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## COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

## PRONOUNS.

FIRST AND SECOND PERSONS.
326. In these pronouns the genders are not distinguished in any of the Indo-European languages; and all the sister dialects agree with one another surprisingly in this point, that the nominative singular first person is from a different base from that from which the oblique cases come. It is, Sanskrit अहम् aham, Zend $G \varepsilon \varsigma^{\wedge}$ azĕm, Greek è $\gamma \dot{\omega}$, Latin ego, Gothic ik, Lithuanian asz, Old Sclavonic az. The am of प्रहम् aham is termination, as in twam, " thou," ayam, "this," and swayam, "self;" and as in the plural, vayam, "we," yûyam, "ye." The Eolic є̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$ answers better than é $\gamma \omega$ to aham; but I would prefer é $\gamma o ́ v$, in order to explain the lengthening of the vowel in $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}$ as a compensation for the loss of the nasal. The abbreviated è $\gamma \dot{\omega}$, may, however, have reacted on the more complete $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega \nu$, and imparted to it the length of its vowel. In the other European languages, except the Latin, the entire termination has disappeared, as is also the case in Greek and Latin in $\sigma \dot{v}, \tau v v^{\prime}, t u$, contrasted with the Sanskrit-Zend twam (from tu-am), Gyo tûm (§. 42.). To the latter, however, answers the Boot. тovv, and the $\eta$ of the Doric and Lacon. túv $\eta$, $\tau o u v \eta$, is, perhaps, an unorganic addition, as, in Gothic, the $\alpha$ in [G. Ed. p. 468.] pronominal accusatives (tha-na for than, from tham, (§. 149.), if not, $v \eta$ must be regarded as an annexed particle. The oblique cases, in Sanskrit, have in the first person ma, and in the second $t w a$, as theme, which is lengthened, however, in some cases, by the admixture of an $i$ (compare $\S$. 158.); hence me, twe. On the other hand, twa, in the
dative, abbreviates itself to tu (tu-bhyam), from which, also, the nominative tw-am: in the genitive tav-a the $u$ of tu receives the Gma, or the $a$ of tua is transposed, To the base ma answers the Greek MO, from which come the genitive $\mu 0 \hat{v}$, and dative $\mu o{ }^{\prime}$. The $\epsilon$ of 'EMO rests on the provailing disposition of the Greek to prefix a vowel to forms beginning with a consonant, as in övo $\mu \alpha$, ódoús, ódpús, è $\lambda \alpha \chi u ́ s$, contrasted with mima, danta-s, blrith-s, laghu-s, "light." The o of MO, 'EMO is interchanged with $\varepsilon(\sec \S .3$.): hence

 Aolic-Doric forms $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \epsilon \hat{v}_{S}, \dot{\epsilon} \mu o \hat{u}_{\varsigma}$, as in $\tau \epsilon \hat{v} \varsigma$, $\tau \epsilon o \hat{u}_{\varsigma}$, the $\Sigma$ is a later addition, introduced by the necessity for a $\Sigma$ as a genitive character, after the old genitive $\Sigma$-which, according to $\S$. 189., in the o declension did not stand at the end but in the middle-had been long lost. Compare, in this respect, the regained genitive sibilants in New German forms like Herzens ( p .167 G. Ed.), In the uninflected accusative $\mu$ é, épé, the final $\epsilon$ for $o$, which latter might have been expected, is to be regarded as similar to the $\epsilon$ of the vocative $\lambda u ́ \kappa \varepsilon$ in §. 201. As to the dispensing with the accusative nasal, however, it is important to remark, that, in Sansk!it, for mâm, " me," and tuxim, " thee," we also find mâ, twá, without the case-sign; and the rejection of the $m$ has,
[G. Ed. p.469.] perhaps, next given occasion to the lengthening of the $a$; so that here that would hold good with regard to $m \hat{a} m$ and $t u \hat{u} m$ that was conjectured above of $\grave{\epsilon} \gamma \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ for $\mathfrak{e} \gamma{ }^{\prime} v . t$ The Latin supports in like manner, by its accusatives $m e ̈$ and $t \vec{e}$, the ancient loss of the inflexion.

[^0]327. The theme of the second person twa divides itself in Greek, after the vowel or semi-vowel has been lost, into the forms $\Sigma \Upsilon$ and $\Sigma O$, for $\Sigma F O$, and the o is exchanged with $\epsilon$, as in the first person, $\sigma c i o, \sigma^{\prime} \theta \in \iota$, \&c. Il. VIII. 37 the $\epsilon$ of $\tau \epsilon 0 \hat{o}-\tau \epsilon 0-(\sigma) \wedge 0$-stands, as it appears, as a melting of the $F$, or thinning of the $v$ (as $\pi \eta^{\prime} \chi \epsilon-\omega s$ for $\pi r^{\prime} \gamma \nu-o s$ ); and the to-be-presupposed $\tau$ Foбıo or tuoato would correspond excellently to the Zend thwa-hyd, to which a Sanskrit twasya would answer, in case thwahyn, which formerly appeared to me to be an instrumental, is really a genitive, as, according to p. 280, Rem. 3., can scarcely be doubted. The Gothic has weakened the $a$ of the base ma to $i$, and contracted the termination $v a$ of the $2 d$ person to $u$; hence $M I, T H U$, dative mi-s, thu-s, accusative mi-k, thu-k. The genitive is, in Sanskrit, in departure from all other genitives, mama, tara. The former appears to have arisen by reduplication; the Zend, however, substitutes for it mann! ; and, in the Gothic, na has assumed so much the character of an inflexion, that it has made its way also into the 2 d person and the 3 d person, which is void of gender; mei-nu, thei-na, sei-na. Theina I regard as an abbreviation of theri-na, as I imagine sei-na to come from svei-na, for thuna must have sprung from $T H U$. As, however, म $m a$ has, in Gothic, become $M I$, and from this has been formed, by lengthening it, MEI; so might also त्व tua become THII and THIET. According to this, the genitive [G. Ed.p.470.] theina-as the abbreviation of thveina-in respect to its base, has the same relation to thu, that, in Greek, $\sigma 0 \hat{v}$ (from $\sigma F o \hat{u}$ ) has to $\sigma u ́$, or that $\tau \epsilon \dot{v}$ (from $\tau F \epsilon \dot{u}$ ) has to $\tau \dot{v}$.
328. In Latin, as in Gothic, the $a$ of the Indian ma has been weakened to $i$, and this, in a measure, has changed the declension of the pronoun from the second, which, according to §. 116., was to have been expected, into the third: dative mi-hi for मह्सम् ma-hyam (§. 215.); accusative me for mem (as hoste-m from HOSTI), not $m u$ for mum; ablative me
from med, not mo from mod =Sansk!it मत् mut. The genitive mei is based, according to $\S .20$., on the locative बfि may-i (cuphonic for mer-i, and belongs, therefore, to the lengthened theme मे $m \hat{f}$. In the second person, according to the analogy of mei, the form trei might have been expected from r्वसि turuy-i, and may originally have existed, but in the actual condition of the language is impossible, for $v$ cannot consist with a preceding consonant, but in this position is either resolved into $u$, and at times, indced, with the sacrifice of the vowel following, as in sud-o, answering to fिद् swid, "to sweat"; or has itself disippeared, as in canis, answering to sum, "a dec," sonus for svonus, answering to suana-s, "a tone";* or has dislodged the preceding comsonant, as above (p. 424), in bis, as a hardening of vis, from dwis. We should hence have to expect for tui, together with some other forms, also tei (for tvei), as, too, ti-bi may be taken to be an abbreviation of tvi-bi: for although the dative in Sanskrit is tu-bhyam, and the transition from $u$ to $i$ in Latin is not unnsnal (fourth declension $i$-bus for $u$-bus), still the Sanskṛit contraction of tua-bhyom to tu-bhyam is scarcely of so old a date
[G. Ed. p. 471.] as to serve for a point of departure, for the Latin $\langle i-b i$; and I therefore prefer considering tibi, sibi, as abbreviations of twi-li, swi-bi, rather that as corruptious of $t u-b i, s u-b i$.
329. In Sansk! it, mê, tê, exist as co-forms for the genitive and dative (mamu, tava, mahyam, tulhy/am): tê, however, is clearly an abbreviation of trê, and I have since found this opinion, which I have expressed before, supported by Rosen's Vêda-specimen (p.26), and by the Zend. . The latter gives shood thwodi for the Vêdic tue ; but at the same time, also, the abbreviated forms $1+10 t i j$ and uete tef by which, as it were, the way of corruption is pointed out to

[^1]the Latin ti-bi and Gothic thei-nu. Although, according to §. 326., मे mé and वे tue lic at the bottom of several cases as theme, still, perlaps, these forms, together with the abbreviated lf, where they appear as genitives or datives, are not to be regarded as naked bases, as it is contrary to the genius of the language to introduce a theme, as such, into speech;* but they may be explained as locatives, according to the principle of the common $a$ bases ( $\$ .196$.), especially as, in Sanskrit, the locative very frequently supplies the place of the dative, and the dative relation is expressed by the genitive even more commonly than by the dative itself. But if मे $m \hat{e}$ and तो $t$, न्वे $t t^{\hat{e}}$, and the corresponding Zend forms, are really locatives, they are then, according to §. 196., identical with the Greek datives $\mu o i^{\prime}$, бoi', or тoi, which, however, must be compared with the actual locatives मfय mu, $;$; , विय $t w a y$, by casting out the semi-vowel, if मे $m e$ and Ì té are to pass as uninflected themes, extended only mechanically.
330. The genitives मम mama, vjuf muna, [G. Ed. p. 472.] and Inva, serve the Litluanian, and, with the exception of the ablative and genitive, also the Old Selavonic, as the groandwork for the declension of the oblique singular cases. They are recognised with a weakening of the final $a$ to $i$ most distinctly in the Lithuanian instrumental and locative manimi, maniye, tawimi, tuwiye. The genitive, dative, and accusative are anomalous-momeiss, tuweiss, man, tuw, manein, tawein,-but have, in like manner, procceded from the old genitive. In Old Sclavonic, the accusative mya, tya, still remains upon the old footing, and, according to §. 255. a. p. 310., answers to मा $m$ â, " me," व्वा tex, "thee," with loss of the $v$ in the second person. The genitive mene, "of me," answers exactly to the Zend

[^2]mana (see §. 225. a.) and tcbe, " of thee," to the Indo-Zend tava. Considered from a Sclavonic point of view, however, $M E N$, TEB, must be regarded as themes, and $e$ for es as the common genitive termination (§. 269.). MNO, TEBO, and TOBO, clearly lic as themes at the bottom of the dative and locative mnye, telye.
331. The plural in the pronoun of the first person is, in most of the Indo-European languages, distinct in base from the singular. I have already elsewhere endeavoured to explain this* on the ground that "I" is properly incapable of a plural, for there is but one " $I$," and the notion "we" comprehends "me" and an indefinite number of other individuals, each of which may even belong to a different species; while by leones a plurality of individuals is represented, of which each is a lion. And the case is similar with the plurals of all other substantives, adjectives, and pronouns; for "they" is a multiplying of "he," and "ye" may at least be rather regarded as the plural of "thou," than "we" as the plural of "I."
[G. Ed. p. 473.] Where, however, the idea "we" is expressed by the plural of "I," it there happens on account of the preponderating feeling of our own personality, in which the " not $I$ " is drowned, and is left unnoticed, or is supplied by the custom of the language. Hence one might seek to compare the Sanskṛit nominative वयम् vayam (from vê $+a m$ ) by the frequent interchange of $m$ and $v(\S, 63$.$) with the length-$ ened singular base मे $m e \hat{e}$ (p. 468 G. ed.), an interchange which must, however, be very old, since the German, scarcely by accident, partakes in it, and which may be favoured by the circumstance that there exists actually an internal motive for a difference in the base syllable.
332. In the Vêdas we find $a-s m e$ also for vayam; and this asmé is, according to $\S .228$., formed from the theme asma, from which also, in the common Sanskrit, all the oblique

[^3]onses proceed, and to which the Greek allies itself, commencing even with the nominative; for the most genuine Æolic form ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon s$ stands, by assimilation, for $\ddot{\alpha} \sigma \mu \epsilon s$ (see §. 170.), as è $\epsilon \mu i ́$ from è $\sigma \mu '$ ', Sanskrit asmi, " I am." For ${ }_{\alpha}^{\prime} \mu \mu \epsilon \varsigma$, however, ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \mu o t$ ought to be the corresponding word to the Vêdic asmê ; as the theme asma, according to §. 116., would, in the Greek, sound ALMO : however, by dropping the final vowel, the Greek form has wandered into the department of another declension. The same is the case with ${ }^{\mu} \mu \mu \epsilon$, answering to the Vêdic yuṣlmé (euphonic for yusmé). On the other hand, $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i \bar{s}, \dot{v} \mu \in i \bar{s}$, pre-suppose a theme 'HMI, ' $\mathbf{Y M I}$, the of which is to be taken as a weakening of the Indian $a$ of asma, yushma ; as, in Gothic, UNSI, IZI'I (\$. 167.), together with $U N S A$, IZIA $A$. The genitives $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \dot{\epsilon}-\omega v, \vec{v} \mu \mu \epsilon^{\prime}-\omega \nu$, also-for $\dot{\alpha} \mu \mu i^{\prime}-\omega \nu, \dot{v} \mu \mu \dot{i}-\omega \nu$, and in the common language $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{v} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu-$ shew that they are deduced from bases in $t$ : just so the datives $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu, \dot{v} \mu i \nu$, for $\dot{\eta} \mu t-\tau \nu, \dot{v} \mu-\tau \nu$, with $\tau \nu$ for the Indian termination lhyam in asmabhyam, yushmabhyam (§. 222.). The accusatives $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{a} s, \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$, are contractions of an unusual kind [G. E. p. 474.]
 be expected. The Folic forms $\alpha^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon, \dot{v} \mu \mu \epsilon$, are uninflected, as in the singular $\mu^{\prime}$, $\sigma^{\prime}$; and in case they are, in respect to their termination, older than $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} \varsigma, \dot{v} \mu \hat{a} s$, they admit of derivation direct from the Sauskrit asmân, yuşhmân (for asma-ns, yushma-ns, §. 236.), by abrasion of the case suffix, without intervention of a theme 'AMMI,' YMMI.
333. In asmé, ${ }_{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon$, the simple vowel $a$ is the characteristic element of the first person, for the rest of the word occurs also in the second person-युप्मे yuṣhmé, ${ }^{v} \mu \mu \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$. If, then, this $a$ is also connected with the singular base ma, it would be requisite to assume an apharesis of the $m$, which, however, would appear to be very old, from the coincidence of the Sanskrit, Zend, \&c. with the Greek and German; for the Gothic base UNSA or UNSI has been regarded by us, in §. 166., as a transposition of asma-Pâli and Prâkrit amha; the $u$ for $a$ is
to be explained by the influence of the transposed nasal (§. 66.). But if the $a$ of खर्म asma is an abbreviation of $m a$, (in the opposite case it would be identical with the demonstrative base a), and if, therefore, in this plural base, the "I" is actually formally expressed, I would then place great stress on the fact, that, in Sanskrit and Grcek, the appended pronoun sma, or that which it has become in Greek, in the pronouns of the 1 st and 2 d person only occurs in the plural. For as sma, which occurs also isolated,* can be nothing else than a pronoun of the third person, $\dagger$ so would
[G. Ed. p. 475.] $a-s m \hat{e}$, as a copulative compound (Gramm. Crit. §. 658.), signify "I" and "they"; but yushmé, "thou" and "they"; so that the singular "I" and "thou" would be expressed by $a$ and $y u$; the plural "they" by $s m e$; and this would be the most natural as well as the clearest and most perfect designation of the compound ideas "we" and "ye." The ingress of the appended pronoun into the singular of the first and second persons, in Zend, Pâli, Prâkṛit, and German (§. 174.), must, then, be ascribed to an abuse of later introduction. In the pronouns of the third person, however, the analogy of which may have had an effect on the abuse cited in the declension of the two first persons in the singular, the union of two, nay, cven of three pronouns of the same person into one whole is extraordinarily frequent, and originally, it seems, betokened only increase of emphasis.
334. The syllable यु $y u$ of युप्मे yuṣhmé, " yc," is pro-

[^4]bably a softening of $t u$, which extends itself also to the dual, to which yuva serves as the theme.* The Greek $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega}$ ( $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} i$ ), however, has been retained more complete, and represents the Sanskrit singular base twa, with $\sigma$ for $t$, and $\phi$ for $v$. In the latter respect, compare also $\sigma \phi \epsilon i s$ and $\sigma \phi{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ with the Sanskrit swayam, "self," and swor-s, "suus," regarding which hereafter. $\dagger$ The Prâkrit and Pâli, and several other Indian dialects. [G. Ed. p. 476.] have retained the $t$ in the plural unaltered, or restored; hence, Pâli-Prâkṛit तुम्हे tumhê for tusmé. In Gothic, however, by rejecting the $u$, and exchanging the $m$ for $v, y u-s m a$ has become $I-Z V A$, and by weakening the a to $i, I-Z I^{\prime} I$ (\$. 167.). The Lithuanian gives $Y U$ as the theme of the majority of cases in the dual and plural, and in the first person $M U$, to which, however, the nominative més "we" does not correspond. The appended pronoun स्स sma has been distinctly retained only in the genitive dual and locative pluralalthough it is originally foreign to the dual,-but, in the former case, to which the numeral is annexed, the $s$, and in the latter case the $m$, has fallen out ; hence mu-mi dwieyú, " of us two"; yu-mu dwifyí, " of you two" $\ddagger$; mu-sûse, " in us"; yusîse " in you."

[^5]335. It is, however, also very probable that the $s$ in the Lithuanian nominative més, " we," ŷ̂.s, " ye," as well as the $s$ of the Gothic veis, yus, is not the sign of the nominative, as it appears to be in the actual condition of the language, but an abbreviation of the syllable smu. This conjecture is raised almost to certainty by the Zend, in which, together with the G\&eb; yuishĕm (sce §. 59.), which rests on the Sanskrit यूयम् yûyam
 occurs; the $s$ of which is represented by Burnouf (Yasna, Notes, p. 121), in which he is clearly right, as identical with the Sanskrit प् ṣh of युप्मत् $\boldsymbol{y} \| \stackrel{1}{l} / \mathrm{mat}$ (ablative, and, in the beginning of compounds, representing the theme, see p. $11 \cong$ G. ed.).
[G. Ed. p. 477.] Wherefore دup. $y^{\prime \prime}$ is, is an abbreviation
 the sign of the nominative; as from a theme $y u$, according to the usual declension in the nominative and vocative plural, must come either yavỏ or yoó. According to the pronominal declension, however, we have already seen Ggeb; yи̂shı'm developed from the Sansk!it यूयम् yuiyam. In Lithuanian, mes, if $s$ were the sign of case, would stand completely isolated as the masculine plural nominative *; and as to the German, that language has, from the earliest period, lost the sign of the case in the nominative plural; while the $r$ of wir, ihr, which corresponds to the Gothic $s$ of veis, yus, has remained to this day, which, with other weighty reasons, awards to this $r$ likewise a destination other than that of denoting the relation of case.
336. According to the principle of the Zend-LithuanianGothic yis, yus, I explain also the Sanskrit नम्, uas, वस् vas, which are used as co-forms in the accusative, dative, and

[^6]genitive of the two first persons; the $s$ of which, however, could not fiud any legitimate place in such different cases, if, by its origin, it was destined to denote a case-connection. In the same way, however, that the Zend $y \hat{u}_{s}$ is the abbreviation of $y$ रीsme, so may नस् nus and वस् vas be deduced in the accusative, from nasmín, vasminn, and in the dative and genitive, from nasmalhyam, nasmalkam, vasmulhyam, vusminkam; and the $s$, therefore, suits all the three cases, exactly because it expresses none of them. There remain, after the dissolution of the rest of the appended pronoun, $n a$ and $v a$, as the chief elements of personal definition, from which have proceeded the dual secondary forms nâu and vam (for vinu). [G. Ed. p. 478.] The $n$ of $n n$, however, is a weakening of the $m$, the ligh antiquity of which may be traced from the coincidence with the Greek, Latin, and Sclavonic: but $v u$ is an abbreviation of twon, as, viikstli, "tweuty," from duciīsurti.
337. The bases न $m$, व $v a$, would lead us to expect in Latin $N U, I U(n o r, r m, \S .116$.$) , as themes; n i, v i$, as plural nomintatives; and nos, ros, as accusatives. The circumstance, however, that nos, ros, are found alrendy in the nominative, and that the final $s$ is retained also in the possessives nos-ter, ves-ter (for ros-ter), must cause the ns of nos, $\boldsymbol{v n s}$, in the accusative, to appear to us in an entirely different light from that of lupos; and the explanation which we have given of the $s$ of the indisputably kindred Sanskrit forms नस् $n o-s-$, वस् $v a-s$, must therefore extend also to that of $n o-s$, ro-s, objectionable as it may appear from the point of view of the self-restricted Latin Grammar, when we seek in nos and ros a remmant of the appended pronoun sma, treated of in $\S .166$. \&c., which we also recognise robbed of its $s^{*}$ in the appended syllable met (rgomet, memet, tumet, nosmet, \&c.)

[^7]which refers itself most closely to the Sanskrit plural ablative a-smat, yu-shmat, which is also employed by the language instead of the theme for all cases and numbers (§. 112.), on which account the like free use of the Latin met cannot appear surprising. Moreover, I have elsewhere endeavoured to explain the Latin immo by assinilation from $i$-smo, and so to apportion the first part to the demonstrative base $i$, and the last to our sma.

33s. We now turn to the Old Sclavonic, where nas* and vas as genitive and locative, are completely identical
[(7. Ed. p. 479.] with the नस् nas and वस् vas of Sansk!it, which in that language are, indeed, excluded from the locative, but still hold the place of genitives. The monosyllabic nature of these forms has, in Sclavonic, protected the old $a$ as well as the final $s$ ( $\$ .255$. a. l.) ; but here, also, this $s$ cannot be looked upon as a case-character, as, without exception, the terminations साम् sim and मु su have, in Old Sclavonic, become ch (p. 355, Note ${ }^{6}$ ). The concurrent disinclination of so many languages to consider the $s$, in the common forms under discussion, as a sign of case, strengthens the evidence for each single individual language. As to the Sanskrit, however, applying in the dual the forms nilu, vam (for vat, p. 472 , Note ${ }^{1}$ ), in cases to which áu does not belong, as the inflexion, in this point it is not supported by any of the Furopean sister languages: we might still, however, admit the conjecture, that here, also, the $\hat{A} u$ is not a case-termination, but is derived from a different origin, and, in fact, to be so regarded, as that $n \hat{u} u, v \hat{a} u$ (corrupted to vím) are extensions of the plural nas, vas, by lengthening the $a$, and by resolving the $s$ to $u$, according to the analogy of §. 206. For if a case termination $d s$ has become wौ $d u$-and in Zend every final as, without distinction, has become ao-it

[^8]cannot be surprising that niss, also, has become ndu; and then in $n d u$ a dual case termination is just as little contained as in nuts a plural. The sensual dual, however, loves broader forms than the plural (compare §. 206.); and to this inclination the lengthening of the a of nas, vas, may be ascribed. But $n d u$ may, however-and this I much prefer-be regarded as a copulative compound from $n i-s$; so that it would stand in the accusative for $n d$-smáu, in the genitive for nd-smayds, according to the principle of the Vêdic pitarâ-nûturiu,* "father and mother," literally, "two fathers, two mothers." [G. Ed. p. 480.] According to this, ndu would properly mean, as accusative, " me and him," as above (§. 333.) asmê, for masme," I and they"; and vân, for vàu-Zend $\varepsilon w \leq$ accusative, "thee and him." According to this principle of copulative composition we may probably view, also, $\hat{a}$-vím, (for $\hat{d}$-cdu), "we two"; so that, with a more retiring designation of the third person, it would literally mean "he and I"; for $a$ is a demonstrative base, which is here lengthened to the dual form $a$ ( $\$ 208$.), and vam (genitive and locative viryis) answers, in respect to its base, to vayam, " we," (p. 462.). $\dagger$
339. At the base of the two first persons of the Greek dual lie $\mathrm{N} \Omega, \Sigma \Phi \Omega$, as themes, which support the opinion, that in नो $n \hat{A} u$, वाम् vam (for $v d u$ ), to which they bear the sume relation that ôкт $\omega$ docs to ashtuu, the $d u$ is not a case termimation. For if $N \Omega, \Sigma \Phi \Omega$ were the themes in Greek, the genitive and dative would necessarily be volv, $\sigma \phi o r$, , as it would be unnatural that the long vowel, which, in the nominative and accusative, would be explicable according to

[^9]the analogy of $\lambda \dot{\kappa} \kappa \omega$, from $\Lambda$ Yко, should be retained before the termination $\iota \nu$. It would, it seems, be rightly assumed, that in the nominative and accusative, $\nu \hat{\omega} t, \sigma \phi \bar{\omega} \bar{i}$, are the original forms, and $\nu \dot{\omega}, \sigma \phi \dot{\omega}($ for $\nu \omega, \sigma \phi(\varphi)$, abbreviations of them. From $\nu \hat{\omega} \hat{i}, \sigma \phi \hat{\omega}$, spring, also, the possessives $\nu \omega i ̈ t \epsilon \rho o s, \sigma \phi \omega \ddot{i}-$ $\tau \epsilon \rho o s$. But how stands it with the very isolated Greek dual forms $\nu \hat{\omega} i, \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} i$ ? Max. Schmidt (1.c. p. 9.1) supposes therein a remnant of the Sanskrit neuter dual termination $i$ ( $($. 212.). It would not be necessary, if this be so, to assume that in $\nu \bar{\omega} \bar{i}$, $\sigma \phi \omega \ddot{i}$, a masculine and neuter dual termination are united,
[G. Ed. p. 481.] as $N \Omega$ and $\Sigma \Phi \Omega$ have already been made to pass as thedres, from which $\nu \hat{\omega} i ̈, \sigma \phi \hat{\omega} i$, would be very satisfactorily explained by the addition of a single termination. Observe, however, that the pronoms of the first and sccond persons do not originally distinguish any genders, and occur in Sanskryit only with masculine terminations; that therefore a remmant of the lost neuter termination is less to be expected in these very pronouns in Greek than in any other word whatever. Hence I prefer recognising in the $t$ of $\nu \hat{\omega} t$, $\sigma \phi \omega \hat{i}$, a weakening of the dual-cuding $a$, which originally pertained to the masculine and feminine, and which, in the common declension, has become $\epsilon$ (§. 209.). According to this, the $\iota$ has the same relation to this $\epsilon$ and the Zend $a$ that
 This opinion finds particular support from the fact that $\nu \hat{\omega} \in$ actually occurs for $\nu \omega \hat{i}$, as in the third person $\sigma \phi \omega \epsilon$, not $\sigma \phi \omega t ;$; and in the second person, also, the Grammarians assume $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega} \epsilon$ together with $\sigma \phi \bar{\omega}$ (Buttmann Lex. I. 52).
340. We give here a comected gencral view of the declension of the pronouns of the two first persons, with the remark that the compared languages do not everywhere agree with one another in regard of inflexion. We select from the Greek, where it is desirable for the sake of comparison, the dialectic forms which come nearest to the Sanskrit or the Zend.

## SINGULAR.


${ }^{1}$ See $\S \S .175 .174$. And as regards the $k$ and that of $s i-k$, "self," see §. 814. p. 1104. Note $\dagger$. In Ohd Scliav. we should read for mya, tya, according to $\S .785$. Rem. and ${ }^{(2)}$, mai, tan. $\quad{ }^{2}$ Sce $\S .222 . \quad{ }^{3}$ See §. 174. ${ }^{4}$ See §. $329 . \quad$ At the base of the forms mattas, tuattas, lies the proper allative mut, twot, as theme (compare Gramm. Crit. $\$ .289$. ), to which has been added the suffi八 tas, which signifies the same as the ablative termination $t$, and is also formally cornected with it, and to which the Greek $\theta_{\epsilon \nu}$ corresponds.
${ }^{6}$ See $\S .200$.
${ }^{7} \mathrm{~S}$ e $\S .174$.

DUAL.


|  | zend. greek. | goriuc. | итн. | old schat. nama. rama. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| avãbhyâm, | $\nu \bar{\omega}{ }^{\text {, }}{ }^{\text {, }}$ | ugkis, | mum dweren, | nama. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | $\nu$ ¢ิї, ${ }^{\text {, }}$ |  |  | nuıma. ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| $\text { A็ }\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { yuvâlhyàm, } \\ \text { vâm, }, \end{array}\right.$ | . . $\sigma \phi \bar{\omega} \stackrel{\nu}{\nu},{ }^{,}$ <br> io, $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \phi \bar{\omega} \nu \bar{\nu},{ }^{\text {² }}$ | igqvis, | yum dwiem, | vamıa. ${ }^{4}$ vama. ${ }^{8}$ |
| - ¢ ${ }^{\text {a }}$ vâbly ${ }^{\text {âm }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {c }}$ yuvîbhyâm |  |  |  |  |
| arcayôs, |  | uykara, | mumit dwieyñ, | naỵu. ${ }^{\text {B }}$ |
| ¢ $\{n \hat{u} u$, | $\nu \omega \bar{\iota} \nu$, |  |  | nuyı. ${ }^{8}$ |
| ธ̛ y yıvayôs, |  | igquara, | yumû dwieyñ, | vuyız." |
| ( $\cdot \mathfrak{a i m}$, | $\cdots \hat{a} o$, $\sigma \phi \hat{\omega}{ }^{\text {a }}$, |  |  | vayû.s |
| - ¢ $^{\text {arayôs, }}$ |  |  |  | vayû. |
|  |  |  |  | vayû. |

${ }^{1}$ I regrard the termination $\hat{a} m$ as a hardening of the common dual termination $\hat{a} u$ (hefore vowels $\hat{\theta} v$ ); and I would crave attention to the frequent interchange of $v$ and $m$ ( $(.63 .$, compare p. 114). This hardening has not. in the lst person, extended into the sccondary form; and in the $2 d$ person the Zend vâo speaks for an older Sanskrit form viâu for viim. The Zend form vino occurs in the 34ih chapter of the Izeshne, and appears, also, to stand as nominative. However, the Zend is not wanting in an analogous form to the Sanskrit dual base yıva; for that which Anquetil, in his Glossary, writes ieouâkem, and renders by vous denx, ought probably to be G. $¢$
 likewise considers as nominative. ${ }^{2}$ See s. 339. ${ }^{3}$ The $t$ clearly belongs to the number two (theme $T^{\prime} W A$ ), which, in Lithuanian, is retained through all the cases. $\quad{ }^{4}$ Feminine muddwi. $\quad{ }^{5}$ The distinction of the genders
[ G. Ed. p. 484.] has been introduced, contrary to the original principle, through the analogy of the common daal (see f.273.), as the Old Sclavonic, too, in the dual personal terminations, which, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, mark the genders just as little as the other numbers distinguishes the feminine from the masculine by the termination ye ( $=\mathbb{e}$ é, §. 155.e.). $\quad{ }^{6}$ Feminine yudwi. $\quad{ }^{7}$ See $\S .169 . \quad{ }^{8}$ The comparison with the Sanskrit principal form regards the case termination; that with the secondary form the theme.

[G. Ed. p. 485.] "Remark.-Max Schmidt (l. c. pp. 9, 10) rightly takes the forms asmikam, yushmákikm, for possessives; and Rosen has since confirmed this view (Journal of Education, July-Oct. 1834, p. 345) by the Vêda dialect युप्माकाभिर् ऊतिभि: yushmikiblitr, útibhis, 'vestris auxiliis'). We must therefore regard asmâkam, yuṣ̂hûkam, as singular neuters, which are, as it were, petrified, and have thus lost the power of being governed according to the gender, number, and case of their substantive. In the two first respects they may be compared with numeral expressions (§. 318.) like पष्व pancha, 'five,' which, in the Greek $\pi \epsilon \in \nu \tau \epsilon$ and Latin quinque, has become completely indeclinable, and therefore exactly like asmäkam, yuṣhmákam, Zend ahmâkĕm, yủsmadkĕm and the
dual form mentioned at p. 472, Note ${ }^{1}$., yarikivivn. It is clear that the Latin forms, also, nostri, nostrum, vestri, vestrum, belong to the possessive; and for nostrum, vestrum, are used also nostrorum, vestrorum (Schmidt, p. 10). As, then, unsaru, izvara, stand altogether isolated in Gothic as genitives, it is, in my opinion, much more natural to derive them from the possessive bases of the same sound which form, in the nominative singular masculine, unsar, izurar (see p. 390 G. ed. Note) - than, on the contrary, to deduce the possessives from the unexplained genitives of the personal pronoun, so that they would be without any derivative sutfix whatever, which is opposed to the common laws for the derivation of words. I most prefer regarding unsara, izrara, and the amalowsons dual forms, as singular and dual neuters, like the Sanskrit asmilkum, ynshmilkam, and with an antiquated retention of the a of the base, which in duur' for daura (§. 153.) has disappeared. Ought, also, the singular genitives to be viewed in this light? for meina, theina, scinu, are possessive bases as well as the genitives of the personal pronouns; and if the former had proceeded from the latter, the addition of a suffix might have been expected. Perhaps even in Sanskrit the expressions mama, fava, which are far removed from all the forms of genitives, are originally possessives, from which, after they were no longer recognised as such, sprang the secondary forms mamakin, tâvolkn, as briluka comes, without alteration of meaning, from brila, 'a boy.' Observe, also, the surprising accordance between the Greek possessive base TEO, from TEFO, and the Sanskrit genitive tava. The form $\sigma$ ó-s, however, has scarecly proceeded from $\sigma o \hat{v}$, but from the more entire $\tau \in \dot{\prime}-\varsigma$, by syncope and exchange of the $\tau$ with $\sigma$. In regard to the replacing of the genitive of pronouns without gender by the corresponding possessives, it deserves further to be remarked,
[G. Ed. p.486.] that, in Lindústíní, the forms, which are represented in both numbers of all declinable words as genitives, are shewn to be unmistakeable possessives,
by being governed by the gender of the following substantive. The pronouns of the first and second person have in the masculine rá, in the feminine ri, as the possessive suffix; other words, in the masculine $k i$, feminine $k \imath^{\prime}$; and the latter answers to the Sanskỵit ka in asmika, yus $h_{m i k n}{ }^{\prime} k$, mâmuka, tínuku. In Hindástání, therefore, mêri' mâ, têri má. is literally, not 'mei mater,' ' tui mater,' but 'mea mater,' ' lua mater;' and the feminine termination $\hat{\imath}$ answers to the Sanskyit feminine formation (§. 119.). In the masculine the possessives under discussion are sounded me'ru, têrâ, plural humurín, tumhirú. In this it is remarkable that the formative suffix ri agrees with the Gothic ra of unsara, izvara, dual uykura, igquara. In respect, also, to the transposition of the nasal, tumhârí for tuhmiri, from tusmîrí, is similar to the Gothic ugkerra, unsara, igquaru.

## IRONOUNS OF THE TIIIRD IPERSON.

341. The Sanskrit is deficient in a simple substantive pronoun of the third person, devoid of gender: that it, however, originally possessed such a pronoun is proved, not only by the unanimous evidence of the European cognate languages, but especially by the circumstance that, in 'Zend, wes hê and sley hai (also uro sê, according to §. 55.), and, in Prâkrit, से sé, are used as the genitive and dative of the third person in all genders,* and indeed in the direct sense, and in form analogous to the secondary forms of the first and second person; Sanskrit मे mé, ते $t e$,



* In Zend I remember only examples of the kind where the pronoun mentioned refers to masculines; but in Prâkrit से sê is often found feminine ; e.g. Urvasi by Lenz, pp. 46. 5 5 twice. Still I have not yet met with examples for se as dative, numerous as the examples of the genitive are. In Zend both cases occur, and the dative, indeed, more frequently than the genitive.
$\dagger$ As to the origin of the Sanskrit sucu see $\oint .946$.
[G.Ed. p. 487.] must be considered as the theme of this pronoun, as, according to $\S .326 .$, ma, mé, twa, turi, are the singular bases of the two first persons. From से sure, in combination with the nominative termination am, (\$. 326.) comes स्वयम् suayam, which meams "self," and in the present state of the language is indeclinable in all cases, numbers, and genders. The form swa prevails as the possessive, but is used not only for suus, but for meus and tuus, in which it is to be observed, that in the majority of the European cognate languages the possessive of the third person may be also used for the two first, and the Doric $\sigma \phi{ }^{\circ}$ s corresponds as exactly as possible with the Sansk!it swa-s, while $\Sigma \Phi I$ lies as theme at the base of the plural of the porsonal pronoum ( $\sigma \phi \in i s, \sigma \phi i-\sigma \iota$ ), with the old $u$ weakened to $i$, as in the plural of the two first persons ( $\S .3 ; 2$.). The apparent agreement of the base with the second person in the dual is, then, to be explained thus, that in the latter the $\sigma$ has proceeded from an older $\tau$, but in the third person is primitive. In $o \hat{v}, o \hat{i}, \notin$ é, for $\sigma \phi o \hat{v}, \sigma \phi o \hat{l}, \sigma \phi \in ́-o f$ which only the latter has been retained-from $\sigma F o \hat{v}$, \&e., the digamma, which may remain after $\sigma$ in the form of $\phi \iota$, has been necessarily suppressed after the $\sigma$ has become a rough breathing. Thus of is similar to the Zend sloes hoii and טes liê (for liviji, hvê), and the Prâkrit से se for sure. A similar rejection of the $x$, together with a weakening of the old $a$ to $i$, shews itself in the Gothie sei-na, si-s, si-k, for svei-na, svi-s, sri-k (see §.327.). On the other hand, the $v$ has remained in the adverb svf, as mentioned at §. 150., which evidently belongs to a theme $S L A$, as hep from $H 1 A$, the from TIIA. As ê, according to §. 69., stands sometimes for the long $n$, so these forms are, l. c., explained as instrumentals. They might, however, be regarded as locatives, examples of [G. Ed. p. 488.] which have been pointed out at §. 294. Rem. 2., with an êtermination. The Lithuanian and Old Sclavonic in this pronoun follow exactly the aualogy of the second
person, and distinguish it from the latter only by the initial $s$ for $t$; but, like the Latin, Greck, and German, dispense with the nominative as they are only used reflectively, and use the singular, also, instead of the dual and plural. From the Latin, besides sui, suus, perhaps also spoutis, sponte, from $S P O N T$, are to be adduced here, since, according to all probability, the meaning "self," or "the self, selfness," is the primitive: $s p$, howerer, may be regarded as the modifieation of $s r$ (comp. §. 50.), as spiro, in my opinion, is connected with śzas, "to breathe." The Doric $\psi^{i}$, for $\sigma \phi_{i}$, and the Latin pse, of $i-p s e$, which should be declined ejus--psius, ei-psi, \&c., for ipsius, ipsi, are formed, in like manner, by transposition. As regards the termination nt of SPONT', it might be carried back to the Sanskrit suffix rant, regarding which see $\S .324$ and more hereafter. It may here le further remarked, that, in Prâkrit, the pronoun of the second person oecurs, anongst other forms, in that of पइ $p a i$ and पfि pomi (Urvasi, pp. 61. 69), so that the $t$ of tew is suppressed, but the $v$ hardened to $p$. Compare, in the former respect, the Doric $\phi$ ì for $\sigma \phi i v$, cas, vos, for tvas, tvos (§. 336.); aud, in both respects, the Latin porta, which in this way may be compared with द्वार् ducurr, "a door" ( $\hat{\text { úpa }) \text {. }}$

312. We here give a comnected view of the declension of the pronoun of the third person, devoid of gender, in the singular, which, excepting in the case of the Greek, supplics also the place of the dual and plural.
frâk. zend. greer. lat. Goth. i.th. olid sclav.
 Instrumental . . . . . . . . . . . savimi, soloyiu. ${ }^{1}$ 回 Dative, sf $\quad h \hat{e}, h \dot{j} i$, oi $\quad$ sibi, sis, saw,' sebye, si ${ }^{1}$ ? Genitive, sí, hí, hiji, ồ, sui, spina, saweens, ${ }^{1}$ sebe. ${ }^{\prime}$ 苞 Locative, . . . . . . . . . . . . sawiye, sebye. ${ }^{1}$

1 Compare § 330. It is not, however, necessary to assume, that, in the second person, the Lithuanian theme taw and the Sclavonic teb have arisen from the Sanskrit genitive tava; but these forms may be regarded as
transpositions of the base ratura. Buth explanations agree in the main, as the syllable tav belongs to the base in the Indian genitive तव tave also, whether we derive it by Guna from tu, whence तुभ्यम् tu-bhyam, " to thee," or regard it as the transposed form of 何 lucu. In the reflective forms given above, saue and scl are based on the same principle as the tave and teb just mentioned, and hence they may be derived, by transposition, from the Indian base sura; or we may suppose a genitive sava to have existed in Sanskrit also, which language, it may be concluded, originally possessed a complete declension oi this pronoun. The Gothic sibya, " kinsman," theme sib!̣/cu, Old High German, sippüa, "relationship," " hith," agrees, in a strihing mamer, with the Sclavonic base sel, ; and it would not be surprising if the " kinsman " has been designated as " the man belonging to him," "his ;" and that, therefore, the original of these ( Gothic forms has been hardened, as in Sclavonic, to $b$. The Gothie sters, thene svêse, "property," is also a derivative from this pronoun.
343. The base त $t a$, feminine nा $t h$, signifies, in Sanskrit, " he," "this," and " that." The Zand form is identical with the Sanskrit: the medial, however, frequently occurs instead of the tenuis, as in the accusative singular masculine, in which the place of Ggo tém is commonly supplied by dëm, or, still more frequently, by dim. In Greck and German this pronoun has assumed the functions of the article, which is not found in the Sanskryit and Zend, nor in the Latin, Lithuaniam, and Sclavonic. The bases TO, [G. Ed. p. 490.] Gothic THA (§. 87.), feminine, TĀ, Tll, Gothic $T H \bar{O}(\S .69$.$) , correspond regularly with the Sansk!it-$ Zend ta, ta, with which the Lithuanian demonstrative base T' , nominative masculine tas, " this," feminine tú, is completely identical. The Old Sclavonic base is, as in Greek, in the masculine and ncuter* $t 0$, in the feminine $t u$ (§. 255.a.), but in the nominative masculine drops the vowel; hence $t$ ', tu, to, " this," m. f. n. This pronoun does not occur, in its simple state, in Latin, with the exception of the adverbial

[^10]accusative forms tum, tunc (like hunc), tam, tan-dem, and Inmen. The latter resembles surprisingly the Sansk!it locative तfिम्म $t_{a}$-smin, "in this" (§. 201.), only that the $s$ is dropped, as in the Lithuanian tumé, (p. 176 G. ed.) ; on which account I am inclined to replace the derivation I formerly gave of it by transposition from the Greck $\mu$ évtoc, by that which I now offer, and which is less remote. Moreover, in Latin, the derivative forms talis, lantus, tot, totidem, toties, tolus,* spring from this pronoun, and will be treated of hereafter. It appears, however, to be declined in the compound iste, of which the first member is is either to be regarded as a petrified nominative masculine, the case-sign of which, unconscious of its derivation, is retained in the oblique cases-istius for ejustius, compare the German jedermann's-or, which seems to me less probable, the $s$ is a pure phonetic affix, adopted on account of the favourite combination of $s$ with $t$ (compare $\$$ S. 95. 9(.).
34. In the same way that iste is compounded in Latin, so also, in Sunsk!it and Zend, the base ta combines with another pronom prefixed to it, in fact, with ${ }^{\prime}$, and thus forms एत Álu, "this," "that," Zend uposa aêlu (§. 2s.). The nominative singular is, in Sansḳ̣it, एप eṣlu, एपा eṣha, एतन् étıt; in 'Kend aútós is a similar compound, the first syllable of which, aú, will subsequently be remarked upon. [G. Ed.p.491.] 'This aútós is again combined with the article as a prefix to it, and forms oútos, aúт $\eta$, $\tau o \hat{v} \tau o$, for $\dot{\delta}-a v-\tau o \varsigma, ~ i=a v-\tau \eta, \tau o-a v-\tau o$. There are several ways in which oîtos, тoûto, may be supposed to have arisen: in the first place as $l$ '-ô̂tos, $\tau^{\prime}$-ô̂to, by suppressing the vowel of the article and weakening the $a$ of the diphthong $a v$ to $o$, both changes being made to prevent the whole word from being too ponderous, for $a$ is

[^11]the heaviest of the three representatives of the Indian $\mathrm{P}_{\boldsymbol{x}} a$ ( $a \in, o$ ); and for this reason av appears to be especially the representative of the V!̣iddhi diphthong wit $u u$,* while for षो $\vec{d}=a+u$, is found either $\epsilon v$ or $o v$. In the feminine form av́r $\eta$, if we distribute it thus, $h-a \dot{\tau} \tau \eta$, the diphthong remains unweakened, as in taưтó. But aǘt may also be derived from ' $\bar{a}-v i \tau \eta$, and the loss of the first element of the diphthong may be assumed: the gender would then be expressed in both members of the compound, and a better distinction would be made from the masculine and neuter base тои̃тo. But if, as appears to me preferable, we make the latter accord with the explanation which has just been given of the feminine form, the $o$ of $o v$ will then be ascribed to the article, and we shall likewise assume that the $a$ of $a v$ is dropped; thus, $\delta$-v̀to¢, to-v̂to. Max. Schmidt (1)e Pronomine Gr. et Lat. p. 38) sces in oûtos only the article compounded with itself, and assumes that $v$ is inserted; thus ov̂tos for ötos, aӥт $\eta$ for $\ddot{\tau} \tau \eta$. He adduces, in support of his view, $\dot{\delta} \sigma o \hat{\tau} \tau o s$, тoıov̂тos, тך入ıкоиิтos, which he supposes to have admitted a similar insertion. I am of opinion, on the contrary, that these forms do not contain the simple base of the article TO as the last element of their composition, but ${ }^{\text {' }} \mathrm{AYTO}$; for why should not this pronoun, though itself already a compound,
[G. Ed. p. 492.] admit, just as well as the article, of being combined with words preceding it? I do not agree with Max. Schmidt in explaining the adverbs $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a, \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \in \nu$, for $\epsilon ่ \nu \theta a \hat{v} \theta a, \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$, Ionic $\epsilon ่ \nu \theta a \hat{\tau} \tau a, \epsilon \in \nu \theta \epsilon \hat{v} \tau \epsilon \nu$, by the simple duplication of the suffixes $\theta a, \theta \epsilon \nu$, but I consider them to be compounded of two adverbs of similar formation. Though $a \dot{\theta} \theta a$, $a \hat{v} \theta \in \nu$, from the pronominal base ' $\Lambda \Upsilon$, of which more hereafter, have not been retained in use by themselves, still I look upon $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a$ as the combination of $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \theta^{\prime}+a \hat{v} \theta a$, and $\hat{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$ as that of ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \nu \theta_{\epsilon} \nu+a \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$. In order to avoid the con-

[^12]currence of two breathings in the two following syllables, the breathing of the former syllable is suppressed, or, as in the Ionic dialect, that of the latter is dropped. It may remain a question, whether the $\epsilon$ of $\epsilon \hat{\delta} \theta \epsilon \nu$ is the thin sound of the $a$ of $a \tilde{v} \theta \in \nu$, in which case the preceding adverb has lost not only its $\nu$, but its $\epsilon$ also, or whether a $\mathfrak{\delta} \theta \in \nu$ has been weakened by the loss of its $a$. In the latter case ç่va $a \hat{v} \theta a$ may be divided into $\hat{e} \nu \tau a-\hat{v} \theta a$. It is at least more natural to suppose the combination of two adverbs, and the weakening of a single one, on account of the ponderous nature of the compound, than to assume the mere doubling of the formative suffix and the insertion of a redundant $v$, for neither part of this assumption can be supported by analogrous phenomena elsewhere.
345. In the nominative singular masculine and feminine the Sanskrit substitutes-and in this the Crothic remarkably coincides with it-for the $\mathbf{T}$ sound of the pronoun under discussion an $s$, which in Zend, aceording to $\$ .53$, becomes $e r h$, and in Greek the rough breathing, hence Sanskrit su, sik, tut, Gothic sil, sí, thuta, Zend hí, hu', tut, Greek $\dot{o},{ }^{\circ} \bar{u}$, $\tau$. The Old Latin has introduced into the accusative this originally purely subjective pronominal base: sum for eum, and sam for amm, also sapsa as nominative for sa-ipsa.* [G. Ed. p. 493.] As this $s$ is excluded from the neuter, we have found in it (§. 131) a satisfactory explanation of the nominative sign, the $s$ of which is likewise foreign to the neuter. A remnant of the old $s$ of the base is still prescred by the Greck in the adverbs $\sigma i \mu \mu \epsilon \rho \frac{1}{}$ and $\sigma \hat{\eta} \tau e=$, though as these compounds express an accusative relation, not that of a nominative, they accord with the use of the S:mskrit language less than the Attic forms $\tau \eta \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu, \tau i \eta \tau \in$, as $\pi t_{a}$ is the general theme, but स sa only that of the nominative.

