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PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

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

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

EDWARD B. EASTWICK.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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 *utrique lingua*, 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 Pehlevi 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 néaceh." I do not insist on translating the adjective *(vahma)* by "praeclarus," but I am certain of this, that *(vahmēn)* and *(vahmāi)* are nothing else than the accusative and dative of the base *(vahma)*; and that *(vahmāi)* 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 *(cha), "and," as the first person singular of the present, viz. *(cesanthrāi-cha)*, *(frānstoṣyā-cha)* (see §. 164.), by "placere cupidio," "vota fucio. 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 Zend, 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 Jñeschné 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. 321), 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 overwhelming 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, *dāmōis drujo* Izet." It is, however, very surprising, and of evil omen, that Nerioesengh, his Pehlvi predecessor, takes the feminine genitive *(dahmāyās)* as a plural genitive, since this expression is evidently, as Burnouf rightly remarks, only an epithet of *afritōis*. I abstain from speaking of the dubious expression *dāmōis upamanahē*, 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 Neriosegheh. The second passage signifies, "I call upon and magnify the stars, the moon, the sun, the eternal, self-created lights!"
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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 gödlai, ἄγαθοι, boni (see p. 251, Note 7, and compare Grimm I. 827.11); and to disconnect the Latin is of lupis (lupibus) from the Greek ἵς 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 χόρα, 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 ð (from the old ā, §. 69.) of the theme.* In certain instances it is extraordi-

* The simple maxim laid down elsewhere by me, and deducible only from the Sanskrit, that the Gothic ð is the long of a, and thereby when shortened nothing but a, as the latter lengthened can only become ð, 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
this class of words,* and which will, therefore, be treated in this point of view among the pronominal adjectives.† It is likely that a chasm in our literature, very prejudicial to inquiries of this kind, may be shortly filled up by a work ready for the press, and earnestly looked for by all friends of German and general philology, the Old High German Treasury of Graff. What we may expect from a work founded on a comprehensive examination of the MS. treasures of libraries national and foreign, as well as on a correction of printed materials, may be gathered from a survey of the amount contributed to knowledge in a specimen of the work, small, but happily selected, “The Old High German Prepositions.”

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

“Remark.—What in §. 63. is said of the rise of the ० or ो out of the older अ 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 अ and the ो, in forms like plintenu (no), plintyu, are to be exempted from the influence of the antecedent consonants.”

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

Berlin, 1833.

F. Bopp.
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

Sanskrit writing distinguishes the long from their corresponding short vowels by particular characters, slightly differing from these latter in form. We distinguish the long vowels, and the diphthongs रे and चौ, which spring from i and u united with an antecedent a, by a circumflex. The simple vowels are, first, the three, original and common to all languages, a, i, u, short and long; secondly, a vowel r, peculiar to the Sanskrit, which I distinguish by r, and its long sound by र. The short r (च) is pronounced like the consonant r with a scarcely-distinguishable i, and in European texts is usually written ri; the long र (च) is scarcely to be distinguished from the union of an r with a long i. Both vowels appear to me to be of later origin; and r presents itself generally as a shortening of the syllable ar by suppression of the a. The long र (च) is of much rarer occurrence. In declension it stands only for a lengthening of the r, where, according to the laws of the formation of cases, a short vowel at the end of the inflective base must be lengthened; and in the conjugation and formation of words, those roots to which grammarians assign a terminating चर almost always substitute for this unoriginal vowel चर ar, चर ir, चर ir, or, after labials, चर ur. The last simple vowel of the Sanskrit writing belongs more to the grammarians than to the language: it is in character, as well as in pronunciation, an union of an ल with चर (चर), or, when lengthened, with चर (चर). 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 ऐ (equivalent to the French ai), and with u becomes ऋ ऐ (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 ए with a following i becomes ऐ ai, and with u, ऋ au, 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 ऑ for ऐ, and ऑ for ऋ. That in ऐ ऐ and ऋ ऐ a short, in ऐ ऑ and ऋ ऑ, 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 ऐ ऐ and ऋ ऐ proceed the sounds य य and ए ए (with short a), but out of ऐ ऑ and ऋ ऑ proceed य य and ए ए. If, according to the rules of combination, a concluding ए ऑ, with an ऐ ऐ, ऐ ऐ, or ऐ ऐ, ऐ ऑ of a following word, be contracted, like the short a, into ऐ ऐ and ऋ ऐ, but not into ऐ ऑ and ऋ ऑ, 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 disappear; and, for example, ददा dadda with उस us makes neither ददास daddus, nor ददस daddś, but ददस dadas. The opinion I have already expressed on [G. Ed. p.3.] this point I have since found confirmed by the Zend; in which ा ऑ always stands in the place of the Sanskrit ऐ ऑ, and ा ऐ or ा ऑ for ऋ ऑ. In support, also, of my theory, appears the fact, that a concluding a (short or long) with a following ऐ ऐ or ऋ ऐ, becomes ऐ ऑ and ऋ ऑ; of which it is to be understood, that the short a contained in ऐ ऐ and ऋ ऐ merges with the antecedent a into a long a, which then, with the i of the diphthong ऐ, becomes ऐ ऑ, and with the u of ऐ, becomes ऑ ऑ. For example, ममदीत mamādiat, from सम रत्न mama ṛat, is to be understood
as if the diphthong रे united its first element ए with the preceding ए into ए, and with this, further united its last element (ी) into रे आ। [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 ए; for an alphabet which lends itself to the subtlest gradations of sound would assuredly not have neglected the difference between ए, ए, and ए, 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 े and ो are also wanting, and that either ए, ई, or उ corresponds, in that dialect, to our German short े.

For example, *faltha, "ich falte," "I fold;" giba, "ich gebe," "I give." In the Zend the Sanskrit ए ए remains usually ए ए, or has changed itself, according to certain [G. Ed. p. 4.] rules, into ए ए. Thus, for example, before a concluding म we always find ए ए; compare the accusative ए ए ए पुत्रे-म "filium" with पुत्र ए पुत्र-म; and its genitive ए ए ए पुत्राः with पुत्र ए पुत्राः-स्या. In Greek the Sanskrit ए ए becomes ए, ए, or ए, 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 ए answers to the Indian ए ए, except in the vocatives, where an ए 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 ए ए.

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

* Grimm, Vol. i. p. 594; with whom I entirely concur in this matter; having long abandoned a contrary opinion, which I maintained in 1819 in the Annals of Oriental Literature.
presented by $\eta$ or $\omega$ than by a long alpha: and though in the Doric the long $\alpha$ has maintained itself in places where the ordinary dialect employs an $\eta$, no similar trace of the long $\alpha$ for $\omega$ is to be found. दधामि $\text{dadham}i$, "I place," becomes $\text{rithmu}$; ददामि $\text{dadami}$, "I give," $\text{dithwu}$; the dual termination ताम $\text{tum}$ answers to $\tau\nu$, and only in the imperative to $\tau\alpha\nu$: on the other hand, the आम $\text{am}$ of the genitive plural is always represented by $\omega$. Never, if we except peculiarities of dialect, does either $\eta$ or $\omega$ stand for the Indian diphthongs $\hat{e} \hat{e}$ or $\hat{a} \hat{o}$, formed by $\hat{r} \hat{i}$ or an $\hat{u} \hat{u}$ following a long $\hat{a}$: for the first, the Greek substitutes $e\iota$ or $o\iota$ (because for $\hat{a} \alpha$, and also for $\alpha$, $e$ and $o$ are the substitutes), and for the last, $e\upsilon$ or $o\upsilon$. Thus, अम $\text{ami}$, "I go," becomes $e\iota\mu$; पतेः $\text{pates}$, "thou mayest fall," $\pi\iota \pi\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon$; $\beta\upsilon \delta \alpha$; गो $\text{go}$, mas. fem. "a bullock or heifer," $\beta\upsilon \omega$. From this dropping of the $i$ or $u$ in the Indian diphthongs $\hat{e} \hat{e}$ and $\hat{a} \hat{o}$ it may happen that $\alpha$, $e$, or $o$, answer to these diphthongs; thus, एकतरस् $\text{ekataras}$, "one of two," becomes $\hat{e} \hat{k}\upsilon \alpha \rho \sigma \upsilon \sigma$: $\delta \varepsilon \nu \iota \iota$, accus. $\delta \upsilon \varepsilon \nu \iota \iota \iota \iota$ (from $\delta \alpha \phi \rho$, $\delta \alpha \iota \phi \rho$); देवस् $\text{devas}$, "God," $\Theta \epsilon \omicron \omicron$: and the $o$ in $\beta \omega \delta \omicron$, $\beta \omega \iota$, stands for $\beta \omega \upsilon \omega \iota$, $\beta \omega \iota$, the $u$ of which must have passed into $\upsilon$, and certainly did so at first, as is proved by the transition into the Latin $\text{bovis}$, $\text{bovi}$, and the Indian गवि $\text{gavi}$ (locative) from $\gamma \delta \iota$. 5. In Latin we sometimes find the long $e$, which, however, may be shortened by the influence of the following consonant, arising from the mixture of $a$ and $i$, as in the above-mentioned word $\text{levir}$, and in the subjunctive $\text{amemus}$; cf. कामयेम $\text{kamayema}$, from $\text{kamaya-ima}$.

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

* The original has $\text{devir}$, but, as observed in p. 1, in European texts it is usual to write $\text{ri}$ for $\hat{c} \hat{u}$; and the absence of any sign for the vowel sound is calculated to cause embarrassment: it seems advisable, therefore, to express $\hat{c} \hat{u}$ by $\text{ri}$.—Editor.
various but sure appearances, which I shall further illustrate in my treatise on Forms, that in Sanskrit ऋ a and ऋ 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 from a reduplicated syllable in cases where *a* allows itself to be weakened down to *i.* Thus in Latin we have *pupKgi,* *tutudi,* while *a,* in cases of repetition, is reduced to *i* or *e* (*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 *ína* of the nominative with the termination *ína* of the oblique cases. *A* stands between the strong *u* and the weaker *i*; and under the threefold change of vowels has its place in the accusative,
which admits of more freedom than the genitive. In the oblique cases, however, of nouns, and in the two-fold change of vowels, it stands opposed to the u of the nominative, and in the dependent subjunctive of the verb to the u of the independent indicative.

9. Between the vowels and the consonants, or at the close of the list of vowels, are commonly placed two signs, the sounds of which are rather to be considered as appendages to, or modifications of, the preceding vowels, than as independent sounds, and take, also, no place in the alphabet of the Native Grammarians, inasmuch as they are considered neither as consonants nor vowels, but rather as complements to the latter. The first, which we distinguish by n, is called Anusvāra, "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 (ㄚ y, ř r, l, ř 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 s of a verbal termination, a radical न n also passes into Anuswāra; as, हानि hañi, "thou killest," from हन् han. Great confusion, however, has arisen from the circumstance that the Indian copyists allow themselves to express the unaltered concluding m, as well as all the nasal alterations, and, in the middle of words, each of the six nasal sounds (the proper Anuswāra included), by Anuswāra.* I have

* The practice is not unauthorized by rule. A final m is convertible to Anuswāra before any consonant (Pān. 8. 3. 23); and a media न or m 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.] in general, the pronunciation of n, and calls it "a shortening of the nasal consonants at the end of a syllable," which leads to the error, that each of the nasal characters, even the concluding न 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 म m of grammatical terminations: and as they give rules for the transition of the Anuswāra into म or म, the necessary consequence occurs, that we must write abhavan or abhavang, "I was;" dantan or dantang, "a tooth;" not abhavam, dantam. Colebrooke, on the other hand, expressing a Sanskrit inscription in Roman letters (Asiatic Transactions, Vol. VII.) gives the proper termination म m, and before t, by a euphonic rule, n; but he maintains the original म m before sibilants and half vowels where Anuswāra is due; as vidwishām śrīmad, for विद्विषां श्रीमः. On the other hand, F. von Schlegel and Frank write n, for the value of Anuswāra, in the place of म m in several grammatical terminations. The first, for example, gives danan, "a gift," for dānam; the second, ahan for aham, "I." A. W. von Schlegel gives rightly म 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 म m (Preface to the Bhag. Gita, p. xv.); while the direct converse is the fact, that the concluding म 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 म m 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 म 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 म 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 अनुस्वर तान अब्रावित, "he said to them," we must also write ताम अनुस्वर ताम अब्रावित, "he said to her;" not ताम अनुस्वर ताम अब्रावित, for the म of ताम ताम 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 तान- or ताम अब्रावित. 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 daśa, फिंस kīś, it is susceptible of expulsion, but not of alteration.

[G. Ed. p. 11.] That the Indian Grammarians, however, consider the m and not the ni as the original but mutable letter in grammatical terminations, like अम am, भ्यद्म bhyledm, &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 इदम idam, विम kim, in which they consider the m as primitive, are treated when the turn comes of the labial nasal m, and together with प्राशा praśām, "quiet," from the root बाम bām. (Laghu-Kaumudī, 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 ni. 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 ni 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 so 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 हन्स्यानि haṇsyāni, "I shall kill," from the root हन han. In the Prākrit, not only the न n, but the न n, at the end of words, has always fallen into Anuswāra, without regard to the following letters Thus we read in Chezy's edition of the Sakuntalâ, p. 70, भसवं, which is certainly to be pronounced, not bhaavam, but bhaavan, for भगवं 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 स s and र r. These two letters (s, r) are very mutable at the end of words, and are changed into Visarga before a pause or the deadened letters of the guttural and labial classes (§. 12.). We write this sign ḵ to distinguish it from the true ḷ ḷ

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 छ h. In the first five ranks of these consonants the single letters are so arranged, that the first are the surd or hard consonants, the thin (tenues), and their aspirates; next, the sonant or soft, the medials, and their aspirates, each class being completed by its nasal. The nasals belong, like the vowels and semi-vowels, to the sonants; the sibilants to the surd or hard. Every thin and every medial letter has its corresponding aspirate. The aspirates are pronounced, like their

* No native scholar would read these as bhaavan or kudhan, 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, \( घ \ ithub, \) not like the English \( th \); \( घ \ ρh, \) not \( f \) or \( \phi \); and \( ख \ kh, \) not like the Greek \( \chi \).* In an etymological point of view it is important to observe that the aspirates of different organs are easily exchanged with each other; thus, \( भ \ bhar, \) \( ध \ dhār, \) (\( भ \ bhri, \) \( ध \ dhri, \) §. 1.) “to bear,” “to hold,” are perhaps originally identical. \( धुमस् \ dhūma-s, \) [G. Ed. p. 13.] “smoke,” is, in Latin, \( fumus-s. \) In Greek, \( θάνω, \) as well as \( φέω, \) is related to \( हन \ han, \) from \( धन \ dhan, \) “to kill.” The Gothic \( thliuhan \) is the German \( flehen, \) 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 \( स \ m \) when the following word begins with a guttural.† We write it without the distinctive sign, as its guttural nature is easily recognised by the following consonant. The aspirates of this class are not of frequent use, either at the beginning or end of words. In some Greek words we find \( \chi \) in the place of \( ख \ kh: \) compare \( ουξ, \) \( ούχ-ος, \) 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 च gh of ग्हर्मा, “heat” (in Greek θέρμη), has passed into the aspiration of another organ; ठुङ 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, ज़ jh, चन n. This class is an offshoot from the preceding, and to be considered as a softening of it. It is only found before vowels and weak consonants (semi-vowels and nasals); and before strong consonants, and at the end of a word, generally retires into the class from which it springs. Thus, for example, the base [G. Ed. p. 14.] वा́च vách, “speech,” “voice” (cf. vox), makes, in the uninflexed nominative, वास् vāk; in the instrumental and locative plurals, वास्स vāg-bhis, वास्स 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 पचाम पचाम, “I cook,” (inf. pactum, part. pass. pakta), with coquo, πέπω (πέπτω, πέττω, πέπσω); चतुर chatur, “four,” nom. चतुरस chatu-ras, with quatuor, τέτταρες, τέσσαρες. Gothic fildvr, Lithuanian ketturi; पचन panchan, “five” (nom. accus. pancha), with quinque, πέντε, πέμπτε, Gothic fimf, Lithuanian penki; राजन rōjan, “king,” with rex, regis; राजत rōjata, nom. rōjatam, “silver” (from rōj, “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, sk; छन्नस cchhind-

* The original has ǧ and ǧ; but the appropriate symbols in English are j and its aspirate.
mas, “we cleave,” विषम् chhinadmī, “I cleave,” answers to the Latin scindo; त्रया chhāyā, “shadow,” to the Greek σκιά. As the terminating letter of a root chh answers, in प्रच्छ prachh, “to ask,” to the Gothic h in fræh, “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 ṭ, together with its [G. Ed. p. 15.] nasal; a kind not original, but which has developed itself from the ordinary class of ṭ sounds. We distinguish them by a point under the letter, thus, रः ṭ, रः ṭḥ, रः ध, रः ध ṭ, खः. In the Prākrit this class has obtained great supremacy, and has frequently supplanted the ordinary ṭ. We there find, for example, भोट bhōṭu, for भवतु bhavatu, “let it be;” and पद्म padhama, for प्रथम prathama, “the first.” With regard to the nasal, the substitution of ख for च is nearly universal. The Indian Grammarians approach the Prākrit nearer than the Sanskrit, when at the beginning of roots they use the same substitution. The practice, also, which we have condemned (§. 9.), of using Anusvāra for म m, at the end of words, is more Prākrit than Sanskrit. At the beginning of words these letters are seldom found in Sanskrit, but they are found as terminations to a certain number of roots; for example, घट 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 ṭ of the Italian tutto is the Sanskrit त.—Editor.
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is not the case with the nasals of the preceding classes; yet never at the beginning of words.

16. The fourth class embraces the dentals, or the sounds which properly answer to the common d and t, together with the common n, which belongs to them. त, थ, ध, न. Of the aspirates of this organ, we have to remark, that थ, in an etymological respect, never—at least in no instance of which we are aware—is represented in Greek by θ, but always like the natural t, by τ. On the other hand, ध does correspond to θ, which also sometimes represents ठ ठ. Thus the imperative ending फ dhi, in Greek becomes θ; मय maadhū, “honey,” “wine,” is μέθυ; धधातi dadhami, “I place,” τιθημι; दुहितर duhitar [G. Ed. p. 16.] (दुहित्र duhitri, § 1.), “daughter,” θυγάτηρ; द्राव dwār, f. and dwara, neut. (nom. dwāram), “door,” θύρα; देव dēva, Lithuan, diewas, “God,” Θεός. With regard to the hard aspirate, compare the terminations τε and τον with थ tha and वस thas, the former in the plural, the second in the dual of the present and future; στήσω with स्थायित्व sthāsyāmi, “I shall stand”; ὅστένω with ὅστι asthi, “bone”; in the Latin, rota with ῥαθα ratha, “carriage”; and in the Gothic, the ending θ, in the second person singular of the preterite, with tha; for example, vais-t, “thou knewest,” with वेठ vēt-tha. From the beginning of words in the Sanskrit this aspirate is nearly excluded.

17. The interchange of d and l is well known. Upon it, among other instances, is founded the relation of lacryma to दार, दार्म. In Sanskrit, also, an apparently original ठ d often corresponds to the l of cognate European languages; for example, दीप dip, “to light,” दीप dīpa, “lamp,” becomes λάμπω, λαμπάς; ठेठ dēha, “body,” Gothic leik. On this relation also rests, as I have shewn elsewhere, the relation of our if, Gothic lif, in elf, zwölf, Gothic tvalf, to दश दाशan, देका. 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, tæðun, in German zehn, its origin from liif was deeply concealed; and even the Lithuanian lika, which accompanies the simple numbers in their compounded forms from eleven to twenty, remained long under my notice without result. The fact, however, that one and the same word may, in the course of time, assume various forms for various objects, proved, as it is, by numberless examples, requires no further

[G. Ed. p. 17.] support. With respect to the affinity of Λικος in ἰλικος, &c., and of the Gothic leiks in hvéleiks, "like to whom?" to ह्रु driśa, Prákrit दिस disa, "like," I refer the reader to my Treatise on the Pronoun and its influence (Berlin, published by Dümmler); and only remark, in addition, that by this analogy of Λικος, leiks, I was first led to that of liif to देका; while the Lithuanian lika had not yet attracted my observation.

18. The labial class comes next, namely, ष p, ष ph, च b, भ bh, म m. The hard aspirate ph is among the rarer letters; the most usual words in which it occurs are, फल phala, "fruit," चेन phéna, "foam," and the forms which come from the root फूल phull, "to burst, blow, bloom." The sonant aspirate भ bh belongs, together with ष dh, to the most frequent of the aspirates. In the Greek and Latin, φ and ψ are the letters which most frequently correspond to this भ bh, especially at the beginning of words; for example, भ्र hi, "to bear," fero, φέρω; भ हु, "to be," fu-i, φύ-ω. भ bh is also often represented by b in Latin, especially in the middle of words. The ψ of fero becomes b in certain compounds which rank as simple words with a derivable suffix, as bev, brum, brium, in words like saluber, candelabrum, manubrium. Thus the ψ 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 भ्यस bhyas, becomes bus in Latin. The nasal of this class, म m, is subject, at the end of a word, to several alterations, and only remains fast before a pause, a
vowel, or letters of its own class: it otherwise governs itself according to the nature of the following letters, and may pass, in this manner, into any of the four preceding nasals, and weakens itself into the softened nasal sound [G. Ed. p. 18.] of the proper Anuswāra, if followed by a semi-vowel, a sibilant, or ḍ h. M has also a full right to the name of a mutable nasal. It is, however, not beseeing, when, in editions of a text otherwise conspicuous for accuracy, we find म, though protected in its original condition by a pause, or by the following letters, written as Anuswāra.

19. The semi-vowels follow next: य, र, ल, व. We distinguish य by the sound of our German j, or the English y in the word year. As the Latin j in English has the sound of a softened y, so in Prākrit य often passes into ज, and in Greek, upon this exchange of sound rests the relation of ζευγήμα, ζυγός, &c. to the root युज, yuj, “to bind,” and that of the verbs in अ्य to the Indian verbs in क्यायम ahāmi; for ζ is ds, but the sound dsch is not to be looked for in the Greek. The relation of the Persian جوان 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, vi-ci (vixī), victum, spring from viv; and in facio I recognise the Sanskrit causal भावायम bhāv-ayāmi, “I make to be,” from the root भू bhū. The connection between factus 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 or य; and these two letters are therefore, as in the Semitic languages, excluded from the end of words: [G. Ed. p. 19.] therefore the word दिव dīv, “Heaven,” forms its nominative, which ought to be dīv (divs being forbidden, see §. 94.).
from चो द्यो. Nominal bases in य do not exist. र is at the end of a word is subject to many alterations, and is interchangeable with स. In places where the concluding च, by favour of the following letter, is retained, र becomes स; and, on the other hand, remains unaltered in places where स becomes र, namely, before vowels and sonant consonants.

20. The semi-vowels, by reason of their tractable and fluent nature, are easily interchanged. For instance, in the more recent Sanskrit works ल often stands for र. We often, also, find in the cognate European languages ल for र. On this interchange is founded the relation of the Latin suffix lent (e.g. opulens), and of the Gothic laud(a)-s (see § 116.). In ḥvēauds, “quantus,” svalauds, “tantus,” sumalauds, “just so much,” to the Sanskrit वन् vant (in the strong case, § 119.), in words like धनवन् dhanavant, “endowed with wealth,” तावन् tāvant, “so much,” यावन् yāvant, “how much.” On the change between च and र is founded, as I believe, the relation of the Old High German pir-u-mēs, “we are” (sing. pim, भवामि bhav-ā-mi), to भवामस bhav-ā-mas; as also that of scrib- u-mēs, “we shriek,” to अवामस 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 ध्रव्य dhwānas, “to fall,” and of the Cretan τρέ “thee” from τέ, to the Sanskrit twāt. The semi-vowel ल is also exchanged with the nasals; thus, चन्यास 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. Menon has aślika for aśrēka.—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 θ; and to the θ, according to § 87., corresponds the old High German t. The u of trus, from the old a, may be produced by the influence of the r, or of the dropped nasal.
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antara-s, "the other," alter; vad, "to speak," answers to the Gothic lath-ôn, "called," "invited," ga-lathon, "called together": dhma, "to blow," answers to flare. (§. 109.) Compare, also, balbus with saµsāiva.

21. The last class embraces the sibilants and h: ś, ṣ, śh, s, and ḍ h. The first sibilant is spoken with a slight aspiration, and usually written by the English sh.* It belongs to the palatal class, and thence supplies the place of the third or proper ṣ when a hard palatal ḍ or ḍh follows; for instance, rāmaś charati, instead of rāmas charati, "Rāmas goes." In its origin, ś appears to have sprung from k; and in Greek and Latin we find c regularly corresponding to the Sanskrit ś. The Gothic substitutes h in pursuance of the law of change of sound; but the Lithuanian stands the nearest to the Sanskrit with reference to this letter, and has in its stead a sibilant compound sz, pronounced like sh. Compare decem, dēka, Gothic taihun, Lithuan. dėzimtis, with daśnā daśa (nom. daśa); canis, κῦων, Gothic hunds, Lithuan. szuo (gen. szuns), with śun śwan (nom. śa śvā, gen. śuṇas śunas, κῦνος), "dog;" dákou, lacrima, oszara, f. with aśru asru n. "tear;" equus (= ecvus), Lith. aszwa f. "mare," with aśa aśva (nom. aśvas), "horse;" szaka f. with aśaka aśkahā "bough." The Lith. szwenta-s, "holy," answers to the Zend ṣpēnta (§. 50.). At the end of a word, and in the middle before strong consonants, ś is not allowed, although admitted as an euphonic substitute for a concluding ś before an initial hard palatal. Otherwise ś usually falls back into the sound from which it appears to have originated, namely, k. In some roots, however, ś passes into ḍ; for instance, ḍris, "seeing," and viś viṣ, "a man of the third caste," form, in the uninflected nominative, ḍriḥ, viḍ viṭ. The second sibilant, śh, is pronounced like our sch, or sh in English, and

* More usually ś; the sh is reserved for the cerebral sibilant.—Editor.
belongs to the lingual class. It often steps, according to certain rules into the place of s; thus, for instance, after k, s never follows, but only sh; and the x, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by ksh. Compare dukshina, with dex-ter, deëtios, Lithuanian dészinė, "the right hand." Of the vowels, i, u, and ä, short or long, are averse from s, to which a and ë alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, s passes into sh; for instance, ths never follows, but only sh; and the |, x, in Greek and Latin, are regularly represented by sh. Compare dakshina, with dexter, ëto, Lithuanian deszine, "the right hand." Of the vowels, i, u, and â, short or long, are averse from s, to which a and ë alone are inclined. After the first-named vowels, s passes into sh; for instance, tandshi, instead of tanosi (extend). As an initial, sh is extremely rare: the Indian grammarians, however, write the roots which, under certain circumstances, change s into sh, from the first with a sh. A word which really begins with sh is shas, "six," to which the Lith. szeszi, a plural nominative, answers most nearly, while other cognate languages indicate an original ordinary s. At the end of a word, and in the middle before other strong consonants, such as t, th, sh is not permitted, but in most roots passes into k; but with some into t: the number six, mentioned above, becomes, in the uninflected nominative, šat.

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 ś, ś, r, : ah or h, Visarga (§. 11.), and u; and only remains unaltered before t and th. We write, for example, sunus tarati, "the son passes over," but sunus: tarati [G. Ed. p. 22.] sunuḥ, sūnuḥ, charit sūnuḥ charati (it), sūnur abavit sūnur bhavati (est). This sensitiveness against a concluding s can only have arisen in the later period of the language, after its division; as in the cognate languages the concluding s remains unaltered, or where it has been changed for r does not return into its original form. Thus, in the decree against Timotheus (Maittaire, §. 383-4.) ρ everywhere stands for s: Timōsēρ ὁ Μιλεύσιορ—παραγενόμενορ—Ἀμαίνεται τὰρ ἀκοὰρ τῶν νέων, &c.* The Sanskrit could not endure

* Cf. Hartung, p. 106.
r before t. The Latin protects the s usually at the end of words; but in the classical period generally sacrifices it, when between two vowels, to the r; for instance, genus, generis, for genesis; a contrast to forms found in Varro and Festus, such as plusima, favdesum, 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 χαμών, hiems, with हिम hima, "snow," "rime;" χαίρω with ह्रिष्य hris.- [G. Ed. p. 23.] yāmi, gaudeo; χήν with हस haṇsa, "goose;" χθές, heri, with यस hyas, "yesterday;" χός with वह vah, "to transport." We also find κ, c, for h: compare καρδία, cor, Gothic hartið, with हर हरिद (n. हरिद hridaya), "heart." We sometimes, but rarely, find the spiritus asper substituted for h; for instance, αἰρέω, हरामि harâmi, "I take away." The Lithuanian exhibits sometimes sz for h; for instance, asz, "I," for श्रम aham, szirdis f. "heart," for हिद hrid. This letter stands sometimes in Sanskrit for a mutilation of other aspirated consonants, of which the aspiration alone has been suppressed; thus, instead of the imperative ending धि dhi, we generally find hi; on which account the grammarians accept हि hi, and not धि dhi, as the original ending, and assume that हि 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.

\( \text{च a, खā d, ि i, ि i, ऐ u, ज u, ङ ri, ङ r̥.} \)

ANUSWARA AND VISARGA.

\( \text{ङ n, अ ah.} \)

CONSONANTS.

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

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

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

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

Semi-Vowels \( \text{अ xr, ख xr, ख xr, ट v.} \)

Sibilants and Aspirates, झ s, झ sh, झ 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: च a is left unexpressed, but is contained in every consonant which is not distinguished by a sign of rest (ङ) or connected with another vowel. ख k is thus read ha; and k by itself, or the absence of the a, is expressed by ख. ि i, ि i, are expressed by ि, ि, and the first of these two is placed before, the second after, the consonant to which it relates; for instance, ध kī, ध k̄. For ऐ u, ख u, झ u, ङ u, the signs ऐ, ऐ, ऐ, ऐ, are placed under their consonants; as, ख ku, ख k̄u, ख k̄rī, ख k̄r̥. For ि e and ि ē, ि and ि are placed over their consonants; as, के ke, के k̄i: झो o and झी ēu are written by omission of the ङ, which is here only a fulcrum; as, झो k̄o, झी k̄au. 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 न, स, य, we have न, न, न; and thus matsya is written मत्स्य, not मत्सय; for न + च we have च; and for ख + य we have झ.
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 र, the nasals, semi-vowels, and all vowels. Another division also appears to us convenient—that of the consonants into strong and weak; in which the nasals and semi-vowels come under the denomination of weak; the remaining consonants under that of the strong. The weak consonants and vowels exercise no influence, as initial letters of inflections and suffixes, in the formation of words, on the terminating [G. Ed. p. 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 Vṛiddhi, increase or augmentation. My predecessors in grammatical inquiry have given no information as to the essence, but have only expounded the effects of these vowel alterations; and it was only in my critical labours upon Grimm’s German Grammar* that I came upon the trace of the true nature and distinctive qualities of these affections, as also of the law by which Guna is usually produced and governed, and at the same time of its hitherto undetected existence in the Greek and Germanic, and, most conspicuously, in the Gothic. My views in this particular have since derived remarkable confirmation from the Zend, with relation to which I refer to §. 2., in which, as I flatter myself, I have dealt successfully with an apparent contradiction to my explanation. Guna consists in prefixing short a, and Vṛiddhi in prefixing a long one: in both, however, the a melts into a diphthong with the primitive vowel.
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according to certain euphonic laws. ॠ, namely, and ऌ, melt with the ॠ a of Guna into ऌ e; ० u, ० ०, into ogh o. These diphthongs, however, dissolve again before vowels into ॠष ay and ॠष av; ॠ ri and ऌ ri become, in virtue of the action of Guna, ॠ ar; by that of Vṛddhi, ॠ ar. As in Greek the [G. Ed. p. 26.] short Sanskrit a is frequently replaced by e; so we find the Guna here, when a radical i or u is prolonged by prefixing an e. As in the Sanskrit the root ॠ i, “to go,” forms, by the Guna modification, हि ēmi (from a-imi), “I go,” in contrast to imas, “we go;” thus in Greek also we have εἴῳ in contrast to μεν. As the root बुध budh, in several tenses in the three numbers, rises, in virtue of Guna, into बोध bōdh (from baudh), for instance, तोधां bōdhami, “I know;” so in the Greek* the root φυγ (ἐφυγον), in the present becomes φευγω. In the Gothic, in the strong form of Grimm’s 8th and 9th conjugations, the radical vowel, strengthened by a in the singular of the preterite, stands in the same contrast to the i and u of the plural, as is the case in the corresponding tense of the Sanskrit. Compare baug, “I bent,” in contrast to bugum, “we bent,” with the Sanskrit form of the same signification, singular बुधो बुधो बुधो, plural बुधजिम babhujima, of the root भुज bhuj; compare vait, “I know,” in contrast with vitum, “we know,” with the Sanskrit forms of the same signification, वेद वेदा (from vaīda), विदिम vidima, from the root वेद विद, “know,” which, like the corresponding Gothic and Greek root, employs the terminations of the preterite with a present signification.

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

* Regarding Greek φ as Guna of ॠ, see §. 491.; and as to Guna in Old Slavonic and Lithuanian, see §§. 255.b) द, 741., 746.
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bug, and I conceived myself bound to ascribe generally, in the present tense, to the prevalent ı of terminations a retro-active influence. It now, however, seems to me indisputable that Grimm’s 8th and 9th conjugations of the [G. Ed. p. 27.] first class correspond to my first Sanskrit conjugation (r. 326.); so that the Guna a of the special tenses has been weakened to i, while the monosyllabic preterite maintains the Guna vowel in the more important shape of a; just as in the 10th, 11th, and 12th conjugations, according to Grimm’s division, the radical a, which has remained in the preterite singular, is, in the present and other tenses, weakened to i; so that, for instance, at, “I” and “he eat,” corresponds to the root अद ad, “to eat;” but in the present, ita stands in place of the form अदि admi, “I eat.”*

28. The Zend possesses, besides the Sanskrit Guna, which has remained everywhere where it stands in Sanskrit, a vowel application peculiar to itself, which likewise consists in उ 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 ı i, ० u, ० o; 2dly, the Guna diphthongs उ े and ० ो. The two latter are the most usually befriended by this addition, and उ े takes it in all cases where the opportunity occurs, both as an initial letter, and even at the end of words wherever the dependent particle म च a, “and,” is appended to it; hence, for example, अजम nairé, “hominis,” धर्म ध्रे, “igni”; but अहिन्दम naraścha, “hominique,” धर्म ध्रा धच, “igni- que.” Also where an े stands in two consecutive syllables, an a is placed before each. Hence, for instance, अजम अजम aṭhāṭhiṣṭa, from तत्तम ठीषय. 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 ıet, the other ıtt? The preterite “ate” is obsolete.—Translator.
cepting at the actual end of the word, rophe remains without the preceding  as a, is when it is produced by the influence of a  y, out of  as a or  as a. We say, indeed, [G. Ed. p. 28.] ya\textit{esi}yō, “glorify,” from येब्यास येब्यास; but not ये\textit{s}ेये, but ये\textit{s}ेये, “I glorify,” from the Sanskrit root, which has been lost, for the verb या यात, from which comes यास् यास, “glory.” Yet we find, for a  ye\text{ }zi, “if” (cf. यदि यदि), sometimes, though perhaps erroneously, also य\textit{s}ेया यास्. The addition of the  as a before ş is just as unlimited, but the occasion is far less frequent. Examples of it are, जूङम् अज्जो, “strength,” from जोन्स ज्ञा; क्रेनाओऽ, “he made,” from क्रि, according to the fifth class, for क्रीकोष्ठ अक्रिोत; अज्जोऽ मरात्, “he spoke,” from अज्जोत् अब्रोत्, which would be the regular form, instead of अज्जोत् अब्रावित (Gramm. Crit. r. 352.). We also find अज्जोऽ मरात् न, “I spoke,” for अज्जोत् अब्रोम्, which would be the form used were, in the Sanskrit adjunct tenses, as in the Greek, a mere nasal, and not सा अम, the suffix of the first person. The vowels  i and  u are much more sparing in their attraction of the  as a 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  as a. We say, for example, अज्जोऽ इमेम्, “this” (accus.), not अज्जोऽ इमेम्; माऴावृक्स मावहना, “a pair,” not माऴावृक्स मावहना; अज्जोऽ गईरियोऽ, “montibus,” not अज्जोऽ गईरियोऽ. The  ş also, according to set rules, very frequently abstains from the  as a; for instance, अज्जोऽ उरुनोऽ, (animae) not अज्जोऽ उरुनोऽ, from अज्जोऽ उरुन; on the contrary, अपः तारुमा, “young,” from तारुमा तारुमा. Where, however, the Sanskrit ş u is replaced by ş o (§. 32.), an  as a is placed before it, as well at the beginning as before two consonants; and in this case ş o stands in this respect in the same category as ş e and [G. Ed. p. 29.] ş o. Compare अज्जोऽ राउच्, “light,” with
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29. In the Vṛiddhi modification, the vowels र ख, ध, त, थ, म, ल, व, श, ष, ठ,ऽ वऽ शऽ षऽ and चऽ, छऽ, जऽ, झऽ, ञऽ, ङऽ, चऽ, छऽ, जऽ, झऽ, ञऽ, ङऽ melt with the preceding यऽ यऽ and यऽ यऽ into यऽ यऽ, यऽ यऽ into यऽ यऽ; यऽ यऽ, into सऽ सऽ. The simple vowel ं ं, as also the diphthongs ऋ ऋ and ऋ ऋ, which would produce the same effect by Guna as by Vṛiddhi—for a + a, like ऋ ऋ, makes ऋ ऋ; a + ऋ ऋ, like ऋ ऋ, makes ऋ ऋ; a + ऋ, like ऋ ऋ, makes ऋ ऋ—are capable of only one higher modification, and reserve this one for cases where grammatical laws demand the highest step, namely, Vṛiddhi, and remain in the cases of Guna unaltered, unless extraordinary grounds of exception occur. It may be convenient here to give a connected summary of the results produced by Guna and Vṛiddhi.

**Guna**
- a   a   d   t   i   i   u   u   r   r
- e   e   o   o   a   a   i   i   ar

**Vṛiddhi**
- a   a   d   t   i   i   u   u   r   r
- e   e   o   o   a   a   i   i   ar

**Primitive Vowels**
- ं ं   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ

**Guna**
- ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ

**Vṛiddhi**
- ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ   ऋ ऋ

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

* According to original Grammars the Guna letters are a, e, o; the Vṛiddhi, a, ai, au; the two first, a and ऋ, being severally substituted for the vowel sounds of ऋ ऋ, ऋ ऋ, in combination with the semi-vowels r and l, as ऋ ऋ, ऋ ऋ, ऋ ऋ.—Editor
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 म, which Anquetil pronounces as a or e, but Rask, certainly with truth, limits to a. The second is ए, which Rask pronounces like the short ए of the Danish, or like the short German ü, as in Hunde, or as a in cane in English, and e in the French après. I consider this ए as the shortest vowel, and write it e. We often find it inserted between two consonants which form a double consonant in the Sanskrit; for instance, मदा dadarēsa (pret. redupl.), for the Sanskrit ददा dadarśa, “he” or “I saw;” मदा dadēmahi (V. S. p. 102), “we give,” for the Vēda form दद्दसिः dadmasi. This shortest ए is also always appended to an originally terminating r. Thus, for instance, एन्दे antarē, “between,” एन्दे dātarē, “giver,” “creator,” एन्दे hvarē, “sun,” stand for the corresponding Sanskrit forms जन्तर antar, दातर dātar, सवर swar, “heaven.” It is worthy also of remark, that always before a final ए m, and generally before a final ज n, and frequently before an intermediate vowelless ज n, the older अ a becomes ए e. Compare, for instance, एन्दे pulhre-m, “filium” with पुत्र putra-m; एन्दे anh-ēn, “they were,” with सामन असान, अहन; एन्दे हेन्त-ेम, “the existing one,” with सन्तमसान sant-am, प्रेसेंतेम, अब-सेंतेम. This retro-active influence of the nasal reminds us of the shortening power of the Latin termination ṁ; as, for instance, सेम stēm, stēmus (Sanskrit तिथ्तेयम् tisṭṭhēy-am, तिथ्तेम् tisṭṭhēma).

31. Anquetil entirely refuses to admit into his alphabet a letter differing but little from the ए e above discussed, but yet distinct from it by rule in practice, namely, ए, which Rask teaches us to pronounce like a long Danish ð. We find this letter usually in connection with a following ∫ u, and this vowel appears to admit, with the excep-
logically to the Sanskrit ची ə, or diphthong formed by च a and ु 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 ०-s, form, in Zend, मू० eus. Compare, for instance, मू०षास्व pašeus with पशोस्य pašos, from pašu, "pecus." And yet the Sanskrit ə 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, >e eu would appear to be a diphthong, and to form but one syllable, as in our German words heute, Leute, &c. The long a (ə) is written ə.

32. Short and long i are represented, as are long and short u, by special characters, भ i, च i, > u, च u: Anquetil, however, gives to the short i the pronunciation e, and to the short u (ी) that of o; while, according to Rask, only च is pronounced as short o.* This short o frequently holds the etymological place of the Sanskrit च u, and never corresponds to any other Sanskrit vowel. For the diphthong ची du, in particular, we have generally the Zend चो do: we yet find, sometimes, also च० du; for instance, चो गोस, "bos," is more frequent than चा गोस, for the Sanskrit ची गोस.

33. The Sanskrit diphthong े, formed out of a + i, is represented by न, which, especially as a terminating letter, is also written न, and which we, as in Sanskrit, represent by े. We must here, however, observe, that the Sanskrit न े is not always preserved as न े in the Zend, but is sometimes replaced by य न, which appears to prevail particularly after a preceding य, especially at the end of words. The Vṛiddhi diphthong न न (out of ० + ०) is always represented by न न न; ०, either by the equivalent य—for which we often find न ० substituted by the neglect of copyists—or by the above-mentioned >e eu, which, according to rule, before a terminating न s replaces the Indian ची ə;
so that a termination in ए० is unheard of in the Zend. For the Vṛiddhi diphthong ठ० (out of ठ + उ) we generally find ठ०, for which there is a special character ऑ; more rarely ठ० ठ०. It would appear that ऑ ऑ ऑ, and the ए० ए० which replaces ए० ए०, 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, ध and श; of which the first, which we represent by क, only appears before vowels and ए०; the other, which we write ्, precedes especially consonants, excepting ए०. Compare, for instance, य० कृ, य० कृ, कृष्ण कृ, (quae, qua, quid), तूष्णा hākērēt, "once," तूष्णा karōtī, "he made," तूष्णा kva, "where," with कृ कृ, का कृ, जिं किम, सक्रित सक्रित, करोति करोति, and तूष्णा kva: on the other hand, तूष्णा csathra, "king," with तूष्णा kshatra; तूष्णा hiecti, "pouring out" (V. S. p. 198), with सिक्तिसिक्ति sikti (from सिक्ति sikh). In what manner the pronunciation of this श ् differs from that of the श क can indeed hardly be defined with certainty: it is probably softer, weaker than that of the श क, which latter is fenced in by no strong consonants. Rask selects for it the character श, without observing that this letter prefers only to precede consonants, and in this position [G. Ed. p. 33.] always corresponds to the Sanskrit श क. Burnouf considers श as an aspirate, and writes तूष्णात्मक takhmahē. He writes, on the other hand, the letter श, which Rask treats as an aspirate, with श. Burnouf has not yet given his reason, which I think, however, I can guess, namely, that श ् is found before त, which, according to Burnouf’s just

* ए०, according to Burnouf, occurs occasionally as the termination of the genitive singular of the u-bases for the more common ए० eus; w. f. ए० ए० बाझ०, "brachii."
remark, generally confers an aspirate upon a preceding consonant. I consider this reason, however, as insufficient; and think that \( \text{c} \) 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 \( \text{c} \). It would be impossible for \( r \), and the other letters of similar agency, to convey aspiration to the preceding hard guttural if \( k \) \( kh \) be not extant in Zend; so that, for instance, the root \( \text{kn} \) \( khan \), "to dig," sounds \( \mu \) \( kan \) in Zend. There are, however, some words in which \( k \) \( kh \) is represented by \( \text{c} \). From \( \text{kr} \) \( khara \), "ass," we find the accusative \( \text{c} \) \( kar\text{em} \); and we find, also, the \( k \) \( kh \) of \( \text{sakhi} \), "friend," replaced by \( c \); the accusative, for instance, \( \text{sakhdym} \) transformed into \( \text{jaucSSajw hac\text{em}} \). It may therefore remain a question whether \( k \) or \( \text{c} \), in respect of their sounds, have the better right to be referred to \( k \) \( kh \); but this much is certain, that \( k \) \( kh \) before vowels and before \( v \) \( v \) is only represented by \( k \) in Zend; before other consonants only by \( \text{c} \); which latter we shall, till better advised, continue to render by \( c \).

35. Anquetil ascribes to \( \text{c} \) the value of \( \text{k} \), 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 \( \text{x} \), and our German \( ch \). Burnouf renders \[ G. Ed. p. 34. \] \( \text{c} \) by \( q \); and observes (l. c. p. 345) that the Sanskrit syllable \( sv \) \( swa \) becomes \( qa \) in Zend, namely, in \( \text{swapna} \), "sleep," written, according to Burnouf, \( qafno \), and in \( \text{swa} \) (\( suus \)), "his." We are inclined to add to these examples, \( \text{swas} \) \( khana \), (nom.) accus. \( \text{swas} \) \( kh\text{rem} \), from \( \text{swas} \) \( swas\text{d} \), "sister" (soror): \( \text{swas}\text{ram} \) \( swas\text{ram} \) (sororem); and \( \text{swas} \) \( kha\text{r\text{en}} \), "splendour," as related to \( \text{swar} \) \( swar \), "heaven," and \( \text{sur} \) \( sur \), "to shine." We must, however, at the same time, remark, that \( sv \) \( sw \) does not universally become \( \text{c} \) \( kh \), and that \( sw \) \( swa \) in particular, in an isolated position and with a possessive signification, much oftener appears in the shape of \( hva \).
or that of वत्तव hava. We render घ by kh, and support our view of its aspiration more on the fact, that in modern Persian it corresponds frequently to ṇ, our ch, than on the circumstance that Rask has marked it as aspirated. This modern Persian ṇ 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 घ kh is derived from the Sanskrit स swa, it was not applied to replace the क k before letters, which would without it produce an aspiration. It may also be here convenient to remember that either u or v (ू) accompanies the Persian ṇ when the latter replaces at the beginning of a word the Sanskrit स swa. It is true that व v is no longer sounded before long vowels, but it must originally have had its influence on the pronunciation, and cannot have been introduced into writing entirely without object, and for the mere employment of the copyist. Compare ख खुद्द, "God," with स्वद्व swadatta, "self-given;" for which, in Zend, we have, under a more regular participial form (see Gramm. Crit. r. 668), खडित khaddta*; which Anquetil, or his Parsi teacher, always understands in the sense of, "given through God," deceived, probably, by the resemblance of sound to ख khudd; while Neriosengh properly translates it by स्वयंद्र swayandatta. The Persian ख खुद्द is, however, as Burnouf correctly assumes, actually related to the Zend खडित khaddta, so as to have its name based in the idea, "created by itself," while in its form it has been mutilated of one syllable. In Sanskrit we find both स्ववृ swabhā, "self-existent," and also the more common स्वयंब स्वयम्भ swayambhā, as appellations of Brahma and Vishṇu. That, however, as has often been maintained, our word "God" is really related to

* This word comes from the root ध to place," net from द, "to give," see §. 637.
and that its primal signification has thus been discovered through the Zend, we are forced still to doubt. We will here only call to mind that the Germanic forms, especially in the older dialects, in general approximate much more to the Sanskrit than to the modern Persian. \( sw \), in particular, in the Gothic, either remains unaltered, or becomes \( st \) (§. 20.). The pronominal syllable \( swa \) exhibits itself in the Gothic as a pronominal adverb, \( swa (sw) \) “thus,” and with an instrumental form, \( sve (wie) \) “how.” The neuter substantive \( svèś (Theme svèsa) \) means Eigenthum, “property,” as in Sanskrit the neuter \( swa \).

I know of no certain form in which a Germanic \( g \) or \( k \) corresponds to a Sanskrit \( sw \) or a Persian \( kh \). To return, however, to the Persian \( khu = sw : \) compare \( khvatan, “to sleep,” \) with \( swap \) \( swap \); \( kh(w)abh, “sleep,“ \) with \( swapo \); \( kh(w)andan, “to sing,” \) with \( swan, “to sound,“ \) \( khwar, “sister,“ \) with \( swasri, Gothic svistar; \( khur-shid, “sun,“ \) Zend \( hvare, with \( swar, “heaven.\) In some words \( kh \) 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, \( khvadon, “to proceed with pomp,” \) corresponds to the Sanskrit \( gnav kram, “to go,” \) “to step;” and \( khvadon, “to buy,” \) to the Sanskrit equivalent root \( krī \). The Persian \( kh \) answers to the Sanskrit aspirated \( kh \), in the word \( khar, “ass” \) (Sanskrit \( sātara \)).

36. The guttural \( g \), and its aspirate \( gh \), are represented by \( g \) and \( gh \). The Sanskrit \( gh \) has, however, sometimes dismissed the aspiration in Zend; at least \( garēma, “heat” \) \( (βέμα and Wärme) \), answers to the Sanskrit \( gharma \); on the other hand, the \( ghna \) in \( vērē-thraghna, “victorious,” \) corresponds to the Sanskrit \( ghna \) at the end of compounds; for instance, in \( sātru-ghna, “enemy slayer.” \) The Zend \( vērē-thraghna \) properly signi-
characters, like the word so often used in the same sense ṽṛ̣ṇaḥra-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 ɡ ch ( = ṝ), and the media, namely ɡ j ( = ū): the aspirates are wanting, which is not surprising, as they are of rare occurrence in the Sanskrit. The following are examples: ɡρΣΣανα charaiti, "he goes," Sanskrit चरति charati; चालचाँत चतुर्दश, "four" (nom. plur. masc.) Sansk. चतुर्दश chatuḍas, चत्तुर्दश chatuḍa; अशोक अशोक, "strength," Sansk. शोक अशोक, अशोक अशोक. 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 ɡ z; for instance, ɡράμ्य zāta, "born," Sansk. जात jātā; secondly, by ɡ sh; for instance, शेन शेन, "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, ɡ t ( = ṝ), ṝ th ( = ṝ), ɡ d ( = ṝ) द dh ( = ṝ), together with a ɡ ( = ṝ), peculiar to the Zend, of which more hereafter. The ɡ t is like the guttural which we represent by k ( = ṝ), in this respect, that its position is almost limited to one preceding vowels. Before र r and व w, and sometimes before य y, in order to gratify the affection of the latter for an aspirate, the aspirated ɡ th steps in. Thus, for instance, थवैर thwaim signifies "thine," while the nominative is written थप tham, and the genitive थम tava; and the word लझ लझ adur, "fire," nom. लझ लझ
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dtars, makes, after rejection of the a which preceded r, धत्रे, “igni,” धथ्र, “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, वस्त्र, not वस्थ्र, “garment,” “vest;” but we have वाण्ड माण्ड्रा, “speech,” not वाण्ड माण्ड्रा, from the root मण्ड्र man. 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 (ट) is represented by a special letter, namely, by ट, which we, with Burnouf, write t, but formerly wrote with a simple t undotted below, because no change is possible with ॠ or ॡ. 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 े is written ;o as well as े; the last, which prevails at the end of words, with a stroke similar to that which distinguishes our े from ो. Before consonants, for instance, in the word त्कैश, 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 ट has merely a feebler pronunciation than ो t, and is, so to say, the last breathing of t; as, in Sanskrit, s and r, at the end of words, are diluted to Visarga (§. 11.); and as ठ t, in Prakrit, and also in Greek, is, at the end of words, altogether suppressed.

39. ट is the ordinary d ट, and ट according to Rask’s just remark, its aspirate dh. This represents the Sanskrit ध, for instance, in the imperative ending धिः. The Zend, moreover, favours ध for d in the middle of words between two vowels. We find, for instance, दाता, “given,” but दम do dhāmi. Sanskrit दद्मिद ददामि, “I give”; and मात मात do mazda-dhāta, [G. Ed. p. 39.]
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"given by Ormusd," "created"; येद्विः येद्वि, "if," Sanskrit यदि यदि; पद्हा, "foot," Sansk. पदा पादा.

40. The labial class embraces the letters ज, झ, झ, झ, and the nasal of this organ न, of which more hereafter. ज answers to the Sanskrit ज, and is transformed into श by the retro-active aspirative power of a following र, ल, and न; whence, for instance, the preposition प्रतिप्र (pratipratipr) becomes, in Zend, जालिस. जालिस and the primitive words जालिस जालिस, "body," form in the nominative, जालिस धार, जालिस धार; on the other hand, in the accusative, जालिस धार, जालिस धार, जालिस धार, or जालिस धार, केरे. In regard to the power which resides in ज of aspirating ज, compare जालिस त्तु, "burning," from the root जालिस त्तु, with the derivative from the same root जालिस त्तु, जालिस त्तु, जालिस त्तु, "he shines" (See Vendidad Sâde, p. 333), and the plural झालिस झालिस, "nights," with the ablative singular झालिस झालिस, झालिस झालिस (Vendidad Sâde, p. 330), in which, even in the root, the interchange between न and र is observable, as the same takes place in the Sanskrit between शहर शहर and शहर शहर, "day." (Gramm. Crit. r. 228. annot.) Originally—

i.e. standing for itself, and not proceeding from the ज by the influence described—ज is of very rare occurrence. In some instances known to me it corresponds to the Sanskrit भ, which, however, for the most part, in the Zend has rejected the aspiration. In Anquetil's Vocabulary we find नवो नवो, "navel," which in Sanskrit is written नवो नवो; and in the fem. accus. plural, of frequent occurrence in the Zend-Avesta, नवो नवो हुसेढ्रिस, we recognise the Sanskrit सुभार सुभार "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 in the

[G. Ed. p. 40.] next place, by which we express the sound of the German and Italian ज, the English consonantal ज. This
semi-vowel is written at the beginning of words by ं or ं, and in the middle by the duplication of the ं, as in the Old High German we find w expressed. This semi-vowel, and the vowels which correspond to it, ः and ः, introduce into the preceding syllable an ः; 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 ए 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, नरेन्द्र “hominis,” for नरेः, is frequent; but नरेः नरेः “hominique,” is an exception. The vowels after which, by the attractive power of the letters mentioned, an ः is placed, are अ, आ, र, ए, ऐ, ओ, as to which we must also observe, that ए, in the case of a succeeding ः, is lengthened. Examples are: माध्यमाद्य माध्यम (मध्य madhya) “middle”; तनायन nairya, “man”; बावैति bavaiti, “he is”; दादास्ति dadhāiti, “he gives”; अण्डाष्टि अन्नाष्टि atapayēti, “he shines”; बेलाने kērenōiti, “he makes”; स्तुद्धि stūdhi, from the root स्तु stū (स्तु); तौरीय tūriya, “the fourth,” from चतुर् chatur, with the च cha suppressed*; अहृत्य ahuirya, an adjective, derived from एहृत ahura. With regard to the influence of य y we must observe, that it does not mix up an ः with a vowel immediately preceding, but only with one separated from it by one consonant; for if there be two, unless the first be ं n, the retroactive power of ध y, ः or ः, is neutralized; thus एस्ति astit, not एस्ति astiti, stands for “he is”; on the other hand we have बावैति bavainti, Sansk. भवानि bhavanti, “they are.” Several other consonants also resist simply this power of attraction; thus we have दक्ष्य daśkhyu, not

* Or more immediately from the Sanskrit ordinal चतुर्थ turyya or चारीय turiya, “fourth.” — Editor.
\[\text{daihyu, “land,” “province”; and the i of the personal terminations } \text{mi and } \text{hi}, \text{ or } \text{shi}, \text{ obtain no influence over the preceding syllable. In the same manner, in the first person plural, } \text{mahī}, \text{ not } \text{maihi}, \text{ corresponds to the Veda termination } \text{masi}; \text{ and in the genitive of the stems, or inflective bases, in } \text{a}, \text{ a-hē, not } \text{aihē}, \text{ stands for }} \text{a-sya.}

42. \text{injy sometimes also exerts that disturbing influence on a following } \text{a} \text{ or } \text{d}, \text{ which is equivalent to the insertion of a vowel, or of } \text{i}, \text{ and consequently effects their transmutation into } \text{ē}; \text{ thus the bases of nouns in

* The expression of the text is “äußert umlautenden Einfluss.” It is hardly possible to render into English without circumlocution certain terms which the philologers of Germany have invented and adopted to express the various modifications of the Indo-Germanic vowel; such as, Ablaut, Anlaut, Inlaut, Umlaut. Whether these terms have in themselves the virtue of suggesting to a Teutonic ear the particular modification of the vowel to which they are respectively applied may be doubted; but if to the student and the teacher they answer the purpose of a memoria technica, their use is fully justified by the necessity of the case, and the practice of a language which possesses a singular and inexhaustible power of progress and adaptation to exigencies. In our language, it seems to us that the uncouthness of such compounds as Upsound, 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. Inlaut is, we believe, merely the Sanskrit Guna. The meaning of the two former, and their distinction from each other, may best be explained by the following extract from our author’s excellent work the Vocalismus, p. 10.

“I designate,” he says, “by the term Ablaut, a change of the root vowel, which is distinguished from the Umlaut by the fact that it is not produced by the influence of the vowel of the termination; for Umlaut is a mere affection, disturbance (Trübung) of the primary sound, through which that sound becomes more homogeneous with the vowel of the termination; while in the Ablaut, without any recognised external cause, it makes room for another, and, in general, totally different sound; as in Gothic. nima, ‘I take’; nam, ‘I took.’ I say, without any recognised ex-
ya form, in the genitive, ये-हे, instead of ये-हे; and, with the verb, the old Sanskrit या or या of the fourth and tenth classes, in the present singular becomes ये. Compare अतापयेमि, अतापयेहि, अतापयेति, with the Sanskrit अतापयामि, अतापयासि, अतापयति. In the last syllable, या before या, according to rule, becomes या; and after the same analogy, यम becomes यम. We find, therefore, for instance, चत्रुष्म् tārṇa, "quartum," from चत्रुष्म् tārṇa; and त्रिश्वम् thrishum, " tertiam partem," चत्रुष्म् chathrushum, " quartam partem," from चत्रुष्म thrishva, चत्रुष्म chathrushva. This appearance is to be thus understood, that the antecedent semi-vowel, after the suppression of the a, passes into its corresponding vowel, which, however, according to the rule of § 64., must be a long one. The य, after its influence has transformed य into य, is often itself suppressed; thus we find य राधेस्वाम् frādeśām, "I shewed," from राधेस्यम् prādeśayam, which

* Internal cause; because I think I can shew that the Ablaut also is produced by the particular quality and condition of the termination. Whether, however, we seek for the radical vowel in the present or the preterite, the change is equally one quite different from that of the Indian Guna or 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, ι and ι with ε, λεηα, φεγνα. In respect of signification, likewise, there is a difference between the Indian Guna and Vṛiddhi and Germanic Ablaut; for the Ablaut has acquired for itself a significatory power for grammatical purposes, even if, as I conjecture, it did not originally possess such: the contrast between the present and the past seems to rest upon it, and there are indications that the latter is expressed by this change. In Sanskrit, Guna and Vṛiddhi present no indication of this significatory power, but, merely in the character of diphthongizing modifications, accompany those inflections which do signify grammatical relations.

Further illustrations of these latter remarks are to be found in the Note 4, which Professor Bopp has appended to the above passage of the Vocalisms. — Trans.

* Cf. p. 963, Note.
according to the rule of the tenth class, would be formed from दिश्य dis. The genitive termination स या sya appears everywhere reduced into ्षा hā. The semi-vowels ध्य y and ्व v are generally suppressed after preceding consonants*; and thus, also, the imperative ending स्वा sva gives up its v.

43. In Sanskrit, य y is sometimes, for euphony, interposed between two vowels (Gram. Crit. rr. 271. 310. 311.); but this does not uniformly occur. In Zend, the interposition of y between ु u, ्उ ù, and a following ्व v, seems to amount to a law. Thus the Sanskrit ब्रुवे bruve, "I say" (from ब्र and र, Gram. Crit. r. 55.), becomes, in Zend, म्रुवे mruve (§. 63.); and the neuter form हे duhe, "two," after the vocalization of the w into u, takes the form म्रुदु दुहे mrudu duhe.

44. We have already remarked (§. 30.) with respect to र r, that at the end of a word an े e is always appended to it; for instance, दतारे datarē, "Creator," "Giver"; हवरे hvarē, "Sun," instead of दतार datar; हवर hvar. In the middle of a word, where an ्व h is not introduced according to §. 48., the union of र r with a following consonant is mostly avoided; so, indeed, that to the originally vowelless र an e is appended: thence, for instance, ददारेशा dadarēsa, from ददारा dadara, "vidi," "vidit"; or the र is transposed, in the same manner as is usual in the Sanskrit for the avoidance of the union of र r with two following consonants. (Gram. Crit. r. 34b.) Hence, for instance, अथरावा athrava, "priests" (nominative), accus. अथ्रावनाम athranām, from the theme अथराव atharvan, which in the weak cases (§. 129.) contracts itself into अथरव athurav or अथरवम athauravam. (§. 28.) To this, also, pertains the fact that polysyllabic stems (or uninflected bases) in अ ar, at the beginning of compounded forms, transpose this syllable into अ ra; and thus अथ्रा athra, "fire," stands instead of

* But see § 721.
The combinations अर्थ, तृत्य, are only permitted where a vowel follows, and the combination अर्थस only as a termination, and in the middle of a word before त; for instance, अर्थस्व तृत्या, “the fourth”; अर्थस्व वार्या, “strong”; श्रृं श्रु उर्वान, “soul” श्रृं श्रु हाउर्वा, “whole” (?); अर्थस्व द्वार्ष, “fire” (nominative); अर्थस्व नार्स, “of a man”; अर्थस्व हर्सा, “ploughed”; but अर्थस्व चात्रुस, “four times,” for अर्थस्व चातृर, since here no अ precedes the र.

45. It is worthy of remark, that in the Zend the ल is wanting, as in Chinese the र, while, nevertheless, it exists in the modern Persian, and shews itself in words which are not of Semitic origin. The Sanskrit व has three representatives in the Zend, ल, », and अ. The two first are so far distinguished from each other in their use, that ल corresponds to the Sanskrit व only at the beginning, and » only in the middle of words; for instance, अम्ल वैम, “we,” वयम् वैम, अम्ल तवा (तु) = तव तवा. This distinction, as Rask justly assumes, is only graphic. अ, which I, with Burnouf, render by उ, most frequently occurs after थ, so that » never accompanies an antecedent थ. On the other hand we find » much oftener than अ after the aspirated medials of this class. Perhaps the law here obtains that the ल ध, which, according to §. 39, stands for ल ध (र), is only followed by », while an original ल ध, corresponding to a Sanskrit ध, only appears in conjunction with अ. Thus अम्ल चद्वादो, “having created,” “given,” from the root चद ल, answers to the Sanskrit नम् चद्वादम्, while the accusative, of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad, अम्ल तवानेम, seems to be identical with the Sanskrit चद्वानेम चद्वानेम, “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 अथ्र for अथ, forms अथ्रवा, अथ्रवानेम, not अथ्रवा, अथ्रवानेम, &c.—Editor.
† The root corresponds to the Sanskrit धध, see §. 637.
Thus we read in the Vendidad (Olsh. p. 23), the nominatives दैविस and दैविस, "beggar," (?) and दैविस, "a worshipper of Daeva." दैविस however, as derived from दैविस through the suffix स, i, seems to me dubious, and I prefer the variation दैविस. Or is it between ए and इ also that दैविस only can be allowed? Another instance is, दैविस aiwyα, "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 झम ap, "water" in such a manner, that after suppression of the प人格, the Sanskrit termination ब्यय, which elsewhere, in the Zend, appears only as ब्यय, has weakened itself to ब्यय, and, according to § 41., has introduced an स into the base. Another instance in which श ब्य has weakened itself in the Zend into a semi-vowel, and obtained the form श ब्य in virtue of its position between two स, is the very common preposition एभ्र, aiwi, for which, however, एभ्र aibi is sometimes substituted. It may be appropriate here to remark that श ब्य has appeared in the Zend, in other company, in the enfeebled shape of श ब्य. We find, namely, the base यब ubha, "both," not only in the shape श ब्य uba, but also in that of एभ्र aova (§. 28.), the neuter dual form of which I think I recognise in the Vend. S. p. 88., where एभ्र एभ्र एभ्र ubha ubha ubha aovē yaśnō amēshē spondō, can hardly signify any thing else than "ambos † venerandus Anschaspatos" (non coniunctos Sanctos, see Nalus, vv. 25, 26.) Anquetil interprets (T. 3, p. 472.) ovē, by "tous deux." We have still another position to mention, in which

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


† Burnouf reads aibi (i.e. "over") and makes yaśne, signify "reverence."
priate than the harder » r. The only example of this case is the feminine ailability of this case is the feminine ailability of this case is the feminine »» suvrd, "sword," "dagger," in which we believe we recognise the Sanskrit उष्ण suhbra, "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 व w as the English v, and the letters » 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 य y, as described in §. 41., unless the term त्रयाय haurva, "all," which often occurs, as well as विश्वa višpa, is derived from the Sanskrit जच sarva, "all." I have, however, already elsewhere ascribed to the corresponding vowel » a power of attraction, howbeit sparingly exerted; in virtue of which, for instance, the base त्याय aûarvan, "priests," in the weak cases (see §. 129.), after that य aûa has contracted itself into य य, by the influence of this u, also converts the a of the preceding syllable into u; hence, for instance, in the dative, त्याय aûarunę for त्याय aûarunę. The Sanskrit त्य तरुनa, "young," is, in Zend, त्याय aûruna or त्याय aûruna (§. 28.); and वस् vasu, "thing," "riches," [G. Ed. p. 46.] has, by the influence of the concluding u, converted itself into त्याय वóhu.

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 य s and » n, and find ourselves compelled to assign the same also to the

* The accusative स्वुरञ्ज suvraim, appears in Olshausen, p. 13, with the variation स्वुरञ्ज sufrain. (§. 40.) Then we often find the instrumental एङ्ग्या suveya, for which, however, we must read एङ्ग्या suveya, if suveya be not derivable from a Theme एङ्ग्या suver, after the analogy of दुर्दर सुदुर, from दुर्दर सुदुर. (Gramm. Crit. r. 270.)
The aspirating virtue of the \( j \) is less potent than that of the \( r \) and \( w \), and we find \( j \) often preceded by the un-aspirated \( t \); for instance, in ब्यत्वः bitya, "the second," थ्रियः thritya, "the third": on the other hand, we have नेपत्यः mērēthyu, "death," Sansk. मृत्यु mṛtyu.

48. In connection with the above rule stands the phenomenon, that before \( r \), when followed by any consonant not a sibilant, an \( h \) is usually placed; for instance यस्माद् mahrka, "death," from the root यस्मि mar (यस्मि,) "to die"; यस्माद् kehrpēm, or यस्माद् kērēpēm, "the body" (nom. यस्माद् kērēs); यस्माद् vēhrka, or यस्माद् vērēka, "wolf" (क्रक vriku.) The semi-vowel \( y \) also, which only appears before vowels, sometimes attracts an \( h \); thus, यस्मादद्वत्वः thwhaṇya, "through thee," corresponds to the Sanskrit त्वायः twayā; and the word यस्मादसः csahya (nom. यस्मादसः csahya)

[G. Ed. p. 47.] csahya adduced by Rask, stands for यस्मादसः csaya and comes from the root यस्मि csī, "to rule," (क्ष kshi.)

49. We come now to the sibilants. The first, a palatal, pronounced in Sanskrit with a gentle aspiration, \( श् \), which we express by \( s \) in Sanskrit, and \( z \) in Zend, is written \( s \) in the latter. Its exact pronunciation is scarcely ascertainable. Anquetil assigns it that of the ordinary \( s \). It in general occurs in those positions in which the Sanskrit in corresponding words has its \( श् s \); thus, for instance, दासः, "ten," चातुः, "hundred." पासू, "beast," are common to both languages. In this respect \( s \) has spread itself wider in Zend than in Sanskrit; that before several consonants,
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nally, \& t, \& k, and \& n, as well at the beginning as in
the middle of words—in the latter place, however, only
after \& a, \& d, and \& a—in it corresponds to the Sanskrit
dental or ordinary s s. Compare न्म्नति stard, “the stars,”
with स्ततमस् stāras; न्म्नति stādīmi, “I praise,” with स्तदमि
stāumi; न्म्नति asti, “he is,” with अस्ति asti; अस्तमि
aṣṭaum, “ossium,” with अस्तः asthi; न्म्नति शंकडा
“shoulder,” (?) with शंकड़ skandha; न्म्नति snā, “to purify,”
with श्ना� snā, “to bathe.” We might infer from this cir-
cumstance 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 श a. The occasion for this pre-
sents itself in the nom. sing. masc. of bases in न्म्न nt.

50. The semi-vowel \& v is regularly hardened into s p
after श s; hence, for instance, मन्वेष स्पद, “canis.” न्म्नति
स्पनेम् “canem,” मन्वेष विस्पा, “all,” [G. Ed. p. 48.]
मन्वेष अस्पा, “horse,” corresponding to the Sanskrit अस्वा
स्वामस्, विष्वाविस्वा, अस्वास्. मन्वेष अस्वेना अस्वेना, “holy,”
is not corresponded to by a Sanskrit अस्वेना अस्वेना, which must
have originally been in use, and which the Lithuanian
स्वाता-स indicates. From the Zend मन्वेष अस्पा, the trans-
ition is easy to the Greek ἵππος, which is less obvious
in the case of the Indian अस्वा.

51. For the Sanskrit lingual sibilant श श्व, the Zend
supplies two letters, श and श्व. The first, according to
Rask, is pronounced like the ordinary s, and therefore like the
Sanskrit dental s s; while श्व has the sound of श = sh,
and marks this by a stroke of aspiration. We therefore write
it sh.* Rask observes that these two letters are often inter-
changed in MSS.; which he accounts for by the circumstance

* It is in this Translation given sh without any mark. श्व denotes the
Sansk. श.
that M is used in the Pehlevi for sh, and that the Parsi copyists have been long better acquainted with the Pehlevi than the Zend. We find, also, in the Codex edited by Burnouf, M almost everywhere corresponding to श. We recognise, however, from the text edited by Olshausen of a part of the Vendidad, and the variations appended, that although in etymological respects M as well as न corresponds to the Sanskrit श, the principal position of M 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 M resembles, among the dentals, त, among the gutturals च, and among the nasals principally न. At the end of words, indeed, M s corresponds to the Sanskrit श, 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 श; namely, after vowels other than a and a, and after the consonants च and र. Hence, for instance, the nominative माताम paitis, “Lord,” माताम pasus, “beast,” माताम oltars, “fire,” माताम drus, “daemon,” from the theme म् druj. On the other hand, माताम barus, “bearing,” from माताम barant.* In the word माताम cvas, “six,” it is true a terminating M s stands after a; but it does not here replace a Sanskrit श, but the original श of श as. As evidence of the use of M s for श before strong consonants, we may adduce the very usual superlative suffix माताम ista (i.e. ṣtost), corresponding to the Sanskrit श isṭha. Other examples are माताम karsta, “ploughed,” for क्रेक kriṣṭa. In the word माताम sayana “camp,” M stands irregularly for म s, which latter was to be anticipated from the Sanskrit श श, but in the fem. numeral

* I retain here the original t, since the theme of the word does not appear in use. त must otherwise have been changed for त.
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The Sanskrit form is तिस्रा, and according to §. 53., becomes श. The श, however, is here in a position (after त) in which the Sanskrit favours the conversion of स into श; and on this rests the Zend form तिस्र. That it does not, however, stand as ति�घ्र, as we might expect from §. 52., is certainly not to be ascribed to the original existence of अ अ, for तिघ्र stands for तिघ्र,®

52. श stands for the Sanskrit श be-
fore vowels and the semi-vowels य र and न न; compare आतेस्यात्र्य आतेस्यात्र्य with तेस्यात्र् तेस्यात्र्, “horum,” and रेतेस्यात्र् रेतेस्यात्र्, “in his”; माश्या, “man,” with माण्या manushya. Yet श श does not unite itself with an antecedent श श; but for the Sanskrit श क्ष we find almost everywhere in Olshausen’s text, and without variation, शक्षक्ष; hence, for instance, शस्त्रक्षक्ष, “king,” Sanskrit श क्षत्र, “a man of the warlike or royal caste.” The word of frequent occurrence, शस्त्रक्षक्ष, and the third person connected with it, शस्त्रक्षक्षक्षक्ष, we must, on a double ground, reject, and prefer the variation given at p. 33, since श ह here is prolonged, as well by the preceding श as by the following न. It is, however, worthy of remark, that the Sanskrit श क्ष in many Zend words abandons the guttural, and appears as श. For instance, ताक्षन्त्र दक्षिन, “dexter,” becomes शक्षन्त्र दक्षिन, (Lithuan. dedzine, “the right hand”), and शक्षन्त्र शक्षन्त्र, “eye,” becomes शक्षन्त्र शक्षन्त्र, which, however, seems only to occur at the end of possessive compounds (Bahuvrihi).

53. श ह is never, in etymological respects, the representative of the Sanskrit ह ह, but of the pure and dental sibilant स स. Before vowels, semi-vowels, and न, in Zend, this letter invariably becomes श, possibly because स श (§. 35.) takes the shape श क्ष while before न, and such consonants as cannot unite with a preceding ह, (§. 49.) it is to be looked for in the shape of श स. The 

[G. Ed. p. 51.]
roots which begin with स्प स्प and स्प स्प have not yet been detected by me in the Zend; but I am convinced that स्प स्प, for instance, “to touch,” could not begin otherwise in Zend than with स्प स्प. Compare, for instance—

ZEND.                SANSKRIT.

मः हा, “they,”          सा सा.

मस्य खप्ता, “seven,”     सप्र्य सप्ता.

हकरेत्, “once,”         सक्रि व सक्रि.

अहि, “thou art,”        असि असि.

अहमाइ, “to this,”      अस्माइ अस्माइ.

hवरे, “sun,”            स्वर स्वर, “heaven.”

हवा, “his,”             स्वा स्वा.

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

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

[G. Ed. p. 52.] Thus I believe I have clearly ascertained the existence of the Sanskrit participle शिद्ध siddha, “perfected,” in the term of frequent occurrence in the Vendidad मस्य sāistēm; after the analogy of मस्य irista, “deceased,” from मस्य irith (see §. 99.) Olshausen notifies (p. 29) as variations of मस्य sāistēm— मस्य sāistēm, मस्य sāistēm, मस्य sāistēm, and मस्य sāistēm. In all these forms, the long a presents a difficulty; for, according to §. 28., शिद्ध shidh would give the form मस्य shaidh; and this, with the suffix ता,
shaiṣṭa, in the nom. and accus. neut. śchiṣṭem. 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), -saṣṭa, saṣṭa, saṣṭa, saṣṭa. Dālārē gaēthanaṁ aśtrātīnaṁ ashāum! kva pāoirīm an-hāo zēmō shaiṣṭem? "Creator mundorum existentium, pure! ubi (quid) primum hujus terræ perfectum (bonum?)"

