were declared to belong to syllables, affect especially the vowels. With the subject of accent the commentator seems, at any

rate, to bring it into special connection. Omitting his usual explanatory paraphrase (a small loss: it would doubtless have been *svaro ksharam bhavati*), he proceeds at once to give an exposition, of which a part occurs again at the close of the third section of the third chapter; it reads, unamended, as follows: *kim aksharasya svaryamāṇasya svaryate: arddham krasvasya pādo dirghasye 'ty eke: sarvam iti çāṅkhamitrah* (under ii. 6 and iii. 74, *çāṅkhamitrih*): *aksharasyāi 'shā dhānam (vīdhāna) vidyate yad yad virasvarābhāvah (yad yad viçvaribhava: the passage goes no farther under iii. 74): svaram aksharam ity āhuh: svarād anyat vyañjanaṁ sarvaṁ pṛthak varṇasāmānyam dvyaḥkṛtāṁjyate budhāih.* I translate, in part, as follows, not without some misgivings: 'what part of a circumflexed syllable is circumflexed? some say, half a short one, quarter of a long one: Çāṅkhamitri says, the whole: here is found no rule for a syllable [*krasva* and *dirgha* are said of vowels only: see note to r. 51, above]; since, in each case, the vowel alone is contemplated [??]: now the vowel is declared to be the syllable . . . , and hence, perhaps, what is taught of the vowel must be understood to be said of the whole syllable. Yet all this would appear to be rendered unnecessary by the rules for syllabication, which, as we have seen, hardly have a meaning if they do not imply that each consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is declared to belong.

## सोष्मणि पूर्वस्यानुष्मा ॥ १३ ॥

94. The sound preceding an aspirate becomes a non-aspirate.

The proper application of this rule, within the sphere of the Prātiçākhyā, is only to cases of the doubling of the first or second consonant of a group, by the *varṇakrama*, as taught in rules iii. 26 etc., yet its form of statement is general, and there can be no doubt that it should apply to all cases arising in the course of derivation and inflection, and that forms such as *mr̥dhdhi*, containing a double lingual sonant aspirate, are strictly excluded by it. Such forms, as is well known, occur in almost all the Vedic manuscripts, and those of our own text offer several instances of them;\* which, however, we have not hesitated to amend in the printed text (except in ii. 5. 4, where the correction has been accidentally omitted) to *ddh*.

Corresponding rules in the other Prātiçākhyas are: Rik Pr. vi. 1 (r. 2, cclxxix), and xii. 3 (r. 9); Vāj. Pr. iv. 106; Tāitt. Pr. xiv. 5: that of the Vāj. Pr. and the former one of the Rik Pr. are restricted in terms to the cases of duplication arising under the rules of the *varṇakrama*; the others are general precepts, like our own.

The examples given by the commentary are such as illustrate the application of the rule to forms of derivation and inflection, as well as of *krama*; they are *iddham (sam-iddham, vii. 74. 4)*, *dugdham* (e. g. x. 6.

\* The details are as follows: ii. 5. 4, all the MSS. *dhdh*; vii. 46. 1, all do.; vii. 97. 7, E. I. do., the rest *dh*; xi. 1. 29, Bp. *dh* only, all the rest *dhdh*; xi. 1. 31, first time, all *dhdh*: second time, Bp. *dh*, the rest *dhdh*; xii. 2. 19, B. *dhdh*, all the rest *dh*; xviii. 3. 42, all *dhdh*; xviii. 4. 1 do.; xviii. 4. 56 do. The true reading, *ddh*, is not given in a single instance by any of the MSS.

31). *nanv â ruruddhre* (iv. 31. 3: ordinary reading *ruruddhre*; but in this instance, as occasionally elsewhere, the *pada* manuscript obeys the rules of the *krama*, and gives *ruruddhre*), *yo daddhre* (xviii. 3. 63, *dadhre*), *valagam vâ nicakkhnuh* (x. 1. 18, *nicakkhnuh*). The commentator then once more commences his citations with his metrical authority, and gives the verse *prathamâḥ ca dvitīyânâm saṁyoge pratyantaram : tṛtīyâḥ ca caturthânâm etat sarvatra lakṣhaṇam*; 'first mutes are substituted for seconds, when directly preceding the latter in a group; and thirds in like manner for fourths: this is a rule of universal application.'

## अन्तर्येण वृत्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

### 95. Conversion is according to propinquity.

That is to say, when any sound is ordered to be changed into another, of any class or description, we are to convert it into that one which is nearest to it, in situation or in character. The commentator, after his customary repetition of the rule, by way of paraphrase, with the bare addition of *bhavati*, proceeds, without any farther explanation, to cite three rules in the interpretation of which it needs to be applied. The first of these is ii. 31, to the effect that *m* before a mute is converted into a letter of the same position with it: which, by this rule, must be understood, *m* being a nasal, to mean the nasal letter of the series, and not either of the non-aspirate or aspirate surds or sonants. The second is ii. 40, by which the *visarjanīya* is to be made of like position with a following surd mute, and, by our rule, still a spirant of like position with the latter. The third example is iii. 39, which prescribes the conversion of a vowel into a semivowel; and this semivowel, by our rule, must be that of the same class with the vowel: we are not to change *i* into *v*, or *u* into *r*, etc. There are other rules to which the present precept applies; so, in explaining the one next preceding, it may be looked upon as determining the non-aspirate into which the duplication of an aspirate is converted to be surd or sonant according as the aspirate is surd or sonant (a matter which, in the other treatises, is expressly prescribed in the rules themselves, and not left for inference): and possibly its bearing upon that rule is the reason why it is introduced here, rather than elsewhere in the treatise. Similar prescriptions are found in the Rik Pr. (i. 14, r. 56, lvii) and the Vāj. Pr. (i. 142).

## खण्वावा३३ खैमखा३३ इत्याकारादिकारो ऽनुदात्तः ॥ १६ ॥

96. In *khaṇvakhâsi* and *khâimakhâsi*, the *i* following the *â* is unaccented.

This is a special rule, evidently intended to guard against an apprehended mispronunciation. The two words in question (iv. 15. 15) are meant for imitations of the croaking of frogs, and are probably for *khaṇvakhâi*, *khâimakhâi*, with protraction (*pluti*) of the final syllable: and it is feared that, without particular caution, the final *i* will be made to

share in the irregular accent which falls upon the protracted vowel, both words being doubly accented, on the first and third syllables.\*

अवशा अबभूवाँ इतीताविकारो ऽप्लुतः ॥ १७ ॥

97. In *avaçá* and *á babhuváñ*, with *iti*, the *e* is not protracted.

The commentator, after paraphrasing the rule, adds simply *avaçe 'ti*, *babhúve 'ti*. The two passages referred to are found at xii. 4. 42 and x. 2. 28, and they read, in the *pada* and *sanhitá* texts, as follows:

p. वशा इयाम् ३ ॥ अवशा ३ ॥ इति ॥ —s. वशेयाश्मवशेति ॥

p. पुरुषः । आ । बभूवाँ ॥ ४ । ३ ॥ —s. पुरुष आ बभूवाँ ३ ॥

They are not analogous cases, as regards the action of the present rule, since one of them actually contains an *iti*, while, in the other, no *iti* follows the protracted vowel in either the *sanhitá* or the *pada* texts, but only in the *krama*-text (see the note to rule 70). All the *sanhitá* manuscripts, however, observe the precept of our treatise in making the combination of *avaçá* ३ with the succeeding word, and accordingly its protraction, which is assured by this rule and by i. 105, and which is exhibited by the *pada*-text, entirely disappears in *sanhitá*—a strange imperfection of the latter text, and one which, if it did not exhibit itself in all the manuscripts, we should be very loth to introduce, upon the sole authority of this rule of the *Prátiçákhya*.

By Váj. Pr. iv. 88, a final *pluta* vowel retains its *pluti* before *iti*, and the closing *krama-pada* of our second verse would be *babhúváñ iti babhúváñ*, instead of *babhúve 'ti babhúváñ*. Neither of the other Vedic texts appears to present any case analogous with the other one which forms the subject of our rule.

व्यञ्जनान्यव्यवेतानि स्वरैः संयोगः ॥ १८ ॥

98. Consonants not separated by vowels form a conjunction.

With this definition of a *saṁyoga*, a conjunction or group of consonants—which, as already noticed, is much more comprehensive than that which would seem to be implied in the definition of *saṁyukta* given above, in rule 49—agree those of the other treatises (R. Pr. i. 7, r. 37, xxxviii; V. Pr. i. 48; T. Pr. offers nothing corresponding).

The commentator's paraphrase of the rule, with the accompanying examples, forms a verse, as follows: *vyañjanāny aryavetāni svarāiḥ*

\* E. I. and H. read the first word *khaṇvakhāsi*, with a single accent only, and the printed text has—wrongly, as it seems to me—followed their authority instead of that of the other manuscripts: and also, by some inexplicable oversight, signs of accent have become attached to the *pluti* figures, as if the preceding *á*'s were circumflex, and the following *í*'s acute. The line ought to read as follows:

खण्वावाश्इ खिम्वावाश्इ मध्ये तदुरि ।

*samyogo bhavati: agnir indraç ca tushtaç ca vrkshah plaksho nidarçanam.* The word *tushta* is not found in the Atharvan, nor *plaksha*, excepting in the form *plakshât* (v. 5. 5).

समानपदे ऽनुत्तमात्स्पर्शादुत्तमे यमैर्यथासंब्यम् ॥ ११ ॥

99. After a non-nasal and before a nasal mute, in the same word, is made the insertion of *yamas*, suited to each case.

The commentator treats this intricate subject with the utmost possible brevity, merely paraphrasing the rule, as follows: *samânapade 'nut-tamât sparçât: uttame paratah sparçe yamâir vyavadhânam bhavati: yathâsamâkhyam*:—and adding as instances *sapatnam* (vii. 109. 3), *çradhnâti* (not found in AV.; the word most nearly resembling it is *crath-nânah* [xiv. 1. 57], for which it may not impossibly be a false reading of the manuscript), *yajñah* (e. g. iv. 11. 4), and *grbhñâti* (MS. *grhnâti*, which is no example of a *yama*: the only form in the AV. admitting *yama* is *grbhñâmî* [iii. 8. 6]). Unfortunately, we cannot be permitted to dismiss the subject in such an off-hand manner, but must endeavor to ascertain, by the aid of the other treatises and of phonetical theory, what these *yamas* are.

We have already seen (under rule 43) that the euphonic system of the Prâtiçâkhyâ does not allow one mute to follow another by a simple consonantal conjunction, but regards the former of the two as suffering a modification which robs it of part of its distinct quality. Now we have the farther direction, which must be taken as to that extent limiting the former, that, within the limits of a simple word, if the latter consonant is nasal and the former not so, there is interposed between the two a *yama*, or 'twin' to one of the other letters. This is all that our treatise says of the *yamas*: none of its other rules mention them, although one or two may be regarded as referring to them, and are so interpreted by the commentator—from whose explication of rule 26, above, we have learned that they are of nasal character. The Tâitt. Pr. is not more explicit: it merely says (xxi. 12, 13): "after a mute not nasal, when followed by a nasal, are inserted, in each several case, nose-sounds (*nâsikya*): these some call *yamas*." The Vâj. Pr., where it teaches the occurrence of the *yamas* (iv. 160), calls them *vicheda*, 'separation,' a word which it does not elsewhere employ; its doctrine is: "within a word, a non-nasal before a nasal suffers separation"—that is, it is to be inferred, a separation or division of itself into two parts, which are as twins to one another—and the *yamas* have elsewhere been stated to be nose-sounds (i. 74), and formed by the root of the nose (i. 82). The Rik Pr. is decidedly more elaborate in its description. After stating (i. 10) that the *yamas* are nose-sounds, it goes on to say (vi. 8-10) that the non-nasal mutes, before following nasals, become their own "twins"—that is to say, if we rightly understand it, each becomes a pair of twins of its own nature; what is left of the original mute being one of the pair, and its nasal counterpart the other; the latter being especially the *yama*, or the twin which is added to make up the pair. The *yama* is then declared to be similar to its original (*prakṛti*); or, it is said, there is an audible utter-



ance in the mouth, of the same quantity with the *yama*; but the office of the suffixed sound is not diverse from that of its original. All this seems intended to be very explicit, but it is so far from being perspicuous that it has led both the editors of the *Rik Pr.*, or allowed them to fall, into the very serious error of supposing the *yama* to be something prefixed to the non-nasal mute, instead of interposed between it and the following nasal. Phonetic analysis does not, as it seems to me, help us to recognize the *yama* of the Hindu grammarians as any necessary accompaniment of the utterance of a mute and nasal, but will lead us to a plausible explanation of what they must have called by the name.\* A nasal is a sound in the production of which there is an expulsion of intonated breath through the passages of the nose, at the same time that the mouth organs are closed in the position in which an ordinary mute is uttered; in any language, then, there will naturally be as many nasals as there are classes of mutes, and the unusually complete alphabet of the Sanskrit language recognizes and distinguishes them all. If, now, we pronounce a *t* before a following *m*, as in *âtma*, the *t*, in the first place, suffers *abhinidhâna*, losing the explosion which is essential to its full utterance: the organs pass, without intervening unclosure, from the dental contact to the labial contact, by which latter the *m* is produced, with expulsion of sound through the nose. By taking sufficient pains, we can make the nasal utterance so closely simultaneous with the labial explosion that nothing shall be audible except the *t* and the *m*. But we may also commence the nasal sound a perceptible interval before the explosion, and we shall even be most likely to do so in a labored utterance: if it be made to begin after the labial position is taken up, the nasal resonance is merely a preface to the *m*, and a dwelling upon it before the explosion: but if we utter sound through the nose before transferring the organs from the dental to the labial contact, we give origin to a kind of nasal counterpart to the *t*, as a transition sound from it to the *m*. If this is not the *yama* of the Hindu grammarians, I am utterly at a loss to conjecture what the latter should be. The theory which recognizes it might be compared with that which, in rule 50, above, taught a general assimilation of the former consonant of a group, in its final portion, to the latter; it is still more nearly analogous with the surd which, by ii. 9, is inserted between a final nasal and a following sibilant: this arises, like the *yama*, by an exchange of the emission (the *anupradâna*) belonging to the former letter for that belonging to the latter before the transfer of the organs from the one position to the other; and the *t* thus introduced, for example, between a *n* and a *s* has just as good a right to be called the *yama* or counterpart of the former letter, as has the *n* inserted after *t* before *m*. That the utterance of the intermediate sound thus described is not necessary, and can readily be avoided, is no objection to our interpretation of the Hindu theory: in the studied explicitness of the scholastic utterance, and with a phonetical science which delighted itself with subtleties, and of which the strong tendency was to grow from descriptive into prescriptive, such

---

\* That Müller pronounces the theory (p. cxvii) "perfectly clear and physiologically comprehensible" must go for nothing, considering his entire misapprehension of the situation and character of the *yama*.

transition sounds would naturally enough rise to a distinctness and a generality of occurrence much beyond what they were originally entitled to. A much more serious difficulty is, that the theory of the *yama* allows its occurrence between an aspirate mute and a nasal: and we should suppose that the unclosure and brief emission of unintonated breath constituting the aspiration would form an impassible barrier between the two letters, the nasal utterance being unable to precede it, and the position of contact of the former letter to follow it, so that no nasal counterpart to the former letter could be uttered. I see no way of getting over this difficulty, excepting by supposing an inaccuracy in the analysis of the Hindu phonetists: a serious charge, it may seem, but one of which I should be glad to see them relieved by any other intelligible explanation of the *yama*. If the whole theory of the phenomenon were more solidly founded and more accurately worked out by them, I should not think they need have explained it in a manner to cause their interpreters so much perplexity. The perplexity, indeed, is not confined to the modern expositors: the ancient commentators themselves (see Müller, p. cxxiii) seem to have been somewhat in doubt as to how many different *yamas* there are, whether twenty, one for each of the non-nasal mutes, or a smaller number. The orthodox doctrine of the Rik Pr. seems to be that of twenty: but its commentator says that there are only four; one for all the first mutes, one for all the seconds, and so on; and the commentary to Tâitt. Pr. xxi. 12 supports the same view.\* This latter view, however, appears to me peculiarly indefensible: I cannot at all see how the nasal counterparts of the *tenues* of the five mute series should be identical with one another; nor, on the other hand, how they should be physically different from the *yamas* of the following mutes of each series respectively; although it might well enough be loosely said, considering their title of "twins," that there are as many of them as of the sounds to which they sustain that relation. Physically, it would seem necessary that a nasal transition-sound between two mutes should be of the nature either of the first or of the second: if of the second, and that second a nasal, it would be indistinguishable from it; if of the first, it would be identical with the nasal of that series (except as being *abhinihita*, or wanting the explosion), and so the same for all the mutes of the series. The doctrine of our own treatise upon this point is not entirely clear, since its expression, *yathâsamkhyam*, 'according to their number,' might possibly be taken as referring either to the non-nasal or to the nasal mutes: yet it is, without much doubt, to be understood of the former; and we are to allow theoretically the existence of twenty *yamas*, although only thirteen of them—viz. those of *k, kh, g, gh, c, j, t, th, d, dh, p, bh*†—occur in the Atharvan text.

\* Weber (p. 125) suggests that the discordance among the authorities upon this point may have grown out of the circumstance that, in speaking of the *yamas*, those of a single series of mutes are sometimes taken as representatives of the whole class, and treated as standing for them all. This seems very plausible: but we can hardly acquit the later expositors of having been misled by this usage into the belief that there are only four *yamas*, and not twenty.

† For the details, see the additional note on the consonantal combinations in general.

In the examples which he gives under this rule, the commentator does not attempt to write the *yamas*. Above, under rules 13 and 26, where the *yamas* were instanced, they were—taking those of the guttural mutes as representatives of the class—written by the mutes with an *anusvāra* sign above: viz. कं, खं, गं, घं; the *anusvāra* being evidently intended here exceptionally to indicate the nasal quality of the consonant itself, and not of the following vowel. The method of the commentary to the Rik Pr. (see Müller, p. xix) is the same, or, in other manuscripts, कुं, खुं, गुं, घुं, and this last mode Weber (under i. 80) conjectures, with much plausibility, to have arisen from writing the guttural nasal ॠ under the other letters, since this would be the most accurate method which the alphabet renders possible of writing the non-nasal and its nasal *yama*.

### हकारान्नासिक्येन ॥ १०० ॥

100. After *h* is inserted in like manner a *nāsikya* before a nasal mute.

The commentator paraphrases with *hakārāt nāsikyena samānapade vyavadhānam bhavati*; and adds as illustrations a part of the words already once given, under rule 58: viz. *prāhṇah, pūrvāhṇah, aparāhṇah, apa hmalayati, vi hmalayati, vi hmute, brahma*.

The Tāitt. Pr. (xxi. 14) teaches the insertion of a *nāsikya* after *h* and before a following nasal in terms nearly equivalent to those of our own rule. The Rik Pr. (i. 10, r. 48, xlix) and the Vāj. Pr. (i. 74, 80) describe its mode of pronunciation, as a nose-sound; and the latter, in its latest portion (viii. 28), speaks of it again among the constituents of the spoken alphabet; but, strangely enough, neither of them gives any rule respecting its occurrence.

What the sound may be which is thus taught to form the step of transition from the aspiration to a following nasal, it is hard to say with confidence. I can only conjecture it to be a brief expulsion of surd breath through the nose, as continuation of the *h*, before the expulsion of the sonant breath which constitutes the nasal. The pure aspiration *h* is a corresponding surd to all the sonant vowels, semivowels, and nasals of the alphabet: that is to say, it is produced by an expulsion of breath through the mouth organs in any of the positions in which those letters are uttered; it has no distinctive position of its own, but is determined in its mode of pronunciation by the letter with which it is most nearly connected. Thus the *h*'s of *ha*, of *hi*, of *hu*, and those heard before the semivowels *w* and *y* in the English words *when* and *hue*, for instance, are all different in position, corresponding in each case with the following vowel or semivowel. *H* is usually initial in a word or syllable, and is governed by the letter which succeeds, and not by that which precedes it: but where it occurs before another consonant in the middle of a word—which is always its position in the Vedas before a nasal—the question may arise whether it shall adopt the mode of utterance of the letter before or after it: whether in *brahma*, for example, we divide *brah·ma*, and pronounce the *h* in the position of the

*a*, or *bra·hma*, and in the position of the *m*, through the nose. According to the Hindu method of syllabication (see rule 56, above), the former is the proper division, and the Hindu phonetists doubtless regarded the *h* as belonging with and uttered like the *a*; and noticing at the same time the utterance, scarcely to be avoided, of at least a part of the *h* in the position of the *m*, they took account of it as a separate element, and called it *nâsikya*.

रेफाद्रूप्मणि स्वरपरे स्वरभक्तिरकारस्यार्धं चतुर्थमित्येके  
अन्यस्मिन्व्यञ्जने चतुर्थमष्टमं वा ॥ १०२ ॥ [॥ १०१ ॥

101. After a *r*, and before a spirant which is followed by a vowel, is inserted a *svarabhakti*, half a short *a*: some say, a quarter.

102. Before any other consonant, the *svarabhakti* after *r* is a quarter or an eighth of *a*.

The two rules are stated and explained separately in the manuscript, but I have put them thus together for the convenience of treating the whole subject of the *svarabhakti* at once.

The term *svarabhakti* signifies a 'fraction or fragment of a vowel,' and the theory evidently is, that a *r* cannot be pronounced in immediate combination with any following consonant: there must always be slipped in between them a little bit of a transition-vowel, varying in length, according to different authorities, from a half to an eighth of a mora, and longer before a sibilant or *h*, if these be followed in turn by a vowel, than before other consonants; while in quality it coincides with the *a*—that is to say, undoubtedly, with the *a samvṛta* (rule 36, above), or the neutral vowel. The theory is this time, at least, perfectly intelligible, and any one may readily convince himself by trial how very easy it is to introduce such a vowel-fragment after a *r*, if he pronounce the latter far enough forward in the mouth for it to require to be trilled—and perhaps especially, if he be one to whom the smoother utterance of the *r*, farther back, is more natural. The reason for distinguishing the case of a following spirant—and that, too, only when followed by a vowel—as requiring a longer insertion, is not so clear, and I confess myself unable to discover the pertinence of the distinction: it is, however, a marked and important one to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, as will appear by a comparison of the teachings of the other treatises.

The Vâj. Pr. (iv. 16) restricts the occurrence of anything like *svarabhakti* to cases in which a spirant is the second member of a group, and is itself followed by a vowel; but it allows it both after a *r* and a *l* (see above, under rule 46), and moreover defines it as being the *r* and the *ḷ*-vowels respectively. Considering, however, that the same authority defines these vowels as ending each with quarter of an *a* (see above, under rule 37), its description of the character of the insertion cannot be regarded as differing essentially from that of our own treatise. The doctrine of the Tâitt. Pr. is very nearly the same: it teaches (xxi.

15, 16) that when *r* and a spirant form a group, a *r* vowel-fragment (*rephasvarabhaktih*) is inserted, except when the spirant is subject to duplication (i. e., is not followed by a vowel) or is followed by a "first" mute: while the commentary explains that a fragment of that vowel which is akin with the *r*, or the *ṛ*-vowel, is meant. According to the Rik Pr. (vi. 13, 14), the *svarabhakti*, which is described as being like the *ṛ*-vowel (*ṛkāravarṇā*), is inserted between a *r* and a following consonant when the former is preceded by a vowel: if the following consonant is a spirant, and itself followed by a vowel, the *svarabhakti* is the longer one, which had before been defined (i. 7, r. 33, xxxiv) as being a half-mora in length; in other cases, the shorter one, of half this length (i. 7, r. 35, xxxvi), is interposed. The accordance of this with the doctrine of our treatise is as close as possible. But the Rik Pr. also allows a *svarabhakti* between a sonant letter and a following mute or spirant; and it then farther cites the views of different authorities, of whom some deny the existence of the *svarabhakti* altogether, others permit it only after a *r*, and others only before a spirant not duplicated (this is very nearly the doctrine of the Vāj. Pr. and Tāitt. Pr.), pronouncing it to agree in character with either the preceding or the following vowel.

As we shall see hereafter (under iii. 46), the manuscripts of the Atharvan acknowledge the virtual correspondence of the *r* followed by the longer *svarabhakti* with the *ṛ*-vowel, by writing the *ṛ* instead of *r*, where the former comes before a spirant, and should be, by iii. 46, converted into *r* after *a* or *ā*.

Our commentator gives us, under rule 102, the instances *aryamā* (e. g. i. 11. 1), *parva* (i. 12. 2), and *dharmanā* (e. g. vi. 132. 1)—the manuscript not attempting to write the interposed vowel-fragment. Under rule 101 he cites no examples, but, after the baldest possible paraphrase of the rule, proceeds to quote from other authorities, as follows: *apara āha: ṛkārasvarabhaktih: ūshmasu svarapareṣu ardhākāravarṇo vyañ-janam śeṣa iti*: "another has said, "a vowel-fragment of the *ṛ*-vowel;" "before spirants followed by vowels is heard half an *a*-vowel; the rest is consonant." These appear to be the *dicta* of two different teachers. Next follow several verses, a part of which are of a character which would render their introduction under rule 37, above, more appropriate, while one line, the second, belongs rather under rule 98; they read: *rephād anyad ṛkāre yat tasyā 'rdham pūrvasavaram: vacanena vyave-tānām saṁyogatvaṁ vihanante: ṛvarne 'pi tu rephasya cā 'rdhamātrā pratiññayā: ardhamātrām svaram vidyāt sa cāi 'vam kriyate punaḥ: tān krasvobhayataḥ kuryād yathā mātrā bhaved iti: darṣo varshaṁ tatha rtavaḥ*:<sup>1</sup> *barhiḥ cā 'tra nidarṣanam: etām ṛtiṁ vijāntiyāt svara-bhaktir yadā bhavet*: "half of what there is in the *ṛ*-vowel different from *r* is of the same character with the preceding vowel. Of consonants separated by audible sound, the conjunction is destroyed. In the *ṛ*-vowels there is, by express rule, half a mora of *r*; half a mora is to be recognized as vowel, and that, again, is thus managed: put the parts upon both sides of the short vowel, so as to make out a mora: exam-

<sup>1</sup> † —MS. *tathātasah*.

ples are *darça, varsha, tatha rtavah, barhîh*: know this to be the way when a *svarabhakti* is to be produced.' I trust that either the commentator or the manuscript, and not the translator, is responsible for the inconcinnity of this passage.

तदेव स्फोटनः ॥ १०३ ॥

103. Of the latter value is *sphoṭana*.

That is to say, if I do not misapprehend the meaning of the rule, *sphoṭana*, like the shorter *svarabhakti*, has a quarter or an eighth the quantity of a short *a*: or it may be that the emphatic *eva* would restrict the reference to the latter value, the eighth, alone. The commentator, as so often, gives not a particle of assistance in comprehending the rule. He simply paraphrases, as follows: *tad eva sphoṭano vyañjako bhavati*—explaining *sphoṭana* by its synonym *vyañjaka*, 'manifestor'—and then cites the same instances of *sphoṭana* which are given later, under ii. 38. For the doctrine of *sphoṭana*, see the rule last mentioned, and the note upon it. The subject is not disposed of here, because the *sphoṭana*, unlike the other insertions treated of in this part of the work, arises only in the combinations of the phrase, when a final mute comes in contact with a following initial mute of an earlier series or *varga*.

पूर्वस्वरं संयोगाविघातश्च ॥ १०४ ॥

104. These belong to the preceding vowel, and do not effect the dissolution of a conjunction of consonants.

There is something wrong with the commentary to this rule; apparently we have a repetition of a part of the commentary to rule 102, with the loss of what should properly be given here: it reads as follows: *pûrvapûrvasvaram ca tad bhavati: samyogasya ca vighâtaḥ yat tat rephât akârasya caturtham vâ bhavaty ashtamam vâ: aryamâ parva dharmanâ*. It furnishes us, it will be seen, no hint as to how far back the teachings of the rule apply. I presume, however, that they may be properly considered as extending themselves to all the phonetic insertions taught in rules 99–103: all these, in the division of the word into syllables, are to be reckoned as belonging to the preceding vowel, and sharing in its accent; and whereas it might seem that the insertion of the vowel-fragment, and of its kindred *sphoṭana*, dissolved the conjunction of the consonants between which they were inserted—since, by rule 98, a conjunction of consonants can only subsist where there is no interposition of vowels—the contrary is expressly declared to be true. This would regard *pûrvasvaram* as belonging to some such word as *angam* understood, and used in an indistinctive or collective manner of all that precedes. It may be, however, that the specification applies only to *svarabhakti* and *sphoṭana*, and that the neuter singular form of *pûrvasvaram* is owing to its agreement with one of the words denoting the quantity of those insertions, *caturtham, ashtamam*, etc. The Rik Pr. specifies only of the *svarabhakti* (i. 7, r. 32, xxxiii) that it belongs

to the previous syllable; the Vāj. Pr. (i. 103) says the same thing of the *yama* alone; while the Tāitt. Pr. (xxi. 6) teaches that the *svara-bhakti* belongs to the preceding syllable, but (xxi. 8) that the *yamas* and *nāsikya* go with the following one. The Rik Pr. alone, besides our treatise, thinks it necessary to say (vi. 10, r. 35, cccxi) that the *svara-bhakti* does not dissolve the conjunction: in the Vāj. Pr. it is left to be pointed out by the commentator (see Weber, p. 217).

खावखाश्इ विमखाश्इ मध्ये तडुरि [iv. 15. 15] । इदं  
 भूयाश् इदाश्मिति [ix. 6. 18] । ऊर्ध्वी नु सृष्टाश्स्तिर्यङ् नु  
 सृष्टाश्ः सर्वा दिशः पुरुष आ बभूवाश् [x. 2. 28] । पराञ्च-  
 मोदनं प्राशीश्ः प्रत्यञ्चाश्मिति [xi. 3. 26] । तमोदनं प्रा-  
 शीश्स्वामोदनाश् इति [xi. 3. 27] । वशेयाश्मवशेश्ति [xii. 4.  
 42] । यत्तदासीश्दिदं नु ताश्दिति [xii. 5. 50] । इति प्लुतानि

॥ १०५ ॥

105. . . . . : these are the cases of protracted vowels.

I have taken the liberty of separating by a stroke the different passages rehearsed in this rule; the manuscript puts them all in *sandhi* together. One or two of the signs of protraction have also been restored which the manuscript has accidentally omitted. On the other hand, I have retained the sign of protraction given by the manuscript to the second case in the last passage but one, *avaṣeṣ'ti* (the MS. writes *avaṣetiṣ*), although it is not written by the *sankhita* codices of the Atharvan text, and is forbidden by rule 97, above. Finally, I have added the accent marks which belong to each passage.

The commentator does not give any paraphrase of the rule, nor does he repeat it at the end of his exposition, yet I cannot question that it is actually the closing rule of the chapter, and not a gratuitous appendix of the commentator's own addition. He discourses respecting it more liberally than usual, in this wise: *kimarthaḥ paripāthah: ita uttaram adhikam: etāvat svārtho 'pi: bahuvīdhās trividhāḥ plutayo bhavanti: svaraparā abhinishtānaparā vyañjanaparāḥ: tāsām yāḥ samānākshara-parās tā itāv aplutavad bhavanti itāv aplutavad bhavanti*; 'for what reason is this enumeration made? because any other instance than these is in excess: within these limits the protracted vowel is pointed out by its own meaning (?). Protractions are various; namely, of three kinds: those which affect a syllable ending in a vowel, in *visarjanīya*,\* and in

\* For the use of the term *abhinishtāna* for *visarjanīya*—of which this is, I believe, the only case which our commentary affords—see rule 42, above, and the note upon it.

a consonant, respectively;\* among these, those which affect syllables ending in simple vowels assume their unprotracted form before *iti*.† No other reason, it would seem, is to be sought for the rule than that here given: it is intended to insure the absence of protraction in any other instances in the text than those here given; in all of which, the protraction is due to the requirements of the sense, and is not merely euphonic or accentual. A somewhat similar enumeration is made by the Vâj. Pr. in ii. 50-53, and, at the same time, directions are given as to the somewhat anomalous accentuation of the several cases. In Rik Pr. i. 6 (r. 31, xxxii), also, are mentioned the only three instances of protraction to be found in the Rig-Veda, all occurring in the latter part of its tenth book.

Our text and commentary say nothing respecting the accentuation of these words, except as regards the final *i* in the two instances contained in the first passage, for which see rule 70, above. From this we may perhaps conclude that the other protracted words offer no anomalies of accent. There is, however, some discordance among the manuscripts as to their treatment, which it may be well enough to notice here. Of the first passage (iv. 15. 15) we have already spoken, in the note to rule 96. In ix. 6. 18, all the manuscripts excepting I. read *bhûyâ 3h*, without accent, and our printed text has followed their authority: but I cannot consider this reading as anything but an error, possibly arising from a blundering confusion of the word with the verbal form *bhûyâs*, from the root *bhû*: we ought to read, with I., *bhû'yâ 3h*. In x. 2. 28, Bp. and E. accent the protracted syllable, *babhûvâ' 3ñ*: and this accent is somewhat supported by the analogy of the first *âsi' 3t* in Rig-V. x. 129. 5: but the case is still more nearly analogous with Vâj.-S. xxiii. 49, *â' viveçâ 3ñ*, and Rig-V. x. 146. 1, *vindati 3ñ*, and hence the reading of the published text is much the more likely to be correct. In xi. 3. 26, all the manuscripts except P. and M. accent *pratyâñcâ' 3m*, which is accordingly the best supported reading. In xii. 5. 50 is only to be noted that the *pada* manuscript in the second instance omits the sign of *pluti*, but doubtless by a clerical error merely. The *pada*-text everywhere writes the vowel in its protracted form, and adds the sign of protraction, not immediately after the vowel, but after the final consonant of the syllable, and sometimes with a stroke, or even a double stroke, interposed.

Except in the first passage, which contains an imitation of animal sounds, we have in all these protractions only cases of doubtful questioning as between two alternatives, of hesitating indecision, of *mîmânsâ*, as it is called once in the text (xii. 4. 42).

The signature of the chapter is *caturâdhyâyikâyâm ca prathamô dhyâyah samâptah*: 13. The figures expressing the number of rules contained in it are obviously corrupt, but how they are to be amended, unless by simply altering them to 105, I do not know. That they mean 113, and that any part of the last section is lost, is not at all probable: I discover nowhere in the section any signs of a *lacuna*.

\* These terms I translate rather according to the evident requirement of the sense than as they would seem naturally to mean.

† This is virtually a restatement of rule 97, above.



## CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS:—SECTION I. 1, introductory; 2, final mutes before sonants; 3, do. as finals; 4, do. before surds; 5, do. before nasals; 6, do. before sibilants; 7, do. before *h*; 8, *ṣ* before *s*; 9, nasals before sibilants; 10, *n* before *ç*; 11, do. before sonant palatals; 12, do. before linguals; 13, *t* before *ç* and *l*; 14, do. before palatals and linguals; 15, dentals after palatals and linguals; 16, do. after *śh*; 17, *ç* after dentals; 18, loss of an initial *s*; 19, do. of *r* before *r*; 20, do. of a mute after a nasal and before another mute; 21, do. of final *y* and *v* after a vowel; 22-23, exceptions; 24, Çakatâyana's view of this combination; 25, insertion of a sibilant after *pum*; 26, do. after *n* before a surd palatal, lingual, and dental; 27, final *ān* before a vowel; 28, do. before *v*, in a special case; 29, insertion of *r* after final *in*, *ūn*, *ṛn*; 30, exceptions; 31, *m* before mutes; 32-33, do. before semi-vowels and spirants; 34, *n* in like position; 35, *m* and *n* before *l*; 36-37, *m* retained before semivowels; 38, *sphoṭana*; 39, *karshaṇa*.

SECTION II. 40, *visarjanīya* before a surd; 41-42, do. before a vowel; 43, do. before a sonant; 44-50, do. converted into *r* after *a* and *i*; 51-52, exceptions; 53-54, *as* converted to *o*; 55-59, loss of final *visarjanīya*.

SECTION III. 60-61, special cases of irregular *sandhi* of final *visarjanīya*; 62, conversion of *visarjanīya* into a sibilant before initial *k* and *p* of the second member of a compound word; 63-80, do. of an independent word.

SECTION IV. 81-101, conversion of final or initial *s* into *śh*; 102-107, exceptions.

## संहितायाम् ॥ १ ॥

1. The following rules are to be understood as of force in the combined text.

The first chapter of the treatise has disposed of all matters of general phonetic theory, and laid down such rules as apply to words in their disjoined and independent form, and we now enter upon the consideration of those changes which may and must occur when the *padas* of the disjoined text are put together into the form of *sankhitā*. This rule is a general heading (*adhikāra*) belonging to the second and third chapters. The other treatises have equivalent or corresponding headings; the Rik Pr. at the head of its second chapter, the Vāj. Pr. of its third, the Tāitt. Pr. of its fifth. We shall see, however, that our treatise does not everywhere strictly limit itself to what concerns the conversion of *pada*-text into *sankhitā*.

## पदान्तानामनुत्तमानां तृतीया घोषवत्स्वरेषु ॥ २ ॥

2. Finals not nasals become, before sonant consonants and vowels, unaspirated sonants.

Considering that, by i. 6, only the first and last of each series of mutes can occur as finals, this rule might have said *prathamānām*, 'first mutes,' instead of *anuttamānām*, 'mutes not nasal;' both this and the

following rules, however, seem constructed in view of the disputed character of the final non-nasal mute, and of the doctrine of Çāunaka himself that it is a *media*, and not a *tenuis* (see i. 8). The corresponding rule of the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 117) is expressed in a precisely equivalent manner: those of the Rik Pr. (ii. 4, r. 10, cxiv, and iv. 1, r. 2, cexxi) and Tāitt. Pr. (viii. 1, 3) use the term *prathama*, even although, as already noticed (under i. 6), the former work in theory recognizes the *mediæ* as possible finals.

The commentator's examples are as follows: *yad yatra viçvam* (ii. 1. 1); *yad yāmam cakruḥ* (vi. 116. 1); *tasmād vār nāma* (iii. 13. 3); *veviśhad viśhaḥ* (v. 17. 5); *yad rājānaḥ* (iii. 29. 1); *suhasto godhug uta* (vii. 73. 7); *sā virād rshayah* (viii. 9. 8); and two which are not to be found in the Atharvan, and of which the latter, at least, is evidently fabricated: viz., *tad abhūtam* and *trishṭub atra*.

### पदान्ते चाघोषाः ॥ ३ ॥

3. And at the end of a word they are surds.

This, in view of i. 6, is a superfluous precept, and its introduction is only to be accounted for by the considerations adverted to under the last rule.

The commentator cites once more his standard assortment of final mutes, viz. *godhuk* etc. (see under i. 3).

### अघोषेषु च ॥ ४ ॥

4. As also before surd consonants.

Also an unnecessary specification; since final surds do not require to become surds before succeeding initial surds, but simply remain unchanged. Only the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 118), among the other treatises, gives an equivalent precept.

The commentator instances in illustration *vāk ce 'ndriyam ca* (xii. 5. 7), *virāt prajāpatiḥ* (ix. 10. 24), and *trishṭup pañcadaçena* (viii. 9. 20).

### उत्तमा उत्तमेषु ॥ ५ ॥

5. Before nasals they become nasals.

The Prātiçākhyas are unanimous in this requirement: compare Rik Pr. iv. 1 (r. 3, cexxii), Vāj. Pr. iv. 120, Tāitt. Pr. viii. 2. Pāṇini, as has already been noticed (under i. 2) allows either the unaspirated sonant or the nasal before a nasal, while manuscript usage is almost, if not quite, invariably in favor of the nasal.

The commentator cites in illustration the following passages from the Atharvan text: *ṛdhanmantra* (p. *ṛdhak-mantraḥ*) *yonim* (v. 1. 1); *ya udānaḥ nyāyanam* (vi. 77. 2); *arṇavān mahatas pari* (i. 10. 4); *madu-ghān madhumattaraḥ* (i. 34. 4); *madhyān nicāiḥ* (iv. 1. 3); and *ya stāyan manyate* (iv. 16. 1); and finally, as the text affords him no instance of a final *p* before a nasal, he fabricates a case, out of words more than once employed by him elsewhere in a similar way, viz. *trishṭum nayati*.

## द्वितीयाः शप्सेषु ॥ ६ ॥

6. Before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, they become aspirated surds.

On this point there is by no means an agreement of opinion among the different Prātiçākhyas. The doctrine of the Tāitt. Pr. (xiv. 12) accords most nearly with that of our treatise, only omitting its restriction to the case of a final before an initial; and the same view is by our commentator mentioned as held by Çāṅkhamitri, Çākatāyana, and Vātsya: his words are: *apadāntānām api çashaseshu dvitīyā bhavanti: iti çāṅkhamitri-çākatāyana-vātsyāh.*<sup>1</sup> *tasyā agnir vathsah;*<sup>2</sup> 'Çāṅkhamitri, Çākatāyana, and Vātsya say that mutes even when not final become "seconds" before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*; as in the instance *tasyā agnir vathsah* (iv. 39. 2).' The Tāitt. Pr. (xiv. 13) adds that Vādabhikāra\* teaches the conversion of the mute into an aspirate only before a sibilant not of the same class;† and the doctrine of the Tāitt. Pr. in this form, as modified by Vādabhikāra, is by the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 119) ascribed to Çāunaka, the putative author of our treatise and of the Rik Pr. The Rik Pr., ignoring all these views, and itself holding, like the Vāj. Pr., that the mute remains unchanged before the sibilant, remarks only (vi. 15, r. 54, cccxxx) that some regard a *tenuis* before a sibilant as to be aspirated, unless it be a final. Finally, a *vārttika* to Pān. viii. 4. 48, as noticed by Weber (p. 249), ascribes to Pāushkarasādi the doctrine which our commentator attributes to the three other grammarians mentioned, and which is also taught by the Tāitt. Pr.—viz., that a mute in any situation becomes aspirated before a sibilant. This comparison of conflicting views is exceedingly curious, and it cannot but inspire us with some distrust of the accuracy, as well as completeness, with which the Hindu grammarians report one another's views.

The commentator, instead of citing from the text any genuine cases, proceeds to repeat a part of the cases which he has already once manufactured (under i. 49), in illustration of a *saṃyukta* combination of consonants, by putting his four words, *godhuk* etc. (see under i. 3), one after another, before *çete*, *shaṇḍe*, and *sāye*; and the manuscript uniformly fails to write the aspirate, except in the case of *dr̥shat*. The cases which actually occur in the Atharvan text are *ks* (e. g. iii. 1. 4), *tç* (ix. 5. 21), *ts* (e. g. viii. 9. 9; but, by rule ii. 8, it is to be read *tts*), *ts* (passim), and *ps* (in *avagraha*; e. g. *ap-su*, i. 6. 2); *ks̥h* and *pç* are found only in the interior of words. The manuscripts of the Atharvan read always the simple surd before the sibilant, and in the printed text we have of course followed their authority rather than that of the Prātiçākhyas. Weber (p. 250) notices that a single Berlin MS. of the Vājasaneyi-Saṅhitā writes the surd aspirate before a *s* not followed by a consonant.

<sup>1</sup> *çāṅkhamitiçākatāyanasyavātsyāh.*

<sup>2</sup> *vatsah.*

\* My manuscripts vary, as to the reading of this name, between *vādabhikāra*, *bādabhikāra*, and *bāḍavikāra*: Weber (p. 78) calls it once *vātabhikāra*.

† Weber says (pp. 245, 250) "only before a sibilant of the same class;" apparently misled by an error of his manuscript.

## तेभ्यः पूर्वचतुर्थो ककारस्य ॥ ७ ॥

7. After final non-nasal mutes, *h* becomes the aspirated sonant of the preceding letter.

The Rik Pr. (iv. 2, r. 5, ccxxiv) and Vāj. Pr. (iv. 121) agree precisely with our treatise upon this point; and the same doctrine is attributed by the Tāitt. Pr. (v. 38) to Plākshi, Kāuṇḍinya, Gāutama, and Pāushkarasādi. The Tāitt. Pr. (v. 39-41) goes on to state that in the view of some the *h* remains unchanged; while the Mimānsakas, and Çāityāyana etc. (the "etc." means, according to the commentator, Kāuhaliputra, Bharadvāja, sthavira-Kāuṇḍinya, and Pāushkarasādi [sthavira-Pāushkarasādi?]) hold that an aspirated sonant\* is inserted between the final surd and the *h*. Pāṇini's rule (viii. 4. 62), as is well known, allows the *h* either to remain unchanged, or to become the sonant aspirate; and there is but a very trifling phonetical difference between the two modes of treatment.

The illustrative citations of the commentator are *ud dharshantām maghavan* (iii. 19. 6), *ud dharshoya satvanām* (v. 20. 8), *uddharshinam munikeçam* (viii. 6. 17), *kad dha nūnam* (xviii. 1. 4), *pr̥thiviyām astu yad dharah* (xviii. 2. 36), *tejasvad dharah* (xviii. 3. 71).

## टकारात्सकारे तकारेण ॥ ८ ॥

8. After *t* is inserted *t* before *s*.

The same phonetic precept is found in the Tāitt. Pr. (v. 33), combined with a part of that contained in our next following rule: *t*, it is said, is to be inserted after *t* and *n*, when they are followed by *s* and *sh*. The Rik Pr. (iv. 6, r. 17, ccxxxvi) also gives it as the view of certain teachers that *t* and *n*, when followed by *s*, receive the appendix of a *t*.

The commentary quotes from the text *virāt svarājam* (viii. 9. 9), *pr̥tanāshōt̥ suvīrah* (xi. 1. 2), and *triçatāḥ shat sahasrāḥ* (xi. 5. 2), which are the only examples of this combination presented by the Atharvan. In the first of the three, P. reads *tt̥s*, in its second copy of the book, and by the emendation of a second hand: the other manuscripts give here, as do all of them in the other two cases, simply *ts*; and the printed text follows their authority.

## ङानिभ्यः कटतैः शषसेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9. After *ñ*, *n*, and *n* are inserted *k*, *t*, and *t* before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*.

The form of this rule is a little ambiguous, since we might be left by it to query whether, for instance, after *ñ*, was to be inserted *k* before *ç*, *t* before *sh*, and *t* before *s*, or only *k* before all the three sibilants—in other words, whether the transition-sound should adapt itself to the character of the following or of the preceding letter. The commentator

\* Weber (p. 251), by a *lapsus calami*, says "the unaspirated sonant."

either does not notice, or does not deign to relieve, this difficulty; he offers no explanation of the rule, and, in the instances which he cites, the manuscript persistently omits to write the transition-sound. For phonetic reasons, however, it cannot be doubted that the latter is determined by the preceding letter, and that after *ñ* is to be uttered a *k*, after *ṅ* a *t*, and after *ṇ* a *t*, before all the sibilants. By no means all the cases, however, which the rule theoretically contemplates, are found actually to occur in practice. The guttural nasal, *ñ*, precedes *s* six times in the Atharvan (iv. 11. 8. vi. 51. 1. xiii. 1. 56; 2. 3; 3. 16. xviii. 1. 29), but is never found before *ç* or *sh*: the manuscripts do not in a single instance write the transitional *k*, nor have we introduced it in the published text. The lingual nasal, *ṅ*, never occurs as a final, except before *v*, in the cases treated of in rule iv. 99. The case of *n* before *ç* is provided for by rules 10 and 17, below; *n* before *sh* is found three times in our text (viii. 9. 17. xiii. 1. 4; 3. 6), and nowhere do the manuscripts write a *t* between them (it is done by the edition, however, in the last two cases); *n* before *s* occurs times innumerable, and the usage of the manuscripts with respect to the *sandhi* is exceedingly irregular; there is hardly an instance in which they all agree together either to reject the *t* or to insert it, nor is any one of them consistent with itself in its practice. In the edition, therefore, we have followed the authority of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, and the *sandhi* is always made *nts* (except in one instance, viii. 5. 16, where the *t* has been omitted by an oversight).

The insertion of these *tenuis* after the nasals is a purely physical phenomenon, and one which is very natural, and liable to occur in any one's pronunciation. There is to be made, in each case, a double transition in utterance: from the sonant nasal to the surd oral emission, and from the close to the partially open position of the organs. If, then, the former is made an instant earlier than the latter, if the nasal resonance is stopped just before, instead of exactly at the same time with, the transfer of the organs to the position of the sibilant, a *tenuis* of the same position with the nasal becomes audible. It is, as already remarked under i. 99, the counterpart of the nasal *yama*, asserted by the Hindu phonetists to be heard between a mute and following nasal. It is also closely analogous with the conversion of *nç* into *ñch*, as will be pointed out below (under rule 17).

The commentator, by way of examples of the combinations taught in the rule, puts *pratyañ* and *gañ* before *çete*, *shandē*, and *sâyē* respectively (the MS., as already noted, always failing to write the transition-sound), and then quotes from the text two actual cases: viz. *shad ākuḥ çtân shad u mâsah* (viii. 9. 17), and *tânt satyâujah* (iv. 36. 1).

The Rik Pr. does not itself teach these euphonic insertions, but merely records it as the opinion of some authorities (iv. 6, r. 16, 17, ccxxxv, ccxxxvi) that *k* is inserted after *ñ* before a sibilant, and *t* after *n* before *s*. The Vâj. Pr. so far agrees with our treatise as to prescribe (iv. 14) the insertion of *k* after *ñ* and *t* after *n*, before *s*, adding (iv. 15) that Dâlbhya is of the contrary opinion. The Tâitt. Pr. (v. 32, 33) inserts *k* after *ñ*, and *t* after *n*, before both *s* and *sh*, and so precisely accords with our own rule, only omitting such cases as are unnecessarily and vainly provided for in the latter.

## नकारस्य शकारे जकारः ॥ १० ॥

10. Before *ç*, *n* becomes *ñ*.

This rule is incomplete, except as taken in connection with rule 17, below, along with which, accordingly, it will be here treated. The commentator's illustrations are two of those which are given under rule 17, viz. *asmāñ chatrūyatim abhi* (iii. 1. 3), and *divi shañ chukrah* (xviii. 4. 59).

## चवर्गीये घोषवति ॥ ११ ॥

11. As also before a sonant palatal.

That is to say, before *j*; since *jh*, as already noticed, never occurs, and *ñ* is never found as initial.

This is another rule as to the observance of which the usage of the Atharvan manuscripts is quite various; and it may almost be said here, as of the insertion of *t* between *n* and *s*, that there is not a passage in which all the codices agree either to make or to neglect the assimilation. We find written in such cases either *anusvāra*, or *ñ*, or *n*; yet the first is notably the most frequent, and in the printed text has been made, in obedience to the authority of the Prâtiçākhyā, the universal usage. It might perhaps have been better, in order to avoid ambiguity, to write the palatal nasal expressly, instead of intimating it by the employment of the nasal sign over the preceding vowel: yet the cases are few in which a final *ñ* so written could be mistaken for one which arises from the assimilation of a final *m*.

The other treatises (R. Pr. iv. 4, r. 9, cccxxviii; V. Pr. iv. 92; T. Pr. v. 24) prescribe the conversion of *n* into *ñ* before any following palatal; and the Rik Pr. and Tâitt. Pr. include the palatal sibilant in the same prescription, their rules thus corresponding to our 10th and 11th together. In the Atharvan, *n* does not occur anywhere before an original *çh*, and *n* before *c* is treated in a later rule (ii. 26). The manuscripts of the Rig-Veda (see Müller, p. lxxxvii) show the same irregularity in their treatment of final *n* before a palatal which has been noted just now as characterizing those of the Atharva-Veda: but the editor does not appear to have attempted to carry out any principle in the readings which he has adopted.

The commentator cites *avapaçyañ jonânām* (i. 33. 2), *irṇahāñ janam* (v. 8. 7), *prâishyañ janam iva* (v. 22. 14), and *vivāhāñ jñātīn* (xii. 5. 44).

## टवर्गीये णकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12. Before a lingual mute, *n* becomes *ṇ*.

As no lingual mute is found at the beginning of any word in the Atharvan, any more than in the other Vedas, this rule is as unnecessary as is the inclusion of *ṇ* along with the other nasals in rule 9 of this chapter, and as is more than one rule or part of a rule in that which is

to follow: such specifications are made merely for the sake of a theoretical completeness. None of the other kindred treatises has a corresponding precept.

The commentator fabricates, as illustrations of the rule, *bhavaṅ dīyate*, *mahāṅ dīyate*.<sup>1</sup>

तकारस्य शकारत्त्कारयोः परसस्थानः ॥ १३ ॥

13. Before *ç* and *l*, *t* becomes of like position with those letters respectively.

There is no discordance among the different treatises with regard to the combination of *t* with either *ç* or *l*, although there are differences in the precise mode of statement of the rules. The corresponding precepts are Rik Pr. iv. 4 (r. 10, 11, cccxix, cccxx); Vâj. Pr. iv. 12, 93; Tâitt. Pr. v. 22, 25. The *sandhi* of *t* with *ç* is not complete without the addition of rule 17, below, which see.

The commentator cites one instance for each part of the rule, viz.: *ucchishte* (p. *ut-çishte*) *nâma* (xi. 7. 1), and *ghṛtâd ulluptam* (v. 28. 14).

There follows a slight *lacuna* in the manuscript, the copyist heedlessly passing, as we may plausibly conclude, from the *takârasya* of the final repetition of this rule to that of the paraphrase of the next, thus over-leaping the latter altogether, so that it has to be restored from its final repetition before rule 15. We may restore as follows, indicating by brackets the portion omitted: *ghṛtâd ulluptam: takârasya [çakâralakârayoh parasasthânaç caçavargayoç ca: caçavargayoç ca takârasya] parasasthâno bhavati*. We have had occasion once before (under i. 64) to note such an omission, and more than one additional instance will appear hereafter. Here, nothing of any consequence is lost.

चटवर्गयोश्च ॥ १४ ॥

14. As also, before palatal and lingual mutes.

One part of this rule, again—viz. that relating to the lingual mutes—is altogether superfluous; and it has no correspondent in any of the other treatises. The assimilation of *t* to a following palatal is taught by them all (see R. Pr. iv. 4, r. 10, 11, cccxix, cccxx; V. Pr. iv. 92; T. Pr. v. 22, 23).

For the palatal combination, the commentator instances *uc ca tishtha* (ii. 6. 2), and *yuj jâmayah* (xiv. 2. 61); and we may add *brhacchandâh* (iii. 12. 3). For the lingual combination, he fabricates the examples *agnicit tikate*, *somasud dīyate*: compare those given under the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (viii. 4. 41).

ताभ्यां समानपदे तवर्गयिस्य पूर्वसस्थानः ॥ १५ ॥

15. A dental mute following these in the same word is assimilated to them.

<sup>1</sup> *bhavâr ñiyate*, *mahâr ñiyate*.

This rule, in its extent as given, is an infringement of the limits laid down in i. 1 as those of a Prâtiçâkhyâ, and also of those laid down in ii. 1 as those of the chapter: and a more notable one, as it concerns in part the very case which is cited in the commentary to i. 1 as an illustration of what it does not belong to a Prâtiçâkhyâ to treat; the instances here quoted in the commentary for the assimilation of a dental to a preceding lingual—they are *mûdâ amitrah* (vi. 67. 2), and *teshâm vo agnimûdâhânâm* (vi. 67. 2)—are precisely analogous with the one there given, and our rule teaches only one out of the series of changes which such a word must undergo, as drawn out in full by the commentator in his exposition. The only practical application of the precept is one which is not recognized, or at least not illustrated, by the commentator; namely, to those cases in which an initial *s* followed by a *t* or *th* is, by later rules (ii. 90 etc.), converted into *sh*: the following dental then becomes by this rule a lingual.

In illustrating the other part of the rule, that which prescribes the assimilation of the dental to a preceding palatal, the commentator first states, *vârttika*-like, the restricted form in which alone it applies—*cavargiyân nakârasya ca*, 'following a palatal mute, a *n* is assimilated'—and cites *yajñena yojñam* (vii. 5. 1), *somâya râjñe* (ii. 13. 2), and *somasya râjñah* (vi. 68. 1). He might have added *yâcñyâya krñute\** (xii. 4. 30), the only instance in the Atharvan of a like assimilation after *c*.

The other treatises, combining the practical part of this rule with the one next following, teach that *t* and *th* are everywhere converted into *t* and *th* after *sh* (see R. Pr. v. 3, r. 11, cccxxviii; V. Pr. iii. 78; T. Pr. vii. 13, 14).

## षकारान्नापदे ऽपि ॥ १६ ॥

16. And even in a different word, after *sh*.

That is to say, a dental following *sh* is assimilated to it, and becomes lingual, not only when both letters occur within the same word, but also when the *sh* is final, and the dental the initial of an independent word. The commentary cites cases of the assimilation in the same and in separate words—viz. *shashṭiḥ* (e. g. v. 15. 6) and *shanṇavatiḥ*—but the former belongs under the preceding rule, and the other is such a case as never occurs in the Atharvan. The precept was evidently only intended for such combinations as *bahish te* (i. 3. 1), in which, by the rules contained in the fourth section of this chapter, an original final *s* becomes lingualized, and the following *t* is assimilated to it.

The corresponding rules of the other Prâtiçâkhyas have been already referred to.

## तवर्ग्याच्छकारः शकारस्य ॥ १७ ॥

17. After a dental mute, *ç* becomes *ch*.

This rule, taken in connection with rules 10 and 13, above, deter-

\* The reading of the printed text, *yâcñyâya*, is an error of the press.



mines the form to be assumed by the combinations  $t+\zeta$  and  $n+\zeta$ . Exception may fairly be taken, however, to the method in which the change is taught. By the other rules referred to,  $t$  and  $n$  are to become  $c$  and  $\bar{n}$  before  $\zeta$ : and if those rules are first applied, there will be no dental mutes for  $\zeta$  to follow; while, if the present rule be first applied, the others are rendered wholly or in part superfluous, by the non-occurrence of  $\zeta$  after  $t$  and  $n$ . In the case of  $t$  there comes in the still farther difficulty that rule 6 of this chapter has converted it into  $ih$ , so that a part of rule 13 is thereby also rendered incapable of application. These are incongruities such as the authors of the Prāticākhya are very seldom guilty of. What is the intention of our treatise is, indeed, sufficiently clear: the combination of  $t$  and  $\zeta$  is to produce  $cch$ , by the conversion of the former into  $c$  and the latter into  $ch$ ; and the combination of  $n$  and  $\zeta$ , in like manner, is to produce  $\bar{n}ch$ . The Rik Pr. (iv. 4, 5, r. 9, 11, 12, ccxxviii, ccxxx, ccxxxi) teaches the same changes, only adding (r. 13, ccxxii), that Çākalya would read instead  $c\zeta$  and  $\bar{n}\zeta$ . The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 93, 94) also agrees, only exempting the  $\zeta$  from conversion into  $ch$  when it is followed by a mute. The Tāitt. Pr. prescribes (v. 22, 24) the change of  $t$  and  $n$  into  $c$  and  $\bar{n}$  before  $\zeta$ , and (v. 34, 35) the conversion of  $\zeta$  into  $ch$  when preceded by any mute excepting  $m$ , Vālmiki (v. 36) also excepting  $p$ , and Pāushkarasādi (v. 37) denying the conversion when  $\zeta$  is followed by a consonant, and denying in this case also the conversion of the preceding  $n$  into  $\bar{n}$ .\*

The commentator cites examples only of the combination of  $n$  and  $\zeta$ ; they are *devān chlokah* (xviii. 1. 33), *asmān charūyatim abhi* (iii. 1. 3), and *divi shañ chukrah* (xviii. 4. 59): as an example illustrative of the other part of the rule, we may take *ārāc charavyāḥ* (i. 19. 1). In the orthography of this class of combinations, we have followed in the printed text the authority of the manuscripts, which, with hardly an exception, write simply  $ch$ , instead of  $cch$ . This orthography is also, to my apprehension, a truer representation of the actual phonetic result of combining  $t$  with  $\zeta$ . That these sounds fuse together into a  $ch$  is very strong evidence that the utterance of the Sanskrit surd palatals did not differ materially from that of our  $ch$  (in *church* etc.); and I conceive that the constant duplication of the  $ch$  and  $jh$  (wherever the latter occurs) between two vowels is to be looked upon simply as an indication of the heaviness of those consonants, and of their effect to make the preceding vowel long by position. The  $c$  and  $j$ , though strictly compound sounds, are too easy combinations to occasion position: in this respect they resemble the aspirate mutes, which are likewise really double in their nature: but they are too heavy to bear the farther addition of even so light an element as the aspiration without acquiring the quantity and phonetic value of double letters.

The conversion of  $n\zeta$  into  $\bar{n}ch$ , on the supposition of the compound nature of the palatal, as made up of a mute and a sibilant element, would be almost precisely analogous with that of  $ns$  into  $nts$ , as taught in rule 9, above, and would be readily and simply explainable as a phonetic process.

\* Pāushkarasādi would read neither *pāpiyāñ chreyase* nor even *pāpiyāñ freyase*, but *pāpiyāñ freyase*: this is misunderstood by Weber (p. 233).

त्तोप उद्ः स्यास्तम्भोः सकारस्य ॥ १८ ॥

18. After the preposition *ud*, the *s* of the roots *sthâ* and *stambh* is dropped.

The commentary cites the only cases from the root *sthâ*, occurring in the Atharvan text, to which the rule properly applies; viz. *mâ ghoshâ ut thuh* (vii. 52. 2), *tatas tvo 't thâpayâmasi* (x. 1. 29), and *ut thâpaya sîdatah* (xii. 3. 30); in each instance, the *pada*-text reads the *s*, leaving the irregular and mutilated *sandhi* for the *sanhitâ* to make. Wherever, however, the preposition receives the accent, and enters into a more intimate combination with the root, as in the participle *ûtthita*, the *pada*-text (by iv. 62) does not separate the compound, or restore the original *s*, but reads the same form which appears in *sanhitâ*. Of this kind is also the only example of the root *stambh* combined with the preposition *ud* which our text presents, viz. *satyeno 'ttabhitâ* (xiv. 1. 1), where the *pada* reads *ûttabhitâ*, and not *ût-stabhitâ*: the passage is cited by the commentator.

The Vâj. Pr. (iv. 95) notices the loss of *s* from the root *stambh*, but, as Weber remarks with surprise, omits all mention of *sthâ*. The Tâitt. Pr. (v. 14) includes these cases in a more general rule, that *s* is dropped when preceded by *ud* and followed by a consonant.

रेफस्य रेफे ॥ १९ ॥

19. *R* is dropped before *r*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. iv. 9 (r. 28, cexlvii), Vâj. Pr. iv. 34, Tâitt. Pr. viii. 16.

The *r* which is thus dropped must itself, of course, be the product of euphonic processes taught elsewhere (ii. 42, 43). The protraction of a preceding short vowel when a *r* is thus dropped is prescribed in a later rule (iii. 20).

स्पर्शादुत्तमादनुत्तमस्यानुत्तमे ॥ २० ॥

20. After a nasal, a non-nasal mute is dropped before a non-nasal.

This rule, also, is hardly in place as a part of the Prâtiçâkhyâ, unless it be meant that in the words to which it applies the non-nasal mute is not to be omitted in the *pada*-text. The most frequent cases occurring under the rule are those of forms of conjugation coming from roots exhibiting a nasal before their final mute, and formed by affixes commencing with a consonant: as, from *indh*, *indhe* instead of *inddhe*, for *indh-te*; from *chind*, *chintam* instead of *chinttam*, for *chind-tam*; from *ânj*, *ântam* instead of *ânktam*, for *ânj-tam*; from *yuñj*, *yuñdhi* instead of *yuñgdhi*, for *yuñj-dhi*, etc. In all such cases, however, the *pada* manuscripts, as well as the others, omit the intermediate mute, nor is it at all likely that they ought to do otherwise: the rule is one properly of supererogation, yet finding a sufficient excuse in the peculiarity of the

mode of utterance which it inculcates, and in the desirability that this should be noticed in the grammatical text-book of the school. Neither of the other known Prâtiçâkhyas teaches the same omission, or even notices it as prescribed by any authority.

The citations of the commentator are *pañtir atra* (fabricated: no such case in AV.), *pântam chandah* (xii. 3. 10), and *sapatnân me bhândhi* (x. 3. 13). As counter-examples, to show that the omission takes place only after a nasal and before a non-nasal mute, he instances *tasyâ vâyur vatsah* (i. e. *vattsah*: iv. 39. 4), *utso vâ tatra* (i. e. *uttso* and *taitra*: vi. 106. 1), *apsarasaḥ sadhamâdam madanti* (i. e. *appsarasaḥ*: xiv. 2. 34), and *nudâma enam apa rudhmah* (i. e. *ruddhmah*: xii. 3. 43).

The Atharvan manuscripts are quite consistent in observing this rule, although there are cases in which one or another of them preserves the mute of which the omission is here directed. In the published text, it is uniformly followed—with, I believe, but one accidental exception, viz. *anuprayukṭâm* (xii. 1. 40): and here, for once, all the manuscripts happen to agree in retaining the *k*.

## स्वराद्यवयोः पदान्तयोः ॥ २१ ॥

21. Final *y* and *v*, following a vowel, are dropped.

This rule applies, on the one hand, to the *y* and *v* of the syllables *ay*, *av*, *ây*, *âv* (the latter, however, being excepted by the following rule), into which, by iii. 40, *e*, *o*, *âi*, and *âu* are converted before a vowel; and, on the other hand, to the *y* into which, by ii. 41, *visarjanîya* theoretically passes before an initial vowel. An equivalent rule is found in the Vâj. Pr., at iv. 124. The teachings of the Tâitt. Pr. upon the subject are found at x. 19–23: that treatise is here, as on so many other points, especially liberal in the citation of the opinions of discordant authorities. According to it, *y* and *v* are dropped when preceded by *a* and *â*; Ukhya, however, maintaining the contrary; Sâmkṛtya denying the loss of *v*; Mâcâkṛtya allowing the elision of both when followed by *u* or *o*; Vâtsapra holding that they are not lost altogether, but only imperfectly pronounced. The treatment of final diphthongs and *visarjanîya* by the Rik Pr. does not include the exhibition of a final semivowel which requires to be got rid of, and hence it has no precept corresponding with the one now in question.

The commentator instances *ka âsañ janyâḥ ke varâḥ* (xi. 8. 1), *ushṇe-na vâya udakene* "hi (vi. 68. 1), *asyâ ichann agruvâi patim* (vi. 60. 1), *sa u eva mahâyamaḥ* (xiii. 4. 5), and *tâ imâ âpah* (xv. 15. 7). In these passages, *ke*, *vâyo*, and *asyâi* are converted into *kay*, *vâyav*, and *asyây*, by iii. 40, prior to the elision of the semivowels: while *sah*, *tâh*, and *imâḥ* are in like manner, by ii. 41, converted into *say*, *tây*, and *imây*.

## नाकारादकारस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22. But *v* is not dropped after *â*.

That is to say, final *âv* before a vowel—the result of the change of an original *âu*, by iii. 40—remains *âv*, being subject to no farther

change. This rule is uniformly observed in the *sanhitā* of the Atharvan, excepting in a couple of cases in book xix, which book the Prātiçākhyā does not recognize as forming part of the Atharvan text: these are *pādā ucyete* (xix. 6. 5), and *citrā imā vṛshabhāu* (xix. 13. 1). The commentator's examples are *dvāv imāu vātāu vātāḥ* (iv. 13. 2), *indravâyū ubhāv iha* (iii. 20. 6), and *ubhāv indragñi ā bharatām* (v. 7. 6).

The Vāj. Pr. teaches the loss of the *v* of *āv* as well as of *av* (iv. 124), but adds (iv. 125) that some would retain the *v* excepting when followed by *u*, *o*, and *āu*. The doctrines of the Tāitt. Pr. have been stated in full under the preceding rule. The Rik Pr. (ii. 9, 10, 11, r. 25, 28, 31, cxxix, cxxii, cxxxv) holds the view referred to by the Vāj. Pr. in its latter rule: *o* and *āu*, according to it, become *av* and *āv* before any other than a labial vowel; before a labial, *a* and *ā*.

## गविष्टौ गवेषण इति च ॥ २३ ॥

23. Nor in *gaviṣṭi* and *gaveṣhaṇa*.

These are the only words found in the Atharvan in which the diphthong *o* is the final of the first member of a compound before a following vowel, and in such a case, as we might expect, the fuller pronunciation is retained, and the *v* preserved. The commentator cites *ishuman-tām gaviṣṭāu* (iv. 24. 5: p. *go-ishtāu*), and *gaveṣhaṇoḥ sahamānaḥ* (v. 20. 11: p. *go-eshanaḥ*). Other like cases, as *gavāçir* and *gaviṣh*, occur in the twentieth book of the text, but with that book the Prātiçākhyā has nothing to do.

## लेशवृत्तिरधिस्पर्श शाकटायनस्य ॥ २४ ॥

24. According to Çakatâyana, there takes place in these cases an attenuated utterance of *y* and *v*, as regards the contact.

The commentator gives us no help whatever as regards the interpretation of this difficult rule: he simply paraphrases it, as follows: *leçavṛttir bhavati adhisparçam çakatâyanasya*, and then proceeds to repeat all the illustrative citations given above under rule 21. The other treatises, however, throw a good deal of light upon its meaning. The word *leça*, 'diminution, attenuation, mutilation,' occurs in the same connection in the Tāitt. Pr., in a rule already quoted (under ii. 21), which states that Vātsapra holds, not the omission, but the *leça*, of final *y* and *v* after *a* and *ā*; and the commentary there explains *leça* by *luptavad uccāraṇam*, 'an utterance of them as if they were omitted.' In the Rik Pr., too, *leça* is once found, in the chapter treating of faulty pronunciation (xiv. 5), and is set over against *piḍanam*—*leçena vā vacanam piḍanam vā*, which Regnier translates "a pronunciation attenuated or pressed (i. e. too forcible)." Pāṇini (viii. 3. 18) attributes to Çakatâyana the same doctrine as regards the pronunciation of final *y* and *v*, according to Çakatâyana, is to be made with slighter effort.' Çakatâyana, then, is to be understood as holding, like Vātsapra, that the final semi-vowels are not to be omitted altogether, but slightly and imperfectly

uttered, the partial contact (i. 30) which is characteristic of them not being completely made. The citation by the commentator of the whole body of examples belonging to ii. 21 under this rule shows that he regards the latter as referring to all the cases included in the former; and its position after rules 22 and 23 would indicate that it applies to the combinations treated in those rules also. The scholiasts to Pāṇini restrict Çākātāyana's doctrine to *y* and *v* when preceded by *bho*, *bhago*, *agho*, and *a*: but the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 126) refers to him as exempting only the word *asāu* from the treatment prescribed for *y* and *v* in every other case—which treatment, however, it does not specify to be attenuation instead of omission.

पुमो मकारस्य स्यर्शे ऽधोषि ञ्नुष्मपरे विसर्जनीयो  
 ऽपुञ्चादिषु ॥ २५ ॥

25. The *m* of *pum* becomes *visarjanīya* before a surd mute not followed by a spirant, except in *puñçca* etc.

This is a rule very hard to get along with. In the first place, it is altogether unnecessary and uncalled for, since, of all the words to which it is intended to apply, but a single one, *puñçcali*, is found in the Atharvan text, and that one is written by the *pada*-text precisely as in *sanhitā*, and so requires no explanation from the Prātiçākhyā. But we have noted, and shall have still to note, many cases in which the treatise deals with irregularities of derivation or combination, even though they are not reduced to regularity by the *pada*-text, so that we need not be much surprised to find the formation of *puñçcali* taught. Another difficulty is that, instead of simply disposing of the case which the text presents, the treatise gives to the rule a general form of statement, applicable to all possible cases. Yet even this is supported by its usage in several other instances, in which it affects a theoretic completeness suited to a general rather than to a special grammar; and the precise virtual accordance of our rule, with the exception of its last word, *apuñçcādishu*, with one contained in Pāṇini's grammar (viii. 3. 6), is a sufficient explanation of the form of statement adopted. The addition of the word *apuñçcādishu* remains the last and the worst difficulty, and I must confess myself unable to give a satisfactory solution of it. The commentator furnishes no help as regards it; his treatment of the whole rule is as follows: he first repeats it, inserting merely the omitted copula *bhāvati* after *visarjanīyo*, and gives as illustrations *puñçkāmā*, *puñçputra*, and *puñçcali* (e. g. xv. 2. 1: the other words cited, here and hereafter, as already remarked, do not occur in AV.; these are all found, with *puñçkokila*, in the scholia to Pāṇini): he then asks "why does it say 'before a mute?'" and cites in reply *puñçānam*; farther, "why 'before a surd mute?'" reply, because of *puñçāna* (*puñçāsa*? Pāṇ., *puñçāsa* and *puñçāva*); again, "why 'before one not followed by a spirant?'" reply, because of *puñçshura* (Pāṇ., *puñçshira* and *puñçshura*); and finally, *apuñçcādishu iti kim: puñçcorah;* 'why "excepting in *puñçca* etc.?" because of such cases as *puñçcora*.' But *puñçcora*, 'he-thief,' is as regular an in-

stance of the application of the rule as *puṅskāmā* or *puṅscalt*; nor does it seem possible to find in *apuṅçcādīshu* itself any form which constitutes an exception to the previous specifications. I can only conjecture that the reading is corrupt, and was corrupt before the commentator set himself at work upon it, and that his explanation was as unintelligible to himself as it is to us. The specification may have been intended for such words as *puṅkhyāna*, which constitutes an actual exception to the rule, and it is cited as such in Böhlingk's note to Pāṇini viii. 3. 6, as from the Siddhānta-Kāumudī.

It deserves to be remarked that the introduction of the word *visarjanīya* into the next following rule tends strongly to show that the one now under discussion is an interpolation: otherwise the term should be understood in the rules which succeed, by implication from this, and should not require to be again specified.

The conversion of the *m* in *pum* into *visarjanīya* of course includes, by i. 68, the nasalization of the preceding vowel, and also the adaptation of the *visarjanīya* to the following consonant, by ii. 40, 62, etc.

नकारस्य चटतवर्गेष्वघोषेष्वनूपमपरेषु विसर्जनीयः ॥ २६ ॥

26. *N* becomes *visarjanīya* before surd palatal, lingual, and dental mutes not followed by spirants.

That is to say, virtually, a sibilant is inserted before the mute, of the same class with the latter, and the *n* itself is replaced by the nasalization of the preceding vowel. Here, again, the mention of linguals is superfluous, no cases arising in the text to which this part of the rule should apply. The commentator fabricates his whole series of examples illustrating the application of the rule, viz.: *bhavāñç cinoti*, *bhavāñç chādayati*, *bhavāñsh ūkate*, *bhavāñs torati*, *bhavāñs tatra*. To explain the reason of the specification "surd" contained in the rule, he cites two actual cases, *brhan dukshinayā* (vi. 53. 1), and *nāi 'nān namasā parah* (vii. 7. 1), which show that no such conversion is made before a sonant or nasal mute. But farther, to explain the addition of the restriction "not followed by spirants," he resorts again to fabricated instances, *bhavān tsaru*, *mahān tsaru*: this time with good reason, since no such cases occur in our text, and the restriction, so far as concerns the Atharva-Veda, is superfluous, and is only inserted, like the specification of the lingual along with the palatal and dental mutes, in order to make the rule theoretically more complete.

The insertion of a sibilant between a final *n* and an initial *c* (as in *parvatāñç ca*, i. 12. 3) is made in the Atharvan uniformly, without a single exception, and, owing especially to the frequency of the particle *ca* after a nominative or an accusative in *n*, the cases are very numerous: of *n* before *ch* the text affords no example. A like insertion of *s* before *t* (*th* never occurs as initial) is not rare (the text presents sixty-seven cases), but the exceptions—which the treatise notes in rule 30, below—are also tolerably numerous: they are all given in a marginal note farther on.

The doctrine of the Vāj. Pr. on the subject of these insertions corresponds precisely with that of our own treatise; its rules (iii. 133, 134),

however, omit the unnecessary mention of the lingual mutes, and restriction to mutes not followed by spirants, although they retain the equally unnecessary mention of *ch* and *th*. The exceptions are given in detail (iii. 142-144); among them are to be found no cases of *n* before an initial *c*. The Tāitt. Pr. gives a general rule (v. 20) for the insertion of the sibilant before *c*, and then (v. 21) rehearses all the cases (seven in number) in which it does not take place. The insertion before *t* is noted in another place (vi. 14). and all the cases of its occurrence (only eighteen in number) are there enumerated. The Rik Pr. (iv. 32 etc.) catalogues all the words before which the sibilant is added, as well before *c* (iv. 32, r. 74, ccxciii), as before *t* (iv. 33, r. 76, ccxcv): such words in the Rig-Veda are not very numerous; its usual method of *sandhi* is *n̄-c* and *n-t* simply. The Rik presents, on the other hand, a few cases (five) in which a sibilant, converted to *visarjantya*, is inserted after *n* before an initial *p* (R. Pr. iv. 34, r. 78, ccxcvii, ccxcviii).

It is sufficiently evident that this insertion of a sibilant after a final *n* before a surd mute is no proper phonetical process: the combination of the nasal and following non-nasal is perfectly natural and easy without the aid of a transition sound, nor can any physical explanation be given of the thrusting in between them of a sibilant, which only encumbers the conjunction. Some other reason must be sought for the phenomenon: nor is such a reason difficult to discover. The historical rather than phonetical origin of the *r* which is appended (see rule 29, below) to a few accusatives plural in the Vedic language before a vowel has been long since pointed out by Bopp (see his shorter Sanskrit grammar, § 82<sup>b</sup>); and a kindred explanation of the conversion of *ān* into *āñ* before a vowel (see rule 27, below) was added by him in his Comparative Grammar (see the second edition, i. 468, 478, 479). He has refrained from tracing the insertion of a sibilant before *c* and *t* to the same cause, doubtless, because of the numerous instances in which the insertion is made after a word which is not entitled by origin to a final *s*. But nothing is more natural than that an insertion originally organic, but of which the true character was forgotten, and which had come to seem merely euphonic, should considerably extend its sphere of occurrence, and should be by degrees, and more and more, applied to cases to which it did not historically belong. Now a very large majority of the words ending in *n* are accusatives plural and nominatives singular,\*

\* That I might not seem to speak at random upon this point, I have looked through half of the Atharvan text, or books i-ix, and have noted the character of every word terminating in *n* which is to be found therein. The result is set forth in the following table:

|                         |           |     |                 |           |     |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| Accusatives plural in   | <i>ān</i> | 520 | Vocatives in    | <i>an</i> | 63  |
|                         | <i>in</i> | 40  |                 | <i>in</i> | 19  |
|                         | <i>ūn</i> | 62  | Locatives in    | <i>in</i> | 64  |
|                         | <i>ṛn</i> | 8   |                 | <i>an</i> | 14  |
|                         |           | 630 |                 |           | 78  |
| Nominatives singular in | <i>ān</i> | 143 | Verbal forms in | <i>an</i> | 138 |
|                         | <i>ān</i> | 117 |                 | <i>ān</i> | 5   |
|                         |           | 260 |                 |           | 143 |
| Total                   |           | 890 | Total           |           | 303 |

It is thus seen that the forms to which a final *s* originally belongs outnumber the others almost precisely in the proportion of three to one, or constitute three-quarters of the whole number of words ending in *n*.

to both of which cases comparative grammar clearly shows that a final *s* belongs as case-ending; and I can entertain no doubt that the whole phenomenon of the insertion of the sibilant arose from its preservation in these forms, and from the inorganic extension of the same mode of combination, by analogy, to the much smaller classes of vocative, locative, and verbal forms. The same conclusion is favored by the aspect of the phenomenon of the insertion of *s* between *n* and *t*, as it presents itself in the text of the Atharva-Veda. Although the insertion is there made after other forms than those originally entitled to a final *s*, it is rare after such forms in a ratio four times greater than that of the rarity of the forms themselves: that is to say, while these are in number one-third of the others, the insertions after them are only one-twelfth as numerous. And, on the other hand, although the insertion is sometimes omitted after nominatives singular and accusatives plural, it is omitted five times as often, in proportion, after the final *n* of other forms than these. For a detailed and classified statement of all the passages in which the sibilant is either inserted or omitted after a final *n* before an initial *t*, see the appended marginal note.\*

## आकारोपधस्योपबद्धादीनां स्वरे ॥ २७ ॥

27. The final *n* of *upabaddha* etc., when preceded by *ā* and followed by a vowel, becomes *visarjanīya*.

This process includes two additional steps, taught elsewhere in the

\* Cases of the *sandhi* with insertion of *s* between *n* and *t*: I. Accusatives plural. 1. in *ān*: i. 8. 4. ii. 12. 7; 25. 4. iii. 2. 5. iv. 19. 4; 22. 1; 36. 3. v. 8. 8. vi. 112. 2. vii. 97. 3. viii. 6. 7. x. 3. 15, 16. xi. 1. 6, 10, 26; 5. 2, 4, 7; 6. 17; 9. 22, 24; 10. 23. xii. 3. 40, 53. xviii. 1. 47; 2. 34; 3. 68; 4. 39, 86, 87. xix. 27. 4 (*ter*); 28. 2; 35. 3, 5; 36. 5; 49. 3; 66. 1. 2. in *īn*: iii. 21. 1. 3. in *ūn*: viii. 8. 8. x. 7. 42. xi. 1. 20. xix. 6. 14. 4. in *ṛn*: iv. 27. 2. II. Nominatives singular. 1. in *an*: vii. 13. 1; 18. 2. xiii. 1. 32, 39. xvii. 10. xviii. 2. 20. 2. in *ān*: ix. 2. 19-24. xii. 1. 18. xiii. 2. 29; 4. 44. xvii. 16. III. Vocatives singular in *an*: v. 22. 5. IV. Locatives singular in *in*: xi. 8. 10. V. Verbal forms in *an*: xix. 19. 10. xx. 135. 6, 7.

Cases of the *sandhi* without insertion of *s*: I. Accusatives plural. 1. in *ān*: vii. 38. 3. 2. in *īn*: xviii. 2. 15, 18. 3. in *ūn*: vii. 84. 3. II. Nominatives singular. 1. in *an*: xiii. 2. 33. xiv. 1. 5. xix. 28. 4. 2. in *ān*: iv. 32. 3. xviii. 2. 32. xx. 128. 14. III. Vocatives singular in *an*: i. 14. 3. vii. 9. 3. IV. Locatives singular in *in*: i. 15. 2; 35. 3. v. 28. 4. vii. 43. 1. x. 3. 17. xiv. 2. 48, 49. V. Verbal forms in *an*: i. 11. 2. iii. 9. 2; 22. 3. iv. 7. 7; 14. 1; 35. 2. x. 10. 24. xi. 5. 2. xiv. 2. 14.

That is, in tabular form:

|                         |           | with <i>s</i> . | without <i>s</i> . |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Accusatives plural in   | <i>ān</i> | 40              | 1                  |
|                         | <i>īn</i> | 1               | 2                  |
|                         | <i>ūn</i> | 4               | 1                  |
|                         | <i>ṛn</i> | 1               | 0                  |
|                         |           | 46              | 4                  |
| Nominatives singular in | <i>an</i> | 6               | 3                  |
|                         | <i>ān</i> | 10              | 3                  |
| Total                   |           | 62              | 10                 |
| Vocatives singular in   | <i>an</i> | 1               | 2                  |
| Locatives singular in   | <i>in</i> | 1               | 7                  |
| Verbal forms in         | <i>an</i> | 3               | 9                  |
| Total                   |           | 5               | 18                 |



treatise, before the combination is complete, and the final *sankhî* form reached. The conversion of the *n* into *visarjantiya* itself implies, by i. 68, the nasalization of the preceding vowel, so that *upabaddhân* becomes *upabaddhâñh*; then the *visarjantiya*, by ii. 41, becomes *y* before the following vowel: *upabaddhâñy iha*; and lastly, by ii. 21, the final *y* is rejected, and we obtain *upabaddhâñ iha*. This seems a cumbrous and artificial process, yet it is in part well-founded and correctly carried out. All the cases in which this loss of a final *n* occurs are accusatives plural or nominatives singular, which originally possessed a final *s* after the *n*, and the loss of the *n* before the sibilant, with accompanying nasalization of the preceding vowel, and then the disappearance of the sibilant itself, as in other cases after *â* and before a vowel, are unquestionably the cause of the *sandhi* as it finally presents itself. Our treatise, then, by bringing in the *visarjantiya* as a step in the process, and treating of this combination in intimate connection with those related ones which form the subjects of rules 26 and 29, has a decided theoretic advantage over either of the other Prâtiçâkhyas. The Rik Pr. (iv. 26, r. 65, cclxxxiv) prescribes simply the omission of the final, excepting at the end of a *pâda*, afterwards (iv. 26, 27) specifying the cases in which the omission takes place even at the end of a *pâda*, and finally (iv. 30, 31) those in which it does not take place even within a *pâda* (there are only eleven such cases). The Vâj. Pr. (iii. 141) and the Tâitt. Pr. (ix. 20) come one degree nearer to the method of our treatise, by converting the *n* into *y* before its elision, and both give in detail (V. Pr. iii. 145-149, T. Pr. ix. 23-24) the exceptional cases in which the *n* remains unchanged.

The commentator cites only the first five instances which the text contains, viz.: *upabaddhâñ ihâ* " *vaha* (i. 7. 7), *çâsa ithâ mahâñ asi* (i. 20. 4), *yo asmâñ abhidâsati* (e. g. i. 19. 3), and *sarvân mac chapathâñ adhi* (e. g. ii. 7. 1). More than a hundred cases occur in the Atharva-Veda, so that the *gana upabaddhâdayah* must have been a tolerably stout one. I add in a marginal note a complete list of the cases, classified.\*

To give with the same detail the exceptions to the rule, or the cases in which final *ân* remains unchanged before a vowel, would be quite useless. They are very frequent, by far outnumbering the instances of the loss of the *n*—thus, in the first four books of the text, against thirteen instances of *âñ* before a vowel, we have forty-one of *ân*, and twelve of these between two *pâdas*—and they are found indifferently in all possible situations, so that it is quite impossible to lay down any rule

\* I. Accusatives plural: 1. before *a*: i. 19. 3; 21. 2. ii. 7. 1. iii. 8. 3. iv. 19. 5, 7. v. 5. 9; 18. 11; 20. 8. vi. 15. 1, 2; 41. 3; 54. 3; 69. 2; 72. 1; 75. 3; 76. 4; 77. 1; 113. 2; 121. 4; 129. 2. vii. 9. 2; 27. 1; 57. 1; 65. 1; 109. 4. viii. 3. 6, 20; 4. 14; 9. 24. ix. 1. 19; 2. 25; 4. 24. x. 2. 22, 23; 5. 41; 6. 19, 30; 7. 7; 10. 6. xi. 1. 29; 9. 17, 22, 24; 10. 23. xii. 1. 25; 2. 12; 3. 15 (*bis*), 18; 4. 31. xiii. 1. 53; 2. 5, 18, 21. xiv. 1. 45, 55; 2. 5, 10. xviii. 1. 45; 2. 11, 13, 15, 18; 4. 58, 61. xix. 6. 8; 13. 8; 26. 3; 32. 7; 36. 4; 50. 4. xx. 127. 7; 128. 4, 5; 136. 15. 2. before *â*: ii. 25. 4. vi. 28. 2. xviii. 3. 55. xix. 59. 2. 3. before *i*: i. 7. 7. ii. 27. 5; 31. 1. v. 8. 1; 13. 6; 23. 8. vi. 22. 3. vii. 117. 1. 4. before *u*: iv. 34. 7. vi. 59. 2. viii. 9. 23. ix. 9. 15, 19 (*bis*). x. 3. 13, 14, 15. xii. 3. 16, 40. xviii. 2. 21. 5. before *r*: viii. 3. 7. xviii. 1. 18. 6. before *e*: xi. 1. 4.

II. Nominatives singular: 1. before *a*: i. 20. 4. iii. 16. 5. vii. 91. 1. viii. 5. 22. xiii. 2. 29 (*ter*). xviii. i. 24. xx. 128. 4, 8. 2. before *i*: vii. 92. 1. viii. 4. 2. 3. before *u*: xviii. 1. 22, 48 (*bis*).

respecting them. The loss of the *n* with nasalization of the vowel is evidently an old-style *sandhi*, going out of use, and no longer appearing except sporadically. It is interesting, as regards this *sandhi* and that taught in the preceding rule—which have both, as explained above, the same historical origin—to note the relations of the Rik and the Atharvan usage to one another and to the practice of the classical Sanskrit. The insertion of the *s*, which has become a necessary proceeding under the modern euphonic rules, is almost universal in the Atharvan, and comparatively rare in the Rik: the conversion of *n* into *anusvâra*, of which the general Sanskrit grammar knows nothing, is only infrequently observed in the Atharvan, while it is made in the Rik with but few exceptions.

वृक्षाँ वनानीति वकारे ॥२८॥

28. In the passage *vrkshân vanâni*, *n* is converted into *visarjanîya* before *v*.

The commentator cites the passage, *vrkshân vanâni sam cara* (vi. 45. 1), which is the only one of its kind in the text. A few such instances, of the loss of *n* before semivowels, with nasalization of the preceding vowel, are found in the Rik and White Yajus, and are noticed in their Prâtiçâkhyas (see R. Pr. iv. 28, r. 68, cclxxxvii, and V. Pr. iii. 135, 136).

The commentary, to explain why the rule does not read simply *vrkshân iti vakare*, says *sopapadasya grahanam etâvattvârtham: iha mâ dhât: vrkshân vâto vrkshân vayâh*; 'the citation of *vrkshân* along with its following word is for the purpose of restricting the action of the rule to this particular case: the conversion is not to be made in the passages *vrkshân vâtaḥ* and *vrkshân vayâḥ*.' These counter-examples, however, are fabricated: no such passages occur in the Atharvan. Nor is the citation of *vanâni* in the rule necessary, although excusable enough: a *v* follows *vrkshân* in no other passage of the text, except in xii. 1. 51, where it is separated from it by an *avasâna*, and so exercises upon it no euphonic influence.

नाम्यपधस्य रेफ ऋतूँरुत्सृजते वशीत्येवमादीनास् ॥२९॥

29. Preceded by an alterant vowel, *n* becomes *r* in the passages *ṛtūñr ut srjate vaci* etc.

All the vowels except *a* and *â* are called *nâmin*, as tending to produce the *nati*, or conversion, of a following *s* into *sh*. The Rik Pr. (e. g. i. 17, 20) has the same term; see Regnier's note to i. 17 (r. 65, 66): the Vâj. Pr. uses instead *bhâvin*.

The Prâtiçâkhyâ is to be reprehended here for not treating the cases to which this rule applies in the same manner as those coming under the preceding rules, by prescribing the conversion of *n* into *visarjanîya*, and leaving it for rule 42, below, to change the latter into *r*. In fact, the first two words of the rule are superfluous, and might advantageously be omitted. The origin of this peculiar and rather uncommon *sandhi*

is clearly the same with that of those which form the subject of rules 26 and 27. Only nine cases of it occur in the Atharvan: of these, three are cited by the commentary, viz.: *ṛtūñr ut sṛjate vaci* (vi. 36. 2), *mo shu panīñr abhi* (v. 11. 7), and *davyūñr uta bodhi* (iv. 32. 6); the others are the word *ṛtán* three times before *a* (vi. 61. 2, 3. vii. 81. 1), and *pilñ* three times before *u* (xviii. 2. 4, 23; 4. 40).

The Rik Pr. (iv. 29, 30) prescribes the insertion of *r* after *in* and *un* everywhere before a vowel, except at the end of a *páda* (and once even there), and in a single instance after *ṛn*. The same *sandhi* is also made in half a dozen instances before *y*, *v*, and *h*. The Váj. Pr. specifies (iii. 140) the few passages in its text where the conversion of *n* to *r* occurs after *i* and *ú*; and the Tãitt. Pr. (ix. 20) puts the conversion of *án* to *áñ* and of *in* and *un* to *iñr* and *uñr* into the same rule together.

## न समैरयन्तादीनाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30. Exceptions are the passages *sam áirayan tám* etc.

By the position of this rule, the *gaṇa samáirayantádayas* ought to include exceptions to all the preceding rules, beginning at ii. 26. Since, however, the rules 27–29 apply only to certain specified cases, it is difficult to see the necessity of specifying any exceptions to them, and we cannot help conjecturing that the present precept belongs to rule 26 alone, and should properly come in next after it, as rule 27. The first passage of the *gaṇa*, *sam áirayan tám vy úrṇvantu* (i. 11. 2), is the first instance which the text presents of a *n* directly preceding *t* without the interposition of a sibilant, and the commentator goes on to cite the two next succeeding cases of the same character, viz.: *kulopá rájan tám u te* (i. 14. 3), and *asmin tishṭhatu yá* (i. 15. 2): the three happen to be typical examples of the three principal classes of cases—verbal forms, vocatives, and locatives—in which we should not expect to see the sibilant inserted, since the forms did not originally end in a sibilant. For a complete list of the exceptions to rule 26, see the final marginal note to the exposition of that rule.

## मकारस्य स्पर्श परसस्थानः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *M*, before a mute, becomes of like position with the latter.

The Rik Pr. (iv. 3, r. 6, ccxxv) adds the restriction *vishṭhane*, ‘before a mute of another class,’ which is a matter of course, and does not need specification; and both it and the other treatises (V. Pr. iv. 11; T. Pr. v. 27) state distinctly what is implied in our rule by i. 95, that the sound into which the *m* is converted is the nasal of the same class with the following mute. The commentator gives the following instances, writing always an *anusvára* for the nasal into which the *m* is converted: *san káçayámi vahatum* (xiv. 2. 12), *udágân jivah* (xiv. 2. 44), *tan ðayamánam* (fabricated: no such case in A.V.), *san nas tebhih* (ii. 35. 2), *san táih paçubhih* (iv. 36. 5), *san nashṭena* (vii. 9. 4), *san tvayáti dhishimahi* (xiv. 2. 17), and *má tvá vṛkshah sam bádhishṭa* (xviii. 2. 25). The manu-

script reads farther *çāntas tām nedā 'natahpade tavarge prakṛtyā: dur-nāmniḥ sarvāḥ*. The beginning of this is probably an additional citation, but, if it be so, it is so corrupted in reading that I am unable to trace it out. The rest is a restriction applied by the commentator himself, *vārttika*-like, to the action of the rule: 'in the interior of a word, *m* remains unchanged before a dental: e. g. *durnāmniḥ sarvāḥ* (iv. 17. 5).' It is unnecessary to remark, however, that the Prātiçākhyā has nothing to do with explaining the *m* of such a word, and that the commentator's emendation of his text is therefore impertinent; it is also bungling, since such a *vārttika*, if constructed at all, should be made to apply, not to a dental only, but to a lingual, in such words as *aryamṇā*.

### अन्तःस्थोष्मसु लोपः ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Before semivowels and spirants, it is omitted.

This omission, by i. 67, carries with it the nasalization of the preceding vowel. The commentator's examples are *vrksham yad gāvah* (i. 2. 3), *pitaram varuṇam* (i. 3. 3), *soṃrādhayantaḥ sadhurāḥ* (iii. 30. 5), *parā dya devā vrjinām çṛṇvntu* (viii. 3. 14), *ny oshatam hatam* (viii. 4. 1), *saṃ subhūtyā* (iii. 14. 1), and *bhavasi saṃ samṛddhyā* (xii. 3. 21).

The Rik Pr. (iv. 5, r. 15, ccxxxiv) converts *m* into *anusvāra* before the spirants and *r*, but treats it before *y*, *l*, and *v* (iv. 3, r. 7, ccxxvi) in the same manner as our treatise (rule 35, below) before *l* alone. The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 1, 3, 9) teaches precisely the same doctrine, but refers (iv. 4) to Kāçyapa and Çākaṭāyana as holding that the *m* is dropped. The Tāitt. Pr. (xiii. 2) declares, like our own treatise, the *m* to be lost, but only before the spirants and *r*; before all the other semivowels it converts it (v. 28) into the nasalized semivowel, agreeing in this with the Rik Pr. and Vāj. Pr.; it also notices, however (xiii. 3), the view of the Ath. Pr. as held by some authorities.

### उष्मस्वेवान्तःपदे ॥ ३३ ॥

33. In the interior of a word, it is omitted before spirants only.

As examples of the loss of *m* in the interior of a word before spirants, the commentary presents the whole list of examples—*dve ca me viṅçatiç ca* etc.—already given above, under i. 27, and repeated under i. 53 and i. 83. As counter-example, we have *patir yah pratikāmyah* (ii. 36. 8) alone. Instances of *m* before *r* in like position would not be hard to give—e. g. *tāmradhūmrāḥ* (x. 2. 11)—but it is found before *l* only in root syllables, as in *malimlucam* (viii. 6. 2), and before *v* only in the case which forms the subject of rule 37, below.

Both this rule and the next concern matters with which the Prātiçākhyā properly has no concern. Accordingly, the Rik Pr. (iv. 3, r. 7, ccxxvi) disposes of them simply by specifying that *m* is altered before an initial semivowel, excepting *r* (in connection with which, in the later rule, it omits to repeat the specification), and the Tāitt. Pr. says nothing upon the subject. But the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 2) gives a precept which includes both the rule we are treating of and the one which follows it.

## नकारस्य च ॥ ३४ ॥

34. As is also *n*.

The commentator's citations to illustrate this rule are those already once given, under i. 84, including the words *parūnshi*, *yajūnshi*, and *havinshi*, and, to show that *n* is not altered in the interior of a word before semivowels, he farther quotes *tāudī nāmā 'si kanyā* (x. 4. 24). As instance of *n* before *v* within a word, we may take *tannaḥ* (e. g. i. 1. 1): before *r* and *l* it is found only when final.

The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 2) is the only other treatise which contains a rule corresponding with this.

## उभयोर्लकारे लकारो ऽनुनासिकः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Both *m* and *n*, before *l*, are converted into a nasalized *l*.

The commentator quotes from the text, as instances of *m* before *l*, *tañl\* lokam* (iii. 28. 5), *aviñl lokena* (iii. 29. 3 etc), *pratimāñl lokāḥ* (xviii. 4. 5); and, as instances of *n* before *l*, *durgandhiñl lohitāsyān* (viii. 6. 12), and *sarvāñl lokān* (e. g. iv. 38. 5).

It is perhaps to be regretted that the editors of the published text did not follow this rule of the Prātiçākhyā with regard to both *m* and *n*. The manuscripts, however, are almost unanimous in reading only a single *l* after an original *m*, with a nasal sign over the preceding vowel (there are but two or three cases, if I recollect aright, of a doubled *l*), and their authority has in this respect been followed. Where an original *n* has disappeared, on the other hand, the manuscripts follow, not without some exceptions, the directions of the Prātiçākhyā, and we have done the same, also without absolute uniformity.

The three other kindred works (see R. Pr. iv. 3, r. 7, ccxxvi; V. Pr. iv. 9; T. Pr. v. 28, 29) agree with one another, and disagree with our treatise, in converting *m* before all the three semivowels *y*, *l*, and *v* into those semivowels nasalized; as regards the treatment of the *n*, there

---

\* The lack of suitable type renders it necessary to represent the *sandhi*, in transcribing the instances, in this imperfect way: properly, no *n* should be written, and the sign of nasality should be set above the first *l* itself. It will have been noticed, also, that (for the same reason) the general method of transcription adopted for the nasal sounds is not in accordance with the theory of the Prātiçākhyā. The latter knows no *anusvāra*, and nothing intermediate between a nasal mute and a nasalized semivowel or vowel. We ought, then, in our transcription, to write, on the one hand, in every instance a nasal adapted in class to the following mute, as has been done in the examples under ii. 31—only, if we choose, taking the liberty to substitute a dotted *n* and *m* in case of the assimilation of those letters, according to rules ii. 10, 11, 31—and, on the other hand, in cases falling under rules ii. 27, 29, 32, etc., to write a vowel with a nasal sign above it. The distinction made in ordinary usage between the simple dot and the dotted crescent, as nasal signs, is purely arbitrary, founded on nothing in the theory of the Prātiçākhyā, and having but a scanty and uncertain support from the Atharvan manuscripts: some of the latter occasionally, or even generally, attempt to use the dotted crescent for a nasalized vowel, and the dot for a nasal mute, but for the most part they employ the latter indiscriminately for both classes of cases.

is a universal accordance (compare R. Pr. iv. 4, r. 8, cccxvii; V. Pr. iv. 13; T. Pr. v. 25, 26).

न समो राजतौ ॥ ३६ ॥

36. An exception is the *m* of *sam* before the root *râj*.

The only words coming under the action of this rule are *samrâj*, *samrâjñi*, and *sâmrâjya*: verbal forms from the root *râj* with the prefix *sam* are not found in the text. The commentary cites *samrâd eko vi râjati* (vi. 36. 3), *samrâjñy edhi çvaçureshu samrâjñy uta devrshu: nanânduh samrâjñy edhi samrâjñy uta çvaçrvâh* (xiv. 1. 44). The derivative *sâmrâjya* (p. *sâm-râjya*) is found once only (xiv. 1. 43).

The other treatises duly notice the same exceptional case (see R. Pr. iv. 7, r. 23, cccxlii; V. Pr. iv. 5; T. Pr. xiii. 4); the Tâitt. Pr. alone attempting to give the rule a more general form, and declaring *sam* and *sâm* not liable to change when followed by *râ*: it is strange if the treatise do not thus lay itself open to the imputation of an error; our own text, at any rate, has such forms as *sâmrâdhayantaḥ* (iii. 30. 5).

संध्ये च वकारि ॥ ३७ ॥

37. As also, before a *v* which is the result of *sandhi*.

The passage here referred to, and cited by the commentator, is *sam v âsnâ 'ha âsyam* (vi. 56. 3), where the particle *u*, following *sam*, is converted into *v* by iii. 39. There are two closely analogous cases—*çam v astu*—in the nineteenth book (xix. 10. 7, 9), which this rule is not constructed to cover, since the Atharvan text recognized by our treatise consists only of the first eighteen books of the present Atharva-Veda.

वर्गविपर्यये स्फोटनः पूर्वेण चेदिरामः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. In case of a combination in the inverted order of the mute-series, there takes place *sphotana*, provided the former is a final.

Weber (p. 267) regards *viparyaya* as signifying here simply 'difference,' but it does not seem to me possible to give the word so general and indefinite a meaning, and the whole treatment of the subject by the two Prâtiçâkhyas goes to show, at least by negative evidence, that the cases contemplated by them are only those in which a mute of one series (*varga*) enters into combination with one of a preceding series, so that, in the group, the natural order of the series appears inverted. The precept of the Vâj. Pr. (iv. 162) is to the effect that it either is or is not an error of pronunciation to utter a guttural after another mute with *sphotana*. This is in appearance a narrowing of the sphere of occurrence of the *sphotana* to no small extent, as compared with our treatise: but it is almost only in seeming; for, allowing the exception made in the next following rule, there are but two combinations requiring *sphotana* to be found in the Atharvan in which a guttural is not the

## नकारस्य च ॥ ३४ ॥

34. As is also *n*.

The commentator's citations to illustrate this rule are those already once given, under i. 84, including the words *parūn̄shi*, *yajūn̄shi*, and *havin̄shi*, and, to show that *n* is not altered in the interior of a word before semivowels, he farther quotes *tāudi nāmā 'si kanyā* (x. 4. 24). As instance of *n* before *v* within a word, we may take *tanvaḥ* (e. g. i. 1. 1): before *r* and *l* it is found only when final.

The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 2) is the only other treatise which contains a rule corresponding with this.

## उभयोर्लकारे लकारो ऽनुनासिकः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Both *m* and *n*, before *l*, are converted into a nasalized *l*.

The commentator quotes from the text, as instances of *m* before *l*, *tañl\* lokam* (iii. 28. 5), *aviñl lokena* (iii. 29. 3 etc), *pratimāñl lokāḥ* (xviii. 4. 5); and, as instances of *n* before *l*, *durgandhiñl lohitàsyān* (viii. 6. 12), and *sarvāñl lokān* (e. g. iv. 38. 5).

It is perhaps to be regretted that the editors of the published text did not follow this rule of the Prātiçākhyā with regard to both *m* and *n*. The manuscripts, however, are almost unanimous in reading only a single *l* after an original *m*, with a nasal sign over the preceding vowel (there are but two or three cases, if I recollect aright, of a doubled *l*), and their authority has in this respect been followed. Where an original *n* has disappeared, on the other hand, the manuscripts follow, not without some exceptions, the directions of the Prātiçākhyā, and we have done the same, also without absolute uniformity.

The three other kindred works (see R. Pr. iv. 3, r. 7, ccxxvi; V. Pr. iv. 9; T. Pr. v. 28, 29) agree with one another, and disagree with our treatise, in converting *m* before all the three semivowels *y*, *l*, and *v* into those semivowels nasalized; as regards the treatment of the *n*, there

---

\* The lack of suitable type renders it necessary to represent the *sandhi*, in transcribing the instances, in this imperfect way: properly, no *n* should be written, and the sign of nasality should be set above the first *l* itself. It will have been noticed, also, that (for the same reason) the general method of transcription adopted for the nasal sounds is not in accordance with the theory of the Prātiçākhyā. The latter knows no *anusvāra*, and nothing intermediate between a nasal mute and a nasalized semivowel or vowel. We ought, then, in our transcription, to write, on the one hand, in every instance a nasal adapted in class to the following mute, as has been done in the examples under ii. 31—only, if we choose, taking the liberty to substitute a dotted *n* and *m* in case of the assimilation of those letters, according to rules ii. 10, 11, 31—and, on the other hand, in cases falling under rules ii. 27, 29, 32, etc., to write a vowel with a nasal sign above it. The distinction made in ordinary usage between the simple dot and the dotted crescent, as nasal signs, is purely arbitrary, founded on nothing in the theory of the Prātiçākhyā, and having but a scanty and uncertain support from the Atharvan manuscripts: some of the latter occasionally, or even generally, attempt to use the dotted crescent for a nasalized vowel, and the dot for a nasal mute, but for the most part they employ the latter indiscriminately for both classes of cases.

is a universal accordance (compare R. Pr. iv. 4, r. 8, ccxxvii; V. Pr. iv. 13; T. Pr. v. 25, 26).

न समो राजती ॥ ३६ ॥

36. An exception is the *m* of *sam* before the root *rāj*.

The only words coming under the action of this rule are *samrāj*, *samrājñī*, and *sāmrajya*: verbal forms from the root *rāj* with the prefix *sam* are not found in the text. The commentary cites *samrād eko vi rājati* (vi. 36. 3), *samrājñy edhi ŷvaçureshu samrājñy uta devr̥shu: nanānduh samrājñy edhi samrājñy uta ŷvaçrvāh* (xiv. 1. 44). The derivative *sāmrajya* (p. *sām-rājya*) is found once only (xiv. 1. 43).

The other treatises duly notice the same exceptional case (see R. Pr. iv. 7, r. 23, ccxlii; V. Pr. iv. 5; T. Pr. xiii. 4); the Tāitt. Pr. alone attempting to give the rule a more general form, and declaring *sam* and *sām* not liable to change when followed by *rā*: it is strange if the treatise do not thus lay itself open to the imputation of an error; our own text, at any rate, has such forms as *sāmrahayantaḥ* (iii. 30. 5).

संधे च वकारे ॥ ३७ ॥

37. As also, before a *v* which is the result of *sandhi*.

The passage here referred to, and cited by the commentator, is *sam v āsnā 'ha āsyam* (vi. 56. 3), where the particle *u*, following *sam*, is converted into *v* by iii. 39. There are two closely analogous cases—*çam v astu*—in the nineteenth book (xix. 10. 7, 9), which this rule is not constructed to cover, since the Atharvan text recognized by our treatise consists only of the first eighteen books of the present Atharva-Veda.

वर्गविपर्यये स्फोटनः पूर्वेण चेद्विरामः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. In case of a combination in the inverted order of the mute-series, there takes place *sphotana*, provided the former is a final.

Weber (p. 267) regards *viparyaya* as signifying here simply 'difference,' but it does not seem to me possible to give the word so general and indefinite a meaning, and the whole treatment of the subject by the two Prātiçākhyas goes to show, at least by negative evidence, that the cases contemplated by them are only those in which a mute of one series (*varga*) enters into combination with one of a preceding series, so that, in the group, the natural order of the series appears inverted. The precept of the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 162) is to the effect that it either is or is not an error of pronunciation to utter a guttural after another mute with *sphotana*. This is in appearance a narrowing of the sphere of occurrence of the *sphotana* to no small extent, as compared with our treatise: but it is almost only in seeming; for, allowing the exception made in the next following rule, there are but two combinations requiring *sphotana* to be found in the Atharvan in which a guttural is not the



second member, and each is represented by but a single case, and one of the two is in the nineteenth book of the text: they are *pch* (*trishṭupchandāḥ*, vi. 48. 3), and *bj* (*trishṭubjagatyāu*, xix. 21. 1). The commentator to the Vāj. Pr. (Weber, p. 266) defines *sphoṭana* to be “the separated utterance of a close combination of consonants” (*piṇḍibhūtasyu saṁyogasya pṛthag uccāraṇam*); our commentator gives no such explanation, merely paraphrasing the rule as follows: *vargānām viparyaye sphoṭanaḥ sandhyo bhavati: pūrveṇa ced virāmo bhavati:* but the text itself has already (see i. 103) defined *sphoṭana* to be a quarter or an eighth of a short *a*—doubtless a *saṁvrta a*, or the neutral vowel. There can be no doubt, then, that the *sphoṭana* is that very brief unclosure of the organs which we often, if not ordinarily, allow to take place between two mutes standing in conjunction with one another, and of the former of which we desire to make clearer the pronunciation. In passing from a *t* to a *k*, for instance, while it is possible by an effort to make the release of the *t*-closure and the formation of the *k*-closure so truly simultaneous that nothing whatever shall escape from the mouth during the transfer, it is more natural to let so much breath slip out between as shall render audible the unclosure of the dental position, and so far relieve the imperfect or *abhinihita* utterance of the *t*, rendering it comparatively clear and distinct (*sphuṭa*). This insertion is then properly enough called *sphoṭana*, ‘that which makes clear, distinct, or evident:’ we have noticed above (under i. 103) that the commentator gives it also another kindred name, *vyoñjaka*, ‘manifestester.’ It is, under other circumstances of occurrence, very nearly the same with that release or separation of the passive and active organs of production which the Vāj. Pr. (i. 90) prescribes after the pronunciation of a final mute in the *pada*-text, so that the next word may begin with a new effort. That the Hindu theory allows *sphoṭana* in the combination of the phrase only in case two mutes meet in the inverse order of the *vargas* to which they belong has something of arbitrariness in it, yet is not without foundation; for it may be noted, I think, that it is perceptibly harder to change from a contact farther forward in the mouth to one farther back, than to make a like transfer in the contrary direction, without allowing any intervening escape of breath or sound: and the order of the *vargas* follows the advance in the mouth of the place of formation.

The commentator cites, as instances of the occurrence of *sphoṭana*, *vashatkāreṇu* (p. *vashat-kāreṇa*, e. g. v. 26. 12), *avatkaṁ* (p. *avat-kam*, ii. 3. 1), *ejatkāḥ* (p. *ejat-kāḥ*, v. 23. 7), *trishṭub gāyatrī* (xviii. 2. 6), and *yad gāyatre* (ix. 10. 1). Of other combinations than these, the text presents *pk* (*anusṭup katham*, viii. 9. 20), *tkh* (e. g. *utkhidan* [p. *ut-khidan*], iv. 11. 10), and *dgh* (e. g. *puḍghoshāḥ* [p. *pat-ghoshāḥ*], v. 21. 8). Whether combinations of the dental nasal with a following guttural mute are to be regarded as coming under the rule, and admitting *sphoṭana*, is rendered at least doubtful by our commentator, who goes on to say: “why does the rule say *pūrveṇa*? because of such cases as *kramān ko asyāḥ* (viii. 9. 10).” It is evident from this that he would understand *pūrva* as equivalent here to *anuttama*, ‘not last in a muteries,’ i. e. ‘non-nasal.’ This seems to me, however, a very forced in-

terpretation, and unsupported by the usage of the word elsewhere, in this or in the other Prāticākhyas. The Vāj. Pr. makes no such exception of the nasals, nor is it noticed in the verse—from the same metrical treatise, doubtless, which has often been found cited above—with which the commentary on the rule closes: *vargānām viparītānām saṁnipāte nibodhata: vyāvāyī sphotānākhyas tu yad gāyatṛe nidarṣanam*; ‘know ye that in the collocation of the series in their inverted order there takes place an insertion called *sphotāna*: *yad gāyatṛe* is an instance of it.’ I am disposed, then, to look upon the exclusion of the nasals from the operation of the rule as a later gloss, foisted in upon the rule itself. There is by no means a lack of reason for making the exception; since the nasals are accompanied throughout their utterance by a free emission of intoned breath through the nose, and are by it made so distinctly audible that there is felt no impulse to give them additional clearness by the insertion of such a sound as *sphotāna*. If the interpretation of the commentator be rejected, we shall have to add to the list of groups given above as coming under the action of the rule not only *nk*, of which an instance has already been cited, but also *nkh* (e. g. *keçān khādantah*, v. 19. 3), *ng* (e. g. *vidvān gandharvah*, ii. 1. 2), and *ngh* (e. g. *devān ghṛtavatā*, iii. 10. 11). To the specification of the rule that the consonant followed by *sphotāna* must be a final, the commentary brings up the counter-example *venor adgā iva* (i. 27. 3), where the group *dg*, although composed of a dental before a guttural, suffers no such interposition. The term *virāma*, which is used once or twice also in the technical language of the other Prāticākhyas, has the same signification with *avasāna*, and denotes a pause accompanied with a suspension of euphonic influences; such as takes place in the ordinary text only where there is a sign of interpunction, or at the end of a sentence or paragraph, but in the *pada*-text is found after every word, and even between the two separated parts of a compound word.

न टवर्गस्य चवर्गे कालविप्रकर्षस्त्वत्र भवति तमाहुः  
कर्षणा इति ॥३१॥

39. But not in the case of a lingual before a palatal; here there takes place a prolongation of the time: and this they call *karshana*.

That is to say, when a *t* comes before a *c*, or a *d* before a *j* (the only two cases which can occur under the rule), there is no separation of the two consonants by unclosure and reclosure of the organs, but the effect of the contact is merely to lengthen out the time employed in uttering the group: the name applied to this prolongation, *karshana*, ‘*tractio*, drawing out, extension,’ is not elsewhere met with in the grammatical literature. The commentator cites as examples *shat ce ’mah*, (iv. 20. 2), *shat ca me shashtiç ca* (v. 15. 6), and *shad jātā* (viii. 9. 16): they are the only instances of these combinations to be met with in the Atharvan text, except one in the nineteenth book (*shat ca*, xix. 47. 4).

It is easy to see the physical ground of this exception to the rule pre-

scribing *sphoṭana*. The same close relationship with respect to place of utterance which causes the final palatal to pass often into a lingual, instead of reverting to the guttural out of which it originally grew, causes the lingual, in coming before the palatal, to virtually double it only. The transfer of position of the organs is too slight and easy to necessitate the emission of an intervening sound.

This is the last rule in the first section of the second chapter. The manuscript this time omits to specify the number of rules contained in the section, and adds simply *dvitīyasya prathamah pādah*.

### विसर्जनीयस्य परसस्थानो ऽघोषे ॥ ४० ॥

40. *Visarjanīya*, before a surd consonant, becomes of like position with the following sound.

That is to say, applying rule i. 95, it is converted into the spirant (*ūshman*) corresponding in position with the following letter. Thus, before *c* and *ch* it becomes *ç*; before *t* and *th*, *sh*; before *t* and *th*, *s*; before *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, it is changed into each of those letters respectively; before *k* and *kh* it becomes *jihvāmūliya*, and, before *p* and *ph*, *upadhmanīya*—these last two spirants being, as already noticed, clearly implied in this rule, although nowhere referred to by name as belonging to the scheme of spoken sounds recognized by the treatise. *Visarjanīya* itself, then, would only stand, in *sanhitā*, before a pause. The theory of the *Prātiçākhyā*, however, is not at all the practice of the manuscripts, and the latter, rather than the former, has been followed by us in the printed text. In none of the Atharvan codices is any attempt made to distinguish the *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya* from the *visarjanīya*—and, as we cannot but think, with much reason: since the division of this indistinct and indefinite sound into three different kinds of indefiniteness savors strongly of an over-refinement of analysis. Nor do the manuscripts—except in a few sporadic cases, and without any agreement among one another as regards these—convert *visarjanīya* into a sibilant before a sibilant. In the final revision of the edited text, the rule of the *Prātiçākhyā* in this respect was begun to be followed in the interior of a word (see ii. 3. 3, 5; iii. 21. 2; iv. 17. 2), but was soon neglected again, and the text in general shows *visarjanīya* before a sibilant in all situations. The rule that the *visarjanīya* is to be dropped altogether before a sibilant followed by a surd mute—a rule which is laid down by the Rik and Vāj. *Prātiçākhyās*, and not by our own, but which is rather more usually, although with very numerous and irregularly occurring exceptions, followed in the Atharvan manuscripts—has been uniformly carried out in the edition; although many will doubtless be inclined to think with me that, considering the varying usage of the manuscripts, it would have been better to follow the authority of the *Prātiçākhyā*, and so to avoid the ambiguity occasionally arising from the omission of the final spirant.

The commentator's illustrative citations are as follows: before gutturals (*kavarge*: he prefixes in each case such a specification to his classes of examples), *antahkoçam iva* (i. 14. 4); before palatals, *yaç ca dvishan*

(i. 19. 4); before linguals, *vrkshash tikate* (a fabricated instance : no case of this conversion is to be found in AV. : the same example occurs under Pān. viii. 3. 34); before dentals, *mayas tokebhyaḥ* (i. 13. 2), *avis tokāni* (v. 19. 2), *balhikān vā parastarām* (v. 22. 7), *yujas tuje janāḥ* (vi. 33. 1), *yathā pasas tāyādaram* (vi. 72. 2), *prā vantu nas tujaye* (vii. 49. 1), *trayastrinṅena jagati* (viii. 9. 20), *makhas tavishyate* (xviii. 1. 23); before labials, *tataḥ pari prajātena* (vi. 89. 1); before *s*, *vātabhrajās stanayan* (i. 12. 1 : edition *-jā stanayan*, and this time with the assent of all the MSS. except E.), *arussrānam* (ii. 3. 3 : I. *aruḥsrānam*, and, in verse 5, I. and H. do.; all the others, in both cases, *arusrānam*; pada *aruḥ-srānam*), *vivratās sthana* (iii. 8. 5 : all the MSS. except H., *vivratāḥ sthana*), *ati durgās srotiyāḥ* (x. 1. 16). Instances for *ç* and *sh* are not given.

The Vāj. Pr. (iii. 8, 11) gives as taught by Cākaṭāyana the doctrines of our treatise—namely, that *visarjanīya* becomes a sibilant before a sibilant, and *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmānīya* before gutturals and labials—while it states (iii. 9) that Çākalya leaves *visarjanīya* unchanged before a sibilant, and itself, not deciding that point, maintains the *visarjanīya* before gutturals and labials. Before palatals and dentals, it prescribes (iii. 6, 7) the conversion into *ç* and *s*: of the hypothetical case of an initial lingual it takes no notice. Before a sibilant followed by a surd mute, it rejects the *visarjanīya* altogether (iii. 12), as already noticed. The Rik Pr. likewise treats at considerable length the changes which our treatise compresses into a single rule. It first (iv. 10, r. 31, 32, ccl, ccli) gives rules which agree in all points with our own, only excepting the case of a mute followed by a sibilant, and, later, that of a sibilant followed by a surd mute, before which (iv. 12, r. 36, cclv) the *visarjanīya* is to be struck out. But it then goes on (iv. 11, r. 33, 34, cclii, ccliii) to permit the retention of the spirant unchanged before gutturals, labials, and unaltered sibilants, and even, finally (iv. 12, r. 38, cclvii), to pronounce this the approved usage before gutturals and labials. The Tāitt. Pr. also (ix. 2, 3) agrees with our treatise, only excepting *ksh*, before which *visarjanīya* is to remain unaltered. It then rehearses the varying opinions of other authorities: Âgniveçya and Vālmiki (ix. 4) hold that the spirant maintains its identity before gutturals and labials, while others (ix. 5) who allow it in these cases to become *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmānīya*, leave it unchanged before sibilants—it being specified, however, that of this number are not Plākshi and Plākshāyana. The omission before a sibilant followed by a surd is mentioned (ix. 1) as the doctrine of Kāṇḍamāyana.

The discordance of opinion among the ancient Hindu grammarians as to the treatment of *visarjanīya* before surd letters is thus shown to have been very great, the only point upon which they all agree being its conversion into *s* and *ç* before dentals and palatals—or, more properly, the retention of the original sibilant in the former position, and its conversion into the nearly related palatal sibilant, by assimilation, in the latter. The assimilation to a following sibilant must, it should seem, be regarded as a more primitive mode of pronunciation than the retention of—or, more properly, conversion into—*visarjanīya*, which latter has become exclusively prevalent in the later language. It is possible, too, that the so-called guttural and labial spirants may have had

more of the sibilant character than the mere breathing *visarjanīya*, and so have been intermediate steps between the latter and the original sibilant.

## स्वरे यकारः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Before a vowel, *visarjanīya* becomes *y*.

This is an intermediate step to the total disappearance of the spirant, by ii. 21, and it is very hard to say whether the conversion into *y* is a matter of grammatical theory only, or whether it gives account of an actual process of phonetic transition. The rule is limited by the one which follows it, and then farther by ii. 53, so that all which remains of it is that *visarjanīya* is lost when following *á* and preceding a vowel, and when following *a* and preceding any other vowel than *a*. The commentator's citations, illustrating these two cases, are *yasyá upastha urv antariksham* (vii. 6. 4: p. *yasyáh*: *upa-sthah*), *madhyandina ud gáyati* (ix. 6. 46), *abhipacyata eva* (x. 8. 24), and *sa ápah* (not found in AV.: perhaps the reading is corrupt, and *va ápah* [iii. 13. 7] or *na ápah* [xii. 1. 30] is the passage intended).

The Táitt. Pr. (ix. 10) gives its general rule in a form closely corresponding with that of our own. The Váj. Pr. (iv. 36) also makes the conversion of the spirant to *y* before elision, but restricts it formally as well as virtually to the case of a *visarjanīya* preceded by *a* and *á*. The Rik Pr. (ii. 9, 10, r. 24, 27, cxxviii, cxxxi) follows a peculiar method: it assumes no conversion into *y*, nor does it declare the spirant omitted, but teaches that when the latter is preceded by a long vowel, not subject to conversion into *r*, and followed by a vowel, it becomes *á*; and when in like circumstances but preceded by a short vowel, it becomes *a*.

## नाम्युपधस्य रेफः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. If preceded by an alterant vowel, it becomes *r* before a vowel.

The alterant vowels, as already noted (under ii. 29), are the whole series excepting *a* and *á*.

The commentator's citations are *agnir ástnah* (ix. 7. 19), *váyur amitránám* (xi. 10. 16), *°syá 'ham manyor ava jyám iva* (v. 13. 6), and *táir amitráh* (v. 21. 8).

The other treatises (R. Pr. i. 20, r. 76, lxxvii, and iv. 9, r. 27, cxxlvi; V. Pr. iv. 35; T. Pr. viii. 6) combine into one this rule and the following.

There is here another *lacuna* in the manuscript: immediately upon the citation *táir amitráh* follow *tasyá agnir vatsah* and the other illustrations of the conversion of *visarjanīya* preceded by an alterant vowel into *r* before a sonant consonant, and then follow the words *ghoshavati ca*, before the rule *ávah* etc. It is evident that the copyist has leaped over the rule *ghoshavati ca*, together with its own paraphrase, the final repetition of the preceding rule, and perhaps some of the illustrative citations belonging to one or both of them. There is no reason whatever to suppose that anything more than this is omitted, or that any rule is lost altogether.

## घोषवति च ॥४३॥

43. As also before a sonant consonant.

The remaining citations of the commentator are *tasyā agnir vatsah* (iv. 39. 2), *agner bhāgah stha* (x. 5. 7), *arātiyōr bhrātṛvyasya* (x. 6. 1), and *tāir medino anگیرasah* (x. 6. 20).

It has been already noticed that the other Prātiçākhyas unite this rule with the preceding.

## आवः कृकश्च वि वरविभरसर्वनामः ॥४४॥

44. Also is changed into *r* before a vowel or sonant consonant the *visarjanīya* of *āvah*, *kaḥ*, *akuḥ*, *ca vi vah*, and *abibhaḥ*—except in the case of a pronoun.

In this and the following rules, as far as the 49th inclusive, are treated the words whose final *visarjanīya* represents an original *r*, and not *s*, and in which, accordingly, the *r* is liable to reappear before a sonant initial, even though *a* or *ā* precede. The Rik Pr. and Vāj. Pr. deal with this class of words in a somewhat different manner. The former, in the concluding part of its first chapter (i. 20–26) rehearses all the words of which the final spirant is *rephīn* or *riphītu*, ‘liable to pass into *r*’; and then, in a later chapter (iv. 9), prescribes the conversion into *r* of the *riphīta visarjanīya* before sonants. The Vāj. Pr. gives a like list (i. 160–168), and a like precept for the alteration (iv. 35). The Tāitt. Pr., like our own treatise, disposes of the whole matter at once (in viii. 8–15). The words of the class are quite differently combined in the different Prātiçākhyas, so that any detailed comparison is impracticable: thus, for instance, the words treated in this rule of ours are found scattered through Rik Pr. i. 21, 22, 23, 26, Vāj. Pr. i. 161, 164, 168, and Tāitt. Pr. viii. 8, 9.

