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PREFACE
TO THE
SECOND EDITION.

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

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

The encomiums of the Reviewer have in fact been justified by
PREFAE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

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

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

EDWARD B. EASTWICK.

Haileybury College,
February, 1854.
THE study of Comparative Philology has of late years been cultivated in Germany, especially, with remarkable ability and proportionate success. The labours of GRIMM, POTT, BOPP, and other distinguished Scholars, have given a new character to this department of literature; and have substituted for the vague conjectures suggested by external and often accidental coincidences, elementary principles, based upon the prevailing analogies of articulate sounds and the grammatical structure of language.

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

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

As the Vergleichende Grammatik of Professor Bopp is especially dedicated to a comprehensive comparison of languages, and exhibits, in some detail, the principles of the Sanskrit as the ground-work and connecting bond of the comparison, it was regarded as likely to offer most interest to the Philologers of this country, and to be one of
the most acceptable of its class to English students: it was therefore selected as the subject of translation. The execution of the work was, however, opposed by two considerations—the extent of the original, and the copiousness of the illustrations derived from the languages of the East, the Sanskrit and the Zend. A complete translation demanded more time than was compatible with Lord F. Egerton's other occupations; and as he professed not a familiarity with Oriental Literature, he was reluctant to render himself responsible for the correctness with which the orientalisms of the text required to be represented. This difficulty was, perhaps, rather over-rated, as the Grammar itself supplies all the knowledge that is needed, and the examples drawn from the Sanskrit and Zend speak for themselves as intelligibly as those derived from Gothic and Slavonic. In order, however, that the publication might not be prevented by any embarrassment on this account, I offered my services in revising this portion of the work; and have hence the satisfaction of contributing, however humbly, to the execution of a task which I consider likely to give a beneficial impulse to the study of Comparative Philology in Great Britain.

The difficulty arising from the extent of the original work, and the consequent labour and time requisite for its translation, was of a more serious description. This, however, has been overcome by the ready co-operation of a gentleman, who adds a competent knowledge of German to eminent acquirements as an Oriental Scholar. Having mastered several of the spoken dialects of Western India, and made himself acquainted with the sacred language of the Parsees during the period of his service under the Presidency of Bombay, Lieutenant Eastwick devoted part of a furlough, rendered necessary by failing health, to a residence in Germany, where he acquired the additional qualifications enabling him to take a share in the transla-
tion of the Vergleichende Grammatik. He has accordingly translated all those portions of the Comparative Grammar, the rendering of which was incompatible with the leisure of the Noble Lord with whom the design originated, who has borne a share in its execution, and who has taken a warm and liberal interest in its completion.

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

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

H. H. WILSON.

October, 1845.
I CONTEMPLATE in this work a description of the comparative organization of the languages enumerated in the title page, comprehending all the features of their relationship, and an inquiry into their physical and mechanical laws, and the origin of the forms which distinguish their grammatical relations. One point alone I shall leave untouched, the secret of the roots, or the foundation of the nomenclature of the primary ideas. I shall not investigate, for example, why the root *i* signifies "go" and not "stand"; why the combination of sounds stha or sta signifies "stand" and not "go." I shall attempt, apart from this, to follow out as it were the language in its stages of being and march of development; yet in such a manner that those who are predetermined not to recognise, as explained, that which they maintain to be inexplicable, may perhaps find less to offend them in this work than the avowal of such a general plan might lead them to expect. In the majority of cases the primary signification, and, with it, the primary source of the grammatical forms, spontaneously present themselves to observation in consequence of the extension of our horizon of language, and of the confronting of sisters of the same lingual stock separated for ages, but bearing indubitable features of their family connection. In the treatment, indeed, of our European tongues a new epoch could not fail to open upon us in the discovery of another region in the world of language, namely the Sanskrit,* of which it has been demonstrated, that, in its

* Sanskrita signifies "adorned, completed, perfect"; in respect to language, "classic"; and is thus adapted to denote the entire family or race." It is compounded of the elements sam, "with," and krita (nom. kritis, krita, kritam), "made," with the insertion of a euphonic s (§§. 18. 96.).
grammatical constitution, it stands in the most intimate relation to the Greek, the Latin, the Germanic, &c.; so that it has afforded, for the first time, a firm foundation for the comprehension of the grammatical connection between the two languages called the Classical, as well as of the relation of these two to the German, the Lithuanian, and Slavonic. Who could have dreamed a century ago that a language would be brought to us from the far East, which should accompany, pari passu, nay, sometimes surpass, the Greek in all those perfections of form which have been hitherto considered the exclusive property of the latter, and be adapted throughout to adjust the perennial strife between the Greek dialects, by enabling us to determine where each of them has preserved the purest and the oldest forms?

The relations of the ancient Indian languages to their European kindred are, in part, so palpable as to be obvious to every one who casts a glance at them, even from a distance: in part, however, so concealed, so deeply implicated in the most secret passages of the organization of the language, that we are compelled to consider every language subjected to a comparison with it, as also the language itself, from new stations of observation, and to employ the highest powers of grammatical science and method in order to recognise and illustrate the original unity of the different grammars. The Semitic languages are of a more compact nature, and, putting out of sight lexicographical and syntactical features, extremely meagre in contrivance; they had little to part with, and of necessity have handed down to succeeding ages what they were endowed with at starting. The triconsonantal fabric of their roots (§ 107.), which distinguishes this race from others, was already of itself sufficient to designate the parentage of every individual of the family. The family bond, on the other hand, which embraces the Indo-European race of languages, is not indeed less universal, but, in most of its bearings, of a quality infinitely more refined. The members of this race inherited, from the period of their earliest youth,
endowments of exceeding richness, and, with the capability (§. 108.), the methods, also, of a system of unlimited composition and agglutination. Possessing much, they were able to bear the loss of much, and yet to retain their local life; and by multiplied losses, alterations, suppressions of sounds, conversions and displacements, the members of the common family are become scarcely recognisable to each other. It is at least a fact, that the relation of the Greek to the Latin, the most obvious and palpable, though never quite overlooked, has been, down to our time, grossly misunderstood; and that the Roman tongue, which, in a grammatical point of view, is associated with nothing but itself, or with what is of its own family, is even now usually regarded as a mixed language, because, in fact, it contains much which sounds heterogeneous to the Greek, although the elements from which these forms arose are not foreign to the Greek and other sister languages, as I have endeavoured partly to demonstrate in my "System of Conjugation."*

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

* Frankfort, a. M. 1816. A translation of my English revision of this treatise ("Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Teutonic Languages," in the "Annals of Oriental Literature," London 1820.) by Dr. Pacht, is to be found in the second and third number of the second annual issue of Seebode's new Record of Philology and Pedagogical science. Grimm's masterly German Grammar was unfortunately unknown to me when I wrote the English revision, and I could then make use only of Hickes and Fulda for the old German dialects.
of itself, and, with it, of the entire Germanic stock, to the Greek and Roman, would necessarily have long since been unveiled, tracked through all its variations, and by this time been understood and recognised by every philologer.* For what is more important, or can be more earnestly desired by the cultivator of the classical languages, than their comparison with our mother tongue in her oldest and most perfect form? Since the Sanskrit has appeared above our horizon, that element can no longer be excluded from a really profound investigation of any province of language related to it; a fact, however, which sometimes escapes the notice of the most approved and circumspect labourers in this department.† We need

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

† We refer the reader to the very weighty judgment of W. von. Humboldt on the indispensable necessity of the Sanskrit for the history and philosophy of language (Indische Bibl. I. 133). We may here borrow, also, from Grimm's preface to the second edition of his admirable Grammar, some words which are worthy of consideration (I. vi.): "As the too exalted position of the Latin and Greek serves not for all questions in German Grammar, where some words are of simpler and deeper sound, so however, according to A. W. Schlegel's excellent remark, the far more perfect Indian Grammar may, in these cases, supply the requisite corrections. The dialect which history demonstrates to be the oldest and least corrupted must, in the end, present the most profound rules for the general exposition of the race, and thus lead us on to the reformation, without the entire subversion of the rules hitherto discovered, of the more recent modes of speech."
not fear that that practical and profound research in utrâque linguae, which is of most importance to the philologer can suffer prejudice by extension over too many languages; for the variety vanishes when the real identity is recognised and explained, and the false light of discrepancy is excluded. It is one thing, also, to learn a language, another to teach one, i.e. to describe its mechanism and organization. The learner may confine himself within the narrowest limits, and forbear to look beyond the language to be studied: the teacher's glance, on the contrary, must pass beyond the confined limits of one or two members of a family, and he must summon around him the representatives of the entire race, in order to infuse life, order, and organic mutual dependency into the mass of the languages spread before him. To attempt this appears to me the main requirement of the present period, and past centuries have been accumulating materials for the task.

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

remark on the age of the Vocabulary to which I advert; while
he ascribes to another, in which the Pehlvi is interpreted
through the Persian, an antiquity of four centuries. The
one in question cannot therefore be ascribed to any very late period. The necessity, indeed, of interpretation for the Zend must have been felt much sooner than for the Pehlvi, which remained much longer current among the Parsee tribes. It was therefore an admirable problem which had for its solution the bringing to light, in India, and, so to say, under the very eye of the Sanskrit, a sister language, no longer understood, and obscured by the rubbish of ages;—a problem of which the solution indeed has not hitherto been fully obtained, but beyond doubt will be. The first contribution to the knowledge of this language which can be relied on—that of Rask—namely, his treatise "On the age and authenticity of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta," published in 1826, and made generally accessible by V. d. Hagen's translation, deserves high honour as a first attempt. The Zend has to thank this able man (whose premature death we deeply deplore) for the more natural appearance which it has derived from his rectification of the value of its written characters. Of three words of different declensions he gives us the singular inflections, though with some sensible deficiencies, and those, too, just in the places where the Zend forms are of most interest, and where are some which display that independence of the Sanskrit which Rask claims, perhaps in too high a degree, for the Zend; a language we are, however, unwilling to receive as a mere dialect of the Sanskrit, and to which we are compelled to ascribe an independent existence, resembling that of the Latin as compared with the Greek, or the Old Northern with the Gothic. For the rest, I refer the reader to my review of Rask's and Bohlen's treatises on the Zend in the Annual of Scientific Criticism for December 1831, as also to an earlier work (March 1831) on the able labours of E. Burnouf in this newly-
opened field. My observations, derived from the original texts edited by Burnouf in Paris, and by Olshausen in Hamburgh, already extend themselves, in these publications, over all parts of the Zend Grammar; and nothing therefore has remained for me here, but further to establish, to complete, and to adjust the particulars in such a manner that the reader may be conducted on a course parallel with that of the known languages, with the greatest facility towards an acquaintance with the newly-discovered sister tongue. In order to obviate the difficulty and the labour which attend the introduction of the learner to the Zend and Sanskrit—difficulty sufficient to deter many, and to harass any one—I have appended to the original characters the pronunciation, laid down on a consistent method, or in places where, for reasons of space, one character alone is given, it is the Roman. This method is also perhaps the best for the gradual introduction of the reader to the knowledge of the original characters.

As in this work the languages it embraces are treated for their own sakes, i.e. as objects and not means of knowledge, and as I aim rather at giving a physiology of them than an introduction to their practical use, it has been in my power to omit many particulars which contribute nothing to the character of the whole; and I have gained thereby more space for the discussion of matters more important, and more intimately incorporated with the vital spirit of the language. By this process, and by the strict observance of a method which brings under one view all points mutually dependent and mutually explanatory, I have, as I flatter myself, succeeded in assembling under one group, and in a reasonable space, the leading incidents of many richly-endowed languages or grand dialects of an extinct original stock. Special care has been bestowed throughout on the German. This care was indispensable to one who, following Grimm's admirable work, aimed at applying to it the correction and adjustment that had become necessary in his theory of relations, the discovery of new affinities, or the more precise definition of those discovered, and to catch, with greater truth, at every step of grammatical progress, the
monitory voices of the Asiatic as well as the European sisterhood. It was necessary, also, to set aside many false appearances of affinity; as, for example, to deprive the *i* in the Lithuanian *geri* of its supposed connection with the *i* of Gothic, Greek, and Latin forms, such as *gudai, ἀγαθοί, boni* (see p. 251, Note †, and compare Grimm I. 827. 11); and to disconnect the Latin *is* of *lupis* (*lupibus*) from the Greek *is* of *άκοι* (άκοι-σι). As concerns the method followed in treating the subject of Germanic grammar, it is that of deducing all from the Gothic as the guiding star of the German, and explaining the latter simultaneously with the older languages and the Lithuanian. At the close of each lecture on the cases, a tabular view is given of the results obtained, in which every thing naturally depends on the most accurate distinction of the terminations from the base, which ought not, as usually happens, to be put forward capriciously, so that a portion of the base is drawn into the inflection, by which the division becomes not merely useless, but injurious, as productive of positive error. Where there is no real termination none should be appended for appearance sake: thus, for example, we give, §. 148, p. 164, the nominatives *χόρα, terra, giba,* &c., as without inflection cf. §. 137. The division *gib-a* would lead us to adopt the erroneous notion that *a* is the termination, whereas it is only the abbreviation of the *ō* (from the old *o*, §. 69.) of the theme.* In certain instances it is extraordi-

* The simple maxim laid down elsewhere by me, and deducible only from the Sanskrit, that the Gothic *ō* is the long of *a*, and thereby when shortened nothing but *a*, as the latter lengthened can only become *ō*, extends its influence over the whole grammar and construction of words, and explains, for example, how from *dags, “day”* (theme *DAGA*), may be derived, without change of vowel, *dōgs* (*DŌGA*), “daily”; for this derivation is absolutely the same as when in Sanskrit *rājata, “argentum,”* comes from *rōjata,* “argentum,” on which more hereafter. Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the Indian system of vowels, pure from consonantal and other altering influences, is of extraordinary importance for the elucidation of the German grammar: on it principally rests my own theory of vowel change, which differs materially from that of Grimm, and which I explain by mechanical laws, with some modifications of my earlier definitions,
narily difficult in languages not now thoroughly understood to hit on the right divisions, and to distinguish apparent terminations from true. I have never attempted to conceal these difficulties from the reader, but always to remove them from his path.

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

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

tions, while with Grimm it has a dynamic signification. A comparison with the Greek and Latin vocalism, without a steady reference to the Sanskrit, is, in my opinion, for the German more confusing than enlightening, as the Gothic is generally more original in its vocal system, and at least more consistent than the Greek and Latin, which latter spends its whole wealth of vowels, although not without pervading rules, in merely responding to a solitary Indian a (septimus for septamas, quatuor for chatvár-as τέσσαρ-ες, momordi for mamorda).
this class of words,* and which will, therefore, be treated in this point of view among the pronominal adjectives.† It is likely that a chasm in our literature, very prejudicial to inquiries of this kind, may be shortly filled up by a work ready for the press, and earnestly looked for by all friends of German and general philology, the Old High German Treasury of Graff. What we may expect from a work founded on a comprehensive examination of the MS. treasures of libraries national and foreign, as well as on a correction of printed materials, may be gathered from a survey of the amount contributed to knowledge in a specimen of the work, small, but happily selected, “The Old High German Prepositions.”

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

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

† The arrangement thus announced, as intended, has undergone, as will be seen, considerable modification.—_Editor._

F. BOPP.

₁/ BERLIN, 1833.
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

Sanskrit writing distinguishes the long from their corresponding short vowels by particular characters, slightly differing from these latter in form. We distinguish the long vowels, and the diphthongs रे and छो, which spring from इ and उ united with an antecedent ए, by a circumflex. The simple vowels are, first, the three, original and common to all languages, ए, इ, उ, short and long; secondly, a vowel ए, peculiar to the Sanskrit, which I distinguish by ए, and its long sound by ए. The short ए (छू) is pronounced like the consonant ए with a scarcely-distinguishable इ, and in European texts is usually written ए; the long ए (छू) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an ए with a long इ. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin; and ए presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable एर by suppression of the ए. The long ए (छू) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the ए, where, according to the laws of the formation of cases, a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened; and in the conjugation and formation of words, those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating छू ए almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel छू एर, छू एरि, छू एर, or, after labials, छू एरि. The last simple vowel of the Sanskrit writing belongs more to the grammarians [G. Ed. p. 2.] than to the language: it is in character, as well as in pronunciation, an union of an ए ए with छू ए (छू), or, when lengthened, with छू ए (छू). We require no representative for this vowel, and shall not further advert to it.

2. Sanskrit possesses two kinds of diphthongs. In the one,
a short a united with a following i becomes $\text{a} i$ (equivalent to the French ai), and with u becomes $\text{a} u$ (equivalent to the French au); so that neither of the united elements is heard, but both melt into a third sound. In the second kind, a long a with a following i becomes $\text{a} i$, and with u, $\text{a} u$, as in the German words waise, baum; so that the two elements form indeed one syllable, but are both audible. In order, however, to fix the observation on the greater weight of the a in this diphthong, we write $\text{a} i$ for $\text{a} i$, and $\text{a} u$ for $\text{a} u$. That in $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$ a short, in $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$, a long a is bound up, I infer from this, that where, in order to avoid a hiatus, the last element of a diphthong merges into its corresponding semi-vowel, out of $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$ proceed the sounds $\text{ay}$ and $\text{au}$ (with short a), but out of $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$ proceed $\text{ay}$ and $\text{au}$. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding $\text{a} a$, with an $\text{a} i$, $\text{a} i$, or $\text{u} u$, $\text{u} u$ of a following word, be contracted, like the short a, into $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$, but not into $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$, this, in my view, is to be understood as if the long a, before its combination with the initial vowel of the following word, had shortened itself. This should the less surprise us, as the long a before a dissimilar vowel of an appended inflexion or a suffix entirely disappears; and, for example, $\text{dadd}$ with $\text{us}$ $\text{us}$ makes neither $\text{dadlus}$, nor $\text{dad} o$, but $\text{dadus}$. The opinion I have already expressed on [G. Ed. p. 3.] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend; in which $\text{di}$ always stands in the place of the Sanskrit $\text{di}$, and $\text{du}$ $\text{du}$ or $\text{du}$ $\text{du}$ for $\text{du}$ $\text{du}$. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding a (short or long) with a following $\text{a} i$ or $\text{a} u$, becomes $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$; of which it is to be understood, that the short a contained in $\text{a} i$ and $\text{a} u$ merges with the antecedent a into a long a, which then, with the i of the diphthong $\text{a}$, becomes $\text{a} i$, and with the u of $\text{a}$, becomes $\text{a} u$. For example, $\text{mamditat}$, from $\text{mam} \text{mam}$ $\text{mam}$ $\text{mam}$ $\text{mam}$, is to be understood
as if the diphthong ṛ ē united its first element a with the preceding a into d, and with this, further united its last element (i) into ṛ di. [Compare § 688, p. 917.]

3. Among the simple vowels the old Indian alphabet is deficient in the designation of the Greek epsilon and omicron (ε and ο) whose sounds, if they existed when the Sanskrit was a living language, yet could only have evolved themselves, subsequently to the fixing of its written character, out of the short a; for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between ā, ē, and ō, if the sounds had been forthcoming.* It is important here to observe, that in the oldest Germanic dialect, namely, the Gothic, the sounds and characters of the short e and o are also wanting, and that either a, i, or u corresponds, in that dialect, to our German short e. For example, faltha, “ich falte,” “I fold;” ǧiba, “ich gebe,” “I give.” In the Zend the Sanskrit ṛ a remains usually as a, or has changed itself, according to certain [G. Ed. p. 4.] rules, into s ē. Thus, for example, before a concluding m we always find s ē; compare the accusative Ṛṭhṛē-m “filium” with पुत्रम putra-m; and its genitive Ṛṭhṛa-hē with पुत्रसम putra-sya. In Greek the Sanskrit ṛ a becomes ā, e, or o, without presenting any certain rules for the choice on each occasion between these three vowels; but the prevailing practice is, that in the terminations of nominal bases the Greek o answers to the Indian ṛ a, except in the vocatives, where an e is substituted. In the Latin, besides ā, ē, and ō, u also is employed, in the terminations of nouns of the second declension and of the first person plural, as also in some adverbial suffixes, to replace the Sanskrit ṛ a.

4. As in the Greek the short Sanskrit a is oftener replaced by e or o than by a short a, so the long ṛ a ē is oftener re-

* Grimm, Vol. i. p. 594; with whom I entirely concur in this matter; having long abandoned a contrary opinion, which I maintained in 1819 in the Annals of Oriental Literature.
presented by η or ω than by a long alpha: and though in the Doric the long a has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an η, no similar trace of the long ā for ω is to be found. ὅθημι ἄδαμι, "I place," becomes τιθημι; ὅθημι ἄδαμι, "I give," δίδωμι; the dual termination ᾱμ tām answers to την, and only in the imperative to των: on the other hand, the ᾱμ ἄm of the genitive plural is always represented by ου. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either η or ω stand for the Indian diphthongs ι έ or ό οι δ, formed by ι ι or an ι ου following a long Α for the first, the Greek substitutes ει or οι (because for ι a, and also for α, ε and ο are the substitutes), and for the last, ευ or ου. Thus, ἐμί ἐμί, "I go," becomes ειμι; πατές, "thou mayest fall," πίπτος; ώδα, "I know," οίδα; γο go, mas. fem. "a bullock or heifer," βοῦ-ς. From this dropping of the ι or ύ in the Indian diphthongs έ and οι it may happen that α, ε, or ο, answer to these diphthongs; thus, δικατάρας, "one of two," becomes ἐκατερός; ἰδιεύρι, "brother-in-law," Latin, levir (nom. ἰδεύρι, accus. ἰδεύρι, ἰδεύρι), becomes δαιήρ (from δαἰήρ, δαι-ήρ); ἰδεύρι, ἰδεύρι-σ, "God," Θεός; and the ο in βοῦς, βούς, stands for βου-ός, βου-ι, the ύ of which must have passed into ι, and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin bovis, bovi, and the Indian गवी gavi (locative) from गद-ि.

5. In Latin we sometimes find the long e, which, however, may be shortened by the influence of the following consonant, arising from the mixture of a and ι, as in the above-mentioned word levir, and in the subjunctive amēmus: cf. कामये कामये, from कामया-ि.

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

* The original has devr, but, as observed in p. 1, in European texts it is usual to write ri for च; and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment: it seems advisable, therefore, to express च by ri.—Editor.
various but sure appearances, which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms, that in Sanskrit ओ a and द्र d are graver than the corresponding quantity of the vowel ए; and this discovery is of the utmost importance for every Treatise on special as well as comparative Grammar. It leads us, in particular, to important discoveries with respect to the Germanic modification of vowels. In Latin, also, the ए may be considered as lighter than a, and generally takes the place of the latter when a root with an original a would otherwise be burthened with a reduplication of sound. Hence, for example, अब्रियो for अब्रि, तेतिगो for तेतागी. I am compelled by this view to retract an earlier conjecture, that the ए in तेतिगो was produced by a virtue of assimilation in the termination ए. I have also to relieve myself from my former theory, that the ए in words like इनर्मिस, इमबर्बिस, instead of इनार्मिस, इमबर्बिस, springs from a retrospective power of assimilation in the following ए, after the fashion of the modification of the vowel in German (Grimm, p. 80), and must place it in the same class with the ए in such forms as अब्जेक्टस and तुबिसेन. The Latin radical ए, for instance, is subject to a double alteration, when the root is burthened with antecedent syllables or words: it becomes ए in open syllables, but ए if the vowel is pressed upon by a following consonant unattended by a vowel. Hence we have तुबिसेन, अब्जेक्टस, in contrast to तुबिसीन, अब्रियो; and इनर्मिस, इमबर्बिस, not इनार्मिस, इमबर्बिस: on the contrary, इनिमिकस, इसिपिदस, not इनिमिकस, इसिपिदस. In connection with this stands the transition of the first or second declension into the third. As अस is the masculine form for ए, we ought to say इनर्मस, इमबर्बस; but इनर्मिस, इमबर्बिस, and other such forms, owe their origin to the lesser weight of the ए. With the displacement of the accent, where it occurs, this change of the vowel has nothing to do; but the removal of the accent and the weakening of the vowel are nearly related, and are both occasioned by the composition. In the Lithuanian we find similar appearances; as, for ex-
ample, pónas, "lord," at the end of compounds, is weakened into ponis, as rótponis, "councillor," Germ. rathsherr." (See p. 1305, Note *).

7. Sanskrit Grammar gives no certain indication of the relative weight of the u with regard to the other original vowels. The u is a vowel too decided and full of character to allow of its being exchanged in this language, in relief of its weight, for any other letter. It is the most obstinate of all, and admits of no exclusion from a terminating syllable, in cases where a and i admit suppression. Nor will it retire [G. Ed. p. 7.] from a reduplicated syllable in cases where a allows itself to be weakened down to i. Thus in Latin we have pupugi, tutudi; while a, in cases of repetition, is reduced to i or é (tetigi, féfelli, &c.) In the Gothic, also, the u may boast of its pertinacity: it remains firm as the terminating vowel of nominal bases where a and i have undergone suppression, and in no single case has it been extinguished or transmuted. No power, however, exists which will not yield at last to time; and thus in the High German, whose oldest records are nearly four centuries younger than Ulphilas, the u has, in many cases, given way, or become in declension similar to i. (See also §§ 400, 584.)

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

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

* The practice is not unauthorized by rule. A final \(m\) is convertible to Anuswāra before any consonant (Pan. 8. 3. 23.); and a medial \(n\) or \(m\) is convertible
endeavoured, in my Grammar, to remedy this confusion in the simple theory of Anuswâra. My predecessors in the treatment of Sanskrit Grammar make no distinction between the real and the supposititious Anuswâra. Colebrooke gives it, in general, the pronunciation of n, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding ़ n, may be abbreviated into Anuswâra. Forster expresses it by the n in the English word plinth; Carey and Yates by the English combination ng; Wilkins by m. All substitute it for the concluding ़ of grammatical terminations: and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswâra into ़ or ़, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write abhavan or abhavang, "I was;" dantam or dantang, "a tooth;" not abhavam, dantam. Colebrooke, on the other hand, expressing a Sanskrit inscription in Roman letters (Asiatic Transactions, Vol. VII.) gives the proper termination m, and before t, by a euphonic rule, n; but he maintains the original m before sibilants and half vowels where Anuswâra is due; as vidwisâm śrimad, for विद्विस्मिन् vidwisāni. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write n, for the value of Anuswâra, in the place of m in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives danan, "a gift," for dānam; the second, ahan for aham, "I." A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly m instead of a spurious or representative Anuswâra at the end of words; and makes, for example, the infinitive termination in tum, not in tun or tung. He, nevertheless, on this important point of grammar, retains the erroneous opinion, that the Anuswâra is a variable nasal, which, before vowels, must of necessity pass into m (Preface to the Bhag. Gita, p. xv.); while the direct converse is the fact, that the concluding m is convertible to Anuswâra before any consonant except a semi-vowel or a nasal. (Ib. 8. 3. 24.) Such are the rules. In practice, the mutation of the final म is constant: that of the medial nasal is more variable, and in general the change occurs before the semi-vowels and sibilants.—Editor.
the variable nasal, which, under certain conditions, passes into
the proper Anuswāra; but before vowels is necessarily re-
tained, both in writing and pronunciation. [G. Ed. p. 10.]
That Von Schlegel also still continues the original ā m at the
end of words as an euphonic alteration of the dead sound of
Anuswāra appears from his mode of printing Sanskrit text, in
which he makes no division between a concluding ā m and
the commencing vowel of the following word; while he does
make a division after ā n, and thereby shews that he admits
a division after terminating letters which remain unaffected
by the influence of the letters which follow. If, however, we
write tān abravit, "he said to them;" we must
also write tām abravit, "he said to her;" not
tāmabravit, for the m of tām is original, and not,
as Von Schlegel thinks, begotten out of Anuswāra. The conjec-
ture of C. Lassen (Ind. Bibl. Book III. p. 39), that the Anuswāra
is to be understood, not as an after sound (Nachlaut), not as an
echo (Nachhall), but as a sound which regulates itself by that
which follows—as it were the term Nachlaut, with the accent
on laut*—appears to me highly improbable. Schlegel's nasalis
mutabilis would indeed be justified by this view, and the imputa-
tion of error removed from the Indian Grammarians, to whom
we willingly concede a knowledge of the value of the Sanskrit
signs of sound, and whom we are unwilling to censure for de-
signating a half sound as mutable, in a language whose termi-

* This seems intended for an explanation, for Lassen has nothing like
it. I have not found an etymological explanation of the term in any
grammatical commentary; but it may be doubted if the explanation of
the text, or that given by Lassen, be correct. Anuswāra may indeed be
termed sequens sonus; but by that is to be understood the final or closing
sound of a syllable. Any other nasal may be used as the initial letter of
a syllable; but the nasal Anuswāra is exclusively an "after" sound, or
final. It is not even capable of blending, as it were, with a following
vowel, like a final n or m, as in tān- or tāmabravit. It is the legitimate
representative of either of the other nasals when those are absolutely
terminal,
nating sounds are almost always governed by the following words. It is true the half sound owes its being to the mutability of a concluding \( m \), but is not mutable itself, since it never has an independent existence of its own at the end of any word; in the middle, however, of a radical syllable, as दानिक, हिन्द hins, it is susceptible of expulsion, but not of alteration.

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

10. The deadened nasal, which is expressed in the Lithuanian by particular signs over the vowel which it follows, appears to be identical with the Sanskrit Anuswāra; and we write it in the same manner with \( n \). At the end of words it stands for the remainder of an ancient \( m \), in the accusative singular for example; and the deadening of \( n \) before \( s \) into \( \dot{n} \) presents terminal, and in pronunciation retains their respective sounds, according to the initial consonant of the following word. Again, with regard to its relation to the semi-vowels and sibilants, it may be regarded as appropriate to them merely in as far as neither of the other nasals is so considered. In this sense Anuswāra may be termed a subsidiary or supplemental sound, being prefixed with most propriety to those letters which, not being classed under either of the five series of sounds, have no rightful claim to the nasals severally comprehended within each respective series.—Editor.
a remarkable accordance with the Sanskrit rule of euphony before mentioned. From laupsin-u, "I praise," therefore comes laupsinsu, "I shall praise;" as in Sanskrit हंस्यामि haisyāmi, "I shall kill," from the root हन han. In the Prākrit, not only the म m, but the न n, at the end of words, has always fallen into Anuswāra, without regard to the following letters. Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the Šakuntalā, p. 70, मघव, which is certainly to be pronounced, not bhaavam, but bhaavan, for मघवन् bhagavan; [G. Ed. p. 12.]

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

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

* No native scholar would read these as bhaavan or kudhaī, as the text affirms, but bha-avam, kudham, agreeably to the final म represented by Anuswāra.—Editor.
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respective non-aspirates, with a clearly audible \( h \); thus, for example, ध \( dh \), not like the English \( th \); फ \( ph \), not \( f \) or \( \phi \); and ख \( kh \), not like the Greek \( \chi \). In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other; thus, भर \( bhar \), धर \( dhar \), (भ्र \( bhri \), ध्र \( dhri \), § 1.) “to bear,” “to hold,” are perhaps originally identical. धुमा-स \( dhūma-s \).

[G. Ed. p. 13.] “smoke,” is, in Latin, \( fumus \). In Greek, थάνω, as well as \( φένω \), is related to हन \( han \), from धन \( dhan \), “to kill.” The Gothic \( thliuhan \) is the German \( siehen \), Old High German \( vliuhan \).

13. The first class is that of the gutturals, and includes the letters ङ \( k \), ङ \( kh \), ग \( g \), घ \( gh \), ङ \( n \). The nasal of this class is pronounced like the German \( n \) before gutturals, as in the words \( sinken \), \( enge \), so as to prepare for the following guttural. In the middle of words it is only found before gutturals; and, at the end, supplies the place of ङ \( m \) when the following word begins with a guttural.† We write it without the distinctive sign, as its guttural nature is easily recognised by the following consonant. The aspirates of this class are not of frequent use, either at the beginning or end of words. In some Greek words we find \( \chi \) in the place of ङ \( kh \): compare \( ονυς \), \( ονυχ-ος \), with \( nakha \), “a nail;” कॉर्ण, कॉν्यος, with \( sankha \), “shell;” चावो, चान्दो, with \( khan \), “to

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

† A careful examination will perhaps shew that the several nasals of the Sanskrit alphabet are mere modifications of one sound, according to the manner in which that is affected by a succeeding letter; and that the modifications prevail equally in most languages, although it has not been thought necessary to provide them with distinct symbols.—Editor.
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13. As regards the sonant aspirates, the ग of gharma, “heat” (in Greek θέρμη), has passed into the aspiration of another organ; लग्न laghu, “light,” has laid aside the guttural in the Latin levis, and, in virtue of the i, changed the u into v. The guttural has kept its place in the German leicht, the English light, and the Old High German lihti.

14. The second class is that of the palatals; and includes the sounds ch and j, with their aspirates and nasal. We write च ch, छ chh, ज j,* क जh,* ङ n. This class is an offshoot from the preceding, and to be considered as a softening of it. It is only found before vowels and weak consonants (semivowels and nasals); and before strong consonants, and at the end of a word, generally retires into the class from which it springs. Thus, for example, the base वच vāch, “speech,” “voice” (cf. vox), makes, in the uninflected nominative, वाक vāk; in the instrumental and locative plurals, वाभन vāgh-bhiṣ, वाङ्क vāṅkhu. In the cognate languages we have to look for, in the place of the letters of this class, first, gutturals; next, labials, on account of their mutual affinity; thirdly, the sounds of t, as, according to pronunciation, the first element of the palatals is a t or d; fourthly, sibilants, as being the last element in the letters of this class. Compare पचान्द pachānd, “I cook,” (inf. paktum, part. pass. pakta), with coquo, पेपο (पेपτο, पेपτω, पेपσω); चात chatur, “four,” nom. चत्वार्ष chatwāras, with quatuor, तेवरेस, तेस-σατες, Gothic fidvīr, Lithuanian ketturi; पंच panchan, “five” (nom. accus. pancha), with quinque, पेन्ते, पेमपे, Gothic fimf, Lithuanian penki; राजन rājan, “king,” with rex, regis; राजत rājata, nom. rājatam, “silver” (from rāj, “to shine”), with argentum, ἀργυρός; जान jān, “knee,” with genu, γόνυ. With regard to the aspirates of this class, the chh, as an initial letter in some words, answers to sc, σκ; स्विन्नह chhind-

* The original has ज and ज; but the appropriate symbols in English are j and its aspirate.
mas, "we cleave," चिनतम् dhinaadmi, "I cleave," answers to the Latin scindo; चाया cchadya, "shadow," to the Greek σκιά. As the terminating letter of a root च answers, in प्रच prachh, "to ask," to the Gothic h in frah, "I or he asked," and to the German and Latin g in frage, rogo, in case that the latter, as I suspect, is a modification of progo. The nasal of this class, for which we require no distinctive sign, as it only precedes palatals, deviates but slightly from the sound of the guttural n, and is pronounced nearly like nj.

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

* Here, also, it may be doubted if similar modifications of the dental sounds are not discoverable in languages which do not express them by separate symbols. The t of the Italian tutto is the Sanskrit त. — Editor.
is not the case with the nasals of the preceding classes; yet never at the beginning of words.

16. The fourth class embraces the dentals, or the sounds which properly answer to the common d and t, together with the common n, which belongs to them, त d, थ th, र r, च ch, छ dh, च n. Of the aspirates of this organ, we have to remark, that थ th, in an etymological respect, never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by θ, but always like the natural t, by τ. On the other hand, छ dh does correspond to θ, which also sometimes represents र d. Thus the imperative ending धि dhi, in Greek becomes θι; मध mādhū, “honey,” “wine,” is μέθυ; दाधामि dadhāmi, “I place,” τίθημι; दुहितर duhitar [G. Ed. p. 16.] (दुहीत्र duhitri, §. 1.), “daughter,” θυγάτηρ; द्वार dwār, f. and dwāra, neut. (nom. dwāram), “door,” θύρα; देवa deva, Lithuan. dievas, “God,” Θεός. With regard to the hard aspirate, compare the terminations τε and τον with थ tha and थस thas, the former in the plural, the second in the dual of the present and future; στήσω with शास्त्रिनिस thāsyāmī, “I shall stand”; ἀσέων with चरिस asthi, “bone”; in the Latin, rota with रथ ratha, “carriage”; and in the Gothic, the ending t, in the second person singular of the preterite, with tha; for example, vais-t, “thou knewest,” with वेत vēt-tha. From the beginning of words in the Sanskrit this aspirate is nearly excluded.

17. The interchange of d and l is well known. Upon it, among other instances, is founded the relation of lacryma to दाक्रु, दाक्रुम. In Sanskrit, also, an apparently original द d often corresponds to the l of cognate European languages; for example, दीप dēp, “to light,” दीप dīpa, “lamp,” becomes लाम्प लाम्पa; देहa deha, “body,” Gothic leik. On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our lf, Gothic lif, in elf, zwulf, Gothic tvalif, to दशक दशक, देक. As also the second consonant has undergone alteration, and has migrated from the gutturals into the
labials; and as, moreover, the number "ten," taken alone, is, in Gothic, taihun, in German zehn, its origin from lif was deeply concealed; and even the Lithuanian lika, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further support. With respect to the affinity of λικος in ἤλικος, &c., and of the Gothic leiks in hvēleiks, "like to whom?" to हुष्ठ drisa, Prākrit दिस disa,"like," I refer the reader to my Treatise on the Pronoun and its influence (Berlin, published by Dümmler); and only remark, in addition, that by this analogy of λικος, leiks, I was first led to that of lif to देकाल; while the Lithuanian lika had not yet attracted my observation.

18. The labial class comes next, namely, प p, म ph, ब b, भ bh, म m. The hard aspirate ph is among the rarer letters; the most usual words in which it occurs are, कथ phala, "fruit," चेन phēna, "foam," and the forms which come from the root पुल phull, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate bh belongs, together with dh, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, φ and θ are the letters which most frequently correspond to this bh, especially at the beginning of words; for example, भ्रिः bhri, "to bear," fero, φέρω; भु bhū, "to be," fu-i, φύ-ω. bh is also often represented by b in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The f of fero becomes b in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as ber, brum, brium, in words like saluber, candelabrum, manubrium. Thus the f of fu appears as b in the forms amābam, amabo, which I have recognised as compounds, and which will be hereafter explained. The dative and ablative termination plural भ्यास bhyas, becomes bus in Latin. The nasal of this class, म m, is subject, at the end of a word, to several alterations, and only remains fast before a pause, a
vowel, or letters of its own class: it otherwise governs itself according to the nature of the following letters, and may pass, in this manner, into any of the four preceding nasals, and weakens itself into the softened nasal sound [G. Ed. p. 18.] of the proper Anuswàra, if followed by a semi-vowel, a sibilant, or ə h. M has also a full right to the name of a mutable nasal. It is, however, not beseeming, when, in editions of a text otherwise conspicuous for accuracy, we find ऋ, though protected in its original condition by a pause, or by the following letters, written as Anuswàra.

19. The semi-vowels follow next: य, र, ल, व. We distinguish य by the sound of our German j, or the English y in the word year. As the Latin j in English has the sound of a softened y, so in Pràkrit य often passes into ज j, and in Greek, upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of ज्ञम् ज्ञति, ज्ञोति, &c. to the root युज् युज्, "to bind," and that of the verbs in ध्वज to the Indian verbs in याति ayâmi; for ध is ds, but the sound dsch is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian جوان javân, "young," to the Sanskrit Theme युवन् yuwan, Lat. juvenis, belongs to this place. By व we here designate the sound of the German w and English v. After consonants, as त्रां tām, "thee," this letter takes the pronunciation of the English w. The occasional hardening of the v into a guttural deserves mention here; thus, in Latin, vic-si (vixi), victum, spring from viv; and in facio I recognise the Sanskrit causal भूव याति bhāv-ayāti, "I make to be," from the root भू bhā. The connection between fac-tus and fio is practically demonstrated. Refer back, in the Old and Modern Greek, to the occasional hardening of the Digamma into Ψ (cf. C. G. Schmidt in the Berlin Jahrbuch, 1831, p. 613.). The voice cannot dwell on व or य; and these two letters are therefore, as in the Semitic languages, excluded from the end of words: [G. Ed. p. 19.] therefore the word दिव div, "Heaven," forms its nominative, which ought to be divi (divs being forbidden, see §. 94.),
from चो dyḍ. Nominal bases in य do not exist. र र at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with ष s. In places where the concluding s, by favour of the following letter, is retained, र र becomes ष s; and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where ष s becomes र र, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20. The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskrit works ष l often stands for र र.* We often, also, find in the cognate European languages l for ष v. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix lente (e.g. opulens), and of the Gothic laud(a)-s† (see § 116.), in hvēlausds, “quantus,” svalauds, “tantus,” samalauds, “just so much,” to the Sanskrit चन्द्र vant (in the strong case, § 119.), in words like धनवन्त dhanavant, “endowed with wealth,” तावन्त tāvant, “so much,” यावन्त yāvant, “how much.” On the change between v and र is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German pir-u-mēs, “we are” (sing. pim, भनवे bhav-a-mēs); as also that of slirr-rawl-v-d-mēs, “we shriek,” to स्राव-या-मास srāv-ayā-mās, “we make to hear” (§ 109.); as also that of triusu, “I fall,” from the [G. Ed. p. 20.] root trus, to the Sanskrit ध्रस्त dhrus, “to fall;” ‡ and of the Cretan τπέ “thee” from τφέ, to the Sanskrit twā. The semi-vowel l is also exchanged with the nasals; thus, अन्या anya-s, “the other,” becomes alius in Latin, and

* It is scarcely correct to say “often,” as the instances are rare: nor are they restricted to recent works. Menu has aśṭika for aśrika.—Ed.
† Grimm (iii. p. 46) assumes an adjective lauds, “great;” which, as far as the Gothic at least is concerned, might be dispensed with, as it is of the greatest antiquity as a suffix, and does not appear alone as an adjective, even in the oldest periods.
‡ Dhā, according to §. 16., = the Greek ἅ; and to the 9, according to §. 87., corresponds the old High German t. The u of trus, from the old a, may be produced by the influence of the r, or of the dropped nasal.
antara-s, "the other," alter; vād, "to speak," answers to the Gothic lath-ēn, "called," "invited," ga-lathon, "called together": dhma, "to blow," answers to fiare. (§ 109.) Compare, also, balbus with βαισαινω.

21. The last class embraces the sibilants and h: श s, च sh, झ s, and झ h. The first sibilant is spoken with a slight aspiration, and usually written by the English sh.* It belongs to the palatal class, and thence supplies the place of the third or proper स s when a hard palatal च ch or झ chh follows; for instance, राम चारति rāmas charati, instead of राम चारति rāmas charati, "Rāmas goes." In its origin, श s appears to have sprung from k; and in Greek and Latin we find κ and c regularly corresponding to the Sanskrit श s. The Gothic substitutes h in pursuance of the law of change of sound; but the Lithuanian stands the nearest to the Sanskrit with reference to this letter, and has in its stead a sibilant compound sz, pronounced like sh. Compare decem, δέκα, Gothic taihun, Lithuan. dēsztimis, with दशा dasan (nom. दशा dasa); canis, κώνω, Gothic hunds, Lithuan. szuo (gen. szuns), with छ्ङ้}

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

G. Ed. p. 21.] it appears to have originated, namely, k. In some roots, however, श s passes into द t; for instance, हस dris, "seeing," and विश viś, "a man of the third caste," form, in the uninflected nominative, हस drik, विद viṭ. The second sibilant, च sh, is pronounced like our sch, or sh in English, and
belongs to the lingual class. It often steps, according to certain rules into the place of \( s \); thus, for instance, after \( \text{k} \), \( s \) never follows, but only \( \text{sh} \); and the \( \text{t} \), \( \text{x} \), in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by \( \text{ksh} \). Compare दक्षिण dukshina, with den-ter, ᵇεξίος, Lithuanian deszine, "the right hand." Of the vowels, \( i \), \( u \), and \( ri \), short or long, are averse from \( s \), to which \( a \) and \( o \) alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, \( s \) passes into \( sh \); for instance, *\( \text{itf} \) tan6shi, instead of \( \text{ltf} \) tanosi. As an initial, \( s \) is extremely rare; the Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change \( s \) into \( sh \), from the first with a \( s \). A word which really begins with \( s \) is \( shash \), "six;" to which the Lith. szeszi, a plural nominative, answers most nearly, while other cognate languages indicate an original ordinary \( s \). At the end of a word, and in the middle before other strong consonants, such as \( t \), \( th \), \( sh \) is not permitted, but in most roots passes into \( k \); but with some into \( t \): the number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, \( shat \).

22. The third sibilant is the ordinary \( s \) of all languages, but which, at the end of Sanskrit words, holds a very insecure position, and by certain rules is subjected to transmutation into श \( s \), \( sh \), \( r \), : \( ah \) or \( h \) Visarga (§ 11.), and \( u \); and only remains unaltered before \( t \) and \( th \). We write, for example, सुनुस् तरति sūnus tarati, "the son passes over," but तरति sūru: tarati [G. Ed. p. 22.] sūnuli, सूनुष् चरति sūnus charati (it), सूनुर बहाति sūnur bhavati (est). This sensitiveness against a concluding \( s \) can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division; as in the cognate languages the concluding \( s \) remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for \( r \) does not return into its original form. Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, §, 383-4.) \( p \) everywhere stands for \( s \): Τιμόσεωρ ὁ Μιλήσιορ—παραγινόμενορ—λυμαίνεται τάρ ἄκοαρ τῶν νέων, &c.* The Sanskrit could not endure

---

* Cf. Hartung, p. 100.
The Latin protects the s usually at the end of words; but in the classical period generally sacrifices it, when between two vowels, to the r; for instance, genus, generis, for genesis; a contrast to forms found in Varro and Festus, such as plusima, foedesum, meliosem, majosibus, in which the s evinces its original existence in the history of the language (see § 127.). The accusative form arbosem, recorded by Festus, is more startling, for here r is the original form, if, as I can hardly doubt, arbor, arbos, is related to the word of such frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, urvarda, “tree.” This expression is not wanting in the Sanskrit, (वृक्ष urvarda;) but it signifies, according to Wilson, “fruitful land,” and “land” in general.

23. ह h belongs to the letters which, in Sanskrit, are never admitted at the end of words, nor in the middle before strong consonants. In these places it passes, by certain rules, into त t, ध d, क k, or ग g. In Greek we often find χ in the place of the Sanskrit ह: compare χειμών, βιον, with हिम hima, “snow,” “time;” χαίρω with हिरिश- [G. Ed. p. 23.] यामि, gaudeo; χιν with हस haina, “goose;” χθές, heri, with जस hyas, “yesterday;” उχοस with चह vah, “to transport.” We also find κ, c, for ह: compare καρδία, cor, Gothic hearta, with ह्रिद hrid (न. ह्रदय hridaya), “heart.” We sometimes, but rarely, find the spiritus asper substituted for ह; for instance, अरपो, हरामि harami, “I take away.” The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes sz for ह; for instance, aš, “I,” for अहम aham, szirdis f. “heart,” for ह्रिद hrid. This letter stands sometimes in Sanskrit for a mutilation of other aspirated consonants, of which the aspiration alone has been suppressed; thus, instead of the imperative ending धि dhi, we generally find हि; on which account the grammarians accept हि hi, and not धि dhi, as the original ending, and assume that हि passes into धि, for euphonic reasons, after consonants.

The root ग्रह grah, “to take,” is written in the Vedas ग्रह graham, and answers thus more nearly to the German greifen, and the Persian girfi.\n
CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

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

VOWELS.

\( \text{अ a}, \text{ए ē}, \text{ई ī}, \text{उ u}, \text{ऋ r̥i}, \text{ॠ r̥} \)

ANUSWĀRA AND VISARGA.

\( \text{ः h} \)

CONSONANTS.

Gutturals . . . . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{क k}, \text{ख kh}, \text{ग g}, \text{घ gh}, \text{ङ n} \)

Palatals . . . . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{च ch}, \text{छ chh}, \text{ज j}, \text{ज jh}, \text{ञ n} \)

Linguals . . . . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{ट t}, \text{ठ th}, \text{ड d}, \text{ध dh}, \text{ण n} \)

Dentals . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{त t}, \text{थ th}, \text{द d}, \text{ध dh}, \text{न n} \)

Labials . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{प p}, \text{फ ph}, \text{ब b}, \text{भ bh}, \text{म m} \)

Semi-Vowels . . . . . . . . . . \( \text{य y}, \text{र r}, \text{ल l}, \text{व v} \)

Sibilants and Aspirates, \( \text{श s}, \text{श sh}, \text{स s}, \text{ह h} \)

[G. Ed. p. 24.] The vowel characters given above are found only at the beginning of words; and in the middle or end of a word are supplied in the following manner: अ a is left unexpressed, but is contained in every consonant which is not distinguished by a sign of rest (\( \text{।} \)) or connected with another vowel. अ k is thus read ka; and k by itself, or the absence of the a, is expressed by ए ē. इ i, ई ī, are expressed by ए ī, ई ī, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates; for instance, कि ki, कृ k̥i. For उ u, ओ o, ऋ r̥i, ओ r̥i, the signs उ, ओ, ऋ, ओ, are placed under their consonants; as, कु ku, कू k̥u, कृ k̥i, कू k̥i. For ध d̄ and ध d̄, \( \text{́} \) and \( \text{̀} \) are placed over their consonants; as, के k̄, कै k̄. ओ o and ओ o are written by omission of the अ, which is here only a fulcrum; as, को k̄o, कै k̄o. The consonants without vowels, instead of appearing in their entire shapes, and with the sign of rest, are usually written so that their distinctive sign is connected with the following consonant; for instance, for त t, स s, य y, we have त t, त t; and thus matsya is written माः, not मत्स्य; for च c + य y, we have च c; and for क + य y we have ख ḷ.
25. The Sanskrit letters are divided into hard or surd, and soft or sonant. Surd are, all the tenues, with their corresponding aspirates; and in fact, according to the order given above, the first two letters in each of the first five rows, also the three sibilants. Soft are, the medials, with their aspirates, the व, the nasals, semi-vowels, and all vowels. Another division also appears to us convenient—that of the consonants into strong and weak; in which the nasals and semi-vowels come under the denomination of weak; the remaining consonants under that of the strong. The weak consonants and vowels exercise no influence, as initial letters of inflections and suffixes, in the formation of words, on the terminating letters of a root; while they themselves are compelled to accommodate themselves to a following strong consonant.

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

according to certain euphonic laws. ० i, namely, and इ, melt with the च a of Guna into र ए; र u, ज a, into चो अ. These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into सु ay and सचर av; चु ri and चु जी become, in virtue of the action of Guna, च्व ar; by that of Vṛddhi, च्व अर. As in Greek the [G. Ed. p. 26.] short Sanskrit a is frequently replaced by e; so we find the Guna here, when a radical i or u is prolonged by prefixing an e. As in the Sanskrit the root ० i, “to go,” forms, by the Guna modification, रमि emi (from a-imi), “I go,” in contrast to imas, “we go;” thus in Greek also we have είμι in contrast to μεν. As the root चु बुध budh, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into चो बॉध bōdh (from baudh), for instance, बोधामि bōdhāmi, “I know;” so in the Greek* the root φυγ (ἐφυγον), in the present becomes φεύγω. In the Gothic, in the strong form of Grimm’s 8th and 9th conjugations, the radical vowel, strengthened by a in the singular of the preterite, stands in the same contrast to the i and u of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskrit. Compare baug, “I bent,” in contrast to bugum, “we bent,” with the Sanskrit form of the same signification, singular ब्रजङ्ग bubhāja, plural ब्रजङ्गितम bubhujima, of the root ब्रजङ्ग bhuj; compare vait, “I know,” in contrast with vitum, “we know,” with the Sanskrit forms of the same signification, वेदः veda (from vāda), विदितम vimidima, from the root वेदः vid, “know,” which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

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

* Regarding Greek αι as Guna of i, see § 491.; and as to Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian, see §§ 255.b) 6, 741., 746.
bug, and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally, in the present tense, to the prevalent *i* of terminations a retro-active influence. It now, however, seems to me indisputable that Grimm’s 8th and 9th conjugations of the first class correspond to my first Sanskrit conjugation (r. 326.); so that the Guna *a* of the special tenses has been weakened to *i*, while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of *a*; just as in the 10th, 11th, and 12th conjugations, according to Grimm’s division, the radical *a*, which has remained in the preterite singular, is, in the present and other tenses, weakened to *i*; so that, for instance, *at*, “I” and “he eat,” corresponds to the root सदू ad, “to eat;” but in the present, *ita* stands in place of the form चाय admi, “I eat.”

28. The Zend possesses, besides the Sanskrit Guna, which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskrit, a vowel application peculiar to itself, which likewise consists in स a, and which was first observed by M. E. Burnouf.† The vowels which admit this addition in the interior, but not at the end of words, are, first, the short स i, स u, स o; 2dly, the Guna diphthongs स e and स o. The two latter are the most usually befriended by this addition, and स e takes it in all cases where the opportunity occurs, both as an initial letter, and even at the end of words wherever the dependent particle म चा, “and,” is appended to it; hence, for example, मैं नाईे, “hominem,” मङ्गळ धार्शे, “igni”; but मङ्गळ नाराय चा, “hominique,” मङ्गळ धाराचा, “ignique.” Also where an e stands in two consecutive syllables, an a is placed before each. Hence, for instance, एलाइब्याक एलेब्यास. The only case in which, ex-

---

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

cepting at the actual end of the word, \( \nu \) is remains without
the preceding \( \iota \), is when it is produced by the influence of
\( \nu \) or \( \iota \). We say, indeed, \( \text{yādīyāḥ, "quibus," from } \text{yēbhyaḥ; but}
\), not \( \text{yāśeḥ, but } \text{yēśeḥ, "I glorify," from the}
\text{Sanskrit root, which has been lost, for the verb } \text{yāṣ, from}
\text{which comes } \text{yāṣas, "glory." Yet we find, for}
\text{yēzi, "if" (cf. } \text{yadi), sometimes, though possibly}
erroneously, also \( \text{yēzi.} \) The addition of the \( \iota \) before
\( \iota \) is just as unlimited, but the occasion is far
less frequent. Examples of it are, \( \text{aōza, "strength," from}
\text{oḷaśa; kērēṇaōt, "he made," from } \text{kri, according to the}
fifth class, for } \text{akriṇōt; mraōt, "he spoke," from }
\text{abrōt, which would be the regular form, instead of}
\text{aabrōt (Gramm. Crit. r. 352.).} \) We
also find \( \text{mraōm, "I spoke," for } \text{aabrōm, which would be the form used were, in the}
\text{Sanskrit adjunct tenses, as in the Greek, a mere nasal, and not } \text{am, the}
suffix of the first person. The vowels \( \iota \) and \( \mu \) are
much more sparing in their attraction of the \( \iota \) now in
question: they refuse it always at the beginning of words,
and in the middle before two consonants; and if transferred
from the end of a word to its middle, by an adventitious ter-
mination or word, they do not acquire the capacity of being
wedded to an \( \iota \). We say, for example, \( \text{imēm, "this" (accus.), not } \text{aimēm; mithwana,}
"a pair," not \( \text{maithwana; gairibyō, "montibus," not gairi}
byō.} \) The \( \mu \) also, ac-
cording to set rules, very frequently abstains from the \( \iota \);
for instance, \( \text{urund, (animate) not } \text{wraund, from urvan; on the contrary,}
\text{tanruna, "young," from taruna.} \) Where, however, the Sanskrit \( \mu \)
is replaced by \( \varepsilon \) (5. 32.), an \( \iota \) is placed before it, as well
at the beginning as before two consonants; and in this case
\( \varepsilon \) stands in this respect in the same category as \( \nu \) and
\( \iota \). Compare \( \text{raoch, "light," with} \)
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which, like the Semitic, proceeds from right to left, and
towards the comprehension of which Rask has contributed
valuable corrections, which give the language an appearance
more natural and more in consonance with the Sanskrit than

assumed in the hands of former commentators, Anquetil's
pronunciation having admitted much that was heterogeneous,
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alphabet in giving the corresponding value of each letter in

[G. Ed. p. 30.] the Zend. The Sanskrit short ओ a has two,
or rather three, representatives; the first is ए, which An-
quetil pronounces as a or e, but Rask, certainly with truth,
limits to a. The second is ए, which Rask pronounces like
the short æ of the Danish, or like the short German ü, as in
Hinde, or as a in cane in English, and e in the French après.
I consider this ए as the shortest vowel, and write it े. We
often find it inserted between two consonants which form a
double consonant in the Sanskrit; for instance, ददारेः (pret. redupl.), for the Sanskrit ददारः dadaria, “he”
or “I saw;” ददेमाहत् dadēmaht (V. S. p. 102), “we give,”
for the Vêda form ददमसि dadmasi. This shortest े is also
always appended to an originally terminating τ. Thus, for in-
stance, एन्तारी antāri, “between,” एदतुरे dāturē, “giver,”
“creator,” एव्हारे hvarē, “sun,” stand for the corresponding
Sanskrit forms अन्तर antar, दत्तर dātar, खर swar, “heaven.”
It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final
ए m, and generally before a final ए n, and frequently before
an intermediate vowelless ए n, the older ओ a becomes ए े.
Compare, for instance, एन्तपल एन्तपल pulhrē-m, “filium” with पुत्रम
पुत्रम putra-m; अन्हेन anh-ën, “they were,” with असन असन, अनष्टः; हेन्तेम hēnt-em, “the existing one,” with सन्तम sant-am,
प्रेसेंतेम ab-sentem. This retro-active influence of the
nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin ter-
mination m; as, for instance, stēm, stēmus (Sanskrit तिक्ष्ठेम्
tiṣṭhitēy-am, तिक्ष्ठेि tisṭhitēma).

31. Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a
letter differing but little from the ए े above discussed, but
yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, ए, which
Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish æ. We find
this letter usually in connection with a following ए u, and
this vowel appears to admit, with the excep-

[G. Ed. p. 31.] tion of the long ए a, no vowel but this ए before it. We write
this ए without the diacritic sign, inasmuch as we represent
the ए, like the Sanskrit ए, by े. Eu ṗ corresponds etymo-
logically to the Sanskrit थो ध, or diphthong formed by ध a and ध उ; thus, for example, the nominal bases in उ, which in the Sanskrit genitive, by the influence of Guna, i.e. by the prefixing of a short a, make ध-स, form, in Zend, अव अव cws. Compare, for instance, अर अर paseus with बशोस pásós, from pásu, "pecus." And yet the Sanskrit ध does not universally become ए in Zend, but often remains as it is, and specially in cases where it arises out of the termination ए, by the solution of the s into उ. According to its pronunciation, ए ए would appear to be a diphthong, and to form but one syllable, as in our German words heute, Leute, &c.

The long a (ा) is written अ।

32. Short and long त are represented, as त are long and short उ, by special characters, त त, त त, त उ, त ऊ: Anquetil, however, gives to the short त the pronunciation ए, and to the short उ (ू) that of ओ; while, according to Rask, only उ is pronounced as short o.* This short o frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit उ, and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong थो ध, in particular, we have generally the Zend अ स ए: we yet find, sometimes, also अ अ ए; for instance, अ अ ए gāus, "bus," is more frequent than अ अ ए gāos, for the Sanskrit नौ gāus.

33. The Sanskrit diphthong ध, formed out of ध + त, is represented by र, which, especially as a terminating letter, is also written ढ, and which we, as in Sanskrit, represent by ध. We must here, however, observe, that the Sanskrit ध ध is not always preserved as ध ध in the Zend, but is sometimes replaced by ध ध, which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding य, especially at the end of [G. Ed. p. 32.] words. The Vṛddhi diphthong ध ध (out of ध + त) is always represented by र र ध; ध, either by the equivalent ध— for which we often find ध ध substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above-mentioned ए ए eu, which, according to rule, before a terminating ए s replaces the Indian थो ध;
so that a termination in ₩ ds* is unheard of in the Zend.
For the Vriddhi diphthong ॠ du (out of トル + トル) we generally find DirectoryName, for which there is a special character ऐ; more rarely स ऐ du. It would appear that ऐ ऐ, ऐ ऐ, स ऐ du, and the ऐ ऐ which replaces ॠ ऐ, should be pronounced as diphthongs, i.e. as monosyllables.

34. Anuswāra and Visarga do not exist in Zend, unless we admit the nasal specified in §. 61. as answering to the sound of the Sanskrit Anuswāra. We proceed meanwhile, for the present, to the proper consonants. The first letter of the Sanskrit guttural class has divided itself into two characters bearing reference to different functions, ं and च; of which the first, which we represent by k, only appears before vowels and » v; the other, which we write c, precedes especially consonants, excepting » v. Compare, for instance, ऋ kो, ऋ त म, ऋ का, ऋ का (quis, qua, quid), ऋ िकायण Bakrēt, "once," ऋ िकायण karōti, "he made," ऋ िकायण kva, "where," with ऋ kो, ऋ का, ऋ kा, ऋ kा, सक्रिय sakrīt, कहरी karōti, and ऋ kwa: on the other hand, सोसथ sasthra, "king," with ऋ सक्रिय kṣatātra; ऋसक्रिय hicti, "pouring out" (V. S. p. 198), with सक्रिय sika (from सक्रिय sikh). In what manner the pronunciation of this च c differs from that of the ङ k can indeed hardly be defined with certainty: it is probably softer, weaker than that of the च k, which latter is fenced in by no strong consonants. Rask selects for it the character q, without observing that this letter prefers only to precede consonants, and in this position

[G. Ed. p. 33.] always corresponds to the Sanskrit च k. Burnouf considers च as an aspirate, and writes चक्षक्षक kṣaka takmaha. He writes, on the other hand, the letter उ, which Rask treats as an aspirate, with q. Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that उ c is found before र, which, according to Burnouf's just

* ऐ ds, according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the u-bases for the more common ऐ eus; e.g. ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ ऐ

"brachii."
remark, generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however, as insufficient; and think that ś c stands before r, because, as we have before remarked, all consonants, v excepted, only admit before them that modification of the k sound which is expressed by ś. It would be impossible for ṭ r, and the other letters of similar agency, to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if ṭkh be not extant in Zend; so that, for instance, the root ṭn khan, “to dig,” sounds ṭ<k> kan in Zend. There are, however, some words in which ṭkh is represented by ś. From śkar khara, “ass,” we find the accusative ś<ś> carēm; and we find, also, the ś kh of ś<k>akhi, “friend,” replaced by c; the accusative, for instance, ś<k>hāyam transformed into ś<ś>hāyam hacāim. It may therefore remain a question whether ṭ k or ś c, in respect of their sounds, have the better right to be referred to ś kh; but this much is certain, that ś k before vowels and before ś r is only represented by ṭ in Zend; before other consonants only by ś; which latter we shall, till better advised, continue to render by c.

35. Anquetil ascribes to ś the value of ṭ, and to both the pronunciation kh; while Rask considers the latter alone, by reason of the aspiration stroke which he recognises, as aspirated, and compares it to the Spanish x and the Arabic خ, and our German ch. Burnouf renders [G. Ed. p. 34.] ś by q; and observes (l. c. p. 345) that the Sanskrit syllable ś swa becomes qa in Zend, namely, in ś<ś> swapna, “sleep,” written, according to Burnouf, qapna, and in ś swa (suus), “his.” We are inclined to add to these examples, m<ś> khanha, (nom.) accus. ś<k> khanhrēm, from ś<s> swasd, “sister” (soror); ś<ś> swasāram (sororem); and ṭ<ś> ḡhora, “splendour,” as related to ś swar, “heaven,” and ś sur, “to shine.” We must, however, at the same time, remark, that ś sw does not universally become ś k, and that ś swa in particular, in an isolated position and with a possessive signification, much oftener appears in the shape of ś<ś> hva,
or that of स्वाभव havau. We render ṣ by kh, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to خ, our ch, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian خ is pronounced, indeed, at present, without aspiration, like an Italian c before a, o, u; but its value in Arabic, and the choice of this letter, so powerfully aspirated in the Arabic to designate a special guttural sound, in true Persian words, seems to indicate an intrinsic stronger or milder aspiration. As ṣ kh is derived from the Sanskrit स swa, it was not applied to replace the ज k before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either u or v (ू) accompanies the Persian خ when the latter replaces at the beginning of a

[G. Ed. p. 35.] word the Sanskrit ज sw. It is true that ू is no longer sounded before long vowels, but it must originally have had its influence on the pronunciation, and cannot have been introduced into writing entirely without object, and for the mere employment of the copyist. Compare ॐ khudda, "God," with स्वद्व swadatta, "self-given;" for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit. r. 608), स्वयंभु khaddta*; which Anquetil, or his Pārsi teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to खudda; while Neriosengh properly translates it by स्वयंभु swayandatta. The Persian ॐ khudda is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend स्वयंभु khaddta, so as to have its name based in the idea, "created by itself," while in its form it has been mutilated of one syllable. In Sanskrit we find both स्वभू swabhū, "self-existent," and also the more common स्वयंभू swayambhū, as appellations of Brahma and Vishṇu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

* This word comes from the root धाः, "to place," not from दाः, "to give," see §. 637.
and that its primal signification has thus been discovered through the Zend, we are forced still to doubt. We will here only call to mind that the Germanic forms, especially in the older dialects, in general approximate much more to the Sanskrit than to the modern Persian. すす swa, in particular, in the Gothic, either remains unaltered, or becomes sl (§. 20.). The pronominal syllable すす swa exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb, swa (so) “thus;” and with an instrumental form, swē (wie) “how.” The neuter substantive sve (Theme svēsa) means Eigenthum, “property,” as in Sanskrit the neuter すす swa. I know of no certain form in which a Germanic g or k corresponds to a Sanskrit すす sw or a Persian ך kh. To return, however, to the [G. Ed. p. 36.] Persian ך khu = すす sw: compare ขฟخ hưutan, “to sleep,” with สว swap; ขواب kh(w)db, “sleep,” with สํว swāpa; ขวานandan, “to sing,” with สํว swan, “to sound;” ขวاهر kh(w)dhar, “sister,” with สํว swasri, Gothic svistar; ขรশี khur-shid, “sun,” Zend स्वह vvar, with สํ swar, “heaven.” In some words ך kh corresponds to a Sanskrit k before r, in which position the Zend loves an aspiration; in the modern Persian, however, a vowel intrudes between the guttural and the r; thus, ขรัวห ขรี khirām-idan, “to proceed with pomp,” corresponds to the Sanskrit ह्र kram, “to go,” “to step;” and ขรี khiridan, “to buy,” to the Sanskrit equivalent root ह्र krt. The Persian ך kh answers to the Sanskrit aspirated ข kh, in the word ข khar, “ass” (Sanskrit ข khar).

36. The guttural ฬ, and its aspirate ข, are represented by ฬ g and ข gh. The Sanskrit ข gh has, however, sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend; at least ขฟ garima, “heat” (θέρμη and Wärme), answers to the Sanskrit ฬ gharma: on the other hand, the ข gha in ขฟ gharma ขฟ gharma, “victorious,” corresponds to the Sanskrit ข gha at the end of compounds; for instance, in ขฟ satru-ghna, “enemy slayer.” The Zend ขฟ gharma ขฟ gharma properly signi-
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dtars, makes, after rejection of the a which preceded r, दत्र अध्रे, “igni,” दध्रत, “ab igne,” &c. If, however, the t be protected by a preceding consonant, excepting ु, the succeeding semi-vowel is thereby deprived of its retro-active power. We find, for instance, वाष्ट्र, not वाष्ट्र, “garment,” “vest;” but we have मन्त्र, “speech,” not मन्त्र, from the root मन.

At the end of a word, and, which rarely occurs, before strong consonants, (§. 25.) at the beginning also, and middle of a word, the Sanskrit t (ृ) is represented by a special letter, namely, by ॠ, which we, with Burnouf, write t, but formerly wrote with a simple t undotted below, because no change is possible with ो or े. Rask represents it by th, because he recognises the sign of aspiration. I am unable, however, to assent to the universal validity of this sign of Rask’s, and I incline to rejecting the aspirate, as in Sanskrit, from the end of words. We should also remember that the diphthong ठ is written ठ as well as ठ; the last, which prevails at the end of words, with a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our ठ from ठ. Before consonants, for instance, in the word ठकेष्ठो, the sounding of th would be more precarious than that of t, in case this th did not somewhat partake of a sibilant sound. I think, however, that ठ t has merely a feebler pronunciation than ो t, and is, so to say, the last breathing of t; as, in Sanskrit, s and r, at the end of words, are diluted to Visarga (ृ. 11.); and as ठ t, in Prâkrit, and also in Greek, is, at the end of words, altogether suppressed.

39. ो is the ordinary d र, and ॐ according to Rask’s just remark, its aspirate dh. This represents the Sanskrit ध dh, for instance, in the imperative ending धव. The Zend, moreover, favours ॐ dh for ो d in the middle of words between two vowels. We find, for instance, दि dāta, “given,” but सदि dadhāmi, Sanskrit सदि dadāmi, “I give”; and वर्णदि mazda-dhāta, [G. Ed. p. 39.]
given by Ormusd,” “created”; Sanskrit yādi; pādha, “foot,” Sanskrit pāda.

40. The labial class embraces the letters o p, (firstName), f, b, and the nasal of this organ m, of which more hereafter. o p answers to the Sanskrit p, and is transformed into f by the retro-active aspirative power of a following r, m s, and n; whence, for instance, the preposition pra (pro, πρὸ) becomes, in Zend, fra; and the primitive words am ap, “water” (aqua, and perhaps ἀφρός), kērēp, “body,” form in the nominative, am ap, kērēfs; on the other hand, in the accusative, kērpēm, kērēpēm, or kērpēm. In regard to the power which resides in n of aspirating a p, compare ἀλάμην tūfnu, “burning,” from the root ἀνα tūp, with the derivative from the same root ἀναλάμπαν ἀλάμπετί, “he shines” (See Vendidad Sāde, p. 333), and the plural ἀλάμπαν csafna, “nights,” with the ablative singular ἀλάμπον csaparāt (Vendidad Sāde, p. 330), in which, even in the root, the interchange between n and r is observable, as the same takes place in the Sanskrit between ohan and ohar, “day.” (Gramm. Crit. r. 228. annot.) Originally—i.e. standing for itself, and not proceeding from the o p by the influence described—f is of very rare occurrence. In some instances known to me it corresponds to the Sanskrit bh, which, however, for the most part, in the Zend has rejected the aspiration. In Anquetil’s Vocabulary we find ndō o, “navel,” which in Sanskrit is written nābhi; and in the fem. accus. plural, of frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, hufēdhrīs, we recognise the Sanskrit subhadra “very fortunate,” “very excellent,” also a title of Vishnu.

41. We come now to the semi-vowels, and must, in order to follow the order of the Sanskrit alphabet, discuss y in the [G. Ed. p. 40.] next place, by which we express the sound of the German and Italian j, the English consonantal y. This
semi-vowel is written at the beginning of words by $\text{sw}$ or $\text{sw}$, and in the middle by the duplication of the $u$ $\ddot{u}$, as in the Old High German we find $w$ expressed. This semi-vowel, and the vowels which correspond to it, $i$ and $e$, introduce into the preceding syllable an $i$; an interesting phenomenon, first observed by Burnouf (l. c. pp. 340, 341), and which in its principle is connected with the German vowel modification (§. 73.). We are obliged to ascribe a similar influence also to the diphthong $o$ $e$ where it stands at the end of a word. Frequent occasion for this presents itself in the dat. sing. and the third pers. pres. of the middle verb. For instance, $\text{swa}j$ $\text{nair}e$, “hominik,” for $\text{swa}j$ $\text{nare}$, is frequent; but $\text{swa}j$ $\text{nare}$, “hominique,” is an exception. The vowels after which, by the attractive power of the letters mentioned, an $i$ is placed, are $a$, $u$, $i$, $e$, $o$, as to which we must also observe, that $u$, in the case of a succeeding $i$, is lengthened. Examples are: $\text{swa}j$ $\text{mai}d$hya (मध य madhya) “middle”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{nair}yu$, “man”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{bavai}ti$, “he is”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{da}d$hái$ti$, “he gives”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{atapay}e$ití, “he shines”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{kér}én$ítí, “he makes”; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{stú}d$hi, “praise,” instead of $\text{swa}j$ $\text{stú}d$hi, from the root $\text{swa}j$ $\text{stu}$ (स्तु); $\text{swa}j$ $\text{tú}r$ya, “the fourth,” from चतुर chatur, with the च cha suppressed*; $\text{swa}j$ $\text{dhú}r$ya, an adjective, derived from छह छह ahura. With regard to the influence of $\ddot{y}$ $y$ we must observe, that it does not mix up an $i$ with a vowel immediately preceding, but only with one separated from it by one consonant; for if there be two, unless the first be $\text{sw}$ $n$, the retroactive power of $y$, $i$, or $e$, is neutralized; thus $\text{swa}j$ $\text{a}l$í, not $\text{swa}j$ $\text{a}l$í, stands for “he is”; on the other hand we have $\text{swa}$ $\text{bavai}ntí, Sansk. भवंति bhavanti, “they are.” Several other consonants also resist simply [G. Ed. p. 41.] this power of attraction; thus we have $\text{swa}$ $\text{dakh}yu$, not

* Or more immediately from the Sanskrit ordinal चतुरत्व turyya or चतुर turiya, “fourth.”—Editor.
daikhyu, "land," "province"; and the i of the personal terminations ज़ा mi and ज़ा hi, or ज़ा shi, obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, ज़ा mahi, not ज़ा maithi, corresponds to the Veda termination ज़ा musi; and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in ज़ा a, ज़ा a-hē, not ज़ा a-hē, stands for ज़ा a-sya.

My sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following ज़ा a or ज़ा d, which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of i, and consequently effects their transmutation into ज़ा e*; thus the bases of nouns in...

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

"I designate," he says, "by the term Ablaut, a change of the root vowel, which is distinguished from the Umlaut by the fact that it is not produced by the influence of the vowel of the termination; for Umlaut is a mere affection, disturbance (Trübung) of the primary sound, through which that sound becomes more homogeneous with the vowel of the termination; while in the Ablaut, without any recognised external cause, it makes room for another, and, in general, totally different sound; as in Gothic, nima, 'I take'; nam, 'I took.' I say, without any recognised external
ya form, in the genitive, ये हें ये-हें, instead of रूपम् ये हें या हें; and, with the verb, the old Sanskrit य या or या या of the fourth and tenth classes, in the present singular becomes येन ये. Compare दीप्यति दीप्यती, दीप्यतिः दीप्यती, दीप्यति, with the Sanskrit ज्ञाताप्यति ज्ञाताप्यति, ज्ञाताप्यति ज्ञाताप्यति. In the last syllable, ॐ या before ॐ, according to rule, becomes ॐ या; and after the same analogy, ॐ याम becomes ॐ या. We find, therefore, for instance, तिर्थे, "quartum," from तिर्थे; and तिर्थेत् thrishūm, "tertiam partem," तिर्थेत् thrishva, तिर्थेत् thrishva. This appearance is to be thus understood, that the antecedent semi-vowel, after the suppression of the अ, passes into its corresponding vowel, which, however, according to the rule of § 64, must be a long one. The य, after its influence has transformed ॐ अ into ॐ ए, is often itself suppressed; thus we find ज्ञाताप्यति ज्ञाताप्यति. "I shewed," from प्रदेशयम् प्रदेशयम्, which

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

Further illustrations of these latter remarks are to be found in the Note 4, which Professor Bopp has appended to the above passage of the Vocalismus.—Trans.  
* Cf. p. 963, Note.
according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिः dis. The genitive termination या sya appears everywhere reduced into हे hē. The semi-vowels य y and v are generally suppressed after preceding conso-

[G. Ed. p. 42.] nants*; and thus, also, the imperative ending त swa gives up its w.

43. In Sanskrit, य y is sometimes, for euphony, interposed between two vowels (Gram. Crit. rr. 271. 310. 311.); but this does not uniformly occur. In Zend, the interposition of y between > u, > a, and a following > el, seems to amount to a law. Thus the Sanskrit बुने bruṇe, "I say" (from बु and र, Gram. Crit. r. 55.), becomes, in Zend, बुनr mrūye (§. 63.); and the neuter form हे dūe, "two," after the vocalization of the w into u, takes the form भ य dūye.

44. We have already remarked (§. 30.) with respect to द ध, that at the end of a word an ए e is always appended to it; for instance, दातरे dātarē, "Creator," "Giver"; हवरे hvarē, "Sun," instead of दात dātar; नव hvar. In the middle of a word, where an ए h is not introduced according to §. 48., the union of द ध with a following con-

sonant is mostly avoided; so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless ध an ए is appended: thence, for instance, बुद्ध dadaresa, from तद बुद्ध dadasa, "vidi," "vidit"; or the ध is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of ध ध with two following con-

sonants. (Gram. Crit. r. 34b.) Hence, for instance, भ य अथ रव अथरव, "priests" (nominative), accus. भ य अथ रव अथरव, from the theme न अथ रव अथरव, which in the weak cases (§. 129.) contracts itself into भ य अथ रव or भ य अथ. To this, also, pertains the fact that poly-

syllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in अ ar, at the be-

ginning of compounded forms, transpose this syllable into अ ra; and thus अ भ य अथ, "fire," stands instead of

* But see § 721.
The combinations $\ddot{r}y$, $\ddot{u}v$, are only permitted where a vowel follows, and the combination $\ddot{r}\ddot{v}s$, only as a termination, and in the middle of a word before $\theta t$; for instance, $\ddot{r}\ddot{u}r\ddot{s}t$ $t\ddot{u}\ddot{r}y$, "the fourth"; $\ddot{r}\ddot{v}r\ddot{s}a$ $v\ddot{a}r\ddot{y}$, "strong"; $\ddot{u}r\ddot{s}h\ddot{v}$ $u\ddot{r}v\ddot{a}$, "soul" $\ddot{h}\ddot{a}r\ddot{v}a$, "whole" (?); $\ddot{r}\ddot{v}s\ddot{a}m$ $d\ddot{a}r\ddot{s}$, "fire" (nomina-

The root corresponds to the Sanskrit $d\ddot{h}$, $s\ddot{h}$.

The Sanskrit $\ddot{v}$ has three representatives in the Zend, $\ddot{f}$, $\ddot{f}$, and $\ddot{w}$: The two first are so far distin-

guished from each other in their use, that $\ddot{f}$ corresponds to the Sanskrit $\ddot{v}$ only at the beginning, and $\ddot{f}$ only in the middle of words; for instance, $\ddot{f}\ddot{s}\ddot{a}\ddot{m}$ $v\ddot{a}m$, "we," $= \ddot{v}y\ddot{a}m$, $\ddot{m}\ddot{a}\ddot{m}$ $t\ddot{a}v$ (tui) $= \ddot{n}y$ $t\ddot{a}v$. This distinction, as Rask justly assumes, is only graphic. $\ddot{w}$, which I, with Burnouf, ren-

der by $w$, most frequently occurs after $\ddot{th}$, so that $\ddot{f}$ never accompanies an antecedent $\ddot{th}$. On the other hand we find $\ddot{f}$ much oftener than $\ddot{w}$ after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the $\ddot{c}d\ddot{h}$, which, accord-

ing to § 39., stands for $\ddot{\ddot{w}}d$ (१), is only followed by $\ddot{f}$, while an original $\ddot{c}d\ddot{h}$, corresponding to a Sanskrit $\ddot{c}d\ddot{h}$, only appears in conjunction with $\ddot{w}$. Thus $\ddot{\ddot{w}}$ $\ddot{w}$ $d\ddot{d}h$ $d$ $d\ddot{d}h$, "having created," "given," from the root $\ddot{w}d$ $d\ddot{d}h$, answers to the Sanskrit nom. $d\ddot{d}h$ $d$ $d\ddot{d}h$ $d$ $d\ddot{d}h$, while the accusative, of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad, $\ddot{f}\ddot{w}$ $\ddot{e}$ $\ddot{w}$ $d$ $d\ddot{d}h$ $d$, seems to be identical with the Sanskrit $\ddot{c}d\ddot{d}h$ $d$ $d\ddot{d}h$, "viam." (Vend. Olsh. p. 18.) After other consonants than

* By Stämme, the author here evidently means the crude derivative words which serve as Stems or Bases to inflected words, or those in combi-

nation with inflectional terminations; thus $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$ for $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$, forms $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$ $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$, $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$ $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$, not $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$ $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$, $\ddot{a}h\ddot{r}$, &c.—Editor.

† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit $d\ddot{h}$, see § 637.
th and dh, w appears not to be admitted, but only » v; on the other hand, w much prevails between two i's or i and y, in which position » v is not allowed.

[G. Ed. p. 44.] Thus we read in the Vendidād (Olsh. p. 23), the nominatives dρiwis, "beggar," (?) and dαiwis, "a worshipper of Daēva." dαiwis however, as derived from daēva through the suffix i, seems to me dubious, and I prefer the variation dαevis. Or is it between e and i also that w only can be allowed? Another instance is, aiwyd, "aquis," as dative and ablative plural; an interesting form which long remained a mystery to me, but which I am now in condition to explain. It springs from the root ṣ ap, "water" in such a manner, that after suppression of the p*, the Sanskrit termination bhyas, which elsewhere, in the Zend, appears only as byd, has weakened itself to byd, and, according to §. 41., has introduced an i into the base. Another instance in which bh has weakened itself in the Zend into a semi-vowel, and obtained the form w in virtue of its position between two i's, is the very common preposition aiwi, for which, however, aibi is sometimes substituted. It may be appropriate here to remark that bh appears in the Zend, in other company, in the enfeebled shape of » v. We find, namely, the base ubha, "both," not only in the shape uba, but also in that of oov aova (§. 28.), the neuter dual form of which I think I recognise in the Vend. S. p. 88., where oov aové yaśn̄d amēshē ṣpēntē, can hardly signify any thing else than "ambos venerans Amschaspantos" (non conniventes Sanctos, see Nalus, vv. 25, 26.) Anquetil interprets (T. 3, p. 472.) ové, by "tous deux." We have still another position to mention, in which

[G. Ed. p. 45.] the semi-vowel w appears, namely, before r, in which connection the softer w is more appro-

* Compare, in this respect, abhra, "cloud," for abbhra, "water-bearing," and the Zend abbhra, nom. "water-bearer." + Burnouf reads sabi (i.e. "over") and makes yaine, signify "reverence."
priate than the harder v. The only example of this case is the feminine भिष्म शूर , "sword," "dagger," in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit शूर, "shining,"
As to the pronunciation of the व w, I think, with Burnouf, that it accords with the English v, which also is akin to the Sanskrit व v after consonants. Rask reverses the powers, pronouncing the Zend व as the English v, and the letters व and व as the English w.

46. I have not detected in the व and व a power of attraction similar to that which belongs to the श y, as described in §. 41., unless the term भिष्म haurva, "all," which often occurs, as well as भिष्म viśpa, is derived from the Sanskrit शे sarwa, "all." I have, however, already elsewhere ascribed to the corresponding vowel व u a power of attraction, howbeit sparingly exerted; in virtue of which, for instance, the base भिष्म dārvan, "priests," in the weak cases (see §. 129.), after that व w van has contracted itself into व u, by the influence of this u, also converts the a of the preceding syllable into u; hence, for instance, in the dative, भिष्म dārurē for भिष्म dārurē. The Sanskrit तरु turuna, "young," is, in Zend, भिष्म turuna or भिष्म tauruna (§. 28.); and व वस u, "thing," "riches,"

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

* The accusative भिष्म शूरā, appears in Olshausen, p. 19, with the variation भिष्म शूराम. (§. 40.) Then we often find the instrumental भिष्म शूर्यa, for which, however, we must read भिष्म शूर्यa, if शूर्यa be not derivable from a Theme भिष्म शूर, after the analogy of सुन्दर सुन्दर, from सुन्दर सुन्दर. (Gramm. Crit. r. 270.)
labial nasal, by which, for instance, the feminine participle जगमुष्ठि had changed itself to जगमुष्ठि. The dental medial is free from this influence, for we find द्वा, “two,” drucś, “a demon,” (accus. द्वृजेम्म) not आक्षे। dhrucś, द्वृजेम्म. The guttural medial is, however, exposed to this influence, as in the abovementioned instance of जगमुष्ठि. We have, on the other hand, added, in §. 38., a limitation of this appearance. The aspirating virtue of the श ष is less potent than that of the र र and श ष, and we find ष ष often preceded by the unaspirated ट; for instance, in बित्या bitya, “the second,” त्रित्या thritya, “the third”: on the other hand, we have रूढ़ियु mṛēthiyu, “death,” Sansk. नृथ मृत्यु.

48. In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before र, when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an ध is usually placed; for instance मह्रका, “death,” from the root मर (मृि) “to die”; केर्पेम्, or केर्पेम्, “the body” (nom. केरिफ्स); वेरका, or वेरिफ्स, “wolf” (वृक्ष vriki.) The semi-vowel ष also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an ध; thus, त्वय्यह्या thwahya, “through thee,” corresponds to the Sanskrit त्वय्यह्या त्वय्यह्या; and the word सच्य असच्य csahya (nom. सच्य सच्य) [G. Ed. p. 47.] csahya added by Rask, stands for सच्य सच्य csaya and comes from the root सच्य सच्य cs, “to rule,” (सच्य kshi.)

49. We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, ष, which we express by š in Sanskrit, and ș in Zend, is written ơ in the latter. Its exact pronunciation is scarcely ascertainable. Anquetil assigns it that of the ordinary s. It in general occurs in those positions in which the Sanskrit in corresponding words has its ष ष; thus, for instance, दशा, “ten,” शता, “hundred,” पाषु, “beast,” are common to both languages. In this respect ष ष has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit; that before several consonants,
namely, \( t \), \( k \), and \( n \), as well at the beginning as in the middle of words—in the latter place, however, only after \( a \), \( d \), and \( an \)—it corresponds to the Sanskrit dental or ordinary \( s \). Compare \( \text{si\'ard} \), "the stars," with \( st\text{\'aras} \); \( \text{sta\'omi} \), "I praise," with \( \text{sl\'umi} \); \( \text{ast\'i} \), "he is," with \( \text{asti} \); \( \text{ast\'nim} \), "ossium," with \( \text{asthi} \); \( \text{sh\'andu} \), "shoulder," (?) with \( \text{skandha} \); \( \text{sn\'ad} \), "to purify," with \( \text{sn\'ad} \), "to bathe." We might infer from this circumstance that \( s' \) was pronounced as a simple \( s \), yet it may have to do with a dialectical preference for the sound \( sh \), as happens with the German \( s \) in the Suabian dialect, and pretty universally at the beginning of words before \( t \) and \( p \). It is further to be remarked, that \( s' \) occurs also at the end of words after \( an \). The occasion for this presents itself in the nom. sing. masc. of bases in \( \text{\text{nt}} \).

50. The semi-vowel \( v \) is regularly hardened into \( p \) after \( s' \); hence, for instance, \( \text{sp\'a} \), "canis." \( \text{sp\'anem} \), "canem," \( \text{vis\'pa} \), "all," [G. Ed. p. 48.] \( \text{aspa} \), "horse," corresponding to the Sanskrit \( \text{a\'swa} \). \( \text{sw\'anam} \), \( \text{vis\'wa} \), \( \text{a\'swa} \). \( \text{sp\'enta} \), "holy," is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit \( \text{sw\'anta} \), which must have originally been in use, and which the Lithuanian \( sz\'anta\)-s indicates. From the Zend \( \text{aspa} \), the transition is easy to the Greek \( \text{\'p\'o\'c} \), which is less obvious in the case of the Indian \( a\'swa \).

51. For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant \( sh \), the Zend supplies two letters, \( \text{sw} \) and \( \text{sp} \). The first, according to Rask, is pronounced like the ordinary \( s \), and therefore like the Sanskrit dental \( s \); while \( \text{sp} \) has the sound of \( \text{sh} \), and marks this by a stroke of aspiration. We therefore write it \( sh \).* Rask observes that these two letters are often interchanged in MSS.; which he accounts for by the circumstance

* It is in this Translation given \( sh \) without any mark. \( sh \) denotes the Sansk. \( sh \).
that *v is used in the Pehlevi for sh, and that the Parsi copyists have been long better acquainted with the Pehlevi than the Zend. We find, also, in the Codex edited by Burnouf, *w almost everywhere corresponding to ख sh. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidad, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects *w as well as श corresponds to the Sanskrit श sh, the principal position of *w is before strong consonants (§. 25.) and at the end of words; a position of much importance in the Zend, and which requires attention in the cases of other classes of letters. In this respect *w resembles, among the dentals, ड t, among the gutturals ख c, and among the nasals principally न n. At the end of words, indeed, श s corresponds to the Sanskrit ज s, but yet [G. Ed. p. 49.] only after such letters as, in the middle of a word, would, according to Rule 101(a) of my Sanskrit Grammar, change an original श s into श sh; namely, after vowels other than a and d, and after the consonants ख c and र r. Hence, for instance, the nominative दत्त ग 'Lord,' र अह 'beast,' दत्त ज 'fire,' दत्त ज 'daemon,' from the theme ख द to druj. On the other hand, ख र 'bearing,' from दत्त र 'bearant.' In the word ख र 'six,' it is true a terminating श s stands after a; but it does not here replace a Sanskrit श s, but the original श sh of श shash. As evidence of the use of श s for श sh before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix श श न श न iṣṭa (i.e. iṣṭos), corresponding to the Sanskrit ज ज iṣṭha. Other examples are श श न श न karsta, "ploughed," for ज र त र krishta. In the word श श न श न sayana "camp," श s stands irregularly for न s, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskrit श न श न sayana (cf. sadā, §. 54.) In the fem. numeral

* I retain here the original t, since the theme of the word does not appear in use. श t must otherwise have been changed for श t.
tisurd, “three” (Olsh. p. 26), the m might seem questionable, for the Sanskrit form is tirsas, and according to §. 53., becomes w h. The m, however, is here in a position (after r i) in which the Sanskrit favours the conversion of s into sh; and on this rests the Zend form tisard. That it does not, however, stand as tishard, as we might expect from §. 52., is certainly not to be ascribed to the original existence of a, for tisard stands for tisard.

52. w stands for the Sanskrit sh before vowels and the semi-vowels y and v; compare akṣam ādīkṣāhaim and ādīkṣāhava, with ātēshām; “horum,” and rētēshu; “in his”; mārsīr mashya, “man,” with manuṣya. Yet w sh does not unite itself with an antecedent c; but for the Sanskrit kṣh we find almost everywhere in Olshausen’s text, and without variation, kṣa; hence, for instance, esāthra, “king,” Sanskrit kṣh kṣatra, “a man of the war-like or royal caste.” The word of frequent occurrence, cshnaoma, and the third person connected with it, cshnaomayitī, we must, on a double ground, reject, and prefer the variation given at p. 33, since w s here is prolonged, as well by the preceding c as by the following n. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the Sanskrit kṣh in many Zend words abandons the guttural, and appears as sh. For instance, ḍakṣiṇa, “dexter,” becomes ḍashina (Lithuan. dészinė, “the right hand”), and ākṣi, “eye,” becomes āshi, which, however, seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrīhi).

53. w h is never, in etymological respects, the representative of the Sanskrit h, but of the pure and dental sibilant s. Before vowels, semi-vowels, and m, in Zend, this letter invariably becomes w, possibly because sw (§. 35.) takes the shape kh; while before n, and such consonants as cannot unite with a preceding h, (§. 49.) it is to be looked for in the shape of s. The [G. Ed. p. 51.]
roots which begin with स्प sp and स्फ sph have not yet been detected by me in the Zend; but I am convinced that स्रि spriś, for instance, “to touch,” could not begin otherwise in Zend than with व व. Compare, for instance—

ZEND.                    SANSKRIT.
मांह हद, “they,”        सा sd.
मांपमाय हप्ता, “seven,” सम सप्ता.
हकरेत, “once,”         सकृत sakrit.
अहि, “thou art,”        असि asi.
ाहमाइ अमाइ, “to this,” अस्माइ asmāi.
ह्वरे, “sun,”            स्वर swar, “heaven.”
ह्वा, “his,”             स्मा sma.

The word मंज् hizva, “tongue,” from ज्ञा jihva, deserves mention, because the sibilant quality of the ज j is treated as स s, and replaced by व h (§. 58.).

54. I do not remember to have met with an instance of the combination व hr; the Sanskrit word शहस sahasra, “thousand,” which might give occasion for it, has rejected the sibilant in the last syllable, and taken the shape सहास्र hazaar. If, in the word मंज् huska, व replaces the Sansk. श s, we must remember that the Latin siccus indicates a Sansk. स s, because c regularly answers to श s. In many instances of Sanskrit roots beginning with स s, the corresponding Zend form may be grounded on the change which is effected on an initial स s by the influence of certain prepositions. (Gram. Crit. r. 80.)

[G. Ed. p. 52.] Thus I believe I have clearly ascertained the existence of the Sanskrit participle शिद्ध siddha, “perfected,” in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad शाधितेम shādistēm; after the analogy of मंज् irista, “deceased,” from अज् irith (see §. 99.) Olshausen notifies (p. 29) as variations of शाधितेम— शाधितेम, शाधित, शाधित, शाधित, and शाधित. In all these forms, the long अ presents a difficulty; for, according to §. 28., शिद्ध shidh would give the form शाधित shaidh; and this, with the suffix ता,
shaista, in the nom. and accus. neut. *shaista*.

What Anquetil (vol. II. p. 279) translates, *Juste juge du monde qui existe par votre puissance, vous qui êtes la pureté même, quelle est la première chose qui plaît à cette terre (que nous habitons), et la rende favorable*, runs in the original (Olsh., p. 29, Burnouf, p. 137), -*śvānāṃ ṝṇākṣaraṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayaṁ ṛṣayanthānaṁ asitvaitinaṁ ashāum! kva paoiriṁ an-
hūo zémō shāiśte? “Creator mundorum existentium, pure!

ubi (quid) primum hujus terrae perfectum (bonum?)”

55. The nominative pronominal base *syā* (Gramm. Crit. r. 268), in the Veda dialect, is under the influence of the preceding word; and we see in Rosen's specimen, p. 6, this pronoun, when it follows the particle *u*, converted into *syā*, after the analogy of rule 101" of my Grammar. I have detected a similar phenomenon in the Zend pronouns; for we find *ṣuḥ hé*, “ejus,” “ei,” which is founded on a lost Sanskrit *ṣe* (cf. *mē*, “mei,” “mihi,” and *te*, “tui,” “tibi”), when it follows *yēzi*, “if,” taking the form *śuḥ se* (more correctly, perhaps, *ṣuḥ shē*); for instance, at p. 37 of Olshausen: while on the same page we find *ṣuḥ asūrav yēzichā hé* (und wenn ihm,) [G. Ed. p. 53.] “and if to him.” In the following page we find a similar phenomenon, if, as I can hardly doubt, *ṣuḥ shāv* (thus I read it with the variation), corresponds to the Sanskrit असूर येजिश वह (text, असूर येजिश वह) darēgha akarsta (text, असूर येजिश वह) “For not this earth which lies long unploughed.”

56a). An *ḥ* standing between *a* or *ā* and a following vowel is usually preceded by a guttural nasal (*ṇ*); and this appendage seems indispensable—I remember, at least, no exception—in cases where the following vowel is *a*, *ā*, or *ē*. We find, for instance, *ṣuṣvānāṃ usāzayānha*, “thou wast born”; while in the active the personal ending *ṣuḥ* of the present admits no nasal; and we find, for
instance, अहि ahi, "thou art," बासहि bacsahī, "thou givest," not अहि anhi, बासन्हि bacsanhi.

56b). The termination as, which in Sanskrit only before sonant consonants (§. 25.) and ज a, dissolves its झ into झ u, and contracts the latter together with the preceding a into चो δ (compare the French au, from al): this ancient termination as appears in Zend, as also in Prākṛit and Pali, always under the shape of δ. On the other hand, the termination ḍs, which in Sanskrit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the s, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of झ o (for [G. Ed. p. 54.] झ u); and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,* that in Sanskrit the suppression of a terminating s after ḍ had preceded the vocalization of this s into u. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an झ n precedes the झ h which springs out of the s of the syllable ḍs, or where, before the enclitic particle अश cha, the s above mentioned is changed into झ ḍ, together with these substantial representatives of the s, its evaporation into झ o is also retained, and the sibilant thus appears in a double form, albeit torpid and evanescent. To illustrate this by some examples, the Sanskrit राष mās, "luna"—an uninflected nominative, for the s belongs to the root—receives in Zend the form राष māo, in which o represents the Sanskrit s; राष शास-cha, "lunaque," gives us राषोऽcha, and राषम māsom, "lunam," राषोऽम māonhēm; so that in the two last examples the Sanskrit sibilant is represented by a vowel and a consonant. The analogy of māonhēm, "lunam," is followed in all similar instances; for example, for राष दसा "fuit," we find राषोऽम donha, and for राषम दसम, "earum," राषोऽम donhaim†.

† Burnouf is of a different opinion as to the matter in question, for in the
57. Two sibilants remain to be mentioned, namely, ʒ and ς, of which the former was probably pronounced like the French z, and may therefore be replaced [G. Ed. p. 55.] by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskritis h for the most part, which never corresponds to the Zend ς h. Compare, for example,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>अहम् aham, “I,”</td>
<td>əʃ əm azêm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हस्ता hasta, “hand,”</td>
<td>मस्ता zasta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सहस्र sahasra, “thousand”</td>
<td>भस्त्र hazanra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हांति hanti, “he strikes,”</td>
<td>मांति zainti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>वहति vahati, “he carries,”</td>
<td>वानति vazniti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हि hi, “for,”</td>
<td>ज़ zi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जिहाद jihvâ, “tongue,”</td>
<td>जीवा hizva, (§. 53.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महत् mahat, “great,”</td>
<td>नाज mazō (from mazas, acc. ८ज्ञन्त्र mazanhem.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. Sometimes ʒ z appears also in the place of the Sanskrit ज j; so that the sibilant portion of this letter, pronounced dsch, is alone represented, and the d sound suppressed (see §. 53.). Thus यज्ञ yaz, “to adore,” answers to the Sanskrit यज yaj; जात्स adašha, “to please,” springs from the Sanskrit root जुश jush, “to please or gratify.” Thirdly, the Zend z represents also the Sanskrit ङ g, which is easily accounted for by the relationship between g and ʒ. The Indian ग, (accus. गम gâm) bos and terra, has, in Zend, as also in Greek, clothed itself in two forms; the first

the Nouveau Journ. Asiatique, tom. iii. p. 342, speaking of the relation of दोन्ह to मानन्ह, without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, मोङ्ह-चा, “lunaque,” उयङ्ह-चा, “arboresque,” he says, “In मोङ्ह, there is perhaps this difference, that the ङ्ह does not replace the Sanskrit z, for this letter has already become o in consequence of a change of frequent occurrence which we have lately noticed.
signification has maintained itself in Zend, but in Greek
has given way to the labial; and βοῦς and ἀγάμος ἄλος, or
ἀμάμος ἄλος, correspond to the Sanskrit nom. गाम गदु.
[G. Ed. p. 56.] For the signification "earth" the Greek
has preserved the guttural, which in Zend is replaced by z.
The nom. गाम zdo supposes an Indian form गान गदु, for
गाम गदु; in the accusative, गान नाम agrees, in respect
of inflection, as closely as possible with गाम गदु and गन.

59. ज is of less frequent use, and was probably pro-
nounced like the French j: we write it zh. It is observable,
that as the French j in many words corresponds to the Latin
semi-vowel j, and derives from it its own development, so
also sometimes, in Zend, ज zh has arisen out of the Sans-
krit ज j. Thus, for instance, यूयम युयम, "you," (vos),
becomes युज्ञम युज्ञम. Sometimes, also, ज zh has
sprung from the sound of the English j, and corresponds to
the Sanskrit ज j, as in जumbnails zhēnu, Sanskrit जान jānu, "knee." Finally, it stands as a terminating letter in some prefixes, in
the place of the Sanskrit dental ज s after i and u; thus,
निज्ज्याप्रस nizhbaruiti, "he carries out"; जुज्ज-जुज्
duzh-ujcem, "ill spoken"; on the other hand, जुज्ज-जुज्
dus-matēm, "ill thought."

60. We have still to elucidate the nasals, which we have
postponed till now, because for them a knowledge of the
system of the other sounds is indispensable. We must first
of all mention a difference from the Sanskrit, that in Zend
every organ has not its particular nasal; but that here, in
respect of न, two main distinctions are established, and that
these mainly depend on the circumstance whether न precedes
a vowel or a consonant. In this manner ज and झ are so
contrasted, that the first finds its place chiefly before whole
and half vowels, and also at the end of words; the latter only
[G. Ed. p. 57.] in the middle of strong consonants. We
find, for instance, अहंकारवित्त hankrayāmi, "I glorify";
पंच pancha, "five"; भुज्यात्म bishyantēm: on the
other hand, अन्य (nom.) “man”; नॉट, “not”; बरायें “they might bear”; अन्य “the other.” Concerning the difference between ज and स—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that ज, being always fenced in by strong consonants, must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer स; and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation, would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter.