[^13]The first member of the said compounds occurs in the primary form or theme, the final $o$ of which ( $=$ ma) has been changed into $\epsilon$, having been melted down with the following $\epsilon$ and $\eta$; thus $\tau \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \sigma \hat{j} \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, from $\tau \epsilon-\epsilon \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \sigma \epsilon-\epsilon \tau \epsilon \varsigma$, for $\tau о-\epsilon \tau \epsilon \varsigma, \sigma о-\epsilon \tau \epsilon \varsigma ; \tau \eta \prime \mu \epsilon \rho о \nu, \sigma \sigma^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho о \nu$, from $\tau \epsilon-\eta \mu \epsilon \rho о \nu, \sigma \epsilon-\eta \mu \epsilon \rho о \iota^{\prime}$, for $\tau o-\eta \mu \epsilon \rho o v, \sigma o-\eta \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$. These adverbs correspond to the Sanskit adverbial compounds (Avyaybi-bháva), which contain a substantive, assuming an accusative neuter form as their last member; e.g. यथाश्रन्वम् yalhit-shraddham, "according to troth," from श्रद्वा shruddha, feminine, "troth."
316. The Greek falls into an abuse, in extending the substitution of the rough breathing for the T sound also to the nominative plural, as in oi, ai, while the cognate languages prescrve the Doric-epic forms roí, raí, as the original: Sansk!it ते lí, तास् tis, Zend tir lé, que tin, Gothic thai, thids (compare §. 22s.).
3.17. With reference to the masculine nominative singular, we have, moreover, to notice the remarkable coincidence of the Greck, Gothic, and Sanskrit in retaining the case-sign, so that $\dot{o}$ for $o$ corresponds to the Sanskrit-Gothic sa for sas.
[G. Ed. p. 494.] The latter appears analogous to the interrogative hers, " who?" in Gothic (§. 135.). In Sansk!̣it, however, the suppression of the case-sign is not quite universal; for before a stop we find स: suli, सो sil, euphonic for sus (§. 22. and Gramm. Crit. §.75. a.) ; and सो sio, before words begimning with $a$, according to a general principle of sound from sus, by melting down the $s$ to $n$, and regularly contracting the $a+u$ to $\hat{\theta}$ (§. $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{ }$ ). On the form sot is based the
 which might be expected for $\mathbf{~ s a}$, does not occur. Although, then, لyy $h \hat{o}$ is strikingly similar to the Greek $\dot{\delta}$, still the relationship of the two forms camot be looked for in the $o$-sound, as the Greek $\dot{o}$ rests on the suppression of the case-sign and usual substitution of $\sigma$ for ग्र $a$ (§. 4.), while the Zend $h i$ is to be referred to the existence of $a$
case-sign ( $n$ for $s$ ), and its contraction with the a of the base to $i$.
348. The reason why this pronoun gladly dispenses with the usual nominative sign $s$ may be, partly, because the said casc-sign has itself proceeded from the base sn, and that sa does not admit of being re-combined with itself; and, partly-and this perhaps is the surer ground --that the pronouns, in general, are so strongly and vividly personified by themselves, that they are not in need of a very energetic and animated sign of personality; for which reason, although श्ञह् aham, "I," व्वम् lwam, "thou," घ्ययम् "yyom, " this," ख्वय् storyam, " self," have a termination, it is not that of the usual nominative, but they appear as neuters in the more objective or accusative garb; while ग्रसो asâu, m. f. "that," if its final diphthong is combined with the $u$ of the oblique [G. Ed. p. 49.].] case ¥मु amu (eompare §. 156.), is completely devoid of termination, and merely adopts the V̧iddhi angment of the final vowel of the base.* The Latin obeys the same principle in the pronouns li-c; ille, iste, ipse, which are deprived of the nominative sign, and for which we might have expected his-c (compare hun-c from hu-mc), illus, istus, and ifsus, which latter actually occurs; and in the same language the relative gui is distinguished from the more energetic interrogative quis by the absence of the nominative sign. In agreement with this principle stands also the circumstance, that in Sanskrit the masculine pronominal bases in $a$, in the plural nominative have not, like other words, as for their termination, but, in like mamer, suppress the case sulfix, and extend the $a$ of the base to e $\dot{c}$, by the admixture of a purely phonetic $i$; hence $\bar{i}$ t', from which the dative and
 been before pointed out (§.92s.) what relation the cognate languages bear to Sanskit in this respect. And it may

[^14]be observed, further, that the pronouns of the first and second person do not admit, in the plural, the termination as, but cmploy वयम् vay-um, गूयम् $y \hat{1} 1-y-n m$, with a neuter singular form, and in the Vêda dialect म्रस्मे asmê, युप्मे $y u s h m{ }^{i}$, after the usagre of pronouns of the third person. The Greek forms ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \mu \epsilon \varsigma, v^{\prime} \mu \mu \epsilon \varsigma, i \mu \epsilon i s, \quad i \mu \epsilon i s$, appear, therefore, so much the more to be a more recent adaptation to the ordinary mode of formation; and what (\$§.335. 337.) has been said regarding the $s$ of the Lithuanian me's, yuls, the Gothic veis, yus, and the Latin nos, vos, obtains additional confirmation from the present remark. The pronominal base उ़्रमु amu, "that," also avoids, in the masculine, the nominative-termination as, and forms ami, illi, which serves as a theme to the oblique plural cases,
[G. Ed. p. 496.] with the exception of the accusative: hence ज्रमीकिस् ami-blis, ज्रमीम्पस् ami-bhyus, ज्रमीपाम् ami-ṣ/uin, ज्रमीपु ami'shu. These forms confirm the opinion that the nominative tás also, and the like, are void of inflexion.
349. We here give a general view of the entire declension of the pronoun under discussion. From the Latin we adduce the compound is-te, as the simple form docs not occur. The Zend forms in brackets I have not met with, but have formed them according to the amalogy of the compound vosy, af-ta, and other pronouns of the third person, with which we may suppose the base de ta to have originally agreed in inflexion. observe, also, the occasional weakening of the $l$ to $d$, mentioned in §. 343. Those cases of the Lithuanian and Sclavonic to which * is prefixed, etymologically do not belong to this place, but to the compound त्य $t y a$, mentioned in $\$ .3 .53$.

> sinculiar.
> masculine.

Sanshirit. Zend. Greek. Lutin. Gothic. Lith. old Sclav.
N. sul, suh, sid, his, $\dot{j}, \quad i s-T L E, \quad s a, \quad$ las, $t$ '.

Ac. tam, tĕm, тóv, is-TUUM, thana, tañ, t'.
I. lènu, (li), ..... .... liu, limi, *y"m.

## SINGULAR.

MASCULJNE.
Sanskrit. Zind. Greek. Lalin. Gothic. Lith. Old Scl.
 Ab. tasmit, (tuhmí!), . . is. TO $(D)$. . . . . . . .

L. tusmin, ${ }^{9}$ (lahmi), ${ }^{n}$. . $\quad$ tımen $?^{10}$. . . tamè, ${ }^{11}$ tom. ${ }^{12}$

NEUTER.
N. Ac.tat, ${ }^{13} \quad$ tut, ${ }^{13} \quad \tau{ }^{\prime},^{13} \quad$ isTUD, ${ }^{13}$ thata, ${ }^{14}$ tai, ${ }^{15}$ to. ${ }^{16}$

The rest like the Masculine.

HMMININE.




' S'cy.l66. $\quad{ }^{2}$ Isti, and similar pronominal forms, differ from the common second declension, to which they helong, in this particular, that they prescrve the case-termination in preference to the final vowel of the base; thus, isti for istoi, opposed to lupo for lupoi. ${ }^{3}$ Regarding mm, from $s m$, see §. 170., and with reference to the termination §. 8.56 . Rem. 3. ${ }^{4} \S .176 . \quad{ }^{3} \oint . \circlearrowright\left(67\right.$. sub finem. ${ }^{6}$ We might, also, expect pess zup tanhe and uyps Sasp tainhe, according to the analogy of Merer unhe, which often oceurs as well as ahe (from the base a), and

 $m$ comes from the appended pronoun sma (comp. $\delta .267 . s u b . f$.) : in the instrumental tyem, on the contrary, it belongs to the case-sign (\$. $2(66$.$) .$ ${ }^{13} \S 5.155 .156 . \quad 14 \$ \$ .155$. and 281. ${ }^{15} \$ .157 . \quad{ }^{15}$ The
Sclavonic to, and similar pronominal neuters, are to be explained, like the Greek, through the suppression of a $T$-sound; while substantive and adjective forms in 0 -with the exception of those from bases in $s$ (as niclor from NEBES)-have lost a final nasel, which the Greck retains, both
 assume that the termination yus, peculiar to the pronouns, which in §. 189. is considered as the trunsposed form of the Sanskrit termination sya, belonged originally to the feminine, and from that gender has been unorganically transferred to the others, then (is)tius-from (is)ti-jus, for (is)ta-jus-would agree tolerably well with the Sanskrit tasyâs, with the loss of the $s$ preceding $j$; in this resembling the Sclavonic taya for tasya, $\oint .271$., and shortening the last $\hat{a}$ but one; after which from the short $a$, as is so frequently done before a final $s$, an unorganic $u$ is formed. ${ }^{23}$ From tosyas, §. 271 . ${ }^{24}$ §. $202 . \quad{ }^{25}$ §. 268. Note *

DUAL.
masculine.
Sanskrit. Zend. Greek. Lith. Old Selars.

NEUTER.

The rest like the Masculine.

| feminine. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N.Ac. te ${ }^{\text {, }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | (tê), | $\tau$ ¢á, | tie, | tye. ${ }^{8}$ |
|  | (tâbya), | D. $\tau$ aî̀, | tom, ${ }^{\text {s }}$ | *tyema. ${ }^{4}$ |
| G. L. tayoss, |  | G. $\tau$ aî̀, | G. $t \hat{1}$ | toyu. |

1 Vêdic form, see §. 208. $\quad{ }^{2} \S .221 . \quad{ }^{3} \oint .215 . \quad{ }^{4} \S .273$, where, however, the reason for the ye, instead of the to-be-anticipated $o$, was incorrectly assigned. The truth is, obyema is founded on the Sanskrit base उभय ubhaya, nom. ubhayam, "both"; and with regard to the designation of the number two, we must observe, that the Lithuanian, also, forms some cases from an extended theme in $i a$, euphonic $i e$; viz. the gen. $d w i e y-\hat{u}$, and the dative dwoie-m; the former, with regard to its $y$ before the case-termination, agrees with the Sclavonic dvoy- $\hat{u}$ and Sanskrit dway-ôs (§. 273. Note $\dagger$ ): the theme of both cases is dwie, from dwia, and is founded, in my opinion, on the Sanskrit द्वय dwaya, "a pair," with the suppression of the a preceding the $y$. On this, then, is based, also, the Sclavonic
deyem, as also tyem, on the compound pronominal base $\boldsymbol{T s}$ tya ( $(\$ .353)$.

p. 358 G.ed. $\quad{ }^{9} \$ .213$.

PlURAL.
mascuine.


The rest like the Masculine.

## femining.



1 \$j. 228.348. Regarding the Lithuanian tie see, also, §. 235. Note $\ddagger$, and for the Sclavonic ti $\wp .274 . \quad{ }^{2}$ §.339. $\quad{ }^{3}$ §. $275 . \quad 4$ §. 219. The surprising agreement between the Sanskrit तैस् tdis and Lithuanian tais is so far fortuitoos, as that the Sanskrit has rejected its $b l$ and the Lithuanian the $m$ derived from $b$, independently of each other. The Sclavonic tyemi, from tyemis ( $(\mathbf{~} .277$.$) , points to a Lithuanian t a$-mis, and is analogous to the Vêdic forms like श़्शे्येभिस् aiweethie, mentioned in $\vdots .219$, and to the common pronominal-instrumental एभिस् ${ }^{\mathcal{E}}$-bhis, "through this," from the base V $a$. It is, however, doabtful whether the ye of tyemi is founded on the corruption of the Sanskrit $₹ \mathbb{d}$ of a Vêdic form which may be supposed to have existed, tebhis, according to $\$ .2255$. e., or whether, as I am more inclined to think, this case, like seeveral others, belongs to the compound base 74 tya, to which, also, is to be assigned the
singular instrumental tyem, as from the base to only tom could proceed, gccording to the analogy of rabom, from the base rabo. On the other hand, the locative tyech is not to be referred to this place, as allo bases in this case have ye corresponding to the Sanskrit ê; as rabyech, from the theme rabo. Concurrent forms are wanting in the common declension for tyech: it answers, however, to तेषाम् tês $h A m$, just as the locative of similar sound does to तोषु tess $h u$; and for it also, therefore, we do not have recourse
[G. El. p. 500.] to the pronoun compounded with य $y a$, however natural it might appear from the point of view of the Grammar, which is limited to the Sclavonic alone, that all the $y e$, which occur in this pronoun, are of the same origin. $\quad{ }^{5}$ From istibus for istobus, see $\S .244$. ${ }^{6} \oint \S .215$. and 288. Rem. 4. $\quad 7 \S \S .215$. and 2355. Note $\ddagger . \quad{ }^{8} \S .276$.
 $a$, Vend. S. p. 230, and elsewhere (erroneously $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mathrm{s}$ for $s h$, see $§ § .51 .52$.). ${ }^{11}$ §. 284. Note ${ }^{6} . \quad{ }^{12}$ §.234. Note $\dagger . \quad{ }^{13}$ §. $231 . \quad{ }^{14}$ §. 274. ${ }^{16} \oint .271 . \quad{ }^{16}$ This has found its way from the other genders into the feminine, where we should expect thôm, while in the masculine and neuter the ai has its ancient fixed position (§. 288. Rem. 4.). In Sclavonic, all oblique plural cases are borrowed from the masculine, hence tyemi, tyem, tyech, for tyami, tyam, tuach, or tami, tam, tach. ${ }^{17}$ Compare the often-occurring Gxvev jew âonhanim, "harum" ( $\$ .56^{\text {h }}$.), Sanskrit asam, from the base $a$. Polysyllabic bases in Zend shorten the feminine $\boldsymbol{a}$ in the genitive plural; hence, not aêtãonharim, but Gxvergusp aêtanhanm (according to §. $56^{\text {a }}$.) answers to the Sanskrit êtasîm.
350. The weakening of the $t$ to $d$, mentioned in §. 343., which occasionally enters into the pronominal base ta, coincides with that which takes place in Greek in the appended particle $\delta \ell$, which, when isolated, is used as a conjunction, and to which no more suitable origin can be assigned than the pronominal base TO. The weakening of the vowel $o$ to $\epsilon$ resembles that which occurs in the uninflected vocative of bases in o (§.204.), as also in the equally uninflected accusatives $\mu \epsilon ́, \sigma$ é, $\neq,(\S .326$.$) . The descent of the tenuis to$ the medial occurs also in Sanskrit, in the isolated neuter form $i$-dam, "this," and $a$-das," that," inasmuch as, in my opinion, this is the proper distribution* which with

[^15]reference to $i$-dam is supported, also, by the Latin $i$-dem, qui-dam. In Sanskrit इदम् $\boldsymbol{i}$-dam and wदस् $a$-das are limited to the nominative and accusative neuter, which are the same in sound, and are deficient in the formation of the other cases, which originally may have be- [G. Ed. p. 501.] longed to them ; as the Greek $\delta \epsilon$ has still left behind it, in Homer, the plural-dative $\delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma t, \delta \epsilon \sigma t$, ( $\tau \hat{i} \delta \delta \epsilon \sigma \sigma t$, тoî̀ $\delta \epsilon \sigma$ ), which, according to what was said in §. 253. Rem., regarding the dative in $\epsilon \sigma-\sigma \iota$, sounds very homogeneous to the Sanskrit neuter das, probably a weakened form of dat. As to the proof of the relation of the idea of the conjunction $\delta$ é to that of our pronoun, it is sufficient to remark, generally, that all genuine conjunctions in the Indo-European family of languages, as far as their origin can be traced, are derived from pronouns, the meaning of which frequently lies more or less obscured in them. Those from $\mu \notin \nu$ and $\delta_{\epsilon ́}$ are contrasted with one another like " this" and "that," or " the other;" and the connection of our German aber, Old High German afar,
 already shewn elsewhere,* and in the same manner the Gothic ith, " but," of which more hereafter, is of pronominal origin, just as the Latin au-tem.
351. A descent from the tenuis to t'e medial, similar to that which we have observed in the Greek $\delta \dot{E}$, and in $\delta \epsilon i v a$, which will be discussed hereafter, is exhibited in Latin in the adverbs dum, demum; donec, denique, which all, with more or less certainty, belong to our demonstrative base. Perhaps dudum, also, is to be referred to this class, and is to be regarded as the doubling of the base $d u$ for $t u$, to, as totus, which has retained the old tenuis. In Sanskrit, the doubling of pronouns, in which both are nevertheless declined, expresses multiplicity; yd yas signifies "whoever," "quicunque," and yai yam,
*Vocalismus, p. 155.
" quemcunque," \&c., and sa sah, tan, tam \&c., answer to them. [G. Ed. p. 502.] Totus is properly "this and this," "the one and the other half," hence "the whole." The case is the same with quisquis. In dudum, "long ago," the notion of multiplicity is equally clear; and for this reason I prefer viewing it as the combination of two similar elements rather than as diu and dum. The same relation, in a phonetic respect, that dudum has to totus, dum has to tum, which latter has been designated above (§.343.) as the accusative. The circumstance, that in those pronominal adverbs the accusative inflexion does not stand in its customary sense, ought not to divert us from this mode of derivation; for in adverbs the case-inflexions very frequently overstep their ordinary signification. Notwithstanding, it cannot be denied that, in all pronominal adverbs of this kind, or at least in some of them, the $m$ might also belong to the appended pronoun sma, which is so widely diffused in Sanskrit and its kindred languages, and has been conjectured to exist in ta-men as analogous to the Sanskrit locative tasmin, and in immo by assimilation from ismo.* According to this mode of explanation, in the Latin forms dum, tum, tam, quam, \&c., there would be exactly as much left of the appended pronoun, and the case-terminations combined with it, as in our German datives, like dem, wem, and the Sclavonic locatives, as tom. The locative would be very suitable for dum, "since," "while," (in which time), and tum in the meaning "then," and consequently $d u-m$ and $t u-m$ would be = Sanskrit तस्मिन् ta-smin, Old Sclavonic tom. For the meaning, "hereupon," which in Sanskrrit is expressed by तसस् tatas, (literally " from there"), it might be better to refer to the ablative तर्मात् $t a$-smât, for it is not necessary that tum, in all its meanings, should belong to one and the

[^16]same case-form, as the $m$ approaches very [G Ed. p. 503.] closely to the terminations रमै smai, स्मात् smatt, and f₹्मन् smin.
352. Dēmum, considered as a demonstrative form, agrees exceedingly well, apart from the weakening of the consonants, with the Greek $\tau \hat{\eta} \mu o s$, with respect to which the obsolete form dēmus is to be remarked. In $\uparrow \hat{\eta} \mu o s$, however, to which the relative $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu o s$ corresponds, there is no necessity to follow Buttmann in regarding the latter portion of it as the substantive $\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho$, notwithstanding the apparent inducement for so doing contained in $\alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha \rho$; but I prefer dividing thus, $\tau \hat{\eta}-\mu 0 \varsigma, \hat{\eta}-\mu o s$, and I consider $\tau \eta, \dot{\eta}$, to be merely the lengthening of the base TO, as according to §§. 3. 4., $o=ष \pi$, and $\eta=$ wi $a$. Thus this $\eta$ coincides with the cognate Sanskrit $\boldsymbol{d}$, in several pronominal derivations, with the base vowel lengthened, as याष्त् $y \hat{a}$-vat, "how much," "how long," "while," \&c., and with the word answering to it, ताषत् tâ-vut. Nay, we might not perhaps venture too far if we were to recognise in $\mu \circ s$ a corruption of वत् vat, the $v$ being hardened to $\mu$, as we perceive happens among other words in $\delta \rho \dot{́} \mu \omega=$ द्रवामि dravami. "I run," (p. 114), with the favourite transition of $\tau$ to $s$, which is necessary at the end of words if the $T$ sound is not to be entirely dropped, modifications which have aided us in explaining several forms of importance in Grammar (§§. 152. 183.). In dèmum, dēmus, however, the demonstrative force is not so clearly perceptible as in the cognate Greek expression, and it lies concealed under the usual translation, "then first," or "at last," which does not affect the general sense of the sentence. Still nunc demum venis? means, properly, " now comest thou at this (so late a time)?" The time is doubly denoted; and in this lies the emphasis, first by nunc, from the pronominal base $n u$, and next by demum. In such adverbs, however, of place and time, it is [G. Ed. p. 504 ] not required to express the place and time formally, and this is done very rarely. In general, the mind has to understand
these categories in the interior, as it were, of the verbal form. It is the property of the pronouns to convey the secondary notion of space, which then admits of being transferred to time. Thus our wo, "where," has reference to place; wann, " when," to time; da, "then" or "there," to both; but the pronominal idea alone is formally represented in all three. When it is required adverbially to denote absolutely definite divisions of time, a pronoun is naturally combined with the designation of time in question, as in hodie, of $\eta \mu \mathrm{\epsilon} \rho \mathrm{\nu}$, and heute, "to-day," (Old High German, hiutu, §. 162.). But if, in these expressions, one of the ideas combined in them were to lose its formal designation, that of time would most easily be dispensed with ; the important matter being thatit is "on this" and not "on that (day);" and the language therefore adheres more tenaciously to the pronominal element than to that of time, which is very faintly seen in our heute, and even in the Old High German liutu. Hence 1 cannot believe that the adverbs dum, demum, donec, denique, are connected with the term for "day" (§. 122.), which is common to the Latin and the Sanskrit, to which Hartung (Gr. Particles, I. 230), besides the forms which have been mentioned, refers, among other words, jam and the Gothic $y u$, "now," "already," and yuthan, "already," as also the appended dam in qui-dam, regarding which see above (§. 350.). In the first place, in the dam of quon-dam, and in the dem of tan-dem, we might admit the term denoting "day," without being compelled, from the reason given above, to this explanation, still less to the inference that qui-dam, qui-dem, and $i$-dem, also have arisen in this manner. If quondam contains the name of "day," then its dam approaches most nearly to the Sanskrit accusative ध्याम् dyam from घ्यो dyd, "heaven," which, like other
[G. Ed. p. 505.] appellations of heaven, may also have signified "day," as a shoot from the root दिव् div, " to shine," (§ 122.). To this accusative द्याम् dyâm, the Greek $\delta \eta \dot{\eta}$, " long," corresponds, if, as Hartung conjectures, it is
taken from an appellation of "day," like the Latin diu
 referring the particle $\delta{ }^{\eta}$ to our demonstrative base, the significant and animating force of which is evinced clearly enough in the way in which it is used. We return to the Latin dōnec-the more complete form of which, dōnicum, $\dagger$ has been already, in another place, divided into do-nicum-since I see in it a connection, in formation and base [G. Ed. p. 506.] with the Greek т $\quad$ viкс, of which hereafter. "So long as" is equivalent to " the time in which," or "in which time," " how long a time," and do here represents the pronominal idea, and nec, nicum, that of time, as it also actually expresses, which will be shewn hereafter, a division of time. In the

[^17]Sanskrit याषत् ydvat, on the other hand, from the relative base $y a$, which signifies both " so long as" and "until,' the pronominal idea is alone represented; and we have hereby a fresh proof of the existence of a demonstrative element in donec, donicum. Dènique, in like manner, with regard to its origin, appears to be related to $\tau \eta \nu i \kappa \alpha$, to which it bears a surprising resemblance, with $q u$ for $k$, as in quis, quid, corresponding to कस् kas, विम् kim, $\kappa \hat{\varsigma}$, $\kappa \hat{i} \circ \mathrm{~s}, \& \mathrm{c}$.
353. The pronominal base $\pi t a$ is combined, in Sanskrit, with the relative base $y a$, for the formation of a new pronoun of similar signification, which belongs especially to the Vêda dialect, and, like many other Vêda words, has found more frequent use in the European cognate languages than in the common Sanskrit. The $a$ of $\pi t a$, is suppressed in this compound, hence $\pi$ tya; and in the nominative of the personal genders, as in the simple $\pi t a$, the $T$ sound is replaced by $s$; hence स्यस् syas, स्या $s y \hat{a}$, त्यत् tyat; accusative त्यम् tyam, त्वाम् tyam, त्यत् tyat, \&c. The base sya, which is limited to the nominative, with its feminine form syâ, possesses a complete declension in several cognate languages, and in the Sclavonic has found its way into the neuter also. The Gothic has adhered most closely to the Sanskrit, and does not permit this pronoun to extend beyond the singular nominative. Moreover, only the feminine form si remains; and one could wish that a masculine syi-s, for sya-s, (according to §. 135,) oc-
[G. Ed. p. 507.] curred with it. Most of the forms, however, which express, in Gothic the idea "he," and its feminine, have proceeded from the demonstrative base $i$, among which si, though, as it were, an alien, has found its place. This si, from the base $s y \delta=$ Sanskrit $s y d$, is an abbreviation of sya, according to the analogy of the substantive declension of the like termination (Grimm's second strong declension), as thivi for thiuya, from the base thiuyof.
354. The Old High German siu-we will leave it undecided
whether it should be written syu*-is more exactly retained than the Gothic si, and has not entirely dropped the Sanskrit सा $\hat{A}$, of स्या syd, but has first shortened it to $a$, and then weakened it to $u . \dagger \quad U$, however, in Old High German, is a favourite letter after $i$ or $y$ (Vocalismus, p. 246. Rem. 80.). The form siu, in Old High German, is not so isolated as si in Gothic; but from the base sió springs also an accusative sia, and in the plural the form sio, which is common to the nominative and accusative, and, in a Gothic dress, would be syds, in Sanskrit स्यास् syds. Contrasted with the singular nominative siu, the accusative sia may appear remarkable, for in both cases similar, forms might have been expected. The difference, however, consists in this, that the nominative form, at the oldest period to which we can arrive by the history of the language, terminated in a vowel without any case-sign whatever, while in the accusative the vowel of the base was protected by a nasal. This nasal, then, may have preserved the old quantity of $a$, just as, in Greek, a final $\alpha$ frequently occurs in places where a nasal was permitted to follow it by the old Grammar; while, where a short $a$ sound is found originally unprotected, or [G. Ed. p. 508.] accompanied by consonants not nasal, it is usually changed
 saptan, navan, daśan, though from these likewise in the nominative and accusative, according to §§. 139. 313., sapta, \&c.; č $\delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha$ answering to चदिष्यम् adikṣham, móס $\alpha$ to पदम् padam,
 to खदिसत adikshata.
355. While the Gothic article, like that in Greek, is to

[^18]be referred to the bases discussed in §. 343., स sa, सा sa, त $t a$, ता $\boldsymbol{t} \hat{d}$, the High German, as has been before remarked (§. 288. Rem. 5.), attaches itself chiefly to the compound ratya, fem. ty $\hat{a}$, and introduces this into the nominative also; hence, in the feminine, diu (or perhaps dyu), as above siu; accusative dia, answering to the Sanskyit त्याम् tydim, and in the nominative and accusative plural dio $=t y i l s$. With regard to the masculine, compare, with the Sanskrit nominative त्ये tyê, the form die, which in High German has found its way also into the accusative, which in this language is everywhere the same as the nominative. In the neuter, diu agrees with similar Old High German forms, from substantive bases in ia, as chunniu. In the masculine singular, and in those cases of the neuter which are the same as the masculine, the compound nature of our pronominal base is less palpable; and taking it as our starting point, or restricting our views to it, we should have classed the forms dër, dës, dëmu, dën, not under tya, but, like the Gothic forms of kindred signification, under the simple base त $t a$. But if dër, dein, be compared with the corresponding feminine cases diu, dia, and with the masculine plural die, without the suppo-sition-which is refuted by the Sanskrit, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic-that in the latter word a redundant $i$ is inserted, [G. Ed. p. 509.] which never occurs in other parts of the Old High German Grammar,* then the assumption becomes necessary that dër, dës, dëmu, dën, have had their origin from older forms, as dyar, dyas (= त्पस् tyas, त्यस्म tyasya), so that, as very frequently happens in Gothic (§.72.), in the syllable $y a$ the $a$ is dropped, and the $y$ changed into a vowel; just as, above, we have seen si and thivi spring from sya thiuya. The Old High German, however, as is well knowu, very commonly employs $\ddot{e}$ for the Gothic $i$.

[^19]356. The distribution of forms with $\ddot{e}$ and $i$ (or $y$ ) and a following vowel is not fortuitous, but rests on an historical basis, so that the contraction to $\ddot{e}$ occurs universally where the Sanskrit has a short $a$ after य् $y$;* but the more full form is found only when a long $\hat{a}$, or the diphthong $\mathfrak{e}$, accompanies the Indian semivowel, though this circumstance does not, in every case, ensure the more complete form in Old High German; for in the genitive plural we find dërr (masculine, feminine, and neuter), notwithstanding the Indian सेपाम tyesshatm in the masculine and neuter, and ल्यासाम् ty $1 \mathrm{~A} A \hat{} \mathrm{~A} m$ in the feminine; and in the dative, together with diêm-according to Notker, dienwe find, also, dem or den, and this, too, in most authorities. The neuter instrumental $d i u$ is based on the instrumental wusb thya, $\dagger$ which may be supposed to exist in Zend, and where, therefore, we have, in like manner, the $i$ or $y$ retained with original long vowels following that letter. Compare

MASCULINE.


[^20]
## FEMININE.

singular.
Sanskrit. Old H. G.
Nominative, sya, siu ${ }^{3}$, diu,

Accusative, tyâm, dia, Dative, tyasyấi, dëru, Genitive, tyasyâs, dëra,
plural.

| Sanskrit. | Old H.G. |
| :--- | :---: |
| tyâs, | dio. |
| tyâs, | dio. |
| tyâbhyas, | diêm. |
| tyâ.săm, | dëro. |

" Remark 1.-I differ from Grimm, whom, §. 288. Rem. 5., I have followed, as I here give die, not diê, and in the feminine plural dio, not did, in the genitive plural dëro, and in the genitive and dative singular dëra, dëru, without a circumflex; since the circumstance that theory, and the history of language, would lead us to expect a long vowel, does not appear sufficient ground for the inference that the original long quantity, which has been retained in Gothic, was not shortened in the three centuries and a half which elapsed between Ulfilas and the oldest High German authorities. Where a long vowel is not shewn by Kero's doubling the vowel, or Notker's accenting it with a circumflex, which is not the case in the examples before us, we have there to assume that the vowel, in the course
[G. Ed. p. 511.] of centuries, has undergone a weakening change. To this, final vowels are, for the most part, subject; hence, also, the subjunctive present preserves the $\ell$, which corresponds to the Sanskrit ए $\hat{e}$ and Gothic ai only in persons in which the vowel is protected by a personal termination following it; but in the first and third persons singular, which have lost the personal signs, the organic length of quantity is also lost.*
"Remark 2.-It is very probable that the simple base

[^21]$\pi \boldsymbol{t a}$, was, in Old High German, originally more fully declined, and that remains of that declension still exist. The neuter $d a z$ has the strongest claim to be viewed as such, which, contrary to $\S$. 288 . Rem. 5., I now prefer referring to the Sanskrit tat, rather than to tyat, as the syllable त्य tya has elsewhere, in Old High German, universally become dë̈ (§.271.). Perhaps, too, the de which occurs in the nominative plural masculine, together with die (Grimm. I. 791.), is not an abbreviation of the latter by the rejection of the $i$, but a remnant of the simple pronoun, and therefore akin to the Sanskrit ì te and Gothic thai. On the other hand, in Old Sclavonic, in the declension of the simple pronoun given at §. 349., several remains of the compound $\pi$ tya have become intermingled, which are there explained. But the forms tou, toe, taya, which occur in the nominative and accusative, together with $t^{\prime}$ (masculine), to (neuter), ta (feminine), though they contain the same elements as the Sanskrit त्य tya, त्या tya, were first formed in Sclavonic, in the sense of §. 284., otherwise they would not have restored the vowel of the first pronoun, which the Sanskrit has suppressed (§. 353.); thus, $t i$ for toĭ, te or tye for toe, and tya for taya (compare §. 282.). The same is the case with the compound plural forms of the nominative and accusative; masculine tii, neuter taya, feminine tyya.
" Remark 3.-In §. 160. I have made the assertion that the German dative is based on the old instrumental, as it often occurs with an instrumental signification. I was, however, particularly impelled to this view by the dative form of bases in $i$, as gasta from the theme gasti. But if we make the division gust- $a$ and regard the $a$ as the casetermination, there is nothing left us but [G. Ed. p. 512.] to refer this form to the Indo-Zend instrumental. There is, however, a way of comparing this form with the Sanskrit dative, which I now far prefer, as theLithuanian and Sclavonic, which are so near akin to the German, have retained the
dative, together with the instrumental; and the Old High German has preserved a particular form for the instrumental, the generic difference of which from the dative is especially observable in the pronoun, in which dëmu answers to त्यस्मे tyasmai ; but the instrumental diu, and the Gothic thé (§. 159.), no more exhibit the appended pronoun sma, mentioned in §. 165. \&c., than does the Sanskrit-Zend instrumental. Diu agrees best with the Zend thya, supposed above, and the Gothic the with the simple tit.* The form dëmu, and the Gothic thamma, compared with त्यस्मै tyasmai and तर्मै tasmâi, have lost the $i$ element of the Sanskrit diphthong ऐ $a_{i}$ ( $=\hat{a}+i$ ); and the long $\hat{a}$ has been shortened in Gothic, otherwise it would have been supplied by $\hat{\delta}$ or ê.t The short Gothic a has, however, in Old High German, been still further weakened to $u$. But to return to the Gothic gasta from the theme gasic; I do not now regard the final $a$ of this word as a case-suffix, but as a Guna-vowel, after which the $i$ of the base has been dropped, together with the case-character, while all bases in $u$, and feminine bases in $i$, have lost only the inflexion, and not a portion of the base with it. The same relation that sunau has to the dative मूनवे sûnav-e, from sûnu-which in Sanskrit also receives the Guna-the feminine anstui, from the theme ansti, has to the Sanskrit matay-e, from mati. The masculine gasta, however, has not only lost the inflexion of gastay-e, as it must originally have been pronounced, but also the $y$, which ought to have reverted to $i$. In the $a$-declension vulfa is readily made to accord with the Sanskrit वृकाय vrikáya, and Zend the same relation that thamma above does to तस्मै ta-smâi. Tho feminine gibai, from the theme gibd, is as easily de-

[^22]rivable, in regard to form, from the dative जिद्हयै $j i h w a ̂ y-a i$, as from the instrumental fजहया jihway-A. In both ways the inflexion has been lost, and the semivowel preceding it changed to a vowel. But if we are to believe [G. Ed. p. 513.] that a genuine dative character is retained in German, we should find it only in the declension of the pronouns, inasmuch as, for instance, the feminine form zai, in thi-zai, is directly derivable from the Sanskrit syâi, from smy-ai, by merely dropping the semivowel; so that thizai and तंस्यै tasydi stand historically near to one another, as we have represented in §. 172., where we expressed our belief that ai, in thizai, may be explained on the same principle as that of gibai; and thus thizai must be considered as an abbreviation of thizay-ai, and, therefore, as indeclinable. But if thizai stands for thizy-ai, and ai is, therefore, in this and similar pronominal forms, a remnant of the Sanskrit feminine dative termination $\hat{a} i$, then the Gothic ai above mentioned is essentially distinguished from the similar termination in gibai, "dono," and anstai, "gratic," as these two, also, are diverse from one another, since the $i$ of anstai belongs to the theme ansti, while an $i$ is foreign to the theme of gibai, viz. gibo, and accompanies the base in the dative only: while in the corresponding class of words in Sanskrit it is added in several cases, after which is annexed the true inflexion, which is omitted in Gothic. But if the ai of thizai is identical with the Sanskrit ऐ $a i$ of तस्यै tasyai, then we must distribute the genitive thizôs into thi-$-z-\delta \delta$, and this must be considered as an abbreviation of thi-zy-ôs $=\mathbf{S k r}$. तस्यास् ta-sy-dेs; and we should have in this, and similar pronominal forms,* a feminine genitive termination $\delta s$, while elsewhere in all genders the genitive sign consists in a mere $s$,
357. It has been already remarked, that our dieser is a com-

[^23]pound pronoun (§. 288. Rem. 5. p. 370.), the first member of which is founded on the Sanskrit base m $t y a$, and our article (§. 353.). It is not, however, requisite to assume that its ie presupposes an older $i a$, but it may be regarded, and this now appears to me preferable, as the unorganic lengthening of the di-sér of Notker. As regards the second part of this demonstrative, its declension might be assigned partly to the simple Sanskyit base स $s a$, partly to the compound sya : to the latter evidently belongs the feminine nominative
[G. Ed. p. 514]] dëSIU ( $=$ स्या sya, diese, "this,") and the neuter plural nominative of the same sound. But if the feminine accusative is dësa, not dësia, and the masculine dësan, not dësian, or dësën, according to the analogy of dën (\$. 356), then, instead of regarding these and other analogous forms as remains of the simple base $\mathbb{\#} s a$, सा $s a$, it may be assumed that the $i$ (or $y$ ) has been dropped, as occurs in most cases of the declension of hirti (theme hirtia or hirtya); so that in the plural, hirta, hirto, hirtum, and in the dative singular hirta, answer to the Gothic hairdyds, hairdyé, hairdyam, hairdya. If this is, as I believe it is, the proper view of the declension of dëser, the declensional difference between dër and ser then lies in this, that it has been necessary to lighten the latter, owing to the incumbrance of the base of the article which is prefixed to it, and that, therefore, $i$ is rejected; hence dësa, "hanc," but without the article sia, "eam." It is remarkable that the Lithuanian presents us with what appears to be the transposed form of our compound die-ser. As such, at least, I regard the so-termed emphatic demonstrative szittas, in which the Sanskrit subjective, but compounded pronoun स्प sya, occupies the first place, and the objective and simple $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{t a}$ the second. The first $t$ of szittas, which I divide thus, szit-tas, is, in my opinion, a remnant of the neuter casesign $t$ (§. 155.), and presupposes a Sanskrit स्पा् syat, which sya would form in the neuter, if it was used in that gender.

It may be observed, that in Sanskrit, also, the neuter casesign $t$, at the beginning of compounds, is drawn into the theme, and tat-putras, "his son," is used, not ta-putras.
358. The $s z(=s h)$ in the Lithuanian $s z i s$ and szittcas is founded on the form assumed by the Sanskrit base in the Vêdas under certain euphonic conditions (§.55.), which change its $s$ into च् s.s. For otherwise [G. Ed.p.515.] the Lithuanian $s z$ does not agree with the Sanskrit $\mathbb{R}^{8}$, but perhaps, among other letters, with ष् sh, e. g. in szeszi $=$ षघ् ṣhash, " six." With regard to the declension of szis, it is to be remarked, that it exhibits several cases, in which the $i$ of the base $s z i a$, feminine $s z i d$, has been rejected, or which belong-and this view is the one I prefer-to the simple pronominal base स $s a$, feminine सा $s t$, which completes the compound szis; as, p. 486, among the cases of the simple Sclavonic base to, we have seen remains of the compound ${ }^{4}$ tya. We here annex the complete declension of the Lithuanian pronoun under discussion, accompanied by the kindred form in Old Sclavonic. We prefix * to the cases which belong to the simple base $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ sa, as also to the Old Sclavonic forms which do not strictly belong to this place, and regarding which reference is to be made to Rem. 1 . which follows.

SINGULAR.
MASCULINE. FEMININE.

| Lithuanian. |  | Old Sclav. | Lith. | old. Sclav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nominative, | szis, | $s y$ | szi, ${ }^{\prime}$ | si. ${ }^{1}$ |
| Accusative, | szin, | $s y^{\prime}$, | szen, | * siyu. |
| Instrumental, | *sziu, szům, | sim, | szè, | sfyut. |
| Dative, | sxiam, | sem $\hat{u}$, | sziti, | sĕ̆. |
| Genitive, | szio, | sego, | szids, | seya. |
| Locative, | sxiamè, szemè, | sem, | szioye, | sĕ. |

[^24]DUAL.
MASCUIINE.

|  | Lithuanian. | Old Sclav. | Lith. | Old Sclav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T'0 Nominative, | *szû, | *siya, | $s z i$, | *siü. |
| $\underset{\sim}{\infty}$ Accusative, | szün, | *siya, | szin. | *siŭ. |
| - Dative, | sziem, | I. D. sima, | sziom, | sima. |
| $\square^{4}$ Genitive, | *szu, | seyu, | szilu, | siy化. |

plural.

| Nominative, | szie, | si, | szios, | *siya. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Accusative, | *szus, | *siya, | szes, | *siya. |
| Instrumental, | szeis, | simi, | *szomis, | simi. |
| Dative, | sziems, | sim, | sszoms, | sim. |
| Genitive, | sziu, | sich, | sziu, | sich. |
| Locative, | *sziuse, | sich, | *szosa, | sich. |
|  | nzotrr. |  |  |  |

feminine.

Nom. Acc. du. . . . . siž.
Nom. Acc. pl. . . . *siya.
this form is a contraction of $a+i$, as in so many other places. While, therefore, the feminine siu is to be referred direct to the Sanskrit स्या syd, and is, as it were, its continuation, sér has been formed first in the German language, by combining the base sa, which has been retained in Gothic in the nominative of the article, with the defining element $i$ (from ya). Compare what has been before remarked (§. 288. Rem. 5.) regarding analogous adjective-nominatives, as plintér from plinta-ir. As a corroboration of this distribution it may be here further observed, that each of the elements $a$ and $i$, which are united in the ê of plintêr, also occurs separately," each having, on different occasions, divested itself of the other. Thus plintur and plintir may occur;-a clear proof that plintêr has been contracted from plinta-ir; for diphthongs are frequently subject to abbreviations, in which one of the elements combined in them is lost; as, in the Gothic, haba, "I have," and habam, " we have," are used instead of habai, habaim, as is shewn by the analogy of the other persons and the Old High German habém, habemess. $\dagger$ The Old High German furnishes examples of forms in which only the latter element of $a i$ is retained; as $c n s t i$, answering to the Gothic dative anstai and genitive anstais. It is not surprising, therefore, that, in the nominative of the definite adjective, together with $e_{r}(=a i r) a r$ and $i r$ also occur. Of these three forms (êr, ar, irr), the first appears to be the original, since it forms the best medium of comparison for the two others. But if plintar, from plintas, was the original form, the $a$ in this place could not have been preserved beyond the fourth century, not to mention the eighth and a still later period; as $a$ in polysyllabic words in Gothic before a final $s$, which has from the

[^25]first held this place, is regularly suppressed, or, after $y$, weakened to $i$,* while $a i$ is retained before a final $s$; hence, in the second person singular, subjunctive ais, Old High German ês, answering to the Sanskrit एस् ês (from ais), Latin ês, $a_{s, ~} \dagger$ and Greek oss."
[G. Ed. p. 518.] 359. The Lithuanian szit-ta-s has been mentioned above ( $(.357$. ), which, with regard to its last portion, is identical with the Greek ajTO-£, and with the Sanskrit एत êTA (§. 344.). But the demonstrative base in tya, also, which is formed of $t a+y a$, occurs in Lithuanian at the end of a compound pronoun. As such I regard patis (pat'-s), "ipse" which I distribute thus, pa-tis: tis stands, according to rule, for tyis from tyas, as yaunikkis, "bridegroom," for yaunikkyis from yaunikkyas (§. 135.). But in Lithuanian, $t$ before two vowels, ie excepted, is changed into $c z(=c h) ; \ddagger$ hence dative $p a-c z i a-m$, locative paczia-mè, or patimè, instrumental pacziu. In the genitive paczio might be expected, according to the analogy of szio and yaunikkio: we find, however, patiess, according to the analogy of awiess (§. 193.) ; the feminine genitive paczids agrees, however, with $s z i d s$, and similar genitives from bases in a feminine $a$ (खा 4 ). As regards the first member of pa-tis, I consider it to be identical with the Sanskrit base swa, swe, whence खयम् swayam, "self." Swa becomes pa by the loss of the initial letter, and the hardening of the $v$ to $p$, as, in Prâkrit, पfि pani, "thou," proceeds from ल्बम् twam; so in the Bohemian or Gipsey language, pen, " sister," comes from खसर् swasar (खसุ swasri). Indeed, in the pronoun under discussion, the Lithuanian admits of comparison with the Gipsey language, as in the latter, as has been already pointed out in

[^26]another place,* pe has been formed from ख $s w a$, whence $p^{e-s}, p e-n$, "self," the former as singular, the latter as plural accusative. $\dagger$
360. We turn to a pronominal base con- [G. Ed. p. 519.] sisting of a simple vowel, viz. $i$, which, in Latin and German, expresses the idea "he," and in Sanskrit and Zend signifies "this," and which has left, in those languages, no proper declension, but only adverbs; as इतस् itas, " from here," " from there," and which supplies the place of the ablative after com-
 " at this," with an inherent notion of place; इसि $i t i$, Zend itha, Latin ita, " so," इदानीम् idânîm, " now," analogous with tadanim "then"; and also इल्पम् it-tham, "so," at the bottom of which lies the obsolete neuter $i t$ as the theme, $\ddagger$ and which occurs in the Vêdas also, as an enclitic particle. I regard this 很 $i t$ as the last portion of चेत् chet "if" (from cha+it), and नेत $n e t$, " if not" (from $n a+i t$ ) which latter is in Zend
 German nicht, it has been forgotten that its initial element alone is negative, while its latter portion signifies something real-in Zend " this," and in German " thing," (ni-cht, from ni-wiht, Gothic ni-vaihts). From the pronominal root $i$ prooeed, also, the derivatives ₹तरस् itara-s, "the other," with the comparative suffix; the accusative of which, itera-m, coincides with the Latin iterum, ईदृश iddrisa, and similar forms, which signify " such," and इ्यत् iyat, "so many." Notwithstanding these numerous offshoots, which have survived the declension of the pronoun under discussion, its base has been entirely overlooked by the Indian gramma-

[^27]rians; and I believe I am the first who brought it to light.* The Indian grammarians, however, give extraordinary ety-
[G. Ed. p. 520.] mologies for some of the abovementioned words, and derive $i t i$, "so," from $\boldsymbol{z}^{i}$, " to go"; itara-s," the other," from $i$, " to wish" (see Wilson). In some, recourse is had to ददम् idam, "this"; and one would not be entirely in error in deriving from this word itas, " from here," though there is a difficulty in seeing how from idam as the theme can spring the form itas by a suffix tas. We should expect idantas or idatas.
361. In Latin the theme of is is lengthened in several cases by an inorganic $u$ or $o$, in the feminine by $a$, and it is thus brought into the second and first declension, in which $i$ is liable to be corrupted to $e$, especially before vowels. As from the verbal root $i$, " to go," come eo and eunt, in opposition to $i s, i t, i n u s, i t i s, i b a m$; so from our pronoun come eum, eo, eorum, eos, and the feminine forms ea, eam, eae, earum, all from the base which has been subsequently lengthened, to which the obsolete ea-bus also belongs. To the old type belong only is, id, the obsolete forms im, ibus, with which agree the Gothic in-a, "him," $i-m$," to them," (from $i-b, \S .215$.), and the genitive and dative $e-j u s, e-i$, which are common to the three genders, and also the locative ibi-in form a dative, according to the analogy of $t i b i$, sibi (§. 215.)-and probably the word immo, which has been already mentioned ( $\$ .351$.), which we may suppose formerly to have been pronounced immod, and which corresponds to the Sanskrit pronominal ablatives in smatt, but by assimilation approaches very closely the Gothic dative imma, "to him." The dative ei stands isolated in Latin Grammar, inasmuch as all other bases in $i$ have permitted this vowel to be melted into one with the case-termination; thus hostē, from hosti-i: the pronominal base $i$, however, escapes this

[^28]combination by being changed into e. In my Vocalismus (p. 204). I have derived the length of quantity in the dative character from the combination of the $i$ of the theme with the $i$ of the inflexion, which is properly [G. Ed. p. 621.] short; and I have assumed that bases terminating in a consonant lengthen the base in the dative singular, as in most of the other cases, by an inorganic $i$; thus pedi from pedī-4. As, then, in this way a long $i$ must be found almost universally in the dative, this would come to be regarded by the spirit of the language as the true sign of this case, and thus $e \bar{e}$, and the whole fourth and fifth declensions, followed the prevailing example of the more numerous class of words. Cui alone retains the proper short quantity. It cannot be objected to the Latin language generally that it shews any undue inclination towards terminations with a long $i$, and thereby lengthens unnecessarily that letter when originally short; for universally where a long final $i$ is found, there is also a reason for its length, as in the genitive singular and nominative plural of the second declension it is the suppression of the final vowel of the base, which has induced the lengthening of the termination as a compensation; thus lup- $\overline{-}$, in both cases, for lupoi; while in the dative lupō for lupoi the termination has been merged in the rowel of the base. We have already mentioned (\$. 349. p. 497 G. ed. Note ${ }^{2}$ ) pronominal datives like istiz for istoi, which would be analogous to the Greek $\mu \mathrm{i}$, $\sigma o i$, oî.
362. The Gothic pronominal base $i$ has two points of superiority over the Latin base which has been just mentioned: in the first place it has never admitted the corruption of the original vowel to $\stackrel{e}{ }$, as generally this comparatively recent vowel is as completely foreign to the Gothic as to the Sanskrit; and secondly, the theme $i$ in the masculine and neuter is preserved free from that inorganic admixture which transfers the Latin kindred form from the third to the second declension, and has
produced eum for in, eo for $e$ or $i$, ii or ei for ès, eorum for ium. The Gothic pronoun, by the side of which are given in parentheses the forms, which have been most probably
[G.Ed.p. 522.$]$ drawn from the corresponding Sanskrit base at the time when it was declined, are as follows:-
masculine.
singular.
Sanskrit. Gothic.
Nominative, $(i-s), \quad i-s$,
Accusative, $i-m,{ }^{1} \quad i-n a$,
Dative, Genitive,
( $i$-shmai $)^{2} \quad i-m m a$,
(i-shya), $\quad i-\mathrm{s}$,
neuter.
Nom. Acc. $\quad i-t,{ }^{4} \quad i-t a, \quad(\imath-n-i), \quad i y-a .^{5}$

[^29]363. Although in Gothic, as in Sanskrit, [G. Ed. p. 523.]

