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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, 1864.
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 Slavonic. He has since extended his researches to the analogies of the Celtic and the Malay-Polynesian dialects, but has not yet incorporated the results with his general Grammar. The subjects already treated of are quite sufficient for the establishment of the principles of the comparison, and it is not proposed to follow him in his subsequent investigations. The first portions of the present Grammar comprise the doctrine of euphonic alphabetical changes, the comparative inflexions of Substantives and Adjectives, and the affinities of the Cardinal and Ordinal Numerals. The succeeding Parts contain the comparative formation and origin of the Pronouns and the Verbs: the latter subject is yet unfinished. The part of the translation now offered to the public stops with the chapter on the Numerals, but the remainder is completed, and will be published without delay.

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

H. H. Wilson.

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 *s tha* 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

---

*Sanskrit* 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. *kritas*, "made," 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 Sclavonic. 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 *utriqque lingue*, 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

et fuis néesch." I do not insist on translating the adjective महान् वाह्मा by "praeclarus," but I am certain of this, that वाह्मेन and वाह्माइ are nothing else than the accusative and dative of the base वाह्मा; and that महान् वाह्माइ could be the first person of a verb is not to be thought possible for a moment. Anquetil, however, in the interlinear version of the beginning of the V. S. attempted by him, gives two other evident datives compounded with the particle म्या cha, "and," as the first person singular of the present, viz. ज्ञेनसन्त एक्जियस eamorthaie-cha, ज्ञेनसन्त एक्जियस स्रास्तोयाइ-cha (see §. 104.), by "placere cupio," "vota facio. One sees then, from the example here adduced, the number of which I could with ease greatly increase, that the Pehlvi Translator of the said Vocabulary has, no more than Anquetil, any grammatical acquaintance with the Zend language, and that both regarded it rather in the light of an idiom, poor in inflexions; so that, as in the Pehlvi and Modern Persian, the grammatical power of the members of a sentence would be to be gathered rather from their position than from their terminations. And Anquetil expressly says (II. 415.): "La construction dans la langue Zende, semblable en cela aux autres idiomes de l'Orient, est astreinte à peu de regles (!). La formation des tems des Verbes y est à peu près la même que dans le Persan, plus trainante cependant, parce qu'elle est accompagnée de toutes les voyelles (!). How stands it, then, with the Sanskrit translation of the Jizeschne made from the Pehlvi more than three centuries before that of Anquetil. This question will, without doubt, be very soon answered by M. E. Burnouf, who has already supplied, and admirably illustrated (Nouv. Journ. Asiat., T. III. p. 331), two passages from the work in a very interesting extract from its Commentary on the V. S. These passages are, however, too short to permit of our grounding on them over-bold influences as to the whole; moreover, their contents are of such a nature that the inflexionless Pehlvi language could follow the Zend original almost verbatim. The one passage signifies, "I call upon, I magnify the excellent pure spell, and the excellent man, the pure and the strict, strong like Dāmi (cf. Sansk. upamāna, "similarity;" and V. S., p. 423, दामोिस द्रुिो) Izet." It is, however, very surprising, and of evil omen, that Neriosengh, or his Pehlvi predecessor, takes the feminine genitive dāmamayās as a plural genitive, since this expression is evidently, as Burnouf rightly remarks, only an epithet of अफ्रिडोि. I abstain from speaking of the dubious expression दामोि उपमानाहे, and content myself
one in question cannot therefore be ascribed to any very late period. The necessity, indeed, of interpretation for the Zend must have been felt much sooner than for the Pehlvi, which remained much longer current among the Parsee tribes. It was therefore an admirable problem which had for its solution the bringing to light, in India, and, so to say, under the very eye of the Sanskrit, a sister language, no longer understood, and obscured by the rubbish of ages;—a problem of which the solution indeed has not hitherto been fully obtained, but beyond doubt will be. The first contribution to the knowledge of this language which can be relied on—that of Rask—namely, his treatise "On the age and authenticity of the Zend Language and the Zend-Avesta," published in 1826, and made generally accessible by V. d. Hagen's translation, deserves high honour as a first attempt. The Zend has to thank this able man (whose premature death we deeply deplore) for the more natural appearance which it has derived from his rectification of the value of its written characters. Of three words of different declensions he gives us the singular inflections, though with some sensible deficiencies, and those, too, just in the places where the Zend forms are of most interest, and where are some which display that independence of the Sanskrit which Rask claims, perhaps in too high a degree, for the Zend; a language we are, however, unwilling to receive as a mere dialect of the Sanskrit, and to which we are compelled to ascribe an independent existence, resembling that of the Latin as compared with the Greek, or the Old Northern with the Gothic. For the rest, I refer the reader to my review of Rask's and Bohlen's treatises on the Zend in the Annual of Scientific Criticism for December 1831, as also to an earlier work (March 1831) on the able labours of E. Burnouf in this newly-self with having pointed out the possibility of another view of the construction, different from that which has been very profoundly discussed by Burnouf, and which is based on Neriosengh. The second passage signifies, 'I call upon and magnify the stars, the moon, the sun, the eternal, self-created lights!'
opened field. My observations, derived from the original texts edited by Burnouf in Paris, and by 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 gōdai, āγαθοι, boni (see p. 251, Note 1, and compare Grimm I. 827.11); and to disconnect the Latin is of lupis (lupibus) from the Greek ις of λύκοις (λύκοι-σι). As concerns the method followed in treating the subject of Germanic grammar, it is that of deducing all from the Gothic as the guiding star of the German, and explaining the latter simultaneously with the older languages and the Lithuanian. At the close of each lecture on the cases, a tabular view is given of the results obtained, in which every thing naturally depends on the most accurate distinction of the terminations from the base, which ought not, as usually happens, to be put forward capriciously, so that a portion of the base is drawn into the inflection, by which the division becomes not merely useless, but injurious, as productive of positive error. Where there is no real termination none should be appended for appearance sake: thus, for example, we give, §. 148, p. 164, the nominatives χώρα, terra, gibā, &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 o (from the old ə, §. 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 ə is the long of a, and thereby when shortened nothing but a, as the latter lengthened can only become ə, extends its influence over the whole grammar and construction of words, and explains, for example, how from days, "day" (theme DAGA), may be derived, without change of vowel, dēgs (DŌGA), "daily"; for this derivation is absolutely the same as when in Sanskrit rājata, "argentus," comes from rājata, "argentum," on which more hereafter. Generally speaking, and with few exceptions, the Indian system of vowels, pure from consonantal and other altering influences, is of extraordinary importance for the elucidation of the German grammar: on it principally rests my own theory of vowel change, which differs materially from that of Grimm, and which I explain by mechanical laws, with some modifications of my earlier definitions.
narily difficult in languages not now thoroughly understood to hit on the right divisions, and to distinguish apparent terminations from true. I have never attempted to conceal these difficulties from the reader, but always to remove them from his path.

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

As the peculiarities of inflection of the latter must have, for the most part, already been discussed in the doctrine of the universal formation of the cases, inasmuch as they are intimately connected and mutually illustrative, what will remain to be said on their behalf will claim the less space, and the main compass of the second division will remain for the verb. To the formation and comparison of words it is my intention to devote a separate work, which may be considered as a completion of its antecedent. In this latter the particles, conjunctions, and original prepositions, will find their place, being, I consider, partly offshoots of pronominal roots, and partly 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, quattuor for chateuar-as, momordi for mamardas).
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.
Diümler) "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. Gott. Schmidt's
excellent tract "Quaest. Gramm. de Praæpositionibus 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-cha, "isque," which in Sanskrit is only a pronoun, in its Zend shape
skáwa ha-cha (§ 53.), often used as a preposition to signify "out of"; the
particle mo cha, "and," loses itself, like the cognate que in absque, in
the general signification.

"Remark.—What in §. 63. 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 piñtemu (mo), piñtyu, 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.

Berlin, 1833.

F. BOpp.
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 \textit{r} \textit{e} and \textit{ch} \textit{o}, which spring from \textit{i} and \textit{u} united with an antecedent \textit{a}, by a circumflex. The simple vowels are, first, the three, original and common to all languages, \textit{a}, \textit{i}, \textit{u}, short and long; secondly, a vowel \textit{r}, peculiar to the Sanskrit, which I distinguish by \textit{r}, and its long sound by \textit{\textae}. The short \textit{r} (\textit{abh}) is pronounced like the consonant \textit{r} with a scarcely-distinguishable \textit{i}, and in European texts is usually written \textit{ri}; the long \textit{\textae} (\textit{abh}) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an \textit{r} with a long \textit{i}. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin; and \textit{r} presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable \textit{ar} by suppression of the \textit{a}. The long \textit{\textae} (\textit{abh}) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the \textit{r}, where, according to the laws of the formation of cases, a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened; and in the conjugation and formation of words, those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating \textit{ch} \textit{\textae} almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel \textit{uch} \textit{ar}, \textit{uch} \textit{ir}, \textit{uch} \textit{ir}, or, after labials, \textit{uch} \textit{\textae} \textit{ir}. 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 \textit{u} \textit{l} with \textit{ch} \textit{r} (\textit{lubh}), or, when lengthened, with \textit{uch} \textit{\textae} (\textit{lubh}). We require no representative for this vowel, and shall not further advert to it.

2. Sanskrit possesses two kinds of diphthongs. In the one,
a short a united with a following i becomes ए ए (equivalent to the French ai), and with u becomes ओ ओ (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 अ with a following i becomes ए अ, and with u, ओ 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 दि for ए, and अu for ओ. That in ए ए and ओ ओ a short, in ए दि and ओ अu, a long a is bound up, I infer from this, that where, in order to avoid a hiatus, the last element of a diphthong merges into its corresponding semi-vowel, out of ए ए and ओ ओ proceed the sounds च्य अय and च्य अव (with short a), but out of ए दि and ओ अu proceed अy and अव. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding च्य अ, with an ि i, ि i, or ा u, ज u of a following word, be contracted, like the short a, into ए ए and ओ ओ, but not into ए दि and ओ अu, 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, ददा dadda with उस us makes neither ददो daddus, nor ददस daddas, but ददस daddus. The opinion I have already expressed on [G. Ed. p.3.] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend; in which अ अ always stands in the place of the Sanskrit ए ए, and अ अ or अ अ for ओ अ. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding a (short or long) with a following ए ए or ओ ओ, becomes ए दि and ओ अu; of which it is to be understood, that the short a contained in ए and ओ merges with the antecedent a into a long a, which then, with the i of the diphthong ए, becomes ए दि, and with the u of ओ, becomes ओ अu. For example, ममित्र mamāt, from मम र्तत्म mama ētat, is to be understood
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as if the diphthong रे united its first element अ with the preceding अ into डे, and with this, further united its last element (i) into रे डि. [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 अ; for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between अ, ए, and ऑ, 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 ε and ο are also wanting, and that either अ, ई, or उ corresponds, in that dialect, to our German short e. For example, faltha, "ich falte," "I fold;" gib, "ich gebe," "I give." In the Zend the Sanskrit अ a remains usually फ a, or has changed itself, according to certain [G. Ed. p. 4.] rules, into ए. Thus, for example, before a concluding m we always find ए; compare the accusative एतो puthre-m "filium" with पुत्रम putra-m; and its genitive पुत्रहेत puthra-hé with पुत्रस्य putra-sya. In Greek the Sanskrit अ a becomes ए, ο, or Ν, without presenting any certain rules for the choice on each occasion between these three vowels; but the prevailing practice is, that in the terminations of nominal bases the Greek ο answers to the Indian अ a, except in the vocatives, where an ε is substituted. In the Latin, besides ए, ए, and ए, उ 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 अ a

4. As in the Greek the short Sanskrit अ is oftener replaced by ε or ο than by a short अ, so the long अ अ is oftener re-

* Grimm, Vol. i. p. 504; with whom I entirely concur in this matter; having long abandoned a contrary opinion, which I maintained in 1819 in the Annals of Oriental Literature.
presented by η or ω than by a long alpha: and though in the Doric the long α has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an η, no similar trace of the long ἀ for ω is to be found. ὄρθαμνι δαδάμι, "I place," becomes ῥίθημι; ὄρθαμνι δαδάμι, "I give," δίδωμι; the dual termination τάμ τάμ answers to την, and only in the imperative to τον: on the other hand, the χάμαι δαμ of the genitive plural is always represented by ω. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either η or ω stand for the Indian diphthongs ऐ ए or ओ औ, formed by ऐ इ or an ओ उ following a long ए: for the first, the Greek substitutes έι or οι (because for ए α, and also for α, ε and ο are the substitutes), and for the last, ευ or ου. Thus, ἐρή ἑμι, "I go," becomes εἰμι; ψέφος, "thou mayest fall," πίπτοις; चेद वेदा, "I know," οiences; गो गो, mas. fem. "a bullock or heifer," βου-ε. From this dropping of the ι or υ in the Indian diphthongs ऐ ए and औ it

[G. Ed. p. 5.] may happen that α, ε, or ο, answer to these diphthongs; thus, एकतरस् एकतरस्, "one of two," becomes ἐκάτερος; देव देव, ἀρχι, * "brother-in-law," Latin, levir (nom. देव देव, accus. देवरस् देवर-αρ्म), becomes δανόρ (from δαμάρ, δα-πάρ); देवस देव-ας, "God," Θεός; and the ο in βο-ός, βο-ι, stands for βου-ός, βο-ι, the u of which must have passed into F, and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin bovis, bovi, and the Indian गौ gavi (locative) from गो-ि.

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. जामयेम kāmayēma, from kāmaya-ima.

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 चू; and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment: it seems advisable, therefore, to express चू by ri.—Editor.
various but sure appearances, which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms, that in Sanskrit ऋ a and ऋ d are graver than the corresponding quantity of the vowel i; and this discovery is of the utmost importance for every Treatise on special as well as comparative Grammar. It leads us, in particular, to important discoveries with respect to the Germanic modification of vowels. In Latin, also, the i may be considered as lighter than a, and generally takes the place of the latter when a root with an original a would otherwise be burthened with a reduplication of sound. Hence, for example, abjicio for abjacio, tetigi for tetagi. I am compelled by this view to retract an earlier conjecture, that the i in tetigi was produced by a virtue of assimilation in the termination i. I have also to relieve myself from my former theory, that the e in words like inermis, imberbis, instead of inarmis, imbarbis, springs from a retrospective power of assimilation in the following i, after the fashion of the modification of the vowel in German (Grimm, p. 80), and must place it in the same class with the e in such forms as abjectus and tubicen. The Latin radical a, for instance, is subject to a double alteration, when the root is burthened with antecedent syllables or words: it becomes i in open syllables, but e if the vowel is pressed upon by a following consonant unattended by a vowel. Hence we have tubicen, abjectus, in contrast to tubicinis, abjicio; and inermis, imberbis, not inirmis, imbirbis: on the contrary, inimicus, insipidus, not inemicus, insepidus. In connection with this stands the transition of the first or second declension into the third. As us is the masculine form for a, we ought to say inermus, imberbus; but inermis, imberbis, and other such forms, owe their origin to the lesser weight of the i. With the displacement of the accent, where it occurs, this change of the vowel has nothing to do; but the removal of the accent and the weakening of the vowel are nearly related, and are both occasioned by the composition. In the Lithuanian we find similar appearances; as, for ex-
ample, pónas, "lord," at the end of compounds, is weakened into ponis, as rátponis, "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 pupuïgi, tutudi; while a, in cases of repetition, is reduced to i or ē (tetigi, fefelli, &c.) In the Gothic, also, the u may boast of its pertinacity: it remains firm as the terminating vowel of nominal bases where a and i have undergone suppression, and in no single case has it been extinguished or transmuted. No power, however, exists which will not yield at last to time; and thus in the High German, whose oldest records are nearly four centuries younger than Ulphilas, the u has, in many cases, given way, or become in declension similar to i. (See also §§ 490, 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 ãna of the nominative with the termination ãna 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,
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which admits of more freedom than the genitive. In the oblique cases, however, of nouns, and in the two-fold change of vowels, it stands opposed to the u of the nominative, and in the dependent subjunctive of the verb to the u of the independent indicative.

9. Between the vowels and the consonants, or at the close of the list of vowels, are commonly placed two signs, the sounds of which are rather to be considered as appendages to, or modifications of, the preceding vowels, than as independent sounds, and take, also, no place in the alphabet of the Native Grammarians, inasmuch as they are considered neither as consonants nor vowels, but rather as complements to the latter. The first, which we distinguish by n, is called Anuswāra, "echo;" and is, in fact, a thick nasal echo, which I think is best represented by the nasal n at the end of a French syllable. The weakness of its expression is discernible in the fact that it does not, like a consonant, impede the euphonic influence of an i or u on a following s, (see Sanskrit Grammar, R. 101). It has its place before semi-vowels (ɣ y, r, l, v), sibilants, and h; and we might thence term it the nasal of the two last lists of consonants, and assign its alphabetical place between them. A concluding m, followed by a consonant of the said two lists, passes into Anuswāra; for example, तस्याम् tasyām, "in this," becomes तस्यान्त tasyānt, with the French nasal pronunciation of the n, if such a word as रात्रि rātrā, "in the night," come after. In connection with the स s of a verbal termination, a radical न n also passes into Anuswāra; as, हैस hāins, "thou killest," from हन han. Great confusion, however, has arisen from the circumstance that the Indian copyists allow themselves to express the unaltered concluding म 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 म is convertible to Anuswāra before any consonant (Pan. 8. 3. 23); and a media न or म is convertible
endeavoured, in my Grammar, to remedy this confusion in the simple theory of Anuswāra. My predecessors in the treatment of Sanskrit Grammar make no distinction between the real and the supposititious Anuswāra. Colebrooke gives it, in [G.Ed. p. 9.] general, the pronunciation of n, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding ṇ n, may be abbreviated into Anuswāra. 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 ṇ of grammatical terminations: and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswāra into ṇ or ṇ, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write abhavan or abhavang, "I was;" dantan or tantang, "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 Anuswāra is due; as vidwishām brām, for ब्रह्मविद्विषां vidwishān. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write n, for the value of Anuswāra, in the place of m in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives danan, "a gift," for dānam; the second, ohan for aham, "I." A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly m instead of a spurious or representative Anuswāra 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 Anuswāra 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 Anuswāra 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 न 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 Anuswâra; but before vowels is necessarily retained, both in writing and pronunciation. [G. Ed. p. 10.] That Von Schlegel also still continues the original न m at the end of words as an euphonic alteration of the dead sound of Anuswâra appears from his mode of printing Sanskrit text, in which he makes no division between a concluding न m and the commencing vowel of the following word; while he does make a division after न 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 तान चन्द्रवीति tān abravit, "he said to them," we must also write ताम चन्द्रवीति tām abravit, "he said to her;" not तामब्रवीति tāma bravit, for the म of ताम tām is original, and not, as Von Schlegel thinks, begotten out of Anuswâra. The conjecture of C. Lassen (Ind. Bibl. Book III. p. 39), that the Anuswâra 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 imputation of error removed from the Indian Grammarians, to whom we willingly concede a knowledge of the value of the Sanskrit signs of sound, and whom we are unwilling to censure for designating a half 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. Anuswâra 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 Anuswâra 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 tāma bravit. 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 देश daĩś, हिंस kiĩś, 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 अर am, भ्यām bhyaĩm, &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 ɪdam, and किम kiṃ, 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 शम šam. (Laghu-Kaunudì, 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 \( ɐ \). 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 \( ɐ \) 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 *laupsin-su*, "I shall praise;" as in Sanskrit हंस्यानि hansyāni, "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 Anusvāra, without regard to the following letters. Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the Sakuntala, p. 70, भावम्, which is certainly to be pronounced, not bhaavam, but bhaavan, for भगवन् 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 ḫ to distinguish it from the true ḥ h.

12. The proper consonants are classed in the Sanskrit alphabet according to the organs used in their pronunciation; and form, in this division, five classes. A sixth is formed by the semi-vowels, and a seventh by the sibilants and the र 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 bhaavān or kudhān, as the text affirms, but bha-avam, kudham, agreeably to the final न represented by Anuswāra. — Editor.
respective non-aspirates, with a clearly audible $h$; thus, for example, च $ṭh$, not like the English $th$; म $ṭh$, not $f$ or $φ$; and ख $kh$, not like the Greek $χ$.* In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other; thus, भर $bhṛ$, घर $dhar$, (भ $bhṛ$, घ $dhrī$, § 1.) “to bear,” “to hold,” are perhaps originally identical. धुम $dhuma-s$, [G. Ed. p. 13.] “smoke,” is, in Latin, $fumu-s$. In Greek, θάνω, as well as φένω, is related to हन $han$, from घन $dhan$, “to kill.” The Gothic $thliuhan$ is the German $fliehen$, Old High German $vliuhan$.

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

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

† A careful examination will perhaps shew that the several nasals of the Sanskrit alphabet are mere modifications of one sound, according to the manner in which that is affected by a succeeding letter; and that the modifications prevail equally in most languages, although it has not been thought necessary to provide them with distinct symbols.—Editor.
dig.” As regards the sonant aspirates, the Г gh of gharma, "heat" (in Greek θέρμη), has passed into the aspiration of another organ; लघु 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, ज्ञ jh, न 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 [G. Ed. p. 14.] vāch vāch, “speech,” “voice” (cf. vox), makes, in the uninflected nominative, वाच vāk; in the instrumental and locative plurals, वाचः vāgh-bhis, वाच्छ vākṣhu. In the cognate languages we have to look for, in the place of the letters of this class, first, gutturals; next, labials, on account of their mutual affinity; thirdly, the sounds of t, as, according to pronunciation, the first element of the palatals is a t or d; fourthly, sibilants, as being the last element in the letters of this class. Compare पचामि pachāmi, “I cook,” (inf. paktum, part. pass. pakta), with coquo, δέπω (δέπτω, δέπτω, δέπσω); चतुर chatur, “four,” nom. चतुरस chaturas, with quatuor, τέτταρες, τέσσαρες, Gothic fidvôr, Lithuanian ketturi; पञ्च panchan, “five” (nom. accus. pancha), with quinque, πέντε, πέμπτε, Gothic fimf; Lithuanian penki; राज रोजन, “king,” with rex, regis; राजत रोजता, nom. राजतम्, “silver” (from रोज, “to shine”), with argentum, ἀργυρός; जानु jānu, “knee,” with genu, γόνυ.

With regard to the aspirates of this class, the chh, as an initial letter in some words, answers to sc, σχ; छिंदस cchind-

* The original has ज and ज; but the appropriate symbols in English are j and its aspirate.
mas, “we cleave,” विन कि chhinadmi, “I cleave,” answers
94.4h to the Latin scindo; न्य पड chhâyā, “shadow,” to the Greek σκιά. As the terminating letter of a root chh answers, in प्रव 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, ट t, ठ ℓh; ड d, ढ dh, ण n. In the Prâkrit this class has obtained great supremacy, and has frequently supplanted the ordinary t. We there find, for example, भेंद bhôdu, for भव bhavatu, “let it be;” and पठम padhama, for प्रथम prathama, “the first.” With regard to the nasal, the substitution of ण for न is nearly universal. The Indian Grammarians approach the Prâkrit nearer than the Sanskrit, when at the beginning of roots they use the same substitution. The practice, also, which we have condemned (§. 9.), of using Anuswâra for म m, at the end of words, is more Prâkrit than Sanskrit. At the beginning of words these letters are seldom found in Sanskrit, but they are found as terminations to a certain number of roots; for example, जट 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, \( \ddot{t} \), \( \dot{t} \), \( \ddot{d} \), \( \dot{d} \). Of the aspirates of this organ, we have to remark, that \( \dot{t} \), in an etymological respect, never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by \( \theta \), but always like the natural \( t \), by \( \tau \). On the other hand, \( \dot{d} \) does correspond to \( \theta \), which also sometimes represents \( \ddot{d} \). Thus the imperative ending \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \ddot{d}hi} \), in Greek becomes \( \theta \delta \iota \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{m}}} madhu} \), “honey,” “wine,” is \( \mu \epsilon \theta \delta \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} dadh\&i} \), “I place,” \( \tau \iota \theta \mu \iota \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}}\underline{\text{\textbf{h}}} hut\&i} \) [G. Ed. p. 16.] (\( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}}\underline{\text{\textbf{h}}} hut\&i} \), §. 1.), “daughter,” \( \theta \nu \gamma \alpha \tau \nu \rho \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}}} dw\&ra} \), f. and \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} dw\&ra} \), neut. (nom. \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} dw\&ra} \)), “door,” \( \theta \omicron \alpha \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} d\&\&a} \), Lithuan. \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{d}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}}} die\&\&a} \), “God,” \( \Theta \omicron \omicron \omicron \). With regard to the hard aspirate, compare the terminations \( \tau e \) and \( \tau ov \) with \( \chi \theta a \) and \( \chi \theta a \), the former in the plural, the second in the dual of the present and future; \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \omega \) with \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} st\&\&a} \), “I shall stand”; \( \sigma \tau \epsilon \o \) with \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} asthi} \), “bone”; in the Latin, \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} ro\&a} \), “carriage”; and in the Gothic, the ending \( \theta \), in the second person singular of the preterite, with \( \theta a \); for example, \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} vais-t} \), “thou knewest,” with \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \&\&a} \), \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} vet-tha} \). From the beginning of words in the Sanskrit this aspirate is nearly excluded.

17. The interchange of \( d \) and \( l \) is well known. Upon it, among other instances, is founded the relation of \( l \alpha \text{\underline{\text{\textbf{c}}}\text{\underline{\text{\textbf{r}}}\&r} \) to \( \ddot{d} \text{\underline{\text{\textbf{a}}}\text{\underline{\text{\textbf{r}}}\&r} \). In Sanskrit, also, an apparently original \( \ddot{d} \) often corresponds to the \( l \) of cognate European languages; for example, \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} dip} \), “to light,” \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} dip} \), “lamp,” becomes \( \lambda \alpha \mu \rho \omega \), \( \lambda \alpha \mu \rho \rho \); \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} d\&\&a} \), “body,” Gothic \( \lambda \iota \iota \iota \). On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our \( l \), Gothic \( \lambda \rho \), in \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} z\&\&f} \), Gothic \( \text{\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} tw\&\&f} \), to \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} da\&\&a} \), \( \text{\\underline{\text{\textbf{w}}} \&\&a} \). 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 *līka*, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further

[G. Ed. p. 17.] support. With respect to the affinity of *λίκος* in *ηλίκος*, &c., and of the Gothic *leiks* in *hvēleiks*, "like to whom?" to हिस *driśa*, Prākrit द्रिस *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 *λίκος*, *leiks*, I was first led to that of *lif* to ḍēka; while the Lithuanian *līka* had not yet attracted my observation.

18. The labial class comes next, namely, भ प, म भ, भ ब, म भ, भ म. The hard aspirate *ph* is among the rarer letters; the most usual words in which it occurs are, पल्ल *phala*, "fruit," गन्ध *phena*, "foam," and the forms which come from the root मुक्त *phull*, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate म भ belongs, together with म ध, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, φ and ϕ are the letters which most frequently correspond to this म भ, especially at the beginning of words; for example, म भ्र, "to bear," *fero*, φέρω; म भु, "to be," *fu*-i, φι-ω. म भ is also often represented by b in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The ϕ of *fero* becomes b in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as *bėr*, *brum*, *brum*, in words like *saluber*, *candelabrum*, *manubrium*. Thus the ϕ of *fu* appears as b in the forms *amabam*, *amabo*, which I have recognised as compounds, and which will be hereafter explained. The dative and ablative termination plural म भयास, becomes *bus* in Latin. The nasal of this class, म भ, 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 Anuswāra, if followed by a semi-vowel, a sibilant, or ṭ 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 न, though protected in its original condition by a pause, or by the following letters, written as Anuswāra.

19. The semi-vowels follow next: य y, र r, ल l, व v. We distinguish y by the sound of our German j, or the English y in the word year. As the Latin j in English has the sound of a softened y, so in Prākrit य y often passes into ज j, and in Greek, upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of ζεύγωνον, ζωγός, &c. to the root युज yuj, "to bind," and that of the verbs in अत्य to the Indian verbs in अयाम ayāmi; for ζ is ड, but the sound डच is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian जवन javān, "young," to the Sanskrit Theme युवन yuvan, Lat. juvenis, belongs to this place. By v we here designate the sound of the German w and English v. After consonants, as त्वाम tvām, "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 (vixī), victum, spring from viv; and in facio I recognise the Sanskrit causal भवायम bhāv-ayā-mi, "I make to be," from the root भ bhū. The connection between fac-tus and fio is practically demonstrated. Refer back, in the Old and Modern Greek, to the occasional hardening of the Digamma into γ (cf. C. G. Schmidt in the Berlin Jahrbuch, 1831, p. 613.). The voice cannot dwell on व v or य y; 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 divis (divis being forbidden, see §. 94.).
from छो dyā. Nominal bases in y do not exist. र r at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with स s. In places where the concluding s, by favour of the following letter, is retained, र r becomes स s; and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where स s becomes र r, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20. The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskrit works च l often stands for र r.* We often, also, find in the cognate European languages l for व v. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix lent (e.g. opulens), and of the Gothic laud(u)-s† (see § 116.), in hvēlunds, “quantus,” svalunds, “tantus,” samalunds, “just so much,” to the Sanskrit वन् vant (in the strong case, § 119.), in words like धनवन् dhanavant, “endowed with wealth,” नावन् tāvant, “so much,” यावन् yāvant, “how much.” On the change between v and r is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German pir-u-mès, “we are” (sing. pim, भवामि bhav-ā-mi), to भवामस bhav-ā-mas; as also that of scribr-u-mès, “we shriek,” to चावामस śrāv-ayā-mas, “we make to hear” (§ 109.); as also that of triusu, “I fall,” from the [G. Ed. p. 20.] root trus, to the Sanskrit चव dhwās, “to fall”;‡ and of the Cretan τρέ “thee” from τρέ, to the Sanskrit twā. The semi-vowel l is also exchanged with the nasals; thus, अन्यास 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 aśrika for aśrīka.—Ed.
† Grimm (iii. p. 46) assumes an adjective laudus, “great;” which, as far as the Gothic at least is concerned, might be dispensed with, as it is of the greatest antiquity as a suffix, and does not appear alone as an adjective, even in the oldest periods.
‡ Dh, according to § 16., = the Greek δ; and to the δ, 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.
CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

The last class embraces the sibilants and $h$: झ ् , ् श, ् स, and ् ह. 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 when a hard palatal च ch or च चh follows; for instance, राम ष चरति रामास चरति, instead of राम ष चरति रामास चरति, “Rāmas goes.” In its origin, झ ् appears to have sprung from क; and in Greek and Latin we find κ and c regularly corresponding to the Sanskrit झ ् . 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 ् $s$, pronounced like ् sh. Compare decem, देका, Gothic taihun, Lithuan. dęxtiis, with तदन् daśun (nom. तदा daśa): canis, कौन, Gothic hunds, Lithuan. szuo (gen. szuns), with ् घुन ् सुन (nom. घा सुड, gen. गृहम् सुनस, kuvōs), “dog;” दाख् ल or lacrima, oszara, f. with घ ज अश्व n. “tear;” equus (= ecvus), Lith. aszwfa f. “maré,” with घ ज अश्वा (nom. घ ज अश्वं aśwas), “horse;” szaka f. with घ ज अश्वा सखः “bough.” The Lith. szventa-ś, “holy,” answers to the Zend एश्वूङ्ग्यम् श्वेंता (§. 50.). At the end of a word, and in the middle before strong consonants, झ ् is not allowed, although admitted as an euphonic substitute for a concluding झ ् before an initial hard palatal. Otherwise झ ् usually falls back into the sound from which it appears to have originated, namely, क. In some roots, however, झ ् passes into ट ्; for instance, हर् ट्रि, “seeing;” and विश तिः, “a man of the third caste,” form, in the uninflected nominative, हर् ट्रि, विश तिः. The second sibilant, श, 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 स s; thus, for instance, after क k, स s never follows, but only श sh; and the र r, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by श ksh. Compare दुक्षिण dukṣhina, with dex-ter, deξίος; Lithuanian dėzinię, “the right hand.” Of the vowels, i, u, and i, short or long, are averse from श s, to which a and त alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, स s passes into श sh; for instance, ततः त ताळि, instead of ततः त ताळि (extendh). As an initial, श sh is extremely rare: the Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change स s into श sh, from the first with a श sh. A word which really begins with श sh is पुर शार्श, “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 त t, थ th, श sh is not permitted, but in most roots passes into क k; but with some into त t: the number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, पुर शात.

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 ब b, श sh, र r, : ah or ह Visarga (§. 11.), and u; and only remains unaltered before त and th. We write, for example, सुनुष्टिरति sūnus tarati, “the son passes over,” but तरति सुनु: tarati [G. Ed. p. 22.] sūnūḥ, सुनुष्टिरति sūnus charati (it), सुनुष्टिरति sūnur bhavati (est). This sensitiveness against a concluding श s can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division; as in the cognate languages the concluding s remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for r does not return into its original form. Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, §. 383-4.) ρ everywhere stands for s: Τιμόσεος ὁ Μιλήσιορ—παρακατικόμενορ—λυμαίνεται τὰρ ἀκούρ τῶν νέων, &c.* The Sanskrit could not endure

* Cf. Hartung, p. 106.
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, factesum, 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, arbus, is related to the word of such frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, urvara, "tree." This expression is not wanting in the Sanskrit, (urvarâ;) but it signifies, according to Wilson, "fruitful land," and "land" in general.

23. 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 t, d, k, or g. In Greek we often find χ in the place of the Sanskrit h: compare χεμυων, hiems, with हिम hima, "snow," "rime;" χαίρω with ह्रिस्म hris̯-. [G. Ed. p. 23.] γαῦμι, gaudeo; χήν with हस hânsa, "goose;" χβές, heri, with ब्यस hyas, "yesterday;" ओχος with वह vah, "to transport." We also find κ, ṝ, for h: compare καρδία, cor, Gothic harto, with ह्रिद hrid (n. ह्रिदय hridaya), "heart." We sometimes, but rarely, find the spiritus asper substituted for h; for instance, ṛipēω, ह्रामि harâmi, "I take away." The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes sz for h; for instance, asz, "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 द्वि dhi, we generally find hi; on which account the grammarians accept हि hi, and not द्वि dhi, as the original ending, and assume that hi passes into dhi, for euphonic reasons, after consonants. The root ग्रह grah, "to take," is written in the Vedas ग्रह grabh, and answers thus more nearly to the German greifen, and the Persian giriflan.
We give here a general view of the Sanscrit characters, with their respective values.

**VOWELS.**
- अ a, आ ā, इ i, ई ī, उ u, ऊ ū, रँ ri, ऋ ri.

**ANUSWĀRA AND VISARGA.**
- ए n, ऐ ah.

**CONSONANTS.**
- Gutturals: ख kh, ग g, घ gh, ङ n.
- Palatals: छ ch, च chh, ज j, झ jh, ङ n.
- Linguals: ट t, ठ th, ड d, ढ dh, ण n.
- Dentals: त t, थ th, द d, ध dh, न n.
- Labials: प p, फ ph, ब bh, भ bh, म m.
- Semi-Vowels: य y, र r, ल l, व v.
- Sibilants and Aspirates: श s, झ sh, ष s, 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 (ॅ) or connected with another vowel. ख k is thus read ha; and k by itself, or the absence of the a, is expressed by क. इ i, ई ī, are expressed by ई, ई, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates; for instance, क इ ki, को kī. For उ u, ऊ ū, च र i, च र i, the signs ग, घ, ङ, are placed under their consonants; as, कु ku, कू kū, कृ kṛi, कृ kṛi. For द d and द ध i, द ध i are placed over their consonants; as, कॆ kē, कॆ kāi: को ध and चू ध u are written by omission of the च, which is here only a fulcrum; as, को हो, कृ हाव. 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, ठ, ड, ढ we have त, ठ, ड, ढ; and thus mātsya is written मत्स्य, not मत्स्य; for न + न we have न; and for व + य we have य.
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 \( \hat{r} \), 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 \[ \text{[G. Ed. p. 25.]} \] 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 \( \text{Vṛiddhi} \), 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 \( \text{Vṛiddhi} \) in prefixing a long one: in both, however, the \( a \) melts into a diphthong with the primitive vowel.

---

according to certain euphonic laws. इ, namely, and ऋ, melt with the ए a of Guna into ए ए; उ ऋ, ऋ ऋ, into ओ ओ. These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into आ आ आ and ऋ ऋ ऋ; ज ज ज and ज ज ज become, in virtue of the action of Guna, ए ए ए; by that of वृद्धि, ओ ओ ओ. As in Greek the

[G. Ed. p. 26.] short Sanskrit ए is frequently replaced by e; so we find the Guna here, when a radical ऑ or ओ is prolonged by prefixing an e. As in the Sanskrit the root इ, “to go,” forms, by the Guna modification, एमि (from ए-एमि), “I go,” in contrast to इम, “we go;” thus in Greek also we have έμ in contrast to έμ. As the root बुध būdh, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into बोध bōdh (from bauḍh), for instance, बोधमि bōḍhāmi, “I know;” so in the Greek* the root φυγ (έφυγον), in the present becomes φευγ. 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 ए and ओ of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskrit. Compare bauγ, “I bent,” in contrast to bugum, “we bent,” with the Sanskrit form of the same signification, singular बुझेन būjheṇa, plural बुझेनिम būjhēṇima, of the root बुज bauj; compare वैत, “I know,” in contrast with vitum, “we know,” with the Sanskrit forms of the same signification, वेद veda (from vaïda), विदिम vidima, from the root विद् vid, “know,” which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

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

* Regarding Greek ο as Guna of ऋ, see §. 491.; and as to Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian, see §§. 255.3, 741., 746.
bugs, and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally, in the present tense, to the prevalent \(i\) of terminations a retro-active influence. It now, however, seems to me indisputable that Grimm’s 8th and 9th conjugations of the [G. Ed. p. 27.] first class correspond to my first Sanskrit conjugation (r. 326.); so that the Guna \(a\) of the special tenses has been weakened to \(i\), while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of \(a\); just as in the 10th, 11th, and 12th conjugations, according to Grimm’s division, the radical \(a\), which has remained in the preterite singular, is, in the present and other tenses, weakened to \(i\); so that, for instance, \(a/\) “I” and “he eat,” corresponds to the root \(सत्\) \(ad\), “to eat;” but in the present, \(i/\) \(a/\) stands in place of the form \(चिन्द्र\) \(admi\), “I eat.”*

28. The Zend possesses, besides the Sanskrit Guna, which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskrit, a vowel application peculiar to itself, which likewise consists in \(a\), and which was first observed by M. E. Burnouf.† The vowels which admit this addition in the interior, but not at the end of words, are, first, the short \(i\), \(u\), \(o\); 2dly, the Guna diphthongs \(e\) \(e\) and \(o\) \(a\). The two latter are the most usually befriended by this addition, and \(e\) \(e\) 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 \(र्र\) \(cha\), “and,” is appended to it; hence, for example, \(र्र\) \(स्म\) \(nairë\) “hominë,” \(र्र\) \(कस्म\) \(dhe\) \(re\), “igni”; but \(र्र\) \(कम\) \(naraëcha\), “hominique,” \(र्र\) \(कम\) \(dhe\) \(raëcha\), “ignique.” Also where an \(e\) stands in two consecutive syllables, an \(a\) is placed before each. Hence, for instance, \(र्र\) \(हङ्ग\) \(स्म\) \(अद्विवं\) \(देवी\) \(वाद\), from राजमय देवियाः. 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, ने is remains without the preceding s a, is when it is produced by the influence of a या, out of आ or या अ. We say, indeed, याविष्ठम् येब्यस्

[G. Ed. p. 28.] याबिष्ठ, "quibus," from येब्यस् येब्यस; but not येब्यस, but येब्यस येब्यस, "I glorify," from the Sanskrit root, which has been lost, for the verb यास या, from which comes यास्य यास, "glory." Yet we find, for या, येति, "if" (cf. यदि yadi), sometimes, though perhaps erroneously, also येति येति. The addition of the या before भा is just as unlimited, but the occasion is far less frequent. Examples of it are, यास् यास् "strength," from योजनस् भास्; यास्यक्षेत् कराया, "he made," from क्रि क्रि, according to the fifth class, for क्रि क्रि क्रि क्रि; यास्यत् म्रा, "he spoke," from यास्यत् म्रा, which would be the regular form, instead of क्रीडऩ म्रा (Gramm. Crit. r. 352.). We also find यास्यत् म्रा, "I spoke," for क्रीडऩ म्रा, which would be the form used were, in the Sanskrit adjunct tenses, as in the Greek, a mere nasal, and not सम am, the suffix of the first person. The vowels ज़ इ and ज़ उ are much more sparing in their attraction of the ज़ अ now in question: they refuse it always at the beginning of words, and in the middle before two consonants; and if transferred from the end of a word to its middle, by an adventitious termination or word, they do not acquire the capacity of being wedded to an ज़ अ. We say, for example, जेष्ठ जेष्ठ, "this" (accus.), not जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ ; जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ, "a pair," not जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ; जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ, "montibus," not जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ जेष्ठ. The उ also, according to set rules, very frequently abstains from the उ अ; for instance, जरूर u r u r u, (animae) not जरूर u r u r u, from विरुद्ध u r u r u; on the contrary, जरूर u r u r u, "young," from तु० u r u r u. Where, however, the Sanskrit उ u is replaced by उ o (§. 32.), an उ अ is placed before it, as well at the beginning as before two consonants; and in this case उ o stands in this respect in the same category as ने and

[G. Ed. p. 29.] उ o. Compare जावृष्ठ रुशेच्, "light," with
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alphabet in giving the corresponding value of each letter in [G. Ed. p. 30.] the Zend. The Sanskrit short अ a has two, or rather three, representatives; the first is अ, which Anquetil pronounces as ऋ or ऋ, but Rask, certainly with truth, limits to ऋ. The second is ऋ, which Rask pronounces like the short ऋ of the Danish, or like the short German य, as in Hunde, or as ऋ in cane in English, and ऋ in the French après. I consider this ऋ as the shortest vowel, and write it ऋ. We often find it inserted between two consonants which form a double consonant in the Sanskrit; for instance, युद्ध dudarēśa (pret. redupl.), for the Sanskrit दुद्ध dadarśa, “he” or “ I saw;” युद्ध daddēmahi (V. S. p. 102), “we give,” for the Vēda form दस्सि dadmasi. This shortest ऋ is also always appended to an originally terminating र. Thus, for instance, तुर्य न antari, “between,” युद्ध dātarē, “giver,” “creator,” युद्ध hvarē, “sun,” stand for the corresponding Sanskrit forms न्यान्त अन्तर, दातर dātar, श्व स्वर, “heaven.” It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final ऋ म, and generally before a final य न, and frequently before an intermediate vowelless य न, the older अ ऋ becomes ऋ ऋ. Compare, for instance, युद्ध pulhrē-m, “filium” with युद्ध putra-m; युद्ध anh-ēn, “they were,” with यशस्व अस्व, यज्ञ; युद्ध हेंल-ēm, “the existing one,” with सन्नाम संत-am, प्रसेंतेम, अब-सेंतेम. This retro-active influence of the nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin termination म; as, for instance, लेम, स्लेमus (Sanskrit तिष्ठेय-म, तिष्ठेत, तिष्ठेम). 31. Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a letter differing but little from the ऋ ऋ above discussed, but yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, ऋ, which Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish ऋ. We find this letter usually in connection with a following उ, and this vowel appears to admit, with the excep-
logically to the Sanskrit ज, ज or diphthong formed by च a and र u; thus, for example, the nominal bases in u, which in the Sanskrit genitive, by the influence of Guna, i.e. by the prefixing of a short a, make द-s, form, in Zend, आु eus. Compare, for instance, आवस्म पासुs with पासोस, from पासु, “ pecus.” And yet the Sanskrit ज does not universally become eu in Zend, but often remains as it is, and specially in cases where it arises out of the termination as, by the solution of the s into u. According to its pronunciation, ञ eu would appear to be a diphthong, and to form but one syllable, as in our German words heute, Leute, &c. The long a (अ) is written उ.

32. Short and long i are represented, as are long and short u, by special characters, ज i, ज i, ज u, ज उ: Anquetil, however, gives to the short i the pronunciation e, and to the short u (अ) that of o; while, according to Rask, only उ is pronounced as short o.* This short o frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit ज u, and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong ज in particular, we have generally the Zend ए o: we yet find, sometimes, also ए o; for instance, एस gôs, “bo$$,” is more frequent than एस gôs, for the Sanskrit गी gôs.

33. The Sanskrit diphthong ज, formed out of द + अ, is represented by अ, which, especially as a terminating letter, is also written ṣ, and which we, as in Sanskrit, represent by द. We must here, however, observe, that the Sanskrit द is not always preserved as अ in the Zend, but is sometimes replaced by द, which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding य, especially at the end of words. The Vṛiddhi diphthong द द (out of द + अ) is always represented by द द; द, either by the equivalent द—for which we often find भ a substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above-mentioned ञ eu, which, according to rule, before a terminating अ s replaces the Indian ज.

* But see §. 447. Note.
so that a termination in ओऽऽ is unheard of in the Zend. For the Vṛiddhi diphthong शऽऽ (out of शऽऽ) we generally find ओऽऽ, for which there is a special character ओऽऽ; more rarely ओऽऽ ओऽऽ. It would appear that ओऽऽ ओऽऽ, ओऽऽ ओऽऽ, and the ओऽऽ ओऽऽ which replaces ओऽऽ ओऽऽ, should be pronounced as diphthongs, i.e. as monosyllables.

34. Anuswara and Visarga do not exist in Zend, unless we admit the nasal specified in § 61. as answering to the sound of the Sanskrit Anuswara. 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, थ and थ; of which the first, which we represent by k, only appears before vowels and ओऽऽ; the other, which we write c, precedes especially consonants, excepting ओऽऽ. Compare, for instance, थऽऽ kā, थऽऽ kāṭ (quis, qua, quid), थऽऽ kāṭaḥ hakērēt, "once," थऽऽ थऽऽ kārōṭi, "he made," थऽऽ kāva, "where," with थऽऽ kā, का kā, जैमिक kim, सकृत sakrīt, करोतित karaṭīt, and थऽऽ kāva: on the other hand, थऽऽ थऽऽ caṭhātra, "king," with थऽऽ kṣattra; थऽऽ थऽऽ hiciṭī, "pouring out" (V. S. p. 198), with थऽऽ sikti (from थऽऽ sikhī). In what manner the pronunciation of this थऽऽ c differs from that of the थऽऽ k can indeed hardly be defined with certainty: it is probably softer, weaker than that of the थऽऽ 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 ः k. Burnouf considers ः as an aspirate, and writes ः ः ः ः takılmahē. He writes, on the other hand, the letter ः, which Rask treats as an aspirate, with q. Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that ः c is found before r, which, according to Burnouf's just
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remark, generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however, as insufficient; and think that \( c \) 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 \( k \).

It would be impossible for \( r \), and the other letters of similar agency, to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if \( kh \) be not extant in Zend; so that, for instance, the root \( kh \) khan, "to dig," sounds \( khan \) kan in Zend. There are, however, some words in which \( kh \) is represented by \( c \). From \( kh \) khan, "ass," we find the accusative \( cak \) carèm; and we find, also, the \( kh \) of \( sakh \), "friend," replaced by \( c \); the accusative, for instance, \( sakh \), "friend," transformed into \( cak \) hacàim. It may therefore remain a question whether \( k \) or \( c \), in respect of their sounds, have the better right to be referred to \( kh \); but this much is certain, that \( k \) before vowels and before \( v \) is only represented by \( k \) in Zend; before other consonants only by \( k \); which latter we shall, till better advised, continue to render by \( c \).

35. Anquetil ascribes to \( k \) the value of \( x \), 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 \( k \), and our German \( ch \). Burnouf renders \[ G. Ed. p. 34. \] \( k \) by \( q \); and observes (l. c. p. 345) that the Sanskrit syllable \( swa \) becomes \( qa \) in Zend, namely, in \( swapna \), "sleep," written, according to Burnouf, \( qafno \), and in \( swa \) (suis), "his." We are inclined to add to these examples, \( swa \) khanha, (nom.) accus. \( cak \) khanhrèm, from \( swa \) swasad, "sister" (soror); \( swasad \) swasàram (sororem); and \( swa \) kharèno, "splendour," as related to \( swa \) swar, "heaven," and \( su \) sur, "to shine." We must, however, at the same time, remark, that \( swa \) does not universally become \( kh \), and that \( swa \) in particular, in an isolated position and with a possessive signification, much oftener appears in the shape of \( hva \),
or that of श्वाय hava. We render ɡ by kh, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to č, our ch, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian č 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 ɡ kh is derived from the Sanskrit श्व a, it was not applied to replace the k before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either u or v (œ) accompanies the Persian č when the latter replaces at the beginning of a word the Sanskrit श्व. It is true that ō u 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 धिā khudd, "God," with स्वद्वृत्त swayālāta, "self-given;" for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit. r. 608), श्वायम्बुष्भ khadda*; which Anquetil, or his Parsi teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to धिां khudd; while Neriosengh properly translates it by स्वयंदृत swayandatta. The Persian धिā khudd is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend श्वायम्बुष्भ khadda, 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 श्वू स्वाभिā, "self-existent," and also the more common श्वयम्बू swayambhā, as appellations of Brahma and Vishnu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

* This word comes from the root dḥā, "to place," not from dā, "to give," see §. 637.
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khudd, 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. \(\text{स्व} sw\), in particular, in the Gothic, either remains unaltered, or becomes sl (§. 20.). The pronominal syllable \(\text{स्व} swa\) exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb, \(\text{स्व} (so) \) "thus;" and with an instrumental form, \(\text{स्व} (wie) \) "how." The neuter substantive \(\text{स्वेस} \) (Theme \(\text{स्वेसा} \)) means Eigenthum, "property," as in Sanskrit the neuter \(\text{स्व} swa \). I know of no certain form in which a Germanic \(g\) or \(k\) corresponds to a Sanskrit \(\text{स्व} sw\) or a Persian \(\text{क्ह} kh\). To return, however, to the [G. Ed. p. 36.] Persian \(\text{क्ह} k\) = \(\text{स्व} sw\): compare \(\text{क्हु} k\) haftan, "to sleep," with \(\text{स्व} swap \); \(\text{क्ह} kh(w)\)ab, "sleep," with \(\text{स्व} swāpa \); \(\text{क्ह} kh(w)\)andān, "to sing," with \(\text{स्व} swan, "to sound;" \(\text{क्ह} kh(w)\)ahar, "sister," with \(\text{स्व} swasri,\) Gothic svistar; \(\text{क्हु} k\) har, "sun," Zend \(\text{ह्वारे} \) hvarē, with \(\text{स्व} swar, "heaven." In some words \(\text{क्ह} kh\) 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, \(\text{ख़िराम} \) kharām-īdan, "to proceed with pomp," corresponds to the Sanskrit \(\text{त्स्र} k\)ram, "to go," "to step;" and \(\text{ख़िर} \) kharīdan, "to buy," to the Sanskrit equivalent root \(\text{त्र} krī.\) The Persian \(\text{क्ह} kh\) answers to the Sanskrit aspirated \(\text{क्ह} kh\), in the word \(\text{क्ह} khar, "ass"\) (Sanskrit \(\text{कर} \) khara).

36. The guttural \(\text{g} \), and its aspirate \(\text{घ} \), are represented by \(\text{घ} g\) and \(\text{घ} gh\). The Sanskrit \(\text{घ} gh\) has, however, sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend; at least \(\text{घरेमा} \) garēma, "heat" (Wärme), answers to the Sanskrit \(\text{घर} \) gharma: on the other hand, the \(\text{घ} \) ghna in \(\text{घरेथ्राग्ना} \) vērāthragna, "victorious," corresponds to the Sanskrit \(\text{घ} \) ghna at the end of compounds; for instance, in \(\text{सत्रु-घ} \) satru-ghna, "enemy slayer." The Zend \(\text{हरेथ्राग्ना} \) vērāthraghnā properly signi-
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phies, like the word so often used in the same sense vērēthra-zan, "killer of Vṛitra," and proves a connection between the Zendish and Indian mythologies, which, however, in consequence of the obscuration of meanings in Zend, and the oblivion of the old Myths, now only exists in affinities of speech. "Killer of Vṛitra" is one of the most usual titles of honour of the prince of the lesser gods, or Indra, who, from his slaughter of the daemon Vṛitra, of the race of the Dā-

[G. Ed. p. 37.] nawas, bears this name.

We shall discuss the nasals apart in §. 60.

37. Of the Sanskrit palatals the Zend has only the tenuis; namely च ch ( = च), and the media, namely ज j ( = ज): the aspirates are wanting, which is not surprising, as they are of rare occurrence in the Sanskrit. The following are examples: सचराचिर charaiti, "he goes," Sanskrit चराचिर charati; चतुर्वारीs chatuwa'ari, "four" (nom. plur. masc.) Sansk. चतुर्वारस chatuwaras, चत्तारो chatuwaro; चोजाडो ajo, "strength," Sansk. चोजस् ājus, चोजो ājo. It is, however, to be observed, that, while the Sanskrit ch remains, by rule, unaltered in Zend, the sonant j is often replaced by other letters; and first, by ज z; for instance, मज़ा zāta, "born," Sansk. जात jāta; secondly, by ज sh; for instance, शजो sānu, "knee," Sansk. जानु jānu.

38. The modification of the sounds of t, peculiar to the Sanskrit, contained in the third row of consonants, is wanting in the Zend. We pass, therefore, to the ordinary sounds of that letter, the dentals. These are, ऐ t (०), ल थ (य), अ d (०) ध dh (०), together with a ऐ t (०), peculiar to the Zend, of which more hereafter. The ऐ t is like the guttural which we represent by k (£), in this respect, that its position is almost limited to one preceding vowels. Before र r and य y, and sometimes before य y, in order to gratify the affection of the latter for an aspirate, the aspirated ल th steps in. Thus, for instance, ठ थwaim signifies "thine," while the nominative is written ठय tām, and the genitive ठय tava; and the word ठय tār, "fire," nom. ठय tām
dtars, makes, after rejection of the a which preceded r,ār̥mār̥ā, “igni,” pār̥mār̥ā r̥thā, “ab igne,” &c. If, however, the t be protected by a preceding consonant, excepting n, the succeeding semi-vowel is thereby deprived of its retro-active power. We find, for instance, vāstra, not vās̥tra, “garment,” “vest;” but we have maṇṭha, “speech,” not maṇṭra, from the root maṇ. 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 (त) is represented by a special letter, namely, by t, which we, with Burnouf, write t, but formerly wrote with a simple t undotted below, because no change is possible with iators or iators. 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 ē is written iators as well as iators; the last, which prevails at the end of words, with a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our iators from iators. Before consonants, for instance, in the word ṭṅaṣṭhō, 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 iators has merely a feebler pronunciation than iators, 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 iators, in Prākrit, and also in Greek, is, at the end of words, altogether suppressed.

39. iators is the ordinary d ट, and iators according to Rask’s just remark, its aspirate dh. This represents the Sanskrit टू dh, for instance, in the imperative ending टि. The Zend, moreover, favours iators dh for ATORS d in the middle of words between two vowels. We find, for instance, ददा dāta, “given,” but ददी daddāmi, Sanskrit ददामि daddāmi, “I give”; and ददा mazda-dhāta, [G. Ed. p. 39.]
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"given by Ormusd," "created"; येद्हि yēdhi, "if," Sanskrit यद् yadi; पाद्हा pādha, "foot," Sansk. पाद pāda.

40. The labial class embraces the letters �� p, ज j, फ f, ब b, and the nasal of this organ न n, of which more hereafter. �� p answers to the Sanskrit प p, and is transformed into ज j by the retro-active aspirative power of a following ॠ r, ओ o, and न n; whence, for instance, the preposition प्र p (pro, πρό) becomes, in Zend, अ फ r; and the primitive words ज्ञ ap, "water" (aqua, and perhaps ἀφρός,), ज्ञाः kērēp, "body," form in the nominative, ज्ञो द्न o, ज्ञाः kērēṣ; on the other hand, in the accusative, ज्ञाः अपेम, ज्ञाः kērēpem, or ज्ञाः kēhrpem. In regard to the power which resides in न n of aspirating a p, compare ज्ञाः t fnu, "burning," from the root याः tap, with the derivative from the same root ज्ञाः अहार, ज्ञाः ahar, "day." (Gramm. Crit. r. 228. annot.) Originally—i.e. standing for itself, and not proceeding from the �� p by the influence described— ज j is of very rare occurrence. In some instances known to me it corresponds to the Sanskrit ब b, which, however, for the most part, in the Zend has rejected the aspiration. In Anquetil's Vocabulary we find नाफ nāfa, "navel," which in Sanskrit is written नाभी nabhī; and in the fem. accus. plural, of frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, नाफ hufedhrīs, we recognise the Sanskrit सुभद्रा 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 य y in the [G. Ed. p. 40.] next place, by which we express the sound of the German and Italian ज j, the English consonantal y. This
semi-vowel is written at the beginning of words by й or ѣ, and in the middle by the duplication of the u ї, as in the Old High German we find w expressed. This semi-vowel, and the vowels which correspond to it, ѣ i and ѕ i, introduce into the preceding syllable an ѕ 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 ѕ 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, ṝmy nairē, "hominis," for ṝmy nareē, is frequent; but ṝmy narēcha, "hominique," is an exception. The vowels after which, by the attractive power of the letters mentioned, an ѕ i is placed, are a, a, ѕ u, ѕ a, ѕ e, ѕ a, as to which we must also observe, that ѕ in the case of a succeeding i, is lengthened. Examples are: ṝmy maitdhya (मध्य madhya) "middle"; ṝmy nairya, "man"; ṝmy bavaiti, "he is"; ṝmy dadhāṭiti, "he gives"; ṝmy dāpayēti, "he shines"; ṝmy kērēnōtī, "he makes"; ṝmy śūidhi, "praise," instead of ṝmy śudhi, from the root ṝmy stū (स्तू); ṝmy lūirya, "the fourth," from चतुर्दश chatur, with the च cha suppressed; ṝmy āhuirya, an adjective, derived from ṝmy ahura. With regard to the influence of ѕ y we must observe, that it does not mix up an ѕ 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 ѕ n, the retroactive power of y, i, or ѕ, is neutralized; thus ṝmy aśī, ṝmy aisti, stands for "he is"; on the other hand we have ṝmy bavaiti, Sansk. bhavanti, "they are." Several other consonants also resist simply [G. Ed. p. 41.] this power of attraction; thus we have ṝmy dakhyu, not
dakhyu.
duikhyu, "land," "province"; and the i of the personal terminations अः mi and अः hi, or अःः shi, obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, अःःः mahi, not अःःःः maithi, corresponds to the Veda termination मस masi; and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in अ a, अःः a-हे, not अःःः ahе, stands for अय a-sya.

42. अःः sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following अ a or अः अ, which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of i, and consequently effects their transmutation into अ अ; thus the bases of nouns in

* The expression of the text is ""auseert umlantenden 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 (Träbung) 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 ex-
\textit{ta} form, in the genitive, \textit{ya} \textit{ya}-\textit{hē}, instead of \textit{ya}-\textit{hē}; and, with the verb, the old Sanskrit \textit{ya} or \textit{ya} \textit{yd} of the fourth and tenth classes, in the present singular becomes \textit{ya} \textit{yē}. Compare \textit{dāpayēmi}, \textit{dāpayēhi}, \textit{dāpayēiti} with the Sanskrit \textit{dāpayāmi}, \textit{dāpayāsi}, \textit{dāpayāti}. In the last syllable, \textit{ya} before \textit{m}, according to rule, becomes \textit{tā}; and after the same analogy, \textit{vam} becomes \textit{um}. We find, therefore, for instance, \textit{tārē} \textit{tērya}; and \textit{thrishum}, \textit{tortiam partem}, \textit{thrishva}, \textit{chathrushum}, \textit{quartum partem}, \textit{chathrushva}. This appearance is to be thus understood, that the antecedent semi-vowel, after the suppression of the \textit{a}, passes into its corresponding vowel, which, however, according to the rule of \S. 64., must be a long one. The \textit{y}, after its influence has transformed \textit{a} into \textit{e}, is often itself suppressed; thus we find \textit{frādēṣaēm}, \textit{I shewed}, from \textit{prādēṣayam}, which

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{frādēṣaēm}
  \item \textit{I shewed}
\end{itemize}

ternal cause; because I think I can shew that the Ablaut also is produced by the particular quality and condition of the termination. Whether, however, we seek for the radical vowel in the present or the preterite, the change is equally one quite different from that of the Indian \textit{Guna} or \textit{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, \textit{i} and \textit{u} with \textit{e}, \textit{æ}, \textit{o}. In respect of signification, likewise, there is a difference between the Indian \textit{Guna} and \textit{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, \textit{Guna} and \textit{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 \textit{Bopp} has appended to the above passage of the Vocalisms. – \textit{Trans.}

* Cf. p. 963, Note.
according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिः dis. The genitive termination स्या sya appears everywhere reduced into हें hें. The semi-vowels ज्ञ y and ग v are generally suppressed after preceding conso-

[43. In Sanskrit, ज्ञ y is sometimes, for euphony, inter-
poSed between two vowels (Gram. Crit. rr. 271. 310. 311.); but this does not uniformly occur. In Zend, the interpo-
tion of ज्ञ between > u, य u, and a following व v, seems to amount to a law. Thus the Sanskrit ब्रेवे bruve, “I say” (from ब्र and र, Gram. Crit. r. 55.), becomes, in Zend, 燔न्ज्ञ mrive (§. 63.); and the neuter form दुे duे, “two,” after the vocalization of the v into u, takes the form ज्ञन्ज्ञ duve.

44. We have already remarked (§. 30.) with respect to आ थ, that at the end of a word an ए e is always appended to it; for instance, ज्ञन्ज्ञ dātare, “Creator,” “Giver”; ज्ञन्ज्ञ hvar, “Sun,” instead of ज्ञन्ज्ञ dātār; ज्ञन्ज्ञ hvar. In the middle of a word, where an ए h is not introduced according to §. 48., the union of आ थ with a following con-
sonant is mostly avoided; so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless आ an ए is appended: thence, for instance, ज्ञन्ज्ञन्ज्ञ dārēsa, from ददन्ज्ञ dārēsa, “vidi,” “vidit”; or the थ is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of आ थ with two following con-
sonants. (Gram. Crit. r. 34.) Hence, for instance, ज्ञन्ज्ञ म ज्ञ dāhrava, “priests” (nominative), accus. ज्ञन्ज्ञ म ज्ञ ज्ञ dāhra-

vanem, from the theme ज्ञ म ज्ञ dāvarvan, which in the weak cases (§. 129.) contracts itself into म ज्ञ म ज्ञ dāhurun or म ज्ञ म ज्ञ dāhaurun. (§. 28.) To this, also, pertains the fact that poly-
syllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in ज्ञ ar, at the be-

* But see § 721.
The combinations जौ त्र्य, [G. Ed. p. 43.]
»/* उर्व, are only permitted where a vowel follows, and the combination मल्यम only as a termination, and in the middle of a word before तः इः; for instance, जौ ल्यम तैर्यम्, "the fourth"; जौ ल्यम् वैर्यम्, "strong"; मन्त्र उर्वान्, "soul" मल्यम् हार्वा, "whole" (?); मल्यम् अतर्स्, "fire" (nominative); मल्यम् नार्स, "of a man"; मल्यम् हर्स, "ploughed"; but मल्यम् चाहर्स, "four times," for मल्यम् चाहर्स, since here no ऐ precedes the र्.

45. It is worthy of remark, that in the Zend the १ is wanting, as in Chinese the r, while, nevertheless, it exists in the modern Persian, and shews itself in words which are not of Semitic origin. The Sanskrit व् ज् has three representatives in the Zend, ज्, », and अः. The two first are so far distinguished from each other in their use, that ज् corresponds to the Sanskrit ज् only at the beginning, and » only in the middle of words; for instance, ज्ञर्यः वैम्, "we," = व्यम् वायम्, मल्यम् तवा (तव) = तव तवा. This distinction, as Rask justly assumes, is only graphic. अः, which I, with Burnouf, render by अ, most frequently occurs after th, so that » never accompanies an antecedent th. On the other hand we find » much oftener than अः after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the अ ध्, which, according to §. 39., stands for अ ध् (अ), is only followed by », while an original अ ध्, corresponding to a Sanskrit ध् ज्, only appears in conjunction with अः. Thus अम् अम् दाहवाद्, "having created," "given," from the root अम् दाह्, answers to the Sanskrit ज् ध्, only appears in conjunction with अः. Thus अम् अम् दाहवाद्, "having created," "given," from the root अम् दाह्, answers to the Sanskrit ज्ञर्यः वैम्; while the accusative, of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad, ज्ञर्यः अध्वानेम्, seems to be identical with the Sanskrit ज्ञर्यः अध्वानेम्, "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 combination with inflectional terminations; thus आध्रा for आध्र, forms आध्रा, आध्रावनेम्, not आध्राव, आध्रावनम्, &c.—Editor.
† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit ज्ञर्यः, see §. 637.
In the Vendidad (Olsh. p. 23), the nominatives driwis, “beggar,” and daiwis, “a worshipper of Daeva.” But daiwis, as derived from daeva through the suffix *i, seems to me dubious, and I prefer the variation *daiwis. Or is it between *i and *i also that *w only can be allowed? Another instance is, anwy, “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 *ap, “water” in such a manner, that after suppression of the p,* the Sanskrit termination bhyas, which elsewhere, in the Zend, appears only as bhod, has weakened itself to bhwyd, 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 i, aiwi, for which, however, jAs aihi is sometimes substituted. It may be appropriate here to remark that *bh appears in the Zend, in other company, in the enfeebled shape of *w. We find, namely, the base ubha, “both,” not only in the shape uba, but also in that of awna ovar (§. 28.), the neuter dual form of which I think I recognise in the Vend. S. p. 88., where awna ovar ameshe spenté, can hardly signify any thing else than “ambos venerandi Amschaspantos” (non communi: Sanctos, see Nalus, vv. 25, 26.) Anquetil interprets (T. 3, p. 472.) ovar, by “tous deux.” We have still another position to mention, in which

† Burnouf reads abi (i.e. “over”) and makes yasne, signify “reverence.”
priate than the harder » v. The only example of this case is the feminine जलविन् जलविन् sword, "sword," "dagger," in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit द्वारका subhra, "shining,"

As to the pronunciation of the » w, I think, with Burnouf, that it accords with the English w, which also is akin to the Sanskrit व v after consonants. Rask reverses the powers, pronouncing the Zend » as the English v, and the letters ष and » as the English w.

46. I have not detected in the v and w a power of attraction similar to that which belongs to the ज j, as described in §. 41., unless the term स्वर्य स्वर्य haurea, "all," which often occurs, as well as श्वसन्ति vispa, is derived from the Sanskrit स्वर्य sarwa, "all." I have, however, already elsewhere ascribed to the corresponding vowel » u a power of attraction, howbeit sparingly exerted; in virtue of which, for instance, the base स्वर्य स्वर्य द्वारका āttarvan, "priests," in the weak cases (see §. 129.), after that स्वर्य वान has contracted itself into » un, by the influence of this u, also converts the a of the preceding syllable into u; hence, for instance, in the dative, स्वर्य स्वर्य द्वारका āttarunē for स्वर्य स्वर्य द्वारका āttarunē. The Sanskrit स्वर्य saruṇa, "young," is, in Zend, स्वर्य स्वर्य तुरुṇa or स्वर्य स्वर्य तुरुṇa (§. 28.); and वसु vasu, "thing," "riches,"

[G. Ed. p. 46.] has, by the influence of the concluding u, converted itself into स्वर्य स्वर्य तुरुṇa vōhu.

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 स s and न n, and find ourselves compelled to assign the same also to the

* The accusative सुन्दरसुदसुन्दरसुद is sucrain, appears in Olshausen, p. 13, with the variation सुन्दरसुद sufrain. (§. 40.) Then we often find the instrumental सुन्दरसुद सुन्दरसुद suvraja, for which, however, we must read सुन्दरसुद सुन्दरसुद suvraja, if suvraja be not derivable from a Theme सुन्दरसुद सुन्दर, after the analogy of सुन्दरसुद सुन्दर, from सुन्दर sundura. (Gramm. Crit. r. 270.)
labial nasal, by which, for instance, the feminine participle जगमुषी jagmushi has changed itself to धरुजम Jagmushi. The dental medial is free from this influence, for we find मुष्वो daa, “two,” मुष्वो druæs, “a demon,” (accus. मुष्वो druæs, मुष्वो druæs.) not मुष्वो druæs, मुष्वो druæs. The guttural medial is, however, exposed to this influence, as in the abovementioned instance of jaghmushi. We have, on the other hand, adduced, in §. 38., a limitation of this appearance.

The aspirating virtue of the य is less potent than that of the र and र, and we find य often preceded by the unaspirated र; for instance, in मः्र्र्र्र्र्र बीया, “the second,” मः्र्र्र्र्र्र थृत्या, “the third”: on the other hand, we have मः्र्र्र्र्र्र मेरेत्यु, “death,” Sansk. मृत्रु मतियु.

48. In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before र, when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an ह is usually placed; for instance मः्र्र्र्र्र्र माह्रका, “death,” from the root मः्र्र्र्र्र्र मा (मः्र्र्र्र्र्र मी), “to die”; श्र्र्र्र्र्र शेर्पेम, or श्र्र्र्र्र्र वेर्पेम, “the body” (nom. मः्र्र्र्र्र्र वेरी); मः्र्र्र्र्र्र वेरका, or मः्र्र्र्र्र्र वेरेका, “wolf,” (वृक्के वृक्के.) The semi-vowel य also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an उ ए; thus, मः्र्र्र्र्र्र थृह्या, “through thee,” corresponds to the Sanskrit नृह् twayā; and the word नृह्या csahya (nom. नृह्या) [G. Ed. p. 47.] csahyo adduced by Rask, stands for मः्र्र्र्र्र्र csaya and comes from the root मः्र्र्र्र्र्र csai, “to rule,” (चिक कशि.)