61. Still feebler and more undecided than ज, perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anuswāra, we conjecture to have been the nasal न, which is always involved with अ, and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of अ and द. We find this letter, which we write an, first, before sibilants, before व h, like the Anuswāra, and before the aspirates ठ th and ड f; for instance, आसयाइत्वा esayainś; “regnans,” accus. आसयाइत्वामै esayain tiem; आसयाइत्वानङ्क वानिहामाना, a part of the middle future of the root मञ्जिन, “to beget,” but, as it seems to me, with a passive signification (“qui nascetur,” Vend. S. pp. 28 and 103); नाविध्रि maithra, “speech,” from the root मञ्जिन man; जोनिन jainśnu, “mouth,” probably from the Sanskrit जप jap, “to pray,” §. 40., and with the nasal inserted. Secondly, before a terminating व m and न. We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination अम दम is always changed to अम in Zend; for instance, दाहिं dadhaśi, “I gave,” Sanskrit अदाद्म adadām; पद्धानायित्वा pādhanāim, “pedum,” Sans. पदादाम pādānām; and that the termination of the third person plural, अन an, provided the अ do not pass into ए, always appears as a double nasal अम aṁ.

62. For the nasal, which, according to §. 56., is placed as an euphonic addition before the व h, which springs from ष s, the Zend has two characters, ज and ऊ, to both which

* The termination aṁ from अम belongs to the potential, precative, and subjunctive.
Anquetil assigns the sound ng.* We write them n, in order to avoid giving the appearance of a g preceded by a guttural n to this guttural, which is only a nasal precursor of the following wh. As to the difference in the use of these two letters, j always follows a and do; ść, on the contrary, comes after i and e, for which the occasion is rare. For instance, in the relative plural nom. येन्हे येन्हे, “qui,” and in the fem. pron. genitives, as अिन्धादू “hujus,” which often occurs, but as often without ść, i, and with ş n, अिन्धादू. What phonetic difference existed between ş and ść we cannot venture to pronounce. Anquetil as we have seen, assigns the same pronunciation to each; while Rask compares ść with the Sanskrit palatal च n, and illustrates its sound by that of the Spanish and Portuguese ñ.

63. The labial nasal ş m does not differ from the Sanskrit च: it must, however, be remarked, that it sometimes takes the place of b. At least the root ब्र ब्र, “speak,” in Zend becomes ʃ hiatus mraṭ; as ʃmraṭ mraṭm, “I spoke,” ʃऋ raṭ “he spoke”: in a similar manner is the Indian मुक्त mukha, “mouth,” related to the Latin bucca; and not [G. Ed. p. 59] much otherwise the Latin mare to the Sanskrit वादृ vāri, “water.” I consider, also, mullus related to बहुल baḥula, the Greek πολύς, and the Gothic filu.

64. A concluding ş m operates in a double manner on a preceding vowel. It weakens (see §. 30.) the आ to १ ē; and, on the other hand, lengthens the vowels i and u; thus, for instance, ोऩ पाई ति, “the Lord,” ोऩ तानि “the body,” from the bases ोऩ पाई, ोऩ तानि. In contradiction to this rule we find the vocative of frequent occurrence, ोऩ अश्व अश्वum, “pure.” Here, however, अ अ, as a diphthong, answers to the Sanskrit च अu, the last element of which is not capable of further lengthening

* Burnouf also writes the first of these ng. I have done the same in my reviews in the Journal of Lit. Crit.
The form in question is a contraction of the theme \textit{ashavan}; with an irregular conversion of the concluding \textit{\textasciitilde{n}} into \textit{\textasciitilde{m}}.

65. We give here a complete summary of the Zend characters.

Simple Vowels: \textit{\textasciitilde{a}, \textordmasculine{e}, \textordmasculine{e}; \textordmasculine{a}, \textordmasculine{i}, \textordmasculine{e}; \textordmasculine{u}, \textordmasculine{o}, \textordmasculine{u}}

Diphthongs: \textit{\textordmasculine{a}, \textordmasculine{e}, \textordmasculine{e}; \textordmasculine{a}, \textordmasculine{i}; \textordmasculine{e}, \textordmasculine{a}, \textordmasculine{a}.

Gutturals: \textit{\textordmasculine{k} (before vowels and \textordmasculine{v}), \textasciitilde{c} (principally before consonants), \textit{\textordmasculine{kh} (from \textit{\textordmasculine{sw}, before vowels and \textit{\textasciitilde{y}}); \textit{\textordmasculine{g}, \textordmasculine{gh}}.

Palatals: \textit{\textordmasculine{ch}, \textordmasculine{j}}.

Dentals: \textit{\textordmasculine{t} (before vowels and \textit{\textasciitilde{y}}, \textit{\textordmasculine{t} (before consonants and at the end of words), \textit{\textordmasculine{th} (before whole and semi-vowels)}, \textit{\textordmasculine{d}, \textordmasculine{dh}}.

Labials: \textit{\textordmasculine{p}, \textordmasculine{f} (the latter before vowels, semi-vowels, nasals, and \textit{\textordmasculine{s}), \textordmasculine{b}}.

Semi-vowels: \textit{\textordmasculine{j}, \textordmasculine{u}, \textit{\textasciitilde{y} (the two [G. Ed. p. 60.] first initial, the last medial), \textordmasculine{r} (the last only after \textit{\textordmasculine{f}), \textit{\textordmasculine{r}, \textordmasculine{v} (the first initial, the last medial), \textit{\textordmasculine{m}}.

Sibilants and \textit{\textordmasculine{h}: \textit{\textordmasculine{s}, \textordmasculine{sh}, \textordmasculine{s}, \textordmasculine{zh} (or like the French \textordmasculine{f}), \textit{\textordmasculine{z}, \textordmasculine{h}}.

Nasals: \textit{\textordmasculine{n} (before vowels, semi-vowels, and at the end of words), \textit{\textordmasculine{n} (before strong consonants), \textit{\textordmasculine{an} (before sibilants, \textit{\textordmasculine{h}, \textit{\textordmasculine{th}, \textit{\textordmasculine{f}, \textit{\textordmasculine{m}, and \textit{\textordmasculine{n}), \textit{\textordmasculine{n} (between \textit{\textordmasculine{a} or \textit{\textordmasculine{m}, and \textit{\textordmasculine{h}, and between \textit{\textordmasculine{a} and \textit{\textordmasculine{r}}), \textit{\textordmasculine{n} (between \textit{\textordmasculine{i} or \textit{\textordmasculine{e}, and \textit{\textordmasculine{h}), \textit{\textordmasculine{m}}.

Remark also the Compounds \textit{\textordmasculine{am} for \textit{\textordmasculine{am}, and \textit{\textordmasculine{am} for \textit{\textordmasculine{am}}.

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

* E.g. \textit{\textordmasculine{a}m\textit{\textordmasculine{a}m havanra, \textquoteleft\textquoteleft a thousand.\textquoteright\textquoteright}
completely to the Sanskrit $a$; and the sounds of the Greek $e$ and $o$ are wanting, in their character of degeneration from $a$, in Gothic as well as in Sanskrit. The ancient $a$ has not, however, always been retained in Gothic; but in radical syllables, as well as in terminations, has often been weakened to $i$, or has undergone suppression; often, also, by the influence of a following liquid, has been converted into $u$. Compare, for instance, $sibun$, "seven," with $saptan$; $taihun$, "ten," with $dasan$.

67. We believe ourselves authorized to lay down as a law, that $a$ in polysyllabic words before a terminating $s$ is everywhere weakened into $i$, or suppressed; but before a terminating $th$ generally appears as $i$. A concluding $a$ in the Gothic either remains unaltered, or disappears: it never becomes $i$.

68. In the Old High German the Gothic $a$ either remains unaltered, or is weakened to $e$, or is changed by the influence of a liquid to $u =$ perhaps $o$. According to this, the relation of the unorganic $e$ to the Gothic $a$ is the same as that of the Gothic $i$ (§. 66.) to $a$; compare, for instance, in the genitive of the bases in $vrika-sya$, Gothic $vufi-s$, Old High German $wolfe-s$. In the dative plural $wulfu-m$ stands to $vulfa-m$ in the same relation as above (§. 66.), $sibun$ to $saptan$. The precedence of a liquid has also, in Old High German, sometimes converted this $a$ into $u$ or $o$; compare $plinte-mu(mo)$, $ceco$, with the Gothic $blindama$. Also after the German $j$ or $y$, which in Sanskrit ($y$) belongs as a semi-vowel to the same class as $r$, the Old High German seems to prefer $u$ to $a$; thence $plintju$, without $j$ also $plintu$, "$ceco," as a fem. nom. sing., and neuter nom. acc. voc. plural; $plinta$ "$cecam." The $u$ of the first person present, as $kipu$, "I give," Gothic $giba$, I ascribe to the influence of the dropped personal letter $m$. Respecting the degeneration of the original $a$ sound to $u$ compare also §. 66. In the Old High German inseparable preposition $ki$ (our German $ge$) = Gothic $ga$, Sanskrit $sa$ or $sam$, we
CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

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

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

70. For इ i and इ i the Gothic has i and ei; which latter, as Grimm has sufficiently shewn, is everywhere to be considered as long i, and also in Old and Middle High German is so represented. We, together with Grimm, as in the case of the other vowels, designate its prolongation by a circumflex. In the Modern High German the long i appears mostly as ei; compare, for instance, mein with the Gothic genitive meina, and the Old and Middle High German mīn. Sometimes a short i is substituted, as in lich, answering to the Gothic leiik, "like," at the end of compounds. On the long i, in wīr, "nos," Gothic veis, we can lay no stress, as we match the dat. sing. mīr also with the Gothic mis. It is scarcely worth remarking that we usually, in writing, designate the elongation of the i and other vowels by the addition of an h.
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71. While the original \( \texttt{va} \) has undergone many alterations in the Germanic languages, and has produced both \( \iota \) and \( \upsilon \), I have been able to detect no other alterations in \( \iota \) and \( \upsilon \) than that \( \iota \) is as often suppressed as \( \alpha \); but it never happens, unless some rare exceptions have escaped me, that \( \iota \) is replaced by a heavier vowel \( \alpha \) or \( \upsilon \).* We may lay it down as a rule, that final \( \iota \) has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पारि pari,</td>
<td>περί,</td>
<td>per,</td>
<td>fair. (§. 82.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपरि upari,</td>
<td>ἕπερ,</td>
<td>super,</td>
<td>ufar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सांति asti,</td>
<td>ἐστί,</td>
<td>est,</td>
<td>ist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>संति santi,</td>
<td>ἐντί,</td>
<td>sunt,</td>
<td>sind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

† In the text harja; but in order to shew more exactly the connection with the Sanscrit \( \texttt{y} \), vide §. 68. 1. 12.; and as the \( j \) is simply and universally pronounced \( y \), the German \( j \) will be represented by \( y \) in this translation.
at the beginning of a syllable is distinguished by two dots above, which Grimm retains.

73. As in Zend (§. 41.), by the attractive force of \(i, i', \) or \(y,\) an \(i\) is introduced into the antecedent syllable; so also, in Old High German, the corresponding sounds have obtained an assimilating power; and frequently an \(a\) of the preceding syllable is converted into \(e,\) without any power of prevention on the part of either a single or double consonant. Thus, for instance, we find from \(ast, \) "branch," the plural \(esti;\) from \(anst, \) "grace," the plural \(ensti;\) and from \(vallu, \) "I fall," the second and third persons \(vellis, vellit.\)

This law, however, has not prevailed the Old High German universally: we find, for instance, \(arpi, \) "hereditas," not \(erpi;\) \(zahari, \) "lacrymæ," not \(zaheri.\)

74. In the Middle High German, the \(e,\) which springs from the older \(i,\) has both retained and extended the power of modification and assimilation; inasmuch as, with few limitations, (Grimm, p. 332,) not only every \(a\) by its retrospective action becomes \(e,\) but generally, also, \(\ddot{a}, u,\) and \(o\) are modified into \(\ddot{e}, \ddot{u},\) and \(\ddot{o};\) \(\ddot{a}\) into \(\ddot{e},\) and \(\ddot{u}o\) into \(\ddot{u}e.\)

Thus the plural \(geste, dret\)e, \(brüche, köche, län, gruese,\) from \(gast, drüt, bruch, koch, lön, gruoz.\) On the other hand, in the Old High German, the \(e\) which has degenerated from \(i\) or \(a\) obtains no such power; and we find in the genitive singular of the above words, \(gaste-s, drate-s, \) &c., because the Old High German has already, in the declension of the masculine \(i\) class, reduced to \(e\) the \(i\) belonging to the class, and which in Gothic remains unaltered.

75. The \(e\) produced in Old and Middle High German by the modification of \(a,\) is retained in the Modern High German, in cases where the trace of the original vowel is either extinguished or scarcely felt; as, \(Ende, Engel, setzen, netzen, nennen, brennen;\) Goth. \(andi, aggilus, satyan, natyan, namnyan, brannyan.\) Where, however, the original vowel is distinctly opposed to the change, we place \(\ddot{u},\) short or
[G. Ed. p. 65.] long, from short or long a; and in the same
relation, å from u, ö from o, iu from au; for instance, Bründe,
Pfâle, Dunste, Flûge, Köche, Töne, Bäume, from Brand,
Pfâl, &c.

76. For Ùu, Ùû, the Gothic has u, which is generally short.
Among the few examples cited by Grimm, p. 41, of long u,
we particularize the comparative sâtizd, the essential part of
which corresponds to the Sansk. सतृ swâdu, “sweet,” (ṣdû-ʃ),
and in which the long u may stand as a compensation for
the absence of the w(v), which becomes vocalized. In Old High
German it seems to me that pûam, “to dwell,” and trûen, “to
trust,” correspond to the Sanskrit roots शु bhû, “to be.” धृ dhrû
“to stand fast”—from which comes धु dhruva, “fast,”
“constant,” “certain” (Gramm. Crit. r. 51.)—with the Guna
form of which (§. 26.) the Goth. baunn, traun, is connected;
cf. भवित्त bhav-itum, “to be,” ध्रवित्त dhrav-itum, “to stand
fast.” The Middle High German continues the Gothic Old
High German ã, but the Modern High German substitutes
au, whence bauen, trauen, Taube (Gothic dûbô).

77. As out of the Sanskrit उ u, in Zend, the sound of a
short Ù* has developed itself (§. 32.), thus, also, the Gothic
u shews itself, in the more recent dialects, oftener in the
form of o than in its own. Thus have the Verbs in the
Old and Middle High German (Grimm’s 9th conjug.) pre-
served a radical u in the plur. of the pret., but replaced it
by o in the passive part. Compare, for instance, bugum,
“we bend,” bugans, “bent,” with Old High German pukumës,
pokanër, Middle High German bugen, bogen. The example
adduced shews, also, the softening of the old u to e, in un-
accented syllables, in Middle High German as in Modern
High German; so that this unaccented e may represent all
original vowels—a, i, u; and we may lay it down as a rule,
that all long and short vowels in the last syllable of poly-

* Cf. §. 447. Note.
Syllabic words, are either worn away or softened down to a mute e.

78. For the diphthongs रे (a + i) and खो ओ (a + u), the Gothic has ai and au, which are also monosyllabic, and were perhaps pronounced like रे and ओ. Compare bavaima, "aedificemus" with भवेम bhavëma, "simus"; sunau-s, "of a son," with its equivalent सनोस sund-s. Where these Gothic diphthongs ai and au have maintained themselves unaltered in value, they then appear, in writing, as э and о, which must be considered as contractions of a + i and a + u; as in the Latin amëmus, from amaëmus (§. 5.); and as in the almost solitary case of ëds, the long о of which is the result of a contraction of a + u, whose latter element appears again before vowels in the independent shape of v (bovis, bøvé). While the first element अ, in its degeneration, appears as о (§. 3.). Compare,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चरेम चरेम (eamus)</td>
<td>faraima,</td>
<td>varêmës.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चरेत चरेता (eatis)</td>
<td>faraith,</td>
<td>varét.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेभ्यस तेभ्यस (his)</td>
<td>thaim</td>
<td>dëm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79. In like manner, in all subjunctives, and in the prenominal declension in which the adjective bases in a take part, an Old High German э corresponds to the Sanskrit रे and Gothic ai. The Middle High [G. Ed. p. 67.] German has shortened this э, as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (varen, varet). Besides this, the Middle High German has, in common with the Old High German,

If, however, the Gothic diphthongs in question were not pronounced like their etymological equivalents रे and खो ओ, but, as Grimm conceives, approximate to the Vṛiddhi-change (§. 26.) रे ai and खी ओ: in such case the High German э, о, as opposed to the Gothic ai, au, are not merely continuations of these Gothic diphthongs: but the pronunciation assigned by the Sanskrit to the union of a with э or u, must have been first introduced into the Germanic, under certain conditions, in the eighth century.
preserved the diphthong ē where it stood in radical syllables under the protection of a following u, r (out of the older s), or h (ch), even in cases where one of these letters had been dropped, or where u had vocalized itself into v or o. (Grimm. pp. 90. 343). Compare,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOITHIC</th>
<th>OLD HIGH GERMAN</th>
<th>MIDDLE HIGH GERMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aiv, &quot;avum,&quot;</td>
<td>ēwin.</td>
<td>snē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaivs, &quot;nix,&quot;</td>
<td>snēo,</td>
<td>snē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mais, &quot;magis,&quot;</td>
<td>mēr,</td>
<td>mé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laisyan, &quot;docere,&quot;</td>
<td>lēran,</td>
<td>lēren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laithv, &quot;commodavit,&quot;</td>
<td>lēh</td>
<td>lēch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Modern High German this ē is partly preserved, partly replaced; for instance, mēr (mehr), Schnē (Schnee), Šēle (Gothic saivala); but ich lieh, gediēh. (Grimm. p. 983.).

80. As the ē for the Gothic ai, so the o for au, in the Old and Middle High German, is favoured by certain consonants; and those which favour the o are the more numerous. They consist of the dentals (according to the Sanskrit division, §. 16.) t, d, z, together with their nasal and sibilant (n, s); further, the semi-vowel r; and h, which, as a termination in Middle High German, becomes ch (See Grimm, pp. 94. 345). The roots, which in the Gothic admit the Guna modification of the radical u by a, in the preterite singular, oppose to the Gothic au, in Middle and Old High German, a double form; namely, o under the condition above mentioned, and next au, §. 34., in the absence

[G. Ed. p. 68.] of the letter which protects o. For instance, Old High German zōh, Middle High German zōch (traxi, traxiē) Gothic tauh, Sanskrit तूर्थ dudōha (mulki, mulsi); but pouc, bouc, flexi, flexit, Gothic baug, Sanskrit बूढौऽ bu-bhōja. The Modern High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong au, either, like the Middle and Old High German, as o, and in a more extended degree, and subject to the modification of §. 75; or next, shortened to o,
the particulars of which will be explained under the verb,
or, thirdly, as \( au \); for instance, \( daupya \), "I baptize," \( hlaupa \), "I run"; or, fourthly, as \( eu \), § 83.

81. As Ulfilas, in proper names, represents both \( e \) and \( a \) by \( ai \), and likewise \( o \) and \( au \) by \( au \) (\( \text{Paitrus, Galeilaia, apaustaulus, Paulus} \)); and as, in the next place, not every Gothic \( ai \) and \( au \) in the cognate dialects is represented in like manner, but in some cases the Gothic \( ai \) is replaced in Old High German by a simple \( i \) or \( \dot{i} \), and \( au \) by \( u \) or \( o \) (§ 77.); but in the others, \( ai \) is replaced by \( \dot{e} \), or (§ 85.) by \( ei \), and \( au \) by \( \delta \) or (§ 84.) \( ou \); therefore Grimm deduces from these facts a double value of the diphthongs \( ai \) and \( au \); one with the accent on the last element (\( ai \), \( au \)), another with the accent on the \( a \) (\( \dot{ai} \), \( \dot{au} \)). We cannot, however, give implicit belief to this deduction of the acute author of the German system of sounds, and prefer assuming an equal value in all cases of the Gothic \( ai \) and \( au \), although we might support Grimm's view by the fact, that, in Sanskrit, \( र \dot{e}, खो \delta \), never replace his \( ai \) and \( au \); but everywhere, where occasion occurs, do replace \( \dot{ai} \) and \( \dot{au} \). We think, however, that the difference is rather phonetic than etymological. As concerns the \( ai \) and \( au \) in proper names, it may be accounted for, inasmuch as the Gothic was [G. Ed. p. 69.] deficient in equivalents for these non-primitive vowels, which have degenerated from the original \( र \ a \). Could Ulfilas have looked back into the early ages of his language, and have recognised the original identity of \( e \) and \( o \) with his \( a \), he would perhaps have used the latter as their substitutes. From his point of sight, however, he embraced the \( ai \) and \( au \), probably because these mixed diphthongs passed with him as weaker than the long \( \dot{e} \) and \( \delta \), \( ejusdem generis \), (\( र \dot{a} \dot{d} \)). It is important here to observe, that in Greek also \( a \) is felt as weaker than \( \eta \) and \( \omega \), as is proved by the fact that \( a \) does not attract the accent towards itself (\( \tau\pi\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\iota \) not \( \tau\nu\pi\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\iota \). The expression of the Greek \( au \) and \( au \) by
the Gothic *ai* and *au* requires the less justification, because even if *ai* was pronounced like ए ए, and *au* like ओ ओ, yet the written character presents these diphthongs as a still perceptible fusion of *a* with a following *i* or *u*.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOUGHIC</th>
<th>SANSKRT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saihs, “six,”</td>
<td>शष्टि शष्टि,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihun, “ten,”</td>
<td>दशन् दशन्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faihu, “cattle,”</td>
<td>पशु पशु,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svaihira “father-in-law,”</td>
<td>शवशुरा शवशुरा,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihsvo, “dexter,”</td>
<td>दाषिन्या दाषिन्या,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairdo, “heart,”</td>
<td>ह्रिद (from hard §. 1.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bairan, “to bear,”</td>
<td>भर्तम् भर्तम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distairan, “to tear,”</td>
<td>दतारम् दतारम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairnd, “star,”</td>
<td>तारा तारा,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is not so to be understood as though an *i* had been placed after the old *a*, but that, by the softening down of the *a* to *i* (§. 66.), the forms *sihs*, *tihun*, had been produced; out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from *h* and *r* had produced *saihs*, *taihun*, *bairan*. The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage; for Old High German *sēhs*, (Anglo-Saxon, “six,”) and *tēhan* or *tēhun*, &c., rest upon an earlier Gothic *sihs*, *tihun*. Thus, *tohtar* rests on an earlier Gothic *duhtar*, for the Guna form *dauhtar*, Sanskrit दुहरतर दुहरतर, (दुहित्रि दुहित्रि, §. 1.) “daughter.” Where the
Sanskrit चँ has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered, that is, not weakened to i, the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong ai, since it is not the a before h and r which demands a subsequent addition, but the i which demands a precedent one; compare ahtau, "eight," with चँटै aśṭāu.∗

83. The alterations to which the simple vowels have been subjected appear again in the simple elements of the diphthongs, as well in the relation of the Gothic to the Sanskrit, as in that of the younger Germanic dialects to the Gothic. Thus the a element of the diphthong चो ठ shews itself often in the Gothic, and in certain places in a regular manner, as i (§. 27.); and in the same places the a contained in चू (a + i) becomes i, which, with the second element of the diphthong, generates a long i (written as ei, §. 70.). The Gothic iu has either retained that form in Old High German, or has altered sometimes one, sometimes both of its constituents. Thus have arisen iō, iō. [G. Ed. p. 71.]

There is a greater distance to be passed in Otfrid’s theory of the substitution of ia for iu, which cannot fail to surprise, as we know that a simple u never becomes a.† In Middle High German iu has either remained unaltered, or has been changed to ie, which is as old as the latest Old High German, as it is found in Notker. In Modern High German the substitution of ie for the old iu is that which princi-

∗ Ahtau=āśṭāu is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic au corresponds to the Sanskrit Vṛddhi diphthong चू āu; on the other hand, au often answers to चू ठ=(a+w).

† There is yet another ia in Old High German, namely, that which Grimm (p. 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction, and formerly dissyllabic, to which, therefore, there is no counterpart diphthong in Gothic. The most important case will be discussed under the head of the verb, in preterites, such as hialt, “I held,” Gothic haihald. After this analogy fiar, “four,” (according to Otfrid), arose out of the Gothic fidvor, in this way, that, after the extrusion of the dv, the ṑ passed into its corresponding short vowel.—Grimm, p. 193.
pally prevails, in which, however, the e is only visibly retained, for phonetically it is absorbed by the i. Compare *ich biete* with the Gothic *biuda*, *giesse* with *giuta*. Besides this form, we also find *eu* in place of the old *iu* or still older *au*, in cases, namely, where e can be accounted for as the result of a no longer perceptible modification (Grimm, p. 523, §. 75.); compare *Leute* with the Gothic *laudeis*, Old High German *liuti*, “people”; *Heu*, “hay,” with Goth, *havi*, “grass.” Usually, however, the Gothic has already acquired an *iu* in place of this *eu*, and the original *au* (which becomes *av* before vowels) is to be sought in the Sanskrit; for instance, *Neune*, “nine,” Old High German *niuni*, Gothic *niuneis*, Sanskrit नवः *navam* (as theme); *neu*, “new,” Old High German *niwi* (indeclinable), Gothic *nivi-s*, Sanskrit नवः *nava-s*. This *e*, however, is difficult to account for, in as far as it is connected with the *Umlaut*, because it corresponds to an *i* in Middle and Old High German; and this vowel, of itself answering to an *i* or *y* in the following syllable, is capable of no alteration through their power of attraction. Long *u* for *iu*, equivalent to a transposition of the diphthong, is found in *lügen*, “to lie,” *trägen*, “to deceive,” Middle High German *lügen*, *trägen*.  

[G. Ed. p. 72.] 84. Where the *a* element of the Sanskrit चौँ *d* retains its existence in the Gothic, making *ou* the equivalent of *ð*, the Middle High German, and a part of the Old High German authorities, have *ou* in the place of *au*, although, as has been remarked in §. 80, under the influence of certain consonants *ð* prevails. Compare Old High German *pouc*, Middle High German *bouc*, with the Gothic preterite *baug*, “flexi.” The *o* of the High German *ou* has the same relation to the corresponding Gothic *a* in *au*, as the Greek *o* in *βοῦς* bears to the Sanskrit चौँ *a*, which undergoes a fusion with *u* in the चौँ *d* of the cognate word गौँ *gdl*. The oldest Old High German authorities (Gl. Hrab. Ker. Is.) have *au* for the *ou* of the later (Grimm. p. 99); and as,
under the conditions specified in §. 80., they also exhibit \( \delta \), this tells in favour of Grimm's assumption, that \( au \) in the Gothic and oldest High German was pronounced like our German \( au \), and thus not like the Sanskrit \( \text{अ} \) (out of \( a + u \)). In this case, in the Gothic \( ai \), also, both the letters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be only an etymological, and not a phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit रे.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>MODERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOTHIC.</td>
<td>HIGH GERMAN.</td>
<td>HIGH GERMAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haitu, &quot;voco,&quot;</td>
<td>heizu,</td>
<td>heisse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skaida, &quot;separo,“</td>
<td>skeidu,</td>
<td>scheide,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. (1.) Let us now consider the consonants, preserving the Indian arrangement, and thus examining [G. Ed. p. 73.] the gutturals first. Of these, the Gothic has merely the tenuis and the medial \( (k, g) \); and Ulfilas, in imitation of the Greek, places the latter as a nasal before gutturals; for instance, "drigkan, "to drink"; "briggan, "to bring"; "tuggd, "tongue"; "yuggs, "young"; "guggs, "a going" (subst.). For the compound \( kv \) the old writing has a special character, which we, like Grimm, render by \( qv \), although \( q \) does not appear elsewhere, and \( v \) also combines with \( g \); so that \( qv \) (=\( kv \)) plainly bears the same relation to \( gv \) that \( k \) bears to \( g \); compare "sigwan, "to sink," with siggvan, "to read," "to sing." \( H \) also, in Gothic, willingly combines with \( v \); and for this combination, also, the original text has a special character; compare "saihvan, leihvan, with our "sehen, "leihen. In respect to \( h \) by itself we have to observe that it often appears in relations in which the dentals place their \( th \) and the labials their \( f \), so that in this case it takes the place of...
kh, which is wanting in the Gothic. In this manner is aih related to aigum, "we have," as bauth to budum, and gaf to gebum. Probably the pronunciation of the Gothic h was not in all positions the same, but in terminations, and before t and s, if not generally before consonants, corresponded to our ch. The High German has ch as an aspirate of the k: for this tenuis, however, either k or c stands in the older dialects, the use of which, in Middle High German, is so distinguished, that c stands as a terminating letter, and in the middle of words before t, and ch also stands for a double k. (Grimm, p. 422.) This distinction reminds us of the use of the Zend ẓ c in contrast to ẓ k, as also of the ꞗ t in contrast to ꞗ t. (§§. 34. 38.)

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

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

* Our Modern High German th is, according to Grimm (p. 525), inorganic, and to be rejected. "It is, neither in pronunciation nor origin, properly aspirated, and nothing but a mere tenuis."
The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskrit does all, with a double aspiration, a surd \( f = \text{ ph} \) (see §. 25.) and a sonant, which is written \( v \), and comes nearer to the Sanskrit \( \text{ bh} \). In Modern High German we perceive no longer any phonetic difference between \( f \) and \( v \); but in Middle High German \( v \) shews itself in this manner softer than \( f \), in that, first, at the end of words it is transformed into \( f \), on the same principle by which, in such a position, the medials are converted into tenues; for instance, \textit{wolf} not \textit{wolv}, but genitive \textit{wolves}; second, that in the middle before surd consonants it becomes \( f \), hence \textit{zwelve} becomes \textit{zwelfte}, \textit{funve} becomes \textit{funfzic}. At the beginning of words \( f \) and \( v \), in Middle High German, seem of equal signification, and their use in the MSS. is precarious, [G. Ed. p. 75.] but \( v \) preponderates (Grimm, pp. 339. 400). It is the same in Old High German; yet Notker uses \( f \) as the original primarily existing breathing-sound, and \( v \) as the softer or sonant aspiration, and therefore employs the latter in cases where the preceding word concludes with one of those letters, which otherwise (§. 93.) soften down a tenuis to its medial (Grimm, pp. 135, 136); for instance, \textit{demo vater}, \textit{den vater}, but not \textit{des vater} but \textit{des fater}. So far the rule is less stringent (observes Grimm), that in all cases \( f \) may stand for \( v \), but the converse does not hold. Many Old High German authorities abandon altogether the initiatory \( v \), and write \( f \) for it constantly, namely, Kero, Otfrid, Tatian. The aspiration of the \( p \) is sometimes, in Old High German, also rendered by \( ph \), but, in general, only at the beginning of words of foreign origin, \textit{phorta}, \textit{phenning}; in the middle, and at the end occasionally, in true Germanic forms, such as \textit{wörphan}, \textit{warph}, \textit{wurphumès}, in Tatian; \textit{limphan} in Otfrid and Tatian. According to Grimm, \( ph \), in many cases, has had the mere sound of \( f \). "In monumental inscriptions, however, which usually employ \( f \), the \( ph \) of many words had indisputably the sound of \( \mu f \); for example, if Otfrid
writes *kuphar*, "*cuprum,*" *scepheri*, "Creator," we are not to assume that these words were pronounced *kufar, sceferi*" (p. 132). In Middle High German the initial *ph* of foreign words of the Old High German has become *pf* (Grimm, p. 326). In the middle and at the end we find *pf*, first, always after *m*, *kampf*, "*pugna,*" *tampf*, "*vapor,*" *krempfen*, "*contra- here,*" in which case *p* is an euphonic appendage to *f*, in order to facilitate a union with *m*. Secondly, in compounds with the inseparable prefix *ent*, which, before the labial aspirates, lays aside its *t*, or, as seems to me the sounder supposition, converts that letter, by assimilation, into the labial tenuis. Hence, for

[G. Ed. p. 76.] instance, *enp-findenden*, later and more harmonious *emp-findenden*, for *ent-findenden*. Standing alone, nevertheless, it appears, in Middle High German, *vinden*, but *v* does not combine with *p*, for after the surd *p* (§. 25.) the surd aspirate is necessary (see Grimm, p. 398). Thirdly, after short vowels the labial aspirates are apt to be preceded by their tenues, as well in the middle as at the end of words: just as in Sanskrit (Gramm. Crit. r. 88.) the palatal surd aspirate between a short and another vowel or semi-vowel is preceded by its tenuis; and, for instance, प्रिच्छिति *prichchhati* is said for प्रिच्छिति *prichhati*. "interrogat," from the root प्रच *prachh.* In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf, kropf, tropfe, klopfen, krippen, kallen* (Grimm, p. 398). In the same words we sometimes find *ff*, as *kaffen, schaffen*. Here, also, *p* has assimilated itself to the following *f*; for *f*, even though it be the aspirate of *p*, is not pronounced like the Sanskrit झ *ph*, that is, like *p* with a clearly perceptible *h*; but the sounds *p* and *h* are compounded into a third simple sound lying between the two, which is therefore capable of reduplication, as in Greek φ unites itself with θ, while *ph + th* would be impossible.

(4.) The Sanskrit semi-vowels are represented in Gothic by *j* (=*y*), *r, l, v*; the same in High German; only in Old High German Manuscripts the sound of the Indo-Gothic *v*
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(our uO is most usually represented by uu> in Middle High German by vv: j (or y) in both is written i. We agree with Grimm in using j (or y) and w for all periods of the High German. After an initial consonant in Old High German, the semi-vowel w in most authorities is expressed by u; for instance, zuelif, "twelve," Gothic tvalif. As in the Sanskrit and Zend the semi-vowels y and v often arise out of the corresponding vowels i and u, so also in the [G. Ed. p. 77.] Germanic; for instance, Gothic suniv-t, "filiorum," from the base sunu, with u affected by Guna (iu, § 27.). More usually, however, in the Germanic, the converse occurs, namely, that y and v, at terminations and before consonants, have become vocalised (see § 73.), and have only retained their original form before terminations beginning with a vowel; for if, for instance, thius, "servant," forms thivis in the genitive, we know, from the history of the word, that this v has not sprung from the u of the nominative, but that thius is a mutilation of thivis (§ 116.); so that after the lapse of the a the preceding semi-vowel has become a whole one. In like manner is thivi, "maid-servant," a mutilation of the base thivy-t (§ 120.), whose nominative, like the accusative, probably was thivya, for which, however, in the accusative, after the v had become vocalized, thivya was substituted.

(5.) Of the Sanskrit sibilants, the Germanic has only the last, namely, the pure dental झ s. Out of this, however, springs another, peculiar, at least in use, to the Gothic, which is written z, and had probably a softer pronunciation than s. This z is most usually found between two vowels, as an euphonic alteration of s, but sometimes also between a vowel and v, l, or n; and between liquids (l, r, n) and a vowel, y or n, in some words also before d; finally, before the guttural medial, in the single instance, azyt, "ashes"; everywhere thus before sonants, and it must therefore itself be considered as a sonant sibilant (§ 25.), while
s is the surd. It is remarkable, in a grammatical point of view, that a concluding s before the enclitic particles ei and uh, and before the passive addition a, passes into z; hence, for instance, thizei “cujus,” from this “hujus,” thanzei “quos,” from than “hos,” vileiszuh “visne” from vileis “vis,” haitaza “ vocaris,” from haitis “vocus,” or rather from its earlier form.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Modern High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative... blind-s,</td>
<td>plintē-r,</td>
<td>blinde-r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive... blindi-s,</td>
<td>plinte-s,</td>
<td>blinde-s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87. The Germanic tongues exhibit, in respect of consonants, a remarkable law of displacement, which has been first recognised and developed with great ability by Grimm. According to this law, the Gothic, and the other dialects-
with the exception of the High German, in relation to the Greek, Latin, and, with certain limits, also to the Sanskrit and Zend, substitute aspirates for the original tenues, *h* for *k*, *th* for *t*, and *f* for *p*; tenues for medials, *t* for *d*, *p* for *b*, and *k* for *g*; finally, medials for aspirates, *g* for χ, *d* for θ, and *b* for *f*. The High German bears the same regular relation to the Gothic as the latter to the Greek, and substitutes its aspirates for the Gothic tenues and Greek medials; its tenues for the Gothic medials and Greek aspirates; and its medials for the Gothic aspirates and Greek tenues. Yet the Gothic labial and guttural medial exhibits itself unaltered in most of the Old High German authorities, as in the Middle and Modern High German; for instance, Gothic *biugu*, "flecto," Old High German *biuga* and *piuka*, Middle High German *biuge*, Modern High German *biege*. For the Gothic *f*, the Old High German substitutes *v*, especially as a first letter (§. 86. 3.). In the *t* sounds, *z* in High German (= *ts*) replaces an aspirate. The Gothic has no aspiration of the *k*, and either replaces the Greek *κ* by the simple aspiration *h*, in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskrit *x* *h*, or it falls to the level of the High German, and, in the middle or end of words, usually gives *g* instead of *k*, the High German adhering, as regards the beginning of words, to the Gothic practice, and participating with that dialect in the use of the *h*. We give here Grimm's table, illustrating the law of these substitutions, p. 584.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old High German,</td>
<td>B (V)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EXAMPLES.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High Germ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>पादस् pāda-s,</td>
<td>πούς, ποδ-ός, pes, pedis</td>
<td>fūtus,</td>
<td>vuoz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पञ्चन् panchan,</td>
<td>πέμπε,</td>
<td>quinque,</td>
<td>fimf,</td>
<td>vinf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पूर्व pūra,</td>
<td>πλέος,</td>
<td>plenus,</td>
<td>fulls,</td>
<td>vol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पितृ pitṛi,</td>
<td>πατήρ,</td>
<td>pater,</td>
<td>fudrein†,</td>
<td>vatar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपारि upari,</td>
<td>ύπερ,</td>
<td>super,</td>
<td>usar,</td>
<td>ubar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κάνναβις,</td>
<td>cannabis,</td>
<td></td>
<td>hanaf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भञ्ज bhanj,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>frangere,</td>
<td>brikan,</td>
<td>preclan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भुज bhuj,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>frui, fructus,</td>
<td>brâkōn,</td>
<td>pruchtōn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भात्र bhrātri</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>brōthar,</td>
<td>pruoder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भृ bhrī,</td>
<td>φέρω,</td>
<td>fero,</td>
<td>baira,</td>
<td>piru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भृ bhrū,</td>
<td>ὀφρύς,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>prava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कपाल kapāla, m.n.,</td>
<td>κεφαλή,</td>
<td>caput,</td>
<td>haubith,</td>
<td>houpit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तम्म twam (nom.),</td>
<td>τοῦ,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>thu,</td>
<td>du.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तम्म (acc.),</td>
<td>τόν,</td>
<td>is-tum,</td>
<td>thana,</td>
<td>den.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्रयाś trayas (n.pl.),</td>
<td>τρεῖς,</td>
<td>tres,</td>
<td>threis,</td>
<td>dri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चन्तर antara,</td>
<td>ἐτερος,</td>
<td>alter,</td>
<td>anther,</td>
<td>andar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दन्ता danta-m (acc.),</td>
<td>ὀδόντ-α,</td>
<td>dentem,</td>
<td>thuntu-s,</td>
<td>zand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द्वृ dwau (n. du),</td>
<td>δύο,</td>
<td>duo,</td>
<td>tva,</td>
<td>zuēnē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दक्षिण daḵšinā,</td>
<td>δεξία,</td>
<td>dextru,</td>
<td>taisvō,</td>
<td>zisawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उदा uda,</td>
<td>ὑδωρ,</td>
<td>unda,</td>
<td>vatō,</td>
<td>wazhar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दुहित्र duhitri,</td>
<td>ὑγάτηρ,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>dauhtar,</td>
<td>tohtar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द्वार dwār,</td>
<td>δύρα,</td>
<td>fores,</td>
<td>dawr,</td>
<td>tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मधु madhu,</td>
<td>μέθυ,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>mēto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>व्यास swan,</td>
<td>κύων,</td>
<td>canis,</td>
<td>hunths,</td>
<td>hund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्रिदयa hridaya,</td>
<td>καρδία,</td>
<td>cor,</td>
<td>hairtō,</td>
<td>hērza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्षa aksha,</td>
<td>ὀκος,</td>
<td>oculus,</td>
<td>augō,</td>
<td>ouga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अश्रु aśru,</td>
<td>δάκρυ,</td>
<td>lacrima,</td>
<td>tagr m.,</td>
<td>zahar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पशु paśu,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>pecus,</td>
<td>faihu,</td>
<td>vihu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rata-s, “wheel,”</td>
<td>रथसं ratha-s, “waggon.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>busu, “I would be,”</td>
<td>भविष्या म् bhaviṣhyāmi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-s, “who,”</td>
<td>कसं ka-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūmi, “I give,”</td>
<td>ददामि daddāmi. [G. Ed. p. 82.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pats, “husband,”</td>
<td>पति-सं pati-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penki, “five,”</td>
<td>पंचसं panchan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trys, “three,”</td>
<td>त्रयसं trayas (n. pl. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keturi, “four,”</td>
<td>चतुरसं chatuṛas (n. pl. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ketwirtas, “the fourth,”</td>
<td>चतुरथसं chatuṛtha-s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* From jan, “to be born.”
Greek, and Latin. As, however, according to §. 47., certain consonants convey an aspiration to the letter which precedes them, this may occasion an accidental coincidence between the Zend and the Gothic; and both languages may, in like manner and in the same words, depart from the original tenuis. Compare,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOTHIC</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>thir</em> (theme), “three,”</td>
<td>द्वित्तीय thri,</td>
<td>त्रिन्ती tri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>thus, “to thee,”</em></td>
<td>धुधो thwot,</td>
<td>त्वेन्ती twê.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>fra, (inseparable prep.)</em></td>
<td>फ्रा fra,</td>
<td>प्रा pra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>friyô, “I love,”</em></td>
<td>फ्रीयो afrînámi,†</td>
<td>प्रीणामी prînâmi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ahva†, “a river,”</em></td>
<td>अहवा afs</td>
<td>अप ap (theme).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[G. Ed. p. 83.] I pronounce this coincidence between the Gothic and the Zend aspirates accidental, because the causes of it are distinct; as, on the one side, the Gothic accords no aspirating influence to the letters v and r (*truda, trauan, trimpan, tvai*), and, in the examples given above, *th* and *f* stand, only because, according to rule, Gothic aspirates are to be expected in the place of original tenuis; on the other side, the Zend everywhere retains the original tenuis, where the letters named in §. 47. do not exhibit an influence, which is unknown to the Gothic; so that, quite according to order, in by far the majority of forms which admit of comparison, either Gothic aspirates are met with in the place of Zend tenuis, or, according to another appointment of the Germanic law of substitution, Gothic tenuis in that of Zend medials. Compare,

* *Twê occurs as an uninflccted genitive in Rosen’s *Veda-Specimen*, p. 26, and may, like the mutilated तेन te, be also used as a dative.
† “I bless,” from the Sanskrit root *prî*, “to love,” united with the prep. *z*.
† *Ahva.* The Sanskrit-Zend expression signifies “water”; and the Gothic form develops itself through the transition, of frequent occurrence, of *p* to *k*, for which the law of substitution requires *h* (see also *aqua*).
In the Sanskrit and Zend the sonant aspirates, not the surd, as in Greek, (ران h too is sonant, see § 25.) correspond, according to rule, to the Gothic medials: as, however, in the Zend the bh is not found, ब द answers to the Gothic b. Compare,

89. Violations of the law of displacement of sounds, both by persistence in the same original sound, or the substitution of irregular sounds, are frequent in the middle and at the end of
words. Thus, in the Old High German vutar, the t of the Greek πατήρ remains; in the Gothic fadrein, "parentes," d is substituted irregularly for th. The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of the Old High German olpenta, and the Gothic ulbandus, contrasted with the τ of ἔλεφαντ-; thus, also, the t of चतुर chatur, "quatuor," has become d in the Gothic fidvör instead of th; but in High German has entirely disappeared. The p of the Sanskrit root स्वं swap, (Latin sopio), "sleep," has been preserved in the Gothic slépa, and

[G. Ed. p. 85.] the Old High German slifiu stands in the Gothic category, but the Sanskrit root is more faithfully preserved in the Old High German in in-suepyu (sopio, see §. 86. 4.)

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

* It would be better to regard the phenomenon here discussed by assuming d as the proper character of the third person in Gothic; and viewing the Old High German t as the regular substitute for it. The d has been retained in the Gothic passive also (bair-a-da), and the active form baerith is derivable from baerid, in that the Gothic prefers the aspirates to the medials at the end of a word. The same is the case with the part. pass., the suffix of which is, in Gothic, da, whence, in Old High German, in consequence of the second law for the permutation of sounds, comes ta; so that the old form recurs again, re-introduced by a fresh corruption.
tions, by an anomalous process, into d; after the same principle by which the th of the third person before the vowel increment of the passive is softened to d; so that da*, instead of tha, corresponds to the Greek το, of ἐτύπτετο, and to the Sanskrit ता, of अभवत abhavata. The Old High German, on the other hand, has preserved the original t in both participles: hapentér, hapelēr, Gothic habands, genitive habandins; habaiths, gen. habaidis.

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

* Da is an abbreviation of da = G. τα Sansk. tē, *see §. 466.
affinity with \( t \): \( ga\text{-}skaf(t)i)s \), “creation,” (from \( sk\text{ap-un} \). The form \( di \) finds its place after vowels, but is able, where the vowel of the suffix falls away, \( i.e. \) in the nom. and accus. sing., to convert \( d \) into \( th \), because \( th \) can, more easily than \( d \), dispense with a following vowel, and is a favourite letter at the end of words and before consonants, though \( d \) also is tolerated in such a position. Hence the root \( bud \), “to bid,” (pres. \( biuda \), § 27.) forms, in the uninflected condition of the pret., \( bauth \), in the plur. \( bud\text{-}um \); and the nominal base, \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}di \), “world,” (according to Grimm’s well-founded interpretation, “seed, not seat, of man,”) forms in the nom. and accus. \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}ts \), \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}th \), or \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}ds \), \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}d \); but in the dat. \( mana\text{-}s\text{\text{-}}d\text{\text{-}}ai \) not \( s\text{\text{-}}d\text{\text{-}}hai \). On the other hand, after liquids the suffix is usually \( thi \), and after \( n \), \( di \): the dental, however, once chosen, remains afterwards in every position, either without a vowel or before vowels; for instance, \( yabaurths \), “birth,” dat. \( yabaurthai \); \( yafau\text{\text{-}}rds \), “gathering” \( [G.\text{ Ed. p. 87.}] \) (from \( fur\text{-}yan \), “to go”), gen. \( yafau\text{\text{-}}rds\text{\text{-}}ais \): \( yakunths \), “esteem,” gen. \( yakunthais \); \( yamunds \), “memory,” gen. \( yamundais \); \( ga\text{\text{-}}qumths \), “meeting,” dat. \( ga\text{\text{-}}qumthai \), dat. plur. \( ga\text{\text{-}}qumthim \). From the union with \( m \), \( d \) is excluded. On the whole, however, the law here discussed accords remarkably with a similar phenomenon in modern Persian, where the original \( t \) of grammatical terminations and suffixes is maintained only after mute consonants, but after vowels and liquids is changed into \( d \): hence, for instance, \( girif\text{-}tan \), “to take,” \( bas\text{-}tan \), “to bind,” \( d\text{\text{-}}sh\text{-}tan \), “to have,” \( pukh\text{-}tan \), “to cook” : on the other hand, \( d\text{\text{-}}t\text{\text{-}}an \), “to give,” \( bur\text{-}dan \), “to bear,” \( tm\text{-}dan \), “to come.” I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix \( ti \), and all other suffixes originally commencing with \( t \), from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this \( t \) entirely to the control of the preceding letter. The Old High German, in the case of our suffix \( ti \), as in that of other suffixes and terminations originally commencing with \( t \), accords to the original \( t \) a
far more extensive prevalence, than does the Gothic; inasmuch as it retains that letter, not only when protected by \( s, h, \) and \( f \), but also after vowels and liquids—after \( m \) an euphonic \( f \) is inserted;—and the \( t \) is only after \( l \) changed into \( d \). Hence, for instance, \( ans-t \), “grace,” \( hlouft \), “course,” \( mah-t \), “might,” \( s\dot{a}-t \), “seed,” \( kipurt \), “birth,” \( var-t \), “journey,” \( mun-t \), “protection,” \( ki-wal-t \), “force,” \( scul-t \), schuld, “guilt,” \( chumft \), “arrival.”

92. The law of substitution shows the greatest pertinacity at the beginning of words, and I have found it everywhere observed in the relation of the Gothic to the Greek and Latin. On the other hand, in some roots which are either deficient or disfigured in the Old European languages, but which are common to the Germanic and the Sanskrit, the Gothic stands on the same footing with the Sanskrit, especially in respect of initial medials. Thus, बन्ध, “to bind,” is also \( band \) in Gothic, not \( pand \); ग्रह, in the Vedas ग्रह ग्रह, “to take,” “seize,” is \( grip \) (pres. \( greipa \) with Guna, §. 27.) not \( krip \);* to गा गा and गम गम, “to go,” correspond गय्या, “I go,” and गा-वा, “street;” धां धां, “to burn,” is, in Old High German, धां धां, “to burn,” “to light.” I can detect, however, no instance in which Gothic tenues correspond to Sanskrit as initial letters.

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

* The Latin \( prehendo \) is probably related to the Sanskrit root \( ग्रह \) \( grah \), through the usual interchange between gutturals and labials.
or an aspirate, if these happen to precede sonants in a sentence. As examples, we select हरित harit, (virdis), “green,” वेद्विद् vedā-vid, “skilled in the Veda,” धन芝加哥 dhana-labh, “acquiring wealth.” These words are, according to §. 94., without a nominative sign. We find, also, अनिष्ठि हरित asti harit, “he is green,” अनिष्ठि वेद्विद्य asti vedā-vit, अनिष्ठि धन芝加哥 asti dhana-lap; on the other hand, हरिट् अनिष्ठि harid asti, वेद्विद्य अनिष्ठि vedavid asti, धन芝加哥 अनिष्ठि dhana-lap asti; also, हरिट् अनिष्ठि harid bhavati, &c. With this Sanskrit law the Middle High German is very nearly in accordance, which indeed tolerates aspirates at the end of words, contrary to the custom of the Sanskrit, only with a conversion of the sonant व into the surd न, see §. 86. a.; but, like the Sanskrit, and independent of the law of displacement explained in §. 87., supplies the place of medials at the end of words regularly by tenues. As, for example, in the genitives tiges, eides, wibes, of which the nom. and accus. sing., deprived of the inflexion and the terminating vowel of the base, take the forms tac, (§. 86. 1.) eit, wip. So also as to the verb; for instance, the roots truy, lad, grab, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers. sing. pret., truoc, luot, gruop, plur. truogen, luoden, gruoben. Where, on the other hand, the tenuis or aspirate (व excepted) is radical, there no alteration of sound occurs in declension or in conjugation. For instance, wort, gen. wortes, not wordes, as in Sansk. दोष dasset, “the giver,” gen. दश dadas, not दश dadas, but दश vit, “knowing,” gen. दश visas, from the base दश vid. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts ट at the end into ए, and ग into c; for instance, wort, wordes; dace, dayes. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenues, but by aspirates. Hence gaf, “I gave,” in contrast to gebum, and the accusatives hlaif, lauf, thiuf, opposed to the nominatives hlaibs, laubs, thiubs, gen. hlaibis, &c. The guttural and dental
medials \((g, d)\) are tolerated by the Gothic in terminations; yet even in these, in individual cases, a preference appears for the terminating aspirates. Compare \textit{bauth}, "I or he offered," with \textit{budum}, "we offered," from the root \textit{bud}; \textit{haitad-a “nominatur”} with \textit{haitith} (§. 67.) "nominat; aib, “I have,” “he has,” with \textit{aigum}, “we have.”

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

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

95. Between a final न n and a suc-
ceeding t sound—as which the palatals also must be 
reckoned, for च ch is equivalent to tsh—in the Sanskrit an 
euphonic sibilant is interposed, from the operation of the 
following t; and न, by this sibilant, is converted, § 9., into 
Anuswāra; for instance, अभाव is abhavān s-tatra, (abhava-
niś-tatra), “they were there.” With this coincides the cir-
cumstance, that, in High German, between a radical n and 
the t of an affix, an s, in certain cases, is inserted; for in-
stance, from the root ann, “to favour,” comes, in Old High 
German, an-s-t, “thou favourest,” on-s-ta or onda, “I fa-
voured,” un-s-t, “favour”; from prann comes prun-s-t, 
“ardour”; from chan is derived chun-s-t, “knowledge,” our 
German Kunst, in which, as in Brunst and Gunst, (from 
gönne, probably formed from the ann before noticed, and 
the prepositon g(e),) the euphonic s has stood fast. The Gothic 
exhibits this phenomenon nowhere, perhaps, but in an-s-ts 
and allbrun-s-ts ‘holocaustum.’ In Old High German we 
find still an s inserted after r, in the root tarr; hence, tar-s-t, 
“thou darest,” tor-s-ta, I dared.” (Cf. § 616. 2d Note.)

96. In Sanskrit the interposed euphonic s has extended 
itself further only among the prefixed prepositions, which 
generally enter into most intimate and facile connection with 
the following root. In this manner the euphonic s steps in 
between the prepositions सम sam, चच ava, परि pari, प्रति prati, 
and certain words which begin with च h. With this the 
Latin s between ab or ob and c, q, and p, remarkably accords*, 

*[G. Ed. p. 92.] which s, ab retains even in an isolated posi-
tion, when the above-mentioned letters follow. To this 
we also refer the cosmitere of Festus, instead of committere
(Schneider, p. 475), unless an original smitto, for mitto, is involved in this compound. In the Greek, 5 shews an inclination for connection with τ, θ, and μ, and precedes these letters as an euphonic link, especially after short vowels, in cases which require no special mention. In compounds like σακες-πάλος I reckon the 5, in opposition to the common theory, as belonging to the base of the first member (§ 128). We have yet to consider a case of the interpolation of an euphonic labial, which is common to the Old Latin and Germanic, and serves to facilitate the union of the labial nasal with a dental. The Latin places p between m and a following l or s; the Gothic and Old High German f between m and t. Thus, sumps, promps, demps, sumps, promps, demps; Gothic andunum-f-ts, “acceptance”; Old High German chum-f-t, “arrival.” In Greek we find also the interpolation of an euphonic β after μ, of a δ after ν, of a θ after σ, in order to facilitate the union of μ, ν, and σ with ρ and λ (μεσημβρία, μέμβλεται, ἀνδρός, ἰμάδθην—see Buttmun, p. 80); while the Modern Persian places an euphonic d between the vowel of a prefixed preposition and that of the following word, as be-d-ά, “to him.”

97. The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words, excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of ρ for 5. The alteration of the ν in the article in old inscriptions, and in the prefixes σύν, ἐν, and πάλιν, seems analogous to the changes which, according to § 18, the terminating Μ m, in Sanskrit, undergoes in all cases, with reference to the letter which follows. [G. Ed. p. 93.] The concluding ν in Greek is also generally a derivative from μ, and corresponds to this letter, which the Greek never admits as a termination in analogous forms of the Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin. N frequently springs from a final 5; thus, for instance, μεν (Doric μες) and the dual τον answer to the Sanskrit personal terminations मस mas, थस thas, तस tas. I have found this explanation, which I have given elsewhere, of the origin of the ν from 5
subsequently confirmed by the Prākrit, in which, in like manner, the concluding s of the instrumental termination plural ब्हि bhis has passed into the dull न (Anuswāra, §. 9.), and हि hiṅ is said for bhis. An operation, which has a prejudicial effect on many Greek terminations, and disturbs the relation to cognate languages, is the suppression of the t sound at the end of words, where, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin it plays an essential part. In respect of the vowels, it is also worthy of notice, that in Sanskrit, but not in Zend, at the meeting of vowel terminations and commencements, a hiatus is guarded against, either by the fusion of the two vowels, or, in cases where the vowel has a cognate semi-vowel at its command, by its transition into this latter, provided the vowel following be unlike. We find, for instance, अस्तिदम astidam, “est hoc,” and अस्तिष्य asty ayam, “est hic.” For the sake of clearness, and because the junction of two vowels might too often give the appearance of two or more words to one, I write in my most recent text अस्ति 'दम, in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the दम dam is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write अस्ति 'दम, in order directly

[G. Ed. p. 94.] at the close of the first word to shew that its final vowel has arisen out of a contraction, and that the following word participates in it.*

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

---

* We cannot guide ourselves here by the original MSS., as these exhibit no separation of words, and entire verses are written together without interruption, as though they were only a series of senseless syllables, and not words of independent place and meaning. As we must depart from Indian practice, the more complete the more rational the separation.
placed on the highest point of antiquity, insomuch as the signification of every radical portion is still so strongly felt, that while it admits of moderate changes, for the avoiding of harshness, it never, if we except some vowel elisions, permits the radical sense to be obliterated, or rendered irrecongnisable by concessions too great, or transitions too daring. Yet does the Sanskrit, more than any of its kindred, afford a field for the conflict of unsociable consonants, a conflict, however, which is honourably and strenuously maintained. The Vowels and weak consonants, (§. 25.) of grammatical endings and suffixes exert no influence over preceding consonants; but strong consonants, if surd (§. 25.), require a tennis, and if sonant a medial, before them. Thus, त t and थ th allow only of क k, not ख kh, ग g, घ gh preceding them; only त t, not थ th, र d, ध dh; while on the other hand, ध dh allows only ग g, not घ gh; only र d, not त t, थ th, ध dh; only ब b, not प p, फ ph, भ bh to precede it. The [G. Ed. p. 95.] roots and the nominal bases have to regulate their final letters by this law; and the occasion frequently presents itself, since, in comparison with the cognate languages, a far greater proportion of the roots connect the personal terminations immediately with the root; and also among the case terminations there are many which begin with consonants (आस bhyām, भिस bhis, भय य bhyas, स su). To cite instances, the root च ad, “to eat,” forms चमिद admi, “I eat”; but not चद्म adsi (for s is surd), nor चद्तित ad-ti, चद्ध ad-tha, but चत्तित at-si, चत्तित at-li, चत्तित at-tha: on the other hand, in the imperative, चद्ध ad-dhi, “eat.” The base प ad pad, “foot,” forms, in the locative plural, पत्त patsu, not पद्द pudsu; on the other hand, महत mahat, “great,” forms, in the instrumental plural, महद्ध bhis mahad-bhīs not महद्धिस mahat-bhis.

99. The Greek and Latin, as they have come down to us, have either altogether evaded this conflict of consonants, or exhibit, in most cases, with regard to the first of any two contiguous consonants, a disposition to surrender it, or
at least an indifference to its assistance towards the signification of the word, since they either abandon it altogether, or violently alter it, i.e. convey it beyond the limits of its proper organ. These two languages afford fewer occasions for harsh unions of consonants than the Sanskrit, principally because, with the exception of 'ΕΣ and 'ΙΔ in Greek, and ES, FER, VEL, ED, in Latin, as ἕσ-τι, ἕσ-μεν, ἕσ-τε, ἰδ-μεν, ἵσ-τε, est, estis, fer-t, fer-tis, vul-t, vul-tis, no root, terminated by a consonant, joins on its personal terminations, or any of them, without the aid of a connecting vowel. The Greek perf. pass. makes an exception, and requires euphonic alterations, which, in part, come within the natural limits recognised by the Sanskrit, and, in part, overstep them.

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

100. In Latin the principal occasion for the alteration of consonants presents itself before the \( s \) of the perfect and the \( t \) of the supine, or other verbal substantive or adjective (participles) beginning with \( t \); and it is in [G. Ed. p. 97.] accordance with the Sanskrit law cited §. 98., and the original condition of the language, that the sonant guttural passes, before \( s \) and \( t \), into \( c \), the sonant labial into \( p \), as in \( rec-si \) (\( rexi \)), \( rectum \) from \( reg \), \( scripsi \), \( scriptum \) from \( scrib \). It is also in accordance with the Sanskrit that \( h \), as a sonant (§. 25.) and incompatible with a tenuis, becomes \( c \) before \( s \) and \( t \); compare \( vec-sit \) (\( vexit \)), with the word of like signification चवाशित a-vāk-śīt. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the \( s \) of the perfect tense (\( mulsi \) from \( mulc \) and \( muly, sparsi \) from \( spary \)), this accords with the Sanskrit law of sounds, by which, of two terminating consonants of a nominal base, the last vanishes before consonants of the case terminations. \( D \) ought to become \( t \) before \( s \); and then the form, so theoretically created, \( claut-sit \) from \( claud \), would accord with the Sanskrit forms, such as चत्तसित \( a-tāut-sīt \), "he tormented," from तुद \( tud \). Instead, however, of this, the \( d \) allows itself to be extinguished; so, however, that, in compensation, a short vowel of the root is made long, as \( di-vī-sī \); or, which is less frequent, the \( d \) assimilates itself to the following \( s \), as \( cessi \) from \( ced \). With roots in \( t \), which are rarer, assimilation usually takes place, as \( con-cus-si \) from \( cut \); on the other hand, \( mi-si \), not \( mis-si \), for \( mit-si \), from \( mit \) or \( mitt \). \( B, m \), and \( r \) also afford instances of assimilation in \( jus-si, pres-si, ges-si, us-si \).* A third resource, for the avoidance

* Compared with the Sanskrit, in which उष्ण \( uṣk \) signifies "burn"; the sibilant must here pass for the original form.
of an union, very natural, but not endurable in this weakened state of the language, *ts*, is the suppression of the latter of these two letters, which is also compensated by the lengthening of a short radical vowel; thus,* sēdi from [G. Ed. p. 98.] sēd, vēdi from vēd. I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from sedūi, vidūi, and I class them with forms like fōdi from fōd, lēgi, for lec-si, from lēy, fugi, for fuc-si, from fūg. To these probably also belong cāvi, fāvi, fōvi, for pāvi, vōvi, from cāv, &c. A cavui, &c. is hardly conceivable; cavi could never have had such an origin. I conjecture forms such as cau-si, fau-si, after the analogy of cautum, fautum; or moc-si (moxi), after the analogy of vic-si, con-nic-si. (§. 19.) Possibly a moc-si form might derive probability from the adverb mox, since the latter is probably derived from mov, as cito is from another root of motion. The c of fluc-si, struc-si, (fluxi, &c.) fluxum, structum, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of v; and a fluv-vo, stru-vo, be presupposed, with regard to which it is to be remembered, that, in Sanskrit also, uv often develops itself out of ṛ u before vowels (Gram. Crit. r. 50.);

on which principle, out of flu, stru, before vowels, we might obtain fluv, struv, and thence before consonants fluc, struc. Thus, also, fructus out of fruv-or for fru-or. In cases of t preceded by consonants, the suppression of s is the rule, and ar-si for ard-i an exception. Prandi, frendi, pandi, verdi, &c., are in contrast to ar-si and other forms, like nuulsi above mentioned, in their preserving the radical letter in preference to the auxiliary verb; and they accord in this with the Sanskrit rule of sound, by which the s of 
vatiyaṃ adāt-ṣam, kṣaṭyaṃ akṣhaip-ṣam, &c., for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, kṣatiyaṃ adāt-ta, instead of kṣatiyaṃ adāt-sta. The perfects scīdi, fīdi, are rendered doubtful by their short vowel, and in their origin probably belong to the reduplicated preterites, their first syllable having

* Cf. §. 547., and for the whole §. cf. §§. 547. 570. 579.
perished in the lapse of time: in other respects, *fīdi, scīdi*, correspond to *tulūdi, pupūgi*, not to speak of *telūjī*, the i of which latter is not original.

101. The suffixes employed in the formation of words and beginning with *t*, for the representation of which the supine may stand, deserve special consideration, in regard to the relations of sound generated by the conflict between *t* and the preceding consonant. According to the original law observed in the Sanskrit, a radical *t* ought to remain unaltered before *tum*, and *d* should pass into *t*; as, भेजुम् *bhetum*, “to cleave,” from निर्द बhid. According to the degenerated practice of the Greek, a radical *d* or *t* before *t* would become *s*. Of this second gradation we find a remnant in *comes-tus, comes-tura*, analogous to *es-t, es-tis*, &c. from *edo*: we find, however, no *comes-tum, comes-tor*, but in their place *comesum, come sor*. We might question whether, in *comēsum*, the *s* belonged to the root or to the suffix; whether the *d* of *ed*, or the *t* of *tum*, had been changed into *s*. The form *com-es-tus* might argue the radicality of the *s*; but it is hard to suppose that the language should have jumped at once from *estus* to *ēsus*, between which two an *essus* probably intervened, analogous to *cessum, fissum, quassum*, &c., while the *t* of *tum, tus*, &c., assimilated itself to the preceding *s*. Out of *essum* has arisen *ēsum*, by the suppression of an *s*, probably the first; for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed, it is generally the first, (*eiμι* from *eiμι, no-σι* from *ποδ-σι*) possibly because, as in § 100., an auxiliary verb is abandoned in preference to a letter of the main verb. After that the language had, through such forms as *ē-sum, cā-sum, divē-sum, fis-sum, quas-sum*, habituated itself to an *s* in suffixes properly beginning with a *t*, *s* might easily insinuate itself into forms where it did not owe its origin to assimilation. *Cs* (x) is a favourite combination; hence, *fic-sum, nec-sum*, &c. for *fic-tum, nec-tum*. The liquids, *m* excepted, evince special incli-
nation for a succeeding s, most of all the r; hence, ter-sum, mer-sum, cur-sum, par-sum, ver-sum, in contrast to par-tum, tor-tum: there are also cases in which r, by a conversion into s, accommodates itself to t, as in ges-tum, us-tum, tos-tum.* This answers to the Sanskrit obligatory conversion of a concluding r into s before an initial t; as, भर्तर् bhrātus tārāya mām, "brother save me," instead of भर्तर् bhrātar: on the other hand, in the middle of words r remains unaltered before t; hence, for instance, भस्तुः bhistum, "to bear." L exhibits in the Latin the forms fal-sum, pul-sum, vul-sum, in contrast to cul-tum; n exhibits ten-tum, can-tum, opposed to man-sum. The other forms in n-sum, except cen-sum, have been mulcted of a radical d, as ton-sum, pen-sum.

102. In the Germanic languages, t alone gives occasion for an euphonic conversion of a preceding radical consonant; for instance, in the 2d pers. sing. of the strong preterite, where, however, the t in the Old High German is retained only in a few verbs, which associate a present signification with the form of the preterite. In the weak preterites, also, which spring from these verbs, the auxiliary t, where it remains unaltered, generates the same euphonic relations. We find in these forms the Germanic on the same footing as the Greek, in this respect, that it converts radical t sounds (t, th, d, and in Old and Middle High German z also) before a superadded t into s. Hence, for instance, in

[G. Ed. p. 101.] Gothic maimais-t (abscidisti), for maimait-t, fai-fals-t (plicavisti), for fai-falth-t, ana-baus-t (imperasti), for anu-baud-t. In Old and Middle High German weis-t, "thou knowest," for weiz-t. The Gothic, in forming out of the root vit, in the weak preterite, vis-sa ("I knew"), instead of

* The obvious relationship of torreo with réproumai, and त्रिष trish from तर्श tarsk, argues the derivation of the latter r from s. Upon that of uro from उष ush, see 97.
vista, from vitta, resembles, in respect of assimilation, the
Latin forms mentioned in §. 101., such as quas-sum for quas-
tum, from quat-tum. The Old High German, however, which
also adopts wis-sa, but from muoz makes not muos-sa, but
muo-sa, corresponds, in the latter case, to such Latin forms,
as ca-sum, clau-sum. The case is different in Old High Ger-
man with those verbs of the first weak conjugation, which,
having their syllables made long generally through two
terminating consonants in the preterite, apply the t of the
auxiliary verb directly to the root. Here the transition of t
into s does not occur, but t, z, and even d, remain unaltered;
and only when another consonant precedes them t and d are
extinguished, z on the contrary remains; for instance, leit-ta,
huld-ta. Of double consonants one only is retained, and of ch
or cch only h; other consonantal combinations remain, how-
ever, undisturbed, as ran-ta, “cucurri,” for rann-ta; wank-ta,
“vacillavi,” for wanch-ta; dah-ta, “texti,” for dacch-ta. The
Middle High German follows essentially the same principles,
only a simple radical t gives way before the auxiliary verb,
and thus lei-te is opposed to the Old High German leit-ta; on
the other hand, in roots in ld and rd the d may be maintained,
and the t of the auxiliary be surrendered—as dulde, “toleravi”
—unless we admit a division of dul-de, and consider the d as
a softened t. The change of g into c (§. 98.) is natural, but
not universal; for instance, anc-te, “arctavi,” for ang-te; but
against this law b remains unaltered. [G. Ed. p. 102.]
Before the formative suffixes beginning with t*, both in Gothic
and High German, guttural and labial tenuis and medials are
changed into their aspirates, although the tenuis accord with
a following t. Thus, for instance, in Gothic, vah-tvo,

* With the exception of the High German passive part. of the weaker
form, which, in the adjunction of its t to the root, follows the analogy of
the pret. above described
“watch,” from vak; sauh-t(t)s, “sickness,” from suk; mah-t(i)s, “might,” from mag; ga-skaf-t(i)s, “creation,” from skap; fragif-t(z)s, “betrothment,” from gib, softened from gab; Old High German suht, maht, ki-skaft, “creature,” kift, “gift.” The dentals replace the aspirate th by the sibilant (s), as is the case in Gothic before the pers. character t of the preterite, as th cannot be combined with t. The formation of words, however, affords few examples of this kind: under this head comes our mast, related to the Gothic mats, “food,” and matyan, “to eat.” In Gothic, the s of blöstreis, “worshipper;” springs from the t of blōtan, “to worship”: beist, “leaven,” comes probably from beit (beitan, “to bite,” Grimm, ii. p. 208). The Zend accords, in this respect, with the Germanic*, but still more with the Greek, in that it converts its t sounds into ʦ, not only before ʦ t, but also before ʦ m; for instance, अर्थिता iriṣṭa, “dead,” from the root ईरि ति iriṭ; बाष्टिता baṣṭa, “bound,” from बाष्टित बद्ध bāṣṭiḥ, with the nasal excluded; as in Modern Persian بسته bastah, from بنگ band; ब्रह्मान्द aesiṣma, “wood,” from रूप idhma.

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

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

* Cf. the Slavonic and Lithuanian, §. 457.
† No other roots in g in this person are to be found in Ulfilas.
the following suffix. We find, for instance, भोज्याति bhōj-syāmi, "I shall know," for बोध्याति bōdhi-syāmi; वेदुत् vēdu-bhut, "knowing the vedas," for बुध् budh; बुध् bud-dha, "knowing," for बुध्द buḍha; धोक्ष्याति dhōk-ṣyāmi, "I shall milk," for दोक्ष्याति dōk-ṣyāmi; दुह् dug-dha, "milked," for दुह्ता dūh-tā. In Greek we find a remarkable relic of the first part of the transposition of the aspirate,* in the necessary suppression of the aspirate in some roots which begin with $t$ and end with an aspirate before $\sigma$, $\tau$, and $\mu$, letters which admit of no union with an aspirate, and in its being thrown back on the initial letter, by which process $\tau$ becomes $\theta$. Hence, τρέφω, θρέπ-σω, (θρέψω), θρεπτύρ, θρέμ-μα; ταφή, θάπ-τω, ἐτάφην, τέθαμ-μαι; τρύφος, θρύπ-τω, ἐτρύφην, θρύμ-μα; τρέχω, θρέξομαι; θρίξτ, τριχός, ταχύς, θάσσων. In the spirit of this transposition of the aspirate, ἔχ obtains the spiritus asper when $\chi$ is obliged to merge in the tenuis, (ἐκτός, ἔξω, ἔξις).†

* See J. L. Burnouf in the Asiatic Journal, III. 368; and Buttmann, pp. 77, 78.

† It is usual to explain this appearance by the supposition of two aspirations in the root of these forms, of which one only is supposed to appear in deference to the euphonic law which forbids the admission of two consecutive aspirated syllables. This one would be the last [G. Ed. p. 101.] of the two, and the other would only shew itself when the latter had been forced to merge in the tenuis. Opposed, however, to this explanation is the fact, that, on account of the inconvenience of accumulated aspirates, the language has guarded itself in the original formation of its roots against the evil, and has never admitted an aspirated consonant at once for the initial and final letter of a root. In Sanskrit, the collection of whose roots is complete, there is no such instance. The forms, however, ἐθάφθαι, τεθάφθαι, τεθάφθω, τεθάφθαται, τεθράφθαι, ἐθράφθην, present a difficulty. These, perhaps, are eccentricities of usage, which, once habited to the initial aspiration by its frequent application to supply the place of the terminating one, began to assume its radicality, and extended it wider than was legitimate. We might also say, that since φθ (as χθ) is so favourite a combination in Greek that it is even substituted for πθ and μθ—while, according to §. 98., an original φθ ought to become πθ—on this ground the tendency to aspiration of the root remained unsatisfied by ἐθάφθην &c.; and as if the φ only existed out of reference to the θ, the original terminating aspirate necessarily fell back on the radical initial. This theory, which seems to me sound, would only leave τεθάφθαται to be explained.
OF THE ROOTS.

[G. Ed. p. 105.] 105. There are in Sanskrit, and the languages which are akin to it, two classes of roots: from the one, which is by far the more numerous, spring verbs, and nouns (substantives and adjectives) which stand in fraternal connection with the verbs, not in the relation of descent from them, not begotten by them, but sprung from the same shoot with them. We term them, nevertheless, for the sake of distinction, and according to prevailing custom, Verbal Roots; and the verb, too, stands in close formal connection with them, because from many roots each person of the present is formed by simply adding the requisite personal termination. From the second class spring pronouns, all original prepositions, conjunctions, and particles: we name them Pronominal Roots, because they all express a pronominal idea, which, in the prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, lies more or less concealed. No simple pronouns can be carried back, either according to their meaning or their form, to anything more general, but their declension-theme (or inflective base) is at the same time their root. The Indian Grammarians, however, derive all words, the pronouns included, from verbal roots, although the majority of pronominal bases, even in a formal respect, are opposed to such a derivation, because they, for the most part, end with a: one, indeed, consists simply of a. Among [G. Ed. p. 106.] the verbal roots, however, there is not a single one in a, although long a, and all other vowels, except du excepted, occur among the final letters of the verbal roots. Accidental external identity takes place between the verbal and pronominal roots; e.g. इ signifies, as a verbal root, "to go," as a pronominal root, "he," "this."

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

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

* Trans. of the Hist. Phil. Class of the R. A. of Litt. of Berlin for the year 1824, p. 126, &c.
idea by themselves alone, without the aid of vowels; and although they may be momentarily compressed into one syllable, still, in this, the combination of the middle radical with the first or last cannot be recognised as original and belonging to the root, because it is only transitory, and chiefly depends on the mechanism of the construction of the word. Thus, in Hebrew, *kāṭāl*，“slain,” in the fem., on account of the addition *āḥ* contracts itself to *ktāl* (*ktāl*-āḥ); while *kōtēl*,” slaying,” before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms *kōṭlāḥ*. Neither *ktāl*, therefore, nor *kōtēl*, can be regarded as the root; and just as little can it be looked for in *ktōl*, as the status *estructus* of the infinitive; for this is only a shortening of the absolute form *kāṭōl*, produced by a natural tendency to pass hastily to the word governed by the infinitive, which, as it were, has grown to it. In the imperative *ktēl* the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskrit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of the word. By them, for example, is distinguished, in Arabic, *katala*, “he slew,” from *kutila*, “he was slain”; and in Hebrew, *kōṭēl*, “slaying,” from *kāṭāl*, “slain.” A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanskrit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus, which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express.
The vowel, with one or more consonants, and sometimes without any consonant whatever, belongs to the fundamental meaning: it can be lengthened to the highest degree, or raised by Guna or Vṛiddhi; and this lengthening or raising, and, more lately, the retention of an original a, opposed to its weakening to i or change to u (§§. 66., 67.), belongs not to the denoting of grammatical relations, which require to be more clearly pointed out, but, as I imagine I can prove, only to the mechanism, the symmetry of construction.

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

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

[G. Ed. p. 110.] pronominal ideas? By inflexion, F. von Schlegel understands the internal alteration of the sound of the root, or (p. 35) the internal modification of the root, which he (p. 48) opposes to addition from without. But when from δο or δω, in Greek, comes δίδω-μι, δω-σω, δο-θησόμεθα, what are the forms μι, σω, θησόμεθα, but palpable external additions to the root, which is not at all internally altered, or only in the quantity of the vowel? If, then, by inflexion, an internal modification of the root is to be understood, the Sanskrit and Greek &c. have in that case—except the reduplication, which is supplied by the elements of the root itself—scarce any inflexion at all to shew. If, however, θησόμεθα is an external modification of the root δο, simply because it is combined with it, touches it, with it expresses a whole; then the idea of sea and continent may be represented as an internal modification of the sea, and vice versā. P. 50, F. von Schlegel remarks: “In the Indian or Grecian language every root is truly that which the name says, and like a living germ; for since the ideas of relation are denoted by internal alteration, freer room is given for development, the fulness of which can be indefinitely
extended, and is, in fact, often wondrously rich. All, however, which in this manner proceeds from the simple root, still retains the stamp of its relationship, adheres to it, and thus reciprocally bears and supports itself." I find, however, the inference not established; for from the capability of expressing ideas of relation by internal alteration of the root, how can the capability be deduced of surrounding the (internally unalterable) root indefinitely, with foreign syllables externally added? What kind of stamp of relationship is there between μι, σω, θησόμεθα, and the [G. Ed. p. 111.] roots to which these significative additions are appended? We therefore recognise in the inflexions of the Sanskrit family of languages no internal involutions of the root, but elements of themselves significative, and the tracing of the origin of which is the task of scientific grammar. But even if the origin of not a single one of these inflexions could be traced with certainty, still the principle of the formation of grammar, by external addition, would not, for that reason, be the less certain, because, at the first glance, in the majority of inflexions, one discovers at least so much, that they do not belong to the root, but have been added from without. A. W. von Schlegel, also, who, in essential points, assents to the above-mentioned division of languages,* gives us to understand, with regard to the so-called

* Nevertheless, in his work, "Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales," p. 14, &c., he gives three classes, viz. Les langues sans aucune structure grammaticale, les langues qui emploient des affixes, et les langues à inflexions. Of the latter, he says: "Je pense, cependant, qu'il faut assigner le premier rang aux langues à inflexions. On pourrait les appeler les langues organiques, parce qu'elles renferment un principe vivant de développement et d'accroissement, et qu'elles ont seules, si je puis m'exprimer ainsi, une végétation abondante et féconde. Le merveilleux artifice de ces langues est, de former une immense variété de mots, et de marquer la liaison des idées que ces mots désignent, moyennant un assez petit nombre de syllabes qui, considérées séparément, n'ont point de signification.
inflexions, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G. Ed. p. 112.] regarded, per se, they have no meaning. In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or inflexions have no meaning, at least in so far that they do not, any more than in Sanskrit, occur isolated in a completely similar state. In Arabic, for instance, antum, and not tum, is said for "ye"; and in Sanskrit ma, ta, and not mi, ti, are the declinable bases of the first and third person; and at-Ti, "he eats," has the same relation to TA-m, "him," that in Gothic IT-a, "I eat," has to the monosyllabic AT, "I ate." The reason for weakening the a of the base to i is probably, in the different cases of the two sister languages, the same, viz. the greater extent of the form of word with i (comp. §. 6.) If, then, the division of languages made by F. von Schlegel is untenable, on the reasons on which it is founded, still there is much ingenuity in the thought of a natural history or classification of languages. We prefer, however, to present, with A. W. von Schlegel (l. c.), three classes, and distinguish them as follows: first, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the

**fiction, mais qui déterminent avec précision le sens du mot auquel elles sont jointes. En modifiant les lettres radicales, et en ajoutant aux racines des syllabes dérivatives, on forme de mots dérivés de diverses espèces, et des dérivés des dérivés. On compose des mots de plusieurs racines pour exprimer les idées complexes. Ensuite on décline les substantifs, les adjectifs, et les pronoms, par genres, par nombres, et par cas ; on conjugue les verbes par voix, par modes, par temps, par nombres, et par personnes, en employant de même des désinences et quelquefois des augments qui, séparément, ne signifient rien. Cette méthode procure l'avantage d'énoncer en un seul mot l'idée principale, souvent déjà très-modifiée et très-complexe, avec tout son cortège d'idées accessoires et de relations variables.**
main point, can only be discovered from the position of the roots in the sentence.* Secondly, languages with monosyllabic roots, which are capable of combination, and obtain their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone. The chief principle of the formation of words, in this class, appears to me to lie in the combination of verbal and pronominal roots, which together represent, [G.Ed.p. 113.] as it were, body and soul (Comp. §. 100.). To this class belongs the Sanskrit family of languages, and moreover all other languages, so far as they are not comprehended under 1. and 3., and have maintained themselves in a condition which renders it possible to trace back their forms of words to the simplest elements. Thirdly, languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single vehicles of the fundamental meaning. This class comprehends merely the Semitic languages, and produces its grammatical forms, not simply by combination, like the second class, but by a mere internal modification of the roots. We here gladly award to the Sanskrit family of languages a great superiority over the Semitic, which we do not, however, find in the use of inflexions as syllables per se devoid of meaning, but in the copiousness of these grammatical additions, which are really significative, and connected with words used isolated; in the judicious, ingenious selection and application of them, and the accurate and acute defining of various relations, which hereby becomes possible; finally, in the beautiful adjustment of these additions to a harmonious whole, which bears the appearance of an organized body.

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

* We find this view of the Chinese admirably elucidated in W. von Humboldt's talented pamphlet, "Lettre à M. Abel Remusat, sur la nature des formes grammaticales en général, et sur le génie de la langue chinoise."
I call the special tenses,* and to the part. pres.,) into ten classes, all of which we have re-discovered in the Zend also, and examples of which are given in the following paragraph.

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

(1.) The first and sixth class add र a to the root; and we reserve the discussion of the origin of this and other conjugational affixes for the disquisition on the verb. The point of difference between the first class of nearly 1000 roots (almost the half of the entire number) and the sixth class, which contains about 130 roots, lies in this, that the former raise the vowel of the root by Guna (§ 26.), while the latter retain it pure; e.g. बोधि bōdhati, "he knows," from बुध budh (1.); तुदति tudati, "he vexes" (comp. tundit), from तुद tud (6.) As र a has no Guna,† no discrimination can take place through this vowel between the classes 1. and 6.: but nearly all the roots which belong to either, having र as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, ε (before nasals o, § 3.) corresponds to the affix र a ; and άείπ-ο-μεν, άφεύ-ο-μεν, from ΆΠΙ, ΦΙΓ (έλιπον, εφυγον), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§ 26.); while, e.g. θν-ο-μεν, θλιβ-ο-μεν, &c., fall under the sixth class.|| In Latin we recognise, in the third conjugation,

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

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

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

|| Sanskrit long vowels admit Guna only when they occur at the end of the root, but in the beginning and middle remain without admixture of the र a ; so do short vowels before double consonants.
which I would raise to the first, the cognate of the Sanskrit first and sixth class, since we regard the addition \( i \) as a weakening of the old \( a \) (§. 8.); and \( e.g. \) legimus has the same relation to \( \lambda \eta \gamma-o-\mu e \), that the genitive \( pe d-i s \) has to \( \pi o d-\hat{o}c \) where the Sanskrit has likewise \( a \) (पदस् [G. Ed. p. 115.] \( p a d-a s \)). In \( le g-u-n t \), from \( le g-a-n t i \), the old \( a \), through the influence of the liquid, has become \( u \) (Comp. §. 66.). In German, all the primitive (strong) verbs, with the exception of some remains of the fourth class (No. 2.), stand in clear connection with the Sanskrit first class, which is here, for the first time, laid down in its full extent.* The \( \tilde{a} \) \( a \) which is added to the root has, in Gothic†, before some personal terminations, remained unchanged; before others, according to §. 67., and as in Latin, been weakened to \( i \); so, hait-a, "I am called," hait-i-s, hait-i-th, 2d pers. du. hait-a-ts; pl. hait-a-m, hait-i-th, hait-a-nd. The radical vowels \( i \) and \( u \) keep the Guna addition, as in Sanskrit, only that the \( a \) which gives the Guna is here weakened to \( i \) (§. 27.), which, with a radical \( i \), is aggregated into a long \( i \) (written \( e i \), §. 70.): hence keina (=kina, from kiina), "I germinate," from \( K I N \); biuya, "I bend," from \( B U G \), Sanskrit \( \mu \dot{u} j \) \( b h u j \), whence \( \mu \dot{n} \) \( b h u g n a \), "bent." The diphthongs \( a i \), \( a u \), as in Sanskrit \( \tilde{a} \) and \( \dot{a} \) (§. 2.), are incapable of any Guna; as are \( \dot{e} \) (\( =\tilde{a} \), §. 69.) and \( a \). The Sanskrit radical vowel \( \tilde{a} \) \( a \) has, however, in Gothic, experienced a threefold destiny. It has either remained unaltered in the special tenses, and is lengthened in the preterite, except in reduplicate roots (\( i.e. \) to \( \delta \), see §. 69.)—

---

* I have already, in my Review of Grimm's Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the \( a \) of forms like haita, haitam, haitaima, &c. does not belong to the personal termination, but is identical with the \( \tilde{a} a \) of the Sanskrit 1st and 6th classes; but I was not then clear regarding the Guna in the present in all roots with vowels capable of Guna. (See Ann. Reg. for Crit. of Litt., Book II. pp. 282 and 269.)

† We make frequent mention of the Gothic alone as the true starting-point and light of German Grammar. The application to the High German will hereafter present itself.
thus, e.g. far-i-th, "he wanders," answers to चरति charati

[G. Ed. p. 116.] (§. 14.), and för, "he wandered," to चचात्रा chachāra; or, secondly, the old a shews itself in the special tenses weakened to i, but retained in the monosyllabic singular of the preterite: so that here the stronger a (§. 8.) corresponds to the weaker i in the same way that, in the first case, the ध (= ध्य ध) does to the short a. The root जाद ad, "to eat," in Gothic, according to §. 87., forms AT; hence, in the present, ita; in the sing. pret., ut, as-t, at. The third fate which befalls the a of the root in Gothic is a complete extirpation, and compensation by the weaker i, which is treated like an original i, existing in the Sanskrit; i.e. in the special tenses it receives Guna by i, and in the pret. sing. by a (§. 27.), but in the pret. pl. it is preserved pure. To this class belongs the KIN, "to germinate," mentioned above, pres. keina, pret. sing. kain, pl. kin-un. The corresponding Sanskrit root is जान jan, "to produce," "to be born" (see §. 97.): the same relation, too, has greipa, graip, gripum, from GRIP, "to seize," to ग्राब grabh (Veda form): on the other hand, BIT, "to bite,"* (beita, bait, bitum), has an original i, which exists in Sanskrit (comp. भिड bhid, "to cleave"); just so, VIT, "to know," Sanskrit विद्विद vid.

(2.) The fourth class of Sanskrit roots adds to them the syllable य ya, and herein agrees with the special tenses of the passive; and from the roots which belong to it spring chiefly neuter verbs, as e.g. नास्यात्त nasyati, "he perishes," Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakeable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable या (weakened to यi), which is added to the root in the


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

(3.) The second, third, and seventh classes add the personal termination direct to the root; but in the cognate European languages, to facilitate the conjugation, these classes have mainly passed over to the first class; e. g. ed-i-mus, not ed-mus (as a remnant of the old construction es-t, es-tis), Gothic it-a-m, Old High German iz-a-mès not iz-mès, answering to the Sanskrit अद्व म ad-mas. The second class, to which ज्ञ ad belongs, leaves the root without any characteristic addition, with Guna of the vowels capable of Guna before light terminations, which must be hereafter explained; hence, e. g. निन नमी, corresponding to इमस imas, from इ म i “to go,” as in Greek εἰμι to  AppState. It contains not more than about seventy roots, partly terminating in consonants, partly in vowels. In this and the third-class, the Greek exhibits roots, almost entirely ending in vowels, as the above mentioned \( \text{I, } \Phi \alpha, \Gamma \nu \Omega \) (\( \gamma ν \nu-thi \)), \( \Delta \omega, \Sigma \tau \alpha, \Theta \iota, \Phi \gamma (\epsilon \gamma \nu \nu) \), \( \Delta \gamma \), &c. To the consonants the direct combination with the consonants of the termination has become too heavy, and \( \text{EE} \) alone (because of the facility of \( \sigma \mu, \sigma \tau \)) has remained in the Sanskrit second class, as the corresponding root in Latin, Lithuanian, and German. Hence, तस्ति asti, ēστί, Lithuan. esti, est, Gothic and High German ist. In the Latin there fall also to the second class, \( I, \text{DA, STA, FLA, FA, and NA}; \) and also in- quam, whence \( \text{QUA} \) weakened to \( \text{QUI} \), is the root, which, in Gothic, appears as \( \text{QUAT} \), weakened to \( \text{QUIT} \), with the accretion of a \( T, \text{FER} \) and \( \text{VEL} (\text{VUL}) \) have preserved some persons of the ancient construction.* [G. Ed. p. 118.]

The third class is distinguished from the second by a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses, and has maintained itself under this form in Greek also, and Lithuanian. In

---

* Five roots of the second class introduce in Sanskrit, between the consonants of the root and the personal termination, an \( \text{I} \), as रोदिति rođ-i-mi, “I weep,” from रुदः rud. I can, however, no longer believe that the \( \text{i} \) of the Latin third conjug. is connected with this \( \text{I} \), as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the \( \text{a} \) of the very copious first class.
Sanskrit it comprehends about twenty roots; e.g. ददामि, ददौ, Lithuanian dudu; ददामि, ददहामि, तिध (§. 16); जाजन्यम jajam, “I beget,” comp गिम-गिम-मू. The seventh class, of about twenty-four roots, introduces, in the special tenses, a nasal into the root, which is extended before the light personal terminations to the syllable na; e.g. भिन्नम् भिन्नमास, “we cleave.” The Latin has kept the weaker form of this nasalization, but has further added to the root the affix of the first class (p. 114 G. Ed.); hence finden, find-i-mus. From the Greek come to be here considered roots, like ΜΑΘ, ΛΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed a, and, like the Latin find-i-mus, is connected with the affix of the first class; thus, μαν-αν-ο-μεν, λαμβ-αν-ο-μεν, θηγγ-αν-ο-μεν.

(4.) The fifth class, of about thirty roots, has nu; and the eighth, with ten roots, which, excepting ऊ kri, “to make,” all terminate in न n or फ n, has u for its characteristic addition: the u, however, of these two classes is lengthened before the light terminations by Guna, which in the corresponding Greek appended syllables, uv and u, is supplied by lengthening the v; thus, e.g. δεικνύμεν, δεικνύμεν, as in Sanskrit जापोमि अप-न-मि, “ad-ip-is-cor,” जापामस अप-न-μस, “adipisci-mur.” An example of the eighth class is तन tan, “to extend,” whence तनोमि tan-मि=राव-स-मि, तनुमस tan-u-μस=राव-स-με. With the ऊ u, ऊ, of the eighth class, is probably connected [G. Ed. p. 119.] the v in some Gothic strong verbs, where, however, it adheres so firmly to the root, that, in a German point of view, it must be regarded as a radical. Hence it is not dropped in the preterite, and receives, in the special tenses, like all strong verbs, the affix of the Sanskrit first class; e.g. saihva,* “I see,” sahv, “I saw.”

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

* I now consider the v of saihva and similar verbs as purely euphonic, cf. §. 86. and Latin forms like cogno, linguo, stinguo.
to ना, replaces the heavy छा a by the lighter इ i (§ 6.), and is thus weakened to नि nī. E.g. from मृद mrid, "to crush," (comp. mordeo) comes मृदनामि mridnāmi, मृदनीमस mridnīmas. In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in νημ (ναμ) ναμεν; e.g. δαμημ, δαμαμεν. As अ, ए, and ओ, are originally one, formations like तेµ-वो-µεν belong to this class, only that they have wandered into the more modern ω-conjugation at a remote period of antiquity; for more lately νω would not have become νο from νημ.

(6.) The tenth class adds सय aya to the root, but is distinguished from the other classes in this farther important point, that this affix is not limited to the special tenses: the final a of सय aya is peculiar to them, but सय ay extends, with very few exceptions, to all the other formations of the root. All causals, and many denominatives, follow this class, and, indeed, from every root a causal can be formed by the addition सय ay, which is always accompanied by Guna of the middle vowel of the root capable of Guna, or by Vṛiddhi of every radical final vowel and of a middle a belonging to the root; e.g. वेदपि vēd-ayatā "he makes to know," from विद vīd; अशयमि śrav-aya-ti, "he makes to hear," from श्रु śru. We recognise, in German, the affix सय aya at least in two shapes: in the one [G. Ed. p. 120.] the first a, in the other the last, is lost, and in the latter case y has become i; so that I have no longer any scruple in tracing back Grimm's first and third conjugation of the weak form to a common origin. According to all probability, however, the verbs with the affix अ also (as Old High German manān, "to mention," "to make to think,") belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb. The Old High German gives अ as the contraction of a + i, (see §. 78.), but retains its अ more firmly than the Gothic its ai, which, in several persons, sinks into a simple a. Compare Gothic haba, habam, haband, with Old High German hapēm, hapēmes, hapēnt. Very remarkable, however, is the concurrence of the Prākṛit with the Old High German and the Latin
of the 2d conj. in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix या aya to रे. Compare Sanskrit मन्यायमि, "I honour," Prâkrit मालेि māñēmi,* Old High German, var-maném, "I despise," Latin moneo:

[O. D. Ed. p. 121.]

SANSKRIT.  प्रâkrit.  OLD  HIGH  GERMAN.  LATIN.

मानयायमि  मालेि māñēmi  var-maném  moneo
मानयसि  मालेि māñēsi  manēs  monēs
मानयाति  मालैदि māneddi  manēt  monet
मानयाहसि  मालैदि mānedha  manēt  monet
मानयाति  मालैदि mānedha  manēt  monet
मानयाति  मालैदि mānedha  manēt  monet

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

* I am not at present able to adduce this verb from the edited texts: it is, however, certain, that मनयायमि in this dialect can have no other sound but मनेमि. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, as चिण्डेि, "I think" (from चिण्डेि), नीवधेि (from नीवधयाय). In the plural the termination mha is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk. smas, "we are"). In the third pers. pl., together with मनेति the forms मानायति and मानानि are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanscrit a root मन्, "to honour": more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from मन्, "honour"; and this substantive itself a derivation from मन्, "to think," whence आव-मन्, "to despise," as in Old High German var-MAN (by Otfried, fir-MON). The root, therefore, which is contained in varmanём is identical with the Gothic MAN (man, "I mean," "I think," pl. munum see § 66.). To this class belongs, also, the Latin monere, as, "to make to think" (Old High German monēm), the radical o for a of which we explain by the principle of § 66. (see, also, § 3.) ; while the i of memin-i is a weakening of the original a, explained by § 6.
be looked for in those in \( \omega, \varepsilon \omega, \omega \); in Latin, besides the 2d conjugation compared above, most verbs of the 1st and 4th also belong to this affinity. We shall recur to them when speaking of the verb.

109b. In order to adduce single examples of the multiform construction of the roots, let us examine the order of the final letters; but we will select only such examples as are common to the Sanskrit and several sister languages. The greatest forbearance, however, is requisite, as an authenticated comparison of all that admits of comparison would easily swell to a book, which shall hereafter be devoted to this subject.*

(1.) Roots ending with a vowel:— [G. Ed. p. 122.]

"There are, as has been already remarked (§. 105.), no roots in \( \textsc{sa} \); but roots in \( \textsc{sa} \, \textsc{d} \) are numerous. Thus गा
, "to go," contained in the Latin navī-yā-re; also, perhaps, in fati-gare, the first member of which belongs to fatiscor, fessus; in Greek, \( \beta\i\i\eta\mu \) answers to जगामि jagāmi, and rests on the frequent interchange of gutturals and labials; Gothic ga-thvād, "a street," (see p. 102. G. Ed.); Zend गात्स गात्स गात्स, "a place," (nom. गायत्रि gātus; Old High German \( \text{ga}\, \text{m} \), "I go," = जगाम गा-गाम; not therefore, as Grimm conjectures (p. 868), by syncope from \( \text{gangu} \), but, with a more ancient and regular foundation, only with a suppression of the Sanskrit syllable of reduplication, introduced, therefore, from the third into the second class (see p. 117. G. Ed.), as in Latin, \( \text{da}\, \text{mus} \) answering to दिदो-\( \mu \varepsilon \). Thus, also, \( \text{stā}\, \text{m} \), \( \text{stā}\, \text{s} \), \( \text{stā}\, \text{t} \). In like manner, with suppressed reduplication, corresponds to \( \iota-\sigma\tau\-\mu \) (for \( \sigma\iota\sigma\nu\mu \)), and to the Sanskrit root \( \text{स्था} \) sthā, which is irregularly inflected, तिष्ठति tīṣṭhāmi, तिष्ठति tīṣṭhasti, तिष्ठति tīṣṭhasti, for tasthāmi, tasthāsi, tasthāti.