Zend, Greek, and Latin, the vowel $i$ in substantives is appropriated equally well to the feminine theme-termination as to the masculine; still in our pronoun of the third person, where the idea is essentially based on the distinction of sex, so that that which signifies "he" cannot mean "she," the necessity for this distinction has produced an extension of the base $i$, in cases which, without such an extension, would be fully identical with the masculine.* In the nominative singular a totally different pronoun is employed, which, in High German, is used throughout all those cases which are formed in Gothic from the extended base: Gothic si, Old High German siu, \&c. (§. 354.). The affix which is used in Gothic to extend the base consists in the vowel which, from a time far prior to the formation of the German language, was especially employed as the fulcrum of feminine bases, but which in Gothic appears in the form of $\delta$ instead of $a$ ( (§.69.); thus, iyd from $i+\delta$, with the euphonic change of the $i$ to $i y$, as in the plural neuter forms iy-a, thriy-a, (§. 233.). From the base iyd is formed however, in the uninflected accusative-as final vowels are for the most part liable to abbreviation-iya, an analogous form to the in like manner shortened Latin ea, eam (for ia, iam), and in the nominative and accusative plural iyos. $\dagger$ In the dative plural the identity with the masculine and neuter is not avoided, and this case is, as from [G. Ed. p. 624.] the Old High German might be conjectured, im, with

[^30]regard to which we must observe, that in Latin, also, in several of the oblique cases, the distinction of gender is less attended to (ejus, ei, old eae). All the cases which distinguish the feminine by the inflexion spring from the original theme; thus $i$-zôs, $i$-zai, genitive plural izô, opposed to is, imma, ize. In Latin, also, the extension of the base $i$ may have been commenced in the feminine, and thus an analogous masculine eum have been made to correspond to eam, and may have superseded the more ancient im. Similar corruptions have been adopted by the language in the other cases; thus eorum placed itself beside earum, and thus the ium, which probably existed, fell into disuse: eabus, iis, eis, were followed by the masculine and neuter iis, eis, which supplanted the older ibus.
364. If the singular nominative of the reflective pronoun given by the old grammarians was i' and not ${ }^{\prime}$, it might be regarded as the kindred form of the pronoun under discussion; and in this view it would be of importance that the Vêdic accusative $\hat{\imath} m$, mentioned above ( $p .510$, Note ${ }^{1}$.), has a reflective meaning in the passage quoted, and is rendered by Rosen " semet ipsum." But if ${ }^{\prime}$ is the right form, then it probably belongs to the Sanskrit base* surn, swê, whence swayam, " self" (§. 341. ), and is connected with $o \dot{v}, o \hat{i}, \hat{\epsilon}$, and $\sigma \phi \in i s, \& c$., the latter from the base $\Sigma \Phi I$. As in this word an \& stands for an original $\alpha$, which would lead us to expect
[G.Ed. p. 5.5.] o, so also in '; and it deserves notice, that so early as the Sanskrit, together with swa is found a weakened form $s w i$, from which I think may be formed the interrogative

[^31]particle fित् swit, as neuter, and analogous to हा् it and बित् chit. In favour of the opinion that $i$ belongs to the old reflective base, may be adduced the circumstance, that, like the two other pronouns in which there is no distinction of gender (é $\gamma \dot{\prime} \omega$, $\sigma u ́$ ), it is without a nominative sign. If it belonged to the base $₹ i$, it would most probably have had the same sound as the Latino-Gothic is, unless we prefer regarding $i$ as the neuter. The dative $\left.{ }^{\prime}\right\rangle$, from its termination, falls under the pronouns devoid of gender (§. 222.), and would, therefore, likewise belong to the reflective base. The accusative ${ }^{i} \nu$, however, considered independently, would not furnish any objection to the opinion that it is identical with the Latin im and the Gothic ina.*
365. We have already mentioned the inseparable demonstrative $i(\S .157$.). There is, however (and this creates a difficulty), another mode of derivation, according to which that $\hat{\imath}$ would be identical with the $e i(=\hat{\imath})$, which is attached in Gothic, in a similar manner, to other pronouns. not to strengthen their demonstrative meaning, but to give them a relative signification : izei, from is $+e i$, means "qui," and sei, a contraction of $s i+e i$, in accordance with a law of sound universally followed in Sanskrit (Gram. Crit. §. 35.) signifies "qua." It is most frequently combined with the article; saei, sofei, thatei, "qui," "qua," "quod"; thizei, feminine thizôzei, "cujus"; and so through all the cases; only in the feminine genitive plural thizôei has as yet not been found to occur (Grimm. III. 15.). If the first or second person is referred to, $e i$ is attached [G. Ed. p.526.] to $i k$ and thu: thus ikei, thuei; for the Gothic relative requires that the person to which it refers should be incorporated with it; and as it is itself indeclinable, the relations of case are denoted by the pronoun. preceding it, which is

[^32]then merged in the meaning of its attendant. Alone, ei signifies "that," like the Latin quod and the Sanskrit relative neuter यत् yat. And I have no doubt that the Gothic ei, in its origin, belongs to the Sanskrit-Zend relative base $y a$, which in Gothic has become ei, just as, in many other parts of Gothic Grammar, ei $(=i)$ answers to the Sanskrit $y a$, as in the nominative singular hairdeis from the base hairdya.* With respect to form, therefore, the derivation of the Gothic $e i$ from the Sanskrit y $y a$, admits of no doubt; and since the signification of the two words are identical, we must rest satisfied with this mode of deducing it, and abandon Grimm's conjecture that $e i$ is intimately connected with is, "he," or only allow it a very distant relationship to it, in as far as the derivation of the Sanskrit relative base ya, from the demonstrative base $i$, is admitted. The relationship, however, of these two is not susceptible of proof; for as $s a, t a, m a, n a$, are simple primary bases, why should not such a one have originated in the semi-vowel $y$ also? But if the Greek demonstrative $t$ is akin to the Gothic appended pronoun of similar sound, it likewise would proceed from the Sanskrit relative base, which appears to be especially destined for combination with other pronouns (see §. 353.); and this disposition is especially observable in Sclavonic, in which language that base, when isolated, has laid aside the relative
[G. Ed. p. 527.] signification (\$. 282.). Hence, before entering deeply into the Sclavonic system of declension, I mistook this base, and thought I saw in its abbreviation to $i(i, " e u m, " ~ i m, " e i$ ") the Sanskrit base $i$.
366. We return to the Sanskrit idam, "this," in order to notice the bases from which its declension is completed, and of which each is used only in certain cases. The most simple, and the one most largely employed, is ज $a$, whence $a$-smAi, " huic," $a$-smadt, " hoc," $a$-smin, "in hoc," in

[^33]the dual $\hat{d}$-bhydm, and in the plural $\hat{\text { ebhis-analogous to }}$ Vêdic forms like aśvé-bhis from aśva (§. 219.)-A-bhyas, ê-sham, d-ghu, exactly like te-bhyas, \&c., from ta, viz. by the commingling of an $i$, as is usual in the common declension in many cases. There is no necessity, therefore, to have recourse to a distinct base $\ell$, but this is only a phonetic lengthening of $a$, and from it comes also the masculine nominative wयम् ayam from $\hat{e}+a m$, as स्वयम् swayam, "self," from $s w e \hat{e}(f o r ~ s w a)+a m$ (§. 341 1.). Max. Schmidt is disposed to compare with this êt the Latin $e$ of eum, ea, \&c. (1.c. p. 10), and to regard the latter as an abbreviation of an originally long $e$; for support of which opinion he relies principally on the form $a e i$, in an inscription to be found in Orelli, and on the circumstance that, in the older poets, the dative $e i$ has a long $e$. But we do not think it right to infer from this dative that every $e$ of the pronoun is is originally long; and we adhere to the opinion expressed at $\S$. 361 ., which is, moreover, confirmed by the circumstance that $i$ also occurs before vowels; and even in the plural $i i$, $i i s$, is more common than ei, eis. As regards, however, the obsolete dative singular with a long $e$, it may be looked upon as the Guna form of $i$; as $i$ in Sanskrit, according to the common declension, would form $a y-\hat{e}=\hat{e}+\hat{c}$. From this $\hat{e}$, however, which is formed by Guna from $i$, that which we have seen [G. Ed. p. 528.] formed from $a$ by the addition of an $i$ is different; and therefore the Latin dative, even if it had an originally long $e$, would still have nothing in common with Sanskrit forms like e-bhis, \&c. The $e$ in the genitive ejus is long through the euphonic influence of the $j$, and for it occurs, also, the form aeius, in an inscription given by Orelli ( $\mathrm{N}^{\text {r }}$. 2866.) When, through the influence of a $j$, the preceding vowel is long, it should not be termed long by position:* $j$ is not a double

[^34]consonant, but the weakest of all sinple consonants, and approximates in its nature closely to that of a vowel. This weakness may have occasioned the lengthening of the preceding vowel, in remarkable coincidence with the Sanskrit, in which $i$ and $u$, where they stand before a suffix commencing with ग् $y$ are always either lengthened or strengthened by the addition of a $t$ : hence the roots जि $j i$ and स्तु $s t u$ form, in the passive, जीये jiyê, स्तूये stîyê, but in the gerund in ya, jitya, stutya.* The case is different where $\boldsymbol{i} i$ or $\hat{\xi} \hat{\imath}$ in monosyllabic forms are changed, before a vowel following them, into इय् iy: the $y$ which arises from $i, \hat{i}$, has no lengthening power. It is scarcely possible to give any decided explanation of the orthographical doubling of the $i$ for $j$ in Latin. When Cicero wrote Maiia, aiio, he may have pronounced these words
[G. Ed. p. 529.] as Mai-ja, ai-jo (Schneider, p. 281); and we cannot hence infer that every initial $j$ was described in writing by $i i$. If this were the case, we should be compelled to the conclusion, that by doubling the $i$ the distinguishing the semi-vowel from the vowel $i$ was intended, as, in Zend, the medial $y$ is expressed by double $i$ (J); and as double $u$ denotes, in Old German, the $w$, though a single $u$, especially after initial consonants, occurs as the representative of $\boldsymbol{w}$. But if Cicero meant a double $j$ by his double $i$, it would not follow that, in all cases, the language intended the same. The Indian grammarians admit the doubling of a consonant after $r$, us sarppa for sarpa, "suake," and
accounted for; as major ( $\$ .301$.) has been derived from magior, whero the rowel may have been lengthened owing to the $g$ being dropped. And a consonant must originally have preceded even the $j$ of the genitive in $j u s$, if this termination is akin to the feminine Sanskrit स्यास् syds ( $\oint .349$. Note $^{22}$ ).

* Compare what has been said in my Vocalismus, p.213, regarding the tendency of the $i$ to be preceded by a long vowel.
they admit, also, of many other still more extraordinary accumulations of consonants, with which the language cannot be actually encumbered. But if the doubling of a consonant following $r$ had any real foundation, the $r$ would be assimilated to the consonant which followed itas, in the Prâkrit, savva from sarva,-and then the simultaneous continuation of the $r$ in writing would only be in order to retain the recollection of its originally having existed.*

367. From the demonstrative base w $a$, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, a feminine base $\hat{\imath}$ might have arisen (see §. 172.), whence, by the addition of the termination am, so common in pronouns, the nominative singular इयम् iyam (euphonic for $\hat{\imath}$-am, Gram. Crit. §. 51.) may be derived. As, however, a short $i$ with $a m$ [G. Ed. p. 530.] might become इयम् iyam, it is uncertain if the feminine of our pronoun should be referred to the masculine base $a$, or to $i$ : the former, however, appears to me the more probable, since thus the masculine nominative स्षयम् ayam, and its feminine इयम् iyam, would be of the same origin, while the base $i$ does not occur uncompounded in the whole masculine and neuter declension. The Gothic iya, "eam," cannot, therefore, be compared with इयम् iyam, particularly as, in §. 363., we have seen the Gothic arrive, in a way peculiar to itself, but still in accordance with the Latin, at a theme iyd lengthened from $i$; but the $a m$ of the Sanskrit iyam is merely the nominative termination.
368. In Zend wयम् ayam becomes Govaêm (§. 42,), and इ鲗 iyam becomes $\mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{im}$. The neuter इसम् idam, however, is replaced by puess imat, from the base ima, which, in Sanskrit, is one of those which supply the declension of idam. Hence, for example, come the accusative masculine इमम् imam, feminine इमाम् imam, Zend G\&Gs imëm,
[^35]Ge̛GJ imaim. Ought we, then, to compare with it the Old Latin emem for eundem, or, with Max. Schmidt (l. c. p. 11), consider it as the doubling of em for im? It need not seem surprising that the base ima,* which, in the singular, occurs only in the accusative, and which is principally limited to this case, should be found in Latin in the accusative only. I regard ima as the union of two pronominal bases, viz. $i$ and ma (§. 105.): the latter does not occur in Sanskrit uncompounded, but is most probably connected with the Greek $\mu / \nu$, and the latter, therefore, with the Old Latin emem.
[G. Ed.p. 531.] 369. As $i$ with $m a$ has formed the combinition ima, in like manner I regard the base षन ana, which likewise enters into the declension of idam as the combination of स $a$ with another demonstrative base, which does not occur in Sanskrit and Zend in isolated use, but, doubtless, in Pâli, in several oblique cases of the three genders, $\dagger$ in the plural also in the nominative, and in that of the neuter singular, which, like the masculine accusative, is नं nan. $\ddagger$ Clough gives the cases in which this pronoun occurs as secondary forms to the base $\pi t a_{0}$ as, in Sanskrit, in several cases, a pronoun is found with the compound एत êta, which has $n a$ instead of $t a$ for its last portion.§ We will here give the compound Sanskrit pronoun over against the Pâli simple pronoun.

* In the pl. the nom. (इमे imé) belongs to this base, and in the dual इमी $i m d u$, is both nom. and accusative.
$\dagger$ In the feminine naturally produced to $n \hat{\alpha}$, the $\hat{d}$ of which, however, is shortened in the accusative नं naì "eam."
$\ddagger$ I write nañ, not nam, as a final $m$ in Pâli, as in Prâkrit, becomes an anuswêra, which is pronounced like a stifled $n$ ( $\$ \oint .9 .10$.). The original $m$ in Pâli has been retained only before initial sounds commencing with a vowel (Burnouf and Lassen, pp.81, 82). Final $n$ is likewise corrupted in Pali to anuswâra, or is lost entirely.

[^36]
## MASCULINE.

| Sanskrit. | aular. Pali. | Sanskrit. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { plural. } \\ & \text { Pali. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N. êsha, | sit, | êtê, | tê, nê, |
| Ac.êtam, ênam, | tuin, nain, | êtan, ênân, | tê', nê, |
| I. êtêna, ênêna, | têna, nêna, | êtâis, | jtêbhi, nêbhi, (or têhi, nêlli. |
| D. êlasmãi. |  | êtêbhyas, |  |
| Ab.êtasmât, | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { tasmâ, nasmâ, } \\ \text { or tamhâ, namhâ, }\end{array}\right.$ | \}etêbhyas, | like Instr. |
| G. êtasya, | tassa, nassa, | êtessham, | têsañ, nêsañ, ${ }^{2}$ |
| L. êtasmin, | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { tasmini, nasmin, } \\ \text { or tamhi, namhi, }\end{array}\right.$ | $\text { \}etês.shu, }$ | têsu, nêsu. |
|  | NEUTER |  |  |
| N. êtat, | tan, nain, | etani, | tîni, nâni. |
| Ac.êtat, ênat, | tain, nain, | êtâni, ênâni | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { \{âni, nâni, } \\ \text { or tê, nê. } \end{array}\right.$ |

## FEMININE.

N. êsha,
sa
étas,
$\left\{\begin{array}{l}t a \hat{,}, n \hat{a}, \\ \text { or tâyô, } n a y y b .\end{array}\right.$

I. êtayâ, ênayâ, tâya, nâya, ${ }^{3}$
D. êtasyâi,
${ }^{1}$. . . .
Ab.êtasyd̂s, tassâ, tissâ,
G. êtasyâs, tassâ, tissa, ${ }^{4}$
L. êtasyâm, tassañ, tissañ,
${ }^{1}$ Is replaced by the genitive. ${ }^{2}$ Or tesanain, [G. Ed. p.583.]
nestinan, as the old genitive is taken as theme, after suppressing the nasal, and from it a new one is formed according to the analogy of the common declension
${ }^{3}$ Observe the transposition of the long vowel. 4 In the form tissd
the Pàli coincides in a remarkable manner with the Gothic thizds, since, like it, it has weakened the old $a$ to i. Tiss $\alpha$, however, is inferior to the Gothic kindred form, in having dropped the final $s$; and in this point ranks with the Old High German, in which the Gothic zôs has become $r a(p .510$. G. ed.). The Pâli, however, has abandoned all final $s$, without exception. The older form tass $d$ (by assimilation from tasya), which is not given by Clough, is supplied by Burnonf and Lassen, with whom, however, the form tissd is wanting, though they furnish an analogous one, viz. imissa (Essai, p. 117). Clough gives, moreover, the forms tissâya and tassataya. The former, like the plural genitive, sppears to be formed by the addition of a new genitive form, according to the common declension, to the pronominal genitive form. From the form tassâtâya we might be led to an obsolete ablative, which, in Sanskrit, must have been tasyat-still earlier tasmyât-which is proved by Zend forms like avanhatut, "ex hac" (§. 180. p. 198 last line). But if we are to give to tassataya not an ablative sense, hut a genitive and dative one, I then prefer dividing it thas: tassal-tâyn, so that the feminine base tâ would be contained in it twice-once with the pronominal, and again with the common genitive termination. But it is probable that the form imamhld, which is given by Burnouf and Lassen (Essai, p. 117) as an anomalous feminine instrumental, is originally an allative; for this case, in its significations, borders ou the instramental, and to it belongs the appended pronoun sma. But if imamhd is an ablative, it is, in one respect, more perfect than the Zend forms, like sumer avanhat, since the Pûli form has retained also the $m$ of the appended prunoun sma-transposed to $m h a$,一while the $n$ of of avanhadt is only an euphonic affix ( $\$ .56{ }^{4}$.) The final $t$, however, in Pâli, must, according to a nniversal law of sound, be removed, as in the masculine; and thus the ablative nature of imamha might the more casily lie hid before the discovery of the Zend form.
370. I have already, in my review of Forster's Grammar,* and before I became acquainted, through the Pâli, with the isolated pronoun, considered the Latin conjunction num as
[G. Ed. p. 534.] an accusative to be classed here; and I have there also represented the Sanskrit êna as a compound, and compared the Latin enim with its accusative एनम् Enam. It will, however, be better to refer enim, as also nam, to the
feminine accusative-P. नं nain, Sans. एनाम् ênâm-as the short masculine $a$ in Latin has elsewhere become $u$, among other words, in nunc, i. e. "at this (time)," which (l.c.) I have explained like tunc, as analogous to hunc. But if tunc and nunc are not accusatives, their nc would appear to be akin to the Greek עiкa, and tunc might be compared to т $\eta \nu_{i} i \kappa a$, of which more hereafter. With respect to nam and enim, we may refer to §. 351. with regard to the possibility, in similar pronominal formations, of their $m$ being a remnant of the appended pronoun sma. There is no doubt, however, of the pronominal derivation of all these adverbs. We may remark, in this respect, our German denn, and the Latin quip-pe from quid-pe, to which, with regard to its last syllable, nempe from nam-pe (compare §. 6.) is analogous. The Sanskrit kincha, "moreover" (euphonic for kimcha), may be regarded as the prototype of quippe, for it consists of kim, " what?" and cha (commonly "and"), which takes from it the interrogative meaning, and is in form the same as que, which also, in quisque, removes the interrogative signification of the pronoun. The syllable pe, however, of quippe, is, in its origin, identical with que, and has the same relation to it that the Æolic $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \mu \pi \epsilon$ has to quinque. As regards the relation of the $i$ of enim to the $a$ of nam, we may refer to that of contingo to tango, and similar phenomena, as also to the Pâli tiss $\hat{d}$ together with tassíd (see Table, §. 369.). [G. Ed. p. 535.] The Greek $\nu_{i} \nu$, like $\mu^{\prime} \nu$, has a weakened vowel, which appears also in the Sanskrit inseparable preposition ni, "down," whence has arisen our German nieder, Old High German ni-dar (p. 382), which bears the same relation to na that the neuter interrogative kim has to the masculine kas. Au also, in analogy with कुतस् ku-tas, "whence?" कुत्र ku-tra, "where?" has been developed in our demonstrative, and appears in the interrogative particle नु $n u$, with which we compare the Latin num, and the Greek $\nu v$, which, in form, and partly in use, is identical with नु nu.* On the other hand, in

[^37]$\nu \hat{v}$, ñun, "now," which likewise belongs to the base na or nu, the original demonstrative signification is retained more truly. Are we to suppose in the $\nu$ of this word, as being a necessary corruption of final $\mu$, a remnant of the appended pronoun sma, and that the vowel preceding has been lengthened in compensation for the loss of the rest? Then $\nu \hat{v} \nu$ would perhaps admit of comparison with the Pâli locative nasmin, or namhi, and the change of $\alpha$ to $v$ would have first taken place in Greek through the influence of the liquids, as $\sigma^{v} \nu$ answers to the Sanskrit सम् sam, "with." Our nun, Gothic $n u$, is likewise related, as is also noch, as analogous to doch. The Gothic forms are nauh, thauh, to the final particle of which, $u h$, we shall recur hereafter.
371. The Sanskrit negative particle न $n a$, which appears in Gothic in the weakened form ni, comes next to be considered: in Old Sclavonic it is ne, ni, the latter only as a prefix.* So it is $n i$ in Lithuanian, in niekas," none," (ni-ékas, compare Sanskrit êkas, "one,") and kindred compounds; but elsewhere it is found as $n e$ : in Greek it is lengthened to $\nu \eta$, but only at the beginning of compounds, as $\nu \eta \kappa \kappa \rho \omega \varsigma, \nu \eta \kappa \eta \delta \eta^{\prime} s$ :
[G. Ed. p. 536.] in Latin it is found only as a prefix $\dagger$ in the form of $n e ̆, n \breve{u}, n \bar{e}, n \bar{\imath}$ (nefas, nefandum, neque, nisi, nimirum). This negative particle occurs in the Vêdas with the signification sicut, which points at its pronominal derivation. $\ddagger$ At least I think that we cannot assume a different origin for the particle in the two significations which are apparently so distinct: for if the idea $y a$, "yes," is denoted by a pronominal expression-in Latin by $i$ - $t a$, in Sanskrit by ta-thu, in Gothic by yai, of which hereafter-its opposite may be contrasted with it, as "that" to " this," and न $n a$ would therefore,

[^38]as "that," simply direct to what is distant; for to say that a quality or thing does not belong to an individual, is not to remove it entirely, or to deny its existence, but to take it away from the vicinity, from the individuality of a person, or to place the person on the other side of the quality or thing designated, and represent it as somewhat "other," than the person. But that which, in Sanskrit, signifies " this," means also, for the most part, "that," the mind supplying the place, whether near or renote, and the idea of personality alone is actually expressed by the pronouns. The inseparable negative particle $\boldsymbol{q}^{a} a$, too -in Greek the $\alpha$ privative-is identical with a demonstrative base (§. 366.), and the prohibitive particle मा $m \hat{a}=\mu \eta^{\prime}$ belongs to the base ma, (§.368.), and the Greek negation oú admits of being compared with a demonstrative, as will be shewn hereafter. Observe, further, that as न $n a$ in the Vêdas unites the relative meaning " as" with the negative, so the corresponding $n e$ in Latin appears both as interroga- [G. Ed. p. 537.] tive and negative ; in the former sense affixed, in the latter prefixed. It is further to be observed of the Sanskrit na, that when combined with itself, but both times lengthened thus नाना nâna -it signifies " much," " of many kinds," as it were, "this and that"; as totus also has been formed by reduplication (§. 351.). The Sanskrit expression, however, is indeclinable, and is found only in the beginning of compounds. We may here mention, also, the interrogative and asseverative particle नूनम् nûnam, which I agree with Hartung (l. c. II. 95.) in distributing into nî-nam, since I regard $n \hat{u}$ as the lengthened form of the $n u$ mentioned above, without, however, comparing nam with नामन् naman, " name," as the pronominal base $n a$ appears to me to be sufficient for the explanation of this Indian nam, as well as that in Latin; which latter, likewise, Hartung endeavours to compare with नामन् naman, "name."
372. We return to the compound wन $a n a$, the last element of which has been considered by us in §. 369. From ana
comes, in Sanskrit, the instrumental masculine and neuter सनेन $a n e ̂ n a$, Zend uju ana (§. 158.), feminine wनया anaya, Sclavonic onoyd (§. 266.), and the genitive and locative dual of the three genders anayds, which, in Sclavonic, has become onû for onoyû (§. 273.). In Lithuanian, ann $a-s$, or $a n '-s$, feminine ana, signifies "that," and, like the Sclavonic on, ona, ono, of the same signification, is fully declined, according to the analogy of tas, tà, $t^{\prime}, t a, t o,{ }^{*}$ being, in this respect, superior to the corresponding words in Sanskrit and Zend. To this pronoun belong the Latin and Greek an, äv, as also the Gothic interrogative particle an (Grimm. III. 756.), though elsewhere in the three sister languages the $n$ is thematic ; which is especially evident in Gothic, where, from a theme ana in the accusative masculine, only an could be formed,
[G. Ed. p. 538.] and the same in the neuter or anata. For the Greek and Latin we should assume that wन ana had lost its final vowel, as we have before seen एन êna abbreviated to ${ }^{\text {© }} \mathrm{EN}$ (§. 308.). But if the $n$ belonged to the inflexion, or to the appended pronoun सम sma, which appears to me less probable, then the simple base - $\quad a$ (§.366.) would suffice for the derivation of $a n, a ̈ v$.
373. As the Latin preposition inter is evidently ideutical with the Sanskrit antar and the Gothic undar, our unter ( $\$ \$$. 293. 294.), and $i$ is a very common weakening of $a$, we must class also the preposition in and the kindred Greek $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ with the demonstrative base $\boldsymbol{ज} \boldsymbol{a n a}$, although in and $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$, considered by themselves, admit of being referred to the base ₹ $i$, and the relation of ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu \theta a$ to the Zend vosidha, "here," might be deduced through the inorganic commixture of a nasal, as in ä $\mu \phi \omega$, ambo, answering to the Sanskrit ubhau and Sclavonic oba. I now, however, prefer regarding the $\nu$ of ${ }_{\epsilon} \nu-\theta a$, ${ }^{\prime} \nu \nu-\theta \epsilon \nu$, which bear the relation of locative and ablative to one another, as originally belonging to the base, and $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$

[^39]therefore, and the Latin in, the pronominal nature of which is apparent in inde, as connected with the Sanskrit खन ana. The $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ of eis, from évs, appears to me an abbreviation of the suffix $\sigma \epsilon$, which, in forms like $\pi o ́ \sigma \epsilon$, ă $\lambda \lambda \lambda \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$, expresses direction to a place, just as $\epsilon \hat{i}-\mathrm{s}$ is an abbreviation of $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma-\sigma^{i}$, $\delta o{ }^{\prime}$, of $\delta_{o}^{\prime} \theta_{l}, \pi \rho o ́ s$ of $\pi \rho o \tau i$. There would then be a fitting reason why eis should express direction to a place: it is opposed in meaning to $\epsilon \nu$, just as our hin, " towards," to hier, "here," only that the Grcek expressions have lost their independent signification, and only precede the particular place denoted of rest, or to which motion is implied; like [G. Ed. p. 539.] an article the meaning of which is merged in that of its substantive. The preposition $\dot{a} \nu a ́$, like the Gothic ana, our an, has preserved more perfectly the pronominal base under discussion: ává is opposed to кatá, as "on this side," to "on that side."* The Gothic anaks," suddenly," may likewise, in all probability, be classed here, and would therefore originally mean "in this (moment)." Its formation recalls that of $\ddot{a} \pi a \xi$, the $\xi$ of which is perhaps an abbreviation of the suffix $\kappa \iota \varsigma$ (§.324.). If the Gothic $k s$ is connected with the suffix of such numeral adverbs, then the removal of the $k$ has been prevented by the close vicinity of the $s$, though elsewhere the Gothic is not indisposed to the combination $h s$. In Lithuanian, an-day, from the base ana, points to past time, and signifies "that time," " lately," while ta-day refers to the future, and means "then."
374. The base wन ana forms, with the relative य $y a$, the combination खन्य anya, and, with the comparative suffix तर tara, सन्तर antara, both expressions signifying alius, and in both the final vowel of the demonstrative base being dropped; for which reason the Indian grammarians do not admit सन्य anya tobe a compound, any more than the previously discussed bases

[^40]ता tya, स्य sya; nor do they see in antara any comparative suffix,* particularly as, besides the irregularity of its formation, $\dagger$ it is removed, by its signification also, from the common pronominal derivatives formed with tara (§. 292.), and expresses, not " the one," or " the other, of two," but, like इ्तर
[G. Ed. p. 540.] itara, "the other" generally. In Gothic, anthar, theme anthara, which has the same meaning, corresponds; in Lithuanian antra-s, " the other," " the second"; in Latin, alter, the $n$ being exchanged for $l(\S .20$.), on which also is founded the relation of alius to क्षन्य anya-s, the base of which is preserved complete in the Gothic $A L Y \neq A . \ddagger$ The Greek äd $\lambda$ os is removed one step further than alius from the original form, and, like the Prâkrit सखा anna, and the Old High German adverb alles, "otherwise," has assimilated the $y$ to the consonant preceding it (compare p. 401.). On the other hand, षन्य anya exists in a truer form, but with a somewhat altered meaning, in Greek, viz. as ধ้̈ıo, "some," which may be well contrasted with the SanskritZend, anyê, "alii." From the base 'EniO comes also є̇viote " sometimes," as analogous to äддотє, єкка́бтотє, \&c., for the derivation of which, therefore, we need not have recourse
 other," and its theme is ino, and thus the $y$ of the SanskritZend anya has been lost. The feminine nominative in Sclavonic is ina, the neuter ino.
375. Together with anya, antara, and itara, the Sanskrit has also two other words for the idea of "another," viz. *पर apara, and पर para. The former may have sprung from the preposition apa, "from," as apa itself from the demonstrative base wa. With it is connected, as has been

[^41]already observed (§.350.), our aber, Gothic and Old High German afar (§.87.), the original meaning of which is still evident in abermals, " over again," " once more," Aberglauben, "superstition," Alerwitz, "over wit," "false wit." In Old High German afar means also, " again," like the Latin iterum, answering to इतरस् itara-s, " the other." पर para, is de. rived by apocope from apara: it is more [G. Ed. p. 541]. used than the latter; and though it has derivatives in the European cognate languages also, the Latin perendie may be among the first which has led to a reference to a word signifying "another." It should properly signify "the morrow," but the use of language often steps beyond the limits of what the actual form expresses; and thus, in the word alluded to, by " on the other day," not the next following is implied, but the day after to-morrow. The language, therefore, proceeds from " this day" (hodie) to cras-in which an appellation of day is not easily perceived-and thence to "the other day," perendie, the first member of which I regard as an adverbial accusative, with $n$ for $m$, as in eundem. In the Sanskrit parê-dyus, " morrow," paré, on the contrary, is apparently in the locative, and the last member in the accusative, if we regard it as the contraction of a neuter divas;* but in parê-dyavi both are in the locative. The Latin peren occurs also in perendino, perendinatio, the last member of which guides us to another Sanskrit appellation of day, viz. to दिन dina. But to dwell for a moment on दिवस् divas and पर para, I am of opinion that these two expressions are united in ves-per, ves-perus, and $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho a$, as it were दिवस्पर divas-para, which, if we look upon para as a neuter substan-

[^42]tive, would signify " the last, latest part of the day," and para, used adjectively, and prefixed to another appellation of day,
[G. Ed. p. 542.] actually occurs with this meaning; for parahna (from para + ahna) signifies "the later, or after part of the day" (see Glossary), as pdrvâhna does "the former, or earlier part." Consequently vesper would stand for dives-per; and this abbreviation of the appellation of day will not appear more remarkable than that of fa्वि् dwis, "twice," to bis. With respect to the loss of a whole initial syllable, I may refer to the relation of the Greek $\mu \epsilon i ́ \rho a \xi$, $\mu є є \rho a ́ \kappa ı \nu, ~ t o ~ क ु म ा र स ् ~$ kumâra-s, " boy," which, by the suppression of its middle syllable, but with the retention of the initial one, has been corrupted to кópos, кov̂pos. We turn now to another trace of पर para, "the other," in Latin, which we find in the first portion of pereger and peregrinus, and which we could not well suppose to be the preposition per. Pereger would consequently signify " being in another land," like the Old High German eli-lenti, and peregrinus, " who from another land." We might also refer per-perus to the same source, as the reduplication of perus = पर्श para-s, in which the " bad and wrong" is opposed to "the right," as the other. In the cognate Greek $\pi \epsilon \in \rho \pi \epsilon \rho o s$ the fundamental meaning has taken a more special direction. Lastly, the particle $\pi$ 白 $\rho$ remains to be mentioned, the use of which is more of a pronominal than a prepositional nature. A word, which originally signifies " other," was well adapted to give particular emphasis to a relative, so as to bring prominently forward the persons or things denoted by it as other than those excluded. In this light let the French nous autres, vous autres, and our German wenn anders, "if otherwise," "provided that," be considered, which is more energetic than the simple wenn, " if."*

[^43]From पर para comes in Sanskrit, pâra, [G. Ed. p. 543.] "the further shore," and from this párayâmi, " I complete": to the former answers $\pi \epsilon \in \rho a \nu$, to the latter $\pi \epsilon \rho \alpha \alpha^{*}$. In German, in the word under discussion the idea of "other" has been changed to that of "the further," Gothic fairra, "far," the second $r$ of which seems to have sprung from $n$ by assimilation. So early as even in Sanskrit, para occurs in the sense of "far," in the compound pardsu, "dead," "having life removed."
376. The Gothic yains (theme yaina), "that," Greek кeîvos,
 to their last element, with the bases in the cognate languages which are compounded with $n a, n o$; among which we may especially notice ana-s (an's) on, which has the same meaning in Lithuanian and Sclavonic. In the Doric t $\hat{\eta} \nu o s$, like т $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ícos, т тvíкa, the vowel of the article is lengthened (comp. §. 352.), and the Æolic к $\hat{\nu} \nu o s$ has the same relation to the interrogative base KO, that $\tau \hat{\eta} \nu o s$ has to TO. But in кєivos, to which éкєivos bears the same relation that $\epsilon \in \mu o \hat{v}$ does to $\mu 0 \hat{v}$ (§. 326.), instead of the base-vowel being lengthened an $t$ is introduced, and the $o$ is weakened to $\epsilon$ : compare, in the former respect, the Sanskrit $\hat{e}$ and the compound एन êna (§. 369.). So, also, in the Gothic yain(a)s, "that," an $i$ has been blended with the Sanskrit relative base य ya. But if in German, as in Sclavonic, a $y$ preceded the old initial vowel, as in yesmy = ष्षस्म asmi, Lithuanian esmi, "I am" (§. 255. n.), yains would then shew itself to be a cognate form to एन êna, "this," the real countertype of which we have, however, already found in the numeral ains, theme aina (§. 308.). In Greek, the word [G. Ed. p. 544.] $\delta_{\epsilon i v a}$, theme $\triangle E I N$, may also be classed here. It is a plural neuter, which has been peculiarly dealt with by the language: its $\epsilon$ has the same relation to the $o$ of the article that $\kappa \in i v o s$ has to KO (котє, ко́тєроע), and the tenuis has been removed,

[^44]as in $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ before mentioned (§. 350). The $\nu$, however, of $\Delta$ EIN can scarcely be connected with the appended pronoun $\boldsymbol{\pi} n a$, but is more probably a mere phonetic affix, as in TIN, of which hereafter, and in many words of our so-called weak declension (g. 142.).
377. The Zend demonstrative base been already repeatedly mentioned. In it we find a new and powerful confirmation of the proposition-which is one of importance for the history of language-that pronouns and genuine prepositions are originally one; for in the Sanskrit, in which ava has been lost as a pronoun, it has remained as a preposition, with the signification "from," "down"; as e.g. ava-plu, ava-tar ( (त̨ trī), "to spring from," " to descend," but the original meaning of which is "to alight down or at this (place)." In Sclavonic, ava has been changed, aocording to rule (§. 255. a), to ovo, which siguifies "this" and "that": its fem. nom. ova is almost identical with the same case in Zend-_s>s ava. With this form is connected the Greek aù of aùtós,* in which, after the suppression of the final vowel, the $v$ has been changed to a vowel. When used alone the pronominal nature of this base is most apparent in aiv $\theta$, "here," which, therefore, is not to be regarded as an abbreviation of aù $\boldsymbol{r} \delta \theta$, for it is quite as natural for the locative suffix to be attached to $a \hat{v}$ as to other prouominal bases. With the same
[G. Ed. p. 645.] signification as à̀ $\theta_{l}$ we might expect to find

 which corresponds in its base, suffix, and signification. But the Greek expression does not occur alone, but only in combination with $\begin{gathered}\nLeftarrow \\ \partial\end{gathered} a$ in $\hat{\epsilon} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta a \hat{v} \theta a \dagger$; and so, also, the ablative adverb $a \hat{v} \theta \epsilon \nu$ is retained only in the compound $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{\varepsilon} \theta \epsilon \nu$ (p. 480). The indeclinable $a \dot{\imath}$, the use of which is not opposed to its pronominal origin, has probably lost some suffix of

[^45]case or of another kind. If it were a neuter for $a \dot{u} \tau$ or $a \dot{u} \delta \bar{\delta}$ the suppression of the $\mathbf{T}$ sound would accord with a universal phonetic law (comp. §. 155.). Perhaps it is an abbreviation of $a \hat{v} \theta$ ss, which has the same meaning, or of aive, which latter agrees in its formation with the pronominal adverbs $\tau o \dot{\prime} \tau \epsilon$, ${ }^{\text {ö }} \tau$, тóte, though the signification has diverged.
378. Through a combination with the comparative suffix is formed aürá $\rho$, "but," with reference to which we must again advert to the relationship of our German aber (Old High German afar, "but," "again") with the Sanskrit apara, "alius." The suffix of à̇тáp is distinguished from the customary $\tau \epsilon \rho \circ$ s by the preservation of the original $a$-sound, and in this manner corresponds exactly to the Sanskrit antur (§. 293.). The Latin au-tem, on the other hand, appears to contain the superlative suffix, as $i$-tem in opposition to $i$-terum.* The $i$ of timus might easily be corrupted to $e$ in a word terminating with a consonant. I now, however, prefer regarding the suffix tem of $i$-tem and au-tem as not originating in the Latin language, but as identical with the suffix घम् tham, which, in Sanskrit, likewise occurs only in [G. Ed. p. 546.] two pronominal adverbs, viz. in इॅ्यम् it-tham, "so," and कयम् ka-tham, "how ?" with regard to which it may be left undecided whether their tham is connected, through a phonetic alteration, with the superlative suffix, just as thama in प्रथमस् prathama-s, "the first" (p. 379. 1. 12.). The Latin $a u-t$ appears to me an abbreviation of $a u-t i$, so that it agrees in its formation with $u t i, u t$, and $i t i$ in $i t i d e m$, as also with the Sanskrit इfत iti, "so." $\dagger$ With regard to the au of aufugio, aufero, I see no adequate reason for dissenting from the common opinion which regards it as a weakened form of

[^46]al.* On the other hand, the Sanskrit inseparable preposition ava, mentioned above (§. 377.), evidently re-appears in the Homeric av̇epv́ $\omega, \dagger$ without the ancient connection between this prepositional av and the particle aṽ being thereby removed, as, as has been remarked above, the Sanskrit preposition $a v a$ and the Zend demonstrative base of similar sound, are cognate forms.
379. It has been elsewhere pointed out $\ddagger$ that of the three forms into which the originally short $a$ in Greek has been distributed ( $\epsilon, 0, \breve{a}$ ), it is $\epsilon$ that most often occurs in places
[G. Ed. p. 547.] where a Sanskrit $a$ is combined with $u$; more rarely the weightier o; and the still heavier a never.§ The Greek diphthong av, however, corresponds to the Vriddhi diphthong षौ $\boldsymbol{a} u$, as $\nu a \hat{u} s=$ नौस् nâus: its $\alpha$ is therefore long, and is found so in $\nu \bar{a} o ́ s, ~ \& c ., ~ f o r ~ \nu \bar{a} F o ́ s=$ नावस् nâvas. If, then, the final vowel of the Indo-Zend ava, Sclavonic ovo, be removed, and then the $u$, formed by the melting down of the $v$, be combined in a diphthong with the initial vowel, we should have $\epsilon v$ or ov. As, however, av has arisen, we must regard the lengthening of the initial vowel as compensation for the final vowel, which has been suppressed. This compensation, however, does not take place universally; for as oviv is plainly shewn, by its use, to be of pronominal origin, $\|$ it may be best compared with our demonstrative base ava, of which it is

[^47]further to be remarked, that, in Zend, in departure from §. 155 , it forms the nominative and accusative neuter, not by $\wp t$ but by $m$. For avëm, according to $\S .42$., â̂m should be employed; but in its place we have the irregularform aom, and the same in the masculine accusative.* I agree with Hartung (l.c.) in considering the Greek oviv likewise as an accusative, whether it be masculine, or, as we may assume from the Zend aom, neuter. The negative particle ou is also to be classed here, according to what has been said in §. 371 ., and before, in my Review of Rosen's Vêda Specimen regarding the derivation of negative particles from pronouns: it has the same relation to oús which, owing to its terminating with a consonant, is used before vowels, [G. Ed. p. 548.] that, in Latin, the prefix ne has to nec, an abbreviation of neque. Oíc is, therefore, an abbreviation of ovict (with the change of the tenuis, oux $i^{\prime}$, the $\kappa i$ of which is, perhaps, connected with the Sanskrit enclitic pronominal base fachi, of which more hereafter. To this fि chi the च $c h a$, which is likewise enclitically used, and with which the Latin que is identical, bears the same relation that कम् kas, " who," has to its neuter कि म् $k i m$. If, then, the syllable $\kappa \iota$ of oivi is connected with the Indian fu chi, it is also related to the Latin que of neque (compare §. 380. , sul finem.)
380. It remains for us to shew that an offshoot of the pronominal base ava exists in German also. Such is our auch, the demonstrative signification of which is easily discoverable in sentences like er ist blind, und auch lahm, "he is blind and also lame," in which the auch adds to the quality "blind," as to "that," another "this:" he is lame and this,-blind." The auch performs the same service for a single quality that the conjunction dass, "that," does for an entire member of a sentence; for in sentences like "I am not willing (dass) that he should come, the conjunction dass expresses generally

[^48]or only grammatically, the subject of my will, and " he should come" expresses it particularly and logically. In Old High German, auh (ouh, ouc, \&c.) has other meanings besides "also," which are elsewhere expressed only by derivatives from pronouns, as denn, aber, sondern, "for," "but," \&c., (see Graff I. 120.), and the Gothic auk occurs only with the meaning "for."* If auch, "also," were the only meaning of the conjunction under discussion, in all German dialects,
[G. Ed. p. 540.] we might suppose it to be connected with the Gothic aukan, "to increase." $\dagger$ But what comection have denn and sondern ("for" and "but") with the verb "to increase?" Moreover, verbal ideas and verbal roots are the last to which I should be inclined to refer the derivation of a conjunction. All genuine conjunctions spring from pronouns (§. 105.), as I have endeavoured to shew in a particular instance in my Review of Forster's Grammar. $\ddagger$ But whence comes the ch of our auch? I do not think that it can be regarded in the same light as that of doch and noch, which have been likewise explained as pronominal formations, $\uparrow$ but, in Gothic, terminate with $h$ (nauh, thauh); while our auch bears the same relation to the Gothic auk that mich, dich, sich, do to mik, thuk, sik. The $k$, therefore, of $a u k$, may perhaps, in its origin, coincide with that of the so-called pronominal accusative, and, like the latter, belong to the appended pronoun स्म sma (§§. 174. 175.), which, in Zend, becomes hma, but in Prâkrit and Pâli is transposed to mha. But if the pronoun ava were used in

[^49]Pâli, its ablative would be avamhtr and locative avamhi (comp. §. 369. Table). In the Gothic auk the sounds which surround the $h$ in these forms are lost, and the final vowel of the base is suppressed, as in the Greek aùrós. With regard to the guttural, however, auk bears the same relation to avamha, avamli, that $i k$, "I," does to wहं ahan. If, of the forms of negation ov́k, oúki, oux $\chi^{i}$, mentioned at p. 533 , the last were the original one, we might suppose the $\chi$ to be related to the Pâli pronominal locatives in fम्ह $m h i$, as $\chi$ usually [G. Ed. p. 550 ] represents the Sansk!̣it and Pâli ह् $h$ (\$. 23.).
381. As regards the etymology of the base ava, the first member of it is easily perceived to be the demonstrative $a$, and the latter portion appears to be analogous to
 \&c., and with the accusative termination êvam, "so," from the base ê (§. 366.). $A$-va and $\hat{e}-v a$, thercfore, would be as closely connected as $a-n a$ and $\mathrm{d}-n a$; and as from the latter has arisen the Gothic term for the numeral "one," (theme aina §. 308.), so from êva would come the Zend numeral for "one," aéva, with a prefixed, according to §. 38. In Gothic, aiv (theme aiva) corresponds, which, however, as "all time," i.e. "eternity," answers to the cognate form in Zend as logical antithesis, or as "another" to "this." It may be observed, that it is highly probable that our all, Gothic alls, "omnis" (theme alla), has been formed by assimilation from the base alya, "alius," and has therefore experienced the same fate as the Greek $a ̈ \lambda \lambda o s$, Old High German alles, "else," and the Latin ille, olle. In Sanskrit, from the energetic subjective demonstrative base $s a$, "he," "this," "that," (\$. 345), arises the general term for "all," viz. सर्वे sar-va " every," plural सरे sarve, "all," and the adverbs of time, सदा sadh, and सना sand, "ever": from the latter comes the adjective मनातन sanattana, "sempiternus." The final member of sarva is identical with that of our wष ava, एष dea, and इष iva; and, with respect to the $r$, analogous
forms to sarva occur in etar-hi, "then," and kar-hi, "when?"* the $h$ of which I consider as an abbreviation of $d h$, and the whole $d h i$ as a cognate suffix to the Greek $\theta_{c}$ (compare $\S_{\text {. 23.). }}$
[G. Ed. p. 551.] Thus etarhi, exclusive of the prefixed pronoun $\ell$, answers to $\tau \dot{\delta} \theta l$, and $k a r-h i$ to $\pi o ́ \theta_{l}$, from $\kappa \dot{o} \theta_{l}$. In the Gothic, tha-r, "there," in our dar in immerdar, (always) darbringen, "to offer," darstellen, "to represent," \&c., and hva-r, "where?" (compare war-um, " wherefore," wor-aus. "whence," \&c.) the syllable $h i$ or $d h i$ of the Indian prototype is wanting. We may notice, also, the compound hvar-yis, "which?" the last member of which belongs to the Sanskrit relative base y ya. In Lithuanian we have in kittur (kit-tur), "somewhere else," a form analogous to the Gothic locative adverbs in $r$. With the Sanskrit sarva, "every," may be compared the Old High German satr, " omnino," our sehr, " much." But to return to the Gothic base aiva, we see clearly enough the pronominal origin of this word in expressions like ni aiv, "nunquam," ni aiva-dayk, "on no day whatever," and still more in our $j e$, "ever," Old High German, $e_{0}, i o$, which latter has been formed from aiv, by suppressing the $a$, and changing the $v$ into a vowel; and by this alteration it has become estranged from êwa, "eternity." A word, however, signifying merely eternity or time, would scarcely have entered into combinations like éo-man "aliquis," our "jemand," in which éo may be regarded as equivalent to the Zend afva, "one;" so, also, in eo-wiht " aliquid," literally, " one thing," or "any one thing": ionêr means "anywhere," and, with respect to its $r$, agrees with the abovementioned locative adverbs (thar, $h v a r)$, and, in regard to its entire final syllable, with pronouns compounded with $n a$, no (§. 376.); and this affords a striking proof that the preceding io cannot, from its origin,

[^50]be a term for denoting time. Perhaps, however, the Old High German io is not in all places the corruption of the Gothic aiv, for a short way of arriving at it is through the old relative base y $y a$. It is certain that the Lithuanian yui belongs to it, which, in its use before comparatives in sentences like yů bagotésnis yů [G. Ed p. 562.] szyksztésnis, "je reicher desto karger," " the richer the more niggardly," corresponds exactly to the use of the German language, only that, as may be done in German also, the same expression is always retained in the corresponding sentence, as, in Sanskrit, the idea of one* is expressed by attraction, after relatives by $y a$, and after interrogatives by $k a$ (see §. 308.). The Lithuanian $y \mathbf{i}$, however, is clearly the instrumental of the base $y a$, which elsewhere signifies "he," but, in this kind of expression, retains the old relative meaning. In Lithuanian, yo may be used for $y \mathfrak{o}$; and if this is not merely an abbreviation of $y \mathrm{ua}$ ( $y u 0$ ), it is the genitive of the pronoun referred to; for yis (for yas), "he," forms, in the genitive, yo. Ruhig renders, Je eher je besser, "the sooner the bettcr," by yo pirm-yaus yo geraus. $\dagger$ Graff (I. 517.) rightly compares the Old High German io with this Lithuanian yo, and the former must therefore be distinguished from the $i o$, which are evidently corruptions of the Gothic aiv.