The cases to which the rule refers are instanced by the commentator, as follows: *suruco vena āvah*: *āvar ity āvah* (iv. 1. 1), *sarasvati tam iha dhātave kaḥ*: *kur iti kaḥ* (vii. 10. 1), *açam nirṛtyā akaḥ*: *akar ity akaḥ* (ii. 25. 1), *sataç ca yonim asataç ca vi vah*: *var iti vah* (iv. 1. 1), and *yam parihasam abibhaḥ aditiḥ putrakāmyā* (vi. 81. 3). It will be noticed that the commentator repeats each word to which the rule applies, with *iti* interposed, except in the last case, where the *r* appears in *sanhitā*. This is in accordance with the usage of the *pada*-text of the Rig-Veda, but not with that of the Atharvan, which in no single instance\* performs *parihāra* of a word ending in a *riphīta visarjanīya*; and we must accordingly regard the repetitions as taken from the *krama*-text, which would give such a form to the words in question, as standing at the end of a line. In the case of *vi vah*, we have the preceding word *ca* also extracted, in order to limit the rule to this particular passage, or, as the commentator has it, *etāvattvārtham* (compare note to ii. 28). The cases

\* Excepting in the twentieth book, whose *pada*-text is shown by this and other peculiarities to be merely a putting together of extracts from that of the Rik.

intended to be thus excluded must be such as *vi vo dhamatu* (iii. 2. 2), but they are sufficiently provided against by the final specification of the rule, "when the word is not a pronoun," and I do not see how the citation in the text of both the *ca* and the *vi* can escape the charge of superfluity. As counter-examples, illustrating the necessity of the final specification, the commentator cites *hironyavarṇā atṛpām yadā vah: va iti vah* (iii. 13. 6), and *yatre 'dam veṣayāmi vah* (iii. 13. 7): he does not choose to notice the fact that these cases are also excluded by their lacking a preceding *ca vi*; and he gives no instances of *kaḥ* as a pronoun, as it was his duty to do. All the other treatises distinguish the *kaḥ* whose final is *riphita* by calling it *anudatta*, 'unaccented,' which compels them then farther to specify the cases in which the verbal form *kaḥ* (*kar*) happens to be accented.

The term *sarvanāman*, 'all-name,' used to denote a pronoun, is an ingenious and interesting one; it is not found in either of the other treatises, but is employed by Pāṇini. *Nāman*, 'name,' includes substantives, adjectives, and pronouns; but while the two former, being descriptive of quality, are restricted in their application to certain objects or classes of objects, a pronoun may be used of anything indifferently; it is a title of universal applicability.

### द्वार्वारिति ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Also that of *dvāḥ* and *vāḥ*.

The commentator cites *prathamā dvāḥ: dvār iti dvāḥ* (ix. 3. 22), *tas-mād vār nāma* (iii. 13. 3), and *divyam ghr̥tam vāḥ: vār iti vāḥ* (xviii. 1. 32); repeating, as under the previous rule, the final words of the half-verses, as they would be repeated in the *krama*-text.

### अजहतिरहाः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Also that of *ahāḥ*, except it be from the root *hā*.

An equivalent and, one would think, preferable form for this rule would have been *harater ahāḥ*, 'ahāḥ when coming from the root *har* (*hr̥*).' The commentator's examples are *indras tām pary ahār dāmnā* (vi. 103. 2, 3), *iha rāshtram ā 'hāḥ* (xiii. 1. 4: the commentator, or the copyist, omits to add *ahār ity ahāḥ*), and *agnish tad ā 'hāḥ* (vii. 53. 3: here is added *ahār ity ahāḥ*, but it is out of place, the word not standing in *pausa*; perhaps the *parihāra* has slipped away from its proper place after the preceding citation to this: but then the word following *ahāḥ* should also have been quoted in the last passage, and it should read *agnish tad ā 'hār nir̥teḥ*). As counter-example, to show that *ahāḥ* from the root *hā* forms no exception to the general rule respecting a *visarjanīya*, the commentator cites *akā arātim* (ii. 10. 7).

### एकामन्त्रिते रौद्विवचनात्तस्य ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Also that of the vocative singular of a noun whose dual ends in *rāu*.

The commentator first cites three phrases, of which the first two are not to be found in the Atharvan, and the third belongs under the next following rule—viz. *dhâtâr dehi, savitar dehi, punar dehi* (xviii. 3. 70: but possibly the three phrases form a single passage together, and are a genuine citation from some other text)—and then adds two genuine and appropriate instances: *bhûme mâtar ni dhehi* (xii. 1. 63), and *ivacam etâm viçastah: viçastar iti vi-çastah* (ix. 5. 4). He goes on to give counter-examples: first, to show that the conversion into *r* takes place only in a singular vocative, he cites a passage—*dâivya hotâra ûrdhvam* (v. 27. 9)—containing a plural vocative from a theme of the same character; and second, to show that a vocative of such a theme only is treated in the manner described, he cites the vocative singular of a theme in *as*, which has *sâu* and not *râu* in the dual, viz. *tavishasya pracetah: praceta iti pracetah* (iv. 32. 5); adding *pracetah sâudvivacanântam*.

Here, as in more than one other instance, our treatise shows a greater readiness than the others to avail itself of the help of grammatical categories in constructing its rules: all the other Prâtiçâkhyas laboriously rehearse in detail, one by one, the words which are here disposed of as a class, in one brief rule.

अन्तः पुनः प्रातः सनुतः स्वरव्ययानाम् ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Also that of *antah, punah, prâtah, sanutah,* and *svah,* when indeclinables.

The final specification is intended only for the first and last words of the series, *antah* being possible as nominative singular of *anta*, and *svah* of *sva*. The commentator illustrates as follows: *antardâve juhutâ* (vi. 32. 1), *punar mâi* " *tv indriyam* (vii. 67. 1), *prâtar bhagam pûsham* (iii. 16. 1), *sanutar yuyotu* (vii. 92. 1), *svar no 'pa tvâ* (ii. 5. 2). As counter-examples, to show the necessity of the specification "when indeclinables," he gives *yo nah svo yo aronah sajâtah* (i. 19. 3), *samagrah samantah: samagra iti sam-agroh: samanto bhûyâsam: samanta iti sam-antah* (vii. 81. 4: the commentator thus gives the *krama*-text for the passage *samagrah samanto bhûyâsam*).

The other treatises exclude the noun *anta* by defining the accent of *antâh*, and the Rik Pr. treats *svâh* in the same way—a method which renders necessary considerable additional limitation and explanation.

स्वर्षाश्च ॥ ४९ ॥

49. And that of *svah,* also in *svarshâh*.

The commentator cites the passage, *çûsham agriyah svarshâh* (v. 2. 8). The reason of the word *ca* in the rule, he says, is that the following letter is a surd; and he adds that the spirant becomes *r* only in *sanhitâ*, the *pada* form being *svah-sâh*: this last is rather a gratuitous piece of information.

अर्द्धनपुंसकम् ॥ ५० ॥

50. Also that of *ahah,* when neuter.



The examples quoted from the text are *yad aharahar abhigachāmi* (xvi. 7. 11), and *ahar mā 'ty apīparaḥ* (xvii. 25). As counter-examples, to show that the final is liable to become *r* only when the word is neuter, we have *samaḥo vartate* (not in AV.), and *dvādaśāho 'pi* (xi. 7. 12).

The passages in which the other Prātiçākhyas take note of this irregular change of *ahas* are Rik Pr. i. 26 (r. 103, civ), Vāj. Pr. i. 163, and Tāitt. Pr. viii. 8, 13.

The next rule furnishes exceptions to this one.

## न विभक्तिद्वपरात्रिरथन्तरेषु ॥ ५१ ॥

51. But not before a case-ending, or the words *rūpa*, *rātri*, and *ratham̐tara*.

As examples of *ahaḥ* before case-endings, the commentator gives us *ahobhyām* and *ahobhiḥ*, but the latter of them (xviii. 1. 55 : p. *ahaḥ-bhiḥ*) is the only instance of the kind which the Atharvan text contains. For the compound *ahorātre* he cites two cases, *ahorātrābhyaṁ nakshatrebhyaḥ* (vi. 128. 3), and *ahorātre idam brūmah* (xi. 6. 5): it is a word of frequent occurrence. For the combinations of *ahas* with following *rūpa* and *ratham̐tara* are quoted *yad aho rūpāni dṛçyante*, and *yadā 'ho ratham̐taram̐ sāma gīyate*, neither of which passages is to be found in the Atharvan. It is a very suspicious circumstance that a *vārttika* to a rule of Pāṇini's (viii. 2. 68) mentions the same three exceptions which our rule gives: and it is very probable that our treatise in this case, as in several others, has constructed its rule so as to include all the cases noted as occurring in general usage; and hence, that the two phrases quoted are not necessarily to be regarded as having constituted a part of the Atharvan text for which the Prātiçākhyas was composed.

The Rik Pr. (iv. 13, r. 40, cclix) makes exceptions only of *ahobhiḥ* and *ahorātre*; the Vāj. Pr. (i. 163) excepts cases in which *ahaḥ* is followed by *bh*; the Tāitt. Pr. (viii. 13, 14) teaches the conversion of the final of *ahaḥ* into *r* when it is not the final member of a compound, nor followed by *bhiḥ* or *bhyām*.

## उधोऽम्नोभुवसाम् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Nor is the *visarjanīya* of *ūdhaḥ*, *amnaḥ*, and *bhuvah* convertible into *r*.

This rule is utterly idle in our treatise, since no precept has been given which should in any way require or authorize the conversion into *r* of the final of these words. The original form of *ūdhas*, however, is *ūdhar*, as is clearly shown by the comparison of the kindred languages (*oððag*, *Euter*, *udder*), and by its treatment in the Rig-Veda; and the Rik Pr., accordingly (i. 22, r. 97, 98, xcvi, xcix), has to give rules respecting it. Neither of the other treatises takes notice of it or of either of the words here associated with it. All three, however, are noted by Pāṇini (viii. 2. 70, 71), as words which may or may not, in Vedic use, change their final into *r*; and the instance there cited for *bhuvah*, *bhuvo viçveshu bhuvaneshu*, looks as if it were meant to be the same which

our commentator gives, viz. *bhuvo viçveshu savaneshu yajñiyah*, and which is not to be found in the Atharvan. The commentator farther cites for *bhuvaḥ* an actual Atharvan passage, *bhuvo vivasvân anvâtâtâna* (xviii. 2. 32); but even here it would hardly be necessary to understand the word as having the same meaning as in the mystic trio *bhûr bhuvah svar*, with which the later religious philosophy amuses itself. For *ûdhah* and *amnah*, the examples quoted are *yo asyâ údho na veda* (xii. 4. 18), and *ye amno jâtân mârayanti* (viii. 6. 19: the only case).

### अकारोपधस्योकारो ञ्कारे ॥५३॥

53. When preceded by *a*, *visarjanîya* becomes *u*, before a following *a*.

And this *u*, of course, combines with the preceding *a*, so that the *aḥ* becomes *o*, as is directly taught by the other treatises (R. Pr. ii. 12, r. 33, cxxxvii; V. Pr. iv. 42; T. Pr. ix. 7). The instances cited are *paro 'pe 'hy asamrdde* (v. 7. 7), and *paro 'pe 'hi manaspâpa* (vi. 45. 1). For the treatment of the following initial *a*, see iii. 53, 54.

This rule is much mutilated by the copyist, both in its first statement (*akâro 'kâre*) and in its final repetition (*akâropadhasyokâre*), so that its true form is only restorable from the commentator's paraphrase, which reads *akâropadhasya visarjanîyasyo 'kâro bhavati: akâre parataḥ*. Evidently the triple recurrence of the syllables *kâro*, *kâro*, *kâre* bothered the copyist's weak head, and he stumbled from the one to the other of them in an utterly helpless manner.

### घोषवति च ॥५४॥

54. As also before a sonant consonant.

The commentator's illustrations are *tathâ saptarshayo viduḥ* (iv. 11. 9), *tad vâi brahmavido viduḥ* (x. 8. 43), and *tasyâm naro vapata bijam asyâm* (xiv. 2. 14).

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. iv. 8 (r. 25, ccxlii), Vâj. Pr. iv. 41, and Tâitt. Pr. ix. 8.

### आकारोपधस्य लोपः ॥५५॥

55. When preceded by *â*, it is dropped.

That is to say, it is so treated in the position defined in the last rule, before a sonant consonant; the case of *âh* before a vowel was included in ii. 41, above. The commentator cites *anamivâ vivakshavoḥ* (ii. 30. 3), *dhîrâ deveḥ* (iii. 17. 1), and *ekaçatam tâ janatâ yâ bhûmih* (v. 18. 12), which last passage contains three cases of the application of the rule.

The corresponding rule of the Vâj. Pr. is found at iv. 37, that of the Tâitt. Pr. at ix. 9. The Rik Pr. (iv. 8, r. 24, ccxliii) teaches that the *visarjanîya* (along with its preceding vowel, of course) in such a case passes into *â*—which is a peculiar way of saying the same thing.

## शेषहर्षणी वन्दनेव वृक्षम् ॥ ५६ ॥

56. As also in *ṣepaharshaṇīm* and *vandane 'va vṛksham*.

The commentator cites the two passages: *oshadhīm ṣepaharshaṇīm* (iv. 4. 1 : p. *ṣepah-harshaṇīm*) and *vandane 'va vṛksham* (vii. 115. 2 : p. *vandanāh-iva*). The former is a striking case of arbitrariness in etymologizing on the part of the authors of the *pada*-text, for there is neither necessity nor plausibility in treating the compound as if made up of *ṣepas* and *harshaṇa*: the former member is evidently *ṣepa*, which in the Atharvan is much the more common of the two forms of this word. And as for the other case, of elision of the *visarjanīya* before *iva* and contraction of the two vowels into a diphthong, it is equally surprising to find this one singled out to be so written, from among the many in the text which are to be so read. For the contraction of a final syllable, ending either in an original *s* or *m*, with the following particle of comparison *iva*, so that the two together form but two syllables, is the rule rather than the exception in the Atharva-Veda. Out of 59 instances in the text, in which a final *aḥ* occurs before *iva*, there are only 13 in which the metre shows the *sandhi* to be regular: in 46 cases we are to read *e 'va*; *am iva* is contracted in the same manner 25 times out of 40; *āḥ iva*, only 4 times out of 19; *im iva*, 3 times out of 5; *iḥ iva*, 7 times out of 10; *uḥ iva*, 6 times, or in every instance the text contains; *um iva*, only once out of 3 times: and there are single sporadic cases of a similar elision after the terminations *eḥ*, *āu*, *ān*, *ad*, *ud*, which would pass without notice, as mere irregularities of metre, were it not for their analogy with the others I have mentioned, but which, considering these latter, are worth adverting to, as illustrations of the same general tendency.

## एष स व्यञ्जने ॥ ५७ ॥

57. As also in *eshaḥ* and *saḥ*, before a consonant.

The instances selected by the commentator are *esha priyaḥ* (ii. 36. 4), and *sa senām mohayatu* (iii. 1. 1).

All the other treatises (R. Pr. ii. 4, r. 11, 12, cxv, cxvi; V. Pr. iii. 15, 16; T. Pr. v. 15) include *syah* in the same rules with *eshaḥ* and *saḥ*: the word, however, nowhere occurs in the Atharvan text.

## न सस्यदीष्ट ॥ ५८ ॥

58. But not in the passage *sas padīṣṭa*.

The passage, *adharah sas padīṣṭa* (vii. 31. 1), is cited by the commentator. It is one which occurs in the Rig-Veda also (iii. 53. 21), and is noticed by its Prātiçākhyā (iv. 20, r. 58, cclxxvii).

## दीर्घायुवायादिषु ॥ ५९ ॥

59. *Visarjanīya* is also dropped in *dīrghāyutvāya* etc.

Besides the word *dirghâyutvāya* (e. g. i. 22. 2 : p. *dirghâyu-tvāya*), which is of frequent occurrence in the Atharvan, the commentary cites *atho sahasracaksho tvam* (iv. 20. 5 : p. *sahasracaksho iti sahasra-caksho*), and *barhishadah* (xviii. 1. 45, 51 : p. *barhi-sadah*). In all these cases, it will be noticed, the *lopa* of the *visarjanīya* is made in the *pada*-text, as well as in *sanhitā*, as is directed in a later rule (iv. 100). In the two first, there is an actual substitution of the themes *āyu* and *cakshu* for the usual *āyus* and *cakshus*; in the other we are to assume, rather, that the final of *barhis* is lost in making the *sandhi*, and we have a right to be surprised that the *pada*-text does not give us *barhiḥ-sadah*.

Here ends the second section of the second chapter: the signature is: 59 : *dvitīyasya dvitīyaḥ pādah*.

## इ उकारो दाशे परस्य मूर्धन्यः ॥ ६० ॥

60. The *visarjanīya* of *duḥ* becomes *u* before *dāça*, and the following dental is replaced by a lingual.

That is to say, *duḥ* becomes *dū*, and *dāça*, *dāca*, making *dūdāça*. The passage containing the word is cited by the commentator, as follows: *yenā dūdāçe asyasi* (i. 13. 1); and he adds *sanhitāyām ity eva: durdāça iti duḥ-dāçe*; this is the form the word would assume in the *krama*-text: the *pada* reads simply *duḥ-dāçe*. The theme of the word is rather *dūdāç* than *dūdāça*.\* The commentator says farther: *apara āha: dhānāçadāçadabhayeshu lupyeta upadhāyāç ca dirghah tavargīyasya tvavargīya iti: dūdāçah: dūdabhah: dūdhyah: ava dūdhyo jahi;* 'another says, before *dhā*, *nāça*, *dāça*, and *abha*, the *visarjanīya* is dropped, the preceding vowel is lengthened, and a lingual substituted for a dental: thus, *dūdāçah*, [*dūnāçah*], *dūdabhah*, *dūdhyah*; *ava dūdhyo jahi* (Rig-Veda i. 94. 9).' Of these words, only the one mentioned in our rule is found in the Atharvan; the others occur in the Rik, and are the subject of a rule of its Prātiçākhyā (v. 24, r. 55, cclxxi). A part of them are also noted by the Vāj. Pr. (iii. 41, 42). The Atharvan has *duḥ-naça* (v. 11. 6), but treats it according to the regular methods of combination, making *durnaça* in *sanhitā*.

## श्रुनि तकारः ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Before *çun*, it becomes *t*.

This is intended merely as an explanation of the mode of formation of the word *ducchunā*, which is accordingly to be regarded as passing through the stages *duḥ-çunā*, *duḥ-çunā*, and hence (by ii. 13, 17) *ducchunā*. Two instances of its occurrence are cited: *ducchunām grāmam* (v. 17. 4), and *tad rāshtram hanti ducchunā* (v. 19. 8). As the *pada*-text does not analyze the word, but writes it simply *ducchunā*, this rule is properly superfluous, and we have a right to wonder that it was intro-

\* It is quite probable, however, that *dāça* in the rule means, not 'the theme *dāça*,' but 'the root *dāç*.'

duced into our treatise, rather than, with Weber (p. 187, 188) to be surprised that nothing like it is found in the Vāj. Pr.

समासे सकारः कपयोरन्तःसद्यःश्रेयश्चन्दसाम् ॥ ६२ ॥

62. In a compound, it becomes *s* before *k* and *p*, excepting in the case of *antah*, *sadyah*, *çreyah*, and *chandaḥ*.

The citations given in illustration of the rule are *adhaspadam* (e. g. ii. 7. 2 : p. *adhah-padam*), *pibasphākam* (iv. 7. 3 : p. *pibah-phākam*), *namaskārena* (iv. 39. 9 : p. *namaḥ-kāreṇa*), and *yo viçvataspānir uta viçvatasprthah* (xiii. 2. 26 : p. *viçvataḥ pāṇiḥ*; *viçvataḥ-prthah*). With regard to the second of these, I would remark that its treatment by the *pada*-text, and its citation under this rule, seem to depend upon a false etymology, inasmuch as its final member is plainly not *phāka*, but *sphāka*, a word allied with *sphāna* and *sphāti*, repeatedly met with elsewhere: in the combination *pibah-sphāka*, then, the final of the first member has disappeared, according to the rule of the Rik Pr. and Vāj. Pr. (spoken of above, under ii. 40) for the loss of a *visarjanīya* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute. The commentator then cites in full the passages illustrating the exceptions, viz. *antahkoçam iva* (i. 14. 4), *antahpātre rerihatīm* (xi. 9. 15), *sadyahkriḥ* (xi. 7. 10), *çreyahketah* (v. 20. 10), and *chandaḥpakshe* (viii. 9. 12). Next follows what has the appearance of being another rule, with its commentary; *paraḥparaḥ : para itī cā "mredītasamāse na sokāro bhavati : tvat paraḥparaḥ ; "paraḥparaḥ : the visarjanīya of paraḥ also does not become s in a compound of repetition : e. g. tvat paraḥparaḥ (xii. 3. 39).*' This is not, however, regarded by the commentator as a rule, since after it, he gives, as final repetition before the next rule, our rule 62, *samāse . . . chandasām*. It is also evidently not to be reckoned as a rule, on account of its interrupting the *anuvṛtti*, or implication by inference from the preceding rule, of *visarjanīyah sakāro bhavati*, which continues to the end of the section. It must be looked upon as a *vārttika*, or secondary limitation by another hand, of the rule under which it is introduced. Respecting the propriety of its introduction, moreover, there may be question. The only other case of the kind occurring in the text is *parushparuh* (e. g. i. 12. 3), which, as we shall see, is cited by the commentator under rule 80, below : as it ought not to be if it belongs under our present rule. It may be, then, that such cases of repeated words are not regarded as distinctly enough compounded to be entitled to the unqualified name *samāsa*, 'compound.\* They seem, however, to be treated as regular compounds by the other Prātiçākhya's, and our own *pada*-text makes no distinction between them and the rest, writing *paruh-paruh* precisely like *vāta-jāḥ*, for example.

Our manuscripts are not consistent or unanimous in their mode of treatment of the class of compounds to which this rule relates, one or more of them, in several instances, retaining the final *visarjanīya* of the

\* The same thing appears from their separate mention in the fourth chapter (iv. 40), as if not included among regular compounds (iv. 9).

first member, instead of changing it into the sibilant: in a single case (*āyuhprataraṇaḥ*, iv. 10. 4), they all agree in so doing: we have, however, regarded this coincidence as accidental, and adopted in the published text the reading which the Prātiçākhyā requires.

Rule ii. 81, below, directs the conversion into *sh*, after an alterant vowel, of the dental sibilants prescribed by this and the following rules of the section.

The other treatises (R. Pr. iv. 14, r. 41, cclx; V. Pr. iii. 29; T. Pr. viii. 23) give the same general precept for the conversion of *visarjanīya* into a sibilant before *k* and *p*, and detail the exceptions in following rules.

निर्दुराविर्द्विरसमासे ऽपि ॥ ६३ ॥

63. The *visarjanīya* of *niḥ*, *duḥ*, *āvih*, and *haviḥ* becomes *s* before *k* and *p*, even elsewhere than in a compound.

The particle *duḥ* never appears in the Atharvan text except as compounded with other words, but it would seem from this rule that the compounds which it forms are not entitled to the name *samāsa*. The commentator cites as examples *dushkṛtam* (e. g. iv. 25. 4) and *dushpītam* (not found in AV.; take instead *dushpratigraha* [x. 10. 28], the only like case which the text affords): both are also given in illustration of the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (viii. 3. 41). *Dushkṛt* and *dushkṛta* are the only words in our text in which *duḥ* is followed by *k*. The preposition *niḥ* becomes *nish* before *k* only, and, excepting a single case (*nishkṛtaḥ*, ii. 34. 1), only in verbal forms and derivatives of the root *kar*: the commentator cites one of them, viz. *kushṭhas tat sarvaṁ nish karat* (v. 4. 10). But it occurs three times before *k* and *p* in the accidental combinations of the phrase (viz. *niḥ kravyādam*, xii. 2. 16 [B. I. *nish kr*°]; do. xii. 2. 42; *niḥ pṛthivyāḥ*, xvi. 7. 6), and the manuscripts almost without exception read there *niḥ*, which has been adopted in the edition as undoubtedly the true reading. *āvih* occurs only in connection with forms of the root *kar* (sometimes not immediately combined with them): the commentator instances *āvish kṛnushva rūpāni* (e. g. iv. 20. 5), and *āvish kṛnute rūpāni* (not found in AV.). *Haviḥ* becomes *haviḥ* but once, in the passage *haviḥ kṛvantāḥ parivatsarinam* (iii. 10. 5), which the commentator cites: it evidently forms here a kind of half-compound with *kar*. For this word the commentator is himself obliged to instance an exception, as follows: *tato 'pa vadati: haviḥ purodāçam*; 'from this is to be made the exception *haviḥ purodāçam* (xviii. 4. 2).' The rule is evidently not entitled to much credit as a clear and complete statement of the phenomena with which it is intended to deal.

त्रिः ॥ ६४ ॥

64. As is also that of *trih*.

The only case in the text coming under the rule is *apālām indra trish pātva* (xiv. 1. 41): the commentator cites it, and adds also *trish kratvā*,

*trish prakāreṇa*, not found in the Atharva-Veda. The Rik Pr. treats the same case in iv. 24 (r. 63, cclxxxii).

कुत्करं करत्कृणीतुकृत्कृधिष्वकर्णयोः ॥ ६५ ॥

65. As also a *visarjanīya*, except that of *karnayoh*, before *kuru*, *karam*, *karat*, *kr̥notu*, *kṛti*, and *kr̥dhi*.

The cases to which this rule is meant to apply are of very different frequency of occurrence, and the rule itself is of very different degrees of accuracy as concerns the forms mentioned. For *kuru*, the commentator cites *pitṛbhyaḥ ca namas kuru* (xiv. 2. 20), the only instance in which this rare form (found elsewhere only at xi. 9. 1, and its repetitions in the same hymn) is preceded in the *pada*-text by *visarjanīya*. For *karam* we have cited *suboddhām amutas karam* (xiv. 1. 18): also the only instance. For *karat*, the instance *sāmmanasas karat* (vii. 94. 1) is given: the text also affords *janḡidas karat* (xix. 34. 2, 10; 35. 5), and, besides this, only *nish karat* (e. g. ii. 9. 5). Under *kr̥notu*, the commentator remarks *kr̥notv ity atra tridhātve 'ti vaktavyam*, 'under *kr̥notu* it should have been noted that the change occurs only in three cases:' and he proceeds to cite the three cases, viz. *dirgham āyush kr̥notu* (vi. 78. 3), *agnish kr̥notu bhesojam* (vi. 106. 3), and *manish kr̥notu devajāh* (x. 6. 31). In all these passages, however, the manuscripts read, without dissent, *visarjanīya* before the *k*, and the edition has followed their authority (except in vi. 106. 3, where, by some oversight, *sh* has been introduced). Other instances in which *kr̥notu* has an unaltered *visarjanīya* before it are tolerably numerous,\* and nowhere among them does a single codex read *s* or *sh*. The next word, *kṛti*, is one which, for a double reason, has no right to a place in the rule: in the first place, it occurs nowhere except in compounds; and secondly, it converts into a sibilant only the preceding *visarjanīya* of *nih* and *havih*, and so would be sufficiently provided for by rule 63, even if not adjudged to fall under rule 62. The commentator cites for it *tasya tvam asi nishkr̥tiḥ* (v. 5. 4). Finally, *kr̥dhi* actually shows a marked tendency to preserve the original final sibilant of the preceding word, and does it in numerous instances: † the commentator cites two of them, viz. *anamitraṁ puras kr̥dhi* (vi. 40. 3), and *se 'mam nish kr̥dhi pūrusham* (v. 5. 4: this belongs rather under rule 63); the only exception is that noticed in the rule, and cited by the commentator, viz. *mithunam karnayoh kr̥dhi* (vi. 141. 2). Besides these, we have, of forms from the root *kar*, *tiras karah* (iv. 20. 7), which the commentator cites under rule 80, below, but which has as good a right to be specially noted in this rule as one or two other of the cases the latter contains. Not much can be said in praise of the way in which the rule is constructed.

The other Prātiçākhyas (R. Pr. iv. 15, r. 43, cclxii; V. Pr. iii. 22, 28, 31; T. Pr. viii. 25, 26) treat these cases in nearly the same way: whether with no greater accuracy, I cannot say.

\* They are vi. 40. 1, 2; 53. 3; 73. 3; 83. 1; 104. 3. vii. 32. 1; 33. 1; 51. 1; 91. 1. viii. 8. 4. ix. 2. 7; 4. 2. xi. 1. 6. xii. 1. 1, 43.

† They are i. 13. 2; 26. 4; 34. 1. v. 5. 4 (H. I. h̄k). vi. 40. 3; 74. 3; 136. 2. vii. 20. 2; 26. 3. viii. 5. 17. xix. 8. 6.

## ततस्यरौ ब्रह्मपरे ॥ ६६ ॥

66. Also the *visarjanīya* of *tataḥ* before *pari*, when the latter is followed by *brahma*.

The case referred to, and cited by the commentator, is *tatas pari brahmaṇā* (i. 10. 1). As counter-example, to show that it is only before *brahma* that the change takes place, is quoted *tataḥ pari projātena* (vi. 89. 1); one other such case is afforded by the text, but in the nineteenth book (xix. 57. 6). A similar case, in which the suffix *taḥ* becomes *tas* before *pari*, is *sindhutas pari* (iv. 10. 4 and vii. 45. 1); the Prātiçākhyā takes no notice of it, if it be not intended to be included in the *gaṇa* with which the section concludes (ii. 80).

## पञ्चम्याश्चाङ्गेभ्यःपर्यादिवर्जम् ॥ ६७ ॥

67. Also the *visarjanīya* of an ablative before *pari*, except in *aṅgebhyaḥ pari* etc.

The Rik Pr. (iv. 15) and Vāj. Pr. (iii. 30) give the additional specification that the *pari* must be at the end of a *pāda*, or before a pause, and the addition of that restriction to our own rule would have made it accurate, and obviated the necessity of the *gaṇa*. The instances and counter-instances are both tolerably numerous, and are detailed in a marginal note.\* The commentator cites, as instances, *kushṭho himavatas pari* (xix. 39. 1), *jātum himavatas pari* (iv. 9. 9 and v. 4. 2), and *vidyuto jyotishas pari* (iv. 10. 1); and, as counter-instance, the passage heading the *gaṇi*, *prāṇim aṅgebhyaḥ pary ācarantam* (ii. 34. 5). The instance first cited is the only one anywhere to be found, in the text or in the commentary of our treatise, which seems to come from the nineteenth book of the present Atharvan text: but I do not regard its occurrence as by any means to be taken for an evidence that that book constituted a part of the commentator's Atharva-Veda; it is to be explained rather as a slip of his memory in quoting, or as a reading of one of his *kushṭha* hymns, differing from that of our text.

## दिवस्पृथिव्यां सचतिवर्जम् ॥ ६८ ॥

68. Also that of *divaḥ* before *prthivī*, except when the latter is followed by the root *sac*.

The commentator cites two of the passages to which the rule relates, viz. *divas prthivyā antarikshāt samudrāt* (ix. 1. 1), and *divas prthivīm abhi ye srjanti* (iv. 27. 4). The text affords three others, viz. vi. 100. 3;

\* Cases of an ablative in *s* before *pari* at the end of a *pāda*: i. 10. 4. iv. 9. 9; 10. 1; 15. 10. v. 4. 2. vi. 111. 3. vii. 38. 2; 53. 7. viii. 4. 5. x. 1. 32. xi. 2. 4. xiv. 2. 44. xix. 39. 1, 5.

Cases of an ablative in *h* before *pari* not at the end of a *pāda*: ii. 34. 5. vi. 125. 2 (bis). vii. 56. 1. viii. 9. 4. ix. 4. 10. x. 7. 25. xiii. 1. 26. xix. 3. 1; 35. 4 (bis); 44. 8, 9; 45. 5; 57. 6.



125. 2. xix. 3. 1. The only counter-instance is that mentioned in the rule, and given in full by the commentator, viz. *â yanti divaḥ prthivīm sacante* (xii. 3. 26).

The Rik Pr. (iv. 20, r. 57, cclxxvi) adds the restriction that the conversion into the sibilant occurs only when *divaḥ* begins a *pāda*. This would be correct also, if made a part of our own rule. The other two treatises do not apparently note any such cases as occurring in their texts.

पृष्ठे च ङ ६१ ॥

69. As also before *prsthā*.

The commentator cites a single case, *divas prsthē dhāvamānaṁ sumpnam* (xiii. 2. 37). The others are iv. 14. 2. xi. 5. 10. xii. 2. 12. xiii. 4. i. xviii. 1. 61. To show that only *divaḥ* is subject to this change of its final before *prsthā*, the commentator instances *bhūmyāḥ prsthē vada* (v. 20. 6).

The original sibilant of *divas* also maintains itself before *p* in two other cases, viz. *divas putrāu* (viii. 7. 20) and *divas payaḥ* (xix. 44. 5). With the latter our treatise has nothing to do; the former it lets fall, apparently, into the *barathrum* of the *gaṇa* which closes the subject and the section (rule 80).

Compare Rik Pr. iv. 22 (r. 61, cclxxx), and Vāj. Pr. iii. 23.

यः पतौ गवामस्याःपरवर्जम् ॥७० ॥

70. Also that of *yaḥ* before *pati*, except when *gavām* and *asyāḥ* precede.

Nearly all the passages of the text to which the rule relates are cited by the commentator; they are *divyo gandharvo bhuvanasya yas patiḥ* (ii. 2. 1), *nr̥ḍād gandharvo bhuvanasya yas patiḥ* (ii. 2. 2), and *dhātā vidhātā bhuvanasya yas patiḥ* (v. 3. 9): to be added are only *bharishyad bhuvanasya yas patiḥ* (xiii. 3. 7), and *yāni cakāra bhuvanasya yas patiḥ* (xix. 20. 2). The exceptions are also cited, as follows: *gavām yaḥ patiḥ* (ix. 4. 17), and *dirghāyur asyā yaḥ patiḥ* (xiv. 2. 2). One cannot but think that a better form for the closing restriction of the rule would have been "whenever *bhuvanasya* precedes."

These cases are not distinguished by the Rik Pr. and Vāj. Pr. from those coming under our next rule.

षष्ठाश्चाशच्याः ॥७१ ॥

71. Also the *visarjanīya* of a genitive, excepting that of *ṣacyāḥ*, becomes *s* before *pati*.

The cases coming under this rule are almost innumerable, and it would be a waste of labor to specify them in full. The commentator cites four, viz. *vācas patiḥ* (e. g. i. 1. 1), *ushas patiḥ* (xvi. 6. 6), *brahmaṇas patiḥ* (e. g. vi. 4. 1), and *jagatas patiḥ* (vii. 17. 1). The only exception is that

which the rule mentions; the commentator cites it: *arâtyâh çaryâh patih* (xiii. 4. 47).

The other treatises bring together all the cases of conversion into a sibilant before *pati*, and give their rules a more empirical form (see R. Pr. iv. 15, r. 42, cclxi; V. Pr. iii. 34; T. Pr. viii. 27).

इडायास्पदे ॥ ७२ ॥

72. Also that of *idâyâh* before *pada*.

The passage is *idâyâs padam* (iii. 10. 6). The commentator gives a counter-instance—*hustinyâh padena* (vi. 70. 2)—to show that only the genitive *idâyâh* undergoes this change before *pada*.

That the rule is not so framed as to include also the closely analogous case *idas pade* (vi. 63. 4), the only other one in the text where an original final sibilant is preserved before *pada*, gives reason to suspect that the verse containing it was not in the commentator's Atharvan: a suspicion which is supported by the peculiar mode of occurrence of the verse, at the end of a hymn with the subject of which it has nothing to do. It looks as if it had been thrust in at the end of vi. 63, because in the Rik text (x. 191) it preceded the verses of which vi. 64 is composed.

Compare Rik Pr. iv. 17 (r. 49, cclxviii), and Vâj. Pr. iii. 22, which note both the cases.

पितुः पितरि ॥ ७३ ॥

73. Also that of *pituh* before *pitar*.

The commentator cites *yas tâni veda sa pitush pitâ 'sat* (ii. 1. 2), and a similar phrase is found once more in the text (at ix. 9. 15). On the other hand, we have three cases in the eighteenth book (xviii. 2. 49; 3. 46, 59) in which *pituh* stands before *pitarah*, and, by the unanimous authority of the manuscripts, maintains its *visarjaniya*. We must suppose either that the Prâtiçâkhyâ and its commentator overlooked these passages, or that they did not stand in the text contemplated by them, or that they stood there with the reading *pitush pitarah*.

The Rik Pr. notes a similar case at iv. 25 (r. 64, cclxxxiii).

द्यौश्च ॥ ७४ ॥

74. As also that of *dyâuh*, in the same situation.

The commentator instances *dyâush pitar yâvaya* (vi. 4. 3\*), and

\* The manuscripts vary somewhat in their reading of these words, both as regards the sibilant and the accentuation: only I. gives the *sh* which the Prâtiçâkhyâ requires; the rest have *h*. Bp and I. accent *dyâ'ush*, the others *dy'âush*. There can be no question that the latter is the true method: the word must be divided into two syllables in reading, and the vocative accent of an initial syllable belongs only to the former of the two: thus, *dî'âush*; which, when written together as a single syllable, becomes, of course, *dy'âush*. One or two other like cases are found in the text.

*dyaush pitar nyaññ adharāñ* (not found in AV.). At iii. 9. 1, where the two words occur again in connection, all the MSS. excepting I. and H. give *dyāush*, and the edition reads the same. At iii. 23. 6, every codex presents *dyāuḥ*, which was accordingly received into the edited text: and the same reading was adopted at viii. 7. 2, where the same line occurs again, although two of the MSS. (W. and I.) there have *dyāush*. It might have been better, considering the discordance of the manuscripts, and the consequent inferior weight of their authority, to allow the Prātiçākhyā to determine the reading of all these passages.

Like cases occurring in the Rik and Vājasaneyi are treated in their Prātiçākhyas (R. Pr. iv. 23, 24; V. Pr. iii. 33).

आयुः प्रथमे ॥ ७५ ॥

75. Also that of *āyuh* before *prathama*.

The passage is cited by the commentator: *āyush prathamam prajām posham* (iv. 39. 2, 4, 6, 8), but, in every case of its occurrence, the manuscripts read without dissent *āyuh*. The edition, however, has in this instance followed the authority of the Prātiçākhyā.

प्रे मुषिञ्जीवपरे ॥ ७६ ॥

76. As also before *pra*, when followed by the roots *mush* or *jīv*.

The two passages to which the rule relates are *mā na āyush pra mo-shñh* (viii. 2. 17), and *dirgham āyush pra jīvase* (xviii. 2. 3). In both passages, however, all the manuscripts read *āyuh*—as does our own commentary, in citing them—and the printed text does the same. As counter-example, the commentator brings forward *jivānām āyuh pra tira* (xii. 2. 45); other cases are viii. 2. 2 (where P. reads *āyush* both times) and xix. 32. 3.

परिधिः पताती ॥ ७७ ॥

77. Also that of *paridhiḥ* before *patāti*.

The passage is *yathā so asya paridhiḥ patāti* (v. 29. 2, 3), and the manuscripts are unanimous in supporting the reading prescribed by the Prātiçākhyā.

निवतस्पृणाती ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Also that of *nivataḥ* before *prñāti*.

That is, in the passage *yā viçvā nivatas prñāti* (vi. 22. 3), as is read by all the MSS.

मनस्यापि ॥ ७९ ॥

79. Also that of *manah* before *pāpa*.

The commentary cites the passage: *paro 'pe 'hi manaspâpa* (vi. 45. 1). The *pada*-text regards *manaspâpa* as a compound, writing it *manah-pâpa*. Its separate mention by the Prâtiçâkhyâ would seem to indicate that the latter regards the two words as independent; since, as a compound, it would fall under rule 62, and would need no special notice. The accentuation does not help to settle the question, and the sense is nearly as good one way as the other.

## रायस्योषादिषु च ॥ ८० ॥

80. Also that in *râyasposha* etc.

Under this rule, the commentator instances only three cases, viz. *râyas posham* (e. g. i. 9. 4), *parush paruh* (e. g. i. 12. 3), and *mâ piçacâm tiras karah* (iv. 20. 7): the latter has been already remarked upon, as not less entitled to be included in rule 65 than some of the cases to which that rule relates. There are to be found in the text quite a number of other like cases, not provided for in any of the foregoing rules; they are as follows: *divas putrâu* (viii. 7. 20) and *divas payah* (xix. 44. 5), already spoken of under rule 69; *idas pade* (vi. 63. 4), referred to under rule 72; *adhamas padishâ* (viii. 4. 16: see R. Pr. iv. 20); *dvishatas pâdayâmi* (xi. 1. 12, 21); *âpas putrâsoh* (xii. 3. 4) and *mahas putrâsoh* (xviii. 1. 2), of which the latter is a Rik passage, and noted in its Prâtiçâkhyâ (iv. 21); *rajas prthu* (xiii. 2. 22: see R. Pr. iv. 19); and *çiras krtam* (xiii. 4. 40). In all these passages, the testimony of the manuscripts is unanimous in favor of the sibilant: in iv. 34. 8, a part of them (P. M. W. E) read *dhenush kâmodughâ*; and in more than one instance elsewhere, one or two manuscripts give a *s* or *sh*, instead of *visarjaniya*, before an initial *p* or *k*. Unfortunately, it is impossible to tell what is the teaching of the Prâtiçâkhyâ with regard to any such cases; we do not even know how accurately it or its commentators had noticed and noted the instances which their text contained. There is no apparent reason why the single cases noted in rules 66, 72, 77, 78, 79 should not have been left to go into the *gana*, if a *gana* was to be established, and neither the accuracy nor the method of the treatise, in dealing with this class of phenomena, is worthy of unqualified commendation.

The eightieth rule ends the section, of which the signature is: 80: *dvitīyasya trītiyāḥ pādāḥ*.

## अत्र नाम्युपधस्य षकारः ॥ ८१ ॥

81. In all these cases, *s* becomes *sh*, when preceded by an alterant vowel.

The commentator says: *yad etat: samāse sakāroḥ kapayor ananta ity anukrāntāḥ: atra nām्यupadhasya sakārasya shakāro bhavati: etāny eva 'dāharānāni: nām्यupadhasye 'ti drashtavyam: ita uttarām yad anukramishyāmah;* 'the meaning is that, from the rule "in a compound" etc. [ii. 62] onward, in every case, a *s* preceded by an alterant vowel becomes *sh*: the illustrative instances are those already given:

the specification "when preceded by an alterant vowel" continues in force, as we go on farther from this point.' That is to say, the action of the present rule is retrospective as well as prospective, and extends to all the cases in which the conversion of *visarjaniya* to *s* takes place according to the rules of the preceding section, as also to the cases which are now farther to be specified; and that, whether the *s* to which the rules relate is original, or comes from *visarjaniya* by rule ii. 40 etc. The subject of this whole section is the *nati* of the dental sibilant, or its conversion into the lingual, *sh*. The same phenomenon is treated in Rik Pr. v. 1-19, Vâj. Pr. iii. 55-82, and Tâitt. Pr. vi. 1-14. The grouping of the cases is so different in the different treatises that any detailed comparison of rule with rule is only occasionally and partially practicable.

सहः साङ्भूतस्य ॥ ८२ ॥

82. Also in the root *sah*, when it takes the form *sât*.

The commentator cites, as cases coming under this rule, *turâshât* (ii. 5. 3), *prâshât* (not in AV.), *prtamâshât* (e. g. v. 14. 8). *çatrûshân nishât* (v. 20. 11), *abhîshâd asmî viçvâshât* (xii. 1. 54). As counter-example, to show that it is only when *sah* becomes *sât* that the change of sibilant takes place, he instances *prasahanam*, which is not found in our text. That *sâdbhûta* means 'when it becomes *sât*,' and not 'when it becomes *sâh*,' appears from the instances *amûtrasâha* and *sâtrâsâha* (see under iii. 23), in which, although the vowel of the root is lengthened, the sibilant remains unaltered. If *ashâdha* occurred in any earlier book than the nineteenth (it is found only at xix. 7. 4), the rule would have to be altered, or else *sâd* in *sâdbhûta* would have to be understood as meaning both *sâd* (*sât*) and *sâdh*. There is no real necessity for any such rule as this, since all the words to which the commentary regards it as relating have precisely the same form in *pada* as in *sankhitâ*. But there is a graver objection to the rule than its dispensability: it is quite out of place where it stands. In the first place, it treats of an initial *s*, while the treatise otherwise puts off such cases until after all those of a final *s* are disposed of; and, much worse, it interrupts the *anuvṛtti* of *nâmyupadhasya*, which must necessarily take place from rule 81 to those that follow; since, in the majority of the cases which it concerns, the sibilant is preceded by long *â*. Either there is here an unusual degree of awkwardness and inconsistency of method on the part of the author of the treatise, or the rule is an interpolation.

The later rules iii. 1 and iv. 70, which deal with the same irregularly formed words from different aspects, are to be compared.

तद्धिते तकारादौ ॥ ८३ ॥

83. Also before a *taddhita*-suffix beginning with *t*.

As instances, the commentator first gives *sarpishtaram*, *yajushtaram*, *vapushtaram*—not one of which words occurs in the Atharvan, while the first two are found as examples under the corresponding rule of

Pânini (viii. 3. 101)—and then *vapushtamam* (*vapushtame*, p. *vapuḥ-tame*, v. 5. 6; I have noted no other similar case in the text). As counter-example, to show the necessity of the restriction “before a *taddhita*-suffix,” he cites *agnis takmânânam* (v. 22. 1); to show that of “beginning with *t*,” he gives *sarpissât*, *yajussât*, *vapussât*, which are not in the Atharvan, while the first of them, again, is an example under Pânini’s rule just referred to.

The corresponding rule of the Rik Pr. is at v. 16 (r. 31, cccxlviii), and Tâit. Pr. vi. 5 includes one or two similar cases. Neither, however, gives a grammatical definition of the phenomenon, like that of our treatise.

## युष्मददेशे तैस्त्वमादिवर्जम् ॥ ८४ ॥

84. Also before forms of the second personal pronoun, excepting in *tâis tvam* etc.

Those forms used as “substitutes for *yushmat*,” or as cases of the pronoun of the second person, before which the conversion of final *s* into *sh* takes place in the Atharvan, are *tvam*, *tvâ*, and *te*: the cases are enumerated below.\* The commentator cites, as instances, five of them, viz. *bâhish te astu* (i. 3. 1 etc.), *ṛtubhish tvâ vayam* (i. 35. 4), *dyâush tvâ pitâ* (ii. 28. 4), *tâbhish tvam asmân* (ix. 2. 25), and *tâish te rohitoh* (xiii. 1. 35). As examples from the *gana* of exceptions, he offers *tâis tvam putram* (iii. 23. 4), *vadhriḥ tvam* (iv. 6. 8), and *pavastâis tvâ* (iv. 7. 6). This *gana* I have not thought it worth while to take the trouble to fill up, deeming it of more interest to give the complete list of the cases in which the change of the sibilant did, rather than of those in which it did not, take place. The former are, I believe, the more numerous of the two classes.

## तत्तानग्रादिषु च ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Also before *tat*, *tân agra*, etc.

The forms of the third personal, or demonstrative, pronoun before which a final *s*, after an alterant vowel, is converted into *sh*, are *tam*, *tat*, and *tân*. The cases, which are not numerous, are detailed below.† The commentator cites four of them, viz. *agnish tad dhotâ* (e. g. vi. 71. 1), *agnish tân agre* (ii. 34. 3), *vâyush tân agre* (ii. 34. 4), and *nish tam bhaja*

\* Before *tvam*: ix. 2. 25. xi. 9. 6. Before *tvâ*: i. 22. 3; 35. 4. ii. 28. 4. iii. 29. 8. v. 28. 5, 13. xiv. 2. 59–62. xviii. 4. 9. xix. 27. 1 (*bis*); 34. 6; 37. 4; 46. 1. Before *te*: i. 3. 1–5. ii. 13. 4; 29. 6. iv. 6. 6. v. 25. 9; 28. 5. vi. 92. 3; 111. 2. vii. 53. 2; 74. 3. viii. 2. 13. ix. 4. 10. x. 9. 2. xii. 1. 18. xiii. 1. 35. xiv. 2. 3. xviii. 4. 9, 15. xx. 133. 2. At iii. 10. 10, all the *sanhitâ* MSS., without exception, give *ṛtubhyash tvâ*, which was deemed however, much too anomalous and unsupported a reading to be received into the edited text.

† Before *tam*: iv. 22. 2. Before *tat*: i. 32. 2. vi. 71. 1, 2. vii. 53. 3. x. 9. 26. xviii. 3. 55. xix. 59. 2. Before *tân*: ii. 34. 3, 4. xviii. 2. 28. There is a single case, moreover, in which all the *sanhitâ* MSS. read *sh* after *a*: viz. *nash tebhish*, ii. 35. 2; but this reading has been rejected in the edition, as an evident blunder, apparently growing out of a confusion with the participle *nashtebhish*.

(iv. 22. 2). He also adds two examples of another class, viz. *dushtano* (p. *dustano ili duḥ tano*: iv. 7. 3), and *nishṭakvarīm* (p. *niḥ-takvarīm*: v. 22. 6). The rule must be meant also to include *gobhish ṭarema* (vii. 50. 7). The word *dushtara* (vi. 4. 1) would seem to come properly under it, but its treatment by the *pada*-texts (it is written *dustara*, not *duḥ-tara*) indicates, I should think, that the Hindus regarded it as an irregular compound of *duḥ* and *stara*, from the root *star* (*str*); hence it would fall under the next rule, or else under rule 98.

## स्तृत्स्वस्वपिषु ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Also before *str̥ta*, *sva*, and the root *svap*.

But three cases occur under this rule, one for each of the words mentioned in it: they are *anishṭr̥taḥ* (p. *aniḥ-str̥taḥ*: vii. 82. 3), *nishva* (p. *niḥ:sva*: vi. 121. 1 and vii. 83. 4), and the frequently occurring *dushvapnyam* (p. *duḥ-svapnyam*: e. g. vi. 46. 3), with which goes its derivative *dāushvapnyam* (p. *dāuḥ-svapnyam*: iv. 17. 5). The commentator cites them all, excepting the last; the second of them he gives in its connection, thus: *duritām nishvā 'smat*. All these words\* have in the edited text been written in a similar manner, with but a single sibilant, as I have here cited them, and as they are given by the commentary in our manuscript. This does not, however, appear to be the way in which the Prāṭicākhya intends that they should be written, for it prescribes that the final *visarjaniya* or sibilant should be converted into *sh* before the initial *s*; not that there should be a dropping out of either sibilant. Yet the Prāṭicākhya also is defective as regards its treatment of them; for, while it has directed above (ii. 16) that a dental mute (*lavaryiḥ*) be converted into a lingual after final *sh* in the preceding word, it has given no such rule respecting the dental sibilant. If we follow our treatise, then, implicitly, we shall write *anishṭr̥taḥ*, *nish svā*, *dushsvapnyam*, which are barbarous and impossible forms. The manuscripts write, without dissent, *anishṭr̥taḥ* and *nishva*; as regards *dushvapnyā*, their usage is very irregular; they vary with the utmost inconsistency between that form and *duḥshvapnyā*, in no single instance writing *dushshvapnyā*. While, therefore, we are compelled to look upon *anishṭr̥taḥ*, *nish svā*, and *dushshvapnyam* as the forms which the Prāṭicākhya intends to sanction, we cannot but hold the editors justified in following for the two former cases the unanimous authority of the MSS., and in making the third conform to them. To *dushtara* reference has been made under the preceding rule, as a case akin with these, but differently treated, in that one of the two sibilants has been rejected: on account of this irregularity, doubtless, it is treated as an anomalous case by the *pada*-text, and left undivided.

The Vāj. Pr. (iii. 71) adopts and sanctions the form *duḥshvapnyā*: the Rik Pr. (v. 1, r. 1, cccviii) requires, like our treatise, *dushshvapnyā*, although the manuscripts, as noticed by Müller, usually read *dushvapnyā*.

\* Except in the passage vi. 121. 1, where the edition, by a reprehensible inconsistency, reads *niḥ svā*.

## नामिकरेफात्प्रत्ययसकारस्य ॥ ८७ ॥

87. Also the *s* of a suffix, after an alterant vowel, *k*, or *r*.

This rule, like the corresponding one in the Vâj. Pr. (iii. 57), is not precisely in place in a Prâtiçâkhya, which has nothing to do with the processes of derivation in connection with which its application must be made: hence the other two treatises present nothing analogous to it. The commentator illustrates it by citing *phâlâj jâtaḥ karishyati* (x. 6. 2), *iyakshamâṇâ bhṛgubhiḥ* (iv. 14. 5), and *havishâ* " *hârsham enam* (iii. 11. 3). He explains *ka* in the rule by *kavargât*, 'after a guttural,' probably in view of the requirement of some authorities (see under ii. 6) that the *k* should become *kh* before the sibilant.

## स्त्रैष्यम् ॥ ८८ ॥

88. Also that of *strâishûya*.

This word occurs but once in the text, in a passage cited by the commentator: *strâishûyam anyatra* (vi. 11. 3: p. *strâishûyam*). Why, among the words mentioned in iv. 83, it should be singled out to be made thus the subject of a special rule, is not at all clear. The position of the rule, too, thrust in between the two closely related rules 87 and 89, and disturbing their connection, is in a high degree awkward, and calculated to inspire suspicions of an interpolation.

## नलोपि ऽपि ॥ ८९ ॥

89. Even when a *n* has been lost.

This rule attaches itself immediately and closely to rule 87, from which it has been blunderingly separated by the intrusion of rule 88. It is intended to apply to such cases as *yajûnshi*, *haviṅshi*, where, by ii. 34, there has been a loss of *n* before the ending *si*, accompanied, by i. 67, with nasalization of the preceding vowel, when the ending itself is converted into *shi* after the alterant vowel, although the latter is nasal. Among the other treatises, the Vâj. Pr. (iii. 56) alone gives a similar precept. The illustrative citations of the commentator are the same which he has already twice before given, under i. 84 and ii. 34.

## उपसर्गाद्गतोः ॥ ९० ॥

90. Also that of a root, after a preposition.

This is a very general precept, and the instances of its application in the text, in forms of conjugation and of derivation, are quite numerous. The commentator selects as illustrations but two: *vrksham yad gâvah parishasvajânâ anusphuram* (i. 2. 3: p. *pari-sasvajânâḥ*; *anusphuram* is an exception to the rule, akin with those detailed in rule 102, below), and *vishitân te vastibilam* (i. 3. 8: p. *vi-sitam*). As counter-examples, to show that it is only after a preposition that the initial *s* of a root is



regularly converted into *sh*, the commentator fabricates a couple of cases, viz. *dadhi siñcati*, *madhu siñcati*; the former of them appears also among the counter-examples under the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (viii. 3. 65). The proper exceptions to the rule are detailed below, in rules 102-107.

The Tāitt. Pr. (vi. 4) has a general rule like this of our own treatise, for the change of an initial *s* after a preposition: the other two Prātiçākhyas rehearse the cases in detail (see R. Pr. v. 4-10; V. Pr. iii. 58-70).

### अभ्यासाच्च ॥ ११ ॥

91. As also after a reduplication.

The commentator is more than usually liberal in his citations under this rule; he gives us *sushūdata* (i. 26. 4), *abhi sishyade* (v. 5. 9), *ā su-shvayantī* (v. 12. 6; 27. 8), *sishāsavaḥ sishāsatha* (vi. 21. 3), *tat sishāsati* (xiii. 2. 14), and *sushuve* (xiv. 1. 43). In all these cases, as in all others of the same kind which the text affords, the *pada*-text gives the dental sibilant unchanged; thus, *susūdata*, *sisyade*, etc.

This class of cases is not treated by itself in the other Prātiçākhyas.

### स्यासहिसिचीनामकारव्यवाये ऽपि ॥ १२ ॥

92. And that of the roots *sthā*, *saḥ*, and *sic*, even when an *a* is interposed.

There is, owing to the imperfection of our manuscript, a slight doubt as to the precise reading of this rule, the copyist, as in one or two other cases which we have already had occasion to notice, having skipped a line of his original, or from one *kāra* to another and later one, whereby we have lost part of the original statement of the rule and nearly the whole of its paraphrase; the final repetition of the rule before the one following being also slightly defective. I restore the mutilated passages conjecturally as follows, noting within brackets the parts supposed to be omitted: *sthāsahisicinām akāra*[*vyavāye 'pi*: *sthāsahisicinām upa-sargasthān nimittād akāravavyavāye 'pi dhātusakāra*] *syā shakāro bhavati*: ..... *sthāsahisicinām akāravavyavā*[*ye*] *'py abhyāsavyavāye 'pi sthāh*.

Of the cases to which the rule relates, the commentator instances three; viz. *abhy ashthām viçvāḥ* (x. 5. 36 and xvi. 9. 1), *tena devā vy ashahanta* (iii. 10. 12), *yenā 'kshā abhyashicyante* (xiv. 1. 36). For the root *sthā* the text affords us two other examples, *adhy ashthāt* (x. 10. 13) and *adhy ashthām* (xii. 1. 11). These are actually all the cases occurring in the Atharvan in which the three roots named in the rule are preceded by prepositions ending in alterant vowels, with interposition of the augment—except the anomalous form *vy āsthan* (xiii. 1. 5), where the irregular initial *ā* is read in *pada* as well as in *sanhitā*, and which does not come under the present rule, since there is an interposition of *ākāra*, not *akāra*.

Similar cases are noted by the other treatises (see V. Pr. iii. 64; T. Pr. vi. 3).

## अभ्यासव्यवाये ञि स्यः ॥ १३ ॥

93. And that of the root *sthâ*, even when the reduplication is interposed.

Two cases are cited by the commentator under this rule, viz. *sapta sindhavo vitashthire* (iv. 6. 2), and *brahma pururûpam vi tashthe* (ix. 10. 19). In the latter passage, the edition gives erroneously *vi tasthe*: two of the manuscripts (W. and E.) read *vi cshthe*; the others have, correctly, *vi tashthe* (or, by a carelessness very common in the codices, *vi tushthe*: E., for instance, never distinguishes *shth* and *shṭ* from one another): the *pada*-text presents *vi : tasthe*. We have in two other passages (ix. 9. 2. xiv. 2. 9) *adhi tashuh* (not *tashihuh*); this apparently constitutes an exception to the rule which has escaped the notice both of the treatise and of the commentator: possibly, however, the *adhi* is not in these passages regarded as standing in the relation of *upasarga* to the root *sthâ*, since it does, in fact, belong rather, in a prepositional relation, to preceding ablative cases, than to the verbal form as its prefix: and this is the more clearly indicated by its retaining its independent accent before the accented verb.

## परमेभ्यो ञ्नापाक्ते ॥ १४ ॥

94. As also after *parama* etc.; but not after *âpâka*.

The commentator's explanatory paraphrase is as follows: *paramâdibhyah pûrvapadebhyah anâpâke uttaropadasthasya sakârasya shokâro bhavati*; 'after *parama* etc., as former members of a compound, excepting *âpâke*, the *s* of the second members of the compound becomes *sh*.' This does not, in terms, restrict the rule to cases of the root *sthâ* in composition, implying an *anuvrtti* of *sthah* from the preceding rule: yet we can hardly doubt that it is properly to be so restricted, and the commentator himself gives examples only from the root *sthâ*: they are *parameshthi* (e. g. iv. 11. 7: p. *parame-sthi*), *bhuvaneshthâh* (ii. 1. 4: p. *bhuvane-sthâh*), *madhyameshthâh* (ii. 6. 4: p. *madhyame-sthâh*), and *añgeshthâh* (vi. 14. 1: p. *añge-sthâh*). The exception, as noted by him, is *âpâkesthâh prahâsinah* (viii. 6. 14: p. *âpâke-sthâh*). These are all the words in which *sthâ* is compounded with a locative ending in *e*; and, considering the form of the rule, it is probable that only such compounds were intended to be included under it: if the other compounds in which the *s* of *sthâ* is lingualized (viz. *rayishthâ*, *rayishthâna*, *giri-shthâ*, *pathishthâ*, *goshthâ*, and *gavishthâra*—of which the last is read in *pada* as in *sankhitâ*, while the others are separated, with restoration of the dental sibilant) had also been aimed at, the exception *bhûrishthâtra* (iv. 30. 2: p. *bhûri-sthâtra*) would likewise have required notice.

The form of statement of the *guna*, *paramebhyah* instead of *paramâdibhyah*, is quite peculiar.

## अप्रसव्याभ्यां च ॥ १५ ॥

95. As also after *apa* and *savya*.

There is still *anuvṛtti* of *sthaḥ*: the *s* of the root *sthá* becomes *sh* after *apa* and *savya*. The cases are separately noticed, because in them the change takes place irregularly after *a*, instead of after an alterant vowel. The commentator cites the two passages: *apāshthāc chr̥ngát* (iv. 6. 5 : p. *apāshthāt*), and *savyashthāc candramāḥ* (viii. 8. 23 : p. *savya-sthāḥ*).

अग्नेः स्तोमसोमयोः ॥ १६ ॥

96. Also that of *stoma* and *soma* after *agnī*.

The commentator instances *yāvad agnishtomena* (ix. 6. 40 : p. *agni-stomena*), and *agnishomāv adadhuh* (viii. 9. 14 : p. *agnishomāu*). As was the case with the last rule, the two words to which the precept relates are of different character, the one necessarily requiring the rule, in order to determine its *sanhitā* reading, while the other might have been safely left unnoticed by the Prātiçākhyā. There is yet another case in the Atharvan text, which would seem to call for inclusion in this rule: it is *agnishvāttāḥ* (xviii. 3. 44 : p. *agni-svāttāḥ*). We can hardly suppose that it was intentionally omitted here, to be included in the *gaṇa* of rule 98, below: either it must have been overlooked by the maker of the treatise, or the verse which contains it (it is also a Rik verse; see RV. x. 15. 11) was not in his Atharva-Veda: that it was, however, contained in the text recognized by the commentator, is shown by the fact that he several times (under i. 80, 84 and ii. 34) cites the phrase *atto havīṅshi*, which forms part of its second line.

The commentator gives, as counter-example, *abhi somo avivṛdhat* (i. 29. 3).

सुजः ॥ १७ ॥

97. Also that of *su*.

The commentary furnishes the following examples: *idam ū shu* (i. 24. 4), *tad ū shu* (v. 1. 5), *mahim ū shu* (vii. 6. 2), *anya ū shu* (xviii. 1. 16), *stusha u shu* (xviii. 1. 37), and *tyam ū shu* (vii. 85. 1). Other cases are: after *ū*, v. 6. 4; after *u* (the same particle not lengthened), vii. 73. 7; after *mo*, v. 11. 7. xviii. 3. 62; after *evo*, vi. 84. 3; after *o*, vii. 72. 2; after *vidmo*, i. 2. 1. These are all the instances in which *su* follows in the Atharvan the particle *u*, or a word whose final is combined with the latter. On the other hand, in the only passage in the text (*prthivi su*: xviii. 3. 51) in which it follows an alterant vowel of another character, it remains unchanged. Our rule, then, is defective, and should have been restricted either by the specification of the alterant vowels to which the effect upon *su* is limited, or by a mention of the exception. The other treatises are less general, and hence, it may be presumed, more accurate, in their treatment of the change of this particle (see R. Pr. v. 2, 3; V. Pr. iii. 59, 60, 61; T. Pr. vi. 2).

आदिभ्यः ॥ १८ ॥

98. Also after *tri* etc.

Here is another of those convenient *gaṇas*, set as a catch-all for whatever cases may not have been otherwise provided for, and rendering it impossible for us to ascertain the precise degree of accuracy with which the authors of the treatise examined and excerpted their text. The commentator cites three passages, *ye trishaptāḥ* (i. 1. 1 : p. *tri-saptāḥ*), *goshedhām* (i. 18. 4 : p. *go-sedhām*), and *raghushyado dhi* (iii. 7. 1 : p. *raghu-syadaḥ*) : he also, in his paraphrase, limits the application of the rule to cases of this character, in which an alterant vowel at the end of the first member of a compound comes before an initial *s* of the following member. Of such cases, besides those falling under rule 90, above, and those which are specially referred to in the rules preceding and following this, or which are mentioned in connection with them, I have noted in the Atharvan text the following : *dhr̥shṇushena* (v. 20. 9 : p. *dhr̥shṇu-sena*), *sushtuti* (e. g. vi. 1. 3 : p. *su-stuti*), *purushtutu* (vi. 2. 3 : p. *puru-stuta*), *r̥shishtuta* (vi. 108. 2 : p. *r̥shi-stuta*), *gab̥hishak* (vii. 7. 1 : p. *gab̥hi-sak*), *pr̥thushṭuka* (vii. 46. 1 : p. *pr̥thu-stuka*), *sushūman* (vii. 46. 2 : p. *su-sūman*), *anushtup* (e. g. viii. 9. 14 : p. *anu-stup*), *trishṭup* (e. g. viii. 9. 14 : p. *tri-stup*), *tr̥āishtubha* (ix. 10. 1 : p. *tr̥āistubha*), *trishandhi* (e. g. xi. 9. 23 : p. *tri-sandhi*), *r̥ātishāc* (e. g. xviii. 3. 20 : p. *r̥āti-sāc*), and *divishṭambha* (xix. 32. 7). Exceptions will be given below, under rule 103.

ऋकारान्तात्सदेः ॥ ११ ॥

99. Also that of the root *sad*, after a word ending in *r̥*.

The commentator instances *hotrshadanam* (vii. 99. 1 : p. *hotr-sadanam*), and *pit̥rshadanāḥ pit̥rshadane tvā* (xviii. 4. 67 : p. *pit̥r-sadanāḥ* etc.). To these may be added *pit̥rshad* (xiv. 2. 33 : p. *pit̥r-sad*) ; and in *nārshada* (iv. 19. 2 : p. *nārsada*) is also implied *n̄rshad*.

बर्हिषथ्यप्सुदिविपृथिवीति च ॥ १०० ॥

100. As also after *barhi*, *pathi*, *apsu*, *divi*, and *pr̥thivi*.

The instances are, as cited in the commentary, *barhishadaḥ pitaraḥ* (xviii. 1. 51 : p. *barhi-sadaḥ*), *pathishadī n̄r̥cakshasā* (xviii. 2. 12 : p. *pathisadī iti pathi-sadī*), *apsushado py agnīn* (xii. 2. 4 : p. *apsu-sadaḥ*), *ye devā divishadaḥ* (x. 9. 12 : p. *divi-sadaḥ*), and *pr̥thivishadbhyaḥ* (xviii. 4. 78 : p. *pr̥thivisat-bhyaḥ*).

We have reason to be surprised that the root *sad* is treated in this manner, being made the subject of these two separate rules. If the compounds into which it enters as final member are to be excepted from the general *gaṇa* of rule 98, we should expect to find it directed that the *s* of *sad* should always be lingualized after an alterant vowel, as is actually the case. Not only is there, by the method adopted, a loss of that brevity which treatises of the *sūtra* class are wont to aim at almost as their chief object, but there is also a loss of completeness: the only remaining compound of *sad* of this class, *sushad* (e. g. ii. 36. 4), is left out, to be provided for in the general *gaṇa*. Or is it possible that *su* is regarded as falling under rule 90, as if a proper *uposarga* or preposi-

tion? If so, the forms into which it enters would be sufficiently provided for; since, excepting in the cases noted in the later rules (102 etc.), it always lingualizes the initial *s* of a root, while it has no effect upon that of a preposition or adverb, as in *susaha* (vi. 64. 3: p. *su-saha*) and the numerous compounds in which it is followed by *sam*, as *susam-rabdha*.

## ह्रिदिविभ्यामस्तेः ॥ १०१ ॥

101. Also that of the root *as* after *hi* and *divi*.

The commentator cites two of the cases falling under this rule, viz. *āpo hi śhṭhā* (i. 5. 1), and *ye devā divi śhṭha* (i. 30. 3): to which I add *divi śhan* (xvii. 12 and xviii. 4. 59). The commentator then notes an exception which had escaped the authors of the treatise—prefacing it with *tato 'pa vadati*, 'from this rule is made the exception'—*vimuco hi santi* (vi. 112. 3): it is, in fact, the only case of the kind which the text affords—unless *hi satyāḥ* (i. 10. 1) is to be regarded as also falling under the rule, *satya* being an evident and acknowledged derivative from the root *as*.

Thus ends the Prātiçākhyā's tale of the conversions of final or initial *s* into *śh*; what remains of the chapter is only a rehearsal in detail of exceptions to the rules already given. But there are still left in the Atharvan text a few instances of the same conversion, which can hardly be regarded as included in any of the preceding rules, since they are analogous with none of the other cases there treated of: unless something has been lost from this final section of the chapter—of which there are no indications—the treatise-makers and their commentator must lie under the imputation of having been careless enough to overlook them. The passages referred to are as follows: *ād u śhṭenam* (iv. 3. 4), *tam u śhṭuḥi* (vi. 1. 2), *nī śha hīyatām* (viii. 4. 10), and *cid dhi śhmā* (xviii. 1. 33). There would be little plausibility in a claim that the verses containing these passages were not included in the Atharva-Veda accepted by the school to which the treatise belonged, or that the readings of the school were different. And certainly, neither of these things could be maintained with regard to *svaṛśāḥ* (v. 2. 8: p. *svaḥ-sāḥ*), since the conversion of the final *visarjanīya* of its *svaḥ* into *r* has already been made the subject of a special rule, while nevertheless the Prātiçākhyā contains no precept directing us to read it otherwise than *svaṛśāḥ*. The word would fall under the analogy of rule 87, but its final syllable could by no means be reckoned as a suffix (*pratyaya*).

## न सृपिसृजिसृशिसृस्फृजिस्वरतिस्मरतिनाम् ॥ १०२ ॥

102. The *s* of the roots *sarp*, *sarj*, *sparç*, *sphūrj*, *svaṛ*, and *smar* is not changed into *śh* according to the preceding rules.

This is evidently a rule of kindred sphere with rule 106, below, and the two might well enough have been combined into one, which should teach that a root containing a *r*, either semivowel or vowel, was not liable to the changes prescribed in this section. The corresponding

rules in the other treatises have nearly this form (R. Pr. v. 11, r. 23, cccxi; V. Pr. iii. 81; T. Pr. vi. 8). As so stated, it would require the notice of but a single exception, *vi shparat* (vi. 56. 1 and x. 4. 8). As the rules now stand, they are slightly inexact, for in neither of them are included *anusphuram* (i. 2. 3), *atisara* (v. 8. 2 etc.), and *pratisara* (e. g. ii. 11. 2), although other forms of the root *sar* are contemplated in rule 106.

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows: *vi srpo vi-rapçin* (not in AV.; take instead *parisarpati* [v. 23. 3]; there are an abundance of such cases in the actual text), *atisrsho apâm vrshabhah* (xvi. 1. 1), *visprçah* (perhaps a corrupted reading for *uparisprçah* [v. 3. 10], the only case our text contains), *vâçyamânâ 'bhi sphûrjati* (xii. 5. 20), *vidathâ 'bhisvaranti* (ix. 9. 22), *nirrtho yaç ca nisvarah* (xii. 2. 14), and *prati smarethâm tujayadbhih* (viii. 4. 7).

## गोसन्यादीनां च ॥ १०३ ॥

103. Nor that of *gosani* etc.

The instances which the commentator has chosen to give from this *gana* are *gosanim* (iii. 20. 10), *vi simatah* (iv. 1. 1), *abhi sishyade* (v. 5. 9), and *anu sûtum savitave* (vi. 17. 1-4). We cannot but be surprised that the first of these words was chosen to head the *gana*; it is no proper exception to any of the foregoing rules; the only one under which it would have any claim to come is rule 98, and there its simple exclusion from the *gana* to which alone the precept is calculated to apply would be sufficient warrant for its reading. The third instance is a fair exception to rule 90, besides being an instance under rule 91. The second and fourth are, like the first, no legitimate cases for a rule like this, since *vi* and *simatah*, *anu* and *sûtum*, are disconnected words, which only accidentally come together in the arrangement of the sentence: if all such cases are to be taken note of, the *gana* will be considerably and unnecessarily extended. Of actual cases having claim to constitute together a *gana* of exceptions, the text does not furnish a great number: I have noted, besides the three words mentioned under the last rule, *antisumne* (vii. 112. 1), *pratispâçanam* (viii. 5. 11), *visalyaka* (e. g. ix. 8. 2), *abhisatvâ* (xix. 13. 5), and *prâtisutvanam* (xx. 129. 2: the reading is very doubtful). As good a right as *gosani* to inclusion in the *gana* have also *bhûristhâtrâm* (iv. 30. 2), and *bahusûvari* (vii. 46. 2).

## अध्यभिग्यां स्कन्देः ॥ १०४ ॥

104. Nor that of the root *skand*, after *adhi* and *abhi*.

The cited instances are *adhi skanda virayasva* (v. 25. 8), and *abhi-skandam mrgi 'va* (v. 14. 11). As counter-instance, the commentator brings forward *ekaçatam vishkandhani* (iii. 9. 6), which is a blunder—unless, indeed, the commentator's grammatical system derives *skandha*, 'shoulder,' from the root *skand*. An actual example of the kind he seeks to give is *parishkanda* (xv. 2. 1 etc.).

परिः स्तृणातिः ॥ १०५ ॥

105. Nor that of the root *star*, after *pari*.

The commentator cites *pari strñhi pari dhehi vedim* (vii. 99. 1), and *paristaranam id dhaviḥ* (ix. 6. 2). As counter-example, he can find only *vishtāri jātaḥ* (iv. 34. 1). *Vishtārin* doubtless comes from the root *star*; yet, as the *pada*-text does not analyze it, but writes it in its *sanhitā* form, it might have been neglected, and the root *star* added to those rehearsed in rule 102, with which it evidently belongs.

रेफपरस्य च ॥ १०६ ॥

106. Nor one that is followed by *r*.

The examples offered in the commentary are *sisratām nāri* (i. 11. 1), *parisrutah kumbhaḥ* (iii. 12. 7), and *pra bhānavah sisrate* (xiii. 2. 46): the first and third are exceptions to rule 91, the second to rule 90. The text furnishes a number of other cases, which it is unnecessary to rehearse here, as there are no counter-exceptions.

अभि स्याम प्रतन्यतः ॥ १०७ ॥

107. Nor in *abhi syāma prtanyataḥ*.

The passage, as cited by the commentator, is *vayam abhi syāma prtanyataḥ* (vii. 93. 1\*): as a quite peculiar case, it is properly enough made the subject of a special rule. To show the necessity of citing in the rule the following word, *prtanyataḥ*, the commentator brings forward *viçvāḥ prtanaḥ abhi shyāma* (xiii. 1. 22).

The signature of the chapter is as follows: 16 : *iti dvitiyo 'dhyāyah samāptah*. The number which should inform us how many rules are counted in the chapter is again unfortunately corrupt, and we are left to conjecture as to how it should be amended. I see no reason to suspect the loss of a rule or rules in the manuscript.

### CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS:—SECTION I. 1–25, lengthening of final and other vowels in *sanhitā*.

SECTION II. 26–28, doubling of consonants when final or in combination with other consonants; 29–32, exceptions; 33–36, vowels exempt from euphonic combination; 37, nasals do.; 38, method of combination of *ā* between two vowels; 39, conversion of final vowels into semivowels; 40, do. of final diphthongs into vowel and semivowel; 41–52, fusion of final and initial vowels; 53–54, absorption of initial *a* after final *e* and *o*.

\* All the MSS. except W. read *shyāma*, which has accordingly been received into the edited text.

SECTION III. 55-64, different kinds of *svârîta* accent; 65-74, occurrence and modifications of the several accents in the combinations of the phrase.

SECTION IV. 75-85, conversion of the dental nasal *n* into the lingual *ṅ*; 86-95, exceptions; 96, anomalous insertion of a sibilant in a single case.

## सहावाडने दीर्घः ॥ १ ॥

1. Before the root *sah*, when it ends in *ât*, the vowel is lengthened.

In this rule, *âḍanta* has virtually the same meaning as *sâḍbhûta* in rule ii. 82. It would not do to say "before *sah* when it becomes *sâh*," because of the words *amîtrasâha* and *abhimâtishâha*, in which, though the vowel of the root is lengthened, the preceding final remains unchanged. The illustrative citations of the commentator are precisely those already given, under ii. 82, including the two words, example and counter-example, *prâshât* and *prasahanam*, which are not found in the Atharva-Veda.

This rule also belongs in the category of the supererogatory, since in none of the words to which it relates does the *pada*-text afford a different reading from that of the *sanhitâ*. There would be just as much reason, so far as we can see, for a rule prescribing the prolongation of the *a* in the root *sah* itself—and that, in fact, is what the Vâj. Pr. (iii. 121) does, while it takes no notice of the change of the preceding vowel.

The Rik Pr. devotes three chapters (vii-ix) to the subject of the irregular prolongation of vowels. In the Vâj. Pr., the same subject occupies the sixth section of the third chapter, and one rule in the seventh (iii. 95-128); in the Tâitt. Pr., the third chapter: the latter treatise inverts the form of statement adopted by the others, and details the cases in which a vowel which is long in *sanhitâ* must be shortened in *pada*. The method in which the different works combine and put forth the phenomena of prolongation is so different, and so little would be gained by any detailed comparison of their teachings, that I shall for the most part content myself with this general reference.

## अष्ट पदयोगपक्षपणदंष्ट्रचक्रेषु ॥ २ ॥

2. Also is lengthened the *a* of *ashṭa*, before *pada*, *yoga*, *paksha*, *parṇa*, *daṅshṭra*, and *cakra*.

Compounds of *ashṭa* with *parṇa* and *daṅshṭra* are not to be found in the present Atharva-Veda, nor are we necessarily to conclude, from their being mentioned in the rule, that any such occurred in the text recognized by the makers of our treatise: it is more likely that they have here, as in some other cases, detailed all the instances of the prolongation which they had noticed, without being particular as to their source. The rule, moreover, is an unnecessary one, since the *pada*-text everywhere offers the same reading with the *sanhitâ*, as is expressly directed by a later rule (iv. 94).



The citations of the commentary are *ashtāpadi caturakṣhī* (v. 19. 7), *ashtāpakṣhām* (ix. 3. 21), *ashtāyogāhī* (vi. 91. 1), *ashtāparnaḥ*, *ashtā-daṅshtram*, *ashtācakraṁ navadvārā* (x. 2. 31), and *ashtācakram vartate* (xi. 4. 22).

### वधावप्रत्यये ॥ ३ ॥

3. Also a vowel before the root *vyadh*, when it is without a suffix.

The commentator's instances are *śvāvit* (v. 13. 9), and *hrdayavidham* (viii. 6. 18); to these is to be added only *marmavidham* (xi. 10. 26), which, under iv. 68, is also cited in the commentary. By the latter rule, the *pada* in all these cases reads precisely like the *sanhitā*, without any division of the words, and without restoration of the short vowel. As counter-example, to show that, when the root takes a suffix, the vowel preceding it is not lengthened, we have a form of verbal inflection, *pravidhyanto nāma* (iii. 26. 4), brought forward.

### उज इदमूष्वादिषु ॥ ४ ॥

4. The particle *u* is lengthened in *idam ū shu* etc.

Of the passages in which *u* is thus made long, the commentator cites six, viz. *idam ū shu* (i. 24. 4), *tad ū shu* (v. 1. 5), *mahim ū shu* (vii. 6. 2), *anya ū shu* (xviii. 1. 16), *stusha ū shu* (xviii. 1. 37), and *tyam ū shu* (vii. 85. 1); the other cases afforded by the text are *pary ū shu* (v. 6. 4), and *para ū te* (xviii. 3. 7). Were it not for this last case, the rule of our treatise might have been constructed like that of the Vāj. Pr., which says (iii. 109) that *u* before *su* is lengthened.

### ऋषधेरपञ्चपद्याम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also the final vowel of *oshadhi*, except in the strong cases.

Those of the strong cases of *oshadhi* which the rule would except are, of course, only the nominative and accusative singular, since the others would, by the rules of declension, show a gunated or a lengthened vowel, or a semivowel, in its place. The commentator cites no actual passages in illustration of the rule, but merely catalogues the forms in which the long vowel would appear, viz. *oshadhībhiḥ* (e. g. ii. 10. 2), *oshadhībhyām* (not found in AV.), *oshadhībhyah* (e. g. vi. 20. 2), *oshadhīnām* (e. g. iii. 5. 1), and *oshadhīshu* (e. g. i. 30. 3): as counter-example, he adds *iyam ha mahyam tvām oshadhīḥ* (vii. 38. 5). The *pada*-text, in all these cases, reads precisely like the *sanhitā*.

Since the rule does not restrict itself to forms of declension, it is guilty of an oversight in taking no account of the compound *oshadhija* (x. 4. 23 : p. *oshadhī-ja*) as a farther exception. In the only other compounds which the text affords—viz. *oshadhisaṁcita* (x. 5. 32 : p. *oshadhī-saṁcita*), and *oshadhimant* (xix. 17. 6 ; 18. 6)—the rule of the Prāçākhya is observed.

## जीवन्तीमोषधीम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. And except in the phrase *jîvantîm oshadhîm*.

The commentator quotes the passage a little more fully, *jîvantîm oshadhîm aham* (viii. 2. 6; 7. 6), and adds that the inclusion of the accompanying word in the rule is intended to limit the exception to this particular passage; citing, as counter-examples, *imâm kkanâmy oshadhîm* (iii. 18. 1), and *oshadhîm çepaharshanîm* (iv. 4. 1).

## साढः ॥ ७ ॥

7. The vowel of *sâdha* is long.

The commentator cites for us the only passage in which this participle occurs, *vâcâ sâdhaç parastarâm* (v. 30. 9). The rule is one of the most utterly superfluous presented by our treatise, which, of course, has nothing to do with the mode of formation of such words. Moreover, if it was inclined to do a work of supererogation as regards them, it should not have omitted to notice also *rûdhvâ, rûdha, mâdha, gâdha*, and other like forms which the text contains. Probably the reason why this particular one was noticed, and not the others, is that the regular form, according to the rules of the general grammar, is *sodha*. Pânini (vi. 3. 113) remarks the occurrence in specific cases of forms like *sâdha*. The compound *ashâdha* is found but once in the Atharvan, and that in the nineteenth book (xix. 7. 4).

## बहुलं रात्रिः ॥ ८ ॥

8. As to the final vowel of *râtri*, diversity of usage prevails.

This is rather a discreditable confession on the part of our treatise, whose business it is to settle authoritatively the reading of its school in all cases admitting of any doubt, that it does not feel equal to dealing with the irregularities of the word in question. Nothing like it has hitherto met us, but we shall find several instances in that which follows. It is also a very unnecessary acknowledgment; for, in the first place, there was no such rule as this absolutely called for, since the *padâ*-text everywhere reads all the forms of *râtri* like the *sanhitâ*; and, in the second place, there is no great perplexity in the phenomena. In the nominative we always meet with *râtri*, except in a single case (xiii. 4. 30), where *râtris* occurs; as accusative, only *râtrim* is found, and *râtrim*, which the Rig-Veda has (e. g. i. 35. 1), is never read; as vocative, we have only *râtri*, never *râtre*; and the other forms are, with the exception of *râtraye* (viii. 2. 20), such as would come from the theme *râtri*.

The commentator, as under rule 5, gives the series of cases *râtribhîç* (xviii. 1. 10), *râtribhyâm, râtribhyah, râtrinâm* (e. g. iv. 5. 4), and *râtrishu*, only two of which are to be found in our text. As example of the short vowel, again, he cites an actual case, *vrâtya ekâm râtrim* (xv. 13. 1).

## विश्वस्य नरवसुमित्रेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9. Also as to that of *viçva*, before *nara, vasu*, and *mîtra*.

Here are quite heterogeneous cases, mixed together in one rule. The noun *viçvânara* and its derivative *vâiçvânara* always show the long vowel, and moreover are read in *pada* precisely as in *sanhitâ*. *Viçvâvasu* the *pada*-text divides, restoring the short vowel: thus, *viçva-vasu*; but the long vowel invariably appears in *sanhitâ*. We also find *viçvâmitra* three times in the text (iv. 29. 5. xviii. 3. 15, 16), and it is each time written *viçvâmitra*, without division, by the *pada*-text. But in a half-verse which occurs twice in the eighteenth book (xviii. 3. 63; 4. 54), we meet with *viçvamitrâh*, which the *pada* divides, *viçva-mitrâh*.\* It is only, then, in regard to this last word that we need in our rule the implication of *bahulam* by inference from the one preceding, and it is so very difficult to justify the implication, with no *ca* in the rule to indicate it, and with nothing in any following rule to denote its cessation, that I am inclined to think that the passage containing *viçvamitrâh* was overlooked by the authors of the treatise, or did not occur in the text they recognized, and that the interpretation of the rule has been modified by the commentator in order to bring it in.

The commentator cites, as instances of the long vowel, *viçvânare akramata* (iv. 11. 7), *yâ viçvâvasum* (ii. 2. 4), and *viçvâmitra jamadagne* (xviii. 3. 16); as example of the short vowel, *tam arcata viçvamitrâh* (xviii. 3. 63; 4. 54).

शुनः पदे ॥१०॥

10. Also as to that of *çvan* before *pada*.

The commentator cites all the instances of occurrence of the compound of these two words which the text contains, three of them as examples of the long vowel, and one of the short; they are as follows: *atho sarvañ çvâpadam* (xi. 9. 10), *çvâpado makshikâh* (xi. 10. 8), and *uta vâ çvâpadah* (xviii. 3. 55); and, on the other hand, *vyâghraç çvapadâm iva* (viii. 5. 11 and xix. 39. 4). All these forms admit of being derived from a theme *çvapad*, instead of *çvapada*, and the last of them must necessarily come from *çvapad*. It would be possible, then, to get rid of the necessity of implying an *anuvṛtti* of *bahulam* in this rule, as the commentator does, by regarding it as relating only to the cases in which *çvan* precedes *pada*, and not to that in which it precedes *pad*. There is the same strong objection to the inference of *bahulam* here as in the preceding rule: that nothing in the rule indicates it, and that the next one implies not *bahulam*, but simply *dīrghaḥ*, without anything to point out the cessation of the former and the resumption of the latter. Such ambiguity is quite foreign to the usual method of the treatise.

The *pada*-text reads, in each of the passages cited, precisely like the *sanhitâ*, without division of the compound, so that the rule might be omitted altogether without practical loss.

\* The first time, all the manuscripts, without exception, accent *viçvâmitrâh*, and the edition follows their authority: in the repetition of the verse, Bp. and M. and the edited text have *viçvamitrâh*, B. and P. *viçvâmitrâh*; this part of the eighteenth book has been lost in E., and is unaccented in I. The word is evidently a vocative, and the true reading is *viçvamitrâh*, without accent, in both passages.

## उपसर्गस्य नामिनो दस्ति ॥ ११ ॥

11. A final alterant vowel of a preposition is lengthened before *t* of the root *dâ*.

The only two words in the text falling under this rule are *apratîttam* (vi. 117. 1) and *parîttah* (vi. 92. 2), in which the final *i* of *prati* and *pari* becomes *î* before the *t* which is all that remains of the root *dâ* before the participial suffix *ta*. The commentator mentions both, and likewise *nîttâ*, *vîttâ*, and *parîttih*, no one of which is to be found in the Atharvan; nor are his counter-examples, *prattam* and *avattam*, Atharvan words. The rule has a more general form of statement than would be required if it were constructed only to fit the cases which our text presents: and we may also, indeed, recognize in the fact of its presence at all the influence of the general grammar: the words to which it relates are read alike in *pada* and in *saṁhitâ*, and none of the other treatises has anything corresponding to it: compare Pāṇini, vi. 3. 124.

## वर्तादिषु ॥ १२ ॥

12. As also before *varta* etc.

What words we are to assume to be implied in this rule, by inference from those which precede it, is not entirely clear. The commentator's understanding of it we are unable to arrive at, for there is here another slight *lacuna* in the manuscript: the copyist has jumped carelessly from the *vartâdishu* of the first statement of the rule to that of the paraphrase, so that the greater part of the latter is lost. The instances given in the commentary are *abhîvartena* (i. 29. 1: p. *abhi-varitena*), and *viçvam anyâm abhîvâra* (i. 32. 4: p. *abhi-vâra*). We may with plausibility conclude from this that we are to imply in the rule not merely the *dirghah*, 'conversion into a long vowel,' which belongs to the whole section, but the specific limitation to a preposition ending in an alterant vowel, given in the last rule; and that the commentary would read, if restored, as follows: *vartâdishu* [: *upasargasya nâmyantasya vartâdishu*] *paratah dirgho bhavati*. The words, then, to which the rule relates, would be, besides those already cited: *vibarha* (ii. 33. 7: p. *vi-barha*), *abhîvarga* (e. g. iii. 5. 2: p. *abhi-varga*), *parîçâsa* (v. 14. 3: p. *pari-çâsa*), *pratîbodha* (e. g. viii. 1. 13: p. *prati-bodha*), *prativarta* (e. g. viii. 5. 4: p. *prati-varta*), *anûvrj* (ix. 4. 12: p. *anu-vrj*), *pratikâçsa* (ix. 8. 6: p. *prati-kâçsa*), *abhîvrta* (e. g. ix. 10. 7: p. *abhi-vrta*), *parivrta* (e. g. x. 8. 31: p. *pari-vrta*), *samparivrta* (x. 2. 33: p. *sam-parivrta*), *pratihâra* (xi. 7. 12: p. *prati-hâra*), *nîvid* (xi. 7. 19: p. *ni-vid*), *abhîmodamud* (e. g. xi. 7. 26: p. *abhîmoda-mud*), *abhîlâpalap* (xi. 8. 25: p. *abhîlâpa-lap*), *anûrâdha* (xix. 15. 2), *pariṇah* (xix. 48. 1), and *nînâha* (xix. 57. 4)—all which are separated by the *pada*-text (except in the nineteenth book, which has no *pada*-text), with restoration of the original short vowel of the preposition. In the same category would belong *anûjahire* (p. *anu-jahire*), which is the reading of all the Atharvan manuscripts at xviii. 3. 46, but which in the published text is altered to *anûhire*, to accord with the Rik reading of the same passage (x. 15. 8), for which the other seems a

blundering substitution. In a single word, *nīhāra* (e. g. vi. 113. 2), the *pada* does not restore the theoretically correct form, but reads with the *sanhitā*: possibly *nināha*, were there a *pada*-text for the passage, would be treated in the same way. There are a few cases where a final *a* of a preposition is also lengthened before a root, but in these the *pada*-text attempts no restoration of the regular form, and their omission from the rules of the Prātiçākhyā would therefore be of no practical importance: they are *prānāha* (ix. 3. 4), *prāvṛsh* (e. g. xii. 1. 46), *prāvṛta* (e. g. xii. 5. 2); and *upānah* (xx. 133. 4) doubtless belongs to the same class.

There are, however, still remaining a few compounds in the Atharvan text, the final vowel of the first member of which is lengthened in *sanhitā*, and which are not treated of in any of the rules which follow; so that, if the rule now in hand is to be so interpreted as to exclude them, no provision would appear to have been made for them in our treatise; they are *sam̐dhanājī* (e. g. v. 20. 3: p. *sam̐dhana-jī*), *ukthā-mada* (v. 26. 3: p. *uktha-mada*), *tardāpati* (vi. 50. 3: p. *tarda-pati*), *sahasrāposha* (e. g. vi. 79. 3: p. *sahasra-posha*; at vi. 141. 3 we have *sahasraposha*), *āhuti-vṛdh* (vii. 32. 1: p. *āhuti-vṛdh*), *svāvasum* (vii. 50. 3: p. *sva-vasum*: RV. reads in the corresponding passage *svavasam*), *naghā-risha* (e. g. viii. 2. 6: p. *nagha-risha*), *pavinasa* (viii. 6. 21: p. *pavi-nasa*), *pūritat* (e. g. ix. 7. 11: p. *puri-tat*), *vishūvrt* (x. 2. 11: p. *vishu-vrt*), *pūrāvrt* (x. 2. 11: p. *puru-vrt*), *pūrūvasu* (xiv. 2. 47: p. *puru-vasu*), and *urūnasa* (xviii. 2. 13: p. *uru-nasa*).

### अकारस्याभ्यासस्य बहुलम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. The *a* of a reduplication is or is not lengthened.

As instances of the prolongation of *a* in a syllable of reduplication, the commentator gives us *dādhrshuh* (i. 27. 3: p. *dadhrshuh*), *abhivāvrdhe* (i. 29. 1: p. *abhi-vavrdhe*), *vāvrdhete* (v. 1. 5: p. *vavrdhete*), and *jītasya vāvrtuh* (v. 19. 13: p. *vavrtuh*). The same prolongation takes place in the Atharvan in *sāsahe* (xix. 34. 5) and *sāsahānah* (iii. 6. 4), *cākpat* (vi. 35. 3), *cākpuh* (ix. 10. 19), and *cākpe* (e. g. vii. 87. 1), and *tātṛshuh* (xviii. 3. 47); and also, in the twentieth book (xx. 127. 3), in *māmahē*. As examples of the short *a* in the same position, the commentator cites *anena viçvā sāsahe* (i. 16. 3) and *sāsahe çatrūn* (ii. 5. 3). The root *sah* is the only one in which, while the *pada*-text gives always the short vowel to the reduplication, the *sanhitā* sometimes prolongs it and sometimes leaves it unchanged. Elsewhere we have in *sanhitā* either always the long *ā* (and especially often in the forms of *vāvrdh*), or always the short *a*.

There are also two or three roots in the reduplications of which other vowels than *a*, short in the *pada*-text, are lengthened in *sanhitā*: they are *rūrupaḥ* (iv. 7. 5), *rīrishah* (e. g. v. 3. 8), and *çūçucaḥ* (xviii. 2. 4). The Prātiçākhyā may intend to include these forms in the *gaṇa* of rule 21, below, but they would much more properly have been provided for in the present rule.

### नीहीडाहम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. Note *jīhīdā* 'ham.

Or, as the commentator expounds it, there is in this passage a lengthened vowel—viz., that of the first syllable of *jihîda*. The passage is cited: *akratur jihîdâ 'ham\** (iv. 32. 5 : p. *jihîda*). The commentator regards the word *bahulam* as still in force from the preceding rule, and adds, as an instance in which a short vowel appears in the reduplication of this root, *yad vâ pitâ 'parâddho jihîde* (vi. 116. 2). But it is evident that there is no need here of any implication of *bahulam*, and that all cases but one of the occurrence of *jihîda* are excluded from the rule by the citation in the latter of the accompanying word *aham*.

Compare farther rule iv. 87, which teaches *samâpatti* of *jihîda* in the *pada*-text.

## साह्याम ॥ १५ ॥

### 15. And *sâhyâma*.

The commentator quotes from the text: *sâhyâma dâsam âryam* (iv. 32. 1 : p. *sahyâma*). He does not attempt to prove the implication of *bahulam* by *anuvṛtti* from rule 13, although there is just as good reason for doing it here as under the preceding rule. Compare the converse of this rule in the next chapter (iv. 88).

There are in the Atharvan text a few causative forms from verbal roots which show in the first or radical syllable a short *a* in *pada* and a long *â* in *sanhitâ*, and which are not specially noted in this section, being left, apparently, to fall into the *gaṇa* of rule 21, below, although no reference is there made to them by the commentator. They are *yāvaya* etc. (e. g. i. 20. 3), from *yu*; *cyāvayati* etc. (e. g. x. 1. 13), from *cyu*; *vânayantu* (vi. 9. 3), from *van*; *yâmaya* (vi. 137. 3), from *yam*; and *glâpayantu* (ix. 9. 10), from *glâ*. Directions for the shortening of their first syllables in *pada* are given in the next chapter (iv. 91–93).

## विद्मदीनां शरादिषु ॥ १६ ॥

### 16. The final vowels of *vidma* etc. are lengthened before *çara* etc.

This rule, together with two later ones of this section (19 and 25)—of which the one relates to the final of an instrumental case, and the other to that of the particle *adha*—makes up the sum of all that our treatise has to say respecting the frequent and important phenomenon of the prolongation in *sanhitâ* of a final vowel. The other Prâtiçâkhyas treat the subject at great length and apparently with exhaustive fullness (see R. Pr., chapters vii and viii; V. Pr. iii. 96–128; T. Pr. iii). As regards our own treatise, we must confess that we can hardly help questioning the actuality of all its *gaṇas*, when we find set up in the rules such as would have to be of so immense extent as the two here presented us, which must contain hundreds of words each.† It were

\* The edition reads erroneously *jihîdâ 'ham*, with the corresponding Rik passage. All the *sanhitâ* manuscripts of the Atharvan give *jihîda*, and in the *pada*-text the word is followed by a figure 4, the usual sign of a *samâpanna* word, or one which the *pada* has reduced from an irregular to a theoretically regular form.

† The longest *gaṇa* belonging to Pâṇini's grammar, *ardharcâdayah*, contains, in Böhling's edition, 232 words.

almost as well, we should think, to turn off the matter with a *kvacit*, as is done below, in rule 54, openly confessing inability to master its intricacy and vastness, as to dispose of it thus.

The commentator does not feel called upon to give himself any more trouble than the authors of the treatise have taken, and he leaves the two *ganas* to take care of themselves, after citing three passages by way of examples, as follows: *vidmā śarasya pītarām* (i. 2. 1), *evā rogam cā śrāvam* (i. 2. 4), and *evā me prāṇa mā bibheḥ* (ii. 15. 1 etc.). In filling out the *gana*, and giving a complete account of the usage of the Atharvan text with reference to the prolongation of a final vowel, I shall put together all the cases, including those which belong under rules 19 and 25, since the same principle evidently governs them all.

The prolongation is so prevailing a metrical phenomenon in the Atharva-Veda, called out by the exigencies of the verse, that I shall arrange my exhibition of it accordingly. There are certain points in the *pāda*, whether of eight, of eleven, or of twelve syllables, at which the long vowel is especially liable to be called forth: these are, 1st, toward the beginning of the *pāda*, of whatever length, the second syllable; 2nd, toward the end, the sixth syllable in a *pāda* of eight syllables, and the eighth or the tenth in one of eleven or twelve syllables: the protraction evidently tending in the former case to give an iambic movement to the commencement of the verse, and, in the latter case, to impress upon it an iambic cadence—which, however, is in the 11-syllable *pāda* made trochaic by the addition of an odd syllable. A long syllable at these points, then, I shall regard as regular; elsewhere, as irregular.

I. The *pāda* of eight syllables (rarely lengthened to ten), usually forming *anushtubh* verses, but, less often, combined into *gāyatrī*, *pankti*, or *brhatī* stanzas: these do not require to be distinguished from one another, since the prolongation depends solely upon the interior construction of the *pāda* itself, and not upon the mode of combination of the latter.

1. Protraction of a final vowel in the second syllable of the *pāda*, as in the example *vidmā śarasya pītarām* (i. 2. 1):

a. Of verbal forms: *vidmā* (i. 2. 1; 3. 1–5), *pībā* (ii. 5. 1), and *tishthā* (iv. 7. 5).

b. Of forms of declension: *tenā* (i. 3. 1–5. iii. 7. 3; \* 14. 1. iv. 5. 1; 7. 1. vi. 7. 1, 2, 3; 12. 1, 2; 24. 3; 80. 1, 3; 82. 3; 91. 1. vii. 38. 2. xviii. 2. 30), and *yenā* (i. 13. 1. iii. 9. 4. vii. 38. 2. ix. 5. 17. xiii. 2. 21).

c. Of particles: *evā* (i. 2. 4; 3. 6–9; 11. 6. ii. 15. 1–6; 30. 1; 36. 4. iii. 6. 3, 6. v. 21. 4–6. vi. 8. 1, 2, 3; 17. 1–4; 46. 3; 58. 2; 70. 1–3; 85. 3; 102. 1; 105. 1–3; 138. 5; 139. 4, 5; 141. 3. vii. 13. 1; 50. 5. ix. 1. 11, 12, 13, 16, 17. x. 1. 13; 3. 13–15, 17–25; 6. 33. xi. 4. 19. xii. 4. 34; 5. 65. xiv. 1. 43. xviii. 4. 55. xix. 50. 4; 57. 1), *adhā* (i. 28. 4. iii. 20. 1. vi. 65. 1. x. 4. 25. xiii. 1. 30. xiv. 2. 20. xviii. 2. 23), *yatrā* (iii. 28. 6), and *ghā* (vi. 1. 3).

2. Protraction in the sixth syllable, or the third from the end of the *pāda*, as in *imam vardhayatā girah*:

a. Of verbal forms: *vardhayatā* (i. 15. 2. xix. 1. 1, 2), *janajathā* (i. 5.

\* The edition, following the authority of a part of the MSS., *tena*.

3), *īlayatā* (i. 17. 4), *yāvayā* (i. 20. 3; 21. 4. iv. 19. 7. xii. 1. 32), *gamayā* (i. 21. 2), *nāçayā* (i. 23. 2, 3), *kr̥ṇutā* (iii. 9. 1. xii. 2. 34), *anadatā* (iii. 13. 1), *jayatā* (iii. 19. 7), *vardhayā* (iii. 20. 1. vi. 5. 3; 54. 1), *tānayā* (iv. 4. 6. vi. 101. 2), *shvāpayā* (iv. 5. 7), *kalpayā* (iv. 12. 5), *nayathā* (iv. 13. 1), *jīvayathā* (iv. 13. 1), *chāpayā* (iv. 18. 4), *dūshayatā* (vi. 100. 2), *dyā* (vi. 103. 2, 3; 104. 2), *cakrmā* (vi. 114. 1; 115. 1. x. 3. 8), *mādayā* (vi. 130. 4), *shyā* (vii. 18. 1), *bhavatā* (vii. 60. 7), *jaghnimā* (x. 4. 12), *bhajā* (xiv. 1. 25), *vāpayā* (xviii. 3. 6), *carā* (xx. 127. 11).

b. Of forms of declension: *sahasyenā* (iv. 5. 1), and *bhadrenā* (vii. 60. 7).

c. Of particles: *ivā* (vi. 37. 2).

3. Besides cases of the two kinds already noted, we have a few in which the protraction still favors the iambic movement of the verse, although not at its two cardinal points:

a. In the fourth syllable of the *pāda*, as in *harīṇasyā bhīyaṁ kṛdhi*: of verbal forms, *parshā* (iv. 33. 8), and *çṛnotā* (xx. 127. 7); of forms of declension, *dhāmā* (vi. 31. 3), and *harīṇasyā* (vi. 67. 3); of particles, *aṅgā* (ii. 3. 2), and *achā* (iii. 20. 2).

b. In the final syllable of the *pāda*: of this class we have but two cases, viz. *kalpayā* (iv. 12. 5), and *aṅgā* (ii. 3. 2); and in each passage the same word occurs in another position, protracted according to the usual analogies, so that we may regard the irregular protractions in the final syllable as the effect of attraction.

4. Protraction of a final vowel in such a position that it seems to obstruct, rather than assist, the regular movement of the verse:

a. Protraction in the third syllable of the *pāda*, as in *çrathayā sūshane tvam*: of verbal forms, *çrathayā* (i. 11. 3), *mṛdayā* (i. 13. 2; 26. 4), *itā* (iii. 19. 7), *sunotā* (vi. 2. 3), *juhotā* (xviii. 2. 2); of particles, *smā* (x. 4. 6).

b. Protraction in the fifth syllable, or in the fourth from the end: only a single case, *ivā* (iv. 4. 7, third *pāda*)\*.

A summary view of the cases of protraction in the 8-syllable *pāda* (including also the very rare 10-syllable *pāda*) is as follows:

| Syllable,            | Regular. |      | Indifferent. |      | Irregular. |      |
|----------------------|----------|------|--------------|------|------------|------|
|                      | 2nd.     | 6th. | 4th.         | 8th. | 3rd.       | 5th. |
| Verbal forms,        | 8        | 40   | 2            | 1    | 6          | 0    |
| Forms of declension, | 26       | 2    | 2            | 0    | 0          | 1    |
| Particles,           | 77       | 1    | 2            | 1    | 1          | 0    |
| Sum,                 | 111 43   |      | 6 2          |      | 7 1        |      |
| Total,               | 154      |      | 8            |      | 8          |      |

II. In the *pāda* of eleven syllables, with trochaic close; usually forming regular *trishṭubh* verses, but not unfrequently irregularly combined, especially with *jagatī pādas*, of twelve syllables:

1. Protraction at the commencement of the *pāda*, in the second syllable: e. g. *vidmā tam utsam yata ābabhūtha*.

a. Verbal forms: *vidmā* (iv. 31. 5. x. 1. 20. xiii. 3. 21), *yukshvā* (xviii.

\* The edition reads, with a part of the MSS., *iva*.



1. 25), *vahā* (xviii. 1. 30), *mṛdā* (xviii. 1. 40), *ācyā* (xviii. 1. 52), *bhavā* (xix. 24. 5), and *ṣrudhī* (ii. 5. 4. xviii. 1. 25).

b. Forms of declension: *tenā* (iii. 16. 5. vii. 20. 4; 79. 1), *yenā* (vii. 12. 1. xviii. 1. 54; 4. 44), and *kshāmā* (xviii. 3. 21).

c. Particles: *evā* (iv. 39. 1, 3, 5, 7. vi. 72. 1; 74. 3. xii. 2. 25), *adhā* (iii. 4. 4. iv. 32. 7. v. 22. 2, 2. vii. 73. 11. viii. 4. 15. x. 2. 7. xii. 3. 2, 9. xviii. 1. 16, 51; 2. 11; 3. 21; 4. 48, 70), *yatrā* (iii. 28. 5. vi. 22. 2; 120. 3. ix. 9. 22. xviii. 1. 50), *atrā* (v. 1. 5. ix. 10. 12. xii. 2. 26, 27), *adyā* (viii. 4. 15. ix. 10. 9), *ghā* (xviii. 1. 11), *achā* (vi. 39. 2), and *smā* (xii. 3. 3).

2. Protraction in the cadence of the *pāda*. Here we have two classes of cases to distinguish, viz., those in which the eighth syllable, or the fourth from the end, suffers protraction, as in *divaṃ gacha prati tishthā ṣarīrāḥ*; and again, those in which the tenth syllable, or the last but one, is made long, as in *mā vaḥ susroc camaso dr̥ṇhatā tam*.

a. Protraction in the eighth syllable.

1. Verbal forms: *vivecā* (i. 12. 3. xi. 4. 20), *tishthā* (ii. 34. 5. xviii. 2. 7), *bhajā* (iii. 4. 2, 4), *avā* (iii. 16. 3), *medayathā* (iv. 21. 6), *bharā* (iv. 32. 3), *svadayā* (v. 12. 2), *ṣṛjā* (v. 27. 11), *juhutā* (vi. 32. 1), *rakshā* (viii. 3. 19), *nahyā* (x. 9. 1), *taratā* (xii. 2. 26, 27), *nudatā* (xii. 2. 30), *pacatā* (xii. 3. 27), *bhavatā* (xii. 3. 29), *ṣṛjatā* (xii. 3. 46), *cakṛmā* (xviii. 1. 51), *dītyā* (xix. 13. 8), and *avatā* (xix. 13. 11).

b. Forms of declension: *asyā* (i. 12. 2), *janimā* (ii. 28. 2. iv. 1. 3. xviii. 3. 22), *amṛtenā* (iii. 12. 8), *kāvyenā* (v. 1. 5), and *martyenā* (ix. 10. 8, 16).

c. Particles: *cā* (vii. 4. 1. x. 8. 12), *adyā* (vii. 82. 6), and *utā* (vii. 97. 1).

β. Protraction in the tenth syllable. This case is comparatively rare, and is nearly confined to verbal forms, of which we have *mṛdatā* (i. 20. 1. xviii. 3. 16), *bhavā* (ii. 6. 3. iv. 32. 7), *ṣṛjā* (v. 2. 3), *hantanā* (vii. 77. 2), and *dr̥ṇhatā* (xix. 58. 4): besides these, we find only *ihā* (xix. 56. 6).

3. In the *trishṭubh pāda*, as in the *anushtubh*, we have in a few odd cases the fourth syllable lengthened, as in *tīrah purū cid arnavāṃ jagan-vān*; they are as follows: verbal form, *tishthā* (xii. 2. 27); form of declension, *purū* (xviii. 1. 1); particle, *ghā* (xviii. 1. 3).

4. The irregular protractions are found to take place in the third, the fifth, or the seventh syllable of the *pāda*.

a. Protraction in the third syllable, as in *urushyā na urujmann aprayuchan*: but two cases occur, viz. *urushyā* (vi. 4. 3), and *vyathayā* (xiii. 1. 31), and in the latter passage the metre is hopelessly irregular.

b. Protraction in the fifth syllable, as in *mītraṣ cid dhī shmā juhurāno devān*: of this class, we have only cases of particles, viz. *prā* (ii. 5. 5. vii. 26. 1\*), and *shmā* (xviii. 1. 33).

c. Protraction in the seventh syllable: an example is *na yat purā cakṛmā kad dha nūnam*. The words of which the final is lengthened in this position are, with a single exception, verbal forms, viz. *kṛmuthā* (iv. 21. 6), *bharā* (iv. 22. 6. vii. 73. 9), *khidā* (iv. 22. 7), *crtā* (vi. 63. 2; 84. 3), *svā* (vii. 14. 3), *nudā* (vii. 34. 1), and *cakṛmā* (xviii. 1. 4, 33). Of forms of declension, we have *janimā* (v. 11. 5).

\* In both these passages the printed text reads *pra*, without any support from the manuscripts.

The tabular summary for the 11-syllable *pāda* is as follows:

| Syllable,            | Regular. |      |       | Indifferent. | Irregular. |      |      |
|----------------------|----------|------|-------|--------------|------------|------|------|
|                      | 2nd.     | 8th. | 10th. |              | 4th.       | 3rd. | 5th. |
| Verbal forms,        | 10       | 23   | 7     | 1            | 2          | 0    | 10   |
| Forms of declension, | 7        | 8    | 0     | 1            | 0          | 0    | 1    |
| Particles,           | 36       | 4    | 1     | 1            | 0          | 3    | 0    |
| Sum,                 | 53 35 8  |      |       | 3            | 2 3 11     |      |      |
| Total,               | 96       |      |       | 3            | 16         |      |      |

III. In the *jagatī pāda*, or that of twelve syllables.

1. Protraction at the beginning of the *pāda*, in the second syllable, as in *çikškā no asmin puruhūta yāmani*. Here we have, of verbal forms, *çikškā* (xviii. 3. 67); of forms of declension, *purū* (vi. 49. 3); of particles, *avā* (iv. 23. 2. vi. 97. 1), *adhā* (vii. 83. 3. xviii. 4. 63), and *yadī* (xviii. 1. 21).

2. Protraction in the cadence of the *pāda*, taking place, as in the *trishṭubh pāda*, at two different points, either at the eighth syllable or at the tenth; that is, at the fifth or the third from the end.

α. At the eighth syllable, as in *asmākam aṅgam ud avā bhare-bhare*: of such cases, the text affords us the verbal forms *muñcā* (ii. 35. 3), *krnutā* (vi. 55. 3), *ruhemā* (vii. 6. 3), *avā* (vii. 50. 4), and *icchā* (xviii. 1. 16); and the form of declension *dharmā* (vi. 51. 3).

β. At the tenth syllable, as in *tāḥ saptaḡṛdhṛā iti çuçrumā vayam*: here we have only the verbal forms *sīncathā* (vi. 22. 2), *dhārayā* (vii. 82. 3), *çuçrumā* (viii. 9. 18), *veçayā* (ix. 2. 25), and *sīdatā* (xi. 1. 12).

3. Of the protraction in the middle of the verse, or at the fourth syllable, there is to be found but a single case, *yad ejathā maruto rukma-vakshasāḥ* (vi. 22. 2).

4. Protraction of a final against the requirements of the metre, in the seventh syllable, or the sixth from the end. Only one unquestionable case can be found, viz. *pary ū shu pra dhanvā vjasātaye* (v. 6. 4); with which may be classed *grṇatā*, at v. 27. 9, in a verse of irregular character, and perhaps rather belonging under the 8-syllable *pāda*.

The cases of the 12-syllable *pāda* may be thus summed up:

| Syllable,            | Regular. |      |       | Indifferent. | Irregular. |
|----------------------|----------|------|-------|--------------|------------|
|                      | 2nd.     | 8th. | 10th. |              |            |
| Verbal forms,        | 1        | 5    | 5     | 1            | 2          |
| Forms of declension, | 1        | 1    | 0     | 0            | 0          |
| Particles,           | 5        | 0    | 0     | 0            | 0          |
| Sum,                 | 7 6 5    |      |       | 1            | 2          |
| Total,               | 18       |      |       | 1            | 2          |

There thus appear to be, in the whole text, 268 cases of the protraction of a final vowel to help the metrical movement in the opening or the cadence of the *pāda*, and 12 which favor the movement in the middle of the *pāda*, against 26 which contravene the orderly flow of the metre. To point out the cases in which protraction does not take place at the two important points at which it is thus shown usually to occur, and to establish the laws, if there be any, which determine in each instance the retention or the change of the short vowel, cannot, of course, be attempted here.

It will be noticed that the vowel which is lengthened is almost always *a*: the text furnishes us, indeed, but three examples of the protraction of a final *i* (ii. 5. 4. xviii. 1. 21, 25), and two of that of *u* (vi. 49. 3. xviii. 1. 1)—except the particle *u*, as taught in rule 4 of this chapter.

## बद्धत्वं मत्तौ ॥ १७ ॥

17. Before the suffix *mant* a vowel is or is not lengthened.

The term *matu* is treated by the commentary as covering both the suffix *mant* and its equivalent *vant*: in fact, he cites instances only for the latter, as follows: *çåle 'çvåvatî* (iii. 12. 2), *açvåvatîr gomatiḥ* (iii. 16. 7), and *açvåvatim pra tara* (xviii. 2. 31); and farther, as examples of the short vowel before the suffix, *vîravatîḥ sadam* (iii. 16. 7), and *ghṛta-vatî payasvaty uc chrayasva* (iii. 12. 2).

The complete list of words in our present Atharvan text which exhibit in *sanhitâ* a prolongation of the final vowel of a theme before the possessive suffix *vant* is as follows: *açvåvant* (e. g. iii. 12. 2), *varanåvant* (iv. 7. 1), *madåvant* (e. g. iv. 7. 4), *samåvant* (iv. 18. 1), *priyåvant* (iv. 18. 4), *uttaråvant* (e. g. iv. 22. 5), *vîryåvant* (e. g. iv. 37. 5), *vṛshnyåvant* (v. 25. 8), *bhaṅguråvant* (vii. 71. 1), *açitåvant* (ix. 6. 38), *rocanåvant* (xiii. 3. 10), *ishtåvant* (xviii. 3. 20), *kladivant* (vii. 90. 3), and *vishûvant* (ix. 3. 8). In all these words, the *pada*-text restores the final vowel of the theme to its short form, and (by iv. 17) separates the theme and the suffix by *avagraha*.\* For the suffix *mant* we have but a single word, *tvishîmant* (e. g. iv. 19. 2: p. *tvishi-mant*): and so also for the suffix *van*—viz. *satyåvan* (p. *satya-van*: iv. 29. 1, 2)—respecting which I do not know whether it should be regarded as included under the technical designation *matu*. There are a few words in which the long vowel before the possessive suffix is properly regarded as rightfully belonging to the theme, and so is left unshortened in the *pada*-text: such are *dakshinåvant*, *çitîkåvant*, *hlådikåvant*, *ulkushîmant*, and *jyotishîmant*.

Of the words mentioned above, only two—viz. *açvåvant* (vi. 68. 3. xviii. 3. 61) and *vîryåvant* (viii. 5. 1. xviii. 4. 38)—ever show in *sanhitâ* forms having the vowel short. The former of them is specially noted in the Vâj. Pr. (iii. 97) as doing so in a single instance.

## इहायां च यकारदौ ॥ १८ ॥

18. As also before a suffix beginning with *y*, in a desiderative form.

In this rule, the *anuvṛtti* of *bahulam* is duly indicated, by the insertion of *ca*. As examples of desiderative forms exhibiting the lengthened vowel before *y*, the commentator cites *adhvari-yatâm* (i. 4. 1: p. *adhvari-yatâm*), *vṛshåyamånaḥ* (ii. 5. 7: p. *vṛsha-yamånaḥ*), and *çatrû-*

\* Our *pada* MS. does, indeed, read *rocanåvant* (xiii. 3. 10), without separation: but this is, it can hardly be doubted, a mere error of the scribe.

*yaṭim abhi* (iii. 1. 3 : p. *çatru-yaṭim*) : as examples of the short vowel, he gives *arāṭiyāt* (iv. 36. 1 : p. *arāṭi-yāt*), *janiyanti* (xiv. 2. 72 : p. *jani-yanti*), *putriyanti* (xiv. 2. 72 : p. *putri-yanti*), and *mṛgayuh* (x. 1. 26 : p. *mṛga-yuh*)—adding to the last word *prabhṛtāni ca*, which I take to be, not a part of this or of any other citation, but (with amendment to *prabhṛtini ca*) a simple expression for ‘et cetera;’ although the commentator does not anywhere else, I believe, give us such an intimation that more examples might be had for the seeking. The only ones of this class which our text farther presents are *sukshetriyā* and *sugātuyā* (both at iv. 33. 2 : p. *su-kshetriyā* : *su-gātuyā*), besides *amitrayu*, in the twentieth book (xx. 127. 13). Of cases of the long vowel, we have also *aghāyant* (e. g. x. 4. 10 : p. *agha-yant*) and *aghāyu* (e. g. i. 20. 2 : p. *agha-yu* : in *abhyaghāyānti* [v. 6. 9 and vii. 70. 3\*] the *pada*-text leaves the vowel long, writing *abhi-aghāyānti*), *vasūyā* (iv. 33. 2 : p. *vasu-yā*), *çapathīyant* (e. g. v. 14. 5 : p. *capathī-yant*), *janīyant* (vi. 82. 3 : p. *jani-yant*), *amitrāyant* (vii. 84. 2 : p. *amitra-yant* : the Rik, in the corresponding passage [x. 180. 3], has the short vowel), *kāvīyamāna* (ix. 9. 18 : p. *kavi-yamāna*), and *nīpriyāyate* (xii. 4. 11 etc. : p. *ni-priyuyate*) : *satvanāyant* (v. 20. 1) seems to belong to the same class, but it is written by the *pada* with the long vowel, *satvanā-yan*. From the themes *amitra* and *jani*, it will be noticed, come desiderative or denominative forms of either class, or with both the short and long vowel.

## तृतीयान्तस्य ॥ १९ ॥

19. As also the final vowel of an instrumental case.

In the form of this rule there is nothing which continues the implication of *bahulam*, but such an implication is, of course, unavoidably necessary, and is made by the commentator. As instance of the long vowel, he cites *yenā sahasraṁ vahasi yenā 'gne sarvavedasam* (ix. 5. 17) ; as instance of the short vowel, *kena çrotriyam āpnoti* (x. 2. 20). All the cases occurring under this rule have been detailed above, in the note to rule 16 : excepting *tenā* and *yenā*, which are tolerably frequent (*tenā* occurs 24 times, and *yenā* 8 times), we have, of instrumentals with lengthened finals, only a few sporadic instances, viz. *sahasyenā*, *bhadrenā*, *amṛtenā*, *kāvīyenā*, and *martyenā*, each in a single passage. Of other forms of declension which undergo a like prolongation, the text affords us two genitives, *asyā* and *harinasyā* ; and, as accusative singular, *puru* is twice lengthened into *purū*. Besides these, we find only such forms as *janimā* for *janimāni*, in which the long vowel may be more properly regarded as thematic and not metrical. This latter class of cases, however, has been reckoned in with the rest under rule 16, because it is so treated by the *pada*-text, which writes the final vowel short.† In a single instance (*brahma* : v. 2. 8) the *sanhitā* preserves the short vowel.

\* Amended in the published text to *abhyaghāyānti*.

† Excepting in two cases, viz. *varimā* (iv. 25. 2), and *nāmā* (ix. 9. 3). I do not at all understand the reason of these exceptions, and they may possibly be mis-readings of our *pada* MSS.; the *pada*-text reads *nāma* at v. 1. 3, and in the Rik passage (i. 164. 3) corresponding with ix. 9. 3, both *pada* and *sanhitā* give *nāma*.

## रलोपे ॥ २० ॥

20. When *r* is dropped, the final vowel is lengthened.

The other treatises (R. Pr. iv. 9, r. 29, ccxlviii; V. Pr. iv. 34; T. Pr. viii. 17), with better reason, give this rule in connection with that for the omission of the final *r*, which takes place (by ii. 19) only before a following initial *r*. The commentator repeats once more the same series of quotations which he has given already twice before, under i. 28 and ii. 19, only excepting the first, *ṣaradaḥ purūci rāyah* (ii. 13. 3): he then, as if in surprise at his own audacity, asks himself why he has omitted this; and makes reply that, although it offers an instance of the loss of a final *r*, it shows no protraction of the vowel, which was long already.<sup>1</sup>

## नारकादीनां प्रथमस्य ॥ २१ ॥

21. Of *nāraka* etc., the first vowel is lengthened.

The commentator cites only three cases under this rule, viz. *nārakam* (xii. 4. 36: p. *narakam*), *sādanam* (e. g. ii. 12. 7: p. *sadanam*), and *āsata indra* (viii. 4. 8: p. *asataḥ*). The first word occurs only once in the Atharvan; the second is found several times, but *sadana*, with short antepenult, still oftener; for *āsata* we have also two other passages in the same hymn with the one quoted (viii. 4. 12, 13). Besides these, the word of most frequent occurrence, belonging to the same class, is *purusha*, which usually\* becomes *pūrusha* at the end of a *pāda* (as noted by the Vāj. Pr., iii. 118), or where its first syllable has that place at which a long vowel is especially needed in the cadence of the *pāda*. Moreover, the text offers us *sūyamān* (iv. 27. 1: p. *su-yamān†*), and *sū-yavasa* (e. g. iv. 21. 7: p. *su-yavasa*), with its compound *sūyavasād* (vii. 73. 11: p. *suyavasa-at*). Causative forms, such as *yāvaya* (p. *yavaya*), which the treatise perhaps meant to include in this rule, have been spoken of above, under rule 15.

## दीद्यादीनां द्वितीयस्य ॥ २२ ॥

22. Of *dīdayat* etc., the second vowel.

The commentator's examples are *dīdayat* (iii. 8. 3: p. *didayat*), *ushāso vīravatīḥ* (iii. 16. 7: p. *ushasaḥ*), and *ushāsānaktā* (e. g. v. 12. 6: p. *ushāsānaktā*). The latter compound occurs several times in our text: from the theme *ushas* we have also once (xiii. 2. 46) the accusative *ushāsam* (p. *ushasam*). The only other word of like character which I have noted in the Atharvan is *ṣrathāya* (vii. 83. 3: p. *ṣrathaya*). A part of the compounds exhibiting protraction in the final syllable of the first member, and of which a detailed list has been given above, under

<sup>1</sup> *kim artham idaṁ nodārdhate: purūci rāyah: yady api valopo dīrgha evāivah.* The reading is very corrupt, but the thing aimed at is, I believe, clear.

\* In the Atharvan only usually, and not universally: exceptions are v. 30. 2. viii. 7. 2. xi. 8. 32. xii. 4. 13. xix. 6. 1, and one or two others.

† The edition reads, with I. and H., *suyamān*.

rule 12, might be regarded as falling under this rule; but as a part of them also would not, since it is their third syllable that is prolonged, and not their second, I preferred to give them all together in that place.

### सात्रासाहृदीनामुत्तरपदाद्यस्य ॥ २३ ॥

23. Of the compounds *sâtrâsâha* etc., the first vowel of the second member.

The instances cited by the commentator are *sâtrâsâhasya* (v. 13. 6: p. *sâtrâ-sahasya*), *amîtrasâhaḥ* (e. g. i. 20. 4: p. *amîtra-sahaḥ*), and *vi-shâsahîḥ* (e. g. i. 20. 6: p. *vi-sasahîḥ*); all of them from the root *sah*. The text furnishes another derivative from the same root belonging under this rule, viz. *abhimâtishâhaḥ* (iv. 32. 4: p. *abhimâti-sahaḥ*): the only other case which I have found is *nyâyanam* (vi. 77. 2: p. *ni-ayanam*). The word *ukthaçasah*, which the *pada*-texts of the Rik and White Yajus write *uktha-çasah*, and which therefore receives attention from their Prâtiçâkhyas (R. Pr. ix. 19; V. Pr. iii. 122), is read in our *pada* (xviii. 3. 21) *uktha-çasah*.

### ऋत वृधवरीवानेषु ॥ २४ ॥

24. Of *ṛta*, the final vowel, before *vr̥dh*, *varî*, and *vân*.

The instances cited by the commentator are *ṛtâvr̥dhah* (e. g. xi. 6. 19: p. *ṛta-vr̥dhah*), *ṛtâvarî yajñiye* (vi. 62. 1: p. *ṛta-varî*), and *ṛtâvânâṃ vâçvânaram* (vi. 36. 1: p. *ṛta-vânâṃ*): the same words occur elsewhere, in a few passages which it is unnecessary to specify; they always show a long vowel in *sankhîta* and a short in *pada*, while the other numerous compounds of *ṛta* have everywhere the short vowel only.

### अथ त्यधीःपरवर्त्तम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also that of *adhâ*, excepting when followed by *tyam* and *dhîḥ*.