55. The nominative pronominal base sya (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 do, converted into sṛṣya, after the analogy of rule 101 of my Grammar. I have detected a similar phenomenon in the Zend pronouns; for we find sṛṣ ḍō, "ejus," "ei," which is founded on a lost Sanskrit sṛṛ ḍō (cf. mṛṛ mē, "mei," "mihi," and ṭō ḍō, "tuī," "tibī"), when it follows sṛṛ ḍō yezi, "if," taking the form sṛṛ ṭō (more correctly, perhaps, sṛṛ śē); for instance, at p. 37 of Olshausen: while on the same page we find sṛṛ ḍō yeziḥa ḍō, (und wēn ḍō,)[G. Ed. p. 53.] "and if to him." In the following page we find a similar phenomenon, if, as I can hardly doubt, sṛṛ ḍō shāo (thus I read it with the variation), corresponds to the Sanskrit saṣṭh akaraṁ asāu ("ille," "illa"): saṣṭh saṣṭh, saṣṭh, saṣṭh, saṣṭh, sṛṛ ṭō saṣṭh, sṛṛ ṭō saṣṭh, sṛṛ ṭō saṣṭh. Nōit zi īm zāo shāo yā (text, sṛṛ yāo) darēgha akarsta (text, sṛṛ ṭō adarsta), "For not this earth which lies long unploughed."

56a). An ḍō h standing between a or ə and a following vowel is usually preceded by a guttural nasal (ḷ ṭ); and this appendage seems indispensable—I remember, at least, no exception—in cases where the following vowel is a, o, or e. We find, for instance, sṛṛ svaṭa-yānha, "thou wast born"; while in the active the personal ending sṛṛ hi of the present admits no nasal; and we find, for
instance, ॐ ahi, "thou art," अ यः कल्याणः bacsahi, "thou givest," not अ यः अः कल्याणः bacsanhi.

56b). The termination as, which in Sanskrit only before sonant consonants(§. 25.) and ॐ a, dissolves its झ into ज u, and contracts the latter together with the preceding a into ज o (compare the French au, from al): this ancient termination as appears in Zend, as also in Prâkrit and Pali, always under the shape of ऊ.

On the other hand, the termination ds, which in Sanskrit before all sonant letters entirely abandons the s, in Zend has never allowed the concluding sibilant entirely to expire, but everywhere preserves its fusion in the shape of ऊ o (for [G. Ed. p. 54.] u); and I consider myself thereby strongly supported in a conjecture I enounced before my acquaintance with Zend,* that in Sanskrit the suppression of a terminating s after ā had preceded the vocalization of this s into u. It is remarkable that where, in Zend, as above observed, an झ झ preceded the झ h which springs out of the s of the syllable ās, or where, before the enclitic particle आ अ cha, the s above mentioned is changed into झ s, together with these substantial representatives of the s, its evaporation into ऊ 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 म ा s, "luna"—an uninflected nominative, for the s belongs to the root—receives in Zend the form ज झ मā o, in which o represents the Sanskrit s; म ा s-cha, "lunaque," gives us ज झ मास च ज झ मास च मास म स, "lunam," ज झ मास...
57. Two sibilants remain to be mentioned, namely, ʂ and ϖ, of which the former was probably pronounced like the French z, and may therefore be replaced [G. Ed. p. 55.] by that letter. Etymologically this letter answers to the Sanskrit ः h for the most part, which never corresponds to the Zend ϖ h. Compare, for example,

**Sanskrit.**

अहम् aham, "I,"
हस्त hasta, "hand,"
सहस्र sahasra, "thousand,"
हाति hanti, "he strikes,"
वहाति vahati, "he carries,"

**Zend.**

鄣ር azēm.
鄣╓ zasā.
鄣ﮞ hazaŋra.
鄣ｫ zainti.
鄣š vazaiti.

(branch,"

58. Sometimes ʂ z appears also in the place of the Sanskrit ः j; so that the sibilant portion of this letter, pronounced dsch, is alone represented, and the d sound suppressed (see §. 53.). Thus 鄣ㄖ yaz, "to adore," answers to the Sanskrit ः yaj; ङ Zimbabwe zaōsha, "to please," springs from the Sanskrit root ः jush, "to please or gratify." Thirdly, the Zend z represents also the Sanskrit ः g, which is easily accounted for by the relationship between g and j. The Indian ः, (accus. ः) 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 मनस्थ to manasñ, without noticing the analogies which occur in cases of repetition, माओश-贪婪, "lunaque," अर्वाोश-贪婪, "arboresque," he says, "In mdengñ, there is perhaps this difference, that the ϖ does not replace the Sanskrit ʂ, 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 βoûς and गदुस, or गदुस, correspond to the Sanskrit nom. गदुस. [G. Ed. p. 56.] For the signification “earth” the Greek has preserved the guttural, which in Zend is replaced by z. The nom. गोय zdo supposes an Indian form गास, for गदुs; in the accusative, गोय zaim agrees, in respect of inflection, as closely as possible with गाम gām and γῆv.

59. Ϝ 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, Ϝ zh has arisen out of the Sanskrit ष y. Thus, for instance, यूयम yūyam, “you,” (vos), becomes यूज़ेम yūzhēm. Sometimes, also, Ϝ zh has sprung from the sound of the English j, and corresponds to the Sanskrit ज j, as in ज़ेम zhēmu, Sanskrit ज़ाज़ jāmu, “knee.” Finally, it stands as a terminating letter in some prefixes, in the place of the Sanskrit dental s after i and u; thus, निझ्बारैत nizhbaraiti, “he carries out”; दुझ-उत्तेम duzh-úctēm, “ill spoken”; on the other hand, दुझ-मातेम duz̄h-mātēm, “ill thought.”

60. We have still to elucidate the nasals, which we have postponed till now, because for them a knowledge of the system of the other sounds is indispensable. We must first of all mention a difference from the Sanskrit, that in Zend every organ has not its particular nasal; but that here, in respect of n, two main distinctions are established, and that these mainly depend on the circumstance whether n precedes a vowel or a consonant. In this manner j and ž 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, বাহ্নকরয়েম hankaṛayēmi, “I glorify”; পঞ্চা pancha, “five”; बुश्यांते būshyantēm: on the
other hand, व्यन (nom.) "man"; नोत, "not"; बरयें, "they might bear"; अन्य, "the other." Concerning the difference between ज and ज—a difference not recognised in European alphabets—it is probable that ज, being always fenced in by strong consonants, must have had a duller and more suppressed sound than the freer ज; and by reason of this weak and undecided character of its pronunciation, would appear to have applied itself more easily to every organ of the following letter.

61. Still feebler and more undecided than ज, perhaps an equivalent to the Indian Anuswāra, we conjecture to have been the nasal ज, which is always involved with ज, and which seems from its form to have been a fusion of ज and ज. We find this letter, which we write an, first, before sibilants, before व and ज (like the Anuswāra), and before the aspirates थ and ज; for instance, जसोसत्सत्सस् csayans, "regnans," accus. जसोसत्सत्सस् csayantem; जसोसत्सत्सस् zanhyanāna, a part of the middle future of the root ज स जन, "to beget," but, as it seems to me, with a passive signification ("qui nascetur," Vend. S. pp. 23 and 103.); जसोसत्सत्सस् manthra, "speech," from the root ज स ज न, ज न, "mouth," probably from the Sanskrit जप, "to pray," §. 40., and with the nasal inserted. Secondly, before a terminating म and न. We have here to observe that the Sanskrit termination अम अम is always changed to अनिम in Zend; for instance, अद्ध हिम, "I gave," Sanskrit अद्ध हिम adaddām; अद्ध हिम pādhanaṇim, "pedum," Sans. पादानाम pādānām; and that the termination of the third person plural, अन an, provided the अ do not pass into ए, always appears as a double nasal अन.

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

* The termination अन from अन 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 v 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. येन्हे्ङ् येन्हे्ङ् येन्हे्ङ्, “qui,” and in the fem. pron. genitives, as ईन्हो ईन्हो “hujus,” which often occurs, but as often without z i, and with z n. ईन्हो ईन्हो. What phonetic difference existed between z and 6 we cannot venture to pronounce. Anquetil as we have seen, assigns the same pronunciation to each; while Rask compares 6 with the Sanskrit palatal न् n, and illustrates its sound by that of the Spanish and Portuguese ñ.

63. The labial nasal 6 m does not differ from the Sanskrit न्: it must, however, be remarked, that it sometimes takes the place of b. At least the root बुः brū, “speak,” in Zend becomes बुः mṛū; as बुः बुः mṛām, “I spoke,” बुः बुः mṛām, “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 वृद्र vāri, “water.” I consider, also, multus related to बहुल bahula, the Greek πολύς, and the Gothic filu.

64. A concluding 6 m operates in a double manner on a preceding vowel. It weakens (see §. 30.) the a to 6 e; and, on the other hand, lengthens the vowels i and u; thus, for instance, जाैैैैै पाईैैैै paitīm, “the Lord,” जाैैैैै तनैैैैै tanūm, “the body,” from the bases जाैैैैै paiti, जाैैैैै tanu. In contradiction to this rule we find the vocative of frequent occurrence, जाैैैैै एश्दाम ashdum, “pure.” Here, however, एश्दाम एश्दाम, as a diphthong, answers to the Sanskrit एश्दाम एश्दाम, 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.
CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

The form in question is a contraction of the theme \( \text{\textit{ashavan}} \); with an irregular conversion of the concluding \( jn \) into \( qm \).

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

Simple Vowels: \( a, \varepsilon, e; u, o, u \)
Diphthongs: \( io, oi; au, do, au \)
Gutturals: \( k \) (before vowels and \( v \)), \( c \) (principally before consonants), \( kh \) (from \( sw \), before vowels and \( y \)); \( g, gh \)
Palatals: \( ch, jh \)
Dentals: \( t \) (before vowels and \( y \)), \( f \) (before consonants and at the end of words), \( th \) (before whole and semi-vowels), \( d, dh \)
Labials: \( p, f \) (the latter before vowels, semi-vowels, nasals, and \( s, b \)
Semi-vowels: \( l, m, y \) (the two [G. Ed. p. 60.] first initial, the last medial), \( r, r \) (the last only after \( f, f \)), \( v \) (the first initial, the last medial), \( wv \)
Sibilants and \( h \): \( s, sh, s, zh \) (or like the French \( j \)), \( z, h \)
Nasals: \( n \) (before vowels, semi-vowels, and at the end of words), \( h, an \) (before strong consonants), \( ah \) (before sibilants, \( h, th, f, m, \) and \( n \)), \( n \) (between \( a \) or \( ao \), and \( h \), and between \( a \) and \( r^* \)), \( m \) (between \( i \) or \( e \), and \( h \)), \( m \)
Remain also the Compounds \( \text{\textit{w}w for \text{\textit{w}a}h} \), and \( \text{\textit{w}w} \)

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 \( a \), which, according to Grimm, is always short, answers

* E.g. \( \text{\textit{w}w} \text{\textit{hazanra}}, \text{“a thousand.”} \)
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 सबन् saptan; tainun, "ten," with दसन् dasan.

67. We believe ourselves authorized to lay down as a law, that च 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 च 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 च a; compare, for instance, in the genitive of the bases in a युक्स स्वरक-स्या, Gothic vulfis, Old High German wolfe-s. In the dative plural wolfu-m stands to vulfa-m in the same relation as above (§. 66.), sibun to saptan. The precedence of a liquid has also, in Old High German, sometimes converted this a into u or o; compare plinte-mu(mo), caeco, with the Gothic blindamma. Also after the German j or y, which in Sanskrit (य 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; plinta "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 a has become i.

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

70. For ई i and ई i the Gothic has i and ei; which latter, as Grimm has sufficiently shewn, is everywhere to be considered as long i, and also in Old and Middle High German is so represented. We, together with Grimm, as in the case of the other vowels, designate its prolongation by a circumflex. In the Modern High German the long i appears mostly as ei; compare, for instance, mein with the Gothic genitive meina, and the Old and Middle High German min. 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 ओ 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 [G. Ed. p. 63.] it down as a rule, that final i has given way in German everywhere, as it has generally in Latin. Compare.

<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>ὑπέρ</td>
<td>super</td>
<td>ufär</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अस्ति asti</td>
<td>ἐστί</td>
<td>est</td>
<td>ist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>सन्ति santi</td>
<td>ἑντί</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, ऋ i is usually suppressed; and the Gothic terminating syllable i 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 ē. We retain this character. We have also to observe of the Gothic, that, in the old text, i

---

* The Sanskrit पितृ pītri, "father," probably stands for पात्र pātṛi, "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 ऋ y, vide §. 68. 1. 12.; and as the j is simply and universally pronounced y, the German j will be represented by y in this translation.
at the beginning of a syllable is distinguished by two dots above, which Grimm retains.

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

This law, however, has not prevailed the Old High German universally: we find, for instance, arpi, "hereditas," not erpi; zahari, "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, ð, u, and o are modified into æ, û, and ö; ð into æ, and wo into ye. Thus the plural geste, drate, brüche, köche, länne, gruse, from gast, drat, bruch, koch, lön, gruz. 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 ï, short or
[G. Ed. p. 65.] long, from short or long ă; and in the same relation, ĭ from u, ĝ from o, ė from au; for instance, Bründe, Pfîle, Dünste, Flûge, Köche, Töne, Bâume, from Brand, Pfîl, &c.

76. For œu, œû, the Gothic has u, which is generally short. Among the few examples cited by Grimm, p. 41, of long u, we particularize the comparative sūtizā, the essential part of which corresponds to the Sansk. सत्ब्ध swādu, "sweet," (�ूद्-स), 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 pûdám, "to dwell," and trûdén, "to trust," correspond to the Sanskrit roots मू bhû ā, "to be." मू dhrû ā "to stand fast"—from which comes मू dhrûvā, "fast," "constant," "certain" (Gramm. Crit. r. 51.)—with the Guna form of which (§. 26.) the Goth. bauan, trauan, is connected; cf. भवतम् bhav-itum, "to be," ध्रवतम् dhrav-itum, "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 dábdō).

77. As out of the Sanskrit ृ u, in Zend, the sound of a short ृ* 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, pōkanēr, Middle High German bugen, bogen. The example adduced shews, also, the softening of the old u to e, in unaccented syllables, in Middle High German as in Modern High German; so that this unaccented e may represent all original vowels—a, i, u; and we may lay it down as a rule, that all long and short vowels in the last syllable of poly-
syllabic words, are either worn away or softened down to a mute e.

78. For the diphthongs \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \) (\( a + i \)) and \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \) (\( a + u \)), the Gothic has \( ai \) and \( au \), which are also monosyllabic, and were perhaps pronounced like \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \) and \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \). Compare \( bavaima, "\text{adificemus}" \) with \( bhavema, "\text{simus}"; sunau-s, "of a son," with its equivalent \( \text{sun} \text{o}s \) \( \text{sun} \text{o}s \). 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 \( am\text{emus} \), from \( ama\text{imus} \) (\( \S. 5.) \); and as in the almost solitary case of \( b\text{os} \), 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 \( v \) (\( \text{bovis, bovem} \)), while the first element \( a \), in its degeneration, appears as \( \dot{a} \) (\( \S. 3.) \). Compare, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>चरेम charēma (eamus),</td>
<td>faraima,</td>
<td>varēmēs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>चरेत charēta (eatis),</td>
<td>faraitth,</td>
<td>varēt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तेम्यस tēbhyaś (his),</td>
<td>thaim</td>
<td>dēm.</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 \( \dot{e} \) corresponds to the Sanskrit \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \) and Gothic \( ai \). The Middle High \[G. Ed. p. 67.\] German has shortened this \( e \), as standing in an unaccented terminating syllable (\( v\text{aren, varet} \)). Besides this, the Middle High German has, in common with the Old High German,

If, however, the Gothic diphthongs in question were not pronounced like their etymological equivalents \( \overline{e} \overline{a} \) and \( \dot{e} \), but, as Grimm conceives, approximate to the Vṛiddhi-change (\( \S. 26. \)) \( \dot{e} \dot{a} \) and \( \dot{a} \dot{u} \): 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 Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Middle High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adv, &quot;avum,&quot;</td>
<td>éwin.</td>
<td>sné.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaius, &quot;nix,&quot;</td>
<td>snéo,</td>
<td>mé.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mais, &quot;magis,&quot;</td>
<td>mér,</td>
<td>lérren.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lasyjan, &quot;docere,&quot;</td>
<td>lérren.</td>
<td>lêch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laihv, &quot;commodavit,&quot;</td>
<td>léh</td>
<td>lêch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Modern High German this ə is partly preserved, partly replaced; for instance, mér (mehr), Schné (Schnee), Sêle (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 of the letter which protects ə. For instance, Old High German zōh, Middle High German zōch (traxi, traxit) Gothic tauh, Sanskrit दुधोः dudōha (mulxi, mulsi); but poue, boue, flexi, flexit, Gothic baug, Sanskrit बुभोज बु-भोजा. 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, apaustaulus, Paulus); and as, in the next place, not every Gothic *ai* and *au* in the cognate dialects is represented in like manner, but in some cases the Gothic *ai* is replaced in Old High German by a simple *i* or *e,* and *au* by *u* or *o* (§. 77.); but in the others, *ai* is replaced by *e,* or (§. 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,* *ai*), 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 ए,* *चो δ,* never replace his *ái* and *ái*; 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. 63.] deficient in equivalents for these non-primitive vowels, which have degenerated from the original *ヱ 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 *é* and *δ,* ejusdem generis, = (*ा ए*). 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 (*ιπτόμαι* not *ιπτόμαι.* 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 र ए, and \(au\) like ओ ए, 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>saihs, “six,”</td>
<td>पप्प शशो,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihun, “ten,”</td>
<td>दशन् दासन,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faihu, “cattle,”</td>
<td>पशु पाशु,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svaihra “father-in-law,”</td>
<td>ब्यायु स्वाशुरा,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taihsvō, “dextera,”</td>
<td>दास्या दक्षिनाः,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairtō, “heart,”</td>
<td>ह्रिद (from hard §. 1.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bairan, “to bear,”</td>
<td>भार्तम् भार्तम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distairan, “to tear,”</td>
<td>दार-ि-तम्,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stairnō, “star,”</td>
<td>तारा 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 \(sihs, tihun\), had been produced; out of which, afterwards, the Guna power arising from \(h\) and \(r\) had produced \(saihs, taihun, bairan\). The High German has, however, remained at the earlier stage; for Old High German \(sihs\), (Anglo-Saxon, “six,”) and \(tēhan\) or \(tēhun\), &c., rest upon an earlier Gothic \(sihs, tihun\). Thus, \(tohtar\) rests on an earlier Gothic \(duhtar\), for the Guna form \(dauhtar\), Sanskrit दृहितर् duhitar, (दृहित्र् duhitri, §. 1.) “daughter.” Where the
The Sanskrit अ has preserved itself in the Gothic unaltered, that is, not weakened to i, the occasion is absent for the development of the diphthong ai, since it is not the a before h and r which demands a subsequent addition, but the i which demands a precedent one; compare ahtau, "eight," with स्वाश्च aśhtau.*

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

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

---

* Ahtau=aśhtau is perhaps the only case in which the Gothic ay corresponds to the Sanskrit Vriddhi diphthong अ ध श; on the other hand, au often answers to अ ध श = (a + u).

† There is yet another ia in Old High German, namely, that which Grimm (p. 103) very acutely represents as the result of a contraction, and formerly dissyllabic, to which, therefore, there is no counterpart diphthong in Gothic. The most important case will be discussed under the head of the verb, in preterites, such as hialt, "I held," Gothic haihald. After this analogy fiar, "four," (according to Otfrid), arose out of the Gothic fidor, in this way, that, after the extrusion of the de, the o passed into its corresponding short vowel — Grimm, p. 198.
pally prevails, in which, however, the e is only visibly re-
tained, 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 be-
fore vowels) is to be sought in the Sanskrit; for instance,
Neume, “nine,” Old High German niuni, Gothic niuneiis,
Sanskrit nava nava (as theme); neu, “new,” Old High Ger-
man niwi (indeclinable), Gothic nivi-s, Sanskrit 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
liügen, trügen.

[G. Ed. p. 72.] 84. Where the a element of the Sanskrit
s transliteration of the Sanskrit a in au, the equivalent of a, 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 ə 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 s a, which undergoes a
fusion with u in the s of the cognate word gnó. 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 \( वि \) \( \delta \) (out of \( a + u \)). In this case, in the Gothic \( ai \), also, both the letters must have been sounded, and this diphthong must be only an etymological, and not a phonetic equivalent of the Sanskrit वि.

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 pronunciation, = \( ai \). Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Gothic</th>
<th>High German</th>
<th>High German</th>
<th>High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>haita, &quot;voco,&quot;</td>
<td>heizu,</td>
<td>heize,</td>
<td>heisse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skaida, &quot;separo,&quot;</td>
<td>skeidu,</td>
<td>scheide,</td>
<td>scheide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86. (1.) Let us now consider the consonants, preserving the Indian arrangement, and thus examining [G. Ed. p. 73.] the gutturals first. Of these, the Gothic has merely the tenuis and the medial (\( k, g \)); and Ulfilas, in imitation of the Greek, places the latter as a nasal before gutturals; for instance, drigkan, "to drink"; briggan, "to bring"; tugd, "tongue"; yuggs, "young"; gagys, "a going"(subst.). For the compound \( kv \) the old writing has a special character, which we, like Grimm, render by \( qv \), although \( q \) does not appear elsewhere, and \( v \) also combines with \( g \); so that \( qv \) (\( =kv \)) plainly bears the same relation to \( gv \) that \( k \) bears to \( g \); compare saiqvan, "to sink," with siggyvan, "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
CHARACTERS AND SOUNDS.

In this manner is aih related to aigum, "we have," as bauth to budum, and gaf to gebum. Probably the pronunciation of the Gothic h was not in all positions the same, but in terminations, and before t and s, if not generally before consonants, corresponded to our ch. The High German has ch as an aspirate of the k: for this tenuis, however, either k or c stands in the older dialects, the use of which, in Middle High German, is so distinguished, that c stands as a terminating letter, and in the middle of words before t, and ch also stands for a double k. (Grimm, p. 422.) This distinction reminds us of the use of the Zend əc in contrast to ʃ k, as also of the ʃ t in contrast to ʃ 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, together with their nasal n. For th the Gothic alphabet has a special character. In the High German z (=ts) fills the place of the aspiration of the t, so that the breathing is replaced by the sibilation. By the side of this z in the Old High German, the old Gothic ·th also maintains its existence.* There are two species of z, which, in Middle High German, do not agree with each other. In the one, t has the preponderance, in the other, s; and this latter is written by Isidor zs, and its reduplication zss, while the reduplication of the former he writes tz. In the Modern High German the second species has only retained the sibilant, but in writing is distinguished, though not universally, from s proper. Etymologically, both species of the Old and Middle High German z fall under the same head, and correspond to the Gothic t.

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

* Our Modern High German th is, according to Grimm (p. 525), inorganic, and to be rejected. "It is, neither in pronunciation nor origin, properly aspirated, and nothing but a mere tenuis."
The High German supplies this organ, as the Sanskrit does all, with a double aspiration, a surd \((f = \text{usk} p\text{h})\) (see §. 25.) and a sonant, which is written \(v\), and comes nearer to the Sanskrit \(\text{bh}\). In Modern High German we perceive no longer any phonetic difference between \(f\) and \(v\); but in Middle High German \(v\) shews itself in this manner softer than \(f\), in that, first, at the end of words it is transformed into \(f\), on the same principle by which, in such a position, the medials are converted into tenues; for instance, \textit{wolf} not \textit{wolw}, but genitive \textit{wolves}; second, that in the middle before surd consonants it becomes \(f\), hence \textit{zwelwe} becomes \textit{zwelfle}, \textit{funwe} becomes \textit{funfte}, \textit{funsfzic}. 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, 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, phenning}; in the middle, and at the end occasionally, in true Germanic forms, such as \textit{wirphan, warph, wurphumés}, 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,* *kampf,* "pugna" *tampf,* "vapor," *krempfen,* "contra-
here," in which case *p* is an euphonic appendage to *f,* in order to facilitate a union with *m.* Secondly, in compounds with the inseparable prefix *ent,* which, before the labial aspirates, lays aside its *t,* or, as seems to me the sounder supposition, converts that letter, by assimilation, into the labial tenuis. Hence, for

[G. Ed. p. 76.] instance, *enp-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 tenues, as well in the middle as at the end of words: just as in Sanskrit (Gramm. Crit. r. 88.) the palatal surd aspirate between a short and another vowel or semi-vowel is preceded by its tenues; and, for instance, प्रिच्छति *prichchhati* is said for प्रिच्छति *prichhati.* "interrogat," from the root प्रच्छ prachh. In this light I view the Middle High German forms *kopf,* *kropf,* *tropfe,* *klopfen,* *kripen,* *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 प त्र *ph,* that is, like *p* with a clearly perceptible *h,* but the sounds *p* and *h* are compounded into a third simple sound lying between the two, which is therefore capable of reduplication, as in Greek *φ* unites itself with *θ,* while *ph + th* would be impossible.

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

(5.) Of the Sanskrit sibilants, the Germanic has only the last, namely, the pure dental $\varpi$ $s$. Out of this, however, springs another, peculiar, at least in use, to the Gothic, which is written $z$, and had probably a softer pronunciation than $s$. This $z$ is most usually found between two vowels, as an euphonic alteration of $s$, but sometimes also between a vowel and $u$, $l$, 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, $azy\acute{d}$, "ashes"; everywhere thus before sonants, and it must therefore itself be considered as a sonant sibilant (§. 25.), while
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s is the surd. It is remarkable, in a grammatical point of view, that a concluding s before the enclitic particles ei and uh, and before the passive addition a, passes into z; hence, for instance, thizei "cujus," from this "hujus," thanzei "quos," from thanz "hos," vileizu "visne" from vileiz "vis," haitaz "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, ixvis,"vobis," "vos,"razn "house," talzyan, "to teach," marzyan, "to provoke," fairzna, "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," lös, "I or he lost," lurumes "we lost." While in these cases the termination takes s under its protection, yet the s of the nominative singular, where it has not been altogether dropped, is everywhere softened down to r; and, on the other hand, the concluding s of the genitive has, down to our time, remained unaltered, and thus an organic difference has arisen between two cases originally distinguished by a similar suffix. For instance,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gothic</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Modern High German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative: blindis,</td>
<td>plinté-r,</td>
<td>blinde-r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:   blindis,</td>
<td>plinte-s,</td>
<td>blinde-s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87. The Germanic tongues exhibit, in respect of consonants, a remarkable law of displacement, which has been first recognised and developed with great ability by Grimm. According to this law, the Gothic, and the other dialects-
with the exception of the High German, in relation to the Greek, Latin, and, with certain limits, also [G. Ed. p. 79.] 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 $biug$, "flecto," Old High German $biuga$ and $piuka$, Middle High German $biuge$, Modern High German $biege$. For the Gothic $f$, the Old High German substitutes $v$, especially as a first letter ($§. 86.$ 3). In the $t$ sounds, $z$ in High German ($=ts$) replaces an aspirate. The Gothic has no aspiration of the $k$, and either replaces the Greek $\kappa$ by the simple aspiration $h$, in which case it sometimes coincides with the Sanskrit $\zeta h$, or it falls to the level of the High German, and, in the middle or end of words, usually gives $g$ instead of $k$, the High German adhering, as regards the beginning of words, to the Gothic practice, and participating with that dialect in the use of the $h$. We give here Grimm's table, illustrating the law of these substitutions, p. 584.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
<td>High Germ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पादस् páda-s,</td>
<td>πούς, ποδ-ός, pes, pedis,</td>
<td>pedis,</td>
<td>fōtus,</td>
<td>voz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पंचन् panchan,</td>
<td>πέμπε,</td>
<td>quinque,</td>
<td>semper,</td>
<td>vincl.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पुर्ण pūrṇa,</td>
<td>πλέος,</td>
<td>plenus,</td>
<td>fulls,</td>
<td>vol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पित्र pitri,</td>
<td>πατήρ,</td>
<td>pater,</td>
<td>padreint,</td>
<td>vatar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उपारि upari,</td>
<td>वृपर,</td>
<td>super,</td>
<td>ufar,</td>
<td>ubar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>बन्ध bhanj,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भुज bhuj,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>frui, fructus,</td>
<td>brükön,</td>
<td>prachón.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ्रात्र bhātri,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>brōthar,</td>
<td>pruoder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ्री bhri,</td>
<td>ἕφρω,</td>
<td>fero,</td>
<td>baira,</td>
<td>piru.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>भ्रु bhru,</td>
<td>ὁφρός,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>prawa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>कपाल kapāla, m. n.,</td>
<td>κεφαλή,</td>
<td>caput,</td>
<td>haubith,</td>
<td>houpit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तम twam (nom.),</td>
<td>τοῦ,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>thu,</td>
<td>du.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तम tum (acc.),</td>
<td>τοῦ,</td>
<td>is-tum,</td>
<td>thana,</td>
<td>dën.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्रयस trayas (n. pl.),</td>
<td>τρεῖς,</td>
<td>tres,</td>
<td>thréis,</td>
<td>dri.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>आंतर antara,</td>
<td>ἐτέρος,</td>
<td>alter,</td>
<td>anhar,</td>
<td>andar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दातां danta-m (acc.),</td>
<td>ὁδόντ-α,</td>
<td>dentem,</td>
<td>thuntu-s,</td>
<td>zand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>द्वाम dwau (n. du.),</td>
<td>δύο,</td>
<td>duo,</td>
<td>trai,</td>
<td>zuén.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दक्षिणā dakśiṇā,</td>
<td>δεξία,</td>
<td>dextra,</td>
<td>taiswō,</td>
<td>zēsawa.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>उद uda,</td>
<td>ὑδωρ,</td>
<td>unda,</td>
<td>vatō,</td>
<td>wazar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दनहित्र duhitri,</td>
<td>θυγάτηρ,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>dauhtar,</td>
<td>tohtar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>दार dwār,</td>
<td>सūra,</td>
<td>fores,</td>
<td>daur,</td>
<td>tor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मधु madhu,</td>
<td>μέθυ,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>méto.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>श्व swan,</td>
<td>κῦν,</td>
<td>canis,</td>
<td>hunths,</td>
<td>hund.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ह्रिदय hridaya,</td>
<td>καρδία,</td>
<td>cor,</td>
<td>hairtō,</td>
<td>hērza.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अक्ष aksa,</td>
<td>ὥκος,</td>
<td>oculus,</td>
<td>augō,</td>
<td>ouga.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>अस्र asru,</td>
<td>δάκρυ,</td>
<td>lacrima,</td>
<td>tagr m.,</td>
<td>zahar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>पाणि paṇi,</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>pecus,</td>
<td>faihu,</td>
<td>vihu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rata-s, &quot;wheel,&quot;</td>
<td>रथस् रथा-स्, &quot;waggon.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>búsu, &quot;I would be,&quot;</td>
<td>भविष्यति भविष्यति.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-s, &quot;who,&quot;</td>
<td>जच् जच्.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dümi, &quot;I give,&quot;</td>
<td>डद्दमि डद्दमि. [G. Ed. p. 82.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pats, &quot;husband,&quot; &quot;master.&quot;</td>
<td>पतिः पति-स्.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penki, &quot;five,&quot;</td>
<td>पंचन् पंचन.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trys, &quot;three,&quot;</td>
<td>स्त्रयस् स्त्रयस (n. pl. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keturi, &quot;four,&quot;</td>
<td>चतुर्वर्षस् चतुर्वर्षस (n. pl. m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ketwirtas, &quot;the fourth,&quot;</td>
<td>चतुर्वर्षस् चतुर्वर्षस-स्.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOTHIC</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>thir (theme), &quot;three,&quot;</td>
<td>स्थ्रिः thri,</td>
<td>त्रिः tri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus, &quot;to thee,&quot;</td>
<td>तृत्वोः thvōi,</td>
<td>तीत्वः twe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fra, (inseparable prep.)</td>
<td>फ्रा fra,</td>
<td>प्र pra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friyd, &quot;I love,&quot;</td>
<td>अफ्रिनामि afrināmi,†</td>
<td>प्रिणामि prīnāmi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahva †, &quot;a river,&quot;</td>
<td>अहवाम् āḍs</td>
<td>अप ap (theme).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

* Twe occurs as an uninflected genitive in Rosen's Veda-Specimen, p. 26, and may, like the mutilated ॠ td, be also used as a dative.
† "I bless," from the Sanskrit root prī, "to love," united with the prep. ॥
‡ 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).
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GOTHIC.  ZEND.

thu, "thou,"

fideor, (ind.) "four,"  चधाच, chathward (n. pl. m.)

fims,  पंचा, pancha.

fulls, "full,"

fadrein, "parents,"

faths, "master,"

faihu, "beast,"

faryith, "he wanders,"

föts-s, "foot,"

fralith, "he asks,"

ufar, "over,"

af, "from,"

thai, "these,"

hvas, "who,"

tvai, "two,"

taihun, "ten,"

tailsvá, "right hand,"

In the Sanskrit and Zend the sonant aspirates, not the surd, as in Greek, (ः h too is sonant, see §. 25.) correspond, according to rule, to the Gothic medials: as, however, in the Zend the bh is not found, _b answers to the Gothic b. Compare,

GOTHIC.  ZEND.  SANSKRIT.

bairith, "he carries,"  बराईति, baraiti,  बिभारति, bibharti.

bróthar, "brother,"  ब्रज्यरे, brátarëm (acc.)  भ्रज्यर, bhrátarom (acc.)

bai, "both,"

brákan, "to use,"

bi (prep.)

midya, "middling,"  मद्य, maidhya,  मध्य, madhya.

bindan, "bind,"

bind,  बंधन, bandh.

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 πατήρ remains; in the Gothic fadrein, “parentes,” d is substituted irregularly for th. The same phenomenon occurs in the cases of the Old High German olpenta, and the Gothic ulbandus, contrasted with the r of ἔλεφαντ-; thus, also, the t of चतुर chatur, “quatuor,” has become d in the Gothic fidvōr 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 slafju 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 hapēt, “he has,” hapēnt, “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 $\tau o$, of $\epsilon t\omega \tau \tau e\tau o$, and to the Sanskrit $n$ $ta$, of सा भवत $abhavatā$. The Old High German, on the other hand, has preserved the original $t$ in both participles: $hâpëntêr, hâpëtr, Gothic $habânds$, genitive $habândins$; $habâiths$, gen. $habâidis$.

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, अष्टाद् ašṭādu, “eight,” ὀκτώ, “octo,” is in Goth. ahtau, in Old High German ahtō: नैक्तम् 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 टि ti in Sanskrit, in Greek σίς, 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, ann(s) (§. 117.), “grace,” from the root $an$, Old High German unnan, “to be gracious,” with the insertion of an euphonious $s$: fraulust(s), “loss,” (from $lus$, pres. $liusa$): maht(s), “strength,” (from $magan$): fra-gifl(s),” betrothment,” (from $gib, gaf$), also fragibts, perhaps erroneously, as $b$ has little

* $Da$ is an abbreviation of $da*i = G. rai Sansk. tê,* see §. 466.
affinity with \( t \): \( ga\text{-}skaff(i)s \), “creation,” (from \( skap\text{-}an \)). 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. \( bud\text{-}um \); and the nominal base, \( mana\text{-}s\text{-}di \), “world,” (according to Grimm’s well-founded interpretation, “seed, not seat, of man,”) forms in the nom. and accus. \( mana\text{-}s\text{-}ths \), \( mana\text{-}s\text{-}th \), or \( mana\text{-}s\text{-}ds \), \( mana\text{-}s\text{ed} \); but in the dat. \( mana\text{-}s\text{ed}ai \) not \( -s\text{ethai} \). 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 \( far\text{-}yan \), “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, \( girif\text{-}tan \), “to take,” \( bas\text{-}tan \), “to bind,” \( d\text{a}sh\text{-}tan \), “to have,” \( pukh\text{-}tan \), “to cook”: on the other hand, \( dd\text{-}dan \), “to give,” \( bur\text{-}dan \), “to bear,” \( \text{Am}\text{-}dan \), “to come.” I do not, therefore, hesitate to release the Germanic suffix \( ti \), and all other suffixes originally commencing with \( t \), from the general law of substitution of sounds, and to assign the lot of this \( t \) entirely to the control of the preceding letter. The Old High German, in the case of our suffix \( ti \), as in that of other suffixes and terminations originally commencing with \( t \), accords to the original \( t \) a
far more extensive prevalence, than does the Gothic; inasmuch as it retains that letter, not only when protected by s, h, and f, but also after vowels and liquids—after m an euphonic f is inserted;—and the t is only after l changed into d. Hence, for instance, ans-t, "grace," klouft, "course," mah-t, "might," sâ-t, "seed," kipur, "birth," var-t, "journey," mun-t, "protection," ki-wal-t, "force," seul-t, schuld, "guilt," chumft, "arrival."

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

93(§). We return now to the Sanskrit, in order, with relation to the most essential laws of sound, to notice one adverted to in our theory of single letters; where it was said of several concurrent consonants that they were tolerated neither at the end of words, nor in the middle before strong consonants, and how their places were supplied in such situations. It is besides to be observed, that, properly, 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 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," वेदविद veda-vid, "skilled in the Vēda," धनलब fibhan-labh, "acquiring wealth." These words are, according to §. 94., without a nominative sign. We find, also, खलित हरित asti harit, "he is green," खलित वेदविद asti veda-vid, खलित धनलप asti dhana-lap; on the other hand, हरित खलित harit asti, वेदविद खलित veda-vid asti, धनलव खलित dhana-lab asti; also, हरिद भक्ति harid bhavati, &c. With this Sanskrit law the Middle High

[6. Ed. p. 89 ]  German is very nearly in accordance, which indeed tolerates aspirates at the end of words, contrary to the custom of the Sanskrit, only with a conversion of the sonant v into the surd f; see §. 86. 2.; 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 tenuis. 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, wip. So also as to the verb; for instance, the roots trug, lud, grab, form, in the uninflected 1st and 3d pers. sing. pret., truoc, luoct, grup, 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. ददत् dadat, "the giver," gen. ददति dadalis, not ददत् dadadas, but विद् viit, "knowing," gen. विद्रस्व vidas, from the base विद् vid. In Old High German different authorities of the language are at variance with respect to the strict observance of this law. Isidor is in accordance with it, insomuch that he converts d at the end into t, and g into c; for instance, wort, wordes; dac, dayes. The Gothic excludes only the labial medials from terminations, but replaces them, not by tenues, but by aspirates. Hence gaf, "I gave," in contrast to gebum, and the accusatives hlaif, lauf, thiuf, opposed to the nominatives hlaubs, laubs, thiubs, 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*; *haitad-a* "nominatur" with *haitith* (§. 67.) "nominat; aih, "I have," "he has," with *aigum*, "we have."

[G. Ed. p. 90.] 93(\(^\circ\)). 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* (*pungo*) *prittu* (*stringo*), the 1st and 3d pers. pret. *stah, ar-prat*. In Middle High German,
in declensions in ck, ff; the last is rejected; for instance, boc, gen. bockes; grif, griffes: tz loses the t; for instance, schaz, schatzes.

95. Between a final न n and a 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 Anuswāra; for instance, अभावाः तत्र abhavaḥ tatra, (abhavaḥs-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 gönnen, probably formed from the ann before noticed, and the preposition 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 च सम, चव आव, परि परि, प्रति प्रति, and certain words which begin with क h. With this the Latin s between ab or ob and e, q, and p, remarkably accords*,

[G. Ed. p. 92.] which s, ab retains even in an isolated position, when the above-mentioned letters follow. To this we also refer the cosmittere of Festus, instead of committere

* We scarcely think it necessary to defend ourselves for dividing, with Vossius, ob-solesco, rather than with Schneider (p. 571) obs-olesco.
(Schneider, p. 475), unless an original smitto, for mitto, is involved in this compound. In the Greek, ç 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 ç, 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 l. Thus, sumpsi, prompsi, dempsi, sumptus, promptus, demptus; Gothic andanum-f-ls, “acceptance”; Old High German chum-f-l, “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 (μεσμηῖπρια, μέμβλεται, άνδρός, ιμάσθην—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-ά, “to him.”

97. The Greek affords few specimens of variability at the end of words, excepting from peculiarities of dialect, as the substitution of ρ for ç. The alteration of the ν in the article in old inscriptions, and in the prefixes σῶν, ἐν, 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. N frequently springs from a final ç; thus, for instance, μεν (Doric μες) and the dual τῶν answer to the Sanskrit personal terminations मस, घस, थस, तस. I have found this explanation, which I have given elsewhere, of the origin of the ν from ç
subsequently confirmed by the Prākṛit, in which, in like manner, the concluding s of the instrumental termination plural बिस bhis has passed into the dull उ (Anusvāra, § 9.), and भिन hīn is said for bhis. An operation, which has a prejudicial effect on many Greek terminations, and disturbs the relation to cognate languages, is the suppression of the t sound at the end of words, where, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin it plays an essential part. In respect of the vowels, it is also worthy of notice, that in Sanskrit, but not in Zend, at the meeting of vowel terminations and commencements, a hiatus is guarded against, either by the fusion of the two vowels, or, in cases where the vowel has a cognate semi-vowel at its command, by its transition into this latter, provided the vowel following be unlike.

We find, for instance, अस्तिदम astidam, "est hoc," and अस्त्य अयम asty ayam, "est hic." For the sake of clearness, and because the junction of two vowels might too often give the appearance of two or more words to one, I write in my most recent text अस्ति 'दम', in order, by an apostrophe which I employ as a sign of fusion, to indicate that the vowel which appears wanting in the दम dam is contained in the final vowel of the preceding word. We might, perhaps, still better write अस्ति 'दम', in order directly.

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

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

* We cannot guide ourselves here by the original MSS., as these exhibit no separation of words, and entire verses are written together without interruption, as though they were only a series of senseless syllables, and not words of independent place and meaning. As we must depart from Indian practice, the more complete the more rational the separation.
placed on the highest point of antiquity, insomuch as the
signification of every radical portion is still so strongly
felt, that while it admits of moderate changes, for the
avoiding of harshness, it never, if we except some vowel
elisions, permits the radical sense to be obliterated, or
rendered irrecongnisable by concessions too great, or 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, त t and च th allow only of क k, ख kh, ग g, घ gh preceding them; only त t, not च th, द d, ध dh; while on the other hand, ध dh allows only ग g, not क k, ख kh, घ gh; only द d, not त t, च th, ध dh; only भ b, not ध p, ध p, 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 ter-
minal there are many which begin with consonants (आ व bhyaṁ, भिस bhis, भयस bhyas, स su). To cite instances, the
root त ad, “to eat,” forms त admi, “I eat”; but not त adsi (for s is surd), nor त ad-ti, त ad-tha, but त at-si, त at-ti, त at-tha: on the other hand, in the
imperative, त ad-dhi, “eat.” The base प pad, “foot,”
forms, in the locative plural, प पot-su, not प pad-su; on
the other hand, महत mahat, “great,” forms, in the instru-
mental plural, महद bhis not महथभ महद bhis.
99. The Greek and Latin, as they have come down to us,
have either altogether evaded this conflict of consonants,
or exhibit, in most cases, with regard to the first of any
two contiguous consonants, a disposition to surrender it, or
at least an indifference to its assistance towards the signification of the word, since they either abandon it altogether, or violently alter it, i.e. convey it beyond the limits of its proper organ. These two languages afford fewer occasions for harsh unions of consonants than the Sanskrit, principally because, with the exception of 'ΕΣ and ΙΔ in Greek, and ES, FER, VEL, EI, in Latin, as €σ-τι, €σ-μέν, €σ-τέ, τδ-μεν, €σ-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 τετριπ-σαι, τετριπ-ται, from ΤΠΙΒ, τετυκ-σαι, τετυκ-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 τετυμ-μαι, τετριμ-μαι, πέπλευ-μαι, τέτυγ-μαι, we should, on Sanskrit principles, write (§. 98.) τέτυπ-μαι, τετρίβ-μαι, πεπλεκ-μαι, τετυχ-μαι. The t sounds carry concession too far, and abandon the Sanskrit, or original principle, as regards the gutturals; inasmuch as δ, θ, and ξ (δσ), instead of passing into τ before σ and τ, are extinguished before σ, and before τ and μ become σ (πέπεισ-ται, πέπει-σαι, πέπεισ-μαι, instead of πέπειτ-ται, πέπειτ-σαι, πεπειθ-μαι, or πεπειδ-μαι. The Greek declension affords occasion for the alteration of consonants only through the ζ of the nominative and the dative plural termination in σι; and here the same principle holds good as in the case of the verb, and in the formation of words: kl and y become, as in Sanskrit, κ (ξ=κ-ζ), and b and ph become p.
The t sounds, on the other hand, contrary to the Sanskrit, and in accordance with the enfeebled condition, in this respect, of the Greek, vanish entirely. We find ποῦς for πῶς, πονσί for πόσι, which latter naturally and originally must have stood for πονσί, πονσί.

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 (vecxit), with the word of like signification अवाक्षित a-vāk-śhit. If of the two final consonants of a root the last vanishes before the s of the perfect tense (muli 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 अत्लुत् a-tālut-sit, "he tormented," from तुद् 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-vē-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 jūs-si, pres-si, ges-si, us-si.* A third resource, for the avoidance

* Compared with the Sanskrit, in which द्ध 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, *ts*, is the suppression of the latter of these two letters, which is also compensated by the lengthening of a short radical vowel; thus, *sēdi* from [G. Ed. p. 98.] *sēd, vēdi* from *vid*.

I believe, at least, that these forms are not derivable from *seduit* *vidui*, and I class them with forms like *fōdi* from *fōl, lēgi*, for *lec-si*, from *lēg, fugi*, for *fuc-si*, from *fāg*. To these probably also belong *cāvi, fāvi, ūvi*, for *pāvi, vōvi*, from *cāv, &c.* A *cāvī*, &c. is hardly conceivable; *cāvi* could never have had such an origin. I conjecture forms such as *cau-si, fau-si*, after the analogy of *cautum, fautum*; or *moc-si* (*moxi*), after the analogy of *vic-si, con-nic-si*. (§. 19.) Possibly a *moc-si* form might derive probability from the adverb *mox*, since the latter is probably derived from *mov*, as *cito* is from another root of motion. The *c* of *fluc-si, struc-si*, (*fluxi, &c.*) *fluxum, structum*, must, in the same manner, be considered as a hardening of *v*; and a *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 *fru-ov* 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 *atdūt-sam, akṣhaip-sam*, &c., for the avoidance of hardness, is suppressed before strong consonants, and we find, for instance, *atdūt-ta*, instead of *atdūt-sta*. The perfects *scīdi, fūdi*, 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 respects, \( \text{fīdī, scīdī,} \) correspond to \( \text{tūdī, pūpūgī,} \) not to speak of \( \text{telīgī,} \) 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, \( \text{bhēttum,} \) "to cleave," from \( \text{bhīd, bhīd.} \) 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 \( \text{comes-tus, comes-tura,} \) analogous to \( \text{es-t, es-tis,} \) &c. from \( \text{edo:} \) we find, however, no \( \text{comes-tum, comes-tor,} \) but in their place \( \text{comesum, comesor.} \) We might question whether, in \( \text{comesum,} \) 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 \( \text{estus to ēsus,} \) between which two an \( \text{essus} \) probably intervened, analogous to \( \text{cessum, fis-sum, quassum,} \) &c., while the \( t \) of \( \text{tum, tus,} \) &c., assimilated itself to the preceding \( s \). Out of \( \text{essum} \) has arisen \( ēsum, \) by the suppression of an \( s, \) probably the first; for where of a pair of consonants the one is removed, it is generally the first, \( (\text{eiµ} \text{ from } \text{ēsµi, no-σi from } \text{poσ-σi,}) \) 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 \( \text{ē-sum, cā-sum, divī-sum, fis-sum, quass-sum,} \) 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. \( \text{Cs (x) is a} \) \( [G. \text{Ed. p. 100.}] \) favourite combination; hence, \( \text{fic-sum, nec-sum,} \) &c. for \( \text{fic-tum, nec-tum.} \) The liquids, \( m \) excepted, evince special incli-
nation for a succeeding s, most of all the r; hence, ter-sum, mer-sum, cur-sum, par-sum, ver-sum, in contrast to par-tum, tor-tum: there are also cases in which r, by a conversion into s, accommodates itself to t, as in ges-tum, us-tum, tos-tum.* This answers to the Sanskrit obligatory conversion of a concluding r into s before an initial t; as, भातस् तारय माम् bhrātasyā tāraya 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, महृद् bhar-tum, not मल्ल्व bhastrum, "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 ῥεπρομαυ, and त्रिष्ठ trish from तर्श tārsh, argues the derivation of the latter r from s. Upon that of uro from उष uṣh, see §. 97.
visu, from vitta, resembles, in respect of assimilation, the Latin forms mentioned in §. 101., such as quas-sum for quas-tum, from quat-tum. The Old High German, however, which also adopts wis-sa, but from muoz makes not muos-sa, but muo-sa, corresponds, in the latter case, to such Latin forms, as ca-sum, clau-sum. The case is different in Old High 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, lei-te, "duxi," ki-neiz-ta, "affixxi," ar-ôd-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, "curcurri," for rann-ta; wanh-ta, "vacillavi," for wanch-ta; dah-ta, "lesi," for dacch-ta. The Middle High German follows essentially the same principles, only a simple radical t gives way before the auxiliary verb, and thus lei-te is opposed to the Old High German leit-ta; on the other hand, in roots in ld and rd the d may be maintained, and the t of the auxiliary be surrendered—as dulde, "toleravi"—unless we admit a division of dul-de, and consider the d as a softened t. The change of g into c (§. 98.) is natural, but not universal; for instance, anc-te, "arctavi," for ang-te; but against this law b remains unaltered. [G. Ed. p. 102.] Before the formative suffixes beginning with t*, both in Gothic and High German, guttural and labial tenuis and medials are changed into their aspirates, although the tenuis accord with a following t. Thus, for instance, in Gothic, vah-twô.

* With the exception of the High German passive part. of the weaker form, which, in the adjunction of its t to the root, follows the analogy of the pret. above described
"watch," from vak; sauh-t(i)s, "sickness," from suk; mah-t(i)s, "might," from mag; ga-skraft(i)s, "creation," from skap; fragif-t(i)s, "betrothment," from gib, softened from gab; Old High German suht, mah, ki-skaft, "creature," kift, "gift." The dentals replace the aspirate th by the sibilant (s), as is the case in Gothic before the pers. character t of the preterite, as th cannot be combined with t. The formation of words, however, affords few examples of this kind: under this head comes our mast, related to the Gothic mats, "food," and matyan, "to eat." In Gothic, the s of blöstres, "worshipper," springs from the t of blötan, "to worship": beist, "leaven," comes probably from beit (beitam, "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 st, not only before ʋ t, but also before ɛ m; for instance, _Implis irista, "dead," from the root _Ilir irith; _Impli basta, "bound," from _Ilban bandh, with the nasal excluded; as in Modern Persian _End bastah, from _End band; _Impli aesma, "wood," from _Ilidma.

103. It is a violation of one of the most natural laws of sound, that, in Gothic, the medial g does not universally pass into k or h (=ch), before the personal character t of [G. Ed. p. 103.] the pret., but generally is retained; and we find, for instance, ǃg-т, "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, ǃh-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, भक्तायमि bhot-syāmि, "I shall know," for चोप्यायमि bādh-syāmि; वेदभुत् vih-bhut, "knowing the vedas," for धुष् budh; दुष् bud-dha, "knowing," for धुष् budha; भोप्यायमि dhōk-śyāmि, "I shall milk," for दोप्यायमि dōk-syāmि; दुष् dug-dha, "milked," for द्वष् 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 σ, τ, and μ, letters which admit of no union with an aspirate, and in its being thrown back on the initial letter, by which process τ becomes θ. Hence, τρέφω, θρέπ-σω, (θρέψω), θρεπτίρ, θρέμ-μα, ταφί, θάπ-τω, ἐτάφιν, τέθαμ-μαι; τρύφος, θρύπ-τω, ἐτρύφην, θρύμ-μα; τρέχω, θρέξομαι; θρίξ, τριχός, ταχύς, θάσσον. In the spirit of this transposition of the aspirate, ἔχ obtains the spiritus asper when χ is obliged to merge in the tenuis, (ἐκτός, ἐξω, ἔξις).†

* See J. L. Burnouf in the Asiatic Journal, 111. 368; and Buttmann, pp 77, 78.

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

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

[G. Ed. p. 106.] the verbal roots, however, there is not a single one in ā, although long a, and all other vowels, śi du excepted, occur among the final letters of the verbal roots. Accidental external identity takes place between the verbal and pronominal roots; e.g. ॥ 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 जगा जग्रि, "to wake," or a preposition which has
grown up with the root, as स्वभाओ अवऽधि, "to despise"; or they have sprung from a noun, like कमार कमार, "to
play," which I derive from कमार कमारा, "a boy." Except
the law of their being monosyllabic, the Sanskrit roots are
subjected to no further limitation, and their one-syllableness
may present itself under all possible forms, in the shortest
and most extended, as well as those of a middle degree.
This free state of irrestriction was necessary, as the language
was to contain within the limits of one-syllableness the
whole body of fundamental ideas. The simple vowels and
consonants were not sufficient: it was requisite to frame
roots also where several consonants, combined in inseparable
unity, became, as it were, simple sounds; e.g. स्थि स्थि, "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 स्कन्द स्कन्द, "to go," (Lat. scand-o) the age of the combination of
consonants, both in the beginning and ending of the root, is
certified by the agreement of the Latin with the Sanskrit.
The proposition, that in the earliest period of language a
simple vowel is sufficient to express a verbal idea, is sup-
ported by the remarkable concurrence of [G.Ed.p.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, *katul*, "slain," in the fem., on account of the addition *áh* contracts itself to *ktál* (*ktál-áh*); while *kótél*, "slaying," before the same addition, compresses itself in an opposite manner, and forms *kóttálh*. Neither *ktál*, therefore, nor *kótél*, can be regarded as the root; and just as little can it be looked for in *któle*, as the *status constructus* of the infinitive; for this is only a shortening of the absolute form *któl*, 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 *któl* the abbreviation is not external, subject to mechanical conditions, but rather dynamic, and occasioned by the hurry with which a command is usually enunciated. In the Semitic languages, in decided opposition to those of the Sanskrit family, the vowels belong, not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of the word. By them, for example, is distinguished, in Arabic, *katola*, "he slew," from *kutila*, "he was slain"; and in Hebrew, *kótél*, "slaying," from *kátul*, "slain." A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanskrit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus, which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express.
The vowel, with one or more consonants, and sometimes without any consonant whatever, belongs to the fundamental meaning: it can be lengthened to the highest degree, or raised by Guna or Vṛiddhi; and this lengthening or raising, and, more lately, the retention of an original $a$, opposed to its weakening to $i$ or change to $u$ (§§. 66., 67.), belongs not to the denoting of grammatical relations, which require to be more clearly pointed out, but, as I imagine I can prove, only to the mechanism, the symmetry of construction.

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

---

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

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

* Nevertheless, in his work, "Observations sur la langue et la littérature provençales," p. 14, &c., he gives three classes, viz. Les langues sans aucune structure grammaticale, les langues qui emploient des affixes, et les langues à inflexions. Of the latter, he says: "Je pense, cependant, qu'il faut assigner le premier rang aux langues à inflexions. On 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 significacion.
inflexions, that they are not modifications of the root, but foreign additions, whose characteristic lies in this, that [G. Ed. p. 112.] regarded, per se, they have no meaning. In the Semitic, the appended grammatical syllables or inflexions have no meaning, at least in so far that they do not, any more than in Sanskrit, occur isolated in a completely similar state. In Arabic, for instance, antum, and not tum, is said for "ye"; and in Sanskrit ma, ta, and not mi, ti, are the declinable bases of the first and third person; and at-Ti, "he eats," has the same relation to TA-m, "him," that in Gothic IT-a, "I eat," has to the monosyllabic AT, "I ate."

The reason for weakening the a of the base to i is probably, in the different cases of the two sister languages, the same, viz. the greater extent of the form of word with i (comp. §. 6.) If, then, the division of languages made by F. von Schlegel is untenable, on the reasons on which it is founded, still there is much ingenuity in the thought of a natural history or classification of languages. We prefer, however, to present, with A. W. von Schlegel (l. c.), three classes, and distinguish them as follows: first, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the
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 pro-nominal 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 disyllabic 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 अ a to the root; and we reserve the discussion of the origin of this and other conjugational affixes for the disquisition on the verb. The point of difference between the first class of nearly 1000 roots (almost the half of the entire number) and the sixth class, which contains about 130 roots, lies in this, that the former raise the vowel of the root by Guna (§. 26.), while the latter retain it pure; e.g. बोधि bodbati, "he knows," from बुध budh (1.); तुदति tudati, "he vexes" (comp. tundit), from तुद tad (6.) As अ a has no Guna,† no discrimination can take place through this vowel between the classes 1. and 6.: but nearly all the roots which belong to either, having अ a as the radical vowel, are reckoned in the first class. In Greek, e (before nasals o, §. 3.) corresponds to the affix अ a; and λείπ-ο-μεν, Φεύγ-ο-μεν, from ΔΠΙ, ΦΥΓ (έλιπον, ἕφυγον), belong to the first class, because they have Guna (§. 26.); while, e.g. θύγ-ο-μεν, Θλιβ-ο-μεν, &c., fall under the sixth class.‖ In Latin we recognise, in the third conjugation,

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

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

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

‖ Sanskrit long vowels admit Guna only when they occur at the end of the root, but in the beginning and middle remain without admixture of the अ a; so do short vowels before double consonants.
which I would raise to the first, the 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. legitimus has the same relation to λεγ-ο-μεν, that the genitive ped-is has to ποι-δς where the Sanskrit has likewise a (पदस् [G. Ed. p. 115.] pad-as). In leg-u-nt, from leg-a-nti, the old a, through the influence of the liquid, has become u (Comp. §. 8.).

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 ओ a which is added to the root has, in Gothic, before some personal terminations, remained unchanged; before others, according to §. 67., and as in Latin, been weakened to i; so, hait-a, “I am called,” hait-i-s, hait-i-th, 2d pers. du. hait-a-ts; pl. hait-a-m, hait-i-th, hait-a-n. 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 keina (= kina, from kiina), “I germinate,” from KIN; biujja, “I bend,” from BUG, Sanskrit मुन्न bhuj, whence मुन्न bhugna, “bent.” The diphthongs ai, au, as in Sanskrit अ and ओ (§. 2.), are incapable of any Guna; as are € (=$ इ, §. 69.) and a.

The Sanskrit radical vowel ओ a has, however, in Gothic, experienced a threefold destiny. It has either remained unaltered in the special tenses, and is lengthened in the preterite, except in reduplicate roots (i.e. to d, see §. 69.)—

* I have already, in my Review of Grimm’s Grammar, expressed the conjecture that the a of forms like haita, haitan, haitaina, &c. does not belong to the personal termination, but is identical with the ओ 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 för, "he wandered," to चचार 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 ē (सा ध) does to the short a. The root गाद ad, "to eat," in Gothic, according to §. 87., forms AT; hence, in the present, ita; in the sing. pret., at, as-i, 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, gipum, from GRIP, "to seize," to ग्रह grabh (Veda form): on the other hand, BIT, "to bite," * (beita, bait, bitum), has an original i, which exists in Sanskrit (comp. भिट bhid, "to cleave"); just so, VIT, "to know," Sanskrit विद vid.

(2.) The fourth class of Sanskrit roots adds to them the syllable य ya, and herein agrees with the special tenses of the passive; and from the roots which belong to it spring chiefly neuter verbs, as e.g. नस्यति nasyati, "he perishes," Their number amounts altogether to about 130. The German has preserved one unmistakeable remnant of this class, in those strong verbs which again lay aside, in the preterite, the syllable 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-(lis), Gothic it-a-m, Old High German iz-a-me: not iz-me:s, answering to the Sanskrit आधम ad-mas. The second class, to which आद 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. रेम रम, corresponding to रेम imas, from आ "to go," as in Greek είμι to ιμ. 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 आ, फा, गो (γνω-θι), डा, ढा, θή, φυ (φυν), ά, &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, आल्त अस्ति, ऐस्ति, Lithuan. esti, est, Gothic and High German ist. In the Latin there fall also to the second class, आ, दा, स्ता, फ्ला, फा, and ना; 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 आ i, as रेडिम रेथिम, "I weep," from रुद rud. I can, however, no longer believe that the i of the Latin third conjg. is connected with this आ i, as there is scarce any doubt of its relationship with the आ of the very copious first class.
Sanskrit it comprehends about twenty roots; e.g. ददामि 
*daddami, διδωμι*, Lithuanian *dudu*; ददामि *dadhāmi, τίθημι* (§. 16.); जाजन्ति *jajanmi, “I beget,”* comp. γι¬γν¬ο¬μαι. The seventh class, of about twenty-four roots, introduces, in the special tenses, a nasal into the root, which is extended before the light personal terminations to the syllable *na*; e.g. भिनादमि *bhinadmi, “I cleave,”* भिन्दमस *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, ΑΑΒ, ΘΙΓ, in which the inserted nasal has been repeated further on in the word, with the prefixed *a*, and, like the Latin *find¬i¬mus*, is connected with the affix of the first class; thus, μανΘ¬άν¬ο¬μεν, λαμΘ¬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 नृ *kri, “to make,”* all terminate in न or न, has *u* for its characteristic addition: the *u*, however, of these two classes is lengthened before the light terminations by Guna, which in the corresponding Greek appended syllables, *uv* and *u*, is supplied by lengthening the *v*; thus, e.g. ḍείκνυμι, ḍείκνυμεν, as in Sanskrit जास्मि *dp¬nô¬mi, “ad¬ip¬is¬cor,” जाज्ञस *dp¬nu¬mas, “adipisci¬mur.” An example of the eighth class is तन *tan, “to extend,”* whence तनोथम *tan¬o¬mi¬=τάν¬-ο¬μι, तनुस्स *tan¬u¬mas¬=τάν¬-ο¬μες. With the उ *u, v*, of the eighth class, is probably connected [G. Ed. p. 119.] the *v* in some Gothic strong verbs, where, however, it adheres so firmly to the root, that, in a German point of view, it must be regarded as a radical. Hence it is not dropped in the preterite, and receives, in the special tenses, like all strong verbs, the affix of the Sanskrit first class; e.g. *saihva,* “I see,” *sahv, “I saw.”

(5.) The ninth class adds न 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, linquo, stinguo.*
to न ना, replaces the heavy जा ए by the lighter इ ई (§ 6.), and is thus weakened to नी नि. E.g. from नूत्र म्रिद, "to crush," (comp. mordao) comes नूतनाती म्रिदुनामि, नूतनामस म्रिदनिमस. In this is easily perceived the relationship with Greek formations in νημ (νάμ) ναμεν; e.g. δάμνημ, δάμνα-μεν. As अ, ए, and ऑ, are originally one, formations like तेव-ते-μεν belong to this class, only that they have wandered into the more modern ओ-conjugation at a remote period of antiquity; for more lately νेव would not have become वेव from नेम.

(6.) The tenth class adds अय अय 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 अ of अय अय is peculiar to them, but अय अय 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 अय अय, which is always accompanied by Guna of the middle vowel of the root capable of Guna, or by य्र य्र of every radical final vowel and of a middle अ belonging to the root; e.g. वेदयाति वेद-अय-ति "he makes to know," from विद्व विद; आधयाति श्रव-अय-ति, "he makes to hear," from श्रु श्रु. We recognise, in German, the affix अय अय at least in two shapes: in the one [G. Ed. p. 120.] the first अ, in the other the last, is lost, and in the latter case य has become ई; 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 मन्दन, "to mention," "to make to think,") belong to this class, regarding which we will speak further under the verb. The Old High German gives द as the contraction of अ + ई, (see § 78.), but retains its द more firmly than the Gothic its ए, which, in several persons, sinks into a simple अ. Compare Gothic haba, habäm, haband, with Old High German hapëm, hapëmes, hapënt. Very remarkable, however, is the concurrence of the Prākṛt with the Old High German and the Latin
of the 2d conj. in this point, that it in like manner has contracted the affix सय aya to रे. Compare Sanskrit मनयामि, “I honour,” Prâkrit मानेहि mānémi,* Old High German, var-manêm, “I despise,” Latin moneo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Prâkrit</th>
<th>Old High German</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>मनयामि मनयामि</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>var-manêm</td>
<td>moneo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मनयसि मनयसि</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>manês</td>
<td>mon's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मनयति मनयति</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>manêt</td>
<td>monet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मनयामस मनयामस</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>manêsês monêsês</td>
<td>monêmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मनयध मनयध</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>manêt</td>
<td>monêtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>मनयति मनयति</td>
<td>मानेहि मानेहि</td>
<td>manêt</td>
<td>monêt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to those weak verbs, which have suppressed the first vowel of the Sanskrit सय aya, and give therefore या as affix, we will here further recall attention to the forms या (iye), which occasionally occur in Old High German and Anglo Saxon, whose connection with सय aya is to be traced thus, that the semi-vowel य has become hardened to ग, (comp. §. 19.), and the preceding अ weakened to ि. 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 मनयामि in this dialect can have no other sound but मानेमि. The conjugation is supported by other examples of this class, सस chintâmi, “I think” (from chintayâmi), नवेद्मि (from नवेद- dayâmi). In the plural the termination मha is nothing else than the appended verb substantive (Sansk. smâs, “we are”). In the third pers. pl., together with मानेति the forms मानांति and मानांति are also admissible. The Indian Grammarians assume for the Sanscrit a root मान, “to honour”: more probably, however, the verb, for which this root is supplied, is only a denominative from मान, “honour”; and this substantive itself a derivation from मन, “to think,” whence ava-man, “to despise,” as in Old High German var-MAN (by Otfrid, fir-MON). The root, therefore, which is contained in varmanêm 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 manôn), 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 \(\alpha\omega, \epsilon\omega, \omega\omega\); in Latin, besides the 2d conjugation compared above, most verbs of the 1st and 4th also belong to this affinity. We shall recur to them when speaking of the verb.

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

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

"There are, as has been already remarked (§. 105.), no roots in \(\text{ṣa}\); but roots in \(\text{ṣa} \text{ḍ}\) are numerous. Thus \(\text{गा} \text{ता}, \text{†} \) "to go," contained in the Latin \(\text{navi-ga-re}\); also, perhaps, in \(\text{fati-gare}\), the first member of which belongs to \(\text{fatiscor}, \text{fessus}\); in Greek, \(\beta\i\nu\eta\mu\) answers to \(\text{जगाम} \text{jagāmi}, \) and rests on the frequent interchange of gutturals and labials; Gothic \(\text{ga-thvō}, \) "a street," (see p. 102. G. Ed.); Zend \(\text{gā-tu}, \) "a place," (nom. \(\text{gā-tus}\); Old High German \(\text{gā-m}, \) "I go," = \(\text{जगाम} \text{jagā-mi}; \) not therefore, as Grimm conjectures (p. 568), by syncope from \(\text{gānu}, \) but, with a more ancient and regular foundation, only with a suppression of the Sanskrit syllable of reduplication, introduced, therefore from the third into the second class (see p. 117. G. Ed.), as in Latin, \(\text{da-mus} \) answering to \(\text{dō-μεν}. \) Thus, also, \(\text{stā-m}, \text{stā-s}, \text{stā-t}, \) in like manner, with suppressed reduplication, corresponds to \(\text{ṣ-ṣτν-μ}\) (for \(\text{σιστημι}\)), and to the Sanskrit root \(\text{स्था} \text{sthā}, \) which is irregularly inflected, \(\text{तिश्षि} \text{tīśṭhāmi}. \text{tīśṭhasi}, \text{tīśṭhati}, \text{for tāsthami, tāsthasi, tāsthāti.}

* Somewhat that pertains to this subject I have already put together very concisely at the end of my Sanskrit Glossary.
† The attached cyphers denote the classes described in §. 109\(^a\).
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which will be more closely considered hereafter. The Latin, in root and inflexion, most resembles the Old High German: the Zend, however, in its \(\text{सिस्ताम्} \text{histāmi}\) (for \(\text{sīśtāmi}\), see §. 53.), appears in a genuine Greek dress. Observe, also, the गुलाम्या\(r\)a\(h\)a\(l\)a\(s\)tādā, “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 \(\text{STA}\) the extended form of the root \(\text{STANT}\), whence the present \(\text{stantu}, \text{I stand},\) and preterite \(\text{stuant}, \text{I or he stood};\) for which the Gothic has \(\text{stāndā, stōth}\). We will here only preliminarily remark, that we have observed in Zend also, in some roots terminating in \(d\), an inclination to connect themselves with a \(t\)-sound. Thus we find, from \(\text{वृद्ध सन्द्}, \text{“to wash,” “to purify,”} \) (Sansk. \(\text{वा सन्द्}, \text{“to bathe,”}) whence \(\text{snāta, “purified,”} \) in Vend. S. p. 233, frequently \(\text{फ्रो-सन्द्धाये”}, \text{“lavit”} \); from \(\text{वृद्ध दा}, \text{“to lay,”} \) (Sans. \(\text{वा dha, p. 118 G. Ed.}) we find \(\text{निदाईत्यान्न, “deponant”} \) (as Vendidād S. pp. 205 and 206, \(\text{हस्के जेमेन निदाईत्यान्न, “in sicca terrā deponant”} \)); from the same root we find the imperative [G. Ed. p. 123.] form, \(\text{अष्टाभः नी-दाठामा, “deponamus”} \) (Vend. S. p. 208, \(\text{सन्द्वन्धार्य: सन्द्वन्धार्य} \) \(\text{अष्टाभः नी-दाठामा कौ निराम: इशिरतान्नम तानाम बादामा अहुरा मादा कौ निदाठामा, “Quo hominum mortuorum corpus feramus, ubi deponamus”} \).