[^51]In Latin we find in avum a form evidently corresponding to this aiv (theme aiva), and one which has quite lost a pronominal signification. It may be left undecided whether the Greek $\alpha i \omega \omega^{\nu}$ should be referred to this class. But we must remark that the syllable $v a$ of प्षव $a v a$, एव êva, and इव iva, is, as it appears to me, of itself a pronoun, and connected with the enclitic vat, "as." Perhaps the $v$ is a weakened form of $m$ (§.63.), and iva therefore connected with the demonstrative ima. Observe that the derivative suffixes vat and mat, in the strong cases vant, mant, are completely identical in meaning, as are also $\min$ and $v i n$.
[G. Ed. p. 553.] 382. We come now to the relative, the base of which is, in Sanskrit and Zend, $y a$, feminine $y d$; and the offshoots of which, in the European cognate languages, have been already frequently mentioned. With respect to the Greek ős, ${ }^{\eta}$, ${ }^{\circ}$, answering to the Sanskrit yas, ya, yat, we may notice how frequently the Indian य् $y$ is represented by the Greek spiritus asper. And ofs has the same relation to yas that $\dot{v} \mu \epsilon \hat{i}$ has to the Vêdic युष्मे yuṣhmé, "ye," $\dot{v} \sigma \mu i \nu \eta$ to युध्म $y u d h m a$, "strife," $\tilde{\eta} \pi a \rho$ to यकृत् yakrit and
 यम् yam, " to restrain." The circumstance, that the relative is dialectically replaced by the article, is as little proof of the connection of the two, as that, because our German welcher, " which," can be replaced by the demonstrative der, " the," it is cognate to it in form. Since, as early as Homer, the use of the true relative is very common, and the relative expressions öбos, oios, $\dot{\eta} \lambda i ́ \kappa o s, ~ \hat{\eta} \mu o s$, answer to the demonstrative derivatives то́боя, тоîos, т $\eta \lambda i ́ \kappa о \varsigma, ~ т \eta ̂ \mu о \varsigma, ~ w e ~$ may find in this alone sufficient evidence, exclusive of proofs drawn from the Sanskrit and other cognate languages, of the original existence of a distinct relative base in Greek.
383. In Zend the relative occurs also with a demonstrative meaning: thus we frequently find the accusative

6s.E yim in the sense of hunc. This guides us to the Lithuanian yis, "he" (euphonic for yas, §. 135.),* accusative yin. The dative yam corresponds with the Sanskrit yasmaii, Zend yahmai ; as does the locative yame (§. 176.) with yasmin, yahmi. In Sclavonic, ye is the most per- [G. Ed.p.554.] fect form that has been retained in the masculine and neuter singular of this pronominal base (see p. 368 G. ed.): in the neuter plural $y a$ agrees most exactly with the Zend and Vêdic $y d$ (§.255. a.), just as, in the nominative singular feminine, ya ( $y$ a-she, " which") corresponds to the Sanskrit-Zend $y a$. The masculine form $i$ is derived, as has been already remarked, by suppressing the vowel of the base, and vocalising the $y$, and thus resembles tolerably closely the Gothic relative particle ei $(=\hat{i})$. In Gothic, however, there exist derivatives from the base under discussion, which are even yet more similar. For instance, the conjunction ya-bai, "if," springs from it as the cognate form of the Sanskrit यदि ya-di, which signifies the same. The suffixes alone differ. The Gothic bai is a corruption of $b a, \dagger$ and appears in this form in the compound thaul-yaba. There is an analogous form to yabai, yaba, viz. iba, ibai, $\ddagger$ which is used particularly as an interrogative particle, and proceeds from the pronominal base $i$. Combined, also, with the negative particle $n i$, iba means " if"; thus niba (for ni iba, as nist, "he is not," for $n i$ ist), "if not," where we must remark that the Sanskrit 涢 $i t$ connected with $i b a$, as regards its base, likewise means "if"; and, indeed, in like manner only

[^52]in combination with particles preceding it; so that nêt ( $n a+i t$ ), "if not," is, as it were, the prototype of the Gothic $n^{\prime}-i b a$ (see §. 360.). It can hardly be that the suffix, also, does not contain somewhat of Sanskrit. I conjecture a connection with the syllables $v a$ in iva, "as," êv-a, "also," \&cc., and $\hat{e}-v a m$, "so," or what almost amounts to the same thing, with the enclitic वत् vat, "as." And thus the deri[G. Ed. p. 555.] vation of the Gothic adverbs in $b a$ may be shewn.* It cannot appear surprising that the $v$ is hardened to $b$, for in Bengâli every Sanskrit $v$ is pronounced as $b$, and in New German, also, we often find $b$ for the $v$ of the older dialects. In Lithuanian the $v$ of the Sanskrit iva, "as," is altered to $p$, as we have before seen $p a$ formed from ख swa (§. 359.). No more satisfactory derivation, therefore, can, in my opinion, be given for pronominal adverbs terminating in ipo or ip, than from the इष iva above mentioned, particularly as the latter is constantly subjoined, as तद् इव tad iva, "like this." So, in Lithuanian, taipo or taip, "so," i. e. " as this," from the base ta+ipo; kaipo or kaip, "how"? kittaipo, kittaip, and antraipo, antraip, "else." Another view of these expressions might be taken, according to which $i$ would be allotted to the principal pronoun, which would be regarded as neuter (§. 157.); thus tai-po, kai-po, \&c. In this case the vowel of the Sanskrit ₹ ${ }^{\boldsymbol{q}} \boldsymbol{i v a}$ would be lost in Lithuanian; but I prefer the former opinion, and believe that the Gothic hvaiva, "how"? taken as hva-iva, must be

[^53]referred to this class; for it cannot appear remarkable that the termination va, in Gothic, should not have been everywhere hardened to $b a$, but that a trace of the original form should be still left. But if the $s v a$, "so," answering to hvaiva, does not, as has been before conjectured, belong to the Sanskrit reflexive base स swa (§. 341.), I should then regard it as analogous to hvaiva, and divide it thus, $s^{3}-v a$, so that it would contain the demonstrative base $s a$, mentioned in §. 345 ., from which, in Sanskrit, [G. Ed. p. 556.] comes, among other words, सदृश sa-drisa," similar," literally " like this appearing." But to return to the Sanskrit yadi, "if," its $d i$ is probably a weakened form of the suffix, which we have seen above in द्रि $i t i$, "thus," and elsewhere, also, in ष्षति ati, "over," and altered to fि dhi in ख्रधि adhi, " on," "towards." The Prâkṛit जइ jaï (§. 19.) has quite dropped the $T$ sound, just as the Lithuanian yey: through both languages the Greek $\epsilon^{\prime}$ is, as it were, prepared; as to the connection of which with our relative base I have no longer any doubt, all being regular up to the suppression of the semi-vowel in the initial sound; and by a similar suppression we have not been prevented from recognising the Vêdic युप्मे yuṣhmé, " ye," in the Æolic ${ }^{v} \mu \mu \epsilon \varsigma$.
384. The Gothic particle yau, in the signification " whether." coinciding with the Sanskrit यदि yadi, which together with "if" means also " whether," supports the derivation of $b a$ from va, given above; for yau has essentially the same relation to yaba, that, in Lithuanian, taip bears to the more full taipo. The form yau; however, probably owes its origin to a time when, in more perfect accordance with the Sanskrit, yava for yaba was still used, whence, after suppressing the $a$, must come yau, as e.g. the base thiva, "servant," forms in the nominative thius, in the accusative thiu. But if $y a u$ arose at a time when $y a b a$ was already in use for yava, we should have to refer to the relation of the Latin au (aufugio, aufero) to ab. The Lithuanian has likewise a particle yau,
which is connected, in its base at least, with the Gothic: it signifies "already," i.e. "at this (time)", and therefore reminds us of jam, which, in Latin, is the only remnant of the pronominal base under discussion. Perhaps the $u$ in the Lithuanian form is the dissolution of a nasal, by which jam
[G. Ed. p. 657.] and yau would be brought still closer, and the latter would be related to the former, as buwau, "I was," to the Sanskrit wभृम् abhavam (compare §. 255. g.). With the Latin jam and Lithuanian yau must be classed, also, the Gothic yu, " now," "already," which, in respect to its $u$, is an analogous form to the $n u$, "now," mentioned above (p. 535 G. ed.), and, with than, forms the combination yuthan, "already." This furnishes a new proof that $y u$ is probably but an abbreviation of the Sanskrit घु dyu, " day;" for if this were the case, it would follow the demonstrative, and thanyu or thayu would be used, as in Latin hodie, and in Old High German hiutu, in Sanskrit a-dya, in Greek $\sigma \tilde{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \rho \nu$. The Old High German ie in $i e x u o$, whence our jetzo, jetzt, is probably a weakened form of the Gothic yu, and literally signifies "to this," with a preposition subjoined. It first occurs in an inscription of the twelfth century (Graff I. 516.), for which reason it cannot be matter of surprise that the $u$ is corrupted to $e$.
385. There remain to be noticed, in order to complete the list of the remnants of the Sanskrit relative base, the affirmative particle $y a, y a i$, (compare §. 371 .) and.the copulative yah, "and," "also." The form $y a$ may be taken as neuter, analogous to the interrogative hva, "what?" and, like the latter, it is indeclinable. The more usual form yai may have sprung from $y a$, through the inclination, which the $a$ manifests, even in Sanskrit, to form a diphthong with the addition of an $i$ (§. 158.). Hence there -arises an apparent affinity of declension with the sole pronominal neuter in Lithuanian, viz. tai. The copulative particle $y a h$ is identical in its final $h$ with the Latin que
and Sanskrit च cha, which is likewise subjoined, and which owes its origin to the interrogative base $k a$, on which we will bestow a closer examination in the following paragraphs.
386. The interrogative bases in Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 558.] are three, according to the three primary vowels, viz. $k a, k u, k i$. The two latter may be looked upon as weakened forms of the first and principal one, for which reason I shall take them in the order of the diminution of the weight of the $a$.* From क $k a$ springs the whole declension of the masculine, as also that of the neuter, with the exception of the singular nominative and accusative fकम् kim. The neuter का् kat, which is obsolete as far as regards its isolated use, and on which the Latin form quod is founded, is easily recognised in the interrogative particle कचित् kach-chit, euphonic for kat-chit: it also appears as the prefix in expressions like कदध्नन् kad-adhwan, $\uparrow$ "a bad street," literally, " what sort of a street!" Other interrogative expressions are similarly prefixed, in order to represent a person or thing as bad or contemptible, as I have already previously noticed. $\ddagger$ But since then my conjecture regarding the cognate form in Sanskrit has been still more confirmed by the Zend, where gat is actually the common neuter of the interrogative. From the masculine and neuter base $k a$ springs, in Sanskrit and Zend, the feminine base $k \hat{a}$, which, according to §. 137., appears in the nominative singular without inflexion. Not one of the European cognate languages agrees better

[^54]with the twin Asiatic sisters than the Lithuanian, in which the masculine nominative kas is completely identical with
[G. Ed. p. 559.] the Sanskrit कस् kas, over which, too, it maintains this superiority in the retention of the original form, that its $s$ remains unalterable, and is not liable to suppression, while the Sanskrit kas is changed into kah, kt, and $k a$, according to the quantity of the initial sound following, or before a following pause, and retains the origisal sibilant, according to a universal law of sound, only before $\pi$ त् $\boldsymbol{t}$, and च् $t h$, and changes it before च् $c h$, च $c h h$, or ट् $t$, ס् $t h$, into the sibilant of the corresponding organ. In the corresponding Zend form there is this remarkable peculiarity, that, if followed by the singular of the pronoun of the second person, the latter combines with the preceding interrogative, and forms one word-a combination which is of course only phonetic, and has no influence on the sense. Though I have no doubt this combination has been occasioned simply by the tendency in several languages to unite $s$ and $t$, or $t$, still in the case before us a conjunctive vowel has been, in the course of time, introduced in Zend; and indeed, according to the oldest MSS., an $\breve{e}, *$ in the sense of $\S .30$. As, however, in the edited codex of the V.S., in two out of four passages in which Gxvor ${ }^{2}$ gusug kašethwañm, " who thee," should be read, we find instead kas̉é thwanim; and in one passage, indeed, these words occur combined, but still with a long $\mathfrak{e}$, kasèthwanim; and, in the fourth case, there is an erroneous reading, kasitllawanm: I was therefore formerly of opinion (Gram. Crit. p. 327.), that we might consider the ê or $i$, combined with kas, as analogous to the Greek demonstrative $\uparrow$; a conjecture which must be withdrawn, owing to the various readings since published by Burnouf, and the inference (l. c. p. 108) thence deduced. With the dative

[^55]Wip te, and with $w, ~ n a$, " man," kas̀ forms, without
 kas̃ná (Burnouf 1. c. p. 409).
387. According to §. 116., from the San- [G. Ed. p. 560.] skrit-Zend-Lithuanian interrogative base $K A$ must come the Greek KO, which, retained in Ionic, has elsewhere become по, through the easy interchange of gutturals and labials. The declension, however, of this KO or $п \mathrm{O}$ is disused in favour of that of $\tau i s$, and the only remains of it are adverbs and derivatives, as $\kappa \dot{o} \tau \epsilon, \pi \dot{\prime} \neq \epsilon, \kappa \hat{\omega} s, \pi \hat{\omega} \varsigma, \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu, \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ (cf क्तरस् kataras, "whether of the two ?"), кóros, Tóvos, кoios, moios, which are clear enough proofs of the original existence of a кós, $\kappa \dot{\eta}, \kappa \kappa^{\prime}$. These form the foundation of those cases of the Latin interrogative and relative, which belong to the second declension, viz. quod (=مvg kat), quo, and, in the plural, qui, quorum, quos. The plural of the neuter qua differs from the common declension, according to which it should be qua. The form quø, however, may have remained from the dual, which is otherwise lost in Latin, and may have assumed a generally plural signification; for $q u a^{*}$ agrees, as has been already remarked (§.234.), exactly with the Sanskrit dual के $k \hat{e}$. The Latin feminine is founded, in the cases peculiar to it, on the Indo-Zend feminine base $k \hat{a}$ : compare, for instance, quam with काम् kadm, quârum with कासमम् kâsâm, quads with कास् kds. The singular nominative qua, however, is remarkable, standing as isolated in Latin grammar as the neuter plural nominative just mentioned; for the demonstrative hic (of which more hereafter), is, in its origin, identical with the pronoun under discussion, the feminine nominative of which should be qua, which it actually is in the compound ali-qua, \&c. Whence, then, the forms qua and ha-c? If they are not corruptions of $q u a$, for which no reason can be assigned, or

[^56]weakened forms of the originally long $q u \bar{a}$ (§. 137.), by the last element of $a(=\breve{a}+\breve{a})$ becoming $i$, [G.Ed. p. $\quad$ 61.] there is no course left but to regard the $a$ of qua, h $\mathcal{C}-c$, as a remnant of the feminine character $\mathbf{\xi} \hat{i}$, mentioned in §. 119 . As, however, in Sanskrit and Zend, the masculine and neuter $a$ of the primitive is dropped before this feminine $\hat{i}$, and from $\boldsymbol{\sigma} k a$ might be formed, in the feminine base, $k \hat{\imath}$ (compare §. 172.), but not $k e$, I now prefer, contrary to my former opinion,* the explanation pointed out above-that the long $\hat{a}$, which should be found in the uninflected nominative of bases in $a$, has, in the first place, been so weakened, as is usual in the vocative of the corresponding Sanskrit class of words, in which सुते sut̂, (=sutaï) "daughter!" bears the same relation to sutà that qua does to का $k d$; and, secondly, by the complete abbreviation of the $\hat{a}$, which, in Sanskrit, is the case only in a small number of vocatives, e.g. सम्म amma, " mother!" from amma.
388. In Gothic, according to a universal law of permutation, the old tenuis of the interrogative base has passed into $h$; and as gutturals freely combine with $v$, with this $h$ a $v$ has been joined as euphonic; hence $H V A$ from क $k a$, and, in the feminine, $H V \bar{O}$ (according to §. 69.) from का $k d$. The $v$ has remained alone in our wer, " who?" We have before drawn attention to the masculine nominative $h v a-s$, with respect to its granmatical importance (§. 135.), and have remarked that the feminine nominative $h v \delta$, as also $s 0$, "this," has not admitted, owing to its being monosyllabic, the shortening of the $\sigma$ to $a$, which takes place elsewhere in this case ( (§. 137.) In the neuter hva the inflection $t a$ is wanting, in which respect the Old High German huaz (Old Saxon huat) is more perfect. In
[G. Ed. p. 562.] Old Sclavonic, according to §. 255. a., a masculine and neuter base $k o$ and a feminine $k a$, might be looked for; but the simple declension of the interrogative does not

[^57]occur, but only that compounded with the definitive, originally relative pronoun (§. 282.): hence, nom. $k y-\check{\text { in }}$ ( $k o-i$, §. $\S .255$. $d$. p. 332.G. ed.), ka-ya, ko-e, genitive masculine and neuter $k o$-eyo, feminine ko-eya, \&c. The same principle is followed in Old High German, only the cases do not occur in which the combination of the interrogative base and old relative base would be most perceptible, with the exception of the instrumental huiu ( $=h$ wiu), German wie, the simple form of which would be huu (hwu). It is a question, however, whether huiu be really an instrumental, and not from the Gothic hvaiva, " how" (p. 555. G. ed.). The feminine, if it were used, would be, in the singular nominative, huiu, and, in the plural, huio (Grimm, 796.). The masculine singular forms huër, huës, huëmu, huën (or huënan); and the case is the same here with regard to the more concealed appended pronoun, as above with dër, dës, dëmu, dën (§.356.). The Old Saxon, on the other hand, clearly displays in the masculine nominative singular huie, the old relative base, just as in the demonstrative thie, which latter forms the truest countertype of the Sanskrit base Tutya (§.353.) The Middle Netherlandish shews quite plainly, in the whole masculine singular of the interrogative, the appended relative $\boldsymbol{y} y a$, the semivowel being corrupted to $i$ and the $a$ to $e$; but the guttural of the interrogative base has disappeared, and only the euphonic affix $w$ has remained; thus, $w$-ie, w-ies, w-ien, w-ien. With respect to the latter portion of the word compare the Sanskrit yas, yasya, yasmadi, yam; the Lithuanian yis, yo, yam, yin; and the Gothic yis, yis, yamma, yana, contained in hvar-yis (p. 551. G. ed.) The Old High German yenér is also to be viewed in the same light, the base of the old relative being added, that is to say, to the Gothic base yaina, and what has been said above [G. Ed. p. 563.] (p. 504) of dësér applies to the long e. Perhaps, too, the ef of the locative adverb ioner, "anywhere" (p. 536), which has been before mentioned, is to be viewed in the same light, as from iona-ir. The feminine of yenêr is yenu, with $i$ suppressed
(compare §. 288. Rem. 5. p. 383. G. ed.); on the other hand, in the Middle High German yeniu, and, according to Notker, eniu, and in the masculine, enêr. If these forms, in which the initial $y$ is wanting, are, not abbreviated from yenêr, yeniu, but genuine, then they would belong to the Sanskrit ana, "this," and Lithuanian ana-s, Sclavonic on, " that" (comp. Graff, I. 598).
389. We turn to the second interrogative base mentioned in §. 386., viz. कु $k u$, from which spring only the adverbs कुत्र ku-tra, "where?" and कुतम् ku-tas, " whence ?" perhaps, also, \&kwa, "where?" if it is to be distributed into $k u-a$, not into $k k^{\prime}-v a$; further in the Zend $د$ Gıg kutha, "how?" which would lead us to expect a Sanskrit कुणा kutha, for which, however, कथम् hatham is used; for कु $k u$ is prefixed in a deteriorating, derisive sense, as in कुतनु kutanu, " having an ugly body," properly "having a what sort of body?" a title of Kuvêra. In Zend this ku occurs as a prefix to verbs, where it gives additional emphasis to the negative expressed by poş nûit, and signifies "any one whatever." Thus we read in the beginning of the Vendidad,
 nôit kudat saitî́m* yêidhi zi nôit azëm daidhyanin, \&c., "not
[G. Ed. p. 164.] any one could have created them if I had not created them." Under this class might be brought the Latin genitive $c u$ - $j u s$ and the dative $c u-i$, which belong to the fourth declension, as the obsolete forms quojus, quoi, from the base $Q V O=K O$, क $k a$, do to the second. It is not requisite, therefore, to consider the classical forms cujus and cui as corruptions of quo-jus, quo-i; for as the base $c u$, as is apparent from the Sanskrit and Zend, is in its origin equally old with

[^58]QVO. from it may have proceeded cujus, cui, cujus, or cujatis, which may have existed together with quojus, quoi, quojas, as quid, from the base QVI, together with quod from QVO. Considering, however, that, in Sanskrit, the whole interrogative declension, with the exception only of kim, comes from the base $k a$-on which the Latin $Q U O$ is based-just as in Lithuanian it all comes from $K A$, and in Gothic from $H V A$; and that the rarely-occurring base $k u$ has, in the European cognate languages in particular, left us no traces which can be relied upon;-under these considerations I now prefer, contrary to my former opinion,* deriving cujus, cui, from quajus, quoi; so that, after rejecting the $o$, the semi-vowel preceding has been changed into a vowel, as, in Sanskrit, $u$ frequently appears as the abbreviation of the syllable va, as ukta spoken for vakta, and even in the Latin cutio (concutio) from quatio. Qu, however, $=k v$, whether the $v$ in this place be pronounced like the English $v$ or German $w$-and the Latin like the Gothic (§.86. 1.) loves the euphonic addition of a $v$ after gutturals; hence the forms $Q V O$ and $H V A$, in the interrogative, correspond in their difference from the Sanskrit, Zend, and Lithuanian $K A$, and thus aqVa, and the Gothic ahva, "river," shew an agreement when [G. Ed. p. 565.$]$ contra3ted with the Sanskrit स्ष ap, " water," with the common interchange between gutturals and labials. We must observe, also, the relation of ang $V$ is to the Sanskrit प्षहिम् ahi-s, " snake," and Greek é $\chi$ 's. If, then, as I doubt not, oujus, cujas, cui, spring from quojus, quojas, quoi, as cum, "since," from quum, cur, from quare, then we must also derive $u t e r, u t i, u t, u b i$, and $u n d e$, from lost forms like quoter, \&c., and the latter would correspond tolerably well with the Gothic hvathar (§. 292.). It is certain that uter, and the other interrogative and relative expressions commencing with $u$, have lost a preceding guttural, as amo has, compared with कामयामि kdmayami, "I love," and nosco, nascor, from gnosco, gnascor. The more perfect culli, cunde, is still preserved in the com-

[^59]pounds ali-cubi, ali-cunde; ${ }^{*}$ as the root of the verb substantive is retained more truly in the compound participles ab-sens and pree-sens, than in the simple ens, answering to the Sanskrit cat, nominative san, accusative santam. Under this head are to be classed, also, unquam, usquam, uspiam, usque: the interrogative meaning, however, is removed by their last element, just as in quisquann, quispiam, and quisque. In abbreviating $c u$ (from QVO) to $u$ all these forms agree, in some measure, with our German wer, " who?" in which only the element which has been added for the sake of euphony, according to §. 86. 1., has remained of the consouants which belonged originally to the base. It might, indeed, be asserted, that the $u$ of uter, and other interrogative "expressions beginning with $u$, has nothing in common with the euphonic $v$ of the base $Q V O$, but that it is the original $a$ of [G. Ed. p. 566.] क $k a$ weakened, and that thus uter is a corruption of कातरस् kataras, by simply dropping the $k$ and changing the $a$ to $u$. To this it may be objected that $u$ in Latin, does, indeed, often enough correspond to an Indian $a$, but still principally only before liquids and before a final $s$ : the wa of कतरस् katara-s, however, it might be expected, would, under the most favourable circumstances, remain unchanged, or, more probably, be altered to $\check{\breve{ } \text {, as in кóтєрov }}$ or to $\check{e}$ or $\grave{i}$.
390. The third interrogative base fक $k i$ is more fertile of derivatives than कु कु $^{6} k$, both in Sanskrit and in the cognate languages. From it comes the word kim, "what"? (as nominative and accusative) which has been frequently mentioned, which is so far isolated in Grammar, as otherwise substantive and adjective neuters in $a$ alone make $m$ the sign of the nominative and accusative singular (§. 152.),

[^60]and bases in $i$ use the simple theme. We should have looked, therefore, for ki, or, according to the pronominal declension, fित् $k i t$, before sonant letters fąe $k i d$. Of the prior existence of this form there can be scarce any doubt, after what has been before said of the neuter $₹ \boldsymbol{F} \boldsymbol{i t}$ and चित् chit: it is, however, confirmed by the Latin quid and the Lithuanian kittur, "elsewhere," which I regard as a compound, and distribute thus kit-tur, with regard to which the szit-tas before cited ( $(357$.), may be again brought to notice, which, with reference to its lost portion, is identical with that of kit-tur, of which mention has been before made as locative adverb. That, in Sanskrit also, there existed a masculine nominative. किस् kis, as prototype to the Latin quis, perhaps with a more full declension, is proved by the compounds माकिस् mâkis and नकिस् nakis, which occur, perhaps, only in the Vêdas, and the former of which probably signifies the same as the corresponding nêquis (from mêquis, §̧.371.), and Zend máchis,* [G. Ed. p. 567.] while the latter agrees in meaning with the Zend naéchis, " not any one," "no one." Grammarians, however, include both expressions among the indeclinables, and write them माकिर् makir, नकिर् nakir, which Colebrooke renders, together with माकिम् makim and नकिक् nakim, by "no," "except," $\dagger$ without signifying that they are masculine nominatives, which might be very easily understood without the aid of the Zend.
391. Other derivatives from the interrogative base for

[^61]$k i$ are kîdriśa, "similar to whom ?" and analogous forms, of which more hereafter, and कियत् kiyat, "how much?" in the strong cases (§. 129.) fियन् kiyant, hence nominative masculine kiyân, accusative kiyantam. As $k$ easily passes into $h$, and, in Germanic, the old tenues are almost always changed into aspirates, and e.g., $k$ to $h$; and as ढ़् $h r i d$ and hridaya, "heart," correspond to the Latin cor and Greek $\kappa \hat{\eta} \rho$ and карঠía; so, perhaps, also $h i$, "for," may be regarded as the weakened form of fo $k i$, with the transition of the interrogative signification into the demonstrative, which is easily intelligible, and which occurs also in the Greek ró $\rho$, which, with regard to its formation, appears analogous to the Gothic hvar, thar, and Sans. kar-hi. As to the change of the tenuis to the medial, it cannot be more a matter of difficulty than in $\delta_{\epsilon}^{\prime}$ and $\delta \epsilon i \nu \alpha$ ( $\S \S .350 .376$.). We may here mention, as derivatives from the interrogative, the particles $\kappa \epsilon$ (Doric $\kappa \alpha$ ), $\kappa \in \nu, \gamma \in($ Doric $\gamma \alpha)$. The Sanskrit hi, [G. Ed. p. 568.] however, occurs in हस् hyas, " yesterday," which I think may be distributed into $h i+a s$, and considered as " that day;" for words which signify " yesterday," " to-day," "to-morrow," (as far as the elements, concealed in them, and often so altered as to be quite undistinguishable, admit of any derivation at all,) can be traced only to pronouns and terms denoting "day." The as, therefore, of hy-as, may be a weak remnant of divas, "day," as in our er of heuer-Middle High German hiure, from hiu-ydru-there is concealed the word Jahr, "year," which is in Zend $\varepsilon / 2 \omega$, yaree, a remuant of which is to be found, also, in the Latin hornus, with $n u$, no, as derivative. In the Greek $\chi^{\theta \text { és, the } \theta}$ appears to have arisen by a kind of semi-assimilation from the older semi-vowel (compare §. 300. p. 414 G. ed.), by which its etymology is still more obscured. In the Latin heri, from hesi (compare hes-ternus, Sanskrit hyas-tana-s), a demonstrative element is more perceptible than in $\chi^{\theta}{ }^{\prime}$ s, from the partial retention of hic. The $g$ of the German gestern, "yes-
terday," Gothic gistra.* is a consequence of the regular transition of old aspirates into medials, but otherwise the gis, to which the tra is affixed as mark of derivation, resembles the Sanskrit बस् hyas tolerably well.
392. From gestern we proceed to morgen; but we must first settle the derivation of a word, which, in Sanskrit, signifies "all," "every," and in which I recognise an affinity to ख्षस् śwas, "to-morrow"; I mean विष्य viśwa, which, in
 Lithuanian is changed by assimilation into wissa-s, whence wissur, "everywhere," analogous to the abovementioned kittur, "elsewhere." The first portion of the Sanskrit विश्य viswa, I believe to be the preposition [G. Ed. p. 569.] $v i$, which expresses "separation," " dissipation," "diffusion," and, with the aid of a pronoun, may be well adapted to express the idea "all." There remains 피 śwa, as a pronoun, in which it may be observed, that श् $s$ is of guttural origin, and represented, in the classical languages, by $k, c$ (§. 21.); so that 壮 sura appears to be related to the interrogative base, with a euphonic $v$, as in the Gothic $H V A$, and Latin QVO. Observe further, that, in Lithuanian, ka-s, combined with the appended particle gi, which is probably a softened ki, signifies both "who then ?" and "every." And without gi, kas diên', means "all days," and diênisskay, with the interrogative appended, signifies the same. But to return to the Sanskṛit विश्य $v i$-śsa, " all," I take its latter portion to explain श्रस् śwas, "to-morrow," with which the Latin cras is connected (§.'20.) We should, however, probably distribute thus, s-vas, so that the pronominal base is represented only by its consonant, as in the Sclavonic $k$-to, "quis?" (§. 297.). The syllable बस् vas, however, we refer to दिवस divas, an appellation

[^62]$r$
of "day," which would therefore be less altered by one letter than in सस् $h y$-as, "yesterday," and which agrees with the Latin ves in ves-per (§. 375.).
393. We return to the interrogative base for $k i$, which has led us to its corruption $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{E}} h$, and thence to the derivation of खस् $h y$-as, "yesterday," and चुम् śuas, " morrow." In Zend I have hitherto found the base gai, unchanged only in the neuter plural nominative, 2 sg $k y-a$ (from ki-a) (§. 233.); with which may be compared the Latin qui-a, which Max. Schmidt (De Pron. p. 34), perhaps rightly, has taken as the plural neuter. The Sanskrit and Zend, therefore, mutually complete the declension of the interrogative, so
[G. Ed. p. 670.] that the former admits the base ki only in the nominative and accusative singular; the latter in the plural ; while in Latin the corresponding $Q V I$ enters more largely into the declension; so that quis and quem have quite dislodged the quus and quum, which might have been expected from the base $Q V O$, or, in the case of the latter word, have restricted it to its use as a conjunction. And in the dative plural, quibus has abolished the use of quis, queis, which spring from QVO. In the ablative singular, however, quī, from QV1̈, has been superseded by $q u \overline{0}$, from QVO, or its use has been much diminished by it; just as, in the plural, the obsolete ques is supplied by qui and quos. I have elsewhere noticed, that four declensions (the first in the feminine), enter into the declension of the Latin relative interrogative and hi-c, which is identical with it in origin.* The use of the fourth is, however, only apparent, as cu-i above has been shewn to be a contraction of quoi, which belongs to the second declension, and, with respect to the more true retention of

[^63]the case-termination, agrees with other obsolete forms, as popoloi Romanoi (§. 200.).
394. That hic is identical in origin with quis, qui, is shewn by its sharing in the peculiarities and mixed declension of the latter,-peculiarities which belong exclusively to hi-c and qui, quis, viz. the feminine ha-c, and the plural neuter of the same sound. The reason of the nonexistence of $h \breve{a}-c$, together with the form given above, as might have been expected from the analogy of aliqua, siqua, \&c., is, that hacc does not occur at the end of compounds; for it seems not to admit of any doubt that qua is reduced
[G. Ed. p. 571.] to quă, on account of the increased weight of the compound, which has occasioned the lightening of its latter part. Though si quis, ne quis, may be written separately, and a word may sometimes be interposed between them; still, where they occur together, they really belong to one another, and form a compound, like the corresponding माकिस् mâkis, नकिस् nakis, in Sanskrit, and, in Zend, uspuug machis, Us, jecture expressed at §. 387., I now prefer regarding the neuter-plural forms qua and heec, not as remains of a dual, and thus corresponding to the Sanskrit के $k e$, but as exhibiting in their $a$ a weakening of the older $a$, which originally belongs to the nominative and accusative plural of the neuter of bases in $\breve{o}$ (from $\breve{a}$ ); but which in Zend, according to §. 231., is retained only in monosyllabic themes, just as, in the nominative singular feminine, its being monosyllabic is the cause of the retention of the original length of $a$ (§.137.). This principle is observed in Gothic in both places; thus si (from sa), "hac," hvo, "que?" and, in the neuter plural, in which the interrogative cannot be cited, tho. This thb, then, being the only monosyllabic form of its kind, and remarkable for its $\bar{\theta}(=\hat{a})$, for $\dot{a}$, as has been noticed by Grimm (I. 790.), coincides with the Latin quce and $h e-c$, which, both in the singular nominative feminine
and neuter plural, are the only monosyllabic forms of their kind; and as, for this reason, they are qualified to retain the long. $a$, that letter is not entirely shortened, but changed to $a(=\check{a}+\check{\imath})$, and afterwards, in compounds, reduced to short $a$, which is more suitable to polysyllabic forms: thus we have aliqua, both in the feminine and in the neuter plural.
[G. Ed. p. 572.] 395. Hi-c resembles the Sanskrit fe hi before mentioned in the irregular change of the old tenuis to the aspirate. This change, however, is not admitted in ci-s and ci-tra, which are likewise demonstrative, and akin to fo $k i$; ${ }^{*}$ and, in hic, may be promoted or occasioned by the accession of $c$, in order that like initial and final sounds may be avoided; as in Sanskrit, to prevent the recurrence of gutturals, these, in the syllable of reduplication, are weakened to palatals; hence चकार chakâra, "he made," for $k a$ $k A r a$; and, according to the same principle, though anomalous, चहि jahi, " kill ye," for hahi, from the root हन् han. Thus also, in Latin, hic, hac, hoc, for the less euphonious cic, ccec, coc. The final $c$ is, I doubt not, an abbreviation of ce, which is again combined with itself in hicce; but ce, as also pe in quip-pe (from quid-pe), is only another form of gue, by abandoning the euphonic affix $V$. As, then, que, pe, quam and piam, which are all originally interrogative, when they are attached to an interrogative destroy its interrogative meaning, and give a different sense to the pronoun; so also the $c$ of hic makes a similar change in it, and should therefore accompany this pronoun through all its cases, as it perhaps originally did. In the neuter hoc the case-sign makes way for the $c$, as hodc would be pro-

[^64]nounced with difficulty. The interrogative meaning is similarly destroyed by the enclitic $u h$ in Gothic, which is also identical in its origin with the $c$ of hic or the que of quis. que.* And hvazuh (euphonic for hvasuh, [G. Ed. p. 578.] §.86.5.) actually signifies "quisque"; and after verbs uh means "and," e.g. gaggith quithiduh, "ite diciteque" (Marc. xvi. 7.); yah bigêtun ina quêthunuh, "et invenerunt eum dixeruntque (Joh. vi. 25.). In yah, "and," therefore (§. 385.), the copulative force may lie principally in the $u h$, which is abbreviated to $h$, and to which the preceding relative base serves only as the fulcrum; as, in Sanskrit, the particle aा va, "or" (cf. Latin ve), which ought always to be subjoined, is attached, when prefixed, to यदि yadi, "if," or क्षा atha, " then," which then lose their signification, like the Latin $s i$ in sive. As to the abbreviation, however, of $u h$ to $h$, this regularly occurs in monosyllabic words terminating in a vowel; hence $h v \delta$ - $h$, " quœque," is the formal countertype of hea-c, just as sva-h, " so," from si-c and ni-h (" and not," nih-nih, "neither, nor"), from nec. Nauh, " yet," and thauh, " but," form an exception, inasmuch as they ought to be divided $n a-u h$, tha-uh, not nau-h, thau-h. It is clear, however, that, in Gothic, in these expressions the composition with $u h$ has been lost sight of: they are obscurely transmitted from an ancient period of the language, and the separate elements of composition are no longer perceived in them. But regarded from the Gothic point of view, how is $u$ to be derived? I agree with Grimm in considering it as $h u$ transposed, and connected with hun, which is likewise enclitic (III. 33.), and occurs almost only in negative sentences; so that $\boldsymbol{n i}$ ainshun and ni hvashun signify " not any one whatever." Hun, like the Latin quam, may be an accusative, but of the masculine gender, [G. Ed. p. 574.] as feminines in Gothic have generally lost the accusative

[^65]sign. But if hun be the accusative masculine it has lost the final $a$, which is added in Gothic to the original final nasal (§. 149.): in this respect it agrees with the adverbial pronominal accusatives than, " then," \&c., and hvan, " when ?" "how?" Perhaps, however, hun is only a contraction of the latter, by suppressing the $a$, and changing the $v$ into a vowel, just like the Latin cujus, cui, from qVojus, qVoi (§. 389.), and like cum from $q V u m$. But in the Gothic there was greater ground for this abbreviation, as hun occurs only in composition, and must not therefore be too broad. The same applies to $u h$ as the transposition of $h u$, inasmuch as this is actually a contraction of the base HVA. The possibility, however, of a different derivation of $u h$ and hun will be shewn subsequently (§. 398.)
396. To the Sanskrit-Zend interrogative base $k i$, and the Latin QVI, HI, and CI, the Gothic demonstrative base $H I$ corresponds; of this, however, as of the Latin $C I$, from which it is only distinguished by the legitimate transposition of sounds, but few derivatives remain, viz. the dative himma, and the accusative hina, as also the adverbial neuter accusative hita, which are used only with reference to time ; himma and hita in the sense of "now," and himmadaga, " on this day," " to-day," hinadag, " this day." The adverb hi-drê, "hither," is also a derivative from HI; and hêr, "here," is likewise irregularly connected with it, being, with respect to its $r$, analogous to the thar and hvar mentioned at §. 381. A regular and undoubted derivative of the base HI, viz. hir, occurs in the compound hir-yan, " to descend"; in which, however, the pronominal expression has an accusative meaning, signifying direction to a place. [G.Ed.p.575.] On the Gothic accusative hina is based the German hin, properly " to this or that (place)," which supplies the place of a preposition in compounds like hingehen, " adire." Instead of the Gothic dative in himmadaga, the Old High German uses the instrumental hiu,
contained in hiutu, German heute," to-day "-according to Grimm's very satisfactory derivation, an abbreviated form of hiutagu-and which is found also in the Middle High German hiure, German heuer, "this year," which presupposes an Old High German hiuru, and is evidently an abbreviation of hiu-yâru; for the Latin hornus cannot be considered as the root, but must itself be compounded of a demonstrative and an appellation of "year," the age of which is shewn by the Zend (compare §. 391.). In Old High German, in combination with naht, " night," we find the form hînaht, Middle High German hînaht, and hînte, German heunt, for heint. I agree with Grimm in considering $h \hat{\imath}$ as an abbreviation of hia, which must be supposed to exist as the accusative feminine; so that the suppression of the $a$ is compensated by lengthening the $i$, which is short of itself. The base HI, therefore, is lengthened in the feminine in the same manner as, in Gothic, the base $i(\S .363$.), the feminine accusative of which, iya (euphonic for $i a$ ), coincides with the to-be-presupposed Old High German hia, the nominative of which was probably hiu, in analogy with siu, accusative sia (§. 354.). This opinion is supported by the Anglo-Saxon and Old Frisian, which express "he," by this pronoun, but, in the feminine, lengthen the base $h i$ by the inorganic affix mentioned; thus, Old Frisian, hiu, "ea," hia, "eam"; and for the former, in Anglo-Saxon, hëo, and in the accusative $h i$, abbreviated from hia. As, then, as appears from what has been said, the base $H I$ refers principally to appellations of time, it may be observed that the Sanskrit had already furnished the example for this by its हास् hyas, " yesterday," from hi+as.
397. The Latin ni-hil is to be mentioned [G. Ed. p. 576.] here, the $l$ of which springs perhaps from the frequent corruption of $d$ to $l$ or $r$, a weakening which takes place especially in compounds, to prevent the whole word from becoming too ponderous. In this respect we may adduce the instance of
the number ten (दशन् dasan, $\delta \in ́ \kappa \alpha$ ), the $d$ of which becomes $r$ in Hindústání and Bengálí, in the compound numerals eleven, twelve, \&c. (p. 442), and $l$ in Germanic and Lithuanian. If, then, nihil is a corruption of nihid, it then literally means "not something"; and may thus be compared with the Zend at §. 390 ., the neuter of which, which I am unable to cite, can scarce be any thing but posporvin naêchit. From nihil, as in its change to $l$ the inflexion is no longer perceived to be the case-sign, might easily come the lengthened form nihilum, and hīlum, after removing the negation, and lengthening the vowel. The Sanskrit intensitive particle कित kila must also be mentioned, which has also probably proceeded from the pronominal base कि ki. And from this quarter must be further adduced खिलस् khila-s, " $v a$ cuum," the negative of which, ष्षखिल akhila, signifies " all," "whole," literally, "having nothing empty"; whence, by assimilation, may have arisen the German all, Gothic alls, theme $A L L A$, supposing it has not been formed by a reverse assimilation from $A L Y A$, "alius." With regard to the Latin omnis, the conjecture has been already elsewhere expressed, that its $o$ is a particular modification of the negative $a$, and mnis may be an abbreviation of minus; so that o-mnis would properly mean "having no minus," and would be based on the same ideal process as the Indian स्रसिल akhila.
[G. Ed. p.577.] 398. The reason that the Sanskrit माषिस् makis, नकिस् nakis, mentioned at §. 390., are, in Zend, corrupted to $c h$, as softer and weaker than $k$, is more suitable in forms encumbered by composition. The same explanation may be applied to the Sanskrit appended particle chit (for kit, §. 390.), the use of which, in Zend, is more extensive, and which is there combined, amongst other words, with katara, "uter," whence, in the nominative masculine, קת katarasakit (V.S. p. 40.), which, when con-
trasted with the Latin uterque for cuterque, and the Gothic hvataruh, is clearly seen to be cognate in form, as in meaning. In Sanskrit, also, षित् chit removes from the interrogative expression preceding it its interrogative force, and forms kaschit, "any one," "one," from कस् ka-s, "who?" and similarly in the other genders; and so kadâchit, "at any time," kathanchit, "in any manner," kwachit, "any where," from kada, "when?" katham, "how?" and kwa, "where?" And as the base chi has proceeded from ki, in the same manner the enclitic $\nabla$ cha, which signifies "and," "but," and "for," springs from the principal base $k a$, which therefore appears more corrupted in cha, than the Latin QLO in the enclitic que. The Sanskrit v cha is further combined with $n a$, and forms चन chana, which is likewise enclitic, and occurs principally, if not solely, in negative sentences like the Gothic hun mentioned above: na kaśchana signifies "nullus," na kadâchana, "nunquam," and na kathanchana, "nullo modo." Hence the appended na may be regarded both as the negation, and as strengthening what is expressed by the simple phrase. But by this चन chana a derivation may be given to the Gothic hun, different from that furnished above (p. 558). It is certain that if the $u$ of hun is not the vocalised $v$ of hvos, it can only have proceeded from an older $a$, whether from the influence of the liquid (\$.66.), or from the weight [G. Ed. p. 578.] of the vowel of the appended particle being lessened on account of the composition. But if hun be identical with chana from kana, I should also prefer regarding the $u$ of the appended particle $u h$ ( p . 557 ), not as the solution of an older $v$, but as the weakened form of a prior $a$; and thus $u h$ from $h u$ might be compared with the Sanskrit cha from kn.
399. As expressions, which occur chiefly in negative sentences, readily adopt, as it were, a negative nature, so that, even when the true element of negation is omitted, they obtain an independent n'gative force, as e. $y$. the French rien by itself
signifies " nothing," and the Old High German nih-ein, "nullus," has, in the German kein, lost precisely that which is the element of negation; so we may suppose that, in the Old Northern expressions, before the enclitic $k i$ or $g i$ (Grimm III. 33.), a particle of negation originally existed. In the present state of the language, however, the said particle is of itself negative; e.g. eingi, "nullus," einskis, "nullius," mangi, " nemo," manskis, "neminis," vaetki, "nihil." I consider this particle to be a derivative of the old and widely-diffused interrogative base $k i$, which, by its being always subjoined to some other word, has been protected from the usual alteration of sound; so that, in the sense of $\S .99$., the old tenuis has been left unchanged after $s$, but the medial has been introduced after vowels and $r$.
400. With regard to what has been observed of the Old Sclavonic, §. 388., that its interrogative base ko occurs only in combination with the definite and originally relative pronoun, it must, however, be understood that $K O$, after the $o$ is dropped, is combined also with the demonstrative base $T O$, since $k t o$
[G. Ed. p. 579.] signifies "quis," though to by itself is only neuter; and in the masculine nominative and accusative, as in all bases in 0 , this vowel is suppressed. In the oblique cases* kto abandons the demonstrative element, and appears as the simple base $K O$. Compare the genitive $k o-g o$ and dative $k o-m 乞$ with the Sanskrit $k a-s y a(\S .269),. k a-s m a ̂ i$. The instrumental kym follows the declension of the definite adjective ( $\S .284$. ), and is, therefore, not simple. The neuter is attached to the Sanskrit-Zend softened interrogative base chi, and is, in the nominative, chto, with the vowel of the base suppressed, as in the masculine kto. The oblique cases likewise drop the demonstrative element : the genitive is che-go

[^66]and che-so,* dative che-mu, locative che-m, instrumental chi-m. These forms may be explained in two ways: either the $e$ of che-go, \&c., is a corruption of the $i$ of the SanskritZend base chi, as the bases gosti and kosti (\$.280.) form, in the dative and locative plural, goste-m, goste-ch, koste-m koste-ch; or the original base chi has assumed, in Sclavonic, a second inorganic affix, and been lengthened to CHYO (compare §. 259.), from which, according to §.255. n., must be formed chye or che, and then, by rejecting the final vowel, chi, as, §. 282., we have seen the base $y o$ in several cases contracted to $i$. Compare, also, §. 280., the declension of the bases $K N \not \subset A Z \not \subset O$ and $M O R \mp O$.
401. There remains to be mentioned the Greek interroga-
 The origin of both is, I have no doubt, similar, and they are derived from the bases $k i$ and chi, which, in Sanskrit and Zend, have not only an interrogative signification, but, under certain circumstances, an indefinite one also. In Greek the old theme in $\iota$ has been lengthened by the affix of a $\nu$; but, in regard to its $\tau$, TIN has the same relation to chi and to the Latin QVI that $\tau \in ́ \sigma \sigma \alpha \rho \epsilon S$ has to चत्वारम् chatwâras and quatuor, and that $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mathrm{TE}$ has to पष्व pancha and quinQVE. Still I am not of opinion that the Greek $\tau$ in these forms has arisen from the $c h$ of the cognate Asiatic languages, but that it has sprung directly from the orginal $k$, from which, at the time of the unity of language, $c h$ had not as yet been developed, as this letter has, in the classical languages also, no existence, but was first formed in Italian from the Latin $c$ (always $=k$ ) before $e$ and $i$. But if $k$ has been frequently changed into the labial tenuis, and thus IO has been formed

[^67]from $K O$, $\pi \in ́ \mu \pi \epsilon$ from the to-be-pre-supposed $\pi \in ́ \gamma \kappa \varepsilon$, we may also see no difficulty in its occasional transition into the lingual tenuis, particularly as $t$ is the primary element of the Indian ch. But if ris comes from kis, and is akin to the Latin quis and Sanskrit ki-s and chi-t, then 'perhaps, also, the particle $\tau \epsilon$ is connected with que and the corresponding $\begin{aligned} & \text { 『 }\end{aligned}$ cha (§. 398.), and has therefore sprung from кє, and is alien to the base of the article, which would be at variance with my former conjecture.*
402. Here may be mentioned, also, the Old Sclavonic enclitic particle she ( $\boldsymbol{\text { (玉E) , which signifies "but," and has the }}$ effect of restoring to the pronoun $i$, "he," its original relative signification (§. 282.), for $i$-she signifies " which." On
[G. Ed. p.581.] the other hand, when combined with interrogatives, it removes, like the Latin que, their interrogative meaning; hence, ni chesoshe, "nihil," " not of any thing." $\dagger$ I consider this particle as identical with the Sanskrit v cha, " and," " but," " for," and with the Latin que, and therefore as a derivative from the interrogative base, the tenuis of which appears in this particle, as in the Greek $\gamma \epsilon$ and $\gamma \alpha \rho$ (§. 391.), to have descended to a medial. $G$ in Sclavonic before $e$, however, is regularly changed, in several parts of grammar, into $s h$; as in the vocative singular, where, in bases in 0 , this vowel is weakened, as in Greek, to $e(\mathbf{E})$; but by the influence of this $e$ the $g$ preceding becomes sh, hence, boshe, " God!" from the base BOGO, nominative bog, whence, also, boshiz, " godlike." I intentionally select this word as an example, since it is important to me to be able'to compare it with an Indian appellation of the highest divinities: I think, that is to say, that the Sclavonic base $B O G O$ is identical with the Sanskrit भगषत् bhagavat, "the exalted, the worthy of veneration,"

[^68]literally " gifted with happiness, power, splendor." This bhagavat, nominative bhagavan, occurs principally as an appellation of Viṣhņu, e.g. in the episode of Sunda and Upasunda (III. 23.), and in the title of an episode of the Mahâbhârata, Bhagavad-Gîtu, i.e. "Song of the exalted," because it refers to Krishna, an incarnation of Viṣhnu. Referring to Brahmâ and Viṣhṇu, bhayavat is only used adjectively; thus Sunda and Upasunda III. 24. and IV. 23. : it comes from bhaga, with the suffix vat, in the strong cases vant ; but bhaga comes from the root bhaj, "to venerate." The Sclavonic base BOGO has dropped the derivative suffix of the Sanskrit bhagavat; but this appears in an abbreviated form, and with an inorganic affix, in bogat [G. Ed. p. 582.] (theme bogato), " rich," which, too, might be the meaning of भगषत् bhagavat, as "gifted with fortune."
403. The same relation that, in an etymological respect, the Sclavonic sh has to $g$, ch has to $k$, and springs from the latter according to the same rule by which $g$ becomes $s h$, viz. before $e$; hence, teku," I run," in the second and third persons forms techeshi, techet, on the same principle by which mosheshi and moshet come from mogû, "I can." Although, then, above, at $\S .400$., we have seen the Sanskrit-Zend interrogative chi in the same form in Sclavonic, or in that of che —che-go, " of whom ?" chim, " by which?" chto, " what ?" for che-to or chi-to-it is not requisite to assume that these forms brought the sound ch with them from the East, because there exists an interrogative chi there also ; but in the Sclavonic and its Asiatic cognate idioms the weakened ch might have arisen independently from the old guttural, which, perhaps, alone existed at the time of their identity; and in the Sclavonic, according to a phonetic law which has been given, an interrogative form che would have proceeded from ki or kya, though in Sanskrit and Zend a base chi never existed.