* Somewhat that pertains to this subject I have already put together very concisely at the end of my Sanskrit Glossary.
† The attached cyphers denote the classes described in §. 109a.
which will be more closely considered hereafter. The Latin, in root and inflexion, most resembles the Old High German: the Zend, however, in its असिद्धा histāmi* (for sisādmi, see §. 53.), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the राज्यसिद्धा rathaśtādo, "warrior," which occurs so often in the Zend-Avesta, properly "chariot stander," with o for s as the sign of the nominative. How, then, in Old High German, comes from STA the extended form of the root STANT, whence the present stantu, "I stand," and preterite stuont, "I or he stood"; for which the Gothic has standa, stōth? We will here only preliminarily remark, that we have observed in Zend also, in some roots terminating in a, an inclination to connect themselves with a t-sound. Thus we find, from अप मद "to wash," "to purify," (Sansk. चन मद, "to bathe,") whence snāta, "purified," in Vend. S. p. 233, frequently फ्रायदहैन "lavent"; from अन dā, "to lay," (Sansk. दधिन. p. 118 G. Ed.), we find निदाइयाईन, "deponent" (as Vendidād S. pp. 205 and 206, हस्के रेमेन nidaithyaın, "in sicca terrā deponent"): from the same root we find the imperative [G. Ed. p. 123.] form, असिद्धाग्र ni-dā-thāma, "deponamus" (Vend. S. p. 208, अनस्क घन gnaharam kva narainm iśritanaim tanām barāna Ahura mazda kva nīdāthāma, "Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus"?) Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root मा mā, "to measure" (cf. μέ-τρον), has connected itself with a t-sound, and forms, in Gothic, MAT, present mita (§. 109a. 1.). जन jnl, "to be acquainted with," "to know," ΓΝΩ, GNA (gnarus) Old High German CHNA (§. 87.); whence chnā-ta, "I knew," annexing the auxiliary verb direct, as in Latin (g)no-vi. To

* I believe I may deduce this form from the 3d pers. pl. असिद्धाग्र histānti (cf. ṭravati) in the V. S. p. 183: more on this head under the verb.
the special form, जानामी जानामी, for जानामी जानामी, may be-
long the Gothic root KANN, Old High German CHANN (kann, chan, “I know,” see §. 94., kunnum, chunnun, “we
know,” see §. 66.). ध्राद्ध, “to blow,” alters itself in the
special forms to ध्राद्ध, Latin FLA, according to the
second class (§. 109 a 3.), Old High German PLA (§§. 12. 20.),
whence प्लाऱ्फ, “flavi.” As in Sanskrit, from the above-men-
tioned ध्राद्ध, comes the nominal base ध्राद्ध, ध्राद्ध, “a vein”; so may the Gothic base BLOTHA (nom. acc.
ब्लोथ, “blood”) come here also under consideration. We
pass on to roots in i, and have to remark that the root
mentioned at p. 107. G. Ed., र in, “to go,” is not unknown
in German. We find it in the Gothic imperative हिर-ि, “come
here”; du. हिर-िट; pl. हिर-िट. I believe, too, that in the
irregular preterite इद्या, “I went,” the इ alone can be as-
sumed as the root. In Zend occurs रोजमा देह-ि, “he goes”
(from रोजे देह, according to §§. 28. 41.), Lithuan. इ-ि.
स्रिन्नि, “to go,” with the prep. उद इु, “to raise itself”; hence,
उच्छरिता, “raised,” “high”; compare cre-sco, cre-ि (see §. 21.), Old High German SCRIT, “to step,” with the
addition of ए, as in the case of मट, from म मट: perhaps the
Latin gradior, as well as cresco, might be here included,
the Guna form of the vowel, as in अयस्सि स्त्रुय-ि-ि, “he
goes,” being observed. इम सूि, “to smile,” Old High
German SMIL; रोज प्रिति, “to love,” Zend मै फ्रिति (§. 47.), Goth.
फ्रिया, “I love” (§. 87.), compare प्रिति प्रिया, “ dear.” रोज भीि.
“to fear,” बिभेंि बिभेणि, “I fear”; Lithuan. भियाउ; Gothic
फ्रिया, “I hate” (फ्रिया, फ्रियाईय), फ्रियांड्, “foe”; Old High Ger-
man विध or फिध, “I hate”: the Greek φέβω-ुμαि answers to
the Sanskrit reduplication of बिभेमि; so that, contrary
to the common rule, the aspirates have remained in the prefix,
but in the base itself have become medials, and this has left
only ब as the whole root, as in Sanskrit da-द-मस, “we give,”
for da-da-मस, दि-डौ-मेग. Perhaps, also, [G. Ed. p. 124.]
ΦΙΔ, फेधोमस, is to be referred to the roots in i, so that an
unorganic dental affix would be to be assumed. शैवं ‘śi,’ “to lie,” “to sleep,” with irregular Guna in the middle; hence शैंि = केवि-ταu. ह्री *= ह्रि. “to be ashamed”; Old High German HRU, “to repent” (hriw-u, hrou, hru-umés, see p. 115. G. Ed.). Of roots in u, दूरू ‘dru,’ “to run,” दूरूि ‘drru-अ-ti,’ “he runs” may furnish, through the Guna form, the Greek δρα-σκω, δί-δρα-σκω, which appears hence to derive its α with suppression of the digamma: the μ of δρέμω, however, might pass as a hardening of the υ. The Greek πλεώ, πλώ is again not to be so regarded as if the old υ had been corrupted to e or o, but πλέ(€)ω, πλο(€)ω supply the place of the Guna form in πλαν-ε (of the middle voice), 3d pers. πλαν-α-τέ: the future πλενωσω, the υ having the Guna (§. 26.), answers to मोि प्लान-श्ये; Lithuan. plaukiu, “I swim,” with a guttural added, as in Latin flue-si from flue (p. 98. G. Ed.). Old High German VLUZ, “to flow,” pre-supposes the Gothic FLUT (§. 87.); with the favourite dental addition, with which all final vowels are so commonly invested. यू ‘srn,’ “to hear,” KAY (§§. 20., 21.), Gothic HLIIU-MAN (nominative hliuma), “ear,” as “hearer,” with weakened Guna (§. 27.); with regard to the kl for sr, compare, also, clunis with ओि श्रोि, f. “hip.”) Lithuan. klausau, “I hear.” Perhaps erudio, as “to make hear,” is to be referred to this class: the derivation from € and rudis is little satisfactory. Anquetil introduces a Zend erodē, cēlēbre, (κλυτός), which I have not yet found in the original text, but I meet with the causal form स्रवायम् (Sansk. श्रवायम् śravaydmi), “I speak,” “recite” (V. S. p. 38). The Old High German, scrirumés, “we have exclaimed,” gives SCRIR as the root, and rests probably on the form śrāv (§. 20.), with a thinning of the ι to i (§. 66.); the present and sing. preterite, however, have lost the r (scriu
for scriru, screi for screir), like the Greek κλη-σω, κέκλη-κα, &c. The Latin clamo, however, has the same relation to άπαν άριν that mare has to चारि vāri, “water” (§ 63.), and ὀξεῦ to ἄρα drav, from ἄρα dru, “to run.” ὑ ὁ, “to extol,” “to glorify” (Ἀγορασ δὴ ὁμολόγα, “he celebrated,” V. S. p. 39.), is probably the root of the Greek ὑμνος (ὑμοῦ νος), which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from ὑμω. पुपु","to purify," PUrus. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire, which are both represented as pure. पद्म pavana (with Guna and aṇa [G. Ed. p. 125.] as suffix) is “the wind,” and the corresponding Gothic FÔNA (neut. nom. acc. fûn, see § 116.) is “fire,” which in Sanskrit is called पवन pavana, with Vṛddhi and aṇa as suffix. The relation of FÔNA to पद्म pavanu resembles that of the Latin mālu from mavolo; the loss of the syllable व a of पवन is replaced by the lengthening of the a (§ 69.). The Greek πορ and Old High German VIURA (nom. acc. viur), the latter with weakened Guna (§ 27.), and ra as suffix, both fall to the root, पुपु. पु पु, “to speak,” Zend ज्ञ mara (e.g. ध्य मरा मुरद-म, “I spoke,” V. S. p. 123.); the Greek πέ(F)ω rests on the Guna form त्रक ह्राव-ि-मि, and has, as often happens, lost the former of two initial consonants (cf. also प्रेव, प्रेव, and rwa, with पु srw, “to flow”). The Old High German SPRAHI, or SPRAIHI (sprihhu, “I speak,” sprah, “I spoke”) appears to have proceeded from प्रच्छ brau, by hardening the प v (see § 19.), and prefixing an s akin to the प. पुहु, “to be,” Zend ज्ञ बु, Lithuan. BU (future bâsu, “I will be”), Latin FU, Greek ΦΥ. Probably, also, BY, in πεσ-βυ-ς, πεσβύτης, &c., is only another form of this root (cf. § 18.); so that πές would have to be regarded as a preposition from πό (प pra,) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf. § 96.). Moreover, the base πέςβυ has a striking resemblance to प्रभ prabhu (excelsus, augustus), literally, “being before.” In Old High German pim or him corresponds to the
Sanskrit भवामि bhavāmि more exact, however, is the correspondence in the plural of pir-u-mēs, pir-u-t, to bhav-ā-tas, "sumus," bhav-a-tha, "estis" (see § 19.). To this class belongs, also, Pū, "to dwell" (pū-ta, "I dwell"), as the Sanskrit वस vas "to dwell," in German VAS, UAS, has become seyu. In Sanskrit, too, from भ हँ buhâ, "to be," comes the substantive bhav-ana "house," as place of being. The Gothic baua, "I build," may be regarded as the causal of the idea "to be," like the Latin faciō (§ 19.): its conjugation answers also to भवायामि bhavayāmि, "I make to be," which, in Prākrit, may sound bhāvām, bhāvēs, bhāvēl (Gothic baua, bauis, bauait). See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskrit roots ending in diphthongs (रे, जे, डे; there are no roots in जे ड़े) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in ख़ ऑ. We abstain from adducing examples of them, as they also offer little occasion for comparison.

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

The most numerous class of roots ending with a consonant has a medial अ a. So वच्1,2 vach, Zend ḯvāḥ vach (प्रच्छ्रा ḯvāḥ, "dixit," Vend. S. p. 124), Greek Eι for ΦΕί (§. 14.), Latin VOC, Old High German, WAH, WAG (ki-wahu, "mentionem facio," pret. ki-wuoh pl. ki wuogumēs), franc, prachh, Zend ḯṣprēṣ Zend ḯṣprēṣ pērēṣ, Gothic FRAH; pres उस्त्रामि prichchhāmि, उस्त्रामि pērēṣāmि, fraīha for friha (see § 82. and §. 109.). The Latin ROG (rogo, interrogo) appears to be abbreviated from FROG. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvāṭ pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. ध पति1 "to fall," "to fly," Zend ṭvाभ patain urvara ucsyaɪn, "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this
indeed, so that the न bh appears before vowels as न v, but before ध t as ध p. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 155: यात्र न भवायु सुन्दर रुप संदर्शनं वेदां महाभारतम् अश्चादम; यथं महत उवाचे यद्य न दृष्ट अग्निपीठम अग्निर्वयक्ते, का हेतु शिता यथा?

"Pure si non dimittis, qui hominem captum capit (i.e. tenet), quænam ci est pena"?

* In the European sister languages I believe I recognise this root in three forms: the Gothic GRIP has been already mentioned (p. 116 G. Ed.), likewise prehendo (§. 92. note): by changing the medials into their tenues, KÆI also seems to belong to this class, Gothic HLIF, "to steal," hlistus, "thief." Finally, also, in Greek, γρίφος, γηφός. "the net," stands quite isolated, and appears to me to be related to the Indian ग्राह grabh, by changing the a into i. अस स as, "to sit," Greek ἩΣ a remnant of the second class, terminating in a consonant to be supplied at §. 109. a.; ἡσ-ταυ answers exactly to असले as-ले (middle voice), and hence ḫµα stands for Ḫµµα, as ṝµµ for ṝµµ (Sanskrit asµi). भाज़¹ bhrâji, "to shine," Zend ῥέρेस (§. 58). or† ῥέσµµµµ bâres, whence the part. pres. ῥέσµµµµ µ्यूµµ bârezant, nom. m. ῥέσµµµµ bârezmis, "splendens," "altus," very frequently occurs. This Zend form prepares the way for the Old High German root PERAH, whence PERAH-TAT, nom. perah-t, "fulgidus." To this root belongs, also, our Pracht. The Greek language gives ΦΑΕΙ (§. 20.) a cognate root, and thus

[G. Ed. p. 128.] points to a Sanskrit short a for the long one. The cognate root in Latin is FLAG, flagro. द्रेस chhid, "to cleave," SCID, scind-i-mus = chhindmas (§. 14.): ΣΧΙΖ, perhaps also ΣΚΘΔ, σκίδνµµµµ, &c. belong to this place; the form is more genuine, and the ideas, too, of

* Anquetil translates, "Si celui qui a commis l'Agueresté ne reconnoit pas sa faute quelle sera sa punition."
† Cf. p. 1281. Note *
‡ The h (in the sense of ch) corresponding to the j, γ, accords with §. 87., but is moreover favoured by the following t.
clearing, dispersing, separating, are kindred ones. The Gothic *SKAID*, “to separate,” if the relationship is certain, has a stiffened Guna, so that *ai* appears to belong to the root. According to §. 87., however, the Gothic form should be *SKAIT* and the Old High German *SKEIZ* for *SKEID*. विद्⁴ *vid,* “to know,” Zend विद् "vid, 'I; Gothic *VID*, Old High German, *VIZ*; in the Latin *VID*, and in *eīω*, “I see,” the seeing is regarded as something, which “makes to know,” and the conjugation of *video* is causal, according to p. 121 G. Ed. Thus, also, another root, signifying “to know,” namely बुध ‘*budh*’, has, in Zend, gained the meaning “to see.”* According to the tenth class, and with the prep. *ni,* *VID*, in Zend, signifies “to summon” (निवादनये *nivādhanayē*, “invoco,” see §. 28.) In Gothic, *VIT* receives through the prep. in the meaning “to adore” (*inveita, invited, invitum*). दिस्⁶ *dis,* “to shew,” Zend बूढ बूढ ‘*dis*’¹⁰; hence *fradaēsayō,* “thou shewest” (Vend. S. p. 123), Greek ΔΙΚ, with Guna δείκνυμι, according to the fifth class; Latin *DIC*, in *dico*, as it were, “to point out,” and *dicis* (*dicis causa*). In Gothic, the rule laid down in §. 87. requires the form *TIIH*, and this root, combined with *ga*, signifies “to announce” (*ga-teiha, gataih, gataiham*, for *ga-tihum*, according to §. 82.). On the other hand, in *taikus*, “sign,” the law for the transposition of letters is violated. जीवः¹ *jiv*, “life;” Lithuanian *gyva-s*, “alive,” *gywenū* “I live,” *gywila* “life;” Gothic *QUIVA*, nom. *quīvs*, “alive”; Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUIV*, as *bis* from *duis* (Sansk. दिस् दिस ‘*dvis*), *viginti* from *tviginti*. The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root. Hence, *e.g.* जीवः *jīva*, nom. जीवः *jīvō*, “living,” (V. S. p. 189); and *hu-jītayō,* “bonam vitam habentes” (l. c. p. 222), from जीव जीति. From *jī*, the root, would become, with Guna, जाजिम, on which rests the Greek ζέω, the *j* having

fallen out (§. 14.); but βλος also belongs to this root, and finds a medium of comparison with जीव jīv, in the Latin vivo. Of roots with u, रुचें रुच, “to shine,” and रुदेऽ रुद, “to weep,” may serve as examples; the former, in Zend, is रोच raōch, (§§. 28, 32.), and follows the tenth class, e.g. रोच्यं rochyaṁ.

[G. Ed. p. 129.] ruoĉhayēti, “splendid.” In Latin correspond LUC, luc- s, luceo (§. 20.) and RUD: the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the r by l, and presents, for comparison, ΛΥΚ (ἄμφιλόκη, λυκόφως) and ΛΥΖ; to the former, λύχνος, λυχ-νέω, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, जोरा तोनु-ς, “burning,” has to the root अण्व tap (§. 40.) We must assign λευκός also, with Guna, to the root ΛΥΚ. The Gothic gives LÜH for LUK, according to §. 87.; whence, with the original, or with weakened Guna (§§. 26., 27.), spring forms like lanhmōni, “lightning,” lanhatyan, “to lighten,” līuhath, “light.” Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands lukarn (theme, lukarna, neut.), “lamp,” rather isolated. A root corresponding to रुदेर रुद is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to §. 87., RUZ, “to weep” (rīuzu, rōz for ruuz, according to §. 80., rusumēs). भृष्ण bhūṣh, “to adorn,” is perhaps contained in the Latin or-no, with loss of the initial letter, as amo in relation to जामयाम kāmayāmi, “I love.” With regard to the r for श श, advert to the relation of uro to उष उष, “to burn,” सेव sev, “to honour,” सेव भेद, “to think”? The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb: it springs, however, from मेद मेद and मेद मेद, “understanding,” unless it should be preferred to assume for these words a root मेद भेद, which, however, the Grammarians do not exhibit. The Gothic has, for comparison, MIT, whence mitō, “I think”: the Greek furnishes an analogous word to sev, viz. ΣΕΒ, σέβω. (§. 4.)

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

---

* I direct attention preliminarily to my treatise "On the Influence of Pronouns in the Formation of Words" (Berlin, by F. Dümmler).
selves through thousands of years in an unaltered form; I say, we may remark this from the perfect accordance which exists between various individuals of the Sanskrit family of languages, although these languages have been removed, as it were, from each other's eyes since time immemorial, and every sister dialect has, since that removal, been left to its own fate and experience.

111. There are also pure radical words, i.e. those of which the theme, without suffix of derivation or personality, repre-
G. Ed. p. 131.] sents the naked root, which are then united in declension with the syllables which denote the relations of case. Except at the end of compounds, such radical words are, in Sanskrit, few in number, and are all feminine ab-
stracts; as, म त hi, "fear," γυ γ yudh, "contest," म o mud, "joy." In Greek and Latin the pure root is the most rare form of the word; but it does not always appear as an abstract substantive. As, for instance, ε. g. φλογε (φλοκ-ς), δπ (δπ-ς), νεφ (νεφ-ς), λεγ (λεγ-ς), πακ (πακ-ς), δυκ (δυκ-ς), πελ-λικ (πελ-λικ-ς).
In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance; for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskrit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself; as, ε. g. धर्मविद्य dharma-vid. "duty-knowing." In Latin, the use of these compounds is as frequent as in Sanskrit, only that, according to §. 6., a radical a is weakened to i or e; thus, carni-fic (fec-s), tubi-cin (con). An example in Greek is χερωβ (for νιπ from νπ-τω). Sanskrit roots which end with short vowels,
as विजि, "to conquer," are, in compounds of this kind, supported by the addition of a t, which so much the more appears to be a simple phonetic affix without signification. That these weakly-constructed roots appear to support themselves on an auxiliary t before the gerundial suffix yu also.

Thus, e.g. विजि svarga-jit, "conquering the heaven," विजित vi-jit-yu, "by conquering." In Latin I find [G. Ed. p. 132.] interesting analogies to these formations in IT and STIT, from the roots I and STA, the latter weakened to STI according to §. 6. Thus, com-it (com-es), "goer with"; equ-it (equ-es), "goer on horseback"; al-it (al-es), "goer with wings"; super-stit (-stes), "standing by." The German has in this way supported throughout with a t several roots terminating with a vowel, and hence given to this letter the character of radicalism, as above mentioned (p. 123 G. Ed.) in MAT, from मां mā, "to measure."
FORMATION OF CASES.

112. The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, i.e. in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example; and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language; but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds—and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension—requires the pure primary form; naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually followed in composition; and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom. and acc. sing. of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in
this point, have applied to the cases furnished to them by
the language, and take the augmented सस्त अस्मत or
सस्त अस्मद, "from us," युष्मत युष्मत or युष्मद युष्मद,
"from you," as the starting-point in the declension, or as
the primary form, although in both pronominal forms only
च a and यु yu belong to the base, which, however, does not
extend to the singular. That, however, in spite of this
error, the Indian Grammarians understand how to decline
the pronouns, and that they are not deficient in external
rules for this purpose, is a matter of course. That
the interrogative, in its declension, resembles bases in a,
cannot escape any one who holds the neuter तिम kīm for the
original indeclinable form of the word. Pāṇini settles the
matter here with a very laconic rule, when he says (edit.
Calc, p. 969) तिय: क: kīnāhi kahā, i.e, kā* is substituted for
kīm. If this strange method were to be followed in Latin,
and the neuter quid in like manner regarded as the
theme, then, in order to get at the dative cu-i (after
the analogy of fruictui), one would have to say "quidis cuis,"
or "quidi cuis." In another place (p. 825), Pāṇini forms
from idam, "this" (which in like manner has the honour
of passing for a base) and kīm, "what?" a copulative
compound; and by इदानिमोर ईश्वर idānīmōr iśkā, the Gram-
marian teaches that the putative bases in [G. Ed. p. 135.]
the formations under discussion substitute for themselves
the forms i and ki.

113. The Sanskrit, and the languages akin to it, which
in this respect have still kept upon the old footing, distin-
guish, besides the two natural genders, another—the
neuter, which the Indian Grammarians call Klīva, i.e. eu-
nuch; which appears to be a peculiarity of the San-

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

114. Number, in Sanskrit and its sister languages, is distinguished, not by a particular affix denoting the number, but by the selection or modification of the case-syllable, so that, with the case-suffix, the number is at once known; e.g. bhyam, bhyām, and bhyas are cognate syllables, and, among other relations, express that of the dative; the first in the singular (only in the pronoun of the 2d person, tuṁ tubhyam, "to thee"), the second in the dual, the third in the plural. The dual, like the neuter, in course of time is the first to be lost with the weakening of the vitality [G. Ed. p. 136.] of the view taken by the senses, or is more and more straitened in its use, and then replaced by the abstract plural expressive of infinite number. The Sanskrit possesses the dual most fully, both in the noun and in the verb, and employs it everywhere where its use could be expected. In the Zend, which otherwise approximates so closely to the Sanskrit, it is found very rarely in the verb, more frequently in the noun. The Pali has only as much left of it as the Latin, viz. a remnant of it in two words, which signify "two"
and "both"; in the Prâkrit it is entirely wanting. Of the German languages, only the eldest dialect, the Gothic, possesses it, but merely in the verb; while, on the contrary, in the Hebrew (speaking here of the Semitic languages) it is retained only in the noun, in disadvantageous contrast with the Arabic, which, in many other respects also, is a more perfect language, and which maintains the dual in equal fulness in the verb also; while in the Syriac it has been almost entirely lost in the noun as well as in the verb.*

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

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

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

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

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

* Cf. p. 1294. 1. 20. G. Ed.
suit a theme in α or η; and further, from such compounds as μυροπῶλης, παιδοπίθης, in which the vowel that has been added to the roots ΠΩΛ and ΤΠΒ supplies the place of the Sanskrit a in similar compounds for which, in Greek, o usually stands.

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

118. The long vowels (α, ι, ο) belong, in Sanskrit, principally to the feminine (see §. 113.), are never found in the neuter, and occur in the masculine very rarely. In Zend the long final a has generally been shortened in polysyllabic words; as it has in Gothic, in which bases [G. Ed. p. 139.] in d correspond (§ 69.) to the Sanskrit feminine bases in द, and the द in the uninflected nom. and accus. sing. is shortened to a, with the exception of the monosyllabic forms sā, "she," "this," Sanskrit सा sā, Zend hā; hvod, "which?" Sanskrit and Zend kə. The Latin, also, in the uninflected nom. and voc., has shortened the old feminine long a; but the Lithuanian has, in the nom., maintained the original length. In Greek, the Doric η approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit feminine ष η, which the common dialect has sometimes preserved, sometimes shortened, sometimes transformed into η.
119. The long \( i \) appears, in Sanskrit, most frequently as a characteristic addition in the formation of feminine bases, thus, the feminine base सहति mahati (magna) springs from महत् mahat. The same holds good in Zend. Moreover, the feminine character \( i \) has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part. pres. and fut. an \( i \) is added to the old participial suffix ant, and ėsant-\( i \), “the existing,” hū-sent-\( i \), “that that shall be,” correspond to the Sanskrit सति sat-\( i \) (for asati or asanti), भविष्यति bhav-\( i \)-\( shyati \). In Greek and Latin this feminine long \( i \) has become incapable of declension; and where it has still left traces, there a later un-organic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either \( \alpha \) or \( \delta \); in Latin, \( c \). Thus, षेकα corresponds to the Sanskrit स्वादव-\( i \), from स्वादु swādu, “sweet”; -τρια, -τρι\( \delta \), e.g. ὀρχύστρια, λυστρίς, λυστρί\( \delta \)-ος, to the Sanskrit च त्रि, e.g. चन्त्री janitri, “genitress,” to which the Latin genitri-c-s, genitri-c-is, corresponds; while in the Greek γενέτειρα, and similar formations, the old feminine \( i \) is forced back a syllable. This analogy is followed by μέλαινα, τάλαινα, τέρεινα, and substantive derivations, as τέκταίνα, Λάκαινα. In θεράπαινα, λέαίνα, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom. masc., shortened by a \( \tau \). In θέαίνα, λύκαινα, it is to be assumed that the proper primitive in \( \nu \) or \( \nu\tau \) has been lost, or that these are formations of a different kind, and correspond to the rather isolated word in Sanskrit इन्द्राष्ट्रि Indrāṣṭrei, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इन्द्र Indra, is termed. The cases where the feminine \( i \) is solely represented by \( \alpha \) are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in \( \nu\tau \), where \( \tau \) passes into \( \sigma \): the preceding \( \nu \), however, is replaced by \( \nu \) or \( \iota \), or the mere lengthening of the preceding vowel, or it is assimilated to the \( \sigma \):

hence, \( \cupνσ-\alpha, \epsilonιν-\alpha, \epsilonσσ-\alpha, \dot\epsilonσ-\alpha* \), \( \epsilonισ-\alpha \)
for \( \cupντ-\alpha, \epsilonντ-\alpha, \epsilonντ-\alpha, \alphaντ-\alpha, \upsilonντ-\alpha \).

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

120. The German, too, can no longer fully decline the old feminine i; and the Gothic, by a foreign affix, introduces it into the d declension, but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable yō in the [G. Ed. p. 141.] uninflected nominative and vocative to i, in the adjective to ya. More commonly, however, the old bases in i are introduced, by the frequently employed affix of an n, into the so-called weak declension; and as i in Gothic is denoted by ei, so to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in जनी antē, and to the fem. comparative bases in ब्यासी iyasi', correspond the forms ndein, izein, regarding the nominative of which refer to §. 142.

121. The long u (ā) appears, in Sanskrit, rather seldom at the end of primary forms, and is for the most part feminine. The words most in use are वधु, “a wife,” भु, “earth,” धातु, “mother-in-law” (socrus), भ्रा, “eyebrow.” To the latter corresponds प्रि, likewise with the long v, the declension of which, however, is not different from that of the short v; while in Sanskrit the long u is distinguished from the short feminine u in the same way as the i from i. But few monosyllabic primary forms end, in Sanskrit, with diphthongs, not any at all with i? 4; with di (from d + i, see §. 2.) only रai, masc. “thing,” “riches”; in
the nom. irregularly रास rās for राती rāṭī. In this is recognised the Latin re-s. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in ɐ should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit दी di; for, in the first place, the Latin ɐ corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit दे (from आ + ɐ), never to दी; secondly, the connection of the ɐ of the fifth declension with the originally long a of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic η does to the Doric ἀ), for many words with the same meaning belong to the A and E declension; and, for example, a suffix which is employed for the formation of abstracts from adjectives is sounded as well tiē as tia (planitie-s, [G. Ed. p. 142.] planitia, canitie-s, canitia); and iē-s, and in, in the formation of primitive and derivative words—like effie-s, effijia, pauperie-s, pauperia—are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit पृया, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek ia, Ionic in. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine ɐ and a. The most weighty is the s in the nom. sing. and pl.: ɐ-s, ɐ-s for ɐ, ei, as musa, musae (musai), κεφαλη, κεφαλαί. As regards the s in the singular, it is, if the identity with the first declension be authentic, very remarkable; and forms like species, canities, seem to be true lingual patriarchs: for the Sanskrit, like the Zend, Greek, Gothic, Lithuanian, exhibits the absence of the nominative sign in the corresponding feminine bases in a. I have, however, never considered as original the abandonment of the nominative sign, and the complete equalization with the primary form in दृता sutā, “daughter,” and similar words, although it has appeared to me as losing itself very deeply in far-distant ages. The Latin, however, in some other points of Grammar, shews greater antiquity than the Sanskrit and Greek, as, for example (to confine the present instance to the nominative case), participial nominatives, like amans, legens, are better and
old forms than the Sanskrit and Greek, like तुदन् tudan, λέγων, τιδεῖς, because they have preserved the nominative s together with the nasal, and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms, like बावाइ bài, "being." I cannot, therefore, find, in the retention of the nominative sign in the fifth declension, any decisive argument against its original identity with the first. We will treat hereafter of the s of the nominative plural. In the genitive singular the common form ei answers to deae (deal), the more rare, however, and better, in ès to familias. Schneider searches, but fortunately without [G. Ed. p. 143.] success, for genitives like die-is: we require them as little, perhaps, as a familia-is. Let dies be written with Greek letters ης-ς, and then, perhaps, a die-is will be as little required as a δικη-ος. Although a few bases of the third declension, by rejecting a consonant or an entire syllable, have passed into the fifth declension, we will not therefore infer that all bases in e have arisen from such an abbreviation. If QUIET, after rejecting the t, could be declined according to the fifth declension, then must there necessarily have formerly been a fifth, i.e. there must have been bases in è, otherwise from QUIET could only have come QUII (quies, quiis, like cædes); i.e. in spite of the rejection of the t it must have continued in the third declension. The connection between re-s and the abovementioned Sanskrit रदि rādi is, in my opinion, to be arrived at through the irregular nominative राम् rā-s; and according to this re-s would be supported on an old ā: it answers to राम् rā-s as re-bus to रामास् rā-bhyas, and as in Greek γη-ν to the Sanskrit गाम् am, "terrām," which, in the remaining cases, has गो gô for its base. In Lithuanian there are feminine primary forms in e (Ruhig's third declension) which resemble the Greek η in the suppression of the singular nominative sign, but in the nominative plural in e-s approach more closely the Latin in è.
122. Primary forms in श्रो श are rare in Sanskrit: the only ones known to me are श्रो शा, "heaven," and शो शा: the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from दिस्य div (a radical word from दिस्य div, "to shine") by the vocalization of the श v, after which the vowel श i becomes its semi-vowel श y. In the accusative the श bases change this diphthong into श. To the श thus obtained in शा शा-म, गाम गाम-म, corresponds the Latin e of die-m, the Greek η, Doric α, of γη-ν, γά-ν: the Latin e, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final m: the original language requires diē-m. In Sanskrit, also, from दिस्य div, "to shine," are derived appellations of day; as on the other side, in Latin, those for the heaven—divum, sub divo, sub dio—viz. दित्रा divā, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds; and also दिष्कम divasa, masc., and श शु, neuter (a contraction from div), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To श शु answers, after rejecting the श (as viginti for dviginti), the Latin Ju of Ju-piter, "heavens-lord or father": the oblique cases Jov-is, Jov-i, Jov-em answer better to the broader theme शो शा, whence the dative शवे शाव-श, and the locat. श्र शाव-श. The Djouis, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian Zeως signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven": I form its relation to शो शा thus, that after dropping the श श the following semi-vowel श y became ζ (§. 19.). The oblique cases, on the contrary (Διως, Δι, &c.), belong to the Sanskrit श शु, and must originally have had a digamma, proceeding by the natural law of sound from उ, after which change the semi-vowel ज must have become a vowel. Διως has the same relation to ΔιFως, that, in Latin, sub dio has to sub divo.

123. Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in श, viz. शो शा. It has several
meanings; but the most common are "bull," as masculine, and "cow" and "earth" as feminine. Both significations have in Zend, as in Greek, divided themselves into two forms. The Greek has preserved for the meaning "earth" the old guttural. With regard to the vowel, γγ, γα follows the example of the Indian accusative, where, as has been already remarked, गाम gām (γ参股) stands for ṣo-m [G. Ed. p. 146.] or gav-am. For the meaning "ox" the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—(for, for चो d = a × u may very well be expected, according to §. 4., ov)—but has exchanged the guttural medials for labials, as, p. 122 G. Ed., βθημ for जगाम jagaṭmi. The base BOY before vowels must originally have become BOF; thus, in the dative, βοF-ि would answer to the Sanskrit locat. गव gav-ि, and the Latin dative bov-ि; but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped; and there is not, as with the initial digamma, the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings. Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here. The Latin has, in the word bō-s, changed the vowels (a + u)—(which were originally of different kinds, but have been united into a diphthong)—into a homogeneous mass (cf. §. 4.), the nature of whose contraction, however, discloses itself before vowel inflexions, since the u-half of BÕ becomes v, and the short a is resolved into the form of a short o; thus, bov-ि answers to the Sanskrit locat. गव gav-ि. The Zend for the meaning "earth" has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into z, and gives in the nominative गास zās for गास zās (§. 56b.), in the accusative गास zām (§. 61.): I am not able to adduce other cases. For the meaning "ox" the guttural has remained in Zend, and the nominative is then गास gās or गास gās.

124. I know only two words in Sanskrit which terminate in चो दू—चो नू, "ship," and ग्रो ग्रो, "moon": the former has navigated very far on the ocean of our wide province of
language, without, however, in Sanskrit, having arrived at a secure etymological haven. I believe नदु to be an abbreviation of snau (cf. Ṝεω, Ṛεύω, ruo, with श्रु, p. 125 G. ed.), [G. Ed. p. 146.] and that it therefore proceeds from the root खा snā, "to bathe," which originally, perhaps, may also have meant "to swim," and with which वां, वें, नू-टो, appear to be connected. नदु would consequently be a radical word; and in regard to the vowel would stand for न, according to the analogy of दद्दू (dedi, dedit) for दद्द, from दद्द-ा. As अ, according to §. 6., is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskrit Vṛddhi-diphthong ना आu better than by आu, while नद ऑ (from short अ+उ) is commonly represented by एu or औu. Hence नस ना-स and वाृ-स correspond as exactly as possible; the उ of NAY, however, like that of BOY, has maintained itself only before consonants; and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions; वण-स, वाँ-स, are from वण-एस (Sansk. तापस nāv-ās), as भ业主-स from भए-स. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses navi-s, navi-bus, for nau-s, nau-bus.* As the semi-vowel ऊ is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19.), we have here also, for nau, nāv-am, a sister form in our Nachen, Old High German naccho, "ship," gen. dat. nacchin.

125. We pass over to the consonants: of these, न, ट, श, and र appear in Sanskrit most frequently at the end of primary forms; all other consonants occur only in radical words, which are rare, and in some nominal bases of uncertain origin. We consider next the more rare or radical consonants. Of gutturals (क, कh, ग, गh) we find none at

* Thus in German an ए has been added to the above-mentioned गद, which, however, according to §. 117., is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German; hence chuo, "cow," gen. chuoï, where the ए does not belong to the case designation, but to the here uninflected base.
the end of the nominal bases most in use; in Greek and Latin, on the contrary, they are of frequent occurrence; e is in Latin both radical and derivative, [G. Ed. p. 147.]
g only radical—DUC, VORAC, EDAC, LEG. In Greek, κ, χ, and γ are only radical, or occur in words of unknown origin, as ΦΙΚ, ΚΟΠΑΚ, ΟΝΥΧ (Sanskrit nakha), ΦΑΟΓ. Of the palatals, ch and j in Sanskrit occur most frequently in वच väch, "speech, voice" (VOC, 'ΟΠ); राज rāj, "king," the latter only at the end of compounds; अस्र asrij, "blood" (sanguis): in Zend we have ḫ̣ ḥ druji, f., as name of an evil demon, probably from the Sanskrit root ḫ̣ druhi, "to hate." Of the two classes of the T-sound, the first, or lingual (र ṭ, &c.), is not used at the end of nominal bases; and therefore the second, dental, or proper T-class, is so much the more frequently employed. Still ṛ d, ṣ dh, occur only in radical words, and therefore seldom; ṣ th perhaps only in पथ path, as the secondary theme of पथिन pathin, "way"; nom. पत्थस panthas, from फत्थस panthas, which I think I again recognise in the Latin PONT, pons. Other examples are, खङ ad, "eating," at the end of compounds, and युध yudh, f., "strife." The letter ṛ t is so much the more common, that several of the most frequently employed suffixes end with it, as that of the part. pres. in अत ant, Greek and Latin nt. The Greek, besides τ, exhibits also δ and θ at the end of primary forms which are not radical; still ΚΟΠΘ and ὨΠΝΘ appear to me to be properly compounds, and to contain the roots ΘΗ, ΘΕ (the vowel being dropped) as their last member; and according to this, ΚΟΠΘ would properly mean "what is placed on the head"; so in Sanskrit, शरद surad, "autumn," "rainy season," which Grammarians explain by a suffix ad, in my opinion means nothing but "water giving," and contains the root श da, "to give," with श suppressed. ὨΠΝΘ finds in Greek itself no etymology: the Sanskrit offers for its explanation शारदिय arañi (according to the pronunciation of Bengal, oroni), "wood"; and if ὈΠΝΘ is con-
nected therewith, we may refer to ὰἶω, “to run,” in respect to the θ: “bird” therefore would derive its name from its going in the wood; while in Sanskrit, from its passage through the air, it is called, among other names, बिहा-गा. Regarding the later origin of the ṣ in feminine bases in ṣ, an account is given in §. 119.; that is to say, patronymics in ṣ may be compared with Sanskrit ones in ṣ, e.g. मेशी bhaimi, “the daughter of Bhîma. Probably, too, the ṣ in feminine patronymics in ṣ is a later addition; they spring, like those in ṣ, not from their masculines, but directly from the primary word of the masculine, and, in my opinion, stand in sisterly, not in filial connection with them. In Latin, d appears as a more modern affix in the base PECUD, which the Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic terminate with u (Sans.-Zend, pasu, Goth. faihu). In Gothic, primary forms with a final T-sound are chiefly limited to the part. pres., where the old t appears changed into d, which remains without extraneous addition: there only, however, where the form stands substantively; otherwise, with the exception of the nominative, it is conducted by the affix an into a more current province of declension. The more modern German dialects under no circumstances leave the old T-sound without a foreign addition commixed with the base. In Lithuanian the participial suffix ant, in regard of the nom. sing. ains for ants, rests exactly upon the Latin and Zend step, which extends beyond the Sanskrit; but in most of the remaining cases the Lithuanian cannot decline any more consonants, i.e. cannot unite them with pure case terminations, but transports them always, by a more modern affix, into a vowel-declension; and, indeed, to the participial suffix ant is added the

[G. Ed. p. 149.] syllable ia, by the influence of which the t experiences the euphonic transformation into ch (= tsch*). The nasal of this dental T-class, viz. the

* This sound is expressed by cz, as in Mielcke’s edition of Ruhig’s Grammar.
proper \( n \), belongs to those consonants which occur most frequently at the end of nominal bases. In the German all the words of Grimm's weak declension like the Sanskrit, and the masculine and feminine in Latin, reject in the nominative the \( n \) of the base, and thereby have a vowel termination. The Lithuanian presents the same appearance in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases adds to a base in \( en \) sometimes \( ia \), sometimes a simple \( i \).

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

* The Latin adds an \( a \) to this old consonantal base, and thus arises, according to the frequent interchange of \( p \) with \( qu \) (cf. \( quinque \) with \( पञ् panchan \)), \( aqua \); on the other hand, \( am-nis \) rests on the form \( ap \), as \( somnus \) for \( sopnus \), and \( σεμός \), for \( σεβνός \), in analogy with a Sanskrit euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. r. 58.). The Sanskrit has from the same root another neuter, \( सापस \) \( ñpas \), in which we recognise the Latin \( aquor \), which therefore would not proceed from \( aquus \), but is transferred from the waves, or the mirror of the sea, to other things of a similar nature. In Greek, \( ἄφρος \) appears to belong to the same origin.
bo (amabam, -bo), as from the root FU, "to be," which, like FER, often changes the B in its middle into F (§. 18.). Without appealing to the cognate languages, it is difficult, in Latin, to distinguish those bases which truly and originally terminate in a consonant from those which only appear to do so; for the declension in i has clearly operated on the consonantal declension, and introduced an i into different places in which it is impossible it could have stood originally. In the dative and ablative plural, the i of forms like amantibus, vocibus, admits of being explained as a conjunctive vowel, for facilitating the affix; it is, however in my opinion, more correct to say that the bases VOC, AMANT, &c., because they could not unite with bus, have, in the present state of the Latin language, been lengthened to VOCI, AMANTI; so that we ought to divide vocibus, amanti-bus, just as at §. 125. it was said of the Lithuanian, that in most cases it extends its participial bases in ant to anchia (euphonic for antia). This view of forms like amanti-bus is proved to be the more probable, in that in the genitive plural also before um, as before the a of neuters, an i frequently finds its place, without its being possible to say that in amanti-um, amanti-a, the i would be necessary to facilitate the annexation of the ending. On the other hand, juveni-s, cani-s, forming the genitives canu-m, juveni-um, remind us of older bases in n; as in Sanskrit śwan, "a dog" (abbreviated śun sun), and yuvan, "young" (abbreviated yuṁ yûn), in Greek κόων, abbreviated [G. Ed. p. 151.] KYN, really close their theme with n. The German resembles the Latin in this point, that for the convenience of declension it has added an i to several numerals, whose theme originally terminated with a consonant; thus, in Gothic, from FIDVŌRI (Sanskrit चतुर chatur, in the strong cases §. 129. चत्वार chatwār) comes the dative fidvōri-m. The themes सप्त saptan, "seven," नवन navan, "nine," दस्य dāsan, "ten," by the addition of an i
in Old High German mould themselves to *SIBUNI, NIUNI, ZEHANI*; which forms, at the same time, pass as masculine nominatives, as these cases, in Old High German, have lost the case-suffix *s*. The corresponding Gothic nominatives, if they occurred, would be *sibunei-s, niunei-s, taitunei-s*. More on this point hereafter.

127. Of the semi-vowels (*y, r, l, v*), I have never found in Sanskrit य य and र र at the end of bases, and व व only in the word दिव div, before mentioned, which contracts itself in several cases to दिः dyo and दु dhun. On the other hand, र र occurs very frequently, especially in words which are formed by the suffix तर tar, to which, in the cognate languages, likewise correspond bases in *r*. Moreover, र र in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original *s*, as, in the comparative suffix *ior* (Sanskrit ईयस ीयस); and, further, as an abbreviation of *ri-s*, *re*, as *l* for ल ल, ले; or, in the second declension, as abbreviated from रु-s; as in Gothic, *vair, “man,”* for *vair(a)s*, belongs to bases in *a* (§. 116.). In Greek आ आ appears as a consonantal base; but in contrast with the Sanskrit सलिला salīla, “water,” आ-ς appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as μέγα-ς from μεγαλός.

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

* Bases in चर ar in several cases, and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds, contract the syllable चर ar to चु ri; and this चु र is regarded by the Grammarians as their proper final sound. (§. 1.)
vowels, especially in the last syllable, is usually rejected, hence, neuters like μένος, γένος (from ΜΕΝΕΣ, ΓΕΝΕΣ, with change of the e into o), form in the genitive μένεος, γένεος, for μένεος, γένεος. The ş of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no ş in the nominative. In the dative plural, however, in the old epic language, the Σ, as it did not stand between two vowels, maintained itself; hence τεύχεσ-σι, ὤμεσ-σι; so likewise in compounds, like σακες-παλος, τελεσ-φόρος, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a Σ to the vowel of the base. In γήρας, γήρα-ος, for γήρασ-ος, after restoring the Σ of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskrit चर्स jaras, “age,” although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffixes terminating with s has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf., in the oblique cases of which us corresponds to the Sanskrit उष uš (euphonic for उस us) of the weakest cases (§. 130.); still, in Lithuanian, on account of the above-noticed incapacity for the declension of the consonants, the old us is conducted, as in other similar cases, by the subsequent addition of ia, a or i, partly into the a, partly into the

[6. Ed. p. 153.] i declension; and only the nominative and the vocative, which is the same with it, belong, in the singular, to the consonantal declension.

129. The Sanskrit and Zend have eight cases, viz. besides those which exist in Latin, an instrumental and a locative. These two cases exist also in Lithuanian; Ruhig calls the former the instrumental ablative, the latter the local ablative; in Lithuanian, however, the proper ablative—which in Sanskrit expresses the relation “whence?”—is wanting. With reference to the primary form, which in Sanskrit does not remain the same in all words, or
suffixes used in the formation of words through all the cases, a division of the cases into strong and weak is desirable for this language. The strong cases are the nominative, accusative, and vocative of the three numbers, with exception of the accusative plural, which, together with all the other cases, is weak. Where a double or triple formation of the primary form exists, there, with surprising regularity, the cases which have been designated as strong always exhibit the fullest form of the theme, which, from a comparison of languages, is proved to be the original one; while the other cases exhibit a weakened form of it, which appears also in the beginning of compounds, and hence is represented by the native Grammarians, according to §. 122., as the proper primary form. The pres. part. may serve as an example: it forms the strong cases with the suffix ant, but in the weak cases and in the beginning of compounds rejects n, which is retained by the cognate European languages, as also, for the most part, by Zend; so that सत at is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to सन ant. The root सूत tud, "to vex," e.g. exhibits in the participle mentioned the form सूत du-dant as the strong and original theme (cf. tundent-em), and सूद tudad as the weak theme; hence the masculine is declined,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG CASES</th>
<th>WEAK CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong>: Nom. Voc.</td>
<td>तुदन tudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>तुदनस् tudantas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>तुदता tudatā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>तुदतें tudatē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>तुदतस् tudatats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>तुदतस् tudatats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>तुदति tudati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual</strong>: Nom. Acc. Voc.</td>
<td>तुदतां tudantādu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>तुदाद्भयम् tudadbhyām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Loc.</td>
<td>तुदातोष tudadās</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONG CASES</th>
<th>WEAK CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural: Nom. Voc.</td>
<td>तुदंतस् tudantas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>तुदतस् tudatas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>तुद्धिः tudadhis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>तुदाध्यस् tudadhyas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>तुदात्म tudatam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>तुदुत्स tudutsu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

131. In suffixes used in the formation of words, which in Sanskrit separate into different forms, the Zend usually carries the strong form through all the cases; for instance, the part. pres. retains the nasal in most of the cases, which in Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 155.] proceed from the weakened theme. Words, however, are not wanting which follow the theory of the Sanskrit gradations of form. Thus, the Sanskrit base घन् śvan, "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to गुन् sun, appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive śdn-ḍ over against the strong nominative and accusative śpā, śpān-ḍm, Sanskrit घन śvā, घान्स śvānām (§. 50.). The base ap, "water," which, in Sanskrit, in the strong cases has a long  долг, but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom. अप्स ṛfs (§. 40.), accus. अप्स ṛpem; on the other hand, ap-ḍ, "of the water," ap-aḍ, "from the water," &c.*

* This word occurs in the Codex of the V. S., edited by Burnouf, very frequently, and mostly with that quantity of the initial a which is required by the theory; so that where that is not the case it can only be imputed to an error in writing.
In the plural, where the Zend very frequently makes the
nominative and accusative the same, confusion has, for
this reason, crept in; and the weak जजजधृ सिऴो, "canes," is
found for जजजधृ जपानो in the nominative; and, on the
other hand, the strong जजजधृ जपो, in the nominative as well
as in the accusative. *

132. The Greek, in the declension of κόιν, has limited the
strong form to the nom. and voc. sing.: in [G. Ed. p. 156.]
some cognate words in ρ, however, in accordance with the
Sanskrit, it has given the accusative also the strong form, in
which the Gothic agrees with it. Compare πατήρ, πατέρα,
πάτερ, πατρί, with पिता पिताः, गितरस्म पिताराम्, पितर पितर, गितिर्व
pitri (locat.); and the Gothic bróðhar, as nom., accus., and
vocat., opposed to bróðhrs, "of the brother," bróðhr, "to the
brother," with the Sanskrit भा भ्रात, भा भ्रातराम, भा भ्रातर, dative भा
भ्रात्रेः, locat. भा भ्रात्रिः. According to the same principle in bases in an, in Gothic, the a in
the genitive and dative sing. is weakened to i (§. 140.); while
the nominative, accus., and vocat. retain the original a; e.g.
ahma, ahmin-s, ahmin, ahman, ahma, from AHMAN, "spirit"
(§. 140.).

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

* I have, however, found also जजजधृ जपो in the accusative; and am
therefore in doubt, whether in this word, owing to the facile exchange of
a and d, the confusion has not originated in mere graphical over-
sights. Thus, V. S. p. 21, we find: जजजधृ जपो वाहिस्तो वाहिस्तो मूर्देन
अपो वाहिस्तो वाहिस्तो मूर्देन, "aquas puras, optimas, ab Ormuzido creates, mundas
celbre"; and जजजधृ जपो वाहिस्तो वाहिस्तो मूर्देन, "omnes aquas." On the
other hand, in the page following: जजजधृ जपो वाहिस्तो वाहिस्तो मूर्देन,
"has aquasque terrasque arboresque celbre."
approximate most nearly to it, as Pāli and Prākrit, through which, to avoid a hiatus, and to maintain pure the vowels of the base and of the termination, a euphonic \( n \) is introduced. This euphonic expedient cannot, in the extent in which it exists in Sanskrit, belong to the original state of the language; otherwise it would not be almost entirely lost in the cognate European dialects, and even in the Zend. We therefore regard it as a peculiarity of the dialect, which, after the period of the division of languages, became the prevailing one in India, and has raised itself to be the universal written language in that country. It is necessary here to remark, that the Vēda language did not use the euphonic \( n \) so universally as the common Sanskrit; and together with \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \) \( \text{तत्त} \), occur also \( चत्त \) \( चत्त \) \( चत्त \) \( चत्त \) \( चत्त \). The euphonic \( n \) is most frequently employed by the neuter

\[ \text{G. Ed. p. 157.} \] gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine: the latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination \( \text{चत्त} \) \( \text{चत्त} \), in which place it is introduced by the Zend also, although not as indispensably requisite. And it is remarkable, that precisely in this place in Old High German, and other Old German dialects, an \( n \) has been retained before the case-suffix; thus in Old High German, \( \text{ahō-}n-\delta \) “aquarium,” from the feminine theme \( \text{AHŌ} \) (nom. \( \text{aha} \)). Besides the use of the euphonic \( n \), there is further to be remarked, in Sanskrit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§. 26.) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies.

**S I N G U L A R.**

**NOMINATIVE.**

134. Bases, of the masculine and feminine genders, ending with a vowel have, in the Sanskrit family of languages, (under the limitation of §. 137.) \( s \) as nominative-suffix, which in Zend, after an \( a \) preceding it, always melts into \( u \), and is then contracted with the \( a \) to \( ð \) (§. 2.), while this in Sanskrit
takes place only before sonant letters (§ 25).* Examples are given at § 148. I find the origin of this case-designation in the pronominal base स sa, "he," "this," fem. स द śa; and a convincing proof of this assertion is the fact, that the said pronoun does not extend beyond the limits of the nom. masc. and fem., but is replaced in the nom. neuter, and in the oblique cases of the masculine, by तः ta, and feminine तः tā regarding which more hereafter.

135. The Gothic suppresses a and i before the case-suffix s, except in monosyllabic bases, where this suppression is impossible. Hva- s, "who?" i-s, "he," are used, but vulf-s, "wolf," gast-s, "stranger," for vulfa-s, gasti-s (cf hosti-s, according to § 87.). In masculine substantive bases in ja (ya), however, the final vowel is retained, only weakened to i (§ 66.); e.g. haryi-s, "army." If, however, as is generally the case, the final syllable is preceded by a long syllable, or by more than one, the ji (yi) is contracted to ei (=*i, § 70.); e.g. ondei-s, "end," raginei-s, "counsel," for andyi-s, raginyi-s. This contraction extends also to the genitive, which is in like manner denoted by s. To the Gothic nominatives in yi-s correspond the Lithuanian, like Atpirktoyi-s, "Saviour," the i of which has likewise arisen from an elder a.† I deduce this from the majority of the oblique cases, which agree with those of the a bases. Where, however, in Lithuanian, a consonant precedes the final syllable ya, which is the more common case, there the y is changed into the vowel i, and the following i, which had arisen from a, is suppressed: hence, yaunikki-s, "young man," for yaunikkyi-s from yaunikkya-s. Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in ya;‡

* E.g. दूतो मम sutō mama, "filius meus," सुसूरः तच sutas tava, "filius tuus" (§ 22.).
† Through the influence of the y, in accordance with a Zend law of euphony (§ 42.).
‡ Respecting the nom. e.g. of Gothic bases in ya, see p. 1309 G. Ed., Remark.
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as midi-s "the middle" (man), for midyi-s from midya-s, Sanskrit madhya-s, The Zend also, in the *vocalization* of the syllable ya, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable madhya ya before a final ğ m regularly to ğ i, as also args va to ğ u (§. 42.).

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

137. Feminine Sanskrit bases in का ग, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in ह ग, together with ह ग stri, "wife," like the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, have lost the old nominative sign (with the exception of the Latin ē bases, see §. 121.), and give the pure base: the cognate languages do the same, the base having been weakened by the abbreviation of the final vowel. In Gothic, ē becomes a (§. 69.); only so, "this," and hwō "which?" remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend mwē hā and mwē kā; while in polysyllabic forms the

* I have used vocalization and vocalize to express the change of a semi-vowel to its corresponding vowel.—Trans.
is shortened. In Zend, also is shortened, even in
the monosyllabic strī, “wife,” see V. S. par. 136, (by Olshausen), p. 28, where we read strī-ča, “femi-
naque”; whilst elsewhere the appended cha preserves
the original length of the vowel. Here, too, the Zend nomi-
natives in ē deserve to be mentioned, which seem very
similar to the Greek in η; as pērēnē, “plena,” which
in the Vendidad occurs very often in relation to zāo,
“earth,” without my being able to remember that I have
found another case from pērēnē. But from the
nom. kainē, “maid” (Sanskrit kanyā [G. Ed. p. 160.]
kanyāl), which is of frequent occurrence, I find the accus.
kanyānim (V. S. p. 420); this furnishes the proof
that the ē in the nominative is generated by the eupho-
nic influence of the suppressed y (§. 42.). In brāturyē, “cousin,” and tūryē, “a relation in the
fourth degree” (V. S. p. 380), the y has remained; on
the other hand, in nyākē “grandmother,” the
dropping of a y must be again assumed. We cannot
here refrain from conjecturing that the ē also of the Latin
fifth declension, as with very few exceptions it is everywhere
preceded by an i, is likewise produced from ē by the in-
fluence of this i; so that the Latin here stands in reversed
relation to the Greek, where i rejects the combination with
η, and preserves the original a (σοφία).

138. Bases of the masculine and feminine genders which
terminate with a consonant, lose, in Sanskrit, according to
§. 94., the nominative sign s; and if two consonants ter-
minate the base, then, according to the same law, the latter of
these also is lost. Hence, bibhrat, for bibhrat-s,
“the bearer”; tudan, for tudant-s “the vexer”;
vāk (from vāch, f.), for vāk-sh, “speech.”
The Zend, Greek, and Latin, in preserving the nominative
sign after consonants, stand in an older position than the
Sanskrit; Zend dīs (for dī-p-s, §. 40.), “water”;
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The Latin and Greek, where the final consonant of the base will not combine with the s of the nominative, prefer abandoning a portion of the base, as χάρις for χάριτ-ς, comes for comit-s (cf. § 6.). The Latin, Æolic, and Lithuanian agree remarkably with the Zend in this point,

[G. Ed. p. 161.] that nt, in combination with s, gives the form ns; thus amans, ριθές, Lith. sukanis (§. 10.), correspond to the Zend ṣrāvānīs, "the speaking" (man).

139. A final n after a short vowel is, in Sanskrit, no favourite combination of sound, although one not prohibited. It is expelled from the theme in the first member of a compound, e.g. राजपुत praja-putra, "king's son," for राजन राजन-पुत्रa; and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines; e.g. राजा राजा, "king," from राजन rājan, m.; नाम nāma, "name," from नामन nāman, n.; धानी dhanī, m., धान dhan, n., from धनिन dhanin, "rich." The Zend in this agrees exactly with the Sanskrit; but from the dislike to a long a at the end, which has been before mentioned, omits the lengthening of the vowel; e.g. अशव अशव, "the pure" (man), from अशव अशव, m.; अशव अशव, "eye," from अशव अशव, n. The Latin follows the Sanskrit in the suppression of the n in the nominative, in the masculine, and feminine, but not in the neuter: sermo, sermon-is, actio, action-is; but nomen, not name or nome.

The root can at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the n, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable; thus tubi-cen, sdi-cen, os-cen (see § 6.). Lien is an abbreviation of lieni-s; hence the retention of the n is not surprising. Pecten stands rather isolated. In Sanskrit the naked roots also follow the principle of the rejection of n; हन “slaying,” “smiting,” ncm. हा हा, is, however, the only root in n which I have
NOMINATIVE SINGULAR.

met with so used. चन्त्र swan “hound,” nom. चन्त्र swâ, which, in the weakest cases, contracts its theme to चन्त्र sun, is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base चन्त्र swan, in the nominative, by an unorganic addition, to cani; so चन्त्र yuvan, “young,” has become juveni (cf. § 126.). As regards the opposition [G. Ed. p. 162.] between o and i, by which, in several words—as homo, homin-is, arundo, arundin-is—the nominative is distinguished from the oblique cases, this o appears to me a stronger vowel,* which compensates for the loss of the n, and therefore is substituted for the weaker i; according to the same principle by which, in Sanskrit, the nom. चन्त्र dhani,† comes from धनिन dhanin; and, in Lithuanian, bases in en and un give, in the nominative, ũ (=uo) for e or u. Thus, from the bases AKMEN, “stone,” SZUN, “hound,” come the nominatives akmû, szû; as in Sanskrit, from the primary forms of the same signification, गहन aśman, चन्त्र swan, have arisen गहन aśmâ and च swâ. It does not follow that homin-is has come from homon-is,‡ because the old language had hemo, hemonis, for homo, hominis; but mon and min are cognate suffixes, signifying the same, and were originally one, and therefore may be simultaneously affixed to one and the same word.

140. The German language also rejects a final n of the base in the nominative and in the neuter, in the accu-

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

† In bases in चन्त्र an the lengthening extends to all the strong cases, with the exception of the vocat. sing.; thus, not merely राजा râjâ, “rex,” but also राजानस râjân-am, “regem,” राजानस râjânas, “reges.”

‡ I now prefer taking the i of homin-is, &c., as the weakening of the o of homo. The relation resembles that of Gothic forms like ahmin-is, ahamin, to the nom. and acc. ahma, ahman, which preserve the original vowel.
sative also, like Sanskrit. In Gothic, in the masculine and neuter—where alone, in my opinion, the \( n \) has an old and original position—an \( a \) always precedes the \( n \). There are, that is to say, only bases in \( an \), none in \( in \) and \( un \); the latter termination is foreign to the Sanskrit also.

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

141. Neuter bases in \( an \), after rejecting the \( n \), lengthen, in Gothic, the preceding \( a \) to \( ð \), in the nominative, accusa-

* In case two consonants do not precede the termination चन \( an \); e.g. जातनस जातman-as, not जातम-स, but जातस जातम-स, not जातम-स, “nominis.”

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring चाय ध, “to speak,” as मन man, “to think,” in Zend मन “to speak”; whence मन्त्र maṁthra, “speech,” and in Gothic \( MUN-THA \), nom. \( munths \), “mouth.” § 66. .
tive, and vocative, which sound the same; [G. Ed. p. 164.]
so that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of
the strong cases (§. 129.), which the Sanskrit neuter obeys
only in the nom., accus., and vocat. plural, where, for ex-
ample, चतुर्वरि chatuvār-i, "four," with a strong theme, is
opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिः chaturbhīs (instr.),
चतुर्भ्यस chaturbhyas. The a, also, of neuter bases in an is
lengthened in the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural
in Sanskrit, and in Gothic; and hence नामिनि namān-ि,
Gothic namān-a, run parallel to one another. However, in
Gothic namn-a also exists, according to the theory of the
Sanskrit weakest cases (§. 130.), whence proceeds the plural
genitive नामिनम namn-ām, "nominum"; while the Gothic
namn-ि has permitted itself to be led astray by the example
of the strong cases, and would be better written namn-े or
namin-े.

142. In the feminine declension in German I can find
no original bases in Ṉ, as also in Sanskrit there exist no
feminines in an or in; but feminine bases are first formed
by the addition of the usual feminine character ई ई; as,
राजि rājini, "queen," from राजन् rājan; धानिनि dhanini, "the
rich" (fem.), from धानिन्द dhanin, m. n. "rich." Gothic fe-
miminé substantive bases in Ṉ exhibit, before this consonant,
either an ऐ (सा, §. 69.) or ei: these are genuine feminine
final vowels, to which the addition of an Ṉ can have been
only subsequently made. And already, at §. 120., a close
connection of bases in ein (= in) with the Sanskrit in ई ई,
and Lithuanian in i, has been pointed out. Most substan-
tive bases in ein are feminine derivatives from masculine-
neuter adjective bases in a, under the same relation, ex-
cluding the modern Ḍ, as in Sanskrit that of सून्दरः sundari,
"the fair" (woman), from सून्दर sundara m. n. "beautiful"
Gothic substantive bases in ein for the most part raise
the adjective, whence they are derived, to an abstract;

* Vide p. 1083, Note.
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[G. Ed. p. 165.] e.g. MANAGEIN, "crowd, nom. managei, from the adjective base MANAGA (nominative masc. manag-s, neut. managa-ta); MIKILEIN, nom. mikilei, "greatness," from MIKILA (mikil-s, mikila-ta), "great." As to feminine bases in ḍn, they have arisen from feminine bases in ḍ; and I have already observed that feminine adjective bases in ḍn—as BLINDŌN, nom. blindō, gen. blindōn-s—must be derived, not from their masculine bases in an, but from the primitive feminine bases in ḍ (nom. a, Grimm's strong adjectives). Substantive bases with the genitive feminine in ḍn presuppose older ones in ḍ; and correspond, where comparison is made with old languages connected in their bases, to Sanskrit feminines in ḍ, Greek in α, η, Latin in a; and in these old languages never lead to bases with a final n. Thus, TUGGŌN (pronounced tungōn), nom. tuggō, answers to the Latin lingua, and to the Sanskrit जिहवा jihva, ( = dschihwa, see §. 17.); and DAURŌN, nom. daurō, to the Greek θύρα; VIDŌVŌN, nom. vidōvō, "widow," to the Sanskrit विधवा vidhva, "the without man" (from the prep. वि vi and धव dhava, "man"). and the Latin vidua. It is true that, in MITATHYŌN, "measure," nom. mitathyō, the suffix thyōn completely answers to the Latin tion, e.g. in ACTION; but here in Latin, too, the on is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of ti-on with the Sanskrit suffix फि ti, of the same import, and Greek σι-ς (old τις), Gothic ti, thi, di (see §. 91.). And in Gothic, together with the base MITATHYŌN exists one signifying the same, MI- TATHI, nom. mitaths. In RATHYŌN, nom. rathyō, "account," a relationship with RATION, at least in respect of the suffix, is only a seeming one; for in Gothic the word is

[G. Ed. p. 166.] to be divided thus, rath-yōn: the th belongs, in the Gothic soil, to the root, whence the strong part. rath- an(u)-s has been preserved. The suffix yōn, of RATHYŌN therefore corresponds to the Sanskrit yd; e.g. in विध यद vid-ya, "knowledge." Of the same origin is GA-RUN-YŌN, nom. garunyō, "inundation."
143. If a few members of a great family of languages have suffered a loss in one and the same place, this may be accident, and may be explained on the general ground, that all sounds, in all languages, especially when final, are subject to abrasion; but the concurrence of so many languages in a loss in one and the same place points to relationship, or to the high antiquity of such a loss; and in the case before us, refers the rejection of an n of the base in the nominative to a period before the migration of languages, and to the position of the original site of the human races, which were afterwards separated. It is surprising, therefore, that the Greek, in this respect, shews no agreement with its sisters; and in its v bases, according to the measure of the preceding vowel, abandons either merely the nominative sign, or the v alone, never both together. It is a question whether this is a remnant of the oldest period of language, or whether the v bases, carried away by the stream of analogies in the other consonantal declensions, and by the example of their own oblique cases, which do not permit the remembrance of the v to be lost, again returned, at a comparatively later period, into the common and oldest path, after they had experienced a similar loss to the Sanskrit, Zend, &c., by which we should be conducted to nominative forms like εὐδαιμω, εὐδαιμο, τέρη, τέρε, τάλα, τάλα? I do not venture to decide with positive-ness on this point, but the latter view appears to be the more probable. It here deserves to be [G. Ed. p. 167.] remarked, that, in German, the n, which in Gothic, in the nominative, is always suppressed, has in more modern dialects made its way in many words from the oblique cases again into the nominative. So early as the Old High German this was the case; and, in fact, in feminine bases in īn (Gothic ein, §. 70.), which, in the nominative, oppose to the Gothic ei the full base īn: as ĭuotlihīn, “glory” (see Grimm, p. 628). In our New High
German the phenomenon is worthy of notice, that many original n bases of the masculine gender, through a confusion in the use of language, are, in the singular, treated as if they originally terminated in na; i.e. as if they belonged to Grimm's first strong declension. Hence the n makes its appearance in the nominative, and the genitive regains the sign s, which, indeed, in Gothic, is not wanting in the n bases, but in High German was withdrawn from them more than a thousand years since. Thus, Brunnen, Brunnen(s), is used instead of the Old High German prunno, prunnin, and the Gothic brunna, brunnin-s. In some words, together with the restored n there occurs in the nominative, also, the ancient form with n suppressed, as Backe or Backen, Same or Samen; but the genitive has in these words also introduced the s of the strong declension. Among neuters the word Herz deserves consideration. The base is, in Old High German, HERZAN, in Middle High German HERZEN; the nominatives are, herza, herze; the New German suppresses, together with the n of Herzen, the vowel also, as is done by many masculine n bases; as, e.g. Bür for Bäre. As this is not a transition into the strong declension, but rather a greater weakening of the weak nominative, the form Herzens, therefore, in the genitive, for an uninflected Herzen, is surprising.

With this assumed or newly-restored inflection s would be to be compared, in Greek, the nominative s, as of δελφί-s, μέλα-s; and with the n of Brunnen for Brunne, the v of δαίμων, τέρην; in case, as is rendered probable by the cognate languages, these old forms have been obtained from still older, as δελφί, μέλα, δαίμων, τέρη, by an unorganic retrograde step into the stronger declension.*

---

* That, in Greek, the renunciation of a v of the base is not entirely unknown may be here shewn by an interesting example. Several cardinal numbers in Sanskrit conclude their base with न n; viz. panchan,
144. Bases in चर (चूर्णि, §. 1.) in Sanskrit reject the r in the nominative, and, like those in च न, lengthen the preceding vowel; e.g. from पितर pitar, "father," भातर bhātār, "brother," मातर mātār, "mother," दुहितर duhitār, "daughter," come पिता pitā, भाता bhātā, माता mātā, दुहिता duhitā. The lengthening of the a serves, I believe, as a compensation for the rejected r. As to the retention, however, through all the strong cases, excepting the vocative, of the long a of the agent, which corresponds to Greek formations in τηρ, τωρ, and to Latin in tōr, this takes place because, in all probability, in these words तार tār, and not तर tār, is the original form of the suffix; and this is also supported by the length of the suffix being retained in Greek and Latin through all the cases—τηρ, τωρ, tōr; only [G. Ed. p. 169.] that in Latin a final r, in polysyllabic words, shortens an originally long vowel. Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. sing. दाता dātā</td>
<td>ὅτηρ ὅτηρ</td>
<td>datōr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. sing. दातारम् dātar-am</td>
<td>ὅτηρ-α</td>
<td>datōr-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. dual, दातारी dātar-āu</td>
<td>ὅτηρ-ε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Voc. pl. दातारस dātar-as</td>
<td>ὅτηρ-ες</td>
<td>datōr-ès</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*panchan,* “five,” *saptan,* “seven,” *ashtan* with *ashtau,* “eight,” *navan,* “nine,” *daśan,* “ten.” These numerals are, indeed, used adjectively, when they are not governed by the gender of their substantive, but display always a neuter form, and indeed, which is surprising, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular terminations, but in the other cases the suitable plural endings; e.g. पच राजानास pancha (not panchānas) rājānas “quinque reges”; on the other hand, पचसु राजसु panchasu rājasu “in quinque regibus.” To the neuter nominatives and accusative of the singular पच pancha, सप्त sapta, नव navan, and दसा daśa—which rest on the regular suppression of the n—answer the Greek πέντε, ἑπτά, ἑννεά, δέκα, with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflected nominative through all the cases.
of the preceding a of the noun agent, in the same places as in the Sanskrit, with the exception of the nominative singular, where the long a, as always when final, is shortened; e.g. paita, "father," dātā, "giver," "Creator;" acc. paitar-ēm, dātār-ēm. In Lithuanian there are some interesting remains, but only of feminine bases in er, which drop this letter in the nominative, but in most of the oblique cases extend the old er base by the later addition of an i. Thus motē, "wife," dukē "daughter," answer to the abovementioned mātā, duhitā; and, in the plural, moter-ēs, dukter-ēs, to māter-ēs, duhitār-ēs. In the genitive singular I regard the form moter-s, dukter-s, as the elder and more genuine, and moteriēs, dukteriēs, as corruptions belonging to the i bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic i; hence, moter-ū, dukter-ū, not moteri-ū, dukteri-ū. Besides the words just mentioned, the base sessēr, "sister," belongs to this place: it answers to the Sanskrit स्वसर् svasar, nom. स्वसा svasa; but distinguishes itself in the nominative from mote and dukte, in that the e, after the analogy of bases in en, passes into ū, thus sessū.

[G. Ed. p. 170.] 145. The German languages agree in their r bases (to which but a few words belong denoting affinity) with the Greek and Latin in this point, that, contrary to the analogy just described, they retain the r in the nominative. As πατήρ, μητήρ, θυγάτηρ, δαήρ (Sanskrit, देवर dēvar, देव dēvī, nom. देवा dēvā), frater, soror; so in Gothic, brōthar, svistar, dauhtar; in Old High German, vatar, pruodar, swēstar, tohtar. It is a question whether this r in the nominative is a remnant of the original language, or, after being anciently suppressed, whether it has not again made its way in the actual condition of the language from the oblique cases into the nominative. I think the latter more probable; for the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian are three witnesses
for the antiquity of the suppression of the r; and the Greek words like πατήρ, μητήρ, σωτήρ, βήτωρ, exhibit something peculiar and surprising in the consonantal declension, in that ρ and σ not combining, they have not rather preferred giving up the base-consonant than the case-sign (as παῖς, παύς, &c.). It would appear that the form της is of later origin, for this reason, that the ρ having given place to the nominative σ, the form τη-ς, whence τηρ-ος should come, was, by an error of language, made to correspond to the η-ς of the first declension. The want of a cognate form in Latin, as in Zend and Sanskrit, as also the, in other respects, cognate form and similarity of meaning with ταρ τορ, το-ς, τηρ and τωρ, speak at least plainly enough for the spuriousness and comparative youth of the nouns of agency in της.

146. Masculine and feminine primary forms in चस as in Sanskrit lengthen the a in the nominative singular. They are, for the most part, compounded, and contain, as the last member, a neuter substantive in चस as, as दुर्मनस् durmanas, "evil-minded," from दुस dūs [G. Ed. p. 171.] (before sonant letters—§. 25.—दुर dūr) and मनस् manas "mind," whence the nom. masc. and fem. दुर्मनास्य durmanās, neut. दुर्मनस् durmanas. A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in δυσμενής, ὦ, ἥ opposed to τὸ δυσμενέος. The त of दुर्मनास durmanās, however, belongs, though unrecognised, to the base; and the nominative character is wanting, according to §. 94. In Greek, on the other hand, the ς of δυσμενής has the appearance of an inflexion, because the genitive, &c., is not δυσμενέος-ός, like the Sanskrit दुर्मनस् durmanas-ς, but δυσμενέος. If, however, what was said at §. 128 is admitted, that the ς of μένος belongs to the base, and μένεος is abbreviated from μένεω-ος, then in the compound δυσμενής also, and all similar adjectives, a Σ belonging to the base must be recognised, and the form δυσμενέος must lie at the bottom of the genitive δυσμενέος. In the
nominative, therefore, either the \( \varsigma \) belongs to the base, and
then the agreement with दुर्मनयाS \( \text{durmanās} \) would be com-
plete; or the \( \varsigma \) of the base has been dropped before the case-
sign \( \varsigma \). The latter is, in my opinion, least probable; for the
former is supported by the Latin also, where the forms which
answer to the Sanskrit \( \text{as} \) bases are in the nom. masc. and
fem. in like manner without the case-sign. Thus the San-
skrit comparative suffix is इयस् \( \text{īyas} \)—the last \( \text{a} \) but one of
which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a
dull nasal (Anuswära, §. 9.)—in Latin, \( \text{iōr} \), with the \( s \) changed
into \( r \), which so frequently happens; and the nominative in
both genders is without the case-sign: the originally long \( \text{o} \),
however, is shortened by the influence of the final \( r \). In the
neuter \( \text{ūs} \) corresponds to the Sanskrit चस \( \text{as} \), because \( u \) is
favourable to a final \( s \), and prevents its transition into \( r \);
hence \( \text{gravius} \) has the same relation to the Sanskrit गरीयस्
\( \text{gariyas} \) (irregular from गुरु \( \text{guru} \), "heavy," ) as \( \text{lupus} \) to
\[ \text{G. Ed. p. 172.} \] वृक्क \( \text{vrihas} \), only that the \( s \) of the nomi-
native character in the latter belongs in the former to the base.
The final syllable \( \text{ōr} \), though short, must nevertheless
be held, in Latin, as graver than \( \text{ūs} \), and hence \( \text{gravior} \) forms
a similar antithesis to \( \text{gravius} \) that in Greek \( \text{δυομενής} \) does to
\( \text{δυομενές} \), and in Sanskrit दुर्मनया \( \text{durmanas} \) to दुर्मनया \( \text{durmanas} \).

147. In Lithuanian a nominative, which stands quite
isolated, \( \text{mėnū} \) \( (= \text{mēnuo}) \), "moon" and "month," deserves
here to be mentioned: it proceeds from the primary form
\( \text{MENES*} \), and, in regard to the suppression of the final
consonant and the transformation of the preceding vowel, has
the same relation to it that, as above (§. 139.), \( \text{akmū} \) has

\* The relation of this to मात \( \text{mās} \) which signifies the same—from मात
\( \text{mās} \), "to measure," without a derivative suffix—is remarkable; for the
interposed nasal syllable \( \text{ne} \) answers to the Sanskrit \( \text{n} \) \( \text{na} \) in roots of the
seventh class (see p. 118); and in this respect \( \text{MENES} \) bears the same
relation to the Latin \( \text{MENSI} \) that l. c. बिनय सी \( \text{bhinaadmi} \) does to \( \text{findo} \).
to AKMEN, sessu to SESSER: in the oblique cases, also, the s of the base again re-appears, but receives, as in the er and en bases, an unorganic increase: thus the genitive is menesio, whence MENESIA is the theme; as wilko, “lupi,” from WILKA, nom. wilka-s.

148. In neuters, throughout the whole Sanskrit family of languages the nominative is identical with the accusative, which subject is treated of at §. 152. &c. We here give a general view of the nominative formation, and select for the several terminations and gender of the primary forms, both for these cases and for all others which suit our purpose, the following examples: Sanskrit वृक vrika, m. “wolf;” क ka. “who?” दान dāna, n. “gift;” त tu, n. “this;” जिहा jihwa, f. “tongue;” का kā, “which?” पति pati, m. “lord,” “husband;” प्रिति priti, f. “love;” वारिवृtī, n. “water;” अविययो bhaviṣhyanti, “who is about to be;” सुन sūnu, m. “son;” [G. Ed. p. 173.]


* Masculines and feminines in the consonantal declension agree in all cases: hence an example of one of the two genders is sufficient. The only exception is the accusative plural of words denoting relationship in अर ar, §. 114.), which form this case from the abbreviated theme in अर अर.
"Lord;" ज्ञान्यां धर्मि, f. "blessing;" ज्ञानय वारी, n. "water;" ज्ञानय बृष्यान्ति, "who will be;" ज्ञान पालि, m. "tame animal;" ज्ञान तानु, f. "body;" ज्ञान मधु, n. "wine;" ज्ञान गो, m. f. "bullock;"

[6. Ed. p. 174.] "cow"; ज्ञान वाच, f. "speech," "voice."; ज्ञान बरान्त, or ज्ञान बरेंट, weakened form ज्ञान बरात, m. n. "bearing;" ज्ञान अस्मन, m. "heaven;" ज्ञान नामन (also ज्ञान नायनम), n. "name;" ज्ञान ब्रातर,†

* It has been remarked at §. 123 of the cognate nom. ज्ञान जाय, "earth," accus. ज्ञान जायम, that I have only met with these two cases. The very common form ज्ञान जेम, which is found only in the other oblique cases, is nevertheless represented by Burnouf, in a very interesting article in the Journal des Savans (Aug. 1832), which I only met with after that page had been printed, as belonging to the same theme. I agree with him on this point at present, so much the rather as I believe I can account for the relationship of ज्ञान जेम, "terra," (dat.) ज्ञान जेम, "in terra," &c. to the Sanskrit ज्ञान गावे, ज्ञान गावी. I do not doubt, that is to say, that, in accordance with what has been remarked at §. 63. and p. 114, the Zend ज्ञ म is to be regarded as nothing else than the hardening of the original v. The Indian ज्ञ गो, before vowel terminations गाव, would consequently have made itself almost unintelligible in the meaning "earth," in Zend, by a double alteration; first by the transition of ग to ज, in which ज must be assumed as the middle step—in which e.g. ज्ञान जाम, "to go," from गा गाम, has remained; secondly, by the hardening of the v to m. Advert, also, to the Greek δη, for γη, in δηνηρηπ; since ड and ज, from ज ज (=द्श), have so divided themselves in the sound whence they have sprung, that the Greek has retained the T-sound, the Zend the sibilant.

† I cannot quote the nominative of this word; but it can only be ज्ञान वा-स, as palatals before म s change into म c; and thus, from ज्ञ ड्रुज, "an evil demon," occurs very frequently the nom. ज्ञान ड्रो-स. I have scarcely any doubt, too, that what Anquetil, in his Vocabulary, writes वाढक्ष, and renders by "parler, cri," is the nominative of the said base; as Anquetil everywhere denotes क by क, and म by श.

† In the theme we drop, intentionally, the ज required by §. 44, as it is clear that ज्ञान ब्रातर, not ज्ञान ब्रातर, must be the base word; ज्ञान बरातर also occurs, with म a interposed.
NOMINATIVE SINGULAR.


SANSKRIT. ZEND. GREEK. LATIN. LITHUAN. GOTHIC.

m. vrika-s, वह्रको vēhrkō,† लुपो-s, lupu-s, wilka-s, vulf-s.
m. ku-s, को-s, . . . . . . ka-s, hva-s.

* In the comp. wies-pati-s, “landlord”; isolated pat-s, “husband,” with i in the nominative suppressed, as is the case in Gothic in all bases in i. Compare the Zend जळविपरिवर्त्तितष्ठा vēhrkāscha, “lupusque,” as in Sanskrit नर्केश vrikaścha.
† These and other bases ending with a consonant are given only in those cases which have remained free from a subsequent vowel addition.
‡ Before the enclitic particle cha, as well here as in all other forms, the termination as, which otherwise becomes o (§. 56b.), retains the same form which, in Sanskrit also, स as assumes before च cha: hence is said जळविपरिवर्त्तितष्ठा vēhrkāscha, “lupusque,” as in Sanskrit नर्केश vrikāscha. And the appended cha preserves the otherwise shortened final vowel in its original length: hence जळविपरिवर्त्तितष्ठा jikvācha, “linguaque,” म्शुज्रुतितष्ठा bushyuintēcha, “suturaque,” म्शुज्रुतितष्ठा brātācha, “fraterque.” Even without the as at times the original length of the final vowel is found undiminished: the principle of abbreviation, however, remains adequately proved, and I therefore observe it everywhere in the terminations.
### FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n. ḍūna-m</td>
<td>ḍūťē-m</td>
<td>ḍōrō-v</td>
<td>donum</td>
<td>gērā, daur'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ta-t</td>
<td>ta-ś</td>
<td>ṛō</td>
<td>is-tu-d, ta-i</td>
<td>thau-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvā</td>
<td>hīzva</td>
<td>χώρα</td>
<td>terra</td>
<td>rankā, giba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. kā</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pāti-s</td>
<td>pāti-s</td>
<td>pōsī-ś</td>
<td>hostī-s, pātī-s, gatī-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-s</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prūti-s</td>
<td>āfrūti-s</td>
<td>pōṛtī-ś</td>
<td>siti-s, awi-s, anstū-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vāri</td>
<td>vaiṛī</td>
<td>īḍṛī</td>
<td>mare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-d</td>
<td></td>
<td>i-tā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyanti</td>
<td>bāshyanti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānu-s</td>
<td>pāśu-s</td>
<td>ḋχθō-ś</td>
<td>pecu-s, sānu-s, sunu-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanu-s</td>
<td>tanu-s</td>
<td>pītū-ś</td>
<td>socru-s</td>
<td>handu-s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu</td>
<td>madhu</td>
<td>ṁēdhū</td>
<td>pecu, darkū, faihu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhā-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gāu-s,†</td>
<td>gāu-s,‡</td>
<td>bōu-ś</td>
<td>bō-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāu-s</td>
<td></td>
<td>vāu-ś</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāk</td>
<td>vāc-s</td>
<td>ṍ̃ī-ś</td>
<td>voc-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharan</td>
<td>bāraṇ-ś</td>
<td>φέρων</td>
<td>feren-s, sukaṇ-ś, siyand-s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ōtmā</td>
<td>ōma</td>
<td>ḍaīmuṇ</td>
<td>sermo, ākmū, ahma'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāma</td>
<td>nāma</td>
<td>śālaṇ</td>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>namō'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrāṭā</td>
<td>bhrāṭa</td>
<td>pāṭhṛ</td>
<td>frater</td>
<td>brōthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitā</td>
<td>dughdha</td>
<td>ṣvṛgātṛ</td>
<td>mater, dukte', dauhtar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātā</td>
<td>dāta</td>
<td>ṣvṛtṛ</td>
<td>dator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas</td>
<td>vachā</td>
<td>ēpōś</td>
<td>opus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACCUSATIVE.

**SINGULAR.**

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

---

* See the marginal note marked (†) on the foregoing page.
† Irregularly for गोः gō-s.
‡ Or गृहस्तः gūs, § 33.
the dull re-echoing nasal, which in Sanskrit is called Anu-
swāra, and which we, in both languages, express by ū (§ 10.). The German languages have, so early as the Gothic even, lost the accusative mark in substantives entirely, but in pronouns of the 3d person, as also in adject-
ive bases ending with a vowel which follow their declen-
sion, they have hitherto retained it; still only in the
masculine: the feminine nowhere exhibits an accusative
character, and is, like its nominative, devoid of inflexion.
The Gothic gives na instead of the old m; the High
German, with more correctness, a simple n: hence, Gothic
blind-na, "occum," Old High German plinta-n, Middle and
Modern High German blinde-n.

150. Primary forms terminating with a consonant prefix
to the case-sign m a short vowel, as otherwise the combi-
nation would be, in most cases, impossible: thus, in San-
skrit am, in Zend and Latin ēm, appears as the accusative
termination*: of the Greek αν, which must originally have
existed, the ν is, in the present condition of the language,
lost: examples are given in § 157.

151. Monosyllabic words in š, .ARR, and dvd, in Sanskrit,
like consonantal bases, give am in place of the mere m, as
the accusative termination, probably in order in this way
to become polysyllabic. Thus, Śī bhī, "fear," and Śī ndu,
"ship," form, not bhī-m and ndu-m, as the Greek ναυ-ν would

* From the bases द्रुज druj and वाच vāch, I find besides द्रुजेम drujēm, वाचेम vāchēm, in the V. S.; also frequently द्रुजिम drujim,
वाचिम vāchim: and if these forms are genuine, which I scarcely doubt,
they are to be thus explained—that the vowel which stands before m is
only a means of conjunction for appending the m; for this purpose, how-
ever, the Zend uses, besides the े mentioned at § 30, not unfrequently
ि�; e.g. for दादेमाहि dadēmahī, occurs also दादिमाहि dadimahī,
and many similar forms; as उ-माहि uṣ-i-mahi, answering to the San-
skrit उ-गमस uēmas (in the Vēdas उ-गमस uēmasi), "we will."
[G. Ed. p. 178.] lead us to expect, but भियम भिय-म, नावम नाव-म. With this agree the Greek themes in ευ, since these give ε-α, from εφ-α, for ευ-ν; e.g. βασιλέ(φ)α, for βασιλευ-ν.

It is, however, wrong to regard the Latin em as the true, originally sole accusative termination, and for lūpu-m, hora-m, fruc-tum, diem, to seek out an older form lūpo-em, hora-em, fructu-em, die-em. That the simple nasal suffices to characterize the accusative, and that a precursory vowel was only added out of other necessary reasons, is proved by the history of our entire family of languages, and would be adequately established, without Sanskrit and Zend, by the Greek, Lithuanian, and Gothic. The Latin em in the accusative third declension is of a double kind: in one case the e belongs to the base, and stands, as in innumerable cases, for i; so that e-m, of igne-m (Sanskrit अग्निम् agni-m), corresponds to the Indian i-m, Zend i-m, Greek i-υ, Lithuanian i-ι, Gothic i-na (from ina, “him”); but in the em of consonantal bases the e answers to the Indian a, to which it corresponds in many other cases also.

152. The Sanskrit and Zend neuter bases in a, and those akin to them in Greek and Latin, as well as the two natural genders, give a nasal as the sign of the accusative, and introduce into the nominative also this character, which is less personal, less animated, and is hence appropriated to the accusative as well as to the nominative in the neuter: hence, Sansk. स्वानम् स्वान-म, Zend श्रवणम् श्रवण-म, “a bed”; so in Latin and Greek, donu-m, δῶρο-ν. All other bases, with but few exceptions, in Latin, remain in the nominative and accusative without any case character, and give the naked base, which in Latin, however, replaces a final i by the cognate e; thus, marē for mari corre-

[G. Ed. p. 179.] sponds to the Sanskrit वारि vrī, “water”; the Greek, like the Sanskrit and Zend, leaves the i unchanged —ιδρ-ς, ἰδρ, as in Sanskrit जुधिस् suchis, जुधि suchi. The following are examples of neuter u bases, which supply the
place both of nominative and accusative: in Sanskrit नम् madhu, "honey," "wine," अस्रु asru, "tear," स्वादु svādu, "sweet"; in Zend वध्व vāhu, "wealth" (Sanskrit वध्व vasu); in Greek μέθυ, δάκρυ, ἡδύ; in Latin pecu, genu. The length of this u is unorganic, and has probably passed into the nominative, accusative, and vocative from the oblique cases, where the length is to be explained from the suppressed case terminations. With regard to the fact that final u is always long in Latin, there is perhaps a reason always at hand for this length: in the ablative, for example, the length of the originally short u is explicable as a compensation for the case sign which has been dropped, by which, too, the ṭ of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the u of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat. pl. २-ibus. The Σ, in Greek words like γένος, μένος, εὐγενές, has been already explained at §. 128. as belonging to the base: the same is the case with the Latin e in neuters like genus, corpor, gravius: it is the other form of the r of the oblique cases, like gener-is, corpor-is, gravior-is (see §. 127.); and corpus appears akin to the Sanskrit neuter of the same meaning, सनस्नृ vapus, gen. सनस्नृ vapus-sh-as (see §. 19.), and would consequently have an r too much, or the Sanskrit has lost one.* The Σ also of neuter bases in T, in τετυφός, τέρας, does not seem to me to be the case sign, but an exchange with T, which is not admissible at the end, but is either rejected (μέλι, πράγμα) or exchanged [G. Ed. p. 180.] for a cognate Σ, as πρός from προτί, Sanskrit प्रति prati ↑

* Compare, in this respect, brachium, βραχίων, with बुहु bāhu-s, "arm"; frango, ῥήγνυμι, with बहन्त बहान्तi, "I break," भण्णस् bhanjmas, "we break."

† With this view, which I have already developed in my treatise "On some Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions" (Berlin, by Dümmler), pp. 4—6, corresponds, as to the essential points, what Hartung has since said on this subject
In Latin it is to be regarded as inconsistent with the spirit of the language, that most adjective bases ending with a consonant retain the nominative sign $s$ of the two natural genders in the neuter, and in this gender extend it also to the accusative, as if it belonged to the base, as $capac-s$, $felic-s$, $soler(t)s$, $uman(t)s$. In general, in Latin, in consonantal bases, the perception of the distinction of gender is very much blunted, as, contrary to the principle followed by the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Gothic, the feminine is no longer distinguished from the masculine.

153. In Gothic substantives, as well neuter as masculine, the case sign $m$ is wanting, and hence neuter bases in $a$ stand on the same footing with the $i$, $u$, and consonantal bases of the cognate languages in that, in the nominative and accusative, they are devoid of all inflexion. Compare, with regard to the form of this case, $dauw(a)$ with $darrow$, $dwarmac$, which has the same meaning. In Gothic there are no neuter substantives in $i$; on the other hand, the [G. Ed. p. 181.] substantive bases in $ya$, by suppression of the $a$ in the nominative and accusative singular (cf. § 135.), gain in these cases the semblance of $i$ bases; e.g. from the base $REIKYA$, "rich" (Sanskrit राज्य rājya, likewise neuter), comes, in the case mentioned, $reiki$, answering to the Sanskrit राज्यम् rājya-m. The want of neuter $i$ bases subject in his valuable work on "On the Cases," p. 152, &c.; where also the $p$ of $ṣapap$ and $ṣápap$ is explained as coming from $T$, through the intervention of $S$. The Sanskrit, however, appears to attribute a different origin to the $p$ of these forms. To यक्रत्य yakрит "liver" (likewise neuter), corresponds both $jcar$ and $ṣapap$, through the common interchange between $t$ and $p$: both owe to it their $p$, as $pitṛ-os$ does its $r$ "pitṛ-os should be $pitr-os$, Sanskrit यक्रत्य yakrit-as. But the Sanskrit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the $r$, but then irregularly substitutes न for त, e.g. gen. यक्रस्य yaks-as for यकनस्य yaknajas. With regard to the $p$ of $ṣápap$, compare उद्रा udra, "water," in समुद्र sam-udra, "sea."
in German is the less surprising, that in the cognate Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, the corresponding termination in the neuter is not very common. Of neuter u roots the substantive declension has preserved only the single FAIHU, "beast." In Lithuanian the neuter in substantives is entirely lost, and has left traces only in pronouns and adjectives, where the latter relate to pronouns. Adjective bases in u, in this case, have their nominative and accusative singular in accordance with the cognate languages, without case sign; e.g. darkù, "ugly," corresponds as nominative and accusative neuter to the masculine nominative darkù-s, accusative darku-ù. This analogy, however, is followed in Lithuanian, by the adjective bases in a also; and thus géra, "good," corresponds as nominative and accusative to the masculine forms géra-s, géra-ù,* which are provided with the sign of the case.

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

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

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

155. Pronominal bases in a in Sanskrit give t, in Zend t, as the inflexion of the nominative and accusative neuter. The
Gothic gives, as in the accusative masculine, *na* for *m* or *n*, so here *ta* for simple *t*; and transfers these, like other peculiarities of the pronominal declension, as in the other German dialects, also to the adjective *a* bases; e.g. *blinda-ta*, "caecum," *midy-ta*, "medium." The High German gives, in the older period, *z* instead of the Gothic *t* (§ 187.), in the most modern period, *s*. The pronominal base *I* (later *E*) follows in German, as in Latin, the analogy of the old *a* bases, and the Latin gives, as in the old ablative, *d* instead of *t*. The Greek must abandon all *T* sounds at the end of words: the difference of the pronominal from the common *o* declension consists, therefore, in this respect, merely in the absence of all inflexion. From this difference, however, and the testimony of the cognate languages, it is perceived that *σ* was originally sounded *το* or *τοῦ*, for a *τω* would have remained unaltered, as in the masculine accusative. Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter-inflexion *τ* in *στι*, so that we ought to divide *στ-τι*; and therefore the double *τ*, in this form, would no more have a mere metrical foundation, than the double *σ* (§ 128.) in *φεσ-σι.* (Buttmann, p. 85.)

156. We find the origin of the neuter case-sign *t* in the pronominal base *π* *ta*, "he," "this," (Greek *ΤΟ*, Goth, *THA*, &c.); and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this, that *ππ* *ta-t* "it" "this," stands, in regard to the base, in the same contrast with *ς* *sa*, "he," *ςα* *sā*, "she," as *t*, as the neuter case-sign, does to [G. Ed. p. 184.] the nominative *s* of masculine and feminine nouns (§. 134.). The *m* of the accusative also is, I doubt not, of pronominal origin; and it is remarkable that the compound pronouns *i-ma*, "this," and *a-mu*, "that," occur just as little as *ta* in the nominative masculine and feminine; but the Sanskrit substitutes for the base *amu*, in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form *asdu*, the *s* of which, therefore, stands in the same relation to the *m* of * amat* *amu-m*, "illum," * amat* *amu-ṣhya*, "illius," and other oblique cases, as, among
the case-terminations, the sign of the masculine feminine nominative to the m of the accusative and neuter nominative. Moreover, in Zend is used ꞏtuvat imat, “this,” (n.) (nom. accus.), but not imat, “this” (m.), but глас aem (from ꞏтамuyam), and ꞏтш im (from ꞏтамiyam), “this” (f.). Observe in Greek the pronominal base MI, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to ꞏμ µα (in the compounded base ꞏтα i-ma) that ꞏκιν hi-m “what?” has to ꞏκας ka-s “who”? The Gothic neut. termination ta anwers, in regard to the transposition of sound (§. 87.), to the Latin d (id, istud): this Latin d, however, seems to me a descent from the older t; as, e.g., the b of ab has proceeded from the p of the cognate ꞏγν apa, ꞏπο; and in Zend the d of ꞏδα ꞏδη� “him,” is clearly only a weakening of the t of ꞏτα, ꞏτα.†

† See my treatise “On the Origin of the Cases” in the Trans. of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826. As T in Greek easily becomes ꞏΣ (but a final ꞏΣ has in many parts of Grammar become ν), Fhartung founds on this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p. 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neutrers in ν (m) with those in t. We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the m, on account of the origin which we ascribe to this case-sign, is as little surprising in the nominative of the neuter as in the accusative of the more animated genders; and besides, a greater antiquity is proved to belong to the neuter m, through the Sanskrit and Zend, than probably the υ sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older ꞏΣ, as ꞏμυ for ꞏμεν ( Mesa mas), and in the dual ꞏτον, ꞏτον for ꞏτάς theas, ꞏτάς tas. What is wanting in the Greek, viz. a neuter inflexion s, appears, however, to be possessed by the Sanskrit; and I am inclined to divide the form ꞏδα ꞏαθα adas, “that” (nom. accus.) into a-da-s, and to explain it as a corruption of a-da-t (cf. Gramm. Crit. Addend. to r. 299.); but to regard the syllable da as weakened from ta, as in the Zend ꞏδα ꞏδη� “him.” We shall recur to this when treating of the pronouns.
is any way connected with the neuter t, d, of the cognate languages: I should rather turn to a relationship with the i demonstrative in the Greek (οὗτος, ἐκείνος), and to the it, which is, in like manner, used enclitically in the Vedas—a petrified neuter, which is no longer conscious of any gender or case; and hence, in several cases, combining with masculine pronouns of the third person.* This it, is consequently the sister form of the Latin id and Gothic i-tu, which, in the Greek ἐκείνος, has, perhaps only from necessity, dropped the τ or δ, and which already, ere I was acquainted with the Veda-dialect, I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत (from cha + it), "it," and नेत (na + it).

The words mentioned at §. 148. form in the accusative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vyika-m, vēhrkē-m, λίκο-v, lupu-m, wilku-ū, vulf&quot;.</td>
<td>m. ka-m, kē-m, ka-i, hwa-na.</td>
<td>n. dīna-m, dātē-m, dōro-v, donu-m, gēra, daur'.</td>
<td>n. ta-t, ta-i, ta-t, thā-ta.</td>
<td>f. jihvā-m, hizva-im, χόρα-v, terram, ranka-ū, giba.</td>
<td>f. kā-m, ka-iun, hvā.†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Examples are given by Rosen in his Veda Specimen, pp. 24, 25, which, though short, are in the highest degree interesting for Sanskrit and comparative Grammar; as, सह sait, "he," तमिन tamit, "him"; तयोरित tayorit, "of these two"; तस्माइत tasmāit, "to him"; अस्माइत asmāit, "to this" (m.). The Zend combines in the same way 𐐹 e or 𐐸 i with the interrogative: 𐐹𐐺𐐹 kāsē and 𐐹𐐺 kāsi, "who?" occur frequently. Perhaps only one of the two modes of writing is correct. Cf. Gramm. Crit. Addend. to r. 270.

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

* Cf. §. 386. p. 544.
The feminine participial bases in i, mentioned at §. 119., remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular: in all other cases, to the old i is further added a more modern a; and the declension then follows RANKA exactly; only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the i, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§. 137.), the added a becomes, or may become, e: in the latter case the i is suppressed, as l. c. ἐπιστάμενον καίξεν for καίνεν (§. 42.). Thus, from sukanti, “the turning” (f.), sukusi, “the having turned” (f.), and sukstanti, “the about to turn,” Mielcke gives the accusatives sukantii, i.e. it stands for sukan-tyi-n from sukan-tya-i-n, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like  טל-מ for  טל-מ (§. 42.), and to the Gothic, like hari from the base ḤARÝA (§. 135.).

† See §. 122.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SANSKRIT.</strong></th>
<th><strong>ZEND.</strong></th>
<th><strong>GREEK.</strong></th>
<th><strong>LATIN.</strong></th>
<th><strong>LITHUAN.</strong></th>
<th><strong>GOTHIC.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. pati-m,</td>
<td>paiti-m,</td>
<td>πότιν,</td>
<td>hostem,</td>
<td>pát-i-n,</td>
<td>gastes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. priti-m,</td>
<td>āfriti-m,</td>
<td>πορτιν,</td>
<td>siti-m,</td>
<td>āwi-n,</td>
<td>anstl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vāri,</td>
<td>vauri,</td>
<td>iōn,</td>
<td>mare,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyantīm, bāshyantīm,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnu-m,</td>
<td>pāsū-m,</td>
<td>ḫiθo,</td>
<td>pecu-m,</td>
<td>sunu-i,</td>
<td>sunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanu-m,</td>
<td>tanū-m,</td>
<td>πίτυν,</td>
<td>socru-m,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>handu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu,</td>
<td>madhu,</td>
<td>μέθυ,</td>
<td>pecu,</td>
<td>darkw,</td>
<td>faihu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhā-m,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f.gā-m,†</td>
<td>ga-īm,†</td>
<td>ḫoav,</td>
<td>bov-em,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāv-am,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>ναυ-ν,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-am,</td>
<td>vāch-ēm,</td>
<td>ḫo-α,</td>
<td>voc-em,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The feminine participial bases in i, mentioned at §. 119., remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular: in all other cases, to the old i is further added a more modern a; and the declension then follows RANKA exactly; only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the i, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§. 137.), the added a becomes, or may become, e: in the latter case the i is suppressed, as l. c. ἐπιστάμενον καίξεν for καίνεν (§. 42.). Thus, from sukanti, “the turning” (f.), sukusi, “the having turned” (f.), and sukstanti, “the about to turn,” Mielcke gives the accusatives sukantii, i.e. it stands for sukan-tyi-n from sukan-tya-i-n, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like  טל-מ for  טל-מ (§. 42.), and to the Gothic, like hari from the base ḤARÝA (§. 135.).

† See §. 122.
The instrumental is denoted in Sanskrit by व ।; and this inflexion is, in my opinion, a lengthening of the pronominal base व ।, and identical with the preposition व ।, “to,” “towards,” “up to,” which springs from this pronoun, and appears only as a prefix. The Zend ḍ appears still more decidedly in its pronominal nature in the compound mentioned at §. 156. Note *, जळम अदम, “him,” “this,” (m.) fem. जळम अदाम. As a case-sign, अ । generally appears abbreviated (see p. 163. Note †), even where this termination has been melted into one with a preceding अ । of the base; so that in this case the primary form and the instrumental are completely similar; e.g. जळम कदा, “voluntarily,” जळम कदा, “involuntarily,” (V. S. p. 12.) जळम कदा, “actione,” often occur; अ । अन, “through this” (m.), जळम पाई-बेरेला, “allevalo.”† The long अ । appears in the instrumental only in monosyllabic bases in अ ।; thus अ । ख द, “proprio” V. S. p. 46.), from the base अ । ख (Sanskrit ख स्वा, §. 35.). In Sanskrit a euphonic न । is added to bases ending with short vowels in the masc.

* See §. 56b.
† Cf. Gramm. Crit. r. 638. Rem. This interesting instrumental form was not known by Rask when he published his work on the Zend, and it was not easy to discover it, on account of its discrepancy from the Sanskrit and the many other forms with final अ ।.
and neut. genders;* a final \( \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{a} \), however, is, as in several other cases, changed into \( \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{e} \); and the \( \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{d} \) of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base; as \( \text{वृक्केन्} \) \( \text{vrikē-n-a} \), but \( \text{सूनिन्} \) \( \text{sūnun-ā} \), \( \text{मद्व्रुन्} \) \( \text{madhu-n-ā} \), from \( \text{वृक्क} \) \( \text{vrika} \), &c. The Vēdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic \( n \), as \( \text{स्वप्नया} \) \( \text{swapnay-ā} \) for \( \text{स्वप्नेन} \) \( \text{swapnēn-ā} \) from \( \text{स्वप्न} \) \( \text{swapna} \), m. “sleep” (see §.133.); \( \text{उरु} \) \( \text{uru-} \) \( \text{ā} \) for \( \text{तुर्य} \) \( \text{uru-n-ā} \), from \( \text{उरु} \) \( \text{uru} \), “great,” with a euphonic \( \text{yū} \) (§. 43.); \( \text{प्राभव} \) \( \text{prabhāv-ā} \), from \( \text{प्राभ} \) \( \text{prabhā} \), from \( \text{ताहु} \) \( \text{bāhu} \), “arm,” with the preposition \( [\text{G. Ed. p. 189.}] \) \( \text{प्र प्रा} \). The Vēda-form \( \text{स्वप्नया} \) \( \text{swapnayā} \), finds analogies in the common dialect in \( \text{मया} \) \( \text{maya} \), “through me,” and \( \text{तव} \) \( \text{tavā} \), “through thee,” from the bases \( \text{मा} \) \( \text{ma} \) and \( \text{तवा} \) \( \text{tava} \), the \( a \) of which in this case, as in the loc., passes into \( \mathfrak{e} \). And from \( \text{पति} \) \( \text{pati} \), m. “Lord,” and \( \text{सक्षि} \) \( \text{sakhi} \), m. “friend,” the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of \( \text{n} \), viz. \( \text{पत्य} \) \( \text{paty-ā} \), \( \text{सक्ष्या} \) \( \text{sakhy-ā} \). Feminines never admit a euphonic \( n \); but \( \mathfrak{d} \), as before some other vowel terminations, passes into \( \mathfrak{e} \), that is to say, \( i \) is blended with it, and it is shortened to \( \text{a} \); hence, \( \text{जिहैया} \) \( \text{jihway-ā} \) (from \( \text{jihwē} + \mathfrak{d} \)). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit.

159. As \( \mathfrak{e} \) in Gothic, according to §. 69., just like \( \mathfrak{e} \), represents \( \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{d} \), so the forms \( \text{थेन्} \) \( \text{theṇ} \), \( \text{हवेन्} \) \( \text{hvenē} \), which Grimm (pp. 790. and 798.) regards as instrumentals, from the demonstrative base \( \text{THA} \) and the interrogative \( \text{HVA} \), correspond very remarkably to the Zend instrumentals, as \( \text{मक्षा} \) \( \text{kha} \) from the base \( \text{क्षा} \) \( \text{kha} \). We must, however, place also \( \text{sve} \) in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved: besides \( \text{sve} \) from \( \text{SVĀ} \) is also, pulses in a do not take a euphonic \( n \), nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augmente in the instrumental: here is no doubt some typographic error. Editor.

* The original has “Stämmen gen. masc. und fem.;” but genitives of nouns in \( \mathfrak{a} \) do not take a euphonic \( n \), nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augment in the instrumental: here is no doubt some typographic error. Editor.
The meaning of sv$ is "as" (ṣ), and the so, which has arisen in High German from sva or svë, means both "as" and "so," &c. The case relations, however, which are expressed by "as" and "so" are genuine instrumentals.† [G. Ed. p. 190.]

The Anglo-Saxon form for svë is svâ, in which the colouring of the Zend aŋa khd is most truly preserved. The Gothic sva, "so," is, according to its form, only the abbreviation of svë; as a is the short equivalent both of ę and of o: through this abbreviation, however, sva has become identical with its theme, just as aŋa ana in Zend is, according to §. 158., not distinguished from its theme.

160. ‡As the dative in Gothic and in Old High German very frequently expresses the instrumental relation, and the termination also of the dative is identical with the Sanskrit-Zend instrumental character, shortened only, as in polysyllabic words in Zend, it may be proper here to describe at the same time the formation of the German dative. In a bases it is in Gothic, as in Zend, identical with the theme, and from VULIFA comes vulfa, as aŋrwaŋr vēhrka from VEHRRKA. Moreover, there are some other remarkable datives, which have preserved their due length, and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals thê, ve, svë, which have been already explained, viz. hvammê-h, hvargammê-h, "cuique," and ainummê-hun, "ulli," for ainammê-

Grimm's conjectures regarding the forms sva and sve (III. 43.) appear to me untenable; and an explanation of these forms, without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend, is impossible. More regarding this at the pronouns.