The commentator's illustrative citations for *adhâ*, with lengthened final, are *adhâ yathâ nah* (xviii. 3. 21), and *adhâ pitṛñr upa drava* (xviii. 2. 23): he also quotes the exceptions mentioned in the rule, as follows: *adhâ tyam drapsam* (xviii. 1. 21), and *adhâ dhir ajâyata* (xviii. 1. 21). There is, however, yet another case in the text in which the final vowel is left short, and which has been overlooked both by treatise and commentator: it is *adhâ syâma* (xviii. 3. 17). All the passages in which *adhâ* occurs have been given above, in the note to rule 16. Except in the single case in which it is followed by *dhîḥ*, the word always stands at the beginning of a *pâda*. The commentator adds from his metrical authority a verse containing a virtual repetition of the rule: *adhe 'ti vyañjane dirgho varjayitvâ tyadhîpâram: svarâdâv api<sup>1</sup> sarvatra vyañjane hrasva eva tu*; 'adhâ is long before a consonant, excepting the cases in which it is followed by *tyam* and *dhîḥ*; but before a consonant preceded by a vowel (?) it is everywhere only short.'

<sup>1</sup> †—MS. *svadîrâvayya*.

Very little can be said in praise of the manner in which our treatise, in this section, deals with the intricate and numerous phenomena of the irregular prolongation of vowels in the Atharvan text; its statements are greatly wanting in accuracy, in completeness, and in systematic construction and arrangement. The form of its general rules, which embrace a great number of cases, is objectionable from indefiniteness: the cases which are made the subject of its special precepts are chosen arbitrarily and with little judgment, and in part are such as required no notice; while, on the other hand, it is doubtful whether one or two classes of cases are provided for at all: and finally, in several instances it abdicates altogether the office of a *Prâtiçâkhya*, and, instead of determining the usage of its school as to the points upon which it touches, leaves them as unsettled as it found them.

As elsewhere in the signature of the separate sections of this chapter, no statement is made respecting the number of rules which the section contains: the manuscript says simply *trîtyasya prathamah pâdah*.

## पदान्ते व्यञ्जनं द्विः ॥ २६ ॥

26. At the end of a word, a consonant is pronounced double.

The subject of the duplicated pronunciation of consonants, or of the *varṇakrama*, as it is sometimes called, is one of the most peculiar in the whole phonetical science of the Hindus. It is also the one, to my apprehension, which exhibits most strikingly their characteristic tendency to arbitrary and artificial theorizing; I have not succeeded in discovering the foundation of fact upon which their superstructure of rules is based, or explaining to myself what actual phonetic phenomena, liable to occur in a natural, or even a strained, mode of utterance, they supposed themselves to have noted, and endeavored thus to reduce to systematic form. The *varṇakrama*, however, forms a not inconspicuous part of the phonetic system of all the *Prâtiçâkhyas*, and is even presented by Pânini (viii. 4. 46-52), although the latter mercifully allows us our option as to whether we will or will not observe its rules. To present and compare in full detail the systems of the other authorities in connection with that of our own treatise would take a great deal of room, and, moreover, could be done at best but imperfectly, since our manuscript, as will be shown below, exhibits a *lacuna* of some extent and importance in the midst of its treatment of the subject. I shall accordingly only refer under each of our own rules to those precepts of the other treatises which are most nearly related to it.

If the first rule of the second chapter is still to be strictly applied, we must conclude that the makers of the *Prâtiçâkhya* recognized the duplicated methods of pronunciation as of force only in the *saṅhita-pâṭha*, and not in the utterance of the disjoined text, or the *padapâṭha*. This interpretation is somewhat supported by the fact that both the *Rik Pr.* (vi. 3, r. 14, cccxc) and Pânini (viii. 4. 51) attribute to Çâkala or Çâkalya, the teacher to whom the invention of the *padapâṭha* is generally ascribed, a denial of all duplicated utterance.

As regards our first rule, it is directly in contravention with the doc-

trine of the other treatises (R. Pr. vi. 2, r. 7, cclclxxxiv; V. Pr. iv. 114; T. Pr. xiv. 15), which unanimously teach that a consonant is not duplicated *in pausa*. The commentator's instances are again *godhuk*, *virāt*, *drshat*, *trishtup*, the same words which we have had adduced so many times before (see i. 3 etc): they are accordingly to be pronounced *godhukk*, *virātt*, *drshatt*, *trishtup*; but the manuscript omits, as in almost all the examples given under the following rules, to write the duplicated letter double.

### ङाना ऋस्वोपधाः स्वरे ॥ २७ ॥

27. As are also *ñ*, *ṇ*, and *n* before a vowel, when final and preceded by a short vowel.

This is a rule familiar to all students of Sanskrit, as being obligatory in the euphony of the later classical dialect, and not in the older language of the Vedas alone. It is equivalently stated by all the treatises (R. Pr. vi. 4, r. 15, cccxci; V. Pr. iv. 104; T. Pr. ix. 18, 19), except that the others omit the needless mention, along with the other two nasals, of *ṇ*, which never occurs as a final. Pāṇini's *pratyāhāra* (viii. 3. 32) includes all the three. Pāṇini and the Tāitt. Pr. very properly treat this doubling of a final nasal as something apart from and unconnected with the phenomena of the *varṇakrama*, by teaching it in a different part of their texts from that which deals with the latter subject; and in the Rik Pr., also, the rule rather follows next after, than is introduced among, those which prescribe the other duplications.

The commentator cites, as examples of a final nasal doubled, *pratyāññ ṛnoti* (not in AV.), *pratyāññ ud eshi* (xiii. 2. 20), *udyann ādityah* (ii. 32. 1), and *sugann āste* (no such case in AV.: the instance is also given by Pāṇini's scholiasts). To illustrate the necessity of the restrictions "when preceded by a short vowel" and "before a vowel," he cites *arvān ākūtyā caru* (iii. 2. 3), and *udan jātaḥ* (v. 4. 8). Finally, he quotes from his metrical authority a verse which restates the rule, with examples: *nānanās tu padāntā ye hrasvapūrvāḥ svarodayāḥ: teshāṃ dvirbhāvam ichanti pratyāññ udyann sugaṇṇ iti*.

### संयोगादि स्वरात् ॥ २८ ॥

28. Also the first consonant of a group, after a vowel.

In all the other treatises (R. Pr. vi. 1, r. 1, cclclxxviii; V. Pr. iv. 97; T. Pr. xiv. 1), this is put at the head of the subject of the *varṇakrama*, as the fundamental and most important rule.

The commentator gives as instances the two indifferent words *agnih* (e. g. i. 7. 4) and *vṛkshah* (e. g. iv. 7. 5), which are to be pronounced *aggnih* and *vṛkkshah*. Then follows a *lacuna* in the manuscript, of some extent and importance, since it certainly includes one or more rules. After the two quoted examples, namely, follows *visarjanīyah sasthāneca*, of which the two last words constitute a rule which the commentary goes on to expound in full, while the first, *visarjanīyah*, is the final repetition of the rule next preceding: and in both of them there is *anuvṛtti*



of *na*, 'not;' that is to say, the text has passed from giving rules for the occurrence of the duplication, to giving those for its non-occurrence. As we have found several times before, where there were lesser *lacunæ*, that the copyist had skipped carelessly from a word to a like word farther on, so we may suppose the same to have taken place here: *agnih* and *vrkshah* were very probably quoted again as examples under the rule *visarjanīyah*, and, the copyist's eye falling upon them, he overleaped all that intervened. It may be, however, that this conjecture is erroneous, and that the *lacuna* is of greater extent than would fairly admit of such an explanation. How many rules it includes, there are no means of determining: of this chapter we appear to have remaining ninety-six rules, while its signature states a hundred and five to be the number contained in it: but, on the one hand, we have not hitherto found reliable the numbers given in the signatures to the chapters; and, on the other hand, there is still another *lacuna*, of undetermined extent, in the fourth section (see under rule 80); and yet once more, we cannot be absolutely certain that the commentator does not, in one or two cases, state and expound two or more rules together, as once or twice in the first chapter (rules 12-13, 14-16). The treatment of the general subject by the other Prāticākhyas varies so much, as regards fullness of detail as well as the doctrines held on minor points, that I do not venture to attempt to fill up, by their guidance, the gap which the carelessness of our copyist has left, and I continue without break the enumeration of the rules which still remain to us.

\* \* \* \* \*

[न] विसर्जनीयः ॥ २९ ॥

29. *Visarjanīya* is not doubled.

The other treatises also exempt *visarjanīya* from duplication: see Rik Pr. vi. 1 (r. 1, cclxxviii), Vāj. Pr. iv. 112, and Tāitt. Pr. xiv. 15.

As already explained, in the preceding note, it is probable that the commentator gave again, in order to show that *visarjanīya* is not doubled when final (by iii. 26), like any other consonant, the instances *agnih* and *vrkshah*.

सस्थाने च ॥ ३० ॥

30. Nor a consonant which is followed by another of the same class.

The Rik Pr. makes no such exception as this: the other two treatises, however, do so, and each divides the precept into two, the one (V. Pr. iv. 108; T. Pr. xiv. 23) prohibiting the doubling of a consonant when followed by the same consonant, the other (V. Pr. iv. 113; T. Pr. xiv. 23, last half), when followed by a mute of the same series; the Vāj. Pr. farther specifying that the following mute must not be a nasal.

The commentator cites as instances a number of words, evidently without any particular reference to the Atharvan text, although two or three of them happen to occur there: they are *indrah* (e. g. i. 9. 1),

*candraḥ* (e. g. ii. 15. 3), *mandraḥ* (xviii. 1. 30), *ushtraḥ*, *kroshtraḥ* (*krosh-tre*, xi. 2. 2), *bhrāshṭram*, *neshṭram*, and *rāshṭram* (e. g. iii. 4. 1). Several of them are found also in the scholia to Pāṇini, as illustrations of his rule (viii. 4. 50) that, according to Çakatāyana, no duplication takes place in a group of more than two consonants. The instances are wanting in variety, as illustrating our text, since they all present groups of three consonants, while we must suppose our rule to apply no less to groups of two, and to forbid duplication in such words as *antah*, *asti*, *ashā*, etc.

रेफहकारौ परं ताभ्याम् ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Nor *r* and *h*—but the consonant following those two letters is doubled.

The commentator's examples are those which have been already given, and in part twice, under i. 58 and i. 100, and they need not, therefore, be repeated here.

The Rik Pr. (vi. 2, r. 4, cclclxxxi) subjects only *r* to this rule, leaving *h* to meet the same treatment with the other spirants; the Tāitt. Pr. (xiv. 4) does the same; the precept of the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 98) is to the same effect with ours, and so is also that of Pāṇini (viii. 4. 46), except that the latter here, as elsewhere, merely allows, and does not require, the duplication.

शषसाः स्वरे ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Not, however, *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, before a vowel.

This is an exception, of course, to the latter part of the preceding rule, since the sibilants would not, by any other precept, be subject to duplication before a vowel. The illustrations given in the commentary are none of them from the Atharvan, although a part of them are to be met with in the *scholia* to the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (viii. 4. 49); they are *karshati*, *adarçah*, *akshatarçah*, and *tatarsha*<sup>1</sup> *purodāçam*. As counter-example, to show that the sibilant is exempt from duplication only before a vowel, we have given us *varshshyodakena yajeta*, which is also no citation from the Atharvan text.

The Rik Pr. (vi. 2, r. 10, cclclxxvii) exempts from duplication any spirant, when followed either by a vowel or by another spirant. The Tāitt. Pr. (xiv. 16) and Pāṇini (viii. 4. 49) precisely agree with our treatise. The Vāj. Pr. fails to make any corresponding exception.

The manuscripts of the Atharva-Veda, so far as known to me, do not, save in very infrequent and entirely sporadic cases, follow any of the rules of the *varṇākrama* proper (rule 27, as already remarked, is really of another character), excepting the one which directs duplication after a *r*; and even in this case, their practice is as irregular as that of the manuscripts of the later literature. See Weber, pp. 246–248, for interesting statements respecting the usages of the codices of the Vājasaneyi-Saṅhitā.

<sup>1</sup> †—MS. *tatarçam*.

## प्रगृह्याश्च प्रकृत्या ॥ ३३ ॥

33. The *pragr̥hya* vowels remain unchanged.

As was already remarked above, under i. 73, the designation of certain vowels as *pragr̥hya*, made in the first chapter (rules 73-81), is not enough to exempt them from the operation of the rules for the combination in *sanhitā* of final and initial vowels: it is deemed necessary to add here that the vowels so designated maintain under all circumstances their own proper form. The method of the Rik Pr. and Vāj. Pr. is the same: see R. Pr. ii. 27 (r. 50, 51, clv, clvi); V. Pr. iv. 84.

The commentator's examples are *kena pārshñi ābhṛte: pārshñi iti* (x. 2. 1), *indravāyū ubhāu: indravāyū iti* (iii. 20. 6), and *ubhāv indragñi ā bharatām: indragñi iti* (v. 7. 6). The text offers a single case in which a final *pragr̥hya* vowel is combined with a following initial: it is *nrpatī 'va* (viii. 4. 6). The same passage is found in the Rīg-Veda (vii. 104. 6), exhibiting the same anomalous *sandhi*, and such exceptional cases are duly noted by the Rik Pr. (ii. 27, r. 54, clix), as is one of the same character by the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 86). That no reference is made to the passage in our treatise is possibly to be taken as an indication that the true Atharvan reading is *nrpatī iva*, as is actually given by E. and I.

## एना एहा आदयश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Also *enā ehāḥ* etc.

The passage cited in the rule as heading the *gaṇa* is found at xii. 3. 33, where both *sanhitā* and *pada* read *enā' ehā'h pári* etc., the establishers of the *pada*-text evidently regarding *enā* as the instrumental of the pronominal root *a*. To me, however, it seems more plausible to take the word as accusative plural feminine of the pronoun *ena*, which is usually enclitic, but in one or two instances (see the Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon, *sub verbo*) is accented, when standing at the head of a *pāda*. The form then would be *enā'h*, and the *sandhi* perfectly regular, and its treatment as an irregularity would be due only to a misapprehension on the part of the author of the *pada*. The other cases cited by the commentator, as composing the rest of the *gaṇa*, are *yathā man nā 'pagā asaḥ* (i. 34. 5. ii. 30. 1. vi. 8. 1-3), and *pr̥thivī uta dyāuḥ* (xviii. 1. 5). The latter is found also in the Rīg-Veda (x. 10. 5), and is noticed by its Prātiçākhyā (ii. 39). The other is a somewhat intricate case. As regards, first, the accent of the word—all analogy requires that, as containing a root for its final member, it should be accented upon the last syllable, *apagā'*. Thus, indeed, the *pada*-text actually reads where the passage first and last occurs; but at ii. 30. 1 it gives *āpa-gā*, and with this accentuation agree all the *sanhitā* manuscripts in every instance, so that this reading has been received into the printed text. Second, as regards the form—there is not, so far as I can see, any reason why we should not regard *apagā* as the theme of the word, and not *apaga*, and so consider the form as found in the text to be *apagās*, and the *sandhi* to be entirely regular. It is true that most of the Atharvan compounds

into which the root *gam* or *gā* enters as final member exhibit it in the shortened form *ga* (as *durgā*, *sugā*, *svargā*), but we have once *purogā* (v. 12. 11), and in like derivatives from other similar roots, as *jan* and *pā*, the short and long forms exchange with one another quite irregularly (e. g. *prathamajā'h*, iv. 35. 1, and *prathamajāh*, iv. 4. 5). I should be inclined to accuse the *pada*-text of a similar misapprehension in this passage with that exhibited in the other. There are one or two other cases in the Atharvan text which belong more or less clearly under this rule. In iv. 16. 1, all the *sanhitā* MSS., without exception, read *adhishthātā antikād iva* (p. *adhi-sthātā*): the edition treats this as a blunder, and amends to *adhishthātā 'ntikād iva*, but it might be possible to regard the passage as offering a case of anomalous *sandhi*. The theory of an error in this case, in which all the *sanhitā* MSS. chance to coincide, is supported by the analogy of the quite similar passage *rocanā' : asyā*, at vi. 31. 2, where P, M., and I. read *rocanā' asyā* in *sanhitā*, while W., E., and H. give *rocanā' 'syā*, with the Rik, Sāman, and White Yajur Vedas. At v. 26. 8, where the *sanhitā* manuscripts read *rūpā' asmin*, the *pada* has *rūpā'h : asmin*. Unless authority for *rūpā* as a feminine noun can be found elsewhere, it will probably seem easier to regard *rūpā* as a briefer form of *rūpāni*, and the *sandhi* as an anomalous one. A like case is vii. 97. 4, *sādanā akarma*, where Bp. is amended by a second hand from *sādanā* to *sādanāh*. An evident instance of pretty gross blundering is to be seen at xviii. 4. 58, where, instead of *pratārīto 'shāsām*, as the sense and metre require, and as is read by the Rik and Sāma Vedas (RV. ix. 86. 19; SV. i. 559), all our *sanhitā* manuscripts present *pratārītā ushāsām*, which the *pada* also supports by giving *pra-tārītāh*.

यवलोपि ॥ ३५ ॥

35. Where *y* or *v* has been dropped, the preceding vowel remains unchanged.

That is to say, wherever, by the loss of a final *y* or *v* according to the phonetic rules of the second chapter (ii. 21), a hiatus takes place, and two vowels are brought into juxtaposition with one another, they are not combined, but the hiatus remains. Two vowels can be thus brought together, according to the rules of our treatise, only by the loss of *y* and *v*, a final *visarjaniya* being converted into *y*, by the theory here taught, before its final disappearance. The same prohibition against applying the rules of combination twice over to the same case is given by the other treatises (R. Pr. ii. 2, r. 5, cix; V. Pr. iii. 3), in the form of a general precept, governing and restricting the application of its special rules.

As instances, the commentator cites again the whole series of passages given under ii. 21, and which I refrain from repeating here.

Although this is a rule of universal application as regards the mode of writing the text, the metre shows that it was not always observed by the authors of the hymns: see, for example, ix. 4. 19, 23, where we have to read *brāhmaṇebhya rshabham dattvā* and *asmin goshtō 'pa pr̥ñca nah*, instead of *brāhmaṇebhya rshabham* and *goshtā upa*. Such

cases are not infrequent. In a single instance, too (x. 1. 15), our *sanhitā* MSS. make the double combination, reading *ayam panihāḥ kṛtye 'ti tvā nayāmah*, instead of *kṛtya iti* (p. *kṛtye : iti*);\* but the edited text has restored the latter reading.

केवल उकारः स्वरपूर्वः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Also an *u* forming a word, when it is preceded by a vowel.

That is to say, of course, the particle *u*—whenever, by the operation of the euphonic rules, a hiatus is produced before it. There are found but three such cases in the Atharva-Veda; two of them are cited by the commentator, as follows: *sa u eva mahāyamah* (xiii. 4. 5), and *sa u aṣmānam asyati* (xiii. 4. 41); the third is *ayam vā u agnih* (xv. 10. 7).

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii. 28 (r. 55, clx), Vāj. Pr. iv. 87, and Tāitt. Pr. ix. 16, 17: the Rik Pr. also leaves the *u* unchanged after a *y* arising from conversion of an original *i*, one such case occurring in its text (*praty u adarṣi*, vii. 81. 1), while the Tāitt. Pr. inserts a transition *v* between the *u* and the following vowel.

नमौ संधौ ॥ ३७ ॥

37. Also *n* and *m*, when the results of euphonic processes.

The commentator fabricates his examples, instead of deriving them from the Atharvan text: they are *nadīm tarati* and *trisṭum nayati*. The former is intended to show that a *n* which is the result of the assimilation of a final *m*, by ii. 31, before an initial *t*, is not liable to a farther insertion of a sibilant before the *t*, by ii. 26; the latter, that a *m* which grows out of the assimilation of a final labial to a following initial dental nasal, by ii. 5, is not then, by ii. 31, convertible into *n* by a second assimilation.

This rule is of the same character with the last but one, and is replaced, or rendered unnecessary, in the other treatises, by the general precepts there referred to.

आकारः केवलः प्रथमं पूर्वेण ॥ ३८ ॥

38. An *ā* forming an entire word is first combined with the preceding vowel.

An instance will best explain the meaning of this rule. In the passage which the *pada*-text writes *dhiyā : ā : ihi*, if *ā* is first combined with the following word, it will form *e 'hi*, and the combination of this with the preceding word will give *dhiyāi 'hi*: but if the combination of *ā* with *dhiyā* be first made, producing *dhiyā*, the addition of *ihi* will give, as final result, *dhiye " 'hi*. The latter is the true method of making the two successive *sandhis*, as we are taught by this rule, and by corresponding rules in the other treatises (R. Pr. ii. 2, r. 7, cxi; T. Pr. v. 3);

\* P. only has, by a copyist's error, *kṛtyāi 'ti* in both its copies of the tenth book.

which, however, express themselves in a more general manner, declaring that all *sandhis* must be made in the order of their occurrence.

The commentator is this time conscientious enough to cite all the passages illustrating the rule which the text contains: they are *dhiye* " 'hi (ii. 5. 4), *jushasve* " 'ndra (ii. 5. 4), *stanayitnune* " 'hi (iv. 15. 11), *kushthe* " 'hi (v. 4. 1), *udakene* " 'hi (vi. 68. 1), and *avapaçyate* " 'ta (xviii. 4. 37).

स्वरे नामिनो ऽन्तःस्था ॥ ३९ ॥

39. Before a vowel, an alterant vowel becomes a semivowel.

Instead of citing actual examples from the text, the commentator prefers to fabricate his illustrations, which are *dadhy atra*, *madhv atra*, *mātraratham*, *pitraratham*: a part of them are identical with those given in the *scholia* to the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (vi. 1. 77).

The other treatises have corresponding rules: that of the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 45) being precisely like our own; that of the Rik Pr. (ii. 8, r. 21, 22, cxxv, cxxvi) being more elaborately stated; and that of the Tāitt. Pr. (x. 15) restricting the conversion into a semivowel to *i*, *î*, and *u*—a restriction which might with the same propriety have been made by all, since final *û* is always *pragrhya*, and final *ṛ* nowhere in the Vedas, so far as I am aware, comes to stand before an initial vowel.

संध्यन्तराणामयवायावः ॥ ४० ॥

40. The diphthongs, in the same situation, become respectively *ay*, *av*, *ây* and *âv*.

And then farther, by ii. 21, 22, the final semivowels are dropped, except in the case of *âv*, so that of *e* and *o* is left before an initial only *a*; of *âi*, only *â*—which vowels are then exempt, by iii. 35, from farther combination with their successors. The absorption of initial *a* by final *e* and *o*, and its retention without change after them in some cases, is taught by rules 53 and 54, below.

The commentator's illustrations are again of his own devising, for the most part; they are *agna âsâm*, *vâya âsâm*, *agna ûtaye*, *vâya ûtaye* (iv. 25. 6), *asmâ ud dhura*, *asâv âdityah* (xv. 10. 7), *çvayanam*, *câyakah*, *lavanam*, *lâyakah*, *pavanam*, *pâvakah* (e. g. vi. 47. 1). The last six are examples of applications of the rule which the Prātiçākhyā does not contemplate. A few of the instances are identical with those given under the corresponding rules of Pāṇini (viii. 3. 18, 19. vi. 1. 78).

The Rik Pr. (ii. 9, 10, 11, r. 25, 28, 31, cxxix, cxxxii, cxxxv) converts *âi* and *âu* directly into *â*, and *e* and *o* directly into *a*, adding that after the *a* and *â* which come from *o* and *âu* a *v* is inserted except before a labial vowel. The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 46) and Tāitt. Pr. (ix. 11–15) precisely agree with our treatise.

पूर्वपरयोरिकः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. In the following rules is taught the fusion of a preceding and a following vowel into a single sound.

This is a general heading or *adhikāra* for that which is to follow, or a rule governing the interpretation of the remaining rules in the section. The technical language of the Prātiçākhyas has no recognized method of indicating the fusion of two sounds into one, and the form of the following rules is ambiguous, since rule 44, for instance, literally means, according to the usual phraseology of the treatise, that *a* before *i* becomes *e*, and not *a* with *i*. Hence the necessity of this special rule of interpretation: it has its correspondents in the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 49), and the Tāitt. Pr. (x. 1); while the Rik Pr. (ii. 6 etc.) attains the desired end by a fuller or less technical mode of statement.

समानाक्षरस्य सवर्णे दीर्घः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. A simple vowel, with one of like quality, becomes long.

The commentator's illustrations are again of his own making: they are *dāṇḍāgram*, *dadhīndrah*, *madhūshnam*, *hotṛçyah*, and *pitṛçyah*. For the last case, indeed, the combination of two *r*'s, no Vedic example\* could be found.

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii. 6 (r. 15, cxix), Vāj. Pr. iv. 50, Tāitt. Pr. x. 2.

सीमन्ते ऋस्वः ॥ ४३ ॥

43. In *śimanta*, the resulting vowel is short.

A most blundering and superfluous rule! The Atharva-Veda contains no such theme as *śimanta*. In the passage which the commentator cites in illustration of the rule—viz. *jinato vajra tvam śimantam* (vi. 134. 3)—the theme is evidently *śimant*, from which we find also a plural accusative, *śimantaḥ*, at iv. 1. 1; it is a parallel form with, and equivalent to, *śiman*, of which the text affords us an accusative singular, *śimānam*, at ix. 8. 13. The rule evidently assumes *śimanta* as the theme, and regards it as composed of *śiman* and *anta*. Our *pada*-text, as might be expected, makes no attempt to analyze the word. The commentator, after his illustrative citation, adds to the rule a restriction of his own, quite in the style of a *vārttika* to Pāṇini, as follows: *śimante keçaveshte 'ti vaktavyam: yo hi śimno antaḥ śimāntaḥ saḥ*; 'it should have been said, "in *śimanta*, when it means the parting of the hair;" for the extremity (*anta*) of a boundary (*śiman*) is *śimānta*.' Since, however, *śimānta* does not occur in the Atharvan, the limitation is just as impertinent as the original rule: more so, it could not well be. Compare *vārttika* 3 to Pāṇ. vi. 1. 94.

अवर्णस्येवर्ण एकारः ॥ ४४ ॥

44. *A* and *ā*, with *i* and *ī*, become *e*.

The commentator's illustrations, as given by our manuscript, are *raṇḍgomālendrah*, which, however, a comparison of the examples under the next rule and under the corresponding rule of Pāṇini (vi. 1. 87) shows to require amendment to *khaṭvendrah*, *mālendrah*.

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii. 6 (r. 16, cxx), Vâj. Pr. iv. 52, and Tâitt. Pr. x. 4.

उवर्ण ओकारः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. With *u* and *û*, they become *o*.

The commentator, as so generally in this portion of his work, makes his own illustrations, viz. *khatvodakam*, *mâlodakam*: compare under Pân. vi. 1. 87.

See the identical rules in the other treatises: Rik Pr. ii. 7 (r. 17, cxxi), Vâj. Pr. iv. 52, and Tâitt. Pr. x. 5.

There is a single instance in the text, in which this rule is not observed, and *a + û* are not combined into *o*, but into *âu*: it is the word *prâudhaḥ* (xv. 15. 4: p. *pra-ûdhaḥ*). B., indeed, reads *prodho*, but doubtless only by an error of the copyist. We must suppose, either that the authors and commentator overlooked this word, or that its *pada* as well as *sankhîta* reading in their text would be *prâudhaḥ*, or that the passage containing it was not in their Atharva-Veda—of which suppositions, I should regard the first as the most plausible, and the last as the least likely.

अर्मवर्णे ॥ ४६ ॥

46. With *ṛ* and *ṝ*, they become *ar*.

The commentator's examples are *tosya rshabhasyâ 'ngâni* (ix. 4. 11), *yajñartoh* (viii. 10. 4: p. *yajña-ṛtah*), *kâmartaḥ* (not in AV.), and *nâi 'nân avartih* (iv. 34. 3: the *pada*-text always writes the word *avartih*, without separation).

The Tâitt. Pr. (x. 8) makes the *sandhi* in the same manner as our treatise: the Rik Pr. (ii. 11, r. 32, cxxvi) and Vâj. Pr. (iv. 48), however, treat it very differently, merely prescribing that both *a* and *â* become *a* before *ṛ*, without requiring the conversion of the latter into *r*. The usage of the *sankhîta* manuscripts of the Atharva-Veda is in conformity with neither rule; they follow a method of their own, in which is to be recognized the influence of a doctrine agreeing with or resembling that of our Prâtiçâkhyâ respecting the *svarabhakti*, or fragment of vowel sound, assumed to be thrust in between *r* and a following consonant (see i. 101, 102). Where the phonetical theory requires the insertion of the longer *svarabhakti*, or where a sibilant follows, there the manuscripts usually and regularly give the vowel *ṛ* instead of *r*, reading *iva rshabhaḥ* (iii. 6. 4), *svasa ṛshinâm* (vi. 133. 4), etc.; before any other consonant, or where our treatise and the Rik Pr. interpose the shorter *svarabhakti* after the *r*, and the other Prâtiçâkhyas require no insertion at all (see the note to i. 101, 102), there our manuscripts regularly make the combination according to the rule now under discussion, writing *ṛtasya rtena* (vi. 114. 1), *iva rbhuḥ* (x. 1. 8), *sa rcâm* (x. 8. 10), etc. These rules are not, however, altogether without exceptions: there are a number of passages in which one or more of the manuscripts read the semivowel *r* instead of the vowel *ṛ* before a *sh* (viz. iv. 4. 8. ix. 8. 14,



15, 16. x. 7. 14a; 10. 10. xi. 1. 1, 3; 3. 38. xii. 1. 6. xiii. 1. 55. xv. 2. 4, first time), and even a few (viz. x. 7. 14c. xi. 6. 11. xv. 2. 4 (bis); 14. 4. xix. 9. 13) in which they all agree in so doing; and, on the other hand, while in the very great majority of cases the *r* is changed to *r̄* before any other consonant (it is found so changed, in the Atharvan text, before *k*, *g*, *c*, *j*, *ch*, *t*, *d*, *n*, *dh*, and *bh*), there are a very few instances (viii. 10. 4. xviii. 2. 31; 3. 24) in which one or more manuscripts leave it unaltered, and even two (x. 1. 12; 5. 30, before *g* and *k*) where they unanimously read *r̄*.\* As regards the orthography of the *sandhi* in the published text, accordingly, three courses were open to the editors: first, to follow the rule of the Prātiçākhyā, and to convert the initial vowel everywhere into the semivowel; second, to carry out consistently the general principle derivable from the practice of the manuscripts, writing always *r̄* before a sibilant, and *r* before any other consonant; and third, to be governed everywhere by the authority of the manuscripts where they were unanimous, and, where they disagreed, to give due weight to the principle just referred to, in choosing between their discordant readings. Unfortunately the edition has adopted none of these courses, but, while adhering with tolerable closeness to the manuscript readings through the early part of the text, gives everywhere only *r̄* from the beginning of the eighth book onward, thus introducing the rule of the Rik and White Yajur Vedas, and following neither the Prātiçākhyā nor the manuscripts of the Atharvan. The details given above, however, will show what are the readings of the manuscripts in any given passage.

It is worthy of remark that the manuscript of our commentary, like those of the Atharvan text, writes *r̄* in the first instance cited (*tasya r̄shabhasya*), and *r* in all the rest.

There is a single passage of the text requiring special notice, as exhibiting in the *sankhītā* manuscripts an entirely irregular *sandhi* of final *ā* with initial *r̄*: it is at xviii. 2. 31, where the *ā* of *suçevā* is left unshortened before *r̄kshākam*, B. writing *suçevā r̄kshākam*, and all the others *suçevā r̄kshākam*. Probably the reading is corrupt, or the words wrongly analyzed by the *pada*-text: perhaps we have to correct and divide *suçevā*: *ārkskhikām*.

## उपर्शन्त्यादिषु च ॥ ४७ ॥

47. Also in *uparshanti* etc.

The words and forms contemplated by this rule are exceptions to the one next following, according to which we should have *upārshanti* etc. The commentator cites in illustration the passages *yā hrdayam uparshanti* (ix. 8. 14), *yāḥ pārçve uparshanti* (ix. 8. 15), and *yās tiraççtr uparshanti* (ix. 8. 16); and these are the only cases of the kind pre-

\* The lingual sibilant, *sh*, is the only spirant before which a *sandhi* of final *a* or *ā* with initial *r̄* is made in the Atharvan text: the text does, indeed, contain a single passage in which such a combination should properly take place before *ç*—viz. *kramava r̄ça iva rohītam* (iv. 4. 7)—but the tradition has most palpably and grossly misunderstood and blundered over the phrase, and the *pada* writes it *krama*: *svārçah-iva*: *rohītam*, instead of *kramava*: *r̄çah-iva*: *rohītam*.

sented by the text, so that the "etc." at the end of the rule is quite superfluous as regards the Atharvan. In the passages cited, the *pada* reads *upa-rshanti*, and the *sanhitâ* manuscripts, as already noticed in the last note, vary between *uparshanti* and *upaṛshanti*, W. even giving, in the second and third cases, *uparishanti*.

### उपसर्गस्य धावादावारम् ॥ ४८ ॥

48. The *a* or *â* of a preposition, with the initial *r* or *ṛ* of a root, becomes *âr*.

The commentator's illustrations are of his own fabrication, and in part are to be found under the corresponding rule of Pânini (vi. 1. 91): they are *upârshâti*, *prârshâti*, *upârçhati*, *prârçhati*, *upârdhnoti*, and *prârdhnoti*. The only case arising under the rule in the Atharva-Veda is *â rçhatu*, at ii. 12. 5. Our treatise might, then, like the Vâj. Pr. (iv. 57), have restricted the operation of the rule to the preposition *â*. The Tâitt. Pr. (x. 9) states the principle in the same general form in which it is here given.

### भूतकरणस्य च ॥ ४९ ॥

49. As does also that of the augment.

This rule, of course, in a treatise whose subject is the *sandhyapadyâu gunâu* of words (i. 1), is out of place and superfluous. It has no correspondent in any of the other treatises, and its chief interest and value to us lies in its presenting a term for 'augment'—*bhûtakarana*, 'maker of past meaning'—which is elsewhere unknown, at least in the Prâtiçâkhyâ literature.

The commentator cites, in illustration of the rule, *sa ârdhnôti* (iv. 39. 1 etc.); and also, as counter-example, showing that it applies only to the augment, *katamâ sa rcâm* (x. 8. 10).

### एकारिकारयोरैकारः ॥ ५० ॥

50. With *e* and *âi*, *a* and *â* become *âi*.

Again the commentator gives us only fabricated illustrations, which, with the help of the *scholia* to the corresponding rule of Pânini (vi. 1. 88), are readable as follows: *khaṭvâirakâ*, *mâlâirakâ*, *khaṭvâitîkâyanah*, *mâlâitîkâyanah*.<sup>1</sup>

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii. 7 (r. 18, cxxii), Vâj. Pr. iv. 55, Tâitt. Pr. x. 6.

### ओकारिकारयोरौकारः ॥ ५१ ॥

51. With *o* and *âu*, they become *âu*.

The commentator this time presents us two actual citations from the

<sup>1</sup> *khaṭvâiragâh*: *mâlâiragâh*: *khaṭvebhîkâyamânah*: *mâlâitîkâyamânah*.

text, viz. *brahmāudanam pacati* (xi. 1. 1 : p. *brahma-ōdanam*), and *tasyāu 'danasya* (xi. 3. 1); but then adds a fictitious case, *brahmāupagavaḥ*, which occurs also in Pānini's *scholia* (to rule vi. 1. 88).

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii. 7 (r. 19, cxiii), Vāj. Pr. iv. 55, and Tāitt. Pr. x. 7.

### शकल्येष्यादिषु परत्रपम् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. In *çakalyeshi* etc., the result has the same form with the latter constituent.

The commentator cites under this rule the following cases : *çakalyeshi yadi vā te janitram* (i. 25. 2 : p. *çakalya-esi*), *anamivā upetana* (iii. 14. 3 : p. *upa-étana*), *arvāci gāur upe 'shatu* (vi. 67. 3), and *upeshantam udumbalam* (viii. 6. 17 : p. *upa-eshantam*). Of these cases, the first would equally admit of being regarded as a case of regular *sandhi*, and analyzed as *çakali-esi*: the second is analogous with the combinations to which rule 38 of this chapter relates, the preposition *ā* being in *sandhi* combined with *upa*, and then the resulting *upā* with *itana*. Of this kind, the text presents one additional instance, in *upeyimā* (x. 1. 10 : p. *upa-eyimā*; it is made up of *upa-ā-tyimā*): it is the only passage falling under the rule which the commentator does not give.

Similar cases are noted by the Rik Pr. at ii. 36, 37, by the Vāj. Pr. at iv. 53, 54, and by the Tāitt. Pr. at x. 14.

### एकारैकारान्तात्पूर्वः पदादेरकारस्य ॥ ५३ ॥

53. After a word ending in *e* or *o*, an initial *a* becomes one with the preceding vowel.

The commentator cites a few instances of this exceedingly common *sandhi* (the occurrence of which will be more particularly treated of under the next rule), as follows : *te 'vadan* (v. 17. 1 : the instance, however, may perhaps be given as one fabricated, and not as a citation from the Atharvan text; it is found in the *scholia* to Pān. vi. 1. 115), *te 'kranvan* (as is read both here and under iii. 55; perhaps we are to amend to *te 'kr̥nvan*, but that also is not to be found in the Atharvan), *so 'bravit* (xv. 3. 2), *yo 'sya dakshinaḥ karnaḥ* (xv. 18. 3), and *so 'rojyala* (xv. 8. 1).

The physical explanation of this combination is exceedingly difficult. The Rik Pr. (ii. 12, 13, r. 33, 34, cxxxvii, cxxxviii) and Vāj. Pr. (iv. 58), as well as Pānini (vi. 1. 109), treat it in the same manner as our treatise, as a union of *a* with the preceding diphthong, or its absorption by the latter. The Tāitt. Pr. alone (xi. 1) teaches an actual loss or omission of the *a*.

### क्वचित्प्रकृत्या ॥ ५४ ॥

54. Sometimes the *a* remains unabsorbed.

The commentator quotes from the text, in illustration, the passage *ye agnayaḥ* (iii. 21. 1), and adds *sahasrarcam ide atra*, which is not found in the Atharvan text.

With this rule and the preceding our treatise makes short shrift of a subject which occupies long passages of the other Prâtiçākhyas (R. Pr. ii. 13-26; V. Pr. iv. 58-82; T. Pr. xi. 1-xii. 8), and has cost their authors a vast deal of labor. The saving is made, however, at the expense of its reputation and value as an authority for the readings of its text, since it does not determine the *sanhitā* form of one of the many hundred passages in which initial *a* comes in contact with final *e* or *o*. There is not in the whole work another so discreditable confession of unwillingness or inability to cope with the difficulties of an intricate subject.

In endeavoring to make some systematic exhibition of the usage of the Atharvan text with reference to this *sandhi*, I have been able, after more than one trial, to devise no better scheme of presentation than one founded upon a comparison of the actual written usage of the text with the requirements of the metre. If there is any rule or system of rules, of a more formal character, underlying and determining the very various phenomena—which I cannot but seriously doubt—I have been unable to discover any trace of it. The tabular conspectus, then, is as follows—the lines distinguishing the cases in which the metre appears to require the retention of the *a* unabsorbed, as a separate syllable, from those in which its absorption is demanded, in order to make the verse of proper length; and the columns showing how often the *a* is by the manuscripts omitted and retained respectively:

|                                          | In written text: |           | Total. |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------|--------|
|                                          | omitted.         | retained. |        |
| I. Where metre requires omission,        | 252              | 41        | 293    |
| II. Where metre requires retention:      |                  |           |        |
| <i>a</i> , at beginning of <i>pāda</i> , | 198              | 39        |        |
| <i>b</i> , elsewhere in <i>pāda</i> ,    | 102              | 965       |        |
|                                          | 300              | 1004      | 1304   |
| Total in metrical part of text,          | 552              | 1045      | 1597   |
| III. In unmetrical passages,             | 192              | 28        | 220    |
| Total in whole text,                     | 744              | 1073      | 1817   |

Upon examining this table, it will be seen, in the first place, that in the unmetrical portions of the Atharvan text the greatly prevailing method of making the *sandhi* is that which is followed in the Sanskrit literature proper, viz. by omission of the *a*: the proportion of omissions to retentions is that of 7 to 1. In the metrical portions, on the other hand, the more common custom is to retain the *a*, the retentions being to the omissions nearly as 2 to 1. When we come to inquire farther what was the usage of the makers of the hymns, we find that the proportion in favor of the retention of the *a* as a separate syllable is considerably greater, or almost as  $4\frac{1}{2}$  to 1. There is, then, considerable discordance between the written and spoken usage in the metrical part; and yet this discordance appears in great measure at a single point, or where the final *e* or *o* of a *pāda* precedes the initial *a* of another *pāda*. In this situation—where, if ever, we should expect the traditional and written reading to correspond with the original spoken form of the verse—the recorded text usually leaves out the *a*, and mars as much as it can the metrical form of the verse: the proportion of omissions to retentions is here as 5 to 1; and in the Rig-Veda, so far as I have observed, it is still larger: there can be but very few instances in the

earlier portions, at least, of that text, where the custom of omission of *a* at the beginning of a *pāda* is not followed. Making exception of this special case, it may be said that the usage of the written text follows in the main the requirements of the metre—although with not infrequent exceptions, which in the case of the required omissions make somewhat less than a sixth of the whole number, and in the cases of required retention, considerably less than one-ninth.

There are, of course, a number of doubtful cases, where the metre is irregular and obscure, or where it might be restored either with the omission or the retention of the *a* as a separate syllable: but, rather than form of them a separate class, I have determined and ranked each case according to my best judgment; and the general relations and bearings of the scheme are not, I am sure, perverted by any errors I may have committed.

Here, at the end of the second section of the chapter, the manuscript says again simply *tr̥tīyasya dvitīyaḥ pādauḥ*.

The proper subject of the next section is the calling forth or modification, in connection with the combinations of the phrase, of the accents already laid down and defined in the first chapter (i. 14–17). With this, however, is also connected a distinction and nomenclature of the different kinds of *svarita* or circumflex accent which the theory of the school recognizes: and the latter subject is even allowed in part to take precedence of and overlie the former, in such a manner as to render their joint presentation confused and imperfect, as will be pointed out in detail below. By way of introduction to the section, and before stating and explaining its first rule, the commentator gives us the following four verses: \* *śhaḍ eva svaritojātāni lākṣhaṇāḥ pratiḥānate: pūrvam pūrvam dr̥dhatarām mrdātyo yad yad uttaram:—abhinihitāḥ prāḡṣiṣṭo jātyaḥ kṣhāipraḥ ca tā ubhāu: tāirovyañjanapādavṛttāv etat svaritamandalam:—sarvatikṣhṇo bhinihitas tataḥ prāḡṣiṣṭa ucyate: tato mrdutarāu svārāu jātyaḥ kṣhāipraḥ ca tāv ubhāu:—tato mrdutarāḥ svāras tāirovyañjana ucyate: pādavṛtto mrdutara iti svārabalābalam;* ‘those skilled in distinctions recognize six kinds of circumflex accent, and no more. Of these, each preceding one is harder, each succeeding one is softer: viz., the *abhinihita*, the *prāḡṣiṣṭa*, and the *jātya* and *kṣhāipra*, these two; farther, the *tāirovyañjana* and *pādavṛtta*: this is the series of circumflex accents. The *abhinihita* is entirely sharp; next is ranked the *prāḡṣiṣṭa*; the next pair, of softer character, are the *jātya* and *kṣhāipra*, these two; the *tāirovyañjana* is called softer than these; the *pādavṛtta* is still softer: thus are laid down the relative strength and weakness of the circumflex accents.’ We have here evidently the schemes of two different authorities, which accord quite closely with one another; the only difference being that the former seems to rank as equal the two accents last mentioned. Indeed, the commentator goes on to add, in accordance with this, *apara āha: tāirovyañjanapādavṛttāu tulyavṛttī iti;* ‘another says, “the *tāirovyañjana*

\* The last two of these verses are also cited in Uvāṭa’s commentary to the Vāj. Pr.: see Weber, p. 139.

and *pādavr̥ta* are of like quality.” Other authorities, however, construct the scale somewhat differently: thus the Vāj. Pr. (i. 125) makes the order run as follows: *abhinihita*, *kshāipra* (with which the commentator declares the *jātya* to agree in rank), *praçliṣṭa*, *tāirovyañjana*, *tāirovirāma* (see below, under rule 62), and *pādavr̥ta*; while the Tāitt. Pr. (xx. 9–12) declares the effort of enunciation (*prayatna*) of the *kshāipra* and *jātya*, together with the *abhinihita*, to be harder, that of the *praçliṣṭa* and *prātihata* (see under rule 62) to be softer, and that of the *tāirovyañjana* and *pādavr̥ta* to be yet less (*alpatara*). The Rik Pr., like our own treatise, takes no notice of these alleged differences of utterance among the different kinds of circumflex. It is not, however, without good reason that our commentator gives himself the trouble to state them, since their recognition can hardly have been without its important influence upon the division of the *svarita* into its numerous forms. The three arrangements quoted above agree, it will be noticed, in ranking the forms of the independent *svarita* above those of the enclitic, but are discordant as regards the relative position of the members of each class; and this may serve to us as a significant indication that the differences of secondary rank are of but trifling consequence. Precisely what is meant by “sharp” (*tikṣhna*) and “hard” (*dr̥dha*) on the one hand, and “soft” (*mṛdu*) on the other, is not very clear: but that the proper circumflex, which arises upon the combination into a single syllable of an original acute and an original grave element, is more strongly marked and distinct in its quality of double pitch than that circumflex which is only enclitic, need not be doubted.

After this preliminary exposition, the commentator goes on to add *udāttaḥ pūrvaḥ: paro nudāttaḥ: svaritaḥ sandhiḥ*; ‘an acute preceding; a grave following: their combination circumflex.’ I am not altogether confident that this is not the first rule of the section, since, as we shall see, the two rules which follow are defective in form, and need some such predecessor. Considering, however, the faulty construction of the whole section, the limited number of the words in question as an *adhikāra* or heading for . . . . ., their inconsistency with rule 66 below, and the absence of the paraphrase and repetition which ought to follow them, if they are a rule, I have not ventured to regard them as a part of the treatise; they are more probably an addition of the commentator, intended to supply the deficiency of the next two rules.

एकारौकारौ पदान्तौ परतो ऽकारं सो ऽभिनिहितः ॥५५

55. When an *a* is absorbed by a preceding final *e* or *o*, the resulting circumflex is *abhinihita*.

This is by no means a close version of the rule as it stands in the text; literally translated, it reads as follows: ‘final *e* and *o*; following them, an *a*: that is *abhinihita*.’ The construction presents a grammatical difficulty. If *akāra*, ‘the sound *a*,’ is not here used as a neuter—and such words are elsewhere only masculine—the form *akāram* must be understood as an accusative, and can only be construed as dependent upon *parataḥ*, used prepositionally, and taken as meaning ‘before’ in-

stead of 'after,' so that we must translate 'final *e* and *o* before an *a* : that is *abhinihita*.' and to treat *parataḥ* thus seems to me hardly admissible.\* The commentator does not help us much, but, if I rightly apprehend his meaning, he treats the word as a neuter nominative; his paraphrase reads *ekāraukāraṁ padāntāu udāttāu parataḥ akāraṁ<sup>1</sup> padādi anumāttam sa abhinihitaḥ svarō bhavati*; 'e and o, final, with acute accent; after them, a, initial, unaccented; that becomes an *abhinihita* accent (or vowel).' But passing over this difficulty, as of inferior consequence, since the virtual meaning of the phraseology is clear, we find another and a graver one in the fact that the form of the rule seems to imply that the occurrence of this *svarita* has been already sufficiently taught, and that nothing remains but to give it a name; while nevertheless the treatise nowhere informs us under what circumstances a circumflex accent arises in connection with the meeting of a final *e* or *o* and an initial *a*, or even that it arises at all. Its doctrine must be, of course, the same which is taught in all the other treatises; namely, that when an initial unaccented or grave *a* is elided after or absorbed into a final diphthong which itself has an acute accent, its own accent is represented in that of the resulting diphthong, reducing the latter from acute to circumflex. This case of circumflex, as well as that which forms the subject of the next rule, is an exception under rule 66 below, which teaches that a vowel resulting from the fusion of elements whereof one is acute, is itself acute: it ought, accordingly, to be specifically described and taught as such an exception. The admission as a rule of the words referred to above as used by the commentator before the statement of the precept now under discussion—viz. 'an acute preceding; a grave following: their combination circumflex'—would not satisfactorily relieve the difficulty, because this would be equivalent to setting up over against rule 66 another general rule opposed to it, without establishing in any way the relation between them. We can hardly avoid supposing that the constructors of this part of the treatise have not been skilful enough, or careful enough, to combine the two subjects of the section in such a manner as to give completeness to both. The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 59) and Tāitt. Pr. (xii. 9) give rules for the occurrence of the *abhinihita* circumflex in connection with those for the absorption of the initial *a*, and define and name the accent elsewhere (V. Pr. i. 114; T. Pr. xx. 4), when treating of the general subject of accent: the Rik Pr. deals with both matters together, but with clearness and precision, first prescribing the *svarita* (iii. 7, r. 12, excix), and then later (iii. 10) giving it its distinctive appellation.

The names of the different kinds of *svarita* are chiefly derived from those belonging to the euphonic combinations in connection with which they arise. These latter, however, are not expressly given in all the treatises. Thus, the Rik Pr. alone (ii. 13, r. 34, cxxxviii) calls the absorption of initial *a* into preceding final *e* and *o* the *abhinihita sandhi*

\* The commentator uses *parataḥ* very often, in paraphrasing the locative of precedence, but always puts it after the locative: thus, in the first rule of this chapter, *sahāu*, 'before the root *sah*,' is explained by *sahāu parataḥ*; and so in scores of other cases.

<sup>1</sup> *akātra*.

while the Vāj. Pr., as well as our own treatise, agrees with it in applying to the resulting circumflex the title of *abhinihita*. The Tāitt. Pr. (xx. 4) has for the same accent the slightly different name *abhinihata*, which is palpably an artificial variation of the other.

As examples of the *abhinihita* circumflex, the commentator gives us precisely the same series of phrases as under rule 53 above, viz. *tè 'va-dan, tè 'kravan, sò 'bravit, yò 'sya dākshinaḥ kárnaḥ, sò 'rajyata*. In a few cases (which are detailed below, in a marginal note\*), our Atharvan manuscripts fail to give the circumflex to an *e* or *o*, originally acute, which has absorbed an unaccented *a*, and leave it acute; but these are evidently to be explained simply as perpetuating original errors of transcription, and as requiring at our hands the emendation which they have not received from the native copyists.

### इकारयोः प्राक्षिष्टः ॥ ५६ ॥

56. The circumflex arising from the fusion of two short *i*'s is *prākṣiṣṭa*.

*Praçliṣṭa* or *praçlesha* is the name given by the Rik Pr. (ii. 7, r. 20, cxxiv) to all those cases of combination in which two vowels, or a vowel and diphthong, are fused together into a single vowel or diphthong: that is to say, to those of which our treatise treats in the latter half of the preceding section (rules 42–51). A *svarita* accent arising in connection with such a combination is by all the other treatises called *praçliṣṭa*. The manuscript of our own treatise, both text and commentary, varies between the two forms *prākṣiṣṭa* and *prākçliṣṭa*, more often reading the latter; which, however, has seemed to me too anomalous, not to say too monstrous, a term to be permitted to stand. The Rik Pr. (iii. 8, r. 13, cc) informs us that a single teacher, Māndukeya, held that the *praçliṣṭa svarita* arose in all cases of a *praçlesha* combination where the former element was acute and the latter grave, and it is well known that the Çatapatha Brāhmaṇa follows this rule of accentuation throughout. Pāṇini (viii. 2. 6) also permits it, whenever the unaccented latter element is the initial of a word—that is to say, everywhere in the combinations of the phrase. But the predilection of the Sanskrit for the circumflex accent is much too weak to allow of so frequent an occurrence of it as the general acceptance of this rule would condition, and all the Prātiçākhyas lend their authority to the usage prescribed in our rule 66 below, that a combination into which enters an *udātta* vowel is itself *udātta*, the acute element raising the grave to its own pitch. All, however, allow the exception which forms the subject of the last rule,

\* The passages are x. 10. 10 (*bis*). xi. 3. 49; 10. 23. xii. 3. 58; 4. 35, 47 (here, however, I. gives *sò* instead of *sò*, and B. has been amended to the same reading). xv. 14. 3 (B. and P. *apò*). xvi. 4. 3. xviii. 4. 15. The edition has generally corrected the accentuation in these cases; but in three passages—viz. xi. 10. 23. xii. 3. 58. xviii. 4. 15—the erroneous reading of the manuscripts remains. Once, by a contrary error, the codices generally agree in giving the circumflex to a final *o*, while leaving the *a* unabsorbed after it: thus, *yajñò ajáyata* (xiii. 1. 48), but I. and E. (the latter by emendation) give the consistent reading *yajñò jáyata*, which has been received into the edited text.



and all but the Tāitt. Pr. allow also that which is treated of in this rule: if *ī* and *i*, both short, are fused together into a long vowel, this vowel has the *praçliṣhta svarita*: thus, *ī̄*. The illustrations cited by the commentator are *abhī̄ 'hi manyo* (iv. 32. 3), *bhindhī̄ 'dām* (vii. 18. 1), and *diçī̄ 'tāh* (xi. 2. 12 etc.).\* But the arising of the circumflex is expressly restricted to the case in which both the *i*'s are short: if the former of the two is long, it is very natural that, as the more powerful element, it should assimilate the weaker grave vowel, and make the whole compound acute. Thus *enī̄'iva* becomes *enī̄'va*, not *enī̄'va* (v. 14. 11); *mahī'iyām* becomes *mahī'yām* (ix. 10. 12), etc. Such cases, especially of *iva* following an acute final *i*, are not uncommon.† The cases in which a long unaccented *ī*, on the other hand, is preceded by a short accented *i*, are exceedingly rare; there is but a single one in the whole Atharvan text, and it is cited by the commentator as a counter-example under the present rule, as follows: *mā' vanīm mā' vācam no vā' 'rīṣiḥ* (v. 7. 6: p. *vi*: *irṣiḥ*); he adds, *paro dīrghah: iha asmāt praçliṣhto na bhavati*; 'the latter of the two *i*'s is long: hence here the *praçliṣhta* accent does not arise.' We should, however, expect that in such a compound, especially, the circumflex would not fail to appear; for if, in the fusion of *i* and *ī*, the grave accent of the second element is represented in the accentuation of the resulting long vowel, by so much the more should this be the case in the fusion of *i* + *i*, where the second element is the stronger. The teachings of accentual theory are so obvious and explicit upon this point that it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that the Hindu grammarians, in establishing their system, overlooked or disregarded the combination *i* + *ī*, on account of its rarity, and that the accent of the cases later noted was made to conform to the rule, instead of the rule being amended to fit the cases. The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 133), indeed, makes a special exception of the word *vīkṣhita* (p. *vi*-*ikṣhita*), allowing it the *praçliṣhta* circumflex which all such compounds palpably ought to have: whether the text of the White Yajus contains any other examples of the class, besides the one cited under the general rule (iv. 132: *hi' 'm*, from *hi*: *im*; the same passage is the only one given under the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. [iii. 7, r. 12, excix]), Weber does not inform us. It is not easy to see any reason in the nature of things why a combination of two *u*'s should not be subject to the same law of accent as that of two *i*'s. This, however, is another very rare case; in the whole Atharvan not a single example occurs, nor have I happened to meet with any in the Rig-Veda; that this is the reason why the Prātiçākhyas generally take no notice of any *praçliṣhta* accent arising from such a combination is altogether probable. It is not a little remarkable, then, that the Tāitt. Pr. takes no note of the fusion of two *i*'s as giving rise to a *svārita*, but (x. 17) prescribes it for the case in which, by a *praçlesha* combination, *ū* is formed, and applies (xx. 5) to this alone the name *praçliṣhta*: the instances cited in

\* The other instances which the text affords are to be found at iii. 11. 2. v. 22. 7. vi. 92. 3; 123. 2; 126. 3. vii. 26. 7; 73. 7. xi. 3. 18. xii. 3. 34, 41. xv. 2. 3. xviii. 2. 41. xix. 44. 7.

† In the Atharvan, we have them at iv. 38. 6. v. 14. 11 (*bis*); 20. 11. vi. 6. 3. vii. 62. 1. ix. 2. 6; 4. 2; 10. 12. x. 1. 14, 32. xi. 5. 1. xiv. 2. 31, 44.

its commentary are *sû* 'nityam iva, *sû* 'dgâtâ, *mâsû* 'titishthan, and *dikshû* 'padâhâti.

Our commentator discourses upon this rule at more than his usual length. After the citation of the examples and counter-example, with the remark upon the latter, which have already been given, he goes on as follows: *âtî* 'va *yâh*: *âtî* 've 'ty *âtî-iva*: *tâirovyañjana ity esha*: *îkârah prâçlishito yadâ syâd udâtta*h *pûrvah paro* 'nudâtta h *sa prâçlishitah svaryata eva nityam sandhijam svaritam nâ nyad âhuh*: *divî* 'va *câkshuh*: *divî* 'va *jyotih*: *divî* 've 'ti *divî-iva*; 'in the passage *âtî* 'va *yâh* (ii. 12. 6)—where the *krama*-text would read *âtî* 'vé 'ty *âtî-iva*—the circumflex of the *i* is *tâirovyañjana*' (see rule 62, below). 'When an *i* is the result of *praçlesha*, the former element being acute and the latter grave, that result of *praçlesha* is always made circumflex. No other circumflex accent is declared to arise from the *sandhi*. Instances are *divî* 'va *câkshuh* (vii. 26. 7), *divî* 'va *jyotih* (vi. 92. 3), where the *krama*-text reads *divî* 'vé 'ti *divî-iva*.' I am not quite sure that I have correctly interpreted all of this, but its significance is evidently of the smallest.

Precisely the same objection lies against the form of this rule as against that of the preceding: that, whereas it ought to be a definition and a prescription, it is in fact merely nomenclatory.

## अनुदात्तपूर्वात्संयोगाद्यवान्तात्स्वरितं परमपूर्वं वा ज्ञात्यः ॥५७॥

57. A circumflex which follows a conjunction of consonants ending with *y* or *v* and preceded by an unaccented vowel, or which has no predecessor, is the *jâtya*.

The meaning of the term *jâtya* is 'natural, original, primitive:' the circumflex syllables to which it is applied are those which have that accent in their own right and always, independently of the combinations of the sentence. The long, lumbering, and awkward account of it which the rule offers may be divided into two parts: that which is necessary to its distinction from the enclitic *svarita*, which, by rule 67 below, ordinarily follows any acute syllable, and that which is added to describe the kind of syllable in which it is invariably found to occur. The former part is contained in the words "preceded by an unaccented vowel, or having no predecessor," the enclitic circumflex being only possible as succeeding an acute. The other part is "after a conjunction of consonants ending with *y* or *v*:" that is to say, no syllable in Sanskrit has an independent circumflex accent except as it results from the conversion of an original accented *i* or *û* (short or long) into its corresponding semivowel *y* or *v* before a following dissimilar vowel; thus *kanyâ* represents an earlier *kani-â*, *svâr* an earlier *sû-ar*, and the like. The *jâtya svarita*, then, precisely corresponds in origin and in quality with the *kshâipra*, the one next to be described, and differs from it only in period, arising in connection with the combination of syllables into words, rather than of words into a sentence.

The definition or description of the *jâtya* circumflex given by our

treatise is after all imperfect, since it fails properly to distinguish the *jātya* from the *kshāipra*. Such *kshāipra* accents as are instanced by *abhyārcata* (vii. 82. 1), *nv èléna* (v. 6. 5), and the like, answer in every particular to the defined character of the *jātya*. The word *pade*, 'in an independent or uncombined word,' or something equivalent, needs to be added to the rule. Such a limitation is not omitted from the description of any of the other treatises. The Rik Pr. (iii. 4, r. 7, exciv) defines all the other kinds of *svarita* first, and describes this as the one which remains, and which occurs in an uncombined word; the Vaj. Pr. (i. 111) gives a definition nearly corresponding to our own, but much more concisely expressed, and omitting the specification corresponding to our *apūrvam vā*, 'or which has no predecessor,' which the commentator is therefore obliged to supply. Finally, the Tāitt. Pr. (xx. 2) agrees quite closely with our treatise in the form of its definition, only adding the item noticed above as omitted here; but it calls the accent *nitya*, 'constant, persistent,' instead of *jātya*.

The commentator, after a simple repetition of the rule with the appendix of *svaro bhavati* to fill out its ellipsis, adds in illustration the same series of words which he has given us once before, under i. 17: they are, as instances of the *jātya* circumflex preceded by an unaccented vowel, *amāvāsyā*, *kanyā*, *dhānyām*, *ācāryāḥ*, and *rājanyām*; of the same in an initial or unpreceded syllable, *nyān*, *kvā*, *svāḥ*.

अन्तःस्थापत्तावुदात्तस्यानुदात्ते क्षैप्रः ॥ ५८ ॥

58. The circumflex arising upon the conversion into a semi-vowel of an acute vowel before a grave is the *kshāipra*.

The name *kshāipra* is given by the Rik Pr. (ii. 8) to the combinations taught in our rule 39, above, or to those in which *i*, *ê*, *u*, *û*, and *r* become respectively *y*, *v*, and *r* before a following dissimilar vowel: the term comes from *kshipra*, 'quick, hasty,' and marks the *sandhi* as one in which there is a gain of time, or a hastened, abbreviated utterance of the semivocalized vowel. All the treatises (R. Pr. iii. 7; V. Pr. iv. 47; T. Pr. x. 16) teach that in such a case, when the former element of the compound is acute and the latter grave, the resulting syllable is circumflex; and all (R. Pr. iii. 10; V. Pr. i. 115; T. Pr. xx. 1) apply to the circumflex thus arising the name of the combination, *kshāipra*. Our own rule is this time free from the ambiguities which we have had occasion to notice in the definitions of the *abhīhīta* and *prāghīta* accents, and would admit of being interpreted as a precept as well as a definition, as follows: 'in the case of the conversion into a semivowel of an acute vowel before a grave, there arises the circumflex called *kshāipra*.'

The commentator cites two actual cases of the *kshāipra* circumflex, viz. *abhyārcata* (vii. 82. 1: p. *abhi*: *arcata*) and *vidvāṅgaḥ* (vi. 125. 1: p. *vidū*-*aṅgaḥ*), and fabricates two others, viz. *mātrārtham*, *pitārtham* (i. e. *mātr'*-*artham* etc.).

अन्तःपदे ऽपि पञ्चपद्याम् ॥ ५९ ॥

59. And even in the interior of a word, in a strong case.

It may be questioned whether this rule is merely nomenclatory, or also prescriptive; whether its meaning is that the *svarita* which appears in the finals of the strong cases of certain words whose themes are oxytone is to be accounted as *kshâipra* and not *jâtya*, or that a circumflex of the *kshâipra* variety arises when the accented final vowel of a theme, in the strong cases, is converted into a semivowel before the case-ending. The same question comes up also in connection with the two following rules. But I presume that they are all to be understood as precepts, and to be reckoned along with the other cases in which our Prâtiçâkhya turns aside to meddle with matters lying without its proper sphere. Not one of the other treatises offers anything corresponding; they would all, apparently, class as *jâtya* the circumflex accents here treated of, not distinguishing them from the others which occur within the limits of a word, or in the uncombined text. The rules, however, are not without some interest, as showing that the authors of our work appreciated the entire analogy which the circumflex accents with which they deal have with the ordinary *kshâipra*. Thus *nadyâs* is equivalent to *nadî'-as*, as *nadyâsti* would be to *nadî' asti*, while *nadyâ'ti*, *nadyâ's* represent *nadî-â'ti*, *nadî-â's*; the terminations of the strong cases showing no trace of that tendency which is exhibited by the other case-endings to draw away upon themselves the accent of the final vowel of the theme: compare *tudântam*, *tudântaù*, *tudântas*, with *tudatâ'*, *tudatós*, *tudatás*.

The commentator cites from the text, by way of illustration, *nadyò ná'ma stha* (iii. 13. 1), *pippalyâh sám* (vi. 109. 2), and *rudatyâh pûrushê haté* (xi. 9. 14); and also, as counter-example, to show that the circumflex arises only in a strong case, *tâyâ sahasraparnyâ' hr'dayam* (vi. 139. 1). Instances of both kinds are of not infrequent occurrence. In a small number of cases—viz. *karkaryâh* (iv. 37. 4), *prââkvâm* (x. 4. 17), and *viliptyâm* (xii. 4. 41)—all the manuscripts give an acute accent to endings of the class to which the rule refers; these are, however, evident errors, and should properly have been amended in the edited text.

The commentator closes his exposition, as so often elsewhere, with a verse which is a virtual re-statement of the rule, but its form is so corrupt that I refrain from attempting to restore and translate it.<sup>1</sup>

उकारस्य सर्वत्र ॥ ६० ॥

60. Or also throughout the declension, if the final of the theme is *û*.

The manuscript reads in this rule *ukârasya*, 'if the final is *u*,' but the facts seem to require the amendment to *û*, and the method of writing of our copyist is too careless to make his authority of much weight against it. The rare termination *û* has power usually to hold its own accent, even before the ending of a weak case, and the resulting final syllable thus becomes circumflex. The commentator's instances are *tanvâ'* (e. g. i. 33. 4), *tanvè* (e. g. i. 3. 1), *uttânâyoç camvôh* (ix. 10. 12),

<sup>1</sup> It reads: *antodâtâ nadi nyâyâ hrasvanâmi cat tathâ: apañcapadyâm vacanam udâttaù kshâipra ucyate.*

and *vadhvāç ca vāstram* (xiv. 2. 41). The only other cases afforded by the text are *tanvās* (gen. or abl.: e. g. ii. 29. 1), *tanvām* (at i. 18. 3, and one or two doubtful places in the nineteenth book), and *asúsvās* (x. 10. 23). But there are also sundry exceptions to be found in the Atharvan, which the commentator has not failed to notice and record; he says: *tato 'pavadati*, 'from this rule one must make the exceptions,' *urvārvā'iva* (vi. 14. 2), *prḍākvā'h* (x. 4. 5), *çvaçrvā'i*<sup>1</sup> (xiv. 2. 26), and *çvaçrvā'h* (xiv. 1. 44); to which is to be added *vadhvā'i* (xiv. 2. 9, 73). All these exceptional forms, it will be remarked, have a heavy ending, while of those which exhibit the circumflex accent the ending is light in every instance but one (*tanvām*). The words *bāhvós* (e. g. vii. 56. 6) and *úrvoś* (xix. 60. 2) are instances—and, if my search has been thorough, the only ones which the text presents—of like forms from themes in *u*, which are not to be regarded as contemplated by the rule.

### ओण्योश्च ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Also in *onyoh*.

That is to say, in the single word *onyoh* the final syllable has a *kshái-pra svarita*, though the form is a weak case, and not from a theme in *ú*. The commentator cites the passage *onyoh kavikratum* (vii. 14. 1), the only one in which the word occurs. The Atharvan affords one other like case, viz. *katyányá'i* (vi. 107. 3), unless we are to assume there an error of the tradition represented by our manuscripts, which seems to me more likely.

### व्यञ्जनव्यवेतस्तैरोव्यञ्जनः ॥ ६२ ॥

62. A circumflex between which and the preceding acute vowel consonants intervene, is the *táirovyañjana*.

Literally, 'one separated by consonants is *táirovyañjana*.' There is here a notable change of subject and of implication. We have passed, without any warning, from considering the necessary or independent circumflex to treating of that which is enclitic only, arising, according to following rules (rules 67-70), in an unaccented syllable which is preceded by an acute, and not again immediately followed by an acute or circumflex. Our treatise and the Rik Pr. (iii. 9, 10) subdivide the enclitic circumflex into two forms only, the *táirovyañjana*, where the circumflexed syllable is separated from the acute by one or more consonants, and the *pádavṛtta* (the Rik Pr. calls it *váivṛtta*), where a hiatus intervenes. The Váj. Pr. (i. 117, 119) and the Táitt. Pr. (xx. 6, 7) also teach the same accents; but the former distinguishes under the *táirovyañjana* a sub-form, *táirovirāma* ('having a pause between'), as occurring when the acute is parted from its enclitic circumflex not only by consonants but by the *avagraha*, or pause which separates the two parts of a compound word: thus, in *prajā'-vat*, for instance, the enclitic accent of *vat* would be the *táirovirāma*, while in *pra-já'nám* that of *nám*

<sup>1</sup> i.—MS. *çvaçurak*.

would be the *tāirovyañjana* simply. The *tāirovirāma*, then, can occur only in the *pada*-text. The Tāitt. Pr. takes no notice of this *pada* accent, but allows the name *tāirovyañjana* only to a circumflex which follows an acute in the same word: if the acute syllable is a final, and the circumflex an initial, the latter is to be denominated *prātihata* (xx. 3): thus, in *tātra*, the enclitic *svarita* of *tra* would be *tāirovyañjana*; in *tāt te*, that of *te* would be *prātihata*.\* The practical importance of these numerous and varying subdivisions of an enclitic accent must be, as we cannot but think, very insignificant.

The commentator's examples of the *tāirovyañjana* accent are *idām devāḥ* (ii. 12. 2) and *idām indra* (ii. 12. 3): it is, in both instances, the initial syllable of the second word which is made circumflex by the influence of the preceding acute. According to the Tāitt. Pr., both would be cases of *prātihata*.

### विवृतौ पादवृत्तः ॥ ६३ ॥

63. Where there is a hiatus, the circumflex is *pādavr̥tta*.

As was noticed in the last note, the Rik Pr. calls this accent *vāivṛtta*, 'arising in connection with a hiatus.' The term *pādavr̥tta* is evidently a mutilated substitute for *pādavivṛtta* or *pādavāivṛtta*, 'arising in connection with a hiatus between two words.†

The commentator illustrates from the Atharvan text with *yā'h kr̥tyā' āngiras̥'r yā'h kr̥tyā' āsur̥'r yā'h kr̥tyā'h svayāmkṛtā yā' u cā 'nyēbhīr ā'bhṛtāḥ* (viii. 5. 9): here are three cases of the *pādavr̥tta* circumflex, viz. in the syllables *āng* and *ās*, following the first and second occurrence of *kr̥tyā'*, and in the particle *u*, following the last *yā'*.

### अवग्रहे सविधः ॥ ६४ ॥

64. Where there is a division between the two parts of a compound word, the accent is of the same character.

This rule is far from possessing all the explicitness that could be desired; two or three different interpretations of it seem admissible. In the first place, it may be understood to apply only to a class of cases falling under the preceding rule, the implication of *vivṛttāu* being continued; it would mean, then, that when in the division of a compound word a hiatus is made between the acute final of the former member and the grave initial of the latter member, the enclitic circumflex accent of the latter is to be ranked as a *pādavr̥tta*, just as if the hiatus caused by the *avagraha* had been due to the operation of the ordinary rules of euphony. This interpretation is supported by the character of the citations made by the commentator to illustrate the rule; they are as follows: *ukshā-annāya*: *vaçā'-annāya* (iii. 21. 6), *yajñā-ṛtaḥ* (viii. 10.

\* Roth (preface to his Nirukta, p. lxxv) and Weber (p. 135) regard the *tāirovirāma* and *prātihata* as identical, but I do not see how this is possible.

† The definition of the Tāitt. Pr. (xx. 6) brings out this derivation more distinctly than our own; we read there *pādavivṛtṭyām pādavr̥ttāḥ*.

4),\* *çatá-odaná* (e. g. x. 9. 1), *çatá-áyushá* (iii. 11. 3, 4), and *dirghá-áyushá* and *dirghá-áyushah* (not to be found in AV.: we have, however, the nominative *dirghá-áyuh*, at xiv. 2. 2, 63) : in all these compounds, the enclitic *svarita* of the vowel following the sign of division is *pádavr̥tta*. But the rule as thus interpreted seems of very little use, since such cases might be regarded as falling under the preceding rule without any special direction to that effect. The commentator does not include the word *vivr̥ttáu* in his paraphrase, and the fact that his citations are all of one class is far from conclusive against the intended comprehension of the other classes also under the same precept. If the implication of *vivr̥ttáu* be rejected, and *avagrahe* be taken to mean 'in any case of the separation of the two parts of a compound,' whether accompanied by a hiatus or not, there will, however, still remain a question as to the signification of *savidhah*, 'of the same character.' Does it refer only to *pádavr̥ttah*, and shall we assume that the enclitic circumflex of an initial syllable after a pause of separation, or *avagraha*, is always to be reckoned as *pádavr̥tta*, the pause having the same effect in all cases as a hiatus—so that in *çatá-vr̥shnyam* (i. 3. 1 etc.), *sám-grutam* (i. 3. 6), *á'-bh̥rtáḥ* (i. 6. 4), and the like, the syllables *vr̥*, *gru*, and *bh̥r* would be *pádavr̥tta*? Or does it refer also to *táirovyañjana*, and shall we understand that, notwithstanding an *avagraha*, the accent of a following syllable remains just what it would be were there no such pause; a hiatus conditioning a *pádavr̥tta*, and the intervention of consonants (as in the examples last quoted) a *táirovyañjana*? Of these three possible interpretations, I am inclined to favor the last; and especially, as it is supported by the authority of the Rik Pr., which lays down the general principle (iii. 15, r. 23, ccx) that where syllables are separated by *avagraha*, their accentuation is the same as if they were connected with one another according to the rules of *sandhi*.

अभिनिहितप्राश्लिष्टात्यक्षैप्राणामुदात्तस्वरितोद्यानाम-  
णुमात्रा निघाता विकम्पितं तत्कवयो वदन्ति ॥ ६५ ॥

65. Of the *abhinihita*, *prāṣliṣṭa*, *jātya*, and *kshāipra* accents, when followed by an acute or a circumflex, a quarter-mora is depressed: this the wise call *vikampita*.

The reason of this rule cannot be made evident without a somewhat detailed exposition of the laws laid down by the Hindu grammarians as regulating the rise and fall of the voice in connection with the consecution of the accents. In the first chapter (i. 14–17) we had merely a brief definition of the three tones of voice in which a syllable may be uttered: the low or grave (*anudātta*), belonging to unaccented syllables, the high or acute (*udātta*), which is the proper tone of an accented syllable, and the circumflex (*svarita*), combining a higher and a lower

\* The *pada* manuscript reads *yajña-r̥tah*, but such an accentuation is contrary to all analogy, and would in itself be in a high degree suspicious; and it is fully convicted of falsity by the citation of the word as an instance under this rule.

pitch within the limits of the same syllable, and, as we have seen, always resulting, as an independent accent, from the fusion of two originally separate elements, of which the one was acute and the other grave. If this were the whole story, the subject of accent in Sanskrit would be of no more intricacy and difficulty than in Greek: nor even of so much, since in Sanskrit neither of the accents is restricted as regards the place which it may occupy in the word; and we should only have to note and learn upon which syllable, and with which accent, each word in the language was uttered, and what were the few simple rules which govern the combinations of accented and unaccented syllables in the phrase. A great complication, however, is introduced into the system, in the first place, by the rule, taught by all the Hindu authorities (see our rule 67, below), that an originally grave syllable, when it follows an acute, receives an enclitic circumflex: that is to say, that the voice, when once raised to the pitch of acute, does not ordinarily come down with a leap to the level of the grave, but makes its descent in the course of the next following syllable; or, to illustrate by an instance, that we do not say *a.mit' trân*, but *a.mit' trân\**. To this rule is made the important exception (rule 70, below), that the syllable which would otherwise receive the enclitic circumflex maintains its character of grave, in case an acute or circumflex comes next after it: the theory being, apparently, that the voice prepares itself for rising to the acute pitch by sinking before it: it must, if possible, mount from the station of a syllable wholly grave. Thus we have, as the mode of utterance of *amitrân pari* and *amitrân kvà*, *a.mit' trân<sup>apar</sup>i*, *a.mit' trân<sup>nkva</sup>*. Now comes the farther complication, in which all the Prâtiçâkhyas agree (see rule 71, below), that the unaccented syllables which follow a circumflex, although regarded as having the value of grave, are yet pronounced at the pitch of acute: that is to say, that, in pronouncing *prshadâjyâpranuttânam*, we say *pr'sha'dâj<sup>yap</sup>Prânut'tâ'nâm*, and not *pr'sha'dâj<sup>yap</sup>Prânut'tâ'nâm*. This grave accent with the tone of acute is in the Rik Pr. (iii. 11) and Tâitt. Pr. (xxi. 10) called the *pracarya* (the word means 'accumulation'): its theoretical ground I find it exceedingly difficult to discover. But it evidently stands in close relation—whether as cause or as effect, I would not attempt to say too confidently—with a somewhat different description of the character of the circumflex. The first portion of the latter accent, namely, is by the Rik Pr. (iii. 2, 3) declared to be uttered, not at acute pitch, but with a yet higher tone, and its later portion at acute pitch. The Tâitt. Pr. (i. 41–42) gives the same account of a circumflex that immediately follows an acute, although, as we have seen (in the note to i. 17), liberally citing the discordant opinions of other authorities. These two treatises, then, would require our pronunciation to be *pr'sha'dâj<sup>yap</sup>Prânut'tâ'nâm*. Neither our own work nor the Vâj. Pr. gives such a definition of the circumflex; and yet the theory of the

\* In writing these instances, I follow the rules for the division of the syllables given in the first chapter (i. 55–58); and also, in order not to misrepresent them, I make the duplications of the *varnakrama* (iii. 26–32), but omit any attempt to designate *abhinidhâna*, *yama*, etc.



*pracaya* accent, to my apprehension, so manifestly recognizes and implies it, that I cannot believe otherwise than that its statement is omitted by them, and that it really forms a part of their system. If the voice has already, in the utterance of the enclitic *svarita*, sunk to the actual grave pitch, it can scarcely be believed that it should be called upon to rise again to the level of acute for the utterance of the following unaccented syllables: while, on the other hand, if the circumflex be removed bodily to a higher place in the scale, and made to end at acute pitch, the following grave syllables might naturally enough be supposed to run on at the same level. Hence I regard the form of the word last given as representing the mode of its pronunciation which must be assumed to be taught by the theory of our treatise, as well as by that of the others. If, now, the grave syllables succeeding a circumflex are uttered at acute pitch, how shall an actual acute, occurring after them, be distinguished from them? Provision for this case is made in the rule, common to all the treatises (see our rule 74, below), that the grave which next precedes an acute or circumflex is not of acute tone, but remains grave. Thus, putting an acute syllable after the word which has been employed in illustrating the *pracaya* accent, we should have *pr̥sha-*

*dājyāpraṇuttānām mā'* pronounced as *pr̥shardāj-yap̄Praṇut-tā: nām.mā'*. Thus is assured to the voice a low syllable from which to rise to the following acute, just as where the enclitic *svarita*, before an acute or circumflex, was given up for a grave pronunciation. Analogous with these two cases is that which forms the subject of the rule at present under discussion. It is constantly happening that an acute syllable follows one which has an independent circumflex, which cannot, of course, like the enclitic, be converted to grave out of complaisance to its successor. If, however, it were left unaltered, the distinction of the following acute from a *pracaya anudatta* would be endangered. If *yè 'syām̄ sthā pra-*

*tī'cyām̄ diṣi* should be uttered *Yes:syāms̄:thap̄ pra.tic.yām̄:diṣi*, it might be understood as *yè 'syām̄ sthā pra°* etc.; while the sinking of the circumflex syllable *yè* to the level of the *anudatta* pitch—as *Yes,syām̄* etc.—would mark the following syllable as truly *udatta* or acute. But that the avoidance of such ambiguities was the sole, or even the principal, reason for the depression of tone taught in the rule is rendered improbable by the fact that the same is prescribed also before an independent *svarita*, which latter could not, even without any alteration of tone in the preceding syllable, be confounded with an enclitic *svarita* or with any other accent. The depression is more probably owing to the theoretical requirement that the voice should, when possible, always rise to the utterance of a real acute or circumflex from the lowest or *anudatta* pitch: which is satisfied by the retention of the *anudatta* quality before an *udatta* or *svarita* in a syllable which would otherwise become enclitic *svarita* or *pracaya anudatta*, and by the lowering of the final portion of an independent *svarita* in the same position.

The equivalent rule of the Rik Pr. (iii. 3, r. 5, excii) is given in connection with the first definition of the *svarita* accent: this is to be of the pitch of *udatta* in its latter portion, unless an *udatta* or *svarita* fol-

lows, in which case it is *anudatta*. The commentary informs us that the depression to *anudatta* pitch is called *kampa*, a term connected with the *vikampita* of our rule (both come from the root *kamp*, 'to tremble'). An interpolated verse at the end of the third chapter of the Rik Pr. (iii. 19) restates the same precept, in terms closely corresponding with those of our treatise. The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 137) says, in like manner, that before an *udatta* or *svarita* the latter portion of a *svarita* is farther depressed. It is upon the authority of the Vāj. Pr. (i. 60) that the term *anumatra*, literally 'minute measure,' used in our text, is interpreted to signify the definite quantity of a quarter-mora. The same phenomenon of *kampa* is treated in the Taitt. Pr. (xix. 3 etc.), but with peculiar complications of theory which it is not necessary to explain here.

The commentator offers instances of each of the kinds of circumflex mentioned in the rule; they are as follows: of the *abhinihita*, *yō 'bhīyā-tāḥ* (xi. 2. 13), *yē 'syām* (iii. 26. 1 etc.), so *'rtham* (the Atharvan contains no such phrase, nor can it be a genuine instance, as *artha* has the acute on the first syllable, and the accentuation of the two words combined would be *sō 'rtham*; it is altogether probable that the reading is corrupt, and that the phrase intended to be cited is *sō 'bhvām* [xiii. 4. 25]: this is the nearest approach to the other which our text furnishes, and is moreover an instance of a circumflex before a circumflex, which the commentator would be likely to seek); of the *prāçlishṭa*, *bhīndhī 'dām* (vii. 18. 1), *diçī 'tāḥ* (xi. 2. 12 etc.); of the *jātya*, *amāvāsya' svāḥ* (these two words do not occur in juxtaposition in the Atharvan: we have *amāvāsya' mām* at vii. 79. 2, and e. g. *svār nā* at ii. 5. 4); and of the *kshāpra*, *nadyō nā'ma sṭha* (iii. 13. 1), *pippalyāḥ sām* (vi. 109. 2), and *rudatyāḥ pūrushe katé* (xi. 9. 14): they are to be pronounced *rwdat<sup>tya</sup> pu<sup>r</sup>u<sup>s</sup>he<sup>ha</sup>te*, *bhin<sup>d</sup>hī<sup>d</sup>dam*, *yō<sup>o</sup>bhī<sup>y</sup>ātāḥ*, etc.

Whether the Hindu grammar is much the gainer by this intense elaboration of the accentual theory may fairly be questioned: whether, indeed, it has not lost more than it has gained by the exaggeration, and even the distortion, in more than one particular, of the natural inflections of the voice. To me, I must acknowledge, it seems clear that those ancient grammarians might better have contented themselves with pointing out in each word the principal accent and its character, leaving the proclitic and enclitic accents, the claimed involuntary accompaniments of the other, to take care of themselves; or, if they could not leave them unnoticed, at least stating them in a brief and general way, as matters of nice phonetic theory, without placing them on a level with the independent accents, and drawing out a complete scheme of rules for their occurrence. The obscurity and false proportion given by them to the subject of the Sanskrit accent has availed to confuse or mislead many of its modern investigators: and we find, for instance, our modern Sanskrit grammarians explaining the independent circumflex as originated by the fusion of an acute with an enclitic circumflex, in which fusion the former accent gives way to the latter, the substance to its own shadow! The Prâtiçākhyas, it will be noticed, countenance no such explanation, but describe the real circumflex as arising from the combination of an acute with a following grave element.

The designation of the accents in the Atharvan manuscripts is somewhat various, and requires a brief explanation. The Rik method of designation is now familiar to all students of the Vedic department of the Sanskrit literature, and is perfectly adapted to the theory of the accent as above set forth; all syllables uttered at grave or *anudatta* pitch have a horizontal mark below them: a *svarita* or circumflex syllable, whether its circumflex be independent or enclitic, has a perpendicular stroke above; all syllables spoken with acute or *udatta* tone are left unmarked, whether they be proper *udatta* or accented syllables, or only *pracita anudatta*, grave in value but acute in pitch. An example is the verse (xi. 10. 19) from which some of the illustrations given above have been drawn:

त्रिषन्धे तमसा त्वमित्रान्यरि वारय ।

*trishandhe tāmāsā tvām amitrān pári vāraya,*

पृषदाज्यप्रणुत्तानां मामीषां मोचि कश्चन ॥

*ṛṣhadājyāpraṇuttānām māmīṣhām moci káṣ canā.*

The agreement between theory and method of designation here is, indeed, so close as reasonably to awaken suspicion whether the latter may not have exercised some influence upon the former. This mode of marking the accented syllables, now, has been adopted in the edited text of the Atharvan, although not followed throughout by a single one of our Atharvan manuscripts. In these, the circumflex, whether independent or enclitic, which follows an acute is usually marked within the syllable itself, sometimes by a dot, sometimes by a horizontal line; the independent circumflex after a grave, generally by an oblique line drawn upward and across the syllable, but often by a convex line below it. The grave syllable is marked as in the Rik, or, quite as often, by a dot instead of a horizontal line below. The different methods are interchanged in several cases within the limits of a single manuscript, and as some of their features are incapable of being represented in printing without complete suits of type prepared expressly for the purpose, no one can call in question the right of the editors to substitute the Rik method.\* But there is one other case, namely that which forms the subject of the rule to which this note is attached, which gives trouble in the designation. A *svarita* immediately preceding an *udatta* cannot receive simply the usual *svarita* sign, lest the following syllable be deemed a *pracaya* instead of *udatta*. The method followed in such a case by the Rik is to append to the circumflexed vowel a figure 1 or 3—1 if the vowel be short, 3 if it be long—and to attach to this figure

\* Lesser and occasional peculiarities of the manuscript usages are passed over without notice: it may be farther remarked, however, that E., throughout a great part of its text, marks the acute syllables with the perpendicular line above, in addition to all the other usual signs of accent. The peculiar *svarita* signs of the White Yajus (see Weber, p. 136) nowhere appear.

the signs both of *svarita* and of *anudatta*. Instances, in part from the examples already given, are :

दिशि॑श्तः । नद्यो॑श् नाम । रुदत्य॑श् पुरुषे ।

*dici* 'tāḥ

*nadyò nā'ma*

*rudatyāḥ pūrushe*

देव्यु॑श्पसः ।

*devy* 'ushāsah  
(x. 8. 30),

घर्मो॑श् ऽर्भन्धे ।

*gharmò 'bhî 'ndhe*  
(xi. 3. 18),

भागो॑श्स्वश्तः ।

*bhāgò 'psv antāḥ*  
(x. 5. 15).

What is the reason of this style of writing the *vikampita* syllable, we are left to find out for ourselves; the Prātiçākhyas teach us only the modes of utterance. In seeking to explain it, we may first note the method pursued in the text of the Sâma-Veda, which is always to protract the vowel of the syllable, lengthening it if short, and adding the usual sign of protraction or *pluti*, the figure 3. This suggests to us, as not wanting in plausibility, the conjecture that the two Rik signs have a similar meaning, and are marks of protraction, the 1 indicating the mora or part of a mora by which the short vowel is regarded as increased, and the 3 the protracted or *pluta* value, to or toward which the long vowel is raised in pronunciation; the cause of the prolongation lying in the necessity of carrying the vowels concerned to a lower pitch of voice, which leads to an extension of their quantity—even though the theory of the Prātiçākhyas known to us does not recognize any such extension. The attachment to the figure of the signs of both *svarita* and *anudatta* tone of course denotes that the syllable, although circumflex in its general character, descends, unlike the other circumflex syllables, to the full level of *anudatta* pitch, indicated by the lower horizontal mark. This Rik method of notation of *vikampita* syllables has also been followed in the published Atharvan text, along with the rest of the system to which it belongs. As to the Atharvan manuscripts, they are not infrequently careless enough to omit the figure altogether, and when they write it, it is in almost all cases a 3, whether the vowel to which it is appended be long or short.\* In about twenty passages,† they follow the method of the Sâma-Veda, and prolong the vowel of the syllable: this has, however, been restored to its short form in the edition, except in three instances (x. 1. 9. xiii. 1. 15; 3. 16). It will, I presume, be generally acknowledged that, in this condition of the manuscript authorities, the editors followed the safest course in accepting and carrying out consistently the Rik method of designation of the class of cases under discussion.

\* In the second half of the text, or in books x-xx, I have noted but a single passage where all the MSS. read 1 after a short vowel, and but three others in which that figure is given by more than a single authority: its occurrence is in general entirely sporadic; it occasionally appears also, in place of 3, after a long vowel.

† The details are as follows: all lengthen the vowel at vi. 109. 1. x. 1. 9. xii. 4. 4; 5. 21. xiii. 1. 15; 3. 16. xix. 44. 8; one or more make the same prolongation at ii. 13. 5; 33. 5. vi. 97. 1; 109. 2; 120. 3. viii. 4. 18. x. 8. 30. xii. 5. 53. xvi. 6. 5. xviii. 1. 3; 2. 24. xix. 3. 2.

## एकादेश उदात्तेनोदात्तः ॥ ६६ ॥

66. A vowel produced by combination with an acute is itself acute.

That is to say, when two simple vowels, or a vowel and a diphthong, coalesce and form a single vowel or diphthong (by rules 42-53, above), in case either of the two was acute, the resulting syllable is acute. The rule is a general one, and suffers only the two exceptions which form the subject of rules 55 and 56, above: namely, that *é* and *ó*, when they absorb a following *a*, become *è* and *ò*, and that *í+i* become *î*. The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. iii. 6 (r. 10, excvii), Váj. Pr. iv. 131, and Tãitt. Pr. x. 10 and xii. 10.

The series of passages given by the commentator in illustration of the rule is the same which was furnished under rule 38, above: viz. *dhiyé* " *hi* (*dhiyá* : *á* : *ihi*), *jushasvé* " *'ndra* (*jushasva* : *á* : *indra*), *stanayitnúné* " *hi* (*stanayitnúná* : *á* : *ihi*), *kúshthé* " *hi* (*kúshtha* : *á* : *ihi*), *udakéné* " *hi* (*udakéna* : *á* : *ihi*), and *áva paçyaté* " *ta* (*ávu* : *paçyata* : *á* : *itu*). The instances are ill chosen, so far as regards variety of combination; but they illustrate sufficiently the fact that, whether the acute element is the former or the latter of the two combined, the accent of the result of fusion is alike acute. It might have been well to offer also examples of the extreme cases in which a final acute *á* assimilates and renders acute a following diphthong, such as *çatá'udaná* (*çatá-odaná* : e. g. x. 9. 1) and *ihá'í'vá* (*ihá* : *evá* : e. g. i. 1. 3) : such combinations with *ái* and *áu* the text does not contain.

The other treatises give the rule (R. Pr. iii. 6, r. 11, excviii; V. Pr. iv. 130; T. Pr. x. 12) that when a circumflex is combined with a following grave, the result of the combination is circumflex. A like rule is needed here also, in order to determine the accentuation of such cases as *tanvá'* *'ntáriksham* (xvii. 13 : *tanvá* : *antáriksham*), *pathyé'va* (xviii. 3. 39 : *pathyá-iva*), etc., and its omission must be regarded as an oversight.

## उदात्तादनुदात्तं स्वर्यते ॥ ६७ ॥

67. A grave syllable following an acute is circumflexed.

This is the rule prescribing the enclitic *svarita*, the position of which in the accentual system has been sufficiently explained in the last note but one. It is, as we have seen above (rules 62, 63), subdivided into the two kinds called *táirovyañjana* and *páдавृत्ता*, according as one or more consonants, or only a hiatus, intervene between the acute vowel and its successor. The commentator gives here only the two instances of the *táirovyañjana* which he had already cited under rule 62.

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. iii. 9 (r. 16, cciii), Váj. Pr. iv. 134, and Tãitt. Pr. xiv. 29, 30.

## व्यासे ऽपि समानपदे ॥ ६८ ॥

68. And even in the disjoined text, within the limits of the same word.

The term *vyâsa*, excepting here and in rule 72, is not met with anywhere in the Hindu grammatical language. Our commentator, according to his usual custom, spares himself the trouble of giving any explanation of it, or even of replacing it in his paraphrases by a less unusual synonym. The instances adduced, however, in illustration of the rules, and the general requirements of the sense, show clearly that it means the disjoined or *pada* text. By their *adhikâra* (ii. 1), all rules in the second and third chapters should apply only to the *sanhitâ*, or combined text; hence it must here be specifically taught that in *pada*, as well as in *sanhitâ*, the syllable following an acute is enclitically circumflex, if the latter be in the same word with the former, and so not separated from it by a pause or *avasâna*. The examples given under the rule are *ayûtam* (e. g. viii. 2. 21), *amṛtam* (e. g. i. 4. 4), and *antâriksham* (e. g. ii. 12. 1); in these words, the syllables *tam*, *tam*, and *rik* have the *tâirovyañjana* variety of the enclitic circumflex, and they are accordingly written अयुतम् । अमृतम् । अन्तरिक्षम्, and not अयुत्म् । अमृत्म् । अन्तरिक्तम्.

A corresponding rule is to be found in the Rik Pr. at iii. 4 (r. 6, cxiii).

अवग्रहे च ॥ ६९ ॥

69. As well as where there is a separation of a compound into its constituents.

That is to say: although, in the *pada*-text, the pause which separates each independent word from the one following it breaks the continuity of accentual influence, so that a final acute of the one does not render circumflex the initial grave of the other, yet the lesser pause of the *avagraha*, which holds apart the two members of a compound word, causes no such interruption; on the contrary, an acute at the end of the former member calls forth the circumflexed utterance in the first syllable of the latter member. The commentator offers us rather a monotonous series of illustrations, namely *sû-samçituh* (vi. 105. 2), *sû-yatah* (vi. 111. 1), *sû-çrtam* (vii. 72. 3), *sû-drđham* (x. 2. 3), *sû-bhṛtam* (e. g. vi. 39. 1), and *sû-hutam* (e. g. vi. 71. 1): these are to be pronounced and written सु ऽ संज्ञितः । सु ऽ यतः etc., and not सु ऽ संज्ञितः । सु ऽ यतः etc.

The Rik Pr. (iii. 15, r. 23, ccx) and Vâj. Pr. (i. 148) lay down the principle that *avagraha* makes no difference in the accentuation of the syllables which it separates; both, also (R. Pr. iii. 16, V. Pr. i. 148), except the rare cases in which each of the parts of a compound has an acute accent; such as are, in the Atharvan, *pâri-dhâtavâi* (ii. 13. 2) and *tânû-nâpât* (v. 27. 1). In such words as the latter, the Vâj. Pr. (i. 120) calls the circumflex of the syllable preceding the pause by a special name, *tâthâbhâvya*.

नोदात्तस्वरितपरम् ॥ ७० ॥

70. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex syllable succeeds.

A syllable originally grave remains grave before a following *udatta* or *svarita*, even though preceded by an *udatta*, and hence, by the last rules, regularly entitled to the enclitic circumflex. The proclitic accent thus appears, in the estimation of the Hindu phonetists, to be more powerful than the enclitic, and the law which requires the voice to plant itself upon a low pitch in order to rise to the tone of acute or independent circumflex to be more inviolable than that which prescribes a falling tone in the next syllable after an acute. The commentator illustrates by citing *śāṁ na á'paḥ* (i. 6. 4), *yó asyá viçvájanmanaḥ* (xi. 4. 23), and *asyá suláśya svāḥ* (ii. 5. 2): the syllables *na*, *as* and *viç*, and *na* and *śya*, which by rule 67 would be circumflexed, are by this rule reinstated in their *anudatta* character, and must be written with the *anudatta* sign below: thus, शं न ऋपः । यो अस्य विश्वजन्मनः । अस्य सुतस्य स्वः।

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Rik Pr. iii. 9 (r. 16, ceiii, last part), Vāj. Pr. iv. 135, and Tāitt. Pr. xiv. 31. Cases of occurrence of the accent called by the Vāj. Pr. *tāthābhāvya* (as noticed under the last rule) constitute in the other systems an exception, which is apparently not admitted by the school to which our Prātiçākhyā belongs.

## स्वृतादनुदात्त उदात्तश्रुतिः ॥ ७१ ॥

71. A grave following a circumflex has the tone of acute.

The position and relations of this rule in the accentual system have been sufficiently treated of in the note to rule 65. All the other treatises (R. Pr. iii. 11, r. 18, ccv; V. Pr. iv. 138, 139; T. Pr. xxi. 10) lay down the same principle, stating also distinctly what must be regarded as implied in our precept, that not only the single grave syllable which immediately follows the circumflex receives the acute utterance, but those also which may succeed it, until, by rule 74, the proximity of an acute or circumflex causes the voice to sink to the proper *anudatta* tone. The Rik Pr. and Tāitt. Pr. use the term *pracaya*, 'accumulation, indefinitely extended number or series,' in describing this accent, the latter employing it in its ordinary sense, the former giving it as the name of the accent.

The commentator cites from the text, as instances, *dévīr dvāro brhatīr viçvamiavāḥ* (v. 12. 5), and *mā'dhvi dhartārā vidathasya satpatī* (vii. 73. 4): each passage presents a whole *pracaya*, or accumulated series, of syllables having the accent prescribed by the rule. Such syllables are, as has been already pointed out, left unmarked with signs of accentuation in the written texts, like the proper acute syllables whose tone they share: thus, देवीद्वारो बृहतीविश्वमिवाः।

Next follow two rules, identical in form with rules 68 and 69 above, and, like them, prescribing the application of this principle in the *pada*-text also. They are covered by the same rules of the other treatises which have already been cited.

## व्यासे ऽपि समानपदे ॥ ७२ ॥

72. And even in the disjoined text, within the limits of the same word.

That is to say, in *pada* as well as in *sanhitâ*, those unaccented syllables which follow in the same word a circumflex, whether independent or enclitic, are uttered at the pitch of acute; and they are correspondingly marked in the written texts. The commentator's examples are *uru gâ'lâyâh* (v. 13. 8) and *kakâ'tikâm* (x. 2. 8): these are uttered and written उ॒रु ऽ गू॒लायाः । क॒काटि॒काम्, and not उ॒रु ऽ गू॒लायाः । क॒काटि॒काम्.

## अवग्रहे च ॥ ७३ ॥

73. As well as where there is a separation of a compound into its constituents.

That is to say, again, the *avagraha*, or pause of division, does not interfere with the influence of a circumflex, any more than (by rule 69) with that of an acute, upon the following unaccented syllables. The commentator gives us the examples *çvân-valih* (xi. 9. 15), *svâh-vali* (xviii. 1. 20), and *âçman-vali* (xii. 2. 26), which we are to read and write प्र॒वन् ऽ वतीः । स्वः ऽ वती । अ॒प्रमन् ऽ वती, and not प्र॒वन् ऽ वतीः । स्वः ऽ वती । अ॒प्रमन् ऽ वती.

## स्वरितोदात्ते ऽन्तरमनुदात्तम् ॥ ७४ ॥

74. But the syllable immediately preceding a circumflex or acute is grave.

This rule applies only to those originally *anudatta* syllables which would otherwise, under the action of rule 71, be spoken with the *udatta* tone, as following a *svarita*. It is, as has been already pointed out, closely analogous in character with rules 65 and 70, above, and has a like theoretic ground. The commentator illustrates it by citing the passages *ojâs tâd dadrçe kvâ* (x. 8. 41), *idâm devâh çñuta yé* (ii. 12. 2), and *idâm indra çñuhi somapa yât* (ii. 12. 3), where the syllables *çek*, *ta*, and *pa*—which, though properly unaccented, would be pronounced at acute pitch, like their predecessors, by rule 71—are depressed to the level of grave, in preparation for the succeeding circumflex or acute. We write, accordingly, अ॒तस्तद् द॑दृ॒ञ्च क्व॑ । इ॒दं दे॒वाः प्र॑णु॒त ये । इ॒दमिन्द्र॑ प्र॒णुहि॒ सोम॑ यत्.

This rule is common to all the systems: compare Rik Pr. iii. 12 (r. 20, ccvii), Vâj. Pr. iv. 140, and Tâitt. Pr. xxi. 11.

As, at the beginning of this section, the commentator gave us an introduction to it, composed mainly of citations from unnamed sources, so here, at the end, he appends a postscript, chiefly made up of the *dicta*, upon points connected with accentuation, of authorities to whom



he refers by name. He first says: *asvarāṇi vyañjanāni svaravanti 'ty ānyatareyah*; 'the consonants are destitute of accent: "they are accented," says Ānyatareya.' Upon this point our treatise nowhere distinctly declares itself, but, as already noticed (under i. 55), its rules of syllabication may be naturally interpreted as implying that the consonant which is assigned to a particular syllable shares in the accentuation of its vowel. The Vāj. Pr. (i. 107) states this explicitly. Next we have: *kim sandheḥ svaritam bhavati: pūrvarūpam ity ānyatareyah: uttararūpam ṣāṅkhamitriḥ*; 'what part of a combination is circumflexed (or accented)? "the former constituent," says Ānyatareya; "the latter constituent," says Ṣāṅkhamitri.' In the absence of any illustrations, I am at a loss to see to what kind of combinations this question and its answers are to be understood as applying. Next follows a passage which we have had once before, in the commentary on i. 93 (see the note to that rule); it reads here as follows: *kim aksharasya svaryamānasya svaryate: ardhm̄ hrasvasya pādo dṛghasye 'ty eke sarvam iti ṣāṅkhamitriḥ aksharasyāi 'shā vidhā na vidyate: yad yad viṣvarībhava*. A renewed consideration affords me no new light upon this passage. Finally, we read *ṛgardharcapadāntanāvagrahavivṛtishu mātrākālakālah*, which appears to me to have to do with the determination of the length of the different pauses occurring in the recitation of the Veda; namely, the pauses at the end of a half-verse, between two words in the *pada*-text, between two parts of a divisible compound (also in *pada*-text), and where a hiatus occurs in *sanhīta*; but I have not succeeded in restoring any intelligible and consistent reading of the passage. The Vāj. Pr. (v. 1) and Rik Pr. (i. 6, r. 28, xxix) declare the pause of division of a compound, or the *avagraha*, to have the length of a mora; the Tāitt. Pr. (xxii. 13) recognizes four pauses (*virāma*): that at the end of a verse, that at the end of a *pada* or disjoined word, that of a hiatus, and that of a hiatus within a word (as *praviṅgam*), declaring them to have respectively the length of three moras, two moras, one mora, and a half-mora.

The signature of the *pāda* or section is *trītyasya trītyaḥ pādah*.

सुवर्णरिषकारेभ्यः समानपदे नो णः ॥ ७५ ॥

75. After *r* and *ṛ*, *r*, and *sh*, within the limits of the same word, *n* is changed to *ṇ*.

This rule is an *adhikāra*, or heading, indicating the subject of the section, and making known what is to be implied in the following rules. It might properly, then, have been left by the commentator without illustration, like ii. 1. He prefers, however, to cite from the text the passages *pari str̄ṇīhi pari dhehi vedim* (vii. 99. 1) and *paristaraṇam id dhaviḥ* (ix. 6. 2), which offer instances of the lingualization of the nasal; and he also adds *koshāṇam* and *toshāṇam*, which are not Atharvan words. As counter-examples, to show that the nasal is converted only if the preceding cerebral is found within the same word, he gives *svar nayati*, *prātar nayati*, which are also fabricated cases; compare the similar ones in the scholia to Pān. viii. 4. 1.

The Rik Pr. introduces the same subject with a precept (v. 20, r. 40, cccclvii) which also includes our next rule and a part of 89 below. The leading rules of the Vāj. Pr. (iii. 83) and Tāitt. Pr. (xiii. 6) are in close agreement with ours.

### पूर्वपदाद्द्रुघणादीनाम् ॥ ७६ ॥

76. In *drughana* etc., the same effect takes place after a cause which is contained in the former member of a compound.

The commentator paraphrases *pūrvapadāt* by the expression which, for the sake of clearness, has been substituted for it in translating, viz. *pūrvapadasthān nimittāt*. His cited illustrations are *drughanaḥ* (vii. 28. 1: p. *dru-ghanah*), *sūtā grāmanyah* (iii. 5. 7: p. *grāma-nyah*), *rakshohanam vājinam* (viii. 3. 1: p. *rakshah-hanam*), *brhaspati-pranuttānām* (viii. 8. 19: p. *brhaspati-pranuttānām*), *prshadājya-pranuttānām* (xi. 10. 19: p. *prshadājya-pranuttānām*), and *durnihitāishinim* (xi. 9. 15: p. *durnihita-eshinim*). The latter case, we should think, is one of somewhat ambiguous quality, since in the form of the word, as given by the *pada*-text, there is nothing to show that *dur* stands in the relation of *pūrvapada*, or former member of a compound, to *nihitā*, they being unseparated by *avagraha*. The same objection lies against the two preceding instances; but also the much more serious one that they are examples properly belonging under rule 79, below, the converted *n* being that of a root after a preposition.

The other examples of the action of this rule afforded by the Atharvan text are *parāyana* (e. g. i. 34. 3: p. *parā-ayana*), *vrshāyamāna* (ii. 5. 7: p. *vrsha-yamāna*; the *uttarapada* is here a suffix of derivative conjugation), *paripāna* (e. g. ii. 17. 7: p. *pari-pāna*), *vrtrahanam* etc. (e. g. iv. 28. 3: p. *vrtra-hanam*), *durnaça* (v. 11. 6: p. *duh-naça*), *trināman* (vi. 74. 3: p. *tri-nāman*), *purunāman* (vi. 99. 1: p. *puru-nāman*), *urūnasa* (xviii. 2. 13: p. *uru-nasa*), and *sahasrañitha* (xviii. 2. 18: p. *sahasra-nitha*). We have also a few cases of a class analogous with the last one given by the commentator, where the principle is precisely the same, although, in the actual division of the words, the *avagraha* falls elsewhere than between the converting lingual and the nasal: they are *suprapāna* (iv. 21. 7: p. *su-prapāna*; our *pada*-manuscript, to be sure, reads here, but doubtless only by an error of the copyist, *su-prapāna*), *suprāyana* (v. 12. 5: p. *su-prāyana*), and *anuprayāna* (vii. 73. 6: p. *anu-prayāna*). Some other words, which would otherwise have to be noted under this rule, are made the subject of special precepts later in the section (rules 82–85).

The general rule of the Rik Pr., as already noticed, includes this of ours as well as the preceding. By the Vāj. Pr. and Tāitt. Pr., the cases are stated in detail.

### अकारान्ताद्ङः ॥ ७७ ॥

77. The *n* of *ahan* is changed after a former member of a compound ending in *a*.

Pāṇini's rule, viii. 4. 7, is precisely coincident with this, and the illustrative citations of its scholiasts are in good part those which our commentator gives us, and which are all strange to the Atharvan: they are, as examples of the rule, *práhnaḥ*, *pūrváhnaḥ*, and, as counter-examples, *niráhnaḥ*, *paryáhnaḥ*, and *duráhnaḥ*. Our text has only the two examples *aparáhnaḥ* (ix. 6. 46: p. *apara-ahnaḥ*) and *sahasráhnyam* (e. g. x. 8. 18: p. *sahasra-ahnyam*), and furnishes no counter-examples at all, so that the rule evidently finds its justification in the observed phenomena of the general language, and not in those of the Atharva-Veda.

### विभक्त्यागमप्रातिपदिकान्तस्य ॥ ७८ ॥

78. Also is liable to be changed the *n* of a case-ending, that of an *ágama*, and the final *n* of a *prátipadika*.

This rule is the exact counterpart in form of Pāṇini's rule viii. 4. 11, and the technical terms which it contains are undoubtedly identical in meaning with those there given: *ágama* is an augment or inorganic insertion;\* *prátipadika* is a theme of regular derivation, ending in a *ḥṛt* or *taddhita* suffix. The commentator's instances are as follows: for the case-ending *ina*, *svargena lokena* (not in AV.), *varáheṇa pṛthivī suvīridīni* (vii. 1. 48); for the *ágama n*, *atī durgāni viśvá* (vii. 63. 1: p. *duḥ-gāni*); for the final of a theme, *nái nam ghnanti paryáyinah* (vi. 76. 4: p. *pari-áyinah*).

The other treatises have nothing corresponding to this rule, which is, indeed, an unnecessary one, as a Prātiçákhyā usually takes the words of its text in their *pada*-form, without going farther back to enquire how they came to assume that form. Such a word as *varáheṇa*, where *pada* and *sanhita* read alike, is not regarded by the others as calling for any notice: those analogous with the other instances cited might have been ranked as falling under the preceding rule. *Paryáyinah* is, it may be remarked, the only word of its class which the text presents, excepting *praváhinah*, in book xx (xx. 127. 2), and *durgāni* also stands alone in its class; nor have I noted a single instance of such a compound form as would be *svah-gena* or *duh-gena*, where the alteration of the case-ending in the second word would be made in the reduction of *pada* to *sanhita*.

### उपसर्गाद्गतोर्नानापदे ऽपि ॥ ७९ ॥

79. Also that of a root after a preposition, even in a separate word.

That is to say, even when the words are not connected together as parts of a compound. The commentator gives us a single instance where the cause of conversion stands *nánápade*, and two in which it stands *pūrvapade*; they are *apah pra ṇayati* (ix. 6. 4), *yá eva yajña ápah pranīyante* (ix. 6. 5: p. *pra-nyante*), and *jívám ṛtebhyah parinīyamánám*

\* The Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon, upon the authority of this rule, erroneously makes it signify 'suffix.'

(xviii. 3. 3: p. *pari-nîyamânâm*). Instances of a somewhat different character, where the preposition lingualizes the initial *n* of the root in *sanhitâ* and not in *pada*, although in the latter text no *avagraha* separates the two words, have been already given above, under rule 76. The text presents us *pranutta* in like combinations also after *vâibâdha* (iii. 6. 7) and *sâyaka* (ix. 2. 12); and we have farther, in *pada*, *su-pranîti* (e. g. v. 11. 5), and *parânayât\** (xviii. 4. 50). The initial *n* of a root is almost always cerebralized by the preceding preposition in the Atharvan, even when (as at ii. 7. 1, ix. 2. 17, x. 4. 26, etc.) the augment intervenes: the only exceptions are the combinations of *nabh* with *pra* (vii. 18. 1, 2), and of *nart* with *pari* (e. g. iv. 38. 3) and *pra* (e. g. viii. 6. 11). It is unnecessary to detail, therefore, all the rather numerous instances of the change.

The cases forming the subject of this rule are not classified together by the other Prâtiçâkhyas.

प्रपराभ्यमिनः ॥ ८० ॥

80. Also that of *ena*, after *pra* and *parâ*.

The commentator cites nearly all the examples which the text affords: they are *prâi 'nân çrînikî* (x. 3. 2), *prâi 'nân vrkshasya* (iii. 6. 8: the same verse has, in its first *pâda*, *prâi 'nân nude*), and *parâi 'nân devah* (viii. 3. 16). As counter-example, to show that it is only after the two prepositions mentioned in the rule that *ena* exhibits the lingualization of its nasal, is farther cited *pary enân prânah* (ix. 2. 5).

Here follows a *lacuna*, apparently of considerable extent. Where this rule should be repeated, before the one next succeeding, we read *praparâbhyâmernayâmasi navateç ca*; and the sequel shows that *navateç ca* is a rule by itself, while what precedes is the mutilated remnant of another. This, aided by the implication in *navateç ca*, and by the text, which offers us the passage to which the rule was evidently intended to refer, we are enabled to restore with tolerable certainty to its true form, as *punar nayâmasi*: what has become lost in the interval, we can only conjecture. Perhaps the treatise next took note of another case which the text affords of the lingualization of the nasal of *ena*, viz. *â jabhârâi 'nâm* (v. 31. 10). Possibly there followed also a mention of the passage *asrjan nir enasah* (ii. 10. 8); but this is very questionable, as the reading itself is doubtful.† But it is beyond question that a part of the omitted passage had reference to the not infrequent change of the *n* of *nah* in *sanhitâ* into *n* after a lingual near the end of the preceding word: this is much too common to have been passed over without notice, and the class of cases is too large and distinct to have been thrown

\* This is a case of entirely anomalous division and accentuation. We should expect *upa-sampârânayât*, like *anu-samprâyâhi* (xi. 1. 36) etc.; but the *pada* reads *upa-sâm : parânayât*, and all the *sanhitâ* MSS. agree with it as regards the accent: it can hardly be otherwise than an error of the tradition: see below, under iv. 2.

† It is given by M. W. H. and I.; but P. (if I have not been careless enough to omit to note its reading) and E. have *enasah*, and the printed text has followed their authority.

under any of the other rules of the section. The statement might be put into the form of two rules, as follows :

प्रपरिभ्यां नः ॥

आप्रीरुव्यमृद्वृषिन्तोयश्च ॥

'The *n* of *naḥ* is lingualized after *pra* and *pari*. As also, after *āṣṭr*, *urushya*, *grheshu*, and *ṣiksha*.'

Under the first rule, the cases would be i. 2. 2; 7. 5. ii. 4. 2, 6; 7. 3. 4. iii. 16. 3; 20. 2. 3. iv. 10. 6. v. 7. 3. vi. 37. 2. vii. 2. 1; 5. 5. xi. 2. 20. xii. 2. 13; 3. 55-60. xiv. 2. 67. xix. 34. 4, 5. Under the second, the passages are *āṣṭr ṇa ūrjam* (ii. 29. 3), *urushyā ṇa urujman* (vi. 4. 3: E. *na*), *asamātim grheshu naḥ* (vi. 79. 1: E. *naḥ*), *upahūto grheshu naḥ* (vii. 60. 5: E. *naḥ*), and *ṣikshā ṇo asmin* (xviii. 3. 67). Where *naḥ* follows *grheshu*, the edition reads both times *naḥ*, without conversion, although the manuscript authority for the lingual nasal is precisely what it is for the same after *urushyā*, E. alone dissenting. At iv. 31. 2, a part of the manuscripts (P. M. W.) read *senāntr naḥ*, but the edition properly follows the prevailing authority of the others (E. I. H.), and gives, with the Rig-Veda (x. 84. 2), *naḥ*. I have noted a single case where the Atharvan reads *naḥ*, while the Rik, in the parallel passage, has *naḥ*: it is vii. 97. 2 (RV. v. 42. 4).

It is altogether probable that a whole leaf, or a whole page, of the original of our copy of the text and commentary (or possibly, of the original of its original), is lost here, with as many as three or four rules. Fortunately, it is in the midst of the rehearsal of cases of a certain kind, which rehearsal can be made complete without the aid of the treatise: so that the loss is not of essential consequence.

\* \* \* \* \*

पुनर्णवामसि ॥ ८१ ॥

81. Also that of *nayāmasi*, after *punah*.

The passage referred to is *taṁ tvā punar nayāmasi* (v. 14. 7): all our *sanhitā* manuscripts agree in giving the lingual nasal. Whether I have given the form of the rule correctly is not quite certain, a portion of it being lost altogether, as was pointed out in the last note.

नवतेश्च ॥ ८२ ॥

82. As also that of the root *nu*.

The word to which alone the rule relates is *punarnava* (p. *punah-nava*), for which the commentator cites three passages, viz. *candramāḥ ca punarnavaḥ* (x. 7. 33), *yā rohanti punarnavāḥ* (viii. 7. 8), and *punar ā 'gāḥ punarnavaḥ* (viii. 1. 20). The authors of our treatise, then, must have derived *nava*, 'new,' from the verbal root *nu*, 'to praise,' instead of from the pronominal word *nu*, 'now.'

पूर्याणः ॥ ८३ ॥

83. Also in *pūryāṇa*.

The commentator instances but a single phrase in illustration of the rule, viz. *pathibhiḥ pūryanāiḥ* (e. g. xviii. 1. 54 : p. *pāḥ-yānāiḥ*). There is small reason to be seen for singling out this word in order to make it the subject of a special rule, and the same is true of those treated in the two following rules : they might all have been as well left to fall into the *gaṇa* of rule 76.

दुर्णाम्नः ॥ ८४ ॥

84. Also that of *durṇāman*.

The commentator extracts from the text three of the passages in which this word occurs, viz. *durṇāmnīḥ sarvāḥ* (iv. 17. 5), *durṇāmā tatra mā gṛdhat* (viii. 6. 1), and *durṇāmā ca sunāmā ca* (viii. 6. 4). The *pada* writes *duḥ-nāman*.

अवग्रहादकारात् ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Also after an *r̥* at the end of the former member of a compound.

The commentator's examples are *devayānāḥ pitṛyānāḥ* (vi. 117. 3 : the *pada* form of the word is everywhere *pitṛ-yāna*), *pitṛyānāiḥ saṁ va ā rohayāmi* (xviii. 4. 1), and *nrmanā nāma* (xvi. 3. 5 : p. *nr-manāḥ*). The text furnishes but a single other word falling under the rule, and that in the nineteenth book ; viz. *nrpāna* (xix. 58. 4).

It is worthy of note that Pāṇini has a rule (viii. 4. 26) which precisely corresponds with this, and that his scholiasts quote the same two words in illustration of it.

न मिनाति ॥ ८६ ॥

86. But not that of the root *mī*.

The commentator brings forward all the illustrations of the rule which the text contains—they are *pra minij janitrim* (vi. 110. 3), *pra minanti vratāni* (xviii. 1. 5), and *pra mināti saṁgirah* (xviii. 4. 60)—excepting one in the nineteenth book, *pramināma vratāni* (xix. 59. 2). The rule itself is to be understood, it may be presumed, as giving exceptions to rule 79 above : yet the latter would seem to apply only to conversions of the nasal of a root itself, and not of the appended conjugational syllable.

The manuscript reads *minanti* instead of *mināti*, and the final repetition of the rule before its successor is wanting.

भानोश्च ॥ ८७ ॥

87. Nor that of *bhānu*.

This rule is entirely superfluous. Of the two cases cited under it by the commentator, the first, *citrabhāno* (iv. 25. 3), could fall under no rule for lingualizing the dental nasal excepting 76, and from that it

would be excluded by absence from the *gana* to which alone the precept applies; the other, *pra bhānavaḥ sistrate* (xiii. 2. 46), cannot be forced under any rule that has been laid down.

The Rik Pr. (v. 22, r. 49, ccclxvi) and Vaj. Pr. (iii. 91) also note *bhānu* as a word whose nasal is not subject to be changed to a lingual.

परेद्दिनोतिः ॥ ८८ ॥

88. Nor that of the root *hi* after *pari*.

The Atharvan text furnishes but one such case, which the commentator quotes: it is *parihinomi medhayā* (viii. 4. 6). As counter-example, the commentator brings up *pra hinomi dūram* (xii. 2. 8); but here, as well as in the other cases where the forms of the same verb exhibit a lingualized nasal after *pra*, the *pada*-text also (by iv. 95) shows the same. A strict application of rule 79, then, to the nasal only of a root itself, would render this rule also unnecessary.

The Rik Pr. (v. 22, r. 50, ccclxvi<sup>b</sup>) has a corresponding precept.

पदान्तस्पर्शयुक्तस्य ॥ ८९ ॥

89. Nor a final *n*, nor one conjoined with a mute.

The commentator's illustrative instances are *pūshan tava vrate* (vii. 9. 3), *saṁkrandanah* (v. 20. 9), and *pāṣo granthih* (ix. 3. 2). To the first part of the rule would need to be made the exceptions noted at iv. 99, but that, by the operation of that precept, they are made to read in *pada* as in *sanhitā*, and so are withdrawn from the ken of the Prātiçākhyā.

The first part of this rule is included in the general precept for the conversion of *n* as given by the Rik Pr. (v. 20, r. 40, ccclxvii); which adds later (v. 22, r. 47, ccclxiv) that the *n* is not altered if combined with *y* or a mute. The Vaj. Pr. also divides the two parts of our precept (iii. 88, 92), but specifies only a dental mute as preventing the conversion of the nasal by combination with it. The Tāitt. Pr. (xiii. 15) includes in one rule this of ours and also 91, 93, and 94 below.

नशेः पान्तस्य ॥ ९० ॥

90. Nor that of the root *naç*, when it ends in *sh*.

This rule is precisely the same with one of Pāṇini (viii. 4. 36), and it belongs rather to the general grammar than to a Prātiçākhyā of the Atharvan, since our text does not furnish a single case to which it should apply. The examples which the commentator gives are in part those which are found also in Pāṇini's scholia: they are *pranashṭah*, *parinashṭah*, *nirnasṭah*, and *durnashṭah*. A counter-example, *durnaçaṁ cid arvāk* (v. 11. 6), he is able to bring up from the Atharvan.

स्वरलोपे कृतेः ॥ ९१ ॥

91. Nor that of the root *han*, when its vowel has been omitted.

The commentator offers the two following examples: *vṛtraghnaḥ stomaḥ* (iv. 24. 1), and *indreṇa vṛtraghnaḥ medi* (iii. 6. 2); and the counter-example *rakshohanaṁ vājinam* (viii. 3. 1), which has already figured as example under rule 76 above. Unless *sparçayukta*, in rule 89, meant only 'combined with a following mute,' which is very unlikely, the present precept is superfluous, as merely specifying a case already sufficiently provided for elsewhere.

Pāṇini (viii. 4. 22) looks at this matter from the opposite point of view, and teaches that the *n* of *han* is lingualized whenever it is preceded by *a*. The Tāitt. Pr. (xiii. 15) mentions the case along with others, in a comprehensive rule.

### क्षुभ्रदीनाम् ॥ १२ ॥

92. Nor that of the root *kshubh* etc.

This, again, is coincident with one of Pāṇini's rules (viii. 4. 39), and, so far as *kshubh* is itself concerned, is out of place in the Prātiçākhyā of the Atharva-Veda: for not only does this Veda contain no derivatives from the root to which it should apply (we find only *vicukshubhé* [vii. 57. 1] and *kshobhana* [xix. 13. 2]), but also, if such forms as *kshubhnāti* (which the commentator gives as an example under the rule), *kshubhnitah*, etc., did occur, their reading would be sufficiently determined by rule 89, above. The commentator fills up the *gaṇa* with *parinṛtyantyor iva* (x. 7. 43), *madhunā prapīnāḥ* (xii. 3. 41), and *pari nṛtyanti keçinīḥ* (xii. 5. 48): to these are to be added other forms of the root *nart* after *pari* and *pra*, and forms of *nabh* after *pra*—as already noted, under rule 79.

### व्यवाये शसलैः ॥ १३ ॥

93. Nor when there is intervention of *ç*, *s*, or *l*.

The instances cited in the commentary are *kaḥ pṛçṇim dhenum* (vii. 104. 1), *garbhe antar adṛçyamānoḥ* (x. 8. 13), and *savitā prasavānām* (v. 24. 1). For the intervention of *l*, no case is brought up, nor do the Rik Pr. and Tāitt. Pr. make any account of this semivowel as ever coming in to hinder the conversion of the nasal. The Vāj. Pr., however, does so, and cites an instance, *nirjarjalpena* (in which, however, there is intervention also of a palatal). The latter treatise (iii. 94) and the Tāitt. Pr. (xiii. 15) throw together into one this rule of ours and the one next following: the Rik Pr. gives a separate precept answering to each (R. Pr. v. 21, r. 44, 42, cclxi, cclxi).

### चटवर्गेश्च ॥ १४ ॥

94. Or of palatal, lingual, or dental mutes.

The commentator gives the examples *upe 'ho 'paparcanaḥ 'smin goshtha upa pṛñca nah* (ix. 4. 23), *reshuyāi 'nān* (xi. 1. 20: this, however, is no example under the rule), *yathā 'so mitravardhanah* (iv. 8. 6), and *taṁ vartaniḥ* (vii. 21. 1).



The corresponding rules of the other Prātiçākhyas have been referred to above (under rule 93).

The physical explanation of the effect of the sounds mentioned in these two rules to prevent the lingualization of the nasal is obvious: they are all of them such as cause the tongue to change its position. When this organ is once bent back in the mouth to the position in which the lingual sibilant, semivowel, and vowels are uttered, it tends to remain there, and produce the next following nasal at that point, instead of at the point of dental utterance; and it does so, unless thrown out of adjustment, as it were, by the occurrence of a letter which calls it into action in another quarter.

पदेनावर्तिते च ॥ १५ ॥

95. Or of a word, unless it be *ā*.

As an example of prevention of the lingualization of *n* by the interposition of a word or words, even though composed only of such sounds as would not in the same word produce such an effect, the commentator gives us *pari 'me gām aneshata* (vi. 28. 2). As an illustration of the specified exception, that *ā* may so intervene, and the conversion yet take place, he gives *paryāñaddham* (xiv. 2. 12: p. *pari-ānaddham*), which is, I believe, the only case of the kind afforded by the text.

The construction of the other rules relating to this general subject in the remaining Prātiçākhyas is not such as to require them to make the restriction here taught. Pāṇini, however, takes due note of it (viii. 4. 38), but omits to except the preposition *ā*, so that (unless he makes the exception by some other rule which I have not observed) he would read *paryāñaddha*.

तुविष्टमः ॥ १६ ॥

96. Note *tuviṣṭamaḥ*.

This word occurs only once in the Atharvan, in a passage cited by the commentator, as follows: *indraḥ patis tuviṣṭamaḥ* (vi. 33. 3). The *pada*-text reads *tuvi-tamaḥ*, so that there takes place, as the commentator says, an inorganic insertion of *s* (*sakārāgamah*). The same word is found more than once in the Rig-Veda, but is written by the *pada*-text *tuviḥ-tama*, so that there is nothing irregular in the *sanhitā* form, and it requires and receives no notice from the Rik Prātiçākhyas. It is a legitimate matter for surprise to find the rule thrust in in this place, in connection with a subject to which it stands in no relation whatever: we should expect to meet it in the second chapter, along with rules 25 and 26 of that chapter, or after rule 30, or elsewhere. Its intrusion here, and the indefiniteness of its form, cannot but suggest the suspicion of its being an interpolation, made for the purpose of supplying an observed deficiency in the treatise.