## DERIVATIVE PRONOMINAL ADJECTIVES.

404. By the suffix lea are formed, in Sanskrit, mâmaka, " meus," and tavaka, "tuus," from the genitives of the personal pronouns, mama, tava, with the vowel of the first syllable lengthened. To these the Vêdic plural possessives are analogous; asmâka, "our," yushmâka, "your," from which we have seen the plural genitives of the personal pronouns
[G. Ed. p. 583.] asmâkam, yuṣhmakam, formed. Perhaps, as Rosen conjectured,* these forms spring from the personal ablatives asmat, yushmat, so that the suppression of the $t$ is made up by lengthening the preceding vowel. It must here be observed, that, as has been already repeatedly remarked, the $t$ of the nominative and accusative singular neuter of pronouns of the third person, as also that of the ablative singular and plural of pronouns of the first and second persons, is so far used as a theme by the language, that it is retained at the beginning of compounds, where otherwise we find the mere base (compare §. 357.); and that several derivative words have proceeded from the form in $t$, whether the $T$ sound has been actually retained in them (§. 405.), or replaced by lengthening the vowel preceding. On the Vêdic asmaka, "our," is based the Zend $\quad$ uguffers ahmaka, whence V.S. p. 30, the instrumental I am unable to cite the possessive of the singular, and of the second person, as the use of possessives in Zend, as in Sanskrit, is very rare, because they are generally supplied by the genitives of the personal pronouns.
405. In Sanskrit, possessives are formed with the suffix ${ }^{\text {§ }}$ $\hat{\imath} y a$, from the ablative singular and plural of pronouns of the first and second person, and from the neuter tat of the third person; also from सर्व sarva, "every," the $a$ of which is rejected before the suffix $\hat{\imath} y a$, while $t$ is changed before it into $d$;

[^69]hence madîya, "mine," from mat; twadîya, "thine," from twat; asmadiya, "our," from asmat; yushmadiya, " your," from yushmat ; tadiy, ", "belonging to him, to this man, or belonging to her, to this woman," from tat.* An analogous formation is, I think, to be found in the Greek [G. Ed. p. 584.] idos, whether it belongs to the demonstrative base $i, \dagger$ and the $\delta \delta$ preceding the cos be identical with the Sanskrit $i t$ (before sonant letters id), contained in नेत् nett, and चेत् chett, and the Latin id; or whether-and this conjecture I prefer-the breathing has been softened, and "'ios for "idos belong to the reflexive (§. 364.); with regard to which it may be remarked, that the cognate Sanskrit ख swa, "his," signifies, also, "own," and can be applied to all three persons. There does not, indeed, exist, in Sanskrit, a pronoun of the third person devoid of gender, with a perfect declension, but only the remains of one, सयम् swayam, "self," and, in Prâkrit, से sé (for swê) "sui" (§. 341.). There is, however, every reason for supposing that स swa, as a personal pronominal base, did possess a complete declension analogous to the pronouns of the first and second person. Its ablative must, therefore, have been खत् swat; and thence might have arisen swadîya, "suus," analogous to madiya, twadiya, and a cognate form to i'sios for ídos, from $\sigma F^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} i o s$; like $i \delta \rho \omega \bar{s}$, from $\sigma F i \delta \rho \omega{ }^{\prime}$, corresponding to the Sanskrit सेद swêdu, and the German Schweiss," sweat"; and
 to form, the correlatives moios, toios, oios, which appear to have lost a middle $\delta$, agree with the possessives in ईंय iya: in other respects, toios answers tolerably well to tadíya-s, which has not only a possessive, bat also a clear demonstrative meaning. $\dagger$

[^70]406. The Sclavonic possessives are based on the Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 585.] in îya, but have dropped the $\hat{i}$ of this suffix, and the $T$ sound of the primitive pronoun. According to §. 257. य ya must become yo, and according to §. 255. n., yo becomes ye or $e$ : the latter is the form assumed; and in those cases which are uninflected, and at the same time deprived of the final vowel of the base, the $y$ has become $i$, as always takes place after vowels: hence mǒ̆, "meus," moya, " mea," moe, " meum," corresponding to the Sanskrit ma-dîya-s, madîya, madîya-m. And in the second person, tvol̆, tvoya, tvoe, bears the same relation to twadîya-s, twadiyd, twadîya-m; and the possessive third person, svoŭ, svoya, svoe, presupposes, like the Greek idoos-if this stands for idoos
-a Sanskrit swadîya. It appears that these possessives have been transmitted to the Sclavonic from the ancient period of the language, and are, as it were, the continuance of the Sanskrit forms; for if they were originally Sclavonic we should then find in them the same corruption of the base of the primitive pronouns that we have before remarked in those pronouns. The possessives would then most probably be, in the nominative masculine, meny or mny, teby, seby, or toby, soby; but no case of the personal pronouns would lead us to expect moĭ, still less tvot̆, svoĭ. In Lithuanian, on the contrary, the possessives mána-s, táva-s, sáwa-s, are comparatively of quite recent date, for they agree with the particular modification of personal bases in the oblique cases singular (see §§. 340. 342.): thus, in Latin, meus, tuus, suus, probably from mei, tui, sui; and in Greek, è $\mu o ́ s$, $\sigma$ ós, ós, are, in their theme, identical with that from which
 $\sigma \phi \eta^{\prime}, \sigma \phi o ́ v$, is the exact countertype of the Sanskrit swa-s, swa, swa-m, which affords the oldest example of possessives without any affix expressing the possession; for swa is purely personal in its form, and, as has been already observed, the [G. Ed. p. 586.] theme of सयम् swayam, "self." (§. 341.).

The formation of possessives in the plural numbers by the comparative suffix is peculiar to the Greek and Latin; but this suffix is not extraordinary in possessives, which prominently contrast the person or persons possessing with those not possessing, and thus contain a duality, which the comparative suffix in pronouns is adapted to express.
407. The Lithuanian plural possessives are musiszkis, " our," yusiszkis, " your," the theme of which terminates in kia (§. 135.), and reminds us of the Sanskrit possessives in $k a$; viz. asmâka, yuṣmatka. It is certain that the syllable si in $m u S I_{s z k i s, ~ y u S I s z k i s, ~ i s ~ c o n n e c t e d ~ w i t h ~ t h e ~ a p p e n d e d ~ p r o-~}^{\text {a }}$ noun सम sma (compare §. 335.); but we shall leave undecided the origin of the $s z(=s h)$ which precedes the $k$. The Old Sclavonic forms the plural possessives nas, vas, from the genitives of the personal pronouns, by the same suffix, which we have noted in moŭ, tvor̆, svoŭ, only with the necessary phonetic difference; hence nashy, "our," vashy, "your,"* genitive nashego, vashego. With this suffix, the interrogative forms, in Sclavonic, also a possessive, viz. chit, "belonging to whom ?" feminine chiya, neuter chie. It belongs to the Sanskrit weaker base $k i$, which we have already noticed in chego, chim, \&c. (§. 400.). As to the weakening of the $k$ to $c h$, we must refer to what has been said on this subject at §. 403.
408. The Germanic possessives are most intimately connected with the genitives of the personal [G. Ed. p. 587.] pronouns, and are identical with them in their theme (p. 474). If it be assumed that, in the genitive plural, the forms unsara, izvara, like the Latin nostri, vestri, nostrum, vestrum, and the Sanskṛit aṣmâkam, yuşhmâkam, are of possessive origin, the $r$ may then be very satisfactorily explained as the

[^71]weakening of the $d$ of the Sanskrit asmadîya, "our," yushmadiya, "your." Observe what has been remarked at p. 441 regarding an original $d$ becoming $r$ in a similar case, and, noreover, the circumstance that, in Hindústání also, the $d$ of the possessives under discussion has become $r$; hence, mêra,* méri, " meus," " mea," for मदीय madíya, मदीया madiya. The dual genitives, ugkara, igqvara, and the dual possessive bases of the same sound, the singular nominatives masculine of which are ugkar, igqvar, are, according to what has been remarked at $\S .169$., originally only different modifications of plural forms, and their $r$, therefore, is founded on the same principle with that of the plural number. If we are to suppose that the singular genitives meina, theina, seina, have proceeded from possessive bases of the same sound, we should then have to assume a weakening of the medial to the nasal of the same organ, as, in general, an interchange between medials and nasals of the same organ is not unusual. But as to the formation, in New High German, of an inorganic possessive, foreign to the old dialects-viz. ihr, "ejus (feminc) proprius," and "eorum or earum proprius," from the feminine genitive singular and the genitive plural of the pronoun of the third person, which is common to all the genders-this circumstance affords no proof that the genuine and original possessives also have sprung from the genitive of the personal pronouns; but only shews that it is agreeable to the use of language to form possessive adjectives from the personal genitives.
[G. Ed. p. 588.] 409. The forms corresponding in sense to the
 Zend, those with the derivative suffix vant, in the weak cases vat ( $($. 129.), before which an $a$ final of the primitive base is

[^72]lengthened,* perhaps as compensation for the dropping of the $T$ sound of the neuter, which probably forms the foundation and theme of these forms (compare §. 404.); hence तावन्त् tâvant, nominative masculine तावान् tâván, tóros, याषन् yâvant, nominative masculine यावाज् yâvân, öros. From the interrogative base $k a$, or the lost neuter $k a t$, we might expect kâvant, which would serve as prototype to the Latin quantus, and would bear that relation to it, which तावन्त tâvant does to tantus. In the Latin tantus, quantus, therefore, a whole syllable is rejected, as in malo, from mavolo; but externally the theme is lengthened, in analogy with the Pâli participial forms mentioned at pp. 300,301; thus tantus for tâvantus, and the latter for tavans. The quantity of the $a$ of quantus, tantus, on account of its position, cannot be discovered: the $a$, however, appears to spring from an originally long $\hat{a}$, inasmuch as from a short wa probably $\check{e}$ or $\check{o}$ would be evolved, as in tot, quot, answering to तfि tati, कात kati, of which hereafter. In Gothic, the suffix बन्त् vant is corrupted in three ways; first in consequence of the easy mutation and interchange of the semi-vowels; $\dagger$ secondly through the no-less-frequent vocalization of the nasal to $u ; \ddagger$ and lastly by extending the theme with $a$, [G. Ed. p. 589.]

[^73]$\ddagger$ See $\oint \oint .236 .255$. g. and 307.
which, however, in accordance with §. i 35 ., is suppressed in the nominative. In the first and last respect LAUDA coincides very remarkably with the form which, in Latin, the suffix बन्त् vant assumes, or may assume, where it does not form pronominal correlatives, but possessive adjectives, as opulentus (with the more organic opulens), virulentus,* \&c. The long vowel required in Sanskrit before the suffix vant, where it forms correlatives, is retained in the Gothic hvelauds, "quantus," the old $\hat{a}$ (§. 69.) being supplied by $\hat{e}$; whence it appears as if the instrumental hvé were contained in hvé-lauds. We should expect a demonstrative thêlauds, róros, as corresponding to hvêlauds, móros, analogous to the Sanskrit तावन्त् tâvant and Latin tantus: this thelauds, however, is rendered superfluous by a svalauds, formed from the original base of the genderless pronoun of the third person (comp. §.341.), which, however, has not preserved the original long vowel.
410. The derivative kâvât, from the Sanskrit interrogative base ka, which is wanting, is supplied by kiyant, from the base $k i$; analogous to which is इयन्त् iyant, "so much," from the demonstrative base $i$. I conjecture fक्यन्त् kiyant
[G. Ed.p.590.] and इयन्य iyant to be abbreviations of $k \hat{v}$ ant and $\hat{i} v a n t$, formed by suppressing the $v$; after which, in accordance with a universal phonetic law, $\dagger$ the preceding $\hat{\imath}$ must become iy. This conjecture is supported by the Zend, in so far as the interrogative form under discussion has retained the full suffix vant : instead of this, however, an abbreviation has taken place in the base, by suppressing the $i$ and weakening the $k$ to $\rho c h$, hence in the nominative

[^74] neuter pospr chvat. + To the Sanskrit relative yavant cor-
 unable to quote any case in the masculine, and only the neuter yavat and the feminine yavaiti. The former occurs tolerably often; the latter I am acquainted with only through a passage given by Burnouf, $\ddagger$ where, in the lithographed codex (V.S. p. 83), avaiti occurs, through an error, for yavaiti§ The tâvant which answers to [G. Ed. p. 591.] the above interrogative and relative expressions, appears to be wanting in Zend, as in Gothic, and is supplied by analogous derivatives from other demonstrative bases; viz. by卫) The latter forms, in the masculine nominative, not avan̈̀, according to the analogy of chvan̆s, "how much ?" and thwâvañs, "as thou," but qus> aváo, which I agree with Burnouf || in explaining by supposing that the nt has given

[^75]place before the nominative sign $\grave{s}$, and has been supplied by the lengthening of the $a$ to $a$; which latter, with the final sibilant, must produce the diphthong $a_{0}$ ( $\$ .56^{6}$.).
411. The Lithuanian idant, which signifies "that" and "thoroughly," is most probably a remnant of the forms which terminate, in Sanskrit and Zend, in vant, and in Latin in $n$ tu-s ; and, indeed, in the $d$ of $i$ Dant, the neuter case-termination appears to be retained, which is replaced in the cognate Asiatic languages by lengthening the preceding vowel: the syllable $y a$ of the relative base has, then, been contracted to $i$. The pronominal origin of this idant is shewn by its signification "that," and also particularly by the circumstance that other terms also for this conjunction have sprung, both in Lithuanian itself and in the cognate languages, from the relative base under discussion; viz. yeib (\$. 383.), in the sense of $u t$, Sanskrit ya-tha, Greek $\dot{\omega}$, Gothic ei (§. 365.), and $y \delta g$, in the sense of quod, Sanskrit yat, Greek ötr. The secondary idea of multitude, expressed in Sanskrit, Zend, and Latin, by the formations in vant, is represented in idant by the signification "thoroughly." From the particular case of the lithuanian language, however, we could scarcely argue
[G. Ed. p. 592.] the possibility of a connection between the suffix ant of $i d$-ant, and that of kieli, "how many ?" Kieli is a masculine plural nominative, according to the analogy of geri from GERA : the theme, therefore, is KIELA, and, for a few cases, KIELIA (see p. 251, Note $\ddagger$ ); and $l a$ the derivative suffix, which admits of being regarded as an abbreviation of $v a-n t$, with a similar exchange of $v$ and $l$, as we have seen above in the Gothic hvelauds. This conjecture is strongly supported by kièlets, which likewise means "how much?" but is so limited in its use that it can only be applied to living beings. Every letter of the Sanskrit suffix vat (the theme of the weak cases) is represented in this kiéLETs, and we even find an interrogative expression, in which the $n$ also of the strong form बन् vant is contained;-I mean
kolinta-s, "der wievielste?" " the how manyeth ?"* with ta as ordinal suffix (8. 321.), probably, therefore, for kolint-tas; so that kolint, "how many?" by adding ta-s, becomes the "how manyeth ?" But to return to id-ant, its suffix ant has lost only the $v$ of the original vant; but la, the suffix of kieli, has retained the $v$ in the form of $l$, and lost, in place of $i t$, the final $n t$. There is, however, no demonstrative tieli corresponding to kieli, but "so many" is expressed by tiek or tiekas, $\dagger$ which has also a corresponding interrogative kiek. The suffix of these forms appears connected with that of tokis or toks (theme tokia), "such," and kôks," what kind of one?"
412. Though at §. 409. we commenced with the comparison
 therefore, suppose that the Greek suffix $\mathbf{\Sigma O}$ is identical with the Sanskrit vant, and those related to it in the cognate languages. The transition of $\mathbf{T}$ into $\Sigma$, as also [G. Ed. p. 593.] the affix of an 0 , would not be extraordinary; but as the vowel of the pronominal base is originally long in this derivative, the retention of this long vowel would be to be expected in Greek; and the rather, as most probably the dropping of the initial sound of the suffix vant would have found a compensation in the preceding syllable, even if this had not been naturally long from the first. A form like tovoos might be regarded as identical with the Sanskrit tavant; but $\boldsymbol{\text { óros }}$ appears to me, with reference to its final element, as of a different origin, and I would rather recognise in it the Zend
 د»» the Sanskrit swa-s, " suus." From सस् swa-s, which, when uncompounded, has become ös or $\sigma$ фós, hardly any thing

[^76]but $\sigma o ́ s$ could arise in the preceding compounds; and $\pi o ́-\sigma o s$ would, according to this view, originally signify " what part?" or, as possessive compound, "having what part?" from which the meaning "how much?" is not far removed.* Nevertheless, if what has been before said (§. 352.) regarding the origin of $\tau \hat{\eta} \mu o s, \hat{\eta} \mu 0 \varsigma$, is well founded, there are not wanting in Greek points of comparison with the pronominal formations in vant or vat. In Sanskrit the adverbial neuter accusative तावत् tavat signifies, amongst other things, also
[G. Ed. p. 594.] "now," "at this time"; and the relative adverb यावत् yâvat, also, which serves as prototype to the Greek $\hat{\eta} \mu o s$, is used principally with reference to time, and signifies "how long?" " while," "how often?" "how far ?" " up to," and "that." It may be cited in the first sense from a passage in the Nalah (V. 23.): -
ŷavachcha mê dharishyanti prânâ dêhê, suchismitê tâvat tvayi bhaviṣhyami; satyam êtad bravîmi tê
" quam diuque mei constabunt spiritus in corpore, sereno-risu pradita! tam diu tecum ero; veritatem hanc dico tibi."
As it frequently happens that one and the same word is divided into several forms, of which each represents one of the meanings which formerly co-existed in the one original form, so may also $\tau \in \in \omega s$ and $\notin \omega s$ be identical with tavat and yâvat; so that the digamma, which has been hardened above to $\mu$, has been here, as usually happens, entirely dropped, but the quantities have been transposed; thus éms

[^77]for $\hat{\eta}(F)$ os, $\tau^{\prime} \in \omega s$ for $\tau \hat{\eta}(F)$ os. But it is probable that the first syllable has been shortened through the influence of the vowel following; and this weakening, and the abbreviation caused by dropping the digamma, have been compensated by lengthening the syllable following. The common adverbs in $\omega$, also, of which an account has been given at §. 183., have operated by their example on éc $\omega$ s, $\tau$ écus. For the rest there exists a form $\tau \in i o s$, as well as téms, teíws.
413. Perhaps the Sclavonic pronominal adverbs in mo may also be classed here, which express direction to a place (Dobr. p. 430): ka-mo, " whither?" ta-mo, "thither." The relative yamo is wanting, which would coincide with the Sanskrit याबत् yâvat, "how far?" in the signification "therein," since the former word likewise expresses the direction to which movement is made. As to the relation in form of the suffix mo to वत् vat, the $t$ in Sclavonic, like all original final consonants, must necessarily disappear (§. 255.l.), and $a$ in Sclavonic becomes $o$ or [G. Ed. p. 695.] $e$ almost universally; but to the long $a$, which, in Sanskrit, precedes the derivative suffix, the Sclavonic $a$ corresponds according to rule (§. 255. a.): thus ta-mo, answers to the Indian ta-vat, with $m$ for $v$, as in the Greek adverbs of time $\hat{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}, \tau \hat{\eta} \mu o \mathrm{~s}$, above mentioned. If an origin for the Sclavonic suffix mo, different from that here assigned, be sought for, the appended pronoun रम sma might be next adduced. which drops the $s$ in Sclavonic. But to take the demonstrative as an example, to the Sanskrit dative ta-smai, and locative ta-smin, correspond, in Sclavonic, to-mû, to-m; and all that is left to find is an analogous form in Sclavonic to the ablative तस्मात् ta-smat. But the ablative is most opposed in meaning to the adverbs in mo, expressing direction to a place; and, as regards form, we could only expect for तसात् $t a-s m a t$, a form toma or tomo, and not $\boldsymbol{t}$ amo. For as the Sanskrit short $a$, at the end of old Sclavonic bases always becomes o (§.257.), an unweakened
$a$, in this sole case, cannot but appear surprising; and there appears no reason why ta-mo should differ from the analogy of $t o-m \hat{u}$ and $t o-m$. There only remains one other possible means of deriving adverbs in mo, viz. by supposing mo to be a more full form of the plural dative termination; so that, of the Sanskrit termination r्पष् bhyas, Latin bus, Lithuanian mus or ms (see §. 215.), which elsewhere, in Sclavonic, has become mere $m$, in the case before us a vowel also is retained. If this opinion be the true one, kamo, " whither?" tamo "thither," inamo, "to somewhere else," onamo, "to that quarter," and similar forms, must be assigned to the feminine gender. Tamo, therefore, would
[G. Ed. p. 596.] correspond to the Sanskrit tabbhyas; while tyem, which is identical with the masculine and neuter, belongs to the compound base mt tya (p. 499 G. ed.). This last derivation appears particularly supported by the consideration, that, in all probability, the adverbs of quantity in $m a$ or $m i$ (Dobr. p. 430) contain plural case-terminations, and those in $m i$ the instrumental; those in $m a$ an unusual and more full form of the dative termination, in which the old a of the bhyas above mentioned is retained, by which it becomes similar to the dual-termination given at $\$ \mathbf{8 7 3}$. It appears to me, however, inadmissible to look for a real dual inflexion in the adverbs under discussion. Examples are : kolyma or kolymi, "how much ?" tolyma or tolymi,* "so much." All these adverbs, however, have the syllable ly (from li) in the middle; and this, in my opinion, expresses the secondary idea of multitude, and is an abbreviation of the suffix liko, nominative masculine lik, e.g. kolik, "quantus," of which more hereafter. From this KOLIKO come, I imagine, the adverbs kolyma and kolymi, as, in Sanskrit, the plural instrumental श़नैम् śandis, expresses

[^78]the adverb "slowly," but does not occur in its own proper signification, i.e. "through the slow." There are also adverbs of quantity in Sclavonic which end in ly, without the case-terminations $m a$ or $m i$; thus koly, "how much?" toly, "so much." With these are also probably connected the adverbs of time in lye, which prefix to the pronoun the preposition do or ot, e.g. do-kolye, "how long?" ot-tolye, " so long."
414. By the suffix fit $t i$ is formed, in Sanskrit, बकित kati, "how much ?" from ka; ताि tati, " so much," from ta; and the relative यf yati, "as much," from ya. The first two expressions are easily recognised in the Latin quot and tot, which, like the personal terminations of [G. Ed. p. 597.] verbs, have lost the final i. The full form is preserved, however, in compounds with dem, die, dianus; thus, totǐ-dem (not from tot-itidem), quoti-die, quoti-dianus. The length of the $i$ of quoti-die, and of its derivative quoti-dianus, is inorganic, and perhaps occasioned by quoti appearing, by a misapprehension, as an ablative. But to return to the Sanskrit kati, tati, yati, these expressions, in a certain measure, prepare the way for the indeclinable cognate forms in Latin, as in the nominative and accusative they have no case-termination, but a singular neuter form, while in the other cases they exhibit the regular plural inflexions. In this respect they agree with the numerals from 5-10, which have become quite indeclinable in Greek and Latin likewise, as is quatuor, in the latter language, also (§.313.). In Zend, kati frequently occurs after the masculine relative plural, and with a regular plural termination, viz.

415. Nearly all pronouns are combined in Sanskrit with the adjectives दृश्र dris', दृश dri'sa, दूष्ब driksha, which spring from the root dris," "to see," and signify "appearing," "like"; but, as they do not occur either isolated or in combination, have completely assumed the character of derivative
suffixes. The final vowels of the pronominal bases, and of the compound plural themes asma and yuṣhma, are lengthened before them, probably to make up for the loss of a $T$ sound of the neuter of pronouns of the third person and of the ablative of the first and second person singular and plural (comp. §. 404.); hence, tâ-dris' (nominative tâdrik), or ta-driśa, or ta-driksha, "to this like," "such," "talis," for tad-dris', \&c.; kitdris's, kî-driśa, kit-driksha, "qualis"? for
[G. Ed. p. 598.] kid-driś, \&́c.; yd̂-di'is, yd̂-driśa, yâ-driksha, "qualis," (relative); má-dris, mâ-driśa, mâ-drikşha, " to me like," "my equal"; asmadrris, \&c., "to us like"; yushmadris', \&c., " to you like." From the demonstrative base $i$, or rather from the neuter $i t$, which is not used uncompounded, comes ídrisá, \&c., "talis": from the subjective demonstrative base sa comes sadris', \&c., which, according to its origin, signifies "resembling this," "appearing like this," but is used to express in general what is "similar." But the reason that there is no form sadrris', according to the analogy of tadris, \&c., is clearly this-that this form springs from the real base sa, and a neuter sat was not used. It is not therefore, requisite to assume, with the Indian grammarians, that sadris' is an abbreviation of sama-dris's, though, perhaps, from sama a form sama-dris might proceed, as from sa the form sadris'. The European cognate languages have, in remarkable agreement with one another, exchanged the old $d$ for $l$ in these combinations; independently, however, of each other, and simply because the interchange between $d$ and $l$ or $r$ is much used,* and weakened sounds in forms encumbered

[^79]by composition are readily introduced. In this way - $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ikos has become so far estranged from the verb $\delta \dot{f} \rho \kappa \omega$, that we should have failed to perceive their common origin without the means of comparison afforded by the cognate Sanskrit. We must here again notice a similar fate [G. Ed. p. 599.] which has befallen the old $d$ of the number "Ten" in several Asiatic and European-Sanskrit languages at the end of compounds (p. 442). And in the preceding case we meet with a concurrent phenomenon in the East; for in Prâkrit, in the compound under discussion, we frequently find $r$-which, according to $\delta$. 20 ., is often the precursor of $l$-instead of the Sanskrit d; e.g. तारिस tarisa, together with तादिस tadisa, for तादृृश tddriśa.** The Doric $\tau \bar{\alpha} \lambda i$ ías closely resembles târisa. The $i$ of both languages, however, springs, not from the Sanskrit $r$, for this is an abbreviation of $a r, \dagger$ the $a$ of which, in Prâkrit and Greek, has been weakened to $i$, while the $r$ is dislodged entirely. While $\lambda$ ikos is based on the Sanskrit दूश driśa, nominative masculine driśa-s, the pure radical दृश् driś, nominative masculine, feminine, and neuter drik, is also represented in Greek, virs. by $\hat{\eta} \lambda \iota \xi$ and $\delta \mu \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda \xi$. The Prâkrit kêrisa resembles the interrogative $\pi \eta \lambda i k o s$ very closely; but it must not be overlooked, that the Prâkrit ê is
approach to the Sanskṛit kravya-m, "flesh," is the Lithuanian krauya-s, Sclavonic kroiy, "blood"; next comes the Old High German base $H R E \bar{E} W A$, nominative hréo, "body," which preserves the original form more truly than the Greek kpéas and Latin caro.

* In my first discussion on this subject I was unacquainted with the resemblance of the Prâkrit to its cognate European languages (see Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, pp. 8 and 27). Since then Max. Schmidt, also (De Pron. Gr. et Lat. p. 72), has shewn the agreement of the Sanskrit formations in drisa-s with the Greek, Gothic, and Latin, in $\lambda$ íkos, leik-s, and li-s. But he overlooks, in the Sanskrit forms, the long vowel of the pronominal base, on which is based the Greek $\eta$, more anciently $\bar{a}$, and Latin $\bar{a}$, whence it is not requisite to make the adverbs $\tilde{\eta}$, $\tau \hat{\eta}, \pi \hat{\eta}$, the basis of the said formations.
$\dagger$ §. 1. and Vocalismus, Rem. 1.
a corruption of $\hat{i}$,* while $\pi \eta \lambda^{i k o s}$ stands for $\pi a \lambda i$ ícos, and is based, not on the Sanskrit kidriśa-s, but on a kddriśa-s to be
[G. Ed. p. 600] expected from the base $k a$, and which probably originally existed, to which, also, the Gothic hvelleiks belongs.

416. In the hvelleiks (theme hvêleika) just mentioned, with which the German welcher, " which," is connected, as also in hvelauds (§. 409.), the Gothic has retained the vowel length, which is thousands of years old, with this difference only, that $\hat{a}$ is replaced by $\hat{e}$, a circumstance of rare occurrence ( (§. 69.). There is no demonstrative thelleiks corresponding to hvelleiks, but instead of it svaleiks, German solcher, "such," like svaluuds for thêlauds (§. 409.); but the Anglo Saxon and Old Northern employ thylic, thilikr, corresponding to the Greek $\tau \eta \lambda$ ikos and Sanskrit tadriśa-s (Grimm III. 40.). The Gothic leiks, "similar," however, occurs also in combinations other than the ancient pronominal ones; never, however, by itself, but instead of it is used ga-leiks, our gleich, from ge-leich, which may be looked upon as the continuation of the Sanskrit sadrisa-s mentioned above: for as the inseparable preposition © sa, सम् sam, has, in Gothic, become ga (Grimm II. 1018.), so may also the pronominal base, from which those prepositions have sprung, be expected as prefix in the form of ga. In analeiks, $\dagger$ German ähnlich, " like," ana, in my opinion, stands, in like manner, as a pronoun, not as a preposition, and answers to the Sanskrit-Lithuanian demonstrative base ana :8. 372.): ana-leiks therefore signifies "to this like." In the other compounds, also, of this kind, with the exception of manleika (theme -leikan), "likeness," literally "man-resembling," the first member of the word corresponds more or less to a pronominal idea. These compounds are antharleikei, "variety," which pre-supposes an adjective antharleiks, as

[^80]connected in sense with the Sanskrit anyd-drisa-s, " to another like," " of a different kind," whence alyaleiks, deducing it from alyaleikos, étép $\rho$ s, is the countertype in form: [G.Ea. p. 601 ] samaleikd, ı' $\sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$, which pre-supposes an adjective $\operatorname{samaleik}(a)-s$, " to the same like," analogous to the Greek $\delta \mu \bar{\eta} \lambda \iota \xi$ and Latin similis :* ibnaleiks, "equal," like the simple ibn(a)-s; according to its origin, the former signifies "seeming equal": missaleiks, " various." I cannot avoid expressing here the conjecture that the Gothic prefix missa, German miss, may be of pronominal origin, and connected with the Lithuanian base WISSA, nominative wissa-s, "all," and therefore also with the Sanskrit विष्य viswa, by the very common exchange of $v$ for $m$ (§. 63.). According to the explanation given above (§. 392.) of fिण्र viswa, this word, through the signification of the preposition fि $v i$, would be very well adapted to express the idea of variety. And the Gothic missa (the bare theme) might originally have signified alius, and still be identical with the Sanskrit-Lithuanian term for "all"; at least its influence in composition is similar to the German aber, which is akin to the Sanskrit apara, "alius" (see §. 350.), in compounds like Aberwitz, "delirium," Aberglaube, "superstition." The German Missethat, therefore, Gothic missadeds, "misdeed," would be $=$ Aber-That, " a deed different from the right"; and Missgunst, "ill-will," would be Aber-gunst, " wrong-will"; and the missaleiks given above would originally signify " to other like." This conjecture is powerfully supported, and confirmed almost beyond doubt, by the adverb missd, which springs from the theme MISSA (compare p. 384), which signifies " one another": goleith izvis misso, [G. Ed. p. 602.]

[^81]$\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\eta} \lambda o u s(1 \mathrm{Cor} . \mathrm{xvi} .20)$. The original meaning "all" is still perceptible in this, as missd, in one word, expresses "the one and the other." In German, the lich, which is based on the Gothic leiks," and which in welcher and solcher has dropped the $i$, and in gleich gives, according to rule, ei as answering to the old $\hat{\imath}$, is much more extensively diffused, and has completely assumed the character of a derivative suffix in words like jährlich, " yearly," jämmerlich, " lamentable,".glücklich, "fortunate," schmerzlich, " painful," \&c. $\dagger$ The occurrence of the simple word in Northern, Anglo-Saxon, and English, may be explained by its being formed by abbreviating the Gothic galeiks, our gleich, by removing the entire prefix.
417. An objection against the identity of the Gothic suffix leika and Greek $\lambda_{\text {ikos }}$ could hardly be raised from the nonmutation of sound in the middle tenuis. I refer the reader, on this head, to $\S .89$., for example to the connection of the Gothic slapa and Old High German insuepiu with the Sanskrit swapimi, Latin sopio, and Greek ünvos, in spite of the retention of the old tenuis. The long $\hat{i}$ (in Gothic written $e i$ ) in the Germanic formation, answering to the short $i$ in the Greek 入ikos, and Prâkrit risa or disa, will still less be a ground for rejecting the identity of the suffix under discussion in the three languages; for as the original form is darka (see p. 598 G. ed.), the rejection of the $r$ may well have been compensated by lengthening the preceding vowel; and the Germanic, therefore, in this respect, approaches the original form one degree closer than the cognate Hellenic and Prâkrit idiom.
[Gr. Ed.p. 603.] 418. The Old Sclavonic exhibits our suffix exactly in the same form as the Greek, in the masculine and neuter liko, nominative masculine lik (according to §. 257.), neuter liko; hence tolik, toliko, "talis," " tale," or "tantus,' "tantum," $=$ Greek $\tau \eta \lambda$ ícos, $\tau \eta \lambda i k o v$, and Prâkrit, tariso, tatisañ,

[^82]Sanskṛit tảdriśsas, tâdrisisam: kolik, kolikn, "qualis,"" quale," "quantus," "quantum?"=Greek $\pi \eta \lambda i ́ k o s, ~ \pi \eta \lambda i ́ к о v, ~ P r u ̂ k r i t ~$ kêrisô, kêrisañ, Sanskṛit kîdriṣas, kîdriśsam: yelik, yeliko, rela-
 yadriśas, yadrísam. With respect to the relative expression, it is inportant to remark, that, in this derivative, the base ye (euphonic for yo,) which commonly signifies " he" (§. 282.), has preserved the original relative signification without the elsewhere necessary enclitic she. Dobrowsky, however ( p . 344), in assuming ik alone in this derivative as suffix " interposito tamen l," appears not to have noticed the surprising similarity of the Greek forms in $\lambda$ íkos, otherwise he would have assigned to the $l$ a more important share in the work of derivation. But the Sclavonic forms differ from those of the cognate languages in this, that they do not lengthen the final vowel of the primitive pronoun, or replace $o$ by $a$ : for, according to §. 255. $u$., the Sclavonic o corresponds to the Sanskrit short $a$, and $a$ to the long $a$. We should therefore look for talik as answering to the Sanskrit tadrisa-s, and Prâkrit tarisó. It cannot, however, be matter of surprise, that, in the course of thousands of years, which scparate the Solavonic from identity with its cognate idioms, a weakening of the vowel should have taken place in the preceding case; as shortenings, weakenings, and abrasions of sounds, are the most common alterations which time introduces into the original form of a language. There are, however, in Sclavonic, other formations of cognate meaning, in which the base syllable has retained the old weight of the vowels, while the suffix has been abbreviated by drop- [G. Ed. p. 604.] ping the syllable $l i$, and appears in combination with the affix of the definite declension: hence takyĭ, "talis," kaky̌̌, "qualis ?" yaky̌̆, " qualis" (relative)." The simple neuters,

[^83]that is, those divested of the definite prefix tako, kako, occur as adverbs, the former with the signification "so," the latter with that of "how?" By the rejection of the syllable li, takyi and its correlatives, in respect to their last element, become identical with the interrogative kyĭ, "quis?" which is likewise declined definitely; and therefore we cannot entirely set aside the objection, that takyi is a compound of the demonstrative with the interrogative. The explanation, however, given above is to be preferred, because by it the $a$ of the first member of the compound, as also the signification of the whole, is shewn to have a very ancient foundation; while by the second mode we should not be able to see why tokyĭ, yekyĭ, koky̆, should not be used, or $t k y i,{ }^{*}$ ikyí; and why the mere appending of the interrogative to the pronoun preceding should have the same effect as the suffix under diocussion has in the cognate languages.
419. But if the Old Sclavonic correlatives takyĭ, kakyĭ, yaky̌, are abbreviations of talikyč, \&c., then the analogous and aqui-significant Lithuanian forms toks, "talis," koks, "qualis" (theme tokia, kokia, see §. 411.), must also be viewed in this light, and the agreement of the former with the
[G. Ed. p. 605.] tockin (Grimm. III. 49.), which exists in Old Swedish, together with tolik and tolkin, would consequently not be fortuitous. The Latin suffix $l i$ in tālis, quälis, cquälis, $\dagger$ exhibits a contrary abbreviation, since it has retained the initial part of the original adjective of

[^84]similarity, as also the long vowel of the pronominal base, but has lost the last syllable, or the guttural only, of ताद्वक्
 The identity of the formation lies beyond all doubt, and Voss has already shewn that tālis is identical with $\tau \bar{\alpha} \lambda i k o s . ~ T o ~ t h e ~$ constant occurrence of a long $\bar{a}$ in these ancient forms may be ascribed the fact, that, in more modern formations of this sort, particularly belonging to the Latin, an $\bar{a}$ is inserted before the suffix, or added to the primitive base, in case it terminates with a consonant; hence, regälis,* legälis, conjugälis, hiemälis, carnālis, augurālis, \&c. On the other hand, in bases with a short final vowel this is merely lengthened, and the $u$ (o) of the second declension is changed into a long $i$ instead of the short $i$, which is elsewhere introduced before suffixes; hence, civī-lis, hostīlis, juvenī-lis, from civi, hosti, juveni; $\dagger$ and so, also, viri-lis from viru, puerï-lis from pueru, servī-lis from servu, \&c.: aniz-lis, also, from the organic $u$ of the fourth declension, which is no less subject to be weakened to $i$, as is proved by the dative-ablatives in $i$-bus. Here, perhaps, may be classed, also, though with a short $i$, words in ti-lis [G. Ed. p. 606.] or si-lis, which spring either from lost abstracts in $t i-s, s i-s, \ddagger$ or passive participles, the $u$ of which must be weakened before the new suffix to $i$; thus, ficti-lis, missi-lis, either from the obsolete abstracts ficti-s, missi-s-whence the secondary forms fictio, missio-or from fictus (weakened from factus, §. 6.), missus. So, also, simi-lis, with short i, from the lost primitive simu-s = Sanskrit sama-s, " similar," Gothic sama (theme saman), and Greek ö $\mu \mathrm{o-s}$; and humi-lis,

[^85]
## THE VERB.