Of the Germanic we will further remark, that the root \(\text{मा माद्}, \text{“to measure”} \) (cf. \(\mu\)-\(\tau\)-\(\rho\)\(\omicron\)), has connected itself with a \(t\)-sound, and forms, in Gothic, \(\text{MATH}\), present \(\text{mita} \) (§. 109\(\omicron\). 1.). \(\text{ज्ञाना} \text{jinā}, \text{“to be acquainted with,” “to know,”} \text{ΓΝΩ, GNA (gnarus); Old High German CHNÄ} \) (§. 87.); whence \(\text{chinā-ta, “I knew,”} \) annexing the auxiliary verb direct, as in Latin \(\text{(g)no-vi}. \text{To}

* I believe I may deduce this form from the 3d pers. pl. \(\text{अष्टाभः ज्ञानीति (cf. iσtαντι) in the V. S. p. 163: more on this head under the verb.
the special form, जानामि jānāmi, for जानामि jnd-nda-mi, may be-
long the Gothic root KANN, Old High German CHANN
(kann. chan, "I know," see §.94., kunnun, chunnum, "we
know," see §.66.). आँ dhmā, "to blow," alters itself in the
special forms to धम dham, Latin FLA, according to the
second class (§. 109a 3.), Old High German PLĀ (§§. 12. 20.),
whence plā-ta, "flavi." As in Sanskrit, from the above-men-
tioned धम dham, comes the nominal base धमनि 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., र 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 अद्वैत आति aeti-ti, "he goes"
(from आति ēti, according to §§. 28. 41.), Lithuan. ei-ti. फ्रें
sri, "to go," with the prep. उत ut, "to raise itself"; hence,
उचच्छ्रेत 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 म म: perhaps
the Latin gradior, as well as cresco, might be here included,
the Guna form of the vowel, as in यर्ति sray-a-ti, "he
goes," being observed. ब्रें smi, "to smile," Old High
German SMIL; ब्रो pri, "to love," Zend स्रī fri (§. 47.), Goth.
frīd, "I love" (§. 87.), compare ब्रिव priya, "dear." ब्रोः bhi,
"to fear," ब्रेव bhibhē-mi, "I fear"; Lithuan. biyou; Gothic
fija, "I hate" (fiyais, fiyaith), fiyands, "foe"; Old High Ger-
man viēm or fiēm, "I hate": the Greek φηβ-ό-μα answers to
the Sanskrit reduplication of bibhēmi; so that, contrary to
the common rule, the aspirates have remained in the prefix,
but in the base itself have become medials, and this has left
only β as the whole root, as in Sanskrit da-d-mus, "we give,
for du-dd-mus, δί-δο-μες. Perhaps, also, [G. Ed. p.124.]
ΦΙΑ, φειδομα, is to be referred to the roots in i, so that an
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unorganic dental affix would be to be assumed. गृः ² 'śi, "to lie," "to sleep," with irregular Guna in the middle; hence ²श-शः = keś-tau. ³हृ hrt, "to be ashamed"; Old High German HRU, "to repent" (hriw-u, hrou, hru-umés, see p. 115. G. Ed.). Of roots in u, ¹ dru, "to run," द्रवत्र drav-a-ti, "he runs" may furnish, through the Guna form, the Greek δρά-σκω, δι-δρά-σκω, which appears hence to derive its a with suppression of the digamma: the μ of δρέω, however, might pass as a hardening of the व (§. 63.), and δρέμ-ο-μεν, δρέμ-ε-τε, &c., therefore represent most truly the forms द्रवः-मस, द्रवः-थाः. गृः ³ plu, "to go," "to swim," "to float" (वा plava, "a ship"), Latin FLU. The Greek πλέω, πλώ is again not to be so regarded as if the old u had been corrupted to e or o, but πλέ(F)ω, πλο(F)ω supply the place of the Guna form in plav-ε (of the middle voice), 3d pers. plav-a-λε: the future πλेनσω, the τ having the Guna.(§. 26.), answers to गोः plō-shyel; Lithuan. plaukš, "I swim," with a guttural added, as in Latin fluc-si from fluv (p. 98. G. Ed.). Old High German VLUZ, "to flow," pre-supposes the Gothic FLUT (§. 87.); with the favourite dental addition, with which all final vowels are so commonly invested. गृः ⁵ śru, "to hear," KAY ( §§. 20., 21.), Gothic H1LIU-MAN (nominative hliuma), "ear," as "hearer," with weakened Guna (§. 27.); with regard to the kl for ९ट, compare, also, clunis with गोः śrōnī, 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 erode, célèbre, (κλωτός), which I have not yet found in the original text, but I meet with the causal form सद्यस्मांस्तं sṛdvayāmi (Sansk. अवधारित srdvayāmi), "I speak," "recite" (V. S. p. 38). The Old High German, scrirumés, "we have exclaimed," gives SCRIR as the root, and rests probably on the form sṛαv (§. 20.), with a thinning of the d to i (§. 66.); the present and sing. preterite, however, have lost the r (scriu
for scriru, screi for screir), like the Greek κλη-σω, κεκλη-κυ, &c. The Latin clamor, however, has the same relation to ἀκρό brōv that mare has to चार वरि, “water” (§. 63.), and δρεμ to द्रव drav, from द्रु dru, “to run.” ἄνυ ἡυ, “to extol,” “to glorify” (ἀφροφεν hunāta, “he celebrated,” V. S. p. 39.), is probably the root of the Greek ὑμός (ὑμενος), which I do not like to regard as an irregular derivative from ὑδω. पु pu; 1.9. “to purify,” Pūrūs. This root is the verbal parent of the wind and fire, which are both represented as pure. पवन pavana (with Guna and ana [G. Ed. p. 125.] as suffix) is “the wind,” and the corresponding Gothic FŌNA (neut. nom. acc. fōn, see §. 116.) is “fire,” which in Sanscrit is called पवक pāva-ka, with Vṛddhi and aka as suffix. The relation of FŌNA to पवन pavana resembles that of the Latin málo from mavolo; the loss of the syllable v va 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, पु pu, ब्रु brū, “to speak,” Zend ᾱ βα mru (e.g. ᾱ βα mraδ-m, “I spoke,” V. S. p. 123.); the Greek ρέ(Φ)ω rests on the Guna form ववोष brav-i-mi, and has, as often happens, lost the former of two initial consonants (cf. also ρέω, ρεω, and ρυω, with प su, “to flow”). The Old High German SPRĀH, or SPRĀHH (sprīhu, “I speak,” sprah, “I spoke”) appears to have proceeded from ब्र ब्रav, by hardening the v (see §. 19.), and prefixing an s akin to the p. प bhū, “to be,” Zend जु bu, Lithuan. BU (future bāsu, “I will be”), Latin FU, Greek ΦΥ. Probably, also, BY, in πρέσ-βυ-ς, πρεσβύτης, &c., is only another form of this root (cf. §. 18.); so that πρές would have to be regarded as a preposition from πρό ( π pra,) essentially distinguished only by a euphonic Σ (cf. §. 96.). Moreover, the base πρέσβυ has a striking resemblance to प्रब्र 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-mès, pir-u-t, to bhav-ā-mas, "sumus," bhav-a-tha, "estis" (see §. 19.). To this class belongs, also, PŪ, "to dwell" (pu-ta, "I dwelt"), as the Sanskrit धस "to dwell," in German VAS, WAS, has become seyn. In Sanskrit, too, from भू bhū, "to be," comes the substantive bhav-anā "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 भवायामि bhavayāmi, "I make to be," which, in Prākrit, may sound bhāvēmi, bhāvēsi, bhāveli (Gothic baua, bauais, bauait). See p. 121 G. Ed. Sanskrit roots ending in diphthongs (रे, रो, रे दि; there are no roots in चो दु) follow in their formations, in many respects, the analogy of roots in चा द. 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 च्रि and चु 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 य a. So वच्च vach, Zend वच्च vach (वच्छ अदा, "dixit," Vend. S. p. 124), Greek ΕΠ for FEΠ (§. 14.), Latin VOC, Old High German, WAH, WAG (ki-wahu, "mentionem facio," pret. ki-wooh pl. ki wuogumēs). प्रब्ध prabh, Zend वच्छ परेशः, Gothic FRAH; pres वच्च प्रिच्छः परेशामि, प्रिच्छः परेशामि, fraiha for friha (see §. 82. and §. 109a. 1.); the Latin ROG (rogo, interrogo) appears to be abbreviated from FROG. पति pat, "to fall," "to fly," Zend पति pat, "to fly" (Vend. S. p. 257. पतिय पयो तातन uvvara ucyaîn, "where birds fly, trees grow"). One sees clearly from this
that, in Greek, πτω, πετάω, πετάομαι, πέτομαι, πτήμι, &c; belong to a common root ΠΕΤ; Latin PET, peto, im-peto, præpetes, 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 $VÄD$, in vēd-ara, "feather," ब्रः 1.10. vad, "to speak," Latin VAD, contained in vas, vad-is. From ब्रः vad proceeds the abbreviated form उद, to which pertains 'YΔ (υδω, υνέω, υ今天我们). 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 वादयानि vādayāmi, according to the tenth class. सदः sad, "to sink, with the prep. न नि, "to set oneself down"; Latin SED, SID, sido, sedeo; Greek 'ΕΔ, 'ΙΖ, εδος, εδρα, ἐδομαι; Gothic SAT (§. 87.), sita, "I sit" (p. 116 G. Ed.). चन्तः 2 an, "to blow," "to breathe," अनिं अनि, "wind," Gothic $AN$, usana, "I expire," cf. ἀνεμος, "anemus." जनः 3 jan, "to beget," Zend $μ$ zan (§. 58.), स्वाराग्न zazāmi, "I beget," Sanskrit जान्य jānami, Greek $ΓΕΝ$, Latin GEN (γέγομαι, γέως, gigno, genus), Gothic KIN, "to germinate," (p. 116 G. Ed.); kuni, "gender" (§. 66.). करोः kar (क्रि), e.g. करोति kardoṭi, "facit": this root, in Zend, follows the fifth class; e.g. जीतत्त्वति kēredaṭiti (§. 41.), "faciti," जीतत्त्वति kēredaṇḍi, "facit," स्वाराग्न kērṇūdhi, "fac"; Old High German karawan or garawan, "to prepare"; Latin creo, cura (cf. क्रुण kuru, "fac"), ceremonia, and with p for c (§. 14.), para; Greek κράινω, κρά-τος; with π, πράσσω, πρακ-σω, [G. Ed. p. 127.] प्राय-μα, where the guttural appears to be a hardening of the व v (§. 19.), e.g. of कुरव anti kuru-anti. वहः 1 vah, "to drive," "to carry," Zend वः vax (§. 57.), Latin VEH, Greek ἕχος, "wagon," as bearer, carrier, for ἐχος. व्यसः 2 svas, "to breathe," cf. spiro, according to §§. 50. and 22. वहः 9.10. grah, "to take": the original form, occurring in the Vedas, is ग्र ग्राह. To this the Zend form belongs, according to the tenth class, and,
indeed, so that the रह ध र appears before vowels as र, but before त as ड. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 155: रुह ध र तम तम जैम्मम मॅज रॅम र म र ज़रमिम तम अशम; ते ज़ि न पुण्य आुरे या ज़ न रकम दे रे रे दे अगुराेणटे, क्ष हे अशी चिधा? "Pure! si non dimittit, qui hominem captum capit (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 teneus, ΚΑΕΠ also seems to belong to this class, Gothic HLIF, "to steal," hliftus, "thief." Finally, also, in Greek, γρηγός, γρήγος, "the net," stands quite isolated, and appears to me to be related to the Indian गु ध grabh, by changing the a into i. चास ड, "to sit," Greek 'ΗΣ a remnant of the second class, terminating in a consonant to be supplied at §. 109. 3.; हो-राई answers exactly to चाले ड-रे (middle voice), and hence हो ई र stands for हो ई ई, as ειμί for εσμί (Sanskrit āsma). आज्ञ bhrāj, "to shine," Zend श्रे bērēz (§. 58). or† श्रे त र रेग, whence the part. pres. श्रे त र रेग, nom. m. श्रे त र रेग, "splendor," "altus," very frequently occurs. This Zend form prepares the way for the Old High German root PERAH, whence PERAH-TAT, nom. perah-t, "fulgidus." To this root belongs, also, our Pracht. The Greek language gives ΦΛΗ (§. 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. चहिद, "to cleave," SCID, scind-i-mus=chhindmas (§. 14.): ΣΧΙΖ, perhaps also ΣΚΙΔ, σχιδνη, &c. belong to this place; the form is more genuine, and the ideas, too, of

* Anquetil translates, "Si celui qui a commis l'Agueresté ne reconnoit pas sa faute quelle sera sa punition."
† Cf. p. 1281. Note *
‡ The h (in the sense of ch) corresponding to the j, γ, accords with §. 87., but is moreover favoured by the following t.
clearing, dispersing, separating, are kindred ones. The Gothic *SKAID*, "to separate," if the relationship is certain, has a stiffened Guna, so that ai appears to belong to the root. According to §. 87., however, the Gothic form should be *SKAIT* and the Old High German *SKEIZ* for *SKEID*. विद् 2 विद्, "to know," Zend ğer ो विद्, 'IA; 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 बुढ् *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" (अभिशापनः निवादैदयं "invoco," see §. 28.) In Gothic, *VIT* receives through the prep. *ni* in the meaning "to adore" (*inveita, invait, invitum*). दिस् 6 *dis*, "to shew," Zend दिस् 6 दिस् 10; hence फ्रादेसयध, "thou shewest" (Vend. S. p. 123), Greek *ΔΙΚ*, with Guna देयन्य, 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 *TIH*, and this root, combined with *ga*, signifies "to announce" (*ga-teiha, ga-taih, ga-taihum, for ga-tihum, according to §. 82.). On the other hand, in *taikus*, "sign," the law for the transposition of letters is violated. जीवः 1 *jiv*, "life;" Lithuanian *gywa*-s, "alive," *gyvenų* "I live," *gywata* "life;" Gothic *QUIVA*, nom. *quives*, "alive;" Latin *VIV*, as it appears from *QUIV*, as *bis* from *dus* (Sansk. द्विस् *dwis*), *viginti* from *tviginti*. The Zend has dropped either the vowel or the *v* of this root. Hence, *e g.* जू ज्वा, nom. जू ज्वो, "living," (V. S. p. 189); and जू ज्वी ज्वी, "bonam vitam habentes" (l. c. p. 222), from जू ज्वी ज्वी. 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 जिव, in the Latin vivō. Of roots with u, रुचि ruch, "to shine," and रुदध rud, "to weep," may serve as examples; the former, in Zend, is राय radch, (§§. 28. 32.), and follows the tenth class, e.g. रायज्ज़ी radchāji

[G. Ed. p. 129.] raotchayēiti, "splendet." In Latin correspond LUC, luc-s, luceo (§. 20.) and RUD: the Greek has, in both roots, replaced the r by l, and presents, for comparison, ΑΥΚ (ἀμφίλύκη, λυκόφως) and ΑΥΖ; to the former, λύχνος, λυχ-νέω, &c., has the same relation that, in Zend, ऐवलय तुफ्नु-s, "burning," has to the root अयु tap (§. 40.) We must assign लέυκός 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 lauhtmōni, "lightning," lauhatyan, "to lighten," liuhath, "light." Without Guna, and preserving the old smooth letter, stands lukarn (theme, lukarna, neut.), "lamp," rather isolated. A root corresponding to रुद� rud is wanting in Gothic, but the Old High German has for it, quite regularly according to §. 87., RÜZ, "to weep" (riuzu, röz for rauz, according to §. 80., ruzumēs). भूषण bhūṣk, "to adorn," is perhaps contained in the Latin or-no, with loss of the initial letter, as amo in relation to कामयादी कामयादी, "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," मेध mēdh, "to think"(?). The latter cannot hitherto be quoted as a verb: it springs, however, from मेधस mēdhas and मेधा mēdhā, "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 mítō, "I think": the Greek furnishes an analogous word to σέβ, 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, भि bhि, "fear," युध yudh, "contest," मुद mud, "joy." In Greek and Latin the pure root is the most rare form of the word; but it does not always appear as an abstract substantive. As, for instance, e.g. φιλογ (φιλόκ-ς), ὅτι (ὅτι-ς), νιφ (νιπ-ς), λέγ (λεκ-ς), πας (πασ-ς), πελ-λει (πελ-λεκ-ς). In German, commencing even with the Gothic, no pure radical words exist, although, by reason of the abbreviation of the base of the word in the singular, many words have assumed that appearance; for from the abbreviation of these verbal bases, which has been constantly extending during the lapse of time, it is precisely the most modern dialects which appear to exhibit the greatest number of naked roots as nouns. (cf. §. 116.) Naked roots seem most generally used at the end of compounds, on account of the clogging of the preceding part of the word. According to this principle, in Sanskrit, every root can, in this position, designate the agent by itself; as, 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-sic (fec-ς), tubi-cin (cen). An example in Greek is χεριβ (for -νιτ from νιτ-τω). Sanskrit roots which end with short vowels,
as विजी, "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. सर्वग-जित svarga-jit, "conquering the heaven," विजित 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 मद, "to measure."
FORMATION OF CASES.

112. The Indian Grammarians take up the declinable word in its primary form, i.e. in its state when destitute of all case-termination; and this bare form of the word is given also in dictionaries. In this we follow their example; and where we give Sanscrit and Zend nouns, they stand, unless it is otherwise specified, or the sign of case is separated from the base, in their primary form. The Indian Grammarians, however, did not arrive at their primary forms by the method of independent analysis, as it were by an anatomical dissection or chemical decomposition of the body of language; but were guided by the practical use of the language itself, which, at the beginning of compounds—and the art of composition is, in Sanscrit, just as necessary as that of conjugation or declension—requires the pure primary form; naturally with reservation of the slight changes of the adjoining limits of sound, rendered necessary at times by the laws of euphony. As the primary form at the beginning of compounds can represent every relation of case, it is, as it were, the case general, or the most general of cases, which, in the unlimited use of compounds, occurs more frequently than any other. Nevertheless, the Sanskrit language does not everywhere remain true to the strict and logical principle usually followed in composition; and as if to vex the Grammarians, and put their logic to the test, it places as the first member of the compounds in the pronouns of the first and second person the ablative plural, and in those of the third person the nom. and acc. sing. of the neuter, instead of the true primary form. The Indian Grammarians, then, in
Formation of cases.
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...this point, have applied to the cases furnished to them by the language, and take the augmented अस्मत asmat, or अस्मद asmad, "from us," युष्मत yushmat or युष्मद yushmad, "from you," as the starting-point in the declension, or as the primary form, although in both pronominal forms only अ and यु belong to the base, which, however, does not extend to the singular. That, however, in spite of this error, the Indian Grammarians understand how to decline the pronouns, and that they are not deficient in external rules for this purpose, is a matter of course. That the interrogative, in its declension, resembles bases in अ, cannot escape any one who holds the neuter अक्षम 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) अक्षम: अ: kimah kāh, 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 इदंकिमरं इदंकिमरं idankimdr iśki, the Grammarian 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.
skrīt, 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 Sanskrīt, 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 Sanskrīt and its sister languages, is distinguished, not by a particular affix denoting the number, but by the selection or modification of the case-syllable, so that, with the case-suffix, the number is at once known; e.g. bhyam, bhyām, and bhyas are cognate syllables, and, among other relations, express that of the dative; the first in the singular (only in the pronoun of the 2d person, 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 Sanskrīt 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 Sanskrīt, it is found very rarely in the verb, more frequently in the noun. The Pali has only as much left of it as the Latin, viz, a remnant of it in two words, which signify “two"
and "both"; in the Prakrit it is entirely wanting. Of
the German languages, only the eldest dialect, the Gothic,
possesses it, but merely in the verb; while, on the con-
trary, in the Hebrew (speaking here of the Semitic
languages) it is retained only in the noun, in disadvan-
tageous contrast with the Arabic, which, in many other
respects also, is a more perfect language, and which main-
tains 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 rela-
tions 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 secon-
dary 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 gra-
dations 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 Düümler.
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 them-
selves, 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, आ अ, औ औ, औ औ;
आ आ, इ इ, उ उ. To the short a, always masculine or neuter,
ever 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 i
commonly supplanted by a more recent u or e. In Greek,
the corresponding termination is the o of the second declen-
sion (e.g. in λόγος): and o was also the termination of the
Latin noun in ancient times; but in the classic period, al-
though sometimes retained, it was commonly changed to u
in the nom. and accus. sing. (of the second declension). An
old a, however, is still left in cola, gena, cida, at the end of
compounds, where, however, from the want of other ana-
logies, it is used in declension similarly to the feminine

[G. Ed. p. 138.] originally long a, on which account the
nominate is written, not colas, genas, cidas, but cola, &c.
The Grecian masculines of the first declension in येस,* with the
येस which has proceeded therefrom, must likewise, accord-
ing to their origin, be compared with the Sanskrit mas-
culine short a, to which, in regard of quality and preserva-
tion 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 excel-
lenty shewn by the genitive in अनु, which does not at all

* Cf. p. 1294. 1. 20. G. Ed.
suit a theme in \(\alpha\) or \(\eta\); and further, from such compounds as \(\mu\nu\rho\rho\omega\nu\lambda\nu\iota\gamma\) and \(\pi\alpha\iota\delta\tau\rho\iota\beta\nu\gamma\), in which the vowel that has been added to the roots \(\Pi\Omega\Lambda\) and TPIB supplies the place of the Sanskrit \(\alpha\) in similar compounds for which, in Greek, \(\circ\) 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 चारः \(\text{vāri}\), "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 (\(\dot{a}, \check{i}, \ddot{u}\)) belong, in Sanskrit, principally to the feminine (see §. 113.), are never found in the neuter, and occur in the masculine very rarely. In Zend the long final \(a\) has generally been shortened in polysyllabic words; as it has in Gothic, in which bases [G. Ed. p. 139.] in \(\delta\) correspond (§. 69.) to the Sanskrit feminine bases in \(\dot{a}\), and the \(\delta\) in the uninflected nom. and accus. sing. is shortened to \(a\), with the exception of the monosyllabic forms \(s\dot{a}\), "she," "this," Sanskrit \(सा\) \(sā\), Zend \(hā\); \(hvō\), "which?" Sanskrit and Zend \(kā\). 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 \(\ddot{a}\) approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit feminine \(\text{सा}\) \(ā\), which the common dialect has sometimes preserved, sometimes shortened, sometimes transformed into \(\eta\).
119. The long \( i \) 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 \( i \) has been preserved most strictly in Lithuanian, where, for example, in the part. pres. and fut. an \( i \) is added to the old participial suffix \( ant \), and एसंत-\( i \), “the existing,” बु-सेंट-\( i \), “that that shall be,” correspond to the Sanskrit सती sat-\( i \) (for असति or असंति), भविंती bhav-\( i \)-श्यanti. In Greek and Latin this feminine long \( i \) has become incapable of declension; and where it has still left traces, there a later un-organic affix has become the bearer of the case-terminations. This affix is, in Greek, either \( α \) or \( δ \); in Latin, \( c \). Thus, \( ἡδεία \) corresponds to the Sanskrit स्वाधी swādhi, from स्वादu, “sweet”; -τριά, -τριδ, e.g. ὄρχοστρια, ληστρίς, ληστ्रίδ-ος, to the Sanskrit त्रितri, e.g. जनित्रीजनित्री, “genitress,” to which the Latin genitalis, genital-is, corresponds; while in the Greek γενιτειρα, and similar formations, the old feminine \( i \) is forced back a syllable. This [G. Ed. p. 140.] analogy is followed by μέλαινα, τάλαινα, τέρεινα, and substantive derivations, as τέκταινα, Λάκαίνα. In θεράπαινα, λέαινα, the base of the primitive is, as in the nom. masc., shortened by a \( τ \). In θέαινα, 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 इन-द्राणि In- drāṇi, as the wife of Indra, as derived from इन्द्र Indra, is termed. The cases where the feminine \( i \) is solely represented by \( α \) are essentially limited to feminine derivatives from forms in \( ντ \), 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 \( σ \):

\[
\text{hence, } ουσ-α, \text{ εσ-α, } εσ-α, \text{ ουσ-α, } \overset{*}{\text{ασ-α}}, \overset{*}{\text{υσ-α}} \\
\text{for } ουτ-α, \text{ εντ-α, } εντ-α, \text{ αυτ-α, } \overset{*}{\text{αυτ-α}}, \overset{*}{\text{υντ-α}}.
\]

* In Doric subsequent and original αυσ-α.
To this analogy belong, moreover, the feminine substantives, like θάλασσα, βασίλισσα, μέλισσα, which J. Grimm (II. 328.) very correctly, in my opinion, compares with forms like χαρί-εσσα, μελιτό-εσσα, and explains the double σ by gemination or assimilation. The feminine formations by a simple α instead of the original 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 ó declension, but in the singular of substantives shortens the syllable yó in the [G. Ed. p. 141.] uninflected nominative and vocative to i, in the adjective to ya. 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 i in Gothic is denoted by ei, so to the Sanskrit feminine participial bases in जनी anti, and to the fem. comparative bases in इयसी iyasi, correspond the forms ntein, izein, regarding the nominative of which refer to §. 142.

121 The long u (ü) 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 vadhû, "a wife," भू bhû, "earth," सवार swaśrû, "mother-in-law" (socrus), भ्रु bhrû, "eyebrow." To the latter corresponds ᄜроৎ, 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 र i from र i. But few monosyllabic primary forms end, in Sanskrit, with diphthongs, not any at all with र i; with र dare (from ठ i, see §. 2) only र taı, masc. "thing," "riches"; in
the nom. irregularly रम् ṛd-s for रस् ṛdi-s. In this is recognised the Latin re-s. Still I do not believe that Latin bases in ṛ should therefore be looked upon as corresponding to the Sanskrit र di; for, in the first place, the Latin ṛ corresponds elsewhere to the Sanskrit र ṛ (from अ + ṛ), never to di; secondly, the connection of the ṛ of the fifth declension with the originally long a of the first is not to be mistaken (to which it bears the same relation that the Ionic η does to the Doric ἄ), for many words with the same meaning belong to the A and E declension; and, for example, a suffix which is employed for the formation of abstracts from adjectives is sounded as well ती as तिय (planitie-s, [G. Ed. p. 142.] planitia, canitie-s, canitia); and ती-s, and ता, in the formation of primitive and derivative words—like effigie-s, effigia, pauperie-s, pauperia—are clearly one and the same suffix, identical with the Sanskrit यd, which is used for the same purpose, and the Greek ια, Ionic ιη. Let us now consider the objections which are opposed to the original identity of the feminine ṛ and a. The most weighty is the s in the nom. sing. and pl.: तू, ता for ṛ, ei, as musa, musae (musai), κεφαλή, κεφαλαί. As regards the s in the singular, it is, if the identity with the first declension be authentic, very remarkable; and forms like species, canities, seem to be true lingual patriarchs: for the Sanskrit, like the Zend, Greek, Gothic, Lithuanian, exhibits the absence of the nominative sign in the corresponding feminine bases in a. I have, however, never considered as original the abandonment of the nominative sign, and the complete equalization with the primary form in तुता 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, τιθεὶς, because they have preserved the nominative s together with the nasal, and therein stand on the same footing with Zend forms, like बताने 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 ei answers to deae (deai), the more rare, however, and better, in ęs to familias. Schneider searches, but fortunately without success, for genitives like die-is: we require them as little, perhaps, as a familia-is. Let dies be written with Greek letters δίν-ς, and then, perhaps, a die-is will be as little required as a δύν-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 ę, otherwise from QUIET could only have come QUII (quies, quiis, like caedes); i.e. in spite of the rejection of the t it must have continued in the third declension. The connection between re-s and the abovementioned Sanskrit रादि is, in my opinion, to be arrived at through the irregular nominative रास रादि-ς; and according to this re-s would be supported on an old ą: it answers to रास रादि-ς as re-bus to राब्य स रादि-भयास, and as in Greek γην-ν to the Sanskrit गाम गाप्त, "terram," which, in the remaining cases, has गो 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 ę.
122. Primary forms in श्रो ज are rare in Sanskrit: the only ones known to me are श्रो dyो, "heaven," and गो gो: the former is feminine, and properly proceeds from दिविन div (a radical word from दिव div, "to shine") by the vocalization of the ध v, after which the vowel ध i becomes its semi-vowel ध y. In the accusative the ज bases change this diphthong into ज. To the ज thus obtained in श्राय्य dyो-m,

[G. Ed. p. 144.] गाम gά-m, corresponds the Latin e of die-*m, the Greek η, Doric α, of γη-ν, γα-ν: the Latin e, however, is rendered short by the influence of the final m: the original language requires diē-*m. In Sanskrit, also, from दिविन 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. दिबिन divान, as an adverb, "by day," and used as a primary form at the beginning of compounds; and also दिवस dicasa, masc., and धु dyu, neuter (a contraction from div), which latter signifies both "day" and "heaven." To धु dyu answers, after rejecting the ध (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 श्रो dyो, whence the dative श्रद्धव धयान-र, and the locat. श्रद्धव धयान-र. The Diovins, moreover, furnished by Varro, deserves mention, as that which keeps most faithfully to the ancient form. The Grecian Zeovs signifies, therefore, in accordance with its origin primarily, "heaven": I form its relation to श्रो dyो thus, that after dropping the ध d the following semi-vowel ध y became ζ (§. 19.). The oblique cases, on the contrary (Διός, Δι, &c.), belong to the Sanskrit ध u 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. Διός has the same relation to ΔιFός, that, in Latin, sub dio has to sub divo.

123. Let us now consider the second of the abovementioned primary forms in ज, viz. गो gो. 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, ρη, ρα follows the example of the Indian accusative, where, as has been already remarked, गाम (ρν) stands for ग्द-म [G. Ed. p. 145.] or गाव-म. For the meaning “ox” the Greek has preserved the old diphthong—for, for ब्र = a × u may very well be expected, according to §. 4., ov)—but has exchanged the guttural medial for labials, as, p. 122 G. Ed., भेव्म for ज्ञानम jayami. The base BOY before vowels must originally have become BOF; thus, in the dative, भोफिं would answer to the Sanskrit locat. गिक गाव-ि, and the Latin dative bov-ि; but in the present state of the language the middle digamma between two vowels has always been dropped; and there is not, as with the initial digamma, the medium of metre for replacing it in the oldest writings. Only theory and comparative grammar can decide here. The Latin has, in the word bō-s, changed the vowels (a + u)—(which were originally of different kinds, but have been united into a diphthong)—into a homogeneous mass (cf. §. 4.), the nature of whose contraction, however, discloses itself before vowel inflexions, since the u-half of BŌ becomes v, and the short a is resolved into the form of a short o; thus, bov-ि answers to the Sanskrit locat. गिक गाव-ि. The Zend for the meaning “earth” has changed the guttural of the word under discussion into z, and gives in the nominative ग्यास zdo for ग्यास ग्दोs (§. 56*.), in the accusative ग्यास गाव-ि (§. 61.): I am not able to adduce other cases. For the meaning “ox” the guttural has remained in Zend, and the nominative is then ग्दो ग्दो-स or ग्दो ग्दो-स.

124. I know only two words in Sanskrit which terminate in दु—नाव, “ship,” and ग्दू ग्दू, “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 ना to be an abbreviation of स्नाव (cf. σῶ, σῶ, ρα, with म स्रु, p. 125 G. ed.), and that it therefore proceeds from the root च च, “to bathe,” which originally, perhaps, may also have meant “to swim,” and with which वाव, वेओ, नाव-तो, appear to be connected. ना would consequently be a radical word; and in regard to the vowel would stand for ना, according to the analogy of दद ददाय (dedi, dedit) for दद, from दद-ा. As आ, according to §. 6., is a grave vowel, the Greek cannot represent the Sanskrit व्रिद्धी-धिघथ (N. आ) better than by αω, while आ (from short आ + उ) is commonly represented by εν or ου. Hence ना नाव-स and नाव-स correspond as exactly as possible; the व of नाय, however, like that of BOY, has maintained itself only before consonants; and the digamma, which replaces it, is lost before vowel inflexions; वी-ες, वी-ες, are from वα-ες (Sansk. नाव-स), as बे-ες from बे-ες. The Latin has given this word a foreign addition, and uses नव-ए, नव-ए, for नाव-ए, नाव-ए. As the semi-vowel व is easily hardened to a guttural (§. 19.), we have here also, for नाव, नाव-म, a sister form in our Nachen, Old High German नाचो, “ship,” gen. dat. नाचो.

125. We pass over to the consonants: of these, न, त, स, 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 i has been added to the above-mentioned ना गो, which, however, according to §. 117., is suppressed, together with the case sign in Old High German; hence चुो, “cow,” gen. चुो, where the i does not belong to the case designation, but to the here uninflected base.
the end of the nominal bases most in use; in Greek and Latin, on the contrary, they are of frequent occurrence; e is in Latin both radical and derivative, [G. Ed. p. 147.]
g only radical—DUC, VORAC, EDAC, LEG. In Greek, κ, χ, and γ are only radical, or occur in words of unknown origin, as ΦΠΙΚ, ΚΟΠΑΚ, 'ONYX (Sanskrit nakha), ΦΛΟΓ. Of the palatals, ch and j in Sanskrit occur most frequently in वच vāch, "speech, voice" (VOC, 'ΩΠ); राज rāj, "king." the latter only at the end of compounds; अस्र aj, "blood" (sanguis): in Zend we have ध्र druh, f., as name of an evil demon, probably from the Sanskrit root द्रह druḥ, "to hate." Of the two classes of the T-sound, the first, or lingual (ङ t, &c.), is not used at the end of nominal bases; and therefore the second, dental, or proper T-class, is so much the more frequently employed. Still द d, ध dh, occur only in radical words, and therefore seldom; ठ th perhaps only in पाठ path, as the secondary theme of पाठन pathin, "way"; nom. पाठ panthas, from पाठ panthas, which I think I again recognise in the Latin PONT, pons. Other examples are, अद 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 अत at or अनt ant, Greek and Latin nt. The Greek, besides त, exhibits also झ and ठ at the end of primary forms which are not radical; still ΚΟΠΘ and 'ΟΠΝΘ appear to me to be properly compounds, and to contain the roots ΘΗ, ΘΕ (the vowel being dropped) as their last member; and according to this, ΚΟΠΘ would properly mean "what is placed on the head"; so in Sanskrit, शरद sarad, "autumn," "rainy season," which Grammarians explain by a suffix ad, in my opinion means nothing but "water giving," and contains the root द dd, "to give," with द suppressed. 'ΟΠΝΘ finds in Greek itself no etymology: the Sanskrit offers for its explanation ओरण arani (according to the pronunciation of Bengal, oroni), "wood"; and if ओρι is con-
connected therewith, we may refer to θέω, "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 द in feminine bases in द, an account is given in §. 119.; that is to say, patronyms in द may be compared with Sanskrit ones in द, e.g. भैमिति, "the daughter of Bhima. Probably, too, the द in feminine patronyms in द 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, pašu, 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 चष् अप (probably from the root चष् अप, “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, f, are either evidently radical, or of unknown origin, with probably radical letters at the end; or in Latin they have suppressed, in the nominative, a vowel belonging to the base; and so, as in [G. Ed. p. 150.]

German, the first and fourth strong declensions, according to Grimm, have only the appearance of a base terminating with a consonant. Of this kind is plebs, from plebis; to explain which it is not requisite to turn, with Voss, to the Greek πληθος: one must keep to the Latin root P.I.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 पचन् panchan), aqua; on the other hand, am-nis rests on the form ap, as somnus for sopnus, and σευμός, for σεβνός, in analogy with a Sanskrit euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. r. 58.). The Sanskrit has from the same root another neuter, सापस् āpas, 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, ἀφρός 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 ancia (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 चावन्, "a dog" (abbreviated गुगुः गुण्), and युवन् युवन्, "young" (abbreviated यूत्त यूत् यून्), in Greek κόων, abbreviated ΚΥΝ, 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 चतुर् chatur, in the strong cases §. 129. चत्वार् chatwār) comes the dative fidvöri-m. The themes सप्तन्, saptan, "seven," नवन् navon, "nine," दशन् dasan, "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 ड़ l at the end of bases, and व v only in the word दियु div, before mentioned, which contracts itself in several cases to झ़ dyो and झ़ dyu. 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 r. Moreover, r in Latin appears frequently as an alteration of an original s, as, in the comparative suffix ior (Sanskrit ईयस iyas); and, further, as an abbreviation of 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 ἌΑΛ appears as a consonantal base; but in contrast with the सलिला salila, “water,” ὀλ-ς appears abbreviated exactly in the same manner as µέγα-ς from µεγαλός.

128. Of the Sanskrit sibilants, the two first (श s, श śh), 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 झस as, which forms principally neuters, e.g. तेजस tejus, “splendour,” “strength,” from तिज tij, “to sharpen.” The Greek appears to be without bases in Σ; this, however, proceeds from the following reason, that this sibilant between two

* Bases in अर ar in several cases, and in the primary form also at the beginning of compounds, contract the syllable अर ar to झू ri; and this झू ri is regarded by the Grammarians as their proper final sound. (§. 1.)
vowels, especially in the last syllable, is usually rejected, hence, neuters like μένος, γένος (from MENEΣ, GENEΣ, with change of the e into o), form in the genitive μένεος, γένεος, for μένεσος, γένεσος. The σ of the nominative, however, belongs, as I have already elsewhere remarked, to the base, and not to the case designation, as neuters have no σ in the nominative. In the dative plural, however, in the old epic language, the Σ, as it did not stand between two vowels, maintained itself; hence τείχεος-σι, ὅρεσ-σι; so likewise in compounds, like σακές-παλος, τελεσ-φόρος, in which it would be wrong to assume the annexation of a Σ to the vowel of the base. In γῆρας, γῆρα-ος, for γῆρασ-ος, after restoring the Σ of the base, the form of word answers exactly to the Sanskrit जरस जरस, “age,” although the Indian form is not neuter, but feminine. In Lithuanian, another remarkable remnant of the Sanskrit suffixes terminating with s has been preserved, viz. in the partic. perf., in the oblique cases of which us corresponds to the Sanskrit उष उष (euphonic for उस उस) 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 at is given as the suffix of this participle in preference to ant. The root τυδ, "to vex," e.g. exhibits in the participle mentioned the form τυδίν τυ- đant as the strong and original theme (cf. tundent-em), and τυδ τudat as the weak theme; hence the masculine is declined,
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Singular : Nom. Voc. τυδν τudan
Acc. τυδνυμ τudantam
Instr. . . . . . .
Dat. . . . . . .
Abl. . . . . . .
Gen. . . . . . .
Loc. . . . . . .

Dual : Nom. Acc. Voc. τυδνιν τudantâu
Instr. Dat. Abl. . . . . .
Gen. Loc. . . . . . .

STRONG CASES.

WEAK CASES.

τυδτα τudatâ.
τυδτε τudatee.
τυδτσ τudatas.
τυδτσ τudatas.
τυδτι τudati.
τυδσ τudatos.
τυδσ τudatos.
τυδσ τudatos.
### Formation of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural: Nom. Voc.</th>
<th>तुदनस् ṭudantas</th>
<th><strong>Strong Cases</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>तुदनस् ṭudantas</td>
<td><strong>Weak Cases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>तुदद्विस् ṭudadbhis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>तुदद्विस् ṭudadbhyas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>तुदनम् ṭudatám</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>तुदस् ṭudatsu</td>
<td></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 शन्त swan, "hound," which in the weakest cases is contracted to शुन्त śun, appears in Zend likewise in a double form, and presents the weak genitive śun-ɖ over against the strong nominative and accusative śpīl, śpān-čm, Sanskrit श्वं सुदः, श्वानम् swānām (§. 50.). The base ap, "water," which, in Sanskrit, in the strong cases has a long ā, but is not used in the singular, forms in the Zend the strong sing. nom. अप्सरं āps (§. 40.), accus. फल अपे m; on the other hand, ap-ā, "of the water," ap-āt, "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 istringstream "canes," is found for istringstream in the nominative; and, on the other hand, the strong istringstream, in the nominative as well as in the accusative.*

132. The Greek, in the declension of istringstream, has limited the strong form to the nom. and voc. sing.: in istringstream, in accordance with the Sanskrit, it has given the accusative also the strong form, in which the Gothic agrees with it. Compare istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, with istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, istringstream (locat.); and the Gothic istringstream, as nom., accus., and vocat., opposed to istringstream, "of the brother," istringstream, "to the brother," with the Sanskrit istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, dative istringstream, istringstream, locat. istringstream. According to the same principle in bases in an, in Gothic, the istringstream in the genitive and dative sing. is weakened to i (§. 140.); while the nominative, accus., and vocat. retain the original istringstream; istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, istringstream, from istringstream, "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 istringstream in the accusative; and am therefore in doubt, whether in this word, owing to the facile exchange of istringstream and istringstream, the confusion has not originated in mere graphical oversights. Thus, V. S. p. 21, we find: istringstream, istring
approximate most nearly to it, as Pāli and Prākrit, through which, to avoid a hiatus, and to maintain pure the vowels of the base and of the termination, a euphonic n is introduced. This euphonic expedient cannot, in the extent in which it exists in Sanskrit, belong to the original state of the language; otherwise it would not be almost entirely lost in the cognate European dialects, and even in the Zend. We therefore regard it as a peculiarity of the dialect, which, after the period of the division of languages, became the prevailing one in India, and has raised itself to be the universal written language in that country. It is necessary here to remark, that the Veda language did not use the euphonic n so universally as the common Sanskrit; and together with रन एन, इन इन, उन उन, occur also च्या ओड, इया ओड, ओड ओड. The euphonic n is most frequently employed by the neuter

[G. Ed. p. 157.] gender, less so by the masculine, and most rarely by the feminine: the latter limits its use to the plural genitive termination चाम ओम, 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 AHO (nom. aha). Besides the use of the euphonic n, there is further to be remarked, in Sanskrit and Zend, the attachment of Guna to the vowels of the base (§. 26.) in certain cases, to which also the Gothic presents analogies.

S I N G U L A R.

NOMINATIVE.

134. Bases, of the masculine and feminine genders, ending with a vowel have, in the Sanskrit family of languages, (under the limitation of §. 137.) s as nominative-suffix, which in Zend, after an a preceding it, always melts into u, and is then contracted with the a to ȳ (§. 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 ṣa, "he," "this," fem. ṣā; 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 ṭa, and feminine ṭā ṭā 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. Ḥva-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 andy-s, raginy-s. This contraction extends also to the genitive, which is in like manner denoted by s. To the Gothic nominatives in yi-s correspond the Lithuanian, like Atpirktoyi-s, "Saviour," the i of which has likewise arisen from an elder a.† I deduce this from the majority of the oblique cases, which agree with those of the a bases. Where, however, in Lithuanian, a consonant precedes the final syllable ya, which is the more common case, there the y is changed into the vowel i, and the following i, which had arisen from a, is suppressed: hence, yaunikki-s, "young man," for yaunikky-s from yaunikkya-s. Hereto correspond in Gothic all adjective bases in ya,‡

* E.g. शुनो मम sutō mama, "filius meus," मुतम् तच sutas tava, "filius tuus" (p. 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 mid-i-s "the middle" (man), for midy-i-s from midya-s, Sanskrit मध्यमन्त्र madhya-s, The Zend also, in the vocalization* of the syllable ya, presents a remarkable analogy to the Lithuanian and Gothic in contracting the syllable मध्यa ya before a final ज्ञ स regularly to ज्ञ i, as also मध्यa va to ज्ञ व (§. 42.).

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

[G. Ed. p. 159.] The High German is, however, in this point, superior to the Gothic in fulness, that in its a bases—to which belong all strong adjectives—it has not suppressed the vowel before the case-sign, but preserved it in the form of e, which, in Old High German—as it appears through the influence of the r—is long, but only in polysyllabic, not in monosyllabic forms. Thus, e.g. plint-ér, "cæcus," 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 चा a, and, with very few exceptions, polysyllables in च औ, together with स्त्री strī, "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, ë becomes a (§. 69.); only sō, "this," and hwā "which?" remain unshortened, on account of their being monosyllabic, as in Zend महा hā and मह 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, \(+i also is shortened, even in the monosyllabic \(stri, “wife,” see V. S. par. 136, (by Olshausen), p. 28, where we read \( stri-cha, “feminaque”; whilst elsewhere the appended \( cha preserves the original length of the vowel. Here, too, the Zend nominals in \( deserve to be mentioned, which seem very similar to the Greek in \( as \( pérené, “plena,” which in the Vendidad occurs very often in relation to \( záo, “earth,” without my being able to remember that I have found another case from \( pérené. But from the nom. \( kainé, “maid” (Sanskrit कायā [G. Ed. p. 160.] kanyā), which is of frequent occurrence, I find the accus. \( kanye (V. S. p. 420); this furnishes the proof that the \( in the nominative is generated by the euphonic influence of the suppressed \( (§. 42.). In \( brāturyē, “cousin,” and \( tāryē, “a relation in the fourth degree” (V. S. p. 380), the \( has remained; on the other hand, in \( nyākē, “grandmother,” the dropping of a \( must be again assumed. We cannot here refrain from conjecturing that the \( also of the Latin fifth declension, as with very few exceptions it is everywhere preceded by an \( is likewise produced from \( by the influence of this \( so that the Latin here stands in reversed relation to the Greek, where \( rejects the combination with \( and preserves the original \( (σοφία).

138. Bases of the masculine and feminine genders which terminate with a consonant, lose, in Sanskrit, according to §. 94., the nominative sign \( and if two consonants terminate the base, then, according to the same law, the latter of these also is lost. Hence, \( bibhrat, for \( bibhrat-s, “the bearer”; \( tudan, for \( tudant-s “the vexer”; \( vāk (from \( vāch, f.), for \( vāk-s, “speech.” The Zend, Greek, and Latin, in preserving the nominative sign after consonants, stand in an older position than the Sanskrit; Zend \( āf-s (for \( s, §. 40.), “water”;
FORMATION OF CASES.

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 ἄρπις for ἀρπιτ-ς, comes for comit-s (cf. §. 6.). The Latin, Éolic, 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, τιθενς, Lith. sukais (§. 10.), correspond to the Zend अद्वयस् सद्वयानि, “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. राजस्यराजपुत्र, “king’s son,” for राजस्यराजनपुत्र; and it is rejected in the nominative also, and a preceding short vowel is lengthened in masculines; e.g. राज्ञ राज, “king,” from राजस्यराजन, m.; नाम नामा, “name,” from नामस्यनामन, n.; धनी धनि, m., धनि धनिन, n., from धनिन्द्र धनिन, “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. अश्वविष्णु अश्व, “the pure” (man), from अश्वविष्णु अश्वान, m.; अश्वविष्णु चश्मा, “eye,” from अश्वविष्णु चश्मान, n. The Latin follows the Sanskrit in the suppression of the n in the nominative, in the masculine, and feminine, but not in the neuter: sermo, sermon-is, actio, action-is; but nomen, not nome or nomo. The root can at the end of compounds, refrains from rejecting the n, probably in order not to weaken still more this weak radical syllable; thus tubi-cen, fidi-cen, os-cen (see §. 6.). Lien-is an abbreviation of lien-i-s; hence the retention of the n is not surprising. Pecten stands rather isolated. In Sanskrit the naked roots also follow the principle of the rejection of n; हन “slaying,” “smiting,” ncm. हa हd, is, however, the only root in n which I have
met with so used. घन् s'wan “hound,” nom. घा s'wâ, which, in the weakest cases, contracts its theme to घन् s'un, is of obscure origin. The Latin has extended the base घन् s'wan, in the nominative, by an unorganic addition, to cani; so घन् yuvan, “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. घन् dhanî;† comes from घनि dhanin; and, in Lithuanian, bases in en and un give, in the nominative, ṛ (\(=\) wo) for e or u. Thus, from the bases AKMEN, “stone,” SZUN, “hound,” come the nominatives akmû, s'wû; as in Sanskrit, from the primary forms of the same signification, घुमन् a'sman, घन् s'wan, have arisen घुमन् aśmâ and घा s'wâ. It does not follow that homin-is has come from homon-is;† because the old language had hemo, hemonis, for homo, hominis; but mon and min are cognate suffixes, signifying the same, and were originally one, and therefore may be simultaneously affixed to one and the same word.

140. The German language also rejects a final n of the base in the nominative and in the neuter, in the accu-
sative also, like Sanskrit. In Gothic, in the masculine and neuter—where alone, in my opinion, the n has an old and original position—an a always precedes the n. There are, that is to say, only bases in an, none in in and un; the latter termination is foreign to the Sanskrit also.

[G. Ed. p. 163.] The a, however, is weakened to i in the genitive and dative (see §. 132.); while in Sanskrit, in these cases, as especially in the weakest cases (§. 130.), it is entirely dropped.* Among masculine bases in an, in Gothic, exist several words, in which an is the whole derivative-suffix, and which therefore correspond to the Sanskrit. राज्य राय-न, “king,” as “ruler.” Thus AHH-AN, “spirit,” as “thinker” (ah-yo, “I think”), STAU-AN, “Judge” (stau-ya, “I judge”), whence the nominatives aha, stawa. There are also, as in Sanskrit, some masculine formations in man; as, AHHMAN, “spirit,” nom. ahma, with which perhaps the Sansk. शामन दत्तन, “soul,” nom. शामता दत्तात्र, is connected; in case this stands for दह-मन, and comes from a lost root दान दह, “to think,”† where it is to be remembered that also the root नाह nah, “to bind,” has, in several places, changed its h into t. The Gothic MILH-MAN, nom. milh-ma, “cloud,” appears to have sprung from the Sanskrit root mih, by the addition of an l, whence, remarkably enough, by the suffix a, and by exchanging the h for gh, arises the nominal base नेम मेघ, “cloud.” In Latin ming-o answers to मिह mih, and in Greek ὤ-με-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 नन an; e.g. शामन दत्तन-न, not दत्तन-न, but नामन नमन-न, not नामन-न, "nominis."

† Perhaps identical with the actually-occurring ताह दह, “to speak,” as मन man, “to think,” in Zend means also “to speak”; whence मन्त्र manthra, “speech,” and in Gothic MUN-THA, nom. munths, “mouth” §. 66.
tive, and vocative, which sound the same; [G. Ed. p. 164.]
so that in these cases the Gothic neuter follows the theory of
the strong cases (§. 129.), which the Sanskrit neuter obeys
only in the nom., accus., and vocat. plural, where, for ex-
ample, चतुर्वर्त chatudr-i, "four," with a strong theme, is
opposed to the weak cases like चतुर्भिस chaturbhis (instr.),
चतुर्भयस 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 नामान्य nāmān-i,
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 नाम्य nām-om, "nominum"; while the Gothic
namōn-ē has permitted itself to be led astray by the example
of the strong cases, and would be better written namn-ē or
namn-ē.

142. In the feminine declension in German I can find
no original bases in n, as also in Sanskrit there exist no
feminines in an or in; but feminine bases are first formed
by the addition of the usual feminine character इ इ; as,
राज्य rājī, "queen," from राजन rājan; धानी dhanī, "the
rich" (fem.), from धान dhan, m. n. "rich." Gothic fe-
mnine substantive bases in n exhibit, before this consonant,
either an ए ए ( = चा, §. 69.) or ए: these are genuine feminine
final vowels, to which the addition of an ए can have been
only subsequently made. And already, at §. 120., a close
connection of bases in ein ( = इन) with the Sanskrit in इ इ,
and Lithuanian in i, has been pointed out. Most substan-
tive bases in ein are feminine derivatives from masculine-
neuter adjective bases in a, under the same relation, ex-
cluding the modern ए, as in Sanskrit that of सुम्बरी sundari,  
"the fair" (woman), from सुम्बर 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. \textit{MANAGEIN}, "crowd, nom. managei, from the adjective base \textit{MANAGA} (nominative masc. manag-s, neut. managa-ta); \textit{MIKILEIN}, nom. mikilei, "greatness," from \textit{MIKILA} (mikil-s, mikila-ta), "great." As to feminine bases in \( \delta_n \), they have arisen from feminine bases in \( \delta \); and I have already observed that feminine adjective bases in \( \delta_n \) — as \textit{BLINDDÖN}, nom. blindó, gen. blindón-s — must be derived, not from their masculine bases in \( an \), but from the primitive feminine bases in \( \delta \) (nom. \( a \), Grimm's strong adjectives). Substantive bases with the genitive feminine in \( \delta_n \) presuppose older ones in \( \delta \); and correspond, where comparison is made with old languages connected in their bases, to Sanskrit feminines in \( \delta \), Greek in \( \alpha, \eta \), Latin in \( \alpha \); and in these old languages never lead to bases with a final \( n \). Thus, \textit{TUGGÖN} (pronounced \textit{tungön}), nom. tugdo, answers to the Latin \textit{lingua}, and to the Sanskrit निहवः \textit{jiḥvā}, ( = \textit{dschiḥvā}, see §. 17.); and \textit{DAURÖN}, nom. daurō, to the Greek \( \thetaόπα \); \textit{VIDDÖVÖN}, nom. vidōvō, "widow," to the Sanskrit \textit{विधवः} \textit{vidhavā}, "the without man" (from the prep. \textit{वि} \textit{vi} and \textit{व} \textit{dhava}, "man"), and the Latin \textit{vidua}. It is true that, in \textit{MITATHYÖN}, "measure," nom. mitathyō, the suffix \textit{thyōn} completely answers to the Latin \textit{tion}, \textit{e.g.} in \textit{ACTION}; but here in Latin, too, the \textit{on} is a later addition, as is evinced from the connection of \textit{ti-on} with the Sanskrit suffix सत \textit{ti}, of the same import, and Greek \textit{σίς} (old \textit{τις}), Gothic \textit{ti}, \textit{thi}, \textit{di} (see §. 91.). And in Gothic, together with the base \textit{MITATHYÖN} exists one signifying the same, \textit{MITATHI}, nom. mitaths. In \textit{RATHYÖN}, nom. rathyō, "account," a relationship with \textit{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, \textit{rath-yōn} : the \textit{th} belongs, in the Gothic soil, to the root, whence the strong part. \textit{rath-an(\( u \))-s} has been preserved. The suffix \textit{yōn}, of \textit{RATHYÖN} therefore corresponds to the Sanskrit \textit{yā}; \textit{e.g.} in विधा \textit{vid-ya}, "knowledge." Of the same origin is \textit{GA-RUN-YÖN}, 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, εὐδαιμο, τέρη, τέρε, τάλα, τάλα? I do not venture to decide with positiveness on this point, but the latter view appears to be the more probable. It here deserves to be 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 guotlihīn, "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 surprising. 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 δελφί, 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 shown by an interesting example. Several cardinal numbers in Sanskrit conclude their base with न \( n \); viz. panchan,
144. Bases in दर अर (चि रि, § 1.) in Sanskrit reject the r in the nominative, and, like those in न n, lengthen the preceding vowel; e.g. from पितर pitar, "father," मातर mātār, "mother," दुहितर duhitar, "daughter," come पिता pita, माता mātā, दुहिता duhitā. The lengthening of the a serves, I believe, as a compensation for the rejected r. As to the retention, however, through all the strong cases, excepting the vocative, of the long a of the agent, which corresponds to Greek formations in ηρ, ῥω, 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—ηρ, ῥω, τōr; only [G. Ed. p. 169.] that in Latin a final r, in polysyllabic words, shortens an originally long vowel. Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. sing.  दाता dātā,</td>
<td>ὀτήρ, ὀτήρ,</td>
<td>datōr,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. sing. दातारम् dātārm am,</td>
<td>ὀτήρ-α, ὀτήρ-α,</td>
<td>datōr-em,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. dual, दातारौ dātā-rou,</td>
<td>ὀτήρ-ε, ὀτήρ-ε,</td>
<td>datōr-es,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Voc. pl. दातारस् dātā-s,</td>
<td>ὀτήρ-ε, ὀτήρ-ε,</td>
<td>datōr-es.</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

panchān, “five,” saptan, “seven,” ashtan with ashtau, “eight,” navan, “nine,” dasan, “ten.” These numerals are, indeed, used adjectively, when they are not governed by the gender of their substantive, but display always a neuter form, and indeed, which is surprising, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative sing. terminations, but in the other cases the suitable plural endings; e.g. चह रजानस् pancha (not panchānas) rājānas “quinqye reges”; on the other hand, पच्च स रजस् panchasu rājasu “in quinque regibus.” To the nenter nominatives and accusative of the singular पच्च pancha, सम sapta, नच nava; and दसा dasa—which rest on the regular suppression of the n—answer the Greek πέντε, ἐπτά, εννέα, δέκα, with the distinction that they have become quite indeclinable, and retain the old uninflcted 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. पति, "father," दाता, "giver," "Creator;" acc पातरे, दातरे. 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 мотé, "wife," дукте "daughter," answer to the abovementioned माता мुता, दुहिता दुहिता; and, in the plural, мотер-ёс, дуктер-ёс, to मातरस्य मातरस्य दुहितरस्य दुहितरस्य. In the genitive singular I regard the form мотер-с, дуктер-с, as the elder and more genuine, and мотерёс, дуктерёс, as corruptions belonging to the i bases. In the genitive plural the base has kept clear of this unorganic i; hence, мотер-у, дуктер-у, not мотер-у, дуктер-у. Besides the words just mentioned, the base СЕССЕР, "sister," belongs to this place: it answers to the Sanskrit स्वसर swasar, nom. स्वसा swasá; but distinguishes itself in the nominative from моте and дукте, in that the е, after the analogy of bases in en, passes into у, thus sessа.

[G. Ed. p. 170.] 145. The German languages agree in their r bases (to which but a few words belong denoting affinity) with the Greek and Latin in this point, that, contrary to the analogy just described, they retain the r in the nominative. As πατήρ, μητήρ, θυγάτηρ, δαήρ (Sanskrit, देवर dévar, देवृ dévri, nom. देवा dévā), frater, soror; so in Gothic, bróðhar, svistor, dauhtar; in Old High German, vatar, pruodar, suéstar, tohtar. It is a question whether this r in the nominative is a remnant of the original language, or, after being anciently suppressed, whether it has not again made its way in the actual condition of the language from the oblique cases into the nominative. I think the latter more probable; for the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian are three witnesses
for the antiquity of the suppression of the \( r \); and the Greek words like \( \pi\alpha\tau\iota\rho, \mu\iota\tau\rho, \sigma\omega\tau\iota\rho, \rho\iota\tau\omega\rho \), exhibit something peculiar and surprising in the consonantal declension, in that \( \rho \) and \( \varsigma \) not combining, they have not rather preferred giving up the base-consonant than the case-sign (as \( \pi\alpha\varsigma, \pi\omicron\varsigma, \&c. \)). It would appear that the form \( \tau\eta\varsigma \) is of later origin, for this reason, that the \( \rho \) having given place to the nominative \( \varsigma \), the form \( \tau\eta-\varsigma \), whence \( \tau\eta\rho-\omicron\varsigma \) should come, was, by an error of language, made to correspond to the \( \eta-\varsigma \) 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 t\( \bar{\text{a}} \)r, \( t\tilde{\text{o}}-r \), \( \tau\eta\rho \) and \( \tau\omega\rho \), speak at least plainly enough for the spuriousness and comparative youth of the nouns of agency in \( \tau\eta\varsigma \).

146. Masculine and feminine primary forms in \( \chi\alpha\varsigma \) 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 \( \chi\alpha\varsigma \) as, as दुर्मनस् \( \text{durmanas} \), "evil-minded," from दुम दुस [G. Ed. p. 171.] (before sonant letters—§. 25.—\( \text{दु} \) \( \text{dus} \) \( \text{dur} \)) and मनस् \( \text{manas} \). "mind," whence the nom. masc. and fem. दुर्मनास \( \text{durmanās} \), neut. दुर्मनस \( \text{durmanas} \). A remarkable agreement is here shewn by the Greek, in δυσμενής, \( \delta \), \( \eta \) opposed to τ\( \delta \) δυσμενέ\( \varepsilon \). The \( \varsigma \) \( s \) of दुर्मनास \( \text{durmanās} \), however, belongs, though unrecognised, to the base; and the nominative character is wanting, according to §. 94. In Greek, on the other hand, the \( \varsigma \) of δυσμενής has the appearance of an inflexion, because the genitive, &c., is not δυσμενέ\( \varepsilon \)-\( \omicron\varsigma \), like the Sanskrit दुर्मनसस् \( \text{durmanas-as} \), but δυσμενέ\( \varepsilon \)ο\( \varsigma \). If, however, what was said at §. 128 is admitted, that the \( \varsigma \) of \( \mu\omicron\nu\varsigma\varsigma \) belongs to the base, and \( \mu\omicron\nu\varsigma\varsigma \) is abbreviated from \( \mu\omicron\nu\varsigma\varsigma\)-\( \omicron\varsigma \), then in the compound δυσμενής also, and all similar adjectives, a \( \Sigma \) belonging to the base must be recognised, and the form δυσμενέ\( \varepsilon \)ο\( \varsigma \) must lie at the bottom of the genitive δυσμενέ\( \varepsilon \)ο\( \varsigma \). In the
nominate, therefore, either the $\varsigma$ belongs to the base, and then the agreement, with $\text{तुमनास} \, \text{durmanas}$ 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 $\text{दैयस} \, \text{iyas}$—the last a but one of which is lengthened in the strong cases, and invested with a dull nasal (Anuswára, §. 9.)—in Latin, $\text{iör}$, 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 $\dot{u}s$ corresponds to the Sanskrit $\text{मस} \, \text{as}$, because $u$ is favourable to a final $s$, and prevents its transition into $r$; hence $\text{gravius}$ has the same relation to the Sanskrit गरीयस $\text{gariyas}$ (irregular from गुरु gurú, "heavy," ) as $\text{lupus}$ to [G. Ed. p. 172.] वृक्ष vrikhas, only that the $s$ of the nominative character in the latter belongs in the former to the base. The final syllable $\ddot{o}r$, though short, must nevertheless be held, in Latin, as graver than $\dot{u}s$, and hence $\text{gravior}$ forms a similar antithesis to $\text{gravius}$ that in Greek δνυμενής does to δνυμενής, and in Sanskrit $\text{तुमनास} \, \text{durmanas}$ to $\text{तुमनास} \, \text{durmanas}$. 147. In Lithuanian a nominative, which stands quite isolated, $\text{मेनु} \, (=\text{menuo})$, "moon" and "month," deserves here to be mentioned: it proceeds from the primary form $\text{MENES}^*$. and, in regard to the suppression of the final consonant and the transformation of the preceding vowel, has the same relation to it that, as above (§. 139.), $\text{akmû}$ has

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

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 \textit{vṛka}, m. "wolf;" \textit{k ka}, "who?" \textit{dāna}, n. "gift;" \textit{ta}, n. "this;" \textit{jihvā}, f. "tongue;" \textit{kā kā}, "which?" \textit{pati}, m. "lord," "husband;" \textit{priti}, f. "love;" \textit{varvāri}, n. "water;" \textit{bhavishyanti}, "who is about to be;" \textit{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 \textit{ar} \textit{ṛi}, §. 114., which form this case from the abbreviated theme in \textit{ṛi}.
FORMATION OF CASES.

* It has been remarked at §. 123 of the cognate nom. कृति zāo, "earth," accus. कृति zāh, that I have only met with these two cases. The very common form कृति 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 कृति zēm, "terra," (dat.) कृति zēmi, "in terra," &c. to the Sanskrit गवे gavē, गवः gavi. I do not doubt, that is to say, that, in accordance with what has been remarked at §. 63, and p. 114, the Zend क म is to be regarded as nothing else than the hardening of the original v. The Indian गो 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 ग to ज, in which ज must be assumed as the middle step—in which e.g. कृष्ण jam, "to go," from पुर्न gav, has remained; secondly, by the hardening of the ज to म. Advert, also, to the Greek δη, for γη, in δηµιρινός; since ध and ज, from ज j (=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 न्यूस्त्राड्य vāc-s, as palatals before य s change into य c; and thus, from न्यूस्त्राड्य druj, "an evil demon," occurs very frequently the nom. न्यूस्त्राड्य druc-s. I have scarcely any doubt, too, that what Anquetil, in his Vocabulary, writes वाहग्स्स, and renders by "parler, cri," is the nominative of the said base; as Anquetil everywhere denotes ध by κh, and य by sch.

‡ In the theme we drop, intentionally, the क required by §. 44, as it is clear that न्यूस्त्राड्य brātar, not न्यूस्त्राड्य brātār, must be the base word; न्यूस्त्राड्य baratar also occurs, with य a interposed.
NOMINATIVE SINGULAR.

m. "brother;" भान्सा dughdhar, f. "daughter;" भान्सा dātar, m. "giver," "creator;" वाच्य vachā, n. (§. 56".)


SANSKRIT. | ZEND. | GREEK. | LATIN. | LITHUAN. | GOTHIC.
---|---|---|---|---|---
m. vrika-s, vēhrkā,† नृको-स, lupu-s, wilka-s, vulfs.
m. ka-s, kā,†..... ka-s, 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 विश-पाति vēspātti, "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 ॰ (§. 56.), retains the same form which, in Sanskrit also, अस as assumes before छ cha: hence is said वेह्र्का-चा, "lupusque," as in Sanskrit वर्का vrika-cha. And the appended cha preserves the otherwise shortened final vowel in its original length: hence जिहवाला jihvācha, "linguaque," बुश्यांतिचा bushyāntichā, "futurique," ब्रत्येचा brātyēcha, "fraterque." Even without the अ 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.

M2
### 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 gōs.
‡ Or अग्निः agnī, § 33.
the dull re-echoing nasal, which in Sanskrit is called Anu-
swāra, and which we, in both languages, express by \( \hat{n} \) (§. 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, "cæcum," Old High German plinta-n, Middle and Modern High German blinde-n.

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

151. Monosyllabic words in \( i, u, \) and \( du \), 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, नी bhi, "fear," and नी nāu, "ship," form, not bhi-\( m \) and nāu-\( m \), as the Greek \( v\nu-v \) would

* From the bases \( d\j\i\j \) druj and ज़्ञ वाच, I find besides ज़्ञ वाच, ज़्ञ वाच, in the V. S.; also frequently ज़्ञ द्रुज, ज़्ञ वाच, 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 \( \hat{e} \) mentioned at §. 30, not unfrequently \( \hat{i} \); e.g. for ज़्ञ दाद, dadēmahi, occurs also ज़्ञ दाद, dadimahi, and many similar forms; as ज़्ञ दाद, us-i-mahi, answering to the Sanskrit उमस उमस (in the Védas उमस उमस), "we will."
FORMATION OF CASES.

[G. Ed. p. 178.] lead us to expect, but भियम् bhiy-am, नासम् nās-am. With this agree the Greek themes in ev, since these give e-α, from ε-α, for ευ-ν; e.g. βασιλε(μ)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-tum, 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 आग्नेयः agnī-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 appropriately to the accusative as well as to the nominative in the neuter: hence, Sansk. यायनम् sayana-m, Zend ǝЦентр sayanē-m, "a bed"; so in Latin and Greek, donu-m, δῶρον. 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, मारे for mari corre-

[G. Ed. p. 179.] sponds to the Sanskrit चार vāri, "water"; the Greek, like the Sanskrit and Zend, leaves the i unchanged —ιδρω-ς, ἵδρυ, as in Sanskrit सुतिस् suchis, सुति suchi. The following are examples of neuter u bases, which supply the
place both of nominative and accusative: in Sanskrit मधु, "honey," "wine," स्वादु, "sweet"; in Zend सदु, "wealth" (Sanskrit वसु); in Greek μέθυ, δάκρυ, ἦδυ; in Latin pecu, genu. The length of this u is unorganic, and has probably passed into the nominative, accusative, and vocative from the oblique cases, where the length is to be explained from the suppressed case terminations. With regard to the fact that final u is always long in Latin, there is perhaps a reason always at hand for this length: in the ablative, for example, the length of the originally short u is explicable as a compensation for the case sign which has been dropped, by which, too, the o of the second declension becomes long. The original shortness of the u of the fourth declension is perceivable from the dat. pl. u-bus. The Σ, in Greek words like 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, वपुस vapus, gen. वपुसम vapa-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 τευφός, 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 (μέλα, πράγμα) or exchanged [G. Ed. p. 180.] for a cognate Σ, as πρός from προτι, Sanskrit मित prati †

* Compare, in this respect, brachium, βραχίως, with बहुम bāhu-s, "arm"; frango, ῥήγγμι, with भनम bhanajmi, "I break," भनम bhanjmas, "we break."

† With this view, which I have already developed in my treatise "On some Demonstrative Bases, and their connection with various Prepositions and Conjunctions" (Berlin, by Dümmler), pp. 4—6, corresponds, as to the essential points, what Hartung has since said on this subject.
In Latin it is to be regarded as inconsistent with the spirit of the language, that most adjective bases ending with a consonant retain the nominative sign s of the two natural genders in the neuter, and in this gender extend it also to the accusative, as if it belonged to the base, as *capac-s felic-s, soler(t)s, 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 ढारस *dwāram*, which has the same meaning. In Gothic there are no neuter substantives in *i*; on the other hand, the 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 यक्रत and यकर 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 यनप, through the common interchange between *k* and *p*: both owe to it their *ρ*, as यनπ-os does its *r* “Hṇπ-os should be यνπρ-os, Sanskrit यक्रतस *yakrit-as*. But the Sanskrit also in this word, in the weak cases, can give up the *r*, but then irregularly substitutes न for न *t*, e.g. gen. यक्रस *yakn-as* for यक्रमस *yakanas*. With regard to the *ρ* of यकर, 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 FAIHU. "beast." In Lithuanian the neuter in substantives is entirely lost, and has left traces only in pronouns and adjectives, where the latter relate to pronouns. Adjective bases in u, in this case, have their nominative and accusative singular in accordance with the cognate languages, without case sign; e.g. darkû, "ugly," corresponds as nominative and accusative neuter to the masculine nominative darkû-s, accusative darku-û. This analogy, however, is followed in Lithuanian, by the adjective bases in a also; and thus géra, "good," corresponds as nominative and accusative to the masculine forms géra-s, géra-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 excluded from the vocative in Sanskrit and Zend), was originally limited simply to the a bases, and was not joined to the

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

I and u bases also; so that, in Sanskrit, for vāri we had originally vāri-m, for madhu, madhu-m? I should not wish to deny the original existence of such forms; for why should the a bases alone have felt the necessity of not leaving the nominative and accusative neuter without a sign of relation or of personality? It is more probable that the a bases adhered only the more firmly to the termination once assumed, because they are by far the most numerous, and could thus present a stronger opposition to the destructive influence of time by means of the greater force of their analogies; in the same way as the verb substantive, in like manner, on account of its frequent use, has allowed the old inflexion to pass less into oblivion, and in German has continued to our time several of the progeny of the oldest period; as, for instance, the nasal, as characteristic of the 1st person in bi-n, Old High German pi-m Sans. 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 फ्रत् ki-m, "what"? from the base फ्र 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 फ्रत् chit, weakened from फ्रत् ki-t. Otherwise i or u-bases of pronouns in the nominative accusative neuter do not occur; for अम amu, "that" (man), substitutes अदस adas; and इ इ i, "this," combines with [G. Ed. p. 183.] इ इ dam (इ इ idam, "this"). Concerning the original procedure of consonantal bases in the nominative and accusative neuters no explanation is afforded by the pronominal declension, as all primary forms of pronouns terminate in vowels, and, indeed, for the most part, in a.

155. Pronominal bases in a in Sanskrit give t, in Zend t, as the inflexion of the nominative and accusative neuter. The
Gothic gives, as in the accusative masculine, na for m or n, so here ta for simple t; and transfers these, like other peculiarities of the pronominal declension, as in the other German dialects, also to the adjective a bases; e.g. blinda-ta, “caecum,” 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 τοτ or τοδ, for a τον would have remained unaltered, as in the masculine accusative. Perhaps we have a remnant of a neuter-inflexion τ in ὀττι, so that we ought to divide ὀτ-τι; and therefore the double τ, in this form, would no more have a mere metrical foundation, than the double σ (§. 125.) in ὄρσ-στ. (Buttmann, p. 85.)

156. We find the origin of the neuter case-sign t in the pronominal base π ta, “he,” “this,” (Greek ΤΟ, Goth, ΤΗΑ, &c.); and a convincing proof of the correctness of this explanation is this, that τν ta-t “it” “this,” stands, in regard to the base, in the same contrast with η sa, “he,” σα sa, “she,” as t, as the neuter case-sign, does to [G. Ed. p. 184.] the nominative s of masculine and feminine nouns (§. 134.). The m of the accusative also is, I doubt not, of pronominal origin; and it is remarkable that the compound pronouns i-ma, “this,” and a-mu, “that,” occur just as little as ta in the nominative masculine and feminine; but the Sanskrit substitutes for the base amu, in the nominative masculine and feminine singular the form asdv, the s of which, therefore, stands in the same relation to the m of अमु amu-m, “illum,” अमुष्य amu-ṣhya, “illius,” and other oblique cases, as, among
the case-terminations, the sign of the masculine feminine nominative to the m of the accusative and neuter nominative. Moreover, in Zend is used $\text{sz}_\text{i} \text{ma}$, “this,” (n.) (nom. accus.), but not imô, “this” (m.), but $\text{z}_\text{a}_\text{m}$ $\text{a}_\text{m}$ (from $\text{ayam}$ $\text{ayam}$), and $\text{z}_\text{i} \text{m}$ (from $\text{iyam}$ $\text{iyam}$), “this” (f.). Observe in Greek the pronominal base MI, which occurs only in the accusative, and, in regard to its vowel, has the same relation to $\text{m}$ $\text{ma}$ (in the compounded base $\text{e}_\text{m}$ $\text{i}$-$\text{ma}$) that $\text{kim}$ $\text{hi}$-$\text{m}$ “what?” has to क्स $\text{ka}$-$\text{s}” “who”? The Gothic neuter termination $\text{ta}$ answers, in respect to the transposition of sound (§ 87.), to the Latin $\text{d}$ (id, $\text{istud}$): this Latin $\text{d}$, however, seems to me a descent from the older $\text{t}$; as, e.g., the $\text{b}$ of $\text{ab}$ has proceeded from the $\text{p}$ of the cognate अप $\text{apa}$, अपो; and in Zend the $\text{d}$ of $\text{z}_\text{e} \text{am}$ $\text{a}_\text{d}$-$\text{em}$, “him,” is clearly only a weakening of the $\text{t}$ of त $\text{ta}$, अष्ट $\text{ta}$.$^{\dagger}$

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

* The $\text{d}$ of $\text{a}$-$\text{d}$-$\text{em}$ is the preposition corresponding to the Sansk. $\text{a}$.

$^{\dagger}$ See my treatise “On the Origin of the Cases” in the Trans. of the Berlin Academy for the year 1826. As $\text{T}$ in Greek easily becomes $\Sigma$ (but a final $\Sigma$ has in many parts of Grammar become $\nu$), Hartung founds on this, in the pamphlet before mentioned, p. 154, the acute conjecture of an original identity of neuters in $\nu$ (m) with those in $\text{t}$; We cannot, however, agree with him in this, because the $\text{m}$, 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 $\text{m}$, through the Sanskrit and Zend, than probably the $\nu$ sounds can boast, which, in Greek, stand for an older $\Sigma$, as $\text{me}$ for $\text{mes}$ (मस्त $\text{mas}$), and in the dual $\text{to}$, $\text{to}$ for पस $\text{thas}$, तम $\text{tas}$. What is wanting in the Greek, viz. a neuter inflexion $\text{s}$, appears, however, to be possessed by the Sanskrit; and I am inclined to divide the form चद्द $\text{ad}$-$\text{as}$, “that” (nom. accus.) into $\text{a}$-$\text{da}$-$\text{s}$, and to explain it as a corruption of $\text{a}$-$\text{da}$-$\text{t}$ (cf. Gramm. Crit. Addend. to r. 299.); but to regard the syllable $\text{da}$ as weakened from $\text{ta}$, as in the Zend $\text{z}_\text{e} \text{am}$ $\text{a}$-$\text{d}$-$\text{em}$, “him.” We shall recur to this when treating of the pronouns.
is any way connected with the neuter $t$, $d$, of the cognate languages: I should rather turn to a relationship with the $i$ demonstrative in the Greek (οὗτος, ἐκεῖνος), and to the इत, 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 इत, is consequently the sister form of the Latin id and Gothic ī-ta, which, in the Greek ἐκεῖνος, has, perhaps only from necessity, dropped the $τ$ or $δ$, and which already, ere I was acquainted with the Vēda-dialect, I represented as a consistent part of the conjunctions चेत चेत (from cha + it). “if,” and नेत नेत (na + it).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan.</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrīka-m, vēhrkē-m, λίκο-ν, lupu-m, wilku-ũ, vulf'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ka-m, kē-m, ... ... ... ka-ũ, hwa-na.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dāna-m, dātē-m, ὀδωρο-ν, donu-m, gēra, dau'r'.</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-īm, χώρα-ν, terram, ranka-ũ, gīna.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. kā-m, ka-īm, ... ... ... 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, सइ, sait, “he,” तमित, tamit, “him”; तयोरि, tayōrit, “of these two”; तस्माइत, tasmāiit, “to him”; अस्माित, asmāiit, “to this” (m.). The Zend combines in the same way ṣo e or $\ddot{s}$ i with the interrogative: जश्न haśē and जश्न kaśē, “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, hva-na, which would be the same as the masculine. With regard to the lost case-termination, it may be observed, that, in general, the feminines are less constant in handing down the old inflexions. A charge which is incurred by the Sanskrit in the nominative, since it gives kā for kā-s* (§. 137.), is incurred by the Gothic (for in this manner the corruption spreads) in the accusative also.

* Cf. §. 386, p. 544.
### FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. pati-m</td>
<td>paiti-m</td>
<td>πόσιν</td>
<td>hostem</td>
<td>pāṭi-ō</td>
<td>gastō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. .....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>i-na.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prūti-m</td>
<td>āfrūti-m</td>
<td>πορτιν</td>
<td>sīti-m</td>
<td>āvī-ō</td>
<td>anstō.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. udri</td>
<td>vairi</td>
<td>ἰδρι</td>
<td>mare</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. .....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>i-d</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>i-tā</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyantām, bāshyantām-</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td><em>.....</em></td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sunu-m</td>
<td>paśū-m</td>
<td>ἰχθύν</td>
<td>pecu-m</td>
<td>suṇu-ūn</td>
<td>suṇu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanu-m</td>
<td>tanū-m</td>
<td>πίτυν</td>
<td>socru-m</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>handu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu</td>
<td>madhu</td>
<td>μέθυν</td>
<td>pecu</td>
<td>darkū</td>
<td>faithu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhū-m</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gā-m</td>
<td>ga-īn</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>βοῦν</td>
<td>bov-em</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāv-am</td>
<td>nāv-ēm</td>
<td>ναῦν</td>
<td>voc-em</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-am</td>
<td>vāch-ēm</td>
<td>όν-α</td>
<td>voc-em</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The feminine participial bases in i, mentioned at §. 119., remain free from foreign commixture only in the nominative and vocative singular: in all other cases, to the old i is further added a more modern a; and the declension then follows RANKA exactly; only that in some cases, through the euphonic influence of the i, and in analogy with the Zend and the Latin fifth declension (§. 137.), the added a becomes, or may become, e: in the latter case the i is suppressed, as l. c. Ṙaḥa kainē for kainyē (§. 42.). Thus, from sukanti, “the turning” (f.), sukusi, “the having turned” (f.), and suksenti, “the about to turn,” Mielcke gives the accusatives sukantei (see. p. 138, Note) or sukanczai, sukusei, and suksencei or sukencei. 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-ō, “the turning” (masc.), is therefore to be regarded in the same light as yaunikki-ō, from the theme YAU NI KYA, i.e. it stands for sukantyi-ō from sukanta-ō, and hence answers to the Zend accusatives, like Ṣaṭā tūrī-ō for tūrīyēm (§. 42.), and to the Gothic, like hari from the base HARPJA (§. 135.).

† See §. 122.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. bharant-am, barênt-em</td>
<td>φέροντ-α</td>
<td>ferent-em</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>fiyand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. átmán-am, ásmán-ém</td>
<td>δαίμων-α</td>
<td>sermon-em</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ahman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. náma', náma'</td>
<td>τάλαν</td>
<td>nomen</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>namö</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrátar-am, brátar-ém</td>
<td>πατέρ-α</td>
<td>fratr-em</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>bróthar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhítar-am, dughdhar-ém</td>
<td>θυγατέρ-α</td>
<td>matr-em</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>dauhtar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dátár-am, dátár-ém</td>
<td>δοτήρ-α</td>
<td>datór-em</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachas, vachó*</td>
<td>ἐπος</td>
<td>opus</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>.....</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE SINGULAR.**

158. The instrumental is denoted in Sanskrit by जा द; and this inflexion is, in my opinion, a [G. Ed. p. 188.] lengthening of the pronominal base ज a, and identical with the preposition जा द, “to,” “towards,” “up to,” which springs from this pronoun, and appears only as a prefix. The Zend द appears still more decidedly in its pronominal nature in the compound mentioned at §. 156. Note *, जाम झा-देम, “him,” “this,” (m.) fem. जाम झा-दानिम. As a case-sign, म झा generally appears abbreviated (see p. 163. Note †), even where this termination has been melted into one with a preceding म a of the base; so that in this case the primary form and the instrumental are completely similar; e.g. महाजन्म zaôsha, “voluntarily,” महाजन्म azaôsha, “involuntarily,” (V. S. p. 12.) महास्म झो झा skyadkhina, “actio,” often occur; महाम ana, “through this” (m.), महाप्रेम paiti-bêrêla, “allevato.”† The long द appears in the instrumental only in monosyllabic bases in म a; thus महाम khâ, “proprio” V. S. p. 46.), from the base मह kha (Sanskrit म swa, §. 35.). In Sanskrit a euphonic म a is added to bases ending with short vowels in the masc.