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

‡ The German dat. sing. is according to §. 356. Rem. 3., to be everywhere identified with the Sanskrit dative; and so, too, the dat. pl. the m of which approaches as closely to the Sansk. bhyas, Latin bus, Lith. mus, as the instrumental termination bhês, Lith. mis.
hun (§. 66.).* Bases in i reject this vowel before the case-sign; hence gast'‑a for gasti‑a: on the other hand, in the u bases the termination is suppressed, and the base-vowel receives the Guna: hence sunau, which will have been pronounced originally su‑nav‑a; so that, after suppressing the termination, the v has again returned to its original vowel nature. The form sunav‑a would answer to the Vêda form pra‑bâhav‑a. In Zend, the bases which terminate with j i and v u, both in the instrumental and before most [G. Ed. p. 101.] *of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend. S. p. 469, maàgus bâzav‑a, “brachio,” as analogous to pra‑bâhav‑a (§. 57.); on the other hand, p. 408, maàgus zanthau from zantu, “the slaying,” “killing.” From jùzú puãnu, “dust,” we find, l. e. p. 229, the form jùgù puãsnû, which Anquetil translates by “par cette poussière”; and if the reading is correct, then puãsnû, in regard of the suppressed termination (compensation for which is made by lengthening the base vowel), would answer to the Gothic sunau.

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

* Here the appended particle has preserved the original length of the termination, as is the case in Zend in all instrumentals, if they are combined with maà chu, “and.”

† The Old High German form fatere (for fatera), “patri,” proceeds, as do the genitive fatere‑s, and the accusative fatere‑n, from a theme FATERA, extended by a. The accusative fatere‑n, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base. In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of FATERA.
character $ di. But as we have recognised in the mas-
culine and neuter dative the Indo-Zend instrumental, we could not, except from the most urgent necessity, betake ourselves to the Sanskrit dative for explanation of the Gothic feminine dative. This necessity, however, does not exist, for, e.g., hveitai, "albae," from HVEITŌ from HVEITA, may be deduced from the instrumental श्रेतया śvēlay-ā, "alba," from चन्ता śvēldā, by suppressing the termination, and changing the semi-vowel to a vowel in the same manner as, above, sunau from sunav-a, [G. Ed. p. 102.] or as the fem. handau, "manui," from handav-a. Analogous with sunau, handau, are also the dative feminine i bases; and, e.g., anstai, "gratia," has the same relation to its theme ANSTI that handau has to HANDU.

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

* With reference to their use with various prepositions we refer our readers to Graff's excellent treatise, "The Old High German Prepositions," p. 181, &c.
and meaning: we rather regard the u* as a corruption
[G. Ed. p. 193.] (although one of very ancient date) of u,
just as in the neuter plural of pronouns and adjectives a u
corresponds to the short a of the Gothic and the older cognate
languages. In Lithuanian the a bases form their instru-
mental in u, which is long, and in which the final vowel
of the base has been melted down. That this u, also, has
arisen from a long a, and thus, e.g. dievû is akin to the
Zend 𐇀𐇁𐇀 daêva, "deo," for 𐇀𐇁 𐇀 daêvâ, appears to
me the less doubtful, as also in the plural dievâs answers
very surprisingly to 𐇀𐇁 𐇀 daêvais, 𐇀𐇁 𐇁 dêvâs. More-
over, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian
u corresponds to the Sanskrit शा d; e.g. in the plural
genitive. In feminine a bases, also, in Lithuanian, the
vowel of the base is melted down with that of the termi-
nation, but its quality is not changed; as, e.g. rankâ
"manu," from RANKâ. In all other bases mi stands as
the termination, to which the plural instrumental termi-
nation mis has the same relation as, in Latin, bis to hi
(voxBIS, tiBL); and, according to §. 63., I do not doubt
that in both numbers the m has arisen from b.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vyikê-p-a</td>
<td>vêhrka</td>
<td>wilku,</td>
<td>vulfa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihway-d</td>
<td>hizvay-a</td>
<td>rankâ,</td>
<td>gibai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-d</td>
<td>paithy-a</td>
<td>pati-mi,</td>
<td>gast'-a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contrary to Grimm’s opinion, I cannot let the instrumental u pass as
long, even not to notice its derivation from a short a; for, first, it ap-
ppears, according to Notker, in the pronominal forms diu, &c. without a circ-
umflex (other instrumentals of the kind do not occur in his works);
secondly, like the short a, it is exchanged for o (§. 77.); hence, wio,
vêo, with wifi, wio-lih, huo-lih, "qualis" (properly, "similar to whom");
thirdly, the length of this u cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms the,
hve, sve, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long
vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf. §. 187.).
164. In Sanskrit and Zend, \( \dot{e} \) is the sign of the dative, which, I have scarce any doubt, originally belongs to the demonstrative base \( \dot{a} \), whence the nom. यस्मात् आयम (from \( \dot{e} + \text{ आम} \)), "this"; which, however, as it appears, is itself only an extension of the base \( \dot{a} \), from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (a-sma, a-smat, a-smin, &c.); and regarding which it is to be observed, that the common \( a \) bases, also, in Sanskrit in many cases extend this vowel to \( \dot{e} \) by the admixture of an \( i \) (§. 2.). The dative sign consequently would, in its origin, be most intimately connected with the case, which, as (§. 160.) was explained, denotes, in German, both the dative and instrumental relation, and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification.*

---

* E. g. Vend. 8. p. 45: आजिझनाटिभिस दाद्हातिस चातिस-पुत्र्म, "Hó̄m gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring." The lithographed Codex, however, gives the form azizānātībis as three words,
[G. Ed. p. 195.] We have here further to remark, that in the pronoun of the 2d person the affix भयम bhyam (from भी + am) in तुभयמ tu-bhyam, “to thee,” stands in evident relationship to the instrumental भिस bhis in the plural. The feminine bases in ज, इ, त, and, at will also, those in आ, प, prolong in Sanskrit the dative termination र ए to र ए; with the final द of the base an इ is blended; hence जीवाय जीवाय d from जीवाय. On the other hand, र इ and र उ receive the Guna augment before र ए, but not before the broader र ए; as देव सुनाव-ए from सुन. In Zend, feminine ज and इ-bases, like the Sanskrit, have ए for their termination: however, हिजवाय-ए is not used, but हिजवाय हिजवाय-ए, from the base हिजव, as long vowels in the penultinate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in ज have, in combination with the particle ना च, preserved the Sanskrit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form जिजपन-ए जिजपन-ए जिजपक-ए (see §. 28.), e.g. जिजपन-अजिजपक-ए karslaya-ए, “and on account of the ploughing,” “in order to plough” (Vend. S. p. 198).

[G. Ed. p. 196.] From karste. Without च, however, the form जिजप जिजप जिजप is almost the sole one that occurs, e.g. जिजप kharē-ए, “in order to eat,” from जिजप kharē-ए. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from जिजप जिजप जिजप, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding ए ए has become ए (§. 31.). Forms like जिजप जिजप जिजप जिजप जिजप afrī-ए or जिजप जिजप afrī-ए, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

azī zāndī-ए. Such separations in the middle of a word are, however, in this Codex, quite common. I entertain no doubt of the correctness of the length of the ए, both of ए ए and ए; and I anticipate a variety azizanaītibīs or—bīs. Probably also csaitō is to be read for csaitō. Anquetil translates: “O Hom, donnez à la femme, qui n’a pas encore engendré, beaucoup d’enfans brillans.” We will return to this passage hereafter; and we will here further remark that, at the same page of the Vend. S., the instr. जिजप aebīs also occurs in the sense of “to them.”

* Cf. p. 280 Note †.
rest on errors in writing.* Bases in \( u \) may take Guna; e.g. \( \text{वण} \text{हव} \) from \( वणहु \), “pure”; or not, as \( \text{राठ} \) from \( रतु \), “great,” “lord.” The form without Guna is the more common. A euphonic \( \text{s} \) also is found interposed between the base and the termination (§ 43.) e.g. \( \text{तनु} \text{य} \), “corpori.”

165. Bases in \( \text{च} \) add to the case-sign \( \text{d} \) an \( \text{च} \); but from \( \text{र} \) \( \text{d} \) \( (= \text{a} + \text{i}) \) and \( \text{a} \) is formed \( \text{चय अया} \); and this, with the \( \text{a} \) of the base, gives \( \text{या} \), thus चूज्यय vrikāya. Hence may have arisen, by suppressing the final \( \text{a} \), the Zendian \( \text{वहरक} \), after which the preceding semi-vowel must return to its vowel nature. It might, however, be assumed, that the Zend has never added an \( \text{a} \) to the dative \( \text{d} \), and that this is a later appearance in Sanskrit, which arose after the division of languages; for from \( \text{a} + \text{d} \) is formed, quite regularly, \( \text{di} \) (§ 2.). The Sanskrit forms also, from the particle \( \text{s} \) \( \text{स} \) \( \text{sma} \), which is added to pronouns of the 3d person, the dative \( \text{सम} \text{दी} \); and thus, e.g. कस्मै kasmāi, “to whom”? answers to the Zend \( \text{काम} \) kahmāi. The Sanskrit, in this case, abstains from adding the \( \text{च} \) \( \text{a} \), which is elsewhere appended to the dative \( \text{र} \) \( \text{d} \); since \( \text{s} \) \( \text{sma} \), already encumbered with the preceding principal pronoun, cannot admit any superfluity in its termination, and for this reason gives up its radi-

166. The particle \( \text{s} \) \( \text{स} \) \( \text{sma} \), mentioned in the preceding section, which introduces itself between the base and the termination, not only in the singular, but (and this, in fact, occurs in pronouns of the two first persons) in the plural also, if not separated from both—as I have first attempted to shew

* अशिष अशिष is undoubtedly incorrect: however, \( \text{e} \) \( \text{e} \) is often found erroneously for \( \text{ए} \) \( \text{e} \) in other forms also.
in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, *sma*, according to § 53, has been changed to *hma*; and also in Prākṛit and Pāli, in the plural of the two first persons, the s has become h, and besides, by transposition of the two consonants, the syllable *hma* has been altered to *mha*; e.g. Prākṛit चन्द्रे anhē, "we" (āμες), Pāli चन्द्रकम् anhākam, Zend चन्द्रकम ahmākem, ṣ्म. From the Prākṛit-Pāli *mha* we arrive at the Gothic *nsu* in *u-nsa-ra*, ṣ्μ, *u-nsi-s,* "nobis," "nos." In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pāli and Prākṛit; and on the other hand, by the change of m into n, for more facile combination with the following s, it rests on a more modern stage. We cannot, therefore, any longer assume the *ns* of *uns*, "nos," to be

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

* The a being changed into i, according to r. 67.
† I. 813. "unsara appears to be derived from the accusative uns, as also the dative unsiś, which, with izvis, preserves a parallel sound to the dative singular." Cf. I. 813. 34.
cannot, also, any longer regard the u of unsa-ra, "nostri," &c. as the vocalized v of veis, "we," although the i of izvara, "vestri," &c. can be nothing else than the vocalized y of yus, "your"; for in Sanskrit, also, the syllable यु yu of yudam, "ye," (§. 43.) goes through all the oblique cases, while in the 1st person the द v of दयम vayam, "we," is limited to the nominative, but the oblique cases combine a base अ a with the particle स्मा sma. This a, then, in Gothic, through the influence of the following liquid, has become u; hence, unsa-ra, &c. for ans-ara (§. 66.).

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

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

* See Ann. of Lit. Crit. March 1831, p. 376, &c.
to the Sanskrit तस्य tasya, which is older than the Homeric form. Compare, without intervention of the Gothic, the Old High German i-wa-r, i-u, i-wi-h, with the Sanskrit yu-श्माकम्, yu-श्मा-भ्यम्, yu-श्मान्, and with the Lithuanian yū-sū, yū-mus, yū-s: thus it would be regarded as settled, that the w or u belongs to the base, but is not the corrupted remainder of a far-extended intermediate pronoun; and it would be incorrect to divide iw-ar, iw-ih, iu, for i-wa-r, &c. I, too, formerly entertained that erroneous opinion. A repeated examination, and the enlarged views since then obtained through the Zend, Prākṛt, and Pāli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable zva has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (e-we-r from i-zva-ra, e-u-ch from i-zvi-s, Old High German i-wi-h): on the other hand, the u of the base yu (ष यु), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual*; and the Gothic i-zva-ra, Old High German i-wa-r, &c., stand for yu-zva-ra, yu-wa-r. The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the u, which in Anglo-Saxon has become o, through all the oblique cases: iu-we-r, Œo-we-r, "vestri," &c. If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskrit and New German forms—be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that euer and युष्माक्षम् yushmākam are connected, and, indeed, in such wise, that the u of euer has nothing

* So much the more remarkable is the u, which is still retained in the North Friesian dialect (Grimm, p. 814), where, e.g. yu-nke-r, yu-nk, in regard to the base, distinguishes itself Advantageously from the Gothic i-yvra-ra, i-nvi-s.
in common with the u of यु, but finds its origin in the m of the syllable म sma.

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

* It must not be overlooked, that here g before k only represents the nasal answering to k (86. 1.).
the other pronouns and all substantive and adjective declensions.

170. The fourth form in which स्मा \( \text{sma} \) appears in Gothic is that which I first remarked, and which I have brought forward already in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (p. 16). What I have there said, that the datives singular, like ठम्मा, इम्मा, have arisen, by assimilation, from ठस्मा, इ-स्मा, I have since found remarkably confirmed by the Grammar of the Old Prussian published by Vater, a language which is nearly connected with the Lithuanian and Gothic, since here all pronouns of the third person have स्मू in the dative. Compare, e.g. अन्तर-स्मू with the Gothic आन्तरा-म्मा, "to the other": कउ-स्मू with the Gothic हवा-म्मा, "to whom?" We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun स्मा similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation,

[\[G. Ed. p. 202.\]] since we deduced the Æolic forms आ-म्म-एस, उ-म्म-एस, &c., from आ-स्मे-एस, उ-स्मे-एस, to which the common forms ज्येई, ज्येई, have the same relation that the Old High German डे-मु has to the Gothic ठा-म्मा, only that ज्येई, ज्येई, in respect to the termination ई, are more perfect than the Æolic forms, since they have not lost the vowel of the particle स्मे, but have contracted ए-एस to अेई.

171. The Gothic datives in म्मा are, as follows from §. 160., by origin, instrumentals,* although the particle स्मा in Sanskrit has not made its way into these cases, and e.g. तेन तेना, "through him," not तस्मेना, or, according to the Zend principle (§. 158.), तास्मा (for तस्मा), is used;—I say, according to the Zend principle; for though in this

* The difference between the forms ठे, हवे, explained at §. 159., and the datives ठा-म्मा, हवा-म्मा, consists first in this, that the latter express the case relation by the affixed particle, the former in the main base; secondly, in this, that ठम्मा, ह्वम्मा, for ठाम्मेई, ह्वाम्मेई, on account of their being polysyllabic, have not preserved the original length of the termination (cf. §. 137.)
language *hma* has entered into the instrumental masculine and neuter, this case in the base *ta* could only be *mahama* or *mahmd* (from *ta-hma-*). In the feminine, as we can sufficiently prove, the appended pronoun really occurs in the instrumental; and while e.g. from the masculine and neuter base *m* *ana*, "this" (m.), "this" (n.), we have found the instrumental of the same sound *m* *ana* not *anahma*, from the demonstrative base *a* occurs rather often the feminine instrumental *ahmy-a*, from the fem. base *ahmi*, increased by the appended pronoun.

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

* The Zend, too, has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine *hmi*, as in the instr. *a-hmy-a*; but in the genitive, dative, and ablative has gone even farther than the Sanskrit in the demolition of this word, and has therein rejected not only the *m* but also the *i*. The feminine *a-hmy-a* (§. 50*.), "hujus," for *a-hmy-do*, often occurs; and for it also *ainh-do*, in which the *i* is, to use the expression, a reflection of the lost *y* (§. 41.). From another demonstrative base we find the dative *ava-nhd* and more than once the ablative *ava-nhd* for *ava-hmy-adi*, *ava-hmy-dt*. 
Thi-zai, "huic," might be deduced from the masculine genitive this, by the addition of the terminations $6$ and $ai$; and as, too, in Lithuanian, the whole of the oblique cases singular of the 1st and 2d person stand in close connection with the Sanskrit-Zend genitives मम mama, म्वा mana, ता tava, म्वा्या tawa, and have the same as base. After discovering the Zend feminine pronominal forms in $hmy-a$ in the instrumental and locative—in the latter for $hmy-ainm$—the above-mentioned forms in Sanskrit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of $ta-smy-di$, &c., as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, thi$6$s, thi$zai$, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into thi$-z6-s$, thi$-zai$. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun $sma$ must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base $SM$ = सा sma, as ब्लिन्दा, nom. blinda, "casta," from ब्लिन्दा, m. n. (nom. blind$'$-s, blinda-ta). $SM$, however, by the loss of the $m$, as experienced by the Sanskrit in the feminine, has become $S$; but the $s$, on account of its position between two vowels (according to §. 86. s.), has become $z$. Therefore, thi$-z6-s$* has only $s$ as case-sign, and the dative thi$-zai$, like gibai in §. 161., is without case character. With the masculine and neuter genitive thi$-s$, therefore, thi$-z6-s$, thi$-zai$, have nothing in common but the demonstrative theme $THA$, and the weakening of its $a$ to $i$ (§. 66.).

173. Gothic adjective bases in $a$ (Grimm's strong adjectives) which follow the pronominal declension, differ from it, however, in this point, that they do not weaken the final $a$ of the base before the appended pronoun to $i$, but extend it to $ai$, and form the feminine dative from the simple theme, according to the analogy of the substantives:† hence blindai$-z6-s$, blindai, not blindi$-z6-s$, blindi$-zai$.

* Cf. §. 356. Rem. 3. p. 501, last line but seven.
† With respect to the extension of the $a$ to $ai$, compare the gen. pl. and Sanskrit forms, as $tē$-bh$y$as, "iis, tē$š$ám, "eorum," for ta-bh$y$as, ta-s$ā$m.
174. The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hma* also into the second, and probably into the first person too: we find repeatedly, in the locative, त्वानाः *thwa-hm’-i*, instead of the Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 205.] त्वाय *tway-i*, and hence deduce, in the 1st person, *ma-him’-i*, which we cannot quote as occurring. The Prākṛit, in this respect, follows the analogy of the Zend; and in the 2d person gives the form तुमसि *tuma-sm’-i*, “in thee,” or, with assimilation, तुममि *tumammi*, with तुम *tumē* (from *tuma-i*) and तः *taī*; and ममसि *mama-sm’-i* or मममि *mama-mmi*, “in me,” together with the simple मः *maē* and मः *maī.* Ought not, therefore, in German also, in the singular of the two first persons, a remnant of the pronominal syllable *sma* to be looked for? The *s* in the Gothic *mi-s*, “to me,” *thu-s*, “to thee,” and *si-s*, “to himself,” appears to me in no other way intelligible; for in our Indo-European family of languages there exists no *s* as the suffix of the instrumental or dative. Of similar origin is the *s* in the plural *u-nsi-s*, “nobis,” “nos,” *i-zvi-s*, “vobis,” “vos”; and its appearance in two otherwise differently denoted cases cannot therefore be surprising, because this *s* is neither the dative nor accusative character, but belongs to a syllable, which could be declined through all cases, but is here deprived of all case-sign. In *u-nsi-s*, *i-zvi-s*, therefore, the Sanskrit शः *sma* is doubly contained, once as the base, and next as the apparent case-suffix. I am inclined, also, to affirm of the above-mentioned Prākṛit forms, *tu-ma-sm’-i*, “in thee,” and *ma-ma-sm’-i*, “in me,” that they doubly contain the pronominal syllable *sma*, and that the middle syllable has dropped a preceding *s*. For there is no more favourite and facile combination in our class of languages than of a pronoun with a pronoun; and what is omitted by one dialect in this respect is often afterwards supplied by another more modern dialect.

* See *Essai sur le Pali*, by E. Burnouf and Lassen, pp. 173.175.
175. The k in the Gothic accusatives mi-k, thu-k, si-k (me, te, se), may be deduced, as above, in u-gka-ra, vūṅ, &c., from s, by the hardening of an intervening h; so that mi-s is altered to mi-h, and thence to mi-k; and therefore, in the singular, as also in the plural, the dative and accusative of the two first persons are, in their origin, identical. In Old High German and Anglo-Saxon our particle appears in the accusative singular and plural in the same form: Old High German mi-h "me," di-h, "thee," u-nsi-h, "us," i-wi-h, "you"; Anglo-Saxon me-c, "me," u-si-c, "us," the-c, "thee," eo-vi-c, "you": on the other hand, in the dative singular the old s of the syllable sma has become r in the High German, but has disappeared in the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon: Old High German mi-r, di-r; Old Saxon mi, thi; Anglo-Saxon me, the.

176. In Lithuanian sma appears in the same form as in the middle of the above-mentioned (§. 174.) Prākṛt forms; namely, with s dropped, as ma; and indeed, first, in the dative and locative sing. of the pronouns of the 3d person and adjectives; and, secondly, in the genitive dual of the two first persons: we cannot, however, refer to this the m, which the latter in some cases have in common with the substantive declension. The pronominal base TA, and the adjective base GERA, form, in the dative, tā-mui, "to thee," gerā-mui, "to the good" (shortened tām, gerām), and in the locative ta-mē, gera-mē; and if -mui and -mē are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive a bases, it is easily seen that mui and mē have sprung from ma. The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, mu-mū, yu-mū, according to the analogy of ponū, "of the two lords."

* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle sma in the locative interrogative form ka-mmē, "where"? Sansk. क्वस्मिन् ka-smin, "in
177. Lithuanian substantives have i for the dative character, but i bases have ei*; a final a before this i passes into u; hence wilku-i. Although we must refuse a place in the locative to the dative i of the Greek and Latin, still this Lithuanian dative character appears connected with the Indo-Zend ē, so that only the last element of this diphthong, which has grown out of α+ι, has been left. For the Lithuanian has, besides the dative, also a real locative, which, indeed, in the a bases corresponds exactly with the Sanskrit and Zend.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikāya,</td>
<td>vēhrkāi,</td>
<td>wilku-i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwāy-āi,</td>
<td>hizvay-āi,</td>
<td>ranka-i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pāty-ē,†</td>
<td>pāte-ē ‡</td>
<td>pāč-ēi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prītay-ē,</td>
<td>āfrīte-ē,</td>
<td>āwi-ēi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyanty-āi,</td>
<td>būshyainty-āi,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnav-ē,</td>
<td>pāsv-ē,</td>
<td>sunu-i.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"in whom," which, according to the common declension, would be कस्मे kasmē (from kasma-ि). Compare the Gothic hvamma, "to whom?" for hvasma.

* The form āwīui, with āwīei appears to admit of being explained as arising from the commixture of the final vowel of the a bases.

† The form पत्ये patyē is, with respect to its want of Guna, irregular, and should be पत्ये patyē.

‡ In combination with छ cha we find in V. S., p. 473. पात्य-चा paithyē-cha, and hence deduce for the instrumental (p. 193 G. Ed.) the form paithyā, while, according to §. 47., also paitya might be expected. From हाच हाचि, "friend," I find in V. S., p. 162, the instrumental हाचाचि hacaya with Guna, after the analogy of the बाचाचि bācava, mentioned at §. 160.
### FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. tanav-े</td>
<td>tanu-y-े,*</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhu-ि</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gav-े</td>
<td>gav-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nav-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vach-े</td>
<td>vach-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-े</td>
<td>barėnt-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. अत्म-े</td>
<td>अःमैं-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. नाम-े</td>
<td>नामैं-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. भ्रात-े</td>
<td>भ्राठ-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitr-े</td>
<td>dughdhiर-े,†</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. दात्र-े</td>
<td>dāthr-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-े,†</td>
<td>vachanं-े</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* I give तनु-य-े tanuyे with euphonic य, because I have found this form frequently, which, however, cannot, for this reason, be considered peculiar to the feminine; and, instead of it, also tanvё and tanavё may be regarded as equally correct. Cf. § 43., where, however, it is necessary to observe, that the insertion of a euphonic य between उ and े is not everywhere necessary; and, for instance, in the dative is the more rare form.

† The च in दुघ्धद्धेरे dughdherे, and in the instr. दुघ्धद्धेरा dughdhera, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants. I deduce these forms from the plural genitive दुघ्धद्धेर-ाइम dughdher-aim, for दुघ्धद्धेर-ाइम dughdhr-aim.

† Respecting नाम-े nāmनें, for नामने nāmanे, and so in the instrumental नाम-े nāmнм, for नामना nāmanा, see § 140. In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the अ in the weakest cases (§ 130.), but examples of its retention, e.g. in the compound aocto-नामना aocto-nāmanā (Vend. S. p. 4, and frequently). I consider the initial अ in this compound as the negation, without euphonic न; for in all probability it means “having untold (countless) names.” Similar compounds precede, viz. गैंजारो-घाटो-भाके-चाशमनो gāzārō-ghāṭo-bākē-čašmanō, “of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed.” Cf. Anquetil II. 82. In words in van, on the other hand, अ is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the व becomes उ or ऊ. Regarding the addition of the य in नामने nāmainे, see § 41.
179. The Ablative in Sanskrit has त t [G. Ed. p. 209.] for its character, regarding the origin of which there can no longer be any uncertainty, as soon as the influence of pronouns on the formation of cases has been recognised, as we are conducted at once to the demonstrative base ता, which already, in the neuter nominative, and accusative, has assumed the nature of a case-sign, and which we shall subsequently, under the verb, see receiving the function of a personal termination. This ablative character, however, has remained only in bases in अ a, which is lengthened before it; a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians, who have been followed by the English, to represent अतः dt as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed, that in वृक्ततम vrikdt the a of the base has been melted down with the d of the termination.*

180. M. E. Burnouf† has been the first [G. Ed. p. 210.] to bring home the ablative character to a class of words in Zend which had lost it in Sanskrit, and whence it can be satisfactorily inferred that a simple t, and not dt, is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in u, of which hereafter. As regards bases in अ a, which in Sanskrit alone have preserved the ablative, we have to observe, that in

---

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

† Nouveau Journal Asiatique 1829, tom. III. 311.
Zend also the short vowel is lengthened, and thus भृगुवष्ण वेह्रकात् answers to पृक्त व्रिकात्. Bases in ज have धि- in the ablative; whence may be inferred in Sanskrit ablatives like प्रत्ति पते-त, प्रवदि प्रिते-त (§ 33.), which, by adding Guna to the final vowel, would agree with genitives in अ-स. The Zend-Avesta, as far as it is hitherto edited, nevertheless offers but few examples of such ablative forms in जो-ऩत: I owe the first perception of them to the word भृगुवष्ण ध्रुवति, "benedictione," in a passage of the Vendidad,* explained elsewhere, which recurs frequently. Examples of masculine bases are perhaps भृगुवष्ण राजोत राजतुष्ट्रोति, "institutione zaratustrica" (V. S. p. 86), although otherwise भृगु राजि, which I have not elsewhere met with, is a masculine: the adjective base zaratustri, however, belongs to the three genders. From भृगु गार, "mount-

[G. Ed. p. 211.] tain," occurs the ablative भृगु गरोत in the Yescht-Sâde.† Bases in ज have भृगु अो-त in the ablative|| and in no class of words, with the exception of

* See Gramm. Crit. add. ad r. 156.
† What Anquetil III. 170. Rem. 4, writes guerded can be nothing else than the ablative भृगु गरोत, for Anquetil generally expresses ज by गु, ज by e, ज by बे, and ज by d. The nominal base भृगु गार, however, is treated in Zend as if gari was the original form, and the i which precedes the r was produced by the final त, as remarked by M. Burnouf in the article quoted at p. 173, and confirmed by the genitive भृगु गरोत. That, however, which is remarked by M. Burnouf, i.e. with respect to the genitive, and of which the Vend. S. p. 64. affords frequent proof in the genitive भृगु पातोि, must also be extended to the ablative in धि; and the त, which, according to § 41., is added through the final ज of the base, is dropped again before this termination.

|| For this we also find भृगु eut; e.g. भृगु गार गारियु from गारियु.

Interchanges of ज o and ज d are particularly common, owing to the slight difference of these letters. Thus, e.g. for भृगु गारोत, "he spoke," occurs very frequently भृगु गारोत; the former, however, is, as we can satisfactorily prove, the right reading; for, first, it is supported by
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that in a, does the ablative more frequently occur, although these words are in number but five or six, the ablative use of which is very frequent; e.g. दोन्हम् ddonhât, "creatione," from dânuhu, in a passage explained elsewhere* दोन्हम् anhaot-ि, "mundo," from डोन्हम् anhu; दोन्हम् tanaot "corpore," from डोन्हम् tanu. Bases ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the [G. Ed. p. 212.] ablative रि without the intervention of another letter, as the accusative is to annex m without an intermediate letter; and they have at as their termination, numerous examples of which occur; e.g. अप्सत् ap-at, "aqua"; अध्र अथ्र-at, "igne"; चश्मान अन्यम-chashman-at, "oculo"; नान्हन अत् nânhan-at "noso"; नव न- ड्रू- ड्रू- drui-at, "daemon"; विक ब्र- विक- viat, "loco" (cf. vicus, according to § 21.). Owing to the facile interchange of the आ with अ, नम at is sometimes erroneously written for नम at; thus, Vendidad S. p. 338, अभकस म सदचंत्त-ि for अभकस म सद- चंत्त-ि "lucente." Bases in u sometimes follow the

by the Sanskrit form अभकस abrot, for which the irregular form अभकस abrot-ि is used; and secondly, it answers to the 1st pers. mraâm (V. S. p. 123) : thirdly, the Sanskrit अः पि is, in Zend, never represented by अः पि, but by अः पि, before which, according to § 28., another अः पि is placed, hence अः पि: on the other hand, अः पि represents u, in accordance with § 32 and § 28. If, then, अभकस पसु formed in the ablative अभकस पसू-ि, this would conduct us to a Sanskrit पसु पसू-ि; while from the ablatives अभकस अभकस-ि, अभकस अभकस-ि, अभकस अभकस-ि, and from the analogy, in other respects, with the genitive, the Guna form, पसू पसू-ि must be deduced. Moreover, in the Vend. S. the ablative form अभकस अब-ि actually occurs; for at p. 102. (अभकस अभकस hacha vanheât mananh-ि, "from pure spirit") occurs vanheât, the ablative of vanhu; and the अ preceding the अ is an error in orthography, and vanheât is the form intended: p. 245 occurs अभकस anhaot, "mundo," from anhu.

consonantal declension in having ष at as the ablative termination instead of a mere t; just as in the genitive, besides a simple s, they exhibit also an ṭ (from as, §. 56b.), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned तनात “corpore,” occurs also tanv-ät (Vend. S. p. 482).* Feminine bases in ष and ज have ष at in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination वास as, whence, in the Zend ष do; e.g. दह्मय-ät, “praetor,” from दह्मद; उवराय-ät) “arbore,” from उवरद; बारेथ्री “genitrice,” from बारे the ablative, whence, in the Zend प्रत intellectual. — The feminine bases also in उ, and perhaps also those in ऋ, may share this feminine termination ष at; thus, from वासu, “begetting,” comes the ablative वास-ät (cf. Gramm. Crit. §. 640. Rem. 2.). Although, then, the ablative has been sufficiently shewn to belong to all declensions in Zend, and the ablative relation is also, for the most part, denoted by the actual ablative, still the genitive not unfrequently occurs in the place of the ablative, and even adjectives in the genitive in construction with substantives in the ablative. Thus we read, Vend S. p. 479, वासविधिर वासित महावास hacha avanhat; visat yat mäzdayasni, “ex hac terrâ quidem mazdayasnică.”

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

† Vendidad Sāde, p. 436: यथा वेर्को चाह्वारो-जाङ्गो निष्दारो-दायरो Yatha vehrkā chathvarē-jangro nishdarē-dairyāt barēthryāt hacha puthrēm, “As a wolf, a four-footed animal, tears a child from its mother.” This sentence is also important as an example of the intensive form (cf. Gramm. Crit. §. 363.). The Codex, however, divides incorrectly nishdarē dairyāt.

† Regarding this form, see p. 172. Rem.
181. The Old Roman corresponds with the Zend in regard to the designation of the ablative; and in those two memorials of the language, that on the Columna rostrata, and the S. C. de Bacchanalibus, which are the most important inscriptions that remain, all ablatives end with d; so that it is surprising that the ablative force of this letter could be overlooked, and that the empty name of a paragogic d could be held satisfactory. Bases ending with a consonant use ed as ablative suffix, as in the accusative they have em instead of a simple m: hence, forms like præsent-ed dictator-ed, answer to the Zend saûchant-at ãthr-at (lucente iyne); while navale-d* præda-d, inalto-d mari-d, senatu-d, like the above-mentioned Zend forms गरोि-t, "monte," ताना-t, "corporis," &c.; and in Sanskrit वृक्तम् vrikā-t, "lupo," have a simple T sound to denote the ablative. The Oscan also takes the ablative sign d through all declensions, as appears from the remarkable inscription of Bantia, e.g. dolu-d [G. Ed p. 214.] mallu-d, cum preivatu-d, toutu-d præsent-i-d.† It may be preliminarily observed, that, in the 3d person of the imperative, old Latin and Oscan forms like es-tod, es-tud—for es-to, and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Vêda forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Pânini; e.g. जीवताः jiva-tāt, which signifies both "vivat" and "vive," but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf. vivito as 3d and 2d person).

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

* The e here belongs to the base, which alternates between e and i.
† See O. Müller's Etruscans, p. 36.
dropped an initial s, and may stand for *smet, and so belong to the appended pronoun *sma, explained in § 165. &c., corresponding with its ablative *smät, to which it stands in the same relation that memor (for mesmor) does to *smrī—from smar, § 1.—"to remember." The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for *sma, as has been shewn, unites itself to all persons, though it must itself be regarded as a pronoun of the 3d person.* The conjunction sed, too, is certainly nothing but the ablative of the reflexive; and sed occurs twice in the S. C. de Bacch. as an evident pronoun, and, in fact, governed by inter;

[G. Ed. p. 215.] whence it may be assumed that inter can be used in construction with the ablative, or also that, in the old languages, the accusative is the same with the ablative: the latter view is confirmed by the accusative use of ted and med in Plautus.

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

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

Thus, \( \delta \mu \omega - \varsigma \) may be akin to the Sanskrit समात् सम्मत, "from the similar," both in termination and in base. In Greek, the transition of the \( T \) sounds into \( \varsigma \) was requisite, if indeed they were not to be entirely suppressed*; and in § 152. we have seen neuter bases in \( \tau \), in the uninflected cases, preserve their final letter from being entirely lost by changing it into \( \varsigma \). We deduce, therefore, [G. Ed. p. 216.] adverbs like \( \delta \mu \omega - \varsigma \), \( \nu \tau \omega - \varsigma \), \( \omega - \varsigma \), from \( \delta \mu \omega - \tau \), \( \nu \tau \omega - \tau \), \( \omega - \tau \) or \( \delta \mu \omega - \delta \), &c., and this is the only way of bringing these formations into comparison with the cognate languages; and it is not to be believed that the Greek has created for this adverbial relation an entirely peculiar form, any more than other case-terminations can be shewn to be peculiar to the Greek alone. The relation in adverbs in \( \omega - \varsigma \) is the same as that of Latin ablative forms like hoc modo, quo modo, raro, perpetuo. In bases ending with a consonant, \( \varsigma \) for \( \sigma \tau \) might be expected as the termination, in accordance with Zend ablatives like चश्मान्-अत्, "oculo"; but then the ablative adverbial termination would be identical with that of the genitive: this, and the preponderating analogy of adverbs from \( \sigma \) bases, may have introduced forms like \( \sigma \omega \phi \rho \delta \nu \omega \varsigma \), which, with respect to their termination, may be compared with Zend feminine ablatives like बरेंथ्र-अत्. We must also, with reference to the irregular length of this adverbial termination, advert to the Attic genitives in \( \omega \varsigma \) for \( \sigma \varsigma \).†

* As, in \( \nu \tau \omega \), together with \( \nu \tau \omega - \varsigma \), \( \delta \delta \epsilon \), \( \delta \phi \nu \omega \), and adverbs from prepositions—\( \gamma \zeta \omega \), \( \lambda \nu \omega \), \( \kappa \alpha \tau \omega \), &c. It is here desirable to remark, that in Sanskrit, also, the ablative termination occurs in adverbs from prepositions, as अधस्तत् अदमस्तत्, "(from) beneath," पुरास्तर् पुरास्तत्, "(from) before," &c. (Gram. Crit. § 652 p. 279.).

† In compounds, remains of ablative forms may exist with the original \( T \) sound retained. We will therefore observe, that in "\( \alpha \)φροδίτρ" the first member
[G. Ed. p. 217.] 184. In no case do the different members of the Sanskrit family of languages agree so fully as in the genitive singular; only that in Latin the two first declensions, together with the fifth, as well as the two first persons of the pronouns, have lost their old termination, and have replaced it by that of the old locative. The Sanskrit terminations of the genitive are स s, स्या sya, चस as, and शास ås: the three first are common to the three genders: as is member has a genuine ablative meaning; and as the division अरो-दिन्य admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with अरो-दिन्य. In Sanskrit, अभ्रदित ा abhrāditā would mean “the female who proceeded from a cloud,” for abhrā-t must become abhrād before ētā (§ 98a.); and in neuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix ta has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage etā, in अरो-दिन्य, might be a remnant, and this compound might mean, therefore, “She who arose, who sprang, from foam.” The only difficulty here is the short vowel of ēd for ω. As regards the Sanskrit, here also the s of the ablative may in most declensions rest on an exchange with an older t (cf. p. 184 G. ed. Note); and, as the Zend gives us every reason to expect Sanskrit ablatives like जिखवाय-ात, pritē-t, सिनो-t, bhavishyanty-āt, ātman-āt; so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms जिखवाय-ās, pritē-s, &c., where they have an ablative meaning, to the exchange of t with s, which is more or less in vogue according to the variety of dialects; particularly as it is known, also, that, vice versā, according to certain laws, स s passes into त t (Gramm. Crit. § 100.). Consequently the identity between the genitive and ablative, in most declensions, would be only external, and the two cases would vary in their history; so that, e.g. jihāy-ās would be, in one sense, viz. in that of lingua, independent and original; and in another, that of lingua, a corruption of jihāy-āt. At the time when Sanskrit and Zend were separated from one another, the retention of the original t must have been the prevailing inclination, and, together with it, may also its change into s have arisen, as the Zend also uses, at times, the genitive form with an ablative meaning (e.g. Vend. S. p. 177.).
principally confined to the consonantal bases,* and hence has the same relation to s that, in the accusative, am has to m, and, in the Zend ablative, at has to t.

185. Before the genitive sign भ s the [G. Ed. p. 218.] vowels ध i and ध u take Guna; and the Zend, and in a more limited degree, also the Lithuanian and Gothic, share this augment. All u bases, for example, in Lithuanian and Gothic, prefix an a to their final vowel: hence the Lithuanian sunuš-s and Gothic sunau-s correspond to the Sanskrit सूतोस sūnōs (filii) from sunaus (§. 2). In the i bases in Gothic, Guna is restricted to the feminines; thus anstai-s, "gratiae," answers to प्रतिस prite-s. Respecting Lithuanian genitives of i bases see §. 193. The High German has, from the earliest period, dropped the genitive sign in all feminines: in consonantal bases (§§. 125. 127.) the sign of the genitive is wanting in the other genders also.

186. The form which the Sanskrit genitive termination after consonants assumes, as it were of necessity (§. 94.), viz. as for s, has in Greek, in the form os, passed over also to the vowels ι and ι and diphthongs terminating in ι; and genitives like πορτει-ς, ἴχθευ-ς, which would be in accordance with §. 185. are unheard of; but πόρτι-ος, ἴχθυ-ος answer, like ποδ-ος, to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases, as पद-स, "pedis," वाचस vāch-as, "vocis." The Latin, on the other hand, answers more to the other sister languages, but is without Guna: so hosti-s is like the Gothic genitive gasti-s. In the u bases (fourth declension) the lengthening of the u may replace the Guna, or, more correctly, this class of words followed the Greek or consonantal principle, and the vowel dropped before s was compensated for by

* Besides this, it occurs only in monosyllabic bases in र ध, ख ध, ग न, त ध, and ध अ; e.g. राय-स, "rei," नाव-स, "navis:" and in neuters in र ध and ख न, which, by the assumption of an euphonic न n, assimilate to the consonantal declension in most cases.
lengthening the u. The S. C. de Bacch. gives the genitive
senatu-os in Grecian garb. Otherwise the termination is
of consonantal bases is better derived from the Sanskrit चस्र
[G. Ed. p. 219.] as than from the Greek ος, because the old
Sanskrit a in other places in Latin has been weakened to i,
as frequently happens in Gothic (§§. 66. 67.).

187. With regard to the senatu-os just mentioned, it is
important to remark, that, in Zend also, the u bases, in-
stead of annexing a simple s in the genitive, as दन्ह इनमोन manयेu-s, “of the spirit,” from mainyu, may, after the
manner of consonantal bases, add य श (from as, cf. p. 212,
G. Ed.), as दन्ह य odenh-ś, or दन्ह य odenhav-ś, for
danheu-ś “loci,” from दन्ह odenhu. This kind of genitive
occurs very frequently as a substitute for the locative, as
also for the ablative (Vend. S. p. 177), more rarely with a
genuine genitive meaning.*

188. Bases in य a, and pronouns of the third person, of
which only amu ends with a vowel other than a, have, in
Sanskrit, the more full genitive sign ह य य; hence, e. g.
वृक्ष यyrika-sya, “lupi,” तस्य ta-sya, “hujus,” &c.,खसुष amu-shyu,

* It might be assumed that as βασιλेयδος clearly stands for βασιλέαFος, 
βόδας for βοFός, νάδας for καFός, (§. 124.), so also ἀςτερος would stand for 
ἀςτεφος, and that ἀςτερος, therefore, should be compared with the Zend 
genitives with Guna, as दन्हाव-ś. The e, therefore, in 
ἀςτερος would not be a corrupted v of the base, but the Guna vowel foreign 
to the base; but the v of the base, which, according to the original law of 
sound, must become F before vowels, is, like all other digammas in the 
actual condition of the language, suppressed. The e is certainly a very 
heterogeneous vowel to the v, and the corruption of the latter to e, in 
the middle of a word, would be a greater violation of the old relations of sound 
than the rejection of a v sound between two vowels. The corruption 
of ɨ to ɛ is less surprising, and occurs also in Old High German (§. 72.).
In Greek, also, a consonant y is wanting, but cannot have been originally 
deficient; and therefore the question might be mooted whether also 
πολεως, σωάπες may not stand for pole-yōs, sinape-yos.
"illius," (§. 21.) In Zend this termination [G. Ed. p. 220.] appears in the form of hē, (§. 42.): hence, e. g. वैद्र्केन् विवेलकहे, "lupi," युनिमस् युनिमस् tूिर्येन्-हेः, "quarti," for tूिर्येन्-हेः.

189. In Greek and Latin we have already, in another place, pointed out a remnant of the genitive termination य्य sya, and, in fact, precisely in places where it might be most expected. As bases in य a correspond to the Greek bases in o, and as σ in Greek at the furthest extremity of words between two vowels is generally dislodged, I do not entertain the smallest doubt that the old epic genitive termination in io is an abbreviation of σιo; and that e. g. in τοio = तस्य ta-sya, the first o belongs to the base, and only io to the case-sign. As regards, however, the loss of the σ in τοio, the Greek Grammar supplies us with another σιo, where a Σ is lost, the necessary and original existence of which no one can doubt: एδिसσο, and the ancient position of the Σ in the second person, testify for एδिसσο instead of एδिसσο, as for एलेगεσσο instead of एलेगεσσ, just as the Indian तस्य ta-sya for το-σιo instead of τοio. In the common language the i, also, has been dropped after the σ, and the o of the termination, which has remained, has been contracted with that of the base to ou; hence τού from το-ο. The Homeric form άο (Boréaco, Aiveiaco) belongs likewise to this place, and stands for ά-ιο, and this for आ-σιo (§. 116.). The Latin has transposed our य्य sya to jus, with the change, which is so frequent, of the old a before the final s to u (cf. चुकस् विका-s, "lupu-s," युक्तम् yunjmas, jungimus); hence, hu-jus, cu-jus, e-jus, illius for illi-jus, &c. I cannot, however, believe that the i of the second declension is an abbreviation of oio, of which the i alone has been retained;* for it is clear that lupi and [G. Ed. p. 221.] lupœ from lupai rest on the same principle; and if lupi proceeds from लुकोio, whence can lupai be derived, as the corresponding Greek feminines nowhere exhibit an αιo or ηιo?

* Hartung's Cases, p. 211.
190. In Lithuanian the genitives of the a bases differ remarkably from those of the other declensions, and denote the case by o, in which vowel, at the same time, the final vowel of the base is contained; thus, *wilko*, "lupi," for *wilka*-s. It is probable that this o (ó) has arisen from a-s, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§. 56b.). In old Sclavonic, also, o occurs, answering to the Sanskrit as; and *nebo*, gen. *nebese*, corresponds to the Sanskrit नभस nabhas. That, however, the Lithuanian has left the syllable as in the nominative unaltered, but in the genitive has contracted it to o, may induce the remark, that like corruptions do not always find entrance in like places, if they have not raised themselves to a pervading law. In this manner, in Gothic, the old a has remained in the interrogative base *HVA* in the nominative (*hvas*), but in the genitive *hvi*-s the weakening to i has taken place; so that here, as in Lithuanian, only the more worthy powerful nominative has preserved the older more powerful form, and an unorganic difference has found its way into the two cases, which ought to be similar.

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

[G. Ed. p. 222.] answering to the Gothic *dagi*-s. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple s for case-sign; hence, *ahmin*-s, *fyand*-s, *bróthr*-s (§. 132.). The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an a, more lately an i, preceded this s—*ahmin-as, fyand-as, bróthr-as,—which, as in the nominative of the a bases (*vulf*-s for *vulfa*-s), has been suppressed. The Zend exhibits in the r roots an agreement with the Gothic, and forms, e. g. वल्य nar-s, "of
the man," not nar-ṛ, probably on account of the nature of the r bordering on that of a vowel, and of its facile combination with s.*

192. Feminines in Sanskrit have a fuller genitive termination in bases ending with a vowel, viz. ās for simple s (see §. 113.); and, in fact, so that the [G. Ed. p. 223.] short-ending bases in ṣ and ṭ may use at will either simple s or ās; and instead of prītās, tanwās, also prīta-ās, tanw-ās, occur. The long vowels ṣa ṛ, ṣa ṛ, ṣa ṛ, ṣa ṛ,† have always ās; hence, jihvāya-ās, bhavishyanta-ās, vadhāya-ās. This termination ās, is, in Zend, according to §. 56b., sounded ṣo; hence, hizvay-ṛo, hizvay-ṛo. In bases in ṣ and ṭ I have not met

* Hence I deduce the genitives drātar-ṛ, dhudhar-ṛ, which cannot be quoted—and the probability that the corresponding Sanskrit forms are properly hrātur, duhītur, which cannot be gleaned from the Sanskrit alone, on account of §. 11., and by reason of the elsewhere occurring euphonic interchange of s and r. śaṭtur, hrātur, and similar forms, would therefore stand for -urs, and this apparently for ars, through the influence of the liquids; and, according to §. 94., they would have lost the genitive sign. The same is the case with the numeral adverb chatur, "four times," for chaur, chaur, for which the Zend, by transposing the r, gives chathrus (§. 44.). The Indian Grammarians also, in the genitives under discussion, assume the absence of the genitive sign (Laghū-Kaumudi, p. 85). As, however, the Visarga, in kroṣṭhā (from the theme kroṣṭar kroṣṭa or kroṣṭra kroṣṭa, see §. 1.), may evidently stand as well for s as for r; so in such doubtful cases it is of no consequence to which side the Indian Grammarians incline, where arguments are not found in the Sanskrit itself, or in the cognate languages, which either confirm or refute their statements. And it is impossible, if the Visarga, in bhṛtah, stands for r, that the preceding u can be a transposition of the final letter of the base (bhṛt), for this cannot be both retained in the form of r, and yet changed into u (cf. Colebrook, p. 55, Rem.)

† Only the few monosyllabic words make an exception. (Gramm. Crit. §. 130.)
with this termination; together with ἀνεύοντες afrītôi-s ἀνεύονται tanuv-s, or ἀνεύοντας tanav-δ, ἀνεύοντας tanav-δ, I find no ἄφθονο / afrîth-άντα, ἄμφοτερα tanuv-άντα. The cognate European languages exhibit no stronger termination in the feminine than in the masculine and neuter; the Gothic, however, shews a disposition to greater fulness in the feminine genitive, inasmuch as the δ bases preserve this vowel in contradistinction to the nominative and accusative; but the ι bases, as has been shewn above, attach Guna to this vowel, while the masculines do not strengthen it at all. Compare gibó-s with the uninflected and base-abbreviated nominative and accusative giba, and anstai-s with gasti-s. Respecting the pronominal and adjective genitives, as thi-ζ6-s, blindai-zô-s, see § 172. The Greek, also, in its feminine first declension preserves the original vowel length in words which have weakened the nominative and accusative—σφύρας, Μοῦσης, [G. Ed. p. 224.] opposed to σφύρα, σφύρα-ν, μοῦσαν.* In Latin, also, ā-s, with the original length of the base escās, terrās, &c. stands opposed to escā, escā-m. It cannot be supposed that these genitives are borrowed from the Greek; they are exactly what might be expected to belong to a language that has s for the genitive character. That, however, this form, which no doubt extended originally to all a bases, gradually disappeared, leaving nothing but a few remains, and that the language availed itself of other helps, is in accordance with the usual fate of languages which continually lose more and more of their old hereditary possessions.

193. The Lithuanian, in its genitive rank-άς for rankâ-ς,

* The Attic termination ως is, perhaps, a perfect transmission of the Sanskrit झास तास; so that forms like πόλε-ως answer to प्रत्यास prity-άς. Although the Greek ως is not limited to the feminine, it is nevertheless excluded from the neuter (ἄστεος), and the preponderating number of a bases are feminine.
resembles the Gothic; and in some other cases, also, replaces the feminine ā by a long or short o. It is doubtful how the genitives of i bases, like awēs, are to be regarded. As they are, for the most part, feminine, and the few masculines may have followed the analogy of the prevailing gender, the division awī-ēs might be made; and this might be derived, through the assimilative force of the i, from awī-ēs (cf. p. 174, note *), which would answer to the Sanskrit genitives like प्रिस्मात्र prīty-ās. If, however, it be compared with प्रत्तस prītēs, and the e of awēs be looked upon as Guna of the i (§. 26.), then the reading awīs for awēs is objectionable. Ruhig, indeed, in his Glossary, frequently leaves out the i, and gives ुग्नेस, “of the fire,” for ुग्नीतेस; but in other cases, also, an i is suppressed before the e generated by its influence (p. 174, note *); and, e.g., all feminine bases in yā have, in the genitive, ēs for i-ēs or y-ēs, as giesē-s, for giesmyēs, from GIESMYĀ (see p. 169, note). Therefore the division awiē-s might also be made, and it might be assumed that the i bases have, in some cases, experienced an extension of the base, similar to those which were explained in the note, p. 174 (cf. §. 120.). This view appears to me the most correct, especially as in the vocative, also, awiē answers to giesme for giesmyē, or giesmie.

194. As regards the origin of the form through which, in the genitive, the thing designated is personified, with the secondary notion of the relation of space, the language in this case returns back to the same pronoun, whence, in §. 134., the nominative was derived. And there is a pronoun for the fuller termination also, viz. त्या sya, which occurs only in the Vēdas (cf. §. 55.), and the s of which is replaced in the oblique cases likewise, as in the neuter, by t (Gramm. Crit. §. 268.); so that त्या sya stands in the same relation to त्या tya-m and त्या tya-t that त sá does to तम ta-m, तह ta-t. It is evident, therefore, that in त्या sya, त्या tya, the bases त sá, त ta, are contained, with the vowel suppressed and united
with the relative base r ya. Here follows a general view of the genitive formation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>LITHUAN.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika-sya,</td>
<td>vēhrku-hē,</td>
<td>λικό-io,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>vilkō,</td>
<td>wulfī-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ka-sya,</td>
<td>ka-hē,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>cu-jus,</td>
<td>kō,</td>
<td>hvi-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jhovāy-ās,</td>
<td>hizvav-āo,</td>
<td>χωρᾶ-s,</td>
<td>terrū-s,</td>
<td>rankō-s,</td>
<td>gibu-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. patē-s,</td>
<td>patōi-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>hosti-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>† gusti-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prātē-s,</td>
<td>āfrāi-si,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>siti-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>† anstäi-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prit-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>φύσε-ως,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyatdy-ās,</td>
<td>būshyainty-āo,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānō-s,</td>
<td>paēu-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>sunau-s,</td>
<td>sunau-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. go-s,</td>
<td>geu-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>bov-is,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. nās-as,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-as,</td>
<td>vāch-ō,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-as,</td>
<td>barēnt-ō,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>† syand-is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman-as,</td>
<td>aśman-ō,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāmn-as,</td>
<td>nāman-ō,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The meanings will be found in § 148.
† See § 193.
‡ See p. 163. Note †.
§ And ṣava[ṃ] baratō also may occur, according to the analogy of ṣava[ṃ] bērēzatō, “splendentis,” V. S. p. 87, and passim. The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted. For ṣava[ṃ] barēntō, also ṣava[ṃ] barantō, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older as a for e e. In some participles, as in aṣv[ṃ] s[ṃ]uṃ feniyanē (nom.), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture (aṣv[ṃ]s[ṃ] naiī vāistrya) e e never occurs.

† Vide §. 254. p. 302, Note †.
### THE LOCATIVE.

195. This case has, in Sanskrit and Zend, for its character, and in Greek and Latin has received the function of the dative, yet has not suffered its locative [G. Ed. p. 227.] signification to be lost; hence, \( \Delta \omega \delta \omega \nu, \) \( \Sigma \alpha \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \nu, \) \( \alpha \gamma \rho \omicron, \) \( \chi \alpha \mu \alpha i; \) and, transferred to time, \( \tau \gamma \alpha \tau \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \eta. \) So in Sanskrit, \( \text{विक्रमं विक्रमं} \), “in the day;” लिंगि niti, “in the night.”

196. With \( \varphi \alpha \) of the base preceding it, the locative \( \varphi \iota \) passes into \( \varphi \varepsilon (\S. 2.), \) exactly as in Zend; but here, also, \( \psi \delta i \) stands for \( \varphi \varepsilon \) (\S. 33.;) so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives like \( \omicron \kappa \iota \omicron, \) \( \mu \iota \iota, \) and \( \sigma \iota, \) in which \( i \) has not yet become subscribed, or been replaced by the extinction of the base vowel. To the forms mentioned answers \( \text{मैथीयोत} \) maidhyot, “in the middle.” One must be careful not to regard this and similar phenomena as shewing a more intimate connexion between Greek and Zend.

197. In Lithuanian, which language possesses a proper locative, bases in \( \alpha \) correspond in this case in a remarkable manner with the Sanskrit and Zend, since they con-

# Table: Locative Singular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrdtur,</td>
<td>brdrar-s</td>
<td>παραρ-ος,</td>
<td>fratr-is,</td>
<td>. . . . brdr-th-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitur,</td>
<td>dughdar-s</td>
<td>θυγαρ-ος,</td>
<td>mattr-is,</td>
<td>dugter-s, dauhr-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dátur,</td>
<td>dátar-s,</td>
<td>δοτήρ-ος,</td>
<td>dator-is,</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-as,</td>
<td>vachanh-6</td>
<td>ἐπε(σ)-ος,</td>
<td>oper-is,</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It would be better to read brāthr-6, after the analogy of dāthr-6, “creatoris.” (Burnouf, "Yaṣna," p. 363, Note).

† The gen. of dughdar is probably dughdēr-6 (see p. 194, Note †).

‡ See p. 163, Note ‡.

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

‖ I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskrit dative, rather than to the locative; see p. 1227 G. Ed., Note †.
tract this $a$ with the old locative $i$, which appears pure nowhere any more, to $e$; hence, $diewe$, "in God," from $DIEWA$, answers to $dew$ $dew$, $dak$v. The bases which terminate with other vowels employ, however, in Lithuanian, without exception, $y$ as the locative termination, without any accent upon the $e$, a circumstance which must not be overlooked. This $e$ is, perhaps, only an unorganic echo, which has occasioned the change of the old locative $i$ into $y$, as, in Zend, the plural locative termination $su$, by adding an $a$, appears, for the most part, in the form of $\text{w}$

[G. Ed. p. 228.] shva, or $\text{w}$ hva. To the Lithuanian $y$ answers also, in old Sclavonic, a locative termination $y$, for which several declensions have the original pure $i$; so that $nebes-i$, "in Heaven," and $imen-i$, "in the name," agree most strictly with the Sanskrit $\text{nas}$$\text{is}$ $nabhas-i$ and नामन $nāman-i$, from जनसम nabhas, नामन nāman.

198. Masculine bases in $i$ and $u$, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, viz. $\text{ki} du$, before which $i$ and $u$ are dropped; but in $\text{pati}$, "lord," and $\text{sa}khi$, "friend," the $i$ has remained in its euphonic change to $y$: hence, $\text{pati}$ $\text{paty-du}$, चक्षू $\text{sakhy-du}$. If we consider the vocalization of the $s$ to $u$, shewn in §. 56b., and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, $\text{ki} du$ has proceeded from जा $ds$ (§. 206.); moreover, the circumstance that in the Vèdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायनक $dak\text{sh}in\text{dy}a$s, "in dexterâ," for $dak\text{sh}in\text{dy}a$m, Pāṇini VII. 1. 39.) and, finally, the fact that, in Zend, masculines in $i$ and $u$ likewise employ genitive terminations with a locative signification; we shall be much disposed to recognise in this $\text{ki} du$, from जास $ds$, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199. In $u$ bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination $\text{eu}$ $\delta$ (from जस $as$), while, in a genitive meaning, the form $\text{eu}$ $\text{eu}$-s is more common; thus we read, in the Vend. S. p. 337., अतिह $ak\text{hmi}$ anhvo yat astvanti, "in
LOCATIVE SINGULAR.

This Zend termination $\delta$ (from $a + u$) has the same relation to the Sanskrit $du$ that a short $a$ has to a long $a$, and the two locative terminations are distinguished only by the quantity of the first member of the diphthong. On the other hand, we find in the feminine base $\text{Jam} tanu$, “body,” very often the genuine locative form $\text{Jam} tan-i$; and we do not doubt that, in Sanskrit also, originally the $u$ bases of the three genders admitted in the locative the termination $i$ ($\text{San} sun-i$, तःन्तर tan-w-i, मध्य madh-w-i, or मध्य munadhu-n-i). Bases in ज employ, in the locative, the usual genitive termination $\text{di}$-$s$; thus, in the Vend. S. p. 234, यमंद्रम नामंद यात् मादियायिदस, “in hac terra quidem maxdayasnica, which Anquetil renders by “dans le pays des mazde'iesnans.” In pronouns, also, though they have a locative, the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning; e.g. Vend. S. p. 46, यमंद्रम नामंद यात् मादियायिदस, “in this way,” or “place,” (cf. the feminine form मादियायिदस ainhâo, § 172. Note.).

200. From the Zend and Sanskrit we have already been compelled to acknowledge a connexion between the genitive and locative; and as we have seen the locative replaced by the genitive, so must we, in Latin, recognise a replacing of the genitive by the locative. Through the formal agreement of the corresponding Latin and Sanskrit termination, and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (Rōme, Corinthi, humi), not in the third or in the plural (ruri not ruris), M. Prof. Rosen was first induced to characterize the Latin genitive of the two first declensions as borrowed from the old locative; a view, the correctness of which I do not doubt, and which I have already corroborated elsewhere by the genitives of the two first persons, in which mei $tui$, agree most surprisingly with मय $mayi$ (from मेय i, § 2.), “in me,” तव $twai$ (from $t\text{vo}$-$i$). Or ought, perhaps, a double inflexion $i$ to be assumed as the sign of both a genitive and
a locative dative? Should *Romae* (from *Romai*), *Corinthi*, be on one occasion genitives and on another locatives, and

[G. Ed. p. 230.] in their different meaning be also of different origin? And where, then, would the origin of the genitive *Romae* be found, as that of the locative has been found already? Should *mei, tui, be compared, not with सूप mayi, तथि twayi, μοι, τοί, but with सम mama, तव tava, μοι, τεοι, Goth. meina, theina? As the cases, like their substitutes the prepositions, pass easily from one relation of space to another, and, to use the expression, the highest become the lowest, nothing appears to me more probable, than that, after the first declension had lost its ॐ-s, then the dative, according to its origin a locative, necessarily became substituted for the genitive also.* In the second declension the form o-i, which belongs to the dative locative, corresponding to the Greek ω, or—and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as *populo Romano*)—has become doubly altered: either the vowel of the base alone, or only that

[G. Ed. p. 231.] of the termination, has been left, and the first form has fixed itself in the dative, and the latter in the

* The assumption that a rejected s lies at the base of the genitives in i, ae (a-r) appears to me inadmissible, because in all other parts of Grammar—numerous as the forms with a final s otherwise are—this letter has in Roman defied all the assaults of time, and appears everywhere where the cognate languages lead us to expect it: no *terrae* for *terras* (acc. pl.), no *lupi* for *lupos*, no *ama* for *amas*, &c. The question is not here that of an occasional suppression of the s in old poets, before a consonant in the word following. The genitives in e-s and a-s occurring in inscriptions (*provincie-s, sue-s*, see Struve, p. 7.) appear to be different modes of writing one and the same form, which corresponds to the Greek η-s for ॐ-s; and I would not therefore derive the common genitive *suae*—older form *suai*—from *suas* with the s dropped. The genitives in *us*, given by Hartung (p. 161.) from inscriptions in Orelli (*nomin-us, exercitio-us, Castor-us*, &c.), I am not surprised at, for this reason, that generally *us* is, in Latin, a favourite termination for खस as; hence *nomin-us* has the same relation to नाम्न नामन-स, that *nomin-i*-*bus* has to नामभ्यस नामु-भ्यास, and *lupus* to वृक्ष वृक्ष वृक्ष.
genitive, which is therefore similar to the nom. plural, where, in like manner, Romani stands for RomanoI. But the dative is not universally represented in Latin by a locative termination; for in the pronouns of the two first persons mihi answers to मझम् ma-hyam, from ma-bhyam, and tibi to तुभ्यम् tu-bhyam; as, however, the league between the dative and locative had been once concluded, this truly dative termination occurs with a locative meaning (ibi, ubi), while vice versa, in Sanskrit, the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative, which latter, however, is most usually expressed by the genitive, so that the proper dative is, for the most part, applied to denote the causal relation.

201. Pronouns of the 3d person have, in Sanskrit, इन in instead of i in the locative, and the ज a of the appended pronoun स ma is elided (see §. 165.); hence, तस्मि in, “in him”; कस्मि kasm’in, “in whom?” This न, which seems to me to be of later origin, as it were an ἐφελκυστικόν, does not extend to the two first persons, and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third; hence, अम ahmi, “in this.” As to the origin of the i signifying the place or time of continuance, it is easily discovered as soon as it is found as the root of a demonstrative; which, however, like the true form of all other pronominal roots, has escaped the Indian Grammarians.

202. Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have, in Sanskrit, a peculiar locative termination; viz. आम आम, in which, also, the feminines in short i and u may at will participate (cf. §. 192.); while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long इ i and आ u, for आम आम, admit also the common इ i; hence, भिया bhiy-आम or भिय bhiy-i, “in fear,” from भि bhī.* In Zend this termination [G. Ed. p. 232.]

---

* Perhaps the termination आम is a corruption of the feminine genitive termination आ (cf. §. 198. दक्षिणायाम dakṣiṇāyām for dakṣiṇāyām), where it should be observed that in Prākrit, as in Greek, a final s has frequently become a nasal.
nation ḍm has become abbreviated to a (cf. § 214.); hence, yahmy-a, "in which," from yahmi (cf. § 172.). This termination appears, however, in Zend, to be less diffused than in Sanskrit, and not to be applicable to feminines in /sweetalert/t and ṣu. The form tanwi is clearly more genuine than the Sanskrit tanṭu, although from the earliest period, also, tanvām may have existed.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikey,*</td>
<td>vēhrkey,*</td>
<td>λυκε,</td>
<td>lup-ė,</td>
<td>wilke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwāy-ām,</td>
<td>hizwāy-a,</td>
<td>χωρε,</td>
<td>terra-i,</td>
<td>ranko-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-āu,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>πότι-i,</td>
<td>host-i,</td>
<td>pāti-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prā-āu,‡</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>πόρτε-i,</td>
<td>sīl-ė,</td>
<td>awi-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyanty-ām,</td>
<td>būshyainty-a,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sān-āu,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>iχθε-i,</td>
<td>pecu-ė,</td>
<td>sunu-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tan-āu,§</td>
<td>tanv-i,</td>
<td>πίτε-i,</td>
<td>socru-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu-n-i,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>μέθυ-i,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhwa-ām,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f.gav-ī,</td>
<td>gav-i,</td>
<td>βο(F)-i,</td>
<td>bov-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nār-ī,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>νά(F)-i,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-ī,</td>
<td>barēnt-ī,</td>
<td>φεροντ-ι,</td>
<td>ferent-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman-ī,</td>
<td>asmān-ī,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ι,</td>
<td>sermon-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nām-n-ī,</td>
<td>nāmān-ī,</td>
<td>τάλαν-ι,</td>
<td>nomin-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātar-ī,</td>
<td>bhrāthr-ī?</td>
<td>πατρ-ī,</td>
<td>frayt-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duḥitar-ī,</td>
<td>dughdhr-ī?</td>
<td>θυγατρ-ī,</td>
<td>matr-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātar-ī,</td>
<td>dāthr-ī?</td>
<td>δοτρ-ī,</td>
<td>datōr-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-ī,</td>
<td>vacas̄h-ī,</td>
<td>ὀπε(σ)-i,</td>
<td>oper-ė,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See § 196. † See § 188. ‡ Or prāty-ām. § Or tanw-ām.

|| The rejection of the a preceding the r in the theme seems to me more probable than its retention. The i of the termination is guaranteed by the other consonantal declension, which in this case we can abundantly enough exemplify. (Regarding dughdhr-ī, see p. 194, Note †). That in Sanskrit bhṛatar-ī, duḥitar-ī, dātar-ī, are used instead of bhṛātri, &c. is contrary to
VOCATIVE SINGULAR.

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

205. Bases in i and u have, in Sanskrit, Guna; neuters, however, have also the pure vowel: on the other hand, 

to the theory of the weakest cases (§. 130.), to which in other respects the locative belongs. As, however, bases in चर ar (चू त्र), with respect to the rejection and lengthening of the a, have a very great agreement with bases in an, it must here be further remarked, that these too, in the locative, do not strictly follow the suppression of the a in the weakest cases, which is conditionally prescribed in §. 140., but optionally retain the a, or reject it; so that with नामन-ि also नामान-ि is used. With ब्रातार-ि, however, exists no bhrātr-ि, and the form pitr-ि, given at §. 132. is an oversight: the Greek πάρπ-ि may therefore, with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative pītr-े.
polysyllabic feminines in \(i\) and \(u\) shorten this final vowel; while a final \(\ddot{a}\) \(i\), by the commixture of an \(i\), becomes \(\ddot{e}\) (§. 2.). The language, however, both by producing and shortening the final vowel, clearly aims at one and the same end, only by opposite ways; and this end, in fact, is a certain emphasis in the address. To the Guna form \(\ddot{a}\) \(i\), from \(a+u\), correspond remarkably the Gothic and Lithuanian; as *sunau, sunaul*, resembling the Sanskrit *sûnā*. Gothic feminine bases in \(i\) do not occur in [G. Ed. p. 235.] Ulfilas in the vocative: as, however, they, in other respects, run parallel to the \(u\) bases, the vocative *anstai*, from *ANSTI*, might be expected as an analogous form to *handau*. The Lithuanian \(i\) bases in the vocative extend their theme in the same manner as in the genitive (§. 193.); so that, properly, there is no vocative of this class of words, and *awie* answers to *zvâke, giesme* (Ruhig's third declension), for *zvâkie, giesmye*.† Masculine bases, in Gothic, in \(i\), like the masculine and neuter \(a\) bases, have lost their final vowel in the vocative, just as in the accusative and nominative; hence *vulf', dawr', gast'. In bases in *n* the Gothic shares with the Latin the suppression of the final consonant, which has passed over from the nominative to the vocative; while only the Sanskrit and Zend again introduce

* The Zend can at will attach Guna to a final \(> u\), or not; and we find both \(mainyo\) and \(mainyu\) as the vocative of \(mainyu\), "spirit." On the other hand, we have found a final \(s\) \(i:\) only, without Guna; and indeed frequently \(paiti\), "lord." So Vend S. p. 456, \(usihista namând-paiti\), "Arise, lord of the place!" The \(s\) \(i\) between the preposition and the verb serves as a conjunctive vowel, to assist the juncture of the words (cf. §. 150. Note).

† It follows from this, and from §. 193., that (§. 177.) I have incorrectly assumed *ei* as the termination in the dative. For *awī-ei*, the division should be made thus, *awie-i*; and this is analogous with *zvāke-i, giesme-i*, for *zvākie-i, giesmye-i*. 
into the vocative the nasal which had been dropped in the nominative. Adjectives in German, with respect to the vocative, have departed from the old path, and retain the case-sign of the nominative; hence Gothic blind's, "blind!" In Old Northern, substantives also follow this irregular use of the nominative sign. The Greek has preserved a tolerable number of its vocatives pure from the nominative sign, and in some classes of words uses the bare base, or that abbreviation of it which the laws of euphony or effeminacy rendered requisite; hence, τάλαν opposed to τάλας, χαρίενν for χαρίεντι opposed to χαρίεις, παί for παιδ opposed to παις. In guttural and labial bases the language has not got free of the nominative sign in the vocative, because κς and πς (ξ, ψ) are very favourite combinations, to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the [G. Ed. p. 236.] vocative ἀνα, together with ἀναξ, is remarkable, and has that sound which might be expected from a theme ἀνακτ', to which, in its uninflected state, neither κτ, nor, conveniently, even the κ, could be left. "For the rest it is easy to imagine (says Buttmann, p. 180), that particularly such things as are not usually addressed, prefer, when they happen to be addressed, to retain the form of the nominative, as ὁ ποῦς!"* The Latin has followed still farther the road of corruption in the vocative which was prepared by the Greek, and employs in its place the nominative universally, except in the masculine second declension. The substantive bases mentioned in §. 148. form, in the vocative,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika,</td>
<td>vēhrka,</td>
<td>ὁψκ,</td>
<td>lupe,</td>
<td>wilke,</td>
<td>vulf'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dāna,</td>
<td>dāta,</td>
<td>ὅρο-ν,</td>
<td>donu-m,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>dour'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvē,</td>
<td>hizvē?</td>
<td>χώρα,</td>
<td>terra,</td>
<td>ranka,</td>
<td>giba?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. patē,</td>
<td>paiťi,</td>
<td>ποσί,</td>
<td>hosti-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>gast'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prūtē,</td>
<td>dfrūti,</td>
<td>πόρτι,</td>
<td>sili-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vāri,</td>
<td>vairi,</td>
<td>ἰδρι,</td>
<td>mare,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavidhyanti,</td>
<td>bōshyainti,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sunō,</td>
<td>pašu,</td>
<td>ῥθό,</td>
<td>pecu-s,</td>
<td>sunau,</td>
<td>sunau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanō,</td>
<td>tanu,</td>
<td>πίτυ,</td>
<td>socru-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>handau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. madhu,</td>
<td>madhu,</td>
<td>μέθυ,</td>
<td>pecu,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadh,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gōu-s,</td>
<td>gōu-s,</td>
<td>βού,</td>
<td>bo-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāu-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>ναύ,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāk,</td>
<td>vāc-s?</td>
<td>ὅς-ς,</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharan,</td>
<td>baran-s,</td>
<td>φέρων,</td>
<td>feren-s,</td>
<td>sukau-s,</td>
<td>sīyand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman,</td>
<td>āśman,</td>
<td>δαίμον,</td>
<td>sermo,</td>
<td>ὀκμῆ,</td>
<td>ahma'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāman,</td>
<td>nāman,</td>
<td>τάλαν,</td>
<td>nomen,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>namō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātar,</td>
<td>brātare*</td>
<td>πάτερ,</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>brūthar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitār,</td>
<td>dughdarē, *</td>
<td>τύγατερ,</td>
<td>mater,</td>
<td>motē,</td>
<td>dauhtar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātār,</td>
<td>dūtare*,</td>
<td>δυτήρ,</td>
<td>datōr,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas,</td>
<td>vachō,</td>
<td>ἐπος,</td>
<td>ὀπος,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DUAL.

#### NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.

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

* See §. 44.
† See §. 128.
plural, and needs, therefore, stronger emphasis, and more lively personification. Compare, also, in the neuter, the long \( i \) of the dual with the short \( i \) of the plural; as \( अश्रु \) अश्रु with \( अश्रुनि \) अश्रुनि.

207. While the Prakrit and Pali have lost the dual, the Zend has retained it; still, however, so that instead of it the plural often occurs, and in the Vend. S., p. 203, लक्ष्यते तु अडो शेषु यायांसिद्धिः "and as far as the knees," is used with a plural termination. In the verb the dual is still more rare; but here, however, it is not entirely lost, and many examples of it can be quoted in the V. S.* The Sanskrit termination ची अू occurs in the corresponding places in Zend in the form of दू आू, which, according to §. 56\(^b\)., stands at the same time for the Sanskrit termination चास दू, and gives an emphatic proof that the Sanskrit dual termination ची अू is nothing else than a corruption of चास दू, and, in fact, an occasional one which appears in grammar only once or twice (see §. 198.), while the example herein given by the Sanskrit has been raised to a general principle by the Zend. This principle becomes almost irrefragable matter of fact from the consideration that the Zend has even actually retained, in the dual, the sibilant before the particle अू चा, and uses दू-चा, not दू-चा, as might have been expected if the dual termination ची अू, in Sanskrit, were the original form, and not a corruption of चास दू. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 225, अपूर्बस्यदेववस्य अपूर्वस्यदेववस्य व दू तो उबे हव्यदू-चा अमर्दत-दू-चा, "the two Haurvats and Amertats."† What Anquetil, in his Voca-[G. Ed. p. 239.]

---


† Cf. Anquetil II. 175. The two Genii, which Anquetil writes Khor-dad and Amerdad, appear very frequently in the dual, also with the termination bya (§. 212.); and where they occur with plural terminations, this may be ascribed to the disuse of the dual, and the possibility of replacing
bulary (p. 456), writes naerekeiao, and renders by "deux femmes," can be nothing else than नारिकाय-दो, from the base नारिका nārikā. The form नारिकाय-दो is, however, evidently more genuine than नारिका; as, according to the Sanskrit principle (§. 213.), from a feminine base must have been formed nārikā. From नारिका दो, Rask cites the form नारिकाय दो, "arms," without remarking that it is a dual: it clearly belongs, however, to this number, which was to be expected referring to the arms; and नारिका दो forms, in the nominative plural, नारिकाय दो or नारिकाय दो. Still, in the edited parts of the Zend-Avesta, examples are wanting of नारिकाय दो, regarding the genuineness of which, however, I have no doubt.

208. In the Vēda dialect, the termination शी दु occurs frequently abbreviated to श, so that the last element of the diphthong is suppressed. Several examples of this abbreviated form occur in Rosen's "Specimen"; as, चिब्बन एविन-श, "the two Aswins," from एविन, and नर नार्द, "two

replacing the dual in all cases by the plural. Thus we read, l. c. p. 211, हाँरवात-श and एमरेट-व-चा as accusative, and with the fullest and perhaps sole correct reading of the theme. We will, however, not dwell on this point any longer here, but only remark, that हाँरवात is very frequently abbreviated to हाँरव, and the श of एमरेट-श is often found shortened; whence, p. 104, हाँरवात श्या, हांरवात श्या amेरेतात्या, (see §. 38.); हांरवात श्या amेरेतात्या श्या is a palpable error. Undoubtedly, in the passage before us, for हाँरवात, must be read either हाँरवात-o-श, or हाँरवात-o-श, or हाँरवात-o-श. Compare l. c. p. 91, हांरवात-o-श, हांरवात-o-श, हांरवात-o-श with the termination नारिका दो for नारिका दो (cf. §. 33.), but incorrectly श for श. The two twin genii are feminine, and mean apparently, "Entireness" and "Immortality." The forms preceding them, therefore, तोि and उबेि are likewise feminine; the former for ती त्य (§. 33.), the latter for उबेि (cf. §. 28.). We must also regard the dual form mentioned at §. 45. of the so-called Amschaspants not as neuter, but as feminine.
(नरि) and from नारा, but which more probably comes from नर. In Zend the abbreviated termination from दु is likewise employed, and, in fact, more copiously than the fuller termination; and we rejoice to see, in the Heaven of Ormuzd also, the twin pair called Indian, and celebrated for their youthful beauty. We read, namely, in Vend. S. p. 313, नाराम् aspinā-cha yavanām yaz (maidhe), “Aśvinosque juvenes veneramur,” which Anquetil renders by “je fais Jezeschné à l’excellens toujours (subsistant”).

The Sanskrit अस्विना aśvinā however, can, in Zend, give nothing but aspīnā or aspīna (§. 50.): the former we owe here to the protecting particle चं cha (see p. 175, Note † G. Ed.). The plural yavan- dh (from yavanās), referring to the dual aspīnā, is worthy of remark, however (if the reading be correct), as it furnishes a new proof that, in the received condition of the Zend, the dual was near being lost: the verb being, for the most part, found in the plural when referring to nouns in the dual form.

209. From the Vēda termination अ, and the short अ, which frequently stands for it in Zend, the transition is easy to the Greek ε, as this vowel, at the end of words, is a favourite representative of the old अ; and, as above, in the vocative (§. 204.), लुके stood for वृक्क vrika, auba vēhrka, so here, also, अवर (with euphonic द) corresponds to the above-mentioned Vēda नरा nara, and Zend मह्य nara- a. Although, according to §. 4., ओ also very frequently stands for आ अ, still we must avoid regarding लुकव as the analogous form to वृक्क vrikā, or auba vēhrkā (see §. 211.). That however, the Lithuanian dual उ of masculine [G. Ed. p. 241.] bases in अ (in the nominative) is connected with the Vēda and Zend dual termination spoken of, i.e. has proceeded from अ, I

have the less doubt, because in the other declensions the Lithuanian dual also agrees in this case most strictly with the Sanskrit, and the Lithuanian u or ū (uo) is, in some other places, equally the representative of an old ā (see §. 162.), compare, dūmi, or dūdu, "I give," with dādāmi; dāsu, "I will give," with dāsya-dāmi. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in a sound in the dual ū; thus tū = τā tā, kū = kā. We hold, therefore, the Vēda form व्रिक्तः व्रिक्तः the Zend वेरक्तः vērkā, and the Lithuanian wilkū, as identical in principle: we are, at least, much more inclined to this view of the matter than to the assumption that the ū of wilkū is the last portion of the Sanskrit diphthong ची दु, and that wilkū belongs to the form व्रिक्तः व्रिक्तः. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter ū, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable: thus wilku, opposed to wilkū, in which respect may be compared πάτερ opposed to πατηρ, and §. 205.

210. Masculine and feminine bases in i and u suppress, in Sanskrit, the dual case termination ची दु, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form; thus, पति pati, from पति pati; सुनु sūnu, from सूनु sūnu. The वृक्ष बाद्रे, "arms," (from bādu) mentioned in §. 207., is advantageously distinguished from these abbreviated forms. The curtailed form is not, however, wanting in Zend also, and is even the one most in use. From एरेजु माइनु, "spirit," we frequently find the dual एरेजु माइनु: on the other hand, for एरेजु माइनु, "two fingers," we meet with the shortened form एरेजु, which is identical with the theme (Vend. S. p. 318). एरेजु dvo ērēzu.

211. The Lithuanian, in its i and u bases, rests on the above-mentioned Sanskrit principle of the suppression of the termination and lengthening of the final vowel: hence, avī, "two sheep" (fem.), answers to चवरि avī, from चवरि avī; and sunū, "two sons," to सूनु sūnu. On this principle rests
also the Greek dual of the two first declensions. If it be not desired entirely to remove the ω of ἀύκω from a Grecian soil, and banish it completely to India, it may be allowed to seek its origin, not in the long α of वृक्षा व्रिका, but in the short ο of the base, as the first declension has a long α in the dual, because its bases terminate with α, although in the common dialect this letter is very frequently represented by η. Or may it, perhaps, have happened, that, in the dual α of the first declension an ι subscribed has been lost, and thus τά for τα would correspond to the Sanskrit ते τे (from ताद + ι or ι)? Be that as it may, still the dual has always the quality α, because it is comprehended in the base, and the ω of λύκω may be regarded as merely the lengthening of the ο of λύκο; for it must be assumed, that if the Sanskrit α bases had preserved the short α in Greek, and वृक्षा व्रिका-ς had become λύκα-ς, then the dual too would be λύκα, and not λύκω.

212. Neuters have, in the Sanskrit dual, for the termination of the cases under discussion, not ते दु, but ते, as in the plural they have not as but short ι (ς). A final ι of the base with this ई ι passes into ए ι (§. 2.); hence, शते साते, “two hundred,” from शतैं सातैं; [G. Ed. p. 243.] other vowels interpose a euphonic μ; hence, तत्तुनी तुहु-ν-ι, “two palates.” In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in the ι bases; as, for example, we frequently find दुय्ये दुईए sātē (§. 41.), answering to the Sanskrit शते sātē; and दुय्ये दुईए dwyē hazānē, “two thousand,” (§. 43.) for हे सहस्रे dwe sahasrē.

213. The Greek has renounced a termination distinguishing the neuter from the two natural genders; but the Sanskrit appears to have extended the neuter ι mentioned above also to the feminine त bases. But the coincidence of the feminine form दुईए jihwē, “two tongues,” from जिहा jihwā, with the neuter दुईए dānē, “two gifts,” is, as the Zend instructs us, only external, and the two forms
meet in quite different ways, and have such a relation to one another, that in dāně, from dāna + ē, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained; but in जिहुवे the masculine-feminine termination ēu (from ēs, § 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form अन्य्रिकाय-डो, "two women." I believe, that is to say, that जिहुवे has arisen or been corrupted from जिहय-डु in such a manner, that after the termination has been dropped, the preceding semi-vowel has returned to its vowel nature, and has become a diphthong with the ē of the base (see § 2. and cf. p. 121 G. ed.). The dual jihwē, therefore, like the Gothic singular dative gibai (§ 161.) would have only an apparent termination, i.e. an extension of the base which originally accompanied the real case termination. In Zend, however, the abbreviated feminine dual form in रा is likewise occurs (§. 207. Note†) and is, indeed, the prevalent one; but it is

[G. Ed. p. 244.] remarkable, and a fair and powerful confirmation of my assertion, that even this abbreviated form in रा, where the appended particle य-चा stands beside it, has preserved the case sign ś; and, as above, अमेरेतत-डोस-चा, "the two Amertats," so we find, Vend. S. p. 58, अर्य-म्य अमेषेस-चा ॲपेन्त, "and two Amshaspants" ("non-conniventesque sanctos," cf. आय्य आमिषा and Nalus V. 25, 26. and see §. 50.).†

The form रा is to be deduced from the full form अमेरेतत अमेशेस- अय-डोस; so that, after dropping the गृह do, the preceding ay must have been contracted to ē, just as (p. 121

* Cf. the dual genitive and locative जिहय-डु.
† The MS. has here अमेरेतत अमेशेस-चा, but च frequently occurs in the place of रा, although, as it appears, through an error. Cf. l. c. p. 88, अर्य-म्य अमेषेस अय-डोस अमेषेस- अपेन्त; and see §. 51.
G. Ed.) in Prakrit, रूमि ēmi has arisen from the Sanskrit क्यामि ayāmi, by rejecting the ē. We may support the derivation of जिह्वे jihwē from जिह्वय-āu, by this circumstance, also, that in the Vēda dialect the feminine i bases may lose the dual termination āu, and then display the naked base; thus, in the scholia to Pāṇini, वाराहो उपानन्हि vārāhi upānahāu, “boar-leather shoes,” for वाराहि vārāhyāu. It is very remarkable, that even this Vēda form, only one example of which can be quoted, can be referred to the Zend language. We find, frequently, विश्वि tevīshī applied to feminine dual substantives (cf. Vend. S. p. 225.); and I infer that its theme ends with a long, not a short i, from the frequently-occurring plural accusative आय्विस्वि tevīshīs (Vend. S. pp. 99, 102).*

214. To the Sanskrit-Zend feminine dual [G. Ed. p. 245.] forms in ē answer the Lithuanian in i, as ranki, from RANKĀ; so that of the diphthong र ए only the last element is left. The Lithuanian forms the accusative dual, in contradistinction to the cognate languages, according to the analogy of the singular, by a ringing nasal, e.g. witkūi. The Latin has preserved only in duo and ambo a remnant of the dual corresponding to the Greek, which, however, in the oblique cases, is replaced by plural terminations. Here follows a general view of the nominative, accusative, and vocative dual (see §. 148.).

* It is perhaps a participle of the reduplicated pret., according to the analogy of the Sanskrit तेनिवस tēnivas, fem. तेनुषि tēnuṣṭi (Gramm. Crit. §. 603.); and indeed, from the root तव tav, “to be able,” it may signify “powerful, strong.” The ज for जो ē is explained by the influence of the ज v. And उतायुट्ट utāyūṭṭ also is an adjective feminine dual; but I am unable to quote examples of the other cases of this word, from which to learn whether ज इ or ज i is its final vowel.
While consonantal bases occur in the dual both with a long and a short a, the a bases, contrary to the practice otherwise adopted of shortening a final a, exhibit in the nom. acc. dual, for the most part, the original long vowel. I deduce this, among other words, from the so-called Amshaspants, which, together with the feminine form noticed at §. 207. Note †, are found also as masculine; e g. Vend. S. pp. 14, 30, 31, &c.: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZENDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrîkha,</td>
<td>vēhrkâ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dānê,</td>
<td>dâtê,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwē,</td>
<td>hizvâ-âo,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pâti,</td>
<td>pâiti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vrî-ñ-ê,</td>
<td>īdrî-ê,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.. .</td>
<td>N. vîkâ, V. vîkû.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. .</td>
<td>N. wîkâ, V. wîkû.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. .</td>
<td>N. wîkî, V. wîkî.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. .</td>
<td>N. rankî, V. rankî.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.. .</td>
<td>N. âvi, N. âvi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *While consonantal bases occur in the dual both with a long and a short a, the a bases, contrary to the practice otherwise adopted of shortening a final a, exhibit in the nom. acc. dual, for the most part, the original long vowel. I deduce this, among other words, from the so-called Amshaspants, which, together with the feminine form noticed at §. 207. Note †, are found also as masculine; e g. Vend. S. pp. 14, 30, 31, &c.: amēshā spēntā hucsaṭrā hudāonhō āyēsē, “I glorify the two Amshaspants (non commventesque sanctos) the good rulers, who created good.” If amēsha spentā and hucsaṭrā were plural forms, the final a would be short, or at least appear much more frequently short than long; while, on the contrary, these repeatedly recurring expressions, if I mistake not, have everywhere a long a, and only in the vocative a short a (Vend. S. p. 67. Cf. §. 209.). That the epithet hudāonhō is in the plural cannot incur doubt, from the dual nature of the Amshasp (cf. §. 209.): this resembles, to a certain degree, the use of adjective genitives referring to a substantive in the ablative, which was mentioned in §. 189. We find, also, the forms ameshâdō spēntâdō (Vend. S. p. 313.), which indeed might also be feminine plural forms, but shew themselves only as masculine duals, in the same meaning as the so frequent ameshâ spēntâ. We find also, frequently, spēnistā maingū, “the two most holy spirits” (p. 80), through which the dual form in â of bases in a is likewise confirmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, Whether generally only two Amshaspants are to be assumed? whether the genitive plural (ameshanamm spēntanamn), and sometimes also the accusative plural, is only the representative of the dual, which is very uncertain and shaken in its use? whether under the name Amshaspants, perhaps, we should always understand the Genii Haurvat (Khordad) and Amertat |
Amertat, and whether these two Genii, according to the principle of the Sanskrit copulative compounds, have the dual termination for this reason alone, that they are usually found together, and are, together, two? whether, in fine, these two twin-genii are identical with the Indian Āśvinī, which were referred in §. 208. to the Zend-Avesta? The reply to all these queries lies beyond the aim of this book. We will here only notice that, Vend. S. pp. 80 and 422, the Genii Haurvat and Amertat, although each is in the dual, still are, together, named आमरतत्।

स्पेनिस्टा मान्यस्मि मात्वाट तेरिस्ति, &c., "the two most holy spirits, the great, strong." As Genii, and natural objects of great indefinite number, where they are praised, often have the word vispa, "all," before them, it would be important to shew whether "all Amshaspants" are never mentioned; and the utter incompatibility of the Amsh. with the word vispa would then testify the impassable duality of these Genii. If they are identical with the celestial physicians, the Indian Āśvinī, then "Entireness" and "Immortality" would be no unsuitable names for them. In Pāṇini we find (p. 803) the expressions मातरापितारी mātara-pitarā and पितरामातारा pitara-mātārā marked as peculiar to the Vēdas. They signify "the parents," but, literally, they probably mean "two mothers two fathers," and "two fathers two mothers." For the first member of the compound can here scarcely be aught but the abbreviatd dual pitarā, mātārā; and if this is the case, we should here have an analogy to the conjectured signification of haurvat-a and amrētāt-a.

* Bases in चरा form the strong cases (§. 129.) from चरा du; those in चन an, and nouns of the agent in तर tar, lengthen in those cases, with the exception of the vocative singular, the last vowel but one (see §. 144.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vâch-â,*</td>
<td>vâch-a,</td>
<td>ḍh-p-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharant-âu,</td>
<td>barant-âo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharant-â,</td>
<td>barant-â,</td>
<td>φépovt-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. âtman-âu,†</td>
<td>âšman-âo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>âtman-â,</td>
<td>âšman-â,</td>
<td>δâimov-e,</td>
<td>N. V. âkmen-u.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nâm-n-â,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>táλαν-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrâtar-âu,</td>
<td>brâtar-âo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhrâtar-â,</td>
<td>brâtar-â,</td>
<td>πατέρ-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitar-âu,</td>
<td>dughdhar-âo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duhitar-â,</td>
<td>dughdhar-â,</td>
<td>δυγατέρ-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dâtâr-âu,†</td>
<td>dâtâr-âo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dâtâr-â,</td>
<td>dâtâr-â,</td>
<td>δοτήρ-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-â,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>ἐπε(σ)-e,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE,ABLATIVE.**

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

---

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

† See the marginal note marked (*), p. 229.
remarkably with it; and mi-hi corresponds to श्वम्म ma-hyam, as ti-hi does to तुभ्यम् tu-bhyam. In the second place, भ्यस् bhyas, which expresses the dative and ablative plural, is pronounced in Zend byā (§. 56b.), in Latin bus, suppressing the y, and with the usual change of as into us. The Lithuanian has mus for bus in the dative plural (§. 63.): this more complete form has, however, remained only in the pronoun of the two first persons, where mu-mus, "nobis," yu-mus, "vobis," are used as well as mu-m's, yu-m's; while in all other words we find simply ms as the sign of the dative—wilka-ms, &c. In the dual dative the Lithuanian has only the m of the Sanskrit termination आम bhyām, as wilka-m. This m is, however, not the final letter of bhyām, but the initial labial, b, in a nasal form (§. 63.)*: to me, at least, it appears improper to regard this dual termination otherwise than that of the cognate plural case; and I have no doubt of the identity of the m of wilka-m, लकौः, with that of wilka-ms (for wilka-mus), लकौः. According to this explanation, therefore, the German plural dative corresponds to the Lithuanian dual dative, vulfa-m, gasti-m, sunu-m.†

216. A third form related to the dual termination आम bhyām is भिस bhis, as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend आम bīs,

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

† Cf. Grimm, I. 828. 17, where the identity of the Lithuanian-German inflection m with the b (bh of the older languages) was first shewn. When, however, Grimm, l.c., says of the Lithuanian that only the pronouns and adjectives have ms in the dative plural, the substantives simply m, this is perhaps a mistake, or the plural is named instead of the dual; for Ruhig gives ponams, "dominis," akims, "oculis," &c.
FORMATION OF CASES.

(also ἁδί bίσ), has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablative,* which must together supply the place of the instrumental; while in Lithuanian, with the exchange of the labial medial for the nasal of this organ (§. 63.), mis is the property of the instrumental alone, so that puti-mis answers to पति-भिस, मिस पति-बिस.

217. I have already elsewhere affirmed, that the Greek termination φι, φιν, is to be referred to this place,† and what is there said may be introduced here also. If φιν, and not φι, be assumed to be the elder of the two forms, we may offer the conjecture that it has arisen from φις, following the analogy of the change of μες into μεν in the 1st person plural, which corresponds to the Sanskrit mas and Latin mus‡; φις would correspond to the Sanskrit bhis and Latin bis, in nobis, vobis. Perhaps, also, there originally existed a difference between φι and φιν (which we find used indifferently for the singular and plural), in that the former may have belonged to the singular, the latter to the plural; and they may have had the same relation to one another that, in Latin, bi has to bίσ in tibi and vobis; and that, in Lithuanian, mi has to mis in akimi, “through the eye,” and akimis, “through the eyes.” It has escaped notice that the terminations φι and

[G. Ed. p. 251.] φιν belong principally to the dative: their locative and instrumental use—άντάφι, θόρηφι, βίνφιν—is explained by the fact, that the common dative also has assumed the sign of these relations. The strict genitive use of the termination φι, φιν, may perhaps be altogether denied; for if prepositions, which are elsewhere used in construction with the

---

* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (no-bίσ, νο-βίσ), where bίσ supplies the place of the bus which proceeds from ब्यत bhyas.
‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskrit instrumental termination bhis has been, in Prākrit, corrupted to बङ्क kin.
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genitive, occur also with the case in φι, φιν, we are not com-
pelled, on this account, to regard the latter as the genitive or representative of the genitive. In general, all prepositions, which are used in construction with the genitive, would, according to the sense, be better used with an ablative or a locative, if these cases were particularly represented in Greek. The suffix θεω also, of genuine ablative signification, expressing separation from a place, is incorrectly con-
dered to represent the genitive termination, where the latter, in the common dialect, has received the sign of the lost ablative. In θσσε δακρυόφιν πιμπλαντο, δακρυόφιν would, in Sanskrit, be rendered by स्तब्धिस असर्विस: the relation is entirely instrumental, and is not changed because the verb mentioned is more usually, though less suitably, used with the genitive. The same is the case with θσσε δα-
κρυόφιν τέρɔσαντο. In Ἡλιόφι κλυτα τείξεα it is not requisite to make Ἡλιόφι governed by τείξεα, but it may be regarded as locative "to Ilium." And in Od. XII. 45. (πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὀστεόφιν θις ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων) there is no necessity to look upon ὀστεόφιν as the genitive, for it can be aptly rendered by ossibus. I know no passages besides where a genitive meaning could be given to forms in φι and φιν. To the accusative, likewise, the form φι, φιν, is foreign, and accord-
ing to its origin does not suit it; nor does it appear in the train of prepositions, which elsewhere occur with the accusative, with the single exception of εκ ἔννηφιν in Hesiod (cf. Buttmann, p. 205). As to the opinion [G. Ed. p. 252.] of the old Grammarians, that φι, φιν, may stand also in the nominative and vocative, and as to the impropriety of the subscripted before this termination in the dative singular of the first declension, we refer the reader to what Buttmann (p. 205) has rightly objected on this head.

218. The neuters in Σ, mentioned in §. 128., are nearly the only ones from bases ending with a consonant, which occur in combination with φι, φιν, in forms like δχεσ-φι,
OF THE FORMATION OF CASES.

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

But to return to the Sanskrit dual termination θ' θμ, it is further to be remarked, that before it a final χ a is lengthened; hence, व्रकायाम् व्रकाभ्याम् for व्रकायाम् व्रकाभ्याम्. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस bhis ; and that hence, from व्रika also व्रिका-भिस would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to व्रीकापैस, which is easily derived from व्रीकाभ्लिस by rejecting the bh; for रे आ is, according [G. Ed. p. 253.] to §. 2., = d + i. This opinion, which I have before expressed,* I can now support by new arguments. In the first place, which did not then occur to me in discussing this question, the pronouns of the two first persons really form from their appended pronoun स सma, sme-bhis; hence समाभिसस asmābhis, युष्माभिसस yuṣmābhis; which forms stand in the same relation to the व्रकाभिसस व्रिका-भिस, assumed by me, that the accusatives समान समान, युष्मान yuṣmān, do to व्रिकान व्रिकान, "lupos." Secondly, the opinion

---

which I arrived at theoretically has, since then, been so far practically established by the Veda dialect, that, in it, from a final च a not घ-phis but भ-phis, has been formed, according to the analogy of the dative and ablative, as चुक्तम् व्रीकेभ्यस्; hence, अभिव अत्वेभिः, “per equos,” from च अवा. In the common dialect the pronominal form र्मिस भ-phis “per hos,” answers to this Veda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base च a, which generally plays the chief part in the declension of इदम् idam. Though, then, on one side, from the pronoun च a springs the form र्मिस भ-phis; on the other side, from स्रास्म asma and युष्म yushma proceed the forms सत्राभिः asmabhis, युष्माभिः yushmadhhis; and though the Veda dialect, in its substantive and adjective bases in च, attaches itself to the former form, still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated धिस to be based on an भ-phis,* as that could never lead to धिस. Perhaps, however, अभिस might become ल्लभिः, either through the assimilative force of the i of भिः, or through analogy to [G. Ed. p. 254.] the dative भ-भ्यस्, the of which may, in like manner, owe its origin to the re-active influence of the च y.†

220. The Prakrit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Veda dialect, and changed into स ए the अ of

* From ल्लभिः would come, after rejecting the भ, not धिस, but अएस, for ए = a + i, cannot be combined with a following i into a diphthong, or, as it is itself already a diphthong, into a triphthong.

† I do not regard the Veda नद्यस nadyatis; for नद्यभिः nadi-bhīs, as an abbreviation of nadi-bhīs (for after rejecting the भ, from nadi+is would be formed nadiś), but as a very common instrumental, for which an extension of the base nadi to nadya is to be assumed. On the other hand, the Zend pronominal instrumental dis mentioned by Burnouf (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 310.) may here be regarded, which occurs frequently in the Zend, and is probably an abbreviation of अद्वित दिभि or दिभि, from a base दि, the accusative of which च दिम, “him,” is often found with i unlengthened, contrary to § 64. The connection of the base दि with च ता cannot, on this account, be disputed.
asmd-bhis, yushmd-bhis, as also, in the locative plural, that of asmāsu, yushmāsu; hence समेहि amhē-hin, तमेहि tumhē-hin, अस्मेस amhēsu, तस्मेस tumhēsu. Moreover, in Prākrit, all other a bases, as well pronouns as substantives and adjectives, terminate the instrumental plural with रहि e-hin; and thus कुसमेहि kusumē-hin, "floribus," (from kusuma,) answers to the Veda कुसमेभिस kusumē-bhis. Before, however, the forms in रिस e-bhis, रहि e-hin, had arisen, from स्मिस dbhis, by the change of a into e, dis must have proceeded by means of rejection and contraction from that most early form. This form exists also in the oldest hymns of the Vēdas, together with that in रिस dbhis: thus, in Rosen, p. 14, यज्ञस yajnāis; pp. 15 and 21 जैनस jainās. In Zend the abbreviated form dis is the only one that occurs, which it does, indeed, extremely often.