[G. Ed. p.617.] 426. The Sanskrit has two forms for the active, of which the one is appointed for the transitive and outwardly-operating direction, and is called by the Indian grammarians parasmâi-padam, equivalent to " strangerform ";" the other, which is called atmanépadam, i.e. "selfform," $\dagger$ serves, when it stands in its primitive signification, for reflexive or intransitive purposes, or shews that the action is to the advantage of the subject or stands in some near relation thereto. For instance, $d d$, " to give," in the itmanêpadam, in conjunction with the preposition $\hat{a}$, has the force of "to take," i.e. "to give oneself": the causative durśayâmi, "to make to see," "to shew," acquires, through the terminations of the âtmanêpadam, the signification "to shew oneself"; ssî," to lie" (s'êté $=\kappa \in i \tau \alpha \iota$ ), âs, " to sit" ( $\lambda s t e ̂=\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, p. 118), mud, " to be pleased," "to please oneself," ruch, " to shine," " to please," " to please oneself," are only used in the atmanêpadam; yâch, " to require," "to ask," has both forms, but the reflexive prevails, as we most generally require or pray for our own advantage. In general, however, the lan-
[G. Ed. p. 618.] guage, as it at present exists, disposes of both forms, in rather an arbitrary manner. But few verbs have retained the two; and where this happens, the primitive intention of both seldom shews itself distinctly. Of the cognate languages, only the Zend, the Greek, and the Gothic have retained this primitive reflexive form; for that the Gothic passive is

[^86]identical in construction with the Indo-Greek middle has been already shewn in my Conjugation-system.* Grimm has since directed attention to two expressions which have remained unnoticed in former Grammars, and which are of the greatest importance, as having preserved the old middle form in a middle signification also. Ulfilas, namely, twice (Matt. xxvii. 42. and Mark xv. 32.) translates $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \alpha ́ \tau \omega ~ b y ~$ "atsteigadau," and once (Matt. xxvii. 43.) $\rho \cup \sigma \alpha ́ \sigma \theta \omega$ by "lausyadau." Lately, also, v. Gabelentz and Löbe, in their valuable edftion of Ulfilas (pp. 187 and 225), have justly assigned to the middle the following forms, all but one lately brought to light, by Castiglione's edition of St. Paul's Epistles : ufkunnanda, $\gamma \nu \omega$ © $\sigma o v \tau \alpha \iota($ John xiii. 35.) ; faianda, "vituperunt" (Rom. ix. 19.); gavasyada undivanein, èvdívךraı $\dot{\alpha} \phi \theta \alpha \rho^{\prime} \alpha \nu$ (1 Cor. xv. 54.); vaurkyada, ép $\alpha^{\prime} \zeta$ єтаı (2 Cor. iv. 17.); ustiu-
 $\tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ ( 1 Cor. vii.9.). Grimm, in the first edition of his Grammar (p. 444), gives the forms atsteigadau and lausyadau, justly, I doubt not, as imperatives, but considers them as erroneous transferences of the Greek expressions into the passive form. What, however, could induce Ulfilas to translate the middle $\dot{\rho} v \sigma \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \omega$, not to mention the active $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega$, by a passive, when he had so many other opportunities for exchanging Greek middles for passives? In the second edition (I. 855.) Grimm asks, "Have we here [G. Ed. p. 019.] the III. subjunctive of a Gothic middle?" Were they, however, subjunctives middle, they must then have retained the characteristic $i$ of this mood, and, in this respect, have answered to the Indo-Greek middle, such as bharêta (from bharaîta), фépoıto. The middle and passive could not be distinguished by the insertion or suppression of the exponent of the subjunctive relation. I explain, therefore, atsteigadau and lausyadau, as well as the later liugandau ( $\gamma \alpha \mu \eta \sigma \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \sigma \alpha \nu$ ),

[^87]without hesitation, as imperatives of the middle voice; for as such they answer excellently well to the Sanskrit middle imperatives, as bhar-a-tam, "let him bear or receive," bhur-a-ntîin, "let them bear or receive." The Gothic au has the same relation here to the Sanskrit $\hat{a} m$, as, in the first subjunctive person active, where, for instance, siyau, "ich sei," "I may be," answers to the Sanskrit syat $m$. The old $m$ has been resolved into $u$, and has formed a diphthong with the preceding $a$ (compare §.255.g.). In respect to form, however, atsteigadau, lausyadau, and liugandau, are at the same time passive; and Ulfilas would probably have also rendered the idea "let him be freed" by lausyadau. In the translation of the Bible, however, an occasion for the use of the passive imperative rarely occurs.
427. While the Greek and Gothic have carried over the middle form into the passive, so that the passive and middle, with the exception of the Greek aorist and future, are perfectly identical; in the Sanskrit and Zend the passive, indeed, exhibits the more important terminations of the middle, through which the symbolical retro-operation of the action on the subject is expressed, but a practical distinction occurs in the special tenses (§. $109^{\text {a }}$.), in that the syllable $y a$-of which more hereafter-is appended to the root, but the characteristic additions and other peculiarities,
[G. Ed. p. 620.] by which the different classes are distinguished in the two active forms, are resumed. In Greek, $\delta \epsilon^{\prime} \kappa-\nu v-\tau \alpha l$ is as well passive as middle, but in Sanskrit,

 passive and middle ; in Sanskrit the kindred forms दन्ते dat-té, anomalous for dada-tê, fिष्षे tishṭhu-le, are only middle, and their passive becomes dî-yatê, sth $\hat{\imath}$-yale.* In that the Sanskrit and Zend passive is formed immediately from the root,

[^88]the class-characteristics being removed, it answers to other derivative verbs, the causal, desiderative, and intensive, and we, in treating of them, shall return to it. The middle, however, we shall treat pari passu with the transitive active form, as it is distinguished from this latter, in nearly every case, only by the extension of the personal terminations.
428. The moods in Sanskrit are five, if we include the indicative, in which, in fact, no modal relations, but only those of time, are expressed. The absence of modal accessary notions is its characteristic. The other moods are, the potential, imperative, precative,* and conditional. Besides these, we find in the Vêdas fragments of a mood, which, in the principle of its formation, corresponds to the Greek subjunctive, and by the grammarians is called lét. $\dagger$ The same moods, even to the subjunctive, or lêt, exist in Zend, only I am not able to cite the conditional, which stands in nearest connection with the future, and [G. Ed. p. 621.] which in Sanskrit, also, is very rare. The infinitive and participle belong to the noun. The indicative has six tenses, viz. one present, three preterites, and two futures. The preterites, in form, correspond to the Greek imperfect, aorist, and perfect. With their use, however, the language, in its present condition, deals very capriciously; for which reason, in my Sanskrit Grammar, I have named them only with reference to their form: the first, single-formed augmented preterite ; the second, multiform augmented preterite; and the third, reduplicated preterite. Both futures are likewise indistinguishable in their use, and I name them according to their composition: the one, which answers to the Greek

[^89]and Lithuanian future, and is most used, the auxiliary future; the other, the participial future, as its first element is a participle which answers to the Latin in turus. In the Zend I have not yet detected this tense, but all the other Sanskrit tenses I have, and have given proofs of this in the reviews mentioned in the preface (p. xii. last line but two.). The moods ranging after the indicative have, in Sanskrit and Zend, only one tense each; yet the potential and precative have, in fact, such a relation to each other, as, in Greek, the present and second aorist of the optative; and Pânini embraces both of these modal forms under the name lin. The same relation of wishing and praying, which is specially represented by the precative, may also be expressed by the potential, which is in far more general use. In the Vêdas traces are apparent of a further elaboration of the moods into various tenses, and it may hence be inferred, that what the European languages, in their developement of the moods, have in excess over the Sanskrit and Zend, dates, at
[G. Ed. p. 622.] least in its origin, from the period of the unity of the language.
429. The numbers of the verb are three in most of the languages here treated of. The Latin verb has, like its noun, lost the dual; but the Germanic has preserved the verbal dual in its oldest dialect, the Gothic, in preference to that of the noun; the Old Sclavonic retains it in both; and so has the Lithuanian to the present day. The Pâli and Prâkrit, otherwise so near to the Sanskrit, have, like the Latin, parted with both the dual and the middle of the active forms. In opposition to the Semitic, there is no distinction of gender in the personal signs of the Sanskrit family; which is not surprising, as the two first persons, even in their simple condition, are without the distinction, while the Semitic dispenses with it only in the first person, as well simple as in the verb, but, in the second and third, in both conditions distinguishes the
feminine from the masculine. The Old Sclavonic has, in the dual, gained a feminine in an inorganic fashion, and by a divergence from the primary type of its class, as well in its simple pronoun of the first person, as in the three persons of the verb. As, namely, va, "we two," has the termination of a masculine substantive dual, to which the feminine in tye corresponds (§.273.); so, by the power of analogy, out of that ba $v a$ has been developed a feminine bt vye, and, in accordance with this, in the verb also; for instance, etва yesva, "we two are" (masculine), кгвь yesvye (feminine), answering to the Sanskrit swas (abbreviated from aswas), and the Lithuanian essa. In the same manner, in the second and third dual persons, which, in the masculine, are both yesta, answering to the Sanskrit (a)sthas, (a)stas, and the
 for as, in virtue of the law by which the terminating sibilant of the Sanskrit form is necessarily rejected [G. Ed. p. 623.] (see §.255.l.), the verbal dual ending became identical with that of the masculine noun, and as, moreover, the termination $t a$ has precisely the same sound with the independent $t a$, "these two" (men), the way was thus opened to the formation of a feminine personal termination TB tye, which is also identical with the independent tye, "these two" (women). These feminine verbal terminations are in any case worthy of observation, as they rest on the feeling of the grammatical identity of the verb with the noun, and shew that the spirit of the language was vitally imbued with the principle of close connection, which had of old existed between the simple pronouns and those joined with the verbal bases.
430. With respect to the personal signs, the tenses and moods fall most evidently, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, into two classes. The one is fuller, the other more contracted in its terminations. To the first class belong those tenses which, in Greek, we are accustomed to call the principal, namely, the present, future, and perfect or reduplicated
preterite, whose terminations, however, have undergone serious mutilations in the three sister languages, which clearly have their foundation in the incumbrance of the commencement by the reduplication-syllable. To the second class belong the augmented preterites, and, in Sanskrit and Zend, all the moods not indicative, with the exception of the present of the lêt or suljunctive, and of those terminations of the imperative which are peculiar to this mood, and are rather full than contracted. In Greek, the subjunctive has the fuller terminations, but the optative, which answers to the Sanskrit potential, has, like its Asiatic prototype, the contracted. The
[G. Ed. p. 624.] termination $\mu l$ of $\tau u ́ \pi \tau o t \mu l$ is, as we have elsewhere observed,* inorganic, as appears from a comparison -ith the $\tau \cup \pi \tau \sigma i \mu \eta \nu$ which has sprung from the original form $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau o l v$ and the conjugation in $\mu(\delta i \delta o i \eta \nu)$.
431. In Latin, this double form of the personal terminations, although in an inverted relation, makes itself observable in this, that where the fuller form $m i$ stood, the termination, excepting in the cases of sum and inquam, has vanished altogether. On the other hand, the original final $m$ has everywhere maintained itself. Hence, amo, amabı; but amabam, eram, sim, amem, as, in Sanskṛit, a-bhavam and $\hat{\text { sisam, " I was," syâm, " I may be," kâmuyêyrm, }}$ "I may love." In the other persons an uniformity of terminations has crept in by the abrasion of the $i$ of the primary forms; thus, legis(i), legit(i), legunt( $i$ ), as legas, legat, legant.
432. In the Gothic, the aboriginal separation into the full and mutilated terminations makes itself principally conspicuous in that the terminations $t i$ and $n t i$ of the primary forms have retained the $T$ sound, because it was protected by a following vowel, but have lost the $i$ : on the other hand, the concluding $t$ of the secondary forms,

[^90]as in the Greek, has vanished: hence, for example: bair-i-th, bair-a-nd, answering to भरति bhar-a-ti, भरन्ति bhar-a-nti ( $\phi \in ́ \rho-o-\nu \tau \iota$ ), but bair-ai, like $\phi \in ́ \rho o \iota$, answering to भरेत् bhar-êt (from bharaît) fer-a-t. In the first person singular, the full termination $m i$ (with the exception of $i m$, "I am") has, in remarkable accordance with the Latin, quite disappeared: on the other hand, the concluding $m$ of the secondary forms has not, indeed, as in the Latin, been retained unaltered, but yet has kept its place in the resolved form of $u$ (compare §.426. p.619.G.ed.): thus bair-a, answering to भरामि blar-d̂-mi, but bair-a-u (from bairam [G. Ed. p. 625.]
for bairaim),* answering to भरेयम् bhar-êy-am, fer-a-m. In the second person singular, as in the Latin, an identity between the primary and secondary forms has introduced itself, since the first have lost the concluding $i$, and the latter have not brought one from the Asiatic seat of their class; hence bair-i-s, answering to भरसि blar-a-si, and also bair-ai-s to भरेस् bhar-ê-s, fer-d-s, ф'́p-ot-s.
433. In the Old Sclavonic, the secondary forms have, in the singular, been compelled entirely to abandon the personal consonant (see §. 255.l.), on account of its being final; hence, in the imperative, which is identical with the Sanskrit potential, the Greek optative, and RomanGerman subjunctive, the second person singular ends with the modal-vowel $i$, and, in the preterite, answering to the Sanskrit-Greek aorist, the second and third persons have the same sound, because the concluding $s$, like $t$, was necessarily dropped. Compare, in the preterite iterative, the termination шe, she, 山E, she, with the Sansk ${ }^{\text {it }}$ सीस् sîs, सीत् sit. On the other hand, the primary forms give the expression of the second person singular with wonderful accuracy, as ши, shi, or $с и, s i$; and out of the fin $t i$ of the third we have $r$, and, in the plural $8 \boldsymbol{r}$ from anti. We now proceed to a closer consideration of the personal signs.

[^91]FIRST PERSON.
434. The character of the first person is, in the singular as well as plural, in its original shape, $m$; but in the dual the languages, which possess a first dual person in the transitive
[G. Ed. p.626.] active form, have softened the $m$ to $v$, as we have also found षयम् vayam "we," for मयम् mayam, in the plural of the simple pronoun, and similar phenomenain several cognate languages (§.331.). The full characteristic of the first person singular is, in the primary form of the transitive active, $m i$, and spreads itself, in Sanskrrit and Zend, over all verbs without exception: in Greek, however-peculiarities of dialect excepted-it extends only over such as answer to the second chief Sanskrit conjugation, which embraces the classes two, three, five, seven, eight, and nine (§. $109^{\text {a }}$.), but altogether comprises but a small proportion of the verbs (about 200). The other Greek verbs have quite suppressed the personal termination, and their $\omega$ (omega), like the Latin $o$ of all conjugations, answers to the Sanskrit $\hat{a}$, which, in forms like $b \hat{o} d h-$ -â-mi, " I know,"tud-â-mi, " I wound," " I slay," belongs neither to the root nor the personal termination, but is the character of the class, which, when it consists of a short $a$, or of syllables ended by $a$, lengthens that letter before $m$ and $v$ followed by a vowel: hence, bôdh-â-mi, bôdh-â-vas, bodh-âmas, in contrast to bôdh-a-si, bôdh-a-ti; bôdh-a-thas, bôdh-atas; bôdh-a-tha, bôdh-a-nti. The Greek has no participation in this lengthening, and makes $\tau \in \rho \pi-0-\mu \epsilon \nu$ answer to the Sanskrit tarp-d-mas. It is possible, however, that, in the singular, $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi-\omega-\mu \ell$ may have once stood, answering to tarp-$\hat{i}-m i$; and if so, we might conjecture that this $\omega$ may have been shortened in the plural and dual (middle) by the influence of the increased weight of the terminations, of which more hereafter; thus, also, in the medio-passive. The to-be-presupposed $\tau \in \tilde{\varepsilon} \rho \pi-\omega-\mu \ell$ has, in fact, the same re-
 and $\delta i \delta-o-\mu \alpha$. If, however, we prefer, which I should not, to
assume $\tau \hat{\rho} \rho \pi-o-\mu \iota$ as the primitive form, the length of $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi \omega$ must then be considered as a compensation for the loss of the termination. In any case the middle-pas- [G. Ed. p. 627.] sive $\mu \alpha l$, which spreads itself over all classes of verbs, proves that they all have had a $\mu t$ in the active; for $\mu \alpha l$ has sprung form $\mu l$, as $\sigma \alpha \iota, \tau \alpha \iota, \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, from $\sigma \iota, \tau \iota, \nu \tau \iota$; and without the presence either of a т́́ $\rho \pi \omega \mu \iota$ or a тє́р $\pi о \mu \iota$ we could have no $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi о \mu \alpha \iota$. With regard to the all-prevalent conservation of the character of the first person in the middle-passives, the Greek maintains a conspicuous advantage over its Asiatic cognates, which, in the singular of the middle, as well in the primary as in the secondary forms, have suffered the $m$ to vanish without leaving a trace. If $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi \omega$ be, as it were, amended from the Sanskrit form $\operatorname{tarp}-\bar{d}-m i$, the mutilated Sanskrit form tarpe* may be, in like manner, traced back from the Greek $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi-0-\mu \alpha \iota$ to its original form $\operatorname{tarp-A}-m e ̂$, or turp-a-mé.
435. We find, in what has been said above, a very remarkable confirmation of the maxim, that the various members of the great family of language now under discussion must of necessity mutually illustrate and explain each other, since not even the most perfect among them have been handed down to us uncorrupted in every part of their rich organism. For while the ending $\mu \alpha \iota$ is still extant in all its splendor in the Modern-Greek passive, the corresponding Sanskrit form lay in ruins at that period when the oldest existing sample of Indian literature, the Vêdas, were composed, the antiquated language of which has conveyed to us so many other remnants of the primæval type of the family. On the other hand, Homer, in all the overwhelming variety of his present and future forms, was compelled to forego the terminating $\mu$, which was the mother of his $\mu \alpha \iota$, which is the only existing termination in the Sanskrit,

[^92]and which to this day the Lithuanian utters in the following verbs.

| 「esmi, "I am," |  | greek. <br> є́цці, єіні |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | єi¢m. |
| 通dimi, "I give," | $=$ dudìmi, | дi̊̀w |
|  | $=$ dadhàmi, | тіөпи. |
| $\underbrace{}_{\text {stowmi, " } \mathrm{I} \text { stand," }}$ | $=$ tishthâm, | iornu. |
| edmi, "I eat," | $=a d m i$ |  |
| sédmi, "I sit." | =ni-shinlimi, " I sit down" |  |
| giedmi, " [ sing," | = gadimi, "I say" |  |
| gellbmi, "I help,"* | =kalpayâmi, " I make, I preparc?"*... |  |
| sêrgmi, "I guard" |  |  |
| sáugmi, "I preserve" |  |  |
| miérgmi, "I sleep" |  |  |
| liekmi, "I leave," | $=$ rahami, "I forsake?" $\dagger$ |  |

436. We must take into account that in all these verbs the termination $\mu$, as in the Sanskrit second class (§. 109.. 3.) and in the verbs which correspond to it, such as $\phi \eta \mu i$, ei $\mu$, is combined directly with the root. The Old Sclavonic also has preserved, in some verbs of this kind, which we would name the Archaic conjugation, the termination mi, not, indeed, in its original purity, but under the shape of $m y$. Before this $m y$, however, as also in the first person plural before $m y$, and before the sibilant of the second person singular, a radical $d$ is suppressed, which $d$, before termi[G. Ed. p. 629.] nations beginning with $t$, in analogy with the Zend and Greek (§. 102. p. 102. G. ed.), passes into s. $\ddagger$ Compare:

[^93]old sclat oonic．
ル！мb yesmy，＂I am，＂ в＇вмb vyemy，＂I know，＂ в＇太גлтb vyedyaty，＂they know，＂ дАми damy，＂I give，＂＊ дадлть dudyaty，＂they oive，＂ IAMb yamy，＂I eat，＂ ＂Адать yadaty，＂they eat，＂

SANSKRIT．
प्रfिस asmi．
वेसि थ仑̂dmi．
निद्नि vidanti．
ददामि daddmi．
ददति dadati．
अर्षास admi．
सदन्ति adanti．

Thus also the compound cntmb sn－yemy for sn－yamy，＂co－ medo，＂＂manduco，＂$\dagger$ and имамь imamy，＂I have．＂The Krainish deserves special attention in respect of the first person singular，as，without exception，it has preserved the personal $m$ ，although with entire renunciation of the $i$ ； for instance，délum，＂I labor＂：so，in Polish，in the first conjugation，as Bandtke has it，czytam，＂I read．＂In Old Sclavonic，however，we find everywhere in the common conjugation $\not \subset u \dot{n}$ ，and we have already remarked that we recognise，in the latter part of this diphthong，the melting of this personal sign $m$ into a short $u$ sound，which，with the preceding conjugation－vowel，has resolved itself into $u \dot{n}$ ，as

In the same light is to be regarded the Lithuanian $\grave{u}$ in Mielcke＇s first and second conjugation；compare sukù， ＂I turn，＂and penù，＂I feed，＂with the plural suk－a－mè， pen－a－mè．On the other hand，in verbs like laikau，＂I hold，＂ yeszkau，＂I seek，＂myliu，＂I love，＂the $u$ only belongs to the personal sign．It is otherwise with the Old High German $u$ in Grimm＇s strong and first weak conjugation：in these，$u$ is a weakening of the Gothic $a$（Vocalismus，p．227，ff．），and this

[^94]is itself a shortening of the Sanskrit d, and so far corresponds to the Greek $\omega$ and Latin o (see §.434.). Compare the Gothic bair-a-', Old High German bir-u-' ( $\quad$ iru), with भरामि bhar-â-mi, ф'ि $\rho-\omega-(\mu l)$, fer-o. The only verb which, in Gothic has preserved a remnant of the termination $\mu$, is im, " I am," = षस्मि asmi, \&c. In High German, however, the remains of this old termination are more numerous: in the German bin it has to this day rescued itself from total suppression. The Old High German form is bim, or pim, a contraction of the Sanskrit bhavami, the $v$ of which reappears in the shape of $r$ in the plural birumês. Besides these, the personal sign in Old High German fastens on some other isolated verbs, as on $g d m$, "I go," = ₹गामि jagami, $\beta^{\prime} \beta \eta \mu$, (p. 111); stâm, "I stand," = निप्षामि tiṣhṭhâmi, Zend sGuuperus
 दधामि dudhâmi, "I place," Greek tí̈ך $\mu$, fवदधामि vi-dadhâmi, "I make"; and, further, on those classes of verbs which exhibit the Sanskrit form aya in the shape of $\hat{e}$ or $\hat{\theta}$ (Grimm's second and third conjugations of the weak form, see §. 109 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 6.). Hence habêm (Gothic haba), damnôm, and phlanzôm, are more perfect than the corresponding Latin forms habeo, damio, planto. Yet it is only the oldest monuments which exhibit the $m$ termination: the more modern substitute $n$.
[G. Ed. p. 631.] 437. In the secondary forms the expression of the first person singular, in Sanskrit and Zend, is terminated by $m$ without a vowel; and this mutilated ending, which has maintained itself in Latin in preference to the fuller $m i$ (§. 431.), has been forced in Greek, by a universal law of sound, to become $v$; just as we have seen, in the Old High German, the final $m$ of the most ancient authorities corrupted into $n$. Compare ${ }^{\prime \prime}$. $\epsilon \in \rho \pi-o-\nu$ with atarp-a-m,
 $\delta_{i} \delta o-i \eta \nu$ and $\delta o-i \eta \nu$ with $d a d '-y \hat{a} m$ and $d e-y \hat{d} m$. In the first Grcek aorist the personal sign has vanished; hence, ${ }^{\mathcal{E} \delta} \delta \iota \iota \xi \alpha$ contrasted with wfदक्षम् adiksham. The older $\epsilon \neq \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha$, from
a still older form ${ }^{\prime} \delta \in \epsilon \xi \alpha \mu$, can be traced, however, out of the resulting middle form $\hat{\varepsilon} \delta e \ell \xi \dot{\xi} \alpha-\eta \nu$. With respect to the Gothic $u$ for $m$, we refer the reader to $\S .432$.
" Remark.-We have, above, divided atarp- $a-m$ after the fashion of the Greek ${ }^{\text {étefer }} \boldsymbol{\text { oo-v }}$, but have further to observe, that, according to the Indian grammarians, the full termination of the first person singular of the secondary form is not a simple $m$, but am : accordingly, atarpam would stand for atarp $a_{m}$ from atarp-a-am, and we should have to assume an elision of the intermediate syllable $a$. In fact, we find the termination $a m$ in places where the $a$ cannot, as in atarp- $a-m$, anas $s-y a-m$, adars $-a y a-m$, be assigned to the class character (§. 109. 1. 2. 6.); for we form, for instance, out of $i$, "go," ay-am, not ai-m, "I went"; from brû, " speak," abrav-am or abruv-am, not abri-m, "I spoke"; and from the syllables $n u$ and $u$, which, in the special tenses, are appended to the roots of the fifth and eighth class ( $\left(.109^{\circ} .4\right.$.), spring, not $n \delta-m, \hat{\sigma}-m$, as we might expect from the present $n \downarrow-m i$, $\dot{\delta}-\mathrm{mi}$, but navam, avam; and thus, for instance, we find घ स्तृषावम् astrinavam, plural घस्तृযुम astrinuma, answering to é $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho v u ̄$, è $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho v \nu \mu \epsilon v$. As, however, the second person in Sanskrit has a simple $s$, the third a simple $t$, for its sign, and, for in-
 $-\nu \bar{u}(\tau)$; from thence, as well as from the fact that the Greek also, in the first person, has a simple $v$, we may deduce that the $a$ of astrinavam is inorganic, and imported from the first conjugation, just as, in Greek, we find for è eróóvī-v [G. Ed. p. 632.] also è $\sigma$ óóvv-o-v; and so, in the third person, together with è étópvū also è éópve- $\epsilon$, to which a Sanskrit astrinav-a-t would correspond. The verbs which unite the personal terminations immediately with roots ending in consonants may have particularly favoured the introduction of an $a$ into the first person; thus, for instance, to the present vedmi, "I know," no avedm could follow; the personal character must have vanished entirely-as in the second and third person, where,
instead of avêt-s, avêt-t, by §. 94. acêt (for avêd) is used*-or else the aid of an intermediate vowel must have been sought, as the nominal bases terminating in a consonant add am instead of simple $m$ in the accusative, from whence this termination has passed also over to monosyllabic bases terminating with a vowel; so that nâv-am for ndum, and bhruv-am for $b h r u m$ have the same relation to the Greek $v \alpha \hat{v}-\nu, \dot{\partial} \phi \rho \bar{v}-\nu$, that we have seen astrinav-am (for astrinठm) bear to é $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu \bar{u}-\nu$. In any case, however, the $a$ has acquired a firm establishment in the first person singular of the secondary forms; and it would be best perhaps, practically as well as theoretically, to lay down the rule, that where $a$ or $\hat{a}$ does not precede the terminating $m$ as the property either of a class, a mood, or a root, that letter is introduced: hence we find atarp-a-m, "plucabam," adad $\hat{-}-m$, "dabam," ayâ-m, "ibam" (from the root yâ), uyu-n $\hat{\alpha}-m$, " lignbam," (cl. 9. see §. $109^{\text {a }}$. 5.), dadyâ-m, " dem"; but also astri-nav-am, "sternebam," for astri-nó-m; and tarp-êy-am, "placem" (§. 43.), for turpêm ; tiṣhthê-y-am, " stem," for tişhṭ̂êm, which last would accord more closely with tishthess, "stes"; tishthlıêt, " stet"; tiṣhthêma, " stêmus"; tiṣhthêta, "stêtis."
438. In the Gothic, as we have before remarked (§. 432.), the $m$ of the secondary forms has resolved itself into $u$. This termination, however, has entirely vanished from the Old High German, with the exception of a solitary example, which has preserved the original $m$ in preference to the Gothic $u$; namely, lirnem, "discam," in Kero. In the Lithuanian, both the mutilated $m$ and the fuller ending mi have been corrupted into $u$, and therefore just as laikau, "I hold," is related to the to-be-presupposed laikam from laikami, [G. Ed.p.633.] so is buwau to the Sanskrit a-bhavam, "I was." With respect to the Sclavonic, I may refer the

[^95]reader to what has been said generally (§. 433.) on the singular secondary terminations, and to what will follow hereafter on the preterite in particular.
439. With regard to the origin of the termination of the first person, I consider $m i$ to be a weakened form of the syllable $m a$ (compare p. 102), which, in Sanskrit and Zend, lies at the foundation of the oblique cases of the simple pronoun as theme. In the word dadâmi, mi has the same relation to the $m a$ in which it originates, as the Latin $i$ bears in compounds like tubiC1N(-cinis), to the true radical form CAN. The secondary form rests on a further weakening of $m i$ to $m$, which, though it be of most remote antiquity, as would appear from its striking accordance with the sister languages of Europe, still does not belong to those times when the organization of the language was yet flourishing in all its parts, and in full vigour. I do not, at least, believe, that in the youth of our family of languages there was already a double series of personal terminations; but I entertain the conjecture, that, in the course of time, the terminations underwent a polishing process in those places where an accession to the anterior part (in the augment-preterites), or an insertion into the interior (in the potential or optative), had given greater occasion for such a process.* The gradual prevalence of the mutilated terminations is illustrated by the fact, that, in Latin, all the plurals still end in $m u s$, in Greek in $\mu \epsilon \nu$ ( $\mu \epsilon \varsigma$ ), while in Sainskrit the corresponding form मस् mas only remains in the primary forms, and even in these shews itself not unfrequently in the mutilated form ma, [G. Ed. p. 634.] which, in the secondary terminations, has become the rule: hence we have, indeed, tarp- $\hat{a}$-mas, sarp- $\hat{a}-m a s$, and occasionally $\operatorname{tarp}-\hat{a}-m a$, sarp- $\hat{-}-m a$, corresponding to $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi-o-\mu \epsilon \rho, \operatorname{serp}$ -i-mus, (§. 109ㄹ. 1.); but constantly atarp- $\hat{-}-m a$, asarp- $\hat{a}-m a$, answering to ėté $\bar{\rho}-0-\mu \epsilon \varsigma$, serpebamus ; constantly $\hat{a} s-m a$,
 tishthê-ma to stêmus. To pass, however, to the explanation of the termination mas, we might assume that it should be divided into $m$-as; that the $m$ should stand as theme, but the as as a plural nominative termination; for mas ends like पदस् padas, $\mu \epsilon s$ like $\pi o ́ \delta \epsilon \varsigma$, and the personal endings always express a nominative relation. It is, however, also possible that the $s$ of mas rests on the same principle as the $s$ of the Zend שسرקט yûs, " you," for yûsmé, and the $s$ of the Sanskrit nas, vas, and Latin nos, vos.* Then ซसस् ad-mas would signify "I and they eat," as we have seen that घक्मे $a$-smé was considered a copulative compound in the sense of "I and they" (§. 333.). $\dagger$ In this view the Vêdic termination masi, on which rests the Zend mahi-for instance, दद्मसि dadmasi, gevergg dadĕmahi, "we give"-would [G. Ed. p. 635.] appear to be a mutilation and weakening of the appended pronoun sma, or the $i$ of masi would be a mutilation of $\hat{e}(=a+i)$; and masi (for masê) would thusjoin itself to the Vêdic plural nominative asmê for masmé. The independent asmé would have lost the first, and the termination masi the second $m$. If, however, the first supposition be the true one, the $i$ of masi might be compared with the Greek demonstrative $i$, omitting the difference of quantity.

[^96]440. The Old High German exhibits the first person plural in the very full and perfect shape $m e s$, as well in the primary as in the secondary forms-i.e. in the indicative and subjunctive-while the Gothic has in the one merely $m$, in the other $m a$. In the Lithuanian we find everywhere $m e$; in the Carniolan mo, for instance, délamo, " we labor"; but the Old Sclavonic has a naked $m$ or $m y$ -the latter, however, only in a few verbs, which have, in the singular, the more full termination $m y$ (p. 609); for instance, гамы $y a-m y$, "we eat," = सनस् ad-mas; вьмы vye-my, " we know," = बिस्मस् vid-mus. This Sclavonic ы $y$ for E or o, which, according to $\S .255$. a., we might expect in answer to the Sanskrit w $a$, is, I believe, produced by the euphonic influence of the original $s$ which concludes the form (compare §. 271.). It is more difficult to account for the long $e$ in Old High German, unless Graff (I. 21.) be right in his conjecture, that the termination mês may rest upon that peculiar to the Vêdas, masi. We should then have to assume either that the $i$ which had been dropped from the termination had been replaced by the lengthening of the antecedent vowel (thus mês for mâs, as in Gothic $\hat{e}=$ wा $a$, 8.69.), or that the $i$ had fallen back into the preceding syllable; for out of $a i$ we have, in Old High German, as in Sanskrit, é. In Gothic, we may be surprised that the more mutilated termination $m$ should answer to the fuller Sanskrit termination मम् mas, while the shorter ma [G. Ed. p. ©36.] of the secondary forms has remained unaltered; thus bair-a-m, "ferimus," contrasted with भरामस् bhar-n-mas and bair-ai-ma, "feramus," answering to भरो bhar-t-ma. Probably the diphthong $a i$, and, in the preterite subjunctive, the long $\hat{\imath}$ (written ei, as in bér-ei-ma), was found better able to bear the weight of the personal termination, after the same principle by which the reduplication-syllable of the preterite, in, the Gothic, has only maintained itself in the roots with long syllables, but has perished in the short. We must con-
sider that the Sanskrit, in the reduplicated preterite has, in: like manner, म mu, not मस् mas; but the Gothic, in this place, does not share the termination ma with the Sanskrit, but-as I believe, on account of the shortness of the antecedent vowel-has a simple $m$; hence, for instance, bund-u-m, " we bound," answering to बबन्चिम bdbandl-i-ma.
441. In the dual, the Sanskrit has vas in the primary forms, and $v a$ in the secondary, in analogy with the plural mas, ma. The difference between the dual and the plural is, however, so far an accidental one, in that, as we have before observed ( $\S .434$. .), the dual $v$ is a corruption of $m$. This difference is, nevertheless, of remote antiquity, and existed before the individualization of the German, Lithuanian, and Sclavonic, which all participate in this peculiar dual form. The Lithuanian universally has wa, the Old Sclavonic, together with bд $v a$, an inorganic feminine вь $v y$ ( (§. 429): but the Gothic has three forms, and the most perfect in the subjunctive, where, for instance, bair-ai-va has the same relation to $\frac{\text { रो }}{}$ bhar- $-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{va}$, as, in the plural, bair-ai-ma to भरेल bhar-d-ma. The reason why the dual ending, in this position, has maintained itself most completely, plainly lies, as in the case of the plural, in the antecedent diphthong, which has felt itself strong enough to bear the syllable $v a$. In the indicative present, however, the long $a$
[G. Ed. p. 637.] which, in the Sanskrit bhar-d-vas, precedes the personal termination, has, in the Gothic, shortened itself, in all probability, as, in the plural, bair- $a-m$, and, in the Greek, $\phi \hat{e} \rho-0-\mu \epsilon \varsigma$, contrasted with bhar-d-mas: then, however, $v$ has permitted itself to be extinguished, and out of baira(v)as, by a union of both the vowels, bairds has been generated, as $\delta$, in Gothic, is the long form of $a(\S .69$.$) ; and$ hence, in the nominative plural masculine of the $a$ bases, in like manner $d_{s}$ is produced out of $a+a s$, so that, for instance, vairús, "men," answers to the Sanskrit virras, "heroes ' (out of virra-as). In the indicative preterite we
cannot expect to meet with $\delta s$, as this tense has for its connecting vowel not $a$ but $u$; nor can we expect to meet with $u$-va, since $v a$, like the plural $m a$, can be borne only by diphthongs or long vowels. The next in turn is $u-v$, as analogous to the plural $u-m$. At the end of a word, however, $v$ is subject, where preceded by a short vowel, to be changed into $u$. Hence, for instance, thiu, " servum," (for thiv), from the base THIVA; and thus, also, from $u-v$, first $u-u$, and next long $\hat{u}$, may have been generated, by the union of the two short vowels into one long. I therefore hold the $u$ of magu, " we two can," siyu, " we two are," the only evidence for the form under discussion,* to be long, and write mag $\hat{u}$, siy $\hat{u}$, as contractions of magu-u, siyu-u, from mag-u-v, siy-u-v. Should, however, the $u$ of this termination be neither long nor the modern shortening of an originally long $u$, it would then be identical with that which stands as a connecting vowel in mag-u-ts, $m a g-u-m$, or it would be explainable as mayu from magva, siyu from siyva. Independently, however, of the phonetic impossibility of the last-mentioned form, [G. Ed. p. 638.] the immediate annexation of the personal ending to the root is incredible, because the first dual person would thus present a contrast scarcely to be justified to the second, and to all those of the plural, as well as to the most ancient practice of this tense. In Zend I know no example of the first person dual.
442. Of the middle terminations I shall treat particularly hereafter. The following is a summary view of the points of comparison we have obtained for the first person of the trausitive active form.

[^97]
also "to bear," from which we easily arrive at the idea of "having." In Greek, however, it seems that, in this verb, two roots of distinct origin have intermixed themselves, namely, 'EX = वह् vah, and EXE ( $\Sigma \mathrm{XH})=$ सह् sah, "to bear," with transposition of the radical vowel, as in $\beta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \beta \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$, as related to BAS. If, however, $\epsilon^{\prime} \chi \omega$ and $\sigma \chi \dot{\eta}-\sigma \omega$ belong to one root, the first must then stand for $\sigma \epsilon \chi \omega$, with the loss of the $\sigma$. We must not, however, consider the spiritus asper of $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi \omega$, and of similar forms, as a substitute for the $\sigma$, as it is very satisfactorily explained by §. 104. 4 In p. 213 of my Glossary I have made the Sanskrit vah correspond to the Gothic vagyan, "to set in motion"; [G. Ed. p. 640.] but this vagya belongs, like the Lithuanian vaź-ô-yu, to the causal vâhayami ( $\oint .109^{a} .6$.) : the primitive of vagya has weakened in the present the radical vowel to $i$ ( p .106 ), and only appears in connection with the preposite $g a$ ( $g a-v i-g a, g a-v a g$ ). In the Lithuanian, the $a$ of waíoyu, "I ride," rests on the long $\hat{a}$ of the Sanskrit váhayâmi; the $e$ of wez'ź on the short $a$ of vahâmi. $\quad 5$ Though, at the beginning of the Vendidad (Olshausen's edition, p. 1,) the form daidhyanm belong to the Sanskrit root $d h \hat{a}$, "to place"-which, if not by itself, at least in conjunction with fि $v i$, has the meaning " to make," " to create"-still we deduce thus much from daidhyarim, that it is also derivable from d $\hat{u}$, " to give": unless the $y$ has exercised no aspirating power on the antecedent $d$, in which case we should necessarily have duidyuinm. On the roots دug $d \hat{a}=$ दा $d \hat{a}$, " to give," and युg $d \hat{a}=$ धा $d h a \hat{a}$, "to place," compare Burnouf's pregnant Note 217 to the Yaçna (p. 356), and Fr. Windischman's excellent critique on the same work in the Jena Literar. Zeit. July 1834. p. 143. $\quad{ }^{6}$ See §. 430. $\quad{ }^{7}$ Or, without reduplication, dûwa, as the analogue of the singular dími, together with which, also, a reduplicated form $d \vec{u} d u$, but wanting the $m i$ termination, is extant. ${ }^{8}$ See $\oint .441$. $\quad 9$ See §. 255.e. $\quad{ }^{10}$ See Mielcke, p. 100. 18
${ }^{11}$ Vêda dialect, see §. $439 . \quad{ }^{12}$ See $\delta .440 . \quad{ }^{13}$ Euphonic for
dadymy, see Dobrowsky, pp. 39 and 530. $\quad 14$ See $\oint \oint .440,441$.

## SECOND PERSON.

443. The Sanskrit pronominal base twa or twe (§. 326.) has, in its connection with verbal themes, split itself into various forms, the $t$ either remaining unaltered, or being modified to th or $d h$, or-as in Greek oi has degenerated into $s$-the $v$ being either maintained or removed, the $a$ remaining unaltered, or being weakened to $i$, or altogether displaced. The complete pronominal form shews
itself in the middle voice, as this affects weightier terminations, and therefore has guarded more carefully against the mutiation of the pronoun, upon the same principle as that in which, in Sanskrit, the verbal forms which take Guna admit no irregular mutilations of the roots.
[G. Ed. p. 641.] For it is natural that a form which loves strengthening should at least, under circumstances which prevent that process, repudiate the contrary extreme of mutilation. Hence we say, for example, asmi, "I am," with the root undiminished, because the latter would receive Guna in the singular, if $a$ would admit of Guna;* but we say, in the dual swas, in the plural smas, in the potential syam, because the two plural numbers and the entire potential refuse all Guna increment, and hence, occasionally, admit of radical mutilation. After the same principle, the pronoun of the second person shews itself in its most complete shape in the

[^98]middle voice, namely, in the plural, where the primary forms end in dhwe, and the secondary in dhwam, and, in the imperative singular, where the termination swa has indeed allowed the $T$ sound to vanish into $s$, but has yet preserved the $v$ of twam, "thou." As we [G. Ed. p. 642.] shall have hereafter to consider the middle forms in particular, we now turn to the transitive active form. This has nowhere completely preserved the semi-vowel of the base $t w a$, yet I believe I recognise a remnant of it in the $t h$, which stands in the primary forms, as well in the dual as in the plural, and, in the reduplicated preterite, also in the singular. On the other hand, the secondary forms, as they generally have blunter terminations, so also they lhave, in the two plurals, the pure tenuis; hence, for instance, tishthé-ta,

 from this, that, in Sanskrit, the aspirates are heavier than the tenues or the medials; for they are the union of the full tenuis or medial, with an audible $h$ ( $\S .12$.), and tishthutha, must then be pronounced tisht-hat-ha: and I think that I recognise in the $h$ of the termination the dying breath of the $v$ of twam, "thou."
444. The above examples shew that the full termination of the second person, in the dual present, is thas, and, in the plural, tha: we have, however, seen the dual, in the noun, arise by strengthening of the plural terminations (§. 206.). As, however, the personal terminations, being pronouns, stand in the closest connection with the noun, it might be assumed that the second person plural in the verb was once thas, and that the dual termination thas had developed itself from this; but that, in the lapse of time, the $s$ had escaped from the thas, and the long vowel from the dual thads. We must consider that even, in the first person, the $s$ of mas has but a precarious tenure, as, even in the primary forms, we often meet with ma. If,
however, in the second person plural, the original termination was thas, the Latin tis corresponds well to it, and.it would confirm Thiersch's conjecture, derived from the hiatus, that
[G. Ed. p. 643.] in Homer, instead of $\tau \epsilon$ the termination $\tau \epsilon \varsigma$ may have stood as analogous to $\mu \epsilon \varsigma$ (Third Edition, §. 163.). As to the origin of the $s$ of the termination thas, it is without doubt identical with that of mas in the first person: it is thus either to be divided as $t h-a s$, and $a s$ is to be explained as a plural nominative termination, or the $s$ of tha-s is a remnant of the appended pronoun sma (§.439.); as also, in an isolated condition, $y u-s h m e ́, " y e$," is found with $a-s m e$, "we" (§. 332.). If the latter assumption be correct, possibly in the $m$ of the secondary dual termination tam we may recognise the sccond consonant of smáa; so that this appended pronoun has suffered a twofold mutilation, surrendering at one time its $m$, at another its $s$. In this respect we may recur to a similar relation in the Lithuanian dual genitives mumí, yumú, opposed to the plural locatives musûse, yusûse (§. 176.). As, however, the secondary forms, by rule, are deduced by mutilation from the primary, we might still-whether the first or the second theory be the true one of the termination thas-deduce the duller $m$ from the livelier concluding $s$; as also in Greek, in the primary forms, we find tov from पस् thas; as, in the first person, $\mu \in \nu$ from mas, $\mu \epsilon s$, and, in the Prâkrit fिं hin from the Sanskrit भिस् bhis (§. 97.). Thus, also, may the dual case-termination भ्याम् bhyám have arisen from the plural bhyas originally by a mere lengthening of the vowel (see §. 215.), but later the concluding $s$ may have been corrupted into $m$.
445. While the Greek already, in the primary forms, has corrupted the $s$ of the dual ending thes into $v$, in the Gothic the ancient $s$ has spread itself over primary and secondary forms; and we are able to deduce from this a new proof, that where, in Sanskrit, in the second person dual,
a nasal shews itself, this did not arise out of $s$ till after the separation of languages. The $a$ which preceded [G. Ed. p.644.] the $s$ has, however, escaped from the Gothic, and, in fact, in pursuance of an universal law, by which $a$ before a terminating $s$ of polysyllabic words is either entirely extinguished, or weakened to $i$. The first of these alternatives has occurred; and thus $t s$ answers to the Sanskrit thas, as, in the nominative singular of the bases in $a$, vulfs corresponds to the Sanskrit vrikas and Lithuanian wilkas. Compare bair-a-ts with भरขम् bhar-a-thas, $\phi_{\text {ép-e-tov, and further, }}$ buir-ai-ts with भरेजम् bhar-ê-tam, фép-oc-tov. The Sclavonic has been compelled, according to $\S$. 225. l., to give up the final consonant of the termination in question; the Lithuanian has chosen to do so: both, in fact, make ta correspond to the घस् thas of the Sanskrit primary forms, as well as to the तम् tam of the secondary. Compare the Sclavonic дагта das-ta (see §. 436.), the Lithuanian düs-ta or $d_{u}^{3} d a-t a$, " ye two give," with दत्यस् dat-thas, סíoo-tov; and дабдытта dashdy-ta," "let you two give," दध्धातम् dadyd--ticm, סıסoíntov, and Lithuanian dûdo-ta, "ye two gave," with षद्त्त् adat-tam, édíco-Tov.
446. In the Zend, I know no example of the second dual person; but that of the plural runs as in the Sanskrit primary forms $د \sigma t h a, \dagger$ and in the secondary up $t a$. The Greek, Sclavonic, and Lithuanian have everywhere te, $\mathbf{T E}$, $t e$; the Latin has in the imperative alone weakened its tis to $t e$

[^99](§. 444.). The Gothic has everywhere th, with the terminating vowel rubbed off: this th is, however, in my opinion, neither to be identified with the Sanskrit-Zend th of the
[G. Ed. p. 645.] primary forms, nor to be explained by virtue of the usual law of displacement by which th is required for the older $t$; but very probably the. Gothic personal termination, before the final vowel was abraded, was $d a$. The Gothic, in fact, affects, in grammatical terminations, or suffixes between two vowels, a $d$ for the original $t$, but willingly converts this $d$, after the suppression of the concluding vowel, into th (see §. 91.). On the Gothic $d$ just presupposed rests also the High German $t$ (§. 87.), by a displacement which has thus brought back the original tenuis: hence we find, for instance, Old High German, wëg-a-t, " ye move," answering to the Latin veh-i-tis, Greek ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi$ - $\epsilon-\tau \varepsilon$, (p. 639 G. 'ed. Note ${ }^{3}$.), Lithuanian weź-a-té, Old Sclavonic bezete ve - -e-te, Sanskrit घहथ vah-a-tha, Zend nGugul vaz--a-tha, and presupposing in Gothic an older vigid for vigith.
447. We now turn to the singular. The primary forms have here, in Sanskrit, the termination सि si, and the secondary only $\mathbb{\mathbb { Z }} s$. Out of $8 i$, however, under certain conditions, frequently comes shi (§. 21.), which has also been preserved in the Zend, where, according to §. 53., the original si is changed to $h i$; as
 " thou makest," answering to कृषोषि kriņ̣̂ṣhi, as kri, according to the fifth class (§. $109^{\text {a }} .4$.), would form. In the secondary forms, according to $\S .56^{\text {b }}$., the concluding sibilant, with a preceding $\Delta a$, has become $\backslash \hat{o}$, and with $u s a$, $\varepsilon u a$, but
 rávayô, " thou spakedst"(V.S. p. 41), answering to प्राश्रावयस्


[^100]to सद्रोस् abros, for which irregularly षबवीस् [G. Ed. p. 646.] nbravis (Gram. Crit. §. 352.). Among the European cognate languages, the Old Sclavonic takes decided precedence for the fidelity and consistency with which it has preserved the primary termination si or shi, and so distributed them that the first has remained in the archaic conjugation, (§.436.) the
and oldest manuscripts (Yaça, pp. lvii. lviii.), that $\downarrow_{\text {as }}$ well as $\dagger_{\text {stands }}$ for the Sanskrit vो; the former, $\downarrow$, however, only for the initial and mediah, aud always accompanied by the new Guna $a$ ( $\left(\right.$ f. 28.)-thus always $b^{2}$ for an initial and medial sit,-and the latter, Ц, only for a terminating \&ो and without the appendage of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$; as also before $e e^{f}$ at the end of a word no $\leadsto a$ is inserted. As a medial letter, $\backslash$ appears sometimes as the representative of the Sanskrit $\mathbb{y} a$, and is then produced by the influence either of an antecedent $v$ or $b$ ( represents in the diphthong suc oti, the $a$ element of the Sanssruit 叉 $\hat{\varepsilon}$ ( $=a+i$ ). As, however, $\grave{y}$ in the purest texts is specially reserved for a position in the last syllable, it happens that, for the most part, it is, according to its origin, the solution of the syllable चस् $a s$, as this terminating syllable, in Sanskrit, becomes $\hat{o}$ only before sonants, in Zend almays ( $\$ .56^{\mathrm{b}}$.). Yet I do not believe that it has been the intention of the Zend speech or writing to distinguish the Guna w्ञो $\hat{0}$, i.e. the $\hat{o}$ which springs from $\mathbf{J} u$ with $a$ inserted before it, from that which springs from सम् $a s$, by vocalization of the sto $u$; for each $\sigma$ consists of $a+u$, and upon the value and the pronunciation the question whether the $u$ - or the $\alpha$-element was there first, whether an $u$ has been prefixed to the $u$, or an $u$ appended to the $a$, can have no influence. The position of a vowel in a word may, however, well have an influence on its value; and it is conceivable that the concluding $\hat{\delta}$, kept pure from the Guna $a$, appeared more important than that which, at the beginning or middle of a word, had $a$ prefixed. If the crude forms in $u$, in Zend as in Sanskrit, had Guna in the vocative ( $\$ .205$.$) , the concluding Guna-wो would also, as I believe, be represented$ in Zend by $\downarrow$ and not by . I I can, however, as it is, discover no reason why a concluding wit in Sanskrit, produced by Guna out of $u$, should be represented in Zend in the one way or the other.
［G．E．p．647．］latter in all the others．I subjoin the verbs of the archaic conjugation，with several examples of the more common，for comparison with the Sanskrit．
old sclavonic．
ஈ！и yesi，＂es，＂
AAE只 dasi，＂＂das，＂
гаки yasi，＂＂edis，＂
вНЕи vyesi，＂＂novisti，＂
пїепи pieshi，＂bibis，＂
чїЕши chieshi，＂quiescis，＂
＂м末кщи smyeyeshi（sya），＂rides，＂ ВНЕШи vyeyeshi，＂flas，＂ $3^{\text {манши }}$ 2nayeshi，＂novisti，＂ коиши boïshi（sya），＂times，＂ д＇Неши dyeyeshi，＂fucis，＂ ※ИВЕши shiveshi，＂vivis，＂ шАдЕши padeshi，＂cadis，＂ ВЕ马Ењи ve？eshi，＂vehis，＂ спиши spishi，＂dormis，＂ ९ЕчЕши recheshi，＂dicis，＂ ＇曰яаеши tryaseshi（sya），＂tremis，＂ БНдЕши byedeshi，＂affligis，＂ NЕЕЕШИ neseshi，＂fers，＂ Зокеши $̧ o b e s / i q, ~ " v o c a s, " 8$ ДерЕпи dereshi，＂excoris，＂ црошиши proshishi，＂precaris，＂ гАдиши gadishi，＂vituperas，＂
审 САышиши slyshishi，＂audis，＂
 คं п\＆дищи pûdishi，＂pellis，＂ вАৎтиши vartishi，＂vertis＂，
－кудиши bûdishi，＂expergefacis，＂ ＂мижищи smishishi，＂nictaris，＂