---

* See §. 56b.
† Cf. Gramm. Crit. r. 633. Rem. This interesting instrumental form was not known by Rask when he published his work on the Zend, and it was not easy to discover it, on account of its discrepancy from the Sanskrit and the many other forms with final म a.
and neut. genders;* a final ś a, however, is, as in several other cases, changed into ṛ ē; and the ś a ḍ of the case-suffix is shortened, as it appears to me, by the influence of this clog of the base; as वृक्ष viřkē-ṇ-a, but भृगुनाग्रिन्त n-ा, पारिक्षि vārī-ṇ-ा, भृगुनाग्रिन्त n-ा, मघुनाग्रिन्त n-ा, from वृक्ष virika, &c. The Vēdas, however, exhibit further remains of formations without the euphonic n, as स्मया swapnay-ा for स्मेन swapnē-ṇ-a from स्म swapna, m. “sleep” (see §. 133.); उद्या uru-y-ā for उद्या uru-ṇ-ा, from उद uru, “great,” with a euphonic ṭ y (§. 43.); प्राह्यa probahav-ā, from प्रष्ठa probahu, from बाहु bāhu, “arm,” with the preposition [G. Ed. p. 189.] प pra. The Vēda-form स्मया swapnayā, finds analogies in the common dialect in मयā mayā, “through me,” and तयā twayā, “through thee,” from the bases ma and twa, the a of which in this case, as in the loc., passes into ē. And from पति pati, m. “Lord,” and सक्षि sakhi, m. “friend,” the common dialect forms instrumentals without the interposition of न n, viz. पत्यa paty-ā, सक्षि sakhy-ā. Feminines never admit a euphonic n; but ḍ, as before some other vowel terminations, passes into ṛ ḍ, that is to say, i is blended with it, and it is shortened to ś a; hence, जह्या jihway-ā (from jihwē + ḍ). The Zend follows in this the analogy of the Sanskrit. 159. As ē in Gothic, according to §. 69., just like ḍ, represents ś a ḍ, so the forms thē, 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 वह kha. We must, however, place also svē in the class of genuine Zend instrumental forms, which have been correctly preserved: besides svē from SVA is also,

* The original has “Stämmen 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 \( \text{sv} \) \( \text{kh} \) \( \text{d} \) from \( \text{kha} \) (§. 35.). The meaning of \( \text{sv} \) is "as" (\( \omega \)), and the \( \text{s} \), which has arisen in High German from \( \text{sva} \) or \( \text{sv} \), 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 \( \text{sv} \) is \( \text{sv} \), in which the colouring of the Zend \( \text{sv} \) \( \text{kh} \) is most truly preserved. The Gothic \( \text{sva} \), "so," is, according to its form, only the abbreviation of \( \text{sv} \), as \( a \) is the short equivalent both of \( \epsilon \) and of \( \delta \): through this abbreviation, however, \( \text{sva} \) has become identical with its theme, just as \( \text{sv} \) \( \text{ana} \) 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 \( \text{VULFA} \) comes \( \text{vulfa} \), as \( \text{sv}\) \( \text{v} \) \( \text{\=v} \) \( \text{\=k} \) \( \text{\=hrka} \) from \( \text{VEHRKA} \). Moreover, there are some other remarkable datives, which have preserved their due length, and answer to the monosyllabic instrumentals \( \text{th} \), \( \text{v} \), \( \text{sv} \), which have been already explained, viz. \( \text{hvar}\) \( \text{ymme}\)-\( h \), \( \text{hvar}\) \( \text{ymme}\)-\( h \), "cuique," and \( \text{ainumme}\)-\( h \) \( \text{un} \), "ulli," for \( \text{ainumme}\)

* Grimm’s conjectures regarding the forms \( \text{sva} \) and \( \text{sv} \) (III. 43.) appear to me untenable; and an explanation of these forms, without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend, is impossible. More regarding this at the pronouns.

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

† The German dat. sing. is according to §. 356. Rem. 3., to be everywhere identified with the Sanskrit dative; and so, too, the dat. pl. the \( m \) of which approaches as closely to the Sansk. \( b\)\( hy\)\( s \), Latin \( b\)\( us \), Lith. \( m\)\( us \), as the instrumental termination \( b\)\( hi \), Lith. \( m\)\( is \).
Bases in i reject this vowel before the case-sign; hence gast'-a for gasti-a: on the other hand, in the u bases the termination is suppressed, and the base-vowel receives the Guna: hence sunau, which will have been pronounced originally su-nav-a; so that, after suppressing the termination, the u has again returned to its original vowel nature. The form sunav-a would answer to the Vêda form pra-bâhav-â. In Zend, the bases which terminate with i and u, both in the instrumental and before most [G. Ed. p. 191.] of the other vowel terminations, assume Guna or not at pleasure. Thus we find in the Vend. S. p. 469, bâzav-a, "brachio," as analogous to pra-bâhav-â (§. 57.); on the other hand, p. 408, zanthwa from zantu, "the slaying," "killing." From panishnu, "dust," we find, l. c. p. 229, the form panishda, which Anquetil translates by "par cette poussière"; and if the reading is correct, then panishdã, 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, brôlhr (§. 132.), for fiyand-a, ahmin-a, brôlhr-a.† All feminines, too, must be pronounced to have lost the dative sign, paradoxical as it may appear to assert that the Gothic gibaî, "dono," and thizai, "huic," izai, "ei," do not contain any dative inflexion, while we formerly believed the ai of gibaî 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 fatere (for fatera), "patri," proceeds, as do the genitive fatere-s, and the accusative fatera-n, from a theme FATERA, extended by a. The accusative fatera-n, however, is remarkable, because substantives, so early as in the Gothic, have lost the accusative sign, together with the final vowel of the base. In Old High German a few other substantives and proper names follow the analogy of FATERA.
character दि. 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 HVEITÓ from HVEITA, may be deduced from the instrumental चेतया स्वेतय-ः, "albā," from चेत स्वेताः, 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 thé, hvé; but authorities differ as to the mode of writing them,* regarding which we shall say more under the pronouns. The form hiu, also, from a demonstrative base HI, has been preserved in the compound hiutu for hiu-tagu, "on this day," "to-day" (see Grimm, p. 794), although the meaning is here properly locative. The Gothic has for it the dative 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 *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. *diewu* is akin to the Zend *Aeja daeva, “deo,” for *Aejas daêva*, appears to me the less doubtful, as also in the plural *diewais* answers very surprisingly to *Aejas daêvdis*, देवस. Moreover, in many other parts of grammar, also, the Lithuanian *u* corresponds to the Sanskrit जा *a*; 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. *ranka* “manu,” from RANKA. In all other bases *mi* stands as the termination, to which the plural instrumental termination *mis* has the same relation as, in Latin, *bis* to *bi* (voBIS, tiBI); and, according to §. 63., I do not doubt that in both numbers the *m* has arisen from *b*.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vriķe-n-a,</td>
<td>vēhrka,</td>
<td>wikę,</td>
<td>vulfa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihway-ā,</td>
<td>hizvay-a,</td>
<td>ranka,</td>
<td>gibai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-ā,</td>
<td>paithy-a,</td>
<td>pati-mi,</td>
<td>gasti'-a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Contrary to Grimm's opinion, I cannot let the instrumental *u* pass as long, even not to notice its derivation from a short *a*; for, first, it 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, *weo*, *wēo*, with *wiu, wio-lih, huēo-lih* “qualis” (properly, “similar to whom”); thirdly, the length of this *u* cannot be deduced from the Gothic forms *thē, hvē, svē*, because these, in all probability, owe the retention of their long vowel to their being monosyllabic (cf. §. 137.).
164. In Sanskrit and Zend, \( \ddot{e} \) is the sign of the dative, which, I have scarce any doubt, originally belongs to the demonstrative base \( \dddot{\epsilon} \), whence the nom. याम् \( ayam \) (from \( \dddot{\epsilon}+am \)), "this"; which, however, as it appears, is itself only an extension of the base ए \( a \), from which arise most of the cases of this pronoun (a-smāī, a-smāt, a-smān, &c.) ; and regarding which it is to be observed, that the common \( a \) bases, also, in Sanskrit in many cases extend this vowel to \( \ddot{e} \) by the admixture of an \( i \) (§. 2.). The dative sign consequently would, in its origin, be most intimately connected with the case, which, as (§. 160.) was explained, denotes, in German, both the dative and instrumental relation, and occurs in Zend also with a dative signification.*

---

* E. g. Vend. S. p. 45: एसीद्यानाईयिबीस दाधाय तूयस्तो-पुत्रिम, "Hél gives a splendid daughter to those who have not had offspring." The lithographed Codex, however, gives the form azizāṇāitibis 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 मम bhyam (from bhi + am) in तुम्म tu-bhyam, “to thee,” stands in evident relationship to the instrumental निस bhis in the plural. The feminine bases in आ, त, आ, and, at will also, those in आ and उ, prolong in Sanskrit the dative termination आ to आ dā; with the final आ of the base an आ is blended; hence निवायते jīhvāy-āi from jīvāi-āi. On the other hand, इ and उ receive the गुणa augment before आ, but not before the broader आ dā; as मूनवे sūnav-ē from sūnu. In Zend, feminine आ and इ-bases, like the Sanskrit, have आ for their termination: however, hizvāy-āi is not used, but मृगम्यम hizvāy-āi, from the base hizvā, as long vowels in the penultimate, in polysyllabic bases, are so frequently shortened. Bases in आ have, in combination with the particle मच cha, preserved the Sanskrit form most truly, and exhibit, without exception in this case, the form मच्चा ay-āē-cha (see §. 23.), e.g. मच्चा मच्चा karstayaēcha, “and on account of the ploughing,” “in order to plough” (Vend. S. p. 198), [G. Ed. p. 196.] from karste. Without cha, however, the form मच eē is almost the sole one that occurs, e.g. मच्चा kharētē, “in order to eat,” from मच्चा kharēti. This form, I doubt not, has arisen from मच्चा ay-ē, by rejecting the semi-vowel, after which the preceding म has become म e (§. 31.). Forms like मच्चा dfëite* or मच्चा dfëite, which sometimes occur, and are most corrupted, may

* Cf. p. 286 Note †.
rest on errors in writing.* Bases in u may take Guna; e.g. र्ववृववृव van-hav-े from र्ववृववृव vanhu, "pure"; or not, as र्ववृववृव ratu-े from र्ववृववृव ratu, "great," "lord." The form without Guna is the more common. A euphonik छ y also is found interposed between the base and the termination (§. 43) e.g. र्ववववव tanu-े, "corpori."

165. Bases in छ a add to the case-sign ऐ also an छ a; but from छ ऐ (= a + i) and a is formed छ aya; and this, with the a of the base, gives aya, thus छ र्ववववव vrikāya. Hence may have arisen, by suppressing the final a, the Zendian र्ववववव vēhrkāi, after which the preceding semi-vowel must return to its vowel nature. It might, however, be assumed, that the Zend has never added an a to the dative ऐ, and that this is a later appearance in Sanskrit, which arose after the division of languages; for from a + ऐ is formed, quite regularly, ऐ (§. 2.). The Sanskrit forms also, from the particle छ sma, which is added to pronouns of the 3d person, the dative छ smāi; and thus, e.g. छ छ समाइ hasmāi, "to whom"? answers to the Zend र्ववववव kahmāi. The Sanskrit, in this case, abstains from adding the छ a, which is elsewhere appended to the dative छ ऐ; since छ sma, already encumbered with the preceding principal pronoun, cannot admit any superfluity in its termination, and for this reason gives up its radi- [G. Ed. p. 197.]

cal छ a before the termination छ ऐ in the locative case also, and forms sm-'in for smēn.

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

* छ अभिशप्त is undoubtedly incorrect: however, छ e is often found erroneously for छ e in other forms also.
in my Sanskrit Grammar—gives to the pronominal declension the appearance of greater peculiarity than it in fact possesses. As this particle recurs also in the cognate European languages, and there, as I have already elsewhere partly shewn, solves several enigmas of declension, we will therefore here, at its first appearance, pursue all its modifications and corruptions, as far as it is possible. In Zend, sna, according to § 53., has been changed to hma; and also in Prakrit and Pali, 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. Prakrit बहे amhe, “we” (αμυς), Pali सम्माकम् amhākam, Zend ٨٢٢मुम ahmākem, ṣµων. From the Prakrit-Pali mha we arrive at the Gothic nsa in u-nsa-ra, ṣµων, u-nsi-s,* “nobis,” “nos.” In that the Gothic has left the sibilant unaltered, it stands on an older footing than the Pali and Prakrit; 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, gasli-ns, sunu-ns—and thence allow it, as though it had become a property of the base, to enter into some other cases, and connect it with new case-terminations. To this is opposed, also, the 2d person, where izvis (i-zvi-s) stands in the accusative, and yet in essentials the two persons are identical in their declension; uns, “nobis,” “nos,” stands, therefore, for unsi-s (from unsa-s), and this has s as the case-suffix, and u-nsa (weakened from u-nsi) as the compound base. And we

* The a being changed into i, according to r. 67.
† I. 813. “unsara appears to be derived from the accusative uns, as also the dative unsi, which, with izvis, preserves a parallel sound to the dative singular.” Cf. I. 813. 34.
cannot, also, any longer regard the 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 य u of ययम् ययम्, "ye," (§. 43.) goes through all the oblique cases, while in the 1st person the व v of ययम् ययम्, "we," is limited to the nominative, but the oblique cases combine a base अ a with the particle स्म स्मa. 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 sva shews itself* in very different forms in juxta-position with different letters, so I believe I can point out the particle स्म स्मa 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. s.); 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-ва-ра has nearly the same relation to the Gothic i-zva-ra that the Homeric genitive το酤 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-भ्याम, यु-श्मान, and with the Lithuanian यु-सा, यु-मस, 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 iu-ær, iu-ih, iu, for i-wa-r, &c. I, too, formerly entertained that erroneous opinion. A repeated examination, and the enlarged views since then obtained through the Zend, Prâkrit, and Pâli, leave me thoroughly convinced, that the Gothic intermediate syllable zva has not been lost in High German, but that one portion of it has been preserved even to our time (e-ue-r from i-zva-ra, e-u-ch from i-zvi-s, Old High German i-wi-h): on the other hand, the u of the base yu (ष yu), as in Gothic so also in the oldest form of the High German, is rejected in the oblique cases, both in the plural and in the dual*; and the Gothic i zva-ra, Old High German i-wa-r, &c., stand for yu-zva-ra, yu-wa-r. The Old Saxon, however, and Anglo-Saxon, like the Lithuanian, shew themselves, in respect to the preservation of the base, more complete than the Gothic, and carry the u, which in Anglo-Saxon has become o, through all the oblique cases: iu-we-r, eo-we-r, "vestri," &c. If merely the two historical extremes of the forms here under discussion—the Sanskrit and New German forms—be contrasted with one another, the assertion must appear very paradoxical, that euer and युष्माकम yuṣhmākam are connected, and, indeed, in such wise, that the u of euer has nothing

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

169. The distinction of the dual and plural in the oblique cases of the two first persons is not organic in German; for the two plural numbers are distinguished originally only by the case-terminations. These, however, in our pronouns are, in Gothic, the same; and the difference between the two plural numbers appears to lie in the base—ugka-ra,* voiv, unsa-ra, युङ्, igqua-ra, σφωι, izva-ra, υμωι. But from a more close analysis of the forms in the two plural numbers, and from the light afforded us by the cognate Asiatic languages, it appears that the proper base is also identical in the two plural numbers; and it is only the particle sma combined with it which has become doubly corrupted, and then the one form has become fixed in the dual, the other in the plural. The former comes nearest to [G. Ed. p. 201.] the Prakrit-Pali form म mha, and between u-nsa-ra and u-γκα-ra (=u-nka-ra) an intervening u-nha-ra or u-mha-ra must be assumed. At least I do not think that the old s became k at one spring, but that the latter is a hardened form of an earlier h, which has remained in the Prakrit and Pali, as in the singular nominative the k of ik has been developed from the h of अहम aham. The second person gives, in Gothic, kv (=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 थ्या 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 थम्या, इम्या, have arisen, by assimilation, from थम्या, इ-स्मः, 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 झु in the dative. Compare, e.g. अंतर-झु with the Gothic अंधरा-म्या, “to the other”: कु-झु with the Gothic ह्वा-म्या, “to whom?” We have also shewn in Greek, since then, a remnant of the appended pronoun स्म थ्या similar to the Gothic, and which rests on assimilation, [G. Ed. p. 202.] since we deduced the ÆEolic forms ड-मु-ेः, ढ-मु-ेः, &c., from ड-स्ये-ेः, ढ-स्ये-ेः, to which the common forms झे, झे, have the same relation that the Old High German डें-झु has to the Gothic था-म्या, only that झे, झे, in respect to the termination एः, are more perfect than the ÆEolic forms, since they have not lost the vowel of the particle स्ये, but have contracted म-ेः to मे।

171. The Gothic datives in म्या are, as follows from §. 160., by origin, instrumental,* although the particle स्म थ्या in Sanskrit has not made its way into these cases, and e.g. तेन तेन, “through him,” not तस्मेना, or, according to the Zend principle (§. 159.), तस्मा (for तस्माद्), is used;—I say, according to the Zend principle; for though in this

* The difference between the forms थै, ह्वै, explained at §. 159., and the datives था-म्या, ह्वा-म्या, 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 थम्या, ह्वम्या, for थम्या, ह्वम्या, 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 $\text{तहमा}$ or $\text{तहम}$ (from $\text{तहम-}$). 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 $\text{मन्य}$ $\text{अन्य}$, "this" (m.), "this" (n.), we have found the instrumental of the same sound $\text{मन्य}$ $\text{अन्य}$ not $\text{नायम}$, from the demonstrative base $\text{अ}$ occurs rather often the feminine instrumental $\text{हम्य}$ $\text{अहम्य-}$ $\text{a}$, from the fem. base $\text{हम्य}$ $\text{अहम्य}$, increased by the appended pronoun.

172. The Sanskrit appended pronoun [G. Ed. p. 203.] $\text{स्मा}$ should, in the feminine, form either $\text{स्मा}$ $\text{स्म्}$ or $\text{स्मी}$ $\text{स्मी}$: on the latter is based the Zend form $\text{हम्य}$ $\text{हम्य}$, mentioned at § 171. But in Sanskrit the feminine form $\text{स्मी}$ $\text{स्मी}$ has been preserved only in such a mutilated condition,* that before my acquaintance with the Zend I could not recognise it. From $\text{ता-स्मी}$ must come the dative $\text{ता-स्म्य-}$ $\text{अ}$, the gen. and ablative $\text{ता-स्म्य-}$ $\text{अ}$; and the locative $\text{ता-स्म्य-}$ $\text{अ}$ $\text{म}$. These forms, by rejecting the $\text{म}$, have become abbreviated to $\text{ता-स्य-}$ $\text{अ}$, $\text{ता-स्य-}$ $\text{अ}$, $\text{ता-स्य-}$ $\text{अ}$; and the same is the case with the feminine pronoun $\text{स्मी}$ in all similar compounds; so that the forms mentioned appear to have proceeded from the masculine and neuter genitive $\text{तस्य}$, by the annexation of new case-terminations. This opinion was the more to be relied on, that in Gothic, also, the feminine forms $\text{थि-}$ $\text{जो}$, "hujus,"

---

* The Zend, too, has not everywhere so fully preserved the feminine $\text{हम्य}$, as in the instr. $\text{a-हम्य-}$ $\text{अ}$; 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 $\text{म}$ but also the $\text{f}$. The feminine $\text{मन्य}$ $\text{अ-न्य-}$ $\text{दो}$ (§ 56.), "hujus," for $\text{a-हम्य-}$ $\text{दो}$, often occurs; and for it also $\text{aन्य-}$ $\text{दो}$, in which the $\text{i}$ is, to use the expression, a reflection of the lost $\text{y}$ (§ 41.). From another demonstrative base we find the dative $\text{मन्य}$ $\text{ा}$ $\text{वा-न्य-}$ $\text{अ-धी}$, and more than once the ablative $\text{वा-न्य-}$ $\text{दी}$ for $\text{वा-हम्य-}$ $\text{अ-धी}, \text{वा-हम्य-}$ $\text{दी}$. 
FORMATION OF CASES.

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 म म म म a, mा म म त त त त a, 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-aिम—the above-mentioned forms in Sanskrit cannot be regarded otherwise than as abbreviations of ta-smy-ाi, &c., as this is far more suited to the nature of the thing. The Gothic forms then, thi-0s, thi'ai, will be regarded as abbreviated, and must be divided into thi-z6-s, thi-zai. The masculine and neuter appended pronoun sma must, for instance, in Gothic give the feminine base SMO = सा sma, as BLINDO, nom. blind'a, "caca," from BLINDA, m. n. (nom. blind'-s, blinda-ta). SMO, however, by the loss of the m, as experienced by the Sanskrit in the feminine, has become S6; 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 ति-भ्यास, "iiς, तेघः, "eorum," for ta-bhyas, ta सम.
174. The Zend introduces our pronominal syllable *sma* in the form of *hma* also into the second, and probably into the first person too: we find repeatedly, in the locative, ब्रज स्मात् *thwa-hm'ī*, instead of the Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 205.] ब्रज *tway-i*, and hence deduce, in the 1st person, *ma-him'ī*, which we cannot quote as occurring. The Prākrit, in this respect, follows the analogy of the Zend; and in the 2d person gives the form तुमसि *tuma-sm'ī*-*i*, "in thee," or, with assimilation, तुममि *tumammi*, with *tume* (from *tuma-i*) and तू तू *taī*; and ममसि *mama-sm'ī*-*i* or मममि *mama-mmi*, "in me," together with the simple म म *maē* and म म *maī*. Ought not, therefore, in German also, in the singular of the two first persons, a remnant of the pronominal syllable *sma* to be looked for? The *s* in the Gothic *mi-s*, "to me," *thu-s*, "to thee," and *si-s*, "to himself," appears to me in no other way intelligible; for in our Indo-European family of languages there exists no *s* as the suffix of the instrumental or dative. Of similar origin is the *s* in the plural *unsi-s*, "nobis," "nos," *izvi-s*, "vobis," "vos"; and its appearance in two otherwise differently denoted cases cannot therefore be surprising, because this *s* is neither the dative nor accusative character, but belongs to a syllable, which could be declined through all cases, but is here deprived of all case-sign. In *unsi-s*, *izvi-s*, therefore, the Sanskrit त्य *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 Prākrit forms, *tu-ma-sm'ī*, "in thee," and *ma-ma-sm'ī*, "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.
[G. Ed. p. 206.] 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, vōtə, &c., from s, by the hardening of an intervening h; so that mi-s is altered to mi-h, and thence to mi-k; and therefore, in the singular, as also in the plural, the dative and accusative of the two first persons are, in their origin, identical. In Old High German and Anglo-Saxon our particle appears in the accusative singular and plural in the same form: Old High German mi-h "me," di-h, "thee," u-nsi-h, "us," i-wi-h, "you"; Anglo-Saxon me-c, "me," u-si-c, "us," the-c, "thee," 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-mē, gera-mē; and if -mui and -mē are compared with the corresponding cases of the substantive a bases, it is easily seen that mui and mē have sprung from ma.—The pronouns of the two first persons form, in the genitive dual, mu-mū, yu-mū, according to the analogy of ponū, "of the two lords."

---

* We have a remnant of a more perfect form of the particle sma in the locative interrogative form ka-mū, "where?" Sansk. कस्मन्  ka-smin, "in
177. Lithuanian substantives have *i* for the dative character, but *i* bases have *ei*; a final *a* before this *i* passes into *u*; hence *wilku-i*. Although we must refuse a place in the locative to the dative *i* of the Greek and Latin, still this Lithuanian dative character appears connected with the Indo-Zend *ē*, so that only the last element of this diphthong, which has grown out of *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. vyrikāya,</td>
<td>vēhrikāi,</td>
<td><em>wilku-i</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihurāy-āi,</td>
<td>hizvay-āi,</td>
<td>ranka-i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. paty-ē,†</td>
<td>paite-ē?†</td>
<td><em>pūch-ēi.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prītay-ē,</td>
<td>āfrītē-ē,</td>
<td>āvi-ēi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhāvishyanty-āi,</td>
<td>būshyainty-āi,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnav-ē,</td>
<td>pośv-ē,</td>
<td>sunu-i.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

† In combination with न चा *cha* we find in V. S., p. 473. न कश्यप *paithye-cha*, and hence deduce for the instrumental (p. 193 G. Ed.) the form *paitya*, while, according to §. 47., also *paitya* might be expected. From हाचि *haci*, "friend," I find in V. S., p. 162, the instrumental हाचि *hacaya* with Guna, after the analogy of the बाश *bāzava*, mentioned at §. 160.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taniv-े</td>
<td>tanu-ऽ-े,*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vadhw-ाi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gav-े</td>
<td>gav-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāv-े</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāch-े</td>
<td>vāch-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bharat-े</td>
<td>barēnt-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātman-े</td>
<td>āsmain-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāmn-े,†</td>
<td>nāmain-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhrātr-े</td>
<td>brā thr-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duhitr-े</td>
<td>dughdhēr-े,†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dātr-े</td>
<td>dāthr-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vachas-े,†</td>
<td>vachauh-े</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

† The य in दुध्वें dughdērṇे, and in the instr. दुध्वें dughdēre, is placed there merely to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants. I deduce these forms from the plural genitive दुध्वें dughdēr-ािम, for दुध्वें dughdhr-ािम.

† Respecting नाम्ने nāmné, for नामने nāmané, and so in the instrumental नाम्ना nāmnā, for नामना nāmanā, see §. 140. In Zend, in this and similar words, I have not met with the rejection of the ए in the weakest cases (§. 130.), but examples of its retention, e.g. in the compound aocē-नामnān, whence the genitive aocē-नामnān (Vend. S. p. 4, and frequently). I consider the initial ए in this compound as the negation, without euphonic ए; for in all probability it means "having untold (countless) names." Similar compounds precede, viz. व्याष्टिस्य तन्वाक्षरः, "of the thousand eared, ten thousand eyed." Cf. Anquetil II. 82. In words in वन, on the other hand, ए ए is rejected in the weakest cases, and then the ए ए becomes उ or ऊ o. Regarding the addition of the ए in नामने, see §. 41.
179. The Ablative in Sanskrit has त 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 τα, which already, in the neuter nominative, and accusative, has assumed the nature of a case-sign, and which we shall subsequently, under the verb, see receiving the function of a personal termination. This ablative character, however, has remained only in bases in अ a, which is lengthened before it; a circumstance that induced the Indian Grammarians, who have been followed by the English, to represent ज as the ablative termination. It would therefore be to be assumed, that in व्रित the a of the base has been melted down with the त of the termination.*

180. M. E. Burnouf† has been the first 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 τ, and not δτ, is the true ablative character. We mean the declension in υ, 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 ([§§. 156. and 264.); and I have deduced from the ablatives of the pronouns of the two first persons (मत, तवत) that either at with short a, or, more correctly, a simple τ, must be regarded as the ablative termination. This view I supported in the Latin edition of my Grammar, on the ground that in old Latin also a simple d appears as the suffix of the ablative. But since then the justness of my opinion regarding the Sanskrit ablative has been still more emphatically confirmed by the Zend language, because the Zend stands in a closer and more evident connection with the Sanskrit than does the Latin.

† Nouveau Journal Asiatique 1829, tom. III. 311
Zend also the short vowel is lengthened, and thus इह्रकात answers to व्रिकात. Bases in त have जीत in the ablativ: whence may be inferred in Sanskrit ablatives like वत् patē-ত, प्रति- pritē-т (§. 33.), which, by adding Guna to the final vowel, would agree with genitives in द. The Zend-Avesta, as far as it is hitherto edited, nevertheless offers but few examples of such ablative forms in ना जी-त: I owe the first perception of them to the word इह्रित, "benedictione," in a passage of the Vendidad,* explained elsewhere, which recurs frequently. Examples of masculine bases are perhaps जाह्न्यव्यसंजाय राजि zaratustrīt, "institutione zaratustrica" (V. S. p. 86), although otherwise जाय राजि, which I have not elsewhere met with, is a masculine: the adjective base zaratustri, however, belongs to the three genders. From जाह्न्य gairi, "mount-

* See Gramm. Crit. add. ad r. 156.

† What Anquetil III. 170. Rem. 4, writes guerdéed can be nothing else than the ablative जाह्न्य gārotīt, for Anquetil generally expresses ज by gu, न by e, थ by ṝe, and द by d. The nominal base जाह्न्य gairi, however, is treated in Zend as if गातi was the original form, and the ज which precedes the त was produced by the final ज, as remarked by M. Burnouf in the article quoted at p 173, and confirmed by the genitive जाह्न्य gāris. That, however, which is remarked by M. Burnouf, i.e. with respect to the genitive, and of which the Vend. S. p. 64. affords frequent proof in the genitive जाह्न्य patōis, must also be extended to the ablative in ति; and the ज, which, according to §. 41., is added through the final त of the base, is dropped again before this termination.

‡ For this we also find जाह्न्य eut; e.g. जाह्न्यले माइन्य माइन्यू from mainyu.

∥ Interchanges of ज o and ज a are particularly common, owing to the slight difference of these letters. Thus, e.g. for जाह्न्य mraot, "he spoke," occurs very frequently जाह्न्य mraot; the former, however, is, as we can satisfactorily prove, the right reading; for, first, it is supported by
that in a, does the ablative more frequently occur, although these words are in number but five or six, the ablative use of which is very frequent; e.g. ददोन्हाट्, "creation," from ददोन्हु, in a passage explained elsewhere* अददोन्हाट्, "mundo," from अददोन्हु; तद्दा, tanaot "corpore," from तद्दा tanu. Bases ending with consonants are just as little able to annex the [G. Ed. p. 212.] 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. अपात्, "aqua"; तद्नाथ्रात्, "igne"; चाश्मानात्, "oculo"; नादोन्हात्, "naso"; द्रूजात्, "daemon"; विसात्, "loco" (cf. vicus, according to §. 21.). Owing to the facile interchange of the अ with आ, अ is sometimes erroneously written for अ at; thus, Vendidad S. p. 335, गाँधानत्-अत् for गांधान-अत् "lucente." Bases in उ sometimes follow the

by the Sanskrit form अब्रोट्, for which the irregular form अब्रवोत् abrav-it is used; and secondly, it answers to the 1st pers. mraom (V. S. p. 123): thirdly, the Sanskrit रो is, in Zend, never represented by र्म ao, but by र्द, before which, according to §. 28., another अ a is placed, hence र्म a: on the other hand, र्म ao represents u, in accordance with §. 32 and §. 28. If, then, अपात् pasu formed in the ablative अपात् pasauot, this would conduct us to a Sanskrit पसु पसु t; while from the ablatives अशिफरि-t, अशिफरि-t, असाराट्रोि-t, असाराट्रोि-t, अगरि-t, and from the analogy, in other respects, with the genitive, the Guna form, पसोत् paso-t must be deduced. Moreover, in the Vend. S. the ablative form अो-t actually occurs; for at p. 102 (लवलात् अो-t hacha वानहाट् वानाहाट्-त, "from pure spirit"") occurs वानहाट्, the ablative of वान्हु; and the त preceding the a is an error in orthography, and वानहाट is the form intended: p. 245 occurs अहाट् अहाट्, "mundo," from अहाट्. * Gramm. Crit. §. 640, ann. 2.
consonantal declension: in having ən at as the ablative termination instead of a mere ɨ; just as in the genitive, besides a simple s, they exhibit also an ə (from as, §. 56b.), although more rarely. Thus, for the above-mentioned ənəma tanaət, “corpore,” occurs also tanv-at (Vend. S. p. 482).*

Feminine bases in ən ə and ɨ i have ən ət in the ablative, as an analogous form to the feminine genitive termination əxəs əs, whence, in the Zend ən ə; e.g. ənəmary-ət, “praeclara,” from ənəmə dəmahə; ənəmə urvaray-ət) “arbore,” from ənəmə urvara; ənəmə [G. Ed. p. 213.] barəthy-ət, “genitrice,” from ənəmə barə- thrə.† The feminine bases also in u, and perhaps also those in i, may share this feminine termination ən ət; thus, from zantu, “begetting,” comes the ablative zanthəu-ət (cf. Gramm. Crit. §. 640. Rem. 2.). Although, then, the ablative has been sufficiently shewn to belong to all declensions in Zend, and the ablative relation is also, for the most part, denoted by the actual ablative, still the genitive not unfrequently occurs in the place of the ablative, and even adjectives in the genitive in construction with substantives in the ablative. Thus we read, Vend S. p. 479, ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə hacha avanəət; viət yat məzdayasənəs, “ex hac terrā quidem mazdayasnicā.”

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

† Vendidād Sāde, p. 436: ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə ənəmə Yatha vehrkə chatkvarə-jaŋrə nishdarədairyət barəthyət hacha puthrəm, “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 nishdarə dairyaət.

‡ Regarding this form, see p. 172. Rem.
ABLATIVE SINGULAR.

181. The Old Roman corresponds with the Zend in regard to the designation of the ablative; and in those two memorials of the language, that on the Columna rostrata, and the S. C. de Bacchanalibus, which are the most important inscriptions that remain, all ablatives end with \( \text{d} \); so that it is surprising that the ablative force of this letter could be overlooked, and that the empty name of a paragogic \( \text{d} \) could be held satisfactory. Bases ending with a consonant use \( \text{ed} \) as ablative suffix, as in the accusative they have \( \text{em} \) instead of a simple \( \text{m} \): hence, forms like \( \text{praesent-ed} \) \( \text{dictator-ed} \), answer to the Zend \( \text{sa\text{o}chant-at} \) \( \text{\text{d\text{a}hr-at}} \) (lucente igne); while \( \text{navale-d*} \) \( \text{praeda-d} \), \( \text{inalto-d} \) \( \text{mari-d} \), \( \text{senatu-d} \), like the above-mentioned Zend forms \( \text{g\text{\text{a}r\text{o}it}t} \), “monte,” \( \text{\text{t\text{n\text{a}o}dt}t} \), “corpore,” &c.; and in Sanskrit व्रिकत् \( \text{vriká-t} \), “lupo,” have a simple \( \text{T} \) sound to denote the ablative. The Oscan also takes the ablative sign \( \text{d} \) through all declensions, as appears from the remarkable inscription of Bantia, e.g. \( \text{dolu-d} \) [G. Ed p. 214.] \( \text{mallu-d} \), \( \text{cum preivatu-d} \), \( \text{touta-d} \) \( \text{præsenti-d} \).† It may be preliminarily observed, that, in the 3d person of the imperative, old Latin and Oscan forms like \( \text{es-tod} \), \( \text{es-tud} \)—for \( \text{es-to} \), and therefore with a double designation of person—correspond remarkably to similar Vėda forms with which we are hitherto acquainted only from Pāṇini; e.g. जीवतत् \( \text{\text{ji}va-tát} \), which signifies both “vivat” and “vive,” but in the latter sense is probably only an error in the use of the language (cf. \( \text{vivito} \) as 3d and 2d person).

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

* The \( \text{e} \) here belongs to the base, which alternates between \( \text{e} \) and \( \text{i} \).
† See O. Müller’s Etruscans, p. 36.
dropped an initial s, and may stand for *smel*, and so belong to the appended pronoun स्मा, explained in §. 165. &c., corresponding with its ablative स्मात्, to which it stands in the same relation that *memor* (for *mesmor*) does to स्मृ—from *smar*, §. 1.—"to remember." The combination of this syllable, then, with pronouns of the three persons, would require no excuse, for स्मा, 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 लेन (§. 158.) and तस्मात् तस्मात्, may both express "on account of which." In adverbial use the ablative spreads still further, and in some words denotes relations, which are otherwise foreign to the ablative. In Greek, adverbs in ως may be looked upon as sister forms of the Sanskrit ablative; so that ω-ς, from bases in o, would have the same relation to the Sanskrit

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

Thus, from bases in $a$, that, *e.g. $d\delta w\sigma i$ has to $dαδ\alpha τ i$.

Thus, $d\mu \omega -$ may be akin to the Sanskrit $sαmατ \ samα-t$, "from the similar," both in termination and in base. In Greek, the transition of the $T$ sounds into $\varsigma$ was requisite, if indeed they were not to be entirely suppressed*; and in §. 152. we have seen neuter bases in $\tau$, in the uninflected cases, preserve their final letter from being entirely lost by changing it into $\varsigma$. We deduce, therefore, [G. Ed. p. 216.] adverbs like $d\mu \omega -$, $o\upsilon \tau \omega -$, $\omega -$, from $d\mu \omega -$, $o\upsilon \tau \omega -$, $\omega -$ or $d\mu \omega -$, &c., and this is the only way of bringing these formations into comparison with the cognate languages; and it is not to be believed that the Greek has created for this adverbial relation an entirely peculiar form, any more than other case-terminations can be shewn to be peculiar to the Greek alone. The relation in adverbs in $\omega -$ is the same as that of Latin ablative forms like *hoc modo, quo modo, raro, perpetuo.*

In bases ending with a consonant, $o\varsigma$ for $o\tau$ might be expected as the termination, in accordance with Zend ablatives like $\chiα\muχα\mu χα\mu χ$ chashman-$\alpha t$, "culo"; but then the ablative adverbial termination would be identical with that of the genitive: this, and the preponderating analogy of adverbs from $o$ bases, may have introduced forms like $σωφρόν-$, which, with respect to their termination, may be compared with Zend feminine ablatives like $\chiα\muχα\mu χ\varphi α$ barēhry-$\alpha t$. We must also, with reference to the irregular length of this adverbial termination, advert to the Attic genitives in $\omega \varsigma$ for $o\varsigma$.†

---

* As, in $o\upsilon \tau \omega$, together with $o\upsilon \tau \omega -$, $d\delta \epsilon$, $d\phi υ ω$, and adverbs from prepositions—$t\xi o$, $\alpha ν\omega$, $kα\tau o$, &c. It is here desirable to remark, that in Sanskrit, also, the ablative termination occurs in adverbs from prepositions, as ज्ञषतात adhāstāt, "(from) beneath," पुरषात purastāt, "(from) before," &c. (Gram. Crit. § 652 p. 273.).

† In compounds, remains of ablative forms may exist with the original $T$ sound retained. We will therefore observe, that in 'Αφροδίτη the first member
THE GENITIVE.

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

member has a genuine ablative meaning; and as the division ज्ञभृद-त्य्य admits of no satisfactory explanation, one may rest satisfied with ज्ञभृद-य्य. In Sanscrit, अभ्रदिता abhrāditā would mean "the female who proceeded from a cloud," for abhrā-t must become abhrād before ītā (§. 93v); and in ncuter verbs the otherwise passive participial suffix ta has usually a past active meaning. Of this usage is, in ज्ञभृद-य्य, 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 oś for oś. As regards the Sanskrit, here also the s of the ablative may in most declensions rest on an exchange with an older t (cf. p. 184 G. ed. Note); and, as the Zend gives us every reason to expect Sanskrit ablatives like jihvāy-āt, prītē-t, sūnō-t, bhavishyanty-āt, ātman-āt; so it will be most natural to refer the existing forms jihvāy-ās, prītē-s, &c., where they have an ablative meaning, to the exchange of t with s, which is more or less in vogue according to the variety of dialects; particularly as it is known, also, that, vice versā, according to certain laws, त 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. jihvāy-ās would be, in one sense, viz. in that of linguae, independent and original; and in another, that of lingua, a corruption of jihvāy-āt. At the time when Sanskrit and Zend were separated from one another, the retention of the original t must have been the prevailing inclination, and, together with it, may also its change into s have arisen, as the Zend also uses, at times, the genitive form with an ablative meaning (e.g. Vend. S. p. 177).
principally confined to the consonantal bases,* and hence has the same relation to s that, in the accusative, am has to m, and, in the Zend ablative, at has to t.

185. Before the genitive sign ः s the [G. Ed. p. 218.] vowels ः i and ः 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- and Gothic sunau-s correspond to the Sanskrit सूनोम् sūnōs (filii) from sunaus (§. 2.). In the i bases in Gothic, Guna is restricted to the feminines; thus anstai-s, “gratia;” answers to प्रिति स priti-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 ὀς, passed over also to the vowels i and u and diphthongs terminating in υ; and genitives like πορτει-ς, ἵθευ-ς, which would be in accordance with §. 185. are unheard of; but πόρτι-ος, ἵθο-ος answer, like ποδ-ος, to Sanskrit genitives of consonantal bases, as पद- pad-as, “pedis,” वच- vach-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 ः i, ः u, ः ai, and ः āu; e.g. राय- as, “rei,” नाव- as, “navis;” and in neuters in ः i and ः u, which, by the assumption of an euphonic ः 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 अम

[G. Ed. p. 219.] as than from the Greek σ, 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 आमन्येव-स, "of the spirit," from mainyu, may, after the manner of consonantal bases, add ज (from as, cf. p. 212, G. Ed.), as आमन्येव-दानहु-व, or आमन्येव-दानहु-व, for दानहु-व "loci," from आमन्येव दानहु. This kind of genitive occurs very frequently as a substitute for the locative, as also for the ablative (Vend. S. p. 177), more rarely with a genuine genitive meaning.*

188. Bases in अ a, and pronouns of the third person, of which only amu ends with a vowel other than a, have, in Sanskrit, the more full genitive sign अम sya; hence, e. g. वृक्ष vrika-sya, "lupi," तात्ता-सया, "hujus," &c., अम amu-shya,

* It might be assumed that as βασιλέως clearly stands for βασιλέφος, βος for βοφός, νάδ for νάφος, (§. 124.), so also ἀστέως would stand for ἀστέφος, and that ἀστέως, therefore, should be compared with the Zend genitives with Guna, as आमन्येव-दानहु-व. The अ, therefore, in ἀστέως would not be a corrupted ν of the base, but the Guna vowel foreign to the base; but the ν 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 अ is certainly a very heterogeneous vowel to the ν, and the corruption of the latter to अ, in the middle of a word, would be a greater violation of the old relations of sound than the rejection of a ν sound between two vowels. The corruption of i to अ 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 πόλεως, σινάτεως may not stand for pole-yos, sinape-yos.
"Illius," (§. 21.) In Zend this termination [G. Ed. p. 220.] appears in the form of hé, (§. 42): hence, e.g. वृक्षस् "lupi-s," युज्ञस् "yunjmas, jungimus"; hence, hu jus, cu-jus, e-jus, illius for illi-jus, &c. I cannot, however, believe that the i of the second declension is an abbreviation of oio, of which the i alone has been retained;* for it is clear that lupi and [G. Ed. p. 221.] lupai from lupai rest on the same principle; and if lupi proceeds from लूकोि, whence can lupai be derived, as the corresponding Greek feminines nowhere exhibit an oio or ηο?}

* 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 (ö) has arisen from a-s, according to a contraction similar to that in the Zend (§. 56b.). In old Sclovonic, also, o occurs, answering to the Sanskrit as; and nebo, gen. nebesé, corresponds to the Sanskrit नम्भस 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 dagi-s. The consonantal bases have, in Gothic, likewise a simple s for case-sign; hence, ahmin-s, fiyand-s, brothr-s (§. 132.). The older sister dialects lead us to conjecture that originally an a, more lately an i, preceded this s—ahmin-as, fiyand-as, brothr-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. मल्य nar-s, "of
the man," not nar-ḍ, 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 ṛ i and ṭ u may use at will either simple ́s s or चास ās; and instead of प्रिते-s, तनो-s, tanो-s, also प्रित्य-ās, तनव-ās, tanw-ās, occur. The long vowels चच a, र i, ऊ ñ;† have always चास ās; hence, जिहवाय जिहवाय-ās, भविष्यताः भविष्यत्य-ās, वधव वधव-ās. This termination चास ās, is, in Zend, according to §. 56b., sounded do; hence, भिबा भिबा hizvay-do, भिबा भिबा bushyainty-do. In bases in ु i and ु u I have not met

* Hence I deduce the genitives भ्रतर-र m brātar-s, भ्रतर-र m duḥḍhar-s—which cannot be quoted—and the probability that the corresponding Sanskrit forms are properly bhrātṛ, duḥḍitur, 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. भ्रतर bhrātṛ, and similar forms, would therefore stand for -urs, and this apparently for ars, through the influence of the liquids; and, according to §. 94., they would have lost the genitive sign. The same is the case with the numeral adverb चतुर् chatur, "four times;" for चतुर्म् chaturs; for which the Zend, by transposing the r, gives मयाचतुर्म् chathrus (§. 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 रोक्षत्र krōṣṭa (from the theme रोक्षर krōṣṭar or रोक्षत्र रोक्षत्री, 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 भ्रत: bhratuk, stands for r, that the preceding u can be a transposition of the final letter of the base (चत्र चत्र), 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 ἀρίθτοις- ἀριθτοῖς tanu-s, or ἀρίθτος tanu-ō, ἀρίθτος tanav-ō. I find no ἀρίθθυ-ά, ἀρίθθυ-ά, tanav-6, 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 6 bases preserve this vowel in contradistinction to the nominative and accusative; but the i bases, as has been shewn above, attach Guna to this vowel, while the masculines do not strengthen it at all. Compare gib-6-s with the uninflected and base-abbreviated nominative and accusative giba, and anstai-s with gasti-s. Respecting the pronominal and adjective genitives, as thi-zo-s, blindai-zo-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, Μούσης, [G. Ed. p. 224.] opposed to σφύρα, σφύρα-ν, μουσάν.* In Latin, also, ã-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 rankā-s,

* The Attic termination ὧς is, perhaps, a perfect transmission of the Sanskrit दा-स; so that forms like πολε-ως answer to प्रित्य-अ. Although the Greck ὧς is not limited to the feminine, it is nevertheless excluded from the neuter (ἄστεος), and the preponderating number of 6 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 awiēs, 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 awiēs might be made; and this might be derived, through the assimilative force of the i, from awi-ās (cf. p. 174, note*), which would answer to the Sanskrit genitives like प्रीतस्य prīty-ās. If, however, it be compared with प्रीतम् prītam, and the ē of awiēs be looked upon as Guna of the i (§. 26.), then the reading awiēs for awēs is objectionable. Ruhig, indeed, in his Glossary, frequently leaves out the i, and gives ugnēs, "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-s, for giesmyēs, from GIESMYĀ (see p. 169, note). Therefore the division awiē-s might also be made, and it might be assumed that the i bases have, in some cases, experienced an extension of the base, similar to those which were explained in the note, p. 174 (cf. §. 120.). This view appears to me the most correct, especially as in the vocative, also, awiē answers to giesme for giesmyē, or giesmie.

194. As regards the origin of the form through which, in the genitive, the thing designated is personified, with the secondary notion of the relation of space, the language in this case returns back to the same pronoun, whence, in §. 134., the nominative was derived. And there is a pronoun for the fuller termination also, viz. 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 त्य tya-m and तद् tya-t that स sa does to तम् ta-m, तत् ta-t. It is evident, therefore, that in स्य sya, त्य tya, the bases स sa, त ta, are contained, with the vowel suppressed and united
Formation of Cases.

with the relative base या. Here follows a general view of the genitive formation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika-sya</td>
<td>vēhrka-hē</td>
<td>λύκο-ιο</td>
<td>wilko, vulfi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ka-sya</td>
<td>ka-hē</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>cu-jus, kō, hvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvay-ās</td>
<td>hizvay-āo</td>
<td>χόρω-ς</td>
<td>terrū-s, rankō-s, gibō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. patē-s</td>
<td>patōi-s.</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>hosti-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td>† gast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>paty-us,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. pritē-s</td>
<td>āfritōi-s,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>siti-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td>† ansi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prity-ās,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyanty-ās</td>
<td>būshyainty-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānō-s</td>
<td>paseu-s,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>sumau-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td>sune,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanō-s</td>
<td>taneu-s,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>socrū-s,</td>
<td></td>
<td>han</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanw-ās</td>
<td>tanv-ō,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhw-ās</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gdō-s</td>
<td>geu-s,</td>
<td>βο(Φ)-ός</td>
<td>bov-is,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. ndv-as,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>να(Φ)-ός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-as</td>
<td>vāch-ō,†</td>
<td>ơπ-ός,</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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. ātman-as</td>
<td>āsman-ō,‡</td>
<td>δαίμον-ος,</td>
<td>sermon-is,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāmn-as</td>
<td>nāman-ō,‡</td>
<td>τάλαν-ος,</td>
<td>nomin-is,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The meanings will be found in § 148.
† See § 193.
‡ See p. 163. Note †.
§ And बराट barāt also may occur, according to the analogy of बर्ज़ात bērzātō, "splendentis," V. S. p. 87, and passim. The retention of the nasal in the genitive, however, as in all other cases, is the more common form, and can be abundantly quoted. For बराट barēntō, also बरान्त barantō, is possible, and likewise, in the other cases, the older य आ for े आ. In some participles, as in फूयक फूया fəyək (nom.), which is of constant recurrence as the usual epithet of agriculture (मुन्यका vastrya) े 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, Μαραθωνί, Ἐλαμμίν, ἄγρᾳ, οἴκοι, χαμαί; and, transferred to time, τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ αὐτῇ νυκτί. So in Sanskrit, दिवसे दिवसे, “in the day;” निद्राः nidi, “in the night.”

196. With a of the base preceding it, the locative ῥ i passes into ῶ ἐ (§. 2.), exactly as in Zend; but here, also, Ἀ ὀ β ὠ stands for ῶ ἐ (§. 33.); so that in this the Zend approaches very closely to the Greek datives like οἴκοι, μοῖ, 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 ब्रह्मभायित maidhyāi, “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 "creatoris."
† See p. 163, Note †.
‡ Few cases admit of being more abundantly quoted in Zend than the locative, with which, nevertheless, Rask appears to have been unacquainted at the time of publishing his treatise, as he does not give it in any or his three paradigms.
§ I now refer the Latin dative to the Sanskrit dative, rather than to the locative; see p. 1227 G. Ed., Note †.
tract this $a$ with the old locative $i$, which appears pure nowhere any more, to $e$; hence, $diewe$, “in God,” from $DIEWA$, answers to $देवे$ $dēve$, उद्वे $udve$. 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 $नम्न$.

[G. Ed. p. 228.] $shva$, or $व्या hua$. To the Lithuanian $ye$ answers also, in old Slavonic, a locative termination $ye$, for which several declensions have the original pure $i$; so that $nebes-i$, “in Heaven,” and $imen-i$, “in the name,” agree most strictly with the Sanskrit नभस $nabhas-i$ and नामन $nāman-i$, from नभस $nabhas$, नामन $nāman$.

198. Masculine bases in $i$ and $u$, and, optionally, feminine bases also, have a different locative termination in Sanskrit, viz. ची $du$, before which $ृ$ $i$ and $ृ$ $u$ are dropped; but in पति $pati$, “lord,” and सखि $sakhi$, “friend,” the $i$ has remained in its euphonic change to $ू$ $y$: hence, पत्य $paty-āu$, सख्य $sakhy-āu$. If we consider the vocalization of the $s$ to $u$, shewn in §. 56b., and that, in all probability, in the dual, also, ची $du$ has proceeded from चास $ās$ (§. 206.); moreover, the circumstance that in the Vêdas the genitive occurs with a locative meaning (दक्षिणायस $dakṣiṇāyās$, “in dexterâ,” for दक्षिणायम $dakṣiṇāyam$, Pâñini 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 ची $du$, from चास $ās$, a sort of Attic or produced genitive termination.

199. In $u$ bases, instead of the locative the Zend usually employs the genitive termination $ψ$ $ð$ (from वस $as$), while, in a genitive meaning, the form उस $eu$-$s$ is more common; thus we read, in the Vend. S. p. 337., अधातम अन्व्य यत $āttahmi anhvā yat astvanti, “in
hoc mundo quidem existente." This Zend termination ° (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 ṣunw tanu, "body," very often the genuine locative form ṳṣunw tanv-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 (सनिव sunw-i, तन्व tanw-i, मध्व madhiw-i, or मधुन madhu-n-i). Bases in १ i employ, in the locative, the usual genitive termination ṣi-s; thus, in the Vend. S. p. 234, आह्मि namānē yat māzdaya:nōis, "in hac terra quidem mazdayasnica, which Anquetil renders by "dans le pays des mazde'iesnans." In pronouns, also, though they have a locative, the genitive sometimes occurs with a locative meaning; e.g. Vend. S. p. 46, माजहोऽ मासेयायादेषिनी ainē vistē, "in this way," or "place," (cf. the feminine form आनिहाओ ainhāo, §. 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 terminations, and from the circumstance that the genitive occurs with a locative meaning only in the two first declensions (Romae, Corinthi, humi), not in the third or in the plural (jump not juris), 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 tu, agree most surprisingly with मय māyi (from mē-i, §. 2.), "in me," त्वय twayī (from twē-i). Or ought, perhaps, a double inflexion i to be assumed as the sign of both a genitive and
FORMATION OF CASES.

a locative dative? Should Romæ (from Romai), Corinthis, be on one occasion genitives and on another locatives, and

[G. Ed. p. 230.] in their different meaning be also of different origin? And where, then, would the origin of the genitive Romæ be found, as that of the locative has been found already? Should mei, tuo, be compared, not with mayi, twayi, moi, roi, but with man mama, twana, moï, roi, 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, or—and of which examples still remain handed down to us (as populo Romanoi)—has become doubly altered: either the vowel of the base alone, or only that

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

* The assumption that a rejected s lies at the base of the genitives in i, ae (o-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 terra 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 ae-s occurring in inscriptions (provinci-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 ab-s; and I would not therefore derive the common genitive suae—older form suai—from sues 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 as; hence nomin-us has the same relation to nomin-i-bus as, that nomin-i-bus has to nāma-bhyas, and lupus to vṛika-s.
genitive, which is therefore similar to the nom. plural, where, in like manner, Romani stands for Romanoi. But the dative is not universally represented in Latin by a locative termination; for in the pronouns of the two first persons mihi answers to महम ma-hyam, from ma-bhyam, and tibi to तुहम 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 ma is elided (see §. 165.); hence, तस्म इन, “in him”; तस्म स्म, “in whom?” This इ in which seems to me to be of later origin, as it were an इ of एकाक्षरीय, does not extend to the two first persons, and is wanting in Zend also in those of the third; hence, अ हम, “in this.” As to the origin of the i signifying the place or time of continuance, it is easily discovered as soon as i is found as the root of a demonstrative; which, however, like the true form of all other pronominal roots, has escaped the Indian Grammarians.

202. Feminine bases ending with long simple vowels have, in Sanskrit, a peculiar locative termination; viz. आम अम, in which, also, the feminines in short i and u may at will participate (cf. §. 192.); while the monosyllabic feminine bases in long ई ई and उ उ, for आम आम, admit also the common इ for; hence, भिय भिय-अम or भिय भिय-ई, “in fear,” from मो भिय. In Zend this termi-
nation əm has become abbreviated to a (cf. §. 214.); hence, əm yahmy-a, "in which," from əm yahmi (cf. §. 172.). This termination appears, however, in Zend, to be less diffused than in Sanskrit, and not to be applicable to feminines in s i and > u. The form tanwi is clearly more genuine than the Sanskrit tanu, although from the earliest period, also, tanwəm 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. vrikə,*</td>
<td>vehrəkə,*</td>
<td>λυκώ,</td>
<td>lup'-i,</td>
<td>wilkə.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwə-dəm</td>
<td>hizvə-a</td>
<td>χώρα,</td>
<td>terra-i,</td>
<td>ranko-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pəty-ən</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>πόσι'-i,</td>
<td>host'-i,</td>
<td>pəți-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prəv'-ən †</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>πόρτι'-i,</td>
<td>sii'-i,</td>
<td>awi-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhavishyanty-ən, bəshyanty-a</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sən'-ən</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>ἰχθύ'-i,</td>
<td>pecu'-i,</td>
<td>sunu-ye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tan'-ən,§</td>
<td>tanw'-i</td>
<td>πίτυ'-i,</td>
<td>socru'-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu-n-i</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>μέθυ'-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vədhu-ən</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gav-i</td>
<td>gav-i</td>
<td>βο(Ф)-i,</td>
<td>bov'-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nəv-i</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>βά(Ф)-i,-</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharət-i</td>
<td>barənt-i</td>
<td>φέροντι,-</td>
<td>ferent'-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ətman-i</td>
<td>aəmain-i</td>
<td>δαιμόν-i,</td>
<td>sermon-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. ndən-i</td>
<td>ndən-i</td>
<td>τάλαν'-i,</td>
<td>nomin'-i,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrətar-i</td>
<td>brəthr'-i</td>
<td></td>
<td>πατρ'-i,</td>
<td>fratr'-i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitər-i</td>
<td>dughdəhr'-i</td>
<td></td>
<td>θυγατρ'-i,</td>
<td>matr'-i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dətər-i</td>
<td>dəthr'-i</td>
<td></td>
<td>δοτήρ'-i,</td>
<td>datər'-i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vəchas-i</td>
<td>vacanəh-i</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See §. 196. † See §. 198. † Or prəty-ən. § Or tanw-ən.
|| 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 dughdəhr'-i, see p. 194, Note †). That in Sanskrit bhrətar-i, duhitər-i, dətər-i, are used instead of bhrətri, &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, भोक्त bhī-स "fear!" as की-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 वृक्क vrīka that πέντε, quinque, have to पञ्च pancha; and the old a, which appears in लुकος as o, in lupus as ū, 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 चर ar (चू ri), with respect to the rejection and lengthening of the a, have a very great agreement with bases in an, it must here be further remarked, that these too, in the locative, do not strictly follow the suppression of the a in the weakest cases, which is conditionally prescribed in §. 140., but optionally retain the a, or reject it; so that with नामन-ि also नामन-ि is used. With brātar-ि, however, exists no bhrātr-ि, and the form pitr-ि, given at §. 132. is an oversight: the Greek παρή may therefore, with respect to the shortening of the base, be better compared with the dative pitr-ि.
polysyllabic feminines in i and ā shorten this final vowel; while a final या ā, by the commixture of an i, becomes ā (§. 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 यो ā, from a + u, correspond remarkably the Gothic and Lithuanian; as sunau, sunu, resembling the Sanskrit सुनः sūnd, * Gothic feminine bases in i do not occur in

[G. Ed. p. 235.] Ulfilas in the vocative: as, however, they, in other respects, run parallel to the u bases, the vocative anstai, from ANSTI, might be expected as an analogous form to handau. The Lithuanian i bases in the vocative extend their theme in the same manner as in the genitive (§. 193.); so that, properly, there is no vocative of this class of words, and awie answers to zwāke, giesme (Ruhig’s third declension), for zwākie, giesmye.† Masculine bases, in Gothic, in i, like the masculine and neuter a bases, have lost their final vowel in the vocative, just as in the accusative and nominative; hence vulf, dau, gasā. 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 यस्य मायिः mainyo and यस्य माय u as the vocative of यस्य माय mainyu, “spirit.” On the other hand, we have found a final i only, without Guna; and indeed frequently यस्य paiti, “lord.” So Vend S. p. 456, यस्य u sīhista namāno-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 ei as the termination in the dative. For āw-ei, the division should be made thus, āw-ei; and this is analogous with zwāke-i, giesme-i, for zwākie-i, giesmye-i.
into the vocative the nasal which had been dropped in the nominative. Adjectives in German, with respect to the vocative, have departed from the old path, and retain the case-sign of the nominative; hence Gothic *blind's*, "blind!". In Old Northern, substantives also follow this irregular use of the nominative sign. The Greek has preserved a tolerable number of its vocatives pure from the nominative sign, and in some classes of words uses the bare base, or that abbreviation of it which the laws of euphony or effeminacy rendered requisite; hence, τάλαν opposed to τάλας, χαρίεν for χαρίεντ' opposed to χαρίεις, παι for παιδ opposed to παις. In guttural and labial bases the language has not got free of the nominative sign in the vocative, because κς and πς (ζ, ς) are very favourite combinations; to which the alphabet also has paid homage by particular letters to represent them. Still the [G. Ed. p. 236.] vocative Δνα, together with Δναξ, is remarkable, and has that sound which might be expected from a theme Δνακτ', 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 Δ τους!"*

The Latin has followed still farther the road of corruption in the vocative which was prepared by the Greek, and employs in its place the nominative universally, except in the masculine second declension. The substantive bases mentioned in §. 148. form, in the vocative,

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuan.</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika</td>
<td>vehrka</td>
<td>λύκε</td>
<td>lupe,</td>
<td>wilke,</td>
<td>vulf'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dāna</td>
<td>dāta,</td>
<td>ἰχθύ</td>
<td>pecu-s</td>
<td>sunau,</td>
<td>sunau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihvē</td>
<td>hizvē?</td>
<td>πτήν</td>
<td>socru-s</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pātē</td>
<td>paiti,</td>
<td>πάτο</td>
<td>hosti-s</td>
<td>gasta,</td>
<td>gasta'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. prītē</td>
<td>áfrīti</td>
<td>πόρτι</td>
<td>siti-s</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vāri</td>
<td>vairi,</td>
<td>ἱδρυ</td>
<td>mare,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. bhāvishyanti</td>
<td>bāshyanti,</td>
<td>βασεις</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sunō</td>
<td>paśu,</td>
<td>ἰχθύ</td>
<td>pecu-s</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tand</td>
<td>tanu,</td>
<td>πτήν</td>
<td>socru-s</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. madhu</td>
<td>madhu,</td>
<td>μέθυ</td>
<td>pecu,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vadhū</td>
<td>ἱδρυ</td>
<td>mare,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.f. gāu-s</td>
<td>gāu-s,</td>
<td>βοῦ</td>
<td>bo-s,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nāu-s</td>
<td>ναῦ</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāk</td>
<td>ναῦ</td>
<td>ναῦ</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bharan</td>
<td>bharān-s,</td>
<td>φέρων</td>
<td>feren-s,</td>
<td>sukau-s,</td>
<td>sukau-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātman</td>
<td>ātman,</td>
<td>δαίμον</td>
<td>sermo,</td>
<td>ākmū,</td>
<td>ākmū,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāman</td>
<td>nāman,</td>
<td>τάλαν</td>
<td>nomen,</td>
<td>namo,</td>
<td>namo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhrātar</td>
<td>bhrātarē,</td>
<td>πάτερ</td>
<td>frater,</td>
<td>motē,</td>
<td>motē,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. duhitar</td>
<td>duhitarē,</td>
<td>θύγατερ</td>
<td>mater,</td>
<td>dauhtar,</td>
<td>dauhtar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. dātar</td>
<td>dātare,</td>
<td>δότηρ</td>
<td>dator,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachus</td>
<td>vachō,</td>
<td>ἐπος</td>
<td>opus,</td>
<td>mano,</td>
<td>mano.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DUAL.

**NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, VOCATIVE.**

206. These three cases have, in Sanskrit, in the masculine and feminine, the termination सृ द् au, which probably arose from सास as 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.
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 अष्रुनि aśrūni with अष्रुइि aśruṇī.

207. While the Prākrit and Pāli have lost [G. Ed. p. 238.] the dual, the Zend has retained it; still, however, so that instead of it the plural often occurs, and in the Vend. S., p. 203, शेनुवयास्चित schēnūbyāschit, "and as far as the knees," is used with a plural termination. In the verb the dual is still more rare; but here, however, it is not entirely lost, and many examples of it can be quoted in the V. S.* The Sanskrit termination शी दू दू occurs in the corresponding places in Zend in the form of दू दू do, which, according to §. 56b., stands at the same time for the Sanskrit termination शास दू, and gives an emphatic proof that the Sanskrit dual termination शी दू दू is nothing else than a corruption of शास दू, and, in fact, an occasional one which appears in grammar only once or twice (see §. 198.), while the example herein given by the Sanskrit has been raised to a general principle by the Zend. This principle becomes almost irrefragable matter of fact from the consideration that the Zend has even actually retained, in the dual, the sibilant before the particle अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, and uses अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, not अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, as might have been expected if the dual termination शी दू दू, in Sanskrit, were the original form, and not a corruption of शास दू. Thus we read in the Vend. S. p. 225, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, अष्रु च च aṣrū cha, "the two Haurvats and Amertats."† What Anquetil, in his Voca- [G. Ed. p. 239.]

† Cf. Anquetil II. 175. The two Genii, which Anquetil writes Khor-dad and Amerdad, appear very frequently in the dual, also with the termination bya (§. 212.); and where they occur with plural terminations, this may be ascribed to the disuse of the dual, and the possibility of replacing
bulary (p. 456), writes naerekevādo, and renders by "deux femmes," can be nothing else than नारिके by naerīkay-do, from the base मार नारिका. The form नारिकाय-do is, however, evidently more genuine than मार नारिका; as, according to the Sanskrit principle (§. 213.), from a feminine base must have been formed नारिका. From नार बाजु, Rask cites the form नार 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 नार बाजु forms, in the nominative plural, नार बाजु or नार बाजू. Still, in the edited parts of the Zend-Avesta, examples are wanting of बाजु, regarding the genuineness of which, however, I have no doubt.

208. In the Vēda dialect, the termination अ दु occurs frequently abbreviated to अ, so that the last element of the diphthong is suppressed. Several examples of this abbreviated form occur in Rosen's "Specimen"; as, अशिवन-अ, "the two Aswins," from अशिव, and द नार, "two
d[G. Ed. p. 240.] men," which can be derived both from नार

replacing the dual in all cases by the plural. Thus we read, 1. c. p. 211, haurvatat-अ and अमेरित-अ-चा as accusative, and with the fullest and perhaps sole correct reading of the theme. We will, however, not dwell on this point any longer here, but only remark, that haurvatat is very frequently abbreviated to haurvat, and the अ of अमेरित is often found shortened; whence, p. 104, अमेरिताथ्य अमेरितता अमेरिताथ्य, (see §. 38.); अमेरिताथ्य अमेरिताथ्य अमेरिताथ्य is a palpable error. Undoubtedly, in the passage before us, for haurvātoścha, must be read either haurvātoścha, or haurvātātoścha, or haurvātātoścha. Compare 1. c. p. 91, अमेरिताथ्य अमेरिताथ्य-चा with the termination अ दु for अ दु (cf. §. 33.), but incorrectly अ for अ. The two twin genii are feminine, and mean apparently, "Entireness" and "Immortality." The forms preceding them, therefore, तोि and उबाद, are likewise feminine; the former for तोि (§. 33.), the latter for उबाद (cf. §. 28.). We must also regard the dual form mentioned at §. 45. of the so-called Amschaspants not as neuter, but as feminine.
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(नृषि) and from nara, but which more probably comes from nar. In Zend the abbreviated termination from āu 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, अस्विन्दाँ-चा यवनां यान् (maudhé), "Asvinośe juvenes veneramur," which Anquetil renders by "je fais Jzeschne à l'excellens toujours (subsistant").

The Sanskrit अस्विना asvinā however, can, in Zend, give nothing but aspinā or aspina (§. 50.): the former we owe here to the protecting particle म cha (see p. 175, Note † G. Ed.). The plural yavan-ō (from yavanās), referring to the dual aspinā, is worthy of remark, however (if the reading be correct), as it furnishes a new proof that, in the received condition of the Zend, the dual was 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 Vėda termination ā, and the short a,* which frequently stands for it in Zend, the transition is easy to the Greek e, as this vowel, at the end of words, is a favourite representative of the old ā; and, as above, in the vocative (§. 204.), लुङ्के stood for चुळ व्रिका, मुग्यत्वृच्य वेर्का, so here, also, एवोप (with euphonic ो) corresponds to the above-mentioned Vėda नर नार, and Zend अस्लय nar-a. Although, according to §. 4., ो also very frequently stands for ए a, still we must avoid regarding लुङ्को as the analogous form to चुळा व्रिका, or मुग्यत्वृच्य वेर्काद (see §. 211.). That however, the Lithuanian dual उ of masculine [G. Ed. p. 241.] bases in a (in the nominative) is connected with the Vėda and Zend dual termination spoken of, i. e. has proceeded from ए a, I

* Thus, Vendidad Sāde, p. 23, मुग्यत्वृच्य वेर्का मुग्यत्वृच्य वेर्काद haurvata amēḍíta, "the two Haurvats and Amertats"; p. 136, and frequently, अस्लय अस्लय द्वा नारा, "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 ō (see §. 162.), compare, dāmi, or ḍudu, "I give," with ददामि dadāmi; ḍusu, "I will give," with हद्दामि ḍdsyāmi. And the monosyllabic pronominal bases also in a sound in the dual ō; thus tū = ta tā, kū = ka. We hold, therefore, the Vēda form वृक्का vrikā, the Zend मित्तैं vēhrkā, and the Lithuanian wilku, 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 wilku is the last portion of the Sanskrit diphthong श्रृ du, and that wilku belongs to the form वृक्की vrikāu. In the vocative the Lithuanian employs a shorter u, and the accent falls on the preceding syllable: thus wilku, opposed to wilku, in which respect may be compared नातेर नाते opposed to नातेर, and §. 205.

210. Masculine and feminine bases in i and u suppress, in Sanskrit, the dual case termination श्रृ du, and, in compensation, lengthen the final vowel of the base in its uninflected form; thus, पति pati, from पति pati; सुनू sūnu, from सुनू sūnu. The राम्मु bāzu-do, "arms," (from bāzu) mentioned in §. 207., is advantageously distinguished from these abbreviated forms. The curtailed form is not, however, wanting in Zend also, and is even the one most in use. From राम्मू mainyu, "spirit," we frequently find the dual राम्मू mainyū: on the other hand, for इरेज़ू ērēzū, "two [G. Ed. p.242.] fingers," we meet with the shortened form इरेजा ērēzu, which is identical with the theme (Vend. S. p. 318, इरेजा औ ओवा ērēzu.

211. The Lithuanian, in its i and u bases, rests on the above-mentioned Sanskrit principle of the suppression of the termination and lengthening of the final vowel: hence, awi, "two sheep" (fem.), answers to सवी avi, from सवि avi; 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 a of वृक्का vrika, but in the short o of the base, as the first declension has a long a in the dual, because its bases terminate with α, although in the common dialect this letter is very frequently represented by η. Or may it, perhaps, have happened, that, in the dual α of the first declension an i subscribed has been lost, and thus τά for τῆς would correspond to the Sanskrit आते (from τά + i or फ). 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 α bases had preserved the short α in Greek, and वृक्षविरुक्स vrika-s had become लुका-ς, then the dual too would be लुका, and not लुकω.

212. Neuters have, in the Sanskrit dual, for the termination of the cases under discussion, not चौ du, but i, as in the plural they have not as but short i (ृ). A final च a of the base with this द i passes into द (ृ) (§. 2.); hence, गाते sate, "two hundred," from गातेस sata-ि: [G. Ed. p. 243.]
other vowels interpose a euphonic n; hence, ताफली तिलु-ि, "two palates." In Zend I can quote the neuter dual only in the a bases; as, for example, we frequently find छन्ते sinit (§. 41.), answering to the Sanskrit गाते sate; and दुई duye hazanre, "two thousand," (§. 43.) for देसहस्रे

213. The Greek has renounced a termination distinguishing the neuter from the two natural genders; but the Sanskrit appears to have extended the neuter i mentioned above also to the feminine a bases. But the coincidence of the feminine form दोहे jihuë, "two tongues," from दोहा jihuā, with the neuter दोण dâne, "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 + े, a dual termination, and, in fact, the usual one of neuters, is actually contained; but in जिह्वेजिह्वेद the masculine-feminine termination du (from अस, §. 206.) is lost, but can, however, be again restored from the Zend form नरिकाय-दो, "two women." I believe, that is to say, that जिह्वेजिह्वेद has arisen or been corrupted from जिह्वेद jihwā-द 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 a of the base (see §. 2. and cf. p. 121 G. ed.). The dual jihwē, therefore, like the Gothic singular dative gibai (§. 161.) would have only an apparent termination, i.e. an extension of the base which originally accompanied the real case termination. In Zend, however, the abbreviated feminine dual form in vo द likewise occurs (§. 207. Note†) and is, indeed, the prevalent one; but it is 

[G. Ed. p. 244] remarkable, and a fair and powerful confirmation of my assertion, that even this abbreviated form in vo द, where the appended particle अष्ठा cha stands beside it, has preserved the case sign s; and, as above, अमेरेल-दो-स-चा amērēlat-दो-स-चा, "the two Amertats," so we find, Vend. S. p. 58, अमेरेश-स-चा amēsēsh-स-चा sपेंटे, "and two Amshaspants" ("non-conniventesque sanctos," cf. अमिशा amisha and Nalus V. 25, 26. and see §. 50.).† The form अष्ठा द is to be deduced from the full form अमेरेल-दो-स; so that, after dropping the गृह do, the preceding अष्ठा must have been contracted to द, just as (p. 121

* Cf. the dual genitive and locative जिह्वायजिह्वाय jihway-दस.

† The MS. has here अमेरेशचा amēsēshcha, but द frequently occurs in the place of द, although, as it appears, through an error. Cf. l. c. p. 88, अमेरेशचा amēsēshcha, and see §. 51.
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G. Ed.) in Prākrit, रति ēmi has arisen from the Sanskrit बयानि ayāmi, by rejecting the a. We may support the derivation of जिहवे jihvē from जिहवय jihway-āu, by this circumstance, also, that in the Vēda dialect the feminine i bases may lose the dual termination āu, and then display the naked base; thus, in the scholia to Pāṇini, वाराहै उपाखे vārāhī upānahāu, "boar-leather shoes," for वाराही vārāhyāu. It is very remarkable, that even this Vēda form, only one example of which can be quoted, can be referred to the Zend language. We find, frequently, त्विशी tevishi applied to feminine dual substantives (e.g. Vend. S. p. 225.); and I infer that its theme ends with a long, not a short i, from the frequently-occurring plural accusative त्विशिः tevishi (Vend. S. pp. 99, 102).*

214. To the Sanskrit-Zend feminine dual [G. Ed. p. 245.] forms in ē answer the Lithuanian in ė, as ranki, from RANKĀ; so that of the diphthong ṛ 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. witkūn. 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 तेनिषस् tēnivas, fem. तेनिषी तेनुषिः tēnushī (Gramm. Crit. §. 603.); and indeed, from the root त to be able," it may signify "powerful, strong." The ē for ṛ ē is explained by the influence of the ṛ ē. And उतायित utayīiti 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 ṛ or ḷ 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 á, 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.: अमेशां} 
मुखसाथ्रा हुदानोंहो अयेशे, “I glorify the two Amshaspants (non con-
vinentesque sanctos) the good rulers, who created good.” If अमेशां श्पेन्ता 
and मुखसाथ्रा 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 हुदानोंहो 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 
अमेरां श्पेन्ता (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 अमेशां श्पेन्ता. We find also, frequently, 
अस्तिना श्पेनिस्ता मैनी, “the two most holy spirits” (p. 80), through which the dual form in a of bases in a is likewise con-
firmed in the most unequivocal manner. The answer to the query, 
Whether generally only two Amshaspants are to be assumed? whether 
the genitive plural (अमेरांनाम) श्पेनिस्तानाम, 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 Hourvat (Khordad) and 
Amertat:
Amertat, and whether these two Genii, according to the principle of the Sanskrit copulative compounds, have the dual termination for this reason alone, that they are usually found together, and are, together, two? whether, in fine, these two twin-genii are identical with the Indian 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 spenistā mainyū mazdā tevisht, &c., "the two most holy spirits, the great, strong." As Genii, and natural objects of great indefinite number, where they are praised, often have the word vispa, "all," before them, it would be important to shew whether "all Amshaspants" are never mentioned; and the utter incompatibility of the Amsh. with the word vispa would then testify the impassable duality of these Genii. If they are identical with the celestial physicians, the Indian Aswînen, then "Entireness" and "Immortality" would be no unsuitable names for them. In Pâñini we find (p. 803) the expressions mātara-pitāru and pitara-mātāru marked as peculiar to the Vedas. They signify "the parents," but, literally, they probably mean "two mothers two fathers," and "two fathers two mothers." For the first member of the compound can here scarcely be aught but the abbreviated dual pitāra, mātāra; and if this is the case, we should here have an analogy to the conjectured signification of haurvat-a and amēretat-a.

* Bases in ध्रे do form the strong cases (§. 129.) from ध्रे दु; those in ब्रा an, and nouns of the agent in तर, lengthen in those cases, with the exception of the vocative singular, the last vowel but one (see §. 144.).
### FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vāch-ā,*</td>
<td>vāch-a,</td>
<td>ὀπ-ε,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>bharant-āu,</td>
<td>barant-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bharant-ā,</td>
<td>barant-ā,</td>
<td>φέροντ-ε,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>atmán-āu,†</td>
<td>asman-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>atmán-ā,</td>
<td>asman-ā,</td>
<td>δαίμον-ε, N. V. ἀκμεν-ν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>nāma-ि,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>τάλαν-ε,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>bhātar-āu,</td>
<td>brātar-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bhātar-ā</td>
<td>brātar-ā</td>
<td>πατέρ-ε,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>duhitār-āu,</td>
<td>dughdhar-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duhitār-ā</td>
<td>dughdhar-ā</td>
<td>θυγατέρ-ε,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>dātār-āu,†</td>
<td>dātār-āo,</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dātār-ā</td>
<td>dātār-ā</td>
<td>δοτήρ-ε,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>vachas-ि</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td>ἑπε(σ)-ε,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE.