The commentator, after citing the passage containing the word, goes on to say: *sañhitāyām ity eva: tuvitama iti tuvitamaḥ*:<sup>1</sup> *anadhikāre*

<sup>1</sup> The MS. writes, in every case, *tuwittama* in the commentary, but doubtless only by a copyist's error.

*sûtranirdeçah*: *sûtrârthas tardyâgaç ca carcâparihârayor vacanam mâ bhûd iti*; 'this is the form only in *sanhitâ*; the *krama* reads *tuvitama iti tui-tamaç*: in the absence of an explanatory heading, the rule simply points out the form; and the significance of the rule is . . . (?): in *carcâ* and *parihâra* [repetitions of *krama*] the reading is not to be so made: that is the meaning.'

The signature of the chapter is as follows: 105: *iti tṛtīyo 'dhyâyaç*. If its enumeration is to be trusted, our two *lacunæ* (unless some parts of the introduction and postscript of section iii are to be accounted as rules) have cost us nine rules.

#### CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS:—SECTION I. 1-2, combination of prepositions in *pada*-text with following verb; 3-6, exceptions; 7, separation by *avagraha* of such combinations; 8-12, do. of the constituents of compound words; 13-30, do. of suffixes of derivation from primitive words; 31-34, do. of case-endings from themes; 35-40, do. of other suffixes and constituents of compounds; 41, do. of *iva* from the preceding word; 42-46, do. of the constituents of words doubly compounded.

SECTION II. 47-48, absence of *avagraha* before suffix *mant* etc. in certain cases; 49-50, absence of division by *avagraha* of certain copulative compounds; 51-54, do. of other compounds; 55, do. of *vṛddhi* derivatives from compound words; 56, do. of compounds with the negative prefix; 57-72, do. of other compounds and derivatives.

SECTION III. 73-77, general rules for restoration in *pada*-text of original or normal forms of words; 78, their application in *krama*-text also; 79-93, rules for restoration in certain cases and classes of cases; 94-100, exceptions.

SECTION IV. 101-109, necessity of the *krama*-text and of its study; 110-126, rules for construction of *krama*-text.

Our three preceding chapters have covered the whole ground which a comparison of the other treatises shows it to have been the bounden duty of a Prâtiçâkhyâ to occupy, and in this final chapter are brought up matters which might have been left unhandled without detriment to the character of the work as a complete and comprehensive phonetic manual for the school to which it belonged. Its first three sections, namely, teach the construction of the *pada*-text: whereas we have hitherto assumed this text as established, and have been taught how to construct the *sanhitâ* upon its basis, we now look upon the body of traditional scripture from just the opposite point of view, and, assuming the *sanhitâ*, receive directions for forming the *pada* from it. No other of the kindred treatises thus includes in its plan the construction of the *pada*-text; the Vâj. Pr. is the only one which takes up the matter at all: devoting, indeed, the whole of one of its chapters, the fifth, to an exposition of the rules determining the use or omission of the *avagraha*, or pause of separation between the two parts of a compound word,

which is the subject of our first two sections, but leaving untouched the subject of our third section, or the restoration of words to their normal form in *pada*, which is not less indispensable than the other to the formation of the text. As regards the fourth section and its theme, the *krama*-text, their correspondences and relations will be set forth when we arrive at the place.

As was the case with the third section of the foregoing chapter, our commentary offers us here a long introduction, containing about twenty *ślokas*, to the subject of the chapter. It is prefaced with the following words: *samāsāvagrahavigrahān pade yatho'vāca chandasi śakatāyanaḥ: tathā vakshyāmi catushtayaṁ padaṁ nāmākhyātopasarganipātānām*; \* 'as Śakatāyana has set forth for the Veda the combination, division, and disjunction of words in *pada*, so will I set forth the quadruple word—noun, verb, preposition, and particle.' Next follows a definition of each of these four classes of words, and then an exposition of the rules according to which they are to be regarded as compounded with one another, as they occur in the connection of continuous text, illustrations of the principles stated being drawn from the Atharvan text. Finally is given a list of the twenty *upasargas* or prepositions, and a designation of their accentuation, which is also followed by a list of the *upasargavṛttinī*, or words which are treated as if they were prepositions—such as *achā*, *tiraḥ*, *purah*, *hiṅ*, etc. The verses are in one or two places very corrupt, and their precise meaning is sometimes doubtful: hence, in order not to interrupt the progress of our treatise by too long an interlude, I defer to an additional note, at the end of the work, a presentation of their text and an attempt to translate them.

## उपसर्ग आख्यतेनोदात्तेन समस्यते ॥ १ ॥

1. A preposition is compounded with a verb when the latter is accented.

This is the well-known usage of all the Vedic *pada*-texts, at least so far as they have been brought to general knowledge. With a true appreciation of the slightness of the bond which connects a verb with its prefix, the constructors of the disjointed text have ordinarily treated the two as independent words: unless, indeed, by the laws of accentuation of the sentence, the usually enclitic verb retains its accent, in which case the preceding preposition in turn loses its accent and becomes proclitic; and the two are then written together as a compound. The commentator cites, as instances of verbs thus compounded, *pari-yānti* (i. 1. 1), *sam-ābharah* (i. 9. 3), and *sam-srāvanti* (i. 15. 3). He adds, *upasargavṛtti-bhīḥ ca*, 'the same is the case with the words which are to be treated as if prepositions,' and cites *yām: arāte: purah-dhatsé* (v. 7. 2), and *yām: amī' iti: purah-dadhīré* (v. 8. 5). That our treatise itself, in mak-

\* With the slight alteration of *yatho'vāca* to *yathā'ha*, we should have here three equal successive *pādas* of a metrical verse: but the impossibility of forcing the last compound into any such metrical form, as a fourth *pāda*, renders it very doubtful whether this is anything more than a curious coincidence, and whether the words are not meant for simple prose.

ing no special reference to such ambiguous words, means to regard them as to all intents and purposes actual *upasargas*, is altogether probable. As counter-example, to show that the preposition is not compounded with the verb when the latter is unaccented, the commentary offers *yātu-dhā'nān : vi : lāpaya* (i. 7. 2).

The rule of the Vāj. Pr. (v. 16) is to the effect that *avagraha* is used between a verb and a preceding preposition, when the latter is unaccented. This is in some degree a better form of statement, since the loss of accent in the preposition is rather the cause of its combination with the verb than the latter's acquisition of a tone.

## अनेको ऽनुदात्तेनापि ॥ २ ॥

2. If there be more than one of them, they are compounded even with an unaccented verb.

If more prepositions than one are compounded with an unaccented verb, only one of them, the one next the verb, is accented, the others becoming proclitic. In such a case, the constructors of the *pada*-text have very properly combined all with the verb, instead of simply putting the prepositions together, since it is not the relation of the former to the latter preposition that costs the former its accent, but rather their common relation to the verb: we have not a compound preposition, but a duplicate verbal compound. A later rule (rule 7, below) teaches us that in such a combination the first of the prepositions is separated by *avagraha* from the rest.

The commentator gives as illustrations the compounds *ut-āvasyati* (ix. 6. 54), *sam-ā'cinushva : anu-samprāyāhi* (xi. 1. 36), and *upa-sāmpārānu-yāt\** (xviii. 4. 50). He adds, as under the last rule, *upasargavṛttibhiḥ ca*, and illustrates with *acha-ā'vadāmasi* (e. g. vii. 38. 3) and *abhi-hiñ-kṛnota* (xii. 3. 37).

I do not find any corresponding precept in the Vāj. Pr., although the cases which it concerns are not such as would properly fall under the rule of that treatise already referred to.

## अनर्थकमप्रवचनीयान्ययुक्तैर्विग्रहो ऽभिवितन्वादिषु ॥ ३ ॥

3. Disjoined from the verb, however, are such as are used without significance, or to set forth the object, or such as are otherwise connected—namely, in the cases *abhi vi tanu* etc.

The Sanskrit language, much more than any other of the Indo-European family, has, throughout its whole history, maintained the *upasargas* or prepositions in their original and proper character of adverbial prefixes, directing the action of the verb itself, and not belonging especially to the object of that action, or immediately governing its case-relation. Even in the Vedic dialect, where the preposition admits of being widely

\* The citation of this word here and under rule 7 shows that its true *pada*-form is as here given, and not as it has been noticed above (under iii. 79) that our *pada*-MS. actually reads.

separated from its verb, it yet, in the great majority of cases, belongs distinctly to the verb, and not to any noun. But, while this is true as a general rule, there are yet cases, in the Vedic as well as in the more modern classical Sanskrit, where the preposition has detached itself from the verb, and is to be construed more intimately with the object of the action. Even here, it more often follows the noun, as auxiliary to its case-ending, and so occupies an intermediate position between adverb and preposition, something like the German adverbs of direction in such phrases as *aus dem Walde heraus*, *in den Wald hinein*, or like the German *an* in *ich blicke ihn an*, as compared with the *at* in our nearly equivalent expression "I look at him." Whenever it happens that a preposition thus attached to a noun comes, in the construction of the sentence, to stand before an accented verb, or before another preposition which is connected with a verb, there arises an exception to the two foregoing rules, and such exceptions are made the subject of this and the two following rules: the first of them deals with such cases as *grhā'n : ūpa : prá : sidāmi* (iii. 12. 9), where the preposition is followed by another accented preposition and an unaccented verb, so that, by iv. 2, 7, we ought to have *upa-prásidāmi*; the second, with such as *yāh : viśvā : abhi : vi-páśyati* (vi. 34. 4), where the following preposition loses its accent before the verb, and the same rules would require *abhi-vipáśyati*; the third, with passages where a single preposition comes before an accented verb, and so ought to lose its own accent and enter into combination with it, so that we should have, instead of *yé : ásatāh : pári : jajñiré* (x. 7. 25), *pari-jajñiré*. The description which our rule gives of such uses of the prepositions is in near accordance with that of Pāṇini, who also (i. 4. 83-98) calls by the name *karmapravacanīya* ('concerned with the setting forth of the object of the action') such prepositions as are used otherwise than in immediate connection with a verb. He likewise uses in the same connection (i. 4. 93) the term *anarthaka*, 'non-significant,' applying it, according to the scholiast's illustrations, to *adhi* and *pari* when used after an ablative adverb—thus, *kutaḥ pari*, 'whence'—where they are unessential to the completeness of the sense. Whether the same term would be applied to the same prepositions when following a case, as an ablative or locative, I do not know; nor precisely how it is to be understood in our rule: the commentator gives no explanation of it, nor of *anyayukta*, nor does he assign his illustrations to the several items of specification which his text furnishes him. The term *anyayukta* probably means 'belonging to another verb,' but such cases are quite rare in the text: an instance of the kind intended is perhaps *nih stuvānāsya pātaya* (i. 8. 3), where the preposition *nih* belongs to the verb *pātaya*, and not to the intervening participle, to which it would otherwise be attached, with loss of its own accent. Pāṇini's *karmapravacanīya* is comprehensive enough to include all the cases to which our rules apply.

In filling up the *gaṇas* of our treatise, and giving all the cases of a preposition preceding a verb, but not placed in accentual and compositional relations with it, I shall include together all that would fall under this and the two following rules, since they evidently form a single class, and are only formally distinct from one another:

Of *adhi*, with an ablative case (or, rarely, an ablative adverb), ii. 7. 3. viii. 9. 4 (*bis*). ix. 5. 6; 9. 18. xiii. 1. 42; 3. 2. xix. 56. 1; with a locative case (or locative adverb), i. 3. 6; 32. 4. ii. 1. 5. viii. 9. 19. ix. 5. 4, 8; 9. 2; 10. 7. x. 7. 1, 12; 8. 41. xi. 7. 8, 9, 14. xii. 3. 36. xiii. 1. 37; 3. 6, 18. xiv. 1. 1; 2. 48. xviii. 4. 3: *anu* with an accusative, ii. 34. 3. vi. 97. 3; 122. 1. viii. 9. 12. x. 5. 25-35. xi. 8. 11, 19-22, 24, 27. xii. 2. 21. xiii. 2. 40; 3. 1. xv. 6. 1-9; 9. 1; 14. 1-12. xviii. 4. 28. xix. 13. 6; 44. 10: *antar* with a locative, i. 13. 3: *abhi*, with an accusative, iii. 21. 5. iv. 1. 3. v. 19. 4. vi. 34. 4. viii. 2. 4; 3. 9. ix. 10. 6. xii. 1. 29, 33; 3. 8, 12, 30, 52. xviii. 3. 2;\* with an ablative, viii. 6. 22; † with a locative, xviii. 3. 40; ‡ *á* with a locative, xviii. 1. 59; *upa* with an accusative, iii. 21. 1, 9. xix. 56. 3; *pavi* with an ablative, ii. 34. 5. x. 7. 25. xii. 3. 53.

But these prepositional or quasi-prepositional uses of the *upasargas* are of less importance to give in detail, because they are liable to occur in any part of the sentence, and their treatment as exceptions to the first rules of our chapter is a result of their accidental position in contact with a verb. There are other passages, considerably less numerous, where the prefixes, although evidently belonging to the verb, have an adverbial signification which is so far independent that they maintain their separate accent before an unaccented verb, or before another verbal prefix. The one most often thus treated is *abhi*, which is found before *pra* at iii. 1. 2; 2. 5. iv. 8. 2; 32. 7. xviii. 3. 73, and before other *upasargas* at i. 1. 3. viii. 4. 21. ix. 9. 3: *upa* occurs only before *pra*, § at i. 28. 1. iv. 31. 1. vi. 37. 1. xviii. 2. 53: *á*, also before *pra* alone, at iii. 4. 5. vi. 35. 1. xviii. 4. 49: *apa*, at iv. 31. 7; 32. 5: *pavi*, at iii. 2. 4: *ava*, at vi. 65. 1 (p. *áva*: *á-yatá*: *áva* etc.): *anu*, at xiii. 4. 26: *sam* (perhaps to be connected with the following instrumentals), at xviii. 2. 58: and *ud*, at xii. 1. 39—where, however, it is difficult not to believe the manuscript reading erroneous, and requiring amendment to *ut-ánrcúh*.

In a single phrase, *sám sám sravantu* (i. 15. 1. ii. 26. 3. xix. 1. 1), the preposition *sam*, being repeated for emphasis before the verb, is both times accented, and so is left uncombined. At vi. 63. 4, in a like repetition, there takes place a combination, with accentuation only of the former word—thus, *sám-sam*: *it*, etc.; and, at vii. 26. 3, the repetition of *pra* is treated in the same manner.

A briefer, and, we should have supposed, a more acceptable manner of disposing of all the cases to which these three rules relate, would have been to prescribe that when an *upasarga* maintained its own accent before an accented verb or another *upasarga*, it did not undergo combination with them. Such exceptions to the general rules for combination are treated by the Váj. Pr. in rules 5 to 10 of its sixth chapter.

The commentator's cited illustrations are *ihá*: *evá*: *abhi*: *vi*: *tanu* (i. 1. 3), *sám*: *sám*: *sravantu* (e. g. i. 15. 1), *sú*: *prá*: *sádahaya* (i. 24. 4),

\* In some of these passages—viz. iii. 21. 5. xii. 3. 12\*, 30—the special connection of *abhi* with the noun is but the faintest, and the cases are hardly to be reckoned as belonging in this class.

† Here, too, the preposition belongs rather with the verb than with the noun.

‡ This is a combination unsupported by other passages, and hardly to be borne: for *abhi* is doubtless to be read *adhi*, with the Rig-Veda (x. 18. 3).

§ Except in the anomalous combination *upa*: *vandyák*, at xviii. 4. 65.

and *úpa : prá : agát* (i. 28. 1). The third is a case having no proper analogy with the others, since *su* is not at all a verbal prefix; I have taken no account of it in drawing out the above statement.

### पूर्वेणाभिविपश्याम्यादिषु ॥ ४ ॥

4. In *abhi vipaśyāmi* etc., the former preposition is disjoined.

The cases falling under this rule—those of a preposition retaining its accent and independence before another preposition which is itself made proclitic and combined with a following accented verb—have been detailed in the preceding note. The commentator quotes four of them, viz. *yá'vat : te : abhi : vi-páśyāmi* (xii. 1. 33), *mánasā : abhi : sam-vidúh* (iii. 21. 5), *yá'vat : sá' : abhi : vi-ján̄gahe* (v. 19. 4), and *yáh : víçvā : abhi : vi-páśyati* (vi. 34. 4). The examples, as in sundry cases elsewhere, are wanting in variety.

### योनावध्यैरयन्तादिषु च ॥ ५ ॥

5. In *yonāv adhy áirayanta* etc., the preposition is also disjoined from the verb.

This rule applies to such of the cases detailed in the note to rule 3, above, as show an accented and independent preposition immediately before an accented verb. The commentator instances *samáné : yónāu : ádhi : á'irayanta* (ii. 1. 5), *ádhi : tasthúh* (ix. 9. 2), *yé : ásatah : pári : jajñire* (x. 7. 25), *samuđrāt : ádhi : jajñishé* (iv. 10. 2), and *pári : bhūma : jā'yase* (xiii. 2. 3). The citation of the last passage seems to imply that the commentator regarded *bhūma* as a verbal form, from the root *bhú*; but he can hardly, except in the forgetfulness of a moment, have been guilty of so gross a blunder.

### आशीर्बभूवेति षुतस्वरस्य सिद्धत्वात् ॥ ६ ॥

6. *Āçih* and *babhūva* are disjoined, owing to the determination of the protracted vowel.

That is to say, if I do not misapprehend the meaning of the rule, owing to the recognition of the final syllable of each word as a protracted one. To what end the precept is given, unless the words referred to (x. 2. 28 and xi. 3. 26, 27) have an irregular accent on the protracted syllable, I do not see. If accented, they would have a right, by the first rule of this chapter, to combination with the preceding preposition; but, the present rule virtually says, they are seen to lose this right upon a recognition of the fact that the accented vowel is protracted, and that its accent is therefore of an anomalous character. It has been already noticed (under i. 105) that a part of our manuscripts accent *babhūvá'çñ* in the latter of the two passages referred to: not one gives an accent to *āçih*, in either case of its occurrence.

### पूर्वेणावग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

7. The former preposition is separated by *avagraha*.

The *avagraha*, or pause of separation between the two parts of a compound word, is defined by two of the Prātiçākhyas (as has been already remarked, in the note following iii. 74) as having the length of a mora. From here to the end of section II (rule 72), the treatise is occupied with rules for its employment or omission. And, in the first place, with however many prepositions a verbal form may be compounded, it is always the first of them that is separated from the rest of the compound by *avagraha*. The commentator gives us as examples the same series of words which we had under rule 2, above, only prefixing to them *upa-ávâiti* (ix. 6. 53).

### यातुमावत् ॥ ८ ॥

8. In *yātumāvat*, also, the former constituent is separated by *avagraha*.

I interpret this rule according to the explanation of the commentator, who regards *pūrveṇa* as implied in it, by inference from the preceding rule. It comes in rather awkwardly here, as only prepositions have been contemplated, thus far in the chapter, as former constituents of compounds. The commentator adds an exposition of the matter, which is, however, too much corrupted and mutilated for me to restore and translate it: it reads *matvarthe: vāyam māvacchabdo manupo makārasya vokārah: ākārāgamah*. The word is apparently regarded as being *yātu-mant*, with an added suffix *vant*, and the rule is designed to teach us that, instead of being divided *yatumā-vat*, as we might expect, it is to read *yātu-māvat*—as our *pada* manuscripts do in fact present it to us. The word occurs only at viii. 4. 23.

### समासे च ॥ ९ ॥

9. Separation by *avagraha* takes place also in a compound.

The *ca* in the rule evidently continues the implication simply of *avagrahaḥ* from rule 7, and the connection of the text casts upon *yātumāvat* the suspicion of being an interpolation. A corresponding precept, *samāse 'vagrahaḥ*, is by the Vāj. Pr. set at the head of its chapter upon the use of *avagraha* (v. 1).

The commentator cites, as examples of separable compounds, *upa-hūtoḥ* (e. g. i. 1. 4), *bhūri-dhāyasam* (i. 2. 1), *bhūri-varpasam* (i. 2. 1), and *bhūri-dhanāḥ* (vii. 60. 4). Whether such words as the first of these, or the participles of compounded verbs, should be regarded as falling under the designation *samāsa*, appears to me doubtful, as they present the closest analogies with the verbs from which they come. I have included them with verbal forms in filling up the *gaṇas* of rules 3 to 5.

### उपजाति परेण ॥ १० ॥

10. When a compound is farther compounded with an appended member, the latter constituent is separated.



The instance which the commentator selects for illustrating this rule is *prajāpatīsr̥ṣṭāḥ* (x. 6. 19). The word *prajā* is itself divisible as a compound—thus, *pra-jā* (e. g. vii. 35. 3); upon farther adding *patī*, the former division is given up in favor of that between the old compound and its added member, and we have *prajā-patī* (e. g. ii. 34. 4); and a similar addition and removal of the pause of separation gives us *prajā-patīsr̥ṣṭāḥ*: while we might have, did the words occur, the yet farther change *prajāpatīsr̥ṣṭāḥ-iva*, or *prajāpatīsr̥ṣṭī-bhīḥ*, and *prajāpatīsr̥ṣṭī-bhīḥ-iva*. In no compound is the separation by *avagraha* made at more than one point, and it is always the member last appended which is entitled to separation.

The form of the corresponding rule in the Vāj. Pr. (v. 7) is vastly preferable to that of our own. That treatise says “in the case of a compound composed of several members, separation by *avagraha* is made of the member last added.” This puts the matter upon its true basis, and accounts for the usage of the *pada*-text-makers both where they separate the latter member, and where they separate the former member, from the rest of the compound. We shall see below (rule 12) that the treatment by our Prātiçākhyā of the separation of a former member is very obscure and imperfect.

## सुप्राव्या च ॥११॥

11. Also in *suprāvya*.

That is to say, in the word specified the last member is separated from the rest of the compound, and not the first, as would be more in accordance with the general analogies of the system of separation. The passage, the only one in the Atharvan where the word occurs, is quoted by the commentator: *supra-avyā*: *yājamanāya* (iv. 30. 6). *Su-prāvi* is divided in the same manner by the *pada*-text of the Rig-Veda (e. g. i. 34. 4): it is of obscure derivation and meaning, and whether the etymology of it which is implied in its analysis as made by the Prātiçākhyā is correct, is at least very doubtful. But whether *supra-avyā* or *su-prā-vi*, we should expect the *pada*-text to write it *su-prāvi* or *su-pravi*, and it is the recognition of its anomalous division which has caused it to be made the subject of a special rule. The commentator adds a verse about it, which, however, appears to deal rather with its accentuation than its division: *avateḥ prapūrvasya [su-prapūrvasya?] tāçabdaḥ [yaçabdaḥ?] svaritaḥ paraḥ: suprāvi 'ti trītyā-yāḥ kshāiprah chandasi svaryate*.

The Atharvan reading *suprāvya* is at any rate established by this rule, against *suprāvyē*, which the Rik (x. 125. 2) offers, and which the connection also appears to require. Possibly the form implies an explanation of the word which seems suggested by the first line of the verse just quoted, as if from the root *av*, with the prefixes *su* and *pra*, and with the added desiderative suffix *yā*, ‘with desire to show propitious favor.’ Such an explanation, of course, would be futile, being sufficiently disproved by the accent alone.

## अनिङ्गेन पूर्वेण ॥ १२ ॥

12. If the appended member is indivisible, the former member is separated.

This rule is very obscure, and I am far from feeling confident that my translation rightly expresses its meaning. The manuscript readings of its first word, in text and in comment, vary between *anīṅgena*, *atiṅgena*, and *amiṅgena*. If the word really means 'immovable,' i. e. 'indivisible, inseparable,' we should expect rather *anīṅgyena* (compare *iṅgya* in rule 76, below); and possibly the latter may be the true reading: but as *iṅga* also is an acknowledged word, having the meaning 'movable,' I have not ventured to alter the form presented by the manuscript. As I have rendered it, the rule would appear to mean only that when to a word already compounded an inseparable appendix, for instance a suffix, was added, the division would remain as before—as in *su-viratâyāi*, *pra-padābhyām*, and the like—but this is a perfectly simple case, and one which hardly calls for especial attention and determination. The commentator's exposition is as follows: *anīṅgeno 'pajāte: anīṅgena viçeshalakṣaṇena avikṛṣhitena: dvayoḥ samāçaye jāte pūrveṇā 'vagraho bhavati*; 'when a word is farther compounded with an indivisible—that is to say, with a modificatory appendage which is not taken apart—and there arises a doubt between two, separation is made of the former.' My translation of the rule is founded upon my (somewhat questionable) interpretation of this paraphrase. The cited illustrations, however, do not at all support it; they are *su-kshetriyā: su-gātuyā* (iv. 33. 2), *sahasūktavākah* (vii. 97. 6), *sa-antardeçāḥ* (ix. 5. 37), and *su-prajāḥ* (iv. 11. 3). The last three of these are plain cases of separation of the constituent last added from the rest of the compound: the first two are less unequivocal, since we should rather regard the suffix *yā* as added to *sukshetra* and *su-gātu*, and the more natural division as being *sukshetriyā, su-gātu-yā*;<sup>\*</sup> but neither is *yā* an *anīṅgya* suffix, as is shown by the next following word, *vasu-yā*, and the others detailed in rule 30, below. The commentator adds a verse of farther exposition, but this also throws no additional light upon the matter in hand: it is *dve yatrā 'vagrahasthāne pūrveṇe 'ti pūreṇa vā: pūrveṇā 'vagrahas tatra sukshetriyā sāntardeçāḥ suprajāç ca nīdarçanam*; 'where there are two places for separation by *avagraha*, either of the former or of the latter member of a compound, separation is there to be made of the first member: instances are *sukshetriyā, sāntardeçāḥ*, and *suprajāḥ*.' I do not see how this statement can be accepted as a correct one; for, of the compounds consisting of more than two members, the last is even more often separated from the first two than the first from the last two: the point of division being, except in a very few cases of which the treatise takes special note, determined by the history of the double or triple compound, upon the principle distinctly laid down in the Vāj. Pr., that the member last added is the one which must be separated. Thus, in

\* The Rik *pada* (i. 97. 2) actually reads *sugātu-yā*, although it divides *su-kshetriyā* like our own text.

the first four books of the text, we have, upon the one hand, *rta-prajāta*, *madhu-saṁdr̥ṣa*, *vi-āyāma*, *prati-obhicarāṇa*, *mushka-ābarha*, *brahma-saṁgīta*, *su-saṁnata*, *svapna-abhikarāṇa*, *ā-utsūryam*, *ā-vyūsham*, *āyuh-pratarāṇa*, *śiva-abhimarṣāṇa*, *akṣha-parājaya*, and *aśva-abhidhāni*; and, on the other hand, *sarūpa-kṛt*, *sarūpam-karaṇi*, *sapatna-kshayāṇa*, *viskan-dha-dūshāṇa*, *sapatna-han*, *abhimāti-jit*, *abhiṣasti-pā*, *saṁkalpa-kulmala*, *aṅnihotra-ḥut*, *ākūti-pra*, *āçāra-eshin*, *vijēsha-kṛt*, *abhibhūti ojas*, and *abhimāti-sahas*. And in the rare cases where three independent words are fused into a compound by a single process, the last one is separated from the other two: such are *nagha-risha* and *itiha-āsa* (xv. 6. 4). It will be difficult, I think, to find any interpretation for our rule which shall make it other than a bungling and inaccurate account of the phenomena with which it professes to deal. To connect *anīṅgena* in construction with *pārvena*, and translate 'the former member is separated from the rest when it is an indivisible word,' although it would satisfy well enough the requirements of the instances given by the commentator, would only throw us into new difficulties, for it would require us to read *sa-rūpakṛt* as well as *sa-antardeça*, *su-parṇasuvana* (v. 4. 2) as well as *su-kshetriyā*, and the like.\*

## तद्धिते धा ॥ १३ ॥

13. *Dhā* is separated, when a *taddhita*-suffix.

As instances of the separation of the secondary suffix *dhā* from the themes to which it is attached, the commentator cites *catuḥ-dhā* : *retāḥ* (x. 10. 29), *aṣṭa-dhā* : *yuktaḥ* (xiii. 3. 19), *nava-dhā* : *hitāḥ* (xiii. 4. 10), and *dvādaça-dhā* (vi. 113. 3): in the same manner is treated *mitra-dhā*, at ii. 6. 4, for which the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā, in the corresponding passage (xxvii. 5), has *mitra-dheye*. On the other hand, the text offers a single exception to the rule, *viçvādā* (vi. 85. 3), which neither the Prātiçākhyā nor its commentary notices: it is accented on the penult, while all the other compounds with *dhā* accent the suffix itself.

The commentator adds: *vyatyayasvaçraddirghelbhyo dhāpratyaye na avagraho bhavati*; 'the suffix *dhā* does not suffer separation after . . . (?), *sva*, *çrat*, and a long vowel.' The words *svadhā* and *çraddhā*, into which the root *dhā* enters as last member, are here referred to, and

\* The best way, it seems to me, of saving the credit of our Prātiçākhyā as regards its treatment of the subject of double composition in these two rules, will be to regard rule 10 as equivalent to Vāj. Pr. v. 7; understanding *upajāte* as meaning simply 'added to,' whether by prefixion or suffixion, and *pareṇa* as signifying 'the later (i. e. the last added) constituent;' and then farther, taking rule 12 to be added in limitation of 10, and to mean: 'when, however, the added constituent is incapable of being separated, the division remains as before.' It might well enough be thought that, in such cases of prefixion as *avira-han* (from *vira-han*), or in such cases of suffixion as *sv-viratā*, *vādhu-ya*, *pari-vatsarīṇa*, *vi-irtsā*, etc., the addition of another element virtually fused the prior compound into one word, and would be understood as annulling its division by *avagraha*, unless some direction was given to the contrary. This interpretation, however, would be contrary to the authority of the commentator, would require us to understand *pareṇa* and *pārvena* in a different from their usual sense, and would convict rule 11 of being an interpolation, made since the misinterpretation of rule 10.

perhaps *godhâ* (iv. 3. 6); but to what the first item in the enumeration refers, I have not succeeded in discovering.

The kindred suffix *dâ* remains always attached to the theme to which it belongs.

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 27) forbids the separation of *dhâ* from a numeral, but allows it in other cases: it would read *caturdhâ*, *ashtadhâ*, etc., in *pada*. The usage of the Rik *pada*-text also does not entirely correspond with that of the Atharvan in regard to the same suffix: thus the former has *bahudhâ*, while the latter separates *baku-dhâ*.

## त्राकारान्ते ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also *trâ*, when it ends in *â*.

The commentator's examples are *deva-trâ*: *ca*: *kr̥nuhi* (v. 12. 2), and *puru-trâ*: *te*: *vanvatâm* (vi. 126. 1); and his counter-examples, of *tra* inseparable, are *yatra*: *devâh*: *amṛtam* (ii. 1. 5), and *tatra*: *amṛtasya*: *cakshanam* (v. 4. 3).

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 9) declares *trâ* separable, and, as our treatise might just as well have done, regards *tra* as excluded by the designation of the form of the separable suffix as *trâ*. The usage of the Rik *pada* is also the same with that taught in our rule. Doubtless it is the character of the forms to which *tra* is attached, as being pronominal roots, that prevents its separation from them, rather than anything in the suffix itself. The ablative suffix *tas* is not separated, even when it follows a word having an independent *status* in the language, as in *abhîtas*.

## थानिकाक्षरेण ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *thâ*, when it is combined with a polysyllable.

The commentator's examples are *ṛtu-thâ*: *vi*: *cakshate* (ix. 10. 26), *nâma-thâ*: *sa*: *manyeta* (xi. 8. 7); and his counter-examples are *adha*: *yathâ*: *nah* (xviii. 3. 21), and *tathâ*: *tat*: *agne* (v. 29. 2). Here, again, it is evidently not the length of the words to which the suffix is appended, as monosyllables or polysyllables, that determines its separability, but the character of the former as pronominal roots and of the latter as nominal themes.

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 12) details the words after which *thâ* is separable.

## तर्तमयोः ॥ १६ ॥

16. Also *tara* and *tama*.

The commentator cites, as instances of these suffixes with separable character, *mâdhoh*: *asmi*: *mâdhu-tarah*: *madûghât*: *mâdhumât-tarah* (i. 34. 4), *ût-tamah*: *asi*: *ôshadhînam* (e. g. vi. 15. 1), *ahâm*: *asmi*: *yacâh-tamah* (vi. 39. 3), and *nṛṇâ'm*: *ca*: *bhâgavat-tamah* (ii. 9. 2). He adds, according to his usual method of introducing counter-examples: *taratamayoh iti kim artham*, 'why does the rule say *tara* and *tama*?' and gives the counter-examples *aṣvatarâsya* (iv. 4. 8) and *aṣvatarayâh* (viii. 8. 22). The citation of these words in this manner, as if they were

excluded by the very form of the rule itself from falling under its operation, suggests as the true reading and interpretation of the rule *taratamapoḥ*, 'tara and tama when unaccented,' giving to the indicatory letter *p* the same force which it has as appended to the same suffixes by Pāṇini (e. g. v. 3. 55, 57). My copy of the manuscript, indeed, gives me everywhere *taratamayoh*; but, considering the small difference between *y* and *p* when hastily formed, I cannot be confident that the Hindu scribe did not mean to write the latter letter. But, in the first place, I find it very hard to admit that our Prāticākhya would thus use an indicatory letter as an essential and determinative part of one of its rules, without giving anywhere any explanation of its value. Other such appendages to a suffix, corresponding with those which Pāṇini employs, are, it is true, elsewhere found in the treatise: thus we have (iv. 20) *tātīl*, where the *l* indicates that the syllable preceding the suffix has the accent; also *matu*, *valu*, and *vasu*, whose appended *u* is intended to show that the suffix receives an augment (*āgama*) *n* in the strong cases, and takes the feminine ending *tī*; and the particles *u* and *su* are called, with Pāṇini, *uñ* and *suñ*, to distinguish them from the exclamation *u* and the case-ending *su*: but the appended letters are nowhere used as significant. Again, we should expect that the *p*, if used at all, would be applied to each suffix, and that the rule would read *taraptamapoḥ* (compare Pāṇ. i. 1. 22), which is certainly not its form in the manuscript. Finally, the admission of the indicatory letter, with its Paninean signification, would not make the rule complete and accurate, as stating the usage of our *pada*-text with regard to the suffixes in question; for, on the one hand, we have *ratham-tarā* (e. g. viii. 10. 13), and the prepositional comparatives *pra-tarām* (e. g. v. 1. 4), *vi-tarām* (v. 12. 4), and *sam-tarām* (vii. 16. 1); and, on the other hand, there are cases in which the unaccented endings are not separated from the themes to which they are attached, and one of these cases is even noted and specified by the commentator. The latter's discussion of the rule is fuller than usual, as he seems, for once, to feel the necessity of doing something to supply the deficiencies of his text; but his effort is only partially successful, and moreover, his language is so mutilated by the manuscript that I can make it out but imperfectly. He first asks why the separation of *tara* and *tama* is not made also in *katarā* and *katamā*, *yatarā* and *yatamā* (to which we may add *itarā* and *antara*), and answers *netāuḥe [nāi 'tāu stas?] taratamāv anyāv etāv akārādi pratyayāu : āngasyā 'trā "dimātram u śishyate lupyate param : svarādi pratyayāv etāu padatvañ nā 'tra śishyate*; 'these are not *tara* and *tama*, but other suffixes, commencing with a [viz. *atara*, *atama*]: in the derivatives in question, the first portion of the theme remains, but the last is dropped [i. e. *yatarā* = *y* + *atara* etc.]: these are two suffixes with initial vowel: capability of standing as separate *padas* is not taught of them.' This distinction of the suffixes as applied to pronominal roots from those applied to other themes is evidently artificial and false: the difference is that the roots themselves are not, like derivative themes, detachable from the suffixes appended to them—as we have seen to be the case under the two preceding rules. The commentator, changing his subject, then goes on to say *gotamaḥ pratishedho vaktavyah*; 'the

word *gotama* must be noted as an exception to the rule; and he cites the passage in which it occurs: *yâ'u : gôtamam : âvathah* (iv. 29. 6); adding, by way of explanation, *sañjñâyâm rûdhiçabdo dhâ tamâ 'trâ 'natiçâyane : asamânah samudrâdis tasmân neiyati gotamaḥ*. I have not succeeded in restoring this verse so as to translate it, but so much of it as applies to *gotama* may be pretty clearly understood: the word, as a proper name, is one of common currency, a *sañjñâ*, or specific appellation employed without reference to its etymology, and its suffix *tama* has no superlative signification; hence there is a propriety in treating it otherwise than as an ordinary superlative.

There yet remains one word in the Atharvan, viz. *uttara*, whose treatment by the *pada*-text requires an exposition which the Prâtiçâkhya omits. While *uttama* is always divided—thus, *ut-tama*—the comparative is variously treated, being sometimes divided and sometimes left without *avagraha*. The Vâj. Pr. (v. 2) takes special note of this irregularity, declaring a word formed with *tara* or *tama* not separable when opposed in meaning to 'south;,' that is, when meaning 'north'—this being, as we may suppose, another case of *sañjñâ*. This principle is so far followed in our text that the word is never divided when it has the meaning 'north;,' but it is also left without *avagraha* in quite a number of passages\* where it has its own proper signification 'upper,' or the naturally and regularly derived ones 'superior,' 'remoter,' or 'later.' I can only suppose that the true principle which should determine the separation or non-separation was misunderstood and misapplied by the constructors of our *pada*-text.

मती ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also *mant*.

The illustrations chosen by the commentator from among the very numerous examples of this rule presented in the Atharvan text are *madhu-mat* (e. g. i. 34. 3) and *go-mat* (xviii. 3. 61). Exceptions are noted farther on, in rule 47.

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 8) states the principle more broadly, including together all possessive suffixes; among them, most of those which form the subject of our next rule.

वकारादौ च ॥ १८ ॥

18. Also a *taddhita* beginning with *v*.

The commentator cites as examples *atri-vat : vah : krimayah : hanmi : kanva-vat : jamadagni-vat* (ii. 32. 3), *ṛta-vanam* (vi. 36. 1), *satya-vanam* (iv. 29. 1, 2), *açva-van* (vi. 68. 3), *añji-vam* (viii. 6. 9), *keça-vah* (viii. 6. 23), † *mârta-vatsam* (viii. 6. 26), *â-vayam* (viii. 6. 26), and *vâdhû-yam*

\* They are as follows: iii. 5. 5. iv. 22. 6. v. 28. 10. vi. 16. 4; 118. 3; 134. 2. viii. 2. 15. xi. 8. 18. xii. 1. 54.

† The MS. next gives *rânvatah*, which I have not succeeded in identifying with any word in the Atharvan text.

(xiv. 1. 29). He must have been nodding when he added the last three words, of which the third has no suffix beginning with *v*, and the two others are not formed by suffixes, but by composition. He goes on to say *vijño pratishedho vaktavyah*, but what is to be understood in, or from, *vijño*, I do not see: the cases of irregular absence of separation by *avagraha* which he adduces are *druvayah : vi-baddhuḥ* (v. 20. 2), *ubhayāvinam* (v. 25. 9), and the three words, of kindred character with the latter, *amayāvi*, *mekhalāvi*, *medhāvi*, no one of which is found in the Atharvan, although we once have an accusative of the last of them, *medhāvinam* (vi. 108. 4).

## शसि व्रीप्सायाम् ॥ ११ ॥

19. Also *ṣas*, with distributive meaning.

The instances given in the commentary are *paru-ṣaḥ : kalpaya : enam* (ix. 5. 4), and *dhāma-ṣaḥ : sthātre : rejante : vi-kṛtāni : rūpa-ṣaḥ* (ix. 9. 16); the counter-examples, showing that *ṣas* is only separable when distributive, are *aṅkuṣaḥ* (vi. 82. 3) and *kināṣaḥ* (e. g. iii. 17. 5)—cases which it was very unnecessary to cite, since their suffix, if they have one, is *ṣa*, not *ṣas*.

The Vāj. Pr. (v. 9) marks *ṣas*, along with other secondary suffixes, as separable.

## तातिलि ॥ २० ॥

20. Also *tāti*.

Pāṇini (e. g. iv. 4. 142) calls the suffix *tāti* by the same name, *tātil*, the appended *l* signifying, as has been already noticed, that the syllable preceding the suffix is accented. The Vāj. Pr., in its corresponding rule (v. 9), calls it simply *tāti*.

The commentator illustrates with the two passages *mahyāi : arishta-tātaye* (iii. 5. 5), and *havishmantam : mā : vardhaya : jyeshtha-tātaye* (vi. 39. 1).

The related suffix *tā* is never separated from the theme to which it is appended: *tva* forms the subject of rule 26, below.

## उभयाद् द्युभि ॥ २१ ॥

21. Also *dyu*, after *ubhaya*.

The commentator cites the examples *ubhaya-dyuh : abhi-eti* (i. 25. 4) and *ubhaya-dyuh : upa : karanti* (viii. 10. 21), and the counter-example *yah : anyedyuh* (i. 25. 4); which are the only cases (except a repetition of the phrase in i. 25. 4 at vii. 116. 2) presented in our text of derivatives—or, more properly, of compounds—formed with *dyu* or *dyus*. The name *dyubh* or *dyubhi*, which our treatise gives to the latter, is a strange one, and not supported by anything in Pāṇini: indeed, the latter seems never to use *bh* as an indicatory letter; the general grammar forms *ubhayadyus* with the suffix *dyus*, and *anyedyus* and its numerous kindred (see the Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon, under *dyus*, or Pān. v. 3. 22)

with the suffix *edyusac*: one is tempted to conjecture that the authors of our system may have regarded *dyus* in these compounds as a contraction for the instrumental plural *dyubhis*. The reading of the word is well assured, not only by the text and comment, but also by a cited verse with which the commentator closes his exposition: it reads *anyasyâ dyubhi tv evam syâd anyo vâ dyahbhir ishyate: lopa edyubhi câ 'ntyasya siddho vâ 'yam punar dyubhi*. This evidently has to do with the formation of *anyedyus*, accounting for the *e* which precedes the suffix: but I can offer no entirely satisfactory restoration of the text.

## मात्रे च ॥ २२ ॥

### 22. Also *mâtra*.

This is most palpably a rule which has its ground in the observed phenomena of the general language, and not in those of the Atharva-Veda; for although, in the later language, *mâtra* came to be used in such a mode and sense as to give some ground for its treatment as a suffix, it is in the Atharvan nothing but a noun, and even enters into composition only with *ati*, forming the adjective *atimâtra*, 'above measure, excessive.' The commentator cites, in illustration of the rule, the two passages in which this compound occurs, namely *ati-mâtram: avardhanta* (v. 19. 1) and *ye: âtmânam: ati-mâtram* (viii. 6. 13).

## विश्वादानीमि ॥ २३ ॥

### 23. Also *dânîm*, after *viçva*.

The commentator cites, as example and counter-example, *viçva-dânîm* (e. g. vii. 73. 11) and *tidânîm* (e. g. x. 8. 39), the only two Atharvan words which are formed with this suffix. Here, again, is an instance of a suffix remaining attached in *pada* to a pronominal root, while it is separated from a nominal theme (compare under rules 14-16).

## मये ऽसकारात् ॥ २४ ॥

### 24. Also *maya*, excepting after *s*.

A single example of the separation of the suffix *maya* is cited in the commentary, viz. *çaka-mayam: dhûmam* (ix. 10. 25); and also a single example of its non-separation, when following a theme ending in *s*, viz. *anaḥ: manasmayam* (xiv. 1. 12).

## के व्यञ्जनात् ॥ २५ ॥

### 25. Also *ka*, after a consonant.

Words in which the suffix *ka* is appended to a consonant are not at all frequent in the Atharvan: the commentator brings up two cases, viz. *avat-kam* (ii. 3. 1) and *çjat-kâḥ* (v. 23. 7), and I have noted but two others, viz. *manah-kam* (vi. 18. 3) and *anîyah-kam* (x. 8. 25). As counter-examples, where the same suffix, following a vowel, is left attached



in *pada* to its theme, he gives us *tundikah* (viii. 6. 5) and *ṣipavitrukāḥ* (v. 23. 7). Such formations occur by scores in our text.\*

वे चान्तोदत्ते ॥ २६ ॥

26. Also *tva*, in a word accented on the final syllable.

The instances cited by the commentator of the occurrence of this common suffix are *mahi-tvā'* : *kásmāi* (iv. 2. 4), *amṛta-tvám* : *ānaṣuḥ* (ix. 10. 1), and *ṣūcayah* : *cuci-tvám* (xii. 3. 28). As counter-example, to show that the *tva* is separated only when it receives the accent, is cited *āditiḥ* : *jānitvam* (vii. 6. 1 : the Rik *pada*, in the corresponding passage [i. 89. 10], has *jāni-tvam*); and this is the only word of the kind which the text contains, for at ii. 28. 3, where the edition reads *jānitvāḥ*, all the manuscripts have *janitrāḥ*. The commentator adds a verse respecting his counter-example, as follows: *janitvam aditeḥ param ne 'ngyate kṛjjanaparataḥ : itvo vā syāj janas tena padatvaṅ nā 'tra ṣishyate* : this informs us that *janitva* following *aditi* is not to be treated as separable, as being formed from the root *jan* by the suffix *itva*, which is not taught to be an ending capable of constituting an independent *pada*. He then proceeds to ask the question *iha kasmāt samāso na bhavati : ekaja : tvam : mahi : tvam*; 'why is there no combination in the passages *ekaja tvām* (iv. 31. 3 : p. *eka-ja : tvām*) and *mahi tvām* (not found in AV.); and he answers by a verse, from the authority, doubtless, which had suggested to him the query : *ekaja tvam mahi tvam ca tad ubhayaṁ samasyate [tū 'bhayaṁ na samasyate?]* : *āmantritaṁ tayoh pūrvam yushmada[s?]* *tvam param padam*; 'in neither of the phrases *ekaja tvam* and *mahi tvam* is there a combination; the former word is there a vocative, and the latter is *tvam* from *yushmad*.' It is clearly a work of supererogation on the part of the commentator to explain such self-evident matters. But he is not content even with this; he continues "why is not *agrepitva* separated?"—that is to say, I presume, why is it not divided *agrepī-tva*, instead of *agre-pitva*?—and he again cites a verse: *taddhite 'vagrahaḥ ṣishtah padatvam nā 'tra ṣishyate : pibates tam nibodhata itvam chānda-sam ishryate*; 'separability is taught only of *taddhitas*; division into separate *padas* is not taught of this case; note that the word comes from the root *pā*, 'to drink,' with the Vedic suffix *itva*.' But, even were this exposition in itself worth giving, the word to which it relates does not occur in the Atharvan, nor—judging from its non-appearance in the Böhtlingk-Roth lexicon—in any other of the known Vedic texts. We could wish that our commentator had reserved his strength for points where its exertion would have done us some service.

The suffix *tra*, which appears in the single word *saṅskṛtatrá* to fill the office of *tva*, is in our *pada*-text (iv. 21. 4) left inseparable, while the Rik, in the corresponding passage (vi. 28. 4), interposes the *avagraha* before it. *Taya*, in *catuṣṭiaya* (x. 2. 3), is not separated from its theme. Of *tā*, notice has been taken under rule 20.

\* For example, in the first eight books, from which alone I have excerpted them, at i. 2. 2; 3. 6-9. 9; 11. 5; 25. 4; 34. 2. ii. 8. 1; 24. 1, 2; 26. 5. iii. 11. 2; 23. 4. v. 18. 8. vi. 29. 3; 43. 1; 83. 3; 121. 4. vii. 56. 6. viii. 6. 19, 21 (6i).

## कृत्वे समासो वा नानापदर्शनात् ॥ २७ ॥

27. *Kṛtva* is combined or not, according to its appearance as an independent word or otherwise.

*Kṛtvas* occurs but three times in the Atharvan: twice it is treated as an independent word, both it and the preceding numeral having an accent; once it is combined with the numeral, the latter losing its separate accent, and it is then separated by *avagraha* from it. The commentator cites all the passages, as follows: *catūr : nāmah : ashta-kṛtvaḥ : bhavā'ya : dāça : kṛtvaḥ* (xi. 2. 9), and *trih : sapta : kṛtvaḥ* (xii. 2. 29). After this, having not yet recovered from the impulse which made him so fertile of exposition under the foregoing rule, he continues: *nanv evam : katham : vyavasthitena vikalpena vāçabdena pratipāditavāt*; 'now then, how is it? since a diversity of usage is taught respecting the word, by the use of the term *vāç*? and he makes reply in a lengthy citation from his metrical authority, which wanders at the end far beyond the limits of the subject in hand: *karoter daçasaptābhyāñ tvaçabdāḥ kṛd vidhityate : sañkhyāyā anudāttāyā ashtaçabdāt samasyate : udāttād daçasapte 'ty evam pūrvena vigrāhāḥ : dhāparyantās taddhitā ye te 'shte vā 'vagrāho bhavet : ato 'nyena padatve 'pi yuvatyādishu taddhitam : dhātrāthātātīliçasidāñmītaratamomatup : vāmātradyubhi ketvāpi mayakṛtvesh'v avagrahaḥ*. In the last verse we have an enumeration of all the suffixes thus far treated of as separable.

## जातीयादिषु च ॥ २८ ॥

28. *Jātiya* etc. are also separable.

As instances of the use of *jātiya*, the commentator gives us *patu-jātiya*, *mṛdu-jātiya*, *pañdita-jātiya*, and *çobhanā-jātiya*: none of these words, however, nor any other compounds with the same final member, are to be met with in the Atharvan text. The general grammar also treats *jātiya* as a suffix, and Pāṇini's scholiasts (under v. 3. 69) give, as an example of its use, the first of the instances of our commentator. The latter farther cites, to fill out the *gaṇa* of the rule, some of the compounds of *dheyā*, viz. *bhāga-dheyam* (e. g. vi. 111. 1), *rūpa-dheyam* (*rūpa-dheyāni*: ii. 26. 1), and *nāma-dheyam* (vii. 109. 6). What other frequently occurring final members of compounds it may have pleased the authors of our treatise to regard as suffixes, and to include in this *gaṇa*, I do not know: I have noted no actual suffixes as needing to be comprehended in it.

## यादविहायां. स्वरात्कर्मनामतन्मानिप्रेक्षुषु ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also a suffix commencing with *y* and preceded by a vowel, in a desiderative form; namely, in participles, denominatives, and desiderative adjectives.

Not one of the technical terms used in this rule is known to me to occur elsewhere than in the grammatical language of our treatise. One

of them, *ichá*, we have had at another place (iii. 18), and in such a connection as to show that it is employed to designate the whole class of words to which this rule applies; the others, then, are specifications under it, or a classified statement of the cases which it includes. The same thing is indicated by the commentator, who paraphrases as follows: *yádáv icháyám svarát avagraho bhavati karma*° etc. *Karmanâma*, then, I have without much hesitation rendered by 'participle;' and *tanmânin* seems to me to mean 'implying the making or doing of that which the theme indicates,' and so to be applicable to such words as *çatrúyanti*, *agháyanti*, where the signification is not simply desiderative: but of this I do not feel altogether confident, and I have at one time sought in the word a designation of the middle participles having the termination *mána*; *prepsu* I think must belong to such derivative adjectives as *devayu*, *çravasyu*. The commentator, as usual, fails to give us any light upon these points: he only cites, as instances of the separable suffixes to which the rule relates, *adhvari-yatám* (i. 4. 1), *agha-yuh* (e. g. iv. 3. 2), *vṛsha-yamânaḥ* (ii. 5. 7), and *çatru-yatim*: *abhi* (iii. 1. 3); and farther, as counter-examples, *tat*: *sisásati* (xiii. 2. 14), to show that no desiderative suffix is separable unless beginning with *y*; and *yena*: *çravasyavaḥ* (iii. 9. 4), to show that the suffix beginning with *y* must not be preceded by a consonant.

The Vâj. Pr. has a corresponding rule (v. 10), but more briefly expressed.

## वस्ववस्वप्सुप्तसाधुभिर्या ॥ ३० ॥

30. Also *yá*, when combined with *vasu*, *ava*, *svapna*, *sumna*, and *sádhu*.

Why this rule should be necessary, after the one which precedes it, and which would include all the cases to which it is intended to apply, I find it difficult to see. It can hardly be that it was meant to exclude such words as *su-kshetriyá*, *su-gátuyá*, since these have been otherwise provided for (see under rule 12, above): more probably, forms like *mithuyá* (e. g. iv. 29. 7) and *urviyá* (e. g. v. 12. 5) are to be regarded as its counter-examples. The Vâj. Pr. (v. 20) also does a like work of supererogation in reference to sundry words of its text. The commentator repeats the words, but gives nothing of the context of the passages in which they occur: they are *vasu-yá* (iv. 33. 2), *ava-yá* (ii. 35. 1), *svapna-yá* (v. 7. 8), *sumna-yá* (vii. 55. 1), and *sádhu-yá* (x. 4. 21). The second of them is classed with the rest only by a blunder, since it is evidently *avcyás*, the irregular nominative singular of *ava-yáj*, and ought to be written by the *pada*-text *ava-yáh*, instead of *ava-yá*.

The comment closes with another verse: *pañcái 'vá 'vagrahân áha yáçabde çákatáyanaḥ: antodáttaḥ padatvaím ca vibhaktiyarthe bhavet tu yá*; 'Çákatáyana mentions five cases in which *yá* suffers separation by *avagraha*: it is accented as final, and stands as an independent element, when used as a case-ending.' I am by no means confident that I have correctly interpreted the last line,

## भिर्भ्याम्भ्यःसु ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Also *bhis*, *bhyâm*, and *bhyas*.

As illustrations, the commentary furnishes *pañca-bhiḥ* : *āṅguli-bhiḥ* (iv. 14. 7), *uru-bhyâm* : *te* : *aṣṭhivād-bhyâm* : *pārshni-bhyâm* : *pra-padā-bhyâm* (ii. 33. 5), and *asthi-bhyaḥ* : *te* : *majja-bhyaḥ* : *snāva-bhyaḥ* : *dhamani-bhyaḥ* (ii. 33. 6). The case-ending *bhyam*, as in *tubhyam* and *asmabhyam*, is not treated as separable.

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 13) puts our rules 31 and 33 into one, declaring a case-ending beginning with *bh* separable, when following a short vowel or a consonant. This would teach the division *tu-bhyam*, *asma-bhyam*, also; but the latter is expressly declared indivisible in another rule (v. 35), and the former was perhaps overlooked.

## सौ च ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Also *su*.

The commentator's instances are *añha-su* (vi. 35. 2), *ap-su* (e. g. i. 4. 4),<sup>1</sup> and *vayam* : *rāja-su* (vii. 50. 7).

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 14) combines this rule with rule 34, and says that *su* is separated when its *s* is not changed to a lingual.

## न दीर्घात् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. But not after a long vowel.

This restriction applies to both the two preceding rules: no case-ending is separable after a long final vowel, whether this be an original long final of the theme, or the result of a prolongation according to the rules of declension. The commentator instances *yābhiḥ* : *sutyam* : *bhavati* (ix. 2. 25), *tābhiḥ* : *tvam* : *asmān* (ix. 2. 25), *akshibhyâm* : *te* : *nāsikā-bhyâm* : *karnābhyâm* (ii. 33. 1), *gobhyaḥ* : *aṣṭebhyaḥ* (iii. 28. 3), and *āsu* : *itarāsu* (iii. 10. 4).

Compare Vâj. Pr. v. 13, as quoted under rule 31, above.

## विनामे च ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Nor where conversion into a lingual takes place.

This is an exception under rule 32, applying only to the termination *su*. The two, as was already remarked, are by the Vâj. Pr. combined into a single rule (v. 14). Our commentator cites *prati* : *tishṭha* : *dikshu* (iv. 14. 9), *namasyoḥ* : *vikshu* : *īdyah* (ii. 2. 1), *mānushishu* : *dikshu* (v. 11. 8), *marutah* : *vikshu* (viii. 4. 18), *yam* : *ca* : *vikshu* (ix. 5. 19), *pari* : *paçya* : *vikshu* (viii. 3. 10), and *su-vrjanāsu* : *dikshu* (xviii. 1. 46).

<sup>1</sup> The MS. adds *dup-su*, which I have not been able to identify with any Atharvan word. Possibly *hṛt-su* is intended.

## वसौ ऋस्वात् ॥ ३५ ॥

35. *Vaṅs* is separated after a short vowel.

The commentator quotes from the text the examples *cakṛ-vān* (ii. 35. 3) and *papi-vān* (xiv. 1. 3), and the counter-example *vidvān* (e. g. ii. 1. 2), and then goes on with a long citation from his metrical authority, as follows: *apade 'vagrahaḥ gīṣṭha ikāreṇa padādinā: dhātvantāc ca vasāu hrasvāc cakṛvān papivān iti: upasargasamāse 'pi vasāv evā 'va-grṛhyate: kikinōuvāviṣeṣeṇa bhūte tābhyām vidhiyate: vasusvārthe tayo lubdham bahulaṁ chandasi 'ti ca: vā tayoh kṛtoḥ samāsāc cā 'pojāyeta vastutaḥ: avakāre padatvaṁ na pūrvenāi 'vā 'vaṛṛhyate: ahrasve 'pi padatvaṁ syāt prāptas tatrā 'py avagrahaḥ: ahrasve chāndasatvāt tu rutvam āhur manīṣiṇaḥ.* The meaning of some of these lines is very clear, and they are seen to cover the ground of our present rule and of the two following: others are obscure, and need emendation before they can be intelligently rendered.

The Vāj. Pr. gives but one rule (v. 11) respecting the separation of the suffix of the perfect participle, combining together the specifications and counter-specifications of the three rules of our treatise.

## तेनैवोपसृष्टे ऽपि ॥ ३६ ॥

36. And that, even when the form is combined with a preposition.

The cited illustrations are *pareyi-vāṅsam* (xviii. 1. 49), *praviṣi-vāṅsam* (iv. 23. 1), *jakṣhi-vāṅsaḥ: papi-vāṅsaḥ* (vii. 97. 3), and *uttasthi-vāṅsaḥ* (vi. 93. 1). The same words (excepting *jakṣhivāṅsaḥ*, perhaps omitted by the carelessness of the copyist) were found cited under i. 88, and it is probably their association there which has caused the inclusion among them here of the two forms from simple roots, which are of no value as regards the matter now under treatment. But for this rule, we might expect *pra-viṣivāṅsam*, *ut-tasthivāṅsam*, and so on, like *pra-vishtam*, *ut-tiṣṭhataḥ*, etc. And yet, the separation as here taught is not discordant with the general principle that the last added member shall be the one which receives *avagraha*, since we may more properly regard the participial suffix as combined with the root after the latter's composition with its prefix than before: were *ta* a separable suffix, we should doubtless also have *praviṣ-ta*, *utthi-ta*, and the like.

## उपसर्गेणावकारे ॥ ३७ ॥

37. But the preposition is separated, when the suffix shows no *v*.

That is to say, when the suffix is contracted into *usk*, in the weak forms of declension, it is no longer separable, and the *avagraha* remains where it was before, between the preposition and the verb; as in the forms cited by the commentator, *ā-jāgmushaḥ: anu-mate* (ii. 26. 2), and *vaṣā: pra-dādushe: duhe* (xii. 4. 35). He adds a verse: *yadā prasāra-*

*nañ tasya padatvañ ne 'shyate tadâ : pûrvenâ 'vagrahañ siddho yatas taj jiyate padam ; 'when the suffix suffers contraction, its capability of standing as an independent pada is not taught : the former constituent then maintains the avagraha, as having a superior right to it (!)'*

समन्तः पूरणे ॥ ३८ ॥

38. *Samanta* is divided, when it has the sense of completion.

The commentator gives us, as instances of the separable compound, *pushkarinîh : sámantâh* (iv. 34. 5 etc.), and *sâm-agrah : sám-antah : bhû-yâsam* (vii. 81. 4); and, as instance of the separable compound, *yâthâ : vrkshâm : libujâ : samantâm* (vi. 8. 1). But how the word has the sense of completion any more in the two former cases than in the latter, I quite fail to perceive. The commentator adds a farther exposition, which puts the distinction upon a safer, though still an arbitrary, ground: *samantam sarvato'rthe 'ntodâttañ ná 'vagrhyate, âdyudâttañ avagrhyate : pûrañârtham pushkarinîh sámantâh ; 'samantam, having the sense of sarvatas, 'wholly,' and accented on the final, does not suffer avagraha ; when accented on the first, and having the sense of completion, it suffers avagraha, as in pushkarinîh sámantâh.'*

अनतौ विसंभ्यां प्राणाख्या चेत् ॥ ३९ ॥

39. The prepositions *vi* and *sam* are separated from the root *an*, when the word formed is a name of the breath.

We should have expected this rule to be stated the other way; namely, that the root *an* was not separated from *pra* and *apa* (in the compounds *prâna* and *apâna*, which are always thus written in *pada*, without division). This would, on the one hand, be theoretically preferable, since the general rules for division would lead us to expect the *pada*-readings *pra-âna*, *apa-âna*, *vi-âna*, and *sam-âna*, and we therefore ought to have the first two denied, rather than the last two ratified, by a special rule: and, on the other hand, it would be practically more accurate, since *udâna*, which occurs in the combination *vyâna-udânau*, is doubtless a separable compound, and is in fact so regarded by the commentator, under rule 42 below. Why *prâna* and *apâna* should not also be divided, it is far from easy to see.

The commentator gives us the examples *vi-ânañ : âyuh* (xviii. 2. 46), and *sam-ânam : amin : kah* (x. 2. 13). To show that it is only after *vi* and *sam* that the *avagraha* takes place before *an*, he brings up the counter-example *prânañ : apânañ* (xviii. 2. 46); and, to show that the compound must be a name of the breath, he cites *samânam : astu : vo : manah* (vi. 64. 3). The specification *prânâkhyâ cet*, however, is after all pleonastic, since the adjective *samâna*, 'resembling, like, accordant,' is from *sa + mâna*, not *sam + âna*.

The Rik and White Yajus treat the word *prâna* in the same manner as our text: *apâna* does not appear to occur in the former Veda, and in the latter it is (Vâj. Pr. v. 33, comm.) separable. Compare also Vâj. Pr. v. 36, which deals with *samâna*.

## काम्यान्नेडितयोः ॥ ४० ॥

40. Also are separated *kāmya* and a repeated word.

This is a strange rule. In the first place, the Atharva-Veda furnishes no ground whatever for the treatment of *kāmya* as a suffix, even though it be regarded as such in certain combinations in the general grammatical system (see Pāṇ. iii. 1. 9 etc.). We find it only in such compounds as the commentator instances by citing *aṣṛaddhāḥ : dhana-kāmyā* (xii. 2. 51) and *anṛtam : vitta-kāmyā* (xii. 3. 52), which would fall under rule 9 of this chapter without occasioning any difficulty or hesitation. In the second place, I can discover no possible reason for combining together in one rule things so utterly unconnected and incongruous as the occurrence of this suffix and that of words repeated in an emphatic or a distinctive sense. The dual termination, however, is our warrant that we have not here, as in the case of rules 12 and 13 of the first chapter, two rules written and explained together by the commentator. The latter cites a single passage containing two words which are *āmreḍīta*, viz. *bhūyuh-bhūyah : svah-svah* (x. 6. 5 etc.).

The Vāj. Pr. (v. 18) has the same rule respecting repeated words, and calls them (i. 146) by the same name. Pāṇini also employs the term *āmreḍīta* (e. g. vi. 1. 99) in a kindred sense.

## इवे च ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Also *iva*.

The commentator cites but a single instance—*sālāvṛkân-iva* (ii. 27, 5)—of this exceedingly frequent case of combination. The Vāj. Pr. notes it at v. 18.

## मिथोवगृह्ययोर्मध्यमेन ॥ ४२ ॥

42. Separation is made between two words which are each of them separable.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases it, when two words, themselves separable, are combined into a single word, separation of the middle member (*parvan*) is made. His instances are *yat : āñjana-abhyañjanam* (ix. 6. 11), *projā-amṛtatvam : uta : dirgham : āyuh* (xi. 1. 34), and *vyāna-udānāu : vāk* (xi. 8. 4); to which we might add indefinitely, not only copulative compounds, but possessives (e. g. *āhṛta-yajñakratuh*, ix. 6. 27) and others.

The Vāj. Pr. finds no need of such a rule as this, nor does it seem imperatively called for, all possible cases being already disposed of by rules 10 and 12, above. Still less is to be seen the necessity of adding to it the two which next follow, and which it obviously includes.

## समासयोश्च ॥ ४३ ॥

43. As also, between two compounds.

The sole example furnished in the commentary is *aghaçaṅsa-duḥçaṅsâbhyâm : kareṇa* (xii. 2. 2).

दिरुक्ते चावगृह्ये ॥ ४४ ॥

44. As also, between a separable word and its repetition.

The commentator cites instances of repeated words occurring in five successive verses of the Atharvan text, without troubling himself about the fact that two of them are not separable: they are *kurvatîm-kurvati* : *eva* (ix. 5. 32), *saṁyatîm-saṁyatîm* : *eva* (ix. 5. 33), *pinvatîm-pinvatîm* : *eva* (ix. 5. 34), *udyatîm-udyatîm* : *eva* (ix. 5. 35), and *abhibhavantîm-abhibhavantîm* : *eva* (ix. 5. 36). He adds a verse: *prthagjyasa-mâse ca madhye kuryâd avagrahum : saṁyatîmsaṁyatîm câi'va vyânô-dânâu nidarçanam*; 'separation by *avagraha* must be made in the middle of a compound made up of two severally separable words: instances are *saṁyatîm-saṁyatîm* and *vyânôdânâu*.'

वसुधातरः सहस्रसातमेति वसुसहस्राभ्याम् ॥ ४५ ॥

45. In *vasudhâtara* and *sahasrasâtama*, separation is made after *vasu* and *sahasra*.

The passages are cited by the commentator: *vasu-dhâtarah : ca* (v. 27. 6), and *sahasra-sâtamâ : bhava* (iii. 28. 4). It is not without reason that the Prâtiçâkhya takes note of these cases; for, since the suffixes *tara* and *tama* are separable (by iv. 16), and are plainly the last added members, the words they form should read, in *pada*, *vasudhâ-tara* and *sahasrasâ-tama*. Comparatives and superlatives of this particular class, however, where the suffixes are appended to root words which directly govern the preceding member of the compound, are treated in the same manner by the *pada*-texts also of the Rik (e. g. *ratna-dhâtamam*, i. 1. 1) and White Yajus, and the latter's Prâtiçâkhya (V. Pr. v. 3), makes special mention of them. The commentator adds: *vasudhâtara iti : vasû-nâm dhâtrtarah : shashthyantena [arthena?] samâsoh : samâse avagraho bhavati : vasûni vâ dadhati : vasu-dhâtarah : samâse avagraho bhavati ; 'vasudhâtara : that is, one who is in a high degree a giver (dhâtrtara) of good things; composition is made with a form having a genitive sense; the compound suffers avagraha : or, vasudhâtaras, 'they bestow good things; the compound suffers avagraha.'* The only item of value derivable from this exposition is that some authorities regarded *vasu-dhâtarah* as the plural of *vasu-dhâtar*. It would be, in fact, in its Atharvan connection, much more easily interpretable in this manner, but that the accent speaks strongly for the other mode of derivation. The passage in which it occurs is shown by comparison with the White Yajus (xxvii. 15) to be curiously misunderstood and corrupted, and the Atharvan *vasudhâtarah* corresponds to *vasudhâ'tumah* of the other text: we may suppose that the former means to give the plural of *vasu-dhâtar*, but gives it the accent which belongs to *vosudhâ'tama* and its corresponding comparative *vasudhâ'tara*. The commentator closes his treatment of the subject with a verse: *sanibhyâm [sâdhâbhyâm?] ca*



*krdantābhyām vikitāu taddhitāu parāu: tābhyām shashih̄samāse ca pūrvenā 'vagrahaḥ smṛtaḥ: 'after sā and dhā (?), as kṛt-endings, taddhitas are declared to follow: in a compound with these having a genitive meaning, the former member is separated by avagraha.'*

### सुभिषक्तमस्तमे ॥ ४६ ॥

46. *Subhishaktama* suffers separation by *avagraha* before *tama*.

The commentator cites *subhishak-tamāḥ* (vi. 24. 2); we have also the nominative singular masculine at ii. 9. 5. He adds *ṣobhanaḥ bhishak: subhishak;* '*subhishak* means propitious physician;' and then again gives a verse: *bhishajā hi suṣabdo 'yam pūmlīṅgena samasyate: upajātas tamas tasmāt pūrvenā [parenā?]' vagrahaḥ smṛtaḥ;* 'here *su* is compounded with the masculine *bhishaj*, and *tama* is farther appended: separation by *avagraha* is made of the latter.'

I can see no reason at all for any such rule as this: the case specified is simply one in which the separation by *avagraha* takes place normally, according to the general rules, and a score more of precisely similar cases might easily be quoted from the Atharvan text: instances are *bhāgavat-tama* (ii. 9. 2) and *bhāgavat-tara* (iv. 13. 6), *sphātimāt-tama* (iii. 24. 6), *mṛtāmanah-tara* (vi. 18. 2), and *vṛtrahān-tama* (vii. 110. 1).

The signature of the first section, which closes here, is as follows: 47: *caturthasya prathamah pādah: caturādhyāyibhāshye caturthasya prathamah pādah samāptah.* We have found but forty-six rules in the section, but have remarked one (rule 40) which ought to have been divided and counted as two. Possibly two may have been fused together in it, in order to allow the commentator's introduction to the chapter to count as a rule, without altering the received number in the section: but I have neither been willing to allow the rank of a rule to anything in that introduction, nor ventured to divide rule 40 into two parts.

### न तकारसकारभ्यां मत्वर्थे ॥ ४७ ॥

47. The suffix *mant* and its equivalents are not separable after *t* and *s*.

The commentator cites in illustration *datvatī* (e. g. iv. 3. 2), *garutmān* (e. g. iv. 6. 3), *marutvān* (e. g. vi. 104. 3), *úrjasvān* (*úrjasvantaḥ*, vii. 60. 2), *payasvān* (e. g. vii. 73. 5), *úrjasvatī* (e. g. iii. 12. 2), and *payasvatī* (e. g. iii. 10. 1). The only consonants other than *t* and *s* which are found to occur before the suffix *vant* are *n* and *ṅ*, which allow separation; instances are *āsan-vat* (vi. 12. 2), *asthan-vantam* (ix. 9. 4), *brahman-vatim* (vi. 108. 2), etc. The rule is an exception under rule 17 above; by the Vāj. Pr. (v. 8) it is included with the general rule in one statement.

### यत्तदेतेभ्यो वतौ ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Nor *vant*, after *ya*, *ta*, and *eta*.

The commentator's examples are *yávat : te : abhi : vi-pacyāmi* (xii. 1. 33), *távat : sam-āitu : indriyam* (iii. 22. 5), and *etávat : asya : prācinam* (iv. 11. 8); and his counter-examples, which are hardly called for, are *sūnrlā-vat* (e. g. v. 20. 6), and *apāshthā-vat* (xiv. 1. 29). This rule, also, is included in Vāj. Pr. v. 8, since in each of the words to which it refers there is an irregular prolongation of the final vowel of the theme before the suffix.

## देवतादन्दे च ॥४१॥

49. Nor a copulative compound made up of the names of divinities.

The commentator gives pretty nearly the whole series of such compounds which the text furnishes: they are *indrāgni* (e. g. i. 35. 4), *indravāyū* (iii. 20. 6), *bhavōrudrāu* (xi. 2. 14), *bhavāçarvāu* (e. g. iv. 28. 1), *vātāparjanya* (x. 4. 16), *agnishomā* (e. g. i. 8. 2), *mitrāvaruṇā* (e. g. iii. 4. 4), *indrāvaruṇā* (e. g. vii. 58. 1), and *indrāsomā* (e. g. viii. 4. 1): to be added are only *somārudrāu* (e. g. v. 6. 5), *indrāpūshanā* (vi. 3. 1), and *agnāvishnū* (vii. 29. 1, 2). A number of verses follow in the commentary, in the usual corrupt condition of text: *devatānām iha dvandve dīrghatvaṁ yadi<sup>1</sup> dṛçyate: anīṅyaṁ tat<sup>2</sup> padam vācyam agnīshomāu nidarçanam*: thus much is clear, and is a virtual repetition of our rule, but with a restriction to cases in which a long vowel appears at the end of the first member of the compound, which requires a specification farther on of the single exception *indravāyū*; what follows is more obscure, and I have not been able, with what time I have given to it, to restore the text to an intelligible form; it reads: *vāsuraṇām dvandve<sup>3</sup> py avagrhyam katham padam: çākalyasye<sup>3</sup> ṅgite nityam yathā sotyānṛte* [i. 33. 2] *tathā: brahma prajāpatīs* [xix. 9. 12] *tv aha nā<sup>3</sup> vagrhyam kadā ana: ānañah pratishedhaç ca vāyoç co<sup>3</sup> bhayataḥ param: indravāyū* [iii. 20. 6] *ādīshu katham dīrgho yatro tad* [na?] *dṛçyate: dvandvamā-trenashedastvam ahorātre nidarçanam*.

The rule of the Vāj. Pr. (v. 28), which includes also our rules 50 and 52, is to the effect that dual copulative compounds whose first members end in a vowel are not separable.

## यस्य चोत्तरपदे दीर्घी व्यञ्जनादौ ॥५०॥

50. Nor one which shows a long vowel before an initial consonant of the latter member of the compound.

The instances furnished by the commentator are *ishtōpātām* (e. g. ii. 12. 4), *pitāputrāu* (vi. 112. 2), *hasāmudāu* (xiv. 2. 43), *dyāvāpṛthivī* (e. g. ii. 1. 4), *dyāvābhūmī* (xviii. 1. 31), and *ushāsānaktā* (e. g. v. 12. 6). To these I add *çundāsīrā* (iii. 17. 5), *sūryāmāsāu* (iii. 29. 5\*), *sūryācan-dramasāu* (vi. 28. 3), and *yojñāyojñīyam* (viii. 10. 13). To the same class, of *dvandvas* exempt from division, belongs *prōṇāpānāu* (e. g. ii. 16. 1), although it does not show the peculiarities of form which this rule

<sup>1</sup> yad.

<sup>2</sup> anityat.

\* In the edition, *sūryam*<sup>o</sup> is a misprint.

demands, and therefore ought to be made the subject of a special precept: our treatise-makers and their commentator, apparently, have overlooked it. A single counter-example the commentator gives, viz. *satyānrte iti satya-anrte* (i. 33. 2). He adds a verse: *irāmivāpurobhyaç<sup>1</sup> ca prakṛtyā dīrgha eva soḥ: hrasvasya yatra dīrghatvaṁ sa dvandvo nā' vaḅṛhyate*; 'after *irā*, *amīva*, and *purah* [avagraha comes in], for in those cases the vowel is long by nature; but where a short vowel is lengthened, there no division by *avagraha* takes place.' This is a very blundering statement, so far as concerns the instances given in the first *pāda*: *purah*, of course, could form no copulative compound; *amīva* forms none such in the Atharvan, and it also, though a feminine with a long final vowel, as a separate word, always shortens its final in composition (*amīva-cātana*, e. g. i. 28. 1; *amīva-han*, e. g. RV. i. 18. 2); *irā*, too, is found only in the compound *irā-kshirā* (x. 10. 6), which is not copulative.

The implication of *dvandva* from the preceding rule seems clearly made by the particle *ca* in this rule, and is supported by the connection as shown by the two following rules: the commentator, also, inserts *dvandvasya* after *yasya* in his paraphrase. Such compounds, then, as *viçvānara*, *svāvṛk*, *vīrudh*, *sūkara*, etc., which are left undivided in the *pada*-text on account of the irregularly protracted final of their first members, must be left to fall into the general *gaṇa* of rule 54.

### षोडशी संदेहात् ॥ ५१ ॥

51. Nor *shoḍaṣin*, on account of the interfusion of the two members of the compound.

Or, it may be, 'on account of doubt'—that is to say, of doubt as to the form to which the constituents should be restored, their mode of combination being an entirely anomalous one. It is to be observed, however, that our treatise has itself (at i. 63) given special directions as to how *shat* and following *daça* are combined together, so that to the student of the *Prāticākhya* the *pada*-reading *shat-daça* ought to occasion no difficulty. That the rule reads *shoḍaṣi* instead of *shoḍaça* is surprising, since both words (each in but a single passage) occur in the text: the commentator cites them, as follows: *ishtāpūrtasya: shoḍaçam* (iii. 29. 1), *shoḍaṣi: sapta-rātraḥ* (xi. 7. 11).

The Vāj. Pr. mentions *shoḍaça* in a rule (v. 37) containing a long list of indivisible words.

### अहोरात्रे ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Nor *ahorātre*.

The commentator's illustrations are *ahorātrābhyām: nakshatrebhyaḥ* (vi. 128. 3), and *ahorātre idam brūmaḥ* (xi. 6. 5). The Vāj. Pr. includes the word in the same rule with *shoḍaça* (v. 37).

There is nothing in the character of either *ahorātre* or *shoḍaça*, so far as I can discover, which should withdraw them from the action of rule 50, and render their separate mention necessary.

<sup>1</sup> MS. *idā*°.

## अञ्चतिजस्त्ववसु ॥ ५३ ॥

53. Nor the root *añc*: nor former constituents of a compound.

It is, if possible, even more surprising here than at rule 40 to find two so utterly heterogeneous matters put together in the same rule. We cannot suppose that the commentator would combine them, in statement and in exposition, unless he regarded them as composing a single precept; but, on the other hand, we have not the same warrant here as in the former case that his division is a correct one: there is nothing in the form of the rule which would absolutely forbid its simple division into two parts, without further change—although we should, in that case, expect rather *añcatāu* than *añcati*.

As illustrations of the inseparability of the root *añc*, we have given us *prācīh* (e. g. v. 28. 11), *prācīci* (e. g. iii. 27. 3), and *udicīh* (e. g. xii. 1. 31). All the compounds with this root are treated as indivisible by our *pada*-text: the Vāj. Pr. also (v. 30) declares the root inseparable, with exception (v. 19) of a single derivative.

To show that, when new members are added to a compound, the existing division by *avagraha* of their former members is given up, the commentator instances *çamātāti-bhiḥ*: *oriṣṭātāti-bhiḥ* (iv. 13. 5): compare *ariṣṭa-tātaye*, cited above, under rule 20. The principle has been already sufficiently illustrated in these notes, under rule 10. The Vāj. Pr. has nothing corresponding to this part of our rule, which is, in fact, virtually superfluous, since the directions already given for the separation of a newly-added member might be understood as involving the suspension of the ancient division.

The commentator ends with a verse which seems to say precisely the opposite of the rule of his text: *yatro 'bhe pratividhye te upajātam jaram ca yat, jaratā 'vagrahaḥ kārya ṛksāmābhyām nidarṣanam*; 'when both members are severally separable, both the newly-added and the ancient, separation by *avagraha* is to be made of the ancient one: an instance is *ṛk-sāmābhyām*.' But this is mere nonsense, as it stands, the word cited being a case where the last-appended element is inseparable, as following a long vowel (see rule 33, above), and where, therefore, the division must be suffered to remain between the two original constituents of the compound. If the theme of declension had been *ṛk-sāman*, instead of *ṛksāma*, we should have an instrumental dual *ṛksāma-bhyām*, which would be a true illustration of the rule. One may conjecture that the last line originally read *jare nā 'vagrahaḥ kārya ṛksāmābhyām nidarṣanam*, and that it was amended to its present form by some copyist who knew that the Atharvan read, not *ṛksāma-bhyām*, but *ṛk-sāmābhyām*, but who was careless enough to overlook the discordance which he thus introduced between the text and its comment.

## समुद्रादिषु च ॥ ५४ ॥

54. Nor *samudra* etc.

The whole comment upon this rule is wanting in our manuscript: the copyist has again carelessly skipped from its first statement to its final

repetition before the rule next following. This, however, gives us reason to believe that the commentator had performed his work in his usual brief and unsatisfactory style, and had done very little toward filling up the *gana*. It would have been particularly curious and interesting to see how many and which of the words contained in the Atharvan the makers of the Prâtiçâkhya looked upon as fairly entitled to a division which the constructors of the *pada*-text had not admitted. The Vâj. Pr. (at v. 37) gives a list of such words for its text, but Weber finds it, as was to have been expected, both deficient and redundant. It is by no means easy to draw up a list which shall include all that ought to be received, and exclude all that ought to be left out; but I have looked through the Atharvan text with some care for this purpose, and trust that my filling up of the *gana* of the text will be found to comprehend all or nearly all of the matter to which the rule ought to apply.

There is, in the first place, in this as in the other Vedic texts, a considerable class of compound words exhibiting an irregular prolongation of the final vowel of the former member, and which the constructors of the *pada*-text have chosen to leave unchanged, instead of separating them by *avagraha* and restoring the normal quantity of the altered vowel. Why they should be thus treated, however, in distinction from the words with which our treatise deals in the first section of its third chapter, no sufficient reason appears. They are as follows: *apâmârگا* (e. g. iv. 17. 6: the word, by V. Pr. v. 21, is divisible), *apâshtha* (iv. 6. 5: see above, ii. 95), *ashthîvant* (e. g. ii. 33. 5), *idâvatsara* (vi. 55. 3: cf. V. Pr. v. 32), *ubhayâdant* (e. g. v. 31. 3: divisible by V. Pr. v. 21), *ubhayâvin* (e. g. v. 25. 9: see above, under iv. 18), *ekâdaça* (v. 16. 11: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *kakshîvant* (e. g. iv. 29. 5: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *tatâmaha* (e. g. v. 24. 17), *dvâdaça* (e. g. iv. 11. 11: cf. V. Pr. v. 15), *nârâçaṅsa* (v. 27. 3: cf. V. Pr. v. 37) and *nârâçaṅsi* (e. g. xiv. 1. 7), *nihâra* (e. g. vi. 113. 2: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *prânâha* (ix. 3. 4), *prâvṛta* (e. g. xii. 5. 2: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *prâvṛk* (e. g. xii. 1. 46), *marmâvidh* (xi. 10. 26: cf. iii. 3, iv. 68), *viçvâmitra* (e. g. iv. 29. 5: cf. iii. 9 and V. Pr. v. 37), *viçvânara* (e. g. iv. 11. 7: cf. iii. 9 and V. Pr. v. 37) and *vâiçvânara* (e. g. i. 10. 4), *vîrudh* (e. g. i. 32. 1), *çvâpad* (e. g. viii. 5. 11: cf. iii. 10), *çvâvidh* (v. 13. 9: cf. iii. 3, iv. 68), *sârâṅga* (e. g. ii. 32. 2), *sârathi* (e. g. viii. 8. 23), *sûkara* (e. g. ii. 27. 2) *sûrṛtâ* (e. g. iii. 20. 3), *svâvṛk* (xviii. 1. 32), and *hṛdayâvidh* (viii. 6. 18: cf. iii. 3, iv. 68).

Another smaller class is composed of certain words which have as their first member a real or an apparent case of declension: such are *anyedyus* (i. 25. 4: cf. iv. 21), *âçuṅga* (vi. 14. 3), *gavishthira* (iv. 29. 5: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *nariṣhṭâ* (e. g. vii. 12. 2: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *pataṅga* (e. g. vi. 31. 3), *pitâmaha* (e. g. v. 5. 1), *madhyâmdina* (e. g. iv. 11. 12), *mâtariçvan\** (e. g. v. 10. 8), and *çitîṅga* (xi. 5. 12).

The number is by no means an inconsiderable one of words whose division seems so naturally suggested by an etymology which is either incontestable or at least very plausible, that we are reasonably surprised

\* At v. 2. 9, all the manuscripts have *mâtariçhvârî*, which the edition, hardly with sufficient reason, has amended to *mâtariçvari*: it is, like the latter, left undivided.

that they were not divided by the Hindu grammarians. Of these, I name *anavâya* (viii. 4. 2), *anushthû* (xii. 4. 45: probably regarded as formed by an inseparable suffix), *apâna* (e. g. ii. 28. 3: cf. under iv. 39), *abhishkti* (e. g. i. 6. 1), *avarti* (e. g. iv. 34. 3), *avaskava* (ii. 31. 4), *açvâra* (e. g. viii. 8. 22: cf. under iv. 16), *asvaga* (xii. 5. 45), *âghrñi* (vii. 9. 2), *âdhi* (vi. 131. 1 etc.: Rik *pada*, *â-dhî*), *ânushak* (iv. 32. 1), *âpri* (xi. 7. 19), *âyudha* (e. g. iii. 19. 5: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *ârta* (e. g. iii. 31. 2), *ârpita* (e. g. vi. 112. 3: at viii. 9. 19 only, we have *â-ârpitâni*), *âçivisha* (xii. 5. 34), *âsakti* (xiv. 1. 26), *âsikta* (xii. 3. 25: probably the absence of division is here only an error of the manuscript; we have *â-siktam* at iv. 7. 1), *uttâna* (e. g. ix. 9. 14), *rtvij* (e. g. vi. 2. 1), *oshadhi* (e. g. i. 23. 1: cf. V. Pr. v. 35), *gopâ* (e. g. iii. 8. 4: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *gopîtha* (e. g. v. 9. 7), *candramas* (e. g. v. 24. 10: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *dâyâda* (v. 18. 6, 14), *nyagrodha* (e. g. iv. 37. 4: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *purodâça* (e. g. ix. 6. 12: see i. 63: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *prâna* (e. g. ii. 12. 7: cf. under iv. 39), *prâyaçciti* (xiv. 1. 30), *vivasvant* (e. g. xi. 6. 2), *vishtap* (e. g. x. 10. 31: cf. V. Pr. v. 41), *vish-tambha* (xiii. 4. 10: cf. V. Pr. v. 41), *vishtârin* (iv. 34. 1 etc.). *giñçumâra* (xi. 2. 25), *çradhdhâ* (e. g. v. 7. 5), *sabhâ* (e. g. iv. 21. 6), *samantâm* (vi. 8. 1: cf. iv. 38), *samudra* (e. g. i. 3. 8: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *surabhi* (e. g. vi. 124. 3: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *sthapati* (ii. 32. 4), *svadhâ* (e. g. ii. 29. 7), *svapati* (viii. 6. 16), *svasti* (e. g. i. 30. 2), and *hâridrava* (i. 22. 4). It is not hard to conjecture, in the case of some of these words, reasons which may have led to their being treated as exceptional cases, but in many of them no such reason is apparent, and in a part, at least, we are compelled to suppose that the composition was fully recognized, and the division neglected for some arbitrary and unexplained cause. That the four compounds of pronominal elements *cana*, *nahi*, *nakis*, and *nâkis* were left by the *pada* in their *sanhîta* form is not to be wondered at: three of them are noted also by the Vâj. Pr. (v. 35, 37) as indivisible.

There yet remains quite a list of compounds and derivatives, the division of which may plausibly be supposed to have been neglected from uncertainty of etymology, anomaly of form, difficulty of restoring the original constituents, or the like: while yet, in most cases, we should not have been surprised to see the constructors of the *pada* making an attempt at their analysis. In drawing up this part of the list, especially, I may very possibly have omitted to note down some words of the text which to another would seem not less worthy of mention than those given: the series, as collected by me, is *akûpâra* (v. 17. 1), *ajagara* (e. g. iv. 15. 7: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *adomada* (vi. 63. 1) and *adomadha* (viii. 2. 18), *anaçvâh* (e. g. iii. 11. 5: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *ançkshara* (e. g. xiv. 1. 34), *abhîçu* (e. g. vi. 137. 2), *abhra* (e. g. iv. 15. 1: cf. V. Pr. v. 34), *avadya* (e. g. ii. 10. 6), *âtura* (vi. 101. 2), *âmikshâ* (e. g. ix. 4. 4), *âhamas* (e. g. iv. 30. 6), *udârathi* (iv. 7. 3), *urvaçt* (xviii. 3. 23), *karmâra* (iii. 5. 6: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *karçapha* (iii. 9. 1), *kasarnîla* (x. 4. 5, 17), *kucara* (e. g. vii. 26. 2: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *krkavâku* (v. 31. 2), *godhâ* (iv. 3. 6: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *jâshkamada* (xi. 9. 9), *daçonasi* (x. 4. 17), *duchunâ* (e. g. v. 17. 4: cf. ii. 61), *duradabhna* (xii. 4. 4, 19), *durâhâ* (viii. 8. 24), *druvaya* (e. g. v. 20. 2: cf. under iv. 18), *dhîvan* (iii. 5. 6), *padbîça* (e. g. vi. 96. 2), *padaga* (viii. 6. 16), *prânada* (iv. 35. 5), *maryâda* (e. g. v. 1. 6), *mahîluka* (x. 10. 6), *ratharvî* (x. 4. 5), *vañsaga* (xviii. 3. 36), *valaga* (e. g.

v. 31. 4 : cf. V. Pr. v. 35), *viçvâhâ* (e. g. vii. 50. 1 : cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *vyâghra* (e. g. iv. 3. 1 : cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *çâṇḍadûrva* (xviii. 3. 6), *sadyas* (e. g. viii. 10. 21), and *svâhâ* (e. g. ii. 16. 1).

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 37) notes a couple of words as indivisible which are found divided in the Atharvan : they are *upa-sti* (e. g. iii. 5. 6) and *pa-vira-vant* (iii. 17. 3). In like manner, *saṁvatsara*, which the Rik *pada* does not analyze, is in our text uniformly written *sam-vatsara* (e. g. iii. 10. 9). One or two other such cases of discordance among the several *pada*-texts are pointed out in the notes to the different rules : but there is, in general, such close agreement among them as to show conclusively that the *pada* method of text-analysis, in its details as well as in its main plan, is the production of a single teacher, or of a single school.

It may be well to add here, *per contra*, a few of the cases in which the *pada*-text makes unintelligible or palpably erroneous divisions of words : I have noted, as the most striking instances of this kind, *anam-gureh* (viii. 6. 22), *anapa-dyatâm* (iv. 17. 6), *jighat-svam* (ii. 14. 1), *go-pana* (xii. 4. 10), *çam-opya* (i. 14. 3), *hr-dyota* (i. 22. 1) and *hr-dyotana* (v. 20. 12). The peculiar form, accentuation, and division of two passages in the fourteenth book—*çûbham : yatîh* (xiv. 1. 32) and *pâtim : yatîh\** (xiv. 2. 52)—is also worthy of remark in connection with this subject.

### वृद्धेनैकान्तरेण स्वरात्तेन ॥ ५५ ॥

55. *Nor* is a member which has suffered *vrddhi* separable, if it be monosyllabic and end in a vowel.

The commentator's examples of an inseparable *vrddhi*ed initial syllable are *sâpatnaḥ* (ii. 7. 2), *sâumanasaḥ* (e. g. iii. 30. 7), *sâumanasam* (e. g. xiii. 1. 19), *sâudhanvanâh* (vi. 47. 3), *trâistubham* (ix. 10. 1), *sâubhagam* (e. g. ii. 36. 1), and *saubhâgyam* (e. g. xiv. 1. 42). His counter-example, brought forward to show that the inseparable member must have suffered *vrddhi*, is *su-parṇaḥ* (e. g. i. 24. 1); to show that it must be monosyllabic, they are *âirâ-vataḥ* (viii. 10. 29), *mârta-vatsam* (viii. 6. 26), and *vâdhû-yam* (e. g. xiv. 1. 29); to show that it must end in a vowel, they are *nâih-bâdhyena : havishâ* (vi. 75. 1) and *dâuh-svopnyam : dâuh-jivityam* (iv. 17. 5). I add, in the farther illustration of the inseparable class, *vâmanasya* (v. 21. 1) and *prâhrâdi* (viii. 10. 22); of the separable class, *sâm-itya* (viii. 10. 6), *sâm-râjya* (xiv. 1. 43), *pâurna-mâsi* (vii. 80. 1), *sâurya-varcasa* (viii. 10. 27), and *avâira-hatya* (vi. 29. 3). The rule is, I believe, carefully observed throughout the whole of the Atharvan text, and the Vâj. Pr. (v. 29) has one precisely corresponding; nor have I noted any cases in which the usage of the Rik *pada*-text was not in accordance with it. Its somewhat arbitrary character, however, is patent.

The commentator again closes his exposition with a verse : *avagrhyât padâd yaṁtu taddhito vrddhimân bhavet : ekât vrddhisvarânteshu na cêi 'vâ 'vagraho bhavet : âirâvato mârtavat sam vâdhûyam ca nidarçanât.*

\* In this passage, the printed text reads *pâtim yatîh*, but without any support from the manuscripts.

A little amendment makes this mean, in restatement of our rule, 'where a *taddhita* suffix requiring *vṛddhi* is appended to a divisible word, separation is not made of a member which is monosyllabic and ends in a vowel.'

अवर्णान्तैकाक्षरेण प्रतिषिद्धेनाप्रयावादिवर्जम् ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Nor a monosyllabic member ending in *a* or *ā* and negated—excepting in the case of *aprayāvan* etc.

The form of statement which our treatise has adopted for its rule respecting the separability of negative compounds is not particularly well chosen. The general usage of the Atharvan *pada*-text, as regards such compounds, is as follows. The negative prefix *a* or *an* is not itself ever separated by *avagraha* from the word to which it is attached: we have *asat*, *anṛta*, etc. If, however, the word negated is already a compound, the negative prefix is in almost all cases treated like any other added inseparable element, and leaves the prior division of the compound unaffected: we have *parā-jīta* and *aparā-jīta*, *vira-han* and *avira-han*, etc. A few exceptions to this mode of treatment occur, and with them it is the province of our rule to deal. The preposition *ā*, with *an* prefixed, is always made inseparable: thus we find *ā-srāva*, but *anāsrāva* (e. g. ii. 3. 2, 3), and, in like manner, *anājānant*, *anādhrshya*, *anārambhana*, *anādishta*, and *anāvṛta*. The same analogy is followed by the negative forms of compounds with *sa*, and by a single one of those with *pra*—viz. *aprajāsam* (e. g. vii. 35. 3)—and by these alone. The Vāj. Pr., then, which declares (v. 24, 25) the negative prefix inseparable when alone and when followed by *ā*, leaving other rare and exceptional cases to be provided for as such, expresses more truly the usage of the text. Our commentator gives us, first, as illustrations of the rule, the only two cases of negative compounds with *sa* which are found to occur in our text: they are *asabandhuḥ* (vi. 15. 2) and *asapatnaḥ* (e. g. i. 19. 4): the latter is mentioned by the Vāj. Pr. (v. 37) in its list of indivisible words, along with *asajāta*; *asabandhu*, according to Weber (p. 305, marginal note), is treated as divisible in the White Yajus.\* The commentator adds *aprajāh*, *aprajātāh*, but neither of the words is to be found in the Atharvan. As counter-examples, he gives first *avi-dvesham*: *kṛnōmi*: *vaḥ* (iii. 30. 1), to show that the negated member must end in *a* or *ā* in order to be inseparable; secondly, to show that, if ending in *a* or *ā*, it must also be monosyllabic, he gives *agne*: *akravya-at* (xii. 2. 3); and thirdly, as evidence that a monosyllabic member ending in the vowels specified is not separable unless negated, he cites *yaḥ*: *sa-patnaḥ* (i. 19. 4). Finally, he partly fills up the *guṇa*, with *apra-yāvan* (iii. 5. 1), *apra-mādam* (e. g. xii. 1. 7), *apra-hitāu* (vi. 29. 2), and *apra-caṅkaçāḥ* (viii. 6. 16): I have noted in addition only *apra-yuchan* (e. g. ii. 6. 3). To close up the exposition, is added the verse *ekāksharasavarṇāntam yad bhavet padam uttaram*: *tat padam nā 'vagrḥṇīyād aprayāvādivarjitam*;

\* In one of the two cases where it occurs in our own text (vi. 54. 3), the *pada* divides it, *asa-bandhuḥ*: this, however, is probably a copyist's error.



'if the word following the negative particle be monosyllabic and end in a vowel homogeneous with it, it is not to be separated, except in the cases *aprayávan* etc.'

## प्राणति प्राणन्ति ॥ ५७ ॥

57. Nor are *prāṇati* and *prāṇanti* divided.

The commentator cites *yáh : prāṇāti* (iv. 30. 4), *yát : ca : prāṇāti* (xi. 4. 10), *yéna : prāṇānti* (i. 32. 1), and *yásmāt : prāṇānti* (xiii. 3. 3). But the rule is an exceedingly insufficient exposition of the treatment by the *pāṭa*-text of the forms of the root *an* with the prefix *pra*. Division is, in fact, omitted only when the verb, and not the preposition, has the accent; but then, not in the two forms specified only, but also in the participles—as *prāṇāt* (e. g. x. 8. 2), *prāṇaté* (xi. 4. 8), *prāṇatás* (iv. 2. 2), *prāṇatām* (iii. 31. 9), and *prāṇatī'nām* (viii. 9. 9)—and in the causative, as *prāṇáyati* (xiii. 3. 3). On the other hand, if the prefix takes the accent, it is disjoined from the verb, according to the general usage in such cases, and we read *prá : ana* (iii. 31. 9), and *prá : anati* (x. 8. 19, xi. 4. 14). If the root is compounded with *apa*, also, the same usage is followed, and we have *apānaté* (xi. 4. 8) and *ápa : anati* (xi. 4. 14).

The Vāj. Pr. (v. 33), as acutely amended by Weber, gives a nearly corresponding precept, although it appears (Weber, p. 303, marginal note) that the text to which it belongs contains no verbal forms in which the division requires to be made.

## संपरिभ्यां सकारादौ करोतौ ॥ ५८ ॥

58. Nor are *sam* and *pari* separated from the root *kar*, if the latter begins with *s*.

The commentator cites the only words occurring in our text in which the root *kar* has the sibilant prefixed to it, in composition with the two specified prefixes: they are *saṅskṛtatram* (iv. 21. 4), *saṅskṛtam* (xi. 1. 35), and *parishkṛtá* (e. g. ix. 3. 10).

The doctrine of the Vāj. Pr. (v. 43) is the same, so far as concerns the compounds of *sam* and *kar*; but it apparently allows the division of *parishkṛta* (which also occurs in its text: see iii. 52).

## सर्वस्मिन्नेवागमसकारादौ तुविष्टमवर्तम् ॥ ५९ ॥

59. Nor is division made in any case where a *s* is inserted—except in *tuvishṭama*.

The instances which the commentator gives of the insertion of *s* as an augment (*āgama*) between the two members of a compound word, and of the consequent unresolvability of the compound, are *ataskarām* (xii. 1. 47), *táskarsh* (e. g. iv. 3. 2), *vānuspátīḥ* (e. g. iv. 3. 1), and *h'hus-pátīḥ* (e. g. ii. 13. 2). Their citation under such a precept implies the acceptance of some such etymological theories of their derivation and form as are given by the Vāj. Pr. (iii. 49, 51), which explains *tas-*

*kara* and *br̥haspati* as from *tat-kara* and *br̥hat-pati* respectively, with loss of *t* and insertion of *s*, and *vanaspati* as from *vana-pati*, with insertion of *s*; but it is unnecessary to remark that such explanations are futile: *taskara* is obscure, and the other two are without much doubt compounds of *pati* with the preceding genitive of an obsolete noun, being analogous with *brāhmanas páti*, *vácas páti*, *çubhás páti*, etc.; and they would doubtless be separated by the *pada*-text into two independent words, like these, but for their frequency of occurrence, and, yet more, the irregularity of the accent of their former members as genitives of a monosyllabic theme. The counter-example, which the commentator also cites—*indroh patis tuvishtamah* (vi. 33. 3: p. *tuvi-tamah*)—has been made the special subject of one of our previous rules (iii. 96).

## विशपतिर्विशपती ॥ ६० ॥

60. Nor in *viçpati* and *viçpatnî*.

The commentator cites instances of the occurrence of each of these words—viz. *svaptu : viçpatih* (ix. 5. 6) and *yá : viçpatnî* (vii. 46. 3)—and adds a verse in explanation of their etymology, as follows: *viçpatir viçpatnî yasya patir viçvasya viçpatih : vaçabdo lupyate patyāu viçām vā patir viçpatih*. This gives us our option as to whether we will take *viçpati* to represent *viçvapati* or *viçām pati*: we shall not be slow to choose the latter. The indivisibility of the compound is doubtless owing to the rarity of the consonantal conjunction *çp*, and the embarrassment which would accompany the restoration of the *sanhitā* form from a *pada*-reading *vit-pati*.

## ददातौ च तकारादौ ॥ ६१ ॥

61. Nor is the root *dā* separated when it begins with *t*.

We have given us once more, under this rule, the whole series of derivatives presenting the root *dā* reduced to the form of a simple *t* which the commentary to iii. 11, above, presented, and of which *apratittam* (vi. 117. 1) and *parittah* (vi. 92. 2) are the only ones found to occur in the Atharvan. The difficulty of making out an acceptable analysis of them for the *pada*-text is reason enough for their being treated in that text as indivisibles.

The Vāj. Pr. marks *paritta* as indivisible at v. 45.

## उदो हन्तिहरतिस्थास्तम्भिषु ॥ ६२ ॥

62. Nor the roots *han*, *har*, *sthā*, and *stambh*, after the preposition *ud*.

For the combination of *han* with *ud*, the commentator cites *uddhatāh*; no such word, however, is to be found in the Atharvan, nor does any other combination of these elements occur there (except at xiv. 2. 16, where the preposition is separated from the root by the intervention

of other words). For *ud + har*, the selected instances are *uddhṛtā* and *uddhriyamānā* (both xii. 5. 34), and *uddhṛteshu\** (xv. 12. 1). The *pada*-text, however, appears to treat the combinations as inseparable only where there is actual composition, as in the participles, and as would also be the case if the unaccented preposition preceded the accented verb, for we find *út : hara* in three passages (iv. 14. 7. ix. 6. 19. xii. 3. 36). For *sthā* with *ud*, two cases are cited, viz. *utthātuh* (ix. 4. 14) and *utthitah* (e. g. vi. 43. 2): it has already been noticed (under ii. 18) that where the preposition would be, by the general rules of combination, disjoined from the verb, it is actually so disjoined, and that the *pada* accordingly has *út : sthuh*, *út : sthāpaya*, etc., where the *sanhitā* has *út thuh*, *út thāpaya*, etc. For *ud + stambh* is quoted the only example which the text affords, viz. *uttabhītā* (xiv. 1. 1).

The Vāj. Pr. takes note of this class of cases at v. 38, but says nothing of the roots *han* and *har*; nor is any reason apparent why their compounds should be treated in this peculiar manner. One would have thought it especially desirable that the *pada*-text should separate *ut-hṛta* etc., in order to mark the forms as coming from the root *har*, and not from *dhar*.

## दधाती च हकारादौ ॥ ६३ ॥

63. Nor the root *dhā*, in a form beginning with *h*.

The commentator illustrates with *ye : dagdhāḥ : ye : ca : uddhitāḥ* (xviii. 2. 34), and we have also *uddhitā* at ix. 3. 6: no finite verbal forms of this root as compounded with the preposition *ud* are found in the Atharvan. We meet, however, with *uddhī* once (viii. 8. 22), and our *pada*-text leaves it undivided, although it does not fall under this rule, being composed of *ud* and *dhi*.

The same rule in the Vāj. Pr. (v. 38) might cover both this and the preceding one of our treatise; but no such forms as *uddhita* are there cited by the commentator.

## ज्ञास्पत्यम् ॥ ६४ ॥

64. Nor is *jāspatyam* divided.

The commentator cites the only passage in which the word in question occurs: *sam : jāhpatyam* (vii. 73. 10). This rule and one in the next section (iv. 83), taken together, show that the true *pada* reading recognized by our treatise is *jāhpatyam*; our *pada* manuscript, however, gives *jāh-patyam*, with *avagraha*. The commentator adds an attempt at an etymological explanation of the form: *jāyāpatyam : yā-ḡabdo lupyate : patyāu : asanturūshmāḡu dvyaksharo jāyāḡ vā jābhāvaḡ*. Although much corrupted, it is evident that this teaches the same etymology with that given by the Vāj. Pr. (at iv. 39): *jāspatya* for *jāyās-patya*.

\* Our *pada* manuscript writes all these words with simple *dh*, instead of *dḥ*: thus, *udhṛtā* etc.

## मनुष्यत् ॥ ६५ ॥

65. Nor *manushyat*.

The commentator cites the passage containing the word—*idā manushyat* (v. 12. 8)—and adds an explanation of its form, as follows: *manushyavan manushyat: yuçabdo lupyate vukârasya ca yakârah; 'manushyat is properly manushyavat: ya is dropped, and v converted into y.'* It is unfortunate that, the Atharvan form of the word being thus fully established, and its treatment having been prescribed by the Prātiçākhyā with so much care, it should have been altered in the edited text to *manushvat*, even though the latter is theoretically decidedly the preferable reading, and is presented by the Rig-Veda in the corresponding passage (x. 110. 8).

## त्रेधा ॥ ६६ ॥

66. Nor *tredhā*.

This word, which our *pada*-text, like that of the Rig-Veda (and, I presume, the other Vedas also), always leaves undivided, is an exception under rule 13 of this chapter.

The manuscript has a *lacuna* here, omitting at least the instances cited under this rule, the first statement of the one next following, its paraphrase, and perhaps a part of the illustrations belonging to it. It is impossible to say, of course, whether a rule or two has not dropped out also, affecting one or more of the words which I have introduced into the *gana* of rule 54; but this is not at all certain, nor would the loss be of much consequence, considering the quality of the rules in this part of the section.

## संज्ञायाम् ॥ ६७ ॥

67. Nor a specific appellative.

The term *sañjñā* is evidently used by our treatise in the same sense as] by Pāṇini (see Böhlingk's glossary to Pāṇini, *sub verbo*) and the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 96): it might be tolerably rendered by our term "proper name." The commentator's illustrations—which, as remarked in the preceding note, follow immediately upon the paraphrase of rule 66, and are perhaps therefore defective—are *açvatthāh: nyagrodhāh* (iv. 37. 4: cf. V. Pr. v. 37), *kaçyapaḥ* (e. g. iv. 37. 1), and *viçvāmitraḥ* (xviii. 3. 15). He adds: *bahulam iti ca vaktavyam*; 'it should have been said that with regard to *sañjñā* usage varies;' and he gives, as instances of proper names which are separable, *jamadagnyātharvāna* (not in *ĀV.*), *jamat-agne* (xviii. 3. 16), *bharat-vājam* (iv. 29. 5), *parā-çara* (vi. 65. 1), and *vāma-deva* (xviii. 3. 16). The amendment is made with exceeding good reason, for the rule is absurdly comprehensive in its form of statement. It can only be said with truth that the being a *sañjñā* is a circumstance which rather favors non-division, helping to excuse the *pada*-text from attempting the analysis of an obscure or anomalously formed word.

व्यधी ॥ ६८ ॥

68. Nor is the root *vyadh* separated.

Compounds with this root have already been made the subject of one of our rules (iii. 3), and it has been there explained that the usage of our *pada*-text is to leave undivided such of them as show a protracted vowel before the root. The commentator cites here two of the three instances which the Atharvan offers, viz. *hr̥dayâvidham* (viii. 6. 18) and *marmâridham* (xi. 10. 26). The rule is too broadly stated, and should have been restricted by him, as was the preceding one: it is only when a protracted vowel precedes the root that the compound is left undivided; and we have, for instance, *vi-vyâdhin*, *abhi-vyâdhin* (both i. 19. 1), and *kṛta-vyadhani* (v. 14. 9).

दृशौ सर्वनामैकारत्तेन ॥ ६९ ॥

69. Nor the root *dr̥ṣ*, when compounded with a pronoun ending in *a* or *i*.

The form of this rule is in one respect very unusual: such a thing as the fusion into a diphthong of two vowels of which the specification is desired is elsewhere unknown. If the reading were slightly amended, to *sarvanâmekârântena*, it would answer all the purposes of a rule of our Prâtiçâkhya, for the Atharva-Veda presents only a single one of the compounds which it appears in its present form to contemplate, viz. *idr̥ṣ* (e. g. iii. 1. 2). The commentator, however, paraphrases as I have translated, and gives the instances *tâdr̥k*, *tâdr̥ṣah*, *yâdr̥k*, *yâdr̥ṣah*, *idr̥k* (iv. 27. 6), and *idr̥ṣah*.

The Vâj. Pr. (v. 37) instances *idr̥ṇ* and *anyâdr̥ṇ* among indivisible words.

सह्वाउत्ते ॥ ७० ॥

70. Nor the root *sah*, when it ends in *ât*.

Under this rule, the commentator gives us once more the same series of compounds of *sah* which we have had above, under rules ii. 82 and iii. 1, and which it is unnecessary to repeat here.

Compare Vâj. Pr. v. 30.

अव्ययानाम् ॥ ७१ ॥

71. Nor are indeclinables divided.

As examples of indivisible indeclinables, the commentator offers us *sanutah*: *yuyotu* (vii. 92. 1), *prâtah* (e. g. iii. 16. 1), *uccâih* (iv. 1. 3), *uccât* (*uccâ*, xiii. 2. 36), *nicâih* (e. g. iv. 1. 3), and *nicât* (*nicâ*, e. g. i. 21. 2). The rule does anything but credit to the acuteness of the authors of the Prâtiçâkhya, for no word in the text which would otherwise be entitled to *avagraha* is left unresolved on account of its being an indeclinable.

## आशा दिशि ॥ ७२ ॥

72. Nor *âçâ*, when it means 'region.'

The word *âçâ*, meaning 'region,' comes from the root *aç*, and furnishes no ground for a division by the *pada*-text: *âçâ*, on the other hand, meaning 'hope, desire,' is a later form of *âças*, and comes from the root *çâns*, with prefix *â*; hence it is divisible. The commentator cites the words and phrases *âçâbhyah* (x. 5. 29), *âçânâm* (i. 31. 1), *âçâh*: *ânu* (vii. 9. 2), and finally, by way of counter-example, *abhi-dhâ-vâmi*: *â-çâ'm* (vi. 119. 3).

The signature of the section is merely *caturthasya dvitīyāḥ pādāḥ*.

## प्रकृतिदर्शनं समापत्तिः ॥ ७३ ॥

73. Restoration is exhibition of the natural form.

This is simply a definition of the term *samâpatti*, which I have ventured, instead of transferring, to translate by 'restoration.' It means, as the next rule will show, the reinstating, in the *pada* and *krama* texts, of that form of a word which is looked upon as the original and normal one, to the rejection of the anomalies of Vedic orthoepy. It does not occur in any other of the grammatical treatises, although its correspondent *samâpâdya* (see below, rules 117, 124) is once found in one of the later chapters of the Rik Pr. (xiii. 11, 12), in a passage so obscure, without the light which the treatment of the subject in our own Prâtiçâkhyâ casts upon it, that its meaning has, very naturally, been misapprehended by the learned editor.

## ष्वणावोपाचारदीर्घदुवल्तोपान्यदानां चर्चापरिहारयोः समापत्तिः ॥ ७४ ॥

74. In the repetitions of the *pada* and *krama* texts, restoration of the natural form is made where *s* has been converted into *sh*, *n* into *ñ*, *visarjanîya* before *k* and *p* into *s*, where a vowel has been lengthened, *t* or *th* made lingual, an element omitted, or final *n* converted into *visarjanîya*.

Most of the technical terms of this rule meet us here for the first time, and several of them are not employed elsewhere in our treatise. *Carçâ* (see iv. 123) designates the repetition, with *iti* interposed, made in the *pada* text of a divisible compound which is also *pragr̥hya*, or which ends in a vowel not subject to the ordinary rules of combination: for example, *satyânrté iti satya-anrté* (i. 33. 2); *parihâra* (see iv. 117) is the like repetition made in the *krama*-text of a *pragr̥hya*, a divisible compound, a word requiring restoration to its natural form, and the last word before a pause. The former term is employed in a like sense by the Vâj. Pr. (e. g. iii. 19); the latter is peculiar to our treatise, being replaced in the others by *parigraha* and *sthitopasthita*. *Upâçâra*, 'the

conversion of *visarjantya* into a sibilant before *k* and *p'* (by ii. 62 etc.), corresponds to the *upâcâra* and *upâcarita* of the Rik Pr. (xiii. 12, iv. 14), and *ânpada* is the term employed by the same treatise (iv. 27) to designate the conversion into *visarjantya*, and consequent loss, of a final *n* before a following vowel, as taught in our rule ii. 27. *Shatva*, *natva*, and *tutva* are of obvious derivation and significance, nor is there anything calling for remark in their form, excepting the *u* in *tutva*, which identifies the term with a Paninean symbol (viii. 4. 41: *shṭunâ shṭuh\**).

A quite embarrassing question now presents itself, in connection with the part of the text contained in this and the following rules; namely, with reference to the constitution of the *pada*-text which they imply. The actual *pada*-text of our manuscripts is very sparing in its use of *carcâ*, or repetition with *iti* interposed: it avails itself of that expedient only in the case already referred to as prescribed by iv. 123, or when a *pragrhya* is likewise *avagrhya*. The Rik *pada* employs it in one additional case; namely, when a word ends in a *visarjantya* which is *riphita*, or liable to pass into *r* before a sonant, but which does not actually become *r* in the *sanhitâ*: it would read, for example, at ii. 32. 1 (where the Atharvan *pada* has simply *antâh*), *antâr ity antâh*. The Vâjasaneyi-Sanhitâ is, according to the rules of its Prâtiçâkhyâ (iv. 17–22)—with which, in the absence of any testimony from Weber to the contrary, we must suppose the usage of the known manuscripts to correspond—very much more liberal in its employment of the repetition; not only in the two cases where this is practised in the Rik *pada*, but also in the case of a simple *pragrhya* (thus it says *dvé iti dvé*, where Atharvan and Rik would give simply *dvé iti*), in that of a word which contains a lengthened vowel or a lingualized consonant, and even in that of a mere divisible compound, it performs *carcâ*. In short, it repeats in *pada*-text all that is repeated in *krama*-text, excepting (by iv. 21) *su* and the final word of a sentence. The precept of the Vâj. Pr. corresponding to this one of ours is to be found implied in iii. 18, 19, where direction is given that in the repetitions of the *pada*-text the remaining rules of the chapter should not be observed—they being, precisely the ones which teach the changes which our precept specifies in detail. Now when we find put forth in our treatise, as its leading and principal direction for the restoration of the natural form in *pada*, a rule like the one here given, which classes *pada* repetitions and *krama* repetitions together, and corresponds, as regards the *pada*, so nearly with the Vâj. Pr., we cannot help suspecting that it contemplates a *pada*-text in which, as in that of the Vâj. Sanhitâ, the repetitions of *krama* and *pada* extend over nearly the same classes of cases. It is actually the fact that, if we allow the *pada*-text to be of the form in which our manuscripts give it, there are but about half a dozen words in the whole Atharvan text to which this rule and the two following, all together, have any application: while, on the other hand, the Prâtiçâkhyâ is found to give no direction at all for

\* *Shṭu* and *shatva* are also used by the little *krama*-treatise belonging to the Rig-Veda, and called the *Upalekha* (*Upalekha, de kramapâtha libellus. Textum Sanscriticum recensuit, varietatem lectionis, prolegomena, versionem Latinam, notas, indicem adjecit Dr. Guil. Pertsch. Berlin: 1854. 8vo*), to which we shall, in the sequel, have frequent occasion to refer.

the use of *iti* alone in *pada* after a *pragrhya*, or for the innumerable restitutions of natural form which are made in words not repeated. I find myself, I must acknowledge, hardly able to avoid the conclusion that this part of our Prâticâkhyâ was framed to suit a *pada*-text in which all *pragrhyas*, divisible words, and words requiring restoration to normal form, were alike repeated, or suffered *carcâ*: such seems to me to be the only intelligible and consistent interpretation of its rules. That the fourth section of the chapter contains a direction for *carcâ* agreeing with the nature of our extant *pada*-text, would find its explanation in the evident character of that section as a foreign addition to the main body of the work; we should have to assume that the school to which the treatise as a whole belonged, in its present form, framed its *pada*-text in the manner there taught, and probably suffered that rule to take the place of one of another character formerly contained in this section, and now omitted from it; while yet they did not so recast the section as to adapt it fully to their new method of construction of the *pada*. This may seem a violent and improbable supposition; but it appears to me, after making every possible attempt to avoid it, to involve less difficulty than the interpretation of the rules of this section in such a manner as to make them suit the *pada*-text of the manuscripts.

The true illustrations of our rule, then, would be of the nature of the following: for the conversion of *s* to *sh*, in *vasosh pate* (i. 1. 2), *vasor iti vasoh*; in *vidmo shu* (i. 2. 1), *sv iti su*; in *vy ashahanta* (iii. 10. 12), *asahante 'ty asahanta*: for the conversion of *n* to *ñ*, in *pari nah* (i. 2. 2), *na iti nah*; in *prâ 'nâikshît* (ii. 7. 1), *anâikshîd ity anâikshît*: for the conversion of *visarjanîya* to *s* before *k* and *p*, in *tatas pari* (i. 10. 1), *tata iti tatah*; in *tokebhya krdhi* (i. 13. 2), *tokebhya iti tokebhya*: for the lengthening of a vowel, in *vidmâ garasya* (i. 2. 1), *vidme 'ti vidma*; in *yāvaya* (i. 2. 3), *yavaye 'ti yavaya*: for the lingualization of dental mutes, in *bahish te* (i. 3. 1), *ta iti te*; in *vi tashthe* (ix. 10. 19), *tastha iti tashthe*: for omission of an element, in *ut thuh* (vii. 52. 2), *sthur iti sthuh*: for the conversion of final *n* to *visarjanîya* and its consequent omission, in *mahâñ asi* (i. 20. 4), *mahân iti mahân*.

One other solution of our difficulties, less satisfactory, but also less violent, deserves to be suggested. If we could omit the words *carcâ-parihârayoh* from the rule altogether, leaving the latter to authorize a restoration of normal form in the *pada* generally, we could perhaps make shift to get along with such inconcinnities and omissions as would still remain—of which the principal would be that the treatise made no provision for the use of *iti* after a *pragrhya* word, and that it did not direct what form words should have in the numerous repetitions of the *krama*-text.

The commentator, offering no explanation of the rule, gives a series of compound words in illustration of it, which belong more properly under the following rules; and to the next, accordingly, I shall take the liberty of relegating them.

पूर्वपदनिमित्तानां च ॥ ७५ ॥

75. And also, where the cause of the conversion stands in a former member of a compound.



The commentator's paraphrase is simply *pūrvapadanimitānām ca śaśvādīnām samāpatir bhavati*; 'and restoration is made of the conversions detailed in the preceding rule when their cause stands in a former member of a compound.' He cites no examples, but says *etāny evo 'dāharaṇāni*, 'the illustrations are those already given' namely, under the preceding rule. According to his exposition, then, the present rule would seem merely an explanatory appendage to its predecessor. But this is clearly inadmissible: not only ought we to have it, in that case, combined with the other, so as to form part of it, but, more especially, it would not contain the particle *ca*, 'and,' which positively stamps it as something added to the other. We cannot avoid, as it seems to me, understanding rule 74 of the abnormal changes of disjoined and independent words, and rule 75 of such as are produced by an altering influence in the prior member of a compound. The illustrations which the commentator offered under the other rule, and which do, in fact, in good part appertain to this, are as follows: conversion of *s* to *śh*, *niśhecānam*: *niśecānam iti niśecānam* (i. 3. 1 etc.: our *pada*, simply *niśecānam*); conversion of *n* to *ṇ*, *parāyanam*: *parāyanam iti parā-ayanam* (e. g. i. 34. 3: p. *parā-ayanam*); conversion of *visarjantiya* to a sibilant, *adhahpadam*: *adhahpadam ity adhaḥ-padam* (e. g. ii. 7. 2: p. *odhaḥ-padam*); prolongation of a vowel, *abhivartena*: *abhivartene 'ty abhi-vartena* (i. 29. 1: p. *abhi-vartena*); conversion of dental mute to lingual, *yo viśtabhnāti*: *viśtabhnāti 'ti vi-stabhnāti* (xiii. 1. 25: p. *vi-stabhnāti*); omission, *ṣepaharshanīm*: *ṣepoharshanīm iti ṣepaḥ-harshanīm* (iv. 4. 1: p. *ṣepaḥ-harshanīm*: see above, ii. 56); and loss of final *n*, *sālāvṛkāṅ iva*: *sālāvṛkāṅ iva 'ti sālāvṛkāṅ-iva* (ii. 27. 5: p. *sālāvṛkāṅ-iva*). The commentator does not state whether he takes his instances from the *pada* or from the *krama* text: according to the construction of our present *pada*, they could only come from a *krama*; if the conclusion drawn above as to the original *pada* contemplated by our text is correct, they may be illustrations of both. In the very rare cases in which the extant *pada*-text has occasion to repeat words showing any of the abnormal changes which the rule mentions, it restores the normal form: thus we have *dustano iti duh-tano* (iv. 7. 3: s. *dushtano*), *pratiśthe iti prali-sthe* (iv. 26. 1, 2: s. *pratiśthe*), *āyushpatnī\* ity āyuh-patnī* (v. 9. 8: s. *āyushpatnī*), *viśtabhite iti vi-stabhite* (x. 8. 2: s. *viśtabhite*), and *pathisādī iti pathi-sādī* (xviii. 2. 12: s. *pathishādī*).

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples—viz. *parirāpiṇam iti pari-rāpiṇam* (v. 7. 2) and *śutrāmāṇam iti su-trāmāṇam* (vii. 6. 3)—to show that, when the effecting cause of an alteration of form is in the same member of a compound with the alteration itself, the latter is not reversed, and the normal form restored, by the repetition and resolution of the word.

\* Our *pada*-MSS. write the word as I have given it, apparently infinging the rule; but I have no question that the *śh* here is only an attempt to represent the labial spirant, or *upadhāniya*, which the theory of the Prāticākhyā requires (by ii. 40) in such a place: another like case is *chandahpakṣhe iti chandāḥ pakṣhe* (viii. 9. 12: s. *chandahpakṣhe*—or, more properly, *chandaḥpakṣhe*—by ii. 62). Before the *iti*, where no pause of *anagraha* intervenes between the two members of the compound, they are, of course, to be put in simple *sandhi* with one another: thus, *dustano*, *ṣepoharshanīm*, and, as we ought strictly to read, *adhahpadam*; we have also *sadhavirdhāne iti sadah-havirdhāne* at xii. 1. 38.

## इग्यानाम् ॥ ७६ ॥

76. And where the compound is divisible.

That is to say, restoration to the normal form is made only in such compounds as are by the *pada*-text resolved into their constituent elements. Those words which, although they may be acknowledged compounds, are left undivided on account of special anomalies of form, retain also their irregularities of orthoepy. The commentator, in his paraphrase, represents *īṅgyānām* by *īṅgyamānānām avagrhyamānānām*, 'forms which undergo division, or separation by *avagraha*,' and adds again *etāny evo 'dāharanāni*, 'the examples are those already given'—namely, under rule 74 (here presented under rule 75). Of counter-examples, however, he furnishes two—viz. *parishkr̥tā* (e. g. ix. 3. 10) and *prāṇanti* (e. g. i. 32. 1)—and then cites a verse which contains two more: *aniṅgyatvāt samāpattir eshu nelapadeshu tu: utpanne 'vagrahe cā 'tra samāpattis tathāi 'va ca: sūnrtāvad apāshthavad ity udāharet*. The commentator's own instances belong to the class of those in which a cause in the former member of the compound produces an effect in the latter member: the words, if divided, would read *pari-sk̥r̥tā*, *prā-ṇanti*: in the other two, the irregularities are mainly in the first members themselves, and, if *sūnrtā* and *apāshtha* were resolvable, we should read (according to the next rule), with restoration, *sūnrtā-vat*, *apastha-vat*, instead of, as now, *sūnrtā-vat* (e. g. v. 20. 6), *apāshtha-vat* (xiv. 1. 29). The rule, as these illustrations help to show, is not a mere additional specification to the one preceding, affecting only the cases to which the other applies: in that case it would have been incorporated with it, not made to follow it, as an independent precept; but it concerns all changes occurring in the interior of divisible words, whether in the former or the latter member, and a part of the commentator's examples, rehearsed under rule 75, belong to it, and not to the latter.

## अन्वेनापि पर्वणा ॥ ७७ ॥

77. In which case restoration is made, even when the word is farther compounded with another member.

That is to say: a compound which, being divisible by *avagraha*, is entitled to restoration of the normal form of its constituent parts, retains its right even when, by farther composition, the division of its original members is lost. Examples are given in the commentary as follows: *visita-srupah* (vi. 60. 1: s. *vishitasrupah*), *abhi-niḥpatan\**: *apā-patat* (vii. 64. 1: s. *abhinishpatan*), *vishthitāḥ-iva* (vii. 115. 4: s. *vishthitāḥ-iva*), *br̥haspati-pranuttānām* (viii. 8. 19: s. °*pranuttānām*), *pr̥shadājya-pranuttānām* (xi. 10. 19: s. as before), and *durnihita-eshinim* (xi. 9. 15:

\* Our manuscript writes *abhi-nishpatan*, as do also the manuscripts of the Atharvan *pada*-text in the passage cited; but I suppose here, as in the other similar cases referred to in the note to rule 75, that the *sh* is an attempt at representing the labial spirant: we have the guttural spirant, the *jihvāmūliya*, in like manner represented by *sh* in *abhi-nishkr̥ta* (x. 1. 12) and *abhi-nishkārīn* (x. 1. 31).

s. *durn'hītāishintm*). Other instances afforded by the text are *viskan-dhri-dūshana* (ii. 4. 1), *atishā-vant* (iii. 22. 6), *su-praniti* (e. g. v. 11. 5), *durnāma-cātana* (viii. 6. 3), *anu-visicyate* (viii. 10. 33), *abhimoda-mud* (xi. 7. 26), *jāgrat-duḥsvapnyam* and *svopne-duḥsvapnyam* (xvi. 6. 9), *ṛṥthivisat-bhyaḥ* (xviii. 4. 78), etc. Three exceptions to the rule are made below, in rule 96, and the text affords one more, as is there pointed out in the note. The commentator again adds a verse, but it is more than usually mutilated and obscure; it reads: *prakṛtyā maṇatvaṁ yad avagrhyet tathāi 'va tat: upatishthanti prapaṇādiny udāhareti*.