SANSKRIT．
घ्रसि $a s i$ ．
ददासि daddsi．
क्षस्सि atsi．
बेत्स vettsi．
पिवसि pivasi．${ }^{2}$
शेषे séesché．
स्मयसे smayase．${ }^{3}$
वासि visi．
जानासि jîndsis．${ }^{4}$
बिभेपि bibhêṣhi．
दधासि dadhasi．${ }^{5}$
जीवfस $\mathfrak{j i v a s i .}$
पतसि patasi．
वहसि vahasi．
खरिषि swapishi．
वर्षस vachasi．
च्रससि trasasi．
विध्रसि vidhyasi．
नयस्स nayasi．${ }^{7}$
द्यसि hwayasi．
दृखासि driñ̂si，＂laceras．＂ः
पृब्र्रस prichchhasi，＂interrogas，＂${ }^{10}$
गदसि gadasi，＂loqueris．＂
সृयोषि ṣ́riñôṣhi．${ }^{11}$
खनसि swanasi．
पादयसि paddayasi．${ }^{12}$
वर्तीस vartasi．
बोधयसि bddhayasi．
fमषसि mishusi．
${ }^{1}$ See $\S .436 \quad 2$ Compare пиво pıo，＂beer．＂${ }^{3}$ A middle．
form, which is replaced in Sclavonic by the appended reflexive. A According to the ninth class ( $\oint$. $109^{\mathrm{s}} .5$.), but with irregular suppression of the $n$ of the root $j n a$, which in the second class would form $j n d s i$, to which the Sclavonic form approaches more closely. ${ }^{5}$ Dhd "to place," obtains, through the preposition $v i$, the meaning "to make" (compare §. 442., Note ${ }^{5}$ ). Perhaps, also, the Carniolan délam, "I work," is based on this root, so that it would stand for dedam ( $\$ .17$.), retaining the reduplication which is peculiar to the Sanskrit and Greek verb, as also the Lithuanian dedu with dêmi. $\quad{ }^{6}$ Observe the favourite interchange between $v$ and $r$ or $l$ ( $\$ .20$ and $\S .409$., Note $\dagger$ ): on this perhaps rests the relation of the inseparable preposition $\left.\rho^{A_{3}} r a\right\}$-which in several compounds corresponds in sense to the Latin dis (Dobr. p. 422, \&c.)-to the Sanskrit बहिस् vahis, "out," for $\mathbb{E}^{h}$ is frequently represented by the
 BE $\mathcal{Z}^{8}$ ve ${ }^{2} u$. The Sanskrit vahis, however, is found in Sclavonic in another form besides this, viz. with the $v$ hardened to $b$; hence EEZ $b e \zeta$, "without"; in verbal combinations $b \zeta$ and $b o \xi$ (Dobr. p.413, \&c.). ${ }^{7}$ I have no doubt of the identity of the Sclavonic root nes and the Sanskrit $n \hat{\text { }}$, which agree in the meaning "to bring"; and in many passages in the Episode of the Deluge the Sanskrit $n \hat{\imath}$ may be very well rendered by "to carry." With reference to the sibilant which is added in Sclavonic observe, also, the relation of the root slys, "to hear," to the Sanskrit śru and Greek KıY. ${ }^{8}$ In the infinitive sbati and preterite sbach the
 zbayêmi, a complex but legitimate modification of the Sanskrit lwwayami ( $\$ \oint .42 .57$.). $\quad 9$ The root is properly dar, according to the Grammarians द $d r \bar{i}$, and या $n \hat{a}$ (euphonic for $n \hat{a}$ ) the character of the ninth class ( $\oint .109^{4} .5$.). Compare Vocalismus, p. $179 . \quad{ }^{10}$ Remark the Zend form ${ }^{1 "}$ Irregularly for śruṇôşi, from the root s'ru, with the character of the fifth class (§. 109 . 4.), and $n$ euphonic for $n$ [G. Ed.p.649.] (comp. Note ${ }^{7}$.). ${ }^{12}$ The causal form of pad, "to go." The Sclavonic has $\hat{u}$ for $\hat{a}$, according to $\oint .255 . \mathrm{h}$. The Latin pello appears to me to belong to this root, with exchange of $d$ for $l$ ( $\$ .17$.), to which a following $y$ may have assimilated itself-as, in Greek, ä $\lambda \lambda$ os from ${ }^{a} \lambda y$ yos-as a remnant of the causal character we aya ( $\oint .374$.).
448. The Lithuanian has, in common with the Greek, preserved the full termination si only in the verb substantive, where es-si and the Doric é $\sigma-\sigma i$ hold out a sisterly hand to
each other. In other cases the two languages appropriate the syllable in question so that the Lithuanian retains everywhere the $i$, the Greek, in accordance with the Latin and Gothic, the s. Compare the Lithuanian did' ${ }^{\prime}-i$ with the Sanskrit daddu-si, Sclavonic da-si, Greek $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \omega-s$, and Latin da-s. Just as $d^{\circ} d^{\prime}-i$ has suppressed its radical vowel before that of the termination, so, in Mielcke's first and second conjugation, is the connecting vowel removed, while the third and fourth form a diphthong of it with $i$, as in the first person with the $u$; hence $w e z-i$ for $w e z e-i$, answering to the Sanskrit vah-a-si, Zend vaz-a-hi, Sclavonic ve ${ }^{2}-e-s h i$, Latin veh-is, Gothic vig-i-s (§. $109^{n} .1$.), Greek ${ }^{\ell} \chi \chi-\epsilon t-\varsigma$, and its own plural vez-e-te, as $d \check{u} d a-t e$, answering to $d \grave{u} d '-i$; but yessk- $a-i$, " thou seekest," analogous to the first person yessk-a-u. In the Greek, however, the $i$ of the second person in the conjugation in $\omega$ has hardly been lost entirely, but has very probably retired back into the preceding syllable. As, for instance, $\gamma \epsilon \nu$ étet $\rho \alpha$ out of $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \alpha=$ Sanskrit janitrı̂; $\mu \in ́ \lambda \alpha \iota \nu \alpha$ out of $\mu \in \lambda \alpha \nu \iota \alpha$ (§.119.), $\mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu, \chi \epsilon i \rho \omega \nu, \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon i \nu \omega v$, for $\mu \epsilon \zeta \omega \nu \nu, \& c$. (§. 300. p. 415 G. ed.); so also $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \pi-\varepsilon \iota-s$ out of $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi-\epsilon-\sigma \iota=$ Sanskrit tarp- $a-s i$. Or are we to assume, that in Greek the $i$ has exercised an attractive force similar to that in Zend (§.41.), and accordingly the antecedent syllable has assimilated itself by the insertion of an $i$, so that $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi \epsilon \iota s$ is to be explained as arising [G. Ed. p. 650.] from an older form $\tau \in \rho \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \iota$ ? I think not, because, of the $i$-forms extant now in Greek, no one exhibits such a power of assimilation, and, for instance, we find
 power which is not attached to the living $九$ is hardly to be ascribed to the dead.
449. The Lithuanian carries over the $i$ of the primary forms also to the secondary, at least to the preterite, or has brought it back by an inorganic path to this place, which it must have originally occupied; so that, for instanoe, buw-a-i corresponds to the Sanskrit $a-b h a v-a-s_{1}$ " thou wast."

On the other hand, in the Sclavonic the secondary forms are without any personal sign of distinction, since the final $s$ of the cognate languages has been compelled to yield to the universal law of suppression of terminating consonants (§. 255.l.). Hence, for instance, the imperatives дджди dushdi, "give," BE ${ }^{\text {t }}$ ve bye, "drive," answering to the Sanskrit dadyd̂s, vahês, Zend daidhyâo (§. 442. Note ${ }^{\text {T, }}$, and §. $56^{\text {b }}$.), vazôis, Greek סıסoins, $^{\text {é }} \chi$ oıs, Latin dês, vehâs, Gothic vigais.
450. There remain two isolated singular terminations of the second person to be mentioned, fu dhi and थ tha. The former is found in Sanskrit in the imperative of the second principal conjugation, which answers to the Greek conjugation in $\mu$; the latter in the reduplicated preterite of verbs in general. The termination dhi has, however, split itself into two forms; inasmuch as, in the common language, consonants alone have the power to bear the full $d h i$, but after vowels all that remains of the $d h$ is the aspiration; hence, for instance, bhâhi, "shine," p $\hat{\alpha}-h i$, " rule," in contrast to $a d-d h i$, "eat," vid-dhi, " know," vag-dhi, "speak," yung-dhi, " bind." That. however, $d h i$ originally had universal prevalence, may be inferred from the fact, that in Greek the corresponding $\theta_{l}$ spreads itself over consonants and vowels, since we find not only ${ }^{\prime} \sigma-\theta_{l}$, кє́кк $\alpha \chi \theta_{l}, \stackrel{\alpha}{\alpha} \nu \omega \chi \theta_{l}, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta_{l}$, but [G. Ed. p. 651.] also $\phi_{\alpha} \theta_{l}, \imath_{l} \theta_{l}, \sigma \tau \hat{\eta} \theta_{l}, \& c$. : furthermore from this, that in Sanskrit, also, many other aspirates have so far undergone mutilation, that nothing but the breathing has remained; inasmuch as, for instance, the root dhd, "to lay," forms hita in the participle passive; and the dative termination bhyam in the pronominal first person, although at an extremely remote period, has been mutilated to hyam (§. 215.) : finally from this, that in more modern dialects also, in many places, a mere $h$ is found where the Sanskrit still retains the full aspirated consonant, as also the Latin opposes its humus to the Sanskrit bhúmi. My opinion hereon, already elsewhere established, that whereas it has formerly been assumed that the termination $h i$, as the original, has, after consonants, been
strengthened to $d h i$, this assumption is false, and conversely the $d h i$ has been shortened, after vowels, to $h i$, is since then confirmed by the Vêdic dialect, which I had not yet consulted; inasmuch as in this it is true the mutilated form $h i^{*}$ is already extant, but the older $d h i$ has not retired so far to the rear as not to be permitted to connect itself also with vowels. Thus, in Rosen's Specimen of the Rig-Vêda (p. 6), the form $\leqslant r u-d h i$, " hear thou," answers remarkably to the Greek $\kappa \lambda \hat{v} \theta_{\iota} . \dagger$ The Zend also gives express confirmation to my theory, in that it never, as far as is yet known, admits of the form hi, or its probable substitute $\Omega^{2} z i(\S .57$.), but proves that at the period of its identity with the Sanskrit the $T$ sound of the ending dhi had as yet not yielded. In Zend, in fact, we find, wherever the personal termination is not altogether vanished, either dhi or $d \hat{\prime}$; for instance,
 " make thou," for the word, deprived of its personal termination, कृणु krinu; دéseg daz-dhi, "give thou," (for देहि dêhi), euphonic for $d a d-d h i$, inasmuch as $T$ sounds before other $T$ sounds pass into sibilants (compare $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma-\theta_{l}$, §. 102 concl.): to soft consonants, however, as Burnouf has shewn, the soft sibilants $\leq z$ and $e b z h$ alone correspond. $\dot{f}$ For د@ gen dazdhi we find, also, gavis dadí, for instance, Vend. S. p. 422; but I do not recollect to have met elsewhere with $d i ̂$ for $d h i$.
451. How much, in Sanskrit, the complete retention of the termination fu dhi depends on the preceding portion of the word, we see very clearly from this, that the character of the fifth class ( $n u, \S .109^{\text {a }} .4$.) has preserved the mutilated form $h i$ only in cases where the $u$ rests against two antece-

[^101]dent consonants ; for instance, in Âpnuhi, " obtain," from $A p$ (compare ad-ipiscor). Where, however, the $u$ is preceded only by a simple consonant, it is become incapable of bearing the hi termination; hence, for instance, chinu, "collect," from the root chi. In this mutilated form the Sanskrit goes along with the corresponding verbal class in Greek, where $\delta \in i \kappa \nu \bar{u}$, according to appearance, is in like manner without personal termination. The coincidence is, however, so far fortuituous, as that each of the two languages has arrived independently at this mutilated form subsequently to their separation. Nor is the Greek $\delta \in i ́ \kappa \nu \bar{u}$ entirely without termination, but, as I conjecture, the $\iota$ of the ending $\theta_{l}$ lies concealed in the $\bar{v}$, as also in the optative long $v o c c u r s$ for $v \iota$; for instance, $\delta \alpha \iota v \hat{\tau} \tau 0$ (Il. xxiv. 665.) from $\delta \alpha \iota v v i \tau o . ~ I t ~ i s ~ n o t ~ r e-~$ quisite, therefore, to derive $\delta \in i ́ \kappa \nu \bar{u}$ from the $\omega$ conjugation, and to consider it as a contraction from $\delta$ 㑑 $\kappa v e$; [G. Ed. p. 653.] and thus, also, to deduce $\tau_{i} \theta \varepsilon \epsilon$, not from $\tau i \theta \epsilon \epsilon$, but from $\tau i \theta \epsilon \tau$, the $\tau$ being rejected, as $\tau u ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \iota$ from $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi \tau \epsilon \tau \iota$, followed out
 (for í $\sigma \tau \eta$ ) from í $\sigma \tau \alpha(\theta) \iota$, as Moú $\sigma \eta$ from Moú $\sigma \alpha$, , $\lambda^{\prime} \gamma \varphi$ from $\lambda$ dónot $^{\text {(compare oĺkoı). If, also, dídou be the contraction of }}$ $\delta^{\prime} \delta o \epsilon$, we find also with it, in Pindar, the dialectic form $\delta i \delta o l$, which admits very well a derivation from $\delta \delta(\hat{\delta} \circ(\theta) \iota$.*
452. As the $\mathbf{J} u$ of the fifth class, where it is not preceded by two consonants, has lost the capacity for supporting the personal termination dhi or hi; thus, also, the short $a$ of the first chief conjugation, both in Sanskrit and Zend, has proved too weak to serve as a support to dhi or hi, and has laid them aside, as would appear, from the remotest period, as the corresponding Greek conjugation,

[^102]namely, that in $\omega$, and the Latin and Germanic conjugations, collectively dispense with the personal termination. The Germanic simple (strong) conjugation also surrenders the connecting vowel; hence vig for viga, Sanskṛit vah-a, Zend vaz-a, Latin veh-e, Greek ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi$ - $\epsilon$.
453. We now turn to the termination e tha, of which it has already been remarked, that it is, in the singular, peculiar to thè reduplicated preterite. In the Zend I know no certain instance of this termination; yet I doubt not that there, also, its prevalence is pervading, and that in a passage of the Izeshne (V.S. p. 311), in which we expect a fuller explanation through Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation,
[G. Ed. p. 654.] the expression vawexgudd fra-dadhâtha can mean nothing else than "thou gavest," as the representative of the Sanskrit pra-dadâtha, (§. 47.); for in the second person plural, after the analogy of the Sanskrit and the Zend first person dadĕmahi (§. 30.), the $\hat{a}$ of the root must have been extinguished, and I expect here $d a s$ for nGuses das̉-tha, insomuch as in the root usp s̀t $A$, answering to the Sanskrit root स्था sthá (compare p. 111), so universally, in Zend, the Sanskrit v th has laid aside its aspiration after $3 s_{s}$.* Among the European cognate languages the Gothic comes the nearest to the aboriginal grammatical condition of our family of languages, in so far that, in its simple (strong) preterite, it places a $t$ as a personal sign, without exception, opposite to the Sanskrit tha, which $t$ remains exempt from suppression, because it is always sustained by an antecedent consonant (compare §. 91.): we might otherwise expect to find a Gothic th answering to the Sanskrit th, yet not as an unaltered continuation of the Sanskrit sound, but because घ् th is a comparatively younger letter (compare p. 621), to which the Greek $\tau$ corresponds,

[^103]and to this latter the Gothic th. If, however, the Greek, in its termination $\theta \alpha$, appears identical with the Sanskrit घ tha, this appearance is delusive, for in an etymological point of view $\theta=\mathrm{v} d h$ (§. 16.). While, however, this rule holds good elsewhere, in the case above, $\theta$ is generated by the antecedent $\sigma$, on the same principle as that which, in the mediopassive, converts every $\tau$ of an active personal termination, after the pre-insertion of $\sigma$, into $\theta$. As to the origin of the $\sigma$ which constantly precedes the ending $\theta \alpha \quad$ [G. Ed. p. 655.] I have now no hesitation, contrary to an earlier opinion,* in referring it to the root in $\hat{j} \sigma \theta \alpha$ and oif $\theta \alpha$, and in dividing them $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\theta \alpha$, oi $\sigma-\theta \alpha$ (for oo $\delta \theta \alpha$ ). The former answers to the Sanskrit $\hat{a}_{s}-\mathrm{i}-\mathrm{th} a$, for which we may expect $\hat{d}_{s}-t h a$, without the connecting vowel, which has perhaps remained in the Vèdadialect. If this treatment and comparison, however, be sound, then is $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\theta \alpha$ also a remnant of the perfect, to which, too, the first person $\hat{\eta}^{\alpha}$ for $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha=$ Sanskrit $\lambda s a$, belongs, and the ending $\theta \alpha$ thus stands in $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$ in its true place: just so, also, in oi $\sigma-\theta \alpha$, answering to the Sanskrit vêt-tha (for véd-tha), " thou knowest," Gothic vais-t for vait-t (\$. 102.), and very probably to the Zend vates-tu (see p.94). The root fिद् vid, in Sanskrit, has the peculiarity, demonstrated by comparison with the cognate languages to be of extreme antiquity, of using the terminations of the reduplicated preterite, but without reduplication, with a present signification: hence, in the first person, vêda (not vivêda), answering to the Greek oijo for
 with Pott, as in all pluperfects, a periphrastic formation, and consider, therefore, his $\epsilon_{\sigma} \theta \alpha$ or $\eta_{\sigma} \theta \alpha$ as identical with the simple $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$. " $\mathrm{H} \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha$ is, as to form, a plusquam perfect: nevertheless, to the Sanskrit first augmented preterite âyam, âyas, そ̌iov, 并ics, correspond. In é $\phi \eta \sigma \theta \alpha$, how-

[^104]ever, and in dialectic forms like $\dot{\epsilon} \theta \in ́ \in \eta \eta \sigma \theta \alpha$, the terminatiou $\theta \alpha$ appears to me unconscious of its primitive destination, and, habituated by $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$, and oi $\sigma-\theta \alpha$ to an antecedent $\sigma$, to have fallen back upon the personal sign $\mathbf{\Sigma}$, which was ready to its hand.
454. In Latin, sti corresponds to the Sanskrit termination tha, with a weakening of the $a$ to $i$, and the pre-insertion of an $s$, which has even intruded itself into the
[G. Ed. p. 650.] plural, where the $s$ is less appropriate. On which account I consider it as a purely euphonic affix. Compare, for example-

| Latin. | s.ansknit. |
| :---: | :---: |
| di-sti, | dadi-tha or dada-tha. |
| eti-sti, | tasthi-tha or tastha-tha. |
| momord-i-sti, | mamard-i-tha, "thou crushedst." |
| $u d-$-sti, | tutodd-i-tha, "thou woundedst." |
| peped-i-sti, | papard-i-tha. |
| poposc-i-sti | ch-i-tha,* " thou asked |

The Latin has preserved the ancient condition of the language more faithfully than the Greek in this respect, that it has not allowed the termination in question to overstep the limits of the perfect. The Lithuanian and Sclavonic have allowed the reduplicated preterite, and, with it, the termination, entirely to perish.
455. We give here a general summary of the points of comparison which we have established for the second persou of the three numbers of the transitive active form.

[^105]SINGULAR.

tişhṭhatha, histatha, ï $\sigma \tau a \tau \epsilon$, statis, *stât bharatha, baratha, фє́рєтє, fertis, ${ }^{22}$ bairith ${ }^{\text {³ }}$ vahatha, vazatha, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\text {є }}$ € $\tau \epsilon, \quad$ vehitis, vigith, ${ }^{23}$ tişhṭhêta, ${ }^{6}$ histaêta, iбraìךrє, stêtis dadydta, daidhyâta, סıঠoìךтє, dêtis, . . . bharêta, baraêta, 申є́poırє, ferâtis, bairaith ${ }^{23}$
 avahata, vazata, єiХєтє, vehebatis, .
 weséte

1 Abbreviated from as-si. ${ }^{2}$ Sce §. 448. ${ }^{3}$ Corresponds, with regard to the immediate connection of the personal termination with the root, to बिभरिष bibharshi of the third class ( $\left(109^{4} .3\right.$.). ${ }^{4}$ See §. 442. Note ${ }^{3}$. $\quad{ }^{5}$ This form is grounded on siy as its root ; $a$ is the usual connecting rowel (p. 105), and $i$ the modal expression. More of this hereafter. ${ }^{6}$ Tiṣhthâyâs, or, with the $\hat{a}$ suppressed, tiṣhṭhyâs, would correspond with the Greek i$\sigma \tau a i \eta s: ~ b u t ~ t h e ~ r o o t ~ s t h e ́ ~ t r e a t s ~ i t s ~ r a d i c a l ~ v o w e l ~$ according to the analogy of the $a$ of the first and sixth class (§. 109 ${ }^{\text {a }}$. 1.), and contracts it, therefore, with the modal character $i$ or $\hat{\imath}$, into $\hat{e}$, as in Latin stés out of stais. More of this hercafter.

7 The Lithuanian imperative, also, like the Sclavonic, rests on the Sanskrit potential. The $i$ is thas here not a personal but a modal expression, but is generally suppressed in the second person singular; and Rulig declares the form with $i$ to be absolute. $\quad{ }^{8}$ See Dobr. p. 530. $\quad{ }^{9}$ See Dobr. p. 539, and the further remarks on the imperative of the Archaic conjugation. ${ }^{10}$ See $\oint \oint .255$. l. and 433 . ${ }^{11}$ Out of $a d-d h i$, and this euphonic for as-dhi, $\imath^{\prime} \sigma-\theta_{l}$ (Gram. Crit. $\oint .100$.); so, below, dé-hi out of dad-dhi. That, however, the form dé-hi has been preceded by an earlier dd-hi or $\dot{d a}-d h i$, may be inferred from the Zend form $d \hat{a} i-d i$ (see $\} .450$.), the first $i$ of which has been brought in by the retro-active influence of the last (§.41.). In Sanskrit, however, I no longer, as I once did, ascribe to the $i$ of $\hat{e} d h i, d e ̂ h i$, an assimilating influence on the antecedent syllable, but I deduce the $\hat{e}$ from $\hat{a}$ thus, that the latter clement of $a+a$ has weakened itself to $i$. I shall recur to this hereafter, when I come to the reduplicated preterite. $\quad{ }^{12}$ As एधि $\hat{d} d h i$ has sprung from $a d-d h i$, the latter leads us to expect a Zend form دygu $a z$-di, by the same law which has generated sgesg daz-di from dad-di. ${ }^{13}$ The here supposed sgebsly vizh-di, from vid-di, distinguishes itself from sgsvg $d a z-d i$, out of dad$d i$, through the influence of the antecedent vowel; for $e b z h$ and $\rho z$ are, as sonant (soft) sibilants, so related to each other as, in Sanskṛit, स् $s$ and प् ṣh among the surd (hard), see $\oint .21$, and compare Burnouf's Yaçna, p. cxxi. ${ }^{14}$ See $\oint .450$., and abọve, Notes ${ }^{11}$ and ${ }^{12}$. ${ }^{15}$ See $\oint .450 .{ }^{16}$ Vêda-form, §. 450. ${ }^{17}$ I have here, and also p. 654 G. ed, given a short $a$ to the ending tha, although the lithographed Codex, p. 311, presents fradadhâthâ with a long $\hat{a}$; but in the passage cited of the Izeshne there are many othcr instances of the short terminating $a$ written long; for which reason I cannot draw from the form fradadath $\hat{a}$ the conclusion that the originally short personal-termination tha has lengthened itselfin Zend, while elsewhere, conversely, the long final $a$ of polysyllabic words has been shortened: compare p. 306 Note $\dagger$. As to what concerns the supposed form aonhitha I have clse-

 toonhitha. ${ }^{18}$ See pp. 63:, 633 . ${ }^{19}$ See §. 102. s. f., and p. 654 G. ed. ${ }^{20}$ The Gothic roots staut and mait have permanently substituted the Guna for the radical vowel, and thus preserved the reduplication : their concluding $\boldsymbol{t}$ for $\boldsymbol{d}$ satisfies the law of substitution, but the first $t$ of staut is retaincd on its original footing by the pre-insertion of the euphonic $s$ ( $\$ .91$.). With regard to the $m$ of mait, as corresponding to the bh of bhid, look to §§.62. and 215., and to the phenomenon, often before mentioned, that one and the same root in one and the same language has often split itself into various forms of various signification; for which reason I do not hesitate to consider as well bit, "to bite" (beita, bait), as mait, " to cut off," with its petrificd Guna, as corresponding to the Sanskrit blid, "to split." ${ }^{21}$ The dual termination $t \hat{o}$, of which we have evidence for the third person, leaves scarcely room for doubt that thô belongs to the second person of the primary forms. ${ }^{22}$ Compare fिभृथ bibhri-tha of the third class, and above Note ${ }^{3} . \quad{ }^{28}$ Upon th for $d$, see $\oint .446$.

> THIRD PERSON.

456 The pronominal base $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{t a}(\S, 343$.$) has, after the analogy$ of the first and second person, weakened its vowel, in the singular primary forms, to $i$, and in the secondary laid it quite aside: the $t$, however, in Sanskrit and Zend, has, with the exception of the termination in us [G.Ed.p.660.] nowhere suffered alteration, while, in the second person, we have seen the $t$ of $t w a$ divide itself into the forms $t, t h, d h$, and $s$. The Greek, on the other hand, has left the $t$ of the third person in ordinary language unaltered only in $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ́=$ घfित asti, sus̀ti, but elsewhere substituted a $\sigma$; so that, for instance, $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota$ more resembles the Sanskrit second person dadasi than the third daddti, and is only distinguished inorganically from its own second person diows, by the circumstance that the latter has dropped the $i$, which naturally belonged to it. That, however, originally $\tau \iota$ prevailed everywhere, even in the conjugation in $\omega$, is proved by the medio-passive termination $\tau \alpha l$; for as $\delta^{\prime} \delta\left(\sigma_{\alpha} \alpha\right.$ is founded on $\delta^{\prime} \dot{\partial} \omega \tau \iota$, so also is $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \pi \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ on $\tau \hat{\rho} \rho \pi-\epsilon-\tau \iota=$ Sanskrit tarp-a-ti. The form тé $\rho \pi \epsilon \iota$ has, however, arisen from a

 ＂dicit，＂is used together with bhanadi．t In the secondary forms the Greek，according to the universal law of sound， has given up the concluding $T$ sound，and goes hand in hand，in this respect，with the Prâkrit，which，with excep－ tion of the Anuswâra（§．10．），has repudiated all consonants at the end of words，as in the Gothic，§．432．，and the Sclavonic，§．255．l．：hence＇́ $\chi \circ$ ot answers better to the Prâkrit form vahê，and to the Gothic vigai and Sclavonic
 and Latin vehat，vehet．

457．While the concluding $T$ sound of the secondary forms in ［G．Ed．p．661．］Sanskrit and Zend has survived the injuries of time in but one other language，the Latin，in the more full termination of the primary forms $t i$ almost everywhere the $i$ alone has been dropped，but the $T$ sound has been preserved to the present day in German and in Russian．Nor has the Old Sclavonic allowed the $i$ to escape entirely，but exhibits it in the form of a $y . \ddagger$ Compare

к⿺辶斤 yes－ty，＂est，＂ raCTb yas－ty，§＂edit，＂ вظटтb vyes－ty，§＂scit，＂ д，аеть das－ty，§＂dat，＂ веzeT＇b veS－e－ty，＂vehit，＂

SANSKRIT．
प्रस्ति $a s-i i$ ．
सคि $a t-t i$ ．
वेश्नि vett－ti．
ददानि dadâ－ti．
वहीति vahu－ti．

[^106]The Lithuanian has, in the ordinary conjugation, lost the sign of the third person in the three numbers; hence wéz-a' corresponding to the Sclavonic ve $\zeta-e-t y$ and Sanskrit vah-a-ti; so, too, in the dual and plural. Those verbs only, which, in the first person, have preserved the termination $m i$ (§. 435.), have, in the third also, partially preserved the full $t i$, or the $t$, and, indeed, at the same time, in direct combination with the root; hence, esti, "he is," düsti, or dưst',* " he gives," êst',* " he eats," giest',* "he sings," dest',* "he places," miegt', "he sleeps," sáugt', "he preserves," gelbt', " he helps," sérgt', "he protects," liekt', "he lets." This singular termination is also carried over to the dual and plural. The Gothic has, with the exception of ist, where the ancient tenuis has maintained itself under the protection of the antecedent $s$, everywhere $t h$ in the third person of the primary forms. This $t$, however, is not the usual substitute of $t$, but stands, as in the [G. Ed.p. 662.] second plural person (see §. 446.), euphonically for $d$, because th suits the ending better than $d$ (§.91.). In the mediopassive, on the other hand, the older medial has maintained itself in the termination $d a$, which also agrees with the Prâkrit ending di. On these medials rests, also, the Old High German $t$, by a displacement which has again brought back the original form. $\dagger$
453. For the designation of plurality a $n$, which has been compared before with the accusative plural (§. 236.), is inserted before the pronominal character. After this $n$, the Gothic, in contradistinction from the singular, has maintained the older medial, since $n d$ is a favourite combination. Compare sind with सन्ति santi, دp,

[^107]$(\sigma) \varepsilon \nu \tau i$. The Sapnskrit observes before the same $n$ the same principle, which we have noticed above (§.437. Rem.), with respect to the vowel-less $m$ of the first person of the secondary forms. It pre-inserts, namely, an $a$ when that letter or $a$ does not already precede the pluralizing $n$ in the class or radical syllable: hence, indeed, tarp-a-nti, like tép $\pi-0-\nu \tau 1$, tishta-nti like í $\sigma \tau \alpha-\nu \tau \iota, b h a ̂-n t i$, " they shine," like $\phi \alpha-\nu \tau i$; but chi-nw-anti, " they collect," not chi-nu-nti from chi; y-anti, "they go," not
[G.Ed. p. 663.] i-nti* from $i$. Thus the Greek $\bar{\alpha} \sigma t$ out of
 foundation; for it is scarcely to be admitted that so striking a coincidence can be accidental. For even if the forms тו $\theta \epsilon \alpha \nu \tau \iota, \delta \iota \delta o \alpha \nu \tau \iota, i \alpha \nu \tau \iota, \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa \nu v \alpha \nu \tau \iota$, are not maintained in any dialect, yet we cannot doubt that the length of the $\alpha$ in $\tau \iota \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma t$, \&c., as well as in í $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ and $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\tau} \phi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, is a compensation for a dropped $v$, and that $\sigma \iota$, as everywhere in the third person, stands for $\tau$. With regard, however, to the interpolated $\alpha$, $\delta \in \iota \kappa v v^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ and ${ }^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \bar{\sigma} \sigma \iota$ coincide the most closely with the aboriginal type of our family of language, as in $\tau t \theta^{\prime} \varepsilon \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ the $\epsilon$, and in $\delta \delta \delta_{o}^{\prime} \alpha \sigma_{\iota}$ the $o$, stand for the Sanskrit $\hat{a}$ or $a$; for $\tau_{i} \hat{\theta}_{\eta \mu t}=\operatorname{dadhâmi~and~} \delta i \hat{\delta} \omega \mu t=d a d a ̂ m i$. These two Sanskrit words must originally have formed, in the third plural person, dadhâ-n-ti, dadâ-nti, or, with a shortened $a$, dadha-nti, dada-nti; and to this is related the Doric $\tau \ell \theta^{\prime} \nu \tau \iota, \delta_{\ell} \delta^{\prime} v \tau \iota$, as $\dot{\epsilon} v \tau i$ to सन्ति santi. The forms $\tau i \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \alpha \sigma!$, $\delta_{i \delta} \delta_{o ́ \alpha} \sigma \iota$, however, have followed the analogy of $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu \dot{v} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ and $\neq \bar{\iota} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$, inasmuch as they

[^108]have treated their radical vowel as though it had not sprung from $a$. Thus the Ionicisms, i $\bar{\sigma} \tau^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma t,{ }^{\prime} \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$.
459. The Sanskrit verbs of the third class (§. 109³. 3.), on account of the burthen occasioned by the reduplication, which they have to bear in the special tenses, strive after an alleviation of the weight of the terminations: they therefore give up the $n$ of the third person plural, and shorten a long $a$ of the root, whence ददाति dada-ti, "they give," दर्थति dadha-ti, " they place," जहति jaha-ti, "they leave." There is, however, no room to doubt that, in the earlier condition of the language, these forms were sounded dada-nti, dadha-nti, jaha-nti, and that in this respect the Doricisms $\delta i \delta o ́-\nu \tau t, \tau \theta \theta \in \in-\nu \tau t$, have handed down more faithfully the original type. The Zend also [G.Ed.p.664.] protects, in reduplicated verbs, the nasal; for in V.S., p. 213, we read gadenté, "they give," perhaps erroneously for dadënti.* If, however, the reading be correct, it is a middle verb, and not the less bears witness to a transitive dadénti. The Sanskrit, however, in the middle, not only in reduplicated verbs, but in the entire second chief conjugation, which corresponds to the Greek in $\mu$, on account of the weight of the personal terminations, abandons the plural nasal; hence chi-nw-até (for chi-nw-anté) contrasted with the transitive chi-nw-anti. This also is evidently a disturbance of the original build of the language, which dates first from an epoch subsequent to the dispersion of tongues; for the Greek maintains in the mediopassive, still more firmly than in the active, the nasal as

[^109]an expression of plurality, and not only opposes $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi-0-\nu \tau \alpha$ to the Sanskrit tarp-a-nté, but also $\delta^{\prime} \delta \delta_{0}-v \tau \alpha \iota, ~ \tau i \theta \epsilon-\nu \tau \alpha l$, to the Sanskrit dadaté, dadhaté. Yet the Greek has, through another channel, found a means of lightening the excessive weight of the middle termination, by substituting $\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ where $\alpha \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ would naturally be expected: hence déıкvv-v $\frac{1}{}$, not $\delta \varepsilon \iota \kappa v v-\alpha \nu \tau \alpha \iota$, which latter we might expect from $\delta \varepsilon \iota \kappa v \dot{v}-\bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ (out of $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu v-\alpha \nu \tau i$ ). The Sanskrit form stri-nw-até and the Greek $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho-\nu v-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ respectively complete one another, since the one has preserved the $a$, the other the nasal. The extrusion of the $\alpha$ from $\sigma \tau о \rho-\nu v-(\alpha) \nu \tau \alpha \iota$ resembles that of the $\eta$ of the optative, inasmuch as, on account of the increasing weight of the personal terminations, in the medio-
[G. Ed.p.665.] passive, we form from $\delta_{i \delta o i \eta \nu}$ not $\delta i \delta o i \eta \mu \eta \nu$, but didoíp $\nu$. The Ionicism has, however, in the third person plural, sacrificed the $\nu$ to the $\alpha$, and in this particular, therefore, harmonizes most strictly with the Sanskrit ; in remarking which, we must not overlook that both, in their respective ways, but from the same motive, have generated their atê, $\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, out of anté, $\alpha \nu \tau \alpha \iota$; thus, $\sigma \tau o \rho-\nu u ́-\alpha(\nu) \tau \alpha \iota$, together with $\sigma$ róp-vu-( $\alpha$ ) vr $\alpha$, the first being analogous to the Sanskrit stri-nw-a(n)té. We do not, therefore, require, contrary to what has been remarked at p . 255 , to assume that the $\alpha$ of $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha v \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$, and similar forms, is the vocalization of the $\nu$ of $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \alpha \nu \nu \tau \alpha l$, but $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \alpha \nu-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ and $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \dot{v}-\alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ are diverse mutilations of the lost original form $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha v$ - $\alpha \nu \tau \alpha l$.
460. *The Old Sclavonic has dissolved the nasal in Dobrowsky's first and second conjugation into a short $u$ sound (as in the first person singular the $m$ ), and contracted this again with the antecedent connecting vowel, which elsewhere appears as E , but here is to be taken as 0 , to 8 ; so that


* Cf. (§. 783.5.).
+ Dobrowsky writes BE $\mathcal{Z}^{8 T} \boldsymbol{v e}\langle\hat{u} t$, and gives, as in the singular, the $y$ only in the Archaic conjugation (see p. 638. Note. $\ddagger$ ).
to the Greek é é ouvı from ${ }^{\prime}$ éXoval for è éovt. The Bohemian wezau has, on the other hand, preserved the old $a$ of the Sanskrit val-a-nti, and the Gothic vig-a-nd, which, in the Latin veh-u-nt, by the influence of the liquid, has become $u$, in contrast to the $i$ of the other persons (veh-i-s, \&c.). The $u$ of the Bohemian wezau, however, like the last constituent
 In the Archaic conjugation the Old Sclavonic has, with the
 èvui, abandoned entirely the nasal of the termination anti, but, instead, has maintained the $a$ in its primary shape, yet with the pre-insertion of an inorganic $y$ [G. Ed.p. 666.] ( $\$ .225^{\mathrm{n}}$. ); otherwise dadaty, for which we find дддалть dadyaty, would he nearly identical with the Sanskrit दद斤ित dadati: as reduplicated verbs have, in Sanskrit also, lost the nasal (\$.459.). въдать vyedyaty, "they know," accords less with fिदfन vidauti, and raдмть yadyaty, "they eat," with *दfor adanti. This analogy is followed, also, by those verbs, which correspond to the Sanskrit tenth class (§. 109. 6.), namely, Dobrowsky's third conjugation, as пвдллть bild-ya-ty, " they wake" = Sanskryit बोधयन्ति bodh-aya-nti. Here, however, as the division and comparison given above shew, the $y$ preceding the $a$ is not inorganic, but belongs with the $a$ to the character-syllable of the conjugation, of which more hereafter.

461. In the secondary forms the vowel has been dropped from the plural termination nti or anti, as from the singular $t i$, $s i, m i$, and with this in Sanskrit, after the law had established itself so destructive to many terminations which forbids the union of two consonants at the end of a word (Ş. 94.), the personal character $t$ was obliged to vanish, which in Greek, where even a simple $t$ is excluded as a termination, had been already withdrawn from the singular. If thus ètepa-e finds itself at a disadvantage opposed to atarp-a-tso, in ér $\tau \rho \pi-0-\nu$, compared with atarp-a-n (for atarp-a-nt)-the two languages, though from different motives, stand essentially on a similar footing of degeneracy. ${ }{ }^{3} \mathrm{H} \sigma-\alpha \nu$ accords
still better with $\hat{a} s-a n$, and aorists like $\neq \mathcal{e} \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha \nu$ with Sanskrit tenses like the equivalent adikshan, as it would seem that the sibilant of the verb substantive has protected the old $a$ of the termination an from degenerating to $o$; for the usual practice of the language would have given us to expect $\hat{\eta} \sigma o \nu$ like ${ }^{\prime} \tau \epsilon \rho \pi \sigma \nu$, or $\hat{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu$ like $\tau \epsilon ́ \rho \pi о \iota-\epsilon \nu$. The Zend goes along with the $\epsilon \nu$ of the latter in forms like

[G. Ed. p.667.] bear"=申'́poıev. We see from this that the Zend also cannot support the weight of the termination $n t$, although it condescends more than the Sanskrit to concluding sibilants sequent on $r, c, f$, and $\dot{n}$; and has handed down to us nominatives such as un untar-s, " fire,"
 " bearing." From the Gothic have vanished all the final $T$ sounds which existed in the period previous to the German language (see §. 294. Rem. 1, p. 399 G. ed.). Hence, if in the present indicative bair-a-nd answer to the Sanskrit bhar-an-ti and Greek $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho-0-\nu \tau \iota$, we can nevertheless look for no bairaind or bairaiand in the subjunctive answering to $\phi \in \rho o \iota v(\tau)$, Zend barayën $(t)$; and we find instead bai-rai-na, as would seem by transposition out of bairai-an, so that an corresponds to the Greek and Zend $\epsilon v$, èn out of $a n$.* In the medio-passive the lost $T$ sound of the active has preserved itself as in the Greek, because it did not stand at the end, but the vowel coming before, and, in Gothic, by transposition, after the $n$, is removed on account of the increscence of the ending; hence, bairaindau, as in Greek фépoıvтo, not $\phi \epsilon \rho о$ '́єvто(compare p.612).
462. The termination un of the Gothic preterite, as in haihaitun, " they were named," may be compared with the Alexandrine $\alpha \nu$ for $\alpha \nu \tau \iota, \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota\left({ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \nu \omega \kappa \alpha \nu, \epsilon \iota \rho \eta \kappa \alpha \nu, \& c\right.$.) with the recollection that the Sanskrit also, in its reduplicated pre-

[^110]terite, although the primary endings belong to it, yet, under the pressure of the reduplication syllable, has been unable to maintain the original anti uncorrupted, but puts $u s$ in its stead. The $s$ of this form is without doubt [G. Ed. p. 668.] a weakening of the original $t$ : with respect, however, to the $u$, it may remain undecided whether it is a vocalization of the nasal, and thus the latter element of the Greek ov of túntoval, or a weakening of the $a$ of anti. The Sanskrit uses the ending us also in the place of an: first, in the potential, corresponding to the Zend-Greek enn, $\epsilon \nu$, hence
 $\phi \in ́ p o t-\varepsilon \nu$; second, in the first augmented preterite of the reduplicated roots, thus, adadhus, "they placed," adadus, "they gave," for adadhan (comp. èti $\hat{\theta}(\nu$ ), adadan ; from which it is clear that $u s$, since $u$ is lighter than $a$ (Vocalismus, p .227 ), is more easily borne by the language than an third, in the same tense, but at discretion together with $\hat{a}-n$, in roots of the second class in $\hat{a}$, for instance, ayus, or aydn, "they went," from $y \hat{a}$; fourth, in some formations of the multiform preterite, for instance, wम्राषुस् as'ríushus, "they heard."
463. The Old Sclavonic could not, according to §. 255. l., maintain unaltered either the $t$ or the $n$ of the secondary form $a n t^{*}$ or $n t$ : it sets in their place either a simple $a$ or 8 ; which last is to be derived from on. These two terminations are, however, so dealt with by the practice of the language, that $a$ appears only after $\omega s h, 8$ only after $\chi$; for instance,
 secondary form of the Latin has been handed down in most perfect condition, and has everywhere retained the pronominal $t$ after the nasal which expresses plurality; thus erant outdoes the abovementioned forms जासन् Asan, $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$, and

[^111]שכנישֶ anhĕn; and ferant, in respect of the personal sign,
 baray-ěn, Gothic bairai-na, and Sanskrit भरेयुस् bharê-y-us.
464. In the dual of the Sanskrit the primary form is $t a s$, and the secondary $t a m$ : to the former, $\tau o v$ corresponds in
[G. Ed. p. 669.] Greek, (§.97.)-thus $\tau$ é $\rho \pi-\epsilon-\tau o \nu=$ tarp-a-tas; -but the termination tám has, according to the variety of the a representation (§.4.) divided itself into the forms $\tau \eta \nu$ and $\tau \omega \nu$, of which the former is the prevalent one, the latter limited to the imperative; hence étє $\tau \pi-\epsilon \in-\tau \eta \nu, \tau \epsilon \rho \pi-\frac{i}{i} \tau \eta \nu$, answering to atarp-a-tâm, tarp-êtếm; $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa-\sigma \alpha ́-\tau \eta \nu$ answering to adik-ha-tam; but $\tau \in \rho \pi-\epsilon \in-\tau \omega \nu$ answering to tarp-a-tàm. From this remarkable coincidence with the Sanskrit, it is clear that the difference in Greek between tov on the one hand, and $\tau \eta \nu, \tau \omega \nu$, on the other, has a foundation in remote antiquity, and was not, as Buttmann conjectures (Gr. §.87.Obs. 2.), a later formation of the more modern prose, albeit in four places of Homer (three of which are occasioned by the metre) $\tau 0 v$ is found for $\tau \eta \nu$. The augment, however, cannot be considered as a recent formation merely because it is often suppressed in Homer, since it is common to the Greek and the Sanskrit. In
 condary, however, which will be Gxup tañm, we have as yet no instance. The Gothic has lost the third dual person, but the Old Sclavonic has ta ta, feminine trb tye, as well for

[^112]the primary form तस् tas (rov) as for the [G. Ed. p. 670.] secondary ताम् tam, $\tau \eta \nu, \tau \omega \nu$ (compare §.445.); hence BEZETI vȩeta, "they two ride," = वहतस् vahatas; вहдогтג veदosta, "they two rode," = प्रवाक्ताम् avâktâm, euphonic for avâkṣhtâm, p. 98 ; $3^{\text {BEntera }}$ 了venyesta, "they two sounded," = स्रसनिसाम् aswanishtâm. As to what concerns the origin of the last letters $s$ and $m$ in the personal expressions तस् tas and ताम् tan, they rest, without doubt, on a similar principle to those of the second person थस् thus, तम् tam; and if one of the explanations given, §. 444. be valid, we must then abandon the conjecture elsewhere expressed, that $m$ of $t a \hat{m}$ sprang indeed originally from $s$, but first through the previous intervention of a $v$ (for $u$ ), after the analogy of צावाम् âvâm, "we two," युवाम् yuväm, " ye two" (§. 340. Table, Dual, 1).
465. The following comparative table presents a summary of the third person in the three numbers:-

SINGULAR.