215. These three cases have in the Sanskrit and Zend dual a common termination; while in Greek the genitive has joined itself to the dative, and borrowed its termination from it. It is in Sanskrit भाम bhyām, which in Zend has been abbreviated to भ्या bya. Connected with the same is, first, the termination भाम 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 स्म hyam (§. 23). This abbreviation appears, however, [G. Ed. p. 249.] to be very ancient, as the Latin agrees

---

* The Vēda duals in ā are as yet only cited in bases in a, n, and ar (छू. §. 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. नाभा nābhā, as locative for नाभी nābhāu, from नाभि nābhi, "navel."

† See the marginal note marked (*), p. 229.
remarkably with it; and mi-hi corresponds to मध्यम ma-hyam, as ti-bi does to तुध्यम tu-bhyam. In the second place, भ्यस 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 μu-mus, "nobis," yu-mus, "vobis," are used as well as μu-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 भ्यम 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, λύκοις, with that of wilka-ms (for wilka-mus), λύκοις. 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 भ्यम bhyām is भिस bhis, as sign of the instrumental plural. This termination which is in Zend भिस bhis,

* On the facile transition of v into m (cf. p. 114) rests also, I doubt not, the connexion of the termination युवाम yuvām, "ye two," आवाम āvām, "we two," with the common termination ām, before vowels ā, which in the pronouns spoken of has stiffened into ām, and in this form has remained even before consonants. Whether the case is the same with the verbal third dual person ताम 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, I.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, "ocularis," &c.
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(also मित्रی bīs), 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 पतिभिस pati-bhis, मित्रित्वा mītṛītva pati-bīs.

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 bīs 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 φιν belong principally to the dative: their locative and instrumental use—αὐτόφι, θύρηφι, βιηφίν—is explained by the fact, that the common dative also has assumed the sign of these relations. The strict genitive use of the termination φι, φιν, may perhaps be altogether denied; for if prepositions, which are elsewhere used in construction with the

* In the 1st and 2d pronoun (no-bis, vo-bis), where bis supplies the place of the bus which proceeds from मत् bhyas.
‡ Observe, also, that the Sanskrit instrumental termination bhis has been, in Prākrit, corrupted to बिन hari.
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 ὅσοι δακρυόφιν πιμπλαντο, δακρυόφιν would, in Sanskrit, be rendered by चरुभी अरुभिस: 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 ὅσοι 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. (πολ'ς δ' ἀμφ' ὅστεόφιν θίς ἀνδρὼν πλουμένουν) there is no necessity to look upon ὅστεόφιν 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 ὑς ἐννηφιν 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 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 § 125., 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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ὅρεσ-φι, στήθεσ-φίν, which have been misunderstood, because the Σ dropped before vowel terminations was not recognised as the property of the base. Of the other consonants, v is the only one, and KOTΥΛΗΔΟΝ the only v base, which occurs in combination with φίν; and since N does not combine with Φ so readily as Σ, it assumes an auxiliary vowel o—κοτυληδόν-ο-φίν—after the analogy of compound words like κυν-ο-θαρσίς. This example is followed, without the necessity for it however, by δάκρυ—δακρυόφιν; while ναο-φίν, in an older point of view, resembles exactly the Sanskrit नौभिस्त nāubhis; for in compounds, also, the base NAY keeps free from the conjunctive vowel o, on which account νासταθμον may be compared with Sanskrit compounds like नौस्थ 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 c a is lengthened; hence, व्रकंभ्याम vrikābhyaṁ for व्रकंभ्याम vrikabhyām. It hardly admits of any doubt, that this lengthening extended to the cognate plural termination भिस bhis; and that hence, from व्र रिकā also vrikā-bhis would be found. The common dialect has, however, abbreviated this form to व्रेस vrikais, which is easily derived from vrikābhis by rejecting the bh; for रे डि 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 sma, smā-bhis; hence अस्माभिस asmābhīs, युष्माभिस yuṣmābhīs; which forms stand in the same relation to the व्रकंभ्याम vrikā-bhis, assumed by me, that the accusatives अस्मान asmān, युष्मान yuṣmān, do to व्रिकān vrikān, “lupos.” Secondly, the opinion
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which I arrived at theoretically has, since then, been so far practically established by the Vēda dialect, that, in it, from a final स a not ध-bhis but ध-bhis, has been formed, according to the analogy of the dative and ablative, as व्रेतमस्य vrikēbhyaḥ; hence, सङ्केश्विस्य अस्वेधिस् "per equos," from सङ्क asva. In the common dialect the pronominal form र्मिस् ध-bhis "per hos," answers to this Vēda form, which must properly be derived from the pronominal base स a, which generally plays the chief part in the declension of र्रमः idam. Though, then, on one side, from the pronoun स a springs the form र्मिस् ध-bhis; on the other side, from सस्म asma and युष्म yushma proceed the forms जस्माथ्विस्त asmābhīs, युष्माथ्विस्त yushmābhīs; and though the Vēda dialect, in its substantive and adjective bases in ध, attaches itself to the former form, still no necessity hence arises for supposing the abbreviated धिस to be based on an ध-bhis,* as that could never lead to धिस. Perhaps, however, धbhis might become धbhis, either through the assimilative force of the i of धhis, or through analogy to [G. Ed. p. 254.] the dative ध-ḥyas, the ṇ of which may, in like manner, owe its origin to the re-active influence of the य y.†

220. The Prākṛit has fully followed out the path commenced by the Vēda dialect, and changed into र ṇ the ṇ of

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

† I do not regard the Vēda नयीध्य nadyāis, for नदोध्यम 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 dis mentioned by Burnouf (Nonv. Journ. Asiat. III. 310.) may here be considered, which occurs frequently in the Jāshne, and is probably an abbreviation of ते धिस dibus or दीबुस, from a base धि, the accusative of which ते धि dim, "him," is often found with i unlengthened, contrary to §. 64. The connection of the base धि di with धिस ta cannot, on this account, be disputed.
FORMATION OF CASES.

asmā-bhis, yuṣhmā-bhis, as also, in the locative plural, that of asmāsu, yuṣhmāsu; hence अम्हे हिन् amhē-hin, तुम्हे हिन् tumhē-hin, चम्हे सु amhēsu, tumhēsu. Moreover, in Prākrit, all other a bases, as well pronouns as substantives and adjectives, terminate the instrumental plural with ए हिन् e-hin; and thus कुसमे हिन् kusumē-hin, “floribus” (from kusuma,) answers to the Veda कुसमे ब्हिस kusumē-bhis. Before, however, the forms in ए ब्हिस ā-bhis, ए हिन् e-hin, had arisen, from शाभिस ābhis, by the change of a into ē, ēis must have proceeded by means of rejection and contraction from that most early form. This form exists also in the oldest hymns of the Vēdas, together with that in शाभिस ābhis: thus, in Rosen, p. 14, यज्ञन् yajnāis; pp. 15 and 21 अर्काइस arkāis. In Zend the abbreviated form ēis is the only one that occurs, which it does, indeed, extremely often.

221. Before the dual termination द्वय 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 भिस bhis, हिन् hīn; it employs, namely, ē for a: but from vēhrkē-bhya, according to §§. 28. 41. comes vēhrkaēibya. Thus, in the Vendīdād, द्वयब्हि māyābhyām, hwaēibya pādhaēibya, “suis pedibus,” = खाभिस पादभिस swābhyaṃ pādābhyām; द्वयथित्थासा zaṣṭāēibya (ह्लाभाम्) “manibus.” But in this case, also, the diphthong ए is supplied by ēi (§. 33.); e.g. द्वयब्हि 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 iv is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit bhyām,* then the Homeric forms like ωμοι-iv are to be compared with the द्वयब्हि ubōi-bhya

* By rejecting the labial, as in अर्काइस vrikās from अर्काभिस vrikābhis, and by contracting the याम yām to iv, as when, in Sanskrit, for yāshtā, ishta is said, from yaj, “to sacrifice,” and Ṉ Zend जङ्ग, “hae,” for र्याम iyam (see, also, §. 42.).
above mentioned; where, therefore, the first \( i \) would fall to the base, which it lengthens, the other to the termination. The third declension, by its forms like \( \delta a i m o u-\nu \), might give rise to the conjecture, that \( \nu \nu \) and not \( \nu \) is the true termination; the latter, however, is shewn to be so from the two first declensions, where \( \nu \) and not \( \nu \nu \) is attached to the final vowel of the base (\( M o u s a-\nu \), \( \lambda o g o-\nu \)). In the third, therefore, we explain the \( o \) before \( \nu \) in the same manner as, §. 218., before \( \phi \nu \) (\( k o t u l \eta d o n-\delta-\phi \nu \)); viz. as a conjunctive vowel, which has made its way from the bases which necessarily have it, \( i.e. \) from those terminating in a consonant into those which might dispense with it (into the bases in \( i \) and \( \nu \)); as, in general, in the third declension the consonantal bases have given the tone, and have shewn the way to the vowels \( i \) and \( \nu \). It might, however, not have been necessary for the conjunctive vowel \( o \) to make its appearance between consonants and the termination, as \( \delta a i m o u-\nu \) could very easily be uttered; but the \( o \) of \( \delta a i m o n-\nu \) comes evidently from a time when the \( \nu \) was still preceded by the consonant, which the corresponding Sanskrit termination \( b h y d a m \) leads us to expect; in all probability a \( \phi \); thus, \( \delta a i m o n-\phi \nu, \) from \( \delta a i m o n-\phi \nu \).* We should have, therefore, here a different \( \phi \nu \) from that which, in §. 217., we endeavoured to explain from \( \phi \nu s, \) \( \text{कौस्त} \) \( \text{भिस} \): the nasal in the dual \( (\phi) \nu \) stands quite regularly for its predecessor \( m \), as, in general, at the end of words. In order to present to our

* The conjunctive vowel \( o \), therefore, before the dual termination \( \nu \), has an origin exactly similar to that of the possessive suffix \( e r \), which has been already elsewhere compared with the Sanskrit \( \text{वन्त} \) \( \text{वन्त} \). \( E r \) must therefore have been originally pronounced \( F e r \); 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 \( \pi r o-\phi \) answers to \( \pi r o-\nu \), from \( \pi r o-\nu \): on the other hand, \( \pi r o-\phi \) to \( \pi r o-\nu \).
view still more clearly how forms quite similar take root in the language as corruptions of preceding dissimilar forms, let the form ἐτυπτοῦν be considered as the first person singular and third person plural; in one case from ἐτυπτοῦμ, in the other from ἐτυπτοῦν.

222. If the dual termination iv be explained as a contraction of bhyām, we shall have found, also, the origin of the dative plural termination iv, which appears to have been changed in this number in the pronouns of one gender as it were by accident (ṅμ'-ṅv, ṯμ'-ṅv, ṱφ'-ṅv, together with ṱφ'-si). 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 ṭम bhyam as termination (ससभम asma-bhyam, “nobis,” युष्मयम yushma-bhyam, (G. Ed. p. 257.) “nobis”), opposed to the भस bhyas of all other words. From this bhyam, then, we arrive at iv quite as easily, or more so, than from the dual termination bhyām (cf. §. 42.). As, however, ṭम bhyam, and its abbreviated form बन bhyam, according to §. 215., has also its place in the singular dative of the pronouns of one gender, but occurs nowhere else; as, moreover, the Latin also, in the pronouns referred to, has maintained a genuine dative termination, and to the common i, which is borrowed from the locative, presents in contrast the termination bi or hi (for bhi) (§. 200.); we can, therefore, in the singular iv also of ᴇμ'-ṅv, ᴱे-ṅv, ᴱ'-ṅv, ṱv, ṱφ'-ṅv, see nothing else than an abbreviation of ṭम 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 i 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 iv here treated of with the Sanskrit in a different way, by designating it as the sister form of the pronominal locative termination
sative use of this termination, in Theocritus, is to be explained from its original signification being no longer felt, and the exchange of its ν with that of the accusative thereby caused. On the other hand, we have in μιν and νιν real accusatives, and should therefore divide them μιν, νιν; and not assume, with Buttmann (p. 296), a connection between this form and the dative -ίν.

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

भिस bhi-s, भय bhy-am, भाम bhy-ām, and भयस bhy-as, which begin with भे bhy (from भे bhi), we must notice, first, their connection with the preposition भि abhi, "to," "towards," "against," (whence भिन्तन abhi-tas, "at," cf. "apud"). However, in abhi itself bhi is clearly, in like manner, the termination, and the demonstrative अ 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 अ, viz. अधि� adhi, "over," finds analogous forms in the Greek locatives, like σ-θι, ἀλλο-θι, ἐπιστ-θι (§. 16.). Related to the suffix धि dhi is ध dha, which has been retained in the common dialect only in the abbreviation ha, in i-hu, "here," and in the preposition sa-ha, "with"; but in the Vēda dialect exhibits the original form and more extended diffusion, and in the Zend, also, is found in several pro-

* In Prākrit the termination धि hiṁ, which is connected with धि bhi (cf. §. 217.), unites also with other pronominal bases, for the formation of locative adverbs, as ताहि ta-hiṁ, "there," काहि ka-hiṁ, "where?"
nominal bases with a locative signification; e.g. अवाध अवाध, "here." In the Greek, compare θα of ενθα, opposed to θε, from ενθε, εμεθε, &c., from θα dhas, for टस ta, in अधस a-dhas, "beneath": in which formations ध dḥ stands as a permutation of t, and occurs in this way, also, in some other formations.* Th refore dha, dhi, are to be derived from the demonstrative base त ta; but it is more difficult to trace the origin of त बhi of चन bhi (Greek ἄμφι). 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 विष्णुती विनंति "twenty," is clearly an abbreviation of विष्णुत द्विनंति, and in Zend अवি bīs, "twice," द्वितीय bitya, "the second," is used for द्वदेव dvīs, (Sanskrit वित्त dvitis), द्वितीय dvitya (Sanskrit द्वितत्त्व द्वितिय), so त बhi may be identical with the pronominal base स swa or त बhi—whence the Greek σφείς, 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 अवि bīs, द्वितीय bitya, and the Latin bis, bi. The changed sibilant might also be recognised in the aspiration of the भ bḥ, as, in Prākrit (§. 166.), सम sma has become स्मhṭa; and, (which comes still closer to the case before us), in Greek for σφίν is found also ψίν. And, in Sanskrit, that भ bḥ should spring from b+h is not entirely unknown; and in this way is to be explained the relation of भूस bhūyas, "more," to बह bhū, "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 द्वे� dhve and द्वम dhwam for त्वे tvē, त्वम tvam.
**INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE DUAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
<th>ZEND</th>
<th>GREEK</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrika-bhyām,</td>
<td>{vēhrkaēi-bhyā, or}</td>
<td>λύκο-iv,</td>
<td>wilka-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihva-bhyām,</td>
<td>hīzvā-bhyā,</td>
<td>χώρα-iv,</td>
<td>ranko-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. patti-bhyām,</td>
<td>patti-bhyā,</td>
<td>ποσί-ο-iv,</td>
<td>pāti-m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| f. tanu-bhyām, | tanu-bhyā, | πιτύ-ο-iv, | .....
| f. vāg-bhyām, | vāch-e-bhyā, | ὀπ-ο-ιν, | .....
| m. bharad-bhyām, | baran'-bhyā, | φερόντ-ο-iv, | .....
| m. ātma'-bhyām.† | āasma'-bhyā, | δαμον-ο-ιν, | .....

---

*I deduce this form principally from the base raoch, "light," which often occurs in the terminations beginning with $b$, and always interposes $e$ as conjunctive vowel—raoch-e-βίς, raoch-e-byā. We find, also, vi-raoch-e-βίς (Vend. S. p. 63.). Bases in $r$ interpose $e$; those in $nt$, when a vowel precedes that letter, conjoin the termination direct (amērēttat-

---

In Sanskrit and Zend, is rejected before case terminations beginning with a consonant; thus, in Greek, δαμο-ο-ιν, and in Gothic āhma'-m.
FORMATION OF CASES.

[PERSONAL NOTE: The following notes are for internal reference only.]

SANSKRIT.

m. bhrāṭrī-bhyām,* bhrāṭar-ē-byā,

n. vachā-bhyām,† vachā-byā,

GREEK.

πατέρ-ο-ιν, . . . .

LITHUANIAN.

ėnė(σ)-o-ιν, . .

GENITIVE, LOCATIVE.

[G. Ed. p. 261.] 225. These two cases, in Sanskrit, have the common termination द्रोष ोs, which may be connected with the singular genitive termination. The following are examples: प्रकृतम् vrikay-ōs, जिह्वयोस jihway-ōs (cf. §. 158.), पत्रोस paty-ōs, तन्न्रोस tanw-ōs, वाचोस vach-ōs, भ्रात्रोs bhrāṭr-ōs, वचोअस vachas-ōs. In Zend this termination seems to have disappeared, and to be replaced by the plural; likewise in Lithuanian, where, awy-ū is both dual and plural genitive.

PLURAL.

NOMINATIVE, VOCATIVE.

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

---

* धर ar before case terminations beginning with consonants is shortened to धृ ri (§. 127.).
† See §. 56b.
become $\delta$ or $\Delta \alpha \delta$ before the appended particles $\chi$ha and $\chi$hit; the Greek exhibits $\epsilon \varsigma$, under the restriction of §. 225.; the Latin $\ddot{\epsilon} \varsigma$, with unorganic length of quantity through the influence of the $s$; the Lithuanian has $\dot{\epsilon} \varsigma$ in bases in $\tau$ but elsewhere simple $s$. Thus the words दुहितारस $\dot{\nu}hitar-as$, नुहितारस $\dot{\nu}hitar-as-\chi$, द्वारेप-८$\epsilon \varsigma$, $\dot{\nu}kter-\dot{\epsilon} \varsigma$, मृत-८$\epsilon \varsigma$, correspond with one another.

227. The $a$ of the termination is melted [G. Ed. p. 262.] down with a preceding स a of the base to अ; thus, वृकास vrikâs, from vrika + as, corresponds to the Gothic $\text{vulfos}$, from $\text{VULFEas}$ (§. 69.). In this concretion only, however, with the vowel of the base, the Gothic has preserved the full termination; but elsewhere, both with vowel and consonantal bases, the s alone of the old as is left, as in general the termination as in Gothic polysyllabic forms has everywhere been weakened to is or s (cf. §§. 135. 191.): hence, $\text{sunyu-}$s, $\text{ahman-}$s, for $\text{suniv-}$as, $\text{ahman-}$as. And स a, too, is contracted with the termination as to अ; hence, जिह्वास jihâs, for jihwâ-8s. It cannot, however, be shewn with certainty, from what has been just said, that the Gothic gibôs, from $\text{GIBO}$, has simple s or as (contracted with the base vowel to अ=अ) for its case designation.

228. The masculine pronominal bases in अ refuse, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Gothic, the full nominative designation, and in place of it extend the base by the addition of an $i$, which, according to §. 2., with the a of the base forms र े, for which, in Zend, is used र े or य ी;
hence, Sanskrit ते, Zend तά, Gothic thai, “this,” [G. Ed. p. 263] answering to the feminine form तास tās, ग्वास tāo (§. 56”), thōs. To this corresponds, in Greek, τοί (Doric for οί). In Greek and Latin, however, this ἰ, which practically replaces the termination as (ες, ἐς), has not remained in the masculine pronominal bases in o (= ο a, §. 116.); but all other bases of the second, as of the first declension, have, in Greek and Latin, taken example from it; hence, λύκοι, χώραι, for λύκο-ες, χώρα-ές, lupi (from lupoi), terrae (from terrai), for lupo-ες, terra-és. The Latin fifth declension, although in its origin identical with the first (§. 121.), has preserved the old termination; hence, rēs from rē-ές, as, in Sanskrit जिहव्द from जीहव्द-अς. 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 ὄς (blindai “cæci”) is, therefore, no violation of the old law.

229. In Zend, in consonantal bases the dual termination ग्व do also (from सास ds, §. 207.) occurs with a plural signification; thus, frequently, ग्वपास vāch-दो, “voces,” ग्वपास ।

Crit. §. 271.) shews itself clearly through most of the oblique cases, as amī-byas, “illis,” amī-šām, “illorum,” to be the naked theme. The form which occurs in the Zend-Avesta विश्वेस-चा vispeš-cha, “omnesque” (V. S. p. 49), considered as a contraction of विसपय-अς-चा (cf. §. 244.), leads to the conjecture, that to ते, and similar uninflected forms, the termination as also might attach itself; thus, ताव tay-अς. In Zend, the pronominal form in तe occurs, for the most part, in the accusative plural; and thus the abovementioned vispeš-cha l. c. stands probably as accusative, although, according to Anquetil’s inaccurate translation, it might be regarded as the nominative.
raoch-\textit{do}, "lucers," which forms cannot be regarded, perhaps, as regular plurals of bases in \textit{d}; for I believe [G. Ed. p. 264.]

I can guarantee that there exists no such base as \textit{vačhā} and \textit{roochā}. The form \( \textit{śvṛća} \textit{doḥ} \) in \textit{a} bases, as \( \textit{śvṛća} \textit{vačhā} \), \textit{vährkadoḥō}, "\textit{lupi}," and "\textit{lupos}," rests on that in the \textit{Vedas}, but which only occurs in the nominative, \textit{śasas} (§. 56.); e.g. \textit{śomās \ stōmdas}, "songs of praise," for \textit{śomās \ stōma}.

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

The Zend employs Guna or not at pleasure; hence \( \textit{\bha\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}t\dddot{\text{a}}} \) \textit{paity-\d}, or \textit{paitay-\d}, \textit{\bha\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}t\dddot{\text{a}}} \textit{pa\ddot{\text{a}}-\d}, or \textit{pa\ddot{\text{a}}\ddot{\text{a}}-\d}.

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

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

\* The \( \textit{\i} \), which, according to §. 41., is blended with the base, remains in spite of the \textit{a} preceding the \textit{\y}.

\* Simple as this point is, I have nevertheless found it very difficult to come to a firm conclusion regarding it, although, from the first, I have directed my attention towards it. Burnouf has already (Nouv. Journ. Asiat. III. 309, 310) given the plural neuter form, and instituted comparisons with the Gothic and Greek, &c. But from forms like \textit{hu-mata}, "\textit{bene-cogitata}," "\textit{hācta}," "\textit{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,  

The following are examples: न्यूनम्यूम ahavan-a, "pura;  

| न्यूनम्यूम bherézant-a, "splendentia; न्यूनम्यूम vách-a, "verba;  

| न्यूनम्यूम nar-a, "hominés; न्यूनम्यूम 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 con-  

sonant. The examination of this subject is, however, much embarrassed,  
in that the Zend, without regard to the gender of the singular, is prone,  
contrary to natural expectation, to make every noun neuter in the  
plural; an inclination which goes so far, that the numerous class of a bases  
have hereby entirely lost the masculine nominative, and but sparingly  
exhibit the masculine accusative. When, e.g. mashya, "human being,"  
is, in the plural nominative, likewise, mashya (with cha, 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 ए a or ए ए stands for हृतस् ए: I am persuaded that this  
form belongs to the neuter. The replacing, however, of the plural mas-  
culine by neuters rests upon a deep internal feeling of the language;  
for in the plural number it is clear that gender and personality are far in  
the back ground. The personality of the individual is lost in the abstract  
infinite and inanimate plurality; and so far we can but praise the Zend  
for its evitation of gender in the plural. We must blame it, however, in  
this point, that it does not, in all places, bring the adjectives or pronouns  
into concord with the substantives to which they refer, and that in this  
respect it exhibits a downright confusion of gender, and a disorder which  
has very much impeded the inquiry into this subject. Thus, e.g. viśpa  
anaghraka-roacháō (not roach-ā), "all lights which have had no beginning";  
tisáro (fem.) satá or thrayó (masc.) satá, "three hundred"; chathuváro  
(masc.) satá "four hundred." In general the numbers "three" and  
"four" appear to have lost the neuter; hence, also, thrayó cañfin-a, "three  
nights," chathuváro caañin-a, "four nights": in Vend. S. p. 237, on the other  
hand, stands tánarā yá, "those persons who . . . ." I divide thus nar-a  
although
principle often quoted, been again shortened, and remains only in monosyllabic bases and before annexed particles. The Gothic and Zend, in this respect, stand [G. Ed. p. 267.] very remarkably upon one and the same footing; for thó, "hæc," is used (for thó, §. 69.), from THAa; hvo, "qua," for HVAA; but daura, from DAURA, as, in Zend, wjo tâ, "hæc," wjo yd, "qua," opposed to wno 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 tâcha, "and those persons." From the theme vâch, "word," "speech," we find frequently vâch-a (also, erroneously as it appears, vach-a); e.g. Vend. S. p. 34, vâchhâma vâchham vâchha vâcha vâcha vâcha humata hîceta hvarêsta, "verba bene-cogitata, bene-dieta, bene-peracta." From jaño vâch ashavan, "pure," occurs very often the neuter plural ashvana-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 Pâli 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 aivihsitâr-a, "peccata corrupmentia (?)". Anquetil renders both expressions together by "la corruption du cœur" (11. 227.); but probably aivi-sitâr stands for -esitâra, and means literally "the destroying" (cf. fiq kshî, 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 tir; and from this example it follows, as also from ashavan-a, that where there are more forms of the theme than one, the Zend, like the Sanskrit (see Gramm. Crit. r. 185. c.), forms the nominative, accusative, and vocative plural from the stronger theme. I refrain from adding 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 râlav-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 rd δορα 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 ᾖ. This ᾖ 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 ᾖ, which has grown out of ᾖ+ᾱ, has become shortened. This ᾖ, however, in contrast with its offspring ᾕ, ᾗ, ᾖ, may even pass for a more weighty ending, which unites base and termination, than if δωρο or δώρε, donē, done, stood as the plural neuter.

232. Bases in i and u may, in Zend, suppress their final vowel before the termination, and u may be suppressed and replaced by lengthening the base-vowel: thus we read in the Vend. S. pp. 46 and 48, ᾡΙαρ gara, "hills," from ᾡΙαρ gairi (see p. 196, Note t): on the other hand, p. 313, gairίς (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), ἀνάπερεθα skyaontha ya narō-vaipaya,

[G. Ed. p. 268.] i. e. "the sins which stop the bridge, the actions which . . ."; and here it is evident that anάπερεθα stands for anάπερεθw-a, for pερετυ means actually "bridge."

* Burnouf's MS. divides thus, anά pερεθα, which is following Olshausen (p. 6), but with the various reading anάpερεθα. I have no ground for assuming that in Zend there exists a preposition anά, "without," so that anά pερεθα might mean "without a bridge"; and that pερετυ would, in the singular instrumental, form pερεθwα or pερεταω. I suppose, therefore, that pερετυ may be conjoined with the preposition ᾖ, 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 यदत्व यद्वत्ता (Vend. S. p. 120; in Olshausen, p. 7), which can only be the plural accusative of यदु, for it stands with अंव agha, “pec cata; and in the same page in Olshausen occurs a derivative of yātu in the accusative singular, viz. यातु यातुमंतेम, “the magician,” “gifted with magic” (according to Anquetil, magicien). I render, therefore, agha yātava literally by “the sins of sorcery” (Anquetil, “la magie très mauvaise”); and in Anquetil’s Vocabulary is (p. 467) यात्वानम् yāthvanam, the regular plural genitive of our base yātu, 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, हेंद्वा hēnda “the Indies”; with hapta hēndu, “the seven Indies” (Anq. II. p. 270). It has the epithet us-astar-a (“up-starred?”) in opposition to दौस-स्तारेम हेंदुम, “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 वोह्वा vohu, “goods,” from वोहु vohu.

233. The interrogative base ki (cf. quis, quid), which in Sanskrit forms only the singular nominative-accusative (neuter) जिन ki-m, but is elsewhere replaced by ka; whence, in Zend, कात् ka-т, “what”: this base, the use of which is very limited, forms in Zend the plural neuter भूत्व क्या-ा*; and

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

234. The Sanskrit gives, in place of the Zend-European neuter \( a \), an \( ः i \), perhaps as the weakening of a former \( a \) [G. Ed. p. 270.] (§ 6.); the final vowel of the base is lengthened, and between it and the case termination a euphonic \( n \) is placed (§ 133.); hence \( दानाि dānā-n-i \), \( चारीञ्ज vārī-n-i \),* \( मध्यि�न madhū-n-i \).† The bases which terminate with a single consonant—\( ः n \) and \( ः r \) being excepted—prefix to it a nasal,

before the masculine \( यस्माि ratavō \) (\( यस्माि ratavō क्या ratavō \), "which are the lords")?.

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

† In the Vēdas, the \( ni \) in a bases is frequently found suppressed; e.g. \( विष्णु viṣṇu \), "omnia," from \( viṣwa \). In this way the Sanskrit is connected with the Zend \( viśpa \), \( viṣpā-chā \); but perhaps this coincidence is only external; for as the Sanskrit nowhere uses a neuter termination \( a \), \( viṣṇa viṣṇa \) cannot well be deduced from \( viśpa+a \), but can only be explained as an abbreviation of the \( Æ-\text{nī} \), which likewise occurs in the Vēdas, as also \( पुरु \) \( purū \), "multa," "magna," is used for \( पुरुस्कrpurūni \) (Rosen's Spec. pp. 9, 10).
and after s and n the preceding vowel is lengthened; hence वचन सि, नामन námān-i. Into relation with this i might be brought the neuter inflexion of quae (quai) and haec (haic) which stand in Latin very isolated; quae is, however, still tolerably distant from the Sanskrit ज़ ज न-ि, while it is nearly identical with the neuter dual ज़ के from ha+i (§.212.). Since, however, the antiquity of this dual termination is supported by the Zend, the plural form कणिस stands on the other side isolated, and its age is thereby rendered doubtful; as, moreover, the Latin, in the verb also, has introduced a termination originally dual into the plural*; [G. Ed. p. 271.] we cannot avoid recognising in the Latin plural quae a remnant as true as possible of the Sanskrit dual के के.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>LITHUAN.</th>
<th>GOThic.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikās, vēλr̥kōd̥,† λύκοι, ὕπ-ι, wilkai, vulfōs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. tē, tē, τοί, is-t'ī, tie;+ thai.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. dānd-ि, dāla, δώρα, dona, . . . . daura.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwās, hizvāo, χώραι, terra, rankos, gibōs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The termination tis answers to चस thas, Greek τοῦ from τος, not to य tha or त 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-ि, 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 त्य, mentioned in §. 194.; while the base च्य sya (च्य श्य, see §. 55.) is fully declined in Lithuanian in the form of SZIE, and in the plural nominative, likewise without inflexion, is
is zie. From the pronominal declension the form ie (from ia) has found
its way into the declension of the adjective also: so that the base GERA,
“good,” forms several cases from GERIE; viz. dat. du. gerie-m for
gera-m, dat. pl. gerie-ms for gera-ms, and nom. pl. geri for gerai. This
geri appears to stand in most complete agreement with the Latin nomina-
tives of the corresponding declension (boni, lupi); but the difference be-
tween the two languages is this, that the i of boni (for bono-i) belongs to
the termination, while geri is void of termination, and stands for gerie
(analogous with tie), but this latter for gerie-i (cf. yaunikkie-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 nenter, as quod is a
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 pre-
served in quia, after the analogy of मृधिश्चास paity-a, for paiti.

§ We might expect gav-ö, gavas-cha, “bovesque;” but we read मृधिश्चास
geus in the Vend. S. p. 253, L. 9, in combination with the pronominal
nenters मृधि tā, “illa,” मृधि yā, “qua,” which, according to §. 231.
Note, cannot surprise us.
NOMINATIVE, VOCATIVE PLURAL.

236. The bases which end with a short vowel annex न n in Sanskrit, and lengthen the final vowel of the base; hence, वृक्षः वृक्षः, पतिः पति, गुरुः सुनूः, &c. We might imagine this n to be related to the m of the singular accusative, as in the verb the termination चानि अनि (1st pers. sing. imperative) has clearly proceeded from चानि अनि. The cognate dialects speak, however, in favour of Grimm's acute conjecture, that the Sanskrit n is, in the accusative plural masculine, an abbreviation of ns, which has remained entire in the Gothic—vulfa-ns, gasti-ns, sunu-ns,—but has been divided in the other sister languages; since the Sanskrit, according to §. 94., 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. BRÖTHAR becomes BRÖTHRU, whence bróthryu-s, &c., according to the analogy of sunyu-s.
§ Or वृप्त्वे vachenba. Thus we read Vend. S. p. 127, nömnéña, which, I think, must be regarded as accusative of nímó (नमः namas, "adoration"), and as governed by ब्रह्म bërèthra, "from him who brings," "from him offering."
|| The Old Prussian, too, exhibits in the acc. pl. ns, e.g. táva-ns, natípas.
Respecting the Védæ termination hr, from iis, 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.] λυκος has preserved the sibilant, but has permitted the ν to volatilize to ν.† In fact, λυκο-νς has the same relation to λυκος that τυπτουσι has to τυπτουσι, from

[G. Ed. p. 275.] τυπτουσι.‡ For ποσι-ας, ἰχθυ-ας, we could not, however, expect a ποσι-νς, ἰχθυ-νς, as the Greek makes the ι and ν bases in all parts similar to the bases which terminate with a consonant, which, in Sanskrit, have as for a termination; hence पदस padas = ποδας: 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 ὑρικάνι for ὑρικάνις; ἀσ, ὑβράντις vidwāns-am, in the uninflcted nominative ὑβραντίς vidwān, ("sapiens").

† As the ν also passes into ι (ῥεϊς for ῥεϊνς, Ἑλικ τῦφας, μέλας for τυφας(ης), μέλας), Hartung (l. c p. 263) is correct in explaining in this sense the ι in Ἑλικ accusative forms like νόμους, τοῖς ορθηγοῖς, &c. As regards, however, the feminine accusatives like μεγάλας, ποικίλας, τείμας, quoted by him, I believe that they have followed the analogy of the masculines, from which they sufficiently distinguish their gender by the a preceding the ι; we cannot, however, thence infer, that also the first and specially feminine declension had originally accusatives in νς, as neither has the Gothic in the corresponding declension an ns, nor does the Sanskrit exhibit an n (see §. 287., and cf. Rask in Vater's Tables of Comparison, p. 62).

‡ It cannot be said that τυπτουσι proceeded from τυπτουσι, a truly monstrous form, which never existed in Greek, while the τυπτουσι 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 ēnti, Goth. nt; and from the singular τι (Dor.), in the plural nothing else than ντι can be expected. But to arrive at oνσι from oντι it is not requisite to invent first so strange a form as oντσι; for that oντσι can become oνσι 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 Υ, 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, oν-σι has arisen from oντ-σι, not from oν-σι (λένσι not δαμοσι), we
the Ionic ἄται, ἀτο, 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 (πεπείδαται, πετράφαται; then, also, πεπαύαται, κεκλιάται, &c. for πέπαυνται, κέκλινται). 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 व्रिका́न्स vrikanś, पतिः patiūs, 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, स्त्रिय-स triy-as, "feminas," मुर्वस bhuvas, "terras," from स्त्री stri, मू 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 (§. 120.).
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 $o$ bases, gives no $ns$, but it appears that $\text{thōs} = \text{tās}$ (cas, 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, $\text{fiyand}$-$s$, $\text{ahman}$-$s$, for $\text{fiyand}$-$as$, $\text{ahman}$-$as$.

238. Feminines with a short final vowel lengthen it, to compensate, as it appears, for the suppression of the $a$; thus $\text{prāti}$-$s$ is formed from $\text{prity}$-$as$, and $\text{tanū}$-$s$ from $\text{tanw}$-$as$. The Greek certainly presents, in this respect, only a casual coincidence, through forms in $\hat{i}$, $\hat{o}$, 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, $\text{paity}$-$ð$ ($\text{paity}$-$a$-$s$-$cha$), $\text{paśv}$-$ð$ ($\text{paśv}$-$a$-$s$-$cha$, or, with Guna, $\text{pai}$-$tay$-$ð$, $\text{paśa}$-$v$-$ð$. In feminine bases in $i$, $u$, occur at times also the forms $i$-$s$, $u$-$s$, corresponding to the Sanskrit; as, $\text{gair}$-$s$,”montes” (Vendidad S. p. 313.), $\text{erēzū}$-$s$,”rectas,” $\text{ta}$-$f$-$n$-$s$,”urentes,” $\text{pērē}$-$t$-$ū$-$s$,”pontes.”

239. Masculine bases in $a$, where they are not replaced by the neuter (§ 231. Note), have, in the accusative, $a$-$i$ (cf. § 61.); as, $\text{imān}$, “hos,” often occurs, $\text{mazistān}$, “maximos” (Vend. S. p. 65.). The sibilant is retained before the [G. Ed. p. 277.] particle $\text{cha}$, and these forms can be copiously quoted; as, $\text{amēsha}$-$a$-$n$-$s$-$cha$, “non-

* Cf. Vedic forms in $a$-$i$.
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conniventesque’; manthrans-cha, “sermonesque”; aësmanés-cha, “lignaque”; vás-tryans-cha, “agricolasque.”* The form aësmanés-cha athaurun-anis-cha, “presbyterosque” (V. S. p. 65.), is remarkable, as there is no reason elsewhere to assume a theme athauruna; and this form would accordingly shew that consonantal bases also could assume the inflexion ns, with an unavoidable auxiliary vowel however; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that, in the perverted feeling of the language, it has been introduced by the preponderating analogy of the a bases. More important, therefore, than this aësmanés-cha are the accusatives aësmanés nareus, “homenes,” and streus, “stellas,” which occur very frequently; while from aësman étar, “fire,” we have found, not aësman étér-eus, but aësman étar-ó, in which it is to be remarked that étar distinguishes itself from other words in r in this point also, that it forms, in the nominative singular, not aësman étar, but aësman étars. But how is the termination eus to be explained? I believe in no other way but from aësman ans, by changing the n into a vowel, as in [G. Ed. p. 278.] λόγος; after which, according to §. 31., the a has become ζ e: the sibilant, however, which, after μ a and ζ aři, is ζ s, must, after ὀ u, appear as μ s. We actually find, too, in the V. S. p. 311, μετρ. nér-anis 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 μη cha (cf. §§. 56b. 207. 228.), then the above examples are the more important, in order to supply a fresh proof that ns is the original designation of masculine plural accusatives of themes terminating with a vowel. The superlative μετρ. verethravānisātēva (of which hereafter) may be regarded as derived from a participal nominative. Other cases, which might suggest occasion to assume, in Zend, a euphonic s after ὀ, have been nowhere met with by me.
FORMATION OF CASES.

As 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 än, which is restricted to the designation of animate creatures, is identical with the Sanskrit जनन än in the masculine plural accusative: thus, मर्दन mardân, "hominis," answers to मर्दन martyrän, "mortales," "hominis."*

If, then, the termination än, 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 तस 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 ha in New Persian; thus, रोज़ा roez-ha, "days," answers to the Zend राहङ्ग़ा raotechanha, "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 ha. 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 अस as; e.g. hūśir, "houses," chalpir, "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>vrikā-n</td>
<td>vehrka-n</td>
<td>āko-νς</td>
<td>lupō-s</td>
<td>wilku-s</td>
<td>vulta-ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāndā-n-i</td>
<td>dāta</td>
<td>ὰρας</td>
<td>dona</td>
<td></td>
<td>daura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jihvā-s</td>
<td>hīvā-o</td>
<td>χόφας</td>
<td>terrā-s</td>
<td>rankā-s</td>
<td>gīdō-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tā-s</td>
<td>tā-o</td>
<td>τά-ς</td>
<td>is-tā-s</td>
<td>tā-s</td>
<td>thō-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patī-n</td>
<td>paity-ό†</td>
<td>πόσι-ας</td>
<td>host'-es</td>
<td></td>
<td>gasti-ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhiy-as</td>
<td>āfrīty-ό†</td>
<td>πόρτι-ας</td>
<td>mess'-es</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priti-s</td>
<td>āfrīt'-s</td>
<td>πόρτι'-ς</td>
<td></td>
<td>āwy-s</td>
<td>ansti-ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vārī-n-i</td>
<td>var'-a</td>
<td>ἰδρι-α</td>
<td>mari-α</td>
<td></td>
<td>iy-α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bhaviśyangi-s, būshyantī-s,†

sūnā-n       | pāv-ό† | ἰχθύ-ας  | pecū-s   | sunū-s   | sunu-ns |
| bhuv-as      | tanv-ό† | πίτυ-ας  |          |          |        |
| tanū-s       | tanū-s  | πίτυ-ς   | socrū-s  |          | handu-ns|
| madhū-n-i    | madhu-a† | μεθυ-α    | pecu-a   |          |        |

* 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 hūśiru-m (from hūśira-m, 6. 168.), the nom. accus. hūśir appears an abbreviation. But the relation of our *ir* to the Sanskrit *asa* 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 अस pēśō-tana, from pēśō-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.: अन्हात  ainhāt (ainhāt?)

hacha
THE INSTRUMENTAL.

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

hacha skyaðthnà-varéza atha bauuinti pësö-tanva, "hac pro facti-peractione tum sunt verbera posteriori corpori inficta" (Anquetil, Celui qui commet cette action sera coupable du tanafour). In regard to the anápërethá, mentioned at §. 232., it is further to be noticed that the G th can only be occasioned by a οντο that has been dropped (§. 47.), for the theme of the concluding substantive is përëtu, not përëthu (Vend. S. pp. 313 and 362, twice).  

* Irregularly—from a theme गा gá (§. 122.), for गृह gau-as. The Zend मूण म gáus (also मूण म gáos), which often occurs, rests on the strengthened Sanskrit form म gdu; 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 मूण म gáus, and in the accusative मूण म geus, rather than vice versa.

† See p. 163, Note 1.
† See §. 129.
§ See §. 127. Note and §. 249. Note 1.
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 ब्हिः bhis than as belonging to the dative-ablative termination भ्यस् bhyas; although it approaches equally near to the two old terminations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>LITHUAN.</th>
<th>GOTH. DAT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikē-bhis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>θεό-φιν,</td>
<td>vo-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>vulfa-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrihā-is,</td>
<td>vēhrkā-is,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>wilka-is,</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwā-bhis,</td>
<td>hizvā-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>ranko-mis,</td>
<td>gibō-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priti-bhis,</td>
<td>āfrītī-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>awi-mis,</td>
<td>ansti-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnu-bhis,</td>
<td>paśu-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>sunu-mis,</td>
<td>sunu-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nau-bhis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>vaū-φιν,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. ātma'-bhis,</td>
<td>aśma'-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>ahma'-m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. nāma'-bhis,</td>
<td>nāma'-bis,</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>namn-am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. vachō-bhis,† vachō-bis,†</td>
<td>ὕχεσ-φίν,†</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 282.]</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 lupī-s, terri-s, speci-s (for speci-bus from specu-bus), must be allotted to the base. Lupī-s stands for lupo-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

---

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Lithuanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikē-bhyas</td>
<td>vēhrkaēi-byō</td>
<td>lupī-s</td>
<td>wilka-m(u)s.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwā-bhyas</td>
<td>hizvā-byō</td>
<td>terrī-s</td>
<td>ranko-m(u)s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. pati-bhyas</td>
<td>pāti-byō</td>
<td>hosti-bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. priti-bhyas</td>
<td>ēfrīti-byō</td>
<td>messi-bus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. bhavishyanti-bhyas, būshyanti-byō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sūnu-bhyas</td>
<td>paśu-byō</td>
<td>pecu-bus,t</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>barēn-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</td>
<td>fratr-i-bus,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### THE GENITIVE.

245. The genitive plural in Sanskrit, in substantives and adjectives, has the termination त्रायिम am, in the Zend eṣān, according to §. 61. The Greek οὐ bears the same relation to the original form of the termination that ὁδὸν does to सन्धाम adadāṁ (§§. 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 जाधु puśu, 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 = वृक्ष vrikam, λύκον-ν.* [G. Ed. p. 284.]

The German, like the Lithuanian, has dropped the final nasal. In Gothic, however, the ठ d, which has been left, shews itself under two forms, and thereby an unorganic difference has been introduced between the feminine genitive termination and that of the masculine-neuter; since the fuller ठ has remained only to the feminine ठ 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 ओ a and म ल: hence, वे र्का-न-अँ वे र्का-न-अँ, वे र्का-न-अँ, वे र्का-न-अँ. To the latter correspond very remarkably the genitives (which occur in Old High German, Old Saxon, and Anglo-Saxon, in the

* Regarding the termination i-um in consonantal bases, and, vice versā, respecting um in places where i-um might have been expected, we refer the reader to §. 126. In adjectives the feminine character i mentioned in §. 119. may have had its effect, and may have passed over from the feminine to the other genders, according to the analogy of the Lithuanian (p. 174. Note * §. 157.): thus the i of ferentī-um reminds us of the Sanskrit feminine भरतभरति. The same is the case with the i of the neuter form ferentί-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 conjunctive vowel, like the त e in the Zend vāch-e-byō. Here it is to be observed that those consonantal bases, which admit neither i-a nor i-um, must nevertheless proceed before bus to annex an i. In the chapter upon the adjectives we shall recur to the feminine character i; and then treat also of the i for e in the singular ablative of the common dialect.
corresponding class of words) in ṣ-n-ṛ, e-n-a; hence, Old High German kēpō-ṇ-ṛ, Old Saxon gēbō-ṇ-ṛ, Anglo-Saxon gife-ṇ-a.

247. We find the bases in short and long i, in Zend, if [G. Ed. p. 285.] polysyllabic, only with euphonic n: on the other hand the monosyllabic i bases annex the termination direct, either attaching Guna to the final vowel, or keeping it pure; thus, thrī-aṁ or thray-aṁ, "trium," from thrī; vay-aṁ, "avium," from vi. Bases in > u admit both of the annexing the termination direct and of the insertion of the euphonic n; but I find from the masculine म्य ga śu only paśv-aṁ: on the other hand, I have found from feminine bases like तम् tanu, "body," म्य na śu, "corpse" (cf. वेकु according to §. 21.), hitherto only u-n-aṁ. With Guna तम् paśv-aṁ would serve as a prototype for the Gothic suniv-ē with Guna weakened (§. 27.).

248. Pronouns of the third person have, in Sanskrit, सम् sām* for जाम əm; and this may be the original and formerly universal form of the case-suffix, so that əm would properly be only the termination of the termination, and the s connected with the genitive singular would be the chief person. If this is the case, the abbreviation of this termination in substantives and adjectives must still be recognised as very ancient; for the Gothic, which in the plural nominative restricts itself so rigorously to the old limits (§. 228.), gives to the sibilant, in the genitive also, no wider scope; hence thi-zē (§. 86. 5.) = te-śām (for tē-sām, according to §. 21.) "horum"; thi-zo = tā-sām, "ha-rum." Here the a, like the ṣ of the base θα, θὸ, appears weakened to i (§. 66.): on the other hand, the adjective a and ṣ bases, which follow the pronominal declension, have ai-zē, ai-ző; and blindai-zē, "cavorum" (for bānda-zē), answers exactly to the Sanskrit तेवाम te-śām

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

(from tā-sām) from the base tā 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, istorum.*

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vrikā-n-ām, vēhrka-n-aïm, λῦκ'-oω, lupō-rum, willk'-ū, vulf'-ē.</td>
<td>veš-šām, toē-shām, ῥ'-ōω, istorum, ῥ'-ū, istorum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. tē-šām, tō-šām, Ῥ'-ōω, istorum, Ῥ'-ū, istorum.</td>
<td>jihvā-n-ām, hizva-n-aïm, χωρά-ωω, terrā-rum, rank'-ū, kepd'-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, amphorium, drachnum, agricultum, &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, nuercum (Hartung, p. 255.)—are to be regarded as correct, and do not perhaps stand for bovo-rum, &c.; as also, in Zend, the base gō may extend itself to gava. The Latin rum and Sanskrit सम śām 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, e-ων (e.g. αἰτία-ων, αἰτέ-ων, ἄγορά-ων, ἄγόπε-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 Ν has been dropped, as in μείω from μείων. According to this, λύκων would be to be derived from λυκο-ν-ων, χωράων from χωρα-ν-ων, but τῶν from τοσων τάων from τασων.

† 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>dōnhaīm*</td>
<td>tā-ov</td>
<td>istā-rum</td>
<td>ē-ū</td>
<td>thi-zh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. n. trā-yā-nām</td>
<td>trāy-anīm</td>
<td>tīri-ov</td>
<td>tri-un</td>
<td>tri-ū</td>
<td>thiyr-ē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. pritī-n-ām</td>
<td>dfrīti-n-anīm</td>
<td>pōrti-ov</td>
<td>messi-un</td>
<td>awi-ū</td>
<td>anstē-e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sānā-n-ām</td>
<td>pāsv-anīm</td>
<td>ičō-ov</td>
<td>pecu-un</td>
<td>sun-ū</td>
<td>suniv-ē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. tanū-n-ām</td>
<td>tanu-anīm</td>
<td>pītu-ov</td>
<td>socru-un</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>handiv-ē.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. gāv-ām</td>
<td>gāv-anīm</td>
<td>βo(F)ōv</td>
<td>bov-un</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nā-vām</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>να(F)ōv</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. vāch-ām</td>
<td>vāch-anīm</td>
<td>δπ-ov</td>
<td>voc-un</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| m. n. bharat-ām | bārent-anīm | φeροντ-ov | ferenti-un | .... | fiyund-ē.
| m. ātman-ām | aśman-anīm | δαιμ-ov | sermon-un | ākmen-ū | ahman-ē. |
| m. bhrātri-n-ām | bṛāthr-anīm | πατέρ-ov | fratr-un | .... | .... |

* This word often occurs, and corresponds to the Sanskrit चासान ए-साम "harum," "earum" (५. 56bh); from ए त, एन्हाईम would be expected, which I am unable to quote. The compound (polysyllabic) pronominal bases shorten the last syllable but one; hence, एर-ताहाम not एत-दाहाम, as might be expected from एन्हाम etā-sām.

† Or, also, एन्हाम barantāim, as in the Vendidad Sāde, p. 131, एन्हाम saochantāim, "lucentium:" on the other hand, also frequently saochentāim.

‡ This and the following genitives from bases in ar are clearly more refined 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 ः ri, and has then treated it according to the analogy of vowels. From आत nar frequently occurs nar-anīm, with retention of the a, on account of the base being monosyllabic: on the other hand, āthr-anīm from ātar, "fire," and एन्हाम tisr-anīm "trium," fem. for the Sanskrit तिस्र एन्हाम (Gramm. Crit. r. 255.). From अत एन्हाम dughdhar, we find the form dughdher-anīm (cf. p. 208, G. Ed. Note †): the Codex has, however, dughdār-anīm (p. 472, L. 2.). In general, in this word the readings dughdhar and dugdar are interchanged in various passages: the former, however, is the more common.
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LOCATIVE.

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

* Therefore, in Zend, the locative श श shu thrisva, "in tribus," is identical with श श su thrisva, "the third part," since the pronoun in the latter compound denotes the idea of part.

† Regarding the termination श of the pronoun of the 1st and 2d person see §. 222. From the Æolic form ἦμισω, quoted by Hartung (p. 260) from Apoll., I cannot infer that श is an abbreviation of ἦw: if it were so, the श also in ἦw 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 σφισι for σφίv.
[G. Ed. p. 289] 251. The bases in $a$ a add to that vowel, as in many other cases, an $i$; but from $a+i$ is formed $\tau\acute{e}$ ($§. 2$), to which the Greek $oi$ corresponds; hence, $\lambda\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron\text{-}si = \nu\varphi\nu\kappa\varphi\nu$ $\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\epsilon\varsigma\text{-}shu$. Hence the $i$ in Greek has also passed over to the bases in $\alpha$, $\eta$, either preserving its full value or subscribed, while in Sanskrit the $\upsilon$ $a$ remains pure; hence, $\nu\iota\mu\alpha\nu\alpha\mu\nu\alpha\mu\nu\alpha\mu\nu\alpha\mu$ $ji\varphi\omega\varsigma\text{-}su$, with which the locatives of names of towns best agree, as $\Pi\lambda\tau\alpha\iota\alpha\varsigma$, $'\Omega\lambda\omicron\mu\mu\pi\alpha\iota\alpha$, $'\Lambda\delta\acute{e}n\epsilon\varsigma$ (Buttmann, $§. 116$. R. 7. and Hartung, p. 461.).

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zent.</th>
<th>Lithuan.</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m. vrikê-shu, vêhrkaê-shva, willu-se, $\lambda\omicron\kappa\omicron\omicron$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. jihwê-su, hizâ-hva, ranko-sa, $\Omega\lambda\omicron\mu\mu\pi\alpha\iota\alpha$, $\chi\omicron\omicron\alpha$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. pûti-shu, ôfrîti-shva,† $\lambda\omicron\iota$-sa, $\pi\omicron\omicron\tau\iota$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. sînu-shu, pâsu-shva, dangû-se, $i\chi\omicron\theta\omicron$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. f. go-shu, . . . , . . . , $\beta\omicron$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. nau-shu, . . . , . . . , $\nu\alpha\upsilon$-si.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The common termination $ois, ais$ ($oi$-$\varsigma$, $ai$-$\varsigma$), formed by curtailing $oi$-$\sigma\iota$, $ai$-$\sigma\iota$, and so brought into agreement of sound with the third declension, is here lost, through its apparent connection with the Sanskrit curtained instrumental ending $\rho\eta\varsigma$ $d\iota\varsigma$ ($§. 219.$), which had before required consideration, because the Greek dative is also used as the instrumental.

† I have no authority for the locative of the Zend bases in $i$, but it can only be analogous to that of the bases in $u$, which can be referred to in copious instances.
Thus, in the Vend. Sāde, p. 499, दक्षताह्वा, from दक्षतस उसहाव, and p. 501, दक्षताह्वा, from दक्षतस दामान.

† The a in this form is not, as is generally supposed, a conjunctive vowel, but rests on a transposition; as थपकोव for थपकोव, and in Sanskrit द्रक्षामि draksyāmi, “I will see,” for द्रक्षामि darkṣyāmi (Sansk. Gramm. §84b): thus παράσι (compare τετράσι) for παράσι (compare τέσσαρας), which, by preserving the original vowel, agrees with the Sanskrit base πιτας better than παρέπα, παρέπεσ, &c. The same applies to the dative ἄρνας, since the theme of ἄρνος has, as appears from the cognate word πιν, ἄρνυ, ἄρνη, rejected a vowel between the π and ν, which again appears in the dative plural in the form of an a, and removed from its place. The whole REN appears to be a transposition of ΝΕΡ, Sanskrit नर nar (नृ), “a man,” for ἄρνυ properly means “male sheep.” The a of ἄρνας is therefore etymologically identical with that of ἄνδρας (comp. Kühner’s complete Greek Grammar, §281. Rem. 2). It is more difficult to give any accurate account of the a of viάσι: it is either the older and stronger form for the ε of viέτι, or this word must have had, besides its three themes (‘ΙΟ, ‘ΥΙ, ‘ΙΕΥ), a fourth, ΥΙΑΤ, from which came viάσι, as γονατι from ΤΟΝΑΤ, the more prevailing co-theme of ΤΟΝΥ, which latter agrees with जानु jānu.

† In the Vendidad Sāde, p. 499, we find the analogous plural locatives दक्षताह्वा, and सापोह्वा. Anquetil translates the former by “au lever du soleil,” and the latter by “à la nuit.” It is impossible to pronounce these forms aught but derivatives from themes in ज ए (§ 2, § 56b). Most of the cases of the latter word, which occurs very frequently in various forms, spring from a theme in ज ए ar, and the interchange of दक्षताह्वा csapar with दक्षताह्वा csapó is a similar case to that in Sanskrit, where अहन ahan, “day,” forms some cases from चहस ahas (from which चहो ahō in चहोभिस ahobhis, &c.); and together with
G. Ed. p. 291.]

"Remark.—From the bases in ΕΣ, to which the dative ἐσσι (= चस्तु as-su) properly belongs, this form appears to have imparted itself to other bases terminating 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 ισ (from ις and ιθις, from as), in Old High German forms, as hūsir, "houses," chalpir "calves," which are the plural themes, with which the nominative, accusative, and vocative are identical, and from which, in the dative, by the addition of the ending for that case, arises hūsirum, chalpirum; as, in Greek, κώνεσ-ςι, νεκύεσσι, πάντεσσι, γυναίκεσσι, πολύεσσι, and others, from the unorganically increased themes KYΝΕΣ, NEΚΥΕΣ, &c., according to the analogy of 'ΕΠΕΣ. From the doubled Σ one may then be rejected (άνάκτεσσιν, πολίεσσι, μύνεσσι), or the doubling of a Σ by itself be employed; as, for example, νέκυ-ςσι, for νέκυ-ςςι. This, with the theme चहस ं exists another, चहर अहर. 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 ι, namely चस्फानक esapan, of which the genitive pl. चस्फानकκ caśfannaim—analogous with चहस ं ahnām, "dierum" (§. 40. relative to ṣ for ṣ p)—is found in connection with the feminine numeral चस्फानककक kaśpanām, "trium" (Vend. S. p. 246); for we read, i. e. §. 163., aśnaṁmeha (= चहात्र ahnaṁeha), caśfanaṁmeha (read caśfanaṁmeha), "of days and nights." In Sanskrit, by the suffix च a, the form चहिन ahna, derivative, but equal in its meaning, has arisen out of चहन ahn, which, however, occurs only in compounds (as चहात्र पुरवर्णह, "the early part of the day"), and in the adverbial dative चहर्य ahnāya, "soon," "immediately," which, therefore, it is not necessary to deduce from the root ह् 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, aśfannak esafna from मुर्यस्तक esapan; whence we find the locative चस्फानककक caśfā, which might also be taken for the dative of मुर्यस्तक esapan,
in most important particulars, is adopted by Thiersch, §. 128., for the development of the forms in εσσι; only that he withdraws from the neuter bases described in §. 128., as ΒΕΛΕΣ, the Σ which belongs to them, and, by a supposition, proved to be erroneous, ΒΕΛΕ is made the theme: and he divides forms like όχεσφι into όχε-σφι instead of όχεσ-σφι, and, by assimilation, derives όχεσ-σσι from όχεσ-σφι; while, as I believe I have proved, the forms όχεσ-σφι and όχεσσι 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 γουνασ-σι, from γουνατ-σι, so that the first letter has assimilated itself to the second, not the reverse. In δέπασ-σι we shall leave it undecided whether the first Σ be primitive, and ΔΕΠΑΣ the theme (comp. γηρας; §. 128.), or whether it has arisen out of τ, and so ΔΕΠΑΤ with ΤΕΠΑΤ, ΚΕΠΑΤ, belong to one class. If, 

cspan, but that it is preceded (V. S. p. 163.) by the unequivocal adjective locative Χηρυς naéme (from Χηρυς naéma, "half"). Compare, also, l. c. §. 149., where χηρυς ηρυς ηρυς ηρυς = ηρυς ithra, ašē, ithra, esafnē, probably means "in this day," "in this night," with the locative adverb ηρυς ithra, "here," in the sense of a locative demonstrative. To the theme χηρυς esafna, the plural of the same sound esafna, might also be assigned, which occurs l. c. §§. 330. 331., and in several places elsewhere: χηρυς θραυδ σαφνα, "three nights," χηρυς κραοσ εσαφνα, "six nights," χηρυς ηνυς νυνυε σαφνα, "nine nights," if here esafna be not (as in §. 231. Note ë it was considered to be) rather to be taken for the plural of χηρυς 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 Χηρυς csaparât, 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, δτ for at.
however, in all these forms, we allow only σ, or σν, to be the
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 ἐπεσσαί, not to men-
tion unorganic forms like κύνεσσαί, did the entire εσσαί present
[G. Ed. p. 293.] itself as pertaining to that which marked
the case; for in the feeling of the speaker ἐπεσσαί could pre-
sent itself, during that period of the language, only as what
it is, namely, as ἐπεσσ-σ, while ἐπεσσος, ἐπεσσαί plural ἐπεσσα and
not ἐπεσσ, &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. s.), in the most ma-
terial points following Greg. Cor. ΑΕol. §. 35., relative to the
production of the Greek plural datives. Kühner says (l. c.)

The character of the dative plural is ες (character of the
plural) and i or iv (character of the dative singular), there-
fore, εσι(ν).” I, however, think ες 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 neutral nouns, to
which ες in the nominative is quite foreign, arrive, in the
dative, at their identity of form with the natural sexes? It
further deserves to be remarked, that, in Prākrit, the
locative ending स ज su frequently assumes an Anuswāra, and
so adapts itself, by the form स ज suñ, for su, to the Greek,
σν, for σ.

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

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

**SINGULAR.**

**Nominative,** Sanskrit *vrīka-s,* Lithuanian *wilka-s,* Zend *vēhrk-ō,* with *cha,* *vēhrkas-cha,* Greek *λύκο-ς,* Latin *lupu-s,* Gothic *vulf-s.*

**Accusative,** Sanskrit, *vrīka-m,* Lithuanian *wilka-ń,* Zend *vēhrkē-m,* Greek *λύκο-ν,* Latin *lupu-m,* Gothic *vulf.*

**Instrumental,** Sanskrit *vrīkē-ṇ-a,* Zend *vēhrka,* Gothic Dat. *vulfa,* Lithuanian Instr. *wilka.*

**Dative,** Sanskrit *vrīkāya,* Zend *vēhrkāi,* Lithuanian *wilku.*

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

**Genitive,** Sanskrit *vrīka-sya,* Greek *λύκο-(ς)σ,* Zend *vēhrka-hē,* 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 *vrīkas* 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* shews, moreover, the equally common interchange of gutturals and labials, and follows the rule for the alteration of letters (Asp. for Tennis, see §. 87.). In Latin the same thing takes place with regard to the supply of the guttural by the corresponding labial; but *lupus* is further altered through the loss of the initial letter *V;* as is the Greek *λύκο-ς:* it may, however, be assumed, that this *v* is introduced into the middle of the word in being vocalized into *u.* While therefore, in Lithuanian, in *wilkas,* *l* and *k* are united, they are, in Greek, separated by *v.*

† M. Reimnitz, whose pamphlet, "The System of Greek Declension" (Potsdam, 1831), had not been seen by me before I completed the preceding Part of this book, unfolds (l. c. p. 122 passim) the same views concerning
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FORMATION OF CASES.

Locative, Sanskrit vriki (from vrika + i), Zend vehrke [G. Ed. p. 295.] (maidhyi, §. 196.), Lithuanian wilke, Greek Dat. λύκε (ο'κοι §. 195.) Latin Gen. lup'i.

Vocative, Sanskrit vrika, Zend vehrka, Lithuanian wilke, Greek λύκε, Latin lupe, Gothic vulf.

DUAL.


Instr. Dat.Abl. Sanskrit vriká-bhyám, Zend vehrkaéi-bya, Greek Dat. Gen. λύκο-ιυ, Lithuanian Dat. wilka-m (see §. 215.).


PLURAL.


Accusative, Sanskrit vriká-n, Zend vehrka-n, Goth. vulfin-ns, Greek λύκο-υς (from λύκο-υς, §. 236.), Lithuanian wilkus, Latin lupó-s.

the Greek oco and its connection with the Sanskrit a-sya which I have, without being aware of his concurrence, brought forward in §. 189. I have, however, in this respect, already stated my views in my pamphlet "On the Demonstrative and the Origin of Case" (in the Transactions of the Hist. Phil. Class of the Academy of Science of Berlin for the year 1826, p. 100. Here I have only further to observe, that the Greek adj δημόσιος, from the root ΔΗΜΟς, is, in the suffix by which it is formed, probably connected with the genitive ending in the text; and is therefore remarkable with reference to the preservation of the s, which is lost in δημοτο. With regard to the origin of δημόσιος from the genitive, let reference be made to the Latin cujus, a, um; and the identity of the Sanskrit suffix of words like मनुष manushya, "man," as a derivative from Mann, with the genitive ending स hya for स sya, as in समुष amu-sya, "illus."

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

Instrumental, Sanskrit vrikā-is* (from vrikā-bhis), Vēda vrikē-bhis, Zend vēhrkā-is, Lithuanian wilka-is. Prākṛit dēve-hīn (from dēva, "God," see §. 220.), Greek θεό-φιν,† Gothic Dat. Instr. wulfa-m (§. 215).

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

Genitive, Sanskrit vrike-bhyas, Zend vēhrka-n-am, Greek λύκ'-uν, 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 λύκo-us; 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 φιν in the plural is perhaps identical with the Sanskrit भिस bhis, and the thence-derived Prākṛit भिर hiin, and the Latin bis in nobis, vobis; and I will not advance more than a conjecture here, also, in comparing θεό φιν with dēve-hīn. This only is certain, that with the syllable भि bhi, which in Sanskrit, lies at the bottom of the case-forms भिस bhis, भ्यम bhyam, and भास bhaṣ am, as their common root (see §. 215. passim), the Greek φι and φιν is also to be associated. I here willingly agree with M. Ag. Bernay (Berl. Ann. July 1833, p. 51.), that φιν might be formed from the ending भ्यम bhyam (§. 222.) by the contraction of य य य a into i (as in ḫiāw, ḫiīr, ḫeīv, &c. §. 222.). The third possible supposition would be the derivation from the usual dative-ablative plural termination भ्यस 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 τον, τον from पαθ that, τας tas. The fourth possible case would be the derivation from the dual termination भास bhaṣ am (§. 215.), and the changing this number of restricted plurality to that of unlimited plurality. I prefer, however, to consider φιν (φι) as from one of the multifarious terminations of the Sanskrit plural belonging to all declensions; therefore, from भिस bhis or भ्यस bhyas.
FORMATION OF CASES.

Locative, Sanskrit vriké-shu, Zend vēhrkaé-shva, Lithuanian wilkûse, Greek Dat. λό¯κοι-σι.

NEUTER BASES IN α, GREEK ε, LATIN u, o.

SINGULAR.

Nom. Acc. Sanskrit dāna-m, Zend dātē-m, Latin donu-m, Greek δωρο-v, Lithuanian gēra, Gothic daur'.

Vocative, Sanskrit dāna, Zend dāta, Gothic daur'.

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 əbdoj aŋhvō which are to be twice found in V. S. p. 312, and on both occasions are rendered by Anquetil, whose

* First, a review of this Part in the Journal des Savans, which refers particularly to the Zend; then the First Part of the First Volume of a Commentary on the Yaçna; lastly, a disquisition in the Nouveau Journal Asiatique, "Sur les mots Zends et Sanscrits Vahista et Vasïshta, 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 यायाव माधवी, 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. यायाव ubोयध, according to that authority, corresponds with the Sanskrit उभयों ubhayōs (amborum, in ambobus), with ो 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 ो of यायाव ubोयध, as I have been so fortunate as to find another example for the hitherto missing dual case, in which यायाव aयध, not यायाव तबद, actually occurs; because, that is to say, no letter exercising the force of assimilation in question precedes the a—I mean the form यायाव माधवी zaśayõ ( = Sanskrit hastayōs), “in the hands,” from माधवी zaśa, [G.Ed. p.298.] in a passage of the Jzschne, which has perhaps not yet been examined by M. Burnouf (V. S. p. 351.): ज्ञात्मक काथायू साधै द्रूजे म द्यान्म द्यातयो, which Anquetil (p. 192) translates by “Comment moi pur, mettrais-je le main sur le Daroudj?” It appears, however, that माधवी aśāi can as little be a nominative as यायाव माधवी zaśayõ 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 anā in bases in a (Yaṣna, p. 98. passim), with n introduced, for the sake of euphony,

* The Codex has faultily माधवी aśāi and ज्ञात्मक druṣjem.
according to the analogy of the Sanskrit रन एना (§. 158).
He rests this, among other forms, on that of म्रणुएम माः maesmana, "urind," a word which had often attracted my attention, and from which I, in like manner, would have deduced instrumentals in a-n-a if I had not differed from Burnouf in the etymology of the same, as I make its theme terminate in n; and this word, which I remember to have seen only in the instrumental, I derive from the Sanskrit root न मह "mingere," by a suffix मन man, according to the analogy of म्रणुएम बरेस्माण barēsman, from बृह vrīh, "to grow," whose instrumental म्रणुएम बरेस्माण barēsmana, analogous with म्रणुएम माः maesmana, occurs very frequently. M. Burnouf appears, on the other hand, to adopt a suffix ma in the word maesmana, in which we think we cannot agree with him as long as we cannot supply any cases which must indubitably belong to a theme in a. If, further, some words, which in their theme terminate in म as (०, Sanskrit चस as), adopt ana in the instrumental form—M. Burnouf quotes, p. 100 note, म्रणुएम mazana, म्रणुएम इरायाणa, and म्रणुएम vanhanai; still, in my opinion, bases in a may be assigned as the origin of these forms, and they can be divided mazan-a, &c., only in as far as such forms have been already proved to belong to undoubted bases in a. But now we prefer dividing them mazan-a, so that the letter s, with which these themes originally terminate, is interchanged with a nasal, just as,

[G. Ed. p. 299.] in Sanskrit, the words यक्रयृक्षृक्ष yakrit, यक्रृत saktir change their t for n in the weak cases, and may substitute यक्रयृक्षृक्ष yakan, यक्रृत sakan; or as, in more remote analogy, the Greek, in the first person plural, has formed μεν from μεσ (सस mas, "mus"). Besides this, M. Burnouf cites also the interrogative instrumental म्रण kana, "with what?" which is the only word that brings to my mind somewhat of conviction, and had struck my attention before, in passages like म्रणुएम म्रण kana mazna yazānē, "with
what offering shall I sacrifice?” (V. S. p. 481.) I have not, however, ventured to draw a grammatical deduction from this form, because the pronominal bases are prone to unite with one another, and because I believed I might assume that the same pronoun which is contained in अन ana and एन ena forms also the last element of अन kana, if from this base the instrumental only had been evolved or preserved, as has also occurred in the Sanskrit अन ana and एन ena in but a few cases. For the rest, the Greek keivos also appears connected with this अन kana, if it is looked upon as a theme, with which the instrumental must agree in sound, for keivos, if not directly of interrogative meaning, is still plainly connected with the old interrogative base (comp. कण kāśchana, “whoever.”). Under these circumstances I cannot yet admit of any instrumentals in a-n-a, especially as also the bases in i and u (in which the Sanskrit in the masculine and neuter likewise introduces a euphonic n) in the Zend, in words which we have noticed, have dispensed with a similar insertion (§. 160.). In another place (Journal des Savans), M. Bur- nouf deduces the frequently-occurring instrumental अशय ashayd, “with purity,” from the masculine theme अशा asha; and there would be accordingly अशय 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., स्वप्नया swapnayā, if one derives this, with the Indian grammarians, from a theme स्वप्न swapna. But if instrumental forms of this kind, in the Vedas or in the Zend, are not to be produced in other undoubted instances as in the case of adjectives in construction with masculine or neuter substantives, nothing prevents the assumption, that the form स्वप्नया swapnayā belongs to a feminine theme स्वप्न swapnā, especially as the suffix न na occurs also in other abstractions in the feminine form ना ud, and therefore स्वप्नया swapnayā
may be explained according to the analogy of \textit{trish-} \\
[\text{G. Ed. p. 300.}] \textit{nay\d}, “with thirst.” In every case I think I may deduce the Zend \textit{ashaya} from a feminine theme \textit{ashd}, as the Zend in general, in the substantive, passes readily from one sex to the other; and, for example, with a masculine base \textit{maithra}, “a speech,” occurs, also, a feminine \textit{maithra}.

“Remark 3.—For the genitive termination \textit{he} there also exists, as Burnouf has most satisfactorily proved, a form nearer to the Sanskrit \textit{syā}, viz. \textit{hyd}, which, although rather rare in comparison with the more corrupt form \textit{he}, is still sufficiently frequent in some chapters of the Jizeschne to satisfy one perfectly of its signification, according to the proofs given by Burnouf. I too had remarked words with the ending \textit{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 \textit{he}, and was, moreover, concealed from me under the appearance of an instrumental form. However, the termination \textit{hyd}—for which is sometimes found, also, \textit{khyd}—approaches so very near to the Sanskrit \textit{syā}, and agrees with it so precisely according to rule, as far as the unorganic lengthening of the \textit{a}, that a single passage, with the accurate translation of Neriosingh, who, in the passages hitherto edited, follows the original word by word, would have led us to it. Such a passage is given, although with a different aim, by Burnouf in his Yaçna (Notes, p. cxxxix.), which we here annex, as it is interesting in other respects, also, for grammar:—

\begin{quote}
\textit{kasnd} zai\textit{thw}a \textit{pat}a \textit{ashahyd} \textit{paourvy\d} \textit{kasnd} k\textit{heng strencha d\d}t ad\textit{hv\d}n\d. Neriosingh translates this passage word for word, only that he renders \textit{kasnd}, “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 पुन्यस्य प्रथम कः दृष्टययस्य तार्कानाथे दृष्ट वर्णीम् को जनानेः पिता पुन्यस्य प्रथमाः [G. Ed. p. 301.]

ratvan kaś chakre, i.e. "boni originem quis fecit?"

kahi सूर्याया tārākānāncha daddū padavim (कित मानेन तेपाठ्क को देवी 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 AucuTcaWf zanthud, for which, in the lithographed codex, p. 351, is erroneously given -WJ^^W zarithd, is plainly the instrumental of जान्तु जान्तु; which would correspond to the theme of a Sanskrit infinitive, जान्तु मण्डाम, as the latter is feminine, and to which I have, in another place, referred the ablative जान्तु जान्तु (Gramm. Crit. p. 253.). This form is, besides, remarkable on this account, viz. that it is identical with the Sanskrit instrumental gerund, which, from जान जान, without a conjunctive vowel and without the euphonious suppression of the न n, would sound जानान्तु. 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, जानथवा janthwa is to be read for zanthwā), 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: जनानेः, 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 prathamā, "primum," is a corruption for प्रथम: prathamāḥ, "primus," which answers to the original, and is to be expected from the sense.

† Vide as to सन्तुक्तं zanthwā, p. 1244 G. ed.
the preposition "through" (for example, Nal. XII. 89.). Considered as a genitive, जननी jananēli would not correspond with जननी क जानीत्व zan̄thwā, which cannot possibly be a genitive, for the genitive of जानुक zantu could only be जानुक क जानुक zanteus, or, also, जानुक क जानीत्व zan̄thwā, or जानुक क जानुक zantavā (see §. 187.), but in no case जानुक क जानीत्व zan̄thwā. Add to this, also, that जननी जननी jananī jananī is feminine, like the Zend जानुक zantu, and पुनःप्यसया punyasya, therefore, could no more pass as the epithet of जननी jananēli than, in Zend, अशाह्यतम asahâyā could pass as the epithet of जानुक क जानीत्व zan̄thwā. I will, however, as concerns the Zend, lay no great stress on this circumstance, since in it the genders of the substantive are constantly changing. M. Burnouf, who looks upon जननी jananēli as a genitive, and refers पुनःप्यसया punyasya to it, according to this interpretation justly takes objection to the पुनःप्यसया punyasya, which does not agree with the gender of जननी जननी jananī jananī, but he confirms, however, the reading expressly by the addition of a

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

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

* In other places (V. S. p. 385) Anquetil renders (p. 137) the words अशाह्यतम
de lui même les astres qui ne sont pas a deux faces?" The sun is here quite left out of the question; and it must be acknowledged, that, as far as relates to etymology, it is very much obscured in this passage; we might identify, with reference to the form of गङ्गांग khang, this expression with the reflective pronoun गङ्गा kha (as in kha-dāta, "created of itself," which is often said of the stars, as of self-created lights), and consider it as the epithet of गङ्गांग stren-cha; so that it would correspond as accusative plural to the Sanskrit गङ्गांग swān. It is here to be remarked, that in some chapters of the Jyeshchne, गङ्गा 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, गङ्गांग dushacsathreng,* गङ्गांग dusskyādhineng, गङ्गांग dushdākheng. Anquetil, indeed, renders these expressions as singular nominatives, "ce roi mechant, qui fait le mal, attaché à la mauvaise loi"; but they, together with [G. Ed. p. 308.] गङ्गांग dushvachanhō, गङ्गांग dushmananhō, refer to the plural गङ्गांग drēgvatō, and I have no doubt of their accusative nature: the whole passage, however, like many others in the Jyeshchne, 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 गङ्गांग kheng,

* The lithographed MS. has गङ्गांग dusa caathreng as two words; the a is, however, clearly only a conjunctive vowel, to unite the prefix गङ्गांग dush more conveniently with the following मस्केस.
the ख makes no difficulty in this expression, even in its acceptance for the sun, for which, commonly, द्वारवेद त्वारे is found (the Sanskrit त्वार, "heaven"), as ख is used very frequently for न्व ह्व (see §. 35.); but we might here expect to find द्वारवेद त्वारे, and may suppose that the न्व 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 द्वारवेद त्वार in "day," with द्वार in the Zend, that of द्वारवेद त्वार, "night," with द्वार in the Zend (I write it thus, and not द्वारवेद त्वार, designedly, see §. 44.). At all events I take द्वारवेद त्वार to be the accusative, if, indeed, it may not also be conjectured that the base द्वारवेद त्वार may have entirely lost its र, and that it may be द्वारवेद त्वार for द्वारवेद त्वार, the accusative of a base द्वार त्वार, द्वारवेद त्वार, 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 द्वारवेद त्वार. Although, from this, द्वारवेद त्रेन might easily be formed by contraction and combination with त्रेन, I nevertheless prefer acknowledging in द्वारवेद त्रेन, a secondary form of द्वारवेद त्रेन, explained in §. 239.; so that the nasal, here vocalized to द, is there retained, but the sibilant has been removed (comp. §. 239.); especially as, in other places also, द्वारवेद त्रेन is found in construction with the accusative of the person, which has been given. In the Zend expression, द्वारवेद त्रेन adhvanem, the Sanskrit त्रेन adhvanam cannot fail to be observed (comp. §. 45.); but in the lithographed MS. we have instead of this, द्वारवेद त्रेन adhvanem, 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 Pârâ 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 ख is
taken for the well-known privative particle, नो duva as the number two, and the last portion finds in the Sanskrit दनाना, "countenance," its corresponding syllable.