### क्रमे परेण विगृह्यात् ॥ ७८ ॥

78. In *krama*, restoration is made of a word which is taken together with another word than the disjoinable cause of its altered form.

The commentator's paraphrase is *krame pareṇ prasamullhāne vigṛhyān nimittāt*; which shows us—what the necessities of the case would of themselves have pointed out—that the important word to be supplied with *vigṛhyāt* is, by inference from rule 75, *nimittāt*, 'the cause of the altered or abnormal form.' *Vigṛhya* denotes a word which is altogether independent, and therefore disjoined from others in the *pada*-text, a *nā-nāpada*, in distinction from *avagrhya*, which means 'divisible into its constituents (*pūrvopada* and *uttarapada*), as a compound.' In the construction of the *krama*-text, then, where each word is in succession taken along with its predecessor and its successor, a word which in *sankhitā* has an abnormal form, under the influence of the former or of the latter, retains that form when in the same *kramapada* with the altering word, but is restored to its natural form when making a *kramapada* along with any other word. The commentator cites a couple of passages—*āpo hi shthā mayobhuvah* (i. 5. 1) and *puri ṇo vr̥ndhi* (vi. 37. 2)—but does not write them out in *krama* form, so as to illustrate the rule: they would read *āpo hi: hi shthā: sthā mayobhuvah*, and *puri ṇaḥ: ṇo vr̥ndhi*. As counter-examples, to show that restoration of the normal form is made in a *kramapada* only when the cause of euphonic alteration stands in a separate word, and so is left out of the *kramapada*, we have given us two passages in their *krama*-form: *ṛṥthivyān te: te nishecanam: nishecanam bahih: nisecanam iti ni-secanam* (i. 3. 1 etc.), and *āyane te: āyana ity ā-ayane: te parāyane: parāyane dūrvā: parāyana iti parā-ayane* (vi. 106. 1). Here the *sh* of *nishecanam* and the *ṇ* of *parāyane* are maintained wherever the words containing them enter into a *kramapada*, and only suffer restoration (by rule 75, above) to *s* and *n* in the repetition or *parihāra*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. x. 5 (r. 5), xi. 21 (r. 44), and Upalekha iii. 3, 4. I do not find in the Vāj. Pr. any special direction upon the subject.

### दीर्घस्य विरामे ॥ ७९ ॥

79. A lengthened vowel is restored to its natural form before a pause.

The illustrative passages are given by the commentator in *pada* form : as, *âpah* : *hi* : *stha* : *mayah-bhuvah* (i. 5. 1 : s. *shihâ*), and *parva* : *asya* : *grabhitâ* (i. 12. 2 : s. *asyâ*). The rule, however, evidently applies not less to the *krama* than to the *pada* text, and is even intended chiefly for the former : it is our authority for shortening a protracted final when it comes to stand at the end of a *krapada*, while it is left long when taken together with its successor : we read *hi shihâ* : *stha mayobhuvah*, and *parvâ 'sya* : *asyâ grabhitâ*.

चतूरात्रो ऽवग्रह एव ॥ ८० ॥

80. In *catûrâtra*, this is done only before the pause of separation.

From rule 74, which prescribes restoration of the normal form of a lengthened vowel in both parts of a repetition, one might draw the conclusion that the word here in question should be written, when repeated, *catûrâtra iti catuh-râtrah* : hence this rule, which teaches the reading *catûrâtra iti catuh-râtrah*. Our commentator cites, in *krama* form, the passage containing the word, *catûrâtrah pañcarâtruh* : *catûrâtra iti catuh-râtrah* (xi. 7. 11).

पदान्तविकृतानाम् ॥ ८१ ॥

81. Restoration is made of alterations taking place at the end of a word.

The commentator's paraphrase is *padântavikrîtânâm ca shatvâdînâm samâpattir bhavati*, which would seem to show that he understands the rule as referring to the same series of abnormal alterations which was detailed in rule 74. His illustrations, however, put quite another face upon the matter : they are *pari-eti* : *rakshan* (iv. 38. 5) and *abhi-âimi* : *devâh* (vi. 118. 3). Here the only changes of form which have undergone restoration are the regular conversions of *i* into *y* (by iii. 39) before the following dissimilar vowel. We are thus guided to a different interpretation of the rule : whereas we have heretofore dealt with irregular or abnormal changes only, learning under what circumstances, in *pada* and in *krama*, they become reversed, and the original form restored, here we are taught that all alterations made at the end of a word, by the ordinary as well as the extraordinary combinations of the phrase, undergo restoration when the word comes to stand, in *pada* or in *krama*, before a pause (*virâme*, rule 79). It should be remarked that the final repetition of this rule is wanting in the manuscript, and that we cannot therefore be certain that we may not have lost with it other examples and farther exposition, which would have set the meaning of the rule, or the commentator's apprehension of it, in a clearer light.

अभ्यासविनतानां च ॥ ८२ ॥

82. Also of forms lingualized by the influence of a reduplication.

The Prātiçākhyā now goes on to inform us where restoration must be made of alterations which have taken place in the interior of a word, and not under the influence of any cause lying outside of the word itself. The rules in this portion of the work are in great part the reverse of others formerly given, when the subject under treatment was the conversion of *pada* into *sanhitā*. Thus, the present precept is the correlative of ii. 91, and it is illustrated by precisely the same series of examples; which, however, are here given in the *pada* form: thus, *susūdata* (i. 26. 4), *abhi* : *sisyade* (v. 5. 9), *ā* : *susvayanti* (v. 12. 6), *sisāsavaḥ* : *sisāsatha* (vi. 21. 3), *sisāsati* (xiii. 2. 14), and *susuve* (xiv. 1. 43).

स्त्रैषूयं नार्षदेन दुष्टरं त्रैष्टुभं त्रैह्याणाञ्जास्पत्यम् ॥८३॥

83. Also of *strāishūyam*, *nārshadena*, *dushtaram*, *traishtubham*, *trāihāyanāt*, and *jāspatyam*.

By rule 76, above, no compound was declared entitled to restoration of the natural form of its constituents, unless it was by the *pada*-text treated as divisible. The words here detailed constitute exceptions under that rule, and have their irregular alterations reversed, even though (partly by rule 55, and partly by 54, above) they are not *ava-grhya*. Our *pada*, in fact, reads *strāishūyam* (vi. 11. 3), *nārshadena* (iv. 19. 2), *dushtaram* (vi. 4. 1), *traishtubham* (ix. 10. 1: we have also other forms from the same theme in the same and the following verse), and *trāihāyanāt* (x. 5. 22 and xii. 4. 16); and *jāspatyam* (vii. 73. 10) is prescribed by iv. 64, although, as there remarked, our *pada*-manuscript actually gives *jāḥ-patyam*.

अभ्यासस्य परोक्षायाम् ॥८४॥

84. Also of a reduplication, in a form of the perfect.

The term *paroksha*, 'beyond the sphere of sight, out of one's sight,' is also employed by Pāṇini (iii. 2. 115 etc.), along with *bhūta*, 'past,' and *anadyatana*, 'not on the present day,' to define the proper sphere of the perfect tense. We may suppose it here used alone as a name of the tense as being its distinctive characteristic, since the imperfect and aorist are also entitled regularly to one or both of the other designations. The commentator cites, as instances, *tāṛpuḥ* (xi. 7. 13: s. *tāṛpuḥ*) and *vāṛtuḥ* (v. 19. 13: s. *vāṛtuḥ*); and, as counter-instances, to show that the vowel is not shortened in any other tense than a perfect, he gives *lālapīti* (vi. 111. 1) and *rārajīti* (vi. 71. 2). The usage of the Atharvan texts as concerns the reduplication was fully explained under iii. 13, the only rule in which the subject is treated in the earlier part of the work.

A couple of verses follow in the commentary; they read as follows: *abhyāsasya ca dirghatvaṁ dirghokitēti dr̥ṣyate: na tasye 'shtā samāpat-tir lālapīti nidarṣanam: yady abhyāsasya dirghatvaṁ nujādinām ca yanlukoh: savarṇe ca parokshayām na samāpadyete kvacit*. I have not succeeded in amending the text so as to be able to translate the whole passage.

## वावृधानप्रभृतीनां च ॥ ८५ ॥

85. Also of *vâvrdhâna* etc.

The commentator's instances under this rule are *vavrdhânaḥ-iva* (not found in AV.), *sasahih* (iii. 18. 5 : s. *sâsahih*), and *vavrdhânaḥ* (e. g. i. 8. 4). The *gana* might be filled up from the material collected and presented in the notes to the first section of the third chapter, but I have not taken the trouble to put it together, as it is uncertain how much and what the authors of the treatise meant the precept to cover.

## कृपिरुपिरीषीणामनह्वानाम् ॥ ८६ ॥

86. Also of the roots *kṛp*, *rup*, and *rish*, when they are *anahva*.

I can find nowhere any clue to the derivation and use of *anahva*, and the range of the cases to which the rule applies is too narrow for the induction with any confidence of a definition from them. For the root *kṛp*, either the commentator furnished no instances, or the manuscript has omitted them : the only derivative from that root, so far as I can discover, which the rule can have any concern with, is *caklpat* (vi. 35. 3 : p. *caklpat*); since *caklpuḥ* and *caklpe* would properly fall under rule 84. For the root *rup* is cited *na : rurupaḥ* (iv. 7. 5. 6 : s. *rûrupoḥ*); for the root *rish*, the two passages *enasoḥ : deva : ririshaḥ* (vi. 51. 3 : s. *ri-rishaḥ*) and *mâ : naḥ : ririshaḥ* (v. 3. 8 : s. *ririshaḥ*). The commentator then asks *anahvânâm iti kim artham*, 'why does the rule say "when they are *anahva*;"' and cites, as counter-examples, *na : animadaḥ : na : arûrupaḥ* (iv. 6. 3), *mâ : ririshaḥ : noḥ* (xi. 2. 29 : this is, however, no counter-example, but precisely analogous with the two already cited for the same word), and *sinivâli : aciklpat* (vi. 11. 3). So far as these instances go, *anahva* might be understood as designating an aorist form which has lost its accent; or, virtually, an aorist subjunctive.

The text affords one other word, *çuçucaḥ* (xviii. 2. 4 : s. *çûçucaḥ*), of the same class with those treated in this rule. Its omission must be understood as signifying, either that the verse containing it was not in the Atharvan text of the authors and commentator of our Prâtiçâkhya, or that their text read, with the Rig-Veda (x. 16. 1), *çocaḥ*, or, finally, that the word escaped their notice.

## जीहिडाहम् ॥ ८७ ॥

87. Also of *jîhîdâ* 'ham.

The commentator cites the passage in its *poda*-form, *akratuḥ : jîhîdâ : aham* (iv. 32. 5). Compare rule iii. 14, of which this is the reverse.

## साह्याम ॥ ८८ ॥

88. Also of *sâhyâma*.

The commentator cites the passage in its *poda*-form, *sahyâma : dâsam* (iv. 32. 1). Compare the previous rule, iii. 15. He adds a verse or two :

*sahyâmejñiya saheḥ dirghatvam yad dṛṣyate: na tasye 'śhṭā samāpattir yāḥ ṣabdo dirgha eva saḥ: ākhyāte 'utahpade krasvo na samāpadyate punaḥ.* The various irregularities of form appearing in, or in connection with, the root *sah* have been the subject of several previous rules: see ii. 82, iii. 1, iv. 70.

दीदायत् ॥ ८९ ॥

89. Also of *didāyat*.

In the former rule (iii. 22), *didāyat* was made the leading word of a *gana* composed of forms exhibiting an irregular prolongation in the second syllable, and we are justly surprised at not finding the statement here made in a corresponding manner. The commentator, in fact, cites precisely the same cases as before, in their *pada*-form—viz. *didāyat* (iii. 8. 3), *ushasah: vira-vatiḥ* (iii. 16. 7), and *ushasānaktā* (e. g. v. 12. 6)—just as if the rule read here also *didāyādīnām*.

नारकादीनाम् ॥ ९० ॥

90. Also of *nāraka* etc.

Here we have the precise counterpart of rule iii. 21, above, and the commentator cites from the text the same three cases, viz. *narakam* (xii. 4. 36), *sadanam* (e. g. ii. 12. 7), and *asataḥ: indra* (viii. 4. 8).

चावयते: कारितान्तस्य ॥ ९१ ॥

91. Also of the root *cyu*, in a form containing the causative affix.

Under this rule the commentator is unusually liberal of his citations: they are *ā: cyavayantu: sakhyāya* (iii. 3. 2), *yathā: vātaḥ: cyavayati* (x. 1. 13), *āngāt-āngāt: pra: cyavaya* (x. 4. 25), *cyavayan: ca: vrkshān* (xii. 1. 51), *devatāḥ: cyavayantu* (xii. 3. 35), and *pūshā: trā: itaḥ: cyavayatu* (xviii. 2. 54). These are all the cases which the text furnishes of causative forms from the root *cyu*: in every instance, the *sanhitā* prolongs the vowel of the first syllable, reading *cyāvayantu* etc.

यावयतेराव्यति ॥ ९२ ॥

92. As also of the root *yu*, if the form be a verbal one.

The commentator cites three of the numerous examples of causative forms from this root, having the long vowel of their first syllable shortened in *pada*: they are *variyah: yavaya: vadham* (e. g. i. 20. 3: s. *yāvayā*), *amat: yavayatam* (i. 20. 2: s. *yāvayatam*), and *varuṇa: yavaya* (i. 20. 3: p. *yāvaya*). He does not explain the meaning of the restriction *ākhyāte* added to the rule, nor cite any counter-example. I can discover no other reason for it than the occurrence of the word *yavayāvānah*, at ix. 2. 13: this may have been deemed by the authors of the treatise to contain the causative ending (*kāritānta*) *aya*, and

therefore to require the rule to be so framed as to exclude it. But the word is divided by the *pada*-text *yava-yâvânah*, as if composed of *yava* and *yâvan*, from *yâ*: and this seems the best account to be given of it.

## वनियमिअथिग्लापि ॥ १३ ॥

93. Also of the roots *van*, *yam*, *çrath*, and *glâp*.

The cases referred to in the rule are cited by the commentator, as follows: *amûm* : *som* : *vanayantu* (vi. 9. 3 : s. *vânayantu*), *vi* : *madhyam* : *yamaya* (vi. 137. 3 : s. *yâmaya*), *madhyamam* : *çrathaya* (vii. 83. 3 : s. *çrathâya*), and *na* : *im* : *ava* : *glopayanta* (ix. 9. 10 : s. *glâpayanta*).

The manuscript contains no final repetition of this rule, but offers, after the last citation, the words *ingyavac ca*. What to make of these words I do not precisely know: they may be part of a cited verse, of which the rest, along with the repetition of the rule, is lost; or they may possibly belong to an omitted rule: but I can hardly suppose the latter to be the case, not seeing what the meaning of the phrase should be, as a rule or a part of one.

The form of our rule 93, it may be remarked, is somewhat unusual: we should expect at the end of it the genitive plural ending: thus, *°glâpinâm*.

## नाष्टनः ॥ १४ ॥

94. *Ashṭa* is not restored to its natural form.

The commentator gives the same citations as under the corresponding rule above (iii. 2): they are, in *pada*-form, *ashtâ-padi* : *catuh-akshî* (v. 19. 7), *ashtâ-pakshâm* (ix. 3. 21), *ashtâ-parnah*, *ashtâ-dânshtvam* (these two are not found in AV.), *ashtâ-yogâih* (vi. 91. 1), *ashtâ-cakrâ* : *navadârâ* (x. 2. 31), and *ashtâ-cakram* : *vartate* (xi. 4. 22). He also interposes, between the first and third examples, *ashtâ-yonih*; but this is a blunder, for the word is read with a short vowel in both *pada* and *sanhitâ* (viii. 9. 21), in our Atharvan manuscripts, nor is *yoni* mentioned (iii. 2) by the Prâtiçâkhyâ among words before which the final vowel of the numeral is made long.

## दिनातिः ॥ १५ ॥

95. Nor the root *hi*.

That is to say—wherever forms of this root, having the conjugational suffix *nu* or its modifications, show in *sanhitâ* after *pra* a lingual nasal, this nasal remains lingual also in the *pada* text. The commentator's examples are *prati-prahimâh* (x. 1. 5), *pra* : *hinomi* : *dûram* (e. g. xii. 2. 4), and *pra* : *hinuta* : *piîṇ* (xviii. 4. 40).

Rule 88 of the preceding chapter is to be compared. The *pada* usage as regards these forms is quite anomalous: I can only conjecture that it may have been adopted in order to mark the euphonic alteration as itself of anomalous and exceptional character: there being, so far as I



have been able to find, no other cases in which a preposition lingualizes the nasal of a conjugational sign.

बोधप्रतीबोधी केसरप्राबन्धाया अभ्यघायन्ति पनिष्य-  
दातिष्ठियं दधार जगार मीमायेति ॥ १६ ॥

96. . . . . : nor is restoration made in the words here mentioned.

The first three of the words detailed in this rule are exceptions under rule 77, above, or cases in which the normal form is not restored to a divisible compound, on its being farther compounded with another member: the *pada* writes them *bodha-pratibodhāu* (v. 30. 10: compare *prati-bodha*, e. g. viii. 1. 13), *kesara-prābandhāyāḥ* (v. 18. 11: *pra-bandha* is not found in the Atharvan text), and *abhi-aghāyanti* (v. 6. 9, vii. 70. 3: compare *agha-yantam*, x. 4. 10). The last three are exceptions under rule 84, above, being forms of the perfect tense with short vowel unrestored in the *pada*-text, which writes them like the *sanhitā*, viz. *dādhāra* (e. g. iv. 2. 7), *jāgāra* (e. g. v. 19. 10), and *mīmāya* (v. 11. 3). The text affords us once *mīmāya* (ix. 10. 21), so that the rule is deficient in explicitness as regards this form, and should have cited along with it a preceding or a following word. The other two, *panishpadā* (v. 30. 16) and *atishthipam* (vii. 95. 2), might be regarded as falling under the first general rule (iv. 74) for restitution of original form; or they might as naturally, one would think, be looked upon as special cases, falling under no previous rule, and therefore not needing specification here.

Of the class of the first three cases is *sam-nishadya* (iv. 16. 2), which equally calls for inclusion in this rule, unless the reading in our *pada* manuscript is a copyist's error, and should be amended to *sam-nisadya*.

प्रपणाः पणतेरेव ॥ १७ ॥

97. Nor in *prapaṇa*, provided only it comes from the root *paṇ*.

The commentator cites the only two passages in which this word is to be found in the Atharvan, namely *yena : dhanena : pra-panam : carā-mi* (iii. 15. 5), and *ḥunam : naḥ : astu : pra-panaḥ* (iii. 15. 4). I cannot in the least understand why any such rule as this should be deemed called for. There is no rule, and no principle, which should require the restoration of the *ṇ* of *prapaṇa* to a dental form, nor is there any word in the text which exhibits an element *pana* whose nasal is lingualized by a previous constituent of a compound. So far as we can see, it is merely the fear lest some one should be stupid enough to mistake the *ṇ* for an effect of the preposition *pra*, and so should commit the blunder of speaking, in *pada*, *pra-pana*, that calls out the precept. Its repetition before the one next following is wanting in the manuscript: possibly, then (as in the case of rule 81, above), we have lost something in the way of exposition or illustration which would have farther enlightened us. In his paraphrase, the commentator says *prapaṇa iti paratāiraka samāpattir na bhavati*; but what *paratāiraka* is, I do not know.

## इदमूघादिषु पदत्वात् ॥ १८ ॥

98. Nor in *idam û shu* etc., on account of their forming together (in *krama*) a single word.

The commentator paraphrases *padatvât* by *tripadatvât*, the latter being apparently a technical designation for those *kramopadas* which, by rule 113, below, are composed of three words, instead of, as usual, two only. The rule evidently applies to the *krama*-text alone; the *padu* reading of the passages referred to does not deviate in any manner from the usual norm: we have *idam : ûñ iti : su*, etc. But what the point of the rule is, as concerns the *krama*-text, I find it rather difficult to see. The passages cited in illustration by the commentator are nearly the same with those already twice given, under ii. 97 and iii. 4: they are *idam û shu* (i. 24. 4), *tad û shu* (v. 1. 5), *pary û shu* (v. 6. 4), *mahim û shu* (vii. 6. 2), *anya û shu* (xviii. 1. 16), and *stusha û shu* (xviii. 1. 37). According as the abnormal alteration aimed at by the rule is understood to be the prolongation of the *u* or the lingualization of the sibilant of *su*, we should add to the series the farther passages vii. 85. 1 and xviii. 3. 7, or vii. 72. 2, 73. 7, and 85. 1. I presume that we must adopt the former of the two interpretations: the *û*, in these passages, is nowhere to be restored to its short form in the *krama*, since it cannot fulfill the condition required by rule 79, and appear before a pause.

## ब्रह्मणवत्यादीनाम् ॥ १९ ॥

99. Nor in *brahmanvatî* etc.

The commentator cites *brahman-vatim* (vi. 108. 2), *paçyat : akshan-vân* (ix. 9. 15), *çirshan-vatî* (x. 1. 2), and *vrshanyantî-iva : kanyalâ* (v. 5. 3). The irregularity which renders necessary the rule is the retention of the lingual *n* as final, against the principle of rule iii. 89, above. The last case cited, however, does not belong with the rest, since the denominative ending, by rule 29, above, is separable only after a vowel, and we read *vrshanyantyâh* (vi. 9. 1) and *vrshanyatah* (vi. 70. 1-3), without *avagraha*: hence there is no ground for restoration.

## दीर्घायुत्वादीनां च ॥ १०० ॥

100. Nor in *dîrghâyutva* etc.

The same passages which were cited under the corresponding rule in another part of the treatise (ii. 59), and no others, are here again given by the commentator: they are, according to the reading of the *padu*-text, *dîrghâyu-tvâya* (e. g. i. 22. 2), *sahasracaksho iti sahasra-caksho : tvam* (iv. 20. 5), and *barkî-sadaḥ* (xviii. 1. 45, 51).

The signature of the section is as follows: 102: *caturthasya trtīyāḥ pādāḥ*; so that, unless rule 53 is to be divided into two, or unless the copyist's count is inaccurate, we have lost, somewhere in the course of the second and third sections, one of the rules of the text.

The concluding section of the treatise is occupied, first, with the recommendation of the study of the *krama* form of the text, and second, with the description of its mode of construction. The way in which it is stated and explained by the commentator is altogether different from that hitherto followed. First we have presented us the whole of the text of the section, separated by marks of punctuation into the rules which compose it. Then follows the independent statement and explanation of each rule in succession; but not, as heretofore, according to the set method of restatement in paraphrase, brief and dry illustration by examples, and final repetition: we have, instead of this, a free exposition, drawn out at considerable length and with some unction, much more in the style of the known comments upon the other treatises of the class. This not only authorizes, but compels us to conclude that the remaining part of the commentary is by another hand than that which furnished the preceding. And the difference in style of the text itself no less justifies us in believing that the section was not an original part of our treatise, but is a later appendage to it. Whether or not it takes the place of another similar body of rules in the original *Prātiçākhyā*, and was substituted for them as being a fuller and more satisfactory exhibition of the subject, it would not become us to attempt to say too confidently: the near agreement of the preceding chapters in respect to extent (each containing not much more than a hundred rules) would favor the supposition that it had been tacked on as new matter to the treatise, carrying with it a new division of the preceding rules of the chapter into three instead of four sections: the subject of *krama* may have been formerly disposed of in a few brief rules forming part of the last section: but our *Prātiçākhyā* has in too many of its previous rules made allusion to or implication of the *krama*-text (sometimes even naming it and contemplating it alone), to allow our assuming with plausibility that the construction of that text was not from the beginning one of the subjects with which the treatise dealt.

The *krama* is not treated by the *Tāitt. Pr.*; it is disposed of by the *Vāj. Pr.* in the closing rules of the final section of its fourth chapter (iv. 179-194), not occupying a whole section. In the *Rik Pr.* it takes up two chapters, the tenth and eleventh, each of which is by itself a complete *krama* treatise; the former giving (in fourteen verses) a concise exhibition of the subject, the latter (in thirty-seven verses) setting it forth with much greater fullness of detail. It is also the exclusive theme of the *Upalekha*, of unknown date and authorship, to which reference has already been made (see note to rule 74, above). The corresponding rules of all these authorities will be cited or referred to in connection with those of our own text.

वेदाध्ययनं धर्मः ॥ १०१ ॥

101. Study of the Veda is duty.

In the comment we read three times, instead of the full form of the rule, *vedā dharmah* (or *dhurmam*) simply; but doubtless by a copyist's omission. The commentator adds to the rule the more detailed state-

ment *karmaçeshabhûtât : vedâ[dyayanam] dharmam âhur yâjñikâh*—because sacrifices are performed by means of the Veda, and sacrifice is obligatory. He makes reference to a couple of verses or sayings which inculcate the necessity or advantage of sacrifice, thus: *svargakâmo aghâyâtâm ity onena mantreṇa çatâudanâstakhyam [çatâudanâkhyam?] karma kṛtvâ svargam sâdhayed iti yâjñikâmnânam*. He then anticipates and explains rule 104, below, concluding *na vinâ vedâir yajñas tâyate*, ‘sacrifice is not performed without the Vedas;’ and he winds up his exposition with *vedâdhyayanam dharmâ ity âdisûtram*, ‘this is the first rule.’

### प्रेत्य ज्योतिष्ट्वं कामयमानस्य ॥ १०२ ॥

102. On the part of one desiring a condition of light after death.

*Pretya*, literally ‘having gone forward, having departed, deceased,’ is by the commentator, with many words, explained to mean ‘having quitted this world and gone on to another.’ Upon *jyotishtvam* he discourses as follows: *jyotirbhâvo jyotishtvam : uktaṁ hi : ye vâ iha yajñâir ârdhuvaṁś teshâm etâni jyotishî yâny amûni nakshatrâni ’ti : jyotir dîptibhâvam ity arthântaram*. The next rule he introduces by the question, “is it merely the reading that is duty? the answer is, no: how is it then?”

### याज्ञिकैर्यासनामनात् ॥ १०३ ॥

103. In the manner as handed down by those who understand the sacrifice.

A *yâjñika* is defined as ‘one who studies or understands the sacrifice’ (*yajñam adhîte yajñam vidur vâ*). Not merely the study of the Veda, but its study according to the traditional methods of those versed in sacred things, is declared meritorious. *Amnâna* is defined by *pathana*, ‘reading,’ and the commentator continues: “and how do the *yâjñikas* read? ‘with the verse *svargakâmo aghâyâtâm* [already referred to, under the first rule of this section] one must secure paradise:’ but it is objected ‘that is an act of sacrifice, not a study of the Veda: hence merit is acquired by sacrifice, not by the study of the Veda:’ this, however, is not so”—as the rule which is next to be given is intended to show.

### यज्ञततिर्न पृथग्वेदेभ्यः ॥ १०४ ॥

104. There is no performance of the sacrifice without the Vedas.

Hence, as the Vedas are an indispensable aid to the performance of that in which duty consists, the declaration that their study is a duty is one to which no objection can be made (*iti niravadyam vedâdhyayanam dharmâ ity*).

## यज्ञे पुनर्लौकाः प्रतिष्ठिताः ॥ १०५ ॥

105. In the sacrifice, again, the worlds are established.

I add the whole argument by which the commentator proves this pious proposition: *dyāur riyad avanis trayo lokā yajñe pratishṭhitāḥ: katham: nirvāpādisonṣkṛtām havir aṅguṣṭhāparvamātreṇa cakayā 'vat-tam antar nidhanasvāhākarṇa agnāu kutām jyotirdhūmabhāvena pari-natām jyotirbhāvena dyāulokām dhūmabhāvenā 'ntarikṣam punar vṛ-ṣhti-bhāvena parinataṁ pṛthivīm yāti: evaṁ yajñe lokāḥ pratishṭhitāḥ.* The properly prepared sacrifice, duly offered in the fire, becomes light and smoke: the light goes to the sky, the smoke to the atmosphere, and, becoming rain, returns again to the earth: thus it reaches all the three worlds—and, if one chooses to look upon it in that light, establishes and supports them all.

## पञ्चजना लोकेषु ॥ १०६ ॥

106. As are the five races in the worlds.

The five races, the commentator says, are men: they are established in the worlds, the worlds in the sacrifice, the sacrifice in the Veda, and the Vedas are *dharmageśhabhūtāḥ: dharmādāvatamatidāṅgat karmaṇi geśhatām ca gachanti:* which last sentence is corrupt and obscure. From this, he goes on to point out the necessity of the study of the *pada*-text, and, as a help to it, of the *Prātiçākhyā*, anticipating the rule which is next to follow: "the connection and distinction<sup>1</sup> of the appellation (*abhidhāna*) and the subject of appellation (*abhidheya*) is not, without the study of the *pada*-text; the recognition of the terminations is not assured, without the study of the *pada*-text: hence, in order to an understanding of the *mantra*, its *pada*-text (*padāni*) must be studied; and, by one who studies the *pada*, the *Prātiçākhyā* must necessarily be studied, in order to the resolution of doubts (*avaçyam saṁçoyachedāya prātiçākhyam adhyeyam*): and the uses of the study of the *pada* are farther set forth in the following rule."

## पदाध्ययनमन्तादिशब्दस्वरार्थज्ञानार्थम् ॥ १०७ ॥

107. The study of the *pada*-text is for the sake of gaining knowledge of the endings, the beginnings, and the proper forms of words, and of their accent and meaning.

The commentator explains and illustrates this rule at considerable length, and by means of examples which are for the most part taken from our present Atharvan text. First, as he says, we are told that a rinsing of the mouth with water (*udakācamanam*) is prescribed to be accompanied by the *pādas* of the verse *çam no devī (çam no devyāḥ pā-dāḥ:* the verse is found at i. 6. 1); and here, without study of the *pada*, one fails to know that the first *pāda* ends with *e* (*abhishtaye:* in *sankhā,*

<sup>1</sup> 1—MS. *sāmbadhāu antanaṁ ca.*

it is *abhishhtaya*). The next following example is intended to illustrate the difficulty, without the *pada*-text, of finding upon occasion the right beginning of a word: it reads *ṛtubhyas tvâ yoja ity ârtavebhyas tvâ yoja ity atrâ "kârâdi na tu jñâyate*. The reference here is to iii. 10. 10, *ṛtubhyas tvâ "rtavebhyah . . . yaje*; eight separate recipients of offering are enumerated in the verse, and it seems intended that, in liturgical use, *tvâ yaje*, which the verse gives once for all, should be appended to each separately; this is intimated, though obscurely, by a prefixed direction: *ashtakâyâm : ṛtubhyas tve 'ti<sup>1</sup> vighraham ashtâu*. Again, "without study of the *pada*, the Vedic forms of words (*vâidikâh çabdâh*) are not known: as for instance, *açvavatiṁ strâisûyam*,<sup>2</sup> etc.; in *sanhitâ* they have different forms, viz. *açvâvotim* (xviii. 2. 31), *strâishûyam*<sup>2</sup> (vi. 11. 3): therefore the *pada*-text must be studied (*adhyeyâni padâni*)." The next point made is the necessity of *pada* study to the understanding and right application of the rules respecting accentuation: "the *brahmajajña* etc. (? *brahmajajñânâdi*) are directed to be made with the employment of the three accents (*trâisvaryeṇa*): here one who does not study the *pada* is unpractised (*apravinah*) as regards the words: here, in the passages *brahmâudanam pacati* (xi. 1. 1) etc., one is to speak not with the accents, but with monotone, at the pitch of acute (? *tatra brahmâudanam pacati 'tyevamâdishu 'dâttoçrutya ekaçrutya tâ na svareṇa adhîyita*): now beware lest there appear here the fault of a *mantra* deprived of [its proper] accent. In the Atharvan rites, excepting the *yâga*, in the tyings on of an anulet, etc., in the performance of the sacrifice (? *yajñavehe*), the employment of the *mantras* is taught to be made with the use of the three accents." Finally, the assertion that study of the *pada* is necessary in order to the comprehension of the meaning of the text is supported with much fullness of illustration: as instances are cited *vi hara* (v. 20. 9: this, however, may be no citation, but part of the exposition), *alasâlâ 'si* (vi. 16. 4: we could wish that the *pada* actually taught us more about this obscure verse), *yavân ne 'd adân* (vi. 50. 1), *ûñ iti* (passim), *sam v âsnâ 'ha âsyam* (vi. 56. 3), *tad v asya retah* (ix. 4. 4); and farther, with special reference to the element of accent, *yé asmâ kañ tanvâm* (ii. 31. 5), and *svâdv admî 'ti* (v. 18. 7): and the conclusion is "here, and in other instances, one who does not study the *pada* would spoil the *sanhitâ*; hence, for these reasons, the *pada* must be studied." I add the whole text, which in places is corrupt and obscure, and of which the value is too small to make an elaborate attempt at restoration necessary or advisable: *mantrârthas ca padâdhyayanâd vinâ na jñâyate: vâkyam hi padaço vibhaktam anuvyanakti: tac ca padâdhyâyî sandhim ca pade chedam tu çakruyâd vibhaktam: vi hara: alasâlâ 'si: yavân ne 'd adân: ûñ iti: sam v âsnâ 'ha âsyam: tad v asya retah: ityevamâdishu sanhitâyâm ca bhavati: rya-jati 'ty atra sanhitikah sa pra kuryât: tathâ udâtasvaritodayena vighâtam ojanan: ye asmâkañ tanvam: anyatrâ 'pi nihanyeta: svâdv admî 'ti: atra ca svaritam kuryât: tathâ udâtântasya pûrvopadasyâ 'nudâtâdâv uttarapade tat tasyâ 'ntasthâpattâu svaritam akshamnarthe janasyarthe 'ty anyatrâ 'pi tat kuryât: evam âdy anyatrâ 'py apadâdhyâyî sanhitâm vinôçayet: tasmâd ebhih kâraṇair avaçyâdhyeyâni: kim ca:*

<sup>1</sup> MS. *ṛtumabhyastyeti*.<sup>2</sup> MS., both times, *trâisûyam*.

## क्रमाध्ययनं संहितापददार्ढ्यायम् ॥ १०८ ॥

108. The study of the *krama* has for its object the fixation of both *sanhitā* and *pada*.

The true reading of this rule is a matter of some doubt. Prefixed to the commentator's exposition, the manuscript gives simply *sanhitā-dārḍhyārtham*, and the commencement of the comment implies or requires no more than that: it might seem, then, that we had here only an addition to the last rule, "the study of *pada* is in order to the fixation of *sanhitā*." But this would be a lame conclusion to the argument of this part of the section, which must be intended finally to bring out the importance of the *krama*-text. And as the exposition closes with pretty clearly assuming as the full form of the rule under treatment that which is presented above, and as the prefixed text of the whole section so far favors the latter as to read *sanhitāpadadārḍhyārtham*, I think there can be little question that it is to be received as here given.

The *pada*, the commentator tells us, must be studied for the sake of the establishment of the *sanhitā*. He defines *dārḍhya* by *drḍhasya bhāṣā*, and cites the rule of Pāṇini which teaches its formation (*varṇadrḍhādibhyaḥ shyāñ ca*,<sup>1</sup> Pāṇ. v. 1. 123). He goes on: "when here, in the *sanhitā*, a doubt arises, the student of the *pada* will give a solution of the doubt. Then what need of a study of the *krama*? On this point, it says: 'the study of the *krama* has for its object the fixation of both *sanhitā* and *pada*.'" What follows is corrupt, and only in part intelligible: *sanhitā ca svasamāhā ca bhavati: yavāmuni ekypada-dvipadāc ca pragṛhyāvogṛhyasamāteḥapanodanam*. Finally, he introduces the next rule by saying *idaṁ ca 'param kāraṇam kramādhyayanasya*, 'and here follows another reason for the study of *krama*.'

## स्वरोपजनश्चादृष्टः पदेषु संहितायां च ॥ १०९ ॥

109. And the origination of accent is not seen in *pada* or in *sanhitā*.

That is to say—as we are doubtless to understand it—in the *pada* we have before us only the accent of the uncombined elements; in the *sanhitā*, only that of the combined phrase: how the one grows out of the other is shown by the *krama*, which gives everything in both its separate and combined state. The commentator defines *upajma* by *utpatti*, and declares it unperceived in *pada* (*padakāle*), while it actually takes place in *krama* (*kramakāle*). As an illustration, he takes *svādv'admī'ṭi* (v. 18. 7): here, in *pada*, we have an oxytone and an unaccented syllable, which form a circumflex, while in the *sanhitā* the circumflex farther suffers depression (*nighāta*, the *vikampita* of our rule iii. 65, above), and the circumflex itself only appears in *krama* (in *svādv'admī*, where the cause of depression of the *svarita* is not present): hence, he concludes, the *krama* ought to be studied. He adds: "now comes the description: of what sort, it is asked, is this *krama*:" the following rules of the section will answer.

<sup>1</sup> MS. *varṇadrḍhādītāt: dhyañ:*

द्वे पदे क्रमपदम् ॥११०॥

110. Two words form a *krama*-word.

The commentator is very brief upon this rule: he says "the study of *krama* being now assured (*prasiddha*), two combined words form a single *krama*-word; their combination will be taught hereafter [in rule 122], where it says 'according to the rules' (*yathāçāstram*)."

The corresponding rules of the other treatises are Vāj. Pr. iv. 180, Rik Pr. x. 1 (r. 2) and xi. 1 (r. 1), and Up. i. 14. With the exception of the latter, they are more comprehensive than ours, including something of what here is made the subject of following rules. The precept of the Vāj. Pr. covers our rules 110-113.

तस्यान्तेन परस्य प्रसंधानम् ॥१११॥

111. With the final of this is made farther combination of the following word.

The term *antena* is explained by *avasānena*, 'close, end:' we might have rather expected the reading *antyaena*, 'with the last word of each *krama*-word as already defined.' To *parasya* is supplied *padasya*, in the comment, as in the translation. The commentator takes the trouble to tell us that to the end of this following word is then to be farther appended its successor, and so on, so that one constructs the *krama* by thus successively combining the words of the text by twos. Were this rule not given, he says, the former one might be erroneously understood as prescribing that we should form our *krama*-words by taking first the first and second words of a verse, then the third and fourth, then the fifth and sixth, and so on; while this shows us that we are to take the first and second, then the second and third, then the third and fourth, and so on. We may take, as an illustration, the last line of the first hymn of the Atharvan (i. 1. 4 c, d), in constructing the *krama*-text of which only this simple and fundamental rule would come into action: it would read *sañ grutena : grutena gamemahi : gamemahi mā : mā grutena : grutena vi : vi rādhishi : rādhishi 'li rādhishi* (by iv. 117).

The Vāj. Pr. and Rik Pr. combine this rule with the preceding: the Upalekha (i. 15) states it separately, and in a distinct manner than our treatise: *tayor uttareṇo 'ttarañ padañ sañdadhyaát*.

नान्तगतं परिण ॥११२॥

112. A last word is not combined with its successor.

By *antagatam*, literally 'a word gone to, or standing at, the end,' is meant, in verse, the closing word of a half-stanza, or one preceding a pause: in a prose passage, it doubtless indicates a word preceding one of the pauses of interpunction by which a numbered passage, or verse, is divided into parts. A pause, which interrupts the ordinary combinations of *sandhi*, interrupts those of *krama* also: there is no need that the *krama*-text should exhibit the euphonic connection of words which



in *sanhitā* do not euphonicaly influence one another. The rule, as the commentator tells us, is intended to restrict the too great extension (*atiprasaktam*) of the one which precedes it. That the final word, thus left uncombined, suffers *parihāra*, or repetition, is taught in rule 117.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Vāj. Pr. iv. 180, Rik Pr. x. 8 (r. 9), 11 (r. 18), and xi. 21 (r. 44), and Up. i. 16.

### त्रीणि पदान्यपृक्तमध्यानि ॥ ११३ ॥

113. Three words form a *krama*-word, if the middle one of them is a pure vowel.

The term *apṛkta* we have met with before (i. 72, 79), as used to designate a word composed of a single vowel or diphthong, unconnected with any consonant: the commentator, after exposition of its meaning, paraphrases it by *avyañjanamiçraçuddhakevalasvaraḥ*, 'a pure and entire vowel, unmixed with consonants.' He cites, as an instance, *dhiyā : ā : ihi* (ii. 5. 4): here the *krama* reading is not *dhiyā " : e 'hi*, but *dhiye " 'hi*: to which, by rule 115, would follow again *e 'hi*, and then, by the present and other rules, *ihy ā naḥ : ā naḥ : na iti naḥ*. The only *apṛkta* words which the text contains are the preposition *ā*, the particle *u* (p. *ūñ iti*: see i. 72, 73), and their combination *o* (p. *o iti*: see i. 79). It is doubtless to point out and call attention to this mode of treatment of the *ā* in the *krama*-text, that our Atharvan *pada* manuscripts quite frequently write a figure 3 after the word which follows it: thus, in the instance cited, the manuscript gives *dhiyā : ā : ihi : 3*, at i. 1. 2, *punaḥ : ā : ihi : 3*, etc.\*

All the *krama*-systems have this feature: compare Vāj. Pr. iv. 180, 181 (which calls such a *krama*-word, composed of three members, a *trikrama*). Rik Pr. x. 2 (r. 3), xi. 2 (r. 3), and Up. i. 17. The two latter authorities, however, except the compound *o*, and would have it treated like any ordinary word. The Vāj. Pr. is obliged to note (iv. 183), as farther instances of *trikramas*, *mo shu naḥ* and *obhi shu naḥ*, where, if the *krama* were performed in the usual way, the *sanhitā* reading of lingual *n* in *naḥ* would not be capable of exhibition; and like reasons compel it (iv. 184) to establish, in a few cases, *krama*-words of four constituents, as *ūrdhva ū shu naḥ*. The Rik systems, also, are not a little complicated by the necessity of attending to such special cases occurring in their text, and which once cause a *krama*-word to contain even five members. The fact that such complicated cases of *sandhi* do not happen to be met with in the Atharva-Veda saves our treatise the like trouble.

### एकादेशस्वरसंधिदीर्घविनामाः प्रयोजनम् ॥ ११४ ॥

114. The grounds of this are the fusion of vowels into a single sound, the combination of vowels, prolongation, and linguization.

\* The addition of the figure is usual, but not invariable, in the first books of the text; later, it is only made here and there. The figure is never inserted after *u*.

The longer of the two *krama*-treatises incorporated into the text of the Rik Prātiçākhyā is the only other authority which gives any reason why *apṛkta* words should not be independently reckoned in constructing the *krama*-text. It says (R. Pr. xi. 2, r. 3) that the omission takes place "for fear of nasalization;" that is, lest the particle should, if suffered to stand at the end of a *krama*-word, receive a nasal pronunciation. The entire disagreement of the two explanations offered is noteworthy, and may be taken as an indication that neither is authoritative, and as a permission to us to find a better one, if we are able. It seems to me more likely that the weakness of the vowel-words *á* and *u*, unsupported by consonants, and their liability to disappear in or become obscured by the final of the word which precedes them, as if they were mere modifications of its termination, was the cause of their exceptional treatment. A similar suggestion has already been made (see under i. 73) as to the way in which the *pada*-text deals with *u*. The commentator's exposition of the rule is elaborate, but deficient in point. To illustrate the item *ekādeça*, 'vowel-fusion, substitution of one vowel-sound for two or more others,' he takes *dhiyó : á : ihi* (ii. 5. 4): here, he says, by the operation of the rule *samínáksharasya* (iii. 42), *dhiyá* and *á* become *dhiyá*: the *á* of the latter, combined with the *i* of *ihi*, becomes *e*, and the result is the one word *dhiyehi*: *ergo*, this is the way the combination must be made, otherwise there would be no *krama*-word (*tasmád ity anena sañdhánena bhavitavyam : anyathá kramapadam eva na syát*). The conclusion appears to me an evident *non-sequitur*, a mere restatement of the original proposition. For the second item, he selects the example *ihí : á : nah* (ii. 5. 4): here, if we compound *ihy á* and *á nah*, a vowel-combination (*svarasandhih*) is made of the *i*, by the rule *svare námīno 'ntahsthá* (iii. 39). How this vowel-combination furnishes a ground for the *krama*-word *ihy á nah*, he does not attempt to point out. For the third and fourth items, the chosen instance is *idam : áñ ití : su* (i. 24. 4). This, too, is to be regarded as (in *krama*) forming a single word. The following text is corrupt, and I subjoin it, instead of attempting a restoration and translation: *tasyá ca na sañdhīh : tathá hí : idamúshvódishv asañhítīkam dirghatvam : carcá 'sya tripadasya madhya-bhāvád ishgate : idamúshv ity evañbhutasyái 'va rūpákhyátáyám avasyám tripadam vañçakramena na bhavatilavyam : atrái 'vá 'padatvam : tad api tripadamadhyóvayavam*. The prolongation of the *u* in this and similar cases would indeed seem to furnish a reason for the construction of the *krama*-word out of three members, since the long vowel could not properly appear if the particle were made the final of one such word and the beginning of another; but I am unable to see how the lingualization of the sibilant should have any effect in the same direction, since there would be no difficulty in reading *u shu* as a *krama*-word, if the *u* were treated in the ordinary manner.

आकारौकारादि पुनः ॥ ११५ ॥

115. *Ā* and *o* are made to begin a word again.

That is to say, after *á* and *o* have been included, as middle members, in a triple *krama*-word, they are again taken as initials of the word next

following. The commentator's examples are *gopāyatā* " 'smākam : ā 'smākam (xii. 3. 55 etc.), *dhiye* " 'hi : e 'hi (ii. 5. 4), and *havir o shu : o shu : o ity o* (vii. 72. 2).

The same usage, as concerns *ā*, is taught also by the other treatises : compare Vāj. Pr. iv. 182, Rik Pr. x. 8 (r. 11) and xi. 18 (r. 34), Up. iv. 13.

उकारः परिहार्य एव ॥ ११६ ॥

116. *U* is merely to be repeated.

The mode of repetition of the particle is taught in the next rule but one. This rule is, as the commentator explains it, intended to forbid the combination of *u* (like *ū* and *o*) with the next following word to form a new *krama*-word (*anyayoganivṛttyarthah*). As an example, he gives us *sa u sūryaḥ : ūñ ity ūñ iti* (xiii. 4. 5).

प्रगृह्यावगृह्यसमापाद्यान्तगतानां द्विर्वचनं परिहार  
इतिमध्ये ॥ ११७ ॥

117. Repetition with *iti* interposed, or *parihāra*, is to be made of *pragrhyas*, of words admitting separation by *avagraha*, of those requiring restoration to the natural form, and of those standing before a pause.

The commentator simply expounds this rule, without bringing up any instances to illustrate it. The kinds of words specified are to be repeated, or spoken twice, in the *krama*-text (*kramakāle*), the name of the double utterance being *parihāra* : and this *parihāra* is to be made with interposition of *iti* : having performed one of the two utterances, one is to say *iti*, and then repeat the word.

The mode of repetition is, as has already been noticed (under iv. 74), called in the Rik Pr. by the related name *parigraha* (e. g. R. Pr. iii. 14). The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 187) styles it *sthitopasthita*, which title is also known to and defined by the Rik Pr. (x. 9 and xi. 15). The Up. (iv. 12) knows only *parigraha*. The forms to be repeated are, according to the doctrine of the Vāj. Pr. (iv. 187-193), a divisible word (*avagrhya*), one in the interior of which appears a prolongation or a lingualization, a *pragrhya*, a *riphita* of which the *r* does not appear in *sanhitā*, and a word preceding a pause (*avasāna*). The first and the last three of these classes are, indeed, treated in the same manner by all the other authorities (compare R. Pr. x. 6-8, r. 7-9, and xi. 13-14, r. 25 ; Up. iv. 4-11) ; but, as regards the words which in *sanhitā* undergo an abnormal alteration of form, there is a less perfect agreement among them. The Rik Pr. and Up. specify as requiring repetition in *krama* (besides sundry special and anomalous cases), words having their initial vowel prolonged, and those in the interior of which there is a change not brought about by external influences—that is to say, due to euphonic causes within the word itself. Whether the Vāj. Pr. includes among the repeatable words those having a prolonged initial, or whether any cases of this kind occur in the text to which it belongs, I do not

know. Our own *krama*-system, it will be noticed, while in one respect more chary of the repetition than the others, in that it repeats no *riphita* words, in another respect is vastly more liberal of its use, applying it in the case of every word which requires restoration from an abnormal to a normal form, according to the rules given in the preceding section of this chapter. There is no limitation made, either by the text or by the commentary, of the term *sumāpādyā*; so far as I can see, every word in the text which undergoes in *sanhitā* any of the changes detailed in rule 74, above, must suffer *parihāra*. The Atharvan *krama* is thus made a more complete and elaborate index of the euphonic irregularities occurring in its text than is that of either of the other Vedas.

By way of introduction to the following rule, our commentator says, at the close of his exposition, that the words mentioned in this precept have their repetition made with a single *iti*: we are next to be told that in the repetition of the particle *u* two are required.

### द्वाभ्यामुकारः ॥ ११८ ॥

118. The particle *u* requires two *iti*'s.

That is to say, when *u* is repeated, each occurrence of the word is followed by *iti*, and we have *ûñ ity ûñ iti*. None of the other treatises supports this reading: all would prescribe simply *ûñ ity ûñ*.

### अनुनासिकदीर्घत्वं प्रयोजनम् ॥ ११९ ॥

119. The reason of this is its nasalization and protraction.

The commentator explains as follows: "the nasalization of this particle *u* when followed by *iti* is taught by the rule *ukārasye 'tāv aprkta-sya* [i. 72]; if, then, it should not be distinguished by (*ādriyeta*) a second *iti*, it would be deprived of its nasal quality—as also of its protraction [since this also, by i. 73, is prescribed only before *iti*]. Therefore, considering its prescribed nasality and protraction, *u* must always be repeated with a double *iti*."

### प्लुतश्चाप्लुतवत् ॥ १२० ॥

120. A protracted vowel is, in repetition, to be treated as if unprotracted.

The commentator's exposition is: *plutaç cā 'plutavac ca parihartavyaḥ*: *aplutena tulyatām prāvahitavyaḥ*: *parihārakāle*: *purushaḥ*: *á*: *babhúvāñ*3: *atra á ity akārah plutaḥ*: *sa aplutavatā parihartavyaḥ*: *á babhúvāñ*3 *iti babhúve 'ti vaktavyam*; 'a protracted vowel is to be repeated as if it were unprotracted; i. e., it is to be reduced, in *parihāra*, to equivalence with an unprotracted vowel: thus, in the passage *purushaḥ*: *á*: *babhúvāñ*3 (x. 2. 28), the *á* is a protracted *a*: it must be repeated along with [or, in the form of] an unprotracted *a*; we must read *á babhúvāñ*3 *iti babhúve 'ti*. The reading of the manuscript is unfortunately corrupt at the end, where the required *krama*-form is to be given: the scope and intent of the rule will be examined under the one next

following, which also concerns only the passage here cited by the commentator.

अनुनासिकः पूर्वश्च शुद्धः ॥ १२१ ॥

121. And a nasal vowel, in its first occurrence, is to be made pure.

I again add the whole comment: *yaḥ pūrvam anunāsiko dṛśtaḥ sa parihārakāle śuddham kṛtvā parihartavyaḥ: etad evo 'dāharaṇam: atrāi 'va puruṣa ā babhūvāñ3 ity avasāne: iti: avasāne ā iti pūrvam anunāsiko dṛśtaḥ śuddhaḥ parihartavyaḥ: babhūve 'ti babhūvāñ;* 'the vowel first seen as nasal is, in *parihāra*, to be repeated pure [i. e. free from nasality]: the instance is the one already given: here, the vowel first appearing as nasal before the pause—by the rule *puruṣa ā babhūvāñ ity avasāne* (i. 70)—is to be repeated pure: thus, *babhūve 'ti babhūvāñ.*' The most obvious and natural understanding of this would be that the nasalization is only to be retained in the first utterance of the word, and that in *parihāra*, by this and the preceding rules, both protraction and nasality should be lost altogether; so that the *krama* would read *ā babhūvāñ3: babhūve 'ti babhūva.* But the rules in the first chapter to which the commentator refers expressly require the nasality to be retained before a pause, and forbid the protraction only before *iti*, so that they would appear to teach *babhūve 'ti babhūvāñ3;* which, as we see, is the actual reading of the commentator under this rule, while, under the preceding, the reading is too corrupt for us to understand what he intends to give us. The best manner, as it appears to me, of reconciling these apparent discrepancies is to take *pūrvāḥ* in the present rule as belonging with the predicate instead of the subject, and as indicating the former of the two occurrences of the repeated word in *parihāra*, thus making the translation such as it is given above; and farther, assuming the same thing to be implied also in rule 120, the repetition, or *parihāra*, there referred to, being, in a restricted sense, the occurrence of the word before *iti*: the *Upalekha* employs *parigraha*, in part, in the same sense.\* It may be, however, that we ought to confess a discordance between the teachings of our treatise here and in the first chapter, and to understand the *krama* reading here prescribed to be *babhūve 'ti babhūva*—or, if *pūrvāḥ* be interpreted in the manner proposed, *babhūve 'ti babhūvoñ.* A like case occurring in the *Rig-Veda* (x. 146. 1) is, according to the *Upalekha* (vii. 9, 10: the *Rik Pr.* seems to take no notice of it), to be treated in the manner laid down in our first chapter: *vindatiñ3*, for *vindati*, is in *krama* to be read *vindati 'ti vindatiñ3.* What is the doctrine of the *Vāj. Pr.* in a similar instance has been mentioned in the note to i. 97.

वयाशास्त्रं प्रसंधानम् ॥ १२२ ॥

122. The successive combination of words into *krama*-words is to be made according to the general rules of combination.

\* See Pertsch's preliminary note to chapter v.

The commentator expounds this rule in a clear and pertinent manner. He says: "it has been said in a former rule [iv. 111], 'with the final of this is made farther combination of the following word:' there, however, the method of combination is not taught (*saṁdhānavidhānam no 'ktam*): wherefore the present rule is here added. The term *yathā-çāstram* means 'according to the several rules (*yad yat chāstram*):' whatever mode of combination of separate words is taught in the *pada-çāstra* (*yad yat padaçāstre padānām saṁdhānalakṣhaṇam uktam*), that has force also here in the formation of each single *krama*-word. This is expressly stated, in order to guard against the danger of understanding a *krama*-word to be composed of disconnected vocables (! *kramapadatvād anyaçabdaçāṅkayo 'cyate*): this must not be the case."

The Vāj. Pr. has no precept corresponding to this, evidently regarding it as clearly enough implied in the general direction that two words "are to be combined" (*saṁ dadhāti*: iv. 180) to form a *krama*-word. It is, however, distinctly laid down by the other treatises (R. Pr. x. 5, r. 6, and xi. 21, r. 44; Ūp. iii. 3-5).

प्रगृह्यावगृह्यचर्चायां क्रमवदुत्तरस्मिन्नवग्रहः ॥ १२३ ॥

123. The *pada*-repetition of a divisible *pragrhyā* is to be made in the manner of that of *krama*, with separation by *avagraha* in the latter recurrence of the word.

The commentator begins with explaining *pragrhyāvagrhyā* to be a determinative and not a copulative compound (*yasminn avagrhyatvam [pragrhyatvam ca] ekasminn eva yugapad bhavati*), and goes on as follows: "such a word, in its *pada*-repetition (*carcāyām*), is to be treated as in *krama*: *carcā* means twofold utterance (*divivacanam*): that takes place in the *pada*-text (*padakāle*) just as in the *krama*-text (*kramakāle*); that is, one repeats (*pariharet*) the form of the *krama*-text. In *krama*, both *pragrhyas* and divisibles suffer repetition; in *pada* (*padeshu*), on the other hand, only a divisible *pragrhyā* is repeated. In such a repetition, how is separation by *avagraha* made? The rule says, 'with separation by *avagraha* in the latter recurrence of the word:' that is, the latter or second recurrence of the word is to receive *avagraha*, and not the first: for example, *virūpe iti vi-rūpe* (x. 7. 6, 42)."

The usage of both our Atharvan *pada*-text and that of the other Vedas in regard to *carcā*, or repetition, has been fully set forth in the note to iv. 74, above, as also the doubt which may reasonably be entertained whether the usage here taught, and followed in the extant manuscripts, is that which the rules of the preceding section contemplate.

The prescription in this rule, and in this alone, of the employment of *avagraha* in separating the constituents of a compound word when it appears for the second time in the repetition, after *iti*, seems necessarily to imply that, in the repetitions of *krama*, separation by *avagraha* is not to be made at all, either before or after *iti*, but that we are to read, for instance (i. 1. 1), *ye trishaptāḥ : trishaptāḥ pariyaṅti : trisaptā itī trisaptāḥ : pariyaṅti viçvā : pariyaṅti 'ti pariyaṅti*, etc. To regard the specification *uttarasminn avagrahaḥ* of our rule as in such manner re-

rospective as to reflect its prescriptive force, through *kramavat*, back into the rule for *krama*-repetition, or *parigraha*—understanding the meaning to be, ‘in *pada*-repetitions, the second recurrence of the repeated word is to suffer division by *avagraha*: as is to be the case also in *krama*-repetitions’—would be, I should think, much too violent. Nevertheless, the Rik Pr. (x. 10, r. 16, and xi. 16, r. 31) and Upalekha (iv. 3) distinctly teach that the *avagraha* is to be used in the repetition of compound words, after *iti*. I cannot find that the Vāj. Pr. prescribes the separation either in *pada* or in *krama*, although it is regularly made by the commentator on that treatise in the examples which he cites, and Weber passes it over without remark.

### समायाद्यानामन्ते संहितावद्वचनम् ॥ १२४ ॥

124. Words requiring restoration, if occurring before a pause, are to be spoken in their *sanhitā* form.

The three last rules of the section and of the treatise concern the treatment of such words as, while they stand at the end of a half-verse, or in any other situation before a pause, also exhibit in *sanhitā* some abnormal peculiarity of orthoepy which, by the rules of the preceding section, requires restoration to the natural form. A word of this class, instead of being combined with its predecessor into a *krama*-word, and then repeated, is, before its repetition, to be spoken once more in *sanhitā* form. The commentator takes the example *sā vṛkshāñ abhi sishyade* (v. 5. 9: p. *sisyade*, by iv. 82), and, without writing it out in full in the *krama* form, says that we must utter *sishyade* again, and then repeat it, *sisyada iti sisyade*. He adds: “so also may be brought forward as instances (*udāhāryāḥ*) *praṇītaye* (vi. 23. 2: p. *pra-ṇītaye*) and all other like words, having the cause of alteration within their own limits.” This last restriction, as we shall see, he insists upon more distinctly under the next following rule.

This special point is left untouched in all the other *krama*-treatises.

### तस्य पुनरास्थापितं नाम ॥ १२५ ॥

125. Of this, furthermore, the name is *āsthāpita*.

Weber (p. 283) regards *punaḥ* here as a part of the title, which he understands to be *punarāsthāpita*. This would not be in itself unlikely, but it is not favored by the commentator, who, both here and under the following rule, treats *āsthāpita* alone as the term designating the word to which the rule relates. He omits *punaḥ* altogether, in his paraphrase of the present rule, as being superfluous: *tasya sanhitāvad vacanasya: āsthāpitam ity evaṃ samjñā bhavati*. He then goes on to state more at large the restriction hinted at under the last rule: namely, that a word which is *samāpādyā*, or liable to restoration, as being altered at its commencement by the influence of the preceding word, is not to be treated in the manner prescribed by these rules: “that is to say, where cause and effect (*nimittanāmittike*) are in one word; for instance, *sishyade*: here the conversion into *sha* produced by the reduplication

holds over, owing to the fact that the reduplication and the altered sibilant are in the same word. But this is not the case in the passage *striyâm anu shicyate* (vi. 11. 2), [or, in *pada* form] *tat : striyâm : anu : sicyate*: here no repetition in the *sanhitâ* form takes place [or, the repetition does not take place in the *sanhitâ* form: *iti na sanhitâvad bhavati*]; and why? because cause and effect are declared to stand in two separate words: *anu* is a preposition; it produces conversion into *sh* by the rule *upasargât* etc. (ii. 90), and that conversion is heard (*çrutah*) in a separate word; here, then, let the process not be performed (? *tenâ-tramidibhûti*): for this reason is this explanation made." It might still seem doubtful, after all this lengthy exposition, whether such a word as *sicyate* was regarded by the commentator as not to be separately spoken at all, or as to be separately spoken, only not in *sanhitâ* form, as follows: *striyâm anu : anu shicyate : sicyate : sicyata iti sicyate*; but the latter interpretation seems to me the more probable.

### स एकपदः परिहार्यश्च ॥ १२६ ॥

126. That is a *krama*-word of a single member, and is also to be repeated.

The commentary upon this rule is not so clear as the rule itself seems to be, without comment or explanation: it reads as follows, with only the most obvious emendations: *parihartavyaç ca sa âsthitasañjñâpâ-drçah* [*âsthâpitasañjñâikapadoh*?]: *yo 'sâu sanhitâdvirvacanena nirâçyate: nimittanâimittikayor bhinnapadasthatvât: sa parihâryaç ca bhavati*. If the intent of this is to limit the application of the rule to those words whose cause of alteration is situated in a preceding independent word, it can hardly be accepted. What follows is still more corrupt and less intelligible: *sanhitâvad vidâci bahulam iti yaç chandast 'ii: varnâlopaçgamahrasvadîrghapluta âtmaneshâ paramâi vibhâshâ api yanti*.

Finally, to close up the commentary, two verses are given us, but so much mutilated that hardly more than their general sense (and even that only in part) is recognizable: *natakibudhyâ nacaçâstra drçhtyâ yathâmnânam anyathâ nai 'va kuryât: âmnâtam parishannasya çâstram drçhto vidhir vyatyayaç pûrvaçâstre: âmnâtavyam anâmnâtam prapâthe 'smin rkvâcatpadam: chandaso 'parimeyatvât parishannasya lakshanam: parishannasya lakshanam iti*.

The signature of the chapter and of the work has been already given in the introductory note, but may be repeated here: *iti çâunakiye caturâdhyâyike caturthah pâdah: caturâdhyâyîbhâshyam samâptam: çrîr astu: lekhaçapâthakayoh çubham bhavatu: çrîcandîkâyâi namaç: çrî-râmaç: samvat 1714 varshe jyâishthaçuddha 9 dine samâptulikkhitam pustakam*. I may also be permitted to add the propitiatory heading of the manuscript, which was, by an oversight, omitted to be given in its proper place: it reads *om namaç sarasvatyâi namaç: om namo brahmavedâya: athânîgirasaç*. The last word is, as I cannot doubt, a copyist's error for *atharvânîgirasaç*.