49. We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, श, which we express by s in Sanskrit, and ʃ in Zend, is written ʃ 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 श s; thus, for instance, daśu, “ten,” सात “hundred,” paśu, “beast,” are common to both languages. In this respect ʃ s has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit; that before several consonants,
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namely, \( \varphi \), \( t \), \( k \), and \( n \), as well at the beginning as in the middle of words—in the latter place, however, only after \( \omega \) \( a \), \( \omega \) \( d \), and \( \nu \) \( an \)—it corresponds to the Sanskrit dental or ordinary \( s \). Compare \( \text{स्तरः स्तरा् } \) stārö, “the stars,” with \( 
\text{स्तारस् स्तारा् } \) stāras; \( \text{स्ताक्ष्मां स्ताक्ष्मी } \) stākṣmi, “I praise,” with \( 
\text{स्ताक्ष्मि स्ताक्ष्मी } \) stākṣumi; \( \text{स्तिः स्ती } \) stī, “he is,” with \( \text{स्तिः स्ती } \) stāti; \( \text{स्तानम् स्ताने } \) stānem, “ossium,” with \( \text{स्तिः स्ती } \) stāhi; \( \text{स्तं किं धना् } \) dhanda, “shoulder,” (?) with \( \text{स्तं किं धना् } \) skandha; \( \text{स्तं किं धना् } \) sād, “to purify,” with \( \text{स्तं किं धना् } \) sād, “to bathe.” We might infer from this circumstance that \( s \) \( s \) 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 \( s \) \( s \) occurs also at the end of words after \( \nu \) \( an \). The occasion for this presents itself in the nom. sing. masc. of bases in \( \text{सं } \) nt.

50. The semi-vowel \( \nu \) is regularly hardened into \( \varphi \) \( p \) after \( \omega \) \( s \); hence, for instance, \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) vispa, “canis.” \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) spānem “canem,” \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) vispa, “all,” [G. Ed. p. 48.]

\( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) aspa, “horse,” corresponding to the Sanskrit \( चाः स्वधा } \) svād. \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) svānam, \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) visāva, \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) asīva. \( \text{विस्पाः विस्पा } \) spenta, “holy,” is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit \( \text{त्वं } \) svanto, which must have originally been in use, and which the Lithuanian \( \text{स्तं } \) szanta-s indicates. From the Zend \( \text{चाः स्वधा } \) aspa, the transition is easy to the Greek \( \text{ιππός } \), which is less obvious in the case of the Indian \( \text{स्वधा } \) asva.

51. For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant \( \varphi \) \( sh \), the Zend supplies two letters, \( \omega \) \( s \) and \( \nu \) \( s \). The first, according to Rask, is pronounced like the ordinary \( s \), and therefore like the Sanskrit dental \( s \) \( s \); while \( \nu \) \( s \) has the sound of \( \varphi = sh \), 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. \( \varphi \) \( sh \) denotes the Sansk. \( \varphi \).
that भ is used in the Pehlevi for भ, 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, भ almost everywhere corresponding to प भ. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidad, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects भ as well as प भ corresponds to the Sanskrit प भ, the principal position of भ 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 भ resembles, among the dentals, त t, among the gutturals श s, and among the nasals principally न n. At the end of words, indeed, भ s corresponds to the Sanskrit श s, but yet [G. Ed. p. 49.] only after such letters as, in the middle of a word, would, according to Rule 101(*) of my Sanskrit Grammar, change an original श s into प भ; namely, after vowels other than अ and ए, and after the consonants श c and ष r. Hence, for instance, the nominative भ भ paitis, “Lord,” भ पासus, “beast,” भ दारस drues, “daemon,” from the theme भ भ drug. On the other hand, भ भ भ भ pares, “bearing,” from भ भ भ भ barant.* In the word भ भ भ भ cvesus, “six,” it is true a terminating भ s stands after a; but it does not here replace a Sanskrit श s, but the original प भ of प भ shash. As evidence of the use of भ s for प भ before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix भ श sista (i.e. ṣṭoṣ), corresponding to the Sanskrit भ श isītha. Other examples are भ श भ भ भ karsa, “ploughed,” for क्रेष्टa krishṭa. In the word भ भ भ भ sayana “camp,” भ s stands irregularly for श s, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskrit भ भ भ भ sayana (cf. saēlē, §. 54.) In the fem. numeral

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

52. श stands for the Sanskrit श sh be— [G. Ed. p. 50] fore vowels and the semi-vowels ज य and » v; compare ज्ञानस्य aetāśaum and मुन्यायोग्यम aetūśya, with तेषाम् तेषाम् “horum,” and सतेपु तेषाम् “in his”; ययाः marshya, “man,” with मनुष्य manushya. Yet श sh does not unite itself with an antecedent त c; but for the Sanskrit श ksh we find almost everywhere in Olshausen’s text, and without variation, यक्ष cs; hence, for instance, मक्षकṣ cṣaṭha, “king,” Sanskrit खष्ठ kṣatra, “a man of the warrior-like or royal caste.” The word of frequent occurrence, मक्षकṣ cṣnaōma, and the third person connected with it, मक्षकष्ठमयेति cṣnaōmayağiti, we must, on a double ground, reject, and prefer the variation given at p. 33, since श s here is prolonged, as well by the preceding c as by the following न n. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the Sanskrit श kṣh in many Zend words abandons the guttural, and appears as श sh. For instance, दक्षिण dasshina, “dexter,” becomes दक्षिण dasshina (Lithuan. dēsinė, “the right hand”), and अखिं akṣhi, “eye,” becomes अक्षिं ashi, which, however, seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrihi).

53. त h is never, in etymological respects, the representative of the Sanskrit त h, but of the pure and dental sibilant त s. Before vowels, semi-vowels, and m, in Zend, this letter invariably becomes त, possibly because ख sw (§. 35.) takes the shape ख 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 त s. The [G. Ed. p. 51.]
roots which begin with स्प sp and स्फ spha have not yet been detected by me in the Zend; but I am convinced that स्प्रिश spris, for instance, “to touch,” could not begin otherwise in Zend than with स्प sp. Compare, for instance—

ZEND. | SANSKRIT.
---|---
मृष hā, “they,” | सा sā.
मृष्य hapta, “seven,” | सप्त sapta.
मृष्श hakērit, “once,” | सक्रिय sakrit.
मृष्द ahi, “thou art,” | अश asi.
मृष्दह ahmāi, “to this,” | अमाई asmāi.
मृष्शह vharē, “sun,” | स्वर swar, “heaven.”
मृष्श hva, “his,” | स्व swa.

The word ग्पुष्ख हिश्वa, “tongue,” from निःहा jihwa, deserves mention, because the sibilant quality of the ज j is treated as स s, and replaced by श h (§. 58.).

54. I do not remember to have met with an instance of the combination श ष hr; the Sanskrit word सहस्र sahasra, “thousand,” which might give occasion for it, has rejected the sibilant in the last syllable, and taken the shape श्हास्त्र hazastra. If, in the word ग्पुष्ख huṣka, “dry,” Sansk. शुष्क śuṣku, श replaces the Sansk. ध s, we must remember that the Latin siccus indicates a Sansk. ध s, because c regularly answers to ध s. In many instances of Sanskrit roots beginning with ध 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 धिज्ञ siddha, “perfected,” in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad श्हास्त्र shāistēm; after the analogy of मृष्शि यि irīsta, “deceased,” from श्री ष्ट irīth (see §. 99.) Olshausen notifies (p. 29) as variations of श्हास्त्र shāistēm— श्हास्त्र shāistēm, श्हास्त्र shāistēm, श्हास्त्र shāistēm, and श्हास्त्र shāistēm. In all these forms, the long a presents a difficulty; for, according to §. 28., धिज्ञ shidh would give the form स्त्राश्न shaidh; and this, with the suffix ता,
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...shaišta, in the nom. and accus. neut. šaišlem. 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 plaise à cette terre (que nous habitons), et la rende favorable, runs, in the original (Olsh., p. 29, Burnouf, p. 137), -ןאָם סאָן שֵּאָיָן מְנַהַּלַּםスポーツָק וּכְּרִיהַּם יַשְּאָלַּם. Dātarē gaēthinānām aśvaitinānām ashāum! kva paoirēm an-hāo zēmō shāišlem? “Creator mundorum existentium, pure! ubi (quid) primum hujus terrae perfectum (bonum?”)

55. The nominative pronominal base סְיָה (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 ס, converted into אָסְיָה, after the analogy of rule 101 of my Grammar. I have detected a similar phenomenon in the Zend pronouns; for we find רָשׁ יֶה, “ejus,” “ei,” which is founded on a lost Sanskrit ס ס (cf. סְيָה, “mei,” “mihi,” and ס יֶה, “tui,” “tibi”), when it follows רָשׁ יָצִי, “if,” taking the form רָשׁ יֶצִי (more correctly, perhaps, סְיָה שֶה); for instance, at p. 37 of Olshausen: while on the same page we find רָשׁ יִפּוּלֶמוּלֶמוּל יָצִי (text, יִפּוּלֶמוּל יָצִי כְּעָלָה) [G. Ed. p. 63] “and if to him.” In the following page we find a similar phenomenon, if, as I can hardly doubt, רָשׁ שֵּה (thus I read it with the variation), corresponds to the Sanskrit सस्ति आसु ("ille," "illa"): סְיָהֵנוּלֵנוּל וּכְּרִיהַּם יַשְּאָלַּם מְנַהַּלַּם, Nōt zi ēm zāō shāō yā (text, יַשְּאָלַּם yād) derēgha adarsta (text, יַשְּאָלַּם adarsta). “For not this earth which lies long unploughed.”

560. An ו h standing between a or å and a following vowel is usually preceded by a guttural nasal (ג n); and this appendage seems indispensable—I remember, at least, no exception—in cases where the following vowel is a, å, or eş. We find, for instance, נָאָסְיָהֵנוּלֵנוּל usazayanha, “thou wast born”; while in the active the personal ending יֵה הִי of the present admits no nasal; and we find, for
instance, अहि ahi, "thou art," बासहि bacsahi, "thou givest," not अन्हि anhi, बासान्हि bacsanhi.

56b). The termination as, which in Sanskrit only before sonant consonants (§. 25.) and श a, dissolves its स into श u, and contracts the latter together with the preceding आ into शो (compare the French au, from al): this ancient termination as appears in Zend, as also in Prākrit and Pali, always under the shape of श. On the other hand, the termination दs, which in Sanskrit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the स, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of श o (for [G. Ed. p. 54.] u); and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,* that in Sanskrit the suppression of a terminating स after आ had preceded the vocalization of this स into श. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an ज श precedes the श h which springs out of the स of the syllable दs, or where, before the enclitic particle शा cha, the स above mentioned is changed into श स, together with these substantial representatives of the स, its evaporation into श 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 मास mās, "luna"—an uninflected nominative, for the स belongs to the root—receives in Zend the form माद mād, in which ओ represents the Sanskrit स; माश्च māś-cha, "lunaque," gives us माशोच्च māśoścha, and माश्च मāśam, "lunam," मादोन्हेम mādorhēm; so that in the two last examples the Sanskrit sibilant is represented by a vowel and a consonant. The analogy of मादोन्हेम, "lunam," is followed in all similar instances; for example, for तास तसा "suit," we find मोन्हा मोन्हा, and for तासम तसम, "earum," मोन्हाम mōn̄hām†.

---

† Burnouf is of a different opinion as to the matter in question, for in
57. Two sibilants remain to be mentioned, namely, \( \gamma \) and \( \varsigma \), of which the former was probably pronounced like the French \( z \), and may therefore be replaced \(^{[G.\ E d.\ p.\ 55.]}\) by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskrit \( \varphi \) for the most part, which never corresponds to the Zend \( \varsigma \). Compare, for example,

**SANSKRIT**

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{अहम्} & \text{ aham, "I," } \\
\text{हस्त} & \text{ hasta, "hand," } \\
\text{सहस्त्र} & \text{ sahasra, "thousand," } \\
\text{हंति} & \text{ hanti, "he strikes," } \\
\text{वहःति} & \text{ vahati, "he carries," }
\end{align*} \]

\[ \text{दि} \quad \text{ hi, "for," } \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{जीहवा} & \text{ jihvā, "tongue," } \\
\text{महात} & \text{ mahat, "great," } \\
\text{भर} & \text{ "bears," }
\end{align*} \]

**ZEND**

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{azeem} & \\
\text{zaśta} & \\
\text{hazaura} & \\
\text{zainiti} & \\
\text{vazaiti} & \\
\text{zi} & \\
\text{hizva} & (§. 53.) \\
\text{mazō} & \text{(from mazas, acc. } \text{mazanhem})
\end{align*} \]

58. Sometimes \( \varsigma \) appears also in the place of the Sanskrit \( \gamma \); so that the sibilant portion of this letter, pronounced \( \text{dsch} \), is alone represented, and the \( \text{d} \) sound suppressed (see §. 53.). Thus \( \text{yaz} \), "to adore," answers to the Sanskrit \( \text{yaj} \); \( \text{zaōsha} \), "to please," springs from the Sanskrit root \( \text{jush} \), "to please or gratify." Thirdly, the Zend \( z \) represents also the Sanskrit \( \gamma \) \( g \), which is easily accounted for by the relationship between \( g \) and \( j \). The Indian \( g\), (accus. \( gām \),) \( bos \) 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 \( \text{mdohho} \) to \( \text{manaitho} \), without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, \( \text{mdosh-cha, "lunaque," urvāraosh-cha, "arboresque,"} \) he says, "In \( \text{mdengho} \), there is perhaps this difference, that the \( \text{ngō} \) does not replace the Sanskrit \( \gamma \), 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 βῶς and ἄγως gāos, or ἄγως gāus, correspond to the Sanskrit nom. गाः gāus.

[G. Ed. p. 56.] For the signification "earth" the Greek has preserved the guttural, which in Zend is replaced by \( z \). The nom. गाः zāō supposes an Indian form गाः gās, for गो गाः gōs; in the accusative, गन् zāim agrees, in respect of inflection, as closely as possible with गाः gām and गूऩ.

59. \( o \) is of less frequent use, and was probably pronounced like the French \( j \): we write it \( zh \). It is observable, that as the French \( j \) in many words corresponds to the Latin semi-vowel \( j \), and derives from it its own development, so also sometimes, in Zend, \( o \) \( zh \) has arisen out of the Sanskrit औ y. Thus, for instance, यूस्म् यूयाम, "you," (vos), becomes ṣवोजञु yūzhēm. Sometimes, also, \( o \) \( zh \) has sprung from the sound of the English \( j \), and corresponds to the Sanskrit ज j, as in ज्ञेश्वम् zhēmu, Sanskrit जातु jāṇu, "knee." Finally, it stands as a terminating letter in some prefixes, in the place of the Sanskrit dental म s after व and ज; thus, त्वरस्पष्टिः нिझबाराई, "he carries out"; दुज्ह-ुटेम, "ill spoken": on the other hand, दुज्ह-मतेम, "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 \( \mu \) 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, हांकरायिम् hānkārayēmi, "I glorify"; पांचा pancha, "five"; बुऩ्यानेतेम būshyantēm: on the
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other hand, \(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{n}\) (nom.) “man”; \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{j}\) nolit, “not”; \(\mathfrak{x}/\mathfrak{j}\) barayen, “they might bear”; \(\mathfrak{x}/\mathfrak{n}\) anyu, “the other.” Concerning the difference between \(\mathfrak{y}\) and \(\mathfrak{x}\)—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that \(\mathfrak{x}\), being always fenced in by strong consonants, must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer \(\mathfrak{y}\); and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation, would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter.

61. Still feebler and more undecided than \(\mathfrak{x}\), perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anuswāra, we conjecture to have been the nasal \(\mathfrak{y}\), which is always involved with \(\mathfrak{a}\), and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of \(\mathfrak{a}\) and \(\mathfrak{y}\). We find this letter, which we write \(\mathfrak{a}n\), first, before sibilants, before \(\mathfrak{w}\ h\), like the Anuswāra, and before the aspirates \(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h}\) and \(\mathfrak{f}\); for instance, \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}n\) csayanes, “regnans,” accus. \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}n\) csayantēm; \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}n\) zanhyamāna, a part of the middle future of the root \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}z\), “to beget,” but, as it seems to me, with a passive signification (“qui nascetur,” Vend. S. pp. 28 and 103.); \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}n\) manthra, “speech,” from the root \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}m\) man; \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}n\) janfnu, “mouth,” probably from the Sanskrit \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{a}j\) jot, “to pray,” §. 40., and with the nasal inserted. Secondly, before a terminating \(\mathfrak{m}\) and \(\mathfrak{n}\). We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination \(\mathfrak{a}_m\) \(\mathfrak{a}d\) is always changed to \(\mathfrak{a}n\) ain in Zend; for instance, \(\mathfrak{a}n\) dadhaim, “I gave,” Sanskrit \(\mathfrak{a}_d\) adādām; \(\mathfrak{a}n\) pādhanaim, “pedum.” Sans. \(\mathfrak{a}_d\) pādānam; and that the termination of the third person plural, \(\mathfrak{a}n\) an, provided the \(\mathfrak{a}\) do not pass into \(\mathfrak{e}\), always appears as a double nasal \(\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{n}\) ain.*

62. For the nasal, which, according to §. 56., is placed as an euphonic addition before the \(\mathfrak{w}\ h\), which springs from \(\mathfrak{s}\) s, the Zend has two characters, \(\mathfrak{z}\) and \(\mathfrak{s}\), to both which

---

* The termination ain from an 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 w h. As to the difference in the use of these two letters, z always follows a and do; 6, on the contrary, comes after i and e, for which the occasion is rare. For instance, in the relative plural nom. येन्हेन येन्हेन, “qui,” and in the fem. pron. genitives, as खेदादू खेदादू, “hujus,” which often occurs, but as often without 0 and with 0 n. खेदादू खेदादू. What phonetic difference existed between 6 and 0 we cannot venture to pronounce. Anquetil as we have seen, assigns the same pronunciation to each; while Rask compares 0 with the Sanskrit palatal 3 n, and illustrates its sound by that of the Spanish and Portuguese 3.

63. The labial nasal 3 m does not differ from the Sanskrit न: it must, however, be remarked, that it sometimes takes the place of b. At least the root बु brū, “speak,” in Zend becomes 3?c mru; as फ़ूँ फ़ूँ mra1m, “I spoke,” फ़ूँ फ़ूँ mra1m, “he spoke”: in a similar manner is the Indian मुख mukha, “mouth,” related to the Latin bucca; and not [G. Ed. p. 59.] much otherwise the Latin mare to the Sanskrit वारि vāri, “water.” I consider, also, multus related to बहुल bahula, the Greek πολύς, and the Gothic fillu.

64. A concluding 3 m operates in a double manner on a preceding vowel. It weakens (see §. 30.) the α a to 3 e; and, on the other hand, lengthens the vowels i and u; thus, for instance, 3 ये paitim, “the Lord,” 3 ये tanum, “the body,” from the bases 3 ये paiti, 3 ये tanu. In contradiction to this rule we find the vocative of frequent occurrence, 3 ये ashtum, “pure.” Here, however, 33 ये, as a diphthong, answers to the Sanskrit ये ये, 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 \( \text{\textit{a\hspace{1mm}shavan}} \); with an irregular conversion of the concluding \( \text{\textit{j\hspace{1mm}n}} \) into \( \text{\textit{m}} \).

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

Simple Vowels: \( \text{\textit{aj, \text{\textit{a}, \text{\textit{e}, \text{\textit{e}, \text{\textit{u}, \text{\textit{o}, \text{\textit{u}}}}} \)}} \)

Diphthongs: \( \text{\textit{aw}, \text{\textit{au}, \text{\textit{oi}, \text{\textit{oi}}}}} \)

Gutturals: \( \text{\textit{k}} \) (before vowels and \( \text{\textit{v}} \)), \( \text{\textit{e}} \) (principally before consonants), \( \text{\textit{kh}} \) (from \( \text{\textit{sw}} \), before vowels and \( \text{\textit{y}} \))

Palatals: \( \text{\textit{ch}} \)

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

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

Semi-vowels: \( \text{\textit{e}}, \text{\textit{aw}}, \text{\textit{y}} \) (the two first initial, the last medial), \( \text{\textit{r}}, \text{\textit{r}} \) (the last only after \( \text{\textit{f}} \)), \( \text{\textit{v}} \) (the first initial, the last medial), \( \text{\textit{w}} \)

Sibilants and \( \text{\textit{h}} \): \( \text{\textit{s}}, \text{\textit{sh}}, \text{\textit{s}}, \text{\textit{zh}} \) (or like the French \( \text{\textit{j}} \))

Nasals: \( \text{\textit{n}} \) (before vowels, semi-vowels, and at the end of words), \( \text{\textit{n}} \) (before strong consonants), \( \text{\textit{an}} \) (before sibilants, \( \text{\textit{h}}, \text{\textit{th}}, \text{\textit{f}}, \text{\textit{m}}, \) and \( \text{\textit{n}} \))

Remark also the Compounds \( \text{\textit{aw}} \) for \( \text{\textit{ah}} \), and \( \text{\textit{aw}} \) for \( \text{\textit{st}} \).

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

* E.g. \( \text{\textit{n\hspace{1mm}a\hspace{1mm}havan\hspace{1mm}ra}} \), "a thousand."
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 समन् saplan; tāhun, "ten," with दशन् dasan.

67. We believe ourselves authorized to lay down as a law, that ए 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 ए a in the Gothic either remains unaltered, or disappears: it never becomes i.

68. In the Old High German the Gothic a either remains [G. Ed. p. 61.] 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 ए a; compare, for instance, in the genitive of the bases in a वृक्ष vrika-sya, Gothic vulfi-s, Old High German wolfe-s. In the dative plural wolfu-m stands to vulfa-m in the same relation as above (§. 66.), sibun to saplan. The precedence of a liquid has also, in Old High German, sometimes converted this a into u or o; compare plinte-mu(mo), caco, with the Gothic blindamma. Also after the German j or y, which in Sanskrit (ऋ 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, "caeca," as a fem. nom. sing., and neuter nom. acc. voc. plural; plintu "caecam." The u of the first person present, as kipu, "I give," Gothic gibu, 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 gu, Sanskrit स sa or सम् sam, we
have an example in which the Gothic-Sanskrit ā has become i.

69. For the Sanskrit चाः ā, the Gothic, which has no long a, almost always substitutes ō (§. 4.), and this ō, 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. ō is softened to a, whence gibō, gibō-s (§. 118.). Generally in the Gothic polysyllabic forms, the concluding चाः ā is shortened to a; and where ō stands at the termination, an originally succeeding consonant has been dropped; for instance, in the gen. plur. fem. ō stands for चानं āṁ. Sometimes, also, in the Gothic, ō corresponds to the Sanskrit ā, as in the gen. plur. masc. and neuter. In the Old High German the Gothic ō either [G. Ed. p. 62.] remains ō, as in the gen. plur., or divides itself into two short vowels; and, according to differences of origin, into oa, ua, or uo; of which, in the Middle High German, uo prevails; while in the Modern High German the two divided vowels are contracted into ū. For the Gothic ē = चाः ā, the Old, Middle, and Modern High German have preserved the old ē, except in the gen. plural.

70. For इ i and इं ī 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 miṁ. Sometimes a short i is substituted, as in lich, answering to the Gothic leiks, "like," at the end of compounds. On the long i, in wir, "nos," Gothic veis, we can lay no stress, as we match the dat. sing. mir also with the Gothic mis. It is scarcely worth remarking that we usually, in writing, designate the elongation of the i and other vowels by the addition of an h.
71. While the original ए a has undergone many alterations in the Germanic languages, and has produced both i and u, I have been able to detect no other alterations in i and i than that i is as often suppressed as a; but it never happens, unless some rare exceptions have escaped me, that i is replaced by a heavier vowel a or u.* We may lay it down as a rule, that final i has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin. Compare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sanskrit</th>
<th>greek</th>
<th>latin</th>
<th>gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>परि pari,</td>
<td>περι,</td>
<td>per,</td>
<td>fair. (§. 82.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपरि upari,</td>
<td>उπερ,</td>
<td>super,</td>
<td>ufar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सति asti,</td>
<td>est,</td>
<td>ist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सति santi,</td>
<td>ἑντι,</td>
<td>sunt,</td>
<td>sind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* The Sanskrit धिः piti, "father," probably stands for पति 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 य, 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 \( i, \dot{i}, \) 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 prevaded the Old High German universally: we find, for instance, arpi, "hereditas," not erpi; zahari, "lacrymae," 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, d, u, and o are modified into ae, ü, and ö; ð into æ, and uo into ue. Thus the plural geste, drate, brüche, köche, læne, gruese, from gast, drât, bruch, koch, lôn, 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 ä, short or
[G. Ed. p. 65.] long, from short or long a; and in the same relation, ü from u, ö from o, ä from au; for instance, Bründe, Pfütze, Dünste, Flüge, Küche, Töne, Bäume, from Brand, Pfal, &c.

76. För ḷ u, ḷ u, the Gothic has u, which is generally short. Among the few examples cited by Grimm, p. 41, of long u, we particularize the comparative sūtizō, the essential part of which corresponds to the Sansk. सादु swādu, “sweet,” (षो०-००), 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 pūdum, “to dwell,” and 튦०००, “to trust,” correspond to the Sanskrit roots भ० bhū, “to be.” ध० dhirū “to stand fast”—from which comes ध० dhrūva, “fast,” “constant,” “certain” (Gramm. Crit. r. 51.)—with the Guna form of which (§. 26.) the Goth. buan, trauan, is connected; cf. भवं bhav-ītu, “to be,” ध्रवं dhrav-ītu, “to stand fast.” The Middle High German continues the Gothic Old High German ā, but the Modern High German substitutes au, whence bauen, trauen, Taube (Gothic dābō).

77. As out of the Sanskrit ḷ u, in Zend, the sound of a short ḷ has developed itself (§. 32.), thus, also, the Gothic u shews itself, in the more recent dialects, oftener in the form of o than in its own. Thus have the Verbs in the Old and Middle High German (Grimm's 9th conjug.) preserved a radical u in the plur. of the pret., but replaced it by o in the passive part. Compare, for instance, bugum, “we bend,” bugans, “bent,” with Old High German pukumēs, pukanēr, Middle High German bugen, bogen. The example adduced shews, also, the softening of the old u to e, in unaccented syllabes, 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 रः (a + i) and ची (a + u), the Gothic has ai and au, which are also monosyllabic, and were perhaps pronounced like रः e and ची o. Compare bavaima, "aedificemus" with भवेम bhavema, "simus"; sunau-s, "of a son," with its equivalent सुनोस sunos-s. Where these Gothic diphthongs ai and au have maintained themselves unaltered in value, they then appear, in writing, as e and o, which must be considered as contractions of a + i and a + u; as in the Latin amemus, from amaīmus (§. 5.); and as in the almost solitary case of bōs, the long o of which is the result of a contraction of a + u, whose latter element appears again before vowels in the independent shape of v (bovis, bovem), while the first element o, in its degeneration, appears as o (§. 3.). Compare,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चरेम</td>
<td>charēma (camus),</td>
<td>faraima,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चरेत</td>
<td>charēta (eatis),</td>
<td>faraih,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेभ्यास</td>
<td>tēbhyaś (his),</td>
<td>thaim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79. In like manner, in all subjunctives, and in the pronominal declension in which the adjective bases in a take part, an Old High German e corresponds to the Sanskrit रः e and Gothic ai. The Middle High German has shortened this e, as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (varen, varei). 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 रः e and ची o, but, as Grimm conceives, approximate to the Vṛiddhi-change (§. 26.) रः ai and ची au: in such case the High German e, o, as opposed to the Gothic ai, au, are not merely continuations of these Gothic diphthongs: but the pronunciation assigned by the Sanskrit to the union of a with i or u, must have been first introduced into the Germanic, under certain conditions, in the eighth century.
preserved the diphthong ə 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>OLD</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>HIGH GERMAN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aiw, “avum,”</td>
<td>lwain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaius, “nix,”</td>
<td>snéo,</td>
<td>sné.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mais, “magis,”</td>
<td>mér,</td>
<td>mé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laisyvan, “docere,”</td>
<td>lérän,</td>
<td>lèren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lathv, “commodavit,”</td>
<td>lēh</td>
<td>lēch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Modern High German this ə is partly preserved, partly replaced; for instance, mér (mehr), Schñé (Schnee), Sélé (Gothic saivala); but ich lieh, gedieh. (Grimm. p. 983.)

80. As the ə for the Gothic ai, so the ə for au, in the Old and Middle High German, is favoured by certain consonants; and those which favour the ə 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, ə under the condition above mentioned, and next ou, §. 34., in the absence

[G. Ed. p. 68.] of the letter which protects ə. For instance, Old High German zōh, Middle High German zóch (traxi, traxit) Gothic tauh, Sanskrit तुष्टी dudáha (mulxi, mulsi.); but pouc, bouc, flexi, flexit, Gothic baug, Sanskrit वृद्धिब्धोजन bu-bhója. The Modern High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong au, either, like the Middle and Old High German, as ə, and in a more extended degree, and subject to the modification of §. 75; or next, shortened to o,
the particulars of which will be explained under the verb, or, thirdly, as *au*; for instance, *daupya, “I baptize,” hlaupa, “I run”; or, fourthly, as *eu*, §. 83.

81. As Ulfilas, in proper names, represents both *e* and *ai* by *ai*, and likewise *o* and *au* by *au* (*Paitrus, Galeilaia, apaustalus, 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 *ü*, and *au* by *u* or *o* (§. 77.); but in the others, *ai* is replaced by *e*, or (§. 85.) by *ei*, and *au* by *o* 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* (*ái*, *áu*). 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 ध, शो ध, never replace his *ái* and *áu*; but everywhere, where occasion occurs, do replace *ái* and *áu*. We think, however, that the difference is rather phonetic than etymological. As concerns the *ái* 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 व *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 *ái* and *au*, probably because these mixed diphthongs passed with him as weaker than the long *ē* and *ō*, *ejusdem generis,* = (ξα ḍ). It is important here to observe, that in Greek also *ai* is felt as weaker than *η* and *ω*, as is proved by the fact that *ai* does not attract the accent towards itself (*τύπτομαι* not *τυπτόμαι*. The expression of the Greek *ai* and *au* by
the Gothic *ai* and *au* requires the less justification, because even if *ai* was pronounced like एः, and *au* like ओः, 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>Gothic</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>saihk,</td>
<td>पघ  शाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihun,</td>
<td>दशन् दाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faihu,</td>
<td>पघु  पाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svaïhra</td>
<td>बसुर  स्वाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihsvo,</td>
<td>दाःशिः दक्षिणाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairtô,</td>
<td>हृद (from हर्ड § 1.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bairan,</td>
<td>भृतम् भर्तम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distairan,</td>
<td>दाःक्रिम्  दाः-क्रिम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairnô,</td>
<td>ताः तार,</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*, *tiihun*, had been produced; out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from *h* and *r* had produced *saïhs*, *taihun*, *bairan*. The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage; for Old High German *sëhs*, (Anglo-Saxon, "six,") and *tëhan* or *tëhun*, &c., rest upon an earlier Gothic *sihs*, *tiihun*. Thus, *tohtar* rests on an earlier Gothic *duhtar*, for the Guna form *dauhtar*, Sanskrit दुहितरः  दुहितर, (दुहित्रः  duhitri, § 1.) "daughter." Where the
Sanskrit आ has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered, that is, not weakened to i, the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong आ, since it is not the आ before ह and र which demands a subsequent addition, but the i which demands a precedent one; compare आत्र, “eight,” with आत्र आत्र.

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 आ element of the diphthong आ औ shews itself often in the Gothic, and in certain places in a regular manner, as i (§ 27.); and in the same places the आ contained in आ (आ + आ) becomes i, which, with the second element of the diphthong, generates a long i (written as ए, § 70.). The Gothic आ has either retained that form in Old High German, or has altered sometimes one, sometimes both of its constituents. Thus have arisen औ, ए. [G. Ed. p. 71.]

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

* आत्र=आत्र is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic आ corresponds to the Sanskrit व to diphthong आ औ; on the other hand, आ often answers to आ औ=(आ + औ).

† There is yet another आ in Old High German, namely, that which Grimm (p. 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction, and formerly disyllabic, 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 हिल, “I held,” Gothic हिलहाल. After this analogy फार, “four,” (according to Otfrid), arose out of the Gothic फ्येवय, in this way, that, after the extrusion of the द, the औ passed into its corresponding short vowel — Grimm, p. 198.
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 lawleis, 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 नवन navan (as theme); neu, "new," Old High German niwi (indeclinable), Gothic nivi-s, Sanskrit नवस 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," trügen, "to deceive," Middle High German liugen, triugen.

[G. Ed. p. 72.] 84. Where the a element of the Sanskrit ओ a retains its existence in the Gothic, making au the equivalent of o, the Middle High German, and a part of the Old High German authorities, have ou in the place of au, although, as has been remarked in §. 80, under the influence of certain consonants o prevails. Compare Old High German pouc, Middle High German bouc, with the Gothic preterite baug, "flexi." The o of the High German ou has the same relation to the corresponding Gothic a in au, as the Greek o in βους bears to the Sanskrit ओ a, which undergoes a fusion with u in the ओ o of the cognate word गो gō. The oldest Old High German authorities (Gl. Hrab. Ker. Is.) have ou 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 ऋ \( \delta \) (out of
\( a + u \)). In this case, in the Gothic \( ai \), also, both the let-
ters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be
only an etymological, and not a phonetic equivalent of the
Sanskrit रि.

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 \( \dot{e} \), contracted from \( ai \) (§. 78.), does
not occur. In Modern High German, however, \( ei \), in pro-
nunciation, = \( ai \). Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
<th>MODERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>High German</td>
<td>High German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haita, &quot;voca,&quot;</td>
<td>heizu,</td>
<td>heize,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skaida, &quot;separo,&quot;</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 in-
stance, driogkan, "to drink"; briggan, "to bring"; tuggð, "tongue"; yuggs, "young"; gaggs, "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 \( qv \) that \( k \) bears to \( g \);
compare siygvan, "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 gai 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 ɛ c in contrast to ʒ k, as also of the ʃ ɡ in contrast to ɡ 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."
m. The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskrit does all, with a double aspiration, a surd \((f = \textit{ṛ} ph)\) (see §. 25.) and a sonant, which is written \(v\), and comes nearer to the Sanskrit ब. 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 \(\textit{zwelfle}\), \(\textit{funw} \) becomes \(\textit{funste}, \textit{funzic}\). 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 \(\textit{wirphan}, \textit{warph}, \textit{wurphumēs}\), 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 \(pf\); for example, if Otfrid
writes *kuphar*, "cuprum," *scepheri*, "Creator," we are not to assume that these words were pronounced *kufar, sceferi*" (p. 132). In Middle High German the initial *ph* of foreign words of the Old High German has become *pf* (Grimm, p. 326). In the middle and at the end we find *pf,* first, always after *m,* "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 tensis. Hence, for [G. Ed. p. 76.] *epf-finden,* later and more harmonious *emp-finden,* for *ent-finden.* Standing alone, nevertheless, it appears, in Middle High German, *vinden,* but *v* does not combine with *p,* for after the surd *p* (§. 25.) the surd aspirate is necessary (see Grimm, p. 398). Thirdly, after short vowels the labial aspirates are apt to be preceded by their tenses, 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 tensis; and, for instance, प्रिच्छति *prichchhati* is said for प्रिच्छतिः *prichhati.* "interrogat," from the root प्रच्छ *prachh.* In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf,* *kropf,* *tropfe,* *klopfen,* *kripfen,* *kapfen* (Grimm, p. 398). In the same words we sometimes find "ff," as *kaffen,* *schuffen.* Here, also, *p* has assimilated itself to the following *f*; for *f,* even though it be the aspirate of *p,* is not pronounced like the Sanskrit प्र *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 w) 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, zuelis, “twelve,” Gothic tvalis. 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-ē, “filiorum,” from the base sunu, with u affected by Gu-ra (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 thivas (§. 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 thivyō (§. 120.), whose nominative, like the accusative, probably was thivyα, 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 ṣ. 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, azyō, “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 s; hence, for instance, thizei “cujus,” from this “hujus,” thanzei “quos,” from thans “hos,” vileizuh “visne” from vileis “vis,” haitaza “vocaris,” from haitis “vocas,” or rather from its earlier form [G. Ed. p. 78.] haitas. The root slēp, “to sleep,” forms, by a reduplication, in the preterite, saizlēp, “I or he slept. Other examples are, izvis, “vobis,” “vos,” razn “house,” talzyan, “to teach,” marzyan, “to provoke,” farzna, “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 lus, comes liusu, “I lose,” lōs, “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>Old High German</th>
<th>Modern High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>blind-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>blindi-e</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 \( h \), and \( k \) for \( g \); finally, medials for aspirates, \( g \) for \( \chi \), \( d \) for \( \theta \), 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 \( \textit{biuga} \), "\textit{specto}," Old High German \( \textit{biuga} \) and \( \textit{piuka} \), Middle High German \( \textit{biuge} \), Modern High German \( \textit{biege} \). For the Gothic \( f \), the Old High German substitutes \( v \), especially as a first letter (§. 86. 2.). In the \( t \) sounds, \( z \) in High German (=\( ts \)) replaces an aspirate. The Gothic has no aspiration of the \( k \), and either replaces the Greek \( \kappa \) by the simple aspiration \( h \), in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskrit \( \varphi \), 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>पदास् </td>
<td>ποῦς,</td>
<td>ποδ-ός,</td>
<td>pes,</td>
<td>pedis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पञ्चन</td>
<td>πέμπε,</td>
<td>quinque,</td>
<td>fimpf,</td>
<td>vinfr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पूर्ना</td>
<td>πλέος,</td>
<td>plenus,</td>
<td>fulls,</td>
<td>vol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पित्र</td>
<td>πατήρ,</td>
<td>pater,</td>
<td>fadrein†,</td>
<td>vatar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपरि</td>
<td>उपेर,</td>
<td>super,</td>
<td>ufar,</td>
<td>ubar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>धर्म्</td>
<td>धर्म,</td>
<td>धर्म,</td>
<td>धर्म,</td>
<td>प्रृचान.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भजन्</td>
<td>भजन्</td>
<td>भजन्</td>
<td>भजन्</td>
<td>प्रृचान.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ्रमक</td>
<td>फेरो,</td>
<td>fero,</td>
<td>baira,</td>
<td>piru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कपाल</td>
<td>कपाल,</td>
<td>caput,</td>
<td>haubith,</td>
<td>houpt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्वम्</td>
<td>त्व,</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तम्</td>
<td>तम,</td>
<td>is-tum,</td>
<td>thana,</td>
<td>dėn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्रयस्</td>
<td>त्रयस्</td>
<td>tres,</td>
<td>threis,</td>
<td>dři.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तुतर</td>
<td>तुतर,</td>
<td>alter,</td>
<td>anhar,</td>
<td>andar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दंतम्</td>
<td>दंतम्</td>
<td>dentem,</td>
<td>thuntu-s,</td>
<td>zand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द्वा०</td>
<td>द्वा०</td>
<td>duo,</td>
<td>tva,</td>
<td>zuëně.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दक्षिण</td>
<td>दक्षिण</td>
<td>dextra,</td>
<td>taisvto,</td>
<td>zėsawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उदा</td>
<td>उदा</td>
<td>unda,</td>
<td>vato,</td>
<td>wazar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दुष्ट्र</td>
<td>दुष्ट्र</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>dauhtar,</td>
<td>tohtar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मधु</td>
<td>मधु</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>daur,</td>
<td>tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्वन्</td>
<td>श्वन्</td>
<td>canis,</td>
<td>hunths,</td>
<td>hund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्रिदया</td>
<td>ह्रिदया</td>
<td>cor,</td>
<td>hairto,</td>
<td>herz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्षा</td>
<td>अक्षा</td>
<td>oculus,</td>
<td>augō,</td>
<td>ouga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अस्रु</td>
<td>अस्रु</td>
<td>lacrima,</td>
<td>tagr m.,</td>
<td>zahar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाशु</td>
<td>पाशु</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.”
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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>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
<th>OLD HIGH GERM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>श्वसुर śvaśura,</td>
<td>ἐκυρός,</td>
<td>socer,</td>
<td>svaihra,</td>
<td>suheur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दासन daśan,</td>
<td>δέκα,</td>
<td>decem,</td>
<td>taihun,</td>
<td>zéhan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जन jnā,</td>
<td>γνώμι,</td>
<td>gnosco,</td>
<td>kan,</td>
<td>chan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जाति jāti,*</td>
<td>γένος,</td>
<td>genus,</td>
<td>kuni,</td>
<td>chuni.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>जानु jānu,</td>
<td>γόνυ,</td>
<td>genu,</td>
<td>kniu,</td>
<td>chniu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>महत mahat,</td>
<td>μέγαλος,</td>
<td>magnus,</td>
<td>mikiš,</td>
<td>mihil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>हेस haśsa,</td>
<td>χίν,</td>
<td>anser,</td>
<td>gans,</td>
<td>kans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्यस hyas,</td>
<td>χθές,</td>
<td>heri,</td>
<td>gistra,</td>
<td>këstar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>लिख līkh,</td>
<td>λείκω,</td>
<td>lingo,</td>
<td>laigò,</td>
<td>lékòm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

̣rata-s, “wheel,”

busu, “I would be,”

ka-s, “who,”

dūmi, “I give,”

pats, “husband,” “master,”

penki, “five,”

trys, “three,”

keturi, “four,”

ketwirtas, “the fourth,”

śakū, f. “bough,”

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 नक्ष्य nakhas. The Zend stands, as we have before remarked, in the same rank, in all essential respects, as the Sanskrit,

* From jaṁ, “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>thir (theme).</td>
<td>thri,</td>
<td>tri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus, “to thee,”</td>
<td>thwobi,</td>
<td>twe.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fra, (inseparable prep.)</td>
<td>fra,</td>
<td>pra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friyd, “I love,”</td>
<td>afrinami,</td>
<td>prinami.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahva †, “a river,”</td>
<td>afög</td>
<td>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,

* Twe is occurs as an uninflected genitive in Rosen’s Veda-Specimen, p. 26, and may, like the mutilated ṭe, be also used as a dative.
† “I bless,” from the Sanskrit root pri, “to love,” united with the prep. a.
‡ 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, (רצהח ח is sonant, see § 25.) correspond, according to rule, to the Gothic medials: as, however, in the Zend the भ is not found, ब 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 vatar, the t of the Greek πατόρ 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 r of ἐλεφαντ-; thus, also, the t of चतूर 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 स्वप swap, (Latin sopio,) "sleep," has been preserved in the Gothic slepa, and [G. Ed. p. 85.] the Old High German sl aşfu 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 hapët, "he has," hapënt, "they have," with habet, habent: the Gothic, on the contrary, says habaith, haband; the first in accordance with the law, the last in violation of it, for habanth. Thus, also, in the part. pres., the t of the old languages has become, under the influence of the preceding n, not th but d; the t of the part. pass., however, is changed before the s of the nom. into th, but before vowel termina-

* It would be better to regard the phenomenon here discussed by assuming d as the proper character of the third person in Gothic; and viewing the Old High German t as the regular substitute for it. The d has been retained in the Gothic passive also (bair-a-da), and the active form bairith is derivable from bairid, 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 ta, of ἑτοπτέρ-ο, and to the Sanskrit ta, of अभवत abhavata. The Old High German, on the other hand, has preserved the original t in both participles: hapentër, hapetër, 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, अष्टत् ashtāu, "eight," ὀκτῶ, "octo," is in Goth. ahtau, in Old High German ahtō: नक्तम् naktam (adverbial accusative), "night," νόξ, 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 ति ti in Sanskrit, in Greek σε, as ποίησις, 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, ansī(i)s (§. 117.), "grace," from the root an, Old High German unnan, "to be gracious," with the insertion of an euphonic s: fraulust(i)s, "loss," (from lus, pres. liusa): maht(i)s, "strength," (from magan): fra-gifl(i)s, "betrothment," (from gib, gaf), also fragibts, perhaps erroneously, as b has little

*Da is an abbreviation of dai = G. ताः Sansk. ताः, see §. 466.
affinity with t: ga-skaff(?)s, “creation,” (from skap-an). 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. binda, §. 27.) forms, in the uninflected condition of the pret., bauth, in the plur. bud-um; and the nominal base, mana-sè-di, “world,” (according to Grimm’s well-founded interpretation, “seed, not seat, of man,”) forms in the nom. and accus. mana-sèths, mana-sèth, or mana-sèds, mana-sèd; but in the dat. mana-sèdai not -sèthai. On the other hand, after liquids the suffix is usually thi, and after n, di: the dental, however, once chosen, remains afterwards in every position, either without a vowel or before vowels; for instance, gabaurths, “birth,” dat. gabaurthai; gafaurds, “gathering” [G. Ed. p. 87.] (from far-yan, “to go”), gen. gafaurdais: gakunths, “esteem,” gen. gakunthais; gamunds, “memory,” gen. gamundais; gaqvumths, “meeting,” dat. gaqvumthai, dat. plur. gaqvumthim. From the union with m, d is excluded. On the whole, however, the law here discussed accords remarkably with a similar phenomenon in modern Persian, where the original t of grammatical terminations and suffixes is maintained only after mute consonants, but after vowels and liquids is changed into d: hence, for instance, girif-tan, “to take,” bas-tan, “to bind,” dâsh-tan, “to have,” pukh-tan, “to cook”: on the other hand, dâ-dan, “to give,” bur-dan, “to bear,” âm-dan, “to come.” I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix ti, and all other suffixes originally commencing with t, from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this t entirely to the 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," \textit{klouft}, "course," \textit{mah-t}, "might," \textit{s\-t}, "seed," \textit{kipurt}, "birth," \textit{var-t}, "journey," \textit{mun-t}, "protection," \textit{ki-wal-t}, "force," \textit{seul-t}, \textit{schuld}, "guilt," \textit{chumfl}, "arrival."

92. The law of substitution shews the greatest pertinacity at the beginning of words, and I have found it everywhere observed in the relation of the Gothic to the Greek and Latin. On the other hand, in some roots which are either deficient or disfigured in the Old European languages, but which are common to the Germanic and the Sanskrit, the Gothic stands on the same footing with \[G. \text{Ed. p. 88.}\] the Sanskrit, especially in respect of initial medials. Thus, बन्ध \textit{bandh}, "to bind," is also \textit{band} in Gothic, not \textit{pand}; ग्रह in the Vedas ग्रह ग्राहम, "to take," "seize," is \textit{grip} (pres. \textit{greipa} with Guna, §. 27.) not \textit{krip};* to \textit{गा} \textit{gd} and \textit{गम} \textit{gam}, "to go," correspond \textit{gagga}, "I go," and \textit{gau\-vd}, "street;" दह \textit{dah}, "to burn," is, in Old High German, दह-\textit{an} (\textit{daw}), "to burn," "to light." I can detect, however, no instance in which Gothic tenuis correspond to Sanskrit as initial letters.

93(\textsuperscript{a}). 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, tenuis 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 \textit{prehendo} is probably related to the Sanskrit root ग्रह, 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, (viridis), "green," वेदविद् veda-vid, "skilled in the Veda," धनलभ dhanalabh, "acquiring wealth." These words are, according to §. 94., without a nominative sign. We find, also, चित्ति वेदविद् asti harit, "he is green," घरियत् वेदविद् asti vedā-vit, घरियत् धनलभ asti dhanal- lap; on the other hand, हरित् घरिय प हारद asti, वेदविद् घरिय प वेदविद् asti, घनलेब घरिय प धनलैब asti; also, हरिद् भवि प हारिद भवावि, &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 v into the surd f; see §. 86. 3.; but, like the Sanskrit, and independent of the law of displacement explained in §. 87., supplies the place of medials at the end of words regularly by tenues. As, for example, in the genitives tages, eides, vibes, 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, vip. So also as to the verb; for instance, the roots trug, lad, grab, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers. sing. pret., truoc, luot, gruop, plur. truogen, luoden, gruoben. Where, on the other hand, the tenuis or aspirate (v excepted) is radical, there no alteration of sound occurs in declension or in conjugation. For instance, wort, gen. wortes, not wordes, as in Sansk. दददद् dadat, "the giver," gen. दददद् dadalas, not दददस् dadadas, but वित् vit, "knowing," gen. विद्विद् vidas, from the base विद् vid. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts d at the end into t, and g into c; for instance, wort, wordes; dæc, dayses. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenues, but by aspirates. Hence gif, "I gave," in contrast to gebum, and the accusatives hlaif, lans, thinf, opposed to the nominatives hlaibs, laubs, thiub, gen. hlaibis, &c. The guttural and dental
medials (\(y\), \(d\)) are tolerated by the Gothic in terminations; yet even in these, in individual cases, a preference appears for the terminating aspirates. Compare bauth, “I or he offered,” with budum, “we offered,” from the root bud; haiite-
a “nominatur” with hailith (§. 67.) “nominat; aih, “I have,” “he has,” with aigum, “we have.”

[93\(^{(*)}\), 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, ih pin, “I am,” but ih ne bin; ter dag, “the day,” but tes tages; mit kote, “with God,” but 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 stihhu (punyo) or-prittu (stringo), the 1st and 3d pers. pret. stah, or-prat. In Middle High German,
in declensions in *ck, ff; the last is rejected; for instance, *boe, gen. *bockes; *grif, *griffes: *tz loses the *t; for instance, *schaz, *schatzes.

95. Between a final न्न n and a succeeding *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 अनुस्वार a; for instance, अभाव न्न abhava-n-s-tatra, (abhavan-s-tatra), “they were there.” With this coincides the circumstance, that, in High German, between a radical *n and the *t of an affix, an *s, in certain cases, is inserted; for instance, from the root *ann, “to favour,” comes, in Old High German, *an-s-t, “thou favourest,” *on-s-ta or *onda, “I favoured,” *an-s-t, “favour”; from *prann comes *prun-s-t, “ardour”; from *chan is derived *chun-s-t, “knowledge,” our German Kunst, in which, as in Brunst and Gunst, (from *gönnten, probably formed from the *ann before noticed, and the preposites *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, चव ava, परि pari, प्रति prati, and certain words which begin with *क k. With this the Latin *s between *ab or *ob and *c, *q, and *p, remarkably accords*, [G. Ed. p. 92.] which *s, *ab retains even in an isolated position, when the above-mentioned letters follow. To this we also refer the committere of Festus, instead of cosmittere

* We scarcely think it necessary to defend ourselves for dividing, with Vossius, *ob-solesco, rather than with Schneider (p. 571) obs-olesco.
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(Schneider, p. 475), unless an original smitto, for mitto, is involved in this compound. In the Greek, ς 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 ς, in opposition to the common theory, as belonging to the base of the first member (§. 128.). We have yet to consider a case of the interpolation of an euphonic labial, which is common to the Old Latin and Germanic, and serves to facilitate the union of the labial nasal with a dental. The Latin places p between m and a following t or s; the Gothic and Old High German f between m and t. Thus, sumpsi, prompsi, dempsi, sumptus, promptus, demptus; Gothic andnum-f-tis, “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, ἰμάσθαι—see Buttman, p. 80); while the Modern Persian places an euphonic d between the vowel of a prefixed preposition and that of the following word, as be-d-ā, “to him.”

97. The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words, excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of ρ for ς. The alteration of the ν in the article in old inscriptions, and in the prefixes σῶν, ἑν, and πάλιν, seems analogous to the changes which, according to §. 18., the terminating m, in Sanskrit, undergoes in all cases, with reference to the letter which follows. [G. Ed. p. 93.] The concluding ν in Greek is also generally a derivative from μ, and corresponds to this letter, which the Greek never admits as a termination in analogous forms of the Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin. Ν frequently springs from a final ς; thus, for instance, μεν (Doric μες) and the dual τον answer to the Sanskrit personal terminations मस mas, चस thas, तस tas. I have found this explanation, which I have given elsewhere, of the origin of the ν from ς.
subsequently confirmed by the Prākrit, in which, in like manner, the concluding ˢ of the instrumental termination plural भिस has passed into the dull न (Anuswāra, §. 9.), and हिन is said for भिस. 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 अस्त्य 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 चाली ⁰, in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the ⁰ dam is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write चाली ⁰, 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 irrecognisable by concessions too great, or trans-
formations 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 in-
fluence over preceding consonants; but strong consonants,
if surd (§ 25.), require a tenuis, and if sonant a medial,
before them. Thus, т t and ч th allow only of क k, not
ख kh, ग g, घ gh preceding them; only т t, not च th,
ध dh, while on the other hand, ध dh allows only ग g,
not झ k, झ kh, घ gh; only र r, not च th, ध dh; only
च b, not प p, प ph, भ bh to precede it. The [G. Ed. p. 93]
roots and the nominal bases have to regulate their final let-
ters 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 termi-
nations there are many which begin with consonants (आम
bhyām, भिस bhis, भय bhyas, स su). To cite instances, the
root अद ad, “to eat,” forms अदिव adi, “I eat”; but not
अद्धिस adsi (for s is surd), nor अद्धित ad-ti, अद्ध प ad-tha, but
अति at-si, अद्धित at-ti, अद्धप at-tha: on the other hand, in the
imperative, अद्धि ad-dhi, “eat.” The base श प pad, “foot,”
forms, in the locative plural, पति pat-su, not पदम pad-su; on
the other hand, महात mahat, “great,” forms, in the instru-
mental plural, महादब्धि mahad-bhis not महादभिः 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 ΗΔ in Greek, and ES, FER, VEL, ED, in Latin, as ὑ-τι, ὑ-μέν, ὑ-τέ, ἢ-μεν, ἢ-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 τ, β, φ, because the surd σ or τ suffers neither medials nor aspirates before it; hence τέτρικ-σαι, τέτρικ-ται, from ΤΠΒ, τέτυκ-σαι, τέτυκ-ται, from ΤΥΧ. The Greek, however, diverges from the Sanskrit in this, that μ does not leave the consonant which precedes it unaltered, but assimilates labials to itself, and converts the guttural, tenuis and aspirate into medials. For τέτυμ-μαι, τέτριμ-μαι, πέπλεγ-μαι, τέτυγ-μαι, we should, on Sanskrit principles, write (§. 98.) τέτυπ-μαι, τέτριμ-μαι, πεπλέκ-μαι, τέτυχ-μαι. The t sounds carry concession too far, and abandon the Sanskrit, or original principle, as regards the gutturals; inasmuch as δ, θ, and ζ (δσ), instead of passing into τ before σ and τ, are extinguished before σ, and before τ and μ become σ (πεπεισ-ται, πεπεισ-σαι, πεπεισ-μαι, instead of πεπειτ-ται, πεπειτ-σαι, πεπειθ-μαι, or πεπειδ-μαι. The Greek declension affords occasion for the alteration of consonants only through the σ of the nominative and the dative plural termination in στ; and here the same principle holds good as in the case of the verb, and in the formation of words: kh and y become, as in Sanskrit, k (ξ=κ-ξ), and b and ph become p.
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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 πού-ς for πῶς-ς, πον-σί for πον-σί', which latter naturally and originally must have stood for πον-σ, πον-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 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 (rexī), 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 अवाक्ष्यत a-vāk-ṣhit. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the *s* of the perfect tense (mulī from mulc and mulg, sparsi from sparg), this accords with the Sanskrit law of sounds, by which, of two terminating consonants of a nominal base, the last vanishes before consonants of the case terminations. *D* ought to become *t* before *s*; and then the form, so theoretically created, claut-sit from claud, would accord with the Sanskrit forms, such as जत्तश्लत a-tāvat-sit, "he tormented," from तदः 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-vā-si; 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, mē-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 उष uṣh 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, *sēd* from *seduit* and *vidui*, is, I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from *sedui*, *vidui*, and I class them with forms like *fōdi* from *fōl*, *lēgi*, for *lec-si*, from *lēg*, *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 *fuc-si*, *struc-si*, (*fluxi*, &c.) *fluxum*, *structum*, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of *v*; and a *flu-vo*, *stru-vo*, be presupposed, with regard to which it is to be remembered, that, in Sanskrit also, *uv* often develops itself out of *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*, *verti*, &c., are in contrast to *ar-si* and other forms, like *mulsi* above mentioned, in their preserving the radical letter in preference to the auxiliary verb; and they accord in this with the Sanskrit rule of sound, by which the *s* of *adut-sam*, *akṣhaip-sam*, &c., for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, *adut-та* instead of *adut-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. 576. 579.*
perished in the lapse of time: in other [G. Ed. p. 99.] respects, $\text{fi}$, $\text{sc}$, correspond to $\text{tu}$, $\text{pupu}$, not to speak of $\text{telig}$, 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 $\text{tum}$, and $d$ should pass into $t$; as, $\text{be}$, $\text{bhettum}$, "to cleave," from $\text{bhid}$ $\text{bhid}$. According to the degenerated practice of the Greek, a radical $d$ or $t$ before $t$ would become $s$. Of this second gradation we find a remnant in $\text{comes-tus}$, $\text{comes-tura}$, analogous to $\text{es-t}$, $\text{es-tis}$, &c. from $\text{edo}$: we find, however, no $\text{comes-tum}$, $\text{comes-tor}$, but in their place $\text{comesum}$, $\text{comesor}$. We might question whether, in $\text{comes-sum}$, the $s$ belonged to the root or to the suffix; whether the $d$ of $\text{ed}$, or the $t$ of $\text{tum}$, had been changed into $s$. The form $\text{com-es-tus}$ might argue the radicality of the $s$; but it is hard to suppose that the language should have jumped at once from $\text{estus}$ to $\text{esus}$, between which two an $\text{essus}$ probably intervened, analogous to $\text{cessum}$, $\text{fissum}$, $\text{quassum}$, &c., while the $t$ of $\text{tum}$, $\text{lus}$, &c., assimilated itself to the preceding $s$. Out of $\text{essum}$ has arisen $\text{esum}$, by the suppression of an $s$, probably the first; for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed, it is generally the first, ($\text{ei}$ from $\text{es}$, $\text{no}$ from $\text{po}$) 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 $\text{esum}$, $\text{ca-sum}$, $\text{divi-sum}$, $\text{fis-sum}$, $\text{quas-sum}$, 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. $\text{Cs}$ ($\bar{x}$) is a [G. Ed. p. 100.] favourite combination; hence, $\text{fic-sum}$, $\text{nce-sum}$, &c. for $\text{fic-tum}$, $\text{nce-tum}$. 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, भातत्स् तारय माम् bhrātas tārya mām, “brother save me,” instead of भातर् bhrātar: on the other hand, in the middle of words r remains unaltered before t; hence, for instance, भस्तुः bhastum, “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 ana-baud-t. In Old and Middle High German weis-t, “thou knowest,” for weiz-t. The Gothic, in forming out of the root vit, in the weak preterite, vis-sa (“I knew”), instead of

* The obvious relationship of torreo with τρέπωμαι, and त्रिः त्रिश from तरश, argues the derivation of the latter r from s. Upon that of uro from उष uṣh, see §. 97.
vista, from viita, 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 rrMo-sfi, corresponds, in the latter case, to such Latin forms, as ca-sum, clau-sum. The case is different in Old High German with those verbs of the first weak conjugation, which, having their syllables made long generally through two terminating consonants in the preterite, apply the t of the auxiliary verb directly to the root. Here the transition of t into s does not occur, but t, z, and even d, remain unaltered; and only when another consonant precedes them t and d are extinguished, z on the contrary remains; for instance, leit-ta, "duxi," ki-neiz-ta, "afflixi," ar-ôt-ta, "vastavi," walz-ta, "volvi," liuh-ta, "luxi," for liuht-ta; hul-ta, "placavi," for huld-ta. Of double consonants one only is retained, and of ch or cch only h; other consonantal combinations remain, however, undisturbed, as ran-ta, "cucurri," for rann-ta; wanht-ta, "vachlavi," for vanch-ta; dah-ta, "texi," for dach-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, ance-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 tenues and medials are changed into their aspirates, although the tenuis accord with a following t. Thus, for instance, in Gothic, vah-tev, * 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-l(i)s, "sickness," from suk; mah-t(i)s, "might," from mag; ga-skri-t(i)s, "creation," from skap; fragif-t(i)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 maty-an, "to eat." In Gothic, the s of blöstris, "worshipper," springs from the t of blötan, "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 s,s, not only before th, but also before m; for instance, इरिस्ता irista, "dead," from the root इरिथ itir; बस्ता basta, "bound," from बन्ध bandh, with the nasal excluded; as in Modern Persian بسته bastah, from بند band; आस्मा aśma, "wood," from आधma.

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 the pret., but generally is retained; and we find, for instance, ðg-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, ðh-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, भौिथयमि bhog- 
syāmi, “I shall know,” for बौिथयमि bōdh-syāmi; चेदभुि 
viduh- 
bhut, “knowing the vedas,” for बुि puh; बुि pud-dhva, 
“knowing,” for बुि pudha; भौिथयमि dhōk-śyāmi, “I shall 
milk,” for दौिथयमि dōh-syāmi; दूि pud-dhva, “milked,” for 

duřh duh-ta. In Greek we find a remarkable relic of the first 
part of the transposition of the aspirate, in the necessary 
suppression of the aspirate in some roots which begin with 
t and end with an aspirate before s, t, and, letters which 
admire of no union with an aspirate, and in its being thrown 
back on the initial letter, by which process t becomes θ. 
Hence, τρέφω, θρέπ-σω, (θρέπσιωs), θρεπτίρ, θρέμ-μα; ταφι, θάπ- 
tω, ἐτάφην, τέθαμ-μαι; τρύφος, θρύπ-τω, ἐτρύφην, θρύμ-μα; 
τρέχω, θρέξομαι; θρεξ, τριχός, ταχύς, θᾶσσων. In the spirit 
of this transposition of the aspirate, ἔχ obtains the spiritus as- 
per when χ is obliged to merge in the tenuis, (ἐκτός, ἐξω, ἐξης).†

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

† It is usual to explain this appearance by the suppression of two aspi- 
rations in the root of these forms, of which one only is supposed to appear 
in deffence to the euphonic law which forbids the admission of two con- 
secutive 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, εἴθρθης, 
τεθάμβαι, τεθάμβω, τεθάμφαται, τεθράβθαι, εἴθρθης, present a difficulty. 
These, perhaps, are eccentricities of usage, which, once habituated to the 
initial aspiration by its frequent application to supply the place of the ter- 
minating 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 φθ and βθ—while, ac- 
cording to §. 98., an original φθ ought to become φθ—on this ground the 
tendency to aspiration of the root remained unsatisfied by εἴθρθης &c.; 
and as if the φ only existed out of reference to the θ, the original ter- 
minating aspirate necessarily fell back on the radical initial. This theory, 
which seems to me sound, would only leave τεθάμφαται 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. ॐ 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 नाग्‍य जाग्रि, “to wake,” or a preposition which has
grown up with the root, as चन्द्र आव-धार्, “to despise”; or they have sprung from a noun, like भुमा भुमार्, “to
play,” which I derive from भुमा 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 unrestriction 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. श्वा स्थान्, “to
stand,” a root in which the age of the co-existence of the s
and th is supported by the unanimous testimony of all the
members of our race of languages. So also, in स्कन्दद्
स्कान्द्, “to go,” (Lat. scando) 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 sup-
ported by the remarkable concurrence of [G. Ed. p. 107.]
107. nearly all the individuals of the Sanskrit family of lan-
guages in expressing the idea “to go” by the root i.

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, ketul, "slain," in the fem., on account of the addition ah contracts itself to k dul (ktul-ah); while kotel, "slaying," before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms kolalah. Neither k dul, therefore, nor k dul, can be regarded as the root; and just as little can it be looked for in k dul, as the status con-structus of the infinitive; for this is only a shortening of the absolute form katul, 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 k dul the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskrit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of

[G. Ed. p. 108.] the word. By them, for example, is distin-guished, in Arabic, katula, "he slew," from kutila, "he was slain"; and in Hebrew, kotel, "slaying," from katul, "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 investi-gate, 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 Vṛddhi; 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 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 διδω-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 versa. P. 50, F. von Schlegel remarks: “In the Indian or Grecian language every root is truly that which the name says, and like a living germ; for since the ideas of relation are denoted by internal alteration, freer room is given for development, the fulness of which can be indefinitely
extended, and is, in fact, often wondrously rich. All, however, which in this manner proceeds from the simple root, still retains the stamp of its relationship, adheres to it, and thus reciprocally bears and supports itself." I find, however, the inference not established; for from the capability of expressing ideas of relation by internal alteration of the root, how can the capability be deduced of surrounding the (internally unalterable) root indefinitely, with foreign syllables externally added? What kind of stamp of relationship is there between μω, σω, θησόμεθα, and the 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
inflections, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G. Ed. p. 112.] regarded, per se, they have no meaning.

In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or 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

fication, mais qui déterminent avec précision le sens du mot auquel elles sont jointes. En modifiant les lettres radicales, et en ajoutant aux racines des syllabes dérivatives, on forme de mots dérivés de diverses espèces, et des dérivés des dérivés. On compose des mots de plusieurs racines pour exprimer les idées complexes. Ensuite on 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.

109*. 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 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. बोध रति bोधति, "he knows," from बुध budh (1.); तुदति tudati, "he vexes" (comp. tundit), from तुद tud (6.) As 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 a as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, e (before nasals o, §. 3.) corresponds to the affix a; and λέγ-ο-μεν, φεύγ-ο-μεν, from ΔΙΠ, ΦΙΓ (έλιτον, ἕφυγον), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§. 26.); while, e.g. θίγ-ο-μεν, θλίβ-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 patati.

‡ 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 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 \( \lambda \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \), that the genitive \( \text{ped-}is \) has to \( \pi\nu\delta\-\delta\) where the Sanskrit has likewise \( a \) [G. Ed. p. 115.] \( \text{pad-as} \). In \text{legi-unt}, from \text{leg-a-nti}, 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 \( a \) 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, \text{hait-a}, "I am called," \text{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 \( ei \), §. 70.): hence \text{keina} (= \text{kiina}, from \text{kiina}), "I germinate," from \text{KIN}; \text{biyga, "I bend," from BUG}, Sanskrit \( \text{bhuj} \) \( \text{bhuj} \), whence \( \text{bhun} \) \( \text{bhugna} \), "bent." The diphthongs \( ai, au \), as in Sanskrit \( \text{r} \) and \( \text{ro} \) (§. 2.), are incapable of any Guna; as are \( \text{e} \) (= \( \text{a} \), §. 69.) and \( a \). The Sanskrit radical vowel \( a \) 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 (\text{i.e.} to \( d \), see §. 69.)—

---

* I have already, in my Review of Grimm's Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the \( a \) of forms like \text{haita, haitam, haitaima, &c.} does not belong to the personal termination, but is identical with the \( a \) 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 259.)

† 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 चारति charati

[G. Ed. p. 116.] (§. 14.), and *f"or,* "he wandered," to चच्चार 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 (≡ छा ध) does to the short *a.* The root छर्द ad, "to eat," in Gothic, according to §. 87., forms *AT*; hence, in the present, *ita*; in the sing. pret., *at*; as-†, *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-um.* The corresponding Sanskrit root is जन jan, "to produce," "to be born" (see §. 87.): the same relation, too, has greipa, graip, grippum, from GRIP, "to seize," to ग्राई grabh (Veda form): on the other hand, BIT, "to bite,"* (beita, bait, bitum), has an original *i,* which exists in Sanskrit (comp. भिद bhid, "to cleave"); just so, VIT, "to know," Sanskrit विद विद.

(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.* नासयति *nasyati,* "he perishes;" Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable *ya* (weakened to *yi*), which is added to the root in the


* * Occurs only with the prep. *and,* and with the meaning "to scold," but corresponds to the Old High German root *BIZ,* "to bite."
(3.) The second, third, and seventh classes add the personal termination direct to the root; but in the cognate European languages, to facilitate the conjugation, these classes have mainly passed over to the first class; e.g. ed-i-mus, not ed-mus (as a remnant of the old construction es-t, es-tis), Gothic il-a-m, Old High German iz-a-mès, not iz-mès, answering to the Sanskrit अद्भुत ad-mas. The second class, to which थब 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. रम रम, corresponding to इमा imas, from आ "to go," as in Greek εἶμι to ίμιν. 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 इ, Φι, Ω, Σ, Θ, Φ, Υ (έφων), ΔΥ, &c. To the consonants the direct combination with the consonants of the termination has become too heavy, and ΕΣ alone (because of the facility of σμ, στ) has remained in the Sanskrit second class, as the corresponding root in Latin, Lithuanian, and German. Hence, यस्ति asti, esti, est, Gothic and High German ist. In the Latin there fall also to the second class, i, DA, STA, FLA, FA, and NA; and also in-quam, whence QUA weakened to QUI, is the root, which, in Gothic, appears as QUAT, weakened to QUIT, with the accretion of a T. FER and VEL (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 इ, as रोदिम रोद-िम, "I weep," from हुइ rud. I can, however, no longer believe that the i of the Latin third conjg. is connected with this इ, as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the नα of the very copious first class.
Sanskrit it comprehends about twenty roots; e.g. तद्दामि daddāmi, δὴωμι, Lithuanian dudu; तद्दामि dadhāmi, τιθημ (§. 16.); जजमिम jajanmi, "I beget," comp. γι-γν-ο-μει. 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. भिनादमि bhinnadmi, "I cleave," भिन्नभद्रल bhindmas, "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 findo, find-i-mus. From the Greek come to be here considered roots, like ΜΑΘ, ΛΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed a, and, like the Latin find-i-mus, is connected with the affix of the first class; thus, μαυβ-άν-ο-μεν, λαμβ-άν-ο-μεν, θργγ-άν-ο-μεν.