FEMININE BASES IN ṇ, GOTHIC ṇ (§ 118.).

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

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

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

Dative, Sansk. dharā-dī, Zend hizvay-dī, Lith. ranka-ī.

Ablative, Zend hizvay-dī, Latin terra(ī).

Genitive, Sanskrit dharāy-īs, Zend hizvay-āo, Greek χόρα-ς, 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 द्वी (वर dhar, §. 1.), "to hold," "carry;" whence, also, परा 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 ṇ, I still have no doubt of the genuineness of the above form, since I can prove by other cognate case terminations: 1. That the ṇ 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. गेन्न कुर्म gēnābīs (V. S. p. 308.) from सुज्जे gēnā "woman" (γυνή).
FORMATION OF CASES.

FEMININE BASES IN i.*

**SINGULAR.**

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

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

Instrumental, Sanskrit prity-ā, Zend ἀφρίθυ-ā, Gothic Dat. Instr. anstai (without case suffix, see §. 161.).

Dative,  Sanskrit pritay-ē (or prity-āi, §. 164.), Zend ἀφρίτε-ē.

Ablative,  Zend ἀφρίτοι-ē, Latin turri-(d).

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

Locative,  Sanskrit prit-āu, (or with the feminine termination only prity-ām).

Vocative,  Sanskrit pritē, Zend ἀφρίτi, Greek πόρτι.

**DUAL.**


---

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

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


Gen. Loc. Sanskrit prīty-ōs, Zend āfrīthy-ō (?) (see p. 276. Rem. 1.).

PLURAL.


Accusative, Sanskrit prīti-s, Zend āfrīti-s, Greek πορτι-ς, Gothic ansti-ns, Lithuanian āny-s.

Instrumental, Sanskrit priti-bhis, Zend āfrīti-bis, Lithuanian awi-mis, Gothic Dat. Instr. ansti-m (§. 215.).

Dat. Abl. Sanskrit priti-bhyās, Zend āfrīti-byō, Latin turri-bus, Lithuanian awi-m(u)s (§. 215.).

Genitive, Sanskrit priti-n-ām, Zend āfrīti-n-āṇm, Latin turri-um, Greek πορτι-ων, Lithuanian awi-ū, Gothic anstē-ē.

Locative, Sanskrit priti-shu, Zend āfrīti-shva (or āfrīti-shu), Lithuanian āni-sa, Greek Dat. πορτι-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 turē-s and similar forms.
FORMATION OF CASES.

MASCULINE BASES IN u.

SINGULAR.

Nominative, Sanskrit sunu-s, Gothic sunu-s, Lithuanian sunu-s, Zend pasu-s, Latin pecu-s, Greek bɔrtu-s.

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

Instrumental, Sanskrit sānu-n-ā (Vēda prabāhav-ā, from prabāhu, §. 158.), Zend paśv-a, Gothic Dat. Instr. sunau.

Dative, Sanskrit sānau-ē, Zend paśv-ē, Lithuanian sunu-ī.

Ablative, Zend paśaū-ā, Latin pecu-(d).

Genitive, Sanskrit sānu-s (from sunau-s), Gothic sunau-s, Lithuanian sunau-s, Zend pasēu-s or paśu-ō (from paśu-ā), Latin pecū-s, Greek bɔrtu-os.

Locative, Sanskrit sānā-dū.

Vocative Sanskrit sun (from sunau), Gothic sunau, Lithuanian sunau, Zend paśu, Greek bɔrtu.

DUAL.


Instr. Dat. Abl. Sanskrit sānu-bhyām, Zend paśu-bya, Greek bɔrtu-o-iv, Lithuanian sunu-m (§. 215.).


PLURAL.

Nom. Voc. Sanskrit sānu-as, Greek bɔrtu-es, Zend paśu-ō (with cha, paśvaš-cha), Latin pecū-s, Gothic sunyu-s (for suniu-s, from sunau-s, §. 230.), Lithuanian sunu-s.

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

Genitive. Sanskrit s\(\text{\text{a}nu-n-\text{\text{a}}m}\) Zend p\(\text{\text{a}v-\text{\text{a}}m}\), Latin pecu-um, Greek \(\beta\sigma\tau\rho\upsilon-\omega\nu\), Gothic suniv-\(\text{\text{a}}\), Lithuanian sun\(\text{\text{a}}-\text{\text{u}}\).

Locative. Sanskrit s\(\text{\text{a}nu-shu}\), Zend p\(\text{\text{a}sh-\text{\text{a}}va}\) (or p\(\text{\text{a}sh-\text{\text{a}}shu}\)), Lithuanian sun\(\text{\text{u}}-\text{\text{se}}\), Greek Dat. \(\beta\sigma\tau\rho\upsilon-\text{\text{a}}\).

Remark.—Feminine bases in \(u\) in Sanskrit differ in declension from the masculine, exactly as, p. 305 G. Ed., गृंति \(p\text{\text{r}\text{\text{i}}t}\) f. differs from शह्रगन \(\text{\text{a}gni}\) in.

NEUTER BASES IN \(u\).

SINGULAR.
Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit madhu, Zend madhu, Greek \(\mu\varepsilon\theta\upsilon\), Latin pecu, Gothic faihu.

The rest like the masculine.

DUAL.
Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit madhu-\(n-\text{\text{a}}\).

The rest like the masculine.

PLURAL.
Nom. Acc. Voc. Sanskrit madhu-\(n-i\), Zend madhv-\(a\), Greek \(\mu\varepsilon\theta\upsilon-\text{\text{a}}\), Latin pecu-\(a\).

The rest like the masculine.

FEMININE BASES IN \(u\).

SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. n(\text{\text{a}ri}), &quot;woman,&quot;</td>
<td>n(\text{\text{a}ri}), &quot;woman.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus. n(\text{\text{a}ri}-\text{\text{m}})</td>
<td>n(\text{\text{a}ri}-\text{\text{m}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
<td>n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}i})</td>
<td>bhiy-(\text{\text{e}}), or bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}i), n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}i})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abr. n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}s})</td>
<td>bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}) or bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}), n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
<td>bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}) or bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}), n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
<td>bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}) or bhiy-(\text{\text{a}}), n(\text{\text{a}ry-\text{\text{a}}})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. n(\text{\text{a}ri})</td>
<td>bhi-(\text{\text{a}})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Zend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V. náry-āu, bhiy-āu, náirī (see §.213, p.227.)</td>
<td>náirī-bya.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Ab. náry-bhyām, bhē-bhyām,</td>
<td>náiry-ā?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. náry-ōs, bhiy-ōs,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. V. náry-ōs, bhiy-ōs, náiry-ō.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus. nári-s, bhiy-as, náirī-s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. nāri-bhis, bhē-bhis, náirī-bēs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Abl. nāri-bhyas, bhē-bhyas, náirī-byā.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. nāri-n-ām, bhiy-ām, náirī-n-aum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. nāri-śu, bhī-śu, náirī-shva or -shu.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Remark.—By the side of the declension of monosyllabic feminine bases in ī, which may reject the terminations peculiar to the feminine alone, may be placed the Greek [G. Ed. p. 319] Servi, and a remarkable similarity of inflexion will be observed, as Nom. bhē-s, kī-ś, Gen. bhiy-as, kī-ōs, Loc. Dat. bhiy-i, kī-i, Acc. strī-m,† kī-v, Voc. bhiy-s, kī-ś. Plural: Nom. bhiy-as, kī-ēs, Gen. bhiy-ām, kī-ōv, Loc. Dat. bhiy-śu, kī-śi, Acc. bhiy-as, kī-ās, Voc. bhiy-as, kī-ēs. 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 ī of kī was not the original concluding radical letter of the word, but that a consonant has fallen out after the ī. I would rather, however, leave the question as to this consonant undecided, than assume

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

† Or, like the other monosyllabic words in ī, with the termination am, strī-ām.
that KIF is the true theme, and that the nominative was originally KIF; for if KIF, KI, in the form in which they have been received, be analogous to ΔΙΩΣ, ΔΙ' , from ΔΙΦΟΣ, ΔΙΦΙ, still, to establish a theme KIF, a proof must be brought similar to that which really attaches to ΔΙΦΙ from its being found in inscriptions. And besides this, that which of itself is alone sufficient proof, the cognate Sanskrit word देव दिव, “heaven” (§. 122.) likewise attests a digamma. All ground for supposing a theme KIF is, however, wanting, for the long i could, as in the Sanskrit मि bhi, and like the long ν in ὀφρός, be also the real final letter of the base, only that the long i in the Sanskrit, except in compounds (for example गतभी gata-bhi m.f., “void of fear,” जलभी m.f., “water-drinking,” see Gramm. Crit. §§. 169.170.), concludes only the feminine themes. We will therefore seek elucidation regarding the Greek KIF 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 किः, as well in form as in meaning; namely, in की kī, Nom. कीस kīs-s, “insect” “worm,” which would lead us to expect in the Greek ΚΙΟΣ, Acc. ΚΙΟΝ, to which κίς, κιν, bear the same relation as μέγας, μέγαν, to the to be presupposed μέγαλος, μέγαλον. I do not consider it requisite to assume a theme MEGAT, 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 महान mahant, Nom. masc. महान mahān, which would correspond to the Greek μεγαν.”

**Feminine Bases in ू, ू.**

**Sanskrit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accus.</td>
<td>vadhū-म, bhrū-म,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>vadhū-ा, bhrū-ा,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>vadhū-०, bhrū-० (or -०),...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ὀφρό-ς.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὀφρό-ν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Singular

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

### Dual

| **N. Ac. V.** vadhu-āu, | bhruv-āu, | ὠφρύ-ε. |
| **I. D. Ab.** vadhu-bhyām. | bhru-bhyām. | ὠφρύ-ο-ιν. |
| **G. L.** vadhu-ōs, | bhruv-ōs. |... |

### Plural

| **N. V.** vadhu-as, | bhruv-as, | ὠφρύ-ες. |
| **Accus.** vadhu-s, | bhruv-as, | ὠφρύ-ας. |
| **Instr.** vadhu-bhis, | bhru-bhis, |... |
| **D. Abl.** vadhu-bhyas, | bhru-bhyas, |... |
| **Gen.** vadhu-n-ām, | bhruv-ān (or bhru-ν-ām), | ὠφρύ-ων. |
| **Loc.** vadhu-śhu, | bhru-śhu, | ὠφρύ-σι. |

**Remark.**—The identity of भ्रु bhru and ὠφρύ* is sufficient proof that the length of the व is organic (comp. §. 121.), and it is not necessary, therefore, to suppose a theme ὠφρύφ (comp. Kühner §. 289.) so as to consider ὠφρύς as coming from ὠφρυς, and the long व as a compensation for the rejected 卬, as perhaps μέλας from μέλας. That, however, ἧ originally stood—for example, ὠφρυφος—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 व in this case is justified, for the Sanskrit

---

* The o in ὠφρύς 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 ὡνξ, ὡνω, to नक्ष्म nāma, is shewn
changes, that is to say in polysyllables, as well v as û, before vowel terminations, into a simple v; but in monosyllables, in order to avoid commencing with two consonants, or to gain a polysyllabic form, the semi-vowel has its corresponding short vowel placed before it, and thus is formed ०ष uv (०ुv), as well from u as from â, as, under a similar condition, ०ष from i and ì: hence the two opposite forms, for example, vadhu-as (not vadhuv-as), "women," and bhruv-as (not bhruv-as), "the eyebrows." as above, bhiy-as (not bhy-as), opposed to nâry-as (nâriy-as). In the dative plural the short v of ðϕϕv-σι for ðϕϕv-σι may be attributed to the effeminate habit of regularly shortening the v before vowel terminations."

**BASES IN âu (अ००,)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>nâu-s</td>
<td>ναο-σ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>nâv-am</td>
<td>ναο-ν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>nâv-as</td>
<td>να(F)-όσ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>nâv-i</td>
<td>να(F)-ί.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>nâu-s</td>
<td>ναο-σ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>[G. Ed. p. 313.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Acc. Voc.</td>
<td>nâv-âu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Dat. Abl.</td>
<td>nâu-bhyām</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PLURAL | | |
|--------|------------------|
| Nominative | nâv-as | να(F)-εσ. |
| Accusative | nâv-as | να(F)-ας. |
| Genitive | nâv-âm | να(F)όν. |
| Locative | nâu-shu | Dat. ναο-σί. |
| Vocative | nâv-as | να(F)-εσ. |

"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.
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in avs, evs, ovs, originally terminated in F, so that in the case before us it would be requisite to suppose a theme NAF: for even if the vocalization of F to v, in order to facilitate the junction with a consonant following, did not surprise us—(forms like vaFś, vaFśi, 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 नद्व ndv for नी nāv, and गव 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 गव gav and नद्व ndv 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 धुभिम् dyu-bhis for दिवभिम् div-bhis, which would be phonetically impossible (Gramm. Crit. §. 208.). The Latin navis cannot compel us to lay down a theme ndv for the Sanskrit and Greek, for the Latin base has extended itself by an unorganic i, as śwan, "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, VĀCH,</td>
<td>VĀCH,</td>
<td>VŪC,</td>
<td>'ΩΠ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. vāk,</td>
<td>vāc-s,</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
<td>ὦπ-ς.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accus. vāch-ām,</td>
<td>vāch-ēm</td>
<td>voc-em,</td>
<td>ὦπ-α.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. vāch-ā,</td>
<td>vāch-a,</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>......</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, vāch-ē,</td>
<td>vāch-ē.</td>
<td>......</td>
<td>...... *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Locative.
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SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ablat.</td>
<td>vāch-at,</td>
<td>voc-e(d),</td>
<td>.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>vāch-ō,†</td>
<td>voc-is,</td>
<td>ὑπ-ός.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>vāch-i, D. voc-i,</td>
<td>D. ὑπ-ι.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>vāk,</td>
<td>voc-s,</td>
<td>ὑπ-ς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

| N. Acc. V. | vāch-āu, | vāch-āo, | ..... |
| or         | vāch-ā,† | vāch-a, | ὑπ-ε. |
| I. D. Abl. | vāg-bhydm, | ..... | D. G. ὑπ-ο-ίν |
| G. L.      | vāch-ōs, | vāch-ō, | ..... |

PLURAL.

| N. V.      | vāch-as, | vāch-ō,† | voc-es, | ὑπ-ἐσ. |
| Accus.     | vāch-as, | vāch-ō,† | voc-es, | ὑπ-ας. |
| Instr.     | vāg-bhis, | ..... | ..... |
| D. Abl.    | vāg-bhyas, | voc-i-bus, | ..... |
| Gen.       | vāch-ājm, | 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 ξ e, in forms like ἱφαίοτα raochebís, no longer as a conjunctive vowel; and therefore no longer attribute the said form to a theme ἱφαίοτα raoch, but assume that ἱφαίοτα raochebís, and similar forms, have proceeded from bases in ἵο(ἐν from as §. 56"'); so that I look upon the ξ e as a corruption of the ὑ, and to the form ἱφαίοτα raochebyό I place as anterior a lost form ἵοτα raochó-byό.§ 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 ἵοτα mazebís, ἵοτα manebís,
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[G. Ed. p. 316.] I find, in the Prakrit (Urvasi, by Lenz, p. 40.), अच्छरीह in for अच्छरीह (Sanskrit अप्सरहिः); and if this form is genuine, then the ए, in forms like अच्छरीह राचेभिः, appears to stand for ए, as generally many interchanges between ए and अ occur, although in the case before us the ए is very constantly written, and अ has not yet been pointed out in its place. If it is further considered that we often find ए ये for ए यो, “which,” ए के for ए को, “who?” and in the pronoun of the 2d person in the plural also ए वे for ए वो; and, finally, in the pronoun of the 1st person ए ने for ए नो; 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-

...
nations beginning with $b$ as yet no $d$ has been pointed out; so that $b$ appears to be as repugnant to a preceding $d$ as favourable to a following $d$, if the conjecture of Burnouf, mentioned at p. 297, G. Ed., is well-founded. On this point I was not yet clearly informed, when, at §§ 224. and 242., I inconsiderately imagined I could deduce $vachō-\text{bya}, \text{vachō-biś}$, from $vachō$ (from $vachas$). Instead of this should be read $\text{vache-bya, vache-biś}$; and besides this, in the locative singular, $vachahi$ for $\text{vachas}$ $vachaṇhi$; 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 $vāghzhbyō$, which itself never occurs. Although these forms, which had struck me likewise, clearly belong to a theme which means "discourse," and is connected with our $vāch$, I would still rather not, with Burnouf, derive it from $vāch$; so that the nominative of this, $\text{vācs}$, raised to a secondary theme, would be contained therein. We dare not, without further authority, attribute to the Zend such a malformation, although it derives its superlatives in $\text{tēma}$ from the masculine nominative, instead of from the theme. But Anquetil, in his Glossary, gives a form $vakhsenghe$, "parole utile," which we ought probably to read $vacsanhe$ (as dative), if not with long $a$ $\text{vacsanhe}$. This latter form would belong to a theme $vācsō$ ($\text{vācasā}$); from which, in the dat. abl. pl., $vāghzhbyō$ ($\text{vāghēzhbyō}$, &c.) might proceed for $\text{vācsbyō}$; as with $\text{mazebś, mazebś, manebś, manebś}$, for the $s$ of $\text{vācsō}$ must, as Burnouf has shewn, in contact with $b$ become $zh$. 
impossible for me to use) the locative वचाहि vachahi; that is to say, in the Vend. S. p. 173, where, for वचाहिण्य manahēcā vachahēcā, is to be read वचाहिण्य 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 paitīs, while, according to §. 180. p. 196, Note †, paitōis is to be written, still the form paitōis was, in its time, instructive in the main, and first taught me that the Sanskrit genitive termination ē-s corresponds to the form ēs in the Zend. If, too, Rask has incorporated in his scheme of declensions the ablative paitōit (for paitōit), 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 was the first to discover; namely this, that bases in i form their ablative in ēit, 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 unfa- vourably 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 considera- tions, and I am very ready to complete and adjust them through those of M. Burnouf. For in this book also, in regard to Zend Grammar, one must carefully distinguish the disquisitions given in the text from the general comparison added at the end of each rule regarding case. In the former I give only those Zend forms which I have seen, and I thence deduce theoretic laws: in the latter I seek to make the deductions from the inquiries pursued in the text evident in one select example. I am perfectly sure of the prevailing majority of the forms given in the tables, and can produce abundant examples
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of them. I have marked some as questionable, and shewn the limits of the probability of others, in notes; and if an error has crept into the forms spoken of, and by me believed to be correct, it will give me pleasure to be able hereafter supplementarily to correct it. The form _vachanhi_ was, however, only in a measure a theoretic formation; and I should not have ventured to 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 _opcoiv_ instead of a conjunctive vowel, as has been stated above (see §. 221.), as a property of the base, _i.e._ as an unorganic extension from the third to the second declension; a declara-
tion which must then naturally extend itself to the dual termination _ov_ of the whole third declension (_pooio-iv, beta-
troo-iv, daimono-iv_ like _luko-iv_), 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 _melitoeis, melitopologi, fuseslogeia, botrooeis, botroodweros_, would be, under the pre-
supposition of the bases _MELITO, Fysei, BOTRYO_, to be divided into _melito-eis, _and would lead us to expect the nominatives _melito-v, &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 _opcoiv_ from _'Opo_ of _ferontoi_ from _Feponto_, was as it were the first commencement of the disease, which came to its full developement in the Pâli; since in this language, which otherwise closely resembles the Sanskrit, the bases which end with consonants are declined
in the old way only in the singular, but in the plural are so corrupted, that, with the exception of the nominative and the vocative of similar sound, and the genitive, which at the same time supplies the place of the dative, they have extended the old base by an unorganic 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 चर char, “to go,” forms its participle present partly from the original base चरन्त charant, or its corruption चरग charat (see §. 129.), partly from the augmented theme चरन्त charanta, and in part also

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Th. CHARANT</td>
<td>CHARANTA</td>
<td>CHARAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. charan,*</td>
<td>charantô</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. charant-am,†</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>charantè-n-a, charat-å.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. like the Genitive,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>....</td>
<td>{charanta-smā, or charanta-mhā,† } charat-å.§</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The final न n is, as in the Prākrit (§. 10.), transmuted into the Anusvāra, which I here express, as in the Sanskrit, by n.
† It might also be divided thus, charanta-m, and deduced from charanta.
‡ Transposed, and with h for s (comp. §. 166.). These forms are derived from the médial pronoun sma mentioned in §. 166., which, in the Pāli 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.
§ Charatá is, according to appearance, identical with the instrumental,
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Th.</th>
<th>CHARANT,</th>
<th>CHARANTA,</th>
<th>CHARAT,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>charanta-ssa,</td>
<td>charat-ō,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>charantē,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>{or charanta-smin,}</td>
<td>charat-i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{or charanta-mhi,}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>{or chara,*}</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or charā,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural.</th>
<th>[G. Ed. p. 320.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>. . . . charantā,†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>. . . . charantē,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>. . . . {charantēbhi,}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{or charantehi,}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>like the Genitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>like the Instrumental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>. . . . charat-am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>. . . . charantē-su,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc.</td>
<td>charantā, charantā,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the Greek in its bases ending with a consonant had followed the declension-confusing example of the Pāli, one would have expected, for instance, from φέρων a genitive φέροντου, dative φέροντω; and in the plural indeed, φέροντων 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 acharā, "he went," from acharāt (Clough, p. 106.).

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

† According to the usual declension ending with a consonant one would expect with charantā also charantō, from the original theme charant; as, for example, gunavantō is used with gunavantā, "the virtues"; the former from gunavant, the latter from gunavanta.
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ΦΕΠΟΝΤ, but φεροντοι, φεροντος, φεροντος, from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ. In this manner the form φεροντον in the dual, which has been lost in Pāli, would be clearly explained as derived from ΦΕΠΟΝΤΟ; but even when standing isolated, φεροντον 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 φεροντον, and all other dative-genitive forms of the third declension, the o belongs neither to the original theme, which lies at the root of all the other cases, nor to the true case-suffix.

[G. Ed. p. 321.]


N. bharan, barai-s, ferent-s, φέρων, fiyand-s.*
Ac. bharant-am, barent-ēm, ferent-em, φέροντ-α(v), fiyand.
Ins. bharat-ā, barēnt-ā, ..... ..... D. I. fiyand.
D. bharat-ē, barēnt-ē, see Locat, see Loc. see Dat.
Ab. see Gen. barant-at, ferent-e(d), ..... ..... 
G. bharat-ās, barent-ā,† ferent-is, φέροντ-ος, fiyand-is; 
V. bharan, barai-s, ferent-s, φέρων, fiyand.

‡ I imagined, p. 210, that I must, in this case, which before was not proved to exist in ND bases, set down fiyand-s as a mutilation of fiyand-is from fiyand-ās, according to the analogy of other bases terminating with a consonant (ahmin-s, brōthr-s, §. 191.); Grimm has (I. 1017.) conjectured friyonds or friyonds from friyonds. Since this, owing to the very valuable additions made by Massmann to our Gothic authorities, the genitive nasyandis of Nasyand ("preserver, "preserving") has come to light (see his Glossary, p. 153), by analogy with which I form fiyand-is.
FORMATION OF CASES.

DUAL.

---|---|---
N. Ac. Voc. bharant-āu, | barant-āo, or baranta, | φέροντ-ε.
Vēedic, bharant-ā,* | . . . | . . .
I. D. Abl. bharad-bhyām, | baran-byā,† | φερόντ-ιον.‡

PLURAL.

---|---|---|---|---
N. V. bharat-as, | barēnt-ā,§ | feren-ēs, | φέροντ-ες, | fiyand-s.
Acc. bharat-as, | barēnt-ā,§ | feren-ēs, | φέροντ-ας, | fiyand-s.||
Instr. bharad-bhis, | baran-bis,¶ | . . . | . . . | . . .
D. Ab. bharad-bhyas, | baran-bya,¶ | feren-i-bus, | . . . | . . .**
Gen. bharat-ām, | barēnt-āim,†† | fereni-um, | φέροντ-ων, | fiyand-ε,††
Loc. bharat-su, | . . . §§ | . . . | φέρουσι. [G. Ed. p. 323.]

* See p. 230, Note *
‡ See p. 299. Rem. 2.
§ Barents-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 friyonds, “amicos” (“amantes”), Matth. 5. 47. as generally with the declension of a root terminating with a consonant. Comp. Grimm (I. 1017.).
¶ See p. 241 Note *, and p. 210 Note §.
** The Gothic dative, which I would have used also as the instrumental (§. 243.), does not occur in roots ending in nd.
†† Or barant-āim. 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, barāśāva (or -shu, or -shā, §. 250.), as Vend. S. p. 354; गुड्रेवासु (read गुड्रेवासु) for drēvatsā, from drēvat, in the strong cases (§. 129.) drēvant; on the supposition that the reading is correct, except the false s. See §. 52.
### Formation of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Zend</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SINGULAR.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. átma', asma', sermo', δαίμων, ahma'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. átman-am, aśman-ēm, sermon-em, δαίμον-α(v), ahman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst átman-ā, aśman-a,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>D. I. ahmin. (§. 132.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. átman-ē, aśmain-ē, see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Dative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl. see Gen. aśman-āt, sermon-e(d),</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. átman-as, aśman-ā, sermon-is, δαίμον-α, ahmin-s (§. 132.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. átman-i, aśmain-i. D. sermon-i, δαίμον-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc. átman, aśman, sermo', δαίμον, ahma'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DUAL.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Acc. Voc. átman-ōu, aśman-ō, or aśman-a, δαίμον-e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vēda. átman-a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. D. Ab. átma'-bhāyam, aśma'-bya,</td>
<td>D. G. δαίμονο-ιν.†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLURAL.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Zend</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. V. átman-as, aśman-ā, sermon-ēs, δαίμον-ες, ahman-s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. átman-os, aśman-ā, sermon-ēs, δαίμον-ας, ahman-s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. átma'-bhis, aśma'-bhis, . . . . (δαίμονο-φιν), D. I. ahma'-m†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Ab. átma'-bhyas, aśma'-byo, sermon-i-bus, . . . .</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. átman-ām, aśman-ām, sermon-um, δαίμόν-ων, ahman-ē.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc. átma'-su, aśma'-hva, . . . . δαίμον-σι,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[G. Ed. p. 324]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Zend</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. bhrātā, brāta, frater, πατὴρ, bróthar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac. bhrātar-am, brātar-ēm, fratr-ēm, πατέρ-α(v), bróthar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Aśman-ās-cha, "cælique." † See p. 200, Rem. 2. ‡ See p. 241, Note †.

Also Greek γερμανία bráthrem might be expected, as Vend. Sāde, p. 357; Greek γερμανία patrem (patherēm?), contrary to the theory of the strong cases (§. 129.), for patarēm.
### FORMATION OF CASES.

#### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit.</th>
<th>Zend.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In.</strong> bhrāṭr-ā,</td>
<td>brāṭhr-a,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.</strong> bhrāṭr-ē,</td>
<td>brāṭhr-ē,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ab.</strong> see Gen.</td>
<td>brāṭhr-at,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G.</strong> bhrāṭur,</td>
<td>brāṭhr-ō,*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L.</strong> bhrāṭar-i,</td>
<td>brāṭhr-i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V.</strong> bhrāṭar,</td>
<td>brāṭarē;†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . . D. Inst. brōthr (see §. 132)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . . brōthr-s (see §. 133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin.</th>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PLURAL.§

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom. Voc.</strong> bhrāṭar-as,</td>
<td>brāṭar-ō,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accus.</strong> bhrāṭrē-n,¶</td>
<td>brāṭhr-eus?**</td>
<td>fratr-ēs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instr.</strong> bhrāṭri-bhis,</td>
<td>brāṭar-ē-bis,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dat. Abl.</strong> bhrāṭri-bhyas,</td>
<td>brāṭar-ē-byo,</td>
<td>fratr-ē-bus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive.</strong> bhrāṭrē-n-ām,</td>
<td>brāṭhr-aīm,††</td>
<td>fratr-um,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locative.</strong> bhrāṭri-šhu,</td>
<td>. . . .</td>
<td>. . . .</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 †.
|| <br>brāṭaras-cha, "fratresque."
¶ See §. 127. Note.
** Perhaps also brāthr-ō, brāthrās-cha ("fratresque"), according to the analogy of áthr-ō, "ignes," from átar. See §. 239.
†† See p. 266, Note †.
FORMATION OF CASES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. A. V.</td>
<td>manas,</td>
<td>manō.†</td>
<td>μένος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>manas-ā,</td>
<td>mananāh-ā,†</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>manas-ē,</td>
<td>mananāh-ē,</td>
<td>see Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>see Gen.</td>
<td>mananāh-āt,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>manas-as,</td>
<td>mananāh-ā (mananahās-cha),</td>
<td>μένε(σ)-ος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>manas-i,</td>
<td>mananāh-i,(see p. 316, G.ed.) D.</td>
<td>μένε(σ)-ι,</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 ā, but in passages where also many a's, originally short, appear to be lengthened at the termination, and which, therefore, I was not willing to bring into account: moreover, the cases could not be included, where, through the particle ἀνά cha, a preceding ἀ is preserved in its original length. After deducting these two classes from forms in anāhā, the computation might perhaps turn out in favour of the short a given above. I have, however, as yet not applied any closer reckoning: it would, however, surprise me if, on more exact calculation, but still in departure from the fate of other polysyllabic words ending with a shortened a, the advantage in this particular case should incline to the side of those words which retain the long vowel, which I would then gladly restore. No one will deny that the collation of MSS. is of great importance in deciding many grammatical and orthographical questions, although I believe I may assert that even a single lithographed MS. opens a rich field to inquiries and important grammatical observations: for although it is very full of errors, it nevertheless shows 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-ī, | . . . | . . .
I. D. Ab. manō-bhyām, mane-bya (p. 316 G. ed.), D.G. meve(σ)-e.

PLURAL.

--- | --- | --- | ---
N. Ac. V. manāius-i, | manaŋh-ā,† | μένε(σ)-α, | gener-a.
Instr. manō-bhis, | mane-bis, | (μένεσ-φιΰ), | . . .
Dat. Abl. manō-bhyas, | mane-byo, | see Loc. | gener-i-bus.
Genitive, manas-ām, | manaŋh-aîm, | μενέ(σ)-ων, | gener-um.
Locative, manas-su, | manō-hva, | μενές-σι, | . . .

SINGULAR, Masculine and Feminine.

--- | --- | ---
Nom. durmanās, | dushmanādo (§. 56b.). | δυσμενής (§. 146.)
Accus. durmanas-am, | dushmanan̄h-ēm, | δυσμενέ(σ)-α(ν).
Voc. durmanas, | . . . | δυσμενές.

The rest like the simple word.

DUAL.

N. Ac. V. durmanas-ū, | dushmanan̄h-a (?) | δυσμενέ(σ)-ε.
Vēda, durmanas-ā,† | dushmanan̄h-ā (?) | δυσμενέ(σ)-ε.

The rest like the simple word.

PLURAL.

N. Voc. durmanas-as, | dushmanan̄h-ō (as-cha), | δυσμενέ(σ)-ες.
Accus. durmanas-as, | dushmanan̄h-o (as-cha), | δυσμενέ(σ)-ας.

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 §. read in the Vendidad Sāde, p. 127, nēmēnha: it should be nēmaŋha, and may also be considered the instrumental singular; then we should have in this passage, which recurs three times, the instrumental in anha in both editions three times with a short a.
‡ See p. 230, Note *. 
FORMATION OF CASES

SINGULAR, NEUTER.

**Sanskrit.**

Nom. Ac. V. durmanas,

**Zend.**

dushmanā (a'cha),

**Greek.**

dvusmevēs.

The rest like the simple word.

"Remark.—It was remarked in § 152. (comp. § 146.), that the Σ in forms like μένος, εὐγενές, belongs to the base, and is not the nominative character; and that the Σ in forms like τετυφῶς 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 τετυφῶς 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 τετυφῶς as marks of the nominative, before

[G. Ed. p. 328.] which the final letter of the base is suppressed on account of the incompatible association of τσ (comp. § 99.), and replaced by lengthening the preceding vowel; as, for example, in μέλας for μέλανς. The Sanskrit has a few bases in which, differing from the ruling principle (see § 139.), run parallel in the nominative to the Greek μέλας; thus, panthās, "the way," from panthan, accusative panthōn-am. Only in this panthās the lengthening of the a can be less regarded as a compensation for the rejected n than in the Greek, because it extends also to the other full cases (§ 129.), with the exception of the vocative; but perhaps the lengthening of the a has originally taken place only in the nominative, and has thence imparted itself, when the reason of this prolongation was no longer perceived, to those cases which otherwise stood upon an equal footing with the nominative. Thus one says महान mahān, "great" (from the theme mahant, properly a participle present from मह mah, "to grow"), with the vowel of the concluding syllable lengthened, according to the analogy of the Greek form, as λέγων. The Sanskrit word, however, retains the long vowel
also in the other strong cases (mahántam "magnum," mahántas "magis," mahánta, "μεγάλος"), 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 ἐντ for Φεντ, in μελιτόεις 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-āu, 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 चन्त vant has maintained itself in the Latin in the form lent (as opulentis), it would not be surprising if the weak form चन vat, without the interchange of v with l but with the weakening of the a to i, had its representative in the Latin dirit, 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 ओ 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, λόγος is related to λέγω, so, in the Old Slavonic, is brod, "ferry," to bredô, "I wade through;" voz, "carriage," to vezô, "I ride in a carriage." And as, in the Greek, the vocative λόγε is related to the theme ΛΟΓΟ, so is, in the Old Slavonic, rabe, "O slave," to rabô, 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 ओ a (comp. vdova, "widow," with विधवा vidhavā), 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-pôi, "water-drinker," for voda-; just as in the Greek Μουσο-τραφής, Μουσο-φίλης, and similar compounds, which have shortened the feminine α or η to o. Even if, therefore, a is in the Old Slavonic a short vowel, I nevertheless regard it, in respect to grammar, as the long o; so that in this the Old Slavonic stands in a reversed relation to the Gothic, in which a has shewn itself to us as the short of d, and, in case of abbreviation, d would become a, exactly as in the Old Slavonic a becomes o.

(b.)—ऋ i and ढ 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 i is anywhere spoken of. Let schivá, "I live," be compared with जीवामि jivâmi; sila, "virtue," with शीलः śiha; 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. trepútye, "trivium." So, also, pûte-shestyê, ὀδοντοπία from PŪTI (§.260.). The i is also very frequently *suppressed, e. g. in the 3d person plural dadyat, "they give," Sanskrit ददिति dadati; sût, "they are," Sanskrit सति santi. Where i forms a diphthong with a vowel preceding it, it is marked in the old writing with a short mark, which we retain, e. g. boź, "strife."

(c).—व u and ऑ o 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 मु
bhā, "to be;" svekrī, "mother-in-law," to śrūṣvaśrū; myshy, "mouse," to mūṣa mūsha; syn, "son," to sūn sūnu; chetyri, tēṣṭas, with chatur (in the theme), nominative masculine chatuṭaḥ chautāras. The instances of y for उ u are, nevertheless, more rare than those where y corresponds to the long ॐ ū; 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 chūpa snushd; oba, "both," to ubha ubhā (Vēdic form), Zend ava ubd. 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 उ u or ऋ ū, 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 a) have y in the nominative plural (vidovy, "viduæ"), still the y here is so much the less to be looked upon as a case termination, as no account could be given of y in this sense; and with bases in ya the a of the base is also really retained (volya, "voluntates"). But as the y exerts the force of an Umlaut on an o succeeding it, by which that vowel is changed to an e, so I think that to an i following the o, without the intervention of another letter, the force of a reactive Umlaut must be ascribed, even if this force is not everywhere exerted, and that some y's must be declared to be the Umlauts of o; that is to say, as soon as so much has been re-
cognised in the Old Slavonic adjectives, that their bases all end either in o or yo (changed by the Umlaut to ye), and are thus sister forms to the Greek, like ἌΓΑΘΟ, 'ἉΓΙΟ; and of the Sanskrit, as चेत स्वेता, "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 yi or ii.* If, however, I may trust that I have obtained an accurate knowledge of the organization of the Old Slavonic grammar on any point, it is on this, that the affix in the nominative singular of definite adjectives consists not in yi or ii, but in i as a mutilation of yo from ya (य a), and in the feminine of ya from yā (या yā). This also appears to me subject to no manner of doubt, that if, for example, the compound word sva\-ti\-n comes from the word sva\-t\-o, "holy," its acknowledged theme, the y is a euphonic product from o, through the influence of the i which is added to it. This i has, in some cases, in which it has been dropped, still in a degree, in its euphonic operation, left its reflection, and thereby the proof of its former existence. Thus, for instance, sva\-t\-o-m, "per sanctum," from the older sva\-t\-in, sva\-t\-i\-ch, "sanctorum," and "in sanctis," from sva\-t\-i\-i\-ch, corresponds to the indefinite forms sva\-t\-o-m, sva\-t\-i\-ch (for sva\-t\-i\-o-ch).† At times, through the said pronominal syllable i, the preceding o may be changed at will into y.

* Dobr. also himself, p. 493, considers simple i or ii as the definitive adjunct; but in considering, as he there does, blagi as the confluence of blag and ii, he appears to look upon the y as having arisen from the i of the suffix, and not to acknowledge in it the final vowel of the simple adjective root.

† In the oldest MSS., according to Dobr. p. 502, the more full forms yich, yim, yimi occur in the plural, for ym, ych, ymi.
FORMATION OF CASES

or not: thus the interrogative exhibits the forms kyī, "quis?" (Dobr. 500 and 343.), kyīm, "per quem?" kyīch, "in quibus, quorum?" kyīm, "quibus?" kyīmi, "per quos? with koī, koīm, koīch, koīmi. The possessive pronouns allow no euphonic reaction at all to the demonstrative i, which forms the last member of them, and they always retain their radical o; e.g. moī, "meus," moīm, "per meum," not myī, myīm. As to the definite form of the adjective bases in yo, which Dobrowsky forms through the addition of ĭ, 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, sīnić "the blue," is to be divided, not into sīn-ī, but into sīn-ī. 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, sīnić, "caerulei," sīnii, oī "caerulei." In order, however, here fully to explain the nature and origin of the definite declension, and not hereafter to be compelled to repeat what is already settled, it may be stated that its pronominal defining addition is identical with the Sanskrit relative base ya, which is most correctly preserved in the Lithuanian, in which language *ya signifies "he" (ya-m, "to him," ya-mē, "in him"). The nominative yis, "he" (for yas), has given the y an assimilating influence, as is the case with all bases in ya (§. 135.). The feminine, also, is pronounced in the nominative, through assimilation, yi for ya; but the genitive yos, and all the other cases, are easily perceived through the declension of ranka, "hand," and giesme, "song,"

* Written ja in the text. This passage furnishes a good reason for writing the Germanic ğ 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 या, या—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,” yo, “she,” and ye, “it,”

I could not imagine how one could create the definitive adjective forms svyaty-и, svyatya-ya, svyato-e (for svyatoye), accusative svyaty-и, svyatü-uy, 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-ma, 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 ii-s, 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 cases, equally etymologically, vyemy, the pronoun which follows, is left unmarked, so that, through all cases, both the adjective which precedes and the pronoun which concludes are declined, while, in the Bohemian, a case is sometimes provided with the inflexions of case, but in some cases this has utterly disappeared, and in others is still to be recognised in the y for o mentioned above.

(e.)—The Sanskrit diphthong ऋ ध I have found always rendered, in the Old Sclavonic, by ye, in similar forms; so that after weakening the ऋ ध, to compensate for this, the semi-vowel y has made its appearance, to which, in this union, a particular legitimacy would be, according to (c.), to be ascribed. Let pyena, "foam," be compared with फेन फेन; svyet "light," with छेत स्वेत; vyemy, "I know," with वेद्मि वेद्मि. The most important cases in the grammar with ye corresponding to ऋ ध 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 ढो ध (from a + u) is represented in the Old Sclavonic by ُ (š);* so that the first

* Although this vowel may at times be pronounced short, still this much, at least, is certain, that, according to its origin and its definition, it is long. In Bohemian it appears in two forms, as au and u: the former is pronounced ou, but the writing points to an older and different pronunciation, in which the a was accurately preserved in its place: the u is pronounced short, whence, however, it cannot be deduced that this short u perhaps corresponds to the Sanskrit ऋ 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 ऋ 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 ढो ध, and also to the Sclavonic ُ (š), only that the former is phonetically more exact, and without the loss brought about by time. Hence, also, ुस्ता (written vsta) "ora" corresponds to the Sanskrit ढोर ध, ha, "the lip": more complete, however, is uṣṭa, "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 ζ (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 ā also (so we write the ζ) to be o; and it becomes visible, too, in this form, when ā is resolved before vowels into ov, (compare βο(凡是 from Β, [G. Ed. p. 335.]
§. 123.), while the Indian झ झ becomes झ before a vowel (गवि gavi = βοf, from झo). Now as, in the Sanskrit, ड u, झ ā, rise to ā through Guna (§. 26.), and stō-şyāmi appears as the future of stu, so in the Old Sclavonic, in like manner, y (cy) is interchanged with ā; 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 yerr (see k.), exhibit, in many oblique cases, the syllable ov before vowel-endings, this ov must neither be considered, with Dobrowsky, for an augment added to the base, nor can it be deduced from forms like synovi, “from a son” (Sanskrit सूनवे sūnav-e, from sūnu), synov-e, “sons” (सूनस sūnav-as), that syn, in the nominative-accusative, is an abbreviation of synū; and that therefore the yerr, when it is added to the form syn, is a representative or weak remainder of ā: 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 ā through the influence of mouth”; and even for estā is to be found austā (Dobr. Böhm. Lehrg. p. 4.): ruka corresponds to the Lithuanian ranka, “hand”; and hus to the Sanskrit हास haśa, “goose”; for which, according to p. 319. ranka, haśa was to have been expected. A distinction must here. according to §. 783. Remark q. v., be made between oy ā, and ā 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-e (£. 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 Sclovonic 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 (BONY).* Derivative substantives
and adjectives in ov, ev (theme oro, evo, the latter for
yivo, see n.), correspond to the Sanskrit in सच ava ; as
पालव pãođav-a (nominative as), "descendant of Pàndu";
शातिव àrtava, "seasonable," from चृत ृतu, "season": so,
in Old Sclovonic, Adamov, "Adamite," from Adam
(ADAMY) ; zarev for zaryev, "kingly," from zar (theme
ZARYY). For these formations, therefore, we must not,
with Dobrowsky (322, 323), assume a suffix ov or ev,
but we must look upon the o alone, which, in the nomi-
native, is suppressed, as the derivative suffix (ADAMOV-O,
ZAREV-O). Through the Vriddhi increase (£. 29.) the
Old Sclovonic y becomes av, because a, according to (a),
usually corresponds to शा â : hence, from the root by,
"to be," comes the causal baviti (infinitive), as in the

though stàviti occurs as the causal of sta, this form may
have arisen in the perverted feeling of the language as an
irregularly analogous word to baviti. In order, then, still
more to establish, by a few other examples, the representa-
tion of the Indian शो 6 or शच av by the Sclovonic o, we
find ušt, "mouth," correspond to शो ośthà, "lip"; shāi
"sinister" (theme SHUYO), to सच savya; bûditi, "to
awake"—a causal, whose primitive bdyeti has entirely

* Dobrowsky supports himself in these cases by calling ov a prefix (p. 329).
lost the vowel of the root—to वोपियतम् bādhayitum, also “to awake,” from बुध् hudh, “to know.” Thus gūbiti is the causal of gyh-nū (1. P.), and stūditi of styd-nū (Dobr. 360, 361.); while vyesiti is the causal of visyeti (see e), as, in the Sanskrit, वेशयितम् væsayitum, “to cause to enter,” from विश् viś, “to go in.”

(y.)—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; pūty, “a way,” Sanskrit पञ्चास panthās, id. Latin pons; goluby, “a dove,” columba; gūy, “a goose,” हंस hansa. The Polish has preserved the old nasal in golamb, “a dove,” yansie, “a gosling,” gansier, “a gander,” and in many similar cases. Hereby the ā in the accusative of bases in a (from खा ā), which are for the most part feminine, is remarkably explained; compare vdvū from vdova, “a widow,” with विधवाम vidhavām, “viduam.” Therefore vdvū is to be derived from vdovo-m for vdova-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 ę, e.g. in piekę, “I bake,” supplies the place of the am of the first conjugation, as czytam, “I read.”

* Cf. §. 783. Remark.
The Old Slavonic has, however, excepting some anomalous remains of an older formation, ḗ in all the conjugations; and, according to what has been said, it admits of no doubt, that in the second part of this diphthong (ο + ḗ) 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 nesū is for nes-o-ũ for nes-o-m from nes-e-m—it must be assumed that the conjunctive vowel e, before its confluence with the ũ, which has arisen out of m, has passed into o; as in Greek ου arises by the contraction of ε and o, through the transition of e into o and o into u. The same relation is to be found in the Old Slavonic in the 3d person plural, where, corresponding to nes-e-m, “we carry,” nes-e-te, “ye carry” (comp. λέγ-ε-τε), the form nesent is expected, but in place of it occurs nesūt in surprising accord with the Greek λέγουσι for λέγοντι 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 (ऋ), and marks this with the diacritical sign mentioned above, which, in the middle of a word, supplies the place of a nasal function; thus, sa, "they are," corresponds to the Sanskrit सन्ति, Slavonic suti. The Bohemian has also, in many conjugations, retained the old conjunctive vowel a in the 3d person plural, but, like the Slavonic, permitted the n to dissolve into a u; therefore, in vezau, "vehunt" (vez-e-me, "vehimus," vez-e-te, "vehitis"), the u answers to the n of वहन्ति vahanti, "vehunt," and the u which, in Bohemian, is united with an a, is essentially different from that which stands alone; for the latter answers to the Old Slavonic diphthong ũ ( Oaks), but the former only to the latter portion of the ũ, which, in the Old Slavonic, never stands alone, at least never occurs as ũ, but as y (e).
If, then, through what has been said, the vocalization of the \( m \) or \( n \), which is of such frequent occurrence in the Sclavonic, has been shewn with sufficient clearness, it is remarkable that conversely, also, the latter portion of the \( ā \) (\( ů \)) has occasionally been hardened into a nasal; and thus \( būdū, \) "I will be," is in Polish \( będzie \) (written \( będzę \)).

(h.)—In certain cases an old \( ā \) (\( ū \)) unorganically supplies the place of the Sclavonic \( ā \), i.e. in the instrumental of pronouns without gender, and all feminines; thus, \( vđovoj-ū, \) "through the widow," answers to विधवव्या \( vidhayā-ā \); and \( tobjoy-ū, \) "through thee," to त्यया \( tway-ā \). Denominatives also, in \( āyū \) (1st per. pres.), in the Old Sclavonic, correspond to the Sanskrit in भाव्यामि \( āyāmi \), as शाभ्यामि \( šabdāyāmi \), "I sound," from शाव्य \( šabda \), "a sound,"; चिरायामि \( chirāyāmi \), "I hesitate," from चिर \( chira \), "long": thus, in the Sclavonic, \( zielāyū \), "I greet," "I kiss," from \( ziel, \) (ZIELO), "healthy": \( vđovāyū \) from \( vđova \), "widow" (Dobr. p. 372.). Finally, words in \( un (UNO) \) answer, as it appears, to the Sanskrit participles of the middle voice, in \( āna, \) as युज्य युज्यना, "uniting," from युज्य \( yuj \); so in the Old Sclavonic, \( perūn, \) (PERUNO), "Deus [G. Ed. p. 338.] tonans," from the root \( per, \) "to shake"; \( byegūn, \) "runner" (BYEGÜNO), from \( BYEG \) "to run" (Dobr. p. 289.).

(i.)—There are in the Sclavonic alphabet two marks, which by some are called \( \text{litterae aphone} \)æ, but by Gretsch semivowels; I mean the so-called soft \( yer, \)* and the hard \( yerr. \) The former is represented by Gretsch as half \( i \), and by his translator, Reiff (47), as answering to the tones 'mouillés' of French (compare Kopitar, p. 5); and thus \( schal \text{b}, \) "sympathy," and \( ogon \text{b}, \) "fire," are, in respect to the soft \( yer \) compared with the pronunciation of \( travaill \) 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 schahl\(^b\) and ogon\(^b\) one hears quite as much of a \( y \) as can be heard of this semi-vowel after a consonant preceding it. Hence we mark it with a \( y \), and write the above words schaly, ogony, Old Scalonic 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.q. in zarya, “regis,” zaryu, “regi,” from zary, “rex,” “rem.” On the consonant which precedes it this \( yer \) has an influence which renders its pronunciation more mild, because its sound is somewhat broken by the \( y \), which throws back its sound. Etymologically the \( yer \) corresponds either to a final \( i \) of the cognate languages, as in /est/, “he is” (\( \text{честь asti} \), \( \text{эстi} \), Lithuanian esti), kosty, “bones” (\( \text{чеснь asthi} \), or in the nominative and accusative singular of masculine substantives and adjectives, to a \( y \) (\( \text{чень} \)), 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 singe 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 compared to the French silent \( e \) and the Hebrew schva: it is therefore, to use the expression, equivalent to “nothing”; and one cannot perceive of what vowel the small, still perhaps remaining vowel part of it is the residue. Consonants preceding it have a stronger and free pronunciation; [G. Ed. p. 339.] and Kopitar (p. 5) tells us that they are pronounced before it sharp, and without echo, and that it is for this reason called the hard \( yerr \), and not on account of its own pronunciation. We require, therefore, in the

* In the Carniolan dialect this sound has mostly disappeared; but where it has remained it is also written by a \( y \); as, kony, “horse.”
Roman character, no substitute for this mark, and Dobrowsky also on 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*.

(1.)—I* believe I may assert, that in the whole extent of the structure of the Sclavonic 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, शाम् Ẩम (नभसाम nabhasām, “caelorum”), Greek *ων* (*veph(ε)ων*), Latin *um*, Gothic *ē*. 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 Sclavonic polysyllables; *e.g.* from *सस* *as, es* is formed, in the nominative plural, *e (e)*; and *synov-e* answers to forms like सुनवस् ṣuṇava-*as, bōrav-ēs*.

(m.)—As far as regards the writing of those consonants which, in the Sclavonic alphabet, properly correspond to the Roman, we express the sound of the French *j* (*zivyːte*, in the Carniolan *sh*), as in Zend (§. 65.), by *sch*, that of our German *sch* (*= ṣ*) by *sh* as in Sanskrit.

* Cf. §. 783. Remark.
and also as, in Sanskrit, the tsch by ch: for the sound of the Greek χ (≡ds) we retain χ, and use z for the sound of our German ẓ (=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 युग्मv snushā. Ch also, in declension and conjugation before certain vowels, passes into s [G. Ed. p. 340.] (Dobr. pp. 39, 41), and in some cases into sh (Dobr. 41.). Finally, in preterites like dach, "I gave," dachom, "we gave," the ch returns to the s (ए s, ए) whence it has proceeded, in the cases where a personal ending beginning with a t follows it; hence, duste, "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 ए, but before a appears as sh; hence, dasha or dachā, "they gave."

(n.)—†For the semi-vowel य (य) the Cyrillic alphabet gives the Greek ι, excepting in the cases for which the inventor of the character has provided by particular letters set together according to their value, which, at the same time, express the य with the following vowel; that is to say, यa is never written by two letters. It would, however, for this reason, be wrong to assume a vowel ɣa, as this syllable, however it may be written, still always unites in itself two sounds. For ye, also,

* Dobrowsky has, however, as it appears to me, not perceived the irrefragable connection between the ch of dach and the s of daste, for he considers the ch and ste, &c. as personal terminations (pp. 264, 363, 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 य, are, with the exception of री ye, and र य, nasalised vowels (see §. 783. Remark); and hence ɣpyty, "five," must be pronounced panya (in the original character पत्य).
Cyril has provided by a simple sign, and yâ is expressed by an o in conjunction with an i. But y often appears in Slavonic as a dialectic addition before vowels foreign to the cognate languages. Compare yesmy, “I am,” yam (for yadmy), “I eat,” pyaty, “five,” desyaty, “ten,” yedin, “one,” with the corresponding Sanskrit forms, asmi, admi, panchan, dâkan, âdi (primus). An o which follows is, in accordance with similar forms which we have observed in the Zend and Lithuanian (§. 137. and p. 174, Note*), changed into e through the influence of a y preceding it. In like manner, in accordance with the Zend and Lithuanian, the y, after it has assimilated a vowel following it, has often itself disappeared, and has left behind only its effect, and thereby the proof of its former existence.*

* Dobrowsky does not express himself with sufficient clearness regarding this form, when he says (cap. II. §. iii.) that o after y and liquid consonants is changed into e. According to this, one would believe that, besides y, certain other consonants had the power of changing an o following them into e. Dobrowsky understands—which, however, as far as I know, he nowhere expressly says—under “consonae liquidae,” those which, in consequence of a following yer (y), have retained a more flowing and softer pronunciation; while he calls the consonants without yer “consonae solidae” (comp. 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 y without a vowel). Thus, in Dobrowsky’s second masculine declension, the consonants r, ch, and k, in zary, “king,” vrachy, “physician,” and knyačy, “prince,” are liquid. But as these words in the instrumental form zarem, brachem, knyačem, Dobrowsky ascribes the e for o to the influence of a liquid consonant; while, according to my opinion, the consonants in these forms have no concern whatever in transforming o into e, but for zarem, &c. zarym must originally have stood. And as in this form the y is the full semi-vowel, not entirely without a vowel sound, and therefore not the expression of the yer without a vowel which softens the consonant preceding it—as in the abbreviated nominative zary—so the r also, in zarym, 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
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 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 \textit{wa} 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 \textit{zarem}, \textit{kayačem}, \textit{golubem}, \textit{lebedem}, are differently pronounced from what they are in \textit{pirom}, \textit{vočom}, \textit{lobom}, \textit{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 binda-ta, "caevum," in contrast with blind'-s, "cacus"): 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 व 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, ā, 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, "cæruleus," syne, "cæruleum," an analogy to Latin adjectives like miti-s, mite.

258. But I recognise in adjectives like that just mentioned, and in similarly-constituted substantives, as knyasřy, "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

the Carniolan, before all inflections beginning with m in the three numbers, as posla-m, "through the domestic," posla-ma "the two domestics." This word appears to be identical with पुत्र putra, "son," Persian pisar "son," "boy," "young man," and to owe its meaning to familiar address.
FORMATION OF CASES

10, iu (ārīo-s, ārīo-v, sociu-s, prēliu-m); that is to say, serdze (nominative and accusative neuter), "heart," corresponds to the Sanskrit हृदयम् hridaya-m, which is likewise neuter. The feminines, again, afford a practical proof of the justice of this theory, for the Slavonic bases in ya correspond to the Sanskrit feminine bases in या yā Greek ia, Latin io); and this form, in the uninflected nominative, stands opposed to the masculine termination य y and neuter e, as sinya, "cærulea," to siny, "cæruleus," and sine, "cæruleum."

[G. Ed. p. 344.] When an i or other vowel precedes the last य y but one of the base, the य 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 य y of which has arisen from i of the form iye, which is to be supposed the original, after dropping the last य y but one. To the Sanskrit सयस savya-s, सया savya, सयम savya-m (sinister, a, um), correspond thus shii, shiya, shée (compare Dobrowsky, p. 285).

259. The Old Slavonic masculine and neuter bases in yo,* with their feminines in ya, are, according to their origin, of four kinds:—1. Those in which, as in श्यो yo 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 MORYO, nom. more, "the sea," the e of which therefore differs widely from

* Where I fix the theme, I leave the euphonic law contained in §. 255, (n.) unregarded, and I give SERDZYO as the theme of serdze ("heart," nom. acc.), although the latter is no other than the theme modified according to that euphonic law, i.e. without inflection, as in the Sanskrit vāch is laid down as the theme, although ch cannot stand at the end of a word, but passes into 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 *CHERVYO*), answers to the Sanskrit *क्रिम krim* and the Latin *VERMI*, Old High German, *WURMI*; and *ङतः* (§ *YATYO*), "gener," to the Sanskrit *जाति jati*, feminine, "familia," "genus," from *जन jan*, "to be born."*

The third kind of bases in *y0* is that where the unorganic *y* precedes a final *o*, according to the euphonic disposition mentioned in § 255. (n.). So *gusy* (*GUSYO*) corresponds to the Indian *हंस haṅsa*, "goose" (§ 255. g.). In the fourth place there exist among bases in *y0* 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 *तर tar* (*त्र tri*, in the strong cases *तः tär*) to the Latin in *tär*, and to the Greek in *τηρ*, *τωρ*; hence the nominatives *my-tary*, *sci-tary*, and *ζλατary* (Dobrowsky, p. 295), and, with *y* for *a*, *pas-tyry*, "shepherd." Of this kind, also, are the nouns of agency in *TELYO*, the *l* of which is clearly an interchange with *r* (§ 20.), so that this suffix also conforms itself to the Sanskrit *तर tar*; hence the nominatives *blago-dyeteley*, "beneficus," *pye-tely*, "a cock," from the root *pye*, "to sing," *schateley*, "messor," *spas-i-tely*, "salvator."†

* γ frequently answers to the Sanskrit *ज j*, and for example *जन jnā*, "to know," is in the Sclavonic *ζνα (infinitive ζνατι)*.
† 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 छौत अ correspond as has been already remarked, Old Slavonic in a. To [G. Ed. p. 346.] this class of words, however, belong also some masculines, particularly proper names, which are then declined entirely as feminines, as in Latin nauta, caelicola, &c. (§. 116.), on which we will not here dwell further. Among the bases in i there are, in Old Slavonic, no neuters, and only a very small number of masculines—as in Lithuanian—which Dobrowsky, p. 469, represents as anomalous, as though they were only irregulars of his second declension masculine: they are, however, in reality, foreign to it, for this very reason, that they end their theme with i, but the former with yo, and in part with yy. (§. 263.). It is only in the nominative and accusative singular that these three classes of words, from various reasons, agree; and, gosovy, "guest," from GOSTI* (Gothic GASTI, Latin HOSTI) agrees with knyayi, "prince," from KNYA^YO, and vrachy, "medicus," from VRACHY. The masculine bases originally ending with n—there are but a few of them—form most of their cases from a base augmented by i; KAMEN, "stone" (Sanskrit CHATRAM aśman), is extended to KAMENI and then follows GOSTI.

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

the suffixes TOR, TURU and the Slavonic TARFO, TELYO, used to borrow their t not at first from another syllable of formation so commencing. They form primitive words from the roots themselves, and not derivatives from other words.

* Thus, also, PÜTI, "a way" (Sanskrit पचन pathin), and LÝUDI, pl. num, nom. lyády-e, "people," Gothic LAUDI, nom. lauths, "a person," the au of which, according to §. 255. (f.), is represented by u (g), and, according to §. 255. (m.), has gained a prefixed y. GOSPODI, "a master" (comp. पति pati Lithuan PATI and Gothic FADI) is in fact irregular, as it passes into several kinds of theme in its declension.
tracts in TI, as PA-MYA-TI, "memory," nom. pamyaty, from the root MAN, as in Sanskrit मन्ति mati (for manti), "spirit," "meaning," from मन् man, "to think"* (compare memini). These words weaken, indeed, in [G. Ed. p. 347.] the nominative and accusative, their i to yer, but in no case overstep their original base by an unorganic addition; and hence they must not, on any account, be looked upon as of the same base with the majority of masculines terminating similarly in the nominative and accusative singular. But Dobrowsky's third feminine declension is of a mixed nature (zerkovy, "a church"): in this we recognise some words which have, by Guna, changed a Sanskrit final अद् to ov; and from this form several cases, as from a base ending with a consonant—e.g. zerke-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-ु, "per ecclesiam," zerkvī, "ecclesiam," zerkví, "ecclesiarum," zerkva-m, "ecclesiis," zerkva-ч, "in ecclesiis," zerkva-ми, "per ecclesiis." The dative locative zerkvi is doubtful, as this case could have no other sound than zerkv, whether it come from ZERKOV or from ZERKV I.

* Dobrowsky (p. 355) imputes, in my opinion wrongly, the n of po-
myanu, "I remember," and some similar bases, to derivation, instead of supposing that the radical n is suppressed before t, in analogy with the Sanskrit, and as, in Greek, τάοις from TAN, Sanskrit तत्त् tati-s, "a line" (as extended), for तत्त् 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 yatvach and krvach would be equally imprac-
ticable (comp. Gretsch by Reiff, p. 163). Brovy, "eyebrow," also appears to form all its cases from a theme BROVI, an extension of the Sanskrit भ्रु bhru, feminine, by the addition of i, with a Guna of the अद्. 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 ṣvaśṛū ṣvaśṛū-s, "socrus" (§. 255. c.); others have, at will, ovy or vi, with o suppressed; hence zerkovy or zerkvi.

262. Among bases in u (Greek υ) of the cognate languages only masculines have maintained themselves in the Old 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 υ (§. 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 similar conformation of theme of the old bases in a and u, it is not surprising that two kinds of bases, which in their origin are widely different, run very much into one another in the Sclavonic declension; and that, in the more modern dialects, these two declensions, which were originally so strictly separate, have fallen almost entirely into one.

263. As in the o bases which have arisen from ṛ a, a υ preceding introduces a difference of declension, which we, in §. 258., have represented as purely euphonic, the same phenomenon makes its appearance also in the y bases, by means of which their Guna form is articulated ev (for yeu) 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 Ṛ 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 Ṛ (etymologically =ṛo ṛo), but the Sanskrit Ṛ 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
decension 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 nomi-
native and genitive plural from bases in i; hence zary e,
“kings,” zarü, “of kings,” from ZARI; as gosy-e, “ho-
spires,” and gosti, “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 ognev-i, from OGNYY, agrees with the Sanskrit अग्नि
agni, Latin IGNI, Lithuanian UGNI.† It [G. Ed. p. 350.]

* Without Guna, the final of the base is pronounced e for ye from yo
(§. 255. n.); and hence, in the cases without Guna the yy bases are just
as little to be distinguished in their inflection from the yo bases, as, in
the instrumental singular, syno-m (from the theme SYNY) from rabo-m
(theme RABO). In the beginning of compound words, also, the yy bases
end like those in yo, with e for ye.

† As regards words inflected like mravii, the only proof which could
bring them under the head of the y bases is the vocative sing. mraviyá: that they, however, although they have borrowed this case from the y
decension, originally belong to the o declension, is proved by their
feminine in iya and neuters in iye or ye (Dobrowsky, p. 282).
deserves here to be further remarked, that in the more modern dialects of the Slavonic 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, ow, ow, form an exception as a case termination. In the Old Slavonic, also, rab (theme RABO), "a servant," may optionally form several cases from a theme RABY (for rabu); 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 चन् 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 पन्त man—e.g. in कर्मन् karman neut., "deed"—and to the Latin men; that is to say, SYEMEN (nominative syemya, "seed," from the base sye) answers to the Latin se-men; and imen, "a name," is a mutilation of नामन् nāman, "nomen." The bases in es answer to the Sanskrit neuter bases in as, as nebey,
"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 α+υ. 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. *matere*, "matris," and *matres* (*ματέρα*-es), partly from *MATERI*, e.g. *matery*, "matrem."

266. *In order now to pass over to the formation of cases, the nominative and accusative have lost the case-signs *s* and *m*, with the exception of the bases in *a*, which present in the diphthong *â* (*a*), a contraction of the vocalized nasal with the final vowel of the base shortened to *o*, (see §. 255. *g.*); hence *voda*, "aquam," from *vodo-â*. 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 *â*, (for *â*, see §. 255. *h.*), not into simple *y*, but into *iy*; so that in this respect the Old Sclavonic agrees more closely with the Pâli, which, in the corresponding class of words, changes the final *i* before all the vowel endings into *iy*, than with the Sanskrit. Hence, let *kostiâ-, from KOSTI*, "bones,” be compared with the Pâli शैलिक *pitiâ-*(from *pâti*, "joy"), for the Sanskrit प्रोत्स *prîty-â*. 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 *BRACHYY* (§. 263.), with Guna.† If the case-sign is suppressed, the preceding *ov* [G. Ed. p. 353.] becomes *â*, and *ev* (from *youv*) becomes *yd*; hence, also, *synâ*, "filio," with *synov-i*, and *zaryâ*, "regi," with

---

* Cf. §. 783¹.

† For *m*, according to Dobrowsky, we should read *m* *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 ľ, hence rabu, 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 ľ; hence, e.g. blagă, "bono," masc. neut.; sinyă, "ceaeuleo," masc. neut.: slovă, "verbo," moryă, "mari": not blagov-i, sinev-i, slovov-i, morev-i. In masculine names of inanimate things this uninflected form in ľ extends itself also to the genitive and locative; hence domu, "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 ľ; for the form mu in to-mu, "to this," is clearly from the Sanskrit appended pronoun ĸma (§. 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 mu, as rabu 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. (c), clearly from the Sanskrit r of vyikē from vyika, and answers to the Lithuanian wilke 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 ĵ u, i.e. of the Latin fourth declension, but for the most part correspond to Sanskrit bases in ĸ 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. pūti, “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 pūti, kosti, uninflected, just like domū, “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 knyaţi, 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 vowel appears as e in all the bases ending with a consonant (§§. 260. 264.): hence imen-e, “of the name,”

* It must be allowed that here occurs the very weighty objection, that the feminine form rankoje in the Lithuanian, and vodye in the Sclavonic, might stand in connection with the Sanskrit ायाम ा्याम in चिह्नायाम jihwāy-ām (§. 202.) ; so that, after dropping the m, as in the Zend (§. 202.), the preceding vowel, which in the Zend is already short, would, through the 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 मताम maty-ām, from mati or ब्हियाम bhīy-ām from bhī (comp. in §.266. kostiy-ū, for kosty-ū, from KOSTTY).
answers to नामनस् nāmna-ś, nomin-śis; nebes-e, "of the heaven," to नाभस्न nabhas-ś, vēpe(s)-oś; muter-ś to matr-śis, μητρός. The pronominal forms also follow this analogy: men-ś, "mei," teb-ś, "tui," seb-ś, "sui," because, in the oblique singular cases, MEN, TEB, SEB are their themes. We recognise the fuller Sanskrit genitive ending ग्य sya in the pronominal genitive termination go, as to-go = ताय 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 Sclavonic 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 Sclavonic has preserved exactly as much as the Greek of the termination sya; and go answers to the Greek io, and to-go, "hujus," to the Greek το-ιο. As, however, in Sclavonic, 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 ग्य 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 ग्य sya and io. As, however, in the Old Sclavonic, ग is elsewhere exchanged only with ज and sch (Dobr. p. 41), but not with s, in my opinion the derivation of ग from य (य y) is to be preferred to that from s.

270. The substantive and adjective (indefinite) o bases, in disadvantageous comparison with the pronouns which hold fast the old form, have lost the genitive termination go; but for it, in compensation for the lost termination, they have retained the old a of the base, instead of, according to §. 255. (a), weakening it to o; hence rab(a, "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 sūndo-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 syaś (§. 172.), as in the word tasyaś tasyaś, of the same import, for the final s must, according to §. 255. (l.), give way; but the a of the Slavonic ya directs us, according to §. 255. (a.), to an Indian अ a, just as the preceding o points to a short अ a. The irregularity, therefore, in the shortening of the Slavonic termination lies only in the dropping of the sibilant before y, as, in the Greek, τῶο, from τα-σya, 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 nőve (from NOIVO, "new").

[G. Ed. p. 357.] Sanskrit नव nava, is identical with the Latin nōve, and answers to the Greek νέ(φ)ε: from VODA, "water," comes vodo; but from VOLYA, according to §. 255. (n.), vole for volyo: and so from KNYAŘYO, "prince," knyashe* for

* ζ before e becomes sh.
Bases in **yy** change their **y** by Guna to **ú** (§. 235. f.), in analogy with §. 205.; hence **vrachyú**—more commonly, with **y** suppressed, **vrachú**—“medice!” from **VRACHYY**. On the other hand, **y** bases without **y** for their penultimate letter commonly omit the Guna, and weaken their final vowel, like the **o** bases, to **e**; hence **syne**, “oh son!” more rarely **synú** (Dobr. p. 470), =Gothic **sunau**, Lithuanian **sunaut**, Sanskrit **sūnō** 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. ubhá (ambo Vedic), ubá,</td>
<td>ubé,</td>
<td>oba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. n. ubhé,</td>
<td>ubé,</td>
<td>obye (§. 235. n.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. D. Ab. m. f. n. ubhá-bhyám.</td>
<td>ubói-bya, I. D.</td>
<td>obye-ma (§. 215.).*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. L. m. f. n. ubhay-ós,</td>
<td>ubóy-ó,</td>
<td>oboy-ú.†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The **ye**, which precedes the termination **ma**, may be compared with the Sanskrit **e** in plural forms, as चुर्के मयः vrikēbhyaś: **ye**-**ma**, however, occurs in the Old Sclavonic only in drye-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 **ú**, for the Sanskrit ending **óś**, 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 **ú**, clearly corresponds to the Sanskrit ज्य **ay** (see §. 225.) and the Zend.
FORMATION OF CASES

[G. Ed. p. 358.] The Sanskrit ubhē, as neuter, comes, according to §. 212., from the theme ubha, in union with the case-suffix i; and the feminine ubhē is an abbreviation of ubhay-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. (l.), opposes ye to the Indian रे, no longer recognizes 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 ḍ, §. 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 stεζ, “two steps,” from STEζYA. The feminine bases in i, in the dual case under discussion, answer to the Sanskrit and Lithuanian forms mentioned at §§. 210. 211., as pati, “two sirs,” from पति pati;

[G. Ed. p. 359.] awi, “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 ḍy or ay (see p. 277); but that occurs only in dvoj-ū=Sanskrit dway-ōs, “of two,” “in two” m. f. n., and in toj-ū=Sanskrit tay-ōs, “of these two,” m. f. n. The genitives and locatives of the two first persons also rest on this principle, only retaining the older a—nayā, vāyā. For the rest, however, the final vowel of the theme is rejected before the termination ā, as st’-ā (Sanskrit shatay-ōs) from STO, “a hundred,” dyev-ā from DYeva, “a girl”; and thus occurs, also, together with dvojā, the syncopated form dvā. Although the Lithuanian generally does not drop the final s, still the ā mentioned in §. 225. may be identical with the Sclavonic ā; as in the Zend, also, in this termination the s is often dropped.
dlany), "vola manus." On the other hand, the masculine endings do not follow this principle, but suppress the final vowel before the case-suffix a; hence syn'-a, "two sons," from SYN.</dlany.

**PLURAL.**

274. In the plural, the masculine nominative termination e (e) for the most part answers to the Greek ες, and, according to a universal rule of sounds, omits the s (§ 255. l); hence synov-ες, "the sons," σύνανος σὺναν-ας: compare βότρυ-ες, kamen-ες, "the stones," for குணாணசம அஸ்மன-ας (§ 21.); compare δαίμον-ες, gosty-ες, "guests" (theme GOSTI), for the Gothic gastei-s, and Greek forms like πόστρ-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 δορα from ΔΩΠΟ—answers to Vedic forms like vanā, "woods," from vana; and the same thing obtains which, § 231. p. 267 G. ed., has been said of Gothic, Greek, and Latin, regarding the relation of the a of the termination to the o of the theme. As regards the bases ending in a consonant, let imen-α, "names," be compared with the Latin nomin-α and Gothic namon-α; nebes-α, "the heavens," with νεφε(σ)-α; and telyat-α, "calves," with Greek forms like σωματ-α.

Feminines, with the exception of the class of words in ov mentioned at § 261., have lost the nominative ending; hence volyα, "voluntates," is the same as the theme and the nominative singular; and [G. Ed. p. 300.] 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
mostly without inflection, exactly as in the few masculine bases in i; hence *gosti* for the Gothic *gasti*-ns. Bases in o, without y preceding, like *Rabo*, change this o into y, as *raby*, "servos"; at least I cannot believe that this y is to be looked upon as the case-suffix; and I pronounce it to be the euphonic alteration of the o of the base, through the influence of the consonant of the inflection which has been dropped (comp. §. 271.): as in Lithuanian, also, the corresponding class of words often changes the final vowel (a) of the base into u; hence *wikū*-s, "lupos," answering to the Gothic *vulfa*-ns and Sanskrit *vrikā*-n. But if the Old Scalian bases in y, of animate creatures, form *owy* in the accusative plural, and thus *synovy*, "filios," answers to the Lithuanian *sunū*-s (from *SUNU*), this very Lithuanian form, as well as the Gothic and Sanskrit *sunu*-ns, *sūnu*-n, prove that the Scalian form is unorganic, and formed from an augmented theme *SYNOVO*, according to the analogy of *raby*. Bases in yy in this case follow bases in yo (from ya, §. 255. a.), which, preserving the old a sound, give ya, as in the genitive singular (see §. 270.); hence *vrachya*, "medicos," like *knyntyn*, "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 [G. Ed. p. 361.] to §. 255. (l.), extends itself over all classes of words, and appears to be attached by a conjunctive vowel e to bases terminating with a consonant; but, in fact, it is to be considered that these, in the cases mentioned as also in the locative (see §. 279.), pass over into the i declension, as a final i, before the signs of case m and ch, becomes e: and a similar metaplasm occurs in the Lithuanian, and indeed, to a
IN THE OLD SCLAVONIC.

much greater extent (§. 125. sub finem, comp. §. 126.); hence imene-м, imene-ch, from IMENI from IMEN, “names,” as koste-м, koste-ch, from KOSTI, “bones.”

277. Less general is the instrumental ending mi, answering, subject to the loss required by §. 255. (l.), to the Lithuanian mis, Sanskrit bhis, and Zend bis. This termination mi is, however, in masculine and neuter nouns for the most part lost (comp. Dobr. pp. 473 and 477); and is preserved principally, and indeed without exception, in feminines, as well as in a few masculine i bases: a final i of the base is, however, suppressed before the termination mi. Let kost'-mi be compared with अस्थि asthi-bhis, from अस्थि asthi, “bone”; vdo-vma-mi with वधणिः vidhavā bhis, from वधणिवā vidhavā, “a widow.” The instrumentals raby, synovy, are, like the accusatives of similar sound, uninflected (§. 275.); the i of knyaţi, vrachi, is the vocalization of the y of the bases KYNAXYO, VRACHYY, after the loss of the final vowel; and the y of neuters terminating in a consonant, like imen “per nomina,” is to be explained by a transition into the o declension, and is therefore analogous to raby, slavy, similarly to the o of the Greek dual forms like σαμόνων (p. 318 G. ed. Rem. 2.).