221. Before the dual termination या bya the Zend, in [G. Ed. p. 255.] its a bases, differs from the Sanskrit in the same way as the Zend and Prākrit do before the termination भीस bhis, ही hin; it employs, namely, e for a: but from वेह्रेक-bya, according to §§. 23. 41. comes वेह्रेकाहीब्या. Thus, in the Vendidad, वेह्रेकाहीब्याम् hvalēbya.padhaēbya, "suis pedibus," = स्वायम् पादायम् svabhym padābhym; वेह्रेकाहीब्याम् zastāhībya (हस्तायम्) "manibus." But in this case, also, the diphthong र e is supplied by ēi (§. 33.); e.g. उभीब्याम ubhībya, "ambobus" (Vend. S. p. 305). If in this form the lost nasal be restored, and it be assumed (of which I have no doubt) that the Greek dual termination ὑ is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit bhyām;* then the Homeric forms like ᾿μοι-ίν are to be compared with the उभौ-ί bibliography

* By rejecting the labial, as in जैनस jainās from जैनाभिस jainābhis, and by contracting the याम yām to υ, as when, in Sanskrit, for yaṣṭa, iṣṭa is said, from yaj, "to sacrifice," and in Zend ᾿iim, "hoc," for इयम iyam (see, also, §. 42.).
above mentioned; where, therefore, the first \(i\) would fall to the base, which it lengthens, the other to the termination. The third declension, by its forms like \(\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu-\omega\nu\), might give rise to the conjecture, that \(\omega\nu\) and not \(\nu\) is the true termination: the latter, however, is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where \(\nu\) and not \(\omega\nu\) is attached to the final vowel of the base (\(\text{Моу} \sigma\alpha-\nu\), \(\lambda\omicron\gamma\nu-\nu\)). In the third, therefore, we explain the \(o\) before \(\nu\) in the same manner as, §. 218. before \(\phi\nu\) (\(\kappa\omicron\tau\upsilon\lambda\vartheta\omicron\dot{\sigma}ν-\dot{o}-\phi\nu\)); viz. as a conjunctive vowel, which has made its way from the bases which necessarily have it, \(i.e.\) from those terminating in a consonant into those which might dispense with it (into the bases in \(i\) and \(u\)); as, in general, in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone, and have shewn the way to the vowels \(i\) and \(u\). It might, however, not have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel \(o\) to make its appearance between consonants and the termination, as \(\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu-\nu\) could very easily be uttered; but the \(o\) of \(\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\nu\) comes evidently from a time when the \(\nu\) was still preceded by the consonant, which the corresponding Sanskrit termination \(b\hyam\) leads us to expect; in all probability a \(\phi\); thus, \(\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu-\omega-\nu\), from \(\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu-\omega-\phi\nu\).*

We should have, therefore, here a different \(\phi\nu\) from that which, in §. 217., we endeavoured to explain from \(\phi\nu\), \(\text{भिस} \ bhis\): the nasal in the dual (\(\phi\)\(\nu\) stands quite regularly for its predecessor \(m\), as, in general, at the end of words. In order to present to our

* The conjunctive vowel \(o\), therefore, before the dual termination \(\nu\), has an origin exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix \(e\nu\tau\), which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit \(\text{वन} \ vant\). \(E\nu\tau\) must therefore have been originally pronounced \(F\nu\tau\); and the conjunctive vowel, which the digamma made requisite or desirable before consonantal bases, and which, from thence, has extended itself to the whole third declension, has remained also after the digamma has been dropped, and thus \(\nu\nu\rho-\dot{e}i\dot{s}\) answers to \(\nu\nu\rho\omicron\nu\), from \(\nu\nu\rho-\omega-\nu\): on the other hand, \(\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\dot{e}i\dot{s}\) to \(\tau\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu\) (\(\tau\upsilon\rho-\nu\)).
view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form ἵτωπον be considered as the first person singular and third person plural; in one case from ἵτωπομ, in the other from ἵτωπον.

222. If the dual termination ὑ be explained as a contraction of ὑμι, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination ὑ, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident (ἡμ-ίν, ἤμ-ίν, σφ’-ίν, together with σφι-σι). The Greek, however, in this respect, is guided or misled by the Sanskrit; or, more correctly, the distinction of the plural dative of the pronouns of one gender is very ancient, and the Sanskrit has in them भम bhyam as termination (सस्मभम asma-bhyam, "nobis," युष्मभम yushma-bhyam, (G. Ed. p. 257.) "vobis"), opposed to the भम bhyas of all other words. From this bhyam, then, we arrive at ὑ quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination ὑμι (cf. §. 42.). As, however, भम bhyam, and its abbreviated form भम hyam, according to §. 215., has also its place in the singular dative of the pronouns of one gender, but occurs nowhere else; as, moreover, the Latin also, in the pronouns referred to, has maintained a genuine dative termination, and to the common i, which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination bi or hi (for bhii) (§. 200.); we can, therefore, in the singular ὑ also of ἢμ-ίν, τε-ίν, τ’-ίν, ἵν, σφ’-ίν, see nothing else than an abbreviation of भम bhyam, a form which the Latin and Greek have shared in such a manner, that the former has retained the beginning and the latter the end. In the ἵ both coincide.* The occasional accu-

* A short time since, Max. Schmidt, in his excellent treatise "Commentatio de Pronomine Graeco et Latino" (p. 77), endeavoured to connect the termination ὑ here treated of with the Sanskrit in a different way, by designating it as the sister form of the pronominal locative termination
sative use of this termination, in Theocritus, is to be explained from its original signification being no longer felt, and the exchange of its ν with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand, we have in μίν and νίν real accusatives, and should therefore divide them μί-ν, νί-ν; and not assume, with Buttmann (p. 296), a connection between this form and the dative -ίν.

223. As to the origin of the case-suffixes [G. Ed. p. 258.] भिस् bhi-s, भाम् bhy-am, भाम् bhy-ām, and भास् bhy-as, which begin with भ् bhy (from भ bhi), we must notice, first, their connection with the preposition सां abhi, “to,” “towards,” “against,” (whence चाभितस abhi-tas, “at,” cf. “apud”). However, in abhi itself bhi is clearly, in like manner, the termination, and the demonstrative स a the theme; so that this preposition, in respect to its termination, is to be regarded as a sister form to the Latin ti-bi, si-bi, i-bi, u-bi;* just as another preposition, which springs from the pronominal base a, viz. शाधि adhi, “over,” finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives, like ε-θι, ἀλλα-θι, ὤφαντο-θι (§. 16.). Related to the suffix दि dhi is ध dha, which has been retained in the common dialect only in the abbreviation ha, in i-ha, “here,” and in the preposition sa-ha, “with”; but in the Vēda dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion, and in the Zend, also, is found in several pro-

* In Prākrit the termination हि hin, which is connected with भि bhi (cf. §. 217.), unites also with other pronominal bases, for the formation of locative adverbs, as तहि ta-hin, “there,” खाहि ka-hin, “where?”
nominal bases with a locative signification; e.g. अव-धा, "here." In the Greek, compare θα of ἑνθα, opposed to θεν, from ἑνθεν, ἑμεθεν, &c., from थस् dhas, for तस् tas, in सचस् a-dhas, "beneath": in which formations द्ह stands as a permutation of त, and occurs in this way, also, in some other formations.* Therefore dha, dhi, are to be derived from the demonstrative base त ta; but it is more difficult to trace the origin of the बह of सब्व abhi (Greek ἄμφί). I suspect that an initial consonant has been [G. Ed. p. 258.] dropped. As in Greek, also, φίν is used for σφίν, and as in Sanskrit द्विनसतः vinśati “twenty,” is clearly an abbreviation of द्विनसतः dwinśati, and in Zend द्विष bīs, “twice,” द्विशष्टिः bitya, “the second,” is used for द्विष dvīṣ, (Sanskrit द्विष dwiṣ), द्विनष्टी dvitya (Sanskrit द्विनष्टी dvitiya), so बह bhi may be identical with the pronominal base व swa or विव swi—whence the Greek σφίς, σφίν, φίν, &c.; and so indeed, that after the s has been dropped, the following semi-vowel has been strengthened or hardened, just as in the Zend द्विष bīs, द्विनष्टिः bitya, and the Latin bis, bi. The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ bh, as, in Prâkrit (§. 166.), स्म sa has become स्म mha; and, (which comes still closer to the case before us), in Greek for σφίν is found also ψίν. And, in Sanskrit, that भ bh should spring from b+h is not entirely unknown; and in this way is to be explained the relation of भूमिः bhûyas, “more,” to परां bahu, “much,” the a being rejected (Gramm. Crit. r. 251. Rem.).

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

---

* Among others, in the 2d person plural of the middle धुे dhué and धुम dhwam for ते twē, तम twam.
* I deduce this form principally from the base राच raoch, "light," which often occurs in the terminations beginning with \( b \), and always interposes \( e \) as conjunctive vowel—राचे-अस raoch-e-bis, राचे-ब्या raoch-e-bya. We find, also, वि-राचे-ब्या vi-vach-e-bya (Vend. S. p. 63.). Bases in \( r \) interpose \( e \); those in \( t \), when a vowel precedes that letter, conjoin the termination direct (अमेरीतात्त-ब्या amērtātaţ-bava, according to § 39.): on the other hand, the \( t \) of भम nt is rejected; thus, V. S. p. 9. भरेंज-ब्या bherēnţ-bya, "splendentibus," with \( p \), contrary to § 69. The form ग्रो व्रत-ब्याम, "supercillii," also deserves notice, because in this solitary word the case termination appears unreduced (§ 61.). The MS., however, as often as this word occurs, always divides the termination from the base (Vend. S. p. 269, twice ग्रो व्रत byaim; pp. 321 and 322, ग्रो व्रत ब्याम barvat byaim), probably for brvat byaim; so that it would seem that ग्रो व्रत is the ablative singular of a theme ग्रो ब्रा brā (Sansk. ब्रा bhṛā). I have not found this word in any other case: it is not likely, however, that any thing but ग्रो व्रत or ग्रो व्रत ब्याम is its theme: in the latter case it would be a participial form, and would demonstrate, that instead of the last consonant of nt, the last but one also may be rejected. Or are we to regard व्रत ब्याम as a form of that singular kind that unites with the termination of the ablative singular that of the dual, and thus ग्रो ब्रा would still be the theme?

† \( N \), in Sanskrit and Zend, is rejected before case terminations beginning with a consonant; thus, in Greek, δαίμον-σι, and in Gothic ahma- m.
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātri-bhyām,*</td>
<td>bhrātar-e-bya</td>
<td>πατερ-ο-ιν,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vacho-bhyām,†</td>
<td>vacho-bya</td>
<td>ἐπέ(ο)-ο-ιν,</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENITIVE, LOCATIVE.**

[G. Ed. p. 261.] 225. These two cases, in Sanskrit, have the common termination भुसन s, which may be connected with the singular genitive termination. The following are examples: व्रकयोस vrikay-ōs, जिह्योस jihway-ōs (cf. § 158.), पत्तोस paty-ōs, तन्योस tanw-ōs, वाचोस vach-ōs, भात्तोस bhrātr-ōs, वचसोस vachas-ōs. In Zend this termination seems to have disappeared, and to be replaced by the plural; likewise in Lithuanian, where, awy-ā is both dual and plural genitive.

**PLURAL.**

**NOMINATIVE, VOCATIVE.**

226. Masculines and feminines have, in Sanskrit, चर as for the termination of the nominative plural, with which, as in the cognate languages, the vocative is identical in all declensions. I consider this as to be an extended form of the singular nominative sign s; so that in this extension of the case-suffix lies a symbolical allusion to plurality: and the s, which is too personal for the neuter, is wanting in that gender, in the singular and dual, as well as in the plural. The three numbers, therefore, with regard to their masculine-feminine termination or personal designation, are related to one another, as it were, like positive, comparative, and superlative, and the highest degree belongs to the dual. In Zend चर as has, according to § 56b.

* चर ar before case terminations beginning with consonants is shortened to चु ri (§ 127.).
† See § 56b.
become $\delta$ or $\omega\mu$ $as$ before the appended particles $cha$ and $chit$; the Greek exhibits $es$, under the restriction of § 228.; the Latin $es$,* with unorganic length of quantity through the influence of the $s$; the Lithuanian has $es$ in bases in $r$ but elsewhere simple $s$. Thus the words $duhitar-as$, $ Fucked-up-text$ $dughdar-as$ $cha$, $bvyar$ $es$; $dukter$ $es$, $mattr$ $es$, correspond with one another.

227. The $a$ of the termination is melted [G. Ed. p. 262.] down with a preceding $\varsigma$ $a$ of the base to $\delta$; thus, $\varsigma$ $\kappa$ $vri$ $as$, from $vrika + as$, corresponds to the Gothic $vulf$ $as$, from $VULEA$ $as$ (§ 69.). In this concretion only, however, with the vowel of the base, the Gothic has preserved the full termination; but elsewhere, both with vowel and consonantal bases, the $s$ alone of the old $as$ is left, as in general the termination $as$ in Gothic polysyllabic forms has everywhere been weakened to $is$ or $s$ (cf. §§ 135, 191.): hence, $sunyu$ $s$, $ahman$ $s$, for $suniv$ $as$, $ahman$ $as$. And $\varsigma$ $a$, too, is contracted with the termination $as$ to $ds$; hence, $jihw$ $as$, for $jihw$ $as$. It cannot, however, be shewn with certainty, from what has been just said, that the Gothic $gib$ $as$, from $GIBO$, has simple $s$ or $as$ (contracted with the base vowel to $\delta=\delta$) for its case designation.

228. The masculine pronominal bases in $a$ refuse, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic, the full nominative designation, and in place of it extend the base by the addition of an $i$, which, according to § 2., with the $a$ of the base forms $\varsigma$ $\delta$;† for which, in Zend, is used $\eta$ $\delta$ or $\psi$ $\delta$;

* Vide § 707. p. 1078.
† As $\varsigma$ $a$ is lengthened in many other cases to $\varsigma$ $\delta$, and with this the case terminations are then first conjoined, there is good ground to assume that in $\varsigma$ $te$, and similar forms, no case designation at all is contained, and that the pronouns, as purely words of personality, find themselves sufficiently personified in this case through themselves alone; as in the singular $su$ is said for $sas$, in Sanskrit as in Gothic, and in Greek $\delta$ for $\delta$; while in Latin, with $is-te$ also $ipse$ and $ille$ are robbed of the nominative sign. This opinion is remarkably confirmed by the fact that $\zeta$ $\mu$ $ami$ (Grimm. Crit. R 2
hence, Sanskrit ते, Zend ॐ tē, Gothic thai, "this,"

[G. Ed. p. 263.] answering to the feminine form तास tās,

\[\text{GEd. p. 263.}\] hence, Sanskrit ते, Zend ॐ tē, Gothic thai, "this,"

Zend यव tās, ग् ताः tā (§. 56\textsuperscript{b}). thās. To this corresponds, in Greek, τοι (Doric for οἰ). In Greek and Latin, however, this i, which practically replaces the termination as (ες, ἐς), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in ο (= ἄ a, §. 116.); but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it; hence, λύκοι, χώραι, for λυκο-ες, χώρα-ες, lupi (from lupoi), terrae (from terrai), for lupo-ες, terrae-ες. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§. 121.), has preserved the old termination; hence, rēs from rē-ēs, as, in Sanskrit jihwās from jihwā-ās. The Lithuanian has fixed narrower restrictions than the Greek and Latin on the misuse of the pronominal inflexion under discussion, or, to speak more correctly, want of inflexion: it gives, indeed, wilkai=λύκοι, lupi, but not rankai, but rankos. Honour, therefore, to the Gothic! that in this respect it has not overstepped by one hair the old Sanskrit-Zend limits; for that the adjective a bases, as they in general follow the pronominal declension, give also ai for ὅς (blindai "cæci") is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229. In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination द ओ also (from सास ὅς, §. 207.) occurs with a plural significance; thus, frequently, द ओ व औच-ओ, "voce," द ओ व औच-ओ

raoch-do, “luces,” which forms cannot be regarded, perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in á; for I believe [G. Ed. p. 264.]

I can guarantee that there exists no such base as स्रोतः vâchá and स्रोतः raochá. The form स्रोतः donhá in á bases, as स्रोतः वह्रकदन्तः, “lupi,” and “tupos,” rests on that in the Vĕdas, but which only occurs in the nominative, सरस Sås (§. 56b.); e.g. सोमस्थ सोऽसमस Sômas, “songs of praise,” for सोमस्थ सोऽसम, from सोऽ सोम.

230. Bases in i and u have, in Sanskrit, Guna; hence पत्रयस्थ patay-as, सूनवस्थ सूनु-as, for paty-as, सूनु-as. The Gothic also has preserved this Guna, but in its weakened form i (§. 27.), which, before u, becomes y; hence, sunyń-s, “sons,” (for suniu-s, from sunau-s,) a form which would be unintelligible without the Guna theory, which has been shewn to belong to the German. In i bases the Guna i is melted down with that of the base to long i (written ei, §. 70.); hence, gastei-s, anstei-s, from GASTI, ANSTI (cf. p. 105.).

The Zend employs Guna or not at pleasure; hence पाय-ड, or paitay-ड, पास ड, or paitay-ड,† पासव ड, or paitay-ड.

231. Neuters have, in Zend, as in the cognate European languages, a short a for their termination; [G. Ed. p. 265.] perhaps the remains of the full as, which belongs to the natural genders, after the s, which is too per-

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

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

† Simple as this point is, I have nevertheless found it very difficult to come to a firm conclusion regarding it, although, from the first, I have directed my attention towards it. Burnouf has already (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 309, 310) given the plural neuter form, and instituted comparisons with the Gothic and Greek, &c. But from forms like hu-mata, “bene-cogitata,” “hucta,” “bene-dicta,” it cannot be perceived what the neuter plural termination properly is; because, setting out with the Sanskrit, we are tempted to assume that the true termination in these forms has
sonal for the dead speechless gender, has been dropped.

[G. Ed. p. 266.] This a remains, then, in the accusative. The masculine and feminine have, in the same case, generally likewise as (Zend \(\delta\), अस्चाः as\(\text{ch}a\)). The following are examples: आनाग्न्नि as\(\text{h}a\)van-a, "pura;" भृगुं परिवर्तित-ा, "splendentia;" वद्ध वद्धच-ा, "verba;" आस्थय नर-ा, "homines;" अस्त अस्त-ा, "ossa." In nominal bases in a the termination is melted down with the vowel of the base: the \(\delta\) so produced has, however, in the received condition of the language, according to a

has been dropped, and its loss either compensated by lengthening the final vowel, or not. We must therefore direct our attention to bases with a different termination than a, especially to such as terminate with a consonant. The examination of this subject is, however, much embarrassed, in that the Zend, without regard to the gender of the singular, is prone, contrary to natural expectation, to make every noun neuter in the plural; an inclination which goes so far, that the numerous class of a bases have hereby entirely lost the masculine nominative, and but sparingly exhibit the masculine accusative. When, e.g. mashya, "human being," is, in the plural nominative, likewise, mashya (with cha, mashya-cha), here I am nevertheless convinced that this plural mashya, or mashya\(\tilde{\text{d}}\), is not an abbreviation of mashy\(\tilde{\text{d}}\) from mashy\(\tilde{\text{d}}\)s (§ 56\(^\text{b}\)), as in no other part of Zend Grammar as a or as \(\delta\) stands for छास\(\tilde{\text{d}}\) अस: I am persuaded that this form belongs to the neuter. The replacing, however, of the plural masculine by neuters rests upon a deep internal feeling of the language; for in the plural number it is clear that gender and personality are far in the back ground. The personality of the individual is lost in the abstract infinite and inanimate plurality; and so far we can but praise the Zend for its evitation of gender in the plural. We must blame it, however, in this point, that it does not, in all places, bring the adjectives or pronouns into concord with the substantives to which they refer, and that in this respect it exhibits a downright confusion of gender, and a disorder which has very much impeded the inquiry into this subject. Thus, e.g. vi\(\text{š}\)pa anaghr-\(\text{a}\)raoch\(\tilde{\text{d}}\)a (not raoch-\(\tilde{\text{d}}\)), "all lights which have had no beginning"; ti\(\text{s}\)ro (fem.) सता or \(\text{t}h\)rayō (masc.) सत, "three hundred"; chathwārō (masc.) सत "four hundred." In general the numbers "three" and "four" appear to have lost the neuter; hence, also, \(\text{t}h\)rayō caśf\(\tilde{\text{n}}\)-ा, "three nights," chathwārō caśf\(\tilde{\text{n}}\)-ा, "four nights": in Vend. S. p. 237, on the other hand, stands tānara \(\tilde{\text{y}}\)a, "those persons who . . . ." I divide thus nar-ा although
principle often quoted, been again shortened, and remains only in monosyllabic bases and before annexed particles. The Gothic and Zend, in this respect, stand [G. Ed. p. 267.] very remarkably upon one and the same footing; for thā, “hæc,” is used (for thá, §. 69.), from THĀa; ḫvā, “quæ,” for HVĀa; but daura, from DAURA, as, in Zend, ṣv ā, “hæc,” ṣv < ṣd, “quæ,” opposed to ṣvā ṣgha, “peccata,” from ṣgha. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Gothic that the a of the base has been dropped before that of the termi-

although the form might also belong to a theme narā, which also occurs, but much less frequently than nar; whence also, elsewhere, the masculine nar-ō tab-chā, “and those persons.” From the theme vāch, “word,” “speech,” we find frequently vāch-a (also, erroneously as it appears, vach-a); e.g. Vend. S. p. 34, ṣvāḥa vāchāh sū ṣvāḥaḥ sū ṣvāḥāḥ sū ṣvāḥaḥ vāchā humata hūcāḥ hvarēṣa, “verba bene-cogitata, bene-dicta, bene-peracta.” From ṣvāḥa ashavan, “pure,” occurs very often the neuter plural ‘shvana-a: as, however, the theme ashavan sometimes, too, although very rarely, extends itself unorganically to ashavana, this form proves less (though it be incorrect) that the neuter ashavan-a should be derived from the unorganic extremely rare ashavana, than from the genuine and most common ashavan, in the weak cases ashaun or ashaon. Participial forms, too, in nt are very common in the neuter plural; and I have never found any ground for assuming that the Zend, like the Pāli and Old High German, has extended the old participial theme by a vowel addition. In the Vend. S., p. 119, we find an accusative agha aiwishtār-a, “peccata corrumpentia (?).” Anquetil renders both expressions together by “la corruption du cœur” (II. 227.); but probably aįwi-sītārā stands for -sītārā, and means literally “the destroying” (cf. फ़ी kṣi, intrans. “to be ruined”). So much is certain, that aįwi is a preposition (p. 42), and tar is the suffix used in the formation of the word (§. 144.), which is in the strong cases tār; and from this example it follows, as also from ashavan-a, that where there are more forms of the theme than one, the Zend, like the Sanskrit (see Gramm. Crit. r. 185. c.), forms the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural from the stronger theme. I refrain from ad- ducing other examples for the remarkable and not to have been expected proposition, that the Zend, in variance from the Sanskrit, forms its plural neuters according to the principle of the Latin nomin-a, Greek ταλάν-α, Gothic namōn-a or namn-a.
nation, for it could not be dropped, because the base-vowel and termination have been, from the first, concrete. The old length of quantity might, however, be weakened: this is the fate of long vowels especially at the end of words. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Greek τὰ δῶρα and the Latin dona, that the a entirely belongs to the termination. This a is an old inheritance of the oldest date, from the time when the second declension, to use the expression, terminated its bases with ā. This ā has since then become, in Greek, o or e (§. 204.), in Latin, u, o, or e, and has maintained its ancient quality only in the plural neuter, and the ā, which has grown out of ā+ā, has become shortened. This ā, however, in contrast with its offspring ō, ē, ū, may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, than if δῶρο or δῶρε, donē, donē, stood as the plural neuter.

232. Bases in i and u may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and u may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel: thus we read in the Vend. S. pp. 46 and 48, мāṇḍ gara, "hills," from мāṇḍ gairi (see p. 196, Note †): on the other hand, p. 313, gairis (fem.). That which Anquetil (II. 268.) renders by "une action qui empêche de passer le pont, le péché contre nature," runs in the original (p. 119), мāṇḍ (sūr) gairis ayha anāpērētha skyaothna yā narō-vaipayā,

[G. Ed. p. 268.] i. e. "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which . . . ."; and here it is evident that anāpērētha stands for anāpērēthu-a, for pērētu means actually "bridge."*
But a final *u* may also be retained, in the form of a semi-vowel, either pure or with *Guna*: the latter form I recognise in ∷´∂µλ ∷ yūtava (Vend. S. p. 120; in Olshausen, p. 7), which can only be the plural accusative of ∷´∂µλ yūtu, for it stands with ∷µµ agha, "peccata"; and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of yūtu in the accusative singular, viz. ∷´∂µλµλ µµ yūtumēniēm, "the magician," "gifted with magic" (according to Anquetil, magicien). I render, therefore, agha yūtava literally by "the sins of sorcery" (Anquetil, "la magie très mauvaise"); and in Anquetil's Vocabulary is (p. 467) ∷´∂µλ g yūthvāṁm, the regular plural genitive of our base yūtu, which means, therefore, "of the sorceries"; while Anquetil faultily gives it the meaning of the derivative (magiciens), and, according to his custom, takes this oblique case for a nominative. An example of a neuter plural form without *Guna* is at V. S. p. 122, ∷µµ µµ µµ hēndva "the Indies"; with hapta hēndu, "the seven Indies" (Anq. II. p. 270). It has the epithet us-astar-a ("up-starred?") in opposition to ∷´∂µλµλ µµ µµ µµ daus-astarēm hēndum, "to the ill-starred (?) [G. Ed. p. 269.] Indies." An example, in which the suppressed termination in a *u* base is replaced by lengthening the final vowel, is the very frequently occurring ∷µµ µµ µµ νōhu, "goods," from ∷µµ µµ µµ νōhu.

233. The interrogative base *ki* (cf. quis, quid), which in Sanskrit forms only the singular nominative-accusative (neuter) ििि ki-m, but is elsewhere replaced by *ka*; whence, in Zend, ििि ki-š, "what": this base, the use of which is very limited, forms in Zend the plural neuter ििि ky-a*; and

* V. S. p. 341. ∷µµ µµ µµ ∷µµ µµ µµ µµ ∷µµ µµ µµ µµ kya aētē vacha yōi-hēnti gāthāhva thris āmrāta (erroneously thris āmrāta), "What are the words which are thrice said in the prayers (songs)?" The masculine forms aētē and yōi can here, according to Note at §. 231., occasion no difficulty. So also V. S. p. 85, ििि kya before
this form is the more important, since we still require examples which can be relied upon, in which the \( i \) of the base is not suppressed before the termination \( a \) (above, \( gara \) for \( gairy-a \)), although it may with reason be conjectured, that, in accordance with the abovementioned \( hēndu-a \) and \( yātav-a \), forms also like \( vairy-a \) or \( vairay-a \), from \( vairi \), were in use. As in Gothic, neuter substantive and adjective bases in \( i \) are wanting, the numeral base \( THRI \), "three," and the nominative base \( I \), "he," are very important for the neuter cases under discussion, in which they form \( thriy-a \) (\( thriya hunda \), "three hundred") and \( iy-a \), according to the principle of the Sanskrit monosyllabic forms, of which the \( i \) sound has not passed into its simple semi-vowel, but into \( iy \); thus, in Sanskrit, भिय \( bhiy-a \), from भि \( bhī \).

234. The Sanskrit gives, in place of the Zend-European neuter \( a \), an \( र \ i \), perhaps as the weakening of a former \( a \) \([G. Ed. p. 270.]\) \((\text{§. 6.})\); the final vowel of the base is lengthened, and between it and the case termination a euphonic \( n \) is placed (\( \text{§. 133.} \)); hence दाणानिदान-\( n-i \), बारिकिवारी-\( n-i \), "मधुनिमधु-\( n-i \)\( ^\dagger \). The bases which terminate with a single consonant—\( न \ n \) and \( र \ r \) being excepted—prefix to it a nasal,

\[ \text{र} रऽवो \ (\text{र} रऽवो या रऽवो}, "which are the lords"?\)

* According to a euphonic law (\( \text{Gram. Crit. r. 84}^a. \)), an \( न \ n \) following after \( र \ r \), and some other letters, is, under certain conditions, changed into \( न \ n \).

\( \dagger \) In the Vēdas, the \( n \) in \( a \) bases is frequently found suppressed; \( e.g. \) विनार्विनव, "omnia," from विनव. In this way the Sanskrit is connected with the Zend विस्पा, विस्प-चा: but perhaps this coincidence is only external; for as the Sanskrit nowhere uses a neuter termination \( a \), विनार्विनव cannot well be deduced from विस्पा+\( a \), but can only be explained as an abbreviation of the \( d-\!i \), which likewise occurs in the Vēdas, as also पुरु, "multa," "magna," is used for पुरुनिरुनी (Rosen's Spec. pp. 9, 10),
and after s and n the preceding vowel is lengthened; hence वच्छन vachān-si, नामानि nāmān-i. Into relation with this i might be brought the neuter inflexion of quae (quaı) and haec (haiec) which stand in Latin very isolated; quae is, however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit जानि kā-n-i, while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual केल from ha + i (§. 212.). Since, however, the antiquity of this dual termination is supported by the Zend, the plural form kāni stands on the other side isolated, and its age is thereby rendered doubtful; as, moreover, the Latin, in the verb also, has introduced a termination originally dual into the plural*; [G. Ed. p. 271.] we cannot avoid recognising in the Latin plural quae a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual केल.

235. We give here a general view of the formation of the plural nominative, and of the vocative, identical with it and the neuter accusative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan.</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikās,</td>
<td>vṛhrkṇonhā,</td>
<td>λύκοι,</td>
<td>lup'-i,</td>
<td>wilkai,</td>
<td>vufds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. tē,</td>
<td>tē,</td>
<td>τοῖ,</td>
<td>is-λ,</td>
<td>τie,†</td>
<td>thai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dānā-n-i,</td>
<td>dāta,</td>
<td>δῶρα,</td>
<td>dona,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>daura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvās,</td>
<td>hizvāo,</td>
<td>χῶρα,</td>
<td>terrae,</td>
<td>rankos,</td>
<td>gibōs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The termination της answers to चस thata, Greek τοῦ from τοῖ, not to थ tha or ट ta, Greek τε. With respect to the otherwise remarkable declension of qui, and of hic, which is akin to it, I would refer preliminarily to my treatise “On the Influence of Pronouns in the formation of Words” (by F. Dümmler), p. 2.
† See §. 229.

† This form belongs not to the base TA (=त ta), whence, in the singular, ta-s, and nearly all the other cases; but to TIA, whence, through the influence of the i, tie has been developed (cf. p. 174, Note* and §. 193.); and whence, in the dative dual and plural, tie-m, tie-ms. The nominative plural is, however, without a case termination. The original form TIA corresponds to the Veda त्यa, mentioned in §. 194.; while the base त्यa shya (ष shya, see §. 55.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of SZIE, and in the plural nominative, likewise without inflexion,
From the pronominal declension the form *ie* (from *ia*) has found its way into the declension of the adjective also: so that the base *GERA*, "good," forms several cases from **GERIE**; viz. dat. *da* for *gera-m*, dat. pl. *gerie-ms* for *gera-ms*, and nom. pl. *geri* for *gerai*. This *geri* appears to stand in most complete agreement with the Latin nominatives of the corresponding declension (*boni, lupi*); but the difference between the two languages is this, that the *i* of *boni* (for *boi-i*) belongs to the termination, while *geri* is void of termination, and stands for *gerie* (analogous with *tie*), but this latter for *gerie-i* (cf. *yaunikkie-i*).

* See p. 163, Note †.
† To this *ky-i, from *hi, corresponds surprisingly the Latin *quia* (guianam, quiune), if, as I scarce doubt, it is a plural neuter, as *quod* is a singular neuter (cf. Max. Schmidt "De pron. Graco et Latino," p. 34). In the meaning "that," *quia* is clearly shown to be an accusative: the meaning "because" is less apt for this case, and would be better expressed by an instrumental or an ablative; but in the singular *quod* we must be content to see the idea "because" expressed by an accusative. On the other hand, *quo*, among other meanings, signifies "whither," a genuine accusative signification in Sanskrit grammar. Without the support of *quod* we might conjecture that an instrumental singular had been preserved in *quia*, after the analogy of **muyav, mavi** *paity-a, for paiti*.

‡ We might expect *gav-*d, *gavai-cha, "bovesque;" but we read **muyay geus in the Vend. S. p. 253, L. 9, in combination with the pronominal neuters *muy yā, "gua," which, according to §. 231. Note, cannot surprise us.
### Nominaive, Vocative, Plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. nāv-as</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>vā(F)-es</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-as</td>
<td>vāch-ā*</td>
<td>ēp-ēs</td>
<td>vocēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharant-as</td>
<td>barēnt-ā*</td>
<td>φεροντ-ēς</td>
<td>ferent-ēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātmān-as</td>
<td>āśman-ā</td>
<td>ḍāimov-ēs</td>
<td>sermon-ēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>ahman-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāmān-i</td>
<td>nāman-ā</td>
<td>ṛālāv-ā</td>
<td>nomin-ā</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>namōn-ā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhūtar-as</td>
<td>bhūtar-ā*</td>
<td>πατέρ-ēς</td>
<td>fratr-ēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitar-as</td>
<td>duhūdrār-ā*</td>
<td>θυγατέρ-ēς</td>
<td>matr-ēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātār-as</td>
<td>dātār-ā*</td>
<td>dātur-ēς</td>
<td>datōr-ēs,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachānś-i</td>
<td>vachānḥ-ā,§</td>
<td>ēne(σ)-ā</td>
<td>oper-ā</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Accusative

236. The bases which end with a short vowel annex न n in Sanskrit, and lengthen the final vowel of the base; hence, वृक्ष vrikān, परित पतिन, सूनून sūnūn, &c. We might imagine this n to be related to the m of the singular accusative, as in the verb the termination चानि द्व (1st pers. sing. imperative) has clearly proceeded from चा मिद. The cognate dialects speak, however, in favour of Grimm’s acute conjecture, that the Sanskrit n is, in the accusative plural masculine, an abbreviation of ns,|| which has remained entire in the Gothic—vulfa-nS, gasti-nS, sunu-nS,—but has been divided in the other sister languages; since the Sanskrit, according to §. 94.1, has given up the latter of the two con-

---

* See p. 163. Note †
† See Note † in preceding page.
‡ The Gothic r bases annex in the plural a u, and can therefore be contrasted no further with the cognate languages. BROTHAR becomes BRŌTHRU, whence brōthryu-s, &c., according to the analogy of sunyu-s.
§ Or सुन्नु मृच vachēnha. Thus we read Vend. S. p. 127, nēmēnha, which, I think, must be regarded as accusative of nīmō (नमस्य namas, “adoration”), and as governed by नमo bērēthra, “from him who brings,” “from him offering.”

|| The Old Prussian, too, exhibits in the acc. pl. ns, e.g. tāva-nS, matrēpas. Respecting the Vēda termination ṛ, from ni, see §. 517. Remark.
sonants, and has lengthened, as it appears, in compensation for this, the final vowel of the base*; while the Greek

[G. Ed. p. 274.] λύκος has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the ν to volatilize to ν.† In fact, λυκο-νς has the same relation to λύκος that τύπτουσι has to τύπτονςι, from

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

* Thus vrikān for vrikānas; as, विद्वानस vidwāns, whence the accusative विद्वानस-मम vidwāns-am, in the uninflected nominative विद्वानं vidwān, ("sapiens").

† As the ν also passes into ι (τωεὶς for τιβένς, Ἑολικ ὀψας, μελας for τυψαντι's, μελανς), Hartung (l. c p. 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the ι in Ἑολικ accusative forms like νόμις, τοίς στρατηγοῖς, &c. As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like μεγάλας, πουκλας, τεῖμας, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the a preceding the ι; we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and especially feminine declension had originally accusatives in νς, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an ns, nor does the Sanskrit exhibit an n (see §. 267., and cf. Rask in Vater's Tables of Comparison, p. 62).

‡ It cannot be said that τύπτονσι proceeded from τύπτοντι, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the τύπτοντι before us answers to all the requirements of Greek Grammar, as to that of the whole base, since ο-ντι corresponds to the Sansk. anti, Zend ēnti, Goth. nt'; and from the singular τι (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than ντι can be expected. But to arrive at oūnti from oūnti it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as oūnti; for that oūnti can become oūnti is proved by the circumstance that the latter has actually arisen from it, by the very usual transition of Τ into Σ, and the not rare vocalization of the Ν to Υ, as also in Sanskrit, in all probability, उष us has arisen from nt (cf. p. 172, Note *), of which more hereafter. But if in the dative plural, indeed, oū-σι has arisen from oū-σι, not from oū-σι (λέοντι not δαμοντι), we
the Ionic ἀται, ἀτο, for νταί, ντο, a form which has extended from the places where the vocalization of the ν was necessary, to those also where ν might be added (πεπείδαται, τετράφαται; then, also, πεπαύσαται, κεκλιάται, &c. for πέπαυσται, κέκλινται). This comparison with the 3d person plural appears to me the more in point, as, in my opinion, the η in the presupposed forms, like चब्रेः व्रिकाय, पतिः पाय, λόκονς, has the same object that it has in the 3d person plural; viz. allusion to plurality by extending (nasalizing) the syllable preceding the sign of personality. The introduction of a nasal is an admixture which is least of all foreign, and comes nearest to the mere lengthening of an already existing vowel.

237. Feminine bases with a final vowel follow in Sanskrit the analogy of consonantal bases; but with the suppression of the a, thus s for as or is; they may perhaps, too, never have had is, for else hence would have arisen, as in the masculine, a simple n: to the [G. Ed. p. 276.]

we must remember that the abandonment of the n before case terminations beginning with a consonant is a very old and therefore pre-Greek phenomenon, which is not to be accounted for in the Greek, and wherefore no compensation is to be required for the ν, which has been dropped. But even if it were so, we must still be satisfied, if the demand for compensation for a lost ν remains unfulfilled in several places of grammar; for there are two kinds of euphonic alteration in all languages: the one, which has acquired the force of a general law, makes its appearance under a similar form on each similar occasion, while the other only irregularly and occasionally shews itself.

* Monosyllabic bases only have preserved the a as the case sign in the singular nominative (§137.); hence, स्त्रियः strī-as, "feminas," भुवास bhuvas, "terras," from स्त्रि strī, भु bhū. There is scarce a doubt that this form originally extended to polysyllabic bases also; for besides the Greek, the Zend also partly evinces this (§238.), as also the circumstance that in the actual condition of the Sanskrit language the accusative plural shews, in general, an inclination to weaken itself, and thus contrast itself more submissively with the imperious nominative (§129.).
feminine gender, too, the well-sounding Ionic a is more suitable than n. In general, the Sanskrit feminines in other parts of grammar cast off the n, which is annexed by masculines and neuters (§. 133.). Moreover, the Gothic also, in feminine 6 bases, gives no ns, but it appears that $thōs = तास tās (eas, has) is a pure dowry from the ancestral house; and when the feminine i and u bases in Gothic, by forms like i-ns, u-ns, assimilate themselves to the masculines, this may be regarded as a disguise of gender, or a deviation caused by the example of the masculines. The consonant bases follow the example of the Indian, but have lost the a, as in the nominative (§. 227.); hence, fiyand-s, ahman-s, for fiyand-as, ahman-as.

238. Feminines with a short final vowel lengthen it, to compensate, as it appears, for the suppression of the a; thus प्रिति pritī-s is formed from prity-as, and तनु tanu-s from tanw-as. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in ἅς, ὕς, which, however, are not restricted to the feminine, and stand at the same time, in the nominative, for ἅς-ς, ὕς-ς. The Zend, like the Greek, follows in its i and u bases the analogy of the consonantal terminations; hence, पाईति paity-δ (paity-ai-cha,) पासव paśv-δ (paśv-ai-cha, or, with Guna, paītay-δ, paśav-δ. In feminine bases in i, u, occur at times also the forms š-s, ś-s, corresponding to the Sanskrit; as, पाईति gairi-s, "montes" (Vendidâd S. p. 313.), माङ्गके ērēxū-s, "rectas," माङ्गकαfśnū-s, "urentes," माङ्गके pērētiū-s, "pontes."

239. Masculine bases in अ a, where they are not replaced by the neuter (§. 231. Note), have, in the accusative, aइ (cf. §. 61.); as, सी नातिन* "hos," often occurs, माञ्जुन्या mazistān, "maximos" (Vend. S. p. 65.). The sibilant is retained before the [Ed. p. 277.] particle च च, and these forms can be copiously quoted; as, माञ्जुन्यानम amēshānē-cha, "non-

* Cf. Vēdic forms in āि.
conniventesque”; ἀνθρώπων manthrais-cha, “sermonesque”; ἀνδρών abamanis-cha, “lignaque”; ἀγριούς agrícolasque.”* The form ἀγριοῦς athaurun-ans-cha, “presbyterosque” (V. S. p. 65.), is remarkable, as there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme athauruna; and this form would accordingly shew that consonantal bases also could assume the inflexion ns, with an unavoidable auxiliary vowel however; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that, in the perverted feeling of the language, it has been introduced by the preponderating analogy of the a bases. More important, therefore, than this ἀγριοῦς athaurun-ans-cha are the accusatives ἀνθρώπων nareus, “homines,” and ἄστρων streus, “stellas,” which occur very frequently; while from λυμμ αtār, “fire,” we have found, not ἀθρ-eus, but ἅθρ-α, in which it is to be remarked that ἀtαr distinguishes itself from other words in r in this point also, that it forms, in the nominative singular, not λυμμ αtα, but ἅλυμμ αtας. But how is the termination eus to be explained? I believe in no other way but from ἄνσ, by changing the n into a vowel, as in [G. Ed. p. 278.] λόγους; after which, according to §. 31., the a has become ζ ε: the sibilant, however, which, after α and άνι, is α s, must, after ν, appear as α s. We actually find, too, in the V. S. p. 311, ἄνσ/ντας in the sense of a dative:

* I formerly thought I could, through forms of this kind, quote the introduction of a euphonic s in Zend, according to the analogy of §. 95. But if this introduction cannot be proved by cases, in which no ground exists for the assumption of an original sibilant, preserved merely by the particle ᾽α cha (cf. §§. 56b. 207. 228.), then the above examples are the more important, in order to supply a fresh proof that ns is the original designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a vowel. The superlative ἀγριοῦς ἀνθρώπων vorēthrasainštēma (of which hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participial nominative. Other cases, which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic s after n, have been nowhere met with by me.
258 FORMATION OF CASES.

240. As a in SANSKRIT occurs the most often of all letters as the termination of masculine bases, and we cannot mistake, in the history of our family of languages, the disposition in the sunken state of a language to introduce, by an unorganic addition, the more inconvenient consonantal declension into that of the vowels, I cannot therefore think that it admits of any doubt, that the New Persian plural termination *dn, which is restricted to the designation of animate creatures, is identical with the SANSKRIT अन् *dn in the masculine plural accusative: thus, मर्दन mardán, "hominis," answers to मॉर्टिन्स martydn, "mortales," "homines."*

241. If, then, the termination अर *dn, applied to animate beings, belongs to a living being in the old language, the inanimate neuter will be fitted to give us information regarding that New Persian plural termination which is appended to the appellations of inanimate objects. 

A suffix, in the formation of words which is peculiarly the property of the neuter, is अर as (§. 128.), which is still more frequently used in Zend than in Sanskrit. In the plural, these Zend neutrers form अन्हa or एन्हa (§§. 56*. 235.); and with this हa is evidently connected the lengthened अ hâ in New Persian; thus, रोज़ हâ, "days," answers to the Zend राऊचन्हa raochaňha, "lights." Many New Persian words have been compared with New German words [G. Ed. p. 279.] and often, too, correctly; but, except through the medium of the Sanskrit and Zend, it could not have been conjectured that our "Wörter" is, in respect to its termination, related to the New Persian hâ. As, however, the High German has, from its earliest period, repeatedly changed s into r, and a into i (later e), I have no

* Thus in Spanish the whole plural has the termination of the Latin accusative.
doubt the *ir*—Middle and New High German *er*—which makes its appearance in the plural in many Old High German neuters, is identical with the Sanskrit neuter suffix अद्व as; e.g. हृदिर, "houses," चाल्पिर, "calves" (cf. Grimm, pp. 622 and 631).*

242. Here follows a general view of the accusative formation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan.</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vi$kà-n,</td>
<td>$e$hrka-n,</td>
<td>λύκο-νς,</td>
<td>lupō-s,</td>
<td>wilku-s,</td>
<td>vulfa-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. da$dā-ni,</td>
<td>dāta,</td>
<td>δόρα,</td>
<td>dona,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>daura.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ji$hā-s,</td>
<td>hizvā-o,</td>
<td>χώρα-ς,</td>
<td>terrā-s,</td>
<td>rankā-s,</td>
<td>gībd-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ta-s,</td>
<td>ta-o,</td>
<td>τα-ς,</td>
<td>is-tā-s,</td>
<td>tā-s,</td>
<td>thd-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pa$ti-n,</td>
<td>pa$tu-o,†</td>
<td>πόστ-ας,</td>
<td>host-ες,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>gasti-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhiiy-as,</td>
<td>âfrity-â,†</td>
<td>πόρτ-ας,</td>
<td>mess'ες,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. priti-s,</td>
<td>âfrīt-s,</td>
<td>πόρτ-ις,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>âwy-ς,</td>
<td>ansti-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vârî-n-i,</td>
<td>var'-a,</td>
<td>ἰδρι-α,</td>
<td>mari-α,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>iy-α.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavi$hya$nî-s, bhu$hya$nî-s,†</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 280.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. su$nî-n,</td>
<td>pa$s-â,†</td>
<td>iyθύ-ας,</td>
<td>pecù-s,</td>
<td>sunù-s,</td>
<td>sunu-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhuv-as,</td>
<td>tanu-o,†</td>
<td>πίτυ-ας,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanā-s,</td>
<td>tanu-s,</td>
<td>πίτυ-ς,</td>
<td>socrū-s,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>handu-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. madhū-n-i,</td>
<td>madhu-a,†</td>
<td>μέθυ-α,</td>
<td>pecu-a,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This *ir*, however, is treated in declension as if the theme originally terminated in *a*, and would thus, in Sanskrit, be *asa*. Hence, compared with the dative हृदिर-म (from हृदिर-म, § 168.), the nom. accus. हृदिर appears an abbreviation. But the relation of our *ir* to the Sanskrit *as* is not thereby disturbed, because in general, most of the original consonantal terminations in High German have received unorganic vowel additions. Cf. pp. 148 and 191, G. Ed. Note. More regarding this hereafter.

† See p. 175, G. Ed. Note.‡

‡ This form is further confirmed by नृपदी$व-म pŚdi-tāva, from pŚdi-tāna, which signifies the hind part of the body (§ 199.), but is also used in the sense of "blow on the hinder part of the body"; and in this manner it occurs in the 15th Fargard of the Vend.: नृपदी$व-म, nṛpēdi-sva$ma ainhāt (ainhāt?) hacha
The formation of this case, and what is connected with it, has been already explained in §§ 215—224; it is therefore sufficient to give here a comparison of the forms which correspond to one another in the cognate languages.

hacha skyadthnd-varēza atha bavaintipesd-tanva. "hac pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inflicta" (Anquetil, Celui qui commet cette action sera coupable du tanafour). In regard to the anāpēretha, mentioned at § 232, it is further to be noticed that the G th can only be occasioned by a κ w that has been dropped (§ 47.), for the theme of the concluding substantive is ρερετου, not ρερεθου (Vend. S. pp. 313 and 362, twice).

* Irregularly from a theme म gā (§ 122.), for গাব gav-as. The Zend গাব gāus (also গাবা gāos), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskrit form VertexArray; so that in respect of the strong and weak cases (§ 129.), the relation in this word is distorted. In the nominative, for instance, we should expect গাব gāus, and in the accusative গাব gāus, rather than vice versa.

† See p. 163, Note †.
‡ See § 129.
§ See § 127. Note and § 249. Note †.
by which a summary view of the subject may be assisted. As the German, in its singular dative,* is identical with the Sanskrit-Zend instrumental, it is hence deducible that its character \( m \) (for \( b \) see \( §. 215 \)), in the dative plural, must rather be regarded as an abbreviation of \( \text{मिस्} bhis \) than as belonging to the dative-ablative termination \( \text{अश्व} bhyas \); although it approaches equally near to the two old terminations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Goth. Dat.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. ( \text{वृक्ष-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{θεό-φιν्} )</td>
<td>( \text{vo-bis} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{vulfa-m.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ( \text{वृक्ष-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{वीर्कक-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ( \text{जीह्व-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{हिस्व-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{ranko-mis} )</td>
<td>( \text{gibb-m.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ( \text{प्रूते-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{अभित-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{awi-mis} )</td>
<td>( \text{ansi-m.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ( \text{सूना-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{पासु-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{sunu-mis} )</td>
<td>( \text{sunu-m.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ( \text{नानू-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{वास-फिन्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ( \text{द्वात्मा-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{अश्वम-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{ahma-m.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ( \text{नामा-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{नामा-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>( \text{namn-am.} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ( \text{वच्छो-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{वच्छो-भिस्न्} )</td>
<td>( \text{οχέο-φιν्} )</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[\( \text{G. Ed. p. 282.} \)]

**THE DATIVE, ABLATIVE.**

244. Mention has already been made of the suffix of these two cases in \( §. 215 \). Only the \( s \) of the Latin \( \text{bus} \) has been left in the first, second, and (according to Nonius) occasionally, also, in the fourth declension; for the \( i \) of \( \text{lupi-s} \), \( \text{terri-s} \), \( \text{speci-s} \) (for \( \text{speci-bus} \) from \( \text{specu-bus} \)), must be allotted to the base. \( \text{Lupi-s} \) stands for \( \text{lupo-bus} \), as evinced by \( \text{ambo-bus} \), \( \text{duo-bus} \). From \( \text{o-bus} \) (by lightening the final vowel of the base, \( o, u \), from an original \( a \), \( §. 6 \)), as occurs in the beginning of compounds (\( \text{multi-plex} \) for \( \text{multu-plex} \) or \( \text{multo-plex} \), of which hereafter), the language arrived at \( i \)-\( \text{bus} \), (\( \text{parvi-bus} \), \( \text{amici-bus} \), \( \text{dii-bus} \), cf. Hartung, p. 261). In the first declension \( a \)-\( \text{bus} \) has been retained with tolerable

* Vide \( §. 160 \). Note \( 1 \)
† See \( §§. 56^b \) and 128.
frequency, but the middle step *i-bus* is wanting; yet the language has scarcely made the spring from *a-bus* at once to *i-s*, but *a-bus* has weakened the *a* of the base to ?i, which, to compensate for the *bu* which has been dropped, has been lengthened; thus *terri-s* from *terri-bus*, for *terra-bus*, as [G. Ed. p. 283.] *mālo* from *māvolo*. Compare,

**Sanskrit.**  **Zend.**  **Latin.**  **Lithuanian.**

m. vrikē-bhyas,  vēhrkaēi-byō,  lupē-s.  *wilka-m(u)s.*

f. jihwā-bhyas,  hizvā-byō,  terrē-s,  *ranko-m(u)s.*

m. pati-bhyas,  paitī-byō,  hosti-bus,  . . . †

f. prīti-bhyas,  ḍṛūti-byō,  messi-bus,  awi-m(u)s.

m. bhaviṣhyantī-bhyas,  būhshyanti-byō,  . . . . . .  . . .

m. sānu-bhyas,  paśu-byō,  pecu-bus;†  sunu-m(u)s,

f. vāg-bhyas,  vāch-e-byō,  voc-i-bus.

m. bharad-bhyas,  barēn-byō,§  ferent-i-bus, . . . . .

m. ātma'-bhyas,  āśma'-byō,  sermon-i-bus, . . .

m. bhrātri-bhyas,  brātar-ē-byō,  fratr-i-bus, . . . .

**THE GENITIVE.**

245. The genitive plural in Sanskrit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination ां ास, in the Zend anm, according to §. 61. The Greek ων bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that ἔδειδων does to ाददाम adadām (§§. 4. 10.). The Latin has, as usual,

---

* See §. 215.

† The masculine *i* bases pass in the plural, by an unorganic increment, into a different declension. And in the dual and dative singular, also, *PATI* had to be given up (Miekle, p. 35, Rem. 1.).

‡ I have selected the masculine base *PECU*, which occurs only in a few cases, on account of its connection with ाः ास *paśu*, and I have carried it through all the cases, and think, therefore, that I may here also give the original *u-bus* for the corruption *i-bus.*

preserved the labial final nasal in its original form, but by its influence has shortened the preceding vowel; hence, *ped-um* (= pad-dm), the u of which supplies the place of a short a, as in *lupum* = वृक्ष्य vrikam, लुको-ँ. [G. Ed. p. 284.]

The German, like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal. In Gothic, however, the झ, which has been left, shews itself under two forms, and thereby an unorganic difference has been introduced between the feminine genitive termination and that of the masculine-neuter; since the fuller झ has remained only to the feminine झ and झ bases.

246. Bases ending with a vowel, with the exception, partly necessary and partly arbitrary, of monosyllables, place, in Sanskrit, a euphonic n between the termination and the base, the final vowel of which, if short, is lengthened. This interposition appears to be pristine, since the Zend partakes of it, although in a more limited degree; for instance, in all bases in ं a and ं d: hence, ं उणुष्वेत् वेह्रकाण-ाइम, ं ज्ञामवाइम, जीहान-ाइम. To the latter correspond very remarkably the genitives (which occur in Old High German, Old Saxon, and Anglo-Saxon, in the

* Regarding the termination *i-um* in consonantal bases, and, *vice versa*, respecting *um* in places where *i-um* might have been expected, we refer the reader to §. 126. In adjectives the feminine character *i* mentioned in §. 119. may have had its effect, and may have passed over from the feminine to the other genders, according to the analogy of the Lithuanian (p. 174. Note *§. 157.): thus the *i* of *ferenti-um* reminds us of the Sanskrit feminine भरति bhārati. The same is the case with the *i* of the neuter form *ferenti-a*; it is bequeathed by the deceased feminine theme *FERTI*. On the other hand, contrary to the opinion preferred in §. 126., we must now regard the *i* before *bus* (e.g. *voc-i-bus*) as a conjunctive vowel, like the *e* in the Zend वध-े-ब्यो. Here it is to be observed that those consonantal bases, which admit neither *i-a* nor *i-um*, must nevertheless proceed before *bus* to annex an *i*. In the chapter upon the adjectives we shall recur to the feminine character *i*; and then treat also of the *i* for *e* in the singular ablative of the common dialect.
corresponding class of words) in 6-n-ð, e-n-α; hence, Old High German ƙępō-n-ð, Old Saxon ƙębō-n-ð, Anglo-Saxon ƙifē-n-α.

247. We find the bases in short and long i, in Zend, if [G. Ed. p. 285.] polysyllabic, only with euphonic n: on the other hand the monosyllabic i bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure; thus, thry-āṁ or thray-āṁ, "trium," from thri; vay-āṁ, "avium," from vi. Bases in > u admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic n; but I find from the masculine ƙaxw paśu only paśu-āṁ: on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like ƙmy tanu, "body," ƙm’y nasu, "corpse" (cf. vēkus according to §. 21.), hitherto only u-n-āṁ. With Guna ƙgûƙm’axw paśu-āṁ would serve as a prototype for the Gothic suniv-ð with Guna weakened (§. 27.).

248. Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskrit, saum sām* for śāṃ ḍm; and this may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that ḍm would properly be only the termination of the termination, and the s connected with the genitive singular would be the chief person. If this is the case, the abbreviation of this termination in substantives and adjectives must still be recognised as very ancient; for the Gothic, which in the plural nominative restricts itself so rigorously to the old limits (§. 228.), gives to the sibilant, in the genitive also, no wider scope; hence thi-zē (§. 86. 5.) = te-şām (for té-sām, according to §. 21.) "horum"; thi-ço = tā-sām, "harum." Here the a, like the ọ of the base THA, THŌ, appears weakened to i (§. 66.): on the other hand, the adjective a and ọ bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have ai-zē, ai-zō; and blindai-zē, "cecorum" (for blënda-zē), answers exactly to the Sanskrit tevaṃ te-şām

* Cf. Old Prussian son, e g. in stei-son, "row."
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(from tai-sdm) from the base π ta. The High German has changed the old sibilant to r, as in many other places; hence, in Old High German, dé-rō for thi-zē and thi-zē, of which termination only the r has remained [G. Ed. p. 286.] to us. To the Latin, in like manner, belongs rum for sum (§ 22.); hence, istorum, istarum.*

249. We give here a general view of the formation of the genitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika-n-ām, vēhrka-n-ām, λυκ-ωv, lupō-rum, wilk-ā, vulf-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. tē-shām, taē-shān, tē-ōv, istō-rum, tē-ā, thi-zē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwā-n-ām, hizvu-n-ān, χωρά-ωv, terrā-rum, rank-ā, kepō-n-ō.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This rum, however, has, like the property of the plural nominative (§ 228.), found its way or returned from the pronominal declension into the entire second, first, and fifth declension, which is originally identical with the latter (§§ 121 and 137.). The transplanting of the rum termination into the declensions mentioned was the easier, as all pronouns in the genitive plural belong to the second and first declension. Forms, however, remain, especially in the old languages, which evince that the language was not always equally favourable to the bringing back the termination rum (deum, socium, amphorum, drachnum, agricolum, &c.). On the other hand, the termination rum appears also to have attempted to fix itself in consonantal bases, with e as conjunctive vowel, if, at least, the forms furnish. by Varro and Charis.—boverum, Joverum, lapiderum, regerum, nuicerum (Hartung, p. 255.)—are to be regarded as correct, and do not perhaps stand for bovo-rum, &c.; as also, in Zend, the base gō may extend itself to gava. The Latin rum and Sanskrit सām lead us to expect the Greek σωv: this is not met with, however, even in the pronoun; so that the Greek, in this respect, stands in the strongest opposition to the Latin. The forms in α-ωv, ε-ωv (e.g. advā-ωv, advē-ωv, ἀγορά-ωv, ἀγοπέ-ωv) point, however, to a consonant that has been dropped. It is a question, therefore, whether universally a Σ (cf. § 128.), or, as the Sanskrit and Zend lead us to expect, only in pronouns a Σ, but in other words of the first and second declension an N has been dropped, as in μελιω from μελιοω. According to this, λουω would be to be derived from λυκ-ωv, χωράω from χωρά-ωv; but τῶv from τοσωv τῶv from τασωv.

† Old High German, see § 246.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. tā-sām, a-ōnhaim,†</td>
<td>ṭā-ōn, istā-ṛum, t-ū,</td>
<td>thi-zō.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. tray-ā-nām, thрай-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭṛi-śv, tri-um, tri-ā,</td>
<td>thriy-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prit-ī-nām, ṭṛī-ṇ-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭṛi-śv, messi-um, awi-ā,</td>
<td>anst-e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. śūnā-nām, pāṣu-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭṛi-ō, pecu-um, sun-ā,</td>
<td>suniv-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ṭanu-ṇ-ām, ṭanu-ṇ-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭṛit-ō, socrum-um,</td>
<td>***** handiv-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gav-ām, ṭav-אמ,</td>
<td>βo(F)-ωv, bōv-um,</td>
<td>***** *****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nā-ṇām,</td>
<td></td>
<td>να(F)-ωv,</td>
<td>***** *****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-ām, vāch-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭr-ō, voc-um,</td>
<td>***** *****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. bharat-ām, bārent-אמ,†</td>
<td>ṭeprōn-ωv, ferenti-um,</td>
<td>***** fiyun-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman-ām, aśman-אמ,</td>
<td>ṭaṃu-ωv, sermon-um, akmen-ā,</td>
<td>uhman-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrāтри-ṇ-ām, brāthr-אמ,†</td>
<td>πατερ-ωv, fratr-um,</td>
<td>***** *****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit बाह्राम "harum," "earum" (§. 56b.); from मा tā, tāṃhaim would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, ॠ ॠ ॠ ॠ ab-tāṃhaim not abtāṃhaim, as might be expected from रतासाम etd-ām.

† Or, also, ॠ ॠ ॠ ॠ ıtātānaim, as in the Vendidad Sāde, p. 131, ॠ ॠ ॠ ॠ ıtāhantaim, "lucentium:" on the other hand, also frequently ıtāhantaim.

† This and the following genitives from bases in ary are clearly more genuine and are more nearly allied therefore to the cognate European languages than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, which, in this case, has shortened ary to ॠ ī, and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From लम ॠ nar frequently occurs nar-ān, with retention of the ā, on account of the base being monosyllabic: on the other hand, ॠ ī ṭār-ān from ātār, "fire," and ॠ ॠ ॠ ॠ tisr-ān, tisrī-ṇ-ām (Gramm. Crit. r. 255). From लम ॠ ॠ dughdhar, we find the form dughdhār-ān (cf. p. 208, G. Ed. Note †): the Codex has, however, dughdār-ān (p. 472, L. 2.). In general, in this word the readings dughdhar and dughdar are interchanged in various passages: the former, however, is the more common.
LOCATIVE.

250. The character of the plural locative [G. Ed. p. 288.] is, in Sanskrit, स su, which is subject to be changed into श su (§. 21.), for which, in Zend, is found शu shu (§. 52.); while from स su, according to §. 53., has been formed शu hu. The more usual form for shu and hu (for which, also, occur शu and हu) is, however, शu shva, शu hva, which leads to a Sanskrit श swa. This appears to me to be the original form of the termination; for nothing is more common in Sanskrit than that the syllables व wa and य ya should free themselves from their vowel, and then change the semi-vowel into a vowel, as उ ukta is said for vakta (see also §. 42.). The supposition, therefore, of the Indian abbreviation of the termination is far more probable than that of a Zend extension of it by a lately-added a, especially as in no other case does a similar aftergrowth admit of being established. But if श swa is the original form of the termination, it is then identical with the reflective-possessive base श swa, of which more hereafter.* The same relation which, in Latin, si-bi has to su-bi (which might be conjectured from su-i), or that ti-bi has to tu-bi, Sanskrit शu tu-bhyām, the Greek dative-locative termination σι (σιν) has to the Sanskrit श su.

* Therefore, in Zend, the locative श शu thrisva, “ in tribus,” is identical with श शu trisva, “ the third part,” since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part.

† Regarding the termination w of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see §. 222. From the Æolic form ἡμεν, quoted by Hartung (p. 260) from Apoll., I cannot infer that w is an abbreviation of σιν: if it were so, the w also in ἡμίν would not adhere so firmly. It appears to me more suitable, therefore, to accord to the common declension an influence upon the transformation of the form of inflexion peculiar to the pronouns without gender, but of the highest antiquity; an influence which has penetrated further in φιν for σιν.
251. The bases in a add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an i; but from a + i is formed ρ (§. 2.), to which the Greek oi corresponds; hence, λύκοι-ς = व्रिकेस vrikhē-shu. Hence the i in Greek has also passed over to the bases in α-, η-, either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskrit the अ remains pure; hence, जिहशत jihwa-su, with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as Πλαταιάσιν, 'Ολυμπίασι, 'Αθήνας (Buttmann, §. 116. R. 7. and Hartung, p. 461.).

252. Like the Gothic, the Lithuanian has an unorganic difference between the terminations which mark the case in the masculine and feminine in the genitive plural: the first has the sound of se, and the latter of sa, with the original and more powerful a, which, in the masculine, has softened into e. The ending sa is plainly from the swa, assumed above (p. 267, l. 7.) to be the original form, from which it is made by rejecting the semi-vowel.

253. Here follows a general view of the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian plural locatives, with the Greek datives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikē-shu, vērkāt-shva, wikū-se,</td>
<td>λύκοι-ς.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwā-su, hizwā-hva,</td>
<td>ranko-sa,</td>
<td>Ολυμπίαςι, χώραςι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prīti-shu, āfrīti-shva,†</td>
<td>āvi-sa,</td>
<td>πόρτιςι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnu-shu, pašu-shva,</td>
<td>dangū-sa,</td>
<td>ἰχθύ-ςι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. go-shu,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>βου-ςι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nau-shu,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>ναυ-ςι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The common termination ois, ais (oi-ς, ai-ς), formed by curtailing oι-ς, aι-ς, and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskrit curtailing instrumental ending � Economis dīs (§. 219.), which had before required consideration, because the Greek dative is also used as the instrumental.

† I have no authority for the locative of the Zend bases in i, but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in u, which can be referred to in copious instances.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>čak-shu,</td>
<td>vdc-sva?</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ḫāya-śi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.n. bharat-su</td>
<td>brdtar-ś-shva?</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ḫerōv-śi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātma-su</td>
<td>āsma-hva*</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>δαίμο-śi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhratri-shu</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>πατρά-śi.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-su</td>
<td>vachā-hva†</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ἐπεο-śi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Thus, in the Vend. Sāde, p. 499, ushan, and p. 500, dāmahva, from dāman.
† The a in this form is not, as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel, but rests on a transposition; as ṣdrakos for ṣdakos, and in Sanskrit draksyāmi, “I will see,” for darkṣyāmi (Sansk. Gramm. § 34b.): thus πατράς (compare τερπας) for πατρας (compare τέσσαρας), which, by preserving the original vowel, agrees with the Sanskrit base πταρ better than πατέπα, πατέπες, &c. The same applies to the dative ṣprāśa, since the theme of ṣprāśa has, as appears from the cognate word ṣw, ṣv, ṣrṇ, rejected a vowel between the p and s, which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an a, and removed from its place. The whole REN appears to be a transposition of Ner, Sanskrit nar (nūrī), “a man,” for ṣv properly means “male sheep.” The a of ṣprāśa is therefore etymologically identical with that of ṣdakos (comp. Kühner’s complete Greek Grammar, § 281. Rem. 2.). It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the a of ṣdā: it is either the older and stronger form for the e of viēs, or this word must have had, besides its three themes (‘yio, ‘yi, ‘yiay), a fourth, yi, from which came viēs, as γόνας from fonat, the more prevailing co-theme of tôn, which latter agrees with जानु jānu.

†† In the Vendīdād Sāde, p. 499, we find the analogous plural locatives uzirōvha, and vasāpōvha. Anquetil translates the former by “au lever du soleil,” and the latter by “à la nuit.” It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in ar (δ, § 56b.) Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in ar, and the interchange of ya with yapār with ya is a similar case to that in Sanskrit, where ṣah, ahan, “day,” forms some cases from ahās (from which ṣah in ahābhīs, &c.); and together with
"Remark.—From the bases in $E_2$, to which
The dative $\text{es} \text{st} (= \text{as} \text{su})$ properly belongs, this form appears to have imparted itself to other bases terminating
[G. Ed. p. 292.] differently, in which, for this case, an extension of the original theme by $e_2$ is to be adopted; which, in its origin, is identical with the abovementioned (§. 241.) plural increase to the base by $i_r$ (from $i_s$ and $t_h$, from $a_s$), in Old High German forms, as $\text{h}u\text{s} \text{i}r$, "houses," $\text{ch}a\text{l}p\text{i}r" "calves," which are the plural themes, with which the nominative, accusative, and vocative are identical, and from which, in the dative, by the addition of the ending for that case, arises $\text{hu}\text{s} \text{i}r\text{um}$, $\text{ch}a\text{l}p\text{i}r\text{um}$; as, in Greek, $\kappa \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma - \sigma \tau$, $\nu \kappa \o v \varepsilon \sigma \tau$, $\pi \alpha \nu \varepsilon \sigma \tau$, $\pi \sigma \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \tau$, and others, from the unorganically increased themes $K_\text{Y} \text{N} \text{E} \sigma$, $N_\text{E} \text{K} \text{Y} \text{E} \sigma$, &c., according to the analogy of 'E$_\text{I}$E$\Sigma$. From the doubled $\Sigma$ one may then be rejected (ανακτεσιν, τολίεσιν, μήνεσιν), or the doubling of a $\Sigma$ by itself be employed; as, for example, $\nu \kappa \o v - \sigma \tau$, for $\nu \kappa \o v - \sigma \tau$. This,

with the theme $\text{h}e\text{s} \text{s}$ exists another, $\text{c}h\text{a} \text{hr} a\text{h} \text{a}$. The anomaly of the Sanskrit "day" appears, in Zend, to have passed completely over to "night," as this latter word has also a theme in $n$, namely $\text{h}u\text{n} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{sa} \text{f} \text{n} \text{m} \text{a} -$ analogous with $\text{h}a\text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{sa} \text{f} \text{n} \text{m} \text{a}$, "dierum" (§. 40. relative to $\delta \varphi$ for $\phi \rho$)—is found in connection with the feminine numeral $\text{t} \text{i} \text{s} \text{m} \text{a} -$ "trium" (Vend. S. p. 246); for we read, l. c. §. 163., $\text{a} \text{n} \text{i} \text{m} \text{m} \text{c} \text{h} \text{a}$ (=$ \text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a} \text{n} \text{c} \text{h} \text{a}$), $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{f} \text{n} \text{a} \text{i} \text{m} \text{m} \text{c} \text{h} \text{a}$ (read $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{f} \text{n} \text{a} \text{i} \text{m} \text{m} \text{c} \text{h} \text{a}$), "of days and nights." In Sanskrit, by the suffix $\text{h} \text{a}$, the form $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a}$, derivative, but equal in its meaning, has arisen out of $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{a}$, which, however, occurs only in compounds (as $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{m}$, "the early part of the day"), and in the adverbal dative $\text{h} \text{a} \text{n} \text{y} \text{a}$, "soon," "immediately," which, therefore, it is not necessary to deduce from the root $\text{h} \text{m} \text{u}$, with the $\alpha$ privative. The Zend, however, whose night-nomenclature, in this respect also, is not outstripped by the Sanskrit, produces, as it appears, by a similar mutation, $\text{h} \text{u} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{n}$ from $\text{h} \text{u} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{n}$; whence we find the locative $\text{h} \text{u} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{n}$, which might also be taken for the dative of $\text{h} \text{u} \text{n} \text{m}$ $\text{c} \text{s} \text{a} \text{n}$,
in most important particulars, is adopted by Thiersch, §. 128., for the development of the forms in εσσι; only that he withdraws from the neuter bases described in §. 128., as ΒΕΛΕΣ, the Σ which belongs to them, and, by a supposition, proved to be erroneous, ΒΕΛΕ is made the theme: and he divides forms like ὀχεσφι into ὀχεσσι instead of ὀχεσ-φι, and, by assimilation, derives ὀχεσσι from ὀχεσ-φι; while, as I believe I have proved, the forms ὀχεσ-φι and ὀχεσσι rest on entirely different case-suffixes (§. 218.), and have only the base ΩΧΕΣ in common with one another. An assimilation, however, may be remarked in γούνας-σι, from γούνατ-σι, so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second, not the reverse. In δέπας-σι we shall leave it undecided whether the first Σ be primitive, and ΔΕΠΑΣ the theme (comp. γηρας, §. 128.), or whether it has arisen out of τ, and so ΔΕΠΑΤ with ΤΕΠΑΤ, ΚΕΠΑΤ, belong to one class. If,

csapan, but that it is preceded (V. S. p. 163.) by the unequivocal adjective locative μενεμή (from μενεμή μενα, "half"). Compare, also, l. c. §. 149., where μενασκει μενας μενας μενας ἢθρα, ἦθρα, κάθα, καθα, καθα, probably means "in this day," "in this night," with the locative adverb μενας ἦθρα, "here," in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme αἱσφανατος csafna, the plural of the same sound csafna, might also be assigned, which occurs l. c. §§. 330. 331., and in several places elsewhere: μενασκει μενας τραυόν ἀσάνα, "three nights;" μενασκει μεσας csafna, "six nights;" μενασκει μεσας κατας csafna, "nine nights," if here csafna be not (as in §. 231. Note † it was considered to be) rather to be taken for the plural of μενασκει csapan, as neuter, since, as has been before observed, the Zend uses the gender of the substantive with great laxity, especially in the plural. For the frequently-occurring ablative τοιούτους csaparati, however, we cannot assume another theme csapara, but we must, if the reading be correct, admit that feminine consonantal roots in the ablative adopt also the broader ending, dt for at.
however, in all these forms, we allow only ςι or σιν to be the case-suffix, and all that precedes it is referred to the true or unorganic increase of the base, it can therewith not be denied that not even to Homer himself, in forms like ἐπεσοςί, not to mention unorganic forms like κύνεσοςί, did the entire ἐσσί present itself as pertaining to that which marked the case; for in the feeling of the speaker ἐπεσοςί could present itself, during that period of the language, only as what it is, namely, as ἐπεσος-ςι, while ἐπεσος, ἐπεσι, plural ἐπεσαί and not ἐπεσι, &c., were used in declension. But different from what has been here adopted is the assumption of Hartung (p. 260, ff.) and Kühner (l. c. §. 255. R. 8.), in the most material points following Greg. Cor. Æol. §. 35,., relative to the production of the Greek plural datives. Kühner says (l. c.)

The character of the dative plural is ες (character of the plural) and ι or κ (character of the dative singular), therefore, ἐσσι(κ)." I, however, think ες not the character of number, but of the nominative plural, and connected with the nominative singular through its Σ: a union of the plural nominative suffix with the singular dative is, to me, not to be imagined. If it were so, how could neuter nouns, to which ες in the nominative is quite foreign, arrive, in the dative, at their identity of form with the natural sexes? It further deserves to be remarked, that, in Prâkṛt, the locative ending सु su frequently assumes an Anuswāra, and so adapts itself, by the form सु sū, for su, to the Greek, σιν, for σι.

254. After laying down the laws of the formation of a single case, it may serve to facilitate the general survey if examples are adduced of the most important classes of words in their connected declension. We pass over here from the Sanskrit, and go to the other languages in their order, according as they have, in the particular cases, most truly preserved their original form; and where one or other of them has departed entirely from the original
principle of formation, or by an unorganic increase to the base has entered the province of another declension, we there, in the place in question, exclude it from the comparison.

MASCULINE BASES IN "A, GREEK IN 0, LATIN IN U, O.

SINGULAR.

Nomina tive, Sanskrit vrika-s, Lithuanian wilka-s, Zend 

værk-k, with cha, vêhrkas-cha, Greek λύκο-ς, 

Latin lupu-s, Gothic vulf-"s."

Accusative, Sanskrit, vrika-m, Lithuanian wilka-n, Zend vêhrkė-m, Greek λύκο-ν, 

Latin lupu-m, Gothic vulf-.

Instrumental, Sanskrit vrikē-n-a, Zend vēhrka, Gothic Dat. 

vulf-a, Lithuanian Instr. wilka.

Dative, Sanskrit vrikāya, Zend vēhrkāi, Lithuanian 

wilka-

Dative, Sanskrit vrikē-t, Zend vēhrkā-t, Latin lup-o(d) (see §. 181.).

Genitive, Sanskrit vrika-sya, Greek λύκο-(σ)οτ, Zend 

vēhrka-hē, Gothic vulf-s, Lithuanian wilko.

* The meaning is, in all these languages, the same, and so is the theme in its first origin. The connection of the Lithuan. wilkas with vrika-s rests on the very usual interchange of the semi-vowels r and l; and this latter goes through the whole of the European sister languages. The Gothic vulfs shews, moreover, the equally common interchange of gutturals and labials, and follows the rule for the alteration of letters (Asp. for Tennis, see §. 87.). In Latin the same thing takes place with regard to the supply of the guttural by the corresponding labial; but lupus is further altered through the loss of the initial letter v, as is the Greek λύκο-ς: it may, however, be assumed, that this v is introduced into the middle of the word in being vocalized into u. While therefore, in Lithuanian, in wilkas, l and k are united, they are, in Greek, separated by v.

† M. Reimnitz, whose pamphlet, "The System of Greek Declension" (Potsdam, 1831), had not been seen by me before I completed the preceding Part of this book, unfolds (1. c. p. 122 passim) the same views concerning
Locative, Sanskrit vriki (from vrika+i), Zend vēhrkē

Vocative, Sanskrit vrika, Zend vēhrka, Lithuanian wilkē, Greek λύκε, Latin lupe, Gothic vulf'.

DUAL.


Instr. Dat.Abl. Sanskrit vrikā-bhyām, Zend vēhrka-ē-bya, Greek Dat. Gen. λυκο-iv, Lithuanian Dat. wilku-m (see §. 215.).

Gen. Loc. Sansk. vrikay-ōs, Zend vēhrkay-ō (see Rem. 1.), Lithuanian wilku.

PLURAL.

Nom. Voc. Sanskrit vrikās, Gothic vulfōs.

Accusative, Sanskrit vrikā-n, Zend vēhrka-ī, Goth. vulfa-ns, Greek λύκο-υς (from λύκο-υς, §. 236.), Lithuanian wilkūs, Latin lupō-s.

the Greek ωω and its connection with the Sanskrit a-sya which I have, without being aware of his concurrence, brought forward in §. 189. I have, however, in this respect, already stated my views in my pamphlet “On the Demonstrative and the Origin of Case” (in the Transactions of the Hist. Phil. Class of the Academy of Science of Berlin for the year 1826, p. 100. Here I have only further to observe, that the Greek adj. δημόσιος, from the root ΔΗΜΟ, is, in the suffix by which it is formed, probably connected with the genitive ending in the text; and is therefore remarkable with reference to the preservation of the s, which is lost in δημοσίο. With regard to the origin of δημόσιος from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin cuius, a, um; and the identity of the Sanskrit suffix of words like समप्त manushya, “man,” as a derivative from Manu, with the genitive ending श्या for श्या, as in समप्त anna-shya, “illius.”

* With reference to the Zend, see §. 231. Note §; and with regard to the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian forms λύκοι, lupi, wilkai, see §. 228.
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Instrumental, Sanskrit vrikā-is* (from vrikā-bhis), Veda vrikē-bhis, Zend vēhrkā-is, Lithuanian wilka-is. Prākrit dēve-hiṃ (from dēva, "God," see § 220.), Greek θεό-φυ,† Gothic Dat. Instr. wulfa-m (§ 215).

Dat. Abl. Sanskrit vrikē-bhyas, Zend [G. Ed. p. 296.] vēhrkaēi-byō, Latin lupi-s (amicī-bus § 244.), Lithuanian wilka-m(u)s (§ 215.).

Genitive, Sanskrit vrikā-ṇ-āṃ, Zend vēhrka-ṇ-āim, Greek λύκ'-ων, Lithuanian wilk'-ū, Gothic wulf'-ē, Latin lupō-rum (§ 248.).

* I take the liberty, in order to separate the base and the termination, to divide the diphthongs, as above in λυκο-υς; therefore one must here pronounce vrikāis, and in Lithuanian wilkais, not as trisyllables, but as dissyllables.

† I have remarked at § 217., but only as a conjecture, that the ending φυ in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit भिस bhīs, and the thence-derived Prākrit भिव hiṃ, and the Latin bis in nobis, vobis; and I will not advance more than a conjecture here, also, in comparing θεό φυ with dēve-hiṃ. This only is certain, that with the syllable भि bhī, which in Sanskrit, lies at the bottom of the case-forms भिस bhīs, भय bhyām, and भास bhyām, as their common root (see § 215. passim), the Greek φυ and φυ is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M. Ag. Beneray (Berl. Ann. July 1833, p. 51.), that φυ might be formed from the ending भय bhyām (§ 222.) by the contraction of यa into i (as in īmu, īmu, reiv, &c. § 222.). The third possible supposition would be the derivation from the usual dative-ablative plural termination भय bhyas; again with the corruption of s to v, as in the 1st person plural μεv from μες, and in the 2d and 3d person τοv, τοv from पας thas, τας tas. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination भस bhyām (§ 215.), and the changing this number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer, however, to consider φυ (φι) as from one of the multiform terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions; therefore, from भिस bhīs or भय bhyas.
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Locative, Sanskrit vrikṣita, Zend vēhrkaē-shva, Lithuanian wilkūse, Greek Dat. λόκοι-ς.

NEUTER BASES IN a, GREEK o, LATIN u, o.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Sanskrit dāna-m, Zend dātē-m, Latin donu-m, Greek δῶρα-ν, Lithuanian gėra, Gothic daur.

Vocative, Sanskrit dāna, Zend dāta, Gothic daur.

The rest as the masculine.

DUAL.


The rest as the masculine.

PLURAL.


The rest as the masculine.

"Remark 1.—The Zend system of declension has received some valuable additions from the treatises published by Burnouf since the appearance of the First Part of this book, which I must lay before my readers.* First a dual case, viz. the genitive-locative, which I imagined to be lost in the Zend, as I had searched for it alone in vain, and could supply all the other dual endings in tolerable copiousness. M. Burnouf supplies this (Yasna, Notes et éclaircissements, p. cxxii.) by the expressions ṣaṣaḥṣaḥ ubāya apahvā which are to be twice found in V. S. p. 312, and on both occasions are rendered by Anquetil, whose

* First, a review of this Part in the Journal des Savans, which refers particularly to the Zend; then the First Part of the First Volume of a Commentary on the Yaṅga; lastly, a disquisition in the Nouveau Journal Asiatique, "Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasichert, et sur quelques superlatifs en Zend."
translation is in this place particularly confused, "dans ce monde." This translation might lead us astray so much the more easily, that श्रवण anhva, according to §. 187., might also be the singular genitive, which frequently occurs with a locative meaning. We await the elucidation which Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation will give of this passage; but, for the present, content ourselves with the inferences deduced by Burnouf. युज्य ubāya, according to that authority, corresponds with the Sanskrit अन्योस ubhayos (amborum, in ambobus), with ơ for a, probably, according to Burnouf's acute conjecture, through the influence of the preceding b, and with the loss of the concluding s. I am the more inclined to assent to Burnouf's opinion regarding the origin of the first ơ of युज्य ubāya, as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case, in which श्रवण ayō, not श्रवण ḍyō, actually occurs; because, that is to say, no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the a—I mean the form श्रवणaऽaऽ zastayō (=Sanskrit hastayōs), "in the hands," from अश्वऽाऽ zāsta, [G.Ed.p.298.] in a passage of the Ζceschne, which has perhaps not yet been examined by M. Burnouf (V. S. p. 354.): श्रवण aऽaऽ काञ्च कऽ aऽविं म aऽविं द्रवयम् zastayō, which Anquetil (p. 192) translates by "Comment moi pur, mettrai-je le main sur le Daroudj?" It appears, however, that अश्वऽाऽ aऽ can as little be a nominative as श्रवणaऽaऽ zastayō a singular accusative; and I believe I am not wrong in the following literal translation: "How can I give the (Dæmon) Drudj into the hands of the pure (into the power)?"

"Remark 2.—In the instrumental singular M. Burnouf admits the termination ana in bases in a (Yaçna, p. 98. passim), with n introduced, for the sake of euphony,

* The Codex has faultily अश्वऽाऽ aऽ and द्रवयम् dṛvjem.
according to the analogy of the Sanskrit रनेन (§. 158.).
He rests this, among other forms, on that of मर्यमर्यम मैस्माना, "urind," a word which had often attracted my
attention, and from which I, in like manner, would have
deduced instrumentals in a-n-a if I had not differed from
Burnouf in the etymology of the same, as I make its
theme terminate in n; and this word, which I remember
to have seen only in the instrumental, I derive from the
Sanskrit root मिम mih, "mingere," by a suffix मन man,
according to the analogy of मर्यमर्यम बारेमान, from वृह
विह, "to grow," whose instrumental मर्यमर्यम बारेमाना,
analogous with मर्यमर्यम मैस्माना, occurs very fre-
quently. M. Burnouf appears, on the other hand, to
adopt a suffix ma in the word मैस्माना, in which we
think we cannot agree with him as long as we cannot
supply any cases which must indubitably belong to a
theme in a. If, further, some words, which in their theme
terminate in मान as (ष, Sanskrit अस as), adopt ana in the
instrumental form—M. Burnouf quotes, p. 100 note, मर्यमर्यम माजाना, मर्यमर्यम स्रयाना, and मर्यमर्यम वाङ्हाना; still, in
my opinion, bases in a may be assigned as the origin of
these forms, and they can be divided माजा-ना, &c., only
in as far as such forms have been already proved to belong
to undoubted bases in a. But now we prefer dividing
them माजा-ना, so that the letter s, with which these themes
originally terminate, is interchanged with a nasal, just as,

[G. Ed. p. 299.] in Sanskrit, the words यक्रिय yakrit, यक्रिय
sakrit change their t for n in the weak cases, and may sub-
stitute यकन yakan, यकन sakan; or as, in more remote
analogy, the Greek, in the first person plural, has formed μεν
from με (μας mas, "mus"). Besides this, M. Burnouf cites
also the interrogative instrumental मम kana, "with what?"
which is the only word that brings to my mind somewhat of
conviction, and had struck my attention before, in passages
like मन kana मन kana बाजाने, "with
what offering shall I sacrifice?” (V. S. p. 481.) I have not, however, ventured to draw a grammatical deduction from this form, because the pronominal bases are prone to unite with one another, and because I believed I might assume that the same pronoun which is contained in चन अना and रन एना forms also the last element of यम ध क ना, if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved, as has also occurred in the Sanskrit चन अना and रन एना in but a few cases. For the rest, the Greek κεῖνος also appears connected with this यम ध क ना, if it is looked upon as a theme, with which the instrumental must agree in sound, for κεῖνος, if not directly of interrogative meaning, is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp. कशन कशचना, “whoever.”). Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in a-n-a, especially as also the bases in i and u (in which the Sanskrit in the masculine and neuter likewise introduces a euphonic n) in the Zend, in words which we have noticed, have dispensed with a similar insertion (§. 160.). In another place (Journal des Savans), M. Burnouf deduces the frequently-occurring instrumental अशयद, “with purity,” from the masculine theme अशा; and there would be accordingly अशय्या अशय, an instrumental form, at present standing alone in the Zend, which I hesitate to acknowledge, although it would be analogous to the Vedic form mentioned in §. 158., अशयाय swapnayā, if one derives this, with the Indian grammarians, from a theme अशय swapna. But if instrumental forms of this kind, in the Vèdas or in the Zend, are not to be produced in other undoubted instances as in the case of adjectives in construction with masculine or neuter substantives, nothing prevents the assumption, that the form अशयाय swapnayā belongs to a feminine theme अशय swapnā, especially as the suffix न na occurs also in other abstracts in the feminine form न न, and therefore अशयाय swapnayā
may be explained according to the analogy of तुषारा trish- [G. Ed. p. 300.] nayā, "with thirst." In every case I think I may deduce the Zend मधुमा ashaya from a feminine theme मधुश ashd, as the Zend in general, in the substantive, passes readily from one sex to the other; and, for example, with a masculine base मन्थ्रा manthra, "a speech," occurs, also, a feminine मन्थ्रा manthra.

"Remark 3.—For the genitive termination नेव hē there also exists, as Burnouf has most satisfactorily proved, a form nearer to the Sanskrit sya, viz. मधुस hyā, which, although rather rare in comparison with the more corrupt form hē, is still sufficiently frequent in some chapters of the Jzeschne to satisfy one perfectly of its signification, according to the proofs given by Burnouf. I too had remarked words with the ending मधुस hyā, but in passages where Anquetil's translation was little adapted to bring to light the genitive nature of the same, which, besides, was very much obscured through its usual representative नेव hē, and was, moreover, concealed from me under the appearance of an instrumental form. However, the termination hyā—for which is sometimes found, also, मधुस khyā—approaches so very near to the Sanskrit स्त्र sya, and agrees with it so precisely according to rule, as far as the unorganic lengthening of the a, that a single passage, with the accurate translation of Neriosingh, who, in the passages hitherto edited, follows the original word by word, would have led us to it. Such a passage is given, although with a different aim, by Burnouf in his Yaśna (Notes, p. cxxxix.), which we here annex, as it is interesting in other respects, also, for grammar:—
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than "who," for the idea of man is lost in the general
signification of the whole,) not by నా kō nā, but simply,
by కా kā, as follows: కా జననే: పిటా పుష్పా ప్రమనే కుచ్చిలు
తాకానాక దద్ది పట్టం kō jananēḥ pitaru puṣyasya práthamaṁ
(G. Ed. p. 301.)
ratvan kā cha khrē, i.e. "boni originem quis fecit?"
kaṁ sūryasya tarakāndancha dādāu pādāvīm
(kīrtā mārgeṇā teṣāḥ kādā dādāu
i.e. "viām ipsīs quis dedit?")
We translate from the Zend, "Quis (qualis vir) creatione pater
est puritatis (or purī) primus? quis (qualis vir) soli stellisque
dedit viām?" The Zend expression తీసే జాంతుండి, for
which, in the lithographed codex, p. 351, is erroneously
given సేచం జాంతుదు, is plainly the instrumental of జాంతు
zantu; which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskrit
indefinitive, జాంతం jantum, as the latter is feminine, and to which
I have, in another place, referred the ablative జాంతువడు
zanthwāḍ (Gramm. Crit. p. 253.). This form is, besides,
remarkable on this account, viz. that it is identical with the
Sanskrit instrumental gerund, which, from జన్ jan, without a
conjunctive vowel and without the euphonious suppression of
the n, would sound జాంతు jantwād. With regard, however,
to the length of the concluding a of the Zend form, which is
preserved contrary to the prevailing rule (see §§. 118, 158.
and 160. p. 191 G. Ed., where, however, తీసే జాంతుండి janthwā is to
be read for zanthwā), I do not attach any particular impor-
ance to that, because in the chapter from which this pas-
sage is taken a, originally short, is repeatedly to be found
lengthened. The Sanskrit జననే: jananēḥ, with which Nerios-
singh translates the Zend instrumental case, must be con-
sidered as an ablative, as this case often enters the depart-
ment of the instrumental, and is also capable of expressing

* Perhaps the adverb ప్రమనే prathamaṁ, "primus," is a corruption for
ప్రమ: prathamāḥ, "primus," which answers to the original, and is to be
expected from the sense.
† Vide as to జాంతు zanthwā, p. 1244 G. ed.
the preposition “through” (for example, Nal. XII. 89.). Considered as a genitive, जननी: जाननी would not correspond with अंजन्तिय zamithwa, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of जानु zamtu could only be अंजान्तिय zamteus, or, also, अंजन्तिय zamithwō, or अंजान्तिय zamtauv (see §. 187.), but in no case अंजन्तिय zamithwa. Add to this, also, that जननी janani is feminine, like the Zend जानु zamtu, and पुण्यय पुन्यस्य, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of जननी: जाननी than, in Zend, अंजन्तिय ashahyā could pass as the epithet of अंजन्तिय zamithwa. I will, however, as concerns the Zend, lay no great stress on this circumstance, since in it the genders of the substantive are constantly changing. M. Burnouf, who looks upon जननी: जाननी as a genitive, and refers पुण्यय पुन्यस्य पुन्यस्य to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the पुण्यय पुन्यस्य पुन्यस्य, which does not agree with the gender of जननी janani, but he confirms, however, the reading expressly by the addition of a

[G. Ed. p. 302.]  sic. His translation runs, “Quel est le premier père de la creation pure? qui a montré leur route au soleil et aux astres.” I look with anxiety for M. Burnouf’s further explanation of this passage, but expect from him rather information of value in other respects, than to find that he has succeeded in making the forms जननी: जाननी and अंजन्तिय zamithwō pass for genitives. Anquetil’s traditionary interpretation sounds, in this place, very strange, but does not contradict my apprehension of अंजन्तिय zamithwa: he makes the genitive अंजन्तिय ashahyā pass for the nominative, and does not, therefore, throw any light on the meaning of the termination अंजन्तिय hyā; for, in the presumption that it was right, अंजन्तिय ashahyā might, perhaps, have next been taken for an instrumental, and perhaps have been translated “father with purity.” His translation is as follows:

“Quel est le premier père pur* qui a engendré ? qui a donné

* In other places (V. S. p. 385) Anquetil renders (p. 137) the words अंजन्तिय
de lui même les astres qui ne sont pas à deux faces?" The sun is here quite left out of the question; and it must be acknowledged, that, as far as relates to etymology, it is very much obscured in this passage; we might identify, with reference to the form of खेङ, this expression with the reflective pronoun ख्स kha (as in kha-datta, "created of itself," which is often said of the stars, as of self-created lights), and consider it as the epithet of खेङ/खेङ stren-cha; so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit खान swān. It is here to be remarked, that in some chapters of the Jheschne, खेङ is repeatedly found instead of a simple nasal, and, indeed, without regard to the organ of the following initial letter. So we read, in the V. S. p. 391, दुस्हासत्त्रेंग dushacsathreng,* दुस्स्योथनेंग dusskyoṭhenneng, दुस्स्यदनेंग dussidanaṛṇeng. Anquetil, indeed, renders these expressions as singular nominatives, "ce roi mechant, qui fait le mal, attaché à la mauvaise loi"; but they, together with [G. Ed. p. 303.] दुस्ह्वचानाङ्खो dushvachanāṅko, दुस्ह्मानाङ्खो dushmanāṅko, refer to the plural द्रिव्य dregvatā, and I have no doubt of their accusative nature: the whole passage, however, like many others in the Jheschne, can be explained only with the help of Neriosingh's Sanskrit translation. We can but regret that the in other respects highly valuable elaborate exactitude of Burnouf's excellent Commentary leaves us no hope that he will come very soon to the elucidation of this and other passages, regarding which I am most curious. But to return to our खेङ, खेङ...
the ṣ kh makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptation for the sun, for which, commonly, Ṛṣw따v hvarē is found (the Sanskrit सर swar, "heaven,"), as ṣ kh is used very frequently for Ṛw ḍv (see §. 35.); but we might here expect to find Ṛṣw ḏv kharē, and may suppose that the Ṛsw Ṇng has arisen out of Ṛ, and this letter out of Ṛ, as these liquids are easily interchanged, as is shewn in Sanskrit, by the connection of सम əhan, "day," with सहर əhar, and, in the Zend, that of नसकोस csapan, "night," with नसकोस csapar (I write it thus, and not नसकोस csaparē, designedly, see §. 44.). At all events I take Ṛṣw ḏv kheng to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base रsw ḍv hvar may have entirely lost its Ṛ, and that it may be रsw ḏv kheng for रsw ḋv khem, the accusative of a base म kha. नसकोस stren-cha, also, according to my opinion, is the accusative, and not, as one might expect from the Sanskrit translation, the genitive plural, which more frequently occurs in the form नसकोस stāraiṃ. Although, from this, नसकोस stren might easily be formed by contraction and combination with म cha, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in नसकोस strencha, a secondary form of नसकोस strens, explained in §. 239.; so that the nasal, here vocalized to Ṛ, is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp. §. 239.); especially as, in other places also, म dd is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given. In the Zend expression, Ṛṣw FirebaseAuth adhvānēm, the Sanskrit अध्यात्म adhvānam cannot fail to be observed (comp. §. 45.); but in the lithographed MS. we have instead of this, Ṛṣw FirebaseAuth advānēm, which is easily seen to be an error. This false reading appears, nevertheless, to be an ancient one, and widely diffused; and upon this is founded Anquetil's, or rather his Pārsī teacher's, interpretation, which is strangely at variance with Neriosingh's exposition; "qui [G. Ed. p. 304.] ne sont pas a deux faces," so that म a is
taken for the well-known privative particle, ज्ञान द्वा as the number two, and the last portion finds in the Sanskrit धानान, "countenance," its corresponding syllable.

**FEMININE BASES IN a, GOTHIC ôte (§ 118.).**

**Nominative,** Sanskrit dharâ,*
Greek χώρα, Lithuanian rankâ, Zend hizva, Gothic giba, Latin terra.

**Accusative,** Sansk. dharâ-ṃ, Latin terram, Zend hizva-āṃ, Greek χόρα-ν, Lith. rankâ-į, Goth. giba.

**Instrumental,** Sanskrit dharay-ā, Zend hizvay-a, Gothic Dat. Instr. gibai (§ 161.), Lithuanian rankâ.

**Dative,** Sansk. dhardy-āi, Zend hizvay-āi, Lith. ranka-i.

**Ablative,** Zend hizvay-āt, Latin terrâ(d).

**Genitive,** Sanskrit dhardy-ās, Zend hizvay-āo, Greek χόρα-s, Latin terrâ-s, Lithuanian ranko-s, Gothic gibô-s.

**Locative,** Sanskrit dharây-ām (§ 202.), Zend hizvay-a, Lithuanian ranko-ye (§ 197.).

**Vocative.** Sanskrit dharâ, Zend hizvâ (?), Greek χόρα, Latin terra, Lithuanian ranka, Gothic giba (?).

**DUAL.**


* Means "earth," and is probably connected with the Greek χώρα, as aspirates are easily interchanged (Buttmann, § 16. Rem. 1.). The root is धृ (धर, § 1.), "to hold," "carry;" whence, also, परा dhâra, which, by reason of the long vowel of its root, approaches nearer the Greek χώρα (§ 4.), although it does not signify earth.

† Without being able to quote this case in Zend bases in â, I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form, since I can prove by other cognate case terminations: 1. That the â is not shortened; and 2. also that an i is not introduced into the theme by the assimilative power of the termination; hence, e. g. in the instr. pl. ज्ञाने gêndis (V. S. p. 308.) from ज्ञाने gênd "woman" (gûnî).
FORMATION OF CASES.

FEMININE BASES IN i.*

SINGULAR.

Nominative, Sanskrit priti-s, Zend āfrīti-s, Greek πόρτι-s,
Latin turri-s, Lithuanian awi-s, Gothic anst'-s.

Accusative, Sanskrit priti-m, Latin turri-m, Zend āfrītī-m,
Greek πόρτι-v, Lithuanian āwi-n, Gothic anst'.

Instrumental, Sanskrit prīty-d, Zend āfrīthy-a, Gothic Dat.
Instr. anstāi (without case suffix, see §. 161.).

Dative, Sanskrit prītyay-e (or prīty-āī, §. 164.), Zend āfrīte-e.†

Ablative, Zend āfrītōi-t, Latin turri-(d).

Genitive, Sanskrit prītē-s (or only with the feminine termination prīty-ās), Gothic anstai-s, Zend āfrītōi-s, Greek πόρτι-ος, φύσε-ως, Lat turri-s.

Locative, Sanskrit prīt-Āu, (or with the feminine termination only prīty-ām).

Vocative, Sanskrit prītē, Zend āfrīti, Greek πόρτι.

DUAL.


* It may be sufficient to give here the cases of a Sanskrit masculine in ī, which differ from the feminine paradigma: from agni, "fire," comes the instrumental singular agni-n-ā—whilst from pati, "master," comes paty-a, and from sakhi, "friend," sakhy-ā (see §. 158.)—and in the accus. plural as, for instance, in the Prakrit चिन्तेमि chintēmi, from चिन्तयामि chintayāmi. ī is here a weaker form of ē—-secondary, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p. 218, Note †.

† Differing from what is stated in §. 164. p. 196. G. Ed., it is now my opinion that the ē in अरिते āfrīte does not represent the a of the original form अरितये āfrītayē, but is the contraction of a and y; as, for instance, in the Prakrit चिन्तेमि chintēmi, from चिन्तयामि chintayāmi. ē is here a weaker form of ē—secondary, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p. 218, Note †.
FORMATION OF CASES.

Instr. Dat. Abl. Sanskrit प्रिति-भ्याम्, Zend ṣfrītī-byā, Greek ἰορτί-ον, Lithuanian Dat. āwi-m (§ 215.).

Gen. Loc. Sanskrit प्रित्य-दस्, Zend ṣfrīthī-ḍ (see p. 276. Rem. 1.).

PLURAL.

Nom. Voc. Sanskrit प्रितय-अस्, Zend ṣfrīthī-ō (with cha "and" ṣfrīthī-ās-cha), Greek πόρτι-ς, Latin turri-ōs, Gothic anstei-s, Lithuanian āmy-s.

Accusative, Sanskrit प्रिति-स्, Zend ṣfrītī-s, Greek πόρτι-ς, Gothic ansti-ns, Lithuanian āwy-s.

Instrumental, Sanskrit प्रिति-भिस्, Zend ṣfrītī-bis, Lithuanian awi-mis, Gothic Dat. Instr. ansti-m (§ 215.).

Dat. Abl. Sanskrit प्रिति-भ्यास्, Zend ṣfrītī-byā, Latin turri-bus, Lithuanian awi-m(u)s (§ 215.).

Genitive, Sanskrit प्रिति-न-धम्, Zend ṣfrītī-n-ām, Latin turri-um, Greek πόρτι-ον, Lithuanian awi-ū, Gothic anst-ē.

Locative, Sanskrit प्रिति-शु, Zend ṣfrītī-shu (or ṣfrīti-shu), Lithuanian āwi-sa, Greek Dat. πόρτι-ς.

NEUTER BASES IN भ.

SINGULAR.


The rest like the masculine.

DUAL.


The rest like the masculine.

PLURAL.


The rest like the masculine.

* Vide p. 1078 G. ed. as to turri-s and similar forms.
FORMATION OF CASES.

MASCULINE BASES IN u.

SINGULAR.

Nom.  Sanskrit sunu-s, Gothic sunu-s, Lithuanian sunu-s, Zend pašu-s, Latin pecu-s, Greek βότρυσ.

Accusative  Sanskrit sunu-m, Latin pecu-m, Zend pašu-m, Greek βότρυν, Lithuanian sunu-i, Gothic sunu.

Instrumental  Sanskrit sunu-n-ā (Veda prabhāv-ā, from pra-bāhu, § 158.), Zend pašv-a, Gothic Dat. Instr. sunau.

Dative  Sanskrit sunau-ē, Zend pašv-ē, Lithuanian sunu-i.

Ablative  Zend pašād-t, Latin pecu-(d).

Genitive  Sanskrit sunu-s (from sunau-s), Gothic sunau-s, Lithuanian sunau-s, Zend pašeu-s or pašv-ō (from pašv-aś), Latin pecū-s, Greek βότρυς.

Locative  Sanskrit sunu-āu.

Vocative  Sanskrit sunu (from sunau), Gothic sunau, Lithuanian sunau, Zend pašu, Greek βότρυ.

DUAL.


Instr. Dat. Abl. Sanskrit sunu-bhyām, Zend pašu-byā, Greek βότρυ-ο-ιν, Lithuanian sunu-m (§. 215.)


PLURAL.

Nom. Voc.  Sanskrit sunu-ās, Greek βότρυς, Zend pašv-ō (with cha, pašvaś-cha), Latin pecū-s, Gothic sunu-s (for suniu-s, from sunau-s, §. 230.), Lithuanian sunu-s.

Instrumental  Sanskrit sunu-bhis, Zend pašu-bis, Lithuanian sunu-mis, Gothic Dat. Instr. sunu-m (§. 215.).
FORMATION OF CASES.

Genitive. Sanskrit sunu-n-ām Zend pasv-āim, Latin pecu-um, Greek βορυων, Gothic suniv-*ē, Lithuanian sun'-ū.

Locative. Sanskrit sunu-śhu, Zend pasu-shva (or pasu-shu), Lithuanian sunū-se, Greek Dat. βότρυ-σι.

Remark.—Feminine bases in u in Sanskrit differ in declension from the masculine, exactly as, p. 305 G. Ed., प्रति prīti f. differs from अग्नि agni m.

NEUTER BASES IN u.