(4.) The fifth class, of about thirty roots, has nu; and the eighth, with ten roots, which, excepting क्र kri, "to make," all terminate in न n or श 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, υυ and υ, is supplied by lengthening the υ; thus, e.g. δείκνυομι, δείκνυομεν, as in Sanskrit जापोम आप-φό-μι, "ad-ip-is-cor," चापुम स आप-νο-मας, "adipisci-mur." An example of the eighth class is तान tan, "to extend," whence तनोम तन-σ-μας=τάν-υ-μες. With the उ u, व, 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 ना nā 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 न na, replaces the heavy झa Destroyed by the lighter टa (§ 6.), and is thus weakened to नी nī. E.g. from नील mrid, "to crush," (comp. mordo) comes नीलत mridnūmi, नीलनमस mrid-nīnāmas. In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in नμ (ναμ) ναμεν; e.g. δαμμεν, δάμαν-μεν. As ध, श, and ष, are originally one, formations like τέμ-νο-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 νέω would not have become νω from नμ.

(6.) The tenth class adds चय 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 चय अ� is peculiar to them, but चय aya 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 चय aya, 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. चन्त्यति vēd-aya-ti "he makes to know," from चन्त्य vid; चावद्यति śrav-aya-ti, "he makes to hear," from श्र श्रu. We recognise, in German, the affix च अय 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 य 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 द also (as Old High German manōn, "to mention," "to make to think," etc.) belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb. The Old High German gives द as the contraction of a + i, (see §. 78.), but retains its द more firmly than the Gothic its ai, which, in several persons, sinks into a simple a. Compare Gothic hava, habaın, haband, with Old High German hapēm, hapēmes, hapēnt. Very remarkable, however, is the concurrence of the Prakrit with the Old High German and the Latin
of the 2d conj. in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix स्व ay aya to रे. Compare Sanskrit मानयामि, "I honour," Prākrit मानेमि, * Old High German, var-manem, "I despise," Latin moneo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Prākrit</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>मानयामि</td>
<td>मानेमि</td>
<td>var-manem</td>
<td>moneo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानयसि</td>
<td>मानेसि</td>
<td>manes</td>
<td>mon's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानयति</td>
<td>मानेति</td>
<td>manet</td>
<td>monet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानयामस् मानयायतस्</td>
<td>मानेमहा मानेद्वा</td>
<td>manēmes manēmus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानयथ मानयाथा</td>
<td>मानेथ मानेद्वा</td>
<td>manet monēlis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मानयति मानयांति</td>
<td>मानेति मानेंति</td>
<td>manēnt monent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* I am not at present able to adduce this verb from the edited texts: it is, however, certain, that मानयामि in this dialect can have no other sound but मानेमि. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, as chintēmi, "I think" (from chintayāmi), nivēdēmi (from nivē-dayāmi). In the plural the termination mha is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk. smas, "we are"). In the third pers. pl., together with mānenti the forms mānaānti and mānanti are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanscrit a root मन, "to honour": more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from मना, "honour"; and this substantive itself a derivation from man, "to think," whence avamān, "to despise," as in Old High German var-MAN (by Otfrid, fir-MON). The root, therefore, which is contained in varmanēm is identical with the Gothic MAN (man, "I mean," "I think," pl. munum see §. 66.). To this class belongs, also, the Latin monere, as, "to make to think" (Old High German manon), 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 αω, εω, οω; 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.

In order to adduce single examples of the multi-form 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 οα; but roots in οα δ are numerous. Thus गागाः, "to go," contained in the Latin navi-ga-re; also, perhaps, in fāti-gare, the first member of which belongs to fātiscor, fessus; in Greek, βιβημ answers to जागाम जागांक, and rests on the frequent interchange of gutturals and labials; Gothic ga-thvā, "a street," (see p. 102. G. Ed.); Zend ṣaṃga gā-tu, "a place," (nom. संग gātus; Old High German gā-m, "I go," = जागाम ja-gā-mi; not therefore, as Grimm conjectures (p. 868), by syncope from gandu, 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, da-mus answering to διδο-μεν. Thus, also, stā-m, stā-s, stā-t, in like manner, with suppressed reduplication, corresponds to तस्मात (for सोस्म), and to the Sanskrit root स्था sthā, which is irregularly inflected, तिष्ठत तिष्ठत, तिष्ठ तिष्ठ तिष्ठ, for तस्थति, तस्थासि, तस्थाति.

* Somewhat that pertains to this subject I have already put together very concisely at the end of my Sanscrit 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 र्थस्तामिḥ histāmi* (for siśṭāmi, see §. 53.), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the र्थस्तामिḥ rathāstāo, "warrior," which occurs so often in the Zend-Avesta, properly "chariot stander," with o for s as the sign of the nominative. How, then, in Old High German, comes from 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 वृष शो "to wash," "to purify" (Sansk. व श श, "to bathe") whence śnāta, "purified," in Vend. S. p. 233, frequently श्रस्तात् fra-śnādhayen "lavent"; from वृष शो "to lay," (Sansk. व श श, p. 118 G. Ed.), we find श्रस्तात् nidaithyānā, "deponant" (as Vendīdād S. pp. 203 and 206, श्रस्तात् huske zemē nidaithyānā, "in siccē terrā deponant"): from the same root we find the imperative [G. Ed. p. 123.] form, श्रस्तात् ni-dā-thāmā, "deponamus" (Vend. S. p. 208, श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् श्रस्तात् क्रो नामिन इसितानाम तानम बराम आहुरा माझा क्रो निश्चामा, "Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus"). Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root ना मा, "to measure" (cf. με-τρων), has connected itself with a t-sound, and forms, in Gothic, MAT, present mita (§. 109ª. 1.). ता जना, "to be acquainted with," "to know," ΓΝΩ, ΓΝΑ (gnarus) Old High German CHNA (§. 87.); whence chna-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. त्थस्तात् histānti (cf. ισταρρι) in the V. S. p. 183: more on this head under the verb.
the special form, जानामि jānāmi, for जानामि jña-nāmi, may be-
long the Gothic root KANN, Old High German CHANN
(kann. chan, "I know," see §. 94., kunnun, chunnum, "we
know," see §. 66.). भास्त dhamā, "to blow," alters itself in the
special forms to भम dham, Latin FLA, according to the
second class (§. 109 a 3.), Old High German PLĀ (§§. 12. 20.),
whence pā-da, "flavi." As in Sanskrit, from the above-men-
tioned भम dham, comes the nominal base भमनि dhamani, "a vein"; so may the Gothic base BLOTHA (nom. acc.
blōth, "blood") come here also under consideration. We
pass on to roots in i, and have to remark that the root
mentioned at p. 107. G. Ed., इ i, "to go," is not unknown
in German. We find it in the Gothic imperative hir-i, "come
here"; du. hir-yats; pl. hir-yith. I believe, too, that in the
irregular preterite iddya, "I went," the i alone can be as-
sumed as the root. In Zend occurs अेति aēi-ti, "he goes"
(from अेति ēti, according to §§. 28. 41.), Lithuan. ei-ti. फ्र
sri, "to go," with the prep. उ उ, "to raise itself"; hence,
उच्चरत uchchhrita, "raised," "high"; compare cre-sco, cre-vi
(see §. 21.), Old High German SCRIT, "to step," with the
addition of a t, as in the case of mat, from उ मा: perhaps the Latin
gradior, as well as cresco, might be here included,
the Guna form of the vowel, as in अयत्ति bray-a-ti, "he
goes," being observed. फिः smi, "to smile," Old High
German SMIL; फ्रī pri, "to love," Zend द्रষ्ट frit (§. 47.), Goth.
fiyā, "I love" (§. 87.), compare प्रय priya, "dear." फ्रī bhi,
"to fear," भिभमि bibhemi, "I fear"; Lithuan. biyau; Gothic
fiya, "I hate" (fiýais, fiýaith), fiyands, "foe"; Old High German
videm or fiém, "I hate": the Greek φιβ-ο-μαυ answers to the
Sanskrit reduplication of bibhemi; 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 θ as the whole root, as in Sanskrit da-d-mas, "we give,"
for da-dd-mas, ὀ-ο-μες. Perhaps, also, [G. Ed. p. 124.]
ΦΙΔ, φιδομαυ, is to be referred to the roots in i, so that an
unorganic dental affix would be to be assumed. 

"to lie," "to sleep," with irregular Guna in the middle; hence sē-tē = kei-tai. 

his old 

hence sē-tē = kei-tai. 

"to be ashamed"; Old High German HRU, "to repent" (hriu-u, hrou, hru-umēs, see p. 115. G. Ed.). Of roots in ū, ṑū dru, "to run," ṑūvān ḍrav-ā-tē, "he runs" may furnish, through the Guna form, the Greek ḍrā-skw, ḍi-ḥrā-skw, which appears hence to derive its a with suppression of the digamma: the μ of ḍreμo, however, might pass as a hardening of the ūv (§. 63.), and ḍreμ-μ-μεν, ḍreμ-ε-τε, &c., therefore represent most truly the forms ḍrav-ā-mas, ḍrav-ā-tha. ṑū plu, "to go," "to swim," "to float" (Av plava, "a ship"), Latin FLU. The Greek πλέω, πλῶ is again not to be so regarded as if the old ū had been corrupted to e or o, but πλέ(μ)ω, πλο(μ)ω supply the place of the Guna form in plav-ē (of the middle voice), 3d pers. plav-a-tē: the future πλένω, the ū having the Guna (§. 26.), answers to ṑūvē plō-shyē; Lithuan. plaukiu, "I swim," with a guttural added, as in Latin fluč-si from fluv (p. 98. G. Ed.). Old High German VLUZ, "to flow," presupposes the Gothic FLUT (§. 87.); with the favourite dental addition, with which all final vowels are so commonly invested. 

śru, "to hear," KAY (§§. 20., 21.), Gothic HLIU-MAN (nominative hliuma), "ear," as "hearer," with weakened Guna (§. 27.); with regard to the kl for ēr, compare, also, clunis with ṕrōsī ṕrōnī, f. "hip.") 

Lithuan. klausau, "I hear." Perhaps erudio, as "to make hear," is to be referred to this class: the derivation from e and rudis is little satisfactory. Anquetil introduces a Zend erodē, célébre, (κλωτός), which I have not yet found in the original text, but I meet with the causal form sāvamāaśā śrāvāmyēmi (Sansk. śrāvāmyāmi, "I speak," "recite" (V. S. p. 38). The Old High German, serirumēs, "we have exclaimed," gives SCRIR as the root, and rests probably on the form śrāv (§. 20.), with a thinning of the ū to i (§. 66.); the present and sing. preterite, however, have lost the r (scriu
OF THE ROOTS.

for scriru, screi for screir), like the Greek κλή-σω, κέκλη-κυ, &c. The Latin clamo, however, has the same relation to चार् ब्राव that mare has to चारि वारि, “water” (§. 63.), and ध्रु to ध्रु द्राव, from धु द्रू, “to run.” नव हु, “to extol,” “to glorify” (अप्रय प्रव हुनुंता, “he celebrated,” V. S. p. 39.), is probably the root of the Greek ᾶμνος (ᾱμ(ε)νος), which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from άδω.

“to purify,” Pūrus. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire, which are both represented as pure. ध्वन pavana (with Guna and ana [G. Ed. p. 125.] as suffix) is “the wind,” and the corresponding Gothic FONĀ (neut. nom. acc. fūn, see §. 116.) is “fire,” which in Sanskrit is called पावक pāv-aka, with Vṛiddhi and aka as suffix. The relation of FONĀ to ध्वन pavana resembles that of the Latin málo from mavorlo; the loss of the syllable वा 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, धु pū. धु ब्राव, “to speak,” Zend यर्म mrā (e.g. यब्रम्द mrād-m, “I spoke,” V. S. p. 123.); the Greek πέ(φ)ω rests on the Guna form ख्वोन्म brau-i-mi, and has, as often happens, lost the former of two initial consonants (cf. also रेव, रेवω, and Ρω, with Ρ sru, “to flow”). The Old High German SPRAH, or SPRAHH (sprihhu, “I speak,” sprah, “I spoke”) appears to have proceeded from ध्रव brav, by hardening the ध v (see §. 19.), and prefixing an s akin to the p. ध bhū, “to be,” Zend 浊 bū, Lithuan. BU (future būsu, “I will be”), Latin FU, Greek ΦΥ. Probably, also, BY, in πεσ-βυς, πεσβύτης, &c., is only another form of this root (cf. §. 18.); so that πες would have to be regarded as a preposition from πό (π pra) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf. §. 96.). Moreover, the base πεσβυ has a striking resemblance to प्रु prabhu (excelsus, augustus), literally, “being before.” In Old High German pim or bim corresponds to the
Sanskrit भवामि bhavāmi: more exact, however, is the correspondence in the plural of pir-u-mēs, pir-u-t, to bhav-ā-mas, "sumus," bhav-a-tha, "estis" (see § 19.). To this class belongs, also, PŪ, "to dwell" (pū-ta, "I dwelt"), as the Sanskrit बस ras "to dwell," in German VAS, WAS, has become seyn. In Sanskrit, too, from म bhā, "to be," comes the substantive bhav-ana "house," as place of being. The Gothic baua, "I build," may be regarded as the causal of the idea "to be," like the Latin facio (§. 19.): its conjugation answers also to भवामि bhavayāmi, "I make to be," which, in Prākrit, may sound bhāvēmi, bhāvēsi, bhāvēli (Gothic baua, bauais, bauait). See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskrit roots ending in diphthongs (ै ए, ओ द, ए दि; there are no roots in ऋ अू) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in ख। ए। 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 ऋ रि and ऋ 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 ः a. So व ः व ः vach, Zend व ः व ः vach (व ः व ः abqa, "dictum," Vend. S. p. 124), Greek ΕΙΙ for ΕΙΙ (§. 14.), Latin VOC, Old High German, WAH, WAG (ki-wahu, "mentionem facio," pret. ki-wuoh pl. ki-wuogumēs). प्रच्छ prachh, Zend प ः प ः पेरेस, Gothic FRAH; pres भविश्व prichchhami, प ः प ः पेरेसामि, friha for friha (see §, 82. and §. 109. 1.); the Latin ROG (rogo, interrogo) appears to be abbreviated from FROG. प ः प ः प ः pat, "to full," "to fly," Zend प ः प ः प ः pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 125. प ः प ः प ः प ः yat prā vayō patain urvara ucyain, "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this
that, in Greek, πτερόν, πετάω, πετάομαι, πετώμαι, πτημόμαι, &c., belong to a common root ΠΕΤ; Latin PET, peto, im-peto, prepetes, penna by assimilation for pet-na. In Gothic FATH, or, with the vowel weakened, FITH, might be looked for. To the latter corresponds, according to §. 87., Old High German VÄĐ, in vēd-ara, "feather," 10. vad, "to speak," Latin VAD, contained in vas, vad-is. From वि väd proceeds the abbreviated form उद ud, to which pertains 'यद (ेद, उदेव, उदीत). The Old High German gives WAZ (var-wazu "maledico"), with z for d, according to §. 87., and the vowel of the base lengthened, as in ओडयामि vadayāmi, according to the tenth class. बधः sad, "to sink, with the prep. नी ni, "to set oneself down"; Latin SED, SID, siso, sedeo; Greek ἝΔ, ἸΔ, σέδω, σέδρα, σέδωμαι; Gothic SAT (§. 87.), sita, "I sit" (p. 116 G. Ed.). दन 2 an, "to blow," to breathe," अनिन्दित anila, "wind," Gothic ἀΝ, usana, "I expire," cf. ἀνεμός, "animus." चन 3 jan, "to beget," Zend पङ्ख zan (§. 58.), स्वायु zazāmi, "I beget," Sanskrit जनम jajamī, Greek ΓΕΝ, Latin GEN (γίγνομαι, γένος, gigno, genus), Gothic KIN, "to germinate," (p. 116 G. Ed.); kuni, "gender" (§. 66.). करः कर (क्रिय), e.g. करोति karoti, "facit": this root, in Zend, follows the fifth class; e.g. जरेनाडित kērenāditi (§. 41.), "facit," जरेनाडित kērenāditi, "facit," जरेनाडित这也 kērenādhi, "fac"; Old High German kara-wan or garawan, "to prepare"; Latin creo, cura (cf. कुर kuru, "fac"), ceremonia, and with p for c (§. 14.), paro; Greek κραῖνω, κρα-τος; with π, πρασσω, πρακ-σω, [G. Ed. p. 127.] prāγ-μα, where the guttural appears to be a hardening of the व v (§. 19.), e.g. of कर्खत kuvanti, "faciant" (from kur-anti). वहः 1 vah, "to drive," "to carry," Zend वाझ vax (§. 57.), Latin VEH, Greek ὁχος, "wagon," as bearer, carrier, for ὁχος. अस्त्य 2 svas, "to breathe," cf. spiro, according to §§. 50. and 22. ग्रहः 9.10. grah, "to take": the original form, occurring in the Vedas, is ग्रह grubh. To this the Zend form belongs, according to the tenth class, and,
indeed, so that the न्फbh appears before vowels as न, but before ज t as ज p. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 155: तेषां तस्मात् तु पुराणां सुभूमिताणां न्फbh अस्तवम् येन नौती उसस्वयति य नएण अग्नरूप्यावै केहे आस्थितिता? “Pure! si non dimittit, qui hominem captum captit (i. e. tenet), quænam ei 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 tenuës, ΚΑΕΠ also seems to belong to this class, Gothic HLIF, “to steal,” hliftus, “thief.” Finally, also, in Greek, γραφὸς, γραφός, “the net,” stands quite isolated, and appears to me to be related to the Indian ग्राह grabh, by changing the a into i. आसः ds, “to sit,” Greek ἨΣ a remnant of the second class, terminating in a consonant to be supplied at §. 109*: 3.; ἰσ-ταί answers exactly to आसे ds-té (middle voice), and hence इμα stands for ἰμα, as eiμί for ἐσμί (Sanskrit asmi). अतिः bhrāj, “to shine,” Zend 𐇗𐇡 bĕrêz (§. 58). or† हे barez, whence the part. pres. हे bĕrêzant, nom. m. हे bĕrēzan, “splendens,” “altus,” very frequently occurs. This Zend form prepares the way for the Old High German root PERAH, whence PERAH-TA, nom. perah-t, “fulgidus.” To this root belongs, also, our Pracht. The Greek language gives ΦΑΕΠ (§. 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. चन्द्र chhid, “to cleave,” SCID, scind-i-mus = chhindmas (§. 14.): ΣΧΙΖ, perhaps also ΣΚΙΔ, σκίνημ, &c. belong to this place; the form is more genuine, and the ideas, too, of

* Anquetil translates, “Si celui qui a commis l’Agueréfité ne reconnoit pas sa faute quelle sera sa punition.”
† Cf. p. 1281. Note *
‡ The h (in the sense of ch) corresponding to the j, y, 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*. 2* vid, "to know," Zend योः vid, या; Gothic *VID*, Old High German, *VIZ*; in the Latin *VID*, and in εἰδω, "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 यथ् *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" (निवाधयययः *nivādţhayemi*, "invoco," see § 28.) In Gothic, *VIT* receives through the prep. in the meaning "to adore" (*invita*, *invait*, *invitum*). 6* dis, "to shew," Zend यद्य *dis*; hence प्रादशयद *fradāśayaḥ*, "thou shewest" (Vend. S. p. 123), Greek ΔΙΚ, with Guna δεῖκνυμι, 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 *THI*, and this root, combined with *ga*, signifies "to announce" (*ga-teiha*, *ga-taith*, *ga-taihum*, for *ga-tihum*, according to § 82.). On the other hand, in *taikus*, "sign," the law for the transposition of letters is violated. 1* jīv, "life;" Lithuanian *gywa*-s, "alive," *gywenū* "I live," *gywata" "life;" Gothic *QUIVA*, nom. *quies*, "alive;" Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUIV*, as *bis* from *duis* (Sansk. द्विस *dwis*), *viginti* from *twiginti*. The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root. Hence, e.g. ज्वा *jva*, nom. ज्वो *jvō*, "living," (V. S. p. 189); and *हु-जितायो* *hu-jiṭayō*, "bonam vitam habentes" (l. c. p. 222), from *हु-जिती* *hu-jiṭi*. From *ji*, the root, would become. with Guna, *jayāmi*, on which rests the Greek *ζω*, the *j* having

---

fallen out (§. 14.); but βίος also belongs to this root, and finds a medium of comparison with सिव jīv, in the Latin vivo. Of roots with u, रुच्च ruch, "to shine," and रुद्दू rudd, "to weep," may serve as examples; the former, in Zend, is राधा rađha, (§§. 28, 32.), and follows the tenth class, e.g. राधा अज्ञातिस्पे त् [G. Ed. p. 129.] racchayēiti, "splendet." In Latin correspond LUC, luz-s, luceo (§. 20.) and RUD: the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the r by l, and presents, for comparison, ΑΥΚ (άμφιλόκη, λυκόφως) and άΥΖ; to the former, λόχνον, λυχν-νέα, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, अपलयत tofno-s, "burning," has to the root άμφο tap (§. 40.) We must assign λευκός also, with Guna, to the root ΑΥΚ. The Gothic gives LUH for LUK, according to §. 87.; whence, with the original, or with weakened Guna (§§. 26., 27.), spring forms like lauhmōni, "lightning," lauhatyan, "to lighten," luhath, "light." Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands lukarn (theme, lukurna, neut.), "lamp," rather isolated. A root corresponding to रुद rudd is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to §. 87., RUZ, "to weep" (riuzu, ṭōz for rauz, according to §. 80., ruzumēs). θυμον bhūṣh, "to adorn," is perhaps contained in the Latin or-no, with loss of the initial letter, as amo in relation to ΚΑΜΑΙΝIN kāmaṇāmī, "I love." With regard to the r for प श, advert to the relation of uro to उष uṣh, "to burn," सेव sev, "to honour," नेष्व mēdh, "to think"(?). The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb: it springs, however, from नेष्व mēdhas and नेष्व mēdha, "understanding," unless it should be preferred to assume for these words a root mēdh, which, however, the Grammarians do not exhibit. The Gothic has, for comparison, MIT, whence mittō, "I think": the Greek furnishes an analogous word to σευ, 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 [G. Ed. p. 130.] persons or things, to which that which the abstract root expresses adheres; and hence it is most natural to look for pronouns in the elements used in the formation of words, as the bearers of qualities, actions, and conditions, which the root expresses *in abstracto*. There appears, too, in reality, as we shall develope 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, represents the naked root, which are then united in declension with the syllables which denote the relations of case. Except at the end of compounds, such radical words are, in Sanskrit, few in number, and are all feminine abstracts; as, भो bhô, "fear," युध yudh, "contest," मूढ 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, ἠλέγχος (φλάκος), ὅτι (ὅτι), υφι (ὑπι), λεγ (λεγ), πας (πας), ἡμι (ημί), πελ-λει (πελ-λει). In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance; for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskrit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself; as, e.g. धर्मविद 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 (fic-s), tubi-cin (cen). An example in Greek is χερνιβ (for -νι α from νι-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 ya also. Thus, e.g. विजित् svarga-jit, "conquering the heaven," विजित् vi-jit-ya, "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 मम्, "to measure."
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112. The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, i.e. in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example; and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language; but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds—and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension—requires the pure primary form; naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually

[G. Ed. p. 134.] followed in composition; and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom. and acc. sing. of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in
this point, have applied to the cases furnished to them by the language, and take the augmented अस्मत् asmat, or अस्मद् asmad, "from us," युष्मत् yushmat or युष्मद् yushmad, "from you," as the starting-point in the declension, or as the primary form, although in both pronominal forms only अ a and य 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 अ, cannot escape any one who holds the neuter अङ्क् kim 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) अङ्क: कि: kimah kah, i. e, ka* is substituted for kim. If this strange method were to be followed in Latin, and the neuter quid in like manner regarded as the theme, then, in order to get at the dative cu-i (after the analogy of fructui), one would have to say "quidis cus," or "quidi cus." In another place (p. 825), Pāṇini forms from idam, "this" (which in like manner has the honour of passing for a base) and kim, "what?" a copulative compound; and by इदांकिमृ ईदांकिमृ idānkimār ēkā 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, distinguish, besides the two natural genders, another—the neuter, which the Indian Grammarians call Klīva, i. e. eunuch; which appears to be a peculiarity of the San-

* He forms, namely, from kim, regarded as a base, kim-as, which in reality does not occur, and which has, for the sake of euphony, here become kimah.
skrît, 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, bhyam, 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, tu tâ 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"
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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 λόγος): and o was also the termination of the Latin noun in ancient times; but in the classic period, although sometimes retained, it was commonly changed to u in the nom. and accus. sing. (of the second declension). An old a, however, is still left in cola, grena, 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 ἀ-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 ων, which does not at all

* Cf. p. 1294. l. 20. G. Ed.
suit a theme in $\alpha$ or $\eta$; and further, from such compounds as $\mu\nu\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\lambda\eta\varsigma$, $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\tau\rho\iota\beta\eta\varsigma$, in which the vowel that has been added to the roots $\Pi\Omega\Lambda$ and $\Pi\Pi\Pi\beta$ 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 $\textit{facile}$ for $\textit{facili}$, $\textit{mare}$ for $\textit{mari}$, Sanskrit $\varphi\alpha\varphi\rho\varphi$ $\varphi\alpha\varphi\rho\varphi$, "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 $u$, 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 ($\delta$, $\iota$, $\delta$) 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 $\delta$ correspond (§. 69.) to the Sanskrit feminine bases in $\delta$, and the $\delta$ in the uninflected nom. and accus. sing. is shortened to $a$, with the exception of the monosyllabic forms $s\delta$, "she," "this," Sanskrit शा $s\delta$, Zend $h\delta$; $hv\delta$, "which?" Sanskrit and Zend $k\delta$. 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 $\alpha$ approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit feminine चा $\delta$, which the common dialect has sometimes preserved, sometimes shortened, sometimes transformed into $\eta$. 
119. The long ī appears, in Sanskrit, most frequently as a characteristic addition in the formation of feminine bases, thus, the feminine base महती mahatī (magna) springs from महत mahat. The same holds good in Zend. Moreover, the feminine character ī has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part. pres. and fut. an į is added to the old participial suffix anī, and ēsant-ī, "the existing," bū-sent-ī, "that that shall be," correspond to the Sanskrit सतī satī (for asati or asanti), भव-शयंती bhav-ī-shyantī. In Greek and Latin this feminine long ī has become incapable of declension; and where it has still left traces, there a later unorganic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either α or σ; in Latin, c. Thus, ἐδεία corresponds to the Sanskrit खाद्ि swādu-ī, from खाद् swādu, "sweet"; -τρια, -τριδ, e.g. ὀρχήστρια, ληπτρίς, ληπτριδ-ος, to the Sanskrit चि trī, e.g. जनित्री janitri, "genitress," to which the Latin genitrī-c-s, genitrī-c-is, corresponds; while in the Greek γενέτειρα, and similar formations, the old feminine ī is forced back a syllable. This 

[G. Ed. p. 140.] analogy is followed by μέλαινα, τάλαινα, τέρεινα, and substantive derivations, as τέκταινα, Λάκαινα. In θεράπαινα, Λέαινα, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom. masc., shortened by a ι. In θείαινα, Λόκαινα, it is to be assumed that the proper primitive in ν or ντ has been lost, or that these are formations of a different kind, and correspond to the rather isolated word in Sanskrit इंद्रायिणी Indrāṇī, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इंद्र Indra, is termed. The cases where the feminine ī is solely represented by α are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in ντ, where τ passes into σ: the preceding ν, however, is replaced by ν or ι, or the mere lengthening of the preceding vowel, or it is assimilated to the σ:

hence, ουσ-α, εισ-α, εσσ-α, ζωσ-α*, ουν-α
for ουν-α, ευν-α, ευν-α, ιν-α, ανυν-α, υνυν-α.

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

120. The German, too, can no longer fully decline the old feminine ι; and the Gothic, by a foreign affix, introduces it into the 6 declension, but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable ιο in the [G. Ed. p. 141.] uninflected nominative and vocative to ι, in the adjective to ια. More commonly, however, the old bases in ι are introduced, by the frequently employed affix of an n, into the so-called weak declension; and as ι in Gothic is denoted by ei, so to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in सन्नी antī, and to the fem. comparative bases in ईयसि iyast, correspond the forms ndein, izein, regarding the nominative of which refer to §. 142.

121 The long u (ू) 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 vadhū, "a wife," भु bhū, "earth," चात्र swāśrā, "mother-in-law" (socrus), भ्र व bhrū, "eyebrow." To the latter corresponds ὅφρος, likewise with the long u, the declension of which, however, is not different from that of the short u; while in Sanskrit the long u is distinguished from the short feminine u in the same way as इ i from इ i. But few monosyllabic primary forms end, in Sanskrit, with diphthongs, not any at all with र e; with र आ (from ι + ι, see §. 2.) only र रai, masc. "thing," "riches"; in
the nom. irregularly रात्रि रा́-s for रस्त्रा́ रा́-s. In this is recognised the Latin re-s. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in ē should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit रा́di; for, in the first place, the Latin ē corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit रा́ (from ā+i), never to di; secondly, the connection of the ē of the fifth declension with the originally long a of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic ı́ does to the Doric Ᾰ), 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 abstractions from adjectives is sounded as well tie as tia (planitie-s, [G. Ed. p. 142.] planitia, canitie-s, canitia); and iē-s, and ia, in the formation of primitive and derivative words—like effigie-s, effyia, pauperie-s, pauperia—are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit या́ yā, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek iā, Ionic iη. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine ē and a. The most weighty is the ś in the nom. sing. and pl.: ē-s, ē-s for ē, ei, as musa, musae (musai), κεφαλή, κεφαλαί. As regards the ś 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 सुता 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
older forms than the Sanskrit and Greek, like तुदन tudan, λέγων πίθευς, because they have preserved the nominative s together with the nasal, and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms, like महावन bavanis, "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 ει answers to deae (deai), the more rare, however, and better, in ἐς 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 δηι-ς, and then, perhaps, a die-is will be as little required as a δηι-ς. 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 ἐ, 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 τε-ς and the abovementioned Sanskrit रेँ rāi is, in my opinion, to be arrived at through the irregular nominative रास rā-ς; and according to this re-ς would be supported on an old ἅ: it answers to रास rā-ς as τέ-bus to ρά-βhyas, and as in Greek γῆ-ν to the Sanskrit गम gdam, "terram," which, in the remaining cases, has गो gō 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-ς approach more closely the Latin in ἐ.
122. Primary forms in श्रो tha are rare in Sanskrit: the only ones known to me are छो dyā, "heaven," and गो gō: the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from दिव div (a radical word from दिव div, "to shine") by the vocalization of the ऋ ṍ, after which the vowel र i becomes its semi-vowel य y. In the accusative the a bases change this diphthong into ड. To the ड thus obtained in द्राः dyā-m,

[G. Ed. p. 144.] गतम gā-m, corresponds the Latin e of die-m, the Greek η, Doric α, of γῆ ν, γα ν: the Latin e, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final m: the original language requires διε- m. In Sanskrit, also, from दिव 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. दिवास divā, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds; and also दिवस divasa, masc., and छ दु dyu, neuter (a contraction from div), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To छ दु dyu answers, after rejecting the ड (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 छो dyā, whence the dative छ दयव-ए, and the locat. छ दव dyav-i. The Djovis, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian Ζεός signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven": I form its relation to छो dyā thus, that after dropping the ड d the following semi-vowel र y became र (§. 19.). The oblique cases, on the contrary (Διος, Δι u, &c.), belong to the Sanskrit छ दु dyu, and must originally have had a digamma, proceeding by the natural law of sound from u, after which change the semi-vowel j must have become a vowel. Διoς has the same relation to ΔιFoς, that, in Latin, sub dio has to sub divo.

123. Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in ध, viz. गो gō. It has several
meanings; but the most common are "bull," as masculine, and "cow" and "earth" as feminine. Both significations have in Zend, as in Greek, divided themselves into two forms. The Greek has preserved for the meaning "earth" the old guttural. With regard to the vowel, \( \gamma \eta, \gamma \alpha \) follows the example of the Indian accusative, where, as has been already remarked, गान्त् गाम (\( \gamma \eta \nu \)) stands for \( \gamma \delta \text{-} m \) [G. Ed. p. 145.] or गाव-अम। For the meaning "ox" the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—(for, for खो \( \delta = a \times u \) may very well be expected, according to §. 4., \( \omega u \))—but has exchanged the guttural medials for labials, as, p. 122 G. Ed., \( \beta \delta \eta \nu \mu \) for जगान्त् जयामि। The base बौ before vowels must originally have become \( \beta \delta \); thus, in the dative, \( \beta \delta \text{-} f \) would answer to the Sanskrit locat. गव गव-\( i \), and the Latin dative \( b o v-\text{-} i \); but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped; and there is not, as with the initial digamma, the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings. Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here. The Latin has, in the word \( \text{bō-} s \), 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 \( \text{Bō} \) becomes \( v \), and the short \( a \) is resolved into the form of a short \( o \); thus, \( b o v-\text{-} i \) answers to the Sanskrit locat. गव गव-\( i \). The Zend for the meaning "earth" has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into \( z \), and gives in the nominative गाव जाद for \( \text{āv} \text{-} \text{zd} \) (§. 56\( ^* \)), in the accusative गाव जाइम (§. 61\( . \)): I am not able to adduce other cases. For the meaning "ox" the guttural has remained in Zend, and the nominative is then नाम्य गाव-\( s \) or नाम्य गाद-\( s \).

124. I know only two words in Sanskrit which terminate in \( ठी \ ठु \text{-} nāu, "ship," and ठी ग्ल्रु, "moon": the former has navigated very far on the ocean of our wide province of
language, without, however, in Sanskrit, having arrived at a secure etymological haven. I believe नौ to be an abbreviation of snau (cf. φέω, φέω, ρυο, with श्रु, p. 125 G. ed.), [G. Ed. p. 146.] and that it therefore proceeds from the root च्वा "to bathe," which originally, perhaps, may also have meant "to swim," and with which वाओ, वेओ, नातो, appear to be connected. नौ would consequently be a radical word; and in regard to the vowel would stand for न, according to the analogy of देह dadd (dedi, dedit) for dadd, from dadd-a. As ए, according to §. 6., is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskrit Vṛiddhi-diphthong ए better than by ए, while ए (from short ए + उ) is commonly represented by ए or ए. Hence नौ-स and वात-स correspond as exactly as possible; the ए of NAY, however, like that of BOY, has maintained itself only before consonants; and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions; ए-ए, ए-ए, are from एएए (Sansk. नव-स), as एएए from एएए. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses नेव-ए, नव-बस, for नौ-स, नौ-बस.* As the semi-vowel ए is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19.), we have here also, for नौ, नव-एम, a sister form in our Nachen, Old High German naccho, "ship," gen. dat. nacchin.

125. We pass over to the consonants: of these, ए, ट, ट, 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, ख, ग, घ) we find none at

* Thus in German an ट has been added to the above-mentioned नौ गो, which, however, according to §. 117., is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German; hence चु, "cow," gen. चुवी, where the ट 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; and in Greek both radical and derivative, [G. Ed. p. 147.]

_y_ 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, 'ONYX (Sanskrit nakha), ΦΑΟΓ. Of the palatals, _ch_ and _j_ in Sanskrit occur most frequently in वच, वाच, "speech, voice" (VOC, 'OH); राज्, राज, "king," the latter only at the end of compounds; असर अस्र, "blood" (sanguis): in Zend we have ḍr, ḍru, ḍ, as name of an evil demon, probably from the Sanskrit root द्रु द्रु, "to hate." Of the two classes of the _T_-sound, the first, or lingual (ङ, ॠ, &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 र, ध, ध, occur only in radical words, and therefore seldom; ध प, may perhaps only in पथ path, as the secondary theme of पथन पथन, "way"; nom. पन्ध्य पथन, from पन्ध्य पथन, which I think I again recognise in the Latin PON, PON. Other examples are, धद ad, "eating," at the end of compounds, and युध yudh, f., "strife." The letter त 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 अं at or अं ant, Greek and Latin _nt_. The Greek, besides _τ_, exhibits also _θ_ and _θ_ at the end of primary forms which are not radical; still KOPYΘ and 'OPNΘ appear to me to be properly compounds, and to contain the roots _Θ_, _Θ_, (the vowel being dropped) as their last member; and according to this, KOPYΘ would properly mean "what is placed on the head"; so in Sanskrit, अंतर अंत, "autumn," "rainy season," which Grammarians explain by a suffix _ad_, in my opinion means nothing but "water giving," and contains the root दद _dd_, "to give," with _d_ suppressed. 'OPNΘ finds in Greek itself no etymology: the Sanskrit offers for its explanation अरण अरण (according to the pronunciation of Bengal, oroni), "wood"; and if _ορν_ is con- [G. Ed. p. 148.]
nected therewith, we may refer to ἑω, "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, विहा-गा. Regarding the later origin of the δ in feminine bases in द, an account is given in §. 119.; that is to say, patronymics in द may be compared with Sanskrit ones in ध, e.g. भैरवी “the daughter of Bhima. Probably, too, the द in feminine patronymics in अद is a later addition; they spring, like those in द, not from their masculines, but directly from the primary word of the masculine, and, in my opinion, stand in sisterly, not in filial connection with them. In Latin, d appears as a more modern affix in the base PECUD, which the Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic terminate with u (Sans.-Zend, paśu, Goth. faihu). In Gothic, primary forms with a final T-sound are chiefly limited to the part. pres., where the old t appears changed into d, which remains without extraneous addition: there only, however, where the form stands substantively; otherwise, with the exception of the nominative, it is conducted by the affix an into a more current province of declension. The more modern German dialects under no circumstances leave the old T-sound without a foreign addition commixed with the base. In Lithuanian the participial suffix ant, in regard of the nom. sing. ans for ants, rests exactly upon the Latin and Zend step, which extends beyond the Sanskrit; but in most of the remaining cases the Lithuanian cannot decline any more consonants, i.e. cannot unite them with pure case terminations, but transports them always, by a more modern affix, into a vowel-declension; and, indeed, to the participial suffix ant is added the [G. Ed. p. 149.] syllable ia, by the influence of which the t experiences the euphonic transformation into ch (= tsch*). The nasal of this dental T-class, viz. the

* This sound is expressed by 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 ṝaṁ ṛp (probably from the root ṝaṁ ṛp, "to take in," "to comprehend"), "water," which is used only in the plural; in Zend, however, in the singular also.* In Greek and Latin, also, bases in p, b, φ, are either evidently radical, or of unknown origin, with probably radical letters at the end; or in Latin they have suppressed, in the nominative, a vowel belonging to the base; and so, as in [G. Ed. p. 150.] German, the first and fourth strong declensions, according to Grimm, have only the appearance of a base terminating with a consonant. Of this kind is plebs, from plebis; to explain which it is not requisite to turn, with Voss, to the Greek πλῆθος: one must keep to the Latin root P.L.E. 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 पंचन् panchan), aqua; on the other hand, am-nis rests on the form ṛp, as somnus for sopnus, and σεισθῆνες, for σεθῆνες, in analogy with a Sanskrit euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. r. 58.). The Sanskrit has from the same root another neuter, सप्तस् ṛpas, in which we recognise the Latin aequor, which therefore would not proceed from aequus, but is transferred from the waves, or the mirror of the sea, to other things of a similar nature. In Greek, ṛphis ṛpas appears to belong to the same origin.
bo (amabam, -bo), as from the root FU. “to be,” which, like *FER, often changes the B in its middle into F (§. 18.). Without appealing to the cognate languages, it is difficult, in Latin, to distinguish those bases which truly and originally terminate in a consonant from those which only appear to do so; for the declension in *i has clearly operated on the consonantal declension, and introduced an *i into different places in which it is impossible it could have stood originally. In the dative and ablative plural, the *i of forms like amantibus, vocibus, admits of being explained as a conjunctive vowel, for facilitating the affix; it is, however in my opinion, more correct to say that the bases VOC, AMANT, &c., because they could not unite with bus, have, in the present state of the Latin language, been lengthened to VOCI, AMANTI; so that we ought to divide voci-bus, amanti-bus, just as at §. 125. it was said of the Lithuanian, that in most cases it extends its participial bases in ant to anchia (euphonic for antia). This view of forms like amanti-bus is proved to be the more probable, in that in the genitive plural also before um, as before the a of neuters, an *i frequently finds its place, without its being possible to say that in amanti-um, amanti-a, the *i would be necessary to facilitate the annexation of the ending. On the other hand, juveni-s, cani-s, forming the genitives canu-m, juveni-um, remind us of older bases in n; as in Sanskrit चन्द्र, "a dog" (abbreviated चुन्नु sūn), and युवन्त yuvan, "young" (abbreviated यूवन्त पुन्त yūn), in Greek κνων, 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 FIDVÖRI (Sanskrit चन्द्र chatur, in the strong cases §. 129. चन्द्र चन्द्र chātwar) comes the dative fidvori-m. The themes सप्त saptan, “seven,” नवन navon, “nine,” दशन daśan, “ten,” by the addition of an *i
in Old High German mould themselves to *SIBUNI, NIUNI, ZEHANI; which forms, at the same time, pass as masculine nominatives, as these cases, in Old High German, have lost the case-suffix *s. The corresponding Gothic nominatives, if they occurred, would be *sibunei-s, niunei-s, taihunei-s. More on this point hereafter.

127. Of the semi-vowels (y, r, l, v), I have never found in Sanskrit य y and ल l at the end of bases, and व v only in the word दिव div, before mentioned, which contracts itself in several cases to द्व dyō and व्य du. On the other hand, 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 र. Moreover, र in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original s, as, in the comparative suffix io (Sanskrit ईयस iyas); and, further, as an abbreviation of ri-s, re, as l for li-s, le; or, in the second declension, as abbreviated from ru-s; as in Gothic, vair, “man,” for vair(a)s, belongs to bases in a (§. 116.). In Greek ἄλλ appears as a consonantal base; but in contrast with the [G. Ed. p. 152.] Sanskrit सलिल sa влия, “water,” ἀλ-ς appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as μέγας from μεγαλός.

128. Of the Sanskrit sibilants, the two first (ष s, घ sh), as also the ह h, are found only in radical words, and therefore seldom; झ s, on the contrary, concludes some very common suffixes used in the formation of words, as शम as, which forms principally neuters, e.g. तेजस tējas, “splendour,” “strength,” from तिस tīs, “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 अर ar in several cases, and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds, contract the syllable अर ar to अ र r; and this अ र r 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. ΤΕΝΕΣ. with change of the e into o), form in the genitive μένεςος, γένεςος, for μένεςος, γένεςος. The of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no 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, ὅρσε-σι; so likewise in compounds, like σακές-πάλος, τελεσ-φόρος, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a Σ to the vowel of the base. In γῆρας, γῆρα-ός, for γήρασ-ός, after restoring the Σ of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskrit जरस jaras, “age,” although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffixes terminating with has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf., in the oblique cases of which us corresponds to the Sanskrit उष uṣh (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 

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

129. The Sanskrit and Zend have eight cases, viz. besides those which exist in Latin, an instrumental and a locative. These two cases exist also in Lithuanian; 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 चन at is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to चन ant. The root तुद tu, “to vex,” e.g. exhibits in the participle mentioned the form तुद-ant as the strong and original theme (cf. tundent-em), and तुद tu as the weak theme; hence the masculine is declined,

[§. p. 154.]

**STRONG CASES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>तूदन tudan</td>
<td>तूदनौ tudantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>तूदनास tudantam</td>
<td>तूदनास tudantam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>तूदनम tuddanam</td>
<td>तूदनम tuddanam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>तूदनद्व tuddanadva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>तूदनः tuddana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>तूदना tuddana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>तूदनः tuddana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEAK CASES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>तूद tuda</td>
<td>तूद tuda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>तूदस्त tuddast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>तूदः tudda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>तूदः tudda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>तूदः tudda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>तूदः tudda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>तूदः tudda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural: Nom. Voc.</th>
<th>STRONG CASES.</th>
<th>WEAK CASES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tudantās</td>
<td>tudantas</td>
<td>tudatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>tudās</td>
<td>tudās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>tudābhās</td>
<td>tudābhās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>tudābhīyas</td>
<td>tudābhīyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>tudām</td>
<td>tudām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>tudatsu</td>
<td>tudatsu</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 शुन्यः, "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to शुन्, "sun," appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive शुन-द over against the strong nominative and accusative सन, सन-द, Sanskrit शान शुन, शानम शुनानम (§. 50.)). The base अप, "water," which, in Sanskrit, in the strong cases has a long ऑ, but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom. अपोः अपस (§. 40.), accus. अपस अपेम; on the other hand, अप-द, "of the water," अप-त, "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 ἵλλος σὺνδ, "canes," is found for ἱλλός ἵππο in the nominative; and, on the other hand, the strong ἵλλος ἵππο, in the nominative as well as in the accusative.*

132. The Greek, in the declension of κύων, 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 रिता पिता, पितर्पम पितराम, पितर पितार, पित्रि (locat.); and the Gothic bróthar, as nom., accus., and vocat., opposed to bróthr, "of the brother," bróthar, "to the brother," with the Sanskrit भाता भ्राताः, भातस्य भ्रातात्तरम्, भातर भ्रातर, dative भाते भ्रात्रे, locat. भाति भ्रात्रि. 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 युक्तम् अपो in the accusative; and am therefore in doubt, whether in this word, owing to the facile exchange of युक्तम् अपो and युक्तम् अपो, the confusion has not originated in more graphical oversights. Thus, V. S. p. 21, we find: जुहाष्टास युक्तम् अपो रवहुस्व वहिस्वां मुजूलुल्हतो आशामिस अय्येके, "aquas puras, optimas, ab Orinuzdo creatas, mundas celebro"; and युक्तम् विश्वाः अपो, "omnes aquas." On the other hand, in the page following: युक्तम् युक्तम् समस्तक युक्तम् मृतस्तताः, इम्दो अपो-चा तेनै-चा उरारो-चा अय्ये, "has aquasque terrasque arboresque celebro."
approximate most nearly to it, as Pāli and Prākṛī, 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 Veda language did not use the euphonic n so universally as the common Sanskrit; and together with एनं, इनं, उनं, उनं नं, occur also चन्या यनं, चन्या यनं, चन्या यनं. The euphonic n is most frequently employed by the neuter gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine: the latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination चानं धम, 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, ahō-n-ō, "aquarum," from the feminine theme एहो (nom. aha). Besides the use of the euphonic n, there is further to be remarked, in Sanskrit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§. 26.) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies.

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

**N O M I N A T I V E.**

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 a (§. 2.), while this in Sanskrit
NOMINATIVE SINGULAR.

147. Takes place only before sonant letters (§. 25.) Examples are given at §. 148. I find the origin of this case-designation in the pronominal base न sa, "he," "this," fem. ना sa; 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 ना ta, and feminine ना 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 Alpirktōyi-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, yauunikki-s, "young man," for yauunikkyi-s from yauunikkya-s. Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in ya,†

* E.g. शुधु मम sutō mama, "filius meus," मूतस् तव 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.
as midi-s “the middle” (man), for midyi-s from midya-s, Sanskrit मध्यम madhva-s. The Zend also, in the vocalization* of the syllable ya, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable या ya before a final य m regularly to ज i, as also ल वा va to ज उ (§. 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-ēr, “caecus,” 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 शा ā, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in ऐ ऐ, together with स्त्री 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 sō, “this,” and hwō “which?” remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend मव hā and म 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 स्त्री "wife," see V. S. par. 136, (by Olshausen), p. 28, where we read न्यूङ श्री-चा, "feminaque"; whilst elsewhere the appended चा preserves the original length of the vowel. Here, too, the Zend nominals in ए deserve to be mentioned, which seem very similar to the Greek in η; as ग्रेग pērēnē, "plena," which in the Vendidad occurs very often in relation to सा zāo, "earth," without my being able to remember that I have found another case from ग्रेग pērēnē. But from the nom. ग्रेग kainē, "maid" (Sanskrit क्वा [G. Ed. p. 160.] kanyā), which is of frequent occurrence, I find the accus. ग्रेग kanyānm (V. S. p. 420); this furnishes the proof that the ए in the nominative is generated by the euphonic influence of the suppressed य (§. 42). In ग्रेग brāturyē, "cousin," and ग्रेग tāiryē, "a relation in the fourth degree" (V. S. p. 330), the य has remained; on the other hand, in ग्रेग nyākē, "grandmother," the dropping of a य must be again assumed. We cannot here refrain from conjecturing that the ए also of the Latin fifth declension, as with very few exceptions it is everywhere preceded by an i, is likewise produced from a by the influence of this i; so that the Latin here stands in reversed relation to the Greek, where i rejects the combination with η, and preserves the original α (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 terminate the base, then, according to the same law, the latter of these also is lost. Hence, बिभ्रत bibhrat, for बिभ्रत bibhrat-s, "the bearer"; तुदन tudan, for तुदन tudant-s "the vexer"; वाक vāk (from वाच vāch, f.), for वाक vāk-sh, "speech." The Zend, Greek, and Latin, in preserving the nominative sign after consonants, stand in an older position than the Sanskrit; Zend अस्व अफ-s (for अप-s, §. 40.), "water";
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$\text{कर्णस्} \text{ k'र्णस्, "body"; कर्णस् druc-s (from the base druj), "a demon."}$ The Latin and Greek, where the final consonant of the base will not combine with the s of the nominative, prefer abandoning a portion of the base, as $\chiάρπς$ for $\chiάρπτς$, 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, ῥιθένς, Lith. sukains (§ 10.), correspond to the Zend $\text{σδραγγαίας} \text{ σδραγγαίας, "the speaking" (man).}$

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. राजस्व राज-पुत्र, "king's son," for राजस्व राजापुत्र; and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines; e.g. राजा राज, "king," from राजस्व राज, m.; नाम नाम, "name," from नाम नाम, n.; धानी धानि, m., धान धानि, n., from धानन् धानिन्, "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. आशवा ashava, "the pure" (man), from आशवाण ashavan, m.; चश्म चश्म, "eye," from चश्म चश्मन, 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: sermon-is, actio, action-is; but nomen, not nome or nomo. The root can at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the $n$, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable; thus tubi-cen, fidi-cen, os-cen (see § 6.). Lien-is 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 $n$; नन् "slaying," "smiting," ncm. हात हात is, however, the only root in $n$ which I have
met with so used. ṣwan “hound,” nom. ṣva, which, in the weakest cases, contracts its theme to ṣun “sun,” is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base ṣwan in the nominative, by an unorganic addition, to cani; so ṣvan yuva, “young,” has become juveni (cf. §. 126.). As regards the opposition [G. Ed. p. 102.] 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. dhani;† comes from dhanin; and, in Lithuanian, bases in en and un give, in the nominative, u (=uo) for e or u. Thus, from the bases AKMEN, “stone,” SZUN, “hound,” come the nominatives akmū, szū; as in Sanskrit, from the primary forms of the same signification, asmā asmā and svā. It does not follow that homin-is has come from homon-is,† because the old language had hemo, homonis, 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 ην, εὐ-ος; υν, οὐ-ος. For the rest it has been already remarked, that between short vowels also exists a difference of gravity (§. 6.).

† In bases in an the lengthening extends to all the strong cases, with the exception of the vocat. sing.; thus, not merely rajā “rex,” but also rājan-am, “regem,” rāja “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, ahmin, 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.

[Text from page 152 of the document]

[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. राज राज-न, "king," as "ruler." Thus *AH-AN*, "spirit," as "thinker" (*ah-ya, "I think"), *STAU-AN*, "Judge" (*stau-ya, "I judge"), whence the nominatives *aha*, *staua*. There are also, as in Sanskrit, some masculine formations in *man*; as, *AHMAN*, "spirit," nom. *ahma*, with which perhaps the Sansk. ज्ञानन *ātman*, "soul," nom. ज्ञानस्व *ātmā*, is connected; in case this stands for *āh-man*, and comes from a lost root ज्ञान *āh*, "to think,"† where it is to be remembered that also the root नाह *nāh*, "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 *h* for *gh*, arises the nominal base नेप *megha*, "cloud." In Latin *ming-o* answers to निक्त *mih*, and in Greek ὠ-μυ-εω; 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 *o*, in the nominative, accusa-

---

* In case two consonants do not precede the termination चतु *an*; e.g. चालस्न *ātman-as*, not *ātmn-as*, but नामस *nāmn-as*, not *nāman-as*, "nominis."

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring चाह *āh*, "to speak," as मन *man*, "to think," in Zend means also "to speak"; whence मन्थन *manthra*, "speech," and in Gothic *MUN-THA*, nom. *munths*, "mouth" §. 66.
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So that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of the strong cases (§. 129.), which the Sanskrit neuter obeys only in the nom., accus., and vocat. plural, where, for example, चतुद्रि chatudri, "four," with a strong theme, is opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिस् chaturbhis (instr.), चतुर्भ्यस् 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 नामान् nāman-ि, Gothic namōn-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 नामन् namn-dm, "nominum"; while the Gothic namōn-e has permitted itself to be led astray by the example of the strong cases, and would be better written namn-e or namin-e.

142. In the feminine declension in German I can find no original bases in Ń, 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 िैै; as, राजी rājī, "queen," from राजन् rājan; पािनी dhaninī, "the rich" (fem.), from पािन dhanin, m. n. "rich." Gothic feminine substantive bases in Ń exhibit, before this consonant, either an आ (= चा, §. 69.) or हिय: these are genuine feminine final vowels, to which the addition of an Ń can have been only subsequently made. And already, at §. 120., a close connection of bases in ein (= in) with the Sanskrit in िैै, and Lithuanian in i, has been pointed out. Most substantive bases in ein are feminine derivatives from masculine-neuter adjective bases in a, under the same relation, excluding the modern Ń, as in Sanskrit that of मूद्रा sundari, "the fair" (woman), from मूद्र 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. management, 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 tugōn), nom. tuggō, answers to the Latin lingua, and to the Sanskrit निध्व, जिहव (dschihwend, see §. 17.); and DAURŌN, nom. daurō, to the Greek θώρα; VIDŌVŌN, nom. vidōvō, "widow," to the Sanskrit विधवा vedhwa, "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 thyyōn completely answers to the Latin tion, e.g. in ACTION; but here in Latin, too, the on is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of ti-on with the Sanskrit suffix ति ti, of the same import, and Greek σύ-ς (old τύς), Gothic ti, thi, di (see §. 91.). And in Gothic, together with the base MITATHYŌN exists one signifying the same, MITATHI, 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(a)-s has been preserved. The suffix yōn, of RATHYŌN therefore corresponds to the Sanskrit ya; e.g. in विष्या vid-yā, "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 εὐδαίμω, εὐδαιμός, 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 in (Gothic ein, §. 70.), which, in the nominative, oppose to the Gothic ei the full base in: as gotlíhhin, "glory" (see Grimm, p. 628). In our New High
German the phenomenon is worthy of notice, that many original \( n \) bases of the masculine gender, through a confusion in the use of language, are, in the singular, treated as if they originally terminated in \( na; \) i.e. as if they belonged to Grimm's first strong declension. Hence the \( n \) makes its appearance in the nominative, and the genitive regains the sign \( s \), which, indeed, in Gothic, is not wanting in the \( n \) bases, but in High German was withdrawn from them more than a thousand years since. Thus, *Brunnen, Brunnens*, is used instead of the Old High German *prunno, prunnin*, and the Gothic *brunna, brunnin-s*. In some words, together with the restored \( n \) there occurs in the nominative, also, the ancient form with \( n \) suppressed, as *Backe or Backen, Same or Samen*; but the genitive has in these words also introduced the \( s \) of the strong declension. Among neuters the word *Herz* deserves consideration. The base is, in Old High German, *HERZAN*, in Middle High German *HERZEN*; the nominatives are, *herza*, *herze*; the New German suppresses, together with the \( n \) of *Herzen*, the vowel also, as is done by many masculine \( n \) bases; as, e.g. *Bär 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 surprizing. With this assumed or newly-restored inflection \( s \) would be to be compared, in Greek, the nominative \( s \), as of \( δελφι-ς, μέλα-ς; \) and with the \( n \) of *Brunnen* for *Brunne*, the \( ν \) of \( δαίμων, τέρην; \) in case, as is rendered probable by the cognate languages, these old forms have been obtained from still older, as \( δελφι, μέλα, δαίμω, τέρη, \) by an unorganic retrograde step into the stronger declension.*

* That, in Greek, the renunciation of a \( ν \) 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. *panchuan,
144. Bases in ऋर (ऋ रि, §. 1.) in Sanskrit reject the \(r\) in the nominative, and, like those in \(n\), lengthen the preceding vowel; e.g. from पिता pitar, "father," माता ātā, "mother," दुहिता duhitā, "daughter," come पिता pita, 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 nominative, which corresponds to Greek formations in \(τῆρ\), \(τωρ\), and to Latin in \(tōr\), this takes place because, in all probability, in these words तर तर, and not तर \(tar\), is the original form of the suffix; and this is also supported by the length of the suffix being retained in Greek and Latin through all the cases—\(τῆρ\), \(τωρ\), \(tōr\) 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.</td>
<td>दाता dātā</td>
<td>ὁστῆρ, datōr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. sing.</td>
<td>दातारम् dātārm,</td>
<td>ὁστῆρ-α, datōr-em,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. dual</td>
<td>दातारेश dātāre,</td>
<td>ὁστῆρ-ε,  .......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Voc. pl.</td>
<td>दातारम् dātārm,</td>
<td>ὁστῆρ-ες, datōr-ες.</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

\[\text{panchan, "five," saptan, "seven," ashtan with \textit{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 sing. terminations, but in the other cases the suitable plural endings; e.g. पच राजानन्स pancha (not panchānas) rājānas "quinque reges"; on the other hand, पचस राजस panchasu rājasu "in quinque regibus." To the neuter nominatives and accusative of the singular पच pancha, श्राव pacta, नव navan, and दश daśa—which rest on the regular suppression of the \(n\)—answer the Greek πέντε, ἐπτά, ἑννέα, δέκα, with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflated 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. माता paita, "father," माता dāta, "giver," "Creator;" acc ता paitar-em, ता dātār-em. 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," dukte "daughter," answer to the abovementioned माता mātā, दुहिता dūhitā; and, in the plural, motor-ēs, dukter-ēs, to मातरेस mātar-as, दुहितरेस dūhitar-as. In the genitive singular I regard the form motor-s, dukter-s, as the elder and more genuine, and motoriēs, dukteriēs, as corruptions belonging to the i bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic i; hence, motor-ū, dukter-ū, not motori-ū, dukteri-ū. Besides the words just mentioned, the base SESSER, "sister," belongs to this place: it answers to the Sanskrit स्वसर swasar, nom. स्वसा swasa; but distinguishes itself in the nominative from mote and dakte, in that the e, after the analogy of bases in en, passes into ą, thus sessa.

[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 θατρ, μητρ, θυγάτρι, δαν (Sanskrit, देवर dēvar, देव dēvri, nom. देव dēvā), frater, soror; so in Gothic, brōθar, svistar, dauhtar; in Old High German, vatar, pruodar, svistar, 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 ~; and the Greek words like πατήρ, μήτηρ, 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 παίς, πούς, &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 ης 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 तर tōr, तो-र, 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 दुर्मनस durmanas, "evil-minded," from दुस dus [G. Ed. p. 171.] (before sonant letters—§. 25.—दुर duk) and मनस manas, "mind," whence the nom. masc. and fem. दुर्मनास durmanas, neut. दुर्मनस durmanas. A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in δυσμενής, ὃ, ἥ opposed to τὸ δυσμενέος. The स s of दुर्मनास durmanás, however, belongs, though unrecognised, to the base; and the nominative character is wanting, according to §. 94. In Greek, on the other hand, theς of δυσμενής has the appearance of an inflexion, because the genitive, &c., is not δυσμενέος-ος, like the Sanskrit दुर्मनास durmanas-as, but δυσμενέος. If, however, what was said at §. 128 is admitted, that theς of μένος belongs to the base, and μένεος is abbreviated from μένεος-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 दुर्मनास् durmanas would be complete; 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 as bases are in the nom. masc. and fem. in like manner without the case-sign. Thus the Sanskrit comparative suffix is इयस् \( ^{iyas} \)—the last \( a \) but one of which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a dull nasal (Anuswāra, § 9.)—in Latin, \( iōr \), with the \( s \) changed into \( r \), which so frequently happens; and the nominative in both genders is without the case-sign: the originally long \( o \), however, is shortened by the influence of the final \( r \). In the neuter \( ās \) corresponds to the Sanskrit अस् \( ^{as} \) as, because \( u \) is favourable to a final \( s \), and prevents its transition into \( r \); hence gravius has the same relation to the Sanskrit गरीयस् \( ^{gariyas} \) (irregular from गुरु
guru, "heavy," ) as lupus to [G. Ed. p. 172.] वृक्षस् vrihas, only that the \( s \) of the nominative character in the latter belongs in the former to the base. The final syllable \( õr \), though short, must nevertheless be held, in Latin, as graver than \( ās \), and hence gravior forms a similar antithesis to gravius that in Greek δουρένης does to δουρένης, and in Sanskrit दुर्मनास् durmanas to दुर्मनस् durmanas.

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

---

* The relation of this to मास् \( ^{mās} \) más, which signifies the same—from मास \( ^{mās} \) más, "to measure," without a derivative suffix—is remarkable; for the interposed nasal syllable \( ne \) answers to the Sanskrit न \( = na \) in roots of the seventh class (see p. 118); and in this respect MENES bears the same relation to the Latin MENSÍ that l. c. भिनयस् bhinadmi does to findo.
to AKMEN, sessū 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 MENEΣIA is the theme; as wilko, "lupī," 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 व्रक vrika, m. "wolf;" क ka, "who?" दान dāna, n. "gift;" त ta, n. "this;" जिहवा jihwā, f. "tongue;" कā kā, "which?" पति pati, m. "lord," "husband;" प्रिति priti, f. "love;" यारवर्तi, n. "water;" भविष्यति bhavishyati, "who is about to be;" सूनू 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 सर ar सू, §. 114.), which form this case from the abbreviated theme in सू ri.
Lord;”  

water;”  

who will be;”  

tame animal;”  

body;”  

wine;”  

goto, m. f. “bullock,”

“cow”;  

speech,” “voice ”

barant, or barent, weakened form barat, m. n. “bearing;”  

asman, m. “heaven;”  

nāman (also nānman), n. “name;”  

brātar,

* It has been remarked at §.123 of the cognate nom.  

zāo, “earth,” accus.  

zām, that I have only met with these two cases.  

The very common form  

zēm, which is found only in the other  

oblique cases, is nevertheless represented by Burnouf, in a very interesting  

article in the Journal des Savans (Aug. 1882), 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  

zēm, “terra,” (dat.)  

zēmi, “in terra,” &c. to the Sanskrit  

gave, gavi.  

I do not doubt, that is to say, that, in accordance with what has been remarked at §.63,  

and p. 114, the Zend  

m is to be regarded as nothing else than the  

hardening of the original v.  

The Indian  

gō, before vowel terminations  
gav, would consequently have made itself almost unintelligible in the  

meaning “earth,” in Zend, by a double alteration; first by the transition  
of g to z, in which j must be assumed as the middle step—in which  

e.g.  

jam, “to go,” from  

gam, has remained; secondly, by the  
hardening of the v to m.  

Advert, also, to the Greek  

for ἐγν, in ἐψχρο;  

since  

and  

from  

(=dsch), 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  

wac-s, as palatals before  
s change into  
c; and thus, from  
druj, “an evil demon,” occurs very frequently the nom.  

druc-s.  

I have scarcely any doubt, too, that what Anquetil, in his  

Vocabulary, writes vāhksch, and renders by “parler, cri,” is the nominal  

ative of the said base; as Anquetil everywhere denotes  
by  

and  

by sch.

‡ In the theme we drop, intentionally, the  
️ required by §. 44, as it  
is clear that  

brātar, not  

brātarē, must be the base  

word;  

baratar also occurs, with  
a interposed.
NOMINATIVE SINGULAR.


SANSKRIT. | ZEND. | GREEK. | LATIN. | LITHUAN. | GOTHIC.
m. vrika-s, vērkó,† लुको-स, lupu-s, wilka-s, vulfs.
m. ka-s, kó,† ...... ...... kas, hva-s.

* In the comp. wiess-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 रवीस-पाति věš-paite, "lord of the region."

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

† Before the enclitic particle cha, as well here as in all other forms, the termination as, which otherwise becomes ṝ (§. 56b.), retains the same form which, in Sanskrit also, चस as assumes before च cha: hence is said वेरकाच वेरकाच वेरकाच, "lupusque," as in Sanskrit वृक्ष vrikasha. And the appended cha preserves the otherwise shortened final vowel in its original length: hence जहाच जहाच जहाच, "linguaque," बुश्याच बुश्याच बुश्याच, "futuraque," ब्राच ब्राच ब्राच, "fraterque." Even without the च 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.
164  FORMATION OF CASES.

| SANSKRIT. | ZEND. | GREEK. | LATIN. | LITHUAN. | GOTHI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dāna-m</td>
<td>dātē-m</td>
<td>ḍōro-v</td>
<td>donum, gēra,</td>
<td>dau'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-t</td>
<td>ta-t</td>
<td>ῥό,</td>
<td>is-tu-d, ta-i,</td>
<td>tha-ta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvā</td>
<td>hīzva.</td>
<td>χώρα,</td>
<td>terra, rankā,</td>
<td>giba.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kā</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>hvd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pati-s</td>
<td>paiti-s</td>
<td>πόσι-s,</td>
<td>hosti-s, pati-s,</td>
<td>gast'-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prōti-s</td>
<td>ᅃfrōti-s</td>
<td>πόρτι-s,</td>
<td>siti-s, awi-s,</td>
<td>anst'-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāri</td>
<td>vairi</td>
<td>ḍīrī,</td>
<td>mare, .......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhavishyantī, būshyainti*</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>būsenthi,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sōnu-s</td>
<td>pašu-s</td>
<td>ḗχόθ-⊥</td>
<td>pecu-s, sunu-s,</td>
<td>sunu-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanu-s</td>
<td>tanu-s</td>
<td>πίτυ-⊥</td>
<td>socru-s, .......</td>
<td>handu-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madhu</td>
<td>madhu</td>
<td>μέθυ,</td>
<td>pecu, darkū,</td>
<td>faihu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vadhu-s</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gāu-s†</td>
<td>gāu-s†</td>
<td>βοδ-⊥</td>
<td>bō-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāu-s</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td>ναυ-⊥</td>
<td>.......</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vak</td>
<td>vāc-s</td>
<td>ṏ-⊥</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharan</td>
<td>baran-⊥</td>
<td>φέρων,</td>
<td>feren-s, sukan-s,</td>
<td>fiyand-s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātma'</td>
<td>āśma,</td>
<td>δαίμων,</td>
<td>sermo', akmā',</td>
<td>ahma'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāma'</td>
<td>nāma'</td>
<td>τάλαν,</td>
<td>nomen, .......</td>
<td>namō'.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhrātā'</td>
<td>brātā',</td>
<td>πατήρ,</td>
<td>frater, .......</td>
<td>brōthar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duhitā'</td>
<td>dughdha,*, θυγάτηρ,</td>
<td>mater,</td>
<td>dukte', dauhtar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dātā'</td>
<td>dātā',*</td>
<td>δοτήρ,</td>
<td>dator,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vachas</td>
<td>vachē,*</td>
<td>ἐπος,</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 गोस gō-s.
‡ Or गोस gōs, § 33.
the dull re-echoing nasal, which in Sanskrit is called Anu-
[165]’sa, and which we, in both languages, express by n (§. 10.). The German languages have, so early as the Gothic even, lost the accusative mark in substantives entirely, but in pronouns of the 3d person, as also in adjective bases ending with a vowel which follow their declension, they have hitherto retained it; still only in the masculine: the feminine nowhere exhibits an accusative character, and is, like its nominative, devoid of inflexion. The Gothic gives na instead of the old m; the High German, with more correctness, a simple n: hence, Gothic blind-na, “caecum,” Old High German plinta-n, Middle and Modern High German blinde-n.

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

151. Monosyllabic words in त, द, and दू, 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, भि “fear,” and दू “ship,” form, not भि-m and दू-m, as the Greek νο-ν would

* From the bases ड्रुज druj and वाच vāch, I find besides ड्रुजम drujem, वाचम vāchem, in the V. S.; also frequently ड्रुजim 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, however, the Zend uses, besides the c mentioned at §. 30, not unfrequently औ i; e.g. for ददेमही dadēmahī, occurs also ददimahī, and many similar forms; as ददिमही ददिमही, answering to the Sanskrit उमस uēmas (in the Vēdas उमस uēma), “we will.”
[G. Ed. p. 178.] lead us to expect, but भियम् bhiy-am, नायम् nāy-am. With this agree the Greek themes in ev, since these give e-α, from εφ-α, for ευ-ν; e.g. βασιλέ(F)α, for βασιλευ-ν. It is, however, wrong to regard the Latin em as the true, originally sole accusative termination, and for lupu-m, hora-m, fructu-m, diem, to seek out an older form lupo-em, hora-em, fructu-em, die-em. That the simple nasal suffices to characterize the accusative, and that a precursory vowel was only added out of other necessary reasons, is proved by the history of our entire family of languages, and would be adequately established, without Sanskrit and Zend, by the Greek, Lithuanian, and Gothic. The Latin em in the accusative third declension is of a double kind: in one case the e belongs to the base, and stands, as in innumerable cases, for i; so that e-m, of igne-m (Sanskrit जिस्न्दः aṃgī-m), corresponds to the Indian i-m, Zend i-m, Greek i-ν, Lithuanian i-n, Gothic i-na (from ina, "him"); but in the em of consonantal bases the e answers to the Indian a, to which it corresponds in many other cases also.