ADDITIONAL NOTES.

~~~~~

1. Analysis of the Work, and Comparison with the other Prātiśākhya.

So far as concerns the agreement or disagreement of the other Prātiśākhya with that of the Atharva-Veda in respect to the doctrines taught in the latter, the comparison has already been made in detail in the notes to the text. I have thought, however, that it would be advisable to append here a systematic view of the contents of our treatise, and a brief statement of the correspondences of the rest, in order to exhibit more clearly the sphere of the former, and to show how far those of the latter coincide with it, and how far they cover more or less ground than it occupies.

I. INTRODUCTORY AND EXPLANATORY.

Introductory, object of the treatise, i. 1, 2; definition of terms, i. 3, 42, 43, 48, 49, 92, iv. 73, 125; interpretation and application of rules, i. 95, iii. 38.

II. PHONETICS AND EUPHONY: PRODUCTION, CLASSIFICATION, PROPERTIES, AND COMBINATION OF SOUNDS.

1. *Simple sounds*: formation and classification of consonants, i. 10-13, 18-31; do. of vowels, i. 27, 32-41, 71; quantity of vowels and consonants, i. 59-62; accents, i. 14-17.

2. *Sounds in combination, and resulting modifications*: possible finals, i. 4-9, ii. 3; final vowels not liable to euphonic change (*pragrhya*), i. 73-81, iii. 33; syllable, i. 93; division of syllables, i. 55-58; quantity of syllables, i. 51-54:—kinds of independent circumflex accent, iii. 55-61, 65; kinds of enclitic do., iii. 62-64; evocation and modification of accents in words and sentences, iii. 67-74:—conjunction of consonants, i. 49, 50, 94, 98, ii. 20; *abhinidhāna*, i. 43-47; *yama*, i. 99, 104; *nāsikya*, i. 100, 104; *svarabhakti*, i. 101, 102, 104; *sphoṭana*, i. 103, 104, ii. 38; *karshaṇa*, ii. 39; euphonic duplication of consonants (*varṇakrama*), iii. 26-32.

III. CONSTRUCTION OF COMBINED TEXT, OR SANHITĀ.

Prolongation of initial, final, and medial vowels, iii. 1-25:—combination of final and initial vowels and diphthongs, iii. 39-54, ii. 21-24, i. 97; resulting accent, iii. 55, 56, 58, 65, 66; resulting nasality, i. 69; final vowels not liable to combination, iii. 38-36:—combinations of final and initial consonants: final non-nasal mutes, ii. 2-8, 13, 14, 38, 39; final nasals: ii. 9-12, 25, 26, 28, 30-37, iii. 37, i. 67; final semivowels, ii. 19, 21-24, iii. 20; final *visarjaniya*, ii. 21, 24, 40, 43-52, 54-59, 62-80; initial consonants, ii. 7, 15-18:—final nasal before a vowel, ii. 27, 29, i. 68, iii. 27; final *visarjaniya* before a vowel, ii. 41, 42, 44-53, 56:—lingualization of *t* and *th*, ii. 15, 16; do. of *n*, iii. 75-95; do. of *s*, ii. 81-107:—insertion of *s*, iii. 96.

IV. CONSTRUCTION OF KRAMA-TEXT.

Importance of *krama*-text, iv. 108, 109; its construction, iv. 110-122, 124-126, 74-100, i. 70, 97.

V. CONSTRUCTION OF DISJOINED, OR PADA-TEXT.

Importance of *pada*-text, iv. 107; combination or separation of verb and preposition, iv. 1-7; do. of suffixes, iv. 13-37, 46-48, 53, 65, 66; do. of compounds, iv. 8-12, 21, 22, 27, 28, 38-45, 49-64, 67-72; restoration of the original form of words, iv. 74-77, 79, 81-97, 99, 100; repetition in *pada*, iv. 123; special cases, i. 72, 73, 81, 82; enclitic accent in *pada*, iii. 68, 69, 72, 73.

VI. SUNDRIES, SPECIAL CASES, ETC.

Study of Veda recommended, iv. 101-109:—special irregularities of formation, i. 63-66, ii. 25, 60, 61, iii. 7, 43; special case of accent, i. 96; list of protracted vowels, i. 105; quantity of nasalized vowels in interior of word, i. 83-91.

In regard to the matters embraced in the first of the general divisions here laid down, it may be said that our treatise is much more curt and concise, and more ready to pass without notice what may be assumed as already known, than either of the others. Definitions of terms are far from numerous, and the whole department of *paribhāshā*, or explanation of modes of phraseology, of extent, bearing, and application of the rules, and the like, which in all the other Prātiçākhyas occupies considerable space, is here almost wholly wanting. This is in part owing to the simpler and less artificial mode of arrangement adopted in our work.

In the division of Phonetics and Euphony, the discordances among the different authorities affect chiefly matters of detail, and are not of a character to call for notice here. The other three treatises include or imply a list and enumeration of the sounds of the spoken alphabet, which is wanting in our own. All, also, after treating the subject of the formation of articulate sounds in the outset in a manner nearly accordng with that here followed, return to it in their later and less genuine chapters, and discuss it anew with a straining after greater theoretic profundity. The niceties of consonantal combination, as *abhīnidhāna* etc., make nearly the same figure in all the four: for minor differences, see the notes on the text. The Rik Pr., to its specification of possible finals (which is wanting only in the Tāitt. Pr.), adds that also of possible initials, and of compatible or conjoinable consonants (xii. 1-4).

Under the head of the conversion of *pada*-text into *sanhitā*, the authorities differ only on minor points, or by the treatment of special cases appertaining to the text with which each has to deal.

Thus far, the subjects treated are those which no Prātiçākhyā can pass over in silence: those which remain are not essential to the completeness of a work of this class, and are accordingly found altogether wanting in one or more of the treatises. Thus, the IVth general division, the construction of the *krama*-text, is not touched upon in the Tāitt. Pr., and the parts of our own and of the Rik Pr. which concern it are open to the suspicion of being later accretions to the text. The Vth division, the construction of the *pada*-text, receives still more scanty attention, being entirely passed over in the Tāitt. Pr. and represented in the Rik Pr. only by a few scattering rules relating to special cases, analogous with those found in the earlier chapters of the Ath. Pr.; only the Vāj. Pr. joining the latter in treating it at large, although in a less complete and elaborate manner.

A more detailed comparison will be necessary under the last head, that of miscellaneous and extra-limital additions to the body of the work, of matters more or less akin with its proper substance, and auxiliary to its object, yet omissible without detriment to its completeness as a Prātiçākhyā. As concerns the study of the Veda, the first subject mentioned in our analysis, the Rik Pr. offers a very interesting chapter (xv. 1-16) on the mode of instruction followed in the schools of Vedic study; the Vāj. Pr. recommends Vedic study (viii. 35-42), and tells (i. 20-26, viii. 32-34) who should pursue it, and under what circumstances. All the other treatises give explanations of single irregular and excep-

tional words and forms, of which the list will be more or less extended according as we include in it all those words which the *pada*-text does not analyze, or only such as are of especially anomalous character. The Rik Pr. alone among them (i. 6) catalogues the few protracted vowels occurring in its text. Like our treatise, it also teaches (in a late chapter, xiii. 7-10) when interior nasalized vowels are long: the Tâitt. Pr. (xvi. 1-31) goes farther, and laboriously catalogues all the nasalized vowels contained in its text, short or long, which are not the result of euphonic combination. Of this same class of appendices, which are designed to call attention to points in the text where especial liability to error is held to exist, are the following: the Rik Pr. (ii. 5) gives a list of instances of hiatus within a word; the Vâj. Pr. attempts (in part, in a bungling manner, and with very sorry success) to point out words which do not end with *visarjaniya* (iv. 26-32), which contain one *y* or two (iv. 149-159), or single, double, or triple groups of consonants (vi. 25-30); the Tâitt. Pr. adds to its list of nasalized vowels only (xiii. 8-14) that of words showing an original lingual *n*. The Vâj. Pr. (iii. 1, viii. 50, 51) defines a word, and both it (i. 27, viii. 52-57) and the Rik Pr. (xii. 5, 8, 9) distinguish and define the parts of speech, while all the three give a list of the prepositions (R. Pr. xii. 6, 7; V. Pr. vi. 24; T. Pr. i. 15): and the Vâj. Pr., after its fashion, carries the matter into the domain of the absurd, by laying down (viii. 58-63) the divinities and the families of *ṛshis* to whom the several classes of words, and even (viii. 47) of letters, belong. The Rik Pr. (x. 12, xi. 12) and Vâj. Pr. (iii. 148, iv. 77, 165-178, 194) treat of the *samaya* or *saṃkrama*, the omission of verses or phrases which have already once occurred in the text. Such omissions are abundantly made in all the manuscripts of the Atharva-Veda, *sanhitâ* as well as *pada*, but the Prâtiçâkhya takes no notice of them. The Rik Pr. has a chapter (xiv. 1-30) on errors of pronunciation, from which, by careful comparative study, important information on phonetic points may be drawn. It also, in its three closing chapters (xvi-xviii), treats with much fullness the subject of metre, which no one of the others even hints at. The Tâitt. Pr. devotes a single brief chapter (xviii. 1-7) to the quantity and accent of the auspicious exclamation *om*. The Vâj. Pr. has an interesting, although rather misplaced, series of rules (vi. 1-23) respecting the accentuation of verbs and vocatives in the sentence, and also makes a foolish and fragmentary attempt (ii. 1-45, 55-64) to define the accent of words in general. With its rules respecting the ritual employment of different tones and accents (i. 127-132) is to be compared what the Tâitt. Pr. (xxii. 12, xxiii. 12-20) says of tone and pitch. The Vâj. Pr., finally, remarks briefly and imperfectly (iii. 17, 137, 138) on the omission in the Vedic dialect of certain terminations.

It is thus seen that the Atharva-Veda Prâtiçâkhya does not greatly differ in its range of subjects from the other treatises of its class; being somewhat less restricted than the Tâitt. Pr., and somewhat less comprehensive than the remaining two, the Vâj. and Rik Prâtiçâkhyas. Its style of treatment is marked by sundry peculiarities, of which the most striking and important is the extensive use which it makes of *ganâs* in the construction of its rules. It is this which has enabled it, while in-

cluding so much, to be at the same time so much the briefest of the four works. This approximates it, also, to the character of the general Sanskrit grammar, as finally and principally represented to us by Pāṇini. The close connection between the two is farther shown by many other circumstances which have been pointed out in the notes upon the text — by the contemplation in numerous rules, both general and special, of phenomena of the general language rather than those of the Atharvan vocabulary alone, by a more liberal introduction of grammatical categories than any other of the Prātiçākhyas makes (the Tāitt. Pr. is its antithesis in this respect), and by the exhibition (not the use, as significant) of some of the indicatory letters employed by Pāṇini himself. It is very sparing of its references to the opinions of other authorities, Çāunaka and Çakatāyana being the only grammarians whom it cites by name. The latter of the two appears, both from the text and the commentary, to have stood in an especially near relation to the authors of our treatise. Çāunaka, although his opinion is rejected in the only rule where his name appears, is yet mentioned in a way which may be regarded as implying his special importance as an authority; it being thought necessary to teach expressly that his *dictum* upon the point referred to is not binding. There is nothing, at any rate, in the mode of the reference, which should militate against the claim apparently implied in the name of the work, that it represents in the main the doctrines of a Çāunaka, and belongs to a school which derives its name from him.

Whether the peculiarities pointed out are of a nature to determine the chronological relation of our treatise to the other Prātiçākhyas is a difficult and doubtful question. The discussions of this point hitherto made appear to me nearly barren of any positive results. They are all more or less based upon the assumption that the appearance in a Prātiçākhyā of a later phase of grammatical treatment or of grammatical phraseology is an unequivocal evidence of later composition. That this is so is not readily to be conceded. Since Prātiçākhyas are no complete grammatical treatises, but only the phonetical text-books, and the manuals of rules for conversion of *pada* into *sanhitā*, belonging to special schools, and since they imply a vastly more complete grammatical science than they actually present, it is not to be denied that any one of them might include more or less of the form and the material of that science, as its compilers chose, or as the traditional usage of their school required. Thus, for instance, there would be no implausibility in supposing that the Tāittiriya Prātiçākhyā, though so much more limited in its grammatical horizon than those of the Vājasaneyi and Atharvan, was actually composed at a later date than either of them, and deliberately adopted the method of treating its material according to the letter rather than the meaning, as being better suited to the character of a Prātiçākhyā, which concerns itself only with phonetic form, and not with sense. If such a supposition admits of being proved false, it can only be so by a more searching and wary investigation and comparison than has yet been made, or than is possible before the full publication and elucidation of all the treatises. It is very doubtful whether any one of the Prātiçākhyas has escaped extensive modifi-

cation, by alteration, insertion, and addition, since its first substantial construction. The fact that in the Rik Pr. all that is essential to make out such a treatise is contained in the first half, or chapters i–ix, is strongly suggestive of the accretion of the later chapters, and the character of more than one of them lends powerful support to such a suggestion. That the Vāj. Pr. has suffered interpolation and increment is the opinion of its editor, and we cannot help surmising that its weakest and most impertinent portions, especially those in which the expression seems intended to conceal rather than convey the meaning they cover, are the work of a very late hand. None of the other treatises is disfigured by such features. In point of dignified style, and apparent mastery of the material with which it deals, the first rank belongs unquestionably to the Rik Prātiçākhyā; with what inaccuracies and deficiencies it may have to be reproached, its editors have not ascertained for us: a careful testing of the rules by the text whose phenomena they were meant to present in full will have to be made for all the treatises before their comparison can be rendered complete. The results of such a testing as regards the Atharva-Veda are to be found scattered everywhere through the notes upon the text, and do not need to be summed up here. I fulfil, however, a promise previously given (note to i. 1), by making summary reference below to the rules in which our treatise oversteps the limits of the subject which it is treating, or of the sphere of such a work as it professes to be, or in which it contemplates euphonic combinations and words not to be found in its text.

Treatment of matters purely concerning the *pada*-text, in the portions properly devoted to *sanhitā*, is made in rules i. 72, 73, 81, 82, iii. 64, 68, 69, 72, 73: a like thing is done for the *krama*-text at i. 70, 97, iv. 74 etc., 98. Combinations not Atharvan are had in view at i. 47, ii. 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 26, iii. 27, 46; words not Atharvan, at i. 77, 86, 87, ii. 25, 51, iii. 2, 92, iv. 28, 62, 69. The bounds set in the first rule of the work are transgressed, by the inclusion of matters of word-formation and derivation, and the explication of forms which have no other qualities in *pada* than in *sanhitā*, at i. 63–66, ii. 18, 33, 34, 52, 59, 60, 61, 82, 87, 89, iii. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8–11, 43, 49, 57, 59, 60, 61, 75, 78, 87, 90. Among these last cases, a few are palpably and grossly out of place; but the greater part may be explained and excused by supposing that the *pada*-text implied by the Prātiçākhyā is an ideal one, which our established and recorded *pada*-texts nearly approach, but do not altogether coincide with.

2. Relation of the Prātiçākhyā to the existing Text of the Atharva-Veda.

In attempting to determine the relation of our treatise to the only known text of the Atharva-Veda, by the help of the citations which the former contains, it is necessary, of course, to consider as one the text and its commentator, since the *gaṇa*-method pursued by the treatise relieves it from quoting more than a small part of the words and passages to which it was intended to apply. And even with the help of the commentator, since he fills out the *gaṇas* but in part, we are able to find references to no more than a portion of the phenomena of the text to which the view of the makers of the Prātiçākhyā was directed. This

state of things deprives our investigation of much of the definiteness and certainty which it ought to possess, and which would attend a similar examination of any other of the Prātiçākhyas by means of its Veda; yet it is desirable even here to make the comparison, which will be found not barren of valuable results. The index of passages in the Atharvan text cited by the Prātiçākhyā and its commentary, to be given later, furnishes in full detail the principal body of the material of investigation; and from that we derive at once the important information that to the apprehension of the Prātiçākhyā the Atharva-Veda comprehended only the first eighteen books of the present collection. The two single apparent references to passages in book xix, the one made by the commentator (under ii. 67), the other by an authority whom he cites (under iv. 49), are of no account as against this conclusion: the absence from the rules of the treatise of any notice of the numerous irregularities of the two closing books, and the want of other citations in the commentary than the two equivocal ones referred to, are perfectly convincing. This testimony of the Prātiçākhyā, moreover, agrees entirely with that which we derive from a consideration of the character of those books and the condition of their text: no *pada*-text of book xix and of those portions of book xx which are not taken bodily from the Rig-Veda is known to be in existence, and it is not at all likely that there ever was one; the text could hardly, in that case, have become so corrupt. The citations run through all the other books of the Atharvan; they are more numerous, as was to be expected, in the earlier books, and in parts of the text they are but thinly scattered; yet no extended portion of the first eighteen books can with plausibility be supposed not to have lain before the commentator for excerption. As regards single passages, there is room for more question: although our lack of the complete *ganās* greatly interferes with a full discussion of this point, we are able to discover phenomena in the existing text of which the Prātiçākhyā, even as at present constructed, plainly fails to take notice. Some such cases of omission the commentator himself has perceived, and calls attention to,* but those which have escaped his notice also are much more numerous.† Many, probably the greater part, of these are to be set down to the account of the authors of the treatise, as results of their carelessness or want of accuracy: but that all of them can be thus disposed of does not appear to me likely; it seems a more probable supposition that in our authors' Atharvan single passages and single readings were wanting which are met with in the present text. The question, however, hardly admits of a positive solution: it would aid us not a little in coming to a conclusion upon it, did we know precisely what is the completeness and accuracy of the other treatises, as tested by their respective texts.

Differences of reading offered by the manuscripts as compared with the Prātiçākhyā form another main branch of the evidence bearing upon the question under consideration. That which I have collected, how-

* See under ii. 63, 65, 101, iii. 60, iv. 16, 18, 67.

† All, so far as my own search for them has been successful, have been set down in the notes on the text, above: see under ii. 63, 72, 93, 96, 97, 101, 102, iii. 5, 12, 13, 25, 33, 45, 61, 80, iv. 13, 16, 39, 50, 57, 63, 68, 86, 96.

ever, is not of decisive character, and hardly furnishes so much ground for suspicion of a discordance between the present text and that of the authors and commentator of our treatise as was derived from the citations. That the manuscripts neglect the refinements of Vedic orthoepy, such as the *yama*, *nāsikya*, *svabhakti*, and *sphoṭana*, and the duplications of the *varṇakrama*, is a matter of course. Other theoretical niceties of a similar character, as the aspiration of a final mute before a sibilant (ii. 6), and insertions between a mute and sibilant (ii. 8, 9), we are equally prepared to see neglected in the written text, and we should not think of founding upon their absence the suspicion that the manuscripts represented the Veda of another school. Some peculiarities of euphonic combination—the insertion of *t* between *n* and *s* (ii. 9), the assimilation of *n* to *j* (ii. 11), the omission of a mute between a nasal and another mute (ii. 20), the conversion of *m* to nasal *l* before *l* (ii. 35), the retention of *visarjanīya* before a sibilant and following mute (ii. 40)—have been noted as followed or disregarded by the copyists of our codices with utter irregularity and absence of rule. Their treatment of *a* or *ā* before *r* (iii. 46) is a more distinctive trait, and may possibly rest upon a difference of scholastic theory. Their writing of *ḍhḍh* or *ḍh* for *ḍḍh* (i. 94) is of no significance, being more or less common in all Vedic MSS., while opposed to all sound phonetic theory and doctrine. Nor do I regard as of importance the great discordance of the manuscript treatment of the *visarjanīya* with that which the Prātiçākhyā teaches (ii. 40)—viz. the neglect of the guttural and labial spirants, and the retention of *visarjanīya*, instead of its assimilation, before a sibilant: all the written Vedic texts, so far as I know (with, at least, but rare and unimportant exceptions), follow in these respects the usage of the later language, and not the requirements of the Vedic phonetic grammars. A few single cases have been pointed out in the notes, where all or nearly all the manuscripts give readings of words differing from those which the rules of the treatise require: but most of these* are of a kindred class with those last noted, or concern the conversion or nonconversion of *visarjanīya* into a sibilant, and are therefore of doubtful value: upon such points our Atharvan manuscripts, closely connected as they are with one another in origin, not unfrequently disagree. These being set aside, only two or three indubitable cases of violation of the Prātiçākhyā rules in the existing *çākhā* of the Atharvan remain,† and these admit of ready and plausible explanation as errors of copyists.

We come now to consider the remaining department of the evidence, or that afforded by the references and citations in the text and commentary which furnish words and phrases not to be found in the extant Atharvan text. Such references and citations are very numerous, occurring in or under nearly a fifth of the rules which the treatise contains.‡ Much the greater part, however, of the considerable body of

* See under ii. 62, 73-76, 80, 86, 93, 107, iv. 75, 77.

† See under iii. 76, 79, iv. 64.

‡ See the notes to i. 4, 14-16, 20, 25, 28, 44, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 65, 68, 77, 78, 86, 87, 89-91, 98; ii. 2, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 26, 28, 31, 40, 41, 47, 50-52, 63, 64, 74, 82, 83, 86, 90, 102; iii. 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 20, 27, 30, 32, 37, 39, 40, 42, 44-46, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 64, 75, 77, 78, 90, 92; iv. 18, 26, 28, 56, 61, 62, 67, 69, 85.

non-Atharvan material thus presented us is recognizable at first sight as of no force to show any discordance between the Atharva-Veda of the Prāticākhya and that of the existing manuscripts. It is, as has been often pointed out in the notes, a peculiarity of the authors of our treatise to give their rules a wider scope than the vocabulary of the Atharvan requires, in many instances contemplating and providing for combinations of sounds which are found nowhere in the whole body of the Vedic scriptures, and for which, accordingly, the commentator is obliged to fabricate illustrations. Moreover, even where the Atharvan furnishes numerous or innumerable examples of the application of a rule, the commentator sometimes prefers to draw upon his own fancy, instead of citing its text (notable instances of this are to be found especially under iii. 42-50). This being the case, it is evidently impossible to draw any distinct and certain line of division between what may be cited from an Atharvan text not agreeing with the one which we possess, and what is derived from other sources. But there are a certain number of sentences, among those given by the commentator, which have more or less clearly the aspect of genuine citations from a Vedic text; and although some among them might be regarded as instances of carelessness on his part, he quoting by memory from another source than his own Veda, we cannot plausibly extend this explanation to them all: it must remain probable that in part, at least, they were contained in some hitherto unknown *śākhā* of the Atharva-Veda. The sentences referred to are as follows: *prā 'mā ca roha* (i. 14-16), *punā raktam vāsaḥ* (i. 28, ii. 19, iii. 20), *rtūñr rtubhīḥ* (i. 68), *amī açaḡre* (i. 78), *tad abhūtam* (ii. 2), *dhātār dehi savitar dehi punar dehi* (ii. 47), *samaho vartate* (ii. 50), *yad aho rūpāni dr̥ḡyante* (ii. 51), *yadā 'ho ratham̐taram̐ sāmā gīyate* (ii. 51), *bhūvo viḡveshu savaneshu yajñīyah* (ii. 52: found in Rīg-Veda, x. 50. 4), *āvish kṛṇute rūpāni* (ii. 63), *dyāush pitar nyāññ adharāñ* (ii. 74), *vi sr̥po virap̥cin* (ii. 102), *tatarsha purodācam* (iii. 32), *vārshyodakena yojeta* (iii. 32), *sahasrarcam ide atra* (iii. 54), *svargeṇa lokena* (iii. 78), *mahi tvam* (iv. 26), *jamadagnyātharvaṇa* (iv. 67), and *vavrdhānah-iva* (iv. 85). In two instances these citations are directly referred to in a rule of the text (ii. 51): in all the other cases where the treatise itself mentions or implies words not found in the Atharvan,* it seems to me unnecessary to see anything but the tendency of the rule-makers to give their rules a wider bearing than the nature of the case required.

The identity or near correspondence of many of the fabricated illustrations furnished by the commentator with those given by the scholiasts to Pāṇini has been remarked in many instances,† and is a very noteworthy circumstance, as adding a new proof to those already elsewhere given of the more intimate relation of the grammatical system of our treatise than of that of any other of the Prāticākhyas with the general Sanskrit grammar; and also, as indicating the antiquity and the persistence in use of at least a part of the examples selected to illustrate the Paninean rules.

* They are i. 77, 86, 87, ii. 25, iii. 2, 92, iv. 28, 62.

† See under i. 58, ii. 14, 25, 40, 52, 63, 83, 90, iii. 27, 30, 32, 39, 40, 44, 45, 48, 50, 51, 53, 77, 90, iv. 28: analogies might also be pointed out in Pāṇini for the examples under i. 49, 98, ii. 6, 9, 26, iii. 42, and a more thorough and careful search than I have made would doubtless bring to light additional correspondences.

3. The Consonantal Combinations of the Atharva-Veda, and their Phonetic Form according to the Rules of the Prātiçākhyā.

In the course of the notes upon certain portions of the text of the Prātiçākhyā, I found it highly desirable, or almost necessary, to ascertain how many consonantal combinations of certain classes were to be found in the Atharva-Veda, and with what frequency they occurred. I was hence led to draw out a complete list of all the combinations of consonants which the text contains. Later, in examining and comparing with one another the nicer points in the phonetic theory of the treatise, particularly those which the written alphabet does not attempt to represent, I thought it worth while to make a practical application of all the phonetic rules to the collection of combinations already drawn up, writing each one out in the form which the rules would require it to assume. The result is the following scheme, which has seemed to me of sufficient interest to be worth appending to the present work.

To make out a complete list of the consonantal groups of our text is a work only of time and patience: to determine in every case what is the Prātiçākhyā's doctrine as to its true phonetic form is less easy, since it involves the application of rules which sometimes appear to trench upon each other's spheres, and of which the reconciliation cannot always be satisfactorily effected. I have not, however, been willing to assent to the opinion which Weber (p. 247) expresses, that any of the modifications prescribed are absolutely inconsistent with, and exclude, one another. It is not easy to see how, in that case, the phonetical treatises should present them side by side without any apparent misgivings, and without notifying us that the application of certain ones exempts us from the necessity of making certain others. At any rate, I shall here follow as accurately as I can all the directions which our Prātiçākhyā gives, expressing now and then such doubts as may suggest themselves respecting the mutual limitations of the rules: if the resulting combinations sometimes look strange, intricate beyond measure, and unutterable, the fault will lie with our Hindu authorities.

One circumstance deserves to be specially noted here: namely, that the loss of a rule or rules from the midst of the passage of the Prātiçākhyā treating of duplication (see under iii. 28) doubtless loads our list with a few more doubled consonants than it should properly bear. I do not venture, however, to fill out the *lacuna* by conjecture: a suggestion or two will be made farther on as to what the lost rules may in part have contained.

I. Groups not liable to phonetic modification. These are, α , of two consonants: *cy, chy, jy, ts, pv, bv, bhv, mv, yy, ll, ḷ, ḷk, zk, kh, çc, çch, çy, çç, shṭ, shth, shn, shsh, st, sth, sn, ss, çp, çph*; β , of three consonants: *tsm, tsy, tsv, xkl, xkr, xksh, çcy, ççm, ççy, ççr, ççl, ççv, shṭy, shtr, shṭv, shthy, shny, shnv, sty, str, stv, sthy, ssk, sst, ssth, ssn, ssp, ssm, ssy, ssr, ssv, çpr, çpl*; γ , of four consonants: *xkshv, shtry, sstr*.

This class, it will be noticed, is composed of combinations containing two consonants of the same organ (*sasthāna*), where, by iii. 30, no duplication is made—the constitution of the group being, at the same time, not such as to necessitate *abhinidhāna*, or any of the euphonic insertions taught at i. 99–104. To the groups containing, in the

printed text, a final *visarjanīya* as their first member, I have given the form required by the Prātiçākhyā at ii. 40, representing (after Müller's example) the *jihvāmūlīya* spirant by *ç*, and the *upadhmanīya* by *φ*, as I have also done in one or two isolated cases in the notes on the text.

II. Groups suffering *abhinidhāna* only (by i. 44). These are as follows: *α*, of two consonants: *kk, gg, ggh, ŋk, ŋkh, ŋg, ŋgh, ŋñ, cc, cch, jj, ŋc, ŋch, ŋj, ddh, nñh, nd, ndh, tt, tth, dd, ddh, nt, nth, nd, ndh, nn, pp, bb, mp, mph, mb, mbh, mm*; *β*, of three consonants: *kksh, ŋkr, ŋkl, ŋkv, ŋksh, ŋkhy, ŋgy, ŋgr, ŋgl, ŋghr, cchr, cchl, cchv, jvy, jv, ŋchy, ŋchr, ŋchl, ŋchv, ŋjy, ddhy, ndy, tly, ttr, ttv, ddy, ddr, ddv, ddhy, ddhr, ddhv, nty, ntr, ntv, nts, ndy, ndr, ndv, ndhy, ndr, ndhv, nny, npr, npl, mps, mbr, mbhr, mml*; *γ*, of four consonants: *ŋkshñ, ŋkshv, ntry, ntst, ntsth, ntsp, ntsv, ndry*.

All these groups are of such a character that, by the rule already referred to (iii. 30), they are not subject to duplication of their initial consonant; which latter, however, by i. 44, must, as being followed by another mute, undergo the weakening process of *abhinidhāna*. Representing, as I propose to do, this weaker utterance by a type smaller and set a little lower, the pronunciation will be *kk, kksh, ŋkshñ*, etc.

III. Groups suffering duplication only: 1st, with duplication of first consonant; *α*, groups of two consonants: *yv* (as *yyv*), *lk, lg, lp, lph, lb, lm, ly, lv, vn, vy, vr, çn, çp, çm, çr, çl, çv, shk, shp, shm, shy, shv, sk, sp, sph, sm, sy, sr, sv*; *β*, of three consonants: *lqv* (as *llqv*), *çrv, çvy, shkr, shpr, shmy, sphy, smy, svy*;—2nd, with duplication of second consonant; *α*, groups of two consonants: *hy* (as *hyy*), *hr, hl, hv*; *β*, of three consonants: *hvy* (as *hvvv*).

IV. Groups suffering duplication and *abhinidhāna*. 1st, with *abhinidhāna* of one consonant; *α*, groups of two consonants: *ky* (as *kky*), *kr, kl, kv, ksh, khy, gy, gr, gl, gv, ghr, ghv, ŋy, ŋv, jr, jv, ty, dy, dr, dv, dhy, dhr, dhv, ny, nv, ty, tr, tv, thy, thv, dy, dr, dv, dhy, dhr, dhv, ny, nr, nv, py, pr, pl, pç, ps, br, bl, bhy, bhr, my, mr, ml, lç, lh*; *β*, groups of three consonants: *kshñ* (as *kkshñ*), *kshm, kshy, kshv, glry, ŋvr, try, trv, dvy, dvr, dhry, nvy, nvr, psy*; *γ*, of four consonants: *kshmy* (as *kkshmy*);—2nd, with *abhinidhāna* of two consonants; *α*, groups of two consonants: *kc* (as *kkc*), *kt, kth, kp, gj, gd, gdh, gb, gbh, ŋj, ŋt, ŋd, ŋdh, ŋn, ŋp, ŋm, ŋh, tt, tp, db, dbh, nn, nm, tp, tph, dg, db, dbh, np, nb, nbh, nm, nh, pt, bj, bd, bdh, mn, mn*; *β*, of three consonants: *ky* (as *kky*), *ktr, ktv, kthy, kpr, gdhy, gdhv, gbhy, ŋty, ŋtv, ŋdhy, ŋpr, ttv, tpr, dbr, dbhy, ŋny, tpr, tpl, dbr, dbhy, dbhv, npr, nps, nbr, nbhr, nmy, pty, ptv, bdhv, mny*.

V. Groups suffering one or both the above modifications, with interposition of *yama*. 1st, with *yama* and double *abhinidhāna*; *α*, groups of two consonants: *jñ* (as *jjñ*), *tn, thn, dn, dhn, pm*; *β*, of three consonants: *cñy* (as *cñy*), *jñy, tny, dhny, sthn* (as *stñhn*);—2nd, with *yama* of second consonant, and triple *abhinidhāna*: *ŋghn* (as *ŋghñn*), *jjñ, ñjñ*;—3rd, with duplication of first consonant, *yama*, and triple *abhinidhāna*; *α*, groups of two consonants: *kñ* (as *kkñ*), *kn, km, khn, gn, gm, ghen, jm, tm, tn, dm, dhm, pn, bhñ, bhñ*; *β*, groups of three consonants: *kny* (as *kkñny*), *gny, ghny, dmy, pny*;—4th, with duplication of first consonant, *yama* of second, and quadruple *abhinidhāna*: *kthn* (as *kkthñn*).

The Vāj. Pr. (iv. 111) has a rule expressly prohibiting duplication of

the first consonant in a case like the last, where a consonant suffering *yama* follows it. Such a precept is very possibly one of those lost in the *lacuna* exhibited by our MS. after iii. 28; and I should hope that the Prâtiçâkhyâ might have extended the exemption from duplication also to any consonant of which *yama* is made, thus including our 3rd division, and allowing us to say simply *kkñ*, etc. There were enough of duplication, one would think.

VI. Groups suffering one or more of the above modifications, with interposition of *nâsikya*; viz. duplication of second consonant, *nâsikya*, and *abhinidhâna*; α , groups of two consonants: *hn* (as *hⁿñ*), *hn*, *hn*; β , groups of three consonants: *hny* (as *hⁿny*), *hny*.

VII. Groups suffering the interposition of *svarabhakti* only: 1st, of the longer *svarabhakti*: *rç* (as *r^oç*), *rsh*;—2nd, of the shorter; α , of three consonants: *rjy* (as *r^jy*), *rls*, *rshl*, *rshñ*; β , of four consonants: *rtsy* (as *r^tsy*), *rshny*.

I have assumed that, in the last class of cases, the rule forbidding the duplication of a consonant before another of the same class prevailed over that prescribing the duplication after the *r*. In the absence, however, of any direction as to this point in either the text or its commentary, I am by no means confident that my understanding is the true one.

VIII. Groups suffering *svarabhakti*, together with one or more of the preceding modifications. 1st, with *svarabhakti* (shorter) and *abhinidhâna*: *rtt* (as *r^tt*);—2nd, with *svarabhakti* and duplication; α , with longer *svarabhakti*: *rh* (as *r^ohh*); β , with shorter; α , groups of two consonants: *ry* (as *r^yyy*), *rl*, *rv*; β , groups of three consonants: *rvy* (as *r^vvyy*), *rvr*, *rçv*, *rshv*, *rshy*, *rshv*, *rhy*, *rhr*, *rhv*;—3rd, with *svarabhakti* (shorter), duplication, and *abhinidhâna*; α , groups of two consonants: *rk* (as *r^kkk*), *rg*, *rgç*, *rc*, *rçh*, *rj*, *rn*, *rt*, *rth*, *rd*, *rdh*, *rn*, *rp*, *rb*, *rhh*, *rm*; β , groups of three consonants: *rksh* (as *r^kkksh*), *rgy*, *rgr*, *rny*, *rtv*, *rtr*, *rtv*, *rdy*, *rdv*, *rdh*, *rdhr*, *rdhv*, *rny*, *rpy*, *rbr*, *rbhy*, *rbhr*, *rmy*; γ , groups of four consonants: *rkshy* (as *r^kkkshy*), *rtvy*;—4th, with *svarabhakti* (shorter), *yama*, and double *abhinidhâna*: *rtñ* (as *r^tññ*), *rdhn*;—5th, with *svarabhakti*, duplication, *yama*, and triple *abhinidhâna*: *rtm* (as *r^tmm*).

Two or three of these combinations are liable to the doubt expressed after the last class. It may also excite a question whether *r* and *h* are to be duplicated when following one another: I have, however, in classifying such groups, interpreted the first part of rule iii. 31 as meaning '*r* and *h* are not liable to duplication when either is the first consonant of a group:' this would leave each free to be doubled when preceded by the other.

IX. Groups liable to *sphoṭana*, together with some of the preceding modifications; viz. to duplication, double *abhinidhâna*, and *sphoṭana*; α , groups of two consonants: *t^k* (as *t^kkk*), *t^k*, *t^{kh}*, *d^g*, *d^{gh}*, *p^k*, *p^{ch}*, *b^g*, *b^j*, *n^k*, *n^{kh}*, *n^g*, *n^{gh}*; β , groups of three consonants: *t^{kr}* (as *t^kkr*), *t^{kv}*, *t^{ksh}*, *d^{gr}*, *n^{kr}*, *n^{ksh}*, *n^{gr}*.

With regard to the question whether the groups commencing with *n* are to be ranked in this class, see the note to ii. 38. If denied *sphoṭana*, they would fall under IV. 2. α .

It would seem most natural to regard a mute as relieved by *sphoṭana*

of its modification by *abhinidhāna*; and if any of these subtle euphonic changes mutually exclude one another, the two in question must certainly do so. It is not absolutely impossible that the Hindu grammarians may have regarded the name *sphotana* itself as implying suspension of *abhinidhāna*, and so have saved themselves the trouble of specifically teaching the fact of such suspension: yet I cannot think this likely, and so have combined the modifications as they are given above. The admission of a nullifying effect in the *sphotana* would remove merely the *abhinidhāna* of one consonant; changing, for instance, *ḍḍḡg* to *ḍḍḡg*.

It remains only to take notice of a peculiar class of cases, where a final surd mute comes to stand before an initial sibilant, and their combination undergoes (according to the rules ii. 6, 8, 9) certain euphonic modifications, which are not usually represented in the manuscripts or in the edited text.

X. Combinations of a final surd mute with an initial sibilant. 1st, with aspiration of the surd: *ts* (as *ths*), *tsy*, *tsr*, *t'sv*, *t'str*;—2nd, with aspiration, duplication, and *abhinidhāna*: *k's* (as *k'khs*), *t'g*, *p's*, *k'sth*, *p'sv*;—3rd, with insertion and *abhinidhāna*: *t's* (as *ṭs*), *t'sv*, *n's* (as *ṅs*), *n'sh*.

Akin with a part of this last class is the combination of *n* and *s*, with insertion of *t*; I have not brought it in here, because the inserted letter is regularly given in the printed text. It might be made a question whether all these inserted mutes are not liable to be converted into aspirates by the action of rule ii. 6, so that we ought to speak *ṭhs*, *ṅkhs*, *n'hs*, etc. But, considering the want of explicitness of the treatise upon this point, and the uncertainty whether the inserted mute is properly to be regarded as appended, in the character of a final, to the former word, I have thought myself justified in adopting for the combinations in question the simpler mode of utterance.

In order to facilitate the determination, with regard to any given group, of its occurrence in the Atharvan text and of the phonetic form to which the rules of the Prāṭicākhya reduce it, I add an alphabetical list of all the groups, each followed by its theoretic mode of pronunciation, and by a reference to a passage of the text where it occurs. As in the preceding examples, a sound which has suffered *abhinidhāna* is marked by a smaller letter; a *yama*, or nasal counterpart, has a straight line above it; the *nāsikya* is expressed by a superior *n*; the two *svara-bhaktis*, shorter and longer, by a heavy dot and a little circle respectively; the *sphotana*, by a superior *s*. Where a group has the phonetic form given it only when composed of final and initial letters taken together, the division between final and initial is made by an interposed period.

I. Groups of two consonants:

kk (*kk*: iv. 19. 6), *kc* (*kkc*: i. 6. 3), *kn* (*kkñ*: viii. 10. 18), *kt* (*kk̄t*: i. 23. 1), *kth* (*kk̄th*: i. 10. 3), *kn* (*kk̄ñ*: i. 23. 1), *kp* (*kk̄p*: i. 14. 1), *km* (*kk̄m*: i. 25. 1), *ky* (*kk̄y*: ii. 33. 2), *kr* (*kk̄r*: i. 12. 1), *kl* (*kk̄l*: ii. 33. 3), *kv* (*kk̄v*: i. 27. 1), *ksh* (*kk̄sh*: i. 2. 3), *k's* (*kk̄hs*: iii. 1. 4); *khn* (*kk̄hñ*: v. 31. 8), *khy* (*kk̄hy*: iii. 3. 2); *gg* (*gg*: ii. 36. 7), *ggh* (*gḡh*: iii. 19. 6), *gj* (*gḡj*: iv. 15. 2), *gd* (*gḡd*: iv. 3. 1), *gdh* (*gḡdh*: i. 10. 2), *gn* (*gḡn*: i. 6. 2), *gb* (*gḡb*: iii. 27. 6), *gbh* (*gḡbh*: iii. 6. 6), *gm* (*gḡm*: ii. 2. 3), *gy* (*gḡy*: vii.

44. 1), *gr* (*ggr*: i. 10. 1), *gl* (*ggl*: iv. 4. 7), *gv* (*ggv*: iv. 19. 5); *ghn* (*gghghn*: i. 28. 4), *ghr* (*gghr*: iv. 3. 1), *ghv* (*gghv*: xix. 55. 5); *ñk* (*ñk*: i. 12. 2), *ñkh* (*ñkh*: iv. 10. 1), *ñg* (*ñg*: i. 12. 2), *ñgh* (*ñgh*: iv. 11. 10), *ññ* (*ññ*: v. 22. 2), *ñj* (*ññj*: v. 4. 8), *ñt* (*ññt*: xvii. 17), *ñd* (*ññd*: xiii. 2. 20), *ñdh* (*ññdh*: i. 25. 1), *ñn* (*ññn*: ix. 1. 3), *ñp* (*ññp*: xii. 2. 1), *ñm* (*ññm*: v. 1. 1), *ñy* (*ññy*: v. 26. 12), *ñv* (*ññv*: iii. 4. 1), *ñ's* (*ñks*: iv. 11. 8), *ñh* (*ññh*: iv. 19. 7).

cc (*cc*: iv. 1. 3), *cch* (*cch*: iii. 12. 3), *cy* (*cy*: i. 3. 6); *chy* (*chy*: ix. 5. 4); *jj* (*jj*: i. 11. 4), *jjñ* (*jjñ*: i. 7. 6), *jm* (*jjm*: iii. 30. 6), *jy* (*jy*: i. 1. 3), *jr* (*jjr*: i. 7. 7), *jv* (*jjv*: iii. 24. 2); *ñc* (*ñc*: i. 4. 1), *ñch* (*ñch*: iv. 8. 4), *ñj* (*ñj*: i. 2. 4).

tk (*ttk*: iv. 18. 3), *tt* (*ttt*: i. 11. 1), *tp* (*ttp*: v. 14. 8), *tm* (*ttm*: viii. 6. 15), *ty* (*ttty*: xix. 44. 6), *tç* (*ttç*: ix. 5. 21), *t's* (*tt's*: xi. 1. 2); *ddh* (*ddh*: vii. 97. 7), *db* (*ddb*: vi. 96. 2), *dbh* (*ddbh*: xii. 2. 48), *dy* (*ddy*: ii. 2. 1), *dr* (*ddr*: xi. 7. 11), *dv* (*ddv*: iii. 11. 5); *dhy* (*addy*: i. 18. 4), *dhr* (*ddhr*: vii. 95. 3), *dhv* (*addhv*: viii. 8. 11); *ñth* (*ñth*: x. 9. 15), *nd* (*ñd*: ii. 7. 3), *ndh* (*ñdh*: xix. 29. 6), *nn* (*nnn*: v. 20. 11), *nm* (*nnm*: i. 13. 3), *ny* (*ny*: i. 9. 2), *nv* (*nnv*: i. 13. 4).

tk (*ttk*: i. 24. 2), *t'kh* (*tt'kh*: iv. 11. 10), *tt* (*tt*: i. 9. 1), *tth* (*tth*: i. 8. 4), *tn* (*ttm*: i. 9. 2), *tp* (*ttp*: i. 12. 2), *tpk* (*ttpk*: vi. 124. 2), *tm* (*ttm*: i. 18. 3), *ty* (*ttty*: i. 7. 4), *tr* (*tttr*: i. 1. 1), *tv* (*ttv*: i. 7. 6), *ts* (*tt's*: i. 15. 3), *ts* (*tt's*: i. 13. 3); *thn* (*ttthn*: ii. 30. 1), *thy* (*ttthy*: iii. 4. 7), *thv* (*ttthv*: xiii. 2. 22); *dç* (*ddç*: i. 27. 3), *d'ç* (*dd'ç*: i. 2. 3), *d'gh* (*dd'gh*: v. 21. 8), *dd* (*dd*: i. 28. 1), *ddh* (*ddh*: i. 7. 7), *dn* (*ddn*: vii. 45. 2), *db* (*ddb*: ii. 29. 1), *dbh* (*ddbh*: i. 20. 1), *dm* (*ddm*: i. 2. 1), *dy* (*ddy*: i. 1. 1), *dr* (*ddr*: i. 3. 8), *dv* (*ddv*: i. 2. 2); *dhn* (*ddhñ*: i. 14. 1), *dhm* (*ddhdhm*: i. 22. 1), *dhy* (*ddhy*: i. 8. 2), *dhr* (*ddhr*: iii. 12. 2), *dhv* (*addhv*: i. 4. 1); *n'k* (*nn'k*: i. 14. 2), *n'kh* (*nn'kh*: v. 19. 3), *n'g* (*nn'g*: ii. 1. 2), *n'gh* (*nn'gh*: iii. 10. 11), *nt* (*nt*: i. 15. 2), *nth* (*ntth*: i. 27. 1), *nd* (*nd*: i. 7. 1), *ndh* (*ndh*: i. 4. 3), *nn* (*nn*: i. 7. 5), *np* (*nnp*: i. 25. 1), *nñ* (*nnñ*: v. 26. 6), *nñh* (*nnñh*: ii. 9. 4), *nm* (*nnm*: i. 10. 4), *ny* (*nnny*: i. 2. 1), *nr* (*nnr*: ii. 35. 2), *nv* (*nnv*: i. 1. 1), *n'sk* (*ntsk*: viii. 9. 17), *n's* (*nts*: viii. 5. 16), *nñh* (*nnñh*: i. 12. 2).

pk (*ppk*: viii. 9. 20), *peh* (*pp'eh*: vi. 48. 3), *pt* (*ppt*: i. 1. 1), *pn* (*ppn*: ii. 11. 1), *pp* (*pp*: iii. 17. 5), *pm* (*ppm*: iii. 31. 1), *py* (*ppy*: i. 14. 3), *pr* (*ppr*: i. 7. 2), *pl* (*ppl*: iii. 6. 7), *pv* (*ppv*: iii. 2. 5), *pç* (*ppç*: vi. 2. 2), *ps* (*pps*: ii. 2. 3), *p's* (*pp's*: i. 6. 2); *b'ç* (*bb'ç*: xviii. 2. 6), *bj* (*bbj*: viii. 4. 1), *bj* (*bb'çj*: xix. 21. 1), *bd* (*bbd*: ii. 24. 6), *bñh* (*bbñh*: v. 18. 4), *bb* (*bb*: xix. 21. 1), *br* (*bb'r*: i. 6. 2), *bl* (*bb'l*: xi. 9. 19), *bv* (*bbv*: xiii. 1. 15); *bñn* (*bbññ*: iii. 8. 6), *bñn* (*bbññ*: x. 3. 3), *bhy* (*bbhy*: i. 4. 3), *bhr* (*bbhr*: i. 1. 1), *bhv* (*bbhv*: v. 2. 7); *mñ* (*mmñ*: ii. 36. 2), *mn* (*mmn*: ii. 25. 2), *mp* (*mp*: iii. 26. 5), *mph* (*mph*: x. 6. 6), *mb* (*mb*: i. 4. 1), *mñh* (*mñh*: i. 6. 2), *mm* (*mm*: iii. 30. 1), *my* (*mmy*: i. 11. 2), *mr* (*mmr*: ii. 24. 3), *ml* (*mm'l*: viii. 6. 2), *mñ* (*mñ*: vi. 56. 3).

yy (*yy*: i. 1. 3), *yv* (*yyv*: i. 11. 4); *rk* (*r'kk*: iii. 3. 2), *rg* (*r'gg*: vi. 69. 2), *rgk* (*r'ggh*: i. 22. 2), *rc* (*r'cc*: i. 2. 3), *rch* (*r'cch*: xx. 34. 12), *rj* (*r'jj*: i. 2. 1), *rñ* (*r'ññ*: i. 10. 4), *rt* (*r'it*: i. 28. 2), *rth* (*r'ith*: i. 7. 6), *rd* (*r'ad*: i. 22. 2), *rdh* (*r'adh*: i. 9. 3), *rñ* (*r'nn*: i. 1. 3), *rp* (*r'pp*: i. 2. 1), *rñ* (*r'ññ*: i. 1. 1), *rñh* (*r'ññh*: i. 11. 2), *rñ* (*r'nn*: i. 4. 1), *ry* (*r'yy*: i. 3. 5), *rl* (*r'll*: i. 18. 1), *rv* (*r'vv*: i. 2. 2), *rç* (*r'cc*: iv. 4. 7), *rsh* (*r'sh*: i. 5. 4), *rñ* (*r'ññ*: i. 8. 4); *lk* (*llk*: v. 17. 4), *lg* (*llg*: ii. 36. 1), *lp* (*llp*: iii. 8. 1), *lph* (*llph*:

x. 2. 1), *lb* (*lbb*: iv. 2. 8), *lm* (*lmm*: ii. 30. 3), *ly* (*lyy*: vi. 11. 3), *ll* (*lll*: ii. 32. 5), *ll̄* (*ll̄l*: iv. 38. 5), *lv* (*llv*: ii. 31. 1), *lç* (*lçç*: vi. 30. 2), *lh* (*lhh*: v. 22. 5); *vn* (*vnn*: vi. 2. 3), *vy* (*vyy*: i. 3. 1), *vr* (*vrr*: ii. 1. 1).

çk (*çkç*: i. 4. 3), *çkh* (*çkhh*: i. 6. 4); *çc* (*çcc*: i. 5. 4), *çch* (*çchh*: ix. 3. 14), *çn* (*çcn*: i. 11. 4), *çp* (*çcp*: iv. 5. 6), *çm* (*çcm*: i. 2. 2), *çy* (*çcy*: i. 7. 5), *çr* (*çcr*: i. 1. 2), *çl* (*çcl*: i. 31. 3), *çv* (*çcv*: i. 1. 1), *çç* (*ççç*: i. 5. 2); *shk* (*shshk*: i. 11. 3), *sht* (*shtt*: i. 3. 1), *shh* (*shhh*: i. 2. 4), *shn* (*shnn*: i. 13. 4), *shp* (*shshp*: i. 1. 2), *shm* (*shshm*: i. 12. 3), *shy* (*shshy*: i. 14. 1), *shv* (*shshv*: i. 2. 1), *shsh* (*shshh*: xi. 5. 2); *sk* (*ssk*: i. 13. 2), *st* (*stt*: i. 1. 2), *sth* (*sthh*: i. 16. 1), *sn* (*snn*: v. 5. 8), *sp* (*ssp*: i. 1. 1), *sph* (*ssph*: iv. 7. 3), *sm* (*ssm*: i. 1. 4), *sy* (*ssy*: i. 2. 2), *sr* (*ssr*: i. 2. 4), *sv* (*ssv*: i. 2. 3), *ss* (*sss*: i. 4. 2); *çp* (*çpp*: i. 1. 1), *çph* (*çp hh*: iii. 15. 4).

hn (*h^{na}n*: ii. 34. 5), *hn̄* (*h^{na}n̄*: ii. 33. 3), *hm* (*h^{mm}m*: i. 8. 4), *hy* (*hyy*: i. 8. 4), *hr* (*hrr*: iv. 15. 14), *hl* (*hll*: xviii. 3. 60), *hv* (*hvv*: i. 4. 3).

II. Groups of three consonants:

kksh (*kkshh*: xix. 24. 2), *kty* (*kkty*: i. 12. 3), *ktr* (*kktr*: iii. 30. 6), *ktv* (*kktv*: iv. 31. 4), *kthy* (*kkthy*: vi. 9. 1), *kthn* (*kkthhn*: xx. 136. 4), *kny* (*kkkny*: i. 23. 3), *kpr* (*kkpr*: ix. 1. 10), *kshn* (*kkshhn*: ii. 33. 3), *kshm* (*kkshhm*: vii. 89. 1), *kshy* (*kkshy*: i. 8. 3), *kshv* (*kkshv*: ii. 2. 1), *ksth* (*kksthh*: xx. 134. 3); *gdhy* (*ggdhy*: iv. 33. 1), *gdhv* (*ggdhv*: v. 18. 10), *gny* (*gggny*: ix. 1. 12), *gbhy* (*gggbhy*: x. 6. 12); *ghny* (*ggghny*: iii. 30. 1), *ghry* (*ggghry*: xii. 2. 4); *ñkr* (*ñkrr*: v. 20. 9), *ñkl* (*ñkll*: vi. 138. 1), *ñkv* (*ñkvv*: x. 7. 1), *ñksh* (*ñkshh*: i. 5. 4), *ñkhy* (*ñkhyh*: iv. 16. 5), *ñgy* (*ñgyy*: iv. 37. 2), *ñgr* (*ñgrr*: xiv. 1. 38), *ñgl* (*ñgll*: iv. 38. 3), *ñghn* (*ñghhn*: vi. 76. 4), *ñghr* (*ñghrr*: xiii. 1. 46), *ñty* (*ñatty*: xiii. 3. 5), *ñtv* (*ñattv*: xviii. 2. 60), *ñdhy* (*ñaddhy*: viii. 3. 6), *ñpr* (*ñppr*: x. 8. 19), *ñvr* (*ñnvr*: xv. 18. 5).

çchr (*çchrr*: iii. 12. 2), *çchl* (*çchll*: x. 2. 1), *çchv* (*çchvv*: xviii. 3. 18), *cñy* (*çcñyy*: xii. 4. 30), *ññ* (*ñññ*: ii. 12. 7), *ñy* (*ñyy*: vi. 61. 1), *ñv* (*ñvv*: iii. 11. 8), *ñny* (*ññny*: xiv. 1. 44); *ñchy* (*ñchyy*: xi. 9. 17), *ñchr* (*ñchrr*: iv. 8. 3), *ñchl* (*ñchll*: xviii. 1. 33), *ñchv* (*ñchvv*: xi. 10. 23), *ñjñ* (*ñjññ*: iii. 14. 4), *ñjy* (*ñjyy*: i. 9. 1).

ttv (*tttv*: iii. 4. 1), *tpr* (*ttpr*: xi. 4. 12), *t^{sv}* (*ttsv*: viii. 9. 9); *ddhy* (*dddhy*: xi. 1. 31), *dbr* (*ddbr*: xi. 8. 30), *dbhy* (*ddbhyy*: iii. 3. 4); *ndy* (*nddy*: vi. 138. 2), *nny* (*nnny*: vi. 77. 2).

tkr (*ttkr*: ii. 12. 6), *tkv* (*ttkv*: ix. 9. 17), *tksh* (*ttkshh*: ii. 8. 2), *tty* (*ttty*: v. 6. 10), *ttr* (*tttr*: vi. 107. 1), *ttv* (*tttv*: i. 23. 4), *tny* (*ttny*: ii. 12. 1), *tpr* (*ttpr*: ii. 34. 2), *tpl* (*ttpl*: v. 5. 5), *try* (*tttry*: ii. 8. 2), *trv* (*tttrv*: vi. 40. 2), *tsm* (*ttsm*: vii. 52. 2), *tsy* (*ttty*: xi. 3. 37), *t^{sy}* (*tttsy*: iii. 13. 4), *t^{sr}* (*tttsr*: xii. 4. 34), *tsv* (*tttv*: ii. 5. 4), *t^{sv}* (*tttsv*: iii. 3. 1); *d^{gr}* (*ddgr*: ii. 10. 6), *ddy* (*dddy*: iv. 19. 6), *ddr* (*dddr*: ii. 10. 1), *ddv* (*dddv*: vi. 107. 2), *ddhy* (*dddhy*: xii. 2. 3), *ddhr* (*dddhr*: vi. 87. 3), *ddhv* (*dddhv*: iv. 14. 2), *dbr* (*ddbr*: i. 32. 1), *dbhy* (*ddbhyy*: ii. 33. 5), *dbhv* (*ddbhvv*: xviii. 4. 26), *dny* (*dddny*: v. 23. 13), *dvy* (*ddvyy*: iv. 19. 6), *dvr* (*ddvrr*: vii. 90. 1); *dñy* (*ddñny*: iv. 1. 1), *dñry* (*ddñry*: iv. 29. 4); *n^{kr}* (*nnkr*: ii. 31. 2), *n^{ksh}* (*nnkshh*: x. 4. 8), *n^{gr}* (*nngr*: viii. 7. 11), *nty* (*ntyy*: i. 3. 7), *ntr* (*nttr*: i. 3. 6), *ntv* (*nttv*: i. 4. 2), *nts* (*ntst*: viii. 6. 8), *ndy* (*nddy*: ii. 14. 2), *ndr* (*ndrr*: viii. 8. 9), *ndv* (*nddv*: ii. 11. 3), *ndhy* (*nddhy*: vi. 25. 3), *ndhr* (*nddhr*: iv. 16. 7), *ndhv* (*nddhv*: v. 13. 7), *nny* (*nnny*: v. 5. 5), *npr* (*nnpr*: i. 10. 2), *nps* (*nnps*: x. 3. 14), *nbr* (*nnbr*: i. 29. 1), *nbhr* (*nnbhr*: v. 22. 12), *nny* (*nnny*: xi. 10. 13), *nvy* (*nnvyy*: iv. 3. 1), *nvr* (*nnvr*: xv. 3. 1).

pty (*ppty*: i. 28. 4), *ptv* (*pptv*: iv. 5. 6), *pn̄y* (*pp̄ny*: iv. 9. 6), *psy* (*ppsy*: x. 9. 7), *p̄sv* (*pp̄shv*: i. 4. 4); *bdhv* (*bbdhv*: i. 8. 2); *mny* (*mmny*: iv. 7. 5), *mpr* (*m̄pr*: i. 7. 4), *mpl* (*m̄pl*: ii. 33. 4), *m̄ps* (*m̄ps*: x. 5. 43), *m̄br* (*m̄br*: i. 8. 4), *m̄bhr* (*m̄bhr*: vi. 120. 2), *m̄ml* (*m̄ml*: vi. 66. 3).

r̄ksh (*r̄kksh*: xviii. 2. 31), *rgy* (*r̄ggy*: ix. 2. 14), *rgr* (*r̄ggr*: iii. 2. 5), *r̄jy* (*r̄jy*: vii. 22. 1) *r̄ny* (*r̄n̄ny*: ii. 25. 1), *r̄tt* (*r̄tt*: ii. 7. 5), *r̄tm* (*r̄tm*: i. 1. 3), *r̄tm* (*r̄t̄tm*: iii. 8. 6), *r̄ty* (*r̄ty*: iii. 31. 2), *r̄tr* (*r̄tr*: x. 1. 30), *r̄tv* (*r̄tv*: i. 4. 3), *r̄ts* (*r̄ts*: v. 7. 1), *r̄dy* (*r̄ady*: vii. 6. 1), *r̄dr* (*r̄adr*: vii. 28. 1), *r̄dv* (*r̄adv*: v. 12. 5), *r̄dhn* (*r̄dh̄hn*: iv. 39. 1), *r̄dhy* (*r̄adh̄y*: vi. 94. 3), *r̄dhr* (*r̄adhr*: vi. 88. 1), *r̄dhv* (*r̄adh̄v*: iii. 26. 6), *r̄ny* (*r̄n̄ny*: ii. 14. 3), *r̄py* (*r̄ppy*: ix. 2. 22), *r̄br* (*r̄b̄br*: iii. 20. 5), *r̄bhy* (*r̄bb̄hy*: i. 12. 4), *r̄bhr* (*r̄bb̄hr*: v. 1. 1), *r̄my* (*r̄m̄my*: iv. 5. 5), *r̄vy* (*r̄v̄vy*: iii. 17. 3), *r̄vr* (*r̄v̄vr*: i. 16. 1), *r̄cv* (*r̄c̄cv*: ii. 33. 3), *r̄sh̄t* (*r̄sh̄t*: iv. 18. 7), *r̄sh̄n* (*r̄sh̄n*: x. 2. 1), *r̄sh̄m* (*r̄sh̄sh̄m*: iii. 4. 2), *r̄sh̄y* (*r̄sh̄sh̄y*: vi. 18. 1), *r̄sh̄v* (*r̄sh̄sh̄v*: xviii. 3. 2), *r̄hy* (*r̄h̄hy*: iii. 1. 2), *r̄hr* (*r̄h̄hr*: xii. 5. 29), *r̄hv* (*r̄h̄hv*: vii. 56. 3); *lgv* (*lgv*: xii. 3. 32).

χkl (*χkl*: ii. 2. 5), *χkr* (*χkr*: ii. 32. 1), *χksh* (*χksh*: ii. 8. 5); *çcy* (*çcy*: x. 1. 13), *çrv* (*çrv*: xiv. 2. 26), *çvy* (*çvy*: viii. 3. 15), *ç̄cm* (*ç̄cm*: v. 31. 8), *ç̄cy* (*ç̄cy*: v. 5. 8), *ç̄gr* (*ç̄gr*: iii. 17. 2), *ç̄gl* (*ç̄gl*: v. 20. 7), *ç̄gv* (*ç̄gv*: viii. 5. 11); *sh̄kr* (*sh̄sh̄kr*: ii. 34. 1), *sh̄ty* (*sh̄ty*: i. 12. 1), *sh̄tr* (*sh̄tr*: viii. 2. 27), *sh̄tv* (*sh̄tv*: i. 22. 3), *sh̄thy* (*sh̄thy*: i. 9. 3), *sh̄ny* (*sh̄ny*: i. 3. 1), *sh̄nv* (*sh̄nv*: iii. 19. 5), *sh̄pr* (*sh̄sh̄pr*: iv. 10. 4), *sh̄my* (*sh̄sh̄my*: ii. 32. 3); *sty* (*sty*: ii. 32. 3), *str* (*str*: i. 8. 1), *stv* (*stv*: i. 10. 3), *sth̄n* (*sth̄n*: iv. 12. 1), *sthy* (*sthy*: iv. 12. 3), *sphy* (*ssphy*: xi. 3. 9), *sm̄y* (*ssm̄y*: iv. 32. 6), *svy* (*ssvy*: v. 28. 10), *s̄k* (*s̄k*: ix. 7. 3), *s̄st* (*s̄st*: i. 8. 3), *s̄sth* (*s̄sth*: i. 31. 2), *sn̄* (*sn̄*: vi. 115. 3), *ssp* (*ssp*: iv. 16. 4), *ssm* (*ssm*: v. 22. 10), *ssy* (*ssy*: ii. 10. 7), *ssr* (*ssr*: ii. 3. 3), *ssv* (*ssv*: i. 19. 3); *ϕpr* (*ϕpr*: i. 7. 5), *ϕpl* (*ϕpl*: ix. 7. 12).

h̄ny (*h̄n̄ny*: x. 8. 18), *h̄ny* (*h̄n̄ny*: vi. 110. 3), *h̄vy* (*h̄vy*: iv. 17. 2).

III. Groups of four consonants:

kshmy (*kkshmy*: i. 18. 1), *ñkshn* (*ñkshn*: v. 20. 1), *ñkshv* (*ñkshv*: iii. 12. 6); *t̄str* (*th̄str*: vi. 11. 1), *n̄try* (*n̄try*: ii. 31. 4), *ntst* (*ntst*: ii. 35. 2), *ntsth* (*ntsth*: v. 2. 4), *ntsp* (*ntsp*: viii. 3. 7), *ntsv* (*ntsv*: iv. 5. 1), *ndry* (*ndry*: x. 2. 9); *r̄kshy* (*r̄kkshy*: vii. 85. 1), *r̄tv̄y* (*r̄t̄tv̄y*: viii. 10. 22), *r̄tsy* (*r̄tsy*: x. 1. 21), *r̄sh̄ny* (*r̄sh̄ny*: vi. 24. 2); *χkshv* (*χkshv*: viii. 3. 7), *sh̄try* (*sh̄try*: iv. 1. 2), *sstr* (*sstr*: vii. 95. 3).

There is no group of five consonants in the Atharva-Veda: if, however, the order of two words in i. 8. 1 had been reversed, we should have had a group of six, viz. *ntstry* (*pum̄ant̄ stry akah̄*). The fact deserves to be remarked here, although familiar to all students of the Vedas, that by no means all the groups of four and three consonants, or even of two, were, in all the cases of their occurrence, actually such groups to the makers of the hymns: in a majority of the passages where a *y* or *v* follows two or three other consonants, and very frequently where they follow a single consonant only, they are, as the metre shows, to be read as *i* or *u*, or *ī* or *ú*, constituting separate syllables. Those combinations which seem most difficult of enunciation are thus often relieved of a part or the whole of their harshness. Rarely (as at v. 28. 10), an apparent group of three consonants is to be resolved into two separate syllables.

4. Longer Metrical Passages cited by the Commentator.

In the notes on the text, I have passed over two extracts of considerable extent, made by the commentator from unnamed sources, and I now offer here the text of them. The first is found under rule i. 10; it runs as follows:

apara âha: caturtho hakâreṇe 'ti:

- I. 1. pañcâi 'va prathamân sparçân âhur eke mantshinâh,
teshâm guṇopasaṁcayâd ânyabhâvyam pravartate.
2. jihvâmûlîyaçashasâ upadhmanîyopañcamâh,
etâir guṇâih samanvitâ dvitîyâ iti tân viduh.
3. ta eva saha ghoshena tṛtîyâ iti tân viduh,
ûshmanâ ca dvitîyena caturthâ iti tân viduh.
4. prathamâh saha ghoshena yadâ syur anunâsikâh,
tân âhuḥ pañcamân sparçânâs tathâ varṇaguṇâh smṛtâh.
5. na tu hi vyañjanasamâdhir asaṁyogo bhavet punah,
saṁyogaç ca prasujyeta kramo vâcyah punar bhavet.
6. dvitvapṛâptiç caturtheshu hakâro hy atra kâra,
dvitîyeshu tu tan nâ 'sti sasthanê tannivâranât.
7. pippalyâdishu yad dvitvam svarâç chabdavidhih kṛtaḥ,
jñâpakonç ca dvitîyânâm dvitvapṛâpter iti sthîtiḥ.
8. guṇamâtrâ nu tatrâi 'shâm apûrnam vyañjanam kvacit,
apûrne vyañjane kramah saṁyogaç ca kuto bhavet.
9. pṛthaksattvâni paçyâmas tulyaliṅgâni kâni cit,
na teshâm liṅgasâmânyâd êkatvâna pratijâyate.
10. sattvapṛthaktvâd dvâiliṅgyam yad eteshu nibodha tat,
tathâi 'va pañçavargeṇa guṇamâtreṇa tulyatâ.

The other passage is the commentator's introduction to the fourth chapter:

sumâsavagrahavigrahân pade yatho 'vâca chandasi çakatâyanah; tathâ vakshyâmi catuštayam padum nâmâkhyâtopasarganipâtânâm.

- II. 1. âkhyâtam yat kriyâvâci nâma sattvâkhyam ucyate,
nipâtâç câdayah sarva¹ upasargâs tu prâdayah.
2. nâma nâmnâ 'nudâttena samastam prakṛtisvaram,
na yushmadosmadvocanâni na câ "mantritam ishate.
3. nâma 'nudâttram prakṛtisvaro gatir anucco vâ nâma cet syâd
udâttram, kriyâyoge gatîḥ pû vah,²
samâso yâvanto 'nuccâh samarthânâs tân samasyate.
4. yatrâ 'neko 'nudâtto 'sti paraç ca prakṛtisvarah,
âkhyâtam nâma vâ yat syât sarvam eva samasyate.
5. sopusargaṁ tu yan nicâih pûrvaṁ vâ yadî vâ param,³
udâttena samasyante tathâi 'va supratishṭhitam.
6. udâttaḥ tu nipâto yah so 'nudâttaḥ kvacid bhavet,
samasyante tathâ vidhim itihâso nidarçanam.
7. naghârishâm susahe 'ty evamâdîny udâharet,
sahe 'ty anenâ 'nudâttram param nâma samasyate.
8. anudâttena co 'dâttram svabhâvo yatra co 'cyate,
sahasûktavâkah sântardeçâḥ çatokrato nidarçanam.

¹ câdayo satva.

² gatishûrvaḥ.

³ pûrvavâyadvâpadaḥ.

9. *anudatto gati¹ madhye pūrvaparāu prakṛtisvarāu, pūrveṇa vīgrahas tatra puruṣhe 'dhi samāhitāh.*
10. *udāttānugati¹ yatrā 'nudāttam paraṁ padam, pūrveṇa vīgrahas tatra' saṁ subhūtyā nidarṣanam.*
11. *yatro 'bhe prakṛtisvare pūrvaṁ yac ca paraṁ ca yat, varjayitvā "dyudāttāni sarvam eva samasyate.*
12. *nā "khyātāni samasyante na cā "khyātāni ca nāma ca, nāma nāmno 'pasargāis tu sambandhārtham² samasyate.*
13. *na yushmadasmadādeṣā anudāttāt padāt pare, nāmopasargagatibhiḥ³ samasyante kudā cana.*
14. *mām anu pra te pra vām ityevamādīny udāharet, etadarṣconudāttāni idam asya tathāi va ca.*
15. *nāmopasargagatibhiḥ³ samasyante kudā cana, bṛhann eṣhām ya enām vanim āyanti pary enām pary asye 'ti nidarṣanam.*
16. *anudatto gatiḥ sarvāiḥ samastāḥ svaritādibhiḥ, saṁsrāvyeṇa⁴ durarmanya ācārye 'ti nidarṣanam.*
17. *pra-parā-ṇi-sam-ā-dur-ṇir-avā-'dhi-pari-vini ca, aty-abhy-āpi⁵-sū-'d-āpā ya upā⁶-'nu-pratir viṅṣatiḥ.*
18. *ekāksharā udāttā ādyudāttās tathā 'pare, abhī 'ty anta upasargāḥ kriyāyoge gatis tathā.*
19. *ādyudāttā daṣṭai 'teshām uccā ekāksharā nava, viṅṣater upasargānām antodāttas tv 'abhī 'ty ayam.*
20. *achā-'ram-astam-hasta-lāṅyūla'-tirah-purak⁶-punar-ṇamah⁷-kshiti¹⁰-vāti¹⁰-phali-hiṅ-srug¹¹-vashat-prādur¹²-ulā-kakojā-svāhā-svadhā-ṣrat-svaralale 'ty upasargavṛttīni yathāstāta-svarāṇi.*

Of this passage, the preliminary sentence (or verse) has been already translated, in the introductory note to the fourth chapter. The first verse gives a definition of the four parts of speech—or rather, a definition only of the verb and noun, the prepositions and particles being referred to as the two series commencing respectively with *pra* and *ca* (compare Pān. i. 4. 57, 58, and the lists of prepositions in the other Prātiçākhyas). Thenceforward, from the second to the sixteenth verse, inclusive, the extract is occupied with giving directions for the combination or non-combination, in the *pada*-text, of the various parts of speech, as they stand in juxtaposition with one another in connected discourse. The text of the Veda is assumed as existing in an utterly disjointed state, each independent element being known in its phonetic form (including its accent), and as such and such a part of speech; and the attempt is made to define the cases in which the elements form compounds with one another. The problem, however, is evidently much too extensive and difficult to be so briefly solved—if, indeed, any solution of it is possible without taking into account also the inflectional forms of the nouns and verbs—and the system of rules laid down is only fragmentary: but I have not taken the trouble to test them by the text, so as to

¹ *anudāttanugavir.*⁴ *saṁsrāvyaṇi.*⁷ *hantolāṅgūlām.*¹⁰ *vākshiti.*² *saṁvadhārtham.*⁵ *abhīpi.*⁶ *punah.*¹¹ *hiṅsrak.*³ *namop.*⁶ *apāyānityupā.*⁹ *navah.*¹² *gudur.*

determine where their deficiencies lie. The second verse informs us that a noun which has its natural accent is compounded with another which is unaccented, except in the case of an enclitic pronoun of the first and second persons, or a vocative: thus we must combine *tri*: *saptā'h* (i. 1. 1), *gatā*: *vrshnyam* (i. 3. 1), into *tri-saptā'h*, *gatā-vrshnyam*. The next verse and the one following treat of the combination of nouns and verbs with prepositions and other words employed as prepositions: these receive here and in what follows the name *gati*, which Pāṇini also (i. 4. 60 etc.) uses. Verse five has for its subject such compounds as are instanced by *sūpratishthitam* (xii. 1. 63: p. *sū-pratishthitam*). The sixth verse applies to compounds into which a particle enters as a constituent, and cites *itihāsāh* (xv. 6. 4: p. *itihā-āsāh*) as an example; and the first line of the next verse adds the farther instances *naghāri-shā'm* (viii. 2. 6; 7. 6: p. *nagha-rishā'm*) and *sūsaha* (vi. 64. 3: p. *sū-saha*). Hence to the end of verse 8, compounds with *saha* (and its substitute *sa*) are defined, the chosen illustrations being *sahāsūktavākāh* (vii. 97. 6: p. *sahā-sūktavākāh*) and *sāntardeçāh* (ix. 5. 37: p. *sā-antardeçāh*): *çatakrato* is also added, but apparently only by a blunder; or rather, the reading is probably false and corrupt, as the metre helps to show. Verse 9 prescribes the mode of combination in such a case as *pūrushé 'dhi samā'hitāh* (x. 7. 15), where an unaccented preposition stands between two others, both of which have their proper accent. The next verse takes for its example *sām sūbhūtyā* (iii. 14. 1), where two accented prepositions precede an unaccented noun, and the former of them is to be made independent. Verse 11 has no example, and, although easily enough translated, its meaning is to me obscure. We are then told what combinations are possible: verbs are not compounded with verbs or with nouns; but nouns with nouns and with prepositions. A verse and a half follows, denying the enclitic forms of the first and second personal pronouns the capability of entering into compounds, and citing as instances *mā'm ānu prā te* (iii. 18. 6) and *prā vām* (e. g. vii. 73. 5): and three additional lines extend the same exception to the enclitic demonstrative pronouns, and give the examples *bṛhānm eshām* (iv. 16. 1), *yā enām vanīm āyānti* (xii. 4. 11), *pāry enām* (ix. 2. 5), and *pāry asya* (xv. 12. 7). The sixteenth verse declares an unaccented preposition capable of composition with a following word, however accented, but illustrates only their composition with a circumflexed word, as *saṃsrā-vyēna* (e. g. i. 15. 1), *durarmānyāh* (xvi. 2. 1), and *ācāryāh* (xi. 5. 3 etc.). The subject now changes, and verses 17-19 give us a list of the twenty prepositions and a definition of their accentuation. Finally, the last verse (or prose passage) attempts to give a list of those words which are treated as if they were prepositions, although properly belonging to other classes. This list is a somewhat strange one, with regard both to what it includes and what it omits. A part of the forms which it contains are in frequent use, and familiarly known as bearing marked analogies with the prepositions proper. Such are *achā*, *tiraḥ*, *purāh*, *punah*, *hiñ*, *prāduh*, and *çrat*. Others, as *aram* and *astam*, are more remotely connected with the same class. *Vashat*, *svāhā*, and *vātī* are in the Atharvan compounded only with *kāra* and *kṛta*, and hardly in such a manner as should require their inclusion in the list. *Svadhā*

and *sruk* form no other compounds than *svadhākāra* and *srukkāra* (ix. 6. 22); *phali* forms *phalīkaraṇa* (xi. 3. 6); *kakajā* forms *kakajākṛta* (xi. 10. 25). *Namas* enters into *namaskāra*, *namaskṛta*, and *namaskṛtya* (vii. 102. 1), which last affords actually good ground for special treatment, as does *hastagr̥hya* (e. g. v. 14. 4), on account of which *hastā* is ranked with the others. For *lāngūla*, *kshiti*, and *ulā*, I can find nothing at all in the Atharvan: there is room in the case of the two last, and especially of the third, to suspect corrupted readings. What may be hidden in *svaralālā*, I have not been able to discover, nor how the last word in the extract, which apparently has to do with the accent of the words treated of, is to be amended into intelligibility. There are two words which we especially miss in this list of *upasargavṛttinī*, and can hardly believe to have been originally absent from it: they are *antaḥ* and *āvih*: I cannot, however, find by emendation any place for them in the text as it stands.

5. Corrections and Emendations.

I add here a rectification of certain errors in the body of the work, which have attracted my attention as I have been engaged in preparing the indexes; as also, corrections of such errors of the press as I have hitherto discovered.

At p. 355, rule i. 24, for त्रिङ्गम् read त्रिङ्गायम्.

At p. 371, rule i. 47, translation, for *palatal* read *lingual*.

At p. 378, l. 16, for *kārpanyam* read *kārpanyam*.

At p. 409, in commenting upon ii. 15, 16, I failed to notice that the implication in the former rule is of *catavargābhyām*, 'after palatal and lingual mutes,' and mutes only: hence this rule has nothing to do with any cases practically arising in the conversion of *pada* into *sankhīta*, and rule 16 covers all the lingualizations of *t* and *th* after *sh*, whether in the same or a different word.

At p. 419, rule ii. 29, at the end, for °दीनास् read °दीनाम्.

At p. 436, comm. to ii. 62, l. 4, the hyphen representing the *avagraha* has dropped out from *viḡvataḥ-pāṇiḥ*.

At p. 436, comm. to ii. 62, l. 28: another like instance of repetition is found at xx. 132. 12, where all the MSS. read *punaḥ punaḥ*.

At p. 437, rule ii. 64, translation: for *is* read *does*.

At p. 442, rule ii. 76, at the end, read °पर (broken letter).

At p. 448, under rule ii. 92, I was so heedless as to refer to *vy āsthan* (xiii. 1. 5) as an anomalous form from *sthā*, forgetting for the moment that it was, in fact, the irregular aorist of the root *as*, although I had formerly interpreted and indexed it as such. The *pada*-reading is *vi*: *āsthan*, as given by our manuscript; but it seems to require amendment to *vi*: *āsthat*, having *rohitaḥ* as subject.

At p. 450, rule ii. 97, comm., l. 3: for *stusha u shu* read *stusha ū shu*.

At p. 456, comm. to iii. 5: a compound analogous with *oshadhi-ja* is *pr̥thivi-sad* (*pr̥thivishadbhyaḥ*: xviii. 4. 78), which has also a claim to the attention of the Prāticākhyā in this part. Its *sh* was prescribed by ii. 100.

At p. 514, at the top, introductory note to chapter iv, I have expressed myself in a manner which misrepresents and does injustice to the Vâj. Pr. Although that treatise does not make the restorations of normal form in *pada* the subject of detailed treatment, yet its rules iii. 18, 19 (as pointed out in the note to iv. 74, above) virtually cover the ground, with more or less completeness.

At p. 539, under rule iv. 53, I have omitted the reference belonging to *ṛksâmâbhyâm*: it is xiv. 1. 11.

At p. 544, rule iv. 59 would have been more accurately translated "nor is division made before any member having an inserted *s* as its initial," etc. Whether, however, there is any propriety in regarding the inserted sibilant of *tuviṣṭama*, and of the other words cited, as the initial of the second member of the compound, is very questionable.

At p. 583, l. 32, for *vavṛdhânaḥ-iva* read *vavṛdhânaḥ-iva*.

The indexes call for but a few words of explanation.

Into the first I have admitted all distinct references to single passages of the Atharva-Veda, made by either the text or the commentary of the Prâtiçâkhya, distinguishing those of the latter always by an appended *c*. Words or brief phrases found at two or more places in the Atharvan (and so referred in the notes to the first of them, with a prefixed *e. g.*) are made no account of unless they are of peculiar and distinctive character; and, when noticed, they are marked here also by an added *e. g.*, or, if found only in a series of passages occurring in the same connection (as in different verses of the same hymn), by an added *etc.* I have also included in the index all passages to which important reference has been made in the notes on the text, as for the purpose of amending a reading, giving account of an emendation made in the edited text, stating the manuscript authority favoring or opposing a given reading, or the like: these are distinguished by an *n* affixed to the Prâtiçâkhya reference.

The second, or Sanskrit index, comprises, in the first place, the whole vocabulary of the treatise itself, both its grammatical phraseology and its citations from the Atharvan, the latter being denoted by a prefixed *a*. I have added as much of the vocabulary of the commentary as seemed to me worth the trouble, adding always a *c* to the reference. The pseudo-citations of the commentator, or the illustrations which he fabricates or derives from other sources than the Atharva-Veda, are also (excepting the phrases given in the latter part of add. note 2) included in the index, and marked with a prefixed *q*. This same indicatory letter is set before the few words quoted in the text of the treatise which are not found in the Atharvan.

In the third index it has not seemed to me worth while to make detailed references to the doctrines of the other treatises referred to in the notes; they may always be found stated in connection with the treatment of the related subject by our own Prâtiçâkhya.

INDEXES.

I. INDEX OF ATHARVAN PASSAGES,

CITED OR REFERRED TO IN THE TEXT, COMMENTARY, AND NOTES.

An *e. g.* added to the Atharvan reference marks it as denoting one of two or more passages where the word or phrase cited is found; an *etc.*, as denoting the first verse of a hymn or passage to which the reference applies. A *c* added to the Prātiçākhyā reference marks it as belonging to the commentary; an *n*, to the editor's note. The passages of the commentary given in add. note 4 are indicated by 4. II. 16 etc.

AV. I.		AV. i.		AV. ii.		AV. iii.	
1. 1	ii. 98c, iv. 1c.	29. 3	ii. 96c.	1. 1	ii. 57c.	1. 1	ii. 57c.
2	i. 79c.	30. 3	ii. 101c.	2	i. 3c etc.	3	ii. 10c, 17c, iii. 18c, iv. 29c.
3	i. 82, iv. 3c.	31. 1	iv. 72c.	4	1 e. g. i. 45c, 68c.	2. 3	iii. 27c.
2. 1	iv. 9c.	32. 1	iv. 57c.	5	iv. 107c.	3. 2	iv. 91c.
1 e. g.	iii. 16.	4	iii. 12c.	32. 1	i. 47c, iii. 27c.	5. 1	iv. 56.
3	ii. 32c, 90c.	33. 2	ii. 11c, iv. 49c, 50c.	3	iv. 18c.	5	iv. 20c.
4	iii. 16c.	34. 4	ii. 5c, iv. 16c.	33. 1	iv. 33c.	7	iii. 76c.
3. 1 e. g.	i. 5c.	5 e. g.	iii. 34c.	5	iv. 31c.	6. 1 e. g.	i. 27c, 53c, 83c, ii. 33c.
1 etc.	ii. 84c, iv. 75c, 78c.	35. 4	ii. 84c.	6	i. 66c, iv. 31c.	2	iii. 91c.
3	ii. 32c.			34. 3, 4	ii. 85.	8	iii. 80c.
8	ii. 90c.	AV. ii.		5	ii. 67.	7. 1	ii. 98c.
4. 1	iii. 18c, iv. 29c.	1. 1	ii. 2c.	35. 1	iv. 30.	3	iii. 16n (to I. 1. b).
5. 1	ii. 101c, iv. 78c, 79c.	2	ii. 73c.	2	ii. 31c, 85n.	8. 3	ii. 22, iv. 89.
6. 1	iv. 107c.	4	ii. 94c.	3	iv. 35c.	5	i. 73c, ii. 40c.
4	iii. 70c.	5	iv. 5, 14c.	36. 4	ii. 57c.	6 (?)	i. 99c.
7. 2	iv. 1c.	2. 1	ii. 70c, iv. 34c.	8	ii. 33c.	9. 4	iv. 29c.
7	ii. 27.	2	ii. 70c.			6	ii. 104c.
9. 3	iv. 1c.	4	iii. 9c.			10. 4	iv. 33c.
10. 1	ii. 66.	3. 1	i. 103c, ii. 38c, iv. 25c.			5	ii. 63c.
4	ii. 5c.	3, 5	ii. 40c, 40n.			6	ii. 72.
11. 1	ii. 106c.	5. 2	ii. 48c, iii. 70c.			10	ii. 84n, iv. 107c.
2	ii. 30.	3	ii. 82c, iii. 1c, 13c, iv. 70c.			12	ii. 92.
12. 1	ii. 40c.	4	i. 94n, iii. 38c, 66c, iv. 113c, 114c, 115c.			11. 3	ii. 87c.
2	i. 101c, iv. 79c.	5	iii. 16n (to II. 4 b).			3, 4	iii. 64c.
13. 1	ii. 60.	7	iii. 18c, iv. 29c.			12. 2	iii. 17c.
2	ii. 40c.	6. 2	ii. 14c.			7	ii. 106c.
14. 3	ii. 30c.	4	ii. 94c.			13. 1	iii. 59c, 65c.
4	ii. 40c, 62c.	7. 1 e. g.	ii. 27c.			3	ii. 2c, 45c.
15. 1 e. g.	iv. 3c, 4. II. 16.	2	iv. 55c.			6	ii. 44c.
2	ii. 30c.	9. 2	iv. 16c.			7	ii. 44c.
3	iv. 1c.	10. 7	ii. 46c.				
16. 3	iii. 13c.	8	iii. 80n.				
18. 4	ii. 98c.	12. 2	iii. 62c, 67c, 74c.				
19. 3 e. g.	ii. 27c.	3	iii. 62c, 67c, 74c.				
3	ii. 48c.	6	iii. 56c.				
4	ii. 40c, iv. 56c.	13. 2	ii. 15c.				
20. 2	iv. 92c.	3	i. 28c, ii. 19c, iii. 20c.				
3	iv. 92c.	15. 1 etc.	iii. 16c.				
4	ii. 27c.	25. 1	ii. 44c.				
24. 4	i. 28c, ii. 19c, 97c, iii. 4, 20c, iv. 3c, 98, 114c.	26. 2	iv. 37c.				
25. 2	iii. 52.	27. 5	i. 45c, 68c, iv. 41c, 75c.				
4	iv. 21c.	28. 3	iv. 26n.				
26. 4	ii. 91c, iv. 82c.	4	ii. 84c.				
27. 3	ii. 38c, iii. 13c.						
28. 1	iv. 3c.						
29. 1	iii. 12c, 13c, iv. 75c.						

AV. iii.		AV. iv.		AV. v.	
14. 1	ii. 32c, 4. II. 10.	17. 2	ii. 40n.	5. 9	ii. 91c, 103c, iv. 82c, 124c, 125c.
3	iii. 52c.	5	ii. 31c, iii. 84c, iv. 55c.	6. 4	iv. 98c.
15. 4	iv. 97c.	18. 6 e.g.	i. 66.	9 e.g.	iv. 96.
5	iv. 97c.	19. 2	iv. 83.	7. 2	iv. 1c, 75c.
16. 1	ii. 48c.	7	i. 47c.	6	i. 75c, ii. 22c, iii. 33c, 56c.
7	iii. 17c, 22c, iv. 89c.	20. 2	ii. 39c.	7	ii. 53c.
17. 1	ii. 55c.	5	ii. 59c, iv. 100c.	8	iv. 30.
18. 1	iii. 6c.	5 e.g.	ii. 63c.	8. 5	iv. 1c.
5	iv. 85c.	7	ii. 80c.	7	ii. 11c.
6	4. II. 14.	21. 4	iv. 58c.	11. 3	iv. 96.
19. 6	ii. 7c.	22. 2	ii. 85c.	6	iii. 90c.
20. 6	i. 75c, ii. 22c, iii. 33c, iv. 49c.	4	i. 82c.	7	i. 68c, ii. 29c.
10	ii. 103.	23. 1	i. 88c, iv. 36c.	8	iv. 34c.
21. 1	iii. 54c.	24. 1	iii. 91c.	12. 2	iv. 14c.
2	ii. 40n.	5	ii. 23.	5	iii. 71c.
5	iv. 4c.	25. 3	i. 81c, iii. 87c.	6 etc.	ii. 91c, iv. 82c.
6	iii. 64c.	5	i. 74c.	8	iv. 65.
22. 5	iv. 48c.	6	i. 81c, iii. 40c.	13. 5	i. 81c.
23. 4	ii. 84.	27. 1	iii. 21n.	6	i. 68c, ii. 42c, iii. 23.
6	ii. 74n.	4	ii. 68c.	8	iii. 72c.
26. 1 etc.	iii. 65c.	6	iv. 69c.	9	iii. 3c.
4	iii. 3c.	29. 1, 2	iv. 18c.	14. 7	iii. 81.
28. 3	iv. 33c.	5	iv. 67c.	11	ii. 104c.
4	iv. 45c.	6	iv. 16c.	15. 2-4	i. 27c, 53c, 83c, ii. 33c.
5	ii. 35c.	30. 4	iv. 57c.	6	ii. 39c.
29. 1	i. 63c, ii. 2c, iv. 51c.	6	iv. 11.	17. 1 (?)	iii. 53c, 55c.
3 etc.	ii. 35c.	31. 2	iii. 80n.	4	ii. 61c.
5	iv. 50n.	3	i. 77n, 94c, iv. 26c.	5	ii. 2c.
30. 1	iv. 56c.	4	i. 81c.	18. 7	iv. 107c, 109c.
5	ii. 32c.	32. 1	iii. 15, iv. 88.	11	iv. 96.
AV. iv.		3	iii. 56c.	12	ii. 55c.
1. 1	ii. 44c, 103c.	5	ii. 47c, iii. 14, iv. 87.	19. 1	iv. 22c.
3	ii. 5c, iv. 71c.	6	i. 68c, 81c, ii. 29c.	2	ii. 40c.
2. 4	iv. 26c.	7	i. 69c.	4	iv. 4c.
4. 1	ii. 56, iii. 6c, iv. 75c.	33. 2	iv. 12c, 30.	7	iii. 2c, iv. 94c.
7	iii. 16n (to I. 4. b), iii. 46n.	34. 1	ii. 105c.	8	ii. 61c.
8	iv. 16c.	3	iii. 46c.	13	iii. 13c, iv. 84c.
6. 2	ii. 93c.	5 etc.	iv. 38c.	20. 2	iv. 18c.
3	iv. 86c.	8	ii. 80n.	6	ii. 69c.
5	ii. 95.	5	ii. 31c.	8	ii. 7c.
8	ii. 84c.	37. 1	i. 28c, ii. 19c, iii. 20c.	9	iii. 89c, iv. 107c.
7. 3	ii. 62c, 85c.	4	iii. 59n, iv. 67c.	10	ii. 62.
5, 6	iv. 86c.	38. 5 e.g.	ii. 35c, iv. 81c.	11	ii. 23, 82c, iii. 1c, iv. 70c.
6	ii. 84c.	39. 1 etc.	iii. 49c.	21. 8	ii. 42c.
8. 6	iii. 94c.	2	ii. 6c, 43c.	22. 1	ii. 83c.
9. 9 e.g.	ii. 67c.	2 etc.	ii. 75.	5	i. 34c.
10. 1	ii. 67c.	4	ii. 20c.	6	ii. 85c.
2	iv. 5c.	9	ii. 62c.	7	ii. 40c.
4	ii. 62n.	AV. v.		9	i. 46c.
11. 3	iv. 12c.	1. 1	ii. 5c.	14	ii. 11c.
7	iii. 9c.	3	i. 76c, 77n.	23. 7	i. 103c, ii. 38c, iv. 25c.
8	iv. 48c.	5	i. 76c, ii. 97c, iii. 4c, 13c, iv. 98c.	24. 1	iii. 93c.
9	ii. 54c.	2. 8	ii. 49.	25. 8	ii. 104c.
12. 4	i. 85c.	9	iv. 54n.	9	iv. 18c.
13. 2	ii. 22c.	3. 8	iv. 86c.	28. 8	iii. 34n.
5	iv. 53c.	9	ii. 70c.	27. 6	iv. 45c.
14. 5	ii. 87c.	10 (?)	ii. 102c.	9	ii. 47c.
7	iv. 31c.	4. 1	iii. 38c, 66c.	28. 14	i. 71c, ii. 13c.
9	iv. 34c.	3	iv. 14c.	29. 2	iv. 15c.
15. 11	iii. 38c, 66c.	8	iii. 27c.	2, 3	ii. 77.
15	i. 96, 96n, 105.	10	ii. 63c.	11	i. 66c.
16. 1	ii. 5c, iii. 34n, 4. II. 15.	5. 3	iv. 99c.	30. 9	iii. 7.
		4	ii. 65c.	10	iv. 96.

AV. v.		AV. vi.		AV. vii.	
30. 16	iv. 96.	77. 2	ii. 5c.	50. 7	iv. 32c.
AV. vi.		78. 3	ii. 65c.	52. 2	ii. 18c.
1. 1	i. 80c.	79. 1	iii. 80n.	53. 3	ii. 46c.
3. 3	i. 74n.	81. 3	ii. 44c.	55. 1	iv. 30.
4. 1	i. 37c, ii. 85n, iv. 83.	82. 3	iv. 19c.	60. 4	iv. 9c.
3	ii. 74c, 74n, 80n.	89. 1	ii. 40c, 66c.	5	iii. 80n.
8. 1	iv. 38c.	91. 1	iii. 2, iv. 94.	63. 1	iii. 78c.
9. 3	iv. 93c.	2	i. 17c.	64. 1	iv. 77c.
11. 1	i. 27c, 53c, 88c, ii. 33c.	92. 2	iii. 11c, iv. 61c.	67. 1	ii. 48c.
2	i. 91c, iv. 125c.	3	iii. 56c.	70. 3	iii. 18n.
3	i. 89c, ii. 88, iv. 83, 86c, 107c.	93. 1	i. 88c, iv. 36c.	72. 2	i. 79c, iv. 115c.
14. 1	ii. 94c.	103. 2, 3	ii. 46c.	3	iii. 69c.
2	iii. 60c.	3	i. 78c.	73. 4	iii. 71c.
15. 1 e. g.	iv. 16c.	105. 2	iii. 69c.	7	ii. 2c.
2	iv. 56c.	106. 1	ii. 20c, iv. 78c.	10	iv. 64, 83.
16. 2	i. 46c.	3	ii. 65n, 65c.	81. 3	i. 69c.
4	iv. 107c.	107. 3	iii. 61n.	4	ii. 48c, iv. 38c.
17. 1 etc.	ii. 103c.	108. 2	iv. 99c.	82. 1	iii. 58c.
21. 3	ii. 91c, iv. 82c.	109. 1	iii. 65n.	3	ii. 86.
22. 3	ii. 78.	2	iii. 59c, 65c.	83. 3	iv. 93c.
23. 2	iv. 124c.	110. 3	iii. 86c.	85. 1	ii. 97c, iii. 4c.
24. 2	iv. 46c.	111. 1	iii. 69c, iv. 84c.	92. 1	ii. 48c, iv. 71c.
27. 3	i. 74c.	112. 2	iv. 50c.	93. 1	ii. 107.
28. 2	iii. 95c.	3	ii. 101c.	94. 1	ii. 65c.
29. 1	i. 47c.	113. 3	iv. 13c.	95. 2	iv. 96.
2	iv. 56c.	116. 1	ii. 2c.	97. 3	i. 88c, iv. 36c.
30. 2	i. 46c.	2	iii. 14c.	4	iii. 34n.
31. 2	iii. 34n.	117. 1	iii. 11c, iv. 61c.	6	iv. 12c, 4. II. 8.
32. 1	ii. 48c.	3	iii. 85c.	7	i. 94n.
33. 1	ii. 40c.	118. 3	iv. 81c.	99. 1	ii. 99c, 105c, iii. 75c.
3	iii. 96, iv. 59.	119. 3	iv. 72c.	104. 1	iii. 93c.
34. 4	iv. 4c.	121. 1 e. g.	ii. 86, 86n.	109. 2	i. 85c.
35. 2	iv. 32c.	122. 2	i. 34c.	3 (?)	i. 99c.
36. 1	iii. 24c, iv. 18c.	125. 1	iii. 58c.	6	iv. 28c.
2	i. 68c, ii. 29.	126. 1	iv. 14c.	115. 2	ii. 56.
3	ii. 36c.	128. 3	ii. 51c, iv. 52c.	4	iv. 77c.
37. 2	iv. 78c.	129. 1	i. 85c.	117. 1	i. 66c.
39. 1	iv. 20c.	134. 3	iii. 43c.		
3	iv. 16c.	136. 2	i. 71c.	AV. viii.	
40. 3	ii. 65c.	137. 3	iv. 93c.	1. 20	iii. 82c.
45. 1	ii. 23, 53c, 79.	139. 1	iii. 59c.	2. 6 e. g.	iii. 6, 4. II. 7.
47. 3	iv. 55c.	141. 2	ii. 65.	17	ii. 76.
50. 1	iv. 107c.	AV. vii.		3. 1	iii. 76c, 91c.
51. 3	iv. 86c.	1. 1	i. 74c.	10	iv. 34c.
53. 1	ii. 26c.	5. 1	ii. 15c.	14	ii. 32c.
54. 3	iv. 56n.	6. 1	iv. 26c.	16	iii. 80c.
56. 3	ii. 37c, iv. 107c.	2	ii. 97c, iii. 4c, iv. 98c.	26	i. 28c, ii. 19c, iii. 20c.
60. 1	ii. 21c, 24c, iii. 35c, iv. 77c.	3	iv. 75c.	4. 1	ii. 32c.
2	i. 80c.	4	ii. 41c.	6	i. 82c, iii. 33n, 88c.
62. 1	iii. 24c.	7. 1	ii. 26c.	7	ii. 102c.
63. 4	ii. 72n.	9. 2	iv. 72c.	8	iii. 21c, iv. 90c.
64. 3	iv. 39c, 4. II. 7.	3	iii. 89c.	18	iv. 34c.
65. 1	iv. 67c.	4	ii. 31c.	23	iv. 8.
67. 2	ii. 15c.	10. 1	ii. 44c.	5. 9	iii. 63c.
3	iii. 52c.	14. 1	iii. 61.	11	iii. 10c.
68. 1	ii. 15c, 21c, 24c, iii. 35c, 38c, 66c.	2	i. 65c.	16	ii. 9n.
3	iv. 18c.	17. 1	ii. 71c.	6. 1	iii. 84c.
70. 2	ii. 72c.	18. 1	iii. 56c, 65c.	4	iii. 84c.
71. 1 e. g.	ii. 85c.	21. 1	iii. 94c.	5	iv. 25c.
2	iv. 84c.	26. 1	iii. 16n (to II. 4. b).	9	iv. 18c.
72. 2	ii. 40c.	7	iii. 56c.	10	i. 52c.
75. 1	iv. 55c.	28. 1	iii. 76.	12	ii. 35c.
76. 4	iii. 78c.	31. 1	ii. 58.	13	iv. 22c.
		38. 5	iii. 5c.	14	ii. 94.
		46. 1	i. 94n.	16	iv. 56c.
		3	iv. 60c.	17	ii. 7c, iii. 52c.
		49. 1	ii. 40c.	18	iii. 3c, iv. 68c.

AV. viii.		AV. ix.		AV. xi.	
6. 19	ii. 52.	10. 1	i. 103c, ii. 38c, iv. 26c, 55c, 83.	1. 20	iii. 94c.
23	iv. 18c.	12	iii. 60c.	29	i. 94n.
26	iv. 18c, 55c.	19	ii. 93c.	31	i. 94n.
7. 2	ii. 74n.	21 (?)	i. 52c.	34	iv. 42c.
8	iii. 82c.	24	ii. 4c.	35	iv. 58c.
8. 19	iii. 76c, iv. 77c.	25	iv. 24c.	36	iv. 2c, 7c.
22	iv. 16c.	26	iv. 15c.	2. 8	i. 87n.
23	ii. 95.			9	iv. 27c.
9. 1	i. 50c.	AV. x.		12 etc.	iii. 46c, 65c.
8	ii. 2c.	1. 2	iv. 99c.	13	iii. 65c.
9	i. 77n, ii. 8c.	5	iv. 95c.	14	iv. 49c.
10	ii. 38c.	9	iii. 65n.	29	iv. 86c.
12	ii. 62.	13	iv. 91c.	3. 1	iii. 51c.
14	ii. 96c.	14	i. 38c.	26	i. 105, 105n.
15	i. 39c.	15	iii. 35n.	26, 27	iv. 6.
16	ii. 39c.	16	ii. 40c.	27	i. 105.
17	i. 23c, ii. 9c.	18	i. 94n.	49	iii. 55n.
20	ii. 4c, 40c.	26	iii. 18c.	4. 10	iv. 57c.
21	iv. 94c.	29	ii. 18c.	22	iii. 2c, iv. 94c.
10. 4	iii. 46c, 64c.	2. 1	i. 75c, iii. 33c.	23	iii. 70c.
21	iv. 21c.	3	iii. 69c.	5. 2	ii. 8c.
29	iv. 55c.	8	iii. 72c.	3 etc.	i. 17c, iii. 57c, 4. II. 16.
AV. ix.		13	iv. 39c.	6. 5	ii. 51c, iv. 52c.
1. 1	ii. 68c.	20	iii. 19c.	14	i. 84c, ii. 34c, 89c.
3	i. 87c.	28	i. 70, 97, 105, 105n, iv. 6, 120c, 121c.	7. 1	ii. 13c.
2. 5	iii. 80c, 4. II. 15.	31	iii. 2c, iv. 94c.	10	ii. 62.
13	iv. 92n.	3. 2	iii. 80c.	11	iv. 51c, 80.
25	ii. 84c, iv. 33c.	13	ii. 20c.	12	ii. 50c.
3. 2	iii. 89c.	4. 2	i. 66c.	13	iv. 84c.
10 e. g.	iv. 58c.	5	iii. 60c.	8. 1	ii. 21c, 24c, iii. 85c.
17	i. 4c, 61c.	16	iv. 49c.	4	iv. 42c.
21	iii. 2, iv. 94c.	17	iii. 59n.	7	iv. 15c.
22	ii. 45c.	21	iv. 30.	28 (?)	i. 65c.
4. 4	iv. 107c.	24	ii. 34c.	9. 10	iii. 10c.
11	iii. 46c.	25	iv. 91c.	14	iii. 59c, 65c.
14	iv. 62c.	5. 7	ii. 43c.	15	ii. 62, iii. 73c, 76c, iv. 77c.
17	ii. 70.	22 e. g.	iv. 88.	10. 8	iii. 10c.
23	iii. 94c.	29	iv. 72c.	16	ii. 42c.
5. 4	i. 87n, ii. 47c, iv. 19c.	36 e. g.	ii. 92c.	19	iii. 76c, iv. 77c.
6	iv. 60c.	6. 1	ii. 43c.	23	iii. 55n.
17	iii. 19c.	2	ii. 87c.	26	iv. 68c.
19	iv. 34c.	5 etc.	iv. 40c.	AV. xii.	
32-36	iv. 44c.	19	iv. 10c.	1. 26	i. 85c.
37	iv. 12c, 4. II. 8.	20	ii. 43c.	33	iv. 4, 48c.
6. 1	i. 84c, ii. 34c, 89c.	31	ii. 65c.	40	ii. 20n.
2	ii. 105c, iii. 75c.	7. 6 e. g.	iv. 123c.	47	iv. 59c.
4	iii. 79c.	15	4. II. 9.	48	iii. 78c.
5	iii. 79c.	25	iv. 5c.	51	iv. 91c.
11	iv. 42c.	33	iii. 82c.	54	ii. 82c, iii. 1c, iv. 70c.
14	i. 69c.	43	iii. 92c.	63	ii. 47c, 4. II. 5.
18	i. 52c, 62c, 105, 105n.	8. 10	iii. 49c.	2. 2	iv. 43c.
40	ii. 96c.	13	iii. 93c.	3	iv. 56c.
46	i. 58c, 100c, ii. 41c, iii. 31c.	24	ii. 41c.	4	ii. 100c.
53	iv. 7c.	27	i. 4c.	4 e. g.	iv. 95c.
54	iv. 2c, 7c.	41	iii. 74c.	8	iii. 88c.
7. 19	ii. 42c.	43	ii. 54c.	9	i. 71c.
8. 14	iii. 47c.	9. 3	i. 66c.	14	ii. 102c.
15	iii. 47c.	12	ii. 100c.	19	i. 94n.
16	iii. 47c.	10. 10	iii. 55n.	26	iii. 73c.
9. 2	iv. 5c.	23	i. 20c.	29	iv. 27c.
10	iv. 93c.	29	iv. 13c.	45	ii. 76c.
15	iv. 99c.	AV. xi.		51	iv. 40c.
16	iv. 19c.	1. 1	iii. 51c, iv. 107c.	3. 10	ii. 20c.
22	ii. 102c.	2	ii. 8c.	21	ii. 32c.
		5	i. 45c.		

AV. xii.

3. 28 ii. 68.
 30 iv. 26c.
 30 ii. 18c.
 33 iii. 34.
 35 iv. 91c.
 37 iv. 2c.
 39 ii. 62c.
 41 iii. 92c.
 43 i. 28c, ii. 19c, 20c,
 iii. 20c.
 52 iv. 40c.
 55 iv. 91c.
 55 etc. iv. 115c.
 58 iii. 55n.
 4. 4 iii. 65n.
 11 4. II. 15.
 18 ii. 52c.
 29, 30 i. 86c, 86n.
 30 ii. 15n.
 35 iv. 37c.
 35 iii. 55n.
 36 iii. 21, iv. 90.
 41 iii. 59n.
 42 i. 97, 105.
 47 iii. 55n.
 5. 7 ii. 4c.
 20 ii. 102c.
 21 iii. 65n.
 34 iv. 62c.
 44 ii. 11c.
 48 iii. 92c.
 50 i. 105.

AV. xiii.

1. 4 ii. 9n, 46c.
 15 iii. 65n.
 16 i. 50c.
 22 ii. 107c.
 25 iv. 75c.
 34 (?) i. 16c.
 35 ii. 84c.
 48 iii. 55n.
 2. 3 iv. 5c.
 14 ii. 91c, iv. 29c,
 82c.
 20 iii. 27c.
 26 ii. 62c.
 36 (?) iv. 71c.
 37 ii. 69c.
 46 ii. 106c, iii. 87c.
 3. 3 iv. 57c.
 6 ii. 9n.
 10 iii. 17n.
 16 iii. 65n.
 19 iv. 13c.
 4. 5 ii. 21c, 24c, iii. 35c,
 36c, iv. 116c.
 10 iv. 13c.
 25 (?) iii. 65c.
 28 i. 74c.
 41 iii. 36c.
 47 ii. 71.

AV. xiv.

1. 1 ii. 18c, iv. 62c.
 3 iv. 35c.
 8 i. 50c.
 11 iv. 53c.
 12 iv. 24c.
 18 ii. 65c.
 29 iv. 18c, 48c, 76c.
 36 ii. 92.
 41 ii. 64.
 43 ii. 91c, iv. 82c.
 44 ii. 36c, iii. 60c.
 57 (?) i. 99c.
 2. 2 ii. 70.
 12 ii. 31c, iii. 95c.
 14 ii. 54c.
 17 ii. 31c.
 20 ii. 65c.
 26 iii. 60c.
 34 ii. 20c.
 37 i. 76c.
 41 iii. 60c.
 43 iv. 50c.
 44 ii. 31c.
 52 iv. 54n.
 61 ii. 14c.
 72 iii. 18c.

AV. xv.

2. 1 etc. i. 90c, ii. 25c.
 3. 2 iii. 53c, 55c.
 6. 4 4. II. 6.
 8. 1 iii. 53c, 55c.
 10. 7 iii. 40c.
 12. 1 iv. 62c.
 7 4. II. 15.
 13. 1 iii. 8c.
 14. 3 iii. 55n.
 15. 4 iii. 45n.
 7 ii. 21c, 24c, iii. 35c.
 18. 3 iii. 53c, 55c.

AV. xvi.

1. 1 ii. 102c.
 2. 1 4. II. 16.
 3. 5 iii. 85c.
 4. 3 iii. 55n.
 6. 6 ii. 71c.
 7. 11 ii. 50c.

AV. xvii.

- 25 ii. 50c.

AV. xviii.

1. 1 i. 79c.
 4 ii. 7c.
 5 iii. 34c, 86c.
 10 iii. 8c.
 16 ii. 97c, iii. 4c. iv.
 98c.
 20 iii. 73c.
 21 iii. 25.
 23 ii. 40c.
 30 (?) iii. 30c.
 31 iv. 50c.

AV. xviii.

1. 32 i. 74c, ii. 45c.
 33 ii. 17c.
 37 ii. 97c, iii. 4c, iv.
 98c.
 39 i. 74c.
 45 etc. ii. 59c, iv. 100c.
 46 iv. 34c.
 49 i. 88c, iv. 36c.
 51 ii. 100c.
 54 e. g. iii. 83c.
 55 ii. 51c.
 2. 3 ii. 76.
 4 iv. 86n.
 6 i. 103c, ii. 38c.
 12 ii. 100c.
 23 iii. 25c.
 25 ii. 31c.
 31 iii. 17c, 46n, iv.
 107c.
 32 ii. 52c.
 34 iv. 63c.
 36 ii. 7c.
 46 iv. 39c.
 54 iv. 91c.
 3. 3 iii. 79c.
 14 i. 80c.
 15 iv. 67c.
 16 iii. 9c, iv. 67c.
 21 iii. 25c, iv. 15c.
 31 i. 82c.
 42 i. 94n.
 44 i. 80c, 84c, ii. 34c,
 89c, 96n.
 46 iii. 12n.
 55 iii. 10c.
 61 iv. 17c.
 63 i. 94c, iii. 9c, 9n.
 70 ii. 47c.
 71 ii. 7c.
 4. 1 i. 94n, iii. 85c.
 2 ii. 63c.
 4 i. 74n.
 5 ii. 35c.
 15 iii. 55n.
 37 iii. 38c, 66c.
 40 i. 38c, iv. 95c.
 50 iii. 79n, iv. 2c, 7c.
 51 i. 37c.
 54 iii. 9c, 9n.
 56 i. 94n.
 58 iii. 34n.
 59 i. 65c, ii. 10c, 17c.
 60 iii. 86c.
 67 ii. 99c.
 78 ii. 100c.

AV. xix.

6. 5 ii. 22n.
 9. 12 iv. 49c.
 13. 1 ii. 22n.
 39. 1 ii. 67c.
 40. 4 i. 77n.
 44. 8 iii. 65n.

2. SANSKRIT INDEX.

A prefixed *a* marks a word or phrase as a citation from the Atharva-Veda; a prefixed *q*, as a quotation in the text or commentary not taken from the Atharvan. Other signs are used as in the preceding Index.

- a*, iv. 69.
 a. *akar*, ii. 44.
akāra, i. 36, 101, ii. 53.
 92, iii. 13, 53, 55, 77.
 q. *akravam*, iii. 53c, 55c.
 q. *akshatarçah*, iii. 32c.
akshara, i. 14, 93. cf. *ekāk-*
sandhyak-, *samānik-*.
 a. *agni*, ii. 96.
 a. *agnī*, iii. 40c.
 q. *agnicit*, ii. 14c.
 q. *agrepitva*, iv. 26c.
aghoshā, i. 12, 13c, ii. 3, 4,
 25, 26, 40.
aṅga, iv. 16c.
 a. *aṅgulī*, i. 66.
aṅguskthaparvamātra, iv.
 105c.
 a. *aṅgebhyaḥ pari*, ii. 67.
añcati (r. *añc*), iv. 53.
 r. *añj*: *anuyānakti*, iv.
 107c.
añumātrā, iii. 65.
atah, i. 49.
atiçāyana, iv. 16c.
 a. *atiskthipam*, iv. 96.
atra, ii. 39, 81.
 q. *atra*, i. 56c, 78c, ii. 2c, 20c,
 iii. 39c.
adrshā, iv. 109.
 a. *adka*, iii. 25.
adharakantha, i. 19.
adharānsktha, i. 25.
 a. *adhī*, ii. 104.
adhika, i. 105c.
adhikāra, iii. 96c.
adhisparçam, i. 9, ii. 24.
adhyayana, iv. 101, 107.
 108.
anati (r. *an*), iv. 39.
anantara, iii. 74.
anartha, iv. 3.
anahā, iv. 86.
anārshā, i. 81.
anāṅga, iv. 12.
anāṅgya, iv. 49c, 76c.
anewca, 4. II. 3.
anuttama, i. 99, ii. 2, 20.
anudarçana, i. 8c.
anudātta, i. 15, 96, iii. 57,
 58, 67, 71, 74, iv. 2.
anunāsika, i. 8c, 10c (4. a. *ami*, i. 78.
 I. 4), 11, 27, 53, 67, 69. q. *amayāvi*, iv. 18c.
 83, ii. 35, iv. 119, 121. a. *anupradīna*, i. 12.
anusvāra, i. 26c.
anūskman, i. 94.
aneka, iv. 2.
anekākshara, iv. 15.
anta, i. 8, 75, 80, 88, ii. 47,
 99, iii. 1, 19, 53, 57, 77,
 78, 90, iv. 14, 55, 56, 69,
 70, 91, 107, 111, 124.
 cf. *padānta*.
antahpade, i. 83, ii. 33, iii.
 59, iv. 88c.
antahsthā, i. 30, ii. 32, iii.
 39, 58, iv. 107c.
antagata, iv. 112, 117.
 a. *antar*, ii. 48, 62.
antodātta, iv. 26, 30c, 38c,
 4. II. 19.
antya, i. 63, 92.
anya, i. 49, 52, 102, iv. 77.
anyayukta, iv. 3.
anyayoga, iv. 116c.
 a. *apa*, ii. 95.
apanodana, iv. 108c.
api, i. 35, ii. 16, 63, 89, 92,
 93, iii. 59, 68, 72, 79, iv.
 2, 36, 77.
apūrṇa, i. 10c (4. I. 8).
apūrva, iii. 57.
aprkta, i. 72, 79, iv. 113.
 q. *aprajā*, *aprajāta*, iv. 56c.
 a. *aprayāvan*, iv. 56.
apravina, iv. 107c.
apluta, i. 97, iv. 120.
 a. *apsu*, ii. 100.
 a. *abibhar*, ii. 44.
 a. *abhi*, ii. 104.
abhidhāna, *abhidheya*, iv.
 106c.
abhinidhāna, i. 43, 44, 49c.
abhinipāta, i. 43c.
abhinishāna, i. 42, 105c.
abhinīhita, iii. 55 intr. n.,
 55, 65.
 a. *abhi vi tanu*, iv. 3.
 a. *abhi viparçyāmi*, iv. 4.
 a. *abhi syāma prtanyataḥ*, ii.
 107.
 a. *abhyaghāyanti*, iv. 96.
abhyāsa, ii. 91, 93, iii. 13,
 iv. 82, 84.
 q. *amayāvi*, iv. 18c.
 a. *amnah*, ii. 52.
ay, iii. 40.
ar, iii. 46.
 q. *arkah*, i. 58c, iii. 31c.
 q. *arcā*, i. 58c, iii. 31c.
 q. r. *arch*: *upārçhati*, *prār-*
çhati, iii. 48c.
artha, i. 74, iv. 107, 108. cf.
anartha, *matvartha*.
 r. *ardh*: *ārçknuvan*, iv.
 102c.
 q. r. *ardh*: *upārçhnoti*, *prār-*
çhnoti, iii. 48c.
ardha, i. 101. cf. *mātrār-*
dha.
ardharca, iii. 74c.
 q. r. *arsh*: *upārshātī*, *prār-*
shātī, iii. 48c.
av, iii. 40.
 a. *ava*, iv. 30.
avakrshā, i. 43c.
avagr̥hya, iv. 42, 44, 49c,
 55c, 108c, 117, 123.
avagraha, i. 45, iii. 64, 69,
 73, 74c, 85, iv. intr. n.,
 iv. 7, 44-46c, 55c, 76c,
 80, 123.
avati (r. *av*), iv. 11c.
avatta, iv. 105c.
 q. *avattam*, iii. 11c, iv. 61c.
avani, iv. 105c.
avarṇa, iii. 44, iv. 56.
 a. *avaçā*, i. 97, 105.
avasanna, i. 43c.
avasāna, i. 70, iv. 111c.
avasānika, *avasita*, i. 8c,
 9c.
avyaya, ii. 48, iv. 71.
 a. *ashta*, iii. 2, iv. 94.
ashtama, i. 102.
 q. *ashtādanshṭra*, iii. 2, iv.
 94c.
 q. *ashtāparṇa*, iii. 2, iv. 94c.
 r. *as*: *samasyate*, iv. 1, 26c,
 27c, 46c, 4. II. 3-7, 11-
 13, 15; *samastah*, 4. II.
 16.
asti (r. *as*), ii. 101.
asmad, 4. II. 2, 13.
 a. *asme*, i. 77.
asyah, ii. 70.
asvara, iii. 74c.
 a. *ahan*, *ahar*, ii. 50, iii. 77.
 a. *ahār*, ii. 46.
 a. *ahorātre*, iv. 52.

- ā. iii. 95.
 ākāra, i. 35, 79, 96, ii. 22,
 27, 55, iii. 38, iv. 14, 115.
 ākshipta, i. 16.
 ākhyā, ii. 38c, iv. 39.
 ākhyāta, i. 1, iv. 1, 88c, 92,
 4. II. 1, 4, 12.
 āgama, iii. 78, iv. 8c, 59,
 126c.
 ācamana, iv. 107c.
 āt, ādanta, iii. 1, iv. 70.
 q. ādarśah, iii. 32c.
 ādi, i. 56, ii. 83, iii. 18, 28,
 48, iv. 18, 29, 50, 58, 59,
 61, 63, 107, 115:—i. 65,
 66, 82, 85, ii. 25, 27, 29,
 30, 59, 67, 80, 84, 85, 98,
 103, iii. 4, 12, 16, 21-3,
 34, 47, 52, 76, 92, iv. 3-
 5, 28, 54, 56, 90, 98-100.
 āditah, i. 17.
 ādeca, i. 63, 77c, ii. 84, 4.
 II. 13. cf. ekādeca.
 ādya, iii. 23.
 ādyudātta, iv. 38c, 4. II. 11,
 18, 19.
 āntarya, i. 95.
 ānpada, iv. 74.
 Ānyataveya, iii. 74c.
 āpatti, i. 68, iii. 58. cf. sam-
 āpatti.
 a. āpāka, ii. 94.
 a. ā babhūvān, i. 70, 97,
 105, iv. 6.
 āmantrita, i. 51, ii. 47, iv.
 26c, 4. II. 2.
 āmnāna, iv. 101c, 103c,
 126c.
 āmredita, ii. 62c, iv. 40.
 āy, iii. 40.
 a. āyuh, ii. 75.
 ār, iii. 48.
 a. ārtni iva, i. 82.
 ārsha. cf. anārsha.
 āv, iii. 40.
 a. āvar, ii. 44.
 a. āvīh, ii. 63.
 a. ācā, iv. 72.
 a. ācīh, i. 105, iv. 6.
 a. āsīt, i. 105.
 q. āste, iii. 27c.
 āsthāpita, i. 48, iv. 125.
 āśya, i. 27c.
 ākūh, ii. 39.
 r. i. cf. pretya, etc., etc.
 ikāra, i. 96, iii. 56, iv. 69.
 r. iṅg: iṅgyate, iv. 28c;
 iṅgita, iv. 49c; iṅgya-
 māna, iv. 76c.
 iṅga. cf. anīṅga.
- iṅgya, iv. 44c, 76, 93c. cf.
 anīṅgya.
 ichā, iii. 18, iv. 29.
 a. idāyāh, ii. 72.
 iti, i. 2, 8, 66, 70, 77, 96,
 97, 101, 105, ii. 23, 28,
 29, 39, 45, 100, iv. 6, 45,
 96, 117.
 a. iti, i. 72, 81, 82, 97.
 itva, i. 77c.
 a. idam ū shu, iii. 4, iv. 98.
 a. idān, i. 105.
 a. iyām, i. 105.
 a. iva, i. 82, iv. 41.
 inarṇa, i. 21c, iii. 44.
 iha, i. 2.
 ikāra, i. 74, iii. 57c.
 iyaḥ, i. 89.
 ishatsprṣhta, i. 30.
 ukāra, i. 63, 72, ii. 53, 60,
 iii. 36, iv. 116, 118.
 ucca, 4. II. 19. cf. anucca.
 uccāh, i. 14.
 uñ (part. v), iii. 4.
 uttama, i. 6, 11, 99, ii. 5,
 20. cf. anuttama.
 uttara, iv. 123.
 uttarapada, ii. 94c, iii. 23,
 iv. 50, 107c.
 uttararūpa, iii. 74c.
 a. ud. ii. 18, iv. 62.
 udaya, iii. 27c, 65.
 udātta, i. 14, 17, 77, iii. 58,
 65, 66, 67, 70, 74, iv. 1.
 cf. anud-, antod-, ādyud-.
 udāttaṅguti, iii. 71, iv.
 107c.
 udāharana, i. 48c, ii. 81c,
 iv. 75c, 76c, 121c.
 q. uddhatah, iv. 62c.
 q. ud dhara, iii. 40c.
 upajña, iv. 109.
 upajāta, iv. 10, 12c, 46c,
 53c.
 upadhā, i. 92, ii. 27, 29,
 42, 53, 55, 81, iii. 27.
 upadhānāniya, i. 10c, 25c.
 upapada, ii. 28c.
 a. upabādha, ii. 27.
 a. uparshanti, iii. 47.
 upasarga, i. 1, ii. 90, iii. 11,
 48, 79, iv. 1, 35c, 37, 4
 II. 1, 5, 12, 13, 15, 18, 19.
 upasargavṛtti, iv. 1c, 2c,
 4. II. 20.
 upasrṣhta, iv. 36.
 upācāra, iv. 74.
 ubha, ii. 35.
 a. ubhaya, iv. 21.
- uvarṇa, iii. 45.
 q. ushtrah, iii. 30c.
 ukāra, i. 74, iii. 60.
 q. ūtaye, iii. 40c.
 a. ūdhah, ii. 52.
 ūshman, i. 10c, 31, 46, 68,
 101, ii. 25, 26, 32, 33. cf.
 anūsh-, sosh-.
 ṛkāra, ii. 99, iii. 85.
 q. ṛṇoti, iii. 27c.
 a. ṛta, iii. 24.
 ṛti, i. 101c.
 a. ṛtān ut srjate vaṣi, ii. 29.
 ṛvarṇa, i. 20c, 37, 71, iii.
 46, 75.
 lkāra, i. 4.
 ḷvarṇa, i. 20c, 39.
 eka, i. 40, ii. 47, iii. 41.
 ekapada, iv. 108c, 126.
 ekamātra, i. 69.
 ekaṅguti, iv. 107c.
 ekākshara, iv. 15, 55, 56,
 4. II. 18, 19. cf. anek-
 ekādeca, i. 69, iii. 66, iv.
 114.
 ekāra, i. 34, 76, 97, iii. 44,
 50, 53, 55.
 eke, i. 33, 101.
 a. eta, iv. 48.
 etāvattva, ii. 28c, 44c.
 a. ena, iii. 80.
 a. enā ehāh, iii. 33.
 eva, i. 103, ii. 34, iv. 36,
 59, 80, 97, 116.
 evan, i. 2, 66, ii. 29.
 a. esha, ii. 57.
 āikāra, i. 41, iii. 50.
 okāra, i. 34, 80, iii. 45, 51,
 53, 55, iv. 115.
 a. onyoh, iii. 61.
 a. odanāh, i. 105.
 a. oshadhi, iii. 5, 6.
 oshtha. cf. adharāushtha.
 oshthya, i. 25.
 āukara, i. 41, iii. 51.
 ka (k), ii. 9, 62, 87.
 ka (suff.), iv. 25.
 kaṅtha. cf. adharakaṅtha.
 kaṅthya, i. 19.
 r. kan: kāmāyama, iv.
 102.
 a. kar, ii. 44.
 karama, i. 18, 18c, 25c, 29,
 50. cf. bhūtakarana.

- a. karat, ii. 65.
a. karam, ii. 65.
karoti (r. kar), iv. 27c, 58.
a. karna, ii. 65.
q. kartṛ, i. 4c
karmān, iv. 101c, 106c.
karmānman, iv. 29.
karmapravacaniya, iv. 3.
karmaṣeṣa, iv. 101c.
karshana, ii. 39.
q. karshati, iii. 32c.
kavarga, i. 20c, ii. 40c, 87c.
kavi, iii. 65.
q. kāmartaḥ, iii. 46c.
a. kāmya, iv. 40.
kāritānta, iv. 91.
q. kārpunya, i. 65c.
kāla, ii. 39. cf. kramak-
padak-, parihārak-.
a. kuru, ii. 65.
a. kṛnotu, ii. 65.
kṛt, iv. 26c, 27c, 35c, 45c.
a. kṛti, ii. 65.
a. kṛtva, iv. 27.
a. kṛdhī, ii. 65.
a. kṛpā, i. 65.
kṛpi (r. kṛp), i. 64, iv. 86.
kevala, iii. 36, 38, iv. 113c.
kevaṣeṣta, iii. 43c.
a. kesaraprabandhāyāḥ, iv.
96.
q. koshanam, iii. 75c.
q. kratvā, ii. 64c.
r. kram : anukramishyā-
mah, ii. 81c; anukrānta,
ii. 81c; upakramyate, i.
18c.
krama, i. 10c (4. I. 5, 8), iv.
78.
kramakāla, iv. 109c, 117c,
123c.
kramaja, i. 58.
kramapada, iv. 110, 122c.
kramavat, iv. 123.
kramādhyayana, iv. 108.
kriyāvācin, 4. II. 1.
kriyāyoga, 4. II. 3, 18.
q. kroshtar, iii. 50c.
kvacit, iii. 54.
r. kship : ākshipta, i. 16.
kshubhna (r. kshubh), iii.
92.
kshāipra, iii. 55 intr. n.,
58, 65, iv. 11c.
q. khatvendra, khatvodakam,
khatvairakā, khatvāiti-
kāyanah, iii. 44c, 45c,
50c.
a. khaṇvakhāsi, khāimā-
khāsi, i. 96, 105.
q. khanati, i. 20c.
q. gaṇ, i. 47c, ii. 9c.
gati, 4. II. 3, 10, 13, 15, 16,
18.
gami (r. gam), i. 86.
a. gavām, ii. 70.
a. gavishṭi, ii. 23.
a. gaveshaṇa, ii. 23.
guṇa, i. 1, 10c (4. I. 1, 2, 4,
8, 10).
guru, i. 43c, 52.
q. goduh, i. 3c, etc., etc.
a. gosani, ii. 103.
r. grah : avagrhyate etc.,
iv. 35c, 38c, 50c, 56c,
76c, 77c. cf. avagrhya,
avagraha.
grahaṇa, i. 68c, ii. 28c.
glāpi (r. glā), iv. 93.
ghosha, i. 10c (4. I. 3, 4).
cf. aghoska.
ghoshavant, i. 13, ii. 2, 11,
43, 54.
ḥa, i. 47, ii. 9, iii. 27.
ca, i. 2, 5, 9, 31, 32, 45, 48,
53, 54, 57, 58, 60, 63, 68,
69, 73, 74, 76, 77, 80, 81,
89-91, 104; ii. 3, 4, 14,
23, 34, 37, 43, 49, 54, 67,
69, 71, 74, 80, 85, 91, 95,
100, 103, 106; iii. 18, 19,
20, 33, 34, 47, 49, 61, 69,
73, 82, 87, 94, 95; iv. 5,
9, 11, 18, 22, 26, 28, 32,
34, 41, 43, 44, 49, 50, 54, 55,
61, 63, 75, 82, 85, 100, 101,
109, 120, 121, 126.
a. cakra, iii. 2.
catuṛ, i. 1.
catuṛtha, i. 1c, 10, 10c (4. I.
3, 6), 101, 102, ii. 7.
a. catuṛātra, iv. 80.
r. car : uccārya, i. 29c.
cayā, iii. 96c, iv. 74, 114c,
123.
cavarga, i. 7, 21c, ii. 14, 26,
39, iii. 94.
cavargiya, ii. 11, 15c.
q. cāyakah, iii. 40c.
q. cinoti, ii. 26c.
cet, ii. 38, iv. 39.
cyāvayati (r. cyu), iv. 91.
chakāra, ii. 17.
a. chandas, ii. 62.
chandas, iv. intr. n., 11c,
35c, 126c.
q. chādayati, ii. 26c.
chāndasa, iv. 26c, 35c.
r. jan : upajāyeta, iv. 35c.
cf. upajana, upajāta.
japana, i. 43c.
jara, iv. 53c.
jarat, iv. 53.
jahāti (r. hā), ii. 46.
jāgāra, iv. 96.
jāta, iii. 55 intr. n. cf. pa-
dajāta.
q. jātiya, iv. 28.
jātiya, iii. 55 intr. n., 57, 65.
a. jāpatya, iv. 64, 83.
jihvā. cf. madhyajihva.
jihvāgra, i. 22, 24.
jihvāmūla, i. 20c.
jihvāmūliya, i. 10c, 20, 20c.
a. jiva, ii. 76.
jivāntim ośadhim, iii. 6.
a. jihidā'ham, iii. 14, iv. 87.
r. jñā : pratijānate, iii. 55
intr. n. cf. pratijñā etc.
jñāna, iv. 107.
jyotiṣṭva, iv. 102.
ñakāra, ii. 10.
ṭa, ii. 9.
ṭakāra, ii. 8.
ṭavarga, i. 22c, ii. 14, 26,
39, iii. 94.
ṭavargiya, ii. 12.
ṭikate, ii. 14c, 26c, 40c.
ṭutva, iv. 74.
ḍa, i. 29c.
dayamānam, ii. 31c.
ḍiyate, ii. 12c, 14c.
ḍha, i. 29c.
ṇa, i. 47, ii. 9, iii. 27, 75.
ṇakāra, ii. 12.
ṇatva, iv. 74.
ṭ, iii. 11.
ta, ii. 9.
takāra, ii. 8, 13, 61, 83, iv.
47, 61.
tataḥ, i. 35.
a. tatas pari, ii. 66.
q. tatra, ii. 26c.
tad, i. 103, ii. 7, 15, 39, iii.
31, 65, iv. 36, 111, 125.
a. tad, ii. 85, iv. 48.
taddhita, ii. 83, iv. 13, 26c,
27c, 45c, 55c.
tanmānin, iv. 29.
tama, iv. 16, 46.

- tara*, iv. 16.
q. tarati, ii. 26c, iii. 37c.
tavarga, i. 24c, ii. 26, iii. 94.
tanargiya, ii. 15, 17.
tātīl, iv. 20.
a. tāḍ, i. 105.
a. tān agre, ii. 85.
tālavya, i. 21.
tīkshya, iii. 55 intr. n.
tu, ii. 39.
tulyatā, i. 10c (4. I. 10).
tulyalīnga, i. 10c (4. I. 9).
tulyavṛtti, iii. 55 intr. n.
a. tuvishṭama, iii. 96, iv. 59.
q. tushṭā, i. 98c.
ṭṛtiya, i. 8, 10c (4. I. 5), ii. 2, iii. 19, iv. 11c.
tāirovyanjana, iii. 55 intr. n., 56c, 62.
a. tāis tvam, ii. 84.
q. toshānam, iii. 75c.
a. tyam, iii. 25.
trā, iv. 14.
tri, iv. 113.
a. tri, ii. 98.
a. trih, ii. 64.
tridhāva, ii. 65c.
tripada, iv. 98c, 114c.
trimātra, i. 62.
q. trīshṭubh, i. 3c, etc., etc.
a. tredhā, iv. 66.
a. trāishṭubha, iv. 83.
trāisvarya, iv. 107c.
a. trāihāyana, iv. 83.
tva, iv. 26.
a. tue, i. 77.
q. tsaru, ii. 26c.

thā, iv. 15.

q. dānshtṛa, iii. 2.
q. dandāgram, iii. 42c.
dādātī (r. *dā*), iv. 61.
dadhāti (r. *dhā*), iv. 63.
q. dādhi, i. 4c, etc., etc.
q. dādhindrah, iii. 42c.
dantamūla, i. 28.
dantya, i. 24.
darpana, iv. 27, 73.
a. daṣa, i. 63.
dā, iii. 11.
a. dādharma, iv. 96.
q. dān, i. 87.
dānim, iv. 23.
dārdhya, iv. 108.
a. dāpa, i. 63, ii. 60.
a. dīvah, ii. 68.
a. divi, ii. 100, 101.
diḥ, iv. 72.
r. diḥ: *nirāḍīyate*, iv. 126c.
q. didānsati, i. 87c.
- a. didāya**, iii. 22, iv. 89.
dīrgha, i. 38, 61, 73, 84, iii. 1, 42, iv. 33, 50, 74, 79, 114, 119.
a. dīrghāyutva, ii. 59, iv. 100.
a. duh, ii. 60, 63.
q. durahnah, iii. 77c.
a. durnāman, iii. 84.
q. durnashtah, iii. 90c.
a. dushtara, iv. 83.
q. dushpitam, ii. 63c.
q. dūdabhah, ii. 60c.
q. dūdhyah, ii. 60c.
q. dūnāgah, ii. 60c.
dṛdha, iii. 55 intr. n.
dr̥ṣi (r. *davṣ*), iv. 69.
q. dr̥shad, i. 3c, etc., etc.
devatā, iv. 49.
dyubhi, iv. 21.
a. dyāuh, ii. 74.
q. r. dru: *āshvati*, *pradravati*, i. 56c.
a. drughana, iii. 76.
dronika, i. 23.
dvandva, iv. 49, 50c.
a. dvār, ii. 45.
dvi, iv. 110, 118.
dvih, iii. 26.
dvitiya, i. 10, 10c (4. I. 2, 3, 6, 7), ii. 6, iii. 22.
dvitva, i. 10c (4. I. 6, 7).
dvipada, iv. 108c.
dvimātra, i. 61.
dvirukta, iv. 44.
dvirbhāva, iii. 27c.
dvirvacana, iv. 117, 123c, 126c.
dvivacanānta, i. 75, ii. 47.
dvāilīngya, i. 10c (4. I. 10).
dvyakshara, iv. 64c.
- dharma*, iv. 101.
dharmāṣha, iv. 106c.
r. dhā: *vidhiyate*, iv. 27c, 35c.
dhā, iv. 13.
dhātu, ii. 90, iii. 48, 79, iv. 35c.
a. dhīh, iii. 25.

na (n), i. 47, ii. 9, 89, iii. 27, 37, 75.
na, i. 7, 8, 41, 65, ii. 22, 30, 36, 39, 51, 58, 102, iii. 70, 86, iv. 33, 47, 94, 104, 112.
nakāra, i. 67, ii. 10, 26, 34.
nakshatra, iv. 102c.
q. nadim, iii. 37c.
napunsaka, i. 84, ii. 52.
q. nayati, ii. 5c, iii. 37c, 75c.
- a. nara**, iii. 9.
navati (r. *nu*), iii. 82.
q. r. naḥ: *nirnashtah*, *parinashtah*, *pranashtah*, iii. 90c.
naḥi (r. *naḥ*), iii. 90.
nāda, i. 13, 43.
nānāpada, ii. 16, iii. 79, iv. 27.
nāman, i. 1, iv. 125, 4. II. 1-4, 7, 12, 13, 15. cf. *karman*-, *sarvan*-.
nāmin, ii. 29, 42, 81, 87, iii. 11, 39.
a. nāraka, iii. 21, iv. 90.
a. nārshada, iv. 83.
nāsikā, i. 26. cf. *mukhan-nāsikya*, i. 26, 26c, 100.
nigama, i. 77c.
a. nih, ii. 63.
niḥhāta, iii. 65, iv. 107c (?), 109c.
nītya, i. 68c, iii. 56c.
nīdarana, i. 29c, 98c, etc.
nīdhana, iv. 105c.
nīpātā, i. 1, 79, 80c, 4. II. 1, 6.
nimitta, iii. 76c, iv. 75, 78c, 125c, 126c.
q. nirahnah, iii. 77c.
nirdeḥa, iii. 96c.
nirvāpa, iv. 103c.
a. nirvatas prāti, ii. 78.
nivāraṇa, i. 10c (4. I. 6).
nivṛtti, iv. 116c.
nicāh, i. 15, 4. II. 5.
q. nittā, iii. 11c, iv. 61c.
q. nilā, i. 4c.
q. neshtram, iii. 30c.
naimittika, iv. 125c, 126c.
- pa*, ii. 62.
a. paksha, iii. 2.
q. paṭi, ii. 20c.
pañcajana, iv. 106.
pañcapadī, i. 88, iii. 5, 59.
pañcana, i. 10c (4. I. 4), ii. 67.
q. patujātiya, iv. 28c.
r. path: *pathet*, i. 8c.
paṇṇati (r. *pan*), iv. 97.
q. paṇḍitajātiya, iv. 28c.
a. patāti, ii. 77.
a. pathi, ii. 100.
r. pad: *samāpadyate* etc., iv. 84c, 88c; *utpanna*, iv. 76c; *pratipādita*, iv. 27c.
a. pada, ii. 72, iii. 2, 10.
pada, i. 8c, iii. 95, iv. intr. n., 106c, 107c, 108, 109,

- 110, 113, 123c. cf. *antahp-*, *ānp-*, *uttarap-*, *ekap-*, *kramap-*, *trip-*, *dvīp-*, *nānāp-*, *pūrcap-*, *samānap-*.
- padakāla*, iv. 109c, 123c.
- padajāta*, i. 1.
- padatva*, iv. 16c, 26c, 27c, 30c, 35c, 37c, 98.
- padaṣaḥ*, iv. 107c.
- padaśāstra*, iv. 122c.
- padādi*, iii. 53, 55n, iv. 35c.
- padādhyaṇana*, iv. 107.
- padādhyaṇin*, iv. 107c.
- padānta*, i. 45, 54, ii. 2, 3, 21, iii. 26, 55, 89, iv. 81.
- padāntya*, i. 3.
- padya*, i. 1, 3, 4, 57.
- a. *panishpada*, iv. 96.
- para*, i. 50, 55, 71, 82, 101, ii. 13, 25, 26, 31, 40, 60, 66, 70, 76, 106, iii. 25, 31, 41, 57, 70, 78, iv. 10, 111, 112.
- parataḥ*, i. 99c, ii. 53c, iii. 55.
- a. *parama*, ii. 94.
- pararūpa*, iii. 52.
- a. *parā*, iii. 80.
- a. *pari*, ii. 105, iii. 88, iv. 58.
- a. *paridhish patāti*, ii. 77.
- paripātha*, i. 105c.
- parikhāra*, iii. 96c, iv. 74, 117.
- parikhārakāla*, iv. 120c, 121c.
- parihārya*, iv. 116, 126.
- q. *parittih*, iii. 11c, iv. 61c.
- parokshā*, iv. 84.
- q. *parṇa*, iii. 2.
- q. *paryaḥnaḥ*, iii. 77c.
- parvan*, iv. 42c, 53, 77.
- q. *pavanam*, iii. 40c.
- pavarga*, i. 25c.
- a. *pānsu*, i. 85.
- pāda*, i. 93c, iv. 107c.
- a. *pādām aṅgulim*, i. 66.
- pādavṛtta*, iii. 55 intr. n., 63.
- a. *pitar*, ii. 72.
- q. *pīṅgvaḥ*, iii. 42c.
- q. *pīṅvartham*, iii. 39c, 58c.
- q. *pībati*, i. 25c.
- pībati* (r. *pā*), iv. 26c.
- pidana*, i. 29c.
- pidita*, i. 43, 43c.
- q. *pumyāna*, ii. 25c.
- pumliḅga*, iv. 46c.
- q. *punṣca*, ii. 25.
- q. *punṣcoṛa*, *punskāma*, *pun-* *sputra*, *punkshura*, ii. 25c.
- a. *punar*, ii. 48.
- punar*, iv. 105, 115, 125.
- a. *punar nṛyāmasi*, iii. 81.
- q. *pundāna*, ii. 25c.
- pum*, ii. 25.
- punans*, i. 91.
- a. *purah*, i. 63.
- a. *purusha ā babbhūvaṅ*, i. 70.
- q. *purushah*, i. 20c, 25c.
- pūraṇa*, iv. 38.
- a. *pūryāna*, iii. 83.
- pūra*, i. 38, 56, 67, 69, 92, 94, 104, ii. 7, 15, 38, iii. 36, 38, 41, 53, 57, iv. 4, 7, 12, 121.
- pūrcapada*, ii. 94c, iii. 76, iv. 75, 107c.
- pūrcarūpa*, i. 50, iii. 74c.
- q. *pūrvāḥnaḥ*, i. 58c, 100c, iii. 31c, 77c.
- prkta*, i. 10c. cf. *aprkta*.
- a. *prādi*, ii. 78.
- prthak*, i. 10c (4. I. 9, 10), iv. 104.
- a. *prthivi*, ii. 68, 100.
- a. *prsthā*, ii. 69.
- a. *pra*, ii. 76, iii. 80.
- q. *prakāreṇa*, iv. 64c.
- prakṛti*, ii. 31c, iii. 33, 54, iv. 50c, 77c.
- prakṛtidarṣana*, iv. 73.
- prakṛtisvara*, 4. II. 2-4, 9, 11.
- pragrhya*, i. 73, iii. 33, iv. 108c, 117, 123.
- pratiñā*, i. 101c.
- pratiñāna*, i. 8, 9c.
- prativeshṭita*, i. 22.
- pratiśiddha*, iv. 56.
- pratiśedha*, iv. 16c, 18c, 49c.
- pratiśhṭita*, iv. 105.
- q. *prattam*, iii. 11c, iv. 61c.
- pratyak*, i. 28c.
- q. *pratyah*, ii. 9c, iii. 27c.
- a. *pratyāñātm*, i. 105.
- pratyaya*, i. 50c, ii. 87, iii. 3, iv. 13c, 16c.
- prathama*, i. 6, 8, 10c (4. I. 1, 4), iii. 21, 38.
- a. *prathama*, ii. 75.
- a. *prapaṇa*, iv. 97.
- prapātha*, iv. 126c.
- prabhṛti*, iv. 85.
- prayatna*, i. 27c, 29c.
- prayojana*, iv. 114, 119.
- praḥlishta*, i. 39c.
- prasamdāna*, iv. 78c, 111, 122.
- q. *prasahanam*, ii. 82c, iii. 1c, iv. 70c.
- prasārāṇa*, iv. 37c.
- prastirṇa*, i. 24.
- prākḥlishta*, iii. 56c.
- prāṇa*, iv. 39.
- a. *prāṇati*, *prāṇanti*, iv. 57.
- a. *prātar*, ii. 48.
- q. *prātar*, iii. 75c.
- prātījñā*, i. 1, 2c.
- prātīpadika*, iii. 78.
- prātīcākhya*, iv. 106c.
- prāpta*, i. 2, 77c, iv. 35c.
- prāpti*, i. 10c (4. I. 6, 7).
- a. *prāṅch*, i. 105.
- praḥlishta*, iii. 55 intr. n., 56, 65.
- q. *prāshāt*, ii. 82c, iii. 1c, iv. 70c.
- q. *prāḥnaḥ*, i. 58c, 100c, iii. 31c, 77c.
- pretya*, iv. 101.
- prepsu*, iv. 29.
- q. *plakshah*, i. 98c.
- pluta*, i. 38, 62, 105, iv. 6, 120. cf. *apluta*.
- pluti*, i. 105c.
- a. *babhūva*, iv. 6. cf. *ā babhūva*.
- a. *barhah*, ii. 100.
- bala*, iii. 55 intr. n.
- bahula*, iii. 8, 13, 17, iv. 35c, 67c, 126c.
- bahuvacana*, i. 78, 84.
- q. *bṛhadbhīh*, i. 44c.
- a. *bōdhapratibodhāu*, iv. 96.
- a. *brahma*, ii. 66.
- a. *brahmaṇvant*, iv. 99.
- brahmayajña*, iv. 107c.
- q. *brahmāupagavaḥ*, iii. 51c.
- q. *bhargah*, i. 58c, iii. 31c.
- q. *bhavan*, ii. 12c, 26c.
- a. *bhānu*, iii. 87.
- bhīh*, iv. 31.
- a. *bhuvah*, ii. 52.
- r. *bhū*: *bhavati*, ii. 39.
- bhūta*, ii. 82.
- bhūtakarāna*, iii. 49.
- a. *bhūyāḥ*, i. 105.
- bhyah*, iv. 31.
- bhyām*, iv. 31.
- q. *bhrāshtram*, iii. 30c.
- ma*, iii. 37.
- makāra*, i. 67, ii. 25, 31.
- maṅḍala*, iii. 55 intr. n.
- matu*, iii. 17, iv. 17.
- matrārtha*, iv. 8c, 47.
- q. *madhu*, i. 4c, etc., etc.

q. *madhūshṁam*, iii. 42c.
madhya, iv. 113, 117.
madhyajihva, i. 21.
madhyama, iv. 42.
a. *manas pāpa*, ii. 79.
manishin, i. 10c (4. I. 1),
 iv. 35c.
a. *manushyat*, iv. 65.
mantra, iv. 101c, 107c.
mayā, iv. 24.
q. *māhār*, ii. 12c, 26c.
a. *mānsa*, i. 85.
a. *mātra*, iv. 22.
q. *mātraratham*, iii. 39c, 58c.
mātrā, i. 38. cf. *aṇum-*
ekam, *trim-*, *dvim-*.
mātrārādha, i. 17, 50.
mān (r. *man*), i. 87.
mālendrah, *mālodakam*,
māldīrakā, *māldāitika-*
yanah, iii. 44c, 45c, 50c.
a. *mitra*, iii. 9.
mīthah, iv. 113c.
mīnāti (r. *mī*), iii. 86.
mīṣra, iv. 113c.
a. *mīmāya*, iv. 96.
mukha, i. 18.
mukhanāsika, i. 27.
mushi (r. *mush*), ii. 76.
mūrdhan, i. 22c.
mūrdhanya, i. 22, 28c, 63,
 ii. 60.
mūla. cf. *dantam*, *hanum-*
mṛdu etc., iii. 55 intr. n.
mṛdūjātiya, iv. 28c.
mṛdūprayatna, i. 29c.
q. *me*, i. 77.
q. *mekhalāvī*, iv. 18c.
q. *medhāvī*, iv. 18c.

ya, i. 68; ii. 21, iii. 35, 57,
 iv. 29.
yakāra, ii. 41, iii. 18.
q. *yajushṭaram*, ii. 83c.
q. *yajussāt*, ii. 83c.
yajña, iv. 105.
yajñātati, iv. 104.
yathā, i. 99, iv. 103, 122.
yad, i. 71, iv. 50.
a. *yad*, iv. 48.
yama, i. 13c, 14, 26c, 99.
yami (r. *yam*), iv. 93.
a. *yas patih*, ii. 70.
yā, iv. 30.
yājñika, iv. 101c, 108.
q. *yāti*, i. 49c.
a. *yātumāvāt*, iv. 8.
yāvayati (r. *yu*), iv. 92.
yukta, iii. 89. cf. *anya-*
yukta.

yushmad, ii. 84, iv. 26c, 4.
 II. 2, 13.
q. *yushme*, i. 77.
a. *yoga*, iii. 2.
a. *yonāv adhy āirayanta*, iv.
 5.

ra, i. 68, iii. 20.
q. *rathamtara*, ii. 51.
q. *rathe*, i. 49c.
rājati (r. *rāj*), ii. 36.
a. *rātri*, ii. 51, iii. 8.
a. *rāyas posha*, ii. 80.
rishi (r. *rish*), iv. 86.
rutva, iv. 35c.
rupi (r. *rup*), iv. 86.
rūdhi, iv. 16c.
rūpa. cf. *parar-*, *pūrvar-*.
a. *rūpa*, ii. 51.
repha, i. 28, 37, 58, 64, 66,
 71, 101, ii. 19, 29, 42,
 87, 106, iii. 31, 75.
rāu, ii. 47.

ṛa, i. 39c, iii. 93.
lakāra, i. 5, 39, 46, 64, 66,
 ii. 13, 35.
lakshana, i. 94c, iv. 12c,
 122c, 126c.
laghu, i. 51.
q. *lavanam*, iii. 40c.
lākshana, iii. 55 intr. n.
q. *lāyakah*, iii. 40c.
lāya, i. 10c (4. I. 9).
r. *lup*: *lupyate*, iv. 16c,
 60c, 64c, 65c.
q. *lāham*, i. 1c.
leṣavṛtti, ii. 24.
loka, iv. 105, 106.
lopa, i. 67, ii. 18, 32, 55,
 89, iii. 20, 35, 91, iv.
 21c, 74.

va, i. 25c, ii. 21, iii. 35, 57.
vakāra, ii. 22, 28, 37, iv.
 18, 37.
vacana, i. 101c, iv. 124, 4.
 II. 2. cf. *dviro-*, *dviv-*,
bahuv-.
vatu, iv. 48.
r. *vad*: *vadanti*, iii. 65;
apa vadati, ii. 63c, 101c,
 iii. 60c.
vanī (r. *van*), iv. 93.
a. *vandane* 'va *vrksham*, ii. a.
 56.
q. *vapushtaram*, *vapussāt*, ii.
 83c.
q. *vayati*, i. 49c.
q. *vayah*, ii. 28c.
vari, iii. 24.

varya, ii. 88. cf. *cav-*, *ṭav-*,
lav-.
vargāntya, i. 13c.
vargottama, i. 26c.
vargiya. cf. *cav-*, *ṭav-*, *lav-*.
varja, ii. 67, 68, 70, 84, iii.
 25, iv. 56, 59.
varjīa, iii. 95.
varga, i. 25-28c, 37c, 40,
 92. cf. *av-*, *iv-*, *uv-*, *rv-*,
lv-, *sv-*.
a. *varta*, iii. 12.
q. *vartak*, i. 58c, iii. 31c.
varga, i. 88, iv. 35.
a. *vāsa*, iii. 9, iv. 30, 45.
a. *vanedhātarah*, iv. 45.
vastutah, iv. 35c.
vā, i. 102, iii. 57, iv. 27.
q. *vātah*, ii. 28c.
vātsya, ii. 6c.
vāna, iii. 24.
q. *vāya*, i. 4c, iii. 40c.
vār, ii. 45.
a. *vātrdhāna*, iv. 85.
a. *vi*, iv. 39.
vikampita, iii. 65.
vikalpa, iv. 27c.
vikṛta, iv. 81.
vikṛshita, iv. 12c.
vighraha, iv. 78.
vighraha, iv. intr. n., iv. 3,
 27c, 107c, 4. I. 9, 10.
vighāta, i. 104, iv. 107c.
vidi (r. *vid*), i. 90.
a. *vidma*, iii. 16.
vidhāna, i. 41c, iv. 122c.
vidhāraṇa, i. 43, 43c.
vidhi, i. 41.
vinata, iv. 82.
vināma, iv. 34, 114.
viparita, ii. 38c.
viparyaya, ii. 38.
viprakarsha, ii. 39.
vibhakta, iv. 107c.
vibhakti, i. 77c, ii. 51, iii.
 78, iv. 30c.
vibhāshā, i. 2, iv. 126c.
viyat, iv. 105c.
q. *virāj*, i. 3c, etc., etc.
virāma, ii. 38, iv. 79.
a. *vi var*, ii. 44.
virṭa, i. 31, 34.
virṭti, iii. 63, 74c.
viśeṣa, i. 18, iv. 12c.
viṣpati, *viṣpatni*, iv. 60.
a. *viṣva*, iii. 9, iv. 23.
visarjanīya, i. 5, 42, ii. 25,
 26, 40, iii. 29.
q. *vittā*, iii. 11c, iv. 61c.
vīpsā, iv. 19.
q. *vrksha*, i. 98c, ii. 28c, 40c.

- a. *vrkshān vanāni*, ii. 28.
vrtti, i. 8, 8c, 9c, 40, 41c.
 95. cf. *tulyavrtti*, *leṣa-*
vrtti.
vrddha, iv. 55.
vrddhimant, iv. 55c.
 a. *vr̥dha*, iii. 24.
veda, iv. 104.
vedādhyayana, iv. 101.
vāiyākaraṇa, i. 1c.
vyāñjaka, i. 103c.
vyāñjana, i. 43, 55, 60, 93,
 102, ii. 57, iii. 26, 62, a.
 iv. 25, 50.
vyatya, iv. 13c, 126c.
 r. *vyadh*: *pratividhya*, iv.
 53c.
vyadhī (r. *vyadh*), iii. 3,
 iv. 68.
vyavadhāna, i. 99c, 100c.
vyavasthita, iv. 27c.
vyavāya, ii. 92, 93, iii. 93.
vyavāyin, ii. 38c.
vyaveta, i. 98, 101c, iii.
 62.
vyākaraṇa, i. 2c.
vyāsa, iii. 68, 72.

ṣa, ii. 6, 9, iii. 32, 93.
 a. *ṣakalyeshin*, iii. 52.
ṣakā, iv. 105c.
ṣakāra, ii. 10, 13, 17.
 a. *ṣaci*, ii. 71.
ṣatāudana, iv. 101c.
ṣabda, iv. 8c, 11c, 16c, 27c
 etc., 107.
 q. *ṣama*, i. 78c.
 a. *ṣara*, iii. 16.
ṣas, iv. 19.
Ṣakatāyana, ii. 6c, 24, iv.
 intr. n., 30c.
Ṣakatya, iv. 49c.
ṣakhā, i. 2c.
Ṣāṅghamitri, i. 93c, ii. 6c,
 iii. 74c.
 q. *ṣān* (r. *ṣā*), i. 87.
ṣāstra, iv. 110c, 122, 126c.
 q. *ṣiṣānsati*, i. 87c.
ṣuddha, iv. 113c, 121.
 a. *ṣun*, ii. 61, iii. 10.
 q. *ṣete*, i. 49c, ii. 6c, 9c.
 a. *ṣepaṭarsaṇam*, ii. 56.
ṣobhana, iv. 46c.
 q. *ṣobhanjātṛya*, iv. 23c.
Ṣāunaka, i. 8, 9c.
ṣrathi (r. *ṣrath*), iv. 93.
ṣruti. cf. *ekar*, *udattar*.
 a. *ṣreyah*, ii. 62.
 q. *ṣreyānam*, iii. 40c.
ṣvāsa, i. 12, 43.

sha, ii. 6, 9, iii. 32, 90.
shakāra, i. 22c, 23, ii. 16,
 81, iii. 75.
 a. *shat*, i. 63.
 q. *shandē*, i. 49c, ii. 6c, 9c.
 q. *shannavati*, ii. 16c.
shatva, iv. 74.
shashthi, ii. 71, iv. 45c.
 a. *shodaṣṭin*, iv. 51.

sa, ii. 6, 9, iii. 32, 93.
sah, iii. 55, iv. 126.
 a. *sah*, ii. 57.
samyukta, i. 49, 50c.
samyoga, i. 10c (4. I. 5, 8),
 51, 56, 94c, 98, 102c, 104,
 iii. 28, 57.
samvṛta, i. 36.
samgaya, iv. 12c, 106c.
samspr̥shṭa, i. 37, 37c, 40,
 41c.
sanhitā, ii. 1, iii. 96c, iv.
 107c, 108, 109.
sanhitāvat, iv. 124.
sanhitika, iv. 107c, 114c.
sakāra, ii. 8, 18, 62, 87, iv.
 24, 47, 58, 59.
saṅkhyā, i. 99, iv. 27c.
sacati (r. *sac*), ii. 68.
sanjñā, i. 13c, 48c, iv. 16c, a.
 67, 125c, 126c.
sattva, 4. I. 9, 10, II. 1.
 r. *sad*: *sanna*, i. 43, 43c;
acasanna, i. 43c; *pari-*
shanna, iv. 126c.
sadi (r. *sad*), ii. 99.
 a. *sadyah*, ii. 62.
san, i. 86.
 a. *sanutar*, ii. 48.
sandeha, iv. 51, 103c.
sandhāna, iv. 114c, 122c. q.
 cf. *prasandhāna*.
sandhi, i. 10c (4. I. 5), 49c, iv.
 iii. 55 intr. n., 74c, iv. 59,
 107c, 114.
sandhija, iii. 56c.
sandhya, i. 1, ii. 37, 38c, a.
 iii. 37.
sandhyakshara, i. 25c, 40,
 iii. 40.
sanna, i. 43, 43c.
sannipāta, ii. 38c.
saptamī, i. 74.
 a. *sana*, ii. 36, iv. 39, 58.
 a. *samanta*, iv. 38.
samartha, 4. II. 3.
samāna, i. 14, 27c, 50.
samānapada, i. 99, ii. 15,
 iii. 68, 72, 75.
samānākshara, i. 105c, iii.
 42.

samāpatti, iv. 73, 74, 75c,
 etc.
samāpādyā, iv. 117, 124.
samāmnāta, iv. 103.
samāsa, ii. 62, 62c, 63, iv.
 intr. n., 9, 27, 35c, 43,
 44c, 45c.
 q. *samādbhih*, i. 44c.
 a. *samudra*, iv. 54.
 a. *sam ārayan ta*, ii. 30.
 q. *sarpishṭaram*, *sarpissāt*, ii.
 83c.
sarva, iv. 59.
sarvatra, iii. 60.
sarvanāman, ii. 44, iv. 69.
sarvaṇa, i. 27c, iii. 42, iv.
 56c, 84c.
savidha, iii. 64.
 a. *savya*, ii. 95.
sasthāna, i. 10c, 10c (4. II.
 6), ii. 13, 15, 31, 40, iii.
 30.
 a. *sas padishta*, ii. 58.
sasvara, i. 101c.
 a. *sahasra*, *sahasrasātama*,
 iv. 45.
sahi (r. *sah*), ii. 82, 92, iii.
 1, iv. 70, 88c.
sāt, ii. 82.
 a. *sādha*, iii. 7.
 a. *sātrāsādha*, iii. 23.
 a. *sādhu*, iv. 30.
sāmānya, i. 2, 10c (4. I. 9),
 95c.
 q. *sāye*, i. 49c, ii. 6c, 9c.
 a. *sāhyāma*, iii. 15, iv. 88.
sici (r. *sic*), ii. 92.
 q. *siñcati*, ii. 90c.
siddhatva, iv. 6.
 a. *simanta*, iii. 43.
su, iv. 32.
 q. *sugaṇ*, iii. 27c.
suñ, ii. 97.
 a. *suprāvya*, iv. 11.
 a. *subhishaktama*, iv. 46.
sumna, iv. 30.
sūtra, iii. 96c, iv. 101c.
sr̥ji (r. *sarj*), ii. 102.
sr̥pi (r. *sarp*), ii. 102.
 a. *sr̥shṭā h*, i. 105.
 a. *soma*, ii. 96.
 q. *sonusut*, ii. 14c.
soshman, i. 10, 94.
skandi (r. *skand*), ii. 104.
stambh (r.), ii. 18.
stambhi (r. *stambh*), iv. 62.
str̥nāti (r. *star*), ii. 105.
 a. *sr̥ta*, ii. 86.
 a. *stoma*, ii. 96.
 a. *str̥ishūya*, ii. 88, iv. 83.

- sthā* (r.), ii. 18, 92, 93, iv. 62.
sthāna, i. 18c, 22c, 25-28c, 41, 43c.
sthiti, i. 10c.
sparṣa, i. 6, 29, 44, 99, ii. 20, 25, 31, iii. 89. cf. *adhispārṣam*.
spr̥ṣi (r. *sparṣ*), ii. 102.
spr̥shṭa, i. 29, 30, 33.
sphūr̥ji (r. *sphūr̥j*), ii. 102.
sphoṭana, i. 103, ii. 38.
smarati (r. *smar*), ii. 102.
a. *sva*, ii. 86.
svapi (r. *svap*), ii. 86.
a. *svapna*, iv. 30.
r. *svar* : *svaryate* etc., i. 93c, iii. 56c, 67, iv. 11c.
a. *svar*, ii. 48.
q. *svar*, iii. 75c.
svāra, i. 4, 13, 32, 55, 93, 98, 101, 104, ii. 2, 21, 27, 41, iii. 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 91, iv. 6, 29, 55, 107, 109, 114.
svarabhakti, i. 101, 101c.
svaravant, iii. 74c.
svarati (r. *svar*), ii. 102.
svarita, i. 16, 17, iii. 57, 65, 70, 71, 74.
svargakāmo aghāyatām, iv. 101c, 103c.
a. *svarshāh*, ii. 49.
svāra, iii. 55 intr. u.
svārtha, i. 105c.
svāhākaraṇa, iv. 105c.
hu, i. 13c.
hakāra, i. 10c (4. I. 6), 47, 58, 100, ii. 7, iii. 31, iv. 63.
hani (r. *han*), i. 86.
r. *han* : *ni hanyeta*, iv. 107c; *vi hanyate*, i. 101c.
hanumūla, i. 20, 28c.
hanti (r. *han*), iii. 91, iv. 62.
r. *har* : *udāharet* etc., iv. 76c, 77c, 124c, 4. II. 7, 14; *pariharet*, etc., iv. 120c, 121c, 123c, 126c. cf. *udāharāṇa*, *parihāra*, *parihārya*.
harati (r. *har*), iv. 62.
a. *havih*, ii. 63.
a. *hi*, ii. 101.
hinoti (r. *hi*), iii. 88, iv. 95.
hina, i. 43, 43c.
q. *holīṣṣyah*, iii. 42c.
q. r. *hnute* : *apa hnute*, *vi hnute*, i. 58c, 100c, iii. 31c.
q. r. *hmal* : *apa hmalayati*, *vi hmalayati*, i. 58c, 100c, iii. 31c.
hrasva, i. 51, 59, 83, iii. 27, 43, iv. 35.

3. GENERAL INDEX.

The references are as in the preceding Indexes.

- a, ā:** are throat-sounds, i. 19n; utterance of *ā*, i. 35; obscure utterance of *a*, i. 36; final *v* retained after *ā*, ii. 22; *ā* between two vowels, how combined, iii. 38; combinations of *a* and *ā* final with initial vowels, iii. 42-52; initial *a* absorbed by final *e* or *o*, iii. 53, 54; full exposition of the Atharvan usage in this respect, iii. 54n; resulting circumflex accent, iii. 55.
- Abhinidhāna:** defined, i. 43; when applied, i. 44-47; also called *āsthāpita*, i. 48.
- Abhinihita circumflex,** iii. 55; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.
- Accents:** general definition, i. 14-17; accents resulting from euphonic combination and construction of sentence, iii. 55-74; comprehensive exposition of accentual theory, iii. 65n; modes of designating accent in the manuscripts, iii. 65n; special case of accent, i. 96:—see also Acute, Circumflex, Grave.
- Acute accent** defined, i. 14; acute tone of grave syllables following a circumflex, iii. 71.
- Āgniveçya,** quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 40n.
- āi:** palatal diphthong, i. 21n; its pronunciation, i. 40n, 41; its combination with following vowel, iii. 40, ii. 21.
- Alterant vowels,** ii. 29n.
- Anudātta:**—see Grave.
- Anusvīra,** not a constituent of the spoken alphabet acknowledged by the Prāticākhyā, i. 11n.
- Ānyatareya,** quoted in commentary, iii. 74n.
- Aspirate mutes,** i. 10, 10n; become non-aspirate before aspirates, i. 94.
- Atharva-Veda,** existing text of: its relation to the Prāticākhyā, add. n. 2; manuscripts of, intr. n.; their mode of designating accent, iii. 65n.
- Atharva-Veda Prāticākhyā:** its distinctive name, manuscript material, character of its commentary, etc., intr. n.; its scope, as defined by itself, i. 1, 2; school to which it belongs, i. 2n; its contents analyzed and compared with those of the other Prāticākhyās, add. n. 1; relation of the Atharvan text which it contemplates to the existing Atharva-Veda, add. n. 2.
- āu:** labial diphthong, i. 25n; its pronunciation, i. 40n, 41; combination with following vowel, iii. 40, ii. 22.
- Augment,** combination of, with initial *r* and *ṛ*, iii. 49; its interposition does not always prevent lingualization of the initial *s* of a root, ii. 92.
- Avagraha,** pause dividing the parts of a compound: its length, iii. 74n; rules for its use in *pada*-text, iv. 7-72; do. in *pada* repetitions, iv. 123; whether to be used in *krama*-repetitions, iv. 123n.
- b,** a labial mute, i. 25n.
- bh,** a labial mute, i. 25n.
- Bharadvāja,** quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.
- ç,** a palatal mute, i. 21n.
- ç:** a palatal spirant, i. 21n, 31n; its phonetic value, i. 21n; its combination, when initial, with preceding final *t* and *n*, ii. 10, 13, 17.
- Çātyāyana,** quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.
- Çākala, Çākalya,** quoted by Rik Pr., Vāj. Pr., and Pāṇini, i. 81n, ii. 17n, 40n, iii. 26n.
- Çākalya,** quoted in commentary, iv. 49n.
- Çākaṭāyana:** quoted in text, ii. 24; in commentary, ii. 6n, iv. intr. n., iv. 30n; by Rik Pr., Vāj. Pr., and Pāṇini, i. 8n, 40n, ii. 24n, 32n, 40n, iii. 30n.
- Çānkhamitri,** quoted in commentary, i. 93n, ii. 6n, iii. 74n.
- Case-endings,** when separable from theme in *pada*-text, iv. 31-34.
- Çāunaka:** quoted in text, i. 8; in commentary, i. 9n; by Vāj. Pr., ii. 6n; his relation to the Prāticākhyā, intr. n., add. n. 1.
- Cerebral mutes:**—see Lingual.
- çh:** a palatal mute, i. 21n; conversion of initial *ç* into, after final dentals, ii. 17.
- Circumflex accent** defined, i. 16, 14-16n, 17; kinds of independent circumflex, iii. 55-61; *vikampita* modification before acute or circumflex, iv. 65; kinds of enclitic circumflex, iii. 62-64; occurrence of enclitic circumflex, iii. 67-70; comparative tone of different kinds of circumflex, iii. 55 intr. n.
- Commentary on the Prāticākhyā,** character of, intr. n.; character of its last section, iv. 101 intr. n.
- Compounds and secondary derivatives:** when divisible by *avagraha* in *pada*-text, iv. 8-72; treatment of double, triple, etc. compounds, iv. 10-12, 42-46; compounds not divisible, iv. 47-72; list of Atharvan compounds left undivided, iv. 54n.

- Conjunction of consonants, i. 49, 98; as simulation of former to latter constituent, i. 50; how divided between syllables, i. 56, 58; conjunction not dissolved by euphonic insertions, i. 104; duplication in consonantal groups, iii. 28, 30-32; complete list of Atharvan combinations of consonants, and exhibition of their theoretical phonetic form, add. n. 3.
- Consonants: classification and description of, i. 10-13, 19-31; belong to what syllables, i. 55-58; quantity of, i. 60; groups or combinations of:—see Conjunction of consonants.
- Contact of organs, degree of, in forming the different classes of sounds, i. 29-36.
- Conversion of sounds made to their next of kin, i. 95.
- d**, a dental mute, i. 24n.
- d̄**: a lingual mute, i. 22n; softened between vowels, i. 29n.
- Dāl̄bhya, quoted by Vāj. Pr., ii. 9n.
- Dentals (*t, th, d, dh, n, l, s*): how formed, i. 24; assimilated after palatal and lingual mutes in the same word, ii. 15; do. after *sh* in all cases, ii. 16; change a following *ç* to *ch*, ii. 17; *s* inserted after final *n* before surd dentals, ii. 26, 30; anomalous change of dental to lingual in certain words, i. 63, ii. 60; restoration of dental in *pada*-text, iv. 74 etc. See also the different letters.
- Derivatives, secondary, when divisible in *pada*-text:—see Compounds.
- Desideratives, certain forms of, exhibit long nasal vowels, i. 86, 87.
- dh**, a dental mute, i. 24n.
- dh̄**: a lingual mute, i. 22n; softened between vowels, i. 29n; found written double in Atharvan MSS., i. 94n.
- Diphthongs (*e, ai, o, au*): character of, i. 40, 41; euphonic combinations of, when final, iii. 40, ii. 21, 22, iii. 35; do. when initial, with *a* and *ā*, iii. 50-52. See also the different letters.
- Duplication of final consonants, iii. 26, 27, 29; of constituents of a group, iii. 28, 30-32; product of duplication after *r* and *h* belongs to what syllable, i. 58; duplication not observed in Atharvan manuscripts, iii. 32n.
- e**: a palatal diphthong, i. 21n; pronunciation of, i. 34, 40n; a *praḡr̄hya* as dual termination, i. 76; do. as termination of certain pronominal forms, i. 77; its combination with following initial vowel, iii. 40, ii. 21; absorbs sometimes an initial *a*, iii. 53-54; full exposition of Atharvan usage in this respect, iii. 54n; resulting circumflex, iii. 55.
- Elision of sounds:—see Omissions.
- Finals, possible, i. 3-9; final mutes, i. 6-9, ii. 3; whether surd or sonant, i. 8n; suffer *abhinidhāna*, i. 45; belong to preceding vowel, i. 57; changes of in *sandhā*, general rules, ii. 2-6; final consonant duplicated, iii. 26.
- Final vowels, possible, i. 4; when exempt from euphonic combination, iii. 33-36; prolongation of final vowels, iii. 4, 16, 19, 20, 25.
- Final syllables heavy, i. 54.
- Forms of declension: their final vowels when prolonged, iii. 19n; when divisible in *pada*-text, iv. 31-34.
- g**, a guttural mute, i. 20n.
- Gaṇas, part of the Prātiçākhyā's grammatical system, intr. n., i. 65n.
- Gārgya, quoted by Rik Pr., i. 8n.
- Gāutama, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.
- gh**, a guttural mute, i. 20n.
- Grammarians quoted by name in the text, i. 8, ii. 24, add. n. 1; in the commentary, i. 9n, 93n, ii. 6n, iii. 74n, iv. intr. n., iv. 30n, 49n; in the other Prātiçākhyas:—see their names in this Index.
- Grave accent defined, i. 15; a grave syllable receives enclitic circumflex when, iii. 67-70, when pronounced at pitch of acute, iii. 71-74.
- Groups of consonants:—see Conjunction of consonants.
- Gutturals (*k, kh, g, gh, ṅ, x, ç, ř, ř̄, ḷ*), how formed, i. 20. See also the different letters.
- h**: a throat-sound, i. 19n; a spirant, i. 31n; its phonetic character, and value as a sonant, i. 13n; nasal mutes suffer *abhinidhāna* before, i. 47; *nāsikyā* inserted after, i. 100; combination of initial *h* with preceding final mute, ii. 7; not doubled, but causes duplication, as first of a group, iii. 31.
- Heavy syllables, i. 52-54.
- i**: palatal vowels, i. 21n; *prāçliṣṭā* circumflex produced by fusion of two *ī*'s, iii. 56; *i* is *praḡr̄hya* as ending of locative case, i. 74; do. of dual, i. 75; do. of *amī*, i. 78.
- Insertions in groups of consonants, i. 99-102, ii. 38; do. in making combinations of consonants, ii. 8, 9, 17, 25-30.
- Instrumental case, final vowel sometimes prolonged, iii. 19.
- Irregular and anomalous combinations and

substitutions, i. 63-66, ii. 60, 61, iii. 43; do. accent, i. 96; do. form, iii. 7.

iti: used in *pada*-text after a *pragṛhya*, i. 72, 74n; in repetitions of *krama* and *pada* texts, iv. 117, 118, 119, 123; its combination with *iva*, i. 82; do. with a protracted vowel, i. 97.

iva: treated in *pada*-text as forming compound with preceding word, iv. 41; its combination with *iti* after a *pragṛhya*, i. 82; its irregular combination with preceding final syllable in Atharvan, ii. 56n.

j: a palatal mute, i. 21n; converts preceding or following *a* to *ā*, ii. 11, 15.

Jātya circumflex, iii. 57; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.

jh: a palatal mute, i. 21n; not found in Atharvan, i. 10n.

Jihvāmūliya(x): a guttural spirant, i. 20n, 31n; *visarjaniya* converted into it before surd gutturals, ii. 40; this rule not observed in MSS. and edited text, ii. 40n; a few times written with *sh* in Atharvan MSS., iv. 77n.

k: a guttural mute, i. 20n; inserted after *ū* before a sibilant, ii. 9; *visarjaniya* converted to *s* or *sh* before, when initial, ii. 62-81; converts *s* of suffix to *sh*, ii. 87.

Kācyapa, quoted by Vāṅ. Pr., ii. 32n.

Kāṇḍamāyana, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 40n.

Karshana, result of combination of final lingual and initial palatal, ii. 39.

Kāubaliputra, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.

Kāuṇḍinya, *sthavira*-Kāuṇḍinya, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.

kh, a guttural mute, i. 20n.

Krama-text: recommendation of study of, iv. 108-109; mode of construction of, iv. 110-126; restorations of normal form in, iv. 74 etc.; special points relating to, i. 70, 97.

Krama-word, how composed, iv. 110, 113, 126.

Kshāipra circumflex, iii. 58-61; its occurrence in declension, iii. 59-61; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.

l: a dental semivowel, i. 24n, 30n; a possible final, i. 5; enters into *l*, i. 39; suffers *abhinidhāna* before spirants, i. 46; exchanges with *r* in certain words, i. 64-66; assimilates preceding *t*, ii. 13; changes preceding *m* and *n* to nasal *l*, ii. 35.

l̥: a guttural vowel, i. 20n; contains *l*, i. 39.

Labials (*p, ph, b, bh, m, v, φ, u, ū, o, āu.*),

how formed, i. 25. See also the different letters.

Light syllables, i. 51.

Linguals (*t, th, d, dh, n, sh*): how formed, i. 22, 23; anomalously substituted for dentals in certain words, i. 63, ii. 60; lingualize preceding *n* and *t*, ii. 12, 14; lingualize following dental, ii. 15; *sh* inserted after final *n* before, ii. 26; combination of final lingual and initial palatal, ii. 39; restoration of dental for lingual in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc. See also the different letters.

Locative case: *i* and *ū* are *pragṛhya* as ending of, i. 74.

Long vowels, i. 61:—and see Prolongation of vowels in *sanhita*.

m: a labial nasal mute, i. 11, 25n; nasalization of a vowel after the loss or conversion of, i. 67, 68; *m* converted into *visarjaniya*, ii. 25; assimilated to a following mute, ii. 31; lost before semivowels and spirants, ii. 32, 33; before *l*, becomes nasal *l*, ii. 35; this change disregarded by the MSS. and edited text, ii. 35n; when retained unchanged before *r* and *v*, ii. 36, 37; when not liable to farther alteration, iii. 37.

Mācākīya, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 21n.

Māṇḍukeya, quoted by Rik Pr., iii. 56n.

Manu-cripts of Atharva-Veda:—see Atharva-Veda.

Mimānsakas, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n.

Mora, measure of quantity, i. 59n.

Mutes: produced by, and named from, complete contact of organs, i. 29; particular mode of formation and designation of the different series and their constituents, i. 6n, 10-13, 20-22, 24, 25; which of them are allowed as finals, i. 6-9, ii. 3; suffer *abhinidhāna* when followed by another mute or when final, i. 44, 45; take *sphoṭana* or *karshana* when combined in inverted order of series, ii. 38, 39. See also the different series and letters.

n: a dental nasal mute, i. 11, 24n; suffers *abhinidhāna* before *h*, i. 47; nasalization of a vowel after the loss or conversion of, i. 67, 68; *t* inserted after it before a sibilant, ii. 9; converted to *ā* before *ç* and *j*, ii. 10, 11; following *ç* becomes *ch*, ii. 17; combination of *n* with linguals, ii. 12, 15, 16; converted, when final, to *visarjaniya* (i. e. has a sibilant inserted after it), ii. 26-28, 30; converted to *r*, ii. 29; these combinations historical, not phonetic, ii. 26n; lost before spirants, ii. 34; converted

before *l* to nasal *l*, ii. 35; this conversion not always made in the MSS. and edited text, ii. 35n; when duplicated between vowels, iii. 27; when not liable to farther euphonic change, iii. 37; *n* changed to *ṅ*, ii. 75-95; phonetic theory of the change, iii. 94n, restoration of *n* in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc.

ñ: a guttural nasal mute, i. 11, 20n; in what words found as final, i. 6n; suffers *abhinidhāna* before *h*, i. 47; *k* inserted after it before a sibilant, ii. 9; when duplicated between vowels, iii. 27.

ṅ: a palatal nasal mute, i. 11, 21n; *n* changed to, before *ç* and sonant palatal, ii. 10, 11; do. after a palatal, ii. 15.

ṇ: a lingual nasal mute, i. 11, 22n; when a final, i. 6n; suffers *abhinidhāna* before *h*, i. 47; *ç* inserted after it before a sibilant, ii. 9; *n* converted into, before and after a lingual mute, ii. 12, 15, 16; when duplicated between vowels, iii. 27; other conversions of *n* to *ṇ*, iii. 75-95; reconverted into *n* in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc.; *ṇ* retained as final in *pada*-text, iv. 99.

Nasal mutes (*ṅ*, *ṅ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*): how formed, i. 11, 27; *yama* and *nāsikya* inserted before, i. 99, 100; duplication of, between vowels, iii. 27; final surd mutes become nasals before them, ii. 5; after a nasal, a non-nasal dropped before a non-nasal, ii. 20.

Nasal semivowel (*l*), i. 27, ii. 35.

Nasal vowels, i. 27; make a heavy syllable, i. 53; result from loss or conversion of *m* and *n*, and from combination with a nasalized vowel, i. 67-69; special case of nasal protracted vowel, i. 70; its treatment in *krama*, iv. 121; the particle *u* nasal in *pada*-text, i. 72; character of *ṛ* and *ṝ* when nasal, i. 71; nasal vowels in interior of words usually short, i. 83; when long, i. 84-91; mode of transliterating them in this work ii. 35n.

Nasalization of a vowel, when made, i. 67-69.

Nāsikya, a nose-sound, i. 26n; when inserted, i. 100.

Negative compounds, treatment of in *pada*-text, iv. 56.

Nose-sounds (*nāsikya*, *yamas*), i. 26.

Noun, i. 1, ii. 44n, add. n. 4. II. 1; composition with other parts of speech, add. n. II. 2-15.

o: a labial diphthong, i. 25n; pronunciation of, i. 34, 40n; is *pragṛhya* as particle, i. 79; do. as termination compounded with particle *u*, i. 80; do. of

vocative in *pada*-text, i. 81; its combination with following initial vowel, iii. 40, ii. 21; *aḥ* converted to *o*, ii. 53, 54; absorbs initial *a*, iii. 53, 54; full exhibition of Atharvan usage in this respect, iii. 54n; resulting circumflex, iii. 55.

Omissions: of initial *s*, ii. 18; of *r* before *r*, ii. 19; of a non nasal mute after a nasal before a non-nasal, ii. 20; of final *y* and *v*, after a vowel, ii. 21-24; of *m* and *n*, before semivowels and spirants, ii. 32-34; of final *visarjaniya*, ii. 55-59; restoration of omitted sounds in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc.

Organs employed in producing articulate sounds, i. 18-23; their distinction in each case as passive and active organ, i. 18n; degree of their contact in the different classes, i. 29-36.

p: a labial mute, i. 25n; *visarjaniya* converted to *s* or *sh* before, when initial, ii. 62-81.

Pada-text: its importance, iv. 107; construction of, iv. 1-100; compounding of verb and proposition in, iv. 1-6; do. of these and other parts of speech, add. n. 4. II. 2-16; use or omission of *avagraha* in compounds, iv. 7-72; differences in this respect between different *pada*-texts, iv. 12n, 13n, 26n, 39n, 54n, 56n, 58n; restoration of natural forms of words, iv. 74-100; repetition of divisible *pragṛhyas*, iv. 123; whether, in this respect, the *pada*-text of the treatise and that of the MSS. agree, iv. 74n; enclitic accent in *pada*-text, iii. 64, 68, 69, 72, 73; treatment of particle *u* in, i. 72, 73; do. of *pragṛhyas*, i. 74n; vocative in *o* is *pragṛhya* in, i. 81; combination of *iti* and *iva* in, i. 82.

Pādavṛtta enclitic circumflex, iii. 63-64; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.

Palatals (*c*, *ch*, *j*, *jh*, *ñ*, *y*, *ç*, *i*, *ī*, *e*, *ai*): how formed, i. 21; probable phonetic value, i. 21n, ii. 17n; not found as finals, i. 7; *n* and *t* before palatals, ii. 10, 11, 13, 14; dental after palatal becomes palatal, ii. 15; *ç* inserted after *n* before surd palatal, ii. 26; final lingual before palatal causes *karshana*, ii. 39.

Paninian indicatory letters and symbols used in *Prāṭicākhya*, iv. 16c; Paninian examples and illustrations given in commentary, add. n. 2.

Pāṇini: his rules cited in commentary, i. 1n, 2n, iv. 108n; his doctrines compared with those of the *Prāṭicākhya*, *passim*.

Particle, i. 1, add. n. 4. II. 1; composition with other parts of speech, add. n. 4. II. 6-8.

- Parts of speech, i. 1n, add. n. 4. II. 1; Quantity of syllables, i. 51-54; of vowels, their various combinations, forming compound words, add. n. 4. II. 2-16. i. 59-62; of nasalized vowels, i. 83-91.
- Pauses in recitation of Veda, their length, iii. 74n. r: a semivowel, i. 30n; how formed, i. 28; different views as to the classification of, i. 28n; enters into *r* and *ṛ*, i. 37, 38; exchanges with *l* in certain words, i. 64-66; is followed by *svara-bhakti* before any other consonant, i. 101, 102; is lost before *r*, and the preceding vowel lengthened, ii. 19, iii. 20; inserted after final *n* before a vowel, ii. 29; *m* when retained before, ii. 36; *visarjanīya* converted into, ii. 42, 43; do. in certain words after *a* and *ā*, ii. 44-52; not doubled as first in a group, but causes duplication, iii. 31; converts *s* of suffix to *sh*, ii. 87; converts succeeding *n* to *ṇ*, iii. 75 etc.
- ph*, a labial mute, i. 25n. *ṛ*: guttural vowels, i. 20n; contain *r*: i. 37, 38; phonetic value of, i. 37n; how nasalized, i. 71; mode of combination with preceding final *a* and *ā*, iii. 46-49; discordant usage in this respect of Prātiçākhyā, MSS., and edited text explained, iii. 46n; convert succeeding *n* to *ṇ*, iii. 75 etc.
- Pāushkarasādi, quoted in *vārttika* to Pāṇini and by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 6n, 7n, 17n.
- Penultimate letter of a word styled *upadhā*, i. 92.
- Plākshīyaṇa, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 40n.
- Plākshī, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 7n, 40n.
- Pluta:—see Protracted.
- Pracaya or *pracita* accent, iii. 71n.
- Prāçishṭa circumflex, iii. 56; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.
- Pragrhya: import of the term, i. 73n; what finals are *pragrhya*, i. 73-81; how treated in *pada*-text, i. 74n, iv. 123, 74n; do. in *krama*-text, iv. 117; they are exempt from euphonic combination in *sanhitā*, iii. 33.
- Prātiçākhyā:—see Atharva-Veda, Rik, Tāittīya, and Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyas.
- Prātihata enclitic circumflex of Tāitt. Pr., iii. 62n.
- Prepositions, i. 1; list of, add. n. 4. II. 17-19; other words construed like, add. n. 4. II. 20, iv. 1n, 2n; prepositions lingualize initial sibilant of root, ii. 90; exceptions, ii. 102-107; their combination with initial *r* or *ṛ* of root, iii. 47, 48; they lingualize *n* of root, iii. 79; exceptions, iii. 79n; when separated from or compounded with verbs, iv. 1-7, 36-39; their independent use and construction, iv. 3n.
- Reduplication: initial *s* of root converted to *sh* after, ii. 91; do. notwithstanding the interposition of, ii. 93; prolongation of vowel of, iii. 13; restored to its normal quantity in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 82, 84-87, 89, 96.
- Repetition of words, treatment of in *pada*-text, ii. 62n, iv. 40, 44.
- Repetitions in *pada* and *krama* texts of words having certain peculiarities: when made in *krama*, iv. 117; do. in *pada*, iv. 123; different usage of the different *pada*-texts in this respect, iv. 74n; restoration of normal form in case of repetition, iv. 74 etc.
- Restoration of normal forms of words in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 73 etc.
- Rik Prātiçākhyā: editions of, intr. n.; mode of citing it here followed, intr. n.; general comparison with the present work, add. n. 1; its doctrines cited or referred to, *passim*.
- Restoration of normal forms of words in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 73 etc.
- Rik Prātiçākhyā: editions of, intr. n.; mode of citing it here followed, intr. n.; general comparison with the present work, add. n. 1; its doctrines cited or referred to, *passim*.
- s*: a dental spirant, i. 24n, 31n; *t* inserted after *t* before, ii. 8; initial *s* of certain roots lost after *ud*, ii. 18; *visarjanīya* converted into, before *k* and *p*, ii. 62-80; *s* converted into *sh* before *k* and *p*, ii. 81; do. in other cases, whether final, medial, or initial, ii. 82-101; even when an augment or reduplication intervenes after the cause of conversion, ii. 92, 93; exceptions, ii. 102-107; irregular case of insertion of, iii. 96; its
- Prolongation of vowels in *sanhitā*: of final of first member of a compound, iii. 1-3, 9-12, 12n, 24; of final of a theme in declension, iii. 5, 6, 8; do. before suffixes, iii. 17, 18; of final of a word, iii. 16, 19, 25; full and systematic exposition of Atharvan usage in this respect, iii. 16n; prolongation of first syllable of a word, iii. 15, 21; of reduplication, iii. 13, 14; of particle *n*, iii. 4; other cases, iii. 7, 22, 23; prolongation very rare except of *ā*, iii. 16n; restoration in *pada* and *krama* texts of a lengthened vowel, iv. 74 etc.
- Pronoun, name for, ii. 44n.
- Protracted (*pluta*) vowel: has three moras, i. 62; list of protracted vowels in Atharva-Veda, i. 105; kinds, accent and designation in MSS., i. 105n; protraction when omitted in *pada* and *krama* texts, i. 97, 105n, iv. 120; protraction of *vikampita* circumflex syllables, iii. 65n.

- insertion prevents division in *pada*-text, iv. 58, 59; *s* restored from *sh* in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc. See also Sibilants and Spirants.
- Sanhitā**-text: its construction the subject of chapters ii. and iii., ii. 1.
- Sāmkrtya**, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 21n.
- Semivowels** (*y, r, l, v*): how formed, i. 30; meaning of the name, i. 30n; *m* omitted before, ii. 32; alternant vowels before dissimilar vowels converted into, iii. 39; resulting *kshāipra* circumflex, iii. 58-61. See also the different letters.
- śh**: a lingual spirant, i. 22n, 31n; special mode of its formation, i. 23; phonetic value, i. 23n; dental mute becomes lingual after, ii. 16; *s* converted into, before *k* and *p*, ii. 81; in other cases, ii. 82-101; exceptions, ii. 102-107; converts succeeding *n* to *ṅ*, iii. 75 etc.; reconverted into *s* in *pada* and *krama* texts, iv. 74 etc.
- Short vowels**, i. 59.
- Sibilants** (*r, śh, s*): aspiration of final mutes before, ii. 6; great discordance of authorities upon this point, ii. 6n; after *ñ, n*, and *n, k, t*, and *t* inserted before, ii. 9; sibilants inserted after final *n*, ii. 26; historical ground of this insertion, ii. 26n; preceding *visarjanīya* assimilated to, ii. 40; this rule not followed in MSS. and edited text, ii. 40n; not duplicated after *r* and *h*, if followed by vowels, iii. 32. See also Spirants, and the different letters.
- Similar or homogeneous sounds, i. 27n.
- Sonant letters**: defined, i. 13; list of, i. 13n.
- Sphoṭana**: defined, i. 103; when it takes place, ii. 38.
- Spirants** (*h, x, ç, śh, s, φ, ḥ*): how formed, i. 31; *l* suffers *abhinidhāna* before, i. 46; longer *svarabhakti* inserted before, after *r*, i. 101; loss of *m* and *n* before, ii. 32-34; final *visarjanīya* before initial surd converted into, ii. 40; partial disobedience of this rule by MSS. and edited text of Atharvan, ii. 40n. See also Sibilants, and the different letters.
- Strong cases**, name for, i. 88.
- Suffixes**, peculiar names of certain, i. 88, iii. 17, iv. 16n, 20, 21, 48; final vowel of theme lengthened before, iii. 17, 18; when separable or not separable from theme by *anagraha*, iv. 13-72.
- Surd consonants** defined, i. 12.
- Svarabhakti**: what, and when inserted, i. 101, 102.
- Svarita**:—see Circumflex.
- Syllables**, i. 93; quantity of, i. 51-54; mode of division of, i. 55-58, 104.
- t*: a dental mute, i. 24n; inserted after *ç* before *s*, ii. 8; do. after *n* before sibilants, ii. 9; mode of combination with *ç* and *l*, ii. 13, 17; the combination of *t* and *ç* how made in the MSS. and edited text, ii. 17n; do. with preceding or following palatals and linguals, ii. 14, 15.
- ṭ*: a lingual mute, i. 22n; when a final, i. 6n; *t* inserted before *s* after, ii. 8; inserted after *n* before sibilants, ii. 9.
- Tāirovirāma** enclitic circumflex of Vāj. Pr., iii. 62n.
- Tāirovyañjana** enclitic circumflex, iii. 62; its comparative tone, iii. 55 intr. n.
- Tāittirīya Prātiçākhyā**: mode of citing it here followed, intr. n.; general comparison with the present work, add. n. I; its doctrines cited or referred to, *passim*.
- Tāthābhāvya** enclitic circumflex of Vāj. Pr., iii. 69n.
- th*, a dental mute, i. 24n.
- ṭh*, a lingual mute, i. 22n.
- Throat-sounds** (*a, á, ḥ, h*), i. 19.
- u, ú*: labial vowels, i. 25n; *ú* a *pragr̥hya* as locative ending, i. 74; do. as dual ending, i. 75.
- u* (particle): technical designation of, iv. 16n; how treated in *pada* text, i. 72, 73; finals compounded with are *pragr̥hya*, i. 79, 80; what words are so compounded in Atharva-Veda, i. 80n; when prolonged in *sanhitā*, iii. 4; when not liable to euphonic combination in *sanhitā*, iii. 36; treatment of in *krama*-text, iv. 113, 114, 116, 118, 119.
- Udatta**:—see Acute.
- Ukhyā**, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 21n.
- Upadhmaniya** (ϕ): labial spirant, i. 25n, 31n; *visarjanīya* converted into it before surd labials, ii. 40n; this rule not observed in MSS. and edited text, ii. 40n; a few times written with *śh* in MSS., iv. 75n, 77n.
- Upalekha**: edition of, iv. 74n; its doctrines cited, iv. 78 etc., etc.
- v*: labial semivowel, i. 25n, 30n; its pronunciation, i. 25n; dropped when final after any vowel but *á*, ii. 21, 22; exceptions, ii. 23; or it has attenuated utterance, ii. 24; *am* once made nasal *á* before it, ii. 28; *m* when retained unchanged before it, ii. 37.
- Vādabhikāra**, quoted by Tāitt. Pr., ii. 6n.
- Vājasaneyi Prātiçākhyā**: edition of, intr. n.; general comparison with the present work, add. n. I; its doctrines cited or referred to, *passim*.

- Vâlmiki, quoted by Taitt. Pr., ii. 17n, 40n.
 Varnakrama:--see Duplication of consonants.
- Vâtsâpra, quoted by Taitt. Pr., ii. 21n, 24n.
- Vâtsya, quoted in commentary, ii. 6n.
- Veda: its study recommended, iv. 101-106.
- Vedamitra, quoted by Rik Pr., i. 29n.
- Verb, i. 1, add. n. 4. II. 1; its composition with modifying prepositions, iv. 1-7.
- Vikampita modification of independent circumflex, iii. 65; mode of designating, iii. 65n; occasional protraction of *vikampita* syllable in MSS., iii. 65n.
- Visarjaniya (*h*): a throat-sound, i. 19n; a spirant, i. 31n; a possible final, i. 5; called *abhinish'âna*, i. 42; conversion of *m* to, ii. 25; do. of *n* to, ii. 26-28, 30; historical origin of this combination, ii. 26n; assimilation of to following surd, ii. 40; disagreement of the grammarians upon this point, ii. 40n; discordance with this rule of the practice of MSS. and edited text, ii. 40n; dropped in edition before sibilant followed by surd mute, ii. 40n; becomes *y* before a vowel, ii. 41; and the *y* is dropped, ii. 21; but becomes *r* after an alterant vowel, ii. 42, 43; and, in certain words, after *a* and *â*, ii. 44-52; *ah* converted to *o*, ii. 53, 54; it is dropped after *â*, ii. 55; do. in *salâ* and *eshah*, ii. 57, 58; do. in special cases, ii. 56, 59; anomalous combinations of, ii. 60, 61; converted to *s* or *sh* before *k* and *p*, ii. 62-81; not duplicated, iii. 29; restored from *s* or *sh*, and restored to *n*, in *krama* and *pada* texts, iv. 74 etc.
- Vocatives in *o*, *praghyâ* only in *pada*-text, i. 81.
- Vowels (*a, â, i, î, u, û, r, ř, l, e, ai, o, au*): belong to various classes of sounds, i. 19n-21n, 25n; degree of contact of organs in production of, i. 32-36; nasal vowels, i. 27n; quantity of vowels, i. 59-62; combinations of vowels, iii. 39-54; resulting accent, iii. 55-61, 65, 66. See also the different letters, also Nasal vowels, and Diphthongs.
- Vridhi derivatives from compounds, how treated in *pada*-text, iv. 55.
- y*: palatal semivowel, i. 21n, 30n; dropped when final after a vowel, ii. 21; or has attenuated utterance, ii. 24; *visarjaniya* before a vowel converted into, ii. 41.
- Yamas: in part sonant, i. 13n; are nose-sounds, i. 26n; when inserted, i. 99; their phonetic value, i. 99n; how written in the commentary, i. 99n.

ERRATA.

- p. 5, l. 3—for ऽऽसति read ऽऽसोत्.
- p. 9, l. 16—for पृष्टं read पृष्टं.
- p. 16, l. 11—for *not* wait to be *entreated* read *not* turn the back on them.
- p. 18, l. 33—for *at an* read *as an*.
- p. 20, l. 22—for *matronymic* read *metronymic*.
- p. 21, l. 4—for *Kártikeya* read *Kárttikeya*.
- p. 22, l. 34— do. do.
- p. 26, l. 16—the plate has दिग्पाल-.
- p. 32, l. 17—for -नेधु- read -नेधु-.
- p. 61, l. 13—for '*at-Tarmidhi* read '*at-Tarmidhi's*.
- p. 72, l. 5—for عبد الرحمن عند الرحمن read عبد الرحمن عند الرحمن.
- “ l. 34—for '*Abdallah* read '*Abdulláh*; and for '*Abd 'ar-Rahmán* read '*Abd 'ar-Rahmán*.
- p. 83, l. 3 from below—for كقول read كقول.

The *errata* for the Atharva-Veda Prâtiçâkhya are given in the last additional note to that work, just before the Indexes.

. . .

P R O C E E D I N G S

O F T H E

A M E R I C A N O R I E N T A L S O C I E T Y .

New Haven, October 17th and 18th, 1860.

THE Semi-annual Meeting for 1860 of the American Oriental Society was held in New Haven, at the residence of Mr. E. E. Salisbury, commencing on Wednesday, October 17th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon. The President being absent, the chair was occupied by Pres't T. D. Woolsey, the only Vice-President present.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and accepted. Dr. Cogswell of New York, and Mr. Gilman and Prof. Whitney of New Haven were appointed a Committee of Arrangements for the present meeting.

The Librarian made a brief verbal report respecting the accessions to the Library during the past six months (of which he laid a detailed list upon the table), and respecting its present condition. He invited the members from abroad to visit and examine the Library and Cabinet at their place of deposit in Yale College Library, during their stay in the city.

The Board of Directors recommended to the Society, for election as Corresponding Members, the following gentlemen, accompanying the recommendation with a statement of their claims to membership :

Dr. Adalbert Kuhn, of Berlin.

Dr. Andrew T. Pratt, Missionary at Aleppo.

they were thereupon balloted for, and declared duly elected.

Other gentlemen were, upon the recommendation of the Directors, elected Corporate Members; the names of such of whom as shall have signified their acceptance of membership will be reported at the next meeting of the Society.

The Corresponding Secretary presented the correspondence of the half-year, reading first the more than usually numerous regrets and excuses for non-attendance which had been received from members compelled by other engagements to be absent from the meeting. Among the letters of a more general interest were the following :

1. From Rev. C. D. Seropyan, dated Paris, March 2nd, 1860, accompanying the donation of two works on topics in the history of Armenia, by G. V. Shahnazarian, and also enclosing a manuscript of the same author, entitled "Programme of a Collection of Armenian Authors, published under the title 'Armenian Historical Gallery,'" of the main part of which a translation (the original is in French) is offered below.

After a few introductory remarks, Mr. Shahnazarian goes on to say :

"After such repeated destructions of our literary monuments—monuments derived in great part from the archives and the schools of Edessa, of Nineveh, of Tarsus, of Antioch, of Alexandria, of Rome, of Athens, of Byzantium, capitals visited and explored, one after another, by most of the Armenian authors—we still possess a considerable number of precious works which time has respected.

"During the three centuries that the Armenians have possessed the art of printing, scarcely fourteen or fifteen historical works* have been published: viz. Agathangelus,¹ secretary of King Tiridates, Zenobius,² Faustus of Byzantium, Korion, Elisha,³ Lazarus of Phorbis,⁴ Moses of Khorene,⁵ John Mamikonian,⁶ Sebeos, historian of Heraclius, John the patriarch,⁷ Mesrob the priest,⁸ Aristakes of Lastivert,⁹ archimandrite, prince Hethum Rubenian,¹⁰ Arakel of Tauris,¹¹ archimandrite, Thomas Ardzuruni,¹² and perhaps a few others; while the greater number still remain in manuscript, and the learned world is constantly in danger of losing a part of them by some unforeseen accident, as has happened so many times. To bring to light, and to preserve henceforward, the historical works of my country, I have devoted myself during the past fifteen years to searching for manuscript copies of them, especially in the rich library of the patriarchal convent of Edchmiadzin, and in those of the convents of Siunik, of Mgr. Carapet, Armenian archbishop of Tiflis, of the National Museum of Constantinople, of that of Jerusalem, in private collections, and, finally, in the Imperial Library of Paris. After having surmounted difficulties of every kind, and expended much labor and no small sums of money, I have succeeded in forming a considerable collection of these manuscripts, and have undertaken the publication of an Armenian Historical Gallery, to be composed of fourteen authors of high interest. They are as follows:

"1. Leontius,¹³ archimandrite, a writer of the 8th century. He treats of the invasions of Armenia, Georgia, and Caucasian Albania by the Arabs, and of the conquests made by them. I have been able to discover only a single manuscript of his work—but a very correct one—coming from the convent of St. John Baptist, in the pashalik of Mueh, and now forming part of the library of the late Mgr. Carapet. On the basis of this unique copy I have published the text, with a French translation.

"2. Stephen Assoghik,¹⁴ archimandrite, who lived in the 10th century. He composed, in three books, a very learned abridgment of universal history, at the request of the patriarch Sarkis I. He begins with the creation, and ends with the year 1004. I have published the work from three manuscripts, of which one was copied by myself at Siunik, the second belongs to the Carapet library, and the third to P. Alichan, Director of the Armenian college Samuel Moorat at Paris.

"3. Sembath the constable, prince of Coricos,¹⁵ an author of the 13th century. He composed a book of annals, starting from the year 952. It treats of the principal events in Armenia, of the Lower Empire, and of the Crusades, and is brought down to 1277. I have published an edition of it, founded on three manuscripts . . .

"4. Vahram Rabuni,¹⁶ vardapet, secretary of the Armenian king Leon III, in the 13th century. It relates in verse the history of the Rubenians of Lesser Armenia, where the Armenian family of Rubenians, allied later to the French house of Lusignan, reigned for three hundred years. I have published it from two manuscripts. . . There was published in 1831 an English translation of the work, by K. F. Neumann.

"5. Stephen Orbelian,¹⁷ metropolitan of Siunik, also of the 13th century. He has left a complete history of the province of Lissak, and of the different families who have possessed it; among others, of the Orbelian princes, from whom he is himself descended. This chapter was translated by Saint-Martin, and published in 1819, as part of the work entitled *Mémoires Historiques et Géographiques sur l'Arménie*. Stephen Orbelian gives precious details respecting the invasions of the Mongols; he copies a great number of inscriptions extant at his period, and presents the nomenclature of all the convents, villages, cities, and cantons of that province. The whole work includes seventy-five chapters. I have published it from three manuscripts. . .

"The learned Saint-Martin, lacking a profound knowledge of the Armenian language, and also led astray by an incomplete and faulty manuscript, has fallen into serious errors, which I have pointed out in my edition, and in my explanatory notes.

"These five works, compared, corrected, explained by means of considerable notes, enriched with biographies of their authors, and with an introduction to each vol-

* We add, in connection with the authors and works mentioned in this Programme, references to Mr Dwight's Catalogue of Works in the Armenian Language, published in Vol. iii of the Society's Journal.

1 See Journ., iii. 246.

5 Ibid., p. 248.

9 Ibid., p. 260.

13 Ibid., p. 258.

17 Ibid., p. 271.

2 Ibid., p. 247.

6 Ibid., p. 252.

10 Ibid., p. 273.

14 Ibid., p. 259.

3 Ibid., p. 250.

7 Ibid., p. 256.

11 Ibid., p. 273.

15 Ibid., p. 276.

COMM. OF PUBL.

4 Ibid., p. 247.

8 Ibid., p. 259.

12 Ibid., p. 257.

16 Ibid., p. 272.

ume, have left the press during the years 1858 and 1859, published almost entirely at my expense. They are to be purchased of the editor, at Paris (No. 86, Rue de l'Ouest), at 9 francs a volume.

"6. Moses of Albania,¹⁸ or of Calancaitatz, has just been put to press. This author composed his historical work, in three books, in the first half of the 7th century. It is of great importance, as being the only one which brings to our knowledge the history of Albania, of the Huns, of the Khozars, and of other neighboring races. His story, which breaks off in the middle of the 7th century, has been continued to the 10th by an anonymous author. I possess four copies of it. . . .

"7. The Universal History of Michael, patriarch of the Syrians, of the 12th century. This extremely interesting work was translated from the Syriac into the Armenian, shortly after the death of its author. I do not know whether the Syriac original is in existence; but the Armenian version, made by Chot, and revised by the learned Vardan Vardapet, and bearing the marks of the decadence of the Armenian language, leaves nothing to be desired, as concerns its fidelity. My edition of this work will be founded on three manuscripts, the first of which, being complete and correct, belongs to the Armenian Museum of Constantinople, and has been kindly lent me for collation; the second I myself copied at Edchmiadzin; the third, which is incomplete and incorrect, belongs to the Imperial Library of Paris. It is from this latter copy that the learned M. Dulaurier has given an extract in French.

"8. The Chronology of Samuel,¹⁹ priest of the cathedral of Ani, capital of Armenia under the Bagratides; a work of no great extent, but of extreme accuracy, and composed by order of the patriarch Gregory IV, in the 12th century. The method of Samuel of Ani reminds one of that of Eusebius of Cesarea. An anonymous author has continued it down to the 13th century. The edition of Samuel of Ani will be based upon four copies. . . .

"9. Mekhithar,²⁰ a monk of Airivank, a writer of the 13th century, and of immense learning. By means of concentric circles, he has traced a view of the astronomy of his period, and has drawn out, in parallel columns, lists of all sovereigns, pontiffs, patriarchs, and Armenian and foreign authors, adding sundry essays on the creation of the world and on the celestial spheres. I possess of this work at present but a single copy, made by myself. . . .

"10. Matthew of Edessa,²¹ an author of the 12th century. He throws a vivid light upon the history of the races of Western Asia in the Middle Ages, and especially upon the Crusades. The priest Gregory is his continuer. I possess of his work but a single incorrect copy. The copies belonging to the Imperial Library of Paris and to that of the convent of the Mekhitharists at Venice are unfortunately in the same condition, and of no more value than my own. M. Dulaurier has this year published Matthew of Edessa in a French translation.

"11. Cyriacus of Gandzak,²² vardapet, a writer of the 13th century. He has composed a History of Armenia, covering a period of near a thousand years. As contemporary, prisoner, and interpreter of the Tatars, he furnishes precious details respecting that people. I have two copies of this history: the first is the more correct, but not complete: it was given me by the Armenian Museum of Constantinople. My second copy is complete, but not very correct: I expect a third, from the library of the Armenian convent of Jerusalem, which will soon be sent me.

"12. Vardan Vardapet of Baretzer-berd,²³ of the 13th century, a fellow-disciple of Cyriacus of Gandzak, profoundly learned, and especially distinguished as a linguist. He has left us a complete history of Armenia from the time of Haik down to his own period. I have but a single copy of it, but expect another from Constantinople.

"13. Malachi the monk,²⁴ likewise of the 13th century. His work is entirely devoted to an account of the invasions of the Mongols, who bore rule in Armenia for nearly two centuries. A single copy of it is at my disposal.

"14. Thomas of Medzob,²⁵ vardapet, of the 15th century. He has composed, as an eye-witness, a brief history of Tamerlane, and of the principal events of his time. The copy which I have in my hands is very correct; the Imperial Library of Paris also possesses an excellent copy, made at the convent of the Mekhitharists at Venice upon the collation of four manuscripts. M. Nève has published at Paris, in the year 1855, a study upon Thomas of Medzob and his history."

18 *Ibid.*, p. 257.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 267.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 266.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 272.

20 *Ibid.*, p. 271.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 271.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 264.

25 *Ibid.*, p. 278.

2. From Rev. J. Austin Merrick, dated Paris, Ky., Sept. 17th, 1860.

After expressing his regret at being unable to attend the Society's meeting, Mr. Merrick says :

" . . . You have doubtless seen newspaper notices of the alleged discovery, in excavating a mound in Newark, Ohio, of a peculiarly shaped stone, described as a truncated pyramid, four or five inches long, and marked on its four sides in low relief with Hebrew characters. It claims to be an Oriental symbol, of unknown antiquity and of a masonic origin, and for these reasons has attracted some attention from Oriental scholars and antiquarians in different sections of the country.

" It is almost needless for me to state that, having been asked my opinion by interested parties, it was unhesitatingly given adversely to the genuineness of the monument as an ancient symbol, or as a work of any character anterior to our own day. Indeed, you will see, by the photographed and traced copies of it herewith forwarded to your address, that it carries its condemnation on its face, as a bungling imitation of the *printed* Chaldee letters in our later editions of the Hebrew Bible. . . . "

The copies sent by Mr. Merrick were passed around among the members present, and no person was found disposed to differ from the opinion expressed by that gentleman, while some surprise was manifested that so transparent a fraud, or piece of pleasantry, should have made so much stir, and deceived so many people.

Communications were now called for.

1. On the Vocabulary of the Modern Greek Language, by Mr. F. P. Brewer, of New Haven.

After premising that a considerable portion of the words in Modern Greek are the same, or nearly the same, with those of the ancient language, Mr. Brewer considered first the changes of form which they had in many cases undergone, attributing them in part to the degradation of the people, and in part to the phonetical corruptions to which every language is subject. Some words were claimed to preserve ante-classical elements, and many new forms to exhibit the carrying out of principles developed in the language during its classical period. The formation of new words as substitutes for old ones was illustrated by numerous examples, classified under several heads. It was shown to be called for in many cases by ambiguities arising from a new pronunciation or from other causes. Some new meanings are the result of metonymy ; others are euphemistic. A few contain references to local customs. The Hellenistic phase of the modern language was pointed out as of conspicuous importance, and was traced to its natural cause, in the currency given by the New Testament to the colloquial dialect of the Grecian Jews. In conclusion, Mr. Brewer offered some reflections on the attempts now making to resuscitate the ancient Greek as the cultivated and literary language of the modern kingdom, and considered briefly the probable issue of the attempt and the future history of the language.

Remarks and comments followed the reading of Mr. Brewer's paper, turning especially upon the last point discussed by him, respecting which some diversity of opinion was manifested.

2. On the Oriental Works in the Astor Library, by Dr. J. G. Cogswell, of New York.

Dr. Cogswell laid before the meeting, and read in part, a list of the latest additions to the Oriental department of the Astor Library. He spoke of the warm interest taken by himself in the progress of Oriental study, and of his desire to contribute what he could to its advancement, by providing for special students the means of pursuing their researches to the best advantage ; which desire, he said, had led him to give the department a special share of attention in making purchases of books. He cordially invited the members of the Society to examine and make use of the collection, and also to suggest the names of works with which they would desire to see it farther enriched.

3. On the Kings of Mandala, as commemorated in a Sanskrit Inscription of the 17th Century, by Fitz-Edward Hall, D.C.L.

4. Two Inscriptions pertaining to the Paramāra Rulers of Mālava; the Sanskrit, with Translations and Remarks. By the same.

These two papers form the first two articles in the seventh volume of the Society's Journal, now in process of publication. In the absence of their author, who has recently returned to his post as Inspector of Schools for the Saugor and Nerbudda Territory in India, they were laid before the Society by the Corresponding Secretary. The latter gave some account of Mr. Hall's labors in Sanskrit epigraphy. He described the two classes of inscriptions to which those treated in the papers under notice belong—the one commemorative of the erection and endowment of sacred edifices and their appendages, the other recording formal grants of lands and villages to Brahmans—and read enough of their translations to illustrate the general character of such monuments, as well as the special features of the specimens of them here presented. He pointed out some of the valuable results derived from the inscriptions, or from Mr. Hall's remarks and notes called out by them; especially the correction of Lassen's error respecting the period of Udayāditya of Mālava.

5. On the Greek Augment, and on Processes of Growth in Language, by Mr. Jacob Wilson, of Canajoharie, N. Y.

Mr. Wilson considered the origin and character of the augment of the Greek verb, which he regarded as identical with the reduplication. He compared it also with certain prefixes in other languages, of which he discussed the significance and mode of development.

6. On Tamil Metre and Music, by Rev. Edward Webb, Missionary at Dindigal, Southern India.

Mr. Webb gave a summary account of the method of construction of Tamil verse, defining and naming first the two kinds of syllables, then the feet, and then the stanzas into which these are combined. He described the attempts of the Christian missionaries in Southern India to introduce our own metres and hymn-tunes as part of the worship of the congregations of native converts, and the complete failure which had attended them; it had been found impossible to make the natives recognize any measure in the verse, or learn to sing the music. In view of this, an effort had been made to obtain Christian songs written by the converts, in their own metres, and adapted to their own melodies, and with the most satisfactory results. A large number of Christian lyrics had been collected, well suited to be introduced into Christian worship, and calculated to help the cause of Christianity. Translations of a number of these were read by Mr. Webb, and were listened to with much interest and admiration. He also read specimens of the original hymns, in illustration of their peculiar rhythmical character, which would be styled in the West highly artificial, being marked with profuse and elaborate rhyme, alliteration, and assonance. He described the musical modes of the Hindus, accepted throughout all India under the same Sanskrit appellations, briefly indicating their relation to the European scale, and referring to the special adaptedness to the expression of different emotions, and to employment at different seasons and different parts of the day, claimed for them by the natives: finally, as a practical illustration, he sang several of them to the hymns which he had before read.

7. On a Revolution in the Ancient Religion of Greece, by Prof. J. C. Moffat, of Princeton.

Prof. Moffat alluded to the fact that Greek literature bears deep marks of an ancient religious revolution. Viewing the Greeks as belonging to two great divisions, the northern, and the southern with eastern connections, or the Hellenes and the Pelasgi or Ionians, he held that the revolution occurred in the religion of the former, at the meeting of the two races, and in and about Thessaly. The religion overthrown was a nature-worship; that set up in its stead was more akin with the earlier civilization of the region, and presented gods having an independent existence. The head of the new religion was without a proper name in Greek, Ζεύς

designating him simply as 'god,' and *Ζεὺς πατήρ* as the 'father god.' The religion came from the Pelasgi, who learned their divine names from the East, especially from Egypt. The Pelasgic Dodona was the earliest Hellenic seat of the Jupiter worship. Prof. Moffat then proceeded to establish, by comparison of traditions and observances, his belief that the Jupiter of Dodona was identical with the Amun of Ammonium and of Thebes, before the latter absorbed the attributes of the ram-headed god Num: and that the worship of Amun came from Ethiopia, and in its original purity was a true worship of the unseen god, as separate from his works—the name Amun signifying 'unseen' or 'concealed.' Accepted by the Pelasgi, who worshipped the god without a name, that religion was afterwards communicated by them to the ruder tribes migrating in upon them from the north. The writer then attempted to approximate to the date at which this change in the religion of the Hellenic people took place, and concluded that it was not long before the Trojan war.

In criticism of Prof. Moffat's views, Prof. Hadley, of New Haven, remarked that the word *Ζεὺς* was proved by the analogy of the kindred languages, especially of the Sanskrit, to mean originally the 'sky,' and to be accordingly the name of a divinity belonging to a nature-religion, while the attributes assigned to the god also strongly favored the same conclusion.

At this stage of proceedings, the Society adjourned until the next day.

On assembling again on Thursday morning, at half past eight o'clock, at the same place, the Society continued to listen to communications.

8. On the Phonetic Processes exemplified in the English Language, by Prof. J. W. Gibbs, of Yale College.

In this paper the author pointed out the principal processes of euphonic change developed in the history of the forms of speech of the Indo-European family, and more especially of the Teutonic branch of that family, as they present themselves in the words and forms of the English language, for the purpose of showing the importance of recognizing them in English grammar.

9. On a Recent Memoir by Professor Chwolson of St. Petersburg, entitled "Remains of Ancient Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations," by Prof. James Hadley, of Yale College.

This memoir of Prof. Chwolson is printed in a separate form from the *Mémoires des Savants Etrangers*, St. Petersburg, 1859. It is in German, and fills nearly 200 quarto pages. Its author is a pupil of Movers, the great explorer of Phœnician antiquities, and in many points resembles his lamented master. He published in 1856 a work of remarkable originality and learning on the "Sabians and Sabianism." Since then he has been much engaged in studying the productions which form the subject of this memoir. They are a series of Arabic texts, not yet published, which purport to be translations, made about 900 A. D., from originals composed in a language called "Nabathæan." They were described in part by Quatremère in his *Mémoire sur les Nabatéens*, *Journal Asiatique*, t. xv, 1835; but no one before Chwolson has given them a thorough study. He proposes to edit them, and states that they will make four quarto volumes of 600 pages each. His object in this memoir—of which the leading points were given by Prof. Hadley—is to furnish a general account of the books, their contents and character, to discuss their authorship, with the times and places of their origin, and to indicate his reasons for referring them in part to a very high antiquity: for he regards the most important one as older by seven centuries than Nebuchadnezzar. He begins by showing that there is no impossibility in supposing that the Chaldæans should have reached an advanced point in literature and science at such an early period, so long before the beginning of Greek culture. He then enumerates the Arabic texts, and speaks of Ibn-Wahshiyyah, the professed translator. He was a native of southern Chaldæa, and therefore a Nabathæan; for this term, as used by the Arabs, referred in a stricter sense to the Chaldæans, while in a wider sense it included the Aramæans and Canaanites, and in fact all Semitic-speaking races, except perhaps the Arabs. The mass of his countrymen were still heathen, and spoke, though in a corrupt form, the old Babylonian language.

Ibn-Wahshiyyah was a man of much travel, and much knowledge of physical science, which procured for him in later times the reputation of a conjuror. Though a Mohammedan, he hated the Arabs, and resented their contempt for his countrymen. It was to overcome this contempt that he undertook to render into Arabic a number of works from the surviving remains of Nabathæan (or ancient Babylonian) literature. The originals he procured with difficulty, their heathen custodians being afraid to trust them in Moslem hands. The works placed at his disposal included books on religion, natural history, medicine, astrology, and perhaps astronomy and history: of these he translated only a part, and of his translations only a part have come down to us. Chwolson finds reason to regard him as a competent and faithful translator. Among his extant versions, the longest, and in all respects the most important, is that which the Arabs call the "Book of Nabathæan Agriculture." It is almost encyclopædical in extent and variety, treating of all matters connected with the cultivation and productions of the soil, and touching incidentally on many things, historical, philosophical, social, and religious, which have little relation to agriculture. Its professed author is Qût'âmî, who describes himself as a Chaldæan, resident in Babylon, but owning large estates in the country. He is a man of philosophic culture, and of true scientific spirit, a liberal inquirer, and opposed at heart to the prevailing polytheism of his countrymen. He makes quotations, almost without number, from a host of preceding authors. Some ten or twelve of these are specially described by Chwolson, with loose estimates of the intervals of time between them, the earliest, Dewânâi, being placed more than 1000 years before Qût'âmî. The most prominent are Yanbûshâd, a sage and saint, of monotheistic tendencies, who lived perhaps 400 years before Qût'âmî, and Dbagrîf, who may have lived 200 years earlier. Among the rest, we find the names of Adami, Ishî'â, Anûhâ, Ibrahim, which remind us of the patriarchs Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, though Chwolson regards them as wholly distinct. The last two are spoken of as Canaanites, and Qût'âmî repeatedly alludes to a Canaanitish dynasty as having long before conquered Babylonia under a chief named Nemrôdâ (apparently the Nimrod of Genesis), and as being still dominant in that country. This dynasty Chwolson identifies with the so-called Arabic kings of Berosus: their rule in Babylonia, which commenced about the middle of the 16th century, he conceives to have been established by some of the Hyksos then driven out of Egypt; and as their line ended soon after the beginning of the 13th century, he concludes that Qût'âmî must have written before 1300 B.C. A number of objections to this prodigious antiquity (part of them already suggested by Ewald) are considered and answered, the most serious being those arising from the way in which the Greeks (or Ionians) are often referred to by Qût'âmî and his predecessors.

Beside the Book of Nabathæan Agriculture, we find in the Arabic versions of Ibn-Wahshiyyah—1. A book on Poisons, which is mainly the work of Yârbûqâ, a writer older even than Qût'âmî—2. A book of Astrology, or horoscopic signs, by a writer named Tenkelûshâ, who seems to have lived not very long before the final destruction of Babylon in the second century after Christ—3. Some fragments of another work entitled "Mysteries of the Sun and Moon."

Prof. Hadley confined himself, for the most part, to representing the statements and arguments of the memoir under review, though not without indicating various difficulties and improbabilities which appear to beset them. In conclusion, he gave the résumé in which Chwolson sketches, with lofty eloquence and glowing enthusiasm, the results to be gained for the history of human culture from these newly recognized remains of ancient Babylonian literature.

10. On the Late Dealings between China and the Western Powers, by Dr. S. Wells Williams, of Canton.

Dr. Williams, who, as interpreter to the American embassies, had borne a share personally in all the recent negotiations with China, gave the Society a sketch of the transactions between China and the English, French, Russians, and Americans, which had led to the formation of the treaties of Tien-tsin, and likewise of the later proceedings of the English and French in the Pei-ho, which resulted in the disastrous repulse of the allied fleets from before the forts at the mouth of the river. Of the expedition of the American embassy from Peh-tang to Peking immediately after, for the purpose of exchanging ratifications of the American treaty, as

also of the negotiations at Peking respecting an audience with the emperor, which resulted in failure, from the steady refusal of the ambassador to pay him the homage of kneeling, Dr. Williams gave a somewhat detailed account, partly oral, and partly from a report of the journey already published by him in the *Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (Shanghai, 1859). He explicitly denied the stories which had been extensively circulated—partly in anticipation of the facts—of the treatment of the embassy with indignity or want of ceremonious attention on the part of the Chinese, and maintained that the latter had acted throughout in good faith, and with candor and liberality; that they were sincerely desirous that the ratification and the presentation to the emperor should take place, and had withdrawn vastly more than ever before of their assumption of superiority and claim to homage, but were unable to prevail upon themselves to give up the point of kneeling. He saw no reason to doubt that preparation had been made at Peking for the reception of all the embassies, and that they were to have been conducted thither from Peh-tang. The different course taken by the English and Americans in this business had finally convinced the Chinese of what they had never before fully believed, namely the entire independence of the two governments.

Dr. Williams farther favored the Society with a brief exposition of the present condition of China, and his views as to the probable result of the pending troubles, internal and external, of the empire; speaking upon the latter point, however, only diffidently and without certainty. He described the rebellion as rather a devastating foray and military occupation of certain provinces than a division of the empire: the rebels organized nothing, and, as soon as they quitted a province, it reverted to its ancient condition under imperial authority. Of the mongrel Christianity professed by them he spoke doubtfully, but thought that their iconoclasm and independence of traditional authority might be agencies for good among the Chinese people.

11. On Müller's History of Vedic Literature, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of Yale College.

This paper was an analysis and criticism of Prof. Max Müller's late volume, entitled "A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, so far as it illustrates the Primitive Religion of the Brahmans" (London, 1859). The writer began with a sketch of Prof. Müller's literary life and labors, and an exposition of his superior claims to the succession of Wilson's chair at Oxford, for which he is now competing. He then proceeded to set forth the general character and objects of the work, and to comment upon some of its statements and deductions. He presented its four-fold division of the Vedic period—into the sub-periods of the Sūtras, of the Brāhmaṇas, of the collection of the hymns, and of their composition—rehearsing the grounds upon which this was founded: but he was not disposed to accept its chronological determination of the time of the periods—by which the earliest was made to include from 1200-1000 B. C.—as of any authority or positive value. In connection herewith, he spoke of the extreme difficulty attending the settlement of dates in Hindu history, and of the successive overthrows experienced by conclusions once thought to be firmly established: the work in hand affording such an instance, in the disproof of the currently accepted date of Buddha's death, 543 B. C., and of the reliability of Buddhist chronology prior to 250 B. C. The claim of Müller that the Vedic literature was produced without and prior to all knowledge of the art of writing was next discussed: Prof. Whitney gave the reasons which led him to question this conclusion, and to believe rather that the art was disowned and ignored in the literature which must have been constructed partly by its aid, and exoterically in the Brahman schools, in order to maintain the Brahman monopoly of the sacred knowledge and of its propagation by tradition and oral instruction. He farther expressed his dissent from Müller's opinion that traces of a primitive monotheism are discoverable in the Vedas, and finally criticised certain views respecting the early history and migrations of nations, brought forward in the introductory portions of the work, as having a form and significance which were rhetorical rather than scientific.

No farther communications being offered, the Directors announced that the next meeting would be held in Boston, on Wednesday the 22nd of May, 1861, and that they had appointed Dr. Beck, Mr. Abbot, and Prof. Whitney a Committee of Arrangements for it; and the Society adjourned.

PROCEEDINGS.