SINGULAR.
The rest like the masculine.

DUAL.
The rest like the masculine.

PLURAL.
The rest like the masculine.

FEMININE BASES IN u. [G. Ed. p. 309.]

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accus. nārī-m</td>
<td>bhiy-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. nāry-a</td>
<td>bhiy-ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. nāry-āi</td>
<td>bhiy-ē, or bhiy-āi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. nāry-ās</td>
<td>bhiy-as or bhiy-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. nāry-ās</td>
<td>bhiy-as or bhiy-ās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. nāry-ām</td>
<td>bhiy-i or bhiy-ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. nāri</td>
<td>bhiṣ-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORMATION OF CASES.

DUAL.

Sanskrit.           Zend.

N. A. V. ndry-du,  bhiy-du,     ndirī (see § 213, p. 227.)
I. D. Ab. ndri-bhydm, bhī-bhydm, ndirī-byā.
Loc. ndry-ōs,       bhiy-ōs,     ndiry-ō?

PLURAL.

N. V. ndry-ōs,       bhiy-ōs,     ndiry-ō.
Accus. ndri-s,       bhiy-s,      ndirī-s.
Instr. ndri-bhīs,    bhī-bhīs,    ndirī-bīs.
D. Abl. ndri-bhyas,  bhī-bhyas,   ndirī-byō.
Gen. ndrī-n-ām,     bhiy-ām,     ndirī-n-āim.
Loc. ndrī-shu,       bhī-shu,     ndirī-shva or -shu.

"Remark.—By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in ī, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek

[G. Ed. p. 310.]  kīṣ, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom. bhī-s, kī-ṣ, Gen. bhiy-ās, kī-ōṣ, Loc. Dat. bhiy-i, kī-i, Acc. strī-m,† kī-v, Voc. bhī-s, kī-ṣ. Plural: Nom. bhīy-ās, kī-ēṣ, Gen. bhiy-ām. kī-ōv, Loc. Dat. bhī-shu, kī-ṣī, Acc. bhiy-ās, kī-āṣ, Voc. bhiy-ās, kī-ēṣ. I consider, however, this coincidence as accidental, but, nevertheless, an accidental coincidence of that nature, that can only occur in languages which were originally really one: and undoubtedly the terminations, whose common sound appears so startling, are historically connected. As far, however, as concerns the theme, I believe, with Kühner (§ 287.), that the į of kī was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the į. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume

* Or bhi-n-ām. Further, the longer case-terminations, which belong to the feminine (see § 164.), are added at will to the monosyllabic feminines in ī, ā; for example, together with bhiyē, bhruvē, also bhiyāī, bhruvāī.

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in ī, with the termination am, strīy-am.
that \( KIF \) is the true theme, and that the nominative was originally \( KIF \); for if \( KI\sigma, KI\iota \), in the form in which they have been received, be analogous to \( \Delta I\sigma, \Delta I\iota \), from \( \Delta IF\sigma, \Delta IF\iota \), still, to establish a theme \( KIF \), a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to \( \Delta IF\iota \) from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this, that which of itself is alone sufficient proof, the cognate Sanskrit word हिव div, "heaven" (§ 122,) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme \( KIF \) is, however, wanting, for the long \( i \) could, as in the Sanskrit भी bhī, and like the long \( u \) in द्रोह, be also the real final letter of the base, only that the long \( t \) in the Sanskrit, except in compounds (for example गतभी gata-bhī m.f., "void of fear," चड्पी m.f., "water-drinking," see Gramm. Crit. §§ 169.170.), concludes only the feminine themes. We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek \( kīς \) in another way, through the Sanskrit, and we find this, as it appears to me, through a like masculine base, which approximates closely to the \( kī-ς \), as well in form as in meaning; namely, in कृत kīta, Nom. कृठ kīta-s, "insect" "worm," which would lead us to expect in the Greek \( kītος \), Acc. \( kītον \), to which \( kīς, kīν \), bear the same relation as \( μεγας, μεγαν \), to the to be presupposed \( μεγαλος, μεγαλον \). I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme \( MEGAT \), although the Sanskrit महान mahān, "great," might support it; but महान mahān is a participial form, and its full and original form [G. Ed. p. 311.] (§ 129.) is महान mahant, Nom. masc. महान mahān, which would correspond to the Greek μεγαν."
FORMATION OF CASES.

SINGULAR,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abl. vadhw-âs</td>
<td>bhruv-âs (or -âs),...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. vadhâ-âs</td>
<td>bhruv-âs (or -âs), ὄφρυ-ας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. vadhâ-âm</td>
<td>bhruv-î (or -âm), ὄφρυ-ι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. vadhâ</td>
<td>bhrû-s, ὄφρυ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.Ac.V. vadhâ-âu</td>
<td>bhruv-âu, ὄφρυ-ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.D. Ab. vadhâ-bhyâm</td>
<td>bhrû-bhyâm, ὄφρυ-ο-μ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.L. vadhâ-ôs</td>
<td>bhruv-ôs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. V. vadhâ-âs</td>
<td>bhruv-âs, ὄφρυ-ες.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus. vadhâ-s</td>
<td>bhruv-âs, ὄφρυ-ας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. vadhâ-bhis</td>
<td>bhrû-bhis, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Abl. vadhâ-bhyas</td>
<td>bhrû-bhyas, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. vadhâ-âm (or bhrû-âm)</td>
<td>ὄφρυ-ως.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. vadhâ-šu</td>
<td>bhrû-šu, ὄφρυ-σι.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark.—The identity of भ्रु bhrû and ὈΦΡΥ* is [G. Ed. p. 312.] sufficient proof that the length of the v is organic (comp. §. 121.), and it is not necessary, therefore, to suppose a theme ὈΦΡΥF (comp. Kühner §. 289.) so as to consider ὄφρυς as coming from ὄφρυFς, and the long v as a compensation for the rejected F, as perhaps μέλας from μέλανς. That, however, F originally stood—for example, ὄφρυFς—before the terminations now commencing with a vowel, though at a time when the language had not a Grecian form is shewn by the Sanskrit bhruv-âs; by which, at the same time, the shortening of the v in this case is justified, for the Sanskrit

* The o in ὄφρυς is based on the peculiar disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to words which originally commenced with a consonant, to which I have already drawn attention in another place, and by which, among other things, the relation of ὅνυξ, ὅνουα, to नखस nakhus-s, नाम nāma, is shewn
changes, that is to say in polysyllables, as well \( u \) as \( \dot{u} \), before vowel terminations, into a simple \( v \); but in monosyllables, in order to avoid commencing with two consonants, or to gain a polysyllabic form, the semi-vowel has its corresponding short vowel placed before it, and thus is formed उच uv (\( \ddot{u}v \)), as well from \( u \) as from \( \dot{u} \), as, under a similar condition, इस from \( i \) and \( \dot{i} \): hence the two opposite forms, for example, vadhuv-as (not vadhuv-as), “women,” and bhruv-as (not bhrw-as), “the eyebrows;” as above, bhuy-as (not bhy-as), opposed to nāry-as (nāriy-as). In the dative plural the short \( u \) of \( \ddot{o}\phi\ddot{r}\ddot{o}-\ddot{s} \) for \( \ddot{o}\phi\ddot{r}\ddot{u}-\ddot{s} \) may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the \( u \) before vowel terminations."

### BASES IN \( \text{ā}u \) (अ०), *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
<td>वाद-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>नाद-म</td>
<td>वाद-व</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
<td>वाद((F))-ो</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>नाद-ई</td>
<td>वाद((F))-ई</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
<td>वाद-स</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>[G. Ed. p. 313.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Acc. Voc.</td>
<td>नाद-ढू</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>नाद-भ्याम</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>नाद-म</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>नाद-श्हु</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>नाद-स</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Remark.—I find no sufficient grounds, with Kuhner, l. c. § 283.) to suppose that the base of the nominatives

---

* I give only the cases retained in the Greek.
in *avś, evś, ouś, originally terminated in *F, so that in the case before us it would be requisite to suppose a theme *NAF: for even if the vocalization of *F to *v, in order to facilitate the junction with a consonant following, did not surprise us—(forms like *vaFś, *vaFṣ, could never occur);—still, on the other hand, the transition of the sound *v into its corresponding semi-vowel, in order to avoid the hiatus, is far more regular, and is required in the Sanskrit according to the common rules of euphony. We will not therefore differ from the Indian grammarians, by the assumption of a theme *nadv for *nī *nāu, and *gav *gav for *go *gō (bos); although, if there were adequate reasons for it, the practice of the Indian grammarians would not restrain us from laying down *gav and *nadv in the Sanskrit as the true themes, which maintained themselves in this form only before vowel terminations, but before consonants have allowed the *v to pass into a *u, according to the analogy of the anomalous दिव् *div, "heaven"; whence, for example, the instrumental plural द्विमिस् *dya-bhis for द्विविस् *div-bhis, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. §. 208.). The Latin navis cannot compel us to lay down a theme *nadv for the Sanskrit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic *i, as *śvan, "dog," lengthened to *cāni; and therefore it exhibits in its declension nowhere *u, but universally *v.

[G. Ed. p. 314] BASES TERMINATING WITH A CONSONANT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend.</th>
<th>Latin.</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thema,</td>
<td>VĀCH,</td>
<td>VĀCH,</td>
<td>VŌC,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>vāk,</td>
<td>vāc-s,</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus.</td>
<td>vāch-am,</td>
<td>vāch-ēm</td>
<td>voc-em,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>vāch-ā,</td>
<td>vāch-ā,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>vāch-ē,</td>
<td>vāch-ē,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Locative.
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SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ablat.</td>
<td>vîcch-ätt,</td>
<td>⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>vîcch-as,</td>
<td>voc-ë(d), ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>vîcch-i,</td>
<td>vîc-s, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>vâk,</td>
<td>⋯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Acc. V.</td>
<td>vîcch-du, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or vîcch-a,</td>
<td>⋯ ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Abl.</td>
<td>vâg-bhyâm, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L.</td>
<td>vîcch-ôs, ⋯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. V.</td>
<td>vîcch-as, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus.</td>
<td>vîcch-ô, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>vâg-bhîs, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Abl.</td>
<td>vâg-bhyas, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>vîcch-âm, ⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>vâk-shu, ⋯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Remark 1.—I leave the terminations in the Zend which commence with b unnoticed, since, contrary to my former opinion (§ 224. Note *), I look on the e, in forms like raochebis, no longer as a conjunctive vowel; and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme raoch, but assume that raochebis, and similar forms, have proceeded from bases in from a§ 56).; so that I look upon the e as a corruption of the ô, and to the form raochebyô I place as anterior a lost form raochô-byô. In a similar way

* Like the Genitive.
† With cha, “and,” vâchas-cha.
‡ See p. 230, Note *.
§ M. Burnouf, who has induced me, by his excellent pamphlet, cited at p. 276, on the Vahista (in the separate impression, p. 16, and following), to rectify my former views, leaves, p. 18 note, the question still undecided, whether forms like mazebis, manebis,
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[G. Ed. p. 316.] I find, in the Prakrit (Urvasi, by Lenz, p. 40.), चधररिः achharthin for चधरीः achhārdhiḥ (Sanskrit apravarobhis); and if this form is genuine, then the े e, in forms like राईः raochēbīs, appears to stand for ro ṑ as, as generally many interchanges between रे e and ro ṑ occur, although in the case before us the े e is very constantly written, and ro ṑ has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find रेः ye for येः yē, "which," ये ke for यो kō, "who?" and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also ये ve for यो vō; and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person ने ne for नो nō; then we see the change of the य o with य e is sufficiently ascertained, although it appears to be restricted to the end of words of a monosyllabic form; and in these the practice of writing the य o is the prevailing one, while before termi-

vaacbēs, राओचेबीस, have so arisen from the bases मादो, &c., that the य o (म as) is suppressed, and य e then introduced as conjunctive vowel; or whether, before the o (from as) only, the s has been rejected, and the preceding a with an epenthetic i united with an e. In the former case I should not have been entirely wrong, from the analogy of raouch-e-bis, to deduce forms like vāch-e-bis. I consider, however, the last view as the right one, only that I prefer letting the o from the pre-supposed original form, manō-bis, raochō-bis, be changed in its whole force into य e, rather than reduce it into its elements, and mix the first of the said elements (a) with a conjoined i: for the derivation of manebis from manūbhis from manabhis, for manasbis, would extend to the Sanskrit form तनोभिः manobhis, which originally may have been manarbhīs (manasa-bhīs was never possible). But I believe that in the Zend the form eēs really preceded the form ebīs. M. Burnouf, in his review in the Journal des Savans (in the separate impression, pp. 30, 31), calls attention to a form वियह्ष्वियः vāghzhēbyō, for which is once found, in the Vend. Sāde, pp. 69 and 70, वियह्ष्वियः vāghēzhēbyō, once वियह्ष्वियः vāghēzhēbyō, which,
nations beginning with $b$ as yet no $d$ has been pointed out; so that $b$ appears to be as repugnant to a preceding $d$ as favourable to a following $d$, if the conjecture of Burnouf, mentioned at p. 297, G. Ed., is well-founded. On this point I was not yet clearly informed, when, at §§ 224. and 242., I inconsiderately imagined I could deduce $vachō-byā, vachō-bīs$, from $vachō$ (from $vachā$). Instead of this should be read $vache-byā, vache-bīs$; and besides this, in the locative singular, $vachahi$ for $vachānhi$; since the nasal to be prefixed to the $h$, according to §. 56b., falls away when the vowel which follows the $h$ is $i$, which has been already indicated in the paragraph quoted, but since then fully proved by Burnouf. Besides, there really occurs, also, in one passage (where, unfortunately, the lithographed MS. is faulty, and is therefore

which, with the conjunctive vowel $e$ (see § 30.) introduced in different ways, plainly represent one and the same word, and have proceeded from $vaghtzhbyō$, which itself never occurs. Although these forms, which had struck me likewise, clearly belong to a theme which means "discourse," and is connected with our $vāch$, I would still rather not, with Burnouf, derive it from $vāch$; so that the nominative of this, $vācs$, raised to a secondary theme, would be contained therein. We dare not, without further authority, attribute to the Zend such a malformation, although it derives its superlatives in $vācs$ $tēma$ from the masculine nominative, instead of from the theme. But Anquetil, in his Glossary, gives a form $vakhsenghē", "parole utile," which we ought probably to read $vacsanḥē$ (as dative), if not with long $a$ $vacsanḥē$. This latter form would belong to a theme $vācsō$ (vācsā); from which, in the dat. abl. pl., $vaghzhbyō$ (vaghēzhbyō, &c.) might proceed for $vācsbyō$; as with $mæzēbīs, mæzēbīs$, $manbīs$, occur also $mæzēbīs, manbīs$; for the $s$ of $vācsō$ must, as Burnouf has shewn, in contact with $b$ become $zh$. 
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impossible for me to use) the locative वचाहि vachahi; that is to say, in the Vend. S. p. 173, where, for वचाहे वचाहे manahēchā vachahēchā, is to be read वचाहिं manahīchā vachahīchā. In a Grammar, the lost acquaintance with which is again to be restored, oversights of this kind will, I trust, be excused in the first labourers; and if, for example, Rask gives to the word paiti the genitive paitōis, while, according to § 180. p. 196, Note †, patōis is to be written, still the form paitōis was, in its time, instructive in the main, and first taught me that the Sanskrit genitive termination ē-s corresponds to the form ēis in the Zend. If, too, Rask has incorporated in his scheme of declensions the ablative paitōit (for patōit), this was indeed a new error, but also a new advantage for the Zend Grammar in its then state, and brought to light a new and important fact, which I believe I was the first to discover; namely this, that bases in ī form their ablative in ēīt, for which the proofs in the Zend-Avesta, as much as I have of it, are neither numerous nor easily found. I make this remark because M. Burnouf, as it appears to me, speaks too unfavourably of such theoretic formations. As far as I am concerned, I believe I may assert that my communications regarding Zend Grammar are founded on careful reflection. I could not, however, perfectly conclude my considerations, and I am very ready to complete and adjust them through those of M. Burnouf. For in this book also, in regard to Zend Grammar, one must carefully distinguish the disquisitions given in the text from the general comparison added at the end of each rule regarding case. In the former I give only those Zend forms which I have seen, and I thence deduce theoretic laws: in the latter I seek to make the deductions from the inquiries pursued in the text evident in one select example. I am perfectly sure of the prevailing majority of the forms given in the tables, and can produce abundant examples
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of them. I have marked some as questionable, and shewn the limits of the probability of others, in notes; and if an error has crept into the forms spoken of, and by me believed to be correct, it will give me pleasure to be able hereafter supplementarily to correct it. The form स्वभाविक vachanhi was, however, only in a measure a theoretic formation; and I should not have ventured to [G. Ed. p. 318.] exhibit it if I had not observed, in other words of the same declension, i.e. in other bases terminating with a consonant, the locative, which has entirely escaped Rask.

"Remark 2.—One might consider the o of ὀτοῦν instead of a conjunctive vowel, as has been stated above (see §. 221.), as a property of the base, i.e. as an unorganic extension of it; or, in other words, regard it as a transition from the third to the second declension; a declaration which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination αῦν of the whole third declension (ποσίο-ιν, βοτρύω-ιν, δαιμόνο-ιν like λύκο-ιν), and to all cases in the formation of words and arrangement of the same, where we have represented an o foreign to the proper base as conjunctive vowel. According to this, forms like μελιτόεις, μελιτοπόλης, φυσιολογία, βοτρυβεῖς, βοτρυδόρως, would be, under the presupposition of the bases ΜΕΛΙΤΟ, ΦΥΣΙΟ, ΒΟΤΡΥΟ, to be divided into μελιτό-εις, and would lead us to expect the nominatives μελιτο-ν, &c., which are not to be found. The statement here given has this in its favour, that similar cases occur also in cognate dialects, since in general that declension which is the most in vogue and most used, is prone, in certain cases, to receive into itself the other declensions, which annex to their original base the final letters of the bases of the declension more in use. The origin of ὀτοῦν from ὌΠΟ, of φερόντον from ΦΕΡΟΝΤΟ, was as it were the first commencement of the disease, which came to its full developement in the Pâli; since in this language, which otherwise closely resembles the Sanskrit, the bases which end with consonants are declined
in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an unorganic \( \alpha \) (= Greek \( \omicron \)), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second; and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root चर char, "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base चरण charant, or its corruption चरत charat (see §. 129.), partly from the augmented theme चरण charanta, and in part also

[G. Ed. p. 319.] arbitrarily from चरण charant or चरत charanta, as follows (see Clough's Pâli Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p. 112 et seq.):

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>CHARANT</td>
<td>CHARANTA</td>
<td>CHARAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>charan,*</td>
<td>charantô</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>charant-am,†</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>charantë-n-a</td>
<td>charat-à.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>like the Genitive,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>{ charantu-smñ,</td>
<td>} charat-à.§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{ or charanta-mldà,† }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The final न n is, as in the Prâkrit (§. 10.), transmuted into the Anuswâra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by \( \tilde{n} \).

† It might also be divided thus, charanta-m, and deduced from charanta.

† Transposed, and with \( \tilde{a} \) for \( s \) (comp. §. 166.). These forms are derived from the medial pronoun sma mentioned in §. 166., which, in the Pâli also, has forced its way into the usual declension. The \( t \), which was to have been expected, is, as generally happens at the end of a word, suppressed.

§ Charatà is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but
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SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>CHARANT</td>
<td>CHARANTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>charanta-ssa</td>
<td>charant-δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>{or charanta-smin,} charat-i, or charanta-mhi,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>charañ, or chara,*</td>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or chará,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLURAL. [G. Ed. p. 320.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>charantát,†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>charanté,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>{charantébhi,}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or charantehi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>like the Genitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>like the Instrumental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>. . . . charat-am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>charanté-su,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>charantó, charantá,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pāli, one would have expected, for instance, from φέρων a genitive φέροντος, dative φέροντος; and in the plural indeed, φέροντος from

but is, in reality, corrupted from charat-at, analogous with Zend forms like ap-at (in §. 180.): the suppressed t is replaced by the lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in achará, “he went,” from acharát (Clough, p. 106.).

* If this form really belongs to a theme in nt, as I believe, it has sprung from the original form charañ, by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp. Burnouf and Lassen, p. 89); and in chará this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel.

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with charantát also charantó, from the original theme charant; as, for example, gunavantó is used with gunavantá, “the virtuous”; the former from gunavant, the latter from gunavanta.
ΦΕΠΟΝΤ, but φεροντοι, φεροντους, φεροντοις, from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ. In this manner the form φερόντοις in the dual, which has been lost in Pāli, would be clearly explained as derived from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ; but even when standing isolated, φερόντοις may be justly referred to a theme ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ, as the first commencement of a corruption which was further pursued in the Pāli; and I prefer this view of the matter now to that laid down at §. 221. Both views, however, concur so far; and thus much of my opinion may be looked on as proved, that in φερόντοις and all other dative-genitive forms of the third declension, the o belongs neither to the original theme, which lies at the root of all the other cases, nor to the true case-suffix.

[G. Ed. p. 321.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. bharan,</td>
<td>barain-s,</td>
<td>feren-s,</td>
<td>φέρων,</td>
<td>fiyand-s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. bharant-am,</td>
<td>barent-čem,</td>
<td>ferent-em,</td>
<td>φέρωντ-α(ν),</td>
<td>fiyand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. bharat-ē,</td>
<td>barēnt-ē,</td>
<td>see Locat, see Loc.</td>
<td>see Dat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. see Gen.</td>
<td>barant-at,</td>
<td>ferent-e(d),</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. bharat-as,</td>
<td>barent-ō,†</td>
<td>ferent-is,</td>
<td>φέρωντ-ος,</td>
<td>fiyand-is.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. bharan,</td>
<td>barain-s,</td>
<td>feren-s,</td>
<td>φέρων,</td>
<td>fiyand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ I imagined, p. 210, that I must, in this case, which before was not proved to exist in ND bases, set down fiyand- as a mutilation of fiyand-is from fiyand-as, according to the analogy of other bases terminating with a consonant (ahmin-s, brōthr-s, 5. 191.); Grimm has (I. 1017.) conjectured friyāndos or friyōndis from friyōnde. Since this, owing to the very valuable additions made by Massmann to our Gothic authorities, the genitive nasīyandis of Nasyand ("preserver, "preserving") has come to light (see his Glossary, p. 153), by analogy with which I form fiyand-is.
**FORMATION OF CASES.**

### DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vēdic, Bharant-ā,†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Abl. Bharad-bhyām</td>
<td>baran-bya,†</td>
<td>φεπόντ-ο-ιν.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Loc, Bharat-ōs</td>
<td>barat-ō? (p. 276, R. 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. V. Bharant-as</td>
<td>barēnt-ō,§</td>
<td>ferent-ēs, φέποντ-ες, ἐφυαν-ς.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. Bharat-as</td>
<td>barēnt-ō,§</td>
<td>ferent-ēs, φέποντ-ας, ἐφυαν-σς.‖</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Bharad-bhis</td>
<td>buran-bīs,¶</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ab. Bharad-bhyas</td>
<td>baran-bya,¶</td>
<td>ferent-i-bus,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Bharat-ām</td>
<td>bārent-āim,††</td>
<td>ferenti-um, φεπόντ-ων, ἐφυαν-δ,††</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. Bharat-su</td>
<td>... §§</td>
<td></td>
<td>φέποντ-σι. [G. Ed. p. 323.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* See p. 230, Note *
‡ See p. 299. Rem. 2.
‖ This form, which, owing to an oversight, is omitted in p. 260, is found at Matth. 5. 44., and agrees with friyondes, “amicos” (“amantes”), Matth. 5. 47. as generally with the declension of a root terminating with a consonant. Comp. Grimm (1. 1017.).
¶ See p. 241 Note *, and p. 210 Note §.
** The Gothic dative, which I would have used also as the instrumental (§. 249.), does not occur in roots ending in nd.
†† Or barant-aim. See p. 266 Note †.
†† This case certainly cannot be proved in bases in nd; but may, however, be correctly deduced from the other bases ending with a consonant, and from the elder sister dialects. See §. 245.
§§ I conjecture a transition into the a declension (comp. p. 299 Rem. 2.), by suppressing the nt; thus, perhaps, baraēshua (or -shu, or -shu, §. 250.), as Vend. S. p. 354; 3333222 drēgovatā (read 33 shā) for drēgovat-su, from drēgovat, in the strong cases (§. 129.) drēgovant; on the supposition that the reading is correct, except the false s. See §. 62.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N. V.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṅāma</td>
<td>ṅāma-ś</td>
<td>ṅāma-ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ac.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gen.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṅāma-ṁa</td>
<td>ṅāma-ś</td>
<td>ṅāma-ś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inst.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instr.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Loc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat.</strong></td>
<td><strong>D. Ab.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Loc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
<td>ṅāma-ṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abl.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Gen.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Loc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voc.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Voc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṅāma</td>
<td>ṅāma</td>
<td>ṅāma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also dx$i brdthrem might be expected, as Vend, Sade, p. 357; hrem?), contrary to the theory of the strong cases (§ 129.), for patarēm.
**FORMATION OF CASES.**

---

### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In. Bharāt-ā,</td>
<td>Bharār-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>D. Inst. brāther (see §. 132.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Bharāt-ē,</td>
<td>Bharār-ē,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. see Gen. Bharār-at,</td>
<td>Fratr-e(d),</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Bharat,</td>
<td>Bharāt-ō,</td>
<td>Fratr-is,</td>
<td>Patēp-ōs,</td>
<td>Brōthrs (see §. 132.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Bharatar-i,</td>
<td>Bharār-i,</td>
<td>D. Fratr-i,</td>
<td>Patēp-i,</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Bharat,</td>
<td>Bharārē,</td>
<td>Frater,</td>
<td>Patēp,</td>
<td>Brōthar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Loc. Bharat-ōs,</td>
<td>Brōthar-ō(?)</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl. Bharatī-bhyas,</td>
<td>Bharat-ē-bhyō,</td>
<td>Fratr-ē-bus,</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, Bharatī-ṇ-ām,</td>
<td>Bharēr-ānim,</td>
<td>Fratr-um,</td>
<td>Patēp-ov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative, Bharatī-śu,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>Patēpā-ṣ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Vide §. 194. p. 211, l. 1. Note.
† See p. 216. Note ||.
†† See §. 44.
§ For the Gothic, which is here wanting, see p. 253, Note †.
|| Μνημονεμήμη Bharataraš-cha, "fratresque."
¶ See §. 127. Note.
** Perhaps also Bharār-ō, Bharāras-cha ("fratresque"), according to the analogy of dēth-ō, "ignes," from dētar. See §. 230.
†† See p. 206, Note †.
## FORMATION OF CASES.

### SANSKRIT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V.</td>
<td><em>manas,</em></td>
<td><em>mano,</em></td>
<td>μένος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td><em>manas-á,</em></td>
<td><em>mananh-a,†</em></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td><em>manas-é,</em></td>
<td><em>mananh-é,</em></td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>see Gen.</td>
<td><em>mananh-at,</em></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td><em>manas-as,</em></td>
<td><em>mananθ-ó (mananθ-ś-cha),</em></td>
<td>μένε(ό)-ος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td><em>manas-i,</em></td>
<td><em>manah-ś,(see p. 316,G.ed.)</em></td>
<td>D. μένε(ό)-ι,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manaś-cha, "mensque," "mentemque."
† M. Burnouf remarks, in his review (in the separate impression, p. 11), that in this class of words the instrumental ending is generally long. I, in like manner, had remarked forms enough of this kind with a long á, but in passages where also many á's, originally short, appear to be lengthened at the termination, and which, therefore, I was not willing to bring into account: moreover, the cases could not be included, where, through the particle aná cha, a preceding an á is preserved in its original length. After deducting these two classes from forms in aná, the computation might perhaps turn out in favour of the short á given above. I have, however, as yet not applied any closer reckoning: it would, however, surprise me if, on more exact calculation, but still in departure from the fate of other polysyllabic words ending with a shortened á, the advantage in this particular case should incline to the side of those words which retain the long vowel, which I would then gladly restore. No one will deny that the collation of MSS. is of great importance in deciding many grammatical and orthographical questions, although I believe I may assert that even a single lithographed MS. opens a rich field to inquiries and important grammatical observations: for although it is very full of errors, it nevertheless shews no systematic opposition to what is correct; and many expressions, passages, and turns recur so frequently, that, taken together, they can in a measure supply the place of a comparison of other MSS. For the rest I had at my command the edition of Olshausen of the three first chapters and part of the fourth of the Vendidad, with the various readings attached to it, so that, through these means, I was not left entirely destitute of MSS.
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit.</td>
<td>N. Ac. V. manas-ã,</td>
<td>μενά(σ)-ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L.</td>
<td>manas-ôs, manaňh-ô (?) (p. 297 G. ed.),</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit.</td>
<td>N. Ac. V. manans-i,</td>
<td>gener-a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Ab.</td>
<td>maná-bhis,</td>
<td>(μένασ-φιν,)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>mane-bhi,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>manas-dm,</td>
<td>μενάσ(σ)-ν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>manas-su,</td>
<td>μένασσ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SINGULAR, MASCULINE AND FEMININE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit.</td>
<td>N. Ac. V. durmanas,</td>
<td><em>dusµeµé(σ)-ε.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I. D. Ab. | dushmanado (§. 56b.). | *
| Vêda, | durmanas-d,† | dushmanânh-ô (?) |

The rest like the simple word.

**DUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. Ac. V.</th>
<th>dushmanâns-ô,</th>
<th><em>dusµeµé(σ)-ε.</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vêda,</td>
<td>durmanas-ô,†</td>
<td>dushmanânh-a (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest like the simple word.

**PLURAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N. Voc.</th>
<th>Accus.</th>
<th>The rest like the simple word.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>durmanas-as,</td>
<td>dushmanânh-ô (aš-cha),</td>
<td><em>dusµeµé(σ)-ες.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dushmanânh-o (aš-cha),</td>
<td><em>dusµeµé(σ)-ας.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* See p. 299, Rem. 2.
† See p. 245, Note †. It was, however, from an oversight that I, as was observed at p. 253, Note 5, read in the Vendidad Sâde, p. 127, *νεµανθα* : it should be *νεµμανθα*, and may also be considered the instrumental singular; then we should have in this passage, which recurs three times, the instrumental in *ναµανθα* in both editions three times with a short *a.*
† See p. 230, Note *.
FORMATION OF CASES

SINGULAR, NEUTER.

Sanskrit.  
Zend.  
Greek.

Nom. Ac. V. durmanas, dushmano (a'-cha), ἰδυσμενες.

The rest like the simple word.

"Remark.—It was remarked in § 152. (comp. § 146.), that the Σ in forms like μένος, εὐγενες, belongs to the base, and is not the nominative character; and that the Σ in forms like τετυφός has come from τ, and in like manner belongs to the theme. • M. Reimnitz, who, in (p. 54, &c.) his pamphlet mentioned at p. 294, G. ed., agrees with this view, first given in my treatise "On some Demonstrative Bases," wishes to look upon the Σ in the masculine τετυφός as belonging to the base, and arising out of τ; in which I cannot agree with him, as I, according to the view generally taken, consider the final letters of τετυφός as marks of the nominative, before

[G. Ed. p. 328.] which the final letter of the base is suppressed on account of the incompatible association of τσ (comp. § 99.), and replaced by lengthening the preceding vowel; as, for example, in μέλας for μέλανς. The Sanskrit has a few bases in which, differing from the ruling principle (see § 139.), run parallel in the nominative to the Greek μέλας; thus, πανθας, "the way," from panthan, accusative πανθίν-am. Only in this πανθας the lengthening of the a can be less regarded as a compensation for the rejected n than in the Greek, because it extends also to the other full cases (§. 129.), with the exception of the vocative; but perhaps the lengthening of the a has originally taken place only in the nominative, and has thence imparted itself, when the reason of this prolongation was no longer perceived, to those cases which otherwise stood upon an equal footing with the nominative. Thus one says महान mahān, "great" (from the theme mahant, properly a participle present from मह mah, "to grow"), with the vowel of the concluding syllable lengthened, according to the analogy of the Greek form, as λέγων. The Sanskrit word, however, retains the long vowel
also in the other strong cases (mahântam "magnum," mahântas "magni," mahântâu, "megálw"), with the exception of the vocative; while the usual participles present leave the a short in all the strong cases. In most exact accordance, however, with the Greek participle present stand the Sanskrit possessive adjectives, which are formed by the suffix vant (Greek evr for Férv, in µελητοεις and others) and mant (in the weak cases vat, mat). These lengthen, that is to say the a only, in the nominative singular; so, for example, dhanavânt, "dives"* (from dhana, "riches"), dhanavânt-am, dhanavânt-âu, dhanavânt-as, as λέγων, λέγοντα, λέγόντω, λεγόντες.

OLD SCLAVONIC DECLENSION.† [G. Ed. p. 329.]

255. Before we enter upon the province of Sclavonic Grammar, we must endeavour to explain its system of sounds; and although it is not requisite to specify all the minutiae of the subject, we must, nevertheless, bring into notice those parts which are indispensable to the understanding of the Grammar. It is therefore our principal object, in the following remarks, to exhibit the connection of the Old Sclavonic sounds with those of the elder languages, of which they are either the true trans-

* If, as has been remarked in another place, the suffix चद्फ vant has maintained itself in the Latin in the form lent (as opulents), it would not be surprising if the weak form चद्फ vat, without the interchange of v with l but with the weakening of the a to i, had its representative in the Latin divit, which stands in the same relation to dhanavat, by passing over the middle syllable, as malo to marolo.

† It is stated by Professor Bopp, in the preface to the second published portion of this Grammar, commencing with the formation of cases in general, that it had not occurred to him to direct his attention at an earlier period to the Sclavonic tongues: having subsequently considered the subject, he found sufficient reason to include them in the same family of languages, and accordingly devotes to its principles of declension the supplementary section which follows.—Editor.
missions, or corruptions more or less vitiated. We give therefore, for the first time, a history of the Sclavonic sounds, in which, however, as is natural, as far as their value is concerned, we have nothing new to bring forward; and in this respect follow only the teaching of native grammarians.

(a.)—The Old Sanskrit ओ a has so far experienced, in the Sclavonic, an exactly similar fate to that which has befallen it in the Greek, that it is most frequently supplied by e or o (e, o), which are always short: it very rarely remains a. In the interior of the bases, also, e and o are interchanged as in Greek; and as, for example, λόγος is related to λέγω, so, in the Old Sclavonic, is брод, “ferry,” to бреду, “I wade through;” вез, “carriage,” to везу, “I ride in a carriage.” And as, in the Greek, the vocative λόγε is related to the theme ΛΟΓΟ, so is, in the Old Sclavonic, рабе, “O slave,” to рабо, nominative раб, “a slave.” The o has more weight than e, but a more than o; and hence a corresponds most frequently to a Sanskrit d, so that, for instance, in the Old Sclavonic, forms in a answer to the feminine bases in ओ ठ (comp. вдова, “widow,” with विथा вишав), which, in the vocative, is in like manner abbreviated to o (вдово!), as above o to e. As final vowel, also, of the first member of a compound, a is weakened to o; for instance, водо-пад, “waterfall,” вода-рот, “water-drinker,” for вода-; just as in the Greek Μουσο-τραφής, Μουσο-φίλης, and similar compounds, which [G. Ed. p. 330.] have shortened the feminine α or η to o. Even if, therefore, a is in the Old Sclavonic a short vowel, I nevertheless regard it, in respect to grammar, as the long o; so that in this the Old Sclavonic stands in a reversed relation to the Gothic, in which a has shewn itself to us as the short of θ; and, in case of abbreviation, θ would become a, exactly as in the Old Sclavonic a becomes o.

(b.)—ś i and ś i' both appear in the Old Sclavonic as i, and the difference of the quantity is removed, at least I
do not find that a longer or shorter $ is anywhere spoken of. Let schivd, "I live," be compared with जीवामि jīvāmi; sila, "virtue," with शीलः sīla; and, on the other hand, vidyeti, "to see," with the root विदः vid, "to know," to the Guna form of which, वेधिः vedhi, the Old Sclavonic vyemy (abbreviated from vyedmy, infin. vyest-i for vyed-ti) "I know," assimilates itself, so that vid and vyed in the Sclavonic appear as two different roots. The short इ i, however, appears frequently in the Old Sclavonic also in the corruption to e (e), as in the Greek and the Old High German (§ 72); that is to say, the bases in i shew, in several cases, e for i, and the numeral three (षे tri) appears frequently in composition in the form tre, e. g. trepitiye, "trivium." So, also, pate-shestve, ṃdoṣHIPs from PŬTI (§ 260). The i is also very frequently *suppressed, e. y. in the 3d person plural dadyat, "they give," Sanskrit ददति dadati; sāt, "they are," Sanskrit सति santi. Where i forms a diphthong with a vowel preceding it, it is marked in the old writing with a short mark, which we retain, e. g. boi, "strife."  (c).—उ u and आ ā have, in the Old Sclavonic, in the forms which are retained most correctly, both become y.† In this manner, for instance, by (infin. by-ti) answers to घः.

* The suppression here noticed offinal i refers to Dobrowsky's incorrect orthography. In point of fact, however, the final i in Old Sclavonic has either been retained unaltered, or has become y; e.g., that which Dobrowsky, l. c., writes dadyat, "they give," sāt, "they are," should be corrected to ददात्य, dadanty, तत्त् swanty. Regarding the nasalized vowels, see § 783. Remark.

† We express, as in Polish, the very or dull i by y, as, like the Greek v, where it is original it supplies the place of the old short or long u. It is pronounced in Russian, according to Reiff (by Gretsch II, p. 666.), as in the French oui, spoken very short and monosyllabically; according to Heym, nearly like i, in union with a very short i (Heym, p. 5). This does not, however, remain the same in all positions of this letter (Reiff, l. c.), and it sounds after consonants other than labials like a dull thick i ("i sourd et étouffé").
bhā, "to be;" svekry, "mother-in-law," to śvārṇa; myshy, "mouse," to mūḍa māsha; syn, "son," to snū sīnu; chetyri, ōṣvāpes, with chatur (in the theme), nominative masculine chaturāschatavāras. The instances of y for u are, nevertheless, more rare than those where y corresponds to the long u; for the short u, as in the Old High German (§ 70.), has for the most part [G. Ed. p. 331.] become o; and thus, for example, soncha, "daughter-in-law," answers to śupā snusha; oba, "both," to ubha (Vedic form), Zend ṣa ubhā. Hence, also, the old u declension has, in many cases, become similar to the o declension, which, according to (a.), has arisen from u a; and, on the other side, o may also, but only in substantives, participate in those forms which belong only to the genuine u declension: whence it is easily perceived that the genius of the language could not everywhere distinguish further the two kinds of o, in their history, indeed, far separated from one another, but phonetically identical.

(d).—Unorganic y, i.e. y as representative of original vowels other than u or u, is not uncommon in the grammar; that is to say, the personal termination my (1st person plural), like the Latin mus, has arisen from the more ancient mas; and if the bases in a (for a) have y in the nominative plural (dvovy, "viduæ"), still the y here is so much the less to be looked upon as a case termination, as no account could be given of y in this sense; and with bases in ya the a of the base is also really retained (volya, "voluntates"). But as the y exerts the force of an Umlaut on an o succeeding it, by which that vowel is changed to an e, so I think that to an i following the o, without the intervention of another letter, the force of a reactive Umlaut must be ascribed, even if this force is not everywhere exerted, and that some y's must be declared to be the Umlauts of o; that is to say, as soon as so much has been re-
cognised in the Old Sclavonic adjectives, that their bases all end either in o or yo (changed by the Umlaut to ye), and are thus sister forms to the Greek, like ἁγίας, ἁγίος; and of the Sanskrit, as छेत्रि svēta, "white," दिम् divya, "heavenly";—so soon, I say, as the abbreviation of the base in the masculine nominative has been recognised (nov, novus, for novo), then will it be no longer said with Dobrowsky (p. 318) that the definite adjectives are derived from the primitives (indefinite) by annexing, according to the measure of the final letter of the primitive, either yī or ī.* If, however, I may trust that I have obtained an accurate knowledge of the organization of the Old Sclavonic grammar on any point, it is on this, that the affix in the nominative singular of definite adjectives consists not in yī or ī, but in ī as a mutilation of yo from ya (य ya), and in the feminine of ya from ya [G. Ed. p. 332]. (या ya). This also appears to me subject to no manner of doubt, that if, for example, the compound word svyatyī comes from the word svyato, "holy," its acknowledged theme, the y is a euphonic product from o, through the influence of the i which is added to it. This i has, in some cases, in which it has been dropped, still in a degree, in its euphonic operation, left its reflection, and thereby the proof of its former existence. Thus, for instance, svyatym, "per sanctum," from the older svyatym, svyaty-ch, "sanctorum," and "in sanctis," from svyatyi-ch, corresponds to the indefinite forms svyato-m, svyatye-ch (for svyato-ch).† At times, through the said pronominal syllable i, the preceding o may be changed at will into y

* Dobr. also himself, p. 493, considers simple i or ii as the definitive adjunct; but in considering, as he there does, blagyi as the confluence of blag and ii, he appears to look upon the y as having arisen from the i of the suffix, and not to acknowledge in it the final vowel of the simple adjective root.

† In the oldest MSS., according to Dobr. p. 502, the more full forms yich, yim, yimi occur in the plural, for ym, ych, ymi.
or not: thus the interrogative exhibits the forms *kyi, "quis?" (Dobr. 500 and 343.), *kyim, "per quem?" *kyi̯ch, "in quibus, quorum?" *kyim, "quibus?" *kyi̯mi. "per quos? with *koi, *ko̯m, *ko̯ch, *ko̯mi. The possessive pronouns allow no euphonic reaction at all to the demonstrative *i, which forms the last member of them, and they always retain their radical *o; e.g. *moi, "meus," *mo̯m, "per meum," not *myi, *my̯m. As to the definite form of the adjective bases in *yo, which Dobrowsky forms through the addition of *ui, I have not the slightest doubt that here, also, a simple *i is the defining element, for the first *i is clearly the vocalization of the *y of the primitive base; so that therefore, for example, *sinii "the blue," is to be divided, not into *sin-*ui, but into *sini-*i. The primitive adjective is sounded in the nominative which is deprived of all inflection and of the last vowel of the base—*siny, the *y of which appears as *i in the nominative plural masculine, just as in the definite pronoun, *sini, "caerulei," *sini̯i, or "caerulei." In order, however, here fully to explain the nature and origin of the definite declension, and not hereafter to be compelled to repeat what is already settled, it may be stated that its pronominal defining addition is identical with the Sanskrit relative base *r *ya, which is most correctly preserved in the Lithuanian, in which language *ya signifies "he" (*ya-*m, "to him," *ya-*me, "in him"). The nominative *yis, "he" (for *yas), has given the *y an assimilating influence, as is the case with all bases in *ya (§. 135.). The feminine, also, is pronounced in the nominative, through assimilation, *yi for *ya; but the genitive *yos, and all the other cases, are easily perceived through the *declension of *ranka, "hand," and *giesme, "song."

[G. Ed. p. 333.] from *GIEMY∗A (p. 169, Note). The

* Written *ja in the text. This passage furnishes a good reason for writing the Germanic *y by *y, as has been done throughout this translation.
Old Sclavonic has, in all the masculine bases ending with a vowel, suppressed this vowel in the nominative and accusative; and since the vowel has dropped from the Sanskrit-Lithuanian base \*ya, ya—which, according to (a), makes one expect yo in the Old Sclavonic, from which, according to (n.), must be formed ye*—the y must be changed into a vowel; hence, i, “he,” “him,” which must, therefore, on no account be placed together with the Latin-Gothic is, from the base i. In the nominative singular masculine, however, this Sclavonic pronoun occurs in all the three genders, not isolated, but in union with the particle sche, which has preserved to it the old relative meaning: i-sche means as well “qui” as “quem”; ya-sche, “quae”; yu-sche, “quam”; and ye-sche “quod.” Now as i means “he,” ya, “she,” and ye, “it,” I could not imagine how one could create the definitive adjective forms svyatyi-\*, svyatya, svyatо-e (for svyatоye), accusative svyatyi-\*, svyatdu-yd, svyatо-e, in their opposition to the indefinites svyat(o), svyatya, svyatо, differently from Dobrowsky (p. 493), and perhaps other grammarians before him, have done, namely, by the addition of the pronoun here under discussion;† for this pronominal suffix supplies the place of the article of other languages; and the Lithuanian language uses the same pronoun

* Hence in the genitive ye-go, dative ye-m\*, the e of which Dobrowsky wrongly ascribes to flexion, because he everywhere seeks the base in the nominative. However, the base ye has not fully maintained itself before all terminations beginning with a consonant, but become, in like manner, shortened to i: in i-m, “per eum,” and iis, i-mi “per eos,” i-ch, “eorum,” “in iis,” for ye-m, &c.

† What Grimm (by Wuk, p. xl.) remarks against this declaration has not convinced me; least of all can I, for the above reasons, concede to him that the i of svyatyi has any thing to do with the a of blinda, “the blind” (from blíndan, §. 140.); so that svyatyi would belong to the indefinite declension; and, on the other hand, svyat, contrary to the Sclavonic Grammarians, would be to be removed from the indefinite into the definite forms.
for the same object, i.e. equally in the emphatic, or, as it is also termed, definite declension of the adjective; and certainly so, that, through all cases, both the adjective which precedes and the pronoun which concludes are declined, while, in the Sclavonic, in most cases the pronoun only is provided with the inflexions of case, but in some

[G. Ed. p. 334.] it has utterly disappeared, and in others is still to be recognised in the for o mentioned above.

(e.)—The Sanskrit diphthong रे I have found always rendered, in the Old Sclavonic, by ye, in similar forms; so that after weakening the रे, to compensate for this, the semi-vowel y has made its appearance, to which, in this union, a particular legitimacy would be, according to (c), to be ascribed. Let pyena, "foam," be compared with ग्नष् phena; svyet "light," with ग्नष् sveta; vyemy, "I know," with ग्नष् वेद्मि. The most important cases in the grammar with ye corresponding to रे are the dual case forms of the feminine and neuter, and those of the imperative, in accordance with the Sanskrit potential of the first conjugation.

(f.)—The Sanskrit diphthong जौ द (from अ + उ) is represented in the Old Sclavonic by उ (ू),* so that the first

* Although this vowel may at times be pronounced short, still this much, at least, is certain, that, according to its origin and its definition, it is long. In Bohemian it appears in two forms, as au and u: the former is pronounced ow, but the writing points to an older and different pronunciation, in which the a was accurately preserved in its place: the u is pronounced short, whence, however, it cannot be deduced that this short u perhaps corresponds to the Sanskrit अ and Greek ὦ, and that au is its intensive or Guna; but, on the contrary, only the u retained in the au corresponds to the Sanskrit अ, and the u which stands alone in Bohemian is a weakening of the au; so that, from this, the concluding element u alone is left: etymologically, that is to say, the Bohemian au, as also u, answers to the Sanskrit जौ द, and also to the Sclavonic उ (ू), only that the former is phonetically more exact, and without the loss brought about by time. Hence, also, usta (written vsta) "ora" corresponds to the Sanskrit जौ द उ, "the lip": more complete, however, is austne, “by word
element of the Indian diphthong has assimilated itself to the second, and, in conjunction with it, presents a similar long vowel, as, in the Greek α (ου), two heterogeneous vowels, according to pronunciation, have united themselves in a similar measure. As, according to (a), the Indian short a has, in the Sclavonic, mostly become short o; we must consider the first element in the diphthong ŭ also (so we write the α) to be o; and it becomes visible, too, in this form, when ŭ is resolved before vowels into ov, (compare βο(F)φ from BS, [G. Ed. p. 335.] §. 123.), while the Indian খো ŭ becomes au before a vowel (গাতি gavi=βοFι, from গো gο). Now as, in the Sanskrit, ट u, ढ ŭ, rise to ŭ through Guna (§. 26.), and stो-श्याम ti appears as the future of stu, so in the Old Sclavonic, in like manner, y (ct) is interchanged with ŭ; so that bu in bù-du, "I shall be," must pass as the Guna form of by (in byti, "to be"): but if a class of nouns, which in the nominative-accusative terminate in a consonant or in yerr (see k.), exhibit, in many oblique cases, the syllable ov before vowel-endings, this ov must neither be considered, with Dobrowsky, for an augment added to the base, nor can it be deduced from forms like synovi, "from a son" (Sanskrit सुनवe сӣnava-e, from сӣnu), synov-ē, "sons" (सूनवस्स सिनव-as), that syn, in the nominative-accusative, is an abbreviation of syνd; and that therefore the yerr, when it is added to the form syn, is a representative or weak remainder of ŭ: but it is clear, from (c.), that syn, "filius," "filium," if its final vowel, in its most genuine form, had remained to it, would sound syny, from which synov is the Guna intensive, the ov of which has arisen from ŭ through the influence of mouth"; and even for vsta is to be found austa (Dobr. Böhm. Lehrg. p. 4.): ruška corresponds to the Lithuanian ranha, "hand"; and hūs to the Sanskrit हुस hauśa, "goose"; for which, according to p. 319. ruška, haus was to have been expected. A distinction must here, according to §. 783. Remark q. v., be made between ůy ŭ, and ख uन.
of the vowel following it, but has remained in the
genitive plural also, after the ending has been dropped.

Let synov, "filiorum," be compared with the Gothic
sunivē (§. 247.) As, in the Sanskrit, the substantive
bases in u adopt the Guna form of the u before the
vowels of the derivative suffix, so it is very remarkable
that, in the Old Sclavonic bases in y, also, this vowel
appears before certain derivative suffixes in its Guna
form; e.g. domov-it from dom (DOMY), "house"; binov-at,
"debtor," from byn (BYNY).* Derivative substantives
and adjectives in ov, ev (theme ovo, evo, the latter for
yovo, see n.), correspond to the Sanskrit in शव ava; as
पादव pāṇḍav-a (nominative as), "descendant of Pāṇḍu";
आतवा ātava, "seasonable," from चूतu rītu, "season": so,
in Old Sclavonic, Adamov, "Adamite," from Adam
(ADAMY); zarev for zaryev, "kingly," from zar (theme
ZARYY). For these formations, therefore, we must not,
with Dobrowsky (322, 323), assume a suffix ov or ev,
but we must look upon the o alone, which, in the nomi-
native, is suppressed, as the derivative suffix (ADAMOV-O,
ZAREV-O). Through the Vṛiddhi increase (§. 29.) the
Old Sclavonic y becomes ov, because a, according to (a.),
usually corresponds to घा ङ: hence, from the root by,
"to be," comes the causal baviti (infinitive), as in the

[G. Ed. p. 386.] Sanskrit भवयितुम bhāvayitum. But
though staviti occurs as the causal of sta, this form may
have arisen in the perverted feeling of the language as an
irregularly analogous word to baviti. In order, then, still
more to establish, by a few other examples, the representa-
tion of the Indian छो ो or शव ov by the Sclavonic ā, we
find āst, "mouth," correspond to चोष ोष्ठha, "lip"; शलि "sinister" (theme SHUÝO), to शव savya; būditī, "to
awake"—a causal, whose primitive bdyeti has entirely

* Dobrowsky supports himself in these cases by calling ov a prefix (p. 329).
lost the vowel of the root—to चोथयितम् bódhayitum, also “to awake,” from पुष् budh, “to know.” Thus gúbìti is the causal of gýb-ná (1. P.), and stúditi of styd-ná (Dobr. 360, 361.); while vyesiti is the causal of visyeti (see e.), as, in the Sanskrit, वेवयितम् vēsayitum, “to cause to enter,” from विन्ह vīś, “to go in.”

(y.)—As the nasals* easily resolve themselves into u, so the second element of the diphthong á sometimes also supplies the place of a nasal in the cognate languages; e.g. rāka, “a hand,” Lithuanian ranka; pūty, “a way,” Sanskrit पान्यस् panthás, id. Latin pons; gotuby, “a dove,” columba; gūśy, “a goose,” हंस haṁsa. The Polish has preserved the old nasal in golamb, “a dove,” gansie, “a gosling,” gansior, “a gander,” and in many similar cases. Hereby the á in the accusative of bases in a (from शा श), which are for the most part feminine, is remarkably explained; compare vdoʊá from vdoʊa, “a widow,” with विषयाम vidhavām, “viduam.” Therefore vdoʊá is to be derived from vdoʊo-m for vdoʊa-m (see a.); so that the a which is weakened to an o is contracted with the nasal mark of the case to á. This view is further supported by the consideration, that in Polish, also, the corresponding feminine declension marks the final vowel of the base with the same sign which, in the middle of a word, expresses a nasal, which is governed according to the organ of the following letter, but at the end, probably through a corruption of sound, is said to have an equal value with a ringing h. This nasalizing mark recurs also in the Polish verb, and, indeed, exactly in such a place where one had to expect a nasal, i.e. in the 1st person singular and 3d person plural; and thus, in Bandtke’s second and third conjugation, the so marked ę; e.g. in piekę, “I bake,” supplies the place of the am of the first conjugation, as czytam, “I read.”

* Cf. §. 783. Remark.
The Old Sclavonic has, however, excepting some anomalous remains of an older formation, in all the conjugations; and, according to what has been said, it admits of no doubt, that in the second part of this diphthong \((o + \bar{u})\) the personal character \(m\), and in the first part of the diphthong the conjunctive vowel, is retained. When therefore, in the 1st person, an \(o\) corresponds to the \(e\) (\(e\)) of \(nes\, e\-shi\), "thou carriest," \(nes\,-e\-t\), "he carries"—[G. Ed. p. 337.] for \(nes\,\bar{u}\) is for \(nes\,-o\-\bar{u}\) for \(nes\,-o\-m\) from \(nes\,-e\-m\)—it must be assumed that the conjunctive vowel \(e\), before its confluence with the \(\bar{u}\), which has arisen out of \(m\), has passed into \(o\); as in Greek \(ov\) arises by the contraction of \(e\) and \(o\), through the transition of \(e\) into \(o\) and \(o\) into \(v\). The same relation is to be found in the Old Sclavonic in the 3d person plural, where, corresponding to \(nes\,-e\-m\), "we carry," \(nes\,-e\-te\), "ye carry" (comp. \(l\,\varepsilon\-\gamma\-e\-re\)), the form \(nes\,e\-t\) is expected, but in place of it occurs \(nes\,\bar{u}\) in surprising accord with the Greek \(l\,\varepsilon\,\gamma\,o\,\nu\,\varsigma\,i\) for \(l\,\gamma\,\nu\,\nu\,\varsigma\,i\) from \(l\,\gamma\,\nu\,\nu\,\nu\,\nu\,\nu\). The Polish has, like the Bohemian, relinquished the character of the 3d person in the plural, as well as for the most part in the singular, but everywhere retains, in the first, the old and more powerful \(a\) (\(\chi\)), and marks this with the diacritical sign mentioned above, which, in the middle of a word, supplies the place of a nasal function; thus, \(sa\), "they are," corresponds to the Sanskrit \(s\,\chi\,\tau\,n\,i\), Sclavonic \(s\,\bar{u}\). The Bohemian has also, in many conjugations, retained the old conjunctive vowel \(a\) in the 3d person plural, but, like the Sclavonic, permitted the \(n\) to dissolve into a \(u\); therefore, in \(we\,z\,e\,a\,u\), "vehunt" (\(we\,-e\,-me\), "vehimus," \(we\,-e\,-te\), "vehitis"), the \(u\) answers to the \(n\) of \(v\,h\,\chi\,\tau\,n\,i\) \(vah\,\tau\,n\,i\), "vehunt," and the \(u\) which, in Bohemian, is united with an \(a\), is essentially different from that which stands alone; for the latter answers to the Old Sclavonic diphthong \(\bar{u}\) (\(\chi\)), but the former only to the latter portion of the \(\bar{u}\), which, in the Old Sclavonic, never stands alone, at least never occurs as \(\bar{u}\), but as \(y\) (\(c\)).
If, then, through what has been said, the vocalization of the m or n, which is of such frequent occurrence in the Sclavonic, has been shewn with sufficient clearness, it is remarkable that conversely, also, the latter portion of the ā (ə) has occasionally been hardened into a nasal; and thus būḍā, “I will be,” is in Polish źędę (written źędę).

(h.)—In certain cases an old ā (ə) unorganically supplies the place of the Sclavonic ā, i.e. in the instrumental of pronouns without gender, and all feminines; thus, vđovoy-ā, “through the widow,” answers to विधवया vidhavay-ā; and toboj-ā, “through thee,” to त्वया tway-ā. Denominatives also, in ąyą (1st per. pres.), in the Old Sclavonic, correspond to the Sanskrit in नायति āyati, as साध्यति sabḍāyati, “I sound,” from साधन 'sabda, “a sound”; चिरायति chirāyati, “I hesitate,” from चिरा chira, “long”: thus, in the Sclavonic, ziel̄ȳt, “I greet,” “I kiss,” from ziel, (ZIELO), “healthy”: vđovāyā from vđova, “widow” (Dobr. p. 372.). Finally, words in źń (ŹNO) answer, as it appears, to the Sanskrit participles of the middle voice, in ąna, as युन्जन yunjōna, “uniting,” from युज् yuj; so in the Old Sclavonic, perń, (PERŨNO), “Deus [G. Ed. p. 338.] tonans,” from the root per, “to shake”; byegęń, “runner” (BYEGŨNO), from BYEG “to run” (Dobr. p. 289.).

(i.)—There are in the Sclavonic alphabet two marks, which by some are called litterae aphonae, but by Gretsch semivowels; I mean the so-called soft yer,* and the hard yerr. The former is represented by Gretsch as half i, and by his translator, Reiff (47), as answering to the tones ‘mouillés’ of French (compare Kopitar, p. 5); and thus schalb, “sympathy,” and ogonb, “fire,” are, in respect to the soft yer compared with the pronunciation of travail and cicogne. This yer, therefore, denotes a tone

* In the original jer, pronounced, however, yer; and hence y has been substituted for j in all that follows.—Editor.
which is rather to be called a \( y \) than an \( i^* \); and it may be said that in \( schal^b \) and \( ogon^b \) one hears quite as much of a \( y \) as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a consonant preceding it. Hence we mark it with a \( y \), and write the above words \( schaly, ogony, \) Old Sclavonic \( ogny \). In the words, too, which end with it in the uninflexed nominative and accusative singular, it occurs in several oblique cases as a distinct proper \( y \), e.g. in \( zarya, "regis," zaryu, "regi," \) from \( zary, "rex," "regem.\) On the consonant which precedes it this \( yer \) has an influence which renders its pronunciation more mild, because its sound is somewhat broken by the \( y \), which throws back its sound. Etymologically the \( yer \) corresponds either to a final \( i \) of the cognate languages, as in \( yesty, "he is" \) (\( \text{सित्} \) \( \text{asti}, \) \( \text{इस्टी} \), Lithuanian \( \text{esti} \)), \( kosty, "bones" \) (\( \text{कोस्त्य} \) \( \text{asthi} \)), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a \( y \) (\( \text{ष्य} \)), from which a vowel has dropped; for the theme of \( siny, "caeruleus," \) concludes neither with \( i \) nor with \( y \), but with \( yo \) (euphonically \( ye \), see \( n.) \); whose final vowel, suppressed in the nominative and accusative masculine, appears, however, in the feminine \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a \), while the neuter \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the neuter \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the

\( \text{neuter} \) \( sine \) for \( sinya, \) in its extension to \( a, \) while the
Roman character, no substitute for this mark, and Dobrowsky also on its it at the end of words. Etymologically, however, this yerr always represents a suppressed mute vowel, only not always an o, nor, as Grimm conjectures (in his valuable Preface to Wuk’s Servian Gramm. p. xxxiv) a u. Rather, each of the three short fundamental vowels—a (as represented also by o, e), i, u, (for which may stand y, o),—is very frequently dropped at the end of words; and although the i is seldom entirely suppressed, more generally throwing back its sound as y, nevertheless the vowel suppressed after the m of rabo-m, “per servum,” and in Russian replaced by yerr, is clearly, as we gather from the Lithuanian, an i.

(I.)—I believe I may assert, that in the whole extent of the structure of the Slavonic language, at least in all the conditions of its noun and verb, not a single final consonant occurs after which some termination, which, through the cognate languages can be pointed out as beginning with a vowel, has not been dropped. Thus, the base NEBES, “caélum,” forms, in the genitive plural, likewise nebes, but the vanished termination is, in Sanskrit, चालम् (नभालम्, “caélorum”), Greek οὖν (νεφή(ζ)οὖν), Latin um, Gothic ȳ. The real final consonants, however, which, in the truly-preserved elder dialects of the Indo-European family, stand as the foundation of the word, have utterly disappeared in Slavonic polysyllables; e. g. from चरम as, es is formed, in the nominative plural, e (e); and synov-e answers to forms like सूनवस् sūnav-as, βότρυς as.

(m.)—As far as regards the writing of those consonants which, in the Slavonic alphabet, properly correspond to the Roman, we express the sound of the French j (zivyete, in the Carniolan sh), as in Zend (§. 65.), by sch, that of our German sch (= छ) by sh as in Sanskrit,

*Cf. §. 783. Remark.*
and also as, in Sanskrit, the tsch by ch: for the sound of the Greek ζ (=ds) we retain ζ, and use z for the sound of our German z (=ts): for χ we write ch. In regard to etymology, it is important to call attention to the relation of this letter to sibilants, by means of which snocha, “daughter-in-law,” corresponds to the Sanskrit स्नुष्ठा snushā. Ch also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into s.

[G. Ed. p. 340.] (Dobr. pp. 39, 41), and in some cases into sh (Dobr. 41.). Finally, in pretectes like dach, “I gave,” dachom, “we gave,” the ch returns to the s (ς, ζ) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a t follows it; hence, daste, “ye gave,” dasta, “ye two” and “they two gave.”* As the vowels exercise a multifarious influence in the transformation of gutturals preceding them, we will further remark that the ch under discussion maintains itself in the 3d person plural before ά, but before a appears as sh; hence, dasha or dachā, “they gave.”

(n.)—†For the semi-vowel y (ι υ) the Cyrillic alphabet gives the Greek ι, excepting in the cases for which the inventor of the character has provided by particular letters set together according to their value, which, at the same time, express the y with the following vowel; that is to say, ya is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel ya, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For ye, also,

* Dobrowsky has, however, as it appears to me, not perceived the irrefragable connection between the ch of dach and the s of daste, for he considers the ch and ste, &c. as personal terminations (pp. 264, 383, 397); and hence he nowhere informs us that ch before t passes into s. More on this subject when we come to the verb.

† The vowels mentioned here, preceded by y, are, with the exception of ιζ ye, and ι ιδ, nasalised vowels (see § 783. Remark); and hence pyatū, “five,” must be pronounced pañty (in the original character पञ्ठ).
Cyril has provided by a simple sign, and ŷ is expressed by an o in conjunction with an i. But y often appears in Sclavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare yesmy, "I am," yam (for yadmy), "I eat," pyat, "five," desyat, "ten," yedin, "one," with the corresponding Sanskrit forms, asmī, admi, panchaṇ, daśaṇ, aḍi (primus). An o which follows is, in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§. 137. and p. 174, Note*), changed into e through the influence of a y preceding it. In like manner, in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian, the y, after it has assimilated a vowel following it, has often itself disappeared, and has left behind only its effect, and thereby the proof of its former existence.*

* Dobrowsky does not express himself with sufficient clearness regarding this form, when he says (cap. II. §. iii.) that o after y and liquid consonants is changed into e. According to this, one would believe that, besides y, certain other consonants had the power of changing an o following them into e. Dobrowsky understands—which, however, as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under "consonae liquidae," those which, in consequence of a following yer (y), have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation; while he calls the consonants without yer "consonae solidae" (comp. l. c. p. 267); so that no consonant is by nature and of itself alone liquid, but receives this quality through a following yer (a y without a vowel). Thus, in Dobrowsky's second masculine declension, the consonants r, ch, and ĺ, in zary, "king," vrachy, "physician," and knyačy, "prince," are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form zarem, brachem, knyačem, Dobrowsky ascribes the e for o to the influence of a liquid consonant; while, according to my opinion, the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming o into e, but for zarem, &c. zaryem must originally have stood. And as in this form the y is the full semi-vowel, not entirely without a vowel sound, and therefore not the expression of the yer without a vowel which softens the consonant preceding it—as in the abbreviated nominative xary—so the r also, in zaryem, was not liquid, and has not, according to my opinion, become liquid after the dropping of the semi-vowel; at least, I find it nowhere stated
We must now, in order to be able to compare the true case-suffixes of the Old Sclavonic with those of the cognate languages, first of all endeavour to ascertain the final letter of the kinds of base which occur, as they have for the most part been rubbed off in the singular nominative, whence it has appeared as if these letters, where they again present themselves in the oblique cases, either belonged to the case termination, or were an addition equally foreign to the base and to the termination, which has been termed "augment" by Dobrowsky. After becoming acquainted with the true base, the case terminations assume, in many points, an entirely different shape from what Dobrowsky has represented (p. 460), with whom we cannot concede to the neuter a nominative termination o or e, but perhaps the advantage of having preserved, in preference to the masculine, the final vowel of the theme in this case. For the practical use of the language, and to keep simply within the limits of the Sclavonic language, all might, notwithstanding, be assumed as inflexion which is usually represented as such. It is not, however, here our object to consider those syllables as supplying the place of grammatical relations which present themselves to the feeling of the speaker as such, but only those which may be so traced through the history of the language, and which, for thousands of years, have subsisted as Grammatical forms.

To the masculine and neuter bases in \( \text{\textbar} a \) correspond, in the Old Sclavonic as well as in Greek, bases in o,\(^*\) which vowel has disappeared in the nominative and stated that the r and other consonants, in forms like xarem, kny\(\text{\textbar}t\)em, gol\(\text{\textbar}d\)em, lebedem, are differently pronounced from what they are in pirom, vo\(\text{\textbar}t\)om, lobom, adom, of Dobrowsky's first masc. declension. The difference in the two classes of words is only this, that the former have a y for the last letter but one of their theme, which, by the power of assimilation, has changed the following o into e, which e, after the y has been dropped, does not again become o.

\(^*\) Dialectically the older a has, in certain cases, maintained itself, as in
accusative singular: so the corresponding a has disappeared in Gothic, except in the neuter (as Gothic blinda-ta, "cæcum," in contrast with blind'-s, "cæcus"): it has also maintained itself frequently in the beginning of compounds in the Gothic and Old Greek, where, according to the oldest principle, the naked theme is required; as, nov, "novus," appears in many compounds as novo (novo-grad, "new-town"), but is then not to be considered as the neuter novo, "novum," but as the common theme of the masculine and neuter, in which as yet no difference of sex is pointed out. The clearest proof that the class of nouns under discussion corresponds to the Indian, Lithuanian, and Gothic nouns in a, is afforded by their feminine bases in a (for या ज); so that to the form rab (for rabo), "servant," corresponds a feminine raba, "a maid": that is to say, all Old Sclovonic primitive adjectives, i.e. those with an indefinite declension, correspond to the Sanskrit in a-s, ḍ, a-m, Greek o-s, η(α), o-n, Latin u-s, a, u-m; much as one might be led astray by outward appearance to seek in the adjectives, which in the nominative masculine end in y (ye), and in the neuter in e, as siny, "cæruleus," syne, "cæruleum," an analogy to Latin adjectives like mitt-s, mile.

258. But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned, and in similarly-constituted substantives, as knyařy, "prince," more, "the sea," bases of such a nature as, without the euphonic form mentioned at §. 255. (n.), must have terminated in yo, whence ye; and hence, in the nominative masculine—according to the suppression of the final vowel of the base, ṣ in this case—and in the neuter e retaining the vowel and dropping the ṣ. These bases, therefore, correspond to the Indian in या, the Greek and Latin in
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10, iu (āγιο-ς, āγιο-ν, σωκι-ς, πρεελιμ-ς); that is to say, serdzye (nominative and accusative neuter), “heart,” corresponds to the Sanskrit ह्रदयम् hridaya-m, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Slavonic bases in ya correspond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in या yā Greek ia, Latin io); and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination y and neuter e, as sinya, “cœrulea,” to siny, “cœruleus,” and sine, “cœruleum.”

[G. Ed. p. 344.] When an i or other vowel precedes the last y but one of the base, the y in the nominative, and accusative masculine is changed into the vowel i; as, nyetiž, “nepos ex sorore” (Dobrowsky, p. 282). The corresponding feminine form is iya, and the neuter ye, the y of which has arisen from i of the form iye, which is to be supposed the original, after dropping the last y but one. To the Sanskrit सव्यस savya-s, सयa savya, सव्यम् savya-m (sinister, a, um) correspond thus shāi, shāya, shāe (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285).

259. The Old Slavonic masculine and neuter bases in yo,* with their feminines in ya, are, according to their origin, of four kinds:—1. Those in which, as in SHŪYO=सव्य savya, both the semi-vowel and the vowel following, from the earliest period of the language, belong to the base of the word; and this case is perhaps the most rare. 2. Such as originally end in i, to which an unorganic o has been added; as, in the Lithuanian, the bases in i, in many cases, change into the declension in ia (ie) (§. 193. and p. 174, Note *). To this class belongs MORYÖ, nom. more, “the sea,” the e of which therefore differs widely from

* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonic law contained in §. 255. (n.) unregarded, and I give SERDZYÖ as the theme of serdzye (“heart,” nom. acc.), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonic law, i.e. without inflection, as in the Sanskrit vāch is laid down as the theme, although ch cannot stand at the end of a word, but passes into k, as in the nominative vāk, which is properly identical with the theme.
the *mare* in Latin, corrupted from *mari*; so that the Sclavonic *y*, which again makes its appearance in the genitive *morya*, dative *morya*, corresponds to the Latin *e* spoken of. The Latin word must, however, in order to be classed with the Sclavonic, be pronounced in the nominative *mariu*-m. Neuter bases in *i*, without an unorganic augment, are entirely wanting in the Sclavonic. [G. Ed. p. 345.]

Among the masculines of this class of words *chervy*, "a worm" (theme *CHERVYO*), answers to the Sanskrit  

_\text{क्रिमि} kr\text{\textsl{i}m}_ and the Latin *VERMI*, Old High German, *WURMI*; and *\text{\textalpha}\text{yty} (\text{\textgamma YATYO}), "gener," to the Sanskrit *\text{\textgamma}तृति j\text{\textalpha}t\text{\texti} ti*, feminine, "familia," "genus," from *जन jan*, "to be born."*

The third kind of bases in *yo* is that where the unorganic *y* precedes a final *o*, according to the euphonic disposition mentioned in §. 255. (n.). So *g\text{\textalpha}s\text{\textgamma} (G\text{\textgamma}SYO) corresponds to the Indian *\text{\textalpha}स ha\text{\texti}\text{\textalpha}sa*, "goose" (§. 255. g.). In the fourth place there exist among bases in *yo* the words in which the *y* as well as the following vowel is an unorganic addition. Thus *nouns of agency in TARYO* correspond to the Sanskrit in *तृ tar* (तृ *tri*, in the strong cases तृर तृर, to the Latin in *t\text{\textalpha}r*, and to the Greek in *τπρ, τ\text{\texti}\text{\textalpha}ρ*; hence the nominatives *my-tary*, *schi-tary*, and *\text{\textgamma}latary* (Dobrowsky, p. 295), and, with *y* for *a*, *pas-tyry*, "shepherd." Of this kind, also, are the nouns of agency in *TELYO*, the *l* of which is clearly an interchange with *r* (§. 20.), so that this suffix also conforms itself to the Sanskrit *तर tar*; hence the nominatives *blago-dyetely*, "beneficus," *pye-tely*, "a cock," from the root *pye*, "to sing," *schately*, "messor," *spas-i-tely*, "salvator."†

* *\text{\textalpha} frequently answers to the Sanskrit *\text{\textalpha} j*, and for example जाव *j\text{\texti}\text{\textalpha}\text{\texti}*, "to know," is in the Sclavonic *\text{\textalpha}na* (infinitive *\text{\textalpha}nati*).

† But see p. 879. Note §. 647.

† As these words stand in analogy with the infinitive in *ti*, in so far that their suffix begins with a like consonant, Dobrowsky (pp. 292, 293) derives them from the infinitive, and allows them simply *\text{\textalpha}ly* as suffix (as also simple *ary* for *tary*), as it has been the custom to derive also, in the Latin, *tor* and *turus* from the supine. However, it is certain
260. To the Sanskrit feminine bases in श्रा correspond as has been already remarked, Old Sclavonic in а. To

[G. Ed. p. 346.] this class of words, however, belong also some masculines, particularly proper names, which are then declined entirely as feminines, as in Latin nauta, caelicola, &c. (§. 116.), on which we will not here dwell further. Among the bases in і there are, in Old Sclavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines—as in Lithuanian—which Dobrowsky, p. 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine: they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with і, but the former with ыо, and in part with ыы, (§. 263.). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree; and, гость, “guest,” from GOSTI* (Gothic GASTI, Latin HOSTI) agrees with knyaъy, “prince,” from KNЫАщYO, and vrachy, “medicus,” from VRACHY. The masculine bases originally ending with н—there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by і; KAMEN, “stone” (Sanskrit समन аімн), is extended to KAMENI, and then follows GOSTI.

261. To the Sanskrit feminine bases in श і correspond numerous Old Sclavonic bases of a similar termination (Dobrowsky, decl. fem. iv.); that is to say, the Sclavonic agrees with the Sanskrit in the formation of feminine ab-

the suffixes TOR, TURU and the Sclavonic TARJO, TELYO, used to borrow their т not at first from another syllable of formation so commencing. They form primitive words from the roots themselves, and not derivatives from other words.

*Thus, also, PУTI, “a way” (Sanskrit पमн pathin), and LYUDI, pl. num, nom. lydy-e, “people,” Gothic LAUDI, nom. lauths, “a person,” the au of which, according to §.255. (f.), is represented by у (g), and, according to §.255. (m.), has gained a prefixed ы. GOSPOДI, “a master” (comp. पати pati, Lithuan. PATI and Gothic FADI) is in fact irregular, as it passes into several kinds of theme in its declension.
stracts in *TI*, as *PA-MYA-TI*, “memory,” nom. *pamya-ti,* from the root *MAN,* as in Sanskrit मन्ति *mati* (for *manti*), “spirit,” “meaning,” from मन् *man,* “to think” (compare *memini*). These words weaken, indeed, in *[G. Ed. p. 347.]* the nominative and accusative, their i to yer, but in no case overstep their original base by an unorganic addition; and hence they must not, on any account, be looked upon as of the same base with the majority of masculines terminating similarly in the nominative and accusative singular. But Dobrowsky’s third feminine declension is of a mixed nature (*zerkovy, “a church”*): in this we recognise some words which have, by Guna, changed a Sanskrit final ज u to ov; and from this form several cases, as from a base ending with a consonant—e.g. *zerkw-e,* genitive singular and nominative plural—but so that the o is suppressed before vowel terminations. In some cases the theme extends itself by an unorganic i, in others by a; and also before these extensions of the base the o of the syllable ov is suppressed†; e.g. *zerkviy-u,* “per ecclesiam,” *zerkvi,* “ecclesia,” *zerkvī,* “ecclesiarum,” *zerkva-m,* “ecclesiis,” *zerkva-ch,* “in ecclesiis,” *zerkva-mi,* “per ecclesiis.” The dative locative *zerkvi* is doubtful, as this case could have no other sound than *zerkvi,* whether it come from *ZERKOV* or from *ZERKVI.*

* Dobrowsky (p. 355) imputes, in my opinion wrongly, the n of *po-myanu,* “I remember,” and some similar bases, to derivation, instead of supposing that the radical n is suppressed before t, in analogy with the Sanskrit, and as, in Greek, πάρο* from TAN,* Sanskrit तत्सः tatī- s, “a line” (as extended), for तत्सः tanti-s.

† The example given by Dobrowsky, *zerkovy,* “a church,” nevertheless does not apply to monosyllables, as *krov,* “blood” (Sanskrit *kṛvya kṛvya,* neuter, “flesh”), nor to those polysyllables in which two consonants precede the syllable ov; for *yatrvach and krvač* would be equally impracticable (comp. Gretsch by Reiff, p. 163). *Brovy,* “eyebrow,” also appears to form all its cases from a theme *BROVI,* an extension of the Sanskrit भ्रो, feminine, by the addition of i, with a Guna of the ज u. The nominative plural is hence *brovi* (Dobrowsky, p. 115), not *brov-e.*
Some words of this class have, in the nominative, y, and
[G. Ed. p. 348.] thus svekry agrees with चब्बृस् स्वास्रु-s, "socrus" (§. 255. c.); others have, at will, ovy or vi, with o suppressed; hence zerkovy or zerkvi.

262. Among bases in u (Greek ν) of the cognate languages, only masculines have maintained themselves in the Old Sclavonic. They, like the bases in o, suppress their final vowel in the nominative and accusative, but in the remaining cases this letter shews itself either with Guna changed to ov or ǎ (§. 255. f.), or without Guna, as o (§. 255. c.); and in the latter form it appears also in the beginning of compound words as a naked theme. Hence it is more probable, that anciently for syn, "flius," "filium," stood syno rather than syny (§. 255. c.).* With this similar conformation of theme of the old bases in a and u, it is not surprising that two kinds of bases, which in their origin are widely different, run very much into one another in the Sclavonic declension; and that, in the more modern dialects, these two declensions, which were originally so strictly separate, have fallen almost entirely into one.

263. As in the o bases which have arisen from Ᾱ a, a y preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we, in §. 258., have represented as purely euphonic, the same phenomenon makes its appearance also in the y bases, by means of which their Guna form is articulated ev (for yev) instead

* We term this class of words, nevertheless, bases in y; for although their final letter never occurs as y, still, according to §. 225. (c.), y is the most legitimate, even if it be the most rare, representative of the Sanskrit ः u. But should it be wished to call them bases in o, they would not be distinguished from the order of words, which, according to § 257., bear this name with more right. The term u bases would be appropriate only so far as here, under the u, might be understood, not the Old Sclavonic e (etymologically = चो ḍ), but the Sanskrit ः u or the Latin u of the fourth declension, which, in the Old Sclavonic, has no real existence.
of ov.* If, however, with Dobrowsky, we divide the Old Sclavonic masculines—with the exception of the bases in i, § 260.—into two declensions, and in doing this desire, as is natural, to ground the division on the final letters of the bases, we must place knyaʒy, "prince" (nominative) of Dobrowsky's second declension in the first, and by the side of rab, "a servant": on the other hand, the words syn, "son," and dom, "a house," of Dobrowsky's first masculine declension must be transferred to the second declension as mutilated y forms. Of the paradigm here given by Dobrowsky, vrachy, "medicus," adheres most strictly to the true y declension, and, according to § 255. (n.), opposes ev to the ov of SYNY. On the other hand, words inflected like zary, "a king" (nominative), clearly form the nominative and genitive plural from bases in i; hence zary-e, "kings," zarii, "of kings," from ZARI; as gosty-e, "hosties," and gostii, "hospitum," from GOSTI. In the dative plural and instrumental singular the form zare-m is doubtful: in this and other words, also, of obscure origin, it remains uncertain whether the more contracted theme in i, or the more extended in yy, is the older; but it is certain that several old i bases have migrated into this declension by an unorganic addition; for instance, ogny, "fire" (nom.), dative ognev-i, from OGNYY, agrees with the Sanskrit अग्नि agni, Latin IGNI, Lithuanian UGNI.† It [G. Ed. p. 350.]

* Without Guna, the final of the base is pronounced e for ye from yo (§ 255. n.); and hence, in the cases without Guna the yy bases are just as little to be distinguished in their inflection from the yo bases, as, in the instrumental singular, syno-m (from the theme SYNY) from rabo-m (theme RABO). In the beginning of compound words, also, the yy bases end like those in yo, with e for ye.

† As regards words inflected like mravii, the only proof which could bring them under the head of the y bases is the vocative sing. mraviy: that they, however, although they have borrowed this case from the y declension, originally belong to the o declension, is proved by their feminine in iya and neuters in iye or ye (Dobrowsky, p. 282).
deserves here to be further remarked, that in the more modern dialects of the Sclavonic stock, the two masculine declensions here spoken of have been transfused almost entirely into one, which has taken several cases regularly from the old u declension, in which, however, from the point of view of the more recent dialects, e.g. in the genitive plural of the Polish and Carniolan, ov, ow, form an exception as a case termination. In the Old Sclavonic, also, rab (theme RABO), "a servant," may optionally form several cases from a theme RABY (for rabū); and for rab, "servorum," we may also have rabov: and in the nominative plural of this class of words we find also ov-e, according to the analogy of synov-e. On the other hand, the adjective masculine o bases (the indefinites) of the y declension have admitted no irregular trespassings any more than the pronouns.

264. Bases ending in a consonant are, under the limitation of §. 260., entirely foreign to the masculine: on the other hand, there are neuter bases in en, es, and at (yat), which are important for the system of declension, because the case suffix, commencing with a vowel, divides itself so much the more distinctly from the base ending with a consonant. The bases in en correspond to the Sanskrit in सन an, and have preserved, too, in the uninflected nominative, accusative, and vocative, the old and more powerful a, but with the euphonic prefix of a y (see §. 255. n.), and with the suppression of n of the base (see §. 139.). All of them have an m before the termination en; so that men is to be considered as the full formative suffix of the word, which answers to the Sanskrit मन् man—e.g. in कर्म न karman neut., "deed"—and to the Latin men; that is to say, SYEMEN (nominative syemya, "seed," from the base sye) answers to the Latin se-men; and imen, "a name," is a mutilation of नाम न naman, "nomen." The bases in es answer to the Sanskrit neuter bases in as, as nebəs,
"heaven," Sanskrit नन्दस nabhas. In the [G. Ed. p. 351.] nominative, accusative, and vocative, they relinquish the concluding s (according to §. 255. l.), and afterwards strengthen the e to o (§. 255. a.). We cannot, therefore, any longer compare the o of nebo with the Sanskrit-Zendian o, which has arisen out of a + u. As in this abbreviation of es to o the neuter es bases in the cases mentioned become similar to the o bases, it is then—on account of the influence of these cases, and because the nominative principally gives the tone in the declension, and shews in the oblique cases as inflection that which is in itself deficient,—it is then, we say, not surprising, if the original o bases at times admit an es in the oblique cases, particularly when we consider the original great extension of these neuter bases terminating in s (compare §. 241.), which induces the conjecture, that many words, now declined as o bases, were originally domiciled in the bases in es. On the other hand, Dobrowsky proves that there is no admixture of es in the thoroughly legitimate adjective o bases. It is also clear, from §. 255. (l.), that the bases in yat* in the uninflected cases must lay aside the t, and follow σῶμα, not महा mahat ("magnum") and caput.

265. Of the class of words in r mentioned in §. 144. two feminine words have remained in the Old Sclavonic which derive most of their cases from the genuine r bases, but in others increase the original base by an unorganic i, or also by ya (compare the Lithuanian in §. 144.): in the nominative singular, however, in accordance with the Sanskrit and Lithuanian, they suppress the r. These are, mati, "mother," and dshchi, "daughter"; in the latter only occurs the increase of the base by ya (in the nominative accusative and dative plural); the declension of the former springs [G. Ed. p. 352.]

* They are all derivatives from names of animals, and denote the young of the animal mentioned.
partly from \( MATER, \) e. g. mater-e, "matris," and matres (\( ματρις-εσ \)), partly from \( MATERI, \) e. g. matery, "matrem."

266. *In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs \( s \) and \( m \), with the exception of the bases in \( a \), which present in the diphthong \( ìu \) (\( u \)), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to \( a \), (see §. 255. \( g \)); hence vodà, "aquam," from vodo-ù. The instrumental has, in the feminine, and the pronouns which have no gender preserved the genuine Sanskrit inflection; but it is to be remarked of the feminine bases in \( i \) that they change this vowel before the termination \( ìu \), (for \( ìu \), see §. 255. \( h \)), not into simple \( y \), but into \( iy \); so that in this respect the Old Sclavonic agrees more closely with the Pâli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final \( i \) before all the vowel endings into \( iy \), than with the Sanskrit. Hence, let kostiy-ù, from \( KOSTI, \) "bones," be compared with the Pâli पीतिया \( pìtiy-ù \) (from \( pìti, \) "joy"), for the Sanskrit पीत्य \( prìty-ù \). Masculines and neuters have \( m^\dagger \) for their instrumental ending; and this is, I have no doubt, an abbreviation of the Lithuanian \( mi \), and comes therefore from \( bi \) (§. 215.).

267. The dative has, in the singular, a common ending with the locative, and, in fact, the Old Sanskrit \( i \) (§. 195.); hence, imen-i, "in nomine," and "nomini"; synov-i, "filio," brachev-i, "medico," from \( SYNY \) and \( BRACHYY \) (§. 263.), with Guna.† If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding \( ov \) becomes \( ìu \), and \( ev \) (from \( you \)) becomes \( yù \); hence, also, synà, "filio," with synov-i, and zaryà, "regi," with

---

* Cf. §. 783\textsuperscript{1}.

† For \( m \), according to Dobrowsky, we should read \( mb \) \( my \).

† Hence I am now disposed, contrary to §. 177., to assume for the Lithuanian a common origin for the two cases, although, in their received condition they are externally separated from one another, as is the case in Old Sclavonic, also, in several classes of words.
the $y$ bases, but prefer, however, the abbreviated form $u$, hence rabů, from RABO, more rarely rabov-i. The $o$ bases of the adjectives, and of these there are, in the masculine and neuter, only $o$ bases, and those of neuter substantives have alone the uninflected form in $u$; hence, e.g. blayů, "bono," masc. neut.; sinyů, "caeruleo," masc. neut.: slovů, "verbo," moryů, "mari": not blagov-i, sinev-i, slovov-i, morev-i. In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in $u$ extends itself also to the genitive and locative; hence domů, "of the house," "to" and "in the house": but in the dative is also found domov-i, and in the locative domyě.* The pronouns of the 3d person masculine and neuter—with exception of the reflexive—have in the dative, in like manner, the uninflected $u$; for the form mů in to-mů, "to this," is clearly from the Sanskrit appended pronoun स्मा (§. 165. &c.), which has extended itself in the cognate European languages so much, and under such different forms, and this, in the Old Sclavonic, would necessarily give the base $SMO$, from which, after dropping the $s$, would come the dative mů, as rabů from RABO.

268. While the $o$ bases, as has been shewn above, have borrowed their dative from the $y$ declension, the $y$ bases appear, in the locative, to have intruded on the $o$ class; for synye answers to rabye, from RABO from RABA (§. 255. a.); but the ye of rabye is, according to §. 255. (e), clearly from the Sanskrit रे of वृक्षे वृक्षे वृक्षे from वृक्ष वृक्ष, and answers to the Lithuanian wilke from [G. Ed. p. 354.] WILKA (§. 197.). As, however, in Lithuanian, from SUNU comes sunu-ye, so may also the Old Sclavonic synye require

* Masculine names of inanimate things all follow the declension of dom (theme DOMY), although very few among them, according to their origin, fall into the class of the old र $u$, i.e. of the Latin fourth declension, but for the most part correspond to Sanskrit bases in श a.
to be divided into syn'-ye; and this is rendered the more probable, as the feminine a bases, also, have in the locative ye for a-ye; hence vod'-ye, “in aqua,” from VODA, answers to the Lithuanian ranko-ye (for ranka-ye) from ranka.* In bases in i, masculine and feminine, it might appear doubtful whether i, with which they end in the dative and locative—e.g. puli, “in the way,” kosti, “in the bone”—is to be ascribed to the theme or to the inflection: as, however, in the genitive, (to which belongs an i, though not through any inflection), they have just the same sound, and otherwise never entirely give up the i of the base, except in the instrumental plural, it is more natural to consider the forms puli, kosti, uninflected, just like domi, “in the house.” We may also look upon the i in the dative and locative of those bases, which have y as the last letter but one, as nothing else than the vocalization of this y; the i, therefore, of knyați, mori, brachi, voli, represents nothing else than the y of the masculine bases KNJAȚYO, VRACHYY, and of the neuter MORYO, and feminine VOLYO.

269. In the genitive the terminations as, os, is, which, in the cognate languages, are joined to bases ending with a consonant, must, according to § 255. (l.), drop the s, but the [G. Ed. p. 355.] vowel appears as e in all the bases ending with a consonant (§§. 260. 264.): hence imen-e, “of the name,”

* It must be allowed that here occurs the very weighty objection, that the feminine form rankoye in the Lithuanian, and vodye in the Slavonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskrit บายम adām in भीमायाम jihwāy-ām (§. 202.); so that, after dropping the m, as in the Zend (§. 202.), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the emphonic influence of the y, become e. As the bases in i in the Lithuanian, down to a few exceptions, are feminine, so might also awiye from awi-s, “a sheep,” be divided into awiy-e, and compared with भ्ययम maty-ām, from mati or बियाय bhīy-ām from bhī (comp. in §. 266. kosti-y-ū, for kosty-ū, from KOSTI).
answers to नाम्नस् namnas-, nomin-is; nebes-e, "of the heaven," to नवहस nasas, vēpe(o)g; mater-e to matr-is, μητρός. The pronominal forms also follow this analogy: men-e, "mei," teb-e, "tui," seb-e, "sui," because, in the oblique singular cases, MEN, TEB, SEB are their themes. We recognise the fuller Sanskrit genitive ending स्या syā in the pronominal genitive termination go, as to-go = तस्य ta-sya (§. 188.). This comparison might alone be sufficient in place of all proof; but, over and above, is to be remarked the easily adopted hardening of the semi-vowel य y to ग g (comp. p. 121 G. ed.), and in the Prākrit to ज j (§. 19.); finally, let the high degree of improbability be considered, that the Slavonic should have formed an entirely new genitive termination, foreign to all the cognate languages. Now, if the ग g of the termination go is taken for a hardening from य y, then the Old Slavonic has preserved exactly as much as the Greek of the termination sya; and go answers to the Greek io, and to-go, "hujus," to the Greek το-το. As, however, in Slavonic, the sibilants are easily interchanged with gutturals (see §. 255. m.), one might also conjecture the ग g of go to be a corruption of the Sanskrit स s and the semi-vowel of स्या syā, which had been lost. This conjecture cannot entirely be put aside; but in any case, even in this supposition, the termination go remains connected with स्या syā and το. As, however, in the Old Slavonic, ग g is else-where exchanged only with ज j and sch (Dobr. p. 41), but not with झ s, in my opinion the derivation of ग g from य y (स य) is to be preferred to that from स s.

270. The substantive and adjective (indefinite) ओ o bases, in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form, have lost the genitive termination go; but for it, in compensation for the lost termina-

[G. Ed. p. 356.]
in the genitive end in a, the comparison of the form syna, “fili,” with the Lithuanian and Gothic sunau-s, sunau-s, and the Sanskrit śānd-ś (from śānau-s), teaches that the a here is only a Guna element, but foreign to the proper base, as well as to the case-suffix, which, according to §. 255. (b.), must disappear.

271. The feminine bases in a, with the exception of those which have a penultimate y, change that a in the genitive into y; hence vody, “aqua,” from VODA, but volya, “voluntatis,” with unaltered base, from VOLYA. I ascribe that y, as well as that in the nominative plural, to the euphonic influence of the s, which originally ends the form (see §. 255. d.): this, however, does not obtain if a y precedes the a; hence volya, “voluntatis,” is identical with the theme. On the other hand, the feminine pronominal bases in a have preserved a remarkable agreement with the Sanskrit pronominal declension; for if ta, “this” (at the same time the theme), forms to-ya in the genitive, I do not doubt of the identity of the ending ya with the Sanskrit syds (§. 172.), as in the word तस्यāḥ tasyāḥ, of the same import, for the final s must, according to §. 255. (l.), give way; but the a of the Sclavonic ya directs us, according to §. 255. (a.), to an Indian ता ḍa, just as the preceding o points to a short च ā. The irregularity, therefore, in the shortening of the Sclavonic termination lies only in the dropping of the sibilant before y, as, in the Greek, τοῖο, from τάκα ta-sya, and in the to-go, for to-(s)ya, mentioned in §. 269.

272. In the vocative, which in the cognate languages is without any case suffix (§. 204.), o is weakened to e (ē) and a to o (§. 255 a.), hence nōve (from NOVO, “new”), for [G. Ed. p. 357.] Sanskrit नाव nāva, is identical with the Latin nōve, and answers to the Greek νέ(τ)ε: from VODA, “water,” comes vodo; but from VOLYA, according to §. 255. (n.), vole for volyo: and so from KNYAČYO, “prince,” knyashe* for

* ζ before e becomes sh.
Bases in \( yy \) change their \( y \) by Guna to \( d \) (§ 255./.), in analogy with § 205.; hence \( vrachyd \)—more commonly, with \( y \) suppressed, \( vrachd \)—"medice!" from \( VRACHYY \) On the other hand, \( y \) bases without \( y \) for their penultimate letter commonly omit the Guna, and weaken their final vowel, like the \( o \) bases, to \( e \); hence \( syne, "oh \) son!" more rarely \( synu \) (Dobr. p. 470), =Gothic \( sunau \), Lithuanian \( suna\d \), Sanskrit \( s\d \) from \( sunau \).

**DUAL.**

273. By preserving a dual, the Old Sclavonic surpasses the Gothic, in which this number is lost in the noun: it exceeds, in the same, the Lithuanian in the more true retention of the terminations, and it is richer than the Greek by one case. The agreement with the Sanskrit and Zend is not to be mistaken: let the comparison be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Old Sclavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Acc. V. m. ubh(\ddot{a}) (ambo Vedic), ub(\ddot{a})</td>
<td>ub(\ddot{e})</td>
<td>o(b)a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. n. ubh(\dot{e})</td>
<td>ub(\dot{e})</td>
<td>o(bye) (§ 255. n.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Ab. m. f. n. ubh(\dot{a})-bh(\ddot{y})(\ddot{a})m.</td>
<td>ub(\dot{o})-bya, I. D. ob(y)-ma (§ 215.).*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L. m. f. n. ubhay-(\ddot{o})s</td>
<td>ub(\ddot{\d})y-(\ddot{\d})</td>
<td>o(bo)-(\ddot{\d})†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The \( ye \), which precedes the termination \( ma \), may be compared with the Sanskrit \( \ddot{a} \) in plural forms, as \( \dot{v}\ddot{r}\dot{u}\ddot{k}\ddot{e}\ddot{b}\ddot{h}\ddot{y}\ddot{a}s \): \( ye\)-\(ma \), however, occurs in the Old Sclavonic only in \( d\dot{v}ye\)-\(ma \), "\( d\dot{u}o\dot{b}\dot{u}\dot{s} \), "\( p\ddot{e}r \ d\ddot{u}o\ddot{s} \), and some pronouns. The usual form of substantive \( o \)-bases before this ending is that with an unchanged \( o \), as \( sto\)-\(ma \), from \( sto \), "a hundred"; and the final \( a \) of feminine substantives also remains unchanged, as \( d\dot{y}\dot{e}v\dot{a}\)-\(ma \), from \( D\ddot{y}v\ddot{e}v\ddot{a} \), "a girl."

† The form \( \ddot{a} \), for the Sanskrit ending \( \ddot{o}\d \), is, according to § 255. (f.) and (l.), necessary: the Zend certainly approaches the Old Sclavonic in casting away the \( s \) voluntarily. The \( oy \), which precedes the termination \( \ddot{a} \), clearly corresponds to the Sanskrit \( \ddot{a}y \) (see § 225.) and the Zend
The Sanskrit ubhi, as neuter, comes, according to § 212., from the theme ubha, in union with the case-suffix i; and the feminine ubhē is an abbreviation of ubhay-du, and is therefore without a case termination (§ 212.). The Old Sclavonic, which runs parallel to the Sanskrit in both genders, and, according to § 255. (l.), opposes ye to the Indian ये, no longer recognises the origin of this ye, and regards it entirely as a case-suffix before which the final vowel of the theme appears to be suppressed. Therefore, also, neuter bases ending in a consonant make ye their termination, if the imenye, “two names,” given by Dobrowsky, p. 513, actually occurs, and is not a theoretic formation. In feminines, however, the termination ye extends, exactly as in Sanskrit, only to bases in a (for Sanskrit ए, § 255. a.); but in such a manner, that those with y as the last letter but one in the theme reject the termination ye, and vocalize the y of the theme; hence dyeyye, “two girls,” from dyeva, but steği, “two steps,” from STEژYA. The feminine bases in i, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§ 210. 211., as pati, “two sirs,” from पति pati;

Zend Ƅy or աy (see p. 277); but that occurs only in ԯoy-թ=Sanskrit dway-ধস, “of two,” “in two” m. f. n., and in toy-թ=Sanskrit tay-ধস, “of these two,” m. f.n. The genitives and locatives of the two first persons also rest on this principle, only retaining the older a—nayā, vāyā. For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination ա, as st’-ա (Sanskrit shatay-ধস) from STO, “a hundred,” dyev-ա from DYeva, “a girl”; and thus occurs, also, together with ԯoyā, the syncopated form ԯā. Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final s, still the ա mentioned in § 225. may be identical with the Sclavonic ա; as in the Zend, also, in this termination the s is often dropped.
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dlany), "vola manus." On the other hand, the masculine y bases do not follow this principle, but suppress the final vowel before the case-suffix a; hence syn'-a, "two sons," from SYNY.

PLURAL.

274. In the plural, the masculine nominative termination e (e) for the most part answers to the Greek ες, and, according to a universal rule of sounds, omits the s (§. 255. 1); hence synov-e, "the sons," सूतवस् sūnav-as: compare βόρυν-ες, kamen-e, "the stones," for श्वमानस aśmān-as (§. 21.); compare δαίμον-ες, gosť-e, "guests" (theme GOSTI), for the Gothic gastei-s, and Greek forms like πόσι-ες.

The bases in o take, as in Lithuanian do the corresponding bases in a, i as their termination (see §. 228.), but before this reject the o of the base; hence rab'-i, "servants," for rabo-i (comp. لَوْکَ-ا), as in Latin lup-ı for lupo-ı. Neuters have a for their ending, like the cognate dialects, with the exception of the Sanskrit with i for a; nevertheless, slova, "verba," from SLOVO—as δορα from ΔΩΠΟ—answers to Vedic forms like vanā, "woods," from vana; and the same thing obtains which, §. 231. p. 267 G. ed., has been said of Gothic, Greek, and Latin, regarding the relation of the a of the termination to the o of the theme. As regards the bases ending in a consonant, let imen-a, "names," be compared with the Latin nomin-a and Gothic namōn-a; nebes-a, "the heavens," with νεφη(σ)-α; and telyat-a, "calves," with Greek forms like σῶματ-α.

Feminines, with the exception of the class of words in ov mentioned at §. 261., have lost the nominative ending; hence volya, "voluntates," is the same as the theme and the nominative singular; and [G. Ed. p. 360.] from KOSTI, "bones" (Sanskrit asthī, neuter) comes the nominative singular kosty, and the plural like the theme.

275. The accusative plural is, in feminine and neuter nouns, the same as the nominative, and therefore in the former
mostly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in i; hence yosti for the Gothic gasti-ns. Bases in o, without y preceding, like RABO, change this o into y, as raby, "servos"; at least I cannot believe that this y is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the o of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. §. 271.): as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel (a) of the base into u; hence wilku-s, "lupos," answering to the Gothic vulfa-ns and Sanskrit vriká-n. But if the Old Sclavonic bases in y, of animate creatures, form owy in the accusative plural, and thus synovy, "filios," answers to the Lithuanian sunu-s (from SUNU), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit sunu-ns, sunú-n, prove that the Sclavonic form is unorganic, and formed from an augmented theme SYNOVO, according to the analogy of raby. Bases in yy in this case follow bases in yo (from ya, §. 255. a.), which, preserving the old a sound, give ya, as in the genitive singular (see §. 270.); hence vračya, "medicos," like knyačya, "principes": but forms, also, like doschdevy, analogous with synovy, occur, following the euphonic rule, §. 255. (n.).

276. The view here given is the more incontrovertible, as in the dative, also, synovo-m, "filiiis" (compare rabo-m), is clearly formed from a theme SYNOVO, increased by o, corresponding to the Lithuanian sunu-ms. This dative suffix m, for the Lithuanian ms (from mus, §. 215.), according to §. 255. (l.), extends itself over all classes of words, and appears to be attached by a conjunctive vowel e to bases terminating with a consonant; but, in fact, it is to be considered that these, in the cases mentioned as also in the locative (see §. 279.), pass over into the i declension, as a final i, before the signs of case m and ch, becomes e: and a similar metaplasm occurs in the Lithuanian, and indeed, to a
277. Less general is the instrumental ending *mi*, answering, subject to the loss required by §. 255. (l.), to the Lithuanian *mis*, Sanskrit *bhis*, and Zend *bis*. This termination *mi* is, however, in masculine and neuter nouns for the most part lost (comp. Dobr. pp. 473 and 477); and is preserved principally, and indeed without exception, in feminines, as well as in a few masculine *i* bases: a final *i* of the base is, however, suppressed before the termination *mi*. Let *kost*'-*mi* be compared with *स्त्रीस्वस्तिः* *asthi-bhis*, from *स्त्री* asthi, "bone"; *vdova-* *mi* with *विधवास्वस्तिः* *vidhavā bhis*, from *विधवा* *vidhavā*, "a widow." The instrumentals *raby*, *synovy*, are, like the accusatives of similar sound, uninflected (§. 275.); the *i* of *kusyaṭi*, *vrachi*, is the vocalization of the *y* of the bases *KYNAÇYO*, *VRACHYY*, after the loss of the final vowel; and the *y* of neuters terminating in a consonant, like *imen* "per nomina," is to be explained by a transition into the *o* declension, and is therefore analogous to *raby*, *slavy*, similarly to the *o* of the Greek dual forms like *δαυμώνου* (p. 318 G. ed. Rem. 2.).