152. The Sanskrit and Zend neuter bases in a, and those akin to them in Greek and Latin, as well as the two natural genders, give a nasal as the sign of the accusative, and introduce into the nominative also this character, which is less personal, less animated, and is hence appropriated to the accusative as well as to the nominative in the neuter: hence, Sansk. जयन्म्य sayana-m, Zend ṣayamam ṣayanē-m, "a bed"; so in Latin and Greek, donu-m, ὀπόνυ. 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 corres-

[G. Ed. p. 179.]: responds to the Sanskrit चार vāri, "water"; the Greek, like the Sanskrit and Zend, leaves the i unchanged —ίσρι-ς, ἵσρι, as in Sanskrit पुष्चिस् suchis, पुष्चि suchi. The following are examples of neuter u bases, which supply the
place both of nominative and accusative: in Sanskrit मधु madhu, "honey," "wine," अश्व aśru, "tear," सवाद swādu, "sweet"; in Zend वधु vādu, "wealth" (Sanskrit वसु vasu); in Greek μέθυ, ἄκρυ, ἰδυ; 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 ṡ of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the u of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat. pl. u-bus. The Σ, in Greek words like 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, corpus, 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, वपस vapus, gen. वपसस 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 τενφός, 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 बाहः bāhu-s, "arm"; frango, ὁγγυμο, with बनाः bhanajmi, "I break," 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 feli-c-s, soler(t)s, aman(t)s*. In general, in Latin, in consonantal bases, the perception of the distinction of gender is very much blunted, as, contrary to the principle followed by the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Gothic, the feminine is no longer distinguished from the masculine.

153. In Gothic substantives, as well neuter as masculine, the case sign m is wanting, and hence neuter bases in a stand on the same footing with the i, u, and consonantal bases of the cognate languages in that, in the nominative and accusative, they are devoid of all inflexion. Compare, with regard to the form of this case, *daur(a)* with *dvar*am, 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 ρ of *ηmap* and *δωρ* is explained as coming from Τ, through the intervention of Σ. The Sanskrit, however, appears to attribute a different origin to the ρ of these forms. To यक्रत yakrit "liver" (likewise neuter), corresponds both *jecur* and *ηmap*, through the common interchange between h and ρ: both owe to it their ρ, as *ηpar-os* does its r. "ηpar-os should be *ηpar-os*, Sanskrit यक्रत as. But the Sanskrit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the r, but then irregularly substitutes न n for त t, *e.g.* gen. यक्रम यक्रम-स for यक्रम-स यक्रम-स. With regard to the ρ of *δωρ*, compare उद्र 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 FALHU. "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 accord-
cence with the cognate languages, without case sign; e.g. darku, "ugly," corresponds as nominative and accusa-
tive neuter to the masculine nominative darku-s, accusative darku-û. This analogy, however, is followed in Lithua-
nian, by the adjective bases in a also; and thus géra,
"good," corresponds as nominative and accusative to the
masculine forms géra-s, géra-û,* 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 ex-
cluded from the vocative in Sanskrit and Zend), was origi-
nally limited simply to the a bases, and was not joined to the

* The e of neuter forms like dide, "great," from the base DIDYA—
nom. masc. didi-s for didya-s, as §. 135.* yaunikkis, "youngling"—I ex-
plain 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 in-
flexion; and dide therefore signifies also "magna," and answers, as femi-
nine, very remarkably to the Zend nominatives explained at §. 137., as
rankû-përenë, rankû-wāž brâturyë. 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 giesne, "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 giesny-û is to be taken like rank-û from
rankû, i.e. the final vowel of the bases is suppressed before the termina-

image
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\(i\) and \(u\) bases also; so that, in Sanskrit, for \(v\text{\textipa{ri}}\) we had originally \(\text{\textipa{v\text{\textipa{r}i\text{-m}}}\), for \(\text{\textipa{madhu, madhu\text{-m}}\) 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 \(b\text{\textipa{i\text{-n}}}\), Old High German \(p\text{\textipa{i\text{-m}}}\) Sans. भवामि bhavā-mi. In Sanskrit, one example of an \(m\) as the nominative and accusative sign of an \(i\) base is not wanting, although it stands quite isolated; and indeed this form occurs in the pronominal declension, which everywhere remains longest true to the traditions of bygone ages. I mean the interrogative form र्कि् ki-m, "what"? from the base र्क ki, which may perhaps, in Sanskrit, have produced a ki-t, which is contained in the Latin qui-d, and which I recognise again, also, in the enclitic र्चित् chit, weakened from र्चित् ki-t. Otherwise \(i\) or \(u\)-bases of pronouns in the nominative accusative neuter do not occur; for \(\text{\textipa{\varphi\text{\textipa{m}}}\text{\textipa{u}}}\) amu, "that" (man), substitutes अदास् adas; and \(\text{\textipa{\varphi\text{\textipa{i}}}\text{\textipa{}}}\) i, "this," combines with [G. Ed. p. 183.] दम् dam (दम् 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, "cecum," midya-ta, "medium." The High German gives, in the older period, z instead of the Gothic t (§. 87.), in the most modern period, s. The pronominal base I (later E) follows in German, as in Latin, the analogy of the old a bases, and the Latin gives, as in the old ablative, d instead of t. The Greek must abandon all T sounds at the end of words: the difference of the pronominal from the common o declension consists, therefore, in this respect, merely in the absence of all inflexion. From this difference, however, and the testimony of the cognate languages, it is perceived that τό was originally sounded τοῦ or τοῦ, for a τοῦ would have remained unaltered, as in the masculine accusative. Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter-inflexion τ in ὡς, so that we ought to divide ὡς-τι; and therefore the double τ, in this form, would no more have a mere metrical foundation, than the double σ (§. 125.) in ὡς-σι. (Buttmann, p. 85.)

156. We find the origin of the neuter case-sign τ in the pronominal base τα, "he," "this," (Greek TO, Goth, THA, &c.); and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this, that τά τα-τ "it" "this," stands, in regard to the base, in the same contrast with σα, "he," σα σά, "she," as τ, 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 τα in the nominative masculine and feminine; but the Sanskrit substitutes for the base amu, in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form asāu, the s of which, therefore, stands in the same relation to the m of असूम amu-m, "illum," असूम amu-ष्या, "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 ἣνε ἵματο "this," (n.) (nom. accus.), but not ἵμα, "this" (m.), but ἵλμ ἀδέμ (from ὄχι ἄμο ayam), and ἵλ ἰμ (from ὕμ ἰμ) "this" (f.). Observe in Greek the pronominal base MA, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to ἦ ma (in the compounded base ἦ Ἰ ma) that ἱκίς ἱμ "what?" has to ἦκας ἱκα "who"? The Gothic neut. termination ta answers, in respect to the transposition of sound (§. 87.), to the Latin d (id, istud): this Latin d, however, seems to me a descent from the older t; as, e.g., the b of ab has proceeded from the p of the cognate ὄψ ἀπα, ἄτο; and in Zend the d of ᶺ ᾳ ἱμ ἱ-ём, "him," is clearly only a weakening of the t of ἦ ta, ἦη ta.†

† See my treatise "On the Origin of the Cases" in the Trans. of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826. As T in Greek easily becomes Σ (but a final Σ has in many parts of Grammar become ν), Hartung founded this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p. 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neuters in ν (m) with those in t. We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the m, on account of the origin which we ascribe to this case-sign, is as little surprising in the nominative of the neuter as in the accusative of the more animated genders; and besides, a greater antiquity is proved to belong to the neuter m, through the Sanskrit and Zend, than probably the ν sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older Σ, as μεν for μες (Μέν μας), and in the dual τον, τον for θανς thatς, τας 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 θας 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 ṝ ᾲ ἱμ ἱ-ём, "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 demonstrative in the Greek (οὐτος, ἐκεῖνος), and to the it, which is, in like manner, used enclitically in the Vēdas—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 ita, which, in the Greek ἐκεῖνος, has, perhaps only from necessity, dropped the τ or d, and which already, ere I was acquainted with the Vēda-dialect, I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत cēt (from cha+it). “if,” and नेत nēt (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. vriküm, vēhrkē-m, λίκο-v, lupu-m, wilku-n, vulf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ka-m, kē-m, ... ... ... ka-n, hwana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dānā-m, dāte-m,  δῶρο-v, donu-m, gēra, dau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ta-t, ta-t, τό, is-tu-d, ta-i, tha-ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwā-m, hizva-nim, χώρα-v, terrain, ranka-n, gibn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. kā-m, ka-nim, ... ... ... hvō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Examples are given by Rosen in his Vēda Specimen, pp. 24, 25, which, though short, are in the highest degree interesting for Sanskrit and comparative Grammar; as, सह sait, “he,” तमित tamit, “him”; तयोरित tayorit, “of these two”; तस्माइत tasmāit, “to him”; अस्माइत asmāit, “to this” (m). The Zend combines in the same way ṣo e or ṣ i with the interrogative: ṣo kaśē and ṣo kaśi, “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-na, or, with abbreviation of the base, hve-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. *pَاLa٠ Jَئَر kainē for kainyē* (§ 42.). Thus, from *sukanti, “the turning”* (f.), *sukusi, “the having turned”* (f.), and *sukṣenti, “the about to turn,”* Mielcke gives the accusatives *sukanczeh* (see, p. 138, Note) or *sukanczian, sukuseh, and sukscenzi* or *sukscenzi*. And even if, according to Ruhig (by Mielcke, pp. 3, 4), the $i$ before $a$, $e$, $o$, $u$ is scarcely heard, it must not therefore, in this case, as well as in those there enumerated, be the less regarded as etymologically present, and it was originally pronounced so as to be fully audible. From the feminine, where the $i$, as Sanskrit grammar shews, has an original position, this vowel appears to have made its way, in Lithuanian participial bases, into the oblique cases of the masculine, and to be here invested with a short masculine $a$. The accusative *sukanti-ähr, “the turning” (masc.), is therefore to be regarded in the same light as *yaunikki-ähr*, from the theme *YAUNIKYA, i.e. it stands for sukantyiähr from sukantyaähr*, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like *γογο tūrī-m for tūryēm* (§ 42.), and to the Gothic, like *hari* from the base *HAPYA* (§ 135.).

† See § 122.
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m. bharant-am, barēnt-em, φέροντ-α, ferenent-em, .... fiyand.
m. ātmān-am, āsmān-ēm, δαιμόν-α, sermon-em, .... ahman.
n. nāma', nāma', τάλαν, nomen, .... namo'.
m. bhrātār-am, bhrātār-ēm, πατέρ-α, fratr-em, .... brōthar.
f. duhītar-am, duhīdhar-ēm, θυγατέρ-α, matr-em, .... dauhtar.
m. dātār-am, dātār-ēm, δοτήρ-α, datōr-em, .... ..... 
n. vachās, vacho,* ἐπός, opus, .... ...
and neut. genders;* a final ं a, however, is, as in several other cases, changed into र ē; and the ं ं of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base; as व्रीकेश vrikē-n-a, but व्रिनिति agni-

n-ं, वारिशा vāri-ं-ं, सूनुता sūnu-ं-ं, मधुना madhu-ं-ं, from वृक vrika, &c. The Vēdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic n, as स्मया swapnay-ं for स्मन swapnē-ं-ं from स्म swapna, m. “sleep” (see §. 133.); उष्या uru-ं-ं for उष्या uru-ं-ं, from उ उ ru, “great,” with a euphonic y (§. 43.); प्रवाहवा prabhāv-ं, from प्रवाह prabhā, from चा bhā, “arm,” with the preposition [G. Ed. p. 189.] प pra. The Vēda-form स्मया swapnayā, finds analogies in the common dialect in नया mayā, “through me,” and जया twayā, “through thee,” from the bases ma and tva, the a of which in this case, as in the loc., passes into ē. And from पति pati, m. “Lord,” and सहक sakhi, m. “friend,” the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of न n, viz. पति paty-ं, सहय sakhy-ं. Feminines never admit a euphonic n; but ं, as before some other vowel terminations, passes into र ē, that is to say, i is blended with it, and it is shortened to ं a; hence, जिहव सिह jihway-ं (from jihwē + ē). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit.

159. As ē in Gothic, according to §. 69., just like ं, represents ं ं, so the forms the, hvē, which Grimm (pp. 790. and 798.) regards as instrumentals, from the demonstrative base THA and the interrogative HVA, correspond very remarkably to the Zend instrumentals, as ो kha from the base खा kha. We must, however, place also स्वे svē in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved: besides svē from SVA is also,

* The original has “Stammen gen. masc. und fem.;” but genitives of nouns in a do not take a euphonic n, nor do feminine nouns ending in short vowels use such an augment in the instrumental: here is no doubt some typographic error.—Editor.
in respect of its base, akin to वेग kha from kha (§. 35.). The meaning of svē is "as" (सः), and the so, which has arisen in High German from sva or svē, 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 svē is svē, in which the colouring of the Zend वेक kha is most truly preserved. The Gothic sva, "so," is, according to its form, only the abbreviation of svē, as a is the short equivalent both of e and of o: through this abbreviation, however, sva has become identical with its theme, just as वेन 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 VULFA comes vulfa, as वेहक vēhrka from VEHRKA. Moreover, there are some other remarkable datives, which have preserved their due length, and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals the, ve, svē, which have been already explained, viz. hvanmē-h, hvar-yammē-h, "cuique," and ainummē-hun, "ulli," for ainammo.
FORMATION OF CASES.

hun (§. 66.). Bases in i reject this vowel before the case-sign; hence gast'-a for gast-i-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 u has again returned to its original vowel nature. The form sunav-a would answer to the Vēda form pra-bāhav-ā. In Zend, the bases which terminate with i and u, both in the instrumental and before most [G. Ed. p. 191.] of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend. S. p. 469, bāzav-a, "brachio," as analogous to pra-bāhav-ā (§. 57.); on the other hand, p. 408, zanthwa from zantu, "the slaying;" "killing." From panišnū, "dust," we find, l. c. p. 229, the form panišnā, which Anquetil translates by "par cette poussière"; and if the reading is correct, then panišnā, 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, brōthr (§. 132.), for fiyand-a, ahmin-a, brōthr-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, "huiç," 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 cha, "and."

† The Old High German form fatera (for fatera), "patri," proceeds, as do the genitive fatera-s, and the accusative fatera-n, from a theme FATERA, extended by a. The accusative fatera-n, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base. In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of FATERA.
character ड़ di. But as we have recognised in the masculine and neuter dative the Indo-Zend instrumental, we could not, except from the most urgent necessity, betake ourselves to the Sanskrit dative for explanation of the Gothic feminine dative. This necessity, however, does not exist, for, e.g., hveitai, “albae,” from HVEITō from HVEITĀ, may be deduced from the instrumental चेतया स्वेतय-ā, “albā,” from चेता स्वेता, 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. 192.] or as the fem. handau, “manui,” from handav-a. Analogous with sunau, handau, are also the dative feminine i bases; and, e.g., anstai, “gratiae,” 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, hve; but authorities differ as to the mode of writing them,* regarding which we shall say more under the pronouns. The form hviu, 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 himma-daga. This termination u has maintained itself also in substantive and adjective bases masc. neut. in a and i, although it is only sparingly used, and principally after the preposition mit (see Graff, l. c. pp. 110, 111); mit 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 instrumental 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.* *dieiwū* is akin to the Zend &mdash; &mdash; &mdash; &mdash; daēva, “deo,” for &mdash; &mdash; daēvā, appears to me the less doubtful, as also in the plural *dieiwais* answers very surprisingly to &mdash; &mdash; daēva, देवां देवां. Moreover, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian *u* corresponds to the Sanskrit ऋ ऋ; *e.g.* in the plural genitive. In feminine *a* bases, also, in Lithuanian, the vowel of the base is melted down with that of the termination, but its quality is not changed; as, *e.g.* रान्का “manu,” from रान्काः. In all other bases *mi* stands as the termination, to which the plural instrumental termination *mis* has the same relation as, in Latin, *bis* to *bi* (वोबिस, तीबि); 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. व्रिकेन-ा,</td>
<td>व्रिकेन,</td>
<td>विकू,</td>
<td>वुल्फा.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. जिहवाय-ा</td>
<td>हिजवाय-ा,</td>
<td>रान्का,</td>
<td>गिब.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. पत्य-ा,</td>
<td>पाइथ्य-ा,</td>
<td>पतिमी,</td>
<td>गास्ट्रा.</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 appears, according to Notker, in the pronominal forms *diu*, &c. without a circumflex (other instrumentals of the kind do not occur in his works); secondly, like the short *a*, it is exchanged for *o* (§. 77.); hence, विश, वी, with विश, वी, लिथ, लिथ, “qualis” (properly, “similar to whom”); thirdly, the length of this *u* cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms *the*, *hvē, svē*, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf. §. 137.).
### INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>f.</strong> prīty-ā,</td>
<td>āfrithy-a,</td>
<td>awi-mi,</td>
<td>anstai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānu-n-ā,</td>
<td>paśv-a,</td>
<td>sunu-mi,</td>
<td>sunau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gāv-ā.</td>
<td>gāv-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. nāv-ā,</td>
<td>vāch-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-ā,</td>
<td>bařént-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>fiyand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ālman-ā,</td>
<td>āšman-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>ahmin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāman-ā,</td>
<td>nāman-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>namin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrāṭr-ā,</td>
<td>brāth-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>brāthr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ṭāṭr-ā,</td>
<td>ṭāthr-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-ā,</td>
<td>vacanha-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

164. In Sanskrit and Zend, ē is the sign of the dative, which, I have scarce any doubt, originally belongs to the demonstrative base ē, whence the nom. यम ayam (from ē+am), “this”; which, however, as it appears, is itself only an extension of the base आ a, from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (a-smā, a-smē, 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 ē by the admixture of an i (§. 2.). The dative sign consequently would, in its origin, be most intimately connected with the case, which, as (§. 160.) was explained, denotes, in German, both the dative and instrumental relation, and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification.*

---

* E.g. Vend. S. p. 45: प्रीत्यः । बहविश्यांति: । सुना: Haōmō azizānātībis dadhāitī csaitō-puthrīm, “Hōm gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring.” The lithographed Codex, however, gives the form azizānātībis as three words,
FORMATION OF CASES.

[G. Ed. p. 195.] We have here further to remark, that in the pronoun of the 2d person the affix भयम bhyam (from bhi + am) in तु-भयम tu-bhyam, "to thee," stands in evident relationship to the instrumental भिस bhis in the plural. The feminine bases in अ, इ, आ, and, at will also, those in इ and उ, prolong in Sanskrit the dative termination र ए to र आ; with the final र of the base an इ is blended; hence धिःधायिः from धिः�ाय आ. On the other hand, इ and उ receive the गुना augment before र इ, but not before the broader र आ; as मूलमः sūnav-ए from sūnu. In Zend, feminine अ and इ-bases, like the Sanskrit, have आ for their termination; however, hizvày-ए is not used, but ज्ञस्मुहयु hizvay-ए, from the base hizvà, as long vowels in the penultimate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in अ have, in combination with the particle अच cha, preserved the Sanskrit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form अचे एच from kasle. Without cha, however, the form आच एच is almost the sole one that occurs, e.g. आचे एच kharètec, "in order to eat," from आचे kharèti. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from आचे एच, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding आ has become आ (§. 31.). Forms like अचे एच आचिलिः or अचे एच आचिलिः, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

मूलमः अचेबिः azī zānātī bis. Such separations in the middle of a word are, however, in this Codex, quite common. I entertain no doubt of the correctness of the length of the आ, both of zā and nā; and I anticipate a variety azīzānātībis or—bis. Probably also cœstitō is to be read for cœstitō. 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. अचेबिः aebis also occurs in the sense of "to them."

* Cf. p. 286 Note †.
rest on errors in writing.* Bases in \( u \) may take Guna; e.g. \( \text{रौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौोौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौौ
in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, sma, according to §. 53., has been changed to hma; and also in Prâkrit and Pâli, in the plural of the two first persons, the s has become h, and besides, by transposition of the two consonants, the syllable hma has been altered to mha; e.g. Prâkrit अमहे amhê, "we" (ἀμοιας), Pâli अमहाकम् amhākam, Zend अमहाम्य mâm, Pâli अमहाकम् amhākam. From the Prâkrit-Pâli mha we arrive at the Gothic nsa in u-nsa-ra, ῥοῦ, u-nsi-s,* "nobis," "nos." In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pâli and Prâkrit; and on the other hand, by the change of m into n, for more facile combination with the following s, it rests on a more modern stage. We cannot, therefore, any longer assume the ns of uns, "nos," to be

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

* The a being changed into s, according to r. 67.
† I. 813. "unsara appears to be derived from the accusative uns, as also the dative unsi, which, with izwis, 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 yuyam, "ye," (§. 43.) goes through all the oblique cases, while in the 1st person the य v of यत्स vayam, "we," is limited to the nominative, but the oblique cases combine a base अ a with the particle स्मāma. 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 स्मāma 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, Pâli, Prâkrit), 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 यु-श्मद-कम, यु-श्मा-भ्यं, यु-श्मद-न, and with the Lithuanian यु-सा, यु-मुस, यु-स: 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-il, 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, Prâkrit, and Pâli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable zva has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (*e-u-e-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 यु (यु), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High [G. Ed. p. 200.] German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual*; and the Gothic *i-zva-ra,* Old High German *i-wa-r,* &c., stand for यु-zva-ra, यु-wa-r.* The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the *u,* which in Anglo-Saxon has become *o,* through all the oblique cases: *iu-we-r, eo-ve-r,* "vestri," &c. If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskrit and New German forms—be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that *euer* and युश्मदकम yuśhmākam 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. यु-नके-र, यु-नक, in regard to the base, distinguishes itself advantageously from the Gothic यु-यवा-रा, यु-नकि-स.
in common with the u of य u, but finds its origin in the m of the syllable स ma.

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,* voiv, unsa-ra, ipa, igqa-ra, σφωι, izva-ra, šμω. But from a closer 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 स्म mha, and between u-nsa-ra and u-ṣka-ra (= u-nka-ra) an intervening u-nha-ra or u-mha-ra must be assumed. At least I do not think that the old s became k at one spring, but that the latter is a hardened form of an earlier k, which has remained in the Prākrit and Pāli, as in the singular nominative the k of ik has been developed from the h of अहम 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 स्म स्मा appears in Gothic is that which I first remarked, and which I have brought forward already in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (p. 16). What I have there said, that the datives singular, like thamma, imma, have arisen, by assimilation, from tha-sma, i-sma, I have since found remarkably confirmed by the Grammar of the Old Prussian published by Vater, a language which is nearly connected with the Lithuanian and Gothic, since here all pronouns of the third person have smu in the dative. Compare, e.g. antar-smu with the Gothic anthara-mma, "to the other": ka-smu with the Gothic hva-mma, "to whom?" We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun स्म स्मा similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation,

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

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

* The difference between the forms θε, ἱβη, explained at §. 159., and the datives tha-mma, hva-mma, consists first in this, that the latter express the case relation by the affixed particle, the former in the main base; secondly, in this, that thamma, hvamma, for thammé, hvammlé, 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 तह्मा or तह्मा (from ta-hma-ā). 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 यान, “this” (m.), “this” (n.), we have found the instrumental of the same sound यान not anahma, from the demonstrative base स a occurs rather often the feminine instrumental न भय या, from the fem. base भय ahmi increased by the appended pronoun.

172. The Sanskrit appended pronoun [G. Ed. p. 203.] स्मा� should, in the feminine, form either स्मा or स्मी: on the latter is based the Zend form स्मां, mentioned at § 171. But in Sanskrit the feminine form स्मी has been preserved only in such a mutilated condition, that before my acquaintance with the Zend I could not recognise it. From तस्मी must come the dative तस्मी, the gen. and ablative तस्मी, and the locative तस्मी. These forms, by rejecting the m, have become abbreviated to तस्मी, तस्मा, तस्मा; and the same is the case with the feminine pronoun स्मी 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-zōs, “hujus,”

* The Zend, too, has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine हम, as in the instr. a-hmy-ā; 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 f. The feminine आन्धो a-nil-ā (§ 56.), “hujus,” for a-hmy-ā, often occurs; and for it also आन्धो, in which the i is, to use the expression, a reflection of the lost ज्ञ (§ 41.). From another demonstrative base we find the dative आन्धो ava-nil-ā, and more than once the ablative आन्धो ava-nil-ā for ava-hmy-ā, ava-hmy-ā.
thi-zai, "huic," might be deduced from the masculine genitive this, by the addition of the terminations 6s 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, भृगु मम, तव तवा, तृष्णा तवा, 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-aim—the above-mentioned forms in Sanskrit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of ta-smý-di, &c., as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, thizós, thizai, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into thi-z6-s, thi-zai. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun smo must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base SMÔ = स्मा smā, as BLINDÔ, nom. blinda, "caca," from BLINDA, m. n. (nom. blind'-s, blinda-ta). SMÔ, however, by the loss of the m, as experienced by the Sanskrit in the feminine, has become SÔ; 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 ते-भये, "iis, ते́ष्ठाम्, "eorum," for ta-bhyas, ta sám.
174. The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hmu* also into the second, and probably into the first person too: we find repeatedly, in the locative, *

The Zeml introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hmu* also into the second, and probably into the first person too: we find repeatedly, in the locative, *thwa-hm’i*, instead of the Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 205.] *

and hence deduce, in the 1st person, *ma-him’i*, which we cannot quote as occurring. The Prakrit, in this respect, follows the analogy of the Zend; and in the 2d person gives the form *tumasi* *tuma-sm’i*, “in thee,” or, with assimilation, *tumami* *tumami*, with *tum* *tum* (from *tuma-i*) and *ta* *tai*; and *mamas* *mama-sm’i* or *mamam* *mama-mmi*, “in me,” together with the simple *ma* *ma* and *ma* *ma*. 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 *unsis*, “nobis,” “nos,” *izvis*, “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-suffix. In *

therefore, the Sanskrit *s* *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 Prakrit forms, *tuma-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.
FORMATION OF CASES.

[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, vāi, &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-si-h, "us," i-wi-h, "you"; Anglo-Saxon me-c, "me," u-si-c, "us," the-c, "thee," ev-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.) Prakrit 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-mè, gera-mè; and if -mui and -mè are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive a bases, it is easily seen that mui and mè have sprung from ma.— The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, mu-mù, yu-mù, according to the analogy of ponù, "of the two lords."

* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle sma in the locative interrogative form ka-mui, "where"? Sansk. कस्मि ka-smni, "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 \(e\), so that only the last element of this diphthong, which has grown out of \(a + i\), has been left. For the Lithuanian has, besides the dative, also a real locative, which, indeed, in the \(a\) bases corresponds exactly with the Sanskrit and Zend.

178. The nominal bases, Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian, explained at §. 148., excepting the neuters ending with 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><strong>wilku-i</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwāy-āi</td>
<td>hizvāy-āi</td>
<td>rankā-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-ē</td>
<td>paite-ē</td>
<td><strong>pūch-ēi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prālay-ē</td>
<td>āfrile-ē</td>
<td><strong>āvi-ēi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhāvishnyanty-āi</td>
<td>būshyainty-āi</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānnav-ē</td>
<td>paśv-ē</td>
<td><strong>sunu-i</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* The form āvīui, with āviei 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 च च **cha** we find in V. S., p. 473. गङ्गा पाथ्येचा, and hence deduce for the instrumental (p. 193 G. Ed.) the form **paithya**, while, according to §. 47., also **paitya** might be expected. From हाचि **haci**, "friend," I find in V. S., p. 162, the instrumental **hacaya** with Guna, after the analogy of the **bāzava**, mentioned at §. 160.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. tanav-ë</td>
<td>tanu-ë, *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhw-âi</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gav-ë</td>
<td>gav-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nâv-ë</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vâch-ë</td>
<td>vâch-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-ë</td>
<td>barënt-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. âtman-ë</td>
<td>ašmain-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nâmn-ë, †</td>
<td>nâmâni-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrâtr-ë</td>
<td>brâthr-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitr-ë</td>
<td>dughdhir-ë †</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dâtr-ë</td>
<td>dâthr-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-ë †</td>
<td>vachânh-ë</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* I give ṣaṇya-ë tanu-ë with euphonic ŋ, because I have found this form frequently, which, however, cannot, for this reason, be considered peculiar to the feminine; and, instead of it, also tanu-ë and tanev-ë may be regarded as equally correct. Cf. §§. 48., 49., where, however, it is necessary to observe, that the insertion of a euphonic ŋ between u and e is not everywhere necessary; and, for instance, in the dative is the more rare form.

† The ç in dughdhir-ë, and in the instr. dughdhir-a, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants. I deduce these forms from the plural genitive dughdhir-ainm, for dughdhir-ainm.

† Respecting nâmâni, for nâmâni, and so in the instrumental nâmâni, for nâmâni, see §. 140. In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the a in the weakest cases (§. 130.), but examples of its retention, e.g. in the compound aocîn-nâmâni, whence the genitive aocîn-nâmâni (Vend. S. p. 4, and frequently). I consider the initial a in this compound as the negation, without euphonic n; for in all probability it means “having untold (countless) names.” Similar compounds precede, viz. hača-ghašchahâ bâv-čâshmanê, “of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed.” Cf. Anquetil II. 82. In words in van, on the other hand, a is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the v becomes u or o. Regarding the addition of the i in Hatsmoni, nâmâni, see §. 41.
ABLATIVE SINGULAR.

ABLATIVE.

179. The Ablative in Sanskrit has त [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, which is lengthened before it; a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians, who have been followed by the English, to represent धत as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed, that in व्रिकत the अ of the base has been melted down with the ध 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 त, and not धत, is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in अ, of which hereafter. As regards bases in अ, 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 (pp. 156. and 264.); and I have deduced from the ablatives of the pronouns of the two first persons (मत, तवत) that either अत with short अ, or, more correctly, a simple त, 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 ध 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 वेह्रकॅत answers to व्रिकॅत. Bases in ज इ have दि-त in the ablative: whence may be inferred in Sanskrit ablatives like पतेत patेत, प्रितेत prितेत (§. 33.), which, by adding Guna to the final vowel, would agree with genitives in द ए. The Zend-Avesta, as far as it is hitherto edited, nevertheless offers but few examples of such ablative forms in दि-त: I owe the first perception of them to the word अङ् तजॅ आत्रमोहसुद् अशैलित, "beneficience," in a passage of the Vendidad, explained elsewhere, which recurs frequently. Examples of masculine bases are perhaps राजिट zaratustrित, "institutione zaratustrica" (V. S. p. 86), although otherwise राजिट, which I have not elsewhere met with, is a masculine: the adjective base zaratustri, however, belongs to the three genders. From गैरित gairi, "mountain," occurs the ablative गैरित gairित in the Yescht-Sâde.† Bases in उ have आ-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 guerbed can be nothing else than the ablative गैरित, for Anquetil generally expresses ज by गैरि, च by इ, ज by दि, and ज by टि. The nominal base गैरित, however, is treated in Zend as if gari was the original form, and the ज which precedes the र was produced by the final ि, as remarked by M. Burnouf in the article quoted at p. 173, and confirmed by the genitive गैरित. That, however, which is remarked by M. Burnouf, I. c. with respect to the genitive, and of which the Vend. S. p. 64. affords frequent proof in the genitive गैरित, patibois, must also be extended to the ablative in दि; and the ज, which, according to §. 41., is added through the final ज of the base, is dropped again before this termination.

† For this we also find जित cut; e.g. जित माये यु from माये.
|| Interchanges of ज ए and ज ए are particularly common, owing to the slight difference of these letters. Thus, e.g. for मित mraot, "he spoke," occurs very frequently मित mroat; the former, however, is, as we can satisfactorily prove, the right reading; for, first, it is supported by
that in a, does the ablative more frequently occur, although these words are in number but five or six, the ablative use of which is very frequent; e.g. दोधु, "creation," from दोहु, in a passage explained elsewhere* एनहू, "mundo," from एन्हु; दोहो "corpor," from दोह. Bases ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the ablative त 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. आपप आत, "aqua"; ध्व धृत "igne"; चाष्मान चायु, "oculo"; ठोळन ठोळन- "naso"; दुज दुजत, "demon"; वीस वीसत, "loco" (cf. vicus, according to § 21.). Owing to the facile interchange of the a with अ, आत is sometimes erroneously written for आत; thus, Vendidad S. p. 338, आतान "sadchant-" for आतान "sadchant-" "lucente." Bases in u sometimes follow the

by the Sanskrit form अब्रोत abrot, for which the irregular form अब्रवीत abrov-it is used; and secondly, it answers to the 1st pers. म्राथम (V. S. p. 123): thirdly, the Sanskrit धो is, in Zend, never represented by धो, but by ध, before which, according to § 28., another ध is placed, hence म्राथम: on the other hand, म्रा represents अ, in accordance with § 32 and § 28. If, then, अपस pās formed in the ablative अपस pās, this would conduct us to a Sanskrit पास पास t; while from the ablatives जस्तौत, जस्तौत, सरातुस्तौत, सरातुस्तौत, गर्वूँ गर्वूँ, and from the analogy, in other respects, with the genitive, the Guna form, पासोत pāsō-t must be deduced. Moreover, in the Vend. S. the ablative form अबू अबू-t actually occurs; for at p. 102 (महा वांहू, "hach vanhead-t mananh-at, “from pure spirit”) occurs vanhead, the ablative of vanhu; and the € preceding the a is an error in orthography, and vanheadt is the form intended: p. 245 occurs अनहू अनहू, "mundo," from आन्हु.

consonantal declension in having \(\text{\small \textit{at}}\) as the ablative termination instead of a mere \(t\); just as in the genitive, besides a simple \(s\), they exhibit also an \(\theta\) (from \(as\), §. 56\(^b\).), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned \(\text{\small \textit{tanaot}}\), "corpore," occurs also \(\text{\small \textit{tanv-at}}\) (Vend. S. p. 482).* Feminine bases in \(\text{\small \textit{a}}\) and \(\text{\small \textit{i}}\) have \(\text{\small \textit{at}}\) in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination \(\text{\small \textit{as}}\), whence, in the Zend \(\text{\small \textit{do}}\); e.g. \(\text{\small \textit{dahmay-at}}, \text{\small \textit{praeclara}},\) from \(\text{\small \textit{dahm\d\d}}\); \(\text{\small \textit{urvaray-at}}\) "arbore," from \(\text{\small \textit{urvar\d\d}}\); \(\text{\small \textit{barethry-at}}, \text{\small \textit{genitrice}},\) from \(\text{\small \textit{barel\d\d}}\).† The feminine bases also in \(u\), and perhaps also those in \(i\), may share this feminine termination \(\text{\small \textit{at}}\); thus, from \(\text{\small \textit{zantu}}, \text{\small \textit{begetting}},\) comes the ablative \(\text{\small \textit{zanthw-at}}\) (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 infrequently 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, 

\[\text{\small \textit{Yatha vehrko chathware-jangro nishdar\d\d \textit{dairy\d\d}}}\]

"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 \(\text{\small \textit{nishdar\d\d \textit{dairy\d\d}}}\).

* Burnouf writes \(\text{\small \textit{tanavat}},\) probably according to another Codex. I hold both forms to be correct, the rather as in the genitive, also, both \(\text{\small \textit{tanv-\d}}\) and \(\text{\small \textit{tanav-\d}}\) 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: \(\text{\small \textit{Yatha vehrko chathvar\d\d-jangro nishdar\d\d \textit{dairy\d\d}}}\) hacha avanh\d\d; vi\textit{\small sat y\textit{\small at m\textit{\small azdayas\textit{\small ndis}, "ex hac terr\d\d \textit{quidem mazdayasn\d\d.}}}

‡ Regarding this form, see p. 172. Rem.
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 $sādhant-at$ $ādir-at$ (lucente igne); while $navale-d* præda-d$, $inalto-d$ $marí-d$, $senatu-d$, like the above-mentioned Zend forms $garōt$ - "monte," $tanāt$ - "corpore," &c.; and in Sanskrit $vrikāt vrikāt$ - "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.] $mallu-d$, $cum preivatu-d$, $touta-d$ $præsenti-d$.† It may be preliminarily observed, that, in the 3d person of the imperative, old Latin and Oscan forms like $es-tōd$, $es-tud$—for $es-to$, and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Veda forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Pānini; e.g. कृत्य्यंत jīva-tāt, which signifies both "vivat" and "vive," but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf. $vivilo$ 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 smel, and so belong to the appended pronoun स ma, explained in §. 165. &c., corresponding with its ablative smât, to which it stands in the same relation that memor (for mèsmor) does to सृ smir—from smar, §. 1.—"to remember." The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for स ma, 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 lêna (§. 158.) and तसमात lasmât, 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 ως, from bases in o, would have the same relation to the Sanskrit

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

Thus, ὀµω-ς may be akin to the Sanskrit समात् samāt-t, "from the similar," both in termination and in base. In Greek, the transition of the ῥ sounds into ζ was requisite, if indeed they were not to be entirely suppressed*; and in §. 152. we have seen neuter bases in τ, in the uninflected cases, preserve their final letter from being entirely lost by changing it into ζ. We deduce, therefore, [G. Ed. p. 216.] adverbs like ὀµω-ς, οὐτω-ς, οτ-ς, from ὀµω-τ, οὐτω-τ, οτ-τ or ὀµω-δ, &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 οτ-ς is the same as that of Latin ablative forms like hoc modo, quo modo, raro, perpetuo. In bases ending with a consonant, ὀς for οτ might be expected as the termination, in accordance with Zend ablatives like चास्मण-त, chashman-nt, "oculo"; but then the ablative adverbial termination would be identical with that of the genitive: this, and the preponderating analogy of adverbs from ο bases, may have introduced forms like σωφρόν-ως, which, with respect to their termination, may be compared with Zend feminine ablatives like बरेठृय-द, barēthry-nt. We must also, with reference to the irregular length of this adverbial termination, advert to the Attic genitives in ὀς for ὀς.†

* As, in οὐτω, together with οὐτω-ς, ὀθε, ἄφω, and adverbs from prepositions—ἐξω, ἄνω, κάτω, &c. It is here desirable to remark, that in Sanskrit, also, the ablative termination occurs in adverbs from prepositions, as अधास्त adhastāt, "(from) beneath," पुरास्त purastāt, "(from) before," &c. (Gram. Crit. § 652 p. 273.).

† In compounds, remains of ablative forms may exist with the original ῥ sound retained. We will therefore observe, that in Ἀφροδίτη the first member
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, शस sas, and आस ās: the three first are common to the three genders: as is member has a genuine ablative meaning; and as the division अपो-इर्न admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with अपोब-इर्न. In Sanskrit, अहंर्दिता abhrāditā would mean "the female who proceeded from a cloud," for abhrā-t must become abhrād before itā (§. 93·); and in neuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix ta has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage इर्न, in अपोब-इर्न, 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 ऋ for ऋ. 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 जिह्वाय-āt, pritē-t, सुनात sūnā-t, bhavishyanty-āt, ātman-āt; so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms जिह्वाय-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, विस विस, 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. जिह्वाय-ās would be, in one sense, viz. in that of linguae, independent and original; and in another, that of lingua, a corruption of जिह्वाय-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 स s the [G. Ed. p. 218.] vowels Ṗ i and Ṛ u take Guna; and the Zend, and in a more limited degree, also the Lithuanian and Gothic, share this augment. All u bases, for example, in Lithuanian and Gothic, prefix an a to their final vowel: hence the Lithuanian sunau-s and Gothic sunau-s correspond to the Sanskrit सूनोम् sūnōś (filii) from sunaus (§. 2.). In the i bases in Gothic, Guna is restricted to the feminines; thus anstai-s, “gratia,” answers to प्रतिस् pritā-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 ος, passed over also to the vowels i and u and diphthongs terminating in u; and genitives like πορτει-ς, ixθευ-ς, which would be in accordance with §. 185. are unheard of; but πορτο-ς, ixθυ-ς answer, like ποδ-ς, to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases, as पद- pad-as, “pedis,” वाचम् 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 अ i, अ u, अ aí, and अ अu; e.g. rāy-as, “rei,” nāv-as, “navis:” and in neuters in अ i and अ अ, 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 अस.

[G. Ed. p. 219.] as than from the Greek $oς$, 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, instead of annexing a simple $s$ in the genitive, as नायुस्य नायुस्य मायेयू-स, “of the spirit,” from मायु, may, after the manner of consonantal bases, add स (from अ, cf. p. 212, G. Ed.), as नायु सन्हव-अ, or नायु सन्हव-अ, for सन्हव-अ “loci,” from नायु सन्हु. This kind of genitive occurs very frequently as a substitute for the locative, as also for the ablative (Vend. S. p. 177), more rarely with a genuine genitive meaning.*

188. Bases in अ अ, and pronouns of the third person, of which only अमु ends with a vowel other than अ, have, in Sanskrit, the more full genitive sign एस एस; hence, e. g. चौकस एरिका-एस, “लप्य,” तास ता-एस, “हॅजस,” &c., ब्राम्ह अमु-एस्या,

* It might be assumed that as बासुलेओस clearly stands for बासुलेफोस, बोफोस for बोफोस, वादोस for वादोस, (§. 124.), so also अर्टेओस would stand for अर्टेफोस, and that अर्टेओस, therefore, should be compared with the Zend genitives with Guna, as जूरायु दान्हव-अ. The $e$, therefore, in अर्टेओस 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 $i$ to $e$ 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 पोलेओस, σηνάπεος may not stand for पोले-एος, σηνापे-एος.

189. In Greek and Latin we have already, in another place, pointed out a remnant of the genitive termination स्या, and, in fact, precisely in places where it might be most expected. As bases in अ a correspond to the Greek bases in ο, and as ο 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 ιο is an abbreviation of σιο; and that e. g. in τοιο = तस्य ta-sya, the first ο belongs to the base, and only ιο to the case-sign. As regards, however, the loss of the σ in τοιο, the Greek Grammar supplies us with another σιο, where a Σ is lost, the necessary and original existence of which no one can doubt: εἰδοσό, and the ancient position of the Σ in the second person, testify for διοσίο instead of διόσιο, as for ελεγεσό instead of ελέγου, just as the Indian तस्य ta-sya for τो-σιο instead of τोιο. In the common language the ο, also, has been dropped after the σ, and the ο of the termination, which has remained, has been contracted with that of the base to ον; hence τοιο from το-ο. The Homeric form αο (Bopéao, Aiveáo) belongs likewise to this place, and stands for α-ιο, and this for α-σιο (§. 116.). The Latin has transposed our स्या to jus, with the change, which is so frequent, of the old α before the final s to u (cf. वृक्स व्रिका-स, "lupu-s," युज्मस युज्मास, युजिमास); 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 οιο, of which the i alone has been retained;* for it is clear that lupi and [G. Ed. p. 221.] lupae from lupai rest on the same principle; and if lupi proceeds from λύκοιο, whence can lupai be derived, as the corresponding Greek feminines nowhere exhibit an αιο or ηιο?

* 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 (ô) has arisen from a-s, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§. 56b.). In old Slavonic, also, o occurs, answering to the Sanskrit as; and nebo, gen. nebese, corresponds to the Sanskrit नम्न 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, daya-s, "of the day,"

[G. Ed. p. 222.] answering to the Gothic dogi-s. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple s for case-sign; hence, ahmin-s, fiyang-s, brôthr-s (§. 132.). The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an a, more lately an i, preceded this s—ahmin-as, fiyang-as, brôthr-as,—which, as in the nominative of the a bases (vulfs for vulfa-s), has been suppressed. The Zend exhibits in the r roots an agreement with the Gothic, and forms, e.g. अश्व nar-s, "of
the man," not nar-ā, 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 र i and व u may use at will either simple स s or चास ās; and instead of प्रिते-s, तनो-s, also प्रितास prītā-s, तन्वास tanvā-s, occur. The long vowels जा a, रि i, ज a;† have always चास ās; hence, जिए्यास jihāy-ās, भविष्यास bhavishyanty-ās, चहास vadhā-ās. This termination चास ās, is, in Zend, according to §. 56b., sounded do; hence, अम्रांनास hixay-do, अम्रांनास hizvay-do, अम्रांनास bushyainty-do. In bases in र i and व u I have not met

* Hence I deduce the genitives अल्पगृहा brāṭar-s, अल्पगृह dughdhar-s—which cannot be quoted—and the probability that the corresponding Sanskrit forms are properly bhrātṛ, duhitṛ, 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. भात्र bhrātṛ, and similar forms, would therefore stand for -urs, and this apparently for urs, 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 चातुः chatur, "four times," for चारुः chaturas (§. 44.). The Indian Grammarians also, in the genitives under discussion, assume the absence of the genitive sign (Laghu-Kaumudi, p. 35). As, however, the Visarga, in क्रोिः krōṣṭu (from the theme क्रोिः krōṣṭar or क्रोिः krōṣṭri, 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 भ्रात्र bhrāṭukī, stands for r, that the preceding u can be a transposition of the final letter of the base (चत न), 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 ἀκρυβία ἄσθρυϊ-ς, ἀκρυβία τάνει-ς, or ἀκρυβία τάν-ό, ἀκρυβία τάνα-ό, I find no ἀκρυβία ἄσθρυθ-ίς, ἀκρυβία τάν-ίς. 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 ὀ bases preserve this vowel in contradistinction to the nominative and accusative; but the ἰ 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 gibá, and anstai-s with gasti-s. Respecting the pronominal and adjective genitives, as thi-zó-s, blindai-zó-s, see §. 172. The Greek, also, in its feminine first declension preserves the original vowel length in words which have weakened the nominative and accusative—σφύρας, Μοῦσης,

[G. Ed. p. 224.] opposed to σφύρα, σφύρα-ν, μοῦσαν.* In Latin, also, ἀ-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-ās for rankâ-s,

* The Attic termination ὦς is, perhaps, a perfect transmission of the Sanskrit चास ās; so that forms like πολε-洸 answer to प्रियास prity ās. Although the Greek ὦς is not limited to the feminine, it is nevertheless excluded from the neuter (ἀστεως), and the preponderating number of ὀ 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 awīēs, 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 प्रीतिः prīty-ēs. If, however, it be compared with प्रीतिः prītēs, and the ē of awīēs be looked upon as Guna of the i (§. 26.), then the reading awīēs for awē; is objectionable. Ruhig, indeed, in his Glossary, frequently leaves out the i, and gives ugniēs, "of the fire," for ugniēs; 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 giesmē-ēs, for giesmyēs, from GIESMYĀ (see p. 169, note). Therefore the division awīē-ēs 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, awīē answers to giesme for giesmye, or giesmie.

194. As regards the origin of the form through which, in the genitive, the thing designated is personified, with the secondary notion of the relation of space, the language in this case returns back to the same pronoun, whence, in §. 134., the nominative was derived. And there is a pronoun for the fuller termination also, viz. स्य sya, which occurs only in the 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 स्य sya stands in the same relation to त्या tya-m and त्या tya-t that स sa does to तम ta-m, ता ta-t. It is evident, therefore, that in स्य sya, त्या tya, the bases स sa, ता ta, are contained, with the vowel suppressed and united
with the relative base य य. 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>GOTHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika-sya,</td>
<td>vēhrku-hē,</td>
<td>ἡuko-io,</td>
<td>willo,</td>
<td>wulf-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ka-sya,</td>
<td>ka-hē,</td>
<td>. . . . cu-jus,</td>
<td>kō,</td>
<td>hvi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwāy-ās,</td>
<td>hizvay-āo,</td>
<td>χόρρα-ς,</td>
<td>terrā-s,</td>
<td>ranko-s,</td>
<td>gibō-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. patē-s,</td>
<td>patōi-s,</td>
<td>. . . . hosti-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paty-us,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>πόσι-ος,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prītē-s,</td>
<td>āfrūtōi-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>siti-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prīty-ās,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>φύσιν-ος,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyantasy-ās,</td>
<td>būshyainty-āo,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnō-s,</td>
<td>paseu-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>sunau-s,</td>
<td>sun-</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>iχθύ-ος,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanō-s,</td>
<td>tanēu-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>socri-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>hants-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanw-ās,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhaw-ās,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gō-s,</td>
<td>geu-s,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>bov-is,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāv-as,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-as,</td>
<td>vāch-ō,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>voc-ōs,</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-as,</td>
<td>barēnt-ō,§</td>
<td>φεροντ-ος,</td>
<td>ferent-is,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. atman-as,</td>
<td>aśman-ō,‡</td>
<td>δαιμον-ος,</td>
<td>sermon-īs,</td>
<td>ākmen-s, ahm-</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāmn-as,</td>
<td>nāman-ō,‡</td>
<td>τάλαυν-ος,</td>
<td>nomin-īs,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The meanings will be found in § 148.
† See § 193.
‡ See p. 103. Note †.
§ And बराट barato also may occur, according to the analogy of बरेन्त barēntō, "splendens," V. S. p. 87, and passim. The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted. For बरेन्त barēntō, also बरान्त barantō, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older আ আ for আ. In some participles, as in সুন্ধর favyanīs (nom.), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture (সুন্ধর vāistṛya) আ never occurs.
‖ Vide §. 254. p. 302, Note †.
THE LOCATIVE.

195. This case has, in Sanskrit and Zend,§ i 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, Δωδώνι, Μαραθώνι, Σαλαμίνι, ἄγρῳ, οἶκοι, χαμάι; and, transferred to time, τῇ αυτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ αυτῇ νυκτί. So in Sanskrit, दिबसेद्वि, "in the day;" रिसि, "in the night."

196. With ए a of the base preceding it, the locative है i passes into ए e (§ 2.), exactly as in Zend; but here, also, ए i stands for ए e (§ 33.); so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives like οἶκοι, μοί, and σοί, in which i has not yet become subscribed, or been replaced by the extinction of the base vowel. To the forms mentioned answers मैद्याद्वि maidhyōi, "in the middle." One must be careful not to regard this and similar phenomena as shewing a more intimate connexion between Greek and Zend.

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

---

* It would be better to read ब्राधर-द, after the analogy of दाधर-द, "creatoris." (Burnouf, "Yaçna," p. 363, Note).
† The gen. of दुधधार is probably दुधधर-द (see p. 194, Note †).
‡ See p. 163, Note †.
§ Few cases admit of being more abundantly quoted in Zend than the locative, with which, nevertheless, Rask appears to have been unacquainted at the time of publishing his treatise, as he does not give it in any of his three paradigms.
|| I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskrit dative, rather than to the locative; see p. 1227 G. Ed., Note †.
tract this a with the old locative i, which appears pure nowhere any more, to è; hence, diewè, "in God," from DIEWA, answers to देवे dève, daeva. The bases which terminate with other vowels employ, however, in Lithuanian, without exception, ye as the locative termination, without any accent upon the e, a circumstance which must not be overlooked. This e is, perhaps, only an unorganic echo, which has occasioned the change of the old locative i into y, as, in Zend, the plural locative termination su, by adding an a, appears, for the most part, in the form of श्वा shva, or ह्वा hva. To the Lithuanian ye answers also, in old Scelavonic, a locative termination ye, for which several declensions have the original pure i; so that nehes-i, "in Heaven," and imen-i, "in the name," agree most strictly with the Sanskrit नाभिः nabhīs-i and नामिः nāman-i, from नाभ्र nabhās, नामन nāman.

198. Masculine bases in i and u, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, viz. जो du, before which ड्र i and ड्र u are dropped; but in पाति pati, "lord," and सक्षा sakhsi, "friend," the i has remained in its euphonic change to य y: hence, पाति paty-āu, सक्षी sakhy-āu. If we consider the vocalization of the s to u, shewn in § 56b., and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, जो du has proceeded from अस śas (§ 206.); moreover, the circumstance that in the Vēdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायाम dakṣiṇāyās, "in dexterā," for दक्षिणायाम dakṣiṇāyām, 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 जो du, from अस śas, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199. In u bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination अ० (from अ० as), while, in a genitive meaning, the form ई० eu-s is more common; thus we read, in the Vend. S. p. 337., अधिष्ठात् aṣṭahmi anhved yat astvainī, "in
hoc mundo quidem existente.” This Zend termination ṭ (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 *yasa tanu, “body,” very often the genuine locative form *yasa tanu-i; and we do not doubt that, in Sanskrit also, originally the u bases of the [G. Ed. p. 229.] three genders admitted in the locative the termination i (सनि sunu-i, तनि tanu-i, मधि madhu-i, or मधुन madhu-n-i).

Bases in i employ, in the locative, the usual genitive termination ò-s; thus, in the Vend. S. p. 234, आह्मने यात माण्द्यानोत, “inhis land are they Mazdeans,” which Anquetil renders by “dans le pays des mazdeiens.” In pronouns, also, though they have a locative, the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning; e.g. Vend. S. p. 46, अिनेविसे अिनेविसे “in this way,” or “place,” (cf. the feminine form अिनेविसे ainhão, §. 172. Note.).

200. From the Zend and Sanskrit we have already been compelled to acknowledge a connexion between the genitive and locative; and as we have seen the locative replaced by the genitive, so must we, in Latin, recognise a replacing of the genitive by the locative. Through the formal agreement of the corresponding Latin and Sanskrit termination, and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (Romæ, Corinthi, humi), not in the third or in the plural (ruri not 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 मय (from mé-i, §. 2.), “in me,” तवय twayi (from twē-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

[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, tu,* be compared, not with *mayi, twayi, moi, roi,* but with *mama, tava, mou, rov,* 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 *a-*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, oi*—and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as *populoi Romanoi*)—has become doubly altered: either the vowel of the base alone, or only that

[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-i*) appears to me inadmissible, because in all other parts of Grammar—numerous as the forms with a final *s* otherwise are—this letter has in Roman defied all the assaults of time, and appears everywhere where the cognate languages lead us to expect it: *no terrae for terras* (acc. pl.), *no lupi for lupos,* *no amae 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 (*province-s, suae-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 *αι-s*; and I would not therefore derive the common genitive *suae*—older form *sui—*

from *suaes* with the *s* dropped. The genitives in *us,* given by Hartung (p. 161.) from inscriptions in Orelli (*nomin-us, exercitu-us, Castor-us,* &c.), I am not surprised at, for this reason, that generally *us* is, in Latin, a favourite termination for *sae-us*; hence *nomin-us* has the same relation to *námn-as,* that *nomin-i-bus* has to *náman-bhyas,* and *lupus to vrikas* *vrikas*.
genitive, which is therefore similar to the nom. plural, where, in like manner, Romani stands for Romano. 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 सङ्ग ma-ḥyam, from ma-ḥiyam, and tibi to तु-भय म 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 अ a of the appended pronoun स्म sma is elided (see §. 165.); hence, तसम् tas'min, “in him”; कस्मन् kasm'in, “in whom?” This ि, which seems to me to be of later origin, as it were an ेफेलकुσ्तिकोν, does not extend to the two first persons, and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third; hence, अहम् ahmi, “in this.” As to the origin of the ि signifying the place or time of continuance, it is easily discovered as soon as i is found as the root of a demonstrative; which, however, like the true form of all other pronominal roots, has escaped the Indian Grammarians.

202. Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have, in Sanskrit, a peculiar locative termination; viz. याम yām, in which, also, the feminines in short i and u may at will participate (cf. §. 192.); while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long उ i and उ u, for याम yām, admit also the common इ i; hence, भयम् bhiy-ām or भिय bhiy-i, “in fear,” from भि bhī.* In Zend this termi-

* Perhaps the termination आम is a corruption of the feminine genitive termination आस (cf. §. 198. दक्षिणायास dakshināyās for dakshināyām), where it should be observed that in Prākrit, as in Greek, a final s has frequently become a nasal.
nation _damage 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 ِة and ِة. The form **tanwi** is clearly 
more genuine than the Sanskrit **tanu**, although from the 
earliest period, also, **tanwâm** 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>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikê,*</td>
<td>vêhrêkê,*</td>
<td>λύκω,</td>
<td>lup-ί,</td>
<td>wilkê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwây-âm,</td>
<td>hizvay-a</td>
<td>χώρα,</td>
<td>terra-ί,</td>
<td>ranko-ye,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-âu†</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>πόσι-ί,</td>
<td>host-ί,</td>
<td>pâti-ye,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. pru-âu†</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>πόρτι-ί,</td>
<td>sil-ί,</td>
<td>awi-ye,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavişhayanty-âm, bûshyanty-âa,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sûn-âu,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>ιχθυ-ί,</td>
<td>pecu-ί,</td>
<td>sunu-ye,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tan-âu,§</td>
<td>tanw-i,</td>
<td>πίτυ-ί,</td>
<td>socru-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu-n-ί,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>μεθυ-ί,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhw-âm,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gav-i,</td>
<td>gav-i,</td>
<td>βο(F)-ί,</td>
<td>bov-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nâv-i,</td>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>vâ(F)-ί,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-i,</td>
<td>barênt-i,</td>
<td>φέροντ-ί,</td>
<td>ferent-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. âtman-i,</td>
<td>âsmain-i,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ί,</td>
<td>sermon-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nâmni-i,</td>
<td>nâmni-i,</td>
<td>τάλαν-ί,</td>
<td>nomin-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhôtar-i,</td>
<td>brâthri?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>πάτρ-ί,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitar-i,</td>
<td>dughdhêr-i?</td>
<td>θυγατρ-ί,</td>
<td>matr-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dâtar-i,</td>
<td>dâthri?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>δοτηρ-ί,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-i,</td>
<td>vacanh-ί,</td>
<td>épe(s)-ί,</td>
<td>oper-ί,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See §. 196. † See §. 198. ‡ Or prity-âm. § Or tanw-âm. 

|| 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 **dughdhêr-i**, see p. 194, Note †). That in Sanskrit 
**bhôtar-i, duhitar-i, dâtar-i**, are used instead of **bhrâtri**, &c. is contrary
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, भूष bhit-s "fear!" as कि-स. 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 λύκε, lupē, case terminations: these forms have the same relation to व्रिक viika that πέντε, quinque, have to पच पांच pancha; and the old a, which appears in λύκος as o, in lupus as ā, has assumed the form of ē 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 ब्र अर (ब्र रि), 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 ब्रह्म रि, however, exists no ब्रह्म रि, and the form पित-ि, given at §. 132. is an oversight: the Greek παρ-ि may therefore, with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative पित-ि.
polysyllabic feminines in \( i \) and \( u \) shorten this final vowel; while a final \( \ddot{a} \), 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 \( \ddot{a} \), from \( \ddot{a} + u \), correspond remarkably the Gothic and Lithuanian; as \( \text{sunau}, \text{sunau} \), resembling the Sanskrit \( \text{suno} \) s\( \ddot{u} \)nd. 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 \( \text{anstai} \), from \( \text{ANSTI} \), might be expected as an analogous form to \( \text{handau} \). 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 \( \text{awie} \) answers to \( \text{zwak}(\text{e}), \text{giesme} \) (Ruhig's third declension), for \( \text{zwak}(\text{e}), \text{giesmye} \).† 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 \( \text{vulf}, \text{daur}, \text{gast} \). 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 \( \text{mainyd} \) and \( \text{mainyu} \) as the vocative of \( \text{mainyu} \), "spirit." On the other hand, we have found a final \( i \) only, without Guna; and indeed frequently \( \text{paiti} \), "lord." So Vend S. p. 456, \( \text{usihista namano-paiti} \), "Arise, lord of the place!" The \( i \) 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 \( e1 \) as the termination in the dative. For \( \text{awie-i} \), the division should be made thus, \( \text{awie}-i \); and this is analogous with \( \text{zwake-i}, \text{giesme}-i \), for \( \text{zwakie}-i, \text{giesmye}-i \).
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, χαρίεν for χαρίεντι opposed to χαρίεις, παῖ 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 τς (ξ, ψ) are very favourite combinations, to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the vocative ἄνα, together with ἄναξ, is remarkable, and has that sound which might be expected from a theme ἄνακτι, 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 ὡς 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.

SANSKRIT. ZENDel. GREEK. LATIN LITHUAN. GOTHIC.
m. vrika, vehrka, λύκε, lupe, Wilke, vulf'.
n. dāna, dāta, ὑδρο-ν, donu-m, ... daus'.
f. jihwe, hizw? χώρα, terra, ranka, giba?
m. patē, pati, πόσι, hosti-s, ... gos'.
f. prītē, āfrūtī, πορτί, siti-s, ... .
n. vāri, vairī, ἱδρί, mare, ... .
f. bhavishyanti, bhūshyanti, ... .
m. sund, paśu, iχθύ, pecu-s, sunau, sunau.
f. tanō, tanu, πίτυ, socru-s, ... handau.
n. madhu, madhu, μέθυ, pecu, ... .
f. vadhu, ... ... ... .
m.f. gāu-s, gāu-s, βοῦ, bo-s, ... .
f. nāu-s, ... vau, ... .
f. vāk, vāc-s? ὄπ-ς, voc-s, ... .
m. bharan, baran-s, φέρων, feren-s, sukau-s, fyaund.
m. atman, aśman, δαίμων, sermo', dkmū', ahma'.
n. nāman, nāman, τάλαν, nomen, ... namo'.
m. bhrātar, bhrātarē*, πάτερ, frater, ... brōthar.
f. duhitar, duhitharē*, θυγατερ, mater, motē, dauhtar.
m. dātar, dātare*, δοτήρ, dator, ... .
n. vachus, vachū, ἐπος;' opus, ... .

DUAL.

NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.

206. These three cases have, in Sanskrit, in the masculine and feminine, the termination छी दु, which probably arose from सास द्व by vocalization of the s (cf. §§ 56°, 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.
NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE DUAL. 221

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 अशुर्यि asruni with अशुर्यि asruti.
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bulary (p. 456), writes naereke sho, and renders by "deux femmes," can be nothing else than नायिकायो नायिकाया. The form नायिकायो नायिकाया is, however, evidently more genuine than नायिकाया; as, according to the Sanskrit principle (§ 213.), from a feminine base must have been formed नायिकाया. From बाजु बाजु, Rask cites the form बाजु बाजु बाजु, "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 बाजु बाजु forms, in the nominative plural, बाजु बाजु or बाजु बाजु. Still, in the edited parts of the Zend-Avesta, examples are wanting of बाजु बाजु, regarding the genuineness of which, however, I have no doubt.

208. In the Veda dialect, the termination ओ दू occurs frequently abbreviated to दू, so that the last element of the diphthong is suppressed. Several examples of this abbreviated form occur in Rosen's "Specimen"; as, अविन-दू, "the two Aswins," from अविन, and तर नारद, "two men," which can be derived both from नार
(नृ न्द) and from nara, but which more probably comes from nar. In Zend the abbreviated termination from ādu 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, अस्पिन्द-चा यवान्दो यास (maidhe), "Asvinosque juvenes veneramur," which Anquetil renders by "je fais Jzeschne à l'excellens toujours (subsistant"). The Sanskrit अबिन् aśvinā however, can, in Zend, give nothing but aśpinā or aśpina (§. 50.); the former we owe here to the protecting particle चा cha (see p. 175, Note § G. Ed.). The plural yavan-ā (from yavanās), referring to the dual aśpinā, 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 ā, and the short ā,* which frequently stands for it in Zend, the transition is easy to the Greek e, as this vowel, at the end of words, is a favourite representative of the old ā; and, as above, in the vocative (§. 204.), लुके stood for चृक व्रिका, युज्वेच वेह्र्का, so here, also, āndra (with euphonic ś) corresponds to the above-mentioned Vēda नर nard, and Zend नाज nār-a. Although, according to §. 4., ō also very frequently stands for शा ā, still we must avoid regarding लुकू as the analogous form to चृक व्रिका, or युज्वेच वेह्र्का (see §. 211.). That however, the Lithuanian dual ā of masculine [G. Ed. p. 241.] bases in a (in the nominative) is connected with the Vēda and Zend dual termination spoken of, i. e. has proceeded from ā, I

---

* Thus, Vendidād Sāde, p. 23, अबिन्द ज्यम् अज्यम् nãrāvata amērtāta, "the two Haurvats and Amertats"; p. 136, and frequently, नाज नाज dva nara, "two men." Cf. Gramm. Crit. Add. to r. 137.
have the less doubt, because in the other declensions the Lithuanian dual also agrees in this case most strictly with the Sanskrit, and the Lithuanian u or ū (uo) is, in some other places, equally the representative of an old ā (see § 162.), compare, dūmī, or dūdu, "I give," with ददामि dadāmī; dūsu, "I will give," with ददयाॆं ददयाॆं. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in a sound in the dual ā; thus tū = ता tā, kū = का. We hold, therefore, the Vēda form व्रिक० व्रिक०, the Zend वहरक० vēhrkā, and the Lithuanian wilkū, as identical in principle: we are, at least, much more inclined to this view of the matter than to the assumption that the u of wilkū is the last portion of the Sanskrit diphthong ची du, and that wilkū belongs to the form व्रिक० व्रिक०. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter u, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable: thus wilku, opposed to wilkū, in which respect may be compared πατέρ opposed to πατήρ, and § 205.

210. Masculine and feminine bases in i and u suppress, in Sanskrit, the dual case termination ची du, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form; thus, पति pati, from पति pati; सुनु sūnu, from सूनू sūmu. The सुन्यळु bāzv-do, "arms," (from bāzvu) 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 देवस्यळु mainyu, "spirit," we frequently find the dual देवस्यळु mainyū: on the other hand, for श्रीरेॆळु श्रीरेॆळु, "two fingers," we meet with the shortened form नूषेॆळु नूषेॆळु, which is identical with the theme (Vend. S. p. 318, नूषेॆळु नूषेॆळु नूषेॆळु नूषेॆळु.)

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, awi, "two sheep" (fem.), answers to यविव० avī, from यविव० avī; and sunū, "two sons," to सूनू 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 λύκω from a Grecian
soil, and banish it completely to India, it may be allowed
to seek its origin, not in the long α of चुक्ता व्रिक्त, but in
the short o of the base, as the first declension has a long
α in the dual, because its bases terminate with α, although
in the common dialect this letter is very frequently repre-
sented by η. Or may it, perhaps, have happened, that, in
the dual α of the first declension an i subscribed has been
lost, and thus τα for τά would correspond to the Sanskrit
ते (from ताः + i 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 o of λύκο; for it must be assumed, that if
the Sanskrit a bases had preserved the short α in Greek, and
चुक्त व्रिक- had become λύκα-5, then the dual too would
be λύκα, and not λύκω.

212. Neuters have, in the Sanskrit dual, for the termi-
nation of the cases under discussion, not जो दु, but i, as in
the plural they have not as but short i (र). A final अ a
of the base with this ई ई passes into ई ई (§ 2); hence,
ते साते, "two hundred," from जाते सता-i: [G. Ed. p. 243.]
other vowels interpose a euphonic n; hence, तात्रित तिल-न-ि,
"two palates." In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in
the a bases; as, for example, we frequently find सान्ते (§ 41.), answering to the Sanskrit ते साते; and
dुये हजारे, "two thousand," (§ 43.) for दे शहे
द्वे सहस्रे.

213. The Greek has renounced a termination distin-
guishing the neuter from the two natural genders; but
the Sanskrit appears to have extended the neuter i men-
tioned above also to the feminine अ bases. But the coin-
cidence of the feminine form जिहो jihwē, "two tongues,"
from जिह jihwά, with the neuter दान dānē, "two gifts," is,
as the Zend instructs us, only external, and the two forms
meet in quite different ways, and have such a relation to one another, that in dānē, from dāna + ē, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained; but in जिह्वेत jihvē the masculine-feminine termination ē (from ēs, §. 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form गन्धर्यन nārīkay-ā, “two women.” I believe, that is to say, that जिह्वेत jihvē has arisen or been corrupted from जिह्वयिज jihway-ā* 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 jihvē, 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 रे ē likewise occurs (§. 207. Notef.) 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 रे ē, where the appended particle शा cha stands beside it, has preserved the case sign s; and, as above, अमेरेलत-डोश-चा amērēlāt-ḍoś-cha, “the two Amertats,” so we find, Vend. S. p. 58, अमेशेश-चा amēshēs-cha ṣpēntē, “and two Amshaspants” (“non-conniventesque sanctos,” cf. समिष amisha and Nalus V. 25, 26. and see §. 50.).† The form रे ēs is to be deduced from the full form अमेरेलत amērēlāt ay-ḍoś; so that, after dropping the गम do, the preceding ay must have been contracted to ē, just as (p. 121

---

* Cf. the dual genitive and locative जिह्वयिज jihway-ās.

† The MS. has here अमेरेलत amērēlāt, but ē frequently occurs in the place of रे, although, as it appears, through an error. Cf. l. c. p. 88, अमेरेलत amērēlāt अमेरेलत amērēlāt avode yasuh amēšē spēntē; and see §. 51.
G. Ed.) in Prākrit, रूम ēmi has arisen from the Sanskrit अयामि ayāmi, by rejecting the ā. We may support the derivation of जिहवे jihwē from जिहवय jihway-āu, by this circumstance, also, that in the Vēda dialect the feminine ī bases may lose the dual termination āu, and then display the naked base; thus, in the scholia to Pāṇini, वाराहि उपानाहि varāhī upānahāu, "boar-leather shoes," for वाराहि varāhyāu. 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, तेविषि tevishī applied to feminine dual substantives (e.g. Vend. S. p. 225.); and I infer that its theme ends with a long, not a short ī, from the frequently-occurring plural accusative मित्विषि mitevishīs (Vend. S. pp. 99, 102).*

214. To the Sanskrit-Zend feminine dual [G. Ed. p. 245.] forms in ē answer the Lithuanian in ī, as rankī, from RANKĀ; so that of the diphthong र ē 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. wākū. 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 तेविः tēvivas, fem. तेविः tenušī (Gramm. Crit. §. 603.); and indeed, from the root मृ तव, "to be able," it may signify "powerful, strong." The ē for र ē is explained by the influence of the व v. And उतयिः utayitī 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 ई or ऊ 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.: amēshā spēntā hucsathrā hudāonbō ḍyēbē, "I glorify the two Amshaspants (non convenentesque sanctos) the good rulers, who created good." If amēshā spēntā and hucsathrā 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. §. 203.). That the epithet hudāonbō is in the plural cannot incur doubt, from the dual nature of the Amshasp (cf. §. 206.): this resembles, to a certain degree, the use of adjective genitives referring to a substantive in the ablative, which was mentioned in §. 180. We find, also, the forms amēshāō ṣpēntāō (Vend. S. p. 313.), which indeed might also be feminine plural forms, but shew themselves only as masculine duals, in the same meaning as the so frequent amēshā spēntā. We find also, frequently, ṣpēnistā mainyā, "the two most holy spirits" (p. 80), through which the dual form in ā of bases in a is likewise confirmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, Whether generally only two Amshaspants are to be assumed? whether the genitive plural (amēshanānām ṣpēntananām), 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 Amertai.
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 Aswînen, 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 अपैनित्य मायु Navyantar-mayū mainyū maxdā tevishī, &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 विशपा, "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 विशपा would then testify the impassable duality of these Genii. If they are identical with the celestial physicians, the Indian Aswînen, then "Entireness" and "Immortality" would be no unsuitable names for them. In Panini we find (p. 803) the expressions मातरपितारी mātara-pitarāu and रिपितरमातरा pitara-mātarā marked as peculiar to the Vêdas. They signify "the parents," but, literally, they probably mean "two mothers two fathers," and "two fathers two mothers." For the first member of the compound can here scarcely be aught but the abbreviated dual pitarā, mātarā; and if this is the case, we should here have an analogy to the conjectured signification of haurvat-ā and amerētāt-ā.