~~~~~  
**Boston and Cambridge, May 22nd, 1861.**  
 ~~~~~

PURSUANT to adjournment, the American Oriental Society held its Annual Meeting for 1861 in Boston and Cambridge, on Wednesday, May 22nd. The Society assembled in the rooms of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was called to order soon after 10 o'clock A. M., by the President, Dr. Robinson of New York.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, reports from the officers were called for. The Treasurer first gave a summary statement of the income and outlay of the past year, and of the present condition of the Treasury, as follows :

RECEIPTS.

Balance in the Treasury, May 17th, 1860,	-	-	-	-	\$520.58
Members' fees : ann. assessm'ts for 1860-61,	-	-	-	\$455.00	
do. do. for previous years,	-	-	-	115.00	
do. do. for 1861-62,	-	-	-	5.00	575.00
Sale of Journal,	-	-	-	-	63.39
Donations from American merchants in China,	-	-	-	-	400.00
Total receipts of the year,	-	-	-	-	\$1038.39
					\$1558.97

EXPENDITURES.

Paper, printing, and engraving for Journal, Vol. VI (balance),	-	-	-	-	\$429.15
do. do. do. Vol. VII (in part),	-	-	-	-	473.43
Other printing,	-	-	-	-	16.59
Binding books,	-	-	-	-	41.18
Other expenses of Library, of correspondence, etc.,	-	-	-	-	41.40
Total expenditures of the year,	-	-	-	-	\$1001.75
Balance in the Treasury, May 22nd, 1861,	-	-	-	-	557.22
					\$1558.97

The Treasurer's accounts were referred to an Auditing Committee composed of Messrs. Charles Folsom of Cambridge and Samuel F. Haven of Worcester, and, having been by them duly examined and audited, were accepted.

The Librarian laid before the Society the list of Additions to the Library and Cabinet since the last annual meeting (which list is annexed to this report of Proceedings). He read the names of the several donors, and pointed out the gifts of highest interest and value. Attention was especially called to a donation from Hon. Charles W. Bradley, lately U. S. Consul at Ningpo, by far the most valuable which the Society has ever received, comprising a collection of more than seven hundred volumes of

works relating to every part of the Orient, but especially to China and Egypt, and adding probably not less than half to the previous value of the Library ; including also a series of Chinese coins, of four hundred and thirty different varieties, and many other objects of curious interest for the Society's Cabinet. The condition upon which Mr. Bradley's gifts are now made was stated : viz., that the Library remains in its present place of deposit in New Haven ; should it at any time be removed to another locality, the books are to be transferred to the Library of Yale College. A special vote of thanks to Mr. Bradley for his unprecedented liberality to the Society was proposed and passed unanimously.

The Committee of Publication reported that the continuation of the Society's Journal, forming the first half of Vol. VII, was almost complete, and would be distributed in a few days to the members for the past year.

The Corresponding Secretary gave information that the following gentlemen had, since the previous meeting, by acceptance of election, become Corporate Members of the Society :

Mr. William F. Allen, West Newton, Mass.
 Mr. Brinton Coxe, Philadelphia.
 Prof. Timothy Dwight, New Haven.
 Mr. S. Hastings Grant, New York.
 Rev. Charles R. Hale, Philadelphia.
 Rev. Edwin Harwood, New Haven.
 Rev. William Hutchison, New Haven.
 Rev. Thomas S. Potwin, Franklin, N. Y.
 Mr. Joseph S. Ropes, Boston.
 Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
 Mr. George F. Vose, Fitchburg, Mass.
 Mr. James M. Whiton, New Haven.

The Directors offered to the meeting the names of several gentlemen with the recommendation that they be elected Corporate Members of the Society ; those proposed were thereupon balloted for, and elected without dissent. Among them were the following American merchants, resident in China, who had recently donated each one hundred dollars to the Society, through Hon. C. W. Bradley, and who were therefore chosen as Life Members :

Mr. John Heard, Hongkong.
 Mr. T. C. Smith, do.
 Mr. Robert M. Olyphant, Shanghai.
 Mr. Thomas Walsh, do.

The Directors farther announced that they had reappointed the Committee of Publication of last year. Also that, while thanking Hon. C. W. Bradley, of Ningpo, for his zealous and efficient efforts to promote the interests of the Society abroad, especially in the far East, they had authorized and requested him to continue his exertions in its behalf as he should find opportunity.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and read in part. Among the letters were the following :

1. From Capt. H. G. Raverty, dated London, Oct. 12th, 1860. Capt. Raverty calls the Society's attention to the series of works on the Afghan, Pukhto, or Pushto language, which he has lately published by subscrip-

tion, and solicits the Society's subscription. The series consists of a Dictionary (four guineas), a Grammar (one guinea), and a Chrestomathy (two guineas), all in quarto. The Corresponding Secretary said he had been compelled to reply that the Society did not authorize its Librarian to make purchases for its Library; but that he should take pleasure in laying Capt. Raverty's letter before its next meeting, and recommending the works in question to individuals as a most valuable contribution to oriental philology and ethnology.

2. From Mr. Brian H. Hodgson, dated Dursley, Oct. 18th, 1860.

"... I have sent you a copy of the third and concluding part of my last papers on the Turanian languages of the Himalaya. . . . Since these notices were penned, I have read Muir's Sanskrit Texts, and it seems to me not improbable that my Haiyus, whose name might as well be written Haiyus, may be identical with the people called Haivas at vol. ii, p. 59 of that work; and that the Haihayas of vol. i, p. 181 of the same work may perchance be still the same. Also, that my Bāhings may be not impossibly the Bāhikas of Muir, vol. ii, p. 481-2, though the language of the Bāhikas be there said to be Sanskrit. But the Brahminical writers, in their notices of the tribes and peoples around them, show extreme ignorance of the forms and of the tongues of those tribes and peoples, since even the Indochinese are by those writers set down as "degraded Kshatriyas," that is, Aryans in race and speech! I mention these things just as they occur to me on the spur of the moment."

3. From Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall, dated Camp Nursinghpoor, Feb. 21st, and Saugor, March 4th, 1861.

"... Lately, when at Eran, I made out the oldest Hindu date hitherto deciphered. It corresponds to A. D. 111. . . . Bāpū Deva's version of the Śūrya-Siddhānta I found published, a fasciculus of the Bibliotheca Indica, when I reached Calcutta. With the same help as before [that of Archdeacon Pratt, of Calcutta], he is now going to give a version of the Siddhānta-S'īromani. . . . Here at Saugor, I have come upon what seems to be a very correct copy of the Kathā-sarīt-sāgara in its entirety. I am having it copied for Brockhaus; and so we may see this huge collection of venerable fibs in print some day or other. . . . I have corrected for the press, this day, the first sheet of my edition of the Das'a-rūpa and its commentary. My translation of it will be printed when I shall have done with the Sanskrit. This I finished before I left India in 1859. . . ."

Dr. Taylor of Andover, Rev. Mr. Hale of Boston, and Mr. Salisbury of Worcester were appointed a committee to nominate a board of officers for election for the ensuing year. They proposed the subjoined ticket, being the same with that chosen last year, which was thereupon balloted for, and declared duly elected:

- President*—Prof. EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D., of New York.
Vice-Presidents { Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D., " Cambridge.
 Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D., " Boston.
 Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D.D., LL.D., " New Haven.
Corresponding Secretary—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, " New Haven.
Secr. of Classical Section—Prof. JAMES HADLEY, " New Haven.
Recording Secretary—MR. EZRA ABBOT, " Cambridge.
Treasurer—MR. D. C. GILMAN, " New Haven.
Librarian—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, " New Haven.
Directors { Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., " Boston.
 Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D., " New York.
 Pres. C. C. FELTON, LL. D., " Cambridge.
 Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D., " Princeton.
 Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D., " New York.
 DR. CHARLES PICKERING, " Boston.
 Prof. E. E. SALISBURY, " New Haven.

The President called the attention of the Society to the decease, since its last meeting, of one of its oldest, most active, and most highly respected members, Prof. J. W. Gibbs, LL. D., of New Haven. Dr. Worcester and Prof. Beck of Cambridge, and Prof. Proudfit of New Brunswick were appointed a Committee to prepare appropriate resolutions, and, at a later period of the meeting, they offered the following :

Resolved, That in the death of Professor Josiah Willard Gibbs, late of Yale College, this Society lament the loss of an eminent linguistic scholar, distinguished for patient and thorough research, for his ardent pursuit and love of truth, for his various attainments, for his amiable qualities of mind, and for his Christian virtues, all which rendered him an ornament to this association.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of our deceased associate.

These resolutions, after remarks from many of the gentlemen present, were passed.

Prof. Francis, of Cambridge, then referred to the death within the past year of another member of the Society, one of its founders, and for a long time one of its officers, Rev. Theodore Parker of Boston, and offered the following resolutions, which were voted on by the meeting, and adopted :

Resolved, That the members of the Oriental Society received with deep regret the intelligence of the death, in a foreign land, of their distinguished associate, Rev. Theodore Parker, and that they desire to do honor to his memory by the expression of their respect for his rich and diversified scholarship, and of their grateful remembrance of the many virtues of his character.

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be communicated to his widow, Mrs. Parker.

Communications being now called for, the following were presented :

1. A few Critical Remarks on the Urim and Thummim, by Rev. Edward C. Jones, of Philadelphia ; read by Mr. Abbot, of Cambridge.

2. An Account of the Country of Siak, on the Northeastern Coast of Sumatra, in a Letter to Hon. C. W. Bradley, dated Singapore, May 20th, 1857, by Maharaja Adam Wilson ; read by Prof. Whitney, of New Haven.

This was a brief account of the extent, surface, soil, productions, trade, and population of that part of Sumatra lying next opposite to Singapore, over a portion of which the writer had become ruler, by gift from the Sultan of Siak, in return for his assistance against rebel chiefs.

3. An Inquiry into the Origin of the Semitic Feminine and Plural Endings, by Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J. ; read by Prof. Salisbury, of New Haven.

Prof. Green pointed out succinctly the peculiarities of Semitic usage in the treatment of gender and number ; he traced the original forms of the terminations employed to distinguish the one and the other, and referred them to the pronominal elements from which he regarded them as derived.

Here the Society took a recess, to come together again at the residence of Prof. Beck, in Cambridge.

Upon reassembling, at 4 o'clock P. M., the Society continued to listen to communications.

4. On the Explorations of the Schlagintweits in Northern India, by Mr. Daniel C. Gilman, of New Haven.

The first Part of the magnificent publication by the brothers Schlagintweit of the results of their Indian quarto volume of text, and an accompanying mammoth folio lithographic pictures and maps—was exhibited to the members present by Mr. Gilman, who described summarily the course of the expedition, the character of the collections it had brought back, and the mode in which it was proposed to give them to the world.

5. On the Ansairiyah of Northern Syria, being a Review of the late work of Rev. Samuel Lyde entitled "the Asian Mystery," by Rev. Charles H. Brigham, of Taunton, Mass.

After some general introductory remarks on the unfitness of the title applied to the work, and the special qualifications of Mr. Lyde for preparing such a work, as also a brief notice of what other travellers had reported respecting the Ansairiyah, Mr. Brigham proceeded to state the principal facts thus far known respecting this people. Their home is the mountain region in the northwest portion of Syria, though they are found widely scattered, from Tarsus in the west to Persia on the east and Mount Hermon on the south. Their estimated number is 200,000, and is steadily decreasing. They are poor, ignorant, rude, and turbulent, hostile to strangers and quarrelsome with each other. Their traffic with their neighbors is very scanty, and chiefly in the tobacco sold at Ladakia. They live mostly in small villages, avoiding the large towns and the plains. They are divided into two great sects: the Shamsiyah or Northerners, and the Kamriyah or Southerners, so named from the superior reverence which they pay respectively to the sun and the moon. The Shamsiyah ndants of the original Canaanites, while the Kamriyah are from Mesopotamia or Persia, who came in the 8th or 9th more numerous, the latter more proud and domineering. The chief difference between them is that tobacco is forbidden to the one and allowed to the other.

The principal topic of the review, however, was the religious system of the Ansairiyah, which was analyzed and discussed at length—the unity and nature of the Supreme Being; the Trinity of the *Ma'na*, the *Isa*, and the *Báb*, with their several names and offices; the seven historical manifestations of this Trinity, from Abel to All, from Adam to Mohammed, and from Gabriel to Salmán the Persian; the Hierarchies, heavenly and earthly, with their names, order, rank, and numbers; the relation of men to these divine beings; the character and use of prayer; and the relation of the religion to the customs and life of the people. The vagueness, confusion, and meagreness of the religion as explained in its catechism and its sacred books were pointed out, while its indebtedness to the Gospel was shown in the practical precepts given for the believer.

6. Remarks on Rev. R. Caldwell's Comparative Dravidian Grammar, by Prof. William D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Prof. Whitney spoke of the great interest of this work as a comparative presentation of the South-Indian group of languages, but wished to treat especially of a single matter brought forward in it, namely, the author's claim that the languages in question form a branch of the Mongolian or Scythian family, specially allied to its Finnish branch. A somewhat similar claim had been some years since put forth by Müller, but upon grounds of which the adequacy had not been generally accepted. The point was one of the highest consequence, in its bearings upon ancient ethnology. It was also one of peculiar difficulty, considering the character of the Mongolian languages, the laxity of their compositions, the great variety and diversity, even as between nearly related dialects, of their formative elements, and the consequent facility offered for establishing coincidences between them and other languages by a loose method of etymologizing: taking the whole wide range of tongues reckoned as Mongolian, it would not be hard to discover here and there resemblances of roots and forms with those of any other given language. The degree of confidence to be placed in Mr. Caldwell's general conclusions, then, must depend upon the qualities which he exhibited as a general linguist—upon his linguistic acquirements and his etymological method: and with these the speaker professed himself not altogether satisfied. He referred by way of illustration to the author's comparison of Dravidian and Sanskrit roots, intended to prove an ultimate relationship between those two families also: it was of no scientific value; the greater part of the Sanskrit employed in the comparison was not even genuine ancient Sanskrit, such as alone had any right to be so used. The speaker insisted, as an indispensable qualification for comparing and determining the relations of two languages or groups of languages, on the possession of an equally profound and familiar knowledge of both, and thought that Mr. Caldwell, whatever his desert

in the special department of Dravidian philology, had no right to an authoritative opinion in a matter concerning the Scythian family also; he could not regard the remoter relationship of the South-Indian group of languages as anything but an open question still.

7. On the Date of Composition of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus, by Prof. George M. Lane, of Cambridge.

The various conclusions or conjectures which had been offered by different writers respecting the date of this play—derived, in lack of other evidence, from hints and allusions in the play itself—were first subjected to criticism, and in part disproved, in part set aside as too vague and unsatisfactory. Evidences more significant, and more decisive of the question of date, than any which had been hitherto pointed out, were seen by Prof. Lane in the references to Bacchants and Bacchanalian rites which the play contained. The prominent importance of these as subjects of common talk and public action at one period in the life of Plautus was explained, and the various allusions to them presented by his different works were noted. The conclusion was arrived at, as one possessing a fair measure of plausibility, that the *Amphitruo* was written during the last two years of the poet's life, or 186–184 B. C.

8. Ought the Greek of the Early Christian Writers to form Part of the Course of School and College Study? By Prof. John Proudfit, D. D., of New Brunswick, N. J.

The object of Prof. Proudfit's paper was to set forth the grounds for answering this question in the affirmative. He maintained the high value of the Christian Greek literature, for the purity of its language, the elevation of its style, the nobility of its sentiments, the genius of its authors, and its important historical relations to the ancient heathenism and the modern Christianity—which qualities rendered it eminently worthy of being allowed a part in the education of the young at the present day. He explained the circumstances in the midst of which it grew up, and which determined its form and character, and extolled the abilities, virtues, and actions of the men who were its chief exponents, particularly Basil and Chrysostom. He contended that it was a defect in a classical education to leave quite out of sight a literary period of such prominent interest. He pointed out that many of the difficulties which had hitherto lain in the way of a study of the works of the period, in their rarity and costliness, their unwieldy form and difficult typography, and the unceritrical condition of their texts, had been of late in great part removed; and he expressed the hope that better justice would ere long be done to their claims upon the attention of modern scholars.

9. On the Ancient and Modern Dialects of the Persian Language, by Prof. Whitney.

This was a succinct view of the five principal forms of Iranian speech, namely the dialect of the Achæmenidan Cuneiform Inscriptions, that of the Avesta, the Huzvâresh, the Pârsi, and the Modern Persian, giving the period and locality of each, as determined by the latest researches, and sketching their phonetic and etymological character.

No other communications were offered. The Directors accordingly gave notice that they had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held in New York, on Wednesday, October 16th, 1861, and had designated Prof. J. J. Owen and Mr. A. I. Cotheal, of New York, and Prof. W. H. Green of Princeton, to act as a Committee of Arrangements for that meeting, and the Society adjourned.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY AND CABINET.

MAY, 1860—MAY, 1861.

From the American Antiquarian Society.

Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society. Vol. iv. [Boston:] 1860. 8vo.
 Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society. . . . Boston, April 25, 1860. . . . Worcester, Oct. 22, 1860. . . . and Boston, April 24, 1861. Boston: 1860-61. 8vo.

From the American Geographical and Statistical Society.

Bulletin of the American Geographical and Statistical Society. Vol. i, Nos. 1, 2, 3. New York: 1852-54. 8vo.
 Journal of the American Geographical and Statistical Society. Vol. i, 1859. Vol. ii, No. 1, 1860. New York. 8vo.
 Annual Report of the Council and Officers of the same, with Appendix. Dec. 1857. New York. 8vo.
 Charter, By-Laws, and List of Members of the same. March, 1860. New York. 8vo.
 Sundry pamphlets published by the same, viz: Access to an Open Polar Sea. . . . by E. K. Kane.—On Northern New York, by W. C. H. Waddell.—The New York Harbor. . . . by D. E. Wheeler.—Report and Memorial on Syrian Exploration.—Report. . . . on Sub-oceanic Geography.—Address on the Northwest. . . . by I. I. Stevens.—The Geography and Resources of Arizona and Sonora. . . . by S. Mowry.—A Statistical View of American Agriculture. . . . by J. Jay. New York and Washington: 1858-60. 8vo.

From the American Philosophical Society.

Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, held at Philadelphia, for promoting Useful Knowledge. Vol. xi, New Series, Parts i, ii, iii. Philadelphia: 1857-60. 4to.
 Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. Vols. i (incomplete), ii, iv-vii. Philadelphia: 1838-60. 8vo.
 Laws and Regulations of the same. . . . Dec. 16, 1859. Together with the Charter of the Society, and a List of its Members. Philadelphia: 1860. 8vo.

From the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. 1855, No. 7. 1856, Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7. 1857, Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6. 1858, Nos. 2, 3, 4. 1859, Nos. 2, 3, 4. Calcutta. 8vo.
 Bibliotheca Indica. Nos. 150-155. The Taittiriya Bráhmaṇa of the Black Yajur Veda, with the Commentary of Sáyanáchárya, edited by Rájendralál Mitra, etc. Fasciculi iv-ix. Calcutta: 1859. 8vo.

From the Asiatic Society of Paris.

Journal Asiatique. . . . 5^{me} Série. Tomes xiii-xvi. Paris: 1859-60. 8vo.

From the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.

Philologische und Historische Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, für die Jahre 1843-59. 17 vols. 4to. Berlin.

From the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church.

Explanatory Notes and Questions on Matthew. 1853. 16mo size. Chinese.

From Professors Boehtlingk and Roth.

Sanskrit-Wörterbuch, herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bearbeitet von Otto Boehtlingk and Rudolph Roth. Lieferungen 17 und 18. St. Petersburg: 1860. 4to.

From Sir John Bowring, of Hongkong.

A Visit to the Philippine Islands. By Sir John Bowring, etc. London: 1859. 8vo.

From Hon. C. W. Bradley, of Ningpo.

- Enquiries touching the Diversity of Languages and Religions through the Chief Parts of the World. Written by Edward Brewerood, etc. London: 1614. 8vo.
- Bilder und Schriften der Vorzeit dargestellt von Ulrich Friedrich Kopp, etc. Mannheim: 1819-21. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Essai sur la Composition d'un Nouvel Alphabet, pour servir à représenter les Sons de la Voix Humaine, et leurs Diverses Modifications.... Par S. Faure. Paris: 1831. 16mo.
- Panorama des Langues. Clef de l'Étymologie, par l'Abbé Auguste Latouche, etc. Paris: 1836. roy. 8vo.
- Chronicon Orientale, Latinitate donatum ab Abrahamo Ecchelensi, etc. Paris: 1685. fol.
- Simonis Ockleii Introductio ad Linguas Orientales....accedit Index Auctorum.... Cambridge: 1706. 8vo.
- An Essay on the Usefulness of Oriental Learning. By the late Mr. Richard Parker. London: 1744. 8vo. (bound with the preceding.)
- Historia Orientalis: quae, ex Variis Orientalium Monumentis collecta, agit de.... Authore Joh. Henrico Hottingero, Tigurino. Tiguri: 1651. 4to.
- A Description of the East and some other Countries. By Richard Pococke. London: 1743-5. 2 vols. in 3. fol.
- A Dissertation on the Languages, Literature and Manners of Eastern Nations. Originally prefixed to a Dictionary, Persian, Arabic and English.... To which is added, Part II, containing Additional Observations. Together with further Remarks on a New Analysis of Ancient Mythology: in answer to an Apology, addressed to the Author, by Jacob Bryant, Esq. By John Richardson, etc. Oxford: 1778. 12mo.
- A Dictionary of the Religious Ceremonies of the Eastern Nations; with Historical and Critical Observations; some Account of their Learned Men; and Situations of the most Remarkable Places in Asia.... To which is added, a Medical Vocabulary. Calcutta: 1787. 4to.
- Oriental Customs: or an Illustration of the Sacred Scriptures, by an Explanatory Application of the Customs and Manners of the Eastern Nations, and especially the Jews, therein alluded to, collected from the most Celebrated Travellers and the most Eminent Critics. By Rev. Samuel Burder, etc. London: 1816. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Sabæan Researches, in a Series of Essays, addressed to Distinguished Antiquaries.... on the Engraved Hieroglyphics of Chaldea, Egypt, and Canaan. By John Landseer, etc. London: 1823. 4to.
- Mémoires Relatifs à l'Asie, contenant des Recherches Historiques, Géographiques, et Philologiques sur les Peuples de l'Orient; par M. J. Klaproth, etc. Paris: 1824. 8vo.
- Oriental Fragments, by the Author of the Hindu Pantheon. London: 1834. 12mo.
- The Works of Sir William Jones. London: 1799. 6 vols. 4to.
- Supplemental Volumes to the Works of Sir William Jones, containing the whole of the Asiatic Researches hitherto published, excepting those Papers already inserted in his Works. London: 1801. 2 vols. 4to.
- Memoirs of the Life, Writings and Correspondence of Sir William Jones. By Lord Teignmouth. London: 1806. 4to.
- Two Essays on the Geography of Ancient Asia; intended partly to illustrate the Campaigns of Alexander, and the Anabasis of Xenophon. By Rev. John Williams, etc. London: 1829. 8vo.
- The Geographical System of Herodotus, examined: and explained, by a Comparison with those of other Ancient Authors, and with Modern Geography. By James Rennell. London: 1800. 4to.
- Lives of the Ancient Philosophers; translated from the French of Fénélon; with Notes, and a Life of the Author. By the Rev. John Cormack. New York: 1841. 24mo.
- Eastern Life, Present and Past. By Harriet Martineau. London: 1850. 16mo.

- Early Oriental History: comprising the Histories of Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Lydia, Phrygia and Phœnicia. Edited by John Eadie, D.D., etc. London: 1852. 16mo. (From the Encyclopedia Metropolitana.)
- Musei Borgiani Velitris Codices Manuscripti Avenses Peguani Siamici Malabarici Indostani. Animadversionibus... illustrati. Accedunt Monumenta Inedita, et Cosmogonia Indico-Tibetana. Auctore P. Paulino a S. Bartholomæo, etc. Romæ: 1793. 4to.
- Examen Historico-criticum Codicum Indicorum Bibliothecæ Sacræ Congregationis de Propaganda Fide. Auctore P. Paulino a S. Bartholomæo, etc. Romæ: 1792. 4to. (bound with the preceding.)
- Bibliotheca Marsdeniana, Philologica et Orientalis. A Catalogue of Books and Manuscripts collected with a View to the General Comparison of Languages, and to the Study of Oriental Literature. By William Marsden, etc. London: 1827. 4to.
- Catalogue of several hundred Manuscript Works in Various Oriental Languages, collected by Sir William Ouseley, etc. London: 1831. 4to.
- A Historical and Descriptive Catalogue of the European and Asiatic Manuscripts in the Library of the late Dr. Adam Clarke, etc. By J. B. B. Clarke, etc. London: 1835. 8vo.
- A Catalogue of a Valuable Collection of Oriental Literature, collected by James Bruce of Kinnaird... London: 1842. 4to.
- A Relation of a Journey begun An. Dom. 1610. Four Bookes, containing a Description of the Turkish Empire, of Ægypt, of the Holy Land, of the Remote Parts of Italy, and Islands adjoining. [By George Sandys.] London: 1632. 4to.
- The Voyages and Travels of John Struys through Italy, Greece, Muscovy, Tartary, Media, Persia, East India, Japan and other Countries in Europe, Africa and Asia: . . . Done out of Dutch by John Morrison. London: 1684. 8vo.
- The Travels of Sir John Chardin into Persia and the East Indies, through the Black Sea; and the Country of Colchis. . . . To which is added, the Coronation of the Present King of Persia, Solyman the III. London: 1691. 4to.
- A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, at Easter, A. D. 1697. To which is now added, an Account of the Author's Journey to the Banks of Euphrates at Beer, and to the Country of Mesopotamia. By Hen. Maundrell, etc. Dublin: 1749. 16mo.
- Travels through Syria and Egypt, in the years 1783, 1784 and 1785. Containing the Present Natural and Political States of those Countries, their Productions, Arts, Manufactures and Commerce; with Observations of the Manners, Customs, and Government of the Turks and Arabs, etc. By M. C. F. Volney. Translated from the French. London: 1788. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Travels through Arabia, and other Countries in the East, performed by M. Niebuhr, etc. Translated into English by Robert Heron. . . . Edinburgh: 1792. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Travels in Turkey, Asia-Minor, Syria and across the Desert into Egypt, during the Years 1799, 1800 and 1801, in Company with the Turkish Army, and the British Military Mission. . . . By William Wittmann, M.D., etc. London: 1803. 4to.
- Travels in Europe, Asia Minor, and Arabia. By J. Griffiths, M.D., etc. London: 1805. 4to.
- The Oriental Voyager; or Descriptive Sketches and Cursory Remarks on a Voyage to India and China, in his Majesty's Ship Caroline, performed in the Years 1803-4-5-6. Interspersed with Extracts from the Best Modern Voyages and Travels. . . . By J. Johnson, etc. London: 1807. 12mo.
- Arrian's History of the Expedition of Alexander the Great, and Conquest of Persia. Translated from the Original Greek. By Mr. Rooke. London: 1813. 8vo.
- Travels in Asia Minor and Greece: or, an Account of a Tour. . . . By Richard Chandler, D.D., etc. London: 1817. 2 vols. bound in one. 4to.
- Travels in Chaldea, including a Journey from Bussorah to Bagdad, Hillah, and Babylon, performed on foot in 1827. With Observations on the Sites and Remains of Babel, Seleucia, and Ctesiphon. By Capt. Robert Mignan, etc. London: 1829. 8vo.
- The Travels of Rabbi David d'Beth Hillel; from Jerusalem, through Arabia, Koor-distan, part of Persia, and India, to Madras. Madras: 1832. 8vo.

- The *Voiage and Travaile* of Sir John Maundeville, Kt, which treateth of the Way to Hierusalem; and of Marvayles of Inde, with other Ilands and Countryes. Reprinted from the Edition of A. D. 1725, with an Introduction, Additional Notes, and a Glossary, by J. O. Halliwell, etc. London: 1839. 8vo.
- Narrative of a Tour* through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopotamia, with Observations on the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries. By Rev. Horatio Southgate. London: 1840. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Travels in Koordistan, Mesopotamia, &c.* . . . with Sketches of the Character and Manners of the Koordish and Arab Tribes. By J. Baillie Fraser, etc. London: 1840. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Travels to the City of the Caliphs*, along the Shores of the Persian Gulf, and the Mediterranean. Including a Voyage to the Coast of Arabia, and a Tour on the Island of Socotra. By J. R. Wellsted, etc. Philadelphia: 1841. 2 vols. 16mo.
- A Personal Narrative of a Journey to the Source of the River Oxus*, by the Route of the Indus, Kabul, and Badakhshan. . . . By Lieut. John Wood, etc. London: 1841. 8vo.
- Voyage Pittoresque en Asie et en Afrique. Résumé Général des Voyages Anciens et Modernes, d'après Erman Lesseps* . . . , par J. B. Eyriès. Paris: 1841. 4to.
- Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia.* By William Francis Ainsworth, etc. London: 1842. 2 vols. 16mo.
- The Ansayrii (or Assassins)*, with Travels in the Further East, in 1850-51. Including a Visit to Nineveh. By Lieut. the Hon. F. Walpole, etc. London: 1851. 3 vols. 8vo.
- The Travels of Marco Polo*, greatly amended and enlarged from Valuable Early Manuscripts recently published by the French Society of Geography, and in Italy by Count Baldelli Boni. With Copious Notes. . . . By Hugh Murray, etc. New York: 1852. 18mo.
- *Account of a Voyage of Discovery to the West Coast of Corea*, and the great Loo-choo Island: . . . By Captain Basil Hall, etc. And a Vocabulary of the Loo-choo Language, by H. J. Clifford, etc. London: 1818. 4to.
- Letter from B. J. Bettelheim, M.D.*, Missionary in Lew Chew, addressed to Rev. Peter Parker, M.D. Canton: 1852. 8vo.
- Four thin Japanese books, profusely illustrated, two of them with colored drawings. An illustrated Japanese work, in two thin parts, with illuminated covers, and enclosed in an illuminated envelop. 16mo size.
- A thin Japanese book, written in the woman's character. 8vo size.
- A large colored Japanese picture, with side text, illustrating scenes in Japanese female life. Folded, in cloth sides.
- The Gospel of Luke*, in Loo-Chooan Japanese, translated by Dr. Bettelheim, and printed at Hongkong, 1854. roy. 8vo size.
- Atlas Général de la Chine; pour servir à la Description Générale de cet Empire.* . . . Rédigée par M. l'Abbé Grosier, etc. Paris: 1785. fol.
- Map of China and the Adjacent Countries*, drawn from the Latest Surveys and other Authentic Documents. London: 1842., Folded in 8vo form.
- Description Géographique, Historique, Chronologique, Politique, et Physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie Chinoise, enrichie des Cartes Générales et Particulières*, etc. Par J. B. Du Halde, etc. La Haye: 1836. 4 vols. 4to.
- Description de la Chine et des Etats Tributaires de l'Empereur.* Par M. le Marquis de Fortia D'Urban, etc. Paris: 1839-40. 3 vols. 8vo.
- Chine, ou Description Historique, Géographique et Littéraire de ce Vaste Empire d'après des Documents Chinois. Première Partie, comprenant un Résumé de l'Histoire et de la Civilization Chinoises* . . . par M. G. Pauthier, etc. Paris: 1844. 8vo.
- China; Political, Commercial and Social: in an Official Report to her Majesty's Government.* By R. Montgomery Martin, etc. London: 1847. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The Middle Kingdom: a Survey of the Geography, Government, . . . etc. of the Chinese Empire and its Inhabitants.* . . . By S. Wells Williams, etc. New York: 1848. 2 vols. 8vo.
- China and the Chinese: their Religion, Character, Customs and Manufactures; the Evils arising from the Opium Trade; with a Glance at our Religious, Moral, Political and Commercial Intercourse with the Country.* By Henry Charles Sirr, etc. London: 1849. 2 vols. 8vo.

- Desultory Notes on the Government and People of China, and on the Chinese Language: illustrated with a Sketch of the Province of Kwang-tung, showing its Division into Departments and Districts. By Thomas Taylor Meadows, etc. London: 1847. 8vo.
- The Chinese and their Rebellions, viewed in Connection with their National Philosophy, Ethics, Legislation, and Administration. To which is added, an Essay on Civilization and its Present State in the East and West. By Thomas Taylor Meadows, etc. London: 1856. 8vo.
- Confucius Sinarum Philosophus, sive Scientia Sinensis Latine exposita. . . . Parisiis: 1687. fol.
- Tabula Chronologica Monarchiæ Sinicæ juxta cyclos annorum LX. ab ante Christum 2952, ad annum post Christum 1683. Auctore R. P. Philippo Couplet, etc. Parisiis: 1686. fol. (bound with the preceding.)
- Résumé de l'Histoire de la Chine, Par M. de S***. Paris: 1825. 24mo.
- A Sketch of Chinese History, Ancient and Modern: comprising a Retrospect of the Foreign Intercourse and Trade with China. . . . By Rev. Charles Gutzlaff, etc. London: 1834. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Histoire Anté-diluvienne de la Chine, ou Histoire de la Chine jusqu'au Déluge d'Yao, l'an 2298 avant notre ère, par M. le Marquis de Fortia D'Urban, etc. Paris: 1840. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Miscellaneous Remarks upon the Government, History . . . and Customs of the Chinese; as suggested by an Examination of the Articles composing the Chinese Museum, in the Marlboro' Chapel, Boston. By John R. Peters, Jr. Boston: 1846. 8vo.
- An Historical Sketch of the Portuguese Settlements in China; and of the Roman Catholic Church and Mission in China. By Sir Andrew Ljungstedt, etc. Boston: 1836. 8vo.
- Description of the City of Canton: with an Appendix, containing an Account of the Population of the Chinese Empire, Chinese Weights and Measures, and the Imports and Exports of Canton. Second Edition. Canton: 1839. 8vo.
- Statistical Notes on Chusan, by Lieut. Ouchterlony, etc. Madras: 1840. 8vo.
- A Statistical Sketch of the Island of Chusan, with a Brief Note on the Geology of China, by Lieut. Ouchterlony, etc. London: 1841. 8vo.
- China: its State and Prospects, with Especial Reference to the Spread of the Gospel: containing Allusions to the Antiquity, Extent, Population, Civilization, Literature and Religion of the Chinese. By W. H. Medhurst, etc. London: 1842. 8vo.
- Brief Description of the Town of Victoria, Hongkong. A. D. 1848. With Lithographed Plan. 8vo.
- La Chine, depuis le Traité de Nankin. . . . Paris: 1853. 8vo.
- The Chinese Revolution, with Details of the Habits, Manners and Customs of China and the Chinese. By Charles Macfarlane, etc. London: 1853. 32mo.
- History of the Insurrection in China; with Notices of the Christianity, Creed, and Proclamations of the Insurgents. By M.M. Callery and Ivan. Translated from the French, with a supplementary chapter, narrating the most recent events, by John Oxenford. New York: 1853. 12mo.
- Ten Thousand Things relating to China and the Chinese; an Epitome of the Genius, Government, History, Literature, Agriculture, Arts, Trade, Manners, Customs and Social Life of the People of the Chinese Empire; together with a Synopsis of the Chinese Collection. By William B. Langdon, etc. London: 1843. 8vo.
- Ten Thousand Things on China and the Chinese; being a Picture of the Genius, Government . . . etc. of the Celestial Empire, as illustrated by the Chinese Collection, 539 Broadway. New York: 1850. 8vo.
- Notices of Chinese Seals found in Ireland. By Edmund Getty, etc. London: 1850. 4to.
- Designs of Chinese Buildings, Furniture, Dresses, Machines, and Utensils. Engraved by the best hands from the originals drawn in China by Mr. Chambers, Architect, etc. To which is annexed, a Description of their Temples, Houses, Gardens, &c. London: 1757. fol.
- The Costume of China, illustrated by Sixty Engravings: with Explanations in English and French. By George Henry Mason, etc. London: 1800. fol.
- The Punishments of China, illustrated by Twenty-two Engravings; with Explanations in English and French. London: 1801. fol.

- Hager on the Numismatical History of the Chinese, and their Intercourse with the Greeks. Copied by C. W. Bradley, from the London Classical Journal, Vol. 1, 1810. sm. 4to.
- Arts, Métiers et Cultures de la Chine, représentés dans une Suite de Gravures.... Vol. I. Art du Vernis, par le P d'Incarville. 1814. Vol. II. Papier de Bambou, d'après les Mémoires des Pp. d'Entrecolle, Cibot, etc. 1815. Paris. 2 vols. bound in one. 32mo.
- Du Thé, ou Nouveau Traité sur sa Culture, sa Récolte, sa Préparation et ses Usages; par F. Marquis Jeune, etc. Paris: 1820. 24mo.
- An Embassy from the East India Company of the United Provinces to the Grand Tartar Cham, Emperour of China, delivered by their Excellencies Peter De Goyer, and Jacob De Keyzer, at his Imperial City of Peking.... By John Nieuhoff, etc. Englished.... by John Ogilby, etc. London: 1669. fol.
- Atlas Chinois: Being a Second Part of a Relation of Remarkable Passages in two Embassies from the East India Company of the United Provinces to the Viceroy Singlamong and General Taising Lipovi, and to Konchi, Emperor of China and East Tartary. With a Relation of the Netherlanders assisting the Tartars against Coxinga, and the Chinese Fleet, who till then were Masters of the Sea. And a more exact geographical description than formerly, both of the whole Empire of China in general, and in particular of every of the fifteen Provinces. Collected out of their several Writings and Journals, by Arnoldus Montanus. Englished and adorned with above a hundred several Sculptures, by John Ogilby, Esq., etc. London: 1671. fol.
- An Authentic Account of an Embassy from the King of Great Britain to the Emperor of China;... together with a Relation of the Voyage undertaken on the Occasion....; with Notices of the several Places where they stopped in their way out and home.... Taken chiefly from the Papers of his Excellency the Earl of Macartney,.... etc. By Sir George Staunton, etc. London: 1798. 2 vols. 4to, and a folio volume of plates.
- Voyage en Chine et en Tartarie, à la Suite de l'Ambassade de Lord Macartney, par M. Samuel Holmes, etc. Auquel on a joint les Vues, Costumes, etc., de la Chine, par M. W. Alexandre, les Planches de l'Atlas Original de cette Ambassade, omises dans la Traduction Française, et leur Explication. Ouvrage traduit de l'Anglais par MM. ***. Revu et publié.... par L. Langlès, etc. Paris: 1805. 2 vols. in one. 12mo.
- Journal of the Proceedings of the Late Embassy to China; comprising a Correct Narrative of the Public Transactions of the Embassy, of the Voyage to and from China, and of the Journey from the Mouth of the Pei-ho to the Return to Canton.... By Henry Ellis, etc. London: 1817. 4to.
- Voyages, made in the Years 1788 and 1789, from China to the Northwest Coast of America. To which are prefixed, an Introductory Narrative of a Voyage performed in 1786, from Bengal, in the Ship Nootka; Observations on the Probable Existence of a Northwest Passage;.... By John Meares, etc. London: 1790. 4to.
- Also, bound with the above,—Remarks on the Voyages of John Meares, Esq., in a Letter to that Gentleman. By George Dixon, etc. London: 1791. 4to.
- Also,—Further Remarks on the Voyages of John Meares, Esq.,... to which is added a Letter from Captain Duncan. By George Dixon, etc. London: 1791. 4to.
- Also,—An Answer to Mr. George Dixon, etc. By John Meares.... London: 1791. 4to.
- The Journal of Mr. Samuel Holmes, etc., during his Attendance, as one of the Guard, on Lord Macartney's Embassy to China and Tartary, 1792-3. London: 1798. 12mo.
- Travels in China, containing Descriptions... made and collected in the Course of a Short Residence at the Imperial Palace of Yuen-min-yuen, and on a Subsequent Journey through the Country from Peking to Canton.... By John Barrow, etc. London: 1806. 4to.
- The Fan-qui in China, in 1836-7. By C. Toogood Downing, etc. London: 1838. 3 vols. 12mo.
- Sketches of China; partly during an Inland Journey of Four Months, between Peking, Nanking, and Canton; with Notices and Observations relative to the Present War. By John Francis Davis, etc. London: 1841. 2 vols. 12mo.

- Six Months with the Chinese Expedition; or, Leaves from a Soldier's Note-Book. By Lord Jocelyn, etc. London: 1841. 16mo.
- The Closing Events of the Campaign in China: the Operations in the Yang-tze-kiang; and Treaty of Nanking. By Captain Granville G. Loch, etc. London: 1843. 12mo.
- An Aide-de-Camp's Recollections of Service in China, a Residence in Hong-kong, and Visits to other Islands in the Chinese Seas. By Captain Arthur Cunynghame, etc. London: 1844. 2 vols. 16mo.
- Three Years' Wanderings in the Northern Provinces of China, including a Visit to the Tea, Silk and Cotton Countries; with an Account of the Agriculture and Horticulture of the Chinese, New Plants, etc. By Robert Fortune, etc. London: 1847. 8vo.
- A Narrative of an Exploratory Visit to each of the Consular Cities of China, and to the Islands of Hong Kong and Chusan, in behalf of the Church Missionary Society, in the Years 1844, 1845, 1846. By the Rev. George Smith, etc. New York: 1847. 8vo.
- Five Years in China; from 1842 to 1847. With an Account of the Occupation of the Islands of Labuan and Borneo by her Majesty's Forces. By Lieut. F. E. Forbes, etc. London: 1848. 8vo.
- Kathay: a Cruise in the China Seas. By W. Hastings Macaulay, etc. New York: 1852. 16mo.
- Voyage en Chine. Ténériffe.—Rio Janeiro.—Le Cap.—Ile Bourbon.—Malacca.—Singapore.—Manille.—Macao.—Canton.—Ports Chinois.—Cochinchine.—Java. Par M. C. Lavollée, etc. Paris: 1853. 8vo.
- Voyage en Chine, et dans les Mers et Archipels de cet Empire pendant les Années 1847—1848—1849—1850. Par Jurien de la Gravière, etc. Paris: 1854. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Rambles in Eastern Asia, including China and Manila, during several Years' Residence. . . . By B. L. Ball, M.D. Boston: 1855. 12mo.
- Crisis in the Opium Traffic: being an Account of the Proceedings of the Chinese Government to suppress that Trade, with the Notices, Edicts, etc., relating thereto. [Canton:] 1839. 8vo.
- La Chine, l'Opium, et les Anglais, contenant des Documents Historiques sur la Commerce de la Grande-Bretagne en Chine, les Causes et les Evénemens qui ont amené la Guerre entre les deux Nations. . . . par M. Saurin. Paris: 1840. 8vo.
- Remarks on Occurrences in China since the Opium Seizure in March 1839 to the Latest Date. By a Resident in China. London: 1840. 8vo.
- Commercial Intercourse with China. London: 1842. 24mo.
- Remarks on China and the China Trade. By R. B. Forbes. Boston: 1844. 8vo.
- A Voice from China and India, relative to the Evils of the Cultivation and Smuggling of Opium: in Four Letters. . . . By James Pegge, etc. London: 1846. 8vo.
- A Chinese Commercial Guide, consisting of a Collection of Details and Regulations respecting Foreign Trade with China. By the late J. R. Morrison. Canton: 1848. 8vo.
- Tea and the Tea Trade. . . . First published in Hunt's Merchants' Magazine. . . . By Gideon Nye, Jr., etc. New York: 1850. 8vo.
- Anglo-Chinese Calendar for 1839, 1844, 1846, 1847, 1849—55. Canton: 1839—55. 8vo.
- Our Commercial and Political Relations with China, by an American Resident in China. [Washington: 1855.] 8vo.
- Papers relating to the Opium Trade in China, 1842—56. Presented to the House of Lords. . . . London. fol.
- The Rationale of the China Question. . . . By an American. Macao: 1857. 4to.
- The New Foreign Settlement at Canton. . . . Macao: 1858. 8vo.
- Returns of the Import and Export Trade, carried on at the Port of Canton,—of Shanghai,—of Swatow, 1859—60. 4to.
- A Few Notices on the Extent of Chinese Education, and the Government Schools of Hongkong. . . . By the Rev. W. Lobscheid, etc. Hongkong: 1859. 8vo.
- Apologie des Dominicains, Missionnaires de la Chine, ou Réponse au Livre du Père Le Tellier, Jesuite, intitulé Défense des Nouveaux Chrétiens; et à l'Eclaircissement du Père Le Gobien de la même Compagnie, sur les Honneurs que les Chinois

- rendent à Confucius et aux Morts. Par un Religieux Docteur et Professeur en Théologie de l'Ordre de S. Dominique. Cologne: 1700. 18mo.
- Documenta Controversiam Missionariorum Apostolicorum Imperii Sinici de Cultu præsertim Confucii Philosophi et Progenitorum Defunctorum spectantia, ac Apologiam Dominicanorum Missionis Sinicæ Ministrorum adversus, Libros RR. Patrum Le Tellier et Le Gobien Societatis Jesu confirmantia. 18mo. (bound with the preceding.)
- Memoirs of the Rev. William Milne, D.D. By Rev. Robert Morrison, D.D. Malacca: 1824. 12mo.
- Memoir of the Rev. Samuel Dyer, Sixteen Years Missionary to the Chinese. By Evan Davies, etc. London: 1846. 12mo.
- A Grammar of the Chinese Language. By Rev. Robert Morrison. Serampore: 1815. 4to.
- Notitia Lingue Sinicæ. Auctore P. Premare. Malaccæ: 1831. 4to.
- Systema Phoneticum Scripturæ Sinicæ. Auctore J. M. Callery, etc. Pars Secunda. Macao: 1841. 8vo.
- Notices on Chinese Grammar. Part I. Orthography and Etymology. By Philo-Sinensis. Batavia: 1842. 12mo.
- Lessons in Chinese, no title, place or date, incomplete. 8vo.
- Grammaire Mandarine, ou Principes Généraux de la Langue Chinoise Parlée, par M. A. Bazin, etc. Paris: 1856. 8vo.
- A Grammar of the Chinese Colloquial Language, commonly called the Mandarin Dialect. By Joseph Edkins, etc. Shanghai: 1857. 8vo.
- The Chinese Speaker, or Extracts from Works written in the Mandarin Language, as spoken at Peking. Compiled for the use of Students, by Robert Thom, Esq., etc. Part I. (Chinese and romanized Chinese with interlinear translation, on opposite pages.) Ningpo: 1846. 8vo.
- Chinese dialogues, in the Canton dialect, with English translations, the text and translation in parallel columns on the same page. By B. Hobson, M.D. Canton: 1850. 4to size. lithographed.
- Anglo-Chinese Manual with Romanized Colloquial in the Amoy Dialect. By Rev. E. Doty. Canton: 1853. 8vo.
- A Dictionary of the Chinese Language; in Three Parts. Part the First, containing Chinese and English, arranged according to the Radicals; Part the Second, Chinese and English, arranged alphabetically; and Part the Third, English and Chinese. By Rev. Robert Morrison. Macao: 1815-23. 6 vols. 4to.
- A Vocabulary of the Canton Dialect. By R. Morrison, D.D. Part II. Chinese and English. Macao: 1828. 8vo.
- Monument de Yu, ou la plus Ancienne Inscription de la Chine; suivie de Trente-deux Formes d'Anciens Caractères Chinois, avec quelques Remarques sur cette Inscription et sur ces Caractères, par Joseph Hager. Paris: 1802. fol.
- Ta Tsing Leu Lee; being the Fundamental Laws, and a Selection from the Supplementary Statutes, of the Penal Code of China; . . . Translated from the Chinese and accompanied with an Appendix. . . . By Sir George Thomas Staunton, etc. London: 1810. 4to.
- The Three-fold San-Tsze-King, or the Triliteral Classic of China, as issued I. by Wang-po-keou; II. by Protestant Missionaries in that Country; and III. by the Rebel-Chief, Tae-ping-wang. Put into English, with Notes, by Rev. S. C. Malan, etc. London: 1856. 12mo.
- Portfolio Chinensis; or a Collection of Authentic-Chinese State Papers, illustrative of the History of the Present Position of Affairs in China. With a Translation, Notes, and Introduction. By J. Lewis Shuck. Macao: 1840. 8vo.
- The Five King. 16 parts, in two board envelopes. roy. 8vo size.
- The Four Books. 6 parts, in a board envelop. roy. 8vo size.
- Tri-metrical Classic, with commentary. 8vo size.
- The Thousand-character Classic, in four different styles of writing. 12mo size.
- The same, with a commentary. 8vo size.
- The same, black page, white letters. long 8vo size.
- The same, do. roy. 8vo size.
- A Treatise on the culture and preparation of rice and silk, illustrated. 4to size.
- A complete treatise on drawing, with figures and illustrations, in part colored. 13 thin parts, in three covered board envelopes. roy. 8vo size.

- A treatise on calligraphy. 8vo size.
- The Hundred Family Names, with commentary. 2 copies, of different editions. 8vo size.
- The Hundred Family Names. 5 parts, in a board envelop. 8vo size.
- History of the Unparalleled Ones. 8vo size.
- Three works on Chinese coins. Each in 4 parts, in a board envelop. roy. 8vo size.
- A work on Chinese coins. 24 parts, in 4 board envelops. 12mo size.
- A complete treatise on agriculture. 24 parts, in 2 parcels, laid between boards. roy. 8vo size.
- An abridged history of Ying-Hwang. 6 parts, in a board envelop. roy. 8vo size.
- Memoirs of distinguished women. 8 parts, in 2 board envelops. roy. 8vo size.
- A record of controverted cases, decided by the highest court of the empire. 28 parts. 8vo size.
- A pocket dictionary, arranged according to the tones. 2 parts, in a board envelop. 18mo size.
- An extract from the Kù-wán, page black, characters white. 8vo size.
- The same, board covers. 8vo size.
- Three Buddhist rituals, page black, letters white, on heavy paper, board covers. roy. 8vo size.
- Plates of the Tombs of Three Generations of the Lu Family. Four thin parts, heavy paper, page black, letters white. long 8vo size.
- History of the Repairing of the Temple of Wu. Page black, letters white. roy. 8vo size.
- Inscription on the Duke Wu's Tomb, page black, letters white. 8vo size.
- Memoir of a Shan-si man, named Kókh, page black, letters white. 8vo size.
- Chu-fu-tsz's maxims for the regulation of the family, page black, letters white. 8vo size.
- A poem in praise of the Celestial Horses, page black, letters white. 8vo size.
- Seventy-two rules for Chinese Chirography, page black, letters white. 8vo size.
- A tract on retribution, by the God of literary excellence, page black, characters white, board covers. 8vo size.
- The same, another edition. 8vo size.
- A treatise on Natural History (Chinese), with illustrations, by B. Hobson, M. D. roy. 8vo size.
- A treatise on Geometry (Chinese), with figures, by D. B. McCartee, M. D. 8vo size.
- A Treatise on Arithmetic in the Chinese Language, for the Use of St. Paul's College, Hong-Kong. By the Rev. E. T. R. Moncrieff, etc. Victoria: 1852. 8vo size.
- Chinese Tract—Guide to Heaven. By Rev. J. L. Nevins. 8vo size.
- Pilgrim's Progress, in Chinese, illustrated. 12mo size.
- A packet of 3 pamphlets, by different authors, on the proper rendering into Chinese of the word "God." 8vo.
- A package of brochures on China, reports of hospitals, public societies and institutions, etc.
- A parcel of books in Chinese, mostly missionary publications.
- Li-Jing Jih Sing [Pilgrim's Progress in Ningpo colloquial, romanized]. Ningpo: 1855. 8vo.
- Tsao-Jing Tao-Kao Veng [a tract on Morning Prayer, in Ningpo colloquial, romanized]. 8vo size.
- Iao Li Te Nyün [a tract, in some Chinese Colloquial dialect, romanized]. [London:] 12mo.
- A map of Peking, mounted on rollers.
- Twenty-four rolls, bearing inscriptions or pictures, for suspension in houses, temples, etc.
- A collection of writing apparatus.
- Two pairs of sandals.
- A large collection of Chinese *cash*, comprising 430 different varieties.
- Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie et le Thibet, pendant les années 1844, 1845 et 1846. Par M. Huc, etc. Paris: 1860. 2 vols. 18mo.
- Translation of the Ts'ing Wan K'e Mung, a Chinese Grammar of the Manchu Tartar Language, with Introductory Notes on Manchu Literature. Shanghae: 1855. 12mo.

- Alphabetum Tibetanum Missionum Apostolicarum Commode editum. Præmissa est Disquisitio qua de vario litterarum ac regionis nomine, gentis origine, moribus, superstitione, ac manichæismo fuse disseritur. . . . Studio et labore Fr. Augustini Antonii Georgii, Eremitæ Augustiniani. Romæ: 1762. 4to.
- Contributions to the Physical Geography of South-Eastern Asia and Australia. By George Windsor Earl, etc. With a Map. Reprinted with Additional Notes, from the "Journal of the Indian Archipelago." (May, 1852.) London: 1853. 8vo.
- Description du Royaume Thai ou Siam, comprenant la Topographie, Histoire Naturelle, Mœurs et Coutumes, Législation, Commerce, Industrie, Langue, Littérature, Religion, Annales des Thai et Précis Historique de la Mission. Par Mgr. Pallegoix, etc. Paris: 1854. 2 vols. 12mo.
- The Kingdom and People of Siam; with a Narration of the Mission to that Country in 1855. By Sir John Bowring, etc. London: 1857. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The Mission to Siam, and Huc, the Capital of Cochîn-China, in the Years 1821-2. From the Journal of the late George Finlayson, etc. With a Memoir of the Author, by Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, F.R.S. London: 1826. 16mo.
- Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Courts of Siam and Cochîn China; exhibiting a View of the Actual State of those Kingdoms. By John Crawfurd, etc. London: 1830. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Narrative of a Residence at the Capital of the Kingdom of Siam; with a Description of the Manners, Customs and Laws of the Modern Siamese. By Fred. Arthur Neale, etc. London: 1852. 16mo.
- Relatorio da Missão Extraordinaria de Portugal a Siam, de que foi encarregado como Ministro Plenipotenciario de S. M. F. o Conselheiro Isidoro Francisco Guimarães, Governador Geral de Macao, etc., etc. Macao: 1859. 8vo.
- Two Siamese manuscripts, on the native slate-books.
- Three Siamese slate-books, prepared for writing.
- A Copy of an Ancient Siamese Inscription, of about the Year 1193, on a stone pillar in the city of Sukhoday, the capital of Siam at that period. Lithographed. Bangkok.
- A set of proclamations of the King of Siam, seven in number, issued at different times, and on different subjects.
- A picture of a white elephant, captured in 1854, with explanatory statement in Siamese and English.
- Nine Siamese drawings, colored, representing Siamese utensils, musical instruments, modes of travelling, etc.
- A Siamese tract in praise of Buddha. Bangkok: (Bhudhtha) 2393. 12mo.
- Acts. Translated from the Greek. By S. Mattoon. [Siamese]. Bangkok: 1855. 12mo.
- Old Testament History, by J. Gaswell (No. 1) and D. B. Bradley (Nos. 2-10).
- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. Creation to Joseph. 1854. | 6. Joshua to Saul. 1854. |
| 2. Joseph. " | 7. Solomon to Elijah. 1855. |
| 3. Moses to Giving of Law. 1855. | 8. Elijah to Destruction of Jer. 1855. |
| 4. Sinai to Nadab. " | 9. Destruction of Jer. to Cyrus. " |
| 5. Tabernacle to Sihon. 1853. | 10. Cyrus to Malachi. " |
- [Siamese.] Bangkok: 10 vols. 12mo.
- Sacred Songs [in Siamese]. 2d Edition. Bangkok: 1847. 24mo.
- Treatise on Midwifery, by D. B. Bradley, M.D. [printed with the first Siamese type ever made.] Bangkok: 1842. 12mo.
- Treatise on Vaccination, comprising a Narrative of the Introduction and Successful Propagation of Vaccination in Siam,—1840 and 1844. By D. B. Bradley, M.D. 2d Edition. [Siamese.] Bangkok: 1845. 12mo.
- Treaty of Friendship and Commerce between the United States and Siam. Signed at Bangkok, May 29, 1856. [Siamese and English on opposite pages.] Bangkok: 1856. sm. 4to.
- Bangkok Calendar, for the Year of our Lord 1860. . . . Supplement to the Bangkok Calendar, for the Year of our Lord 1859. . . . Bangkok: 1859-60. 8vo.
- A suit of Siamese war garments.
- Journal of an Embassy from the Governor-General of India to the Court of Ava. By John Crawfurd, etc. With an Appendix, containing a Description of Fossil Remains, by Prof. Buckland and Mr. Clift. London: 1834. 2 vols. 8vo.

- Voyage à la Cochin Chine, per les Iles de Madère, de Ténériffe, et du Cap Verd, le Brésil et l'Île de Java, . . . par John Barrow, etc. Traduit de l'Anglais. . . par Malte-Brun. Paris: 1807. 2 vols. 16mo.
- Mission de la Cochin Chine et du Tonkin, avec Gravure et Carte Géographique. Paris: 1858. 8vo.
- The Indian Archipelago; its History and Present State. By Horace St. John, etc. London: 1853. 2 vols. 16mo.
- Considérations Générales sur l'Océan Indien, par M. Ch. Philippe de Kerhallet, etc. . . . suivies de la Traduction par le Même des Instructions pour la Navigation dans le Détroit de Torres, et accompagnées des Prescriptions Nautiques pour échapper aux Ouragans. Deuxième Edition. Paris: 1853. roy. 8vo.
- A Descriptive Dictionary of the Indian Islands and Adjacent Countries. By John Crawford, etc. London: 1856. 16mo.
- Chronicas de la Apostolica Provincia de San Gregorio. . . . en las Islas Philipinas, China, Japon, etc. Parte Tercera. De la Celeberrima Seraphica Mission de Japon . . . su autor, el P. Fr. Juan Francisco de San Antonio, etc. Manila: 1744. folio.
- The History of Java. By the late Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, etc. London: 1830. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Memoir of the Life and Public Services of Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, etc., particularly in the Government of Java 1811-1816, and of Bencœlen and its Dependencies 1817-1824; with Details of the Commerce and Resources of the Eastern Archipelago, and Selections from his Correspondence. By his Widow. London: 1830. 4to.
- The Eastern Seas, or Voyages and Adventures in the Indian Archipelago in 1832-33-34, comprising a Tour of the Island of Java, Visits to Borneo, the Malay Peninsula, Siam, &c; also an Account of the Present State of Singapore, with Observations on the Commercial Resources of the Archipelago. By George Windsor Earl, etc. London: 1837. 8vo.
- The Claims of Japan and Malaysia upon Christendom, exhibited in Notes of Voyages made in 1837 from Canton, in the Ship Morrison and Brig Himmaleh, under Direction of the Owners. Volume Second. By G. Tradescant Lay, etc. New York: 1839. 12mo.
- Trade and Travel in the Far East; or Recollections of Twenty-one Years passed in Java, Singapore, Australia and China. By G. F. Davidson. London: 1846. 12mo.
- Narrative of the Voyage of H. M. S. Samarang, during the Years 1843-1846; employed surveying the Islands of the Eastern Archipelago; accompanied by a Brief Vocabulary of the Principal Languages. . . . By Captain Sir Edward Belcher, etc. London: 1848. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Borneo, and the Indian Archipelago, with Drawings of Costumes and Scenery. By Frank S. Marryat, etc. London: 1848. 8vo.
- The Private Letters of Sir James Brooke, K. C. B., Rajah of Sarawak, narrating the Events of his Life, from 1838 to the Present Time. Edited by John C. Templar, etc. London: 1853. 3 vols. 12mo.
- Evidence given before the Commission of Enquiry into the Charges against Sir James Brooke, K. C. B. (From the Singapore Free Press.) Singapore: 1854. fol.
- The Borneo Question, or the Evidence produced at Singapore, before the Commissioners charged with the Enquiry into the Facts relating to Sir James Brooke, K. C. B., &c. Compiled from the "Singapore Free Press" and other Sources. Singapore: 1854. 8vo.
- Memoirs of the Rev. Samuel Munson and the Rev. Henry Lyman, late Missionaries to the Indian Archipelago, with the Journal of their Exploring Tour. By Rev. Wm. Thompson. New York: 1839. 12mo.
- The Straits Times, Almanack, Calendar and Directory, for the year 1846, containing the Government, Various Departments, Merchants, Agents, Trades and Professions of the Incorporated Settlements, Prince of Wales Island, Singapore, and Malacca . . . Compiled and arranged by R. C. W. Singapore. 12mo.
- Tabular Statements of the Commerce and Shipping of Prince of Wales Island, Singapore and Malacca, for the Official Years 1843-44, 1851-52, 1852-53, and 1853-54. Calcutta: 1845-55. 4 vols. 4to.
- Polynesian Researches during a Residence of nearly Eight Years in the Society and Sandwich Islands. By William Ellis. London: 1853. 4 vols. 16mo.

- A package of pamphlets relating to the Indian Archipelago. 8vo.
- A package of Congressional documents relating to the Coolie trade. 8vo.
- Javanese, Hindustani, Bengali, Tamil, Telugu, and Armenian tracts, one each. 12mo.
- A Grammar and Dictionary of the Malay Language.... by John Crawfurd, etc. Vol. 1. Preliminary Dissertation and Grammar. Vol. 2. Malay and English, and English and Malay Dictionaries. London: 1852. 8vo.
- A Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages, in the Roman and Arabic Character. A New Edition, enlarged and improved. Malacca: 1837. 8vo.
- A Vocabulary of the English and Malay Languages. Third Edition, considerably enlarged. Singapore: 1856. 8vo.
- A book of English and Malay phrases, designed to assist Malay boys in learning English. No title, place, or date. 8vo.
- "Fragments from all Science," in Malay. Lithographed. 16mo.
- The Tabular Statement of the Commerce and Shipping of Singapore during the Years 1840-41, 1841-42, 1842-43, and 1843-44. Compiled from Official Documents. By C. P. Holloway, Deputy Register of Imports and Exports. Singapore: 1845. fol.
- Bugis Laws, in the Bugis language and character. 8vo.
- A Bugis tract. 8vo.
- Index, containing the Names and Geographical Positions of all Places in the Maps of India; designed to facilitate the Use of those Maps, and especially that of the newly constructed and extended Map of India, lately published by Kingsbury, Parbury & Allen, etc. London: 1826. 24mo.
- The East-India Gazetteer, containing Particular Descriptions of the Empires, Kingdoms.... etc. of Hindostan, and the Adjacent Countries, India beyond the Ganges, and the Eastern Archipelago.... By Walter Hamilton. London: 1828. 2 vols. 16mo.
- The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and its Dependencies, containing Original Communications.... Vols. i-xiv. London: 1816-22. 8vo.
- The same. New Series. Vols. xvi-xxi. London: 1835-36. 8vo.
- Description Historique et Géographique de l'Inde, qui présente en Trois Volumes, enrichis de 64 Cartes et autres Planches: 1. La Géographie de l'Indoustan, écrite en Latin, dans le Pays même, par le Père Joseph Tieffenthaler, Jesuite et Missionnaire Apostolique dans l'Inde. 2. Des Recherches Historiques et Chronologiques sur l'Inde, and la Description du Cours du Gange et du Gagra, avec une très Grande Carte, par M. Anquetil Duperron, etc. 3. La Carte Générale de l'Inde, celles du Cours du Brahmapoutre, and de la Navigation Intérieure du Bengal, avec des Mémoires Relatifs à ces Cartes, publiés en Anglois par M. Jaques Rennell, etc. Le tout, augmenté de Remarques et d'autres Additions, rédigé and publié en François par M. Jean Bernoulli, etc. Berlin: 1786-89. 3 vols. 4to.
- Sketches chiefly relating to the History, Religion, Learning and Manners of the Hindoos. With a Concise Account of the Present State of the Native Powers of Hindostan. London: 1792. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Indian Antiquities; or, Dissertations relative to the Ancient Geographical Divisions, the Pure System of Primeval Theology, the Grand Code of Civil Laws, the Original Form of Government, the widely Extended Commerce, and the Various and Profound Literature of Hindostan.... [by Thomas Maurice.] London: 1793-1800. 7 vols. 8vo.
- The History of Hindostan; its Arts and its Sciences, as connected with the History of the other Great Empires of Asia, during the most Ancient Periods of the World.... By the Author of Indian Antiquities. London: 1795-98. 2 vols. 4to.
- India Illustrated; an Historical and Descriptive Account of that Important and Interesting Country. By Linny Gilbert, etc. London. 8vo.
- Indian Recreations; consisting chiefly of Strictures on the Domestic and Rural Economy of the Mahomedans and Hindoos. By Rev. William Tennant, etc. Vol. i, ii. London: 1804. Vol. iii. Edinburgh: 1808. 12mo.
- The Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients in the Indian Ocean. By William Vincent, D.D., etc. London: 1807. 2 vols. 4to.
- A View of the History, Literature and Mythology of the Hindoos; including a Minute Description of their Manners and Customs, and Translations from their Principal Works. London: 1822. 3 vols. 12mo.

- The History of British India. By James Mill, etc. London: 1826. 6 vols. 8vo.
- Historical and Descriptive Account of British India, from the most Ancient Period to the Present Time; . . . By Hugh Murray, James Wilson, R. K. Greville, Professor Jameson, Whitelan Ainslie, M.D., William Rhind, Professor Wallace, and Captain Clarence Dalrymple. New York: 1836. Vols. ii. iii. 24mo.
- Modern India; with Illustrations of the Resources and Capability of Hindústán. By Henry H. Spry, M.D., etc. London: 1837. 2 vols. in 1. 24mo.
- British India, in its Relation to the Decline of Hindooism, and the Progress of Christianity; containing Remarks on the Manners, Customs, and Literature of the People; . . . By the Rev. William Campbell, etc. London: 1839. 8vo.
- Commerce des Anciens dans l'Inde, par L. Labat, etc. Paris: 1839. 8vo.
- Etat Actuel de l'Inde et de l'Asie Centrale, par L. Labat, etc. Paris: 1839. 8vo. (bound with the preceding.)
- L'Inde Contemporaine, par F. de Lanoye. Paris: 1858. 24mo.
- The Oriental Interpreter and Treasury of East India Knowledge. . . . By J. H. Stocqueler, etc. London. 16mo.
- India; or Facts submitted to illustrate the Character and Condition of the Native Inhabitants, with Suggestions for reforming the Present System of Government. By R. Rickards, etc. London: 1828-29. 2 vols. 8vo.
- A Memoir of Central India, including Malwa, and Adjoining Provinces, with the History, and Copious Illustrations, of the Past and Present Condition of that Country. By Sir John Malcolm, etc. London: 1832. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Personal Observations on Sindh; the Manners and Customs of its Inhabitants; and its Productive Capabilities: with a Sketch of its History, a Narrative of Recent Events. . . . By T. Postans, etc. London: 1843. 8vo.
- The Punjab; being a Brief Account of the Country of the Sikhs; its Extent, History. . . . etc. By Lieut. Colonel Steinbach, etc. London: 1845. 12mo.
- History of the Political and Military Transactions in India during the Administration of the Marquess of Hastings, 1813-1823. By Henry T. Prinsep, etc. London: 1825. 2 vols. 8vo.
- History of the War in Afghanistan. From the Unpublished Letters and Journals of Political and Military Officers. . . . By John William Kaye, etc. London: 1851. 2 vols. 8vo.
- A History of British Military Exploits, and Political Events in India, Afghanistan and China, from the Capture of Calcutta in 1757 to the Battle of Chillianwalla in 1849. By Major William Hough, etc. London: 1853. 12mo.
- A Voyage to the East Indies; containing Authentic Accounts of the Mogul Government in general, the Viceroyalties of the Decan and Bengal, with their several Subordinate Dependances. Of Angria, the Morattoes, and Tanjoreans. Of the Mahometan, Gentoo, and Parsee Religions. Of their Customs and Antiquities, with General Reflections on the Trade of India. Of the European Settlements, particularly those belonging to the English; their respective Factories, Governments, Trade, Fortifications and Public Buildings. The History of the War with the French from 1754 to the Conclusion of the General Peace in 1763. By Mr. Grose. London: 1772. 2 vols. 8vo.
- A Voyage to East India; wherein some Things are taken notice of in our Passage thither, but many more in our Abode there, within that most Rich and most Spacious Empire of the Great Mogul. . . . Reprinted from the Edition of 1655. Observed by Edward Terry, etc. London: 1777. 16mo.
- A Voyage to the East Indies: containing an Account of the Manners, Customs, &c. of the Natives, with a Geographical Description of the Country. . . . By Fra Paolino da San Bartolomeo, etc. With Notes and Illustrations by John Reinhold Forster, etc. Translated from the German by William Johnston. London: 1800. 8vo.
- Pen and Pencil Sketches, being the Journal of a Tour in India. By Captain Mundy. London: 1833. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The Rural and Domestic Life of Germany; . . . etc. By William Howitt. Philadelphia: 1843. 8vo.
- Austria, Vienna, Prague, etc. etc. By J. G. Kohl, etc. Philadelphia: 1844. 8vo.
- Cabool: a Personal Narrative of a Journey to, and Residence in that City in the years 1836, 7 and 8. By the late Lieut. Colonel Sir Alexander Burnes, etc. Philadelphia: 1843. 8vo.

- The Last Year in China, to the Peace of Nanking:** as sketched in Letters to his Friends by a Field Officer actively employed in that Country, etc. Philadelphia: 1843. 8vo. (the above 4 works bound together in one volume.)
- Diary of Travels and Adventures in Upper India, from Bareilly in Rohilcund to Hurdwar and Nahun in the Himmalaya Mountains, with a Tour in Bundelcund, a Sporting Excursion in the Kingdom of Oude, and a Voyage down the Ganges.** By C. J. C. Davidson, etc. London: 1843. 2 vols. 16mo.
- Travels in Kashmir and the Panjab.** Containing a particular account of the Government and Character of the Sikhs, from the German of Baron Charles Hügel, with Notes by Major T. B. Jervis, etc. London: 1845. 8vo. Bound in 2 vols.
- Voyage dans l'Inde et en Perse, par le Prince Alexis Soltykoff.** Paris: 1858. 24mo.
- The Wonders of Elora; or the Narrative of a Journey to the Temples and Dwellings excavated out of a Mountain of Granite, and extending upwards of a mile and a quarter, at Elora, in the East Indies, by the Routes of Poona, Ahmed-nuggur, and Toka, returning by Dowlutabad and Aurungabad; with some General Observations on the People and Country.** By John B. Seely, etc. London: 1824. 12mo.
- Illustrations of the Rock-cut Temples of India.** Text to accompany the folio Volume of Plates. By James Ferguson, etc. London: 1845. 8vo vol. of text, and large fol. vol. of plates.
- Hindu Infanticide.** An Account of the Measures adopted for suppressing the Practice of the Systematic Murder by their Parents of Female Infants; with Incidental Remarks on other Customs Peculiar to the Natives of India. Edited, with Notes and Illustrations, by Edward Moor, etc. London: 1811. 4to.
- The Madras New Almanac, Directory and Register, for the Year of our Lord 1847.** Arranged and Compiled by J. B. Pharaoh. Madras. 8vo.
- A Grammar of the Pure and Mixed East Indian Dialects, with Dialogues affixed, spoken in all the Eastern Countries, methodically arranged at Calcutta, according to the Brahmenian System of the Shamscrit Language.** By Herasim Lebedeef. London: 1801. 4to.
- An Introductory Treatise on Sanscrit Hagiographa; or the Sacred Literature of the Hindus.** In Two Parts. Part I. The Philosophy of the Hindus. Part II. The Veda and Puranas. . . . By Rev. R. Wrightson, etc. Dublin: 1859. 16mo.
- Selections from the Mahábhárata.** Edited by Francis Johnson, etc. London: 1842. 8vo.
- A Pali Manuscript, written on fourteen strips of palm-leaf.**
- Viri Plur. Reverendi Benjamini Schulzii etc. Grammatica Hindostanica collectis in diuturna inter Hindostanos commoratione. . . . Edidit. . . . Dr. Jo. Henr. Callenberg, etc. Halae Saxonum: 1745. 8vo.**
- An Introduction to the Study of the Hindostany Language, as spoken in the Carnatic.** Compiled for the use of the Company of Gentlemen Cadets on the Madras Establishment at New Town, Cuddalore. 1808. 4to.
- A Grammar of the Hindustani Language.** By John Shakespear, etc. London: 1818. 8vo.
- Muntakhabát-i-Hindi, or Selections in Hindustani, with Verbal Translations or Particular Vocabularies, and a Grammatical Analysis of some Parts, for the use of Students of that Language.** By John Shakespear. Vol. 1. Fourth Edition. London: 1840. Vol. 2. Third Edition. London: 1838. (bound in one volume.)
- A Glossary, Bengálí and English, to explain the Tótá-itihás, the Batris Singhásan, the History of Rájá Krishna Chandra, the Purusha-Parikhyá, the Hitópadesá (translated by Mrityunjaya.)** London: 1825. 4to.
- Gospel of Matthew, in Bengali.** No title, place or date. 8vo.
- Gospel of John, in Bengali.** No title, place or date. 8vo.
- Proceedings of a Meeting of the Native and European Inhabitants of Bombay, held in the Town-Hall, on the 15th December 1858, to establish the Victoria Museum and Gardens.** Bombay: 1859. 8vo.
- The same, in Gujarathi.**
- A Grammar of the Telinga Language.** By W. Carey, D.D., etc. Serampore, 1814. 8vo.
- Canarese and English dictionary—[title page torn out.]** 12mo.
- A Compendious Grammar of the Current Corrupt Dialect of the Jargon of Hindostan (commonly called Moors): with a Vocabulary, English and Moors, Moors and**

- English. . . . To which are added Familiar Phrases and Dialogues, &c., &c. . . . By George Hadley. London: 1809. 8vo.
- A Tamil Drama. 16mo.
- A Report on the Cultivation, Preparation and Adulteration of Malwa Opium. By Assistant Surgeon Impey. Bombay: 1846. 8vo.
- A Description of Ceylon, containing an Account of the Country, Inhabitants, and Natural Productions; with Narratives of a Tour round the Island in 1800, the Campaign in Candy in 1803, and a Journey to Ramisseram in 1804. . . . By Rev. James Cordiner, &c. London: 1807. 2 vols. 4to.
- Eleven Years in Ceylon. Comprising Sketches of the Field Sports and Natural History of that Colony, and an Account of its History and Antiquities. By Major Forbes, etc. London: 1841. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Recollections of Ceylon, after a Residence of nearly Thirteen Years; with an Account of the Church Missionary Society's Operations in the Island; and Extracts from a Journal. By the Rev. James Selkirk, etc. London: 1844. 8vo.
- Journal of a Tour in Ceylon and India, undertaken at the Request of the Baptist Missionary Society, in Company with the Rev. J. Leechman, M.A. By Joshua Russell. London: 1852. 12mo.
- Ceylon: Past and Present. By Sir George Barrow, etc. London: 1857. 16mo.
- Mesmerism in India, and its Practical Application in Surgery and Medicine. By James Esdaile, M. D., etc. Hartford: 1851. 24mo.
- Wanderings in the Islands of Interview, (Andaman), Little and Great Coco. By J. H. Quigley. Maulmain: 1850. 12mo.
- Histoire de Nader Chah, connu sous le Nom de Thammas Kuli Khan, Empereur de Perse. Traduite d'un Manuscrit Persan, par ordre de sa Majesté le Roi de Danemark. Avec des Notes Chronologiques, Historiques, Géographiques. Et un Traité sur la Poésie Orientale. Par Mr. William Jones, etc. London: 1770. 4to. 2 parts bound in one volume.
- The Voyages and Travels of the Ambassadors sent by Frederick Duke of Holstein, to the Great Duke of Muscovy, and the King of Persia. Begun in the Year 1633, and finished in 1639; containing a Compleat History of Muscovy, Tartary, Persia and other Adjacent Countries. . . . In 7 Books. (Where to are added the Travels of John Albert de Mandelslo. . . . from Persia into the East Indies. . . . in 3 Books . . .) written originally by Adam Olearius, etc. Faithfully rendered into English by John Davies, etc. London: 1669. 4to.
- Narrative of a Journey into Khorasán, in the Years 1821 and 1822. Including some Account of the Countries to the North-east of Persia; with Remarks. . . . By James B. Fraser, etc. London: 1825. 4to.
- Dissertations on the Rhetoric, Prosody and Rhyme of the Persians. By Francis Gladwin, etc. London: 1801. 4to.
- A Specimen of Persian Poetry; or Odes of Haféz: with an English Translation and Paraphrase, chiefly from the Specimen Poeseos Persicæ of Baron Revizky, etc. . . . By John Richardson, etc. London: 1802. 4to.
- De Persidis Lingua et Genio. Commentationes Phaosophico-Persicæ. Auctore Othm. Frank, etc. Norimbergæ: 1809. 16mo.
- Rudimenta Linguae Persicæ. Authore Ludovico de Dieu. Accedunt duo Priora Capita Geneseos, ex Persica Translatione Jac. Tawusii. Lugduni Batavorum (Elzevir): 1639. sm. 4to.
- Historia S. Petri Persicæ conscripta, simulque multis Modis contaminata. Latine reddita, et Brevibus Animadversionibus notata, a Ludovico de Dieu. Lugduni Batavorum (Elzevir): 1639. sm. 4to. (bound with the preceding.)
- Gazophylacium Linguae Persarum, Triplici Linguarum Clavi Italicae, Latinae, Gallicae, nec non Specialibus Præceptis ejusdem Linguae referatum. Opus Missionariis Orientalibus, Linguarum Professoribus, Sacrorum Bibliorum Scrutatoribus, Mercatoribus, Caeterisque Regionum Orientalium Lustratoribus Perutile, ac Necessarium. Authore Reverendo Adm. P. Angelo à S. Joseph, etc. Amsterdam: 1684. fol.
- A Grammar of the Persian Language. By William Jones, Esq. The Sixth Edition, with Additions and Improvements. London: 1804. sm. 4to.
- The Flowers of Persian Literature: containing Extracts from the most Celebrated Authors, in Prose and Verse; with a Translation into English: being a Companion

- to Sir William Jones's Persian Grammar. To which is prefixed an Essay on the Language and Literature of Persia. By S. Rousseau, etc. London: 1801. sm. 4to. (bound with the preceding.)
- A Concise Grammar of the Persian Language, containing Dialogues, Reading Lessons, and a Vocabulary, together with a New Plan for facilitating the Study of the Languages, and Specimens in Arabic, Armenian.... and Turkish. By A. H. Bleek, etc. London: 1857. 32mo.
- Joh. Joachimi Schröderi Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae, Antiquae et Hodiernae, cum Varia Praxios Materia.... Amstelodami: 1711. sm. 4to.
- A History of Armenia, in Armenian. 1784. 2 vols. 4to.
- Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopi Chronicon Bipartitum, nunc primum ex Armeniaco Textu in Latinum conversum.... Opera P. Jo. Baptistae Aucher Ancyrani, etc. Pars I. Historico-Chronographica. Pars II. Chronicus Canon. Venice: 1818. 2 vols. 4to.
- Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, translated into Armenian verse. 1843. 2 vols. 12mo.
- An Armenian book, not identified. 18mo.
- Dichiaratione più Copiosa della Dottrina Christiana, tradotta dalla Italiana nella Lingua Armena dal P. Pietro Paolo Sacerdote Armeno.... Romae: 1630. sm. 4to. (Latin and Armenian in parallel columns on each page.)
- Commentary on the Old Testament, in Armenian. Venice: 1819. 4 vols. 8vo.
- Commentary on the New Testament, in Armenian. Venice: 1824. 3 vols. 8vo.
- Mesopotamia and Assyria, from the Earliest Ages to the Present Time, with Illustrations of their Natural History. By J. Baillie Fraser, etc. New York: 1842. 32mo.
- Observations connected with Astronomy and Ancient History, Sacred and Profane, of the Ruins of Babylon, as recently published and described by Claudius James Rich, etc. By Rev. Thomas Maurice, etc. London: 1816. 4to.
- Researches in Assyria, Babylonia, and Chaldea; forming Part of the Labors of the Euphrates Expedition. By William Ainsworth, etc. London: 1838. 8vo.
- The Buried City of the East, Nineveh: a Narration of the Discoveries of Mr. Layard and M. Botta at Nimroud and Khorsabad; with Descriptions of the Exhumed Sculptures, and Particulars of the Early History of the Ancient Ninevite Kingdom. London: 1851. 16mo.
- Nineveh and its Remains; with an Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, or Devil-worshippers; and an Inquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians. By Austin Henry Layard, etc. New York: 1852. 2 vols. bound in one. 8vo.
- Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon; with Travels in Armenia, Kurdistan and the Desert; being the Result of a Second Expedition undertaken for the Trustees of the British Museum. By Austin H. Layard, etc. New York: 1853. 8vo.
- The Monuments of Assyria, Babylonia and Persia; with a New Key for the Recovery of the Lost Ten Tribes. By Rev. Charles Forster, etc. London: 1859. 8vo.
- The Holy Land: being Sketches of the Jews, and of the Land of Palestine. Compiled from the Best Sources. London: 1844. 16mo.
- Lands, Classical and Sacred. By Lord Nugent. London: 1845. 2 vols. 12mo.
- The Modern Judaea, compared with Ancient Prophecy; with Notes illustrative of Biblical Subjects. By Rev. James Aitken Wylie, etc. Glasgow and London. 16mo.
- Narrative of a Journey round the Dead Sea and in Bible Lands in 1850 and 1851. By F. De Sauley. Edited, with Notes, by Count Edward de Warren. Second Edition. London: 1854. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Sinai and Palestine; in Connection with their History. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, etc. London: 1857. 8vo.
- View of the Hebrews; or the Tribes of Israel in America.... By Ethan Smith, etc. Poultney (Vt.): 1825. 12mo.
- Discursus de Confusione Linguarum, tum Orientalium tum Occidentalium.... statuens Hebraicam omnium esse Primam, et ipsissimam Matricem, concinnatus à M. Christoph. Crinesio, etc. Noribergæ: 1629. sm. 4to.
- De Linguarum Orientalium, præsertim Hebraicæ, Chaldaicæ, Syricæ, Arabicæ, et Samaritanæ Præstantia, Necessitate, et Utilitate quam et Theologis præstant

- et Philosophis. Per G. B. [William Beveridge.] London: 1658. 12mo. (bound with the author's *Grammatica Syriaca*.)
- Lexicon Heptaglotton; Hebraicam, Chaldaicum, Syriacum, Samaritanum, Aethiopicum, Arabicum, conjunctim, et Persicum separatim. . . . Authore Edmundo Castello, etc. London: 1669. 2 vols. fol.
- Histoire Générale et Système Comparé des Langues Sémitiques, par Ernest Renan, etc. . . . Première Partie. Histoire Générale des Langues Sémitiques. Paris: 1858. 8vo.
- Joannis Seldeni de Jure Naturali et Gentium, juxta Disciplinam Ebræorum, Libri Septem. Londini: 1640. 4to.
- Joannis Seldeni de Synedriis et Praefecturis Juridicis Veterum Ebraeorum. Londini: 1650-53. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Hierozoicon, sive Bipartitum Opus de Animalibus S. Scripturæ. . . . cum Indice Septuplici. . . . Authore Samuele Bocharto. Revisum atque correctum. . . . Opera atque Studio David Clodii, etc. Francofurti ad Moenum: 1675. fol.
- Philologus Hebraeus, continens Quaestiones Hebraicas, quae circa Vetus Testamentum Hebraeum fere moveri solent, Auctore Johanne Leusden, etc. Ultrajecti: 1686. 8vo.
- De Ara Exteriore Templi Secundi Exercitationes Philologicae. . . . Auctore Johanne Jacobo Cramero Tigurino. Lugduni Batavorum: 1697. sm. 4to. (bound with Hottinger's *Comm. Phil. de Decimis Judæorum*.)
- Petri Cunaei de Republica Hebraeorum Libri Tres: Variis Annotationibus. . . . editi a Johanne Nicolai, etc. Lugduni Batavorum: 1703. 8vo.
- Clavis Domus Heber, referens Januam ad Significationem Hierologypticam Litteraturæ Hebraicæ perspicendam. . . . Studio atque labore Casparis Neumanni. Wratislavii: 1712. sm. 4to.
- Commentarius Philologicus de Decimis Judæorum, Decem Exercitationibus absolutus. . . . Actore Joh. Cour. Hottingero, etc. Præmittitur. . . . Hadriani Relandi Epistola ad Auctorem. Lugduni Batavorum: 1713. sm. 4to.
- De Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus et earum Rationibus, Libri Quatuor. . . . Auctore Joanne Spencero, etc. Cambridge: 1727. 2 vols. fol.
- Apparatus Historico-Criticus Antiquitatum Sacri Codicis et Gentis Hebrææ. Uberimis Annotationibus in Thomæ Goodwini Mosen et Aaronem subministravit Joh. Gottlob Carpov. Francofurti et Lipsiæ: 1748. 4to.
- De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum. Praelectiones Academicæ Oxonii habitæ a Roberto Lowth, etc. Oxonii: 1775. 8vo.
- Joh. Bernardi De-Rossi etc. de Typographia Hebræo-Ferrariensi Commentarius Historicus quo Ferrarienses Judæorum Editiones Hebraicæ, Hispanicæ, Lusitanæ recensentur et illustrantur. Parmae: 1780. 16mo.
- A Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship; in which the Wise Designs and Usefulness of that Ritual are explained, and vindicated from Objections. By Moses Lowman. A New Edition. London: 1816. 8vo.
- Essais sur la Littérature des Hébreux. Rachel.—Le Meurtrier.—Les Noces Funèbres.—Néhémie; Narrations imitées de l'Hébreu; précédées d'une Introduction et du Voyage de Benjamin de Tudèle à l'Oasis Lointaine; suivies de Notes et de Dissertations qui peuvent servir à l'Intelligence de la Bible. Par J. Ch. de Montbron. Paris: 1819. 4 vols. 32mo.
- Jewish Antiquities: or, a Course of Lectures on the Three First Books of Godwin's Moses and Aaron. To which is annexed a Dissertation on the Hebrew Language. By the late David Jennings, D.D. Ninth Edition. London: 1837. 8vo.
- Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebrææ. Quibus Via panditur ad ejusdem Analogiam restituendam, et vindicandam. In usum Collegii Domestici edidit A. Schultens. Lugduni Batavorum: 1756. 4to.
- Grammatica Hebræo-harmonica, cum Arabica et Aramæa Methodo-logico Mathematica etc. ex Altingio, Buxtorio . . . contracta et emendata; charta Lusoria, . . . J. G. Kals, etc. Amstelædami: 1758. 8vo.
- Elements of Hebrew Grammar: to which is prefixed a Dissertation on the two Modes of Reading, with or without the Points. By Charles Wilson, etc. Edinburgh: 1782. 8vo.
- Institutiones ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebrææ. In Usum Studiosæ Juventutis edidit Nicol. Guil. Schroeder, etc. Ulmæ: 1792. 16mo.

- Appendix Institutionum ad Fundamenta Linguae Hebraicae a Cel. Schroedero editarum, Chaldaismi Biblici Præcepta exhibens. Ulmæ: 1810. 16mo. (bound with the preceding.)
- Hebräische Sprachlehre, von Johann Severin Vater, etc. Leipzig: 1797. 16mo.
- A new and Easy Introduction to the Hebrew Language: upon the Plan of Grammar in General. . . . By the Rev. James Williams Newton, etc. Second Edition. London: 1809. 8vo.
- The True and Antient Manner of reading Hebrew without Points: and the Whole Art of the Hebrew Versification deduced from it. By Th—s Cl—s, Midras Iaeus. London: 1747. 8vo.
- The Key to the Sacred Language, being a Concise though Comprehensive Orthographical and Orthoepical Hebrew and English Grammar, with Points. By E. P. Marks, etc. London: 1818. 8vo. (the three preceding works bound together in one volume.)
- An Hebrew Grammar, for the use of the Students of the University of Dublin. By Rev. Gerald Fitz-Gerald, D.D. Dublin: 1813. 8vo.
- The Hebrew Grammar, with Principal Rules; compiled from some of the most Considerable Hebrew Grammars; and particularly adapted to Bythner's *Lyra Prophetica*; also, complete Paradigms of the Verbs, and Tables of the Nouns. With a Preface and Additions, by T. Yeates. London: 1823. 8vo.
- Elements of the Chaldee Language, intended as a Supplement to the Hebrew Grammar, and as a General Introduction to the Aramean Dialects. By Rev. William Harris, LL.D. London: 1822. 8vo. (bound with the preceding.)
- Hebräisches Elementarbuch von D. Wilhelm Gesenius. Erster Theil. Hebräisches Grammatik. Neunte Auflage. 1828. Zweyter Theil. Hebräisches Lesebuch. Sechste Auflage. 1834. Halle. 8vo.
- Études Hébraïques. Grammaire par l'Abbé Auguste Latouche, etc. Paris: 1836. 8vo.
- Hebrew Grammar designed for the use of Schools and Students in the Universities. By Christopher Leo, etc. Cambridge and London: 1836. 8vo.
- An Introduction to Hebrew Grammar. By William Thomas Philipps, etc. Second Edition. Oxford: 1837. 8vo.
- Grammaire Hébraïque, précédée d'un Précis Historique sur la Langue Hébraïque; par S. Preiswerk, V.D.M. Genève: 1838. 8vo.
- Hieronymian Hebrew; or, a Grammar of the Sacred Language on the System disclosed by the Writings of Saint Jerome. By William Beeston, etc. London: 1843. 8vo.
- On the Etymology and Prophetic Character of the Proper Names found in the Old Testament; being a Key to the Masoretic Punctuation of the Hebrew Scriptures. By William Beeston, etc. London: 1843. 8vo. (bound with the preceding.)
- A Hebrew Grammar, containing a Copious and Systematic Development of the Etymology and Punctuation of that Language. By Samuel Ransom, etc. London: 1843. 8vo.
- Henrici Opatii etc. *Novum Lexicon Hebræo-Chaldæo-Biblicum*. . . . Lipsiæ: 1692. 8vo.
- Lapis Adjutorii, sive Lexici Philologici Hebræo-Chaldæo-Sacri Pars Prima, continens omnes Voces Hebraicas et Chaldaicas V. T. in duabus Prioribus Alphabeti Hebraici Literis Aleph et Beth occurrentes, quæ Commentario Philologico-Theologico illustrantur. . . . cum Indicibus Necessariis. Auctore Johanne Heeser, etc. Harderovici: 1716. sm. 4to.
- Theoph. Inman. Dindorfii etc. *Novum Lexicon Linguae Hebraico-Chaldaicæ Commentario in Libros Veteris Testamenti Dialectorum Cognatorum inprimis Ope Animadversionibusque Præstantissimorum Interpretum locupletatum*. Lipsiæ: 1801-4. 3 vols. 8vo.
- Hebrew Dictionary and Grammar, without Points; together with a Complete List of such Chaldee Words as occur in the Old Testament, and a Brief Sketch of Chaldee Grammar. . . . By James Andrew, etc. London: 1823. 8vo.
- Études Hébraïques. Dictionnaire Idio-étymologique Hébreu, et Dictionnaire Grec-Hébreu, par l'Abbé Auguste Latouche, etc. Paris: 1836. 8vo.
- Innocentii Fessler etc. *Anthologia Hebraica e Sacris Hebraeorum Libris deprompta. Adjecta est Versio Latina et Annotationes*. Leopoli: 1787. 8vo.

- A Hebrew Chrestomathy. By Moses Stuart, etc. Oxford: 1834. 8vo.
- Analecta Hebraica; with Critical Notes, and Tables of Paradigms of the Conjugations of the Regular and Irregular Verbs....By C. W. H. Pauli. Second Edition, with a Key. Oxford: 1842. 8vo.
- A Key to the Second and Third Sections of Pauli's *Analecta Hebraica*....By C. W. H. Pauli. London: 1839. 8vo. (bound with the
- Psalmi Davidis Hebraicè, cum Interlineari Versioneriae
Montani et aliorum Collato Studio ad Hebraicam ex-
pensa. Raphaelengii: 1608. 8vo.
- Proverbia Salomonis, Job, Canticum Canticorum, Ruth, Lamentationes Jeremiæ, Ecclesiastes, et Esther, Hebraicè, cum etc. (as above). Raphaelengii: 1608. 8vo.
- The Book of Psalms in Hebrew, metrically arranged: with Selections from the Various Readings of Kennicott and De Rossi, and from the Ancient Versions. By J. Rogers, etc. Oxford. 12mo.
- The Pilgrim's Progress, in Hebrew. London: 1851. 12mo.
- The Book of Jasher, referred to in Joshua, and Second Samuel. Faithfully translated from the Original Hebrew into English. New York: 1840. 8vo.
- Joh. Gasbaris Myricæi Themarensis Hennebergico Franci Grammaticæ Syro-Chaldææ Libri Duo, quorum Primus Voces Simplicis: Secundus verò Conjunctas considerat. Interseritur sparsim Rabbinico-Talmudicæ Dialecti Variatio. Genevæ: 1619. sm. 4to.
- Ratio, Institutioque addiscendæ Lingvæ Chaldaicæ-Rabbinicæ-Talmudicæ, cum singularum Dialectorum Exemplis etiam Latinitate donatis. Accedit ad exercendos Tyrones inventa difficillima Peregrinatio Rabbinii Petachicæ cum Interpretatione Latina et Adnotationibus. Alia passim addita Indicum auxilio patefacta. Auctore Antonio Zanolini, etc. Patavii: 1750. 4to.
- Elements of the Chalde Language, intended as a Supplement to the Hebrew Grammars, and as a General Introduction to the Aramean Dialects. By Rev. William Harris, LL.D. London: 1822. 8vo.
- Grammatica Syriaca Tribus Libris tradita, quorum Primus Vocum Singularum Proprietatem, Secundus Syntaxin, Tertius Figuras Grammaticas et Praxin continet....Opera et studio Gulielmi Beveridgii, etc. London: 1658. 12mo.
- Abhandlung von der Syrischen Sprache, und ihrem Gebrauch: nebst dem ersten Theil einer Syrischen Chrestomathie. Von Johann David Michaelis. Göttingen: 1786. 32mo.
- Psalterium Davidis Aethiopice. Londini: 1815. 4to.
- Arabice Lingvæ Tyrocinium: id est Thomæ Erpenii Grammatica Arabica;...Lugduni Batavorum: 1656. 8vo.
- Thomæ Erpenii Grammatica Arabica cum Fabulis Locmanni etc. Accedunt Excerpta Anthologiæ Veterum Arabiæ Poëtarum, quæ inscribitur Hamasa Abi Temmam, ex MSS. Biblioth. Academ. Batavæ edita, conversa et Notis illustrata ab Alberto Schultens....Lugduni Batavorum: 1748. 8vo.
- Primæ Linæ Institutionum ad Fundamenta Dialecti Arabice, sive Specimen Grammaticæ Arabicæ, ad Intimam Antiquissimæ hujus Dialecti, cum Hebræa Lingua, demonstrandam Harmoniam, secundum Paragraphos elegantissimæ Grammaticæ Hebrææ Schræderianæ, descriptum. Lugduni Batavorum: 1779. 4to.
- Arabische Grammatik, nebst einer Arabischen Chrestomathie, und Abhandlung vom Arabischen Geschmack, sonderlich in der Poetischen und Historischen Schreibart. Von Johann David Michaelis. Göttingen: 1781. 32mo.
- Grammaire de la Langue Arabe Vulgaire et Littérale; Ouvrage Posthume de M. Savary, etc. Augmentée de quelques Contes Arabes, par l'Editeur [L. Langlès]. Paris: 1813. 4to.
- Vocabulaire Français-Arabe des Dialectes Vulgaires Africains d'Alger, de Tunis, de Marok et d'Egypte, par J. J. Marcel, etc. Paris: 1837. 8vo.
- The Oriental Geography of Ebn Haukal, an Arabian Traveller of the Tenth Century. Translated....by Sir William Onseley, etc. London: 1800. 4to.
- Abdollariphi Historiæ Aegypti Compendium, Arabice et Latine. Partim ipse vertit, partim a Pocockio versum emendum curavit, Notisque illustravit J. White, etc. Oxonii: 1800. 4to.
- Sententiæ Ali Ebn Abi Talebi Arabice et Latine. E Codicibus Manuscriptis descriptis, Latine vertit, et Annotationibus illustravit Cornelius Van Waenen. Oxford: 1806. 4to.

- Szaffi'eddini Hellensis ad Sulthanum Elmelik Eszszaleh Schemseddin Abulmekarem Ortokidam Carmen Arabicum; . . . edidit. . . D. Georgius Henricus Bernstein, etc. Lipsiae: 1816. fol.
- Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects, by Muhammad Al Sharastani. Part I. containing the Account of Religious Sects. Now first edited from the collation of several MSS. By the Rev. William Cureton, etc. London: 1842. 8vo.
- Abu Nasri Ismaëlis Ebn Hammad Al-Gieuharii Farabiensis Purioris Sermonis Arabici Thesaurus vulgo dictus Liber Sehah sive Lexicon Arabicum. Particula I. E Codicibus Manuscriptis Summa Fide edidit ac Versione Latina instruxit Everardus Scheidius. Harderuci Gelrorum. 4to.
- Rabbi Yapheth Ben Heli Bassorensis Karaitæ in Librum Psalmorum Commentarii Arabici e duplici Codice MSS. Bibliothecæ Regiæ Parisiensis edidit Specimen et in Latinum convertit L. Bargès, etc. Lutetiæ Parisiorum: 1846. 8vo.
- The History of the Saracens; . . . By Simon Ockley, etc. Vol. I. 2nd Edition; Vol. II. London: 1718. 8vo.
- The same. The Fourth Edition, revised, improved, and enlarged. London: 1847. 8vo.
- Hadriani Relandi de Religione Mohammedica Libri Duo. Trajecti ad Rhenum: 1717.
- A Faithful Account of the Religion and Manners of the Mahometans. . . . By Joseph Pitts, etc. The Fourth Edition, corrected, with Additions. . . . London: 1738. 18mo.
- De Mohammede Resurrectionis Christi Teste, et Mohammedanis in Neo-Borussia Orientali. Sectio I. 1802. Sectio II. 1803. Sectio III. 1804. Programma. . . Civibus propositum, a Rectore, Cancellario, Directore et Senatu Academiae Regiomontanae. Regiomonti. sm. 4to.
- Exercitatio de Religione Muhammedica. . . . Tubingæ: 1761. sm. 4to.
- Dissertatio Theologica Joh. Michaelis Langii, etc., de Fabulis Mohammædicis circa SS. Trinitatis Mysterium et Generationem in Divinis. . . . Noribergæ: 1697. sm. 4to.
- Dissertatio Inauguralis de Prima Alcorani Sura. . . . Jacobi Christophori Gulielmi Holste. Altorfii Noricorum: 1743. sm. 4to. (the above four works bound together in one volume)
- Derivationes Alcoranicae. In Usum suum et Arabicis Studentium comparatae cum Surarum aliquot Indicibus adjectis a Rev. Gulielmo Vansittart, D.D., etc. Londini: 1826. 8vo.
- Selections from the *Kur-ân*, commonly called in England the *Koran*, with an interwoven Commentary; translated from the Arabic, methodically arranged, and illustrated by Notes, chiefly from Sale's Edition: to which is prefixed an Introduction, taken from Sale's Preliminary Discourse. . . . By Edward William Lane, etc. London: 1843. 8vo.
- Séjour chez le Grand-chérif de la Mekke, par Charles Didier. Paris: 1857. 24mo.
- Le *Koran*. Traduction Nouvelle faite sur le Texte Arabe par M. Kasimirski, etc. Paris: 1859. 24mo.
- Historiæ Musulmanæ Turcorum, de Monumentis ipsorum exscriptæ. Libri xviii. Opus Jo. Leunclavii, Amelburni. . . . Accessere Commentarii Duo, Libitinarium Index Osmanidarum. . . et Apologeticus alter, cum Onomastico Gemino et Indice Copioso. Francofurti: 1591. 4to.
- Annals of the Turkish Empire, from 1591 to 1659 of the Christian Era. By Naima. Translated from the Turkish by Charles Fraser. Vol. I. London: 1832. 4to.
- Histoire de la Turquie. Par Théophile Lavallée. Paris: 1859. 2 vols. 24mo.
- Epistolæ Quatuor: quarum duæ de Moribus ac Institutis Turcarum agunt, duæ septem Asiæ Ecclesiarum et Constantinopoleos Notitiam continent. Authore Tho. Smith, etc. Oxonii: 1674. 32mo.
- A Residence at Constantinople, in the Year 1827, with Notes to the Present Time. By Josiah Brewer, etc. New Haven: 1830. 12mo.
- Linguarum Orientalium Turcicæ, Arabicæ, Persicæ Institutiones, seu Grammatica Turcica, . . . cujus singulis Capitibus Præcepta Linguarum Arabicæ et Persicæ subjiciuntur. . . . Operâ, typis, et sumptibus Francisci à Mesgnien Meninski, etc. Vienna: 1680. fol.

- Francisci à Mesgnien Meninski Institutiones Linguæ Turcicæ, cum Rudimentis Parallellis Linguarum Arabicæ et Persicæ. Editio altera Methodo Linguam Turcicam suo Marte discendi aucta. Curante Adamo Francisco Kollar, etc. Vindobonæ: 1756. 2 vols. in one. sm. 4to.
- Élémens de la Grammaire Turke, à l'usage des Élèves de l'École Royale et Spéciale des Langues Orientales Vivantes. Par P. Amédée Jaubert, etc. Paris: 1823. 4to.
- Grammaire Turke; précédée d'un Discours Préliminaire sur la Langue et la Littérature des Nations Orientales; avec un Vocabulaire Volumineux, des Dialogues, un Recueil d'Extraits en Prose et en Vers. . . . Par Arthur Lumley Davids, etc. Traduite de l'Anglais par Madame Sarah Davids, etc. London: 1836. 4to.
- A Reading Book of the Turkish Language, with a Grammar and Vocabulary, containing a Selection of Original Tales, literally translated and accompanied by Grammatical References. The Pronunciation of each Word given as now used in Constantinople. By William Burkhardt Barker, etc. London: 1854. 8vo.
- Contes Turcs en Langue Turque, extraits du Roman intitulé Les Quarante Vizirs. Par feu M. Belletête. Paris: 1812. 4to.
- Notes, during a Visit to Egypt, Nubia, the Oasis, Mount Sinai, and Jerusalem. By Sir Frederick Henniker, etc. London: 1823. 8vo.
- Rambles in Egypt and Candia, with Details of the Military Power and Resources of those Countries, and Observations on the Government, Policy, and Commercial System of Mohammed Ali. By C. Rochford Scott, etc. London: 1837. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The American in Egypt, with Rambles through Arabia Petræa and the Holy Land, during the Years 1839 and 1840. By James Ewing Cooley. New York: 1842. 8vo.
- A Journal of Travels in Egypt, Arabia Petræa, and the Holy Land, during 1841-2. By David Millard. Rochester: 1843. 8vo.
- A Pilgrimage to the Temples and Tombs of Egypt, Nubia, and Palestine, in 1845-6. By Mrs. Romer, etc. London: 1846. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The Boat and the Caravan, a Family Tour through Egypt and Syria. London: 1847. 12mo.
- Travels in Egypt and Palestine. By J. Thomas, M.D. Philadelphia: 1853. 12mo.
- Ancient Egypt and Idumea. London. 32mo.
- Voyage d'Égypte et de Nubie, par Frédéric-Louis Norden. Nouvelle Edition, soigneusement conférée sur l'Originale, avec des Notes, et des Additions tirées des Auteurs Anciens et Modernes, et des Géographes Arabes. Par L. Langlès, etc. Paris: 1795-98. 2 vols. 4to and a vol. of plates.
- Travels in Upper and Lower Egypt; undertaken by order of the Old Government of France; by C. S. Sonnini, etc. Translated from the French by Henry Hunter, D.D. London: 1799. 3 vols. 12mo.
- History of the British Expedition to Egypt; to which is subjoined, a Sketch of the Present State of that Country and its Means of Defence, etc. By Robert Thomas Wilson, etc. London: 1803. 4to.
- Voyages dans la Basse et la Haute Égypte, pendant les Campagnes de Bonaparte. Par Vivant Denon et les Savants attachés à l'Expédition des Français. London: 1809. 2 vols. 4to.
- Narrative of a Journey in Egypt, and the Country beyond the Cataracts. By Thomas Legh, etc. London: 1816. 4to.
- Narrative of the Operations and Recent Discoveries within the Pyramids, Temples, Tombs, and Excavations, in Egypt and Nubia; and of a Journey to the Coast of the Red Sea, in search of the ancient Berenice, and another to the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. By G. Belzoni. London: 1821. 4to.
- Khartoum, and the Blue and White Niles. By George Melly. London: 1851. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Village Life in Egypt, with Sketches of the Saïd. By Bayle St. John, etc. London: 1852. 2 vols. 12mo.
- 500 Lieues sur le Nil, par Charles Didier. Paris: 1858. 18mo.
- The History of Egypt under the Ptolemies. By Samuel Sharpe. London: 1838. 4to.
- The History of Egypt, from the Earliest Times till the Conquest by the Arabs, A.D. 640. By Samuel Sharpe. London: 1846. 8vo.

- Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs.** By John Kenrick, A.M. New York: 1852. 2 vols. 8vo.
- The Monumental History of Egypt, as recorded on the Ruins of her Temples, Palaces and Tombs.** By William Osburn, etc. London: 1854. 2 vols. 8vo.
- A Popular Account of the Ancient Egyptians.** Revised and abridged from his Larger Work, by Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, etc. New York: 1854. 2 vols. 12mo.
- The Modern History and Condition of Egypt, its Climate, Diseases, and Capabilities; exhibited in a Personal Narrative of Travels in that Country, with an Account of the Proceedings of Mohammed Ali Pasha, from 1801 to 1843: interspersed with Illustrations of Scripture History, the Fulfilment of Prophecy, and the Progress of Civilization in the East.** By William Holt Yates, M.D., etc. London: 1843. 2 vols. 8vo.
- Letters on Egypt, with a Parallel between the Manners of its Ancient and Modern Inhabitants, the Present State, the Commerce, the Agriculture, and Government of that Country; and an Account of the Descent of St. Lewis at Damietta: extracted from Joinville, and Arabian Authors.** By M. Savary, etc. London: 1786. 2 vols. 8vo.
- An Account of the Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, written in Egypt during the Years 1833-34 and -35. Partly from Notes made during a Former Visit to that Country in the Years 1825-28.** By Edward William Lane, etc. London: 1846. 3 vols. in one. 24mo.
- The Englishwoman in Egypt: letters from Cairo, written during a Residence there in 1842, 3, and 4, with E. W. Lane, etc.** By his Sister. London: 1851-53. 2 vols. 24mo.
- The same. Second Series.** London: 1846. 24mo. (bound with the preceding.)
- Les Nuits du Caire.** Par Charles Didier. Paris: 1860. 24mo.
- Egypt and the Great Suez Canal. A Narrative of Travels.** By J. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, etc. London: 1857. 8vo.
- Laurentii Pignorii Patavini Mensa Isiaca . . . accessit ejusdem Authoris de Magna Deum Matre Discursus . . . necnon Jacobi Philippi Tomasini Manus Ænea, et de Vita Rebusque Pignorii Dissertatio.** Amstelodami: 1669. sm. 4to.
- Ægyptiaca: or Observations on Certain Antiquities of Egypt. In Two Parts. Part I. The History of Pompey's Pillar, elucidated. Part II. Abdollatif's Account of the Antiquities of Egypt, written in Arabic, A. D. 1203. Translated into English, and illustrated with Notes.** By J. White, D.D., etc. Part I. Oxford: 1801. 4to.
- Memoranda, illustrative of the Tombs and Sepulchral Decorations of the Egyptians; with a Key to the Egyptian Tomb now exhibiting in Piccadilly. Also, Remarks on Mummies, and Observations on the Process of Embalming.** London: 1822. 16mo.
- A History of Egyptian Mummies, and an Account of the Worship and Embalming of the Sacred Animals by the Egyptians; with Remarks on the Funeral Ceremonies of Different Nations. . . .** By Thomas Joseph Pettigrew, etc. London: 1834. 4to.
- The Pyramids of Gizeh, from Actual Survey and Admeasurement, by J. E. Perring, Civil Engineer: illustrated by Notes and References to the several Plans, with Sketches taken on the Spot, by E. J. Andrews, Esq.** Parts i, ii, iii, in one volume. London: 1839-42. mammoth folio.
- Joannis Pierii Valeriani Bellunensis Hieroglyphica, seu de Sacris Ægyptiorum aliarumque Gentium Literis Commentarii. . . .** Lugduni: 1610. fol.
- Pro Sacerdotum Barbis, ad Clarissimum Cardinalem Hippolytum Medicem Declamatio. Authore Joanne Pierio Valeriano Ballunensi . . . accesserunt Varia Poemata. . . .** Lugduni: 1610. fol.
- Hieroglyphicorum Collectanea, ex Veteribus et Neotericis descripta. In Sex Libros . . . et nunc primum Joannis Pierii Valeriani, et Eruditi Anonymi Sexaginta Hieroglyphicorum Libris addita.** Lugduni: 1610. fol. (the above three works bound together.)
- An Account of the Rosetta Stone, in Three Languages, which was brought to England in the Year 1802. By Rev. Matthew Raper. (Including a letter from Gen. H. Turner, a translation of the Greek text by Stephen Weston, and a Latin Version of the Trilingual Stone, together with Illustrations of the Inscription, by**

- Christ. Gottlob Heyne, etc.; and remarks on the inscription by Taylor Combe: from the *Archæologia, or Journal of the Antiquarian Society.*) London: 1807. 4to.
- Frid. Aug. Guil. Spohn, etc. de *Lingua et Literis Veterum Ægyptiorum cum Permultis Tabulis Lithographicis, Literas Ægyptiorum tum Vulgari tum Sacerdotali Ratione Scriptas explicantibus, atque Interpretationem Rosettanae aliarumque Inscriptionum et aliquot Voluminum Papyraceorum in Sepulcris reperorum exhibentibus. Accedunt Grammatica atque Glossarium Ægyptiacum.* Edidit. . . . Gustavus Seyfarth, etc. Lipsiæ: 1825-31. 2 vols. 4to.
- Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des Anciens Egyptiens, ou Recherches sur les Elémens Premiers de cette Ecriture Sacrée. . . . Par M. Champollion le Jeune. Seconde Edition, revue par l'Auteur, et augmentée de la Lettre à M. Dacier. . . . Paris: 1828. 8vo. and volume of plates. 1827. 8vo.
- Examen Critique des Principaux Groupes Hiéroglyphiques, par A. Thilorier. Paris: 1832. 4to.
- Rudiments of a Vocabulary of Egyptian Hieroglyphics. By Samuel Sharpe. London: 1837. 4to.
- Essay on the Hieroglyphic System of M. Champollion Jun., and on the Advantages which it offers to Sacred Criticism. By J. G. H. Greppo, etc. Translated from the French by Isaac Stuart, with Notes and Illustrations. Second Edition. New York: 1842. 8vo.
- Otia Ægyptiaca. Discourses on Egyptian Archæology and Hieroglyphical Discoveries. By George R. Gliddon. London: 1849. 8vo.
- A mummy skull, from the catacombs of Sakkara.
- Three ancient Egyptian scarabæi.
- The New Testament in Coptic and Arabic (the two versions in parallel columns on each page). Part I. The Gospels. 1847. Part II. Acts—Revelation. 1852. London, 2 vols. fol.
- Travels to discover the Sources of the Nile, in the Years 1768, 1769, 1770, 1771, 1772, and 1773. By James Bruce, etc. Edinburgh: 1805. 7 vols. 16mo. and Vol. 8, plates and maps. 4to.
- Travels in Nubia; by the late John Lewis Burckhardt. London: 1819. 4to.
- Inscriptiones Nubienses. Commentatio lecta in Conventu Academicæ Archæologiæ A. D. vi Kal. Aug. mccccxx. a B. G. Niebuhrio, etc. Romæ: 1820. 4to.
- Nubia and Abyssinia: comprehending their Civil History, Antiquities. . . . etc. By the Right Rev. M. Russell, etc. Edinburgh. 24mo.
- Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie, et d'Arménie; par Monsieur Maturin Veyssière Lacrose, etc. La Haie: 1739. 18mo.
- The Highlands of Ethiopia. By Maj. W. Cornwallis Harris, etc. London: 1844. 3 vols. 12mo.
- A Voyage to Abyssinia, by Father Jerome Lobo, etc., containing the History of that Country, continued down to the Beginning of the Eighteenth Century: with Fifteen Dissertations on Various Subjects, relative to the Antiquities, Government. . . . of Abyssinia. By M. le Grand. Translated from the French by Samuel Johnson, LL.D. To which are added various other tracts, by the same author. . . . London: 1789. 8vo.
- A Voyage to Abyssinia, and Travels into the Interior of that Country, executed under the orders of the British Government, in the years 1809 and 1810: in which are included, an Account of the Portuguese Settlements on the East Coast of Africa, . . . a Concise Narrative of Late Events in Arabia Felix; and some Particulars respecting the Aboriginal African Tribes, extending from Mosambique to the Borders of Egypt; together with Vocabularies of their respective Languages. . . . By Henry Salt, etc. London: 1814. 4to.
- Journals of the Rev. Messrs. Isenberg and Krapf, etc., detailing their Proceedings in the Kingdom of Shoa, and Journeys in other Parts of Abyssinia, in the Years 1839, 1840, 1841, and 1842. To which is prefixed, a Geographical Memoir of Abyssinia and South-eastern Africa, by James McQueen, Esq. . . . London: 1843. 8vo.
- Journal of Three Years' Residence in Abyssinia. By Rev. Samuel Gobat, etc. Preceded by an Introduction Geographical and Historical, on Abyssinia, translated from the French by Rev. Sereno D. Clark. Accompanied with a Biographical Sketch of Bishop Gobat, by Robert Baird, D.D. New York: 1850. 12mo.

- Life in Abyssinia; being Notes collected during three Years' Residence and Travels in that Country. By Mansfield Parkyns. New York: 1854. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Dictionary of the Amharic Language. In Two Parts. Amharic and English, and English and Amharic. By the Rev. Charles William Isenberg, etc. London: 1841. 4to.
- Grammar of the Amharic Language. By the Rev. Charles William Isenberg, etc. London: 1842. roy. 8vo.
- Life with the Zulus of Natal, South Africa. By G. H. Mason, etc. London: 1855. 16mo.
- Travels in Southern Africa, in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, and 1806. By Henry Lichtenstein, etc. Translated from the Original German, by Anne Plumptre. London: 1812-15. 2 vols. 4to.
- Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast, thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean. By David Livingstone, etc. New York: 1858. 8vo.
- Mission from Cape Coast Castle to Ashantee, with a Statistical Account of that Kingdom, and Geographical Notices of other Parts of the Interior of Africa. By T. Edward Bowdich, etc. London: 1819. 4to.
- Narrative of an Expedition to Explore the River Zaire, usually called the Congo, in South Africa, in 1816, under the direction of Captain J. K. Tuckey, etc. To which is added the Journal of Professor Smith: . . . London 1818. 4to.
- A New and Accurate Description of the Coast of Guinea, divided into the Gold, the Stone, and the Ivory Coasts. . . . Written originally in Dutch by William Bosman, etc. London: 1705. 16mo.
- The Journal of a Mission to the Interior of Africa, in the Year 1805. By Mungo Park. Together with other Documents, Official and Private, relating to the same Mission. To which is prefixed an Account of the Life of Mr. Park. London: 1815. 4to.
- Historical Account of Discoveries and Travels in Africa, by the late John Leyden, M.D. Enlarged, and completed to the Present Time, with Illustrations of its Geography and Natural History, as well as of the Moral and Social Condition of its Inhabitants. By Hugh Murray, etc. Edinburgh: 1817. 2 vols. 8vo.
- An Account of Timbuctoo and Housa, Territories in the Interior of Africa, by El Hage Abd Salan Shabeeny; with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. To which is added, Letters Descriptive of Travels through West and South Barbary, and across the Mountains of Atlas; also Fragments. . . . By James Grey Jackson, etc. London: 1826. 8vo.
- A Grammar and Vocabulary of the Yoruba Language, compiled by the Rev. Samuel Crowther, etc. Together with Introductory Remarks, by O. E. Vidal, etc. London: 1852. 8vo.
- Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, in the Years 1822, 1823, and 1824, by Major Denham, F.R.S., Captain Clapperton, and the late Doctor Oudney. . . . Third Edition. London: 1828. 2 vols. 8vo.
- An Expedition of Discovery into the Interior of Africa, through the hitherto Undescribed Countries of the Great Namaquas, Boschmans, and Hill Damaras. . . . conducted by Sir James Edward Alexander, etc. London: 1838. 2 vols. 12mo.
- Naukeurige Beschrijvinge der Afrikaensche Gewesten van Egypten, Barbaryen, . . . vertoont in de Benamingen, Grenspalen. . . . Met Lantkaarten. . . . Door Dr. O. Dapper. . . . Amsterdam: 1668. 4to.
- Naukeurige Beschrijvinge der Afrikaensche Eylander: als Madagaskar, of Sant Laurens. . . . vertoont in de Benamingen, Gelegentheit, Steden. . . . Door Dr. O. Dapper. Amsterdam: 1668. 4to. (bound with the preceding.)
- Travels, or Observations, relating to several Parts of Barbary and the Levant. Illustrated with Copperplates. By Thomas Shaw, etc. Edinburgh: 1808. 2 vols. 8vo.
- An Account of the Empire of Morocco, and the Districts of Suse and Tafillet; compiled from Miscellaneous Observations. . . . To which is added an Account of Shipwrecks on the Western Coast of Africa, and an Interesting Account of Timbuctoo, the Great Emporium of Central Africa. By James Grey Jackson, etc. London: 1814. 4to.

- Narrative of a Ten Years' Residence in Tripoli in Africa: from the Original Correspondence in the Possession of the Family of the late Richard Tully, Esq., the British Consul, comprising Authentic Memoirs and Anecdotes of the Reigning Bashaw, his Family, and other Persons of Distinction; also an Account of the Domestic Manners of the Moors, Arabs, and Turks. London: 1817. 4to.
- Narrative of a Residence in Algiers; comprising a Geographical and Historical Account of the Regency; Biographical Sketches of the Dey and his Ministers; Anecdotes of the Late War; Observations on the Relations of the Barbary States with the Christian Powers; and the Necessity and Importance of their Complete Subjugation. By Signor Pananti. London: 1818. 4to.
- A Narrative of Travels in Northern Africa, in the Years 1818, 19, and 20; accompanied by Geographical Notices of Soudan, and of the Course of the Niger . . . By Captain G. F. Lyon, etc. London: 1821. 4to.
- Adventures in the Libyan Desert, and the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. By Bayle St. John. New York: 1849. 12mo.
- The Pillars of Hercules; or, a Narrative of Travels in Spain and Morocco in 1848. By David Urquhart, etc. New York: 1850. 2 vols. 24mo.
- Algeria: the Topography and History, Political, Social, and Natural, of French Africa. By John Reynell Morell. London: 1854. 8vo.
- Etude sur la Conquête de l'Afrique par les Arabes, et Recherches sur les Tribus Berbères qui ont occupé le Maghreb Central. Par Henri Fournell. [Première Partie.] Paris: 1857. 4to.
- The Pilgrim's Progress, in Modern Greek, translated by S. C. Wilson. Malta: 1831. 12mo.

From Prof. Hermann Brockhaus, of Leipzig.

- Analyse des 6ten Buches von Somadeva's Märchensammlung, von Hermann Brockhaus [pp. 101-162 of Berichte der phil.-hist. Cl. d. Kön. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, 1860]. 8vo.
- Die Lieder des Hafis. . . herausgegeben von Hermann Brockhaus. iii, 1, 2. Leipzig: 1860. roy. 8vo.

From the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

- Transactions of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. Parts i, ii, iii, v, vi. Hongkong: 1848-59. 8vo.

From the Commissioner of Patents.

- Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the Year 1859. Agriculture. Washington: 1860. 8vo.

From Mr. George L. Ditson, of New York.

- Adventures and Observations on the North Coast of Africa; or, the Crescent and the French Crusaders. By G. L. Ditson, etc. New York: 1860. 12mo.

From M. Garcin de Tassy, of Paris.

- Description des Monuments de Dehli en 1852, d'après le Texte Hindoustani de Saiyid Ahmad Khan, par M. Garcin de Tassy, etc. [Extrait du Journal Asiatique.] Paris: 1861. 8vo.

From the German Oriental Society.

- Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. xiv. 3, 4; xv. 1. Leipzig: 1860. 8vo.
- Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. Band ii. Leipzig. 8vo.
- No. 1. Hermae Pastor. Aethiopicæ primum edidit et Aethiopica Latine vertit Antonius d'Abbadie. 1860.
- No. 2. Die Gáthás des Zarathustra. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert von Dr. Martin Haug. Zweite Abtheilung. 1860.

From Dr. L. H. Gulick, of Ponape.

- Notes on the Grammar of the Ponape Dialect. By L. H. Gulick, M.D. Honolulu: 1855. 12mo.

From Messrs. Hale, Morton, and Jones, of Philadelphia.

Report of the Committee appointed by the Philomathean Society of the University of Pennsylvania to translate the Inscription on the Rosetta Stone. [By Charles R. Hale, S. Huntington Jones, and Henry Morton.] Second Edition. Philadelphia: 1859. sm. 4to. lithographed, with illuminated borders and decorations, and numerous illustrations, printed in colors.

From Mr. Brian H. Hodgson, of Dursley, England.

Papers Relative to the Colonization, Commerce, Physical Geography, etc., etc., of the Himalaya Mountains and Nepal, by B. H. Hodgson, etc. Calcutta: 1857. 8vo. Essays on the aboriginal tribes of India, by B. H. Hodgson, extracted from various volumes of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal; viz. Aborigines of Southern India.—Aborigines of the South.—Aborigines of the Nilgiris.—Aborigines of the Eastern Ghâts.—Aborigines of the Nilgiris, with Remarks on their Affinities.—On the Aborigines of the Eastern Frontier.—Aborigines of the North East Frontier.—On the Indo-Chinese Borderers.—On the Mongolian Affinities of the Caucasians.—Route from Káthmándú, the Capital of Népal, to Darjeling in Sikim, interspersed with Remarks on the People and Country.—Memorandum relative to the Seven Cósís of Népal.—On the Chépáng and Kúsúnda Tribes of Népal.—Sifán and Hórsók Vocabularies, with another Special Exposition in the Wide Range of Mongolian Affinities, and Remarks on the Lingual and Physical Characteristics of the Family.—Comparative Vocabulary of the Languages of the Broken Tribes of Népal.—Comparative Vocabulary of the several Languages (Dialects) of the Celebrated People called Kirántis, now occupying the Easternmost Province of the Kingdom of Népal. . . .—Váyu Vocabulary.—Váyu Grammar.—Báhing Vocabulary.—Báhing Grammar.—On the Váyu Tribe of the Central Himálaya.—On the Kiránti Tribe of the Central Himálaya. [With numerous manuscript corrections, additions, and remarks, by the Author.]

From Prof. C. A. Holmboe, of Christiania, Norway.

Traces de Buddhisme en Norvège avant l'Introduction du Christianisme, par M. C. A. Holmboe, etc. Paris: 1857. 8vo.

Four essays, by C. A. Holmboe, on philological and archæological subjects, viz: Om Præget paa Nogle i Norden fundne Guldmynter og Guldbracteater fra Oldtiden.—Asaland og Vanaland.—Forsvar for den Maade, hvorpaa de Gamle Oversættelser gjengive Ordet קִרְיָטִים .—Om Betydningen af Ordet Saraph i det Gamle Testamente. (Extracts from Videnskabs-Seiskabets Forhandling for 1858 and 1859.)

From the University of Kiel.

Chronik der Universität zu Kiel, 1854–58. Kiel: 1855–59. 4to.

Schriften der Universität zu Kiel, aus dem Jahre 1859. Kiel: 1860. 4to.

From Dr. Adalbert Kuhn, of Berlin.

Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, etc. ix. 5, 6; x. 1–3. Berlin: 1860–61. 8vo.

Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sprachforschung, etc. ii. 3, 4. Berlin: 1860–61. 8vo.

From M. Léon de Rosny, of Paris.

Revue Orientale et Américaine, publiée. . . . par Léon de Rosny. Tome Troisième. Paris: 1860. 8vo.

The same, No. 27, for Dec. 1860. Paris. 8vo.

Four articles, by L. Léon de Rosny, on oriental subjects, viz: Le Livre de la Récompense des Bienfaits Secrets, traduit sur le Texte Chinois.—Sur une Nouvelle Carte du Royaume de Siam, dressée sous la Direction de M^r Pallegoix.—L'Orient.—Le Poème de Job et le Scepticisme Sémitique. (Extracts from the Journal Asiatique, etc.)

From Rev. D. W. Marsh, of Mosul.

A small Assyrian tablet, in burnt clay, impressed with cuneiform characters, and with three heads: about $2\frac{1}{2}$ by $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

From Rev. H. M. Morgan, of Antioch.

A photographic view of the Phœnician ruins of Ruad, on the coast of Syria.

From Mr. John Muir, of Edinburgh.

Original Sanskrit Texts on the Origin and Progress of the Religion and Institutions of India. . . . By J. Muir, etc. Part First. The Mythical and Legendary Accounts of Caste. 1858.—Part Second. Trans-Himalayan Origin of the Hindus, and their Affinity with the Western Branches of the Arian Race. 1860.—Part Third. The Vedas: Opinions of their Authors, and of Later Indian Writers, in regard to their Origin, Inspiration, and Authority. 1861. London. 3 vols. 8vo.
Index to Mr. Muir's Sanskrit Texts. Parts First and Second. Compiled by G. B. London: 1861. 8vo.

From the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. i. 3; ii. 1. Shanghai: 1859. 8vo.

From the Oriental Society of France.

Revue de l'Orient. Juillet, 1860. 8vo.

From M. Païé.

Pasigraphie mittels Arabischer Zahlzeichen. Ein Versuch von Moses Païé. Semlin: 1859. 8vo.

From Rev. Justin Perkins, D.D., of Oraniah.

A Manuscript Vocabulary of the Modern Syriac Language. sm. 4to.

From Miss Mary P. Pickering, of Salem.

Linguarum Duodecim Characteribus Differentium Alphabetum Introductio, ac Legendi Modus longè Facilimus. . . . Guilielmi Postelli Barentonii Diligentia. Paris: 1538. sm. 4to.

From Dr. A. T. Pratt, of Aleppo.

Four Saracenic Arrows, from the castle at Aleppo.

From M. Reinaud, of Paris.

Notice sur Mahomet, par M. Reinaud, etc. Extrait de la Nouvelle Biographie Générale. . . . avec quelques Additions. Paris: 1860. 8vo.

From Prof. E. Robinson, D.D., of New York.

A manuscript collection of treatises on religious subjects, in Modern Syriac; without title or date, and incomplete. sm. 4to.

From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. xvii. 2; xviii. 1. London: 1860. 8vo.

From Rev. D. C. Scudder, of Boston.

Manuscripts of the late Rev. H. R. Hoisington, viz:

Text and translation of the Siva-pirakâsam, a Tamil philosophical work (published in Journ. Am. Or. Soc., Vol. iv). fol.

Treatise on Hindu horoscopy (incomplete), and text and translation (incomplete) of Yokâpâdul, a Tamil poem on the conjunctions of planets at the birth of a child. fol.

Translation of the Kirakasintamani, a Tamil work on astrology (incomplete). 4to and fol.

A Comparative Grammar of the Hebrew Language, for the use of Classical and Philological Students. By John William Donaldson, D.D., etc. London: 1853. 12mo.

Synopsis of a Grammar of the Karen Language, embracing both Dialects, Sgau and Pgho or Sho. By F. Masoe. Tavoy: 1846. 4to.

From Rev. C. D. Seropyan, of Constantinople.

Esquisse de l'Histoire de l'Arménie. Coup d'Oeil sur l'Arménie Ancienne, et sur son État Actuel, par G. V. Chahnazarian. Paris: 1856. 8vo.

Histoire des Guerres et des Conquêtes des Arabes en Arménie, par l'Eminent Ghévond, Vardahed Arménien. Ecrivain du huitième Siècle, traduite par G. V. Chahnazarian, et enrichie de notes nombreuses. Paris: 1856. 8vo.

From the Smithsonian Institution.

Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge. Vols. xi, xii. Washington: 1859-61. 4to.
 Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections: Catalogue of the Described Diptera of North America, by R. Osten Sacken.—Directions for Collecting, Preserving, and Transporting Specimens of Natural History.—Catalogue of Publications of Societies and of other Periodical Works in the Library of the Smithsonian Institution, July 1, 1858. Foreign Works.—Catalogue of the Described Lepidoptera of North America, by John G. Morris. Washington: 1858-60. 8vo.

From the Society for American and Oriental Ethnography, of Paris.

Comptes-Rendus de la Société d'Ethnographie Américaine et Orientale. . . publiés par le Secrétaire Perpétuel. Tome Premier. Paris: 1860. 8vo.
 Annuaire Oriental et Américain, publié avec le Concours et sous les Auspices de la Société d'Ethnographie Américaine et Orientale, par Léon de Rosny, etc. Paris: 1860. 12mo.

From the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg.

Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg. i, ii. 1-3. St. Petersburg: 1860. 4to.
 Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg. i, ii, iii. 1. St. Petersburg: 1859-60. 4to.
 Ueber die Ueberreste der Altbabylonischen Literatur in Arabischen Uebersetzungen. Von D. Chwolsohn, etc. St. Petersburg: 1859. 4to.

From the Family of the late Prof. W. W. Turner, of Washington.

Two manuscript books, containing collections for studies on the Phœnician Inscription of Sidon, by Prof. W. W. Turner; being, the one a comparative table of the characters in fac-simile; the other, a comparative view of the transcriptions and translations of the scholars who have treated of the inscription. Also, criticisms on the different works which have appeared upon the subject (incomplete.—See Journ. Am. Or. Soc., vii. 55, 56).

From Dr. C. A. Van Dyck, of Beirut.

The New Testament in Arabic, being the version of Dr. Eli Smith, completed and published by Dr. Van Dyck. Beirut: 1860. 8vo.
 The same. Beirut: 1860. 16mo.

From the Imperial-Royal Geographical Society, of Vienna.

Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft. iii. 3. Wien: 1859. 8vo.

From Rev. Edward Webb, of Dindigal.

Tamil manuscript of the Sethu-Purāna, on 273 strips of palm-leaf.

From Messrs. Williams and Norgate, of London.

The Elements of the Vedantic Philosophy, translated from the Tamil, by Thomas Foulkes, etc. Madras: 1860. 8vo.

From Dr. S. Wells Williams, of Canton.

The treaty of 1860 between the United States and China, in Chinese. 8vo size.
 A Chinese map of the city of Hang-chow.

From Rev. W. F. Williams, of Mosul.

An Egyptian scarabæus, found in Assyria.
 A figure, cast in bronze, of the Assyrian goddess Astarte, found in a quarry near Mosul. About 2½ inches high: the head and body broken apart by a recent fracture.

From Dr. A. H. Wright, of Orumiah.

The Raudhat as-Safā, a history of Persia, in Persian. Teheran: A. H. 1270-72 (A. D. 1853-56). 3 vols. in 1. fol. lithographed.
 The Shah-Nameh. An Heroic Poem, containing the History of Persia from Kioumurs to Yesdejird; that is, 1849. [in Persian.] Shiraz: A. H. 1245 (A. D. 1830). fol. lithographed.

PROCEEDINGS.