278. Dobrowsky (p. 461) represents ov, y, ī, ev, en, yat, and es, as plural genitive terminations; but in reality the suffix of this case has entirely disappeared, and in bases in o, a, and y, has also carried away those final vowels with it, while bases in i double that vowel; hence rab, [G.Ed. p. 362.] “servorum,” from RABO; vod, “aquarum,” from ΒΟΔΑ; syn. “filiorum,” from SYNY; kostiň, “ossium,” from KOSTI; imen. “nominum,” from IMEN; nebes, “cælorum,” from NEBES. The n and s of imen, nebes, would, without the former protection of a following termination have been dropped, as in Sclavonic we have only a second generation of final consonants; while the former, with the exception of a few monosyllabic forms, has, according to §. 255. (l.), disappeared.
279. The termination of the locative plural is *ch* throughout all classes of words, and has been already, at §. 255. (m.) recognised as identical with the Indian *su*, and therefore, also, with the Greek *σι*; compare, also, the Zend *xga* *kha*, for the Sanskrit *sua*, in §. 35. Before this *kh*, *o* passes into *ye*, exactly as the corresponding Sanskrit *a* into *e* (see §. 255. e.); hence *rabye-ch*, "in servis," answers to व्रकेसु *vrike-shu*, "in lupis." Bases in *yo*—and those in *yy* follow their analogy—suppress, however, before this *ye*, their preceding *y*, as in similar cases; hence *knyačye-ch*, "in principibus," not *knyačyy-ch* from KNYAČYO. A final *a* remains unchanged; hence *vdoča-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 *a* (§. 255. a.). All bases in *t* have a *y* before the preceding *a*; this semi-vowel is, however, readily suppressed after sibilants; hence *ovecha* for *ovehya*, Dobr. p. 475; and hence, also, from *lizyo* come (nom. *lize*) the genitive, dative, and nominative accusative plural *liza*, *lizū*, for *lizya*, *lizyū*. If in bases in *yo*, m. n., and in feminines in *ya*, an *i* precedes the semi-vowel, this involves some apparent variations
those forms of the following table in which a part of the word is not separated from the rest, thereby shewing itself to be the inflection, we recognise no inflection at all, i.e. no case-suffix; but we see therein only the bare base of the word, either complete or abbreviated; or also a modification of the base, through the alteration of the final letter, occasioned by the termination which has been dropped (compare §. 271.). In some cases which we present in the notes, base and termination have, however, been contracted into one letter, by which a division is rendered impossible. With respect to the dual, which cannot be proved to belong to all the words here given as specimens, we refer to §. 273.

variations in the declension, which require no particular explanation here (see, in Dobr. mračn, m. p. 468; ladiya, f. p. 478; and uchenye, n. p. 474. With regard to zary, “a king,” see §. 263 ).
FORMATION OF CASES.

[G. Ed. p. 364.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME.</th>
<th>NOM.</th>
<th>ACCUS.</th>
<th>INSTR.</th>
<th>DATIVE.</th>
<th>GEN.</th>
<th>LOC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RABO, m.¹</td>
<td>rab',</td>
<td>rab',</td>
<td>rabo-my, rabu,¹³</td>
<td>raba,²¹</td>
<td>rabye,²⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNYAČYO, m.²</td>
<td>knyačy',</td>
<td>knyačy',</td>
<td>knyače-my, knyačyů,</td>
<td>knyačyą,²¹</td>
<td>knyačį,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOVO, n.³</td>
<td>slovo,</td>
<td>slovo,</td>
<td>slovo-my, slovu,</td>
<td>slovu,²¹</td>
<td>slovu,²⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORYO, n.²</td>
<td>more,</td>
<td>more,</td>
<td>more-my, moryů,</td>
<td>moryą,²¹</td>
<td>moryį,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VODA, f.⁴</td>
<td>voda,</td>
<td>vodů,¹⁵</td>
<td>vodoy-ů,¹⁶</td>
<td>vody,²²</td>
<td>vod'-yê,²⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLYA, f.⁴</td>
<td>volya,</td>
<td>volyů,¹⁵</td>
<td>voley-ů,¹⁶</td>
<td>woly,</td>
<td>voli,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOSTI, m.⁵</td>
<td>gosty,</td>
<td>gosty,</td>
<td>goste-my, gosti,²⁰</td>
<td>gosti,</td>
<td>gosti,²⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOSTI, f.⁵</td>
<td>kasty,</td>
<td>kasty,</td>
<td>kosty-ů,¹⁶</td>
<td>kosti,²⁰</td>
<td>kosti,²⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNY, m.⁶</td>
<td>syn',</td>
<td>syn',</td>
<td>syno-my, synov-i,</td>
<td>syna,²¹</td>
<td>synye,²⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMY, m.⁷</td>
<td>dom',</td>
<td>dom',</td>
<td>domo-my, domov-i,</td>
<td>domů,</td>
<td>domů, dome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VRACHY, m.³</td>
<td>vrachy',</td>
<td>vrachy',</td>
<td>vrache-my, vrahov-i,</td>
<td>vrahya,²³</td>
<td>vrachi, vrachų</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAMEN, m.⁹</td>
<td>kamy',¹⁴</td>
<td>kamy',</td>
<td>kamene-my, kamen-i,</td>
<td>kamen-e,²⁴</td>
<td>kamen-i,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMEN, n.¹⁰</td>
<td>imya,</td>
<td>imya,</td>
<td>imene-my, imen-i,</td>
<td>imen-e,²⁴</td>
<td>imen-i,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATER, f.¹¹</td>
<td>mati,</td>
<td>mati,</td>
<td>mater-i,</td>
<td>mater-e,²⁴</td>
<td>mater-i,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBES, n.¹²</td>
<td>nebo,</td>
<td>nebo,</td>
<td>nebesi-my, nebesi-i,</td>
<td>nebes-e,²⁴</td>
<td>nebes-i,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELYAT, n.¹³</td>
<td>telya,</td>
<td>telya.</td>
<td>telyate-my, telyat-i,</td>
<td>telyat-e,²⁴</td>
<td>telyat-i,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Comp. p. 273, &c. ² See §§ 258, 259. ³ Comp. pp. 275, 276. ⁴ Comp. p. 258. ⁵ Comp. p. 286. ⁶ Comp. p. 288. ⁷ See p. 337, Note. ⁸ See § 203. 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 Dobir. p. 287. ¹⁵ See § 266. ¹⁶ Comp. Sanskrit jihway-ą, &c. See § 266. ¹⁷ Comp. Lith. pati-mi, sunu-mi. ¹⁸ Or rabovi, § 267. ¹⁹ See § 268. ²⁰ The i may also be ascribed to the mark of case, and the dropping of the final letter of the base may be assumed; but in the genitive of the same sound, the i clearly belongs to the theme. ²¹ See § 270. ²² See § 271. ²³ More commonly vracha, and in the vocative, vrachů. See p. 347, Note. ²⁴ See § 269. ²⁵ See § 268. ²⁶ Or sync.
### PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM. VOC.</th>
<th>ACCUS.</th>
<th>INSTR.</th>
<th>DATIVE.</th>
<th>GEN.</th>
<th>LOCATIVE.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rab’-i,</td>
<td>raby,</td>
<td>raby,</td>
<td>rabo-m,</td>
<td>rab’</td>
<td>rabyte-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knyaza,</td>
<td>knyaza,</td>
<td>knyaza,</td>
<td>knyaze-m</td>
<td>knyazy</td>
<td>knyaze-ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slova,</td>
<td>slova,</td>
<td>slova,</td>
<td>slovo-m</td>
<td>slov’</td>
<td>slovy-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morya,</td>
<td>morya,</td>
<td>mori,</td>
<td>more-m,</td>
<td>mory’</td>
<td>mory-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vody,</td>
<td>vody,</td>
<td>voda-mi</td>
<td>voda-m</td>
<td>vod’</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-mi</td>
<td>goste-m</td>
<td>gosti</td>
<td>goste-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti,</td>
<td>kosti-mi</td>
<td>koste-m</td>
<td>kosti</td>
<td>koste-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synov-e,</td>
<td>synovy,</td>
<td>synovy,</td>
<td>synovo-m</td>
<td>synov</td>
<td>synovy-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domov-e,</td>
<td>domy,</td>
<td>domy-m</td>
<td>domo-m</td>
<td>domov</td>
<td>dome-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrachev-e,</td>
<td>vrachya,</td>
<td>vrachi,</td>
<td>vrache-m</td>
<td>vrachev</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></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>nebesy-ch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telyat-a,</td>
<td>telyat-a</td>
<td>telyaty,</td>
<td>telyate-m</td>
<td>telyat</td>
<td>telyate-ch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See §.274.  
2 See §.271.  
3 See §.275.  
4 From SYNOVO, see §.275. In the locative occur also synovo-ch and synove-ch.  
5 See §.277.  
6 See §.276.  
7 See §.278.  
8 See §.279.  
9 One would expect nebes-e-ch; but in this case ech and yech are frequently interchanged with one another, and the form yech appears to agree better with the preceding s (comp. Dobrowsky, p. 477).
ADJECTIVES.

[G. Ed. p. 366.] 281. The declension of the adjective is not distinct from that of the substantive; and if some inflected forms, which in the Sanskrit and Zend belong only to the pronouns, have, in the cognate languages, emerged from the circle of the pronouns, and extended themselves further, they have not remained with the adjectives alone, but have extended themselves to the substantives also. As regards the Greek, Latin, and Slavonic, we have already explained at §§ 228, 248, and 274. what has been introduced from pronominal declension in those languages into general declension: we will here only further remark that the appended syllable sma, in § 165. &c., which, in Sanskrit, characterises only the pronominal declension, may in the Pāli be combined also, in several cases, with masculine and neuter substantive and adjective bases, and indeed with all bases in a, i, and u, including those which, originally terminating in a consonant, pass by augment or apocope into the vowel declension; thus the ablative and locative singular of kesa, "hair," is either simply kesā (from kēṣāt, see p. 300), kēsē, or combined with sma or its variation mha, kēsa-smā, kēsa-mhā, kēsa-smīn, 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, geram, "bono," gerume, "in bono." According to this principle it would be possible, and such indeed was lately my intention,
to explain the agreement of the Gothic full adjective dative, as *blindamma* (from *blindasma*, §. 170.), with [G. Ed. p. 367.] pronominal datives like *tha-mma*, “to this,” *i-mma*, “to him”; but the examination of the Old Sclavonic declension, in which the indefinite adjectives remove themselves from all admixture of the pronominal declension, and run entirely parallel to the German strong substantive, not to the weak, has led me to the, to me, very important discovery, that Grimm's strong and Fulda’s abstract-declension-form of adjectives diverges in not less than nine points from the strong substantives (i.e. those which terminate in the theme in a vowel), and approaches to the pronominal declension for no other reason than because, like the definite adjectives in the Sclavonic and Lithuanian, they are compounded with a pronoun, which naturally follows its own declension. As, then, the definite (so I now name the strong) adjectives are defined or personified by a pronoun incorporated with them, it is natural that this form of declension should be avoided, where the function of the inherent pronoun is discharged by a word which simply precedes it; thus we say *guter*, or *der gute*, not *der guter*, which would be opposed to the genius of our language; for it still lies in our perception that in *guter* a pronoun is contained, as we perceive pronouns in *im, am, beim*, although the pronoun is here no longer present in its original form, but has only left behind its case-termination. In comprehending, however, the definite adjective declension, the science of Grammar, which in many other points had raised itself far above the empirical perception of the language, was here still left far behind it; and we felt, in forms like *guter, gutem, gute*, more than we recognised, namely, a pronoun which still operated in spirit, although it was no longer bodily present. How acute, in this respect, our perception is, is proved by the fact that we place the definite form of the adjective beside the *ein* when deprived [G. Ed. p. 368.]
of its definitive pronominal element; but, in the oblique cases, beside the definite *eines, einem, einen*, the indefinite: *ein grosses, eines grossen* (not *grosses, einem grossen*)

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,</td>
<td>m. <em>yis</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>m. <em>yini</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yeni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental,</td>
<td>m. <em>yu</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yë</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>m. <em>yûm</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yei</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>m. <em>yo</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yûs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>m. <em>yamë</em></td>
<td>f. <em>yoyë</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Occurs only as the relative in union with *sche*. 
ADJECTIVES.

PLURAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithuanian (Nominative)</th>
<th>Old Sclavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative, m.</td>
<td>yie (yi), f. yos,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative, m.</td>
<td>yâs, f. yes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental, m.</td>
<td>yeis, f. yomis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, m.</td>
<td>yiem, f. yoms,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, m.</td>
<td>yû,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative, m.</td>
<td>yûsê, f. yosâ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DUAL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lithuanian (Nominative)</th>
<th>Old Sclavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative, m.</td>
<td>yu (yû), f. yî,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative, m.</td>
<td>yuû, f. yin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative, m.</td>
<td>yiem, f. yom, Instr. Dat. m. f. n. yima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive, m.</td>
<td>yû, Gen. Loc. m. f. n. yeyû.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. Gēras, “good,” will serve as an example.

MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>gerâsis,†</td>
<td>gerûyu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>gerânyan,</td>
<td>gerûynû,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>gerûyu,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>geramyam,</td>
<td>giriemsion,‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>geroyo,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>geramyame,</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>gerasis,</td>
<td>gerûyu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note on preceding page.
† Or gerassis, by assimilation from gerasyis, as, in the Prâkrit 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.
### ADJECTIVES.

#### FEMININE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>DUAL</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>geroyi,</td>
<td>gerieyi,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>geranyei,</td>
<td>geriyin,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental,</td>
<td>geraye,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>geraisyei,</td>
<td>geromsom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>gerosies,</td>
<td>geruyu,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>geroyoye,</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative,</td>
<td>geroyi,</td>
<td>geriy,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

#### SINGULAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASCULINE</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indef.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Def.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>svyat,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental,</td>
<td>svyatom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>svyatá,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive,</td>
<td>svyata,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative,</td>
<td>svatyge,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See Note 1 on preceding page.

1 See §. 255. d. 2 Or svaty-m, in which, as in the Lithuanian, the adjective is inflected at the same time.

3 The indefinite and definite forms are here the same, for this reason, that svatoyu-yejá, 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 svatoyu-i, where an external identity with the indefinite form is not perceptible.

4 Or svatyge-i. Comp. Note 2.
**ADJECTIVES**

**PLURAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASCULINE</th>
<th>FEMININE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indef.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Def.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative,</td>
<td>svyati,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative,</td>
<td>svyaty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental,</td>
<td>svyaty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative,</td>
<td>svyatom,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SINGULAR.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEUTER</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indef.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Def.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom. Accus.</td>
<td>svyato,</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: svaty-imi, svaty-m, svaty-ch.

6 Although in the pronominal declension the genitive plural is externally identical with the locative, we must nevertheless, in my opinion, separate the two cases, in respect to their origin. I find, however, the reason of their agreement in this, that the Sanskrit, which in this case is most exactly followed by the German and Slavonic, in pronouns of the third person begins the plural genitive termination with a sibilant, Sanskrit sām, Gothic ze (for se, §. 248.). This s, then, has, in Old Slavonic, become ch, just like that of the locative characteristic sū (§. 279.). The nasal of sām must, according to rule, be lost (§. 255. l.): the vowel, however, has, contrary to rule, followed it, as also in the ordinary declension the termination ām has entirely disappeared (§. 278.); and the same relation which imen, "nominum," has to the Gothic naman-e, tye-ch, "horum," has to thī-ze. This tye-ch, however, answers as genitive to the Sanskrit तेषाम् tē-ṣām, and as locative to हेत्र् tē-ṣhu; 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.
[G. Ed. p. 371.] 285. As in the Sanskrit the preponderating majority of adjective bases end in the masculine and neuter in a, and in the feminine in ō; and as this class is, in the Old Sclavonic, only represented by bases in o, yo in the masculine and neuter (see §. 257.), and a, ya in the feminine; it is not surprising that in German also, with the exception of a few in u (of the comparative and participle present), all other adjective bases, in their original condition, end in a, feminine o for ō (§. 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—

MASCULINE. | NEUTER. | FEMININE.
---|---|---
**Theme, BLINDAN.** | **BLINDAN.** | **BLINDON.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. V. blinda,</td>
<td>blinda-s,</td>
<td>blindo,</td>
<td>blindon-a,</td>
<td>blindo',</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc. blinda,</td>
<td>blinda-s,</td>
<td>blindo',</td>
<td>blindon-a,</td>
<td>blindon,</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat. blinda,</td>
<td>blinda',</td>
<td>blindin,</td>
<td>blinda'-m,</td>
<td>blindón,</td>
<td>blindo'-m,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. blinda-s,</td>
<td>blinda'-e,</td>
<td>blindin-s,</td>
<td>blindon-s,</td>
<td>blindon-0.</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.

### MASCULINE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. vulfs,</td>
<td>blind's,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. vulf,</td>
<td>hva-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. vulfa,</td>
<td>hva-na,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. vulfi-s,</td>
<td>hvai-ns,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. vulf',</td>
<td>hvlai,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. haryi-s,</td>
<td>midyis,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. hari,</td>
<td>hvaria-s,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. harya,</td>
<td>harya-sveipains, &quot;deluge,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. haryi-s,</td>
<td>hary-is,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. hari,</td>
<td>midyis,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See §. 135.  
2 See §. 228.  
3 See §. 171.  
4 See §. 227.  
5 See §. 160.  
6 From haryu-s, see §. 135.  
7 The nominative in adjective bases in ya does not occur, unless perhaps in the fragments which have last appeared; and I have here formed it by analogy with haryis and haryis. Grimm gives midis (I. 170.). If, 1. 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  *daura*  *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>
<th>[G. Ed. p. 375]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. giba,  <em>blinda</em></td>
<td><em>hvó</em></td>
<td><em>gibó</em> 2  <em>blindó</em> 2  <em>hvó</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. giba,   <em>blinda</em></td>
<td><em>hvó</em> 11</td>
<td><em>gibo</em>-s,  <em>blindó</em>-s,  <em>hvó</em>-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. gibai,  <em>blindai</em> 12</td>
<td><em>hvizai</em> 13</td>
<td><em>gibó</em>-m,  *blindaim, hvai-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. gibó-s,  <em>blindaizó</em> 13</td>
<td><em>hvizó</em>-s, 13</td>
<td><em>gib'ó</em>,  *blindaizo, hví-zó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. giba,   <em>blinda?</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>gibó</em>,  <em>blindó</em>,  <em>hvó</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. kunthi,  <em>midya</em></td>
<td><em>hvarya</em></td>
<td><em>kunthyó</em> 2  <em>midyó</em> 2  <em>hvaryó</em> 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. kunthya, <em>midya</em></td>
<td><em>hvarya</em></td>
<td><em>kunthyó</em>-s,  <em>midyó</em>-s,  <em>hvaryó</em>-s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. kunthyai,  <em>midyai</em> 12</td>
<td><em>hvarya</em> 12</td>
<td><em>kunthyó</em>-m,  <em>midyó</em>  m,  <em>hvaryó</em>-m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. kunthyó-s,  <em>midyaizó</em> 13</td>
<td><em>hvaryaizó</em> 13</td>
<td>*kunthyó'-ó,  *midyó'-ó,  *hvaryó'-ó.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. kunthi,  <em>midya</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>kunthyó</em>-s,  <em>midyó</em>-s,  <em>hvaryó</em>-s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answers to the Sanskrit मध्य madhya. Formed from midya as theme, midyás 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 ς.z.y. tuirim, "quartum," from ςςς.y. tuirya (§. 42 ).

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

10 The form *hvo*, which, like some others of this pronoun, cannot be shown to occur, is, by Grimm, rightly formed by analogy from *thó, *hec." 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. 187. 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 Sclavonic [G. Ed. p. 376.] and Lithuanian, renders the adjective definite, namely, the Indian relative या (ya). This pronoun in German, indeed, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, 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 it base must be acknowledged to belong to the Sanskrit, which, in Latin, is completely declined; in Gothic almost completely; but in Sanskrit, except the neuter nominative accusative idam, “this,” has maintained itself only in derivative forms, as इति i-ti, इत्यथम it-tham, “so,” इत्यत iy-at, “so much,” इत्येद i-dṛśa, “such.” The case is the same in Gothic, with the pronominal base या: from this comes, in my opinion the affirmative particle या, as in other languages, also, affirmation is expressed by pronominal forms (i-tu, तथा ta-thā, “so,” o’rlos), and further याबै, “if,” analogous with ibai, “whether,” ibaini, “lest”; as also, in Sanskrit, यदि yadi, “if,” comes from the same base, and to this, as I now believe, the Greek ει—the semi-vowel being laid aside—has the same relation as in Prākrit, in the 3d person singular present, αι, e.g. भमेद bhamai, “he wanders” (Urvasi by Lenz, p. 63), has to the more usual बद ऐ, for the Sanskrit सत्ति ati. In Prākrit, too, जइ 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 λέγει from λέγετι), the Greek runs parallel to the corruption of the Prākrit. If, however, in ει the Sanskrit य y has disappeared, as in the ΑEolic वμες—Sanskrit युश्मेद, it appears as h in ṥ, which has nothing to do with the article ṝ, ṭ, where h falls only to the nominative masculine and feminine, while in ṝ it runs through all the cases, as
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in Sanskrit the y of yast yas-s. To this [G. Ed. p. 377.]

In regard to the rough breathing, bears the same relation as \( \nu \) to \( \nu shme. \) \( \alpha \) to \( \nu aj, \) "to worship," "to sacrifice," \( \nu shya, \) "to be worshiped;" \( \nu shiv \) to \( \nu yudh, \) "to strive," \( \nu shma. \) "strife" (comp. Pott, pp. 236, 252.) But to return to the Gothic \( \text{YA}, \) let us further observe \( \nu h, \) "and," "also," with \( h \) enclitic, of which hereafter, and \( \nu n, \) "now," i.e. "at this time," "already" (comp. Latin \( j a m). \)

It also clearly forms the last portion of \( hvar-\text{yis} \) (for \( yas), \) as, in the Slavonic, this pronoun often unites itself with almost all others, and, for example, is contained in \( ky-i, \) "who?"

although the interrogative base also occurs without this combination.

298. In Gothic definite adjectives the pronominal base \( \text{YA} \) shews itself most plainly in bases in \( u. \) Of these, indeed, there are but a few, which we annex below;\( h \) but a \( y a \) shews itself in all the cases, and these in \( \text{blinds} \) differ from the substantive declension, to such an extent that before the \( y \) the \( u \) of the adjective is suppressed, as in Sanskrit before the comparative and superlative suffixes \( iyas, ishta; \) e.g. laghiyas, "more light," laghishta, "most light," for laghv-iyas, laghv-ishta from laghu; and as, even in Gothic, hard-izd, "more hard" (according to

---

* The \( h \) may assimilate itself to the initial consonant of the following word, and thus may arise \( yag, yan, \) and \( yas, \) and in conjunction with \( th\) : \( \text{yatthe, or} \) (see Massmann's Gloss.).

† Agvus, "narrow," \( a\) glus, "heavy," glaggvus, "industrious," hardus, "hard," manvus, "ready," thaurus, "dry," thlaqvus, "tender," seithus, "late," fillus, "much," and, probably, hnasqvus, "tender." Some occur only as adverbs, as glaggou-\( h\)a, "industriously." In addition to the adverb fillu, "much," since Grimm treated this subject the genitive fillus has been found (fillus mais, "for much more," see Massmann's Gloss.), which is the more gratifying, as the adjective \( u \) bases had not yet been adduced in this case.
[G. Ed. p. 378.] Massmann, p. 48), for hardv-izō from HARDU. Hitherto, however, only the accusative singular masculine thaurś-vana, "siccum," manv'-yana, "paratum"; the accusative singular neutral 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 hnasquvs.* 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:—

**MASculine.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>manv'-s,</td>
<td>(manv'-yai), manv'-s, (manv'-yás).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac.</td>
<td>manv'-ya-na, manv'-ya-ns, (manv'-ya), (manv'-yás),</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>(manv'-ya-mna), manv'-ya-i-m, (manv'-ya), (manv'-yaizm).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>manvau-s, (manv'-yaizé), (manv'-yaizós), (manv'-yaizd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMININE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR.</th>
<th>PLURAL.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>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 ख n, र r, or त t, to त u. So Urvasi, p. 72, álu, tālu, ávarānu, for kāla, tāla, ávarāna; p. 71, manāharu for manāhora.

† Without inflection and pronom. manvu, as खातु svadu, ḫōv, Lithuanian darkū.
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“Remark I.—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. \(^2\)). That, however, the feminine has equal claim to s as the nominative character, and that it is entirely without inflection where this is wanting, I think I have shewn in §§. 134. 137. Adjective bases in i, which in the Gothic, as in the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, are wanting, end, in the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, in the nominative of both genders, in is; and only the neuter is devoid of inflection: compare शुचिस् suchi-s m. f., “clean,” suchi n., with दोषी-स, दोषी 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 मन्वु-s above, and the neuter pāṇḍu with manvus. If two consonants do not precede the final य u, as in पाण्डु, the feminine base may, except in compound words, be lengthened by an त, which is particularly characteristic of this gender; and thus स्वाति swādi, “the sweet” (theme and nominative), answers to the Greek word ἱδεῖα, which is lengthened by an unorganic α (§. 119.), for ἱδὴ; and swādi-s answers both as feminine and masculine nominative to the Gothic manvus. In the Sanskrit, also, a short u in the feminine base may be lengthened, and thus the feminine of तन् tanu, “thin,” is either tanu or tanā, whence the nominative tanū-s; and tanū, as substantive, means the “slender woman.” The Lithuanian has adjective bases in u, as szwiesu-s, m. “light,” “clear,” (compare स्वेता svēta, “white,”) which nevertheless, in several cases, replace the u by a; as szwiesām dangui, “to the bright heaven”: in some, too, they prefix an i to the a, the assimilating power of which changes the a into e (comp. p. 169 Note); as, szwiesiems dangums, “to the bright heavens.” The feminine is, in the nominative, szwiesi, the
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[G. Ed. p. 380.] final i of which is evidently identical with the Sanskrit ग्ति in swādāt. In the oblique cases, however, an unorganic a also is added to the Lithuanian i, as it has been in नेवा: this ia, however, becomes either by euphony, e (comp. p. 174, Note *), e.g. accus. szwiesen, 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 szwiesōs rankōs, “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 manvyanā which has been cited, the conjectured dative manvyamma is least doubtful. That Grimm should suggest forms like hardvamma, hardv-ana, arises from his regarding amma, ana, as the dative and accusative terminations of the pronoun and adjective; while, in fact, the terminations are simply mma and na. When, therefore, HARDU, in the dative and accusative, without annexing a pronoun, follows nevertheless the pronominal declension, the cases mentioned must be written hardu-mma, hardu-na, analogous with tha-mma, tha-na, i-mma, i-na. If, however, contrary to all expectation, forms like hardvamma, hardvana, shew themselves, they must be deduced from hardu-ya-mma, hardu-ya-na; so that after suppressing the y, the preceding u, in the place in which it would be left, has passed into v. With regard to blindamma, blindana, blindata, it is doubtful whether they ought to be divided blind’-(y)amma, blind’-(y)ana, blind’-(y)ata, as analogous with manv(u)-yamma, manv(u)-ya-mma, manv(u)-ya, 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 Scæl- 

vonic dative sryato-mā, 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 gerūs-us for gerūs-yus (see p. 353); and with respect to the y which has been dropped and the vowel which is left, blind'-amma would have the same relation to blind'-yamma as midums, "the middle man" (theme MIDUMA), to its Sanskrit cognate form of the same import. Madhyāna 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 vullans, 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 hnasv'-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, केः kē) to be an abbreviation of blind'-ya.

"Remark 4.—In the Sanskrit, in some cases an i blends itself with the final a, which, with the a of the base, becomes e: hence the instrumental plural of the Veda dialect and of the Prākrit, सदभिः aśvē-bhīs from aśwa, कुसोभिः kusumē-hin from kusuma. To this e answers the ai in
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 \( \mathcal{Y}A \) 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 defines, an \( i \) unsubstantiated by the oldest grammar shews itself, to recognise in the \( i \) a remnant of the pronominal base \( \mathcal{Y}A \), 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 \( \mathcal{Y}A \), as in the Lithuanian \( geras-is \) for \( geras-yis \), (p. 353). The latter view pleases me the better because it accords more closely with blind'-amma, blind'-ana, &c., from blind'-yamma, blind'-yana. The vowel, then, which in blind'-amma, &c., maintains itself in its original form, appears, in this view, as \( i \) in the feminine singular genitive blindaizós—which is to be divided blindaizós—from blinda-yizós; and this yizós is analogous with hvizós, thizós, from hvazós, thazós, = Sanskrit kasyás, tasyás (§. 172.). We must not require blindó-izós — because BLINDÓ is the feminine adjective base—for there is a reason for the thinning of the \( d \), in the difficulty of placing the syllables together, and \( a \) is the short of \( d \) (§. 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, salbóí). In the feminine dative one should expect blindaizai 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 रे of the pronominal genitive, as तेषाम्, "horum"; and therefore the division blindai-ze or blind'-(y)aize should be made: as, however, the monosyllabic pronominal bases, in which one would rather expect a firm adherence to the old diphthong (comp. §. 137.), do not retain it, and thi-zé, "horum," hvi-zé, "quorum," as weakened forms of tha-zé, hva-zé, are used; and in the feminine thi-zó, hvi-zó, for thó-zó, hvó-zó, = Sanskrit tó-sám, ká-sám; I therefore prefer to substantiate in a different way the ai in blindaižé m. n., and blindaizó f., than by the Sanskrit é of तेषाम् m. n. (f. tó-sám), which, moreover, would not be applicable to the feminine form blindaizó; and I do it, in fact, by the pronominal base या, so that blindaižé blindai-izó, is the division to be made according to the analogy of blindai-izós.

“Remark 5.—The nominative masculine and feminine has kept itself free, in Gothic, from union with the old relative base, and has remained resting upon the original, as received from the Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin. The masculine blinds, also, through the very characteristic and animated s (see §. 134.), has cause to feel itself personified and defined determinately enough. Even if blinds could be looked upon as an abbreviation of blindeis (comp. altheis, "old," from the base ALTHYĀ, 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,
like manvu-s above, which, in the oblique cases, shew so clearly the pronominal base \( \mathbf{YA} \), have not received it in the nominative singular of the personal genders. In Old High German however, the pronoun spoken of has had time, in the space of almost four centuries which intervene between its oldest memorials and Ulfilas, to raise itself up from the oblique cases to the nominative; which was the more desirable, as the Old High German substantive declen-

[\text{G. Ed. p. 383.}] sion in the nominative masculine, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, omits the mark of case. Plintër (the length of the \( e \) is here rendered certain) is contracted from plinta-ir (for plinta-yir); for the Old High German \( e \) corresponds, according to §. 78., to the Gothic ai. In the feminine, therefore, the form plintyu, which occurs in the chief number of strict Old High German authorities, and those which, as Grimm remarks, are the oldest of all, has good substantiation, and corresponds very fitly to the masculine plintër; and in the nominative and accusa-
tive plural and neuter the form plint-yu, with regard to the retaining the \( y \) of the pronoun, is more genuine than the Gothic blind-a for blind-ya. The form plintyu, moreover, answers to feminine pronominal forms like dyu, "the" (f.), syu, "she," dësyu (di-syu), "this"* (f.), and to the instru-
mental masculine and neuter dyu (in the interrogative huiu), where all authorities concur in retaining the \( i \) or \( y \); while in the adjective, Otfrid, and, as Grimm remarks, here and there Isidore and Tatian, have \( u \) for \( yu \). For explanation,

* As in the Old High German \( i \) and \( j \) (\( y \)) are not distinguished in writing, it remains uncertain in many, if not in all cases, in what places of the memorials which have come down to us the sound \( j \), and in what that of \( i \) is intended; as even where the Gothic has \( a \), 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 dêsju; 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 यa, by which the first pronoun loses its vowel. Compare, then—

**Sanskrit.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old High German.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old Scævonic.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
<th>सा</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
<td>या</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
<td>ते</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
<td>त्य</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
<td>तन</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here, then, in a manner as remarkable as convincing, the relation is proved in which the Old High German forms mentioned stand to the Gothic só, thó, thai; [G. Ed. p. 384.] thó, thó: one must first transpose these into syó, thyó, &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 Scævonic, where the demonstrative base TO may indeed be simply inflected through all the cases: in several, however, which we have partly given above, it occurs also in union with YO. It is most probable, that in the Old High German the combination of the base of the article with the old relative pronoun has extended itself over all the cases of the three genders; for that it does not belong to the feminine alone is seen from the masculine and neuter instrumental form dyu (d'-yu), and from the dative plural, where together with dém occurs also dyém (diém), and, in Notker, always dien. According to this, I deduce the forms dër, dês, dém, &c., from dyr, dyes (for dyis), dyemu (from dyamu); so that, after suppression of the vowel following the य, that letter has vocalized itself first to i and thence to ē. According to this, therefore, dês, and the Gothic genitive
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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 blindyata—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 thā-na and the Old High German dē-n (I give the accusative intentionally) is furnished by the demonstrative dēsēr, 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 Sclavonic, also, as a simple word. Dēsēr stands, therefore, for dyā-sēir (ē=ai); and our Modern German dieser rests, in fact, upon a more perfect dialectic form than that which is preserved to us in the above dēsēr, 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 MIDYĀ=Sanskrit madhya, are less favourable to the retention of the y of the definite pronoun; for to the feminine or plural neuter plint'-yu for plinta-yu a midy'-yu would be analogous, which, on account of the diffi-

[G. Ed. p. 385.] culty of pronouncing it, does not occur, but may have originally existed in the form midya-yu, or midya-ya; for the masculine nominative midyēr is from midya-ir for midya-yr, 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.
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 fiyand-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, szissai, 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 (\(^{2}\), sec §. 119.); e.g. from *charant* m., comes *charantē*, and there was therefore no reason in the Pāli to give also to the more recent form *charanta* a feminine theme *charantā*. Here, again, the Gothic stands in remarkable accordance with the Pāli, for it has produced no feminine base *GIBANDŌ* from the presupposed *GIBANDA*; and therefore, also, the indefinite *GIBANDAN* has no feminine, *GIBANDŌN*, nom. *gibandā*, answering to it (as *BLINDŌN* to *BLINDAN*); but the feminine form *gibandeī* (*ei=ī*, §. 70.), which has arisen from the old theme *GIBAND*, in analogy with the Sanskrit *charantē*, has become *GIBANDEIN*, by the later addition of an *n*. Hence, according to §. 142., in the nominative *gibandeī* 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 *charantē* (§. 137.), and to Lithuanian forms like *sukanti*, "the turning," for which a theme *sukantin* is nowise admissible. In Latin, bases in *i* or *ī*, originally feminine, must have arisen from adjective bases terminating with a consonant; thus *FERENTI* from *FERENT* (compare §. 119. *genitrē-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 ablative 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
ADJECTIVES.

Participles, when standing as substantives, freely take this i, which is introduced into them from the feminine adjective (infante, sapiente).

"Remark.—In the yu of kèpan'yu, the Old High German feminine of kēpentër, I recognise the regular defining element, as above in plintyũ, answering to the masculine plintēr. On account of the participial feminines in yu, therefore, it is not requisite to presuppose masculines in yēr, according to the analogy of midyēr, midyũ, midyaz, partly as kēpentēr and kēpantaz, incline, in none of their cases, to the declension of midyēr, midyaz, and also as the derivative indefinite base in an has sprung from KĒPANTA, and not from KĒPANTYA: therefore m. kēpanto (=Gothic gibanda), f. n. kēpanta (=Gothic gibandō). This only is peculiar to the Old High German participle present, in relation to other adjectives, that in its uninflected adverbial state it retains the defining pronominal base YA in its contraction to i; therefore kēpantī, "giving," not kepan, like plint. It is, however, to be observed, that there is far more frequent occasion to use this form divested of case terminations in the participle present, than in all other adjectives, as the definite form in nds in Gothic, in the nominative singular masculine, corresponds to it; and as it may be assumed, that here the 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 taufantēr, although the reverse might just as well occur, or both participles might stand in the same form, whether that of the nominative or adverbial. As regards the Old Saxon forms mentioned by Grimm, namely, slāpandyes or slāpandeas, "dormientis," gnornondye, "maerentes," buandyum, "habitan-tibus," they should, in my opinion, be rather adduced in
proof of the proposition, that the participle present has, in the dialect mentioned, preserved the defining element more truly than other adjectives; and that those forms have maintained themselves in the degree of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 388.] forms like 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 tamā, which are added to the common masculine and neuter theme of the positive; e.g. punya-tara, punya-tama, from punya, "pure"; sichī-tara, sichī-tama, from sichī, "clean"; balavat-tara, balavat-tama, from balavat, "strong." In the Zend, through a perversion of the language ṛātīr tara and ṛātīr tēma unite themselves with (in place of the theme) the nominative singular masculine; e.g. ṛātīrā humkētara (Vend. S. p. 383) from humka, nominative masculine humkā, "dry"; ṛātīrā spēntēma from spēnta, "holy"; ṛātīrā vērēthrazāntēma (Vend. S. p. 43) from vērēthrazānt, nom. vērēthrazāns, "victorious" (literally, "Vṛitra-slaying").* According to my opinion tar tara owes

* The participle present zant, the nominative of which I recognise in vērēthra-zāns, rests on the analogy of the frequently-occurring upa-zōit, "let him strike"; since, in fact, the root zan (Sanskrit ḍan 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 ḍan han, "slaying," which appears in Vṛitra-han, "Vṛitra slaying," and similar compounds, has, in Zend, taken the form jan, the nominative of which is ḍano (Vend. S. p. 43),
its origin to the root त्र (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 pre-position 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 तन tan, "to extend," whence, also, τατος 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 इष्टha may be satisfactorily considered as derived from its comparative ḗyas, through the suffix tha, which, in the Greek, is contained in the form of το, as well in ισ-τος as in τατος, for τατος or τατος. In this manner, therefore, is formed τατος and तमस 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 पंचम panchama, "the fifth": the vowel, however, is more truly retained in the derivative τατος than in its base τερος. In Latin, तमस tama-s has become timu-s (optimus, intimus, extimus, ultimus); and, by the exchange of the t with s, which is more usual in Greek than in Latin, simus; hence,
ADJECTIVES.

*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 *कातरस्* *katara-s* is "which of two persons?" and *कठमस्* *katama-s*, "which of more than two persons?" *एकातरस्* *ekataras* is "one of two persons," and *ekatama-s*, "one of more than two." It is hardly necessary to call attention to similar forms in Greek, as *πότερος* (for *κότερος*), *ἐκάτερος*. In *ἐκαστός* the superlative suffix (*στός* for *ιστός*) presents a different modification from that in *ἐκαταμα-s*, and expresses "the one of two persons," instead of "the one of many persons." In Latin and German, indeed, the suffix *tara* is not in use in genuine comparatives, but has maintained itself in pronouns in Latin in the form of *TERU* (*ter*, *teru-m*), and in Gothic in that of *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 *wedder*, 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 *ra*. Hence, above, *hvathar* for *hvathar(a)s*, as *alter* for *alterus*; so also vair, "man," = Latin *vir* for *viri-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 *akra*, "a field" (comp. Grimm, p. 599); still the adjective nominatives *gaurs*, "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 newèder. Anthar, also, our anderer, belongs here, and answers to the Sanskrit अनर्ग् antara-ś, whose initial syllable is the same which in अन्य anya, “alias,” has united itself with the relative base य yā. From this अन्य anya comes anyatara, “alter.” If, however, अन्तर antara means, in general, “the other,” the comparative suffix is here intended to denote the person following after, passing over this thing; so is, also, the Latin ceterus to be considered, from ce as demonstrative base (compare ci-s, ci-tra); and so, also, in Sanskrit, itara, “the other,” comes from the demonstrative base i, as, in Latin, the adverb iterum from the same base.”* In our German, also, wieder is the comparative suffix, and the whole rests, perhaps, on a pre-existing Old High German word huia-dar or hwyadar, with a change of the interrogative meaning into the demonstrative, as in weder, ent-­weder. The wie in wieder, therefore, should be regarded as, p. 370, die in dieser; and herein we may refer to the Isidoric dhēa-sa.

293. In prepositions, also, it cannot be surprising if one finds them invested with a comparative or superlative suffix, or if some of them occur merely with a comparative termination. For at the bottom of all genuine prepositions,
at least in their original sense, there exists a relation between

[G. Ed. p. 392.] two opposite directions — thus, "over," "from," "before," "to," have the relations "under," "in," "towards," "from," as their counter-poles and points of comparison, as the right is opposed to the left; and is always expressed in Latin, also, with the comparative suffix, dexter (दक्षिण 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, sinisterior, like exterior, interior); while the superlative timus has affixed itself to the core of the word (dextimus or -tumus, sinistimus).

The prepositions which, in Latin, contain a comparative suffix, are inter, praeter, propter, the adverbially-used subter, and probably, also, obiter (compare audacter, pariter).* To inter answers the Sanskrit अन्तर antar, "among," "between"; for which, however, a primitive an is wanting, as in Sanskrit the relation "in" is always expressed by the locative. Notwithstanding this, antar, in regard to its suffix, is an analogous word to 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 अभि abhi, "to," "towards," the division obi-ter might also be made, and the original form of the preposition recognised in obi: observe the Sanskrit derivative अभित्स 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, prati, for ni, &c. in certain compounds. Formations which do not quite follow the usual track, and are rendered intelligible by numerous analogies, are nevertheless frequently misunderstood by the Indian Grammarians. Thus Wilson, according to native authorities, derives अन्तर antar from anta, "end," with rd, "to arrive at," and the analogous
Greek πρωτ from προ. For the relation "under," the Sanskrit has the preposition धर adhas, which I have elsewhere explained as coming from the demonstrative base ए a; from which, also, come धर a-dhara and धम a-dhama, "the under one," or "the most under," to which inferus and infimus are akin, as fumus to धुमस dhuma-s, "smoke," and, with a nasal prefixed, as in धुम "ambo," answering to उभू ubhāu, Old Slavonic oba. The suffixes धर dhara and धम dhama are, in my opinion, only slightly-corrupted forms of the tara and tama mentioned in § 291.; as also in प्रथम prathama, "the first," m. from pra, "before," the T sound of the suffix is somewhat differently transposed. The suffix dhas of adhas, "beneath," however, has exactly the same relation to tasa, in तस 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 θέν (from θεω, comp. § 217.) corresponds with it, which, in regard to its T sound, rests on the form धस dhas in धस adhas (§ 16.), as the latter also serves as the pattern of the Old Slavonic suffix dū, which only occurs in pronouns, and expresses the same relation as तस tas, θέν, tus: e.g. ὁδῷ-उद, "hence," * ono-udū, "thence." The form dū, however, corresponds to the euphonic alteration, which a final as in the Sanskrit must suffer before [G. Ed. p.394.] sonant letters (§ 25.), viz. that into δ (see § 255. f.), which in Zend has become fixed (§ 56*).

* The demonstrative base OVO answers remarkably to the Zend आ ava, with ो for a, according to § 255. (a.).
ADJECTIVES.

“Remark.—Dobrowsky p. 451 gives údâ as the full form of the suffix, just as he also lays down a suffix ûdye, which forms adverbs of place, as kûdye, “where?” onûdye, “there.” As, however, the definite pronoun, which has been treated of at p. 353, &c., exists in these two adverbs, ûdâ, ûdye, and forms, with sche, ûdûsche, ûdyesche, for yûdâ, &c.; and as this pronoun is, in general, so frequently compounded with other adverbs, there is every reason to assume that it is also contained in ovo-ûdâ, ono-ûdâ, on’-ûdye, ê-ûdye, and others. But how is the û itself in u-đâ, yû-đye, to be explained? I cannot speak with confidence on this point; but as, according to §. 255. (g.), in the last element of the diphthong ú a vocalised nasal is sometimes recognised, yudâ, yûdye, might be regarded as corruptions of yonđâ, yondye, and, in respect to their nasal, be compared with the Latin inde, unde, from I, U. Yûdye, yûdyâ, might also have proceeded from the feminine accusative yû, 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 hintar, has arisen from hin, a petrified accusative, on which the Gothic hina-dag, “this day,” “to day,” throws light. Before the suffix dye, however, elder form de, occur also the pronouns in a simple form, as gðye, “where?” (more anciently kde, with the final vowel of the base KO suppressed); zdye (older sde), “here”; idyesche, “where” (relative). As e (e), according to §. 255. (b.), frequently stands as the corruption of an older i, I recognise in the suffix de the Sanskrit य द hi, from सचि adhi, “over,” “upon” “towards,” (from the demonstrative base a), which, in Greek, is far more widely diffused in the form of ν (πόν, ἕλκονν"

294. In German, even more than in Latin, the prepositions shew themselves inclined to combine with the comparative suffix. To the Sanskrit चन्द्र 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 uf-tar, "after," for the primitive language, or languages, transmit to us only Ḫap apa, Ḫπό, "from"; to which, in the spirit of Ḫनर antar, inter, subter, &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 oʃtara, as in Latin extra, intra, contra, and others, as feminine adjectives, from extera, &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 अन्तरेण antaréṇa, "between." Perhaps, also, the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs in tra, although they have a locative meaning, like मत्र 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 tارد: compare forms like मनुष्या त्रा manuʃhya-ṭra, "inter homines" (Gramm. Crit.

* Regarding dar and tar for thar, see §. 91.
† Grimm however, also, at II. 121. &c., divides bróth-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 after is related to after, so is the Gothic withra, "against," to the Old High German widar, our wider, the primitive of which is supplied by the Sanskrit through its

[G. Ed. p. 396.] inseparable preposition फ़ि वि, which expresses separation, distraction, e.g. in visrip, "to go from one another," "to disperse." Exactly similar is the Sanskrit फ़ि ni, to which I was the first to prove the meaning "below" to belong,* and whence comes the adjective नीच nīcha, "low" (Gramm. Crit. §. 111.), the base of our nieder, Old High Ger-

[G. Ed. p. 397.] man ni-dar.† From hin-dar, Old High German hin-tar, comes our hin-ter which has already been discussed (p. 394, G. ed. compare Grimm. III. 177. c.). In the Old High German sun-dar, Gothic sun-drō, "seorsim," afterwards a preposition, our sondern, dar is, in like manner, clearly the comparative suffix, and the base appears to me, in spite of the difference of signi-

* It is usual to attribute to it the meaning "in," "into," which cannot in any way be supported.

† Grimm assents to my opinion, which has been already expressed in another place, regarding the relationship of फ़ि ni and nidār (III. 258, 259): he wishes, however, to divide thus nid-ar, and to suppose a Gothic verb nithan, nath, nethun, 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-vē-da, "afflatus," to which the Sanskrit supplies या wa, "to blow," as root, the Gothic gives vō (§. 69.) (vaia, varvō). To gi-nā-

-da, indeed, the Sanskrit supplies no root nā, but perhaps nam, "to bend oneself," the m of which, according to the laws of euphony, is suppressed before t, which does not produce Guna; as nata, "bent," nati, "bending," with the preposition sam, san-nati, which Wilson explains by "reverence," "obeisance," "reverential salutation." As the Gothic inseparable prepo-

sition ga, Old High German gi or ki, is, as Grimm first acutely remarked, identical with the Sanskrit sam, gi-nā-da has much the same formation with san-na-ti: it would, however, still better agree with the feminine

passive
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ification, related to the Sanskrit सम् sam, "with" (compare Gothic samath, "together with," Old High German samant), and the u, therefore, is from a, according to §. 66. The Latin contra, however, is nearly just as much opposed in meaning to its primitive cum; and as cum (compare σῶν) belongs, in like manner, to सम् sam, so sundar, sundrö, and contra, would be, in a double respect, sister forms. Observe, also, the Gothic samath, Old High German samant, "together with": the latter answers surprisingly to the Sanskrit समन्त samanta (from sam + anta, "an end"), the ablative of which, samantát, as also the adverb, samantalas, mean "everywhere." Perhaps, too, in all other Old High German adverbs in nt (Grimm. III. 214.), the said सन्त अंत a is contained, for the meaning "end," cannot be unexpected in adverbs of place and time, and, like Mittle, "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 nidad, as they can be fully set at rest by the existence of a Sanskrit primitive नि ni, "below," and the comparative suffix dar, which frequently occurs in prepositions. And as the circumstance that genuine original prepositions never come from verbs, but are connected with pronouns, I must, with regard to its etymology, keep back every verb from our nidad. Grimm wishes also to divide the Gothic preposition vi-thrå, Old High German vi-dar, into vi-th-ra, wid-ar, and to find their base in the Anglo-Saxon preposition with, English with, Old Slavonic vid, Old Norman vidh, Swedish vid, Danish ved, which mean "with," and, according to appearance, are wanting in the Gothic and High German. If, however, one considers the easy and frequent interchange of t, b, and m (चारि vāri, "water," = mare, βπότος = म्रीतस mritis, "mortus"), 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 māt), and which, in most of the dialects mentioned, maintains itself equally with the other forms; as it often occurs, in the history of languages, that the true form of a word is equally preserved with a corruption of it.
(compare *innitten*, "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.*

[Note]: *p. 201.* Many other Gothic adverbs in ɵ as *sinteið*, "always," *sinumundð*, "hastily," *sprantð*, "suddenly," *thrídyð*, "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 *thrídyð* would
answer to the Sanskrit ablative tritīyāt while the common Gothic declension extends the ordinal bases in a by an unorganic n; thus THRIDIYN, 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 τοῦνατιον, 2 Cor. ii. 7., by thata andaneithό, here of course andaneithό is the neuter accusative; but the indument for using the indefinite form is supplied by the article, and τοῦνατιον could not be otherwise literally rendered. The case may be similar with 2 Cor. iv. 17., where Castiglione takes thata andavairthό for the nominative, but Grimm for the adverbial accusative: as it would else be an unsuitable imitation of the Greek text, where τό does not belong to αυτίκα, 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, andaneithό and andavairthό do not occur by themselves alone adverbially. As, then, thrό 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 Prákrit, 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 Slavonic final consonants (§. 255. 1). 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, चानि anti, थि tha or ता ta; and I explain the th or d, which, in pronominal bases, expresses direction to a place, as coming from the Sanskrit suffix ध a dha (र ha); which, in like manner, in pronouns expresses the locative relation. The passing over from the locative relation to the accusative, expressing the direction whither, cannot be surprising, as, even in Sanskrit, the common locative adverbs in tra, and the ablatives in tas, occur also with accusative meaning, i.e. expressing the direction to a place (see tatra in my Glossary). The Sanskrit suffix ध a dha appears, in common language, abbreviated to ha, and is found indeed, only in i-ha, “here,” from the pronominal base i and म् 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 इह iha, “here,” is, in Zend, मह idha,* and fre-

[G. Ed. p. 400.] quently occurs in combination with मन na, "not"; so that महम् naēdha† means "nor," answering to नौ nit. "neither" (literally "not it," from na+i, §. 33.). From मम ava and मम adha, “this” (mas.), comes मममम

* Vend. Sâde, p. 368. several times: मममम मम adha, मम adha imam idha vachô framrava, “haec hic verba enuntia,” which Anquetil translates by “en prononçant bien ces paroles.” In the same page also occurs repeatedly मम adha, with the same meaning, from the demonstrative base a, as in the Vêda’s अध adha (Rosen’s Sp. p. 10), without perceptible meaning.

† a+i makes ल, according to §. 2.; and from nēdha is formed, by §. 28., naēdha.
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avadha and 诟呁呁呃呃 aeta-dha (Vend. S. p. 164). To the Zend-Vedic suffix dha corresponds most exactly the Greek θα, in ἔνθα and ἑντα-θα, “here.” Perhaps ἔνθα and μόζ i-dha, ἵθ ια, are, with regard to their base, identical; ἔνθα, therefore, is for ἑνθα from θα (comp. in, inde), as nasals are easily prefixed to another consonant, and thus ἀμφί answers to अभि abhi, άμφω to अभि ubhāu, Old Sclavonic oba; but अथा, in the triple compound ἐν-τ-αύθα, is completely the Zend मध्यम avadha, whose theme ava has been contracted in the Greek to αύ (compare αυ-θι and αυ-τός, the latter being combined with the article), but in the Old Sclavonic it is more correctly preserved in the form of OVO. To the word हत्य ihatya, “of this place,” which is derived from हत iha through the suffix य tya, corresponds the Greek ἐνθάσιος, 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 य tya belongs only to local adverbs and prepositions, so might also the Gothic ni-thyis, “cousin” (for ni-thyas, §. 135.), as propinquus, or one who stands somewhat lower in relationship than a brother, &c., be derived from the [G. Ed. p. 401.]

* Before my acquaintance with the Zend, and deeper examination of the Sclavonic, I believed I could make out the Greek base αυ to agree with the Sanskrit amu, “ille,” by casting out the m (as κούπος with κυ-μάδα): now, however, अध 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 नपत naptri, “a grandson,” is, I have no doubt, compounded of na, “not,” and pitri, “father”; and “not-father” is regarded as a possessive compound, “not having as father,” in relation to the grandfather, who is not the father of the grandson. In Latin it would be difficult to find the etymology of nepos (nepot-)—and the same may be said of our word neffe—without the aid of the word Vater, which is fully preserved from the Sanskrit. In the

meaning
ancient preposition *ni*, mentioned at p. 382, from which, in Sanskrit, *nitya* actually comes, but differently related, and with a signification answering less to the meaning of the preposition, namely, *sempiternus*. In consideration of the aspirates in Greek being easily interchanged, and, *e.g.* in the Doric, "OPNIX is said for "OPNIΘ, one may also recognise in the syllable *xο*, in forms like *παντα-χό-θεν* *παντα-χό-σε*, *πολλαχόσε*, and others, a cognate form of the suffix *θα*, *dha*, or of the corrupted *πα* (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*). *Πανταχό* might, in the identity of its suffix with *θα*, *dha*, or *ha*, mean "everywhere"; whence may then be said *πανταχό-σε*, "from everywhere," &c., as we combine our locative adverbs *wo* and *da* with *her* and *hin* (*woher*, *wohin*); and in Greek, also, *ἐκεῖθε*, *ἐκεῖσε*, *ἐκεῖθεν*, which might literally mean *in illic*, *versus illic*, *ab illic*, as *ἐκεῖ* is a local adverb. Forms in *χο*, however, are in a measure raised to themes capable of declension, though only for adverbs, and develope, also, case-forms, as *πανταχό*ο, *πανταχόι* (old locative and dative), *πανταχόν*. The addition of new suffixes or terminations to those already existing, but which are obsolete, appears to me assuredly more natural than, as Buttmann supposes, the introduction of an unmeaning *αχ* or even *αχο*, in which case we should have to divide *παντ-αχό-θεν*, &c. But as the *χο* under discussion has arisen from *θα*, *dha*, I think I recognise in the *χι* of ᾨχι a corruption of the suffix *θι*, from ᾲ *dhi*; in which respect might be compared ᾲγχι, 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 *рат*, "to fall," and a Unādi suffix *τρί*.
degrees of comparison.
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As a third form in which the Vedic-Zend suffix dha appears in Greek, I notice σε, with σ for θ, ὑ ὑ, as μεσός from मध्य madhya, “midst,” the y 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 γαγγίς, ποῦ ὑπάγεις—γαίν-ά, ἕκρι-σε, αλγα-θ, ἀλλα-σε. To the Zend idha, Greek ἐνθά, 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 य या, has preserved the original locative meaning together with the accusative, and thad-ei may be cited as “where” and “whither.” The d in these forms, answering to the Greek Θ, agrees with the rule for the transmutation of sounds (§. 87.); and it is to be observed that medials at the end of a word freely pass into aspirates—compare bauth, bu-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 thró, taró, 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 hidrè,* “hither,” Mark xi. 3. Luke xiv. 21.; hva-dré, “whither?” John vii. 35. On the other hand, yaindrè ac-

* Vide §. 901.
tually occurs with a locative meaning; tharei leik, yaindre galisand sik arans, ἰπον τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ συναχθοῦσαν οἱ αἰτοῖ. Compare these forms with the Sanskrit, as, adharê, “in
the lower,” and the Lithuanian wilkè (§. 197.). That, however, the Gothic ð, which in the genitive plural masculine
and neuter answers to the Sanskrit झा d (§. 69.), moreover corresponds to घ, is proved by preterites like nênum, ‘we took,’ answering to the singular nam; as, in Sanskrit, नेमिना, ‘we bent ourselves,’ answers to नन ननाम or नन ननाम, ‘I bent myself.’ ”

295. The superlative suffix तम tama occurs in the Gothic also in the form of TUMAN, nominative tuma, or, with d for t in prepositional derivations, either simply or in combination with the common superlative suffix ISTA; thus, af-tuma, “posterus,” af-tumists, “postremus,” hin-dumists, “extremus.” If one considers the Indian suffix तम tama, to have suffered apocope of the a—as in Latin, also, timus appears abbreviated to tim in adverbs like viri-tim, caterva-tim, which I have already, in another place (Heidelb. Jahrb. 1918. p. 480), explained, together with forms like legi-timus, as superlatives—one may look for that tam in the Gothic cor-

[G. Ed. p. 403.] rupted to tana, after the analogy of the accusative masculine of pronouns, like tha-na = तम tam, τὸν, hva-
-na = का ka-m, “whom?”; and accordingly regard the pre-
positional derivations in tana, dana, as superlative forms; thus,
Gothic af-tana, “behind”; hindana, πέραν, Old High German
ni-dana, “under” (compare our hie-nieden, “here below.” As,
however, in Old High German there exist, also, formations in ana without a preceding t sound (Grimm III. 203, &c.), it is a question whether innana “within,” ãzana “abroad,”
forana shortened to forna “from the beginning,” fêrrana
“πόρρωθεν,” rûmana “from a distance,” lôhana “ὑψάθεν,”
heimina “οὐκοθεν,” have lost a t or a d preceding the a;
or if they are formed after those in tana, dana, in the notion that the whole of the suffix consists merely of ana;
or, finally, whether they rest on some other principle.
The preposition obar, "over," Gothic ufar, which answers to the Sanskrit उपरि upari, Greek ὑπέρ, 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 चः anch, "to go"; thus the east is denoted as "that which is before," by प्रचः prâanch, from प्रpra, "before"; the west as "that which is over against it," by प्रत्यचः pratyanch, from प्रति prati, "opposite"; the south as "that below," by अवचः avâanch, from चः ara, "below"; and its opposite pole, the north, as "that above," is called उदचः 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 r and na in such a manner, that the former expresses the direction whither (Grimm. III. 205.), the latter the direction whence, which, however, was not, perhaps, the original intention of the terminations, both which seem adapted to express the same direction; the former comparatively, with a glance at [G. Ed. p. 404.]

that which is opposite, the latter superlatively, in relation to all the quarters of the globe, as, p. 376, एकतर ēkatara, "one of two persons," but एकतम ēkatama, "one of many persons." The west may perhaps be most satisfactorily explained, and in fact, as being etymologically pointed out to be that which lies over against the east, as in Sanskrit. For this object we betake ourselves to the prepositional base wi, mentioned at p. 382, whence the comparative wi-dar. We do not, however, require to deduce wēs-tar,*

---

* By writing wē, Grimm marks the corruption of the e from i, in which I readily agree with him.
"towards the west," \textit{wēs-tana}," from the west," from the derivative \textit{widar}; but we may keep to its base \textit{wi}, with the assumption of a euphonic \textit{s}; as in the Sanskrit, also, some prepositions terminating in vowels in certain combinations, and before consonants which are disposed to have an \textit{s} before them, assume this letter; \textit{e.g.} \textit{pratiśhkaśa} for \textit{pratikaśa}; and as in Latin \textit{obs}, \textit{os} (for \textit{obs}), from \textit{ab}, \textit{ob} (§. 96.). But if it were preferred to deduce \textit{wēstar}, \textit{wēstana}, from the derivative \textit{widar}, it would then be necessary to force the \textit{d} of derivation into the base, and, according to §. 102., change it into \textit{s}. The east is more difficult of explanation than the west—Old High German \textit{ōs-tar}, "towards the east," \textit{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.

\[\text{[G. Ed. p. 405.]}\] 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, \textit{ava}, which in Sanskrit signifies "below," exists as a pronoun, and means "this"; and as this pronoun is also proper to the Sclavonic (\textit{OVO}, nom. \textit{ov}), and occurs in Greek as \textit{αὐ}, (\textit{αὐ-θι}, \textit{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 \textit{ava}, in like manner, annexes a euphonic \textit{s}; from
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avas, therefore, by suppressing the last a but one, would arise (as in Greek αυ) aus (different from our aus, Old High German úz, Gothic út, in Sanskrit उ त ut, "up"), and hence, according to §. 80., ðs: 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 आवाच्छ avānceh (ava + anch), "southern," to be related. The derivations from haurio, or αυω, 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" (au-estar 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 sundró, 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 definite pronoun is contained (p. 352): *vtory-i*, then, is formed from *vtoro-i* (§. 255. d.), in which the cardinal number *dva* 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 ज्ञतः *katara*, "which of two? m." (Gothic *hva-thar*) and यवतः *ya-tara*, "which of both," corresponds etymologically, the Old Slavonic *ko-tory-i* (as definite), older *ko-tery-i* and *ye-ter*, feminine *ye-tera* (*ye-tera*), neuter *ye-tero*. The origin of these two pronouns is, however, forgotten, together with their comparative meaning; for *kotoryi* means "who?" and *yeter*, "some one" (compare p. 352). Dobrowsky (p. 343), however, in which he is [G. Ed. p. 407.] clearly wrong, divides the suffix into *ot-or*; for although the interrogative base *ko* may lay aside its *o*, and combine with the demonstrative base *to* (*hto*, "quis?" Dobr. p. 342), still it is more in accordance with the history of language to divide *ko-toryi* than *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 ईयस् *iyas*, and the corresponding superlative by ईष्ठः *ishtha*, in which *ishtha*, as has been already remarked (p. 389.), we recognise a derivation from *iyas* in its contraction to *ish* (compare *ish-ta*, "offered," from *yaj*), so that the suffix of the highest degree is properly थः *tha*, through which, also, the ordinal numbers सत्तरशस् *chatur-thas* (तत्तर-तौ-ς), and मशशस् *shash-thas* (*κ-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 superlatives, and hence the suffix तम tama occurs in ordinal numbers; e.g. विनातितमस vínasati-tama-s, "the twentieth," wherefore ma, in forms like पच्चमस pancha-ma-s, "the fifth," may be held to be an abbreviation of tama. To the form इष्ट ish, contracted from इयस—euphonic for इ—is in Greek and Zend इ, corresponds the Latin इ, in the superlatives in इसिमus, which I deduce through assimilation from इसिमus (comp. §. 101.); the simple इ, however, which, viewed from Latin, is a contraction of इस (§. 22.), appears in the simple form in the adverb मग-इ, which may be compared with μεγίς in μέγισ-τος. In the strong cases (§. 129.) the Indian comparative shows a broader form than the इयस above, namely, a long ऑ and a nasal preceding the s, thus ईयांस ईयांस (see §. 9.). This form, how- [G. Ed. p. 408.] ever, may originally have been current in all the cases, as the strong form in general (§. 129.), as is probable through the pervading long ऑ in Latin, इरिस, इरी, &c., if one would not rather regard the length of the Latin ऑ as compensation for the rejected nasal: compare the old accusative मेल-इोस, mentioned in §. 22., with Sanskrit forms like गरियांसम गर-इयांस-अम (graviorem). The breadth of the suffix, which is still remarkable in the more contracted from इयस, 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 मति-मति mati-mat, "intelligent," from मति, "understanding," comes मत-इयांस; from बलवात, "strong" ("gifted with strength,"

* The Taddhita suffixes are those which form derivative words not primitives direct from the root itself.
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from bala- VAT, bal- ñyas; from kshipra, "quick" (from the base kship, "to throw"), comes kshép- ñyas; from kshipra, "insignificant," kship- ñyas; from trípra, "satisfied," trap- ñyas; since with vowels capable of Guna the dropping of the suffix is compensated by strengthening the radical syllable by Guna, as in the Zend vaédistá; which Burnouf (Vahista, p. 22) deduces, as it appears to me, with equal correctness and acuteness from vídvás (vídvó, §. 56b, Sanskrit vídwás), "knowing." With respect to trap- ñyas, from trípra, let it be observed that ar, as Guna of ri, is easily transposed to ra (Gramm. Crit. §. 34b): compare the Greek ε一年多 for έ一年多; παράσι for πατάρσι (see p. 290, G. ed.). In a similar manner M. Ag. Benary explains the connection of varîyas with urú "great," with which he rightly compares the Greek εὐρός (Berl. Jahrb. 1834. I. [G. Ed. p. 409.] pp. 230, 231). But varîyas might also come from vara, "excellent," and urú might be an abbreviation of varu, which easily runs into one. To the superlative परि varíshtá, which does not only mean latissimus but also optimus, the Greek ἄριστος (therefore Fάριστος) 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, ἕχθιστος, αὐχιστός, αὐκτιστός, κῦδιστος, μῆκιστος, ἀλγιστός, from ἕχθρος, &c., exactly as above kshépíshthás and others from kshipra; and I believe I can hence explain, according to the same principle, the lengthening of the vowel in μῆκιστος, 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, ἀσσον, where Buttmann (§. 67. Rem. 3. N. **) assumes that
the comparative ı has fallen back and united itself with the α (a); while, in my opinion, a different account is to be given of what has become of the ı in forms like θάσσων, βράσσων (§. 300.). The formation of μέγιστος from μέγας, from μεγάλος-ς, is similar to the origin, in Sanskrit, of बैरं बन्हिष्ठा, from bahula, “much”; from bahu, “much” comes bhūyishțha; and μέγιστος, in relation to METAŁO, has lost as much as baṅh-ishțha, compared with bahula, only that the Sanskrit positive base is compensated for the loss of ula by the addition of a nasal; which therefore, as Ag. Benary (l. c.) has very correctly remarked, rests on the same principle with the Guna in kṣhepįśṭha, &c.*

“Remark.—It will then, also, be necessary [G. Ed. p. 410.]—as Burnouf (Yaçna, p. 131) first pointed out, but afterwards (Vahista, p. 25), in my opinion, wrongly retracted—to explain the रे of śṛyas, “better,” śṛṣṭha, “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 ỹas, ỹṣṭha, forming śṛyas, śṛṣṭha. From śṛ comes the derivative śṛ-ṃal, “fortunate,” from which I deduce śṛ-ṃas, śṛ-ṃsṭha, by the prescribed removal of the suffix,† although one might

* The Guna, however, in the gradation forms under discussion, might also be accounted for in a different way, namely, by bringing it into connection with the Vriddhi, which occurs before many other Taddhita suffixes, especially in patronymics, as वर्चस्तत् vaivaswata, from वर्चस्तत् vivaswata. On account of the great weight of the gradation suffixes ỹas, ỹṣṭha, which has given rise to the suppression of the suffix of the positive base, the initial vowel also of the same would accordingly be raised by the weaker Guna, instead of by the Vriddhi, as usual (§. 26.). Be that how it may, one must in any case have ground to assume an historic connection between the Grecian vowel-lengthening in μῆκος, θάσσον, and others, and that of Sanskrit forms like kṣhep’yas, kṣhepįśṭha.

† If there existed, as in Zend, a śṛra, one might hence also derive the above gradations.
expect in the superlative śray-śīṭha, euphonic for śṛē-śīṭha; 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 ἱστος, are nevertheless nothing else than superlative forms, I do not see why, in certain cases, in Sanskrit, also, the suppression of an i may not hold good. This happens, moreover, in sthē-śīṭha from sthi-ra, "fast," sphē-śīṭha from spī-śa, "swollen," and prē-śīṭha from priy-a, "dear." In the latter case, after removing the suffix a, the preceding y, also, must retire, since priy is only a euphonic alteration of pri (Gramm. Crit. §, 51.) As to the derivation, however, of the meanings melior, optimus, from a positive with the meaning "fortunate," it may be further remarked, that, in Sanskrit, "fortune" and "splendour" are generally the fundamental notions for that which is good and excellent; hence, bhagavat, "the honourable," "the excellent," properly, "the man gifted with fortune"; for our besserer, bester, also Gothic bat-iza, bat-ists, are associated with a Sanskrit root denoting fortune (bhad, whence bhadra, "fortunate," "excellent"), which Pott was acute enough first to remark (Etymol. Inquiries, p. 245), who collates also 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, βελτιστός, should belong to this class, and the τ be an unorganic addition, which is wanting in βέλτερος, βέλτι-τατός, βελ would then give the middle step between ო ἱδ and mel. The ideal positive of βελτίων, namely ἀγαθός, might be connected with सगाय agāda "deep," with which, also, the Gothic gōths (theme
gōda) is to be compared, with o, according to rule, for छ घ (§. 69.), and medials for Greek aspirates, according to §. 87.

299. From the strong theme ἐλαύνσ ἐλάυνıs, mentioned at §. 298., comes the nominative ἐλάυν, with the suppression of the final letter rendered necessary through §. 94. The vocative has a short a, and sounds ἐλάν. To ἐλάν answers the Greek οὐ, and to the vocative ἐλάν answers οὐ; to the neuter ἐλας (N. A. V.), identical with the weak theme, corresponds the Latin ius (§. 22.). The Greek, however, cannot become repossessed of the s, which is abandoned in Sanskrit in the nominative and vocative masculine for legitimate reasons, since it declines its comparative as though its theme terminated from the first with v; hence accusative οὐ-α for the Sanskrit ἐλαύνσ-α, Latin ιό-εμ (ιό-εμ, §. 22.), genitive οὐ-ος for ἐλας-α, ιό-ις. However, one might, as Pott has already, I believe, noticed somewhere, reduce the contracted forms like βελτίω, βελτίους, to an original ιοσά, ιοσες, ιοσας, corresponding to ἐλάυνσαμ, ἐλάυσι (neuter plural), ἐλάυν-ας, ἐλας-ας, the σ of which, as is so common between two vowels, would be rejected.* On the other hand, v, except in [G. Ed. p. 412.] comparatives, on the presupposition that the contracted forms have rejected an v and not σ, is suppressed only in a few isolated words (Ἀπόλλω, Ποσειδῶ, εἰκῶ, ἀγδοῦς, 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 ἅς, the Greek, which was still less favourable to the νσ-, has given up the latter, as perhaps one may suppose in the oldest, as it were, pre-Grecian period, forms like βελτίονσα. It is, however, remarkable, that while all other European sister lan-

* Comp. p. 325 G. ed.
Languages have only preserved the last element of the comparative *ns*—the Latin in the form of *r*—and while the Sanskrit also shews more indulgence for the *s* than for the *n*, the Greek alone has preserved the nasal; so that in the comparative it differs in this respect from all the other languages. Without the intervention of the Sanskrit and Zend it would be hardly possible to adduce from the European sister languages a cognate termination to the Greek *iων*, *iων*; or if *iōr* and *iων* should be compared, one would think rather of a permutation of liquids,* than that after the Greek *v* the prototype of the Latin *r*, namely *σ*, has originally existed.

300. In Zend, the superlatives in *meye* *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 *meye* *ista* stands nearer to the Greek *ιωτο-ς* than the Indian *iśtha*, 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 *meye* *masyēhi*, which occurs repeatedly, and to which I have already elsewhere drawn attention.† It springs from the positive base

---

* Comp. §. 20.
† Berl. Jahrb. 1831. I. p. 372. I then conceived this form to be thus arrived at, that the *y* of the Sanskrit *iṇasi* had disappeared, as in the genitive termination *ḥē*, from *र्य sya*: after which the *i* must have passed into *y*, still the above view of the case, which is also the one chosen by Burnouf.
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... maso\'s, "great" (mas\'o, mas\'ah, mas\'on\'h, §§. 56\". 56\")... and confirms, like other Zend forms, the theory which holds good for the Sanskrit, that other suffixes fall away before the exponents of the comparative and superlative relation under discussion. If yēhē is compared with the Sanskrit feminine base i\'yasē, the loss of the ṭ shews itself, and then the a has, through the power of assimilation of the y (§. 42.), become ē, and s has, according to §. 53., become h. In the loss of the ṭ the Zend coincides with the Sanskrit forms like śrē-ya\'s, mentioned at p. 397, with which, also, bhū-ya\'s, "more," and jydh-ya\'s, "older," agree. Greek comparatives with a doubled σ before ον, as κρεισσων, βράσσων, ἐλάσσων, are based on this; which, according to a law of euphony very universally followed in Prākrit, have assimilated the y to the preceding consonant, as elsewhere ἀλλας [G. Ed. p. 414.] from ἀλγος, Gothic alya-, Latin alius-, Sanskrit anya, are explained (Demonstrative Bases, p. 20). In Prākrit, in the assimilations which are extremely common in this dialect, the weaker consonant assimilates itself to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; thus anna, "the other," from anya, corresponds to the Greek ἀλλας; 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 i\'yas had disappeared in Zend, it would fall to the turn of the preceding i to become y.

* Comp. ēsoumā, from ēsoumā, with स्यामि syāmi, in composition with attributive verbs. It may be allowed here preliminarily to mention another interesting Prākrit form of the future, which consists in this, that the Sanskrit s passes into h, but the syllable य ya is contracted to ī, herein agreeing with the Latin i in eris, erit, amabis, amabit, &c.; as, karthiṣi, "thou wilt make," from karīṣyasi; sahiṣhimi, "I will endure," from sahiṣyāmi, instead of the medial form sahiṣhē (Urvasi, by Lenz. p. 59).
which it is clear that \( v \) is stronger than \( y \), as it also is more powerful than \( r \); hence \( səvə \) from \( səvə \), “every-one.” It is remarkable that the \( i \) also of \( ili “thus” \) assimilates itself to the following \( t \); hence, \( ili \), which, in pronunciation, naturally leans upon the word preceding. Therefore one might thus also, without presupposition of a form \( yəwə \), establish the assimilation from \( ɪəwə \). As to the transition of the consonant of the positive base into \( σ (κρέισ-\cdot θαϊ-υών, βράσ-σών, βάσ-σών, μάσ-σών, ἐλάσ-σών, &c.) \), to which the \( y \) has assimilated, the transition of \( τ, δ, θ \), into \( σ \) need least of all surprise us (see §. 99.); but with regard to the gutturals, the Old Sclavonic may be noticed, in which, besides what has been remarked in §. 255. (m.), \( y, i, \) and \( e— \) which latter comes very near the vowel combined with \( a \) \( y \), and is frequently the remainder of the syllable \( ye— \) exert an influence on a guttural preceding them, similar

[G. Ed. p. 415.] to that which the comparative \( y \) or \( i \) produces in Greek. Before the \( i \), namely, of the nominative plural, and before \( ye \) in the dative and locative singular, as before \( i \) and \( ye \) of the imperative, \( ch \) becomes \( s; \) e.g. \( gryes-i \) from \( gryech \), as \( θάό-σων \) from \( θάό-γων \), from \( τάγ-\); \( g \) becomes \( ζ \), e.g. \( prɪζι \) from \( prɪγ \), as \( μείζον, όλίζων, \) from \( μείζον, όλίζων, \) from \( μεγ-\), \( δλγ-\); \( k \) becomes \( ch \), while in Greek \( k \) is modified in the same way as \( χ \) On account of the contracted nature of the \( κ \) (= \( δσ \)) no assimilation takes place after it, but the \( y \) entirely disappears, or, in \( μείζον, \) is pressed into the interior of the word (comp. §. 119.), as in \( ἀμείνων, χείρων, \) which latter may be akin to the Sanskrit \( जवर \) \( adhara, “the under \) (m),” consequently with apheresis of the \( a \) (comp. §. 401.). With the superlative \( μέγιστος \) compare the Zend \( məζəνιζμəζ məsəzta, where \( ɪ z, \) according to §. 57., answers to the Sanskrit \( h \) of \( məζh \) \( məhət, “great”; \) while in the above \( məζəνιζμəζ məiζhɛ haze, as in the positive \( məζəz \) (euphonically \( məζh) \), \( ɪ \) stands irregularly for \( z \), as if the Zend, by its permutation of consonants in this word, would vie with the Greek; but
we find, Vend. S. p. 214, देस्व माया, with z, which I hold to be a neuter comparative; thus, सन्त्व स्वार्थः माया विद्वदो, "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-ς, in universal use; so the German, the Slavonic, and Lithuanian, in their degrees of comparison everywhere attach themselves to the more rare forms in Sanskrit and Greek; and indeed in the Gothic the suffix of the comparative shews itself in the same shortened form in which it appears in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin, in its combination with the superlative suffix (see §. 298. p. 395 &c.), namely, as is; and this most plainly in adverbs like mais, "more," whose 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. μέγυσ-τος, 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-yo (from maz-yaš), which we have become acquainted with above (p. 415 G. ed.) in the sense of "more."