* Bases in जो ध form the strong cases (§. 129.) from जो दु; those in चन् an, and nouns of the agent in तार tar, lengthen in those cases, with the exception of the vocative singular, the last vowel but one (see §. 144.).
### 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 भध bhyām, which in Zend has been abbreviated to भध bya. Connected with the same is, first, the termination भध 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 भध hyam (§. 23). This abbreviation appears, however, [G. Ed. p. 249.] to be very ancient, as the Latin agrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vāch-ā,*</td>
<td>vāch-a</td>
<td>ὃ-ε</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharant-āu</td>
<td>barant-āo</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharant-ā</td>
<td>barant-ā</td>
<td>φέροντ-ε</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātmān-āu†</td>
<td>āsman-āo</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nām-ā</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td>ῥάλαν-ε</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātar-āu</td>
<td>brātar-āo</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitar-āu</td>
<td>dughdhar-āo</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātar-āu†</td>
<td>dātar-āo</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas-ā</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
<td>eπε(σ)-ε</td>
<td>⋯⋯⋯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Vēda duals in ā are as yet only cited in bases in a, n, and ar (चु, §. 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 Vēdas ā is occasionally found for āu, and other diphthongs; e.g. नामा nābhā, as locative for नामी nābhāu, from नाभि nābhī, “navel.”

† See the marginal note marked (*), p. 229.
remarkably with it; and mi-hi corresponds to नम्न ma-hyam, as ti-bi does to तुम्म tu-bhyam. In the second place, अस bhyas, which expresses the dative and ablative plural, is pronounced in Zend byō (§. 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 भ्यः 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, λύκως, with that of wilka-ms (for wilka-mus), λύκος. 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 भ्यः bhyām is भिस bhis, as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend म्वः bhīs,

* On the facile transition of v into m (cf. p. 114) rests also, I doubt not, the connexion of the termination युवः yuvām, "ye two," अवान avām, "we two," with the common termination ār, before vowels ār, 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 तम 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.e., 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.
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(also ἄρας bis), has in Latin fixed itself in the dative and ablative,* which must together supply the place of the instrumental; while in Lithuanian, with the exchange of the labial medial for the nasal of this organ (§. 63.), mis is the property of the instrumental alone, so that puti-mis answers to पतिनियम pati-bhis, अँगुमोश्तस्य пaiti-bís.

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 bis in tibi and vobis; and that, in Lithuanian, mi has to mis in akimi, "through the eye," and akimis, "through the eyes." It has escaped notice that the terminations φι and

* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (no-bis, vo-bis), where bis supplies the place of the bus which proceeds from भयस bhyas.


‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskrit instrumental termination bhis has been, in Prākrit, corrupted to र्हिन hīn.
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genitive, occur also with the case in φι, φιν, we are not compelled, on this account, to regard the latter as the genitive or representative of the genitive. In general, all prepositions, which are used in construction with the genitive, would, according to the sense, be better used with an ablative or a locative, if these cases were particularly represented in Greek. The suffix θεν also, of genuine ablative signification, expressing separation from a place, is incorrectly considered to represent the genitive termination, where the latter, in the common dialect, has received the sign of the lost ablative. In ὅσον δακρυόφιν πίμπλαγγο, δακρυόφιν would, in Sanskrit, be rendered by सन्धुनिन्द aśrubhis: 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 ὅσον δακρυόφιν τέρσαντο. In Ἰλιόφι κλυτα τείχεα it is not requisite to make Ἰλιόφι governed by τείχεα, but it may be regarded as locative "to Ilium." And in Od. XII. 45. (πολὺς δ' ἀμφ' ὄστεόφιν θεὶς ἀνδρῶν πυθομένων) there is no necessity to look upon ὄστεόφιν 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 according to its origin does not suit it; nor does it appear in the train of prepositions, which elsewhere occur with the accusative, with the single exception of ἐς εὐνηφίν 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 I subscribed 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 ὅχεσ-φι,
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ορέσ-φι, στήθεσ-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, ι is the only one, and ΚΟΤΥΛΑΘΔΩΝ the only ι 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—κοτυληθδον-ο-φιν—after the analogy of compound words like κυν-ο-θαρσής. This example is followed, without the necessity for it however, by δάκρυ—δακρυόμιν; while νον-φιν, in an older point of view, resembles exactly the Sanskrit नीमिस nāubhis; for in compounds, also, the base NAY keeps free from the conjunctive vowel ο, on which account νांस-ταμν π मय may be compared with Sanskrit compounds like नैस्थ nāu-stha, "standing (being) in the ship."

219. But to return to the Sanskrit dual termination भ्याम bhyām, it is further to be remarked, that before it a final च a is lengthened; hence, वृक्षाय व्रिकाभ्याम for वृक्षाय व्रिकाभ्याम. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस bhis; and that hence, from वृक्ष vrika also vrikā-bhis would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to वृक्ष vrikāis, which is easily derived from vrikābhis by rejecting the bh; for ए di 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 म sma, smā-bhis; hence अस्माभिस asmābhis, युप्ताभिस yuṣṭmābhis; which forms stand in the same relation to the वृक्षाभिस vrikā-bhis, assumed by me, that the accusatives समान asmān, युप्तान yuṣṭmān, do to व्रिकान vrikān, "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 ə a not ə-bhis but ə-bhis, has been formed, according to the analogy of the dative and ablative, as ʋrɪkɛbhyas; hence, ṣrəbхиs əsəbхiṣ, “per equos,” from əsə əsva. In the common dialect the pronominal form ṭəbхис “per hos,” answers to this Veda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base ə a, which generally plays the chief part in the declension of ḍɪdɪm idam. Though, then, on one side, from the pronoun ə a springs the form ṭəbхис; on the other side, from əsəm asma and ṣuṣə yuṣhma proceed the forms ṣəsəbхис əsəməbхиṣ, ṣuṣəbхис əyuṣhмəbхиṣ; and though the Veda dialect, in its substantive and adjective bases in ə, attaches itself to the former form, still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated ə ḍis to be based on an ə-bhis,* as that could never lead to ə ḍis. Perhaps, however, ḍbхiṣ might become ḍbхis, either through the assimilative force of the i of bхiṣ, or through analogy to [G. Ed. p. 254.] the dative ə-bhyas, the ə of which may, in like manner, owe its origin to the re-active influence of the ə y.†

220. The Prakrit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Veda dialect, and changed into ṛ ə the ə of

---

* From ḍbхiṣ would come, after rejecting the bh, not ḍis, but ayis, for ə, =ə + 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 Ṛdйm nadyais, for Ṛdйbхис nadi-bhis, as an abbreviation of nadi-bhis (for after rejecting the bh, 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 ḍis mentioned by Burnouf (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 310.) may here be considered, which occurs frequently in the Jzeshne, and is probably an abbreviation of ḍɪbɪs or ḍɪbɪs, from a base di, the accusative of which Ṛdй dim, “him,” is often found with i unlengthened, contrary to §. 64. The connection of the base Ṛdй di with Ṛdйtа cannot, on this account, be disputed.
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asmā-bhis, yuṣhmā-bhis, as also, in the locative plural, that of asmāsu, yuṣhmāsu; hence amhē-hin, tumhē-hin, amhēsu, tumhēsu. Moreover, in Prākrit, all other a bases, as well pronouns as substantives and adjectives, terminate the instrumental plural with e-hin; and thus kusumē-hin, “floribus,” (from kusuma,) answers to the Veda kusumē-bhis. Before, however, the forms in e-bhis, e-hin, had arisen, from abhis, 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 Vedas, together with that in e-bhis: thus, in Rosen, p. 14, yajnāis; pp. 15 and 21 arkaēs arkāis. In Zend the abbreviated form dis is the only one that occurs, which it does, indeed, extremely often.

221. Before the dual termination 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 bhis; it employs, namely, e for a: but from vēhrkē-bya, according to §§. 28. 41. comes vēhrkāčiba. Thus, in the Vendidad, pāldhačiba, “suis pedibus,” = Ṛṣamāṃ pañaddhaṃ swābhyaṃ pālda-bhyām; zoṣtāčiba (Ṛṣamāṃ) “manibus.” But in this case, also, the diphthong ṛ ē is supplied by ōi (§. 33.); e.g. ubōibya, “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 τοί is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit bhyām,* then the Homeric forms like ὰμοι-τοι are to be compared with the ubōibya

* By rejecting the labial, as in vṛkās vṛikās from vṛkābhīs vṛikābhīs, and by contracting the yām yām to υ, as when, in Sanskrit, for yasyta, ishta is said, from yaj, “to sacrifice,” and n Zend cēm, “hae,” for ḳum ḳum (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 $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$-$\omicron\nu$, might give rise to the conjecture, that $\omicron\nu$ and not $\omicron\nu$ is the true termination: the latter, however, is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where $\omicron\nu$ and not $\omicron\nu$ is attached to the final vowel of the base ($\text{Mou}\sigma\alpha$-$\omicron\nu$, $\lambda\gamma\omicron$-$\omicron\nu$). In the third, therefore, we explain the $o$ before $\omicron$ in the same manner as, §. 218, before $\phi\omicron$ ($\kappa\omicron\upsilon\lambda\gamma\omicron\delta$-$\omicron\phi\omicron$); 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 $\omicron$); as, in general, in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone, and have shewn the way to the vowels $i$ and $\omicron$. It might, however, not [G. Ed. p. 256.] have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel $o$ to make its appearance between consonants and the termination, as $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$-$\omicron\nu$ could very easily be uttered; but the $o$ of $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ comes evidently from a time when the $\omicron$ was still preceded by the consonant, which the corresponding Sanskrit termination $\text{bh}y\alpha m$ leads us to expect; in all probability a $\phi$; thus, $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$-$o$-$\omicron\nu$, from $\delta\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$-$o$-$\phi\omicron$.* We should have, therefore, here a different $\phi\omicron$ from that which, in §. 217., we endeavoured to explain from $\phi\omicron$, निस bhis: the nasal in the dual ($\phi$)$\omicron$ 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 $\omicron$, has an origin exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix $e\upsilon\tau$, which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit बन् vant. $E\upsilon\tau$ must therefore have been originally pronounced $Fe\upsilon\tau$; 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 $\pi\upsilon\rho$-$e\upsilon$ answers to $\pi\upsilon\omicron\nu$, from $\pi\upsilon$-$o$-$\omicron\nu$: on the other hand, $\tau\upsilon\rho$-$e\upsilon$ to $\tau\upsilon\omicron\nu$ ($\pi\upsilon$-$\omicron\nu$).
view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form Ἐτωπτόν be considered as the first person singular and third person plural; in one case from Ἐτωπτόμου, in the other from Ἐτωπτοτηρ.

222. If the dual termination ὅ be explained as a contraction of ὑμαμ, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination ὅ, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident (ὅμ' ὅ, ὅμ' ὅ, σφ' ὅ, together with σφ' ατ). 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 (समभाम asma-bhyam, "nobis," युष्मयम युष्मा-bhyam, (G. Ed. p. 257.) "vobis"), opposed to the भम bhyas of all other words. From this bhyam, then, we arrive at ὅ quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination ὑμαμ (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 ὅ, which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination ὅ or ὅ (for bhi) (§. 200.); we can, therefore, in the singular ὅ also of ὅ-ατ ὅ, ὅ-ατ ὅ, ὅ-ατ ὅ, ὅ, 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 ὅ 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 ὅ 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 \( v \) with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand, we have in \( \mu v \) and \( v i v \) real accusatives, and should therefore divide them \( \mu i v, vi v \); and not assume, with Buttmann (p. 296), a connection between this form and the dative -\( iv \).

223. As to the origin of the case-suffixes [G. Ed. p. 258.]

\( \text{bh}i-s, \text{bh}y-am, \text{bh}a\text{m}, \text{bh}y-\text{dm}, \) and \( \text{bh}y-as, \) which begin with \( \text{bh}y \) (from \( \text{bh}i \)), we must notice, first, their connection with the preposition \( \text{bh}i \), "to," "towards," "against," (whence \( \text{b}hi\text{ta}s, \) "at," cf. "apud"). However, in \( \text{b}hi \) itself \( \text{b}h i \) is clearly, in like manner, the termination, and the demonstrative \( \text{a} \) 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. \( \text{a}dh\text{i} \), "over," finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives, like \( \text{a}\text{th}i, \text{a}lx\text{o-th}i, \text{ou}p\text{av-t}h \) (§. 16.). Related to the suffix \( \text{d}hi \) is \( \text{d}ha \), 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 \( \text{V} \)eda dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion, and in the \( \text{Z} \)end, also, is found in several pro-

---

* In Prakrit the termination \( \text{bh}i \), which is connected with \( \text{bh}i \) (cf. §. 217.), unites also with other pronominal bases, for the formation of locative adverbs, as \( \text{ta-bhi} \), "there," \( \text{ka-bhi} \), "where?"
nominal bases with a locative signification; e.g. अवा-धा, “here.” In the Greek, compare θα of ἐνθα, opposed to θεν, from ἐνθεν, ἐμεθεν, &c., from प्रस dhas, for तस tas, in सन a-dhas, “beneath”: in which formations ध dḥ stands as a permutation of t, 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 भ bhi of सन abhi (Greek ἀμφι). I suspect that an initial consonant has been [G. Ed. p. 259.] dropped. As in Greek, also, φίν is used for σφίν, and as in Sanskrit द्विनाति viṅbati “twenty,” is clearly an abbreviation of द्विनाति dwiṅbati, and in Zend ब्य म bhs, “twice,” न्य bitya, “the second,” is used for द्वित्य dwīta, (Sanskrit द्वित्य dwis), द्वित्य dvitya (Sanskrit द्वित्य dwitīya), so भ bhi may be identical with the pronominal base स swa or भ 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 ब्य म bhs, ब्य म bitya, and the Latin bis, bi. The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ bh, as, in Prākrit (§. 166.), स sma has become म्हa; 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 भूयस bhūyas, “more,” to बहु bahu, “much,” the a being rejected (Gramm. Crit. r. 251. Rem.).

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

* Among others, in the 2d person plural of the middle धे dhwē and धम् dhwam for ते twē, तम twam.
I deduce this form principally from the base \( ra\text{-}a\) "light," which often occurs in the terminations beginning with ą, and always interposes ę as conjunctive vowel—\( ra\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}bis, ra\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}bya. \) We find, also, \( vi\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}bis \) (Vend. S. p. 63.). Bases in ąr interpose ę; those in ą, when a vowel precedes that letter, conjoin the termination direct (\( am\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}bya, \) according to §. 33.): on the other hand, the ąt of \( a\text{-}a\text{-}a\) is rejected; thus, V. S. p. 9. \( b\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}e\text{-}bya, \) "splendidibus," with ą, contrary to §. 60. The form \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m, \) "supercilii," 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 \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m, \) pp. 321 and 322, \( am\text{-}a\text{-}a\text{-}m, \) \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m, \) probably for \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m; \) so that it would seem that \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m \) is the ablative singular of a theme \( a\text{-}a\text{-}y \) (Sansk. \( b\text{-}hru\)). I have not found this word in any other case: it is not likely, however, that any thing but \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m \) or \( a\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m \) is its theme: in the latter case it would be a participial form, and would demonstrate, that instead of the last consonant of ąt, the last but one also may be rejected. Or are we to regard \( b\text{-}a\text{-}y\text{-}a\text{-}m \) as a form of that singular kind that unites with the termination of the ablative singular that of the dual, and thus \( a\text{-}a\text{-}y \) would still be the theme?

† \( N, \) in Sanskrit and Zend, is rejected before case terminations beginning with a consonant; thus, in Greek, \( a\text{-}i\text{-}m-o\text{-}a, \) and in Gothic \( a\text{-}k\text{-}m-a\text{-}m. \)
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SANSKRIT.  

m. bhrātrī-bhyām,*  bhrātar-ē-bya,  πατέρ-ο-ιν,  ....  
n. vachō-bhyām,†  vachō-bya,  ἐπέ(ο)-ο-ιν,  ... 

表 225. These two cases, in Sanskrit, have the 
common termination जोस ०, which may be connected with 
the singular genitive termination. The following are 
examples: वृक्षोम् vrikay-०, निहयोम् jihway-० (cf. §. 158.), 
पतोम् paty-०, तनयोम् tanw-०, वाचोम् vach-०, भ्राम् bhrātr-०, 
वचोम् vachas-०. In Zend this termination seems to have 
disappeared, and to be replaced by the plural; likewise in 
Lithuanian, where, awy-ʊ is both dual and plural genitive.

PLURAL.

NOMINATIVE, VOCATIVE.

226. Masculines and feminines have, in Sanskrit, जस as 
for the termination of the nominative plural, with which, as 
in the cognate languages, the vocative is identical in all de-
clensions. 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 designa-
tion, are related to one another, as it were, like positive, 
comparative, and superlative, and the highest degree be-
longs to the dual. In Zend जस as has, according to §. 56b.

* चर ar before case terminations beginning with consonants is short-
ened to चु rī (§. 127.).  
† See §. 56b.
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FORMATON OF CASES.

hence, Sanskrit à té, Zend गृ हौ t̪̄े, Gothic thai, "this,"

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

 answering to the feminine form तास t̪̄ो (§. 56".), thōs. To this corresponds, in Greek, τοῖ (Doric for oi). In Greek and Latin, however, this i, which practically replaces the termination as (ες, ὥς), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in o (= ά α, §. 116.); but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it; hence, 

 λύκοι, χοραι, for λυκο-ες, χορα-ες, lupi (from lupoi), terrae (from terrai), for lupo-ες, terra-ες. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§. 121.), has preserved the old termination; hence, rēs from rē-ες, as, in Sanskrit jihwās from jihwā-ας. 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 ὥς (blindai "caeci") is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229. In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination 

 ēω do also (from चास ds, §. 207.) occurs with a plural signification; thus, frequently, 

 दुष्ठो do, "voces," दुष्ठो do. Crit. §. 271.) shews itself clearly through most of the oblique cases, as 

 amī-byas," illis," amī-śham, "illorum," to be the naked theme. The form which occurs in the Zend-Avesta 

 दुष्ठो do, "omnesque" (V. S. p. 49), considered as a contraction of vispey-ας-cha (cf. §. 244.), leads to the conjecture, that ß to ße, and similar uninflected forms, the termination as also might attach itself; thus, दुष्ठ टय-ας. In Zend, the pronominal form in e occurs, for the most part, in the accusative plural; and thus the abovementioned vispey-ας-cha l. c. stands probably as accusative, although, according to Anquetil's inaccurate translation, it might be regarded as the nominative.
raoch-do, "luces," which forms cannot be regarded, perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in d; for I believe [G. Ed. p. 264.]
I can guarantee that there exists no such base as वच्दा and राोचा. The form दोन्हो in a bases, as वेरकोन्हो, "lupi," and "lupos," rests on that in the Vêdas, but which only occurs in the nominative, दस्त (§. 56.); e.g. तोमास दोमस, "songs of praise," for तोमास दोमस, from तोम दोम.

230. Bases in इ and उ have, in Sanskrit, Guna; hence पतायं पताय एस, सूनव एस, for पत क एस, सून एस. The Gothic also has preserved this Guna, but in its weakened form इ (§. 27.), which, before अ, becomes ग; hence, सूनव एस, "sons," (for सूनव एस, from सूनव एस,) a form which would be unintelligible without the Guna theory, which has been shewn to belong to the German. In इ bases the Guna इ is melted down with that of the base to long इ (written ei, §. 70.); hence, गास-एस, अनस-एस, from गास- एस, अनस-एस (cf. p. 105.).

The Zend employs Guna or not at pleasure; hence वेल्प- ड, or पताय-ड,† वेट्स- ड, or पताय-ड, or पताय-ड.

231. Neuters have, in Zend, as in the cognate European languages, a short a for their termination; but from forms like हु-मतो, "bene-cogitata," हु-दिता, "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

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

† The इ, which, according to §. 41., is blended with the base, remains in spite of the ए preceding the य.

† 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 हु-मतो, "bene-cogitata," हु-दिता, "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 ū a, अश्वन ascha). The following are examples: मुल्ल悍्य ashavan-a, "pura;" मुल्ल悍्य berézant-a, "splendentia;" मुल्ल्य vách-a, "verba;" मुल्ल्य nar-a, "hombres;" मुल्ल्य ast-a, "ossa." In nominal bases in a the termination is melted down with the vowel of the base: the a 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 neutral 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, mashyá-cha), here I am nevertheless convinced that this plural mashya, or mashyá, is not an abbreviation of mashyán from mashyás (§. 56b.), as in no other part of Zend Grammar a or a stands for सा as: 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 background. 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 evituation 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. viśpa anaghra-raochand (not raoch-a), "all lights which have had no beginning"; tisaró (fem.) sata or thrayó (masc.) sata, "three hundred"; chathwáró (masc.) sata "four hundred." In general the numbers "three" and "four" appear to have lost the neuter; hence, also, thrayó csaṅin-a, "three nights," chathwáró csaṅin-a, "four nights": in Vend. S. p. 237, on the other hand, stands tā nara yā, "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 thô, "hæc," is used (for thá, §. 69.), from THAa; hó, "qua," for HVAa; but daura, from DAURA, as, in Zend, wo tâ, "hæc," "ya," "qua," opposed to nom agha, "peccata," from agha. It cannot, therefore, be said of the Gothic that the a of the base has been dropped before that of the termi-

although the form might also belong to a theme nara, which also occurs, but much less frequently than nar; whence also, elsewhere, the masculine nar-ô tâ-la, "and those persons." From the theme vâch, "word," "speech," we find frequently vâch-ô (also, erroneously as it appears, vach-ô); e.g. Vend. S. p. 34, vâchârâya vâchâya vâchâya vâchâya vâcha humata húcta hvarêśta, "verba bene-cogitata, bene-dieta, bene-peracta." From jâwâjum 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 Pali 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 aivishitâr-a, "peccata corruptantia (!)." Anquetil renders both expressions together by "la corruption du cœur" (11. 227.); but probably aivi-sitâr stands for -csitâra, and means literally "the destroying" (cf. फ़्ञ kshi, intrans. "to be ruined"). So much is certain, that aivi is a preposition (p. 42), and tar is the suffix used in the formation of the word (§. 144.), which is in the strong cases tîr; and from this example it follows, as also from asha-
van-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 râlavar-a, Gothic namôn-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 ᾀ. This ᾀ 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 ᾀ, which has grown out of ᾀ+ᾰ, has become shortened. This ᾀ, however, in contrast with its offspring ᵉ, ὕ, Ὑ, may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, than if ὑῳρο or ὑῳς, dona, done, stood as the plural neuter.

232. Bases in ὰ and ή may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and ὤ may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel: thus we read in the Vend. S. pp. 46 and 48, ἀλαιο gara, "hills," from ἀλαιο 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), ἁνᾶ ἀναπερεθα καθαρίζειν χαῖραι ἁγία μου αγροκύμον t' agha anāpērētha skyaōthna ἀδ ναρδ-Βαύπα, [G. Ed. p. 268.] i. e. "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which ..."; and here it is evident that anāpērētha stands for anāpērēthw-ᾰ, for pērētu means actually "bridge."

* Burnouf's MS. divides thus, anā pērētha, which is following Olshausen (p. 6), but with the various reading anāpērētha. I have no ground for assuming that in Zend there exists a preposition anā, "without," so that anā pērētha might mean "without a bridge"; and that pērētu would, in the singular instrumental, form pērēthwa or pērētava. I suppose, therefore, that pērētu may be conjoined with the preposition ἀ, and then the negative an have been prefixed.
But a final u may also be retained, in the form of a semi-vowel, either pure or with Guna: the latter form I recognise in यद्वाय यद्वा (Vend. S. p. 120; in Olshausen, p. 7), which can only be the plural accusative of यद्वा यदु, for it stands with अग्न अग्न अग्न, "peccata; and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of यदु in the accusative singular, viz. यदुमेतें, "the magician," "gifted with magic" (according to Anquetil, magicien). I render, therefore, अग्न यद्वा literally by "the sins of sorcery" (Anquetil, "la magie très mauvaise"); and in Anquetil's Vocabulary is (p. 467) यद्वा यद्वान, the regular plural genitive of our base यदु, 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, वंद्वाय हेंद्वा "the Indies"; with हाप्त हेंदु, "the seven Indies" (Anq. II. p. 270). It has the epithet us-astar-a ("up-starred?") in opposition to यदुम्वाय यदुम्वाय douas-astarëm हेंदुम्, "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 वोहु वोहु, "goods," from वोहु वोहु.

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

* V. S. p. 341. यदुम्वाय यदुम्वाय यदुम्वाय यदुम्वाय kya aëté vacha yoi hënti gathāhva thris āmṛtā (erro-
neously thris āmṛtā), "What are the words which are thrice said in the prayers (songs)?" The masculine forms aëté and yoi can here, according to Note at §. 231., occasion no difficulty. So also V. S. p. 85, मृच्च 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 con- jected, that, in accordance with the abovementioned hēndv-a and ydtav-a, forms also like vairy-a or vairay-a, from vairi, were in use. As in Gothic, neuter substantive and adjec-
tive bases in i are wanting, the numeral base THRI, "three," and the pronominal base I, "he," are very im-
portant 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-ा, from भि bhi.

234. The Sanskrit gives, in place of the Zend-European neuter a, an न i, perhaps as the weakening of a former a [G. Ed. p. 270.] (§ 6.); the final vowel of the base is length-
ened, and between it and the case termination a euphonic n is placed (§ 133.); hence दानाई dānā-^-i, चारीस vārī^-^-i,* मधुन madhu^-^-i.† The bases which terminate with a single con-
sonant—न n and र r being excepted—prefix to it a nasal,

before the masculine रतवो ratavō (रतवो मद्वा kya ratavō, "which are the lords"?).

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

† In the Vēdas, the न i in a bases is frequently found suppressed; e.g. विश्वा viśwā, "omnia," from viśwa. In this way the Sanskrit is connected with the Zend viśpa, viśpā-cha: but perhaps this coincidence is only exter-
nal; for as the Sanskrit nowhere uses a neuter termination a, विश्वा viśwā cannot well be deduced from viśpa+ा, but can only be explained as an ab-
breviation of the a-न i, which likewise occurs in the Vēdas, as also पुरुा purū, "multa," "magna," is used for पुरुष purūni (Rosen's Spec. pp. 9, 10).
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and after s and n the preceding vowel is lengthened; hence वचनसि vachan-si, नामानि naman-i. Into relation with this i might be brought the neuter inflexion of quæ (quæ) and haë-c (haec) which stand in Latin very isolated; quæ is, however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit जानि kān-i, while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual के kê from ka+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 quæ a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual के kê.

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>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikōs</td>
<td>vēhrkōndhā</td>
<td>λύκοι</td>
<td>lup'-ī</td>
<td>wilkaí, vulfōs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. tē</td>
<td>tē</td>
<td>τοί</td>
<td>is-l'ī</td>
<td>tie;+ thai.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dānā-n-ī</td>
<td>dāla</td>
<td>δῶρα</td>
<td>dona, ... daura.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwās</td>
<td>hizvāo</td>
<td>χωραί</td>
<td>terrae, rankos, gibōs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The termination tis answers to थस that, Greek τον from τον, not to थ tha or थ 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 Vēda य lyu, mentioned in §. 194.; while the base स्य syu (ष shyā, see §. 55.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of SZIE, and in the plural nominative, likewise without inflexion,
is szie. From the pronominal declension the form ie (from ia) has found its way into the declension of the adjective also: so that the base GERA, "good," forms several cases from GERIE; viz. dat. du. gerie-m for gera-m, dat. pl. gerie-ms for gera-ms, and nom. pl. gerie for gerai. This gerie 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 bono-i) belongs to the termination, while gerie is void of termination, and stands for gerie (analogous with tie), but this latter for gerie-i (cf. yanikkie-i.)

* See p. 163, Note †.
† See p. 1078.

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

§ We might expect gav-ो, gavas-cha, "bovesque;" but we read गौस् geus in the Vend. S. p. 253, L. 9, in combination with the pronominal neuters मुष्ठ tा, "illa," मुष्ठ ya, "qua," which, according to §. 231. Note, cannot surprise us.
<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. vucli-as,</td>
<td>vdupl-ê</td>
<td>φρωντ-ês,</td>
<td>vocês,†</td>
<td></td>
<td>fiyand-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharan-f-as,</td>
<td>barent-6*</td>
<td>δαίμον-ês,</td>
<td>sermon-ês,†</td>
<td></td>
<td>ahrman-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dlmdn-as,</td>
<td>asman-6,</td>
<td>τάλαν-α,</td>
<td>nomin-α,</td>
<td></td>
<td>namon-α.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vachans-i,</td>
<td>vachanh-α,</td>
<td>οπερ-στ-α,</td>
<td>oper-α,</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 वृक्ष, पती पती, सूनू सून, &c. We might imagine this n to be related to the m of the singular accusative, as in the verb the termination दान दान (1st pers. sing: imperative) has clearly proceeded from दान दान. 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—वुल्फ-ns, गस्ती-ns, सून-ns,—but has been divided in the other sister languages; since the Sanskrit, according to §. 94., 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. **BRÔTHAR** becomes **BRÔTHRU,** whence brôthru-s, &c., according to the analogy of sunyu-s.
§ Or गच्छन vachenha. Thus we read Vend. S. p. 127, nōnēnha, which, I think, must be regarded as accusative of निमो (नमस namas, “adoration”), and as governed by निमो bôrēthra, “from him who brings,” “from him offering.”
|| The Old Prussian, too, exhibits in the acc. pl. ns, e.g. láva-ns, parīpas.
Respecting the Vēda termination ʰir, from ʰis, 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.] -hero- has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the v to volatilize to u.† In fact, hero- has the same relation to hero- that τόπτους has to τόπτοντι, from

[G. Ed. p. 275.] τόπτοντι.‡ For ποσι-ας, ιχθυ-ας, we could not, however, expect a ποσι-νς, ιχθυ-νς, as the Greek makes the i and u bases in all parts similar to the bases which terminate with a consonant, which, in Sanskrit, have as for a termination; hence পদস 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 vrikάνι for vrikaός; as, विद्वा́ंस vidwάंs, whence the accusative विद्वा́ंस am, in the uninflected nominative विद्वान् vidwά́n, ("sapiens").

† As the v also passes into i (rιδείς for τιβένς, Εροι τιψάς, μέλας for τιψαρ(τ)ς, μέλας), Hartung (I. c p. 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the i in Eolic accusative forms like νόμοις, τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, &c. As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like μεγάλας, ποικιλας, τείμας, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the α preceding the i; we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and specially feminine declension had originally accusatives in ns, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an ns, nor does the Sanskrit exhibit an n (see §. 287., and cf. Rask in Vater's Tables of Comparison, p. 62).

‡ It cannot be said that τόπτοντι proceeded from τόπτοντι, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the τόπτοντι before us answers to all the requirements of Greek Grammar, as to that of the whole base, since o-ντι corresponds to the Sansk anti, Zend ęnti, Goth. nt'; and from the singular τι (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than τι can be expected. But to arrive at oντι from oντι it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as oντσι; for that oντι can become oντι is proved by the circumstance that the latter has actually arisen from it, by the very usual transition of T into Σ, and the not rare vocalization of the N to Y, as also in Sanskrit, in all probability, उस us has arisen from nt (cf. p. 172, Note *), of which more hereafter. But if in the dative plural, indeed, oυ-σι has arisen from oυ-σι, not from oυ-σι (λέοντι not δάιμονι), we
the Ionic atai, aτο, for νται, 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 (πεπείθαται, τετράφαται; then, also, πεπαύαται, κεκλιάται, &c. for πέπαυνται, κέκλινταί). This comparison with the 3d person plural appears to me the more in point, as, in my opinion, the n in the presupposed forms, like υρίκας, πάτις, λόκος, 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, स्त्रियाः striy-as, "feminas," मुखाः bhwas, "terras," from स्त्रि stri, नू 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 *ō* bases, gives no *ns*, but it appears that *thōs = 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 *prīti-s* is formed from *prīty-as*, and *tāni-s* from *tanw-as*. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in ᾶ, ὀ, which, however, are not restricted to the feminine, and stand at the same time, in the nominative, for *i-es, u-es*. The Zend, like the Greek, follows in its *i* and *u* bases the analogy of the consonantal terminations; hence, *paity-ō* (*paity-as-cha,*) *paśv-ō* (*paśv-as-cha, or, with Guna, paity-ō, paśav-ō*). In feminine bases in *i, u*, occur at times also the forms *ē-s, ā-s*, corresponding to the Sanskrit; as, *paitay-ō, paśav-ō*. The sibilant is retained before the particle *aj cha*, and these forms can be copiously quoted; as, *amēshanās-cha*, "non-

* Cf. Vēdic forms in *ān.*
The form पुराना अथारुन अनि́श च is remarkable, as there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme अथारुना; 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 पुराना अथारुन अनि́श च are the accusatives अनि́श नारेउस, "hominès," and अनि́श स्ट्रेयस, "stellas," which occur very frequently; while from अनि́श अटार, "fire," we have found, not अनि́श अथ्र-एस, but अनि́श अथ्र-अ, in which it is to be remarked that अटार distinguishes itself from other words in र in this point also, that it forms, in the nominative singular, not अनि́श अटा, but अनि́श अटार्स. But how is the termination एस to be explained? I believe in no other way but from अणि́श, by changing the n into a vowel, as in [G. Ed. p. 278.] लोगौस; after which, according to §. 31., the अ a has become ξ e: the sibilant, however, which, after अ a and अ अनि́श, is अ s, must, after अ u, appear as अ s. We actually find, too, in the V. S. p. 311, नेर-अनि́श 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 अणि́श cha (cf. §§. 56b. 207. 228.), then the above examples are the more important, in order to supply a fresh proof that अ is the original designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a vowel. The superlative पुराना अस्त्रासैंष्टेमा (of which hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participial formative. Other cases, which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic s after अ, have been nowhere met with by me.
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 ān, which is restricted to the designation of animate creatures, is identical with the Sanskrit अन in the masculine plural accusative: thus, मर्दान mardān, "hominis," answers to मात्र मात्र martyān, "mortales," "hominis."*  

241. If, then, the termination ān, 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 अन as (§. 128.), which is still more frequently used in Zend than in Sanskrit. In the plural, these Zend neuters form anha or enha (§§. 56*. 235.); and with this ha is evidently connected the lengthened he ha in New Persian; thus, राजोऽ राजोऽ roz-hā, "days," answers to the Zend राजोऽ रा० raôchanha, "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 hā. 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 श्र स as; e.g. *hūsir*, "houses," *chālpir*, "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><em>vrikā-n</em></td>
<td><em>vēhrka-ū</em></td>
<td>ἀλφων-ς</td>
<td><em>lupō-s</em></td>
<td><em>wilkū-s</em></td>
<td><em>vulfa-ns</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>dānā-n-i</em></td>
<td><em>dāta</em></td>
<td>ῥωρα-ς</td>
<td><em>donα</em></td>
<td><em>daura</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jihvā-s</em></td>
<td><em>hizā-o</em></td>
<td>τρερα-ς</td>
<td><em>terrā-s</em></td>
<td><em>rankā-s</em></td>
<td><em>gībō-s</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tā-s</em></td>
<td><em>tā-o</em></td>
<td>τά-ς</td>
<td><em>is-lā-s</em></td>
<td><em>tā-s</em></td>
<td><em>thō-s</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>patī-n</em></td>
<td><em>paity-ō</em></td>
<td>ποσι-ας</td>
<td><em>host'-es</em></td>
<td><em>gasti-ns</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhīy-as</em></td>
<td><em>āfrīly-ō</em></td>
<td>πόρτι-ας</td>
<td><em>mess'-es</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prēlī-ṇ</em></td>
<td><em>āfrīli-s</em></td>
<td>πόρτι-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vārī-ṇ-i</em></td>
<td><em>var'-a</em></td>
<td>ἱδρι-ας</td>
<td><em>mari-a</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhavīshyantī-s</em></td>
<td><em>būshyaintī-ś</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 280.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sūnā-n</em></td>
<td><em>paśv-ō</em></td>
<td>ἵχθω-ας</td>
<td><em>pecū-s</em></td>
<td><em>sunū-s</em></td>
<td><em>sunu-ns</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhuv-as</em></td>
<td><em>tanv-ō</em></td>
<td>πίτυ-ας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tanū-s</em></td>
<td><em>tanū-s</em></td>
<td>πίτυ-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>madhū-n-i</em></td>
<td><em>madhuv-a</em></td>
<td>μέθυ-ας</td>
<td><em>pecu-a</em></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 *hūsiru-m* (from *hūsira-m*, 6.168.), the nom. accus. *hūsir* 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 *pēsō-tana*, from *pēsō-tanu*, which signifies the hind part of the body (5.199.), 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.: *ainhat* (ainhát?) hacha
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhā-s,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gā-s,</td>
<td>gāu-s,</td>
<td>βό(F)-ας,</td>
<td>bov-ēs,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāv-as.</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>νά(F)-ας,</td>
<td>voc-ēs,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-as.</td>
<td>vāch-ō,</td>
<td>ὄν-ας,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharat-as,</td>
<td>bārōnt-ō,</td>
<td>φέροντ-ας,</td>
<td>ferent-ēs,</td>
<td>fiyand-ēs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman-as,</td>
<td>āśman-ō,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ας,</td>
<td>sermon-ēs,</td>
<td>ahman-ēs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāmān-i,</td>
<td>nāma-n-a,</td>
<td>τάλαν-α,</td>
<td>nomin-ēs,</td>
<td>namōn-ēs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrāṭrij-n,</td>
<td>brāthr-eus?</td>
<td>πατέρ-ας,</td>
<td>fratr-ēs,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitri-s,</td>
<td>dughdhēr-eus?</td>
<td>ὑγατέρ-ας,</td>
<td>matr-ēs,</td>
<td>dugter-ēs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātrij-n,</td>
<td>dāthr-eus?</td>
<td>δοτήρ-ας,</td>
<td>dutor-ēs,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachāns-i,</td>
<td>vachān-h-a,</td>
<td>ἐπε(σ)-α,</td>
<td>oper-ēs,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE INSTRUMENTAL.

[G. Ed. p. 281.] 243. The formation of this case, and what is connected with it, has been already explained in §§215—224; it is therefore sufficient to give here a comparison of the forms which correspond to one another in the cognate languages,

ḥacha skyaōthnā-varēza atha buvanti pēśō-tanva, "haec pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inficta" (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 σύ can only be occasioned by a ον that has been dropped (§. 47.), for the theme of the concluding substantive is ἡττεν pērētu, not pērēthu (Vend. S. pp. 313 and 362, twice).

* Irregularly from a theme गा gā (§. 122.), for गवस gav-as. The Zend महल gāus (also महल gāos), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskrit form गा gāu; 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 महल gāus, and in the accusative महल geus, 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 भिस bhis than as belonging to the dative-ablative termination भ्यस bhyas; although it approaches equally near to the two old terminations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikê-bhis,</td>
<td>थू-φιव,</td>
<td>vo-bis,</td>
<td>vulis-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrikâ-is,</td>
<td>वेरका-िस,</td>
<td>wilka-is,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwâ-bhis,</td>
<td>हिजवा-िः,</td>
<td>ranko-mis,</td>
<td>gibô-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priti-bhis,</td>
<td>ध्रिति-िः,</td>
<td>awi-mis,</td>
<td>anstî-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sînu-bhis,</td>
<td>पञु-िः,</td>
<td>sunu-mis,</td>
<td>sunu-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nau-bhis,</td>
<td>वाह-िः,</td>
<td>ahma'-m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātma'-bhis,</td>
<td>अमा'-िः,</td>
<td>namn-am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nâma'-bhis,</td>
<td>नामा'-िः,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachô-bhis,†</td>
<td>ध्रो-िः,</td>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 282.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE DATIVE, ABLATIVE.**

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

---

* Vide §. 160. Note†
† See §§. 56b. 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 terrī-s from terri-bus, for terra-bus, as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zenda</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikē-bhyas</td>
<td>vēhrkaēi-byō</td>
<td>lupil-s</td>
<td>wilka-m(u)s*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvā-bhyas</td>
<td>hizvā-byō</td>
<td>terrī-s</td>
<td>ranko-m(u)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pati-bhyas</td>
<td>pātī-byō</td>
<td>hosti-bus</td>
<td>...†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. priti-bhyas</td>
<td>ḍrītī-byō</td>
<td>messi-bus</td>
<td>awi-m(u)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhaviṣhyantī-bhyas, būṣhyanti-byād</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānu-bhyas</td>
<td>paśu-byō</td>
<td>pecu-bus†</td>
<td>sunu-m(u)s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāg-bhyas</td>
<td>vāch-e-byō</td>
<td>voc-i-bus</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharad-bhyas</td>
<td>bārēn-byō,§</td>
<td>ferent-i-bus</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātma’-bhyas</td>
<td>aśma’-byō</td>
<td>sermon-i-bus</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātri-bhyas</td>
<td>brātar-ē-byō, fraitr-i-bus</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE GENITIVE.

245. The genitive plural in Sanskrit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination जाम अंम, in the Zend anm, according to §. 61. The Greek ὦν bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that ηδιῶ is to ξηδιάδ (§§. 4. 10.). The Latin has, as usual,

* See §. 215.
† The masculine i bases pass in the plural, by an unorganic increment, into a different declension. And in the dual and dative singular, also, PATI had to be given up (Mielcke, p. 35, Rem. 1.).
† I have selected the masculine base PECU, which occurs only in a few cases, on account of its connection with >mājā pašu, 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 = लूकम vrikam, लिकन-व. [G. Ed. p. 284.]
The German, like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal.
In Gothic, however, the ला d, which has been left, shews itself
under two forms, and thereby an unorganic difference has
been introduced between the feminine genitive termi-
nation and that of the masculine-neuter; since the fuller o
has remained only to the feminine ø and n 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 w a and w ø: hence, श ह्रका n-äm, श ह्रका n-äm, jihva-n-äm. To the latter cor-
respond 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 versâ, 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 femi-
nine 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 भरत ि भरान्ति. The same is the case with the i of the neuter
form ferenti-a; it is bequeathed by the deceased feminine theme FE-
RENTI. 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 conjun-
tive vowel, like the e in the Zend vâch-e-byô. Here it is to be observed
that those consonantal bases, which admit neither i-a nor i-um, must never-
theless proceed before bus to annex an i. In the chapter upon the adject-
ives 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 ɵ-n-ə, e-n-a; hence, Old High German köpö-n-ə, Old Saxon gëbô-n-ə, Anglo-Saxon gifé-n-a.

247. We find the bases in short and long ı, in Zend, if [G. Ed. p. 285.] polysyllabic, only with euphonic ın: on the other hand the monosyllabic ı bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure; thus, thrı-anım or thray-anım, "triıum," from thri; vay-anım, "avıüm," from vi. Bases in ıu admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic ın; but I find from the masculine ımu pašu only pašv-anım: on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like ımu tenu, "body," ımu našu, "corps" (cf. vékus according to §. 21.), hitherto only u-n-anım. With Guna ımu pašav-anım would serve as a prototype for the Gothic suniv-ı with Guna weakened (§. 27.).

248. Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskrit, saµ سود* for saµ ɗam; and this may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that ɗam 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-žé (§. 86. 5.) = te-šám (for te-šám, according to §. 21.) "horum"; thi-žo = tå-šám, "hu- rim." Here the ą, like the ɵ of the base THA, THÔ, appears weakened to i (§. 66.): on the other hand, the adjective a and ɨ bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have ai-žé, ai-žó; and blindai-žé, "caecorum" (for blinda-žé), answers exactly to the Sanskrit te-šám

*Cf. Old Prussian son, e.g. in stei-son, "row."
GENITIVE PLURAL.

265 (from tāśām) from the base ta. The High German has changed the old sibilant to r, as in many other places; hence, in Old High German, dē-rō for thi-zē and thi-zō, of which termination only the r has remained [G. Ed. p. 286.] to us. To the Latin, in like manner, belongs rum for sum (§. 22.); hence, istorum, istarum.*

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

<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>vrikd-n-ām, vēhrka-n-āīm, lūk-ōv,</td>
<td>lupō-rum, willk'-ū,</td>
<td>vulf'-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.tē-šām, teš-shaim, t'-ōv,</td>
<td>istō-rum, t'-ū,</td>
<td>thi-zē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihwā-n-ām, hizva-n-āīm, χωρά-ων, terrā-rum, rank'-ū,</td>
<td>kepā-n-ō.†</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 furnished by Varro and Charis.—boverum, Joverum, lapiderum, regerum, nucerum (Hartung, p. 255.)—are to be regarded as correct, and do not perhaps stand for bovo-rum, &c.; as also, in Zend, the base gā may extend itself to gava. The Latin rum and Sanskrit साम sām lead us to expect the Greek σων: 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 a-ων, ε-ων (e.g. airta-ων, airtē-ων, ὕφορά-ων, ὕφορέ-ων) 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 μείζω from μειζονα. According to this, λύκων would be to be derived from λυκο-ν-ων, χωράων from χωρα-ν-ων; but τῶν from τόσων τῶν from τάσων.

† 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>tā-sām</td>
<td>ā-ōnhaṁ</td>
<td>tā-ōv</td>
<td>istā-ram</td>
<td>ē-ū</td>
<td>thi-zō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. tray-ā-nām</td>
<td>thra-ānim</td>
<td>ṭrī-ōv</td>
<td>tri-um</td>
<td>tri-ū</td>
<td>thri-yē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prītī-ṇām</td>
<td>āfrītī-ṇāim</td>
<td>pūrtī-ōv</td>
<td>messi-um</td>
<td>awī-ū</td>
<td>anst-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānā-ṇām</td>
<td>paśu-ṇāim</td>
<td>ḍīḍh-ōv</td>
<td>pecu-um</td>
<td>sunī-ū</td>
<td>suniv-ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanu-ṇām</td>
<td>tanu-ṇāim</td>
<td>pūtī-ōv</td>
<td>socru-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. gav-ām</td>
<td>gav-āim</td>
<td>βe(F)-ōv</td>
<td>bov-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nā-vām</td>
<td>nāvām</td>
<td>νa(F)-ōv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-ām</td>
<td>vāchānim</td>
<td>ḍī-ōv</td>
<td>voc-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. bharat-ām</td>
<td>bāren-ānim</td>
<td>φeρόντ-ōv</td>
<td>serenti-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman-ām</td>
<td>ātman-āim</td>
<td>dāmuṇ-ōv</td>
<td>sermon-um</td>
<td>akmon-ū</td>
<td>ahman-ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātrī-ṇām</td>
<td>bāthr-ānim</td>
<td>nātēp-ōv</td>
<td>fratr-um</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit भास्म अ-साम “harum,” “earum” (ि. 56b); from अ-अ, āndonhaṁ would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, ॐ श्रयोः ad-ṭaṁhaṁ not aḍṭaṁhaṁ, as might be expected from एततासाम etā-sām.

† Or, also, ॐ प्रोक्तश्रयो बरंताम, as in the Vendidad Sāde, p. 131, ॐ प्रोक्तश्रयो जोश्च भं श्रयो जोश्च बरान्ताम, “lucentium:” on the other hand, also frequently ॐ जोश्च भं श्रयो जोश्च.

† This and the following genitives from bases in ar are clearly more gnuine and are more nearly allied therefore to the cognate European languages than the corresponding ones in Sanskrit, which, in this case, has shortened ar to स र, and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From भुर nar frequently occurs nār-āim, with retention of the a, on account of the base being monosyllabic: on the other hand, āṭhr-āim from āṭar, “fire,” and श्रयोः tisṛ-āim “trium,” fem. for the Sanskrit तिस्र अ-साम tisṛ-ṇām (Gramm. Crit. r. 255.). From भुर dughdhar, we find the form dughdheṛ-āim (cf. p. 208, G. Ed. Note †): the Codex has, however, dughdēr-āim (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.
The locative of the plural locative [G. Ed. p. 288.] is, in Sanskrit, म su, which is subject to be changed into य shu (§. 21.), for which, in Zend, is found ष्ट hshu (§. 52.); while from म su, according to §. 53., has been formed ष्ट hhu. The more usual form for shu and hu (for which, also, occur shu and hu) is, however, म पर shu, म पर hava, which leads to a Sanskrit ल su. This appears to me to be the original form of the termination; for nothing is more common in Sanskrit than that the syllables व va and छ ya should free themselves from their vowel, and then change the semi-vowel into a vowel, as तक 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 ए, especially as in no other case does a similar aftergrowth admit of being established. But if ल su is the original form of the termination, it is then identical with the reflective-possessive base ल su, 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 तु bhyan, the Greek dative-locative termination σι (σι) has to the Sanskrit म su.†

* Therefore, in Zend, the locative म पर त्र shu, “in tribus,” is identical with म पर त्र shu, “the third part,” since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part.

† Regarding the termination उ of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see §. 222. From the Æolic form ἰμιω, quoted by Hartung (p. 260) from Apoll., I cannot infer that उ is an abbreviation of σι: if it were so, the उ also in ἰμω 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 σι for σι.
FORMATION OF CASES.

[G. Ed. p. 289] 251. The bases in \( \text{a} \) add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an \( \text{i} \); but from \( \text{a} + \text{i} \) is formed \( \text{e} \) (§ 2.), to which the Greek \( \text{oi} \) corresponds; hence, \( \text{λόκοι-σι} = \) \( \text{vrikē-shu} \). Hence the \( \text{i} \) in Greek has also passed over to the bases in \( \text{α-}, \text{η-} \), either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskrit the \( \text{a} \) remains pure; hence, \( \text{विहास} \) \( \text{jihwd-su} \), with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as \( \text{Πλαταιάσιν} \), \( \text{Ολυμπίασι} \), \( \text{Αθήναισι} \) (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 \( \text{se} \), and the latter of \( \text{sa} \), with the original and more powerful \( \text{a} \), which, in the masculine, has softened into \( \text{e} \). The ending \( \text{sa} \) is plainly from the \( \text{swa} \), 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>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>LITHUAN.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>( \text{vrikē-shu} ), ( \text{vēhrkaē-shva} ), ( \text{wilkū-se} )</td>
<td>( \text{λόκοι-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>( \text{jihwē-su} ), ( \text{hizvā-hva} ), ( \text{ranko-sa} )</td>
<td>( \text{Ολυμπίασι} ), ( \text{χώραι-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>( \text{prēli-shu} ), ( \text{āfrēti-shva} )</td>
<td>( \text{āwi-sa} ), ( \text{πόρτι-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>( \text{sūnu-shu} ), ( \text{paśu-shva} ), ( \text{dangū-se} )</td>
<td>( \text{ιχθύ-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>( \text{go-shu} )</td>
<td>( \text{βου-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>( \text{nau-shu} )</td>
<td>( \text{ναυ-σι} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The common termination \( \text{ois} \), \( \text{ais} \) (\( \text{oi-σι} \), \( \text{ai-σι} \)), formed by curtailing \( \text{oi-σι} \), \( \text{ai-σι} \), and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskrit curtained instrumental ending \( \text{रेम} \) \( δις \) (§ 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 \( \text{i} \), but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in \( \text{u} \), which can be referred to in copious instances.

\* The \textit{a} in this form is not, as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel, but rests on a transposition; as \textit{tôpakov} for \textit{çôpakov}, and in Sanskrit \textit{drakshyâmi}, “I will see,” for \textit{darkshyâmi} (Sansk. Gramm. §.84b): thus \textit{tôpâs} (compare \textit{têpâs}) for \textit{tôpâs} (compare \textit{têpâs}), which, by preserving the original vowel, agrees with the Sanskrit base \textit{pitar} better than \textit{pêpâs}, \textit{pêpês}, &c. The same applies to the dative \textit{apvâs}, since the theme of \textit{dpvâs} has, as appears from the cognate word \textit{pie}, \textit{dpe}, \textit{dprê}, rejected a vowel between the \textit{p} and \textit{v}, which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an \textit{a}, and removed from its place. The whole \textit{REN} appears to be a transposition of \textit{Ner}, Sanskrit \textit{nâr nar} (\textit{nâri}), “a man;” for \textit{dpvâs} properly means “male sheep.” The \textit{a} of \textit{dpvâs} is therefore etymologically identical with that of \textit{dôpâs} (comp. Kühner’s complete Greek Grammar, §.281. Rem. 2.). It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the \textit{a} of \textit{vîâs}: it is either the older and stronger form for the \textit{e} of \textit{vîéâ}, or this word must have had, besides its three themes (\textit{YIO, YI, YIEY}), a fourth, \textit{YIAT}, from which came \textit{vîâs}, as \textit{gôvâs} from \textit{gonat}, the more prevailing co-theme of \textit{tONY}, which latter agrees with \textit{janu jânû}.

\† In the Vendidad Sâde, p. 499, we find the analogous plural locatives \textit{udzirôhva}, and \textit{csapôhva}. Anquetil translates the former by “\textit{au lever du soleil},” and the latter by “\textit{à la nuit}.” It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in \textit{vâs} (§.6, §.56b.). Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in \textit{ar}, and the interchange of \textit{csapar} with \textit{csapô} is a similar case to that in Sanskrit, where \textit{ahn} \textit{ahan}, “day,” forms some cases from \textit{ahs} \textit{ahas} (from which \textit{ahô} in \textit{ahôbhis}, &c.); and together with
FORMATION OF CASES.

G. Ed. p. 291.] "Remark.—From the bases in ΕΣ, to which The dative ἐσοι (= ἀγαθος as-su) properly belongs, this form appears to have imparted itself to other bases terminating [G. Ed. p. 292.] differently, in which, for this case, an extension of the original theme by ἐς is to be adopted; which, in its origin, is identical with the abovementioned (§. 241.) plural increase to the base by ἵς (from ἴς and this, from ἀς), in Old High German forms, as ὕσιρ, "houses," χαλπιρ "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 ὕσιρομ, χαλπιρομ; as, in Greek, κύνεο-ι, νεκύεσσι, πάντεσσι, γυναίκεσσι, πολίεσσι, and others, from the unorganically increased themes ΚΥΝΕΣ, ΝΕΚΥΕΣ, &c., according to the analogy of 'ΕΠΕΣ. From the doubled Σ one may then be rejected (ἀνάκτεσιν, πολίεσι, μήνεσι), or the doubling of a Σ by itself be employed; as, for example, νέκυ-σσι, for νέκυ-σι. This, with the theme ख्रहस् exists another, ख्रम् ahar. 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 ख्रणांक cəsapan, of which the genitive pl. ख्रष्णनम् cəsanaṁ—or analogous with ख्रस्त्र ahnām, "dierum" (§. 40. relative to § for § p)—is found in connection with the feminine numeral ख्र्नस् tisnam, "trium" (Vend. S. p. 246); for we read, l. c. § 163., ख्रशन्नम्च ख्र्नांकेह (i. e. ahnāncha), cəsananaṁcha (read cəsanaṁcha), "of days and nights." In Sanskrit, by the suffix ख्र a, the form ख्र्रहन, derivative, but equal in its meaning, has arisen out of ख्रहन ahun, which, however, occurs only in compounds (as ख्र्रपवहन् ख्र्रपवहन, "the early part of the day"), and in the adverbial dative ख्रहनया ahnāya, "soon," "immediately," which, therefore, it is not necessary to deduce from the root ह्र hnu, with the a privative. The Zend, however, whose night-nomenclature, in this respect also, is not outstripped by the Sanskrit, produces, as it appears, by a similar mutation, ख्रशन्ति cəsana from ख्रणांक cəsapan; whence we find the locative ख्रशन्ति cəsane, which might also be taken for the dative of ख्रणांक cəsapan.
Locative Plural.

In most important particulars, is adopted by Thiersch, §. 128., for the development of the forms in eοσί; 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 οχσφι into οχε-σφι instead of οχεσ-φι, and, by assimilation, derives οχεσ-σί from οχεσφι; while, as I believe I have proved, the forms οχεσφι and οχσφι rest on entirely different case-suffixes (§. 218.), and have only the base 'ΟΧΕΣ in common with one another. An assimilation, however, may be remarked in γοναο-σί, from γονατ-σί, so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second, not the reverse. In δεπαο-σί 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 κοκοι/η naemon (from κοκοι/η naema, "half"). Compare, also, l. c. §. 149., where ιημεικοι καθιξ δεικτης κοκοι ithra, ακέ, ithra, csafne, probably means "in this day," "in this night," with the locative adverb κοκοι ithra, "here," in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme ιημεικοι csafna, the plural of the same sound csafna, might also be assigned, which occurs l. c. §§. 330. 331., and in several places elsewhere: ιημεικοι υποθραυ θραυ η καθιξ csafna, "three nights;' ιημεικοι ακοσ εκας csafna, "six nights;' ιημεικοι ακοσ νυς 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 ιημεικοι 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 ιημεικοι csaparā, 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, ἄτ for ἄτ.
however, in all these forms, we allow only σι or σιν to be the 
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case-suffix, and all that precedes it is referred to the true or un- 

organic increase of the base, it can therewith not be denied that 

not even to Homer himself, in forms like ἐπεσσιν, not to men- 

tion unorganic forms like κύνεσσιν, did the entire εσσι present 

[G. Ed. p. 293.] itself as pertaining to that which marked 

the case; for in the feeling of the speaker ἐπεσσιν could pre- 

sent itself, during that period of the language, only as what 

it is, namely, as ἐπεσ-σι, while ἐπεσος, ἐπεσι, plural ἐπεσα and 

not ἐπεος, &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 ma- 

terial points following Greg. Cor. ΑΕολ. §. 35., relative to the 

production of the Greek plural datives. Kühner says (l. c.) 

The character of the dative plural is Ἔ (character of the 

plural) and ι or ιυ (character of the dative singular), there- 

fore, εσιν(ν).” I, however, think Ἐ not the character of num- 

ber, 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 Ἐ 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 Prákṛt, the 

locative ending गु su frequently assumes an Anusvāra, and 

so adapts itself, by the form गु suन, 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 Sanskrīt, and go to the other languages in their 

order, according as they have, in the particular cases, 

most truly preserved their original form; and where one 

or other of them has departed entirely from the original
principle of formation, or by an unorganic increase to the base has entered the province of another declension, we there, in the place in question, exclude it from the comparison.

**MASCULINE BASES IN a, GREEK IN o, LATIN IN u, o.**

**SINGULAR.**

**Nominative,** Sanskrit *vrika-s*, Lithuanian *wilka-s*, Zend *vehrk-ô*, with cha, *vehrkas-cha*, Greek *λύκο-ς*, Latin *lupu-s*, Gothic *vulf'-s*.

**Accusative,** Sanskrit, *vrika-m*, Lithuanian *wilka-n*, Zend *vehrké-m*, Greek *λύκο-n*, Latin *lupu-m*, Gothic *vulf*.

**Instrumental,** Sanskrit *vrike-n-a*, Zend *vehrka*, Gothic Dat. *vulfa*, Lithuanian Instr. *wilku*.

**Dative,** Sanskrit *vrikāya*, Zend *vehrkāi*, Lithuanian *wilkui*.

**Ablative,** Sanskrit *vrikā-t*, Zend *vehrkā-t*, Latin *lup-o-(d)* (see §. 181.).

**Genitive,** Sanskrit *vrika-sya*, Greek *λύκο-(o)ιό*, Zend *vehrkā-hé*, Gothic *vulf-s*, Lithuanian *wilkō*.

* The meaning is, in all these languages, the same, and so is the theme in its first origin. The connection of the Lithuan. *wilkas* with *vrikas* rests on the very usual interchange of the semi-vowels *r* and *l*; and this latter goes through the whole of the European sister languages. The Gothic *vulf* shows, 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 (l. c. p. 122 passim) the same views concerning

Vocative, Sanskrit \textit{vrika}, Zend \textit{vēhrka}, Lithuanian \textit{wilkē}, Greek \textit{λύκε}, Latin \textit{lupe}, Gothic \textit{vulf’}.

**DUAL.**


**PLURAL.**


Accusative, Sanskrit \textit{vrikā-\textit{n}}, Zend \textit{vēhrka-\textit{n}}, Goth. \textit{vulfs-\textit{n}}, Greek \textit{λύκο-\textit{\textit{v}}}, (from \textit{λύκο-\textit{v}}, §. 236.), Lithuanian \textit{wilkus}, Latin \textit{lupo-s}.

the Greek \textit{\textit{o}ō} and its connection with the Sanskrit \textit{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 \textit{δημόσιος}, from the root \textit{ΔΗΜΙΟ}, 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 \textit{s}, which is lost in \textit{δημοῖο}. With regard to the origin of \textit{δημόσιος} from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin \textit{cujus}, \textit{a}, \textit{um}; and the identity of the Sanskrit suffix of words like \textit{मनुष्य manushya}, “man,” as a derivative from \textit{mann}, with the genitive ending \textit{\textit{shya} for स्य sya}, as in \textit{मनुष्य amu-shya}, “illius.”

* With reference to the Zend, see §. 231. Note†; and with regard to the Greek, Latin, and Lithuanian forms \textit{λύκοι}, \textit{lupi}, \textit{wilkai}, see §. 228.
**FORMATION OF CASES.**


Genitive, Sanskrit *vrikē-bhyas*, Zend *vēhrka-n-ain*, Greek *λόκ'-ov*, 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 *λωκ'-ov*; 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 *φω* in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit भिस् bhis, and the thence-derived Prākrit भि hiṣ, and the Latin *bis* in *nobis*, *vobis*; and I will not advance more than a conjecture here, also, in comparing *θεό φω* with *dēve-hin*. This only is certain, that with the syllable भि bhi, which in Sanskrit, lies at the bottom of the case-forms भिस् bhis, भय bhyam, and भाम bhyām, as their common root (see §. 215. passim), the Greek φω and *φω* is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M. Ag. Bemary (Berl. Ann. July 1833, p. 51.), that *φω* might be formed from the ending भाम bhyam (§. 222.) by the contraction of य as in *ιψ*, *ίψ*, *τέψ*, &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 *μεν* from *μες*, and in the 2d and 3d person *του*, *τον* from तस तας, तस तας. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination भाम bhyām (§. 215.), and the changing this number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer, however, to consider *φω* (φω) as from one of the multifarious terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions; therefore, from भिस् bhis or भय bhyas.

T 2
Locative. Sanskrit vriikē-shu, Zend vēhrkaē-shva, Lithuanian wilkūse, Greek Dat. λύκοι-σι.

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

SINGULAR.
Nom. Acc. Sanskrit dāna-m, Zend dātē-m, Latin donu-m, Greek δῶρον, Lithuanian gēra, Gothic dau‘.
Vocative. Sanskrit dāna, Zend dāta, Gothic dau‘.
The rest as the masculine.

DUAL.
The rest as the masculine.

[G. Ed. p. 297.]

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 ḫvāhrkā udōyō aŋhūd 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 Yaença; lastly, a disquisition in the Nouveau Journal Asiatique, "Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasichita, 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 अङ्क्वा anhō, 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. वेदं ubōyd, according to that authority, corresponds with the Sanskrit उभयोः ubhayōs (amborum, in ambobus), with ō 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 ō of वेदं ubōyd, as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case, in which अयो ayo, not अयो oyo, actually occurs; because, that is to say, no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the a—I mean the form वेदं अयं zaslayd (=Sanskrit hastayōs), "in the hands," from अयं अयं zasta, [G.Ed.p.298.] in a passage of the Jñeschna, which has perhaps not yet been examined by M. Burnouf (V. S. p. 354.): स्त्राः kathā ashāi drujem dyaīm zaslayo, which Anquetil (p. 192) translates by "Comment moi pur, mettrai-je le main sur le Daroudj?" It appears, however, that अशाः ashāi can as little be a nominative as वेदं अयं zaslayo a singular accusative; and I believe I am not wrong in the following literal translation: "How can I give the (Daemon) 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 (Yaçaṇa, p. 98. passim), with a introduced, for the sake of euphony, 

* The Codex has faultily सम्म asāi and चें द्रुजें drujem.
according to the analogy of the Sanskrit एनेना (§. 158). He rests this, among other forms, on that of अनुष्पुষ्पुष्पु�
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 anā and रन ēnā forms also the last element of ज्र kana, if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved, as has also occurred in the Sanskrit चन anā and रन ēnā in but a few cases. For the rest, the Greek κείνος also appears connected with this ज्र kana, if it is looked upon as a theme, with which the instrumental must agree in sound, for κείνος, if not directly of interrogative meaning, is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp. कधन kaśchana, “whoever.”). Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in अ-न-अ, 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. Bur- nourf deduces the frequently-occurring instrumental अशायं ashayd, “with purity,” from the masculine theme अशा asha; and there would be accordingly अशायं ashaya, 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 §. 155., स्मय swapnayd, if one derives this, with the Indian grammarians, from a theme स्म 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 स्मय swapnayd belongs to a feminine theme स्म swapna. especially as the suffix न na occurs also in other abstracts in the feminine form ना uṇa, and therefore स्मय swapnayd
may be explained according to the analogy of तृष्णाया trish-
[G. Ed. p. 300.] नायद्, "with thirst." In every case I think
I may deduce the Zend अशयां ashaya from a feminine
theme अश्वस ashâ, as the Zend in general, in the substantive,
passes readily from one sex to the other; and, for example,
with a masculine base अश्व manthra, "a speech," occurs,
also, a feminine अश्व-न्य manthrâ.

"Remark 3.—For the genitive termination एश्व हे there
also exists, as Burnouf has most satisfactorily proved, a
form nearer to the Sanskrit sya, viz. एश्व hyd, which,
although rather rare in comparison with the more
corrump form हे, is still sufficiently frequent in some
chapters of the Jæschen to satisfy one perfectly of its
signification, according to the proofs given by Burnouf.
I too had remarked words with the ending एश्व hyd,
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 एश्व हे, and was, moreover, concealed from
me under the appearance of an instrumental form.
However, the termination hyd—for which is sometimes
found, also, एश्व khyd—approaches so very near to the
Sanskrit स्या sya, and agrees with it so precisely according
to rule, as far as the unorganic lengthening of the a, that
a single passage, with the accurate translation of Nerio-
singh, who, in the passages hitherto edited, follows the
original word by word, would have led us to it. Such a
passage is given, although with a different aim, by Bur-
ouf in his Yaçna (Notes, p. cxxxix.), which we here annex,
as it is interesting in other respects, also, for grammar:—
मूम् त्रिस्त्रितं एश्वप्रस्तम्या मूयं मूयं काश्चकाश्चका
काशं काशं एशाह्यदपतं एशाह्यद पावुर्यो काशं
क्षेण श्रेण्यच दात अद्वेदनेम. Ner-
riosingh translates this passage word for word, only that
he renders काशं, "which man?" (here properly not more
than “who,” for the idea of man is lost in the general signification of the whole,) not by को ना को ना, but simply, by को को, as follows: को जनने: पिता पुनःप्रथम कः सूचयेक तारकानाच ददी पद्यविम kō jananēti pitā punyasya prathamān

(कभिः सद्यापारत्वः कष्ट चतुर्थ kila sadyāpā— [G. Ed. p. 301.]
ratvan kaś chakrē, i.e. “boni originem quis fecit?”) kahi sūryasya tārakānāntcha daddū padavim (कित मागेन तेपाः को ददी kila mārgan tēshān kō daddū, i.e. “viam ipsis quis dedit?”). We translate from the Zend, “Quis (qualis vir) creatione pater est puritatis (or puri) primus? quis (qualis vir) soli stellisque dedit viam?” The Zend expression मुरुक्तुं zanithwā, for which, in the lithographed codex, p. 351, is erroneously given मुरुक्तुं zanithā, is plainly the instrumental of मुरुक्तुं zantu; which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskrit infinitive, जननम् jantum, as the latter is feminine, and to which I have, in another place, referred the ablative मुरुक्तुं zanithwā (Gramm. Crit. p. 253.). This form is, besides, remarkable on this account, viz. that it is identical with the Sanskrit instrumental gerund, which, from जन जन, without a conjunctive vowel and without the euphonious suppression of the न, would sound जननम् jantum. 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, मुरुक्तुं jantum is to be read for zanithwā), I do not attach any particular importance to that, because in the chapter from which this passage is taken a, originally short, is repeatedly to be found lengthened. The Sanskrit जनने: jananē, with which Neriosingh translates the Zend instrumental case, must be considered as an ablative, as this case often enters the department of the instrumental, and is also capable of expressing  

* Perhaps the adverb प्रथम prathamān, “primum,” is a corruption for प्रथम prathamān, “primus,” which answers to the original, and is to be expected from the sense.
+ Vide as to मुरुक्तुं zanithwā, p. 1244 G. ed.
the preposition "through" (for example, Nal. XII. 89.). Considered as a genitive, ज्ञनी: जाननेही would not correspond with मात्रक्षज़ zantuhा, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of धात जातु could only be मात्रक्षज़ zanteus, or, also, मात्रक्षज़ zantuhा, or मात्रक्षज़ zantavafd (see §. 187.), but in no case मात्रक्षज़ zantuhा. Add to this, also, that ज्ञनी janani is feminine, like the Zend धात जातु, and पुरुषस्य punyasya, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of ज्ञनी: जाननेही than, in Zend, श्रायस्तम्भ ašahyā could pass as the epithet of मात्रक्षज़ zantuhा. 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 ज्ञनी: जाननेही as a genitive, and refers पुरुषस्य punyasya to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the पुरुषस्य punyasya, which does not agree with the gender of ज्ञनी 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 ज्ञनी: जाननेही and मात्रक्षज़ zantuhा pass for genitives. Anquetil's traditionary interpretation sounds, in this place, very strange, but does not contradict my apprehension of मात्रक्षज़ zantuh: he makes the genitive मात्रक्षज़ ašahyā pass for the nominative, and does not, therefore, throw any light on the meaning of the termination मात्रक्षज़ ašahyā; for, in the presumption that it was right, मात्रक्षज़ ašahyā 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. 365) Anquetil renders (p. 137) the words ज्ञानिया
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 khen, this expression with the reflective pronoun 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 stren-cr; so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit स्वान. It is here to be remarked, that in some chapters of the Jezesne, ng is repeatedly found instead of a simple nasal, and, indeed, without regard to the organ of the following initial letter. So we read, in the V. S. p. 391, dushacsathreng,* dusskyothrng, dushdethreng. Anquetil, indeed, renders these expressions as singular nominatives, “ce roi mechent, qui fait le mal, attaché à la mauvaise loi”; but they, together with [G. Ed. p. 308.] dushvachanhō, dushmananhō, refer to the plural drēvatō, and I have no doubt of their accusative nature: the whole passage, however, like many others in the Jezesne, 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 kheng,

* The lithographed MS. has dusa csathreng as two words; the a is, however, clearly only a conjunctive vowel, to unite the prefix dush more conveniently with the following words.
the ॐ kh makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptation for the sun, for which, commonly, ॐ७्व hvarē is found (the Sanskrit खर्व swar, "heaven"); as ॐ kh is used very frequently for ॐव hv (see §. 35.); but we might here expect to find ॐवू khare, and may suppose that the ॐ न्ग ng has arisen out of न, and this letter out of र, as these liquids are easily interchanged, as is shown in Sanskrit, by the connection of चहन ahan, "day," with चहर अहर, and, in the Zend, that of असापन csapān, "night," with सापन csapar (I write it thus, and not असापन csapāre, designedly, see §. 44.).