278. Dobrowsky (p. 461) represents *ov*, *y*, *ū*, *ev*, *en*, *yat*, and *es*, as plural genitive terminations; but in reality the suffix of this case has entirely disappeared, and in bases in *o*, *a*, and *y*, has also carried away those final vowels with it, while bases in *i* double that vowel; hence *rab*, [G.Ed.p.362.] "servorum," from *RABO*; *vod*, "aquarum," from *VODA*; *syn. "filiorum," from *SYNY*; *kostii*, "ossium," from *KOSTI*; *imen. "nominum," from *IMEN*; *nebes*, "caelorum," from *NEBES*.

The *n* and *s* of *imen*, *nebes*, would, without the former protection of a following termination have been dropped, as in Sclavonic we have only a second generation of final consonants; while the former, with the exception of a few monosyllabic forms, has, according to §. 255. (l.), disappeared.
279. The termination of the locative plural is ch throughout all classes of words, and has been already, at §. 255. (m.) recognised as identical with the Indian ṣu, and therefore, also, with the Greek σϊ: compare, also, the Zend ḵa, for the Sanskrit svā, in §. 35. Before this kh, ṣ passes into ye, exactly as the corresponding Sanskrit a into ḍ (see §. 255. e.); hence rabye-ch, “in servis,” answers to ṽrikē-shu, “in lupis.” Bases in yo—and those in yy follow their analogy—suppress, however, before this ye, their preceding y, as in similar cases; hence knyatye-ch, “in principibus,” not knyatyy-ch from KNYAŢYO. A final a remains unchanged; hence vdoya-ch, “in viduis,” answers to the Sanskrit vidhad-su. For bases in i, and consonants, see §. 276.


* The above examples are arranged according to their final letters, with the observation, however, that o represents an original short a, and hence precedes the a for Sanskrit ḍ (§. 255. a.). All bases in t have a y before the preceding a; this semi-vowel is, however, readily suppressed after sibilants; hence ovcha for ovchya, Dobr. p. 475; and hence, also, from lizyo come (nom. lize) the genitive, dative, and nominative accusative plural līzna, līzā, for līzya, līzyā. If in bases in yo, m. n., and in feminines in ya, an i precedes the semi-vowel, this involves some apparent variations
those forms of the following table in which a part of the word is not separated from the rest, thereby shewing itself to be the inflection, we recognise no inflection at all, i.e. no case-suffix; but we see therein only the bare base of the word, either complete or abbreviated; or also a modification of the base, through the alteration of the final letter, occasioned by the termination which has been dropped (compare §. 271.). In some cases which we present in the notes, base and termination have, however, been contracted into one letter, by which a division is rendered impossible. With respect to the dual, which cannot be proved to belong to all the words here given as specimens, we refer to §. 273.

variations in the declension, which require no particular explanation here (see, in Dobr. mrvii, m. p. 468; ladiya, f. p. 478; and òchenye, n. p. 474. With regard to zary, "a king," see §. 263).
FORMATION OF CASES.

[ G. Ed., p. 364. ]

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>NOM.</th>
<th>ACCUS.</th>
<th>INSTR.</th>
<th>DATIVE.</th>
<th>GEN.</th>
<th>LOC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RABO, m.¹</td>
<td>Ῥαβ', Ῥαβ', Ῥαβο-μυ, Ῥαβη,²⁶</td>
<td>Ῥαβ, ²⁵</td>
<td>Ῥαβο-μυ,</td>
<td>Ῥαβο-μυ,</td>
<td>Ῥαβα, ²⁷</td>
<td>Ῥαβη, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΝΥΑΞΙΟ, m.²</td>
<td>Κνυαξ', Κνυαξ', Κνυαξ-μυ, Κνυαξη,²⁵</td>
<td>Κνυαξ, ²⁵</td>
<td>Κνυαξ-μυ,</td>
<td>Κνυαξ-μυ,</td>
<td>Κνυαξα, ²¹</td>
<td>Κνυαξη, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΛΟΠΟ, n.³</td>
<td>Σλοπο, Σλοπο, Σλοπο-μυ, Σλοποι,</td>
<td>Σλοπο, ²⁵</td>
<td>Σλοπο-μυ,</td>
<td>Σλοπο-μυ,</td>
<td>Σλοποι, ²¹</td>
<td>Σλοποι, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΟΡΥΟ, n.²</td>
<td>Μορο, Μορο, Μορο-μυ, Μοροη,</td>
<td>Μορο, ²ⁱ</td>
<td>Μορο-μυ,</td>
<td>Μορο-μυ,</td>
<td>Μοροη, ²¹</td>
<td>Μοροη, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΒΟΔΑ, t.⁴</td>
<td>Βοδα, Βοδα, Βοδα-μυ, Βοδη,</td>
<td>Βοδα, ²⁵</td>
<td>Βοδα-μυ,</td>
<td>Βοδα-μυ,</td>
<td>Βοδη, ²⁵</td>
<td>Βοδη, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΒΟΛΥΑ, t.⁴</td>
<td>Βολυα, Βολυα, Βολυ-μυ, Βολι,</td>
<td>Βολα, ²⁰</td>
<td>Βολα-μυ,</td>
<td>Βολα-μυ,</td>
<td>Βολι, ²⁰</td>
<td>Βολι, ²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΟΣΤΙ, m.⁵</td>
<td>Γοστη, Γοστη, Γοστη-μυ, Γοστη,</td>
<td>Γοστη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Γοστη-μυ,</td>
<td>Γοστη-μυ,</td>
<td>Γοστη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Γοστη, ²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΟΣΤΙ, t.⁶</td>
<td>Κοστη, Κοστη, Κοστη-μυ, Κοστη,</td>
<td>Κοστη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Κοστη-μυ,</td>
<td>Κοστη-μυ,</td>
<td>Κοστη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Κοστη, ²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΣΥΝΥ, m.⁶</td>
<td>Συνη, Συνη, Συνη-μυ, Συνη,</td>
<td>Συνη, ²¹</td>
<td>Συνη-μυ,</td>
<td>Συνη-μυ,</td>
<td>Συνη, ²¹</td>
<td>Συνη, ²⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΟΜΥ, m.⁷</td>
<td>Δομη, Δομη, Δομη-μυ, Δομη,</td>
<td>Δομη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Δομη-μυ,</td>
<td>Δομη-μυ,</td>
<td>Δομη, ²⁰</td>
<td>Δομη, ²⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΒΡΑΧΗΥ, m.⁸</td>
<td>Βραχη, Βραχη, Βραχη-μυ, Βραχη,</td>
<td>Βραχη, ²³</td>
<td>Βραχη-μυ,</td>
<td>Βραχη-μυ,</td>
<td>Βραχη, ²³</td>
<td>Βραχη, ²³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΜΕΝ, m.⁹</td>
<td>Καμη, Καμη, Καμη-μυ, Καμη,</td>
<td>Καμη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Καμη-μυ,</td>
<td>Καμη-μυ,</td>
<td>Καμη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Καμη, ²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΑΤΕΡ, f.¹¹</td>
<td>Ματη, Ματη, Ματη-μυ, Ματη,</td>
<td>Ματη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Ματη-μυ,</td>
<td>Ματη-μυ,</td>
<td>Ματη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Ματη, ²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΝΕΒΕΣ, n.¹²</td>
<td>Νεβο, Νεβο, Νεβο-μυ, Νεβο,</td>
<td>Νεβο, ²⁴</td>
<td>Νεβο-μυ,</td>
<td>Νεβο-μυ,</td>
<td>Νεβο, ²⁴</td>
<td>Νεβο, ²⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΕΛΥΤ, n.¹³</td>
<td>Τελη, Τελη, Τελη-μυ, Τελη,</td>
<td>Τελη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Τελη-μυ,</td>
<td>Τελη-μυ,</td>
<td>Τελη, ²⁴</td>
<td>Τελη, ²⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Comp. p. 273, &c. ² See §§ 268, 269. ³ Comp. pp. 275, 276. ⁴ Comp. p. 285. ⁵ Comp. p. 286. ⁶ See p. 337, Note. ⁷ See §§ 268. ⁸ See §§ 266. ⁹ Comp. p. 304. ¹⁰ The cases wanting come from KAMENI (see § 260.); whence, also, kamene-, kamene-ch (§ 266.); and whence, also, might be derived the dative and locative kamene-i, which I prefer, however, deriving from the original theme, just as in MATER. ¹¹ More commonly vrachã, and in the vocative, vrachá. See p. 267, Note. ¹² See §§ 268. ¹³ More commonly vracha, and in the vocative, vrachá. See p. 267, Note. ¹⁴ Or syn. ¹⁵ Or syn. ¹⁶ See §§ 268. ¹⁷ Comp. Lith. pati-imi, sunu-mi. ¹⁸ Comp. p. 306. and § 147.
IN THE OLD SCLAVONIC.

PLURAL. [G. Ed. p. 365.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM. VOC.</th>
<th>ACCUS.</th>
<th>INSTR.</th>
<th>DATIVE.</th>
<th>GEN.</th>
<th>LOCATIVE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rab'-i</td>
<td>raby</td>
<td>raby</td>
<td>rabo-m</td>
<td>rab'</td>
<td>rabye-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knyaţi</td>
<td>knyaţya</td>
<td>knyaţi</td>
<td>knyaţe-m</td>
<td>knyaţy</td>
<td>knyaţe-ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slova</td>
<td>slova</td>
<td>slovy</td>
<td>slovo-m</td>
<td>slov'</td>
<td>slovye-ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morya</td>
<td>morya</td>
<td>mori</td>
<td>more-m</td>
<td>mory'</td>
<td>morye-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vody</td>
<td>vody</td>
<td>voda-m</td>
<td>voda-m</td>
<td>vod'</td>
<td>voda-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volya</td>
<td>volya</td>
<td>volya-m</td>
<td>volya-m</td>
<td>voly'</td>
<td>volya-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosty-e</td>
<td>gosti</td>
<td>gostî-m</td>
<td>gostî-m</td>
<td>gostî</td>
<td>goste-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kosti</td>
<td>kosti</td>
<td>koste-m</td>
<td>koste-m</td>
<td>kosti</td>
<td>koste-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synov-e</td>
<td>synovy</td>
<td>synovy</td>
<td>synovo-m</td>
<td>synov</td>
<td>synovye-ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domov-e</td>
<td>domy</td>
<td>domy-m</td>
<td>domo-m</td>
<td>domov</td>
<td>dome-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrachev-e</td>
<td>vrachy</td>
<td>vrachi</td>
<td>vrache-m</td>
<td>vrachev</td>
<td>vrache-ch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| . . . . . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . | . . . . |
| imen-a   | imen-a | imeny  | imene-m | imen  | imene-ch. |
| mater-e  | mater-m| mater-m| mater-m | . . .  | . . . . |
| nebes-a  | nebes  | nebesy | nebes-e-m| nebes | nebesče-ch.|
| telyat-a | telyat-a| telyaty| telyate-m| telyat| telyate-ch. |

1 See §. 274.
2 See §. 271.
3 See §. 275.
4 From SYNVO, see §. 275. In the locative occur also synovo-ch and synove-ch.
5 See §. 277.
6 See §. 276.
7 See §. 278.
8 See §. 279.
9 One would expect nebes-e-ch; but in this case ech and yech are frequently interchanged with one another, and the form yech appears to agree better with the preceding s (comp. Dobrowsky, p. 477).
ADJECTIVES.

[G. Ed. p. 366.] 281. The declension of the adjective is not distinct from that of the substantive; and if some inflected forms, which in the Sanskrit and Zend belong only to the pronouns, have, in the cognate languages, emerged from the circle of the pronouns, and extended themselves further, they have not remained with the adjectives alone, but have extended themselves to the substantives also. As regards the Greek, Latin, and Slavonic, we have already explained at §§. 228, 248, and 274. what has been introduced from pronominal declension in those languages into general declension: we will here only further remark that the appended syllable *sma*, in §. 165. &c., which, in Sanskrit, characterises only the pronominal declension, may in the Pāli be combined also, in several cases, with masculine and neuter substantive and adjective bases, and indeed with all bases in *a*, *i*, and *u*, including those which, originally terminating in a consonant, pass by augment or apocope into the vowel declension; thus the ablative and locative singular of *kēsa*, "hair," is either simply *kēsā* (from *kēsāt*, see p. 300), *kēsē*, or combined with *sma* or its variation *mha*, *kēsa-smā*, *kēsa-mhā*, *kēsa-smīn*, *kēsa-mhī*. In the Lithuanian, this syllable, after dropping the *s*, has, in the dative and locative singular, passed over to the adjective declension, without imparting itself to that of the substantive, and without giving to the adjective the licence of renouncing this appended syllable; as, *gēram*, "bono," *geramē*, "in bono." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention,
to explain the agreement of the Gothic full adjective dative, as blindamma (from blindasma, §. 170.), with [G. Ed. p. 367.] pronominal datives like tha-mma, "to this," i-mma, "to him"; but the examination of the Old Sclavonic declension, in which the indefinite adjectives remove themselves from all admixture of the pronominal declension, and run entirely parallel to the German strong substantive, not to the weak, has led me to the, to me, very important discovery, that Grimm's strong and Fulda's abstract-declension-form of adjectives diverges in not less than nine points from the strong substantives (i.e. those which terminate in the theme in a vowel), and approaches to the pronominal declension for no other reason than because, like the definite adjectives in the Sclavonic and Lithuanian, they are compounded with a pronoun, which naturally follows its own declension. As, then, the definite (so I now name the strong) adjectives are defined or personified by a pronoun incorporated with them, it is natural that this form of declension should be avoided, where the function of the inherent pronoun is discharged by a word which simply precedes it; thus we say guter, or der gute, not der guter, which would be opposed to the genius of our language; for it still lies in our perception that in guter a pronoun is contained, as we perceive pronouns in im, am, beim, although the pronoun is here no longer present in its original form, but has only left behind its case-termination. In comprehending, however, the definite adjective declension, the science of Grammar, which in many other points had raised itself far above the empirical perception of the language, was here still left far behind it; and we felt, in forms like guter, gutem, gute, more than we recognised, namely, a pronoun which still operated in spirit, although it was no longer bodily present. How acute, in this respect, our perception is, is proved by the fact that we place the definite form of the adjective beside the ein when deprived [G. Ed. p. 368.]
of its definitive pronominal element; but, in the oblique cases, beside the definite eines, einem, einen, the indefinite: *ein grosses, eines grossen* (not *grosses*), *einem grossen* (not *grossem*). In the accusative, *grossen* is at the same time definite and indefinite; but in the former case it is a bare theme, and therefore identical with the indefinite genitive and dative, which is likewise devoid of inflection; but in the latter case the *n* evidently belongs to the inflection.

282. The pronominal base, which in Lithuanian and Old Sclavonic forms the definite declension, is, in its original form, *ya* (== Sanskrit यَا, "which"); and has, in the Lithuanian, maintained itself in this form in several cases (see below). In the Old Sclavonic, according to § 255. (a.), *yo* must be formed from *ya*; and from *yo* again, according to § 255. (n.), *ye* or *e*: but the monosyllabic nature of the form has preserved it from the suppression of the *y*, which usually takes place in polysyllabic words. In some cases, however, the *y* has vocalized itself to *i* after the vowel has been dropped. It signifies in both languages "he"; but in Old Sclavonic has preserved, in union with *sche*, the old relative meaning (*i*-sche, "which"). The complete declension of this pronoun is as follows:

### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Old Sclavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental, m. <em>yu</em>, f. <em>ye</em>, m. n. <em>im</em>, f. <em>yeyd</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, m. <em>yam</em>, f. <em>yei</em>, m. n. <em>yemA</em>, f. <em>yei</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, m. <em>yo</em>, f. <em>yis</em>, m. n. <em>yeyo</em>, f. <em>yeya</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative, m. <em>yamₑ</em>, f. <em>yoₑ</em>, m. n. <em>yem</em>, f. <em>yei</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Occurs only as the relative in union with *sche.*
ADJECTIVES.

PLURAL.

LITHUANIAN.          OLD SCLAVONIC.
Nominative, m. yie (yi), f. yos, m. i* f. n. ya.*
Accusative, m. ýus, f. yes, m. f. n. ya.
Instrumental, m. yeis, f. yomis, m. f. n. imi.
Dative, m. yiems, f. yoms, m. f. n. im.
Genitive, m. f. yá, m. f. n. ich.
Locative, m. yûsè, f. yosè, m. f. n. ich.

DUAL. [G. Ed. p. 369.]

LITHUANIAN.           OLD SCLAVONIC.
Nominative, m. yu (yû), f. yi, m. yim f. n. yima.
Accusative, m. yui, f. yin, m. f. n. yima.
Dative, m. yiém, f. yom, Instr. Dat. m. f. n. yima.
Genitive, m. f. yá, m. f. n. yim.

283. The Lithuanian unites, in its definite declension, the pronoun cited—which, according to Ruhig (Mielcke, p. 52.), signifies the same as the Greek article—with the adjective to be rendered definite; so that both the latter, and the pronoun, preserve their full terminations through all the cases; only the pronoun in some cases loses its y, and the terminations of the adjective are in some cases somewhat shortened. Geras, "good," will serve as an example.

MASCULINE.

SINGULAR.          DUAL.          PLURAL.
Nominative, gerasis†, geraiyû, gerieyi.
Accusative, geraiýain, geraiuyin, geraiusus,
Instrumental, geraiyu, geraiyu, geraiyei.
Dative, geramyam, giriemsiom, geriemi,
Genitive, geroyo, geroyo, geroyd.
Locative, geramyame, geramyame, gerasíse.
Vocative, gerasis, geraiyu, gerieyi.

* See Note on preceding page.
† Or gerasis, by assimilation from gerasyis, as, in the Prákrit ā frequently assimilates itself to a preceding s, as tassa, "hujus," for तस्य tasya.
‡ The s of the adjective is here not in its place, and appears to be borrowed from the plural.
**ADJECTIVES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOMINATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>geroji,</td>
<td>geriiyi,</td>
<td>gerosos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>geraiiyen,</td>
<td>geriyiin,</td>
<td>gerases,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>geroye,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>geromsomis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>geraisyei,</td>
<td>geromsom,*</td>
<td>geromsoms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>gerosiies,</td>
<td>geruyu,</td>
<td>geruyu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>geroyoye,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>gerososa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>geroji,</td>
<td>geriyi,</td>
<td>gerosos.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[D. Ed. p. 370.] 284. The Old Sclavonic, differing from the Lithuanian, declines only in some cases the adjective together with the appended pronoun, but in most cases the latter alone. While, however, in the Lithuanian the appended pronoun has lost its y only in some cases, in the Old Sclavonic that pronoun has lost, in many more, not only the y but also its vowel, and therefore the whole base. Thus the termination alone is left. For more convenient comparison we insert here, over against one another, the indefinite and definite declension: svyat (theme SVYATO), "holy," may serve for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASCULINE</strong></td>
<td>Def.</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
<td>svyatyi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
<td>svyatyi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>svyatomi,</td>
<td>svyatym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>svyatka,</td>
<td>svyatym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>svyatka,</td>
<td>svyatym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>svyatye,</td>
<td>svyatym,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note 1 on preceding page.
1 See § 255. d. 2 Or svaty-m, in which, as in the Lithuanian, the adjective is inflected at the same time.
3 The indefinite and definite forms are here the same, for this reason, that svyato-yo, as the latter must originally have been written, has dropped the syllable ye. The adjective base svyata has weakened its o to a before the pronominal addition (§ 255. a.), just as in the dative and locative svyato-y, where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible.
4 Or svatyey-i. Comp. Note 2.
ADJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>svyat, svyat-e, svyata, svyata-ya.</td>
<td>svyat, svyat-ya, svyat, svyat-ya, svyat, svyat-ya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rest like the masculine.

---

5 I give those forms which, according to Dobrowsky (p. 302.), occur in the oldest MSS., in place of the more ordinary forms, which have lost the i of the pronominal base: svyat-mi, svyat-m, svyat-ch.

6 Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative, we must nevertheless, in my opinion, separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find, however, the reason of their agreement in this, that the Sanskrit, which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Sclavonic, in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant, Sanskrit sām, Gothic xé (for sē, §. 248.). This s, then, has, in Old Sclavonic, become ch, just like that of the locative characteristic झ su (§. 279.). The nasal of साम sām must, according to rule, be lost (§. 255. 1.): the vowel, however, has, contrary to rule, followed it, as also in the ordinary declension the termination ām has entirely disappeared (§. 278.); and the same relation which imen, “nominum,” has to the Gothic naman-ē, tye-ch, “horum,” has to thi-ze. This tye-ch, however, answers as genitive to the Sanskrit तेषा tē-śām, and as locative to ते झ tu tē-śhu; ye being used in both cases for के, according to §. 255. (e.)

7 See Notes 5 and 6. The identity with the masculine and neuter forms arises from this, that the grave a of the feminine adjective base is changed into the lighter o; and this again, as in the masculine neuter, is converted, according to §. 255. (d.), into y.
ADJECTIVES.

[G.Ed.p.371.] 285. As in the Sanskrit the preponderating majority of adjective bases end in the masculine and neuter in a, and in the feminine in d; and as this class is, in the Old Sclavonic, only represented by bases in o, yo in the masculine and neuter (see §. 257.), and a, ya in the feminine; it is not surprising that in German also, with the exception of a few in u (of the comparative and participle present), all other adjective bases, in their original condition, end in a, feminine o for d (§. 69.). It is, however, remarkable, and peculiar to the German, that its adjectives, in their indefinite condition, have all lengthened their theme.

[G. Ed. p. 372.] by an unorganic n, and that in substantives the class of words in n appears to be the most generally made use of, inasmuch as a large number of words, whose bases in Gothic terminate in a vowel, have, in the more modern dialects, permitted this to be increased by n. The reason, however, why the indefinite adjectives—not simply in part, and for the first time in the more modern dialects, but universally, and so early as in Gothic—have passed into the n declension, is to be sought for in the obtuseness of the inflection of this class of words, which, according to §§. 139. 140., in common with the Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek, omits the nominative sign, and then, in variance from the older languages, dispenses also with the dative character, upon the loss of which, in Old High German, has followed, also, that of the genitive character. This absence of the animating and personifying mark of case might belong to the indefinite adjective, because it feels itself more exactly defined through the article which precedes it, or through another pronoun, than the definite adjective, the pronoun of which, incorporated with it, has for the most part left behind only its case terminations. In the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, in which the article is wanting, and thereby an inducement further to weaken the declension of the indefinite adjectives, the latter stand on an
ADJECTIVES.

Equal footing with Grimm's strong declension of substantives, i.e. they maintain themselves, without an unorganic consonantal augment, in the genuine, original limits of their base.

286. As the feminine, where it is not identical, as in adjective bases in i in the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, with the theme of the masculine and neuter, is always, in the Indo-European family of languages, made to diverge through an extension or an addition to the end, it is important for German Grammar to remark—and I have already called attention to this point in another place—that the feminine of the German indefinite adjective, in variance from the principle which has been [G. Ed p. 373.] just given, has not arisen from its masculine, but from an older form of the feminine; e.g. the primitive feminine BLINDA m. n. "blind," has extended itself in the indefinite to BLINDAN, and the primitive feminine BLINDO to BLINDON: one must not, therefore, derive the latter, although it is the feminine of BLINDAN m., from this, as it is entirely foreign to the Indo-European family of languages to derive a feminine base through the lengthening of the last letter but one of the masculine and neuter. As far as regards the declension of BLINDAN m., it follows precisely that of AHMAN (p. 322 G. ed.), and BLINDAN n., that of NAMAN (p. 176 G. ed. &c.); the fem. BLINDON differs from the masculine only by a more regular inflection, since its o remains everywhere unchanged, while a, in the genitive and dative singular, is, according to §. 132., weakened to i; therefore—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>MASCULINE</th>
<th>NEUTER</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td>BLINDAN</td>
<td>BLINDAN</td>
<td>BLINDON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. V.</td>
<td>blinda', 1</td>
<td>blindan-s,</td>
<td>blindon-s, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blindo', 2</td>
<td>blindon-a, 3</td>
<td>blindon', 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>blindan,</td>
<td>blindan-s,</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blindo', 2</td>
<td>blindon-a, 3</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>blindin, 1</td>
<td>blindin'-m,</td>
<td>blindon,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blindin', 1</td>
<td>blindin'-m,</td>
<td>blindon',</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blindin-s, 1</td>
<td>blindin-s, 1</td>
<td>blindin'-s, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>blindin-s, 1</td>
<td>blindan-s,</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blindin-s, 1</td>
<td>blindon-s, 3</td>
<td>blindon-s, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See § 140. 2 See §. 141. 3 See §. 245.
287. In order, then, to examine the definite declension of adjectives in Gothic, we will, in the first place, for the purpose of bringing into view their agreement and discrepancy with substantives and simple pronouns, place by the side of each other the declension of the definite BLINDA m. n. and BLINDŌ f., and that of VULFA m., "wolf," DAURA n., "a gate," GIBŌ f., a gift," and the interrogative [G. Ed. p. 374.] HVA m. n., "who? "what?" HVŌ f.; further, that of MIDYA m. n. (medius), MIDYŌ f., by that of HARYA m., "an army," BADYA n., "a bed," KUNTHYO f., "news," and HVARYA m. n., "who?" " what?", HVARYŌ f.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. vulʃ's, blind's, hva-s,</td>
<td>vulfős, blindai, hvai,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. vulʃ', blindana, hva-na,</td>
<td>vulfna, blindans, hva-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. vulʃa, blindamma, hva-mma,</td>
<td>vulf-, blindaize, hvai-zé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. vulʃ-s, blindis, hvi s,</td>
<td>vulf-, blindai, hvai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. vulʃ', blind's, ....</td>
<td>vulfós, blindai, ....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. haryi-s, midyis, hvaryi-s,</td>
<td>haryds, midyai, hvaryai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. hari, midyana, hvarya-na,</td>
<td>harya-ns, midyaen, hvarya-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. harya, midyamma, hvarya-mma,</td>
<td>harya-m, midyaim, hvarya-i-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. haryi-s, midyis, hvarya-is,</td>
<td>harye, midyaizé, hvaryaizé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. hari, midyis, ....</td>
<td>haryds, midyai, ....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 135. 3 See §. 228. 5 See §. 171.
2 See §. 227. 4 See §. 160.
6 From harya-s, see §. 135.
7 The nominative in adjective bases in ga does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared; and I have here formed it by analogy with haryi- and hvaryi-. Grimm gives midis (I. 170.). If, 1. e., the form gis is considered as unorganic, and, in regard to midis, if its analogy with hardus is remembered, then Grimm is wrong in taking MIDI for the theme, as in reality HARDU is the theme of hardus. The true theme MIDYA occurs, however, in the comp. midya-sveipains, “deluge,” and
### ADJECTIVES.

#### NEUTER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. daur, blindata, hva.</td>
<td>daura, blinda, hvō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rest like the masculine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. badi, midyata, hvarya-ta, badya.</td>
<td>midya, hvarya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rest like the masculine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. giba, blinda, hvō.</td>
<td>gibōs, blindōs, hvōs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. giba, blindas, hvō.11</td>
<td>gibō-s, blindōs, hvō-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. gibai,12 blindai, hvizai.13</td>
<td>gibō-m, blindaim, hvai-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. gibō-s, blindaisōs, hvizō-s.13</td>
<td>gib-ō, blindaizo, hvizō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. giba, blinda?</td>
<td>gibōs, blindōs, . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. kunthi,14 midya, hvarya.</td>
<td>kunthyōs,2 midyōs, hvaryōs.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. kunthyya, hvarya.</td>
<td>kunthyō-s, midyōs, hvaryō-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. kunthyai,12 midyai,12 hvarya12</td>
<td>kunthyō-m, midyōm, hvaryō-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. kunthyō-s, midyaisōs, hvaryaizōs.13</td>
<td>kunthy-ō, midy'iō, hvary'iō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. kunthi, kunthi</td>
<td>kunthyo, midyōs, hvaryōs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answers to the Sanskrit नम्य madhya. Formed from midya as theme, midyōs would be clearly more organic than midis. Adjective i bases, which could be referred to hardu-s as u base, do not exist, but only substantive, as GASTI, nom. gasts.

8 Compare Zend forms like ज्यो तूरिम, "quartum," from ज्यो तूरिम.

9 Hva, with suppressed termination, for hvata, Old High German huaz, see §§. 155. 156.; for blindata also blind; and so for midyata also midb.

10 The form hvō, which, like some others of this pronoun, cannot be shown to occur, is, by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from thō, "hec." Grimm here finds, as also in the accusative singular, the o in opposition to the a of blinda surprising: the reason of the deviation, however, is fixed by §§. 69. 157. 251.


14 For kunthyā, from kunthyō, by suppression of the final vowel of the base, which again appears in the accusative, but shortened to a (see §. 69.); but here, also, the final vowel can be dropped; hence kunthi as accusative. Luc. 1. 77.
If, then, it is asked which pronoun is contained in the German definite adjective, I answer, the same which, in Scavonic and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative ya (मा). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Scavonic, does not occur isolated in its inflected state; but it is not uncommon in the history of languages, that a word has been lost in regard to its isolated use, and has been preserved only in composition with other words. It should be observed, too, that a demonstrative द base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskrit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely; but in Sanskrit, except the neuter nominative accusative idam, "this," has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as ति i-ti, इत्यम् it-tham, "so," इय-य iy-at, "so much," ईद्या i-drisa, "such." The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base ya: from this comes, in my opinion the affirmative particle ya, as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (i-tu, तथः ta-thā, "so," सोत्रस्), and further yabai, "if," analogous with ibai, "whether," ibaini, "lest"; as also, in Sanskrit, यदि yadi, "if," comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek ei—the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Prakrit, in the 3d person singular present, ai, e.g. भामाय ibhamai, "he wanders" (Urvasi by Lenz, p. 63), has to the more usual चै adi, for the Sanskrit चति ati. In Prakrit, too, जै jai (l. c. p. 63 on j for y, see § 19.), really occurs for yadi; so that in this conjunction, as in the 3d person of the present ने य from ने य (Urvasi), the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Prakrit. If, however, in ei the Sanskrit य has disappeared, as in the Æolic युमेः=Sanskrit yushmaḥ, it appears as h in ḍs, which has nothing to do with the article ṇ, ṇ, where h falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in ḍs it runs through all the cases, as
in Sanskrit the \( \text{y} \) of \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a}s \). To this [G. Ed. p. 377.]

Sanskrit the \( \text{y} \) of \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a}s \). To this [G. Ed. p. 377.]

ir\*f \( \text{N} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a}s \), \( \text{y} \), in regard to the rough breathing, bears the same relation as \( \text{y} \) \( \text{m} \) to \( \text{y} \) \( \text{u} \) \( \text{sh} \) \( \text{m} \), \( \text{y} \) \( \text{z} \), \( \text{y} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{o} \) to \( \text{y} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \), “to worship,” “to sacrifice,” \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{j} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \), “to be worshiped;” \( \text{y} \) \( \text{o} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{u} \) to \( \text{y} \) \( \text{u} \) \( \text{d} \), “to strive,” \( \text{y} \) \( \text{u} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{u} \) \( \text{d} \) \( \text{m} \), “strife” (comp. Pott, pp. 236. 252.). But to return to the Gothic \( \text{Y} \) \( \text{A} \), let us further observe \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{h} \), *“and,” “also,” with \( \text{h} \) enclitic, of which hereafter, and \( \text{y} \) \( \text{u} \), “now,” i.e. “at this time,” “already” (comp. Latin \( \text{j} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{a} \)). It also clearly forms the last portion of \( \text{h} \) \( \text{v} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{s} \) (for \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \)), as, in the Slavonic, this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others, and, for example, is contained in \( \text{k} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{i} \), “who?” although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination.

288. In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base \( \text{Y} \) \( \text{A} \) shews itself most plainly in bases in \( \text{u} \). Of these, indeed, there are but a few, which we annex below,† but a \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) shews itself in all the cases, and these in \( \text{b} \) \( \text{l} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{n} \) \( \text{d} \) \( \text{s} \) differ from the substantive declension, to such an extent that before the \( \text{y} \) the \( \text{u} \) of the adjective is suppressed, as in Sanskrit before the comparative and superlative suffixes \( \text{i} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \), \( \text{i} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \); e.g. \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \), “more light,” \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \), “most light,” for \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{v} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \), \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \) from \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{u} \) ; and as, even in Gothic, \( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{r} \) \( \text{d} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{z} \) \( \text{d} \), “more hard” (according to

* The \( h \) may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{g} \), \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{n} \), and \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \), and in conjunction with \( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{e} \) : \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{t} \) \( \text{h} \) \( \text{e} \) \( \text{y} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \), “or” (see Massmann’s Gloss.).

† *Agggus, “narrow,” *aglus, “heavy,” *glaggvyus, “industrious,” *hardus, “hard,” *manvus, “ready,” *thaursus, “dry,” *thlaqvyus, “tender,” *seithus, “late,” *filus, “much,” and, probably, *hnavvyus, “tender.” Some occur only as adverbs, as *glaggvyus-\( \text{h} \) \( \text{a} \), “industriously.” In addition to the adverb *filu, “much,” since Grimm treated this subject the genitive *filus has been found (*f \( \text{i} \) \( \text{l} \) \( \text{a} \) \( \text{s} \) \( \text{m} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{s} \), “for much more,” see Massmann’s Gloss.), which is the more gratifying, as the adjective *u bases had not yet been adduced in this case
ADJECTIVES.

[G. Ed. p. 378.] Massmann, p. 48), for hardv-iz6 from HARDU. Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine thaurş-yana, "siccum," manv'-yana, "paratum"; the accusative singular neuter manv'-yata; the dative plural hnasqv'-yaim are adduceable, if Grimm, as I doubt not, is right in ascribing to this word, which is not to be met with in any other case, a nominative hnasqvus.* Finally, also, the accusative plural masculine unmanv'-yans, ἀπαρα-σκευάστους (2 C. 9. 4.), although, in this case, blindans is not different from vulfans. These examples, then, although few, furnish powerful proof; because, in the cases to be met with, they represent an entire class of words—viz. the definite adjective in u—in such a manner, that not a single variety of form occurs. It may be proper to annex here the complete definite declension of MANVU, as it is either to be met with, or, according to the difference of cases, is, with more or less confidence, to be expected:—

MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. manv'u-s,</td>
<td>(manv'-yai), manv'u-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. manv'-ya-na,</td>
<td>manv'-ya-ns, (manv'-ya),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. (manv'-ya-mna),</td>
<td>manv'-yai-m, (manv'-yai),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. manvau-s,</td>
<td>(manv'-yaizê), (manv'-yaizôs),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NEUTER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Accus. manv'-ya-ta,†</td>
<td>(manv'-ya).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* I am the more inclined to agree with him, as a few other adjective bases in vu occur. Perhaps a euphonic influence of the v on the vowel which follows it is also at work; as at times one finds in the Prâkrit a final a changed through the influence of a preceding अ, उ, र, or त, to तu. So Urvasi, p. 72, ādu, tālu, āvaranu, for kāla, tāla, āvarana; p. 71, maŋoharu for maŋohara.

† Without inflection and pronom. manvu, as स्याद् svādu, य्दु, Lithuanian darkū.
"Remark 1.—Grimm finds (I. 721.) the identity of the feminine with the masculine remarkable, since he, as it appears, looks upon s as an originally mere masculine termination (comp. l. c. 824, 825. 2, 3). That, however, the feminine has equal claim to s as the nominative character, and that it is entirely without inflection where this is wanting, I think I have shewn in §§. 134. 137. Adjective bases in i, which in the Gothic, as in the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, are wanting, end, in the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, in the nominative of both genders, in is; and only the neuter is devoid of inflection: compare पुरुष suchi-s m. f., "clean," suchi n., with ṍṛi-Ṛ, Ṙṛi, fucili-s, fucile. Adjectives in u, in Sanskrit, frequently leave, in like manner, the feminine base undistinguished from the masculine and neuter, and then end, according to §. 234., in the nominative in u-s; so pāṇḍu-s m. f., agrees with manvus above, and the neuter pāṇḍu with manvu. If two consonants do not precede the final ः u, as in pāṇḍu, the feminine base may, except in compound words, be lengthened by an ः, which is particularly characteristic of this gender; and thus साहि swāduḥ, "the sweet" (theme and nominative), answers to the Greek word ἱδης, which is lengthened by an unorganic a (§. 119.), for ἱδης; and swādu-s answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic manvus. In the Sanskrit, also, a short u in the feminine base may be lengthened, and thus the feminine of तनु tanu, "thin," is either tanu or tanḍ, whence the nominative tanḍ-s; and tanḍi, as substantive, means the "slender woman." The Lithuanian has adjective bases in u, as szwiesu-s, m. "light," "clear," (compare चेत swēta, "white," ) which nevertheless, in several cases, replace the u by a; as szwiesām dangui, "to the bright heaven": in some, too, they prefix an i to the a, the assimilating power of which changes the a into e (comp. p. 169 Note); as, szwiesiems dangums, "to the bright heavens." The feminine is, in the nominative, szwiesi, the
ADJECTIVES.

[G. Ed. p. 380.] final i of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit घ in स्वादवि. In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic a also is added to the Lithuanian i, as it has been in गृदेः: this ia, however, becomes either euphony, e (comp. p. 174, Note *), e.g. accus. szwiesę, accus. plural szwiesęs; or it happens, and that, indeed, in the majority of cases that the i is entirely suppressed, so that SZWIESA passes as the theme; as szwiesęs rankęs, "of the bright hand" (gen. szwiesai rankai (dat.). The i of ia, however, appears, as with the participles, to have communicated itself from the feminine to the masculine,

"Remark 2.—With the accusative manvyaana which has been cited, the conjectured dative manvyamma is least doubtful. That Grimm should suggest forms like hardvamma, hardv-ana, arises from his regarding amma, ana, as the dative and accusative terminations of the pronoun and adjective; while, in fact, the terminations are simply mma and na. When, therefore, HARDU, in the dative and accusative, without annexing a pronoun, follows nevertheless the pronominal declension, the cases mentioned must be written hardu-mma, hardu-na, analogous with tha-mma, tha-na, i-mma, i-na. If, however, contrary to all expectation, forms like hardvamma, hardvana, shew themselves, they must be deduced from hardu-ya-mma, hardu-ya-na; so that after suppressing the y, the preceding u, in the place in which it would be left, has passed into v. With regard to blindamma, blindana, blindata, it is doubtful whether they ought to be divided blind'-yamma, blind'-yana, blind'-yata, as analogous with manv(u)-yamma, manv(u)-yana, manv(u)-yata, or blinda-(ya)mma, &c.: I have therefore left them, as also the corresponding forms from MİDYA, undivided. If the division blinda-mma, &c. is made, nothing is left of the pronoun, as in the Old Slavonic dative svyato-mu, and as in our expressions like beim, am, im, except the case-termination, and the adjective base
ADJECTIVES.

has preserved its a. If, however, the division blind'-amma, &c. is made, to which I now give the preference, and which is also adopted by Grimm, though from a different point of view, then the pronoun has only lost its y, as in some cases of the Lithuanian definite, e.g. in gerās-us for gerās-yus (see p. 353); and with respect to the y which has been dropped and the vowel which is left, blind'-amma would have the same relation to blind'-yamma as midums, “the middle man” (theme MIDUMA), to its Sanskrit cognate form of the same import, madhyama, whose relation to MIDUMA I thus trace—the latter has softened the first a to i, and has changed the middle a, through the influence of the liquid, into u; and both, however, have, according to §. 66., suppressed the semi-vowel.

“Remark 3.—Although, in the accusative plural masculine, blindans is not different from vulfans, and the simple word BLINDA could not form aught but [G. Ed. p. 381.] blinda-ns; nevertheless the word manv-yans, mentioned above, which is of the highest importance for the Grammar, as well as the circumstance that where any inflections peculiar to the pronoun admonish us of the existence of an inherent pronoun in the definite adjective, this inheritance really exists;—these two reasons, I say, speak in favour of dividing thus, blind'-ans, and of deducing it from blind-yans. Just in the same manner the dative blindaim, both through the aim, which occurs elsewhere only in pronouns, as through the word hnasqy'-yaim, mentioned above, declares itself to be an abbreviation of blind'-yaim; but blindai proves itself only by its pronominal inflection (compare thai, hvai, Sanskrit ṭe, ḍe kē) to be an abbreviation of blind'-ya.

“Remark 4.—In the Sanskrit, in some cases an i blends itself with the final a, which, with the a of the base, becomes ē: hence the instrumental plural of the Vēda dialect and of the Prākrit, aśvē-bhis from aśwa, kusumē-hin from kusuma. To this ē answers the ai in
ADJECTIVES.

Gothic pronominal datives -like *hvaí-m*, "*quibus,*" *tha-im* "*his,*" as the German dative, in accordance with its origin, is identical with the old instrumental. We were, however, compelled, before we had a reason for seeking the pronoun *YA* in the Gothic definite adjective, to give to the extension of the base in German a wider expansion by an *i* which means nothing, than it has in the Sanskrit; while we have now every reason, where, in Gothic definites, an *i* unsubstiantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to re- gnise in the *i* a remnant of the pronominal base *YA*, either as a vocalization of the *y*, which so often occurs in the Sclavonic (see p. 354), or the *i* may be considered as an alteration of the *a* of *YA*, as in the Lithuanian *geras-is* for *geras-yis*, (p. 353). The latter view pleases me the better because it accords more closely with *blind'-amma*, *blind'-ana*, &c., from *blind'-yamma*, *blind'-yana*. The vowel, then, which in *blind'-amma*, &c., maintains itself in its original form, appears, in this view, as *i* in the feminine singular genitive *blindaizós*—which is to be divided *blindai-zós*—from *blinda-yizós*; and this *yizós* is analogous with *hvázós*, *tházós*, from *hvazós*, *thazós*, = Sanskrit *kasyáś*, *tasyáś* (§. 172.). We must not require *blindó-izós*—because *BLINDÓ* is the feminine adjective base—for there is a reason for the thinning of the *ð*, in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and *a* is the short of *ð* (§. 69.). For the rest, let it be considered, that in the Sclavonic the graver feminine *a* before its union with the pronoun is weakened to the lighter masculine *e* (p. 354, Note 3.); and that a diphthong *oi* in the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 382.] is never admissible; on which account *salbó*, "I anoint," in the subjunctive suppresses the *i*, which belongs to this mood (*salbós*, *salbô*, for *salbóis*, *salbôi*). In the feminine dative one should expect *blindai-zai* for *blindai*, which is simple, and answers to *gibai*, while the remaining German dialects are, in this case, compounded in the very
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same manner: in Old High German the genitive is plintera, and the dative plinteru.* In the genitive plural masculine and neuter the ai in blindai-ze might be substantiated through the Sanskrit रे of the pronominal genitive, as तेशाम् tēshām, "horum"; and therefore the division blindai-ze or blind"-(y)aize should be made: as, however, the monosyllabic pronominal bases, in which one would rather expect a firm adherence to the old diphthong (comp. § 137.), do not retain it, and thi-泽, "horum," hvi-泽, "quorum," as weakened forms of tha-泽, hva-泽, are used; and in the feminine thi-泽, hvi-泽, for thō-泽, hvo-泽, = Sanskrit tō-sām, kā-sām; I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the ai in blindai-泽 m. n., and blindai-泽 f., than by the Sanskrit रे of तेशाम m. n. (f. tō-sām), which, moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form blindai-泽; and I do it, in fact, by the pronominal base या, so that blindai-泽 blindai-泽, is the division to be made according to the analogy of blindai-泽s.

"Remark 5.—The nominative masculine and feminine has kept itself free, in Gothic, from union with the old relative base, and has remained resting upon the original, as received from the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. The masculine blinds, also, through the very characteristic and animated s (see § 134.) has cause to feel itself personified and defined determinately enough. Even if blinds could be looked upon as an abbreviation of blindeis (comp. altheis, "old," from the base ALTHYA, according to Massmann), or of blindais, to which the Old High German plinter would give authority, I should still believe that neither the one nor the other has existed in Gothic, as even the u bases,

* The Gothic ai would lead us to expect े, and this, too, is given by Grimm. As, however, with Kero, the doubling of the vowel, and, with Notker, the circumflex is wanting, I adopt in preference a shortening of the e, or leave the quantity undecided.
like *manu-*s above, which, in the oblique cases, shew so clearly the pronominal base $Y\alpha$, have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative; which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declen-

[G. Ed. p. 383.] sion in the nominative masculine, in dis-

advantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. *Plintër* (the length of the $e$ is here rendered certain) is contracted from *plinta-*ir (for *plinta-*yir); for the Old High German $e$ corresponds, according to §. 78., to the Gothic ai. In the feminine, therefore, the form *plintyu*, which occurs in the chief number of strict Old High German authorities, and those which, as Grimm remarks, are the oldest of all, has good substantiation, and corresponds very fitly to the masculine *plintër*; and in the nominative and accusa-

tive plural and neuter the form *plint-yu*, with regard to the retaining the $y$ of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic *blind-a* for *blind-ya*. The form *plintyu*, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like *dyu* "the" (f.), *syu*, "she," *dësyu* (*dë-*syu), "this"* (f.), and to the instru-

mental masculine and neuter *dyu* (in the interrogative *huiu*), where all authorities concur in retaining the $i$ or $y$; while in the adjective, Otfrid, and, as Grimm remarks, here and there Isidore and Tatian, have $u$ for *yu*. For explanation,

* As in the Old High German $i$ and $j$ ($y$) are not distinguished in writing, it remains uncertain in many, if not in all cases, in what places of the memorials which have come down to us the sound $j$, and in what that of $i$ is intended; as even where the Gothic has a $j$, it may become $i$ in the Old High German. If, however, in the analogous adjective forms like *plintju* one reads $j$, which is supported by the Gothic (p 362), we must, in my opinion, leave it in the above forms also. Grimm writes *diu*, *siu*, but *dësyu*; and expresses, p. 791, his opinion regarding the $i$. 
however, of the pronominal forms which have been mentioned, it is important to consider, that in the Sanskrit the pronominal base *ta*, or the *sa* which supplies its place in the nominative masculine and feminine, unites itself with the relative base *ya*, by which the first pronoun loses its vowel. Compare, then—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Old High Germ.</th>
<th>Old Sclavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>स्या syā (= syā,) “hæc,”</td>
<td>syu, dyu, ta-ya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्याम् tyām, “hanc,”</td>
<td>dyā, tū-ya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ते tyē, “hi,”</td>
<td>dyē, ti-i.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्यास् tyās, “hæ,” “has,”</td>
<td>dyā, ty-ya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>स्यानि tyāni, “hæc,”</td>
<td>dyu, ta-ya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, then, in a manner as remarkable as convincing, the relation is proved in which the Old High German forms mentioned stand to the Gothic *sō, thō, that*, [G. Ed. p. 384.] *thōs, thō*: one must first transpose these into *syō, thyō*, &c., before they can pass as original forms for the Old High German. Our mother tongue, however, in the case before us, obtains more explanation through the Sclavonic, where the demonstrative base *TO* may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases: in several, however, which we have partly given above, it occurs also in union with *YØ*. It is most probable, that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders; for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form *dyu* (*d'-yu*), and from the dative plural, where together with *dēm* occurs also *dyēm* (*diēm*), and, in Notker, always *dien*. According to this, I deduce the forms *dër, dēs, dēmu*, &c., from *dyer, dyes* (for *dyis*), *dyemu* (from *dyamu*); so that, after suppression of the vowel following the *y*, that letter has vocalized itself first to *i* and thence to *ē*. According to this, therefore, *dēs*, and the Gothic genitive
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thi-s, would be, in their origin, just as different as in the accusative feminine dya and thô. In the neuter, on the other hand, daz—for dyaz, as Gothic blind’-ata for blind-yata—the vowel of the base DYA is left, and the semi-vowel, which above had become ē (from i) has disappeared. Further support of my views regarding the difference of bases in the Gothic tha-na and the Old High German dê-n (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative dêsér, which I explain as compounded, and as, in fact, a combination of the Sanskrit स tya, mentioned at p. 383 G. ed., for taya, and झ sya for sa-ya, the latter of which has a full declension in the Old Slavonic, also, as a simple word. Dëser stands, therefore, for dya-sûir (ē=ai); and our Modern German dieser rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above dêsér, namely, upon dya-sèr or dia-sèr; referred to which the Isidorean dhëa-sa, mentioned by Grimm (I. 795.), at least in respect of the first syllable, no longer appears strange, for dhëa from dhia for dhya,* answers admirably to the Sanskrit स tya, and the final syllable sa answers to the Sanskrit Gothic nominative form sa (Greek ἰ), which has not the sign of case.

“Remark 6.—The adjective bases which from their first origin end in ya, as MIDYA=Sanskrit madhya, are less favourable to the retention of the y of the definite pronoun; for to the feminine or plural neuter plint-ya for plinta-ya a midy'-yu would be analogous, which, on account of the diffic-

[G. Ed. p. 385] culty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but may have originally existed in the form midya-ya, or mid-

ya-ya; for the masculine nominative midyèr is from midya-ir for midya-yaar, as, in Gothic, the feminine genitive-form midyaizôs from midya-yizôs. If, however, according to this even hvar-yaizôs (from hvar-yayizôs) be used, and analogous

* D. th, and dh are interchanged according to different authorities.
forms in several other cases, so that the base \( YA \) is therein doubled, we must recollect, that in the Lithuanian also the base \( YA \), besides its composition with adjectives, combines itself, also, with itself, for stronger personification; and, indeed, in such a manner, that it is then doubly declined, as yis-sai (for yis-yai*), 'he'; yo-yo, 'of him,' &c.”

289. The participle present has, in Gothic, preserved only the nominative singular masculine of the definite declension, e.g. gibands, “giving,” which may be deduced as well from a theme GIBAND, according to the analogy of flyand-s (see p. 164), as from GIBANDA, according to the analogy of vulf”-s (§. 135.). The Pāli (see p. 300) and Old High German support the assumption of a theme GIBANDA, as an extension of the original GIBAND; whence, then, by a new addition, the indefinite theme GIBANDAN has arisen, as, above, BLINDAN from BLINDA; and it is very probable that all unorganic \( n \) bases have been preceded by an older with a vowel termination: for as all bases which terminate in a consonant (nd, r, and n. §. 125.) are in their declension, with the exception of the nominative nd-s, alike obtuse; [G. Ed. p. 386.] so it would not be necessary for GIBAND, in order to belong, in the indefinite adjective, to a weak theme, or one with a blunted declension, to extend itself to gibandan (compare p. 302), unless for the sake of the nominative gibanda (see §. 140.).

290. In the Pāli, no feminine theme charanti has been formed from the unorganic theme charanta, mentioned at p. 319 G. ed.

* Ruhig (by Mielske, p. 68) wrongly gives ai as the emphatic adjunct, as the doubling of the s in tassai, ssissai, yissai is clearly to be explained through the assimilative power of the y (see p. 353, Note †). The termination ai answers to the neuter tai, mentioned at §. 157., for tat, which latter is contained in the compound tat-tai (comp. kok-tai, tok-tai). After two consonants, however, the y is entirely dropped; hence e.g. kurs-ai, not kurs-sai.
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for the masculine and neuter form charanta has arisen from the necessity of passing from a class of declensions terminating in a consonant into one more convenient, terminating with a vowel in the theme. The Sanskrit, however, forms from bases terminating in a consonant the feminine theme by the addition of a vowel (sand, see § 119.); e.g. from charunt m., comes charanti, and there was therefore no reason in the Pâli to give also to the more recent form charanta a feminine theme charanti. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pâli, for it has produced no feminine base GIBANDŌ from the presupposed GIBANDA; and therefore, also, the indefinite GIBANDAN has no feminine, GIBANDŌN, nom. gibandō, answering to it (as BLINDŌN to BLINDAN); but the feminine form gibandei (ei=','- § 70.), which has arisen from the old theme GIBAND, in analogy with the Sanskrit charanti, has become GIBANDEIN, by the later addition of an n. Hence, according to § 142., in the nominative gibandei must have arisen. It is not, however, right to regard this nominative as a production of the more recent theme, but as a transmission from the ancient period of the language, for it answers to the feminine Sanskrit nominative charanti (§ 137.), and to Lithuanian forms like sukanti, "the turning," for which a theme sukantin is nowise admissible. In Latin, bases in i or -i, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant; thus FERENTI from FERENT (compare § 119. genitrī-c-s): and this feminine i, as is the case in Lithuanian, as well with the participles (see p. 174, Note) as

[G. Ed. p. 387.] with the adjective bases in u (p. 363), has in some cases no longer remembered its original destination, and been imparted to the other genders: hence the ablatives in i (for i-d), genitive plural in i-um, neuter plural in in (ferenti(d), ferenti-um, ferenti-a); and hence is explained, what must otherwise appear very surprising, that the
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participles, when standing as substantives, freely take this
i, which is introduced into them from the feminine adject-
itive (infante, sapiente).

"Remark.—In the yu of képantyu, the Old High German
feminine of képantèr, I recognise the regular defining ele-
ment, as above in plintyu, answering to the masculine plintèr.
On account of the participial feminines in yu, therefore,
it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in yèr, accord-
ing to the analogy of midýèr, midyu, midyaz, partly as
képentèr and képantaz, incline, in none of their cases, to the
declension of midýèr, midyaz, and also as the derivative
indefinite base in an has sprung from KÉPANTA, and not
from KÉPANTYA: therefore m. képanto (=Gothic gibanda),
f. n. képanta (=Gothic gibandó). This only is peculiar
to the Old High German participle present, in relation to
other adjectives, that in its uninflccted adverbal state it
retains the defining pronominal base XMLLoader in its contrac-
tion to i; therefore képanti, "giving," not kepant, like plint.
It is, however, to be observed, that there is far more
frequent occasion to use this form divested of case termi-
nations in the participle present, than in all other adject-
ives, as the definite form in nds in Gothic, in the
nominative singular masculine, corresponds to it; and as
it may be assumed, that here the i supplies the place of
the case termination, which has been laid aside; so that it
is very often arbitrary whether the definite form of the
participle, or the uninflccted form in i, be given. So in
Grimm’s hymns (II. 2.), sustollens is rendered by the uninfl-
ccted uspurrenti, and baptizans by taufantèr, although the
reverse might just as well occur, or both participles might
stand in the same form, whether that of the nominative
or adverbal. As regards the Old Saxon forms men-
tioned by Grimm, namely, slá pandyes or slá pandeas,
"dormientis," gnornondyè, "mærentes," buandyum, "habitan-
tibus," they should, in my opinion, be rather adduced in
proof of the proposition, that the participle present has, in the dialect mentioned, preserved the defining element more truly than other adjectives; and that those forms have maintained themselves in the degree of the Gothic.

[G. Ed. p. 388.] forms like manya-ana, mentioned at p. 362, than that a theme in ya belonged to the Old High German participle present before its conjunction with the pronominal syllable."

**DEGREES OF COMPARISON.**

291. The comparative is expressed in Sanskrit by the suffix tara, feminine tará, and the superlative by tama, feminine tamá, which are added to the common masculine and neuter theme of the positive; e.g. punya-tara, punya-tama, from punya, "pure"; suchi-tara, suchi-tama, from suchi, "clean"; balavat-tara, balavat-tama, from balavat, "strong." In the Zend, through a perversion of the language म्यो tara and म्यो tama unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine; e.g. तुर्क tara (Vend. S. p. 383) from huska, nominative masculine तुर्क huskó, "dry"; त्रुतेतेमा śpēntētēma from śpēnta, "holy"; त्रुतेतेमा vērēthra-zaṇētēma (Vend. S. p. 43) from vērēthra-zaṇant, nom. vērēthra-zaṇās, "victorious" (literally, "Vṛtra-slaying"). According to my opinion तर tara owes

* The participle present saṇt, the nominative of which I recognise in vērēthra-zaṇāst, rests on the analogy of the frequently occurring upa-zōit, "let him strike"; since, in fact, the root saṇ (Sanskrit सन han) suppresses its final vowel, and has treated the a which remains according to the analogy of the conjugation vowel of the first and sixth class (see p. 104). The Sanskrit radical हन han, "slaying," which appears in वृत्रहन Vṛtra-han, "Vṛtra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form jan, the nominative of which is सन jāo (Vend. S. p. 43),
its origin to the root त्रि (tar, § 1.), "to step beyond" "to place beyond" (e.g. "over a river"); hence, also, the substantive tara, "a float." In the Latin, as Lisch has acutely remarked, with this root are connected the preposition trans, and also terminus, as that which is overstepped, and probably also tra, in in-tra-re, penetra-re. The superlative suffix I derive, with Grimm (III. 583.), from that of the comparative, although I assume no theoretic necessity that the superlative must have been developed through the degree of the comparative. But tama, as a primitive, presents no satisfactory etymology: I formerly thought of the base तन् tan, "to extend," whence, also, τατός could be explained; but then तम tama would be no regular formation, and I now prefer recognising in it an abbreviation of tarama, partly because the superlative suffix इष्ठ इष्ठa may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative iyas, through the suffix tha, which, in the Greek, is contained in the form of τό, as well in ω-τός as in τατός, for τατός or τατοτός. In this manner, therefore, is formed τατό-ς and तमस् tama-s: they both contain the same primitive, abbreviated in a similar manner, but have taken a different derivative suffix, as in πέμμ-τός contrasted with पञ्चम panchama, "the fifth": the vowel, however, is more truly retained in the derivative τατός than in its base τερός. In Latin, तमस् tama-s has become timus-s (optimus, intimus, extimus, ultimus); and, by the exchange of the t with s, which is more usual in Greek than in Latin, simus; hence,
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maximus (mac-simus) for mag-simus. However, the simus is generally preceded by the syllable is, which we will hereafter explain.

292. As in comparatives a relation between two, and in [G. Ed. p. 390.] superlatives a relation between many, lies at the bottom, it is natural that their suffixes should also be transferred to other words, whose chief notion is individualized through that of duality or plurality: thus they appear in pronouns, and जतरस् kataras is "which of two persons?" and जतमस् katama-s, "which of more than two persons?" शजतरस् ekataras is "one of two persons," and ekatama-s, "one of more than two." It is hardly necessary to call attention to similar forms in Greek, as πότερος (for κότερος), ἐκάτερος. In ἐκαστος the superlative suffix (στος for ιστος) presents a different modification from that in ἐκαταμα-s, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix tara is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of TERU (ter, teru-m), and in Gothic in that of THAR; hence uter, neuter, alter; Gothic, hva-thar,* "which of two persons?" Old High German, [G. Ed. p. 391.] huëdœr, which has remained to us in the adverb weder, as an abbreviation of the Middle High Ger-

* The Gothic resembles the Latin in withdrawing the sign of the nominative from its masculine bases in ra, as the latter does from its corresponding bases in ru. Hence, above, hvathar for hvathar(a)s, as alter for alterus; so also vair, "man," = Latin vir for viru-s. This suppression has, however, not extended itself universally in both languages. In the Gothic, as it appears, the s is protected by the two preceding consonants; hence ahrs, "a field" (comp. Grimm, p. 599); still the adjective nominatives gaurs, "mournful" (theme Gaura, comp. Sanskrit गोर ghôra, "terrible"), and svêrs, "honoured," occur, where this cause is wanting, where, however, the preceding long vowel and the diphthong au may have operated. In vair, indeed, a diphthong precedes; but the a is here first introduced through the euphonic law 82. If, in Latin, in adjective bases in ri, only the masculine has predominantly given up the s, with the preceding
man, combined with a particle of negation newèder. 'Anthar, also, our anderer, belongs here, and answers to the Sanskrit चन्द्र aṣṭ antara-s, whose initial syllable is the same which in चन्द्र anya, "alius," has united itself with the relative base य ya. From this चन्द्र anya comes anyatara, "alter." If, however, चन्द्र antara means, in general, "the other," the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after, passing over this thing; so is, also, the Latin ceterus to be considered, from ce as demonstrative base (compare ci-s, ci-tra); and so, also, in Sanskrit, itara, "the other," comes from the demonstrative base i, as, in Latin, the adverb iterum from the same base.”* In our German, also, wieder is the comparative suffix, and the whole rests, perhaps, on a pre-existing Old High German word huia-dar or hwyadar, with a change of the interrogative meaning into the demonstrative, as in weder, ent-weder. The wie in wieder, therefore, should be regarded as, p. 370, die in dieser; and herein we may refer to the Isidoric dhēa-sa.

293. In prepositions, also, it cannot be surprising if one finds them invested with a comparative or superlative suffix, or if some of them occur merely with a comparative termination. For at the bottom of all genuine prepositions,
at least in their original sense, there exists a relation between [G. Ed. p. 392.] two opposite directions — thus, "over," "from," "before," "to," have the relations "under," "in," "towards," "from," as their counter-poles and points of comparison, as the right is opposed to the left; and is always expressed in Latin, also, with the comparative suffix, dexter (दक्षिण dakśiṇa), sinister. As, however, the comparative nature of these formations is no longer recognised in the present condition of the Latin, the suffix ter admits of the further addition of the customary ior (dexterior, sinisterior, like exterior, interior); while the superlative timus has affixed itself to the core of the word (dextimus or -tumus, sinistimus). The prepositions which, in Latin, contain a comparative suffix, are inter, præter, propter, the adverbially-used subter, and probably, also, obiter (compare audacter, pariter).* To inter answers the Sanskrit अन्तर antar, "among," "between"; for which, however, a primitive an is wanting, as in Sanskrit the relation "in" is always expressed by the locative. Notwithstanding this, antar, in regard to its suffix, is an analogous word to प्रातयः praítar, "in the morning," from the preposition

[G. Ed. p. 393.] pra, "before,"† with a lengthened a, as in the

* I was of opinion, when I first treated this subject (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818, p. 480), that ob-i-ter must be so divided, and i looked upon as the vowel of conjunction. As, however, the preposition ob is connected with the Sanskrit अभि abhi, "to," "towards," the division obi-ter might also be made, and the original form of the preposition recognised in obi: observe the Sanskrit derivative अभितस abhi-tas, "near," from abhi with the suffix tas. The common idea, however, that obiœr is compounded of ob and iter cannot entirely be disproved, partly as then obiter would be a similar compound to obviam.

† Comp. ni, pari, prati, for ni, &c. in certain compounds. Formations which do not quite follow the usual track, and are rendered intelligible by numerous analogies, are nevertheless frequently misunderstood by the Indian Grammarians. Thus Wilson, according to native authorities, derives अन्तर antar from anta, "end," with rd, "to arrive at," and the analogous
Greek πρωτ from προ. For the relation "under," the Sanskrit has the preposition अधस adhas, which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base अ a; from which, also, come अधार a-dhara and अधम a-dhama, "the under one," or "the most under," to which inferos and infimus are akin, as fumus to धुम dhuma-s, "smoke," and, with a nasal prefixed, as in आधि in relation to अभि abhi, and in आधिन, "ambo," answering to उड़ उभाय, Old Scatonic oba. The suffixes धर dhara and धम dhama are, in my opinion, only slightly-corrupted forms of the tara and tama mentioned in §. 291.; as also in प्रथम prathama, "the first," m. from pra, "before," the T sound of the suffix is somewhat differently transposed. The suffix dhas of adhas, "beneath," however, has exactly the same relation to tas, in सतस atas, "from here," as dhara, dhama, have to tara, tama; and therefore adhas, as a modification of atas, is, in respect to its suffix, a cognate form of subtus, intus. The usual intention of the suffix तस tas, like that of the Latin tus, is to express distance from a place. In this, also, the Greek θεν (from θεσ, comp. §. 217.) corresponds with it, which, in regard to its T sound, rests on the form धस dhas in अधस adhas (§. 16.), as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Scavonic suffix द्द, which only occurs in pronouns, and expresses the same relation as तस tas, θεν, tus: e.g. ουο-ΰδ, "hence,"* ονο-ΰδ, "thence." The form द्द, however, corresponds to the euphonic alteration, which a final as in the Sanskrit must suffer before [G. Ed. p. 394.] sonant letters (§. 25.), viz. that into δ (see §. 255. f.), which in Zend has become fixed (§. 56*).

* The demonstrative base OVO answers remarkably to the Zend अν ava, with o for a, according to §. 255. (a.).

analogous word prūtar from pra, with at, "to go." A relation, nevertheless, between anta, "end," and antar, "among," cannot perhaps be denied, as they agree in the idea of room. They are, however, if they are related, sister forms, and the latter is not an offshoot of the former.
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"Remark.—Dobrowsky p. 451 gives add as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix dy, which forms adverbs of place, as kūdye, "where?" onūdye, "there." As, however, the definitive pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, add, adye, and forms, with sche, adysche, adyesche, for yūdā, &c.; and as this pronoun is, in general, so frequently compounded with other adverbs, there is every reason to assume that it is also contained in ono-iddā, ono-addā, on-adye, e-addye, and others. But how is the ā itself in u-dd. yū-ddie, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point; but as, according to §. 255. (g.), in the last element of the diphthong ā a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, yuddā, yūdye, might be regarded as corruptions of yondā, yonde, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin inde, unde, from I, U. Yūdye, yūdāyd, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative yā, which would again conduct us to a nasal (§. 266.): this accusative would then stand as theme to the derivative adverb, as our preposition hinter, Old High German hinter, has arisen from hin, a petrified accusative, on which the Gothic hina-day, "this day," "to day," throws light. Before the suffix dy, however, elder form de, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as gdye, "where?" (more ancienly kde, with the final vowel of the base KO suppressed); zdye (older sde), "here"; idyesche, "where" (relative). As e (e), according to §. 255. (b.), frequently stands as the corruption of an older i, I recognise in the suffix de the Sanskrit ṝi dhi, from स्थि adhi, "over," "upon" "towards," (from the demonstrative base a), which, in Greek, is far more widely diffused in the form of θι (πόθι, ἄλλοθι)

294. In German, even more than in Latin, the prepositions show themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskrit चन्तर antar, Latin inter, mentioned above (at p. 392, G. ed.), corresponds our unter, Gothic
unde_r, with u for the old a, according to §. 66.* If, however, the, in my opinion, incontrovertible original identity of the latter with the two former is recognised, [G. Ed. p. 395.] one must not, with Grimm (III. 260.), derive unde_r from the preposition unde_r, "as far as," &c., by a suffix ar, and so again divide the dar; for unde_r,† as transmitted from an ancient period of the language, was already formed, before the existence of a German dialect, and the abovementioned preposition has only to dispose itself according to the relations of sound mentioned in §§. 66. 91. The matter is different with the Old High German uf-tar, "after," for the primitive language, or languages, transmit to us only ṛṇḍa, ṛṇḍa, "from"; to which, in the spirit of ḍanā ṛṇḍa antar, inter, subter, &c., the old comparative suffix has first united itself upon German ground. In Gothic, aftra means "again," which I look upon as an abbreviation of aftara, as in Latin extra, intra, contra, and others, as feminine adjectives, from extera, &c. In regard to the termination however, aftra, and similar forms in tra, thra, appear to me as datives, i.e. original instrumentals (§. 160.), as also, in the Sanskrit, this case occurs as an adverb, e.g. in चनरेण antarēṇa, "between." Perhaps, also, the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs in tra, although they have a locative meaning, like चत्र yatra, "where," are to be regarded as instrumental forms, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.), and of the gerund in य य a, (Gramm. Crit. §. 638. Rem.), so that their tra would be to be derived from तर तर : compare forms like मनुष्यम् manushya-ṭrā, "inter homines" (Gramm. Crit.

* Regarding dar and tar for thar, see §. 91.
† Grimm however, also, at II. 121. &c., divides brōth-ar, vat-ar ("brother," "father"), although the many analogous words denoting relationship in the German and the cognate languages clearly prove the T sound to belong to the derivative suffix (see Gramm. Crit. §. 178. Rem.).
§. 252. suff. tr'd). As aftar is related to aftar, so is the Gothic vithra, "against," to the Old High German widar, our wider, the primitive of which is supplied by the Sanskrit through its [G.Ed. p.396.] inseparable preposition फ़ि ṣि, which expresses separation, distraction, e.g. in visrip, "to go from one another," "to disperse." Exactly similar is the Sanskrit फ़ि ni, to which I was the first to prove the meaning "below" to belong,* and whence comes the adjective नीच nīcha, "low" (Gramm. Crit. §§. 111.), the base of our nieder, Old High Ger-

[G.Ed. p.397.] man ni-dar.† From hin-dar, Old High German hin-tar, comes our hin-ter which has already been discussed (p. 394, G. ed. compare Grimm. III. 177. c.). In the Old High German sun-dar, Gothic sun-drō, "seorsim," afterwards a preposition, our sondern, dar is, in like manner, clearly the comparative suffix, and the base appears to me, in spite of the difference of signi-

* It is usual to attribute to it the meaning "in," "into," which cannot in any way be supported.

† Grimm assents to my opinion, which has been already expressed in another place, regarding the relationship of फ़ि ni and nidar (III. 258, 259): he wishes, however, to divide thus nid-ar, and to suppose a Gothic verb nithari, nath, nithun, to which the Old High German gināda (our Gnade) may belong. Does, however, gi-nāda really signify humilitas? It appears that only the meaning gratia can be proved to belong to it; and this is also given by Grimm, I. 617. and II. 235. gratia, humanitas, where he divides ki-nā-da, which appears to me correct, and according to which nā would be the root, and da the derivative suffix; as in the etymologically clear ki-wā-da, "afflatus," to which the Sanskrit gives या wa, "to blow," as root, the Gothic gives vō (§. 69.) (vaia, vaivō). To gi-nā-
da, indeed, the Sanskrit supplies no root nā, but perhaps nam, "to bend oneself," the m of which, according to the laws of euphony, is suppressed before t, which does not produce Guna; as nata, "bent," nati, "bending," with the preposition sam, san-nati, which Wilson explains by "reverence," "obeisance," "reverential salutation." As the Gothic inseparable prepo-
sition ga, Old High German gi or ki, is, as Grimm first acutely remarked, identical with the Sanskrit sam, gi-nā-da has much the same formation with san-na-ti: it would, however, still better agree with the feminine passive
DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

... as much opposed in meaning to its primitive cum; and as cum (compare o'nu) belongs, in like manner, to सम् sam, so sundar, sundro, and contra, would be, in a double respect, sister forms. Observe, also, the Gothic samath, Old High German samant, "together with": the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit समांत samanta (from sam + anta, "an end"), the ablative of which, samantit, as also the adverb, samantitas, mean "everywhere." Perhaps, too, in all other Old High German adverbs in nt (Grimm. III. 214.), the said चम् anta is contained, for the meaning "end," cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time, and, like Mitte, "mid,"

passive participle san-na-tā. Be that as it may, so much is certain, that there is no necessity for a hypothetic Gothic base nith or nath, either for the substantive gi-nada or for the preposition nidar, as they can be fully set at rest by the existence of a Sanskrit primitive नि ni, "below," and the comparative suffix dar, which frequently occurs in prepositions. And as the circumstance that genuine original prepositions never come from verbs, but are connected with pronouns, I must, with regard to its etymology, keep back every verb from our nidar. Grimm wishes also to divide the Gothic preposition vi-thrō, Old High German wi-dar, into vi-th-ra, wid-ar, and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition widh, English with, Old Sclavonic wid, Old Norman vidh, Swedish vid, Danish ved, which mean "with," and, according to appearance, are wanting in the Gothic and High German. If, however, one considers the easy and frequent interchange of v, b, and m (बारी vāri, "water," = mare, βπόρος = μετα mritas, "mortuus"), one would rather recognise, in the above prepositions, dialectic variations of sound from the Gothic mith, which is of the same import with them (= the Zend raic mat), and which, in most of the dialects mentioned, maintains itself equally with the other forms; as it often occurs, in the history of languages, that the true form of a word is equally preserved with a corruption of it.
ADJECTIVES.

(compare inmitten, "in the midst") and Anfang, "beginning," it attaches itself first to the prepositional ideas: therefore hinont, "this side," enont, "that side," would be the same as "at this end," "at that end." With regard to the comparative forms there is, further, the Old High German for-dar, fur-dir ("porro," "amplius"), our für-der to be mentioned, whence der vorder, vorderste.

[G. Ed. p. 398.] "Remark 1.—As we have endeavoured above to explain the Gothic af-tra and withra as datives, I believe I can with still more confidence present the forms in thrō or tarō as remarkable remains of ablatives. Their meaning corresponds most exactly to that of the Sanskrit ablative, which expresses the withdrawing from a place, and to that of the Greek adverbs in θεβ; thus hva-thrō, "whence?" tha-thrō, "thence," yain-thrō, "hence," alya-thrō, "from another quarter," inna-thrō, "from within," uta-thrō, "from without," af-tarō, "from behind," dala-thrō, "from under," and some others, but only from pronouns, and, what is nearly the same, prepositions. I might, therefore, derive dalathrō, not from dal, "a valley," but suppose a connection with the Sanskrit लङ्क adhara, "the under person," with apophthegesis of the a and the very common exchange of the r with l (§. 20.). Perhaps, however, on the contrary, that is so named from the notion of the part below. As to the ablative forms in tarō, thrō, the ó corresponds to the Sanskrit òt (§. 179.), with ó, according to rule, for व झ (§. 69.), and apocope of the t; so that ó has the same relation to the to-be-presupposed òt that in Greek ουτω has to ουτως, from ουτωρ (§. 183. Note * p. 201). Many other Gothic adverbs in ó, as sinteinó, "always," sniumundó, "hastily," sprantó, "suddenly," thrídýð, "thirdly," &c., might then, although an ablative meaning does not appear more plainly in them than in the Latin perpetuo, cito, subito, tertio, and others, be rather considered as ablatives than as neuter accusatives of indefinite (Grimm’s weak) forms; so that thrídýð would
answer to the Sanskrit ablative *tritiyāt* while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in *a* by an unorganic *n*; thus *THRIDYAN*, nom. *thridya*. It must be further observed, that all unorganic adjective bases in *an* are, in general, only used where the adjective is rendered definite through a pronoun preceding it; that therefore the forms in *d*, which pass for adverbial, are, for the very reason that no pronoun precedes them, better assigned to the definite (strong) declension than to the indefinite; especially as most of them are only remains of an old adjective, which is no longer preserved in other cases, and, according to their formation, belong to a period where the indefinite adjective declension had not yet received the unorganic addition of an *n*. As to the translation of *τοῦναντίων*, 2 Cor. ii. 7., by *thatha andaneith̀o*, here of course *andaneith̀o* is the neuter accusative; but the inducement for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article, and *τοῦναντίων* could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor. iv. 17., where Castiglione takes *thatha andavairth̀o* for the [G. Ed. p. 390.] nominative, but Grimm for the adverbial accusative: as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text, where *τò* does not belong to *αὐτίκα*, but to *ἐλαφρόν*. In my opinion, however, it can in no case be inferred from these passages that the adverbs in *d*, without an article preceding them, belong to the same category. Moreover, also, *andaneith̀o* and *andavairth̀o* do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As, then, *thrò* has shewn itself to us to be an abbreviation of *thròt*, it is a question whether the suppression of the *t* by a universal law of sound was requisite, as in Greek, and in the Prakrit, all *T* sounds are rejected from the end of words, or changed into *Σ*. It is certain that the *T* sounds (*t, th, d*) which, in the actual condition of the Gothic, are finals, as far as we can follow their etymology, had originally a vowel after them; so that
they are final sounds of a second generation, comparable in that respect to the Sclavonic final consonants (§ 255. l.). This holds good, for example, with regard to th, d, in the 3d person singular and plural, and the 2d person plural = Sanskrit ति tि, चन्ति अंति, ध था or ता ta; and I explain the th or d, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix ध dha (ः ha); which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in tra, and the ablatives in tas, occur also with accusative meaning, i.e. expressing the direction to a place (see tatra in my Glossary). The Sanskrit suffix ध dha appears, in common language, abbreviated to ha, and is found indeed, only in i-हा, “here,” from the pronominal base इ and विस sa-ha—in the Vedic dialect and Zend sa-dha—which I derive from the pronominal base so. It ought, according to its origin, and consistently with the usual destination of the suffix dha, to mean “here or there”: it has, however, become a preposition, which expresses “with.” The adverb इह aḥ, “here,” is, in Zend, मह idha,* and fre-

[G. Ed. p. 400.] quently occurs in combination with म ne, “not”; so that मह मह nādha† means “nor,” answering to न नौ, “neither” (literally “not it,” from na + it, § 33.). From म म av and म म adha, “this” (mas.), comes म म mar

* Vend. Sāde, p. 368, several times: म दा म
avadhā and आवधाम् aḷṭa-dha (Vend. S. p. 164). To the Zend-Vedic suffix dha corresponds most exactly the Greek θα, in ἐνθα and ἐνταθα, “here.” Perhaps ἐνθα and आवधाम् i-dha, अ ख iha, are, with regard to their base, identical; ἐνθα, therefore, is for ἐνθα from ἰθα (comp. ἰν, ἱνδε), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant, and thus आम्फ़ि answers to अभि abhi, आम्फ़ो to अ本领 ubhdu, Old Sclavonic ṭha; but आृθa, in the triple compound ἐν-τ-आृθα, is completely the Zend मृजम्भ avadhā, whose theme ava has been contracted in the Greek to ἀυ (compare ἀυ-θι and ἀυ-τός, the latter being combined with the article), but in the Old Sclavonic it is more correctly preserved in the form of OVO.* To the word इहया ihatya, “of this place,” which is derived from इह iha through the suffix त्या tya, corresponds the Greek ἐνθασίος, with σ from τ; compare, with regard to the suffix, the Latin propitius from prope, and, in the Gothic, frama-thya, “a foreigner,” through which the preposition fram shews itself to be an abbreviation of frama. As in the Sanskrit the suffix त्या tya belongs only to local adverbs and prepositions, so might also the Gothic ni-thyis, “cousin” (for ni-thyas, §. 135.), as propinquus, or one who stands somewhat lower in relationship than a brother, &c.,† be derived from the [G. Ed. p. 401.]

* Before my acquaintance with the Zend, and deeper examination of the Sclavonic, I believed I could make out the Greek base ἀυ to agree with the Sanskrit amu, “il/e,” by casting out the m (as koivos with ku-māra): now, however, अृथ ava and OVO have clearly nearer claims to take the Greek forms between them.

† Terms of relationship often express the relation, of which they are the representatives, very remotely, but ingeniously. Thus नृṣu naptri, “a grandson,” is, I have no doubt, compounded of na, “not,” and pitri, “father”; and “not-father” is regarded as a possessive compound, “not having as father,” in relation to the grandfather, who is not the father of the grandson. In Latin it would be difficult to find the etymology of nepos (nepot-)—and the same may be said of our word neffe—without the aid of the word Vater, which is fully preserved from the Sanskrit. In the
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ancient preposition *ni*, mentioned at p. 382, from which, in Sanskrit, *nitya* actually comes, but differently related, and with a signification answering less to the meaning of the preposition, namely, *sempiternus*. In consideration of the aspirates in Greek being easily interchanged, and, e.g. in the Doric, "OPNIX is said for "OPNIΘ, one may also recognise in the syllable *χο*, in forms like παντα-χΣ-θεν, παντα-χΣ-σε, πολλαχσε, and others, a cognate form of the suffix θα, dha, or of the corrupted Χα (comp. § 23.). At the bottom of these forms lies, in my opinion, as the theme, the plural neuter, which need not be wondered at, as πάντα and πολλά are also used as first members of compounds (πολλά-σημος, παντά-μορφος). Πανταχσ might, in the identity of its suffix with θα, dha, or ha, mean "everywhere"; whence may then be said πανταχσ-σε, "from everywhere," &c., as we combine our locative adverbs wo and da with her and hin (woher, wohin); and in Greek, also, ἐκείθε, ἐκείσε, ἐκείθεν, which might literally mean in illic, versus illic, ab illic, as Ἐκεί is a local adverb. Forms in *χο*, however, are in a measure raised to themes capable of declension, though only for adverbs, and develope, also, case-forms, as πάνταχσθεν, πανταχσθε (old locative and dative), πανταχσθ. The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning αχ or even αχα, in which case we should have to divide παντ-αχσ-θεν, &c. But as the *χο* under discussion has arisen from θα, dha, I think I recognise in the χι of Ἐχι a corruption of the suffix θι, from ψα dhi; in which respect might be compared ἔγχι, as a sister form to

meaning of Neffe the negation of the relationship of father points to the uncle. The Indian Grammarians, according to Wilson, see in naptri the negation, but not the father, but the root *pat*, "to fall," and a Unādi suffix *tri*. 


DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

As a third form in which the Vedic-Zend suffix *dha* appears in Greek, I notice *ṣe* with *σ* for θ, ध, as *μέσος* from मध्या *madhya* "midst," the *γ* of which has assimilated itself, in the form *μέσος*, to the *σ*. The suffix *ṣe*, however, in that it is altered from its original intention to denote rest in a place, to the expression of motion to a place, answers to the Gothic *th* or *d*, whence we set out in this examination, in forms like *hwa-th*, πό-σε, "whither?" also *hwa*-—John xiii. 3. *hwa gaggis, ποῦ ἄφαγεν—γαίν-δ, ἐκεῖ-σε, αλήα-th, ἄλλο-σε*. To the Zend *idha*, Greek ἐνθα, corresponds ἰ-θ; which, however, contrary to the original intention of the form, does not mean "thither," but is used as a conjunction—“but,” "if," "then" (1 Cor. vii. 7.). To this class, also, belongs *ath*, which only occurs in combination with *than* —*ath-than*, "but," like *ith-than*; and it has [G. Ed. p. 402.] the Vedic-Zend *a-dha* as prototype (§. 399.). *Thad*, in combination with the relative particle *ei*, which is probably connected with य या, has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and *thad-ei* may be cited as "where" and "whither." The *d* in these forms, answering to the Greek θ, agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§. 87.); and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare *bauth*, *bu-dum* (§. 91.);—so that the Gothic *T* sound of the suffix under discussion, after it has, in one direction, diverged from the Greek, has, in another, again approached it.

"Remark 2.—As we have above recognised ablative in the formations in *thr̩d, tar̩b*, so we find in this comparative suffix, also, a remnant of the Sanskrit locative; in which, however, as in the adverbs in *th, d*, the expression of repose in a place is changed into that of motion to a place—in *hidr̩*,* "hither," Mark xi. 3. Luke xiv. 21.; *hwa-ldr̩*, "whither?" John vii. 35. On the other hand, *yaindr̩ ac-

* Vide §. 991.
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tually occurs with a locative meaning; tharei leik, yaindre
galisand sik arans, 'ἔναυ τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθονταί οἱ αἰετοὶ.'

Compare these forms with the Sanskrit, as, adharé, "in
the lower," and the Lithuanian wilke (§. 197.). That, how-
ever, the Gothic ḍ, which in the genitive plural masculine
and neuter answers to the Sanskrit छा ḍ (§. 69.), moreover
corresponds to र ḍ, is proved by preterites like nēmum,
‘we took,’ answering to the singular nam; as, in Sanskrit,
नेमिम nēmima, ‘we bent ourselves,’ answers to ननम nanama
or ननाम nanāma, ‘I bent myself.’

295. The superlative suffix तम tama occurs in the Gothic
also in the form of TUMAN, nominative tuma, or, with
d for t in prepositional derivations, either simply or in com-
bination with the common superlative suffix ISTA; thus,
af-tuma, "posterus," af-tumists, "postremus," hin-dumists, "ex-
tremus." If one considers the Indian suffix तम tama, to
have suffered apocope of the a—as in Latin, also, timus
appears abbreviated to tim in adverbs like viri-tim, caterva-tim,
which I have already, in another place (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818.
p. 480), explained, together with forms like legi-timus, as
superlatives—one may look for that tam in the Gothic cor-

[G. Ed. p. 403.] rupted to tana, after the analogy of the ac-
cusative masculine of pronouns, like tha-na = ता tam, ῥόv, hva-
-na = कν ka-m, "whom?"; and accordingly regard the pre-
positional derivations in tana, dana, as superlative forms; thus,
Gothic af-tana, "behind"; hindana, πέραν, Old High German
ni-dana, "under" (compare our hie-nieden, "here below." As,
however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations
in ana without a preceding t sound (Grimm III. 203, &c.),
it is a question whether innana "within," ãzana “abroad,”
forana shortened to forna "from the beginning," fērrana
"πέρρωθεν," rāmana "from a distance," hōhana "υψόθεν,"
heimina "οἴκωθεν," have lost a t or a d preceding the a;
or if they are formed after those in tana, dana, in the
notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of ana;
or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle.
The preposition *obar*, “over,” Gothic *ufar*, which answers to the Sanskrit *वपरि* *upari*, Greek *ὑπὲρ*, has, in the same manner, an adverb *obana*, “above,” corresponding to it.

296. In the Sanskrit the appellations of the quarters of the heavens come from prepositions in combination with the root स्थान *anch*, “to go”; thus the east is denoted as “that which is before,” by वाचः *prānch*, from प्र *pra*, “before”; the west as “that which is over against it,” by प्रत्य वाचः *pratyanch*, from प्रति *prati*, “opposite”; the south as “that below,” by अवाचः *avānch*, from अव *a va*, “below”; and its opposite pole, the north, as “that above,” is called उदाचः *udanch*, from उ त *ut*, “up.” Now it is remarkable that in German the names of the quarters of the world shew themselves through their terminations, Old High German *tar* and *tana*, or as they so frequently occur in prepositions, *dar*, *dana*, to be derivations from prepositions, though the nature of their origin has become obscure. The custom of the language disposes of the forms in *r* and *na* in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm. III. 205.), the latter the direction whence, which, however, was not, perhaps, the original intention of the terminations, both which seem adapted to express the same direction; the former comparatively, with a glance at [G. Ed. p. 404.] that which is opposite, the latter superlatively, in relation to all the quarters of the globe, as, p. 376, एकतार *ekatara*, “one of two persons,” but एकताम *ekatama*, “one of many persons.” The west may perhaps be most satisfactorily explained, and in fact, as being etymologically pointed out to be that which lies over against the east, as in Sanskrit. For this object we betake ourselves to the prepositional base *wi*, mentioned at p. 382, whence the comparative *wi-dar*. We do not, however, require to deduce *wēs-tar,*

* By writing *wē*, Grimm marks the corruption of the *e* from *i*, in which I readily agree with him.
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"towards the west," westana," from the west," from
the derivative widar; but we may keep to its base wi,
with the assumption of a euphonic s; as in the Sanskrit,
also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain
combinations, and before consonants which are disposed
to have an s before them, assume this letter; e.g. prati-
śikāśa for pratikāśa; and as in Latin abs, os (for obs),
from ab, ob (§. 96.). But if it were preferred to deduce
westar, westana, from the derivative widar, it would
then be necessary to force the d of derivation into
the base, and, according to §. 102., change it into s.
The east is more difficult of explanation than the west
—Old High German öst-tar, "towards the east," öst-tana,
"from the east,"—for several prepositions start up toge-
ther that would gladly sustain this quarter of the heavens.
It is not necessary that the preposition after which the
east is named should elsewhere, also, be received as a
German preposition; for in this appellation a prepo-
sition might have incorporated itself, which, except in this
case, is foreign to the practice of the German language.

[G. Ed. p. 405.] It may therefore be allowable for us,
first of all, to turn to a preposition which, in the Indian
language, is prefixed to the south, and, in the German,
may have changed its position to the east; the more so,
as, with prepositions, the principal point is always where
one stands, and the direction to which one is turned;
and one may, with perfect justice, turn that which is at the
bottom to the uppermost, or to the front. In Zend, ava,
which in Sanskrit signifies "below," exists as a pronoun,
and means "this"; and as this pronoun is also proper to
the Sclavonic (OVO, nom. ov), and occurs in Greek as av,
(αυ-θι, αυρός, see p. 387), it need not surprise us to find an
obsolete remnant of this base in German, and that the
east is taken as the side opposed to the west. Here it
may be necessary to observe, that in Sanskrit the pre-
position ava, in like manner, annexes a euphonic s; from
avas, therefore, by suppressing the last a but one, would arise (as in Greek αὐ) aus (different from our aus, Old High German ûz, Gothic út, in Sanskrit उत् ut, "up"), and hence, according to §. 80., ñs: the old northern form is austr, austan. The Latin auster-ter might then—to which Grimm has already alluded (Wiener Jahrb. B. 28. p. 32)—be placed with more confidence beside the Old High German as a sister form, and led back by the hand of our comparative suffix to the preposition, which in Sanskrit has given its name to the south, bold as it at the first glance might appear, if we declared auster and अवाच् avâanch (avâ + anch), "southern," to be related. The derivations from haurio, or avâ, certainly deserve less notice. As, however, the juxta-position of auster with the Latin auster and the Indian preposition ava, avas, is most suitable, we refrain from giving other prepositional modes in which one might arrive at the appellation of the east in German. As the most natural point of departure, we cannot place it in so subordinate a position to the west as to mark it out as "not west" (a-ustar from a- [G. Ed. p. 406.] -wëstar). We turn now to the south, in Old High German sun-dar, "towards the south," sundana, "from the south," the connection of which with the sundrô, sundar, mentioned at p. 383, is not to be mistaken. The south, therefore, appeared to our ancestors as the remote distance, and the reason for the appellation of this quarter of the heavens being clearly in allusion to space, is a new guarantee for the prepositional derivation of the names for east and west, as also for the fact that the designation of the north, too, has subjected itself to a preposition, although it is still more veiled in obscurity than that of the three sister appellations. We cannot, however, omit calling attention to the Sanskrit preposition निस् nis, which signifies "out, without," and before sonant letters, to which d belongs (§. 25.) according to a universal law of euphony, appears
in the form of nir, which it is also usual to represent as the original form.

297. In the Old Sclavonic the Indo-Greek comparative suffix occurs in vtoryi, “the second” (m.), in which the definitive pronoun is contained (p. 352): vtory-î, then, is formed from vtoro-i (§. 255. d.), in which the cardinal number dwa is melted down to v, corresponding in this respect to the Zend b in b-yarê, “two years,” but singular, with b as a hardened form from v. To the Sanskrit ज्या kātura, “which of two? m.” (Gothic hva-thar) and या ya-tura, “which of both,” corresponds etymologically, the Old Sclavonic ko-tory-i (as definitive), older ko-tory-î and ye-ter, feminine ye-tera (ye-repa), neuter ye-tero. The origin of these two pronouns is, however, forgotten, together with their comparative meaning; for kotoryi means “who?” and yeter, “some one” (compare p. 352). Dobrowsky (p. 343), however, in which he is [G. Ed. p. 407.] clearly wrong, divides the suffix into ot-or; for although the interrogative base KO may lay aside its o, and combine with the demonstrative base to (kto, “quis?” Dobr. p. 342), still it is more in accordance with the history of language to divide ko-toryi than kotoryi or koto-ryî, as the formation or would there stand quite isolated; and besides this the pronoun i, “he,” from yo, does not occur in combination with the demonstrative base to, and yet ye-ter is said.

298. A small number of comparatives are formed in Sanskrit by ईधस् iyas, and the corresponding superlative by ईध ishtha, in which ishtha, as has been already remarked (p. 389.), we recognise a derivation from iyas in its contraction to ish (compare ish-îa, “offered,” from yaj), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly च thà, through which, also, the ordinal numbers चतुर्थ स chatur-thas (rētap-ro-ś), and चस स shas-thas (śk-ros), are formed, for the notion of the superlative lies very close to the ordinal
numbers above two, as that of order does to the superlatives, and hence the suffix तम tama occurs in ordinal numbers; e.g. विनसतितमस् viṁśati-tama-s, “the twentieth,” wherefore ma, in forms like पञ्चमस् pancha-ma-s, “the fifth,” may be held to be an abbreviation of tama. To the form इष्ठ isht, contracted from इयास—euphonic for is—in Greek and Zend is, corresponds the Latin is, in the superlatives in is-simus, which I deduce through assimilation from is-timus (comp. §.101.); the simple is, however, which, viewed from Latin, is a contraction of iōs (§.22.), appears in the simple form in the adverb may-is, which may be compared with μεγις in μέγισ-τος. In the strong cases (§.129.) the Indian comparative shews a broader form than the ḫyas above, namely, a long ā and a nasal preceding the s, thus ईयास iyahis (see §.9.). This form, however, may originally have been current in all the cases, as the strong form in general (§.129.), as is probable through the pervading long o in Latin, iōris, iōri, &c., if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin o as compensation for the rejected nasal: compare the old accusative meλ-ιोσεμ, mentioned in §.22., with Sanskrit forms like गरियासम् gar-iyāṁs-am (graviorem). The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted from ḫyas, may be the cause why the form of the positive is exposed to great reductions before it; so that not only final vowels are rejected, as generally before Taddhita suffixes* beginning with a vowel, but whole suffixes, together with the vowel preceding them, are suppressed (Gramm. Crit. §.252.); e.g. from मतिमत् mati-mat, “intelligent,” from mati, “understanding,” comes mati-iyds; from balḍvat, “strong” (“gifted with strength,”

* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself.
from \textit{bala + vat}), \textit{bal-\textit{i}yas}; from \textit{kshipra}, "quick" (from the base \textit{kship}, "to throw"), comes \textit{ksh\textit{ep}-\textit{i}yas}; from \textit{kshudra}, "insignificant," \textit{ksh\textit{ed}-\textit{i}yas}; from \textit{tripra}, "satisfied," \textit{trap-\textit{i}yas}; since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend \textit{va\textit{edista}}; which Burnouf (Vahista, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from \textit{vidvos} (\textit{vidud}, §. 56\textsuperscript{b}, Sanskrit \textit{vidwas}), "knowing." With respect to \textit{trap\textit{i}yas}, from \textit{tripra}, let it be observed that \textit{ar}, as Guna of \textit{n}, is easily transposed to \textit{ra} (Gramm. Crit. §. 34\textsuperscript{b}.): compare the Greek \textit{e\textit{d}rakov} for \textit{e\textit{d}ar	extit{k}ov}; \textit{patr\textit{a}si} for \textit{patar\textit{si}} (see p. 290, G. ed.). In a similar manner M. Ag. Benary explains the connection of \textit{var\textit{iyas}} with \textit{uru} "great," with which he rightly compares the Greek \textit{e\textit{v}\textit{r}o\textit{s}} (Berl. Jahrb. 1834. I. [G. Ed. p. 409.] pp. 230, 231). But \textit{var\textit{iyas}} might also come from \textit{vara}, "excellent," and \textit{uru} might be an abbreviation of \textit{varu}, which easily runs into one. To the superlative \textit{वरिः varish\textit{tha}}, which does not only mean \textit{latissi\textit{mus}} but also \textit{optimus}, the Greek \textit{\textalpha\texti{r}i\textst\textos} (therefore \textit{F\textalpha\texti{r}i\textst\textos}) is without doubt akin, the connection of which with \textit{e\textit{v}\textit{r}o\textit{s}} one could scarcely have conjectured without the Sanskrit. Remarkable, too, is the concurrence of the Greek with the Sanskrit in this point, that the former, like the latter, before the gradation suffix under discussion, disburthens itself of other more weighty suffixes (compare Burnouf's Vahista, p. 28); thus, \textit{\textepsilon\textchi\textst\textos}, \textit{\textalpha\texti\textchi\textst\textos}, \textit{\textalpha\texti\textk\textst\textos}, \textit{k\textit{u}\textst\textos}, \textit{\textmu\textk\textst\textos}, \textit{\textalpha\textl\textg\textst\textos}, from \textit{\textepsilon\textchi\textbr\textos}, &c., exactly as above \textit{ksh\textit{ep\textit{i}sh\textit{th\textit{has}}} and others from \textit{kshipra}; and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in \textit{\textmu\textk\textst\textos}, \textit{\textmu\texta\textss\textos}, from \textit{\textmu\texta\textkr\textos}, on which principle also rests the Guna in analogous Sanskrit forms—namely, as a compensation for the suppression of the suffix. The case is the same with the lengthened vowel in forms like \textit{\texttheta\texta\textss\textos}, \textit{\texta\textss\textos}, where Buttmann (§. 67. Rem. 3. N. **) assumes that
the comparative \( i \) has fallen back and united itself with the \( a \); while, in my opinion, a different account is to be given of what has become of the \( i \) in forms like \( \theta\acute{a}s\varphi\nu\nu \), \( \beta\acute{r}\acute{a}s\varphi\nu\nu \) (§. 300.). The formation of \( \mu\acute{e}\gamma\varphi\sigma\tau\sigma\varphi \) from \( \mu\acute{e}\gamma\varphi\varsigma \), from \( \mu\acute{e}\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\varsigma \), is similar to the origin, in Sanskrit, of \( \text{बन्हिष्ठा} \), from \( \text{बहुला} \), "much"; from \( \text{बहु} \), "much" comes \( \text{व्यिष्ठा} \); and \( \mu\acute{e}\gamma\varphi\sigma\tau\sigma\varphi \), in relation to \( \text{MEΓΑΛΟ} \), has lost as much as \( \text{बन्ह-िष्ठा} \), compared with \( \text{बहुला} \), only that the Sanskrit positive base is compensated for the loss of \( \text{ु} \) by the addition of a nasal; which therefore, as Ag. Benary (l. c.) has very correctly remarked, rests on the same principle with the Guna in \( \text{kशेपिष्ठा} \), &c.∗

"Remark.—It will then, also, be necessary [G. Ed. p. 410.]—as Burnouf (Yaça, p. 131) first pointed out, but afterwards (Vahista, p. 25), in my opinion, wrongly retracted—to explain the \( \text{ए} \) of \( \text{स्रे} \), "better," \( \text{स्रे} \), "the best," as coming from the \( i \) of \( \text{स्र} \), "fortune," by Guna, instead of the common view, in which I formerly concurred, of substituting a useless \( \text{ब्र} \) as positive, and hence, by contraction with \( \text{य} \), \( \text{िष्ठा} \), forming \( \text{स्रे} \), \( \text{स्रे} \). From \( \text{स्र} \) comes the derivative \( \text{स्रे} \), \( \text{स्रे} \), "fortunate," from which I deduce \( \text{स्रे} \), \( \text{स्रे} \), by the prescribed removal of the suffix;† although one might

∗ The Guna, however, in the gradation forms under discussion, might also be accounted for in a different way, namely, by bringing it into connection with the Vriddhi, which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes, especially in patronymics, as \( \text{वैवस्वत} \), \( \text{वैवस्वत} \), from \( \text{वैवस्वत} \). On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes \( \text{य} \), \( \text{िष्ठा} \), which has given rise to the suppression of the suffix of the positive base, the initial vowel also of the same would accordingly be raised by the weaker Guna, instead of by the Vriddhi, as usual (§. 20.). Be that how it may, one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel-lengthening in \( \mu\acute{e}\kappa\iota\varphi\tau\sigma\varsigma\varsigma \), \( \theta\acute{a}s\varphi\nu\nu \), and others, and that of Sanskrit forms like \( \text{kशेपिया} \), \( \text{kशेपिष्ठा} \).

† If there existed, as in Zend, a \( \text{श्र} \), one might hence also derive the above gradations.
expect in the superlative śray-śṭha, euphonic for śṛ-śṭha; and on this ground it is that Burnouf takes his objection. But as in Greek ἐκα-στος, ὄπο-στος (see p. 376), in spite of the want of the i of ἱστος, are nevertheless nothing else than superlative forms, I do not see why, in certain cases, in Sanskrit, also, the suppression of an i may not hold good. This happens, moreover, in sthē-śṭha from sthi-ra, "fast," sphē-śṭha from sphi-ra, "swollen," and prē-śṭha from priy-a, "dear." In the latter case, after removing the suffix a, the preceding y, also, must retire, since priy is only a euphonic alteration of pri (Gramm. Crit. §. 51.) As to the derivation, however, of the meanings melior, optimus, from a positive with the meaning "fortunate," it may be further remarked, that, in Sanskrit, "fortune" and "splendour" are generally the fundamental notions for that which is good and excellent; hence, bhagavat, "the honourable," "the [G. Ed. p. 411.] excellent," properly, "the man gifted with fortune"; for our besserer, bester, also Gothic bat-iza, bat-ists, are associated with a Sanskrit root denoting fortune (bhad, whence bhadra, "fortunate," "excellent"), which Pott was acute enough first to remark (Etymol. Inquiries, p. 245), who collates also bō yan, "to use." The old d gives, according to §. 87., in the Gothic t, and the Sanskrit bh becomes b. It might appear too daring if we made an attempt to refer melior also to this root; but cognate words often assume the most estranged form through doubled transitions of sound, which, although doubled, are usual. It is very common for d to become l (§. 17.), and also between labial medials and the nasal of this organ there prevails no unfrequent exchange (comp. §. 63.). If, also, the Greek βελτίων, βέλτιστος, should belong to this class, and the τ be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in βέλ-τερος, βέλ-τατος, βέλ would then give the middle step between भद्र bhad and mel. The ideal positive of βελτίων, namely ἀγαθός, might be connected with अगद्ध a gādha, "deep," with which, also, the Gothic gōths (theme
gdda) is to be compared, with δ, according to rule, for χα δ (§. 69.), and medials for Greek aspirates, according to §. 87.