~~~~~  
**New York, October 16th and 17th, 1861.**  
~~~~~

THE regular Autumn Meeting of the American Oriental Society was convened in New York, on Wednesday, October 16th, 1861, at the Council-Room of the University of the City of New York. The Society was called to order by the President soon after 3 o'clock, P. M.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read, the Directors announced that they had appointed the Committee of Arrangements, with the addition of the Corresponding Secretary, a Business Committee for the meeting. Also, that they had accepted with thanks, on behalf of the Society, an invitation from Rev. William Adams, D.D., to hold the evening session at his house, commencing at half past seven o'clock.

It was further announced that

Rev. Stephen Bush, Cohoes, N. Y.,
Rev. William Clark, Newburyport, Mass., and
Mr. Russell Sturgis, London,

had signified their acceptance of election, and become Corporate Members of the Society, since its last meeting; and that the gentleman last named, Mr. Sturgis, had made himself a Life Member.

The election of new members being next in order, all those persons recommended by the Directors were balloted upon, and chosen without dissent. As Corresponding Members, were elected

Dr. A. G. Paspati, Constantinople, and
Rev. E. W. Syle, Shanghai, China.

The Corresponding Secretary, Prof. Whitney of New Haven, laid on the table the correspondence of the last half year, and read such parts of it as were of a nature to interest the meeting. He had received from England the announcement of a prize offered through the Royal Asiatic Society for the best History and Exposition of the Vedanta System of Hindu Philosophy, to be written in English, French, or German, and handed in before October 1st, 1864; the prize is of £300, and is to be awarded by Professors Lassen of Bonn, Regnier of Paris, and Goldstücker of London. The requirements are: 1. A historical sketch of the origin and early development of the Vedantic doctrines; 2. a dissertation on the text-book of the system, the Brahma-sûtras; 3. a literal translation of this work, and of Çankara's commentary upon it, to be accompanied by the original text of the sûtras; 4. an explanation of the principal variations in doctrine exhibited by Vedantic writers posterior to Çankara.

A letter from Rev. Homer B. Morgan, of Antioch, was read, announcing the despatch to the Society of the inscription-stone from Daphne, of which the inscription had been transcribed and translated in Vol. vi of

the Society's Journal. The Secretary added that this interesting monument had come safely to hand, and would be made the subject of an additional communication at the present meeting.

Farther was read a letter from Rev. Edward Webb, of Dindigal, South India—dated Madras, June 27, 1861—accompanying an essay on the Scythian Affinities of the Dravidian Languages, which was itself later presented to the meeting.

Communications were now called for, and the following were presented :

1. On the Greek Inscription-Stone from Daphne, by Prof. James Hadley, of Yale College.

Prof. Hadley first briefly recapitulated the circumstances attending the discovery of the stone by Mr. Morgan, and his sending to this country the copies of its inscription which had been made the foundation of his own version and translation of it, published in the Society's Journal (vol. vi, pp. 550-55). He farther stated the circumstances which gave it a special interest—such as its extent, its well ascertained date of 189 B. C., the distinction of the Syrian king, Antiochus the Great, to whose time it belongs, and, above all, its connection with the long-celebrated temples and worship of Apollo and Artemis at Daphne; respecting these he entered into some illustrative details. He then went on to describe the stone, as it now stands in the Society's Cabinet at New Haven, and to give the results of a personal examination of it. It is irregularly broken off at the top, and there is nothing to forbid the conjecture, already expressed, that one or more lines have been lost in this way. The edges of the slab have also been a little broken, especially on the left, causing the disappearance of sundry letters. The characters are somewhat irregular in form and size, and still more in interval from each other, so that the successive lines, which have all the same length upon the stone, are very unequal in the printed copy. They are, besides, so lightly traced as to have been very easily obliterated, and from this circumstance arises the chief difficulty in making out the inscription. In one or two places, where a number of letters are gone, the surface of the stone is smooth, with scarcely any appearance of depression: one might almost think that the passing of a sponge over them had wiped them out.

Prof. Hadley also spoke of three conjectural readings proposed by the distinguished archaeologist, G. F. Schömann, of Greifswald, who has reproduced the inscription, from the Society's Journal, in the German periodical *Philologus*, Vol. xvii (1860), p. 344 etc. These are: 1. *ἡμῖν* for HMIN in line 20; 2. *Δαφναίων* for ΔΑΙΤΤΩΝ in line 22; 3. *συντάξει* (as subject of *ἔσται ἐπιμελής*, l. 20) for ΣΤΝΤΑΞΩΝ in line 31. In supporting his first and third changes, Schömann represents the king Antiochus as speaking in this document to the members of the city-council, and saying: "it shall be *your* care . . . to instal" the person designated as high priest: while he accounts for the enormous intervening parenthesis of eleven lines as the peculiarity of a cumbrous and long-winded court-style. An inspection of the stone shows, however, beyond all reasonable doubt, that the forms HMIN and ΣΤΝΤΑΞΩΝ were correctly given in Mr. Morgan's copy. As regards the second change, *Δαφναίων* for ΔΑΙΤΤΩΝ, the letters given in the copy as ITT are very obscure; and, though it does not seem possible to bring the traces on the stone into any connection with the ΦΝΑΙ which Schömann would recognize in them, yet this is perhaps hardly sufficient to justify the rejection of a reading which is so strongly recommended by its fitness for the place.

The painstaking and accuracy with which Mr. Morgan's copies had been executed were referred to as deserving of high commendation: it had not been found possible, upon a study of the monument itself, to emend in a single point the readings which they had furnished or suggested.

2. Evidences of the Scythian Affinities of the Dravidian Languages, condensed from Rev. R. Caldwell's Comparative Dravidian Grammar, by Rev. Edward Webb, of Dindigal, S. India.*

* See the Society's Journal, Vol. vii (1862), where this article is to be printed in full.

The letter of Mr. Webb, by which this paper was accompanied, stated that he had been led by strictures made by the Corresponding Secretary, in a private communication to himself, on Mr. Caldwell's work, to give a renewed examination to the latter's arguments for the Scythian relationship of the Southern Indian languages, and that his faith in them had thereby been increased; while he had also been impressed with the opinion that their force was much diminished by their being scattered at large through Mr. Caldwell's volume, and that, were they presented in combination, their weight would be more clearly appreciated and more universally acknowledged. He had accordingly collected, combined, and condensed them, adding a few remarks and suggestions from other sources, in confirmation of the author's views. His article, after some introductory matter, treated of the Scythian affinity of the languages in question under the following heads: 1. history of the Dravidian people; 2. absence of physiological evidence to the contrary; 3. evidence derived from religious usages; 4. evidence furnished by the Behistun tablets; 5. evidence from grammatical analysis, as furnished by a consideration of *a*. the phonetic laws; *b*. roots; *c*. nouns; *d*. numerals; *e*. pronouns; and *f*. verbs; 6. evidence from glossarial affinities.

The paper was read by the Corresponding Secretary, who accompanied it with remarks upon the subjects discussed, and criticisms of the arguments presented.

3. A Chart of Chinese Ethics, with a Translation, and Remarks on the Ethical Philosophy of the Chinese, by Rev. W. A. P. Martin, D.D., of Ningpo, China.

The general character of the chart, which was exhibited to the meeting, was explained by Dr. Martin: it laid no claim to originality, but was a successful and popular epitome and systematization of the national scheme of ethics. He then explained its arrangement and contents. It consists of four parts: 1. An epitome of the *Ta-hio*, the first and most esteemed of the Confucian classics. This exhibits, in parallel columns, the rule of virtue and the art of government, the latter founded on the former, and the whole denominated the "Great Study," as the name signifies. The very title of this treatise has done much to give a preponderance to ethical studies in China, and the tract itself has imparted a moral tone to the spirit of the empire, exerting, through more than twenty centuries, an influence as beneficent as it has been powerful.—2. A chart of the heart. This places in contrast the traits of the virtuous and the vicious character, the dispositions from which they proceed being denominated *Taou-sing* and *Jin-sing*, the 'wisdom-heart' and the 'human heart.' The goodness of human nature is a prime article in the Chinese creed, but experience, opposed to theory, has led them to put "human" as the antithesis to "wisdom and virtue;" and, in drawing a genealogical tree of the vices, the human heart is placed at the root. This inconsistency they reconcile by a hypothesis similar to the Platonic account of the origin of evil.—3. A chart of moral excellence. In this, the virtues are grouped in five families, under the heads of benevolence, justice, wisdom, good-faith, and politeness. This was shown to be more complete and Christian like than the Greek and Roman classification under their four cardinals.—4. A chart of the vices, the counterpart of the foregoing, and intended as an aid in self-examination. The thorny path of self knowledge exhibits even in China here and there a traveller, but the religious sentiments of the Chinese are too feeble to make the study of the heart, and the practice of virtue, a familiar duty.—The work is valuable as a projection of the national mind: and, while it betrays a want of analytical power, and a very elementary stage in mental science, it gives unmistakable evidence of a high state of civilization. The chart treated of was presented to the Society's Library by Dr. Martin, along with its translation.

At the conclusion of the reading of this paper, the afternoon session of the meeting was, as before arranged, adjourned.

At the evening meeting, held at the residence of Rev. Dr. Adams, the presentation of communications was resumed.

4. A Brahman's Sermon, with Remarks on the Popular Religion and Worship of the Hindus, by Rev. Nathan Brown, D.D., of New York, formerly Missionary in Assam.

Dr. Brown began with a summary exposition of the popular religion of India, as distinguished from the abstruse metaphysical systems of the Hindu religious books. Its fundamental ideas are clear and simple. The universe consists of matter and spirit: the latter is God, the former the body or dress in which he is clothed. All mind is Deity: as fire may be separated and become a thousand fires, which are still all the same fire, so the original Mind is divided into millions of minds, yet all are parts of the same whole. Minds pass from one body into another, and thus go on through an almost endless round of transmigration, before they are again absorbed into the Deity. Two antagonistic principles are observed in constant operation—the principle of increase and preservation, and the principle of destruction: these opposing powers are Vishnu, the Preserver, and Shiva, the Destroyer. Preaching, of course, bears no such part in the Hindu religious services and worship as in ours, yet it was not unusual, at religious festivals, for learned Brahmans to harangue the assembled crowds of their countrymen on matters of religion. Their manner was very quiet, their posture a sitting one, their style of delivery a cadenced monotone, and all gestures were eschewed: anything different from this was thought unsuited to the dignity and sacredness of the theme. Dr. Brown read in full such a harangue as is thus given: a great part of it had been taken down connectedly, as the report of a single actual address: but he had somewhat enlarged and completed it by adding a few other of the commonplaces of these discourses. It began with a lament over the degeneracy of modern times as compared with ancient, and the resulting judgments brought upon the country—in part, the domination of foreigners, and the intrusion of foreign teachers. The staple of the discourse consisted thenceforward in denunciations of the missionaries, and artful and ingenious appeals to the prejudices of the auditors against them and their doctrine. Dr. Brown was himself specially denounced, and threatened with misfortune, for having in his profane possession a *sālagrāma*, or sacred stone, such as is revered by the Brahmans as a direct incarnation of Vishnu. The stone referred to was passed around for the inspection of the members present. It was of a rounded shape, rather larger than the fist, of a very dark green color, and open on one side into a hollow within, which showed the interior cavity of some fossil shell, apparently an ammonite.

5. On Recent Explorations in the Lake Country of Eastern Equatorial Africa, by Mr. Daniel C. Gilman, of Yale College.

In this paper, Mr. Gilman gave a sketch of the history of opinion and of discovery with reference to the lake or lakes occupying a part of the eastern interior of Africa, between the equator and about 12° S. latitude. It had been from ancient times a prevailing opinion that the Nile had its rise in a vast lake, and the Portuguese, since their occupation of the Zanzibar coast, had told of a lake in the interior, which was also laid down on their maps, with uncertain position and limits. In 1845, Mr. Cooley, of London, had carefully compared all the information obtained concerning this lake, and attempted to fix its position and relations. The question was stated anew by Petermann in 1855. The same year, the Mombasa missionaries, Rebmann and Erhardt, sent home accounts which they believed correct of an immense inland sea, called Unyamezi or Ukerewe, very nearly as large as the Black and Caspian together. These, with the accompanying map, were published in Petermann's *Geographische Mittheilungen*, not without a skeptical re-examination of their authorities, and a consequent change of place of the lake, with a reduction of it to less than half the stated dimensions. In 1856, Capts. Burton and Speke set out in search of this sea, and discovered in 1858 a lake Tanganyika, occupying part of the area claimed for it: they estimated it to extend 250 miles north and south, with a breadth of 20 miles, and regarded it as absorbing, without an outlet, the river-system of that part of the continent. In another part of the same expedition, Capt. Speke came upon the southern extremity of the lake Nyanza, 350 miles to the northeast, and 2000 feet higher, which he regarded as the source of the Nile. Various expeditions are now approaching the region from different sides, and we

may hope soon to receive a full solution of the various questions raised about it. Speke has again set out inland from Zanzibar, for the exploration of the Nyanza: Petherick is ascending the Nile to meet him: Livingstone is on the southern edge of the region, and has explored one small lake, the source of a branch of the Shire, and separated from another lake—perhaps the Nyassa—by but a narrow interval. Other explorers of less consequence are laboring to penetrate the same country.

Mr. Gilman's discussion of the subject was illustrated by maps, and by charts which presented the views and theories and discoveries of the different writers and travellers to whose works reference was made.

6. On the Ruins of Ancient Nineveh, by Rev. Dwight W. Marsh, Missionary in Eastern Turkey, lately stationed at Mosul.

Mr. Marsh's object was, by an oral description of these ruins, to convey as lively an impression as possible of their situation, extent, and present appearance. He first described the general aspect of the plain, with its background of mountains, as seen from the house-tops of Mosul: he indicated the site and appearance of the mounds upon this plain which cover the remains of the city, both as seen from Mosul, and as beheld by one riding over and among them—the great circuit of the wall of the city, with the two principal mounds of Kouyunjik and Nebbi Yunus in it, and the remoter outlying series of mounds, from Khorsabad on the north to Nimroud on the south. He gave an account of the method of the excavations undertaken by Layard and others, and the look of the edifices as laid open by them, and explained the mode of construction of the latter, as raised upon immense elevated platforms, composed of long narrow halls of great height, which were separated by heavy walls of unburnt brick, lined at the base with the well-known sculptured slabs of gypsum, and covered with wooden roofs. He pointed out the evidences that the buildings were destroyed by fire, and, referring to the interesting and difficult question of how their ruins had become covered as at present under mounds of earth, said that he could not explain it otherwise than by their having become, during the twenty centuries of their ruined state, filled up and enveloped by dust and sand blown into and over them from the neighboring plains during the heat and dryness of summer: in connection with this, he spoke of the violent dust-storms and sand-spouts which are often seen sweeping through the valley.

Reference being made to the battle-field of Arbela, the scene of the final conflict between Alexander and Darius, Mr. Marsh was drawn on by inquiries to point out its precise situation, and set forth the circumstances by which its identity is established.

With this the reading of communications was closed for the evening, and, after an hour or two of social intercourse and festivity, the Society separated.

The Society reassembled on Thursday morning, Oct. 17th, at 9 o'clock, in the Law lecture-room of the University.

After the transaction of a few matters of business, Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge, introduced the subject of the very illiberal management of the Vatican Library, in the past and at present, and the almost insuperable difficulties thrown in the way of scholars who desired to make acquaintance with its treasures, or use them for the benefit of the world—difficulties of which he had himself, within no long time, made experience. He referred to the prospect that Rome might at an early day become a part of the Kingdom of Italy, and thought it would not be impertinent or out of order to request our Minister at Turin to use his influence in putting an end to the present style of administration of the Library, and introducing a system which should render its collections

readily accessible to those who are qualified and desirous to use them. He therefore moved the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the American Minister in Italy be respectfully requested to use, at the earliest opportunity that may offer and in such a manner as he may deem expedient, his influence in bringing about a change in the administration of the Vatican Library.

Resolved, That the President and Corresponding Secretary be requested to communicate, with a suitable explanation, the foregoing resolution to the American Minister in Italy.

The offering of communications was then resumed.

7. Notes on the City of Yedo, by Dr. R. Lindau; communicated by Rev. E. W. Syle, of Shanghai, China.

This paper was a detailed and elaborate description of the Japanese capital, founded on native documents and on personal observations. After describing its geographical position and general situation, Dr. Lindau takes up the different quarters of the city, in the following order: 1. The suburb of Honjo, on the east side of the Ogava river; 2. Siro, the imperial castle, the nucleus of the city proper; 3. Soto-siro, "outside the castle," separated from the castle and from the Midzi respectively by broad canals; the portion of it between the castle and the bay and Ogava river being the true commercial city; 4. Midzi, "habitation-town," extending out into the country on every side except toward the bay. The author goes through in succession the districts into which these principal divisions are subdivided, specifying the temples, palaces, and other things of interest which they severally contain, and indicating the character of their population; naming also the principal roads, canals, and bridges. In a general recapitulation and summary, he distributes as follows the 85 square kilometres (each about $\frac{1}{18}$ of a sq. mile) which he estimates the whole city to cover: paddy-fields, 26 $\frac{1}{2}$; temples, 19 $\frac{1}{2}$; palaces, 30 $\frac{1}{2}$; residences of the population at large, only the small remainder, or 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ square kilometres. The population he estimates much below the number usually reckoned, or at 1,555,000, divided between followers of the great princes, 90,000; followers of the lesser princes, 342,000; imperial officials, 150,000; priests, 200,000; merchants and other residents (by actual census in 1857), 573,000; floating population, 200,000. The external aspect of the city is described as imposing from a distance, but rather poor and mean from within: in riding through it, one might alternately think he was passing through a flourishing village, or the handsome park of a rich proprietor, or a manufacturing city with a poor population. The finest sight to be seen in it is the cortege of a prince, making its way through the streets. Vehicles drawn by beasts of burden are unknown, and horsemen are very rarely to be seen.

The description was illustrated by Mr. Syle by reference to a large colored Japanese map of the city, borrowed by him for the occasion.

After the reading of this paper was finished, Dr. Martin exhibited to the meeting a smaller map of Yedo, as also a map of Nagasaki, both which he had brought for presentation to the Society's Cabinet. He likewise showed an impression from the face of the Nestorian monument of Si-ngan Fu, brought for a similar purpose, but which, as the Society already possessed two counterparts of it, he should dispose of in another manner: like the Society's copies, it presented only the two lines of Estrangelo characters which run along the principal Chinese inscription, and not the rest of the Syriac portion of the inscription. The subject of this famous inscription being thus introduced, reference was made by the Corresponding Secretary to a somewhat flippant criticism, coming from a German source (*Zeitsch. d. Deut. Morg. Gesellschaft*, xiv. 173), upon Mr. Wylie's article respecting it, printed in Volume v. of the Society's Journal, and Dr. Martin was inquired of as to the state of opinion among Chinese scholars, native and foreign, in China itself, touching the disputed question

of the authenticity of the inscription. He replied that he knew of no foreign scholar of note who questioned its authenticity; and as to the Chinese, it had not apparently entered into their heads to doubt it: the question was no question at all to them. He strongly supported the genuineness of the inscription, as a work of the period and authorship to which it laid claim. Its forgery by Chinese hands he regarded as an utter impossibility; and even with Jesuit aid, it was so exceedingly improbable as to be virtually impossible.

8. On Lepsius's Standard Alphabet, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of Yale College.

Prof. Whitney stated that he had been repeatedly inquired of, by missionaries and others, during two or three years past, respecting the merits of Lepsius's "Standard Alphabet for reducing Unwritten Languages to a Uniform Orthography in European Letters" (Leipsic, 1855; London, do.), and that he had been led thereby, and by the general interest of the subject, to give the work a careful examination, of which he presented the results in this paper. He began with considering the general aspects of the question, setting forth the end to be attained and the difficulties in the way of attaining it; he detailed the qualifications required for treating such a matter successfully, and showed the especial fitness of Lepsius for the work: in this, and in the extensive approbation and adoption which the work had received at the hands of literary and missionary associations, he saw powerful reason for regarding it in the most favorable light possible, and aiding in securing its general acceptance. He then went on to examine and criticise in detail the analysis of spoken sounds, and the rules for transcription laid down, and the system of signs for sounds selected by Prof. Lepsius:—but as the paper is expected to appear in full in the next Number of the Society's Journal, it is not necessary to give here any fuller statement of its contents.

In the course of the discussion which followed the reading of this communication, Messrs. Martin and Syle explained to the meeting the methods of transcription of the Chinese vernacular dialects adopted by the missionaries in China.

9. On the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus, as edited by Dr. J. Bernays of Breslau, by Prof. Charles Beck, of Cambridge.

Prof. Beck gave a summary account of the life and literary activity of Severus, as reported by his editor. He referred particularly to his connection or sympathy with certain heretical sects of his time, which were persecuted and repressed by the civil rulers, and pointed out passages in his Sacred History where he had slightly altered or added to the scriptural account, evidently in covert allusion to these and other events of his own period. Such alterations were regarded by Bernays as of little or no account, but Prof. Beck thought them important, as indicating that the chronicler was not altogether above amending his authorities where it suited his own purposes. He then went on to the principal topic discussed in his paper—namely, Severus's account of the circumstances preceding and attending the capture of Jerusalem, in which he differs greatly from Josephus respecting Titus's purpose as regards the destruction of the temple and city, as well as the good faith of his offers of peace during the siege. Prof. Beck offered a full synopsis of Bernays's elaborate argument intended to prove that Severus was upon this matter more trustworthy than Josephus, who wrote under the influence of Titus himself, and that he had derived his facts from the part of the History of Tacitus now lost. He then, while doing full justice to the great learning and ingenuity displayed by Bernays, proceeded to answer his arguments, and to show that they lacked a sufficient foundation, and did not touch the credibility of Josephus, whose account was much more to be relied upon than that of the later chronicler.

The hour fixed upon for adjournment having arrived, the Directors gave notice that the next meeting of the Society would be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 21, 1862; a vote of thanks to the authorities of the University for the use of their rooms, kindly afforded for the occasion, was passed; and the Society adjourned.

P R O C E E D I N G S.

~~~~~  
**Boston and Cambridge, May 21st, 1862.**  
 ~~~~~

THE Annual Meeting of the Society was held in Boston and Cambridge, Wednesday, May 21st, 1862, commencing at 10 o'clock A. M., at the room of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, in the Athenæum building, Boston.

The chair was taken by Prof. Beck, of Cambridge, who briefly explained to the Society the circumstances which caused the absence of its President from the meeting: he had recently sailed for Europe, for the benefit of his health, and especially in order to consult eminent foreign oculists with respect to his eyes, of the use of which he had been deprived during several months past. A resolution expressing the regret and sympathy of the Society was a little later offered by the Corresponding Secretary, and unanimously adopted, as follows:

Resolved, That the Society sees with regret the absence of its honored President, Prof. Edward Robinson, D.D., of New York, and is pained to learn that he has been compelled by the state of his health, and especially by the impaired condition of his eye-sight, to cross the ocean for medical aid; and it would express its earnest hope that the voyage may prove successful, and that the health and strength, so important in this case to the interests of learning, may be restored and long preserved.

The Treasurer's report was presented, containing the following *résumé* of the receipts and expenditures of the year:

R E C E I P T S.				
Balance on hand, May 22nd, 1861,	-	-	-	\$557.22
Member's fees: one life-membership,	-	-	\$75.00	
ann. assessments for 1861-62,	-	-	395.00	
do. do. for previous years,	-	-	145.00	
do. do. for 1862-63,	-	-	5.00	620.00
Sale of Journal,	-	-	-	57.71
Total receipts during the year,	-	-	-	<u>\$677.71</u>
				\$1234.93
E X P E N D I T U R E S.				
Paper and printing for Journal, Vol VII (in part),	-	-	-	\$566.34
Other printing,	-	-	-	7.89
Binding books,	-	-	-	48.50
Expenses of Library, Cabinet, correspondence, etc.,	-	-	-	46.25
Total expenditures during the year,	-	-	-	<u>\$668.98</u>
Balance on hand, May 21st, 1862,	-	-	-	565.95
				<u>\$1234.93</u>

It was explained that the balance in the Treasury appeared greater than it actually was, because there was a larger outstanding liability

now than at the corresponding time last year, on account of the printing of the Part of the Journal, yet incomplete, which is to form the issue for 1861-62.

The Treasurer's accounts were audited by a committee, and accepted by the Society.

The Librarian presented and read a list of the donors to the Library and Cabinet during the year past, and described the several donations.* He stated that the present number of titles of printed books contained in the Library was 2358, and of manuscripts, 117. About \$50 had been expended in binding.

The Committee of Publication informed the Society that the second half of the seventh volume of the Journal, due to the members at or about the time of this meeting, was not yet through the press, and that its distribution would be unavoidably deferred for some time longer. The Number was to contain, besides the usual miscellanies, three principal articles; of these, two were presented at the last meeting, viz. Mr. Webb on the Dravidian Languages, and Prof. Whitney on Lepsius's Standard Alphabet: the third, the text of the Atharva-Veda Prâtiçâ-khya, with translation and notes, by Prof. Whitney, which would be presented at this meeting, was already partly in type, and was being pushed forward as rapidly as circumstances permitted.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the names of the following persons, who, having accepted election to Corporate Membership of the Society since its last meeting, were newly enrolled in its list of members:

- Mr. George L. Ditson, Burlington, Vt.
- Mr. Pelatiah Perit, New Haven.
- Mr. Charles E. West, LL.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.

He farther reported the decease during the past six months of the following Corporate and Corresponding Members:

- Pres. Cornelius C. Felton, LL.D., Cambridge, Mass.
- Prof. Samuel H. Turner, D.D., New York.
- Pres. John Wheeler, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
- Rev. Elijah C. Bridgman, D.D., Shanghai, China.
- Rev. Harrison G. O. Dwight, D.D., Constantinople.
- Rev. Benjamin C. Meigs, lately of Ceylon.
- P. E. LeVaillant de Florival, Paris.

This announcement, containing a greater than usual number of venerated names, was not suffered to pass without due expression of the Society's sense of the losses it had sustained, and a tribute of admiring respect to the memories of the deceased. Dr. Francis, of Cambridge, gave an eloquent sketch of the life and labors of Pres. Felton, and an estimate of his character as a man and as a scholar. Dr. Anderson spoke in the same strain, and added also a more particular statement of his important aid to the Society in the early years of its weakness. Dr. Anderson then went on to describe the character, as laborers in the missionary work and in the cause of science, of Drs. Bridgman and Dwight and Mr. Meigs, and was followed upon the same subject by Rev.

* A list of the accessions to the Library and Cabinet since May 1861 will be found appended to this report of Proceedings.

Mr. Treat and Rev. Dr. Allen, and farther, by Rev. Dr. Dean, of Shanghai, in an especial tribute to his late fellow-laborer in China. The Corresponding Secretary added a few words respecting the position and services of Dr. Turner and Prof. de Florival.

The Directors presented to the meeting the names of several gentlemen, recommending that they be elected Corporate Members of the Society, and they were, upon ballot held, elected without dissent.

The Directors farther gave information that they had reappointed the Committee of Publication of last year. Also, that they had accepted an invitation of the members of the Society at Princeton, N. J., to hold the next Semi-annual meeting in that city, and had appointed it to be held there on the 15th of October next, designating Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, Alexander I. Cotheal, Esq., of New York, and the Corresponding Secretary, as Committee of Arrangements for the meeting.

The Business Committee for the present meeting announced that they proposed that, in accordance with the usual custom of late years, the morning session should adjourn at or before 1 o'clock, and that the Society should reassemble at 4 o'clock, at the residence of Dr. Beck, in Cambridge: and the proposal was, upon motion, accepted by the Society.

The election of a board of officers for the ensuing year being next in order, the following gentlemen, proposed by a nominating committee, were balloted for and duly chosen:

President—Prof. EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D., of New York.

Vice-Presidents { Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D., " Cambridge.
Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D., " Boston.
Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D D., LL. D., " New Haven.

Corresponding Secretary—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, " New Haven.

Secr. of Classical Section—Prof. JAMES HADLEY, " New Haven.

Recording Secretary—Mr. EZRA ABBOT, " Cambridge.

Treasurer—Mr. D. C. GILMAN, " New Haven.

Librarian—Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, " New Haven.

Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., " Boston.

Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D., " New York.

Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D., " Princeton.

Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D., " New York.

Prof. A. P. PEABODY, D. D., " Cambridge.

Dr. CHARLES PICKERING, " Boston.

Prof. E. E. SALISBURY, " New Haven.

The Corresponding Secretary laid upon the table the correspondence of the half-year, and described its character. The only parts of it which he proposed to read were two papers which had been sent to him to be laid before the present meeting. These were accordingly called for first among the communications to be presented.

1. Brief Notes on the Language of the Kemi Tribe, in Arracan; by Rev. L. Stilson, lately missionary of the American Baptist Missionary Union in Farther India.

A letter from Mr. Stilson, accompanying this paper, gave an account of the circumstances which led to his making acquaintance with the tribe, and of his residence among them for several months in 1843, for the purpose of gaining some knowledge

of their language, and preparing a system for its reduction to writing, in the Burmese character. A spelling book and reader were prepared by him, specimens of which were sent with the paper. Circumstances, however, had caused the relinquishment of the plan formed by the Missionary Union for establishing a mission with the tribe, intercourse with it had terminated, the books prepared had not been used, and no European had since learned the language. The paper, which is expected to appear in a future number of the Journal, contained a summary presentation of the Kemi grammar, with brief vocabulary, sentences, Lord's Prayer, and analysis.

2. On the Species or Derivative Forms of Semitic Verbs, by Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J.

In this brief paper, Prof. Green gave a concise exhibition of the Semitic scheme of conjugations, founding it upon the Arabic, as the most complete and regular among them. He first pointed out the fundamental character of the Semitic roots, as trilateral, and as developing into forms in great part by internal modification, instead of, as in the Indo-European languages, by external additions alone. The first form of Semitic conjugation was produced by vocalizing the consonants, as *qatala*; this was strengthened by duplication, prolongation, or prefixion of a vowel, to form the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th conjugations, with transitive, intensive, or causative meaning, as *qattala*, *qátala*, *aqtala*; and again, with duplication at the end, the 9th and 11th, or color conjugations, as *qtalla*, *qtállé*. The formation of the passive of these and the other forms was by a weaker vocalization, as *qutíla*, *quttíla*, etc. Middles were derived by the prefixion of reflexive pronominal elements, *n* and *t*, giving, from the first, the 7th and 8th, as *inqátala*, *iqtátala*, from the 2nd and 3rd, the 5th and 6th, as *taqátala*, *taqátala*, and from the 4th, with the help also of a sibilant, the 10th, *istáqala*. The Hebrew conjugations are identical with some of these, formed with the same materials and in the same manner. The other dialects have lost all means of forming middles and passives except by prefixing *t*. The Hebrew rarely, and the Ethiopic regularly, produces compound forms, ingrafting one conjugational sign upon another.

The comparative scheme of conjugations is then as follows:

ARABIC.	Simple.	Intensive.	Trans. or Rel.	Causative.	Intens., Color.
Active (with passive)	1	2	3	4	9, 11
Middle (with passive)	7, 8	5	6	10	
ETHIOPIC.					
Active	1	2	3	4	(2×4 3×4)
Middle	8	5	6	10	(2×10 3×10)
ARAMAIC.					
Active	<i>Peal</i>	<i>Pael</i>	<i>Aphel</i> and <i>Shaphel</i> .		
Middle	<i>Ithpeel</i>	<i>Ithpaal</i>	<i>Ittaphal</i> and <i>Ishtaphal</i> .		
HEBREW.					
Active	<i>Kal</i>	<i>Piel</i>	<i>Hiphil</i> .		
Passive		<i>Pual</i>	<i>Hophal</i> .		
Middle	<i>Niphal</i>	<i>Hithpaal</i>			

The presentation of communications was resumed in the afternoon, at the meeting in Cambridge.

3. The Atharva-Veda Prâtiçákhyá, or Çâunakîyâ Caturâdhyâyikâ: Text, Translation, and Notes, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

This work, which is to occupy a considerable part of the forthcoming half volume of the Society's Journal, was laid before the meeting by Prof. Whitney. He read, by way of specimens of it, the introduction, and characteristic passages of the translation, with the notes upon them. He then described the position and value in the Hindu literature of the class of works of which this was one, the system of

schools of Vedic study in which they grew up, and the character of the grammatical science which they represented.

The subjects touched upon led to a general discussion of the probable mode of transmission of the Vedas and of the Prātiçākhyas themselves, and on the extent to which the memory may be trained to preserve long literary compositions without the aid of writing.

4. On Chwolson's "Remains of Ancient Babylonian Literature in Arabic Translations," by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley began by referring to a former communication, presented Oct. 18, 1860, in which his aim was to describe the memoir of Chwolson, rather than to criticise it. He spoke of the discussions excited by the startling announcement of an extant Babylonian literature, as old, nearly, as the Pentateuch; and mentioned particularly the adverse criticisms of Renan and Gutschmidt—Renan's (a full analysis of his memoir) in the *Journal de l'Institut* for 1860, and Gutschmidt's in the 15th volume of the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. He then proceeded to give a condensed synopsis of the objections urged against the antiquity and authenticity of the writings which Ibn Wah-shiyyah, about 900 A.D., professed to translate from the Nabathæan (or Babylonian) language into Arabic. The following were specified as the main grounds of objection:—1. The way in which they represent Adam, Seth, Noah, Abraham, and other biblical personages, with legendary features, such as appear in Rabbinic, Christian, and Mohammedan traditions.—2. The numerous references which they make to the Greeks (or Ionians), as having a prose literature known to the Babylonians and looked upon by them with jealousy. Also, allusions to Greek mythology, and traces of Pythagorean and New-Platonic ideas.—3. Apparent allusions to the religious festivals of the Christians, and to their monastic system, as developed in the East.—4. The spirit and character of these writings, diffuse, trivial, rationalistic, and in general unlike the known productions of very early times.—5. Their total absence of agreement, and even of connection, with the notices of Babylonian antiquity found in the fragments of Berosus and in other sources. It was shown that these arguments, taken as a whole, are unanswerable, and that the Nabathæan writings must accordingly be recognized as forgeries. As to the time when they were forged, Prof. Hadley stated the views of Renan, who regards them as composed in an Aramaean dialect, shortly before the rise of Mohammedanism, and of Gutschmidt, who holds that (excepting, perhaps, the one ascribed to Tenkelusha) they were, all of them, productions of Ibn Wah-shiyyah himself; and then gave his reasons for preferring the latter opinion.

5. On the Historical Credibility of the Reported Burning of the Alexandrian Library by order of the Caliph Omar, by Prof. Convers Francis, D.D., of Cambridge.

This was a full and elaborate discussion of the historical point which formed its subject. Its author assembled and reviewed the information handed down to us respecting the libraries assembled at Alexandria during its flourishing period, and their fates under the Christian domination down to the time of the Mohammedan invasion, arguing that they had greatly suffered prior to the latter event, and that the continued existence of so colossal a collection was not probable. He then traced the popular story respecting the destruction of the library to its earliest sources, which he showed to be considerably posterior to the alleged event, while no notice of it was found in authors more nearly contemporary. He examined the story itself in the light of its own intrinsic probability and the credibility of its details, indicating its weak points, and also in the light of its relation to the character of the Mohammedan conquerors. His conclusions were decidedly unfavorable to the trustworthiness of the narrative.

The time of adjournment having arrived, the Society separated, to come together again at Princeton, N. J., on Wednesday, Oct. 15th, 1862.

PROCEEDINGS.

Princeton, October 15th and 16th, 1862.

Pursuant to adjournment, the Society convened for its Semi-annual Meeting on Wednesday, October 15th, 1862, at 3 o'clock, P. M., in the Library room of the College of New Jersey, at Princeton, N. J.

In the absence of the President, who was understood to be upon his way home from Europe, the chair was taken by Dr. Beck, of Cambridge, the only Vice-President present. Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven, was appointed Recording Secretary *pro tempore*.

The Committee of Arrangements gave notice of their proposed plan of proceedings for the meeting: namely, that the Society should adjourn at about 6 o'clock, to meet again at 9 o'clock on the morning of the next day, and should accept an invitation from Prof. Green to a social gathering at his house in the evening. The proposal was accepted, and the sessions ordered accordingly.

From the Directors was reported a recommendation that, in view of the disturbed state of the country and consequent straitening of the means of many of the members, and also because the publication of the half-volume of the Journal for 1861-62 had been so long delayed that it would not be possible to issue another before the end of the current fiscal year, the collection of the annual assessment for the year be omitted. The proposition was briefly discussed, and, upon motion, adopted, and the Society voted not to exact of its members the regular contribution for 1862-63.

The following gentlemen, elected at the last meeting, were announced as having become Corporate Members:

Prof. James M. Hoppin, of New Haven.
Rev. T. Starr King, of San Francisco, Cal.
Rev. Charles P. Krauth, D.D., of Philadelphia.
Prof. Andrew P. Peabody, D.D., of Cambridge.

Other gentlemen, proposed by the Directors, were by ballot duly elected to membership; among them, as Corresponding Member,

Rev. Isidore Loewenthal, Missionary at Peshawur, N. W. India.

The Committee of Publication reported that the completion of the part of the Journal now due to the members had been delayed by the difficult nature of the matter in hand longer than was anticipated, but that its appearance would be deferred but a few weeks.

The Corresponding Secretary presented his budget, and read two brief communications which had been sent to him for presentation to the meeting. One of these was by Mr. George L. Ditson, of Burlington, Vt., upon the significance of the Semitic letter *aleph*; the other was by Mr. Pliny E. Chase, of Philadelphia, on the radical etymology of the words *love* and *friend*.

The following communications were then offered :

1. On the Aspirate Mutes of the Primitive Indo-European Language, by Prof. James Hadley, of New Haven.

The paper began with an examination of the aspirate letters in the various branches of the Indo-European family. The Sanskrit *ph, bh, th, dh*, etc., are now sounded in India as *p, b, t, d*, etc., followed by a distinctly audible *h*. That the *h* was prominent in the ancient sounds is proved by the fact that they often passed into it, losing their mute element. This fact seems fatal to the recently expressed opinion of Lepsius, that Skr. *ph, th, kh* were not more strongly aspirated than English and German *p, t, k*. It was shown that the Greek φ, θ, χ must have been originally sounded like Skr. *ph, th, kh*; and that they probably kept those sounds down to the Christian era, or even later; though it is not easy to understand how φ and χ could be thus sounded before θ . Etymologically, φ, θ, χ correspond to Skr. *bh, dh, gh*, and Lat. *b, d, g*; but, at the beginning of a word, the Latin has *h* for χ , and *f* for φ and sometimes for θ . The Letto-Slavic languages are without aspirate mutes, and those of the Germanic and Celtic tongues are of secondary origin: all these have *b, d, g* in place of Gr. φ, θ, χ , and Skr. *bh, dh, gh*. Yet the Germanic languages show by their *Lautverschiebung* that the sounds so represented were primitively distinguished from the unaspirate mutes, both surd and sonant. The question then arises whether the aspirates of the original language were surd, like Gr. φ, θ, χ , or sonant, like Skr. *bh, dh, gh*. The latter is made probable by the fact that they are represented by sonant letters in nearly all branches of the Indo-European family. This opinion, adopted by Curtius, Bopp, and Schleicher, has been lately impugned by Kuhn. His argument that a change from *bh* to *ph* (in Gr. φ) is improbable, as being from weaker to stronger, has little force, since such changes are not uncommon: in the Gothic and the Modern Armenian, for example, every original *b* has become *p*. And besides, *ph* is certainly easier of utterance than *bh*, which combines surd and sonant elements. The argument that, where new aspirates have been developed in the Indo-European languages, the beginning has been made with surd aspirates, has greater weight: although it is not true, as Kuhn appears to suppose, that the sonant aspirates of the Celtic have been developed out of the surd. His remaining argument is founded on the fact that in some cases the Gr. φ, θ, χ correspond to the surd aspirates of the Sanskrit: but it is not yet clear that this correspondence may not be fairly attributed, either to occasional anomaly, or to independent development of aspirates out of *tenues*. It therefore still remains probable that the primitive aspirates were sonant, or *bh, dh, and gh*.

2. On the Internal History of the Authorized English Version of the Bible, by Rev. C. P. Krauth, of Philadelphia.

Dr. Krauth simply sketched out, in his present communication, the main features of the work he had undertaken upon the English versions of the Scriptures. He described in their chronological order the different translations made after that of Wickliff, and showed the close relation subsisting between them, each being founded upon its predecessors, and all of them owing much more than was generally supposed to the German version of Luther; so that the language of our authorized Bible contains elements from them all. He called attention to the many valuable results derivable from their comparison, as regards not only the sources and history of the familiar text, but also the character and progress of early English Oriental scholarship, and the history of the English tongue.

3. Remarks upon the Use of the Roman Character in writing and printing the Modern Languages of India, by Rev. J. H. Morrison, D.D., Missionary in N. W. India.

Dr. Morrison laid before the meeting (in part, as gifts from himself to the Society's Library) several works bearing on this subject, either as containing records of the controversy respecting it in India, or as illustrating the practically accomplished romanization of some of the dialects. He gave a brief history of the movement, from its inception, and presented the main arguments which had been employed in support of the relinquishment of the native alphabets, and the adoption in their place of one modelled upon our own: these arguments being chiefly the vastly

increased correctness, compactness, and cheapness of printing, the augmented intelligibility of the text, the greater ease of acquisition, both by natives and foreigners, the encouragement and aid it would furnish the natives toward acquiring English, its influence in helping to break down the distinctions of race, etc. On some of the points referred to, carefully prepared statistics were given. The obstacles which had impeded the progress of the movement, both with English and natives, were also explained, and it was stated to have gained steadily in strength and favor, and to have obtained the approval and support of many who at first opposed it most strongly: it was now spreading even in Southern India, where, until quite recently, the subject had not been at all agitated. A large number of works, in many dialects, had been published in Roman characters, and their use was rapidly extending.

The sessions of the Society were resumed on Thursday morning, and continued through the day, with an hour's intermission at noon. The following additional communications were presented:

4. On the Ethnology of the Tribes of Southern Africa, by Rev. Lewis Grout, lately Missionary at Umsunduzi, Port Natal.

Mr. Grout had brought with him to the meeting the manuscript of a work on Southern Africa, in which were embodied the fruits of his observation and study during his residence of fifteen years in that country, and of which the publication may be looked for as soon as the times allow. He read from it, by request, one or two chapters, which treated of the ethnology of the country, and especially of the origin and affinities of the family to which the Zulu tribes belong, or the Zingian family, as he preferred to call it. He said that Dr. Bleek's recent investigations had convinced him that there was a genetic connection between the Coptic or Egyptian race on the north, and the Hottentots of the south, and he supposed that a portion of the North-African people had been detached from the rest by the intrusion of other races, and driven forward from point to point until it had reached its present southern position.

Questions from some of the members present drew out from Mr. Grout farther information respecting the Zulus.

5. The Teachings of the Vedic Prātiçākhyas with respect to the Theory of Accent, and the Pronunciation of Groups of Consonants, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

These two subjects, Prof. Whitney said, he had had occasion recently to work out more fully than any one, to his knowledge, had hitherto done, in the notes to the Atharva-Veda Prātiçākhyas, now on the eve of appearing in the Society's Journal; and they were brought forward as fairly illustrating the character of the ancient Hindu phonetic science—the most ancient which the history of philology has to show, and superior to any, except the latest European, both in the nicety of its observation and the subtlety of its distinctions; illustrating, also, the tendency which it exhibited to over-refinement, and to exaggeration of subordinate, accidental, or doubtful elements of articulation, which converted it, in no small degree, into a prescriptive instead of a descriptive science.

A discussion of some length, in which many of the members present took part, followed, with respect to the modes of reading or reciting written and memorized texts practised among Eastern nations, and among the ancient Greeks; as also respecting the character of the Sanskrit as a language reduced to its present form by long and rigid grammatical culture, and as wanting the naturalness and freedom of a proper vernacular.

6. An Account of Dillmann's Ethiopic Grammar, with some Remarks respecting the Ancient Ethiopic Language, by Prof. W. H. Green, D.D., of Princeton.

Prof. Green began with an account of what had been done in Europe for the elucidation of the ancient Semitic dialect known as the Ge'ez or Ethiopic; it was, in his opinion, much less than the importance and interest of the subject called for,

neither grammar nor dictionary having appeared since the imperfect, though very creditable, works of Ludolf (about A.D. 1700). He passed to a description of the Ethiopic labors of Prof. Dillmann, of Kiel, who had begun a critical edition of the Ethiopic version of the Bible, had prepared a grammar, and had just now published the first half of a large and comprehensive lexicon of the language. He then took up more particularly an examination of the grammar. By way of introduction, he discussed at some length the question whether the profoundly theoretical method, adopted by Ewald and his pupil Dillmann, of setting forth grammatical material, or the more empirical one usually followed by other grammarians, was to be preferred; and he came to the conclusion that while the former had its advantages, and presented the facts of a language in a form which a scholar deeply versed in it would seek to give them in his own mind, the other had such a great and obvious practical superiority as a help to the student that it must be allowed to be decidedly the better of the two. After an account of the work, to which he awarded high praise as a complete and trustworthy manual of the language, he went on to give, as derived from it, a characterization of the language itself. Its relation to the other Semitic dialects, and especially to the Arabic, which was shown to be its next of kin, although not its parent, was set forth and illustrated. Finally, the striking peculiarities of its alphabet, as compared with those of the Semitic languages in general, in respect to the form of the letters, their arrangement, the direction of writing, the mode of designation of the vowels, etc., were described, and the different theories which had been formed to account for them were stated and criticized.

7. Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Scenery of the Turkish Empire, by Rev. H. J. Van Lennep, Missionary in Turkey.

This communication consisted of a series of extracts from a work which Mr. Van Lennep, after a residence of about twenty years in the East, had been preparing during his vacation and temporary sojourn in this country for the benefit of his health, with the intention of bringing as vividly as possible before the eyes and minds of the Occidentals the characteristic features of Oriental life and character, both in general, and as distinctively belonging to the different nationalities collected under the sceptre of the Sultan. The work is now publishing by subscription. It is to be illustrated by elegant colored lithographs of large size, of which a specimen was shown to the members present. The passages read related to a variety of subjects, and illustrated the manners and customs of the different classes of the Turkish population. The last extract characterized the Oriental music, and described a contest in improvisation between a local and a wandering poet and singer which Mr. Van Lennep had witnessed.

8. Translations of Bulgarian Popular Poetry, by Prof. E. Riggs, D.D., of Constantinople: read by Prof. Hadley, of New Haven.

The songs of which Dr. Riggs had sent translations were selected from a collection of more than six hundred pieces, all professedly taken from the mouths of illiterate common people, and forming a volume of nearly 600 octavo pages, one of the largest yet printed in the Bulgarian language.* The versions were stated to be made as literal as possible, and in the metre of the original. The pieces were entitled *Ivan Popoff* and the *Fairy*, *Anna the Cuckoo*, and *King Ivan Shishman*. The translator called attention to the style of the two former, as very strikingly resembling that of Mr. Longfellow's *Song of Hiawatha*, in respect to the measure, the absence of rhyme, the repetition of words from the end of one line to the beginning of the next, and of whole lines in a question and its answer, a promise and the story of its fulfillment, and the like. This style Dr. Riggs declares to be the one most employed in the volume. Other measures, with lines of from five to seventeen syllables, are also found. The themes are various: some are heroic, some erotic; some exhibit religious legends, or fables of the doings of fairies and dragons, or stories of the contests of saints with monsters inhabiting pools or fountains. The whole presents an interesting picture of the traditions and fancies prevailing among the mass of the Bulgarian people.

* *Bulgarski Narodni Pesni*, etc.: i. e., Bulgarian Popular Songs, collected by Demetrius and Constantine Miladinov. Agram: 1861.

9. On New English Words, by Mr. F. P. Brewer, of New Haven.

Mr. Brewer had collected from various sources a considerable number of words which had begun the attempt to gain an acknowledged place in the vocabulary of the English language, and he presented them as illustrating the ways in which a language enriches itself by increase of material, pointing out the analogies according to which the new formations were made, and indicating their probable fate.

He also added a brief exposition of the figure conveyed in Hebrews vi. 20 by the use of the word *πρόδρομος*, proposing a new interpretation of the latter, as meaning one sent forward from the bow of a ship with an anchor to plant out in front of it, for its greater security. He sought support for this interpretation in other passages, culled from the New Testament as well as from the classic Greek literature.

10. On the Relation of the Semitic to the Indo-European Languages, by Mr. Jacob Wilson, of Canajoharie, N. Y. : read by the Corresponding Secretary.

This paper set forth its author's reasons for holding, as he did, the close relationship of the Semitic and Indo-European idioms. It presented a somewhat detailed comparison and identification of their elements and forms, followed out through every department of the grammar.

11. On the Views of Biot and Weber respecting the Origin of the Hindu and Chinese Asterisms, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Prof. Whitney began with referring to a series of articles, respecting the translation etc. of the *Sūrya-Siddhānta* which had appeared in the sixth volume of the Society's Journal, furnished to the *Journal des Savants*, 1860, by the venerable M. Biot, since deceased, and availed himself of the opportunity to offer some explanations and reclamations in answer to unfavorable criticisms made upon certain points in the work in the course of this generally favorable notice of it. He then went on to introduce the proper subject of his paper, by citing a paragraph from Biot's articles, in which the latter accuses the Indianists of the present day of shutting their eyes, partly in ignorance and partly in prejudice, to his demonstration of the Chinese origin of the Hindu asterisms. This led to an account of the discussion of this subject, first opened by Biot in 1840, and since renewed by him at various times, especially against Weber, who held the contrary opinion; and also, to an energetic disclaimer on the part of the translators of the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, and an earnest protest in behalf of their fellow Indianists, against such injurious imputations. The recent restatement and defence made by the French savant of his views upon the matter in hand was submitted to examination. Its only new feature and strongest point, the division of the Hindu *nakshatra* system into two forms, an ancient and a modern one, was claimed to be merely subjective, to exist in M. Biot's apprehension and classification of the facts bearing upon its history, but to be unfounded in the facts themselves, as properly interpreted and connected. Especially, the assumption made by Biot and Weber, that the *nakshatras*, considered as divisions of the ecliptic, were ever measured from the circle of declination of one star of the series to that of another, was objected to as arbitrary and unsupported, and its refutation was attempted. The conclusion which the writer had earlier arrived at, and had expressed in the notes to the *Sūrya-Siddhānta*, was reiterated and urged anew: that the only effective part of M. Biot's argument for the Chinese origin of the *nakshatras* lay in his history of the Chinese astronomy: while the considerations with which Weber has assailed the documentary part of his historical argument, and the objections to which its scientific part was also shown to be open, so far weakened its force that it could not be regarded as at all conclusive; and the Chinese origin of the system must be pronounced at present unproved. The writer then passed to consider the opposing view of Weber, who holds that, while the Hindu system was itself of foreign origin, and probably derived from Chaldea, it was nevertheless the direct parent of the Arab and Chinese, and of all the other known forms of the same original. The *a priori* improbability of this view was first pointed out. It was claimed that the appearance of the fully developed system in China, even as reduced to its latest possible date by Weber himself, was too early for the admission of a direct influence of India on China, the other indications relied on to support

this being of more than doubtful value. The evidence of the derivation of the Arab system from the Hindu was pronounced unsatisfactory, the historically known influence of the Hindu on the Arab science being of a date at which we know the *nakshatras* in detail, as notably different from the *manzil*. Weber's chief argument, that the Hindu system had been a shifting and changing one, and that the others represented one of its latest forms, was discussed in detail. It was shown to be underlaid throughout by the assumption already refuted, that the arcs of the zodiac were originally measured from star to star of the series: if this fell away, a great part of the ground of plausibility of the argument and its proofs fell also. The detailed evidences of the varying nature of the *nakshatra* series were carefully criticised, and condemned as small in amount and weak in character: many of the circumstances brought up as indications of change were, rightly interpreted, either indications of stability, or readily explainable on the supposition of stability; and the whole residue amounted to less than was derivable from a simple comparison of the *nakshatras* with the *manzil* and *sieu*. The strongest point in the argument was the number of the stars or groups in the extra-Indian systems, being 28, while the earlier traceable and generally accepted Indian number was 27, and the system admitted of being looked upon as expanded from 27 to 28. But it was argued against this that the priority of appearance of the 27-series was too slight to furnish unequivocal evidence of priority of origin, and that the parallelism in use of the two systems afforded ground for a different explanation, which was favored by the general probabilities of the case. The writer was of opinion, then, that Weber's essay, while it was an admirable monument of the learning, industry, and acuteness of its author, and the most valuable contribution yet made to the history of the *nakshatras*, furnishing the greatly needed material for an understanding of their earliest traceable character and use, yet failed to establish the historical thesis which it was, in part, framed and intended to support. He inclined still to cling to his former opinion, that neither China nor India had received the system of asterisms direct from the other: it had most probably spread to both countries from a centrally situated original.

The length of Prof. Whitney's paper, and the lack of time, necessitated the presentation of the greater part of it in the form of a *résumé* and abstract.

The time of separation having arrived, it was announced that the next meeting of the Society would be held in Boston, on Wednesday, May 20th, 1863, and that Prof. Beck of Cambridge, and the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, had been appointed a Committee of Arrangements for it; a vote of thanks was passed to the College of New Jersey for the use of its Library, kindly furnished as the place for holding the sessions just brought to a close; and the Society adjourned.

ADDITIONS TO THE LIBRARY AND CABINET.

MAY, 1861—OCTOBER, 1862.

From the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. viii, Part 1. Boston: 1861. 4to.

Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Vol. v, pp. 1-312. Boston: 1861. 8vo.

From the American Antiquarian Society.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society. . . . Worcester, Oct. 21, 1861; . . . Boston, Apr. 30, 1862. Boston: 1861-2. 8vo.

From the Secretaries of the Am. Board of Comm. for Foreign Missions.

Memorial Volume of the First Fifty Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Fourth Edition. Boston: 1861. 8vo.

Seven pamphlets concerning the missions and operations of the A. B. C. F. M., viz. Historical Sketch of the Missions in European Turkey, Asia Minor, and Armenia. —Historical Sketch of the Mission to the Nestorians, by J. Perkins, D.D., and of the Assyria Mission, by Rev. Thos. Lawrie.—Historical Sketch of the Syria Mission, by Rev. Thos. Lawrie.—Maps of Missions.—Letter to the Rev Robert S. Candlish, D.D., by R. Anderson, D.D.—The A. B. C. F. M., by A. P. Peabody.—The American Board and its Reviewers. Boston and New York: 1861-62. 8vo.

Annual Report of the A. B. C. F. M. 1861. Boston: 1861. 8vo.

Rules for the Orthography of Arabic and Turkish Words in Roman Letters. Adopted by the Syrian Mission of the A. B. C. F. M., April, 1838. Reprinted with slight modifications, 1860. 18mo.

From the American Philosophical Society.

Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society. Vol. viii, pp. 277-408; Vol. ix, pp. 1-52. Philadelphia: 1862. 8vo.

From the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. 1858, No. 5. 1859, No. 5. 1860, Nos. 1-4. 1861, No. 1. Calcutta. 8vo.

From the Batavian Society of Arts and Sciences.

Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen. Deel xxvii, xxviii. Batavia: 1860. 4to.

Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde. . . . Deel vii-x. Batavia: 1858-61. 8vo.

From Rev. K. M. Banerjea, of Calcutta.

Dialogues on the Hindu Philosophy, comprising the Nyaya, the Sankhya, the Vedant; to which is added a Discussion of the Authority of the Vedas. By Rev. K. M. Banerjea, etc. London and Edinburgh: 1861. 8vo.

From the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin.

Monatsberichte der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Aus dem Jahre 1860. Berlin: 1861. 8vo.

Philologische und Historische Abhandlungen der Kön. Ak. d. Wiss. zu Berlin. Aus dem Jahre 1860. Berlin: 1861. 4to.

From Prof. Otto Böhtlingk, of St. Petersburg.

Bemerkungen zu Benfey's Uebersetzung des Pañk'atantra, von Otto Boehtlingk. [pp. 204-279 of Tome iv of Mém. As. . . de l'Ac. Imp. . . de St. Pétersbourg.] St. Petersburg: 1861. 8vo.

From Professors Böhtlingk und Roth.

Sanskrit Wörterbuch, herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bearbeitet von Otto Boehtlingk und Rudolph Roth. Lieferungen 19-21. St. Petersburg: 1860-61. 4to.

From the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. No. xxi, Vol. vi. Bombay: 1862. 8vo.

*From Hon. C. W. Bradley, of Ningpo.**

The Mesnevi Hesht Gulzar, and the Shah-Nameh in Hindustani. roy. 8vo. lithographed.

The Wasukht Ananüt, etc. roy. 8vo. lithographed.

The Sih-r-i-Mahfil, etc.

The Divan Mir Yar Ali, etc.

Meddelelser angaaende Ævangeliets Udbredelse i China. 1855-57. Copenhagen. 8vo.

Travels into Bokhara. . . . By Capt. Sir Alexander Burnes etc. New Edition. London: 1839. 3 vols. 16mo.

From Prof. Hermann Brockhaus, of Leipzig.

Die Lieder des Hafis, . . . herausgegeben von Hermann Brockhaus. iii. 3, 4. Leipzig: 1861. roy. 8vo.

Analyse der Indischen Märchen-Sammlung des Somadeva. Buch vii, ch. 35-43. Leipzig: 1861. 8vo.

From John P. Brown, Esq., of Constantinople.

Majmû'ah Funûn, athar Jam'iah 'Ilmiyah 'Uthmâniyah, i. e. Diverse Branches of Knowledge Combined, by way of a Summary of Ottoman Learning. Nos. 1, 2, for Muharram and Şafar, A. H. 1279. A monthly periodical, published at Constantinople.

Taswir Afkâr, i. e. Actualization of Ideas. Nos. 18, 19, 20, 21. Aug., A. H. 1279. An Ottoman gazette.

From Rev. Nathan Brown, D.D., of New York.

The New Testament . . . translated into the Asamese Language . . . By Nathan Brown . . . Third Edition. Sibsagor, Asam: 1850. roy. 8vo.

From Charles Bruce, Esq.

Die Geschichte von Nala. Versuch einer Herstellung des Textes von Charles Bruce. St. Petersburg: 1862. 8vo.

From Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, of Lanesville, Mass.

Devanâgarî manuscript of the Çakalya-Sanhitâ, a Sanskrit astronomical work; modern copy. sm. 4to size. European paper and form.

From the Royal University of Norway, at Christiania.

Karlamagnus Saga ok Kappa hans . . . Udgivet af C. R. Unger. II. Christiania: 1860. 8vo.

Det Kongelige Norske Frederiks Universitets Stiftelse, fremstillet . . . af M. J. Monrad. Christiania: 1861. 8vo.

Three University programmes, on scientific subjects, viz. H. Mohn. Om Kometbanernes Indbyrdes Belliggenhed.—Michael Sars. Om Siphodentalium Vitreum.—C. M. Guldberg. Om Cirklersberøring. Christiania: 1861. 4to.

* These are in part accidental omissions from last year's list.

From J. G. Cogswell, LL.D., of New York.

Catalogue or Alphabetical Index of the Astor Library. In Two Parts. Part I. Authors and Books. 4 vols. roy. 8vo. New York: 1860.

From Rev. Prof. G. E. Day, of Walnut Hill, O.

De Munten der Engelschen voor den Oost-Indischen Archipel, beschreven door H. C. Millies. Amsterdam: 1852. 8vo.

Notice sur les Nouvelles Monnaies pour les Colonies Orientales Néerlandaises, par H. C. Millies. Bruxelles: 1858. 8vo.

Proeve eener Makassaarsche Vertaling des Korans, door B. F. Matthes. Batavia. 8vo.

From Dr. M. R. Delany.

Official Report of the Niger Exploring Party. By M. R. Delany. New York: 1861. 8vo.

From the German Oriental Society.

Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft. xv. 2-4; xvi. 1-3. Leipzig: 1861-2. 8vo.

Indische Studien . . . herausgegeben von Albrecht Weber. v. 1-3; vi. Berlin: 1861. 8vo.

Die Krone der Lebensbeschreibungen, enthaltend die Classen der Hanefiten, von Zeit-ad-din Kâsim Ibn Kutlûbugâ . . . herausgegeben . . . von Gustav Flügel, etc. [ii. 3 of Abhandl. d. Deutsch. Morg. Ges.] Leipzig: 1862. 8vo.

From Rev. William Goodell, D.D., of Constantinople.

A sheet, 30 by 22 inches, containing calligraphic specimens, in black and red ink, of twelve different styles of writing used by the Turks.

From S. Hastings Grant, Esq., of New York.

The New Testament in Ancient Syriac, in the Nestorian character. London: 1829. sm. 4to.

From Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J.

A Grammar of the Hebrew Language. By William Henry Green, etc. New York: 1861. 8vo.

From Prof. Johannes von Gumpach, of Munich.

Der Prophet Habakuk. Nach dem . . . Hebräischen Text auf's neue übersetzt, eingeleitet, und erklärt von Johannes von Gumpach. München: 1860. 8vo.

From Prof. S. Stehman Haldeman, of Columbia, Pa.

Analytical Orthography: an Investigation of the Sounds of the Voice, and their Alphabetic Notation . . . By S. S. Haldeman, etc. Philadelphia: 1860. 4to.

From Mrs. Dr. J. C. Hepburn, of Japan.

A Japanese primer and phrase-book.

From Prof. C. A. Holmboe, of Christiania, Norway.

Four essays, by C. A. Holmboe, on philosophical and archæological subjects, viz: Om og Eg, Metal og Steen som Amulet:—Om Hedenske Korsmonumenter:—Om Helleristninger:—Om Kido, en Sacheisk Afgud. Christiania: 1861. 8vo.

From the University of Kiel.

Schriften der Universität zu Kiel. VII. Aus dem Jahre 1860. Kiel: 1861. 4to.

From Dr. Adalbert Kuhn, of Berlin.

Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung. x. 4-6; xi. 1-5. Berlin: 1861-62. 8vo.

Beiträge zur Vergleichenden Sprachforschung. iii. 2. Berlin: 1862. 8vo.

From Prof. Christian Lassen, of Bonn.

Indische Alterthumskunde. Von Chr. Lassen, etc. iv. 1, 2. Leipzig: 1861. 8vo.

From M. Léon de Rosny, of Paris.

Revue Orientale et Américaine, etc. N^{os}. 25, 26, 28-32. Paris: 1860-61. 8vo.
La Civilization Japonaise . . . par L. Léon de Rosny. Paris: 1861. 8vo.

From John Lockwood, Esq., of Perth Amboy, N. J.

Akademische Voorlezingen over . . . Grammatiche Vergelijking . . . door H. A. Hamaker, etc. Leyden: 1835. 8vo.: also, a manuscript translation of the same into English, by Mr. Lockwood.

From Rev. W. A. P. Martin, D.D., of Shanghai.

A Japanese edition of the Chinese Four Books, with the commentary of Chu-hi. In eight parts, roy. 8vo size.

Japanese maps of Yedo and Nagasaki, colored, mounted on rollers.

A Chinese Chart of Ethics: also, a manuscript translation of the same.

From Rev. H. B. Morgan and Rev. A. T. Pratt, M.D., of Syria.

Cogswell's Theological Class Book, in Armeno-Turkish. Smyrna: 1861. 18mo.

From Rev. J. H. Morrison, D.D., of Lodiana, N. W. India.

Original Papers illustrating the History of the Application of the Roman Alphabet to the Languages of India. Edited by Monier Williams, etc. London: 1859. 8vo.
Our Blessed Lord's Sermon on the Mount, in English; . . . in Tamil; . . . in Malayalam; . . . in Kanarese; . . . and in Telugu; in the Anglo-Indian Character, with a Vocabulary, Minute Grammatical Praxis, and Inflectional Tables; by the Rev. G. U. Pope, etc. Madras: 1860. 8vo.

From the Society for American and Oriental Ethnography, of Paris.

Annuaire de la Société d'Ethnographie Américaine et Orientale. 2me Année. Paris: 1861. 12mo.

From the Library Company of Philadelphia.

A Catalogue of the Books belonging to the Library Company of Philadelphia. Vols. i and ii, bound in one. 1835. Vol. iii. 1856. 8vo.

Catalogue of the Books belonging to the Loganian Library . . . Philadelphia: 1837. 8vo.

From Prof. A. F. Pott, of Halle.

Etymologische Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der Indo-Germanischen Sprachen . . . von Aug. Fried. Pott, etc. ii. 1, Wurzeln, Einleitung. Lemgo und Detmold: 1861. 8vo.

From the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland. xviii. 2; xix. 1, 2. London: 1861. 8vo.

From the Royal Society of Northern Antiquaries.

Séance Annuelle de 1860 de la Société Royale des Antiquaires du Nord. Copenhagen: 1860. 8vo.

From Mons. C. de Sabir, of Paris.

Le Fleuve Amour: Histoire, Géographie, Ethnographie, par C. de Sabir, etc. Paris: 1861. 4to.

Le Pays des Sept Rivières et la Contrée Transilienne, par C. de Sabir, etc. Paris: 1862. 8vo.

From Rev. L. Stilson, of Nunda, N. Y.

Kemee Spelling-Book, or an Alphabetic Arrangement of the Syllables of the Kemee Language. By L. Stilson Maulmain: 1848. 4to.

Easy Reading Lessons in the Kemee Language . . . by L. Stilson. 2d edition, revised. To which is added a Brief Catechism of Christian Doctrine. By H. E. Knapp. Maulmain: 1850. 12mo.

From Dr. Leonard Tafel and Prof. R. L. Tafel, of Philadelphia and St. Louis.

Latin Pronunciation and the Latin Alphabet. By Dr. Leonard Tafel, etc., and Prof. Rudolph L. Tafel, etc. Philadelphia: 1860. 12mo.

A Review of some Points in Bopp's Comparative Grammar. By the same. Andover: 1861. 8vo.

Semitic Comparative Philology. A Review of the Hebrew Grammars of Gesenius and Ewald. By the same. Andover: 1862. 8vo.

Investigations into the Laws of English Orthography and Pronunciation. By Prof. R. L. Tafel, etc. Vol. i, No. 1. New York: 1860. 8vo.

From the Smithsonian Institution.

Results of Meteorological Observations, made . . . 1854 to 1859. Vol. i. Washington: 1861. 4to.

Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections. Vols. i-iv. Washington: 1862. 8vo.

From the Imperial Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg.

Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg. ii. 4-8; iii; iv. 1, 2. St. Petersburg: 1860-61. 4to.

Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale, etc. iii. 2-12. St. Petersburg: 1860-61. 4to.

From the Imperial Archaeological Institute of St. Petersburg.

Bulletin of the Oriental Section of the Imp. Arch. Institute. i. 1-5. St. Petersburg: 1858-60. 8vo. [Russian.]

Memoirs of the same. Vols. vi, vii. St. Petersburg: 1858-61. 8vo. [Russian.]

From Rev. E. W. Syle, of Shanghai.

A Japanese work illustrating the culture of plants in pots: pictures, with explanations. 2 parts. roy. 8vo size.

A book of colored pictures, illustrating scenes in Japanese life. 8vo size.

From Mrs. W. W. Turner, of Washington.

Prof. W. W. Turner's fac-similes of the inscriptions on the royal sarcophagus of Sidon: mounted on rollers.

From the Imperial-Royal Geographical Society of Vienna.

Mittheilungen der Kaiserlich-Königlichen Geographischen Gesellschaft. iv. Vienna: 1860. 8vo.

From Prof. Albrecht Weber, of Berlin.

Die Vedischen Nachrichten von den Naxatra (Mondstationen). Von A. Weber. Erster Theil. Historische Einleitung. 1860.—Zweiter Theil, 1862. [From the Abh. d. Kon. Ak. d. Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1860-61.] Berlin. 4to.

From Dr. M. C. White, of New Haven.

A Chinese Tonic Dictionary, containing about 50,000 characters (the first 9 pages wanting). 12 parts. 8vo size.

From Messrs. Williams and Norgate, of London.

Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record. No. xxvii. Oct. 1861. 8vo.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

OCTOBER, 1862.

1. CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Names marked with † are those of Life Members.

EZRA ABBOT,	Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. CHARLES A. AIKEN,	Hanover, N. H.
Rev. DAVID O. ALLEN,	Lowell, Mass.
WILLIAM F. ALLEN,	West Newton, Mass.
Pres. MARTIN B. ANDERSON,	Rochester, N. Y.
Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON,	Boston.
Rev. GEORGE B. BACON,	Orange, N. J.
Prof. HENRY M. BAIRD,	New York.
Prof. ELISHA BALLANTINE,	Bloomington, Ind.
Prof. ELIJAH P. BARROWS,	Andover, Mass.
JOHN R. BARTLETT,	Providence, R. I.
Prof. CHARLES BECK,	Cambridge, Mass.
Rev. HIRAM BINGHAM,	New Haven.
Rev. GEORGE W. BLAGDEN,	Boston.
Prof. JAMES J. BLAISDELL,	Beloit, Wisc.
CHARLES L. BRACE,	New York.
FISK P. BREWER,	New Haven.
Rev. CHARLES H. BRIGHAM,	Taunton, Mass.
Rev. NATHAN BROWN,	New York.
Prof. SAMUEL G. BROWN,	Hanover, N. H.
WILLIAM C. BRYANT,	New York.
Rev. EBENEZER BURGESS,	Lanesville, Mass.
Rev. STEPHEN BUSH,	Cohoes, N. Y.
Prof. HENRY C. CAMERON,	Princeton, N. J.
Prof. WILLIAM H. CAMPBELL,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Dr. ELBERT H. CHAMPLIN,	New York.
Pres. AARON L. CHAFIN,	Beloit, Wisc.
PLINY E. CHASE,	Philadelphia.
JOSIAH CLARK,	Easthampton, Mass.
Rev. WILLIAM CLARK,	West Brattleboro, Vt.
Rev. JAMES F. CLARKE,	Jamaica Plains, Mass.
†JOSEPH G. COGSWELL,	New York.
Rev. HENRY M. COLTON,	Middletown, Conn.
ALEXANDER I. COTHEAL,	New York.
BRINTON COXE,	Philadelphia.
Prof. ALPHEUS CROSBY,	Salem, Mass.
Prof. HOWARD CROSBY,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Pres. E. A. DALRYMPLE,	Baltimore.
Prof. JAMES D. DANA,	New Haven.
Prof. GEORGE E. DAY,	Walnut Hill, O.
JOHN W. DEFOREST,	New Haven.
CHARLES R. DEGEN,	New York.

Rev. JAMES T. DICKINSON,	Middlefield, Conn.
GEORGE L. DITSON,	Burlington, Vt.
EPES S. DIXWELL,	Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. HENRY DRISLER,	New York.
SAMUEL F. DUNLAP,	New York.
Rev. BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT,	Clinton, N. Y.
Prof. THEODORE W. DWIGHT,	New York.
Prof. TIMOTHY DWIGHT,	New Haven.
Prof. CHARLES ELLIOTT,	Oxford, O.
RALPH W. EMERSON,	Concord, Mass.
EDWARD EVERETT,	Boston.
RICHARD S. FELLOWES,	New Haven.
Chanc. ISAAC FERRIS,	New York.
Prof. GEORGE P. FISHER,	New Haven.
CHARLES FOLSON,	Cambridge, Mass.
Admiral ANDREW H. FOOTE, U. S. N.,	Washington.
†JOHN M. FORBES,	Boston.
Prof. JOHN FORSYTH,	New Brunswick, N. J.
DWIGHT FOSTER,	Worcester, Mass.
Prof. WILLIAM C. FOWLER,	Durham Centre, Conn.
Prof. CONVERS FRANCIS,	Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE,	University of Virginia.
DANIEL C. GILMAN,	New Haven.
†Capt. JAMES GLYNN, U.S.N.,	New Haven.
Prof. WILLIAM W. GOODWIN,	Cambridge, Mass.
S. HASTINGS GRANT,	New York.
Rev. DAVID GREEN,	Windsor, Vt.
Prof. W. HENRY GREEN,	Princeton, N. J.
Rev. LEWIS GROUT,	West Brattleboro, Vt.
Prof. ARNOLD GUYOT,	Princeton, N. J.
Prof. HENRY H. HADLEY,	New York.
Prof. JAMES HADLEY,	New Haven.
Prof. S. STEHMAN HALDEMAN,	Columbia, Pa.
Rev. CHARLES R. HALE,	Andalusia, Pa.
Rev. EDWARD E. HALE,	Boston.
Prof. FITZ-EDWARD HALL,	London.
Rev. EDWIN HARWOOD,	New Haven.
SAMUEL F. HAVEN,	Worcester, Mass.
†JOHN HEARD,	Hongkong.
Prof. FREDERICK D. HEDGE,	Brookline, Mass.
Prof. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK,	New York.
WILLIAM B. HODGSON,	Savannah, Ga.
Rev. FREDERICK W. HOLLAND,	Dorchester, Mass.
HENRY A. HOMES,	Albany, N. Y.
NATHANIEL L. HOOPER,	Boston.
Prof. JAMES M. HOPPIN,	New Haven.
FISHER HOWE,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
JOSEPH HOWLAND,	Fishkill, N. Y.
Rev. WILLIAM HUTCHISON,	New Haven.
Prof. WILLIAM IRVIN,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. MELANCHTHON W. JACOBUS,	Allcgheny City, Pa.
CHARLES W. JENES,	Boston.

†Prof. JOSEPH W. JENKS,	Boston.
†Rev. WILLIAM JENKS,	Boston.
Prof. CHARLES C. JEWETT,	Boston.
Rev. EDWARD C. JONES,	Philadelphia.
Rev. T. STARR KING,	San Francisco, Cal.
WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY,	New Haven.
Rev. EDWARD N. KIRK,	Boston.
Rev. CHARLES P. KRAUTH,	Philadelphia.
Prof. GEORGE M. LANE,	Cambridge, Mass.
J. PETER LESLEY,	Philadelphia.
Prof. TAYLER LEWIS,	Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. J. H. McILVAINE,	Princeton, N. J.
Rev. DWIGHT W. MARSH,	Rochester, N. Y.
Rev. JOHN A. MERRICK,	Paris, Ky.
†Rev. JAMES L. MERRICK,	So. Amherst, Mass.
Prof. JAMES C. MOFFAT,	Princeton, N. J.
GEORGE H. MOORE,	New York.
Rev. MARK MURPHY,	New Brighton, N. Y.
CHARLES E. NORTON,	Cambridge, Mass.
†ROBERT M. OLYPHANT,	Shanghai.
Prof. JOHN J. OWEN,	New York.
Prof. JOSEPH PACKARD,	Theol. Sem'y, Fairfax Co., Va.
Dr. PETER PARKER,	Washington.
Prof. ANDREW P. PEABODY,	Cambridge, Mass.
†GREGORY A. PERDICARIS,	Trenton, N. J.
PELATIAH PERIT,	New Haven.
Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,	Boston.
Rev. SWAN L. POMROY,	Boston.
HENRY W. POOLE,	Boston.
Rev. THOMAS S. POTWIN,	Franklin, N. Y.
WILLIAM C. PRIME,	New York.
Prof. JOHN PROUDFIT,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Prof. JOHN N. PUTNAM,	Hanover, N. H.
†Prof. EDWARD ROBINSON,	New York.
JOSEPH S. ROPES,	Boston.
GEORGE R. RUSSELL,	Jamaica Plains, Mass.
D. WALDO SALISBURY,	Boston.
†Prof. EDWARD E. SALISBURY,	New Haven.
STEPHEN SALISBURY,	Worcester, Mass.
FRANK B. SANBORN,	Concord, Mass.
Prof. M. SCHELE DE VERE,	University of Virginia.
Prof. JULIUS H. SEELYE,	Amherst, Mass.
CHARLES SHORT,	Philadelphia.
†THOMAS C. SMITH,	Hongkong.
Rev. THOMAS SMYTH,	Charleston, S. C.
Prof. EVANGELINUS A. SOPHOCLES,	Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. JESSE A. SPENCER,	New York.
CHARLES STODDARD,	Boston.
Rev. COLLINS STONE,	Columbus, O.
†WILLIAM W. STONE,	New York.
†RUSSELL STURGIS,	London.
JOHN TAPPAN,	Boston.

BAYARD TAYLOR,
 Rev. JAMES B. TAYLOR,
 SAMUEL H. TAYLOR,
 Prof. THOMAS A. THACHER,
 Rev. JOSEPH P. THOMPSON,
 CHARLES TRACY,
 Rev. SELAH B. TREAT,
 J. HAMMOND TRUMBULL,
 Prof. WILLIAM S. TYLER,
 WILLIAM J. VAUGHN,
 Rev. THOMAS E. VERMILYE,
 †THOMAS WALSH,
 Rev. FERDINAND DE W. WARD,
 RICHARD P. WATERS,
 CHARLES E. WEST,
 Prof. ANDREW D. WHITE,
 Dr. MOSES C. WHITE,
 Prof. JOSIAH D. WHITNEY,
 Prof. WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,
 JAMES M. WHITON,
 Dr. JOSEPH WILSON, U. S. N.,
 JACOB WILSON,
 Rev. JOHN L. WILSON.
 Prof. SAMUEL J. WILSON,
 Rev. GEORGE W. WOOD,
 Pres. THEODORE D. WOOLSEY,
 JOSEPH E. WORCESTER,

New York.
 Richmond, Va.
 Andover, Mass.
 New Haven.
 New York.
 New York.
 Boston.
 Hartford, Conn.
 Amherst, Mass.
 Tuscaloosa, Ala.
 New York.
 Shanghai.
 Geneseo, N. Y.
 Salem, Mass.
 Brooklyn, N. Y.
 Ann Arbor, Mich.
 New Haven.
 San Francisco, Cal.
 New Haven.
 New Haven.
 Philadelphia.
 Canajoharie, N. Y.

 Allegheny City, Pa.
 New York.
 New Haven.
 Cambridge, Mass.

Deceased since May, 1860.

Pres. CORNELIUS C. FELTON,
 Prof. JOSIAH W. GIBBS,
 †GEORGE W. PRATT,
 Prof. SAMUEL H. TURNER,
 Rev. JOHN WHEELER,

Cambridge, Mass.
 New Haven.
 New York.
 New York.
 Burlington, Vt.

2. CORRESPONDING MEMBERS.

Rev. JOHN C. ADAMSON,	New York.
Rev. HENRY BALLANTINE,	Missionary at Ahmednuggur, India.
JAMES R. BALLANTYNE,	London.
Rev. CEPHAS BENNETT,	Missionary at Maulmain, Farther India.
Rev. WILLIAM A. BENTON,	Missionary at Bhamdun, Syria.
OTTO BLAU,	Trebizond.
WILLIAM H. I. BLEEK,	Port Natal, S. Afr.
Rev. HENRY BLODGETT,	Missionary at Shanghai, China.
Bishop WILLIAM J. BOONE,	Missionary at Shanghai, China.
CHARLES W. BRADLEY,	Shanghai, China.
Prof. HERMANN BROCKHAUS,	Leipzig.
JOHN P. BROWN,	Constantinople.
Rev. SAMUEL R. BROWN,	Missionary in Japan.
HEINRICH BRUGSCH,	Berlin.
Rev. ALBERT BUSHNELL,	Missionary at the Gaboon, W. Afr.
Rev. SIMEON H. CALHOUN,	Missionary at Abeih, Syria.
J. COR,	Constantinople.
Rev. E. B. CROSS,	Missionary at Tavoy, Farther India.
Rev. CHARLES H. A. DALL,	Missionary at Calcutta.
Prof. AUGUST DILLMANN,	Kiel.
Rev. JACOB L. DÖHNE,	Missionary at Table Mountain, S. Afr.
Dr. CORNELIUS V. A. VAN DYCK,	Missionary at Beirut, Syria.
Prof. ROMEO ELTON,	Exeter, England.
Prof. GUSTAV FLÜGEL,	Dresden.
Rev. J. EDWARDS FORD,	Missionary at Sidon, Syria.
Dr. S. FRÄNKEL,	Jerusalem.
Rev. JOGUTHCHUNDER GANGOOLY,	Calcutta.
Rev. WILLIAM GOODELL,	Missionary at Constantinople.
Rev. CYRUS HAMLIN,	Constantinople.
Rev. C. C. HOFFMANN,	Missionary at Cape Palmas, W. Afr.
Prof. C. A. HOLMBOE,	Christiania, Norway.
Dr. SAMUEL R. HOUSE,	Missionary at Bangkok, Siam.
JAMES J. JARVES,	Boston.
Rev. HENRY H. JESSUP,	Missionary at Tripoli, Syria.
Rev. J. W. JOHNSON,	Missionary at Hongkong, China.
Rev. GEORGE JONES, U. S. N.,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Prof. MIRZA KASEM BEG,	St. Petersburg.
Chev. NICHOLAS KHANIKOFF,	St. Petersburg.
Rev. JONAS KING,	Missionary at Athens.
PETER I. VON KOEPPEN,	St. Petersburg.
ADALBERT KUHN,	Berlin.
L. LÉON DE ROSNY,	Paris.
Rev. ISIDOR LOEWENTHAL,	Missionary at Peshawur, N. W. India.
Dr. D. J. MACGOWAN,	Missionary at Ningpo, China.
Dr. EDWARD M'GOWAN,	Jerusalem.
Rev. WILLIAM A. P. MARTEN,	Missionary at Ningpo, China.
Rev. FRANCIS MASON,	Missionary at Toungoo, Farther India.
Dr. D. B. M'CARTEE,	Missionary at Ningpo, China.
THOMAS T. MEADOWS,	Ningpo, China.

DR. A. D. MORDTMANN,	Constantinople.
REV. HOMER B. MORGAN,	Missionary at Antioch, Syria.
JOHN MUIR,	Edinburgh.
PROF. MAX MÜLLER,	Oxford.
DR. A. G. PASPATI,	Constantinople.
BISHOP JOHN PAYNE,	Missionary at Cape Palmas, W. Afr.
REV. JUSTIN PERKINS,	Missionary at Orûmiah, Persia.
DR. ANDREW T. PRATT,	Missionary at Aleppo.
JAMES W. REDHOUSE,	Constantinople.
ADOLPHE REGNIER,	Paris.
ERNEST RENAN,	Paris.
REV. SAMUEL A. RHEA,	Missionary in Kurdistan.
REV. ELIAS RIGGS,	Missionary at Constantinople.
DR. G. ROSEN,	Jerusalem.
PROF. RUDOLPH ROTH,	Tubingen.
REV. WILLIAM G. SCHAUFFLER,	Missionary at Constantinople.
REV. DAVID C. SCUDDER,	Missionary in Southern India.
REV. HENRY M. SCUDDER,	Missionary in Southern India.
REV. WILLIAM W. SCUDDER,	Missionary in Southern India.
HENRY STEVENS,	London.
REV. E. W. SYLE,	Missionary at Shanghai, China.
REV. WILLIAM TRACY,	Missionary at Pasumalic, S. India.
REV. WILLIAM M. THOMSON,	Missionary in Syria.
REV. HENRY J. VAN LENNEP,	Missionary at Tocat, Turkey in Asia.
REV. DANIEL VROOMAN,	Missionary at Canton.
REV. WILLIAM WALKER,	Missionary at Baraka, W. Afr.
REV. GEORGE T. WASHBURN,	Missionary at Battalagundu, S. India.
REV. EDWARD WEBB,	Missionary at Dindigul, S. India.
PROF. ALBRECHT WEBER,	Berlin.
PROF. GUSTAV WEIL,	Heidelberg.
DR. S. WELLS WILLIAMS,	Canton.
REV. W. FREDERIC WILLIAMS,	Missionary at Mardin, Turkey in Asia.
REV. MIRON WINSLOW,	Missionary at Madras, India.
WILLIAM WINTHROP,	Malta.
DR. AUSTIN H. WRIGHT,	Missionary at Orûmiah, Persia.

Deceased since May, 1860.

REV. ELIJAH C. BRIDGMAN,	Missionary at Shanghai, China.
REV. HARRISON G. O. DWIGHT,	Missionary at Constantinople.
P. E. LE VAILLANT DE FLORIVAL,	Paris.
REV. BENJAMIN C. MEIGS,	Missionary in Ceylon.

3. HONORARY MEMBERS.

RÂJA APÛRVA KRISHNA BAHÂDUR,	Calcutta.
JAMES BIRD,	London.
Prof. OTTO BÖHTLINGK,	St. Petersburg.
Sir JOHN BOWRING,	Hongkong.
Prof. FRANZ BOPP,	Berlin.
RICHARD CLARKE,	London.
Prof. HEINRICH VON EWALD,	Göttingen.
M. CHAMPOLLION FIGEAC,	Paris.
Prof. GEORG WILHELM FREYTAG,	Bonn.
His Excellency FCAD EFFENDI,	Constantinople.
JULIUS FÜRST,	Leipzig.
Prof. JACOB GRIMM,	Berlin.
BRIAN HOUGHTON HODGSON,	Dursley, England.
Prof. STANISLAS JULIEN,	Paris.
Rev. JOHN DUNMORE LANG,	Sidney, N. S. Wales.
Prof. CHRISTIAN LÄSSEN,	Bonn.
Prof. RICHARD LEPSIUS,	Berlin.
Duc DE LUYNES,	Paris.
Prof. JULIUS MOHL,	Paris.
Prof. JULIUS HEINRICH PETERMANN,	Berlin.
Prof. AUGUST FRIEDRICH POTT,	Halle.
RÂJA RÂDHÂKÂNTA DEVA BAHÂDUR,	Calcutta.
Prof. REINAUD,	Paris.
Prof. EMILIUS RÖDIGER,	Berlin.
Prof. FRIEDRICH RÜCKERT,	Coburg.
His Excellency SAFVET EFFENDI,	Constantinople.
Prof. GARCIN DE TASSY,	Paris.
Prof. C. J. TORNBORG,	Lund.
Sir J. GARDINER WILKINSON,	London.
Their Majesties, the First and Second KINGS OF SIAM.	



**Central Archaeological Library,
NEW DELHI.**

Call No

Author—

Title—