At all events I take अन्वऱ kheng to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base अन्वऱ hvar may have entirely lost its र, and that it may be अन्वऱ kheng for अन्वऱ khem, the accusative of a base अन्व kha. अन्वऱऱ 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 अन्वऱऱऱ stāraṇim. Although, from this, अन्वऱ stren might easily be formed by contraction and combination with अन्व cha, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in अन्वऱऱऱ strencha, a secondary form of अन्वऱऱऱ strenus, explained in §. 239.; so that the nasal, here vocalized to उ, is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp. §. 239.); especially as, in other places also, अन्व dā is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given. In the Zend expression, अन्वऱऱऱ adhvānēm, the Sanskrit अध्वानम adhvānam cannot fail to be observed (comp. §. 45.); but in the lithographed MS. we have instead of this, अन्वऱऱऱ 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 Pārśī teacher's, interpretation, which is strangely at variance with Neriosingh's exposition; "qui

[G. Ed. p. 34.] ne sont pas a deux faces," so that अ अ अ is
taken for the well-known privative particle, न्यो dva as the number two, and the last portion finds in the Sanskrit धनानā "countenance," its corresponding syllable.

**Feminine Bases in ध, Gothic ṣ (§. 118.).**

Nominative, Sanskrit dharā, Greek χόρα, Lithuanian ranka, Zend hizva, Gothic gibā, Latin terra.

Accusative, Sansk. dharā-m, Latin terram, Zend hizva-īm, Greek χόρα-v, Lith. ranka-ī, Goth. gibā.

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

Dative, Sansk. dharā-dāi, Zend hizvā-dāi, Lith. ranka-i.

Ablative, Zend hizvā-dāi, Latin terra(d).

Genitive, Sanskrit dharāy-īs, Zend hizvāy-āo, Greek χόρα-s, Latin terrā-s, Lithuanian ranko-s, Gothic gibō-s.

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

Vocative, Sanskrit dharē, Zend hizvē (?), Greek χόρα, Latin terra, Lithuanian ranka, Gothic gibā (?).

**Dual.**


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

† Without being able to quote this case in Zend bases in ध, I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form, since I can prove by other cognate case terminations: 1. That the ध 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. gēnatbīs (V. S. p. 308.) from gēnā "woman" (γυνή).
FORMATION OF CASES.

FEMININE BASES IN i.*

SINGULAR.

Nominative, Sanskrit priti-s, Zend afragi-s, Greek πόρτι-s, Latin turri-s, Lithuanian awi-s, Gothic ansli-s.

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

Instrumental, Sanskrit afragy-a, Zend afragthy-a, Gothic Dat.

Instr. anstai (without case suffix, see §. 161.).

Dative, Sanskrit afragay-e (or prity-d, §. 164.), Zend afragy-e.†

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

Genitive, Sanskrit priti-s (or only with the feminine termination prity-as), Gothic anstai-s, Zend afragyi-s, Greek πόρτι-os, φόρε-ως, Lat turri-s.

Locative, Sanskrit priti-a, (or with the feminine termination only prity-am).

Vocative, Sanskrit priti, Zend afragi, Greek πόρτι.

DUAL.


---

* It may be sufficient to give here the cases of a Sanskrit masculine in i, which differ from the feminine paradigma: from agni, "fire," comes the instrumental singular agni-n-a—whilst from pati, "master," comes paty-a, and from sakhi, "friend," sakhy-a (see §. 158.)—and in the accus. plural आग्निक् agni-n.

† Differing from what is stated in §. 164. p. 196. G. Ed., it is now my opinion that the e in आग्रेत् afragyed does not represent the a a of the original form afragayae, but is the contraction of a and y; as, for instance, in the Prakrit चिन्तेमि chintemi, from चिन्तयायि chintayayi. e is here a weaker form of े=े, and is more properly used to represent the latter than another vowel. With regard to the Lithuanian, see p. 218, Note †.
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PLURAL.


Accusative, Sanskrit *prīt-s*, Zend *āfrūti-s*, Greek *πορτί-σ*, Gothic *ansti-s*, Lithuanian *āvy-s*.


Dat. Abl. Sanskrit *prīli-bhyas*, Zend *āfrūti-byō*, Latin *turri-bus*, Lithuanian *awi-m(u)s* (§. 215.).


Locative, Sanskrit *prīti-shu*, Zend *āfrūti-shva* (or *āfrūti-shu*), Lithuanian *āvi-sa*, Greek Dat. *πορτί-σι*.

NEUTER BASES IN *i*.

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-ēs* and similar forms.
FORMATION OF CASES.

MASCULINE BASES IN u.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit sunu-s, Gothic sunu-s, Lithuanian sunu-s, Zend pasu-s, Latin pecu-s, Greek bβrnu-s.

Accusative, Sanskrit sunu-m, Latin pecu-m, Zend pasu-m, Greek bβnu-v, Lithuanian sunu-n, Gothic sunu.

Instrumental, Sanskrit sunu-n-h (Veda prabhav-á, from prabháhu, §. 158.), Zend pasv-a, Gothic Dat. Instr. sunau.

Dative, Sanskrit sunav-é, Zend pasv-é, Lithuanian sunu-i.

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

Genitive, Sanskrit sunó-s (from sunau-s), Gothic sunau-s, Lithuanian sunu-s, Zend pasu-s or pasv-b (from pasv-as), Latin pecu-s, Greek bβnu-oč.

Locative, Sanskrit sun-áu.

Vocative Sanskrit sund (from sunau), Gothic sunau, Lithuanian sunau, Zend pasu, Greek bβnu.

DUAL.


Instr. Dat. Abl. Sanskrit sunu-bhyám, Zend pasu-bya, Greek bβnu-óu, Lithuanian sunu-m (§. 215.)


PLURAL.

Nom. Voc. Sanskrit sunav-as, Greek bβnu-e, Zend pasv-b (with cha, pasuš-cha), Latin pecu-s, Gothic sunu-s, Greek bβnu-s (for suniu-s, from sunau-s, §. 230.), Lithuanian sunu-s.

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


Locative, Sanskrit sūnu-šu, Zend paśu-shva (or paśu-šu), 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., प्रिति priti f. differs from अग्नि agni in.

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 े [G. Ed. p. 309.]

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accus. nārī-m</td>
<td>nāri-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. nāry-ā</td>
<td>nāiry-ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. nāry-āi</td>
<td>nāiry-āi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. nāry-ās</td>
<td>nāiry-ās or nāiry-ās, nāiry-āi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. nāry-ās</td>
<td>nāiry-ās or nāiry-ās, nāiry-āi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. nāry-ām</td>
<td>nāiry-ām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. nārī</td>
<td>nāri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f
FORMATION OF CASES.

---|---|---
N. A. V. náry-áu, | bhiy-áu, | náiri (see §. 213, p. 227.)
I. D. Ab. nári-bhyádm, | bhê-bhyádm, | náiri-byá.
Loc. náry-ós, | bhiy-ós, | náiry-ó?

N. V. náry-ás, | bhiy-as, | náiry-áo.
Accus. nári-s, | bhiy-as, | náiri-s.
Instr. nári-bhis, | bhê-bhis, | náiri-bês.
D. Abl. nári-bhyás, | bhê-bhyás, | náiri-byó.
Gen. nári-n-ám, | bhiy-ám, | náirê-n-ãim.
Loc. nári-shu, | bhiê-shu, | náiri-shva or -shu.

"Remark.—By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in i, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek [G. Ed. p. 310] kí, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom. bhî-s, kí-s, Gen. bhiy-as, kí-ós, Loc. Dat. bhiy-i, kí-i, Acc. stri-m,† kí-v, Voc. bhê-s, kí-s. Plural: Nom. bhîy-as, kí-és, Gen. bhiy-ám. kí-óv, Loc. Dat. bhê-shu, kí-ôi, Acc. bhiy-as, kí-ás, Voc. bhiy-as, kí-ès. 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 i of kí was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the i. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume

* Or bhî-n-ám. Further, the longer case-terminations, which belong to the feminine (see §. 164.), are added at will to the monosyllabic feminines in i, á; for example, together with bhiyê, bhruvê, also bhiyâi, bhruvâi.

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in i, with the termination am, striy-am.
that ΔΙ Favor is the true theme, and that the nominative was originally ΔΙ Favor; for if ΔΙ Favor, ΔΙ occurs, in the form in which they have been received, be analogous to ΔΙ Favor, ΔΙ, from ΔΙ Favor, ΔΙ Favor, still, to establish a theme ΔΙ Favor, a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to ΔΙ Favor from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this, that which of itself is alone sufficient proof, the cognate Sanskrit word दिव, "heaven" (§ 122.) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme ΔΙ Favor is, however, wanting, for the long i could, as in the Sanskrit भिन, and like the long v in ὕπρός, be also the real final letter of the base, only that the long i in the Sanskrit, except in compounds (for example गतभी gata-bhī m.f., "void of fear," तट् पी m.f., "water-drinking," see Gramm. Crit. §§ 169, 170.), concludes only the feminine themes. We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek ΔΙ Favor 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 ΔΙ-5, as well in form as in meaning; namely, in कृष्ण kita, Nom. कृष्ण kita-s, "insect" "worm," which would lead us to expect in the Greek κίτος, Acc. κίτον, to which κίς, Κίς, bear the same relation as μέγας, μέγαν, to the to be presupposed μέγαλος, μέγαλον. I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme ΜΕΓΑΣ, although the Sanskrit महत mahat, "great," might support it; but महत mahat is a participial form, and its full and original form (G.Ed.p.311.) (§ 129.) is महत् mahant, Nom. masc. महान् mahān, which would correspond to the Greek μεγανν."

**Feminine Bases in उ, ऊ.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accus. vadhu-म,</td>
<td>bhruv-am,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. vadhu-व,</td>
<td>bhruv-द,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. vadhu-दिः,</td>
<td>bhruv-ॆ (or -दिः),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formation of Cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>vadhu-ās</td>
<td>bhruv-as (or -ās), óφρύ-ος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>vadhu-ās</td>
<td>bhruv-as (or -ās), óφρύ-ι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>vadhu-ām</td>
<td>bhruv-i (or -ām), óφρύ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>vadhu</td>
<td>bhrū-s, óφρύ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Singular**

**Dual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.Ac.V.</td>
<td>vadhū-āu</td>
<td>bhruv-āu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L.</td>
<td>vadhū-ōs</td>
<td>bhruv-ōs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plural**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.V.</td>
<td>vadhū-as</td>
<td>bhruv-as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus.</td>
<td>vadhū-s</td>
<td>bhruv-as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>vadhū-bhīs</td>
<td>bhrū-bhīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Abl.</td>
<td>vadhū-bhyās</td>
<td>bhrū-bhyās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>vadhū-n-ām</td>
<td>bhruv-n-ām (or bhrū-n-ām), óφρύ-ων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>vadhū-śhu</td>
<td>bhrū-śhu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark.—The identity of श bhrū and 'ΟΦΡΥ* 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 ΟΦΡΥF (comp. Kühner §. 289.) so as to consider óφρυς as coming from óφρυFς, and the long v as a compensation for the rejected F, as perhaps μέλας from μέλαντς. That, however, F originally stood—for example, óφρυFος—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-as; by which, at the same time, the shortening of the v in this case is justified, for the Sanskrit

* The o in óφρυς 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 ονυς, ονουα, to नक्हस nukha-s, नाम nāma, is shewn.
changes, that is to say in polysyllables, as well  as  \( \hat{\imath} \), before vowel terminations, into a simple  \( \imath \); 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  \( \hat{\imath}v \) (\( \hat{\imath}v \)), as well from  \( \imath \) as from  \( \hat{\imath} \), as, under a similar condition,  \( \hat{i} \) from  \( \imath \) and  \( \hat{i} \): hence the two opposite forms, for example,  \( vadvh-as \) (not  \( vadhuv-as \)), “women,” and  \( bhruv-as \) (not  \( bhrw-as \)), “the eyebrows;” as above,  \( bhiy-as \) (not  \( bhy-as \)), opposed to  \( n\hat{\imath}ry-as \) (\( n\hat{\imath}riy-as \)). In the dative plural the short  \( v \) of  \( \hat{\omicron}fr\hat{\omicron}v-\sigmai \) for  \( \hat{\omicron}fr\hat{\omicron}v-\sigmai \) may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the  \( v \) before vowel terminations.”

**BASES IN  \( \hat{\imath}u \) (\( \hat{\imath}i \)),**

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}u-s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-um )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-as )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}u-s )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Acc. Voc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Dat. Abl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-as )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-as )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-\dot{a}m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}u-\dot{a}m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative,</td>
<td>( n\hat{\imath}v-as )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* I give only the cases retained in the Greek.
FORMATION OF CASES.

in avs, evs, oṿs, 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 vaF̣s, vaF̣s, 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 नाव ṇdv for नी ṇdv, and गाव gav for गो gō (bos); although, if there were adequate reasons for it, the practice of the Indian grammarians would not restrain us from laying down गाव gav and नाव ṇdv 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 दिव div, “heaven”; whence, for example, the instrumental plural द्विभिस ḍu-bhis for द्विभिस div-blis, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. §. 208.). The Latin navis cannot compel us to lay down a theme ṇdv for the Sanskrit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic i, as swan, “dog,” lengthened to cani; and therefore it exhibits in its declension nowhere u, but universally v.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thema,</td>
<td>VĀCH,</td>
<td>VĀCH,</td>
<td>VŌC,</td>
<td>ὦΠ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>vāk,</td>
<td>vāc-s,</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
<td>ὀπ-ς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus.</td>
<td>vāch-ain,</td>
<td>vāch-ēm</td>
<td>voc-em,</td>
<td>ὀπ-α.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>vāch-ā,</td>
<td>vāch-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>vāch-ē,</td>
<td>vāch-ē.</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Locative.
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ablat.</strong></td>
<td>vāch-āt,</td>
<td>voc-e(d),</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gen.</strong></td>
<td>vāch-ās,</td>
<td>vāch-ō,†</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loc.</strong></td>
<td>vāch-i,</td>
<td>vāch-i, D. voc-i,</td>
<td>D. ὀπ-ι.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Voc.</strong></td>
<td>vāk,</td>
<td>voc-s?, voc-s,</td>
<td>ὀπ-ς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DUAL.**

| N. Acc. V. | vāch-āu, | vāch-āo, | ..... |
| or | vāch-ō, | vāch-a, | ..... | ὀπ-e. |
| I. D. Abl. | vāg-bhyām, | ..... | D. G. ὀπ-o-ίν |
| G. L. | vāch-ōs, | vāch-ō? | ..... |

**PLURAL.**

| N. V. | vāch-as, | vāch-ō,† | voc-es, | ὀπ-ες. |
| Accus. | vāch-as, | vāch-ō,† | voc-es, | ὀπ-ας. |
| Instr. | vāg-bhais, | ..... | ..... |
| D. Abl. | vāg-bhyas, | ..... | voc-i-bus, |
| Gen. | vāch-ām, | vāch-āum | voc-um, | ..... |

"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 ε, in forms like ἀραχῆς raochebīs, no longer as a conjunctive vowel; and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme ἀραχ, but assume that ἀραχῆς raochebīs, and similar forms, have proceeded from bases in ἄδ(from as §.56.); so that I look upon the ε as a corruption of the ο, and to the form ἀραχῆς raochebīd I place as anterior a lost form ἀραχῆς raochebīd.§ In a similar way

* Like the Genitive.
† With cha, "and," vāchas-cha.
‡ See p. 290, 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 ἀραχῆς mazebīs, ἀραχῆς manebīs,
[G. Ed. p. 316.] I find, in the Prakrit (Urvasi, by Lenz, p. 40.), अच्छरेहिँ for अच्छरेहिँ (Sanskrit अपसर्भिः); and if this form is genuine, then the ए, in forms like राचेरेहिँ, appears to stand for ए, as generally many interchanges between ए and ए occur, although in the case before us the ए is very constantly written, and ए has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find ए for ए, “which,” ए for ए, “who?” and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also ए for ए; and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person ए for ए; then we see the change of the ए with ए 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 ए is the prevailing one, while before termi-

पचेरेहिँ, रुचेरेहिँ, have so arisen from the bases मधो, &c., that the द (मु आ) is suppressed, and ए then introduced as conjunctive vowel; or whether, before the द (from अद) only, the द has been rejected, and the preceding अ with an epenthetic ऐ united with an ए. In the former case I should not have been entirely wrong, from the analogy of राचे-बिः, to deduce forms like वाचे-बिः. I consider, however, the last view as the right one, only that I prefer letting the द from the pre-supposed original form, मनो-बिः, रुचो-बिः, be changed in its whole force into ए, rather than reduce it into its elements, and mix the first of the said elements (क) with a conjoined ऐ: for the derivation of मनेबिः from मनुिः, मनाबिः, मनाशिः, would extend to the Sanskrit form मनोभिः मनोभिः, which originally may have been मनरभिः (मनस-भिः was never possible). But I believe that in the Zend the form एबिः really preceded the form ओबिः. M. Burnouf, in his review in the Journal des Savans (in the separate impression, pp. 30, 31), calls attention to a form वाङ्खैः वो वाङ्खेयो, which is once found, in the Vend. Sāde, pp. 69 and 70, वाङ्खेयो, वाङ्खेयो, वाङ्खेयो, which,
nations beginning with b as yet no δ has been pointed out; so that b appears to be as repugnant to a following δ as favourable to a following b, 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 vachó-bya, vachó-bís, from वांचू vachó (from vachás). Instead of this should be read वचे ब्या vache-bya, वचे बिस vache-bís; and besides this, in the locative singular, वचाहि vachahi for वचान्धि vachanhi; 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 वांच्याऊ váchzybyó, 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 vác, I would still rather not, with Burnouf, derive it from vác; so that the nominative of this, वाः vács, 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 वांच्याऊ tēma from the masculine nominative, instead of from the theme. But Anquetil, in his Glossary, gives a form vakhsenghé, "parole utile," which we ought probably to read वांच्याऊ vacanhé (as dative), if not with long a झ्यवाङ्ख्याऊ vacasánhé. This latter form would belong to a theme वांच्याऊ vásō (vásas); from which, in the dat. abl. pl., वांच्याउँ vághzybyó (vághzebyó, &c.) might proceed for वांच्याऊ vásbyó; as with मजेष्थै mazéś, मजेष्ठै manéś, occur also मजेस्थै mazés, मजेस्थै manés; for the as of वांच्याऊ vásō must, as Burnouf has shewn, in contact with b become झ zh.
impossible for me to use) the locative वचाहि vachahi; that is to say, in the Vend. S. p. 173, where, for वचाहिः manahēcha vachahēcha, is to be read वचाहिः manahichā vachahichā. 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 श-० corresponds to the form ०० 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 ० form their ablative in ००, 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
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 स्वामाल्ह 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 ὀποῖν 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 declara-
ation which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination ον of the whole third declension (ποσίο-ιν, βο-

τρύο-ιν, δαμύο-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, βοτρυόεις, βοτρυόδωρος, would be, under the pre-
supposition of the bases ΜΕΛΙΤΟ, ΦΥΣΙΟ, ΒΟΤΡΥΟ, to be divided into μελιτό-εις, and would lead us to expect the nominatives μελιτο-ιν, &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 ὀποῖν from ὈΠΟ, of φερόντων from ΦΕΡΟΝΤΟ, was as it were the first commencement of the disease, which came to its full development 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 \( a \) (=Greek \( o \)), and have thus partly brought it from the Greek third declension into the second; and in the singular, also, most of the cases may, together with the old form, assume more recent forms, which have originated in the manner stated. In this manner, for example, the root चर् \( \text{char} \), "to go," forms its participle present partly from the original base \( \text{चरं} \) \( \text{charant} \), or its corruption \( \text{चरत्} \) \( \text{charat} \) (see §. 129.), partly from the augmented theme \( \text{चरन्त} \) \( \text{charanta} \), and in part also

\[\text{[G. Ed. p. 319.]}\] arbitrarily from \( \text{चरन्त} \) \( \text{charant} \) or \( \text{चरन्त} \) \( \text{charanta} \), as follows (see Clough's Pālī Grammar, Colombo 1824, p. 25, and compare Burnouf's and Lassen's Essay, p. 112 et seq.):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th.</td>
<td>( \text{CHARANT} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>( \text{charantu}^{*} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>( \text{charant-am}^{†} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>( \text{charante-n-a} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>like the Genitive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>( { \text{charanta-smd}, \text{charanta-mhd}^{†} } \text{charat-(d).}^{\S} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The final न \( n \) is, as in the Prākṛit (§. 10.), transmuted into the Anuswāra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by \( n \).

† It might also be divided thus, \( \text{charanta-m} \), and deduced from \( \text{charanta} \).

† Transposed, and with \( h \) for \( s \) (comp. §. 166.). These forms are derived from the médial pronoun \( \text{sma} \) mentioned in §.166., which, in the Pālī 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.

§ \( \text{Charat\(d\)} \) is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental, but
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>charant,</td>
<td>charantã,†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>{charanta-ssa, charantã,} or {charanta-smin, charant-i,} or {charanta-mhi, }</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc</td>
<td>{charã, or charã,} or charã,</td>
<td>charantã,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>charantã,†</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>charante,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>{charantebhí, or charantehi,}</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>like the Genitive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>like the Instrumental.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>charat-am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>charante-su,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>charantã,</td>
<td>charantã,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pali, one would have expected, for instance, from φέρων a genitive φέροντου, dative φέροντος; and in the plural indeed, φερόντων from

but is, in reality, corrupted from charat-at, analogous with Zend forms like ap-āt (in §. 180.): the suppressed t is replaced by the lengthening of the preceding vowel, as in acharâ, “he went,” from acharât (Clough, p. 106.).

* If this form really belongs to a theme in nt, as I believe, it has sprung from the original form charâi, by suppression of the concluding nasal (comp. Burnouf and Lassen, p. 89); and in charâ this deficiency is replaced by lengthening the vowel.

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with charantã also charantã, from the original theme charant; as, for example, gunavantã is used with gunavantã, “the virtues”; the former from gunavant, the latter from gunavantã.
FORMATION OF CASES.

ΦΕΠΟΝΤ, but φεροντοι, φεροντους, φεροντος, from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ. In this manner the form φεροντος in the dual, which has been lost in Pāli, would be clearly explained as derived from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ; but even when standing isolated, φεροντος 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 φεροντος, and all other dative-genitive forms of the third declension, the ơ 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, baran-s, feren-s, φέρων, φιγανδ-ς. *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. bharant-am, barent-ën, feren-t-em, φέροντ-α(ν), φιγανδ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins. bharat-ā, barēnt-a, .... .... D. I. φιγανδ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. bharat-ē, barēnt-ē, see Locat, see Loc. see Dat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. see Gen. barant-at, feren-ē(d), .... ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. bharat-as, barent-ā,† feren-is, φεροντ-ος, φιγανδ-ις. †</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. bharat-ī, barent-ī, D. feren-ī, D. φεροντ-ι, ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. bharan, baran-s, feren-s, φέρον, φιγανδ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 φιγανδ-ς as a mutilation of φιγανδ-ις from φιγανδ-ς, according to the analogy of other bases terminating with a consonant (ahmin-s, bððhr-s, §. 191.); Grimm has (I. 1017.) conjectured φριγάνδις or φρηγάνδς from φριγάνδς. Since this, owing to the very valuable additions made by Massmann to our Gothic authorities, the genitive nasyandis of Nasyand ("preserver, "preserving") has come to light (see his Glossary, p. 153), by analogy with which I form φιγανδ-ις.
FORMATION OF CASES.

N. Ac. Voc. bharant-ā, Vedic, bharant-ā,*
I. D. Abl. bharad-bhayam, Gen. Loc. bharat-ōs,

---|---|---
barant-ā, or baranta, | baran-ā, | φέροντες,

PLURAL.

---|---|---|---|---
V. bharant-as, | barēnt-ō,§ | ferent-ōs, | φέροντας, | fiyand-s.
Acc. bharat-as, | barēnt-ō,§ | ferent-ōs, | φέροντας, | fiyand-s.|
Instr. bharad-bhis, | baran-bīs,† | . . . | . . . | . . .
D. Ab. bharad-bhyas, | baran-byā,† | ferent-i-bus, | . . . | . . .
Gen. bharat-ām, | barēnt-aum,‖ | ferent-i-um, | φέροντας, | fiyand-ē,‖
Loc. bharat-su, | . . .§§ | . . . | φέρον-σι. [G. Ed. p. 323.]

---

* See p. 230, Note *
†† See p. 299. Rem. 2.
§ Barentaš-cha, "ferentesque." See p. 210 Note §.
|| This form, which, owing to an oversight, is omitted in p. 260, is found at Matth. 5. 44., and agrees with friyōndes, "amicos" ("amantes"), Matth. 5. 47, as generally with the declension of a root terminating with a consonant. Comp. Grimm (I. 1017.).
†† The Gothic dative, which I would have used also as the instrumental (§. 243.), does not occur in roots ending in nd.
††† Or barant-aum. 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, barac̣ha (or -shu, or -shū, §. 250.), as Vend. S. p. 354; γρηγαςάσι drēgvaśu (read ġrēp shu) for drēgvaśu, from drēgva, in the strong cases (§. 129.) drēgvaṇt; on the supposition that the reading is correct, except the false s. See §. 52.
### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. átma',</td>
<td>aśma',</td>
<td>sermo',</td>
<td>δαίμων,</td>
<td>ahma'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. átman-am,</td>
<td>aśman-ēm,</td>
<td>sermon-em,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ά,</td>
<td>ahman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst átman-ā,</td>
<td>aśman-ā,</td>
<td></td>
<td>D. I. ahmin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. átman-ē,</td>
<td>aśman-ē,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. see Gen.</td>
<td>aśman-āt,</td>
<td>sermon-e(d),</td>
<td>D. I. ahmin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. átman-ās</td>
<td>aśman-ā,*</td>
<td>sermon-is,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ο,</td>
<td>ahmin-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. átman-i,</td>
<td>aśman-i,</td>
<td>D. sermon-i,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. átman,</td>
<td>aśman,</td>
<td>sermo',</td>
<td>δαίμον,</td>
<td>ahma'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANSKRIT.

| N. Acc. Voc. átman-āu, | aśman-āo, or aśman-a, | δαίμον-e. |
| Vēda. átman-a, | | |
| Instr. D. Ab. átma‘-bhīyam, | aśma‘-bya, | D. G. δαίμον-ιν.† |
| Gen. Loc. átman-ōs, | aśman-ō? (p. 276, R. 1.), | |

### DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. V. átman-as,</td>
<td>aśman-ō,*</td>
<td>sermon-ēs,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ες,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. átman-as,</td>
<td>aśman-ō,*</td>
<td>sermon-ēs,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ας,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. átma‘-bhis,</td>
<td>aśma‘-bhis,</td>
<td>(δαίμον-φιν),</td>
<td>D. I. ahma‘-m†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ab. átma‘-bhyaś,</td>
<td>aśma‘-byā,</td>
<td>sermon-ī-bus,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. átman-ām,</td>
<td>aśman-ām,</td>
<td>sermon-um,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ων,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. átma‘-su,</td>
<td>aśma‘-hva,</td>
<td>δαίμον-σι,</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. bhṛata,</td>
<td>brāta,</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>πατήρ,</td>
<td>bróthar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. bhṛatar-am,</td>
<td>brātar-ēm,</td>
<td>fratr-ēm,</td>
<td>πατέρ-α,</td>
<td>bróthar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Aḥman-ās-cha, "caelique." † See p. 299, Rem. 2. ‡ See p. 241, Note †.

† Also ἡ ἡ θεότητα brāthrem might be expected, as Vend. Sāde, p. 357; ἡ ἡ Patrem (paterem?), contrary to the theory of the strong cases (§ 129.), for paterem.
### FORMATION OF CASES.

#### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In. bhrä'r-ā,</td>
<td>brāthr-a,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>D. Inst. bróthr (see §. 132).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. bhrä'r-ē,</td>
<td>brāthr-ē,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ab. see Gen. bhrā'r-at,</td>
<td>fratr-e(d),</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. bhrä'tur,</td>
<td>brāthr-ō,</td>
<td>fratr-is,</td>
<td>πατρ-ός,</td>
<td>bróthr-s (see §. 131).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. bhrä'tar-ī,</td>
<td>brāthr-i,</td>
<td>D. fratr-i,</td>
<td>πατρ-ί,</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. bhrā'tar,</td>
<td>brātarē,</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>πατρε,</td>
<td>bróthar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. Acc. Voc. bhrā'tar-āu, Vēd. bhrā'tar-ā,</td>
<td>brātar-āō or brātar-ā,</td>
<td>πατέρ-ε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Loc. bhrā'tr-ōs,</td>
<td>brāthr-ō(?).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accus. bhrā'ti-n,</td>
<td>brāthr-eus?</td>
<td>fratr-ēs,</td>
<td>πατέρ-α.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. bhrā'tri-bhīs,</td>
<td>brātar-ē-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 325].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl. bhrā'tri-bhyās,</td>
<td>brātar-ē-byo,</td>
<td>fratr-i-bus,</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, bhrā'trin-ām,</td>
<td>brāthr-aum,††</td>
<td>fratr-um,</td>
<td>πατέρ-ω.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative, bhrā'tri-shu,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>πατέρα-ν.</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 †.
|| ब्राताः-च ब्राताः-चा, “fratresque.”
¶ See §. 127. Note.
** Perhaps also brāthr-ō, brāthrōs-cha (“fratresque”), according to the analogy of áthr-ō, “ignes,” from átar. See §. 239.
†† See p. 266, Note †.
FORMATION OF CASES.

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Zend.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V.</td>
<td>manas,</td>
<td>manô.*</td>
<td>µênos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>manas-â,</td>
<td>mananh-a,†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>manas-ê,</td>
<td>mananh-ê,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>see Gen.</td>
<td>mananh-at,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>manas-as,</td>
<td>mananh-ô (mananhaš-cha),</td>
<td>µêve(σ)-ôs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>manas-i,</td>
<td>manah-i,(see p. 316,G.ed.)D.</td>
<td>µêve(σ)-i,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Manas-cha, "mensque," "mentemque."
† M. Burnouf remarks, in his review (in the separate impression, p. 11), that in this class of words the instrumental ending is generally long. I, in like manner, had remarked forms enough of this kind with a long â, but in passages where also many â'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 Man cha, a preceding â is preserved in its original length. After deducting these two classes from forms in anhâ, the computation might perhaps turn out in favour of the short a given above. I have, however, as yet not applied any closer reckoning: it would, however, surprise me if, on more exact calculation, but still in departure from the fate of other polysyllabic words ending with a shortened â, 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.

DUAL.

--- | --- | ---
N. Ac. V. manas-ê | ō | μένε(σ)-ê.
I. D. Ab. manô-bhyâm, mane-bya (p. 316 G. ed.), D. G. μένε(σ)ο-ιν.∗

PLURAL.

--- | --- | --- | ---
N. Ac. V. manânîs-i, mananh-â,† μένε(σ)-α, gener-a.
Instr. manô-bhîs, mane-bîs, (μένεο-φιν,) . . .
Dat. Abl. manô-bhîyas, mane-bîd, see Loc. gener-i-bus.
Genitive, manas-âm, mananh-ainâ, μένε(σ)-ων, gener-um.
Locative, manas-su, manô-hva, μένεο-σi, . . .

SINGULAR, MASCULINE AND FEMININE.

--- | --- | --- | ---
Nom. durmanás, dushmanando (§. 56b.). δυσμενής (§. 146.)
Accus. durmanas-am, dushmananâh-êm, δυσμενε(σ)-α(ν).
Voc. durmanas, . . .

The rest like the simple word.

DUAL.

N.Ac.V. durmanas-ôu, | dushmananâh-ô (?) | δυσμενε(σ)-ô.
Vêda, durmanas-û,† | dushmananâh-ô (às-cha) | δυσμενε(σ)-ês.

The rest like the simple word.

PLURAL.

N. Voc. durmanas-as, dushmananâh-ô (às-cha), δυσμενε(σ)-ês.
Accus. durmanas-as, dushmananâh-o (às-cha), δυσμενε(σ)-ôs.

The rest like the simple word.

* See p. 299, Rem. 2.
† See p. 245, Note †. It was, however, from an oversight that I, as was observed at p. 253, Note ñ. read in the Vendidad Sâde, p. 127, "nêmênha"; it should be "nêmañha", and may also be considered the instrumental singular; then we should have in this passage, which recurs three times, the instrumental in "ôha in both editions three times with a short a.
† See p. 230, Note *.
FORMATION OF CASES

SINGULAR, NEUTER.

Nom.  Ac. V.  durmanas,  dushmano (a'-cha),  δυσμενές.
The rest like the simple word.

"Remark.—It was remarked in §. 152. (comp. §. 146.), that the Σ in forms like μένος, εὔγενές, 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 μέλαινς. The Sanskrit has a few bases in n which, differing from the ruling principle (see §. 139.), run parallel in the nominative to the Greek μέλας; thus, pānthās, "the way," from pāthān, accusative pāthān-am. Only in this pānthās the lengthening of the a can be less regarded as a compensation for the rejected n than in the Greek, because it extends also to the other full cases (§. 129.), with the exception of the vocative; but perhaps the lengthening of the a has originally taken place only in the nominative, and has thence imparted itself, when the reason of this prolongation was no longer perceived, to those cases which otherwise stood upon an equal footing with the nominative. Thus one says महान् 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, "μεγάλο"), 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 ént for Fênt, in μελιτοεις 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, dhanaván, "dives"* (from dhana, "riches"), dhanavant-am, dhanavant-âu, dhanavant-as, as λέγων, λέγοντα, λεγόντω, 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 चत्र vant has maintained itself in the Latin in the form lent (as opulentis), it would not be surprising if the weak form चत्रvat, 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 mavolo.

† 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 Slavonic sounds, in which, however, as is natural, as far as their value is concerned, we have nothing new to bring forward; and in this respect follow only the teaching of native grammarians. (a.)—The Old Sanskrit आ a has so far experienced, in the Slavonic, an exactly similar fate to that which has befallen it in the Greek, that it is most frequently supplied by e or o (e, o), which are always short: it very rarely remains a. In the interior of the bases, also, e and o are interchanged as in Greek; and as, for example, ल्‌γος is related to ल्‌γω, so, in the Old Slavonic, is bród, "ferry," to bred̄, "I wade through;" voz, "carriage," to vez̄, "I ride in a carriage." And as, in the Greek, the vocative ल्‌γε is related to the theme ΛΟΓΟ, so is, in the Old Slavonic, rabe, "O slave," to rabo, nominative rab, "a slave." The o has more weight than e, but a more than o; and hence a corresponds most frequently to a Sanskrit ā, so that, for instance, in the Old Slavonic, forms in a answer to the feminine bases in झा ḍ (comp. vdova, "widow," with विधवा vidhava), which, in the vocative, is in like manner abbreviated to o (vdovo!), as above o to e. As final vowel, also, of the first member of a compound, a is weakened to o; for instance, vodo-pad, "waterfall," vodo-pō, "water-drinker," for voda-; just as in the Greek Μονσο-τραφής, Μονσο-φίλης, and similar compounds, which

[G. Ed. p. 330.] have shortened the feminine a or η to o. Even if, therefore, a is in the Old Slavonic a short vowel, I nevertheless regard it, in respect to grammar, as the long o; so that in this the Old Slavonic stands in a reversed relation to the Gothic, in which a has shewn itself to us as the short of ā, and, in case of abbreviation, ā would become a, exactly as in the Old Slavonic a becomes o.

(b.)—ऋ i and ऍ ī both appear in the Old Slavonic as i, and the difference of the quantity is removed, at least I
do not find that a longer or shorter  DialogResult is anywhere spoken of. Let schivā, “I live,” be compared with जीवामि jivāmi; sīla, “virtue,” with शीत sīla; and, on the other hand, vidyeti, “to see,” with the root विद् vid, “to know,” to the Guna form of which, वेद्मि vedmi, the Old Sclavonic vyemy (abbreviated from vyedmy, infin. vyes-t for vyed-ti) “I know,” assimilates itself, so that vid and vyed in the Sclavonic appear as two different roots. The short र 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 (त्र tri) appears frequently in composition in the form tre, e. g. treptye, “trivium.” So, also, पुते-शेस्त्वे, ὁδορύψ from PŪTI (§. 260.). The i is also very frequently *suppressed, e. g. in the 3d person plural dadyat, “they give,” Sanskrit ददति dadati; sūt, “they are,” Sanskrit सौत 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. boż, “strife.”

(c).—उ u and ऋ ō 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 भ

* The suppression here noticed of final 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,” sūt, “they are,” should be corrected to ददायत्, dadātya, काव्य śaūty. Regarding the nasalized vowels, see §. 783. Remark.

† We express, as in Polish, the very or dull i by y, as, like the Greek u, 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 ou, spoken very short and monosyllabically; according to Heym, nearly like ū, 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 étoffé”).
bhū, "to be;" svecry, "mother-in-law," to स्वाृस्वारु; myshy, "mouse," to मूष मुष; syn, "son," to सून सून; chetyri, тёсёапе; with чатур чатур (in the theme), nominative masculine чатварис чатварас. The instances of y for अ u are, nevertheless, more rare than those where y corresponds to the long आ a; for the short u, as in the Old High German (§. 70.), has for the most part [G. Ed. p. 331.] become o; and thus, for example, snocha, "daughter-in-law," answers to चुपा सुष्ठा; oba, "both," to ऋषा ऋषा (Vedic form), Zend अय ubdā. Hence, also, the old u declension has, in many cases, become similar to the o declension, which, according to (a.), has arisen from ऋ 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 अ u or आ आ, 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 ऋ ऋ) have y in the nominative plural (vdoxy, "viduae"), 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 ΑΓΑΘΟ, 'ΑΤΙΟ; and of the Sanskrit, as वैत śvēta, "white," दिव्यa 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 ĭī. 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 ĭī, but in ĭ as a mutilation of yo from ya (्य ya), and in the feminine of ya from yā (य yā). 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 ĭ which is added to it. This ĭ 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, svyaty-m, "per sanctum," from the older svatyīm, svaty-ch, "sanctorum," and "in sanctis," from svatyī-ch, corresponds to the indefinite forms svyato-m, svaty-čh (for svyato-ch).† At times, through the said pronominal syllable ĭ, the preceding o may be changed at will into y

---

* Dobr. also himself, p. 493, considers simple ĭ or ĭī as the definitive adjunct; but in considering, as he there does, blagī as the confluence of blag and ĭī, he appears to look upon the y as having arisen from the ĭ 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, yım, yimi occur in the plural, for yım, yıc, ymı.
or not: thus the interrogative exhibits the forms kyí, "quis?" (Dobr. 500 and 343.), kyím, "per quem?" kyích, "in quibus, quorum?" kyím, "quibus?" kyími, "per quos? with koí, koím, koích, koími. 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," moím, "per meum," not myí, myím. As to the definite form of the adjective bases in yo, which Dobrowsky forms through the addition of ii, 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, siní "the blue," is to be divided, not into sin-ii, but into sin-íi. 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, siní, "cærulei," siníi, oí "cærulei." In order, however, here fully to explain the nature and origin of the definite declension, and not hereafter to be compelled to repeat what is already settled, it may be stated that its pronominal defining addition is identical with the Sanskrit relative base य या, which is most correctly preserved in the Lithuanian, in which language *ya signifies "he" (ya-m, "to him," ya-mé, "in him"). The nominative yís, "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 ranká, "hand," and giesme, "song," [G. Ed. p. 333.] from GIESMYA (p. 169, Note). The

* Written ja in the text. This passage furnishes a good reason for writing the Germanic f 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 τya, 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-ř, svyata-ya, svyato-e (for svyatoye), accusative svyatyi-ř, svyatu-û, svyato-e, in their opposition to the indefinites svyat(o), svyata, svyato, differently from Dobrowsky (p. 493), and perhaps other grammarians before him, have done, namely, by the addition of the pronoun here under discussion;† for this pronominal suffix supplies the place of the article of other languages; and the Lithuanian language uses the same pronoun.

* Hence in the genitive ye-go, dative ye-mû, loc. ye-m, the e of which Dobrowsky wrongly ascribes to flexion, because he everywhere seeks the base in the nominative. However, the base ye has not fully maintained itself before all terminations beginning with a consonant, but become, in like manner, shortened to i: in i-m, "per eum," and 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 blindan, §. 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 \( y \) for \( o \) mentioned above.

(e.)—The Sanskrit diphthong \( \text{र े} \) I have found always rendered, in the Old Sclavonic, by \( ye \), in similar forms; so that after weakening the \( \text{र े} \), 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 \( \text{pyena, "foam,}" \) be compared with \( \text{फेन phena; svyet "light," with छेत śveta; vymy, "I know," with वेंचर vedmi. \text{The most important cases in the grammar with ye corresponding to र े are the dual case forms of the feminine and neuter, and those of the imperative, in accordance with the Sanskrit potential of the first conjugation.} \)

(f.)—The Sanskrit diphthong \( \text{चो ो} \) (from \( a + u \)) is represented in the Old Sclavonic by \( ā (u) \);* 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 \( au \), 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 \( र \) and Greek \( υ \), and that \( au \) is its intensive or Guna; but, on the contrary, only the \( u \) retained in the \( au \) corresponds to the Sanskrit \( र \) \( u \), and the \( u \) which stands alone in Bohemian is a weakening of the \( au \); so that, from this, the concluding element \( u \) alone is left: etymologically, that is to say, the Bohemian \( au \), as also \( u \), answers to the Sanskrit \( चो ो \), and also to the Sclavonic \( ā (u) \), 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 \( ऋषो ोषो ोषो \) \( \text{āṣha, "the lip"; more complete, however, is uṣṭena, "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 ω (ov), two heterogeneous vowels, according to pronunciation, have united themselves in a similar measure. As, according to (a), the Indian short a has, in the Sclavonic, mostly become short o, we must consider the first element in the diphthong ąda also (so we write the ω) to be o; and it becomes visible, too, in this form, when ąda is resolved before vowels into ov, (compare βo(F)ος from BS, [G. Ed. p. 335.]) §. 123.), while the Indian ज्रो ə becomes av before a vowel (गवि gavi = βοFinya, from गो gō). Now as, in the Sanskrit, ज u, ज ąda, rise to ə through Guna (§. 26.), and stō-šyāmi appears as the future of stu, so in the Old Sclavonic, in like manner,  ICommand (cy) is interchanged with ąda; so that bu in bā-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 .recv (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 सूनवे sūnav-e, from sūnu), eynov-e, "sons" (सूनवस् sūnav-as), that syn, in the nominative-accusative, is an abbreviation of synā; and that therefore the recv, when it is added to the form syn, is a representative or weak remainder of ąda: 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 ąda through the influence of mouth"; and even for vsta is to be found uusta (Dobr. Bōhm. Lehrg. p. 4.): ruka corresponds to the Lithuanian ranka, "hand"; and hus to the Sanskrit हाँ hāsə, "goose"; for which, according to p. 319. rauka, hauσa was to have been expected. A distinction must here, according to §. 783. Remark q. v., be made between oy ąda, and त uṇ.
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 suniv-ē (§. 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 स्व अवा; as पान्धु pāṇḍav-a (nominative ās), "descendant of Pāṇḍu"; अर्तव árta, "seasonable," from चतु रितु, "season": so, in Old Sclavonic, Adamov, "Adamite," from Adam (ADAMY); zarev for zaryev, "kingly," from zar (theme ZARYYY). For these formations, therefore, we must not, with Dobrowsky (322, 323), assume a suffix ov or ev, but we must look upon the o alone, which, in the nominative, is suppressed, as the derivative suffix (ADAMOV-O, ZAREV-O). Through the Vṛiddhi increase (§. 29.) the Old Sclavonic y becomes av, because a, according to (a.), usually corresponds to छ अः: hence, from the root by, "to be," comes the causal baviti (infinitive), as in the

[G. Ed. p. 336.] Sanskrit भावयत्र्म bhāvyatum. But though staviti occurs as the causal of sta, this form may have arisen in the perverted feeling of the language as an irregularly analogous word to baviti. In order, then, still more to establish, by a few other examples, the representation of the Indian छ अ or छ अ by the Sclavonic ā, we find āst, "mouth," correspond to चोथा oṣṭha, "lip"; shâi "sinister" (theme SHUYO), to स्व अवा; būditi, "to awake"—a causal, whose primitive būyeti has entirely

* Dobrowsky supports himself in these cases by calling ov a prefix (p. 320).
lost the vowel of the root—to बोधितum bōdhayitum, also “to awake,” from बुध būdh, “to know.” Thus gūbīti is the causal of gyb-nū (1. P.), and stūdīti of styd-nū (Dobr. 360, 361.); while vyesīti is the causal of visyeti (see e.), as, in the Sanskrit, वेदयितम vēdayitum, “to cause to enter,” from विज विस is “to go in.”

(g.)—As the nasals* easily resolve themselves into u, so the second element of the diphthong ā sometimes also supplies the place of a nasal in the cognate languages; e.g. rūka, “a hand,” Lithuanian ranka; pūtī, “a way,” Sanskrit पङ्क्तिः pabhās, id. Latin pons; golubī, “a dove,” columba; gūvī, “a goose,” हंस hānsa. The Polish has preserved the old nasal in golub, “a dove,” gansie, “a gosling,” gansior, “a gander,” and in many similar cases. Hereby the ā in the accusative of bases in a (from ा ā), which are for the most part feminine, is remarkably explained; compare vdoa from vdoa, “a widow,” with विधवाम another “vidham.” Therefore vdoa is to be derived from vdoa-n for vdoa-m (see a.); so that the a which is weakened to an o is contracted with the nasal mark of the case to ā. 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 e, e.g. in pieke, “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, *đ* 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 + ū*) 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 *nesù* is for *nes-o-ū* for *nes-o-m* from *nes-e-m*—it must be assumed that the conjunctive vowel *e*, before its confluence with the *ū*, 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. *λέγει-e-te*), the form *nesent* is expected, but in place of it occurs *nesût* in surprising accord with the Greek *λέγονσαι* for *λέγονσαι* from *λέγοντι*. The Polish has, like the Bohemian, relinquished the character of the 3d person in the plural, as well as for the most part in the singular, but everywhere retains, in the first, the old and more powerful *a* (*অ*), 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 *सानि* *santi*, Sclavonic *sùt*. 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 *wezau*, "vehunt" (*wez-e-me,""vehimus," *wez-e-te,""vehitis"), the *u* answers to the *n* of *वहृत्* *vahanti*, "vehunt," and the *u* which, in Bohemian, is united with an *a*, is essentially different from that which stands alone; for the latter answers to the Old Sclavonic diphthong *ū* (*ू*), but the former only to the latter portion of the *ū*, which, in the Old Sclavonic, never stands alone, at least never occurs as *ū*, but as *y* (*०*).
If, then, through what has been said, the vocalization of the m or n, which is of such frequent occurrence in the Slavonic, has been shewn with sufficient clearness, it is remarkable that conversely, also, the latter portion of the ė (ě) has occasionally been hardened into a nasal; and thus hūdū, "I will be," is in Polish bendę (written będę).

(h.)—In certain cases an old ā (आ) unorganically supplies the place of the Slavonic ā, i.e. in the instrumental of pronouns without gender, and all feminines; thus, udovoy-ā, "through the widow," answers to विधवया vidiha-vay-ā; and toboj-ā, "through thee," to त्या tway-ā. Denominatives also, in āyū (1st per. pres.), in the Old Slavonic, correspond to the Sanskrit in आयामि āyāmi, as शाह्यामि šabdāyāmi, "I sound," from शाह sabda, "a sound,"; चिरायामि chīrayāmi, "I hesitate," from चिर chira, "long": thus, in the Slavonic, zielūyū, "I greet," "I kiss," from ziel, (ZIELO), "healthy": udovūyū from udova, "widow" (Dobr. p. 372.). Finally, words in ūn (ŪNO) answer, as it appears, to the Sanskrit participles of the middle voice, in ānu, as युन्तन yunjāna, "uniting," from युज yuj; so in the Old Slavonic, perūn, (PERŪNO), "Deus [G. Ed. p. 338.] tonans," from the root per, "to shake"; byegūn, "runner" (BYEGŪNO), from BYEG "to run" (Dobr. p. 289.).

(i.)—There are in the Slavonic alphabet two marks, which by some are called litterae aphonae, but by Gretsch semi-vowels; 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 schal b, "sympathy," and ogon b, "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 yer, 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 and ogon one hears quite as much of a y as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a con-
sonant 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 uninflected 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 ren-
ders 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" (ast s asti, ėorl, Lithuanian esti), kosty, "bones" (asth asthi), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a y (y y), 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 sinye has rejected the y.

(k.)—The hard yerr is represented by Gretsch as a semi o, but by Reiff, more correctly in my opinion, it is com-
pared to the French silent e and the Hebrew schwa: it is therefor, to use the expression, equivalent to "nothing"; and one cannot perceive of what vowel the small, still perhaps remaining vowel part of it is the residue. Conso-
nants preceding it have a stronger and free pronunciation;

[Ch. Ed. p. 389.] and Kopitar (p. 5) tells us that they are pronounced before it sharp, and without echo, and that it is for this reason called the hard yerr, and not on account of its own pronunciation. We require, therefore, in the

* In the Carniolan dialect this sound has mostly disappeared; but where it has remained it is also written by a y; as, kony, "horse."
Roman character, no substitute for this mark, and Dobrowsky also 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, "caelum," forms, in the genitive plural, likewise nebes, but the vanished termination is, in Sanskrit, छाम्य टम् (तम्न्य) nabhasám, "cælorum"), Greek ων (νεφε(σ)ων), Latin um, Gothic e. The real final consonants, however, which, in the truly-preserved elder dialects of the Indo-European family, stand as the foundation of the word, have utterly disappeared in Slavonic polysyllables; e.g. from चास as, es is formed, in the nominative plural, e (e); and synov-e answers to forms like नवनस् suṇav-as, βότρυ-ες.

(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 (zivyote, in the Carniolan sh), as in Zend (§. 65.), by sch, that of our German sch (= प्ः) 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 स्नुचा snuṣhā. Ch also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into s [G. Ed. p. 340.] (Dobr. pp. 39, 41), and in some cases into sh (Dobr. 41.). Finally, in preterites like dach, “I gave,” dachom, “we gave,” the ch returns to the s (ι s, Σ) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a t follows it; hence, daste, “ye gave,” dasta, “ye two” and “they two gave.”* As the vowels exercise a multifarious influence in the transformation of gutturals preceding them, we will further remark that the ch under discussion maintains itself in the 3d person plural before a, but before a appears as sh; hence, dasha or dachā, “they gave.”

(n.)—†For the semi-vowel υ (υ) the Cyrillian 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 υ with the following vowel; that is to say, υα is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel υα, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For υε, 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 υ, are, with the exception of ιε υε, and υε, nasalised vowels (see §. 783. Remark); and hence pyaty, “five,” must be pronounced paîty (in the original character πάτι).
Cyril has provided by a simple sign, and яд is expressed by an о in conjunction with an е. But я often appears in Sclavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare yesmy, "I am," ям (for ядmy), "I eat," pyaty, "five," desyaty, "ten," yedin, "one," with the corresponding Sanskrit forms, аsmи, admi, panchan, dasan, adi (primus). An о which follows is, in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§. 137. and p. 174, Note*), changed into е through the influence of a я preceding it. In like manner, in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian, the я, 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 о after я and liquid consonants is changed into е. According to this, one would believe that, besides я, certain other consonants had the power of changing an о following them into е. Dobrowsky understands—which, however, as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under "consonae liquideae," those which, in consequence of a following yer (я), have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation; while he calls the consonants without yer "consonae solideae" (comp. 1 c. p. 267); so that no consonant is by nature and of itself alone liquid, but receives this quality through a following yer (a я without a vowel). Thus, in Dobrowsky's second masculine declension, the consonants р, ch, and л, in яры, "king," ярчы, "physician," and яняча, "prince," are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form ярем, brachem, kняжем, Dobrowsky ascribes the е for о to the influence of a liquid consonant; while, according to my opinion, the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming о into е, but for ярем, &c. ярым must originally have stood. And as in this form the я 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 яры—so the р also, in ярым, 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
FORMATION OF CASES

[G. Ed. p. 341.] 256. We must now, in order to be able to compare the true case-suffixes of the Old Slavonic with those of the cognate languages, first of all endeavour to ascertain the final letter of the kinds of base which occur, as they have for the most part been rubbed off in the singular nominative, whence it has appeared as if these letters, where they again present themselves in the oblique cases, either belonged to the case termination, or were an addition equally foreign to the base and to the termination, which has been termed "augment" by Dobrowsky. After becoming

[G. Ed. p. 342.] acquainted with the true base, the case terminations assume, in many points, an entirely different shape from what Dobrowsky has represented (p. 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 Slavonic language, all might, notwithstanding, be assumed as inflexion which is usually represented as such. It is not, however, here our object to consider those syllables as supplying the place of grammatical relations which present themselves to the feeling of the speaker as such, but only those which may be so traced through the history of the language, and which, for thousands of years, have subsisted as Grammatical forms.

257. To the masculine and neuter bases in α a correspond, in the Old Slavonic as well as in Greek, bases in o,* which vowel has disappeared in the nominative and

stated that the r and other consonants, in forms like zarem, knyaζem, goluβem, lebedem, are differently pronounced from what they are in pirom, voγom, 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, "caevum," in contrast with blind'-s, "caecus"): 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 [G. Ed. p. 343.] of the masculine and neuter, in which as yet no difference of sex is pointed out. The clearest proof that the class of nouns under discussion corresponds to the Indian, Lithuanian, and Gothic nouns in a, is afforded by their feminine bases in a (for ए a); so that to the form rab (for rabo), "servant," corresponds a feminine raba, "a maid": that is to say, all Old Sclavonic primitive adjectives, i.e. those with an indefinite declension, correspond to the Sanskrit in a-s, a, a-m, Greek o-s, η(α), o-v, Latin u-s, a, u-m; much as one might be led astray by outward appearance to seek in the adjectives, which in the nominative masculine end in y (yer), and in the neuter in e, as siny, "caeruleus," syne, "caeruleum," an analogy to Latin adjectives like mili-s, mite.

258. But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned, and in similarly-constituted substantives, as knyaçy, "prince," more, "the sea," bases of such a nature as, without the euphonic form mentioned at §. 255. (n.), must have terminated in yo, whence ye; and hence, in the nominative masculine—according to the suppression of the final vowel of the base, y in this case—and in the neuter e retaining the vowel and dropping the y. These bases, therefore, correspond to the Indian in य ya, the Greek and Latin in
FORMATION OF CASES

10, in (āγιο-ς, ἀγιον, σοιον-ς, προιον-ς); that is to say, serdze (nomina- 

tive and accusative neuter), "heart," corresponds to the Sanskrit हिद्यम, hridaya-m, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Scii'onic bases in ya correspond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in या या Greek ια, Latin iα); and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination y and neuter e, as sinya, "cærulea," to siny, "cæruleis," and sine, "cæruleum."

[G. Ed. p. 344.] When an i or other vowel precedes the last y but one of the base, the y in the nominative, and accusative masculine is changed into the vowel i; as, nyetii, "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 सव्यय savya-s, सव्यय savya, सव्यय savya-m (sinister, α, un), correspond thus shuí, sháya, shúe (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285).

259. The Old Scii'onic 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 SHÚΓΟ = 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 MORΓΟ, nom. more, "the sea," the e of which therefore differs widely from

* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonie law contained in §. 255, (n.) unregarded, and I give SERDΖΟ as the theme of serdze ("heart," nom. acc.), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonie law, i.e. without inflection, as in the Sanskrit vāc 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 *moryu*, 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 *CHERYO*), answers to the Sanskrit क्रिम *krimi* and the Latin *VERMI*, Old High German, *WURMI*; and *zyaty* (*ZYATYO*), "gener," to the Sanskrit जाति *jāti*, 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 *gušy* (*GUSYO*) corresponds to the Indian हंस *hāṇsa*, "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 त्र *tṛ* (त्र *tri*, in the strong cases तर *tār*) to the Latin in *tōr*, and to the Greek in τηρ, τῶρ; hence the nominatives *my-tary*, *schi-tary*, and *ślatary* (Dobrowsky, p. 295), and, with *y* for *a*, *pas-tetry*, "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 *tār*; hence the nominatives *blago-dyeley*, "beneficus," *pye-tely*, "a cock," from the root *pye*, "to sing;" *schately*, "messor," *spas-i-tely*, "salvator."

* ζ frequently answers to the Sanskrit ज *j*, and for example हाज *jna*, "to know," is in the Sclavonic *ζna* (infinitive *ζnati*).

† 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 *ely* as suffix (as also simple *ary* for *tary*), as it has been the custom to derive also, in the Latin, *tor* and *turnus* from the supine. However, it is certain the
To the Sanskrit feminine bases in झा́ छा́ correspond as has been already remarked, Old Slavonic in ा. 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 झा there are, in Old Slavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines—as in Lithuanian—which Dobrowsky, p. 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine: they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with झा, but the former with झू, and in part with झू (§. 263.). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree; and, gosty, "guest," from GOSTI* (Gothic GASTI, Latin HOSTI) agrees with knyá?y, "prince," from KNYÁ?YO, and vrachy, "medicus," from VRACHÝY. The masculine bases originally ending with न—there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by झा; KAMEN, "stone" (Sanskrit ज्ञानस्य aśman), is extended to KAMENI and then follows GOSTI.

To the Sanskrit feminine bases in झा́ छा́ correspond numerous Old Slavonic bases of a similar termination (Dobrowsky, decl. fem. iv.); that is to say, the Slavonic agrees with the Sanskrit in the formation of feminine ab-

the suffixes TOR, TURU and the Slavonic TARФO, TELФO, used to borrow their Ń 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, PŮTY, "a way" (Sanskrit पौढ़ pathin), and LFrUDI, pl. num, nom. lůdy-e, "people," Gothic LAUDI, nom. lauths, "a person," the au of which, according to §. 255. (f.), is represented by ū (ू), and, according to §. 255. (m.), has gained a prefixed y. GOSPODI, "a master" (comp. गौति 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. pamyaty, from the root MAN, as in Sanskrit मति mali (for manti), "spirit," "meaning," from मन 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 अ u to ov; and from this form several cases, as from a base ending with a consonant—e. g. zerko-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-ů, "per ecclesiam," zerkvi, "ecclesia," zerkviy, "ecclesiareum," 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-myana, “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, τάοις from TAN, Sanskrit ततिस tati-s, “a line” (as extended), for ततिस tanti-s.

† The example given by Dobrowsky, zerkovy, “a church,” nevertheless does not apply to monosyllables, as krovy, “blood” (Sanskrit क्रय kravya, neuter, “flesh”), nor to those polysyllables in which two consonants precede the syllable ov; for yatrvach and krvach 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 ब्रु bhri, feminine, by the addition of i, with a Guna of the अ 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 चन्द्रस 'swaśrū-s,
"socrus" (§. 255. c.); others have, at will, ovy or vi, with
o suppressed; hence zerkovy or zerkvi.

262. Among bases in u (Greek ι) of the cognate lan-
guages 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 u (§. 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, "filius," "filium,
stood syno rather than syny (§. 255. c.).* With this simi-
lar 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 ओ a, a y
preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we,
in §. 258., have represented as purely euphonic, the same phe-
nomenon makes its appearance also in the y bases, by means
of which their Guna form is articulated ev (for ɣev) 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
ऋ 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 ओ
(etymologically = चो ॠ), but the Sanskrit ऋ 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 di-
vide the Old Sclavonic masculines— with the exception of the bases in i, §. 260.—into two declensions, and in doing this de-
sire, as is natural, to ground the division on the final letters of the bases, we must place knya۝y, "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 gosdy-e, "ho-
spites," and gostii, "hospitum," from GOSTI. In the dative plural and instrumental singular the form zare-m is doubt-
ful: in this and other words, also, of obscure origin, it re-
 mains 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 ognov-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{ū:} 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 ỹya and neuters in ỹye or ye (Dobrowsky, p. 282).
deserves here to be further remarked, that in the more modern dialects of the Scavonic 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 Scavonic, also, rab (theme RABO), "a servant," may optionally form several cases from a theme RABY (for rabû); 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 ेन 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 प्रण man—e.g. in कमन korman 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 नामन nāman, "nomen." The bases in es answer to the Sanskrit neuter bases in as, as nebes,
"heaven," Sanskrit नभस 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 σωμα, not महत 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* (*ματέρ*-*ε*), partly from *MATERI*, e. g. *mater*-y, "*matrem*."

266. *In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs ǔ and ǹ, with the exception of the bases in a, which present in the diphthong *ǔ* (ǔ), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to o, (see §. 255. ǔ); hence *vodų*, "*aquam*," from *vodo-ǔ*. 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 ǜ, (for ǜ, see §. 255. ʰ), not into simple ỹ, but into ｉų; so that in this respect the Old Sclavonic agrees more closely with the Pāli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final i before all the vowel endings into iy, than with the Sanskrit. Hence, let *kostių-ǜ*, from *KOSTI*, "bones," be compared with the Pāli पौर्णियः *pitiy-ǜ* (from *piti*, "joy"), for the Sanskrit पौर्णियः *pitiy-ǜ*. Masculines and neuters have *m* for their instrumental ending; and this is, I have no doubt, an abbreviation of the Lithuanian *mi*, and comes therefore from *bi* (§. 215.).

267. The dative has, in the singular, a common ending with the locative, and, in fact, the Old Sanskrit i (§. 155.); hence, *imen-i*, "in nomine," and "nomini"; *synov-i*, "*filio*," *brachev-i*, "*medico*," from *SYNY* and *BRACHY* (§. 263.), with Guna.† If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding *ov* [G. Ed. p. 353.] becomes ǜ, and *ev* (from *yov*) becomes *yǜ*; hence, also, *synų*, "*filio*," with *synov-i*, and *zaryų*, "*regi*," with

* Cf. §. 783.¹

† For *m*, according to Dobrowsky, we should read *mę* *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 ë, hence rabû, 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 ë; hence, e.g. blagû, "bono," masc. neut.; sinyû, "caeruleo," masc. neut.; slovû, "verbo," moryû, "mari": not blagov-i, sinev-i, slovov-i, morev-i. In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in ë extends itself also to the genitive and locative; hence domû, "of the house," "to" and "in the house": but in the dative is also found domov-i, and in the locative domye.* The pronouns of the 3d person masculine and neuter—with exception of the reflexive—have in the dative, in like manner, the uninflected ë; for the form mú in to-mú, "to this," is clearly from the Sanskrit appended pronoun स्म śma (§. 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 mú, as rabû 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. (v), clearly from the Sanskrit य ए of यः यः यः from यः यः, and answers to the Lithuanian vilkė from 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 द u, i.e. of the Latin fourth declension, but for the most part correspond to Sanskrit bases in ख 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. pāti, "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 pāti, kosti, uninflexed, just like domā, "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 knyaći, mori, brachi, voli, represents nothing else than the y of the masculine bases KNYAČYO, VRACHYY, and of the neuter MORYC, 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 f. minine form ranko ye in the Lithuanian, and vodye in the Sclayonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskrit ाम áyám in ाम jihuváy-ádm (§. 202.); so that, after dropping the m, as in the Zend (§. 202.), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the euphonic influence of the y, become e. As the bases in 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 मत्य-ádm, from mati or भहि bhiy-ádm from bhi (comp. in §. 266. kostyi-á, for kosty-á, from KOSTI).
answers to नाम्नस् nāmn-as, nomin-is; nebes-e, "of the heaven," to नभस् nabhas-as, vēpe(σ)-os; muter-e to matr-is, μητρός. The pronominal forms also follow this analogy: men-e, "mei," teb-e, "tei," seb-e, "sui," because, in the oblique singular cases, MEN, TEB, SEB are their themes. We recognise the fuller Sanskrit genitive ending स्य sya 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 to ग (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 of the termination go is taken for a hardening from य (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, "huius," to the Greek το-ιο. As, however, in Slavonic, the sibilants are easily interchanged with gutturals (see §. 255. m.), one might also conjecture the ग of go to be a corruption of the Sanskrit s and the semi-vowel of स्य sya, which had been lost. This conjecture cannot entirely be put aside; but in any case, even in this supposition, the termination go remains connected with स्य sya and io. As, however, in the Old Slavonic, ग is elsewhere exchanged only with छ and sch (Dobr. p. 41), but not with श, in my opinion the derivation of ग from य (य y) is to be preferred to that from श.

270. The substantive and adjective (indefinite) o bases, in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form, have lost the genitive termination go; but for it, in compensation for the lost termination, they have retained the old a of the base, instead of, according to §. 255. (a.), weakening it to o; hence raba, "servi." nova (= Sanskrit nava-sya) "novi." Now, although the y bases...
in the genitive end in a, the comparison of the form syna, "filii," with the Lithuanian and Gothic sunau-s, sunau-s, and the Sanskrit sūnā-s (from sūnau-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 to, "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 sūds (§. 172.), as in the word tasyāṃ tasyāṃ, 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 ā, just as the preceding o points to a short ā a. 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 τα-sya, and in the to-go, for to-(s)yo, mentioned in §. 269.

272. In the vocative, which in the cognate languages is without any case suffix (§. 204.), o is weakened to e (e) and a to o (§. 255 a.), hence nove (from NOVO, "new"), for [G. Ed. p. 357.] Sanskrit नव navā, is identical with the Latin novē, and answers to the Greek νέ(Γ)ε: from VODA, "water," comes vodo; but from VOLYA, according to §. 255. (n.), vole for volyo: and so from KNYAζYO, "prince," knyashe* for

---

* ξ before e becomes sh.
**knyaçye.** Bases in *yy* change their *y* by Guna to *ú* (§. 255. f.), in analogy with §. 205.; hence *vrachyú*—more commonly, with *y* suppressed, *vrachu*—"medice!" from *VRACHY Y* 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 *synú* (Dobr. p. 470), = Gothic *sunau*, Lithuanian *sunau*, Sanskrit *sûnô* 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. <em>ubhá</em> (ambo Vedic), <em>ubá</em>,</td>
<td><em>oba</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. n. <em>ubhé</em>,</td>
<td><em>ubé</em>,</td>
<td><em>oby</em> (§. 255. n.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Ab. m. f. n. <em>ubhá-bhyám</em>.</td>
<td><em>ubôi-bya</em>, I. D. <em>oby-e</em> (§. 215.).*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L. m. f. n. <em>ubhay-ôs</em>,</td>
<td><em>ubôy-ô</em>,</td>
<td><em>oboy-û</em>.†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The ye, which precedes the termination *ma*, may be compared with the Sanskrit *e* in plural forms, as व्रेक्ष्यत् व्रिकेभ्यः : ye-*ma*, however, occurs in the Old Sclavonic only in *dye-* *ma*, "duobus," "per duos," and some pronouns. The usual form of substantive *o*-bases before this ending is that with an unchanged o, as *sto-* *ma*, from *sto*, "a hundred"; and the final a of feminine substantives also remains unchanged, as *dyeva-* *ma*, from *DYEVA*, "a girl."