299. From the strong theme ἵππος ἱππός, mentioned at §. 298., comes the nominative ἱππός, with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through §. 94. The vocative has a short a, and sounds ἱππα. To ἵππα answers the Greek ἵον, and to the vocative ἵππον answers ἵον; to the neuter ἱππας (N. A. V.), identical with the weak theme, corresponds the Latin ius (§. 22.). The Greek, however, cannot become repossessed of the s, which is abandoned in Sanskrit in the nominative and vocative masculine for legitimate reasons, since it declines its comparative as though its theme terminated from the first with v; hence accusative ἱον-α for the Sanskrit Ṛgeśaṃ ἱππός-am, Latin ἱορ-em (iōs-em, §. 22.), genitive ἱον-ος for ἱππας-as, ἱορ-ις. However, one might, as Pott has already, I believe, noticed somewhere, reduce the contracted forms like βελτίω, βελτίος, to an original ἰοσα, ἰοσες, ἰοσας, corresponding to ἱππόςam, ἱππίσι (neuter plural), ἱππός-as, ἱππας-as, the σ of which, as is so common between two vowels, would be rejected.* On the other hand, ν, except in [G. Ed. p. 412.] comparatives, on the presupposition that the contracted forms have rejected an ν and not σ, is suppressed only in a few isolated words (Ἀπόλλω, Ποσειδῶ, εἰκό, ἀνδόνυ, and a few others), which, however, the theoretic derivation of the comparative Σ renders very embarrassing. We would therefore prefer giving up this, and assuming, that while the Sanskrit in the weak, i.e. in the majority of cases, has abandoned the former consonant of ἵς, the Greek, which was still less favourable to the νσ-, has given up the latter, as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest, as it were, pre-Grecian period, forms like βελτιονσα. It is, however, remarkable, that while all other European sister lan-

* Comp. p. 325 G. ed.
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Languages have only preserved the last element of the comparative *ns*—the Latin in the form of *r*—and while the Sanskrit also shews more indulgence for the *s* than for the *n*, the Greek alone has preserved the nasal; so that in the comparative it differs in this respect from all the other languages. Without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend it would be hardly possible to adduce from the European sister languages a cognate termination to the Greek *iων, iον*; or if *iόr* and *iων* should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,* than that after the Greek *v* the prototype of the Latin *r*, namely *σ*, has originally existed.

300. In Zend, the superlatives in *αναγγελικα* *ista* are more numerous than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, and require no authentication. With regard to their theory, Burnouf has rendered important service, by his excellent [G. Ed. p. 413.] treatise on the Vahista; and his remarks are also useful to us in Sanskrit Grammar. In form *αναγγελικα* *ista* stands nearer to the Greek *ιστο-ς* than the Indian *ishtha*, and is completely identical with the Gothic *ista*, nom, *ilst*-s (§. 135.), as the Zend frequently exhibits *t* for the Sanskrit aspirates. The comparative form which belongs to *ista* is much more rare, but perhaps only on account of the want of occasion for its appearance in the authorities which have been handed down to us, in which, also, the form in *tara* can only scantily be cited. An example of the comparative under discussion is the feminine *αναγγελικα* *masyḥ*:*h*, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere drawn attention.† It springs from the positive base

---

* Comp. §. 20.
† Berl. Jahrb. 1831. I. v. 372. I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *y* of the Sanskrit *tyast* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *hé*, from *ख़ स्या*: after which the *t* must have passed into *y*. Still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf.
DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

and confirms, like other Zend forms, the theory which holds good for the Sanskrit, that other suffixes fall away before the exponents of the comparative and superlative relation under discussion. If yēhē is compared with the Sanskrit feminine base āyast, the loss of the ī shews itself, and then the a has, through the power of assimilation of the y (§. 42.), become ē, and s has, according to §. 53., become h. In the loss of the ī the Zend coincides with the Sanskrit forms like śrē-yas, mentioned at p. 397, with which, also, bhā-yas, "more," and jyā-yas, "older," agree. Greek comparatives with a doubled σ before ω, as κρείσσων, βράσσων, ἐλάσσων, are based on this; which, according to a law of euphony very universally followed in Prākrit, have assimilated the y to the preceding consonant, as elsewhere ἄλλος [G. Ed. p. 414.]

from ἄλγος, Gothic alya-, Latin alius-s, Sanskrit anya, are explained (Demonstrative Bases, p. 20). In Prākrit, in the assimilations which are extremely common in this dialect, the weaker consonant assimilates itself to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; thus anāa, "the other," from anya, corresponds to the Greek ἄλλος; the Sanskrit tasya, "hujus," becomes tassa; bhavishyati, "he will be," becomes bhavissadi,* divya, "heavenly," divva; from

is simpler, and closer at hand, although the other cannot be shewn to be impossible; for it is certain that if the y of īyas had disappeared in Zend, it would fall to the turn of the preceding ī to become y.

* Comp. ἵσομαι, from ἵγομαι, with स्यात्यम स्यामि, in composition with attributive verbs. It may be allowed here preliminarily to mention another interesting Prākrit form of the future, which consists in this, that the Sanskrit s passes into h, but the syllable य ya is contracted to i, herein agreeing with the Latin i in eris, erit, amabis, amabit, &c.; as, karthi, "thou wilt make," from karthyasati; sahikimi, "I will endure," from sahishyami, instead of the medial form sahishyē (Urvasi, by Lenz. p. 59).
which it is clear that \( v \) is stronger than \( y \), as it also is more powerful than \( r \); hence savva from sarva, “everyone.” It is remarkable that the \( i \) also of \( iti \) “thus” assimilates itself to the following \( t \); hence, \( tti \), which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding. Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form \( yων \), establish the assimilation from \( των \). As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into \( σ \) (κρέωσ-σων, βράσ-σων, βάς-σων, μάς-σων, ἑλάς-σων, &c.), to which the \( y \) has assimilated, the transition of \( τ \), \( δ \), \( θ \), into \( σ \) need least of all surprise us (see §. 99.); but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Slavonic may be noticed, in which, besides what has been remarked in §. 255. (m.), \( y \), \( i \), and \( e \)—which latter comes very near the vowel combined with a \( y \), and is frequently the remainder of the syllable \( ye \)—exert an influence on a guttural preceding them, similar [G. Ed. p. 415.] to that which the comparative \( y \) or \( i \) produces in Greek. Before the \( i \), namely, of the nominative plural, and before \( ye \) in the dative and locative singular, as before \( i \) and \( ye \) of the imperative, \( ch \) becomes \( s \); e.g. gryes-i from gryech, as θάς-σων from θάς-γων, from ταξι; \( g \) becomes \( ζ \), e.g. πράζι from πράγ, as μείζων, ὀλίζων, from μελιζων, ὀλιγζων, from μεγα-, ὀλυγγ--; \( k \) becomes \( ch \), while in Greek \( κ \) is modified in the same way as \( χ \). On account of the contracted nature of the \( ζ \) (= δο) no assimilation takes place after it, but the \( y \) entirely disappears, or, in μείζων, is pressed into the interior of the word (comp. §. 119.), as in ἀμείνων, χείρων, which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit अधरा adhara, “the under (m),” consequently with aphaeresis of the \( a \) (comp. §. 401.). With the superlative μέγιστος compare the Zend अधि mazista, where \( z \), according to §. 57., answers to the Sanskrit \( h \) of महत mahāt, “great”; while in the above गूँगम्य masyēhī, as in the positive māsās (euphonically māsād), \( s \) stands irregularly for \( z \), as if the Zend, by its permutation of consonants in this word, would vie with the Greek; but
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we find, Vend. S. p. 214, वज्ञद mazyd, with z, which I hold
to be a neuter comparative; thus, वज्ञद vāydo, “the more (literally greater) wise.”

301. As in the Latin comparative a suffix has raised itself to universal currency, which in Sanskrit and Greek is only sparingly applied, but was, perhaps, originally, similarly with the form in tara, τερός, in universal use; so the German, the Slavonic, and Lithuanian, in their degrees of comparison everywhere attach themselves to the more rare forms in Sanskrit and Greek; and indeed in the Gothic the suffix of the comparative shews itself in the same shortened form in which it appears in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin, in its combination with the superlative suffix (see §. 298. p. 395 &c.), namely, as is; and this most plainly in adverbs like mais, “more,” whose con-

nection with comparatives in the Sanskrit, &c., I first pointed out in the Berl. Jahrb. (May 1827, p. 742). We must divide, therefore, thus, ma-is; and this word, as well in the base as in the termination, is identical with the Latin mag-is (comp. μέγιστος, p. 402); whence it is clear that the Gothic form has lost a guttural (compare ma-jor and mag-ior), which, in mikils, “great”—which has weakened the old a to i—appears, according to the rule for the removal of letters (§. 87.), as k. Mais, therefore, far as it seems to be separated from it, is, in base and formation, related to the Zend maz-yi (from max-yaś), which we have become acquainted with above (p. 415 G. ed.) in the sense of “more.”

“Remark.—There are some other comparative adverbs in is, of which, the first time I treated of this subject, I was not in possession, and which Grimm has since (III 589, &c.) represented as analogous to mais. He has however, afterwards, l. c. p. 88, agreed, with Fulda, in viewing hauhis, ἀνώτερον, as the genitive of the positive hauhs, “high.” Yet hauhis stands in exactly the same relation to hau-
hiza, “the higher,” that mais does to maiza, “major.”

D D 2
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Compared with the Zend *maź-yō* and Greek *μείζων*, one might believe the *z* in *maīza* belonged to the positive base, particularly as the Old High German adds a second comparative suffix to its adverb *mēr*, answering to the Gothic *mais* (*mērio*, 'major') because in *mēr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Raihtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p. 88, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *potius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rēhtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rēhtōr*. The comparative *ga-raihtōza*, 'justior,' which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *raihtiza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ōza*; for, together with the comparative adverb *frumōzdō*, 'at first' (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumists*. Perhaps, however, the genius of the Old High German language has allowed itself to be deceived through the identity of the comparative suffix *i*- with the genitive termination *i*-; and taking some obsolete comparatives, which have been transmitted to it

[G. Ed. p. 417.] for genitives, left them the *s*, which, in evident comparatives, must pass into *r*; but is also still retained as *s* in *wirs*, 'pejus.' I prefer to consider, also, *allis*, 'omnino,' as a comparative, in order entirely to exclude the Gothic apparent genitive adverbs from the class of adjectives. In the Old High German, together with *alles*, 'omnino,' exists *alles*, 'aliter,' which, according to its origin, is an essentially different word—through assimilation from *alīes*, as above (p. 414 G. ed.) *ἀλλος*—in which the comparative termination, in the Latin *alī-ter* and similar adverbs, is to be observed. The probability that these forms, which, to use the expression, are clothed as genitives, are, by their origin, comparatives, is still further increased thereby, that together with *eines*,
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'\textit{semel}', and \textit{anderes}, 'aliter,' there occur, also, forms in the guise of superlatives, namely, \textit{einst}, 'once' (see Graff, p. 329), and \textit{anderest}, 'again.' Some comparative adverbs of this sort omit, in Gothic, the \textit{i} of \textit{is}; thus \textit{min-s}, 'less' (compare \textit{minor}, \textit{minus}, for \textit{minior}, \textit{minius}), perhaps \textit{vair-s}, 'worse,' which is raised anew into \textit{vairsiza}, 'pejor, and may be connected with the Sanskrit \textit{avara}, 'posterus, as above \textit{χελων} was compared with \textit{सघर adhara}; \textit{seith-s}, 'amplius' (from \textit{seithu}, 'late'); and probably, also, \textit{suns}, 'statim,' and \textit{anaks}, 'subito.'"

302. The comparative-suffix \textit{is} is required in Gothic, where the consonant \textit{s} is no longer capable of declension,* an unorganic addition, or otherwise the sibilant would have been necessarily suppressed. The language, however, preserved this letter, as its meaning was still too powerfully perceived, by the favourite addition \textit{an}, which we have seen above, though without the same urgent necessity, joined to participial bases in \textit{nd} in their adjective state (§. 289.). As, then, \textit{s} comes to be inserted between two [G. Ed. p. 418.] vowels, it must, by §. 86. (5.), be changed into \textit{z}: hence the modern theme \textit{MAIZAN}, from the original \textit{MAIS}, which has remained unaltered in the adverb. The nominative masculine and neuter are, according to §§. 140. 141., \textit{maiza}, \textit{maizd}. On the other hand the feminine base does not develop itself from the masculine and neuter base \textit{MAIZAN}—as in general from the unorganic bases in \textit{an} of the indefinite adjectives

---

* A base in \textit{s}, as the abovementioned \textit{mais}, would not be distinguished from the theme in all the cases of the singular, as also in the nominative and accusative plural, as, of final double \textit{s}, the latter must be rejected (comp. \textit{drus}, "fall," for \textit{drus-s} from \textit{drusa-s}, §. 292. 1st Note). In the nominative and genitive singular, therefore, the form \textit{mais-s} must have become \textit{mais}; just as, in the nominative and accusative plural, where \textit{ahman-s} comes from the theme \textit{ahman}. The dative singular is, in bases ending in a consonant, without exception devoid of inflection; and so is the accusative, in substantives of every kind.
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no feminines arise—but to the original feminine base in i, which exists in the Sanskrit and Zend, an n is added, as in the participle present; thus MAIZEIN (ei = i, §. 70.), from mais + ein, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, mazâyêti, and Sanskrit forms like गरियासी garîyas-i, from garîyas. The nominative maizei may then, according to §. 142., be deduced from MAIZEIN, or may be viewed as a continuation of the form in Zend and Sanskrit which, in the nominative, is identical with the theme (§. 137.); in which respect again the participle present (§. 290.) is to be compared. These two kinds of feminines, namely, of the said participle and the comparative, stand in Gothic very isolated; but the ground of their peculiarity, which Jacob Grimm, III. 566, calls still undiscovered (compare I. 756), appears to me, through what has been said, to be completely disclosed; and I have already declared my opinion

[G. Ed. p. 419.] in this sense before.* The Old High German

* Berl. Jahrb. May 1827, p. 743, &c. Perhaps Grimm had not yet, in the passage quoted above, become acquainted with my review of the two first parts of his Grammar; since he afterwards (II. 650.) agrees with my view of the matter. I find, however, the comparison of the transition of the Gothic s into z with that of the Indian श s into श sh inadmissible, as the two transitions rest upon euphonic laws which are entirely distinct; of which the one, which obtains in the Gothic (§. 86. 5.), is just as foreign to the Sanskrit, as the Sanskrit (§. 21. and Gramm. Crit. 101*) is to the Gothic. It is further to be observed, that, on account of the difference of these laws, the Sanskrit श sh remains also in the superlative, where the Gothic has always st, not xt. In respect to Greek, it may here be further remarked, that Grimm, I. c. p. 651, in that language, also, admits an original s in the comparative; which he, however, does not look for after the ν of ωνν, as appears from §. 299., but before it; so that he wishes to divide thus μελ-ων, as an abbreviation of μεγήλων; and regards the ζ not as a corruption of the γ, as Buttmann also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic ma-iza. The Greek ων, ων, would, according to this, appear identical with the unorganic Gothic an in MAIZAN; while we have assigned it, in §. 299., a legitimate foundation, by tracing it back to the Sanskrit गिः.
has brought its feminine comparatives into the more usual path, and gives, as corresponding to the Gothic minnizei, "the lesser" (fem.), not minniri, but minnira. The Gothic sibilant, however, was, in the High German comparatives, in the earliest period transmuted into r, whence, in this respect, minniro, minnira, has more resemblance to the Latin minor than to the Gothic minniza, minnizei.

303. The comparative suffix in the Gothic, besides is, iz-an, exhibits also the form 6s, 6z-an: it is, however more rare; but in the Old High German has become so current, that there are more comparatives in it in ero (nominative masculine), ora (nominative feminine and neuter), than in iro, ira, or éro, ėra. The few forms in ÖZAN which can be adduced in Gothic are, svinthôza, "fortior" (nominative masculine), frôdôza, "prudentior," frumôza, "prior," hlasôza, "hilarior," garaithôza, "justior," framaldrôza, "provectior ætate," usdaudoza, "sollicitior," unsvikunthôza, "inclarior" (Massmann, p. 47), and the adverbs sniumundôs, "σπουδαοτέρως," and alyaleikôs, "étréψως." How, then, is the 6 in these forms to be explained, contrasted with the i of IS, IZAN? I believe only as coming from the long a of the Sanskrit strong themes jyáris or yuris (§§. 299. 300.), with 6, according to rule, for या ā (§. 69.). If one starts from the latter [G. Ed. p. 420.] form, which, in the Zend, is the only one that can be adduced, then, beside the nasal, which is lost also in the Latin and in the weak cases in the Sanskrit, jyáris has lost in the Gothic either the d or the y (=j), which, when the d is suppressed, must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic 6s, 6z, and still more the Old High German 6r, correspond, therefore, exactly to the Latin dr in minor, minór-is, for minior. There is reason to assume that, in the Gothic, originally y and 6 existed in juxta-position to one another; and that for miniza, "the lesser," was used minnyôza, and for frôdôza, "the more intelligent," frôdyôza.
The forms which have lost the \( y \) are represented in Latin by *minor*, *minus*, and *plus*, and those with \( ø \) suppressed by *mag-is*. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in *OSTA*, nom. *öst-s*, corresponding to the comparatives in *üs*, *üz*; because this degree in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin always springs from the form of the comparative, contracted to *is*, *ish*. It is, however, quite regular, that, to the *frumōza*, "prior," corresponds a *frumist*, "primus," not *frumōst*. To the remaining comparatives in *öz* the superlative is not yet adduced; but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with \( ø \), after their fashion; and thus, in the Old High German, *öst* usually stands in the superlative, where the comparative has *ör*: the Gothic furnishes two examples of this confusion of the use of language, in *lasivōst*, "*infirmissimus*" (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and *armōst*, "*miser-rimus*" (1 Cor. xv. 19.).

304. In the rejection of the final vowel of the positive base before the suffixes of intensity the German agrees with the cognate languages; hence *sul'-iza*, from *SUTU*", "sweet";

[G. Ed. p. 421.] *hard'-iza*, from *HARDU*, "hard"; *seith-s* (thana-seiths, "*amplius"*), from *SEITHU*, "late"; as in the Greek *φδιον* from *'HΔY*, and in the Sanskrit *laghiyas* from *laghu*, "light." *Ya* is also rejected; hence *spēd'-iza*, from *SPÉDYA*, "late" (see p. 358, Note 7.); *rek'-iza*, from *REIKYÀ", "rich." One could not therefore regard the \( ø \), in forms like *frōdōza*, as merely a lengthening of the \( a \) in *FRŌDA* (§. 69.), as it would be completely contrary to the principle of these formations, not only not to suppress the final vowel of the positive base, but even to lengthen it. The explanation of the comparative \( ø \) given at §. 303. remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.

* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskrit *suð̄au-s* and Greek *ηδό'-s* lead us to expect a final \( u \).
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305. In the Old Sclavonic, according to Dobrowsky, p. 332, &c., the comparative is formed in three ways, namely,

(1) By masculine ÷i, feminine shi, neuter yee; as, ûnii, “the better (m.)”; ûnshit, “the better (f.)”; ûnyee, “the best (n.),” from a positive which has been lost, as batiza, melior, and ðmezivov; and it is perhaps connected in its base with the latter, so that a may have become o (§. 255. a.), but µ, û, as frequently occurs with n; and this û, with the preceding o, has become û (g).* Mnii, “the lesser, (m.)” fem. menshi, neuter mnyee, spring, in like manner, from a positive which has been lost. Bolii, “the greater,” fem. bolshi, neuter bolyee, may be compared with the Sanskrit baliyan, “the stronger” (p. 396), fem. baltyasti, neuter baltiwas.† For [G. Ed. p. 422.] bolii is also used bolyei; and all the remaining comparatives which belong to this class have yei for ÷i, and thus answer better to the neuter form yee. If, as appears to be the case, the form yei is the genuine one, then ye answers to the Sanskrit yas of jya-yas, bhâ-yas, śre-yas, &c. (§. 300.), and the loss of the s is explained by §. 255. (i.): the final i of ye-i, however, is the definite pronoun (§. 284.), for comparatives always follow, in the masculine and neuter, the definite declension. In the feminine in shi it is easy to recognise the Sanskrit st of iyas-t, oryas-t, and herewith also the Gothic zei (oblique theme ZEIN,

* The a in ðmezivov appears to me to be privative; so that mezivov would seem to be a sister form to the Latin minor, Gothic minniza, Sclavonic mnii; and ðmezivov would properly signify “the not lesser,” “the not more trifling.” Perhaps this word is also inherent in omnis; so that o for a would be the negation, which, in Latin, appears as in; where it may be observed, that, in Sanskrit, a-sakrit, literally “not once,” has taken the representation of the meaning “several times.”

† The positive velii, with v for b and e for o, occurs only in this definite form (Dobr. p. 320); the primitive and indefinite form must be vel. With respect to the stronger o corresponding to the weaker letter e (§. 255. a.), bolii, in the positive, answers to the manner in which vowels are strengthened in Sanskrit, as mentioned at §. 298.
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p. 418 G. ed.); that is to say, bol-shi, "the greater (fem.)," corresponds to the Sanskrit बलीयसि balīyasi, "the stronger (f.)," and menshi, "the lesser," to the Gothic minn-izei. While, therefore, the Sclavonic masculine and neuter have lost the s of the Sanskrit yas, the feminine has lost the ya of yas-ि.* This feminine shi, also, in departure from (2) and (3), keeps free from the definite pronoun. There are some comparative adverbs in e, as the abbreviation of ye (§. 255. n.), which in like manner dispense with the definite pronoun; thus, ãné, "better"; bole, "greater"—in Servian MSS. ãnje, bolye;

[G. Ed. p. 423.] pache, "more," probably related to παχύς, παχυσων; so that (which is very obscure) the final vowel of pache for pach-ye, for reasons which have been given before, is, in fact, identical with the Greek σο of παχυσον, for παχυςον. The ch of pache may, according to p. 415 G. ed., be regarded as a modification of k, as the first σ of παχυσων has developed itself from χ. Thus the ζ of dolg-yee, "longer" (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the γ of dolg, dolya, dolgo (longus, a, um), answers remarkably to the Greek ζ in μειζων, ὀλιζων, for μειγνων, ὀλιγων. That, however, the positive dolg is connected with the Greek δολιχός needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskrit द्विध ा-s, of the same meaning, in which the frequently-occurring interchange between r and l is

* It may be proper here to call remembrance to the past gerund, properly a participle, which in the strong cases वांस, nom. masc. वा for vāns, fem. uṣhi, neuter vāt (for vas), corresponds to the Sanskrit of the reduplicated preterite in vas. The Old Sclavonic has here, in the nominative masculine, where the s should stand at the end, lost this letter, according to §. 255. (l.), as by-v, "qui fuit," but by-ūshi, "qua fuit"; and in the masculine also, in preference to the comparative, the s again appears in the oblique cases, because there, in the Sanskrit, after the s follow terminations beginning with a vowel; so in rek-sh, "eum qui dixit," the sh corresponds to the Sanskrit वांस-am, as rurud-वांs-am, "eum qui ploravit."
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to be noticed (§. 20.). The i of ὅλαχός; however, shews itself, by the evidence of the Sclavonic and Sanskrit, to be an organic addition. Let garyee, "pejus," be compared with the Sanskrit garīyas, "gravius," from guru, "heavy"—according to Burnouf's correct remark from garu, as this adjective is pronounced in Pâli—through the assimilating influence of the final u, to which the kindred Greek βαρός has permitted no euphonic reaction.

(2) The second, by far the most prevalent form of the Old Sclavonic comparative, is nominative masculine shit, feminine shaya, neuter shee. The i of shii is the definitive pronoun, which, in the feminine, is ya, and in the neuter e for ye (§§. 282. 284.). After the loss, then, of this pronoun, there remains shi, sha, she; and these are abbreviations of shyo, shyec, shyec, as we have seen, p. 332, G. ed., the adjective base SINYO (nominative siny), before its union with the defining i, contracted to sini (sini-i, neuter sine-e for sinye-ye). The definite feminine of SINYO is sinya-ya; and as to the feminine comparatives not being shyə-ya but sha-ya, this rests on the special ground that sibilants gladly free themselves from a following y, especially [G. Ed. p. 424.] before a (Dobrowský, p. 12); so in the feminine nominalives dāsha, sāsha, chasha, for sāsya, &c. (Dobr. p. 279). The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskrit यस्य yas and Zend 𐐫𐐬(_.) yas; (p. 401) is therefore to be taken thus, that the ya which precedes the sibilant is suppressed, as in the above feminines in shi; but for it, at the end, is added an unorganic YO, which corresponds to the Gothic-Lithuanian YA in the themes NIUYA, NAUYA, "new," answering to नव nava, NOVU, NEO, Sclavonic NOVO. This adjunct YO has preserved the comparative sibilant in the masculine and neuter, which, in the first formation, must yield to the euphonic law, §. 255. (l.) Examples of this second formation are, ἀν-σ CreateUser에게 "the better (m.)," feminine
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un-shaya, neuter un-shee; pust-shii from pust, theme PUSTO. "desert." Hence it is clear that the final vowel of the positive base is rejected, as in all the cognate languages, however difficult the combination of the t with sh. Even whole suffixes are rejected, in accordance with §. 298; as, glub-shii from glubok, "deep" (definite, gluboky-i), sladshii from sladok, "sweet."

(3) Masculine yeishii, feminine yeishaya, neuter yeishee; but after sch, sh, and ch, ai stands for yei: and this ai evidently stands only euphonically for yař, since the said sibilants, as [G. Ed. p. 425.] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following y: hence blasch-aišhii, "the better" (masculine), from blag (theme BLAGO), "good,"† since g, through the influence of the y following, gives way to a sibilant, which has subsequently absorbed the y; compare ol'-uyw, for ol'iy-uyw, olig-yuyw (p. 402): so tish-aišhii, from tich (theme TICHO), "still,"† as in the Greek bás-σων from ταχύς. As example of the form

* I hold ko, whence in the nom. masc. k, for the suffix of the positive base, but the preceding o for the final vowel of the lost primitive; and this o corresponds either to a Sanskrit a, according to §. 255. (a.), or to an u, according to §. 255. (c.); for example, tano-k, "thin," theme TANOKO, corresponds to the Sanskrit tanu-s, "thin," Greek τανω; and slado-k to the Sanskrit swādu-s, "sweet," with exchange of the v for l, according to §. 20. Thus the above slad-shii shews itself to be originally identical, as well in the suffix of the positive as of the other degrees with the Greek θό-λων and Gothic sut-īza (§. 304.), far as the external difference may separate them; and to the Slavonic is due, as to the truer preservation of the fundamental word, the preference above the Greek and Gothic, although, on account of the unexpected transition of the v into l, the origin of the Slavonic word is more difficult to recognise.

† Dobrowsky says (p. 334) from blagyi (this is the definite, see §. 284.): it is, however, evident that the comparative has not arisen from the adjective compounded with a pronoun, but from the simple indefinite one.

† Compare the Sanskrit adverb tūṣhām, "still, silent," and refer to §. 255. (m.).
with yei, yûn-yeishii, "junior," from yûn, may serve. Whence comes, then, the yei or ai (for yai), which distinguishes this formation from the second? It might be supposed that to the first formation in yei, where, for example, also yûn-yei, "the younger (m.)," occurs, that of the second has also been added, as in Old High German mërero, "the greater" (masculine), and in Gothic, probably, vairsiza, "the worse" (p. 405), are raised twice to the comparative degree; and as, in Persian, the superlatives in terín, in my opinion, contain, as their last element, the comparative ईयन्य ईयन्य, which forms, in the nominative masculine, ēydn, and from this could be easily contracted to in. In Persian the comparative is formed through ter; as, behter, "the better," whence behterin, "the best." Now it deserves remark, that in Old Sclovonic the formation before us frequently occurs with a superlative meaning, while in the more modern dialects the superlative relation is expressed through the comparative with nai, "more," prefixed (probably from mæi = Gothic mais, according to §. 225. l.). The only objection to this mode of explanation [G. Ed. p. 426.] is this, that the element of the first formation ye-i has not once laid aside the definitive pronoun i, which is foreign to the comparative; so that therefore in yûn-yei-shiï the said pronoun would be contained twice. There is, however, another way of explaining this yeishii or (y)aishii, namely, as an exact transmission of the Sanskrit iyas or yas, from which the second formation has only preserved the sibilant; but the third, together with this letter, may have retained also that which preceded. Still, even in this method, the i of yei, (y)a", is embarrassing, if it be not assumed that it owes its origin to a transposition of the i of iya.

306. As to the remark made at p. 400, that among the European languages the Greek only has preserved the nasal, which the Sanskrit shews in the strong cases of the comparative suffix ēydnus, I must here admit a limitation in
favour of the Lithuanian, which, exceeding in this point
the Greek, continues not only the nasal,* but also the com-
parative sibilant through all the cases. For an example,
gérësnis, “the better” (m.), may serve, with which we would
compare the Sanskrit gariyāṇasam, “graviorem” (nominative
gariyāṇ). It may be, but it is not of much consequence
to us, that gérësnis and gariyāṇis (strong theme) are also
connected in the positive base; so that, as according to
p. 398, in Greek and Gothic goodness is measured by depth,
in Lithuanian it is measured by weight. The Sanskrit com-
parative under discussion means, also, not only “heavier,”
or “very heavy,” but also, according to Wilson, “highly
venerable.” In order, however, to analyze the Lithuanian
gérësnis, we must observe that gérësnis stands for gérësnias,
and the theme is clearly GERÉSNIA; hence genitive
gérësnio, dative gérësniam; as gëro, gerâm, from gëra-s.

[G. Ed. p. 427.] The termination ia, therefore—for which
ya might be expected, the y of which, as it appears for
the avoiding of a great accumulation of consonants, has
been resolved into i—corresponds to the unorganic addi-
tion which we, p. 411, have observed in Sclavonic compara-
tives. We have now geresn remaining, which I regard
as a metathesis from geren,† through which we come
very near the Sanskrit gariyāṇs. But we come still
nearer to it through the observation, that, in Lithuanian, e
is often produced by the euphonic influence of a preceding
y or i (§. 193.). We believe, therefore, that here also we
may explain geresn as from geryas (geryans), and further
recall attention to the Zend মদ্যে (§. 300.).

* In the Lith. comparative adverbs like daugiaus, “more,” mazaus,
“less,” I regard the u as the vocalization of the n; thus daugiaus from
daugians, where ians—Skr. iyāns of the strong cases.

† This has been already alluded to by Grimm (III. 635, Note *), who
has, however, given the preference to another explanation, by which esnis
is similarly arrived at with the Latin issimus
DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

The emphasis upon the e of geresnis may be attibutable to the original length in the Sanskrit strong theme garīyāns. Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian, even to the present day, continues to use the Sanskrit comparative suffix īyāns, or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend yāis.

307. The Lithuanian superlative suffix is only another modification of the comparative. The nasal, that is to say, which in the latter is transposed, is, in the superlative, left in its original place: it is, however, as often happens, resolved into u,* and to the s which ends the theme in the Sanskrit, which, in Lithuanian, is not declinable (§. 128.), is added ia: hence GERΑUSΙΑ, the nominative of which, however, in departure from geresnis, has dropped, not the a, but the i; thus gerausa-s, gen. gerausio, and, in the feminine, gerausa, gerausios; in which forms, [G. Ed. p. 428.] contrary to the principle which is very generally followed in the comparative and elsewhere, the i has exercised no euphonic influence.

"Remark.—With respect to the Sanskrit gradation-suffixes tara, tama, I have further to add, that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition शत उत; hence ut-tara, 'the higher,' ut-tama, 'the highest,' as above (§. 295.) af-tuma, and in Latin ex-timus, in-timus. I think, however, I recognise the base of ut-tara, ut-tama, in the Greek ὑς of ὕσ-τερος, ὕσ-τατος, with the unorganic spir. asp., as in ἐκάτερος, corresponding to the Sanskrit ēkaturea-s, and with σ from τ (compare §. 99.), in which it is to be remarked that also in the Zend for ut-tara, ut-tama, according to §. 102., us-tara, us-tema, might be expected.

* Comp. §. 255. (g.); in addition to which it may be here further remarked, that in all probability the u also in Gothic conjunctives like haitau, haihaityau, is of nasal origin.
NUMERALS.

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

308. I. In the designation of the number one great difference prevails among the Indo-European languages, which springs from this, that this number is expressed by pronouns of the 3d person, whose original abundance affords satisfactory explanation regarding the multiplicity of expressions for one. The Sanskrit ēka, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek ēkārēpos, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base ē, of which hereafter, with the interrogative base ka, which also, in combination with api, “also” (nom. masc. kō’pi), signifies “whoever”; and even without this api, if an interrogative expression precedes, as Bhagavad-Gītā, II. 21, "kathāṁ sa purushāṁ Pārthu kan ghōtayati hanti kam, “How can this person, O Pārtha, cause one to be slain (or) slay one?” The Zend aevā, is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs ēva, “also,” “only,” &c., and ēvam, “so,” of which the latter is an accusative, and the former, perhaps, an instrumental, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.). The Gothic ain’-s, theme AINA, our einer, is based on the Sanskrit defective pronoun ēna (§. 72.) whence, among others, comes the accusative masculine ēna-m, “this.” To this pronominal base belongs, perhaps, also the Old Latin oinos, which occurs in the Scipionian epitaphs, from which the more modern ānus may be deduced, through the usual transition of the old ē into u, which latter is lengthened to make up for the ē suppressed. Still ānus shews, also, a surprising resemblance to the Sanskrit āna-s, which properly means “less,” and is prefixed to the higher numerals in order to express diminution by one; as, ānaviṁshati, “undeviginti,” ānatriṁshat, “undetriginta.” This ānas could...
not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of ānu-s, or, more anciently, āno-s. The Greek 'EN is founded, it is highly probable, in like manner, on the demonstrative base ए न ए न a, and has lost its final vowel, as the Gothic AINA, in the masculine nominative ains: with respect to the ē for è compare ἐκάτερος. On the other hand, οίς, "unicus," if it has arisen from οίνος compare oinos), as μεиζώ from μειζόνα, has retained the Indian diphthong more truly, and has also preserved the final vowel of ए न ए न. If οίνος, the number one in dice, really has its name from the idea of unity, one might refer this word to the demonstrative base ए न ए न a, Slavonic ONO (nominative on, "that"), which also plays a part in the formation of words, where оνη corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix anā (feminine of the masculine and neuter anā), if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in anā, as μονή to māna. The Old Slavonic, yedin, "one," is clearly connected with the Sanskrit ए द ए द u, "the first," with य which has been prefixed according to §. 255. (n.): on the other hand, in the Lithuanian wiena-s, [G. Ed. p. 480.] if it is connected with the Gothic AINA and Sanskrit ए न ए न an, an unorganic w has been prefixed. In regard to the iē for ए ए compare, also, wies-te, "knowledge," with वेद hi vēdmi, "I know."

"Remark.—The German has some remarkable expressions, in which the number one lies very much concealed as to its form, and partly, too, as to its idea: they are, in Gothic, haihs, "one-eyed," hanfs, "one-handed," halts, "lame," and halbs, "half." In all these words the number one is expressed by ha; and in this syllable I recognise a corruption of the abovementioned Sanskrit ए क ए क a for ए क ए क a, "one," which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§. 87.). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend म ए of ṍूṛṛḥṣैष्म म ha-kērēt, "once" (Sanskrit सकृत sakṛt), as the Zend Ṙ
stands, without exception, for the Sanskrit र s, to which the h in Gothic never corresponds.* J. Grimm compares haihs with cecus (II. 316), not with the purpose of following out the origin of these cognate words, but in order to prove the transition of the tenuis into the aspirate; for the simple aspiration stands in Gothic instead of kh, which is wanting. These words are, however, so far connected, that, in both, the word eye is contained. It is only the question whether the one-eyed in Latin has also lost the other eye, and if the blind (cecus), in regard to etymology, has not preserved one eye left. This appears to me more probable than that the blind in Gothic should recover his sight, though but with one eye. The theme of haihs is HAIHA: one may, then, divide HAIHA into HA-IHA or into H-AIHA; thus the latter portion of this compound word is assuredly connected with the word अक्ष ा, “eye,” in Sanskrit, which only occurs at the end of compounds; so that of the compounded अक्ष only the first portion is left, while the Zend अशां “eye”—which, in like manner, I have found only at the end of compound words, as अशां अषां “the six-eyed”—has preserved the last element: the Latin ocus, however (the primitive base of oculus), preserves only the first like the Gothic. If in HAIHA the diphthong ai is left entirely to the share of the eye, we must assume that the a is introduced through the euphonic influence of the h (§. 82.), and that AIHA stands for [G. Ed. p. 431.] IHA, and this for AHA; as fimf from चान pancha; fidwdr from चान चातुर “the six-eyed” has preserved the last element: the Latin ocus, however has introduced any euphonic a, because, with the aid of the first member of the compound, the

* Connected, however, with this designation of “one,” which is taken from the pronominal base sa (Greek ὁ), may be the Greek ἀ in ἄ-πλαύς.
disposition of the h to ai was already satisfied. We must further recall attention to the Latin cæcles, in which, however, the notion of unity is evidently represented only by the c, for the a must be left to the cæcles as a derivative from oculus: cæcus, however, if æ is the correct way of writing, and if the number one is contained therein, would spring from ca-icus; and the Indian a, therefore, is weakened, as in Gothic, to i, which, in Latin compounds, is the usual representative of an a of the base (§. 6.). Let us now examine the one-handed. Its theme is, in Gothic, HAUFNA, nominative abbreviated hanfs; so that here, as in a skein, two bases and a pronominal remnant, as mark of case, lie together. The numeral is here the most palpable element: it is more difficult to search out the hand. In the isolated state no theme nfA could be expected; but in compounds, and also in prefixed syllables of reduplication, a radical vowel is often rejected; as, in the Sanskrit जग्मिम jagmima, “we went,” of the root गम gam, only gm is left; and in the Greek, πιπτω for πιπέτω, ΠΕΤ, which corresponds to the Sanskrit पत् pat, “to fall,” is abbreviated to πτ. We shall, therefore, be compelled to assume that a vowel has fallen out between the n and f of HA-NFA. If it was an i which was displaced, then NIFA might pass as a transposition of the Sanskrit पाणि pâni, “hand,” with f for p, according to §. 87. In HA-LTA, “lame”—nominative halts—must ha again pass for a numeral, and ha-lta may originally signify “one-footed,” for it is (Mark ix. 45.) opposed to the Gothic tvans fûtuns habandin, “having two feet,” where it is said ‘it is better for thee to enter into life with one foot, than having two feet to be cast into hell.’ It is at least certain, that a language which had a word for one-footed would very fitly have applied it in this passage. If the last element, however, in HA-LTA means the foot, we must remember that, in Sanskrit, several appellations of this member are derived from roots which mean “to go.” Now, there is, in
Gothic, a root *LITH*, "to go," with an aspirated *t*, indeed; but in compounds the consonants do not always remain on the same grade which they adopt in the simple word; [G. Ed. p. 432.] *e.g.* the *t* of *quatuor* appears as *d* in many derivatives and compounds, without this *d* thereby dissembling its original identity with the *t* of *quatuor* and *चतुर्* *chatur*. So, then, *HA-LTA* may stand for *HA-LITHA*; and it may be remarked, that from the root *LIT* comes, also, *lithus*, "the limb," as that which is moveable. Before I pass on to the explanation of *halb*, I must mention that J. Grimm divides the pronoun *selber*, as it appears to me very properly, into two parts; so that the syllable *si* of the Gothic *silba* devolves on the reciprocal (*sci-na, si-s, si-k*). With respect to the last portion, he betakes himself to a verb *leiban*, "to remain," and believes that *silba* may, perhaps, have the meaning of "that which remains in itself, enduring." Be this as it may, it is clear that *halbs* — the theme is *HALBA*—might be, with equal right, divided into two parts; and it appears to me, that, according to its origin, this word can have no better meaning than, perhaps, "containing a part"; so that the ideas *one* and *a part, remnant*, or something similar, may be therein expressed, and, according to the principle of the Sanskrit possessive compounds, the notion of the possessor must be supplied, as in the already explained *haihs*, "having one eye." In the Gothic, also, *luiba* means "remnant." It scarcely needs remark, that *halb* is no original and simple idea, for which a peculiar simple word might be expected, framed to express it. The half is one part of the whole, and, in fact, equal to the absent part. The Latin *dimidius* is named after the middle through which the division went. The Zend has the expression *椋死* *naéma*, for *halb*, according to a euphonic law for *nëma*, which in Sanskrit, among other meanings, signifies "part": this is probably the secondary meaning, and the half, as part of the whole,
the original. If it is so, नेम nēma appears to me a very ingenious designation for a half, for it is a regular contraction of न na, "not," and इम ima, "this or that"; and the demonstrative therefore points at the "this or that" portion of the whole excluded by the negative na. In Sanskrit, halb is termed, among other appellations, सामि sāmi, in which one recognises both the Latin semi and the Greek ημι, and the three languages agree in this also, that they use this word only without inflection at the beginning of compounds. As to its origin, सामि sāmi may be viewed as a regular derivative from सम sama, "equal," "similar," by a suffix i, by which the suppression of the final vowel, and widening of the initial vowel of the primitive, become necessary. If this explanation is well founded, [G. Ed. p. 433.] then in this designation of halb only one part of the whole, and, indeed, one equal to the deficient part, would be expressed, and the सामि sāmi would be placed as ἐτερποῦ over against the deficient ἐτερποῦ; and the Sanskrit and German supply each other's deficiencies, so that the former expresses the equality, the latter the unity, of the part; i.e. each of the two languages only semi-expresses the half. As to the relation, however, of the Greek ημινς to ημι, it follows from what has been already said—that the latter is not an abbreviation of the former, but the former is a derivation from the latter; and indeed I recognise in συ the Sanskrit possessive swa, "suus," which, remarkably enough, in Zend enters into combinations with numerals with the meaning "part"; e.g. त्री-म thri-shva, "a third part," चाष्ठ-म chathru-shva, "a fourth part." In the accusative these words, according to §. 42., are written त्री-म thri-shū-म, चाष्ठ-म chathru-shūm, of which the last member comes very near to the Greek συν of ημινς. "Ημι-νς means therefore, "having one equal part," and the simple ημι means only the equal. The Sanskrit designation of "the whole" deserves further to be mentioned, सकलस sa-kala-s,
which, as signifying that which joins the parts and unites them, is opposed to the German halb as applying to one part, and in a measure furnishes a commentary and guarantee for the correctness of my view of the latter. The word सक्ला sakala consists, though this is scarcely perceptible, of स su, "with," and कला "part," so that, if the latter is regarded in the dual relation—and the last member of a compound may express each of the three numbers—सक्ला sakala expresses that in which the two parts are together. Thus the word सम-agra, "full," is used especially in regard to the moon, as a body with points, i.e. that in which the two points touch one another. Transposed into Greek relations of sound sakala-s would give, perhaps, ὀκαλος, or ὀκελος, or ὀκολος; but from this the present ὅλος has rejected the middle syllable, as is the case in κόρος, κοῦρος, compared with ज्ञारस kumāra-s, "a boy."

309. II. The theme of the declension is, in Sanskrit, द्व, which is naturally inflected with dual terminations: the Gothic gives for it tvá, according to § 87., and inflects it, in the want of a dual, as plural, but after the manner of pronouns:

[G. Ed. p. 434.] nominative tvai, tvós, tva; dative tvaim; accusative tvans, thvós, tva.* The Sanskrit displays in the dual

* One would expect tvó, on account of the form being monosyllabic (§ 231.). In the genitive masculine and neuter I should look for tví-zé, after the analogy of thi-zé, "horum," from THA, or tvaisé, according to the analogy of the definite adjectives (§ 287. p. 374 G. ed.), and according to the common declension tv'-é (p. 276). However, the form tvaddyé occurs three times in the sense of duorum; whence it is clear that the genitive of the base TVA was no longer in use in the time of Ulfila. The form tvaddy'-é belongs to a theme TVADDYA (as hary'-é from HARYA), and appears, from the ordinal number, which in Sanskrit is dwi-tiya for dva-tiya, to have introduced itself into the cardinal number. From tvaddyé, by rejecting both the d—of which one is, besides, superfluous—and by changing the y into a vowel, we arrive at the Old High German zueið, according to Isid. zueiyó, as for fidvor; also definite, zueiðrð, which, in Gothic, would be tvaddyaizð. Grimm appears, on the other hand, to have
no difference between the pronominal declension and the ordinary one, and *dwāu* is declined like *vrikāu* (p. 274), *dwē* feminine like *dhārē* (p. 285), and *dwe* neuter like *dānē* (p. 276). As, however, the notions of number are much akin to those of the pronouns; and as अल्प, "a little," forms, in the nominative plural masculine, अल्प (§. 228.); so from the masculine theme *dwa*, if it had a plural, might be expected *dwē*, to which, according to §. 78., the Gothic *tvaɪ* would correspond, which it is not requisite to regard like adjectives terminating similarly, as if compounded with a definite pronoun, espesially as a genitive *tvaɪzē*, which would make the latter view necessary, does not occur. To *tvaɪ* corresponds, also, *bāi*, "both," from the theme *BA*, neuter *bu*, dative *baim*, accusative masculine *bans*, which is to be deduced through aphaeresis from the Sanskrit base *ubha*, Old Sclavonic *oba* (nominative and accusative dual), from the base *OBO*. In Zend the masculine of the number two is द्वा (for *dvā*, §. 208.), with which the Old Sclavonic *dva* is identical, while the feminine neuter *dvyē* answers to the Sanskrit *dwe* (§. 255. e.). The Zend neuter is *duyē*, with euphonic *y* (§. 43.), and the *v* resolved into *u*. In the Greek and Latin ὅ, ὅ, *duo*, the

have taken occasion, from the Old High German forms, to suppose a Gothic *tvaɪyē* and *tvaɪaɪzē*, in which I cannot agree with him. The Old Northern, by exchanging the dental medials with gutturals, gives *tvaggya* for the Gothic *tvadyyē*. In the accusative plural feminine is found, in Gothic, together with *tvod* also *tveihnōs*, which presupposes a masculine and neuter base *TVEIHNA*, fem. *TVEIHŇO*; and in which the annexed *HNA* reminds us of the appended pronoun अइ, discussed at §. 165. &c., which, by metathesis, and with the alteration of the *s* into *h*, has in Prakrit and Pâli taken the form *mha* (comp. §. 169.). On this Gothic *TVEIHNA* is based the Old High German nominative and accusative masculine *zuνē* with loss of the *h*. The feminine, however, appears in Old High German free from this addition, and is in the nominative and accusative *zuo*, also abbreviated *zua* (comp. §. 69.).
old \( v \) is, in the same way, resolved into the \( u \), but the final vowel of the base is not abandoned: \( \delta\omega \) answers to the Vedic masculine \( du\) (§. 208.); but in distinguishing the genders the Greek is surpassed by the Latin and the other European sister languages. The Lithuanian has \( du \) in the nominative masculine, and \( dwi \) in the nominative feminine; with the closer explanation of which, and their dual declension, we will not here occupy ourselves further. It is, however, to be remarked of the Sanskrit numeral, that the \( a \) of \( dwa \) is, in the beginning of compounds, weakened to \( i \) (compare §. 6.): hence \( dwi \), which is represented by the native grammarians as the proper theme (comp. p. 102). The Greek, in which \( f\i \) is inadmissible, gives in its stead \( \delta \); hence, \( d\i u\i n\i t\i o\i p = \text{हिन्दी} dwimātri \) (theme), "having two mothers." The Zend and Latin agree in the corruption of this \( dwi \) very remarkably, in this point, that they have both dropped the \( d \) and have both hardened the \( v \) to \( b \); hence \( \text{λειμανόμενως} \) bipaitistana, "with two nipples," like biceps, bidens, and others. From this abbreviated \( bι \), comes, in both languages, also the adverb \( bις \), "twice," in contrast to the Sanskrit \( dwis \) and Greek \( \deltaις \): the Greek \( \deltaι \), however, in compounds, cannot be regarded as an abbreviation of \( \deltaις \), as is wont to be done. The German dialects, with exception of the Old High Ger-

[87.] The German man, require, according to §. 87., \( t\i v\i \) for \( dvi \), as the initial member of compounds; this is furnished by the Anglo-Saxon in compound words like \( t\i v\i -f\i t\i e \), "bipes," \( t\i v\i -f\i n\i g\i r \), "duos digitos longus," \( t\i v\i -h\i v\i e \), "bicolor." The Old High German gives \( zui \) (=\( \text{zwi} \)) or \( qui \); e.g. \( zui\i -b\i n\i e \), "bipes," \( qu\i -f\i l\i t \), "duplex" (Grimm III. 956.). The adverb \( zui\i r\i \), more fully \( zui\i r\i r\i \), also \( qu\i r\i \), "twice," belongs, according to its formation, but not without the intervention of another word, to the above \( dwis \), \( \deltaις \), \( bις \); but it is clear, from the Old Northern \( t\i v\i s\i -v\i r\i \), that \( ro \) has arisen from \( s\i v\i a \) by apocope of the \( a \) and vocalization of the \( v \), perhaps more
anciently to \( u \), and thence to \( o \) (§. 77.) as in \( d\ddot{e}o \) (also \( d\ddot{i}o \)), "a servant," genitive \( diwe-s \), from the base \( DIWA \). Whence comes, however, the Old Northern \( svar \), which occurs also in \( thrisvar \), "thrice," and with which the English \( ce \) in \( twice, thrice \), is connected. I believe that the \( s \), which precedes the \( var \), is certainly identical with the \( s \) of \( द्वि dwis, \( धि d\ddot{i} \), and \( त्रि tris, \( τρί \), but the annexed \( var \) corresponds to the Sanskrit substantive \( वद्रा v\ddot{a}ra \), which signifies period and time; hence \( \ddot{e}kav\ddot{a}ra \), "once" (see Haughton), and \( v\ddot{a}ram\ddot{v}\ddot{a}ram \), "repeatedly." Hence comes the Persian \( b\ddot{a}r \), e.g. \( b\ddot{a}r-i \), "once"; and as the original meaning of this word is "time," and we have already seen, in Persian, the transition of the \( v \) into \( b \), we may hence very satisfactorily explain the Latin \( ber \) in the names of months; and \( Septem-ber \), therefore, is literally the seven-time, i.e. the seventh time-segment of the year. But to return to the Old Northern \( svar \), in \( trisvar, thrisvar \), which we must now divide into \( tris-var, thris-var \), according to the explanation which has been given, the idea of time, is expressed therein twice, which is not surprising, as in the Old High German \( m\ddot{e}r\ddot{r}o \), also mentioned above, the comparative suffix is twice contained, because it is no longer felt the first time, by the genius of the language, with sufficient clearness. As then, in Old High German, first the \( r \), and more lately also the \( o \) (from \( v \)), of \( s-var \) has been dropped, we see, in the Middle High [G. Ed. p. 437.] German \( drir \), from \( dris \), the form again returned into the original limits of the Sanskrit-Greek \( tris \).

310. III. The theme is, in the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, and Old Sclavonic, \( TRI \), whence in the Gothic, according to §. 87., \( THRI \), and exactly the same in Zend, according to another law of sound (§. 47.). The declension of this base is, in most of the languages mentioned, perfectly regular: it is only to be remarked of the Gothic, in which, however, all the cases cannot be
adduced, that on account of the word being monosyllabic, the \( i \), is not suppressed before vowel terminations, but becomes \( iy \) (compare the Pali, § 226): hence the genitive thrīy-ē, and nominative neuter thrīy-ā (§ 233). Besides these, the dative thrī-m and the accusative thrī-nəs may be cited. The Sanskrit forms the genitive from an extended theme traya, hence traya-d-əm; while the Zend thry-anm or thray-anm comes from the original base. Both languages, however, agree in this, that \( tri, thri, \) is only a theme of the masculine and neuter; and although, according to its termination, it might quite as well be assigned to the feminine, nevertheless the feminine number has an appellation peculiar to it, which is rather different from \( tri, thri, \) of which the theme is tisar (तिस्र tisr, § 1), the \( a \) of which, in the Sanskrit nominative, accusative, and vocative, is irregularly suppressed; hence तिस्र tisra\(\text{ś} \) for tisras, Zend \( \text{f} \) tisræ.

[Ed. p. 438.] 311. IV. The Sanskrit feminine theme चतस्र chastr (chatasri) follows the analogy of the tisar just mentioned; and the similarity between the two forms is so great that it appears, which is perhaps the fact, that the number three is contained in the fourth numeral; so that tisr-as would be a weakened form of tisr-as, and the cha prefixed to the number four would be identical with the particle, which means "and," and which, in other places, is attached to the end of the word. If one wished to press still farther into the deep mystery of the appellations of numbers, one might moot the question whether

* With this extended theme one may compare the Old High German nominative masculine driē in Isidor, which belongs to a theme DRIA, with pronominal declension. The feminine driō, from the base DRIÖ, of the same sound, presupposes in like manner a masculine and neuter theme DRIA.

† In the accusative, tisras is more organic than तिस्र tisra, as it must stand according to the common rule (comp. § 242.).
the syllables *tasa* in the theme *cha-ta-sar*, might not be considered as identical with the demonstrative bases of the same sound. I do not think, at least, that any language whatever has produced special original words for the particular designation of such compound and peculiar ideas as three, four, five, &c.; and as the appellations of numbers resist all comparison with the verbal roots,* the pronominal roots remain the only means by which to explain them. Without attempting to resolve the difficulties in the individual numbers, we will express the conjecture, that the operation of speech with regard to the numbers might originally be expounded nearly in this manner—that one might perhaps say, "it, this, that, and it, and this," &c.: thus the pronouns might actually suffice better than they appear to do in the forms of numerals which lie before us. But an obscuration of the original clearness of this method, which would occur in the course of time, would be owing also [G. Ed. p. 439.] to this, that a simple or compound word might undertake immediately to designate this or that number, and no other one, though equally adapted to denote it.

312. The masculine and neuter of the number four have, in Sanskrit, चत्वार chatwâr as the strong theme, and छतुर chatur as the weak†; hence, nom. masc. chatwâr-as, accus. chatur-as, nom. accus. voc. neut. chatwâr-i: the gen. masc. and neut. is irregularly chatur-y-ām for chatur-ām, since, according to the analogy of bases terminating with a vowel, a nasal

* Only in three might one perhaps think of the Sanskrit root त्रि, "trans-gredi," and consider three, therefore, as the more (than two). This verbal notion of passing over, adding, is, however, also the only possible one which could be blended with the names of numbers.

† To §. 129. is further to be added, that from the strong theme springs also the form of the nom., acc., and voc. plural of the neuter; while this kind forms the whole singular and dual from the weak theme.
is introduced (§ 246.). In the Zend the strong theme is चाथूर chathwār, according to § 47.; hence, nom. masc. चाथूर chathwār; and the weak theme is, by transposition, चाथूर chathru; as, chathru-mdhām, “four months” (accus. sing.), Vend. S. p. 248. For the Sanskrit genitive चाथुर्म chathum, we find चाथूर्म chathrusnaím (l. c. pp. 204 and 206, with a inserted, चाथूर्म chathrusnaím); but in the beginning of compound words it is more frequently found चाथूर्म chathwār; so that the weakening consists merely in the shortening of the ā, and, according to § 44., an ē is added to the r; as, chatwārē-paitistanydo, “of her with four teats” (gen. fem., Vend. S. p. 83). As to the European sister languages, one must expect, according to § 14., for ch, gutturals and labials, hence, in Gothic fidvōr, and aspirates for smooth letters, according to § 87. This fidvōr is based on the strong theme चाथूर chathwār, but in the state of declension extends the theme by an unorganic i, hence dative fidvōri-m, the only adduceable case. In Old Northern the nom. masc. is fidōri-r.

[G. Ed. p. 440.] The original theme fidvōr appears in the compound fidvōr-týguns, “forty” (accus.): on the other hand, fidur in fidur-dōys, “four days,” is referable to the Indian weak theme chatur; whence, however, it should not be said that the weak theme of the German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic has been brought from an Asiatic original site, for it was as easy for the Gothic, by suppressing the last vowel but one, to contract its fidvōr to fidur—like thiú-s “servant,” from thiva-s, gen. thivi-s—as for the Sanskrit to abbreviate chathwār to chatur. The Lithuanian theme follows the example of abbreviation in its interior, but extends the theme at the end; the masc. nom. is keturi, and the feminine keturios: KETURIA serves the latter as theme: the masculine keturi is analogous with geri, “the good” (see p. 251, Note †), and therefore has KETURIE, euphonic for KETURIA, as its base. The genitive and
accusative masculine keturi-<*4, keturi-s, proceed from the base KETURI. The Old Sclavonic gives CHETYRI as the masculine and feminine theme, and inflects the masculine like GOSTI, and the feminine like KOSTI (p. 349); hence nom. chetyry-e, chetyri, just as in the third numeral triy-e, "tri"; and the feminine form may, in both, represent also the masculine, and always supplies the neuter. But the collective chetvero, and the ordinal numberchetverty-i, stand in closer agreement with the Indian strong theme चत्वारी chatwār: the Latin quatuor, also, which, in disadvantageous comparison with the cognate languages, has lost the capability of declension, and the Greek τέσσαρες, τέτταρες, rest on the strong चत्वारस chatvāras; so that τέτταρες, just like the Pāli form चत्वारो chattāro, has gained its last t by assimilation of the semi-vowel. The Prākrit form, also, which I am not able to quote, will scarcely be other than chattāro (comp. §. 300 p. 414 G. ed.). With regard to the initial τ let reference be made to §. 14., by which this τ is accommodated with the Æolic πίσυρες, which refers itself to the weak theme चतुर चतुर. With the Zend transposition of the weak theme to chathru (p. 439 G. ed.), at the beginning of compounds, agrees surprisingly the Latin quadrupes, in quadrupes and other words. The adverbial s, by which द्वित dwis, "twice," and त्रिस tris, Zend thris, "thrice," are formed, is, in the Sanskrit chatur, suppressed by the rule of sound mentioned in §. 94.; hence chatur, "four times," for chaturus. That the latter has originally existed one learns from the Zend transposed form चतुर्व चतुर्व chathrus. The Latin has already, in the number three, without being forced by a compulsory law, dropped the s, and hence ter and quater appear only as internal modifications of the cardinal numbers.

313. V. Sanskrit पञ्चन panchan, Zend पञ्च म panchon, Lithuanian penki,* Greek πέντε, Æolic πέμπε, Gothic
Latin quinque, Old Sclavonic pycty. The Sanskrit-Zend panchan is the theme, and the genders are not distinguished in this and the following numbers; hence the nominative, accusative, and vocative have always singular neuter forms (therefore pancha, according to § 139.): the other cases shew plural terminations; as, genitive pchananm, Zend Ԫkgмkm pchananam (Vend. S. p. 52). By this irregularity in the declension the Sanskrit and Zend prepare us in a measure for complete want of inflection in Greek and Latin. Moreover, it is remarkable that not one of the European languages will, at all recognise the final nasal, while, nevertheless, that of saptan, navan, and dasan is found also in Gothic and Lithuanian; and in Lithuanian, also, that of aštan, “eight” (asztâni). The Greek has frequently preserved an old α

the same relation to it that keturios does to keturi (p. 428). The same obtains with the appellations of the numbers 6, 7, 8, 9, of which we give only the masculine.

* Occurs only uninflected: in the declined theme, the unorganic addition of an i must be expected, as in FIDFORI; and as is also actually the case in Old High German in this number, and the appellations for the six to ten inclusive. In Gothic, however, occur also saïhs, “six,” sibun, “seven,” ahtau, “eight,” and taihun, “ten,” only uninflected, and therefore without the unorganic i; but from niun, “nine,” comes the genitive niun-ê, which indeed might also have proceeded from a theme NIUN or NIUNA, but which I doubt not comes from NIUNI.

† The theme is FYATI, and is inflected like KOSTI (p. 348), and with singular terminations; so that one has to look upon this numeral as a feminine collective, beside which the object numbered stands in apposition in like cases. The same obtains with the appellations for the numbers 6 to 10 inclusive. As to the formal relation of FYATI to panchan, we must observe, that of the latter, in Sclavonic, only the syllable pa is represented by pya (§ 225. n.); but TI is a derivational suffix, as in SHESHTI, “six,” DEVYATI, “nine,” and DESYATI, “ten,” and corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix ti in the multiplied numbers viñsati, “twenty,” phashti, “sixty,” &c.
before a nasal originally there, while it has preferred weakening the same to \( e \) before other consonants; hence \( \delta \tau \nu \pi \alpha (\mu, \nu), \delta \tau \nu \pi \alpha \nu, \) but \( \delta \tau \nu \pi \nu (\tau) ; \) \( \tau \tau \nu \pi \alpha (\mu) \) but \( \tau \tau \nu \pi \nu (\tau) \); and so \( \epsilon \pi \tau, \) \( \epsilon \nu \nu \alpha \), \( \delta \kappa \alpha : \) not \( \pi \nu \tau \alpha , \) however, but \( \pi \nu \nu \tau e . \) It might therefore well be assumed, that the nasal in Indo-Zend numerals is a later addition, but that \( cha \) is the particle signifying “and,” which, in the number four, we have taken for the prefix (§. 311.). In Latin, also, \( quinque \) is, in regard to its termination, similar to words connected with the particle \( que, \) as in \( \nu \nu \nu \nu \nu \) the enclitic \( \tau e, \) which is akin to \( que \) and \( cha \) (see §. 14.) appears to be contained. This being the case, I would prefer regarding \( pan \) in \( \pi \tau \tau \tau \) \( pan \) as euphonic for \( pam, \) and the \( m \) as a neuter case-sign; but the \( pa \) which remains over as a pronoun, and indeed as identical with the \( ka \) which occurs in the number one (§. 308), in regard to which one might advert to the [G. Ed. p. 443.] old Latin \( \pi \pi \pi \pi \pi \) for \( quidquid, \pi \nu \nu \nu \nu \) for \( \kappa \nu \nu \nu, \&c. \) Five would, therefore, literally mean “and one,” and in fact that one which is to be added to four.*

314. VI. Sanskrit \( \pi 

* Ag. Benary, who likewise recognises in \( pancha \) the particle “and,” seeks to compare the preceding syllable with \( p\ddot{a} \nu \), “hand” (Berl. Jahrb. 1838. II. p. 49). If, however, a connection exists between the appellations of the hand and five, the former word might be named from the number of the fingers; as one might also venture an attempt to explain \( digitus \) and \( \delta \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \nu \lambda \alpha \) with the number “ten,” and our “finger,” Gothic \( figgrs \) (=\( f\ddot{u}n \)), theme \( \ddot{F} \dddot{G} \dot{G} \ddot{R} \), with \( f\ddot{u}n \) \((f\ddot{m})\); so that in this word no transition of the guttural organ into the labial has taken place. I do not think it probable that \( f\ddot{u}nger \) in named from \( f\ddot{a}n \ddot{a} \nu \), “to seize”; also, as far as regards the Greek and Latin, the appellation of each single finger is more likely to be derived from the total number than from pointing (\( \delta \varepsilon \kappa \nu \nu \mu \)).
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$k\text{hash}$, for $sh$ is otherwise not an initial syllable in Sanskrit, and also no original sound, but that sibilant which is only admissible with a preceding $k$ (§ 21.). In Latin, Greek, and German the guttural appears to be transposed, for sex is the transposition of xes.

315. VII. Sanskrit सप्तः saptan, Zend ᾳτά haptan, nominative and accusative सप्ता sapat, ᾳटा hahta (see § 313.), Greek ἑπτά, Latin septem, Lithuanian septyni, Old Sclavonic sedmy (theme SEDMI). The $m$ of septem and sedmy seems to me to have been introduced from the ordinal number, which is, in Sanskrit, saptama, nom. masc. saptama-s, and in Sclavonic sedmyi. The same holds good of the termination of osmy, “eight,” and the Latin novem, decem, Sanskrit navama-s, [G. Ed. p. 444.] “the ninth,” daśama-s, “the tenth”; for it is not probable that the $n$ of the Sanskrit cardinal number has become $m$ in the abovementioned languages, as $m$ is very frequently corrupted to $n$, especially at the end of words, where, in Greek, this transition is necessary; while the reverse method of the $n$ to $m$ scarcely occurs anywhere.

316. VIII. Sanskrit अष्टः aśṭan or अष्ठी aśṭī; from the former the nominative and accusative aśṭa, from the latter again aśṭā; Zend ᾳτά astan, nominative ᾳτά asta, Lithuanian asztāni, Gothic ahtau, Greek ὀκτώ, Latin octo, Old Sclavonic osmy (theme OSMI). The Sanskrit aśṭā and the analogous ὀκτώ appear, as it were, in a dual dress (see § 206.); nevertheless, aśṭā is, in my opinion, just as much as aśṭan, a bare theme, and has perhaps proceeded from the latter form, which occurs only in Zend, by the resolution of the $n$ to $u$, which is so common (comp. p. 415, Note), and the lengthening of the $a$; if it is not preferred to develope it from aśṭas, according to the analogy of § 206. From अष्ठी aśṭī comes, by suppression of the last element of the diphthong, aśṭā-bhis, aśṭā-bhyas, aśṭā-su, as rd-bhis, &c., from rāi, “thing,” “riches,” while aśṭān, in the cases mentioned, forms regularly aśṭabhis, aśṭa-
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bhyaś, aśḥāsū (comp. p. 304). The genitive has only one form, namely, अष्टान्तः aṣṭāṇāṁ. The strength of the āu of aṣṭāu is preserved, also, in the cognate languages, and indeed in the Latin octav-us, Greek ὀγδοος for ὀγδοῖ-ος, and in German forms as ahtowe-n, dative, according to Notker the cardinal number from ahtowi-m, from the theme AHTOWI. But if aṣṭāu were connected in its base with चतुर् chatur, "four," there would be strong reason for considering the former form as the dual, expressing four twice, and for assuming that an unorganic corruption of a dual termination, which made its appearance in the earliest antiquity, has grown up with the theme.

317. IX. Sanskrit नवन navan, Zend [G. Ed. p. 445.] नवन navan (nominative and accusative nava), Gothic niun —by contracting the va to u and weakening the a to i, as is so common, §. 66.—Latin novem (see §. 315.), Greek ἐννεά, Lithuanian dewyni, Old Slavonic devyat (theme DEVYAṬI) The last two appellations appear foreign to the system of the other sister languages: they are based, however, as I have already remarked in another place,* on the facile interchange of a nasal with the organically corresponding medial on which, among others, rests the relation between βορός and मृत्तिः mritis, "mortuus." As regards the origin of this numeral term, there exists a close connection in respect of form with the expression for "new" (Sanskrit nava). That, however, a relation of ideas actually exists between the two designations, as Ag. Benary first acutely conjectured (Berl. Jahrb. 1832. ii. p. 50), appears to me likewise probable; for without recognising a dual in aṣṭāu, and without excluding the thumbs in reckoning by the fingers, the number, nine can still only be thought of with reference to the earlier numbers, and as next to eight, and

* Historical and Philological Transactions of the Academy of Letters for the year 1833, p. 168.
nine, in contrast with eight or all the preceding numbers, is just as much a new number, as that which is new itself is always a something later and successive, a this corresponding to the old that. As a case in point, observe the Latin secundus from sequor. One must also admit that it would not be surprising if any former number whatever, excluding one, were named after the idea of that which is new, and that this origin is most intimately connected with the pronominal origin of other numerals.

[G. Ed. p. 446.] 318. X. Sanskrit द्वादशः daśaṁ, Zend dašan (nominative and accusative daša), Greek δέκα Latin decem, Lithuanian deszimt, deszimt-s and deszimtis (the two first indeclinable), Old Sclavonic desyaty (theme DESyatI see §. 313. Note §), Gothic taihun. Concerning the ai and u of taihun, see §§. 66. and 82.: the consonants have obeyed the law of removal (§. 87.). The Greek, rather than the Sanskrit, therefore serves as prototype to the Gothic in regard to the second consonant; and we have laid down in §. 21. the Sanskrit झः s as a proportionably modern sound. If, then, in this corruption, the Lithuanian and Sclavonic agree with the Sanskrit, this may be so explained, that these languages, guided independently by the Sanskrit and Zend, but with the same euphonic feeling, have transformed an old guttural to a sibilant;* in which change of sound, however, the Sclavonic, in other cases, goes farther than the Sanskrit (comp. p. 415 G. ed.). If, however, we desire to base on historical tradition the peculiar coincidence with the Sanskrit and Zend in the case before us, and some others, we must arrive at this through the assumption that the Lithuanian and Sclavonic races at some period wandered from their original settlement in Asia, when corruption

* But not universally, where, in Sanskrit, झः s is found; for aśman “a stone,” nom. aśma, is, in Lithuanian, AKMEN, nom. akmu (§. 189.) and in Old Sclavonic KAMEN, nom. kamy (§. 264.).
had already entered into the language, which did not exist at the time when the Greeks and Romans transplanted the Asiatic original language to Europe.

319. XI—XX. The smaller numbers are combined with the expression for ten: Sanskrit एकादश ेकादशान्, द्वादशान्, त्रयोदशान्, चतुर्दशान्, चतुर्दशान्, etc.; Zend μεσοκοιταί σεκάδαςάν, μεσοκοιταί δώδεκασάν;* Greek ἑνδεκά, δώδεκα, τρισκαίδεκα, τεσσαρεσ— [G. Ed. p. 447.] καίδεκα; Latin undecim, duodecim, tredecim, quattuordecim; Lithuanian wienolika, dwylika, trylika, keturda Lisa; Gothic ainlif (1 C. xv. 5.), twalif,† fimftaihun, “fifteen”; Old Sclavonic chetynadesyaty, “fourteen,” pyatynadesyaty, “fifteen,” &c.

“Remark.—Before the simple dasan (from dakan) had been changed in the Gothic into taihun, according to the

* These may be deduced from the ordinals abvandasā, dvadasā (Vend. S. p. 120). So also chathradasā, “fourteen,” panchadorasā, “fifteen,” from chathradasā, “the fourteenth,” panchadorasā, “the fifteenth.” The nasal in abvandasā appears to have proceeded from m, and to be an accusative sign, for the whole stands l. c. in the accusative (abvandasām). By this doubt is thrown on the abvandasān given above, and perhaps abvōdasan, or, according to the original principle of the compound, abvadasan might be expected. In one other passage, indeed, occurs the nominative of the ordinal abvandasō (1. c. p. 230): it is, however, clearly a false reading and the sense requires the accusative, as governed by abvandasām frāsnaōiti, which Anquetil renders by a atteint; thus, एकादशान् abvandasām frāsnaōiti, “decimum attingit”; and in the following analogous constructions the ordinal number also stands always in the accusative. The form abvandasēm, from abvandasēm, is remarkable, also, in a phonetic respect, because elsewhere in Zend a final m is not governed by the organ of the following letter.

† I do not take the tva here, with Grimm (II. 947.), for the neuter, but, according to the principle of genuine compounds, for the theme (compare §. 112.), whence the nom. masc. tvai. Tva may also—and this appears to me more correct—be regarded, without the Gothic being conscious of the formation, precisely as the abbreviation of the Sanskrit ḍwā, which is a lengthening of the theme ḍwa, as ḍka from ḍka.
comparatively recent law for the alteration of sounds (compare §. 82.), it may have happened that, through the very widely-diffused disposition for exchanging the $d$ with $l$, and through the not less common permutation between gutturals and labials—through which, among others, the relation of *fidvőr* to the Lithuanian *keturi* and Latin *quatuor* becomes explicable—the *daśan* contained in *ekā-daśan* "eleven," and *dwa-daśan*, "twelve" (from *dakun*), may have passed, in Gothic, into LIBI. Through the dative *tva-libi-m*, genitive *tva-lib'-ē*, LIBI is preserved, in fact, as the true theme; so that each $a$ of *daśan* is weakened to $i$. The $f$ of [G. Ed. p. 448.] the uninflected *tvalif* is, therefore, not to be explained according to §. 87., but according to §. 93*; and if the theme *libi* has not obeyed the law for the mutation of sounds, the objection, which has been raised by Graff (Old High German Thesaurus, p. 317) against my explanation, is removed by what has been remarked in §. 99., for we refer to *fidvőr*, not *fílhvőr*. The Latin *quadraginta*, also, for *quattuorinta*, and the Greek *όγδοος* for *ὀκτος*, *ἐβδομος* for *ἐπτομος*, and several others, may be noticed, in support of the proposition that the numeral formations in the choice of the degree of the organ of the consonants have not always remained in the customary path; and in cumbrous compounds the medials are more admissible than the smooth letters and aspirates.* To remove the objection which may be taken on the ground that LIBI is so very different from the form of *taihun*, we may remark, that, in French

* The Anglo-Saxon *endleofan*, *endlyfan*, compared with *twelf*, and the Old Friesian *andlова* with *tvalif*, should not make us doubt, since the Anglo-Saxon *eo* corresponds to the Sanskrit *a* of *daśan* and Gothic *i* of *lif*, as in the relation of *seofon* (Old Friesian *siugon*) to the Sanskrit *saptan*, Gothic *sibun*. Let, then, the Old Friesian *o* of *lova* be regarded like that of *siugon*. To the Sanskrit *chatwār*, Gothic *fidvór*, correspond the Anglo-Saxon *fcover*, Old Friesian *fiuwer*. 
also, the number ten, in compounds like on-ze, dou-ze, trei-ze, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable ze to be akin, or originally identical with dix, if it were not historically certain that onze, douze, &c., have arisen from undecim, duodecim, and that therefore ze is a corruption of decim, as dix is a less vitiated form of decem.

If, then, onze, douze, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our eilf and zwölf, in which, perhaps, as in onze and douze, a connection with ein and zwei may be recognised, but none with zehn; and in the English eleven, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not dreilf, vierlf, or similar forms in lf, but dreizehn, vierzehn, &c., in which zehn is just as unaltered as the drei and vier, this arises from the Germans having forgotten the old Indo-European compounds for these numbers, and then having compacted the necessary expressions anew from the elements as they exist uncompounded. Nay, even [G. Ed. p. 449.] the Greek has reconstructed afresh, as well as it could, its numerals from thirteen upwards, after that the old more genuine compounds had fallen into disuse; but this has been done, I must say, in a clumsy, awkward fashion, by which the addition of a particle signifying and was found requisite in an attempt at extreme perspicuity, while évdeka, dówdeka, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of τρισκαίδεκα (for τρίδεκα) is "thrice and ten," and the numeral adverb τρίς, instead of the bare theme τρι, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit chatur-daśan, not chatvāras-daśan (chatvārō-daśan). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number
thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of *tri-daśan, trayā-daśan*—euphonic for *trayas-daśan*—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin *tre-decim* is therefore a more pure formation, as it dispenses with a case-sign in the first member of the compound: just so the Lithuanian *try-lika*, not *trys-lika*. This *lika*, which concludes the form, in all Lithuanian adding numerals (eleven to nineteen), exchanges the old *d* for *l*, as in German, and is therefore as far estranged from the simple *dessint's* as the Gothic *libi* from *taihun*; partly, as the second consonant in *lika* has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that *lika* and *δέκα* resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian *lika*, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic *libi* and the French *se* in *onze, douze, &c.*, from the old compound which has been handed down, and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers *wieno-lika, dwy-lika, &c.* do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—as, perhaps, *septyni* is felt to be independent of each of the earlier numbers—so, naturally, in these compounds the first member has kept tolerably equal pace with the form which it shews in its isolated state; on which account *wieno-lika*, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from *रक्षस्यतनं ḍāḍ-daśan.*

[G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic *ainlif*, in Greek *ἐδέκα*, in Latin *undecim*, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, *δόδεκα* is almost entirely the Sanskrit *dva-ḍaśa*
(ω for δ, according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as
υ (Φ) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in
the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the prece-
ding consonant (compare τέταρτος from τέταρτος), for δδωδεκά
could not be uttered. In Latin, duodecim has formed its first
member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the
French has paid no regard to the form in which the prece-
ding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the
composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbrevi-
ations which time has by degrees introduced. With refe-
rence to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would
have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said unze,
deuze, troize, &c. After what has been stated, I think no
one can any longer doubt, that in our elf (elf) and zwolf,
strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is con-
tained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin
with dasan, đéka, and zehn. If, however, the older LIBI,
lif, and Lithuanian lika, be regarded without the suspicion
arising, that in them corrupt though very common permuta-
tions of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose
in Lithuanian a root lik, and in Gothic lif or lib (Gothic
af-lifnan, "reliqui, superesse," laibós, "reliquiae"), which both
signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other
and with the Greek λείπω (ΔΠ). Grimm, who has recog-
nised (II. 946) the original identity of our lif and the Lithu-
anian lika, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by
Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the
latter from likit, "linqui, remanere," the former from leiban,
"manere." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds lika for
the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the car-
dinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding
the 3d person plural number present indicative lika (from
likù s. liekmi); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the
simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, how-
ever, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of
the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding
simple number must be regulated."

The languages, however, do not proceed so pedantically; and if they hold any thing understood, as very commonly happens, they do not expressly state that any thing remains over to be expressed. It is certain, however, that the Slavonic languages, in their expressions for eleven to twenty, do not keep back any thing to be understood, but form those expressions, after the loss of the old, no longer intelligible compounds, anew, with the annexed preposition na, "over"; e.g. in Old Slavonic, where the numbers eleven, twelve, thirteen, no longer occur, chetyri-na-desyaty, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are yedinýi-na-desyaty, "the first over ten," vtoryi-na-desyaty, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which weenpazmit signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the d(e)s of desmit, "ten," to z, and overlapping the e. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older lika being no longer intelligible. If it was to be so understood, as Ruhig has taken it, its form would be palpable, and the Lettians might have been satisfied with it. With reference to the composition of the numerals under discussion, there remains to be noticed a most remarkable coincidence of the Lithuanian and German with a Prâkrit dialect, which coincidence, when I formerly touched upon this

* Grimm's view is certainly much more natural, "ten and one over, two over." Only it would be to be expected, if the language wished to designate the numbers eleven and twelve as that which they contain more than ten, that they would have selected for combination with one and two a word which signifies "and over, or more," and not an exponent of the idea "to leave," "to remain." It would, moreover, be more adapted to the genius and custom of the later periods of the language, not to forget the number ten in the newly-formed compounds, like the Lettish and Slavonic. J. Grimm, in his "History of the German Language," p. 246, agrees with my explanation of eilf, zwölf, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.
subject,* was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of Urvasi (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दाह dāha—approaching closely to the Gothic taihun—but at the end of the compounds under notice raha: r and l, however, are, according to § 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, द्वारह वद्राह, "twelve," from द्वादश dwādaśa, and अष्टदश atḍhāraha, "eighteen," from अष्टादश aṣṭādaśa, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this category, have an r for d, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the d for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this raha we should be led to the root rah, "to leave," which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstānī grammar, where I was agreeably surprised by perceiving that here, also, the number ten, in the designation of eleven, twelve, &c., has taken another lighter form than in its simple state, in which it is pronounced das.‡ But in the compounds under discussion this becomes rah,† and, for example, bdrah,

* Influence of the Pronoun on the formation of Words, p. 27; and Histor. Philol. Trans. of the Academy for the year 1833, p. 178, &c.

† The a of rah has been weakened in the cognate languages to i: hence linquo, Lithuanian likū, Greek λείπω (λειπω), Gothic af-li-f-na. In respect to the consonants, we refer the reader to §§ 20.23.: remark, also, the connection of the Lithuanian lakū, "I lick," with the Sanskrit root liḥ, "to lick." Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin linquo, Greek λείπω. Gothic af-li-f-na, to the Skr. root riḥ, from riḥ, "to leave."

‡ The text has des and reh but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindustani numerals which follow.—Translato.
"twelve," answers to the abovementioned Prākrit बारहा, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form द्वादश dwādaśa, without heeding the form of the simple do, "two," and das, "ten." It may be proper here to quote all the Hindūstānī compounds which belong to this subject, together with the corresponding Sanskrit words of which they are the corruptions. We annex, also, the number twenty, and nineteen which is related to it as being twenty less one, as also the simple lower numbers in Hindūstānī.

[H. Ed. p. 458.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HINDŪSTĀNĪ</th>
<th>SANSKRĪT, NOMINATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ēk</td>
<td>1, igā-rah, 11, ēkādaśa 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>2, bā-rah 12, dwādaśa 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn</td>
<td>3, ṭēraḥ 13, trayōdaśa 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chār</td>
<td>4, chau-dah 14,* chaturdaśa 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pāncḥ</td>
<td>5, pānd-rah 15, panchādaśa 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chhah</td>
<td>6, sō-lah 16,† śhādaśa 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāt</td>
<td>7, sat-rah 17, saptadaśa 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ākḥ</td>
<td>8, aṭh-rah 18, aṭhādaśa 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nau</td>
<td>9, unnīs 19, Ṽunavīniśati (&quot;undeviginti&quot;) 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>das</td>
<td>10, bīs 20, vīniśati 20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by दश sati, दश sat or दश ti; in Zend by दस satī, दस satā, or दस ti; and the words therewith compounded are substantives with singular terminations, with which, in Sanskrit, the thing numbered agrees in case, as in apposition, or is put, as in the Zend, in the genitive, as

* The retention of the d is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with r, although in the Hindūstānī corruption this is no longer present. The Bengāli has assimilated the r to the following d, hence chāudo; but, as a general rule, the Bengāli in these compounds changes the d into r, and in all cases suppresses the Hindūstānī h; as ḍārō, "eleven," bārō, "twelve," tērō, "thirteen."

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its l for the r found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German lika, lif. The Bengāli is Ṽhōlo.
dependent upon it. Occasionally, too, one finds these numerals in Sanskrit used adjectively, with plural endings. Compare,
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[G. Ed. p. 454.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20, दशस्ति viśāti, ἱδέον ἱδαντι, εἴκατι, viginti,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, त्रिशति trisāt, ἱδέον ἱθρισάτα, τρίάκοντα, triginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, चतुर्दशिस्ति, chathwāriśātata, τεσσαράκοντα, quadraginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, panchāṣat, panchāṣata, πεντήκοντα, quinquaginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, shashti, cvsasti, ἐκτήκοντα, sexaginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70, sapta, haptāiti, ἑξάδομήκοντα, septuaginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80, asiti, ... ὀκτώδοκοντα, octoginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, navati, navaiti, ἑνενήκοντα, nonaginta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100, sa(a)-m, satē-m, ἑκατόν, centu-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Remark.—I hold ṣati, ṣat, ṣata, ti, to be abbreviations of dasati, dasat, daśata, and therefore derivations from dasan, “ten,” by a suffix ti, ta, or t: the former is

* The numerals in ṣata, answering to the Sanskrit forms in ṣat, are neuters, and occur, like the forms in ti, very frequently in the 6th and 12th Fargard of the Vendidad, but only in the accusative singular, in which ṣatēm might also belong to a theme ṣat. That, however, ṣata is the theme and the neuter form is clear from Vend. S. p. 290. (in the 7th Fargard), where pancha ṣatēm (panchāṣatēm), “fifty,” stands as nominative. From cvsasti, “sixty,” haptāiti, “seventy,” and navaiti, “ninety,” we find the accusative cvsastim, haptātitim, navaitim: on the other hand, in the 12th Fargard, occurs several times viśāti (also written viśati and viśati) as accusative of viśāti, which perhaps is a dual neuter form (two decades), and according to this would stand for viśāti (§. 210.). But if the final vowel is retained in its original form it is a singular neuter. It is, however, remarkable, that only this final i, and no other, is again found in the cognate Latin and Greek forms.

† This and the following number are renovated forms, in which the first member proceeds unorganically from the ordinal number. We might have expected ἑνενήκοντα, ἑκτάκοντα, for the latter Ion. ὀκτώκοντα. In ἑνενήκοντα the two ν are separated from each other: the epic form ἑνή-

κοντα is more genuine.
in Lithuanian and Sclavonic, already contained in the simple *deszimt's, deszimtis, Old Sclavonic desyaty*. With regard, however, to the ten being expressed without abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in compounds, also—as in Lithuanian *dwideszimti* (or *tis*), “twenty,” *trysdeszimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sclavonic *che-tyridesyaty, “forty,”* *pyatydesyaty, “fifty”—I do not consider [G. Ed. p. 455] this as a more true retention of the original form, but as a new formation. The Lithuanian, too, from forty upwards, separates the two numbers, and puts the former in the feminine plural, *e.g.* _keturios deszimtis_, “forty,” _penkios deszimtis_, “fifty”; in which it is surprising that _deszimtis_, also, does not stand in the plural. The Gothic method in this numeral category is of comparatively recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the ancient compound, and gives, in the numbers under seventy (sixty does not occur), _tigus_, masculine, as the expression for ten, and declines this, and in twenty, thirty, the lesser number also, with regular plural terminations: hence the accusatives _tvanstiguns, thrinstiguns, fidv6rtiguns, fimftiguns_, genitive _thriy6rtig'vi_. The substantive _tigus_, however, is the etymological quaver to _taihun_, and _LIBI_: it is related to the former essentially, the aspirate having become a medial (see §. 89.), thus rendering the _a_, which, in _taihun_, is brought in by the rule of sound mentioned in §. 82., superfluous. Advert, also, to the Latin medials in _ginti, ginta_, contrasted with the Greek _kati, konta_, which answer better to _déka_. _Tigu-s_ may be identical with the Sanskrit ordinal _daśa_, nominative masculine _daśa-s_, which occurs only in compounds, as _dvádaśa-s_, “the twelfth.” To this _daśa-s_, therefore, is related _tigu-s_ in regard to its _u_, as _foltu-s_ to _páda-s_, “a foot.” In the numbers seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by the neuter

* Twenty and thirty do not occur.
substantive *téhund* (theme *TEHUNDA*, genitive *téhundi*-s); hence *sibun-téhund*, "seventy," *ahtau-téhund*, "eighty," *niun-téhund*, "ninety." The *é* of this *TEHUNDA* stands as the representative of the *ai* of *taihun*, and I hold *DA* to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic *N* or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence *TAIHUNDAN*, nominative *taihunda*, "decimus." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned *tigus* also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to *zig* or *ssig* (*dreissig*), and is found also in *siebenzig*, *achtzig*, *neunzig*, Old High German *sibunzog*, *ahtozog*, *niunzog*, or *-zoc*, and *zéhanzog* (*zoc*), Gothic *taihuntéhund*, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend *sata*, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative *षतम्* *satam*, *षतेम्* *satēm*—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (*daśan*), whence it is formed by the suffix *ta*—the suppression of the final nasal is regular;—so that it is to be regarded as an abbreviation of *daśata*, as above, *षति* *sati*, *षत्* *sát*, and the Zend *षत्तम्* *sata* for *daśati*, &c. This abbreviation, however, which has given to the word the stamp of a primitive expression specially created for the idea "a hundred," is proved to be of the highest antiquity by the consentaneous testimony of all the cognate languages, Greek *κατόν* (*ékatóv* is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin *centum*, Lithuanian *szumta*-s (masculine), Old Sclavonic *sto* (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).* The Gothic *hund* and Old High German *hunt* (theme *HUNDA, HUNTA*) occur only in compounds, as *tva-húnda*, *thria-hunda*, *zwei-hunt*, *driu-hunt*, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also *षति* *sati*, *षत्* *sát*, and the corresponding words

* In Zend *śta* occurs frequently for *sata*, and just so in the numbers compounded therewith.
in the cognate languages, have in the earliest periods lost the initial syllable of the number ten, and with it the lingual remembrance of the same; and that in विनांति vināti, विनासि viṇāsi, ईकारि eikārī, ईकोक vīṇitti, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the ड of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce bis from dwis, and bi from dwi, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of विनांति vināti, the Prākrit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the ड in the number twelve also (वारहा for dwāraha). It is remarkable that the four oldest and most perfect languages of the Indo-European family in the category of numerals before us, have lost exactly as much of the number ten as the French in the forms for eleven, twelve, &c.; and the ze of douze is therefore identical with the Sanskrit झा of विनांति vināti. The Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word daśati to be melted down to the derivation suffix ti, and this ti corresponds to the French te of trente, quarante, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, शष्ठि shashti (ti euphonic for ti), सवस्ति savasti. To the झाति of विनांति vināti सवस्ति viṇāsi, regularly corresponds the Doric κατί of eikārī, while in the Latin gīnti the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in ginta = κοντα of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the न of viṇāsi.
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The introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long i of the Zend viśāiti, as in the long a of panchāsat, chathwareḥsata, “forty” (Vend. S. p. 380), is likewise stronger than cha-thru-sata, which might have been expected from §. 312. As μφω sata is a neuter, to which, in Greek, κατον or κοντον would correspond, κοντα therefore, and the Latin ginta, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of τριὰ and τεσσαρα is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in εξήκοντα, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that εη, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare ἐξά-κις, ἐκαπλοῦς, and the remarks on πάντα and πολλά, p. 401, G. ed.

* The ω for ο is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the p, τετρω answers to τετρα in τετράκις, τετραπλοῦς, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.
321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are almost unanimous in their designation of the first, which idea none of the languages here treated of derives from the corresponding cardinal number: Sanskrit प्रथम् prathama-s (nom.), Zend  يوسف frathemō (§ 56.), Latin primus, Lithuanian prima-s, Gothic frum-s (for fruma-s, § 135.), or indefinite fruma (theme FRUMAN, § 140.), or, with newly-added superlative suffix, frumisf-s, Old High German ēristēr, usually indefinite ēristo (from the adverb ēr, “before”), Greek πρώτος, Old Slavonic pervyž. प्रथम prathamu, from the preposition pra, has been already discussed (p. 393 G. ed.); so the Greek πρώτος is derived from the corresponding preposition πρό, the lengthening of which to πρω accords with the Sanskrit pra in prātar, “in the morning” (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix TO is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit tama or thama, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चतुर्थ chatur-tha-s, “the fourth,” and शष्ठ shash-tha-s, “the sixth,” as also in Latin in the form of TU in quartus, quintus, sextus, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δευτερος, εζδευτερος, and γενετος. In Lithuanian the corresponding TA of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with septintas, asztuntas, occur also sekmas, âszmas, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तम् saptama-s, अष्टमस् ashtama-s, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix tama or thama has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चमस् panchama-s, नवमस् navama-s, and दसमस् dasama-s, partake, which therefore complete, by their suffix, the tha of chaturtha, so that both united present the perfect word. The Zend agrees herein with the Sanskrit, only that its हाप्ताथ haptatho agrees more with septintas than with सप्तमस् saptama-s and septimu-s; and
that also पुग-धो, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian penk-ta-s. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 450.] in Greek, ὀκτος for ἐκτος; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, basta from bandh), and irregularly changed the a to u, as in "ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख nakha, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दसम dasama, दशेम dašema, and of all the derivational suffix only the a is left, before which the a of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादश dwa-daša, द्वादेश dvādaśa, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दश chaturdaśa, चतुरुद्ध chathrudasa, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its undecimus, duodecimus, not undecus, duodecus; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in lif: hence, tertius decimus for the lost tredecimus, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend daśa is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms octav-us, ὀκτο(ο)ς, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὀκτωμος, octomus. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix simu-s (from timu-s=तम् tama-s); thus vicesimus or vige-
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[G. Ed. p. 460.] simus, trigesimus, as in Sanskrit vinśatitama-s, trīśatitama-s.* In Latin, however, the termination nti or nta of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of ē. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in § 298. The Greek shows its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit ः म े ः in the ordinal numbers like είκοστός, τριακοστός, with the loss of the i of ἴστος, as in ἐκαστός, πόστος. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the η, σ, and ντα of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German dăr-zugōsto, “the thirtieth,” fior-zugōsto, “the fortieth”: but in the numbers from four to nineteen the TAN or DAN, in Gothic, corresponds, according to the measure of the preceding letter (§ 91.), to the suffix of the cognate languages, as in चतुर्थि chaturtha-s, तेऄर्थि-स, quattu-s, ketwir-ta-s. The N, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§ 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—vierter, “fourth,” fünfter, “fifth,” &c.; hence, Gothic FIMFTAN, nom. masc. fīmfta.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base दू dwi “two” (p. 424), and from the त्रि� tri, “three,” contracted to त्र tri, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix tiya; hence dwi-tiya-s, tritiya-s. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin ter-

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of ēkādasi-s, “the eleventh”; hence, also, vinśa, trinō-a, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like fīmftataihunda, “the fifteenth,” the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the n, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or fīmfta is here the regular abbreviation of the theme FIMFTAN, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Borl. Ann. May 1827. p. 759), bases in n, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the n in the beginning of compounds.
tius, as also in the Old Sclavonic tretii, fem. tretiya, which, like all the ordinal numbers, has only a definite declension, in which, however, the particular case occurs, that the defining element is brought with it direct from the East, while the tyi of chetwertyi and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with तीय tīya might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च था, TO, TU of चतुर्थ था, द्वार्थ, quarter, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective chetvera, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that chetwertyi, shestyi, have to chaturtha-s, shaśthha-s, sedmyi, osmyi, have to सप्तमा saptama, अष्टमा ashtama; and pervyi, "the first," to पूर्व pūra, "the former;" which expressions, in Sclavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base अ पा apā (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the t of the suffix tīya, and abbreviated dwi to bi; hence बिया bitya, ब्रि thritya, in which it is to be remarked that the y, which is thus by syncope united with the t at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend tya corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle t, the Gothic DYN (from dya, §. 285.) in THRIDYAN, nom. masc. thridya, the y of which in the Old High German dritto, has assimilated itself to the preceding t, in analogy with the Prākrit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρείττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριτ्तός (δισσός, τρισσός), which are evidently, in [G. Ed. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German dritto has to the Gothic thrīda. Regarding tvaddy, "duorum," see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun anthar (see p. 377), Old High German andar, Middle High German ander. Our zweiter, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Sclavonic vtoryi (see §. 297.)
answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek δεύτερος, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend bitya, only that it has lost also the i of the Sanskrit dwi-tīya, in regard to which we have, in § 297., adverted to the Zend ḗwya b-yāre*, "two years."

323. We give here a general view of the ordinal numbers in the feminine nominative singular, since in this case the agreement of all the languages strikes the eye more than in the nominative masculine. The Gothic forms which do not occur we give in parentheses, formed theoretically, and according to the Old High German.

[G. Ed. p. 463.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prathamā,</td>
<td>frathēma,</td>
<td>πρῶτα, primā,</td>
<td>fruma,</td>
<td>pirmā,</td>
<td>perva-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwiṭyā,</td>
<td>bitya,</td>
<td>δεύτερα, altera,</td>
<td>anthara,</td>
<td>antrā,</td>
<td>vtora-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tritiya,</td>
<td>tertiya,</td>
<td>τρίτα, tertia,</td>
<td>thridyō,</td>
<td>trēchiā,</td>
<td>treti-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chalurthā,</td>
<td>tūryā,</td>
<td>τετάρτα, quarta,</td>
<td>(fēdōrō),</td>
<td>ketuviā,</td>
<td>chevertiya-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panchama,</td>
<td>pugdha,</td>
<td>πέμπτα, quinta,</td>
<td>femtī,</td>
<td>penktā,</td>
<td>pynya-ya.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shashīha,</td>
<td>estvā,</td>
<td>ἑξη, sexta,</td>
<td>saithō,</td>
<td>sēxēta,</td>
<td>stesha-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saptamā,</td>
<td>haptalha,</td>
<td>ἑπτάμα, septima,</td>
<td>(sibundō),</td>
<td>sēkna,</td>
<td>sema-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aṣṭamā,</td>
<td>asēma,</td>
<td>ἑθάμα, octava,</td>
<td>ahtudō,</td>
<td>āzma,</td>
<td>osma-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navamā,</td>
<td>nāuma,</td>
<td>ἑνεντα, nona,</td>
<td>niuındō,</td>
<td>devinīdā,</td>
<td>devyata-ya.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsamā,</td>
<td>daśēma,</td>
<td>ἑδέσμα, decima,</td>
<td>tainhundō,</td>
<td>desmytā,</td>
<td>desyata-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekādaśa,</td>
<td>aśvandas,</td>
<td>ἑκατόν, undecima, (ainīlio),</td>
<td>wienisōkta,</td>
<td>ūdina-ya-na-desyaty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viṇasati-tamā,</td>
<td>viśishtēma,</td>
<td>ἑκαστατοῖ, vícesima,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>dvadesimīdā,</td>
<td>vtor,a-ya-na-desyaty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We should read thus § 297. for byarē, as accusative singular (see Olshansky, Vend. S. 48).

1 More usually paoirya, masc. paoiryd, by which the Sclavonic pervyi, perva-ya, is, as it were, prepared.

2 Also turīyā, masc. turtya-s, on which is based the Zend tārya, masc. tāryō. The suppression of the syllable cha might announce the looser connection of the same with the remaining portion of the word, and thereby support the conjecture expressed at § 311.

3 The t of pyataya, masc. pyatyi, has nothing in common with the t of the cardinal number pyat; the proper primitive is pya (see p. 430 Note t), whence PYATI by the suffix TI, and PYATO, fem. PYATA, by the suffix TO, fem. TA (see § 322.). The same holds good with regard to šestayā in relation to šesty, &c.

4 By transposition and syncope from csasta, as must be expected from the cardinal number MNAHOMOŚ cvas.

5 Regarding the d for n, see § 317. 6 See § 319, Note *, p. 435.
"Remark.—As the old a of the preposition ἡ pra has been weakened to i—as in quinque, answering to panchan—the Latin prima appears distinct from the preposition pro, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian prathamā, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb πρίν, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition πρό. In the comparative prior only the pr of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the i belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the m of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition pirm, 'before'; but the unaltered pra stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also pri, 'by, before,' as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic fruma shews the same relation to prathamā that the Latin and Lithuanian do: the u of fru has arisen from a through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition fram, 'before, by,' &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian pirm, the superlative m is contained. On ἡ pra is based, also, faur, 'before,' with transposition of the u of fru-ma, and with a prefixed, according to §. 82.

NUMERAL ADVERBS.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas "twice," "thrice," "four times," have been already discussed (p. 435 G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Old Northern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dwis,</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>δίς</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>tvis-var (p. 436 G. ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tris,</td>
<td>thris</td>
<td>τρίς</td>
<td>ter</td>
<td>thris-var</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chatur,*</td>
<td>chathrus</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>quater</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to §. 94. for chatur.
The Greek forms in κις like τετράκις, πεντάκις, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but κις answers to the Sanskrit sas (§. 21.), the a being weakened to i; this sas, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as sataśas, "by hundreds," sahasraśas, "by thousands," bahuśas, "of many kinds," gaṇaśas, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but e.g. sataśas is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in ekatovtάκις the repetition is strictly defined by the numeral. How stands it, then, with the Latin forms like quinquies, sexies, &c.? I believe that in respect to their suffix they are connected neither with the forms in s like dwis, δίς, nor with those in κις (sas), by suppression of the guttural; but as totias, quoties, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced quotiens, totiens, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, τιθέν is more genuine than τιθείς (§. 138.), I therefore prefer bringing these forms in ens, es, into conjunction with the Sanskrit suffix vant (in the weak cases vat), which signifies, in pronominal bases, "much," but elsewhere, "gifted with," and the nominative of which is, in Zend, vaṁś, e.g. chvāṁś, "how much," for chivāṁś. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base ki, and the demonstrative base i, laid aside the v; hence kiy-ant, iy-ant—weak form kiyat, iyat—nomina
tive masculine kiyāṁ, iyāṁ; this ant for vant answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine eίς), e.g. in μεληθείς, and also to the Latin ens, in totiens, quotiens, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in nt, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide toti-ens quoti-ens, or tot-iens, quot-iens? In the former case tot, quot, would have preserved, in this combination, the i
which belongs to them, for they are based on the Sanskrit तति tati, “so much,” कति kati, “how much”;* and the ens in toti-ens would, according to that, express the “time,” and toti, “so much.” In the division toti-ens, however, we should have to assume that in iens, the abovementioned demonstrative इतन्त iyant, “so much,” is contained, but in such wise, that only the meaning of the suffix is still perceived. Under this supposition quinqu-ies [G. Ed. p. 466.] would, accordingly, express “five-somuch” (times); in the former case, however, the i, as quinqui-es, octi-es, would have to pass as representative of the e and o of quinque, octo, and that of sexies as a conjunctive vowel, or as an accommodation to the prevailing analogy. In any case, however, the identity of the suffix ens, es, with the Sanskrit ant, from vant, is highly probable. The Sanskrit expresses the idea “times” from five upwards by kritwas; as, पञ्चक्रित्वस panchakritwas, “five times.” This kritwas comes from krit, “making,” which in sakrit, “once,” is sufficient of itself: the annexed vas, however, might, by exchange of the t for s (compare §. 156. Note *), have arisen from vat, which should be given above as the weak theme for vant; as, tāvat, “so much,” ydavat, “how much” (rel.). With krit from kart (§. 1.) is clearly connected the Lithuanian karta-s, “time,” a masculine substantive, which, like the defining number, is put in the accusative, in order to make up for the adverbs under discussion; e.g. wienan kartañ, “once,” dū kartū, “twice” (accusative du), tris kartus, “three times.” In Old Sclavonic the corresponding krat or krazy is not declined, and the former appears to be an abbrevia-

* These are neuters, which, in common with the numerals पञ्चम पञ्चम, “five,” &c. (§. 313.), have, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative, a singular form; in the other cases, plural terminations; while in Latin quot, tot, like quinque, &c., have become completely indeclinable.
tion of the latter, for it cannot be brought into direct comparison with the Sanskrit जूल krit on account of §. 255. (L): kraty, however, is to be deduced from जृत्ता kritwas, by suppression of the v. With regard to the y for as compare §. 271.

325. Through the suffix घा dha the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in χα, which, therefore, have altered the T sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organs in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNIO, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 467.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>द्विः</th>
<th>द्विधा</th>
<th>द्विधाः</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>त्रिः</td>
<td>त्रिधा</td>
<td>त्रिधाः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चतुर्</td>
<td>चतुर्धाः</td>
<td>च तर णाः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पञ्चः</td>
<td>पञ्चधाः</td>
<td>पेन्तα-χα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* "Divided into two parts," Sav. V. 108.

END OF VOL. I.