"Remark.—There are some other comparative adverbs in is, of which, the first time I treated of this subject, I was not in possession, and which Grimm has since (III. 589, &c.) represented as analogous to mais. He has however, afterwards, l. c. p. 88, agreed, with Fulda, in viewing hauhis, ἀνώτερον, as the genitive of the positive hauks, "high." Yet hauhis stands in exactly the same relation to haughiza, "the higher," that mais does to maiza, "major."
Compared with the Zend *max-yō* and Greek μείζον, 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* (*mēriro, 'major') because in *mēr* no formal expression of the comparative relation was any longer felt. *Raihtis*, which Grimm wishes to leave under the forms which, III. p. 88, are considered as genitive, seems to me properly to signify *potius*, or our *rechter*; and I consider it, therefore, as a comparative, although the Old High German *rēhtes*, examined from the point of view of the Old High German, can only be a genitive, and the comparative adverb is *rēhtōr*. The comparative *ga-raihtōza, 'justior*', which may be cited in Gothic, does not prevent the assumption that there may have been also in use a *raihtiza*, as in all adjectives *iza* may just as well be expected as *ōza*; for, together with the comparative adverb *frumōzd, 'at first'* (R. xi. 35), occurs the superlative *frumistis*. 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 *alyes*, as above (p. 414 G. ed.) ἀλλας—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, einest, '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, 'posterus, as above χειρων 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, maizō. 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.
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no feminines arise—but to the original feminine base in †, which exists in the Sanskrit and Zend, an n is added, as in the participle present; thus MAIZEIN (ei = †, § 70.), from mais + ein, answers to the Zend feminine base of the same import, ma∫yha∫, and Sanskrit forms like गरीयसः गरीयस-∫, from gariyas. 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 ः s into ः sh inadmissible, as the two transitions rest upon euphonic laws which are entirely distinct; of which the one, which obtains in the Gothic (§. 86. 5.), is just as foreign to the Sanskrit, as the Sanskrit (§. 21. and Gramm. Crit. 101n.) is to the Gothic. It is further to be observed, that, on account of the difference of these laws, the Sanskrit ः sh remains also in the superlative, where the Gothic has always st, not zt. In respect to Greek, it may here be further remarked, that Grimm, I. c. p. 651, in that language, also, admits an original s in the comparative; which he, however, does not look for after the ν of οων, as appears from §. 299., but before it; so that he wishes to divide thus μει-ιοων, as an abbreviation of μεγιλιοων; and regards the ι as not a corruption of the γ, as Buttmann also assumes, but as a comparative character, as in the kindred Gothic ma-iza. The Greek οων, ον, would, according to this, appear identical with the unorganic Gothic an in MAIZAN; while we have assigned it, in §. 299., a legitimate foundation, by tracing it back to the Sanskrit अनस.
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, minnirò, minnira, has more resemblance to the Latin minor than to the Gothic minniza, minnizei.

303. The comparative suffix in the Gothic, besides is, iz-an, exhibits also the form 6s, 6z-an: it is, however more rare; but in the Old High German has become so current, that there are more comparatives in it in 6rò (nominative masculine), 6ra (nominative feminine and neuter), than in iro, ira, or ëro, ëra. The few forms in ŬZAN which can be adduced in Gothic are, svinthóza, "fortior" (nominative masculine), fródóza, "prudentior," frumóza, "prior," hlasóza, "hilarior," garaihtóza, "justior," framaldróza, "pro vectior ætate," usdaudoza, "sollicitior," unsvikunthóza, "inclarior" (Massmann, p. 47), and the adverbs sniumundós, "σπουδαιοτέρως," and alvaleikós, "étérws." How, then, is the 6 in these forms to be explained, contrasted with the i of IS, IZAN? I believe only as coming from the long a of the Sanskrit strong themes iyáns or yaïns (§§. 299. 300.), with 6, according to rule, for ṣa 6 (§. 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, yaïns has lost in the Gothic either the 6 or the y (=j), which, when the 6 is suppressed, must be changed into a vowel. The Gothic 6s, 6z, and still more the Old High German 6r, correspond, therefore, exactly to the Latin 6r in minor, minór-is, for minior. There is reason to assume that, in the Gothic, originally y and 6 existed in juxta-position to one another; and that for minniza, "the lesser," was used minnyóza, and for fródoza, "the more intelligent," fródyóza.
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The forms which have lost the y are represented in Latin by minor, minus, and plus, and those with ὀ suppressed by mag-is. One cannot, however, in Gothic, properly require any superlatives in ὍΣΤΑ, nom. ὀστ-š, corresponding to the comparatives in ὀς, ὀς; because this degree in the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin always springs from the form of the comparative, contracted to ὁ, ὁ. It is, however, quite regular, that, to the frumōza, “prior,” corresponds a frumists, “primus,” not frumōsts. To the remaining comparatives in ὀς the superlative is not yet adduced; but in the more recent dialects the comparatives have formed superlatives with ὀ, after their fashion; and thus, in the Old High German, ὀστ usually stands in the superlative, where the comparative has ὀτ: the Gothic furnishes two examples of this confusion of the use of language, in lasivōsts, “infirmissimus” (1 Cor. xii. 22.), and armōsts, “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. Ed. p. 421.] hard'-iza, from HARDU, “hard”; seith-s (thana-seiths, “amplus”), from SEITHU, “late”; as in the Greek ἤδιον from ‘ΗΔΥ, and in the Sanskrit laghēyas from layhu, “light.” Υα is also rejected; hence spēd'-iza, from SPEDYA, “late” (see p. 358, Note 7.); reik'-iza, from REIKYA, “rich.” One could not therefore regard the ὀ, in forms like frōdōza, as merely a lengthening of the a in FRŌDA (§. 69.), as it would be completely contrary to the principle of these formations, not only not to suppress the final vowel of the positive base, but even to lengthen it. The explanation of the comparative ὀ given at §. 303, remains therefore the only one that can be relied upon.

* The positive does not occur, but the Sanskrit swādu-s and Greek ἡν-ı 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 õi, feminine shi, neuter yee; as, õîã, "the better (m.)"; õišhi, "the better (f.)"; õiŋye, "the best (n.)," from a positive which has been lost, as batiza, melior, and õeirown; and it is perhaps connected in its base with the latter, so that α may have become o (§. 255. a.), but μ, ŭ, as frequently occurs with n; and this ŭ, with the preceding o, has become ŭ (x). Mniï, "the lesser, (m.)" fem. menshi, neuter mnyee, spring, in like manner, from a positive which has been lost. Bolii, "the greater," fem. bolshï, neuter bolye, may be compared with the Sanskrit boliyān, "the stronger" (p. 396), fem. balīyasā, neuter balīyas.† For [G. Ed. p. 422.] bolii is also used bolyei; and all the remaining comparatives which belong to this class have yei for ii, and thus answer better to the neuter form yee. If, as appears to be the case, the form yei is the genuine one, then ye answers to the Sanskrit yas of jyā-yas, bhū-yas, śre-yas, &c. (§. 300.), and the loss of the s is explained by §. 255. (l.): the final i of ye-i, however, is the definitive pronoun (§. 284.), for comparatives always follow, in the masculine and neuter, the definite declension. In the feminine in shi it is easy to recognise the Sanskrit si of iyās-i, or yas-ī, and herewith also the Gothic čei (oblique theme ZEIN,

* The α in õeirown appears to me to be privative; so that õeirown would seem to be a sister form to the Latin minor, Gothic minniza, Slavonic mnii; and õeirown would properly signify "the not lesser," "the not more trifling." Perhaps this word is also inherent in omnis; so that o for α would be the negation, which, in Latin, appears as in; where it may be observed, that, in Sanskrit, a-sakrit, literally "not once," has taken the representation of the meaning "several times."

† The positive velii, with v for b and e for o, occurs only in this definite form (Dobr. p. 320); the primitive and indefinite form must be vel. With respect to the stronger o corresponding to the weaker letter e (§. 256. a.), bolii, 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 baliyati, “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, अनेने, “better”; bole, “greater”—in Servian MSS. अन्ये, bolye; [G. Ed. p. 423.] pache, “more,” probably related to παχύς, πάσσον; so that (which is very obscure) the final vowel of pache for pach-yे, for reasons which have been given before, is, in fact, identical with the Greek σ of πάσ-σον, for πασ-γον. The ch of pache may, according to p. 415 G. ed., be regarded as a modification of k, as the first σ of πάσσον has developed itself from χ. Thus the ζ of dolk-yे, “longer” (neuter and adverbial), as euphonic representative of the y of dolg, dolga, dolgo (longus, a, um), answers remarkably to the Greek ζ in μείζων, ὀλίζων, for μείγων, ὀλίγων. That, however, the positive dolg is connected with the Greek δολχός needs scarce to be mentioned. Somewhat more distant is the Sanskrit दीर्घात् 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 vā́is, nom. masc. vā́n for vā́us, fem. uṣhi, 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-ujhi, “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 š corresponde to the Sanskrit vā́is-am, as rurud-vā́is-am, “eum qui ploravit.”
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to be noticed (§. 20.). The i of δολικός, however, shews itself, by the evidence of the Sclovonic and Sanskrit, to be an organic addition. Let garyee, "pejus," be compared with the Sanskrit gariyas, "gravius," from guru, "heavy"—according to Burnouf's correct remark from garu, as this adjective is pronounced in Pali—through the assimilating influence of the final u, to which the kindred Greek βαρός has permitted no euphonic reaction.

(2) The second, by far the most prevalent form of the Old Sclovonic 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, shye, shye, as we have seen, p. 332, G. ed., the adjective base SINYO (nominative siny), before its union with the defining i, contracted to sini (sini-i, neuter sine-e for sinye-ye. The definite feminine of SINYO is sinya-ya; and as to the feminine comparatives not being 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 nomi-
natives dūsha, sūsha, chasha, for sūsyā, &c. (Dobr. p. 279). The relation of the comparative form under discussion to the Sanskrit यस् yas and Zend यά yas (p. 401) is therefore to be taken thus, that the ya which precedes the sibilant is suppressed, as in the above feminines in shi; but for it, at the end, is added an unorganic YO, which corresponds to the Gothic-Lithuanian YA in the themes NIUYA, NAUYA, "new," answering to नव nava, NOVU, NEO, Sclovonic 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, ṣūn-shii, "the better (m.)." feminine
ADJECTIVES.

án-shaya, neuter án-shee; pást-shii from pást, theme PÜSTO; "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; gláb-shii from glábok, "deep" (definite, gláboky-ই), sladshi 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 yai, since the said sibilants, as [G. Ed. p. 425.] has been already remarked, gladly divest themselves of a following y; hence blasch-ai'ihn, "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 ðliज-ων, for ðliγ-ιων, ðλγ-γσον (p. 402): so tish-aišhii, from tich (theme TICHO), "still," as in the Greek θάσ-σων from ταχύς. As example of the form

* I hold ho, whence in the nom, masc. 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 ά u, according to §. 255. (c.); for example, tano-k; "thin," theme TANOKO, corresponds to the Sanskrit tanu-α, "thin," Greek τανω; and slado-k to the Sanskrit swādu-sα, "sweet," with exchange of the v for l, according to §. 20. Thus the above slad-shii shows itself to be originally identical, as well in the suffix of the positive as of the other degrees with the Greek ᵃδ-ιω and Gothic sut-iza (§. 304.), far as the external difference may separate them; and to the Sclavonic 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 Sclavonic 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 tůshnǐm, "still, silent," and refer to §. 255. (m.).
with yeī, yūn-yeīshī, "junior," from yūn, may serve. Whence comes, then, the yeī or aī (for yaī), which distinguishes this formation from the second? It might be supposed that to the first formation in yeī, where, for example, also yūn-yeī, "the younger (m.)," occurs, that of the second has also been added, as in Old High German mērero, "the greater" (masculine), and in Gothic, probably, vairṣa, "the worse" (p. 405), are raised twice to the comparative degree; and as, in Persian, the superlatives in terīn, in my opinion, contain, as their last element, the comparative इधिन iyādis, which forms, in the nominative masculine, iyān, and from this could be easily contracted to in. In Persian the comparative is formed through ter; as, behter, "the better," whence behterīn, "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 yeī has not once laid aside the definitive pronoun i, which is foreign to the comparative; so that therefore in yūn-yeī-shī the said pronoun would be contained twice. There is, however, another way of explaining this yeīshī or (y)aīshī, namely, as an exact transmission of the Sanskrit iyas or yas, from which the second formation has only preserved the sibilant; but the third, together with this letter, may have retained also that which preceded. Still, even in this method, the i of yeī, (y)aī, is embarrassing, if it be not assumed that it owes its origin to a transposition of the i 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 iyānis, I must here admit a limitation in
favour of the Lithuanian, which, exceeding in this point the Greek, continues not only the nasal,* but also the comparative sibilant through all the cases. For an example, gerësnis, "the better" (m.), may serve, with which we would compare the Sanskrit garëyànsam, "gravíorem" (nominative garëyâns). It may be, but it is not of much consequence to us, that gerësnis and garëyâns (strong theme) are also connected in the positive base; so that, as according to p. 398, in Greek and Gothic goodness is measured by depth, in Lithuanian it is measured by weight. The Sanskrit comparative under discussion means, also, not only "heavier," or "very heavy," but also, according to Wilson, "highly venerable." In order, however, to analyze the Lithuanian gerësnis, we must observe that gerësnis stands for gerësnia, and the theme is clearly GERÉSNIA; hence genitive gerësnio, dative gerësniam; as gëro, gerâm, from géra-s.

[G. Ed. p. 427.] The termination ia, therefore—for which ya might be expected, the y of which, as it appears for the avoiding of a great accumulation of consonants, has been resolved into i—corresponds to the unorganic addition which we, p. 411, have observed in Slavonic comparatives. We have now gerësn remaining, which I regard as a metathesis from gerëns,† through which we come very near the Sanskrit garëyâns. But we come still nearer to it through the observation, that, in Lithuanian, e is often produced by the euphonic influence of a preceding y or i (§. 193.). We believe, therefore, that here also we may explain gerësn as from geryasn (geryans), and further recall attention to the Zend 𐁭𐁭𐁱𐁪𐁧𐁪𐁱 məʃyəh (§. 300.).

* In the Lith. comparative adverbs like daugiaus, "more," mažaus, "less," I regard the u as the vocalization of the n; thus daugiaus from daugians, where ians=Skr. iyâns 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 ėsnis is similarly arrived at with the Latin issimus.
The emphasis upon the e of *gérésnis* may be attributable to the original length in the Sanskrit strong theme *gariyāns*. Hence the astonishing accuracy may justly be celebrated with which the Lithuanian, even to the present day, continues to use the Sanskrit comparative suffix *iyāns*, or rather its more rare form preferred in Zend *yāns*.

307. The Lithuanian superlative suffix is only another modification of the comparative. The nasal, that is to say, which in the latter is transposed, is, in the superlative, left in its original place: it is, however, as often happens, resolved into *u*, and to the *s* which ends the theme in the Sanskrit, which, in Lithuanian, is not declinable (§ 128.), is added *ia*: hence *GERAUSIA*, the nominative of which, however, in departure from *gérésnis*, has dropped, not the *a*, but the *i*; thus *gerausa*-s, gen. *gerausio*, and, in the feminine, *gerausa*, *gerausiós*; in which forms, [G. Ed. p. 428.] contrary to the principle which is very generally followed in the comparative and elsewhere, the *i* has exercised no euphonic influence.

"Remark.—With respect to the Sanskrit gradation-suffixes *tara*, *tama*, I have further to add, that they also occur in combination with the inseparable preposition तः *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 ὑς of ὑς-τερος, ὑς-τατος, with the unorganic spir. asp., as in ἐκατερος, corresponding to the Sanskrit ḍkatala-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-tēma*, 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*, *haihaitau*, is of nasal origin.
NUMERALS.

CARDINAL NUMBERS.

308. I. In the designation of the number one great difference prevails among the Indo-European languages, which springs from this, that this number is expressed by pronouns of the 3d person, whose original abundance affords satisfactory explanation regarding the multiplicity of expressions for one. The Sanskrit ēka, whose comparative we have recognised in the Greek ἑκάτερος, is, in my opinion, the combination of the demonstrative base ḍ, of which hereafter, with the interrogative base kā, which also, in combination with api, "also" (nom. masc. kō'pi), signifies "whichever"; and even without this api, if an interrogative expression precedes, as Bhagavad-Gītā, II. 21, कथान स पुरुषः पप्पस छातावतः हि ति कस kathāṁ sa purushah Pārtha kan ghatayati hanti kam, "How can this person, O Pārtha, cause one to be slain, (or) slay one?" The Zend aēva, is connected with the Sanskrit pronominal adverbs ēva, "also," "only," &c., and ēvam, "so," of which the latter is an accusative, and the former, perhaps, an instrumental, according to the principle of the Zend language (§. 158.). The Gothic ain'-s, theme AINA, our einer, is based on the Sanskrit defective pronoun ēna (§. 72.) whence, among others, comes the accusative masculine ēna-m, "this." To this pronominal base belongs, perhaps, also the Old Latin oinos, which occurs in the Scipionian epitaphs, from which the more modern ûnus may be deduced, through the usual transition of the old o into u, which latter is lengthened to make up for the i suppressed. Still ûnus shews, also, a surprising resemblance to the Sanskrit ûna-s, which properly means "less," and is prefixed to the higher numerals in order to express diminution by one; as, ûnaviññatī, "undeviginti," ûnatriññhat, "undetriginta." This ûnas could
not have appeared in Latin, more accurately retained than under the form of *ānu-s*, or, more anciently, *āno-s*. The Greek 'EN is founded, it is highly probable, in like manner, on the demonstrative base एन ेना, and has lost its final vowel, as the Gothic *AINA*, in the masculine nominative *ains*: with respect to the *e* for *ἐ* compare *ἐκάτερος*. On the other hand, οἷς, "unicus," if it has arisen from οἴνος compare οίνος, as μεγίστω from μεγίστων, has retained the Indian diphthong more truly, and has also preserved the final vowel of एन ेना. If οἴνος, the number one in dice, really has its name from the idea of unity, one might refer this word to the demonstrative base एन अना, Slavonic *ONO* (nominative *on*, "that"), which also plays a part in the formation of words, where ονη corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *anā* (feminine of the masculine and neuter *anu*), if it is not to be referred to the medial participle in अना, as μονη to μονα. The Old Slavonic, *yedin*, "one," is clearly connected with the Sanskrit यादि *adi*, "the first," with *y* which has been prefixed according to § 235. (n.): on the other hand, in the Lithuanian *wenas*, [G. Ed. p. 430.] if it is connected with the Gothic *AINA* and Sanskrit एन ेना, an unorganic *w* has been prefixed. In regard to to the *ie* for इ *े* compare, also, *wies-te*, "knowledge," with वेदिं *vedmi*, "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, *haibis*, "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 recognize a corruption of the abovementioned Sanskrit कु *ku* for एक एका, "one," which is founded on the universal rule for the mutation of consonants (§ 87.). It would be erroneous to refer here to the Zend ए *ha* of एक *ha-kērti, "once" (Sanskrit सक्रित *sakrit*), as the Zend ए *h*
stands, without exception, for the Sanskrit ए s, 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-ÁIHA; thus the latter portion of this compound word is assuredly connected with the word अक्ष एक्ष (एक्ष) akṣha, “eye,” in Sanskrit, which only occurs at the end of compounds; so that of the compounded एक्ष h kṣ only the first portion is left, while the Zend अक्ष aṣhi, “eye”—which, in like manner, I have found only at the end of compound words, as ṇक्षमाक्षम cvas-ashīm, “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 AΗΑ; as śimf from पन्च pancha; fidwór from चतवर 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 ὁ), may be the Greek ἀ in ἀ-πλοῦς.
disposition of the \( h \) to \( ai \) was already satisfied. We must further recall attention to the Latin \( voces \), in which, however, the notion of unity is evidently represented only by the \( c \), for the \( c \) must be left to the \( voces \) 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 \( haufi \); 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 जग्मिन jagmima, "we went," of the root गम \( gam \), only \( gm \) is left; and in the Greek, \( πιγμο \) for \( πιγμω \), \( ΠΕΤ \), which corresponds to the Sanskrit पाणि \( pat \), "to fall," is abbreviated to \( π\tau \). We shall, therefore, be compelled to assume that a vowel has fallen out between the \( n \) and \( f \) of \( HA-NFA \). If it was an \( i \) which was displaced, then \( NIFA \) might pass as a transposition of the Sanskrit पाणि \( pat \), "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 \( twans fōtuns habandin \), "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 \textit{LITH}, "to go," with an aspirated \textit{t}, indeed; but in compounds the consonants do not always remain on the same grade which they adopt in the simple word;

\[\text{[G. Ed. p. 432.]} \quad \text{e.g. the t of \textit{quatuor} appears as d in many derivatives and compounds, without this d thereby dissembling its original identity with the t of \textit{quatuor} and \textit{chatur}.}\]

So, then, \textit{HA-LTA} may stand for \textit{HA-LITHA}; and it may be remarked, that from the root \textit{LIT} comes, also, \textit{lithus}, "the limb," as that which is moveable. Before I pass on to the explanation of \textit{halb}, I must mention that J. Grimm divides the pronoun \textit{selber}, as it appears to me very properly, into two parts; so that the syllable \textit{si} of the Gothic \textit{silba} devolves on the reciprocal (\textit{sci-na, si-s, si-k}). With respect to the last portion, he betakes himself to a verb \textit{leiban}, "to remain," and believes that \textit{silba} may, perhaps, have the meaning of "that which remains in itself, enduring." Be this as it may, it is clear that \textit{halbs} —the theme is \textit{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 \textit{one} and \textit{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 \textit{haihs}, "having one eye." In the Gothic, also, \textit{laiba} means "remnant." It scarcely needs remark, that \textit{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 \textit{dimidius} is named after the middle through which the division went. The Zend has the expression \textit{m\textsuperscript{3}r\textsuperscript{n} na\textsuperscript{e}ma}, for \textit{halb}, according to a euphonic law for \textit{n\textsuperscript{e}ma}, 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 nêma appears to me a very
ingenious designation for a half, for it is a regular contrac-
tion of न na, "not," and इम ima, "this or that"; and the
demonstrative therefore points at the "this or that" portion
of the whole excluded by the negative na. In Sanskrit,
halb is termed, among other appellations, सामि sāmi, in
which one recognises both the Latin semī and the Greek ἴμοι, and
the three languages agree in this also, that they use
this word only without inflection at the beginning of com-
ounds. As to its origin, सामि sāmi may be viewed as a
regular derivative from सम sama, "equal," "similar," by a
suffix i, by which the suppression of the final vowel, and
widening of the initial vowel of the primitive, become neces-
sary. If this explanation is well founded, [G. Ed. p. 433.]
then in this designation of halb only one part of the whole,
and, indeed, one equal to the deficient part, would be ex-
pressed, and the सामि sāmi would be placed as ἑτερον over
against the deficient ἑτερον; 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 ἴμος to ἴμοι, it follows
from what has been already said—that the latter is not an
abbreviation of the former, but the former is a derivation
from the latter; and indeed I recognise in συ the Sanskrit
possessive swa, "suus," which, remarkably enough, in Zend
enters into combinations with numerals with the meaning
"part"; e.g. ॐ घ्रि-श्वा thrī-shva, "a third part," ब्राह्मन chathru-shva, "a fourth part." In the accusative these
words, according to §. 42., are written ब्राह्मन thri-shūṃ, ब्राह्मन chathru-shūṃ, of which the last member comes
very near to the Greek συν of ἴμον. ἴμο-συς means
therefore, "having one equal part," and the simple ἴμο
means only the equal. The Sanskrit designation of "the
whole" deserves further to be mentioned, सकलस् 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 सक्ल sakala consists, though this is scarcely perceptible, of स sa, “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—सक्ल sakala expresses that in which the two parts are together. Thus the word समान sam-agra, “full,” is used especially in regard to the moon, as a body with points, i.e. that in which the two points touch one another. Transposed into Greek relations of sound sakala-s would give, perhaps, ὅκαλος, or ὁκελος, or ὅκολος; but from this the present ὅλος has rejected the middle syllallable, as is the case in κόρος, κούρος, compared with κομάρος 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 tvai, tvōs, tva; dative tvaim; accusative tvans, thvōs, tva.* The Sanskrit displays in the dual

* One would expect tvō, on account of the form being monosyllabic (§. 231.). In the genitive masculine and neuter I should look for tvī-zē, after the analogy of thi-zē, “horum,” from THA, or tvaizē, according to the analogy of the definite adjectives (§. 287. p. 374 G. ed.), and according to the common declension tv-ē (p. 276). However, the form tvaddyaē occurs three times in the sense of duorum; whence it is clear that the genitive of the base TVA was no longer in use in the time of Ulfila. The form tvaddy’-ē belongs to a theme TVADDYA (as hary’-ē from HARYA), 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. zueiyō, as fior from fidvor; also definite, zueiērō, which, in Gothic, would be tvaddyaizē. Grimm appears, on the other hand, to have
no difference between the pronominal declension and the ordinary one, and dwāu is declined like vrīkāu (p. 274), dwē feminine like dhārē (p. 285), and dve neuter like dānē (p. 276). As, however, the notions of number are much akin to those of the pronouns; and as अंकल alpa, "a little," forms, in the nominative plural masculine, अंकल alpē (§. 228.); so from the masculine theme dwa, if it had a plural, might be expected dwē, 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, especially as a genitive tvaižē, 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 Slavonic oba (nominative and accusative dual), from the base OBO. In Zend the masculine of the number two is dva (for dvā, §. 208.), with which the Old Slavonic dva is identical, while the feminine neuter dvyē answers to the Sanskrit ducē (§. 255. e.). The Zend neuter is dvyē, with euphonic y (§. 43.), and the v resolved into u. In the Greek and Latin δυo, δυo, duo, the

have taken occasion, from the Old High German forms, to suppose a Gothic tvaiyē and tvaiayē, in which I cannot agree with him. The Old Northern, by exchanging the dental medials with gutturals, gives tvaggya for the Gothic tvaddýē. In the accusative plural feminine is found, in Gothic, together with tvōs also tvaihnōs, which presupposes a masculine and neuter base TVEIHNA. fem. TVEIHNō; and in which the annexed HNA reminds us of the appended pronoun स्मма, discussed at §. 165. &c., which, by metathesis, and with the alteration of the s into h, has in Prākrit and Pāli taken the form mha (comp. §. 169.). On this Gothic TVEIHNA is based the Old High German nominative and accusative masculine zvēnē with loss of the h. The feminine, however, appears in Old High German free from this addition, and is in the nominative and accusative zuō, also abbreviated zua (comp. §. 69.).
old \( v \) is, in the same way, resolved into the \( u \), but the final vowel of the base is not abandoned: \( \delta \upsilon \omega \) answers to the Vedic masculine \( dwâ \) (§. 208.); but in distinguishing the genders the Greek is surpassed by the Latin and the other European sister languages. The Lithuanian has \( du \) in the nominative masculine, and \( dwi \) in the nominative feminine; with the closer explanation of which, and their dual declension, we will not here occupy ourselves further. It is, however, to be remarked of the Sanskrit numeral, that the \( a \) of \( dwâ \) is, in the beginning of compounds, weakened to \( i \) (compare §. 6.): hence \( dwi \), which is represented by the native grammarians as the proper theme (comp. p. 102). The Greek, in which \( \delta \upsilon \) is inadmissible, gives in its stead \( \delta i \); hence, \( \delta i \mu \nu \tau \omega \rho = \text{dvināt} \text{ dwimātri} \) (theme), "having two mothers." The Zend and Latin agree in the corruption of this \( dwi \) very remarkably, in this point, that they have both dropped the \( d \) and have both hardened the \( v \) to \( b \); hence \( \mu \nu \rho \nu \tau \omega \rho = \text{bipaitistana} \), "with two nipples," like \( \text{biceps, bidens, and others.} \) From this abbreviated \( bi \), comes, in both languages, also the adverb \( b i s \), "twice," in contrast to the Sanskrit \( dwis \) and Greek \( \delta i \xi \): the Greek \( \delta i \), however, in compounds, cannot be regarded as an abbreviation of \( \delta i \xi \), as is wont to be done. The German dialects, with exception of the Old High Ger-

\[ \text{[G. Ed. p. 436.]} \]

man, require, according to §. 87., \( t vi \) for \( dwi \), as the initial member of compounds; this is furnished by the Anglo-Saxon in compound words like \( t vi-fête, "bipes," tvi-finger, "duos digitos longus," tvi-hive, "bicolor." \) 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 \( zuirov \), also \( quiro, "twice," \) belongs, according to its formation, but not without the intervention of another word, to the above \( dwis, \delta i \xi, bis \); but it is clear, from the Old Northern \( tvis-var \), that \( ro \) has arisen from \( svu \) 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 \( द्विस् \) \( dwis \), \( दिस् \) \( δίς \), and \( त्रिस् \) \( tris \), \( τρις \), 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 \( mēiro \), also mentioned above, the comparative suffix is twice contained, because it is no longer felt the first time, by the genius of the language, with sufficient clearness. As then, in Old High German, first the \( r \), and more lately also the \( o \) (from \( v \)), of \( s-var \) has been dropped, we see, in the Middle High [G. Ed. p. 437.] German \( drir \), from \( dris \), the form again returned into the original limits of the Sanskrit-Greek \( tris \).

310. III. The theme is, in the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, and Old Scelavonic, \( TRI \), 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 Pāli, §. 226.): hence the genitive thriy-ē, and nominative neuter thriy-a (§. 233.). Besides these, the dative thri-m and the accusative thri-ns may be cited. The Sanskrit forms the genitive from an extended theme traya, hence trayā-p-am; while the Zend thry-ānm or thray-ānm comes from the original base. Both languages, however, agree in this, that त्रि trī, ḍh 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 (तिसर tisṛ, §. 1.), the a of which, in the Sanskrit nominative, accusative, and vocative, is irregularly suppressed; hence तिस्रस tisras† for tisaras, Zend 𐐷𐐻𐐷𐐹 tisarō.

* With this extended theme one may compare the Old High German nominative masculine diē in Isidor, which belongs to a theme DRIA, with pronominal declension. The feminine driō, from the base DRIO, of the same sound, presupposes in like manner a masculine and neuter theme DRIA.

† In the accusative, tisras is more organic than तिस्रस tisṛś, as it must stand according to the common rule (comp. §. 242.).
the syllables *tasa* in the theme *cha-ta-sar*, might not be considered as identical with the demonstrative bases of the same sound. I do not think, at least, that any language whatever has produced special original words for the particular designation of such compound and peculiar ideas as three, four, five, &c.; and as the appellations of numbers resist all comparison with the verbal roots,* the pronominal roots remain the only means by which to explain them. Without attempting to resolve the difficulties in the individual numbers, we will express the conjecture, that the operation of speech with regard to the numbers might originally be expounded nearly in this manner—that one might perhaps say, “it, this, that, and it, and this,” &c.: thus the pronouns might actually suffice better than they appear to do in the forms of numerals which lie before us. But an obscuration of the original clearness of this method, which would occur in the course of time, would be owing also [G. Ed. p. 439.] to this, that a simple or compound word might undertake immediately to designate this or that number, and no other one, though equally adapted to denote it.

312. The masculine and neuter of the number four have, in Sanskrit, चत्वार *chatwār* as the strong theme, and चतुर *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-ṇ-ām* for *chatur-ām*, since, according to the analogy of bases terminating with a vowel, a nasal

---

* Only in three might one perhaps think of the Sanskrit root त्रि, "trans-gredi," and consider three, therefore, as the more (than two). This verbal notion of passing over, adding, is, however, also the only possible one which could be blended with the names of numbers.

† To §. 129. is further to be added, that from the strong theme springs also the form of the nom., acc., and voc. plural of the neuter; while this kind forms the whole singular and dual from the weak theme.
is introduced (§. 246.). In the Zend the strong theme is चतुर्वर्त chathwār, according to §. 47.; hence, nom. masc. चतुर्वद्र chathwār; and the weak theme is, by transposition, चत्र chathru; as, chathru-māhām, “four months” (accus. sing.), Vend. S. p. 248. For the Sanskrit genitive चतुर्वद्रम् chaturnām, we find चतुर्वनाम chathrusnām (l. c. pp. 204 and 206, with a inserted, चतुर्वनाम chathrusnām); but in the beginning of compound words it is more frequently found चतुर्वर्त chathwārā; so that the weakening consists merely in the shortening of the d, and, according to §. 44., an ē is added to the r; as chathwār-प्रतिस्तायत, “of her with four teats” (gen. fem., Vend. S. p. 83). As to the European sister languages, one must expect, according to §. 14., for ch, gutturals and labials, hence, in Gothic fidvōr, and aspirates for smooth letters, according to §. 87. This fidvōr is based on the strong theme चतुर्वत chathwār, but in the state of declension extends the theme by an unorganic i, hence dative fidvōrī-m, the only adduceable case. In Old Northern the nom. masc. is fidrī-r.

[G. Ed. p. 440.] The original theme fidvōr appears in the compound fidvōr-tiguns, “forty” (accus.): on the other hand, fidur in fidur-dōgs, “four days,” is referable to the Indian weak theme chatur; whence, however, it should not be said that the weak theme of the German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic has been brought from an Asiatic original site, for it was as easy for the Gothic, by suppressing the last vowel but one, to contract its fidvōr to fidur—like thiw-s “servant,” from thiva-s, gen. thivi-s—as for the Sanskrit to abbreviate chathwār to chatur. The Lithuanian theme follows the example of abbreviation in its interior, but extends the theme at the end; the masc. nom. is keturi, and the feminine keturios: KETURIA serves the latter as theme: the masculine keturi is analogous with geri, “the good” (see p. 251, Note †), and therefore has KETURIE, euphonic for KETURIA, as its base. The genitive and
accusative masculine keturi-ů, keturi-s, proceed from the base KETURI. The Old Sclavonic gives CHETYRI as the masculine and feminine theme, and inflects the masculine like GOSTI, and the feminine like KOSTI (p. 349); hence nom. chetyry-e, chetyri, just as in the third numeral triy-e, "tri"; and the feminine form may, in both, represent also the masculine, and always supplies the neuter. But the collective chetvero, and the ordinal numberchetverty-ř, stand in closer agreement with the Indian strong theme चत्वार चतवार: the Latin quatuor, also, which, in disadvantageous comparison with the cognate languages, has lost the capability of declension, and the Greek τέσσαρες, τέτταρες, rest on the strong चत्वारस् chativāras; so that τέτταρες, just like the Pāli form चत्वारो chattāro, has gained its last t by assimilation of the semi-vowel. The Prākrit form, also, which I am not able to quote, will scarcely be other than chattāro (comp. §. 300 p. 414 G. ed.). With regard to the initial τ let reference be made to §. 14., by which this τ is accommodated with the Æolic τίσυπος, which refers itself to the weak theme चतुर चतुर. With the Zend transposition of the weak theme to chathru (p. 439 G. ed.), at the beginning of compounds, agrees surprisingly the Latin quadrupes and other words. The adverbial s, by which द्विस dvis, "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 chatars. That the latter has originally existed one learns from the Zend transposed form चतरस् 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 पन्तन panchan, Zend पंचान panchan. Lithuanian penki,* Greek πέντε, Æolic πέμπε, Gothic

* This is the nominative masculine; the feminine is penkios, and holds
The Sanskrit-Zend *panchan* is the theme, and the genders are not dis-

[G. Ed. p. 442.] distinguished in this and the following num-

bers; 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 वननामके *panchānām*, Zend 𐐸𐐸𐐸𐐸𐐸𐐸 panchānām (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*

*navaṇa*, and *dašan* is found also in Gothic and Lithuanian;

and in Lithuanian, also, that of शतन *aštan*, “eight” (asztănini). 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 uninfluenced: 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 *sahs*, “six,” *sibun*, “seven,” *ahtar*, “eight,” and *taihun*, “ten,” only uninfluenced, and there-
fore without the unorganic i; but from *niun*, “nine,” comes the genitive *niuvè*, which indeed might also have proceeded from a theme *NIUN* or *

NIUNA*, but which I doubt not comes from *NIUNI*.

† The theme is *PYATI*, and is influenced like *KOSTI* (p. 348), and with singular terminations; so that one has to look upon this num-

cr al 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 Sclavonic, only the syllable *pa* is represented by *pya* (§. 225. n.); but *TI* is a derivational suffix, as in *SHESHTI*, “six,” *DEYATI*, “nine,” and *DEŠATI*, “ten,” and corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix *ti* in the multiplied numbers *višati*, “twenty,” *šašṭi*, “sixty,” &c.
before a nasal originally there, while it has preferred weakening the same to e before other consonants; hence 
\[\text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\&\alpha\)}(\mu, \nu), \text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\&av\)}, \text{but } \text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\&\varepsilon\)}(\tau); \text{\(\tau\varepsilon\nu\&\alpha\)}(\mu) \text{ but } \text{\(\tau\varepsilon\nu\&\varepsilon\)}(\tau); \text{and so } \text{\(\eta\varepsilon\tau\alpha\), } \text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\)}, \text{\(\delta\varepsilon\kappa\alpha\): not } \text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\), however, but } \text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\).} \]

It might therefore well be assumed, that the nasal in Indo-Zend numerals is a later addition, but that cha is the particle signifying "and," which, in the number four, we have taken for the prefix (§ 311.). In Latin, also, quinque is, in regard to its termination, similar to words connected with the particle que, as in \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\) the enclitic te, which is akin to que and cha (see § 14.) appears to be contained. This being the case, I would prefer regarding pan in \(\text{\(\varphi\varepsilon\nu\)} \text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\)h\)} as euphonic for \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\), and the m as a neuter case-sign; but the pa which remains over as a pronoun, and indeed as identical with the ka which occurs in the number one (§ 308), in regard to which one might advert to the old Latin \(\text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\pi\varepsilon\)}\) for quidquid, \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\) for koioς, &c. Five would, therefore, literally mean "and one," and in fact that one which is to be added to four.*

314. VI. Sanskrit \(\text{\(\varphi\varepsilon\nu\)} \text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\)h\)}, Zend \(\text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\nu\&\nu\varepsilon\&\nu\varepsilon\)} \text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\)}, \text{Lithuanian } \text{\(\sigma\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\)}, \text{Old Scavonic } \text{\(\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\)}, \text{Greek } \varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon\varepsilon. \text{One}

may justly suppose that the guttural which begins the Zend word has also existed in Sanskrit, for instance, \(\text{\(\varphi\varepsilon\nu\)} \text{\(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\)h\).}

* Ag. Benary, who likewise recognises in \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\)h the particle "and," seeks to compare the preceding syllable with \(\pi\varepsilon\nu\tau\alpha\), "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 digitus and δάκρυος with the number "ten," and our "finger," Gothic figgrs (=fingrs), theme FIGGRA, with fünf (fimf); so that in this word no transition of the guttural organ into the labial has taken place. I do not think it probable that finger in named from fangen, "to seize"; also, as far as regards the Greek and Latin, the appellation of each single finger is more likely to be derived from the total number than from pointing (\(\delta\varepsilon\kappa\varepsilon\nu\mu\)).
ks'hnsh, for sh is otherwise not an initial syllable in Sanskrit, and also no original sound, but that sibilant which is only admissible with a preceding k (§. 21.). In Latin, Greek, and German the guttural appears to be transposed, for sex is the transposition of xes.

315. VII. Sanskrit सप्तम् saptan, Zend मष्टम haptan, nominative and accusative सप्त sapta, मष्टम hapta (see §. 313.), Greek ἑπτά, Latin septem, Lithuanian septuni, Old Slavonic 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 Slavonic 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 आष्ट्यं aśtan or आष्ठे aśṭāu; from the former the nominative and accusative aśṭa, from the latter again aśṭāu; Zend मष्ठम astan, nominative मष्ठम aṣṭa, Lithuanian aštəni, Gothic ahtau, Greek ῥκτω, Latin octo, Old Slavonic osmy (theme OSMI). The Sanskrit aśṭāu and the analogous ῥκτω appear, as it were, in a dual dress (see §. 206.); nevertheless, aśṭāu is, in my opinion, just as much as aśṭan, a bare theme, and has perhaps proceeded from the latter form, which occurs only in Zend, by the resolution of the n to u, which is so common (comp. p. 415, Note), and the lengthening of the a; if it is not preferred to develope it from aṣṭa-s, according to the analogy of §. 206. From आष्ठे aśṭāu comes, by suppression of the last element of the diphthong, aśṭā-bhis, aṣṭā-bhyas, aṣṭā-su, as rd-bhis, &c., from rāi, "thing," "riches," while aṣṭāu, in the cases mentioned, forms regularly aṣṭabhās, aṣṭa-
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bhyas, aṣṭādus (comp. p. 304). The genitive has only one form, namely, खळ्य ानम aṣṭāndam. The strength of the du of aṣṭādu is preserved, also, in the cognate languages, and indeed in the Latin octav-us, Greek ὀγδοος for ὀγδωο-ος, and in German forms as ahtoue-n, dative, according to Notker the cardinal number from ahtowi-m, from the theme AHTOWI. But if अष्टादु were connected in its base with चतुर् chatur, “four,” there would be strong reason for considering the former form as the dual, expressing four twice, and for assuming that an unorganic corruption of a dual termination, which made its appearance in the earliest antiquity, has grown up with the theme.

317. IX. Sanskrit नवन nava, Zend [G. Ed. p. 445.] नूय 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 ἐνεά, Lithuanian dewyni, Old Sclavonic 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 βρότος and मृतस् mritis, “mortuus.” As regards the origin of this numeral term, there exists a close connection in respect of form with the expression for “new” (Sanskrit nava). That, however, a relation of ideas actually exists between the two designations, as Ag. Benary first acutely conjectured (Berl. Jahrb. 1832. ii. p. 50), appears to me likewise probable; for without recognizing a dual in aṣṭādu, 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 द्वान् daśan, Zend Ḍašan (nominative and accusative daša), Greek δέκα, Latin decem, Lithuanian deszimt, deszimt' - s and deszimtis (the two first indeclinable), Old Sclavonic desyati (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 श् as a proportionally 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, श् is found; for आश्म “a stone,” nom. आश्म, is, in Lithuanian, AKMEN, nom. akmū (§. 139.) and in Old Sclavonic KAMEN, nom. kamy (§. 264.).
had already entered into the language, which did not exist at the time when the Greeks and Romans transplanted the Asiatic original language to Europe.

319. XI—XX. The smaller numbers are combined with the expression for ten: Sanskrit एकदशने ēkādaśan, द्वदशने dvādaśan, त्रयोदशने trayōdaśan, चतुर्दशने chaturdaśan, &c.; Zend 𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱 aēvandaśan (?), 𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱 xeudasa; Greek εἷδεκα, δώδεκα, τρισκαίδεκα, τεσσαρεσ- [G. Ed. p. 447.] καίδεκα; Latin undecim, duodecim, tredecim, quatuordecim; Lithuanian wienolika, dwylika, irylika, keturdlika; Gothic ainlif, C. XV. 5; tvalif, Jaimfiaihun, "fifteen"; Old Sclavonic chetirinadesyafy, "fourteen," puainadesyafy, "fifteen," &c.

* Remark.—Before the simple daśan (from dakan) had been changed in the Gothic into tāihun, according to the

* These may be deduced from the ordinals aēvandaśa, dvadaśa (Vend. S. p. 120). So also chathrudaśan, "fourteen," panchadaśan, "fifteen," from chathrudaśa, "the fourteenth," panchadaśa, "the fifteenth." The nasal in aēvandaśa appears to have proceeded from m, and to be an accusative sign, for the whole stands l. c. in the accusative (aēvandaśem). By this doubt is thrown on the aēvandaśan given above, and perhaps aēvodaśan, or, according to the original principle of the compound, aēvadaśan might be expected. In one other passage, indeed, occurs the nominative of the ordinal aēvandaśo (l. c. p. 230): it is, however, clearly a false reading and the sense requires the accusative, as governed by 𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱 xeudaioi, which Anquetil renders by o atteint; thus, 𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱𐐱 xeudasaioi, "decimum attingit"; and in the following analogous constructions the ordinal number also stands always in the accusative. The form aēvandaśem, from aēvandaśem, is remarkable, also, in a phonetic respect, because elsewhere in Zend a final m is not governed by the organ of the following letter.

† I do not take the tva here, with Grimm (II. 947.), for the neuter, but, according to the principle of genuine compounds, for the theme (compare § 112.), whence the nom. masc. tvai. Tva may also—and this appears to me more correct—be regarded, without the Gothic being conscious of the formation, precisely as the abbreviation of the Sanskrit dvā, which is a lengthening of the theme dvā, as ēkā from ēka.
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 fidvôr to the Lithuanian keturi and Latin quatuor becomes explicable—the dasan contained in ekd-dasân "eleven," and dwâ-dasân, "twelve" (from dakan), may have passed, in Gothic, into LIBI. Through the dative tva-libi-m, genitive tva-libi'-ê, LIBI is preserved, in fact, as the true theme; so that each a of dasan is weakened to i. The f of [G. Ed. p. 448.] the uninflected tvaliff is, therefore, not to be explained according to §. 87., but according to §. 93a.; 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 §. 89., for we refer to fidvôr, not fithvôr. The Latin quadraginta, also, for quatraginta, and the Greek ὀγδοα for ὀκτος, ἐβδομος for ἑπτομος, and several others, may be noticed, in support of the proposition that the numeral formations in the choice of the degree of the organ of the consonants have not always remained in the customary path; and in cumbrous compounds the medials are more admissible than the smooth letters and aspirates.* To remove the objection which may be taken on the ground that LIBI is so very different from the form of taihun, we may remark, that, in French

* The Anglo-Saxon endlefan, endlefan, compared with twelf, and the Old Friesian andlova with twiliff, should not make us doubt, since the Anglo-Saxon eo corresponds to the Sanskrit a of dasan and Gothic i of lif, as in the relation of senfon (Old Friesian siugon) to the Sanskrit saptan, Gothic sibun. Let, then, the Old Friesian o of lova be regarded like that of siugon. To the Sanskrit chatwôr, Gothic fidvôr, correspond the Anglo-Saxon feower, Old Friesian fiuwer.
also, the number ten, in compounds like on-ze, dou-ze, trei-ze, is so remote from the expression of the simple ten, that one would hardly venture to pronounce the syllable ze to be akin, or originally identical with dix, if it were not historically certain that onze, douze, &c., have arisen from undecim, duodecim, and that therefore ze is a corruption of decim, as dix is a less vitiated form of decem. If, then, onze, douze, &c., have assumed the appearance of uncompounded words through the great alteration of the expression for the number ten contained in them, the same holds good with regard to our eilf and zwolf, in which, perhaps, as in onze and douze, a connection with ein and zwei may be recognised, but none with zehn; and in the English eleven, also, the relation to one is entirely obliterated. But with regard to our using for thirteen, fourteen, &c., not dreilf, vierlf, or similar forms in 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 ἑνδέκα, δώδεκα, move more freely, and are suited to the spirit of the ancient compounds. The literal meaning, too, of τρισκαίδεκα (for τριδέκα) is “thrice and ten,” and the numeral adverb τρίς, instead of the bare theme τρι, is here just as much a mistake as the masculine plural nominative serves as a reproach to the τεσσαρεσκαίδεκα, and is inferior in purity to the Sanskrit chatur-daśan, not chatvāras-daśan (chatvārō-daśan). On the other hand, the Sanskrit, in the designation of the number
thirteen, commits a similar error, and awkwardly gives instead of \textit{tri-da\'san}, \textit{tray\'o-da\'san}—euphonic for \textit{tray\'as-da\'san}—where the masculine plural nominative instead of the theme, which is adapted for all genders, is not well selected. The Latin \textit{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 \textit{try\text{-}lika}, not \textit{trys\text{-}lika}. This \textit{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 \textit{dessimt\text{'}s} as the Gothic \textit{libi} from \textit{taihun}; partly, as the second consonant in \textit{lika} has maintained itself in its oldest form received from the Greek, and has not become a sibilant; so that \textit{lika} and \textit{\'e\'eka} resemble each other very closely. The Lithuanian \textit{lika}, therefore, is derived, like the Gothic \textit{libi} and the French \textit{ze} in \textit{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 \textit{wieno\text{-}lika}, \textit{dwy\text{-}lika}, &c., do not appear as independent simple designations of numbers—as, perhaps, \textit{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 shows in its isolated state; on which account \textit{wieno\text{-}lika}, if it is regarded as an ancient compound from the time of the unity of language, or perhaps as derived from रूकाद्वात् लक्त-दासन, [G. Ed. p. 450.] has nevertheless undergone, in its initial member, a renovation; as also in Gothic \textit{ainli}f, in Greek \textit{\'e\'deka}, in Latin \textit{undeceim}, have regulated their first member according to the form which is in force for the isolated number one. On the other hand, \textit{\'o\'deka} is almost entirely the \textit{Sanskrit} \textit{dw\'a\text{-}dasa}. 
(ω for ά, 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 zwölfe strange as it at the first glance may appear, a word is contained expressing the number ten, and identical in its origin with dasan, δέκα, 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 aflifnan, “relinqui, superesse,” laibōs, “reliquiae”), which both signify “to remain,” and are also connected with each other and with the Greek λέιπω (ΛΙΠ). 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 likiti, “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-desyaty, "four over ten." The ordinal numbers for eleven and twelve are yedinyi-na-desyaty, "the first over ten," vtoryi-na-desyaty, "the second over ten." In the same manner proceeds the twin sister of the Lithuanian—accompanying it, but corrupted—the Lettish, in which weenpazmit signifies "eleven," as it appears to me, with contraction of the d(e)s of desmit, "ten," to z, and overlapping 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 Prâkît 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 elf, zwolf, and analogous forms in Lith. and Slavonic.
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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 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, चारस vāraha, "twelve," from द्वादश dwādaśa, and अष्टादश aṭṭhāraha, "eighteen," from अष्टादश aṣṭādaśa, can be cited, but still from them it is probable that the other numerals too, which fall under this category, have an r for d, apparently to lighten the word loaded by the prefixing of lesser numbers, by exchanging the d for a weak semi-vowel. Now it is a remarkable coincidence that if we were desirous of not seeing a mutation of letters in this raha we should be led to the root rah, "to leave," which is probably identical with the verb, to which recourse has been had for the explanation of the corresponding Lithuanian and German numeral forms.† I thought I had exhausted this subject, when I was led by other reasons to the Hindūstāni 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 rāha,† and, for example, bāraha,

* 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 líquo, Lithuanian likū, Greek leitō (держан), Gothic of-lif-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 lík, "to lick." Since writing this note, I have come to the conclusion that it is better to concur with Benfey, in assigning the Latin líquo, Greek leitow. Gothic of-lif-na, to the Skr. root rich, from rik, "to leave."
‡ The text has des and reh but as these sounds are incorrect, I have altered them, as well as some other inaccuracies in the Hindūstāni numerals which follow.—Translator.
"twelve," answers to the abovementioned Prākrit bāraha, and, like this, has proceeded directly from the Sanskrit original form dvāḍāsa, without heeding the form of the simple do, "two," and das, "ten." It may be proper here to quote all the Hindūstāni 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 Hindūstāni.

[G. Ed. p. 453.]

**HINDŪSTĀNI.**

- ḍk 1, iγd-rah, 11, ēkāḍāsa 11.
- do 2, bā-rah 12, dvāḍāsa 12.
- ḍn 3, tērah 13, trayāḍāsa 13.
- chār 4, chau-dah 14, chaturḍāsa 14.
- pānch 5, pand-raḥ 15, panchāḍāsa 15.
- chhah 6, so-lah 16†, shōḍāsa 16.
- sāt 7, sat-raḥ 17, saḍḍaḍaṣa 17.
- āth 8, athā-rah 18, aḥṭāḍāsa 18.
- nau 9, unnīṣ 19, ānāviniṣati ("undeviginti") 19.
- das 10, bīṣ 20, viṇīṣati 20.

320. XX—C. The idea of ten is expressed in Sanskrit by śrīt sati, sāt or ṭi ṭi; in Zend by sātī, sātā, or ṭo ṭi; 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 ṭ is here clearly to be ascribed to the circumstance that the lesser number ends with ṭ, although in the Hindūstāni corruption this is no longer present. The Bengāli has assimilated the ṭ to the following ṭ, hence chāuddo; but, as a general rule, the Bengāli in these compounds changes the ṭ into ṭ, and in all cases suppresses the Hindūstāni ṭ; as ṭgāro, "eleven," bāro, "twelve," ṭēro, "thirteen."

† This form merits particular notice, as, through its l for the ṭ found elsewhere, it comes so near to the Lithuanian and German lika, līf. The Bengāli is shōlo.
dependent upon it. Occasionally, too, one finds these numerals in Sanskrit used adjectively, with plural endings. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 454.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARDINAL NUMBERS.</th>
<th>ZENS.</th>
<th>GREEK.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20, विसाति viśāti, वीशालिः viśālī, εικατι, εγιγιντι,</td>
<td>संस्कृत.</td>
<td>वीशालिन्त, वीशालिन्त, τριάκοντα, τριάκοντα,</td>
<td>viginti,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30, त्रिसात् trisāt, त्रिसात् thrisala, τριάκοντα, τριάκοντα,</td>
<td>वीशालिन्त, वीशालिन्त, वीशालिन्त,</td>
<td>triginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40, चतुर्विसात् chaturviśāt, चतुर्विसात्, चतुर्विसात्,</td>
<td>चतुर्विसात्, चतुर्विसात्, चतुर्विसात्,</td>
<td>quadraginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, पांचासात् panchāsat, पांचासात्, पांचासात्,</td>
<td>पांचासात्, पांचासात्, पांचासात्,</td>
<td>quintaginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60, सप्ताशि सप्ताशि सप्ताशि सप्ताशि</td>
<td>सप्ताशि सप्ताशि सप्ताशि सप्ताशि</td>
<td>sexaginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70, अष्टाशि अष्टाशि अष्टाशि अष्टाशि</td>
<td>अष्टाशि अष्टाशि अष्टाशि अष्टाशि</td>
<td>septuaginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80, नवासि नवासि नवासि नवासि</td>
<td>नवासि नवासि नवासि नवासि</td>
<td>octoginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90, शतासि शतासि शतासि शतासि</td>
<td>शतासि शतासि शतासि शतासि</td>
<td>nonaginta.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100, सतासि-म satē-m, satē-m, satē-m,</td>
<td>satē-m, satē-m, satē-m,</td>
<td>centum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Remark.—I hold sāti, sāt, sāta, ti, to be abbreviations of dasāti, dasat, dasāta, and therefore derivations from dasan, "ten," by a suffix ti, ta, or t: the former is

* The numerals in sāta, answering to the Sanskrit forms in sāt, 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 satām 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 sātēm (panchāsatēm), "fifty," stands as nominative. From csvasti, "sixty," haptāiti, "seventy," and navaiti, "ninety," we find the accusative csvastim, haptāitim, navaitim: on the other hand, in the 12th Fargard, occurs several times viśaṭṭi (also written viśaṭi and viśati) as accusative of viśaṭṭi, which perhaps is a dual neuter form (two decades), and according to this would stand for viśaṭti (§. 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 ἐνενήκοντα, ἐκτώκοντα, for the latter Ion. ὀγδώκοντα. In ἐνενήκοντα the two ν are separated from each other: the epic form ἐννήκοντα is more genuine.
in Lithuanian and Sclevonic, already contained in the simple deszimt's, deszimtis, Old Sclevonic desyaty. With regard, however, to the ten being expressed without abbreviation in the languages mentioned, in compounds, also—as in Lithuanian dwideszimti (or tis), "twenty," trysdeszimti (or tis), "thirty," and in Old Sclevonic che-tyridesyaty, "forty."* pyatydesyaty, "fifty"—I do not consider

* G. Ed. p. 465. 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. ketiros deszimtis, "forty," penkios deszimtis, "fifty"; in which it is surprising that deszimtis, also, does not stand in the plural. The Gothic method in this numeral category is of comparatively recent date: it has lost, as in thirteen, &c., the ancient compound, and gives, in the numbers under seventy (sixty docs 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 thriyétigv. 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 κατι, κοντα, 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 dvādaśa-s, "the twelfth." To this daśa-s, therefore, is related tigu-s in regard to its a, 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 tēhound (theme TEHUNDA, genitive tēhundi-s) hence sibun-tēhound, "seventy," ahtau-tēhound, "eighty," niun-tēhound, "ninety." The ē 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 ssiğ (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 šata, "a hundred," which is a neuter substantive—nominative पत्रण् ्षतम् ्षतəम्—in my opinion owes its designation to the number ten (dašan), 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 dašata, as above. पत्रति ्षति, पत्र ्षत, and the Zend मुषम् ्षता for dašati, &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 κατὼν (ἐκατὼν is, verbatim, "one hundred"), Latin centum, Lithuanian szimta-s (masculine), Old Slavonic sto (at once theme and nominative and accusative neuter).* The Gothic hund and Old High German hunt (theme HUNDA, HUNTA) occur only in compounds, as tva-hunda, thria-hunda, zuei-hunt, drie-hunt, where the lesser number is likewise inflected. That also पत्रति ्षति, पत्र ्षत, and the corresponding words

* In Zend šta occurs frequently for šata, 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 विनसति vīnśati, समस्यो विनसति, दकति, दकोषि, विगिति, the single elements have lain together undisturbed for thousands of years, affords a fresh proof of the agreement of the languages which have most faithfully preserved their ancient construction. I would not, however, wish to maintain that the loss of the d of the number two in the above forms falls under the period of the unity of languages; and that it may not have happened that each of the four individual languages, having become weary of the initial double consonant in a word already encumbered by composition, may have disburthened itself of the initial sound, as we have above seen the Latin and Zend, independently of each other, produce bis from dwis, and bi from dwi, and as, in agreement with the abbreviation of विनसति vīnśati, the Prākrit dialect mentioned at p. 451 G. ed. has laid aside the d in the number twelve also (वध्रा for dwध्रा). 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 विनसति vīnśati. The Sanskrit and Zend, however, in a later corruption which is unsupported by the Greek and Latin, have caused the word dasati to be melted down to the derivation suffix ti, and this ti corresponds to the French te of trente, quarante, &c. The numbers which have been thus far abbreviated begin, in Sanskrit and Zend, with sixty, शष्ठी śaṣṭī (ti euphonic for ti), सम्मस्यो शष्ठी cṣasti. To the शति of विनसति vīnśati समस्य समस्यो विनसति, regularly corresponds the Doric κατί of εκατί, while in the Latin ginti the smooth

[G. Ed. p. 457.] letter has sunk to a medial, as in ginta=κοντα of the higher numbers. In Sanskrit the न of vīnśati,
trinišat, chatwārinšat, is surprising, and one might imagine a transposition of the nasal, so that in the Latin ginti, ginta, centum, and in the Gothic HUNDA, “one hundred,” it would stand in its proper place. For the rest, chatwārinšat shews its relation to the neuter chatwāri (see §. 312.); as also τρια, τεσσάρα, in τριάκοντα, τεσσάρακοντα, are, in my opinion, plural neuter forms, with the termination lengthened in τριά, and originally, also, in τεσσάρα, as the Ionic τεσσαρήκοντα, Doric τετράκοντα, Latin quadrāginta, 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 višaiti, as in the long a of panchāsat, ṣapamāt, panchāsatēm from panchan (§. 318.), and to which again the length of πέντεκοντα, quinquaginta, runs parallel. The Zend chathvarē, in ṣuṣaḥam kathuvarēsata, “forty” (Vend. S. p. 380), is likewise stronger than cha-thru-sata, which might have been expected from §. 312. As ṣuṣaḥ sata is a neuter, to which, in Greek, κατον or κοντον would correspond, κοντά therefore, and the Latin ginta, are best explained as neutrals in the plural, by which the neuter nature of τριά and τεσσάρα is still more authenticated. An auxiliary vowel, which merely facilitated the combination, and which might be assumed in ἐξήκοντα, would at least be very superfluous in the theme TPI; and it is much more probable that ἐξη, too, is a lengthened plural neuter. Compare ἐξά-κις, ἐξάπλως, and the remarks on πάντα and πολλά, p. 401, G. ed.

* The α for ṛ is explained by §. 4. As to the suppression of the vowel before the r, τετρω answers to τετρα in τετράκις, τετραπλοῦς, which in like manner are based on plural neuter forms instead of the theme.
ORDINAL NUMBERS.

321. While, in designating the number one, the greatest variety obtains amongst the Indo-European languages, they are [G. Ed. p. 458.] almost unanimous in their designation of the first, which idea none of the languages here treated of derives from the corresponding cardinal number: Sanskrit प्रथमस् prathama-s (nom.), Zend 𐓹𐓘𐒃𐒋𐒉 frathemō (§. 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 birstēr, usually indefinite bisto (from the adverb ird, “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 πρω accords with the Sanskrit prá in prātar, “in the morning” (see p. 392 G. ed.). The suffix TO is an abbreviation of the Sanskrit tama or thama, which occurs even in Sanskrit in चतुर्थ स chatur-tha-s, “the fourth,” and पञ्चार्थ śaśārth-tha-s, “the sixth,” as also in Latin in the form of TU in quartus, quintus, sextus, while in Greek this abbreviation extends to all the ordinal numbers, exclusive of δεύτερος, ἑβδομος, and ὑδύος. In Lithuanian the corresponding TA of four runs through all, but in such wise, that together with septintas, asztuntas, occur also sėkmas, āsžmas, which correspond to the Sanskrit सप्तमस् saptama-s, अष्टमस् ashta-s, in which the last portion of the superlative suffix tama or thama has remained; of which kind of division, also, पञ्चमस् panchama-s, नवमस् navama-s, and दशमस् daśama-s, partake, which therefore complete, by their suffix, the tha of chaturtha, so that both united present the perfect word. The Zend agrees herein with the Sanskrit, only that its 𐓹𐓘𐒃𐒃 haptathō agrees more with septintas than with सप्तमस् saptama-s and septimu-s; and
that also ॠष्टि pug-dho, "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, ὅ γ ρ ως for ὅ κ τ ρ ως; and, besides this, has aspirated the last, rejected the nasal (comp. p. 94, basta from bandh), and irregularly changed the a to u, as in "ONYX, corresponding to the Sanskrit नख nakha, "a nail." In the numbers from eleven to twenty the superlative suffix, in Sanskrit and Zend, is abbreviated still more than in the simple दसम् dasama, महिसम् daśema, and of all the derivational suffix only the a is left, before which the a of the primitive word must fall away, according to a universal principle for the derivation of words; as, द्वादशं dvādaśa, महिसम् dvadaśa, "the twelfth"; चतूर्दशं chaturdaśa, महिसम् chathrudasa, "the fourteenth." The Latin appears to prove that this abbreviation is comparatively of recent date, and it goes beyond both the Asiatic sisters by its undecimus, duodecimus, not undecus, duodecus; but has, as it were, exhausted itself in the effort which the continuance of these heavier forms has cost it; and has given up the analogous formations in the very place in which the German cardinal numbers have lost the old compound in lif: hence, tertius decimus for the lost tredecimus, &c. An imitation, however, of the abbreviation which we have just remarked in the Sanskrit-Zend daśa is supplied by the Greek and Latin in the forms octav-us, ὅ γ ρ ως(F)-ος, where, of the ordinal suffix, in like manner, only the final vowel is left: we might have expected ὅ γ ρ ως, octomus. In the very remarkable coincidence which here exists between the said languages, it must seem strange that, in the remaining designations of the ordinal numbers, the Latin is a much truer colleague to its Asiatic sisters than to the Greek; and it preserves this character, also, in annexing, from twenty upwards, the full superlative suffix simu-s (from timu-s=तमस् tama-s); thus vicesimus or vige-
[G. Ed. p. 460.] *simus, trigesimus, as in Sanskrit viinéátitana-s, triinisattama-s.* In Latin, however, the termination *nti* or *nta* of the primitives is rejected, and in compensation the preceding vowel is lengthened in the form of *è*. Compare, in this respect, the comparative formations discussed in §. 298. The Greek shews its more rare superlative suffix, corresponding to the Sanskrit स्म ishtha, in the ordinal numbers like εικοστός, πριακοστός, with the loss of the *i* of ἰατός, as in ἐκαστός, πόστος. Here also, therefore, as in Latin, the *ti, si, and nta* 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 *dri-zugóst*o, “the thirtieth,” fior-zugóstoo, “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 चतुर्थ चतुर्थa-s, तेषत्रत्रo-s, quartu-s, ketwir-ta-s. The *N*, however, is an unorganic addition, after the principle of the indefinite adjective declension (§. 285.), which is followed by the ordinal numbers, with the exception of 1 and 2 in the older dialects; while the New German has also introduced the definite—vierter, “fourth,” fünfter, “fifth,” &c.; hence, Gothic FIMFTAN, nom. masc. fimfta.†

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

* However, this and the higher numbers may follow the analogy of इकुदासा-s, “the eleventh”; hence, also, viina, triins-a, &c. In Zend I am unable to quote the ordinal numbers from twenty upwards.

† In compounds like fimftataihunda, “the fifteenth,” the lesser number has either preserved the original theme while still free from the *n*, which was added more lately,—for the lesser number in these compounds does not partake of declension,—or fimfta is here the regular abbreviation of the theme FIMFTAN, since, as I have already elsewhere remarked (Borl. Ann. May 1827. p. 750), bases in *n*, in strict accordance with the Sanskrit, drop the *n* in the beginning of compounds.
tius, as also in the Old Sclavonic tretiì, 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 tha, TO, TU of ꞌερίκειν chaturtha, τέταρτος, quartus, and has arisen from the indefinite theme in TO (comp. the collective chetvero, §. 312.), according to §. 255. (d.), although the simple word in most of the formations falling under this category no longer exists. The same relation, then, that chetvertyi, shestyi, have to chaturtha-s, शष्ठिता-s, sedmyi, osmyi, have to चाव्रम sapta, चाव्रम aṣṭama; and pertyi, “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 i of the suffix tiya, and abbreviated dwi to bi; hence नम्बर्त्या bitya, नम्बर्त्या thritya, in which it is to be remarked that the y, which is thus by syncope united with the t at a comparatively later period, has gained no aspirating influence (§. 47.). To this Zend tya corresponds, by similar suppression of the middle i, the Gothic DÝAN (from dya, §. 285.) in THRIDÝAN, nom. masc. thrīda, the y of which in the Old High German dritto, has assimilated itself to the preceding t, in analogy with the Prākrit forms and Greek comparatives, like θάσσων, κρείσσων, κρεῖττων, mentioned at p. 402. Still closer, however, lies the comparison with διττός, τριττός (διςός, τριςός), which are evidently, in [G. Ed. p. 462.] their origin, one with the corresponding Sanskrit-Zend ordinal numbers; and, in respect of their reduplicated consonant, have the same relation thereto that the Old High German dritto has to the Gothic thrīda. Regarding tvaddyē, “duorum;” see p. 422, Note *: the place of the ordinal number is supplied by the pronoun anthar (see p. 377), Old High German andar, Middle High German ander. Our zweiter, however, is a new unorganic formation. The Old Sclavonic storyi (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-tiya, in regard to which we have, in §. 297., adverted to the Zend ζωος 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.

[G. Ed. p. 463.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT.</th>
<th>ZEND.</th>
<th>GR. DOR.</th>
<th>LATIN.</th>
<th>GOTHIC.</th>
<th>LITHUANIAN.</th>
<th>OLD SCLAVONIC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prathama,</td>
<td>prathaema,</td>
<td>πρώτα.</td>
<td>prima</td>
<td>fruma</td>
<td>pirmā</td>
<td>perva-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwitiya,</td>
<td>bitya,</td>
<td>δεύτερα.</td>
<td>altera</td>
<td>anithara</td>
<td>antrā</td>
<td>vitora-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triitiya,</td>
<td>thritya,</td>
<td>τρίτα.</td>
<td>tertia</td>
<td>thradya,</td>
<td>trēchā,</td>
<td>treti-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaturthā,</td>
<td>türya,</td>
<td>τετάρτα.</td>
<td>quarta</td>
<td>(fītvōrdō),</td>
<td>ketvīrīt,</td>
<td>cheyerta-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panchamā,</td>
<td>pugdha,</td>
<td>πέμπτα.</td>
<td>quinta</td>
<td>fimfīto</td>
<td>penktā</td>
<td>pyata-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣaṭṭhā,</td>
<td>estva,</td>
<td>ἑκτά.</td>
<td>sexia</td>
<td>saistō,</td>
<td>ŝešsēta</td>
<td>shesta-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saptamā,</td>
<td>haptatha,</td>
<td>ἑξαδέκατα.</td>
<td>septima</td>
<td>(sibundō),</td>
<td>sekma</td>
<td>sedma-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neśtamā,</td>
<td>astēma,</td>
<td>ὑπόδει.</td>
<td>octava</td>
<td>ahtudō,</td>
<td>āsma</td>
<td>osma-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>navamā,</td>
<td>nāuna,</td>
<td>ἑννεατά.</td>
<td>nona</td>
<td>niundō,</td>
<td>dewinta,</td>
<td>devyata-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daśamā,</td>
<td>daśima,</td>
<td>ἑξακόστα.</td>
<td>decima</td>
<td>tālunda,</td>
<td>desyata-ya,</td>
<td>desyata-ya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekāṭasā,</td>
<td>aevandaia,</td>
<td>ἑνεκάτα.</td>
<td>undecima,</td>
<td>(aunlītō),</td>
<td>wiešlipta,</td>
<td>yedina-ya-na-devyat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinīati tūmā,</td>
<td>visatitičina?</td>
<td>εἰκοστά.</td>
<td>viceima</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>didwideszima,</td>
<td>vitora-ya-na-desyat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1 More usually paotrya, masc. paotryb, by which the Sclavonic pervyt, pervaya, is, as it were, prepared.

2 Also turiya, masc. turiya-s, on which is based the Zend türya, masc. türyō. 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 pyatatya, masc. pyatyi, has nothing in common with the t of the cardinal number pyaty; the proper primitive is pya (see p. 430 Note t), whence PYATI by the suffix TI, and PYATOS, fem. PYATA, by the suffix TO, fem. TA (see §. 322.). The same holds good with regard to shestaya in relation to shesty, &c.

4 By transposition and syncope from cvasta, as must be expected from the cardinal number asvastas asvastas.

5 Regarding the d for n, see §. 317. 6 See §. 319, Note *, p. 435.
Remark.—As the old $a$ of the preposition $w$ *pra* has been weakened to $i$—as in *quinqve*, answering to *panchan*—the Latin *prima* appears distinct from the preposition *pro*, and is decidedly not derived from a Roman soil, but is, as it were, the continuance of the Indian *prathamā*, the middle syllable being cast out. A similar weakening of the vowel is exhibited in the Greek adverb $πρίν$, which is hereby, in like manner, brought into connection with the preposition $πρό$. In the comparative *prior* only the *pr* of the preposition, which forms the base, is left, as the $i$ belongs to the comparative suffix. In Lithuanian the *m* of the superlative formation has introduced itself also into the preposition *pirm*, ‘before’; but the unaltered *pra* stands as prefix. To the same base, however, belongs also *pri*, ‘by, before,’ as well isolated as prefixed. The Gothic *fruma* shews the same relation to *prathamā* that the Latin [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 *w* *pra* is based, also, *faur*, ‘before,’ with transposition of the *u* of *fru-ma*, and with *a* prefixed, according to §. 82.

### Numeral Adverbs.

324. The adverbs which express the ideas “twice,” “thrice,” “four times,” have been already discussed (p. 435 G. ed.). Let the following serve for a general view of them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dwis</em></td>
<td><em>bis</em></td>
<td>$δίς$</td>
<td><em>bis</em></td>
<td><em>tvīs-var</em> (p. 436 G. ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tris</em></td>
<td><em>thris</em></td>
<td>$τρίς$</td>
<td><em>ter</em></td>
<td><em>thris-var.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>chatur,</em></td>
<td><em>chathrus,</em></td>
<td>....</td>
<td><em>quater,</em></td>
<td>....</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* According to §. 94. for *chatur*. 

---

**ORDINAL NUMBERS.**
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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 sataśas, "by hundreds," sahasraśas, "by thousands," bahuśas, "of many kinds," ganaśas, "in swarms." The original idea of the suffix in both languages is that of repetition, but e.g. sataśas is an indefinite repetition of a hundred, while in ἐκατοντάκις 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 divis, δίς, nor with

[G. Ed. p. 465.] 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, τιθένς is more genuine than τιθεῖς (§. 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, vaṇs, e.g. chvaṇs, "how much," for chivais. This suffix has, in Sanskrit, in combination with the interrogative base ki, and the demonstrative base i, laid aside the v; hence ki-y-ant, iy-ant—weak form kiyat, iyat—nominative masculine kiyān, iyān; this ant for vant answers therefore to the Greek ENT (nominative masculine εἰς), e.g. in μελτοῖς, and also to the Latin ens, in totiens, quotiens, which indeed are, in form, masculine nominatives, but must also be considered as neuters, as in the participles, too, in nt, the masculine nominative has forced its way into the neuter. Now comes the question whether we ought to divide toti-ens quoti-ens, or tot-iens, quot-iens? In the former case tot, quot, would have preserved, in this combination, the i
which belongs to them, for they are based on the Sanskrit तत् tati, "so much," कति kati, "how much";* and the ens in toti-ens would, according to that, express the "time," and toti, "so much." In the division tot-iens, 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-somuch" (times); in the former case, however, the i, as quinqui-es, octi-es, would have to pass as representative of the e and o of quinque, octo, and that of sexies as a conjunctive vowel, or as an accommodation to the prevailing analogy. In any case, however, the identity of the suffix ens, es, with the Sanskrit ant, from vant, is highly probable. The Sanskrit expresses the idea "times" from five upwards by kritwas; as, पञ्चक्रितवस् 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, távat, "so much," yávat, "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. vienač kartan, "once," dū kartū, "twice" (accusative du), tris kartūs, "three times." In Old Scaliane the corresponding krat or kraty is not declined, and the former appears to be an abbrevia-

* These are neuters, which, in common with the numerals पचन् panchan, "five," &c. (§. 313.), have, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative, a singular form; in the other cases, plural terminations; while in Latin quot, tot, like quinque, &c., have become completely indeclinable.
tion of the latter, for it cannot be brought into direct comparison with the Sanskrit कृत krit on account of §. 255. (l.): krapy, however, is to be deduced from कृतस kritis, by suppression of the v. With regard to the y for as compare §. 271.

325. Through the suffix ला dha the Sanskrit forms adverbs in sense and in form, corresponding to the Greek in χα, which, therefore, have altered the T sound of the suffix into a corresponding guttural, by the usual exchange of organ in aspirates, as in OPNIX for OPNIO, and in the forms mentioned at p. 401 G. ed. Compare,

[G. Ed. p. 467.]

| द्वि-dhā | दी-χα. |
| त्रि-dhā | τρι-χα. |
| चतुर-dhā | τετρα-χα. |
| पञ्चa-dhā | πεντα-χα. |

* "Divided into two parts," Sav. V. 108.
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