† The form *ù*, for the Sanskrit ending *ôs*, 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 *ù*, clearly corresponds to the Sanskrit चय भ्र (see §. 225.) and the Zend...
The Sanskrit ubhê, as neuter, comes, according to §. 212., from the theme ubha, in union with the case-suffix ḫ; and the feminine ubhê is an abbreviation of ubhay-āu, and is therefore without a case termination (§. 212.). The Old Sclavonic, which runs parallel to the Sanskrit in both genders, and, according to §. 255. (I.), opposes ye to the Indian ḫē, 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 ḫ, §. 255. a.); but in such a manner, that those with y as the last letter but one in the theme reject the termination ye, and vocalize the y of the theme; hence dyevye, “two girls,” from dyeva, but stećī, “two steps,” from STEČȳA. The feminine bases in i, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§. 210. 211., as patī, “two sirs,” from पित pati; [G. Ed. p. 359.] awī, “two sheep,” from AWI; only that, according to §. 255. b.), the i in the Sclavonic is not lengthened; as dlani from DLANI (nominative singular

Zend ḫy or ay (see p. 277); but that occurs only in dvoy-ū=Sanskrit dway-ūs, “of two,” “in two” m. f. n., and in toy-ū=Sanskrit tay-ūs, “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—nayū, vāyū. For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination ū, as st'-ū (Sanskrit shatay-ūs) from STO, “a hundred,” dyev-ū from DYeva, “a girl”; and thus occurs, also, together with dvoyū, the syncopated form dvū. Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final s, still the ū mentioned in §. 225. may be identical with the Sclavonic ū; as in the Zend, also, in this termination the s is often dropped.
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 (ε) for the most part answers to the Greek ες, and, according to a universal rule of sounds, omits the s (§ 255. l); hence synov-e, “the sons,” सूनवस् सुनव-ας: compare βότρυ-ες, kamen-e, “the stones,” for खैमापस asmāν-ας (§. 21.); compare δαίμον-ες, gosty-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. λύκο-ι), as in Latin lup-i for lupo-i. Neuters have a for their ending, like the cognate dialects, with the exception of the Sanskrit with i for a; nevertheless, slova, “verba,” from SLOVO—as δῶρα 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 veφε(σ)-α; and telyat-a, “calves,” with Greek forms like σώματ-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 asthi, 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
mostlly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in $i$; hence *gosti* for the Gothic *gasti*-ns. Bases in $o$, without $y$ preceding, like *RABO*, change this $o$ into $y$, as *raby*, "servos"; at least I cannot believe that this $y$ is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the $o$ of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. §. 271.): as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel ($a$) of the base into $u$; hence *wiltu*-s, "lupos," answering to the Gothic *vulfa*-ns and Sanskrit *vrikà*-n. But if the Old Sclovonic bases in $y$, of animate creatures, form *owy* in the accusative plural, and thus *synovy*, "filios," answers to the Lithuanian *sunû*-s (from *SUNU*), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit *sunu*-ns, *sûnu*-n, prove that the Sclovonic 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 *ya* (from *ya*, §. 255. a.), which, preserving the old $a$ sound, give *ya*, as in the genitive singular (see §. 270.); hence *vrachya*, "medicos," like *knyagtva*, "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, "filiis" (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
much greater extent (§. 125. sub finem, comp. §. 126.); hence
imene-m, imene-ch, from IMENI from IMEN, "names," as
koste-m, koste-ch, from KOSTI, "bones."

277. Less general is the instrumental ending mi, an-
swering, subject to the loss required by §. 255. (l.), to the
Lithuanian mis, Sanskrit bhis, and Zend bis. This ter-
mination 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 termina-
tion mi. Let kost'-mi be compared with जियमियस asthi-bhis,
from जस्य asthi, "bone"; vdova-mi with विधायिस्य vidhavā
bhis, from विधाया vidhavā, "a widow." The instrumentals
raby, synovy, are, like the accusatives of similar sound,
uninflected (§. 275.); the i of kvya^i, vrachi, is the vocali-
zation of the y of the bases KYNA^YO, VRACHYY,
after the loss of the final vowel; and the y of neuters
terminating in a consonant, like imený "per nomina," is to be
explained by a transition into the o declension, and is there-
fore analogous to raby, slavy, similarly to the o of the Greek
dual forms like δαμόνων (p. 318 G. ed. Rem. 2.).

278. Dobrowsky (p. 461) represents ov, y, ii, 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 rαβ, [G. Ed. p. 362.]
"servorum," from RABO; vod, "aquarum," from VODA; syn.
"filiorum," from SYNY; kostī, "ossium," from KOSTI; imen.
"nominum," from IMEN; nebes, "cælorum," from NEBES.
The n and s of imen, nebes, would, without the former protec-
tion of a following termination have been dropped, as in
Sclavonic we have only a second generation of final conso-
nants; while the former, with the exception of a few mono-
syllabic 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 *śu* su, and therefore, also, with the Greek *στι*; compare, also, the Zend *xq* *kha*, for the Sanskrit *swa*, in §. 35. Before this *kh*, *o* passes into *ye*, exactly as the corresponding Sanskrit *a* into *ṛ ṝ* (see §. 255. e.); hence *rabye*-ch, “in servis,” answers to वृक्षेः *vrikṣe*-śu, “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 *knyāye*-ch, “in principibus,” not *knyačyy*-ch from *KNYĀČYO*. A final *a* remains unchanged; hence *vdova*-ch, “in viduis,” answers to the Sanskrit *vidhavā-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 *ā* (§. 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 *liza*, *lizā*, for *lizya*, *lizytā*. 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 modifica-
tion of the base, through the alteration of the final letter,
occaisioned 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. mravî, m. p. 468; ladîya, f. p. 478; and uchenye, n. p. 474.
With regard to zary, “a king,” see §. 263).
### FORMATION OF CASES.

#### 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><strong>RABO</strong>, m.</td>
<td>rab', rab', rabo-my, rabu,</td>
<td>rabo,</td>
<td>rabu,21</td>
<td>rabu,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNYAÎÝO</strong>, m.</td>
<td>knya‘, knya‘, knya‘-my, knya‘ű,</td>
<td>knya‘,</td>
<td>knya‘-my,</td>
<td>knya‘-ų,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SLOVO</strong>, n.3</td>
<td>slovo, slovo, slovo-my, slovu,</td>
<td>slovo,</td>
<td>slovo,21</td>
<td>slovo,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MORYO</strong>, n.2</td>
<td>more, more, more-my, morų,</td>
<td>more,</td>
<td>morų,21</td>
<td>morų,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VODA</strong>, f.</td>
<td>voda, voda, vodo-ų,</td>
<td>voda,</td>
<td>voda,22</td>
<td>voda,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VOLYA</strong>, f.</td>
<td>volya, volya, volo-ų,</td>
<td>volo,</td>
<td>volo,</td>
<td>volo,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOSTI</strong>, m.5</td>
<td>gosty, gosty, goste-my, gosti,</td>
<td>goste,</td>
<td>goste,20</td>
<td>goste,20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KOSTJ</strong>, f.5</td>
<td>kosty, kosty, kosti-ų,</td>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNY</strong>, m.6</td>
<td>syn‘, syn‘, syno-my, syno-i,</td>
<td>syno,</td>
<td>syno,21</td>
<td>syno,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMY</strong>, m.7</td>
<td>dom‘, dom‘, domo-my, domo-i,</td>
<td>domo,</td>
<td>domo,</td>
<td>domo,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VRACHYY</strong>, m.8</td>
<td>vrachy‘, vrachy‘, vrache-my, vrachev-i,</td>
<td>vrache,</td>
<td>vrache,23</td>
<td>vrache,23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KAMEN</strong>, m.9</td>
<td>kamy‘, kamene-my, kamene-i,</td>
<td>kamene,</td>
<td>kamene,24</td>
<td>kamene,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMEN</strong>, n.10</td>
<td>imya, imya, imene-my, imen-i,</td>
<td>imen,</td>
<td>imen,24</td>
<td>imen,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MATER</strong>, f.11</td>
<td>matty, matty, mater-i,</td>
<td>mater,</td>
<td>mater,24</td>
<td>mater,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEBES</strong>, n.12</td>
<td>nebo, nebo, nebesa-my, nebes-i,</td>
<td>nebes,</td>
<td>nebes,24</td>
<td>nebes,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TELYAT</strong>, n.13</td>
<td>telya, telya, telyate-my, telyat-i,</td>
<td>telyat,</td>
<td>telyat,24</td>
<td>telyat,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Comp. p. 273, &c. 2 See §§ 258, 259 3 Comp. pp. 275, 276. 4 Comp. p. 255. 5 Comp. p. 286. 6 Comp. p. 288. 7 See p. 337, Note. 8 See § 263. 9 Comp. p. 304. The cases wanting come from KAMENI (see § 260.) ; whence, also, kamene-m, kamene-ch (§ 266.); and whence, also, might be derived the dative and locative kamen-i, which I prefer, however, deriving from the original theme, just as in MATER. 10 Comp. § 139. 11 See § 265. and comp. p. 305. 12 Comp. p. 306. and § 147. 13 See § 264. 14 Dobr. p. 287. 15 Comp. Sanskrit jihway-ā, &c. See § 266. 16 Or rabovi, § 267. 20 The i may also be ascribed to the mark of case, and the dropping of the final letter of the base may be assumed; but in the genitive of the same sound, the i clearly belongs to the theme. 21 See § 270. 23 More commonly vracha, and in the vocative, vrachū. See p. 347, Note. 24 See § 269. 25 See § 268. 26 Or sync.
IN THE OLD SCLAVONIC.

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM. VOC.¹</th>
<th>ACCUS.³</th>
<th>INSTR.⁵</th>
<th>DATIVE.⁶</th>
<th>GEN.⁷</th>
<th>LOCATIVE.³</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>knyäţi,</td>
<td>knyäţi,</td>
<td>knyäţi,</td>
<td>knyäţi-m.</td>
<td>knyäţi',</td>
<td>knyäţi-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,²</td>
<td>vody,</td>
<td>voda-mi</td>
<td>voda-m,</td>
<td>voda',</td>
<td>voda-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volya,</td>
<td>volya,</td>
<td>volya-mi</td>
<td>volya-m,</td>
<td>voly',</td>
<td>volya-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosty-e,</td>
<td>gosti,</td>
<td>gosti-m</td>
<td>goste-m,</td>
<td>gost',</td>
<td>goste-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti-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>synov-m,</td>
<td>synov,</td>
<td>synovy-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domov-e,</td>
<td>domy,</td>
<td>domo-m,</td>
<td>domov,</td>
<td>dome',</td>
<td>dome-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrachev-e,</td>
<td>vrachya,</td>
<td>vrachy,</td>
<td>vrache-m,</td>
<td>vrache',</td>
<td>vrache-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imen-a,</td>
<td>imen-a,</td>
<td>imeny,</td>
<td>imene-m,</td>
<td>imen',</td>
<td>imene-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mater-e,</td>
<td>mater-mi</td>
<td>mater-e-m</td>
<td>mater-e-m,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nebes-a,</td>
<td>nebesy,</td>
<td>nebes-m,</td>
<td>nebes-m,</td>
<td>nebes,</td>
<td>nebes-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telyat-a,</td>
<td>telyat-a</td>
<td>telyaty,</td>
<td>telyat-m</td>
<td>telyat,</td>
<td>telyate-ch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 eek and yeck are frequently interchanged with one another, and the form yeck appears to agree better with the preceding s (comp. Dobrowsky, p. 477).
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[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 *mḥa*, *kēsa-smā*, *kēsa-mḥā*, *kēsa-smiṅ*, *kēsa-mhi*. 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, *géram*, "*bono*," *gerame*, "*in bono*." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention,
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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 य या, "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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN</th>
<th>OLD SCLAVONIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative, m. yis</td>
<td>f. yi</td>
<td>m. i*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative, m. yiu</td>
<td>f. yei</td>
<td>m. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental, m. yù</td>
<td>f. ye</td>
<td>m. n. im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, m. yum</td>
<td>f. yei</td>
<td>m. n. yemù</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, m. yo</td>
<td>f. yós</td>
<td>m. n. yego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative, m. yamè</td>
<td>f. yoyè</td>
<td>m. n. yem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PLURAL.

LITHUANIAN.  OLD SCLAVONIC.

Nominative, m. yie (yi), f. yos,  m. i,* f. n. yu.*

Accusative, m. yas,  f. yes,  f. n. ya.

Instrumental, m. yeis,  f. yomis,  m. f. n. imi.

Dative, m. yiems,  f. yoms,  m. f. n. ich.

Genitive, m. f. yu,  f. yosu,  m. f. n. ich.

Locative, m. yase,  f. yosu,  m. f. n. ich.

DUAL.  [G. Ed. p. 369.]

LITHUANIAN.  OLD SCLAVONIC.

Nominative, m. yu (yu), f. yl,  m. yu,  f. yu.

Accusative, m. yuni,  f. yin,  m. yu,  f. yu.

Dative, m. yiém,  f. yom, Instr. Dat. m. f. n. yima.

Genitive, m. f. yu,  m. yu,  Gen. Loc. m. f. n. yeyu.

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,† gerayu, gerieyu.

Accusative, geranjan, gerayun, gerayus, geraysus.

Instrumental, gerayu,  geraysu,  geraisais.

Dative, geramyam, giriensiom,‡ geriemsiems.

Genitive, geroyo, geroyu, geraysu.

Locative, geramyame, gerayu, geraysuse.

Vocative, gerasis, gerayu, gerieyu.

* See Note on preceding page.

† Or gerasis, by assimilation from gerasyis, as, in the Prākrit y 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.
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FEMININE.

SINGULAR.

Nominative, geroyi, geriyi, gerosos.
Accusative, geranyei, geriyin, gerases.
Instrumental, geraye, . . ., geromsom.
Dative, geraiyei, geromsom,* geruyu.
Genitive, gerosies, geruyu, gerossa.
Locative, geroyoye, gerosusa.
Vocative, geroyi, geriyi, gerosos.

[D. Ed. p. 370.] 284. The Old Scialvonic, differing from the Lithuanian, declines only in some cases the adjective together with the appended pronoun, but in most cases the latter alone. While, however, in the Lithuanian the appended pronoun has lost its y only in some cases, in the Old Slavonic that pronoun has lost, in many more, not only the y but also its vowel, and therefore the whole base. Thus the termination alone is left. For more convenient comparison we insert here, over against one another, the indefinite and definite declension: svyat (theme SVYATO), “holy,” may serve for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASCULINE.</th>
<th>FEMININE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td>Indef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental,</td>
<td>svyatym,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>svyata,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>svyatye,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note 1 on preceding page.
1 See §. 255. d. 2 Or svatyem, 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-yeyu, 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-ix where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible.
4 Or svatye-i. Comp. Note 2.
### ADJECTIVES

#### PLURAL.

**MASCULINE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>svyati</td>
<td>svyati-i</td>
<td>svyaty</td>
<td>svyaty-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>svyaty</td>
<td>svyaty-ya</td>
<td>svyaty</td>
<td>svyaty-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>svyaty</td>
<td>svyaty-imi</td>
<td>svyata-m</td>
<td>svyaty-imi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>svyatom</td>
<td>svyaty-imi</td>
<td>svyata-m</td>
<td>svyaty-imi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyaty-ich</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyaty-ich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>svyatych</td>
<td>svyaty-ich</td>
<td>svyata-ch</td>
<td>svyaty-ich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMININE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-i</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-ya</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-imi</td>
<td>svyata-m</td>
<td>svyat-imi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>svyatom</td>
<td>svyat-imi</td>
<td>svyata-m</td>
<td>svyat-imi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-ich</td>
<td>svyat</td>
<td>svyat-ich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>svyatych</td>
<td>svyat-ich</td>
<td>svyata-ch</td>
<td>svyat-ich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SINGULAR.

**NEUTER.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
<th>Indef.</th>
<th>Def.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Accus.</td>
<td>svyato</td>
<td>svyato-e</td>
<td>svyato</td>
<td>svyato-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-imi, svyat-m, svyat-ich.

6 Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative, we must nevertheless, in my opinion, separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find, however, the reason of their agreement in this, that the Sanskrit, which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Slavonic, in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant, Sanskrit sám, Gothic xe (for sé, § 248). This s, then, has, in Old Slavonic, become ch, just like that of the locative characteristic su (§ 279.). The nasal of sam must, according to rule, be lost (§ 255. I.) the vowel, however, has, contrary to rule, followed it, as also in the ordinary declension the termination åm has entirely disappeared (§ 278.); and the same relation which men, "nominum," has to the Gothic naman-e, tye-ch, "horum," has to thi-ze. This tye-ch, however, answers as genitive to the Sanskrit तेषाम् tे-śām, and as locative to हृदः tे-ṣu; ye being used in both cases for ये, 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.
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[G. Ed. p. 371.] 285. As in the Sanskrit the preponderating majoritiy of adjective bases end in the masculine and neuter in \(a\), and in the feminine in \(a\); and as this class is, in the Old Sclavonic, only represented by bases in \(o\), \(ya\) 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 \(a\) (§. 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
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>MASCULINE</th>
<th>NEUTER</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme, BLINDAN</td>
<td>BLINDAN</td>
<td>BLINDOn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td>PLURAL.</td>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. V. blinda', 1 blindan-s, blindo', 2 blindon-a, 2 blindo', blindon-s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. blindan, blindan-s, blindo', 2 blindon-a, 2 blindon, blindon-s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. blindin, 1 blindin-s, blindin-m, 1 blinda'-m, blindin-s, 1blindin-é, 2 blindon-s, blindon-é. 3</td>
<td>blindon, blindo'-m, blindon-s, blindon-o. 3</td>
<td></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," KUNTHYŌ 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. vulf's, blind's, hva-s,</td>
<td>vulfōs,2 blindai, hvai,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. vulf', blindana, hva-na,</td>
<td>vulfα-ns, blindans, hva-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. vulfα,4 blindamma, hva-mma,5</td>
<td>vulfα-m, blindaim, hvai-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. vulfis, blindis, hvi s,</td>
<td>vulf'ē, blindaiżē, hvai-żē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. vulf', blind's, ...</td>
<td>vulfōs, blindai, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. hari-s,6 midyis,7 haryi-s,</td>
<td>haryōs,2 midyai, hvaryai,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. hari,8 midyana, hvarya-na,</td>
<td>harya-ns, midyans, hvarya-ns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. hariya, midyamamma, hvarya-mma, harya-m, midyaim, hvaryai-m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. harii-s, midyis, hvary-is,</td>
<td>hary-ē, midyaiżē, hvaryaiżē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. hari, midyis, ...</td>
<td>haryōs, midyai, ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 135. 2 See §. 228. 3 See §. 171.
4 See §. 160.
6 From hariu-s, see §. 135.
7 The nominative in adjective bases in ya does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared; and I have here formed it by analogy with hariu-s and hvaryis. Grimm gives midis (l. 170.). If, l. c., the form yis is considered as unorganic, and, in regard to midis, if its analogy with hardus is remembered, then Grimm is wrong in taking MIDI for the theme, as in reality HARDU is the theme of hardus. The true theme MIDYA occurs, however, in the comp. midya-sveipains, "deluge," and answers
ADJECTIVES.

NEUTER.

N. A. V. 
daur',
 blindata,⁹ hva.⁹
dauro,
 blinda, hvo.
The rest like the masculine.

N. A. V. badi,
midyata,⁹ hvarya-ta, badya,
midya, hvarya.
The rest like the masculine.

FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. giba, blinda, hvo.</td>
<td>gibós, blindós, hvós.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. giba, blinda, hvo.¹¹</td>
<td>gibó-s, blindós, hvó-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. gibai,¹² blindai, hvizai.¹³</td>
<td>gibó-m, blindaim, hvai-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. gibó-s, blindaizós,¹³ hvizó-s.¹³</td>
<td>gib'ó, blindaizo, hví-zó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. giba, blinda, . . .</td>
<td>gibó, blindó, . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. kunthi,¹⁴ midya, hvarya.</td>
<td>kunthyós, midyós, hvayós.²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. kunthyā, midya, hvarya.</td>
<td>kunthyó-s, midyós, hvayó-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. kunthyai,¹² midyai,¹² hvaryaı.¹²</td>
<td>kunthyó-m, midyóm, hvayó-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. kunthyó-s, midyaizós, hvaryaizós.¹³</td>
<td>kunthyó, midyó, hvaryaó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. kunthi, midya. . .</td>
<td>kunthyós, midyós, hvayós.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answers to the Sanskrit मध्य madhya. Formed from midya as theme, midyis 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 ξέβό tārim, "quartum," from Ξέβό tārya (§. 42).

⁹ Hva, with suppressed termination, for hvata, Old High German huaz, see §§. 155. 156.; for blindata also blind; and so for midyata also midí.

¹⁰ The form hvó, which, like some others of this pronoun, cannot be shown to occur, is, by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from thó, "haec." Grimm here finds, as also in the accusative singular, the ó in opposition to the a of blinda surprising; the reason of the deviation, however, is fixed by §§. 69. 137. 231.


¹⁴ For kunthya, from kunthyó, by suppression of the final vowel of the base, which again appears in the accusative, but shortened to a (see §. 69.); but here, also, the final vowel can be dropped; hence kunthi as accusative. Luc. 1. 77.
If, then, it is asked which pronoun is contained in the German definite adjective, I answer, the same which, in Slavonic [G. Ed. p. 376.] and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative \( \text{ya} (\text{ ya}) \). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Slavonic, does not occur isolated in its inflected state; but it is not uncommon in the history of languages, that a word has been lost in regard to its isolated use, and has been preserved only in composition with other words. It should be observed, too, that a demonstrative \( i \) base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskrit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely; but in Sanskrit, except the neuter nominative accusative \( \text{idam} \), “this,” has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as \( \text{ir} \ i-ti, \text{it-tham} \), “so,” \( \text{ir} \ iy-at, \) “so much,” \( \text{ir}\text{a} \ i-dri\text{a}, \) “such.” The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base \( \text{ya} \): from this comes, in my opinion the affirmative particle \( \text{ya} \), as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (\( i-tu, \text{ta-tha} \), “so,” \( \text{o} \text{trw} \)), and further \( \text{yabai, “if,”} \) analogous with \( \text{ibai, “whether,”} \) \( \text{ibaini, “lest”;} \) as also, in Sanskrit, \( \text{adb} \ yudi, “if,” \) comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek \( \text{ei} \)—the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Prākrit, in the 3d person singular present, \( aI, \text{e.g.} \text{bhama} \), “he wanders” (Urvasi by Lenz, p. 63), has to the more usual \( \text{adb} \ adi \), for the Sanskrit \( \text{adb} \ ati \). In Prākrit, too, \( \text{jab} \ jai \) (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 \( \text{a} \text{y} \text{e} \text{i} \) from \( \text{a} \text{y} \text{e} \text{r} \text{i}; \) the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Prākrit. If, however, in \( \text{ei} \) the Sanskrit \( \text{y} \) has disappeared, as in the Aeolic \( \text{u} \text{m} \text{u} \text{e} \text{s} = \text{Sanskrit yushme} \), it appears as \( h \) in \( \delta \), which has nothing to do with the article \( \delta, \) where \( h \) falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in \( \delta \) it runs through all the cases, as
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in Sanskrit the ८ y of यस्य या-s. To this [G. Ed. p. 377.]

in regard to the rough breathing, bears the same relation as ८मेय to ८श्मे युष्मेय, ८ωμ, ८मो to यज्ञ यज्ञ, "to worship," "to sacrifice," यज्ञ याज्ञ, "to be worshiped;" ८प्रू to ८यु युद्ध, "to strive," ८यु युद्ध, "strife" (comp. Pott, pp. 236. 252.). But to return to the Gothic यA, let us further observe यA, "and," "also," with h enclitic, of which hereafter, and यA, "now," i.e. "at this time," "already" (comp. Latin jam). It also clearly forms the last portion of हवः-यिस (for यास), as, in the Slavonic, this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others, and, for example, is contained in क्य-ि, "who?" although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination.

288. In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base यA shews itself most plainly in bases in उ. Of these, indeed, there are but a few, which we annex below,† but a यA shews itself in all the cases, and these in blinds differ from the substantive declension, to such an extent that before the य the उ of the adjective is suppressed, as in Sanskrit before the comparative and superlative suffixes यास, इश्ता; e.g. लाघ्वियास, "more light," लाघ्विष्ठा, "most light," for लाघ्वि-यास, लाघ्वि-इश्ठा from लाघ्वु; and as, even in Gothic, हार्ड़-इज्ध, "more hard" (according to

* The य may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise याग, यान, and यास, and in conjunction with थेत: याथेत, "or" (see Massmann's Gloss.).

† अग्व, "narrow," अगु, "heavy," गल्ग्व, "industrious," हार्ड, "hard," नास्ति, "ready," थाय्रस, "dry," थ्लाय्रस, "tender," येट्स, "late," फाल्स, "much," and, probably, ह्नास्ति, "tender." Some occur only as adverbs, as गल्ग्व-बा, "industriously." In addition to the adverb फाल्स, "much," since Grimm treated this subject the genitive फाल्स has been found (यलक्ष्म या, "for much more," see Massmann's Gloss.), which is the more gratifying, as the adjective उ bases had not yet been adduced in this case.
Massmann, p. 48), for hardv-izō from HARDU. Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine thaws-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, ἀπαρασκευάστος (2 C. 9. 4.), although, in this case, blindans is not different from vulfsans. 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:—

MASCLNLNE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. manvu-s, (manv'-yai),</td>
<td>manvu-s, (manv'-yds).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. manv'-ya-na, manv'-ya-ns, (manv'-ya),</td>
<td>(manv'-yds),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. (manv'-ya-mma),manv'-yai-m, (manv'-yai),</td>
<td>(manv'-yaim).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| G. manvau-s, (manv'yaize), (manv'-yaizds), | (manv'-yaizd).

NEUTER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Accus. manv'-ya-ta,† (manv'-ya).</td>
<td></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 Prākrit a final a changed through the influence of a preceding न, र, or ल, to न u. So Urvasi, p. 72, ātu, tātu, āvaranu, for kāla, tāla, āvarana; p. 71, manūharu for manūhara.

† Without inflection and pronom. manvu, as सनव sūdū, īdū, 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 shown 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 शृङ्खिस् suchi-s m. f., “clean,” such i n., with इभस्, इभु facili-s, facile. Adjectives in u, in Sanskrit, frequently leave, in like manner, the feminine base undistinguished from the masculine and neuter, and then end, according to §. 234., in the nominative in u-s; so पंदु-s m. f., agrees with manu-s above, and the neuter पंदु with manu. If two consonants do not precede the final य u, as in पंदु, the feminine base may, except in compound words, be lengthened by an इ, which is particularly characteristic of this gender; and thus स्वाहास् svadwī, “the sweet” (theme and nominative), answers to the Greek word ἱδεια, which is lengthened by an unorganic a (§. 119.), for ἱδία; and svādu-s answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic manus. 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 tanu, whence the nominative tanu-s; and tanu, as substantive, means the “slender woman.” The Lithuanian has adjective bases in u, as szwiesu-s, m. “light,” “clear,” (compare खेत्त युलो, “white,”) which nevertheless, in several cases, replace the u by a; as szwiesám 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, szwiesiem dangums, “to the bright heavens.” The feminine is, in the nominative, szwiesi, the
G. Ed. p. 380.] final i of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit ś i in swādvi. In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic a also is added to the Lithuanian i, as it has been in ḫeia: this ia, however, becomes either by euphony, e (comp. p. 174, Note *), e.g. accus. szwiesii, accus. plural szwiesēs; 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 szwiesē rankēs, "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 manvvana which has been cited, the conjectured dative manvymma 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-yala-mma, hardu-yala-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'-ya-mma, blind'-ya-ana, blind'-ya-ata, as analogous with manv(u)-yamma, manv(u)-yana, manv(u)-yata, or blinda-(ya)mma, &c.: I have therefore left them, as also the corresponding forms from MIDYA, undivided. If the division blinda-mma, &c. is made, nothing is left of the pronoun, as in the Old Slavonic dative svjato-mu, and as in our expressions like beim, am, im, except the case-termination, and the adjective base
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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 gerus-us for gerus-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, नध्यम 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 hnasqu'-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 ते, के) 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 e: hence the instrumental plural of the Veda dialect and of the Prakrit, चष्येभिः aśve-bhis from aśwa, जुस्मेहि kusumé-hin from kusuma. To this e answers the ai in
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Gothic pronominal datives like hvai-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 unsubstantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to recognise 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 blindaizos—which is to be divided blindaizos—from blinda-yizos; and this yizos is analogous with hvizos, thizos, from hvazos, thazos, = Sanskrit kasyás, tasyás (§. 172.). We must not require blindo-izos — because BLINDÓ is the feminine adjective base—for there is a reason for the thinning of the o, in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and a is the short of o (§. 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 o (p. 354, Note 3.); and that a diphthong oi in the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 382.] is never admissible; on which account salbó, "I anoint," in the subjunctive suppresses the i, which belongs to this mood (salbós, salbó, for salbóis, salbói). In the feminine dative one should expect bindaizai for blindai, which is simple, and answers to gibai, while the remaining German dialects are, in this case, compounded in the very
same manner: in Old High German the genitive is *plintera,* and the dative *plinteru.* In the genitive plural masculine and neuter the *ai* in *blindaize* might be substantiated through the Sanskrit ए of the pronominal genitive, as तेषम्, "horum"; and therefore the division *blindaize* 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-zē,* "horum," *hvi-zē,* "quorum," as weakened forms of *tha-zē,* *hva-zē,* are used; and in the feminine *thi-zō,* *hvi-zō,* for *thō-zō,* *hvi-zō,* = Sanskrit *tā-sām,* *kā-sām;* I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the *ai* in *blindaizē* m. n., and *blindaizō* f., than by the Sanskrit *e* of तेषम् m. n. (f. तासाम), which, moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form *blindaizō;* and I do it, in fact, by the pronominal base या, so that *blinda-izē* *blinda-izō,* is the division to be made according to the analogy of *blinda-izōs.*

"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. *althcis,* "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 *e,* 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 manvu-s above, which, in the oblique cases, show so clearly the pronominal base \( \mathcal{Y} \mathcal{A} \), have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative; which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declension in the nominative masculine, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. Plintèr (the length of the \( \hat{e} \) is here rendered certain) is contracted from plinta-\( \hat{e} \)-r (for plinta-yir); for the Old High German \( \hat{e} \) 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 plintèr; and in the nominative and accusative plural and neuter the form plint-yu, with regard to the retaining the \( y \) of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic blind-\( \alpha \) for blind-ya. The form plintyu, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like dyu, "the" (f.), syu, "she," désyu (di-syu), "this"* (f.), and to the instrumental masculine and neuter dyu (in the interrogative hui\( w \)), 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 \( y u \). 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 désju; 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—

**SANSKRIT.**  
<sanskrit>स्मा syā (= syā,) "hæc,"
त्वाम् tyām, "hanc,"
भे tyē, " hi,"
हस् tyāς, "hae,“ "has,"
धान्त tyāni, "hæc,"
</sanskrit>  
**OLD HIGH GERM.**  
<gher>syu, dyu, tu-ya.
dya, tū-ya.
dyē, ti-i.
dyō, ty-ya.
dyu, ta-ya.
</gher>  
**OLD SCLAVONIC.**

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, thai*, [G. Ed. p. 384.]  
\( \text{thōs, thō} \) : 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 Slavonic, where the demonstrative base *TO* may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases: in several, however, which we have partly given above, it occurs also in union with *YO*. It is most probable, that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders; for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form *dyu* (*d'-yu*), and from the dative plural, where together with *dēm* occurs also *dyēm* (*diēm*), and, in Notker, always *dien*. According to this, I deduce the forms *dēr, dēs, dēmu, &c.*, from *dyer, dyēs* (*for dyis*), *dyēmu* (*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
thi-s, would be, in their origin, just as different as in the accusative feminine dyā and thō. 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 dē-n (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative désēr, which I explain as compounded, and as, in fact, a combination of the Sanskrit त्या, mentioned at p. 383 G. ed., for taya, and स्या for sa-ya, the latter of which has a full declension in the Old Slavonic, also, as a simple word. Désēr stands, therefore, for dyā-sūt (ē=ai); and our Modern German dieses rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above désēr, namely, upon dyā-sēr or dia-sēr; referred to which the Isidorean dhēa-sa, mentioned by Grimm (I. 795.), at least in respect of the first syllable, no longer appears strange, for dhēa from dhia for dhya,* answers admirably to the Sanskrit त्या, and the final syllable sa answers to the Sanskrit Gothic nominative form sa (Greek ὅ), which has not the sign of case.

"Remark 6.—The adjective bases which from their first origin end in ya, as MIDYA=Sanskrit madhya, are less favourable to the retention of the y of the definite pronoun; for to the feminine or plural neuter plint'-yu for plinta-yu a midy'-yu would be analogous, which, on account of the difficulty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but may have originally existed in the form midya-yu, or midya-ya; for the masculine nominative midyër is from midya-ir for midya-yar, as, in Gothic, the feminine genitive-form midyaizōs from midya-yizōs. If, however, according to this even hvar-yaizōs (from hvar-yaizōs) be used, and analogous

* D, th, and dh are interchanged according to different authorities.
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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 finand-s (see p. 164), as from GIBANDA, according to the analogy of vulf'-s (§. 135.). The Pâli (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 Pâli, no feminine theme charanti has been formed from the unorganic theme charanta, mentioned at p. 319 G. ed.

---

*Ruhig (by Mielke, p. 68) wrongly gives \( ai \) as the emphatic adjunct, as the doubling of the \( s \) in tassai, szissui, 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 tut-tai (comp. kok-tai, tok-tai). After two consonants, however, the \( y \) is entirely dropped; hence e.g. kurs-ai, not kurs-sai.
for the masculine and neuter form *charanta* has arisen from the necessity of passing from a class of declensions terminating in a consonant into one more convenient, terminating with a vowel in the theme. The Sanskrit, however, forms from bases terminating in a consonant the feminine theme by the addition of a vowel (*i*, see §. 119.); *e.g.* from *charant* m., comes *charanti*, and there was therefore no reason in the Pali to give also to the more recent form *charanta* a feminine theme *charanti*. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pali, for it has produced no feminine base *GIBANDŌ* from the presupposed *GIBANDA*; and therefore, also, the indefinite *GIBANDAN* has no feminine, *GIBANDŌN*, nom. *gibandō*, answering to it (as *BLINDŌN* to *BLINDAN*); but the feminine form *gibandi* (*ei=**i*, §. 70.), which has arisen from the old theme *GIBAND*, in analogy with the Sanskrit *charanti*, has become *GIBANDEIN*, by the later addition of an *n*. Hence, according to §. 142., in the nominative *gibandi* 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 *ē*, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant; thus *FERENTI* from *FERENT* (compare §. 119. *genītī-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 *ia* (*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 

which is introduced into them from the feminine adjec-

rive (infante, sapiente).

"Remark.—In the of kepantyu, the Old High German feminine of kepantër, I recognise the regular defining ele-

ent, as above in plintyu, answering to the masculine plintër. On account of the participial feminines in yu, therefore, it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in yer, according to the analogy of midyër, midyu, midyaz, partly as kepantër and kepantaz, incline, in none of their cases, to the declension of midyër, midyaz, and also as the derivative indefinite base in an has sprung from KEPANTA, and not from KEPANTYA; therefore m. kepanto (=Gothic gibanda), f. n. kepanta (=Gothicibandó). This only is peculiar to the Old High German participle present, in relation to other adjectives, that in its uninflected adverbial state it retains the defining pronominal base YA in its contraction to i; therefore kepanti, "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 termina-

ions in the participle present, than in all other adjectives, as the definite form in nds in Gothic, in the nominative singular masculine, corresponds to it; and as it may be assumed, that here the 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 uninflected form in i, be given. So in Grimm's hymns (II. 2.). sustollens is rendered by the uninflected uspurrenti, and baptizans by taufantër, although the reverse might just as well occur, or both participles might stand in the same form, whether that of the nominative or adverbial. As regards the Old Saxon forms men-

tioned by Grimm, namely, slápandyes or slápandees, "dormientis," gnornondye, "maerentes," buandyum, "habilan-
tibus," they should, in my opinion, be rather adduced in
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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 manyana, mentioned at p. 362, than that a theme in ya belonged to the Old High German participle present before its conjunction with the pronominal syllable."

DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

291. The comparative is expressed in Sanskrit by the suffix tara, feminine tarā, and the superlative by tama, feminine tama, 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 Ṣṣa tara and Ṣṣa tēma unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine; e.g. Ṣṣaṭo tara (Vend. S. p. 383) from huska, nominative masculine Ṣṣaṭo huskō, "dry"; Ṣṣaṭa tēma from Ṣṣaṭa, "holy"; vērēthra-zanēma (Vend. S. p. 43) from vērēthrazan, nom. vērēthražan, "victorious" (literally, "Vṛitra-slaying").* According to my opinion Ṣṣa tara owes

* The participle present zant, the nominative of which I recognise in Ṣṣaṭa vērēthra-zanō, rests on the analogy of the frequently-occurring Ṣṣaṭa upa-zōit, "let him strike"; since, in fact, the root zan (Sanskrit हन 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 Vṛitra-han, "Vṛitra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form jan, the nominative of which is Ṣṣaṭa jīdo (Vend. S. p. 43),
its origin to the root त्रि (tar, § 1.), "to [G. Ed. p. 389.] step beyond" "to place beyond" (e. g. "over a river"); hence, also, the substantive tara, "a float." In the Latin, as Lisch has acutely remarked, with this root are connected the preposition trans, and also terminus, as that which is overstepped, and probably also tra, in in-tra-re, penetra-re. The superlative suffix I derive, with Grimm (III. 583.), from that of the comparative, although I assume no theoretic necessity that the superlative must have been developed through the degree of the comparative. But tama, as a primitive, presents no satisfactory etymology: I formerly thought of the base तन् tan, "to extend," whence, also, ταξός 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 इष्ट ishtha may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative ḍyas, through the suffix tha, which, in the Greek, is contained in the form of το, as well in ὑσ-τος as in ταςος, for ταςος or ταςος. In this manner, therefore, is formed ταςο-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 πέμπ-τος contrasted with पञ्चम panchama, "the fifth": the vowel, however, is more truly retained in the derivative ταςος than in its base ταςος. In Latin, तमस् tama-s has become timus- (optimus, intimus, extimus, ultimus); and, by the exchange of the t with s, which is more usual in Greek than in Latin, simus; hence,
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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 कतरस् katara-s is "which of two persons?" and कतमस् katama-s, "which of more than two persons?" एकतरास् ēkataras is "one of two persons," and ēkatama-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 ēkatama-s, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix tara is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of TERU (ter, teru-m), and in Gothic in that of THARA; hence uter, neuter, alter; Gothic, hva-thar,* "which of two persons?" Old High German, [G. Ed. p. 391.]: huëdar, 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 akr̄s, "a field" (comp. Grimm, p. 599): still the adjective nominatives gaur̄s, "mournful" (theme Gaura, comp. Sanskrit घोर ghōra, "terrible"), and evērs, "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 newéder. Anthar, also, our anderer, belongs here, and answers to the Sanskrit अन्तरस् antara-s, whose initial syllable is the same which in अन्य anya, “alius,” has united itself with the relative base य ya. From this अन्य anya comes anyalara, “alter.” If, however, अन्तर antara means, in general, “the other,” the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after, passing over this thing; so is, also, the Latin ceterus to be considered, from ce as demonstrative base (compare ci-s, ci-tra); and so, also, in Sanskrit, itara, “the other,” comes from the demonstrative base i, as, in Latin, the adverb iterum from the same base.”* In our German, also, wieder is the comparative suffix, and the whole rests, perhaps, on a pre-existing Old High German word huia-dar or huwyadar, 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,

preceding i, while e.g. the feminine acris might have permitted its is to have been removed, just as well as the masculine, I can find the reason of this firm adherence of the feminine to the termination is only in the circumstance that the vowel i particularly agrees with that gender, as it is in Sanskrit (although long), according to § 119., the true vowel of formation for the feminine base. In Gothic, the suppression of the nominative sign s is universal in bases in sa and si, in order that, as the final vowel of the base is suppressed, two s should not meet at the end of the word; hence e.g. the nominative drus, “a tall,” from DRUSA; garuns, “a market,” from GARUNSI, f.

* I have traced back the comparative nature of this adverb, which Voss derives from iter, “the journey,” for the first time in my Review of Forster’s Sanskrit Grammar in the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818. i. p. 479.
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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 dakṣiṇa), 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, sinistrior, 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, praeter, propter, the adverbially-used subter, and probably, also, obiter (compare audacter, pariter).* To inter answers the Sanskrit चन्तर 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 प्रातः prātar, "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 चन्तर 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 चन्त्वित abhi-tas, "near," from abhi with the suffix tas. The common idea, however, that obiter is compounded of ob and iter cannot entirely be disproved, partly as then obiter would be a similar compound to obviam.

† Comp. ni, pari, pratī, 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 चन्तर antar from anta, "end," with rd, "to arrive at," and the analogous
Greek προε from προ. For the relation “under,” the Sanskrit has the preposition सम adhas, which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base स a; from which, also, come सघ a-dhara and सघम, a-dhama, “the under one,” or “the most under,” to which inferus and infimus are akin, as fumus to पूर्ण dhúma-s, “smoke,” and, with a nasal prefixed, as in áμphi in relation to चन्ति abhi, and in अम्फो, “ambo,” answering to ज्ञेन ubhāu, Old Slavonic oba. The suffixes घर dhara and घम 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 tás, in समस 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 θεύ (from θές, comp. §. 217.) corresponds with it, which, in regard to its T sound, rests on the form पूर्ण dhas in समस adhas (§. 16.), as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Slavonic suffix dů, which only occurs in pronouns, and expresses the same relation as तस tas, θεύ, tus: e.g. ovo-údů, “hence,”* ono-údů, “thence.” The form dů, 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 ṝ (see §. 255. f.), which in Zend has become fixed (§. 56*).

*The demonstrative base यः answers remarkably to the Zend म म ava, with o for a, according to §. 255. (a.).
“Remark.—Dobrowsky p. 451 gives उदाः as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix उद्ये, which forms adverbs of place, as कुद्ये, “where?” ओनुद्ये, “there.” As, however, the definitive pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, उदाः, उद्ये, and forms, with sche, उदास्चे, उद्येश्चे, for युद्दाः, &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 ओनो-उदाः, ओनो-उद्दाः, on’-उद्ये, ए-उद्ये, and others. But how is the य itself in उ-द्ये, यु-द्ये, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point; but as, according to §. 255. (g.), in the last element of the diphthong य a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, युद्दाः, युद्ये, might be regarded as corruptions of योनदा, योन्दे, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin inde, unde, from I, U. युद्ये, युद्या, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative या, 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-dag, “this day,” “to day,” throws light. Before the suffix द्ये, however, elder form दे, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as गद्ये, “where?” (more ancietly के, with the final vowel of the base KO suppressed); ज्ञे (older sde), “here”; इद्येश्चे, “where” (relative). As e (e), according to §. 255. (b.), frequently stands as the corruption of an older ए, I recognise in the suffix दे the Sanskrit नु dhi, from अनु adhi, “over,” “upon” “towards,” (from the demonstrative base ए), 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 shew themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskrit अन्तर antar, Latin inter, mentioned above (at p. 392, G. ed.), corresponds our unter, Gothic
DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

undar, with u for the old a, according to §. 66.* If, however, the, in my opinion, incontrovertible original identity of the latter with the two former is recognised, [G. Ed. p. 395.] one must not, with Grimm (III. 260.), derive undar from the preposition und, “as far as,” &c., by a suffix ar, and so again divide the dar; for undar,† as transmitted from an ancient period of the language, was already formed, before the existence of a German dialect, and the abovementioned preposition has only to dispose itself according to the relations of sound mentioned in §§. 66. 91. The matter is different with the Old High German af-tar, “after,” for the primitive language, or languages, transmit to us only खप apa, अप “from”; to which, in the spirit of जनर antar, inter, subtler, &c., the old comparative suffix has first united itself upon German ground. In Gothic, oftra means “again,” which I look upon as an abbreviation of oftara, as in Latin extra, intra, contra, and others, as feminine adjectives, from externa, &c. In regard to the termination however, oftra, and similar forms in tra, thra, appear to me as datives, i.e. original instrumental (§. 160.), as also, in the Sanskrit, this case occurs as an adverb, e.g. in जनरेक antareṇa, “between.” Perhaps, also, the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs in tra, although they have a locative meaning, like यत्र yatra, “where,” are to be regarded as instrumental forms, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.), and of the gerund in य ya, (Gramm. Crit. §. 638. Rem.), so that their tra would be to be derived from तरा tard: compare forms like मनुष्यत्रा manushya-trā, “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. trā). As oftra is related to oflar, 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 भ्र vi, which expresses separation, distraction, e.g. in visrip, “to go from one another,” “to disperse.” Exactly similar is the Sanskrit भ्र ni, to which I was the first to prove the meaning “below” to belong,* and whence comes the adjective निचā 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-ter, 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-dāro, “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 भ्र ni and nidar (III. 258, 259): he wishes, however, to divide thus nid-ar, and to suppose a Gothic verb nithan, nath, nithum, 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, “aflatus,” to which the Sanskrit gives वा uṣa, “to blow,” as root, the Gothic gives vō (§. 69.) (vaia, vairō). 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 Gunā; as nata, “bent,” nati, “bending,” with the preposition sam, san-nati, which Wilson explains by “reverence,” “obeisance,” “reverential salutation.” As the Gothic inseparable prepo-

passive

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
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fication, related to the Sanskrit सम “with” (compare Gothic samath, “together with,” Old High German samant), and the u, therefore, is from a, according to § 66. The Latin con-trae, however, is nearly just as much opposed in meaning to its primitive cum; and as cum (compare σῶ) belongs, in like manner, to सम sam, so sundar, sundra, and contra, would be, in a double respect, sister forms. Observe, also, the Gothic samath, Old High German samant, “together with”: the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit सामसंत samanta (from sam + anta, “an end”), the ablative of which, samantát, as also the adverb, samantalas, mean “everywhere.” Perhaps, too, in all other Old High German adverbs in nt (Grimm. III. 214.), the said साम anta is contained, for the meaning “end,” cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time, and, like Mille, “mid,”

passive participle san-na-tá. 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 नन 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-thrá, Old High German vi-dar, into vih-ra, wid-ar, and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition with, English with, Old Scavonic vid, Old Norman vid, 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 (वारि vāri, “water,” = mare, βπρόσ— मृतस mritis, “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 मत 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.
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(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 fur-der to be mentioned, whence der vordere, vorderste.

[G. Ed. p. 398.] "Remark 1.—As we have endeavoured above to explain the Gothic af-tra and 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 ἄνω; thus hvo-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 यधर adhara, "the under person," with aphæresis of the a and the very common exchange of the r with l (§. 20.). Perhaps, however, on the contrary, thal is so named from the notion of the part below. As to the ablative forms in tarō, thrō, the ᵀ corresponds to the Sanskrit ṅ (§. 179.), with ᵀ, according to rule, for त ᵀ (§. 69.), and apocope of the t; so that ᵀ has the same relation to the to-be-presupposed ᵀ that in Greek οὖς to οὔς, from οὔτω (§. 183. Note * p. 201). Many other Gothic adverbs in ᵀ, as sinteindo, "always," sniumundō, "hastily," sprantō, "suddenly," thridyō, "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 thridyō would
answer to the Sanskrit ablative tritiyāt while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in a by an unorganic n; thus THRIDIKA, 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 o, 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 θωναυρίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7., by thata andaneithō, here of course andaneithō is the neuter accusative; but the inducement for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article, and θωναυρίον could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor. iv. 17., where Castiglione takes thata andavairthō for the [G. Ed. p. 399.] nominative, but Grimm for the adverbial accusative: as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text. where tò does not belong to αύτικα, but to ἐλαφρόν. In my opinion, however, it can in no case be inferred from these passages that the adverbs in o, without an article preceding them, belong to the same category. Moreover, also, andaneithō and andavairthō do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As, then, thrō has shewn itself to us to be an abbreviation of thrōt, it is a question whether the suppression of the t by a universal law of sound was requisite, as in Greek, and in the Prākrit, 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
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they are final sounds of a second generation, comparable in that respect to the Scalvonic final consonants (§. 255. l.). This holds good, for example, with regard to th, d, in the 3d person singular and plural, and the 2d person plural = Sanskrit ति ti, जन्नि anti, य tha or त ta; and I explain the th or d, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix य dha (ह ha); which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in tra, and the ablatives in tas, occur also with accusative meaning, i.e. expressing the direction to a place (see tatra in my Glossary). The Sanskrit suffix य dha appears, in common language, abbreviated to ha, and is found indeed, only in i-ha, “here,” from the pronominal base i and सह sa-ha—in the Vedic dialect and Zend sa-dha—which I derive from the pronominal base sa. It ought, according to its origin, and consistently with the usual destination of the suffix dha, to mean “here or there”: it has, however, become a preposition, which expresses “with.”

The adverb इ ha, “here,” is, in Zend, आ स idha,* and frequently occurs in combination with म na, “not”; so that माम म naēdha† means “nor,” answering to नōit. “neither” (literally “not it,” from na + it, §. 33.). From म a va and म a na aēla, “this” (mas.), comes म a m

* Vend. Sāde, p. 368. several times: म a m म a n म a n म a m म a n म a n imāh idha vachō framrava, “haec hic verba enuntia,” which Anquetil translates by “en prononçant bien ces paroles.” In the same page also occurs repeatedly म a m adha, with the same meaning, from the demonstrative base a, as in the Vēda’s प adha (Rosen’s Sp. p. 10), without perceptible meaning.

† a + i makes त, according to §. 2.; and from nēdha is formed, by §. 28., naēdha.
avatadh and avadhavatadh (Vend. S. p. 164). To the Zend-Vedic suffix dha corresponds most exactly the Greek θα, in ένθα and ένταθα, “here.” Perhaps ένθα and θα i-dha, ἰδά ἱα, are, with regard to their base, identical; ένθα, therefore, is for ένθα from θα (comp. in, inde), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant, and thus ἄμφι answers to सम abhi, ἅμφω to ὑμή ubhāu, Old Sclavonic oba; but αὐθα, in the triple compound ἐν-ταθα, is completely the Zend ἀχαμ avatadh, whose theme ava has been contracted in the Greek to αὐ (compare αὐθι and αὐθα, 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 ῆχα ihatya, “of this place,” which is derived from ἰδά ἱα through the suffix ῆ tyα, corresponds the Greek ἑνθάςιος, 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 ῆ tyα 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 αὐ to agree with the Sanskrit amu, “ilie,” by casting out the m (as κοοπος with κυ-πάρα): now, however, भव 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 नाप्रि 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 Vatzr, which is fully preserved from the Sanskrit. In the

meaning
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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 "*OPNIO\(\theta\)*, one may also recognise in the syllable *χο*, in forms like *παντα-χο-θεν* *παντα-χο-σε*, *πολλαχόσε*, 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*). *Πανταχο* might, in the identity of its suffix with *θα, dha*, or *ha*, mean "everywhere"; whence may then be said *πανταχο-σε*, "from everywhere," &c., as we combine our locative adverbs *wo* and *da* with *her* and *hin* (*woher, wohin*); and in Greek, also, *ἐκείθι, ἐκεῖσε, ἐκεῖθεν*, 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 develop, also, case-forms, as *πανταχοῦ, πανταχοί* (old locative and dative), *πανταχῆ*. The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning *αχ* or even *αχο*, in which case we should have to divide *παντ-αχο-θεν*, &c. But as the *χο* under discussion has arisen from *θα, dha*, I think I recognise in the *χι* of *χι* a corruption of the suffix *θι*, from *θι dhi*; in which respect might be compared *άγγι*, as a sister form to

meaning of *Neffe* the negation of the relationship of father points to the uncle. The Indian Grammarians, according to Wilson, see in *naptri* the negation, but not the father, but the root *pat*, "to fall," and a Unâdi suffix *τρι*.
DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

As a third form in which the Vedic-Zend suffix dha appears in Greek, I notice σε, with σ for θ, ψ dh, as μεσος from μη medhya, "midst," the γ of which has assimilated itself, in the form μέσος, to the σ. The suffix σε, however, in that it is altered from its original intention to denote rest in a place, to the expression of motion to a place, answers to the Gothic th or d, whence we set out in this examination, in forms like hva-th, πό-σε, "whither?" also hva—John xiii. 3. hva gaggis, πού ὑπάγεις—γαιν-δ, ἐκεῖ-σε, ἀλα-θ, ἄλαο-σε. To the Zend idha, Greek ἐνθα, corresponds i-th; which, however, contrary to the original intention of the form, does not mean "thither," but is used as a conjunction—"but," "if," "then" (1 Cor. vii. 7.). To this class, also, belongs ath, which only occurs in combination with than—ath-than, "but," like ith-than; and it has [G. Ed. p. 402.] the Vedic-Zend a-dha as prototype (§. 399.). Thad, in combination with the relative particle ei, which is probably connected with υ ya, has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and thad-ei may be cited as "where" and "whither." The d in these forms, answering to the Greek θ, agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§. 87.); and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare bauth, bu-dun (§. 91.);—so that the Gothic T sound of the suffix under discussion, after it has, in one direction, diverged from the Greek, has, in another, again approached it.

"Remark 2.—As we have above recognised ablatives in the formations in thrō, tarō, 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 hidrē,* "hither," Mark xi. 3. Luke xiv. 21.; hva-dré, "whither?" John vii. 35. On the other hand, yaindrē ac-

* Vide §. 901.
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tually occurs with a locative meaning; *tharë leik, yaindë
galisand sik arans, ἵππον τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθονταί οἱ σατοί.*
Compare these forms with the Sanskrit, as, adharë, “in
the lower,” and the Lithuanian vilke (§. 197.). That, how-
ever, the Gothic ḍ, which in the genitive plural masculine
and neuter answers to the Sanskrit ṣa ḍ in §. 69.), moreover
corresponds to ḍ ḍ, is proved by preterites like nēnum,
‘we took,’ answering to the singular nam; as, in Sanskrit,
नेमिमा nēmima, ‘we bent ourselves,’ answers to ननम nana
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 ṭ in prepositional derivations, either simply or in com-
bination with the common superlative suffix ISTA; thus,
aftuma, “posterus,” aftumists, “postremus,” hindumists, “ex-
tremus.” If one considers the Indian suffix तम tama, to
have suffered apocope of the a—as in Latin, also, timus ap-
ppears 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 = तम tam, τῶν, hva-
-na = क्रम ka-m, “whom?”; and accordingly regard the pre-
positional derivations in tana, dana, as superlative forms; thus,
Gothic aftana, “behind”; hindana, πέραν, Old High German
ni-dana, “under” (compare our hier-nieden, “here below.” As,
however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations
in ana without a preceding ṭ sound (Grimm III. 203, &c.),
it is a question whether innana “within,” ḍzana “abroad,”
forana shortened to forna “from the beginning,” fěrrana
“πόρρωθεν,” rūmana “from a distance,” höhana “ὑψόθεν,”
heimina “οἶκοθεν,” have lost a ṭ or a ḍ preceding the a;
or if they are formed after those in tana, dana, in the
notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of ana;
or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle.
The preposition *obar*, "over," Gothic *ufar*, which answers to the Sanskrit उपरि *upari*, Greek 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 चन्च *anch*, "to go"; thus the east is denoted as "that which is before," by प्राच *prâanch*, from प्र *pra*, "before"; the west as "that which is over against it," by प्रत्याच *pratyanch*, from प्रति *prati*, "opposite"; the south as "that below," by अवाच *avâanch*, from अच *ava*, "below"; and its opposite pole, the north, as "that above," is called उदच *udanch*, from उत *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 ර and 才知道 in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm. III. 205.), the latter the direction whence, which, however, was not, perhaps, the original intention of the terminations, both which seem adapted to express the same direction; the former comparatively, with a glance at [G. Ed. p. 404.] that which is opposite, the latter superlatively, in relation to all the quarters of the globe, as, p. 376, एकतर *ekatara*, "one of two persons," but एकतम *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 ウィ, mentioned at p. 382, whence the comparative ウィ-दर. We do not, however, require to deduce *weis-tar,*

* By writing ウィ, Grimm marks the corruption of the े from ी, in which I readily agree with him.
“towards the west,” wěs-tana,” “from the west,” from the derivative widar; but we may keep to its base wi, with the assumption of a euphonic s; as in the Sanskrit, also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain combinations, and before consonants which are disposed to have an s before them, assume this letter; e.g. pratišhkaśa for pratikāśa; and as in Latin abs, os (for obs), from ab, ob (§. 96.). But if it were preferred to deduce wēstar, wēstana, 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 ōs-tar, “towards the east,” ōs-tana, “from the east”—for several prepositions start up together that would gladly sustain this quarter of the heavens. It is not necessary that the preposition after which the east is named should elsewhere, also, be received as a German preposition; for in this appellation a preposition might have incorporated itself, which, except in this case, is foreign to the practice of the German language.

[G. Ed. p. 405.] It may therefore be allowable for us, first of all, to turn to a preposition which, in the Indian language, is prefixed to the south, and, in the German, may have changed its position to the east; the more so, as, with prepositions, the principal point is always where one stands, and the direction to which one is turned; and one may, with perfect justice, turn that which is at the bottom to the uppermost, or to the front. In Zend, ava, which in Sanskrit signifies “below,” exists as a pronoun, and means “this”; and as this pronoun is also proper to the Sclovonic (OV, nom. ov), and occurs in Greek as αὐ, (αὐ-θ, αὐτός, see p. 387), it need not surprise us to find an obsolete remnant of this base in German, and that the east is taken as the side opposed to the west. Here it may be necessary to observe, that in Sanskrit the preposition ava, in like manner, annexes a euphonic s; from
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Avas, therefore, by suppressing the last *a* but one, would arise (as in Greek *av*) *aus* (different from our *aus*, Old High German *uz*, Gothic *út*, in Sanskrit उ त ut, "up"), and hence, according to §. 80., *av* : the old northern form is *austr*, *austan*. The Latin *aus-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 *aus-ter* and स्वाच्छ avānch (*ava* + anch), "southern," to be related. The derivations from *haurio*, or *avō*, certainly deserve less notice. As, however, the juxta-position of *austar* 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.] -westar*). 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 *sundrō*, *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 निस 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 Slavonic the Indo-Greek comparative suffix occurs in vtoryi, "the second" (m.), in which the definitive pronoun is contained (p. 352): vtory-i, then, is formed from vtoro-i (§. 255. d.), in which the cardinal number dwa is melted down to v, corresponding in this respect to the Zend b in b-yarē, "two years," but singular, with b as a hardened form from v. To the Sanskrit जतर katara, "which of two? m." (Gothic hva-thar) and यत्स ya-tara, "which of both," corresponds etymologically, the Old Slavonic ko-tory-i (as definitive), older ko-tery-i and ye-ter, feminine ye-tera (ye-terα), 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-ryi, as the formation or would there stand quite isolated; and besides this the pronoun i, "he," from yo, does not occur in combination with the demonstrative base to, and yet ye-ter is said.

298. A small number of comparatives are formed in Sanskrit by इयस iyas, and the corresponding superlative by इष्ठ ishtha, in which ishtha, as has been already remarked (p. 389.), we recognise a derivation from iyas in its contraction to iš (compare ish-ṭa, "offered," from yaj), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly था tha, through which, also, the ordinal numbers चतुर्थस chatur-thas (τέταρ-το-ς), and षष्ठस shash-thas (έκ-τος), are formed, for the notion of the superlative lies very close to the ordinal
numbers above two, as that of order does to the superlative, and hence the suffix तम tama occurs in ordinal numbers; e.g. विनोतितमस् viśaṭi-tama-s, "the twentieth," wherefore ma, in forms like पच्चमस् pancha-ma-s, "the fifth," may be held to be an abbreviation of tama. To the form Ḭṣ, contracted from Ḥyas—euphonic for ḍ— in Greek and Zend ḍs, corresponds the Latin ḍs, in the superlatives in ḍs-simus, which I deduce through assimilation from ḍs-timus (comp. §. 101.); the simple ḍs, however, which, viewed from Latin, is a contraction of ḍś (§. 22.), appears in the simple form in the adverb ḍag-Ḥs, which may be compared with ḍṛṣ in ḍṛg-ṛṣṭoṣ. In the strong cases (§. 129.) the Indian comparative shows a broader form than the ḍyas above, namely, a long ḍ and a nasal preceding the s, thus ḍायाः ḍyāis (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, ḍōris, ḍōri, &c., if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin o as compensation for the rejected nasal: compare the old accusative mel-ḥōsem, mentioned in §. 22., with Sanskrit forms like गरीयांसम् gar-ḥyāis-am (graviorem). The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted from ḍyas, 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 mat-ḥyās; from balavat, "strong" ("gifted with strength,"

* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself.
from bala + vat), bal-īyas; from kṣipra, “quick” (from the base kṣip, “to throw”), comes kṣhēp-īyas; from kṣudra, “insignificant,” kṣhēd-īyas; from tripra, “satisfied,” trap-īyas; since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend vaedista; which Burnouf (Vahista, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from vidvas (vidvō, §. 56b, Sanskrit vidwas), “knowing.” With respect to trapīyas, from tripra, let it be observed that ar, as Guna of f, is easily transposed to ra (Gramm. Crit. §. 34b): compare the Greek ἐδρακόν for ἐδαρκόν; πατράσι for παταρσι (see p. 290, G. ed.). In a similar manner M. Ag. Benary explains the connection of varīyas with uru “great,” with which he rightly compares the Greek εὐρός (Berl. Jahrb. 1834. I. [G. Ed. p. 409.] pp. 230, 231). But varīyas might also come from vara, “excellent,” and uru might be an abbreviation of varu, which easily runs into one. To the superlative वरेछ varēṣṭha, which does not only mean latissimus but also optimus, the Greek ἄριστος (therefore Φάριστος) is without doubt akin, the connection of which with εὐρός 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, ἔχθιστος, οἶκτιστός, οἴκιστός, κῦνιστός, μήκιστός, ἀλγιστός, from ἔχθρος, &c., exactly as above kṣhēpīṣṭhas and others from kṣipra; and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in μήκιστος, μᾶσσον, from μακρός, on which principle also rests the Guna in analogous Sanskrit forms—namely, as a compensation for the suppression of the suffix. The case is the same with the lengthened vowel in forms like θᾶσσον, ἀσσόν, where Buttmann (§. 67. Rem. 3. N. **) assumes that
the comparative \( \varepsilon \) has fallen back and united itself with the \( \alpha \) (\( \alpha \)); while, in my opinion, a different account is to be given of what has become of the \( \varepsilon \) in forms like \( \theta \alpha \sigma \omega \nu \), \( \beta \rho \alpha \sigma \omega \nu \) (§. 300.). The formation of \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \omicron \) from \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \sigma \), from \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \omicron \-\), is similar to the origin, in Sanskrit, of बाइंक bahuśththa, from bahu, “much”; from bahu, “much” comes bhūyāśththa; and \( \mu \varepsilon \gamma \-\iota \sigma \tau \omicron \), in relation to METALO, has lost as much as bahu-śththa, compared with bahuḍa, only that the Sanskrit positive base is compensated for the loss of uḷa 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 kṣhepśththa, &c.*

“Remark.—It will then, also, be necessary [G. Ed. p. 410.] —as Burnouf (Yaṣña, p. 131) first pointed out, but afterwards (Vahista, p. 25), in my opinion, wrongly retracted—to explain the ऋ of śṛyas, “better,” śṛśththa, “the best,” as coming from the \( i \) of śṛ, “fortune,” by Guna, instead of the common view, in which I formerly concurred, of substituting a useless śra as positive, and hence, by contraction with iyas, iṣṭha, forming śṛyas, śṛśththa. From śṛ comes the derivative śṛ-mat, “fortunate,” from which I deduce śṛ-yas, śṛ-śththa, 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 Vṛddhi, which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes, especially in patronymics, as वीवस्वत vaivasvata, from वीवस्वत् vivasvat. On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes iyas, iṣṭha, 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 Vṛddhi, as usual (§. 26.). Be that how it may, one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel-lengthening in μήκαςτος, θάςσων, and others, and that of Sanskrit forms like kṣhep-yas, kṣhepśththa.

† If there existed, as in Zend, a śṛṛa, one might hence also derive the above gradations.
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expect in the superlative śray-िष्ठa, euphonic for srē-िष्ठa; and on this ground it is that Burnouf takes his objection. But as in Greek ἕκα-στος, ὑπό-στος (see p. 376), in spite of the want of the i of στος, 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-िष्ठa from sthi-ra, “fast,” sphē-िष्ठa from sphi-ra, “swollen,” and prē-िष्ठa 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 prē (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 excellent,” [G. Ed. p. 411.] “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 bōtyan, “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, béltiστος, should belong to this class, and the τ be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in bélt-τερος, βέλ-τατος, βελ would then give the middle step between भद्र bhad and mel. The ideal positive of βελτίων, namely ἀγαθός, might be connected with सगाय अगाधा “deep,” with which, also, the Gothic göðhs (theme
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góda) is to be compared, with ṣ, according to rule, for चा (§. 69.), and medials for Greek aspirates, according to §. 87.

299. From the strong theme ईयांस् ฤणिः, mentioned at §. 298., comes the nominative ṍणन्, with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through §. 94. The vocative has a short a, and sounds ṍ yan. To ṍ yan answers the Greek ṍων, and to the vocative ṍ yan answers ṍ on; to the neuter ṍ as (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 ν; hence accusative ṍ on-α for the Sanskrit ईयांस् ฤणिः-α, Latin ṍ or-em (iosis-em, §. 22.), genitive ṍ on-ος for ṍ as-ας, ṍ or-ις. However, one might, as Pott has already, I believe, noticed somewhere, reduce the contracted forms like βελτίω, βελτίοις, to an original ṍ oσα, ṍ oσες, ṍ oσας, corresponding to ṍ aनिस-ाम, ṍ aनि (neuter plural), ṍ aनिस-ας, ṍ aς-ας, 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 (Απόλλω, Ποσείδῶ, εἰκώ, ἀγόους, 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 ṍ is, the Greek, which was still less favourable to the νο-, has given up the latter, as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest, as it were, pre-Grecian period, forms like βελτίονσα. 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 ίων, ἰων; or if ἵορ and ἰων should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,* than that after the Greek ν the prototype of the Latin *r*, namely *σ*, has originally existed.

300. In Zend, the superlatives in अवृत्त 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 अवृत्त ista stands nearer to the Greek ἱστο-ς than the Indian इष्ठहा, and is completely identical with the Gothic ista, nom, ist'-s (§. 135.), as the Zend frequently exhibits *t* for the Sanskrit aspirates. The comparative form which belongs to ista is much more rare, but perhaps only on account of the want of occasion for its appearance in the authorities which have been handed down to us, in which, also, the form in *tara* can only scantily be cited. An example of the comparative under discussion is the feminine अवृत्तमय्येति masyēti, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere drawn attention.† It springs from the positive base

---

* Comp. § 20.
† Berl. Jahrb. 1831. I. p. 372. I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *γ* of the Sanskrit *ियसि* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *हे*, from भय *γρα: * after which the *ι* must have passed into *γ*, still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf.
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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 yehi is compared with the Sanskrit feminine base iyas, the loss of the i shews itself, and then the a has, through the power of assimilation of the y (§ 42.), become \( \acute{e} \), and \( s \) has, according to § 53., become \( h \). In the loss of the i the Zend coincides with the Sanskrit forms like sr\( \acute{e} \)-yas, mentioned at p. 397, with which, also, bh\( \acute{u} \)-yas, "more," and j\( \acute{y}d \)-yas, "older," agree. Greek comparatives with a doubled \( s \) before \( \omega \), as krei\( \acute{p} \)s\( \acute{o} \)w, br\( \acute{p} \)s\( \acute{o} \)w, el\( \acute{a} \)s\( \acute{o} \)w, are based on this; which, according to a law of euphony very universally followed in Pr\( \acute{a} \)krit, have assimilated the \( y \) to the preceding consonant, as elsewhere \( \acute{a} \)\( \lambda \)\( \lambda \)\( o \)s [G. Ed. p. 414.] from \( \acute{a} \)\( \lambda \)\( \lambda \)\( o \)s, Gothic al\( \lambda \)-ya-, Latin aliu-s, Sanskrit an\( \lambda \)ya, are explained (Demonstrative Bases, p. 20). In Pr\( \acute{a} \)krit, in the assimilations which are extremely common in this dialect, the weaker consonant assimilates itself to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; thus anna, "the other," from an\( \lambda \)ya, corresponds to the Greek \( \acute{a} \)\( \lambda \)\( \lambda \)\( o \)s; the Sanskrit tasya, "hujus," becomes tassa; bhavishyati, "he will be," becomes bhavissadi,* divya, "heavenly," divya; from

is simpler, and closer at hand, although the other cannot be shewn to be impossible; for it is certain that if the \( y \) of iyas had disappeared in Zend, it would fall to the turn of the preceding \( i \) to become \( y \).

* Comp. \( \acute{\iota} \)\( \sigma \)\( \sigma \)\( o \)m\( \alpha \) from \( \iota \)\( \sigma \)\( \sigma \)\( o \)m\( \alpha \), with \( \sigma \)\( \sigma \)\( a \)m\( \alpha \)i, in composition with attributive verbs. It may be allowed here preliminarily to mention another interesting Pr\( \acute{a} \)krit form of the future, which consists in this, that the Sanskrit \( s \) passes into \( h \), but the syllable \( \varsigma \) ya is contracted to \( \iota \), herein agreeing with the Latin \( i \) in eris, erit, amabis, amabit, &c.; as, karthisi, "thou wilt make," from karishyasi; sa\( \acute{h} \)himi, "I will endure," from sa\( \acute{h} \)\( \acute{h} \)\( h \)\( \acute{y} \)\( m \)i, instead of the medial form sa\( \acute{h} \)\( \acute{h} \)\( h \)\( y \)\( \acute{y} \)\( e \) (Urvasi, by Lenz. p. 59).
which it is clear that \( v \) is stronger than \( y \), as it also is more powerful than \( r \); hence \textit{sava} from \textit{sara}, “everyone.” It is remarkable that the \( i \) also of \( iii \) “thus” assimilates itself to the following \( t \); hence, \( iti \), which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding. Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form \( y\omega \), establish the assimilation from \( \gamma\omega \). As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into \( \sigma \) (\( \kappa\rho\varepsilon\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \), \( \beta\rho\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \), \( \beta\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \), \( \mu\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \), \( \varepsilon\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \), \&c.), to which the \( y \) has assimilated, the transition of \( \tau \), \( \delta \), \( \theta \), into \( \sigma \) need least of all surprise us (see §. 99.); but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Scelavonic 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. \textit{gryes-i} from \textit{gryech}, as \( \theta\alpha\sigma\sigma\omega \) from \( \theta\alpha\gamma\omega \), from \( \tau\alpha\chi \); \( g \) becomes \( \zeta \), e.g. \textit{prul\t} from \textit{prul\t}, as \( \mu\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\omega \), \( \delta\lambda\iota\varepsilon\omega \), from \( \mu\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\omega \), \( \delta\lambda\iota\varepsilon\omega \), from \( \mu\varepsilon\gamma \), \( \delta\lambda\gamma \); \( k \) becomes \( ch \), while in Greek \( k \) is modified in the same way as \( \chi \). On account of the contracted nature of the \( \zeta \) (\( =\delta\sigma \)) no assimilation takes place after it, but the \( y \) entirely disappears, or, in \( \mu\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\omega \), is pressed into the interior of the word (comp. §. 119.), as in \( \alpha\mu\varepsilon\iota\varepsilon\omega \), \( \chi\epsilon\rho\omega \), which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit \textit{\varth} \textit{adhara}, “the under \( (m) \),” consequently with apæresis of the \( a \) (comp. §. 401.). With the superlative \( \mu\varepsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\sigma\sigma \) compare the Zend \textit{\varshy} \textit{mazista}, where \( \zeta \) \( z \), according to §. 57., answers to the Sanskrit \( k \) of \textit{\varsh} \textit{mahat}, “great”; while in the above \( \varshy\mu\varepsilon\gamma\iota\sigma\sigma \) \( m\varshy\varepsilon\hbar \), as in the positive \textit{\varshy\varepsilon\hbar} (euphonically \textit{mah\hbar}), \( \zeta \) 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, mazydo, with which I hold to be a neuter comparative; thus, mazydo-videvo, "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, τερο-, 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 shows 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 connection 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-yd (from maz-yas), which we have become acquainted with above (p. 415 G. ed.) in the sense of "more."

"Remark.—There are some other comparative adverbs in is, of which, the first time I treated of this subject, I was not in possession, and which Grimm has since (III 589, &c.) represented as analogous to mais. He has however, afterwards, l. c. p. 88, agreed, with Fulda, in viewing hauhis, ἄνωτερον, as the genitive of the positive hauhs, "high." Yet hauhis stands in exactly the same relation to hauhiza, "the higher," that mais does to maiza, "major."
Compared with the Zend *maq-yó* and Greek μείζ-ων, one might believe the *z* in *maiza* belonged to the positive base, particularly as the Old High German adds a second comparative suffix to its adverb *mēr*, answering to the Gothic *mais* (*mērivo, ‘major*”) because in *mēr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Raichtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p. 88, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *spotius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rähtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rähtōr*. The comparative *ga-raichtōza, ‘justior*,” which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *raichtiza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ōza*; for, together with the comparative adverb *frumōzd, ‘at first*” (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumists*. Perhaps, however, the genius of the Old High German language has allowed itself to be deceived through the identity of the comparative suffix *is* with the genitive termination *i-s*; and taking some obsolete comparatives, which have been transmitted to it [G. Ed. p. 417.] for genitives, left them the *s*, which, in evident comparatives, must pass into *r*; but is also still retained as *s* in *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 *alles, as above (p. 414 G. ed.) ἀλλαζ*—in which the comparative termination, in the Latin *ali-ter* and similar adverbs, is to be observed. The probability that these forms, which, to use the expression, are clothed as genitives, are, by their origin, comparatives, is still further increased thereby, that together with *eines,*
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'semel,' and 'anderes, 'aliter,' there occur, also, forms in the guise of superlatives, namely, 'einst, 'once' (see Graff, p. 329), and 'anderest, 'again.' Some comparative adverbs of this sort omit, in Gothic, the i of is; thus min-s, 'less' (compare minor, minus, for minior, minius), perhaps vair-s, 'worse,' which is raised anew into vairsiza, 'pejor, and may be connected with the Sanskrit avara, 'posterusr as above xeiçow was compared with अवर adhara; seith-s, 'amplius' (from seithu, 'late'); and probably, also, suns, 'statim,' and anaks, 'subito.'"

302. The comparative-suffix is required in Gothic, where the consonant s is no longer capable of declension,* an un-organic addition, or otherwise the sibilant would have been necessarily suppressed. The language, however, preserved this letter, as its meaning was still too powerfully perceived, by the favourite addition an, which we have seen above, though without the same urgent necessity, joined to participial bases in nd in their adjective state (§. 289.). As, then, s comes to be inserted between two [G. Ed. p. 418.] vowels, it must, by §. 86. (5.), be changed into z: hence the modern theme MAIZAN, from the original MAIS, which has remained unaltered in the adverb. The nominative masculine and neuter are, according to §§. 140. 141., maiza, maiz6. On the other hand the feminine base does not develope itself from the masculine and neuter base MAIZAN—as in general from the unorganic bases in an of the indefinite adjectives

* A base in s, as the abovementioned 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 s, the latter must be rejected (comp. drus, "fall," for drus-s from drusa-s, §. 292. 1st Note). In the nominative and genitive singular, therefore, the form mais-s must have become mais; just as, in the nominative and accusative plural, where ahman-s comes from the theme 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.
ADJECTIVES.

no feminines arise—but to the original feminine base in ī, which exists in the Sanskrit and Zend, an ṅ is added, as in the participle present; thus MAIZEIN (ei = ī, §. 70.), from mais + eiṃ, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, əsəmī, and Sanskrit forms like गाँरीयसी garīyas-ī, from garīyas. The nominative maizei may then, according to §. 142., be deduced from MAIZEIN, or may be viewed as a continuation of the form in Zend and Sanskrit which, in the nominative, is identical with the theme (§. 137.); in which respect again the participle present (§. 290.) is to be compared. These two kinds of feminines, namely, of the said participle and the comparative, stand in Gothic very isolated; but the ground of their peculiarity, which Jacob Grimm, III. 566, calls still undiscovered (compare I. 756), appears to me, through what has been said, to be completely disclosed; and I have already declared my opinion [G. Ed. p. 419.] in this sense before.* The Old High German

* 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 ष s into ष श 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 ष श 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, l. 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 κων, as appears from §. 299., but before it; so that he wishes to divide thus μει-κων, as an abbreviation of μεγίκων; and regards the γ not as a corruption of the y, as Buttmann also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic ma-īza. The Greek εν, εν, 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 āṇs.
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, minnire, 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 ős, őz-an: it is, however more rare; but in the Old High German has become so current, that there are more comparatives in it in őro (nominative masculine), őra (nominative feminine and neuter), than in iro, ira, or ĕro, ĕra. The few forms in ÖZAN which can be adduced in Gothic are, svinþóza, "fortior" (nominative masculine), fróðóza, "prudentior," frumóza, "prior," hlasóza, "hilarior," garaihtóza, "justior," framaldróza, "profectior ætate," usdaudóza, "sollicitior," unsvikunþóza, "inclarior" (Massmann, p. 47), and the adverbs sniumundós, "σπουδαιοτέρως," and alyaleikós, "ετέρως." How, then, is the ĕ 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 iyãns or yâns (§§. 299. 300.), with ĕ, according to rule, for ṁa ď (§. 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, yâns has lost in the Gothic either the ď or the y (=j), which, when the ď is suppressed, must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic ős, őz, and still more the Old High German őr, correspond, therefore, exactly to the Latin őr in minor, minőr-is, for minior. There is reason to assume that, in the Gothic, originally y and ď existed in juxta-position to one another; and that for minniza, "the lesser," was used minnyóza, and for fróðóza, "the more intelligent," fródyóza.
The forms which have lost the \( y \) are represented in Latin by *minor*, *minus*, and *plus*, and those with \( o \) suppressed by *mag-is*. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in *ÖSTA*, nom. *öst-s*, corresponding to the comparatives in *öz*, *öz*; 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 *frumöza*, "prior," corresponds a *frumists*, "primus," not *frumösts*. To the remaining comparatives in *öza* the superlative is not yet adduced; but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with \( o \), 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 *lasivösts*, "*infirmissimus*" (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and *armösts*, "*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 *sut'-iza*, from *SUTU*\(^*\), "sweet";

\[ [G. \text{Ed. p. 421.}] \text{hard}^{-}-iza, \text{from } \text{HARDU}, \text{"hard";} \text{seith-s} \text{(thana-seiths, "amplius"), from } \text{SEITHU}, \text{"late";} \text{as in the Greek } \acute{\nu} \text{ðiów from } \text{"HΔγ}, \text{and in the Sanskrit } laghêyas \text{from } laghu, \text{"light."} \text{Ya} \text{is also rejected; hence } \text{spéd'-iza}, \text{from } \text{SPEDÝA}, \text{"late" (see p. 358, Note 7.); reik'-iza, from } \text{REIKÝA, "rich." One could not therefore regard the } \delta, \text{in forms like } \text{fródöza, as merely a lengthening of the } a \text{ in } \text{FRÔDA} \text{ (§. 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 } \delta \text{ given at §. 303, remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.}

\* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskrit *swádu-s* and Greek *ηóu-ς* lead us to expect a final *u*.  

---
305. In the Old Slavonic, according to Dobrowsky, p. 332, &c., the comparative is formed in three ways, namely,

(1) By masculine

, feminine

, neuter

; as,

, "the better (m.)"; 

, "the better (f.)"; 

, "the best (n.)" from a positive which has been lost, as

, melior, and

; and it is perhaps connected in its base with the latter, so that

may have become

(§ 255. a.), but

, as frequently occurs with

; and this

, with the preceding

, has become

.*

, "the lesser, (m.)" fem. menshi, neuter

, spring, in like manner, from a positive which has been lost. 

, "the greater," fem. boliši, neuter

, may be compared with the Sanskrit

, "the stronger" (p. 396), fem. baliyasā, neuter baliyas.† For [G. Ed. p. 422.] boliš is also used

; and all the remaining comparatives which belong to this class have

for

, and thus answer better to the neuter form

. If, as appears to be the case, the form

is the genuine one, then

answers to the Sanskrit

, bhū-yas, śrē-yas, &c. (§ 300.), and the loss of the

is explained by § 255. (l.): the final

of

, however, is the definitive pronoun (§ 284.), for comparatives always follow, in the masculine and neuter, the definite declension. In the feminine in

it is easy to recognise the Sanskrit

of

, or

, and herewith also the Gothic

 (oblique theme

, * The

 in

 appears to me to be privative; so that

 would seem to be a sister form to the Latin

, Gothic

, Slavonic

; and

 would properly signify "the not lesser," "the not more trifling." Perhaps this word is also inherent in

; so that

 for

 would be the negation, which, in Latin, appears as

; where it may be observed, that, in Sanskrit, a-sakrit, literally "not once," has taken the representation of the meaning "several times."

† The positive

, with

 for

 and

 for

, occurs only in this definite form (Dobr. p. 320); the primitive and indefinite form must be

. With respect to the stronger

 corresponding to the weaker letter

 (§ 255. a.), boliš, in the positive, answers to the manner in which vowels are strengthened in Sanskrit, as mentioned at § 293.
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p. 418 G. ed.; that is to say, bol-shi, "the greater (fem.)," corresponds to the Sanskrit बड़ीयति bāliyati, "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, ane, "better"; bole, "greater"—in Servian MSS. anye, bolye; [G. Ed. p. 423.] pache, "more," probably related to παχύς, πᾶσσων; 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 σ of πασσόν, for πασ-γον. The ch of pache may, according to p. 415 G. ed., be regarded as a modification of k, as the first σ of πασσόν has developed itself from χ. Thus the ζ of dol-ye, "longer" (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the γ of dolg, dolga, dolgo (longus, a, um), answers remarkably to the Greek ζ in μείζων, ολίζων, for μείγων, ὀλίγων. That, however, the positive dolg is connected with the Greek δολάχος needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskrit दीर्घे dirgha-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 vāiśas, nom. masc. vān for vāins, fem. vāshi, neuter vat (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-vshi, "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 vāiśas-am, as rurud-vāins-am, "eum qui ploravit."
to be noticed (§. 20.). The $i$ of $\delta\delta\lambda\iota\chi\omicron\varsigma$, however, shews itself, by the evidence of the Scyavonic and Sanskrit, to be an organic addition. Let $garyee$, "pejus," be compared with the Sanskrit $gar\bar{\iota}yas$, "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 $\beta\alpha\rho\dot{\psi}$ has permitted no euphonic reaction.

(2) The second, by far the most prevalent form of the Old Scyavonic comparative, is nominative masculine $shii$, 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 $shyo$, $shyc$, $shye$, as we have seen, p. 332, G. ed., the adjective base $SIN\bar{\iota}O$ (nominative $siny$), before its union with the defining $i$, contracted to $sini$ ($sini-i$, neuter $sine-e$ for $sinye-ye$). The definite feminine of $SIN\bar{\iota}O$ is $sinya-ya$; and as to the feminine comparatives not being $shya-ya$ but $sha-ya$, this rests on the special ground that sibilants gladly free themselves from a following $y$, especially [G. Ed. p. 424.] before a (Dobrowsky, p. 12); so in the feminine nominals $d\bar{u}sha$, $s\bar{u}sha$, $chasha$, for $s\bar{s}ya$, &c. (Dobr. p. 279). The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskrit $\varphi\varsigma$ $yas$ and Zend $\mathfrak{un}\mathfrak{u}d$ $yas$ (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 $\mathfrak{y}A$ in the themes $NIU\mathfrak{Y}A$, $NAU\mathfrak{Y}A$, "new," answering to $n\mathfrak{a}va$, $NOVU$, NEO, Scyavonic $NOVO$. 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, $\varphi\mathfrak{n}-shii$, "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 ya, since the said sibilants, as [G. Ed. p. 425.] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following y: hence blasch-aishii, "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 ôli'c-ow, for ôli'g-iov, ôli'-g-ow (p. 402): so tish-aishii, from tich (theme TICHO), "still,"‡ as in the Greek òpò-ow from òpòc. 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 ò u, according to §. 255. (c.); for example, tano-k, "thin," theme TANOKO, corresponds to the Sanskrit tamu-s, "thin," Greek raov; and slado-k to the Sanskrit swádu-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 òò-aiov and Gothic swàt-iza (§. 304.), far as the external difference may separate them; and to the Slavonic is due, as to the truer preservation of the fundamental word, the preference above the Greek and Gothic, although, on account of the unexpected transition of the v into l, the origin of the Slavonic word is more difficult to recognise.

† Dobrowsky says (p. 334) from 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 tushnîm, "still, silent," and refer to §. 255. (m.).
with yeĩ, yún-yeĩšii, "junior," from yún, may serve. Whence comes, then, the yeĩ or ai (for yaĩ), which distinguishes this formation from the second? It might be supposed that to the first formation in yeĩ, where, for example, also yún-yeĩ, "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 इयङ्गः iyāis, which forms, in the nominative masculine, iyān, and from this could be easily contracted to ìn. In Persian the comparative is formed through ter; as, behter, "the better," whence behterín, "the best." Now it deserves remark, that in Old Slavonic 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 mai = 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 yeĩ has not once laid aside the definitive pronoun i, which is foreign to the comparative; so that therefore in yún-yeĩ-shiĩ the said pronoun would be contained twice. There is, however, another way of explaining this yeĩšii or (y)aĩšii, namely, as an exact transmission of the Sanskrit āyäs 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 yeĩ,(y)aĩ, is embarrassing, if it be not assumed that it owes its origin to a transposition of the t of iyā.

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 āyäis, 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,
gerésnis, "the better" (m.), may serve, with which we would
compare the Sanskrit garīyānisam, "graviorem" (nominative
garīyān). It may be, but it is not of much consequence
to us, that gerésnis and garīyān (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
gerésnis, we must observe that gerésnis stands for gerésniae,
and the theme is clearly GERÉSNIA; hence genitive
gerésnio, dative gerésniam; as gēro, gerām, from gēra-s.

* In the Lith. comparative adverbs like daugiaus, "more," mazaus,
"less," I regard the u as the vocalization of the n; thus daugiaus from
daugiaus, 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 ēsimus.
The emphasis upon the e of gêresnis may be attributable to the original length in the Sanskrit strong theme garîyâns. Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian, even to the present day, continues to use the Sanskrit comparative suffix iyâns, or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend yâns.

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 GERAUΣIA, the nominative of which, however, in departure from gerésnis, has dropped, not the a, but the i; thus gerausa-s, gen. gerausio, and, in the feminine, gerasa, 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, twina, I have further to add, that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition यत ut; 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 ύς of το-τερος, το-τατος, with the unorganic spir. asp., as in ekáρερος, corresponding to the Sanskrit ekâtara-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-têma, 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, haitaitau, is of nasal origin.
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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 *eka*, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek *ekáthepos*, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base *e*, 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, कथाय स पुरुषः पार्थ तत्सुतः हति कः kathāi sa purushā Pārtha kan ghātayati hanti kah, “How can this person, O Pārtha, cause one to be slain,(or)slay one?” The Zend *aevā* is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs *eva*, “also,” “only,” &c., and *evam*, “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 *ō* into *u*, which latter is lengthened to make up for the *i* 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, *ānaviśhati*, “undeviginti,” *ānatriśhat*, “undetriginta.” This *ānas* could
not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of unus, or, more anciently, uno-s. The Greek 'EN is founded, it is highly probable, in like manner, on the demonstrative base एन एना, and has lost its final vowel, as the Gothic AINA, in the masculine nominative ains: with respect to the e for e compare ἐκάτερος. On the other hand, oinos, "unicus," if it has arisen from oinos compare oinos), as melΣω from melΣωνα, has retained the Indian diphthong more truly, and has also preserved the final vowel of एन एना. If oinos, the number one in dice, really has its name from the idea of unity, one might refer this word to the demonstrative base एन एना, Slavonic ONO (nominative on, "that"), which also plays a part in the formation of words, where ovη corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix and (feminine of the masculine and neuter anu), if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in ëna, as µονη to µàna. The Old Slavonic, yedin, "one," is clearly connected with the Sanskrit अदि, "the first," with य which has been prefixed according to §. 255. (n.); on the other hand, in the Lithuanian wiena-s, [G. Ed. p. 430.] if it is connected with the Gothic AINA and Sanskrit एन एना, an unorganic v has been prefixed. In regard to to the ie for ए ए compare, also, viest-te, "knowledge," with वेदमि 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 एक for एक एक, "one," which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§. 87.). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend wv ha of एक एक ha-kërél, "once" (Sanskrit सक्रिय sukrit), as the Zend wv h
stands, without exception, for the Sanskrit स, to which the h in Gothic never corresponds.* J. Grimm compares haihs with cæcus (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 (cæcus), 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 me, “eye,” in Sanskrit, which only occurs at the end of compounds; so that of the compounded अ kṣh only the first portion is left, while the Zend अष्टि ashi, “eye”—which, in like manner, I have found only at the end of compound words, as ईसिमसुरत् ēvas-ashim, “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 फिम from पञ्च pancha; fidwōr from छत्तर chatwār. But if the a of HAIHA is allotted to the numeral, which appears to me more correct, then the h in this word has not 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 ὅς), may be the Greek ἀ in ᾱ-πλοῦς,
disposition of the $h$ to $ai$ was already satisfied. We must further recall attention to the Latin $cocles$, in which, however, the notion of unity is evidently represented only by the $c$, for the $c$ must be left to the $o$ $cles$ as a derivative from $oculus$: $caecus$, however, if $ae$ 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, $HAUFA$, nominative abbreviated $haufs$; 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 जमिम $jagmima$, "we went," of the root गम $gam$, only $gm$ is left; and in the Greek, $πίπτω$ for $πιπέτω$, IIET, which corresponds to the Sanskrit पानि $pani$, "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 $tvans$ $fōtuns$ $habandin$, "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 चतुर 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 *selher*, 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, *laiba* 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 मेम/naēma, for *halb*, according to a euphonic law for *nêma*, 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 नेमा appears to me a very ingenious designation for a half, for it is a regular contraction of न न, “not,” and इम इमा, “this or that”; and the demonstrative therefore points at the “this or that” portion of the whole excluded by the negative न. In Sanskrit, हाल्ब is termed, among other appellations, सामि सामि, in which one recognises both the Latin semi and the Greek ἥμυ, 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 सामि may be viewed as a regular derivative from सम साम, “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 हाल्ब only one part of the whole, and, indeed, one equal to the deficient part, would be expressed, and the सामि सामि would be placed as ἐτερὸν over against the deficient ἐτερὸν; 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 ἥμυσις to ἥμυ, 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 स्व, “स्वस,” which, remarkably enough, in Zend enters into combinations with numerals with the meaning “part”; e.g. स्वस्सर में thri-shwa, “a third part,” स्वस्सर में chathru-shva, “a fourth part.” In the accusative these words, according to §. 42., are written ἡμὺ-σις thri-shû-m, ἡμὺ-σις chathru-shûm, of which the last member comes very near to the Greek συν of ἥμυσις. ἥμυ-σις means therefore, “having one equal part,” and the simple ἥμυ means only the equal. The Sanskrit designation of “the whole” deserves further to be mentioned, सकळस् 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 सकल sakala consists, though this is scarcely perceptible, of स su, "with," and कल kal, "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—सकल sakala expresses that in which the two parts are together. Thus the word समग्र samagra, "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, ὀκαλός, or ὀκέλος, or ὀκόλος; but from this the present ὀλος has rejected the middle syllallable, as is the case in κόρος, κούρος; compared with गुमरस kumāra-s, "a boy."

309. II. The theme of the declension is, in Sanskrit, dwa, which is naturally inflected with dual terminations: the Gothic gives for it tva, 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 tvaî, tvós, tva; dative tvaim; accusative tvans, thvós, tva.* The Sanskrit displays in the dual

* One would expect tvo, on account of the form being monosyllabic (§ 231.). In the genitive masculine and neuter I should look for tvi-zé, after the analogy of thi-zé, "horum," from THA, or tvaizé, 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 tvaddylē 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 tvaddyl-b belongs to a theme TVADDYÅ (as hary'-b from HARVÅ), and appears, from the ordinal number, which in Sanskrit is dwi-tiya for dwa-tiya, to have introduced itself into the cardinal number. From tvaddyē, 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 zueiō, according to Isid. zueiyē, as for from fidvor; also definite, zueiērō, which, in Gothic, would be tvaddyaizē. Grimm appears, on the other hand, to have
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no difference between the pronominal declension and the ordinary one, and "dwau is declined like vrikau (p. 274), dwé feminine like dháré (p. 283), and dwe neuter like dáné (p. 276). As, however, the notions of number are much akin to those of the pronouns; and as च य alpa, “a little,” forms, in the nominative plural masculine, च य alpé (§. 228.); so from the masculine theme dwa, if it had a plural, might be expected dwe, to which, according to §. 78., the Gothic tvai would correspond, which it is not requisite to regard like adjectives terminating similarly, as if compounded with a definite pronoun, espe-

cially as a genitive tvaicznie, which would make the latter view necessary, does not occur. To tvai corresponds, also, bai, “both,” from the theme BA, neuter ba, dative baim, accusative masculine bans, which is to be deduced through aphaeresis from the Sanskrit base ubha, Old Sclovonic oba (nominative and accusative dual), from the base OBO. In Zend the masculine of the number two is मंg dva (for dvā, §. 208.), with which the Old Sclovonic dva is identical, while the feminine neuter deye answers to the Sanskrit dve (§. 255. e.). The Zend neuter is duye, with euphonic y (§. 43.), and the v resolved into u. In the Greek and Latin ßώ, ßό, duō, the

have taken occasion, from the Old High German forms, to suppose a Gothic tvaiyé and tvaiainé, in which I cannot agree with him. The Old Northern, by exchanging the dental medials with gutturals, gives tvaggýa for the Gothic tvaddyé. In the accusative plural feminine is found, in Gothic, together with tvós also tvéihnós, which presupposes a masculine and neuter base TVEIHNA. fem. TVEIHNO; and in which the annexed HNA reminds us of the appended pronoun स्मİ sma, discussed at §. 165. &c., which, by metathesis, and with the alteration of the s into h, has in Prákrít and Páli taken the form mha (comp. §. 169.). On this Gothic TVEIHNA is based the Old High German nominative and accusative masculine zuéné with loss of the h. The feminine, however, appears in Old High German free from this addition, and is in the nomi-
native and accusative zuó, 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: ḍvā answers to the Vedic masculine dva (§. 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 dvi 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 dvi, which is represented by the native grammarians as the proper theme (comp. p. 102). The Greek, in which ḍt is inadmissible, gives in its stead δι; hence, διήτωρ = διημήτηδ d reimbatri (theme), “having two mothers.” The Zend and Latin agree in the corruption of this dvi very remarkably, in this point, that they have both dropped the d and have both hardened the v to b; hence ἐμπετίστανα, “with two nipples,” like biceps, bidens, and others. From this abbreviated ὑι, comes, in both languages, also the adverb ὑσ, “twice,” in contrast to the Sanskrit ḍvīs and Greek ὑς: the Greek ὑ, however, in compounds, cannot be regarded as an abbreviation of ὑς, as is wont to be done. The German dialects, with exception of the Old High Germ-[G. Ed. p. 486.] man, require, according to §. 87., τυ for ὑ, as the initial member of compounds; this is furnished by the Anglo-Saxon in compound words like τυ-fête, “bipes,” τυ Finger, “duos digitos longus,” τυ-hive, “bicolor.” The Old High German gives zui (=zwi) or qui; e.g. zui-beine, “bipes,” qui-falt, “duplex” (Grimm III. 956.). The adverb zuiro, more fully zuiro, also quiro, “twice,” belongs, according to its formation, but not without the intervention of another word, to the above ḍvīs, ὑς, bis; but it is clear, from the Old Northern τυ-is-var, that ro has arisen from suv by apocope of the a and vocalization of the v, perhaps more
anciently to u, and thence to o (§. 77.) as in dēo (also diu), "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 द्विस dvis, ḍīs, and चिस tris, ṭpīs, but the annexed var corresponds to the Sanskrit substantive vāra, which signifies period and time; hence ēkavāra, "once" (see Haughton), and vāramvāram, " repeatedly." Hence comes the Persian bār, e.g. bār-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 mēriro, 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 ḍṛiṛ, from ḍriṣ, 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 Pàli, § 226.): hence the genitive \( thrīy-\dot{e} \), and nominative neuter \( thrīy-\dot{a} \) (§. 233.). Besides these, the dative \( thrī-\dot{m} \) and the accusative \( thrī-\dot{n} \) may be cited. The Sanskrit forms the genitive from an extended theme \( traya \), hence \( trayā-\dot{m}× \); while the Zend \( thry-a\dot{m} \) or \( thray-a\dot{m} \) 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 \( tisar \) (१िस १िस, §. 1.), the \( a \) of which, in the Sanskrit nominative, accusative, and vocative, is irregularly suppressed; hence १िस१िस for \( tisaras, Zend \) १िस१िस tisarō.

[G. Ed. p. 438.] 311. IV. The Sanskrit feminine theme चतसर् चतसर् (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 \( tasr-as \), 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 \( dri\dot{e} \) in Isidor, which belongs to a theme \( DRIA \), with pronominal declension. The feminine \( dri\dot{o} \), from the base \( DROI \), of the same sound, presupposes in like manner a masculine and neuter theme \( DRIA \).

† In the accusative, \( tisras \) is more organic than १िस१िस tisrīs, as it must stand according to the common rule (comp. § 242.).
the syllables \textit{tasa} in the theme \textit{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, 
\textit{chatwār} chatwār as the strong theme, and \textit{chatur} chatur as the weak†; hence, nom. masc. chatwār-as, accus. chatur-as, nom. accus. voc. neut. chatwār-i: the gen. masc. and neut. is irregularly chatur-\textit{a}-\text{ám} for chatur-\text{ám}, since, according to the analogy of bases terminating with a vowel, a nasal

* Only in three might one perhaps think of the Sanskrit root \textit{trī}, "trans-predi," 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 \( \textit{chatw\text{\^}r} \), according to §. 47.; hence, nom. masc. \( \textit{chatw\text{\^}rd} \); and the weak theme is, by transposition, \( \textit{chatru} \); as, \( \textit{chatru-m\text{\^}hm} \), “four months” (accus. sing.), Vend. S. p. 248. For the Sanskrit genitive चतुर्याम, we find चतुर्यानम (1. c. pp. 204 and 206, with a inserted, चतुर्यानम); but in the beginning of compound words it is more frequently found चतुर्यानम; so that the weakening consists merely in the shortening of the \( d \), and, according to §. 44., an \( e \) is added to the \( r \); as चातुर्यानम-पातिस्याद, “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 \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}r} \), and aspirates for smooth letters, according to §. 57. This \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}r} \) is based on the strong theme चतुर्यानम, but in the state of declension extends the theme by an unorganic \( i \), hence dative \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}ri-m} \), the only adduceable case. In Old Northern the nom. masc. is \( \textit{fi\text{\^}ri-r} \).

[G. Ed. p. 440.] The original theme \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}r} \) appears in the compound \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}r-tiguns} \), “forty” (accus.): on the other hand, \( \textit{fidur} \) in \( \textit{fidur-d\text{\^}gs} \), “four days,” is referable to the Indian weak theme त्रु; whence, however, it should not be said that the weak theme of the German, Lithuanian, and Scelavonic 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 \( \textit{fidv\text{\^}r} \) to \( \textit{fidur} \)—like ठिव-“servant,” from ठिव-स, gen. ठिवि-स—as for the Sanskrit to abbreviate चतुर्यानम to चतुर. The Lithuanian theme follows the example of abbreviation in its interior, but extends the theme at the end; the masc. nom. is केतु, and the feminine केतुि: KETURIA serves the latter as theme: the masculine केतुि is analogous with \( \textit{ger} \), “the good” (see p. 251, Note †), and therefore has KETURIE, euphonic for KETURIA, as its base. The genitive and
ACCUSATIVE masculine keturi-û, keturi-s, proceed from the base KETURI. The Old Slavonic 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 numberchetverti, stand in closer agreement with the Indian strong theme chaturá: the Latin quatuor, also, which, in disadvantageous comparison with the cognate languages, has lost the capability of declension, and the Greek τέσσαρες, τέταρτες, rests on the strong chaturas; so that τέταρτες, just like the Pâli form chattáro, has gained its last i by assimilatson of the semi-vowel. The Prâkrit form, also, which I am not able to quote, will scarcely be other than chattáro (comp. §. 300 p. 414 G. ed.). With regard to the initial r let reference be made to §. 14., by which this r is accommodated with the Æolic πινυπης, which refers itself to the weak theme chatur. With the Zend transposition of the weak theme to chathru (p. 439 G. ed.), at the beginning of compounds, agrees surprisingly the Latin quadrupes and other words. The adverbal s, by which द्विस divis, “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 chaturas. That the latter has originally existed one learns from the Zend transposed form πανχατρα 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 पचन panchan, Zend پانچ panchan, Lithuanian penki, Greek πέντε, Æolic πέμπε, Gothic penkios, and holds
fimf,* Latin quinque, Old Slavonic pytcty.† The Sanskrit-Zend panchan is the theme, and the genders are not dis-
[G. Ed. p. 442.] tinguished in this and the following num-
bbers; hence the nominative, accusative, and vocative have always singular neuter forms (therefore pancha, according to §. 139.): the other cases shew plural terminations; as, geni-
tive पञ्चानाम panchānām, Zend 𐅙𐅙𐅙𐅙𐅙 panchanaŋm (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 remark-
able that not one of the European languages will at all recog-
nise the final nasal, while, nevertheless, that of saptan.
navan, and dāsan is found also in Gothic and Lithuanian; and in Lithuanian, also, that of अष्टन ashtan, "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 addi-
tion of an i must be expected, as in FIDVORI; 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 saîhs, "six," sibun, "seven," ahtau, "eight," and taihun, "ten," only uninflected, and therefore without the unorganic i; but from niun, "nine," comes the genitive niur-ā, which indeed might also have proceeded from a theme NIUN or NIUN a, but which I doubt not comes from NIUNI.

† The theme is PYATI, and is inflected like KOSTI (p. 348), and with singular terminations; so that one has to look upon this num-
cral 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 PYATI to panchan, we must observe, that of the latter, in Slavonic, only the syllable pa is represented by pyt (§. 225. n.); but TI is a derivational suffix, as in SHESHTI, "six," DEVYTATI, "nine," and DESYTATI, "ten," and corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix ti in the multiplied numbers višatī, "twenty," šašṭi, "sixty," &c.
before a nasal originally there, while it has preferred
weakening the same to e before other consonants; hence
\( \epsilon \tau \nu \psi \alpha (\mu, \upsilon) \), \( \epsilon \tau \nu \psi \alpha \upsilon \), but \( \epsilon \tau \nu \psi \epsilon (\tau) \); \( \tau \tau \nu \nu \psi \phi \alpha (\mu \iota) \) but \( \tau \tau \nu \psi \phi \epsilon (\tau \iota) \); and so \( \epsilon \pi \tau \alpha \), \( \epsilon \nu \nu \epsilon \alpha \), \( \delta \epsilon \kappa \alpha \): not \( \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \), however, but \( \pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \).

It might therefore well be assumed, that the nasal in Indo-
Zend numerals is a later addition, but that \( \chi \alpha \) is the par-
ticle signifying "and," which, in the number four, we have
taken for the prefix (§. 311.). In Latin, also, \textit{quinque} is, in
regard to its termination, similar to words connected with
the particle \textit{que}, as in \textit{\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon} the enclitic \textit{\tau \epsilon}, which is akin to \textit{\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \epsilon} and \textit{\chi \alpha} (see §. 14.) appears to be contained.

This being the case, I would prefer regarding \textit{\p a n} in \textit{\p a n \p a n c h a}
as euphonic for \textit{\p a m}, and the \textit{\m} as a neuter case-sign; but
the \textit{\p a} which remains over as a pronoun, and indeed as
identical with the \textit{\k a} which occurs in the number one (§. 308),
in regard to which one might advert to the [G. Ed. p. 443.]
old Latin \textit{p i d p i d} for \textit{\k u d q u i d}, \textit{\p o \i o \s} for \textit{\k o \i o \s}, &c. Five would,
therefore, literally mean "and one," and in fact that one
which is to be added to four. 

314. VI. Sanskrit \textit{\m \s h a \s h}, Zend \textit{\a m \m \m \a \o \s v a \s}, Lithu-
anian \textit{s z e s z i}, Old Slavonic \textit{s h e s t y} (theme \textit{S H E S}
\textit{H T I}, p. 430, Note †), Gothic \textit{s a i h s} (see §. 82.), Latin \textit{s e x}, Greek \textit{\dot{e} \xi}. One
may justly suppose that the guttural which begins the
Zend word has also existed in Sanskrit, for instance, \textit{\m \p}.

* Ag. Benary, who likewise recognises in \textit{\p a n \c h a} the particle "and,"
seeks to compare the preceding syllable with \textit{\p a \n i}, "hand" (Berl. Jahrb.
1833. 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 \textit{d i g i t u s}
and \textit{\d a \k r \nu \lo s} with the number "ten," and our "finger," Gothic \textit{\f i g g r a}
\((=\text{fingers})\), theme \textit{F I G G R A}, with \textit{\f u n f} (\textit{\f i m f}); so that in this word no
transition of the guttural organ into the labial has taken place. I do not
think it probable that \textit{f i n g e r} in named from \textit{\f a n g e n}, "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
(\textit{\d e i \k r \nu \mu i}).
ks'hnsh, for śh 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 समन् saptan, Zend ḫapīn, nominative and accusative सम sapta, ḫapī (see §. 313.), Greek ἑπτά, Latin septem, Lithuanian septini, 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,” dasama-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 अष्टन् ashtan or अष्टो asl ūu; from the former the nominative and accusative ashta, from the latter again ashtā; Zend ḫastan, nominative ḫast osta, Lithuanian asztāni, Gothic ahtau, Greek ὧκτο, Latin octo, Old Sclavonic osmy (theme OSMI). The Sanskrit ashtāu and the analogous ὧκτο appear, as it were, in a dual dress (see §. 206.); nevertheless, ashtāu is, in my opinion, just as much as ashtan, 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 ashtas, according to the analogy of §. 206. From अष्ट oṣhtāu comes, by suppression of the last element of the diphthong, ashtā-bhīs, oṣhtā-bhyas, ashtā-su, as rd-bhīs, &c., from rāi, “thing,” “riches,” while ashtāu, in the cases mentioned, forms regularly ashtabhīs, ashta-
bhyas. aṣṭāsa (comp. p. 304). The genitive has only one form, namely, चश्नान्तः aṣṭāndm. The strength of the du of aṣṭāsa is preserved, also, in the cognate languages, and indeed in the Latin octav-us, Greek ὁγος for ὁγοφ-ος, and in German forms ahtowe-n, dative, according to Notker the cardinal number from ahtowi-m, from the theme AHTOWI. But if aṣṭāsa 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 नवन् nava, Zend [G. Ed. p. 445.] नवन्य 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 ἐνεα, Lithuanian de巫ni, Old Scavonic devyaty (theme DEVYATI) 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 βρόσος and चूतस् mritas, “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 aṣṭāsa, 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 द्वां दा््श, 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 श 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, श is found; for aśman "a stone," nominative aśmā, is, in Lithuanian, AKMEN, nominative akmū (§. 130.) and in Old Sclavonic KAMEN, nominative 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 द्वमदसि, dwāḍaśa, चतुर्दशिन, chaturdasaś, &c.; Zend एवंदासि, aevandasa; Greek ἑνδέκα, δώδεκα, τρικαίδεκα, τεσσαρεσ- [G. Ed. p. 447.] καίδεκα; Latin undecim, duodecim, tredecim, quatuordecim; Lithuanian vienolika, dwylika, irylika, keturdlika; Gothic āilf{i (C. XV. 5.), tvalif,] Old Sclavonic četyrinadesyafy, "fourteen," puainadesyafy, "fifteen," &c.

* These may be deduced from the ordinals aevandasem, dvadasem (Vend. S. p. 120). So also chathrudasa, "fourteen," panchadaśa, "fifteen," from chathrudasa, "the fourteenth," panchadaśa, "the fifteenth." The nasal in aevandaśa appears to have proceeded from m, and to be an accusative sign, for the whole stands l. c. in the accusative (aevandasém). By this doubt is thrown on the aevandaśa given above, and perhaps aevódaśa, or, according to the original principle of the compound, aevadaśan might be expected. In one other passage, indeed, occurs the nominative of the ordinal aevandaśa (l. c. p. 230): it is, however, clearly a false reading and the sense requires the accusative, as governed by aevandaśem frasnaoítit, which Anquetil renders by a atteint; thus, ἑνδέκα ἑνδέκα aevandesem frasnaoítiti, "decimum attingit"; and in the following analogous constructions the ordinal number also stands always in the accusative. The form aevandaśem, from aevandasaśem, 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 tvai 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. Tvai 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 dvad, which is a lengthening of the theme dwa, as éka from éka.
NUMERALS.

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 \( fidvör \) to the Lithuanian \( keturi \) and Latin \( quatuor \) becomes explicable—the \( daśan \) contained in \( ekā-dāśan \) "eleven," and \( dwā-dāśan \), "twelve" (from \( dakun \)), may have passed, in Gothic, into \( LIBI \). Through the dative \( tva-libi-m \), genitive \( tva-libi-ē \), \( LIBI \) is preserved, in fact, as the true theme; so that each \( a \) of \( dasan \) is weakened to \( i \). The \( f \) of

[\( \text{G. Ed. p. 448.} \)] the uninflected \( tvalif \) is, therefore, not to be explained according to §. 87., but according to §. 93.\(^a\); 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 \( fidvör \), not \( fithvör \). The Latin \( quadraginta \), also, for \( quatraginta \), and the Greek \( ὀγδώος \) 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 \( taïхun \), we may remark, that, in French

\* The Anglo-Saxon \( endleofan, endluofan \), compared with \( twelf \), and the Old Friesian \( andluva \) with \( twilif \), 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 \( sefon \) (Old Friesian \( siugon \)) to the Sanskrit \( sapta\)N, Gothic \( sibun \). Let, then, the Old Friesian \( o \) of \( lova \) be regarded like that of \( siugon \). To the Sanskrit \( chatwdr \), Gothic \( fidvör \), correspond the Anglo-Saxon \( fæower \), 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 eif 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 dreif, vierlf, or similar forms in if, 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 ἕνδέκα, δώδεκα, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of τρισκαίδεκα (for τρίδεκα) is “thrice and ten,” and the numeral adverb τρίς, instead of the bare theme τρι, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the ἑπτάκαιδεκα, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit chatur-daśan, not chatvāras-daśan (chatvāro-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-lica, not trys-lica. 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 desimt'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 déka resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian lika, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic libi and the French ze in onze, douze, &c., from the old compound which has been handed down; and cannot, therefore, be censured for its want of agreement with the simple number ten: it is no longer conscious of its meaning, and, like an inanimate corpse, is carried by the living inferior number. As, however, the smaller number in these compounds is still living, so that in the feeling of the speaker the numbers wieno-lica, dwy-lica, &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-lica, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from रक्षाद्वासन् ékā-daśan, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic ainli, in Greek ἑυδέκα, 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, déka is almost entirely the Sauskr̥t dwā-daśa.
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(ω for δ, according to §. 4.), and is as similar to it as possible, as ν (F) in Greek cannot be pronounced after consonants, and in the first syllable, also, could not assimilate itself to the preceding consonant (compare τέτταρες from τέτταρες), for δέκα could not be uttered. In Latin, duodecim has formed its first member exactly after the simple form: on the other hand, the French has paid no regard to the form in which the preceding number appears in its isolated state, but has left the composition entirely in the old form, only with the abbreviations which time has by degrees introduced. With reference to the isolated state of the smaller number, it would have been, perhaps, necessary in French to have said unze, deuze, troize, &c. After what has been stated, I think no one can any longer doubt, that in our elf (elf) and zwölf, strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with dasan, déka, and zehn. If, however, the older LIBI, lif, and Lithuanian lika, be regarded without the suspicion arising, that in them corrupt though very common permutations of sounds may have preceded, then one would propose in Lithuanian a root lik, and in Gothic lif or lib (Gothic af-lifnan, "relinqui, superesse," laibōs, "reliquiae"), which both signify "to remain," and are also connected with each other and with the Greek λείπω (ΑΙΙ). Grimm, who has recognised (II. 946) the original identity of our lif and the Lithuanian lika, has perhaps allowed himself to be led astray by Ruhig in the meaning of these expressions, and deduces the latter from likti, "linqui, remanere," the former from leiban, "manere." Ruhig, according to Mielcke, p. 58, holds lika for the 3d person plural, since he says, "Composition in the cardinal numbers from ten to twenty takes place by adding the 3d person plural number present indicative lika (from likā s. liekmi); scil., the tenth remains undisturbed with the simple number, e.g. one, two, &c.; which addition, however, in composition degenerates into a declinable noun of the feminine gender, according to which, also, the preceding
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-desyatj, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are yedinyi-na-desyatj, "the first over ten," vtoryi-na-desyatj, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian —accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in whichweenpazmit signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the d(e)s of desmit, "ten," to z, and overleaping the e. This procedure in Lettish has no doubt originated from the older liku 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 Prakrit 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 elfj; zwolf, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.
subject, was not yet known to me, and which has been since then observed by Lenz in his edition of Urvasi (p. 219). In this dialect, then, the number ten is pronounced simply दह daha—approaching closely to the Gothic tailhun—but at the end of the compounds under notice raha: r and l, however, are, according to § 17., most intimately connected. Hitherto only, बारह vāraha, "twelve," from छादः dwādāsa, and छठ्ठारह aṭṭhāraha, "eighteen," from छठ्ठास aṣṭṭādāsa, 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, bāraḥ.

* 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 Unquo, Lithuanian likū, Greek λειπω (λιπω), Gothic of-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 lih, "to lick." Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin lingua, Greek λείπω. Gothic of-li-f-na, to the Skr. root rikh, from rik, "to leave."† The text has des and reh but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstānī numerals which follow.—Translator.
"twelve," answers to the abovementioned Prākrit बारह bāraha, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form द्वादश dwādasa, 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.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

**HINDŪSTĀNĪ.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>हन</th>
<th>सन्स्कृत, नोमिनेटिव</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>एक</td>
<td>एकादश 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दो</td>
<td>द्वादश 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तीन</td>
<td>त्रयोदश 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चार</td>
<td>चतुर्दश 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाँच</td>
<td>पंचादश 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चाह</td>
<td>सोलह 16†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सात</td>
<td>सप्तदश 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अष्ट</td>
<td>अष्टदश 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>नौ</td>
<td>अनविनशति (&quot;undeviginti&quot;) 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दस</td>
<td>बिस 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by शति sati, चतु ति chātuṭi; in Zend by ṣάतί saiti, ṣात् sata, or ṣो 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 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 chāuddo; but, as a general rule, the Bengāli in these compounds changes the d into r, and in all cases suppresses the Hindūstānī h; as ēgāro, "eleven," bāro, "twelve," tēro, "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 shōlo.
dependent upon it. Occasionally, too, one finds these numerals in Sanskrit used adjectively, with plural endings. Compare,

\[\text{SANSKRIT.} \quad \text{ZEND.} \quad \text{GREEK.} \quad \text{LATIN.}\]

20, विसाति visāati, Ṛṣmmyā viśaili, εἴκατι, viginti,
30, विसात trisāt, mhaṃcjo thrīsata, τριάκοντα, triginta.
40,chatwārinīsāt,chatwārēśāt,τεσσαράκοντα, quadraginta.
50, panchāsāt, panchāsata, πεντήκοντα, quinquaginta.
60, sāṣṭī, csvasti, ἕξηκοντα, sexaginta.
70, saptātī, ἕπτακοντα, septuaginta.
80, asītī, ὀκτάκοντα, octoginta.
90, navatī, navaiti, ἑνενήκοντα, nonaginta.
100, sata-m, sāte-m, ἑκατόν, centu-m.

"Remark.—I hold sāti, sāt, sāta, ti, to be abbreviations of daśati, daśat, daśata, and therefore derivations from daśan, "ten," by a suffix ti, ta, or t: the former is

* The numerals in sāta, answering to the Sanskrit forms in sat, 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 sātem might also belong to a theme sāt. That, however, sāta is the theme and the neuter form is clear from Vend. S. p. 230. (in the 7th Fargard), where pancha sātem (panchāsātem), "fifty," stands as nominative. From csvati, "sixty," haptātī, "seventy," and navaiti, "ninety," we find the accusative csvastim, haptātīm, navaitīm: on the other hand, in the 12th Fargard, occurs several times viśaiti (also written viśati and viṣati) as accusative of viśaiti, which perhaps is a dual neuter form (two decades), and according to this would stand for viśai (§. 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, ὀκτάκοντα, for the latter Ion. ὀκτάκοντα. In ἑνενήκοντα the two ν are separated from each other: the epic form ἑννήκοντα is more genuine.
in Lithuanian and Sclavonic, already contained in the simple *deszimt's, deszimitis*, Old Sclavonic *desyaty*. With regard, however, to the ten being expressed without abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in compounds, also—as in Lithuanian *duideszimti* (or *tis*), “twenty,” *trydszimti* (or *tis*), “thirty,” and in Old Sclavonic *chetryridesyaty*, “forty,”* pyatydesyaty, “fifty”—I do not consider 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 deszimitis*, “forty,” *penkios deszimitis, “fifty”; in which it is surprising that deszimitis, 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, fidvortiguns, fimftiguns*, genitive *thriyétigve*. 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, kontra*, 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 *duḍḍaśa-s*, “the twelfth.” To this *daśu-s*, therefore, is related *tigu-s* in regard to its *u*, as *fōtu-s* to *pāda-s*, “a foot.” In the numbers seventy, eighty, and ninety, ten is denoted by the neuter

* Twenty and thirty do not occur.
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substantive tēhund (theme TEHUNDA, genitive tēhundi-s) hence sibun-tēhund, "seventy," ahtau-tēhund, "eighty," niun-tēhund, "ninety." The etymology of this TEHUNDA stands as the representative of the ai of taihun, and I hold DA to be the ordinal suffix, which has introduced into the common ordinals another unorganic N, or, according to Grimm, follows the weak declension; hence TAIHUNDAN, nominative taihunda, "decimus." Hereby, then, it becomes still more probable that the abovementioned tigus also is originally an ordinal number. In our New German this word has transformed itself to zig or ssig (dreissig), and is found also in siebenzig, achtzig, neunzig, Old High German sibunzog, ahtozog, niunzog, or -zoc, and zēhanzog (zoc), Gothic taihuntehund, "a hundred." The Sanskrit-Zend sāta, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative शतस् षतम् षतेम्—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. शतिः षति, षत् षत्, and the Zend मृष्टव्य षता 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 κατὸν (έκατὸν is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin centum, Lithuanian szimta-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-hunda, thria-hunda, zwei-hunt, drie-hunt, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also षतिः षति, षत् षत्, and the corresponding words

* In Zend āta occurs frequently for āta, 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 विनोति viṇोति, विनोति viṇोति, विकती विकती, विकोत, विकित, 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 द 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 बिस from द्विस, and ब from द्वि, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of विनोति viṇोति, the Prākṛt dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the द in the number twelve also (वराहा for dwराहा). 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 शा of विनोति viṇोति. The Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word दासति to be melted down to the derivation suffix ति, and this ति corresponds to the French टे of trente, quarante, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, चौषद्विती (ति euphonic for ति), च्छवाति čvāati. To the शति of विनोति viṇोति, विनोति, regularly corresponds the Doric कατί of eिकατ, while in the Latin गिन्ति the smooth [G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in गिंता=कोव्या of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the श of viṇोति,
triṃśat, chatwārinśat, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin gīnti, ginta, centum, and in the Gothic HUNDA, "one hundred," it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, chatwārinśat shews its relation to the neuter chatwārī (see §. 312.); as also tria, teṣṣāra, in triākοντα, teṣṣārākοντα, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in triā, and originally, also, in teṣṣāra, as the Ionic teṣṣārīκοντα, Doric tetrapοκοντα,* Latin quadraginta, prove. These forms excite the conjecture, that, in Sanskrit, the introduction of the nasal may, contrary to the explanation attempted above, have the same object that, in Greek, the lengthening of the termination has, namely, an emphatic repetition of the prefixed number, which is also perceptible in the long i of the Zend viśaiti, as in the long a of panchāsat, eξημμενον panchāḍaṭem from panchaṇ (§. 318.), and to which again the length of πεντήκοντα, quinquaginta, runs parallel. The Zend chathuwarē, in *eξημμενον chathuwarēsata, "forty" (Vend. S. p. 380), is likewise stronger than cha-thru-śata, which might have been expected from §. 312. As *aγαςata is a neuter, to which, in Greek, κατον or κοντον would correspond, koντα therefore, and the Latin gīnta, are best explained as neuters in the plural, by which the neuter nature of triā and teṣṣāra is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in eξήκοντα, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that eξη, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare eξά-κις, eξαπλοῦς, and the remarks on πάντα and πολλά, p. 401, G. ed.

---

* The o for a is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the ρ, teτρος answers to teτρα in teτρακίς, teτραπλοῦς, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.
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321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are [G. Ed. p. 468.] 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 𐭍𐐶𐐹𐐸𐐸 frathēmō (§. 56b.), Latin primus-s. Lithuanian prima-s, Gothic frum′-s (for fruma-s, §. 135.), or indefinite fruma (theme FRUMAN, §. 140.), or, with newly-added superlative suffix, frumis′-s, Old High German frilstér, usually indefinite ēristo (from the adverb ēr, "before"), Greek πρῶτος, Old Slavonic pervyj. प्रथम prathama, from the preposition pra, has been already discussed (p. 393 G. ed.); so the Greek πρῶτος is derived from the corresponding preposition πρό, the lengthening of which to πρῶ agrees with the Sanskrit prā in prātar, "in the morning" (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix TO is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit tama or thama, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चातुर्षेष chatur-tha-s, "the fourth," and पञ्छ शश्तह thā-s, "the sixth," as also in Latin in the form of TU in quartus, quintus, sextus, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δεύτερος, ἕβδομος, and ὑπόδοος. In Lithuanian the corresponding TA of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with septintas, asztuntas, occur also sēkmas, āszmas, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तम् saptama-s, अष्टमस् aṣṭama-s, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix ṭama or thama has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चम पञ्चामास 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 𐐶𐐸𐐸𐐶𐐶 haptathō agrees more with septintas than with सप्तम saptama-s and septimu-s; and
that also ἑάνα pug-dhó, "the fifth," belongs more to the European cognate languages, in which it comes nearest to the Lithuanian penk-ta-s. The Lithuanian, however, is more true to the original form, as its sister, the Zend, has softened two original smooth letters, as [G. Ed. p. 459.] in Greek, ὥκτος for ὅκτος; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, basta from bandh), and irregularly changed the ὀ to υ, as in "ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख nakha, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दशम dasama, दशेम dašäma, and of all the derivational suffix only the ὀ is left, before which the ὀ of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादशा dvādaśa, चतुर्दशा chaturdaśa, "the twelfth"; चतुर्दशा chaturdaśa, "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 octau-us, ὥκτος(όσ), where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὥκτομος, 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 limu-s = तमस tama-s); thus vicesimus or vige-
NUMERALS.

[G. Ed, p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus, as in Sanskrit viṁśatitama-s, triṁśatlama-s.* In Latin, however, the termination nli or nta of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of ē. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit निः ishtha, in the ordinal numbers like εικοστός, τριακοστός, with the loss of the i of ιστος, as in ἕκαστος, πόστος. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the τι, στ, and ντα of the cardinal number are rejected. The German languages employ in like manner the superlative suffix in numbers from twenty upwards: hence, Old High German drī-zugöstō, "the thirtieth," fīor-zugöstō, "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 चतुर्थं chaturtha-s, τέταρτο-ς, quartu-s, ketwir-taş. The N, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 235.), 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. fimfsta.†

[G. Ed. p. 461.] 322. From the weakened base द्वि dvi "two" (p. 424), and from the त्रि tri, "three," contracted to त्रि lrière, the Sanskrit forms the ordinal numbers by a suffix tiya; hence dvi-tiya-s, tritiya-s. This suffix is easily recognised in the Latin ler-

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of ḍuḍāka-s, "the eleventh"; hence, also, viṁśa, triṁś-a, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like fimfstaḥhunda, "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 fimfsta is here the regular abbreviation of the theme FIMFTAN, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Borl. Ann. May 1827. p. 750), bases in n, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the n in the beginning of compounds.
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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 chetvertyi and others, in which, in like manner, a connection with तीय tiya might be easily conjectured, is, in fact, connected with the च ठा, TO, TU of चुन्ये chaturtha, τέταρτος, quartus, 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 chetvertyi, shestyi, have to chaturtha-s, shaśṭha-s, sedmyi, osmyi, have to चस्म सप्ताम, चस्म अष्टाम; and peryi, "the first," to पूर्व pūrva, "the former;" which expressions, in Sclavonic, remain only in combination with the pronominal base YO (§. 282.). The Zend has rejected the of the suffix tiya, and abbreviated dwi to bi; hence मसह बिया, मसह थ्रिया, in which it is to be remarked that the y, which is thus by syncope united with the t at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend tya corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle i, the Gothic DYAN (from dya, §. 285.) in THRIDYAN, nom. masc. thridya, the y of which in the Old High German dritto, has assimilated itself to the preceding t, in analogy with the Prākṛit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρείττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριττός: (δισσός, τρισσός), which are evidently, in [G. 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 thriyda. Regarding tvaddye, "duorum;" see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun anther (see p. 377), Old High German andar, Middle High German ander. Our zweiter, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Sclavonic स्तोर्यि (see §. 297.)
answers, in respect to its derivation, to the Greek δευτερος, and, in abbreviation of the base, to the Zend bitya, only that it has lost also the i of the Sanskrit dwi-līḍa, in regard to which we have, in §. 297, adverted to the Zend ḫwai b-yārē*, "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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Gr. Dor.</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Old Slavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prathama</td>
<td>fratīme</td>
<td>piwrtā</td>
<td>prima</td>
<td>fruma</td>
<td>pirmā</td>
<td>perva-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwitiya</td>
<td>bitya</td>
<td>devrēpā</td>
<td>altera</td>
<td>anthara</td>
<td>antrā</td>
<td>vōra-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tritiya</td>
<td>thritya</td>
<td>trīrā</td>
<td>tertia</td>
<td>thridyē</td>
<td>irēchīa</td>
<td>treti-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaturthi</td>
<td>tūrīya</td>
<td>tetrārā</td>
<td>quarta</td>
<td>(fēvōrdō')</td>
<td>kētevīrā</td>
<td>cheīvērta-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panchamā</td>
<td>pugdha</td>
<td>pēmpta</td>
<td>quinta</td>
<td>fimptē</td>
<td>penktā</td>
<td>pēyata-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaṣṭhīḥa</td>
<td>cestvā</td>
<td>ēktā</td>
<td>sexa</td>
<td>sailstō</td>
<td>šērēsata</td>
<td>šēstā-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saptamā</td>
<td>haptatha</td>
<td>ḫbōlā</td>
<td>septima</td>
<td>(sibundō')</td>
<td>sēkma</td>
<td>sedma-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niṣṭamā</td>
<td>astēma</td>
<td>ḫyōdō</td>
<td>octava</td>
<td>ahūdō</td>
<td>āsma</td>
<td>osma-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navamā</td>
<td>nāuma</td>
<td>ēnārā</td>
<td>nona</td>
<td>niunō</td>
<td>diwintō</td>
<td>diyēta-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daśamā</td>
<td>dāśma</td>
<td>dēkārā</td>
<td>decima</td>
<td>tāhundō</td>
<td>ēšimintē</td>
<td>diēsata-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekādaśā</td>
<td>āvandāra</td>
<td>ēvēkārā</td>
<td>undēeima</td>
<td>(ainīftō')</td>
<td>viēnēliktā</td>
<td>yēdina-ya-na-desya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vināati tamā</td>
<td>viśāvitiēma</td>
<td>ēikostā</td>
<td>vicesima</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>ēdwiēsintā</td>
<td>vōrōra-ya-na-desyata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We should read thus §. 297. for byarē, as accusative singular (see Olshausen, Vend. S. 43).

1 More usually paorīya, masc. paorīyō, by which the Slavonic pervyā, pervaya, is, as it were, prepared.

2 Also turiyā, masc. turiyā-s, on which is based the Zend tūrīya, masc. tūrīyō. 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 PȳATI by the suffix TI, and PYATO, fem. PYATA, by the suffix TO, fem. TA (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to šestaya in relation to šesty, &c.

4 By transposition and syncope from cvasta, as must be expected from the cardinal number mā-<mā-> cvas.

5 Regarding the d for n, see §. 317. 6 See §. 319, Note *, p. 435.
"Remark.—As the old a of the preposition उ प्रा 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 πρὶν, 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 [G. Ed. p. 464.] and Lithuanian do: the u of fru has arisen from a through the influence of the liquid (§. 66.). In the cognate preposition fram, ‘before, by,’ &c., the original vowel has remained, and in this form, as in the Lithuanian pirm, the superlative m is contained. On उ प्रा 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>dvīs</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>δις</td>
<td>bis</td>
<td>tvis-var (p. 436 G. ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trīs</td>
<td>thris</td>
<td>τρīς</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 κς like τετράκις, πεντάκις, &c., in regard to their suffix, do not belong to this class, but κς answers to the Sanskrit śas (§. 21.), the a being weakened to i; this śas, however, forms adverbs from words which express a great number, multitude or number, as satasas, "by hundreds," sahasrasas, "by thousands," bahuśas, "of many kinds," gaṇasas, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but e.g. satasas is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in ēkatoντάκις 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 κς (śas), by suppression of the guttural; but as toties, quoties, evidently belong to this class, which are also pronounced quotiens, totiens, this probably being the more genuine form, as in Greek, in a similar case, τίθέντις is more genuine than τίθεις (§. 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, vaṅs, e.g. chvaṅs, "how much," for chivaṅs. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base ki, and the demonstrative base i, laid aside the v; hence kiy-ant, iy-ant—weak form kiyat, iyat—nominative masculine kiyān, iyān; this ant for vant answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine eis), e.g. in μελτόεις, 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 totiens quotiens, 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 इयंत 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-so-much" (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, पन्छक्रितवस् 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," yāvat, "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. wienai kartai, "once," dū kartū, "twice" (accusative du), tris kartūs, "three times." In Old Slavonic 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 पञ्चन् pancham, "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 क्रृत krit on account of §. 255. (l): krate, however, is to be deduced from कृतस kritwas, by suppression of the v. With regard to the y for as compare §. 271.

325. Through the suffix धa dh a the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in $\chi\alpha$, which, therefore, have altered the T sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organ in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNITO, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

\[ \text{[G. Ed. p. 467.]} \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{द्विधा} & \text{dwi-dhā,} \\
\text{त्रिधा} & \text{tri-dhā,} \\
\text{चतुःधा} & \text{chatur-dhā,} \\
\text{पञ्चधा} & \text{pancha-dhā,}
\end{array} \]

\[ \begin{array}{ll}
\text{दिः} & \text{Δi-χα.} \\
\text{τρι} & \text{τρι-χα.} \\
\text{τέτρα} & \text{τέτρα-χα.} \\
\text{πέντα} & \text{πέντα-χα.}
\end{array} \]

* "Divided into two parts," Sav. V. 108.
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— Vide Theological Translation Fund Library.


Reville (Prof. Albert) Prolegomena of the History of Religions. By Albert Reville, D.D., Professor in the Collège de France, and Hibbert Lecturer, 1884. Translated from the French. With an Introduction by Professor F. Max Muller. 8vo. cloth 10s 6d

— Vide Theological Translation Fund Library.

Reville (Prof. Albert) Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion, as illustrated by the Native Religions of Mexico and Peru. Translated by the Rev. P. H. Wicksteed, M.A. Hibbert Lectures, 1884. 8vo. cloth 10s 6d

Samuelson (Jas.) Views of the Deity, Traditional and Scientific; a Contribution to the Study of Theological Science. By James Samuelson, Esq., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Founder and Former Editor of the Quarterly Journal of Science. Crown 8vo. cloth 4s 6d

Savage (Rev. M. J.) Beliefs about the Bible. By the Rev. M. J. Savage, of the Unity Church, Boston, Mass., Author of "Belief in God," "Beliefs about Man," &c., &c. 8vo. cloth 7s 6d

Schrader (Prof. E.) The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament. Translated with Additions by the Author, by the Rev. O. C. Whitehouse. Vol. I. with a Map. 8vo. cloth 10s 6d

Schurman (J. G.) Kantian Ethics and the Ethics of Evolution. A Critical Study, by J. Gould Schurman, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Acadia College, Nova Scotia. Published by the Hibbert Trustees. 8vo. cloth 5s

Seth (A.) The Development from Kant to Hegel, with Chapters on the Philosophy of Religion. By Andrew Seth, Assistant to the Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Edinburgh University. Published by the Hibbert Trustees. 8vo. cloth 5s


Sharpe (S.) The New Testament. Translated from Griesbach's Text. 14th Thousand, fcap. 8vo. cloth 1s 6d
Catalogue of some Works


Spencer (Herbert) The Man versus the State. 1s; or on better paper, in cloth 2s 6d

Spencer (Herbert) The Philosophy of M. Comte—Reasons for Dissenting from it. (Republished from “The Classification of the Sciences,” &c., 1864) 6d

Spinoza. Four Essays, by Professors J. Land, Kuno Fischer, Van Vloten, and Ernest Renan. Edited, with an Introduction, by Professor W. Knight, of St. Andrews. 8vo. cloth 5s

Stokes (G. J.) The Objectivity of Truth. By George J. Stokes, B.A., Senior Moderator and Gold Medallist, Trinity College, Dublin; late Hibbert Travelling Scholar. Published by the Hibbert Trustees. 8vo. cloth 5s

Strauss (Dr. D. F.) New Life of Jesus, for the People. The Authorized English Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth 24s


Talmud of Jerusalem. Translated for the first time into English by Dr. Moses Schwab, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Vol. I. The Treatise of Berakhoth (Blessings). Foolscap 4to. 9s

Tayler (Rev. J. J.) An Attempt to Ascertaining the Character of the Fourth Gospel, especially in its relation to the first three. New Edition. 8vo. cloth 5s

Ten Services of Public Prayer, taken in Substance from the “Common Prayer for Christian Worship,” with a few additional Prayers for particular Days. Crown 8vo. cloth, 2s 6d; with Special Collects 3s — 32mo. 1s; with Special Collects 1s 6d — Psalms and Canticles. (To accompany the same.) Crown 8vo. 1s 6d With Anthems 2d
Thoughts for every day in the Year. Selected from the Writings of Spiritually-minded Persons. By the author of "Visiting my Relations." Printed within red lines. Crown 8vo. cloth 2s 6d

Theological Translation Fund. A Series of Translations, by which the best results of recent Theological investigations on the Continent, conducted without reference to doctrinal considerations, and with the sole purpose of arriving at truth, will be placed within reach of English readers. A literature which is represented by such works as those of Ewald, F. C. Baur, Zeller, Roth, Keim, Nöldeke, &c. in Germany, and by those of Kuenen, Scholten, and others in Holland.

Three Volumes annually, for a Guinea Subscription. The Prospectus, bearing the signatures of Principal Tulloch, Dean Stanley, Professors Jowett, H. J. Smith, Henry Sidgwick, the Rev. Dr. Martineau, Mr. W. G. Clark, the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Principal Caird, and others, may be had.

33 Volumes published (1873 to 1884) for £11. 11s.
Protestant Commentary, a Short, on the New Testament. 3 vols.
Keim's History of Jesus of Nazara. 6 vols.
Baur's Paul, his Life and Work. 2 vols.
Baur's Church History of the First Three Centuries. 2 vols.
Kuenen. The Religion of Israel. 3 vols.
Ewald's Commentary on the Psalms. 2 vols.
Bleek, on the Apocalypse.
Pfleiderer's Paulinism. 2 vols.
Reville's Prolegomena of the History of Religions.

In the Press.
Pfleiderer's Philosophy of Religion. 2 vols.
All new Subscribers may purchase any of the previous volumes at 7s instead of 10s 6d per volume. A selection of six or more volumes from the list may also be had at the Subscribers' price, or 7s per volume.

Vickers (J.) The History of Herod; or, Another Look at a Man Emerging from Twenty Centuries of Calumny. Crown 8vo. cloth 6s
Williams (Dr. Rowland) The Hebrew Prophets. Translated afresh and illustrated for English Readers. Two vols. 8vo. cloth 22s 6d
Wright (Rev. J.) Grounds and Principles of Religion. Crown 8vo. cloth 3s

— Vide Theological Translation Fund Library.
PAMPHLETS.

Athanasian Creed. Two Prize Essays. By C. Peabody and C. S. Kenny 1s
Bastard (T. H.) Scepticism and Social Justice 1s
Beaumont (Rev. G.) Science and Faith. A Discourse 1s
Beard (C.) William Ellery Channing. In Memoriam. A Sermon. 12mo. 6d
Beard (C.) The Kingdom of God. A Sermon 6d
Beard (C.) The House of God, and two Sermons by Rev. R. A. Armstrong 1s
Bennett (W.) Popular Contributions towards a Rational Theology 1s 6d
Butler’s Analogy: A Lay Argument. By a Lancashire Manufacturer 1s
Carpenter (Prof. J. Estlin) The Church of England during the Middle Ages 1s
Drummond (Prof. J.) Philo and the Principles of the Jewish-Alexandrine Philosophy 1s
Drummond (Prof. J.) Religion and Liberty 1s
Gordon (Rev. A.) Gospel Freedom. A Sermon 6d
Hopgood (Jas.) Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church of England 6d
Hopgood (Jas.) An Attempt to Define Unitarian Christianity 6d
Howe (Rev. C.) The Athanasian Creed. Two Discourses 1s
Infinite Love. A Meditation 1s
Jesus of Nazareth and his Contemporaries 1s
Journey to Emmaus. By a Modern Traveller 2s
Lisle (L.) The Two Tests: the Supernatural Claims of Christianity tried by two of its own Rules. Cloth 1s 6d
Marriage of Cana, as read by a Layman 6d
Martineau (Rev. Dr. James) New Affinities of Faith; a Plea for free Christian Union. 12mo. 1s
Must God Annihilate the Wicked? A Reply to Dr. Jos. Parker 1s
Odgers (J. Edwin) Our Church Life: its Significance and Value 6d
Reasonable Faith, A, the Want of our Age 1s
Sharpe (S.) Journeys and Epistles of the Apostle Paul 1s 6d
Sidgwick (H.) The Ethics of Conformity and Subscription 1s
Tayler (Rev. J. J.) Christianity: What is it? and What has it done? 1s
The Recent Prosecutions for Blasphemy 1s
Who was Jesus Christ? 8vo. sewed 6d
Wicksteed (Rev. P. H.) The Ecclesiastical Institutions of Holland. 8vo. 1s
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