## PLURAL．

| sanskrit． santi， | zend． hĕnti， | greek． <br> （ $\sigma$ ）$\epsilon \nu \tau i$ ， | latin． <br> sunt， | $\begin{aligned} & \text { german.* } \\ & \text { sind, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LITH. } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | old sclat． sunty．${ }^{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tişhthanti， | histĕnti， | ı̈бта⿱亠乂兀， | stant， | †tiânt． | 8 | oyanity． |
| dadati，${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | dadĕnti，＂ | סьoóvтı， | dant， |  | 8 | dadyanty． |
| bharanti， | barĕnti， | фє́роить， | ferunt， | bairand |  |  |
| vahanti， | vazĕnti， | ${ }_{\text {¢ }}$ Хоутı， | vehunt， | vijand， |  | \}uinty. ${ }^{9}$ |
| tishthêyus，${ }^{12}$ | histayĕn， | íraîev， | stent |  |  |  |
| bharêyus，${ }^{12}$ | barayĕn | фє́potev， | ferant， | bairaina ${ }^{13}$ |  |  |
| dsan， | aṇhĕn， | $\boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{\sigma} a \nu$ ， | erant |  |  |  |
| atarpişhus， |  |  |  |  |  | ， |
| aṣwunishus， |  |  |  |  |  | venyeshan． |
| alikshan， |  |  |  |  |  | okushaṅ． |

 means＂to suffer，＂＂to bear，＂so that the original signification appears to be inverted：compare the Gothic thaurban，＂to need＂（Vocalismus， p．170）．The Sanskrit root tarp（trip）means，according to the fifth class （tripyâmi），＂to be content，satisfied＂；according to the first（tarpanni）， tenth（tarpayâmi），and sixth（tripami），＂to rejoice，＂＂to content，＂\＆c．

## MIDDLE TERMINATIONS．

［G Ed．p．672．］466．The middle terminations，in which the passive participates，distinguish themselves throughout from those of the transitive－active by a greater fulness of form，even though the mode of formation be not always the same．Sanskrit，Zend，and Greek accord in this， that they lengthen a concluding $i$ ，in the primary forms，by the pre－insertion of $a$ ：hence，$\mu \alpha l$ from $\mu l, \sigma \alpha l$ from the $\sigma \iota$ which remains uncorrupted only in $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \sigma i$ of the second person （§．448．），$\tau \alpha \iota$ from $\tau t$ ，and，in the plural，$\nu \tau \alpha \iota$ from $\nu \tau \iota$ ．The Sanskrit and Zend make their diphthong ê corrospond to the Greek $\alpha \iota$ ；and this applies to the rare cases in which the $\hat{e}$ produced by $a+i$ is represented in Greek by $\alpha l$ ，as usually the first element of the Indo－Zend diphthong appears，in Greek，
in the shape of $\varepsilon$ or $o$ (see Vocalismus, p. 196). The weightier and original $\alpha$ seems, however, in the terminations of the middle voice here spoken of (cf. §. 473.), where expressive fulness of form is of most importance to the language, to have been purposely guarded. The Gothic has lost the $i$ element of the diphthong $a i$; hence, in the third person, $d a$ for dai; in the second, za (euphonic for sa, §. 86.5.) for $z a i$; and in the third person plural, nda for ndai. The first person singular and the first and second of the plural have perished, and are replaced by the third, as our German sind, which, pertaining only to the third person plural, has penetrated into the first. The $a$ which precedes the personal termination, as in hait-a-za, " vocaris," hait-a-da, " vocatur," as opposed to the $i$ of haitis, " vocas," haitith, "vocat," formerly appeared mysterious, but has since, to my mind, fully ex- [G. Ed. p. 673.] plained itself, by the assumption that all Gothic verbs of the strong form correspond to the Sanskrit first or fourth class (p. 105), and that the $i$ of haitis, haitith, is a weakening of an older $a$, conformable to rule, and the result of a retro-active influence of the terminating $s$ and th (§. 47.). The mediopassive, however, found no occasion for a necessary avoidance of the older a sound, and it therefore continues, in this particular, in the most beautiful harmony with the Asiatic sister idioms.
467. The Sanskrit and Zend have lost in the first person singular, as well of the primary as the secondary forms, the pronominal consonant, and with it, in the first chief conjugation, the $a$ of the class-syllable (see §. 435.); hence घोधे $b o d h e ̂, " ~ I ~ k n o w, " ~ f o r ~ b o d h-i-m e ̂ ~ o r ~ b o ̂ d h-a-m e ̂, ~ i n ~ c a s e ~ t h e ~$ weightier personal ending has impeded the lengthening of the class-vowel mentioned in §. 434. Compare-

| sanskrit. | zEND. | gremk. | gothic. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhar-ê, |  | $\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho-0-\mu \alpha \iota$ |  |
| blar-a-sê, |  | ( $\phi \in \rho \rho-\varepsilon-\sigma \alpha \iota)$ | $i r-a-z a$, |
| bhar | H0¢SMAs $b a r-a i-t e{ }^{1}$ | $\phi \varepsilon \rho^{\rho}-\epsilon-\tau \alpha \iota$, | bair-a-da, |
| तh bhar | بpomextus bar-ai-ntê, | 中ép-o-vtor, | bair-a-nda. |

* See §. 41 .
${ }^{2}$ In the passive the third person plural often nccurs as uppusyJJugu> uśsayêintê " nascuntur," (Vend. S. p. 136), with ê for $a$, through the influence of the preceding $y$ (i.42.). For the middle $I$ have no instance of this person : we might, however, at the utmost be in doubt whether we should use barëntê after the analogy of the transitive barěnti, or baraintê. Both are possibly admissible, but barainté appears to me the safest, as in the active transitive, also, ainti is extant as well as ĕnti, especially after $v$, where ĕnti would, perhaps, not be allowed: hence,
 jïvanti; spe also, without $v$ preceding, yazainti=yajanti in a passage cited from the Tashter-Yesht by Burnouf (Yaçna, Notes, p.74). Or should we here read yuzaintê, as yaz is specially used in the middle.

468. In the secondary forms the terminating diphthong in Sanskrit and Zend weakens itself in the same manner as in Gothic already in the primary; the $i$ element, namely, vanishes, but the a remaining appears, in•Greek, as o;
 bar-a-ta; in the plural, éф'́ $\rho-0-\nu \tau 0$, to षभरन्न abhar-a-nta,
 striking likeness to the Gothic bair-a-da, buir-u-nda, given above. Yet I am not hence disposed, as formerly,* to adjust the Gothic primary to the Sanskrit secondary forms, and to make the comparison between bair-a-da, bair-a-nda, (instead of bhar-a-té, bhar-a-ntê,) and abhar-a-ta, abhar-a-nta. The termination $a u$, in the Gothic subjunctive, is puzzling; where, for instance, bair-ai-duu is opposed to the Sanskrit bhar-é-ta, Zend bar-ấ-ta, Greek $\phi \in ́ \rho-o t-\tau o$; and thus, in the plural, bair-ai-ndau answers to $\phi \in ́ \rho-o c-\nu \pi o$; $\dagger$ and, in the second per-

[^113]son singular, bair-ai-zau to фép-o九-(бo). [G. Ed. p. 675]
It is not probable that this au has arisen out of $a$ by the inorganic addition of a $u$, as the corruptions of a language usually proceed rather by a wearing off than an extending process. I think, therefore, that the termination $a u$ of the imperative, where it has already attained a legal foundation (p. 597), has insinuated itself into the subjunctive; that thus the speakers, seduced by the analogy of bair-a-dau, bair-andau, have used bair-ai-duru, bair-ai-ndau, also in the subjunctive; and that thence the au has made its way into the second person singular, thus bair-ai-zau for bair-ai-za. This ought not to surprise, as the medio-passive in the Gothic has already got into confusion in this respect, that the first person, and, in the plural, the second also, has been entirely displaced by the third.
469. In the second person singular of the secondary forms the Sanskrit diverges from the principle of the third and first. Just as ta stands opposite to the primary te and the secondary $t$ of the transitive active, so we should expect sûas a counterpart to sế and s. In its place, however, we find thads; thus, for instance, abh $\hat{d} d h-a-t h a ̂ s, ~ " t h o u ~ k n e w e s t, " ~ b h o ̂ d h-e ̂-~$ -thás, " thou mayest know." That, however, originally there was a form sa co-existent with this thas is indicated, not only by the Greek, in which èdído- $\sigma 0$, didot- $\sigma 0$, accord exactly with édíno-то, סídoו-то, but also by the Zend, which exhibits $h a$ in places where, in Sanskrit स sa would be to be expected, the $\mu \boldsymbol{H}$ being a regular correspondent to स् $s$ (§. 53.), and sha after such vowels as, in Sanskrit, require
imperative and first augmented preterite, according to $\oint$. 459., the nasal of plurality; hence séé-ra(n)té=кє̂́-עtat; potential s'ay-î-ran, imperative ée-ra(n)tam, preterite aśé-ra(n)ta= ̈́кєเขro. We shall hereafter recognise such an $r$ in the middle of the reduplicated preterite. As to its origin, however, I conjecture it to be the radical consonant of the verb substantive, with an anomalous exchange of 8 for $r$ (comp. $\oint .22$.), so that, for instance, dad-i-ran, for dad-i-ranta, would run parallel with the Greek active

the conversion of the $s$ into $\operatorname{sh}$ ( p .20 ). The termination ha has. [G. Ed. p. 676.] according to §. $56^{\text {a }}$., an $n$ prefixed, and thus it occurs in the passive form noticed in my first Zend attempt (Berlin Jahrb. March 1831, p. 374), and still hitherto unique, uśazayaṇha, " thou wast born" (Vend. S. p. 42). Anquetil translates the passage, which cannot admit two interpre-
 thou wast born," by " lui qui a eu un fils célebre comme vous," and thus conceals the true grammatical value of this remarkable expression, which was perhaps no longer intelligible even to Anquetil's Pârsî instructors. I have since been unable to find a second instance of this form; but Burnouf (Yaçna, Notes, p. 33) has brought to light a middle aorist form of no less
 to which we shall recur hereafter. At present we are concerned only with the substantiation of the termination sha, the sh of which is used under the cuphonic influence of a preceding $u$.
470. We return to the Sanskrit termination thâs. This stands in obvious connection with the active termination tha, discussed §. 453., which probably had, in its origin, a still farther extension in the singular, and from which the form thet-s arose, by elongation of the vowel and the addition of $s$; which $s$, as elsewhere noticed (Gram. Crit. §. 301. d.), probably stands also to designate the second person. If this be so, then either the first or the second personal-expression would designate the person, which sustains the operation of the action or its advantage, which in all middle forms is forthcoming at least in spirit if not in form. Thus in adat-thds," thou gavest to thee" (tookest), either "thou" is designated by $t \hat{a}$, and "to thee" by $s$, or the converse.
[G. Ed. p. 677.] If this be so, and if in the Greek first person the $\nu$ of the termination $\mu \eta \nu$ (Doric $\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ) be organic, i.e not a later nugatory addition, but intentional, and a legacy of the primeval period of our race of languages, then édiסó $\mu \eta \nu$ also signifies "I gave to me," whether it be that $\mu \eta$ ( $\mu \bar{\alpha}$ ) or, as seems to me more probable. the $\nu$ expresses the subjective
relation: in either case, however, $\mu \eta-\nu(\mu \bar{\alpha}-\nu)$ stands, even with respect to the length of the vowel, in perfect analogy to the Sanskrit thd-s. To this we must add, as an analogy for the third person, the termination तात् $t \hat{a}-t$ of the Vêdadialect, where the expression of the third person stands doubled. I therefore hold this remarkable termination for a middle one, although Pânini (VII. 1. 35.) gives it as a substitute for the transitive imperative terminations $t u$ and $h i *$ which occur in benedictions; for instance, bhavân jîvatât, "May your honour live!" (respectful for "mayest thou live!"). It is true the root $j \hat{v} v$ (and perhaps many others with the ending tat), is not used in the ordinary language in the middle voice, but this termination may be a remnant of a period in which all verbs had still a middle voice. The middle is, moreover, in its place in blessings, in which some good or advantage is always invoked for some one. Finally, tât, in a formal respect, is much nearer to the usual middle imperative termination tan the transitive $t u$; yet I do not believe that tât has arisen out of $t a m$, but [G. Ed. p. 678.] rather that the converse has taken place, perhaps by the intervention of an intermediate tâs (compare §. 444.). However this may be, the termination tât, which Burnouf's acuteness has detected also in Zend, $\dagger$ is of importance, because it affords an ancient foundation for the Oscan imperative in tud, $\ddagger$ preserved to us in the table of Bantia, as licitu-d for

[^114]liceto, estu-d for esto, ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \tau \omega$.* To the Greek imperative termination $\tau \omega$ a middle origin has been already elsewhere ascribed; for in the plural, $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi-o \delta-\nu \tau \omega \nu$ accords perfectly with the Sanskrit middle tarp-a-ntâm, and is related to it as $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi-\epsilon \in \tau \omega \nu$ to the purely active dual tarp-a-tám. Should, however, $\tau \in \rho \pi-o ́-$ $-\nu \tau \omega \nu$ be identical with the transitive tarp-a-ntu, this would be a solitary instance in the whole grammar of the Greek language, of $\omega$ corresponding to a Sanskrit $u$, with, moreover, an inorganic accession of a nasal. We should be more inclined in $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \epsilon \in \tau \omega$ -if we compare it to the middle tarp- $a$-tâm-to admit the abrasion of a nasal sound, as in ${ }^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha$, opposed to wदिक्षम् adiksham. I now, however, prefer to identify $\tau \epsilon \rho \pi \epsilon^{\prime} \tau \omega$ with the Vêdic word tarpatît, for the abandonment of the $\tau$ was compulsory, that of the nasal an accidental caprice.
[G. Ed. p. 679.] The relation of $\tau \varepsilon \rho \pi-\epsilon-\tau \omega$ to tarp- $a-t a \hat{t}$ would be similar to that of $\epsilon \delta^{\prime} \hat{\delta} \omega, \notin \delta \omega$, to adadatt, adât. If, however, $\tau \in \rho \pi \epsilon ́ т \omega$ be identical with tarpatât and Oscan forms like licitud, estud, the view we have mentioned above, that the Vêda-ending tât belongs properly to the middle, acquires a new support; for if $\tau \in \rho \pi o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ is based on tarpantûm, and is therefore of middle origin, then its singular counterpart, also, can belong to no other verbal genus, and will prove a similar origin for that of its Asiatic prototype tarpatât.
471. The first person singular of the secondary forms ought, in Sanskrit, after the analogy of the third in ta, to be $m a$, so that bharêma would be the counterpart of the Greek

[^115]$\phi \in \rho o i \mu \bar{\alpha} \nu(-\mu \eta \nu)$. This form, if not the oldest, must have been of long standing in Sanskrit. In the present condition, however, of the language, the $m$, as everywhere in the singular of the middle, has given way, and for bharê(m)a we find bharet $y-a$, with euphonic $y$, which is inserted before all personal terminations beginning with vowels, in both active forms of the potential (compare §.43.). In the forms burthened with an augment, the termination $a$, already much mutilated, has experienced a further weakening by the transition of $a$ into $i$; hence, e. $g$., astri-nv-i, " sternebam," for astri-$-n v-a$, and this from astrinu-ma, or a still older astri- $\eta u-$ $m a ̂ m$, which would correspond to the Doric écorop-vú- $\mu \bar{\alpha} \nu$.
472. We return to the primary forms, in order to remark, that, in Sanskrit, not merely those forms end in é which, in the transitive active, end in $i$, and above have been classed opposite the Greek middle forms in al; but also those which, in the transitive active, ex- [G. Ed. p. 680.] hibit no $i$, and, in the Greek middle, no $\alpha$. The collective primary forms run-

| ${ }_{\text {singular. }}$ | doal. | plural. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (m) ${ }^{2}=\mu \alpha \iota$, | vahe, | $m a h e=\mu \in \theta \alpha$. |
|  | ate, | ntêt or $a t \hat{e}=\nu \tau \alpha \iota, \alpha \tau \alpha \iota$ (§. 459. ) |

The Zend follows, as far as evidence exists, the analogy of the Sanskrit, yet the first person plural is not ƯSN\& maze, as would be expected from महे mahe, but せeふus maidhe ( $(.41.) ;{ }^{*}$ from which it is clear, that the Sanskrit mahé is a mutilation of मधे madhé (§. 23.), as, before I studied Zend, I had already inferred from the Greek $\mu \in \theta \alpha$. The Greek $\mu e \theta \alpha$, however, has on its side lost the terminating $i$, and thus ranks with the Gothic forms, mentioned §. 467. In the secondary forms, महे mahe weakens itself by the loss

[^116]of the initial element of the diphthong $\hat{e}$ to mahi; on the other hand it extends itself, in a manner which argues a propensity to the greatest fulness of form, in the first person imperative to सामहै $d m a h d i$; and analogous to this the dual exhibits together with वहे vahe the forms vahi and avahai. The Zend retains, also, in the secondary forms, the full termination maidhe; at least there is evidence of this
 may see," (Vend. S., p. 45) repeatedly.
473. Though, in Sanskrit, all the middle terminations of the primary forms end in $\hat{e}, I$ am not of opinion, therefore, that all these ê rest on the same principle. As to those to which, in the transitive active, $i$, and, in the Greek middle,
[G. Ed. p. 681.] $\alpha$, corresponds, I am much inclined to assume the dropping of a pronominal consonant between the two elements of the diphthong,* and, indeed, to derive ( $m$ ) e, $\mu \alpha \iota$, from mami; sê, $\sigma \alpha \iota$, from sasi; té, $\tau \alpha \iota$, from tati; as we have before seen $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \epsilon \iota$ spring from $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \epsilon \tau \iota$, and, in the Prâkrit, bhanai from bhanadi; and as, also, in the Greek, the middle $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau e \sigma \alpha \iota$ has been still further shortened into $\tau \dot{u} \pi \tau \eta$, and, in Sanskrit, mê into ê. In this ê, therefore, the expression of the first person is contained in a twofold manner, once in $a$ for $m a$, and then in $i$ for $m i$; and thus, also, the reduplicated preterite in the third person exhibits ê opposite the Greek $\tau \alpha \iota$ for $\tau \alpha \tau \iota$, and the Vêda-dialect gives us, even in the present for $\operatorname{sé}^{2}-t \hat{e}=\kappa є \imath \imath \tau \alpha \iota$ of the ordinary language, the form s'ay-ê (euphonic for setê), and other similar mutilations of the terminations of the middle voice, as aduh, " they milked," for aduh-ata; duhám, " let him milk," for $d u g-d h a ́ m$, and this last euphonic for duh-tâm (Pânini VII. 1.41.) If we now refer $(m) \hat{e}=\mu \alpha \iota$, sêt $=\sigma \alpha \iota$, and $t \hat{e}=\tau \alpha \iota$, to the probably pre-existing forms mami, sasi, tati, perhaps,

[^117]also, mâmi, sâti, tatit,* the question arises which of the two pronouns expressed the subjective, and which the objective relation. Do dat-sa(s)i, dido- $\sigma \alpha(\sigma)_{\text {t }}$ signify "give to thee thou," or "give thou to thee"? If we assume the former, we obtain the same order as in $\delta \dot{\delta} \delta o \sigma \theta \varepsilon, \delta^{\prime} \delta o \sigma \theta o v, \& c$., of which more hereafter; and the remarkable case would occur, that, after the suppression of the second pronominal consonant, the first, which, with its vowel, expressed the pronoun standing in the relation of the oblique case, has obtained the appearance of designating the subjective, [G. Ed. p. 682.] or of belonging to the proper personal termination; for, in $\delta^{\prime} \delta o-\mu \alpha(\mu) \iota$, the feeling of the language would better dispense with the expression of the "to me" or "me" (accusative) than with that of "I." Whichever of the two explanations be true, it is thought we find in $\delta i \delta o-\mu \alpha \ell$ the same $\mu$ as in $\delta \delta \delta \omega-\mu$. That this should so appear is, however, no proof of the real state of the matter; for if-which much resembles the case in question, and has often occurred in the history of language-reduplicated forms undergo interior mutilation, by extrusion of the consonant of the second syllable, the first syllable then acquires the appearance of belonging to the root itself. No one misses, from the point of sight of our current language, from preterites like hielt the initial consonant of the root: every one holds the $h$ of hielt as identical with that of halte; and yet, as Grimm, with much acuteness, was the first to discover (I. 103. 104.), the syllable $h i$ of hielt has gained this place by reduplication. The Old High German form is hialt hi(h)alt, and the Gothic haihald, whose second, and thus radical $h$, has escaped from the younger dialects. I now hold, contrary to my earlier opinion, the initial consonants of Sanskrit forms like têpima, "we expiated," for reduplicative, and I assume an extrusion of the base letter $t$ of tatapima, producing

[^118]tapima $=$ taapima, and hence, by weakening the $a$ $(=a+a)$ to $\hat{e}(=a+i)$, têpima. In the Sclavonic damy, "I give," also, and in the Lithuanian dỉmi, the first syllable has arisen by reduplication, and the radical syllable has entirely vanished. More of this hereafter.
474. Let us now turn to those middle terminations in $\ell$, to which, in Greek, no $\alpha \iota$ corresponds, and we believe that we recognise in the plural dhwé a pronominal nominative form in the sense of §. 228.; thus dhwê out of $d h w a-i$, from the base $d h w a$ for $t w a$. The dual torminations âthê, ate, correspond, on the other hand, with neutral dual forms; such, for
[G.Ed.p.683.] instance, as $t \hat{e}$, "these two." In the secondary forms, dhwam, distributed into $d h u-a m$, may, in regard of its termination, be compared with y $\hat{u}-y-a m$, "you,"
 lated, with respect to their terminations, to dhwam, as, according to §.206., $\hat{a} u$ (out of $\hat{A} s$ ) is to as, and answer to $\hat{a} v a m$, " we two," yuvâm, " ye two." For the rest, साथे $\hat{u}$-thê, खाते ate, साथाम् âthâm, साताम् atam, appear to me mutilations of tâthê, \&c. (see Kuhn, l. c., p. 31); just as we have found above in the Vêda-dialect, in the third person singular imperative $\hat{a} m$ for $t a ̂ m$ (p. 681 G. ed.). The syllables ( $t$ ) $h \hat{a}$, ( $t$ ) $\mathfrak{a}$, which express the pronoun standing in the objective case-relation, are represented in Greek by the $\sigma$ in $\delta^{\prime} \delta o-\sigma-\theta o v, \delta i \delta o-\sigma-\theta \eta \nu$, édído- $\sigma-\theta o v$, èdíoó $\sigma-\theta \eta v$, which $\sigma$, according to §. 99., explains itself very satisfactorily as out of $\tau$ : the following $\theta$, however, has likewise proceeded from $\tau$ through the influence of this $\sigma ; \theta$ with a preceding aspirate, or $\sigma$, being a very favourite union. If we contrast $\delta i \delta o-\sigma-\theta o v, \& c$. , with the Sanskrit dad'-(th)d-thé, we perceive that the two languages, in dealing with the aboriginal form, so divide themselves, that the one has preserved only the consonant, the other only the vowel, of the pronominal expression standing in the oblique case-relation. In the second person plural the Sanskrit has dropped the vowel as well as the consonantal-element of the inter-
mediary pronoun; but I believe that dhwé, dhwam, in the condition of the language immediately anterior, were $d$-dhwe, $d-d h w a m$; thus Lhar- $-d-d h w e ̂, a b h a r-a-d-d h w a m=\phi e ́ \rho-\epsilon-\sigma-\theta \varepsilon$ $\grave{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon \epsilon^{\rho}-\epsilon-\sigma-\theta \varepsilon$; for $T$ sounds are easily suppressed before $t w$ and $d h w$ : hence we find in the gerund for dat-twa, "after giving," bhit-twâ, "after cleaving," more commonly da-twa, bhi-twat and in the second aorist form the second person plural of the middle exhibits both id-dhwam [G. Ed. p. 684.] (out of is-dhwam) and $i$-dhwam: finally, before the termination dhi of the second person imperative singular, a radical $s$ is converted into $d$ : this $d$ may, however, also be suppressed; hence śs $\alpha-d h i$, as well as s'ád $d$ - $d h i$, "reign thou," for $s t d s-d h i$. The root as, "to be," forms merely $\hat{e}-d h i^{*}$ for $a d-d h i$, out of $a s-d h i$. As, then, this $\hat{e}-d h i$ is related to the Greek ${ }_{i}^{\prime} \sigma-\theta 1$, so is bharadhwê for bharaddhwê to $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, only that in the latter place the Greek $\theta$ represents, not the Sanskrit $d h(\S .16$.$) , but the Greek \tau$, through the influence of the preceding $\sigma$. Hence arises, in the imperative also, $\phi \in \rho \in \in \theta \theta \omega$, as a middle after-growth. For after фe¢ét $\omega$, a middle itself by origin (p. 678 G. ed.), had been applied in practice with a purely active signification, the necessity arose of forming from it a new medio-passive on the old principle. Even the infinitives in $\sigma \theta \alpha \downarrow$ appear to me, by a misdirected feeling, to have proceeded out of this principle; for after the true signification of the $\sigma$ under discussion was extinguished, the spirit of the language found it adapted, everywhere by its insertion before a $\tau$, and the conversion of the latter into $\theta$, to call forth a medio-passive signification. If, however, we disrobe the form $\delta\left(i_{0} \sigma \theta \alpha\right.$ of its $\sigma$, and bring back the $\theta$ to $\tau$, we arrive at $\delta i \hat{0} o \tau \alpha l$, which admits of comparison with the Scla-vonic-Lithuanian infinitive in $t i$, just as this last has itself been traced back elsewhere to abstract substantives in

[^119]Sanskrit with a similar termination in $t i$. The Vêda-dialect also supplies us with infinitives in धै dhyai, as dative feminine abstracts in fy $d h i$, in which I can only recognise a transposition of the ordinary suffix fit $t i$ (Gram. Crit. §. 640. Obs. 3.).
[G. Ed. p. 685.] 475. If we cast a glance back over the attempts we have made to explain the origin of the terminations of the middle voice, the theory, that they depend on the doubling of each personal designation as it occurs, will be found to rest principally on the fact, that, in the Greek é $\phi \epsilon \rho \frac{\rho}{\rho} \mu \eta$, the Sanskrit abharaths, and Vêdic bharatat, one and the same personal expression is manifestly doubled, as also on the principle that it is most natural so to express ideas like "I give to me," "I rejoice me," that the " $I$ " as well as the "to me," or " me"-the subjective as well as the objective case-relationshould find a formal representative in one and the same pronominal base. Apart, however, from è $\phi \epsilon \rho o ́ \mu \eta \nu$, forms like $\phi_{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \tau e$, and the to-be-supposed Sanskrit bhuraddhwé for the existing bharadhwê, would admit yet another exposition, namely, that the Greek $\sigma$ does not stand euphonically for $\tau$, but on its own account, and as the base-consonant of the reflexive (§. 341 .); which, although belonging to the third person, yet willingly undertakes the functions of both the others. In Sanskrit, the $s$ of the reflexive base before the personal terminations dhwe and dhwam, by the universal laws of sound, would either become $d$, or be dropped; and so far in this way, also, the Greek $\phi_{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \theta \epsilon$, é $\phi \in ́ \rho \in \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, would go along with a Sanskrit bhara(d)dhwe, abhara(d)dhwam: for the above presupposed forms, such as bharathâthé, answering to 中épe$\sigma \theta o v$, we should have to assume blarasathe, out of bharaswithe. Were this assumption well founded, as probably a similar principle would have prevailed in all the productions of the middle voice, the terminations ( $m$ )é, $t e, \mu \alpha \iota, \tau \alpha t$, would have to be explained, not as from mami, tati, but from masi, tasi, or maswi,

[^120]taswi. The second person would remain sasi, but the second $s$ would pertain, not to the second person, but to the reflexive, and we should then refer, also, the $s$ of abharathds to the reflexive, and necessarily suffer the $\mu \eta \nu$ of [G.Ed. p.680.] èфєюó $\mu \eta \nu$ to stand totally isolated, without sympathy with an old principle.
476. With respect to the Latin, it was in the "Annals of Oriental Literature" (London, 1820, p. 62), that it was first observed that the passive $r$ might owe its origin to the reflexive. I am now the more decided in giving a preference to this hypothesis over that which resorts to the verb substantive, as I have since recognised in the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, which I had not then drawn within the circle of my inquiries into comparative language, a similar, and, in truth, universally-recognised procedure; not, however, necessarily that aboriginal one which, in the remotest æra of the formation of the language, must have governed those middle forms which are common to the Greek and Asiatic sisterhood; but I rather assume a gradual inroad of the reflexive of the third person into the second and first, as a substitute for some older and more decided expression of each person, on whom the action works retro-actively. The Old Sclavonic appends the accusative of the reflexive to the transitive verb, in order to give it a reflexive or passive signification; for instance, чтs chtu, "lego," becomes chtitsya, "legor"; and thus in the second and third person чтешисл chteshisya, чтетьга chetysya, plural чтемса chtemsya, \&c. (Dobrowsky, p. 544, Kopitar's Glag. p. 64, xvii.) In the Bohemian, se is not so much as graphically connected with the verb, and may stand as well before as after it, but is used by preference for the expression of the passive only in the third person (Dobr. Böhm. Lehrg. p. 182), whieh may also be the case with the Old Sclavonic. In the Lithuanian such verbal expressions have merely a reflexive signification,
[G Ed. p.687.] but bear more the appearance of a grammatical unity, and therefore more resemble the Latin passive, because it is not a positive case of the refexive pronoun, whose accusative is sawen (p. 477),* but only its initial consonant, which is appended to the verb, either immediately, or with an $e$ prefixed. The latter occurs in the persons which end in $i$ or $e$, the latter of which, before the appended es, becomes $i$. Compare, in this respect, the Old Latin amari-er from amare-er, with forms like wadinnati-es, " ye name you," for wadinnate-es. The dual terminations wa and $t a$ convert their $a$ into $o$, and a simple $u$ of the first person becomes $\mathfrak{u}$. I annex here the present of wadinnûs, "I name myself," $\dagger$ opposite the simple transitive.

SINGULAR.

1. wadinnu, wadinnis.
2. wadinni, wadinnies.
3. wadinna, wadinnas.

DUAL.

1. wadinnawa, wadinnawos.
2. wadinnata, wadinnatos.
3. like sing. like sing.

PLURAL.
[G.Ed.p.688.] 1. wadinname, wadinnamies.
2. wadinnate, wadinnaties.
3. like sing. like sing.

[^121]477. To these formations the Latin passive is strikingly similar, only that here the composition is already obscured, as the sense of independence of the reflexive pronoun is not here maintained by its mobility, as in the Lithuanian, where, under the above-cited conditions, it is placed before the verb. By the favourite interchange, also, between $s$ and $r$, a scission has occurred between the passive suffix and the simple reflexive. In the persons ending with consonants, a connecting vowel was necessary towards the adjunction of the $r$, and $u$ stands as such in amatur, amantur, as it seems to me through the influence of the liquids. The imperative-forms amato-r and amanto-r required no auxiliary vowel. In amamur the $s$ of amamus has given way before the reflexive, which is not surprising, as the $s$ does not belong to the personal designation, and, in Sanskrit, is given up also in the simple verb, in the secondary forms, and occasionally even in the primary. In amer, on the other hand, the personal character is itself sacrificed to the suffix, for umemr was not possible, and amemur was forestalled for the plural (instead of amemusr). In amaris, ameris, \&c., there is either a transposition of amasir, or the personal character $s$ has been unable to withstand the inclination to become $r$ when placed between two vowels (§. 22.); and the reflexive has protected its original $s$, (just as the comparative suffix in the neuter exhibits ius opposed to ior (§. 298.), ) and hence $i$ here forms the conjunctive vowel of the $s$, not $u$, which is used to conjoin $r$.* In the singular imperative-person ama-re, [G. Ed. p. 689.]

[^122]the reflexive, in advantageous contrast with the other passive forms, has protected its vowel; and if we commute this $r e$ into se, we obtain the perfect accusative of the simple pronoun. We have already attended to the old infinitive form amari-er, produced by transposition for amare-re (p.662). If we prefer, however, which I do not, to exempt the imperative amare from the universal principle of the Latin passive, we might recognise in it a remnant of the Hellenic-Sanskrit and Zend structure, and compare re as a personal termination to $\sigma 0$, स swa, $\mathrm{N} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { N }} \mathrm{h}$, of which more hereafter.
478. That the second person plural amamini steps out of all analogy with the other passive persons is easy to observe, and nothing but the circumstance, that the earlier procedure of grammar did not trouble itself at all with the foundation of lingual phenomena, and that the relationship between the Greek and Latin was not systematically and scientifically traced out, can account for the fact, that the form amamini had so long found its place in the paradigms, without raising the question how and whence it came there. I believe I was the first to bring this under discussion in my Conjugation System (Frankf. a. M. 1816. p. 105, ff.); and I repeat with confidence the explanation there given, namely, that amamini is a passive participle in the masculine nomi-
[G. Ed. p.690.] native plural; thus amamini for amamini estis, as, in Greek, tetum $\mu$ evol eioí. The Latin suffix is minu-s, and corresponds to the Greek $\mu \in v o s$ and Sanskrit mân-as. From the fact, however, that these participles in Latin are thrust aside in ordinary practice, mini has, in the second person plural-where it has continued as if petrified, as far as the practice of the language is con-cerned-assumed the character of a verbal termination, and has thus also, having lost the consciousness of its nominal nature, renounced its distinction of gender, and its appendage estis. If we found amamince for the feminine
and amamina for the neuter, we should be spared the trouble of seeking an explanation for amamini, inasmuch as it would partly be afforded by the language itself. It may be suitable here to bring to remembrance a similar procedure in Sanskrit: this employs datt (from the base datar, §. 144.), properly daturus, in the sense of daturus est, without reference to gender, and, therefore, also for datura and daturum est, although this form of word, which is also a representative of the Latin nomen agentis in tor, has a feminine in trî at its command (see trî-c, §. 119.), and the giveress is no more called data than the giver in Latin dator. In the plural, also, dâtâras, used as a substantive, stands for "the givers," and in the character of a verbal person, "they will give;" this in all genders; likewise in the dual, dataráa. The procedure of the Sanskrit is thus still more remarkable than that of the Latin, because its dâta, dâtârâu, datârâs, has maintained itself in the ordinary nominal usage of the language. It is therefore due merely to the circumstance, that the language, in its condition as handed down to us, could no longer deal ad libitum with the forms in the sense of future participles, that dâtâ, dâtdrdu, dattardas, where they signify dabit, dabunt, have lost all consciousness of their adjectival nature, and their capacity for distinction of gender, [G. Ed. p. 691.] and have assumed altogether the character of ordinary personal terminations. To return, however, to the Latin amamini: the Reviewer of my Conjugation System, in the "Jena Literaturzeitung" (if I mistake not, Grotefend), supports the explanation given by the forms alumnus, vertumnus, which evidently belong to these participial formations, but have lost the $i$. This, however, has been preserved in terminus, if, as Lisch, and beyond dispute correctly, lays down, we consider it as expressing "that which is overstepped," and identify its root with the Sanskrit tar (trī).* Fe-mina
(as giving birth, and therefore middle), which is likewise instanced by Lisch, I had before recognised as a formation belonging to the same category: the root is $f \bar{e}$, from which also fetus, fetura, and fecundus. Gemini, moreover, as "the born together," (from the root gen) may be considered as an abbreviation of genmini or genimini.
479. How stands the case now with the imperative amaminor? Are we to consider its $r$ as identical with that of amor, amator, amantor? I think not; for it was not necessary to express here the passive or reflexive meaning by an appended pronoun, as the medio-passive participial suffix was fully sufficient for this purpose. Our best course. then, is to seek in amaminor for a plural case-termination as in amamini; and this is afforded us, as I have observed in my Conjugation System (p. 106), by the Eugubian Tables, where, for instance, we find subutor for the Latin subacti, screhitor for scripti.* The singulars, however, of the second masculine declension in the Umbrian end in o: we
[G. Ed. p. 692.] find orto for ortus, subuto for subactus. Now it is remarkable that, in accordance with these singular forms in $o$, there are extant also, in Latin, singular imperatives in mino, namely, famino in Festus, and prafamino in Cato de R. R. To these forms, before described, we can add fruimino, which Struve (Lat. Decl. and Conj. p. 143) cites from an inscription in Gruter, "is eum agrum nei habeto nei fruimino," where the form in question plainly belongs to the third person, by which it still more conclusively proclaims itself to be a participle, in which character it may with equal right be applied to one as to the other person.
"Remark.-Gräfe, in his work, 'The Sanskṛit verb compared with the Greek and Latin from the point of

[^123]view of Classical Philology, remarks, p. 120, that he once considered, as I do, the form in mini as a participle similar in kind to the Greek in $\mu$ evos, but now considers it. with confidence, as a remnant of an old analogy of the Greek infinitive in $\epsilon \mu \varepsilon v \alpha l$, which, having been originally passive, had first been applied to the imperative in Latin, and thence had been further diffused. How near the imperative and infinitive come together, and how their forms are interchanged, Gräfe thinks he has shewn, l. c. p. 58 ff., where, namely, the Greek second person in ov ( $\tau \dot{u} \psi o v$ ) is deduced from the Sanskrit first person singular in ani; but where the remark follows, that in any case, tisth 4 ni ('let me stand ') is manifestly and strikingly like the infinitive if $\sigma \alpha \alpha_{\nu \alpha}$, and much more, if we consider that $a i$ in Sanskrit is merely the diphthong nearest to $i$ (in Greek, however, the rarest, see Vocalism. p. 193). We have, however, to remember, that, in io icával, the $\alpha$ belongs to the root, and that, therefore, for a parallel with the Sanskrit imperative, if such be admitted, only vas can be compared to dani. Gräfe goes on: 'It would be easy to imagine that the first person plural fिधाम tishthatma had its counterpart in the other infinitive form $\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \in v$, properly $\{\sigma \tau \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon, *$ i.e. stare. Finally, it may not be left unobserved, that the Greek [G. Ed. p. 693.] and Sanskrit imperative in $\theta l$, dli, is again the form of the infinitive in the Sclavonic dialects, $\dagger$ and that custom admits the frequent use of the infinitive for the imperative in Greek.' I could hardly have expected that the personal terminations of the Sanskrit imperative could lead to so many and various comparisons. It appears, however, to me ill suited to the spirit of classical philology, without necessity to attribute to the Greek that it has borrowed inter alia its

[^124]second person imperative in ov from any Sanskrit first person. I find it still less congenial to the spirit of a more universal comparative philology, that Gräfe, who has before overlooked many laws of sound incontrovertibly established, should, in his comparisons, lend too willing an ear to mere similitudes of sound ; for instance, where (p. 39.) he explains the root षर् char, 'to go,' by the periphrasis ('hinscharren'), 'to move scraping along on the ground,' and where ( p .32 , Note) he compares लप् lap, 'to speak,' with lappen, 'to botch,' 'to speak imperfectly,' and $\lambda \alpha \pi \pi \pi \omega$. I was not aware that a German sch anywhere corresponded to a Sanskrit ch, but I knew that it did so to $f$ (or $v$ ), in observance of the law of permutation of sounds (§.87.), and of the favourite practice of exchange between gutturals and labials. Remark but the relation of chatwâras to the Gothic fidvór and German vier, as also that of panCHan tofün $F$, and the identification of the Sanskrit char, 'go,' and Gothic farya (preterite forr), 'to go,' 'to wander'' German fahren, will be satisfactorily proved. If, however, we are to admit that any infinitive has arisen out of any imperative person, it would be the least far-fetched supposition, which derived the Sanskrit infinitive and the Latin supine in tum from the third person imperative तु $t u$, by the addition of $m$; for instance, bhatum, 'to shine,' from bhatu, 'let him shine'; patum, ' to rule,' from patu, 'let him rule.' In kartum, ' to make,' from karotu, 'let him make,' the class vowel only would be thrust aside. As, however, Gräfe (l. c. p. 58) has found a jest in what I have elsewhere said, and mean to repeat, of the first person imperative, I must take care that he does not take for earnest what I mean as a jest. We do not, in truth, go so far in deriving lhâtum from bhâtu as in deducing iotávoı from faytfo tiṣhthâni (Zend histani), 'let me stand'; but I can find no other relationship between $b h \hat{u}-t u$ and bhâ-tum than this, that in the infinitive, as an abstract substaniive, the action is personified through a form which comes near the expression of
the third person in the imperative. I recog- [G. Ed. p. 694.] nise in the suffix $t u$, as also in that of $t i$, (of another class of abstracts, with which the Sclavonic and Lithuanian infinitive is connected), different gradations of one and the same pronoun of the third person-as in the interrogative we find the forms $k a, k i, k u$,-and so far a relationship between the nominal classes in question and the terminations $t i$ and $t u$ of bhâti, 'he shines,' and bhatu, 'let him shine.' The coincidence is thus in any case not quite so fortuitous as that between i $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}-\nu \alpha \iota$ and tiṣthâni, 'let me stand.' Whosoever derives the former from the latter cannot escape from bringing into this family the Gothic infinitives in an, especially as the $a$ of stand-an does not, like that of io $\sigma \dot{\alpha}-\nu \alpha l$, belong to the root. Historically, however, as I doubt not, the German infinitive belongs to the class of the Sanskrit abstracts in ana, as bandh-ana, ' the binding " = Gothic bind-an."

## INFLUENCE OF THE WEIGHT OF THE PERSONAL TERMINATIONS.

480. The weight of the personal terminations exercises, in Sanskrit and Greek, and, as far as we have evidence, also in Zend, an influence on the antecedent radical or class syllable, obvious and comprehensive, though till lately quite overlooked.* Before light terminations extensions are frequent, which, before the heavier, are withdrawn; so that in many anomalous verbs the entire body of the root can only be maintained before the light terminations, but, before the heavy, mutilation occurs. For instance, the root प्रस् as, " to be," retains its a only before the light terminations, but rejects it before the heavy, as if it had been overgrown by the augment; hence, indeed, asmi, "I am," but smas," we are"; stha, " ye are," santi," they are." [G. Ed. p. 695.]
[^125]We see, however, that this mutilation had not yet established itself at the period of the unity of the language; for the Greek protects, in the verb substantive, the radical vowel corrupted to $\epsilon$, even before the heavier terminations, and opposes è érés, è éé, évcóv, è $\sigma t o ́ v$, to the Sanskrit smas, stha, sthas, stas. The Lithuanian and Sclavonic, also, testify to the comparatively recent loss of the Sanskrit $a$ before the weightier terminations. Compare

## SINGULAR.

| SANSKRIT. प्वसिन $a s-m i$, | GKEEK. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu-\mu i^{\prime},^{*}$ | LITH. $e s-m i$ | sclavonic. IECMb yes-my. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| बसि $a s-i, \dagger$ | $\dot{\boldsymbol{e}} \sigma-\sigma i ́$ | $e s-s i$ | Ієи $y^{\rho-s i .}$ |
| असित ns-ti, | $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma}-\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{i}$, | es-ti, | ІеГТЬ yes-ty. |
|  |  | DUAL. |  |
| खस् s-wos, |  | es-wit, | にCBA yes-va. |
| स्यस् s-thas, | ė $\sigma$-тóv, | es-tu, | revira yes-tu. |
| रतस् s-tas, | ė $\sigma$-Tóv, | like the Sing. | recta yes-ta. |

## PLURAL.

| स स $s$-mas | è $\sigma$ - $\mu$ és, | es-me, | Iccmbl yes-my. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| स्य s-tha, | $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$-тé, | $e s-t e$, | IEETE yPs-te. |
| सनित s-anti, | $(\sigma)$-evtí, | like the Sing. | [8Tb s-unity. |

"Remark.-It is possible that the suppression of the radical vowel may have begun with the third person plural, whose termination anti is also the heaviest of all, and it may have existed in this position even before the migration of language, and its manifold individualizations; at least, all
[G. Ed. p.696.] the languages under comparison exhibit in this case a wonderful harmony scarcely attributable to chance: and, in addition to these, the Latin sunt, as opposed

[^126]to es-tis, as well as the Gothic sind, are in accordance. On the other hand, the dropping of the $e$ in sumus first appeared on Roman ground, and, in the singular likewise, sum for esum is quite isolated. After the falling away of the initial and terminating vowels of asmi in the Latin, the insertion of an auxiliary vowel became necessary, and the influence of the liquids prevailed in favour of $u$. This $u$ remained, also, in the plural, where s-mus was possible, but not favoured, as the Latin has generally gone out of its way to avoid the immediate connection of the ending mus with roots terminating in consonants; whence we have vol-u-mus opposed to vul-tis, vul-t; fer-i-mus to fer-tis, fer-s, fer-t (Sanskrit bibhri-mas, bibhri-tha, bi-bhar-shi, bibhur-ti from bhri class 3) ; ed-i-mus opposed to es-tis, ê-s, es-t (Sanskṛit add-mas, at-tha, at-si, at-ti). To the Greek, in the case of the third person plural, évtí, if, as I scarcely doubt, it stands for $\sigma$ - $\varepsilon \tau \tau_{i}^{\prime}$ ( $=$ Zend $h$-ĕnti), nothing has remained but the termination, as in the Sanskrit, in the second person middle, sê for $a(s)$-sé. The Gothic we have excluded from the above comparison, although $i-m, i-s$, $i s-t$, are based upon as-mi, a-si, as-ti; but, in the plural numbers, sind alone is organic, for siy-u-m, siy-u-th Dual siy-री (see §. 441.), siy-u-ts, have the terminations of the preterite, and belong to a secondary root siy, which proceeds from the Sanskrit potential syam, in which sy has changed itself to siy.
481. All Sanskrit roots of the third class in $\hat{a}$ (§. $109^{\text {a }} .3$.) depend, on account of the anterior burthen created in the reduplication syllable, on the influence of the weight of the personal terminations, so that they retain their $a$ only before the light, but before the heavier either altogether suppress or shorten it, or change the length of the $a$ sound into that of the lighter $i$; and this is one of the evidences from which I deduce the maxim-very important for the history of language-that the organism of the lingual body sustains a greater weight in the $a$ than in the $i$
sounds, the long $\hat{a}$ being heavier than the long $\hat{\imath}$, and the short $a$ heavier than the short $\hat{i}$ (see Vocalismus, Obser. 12. p. 214). [G. Ed. p. 697.] The roots $d a$, "to give," and dha, "to place," suppress their $\hat{a}$ before heavy terminations, with exception of the third person plural, if, as I prefer, we make the division dada-ti, not dad-ati (compare §. 45s.); for the original form was certainly dadd-nti, whence never could come dad-nti, but dada-nti well enough, and, out of this, with a new sacrifice to the reduplication syllable, dada-ti. The Greek only shortens the long vowel before the increasing terminations, and makes $\delta_{i} \delta o$, $\tau i \theta \in$, i $\sigma \tau \tau \alpha$, , out of $\delta \delta \delta \omega, \tau_{i} \theta \eta$, iora. In the Latin, Sclavonic, and Lithuanian, the influence of the weight of the personal endings on the antecedent syllable has utterly vanished, and $d \breve{a}$ has also lost the original length of its vowel and the reduplication syllable. The Lithuanian and Sclavonic have, on the other hand, saved their reduplication, but have absolutely suppressed the rootvowel, which the Sanskrit only does before heavy terminations. As, however, the $d$ also vanishes before endings which commence with $m$ and $s$-in Lithuanian also with $w$ but before $t$ passes into $s$ ( $\S .457$.), the reduplication in these verbs is almost totally overlooked, and in dümi, дамь damy, which are mutilations of $d \grave{u}-d^{\prime}-m i, d a-d^{\prime}-m y$, the reduplication has, by thrusting out the most essential element of the entire form, acquired the appearance of a radical syllable. It is, however, certain, that in důmi, damy, the syllables $d \stackrel{i}{u}$, $d a$, are identical with those of $d \grave{u}-s-t i$, $d a-s-t y$, for $d \grave{u}-d-t i$, $d a-d$-ty, thus merely reduplicators.* Compare-

[^127]| singular. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sanskrit. | 2END. | grekr. |  | old sclat. latin. |  |
|  | dadha-mi, | $\delta^{\prime} \delta \omega$, $\mu$, | $d \mathfrak{u}(d)-m i$ | $d a(d)-m$ |  |
| $d a d \hat{a}-s i$ | dadhâ-hi, | $\delta i \hat{\omega} \omega-s$, | $d \grave{u}(d)-i,$ | $d a(d)-s i,$ | $d a-s$ |
| dadi-ti, | dadhai-ti, | díd $\omega$-Tt, | $d{ }_{\text {diss }}$-ti, | das-ty, | dut. |
| dual. |  |  |  |  |  |
| dad-was, |  |  | $d^{\circ}(d)-w a$ | , dad-e-va |  |
| dat-thas, | $d a s-t o ?^{1}$ | dído-tov, | dùs-ta, | das-ta |  |
| dat-tas, | $d a s-t t ?^{2}$ | díoo-tov, | like Sing | . das-ta |  |

## PLURAL.

$d a d-m a s, d a d-\stackrel{\imath}{-}-m a h i{ }^{3}{ }^{\text {dído- }} \boldsymbol{\mu \in s}, d i(d)-m e, d a(d)-m y, d a-m u s$. dut-tha, das’-ta? ${ }^{4}$ dído-тє, dî̀s-te, das-te, da-tis. duda-ti, dadĕ-nti, ${ }^{5} \quad \delta i \delta o ́-v \tau \iota, ~ l i k e ~ S i n g . ~ d a d-y a t y, ~ d a-n t . ~$ In the Greek the influence of the weight of the personal terminations over the radical syllable has penetrated further than in Sanskrit, in this respect, that even the aorist forms, set free from reduplication, ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$ and ${ }^{\prime} \delta \partial \nu$, have shortened their vowel before the increasing terminations, while ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ ( $\varepsilon$ हैб $\tau \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ), in accordance with similar Sanskrit aorist-forms, allows no influence to the weight of the endings. In Sanskrit, from the first augmented preterite adadd $-m$ comes the plural
 comes, not adma, but the root remains un- [G. Ed. p. 699.] diminished. It may be convenient to give here in full the two augmented preterites, which are distinguished in the two languages by retaining and laying aside the reduplication syllable.

[^128]SINGULAR.
 adadu-s, édíd $\omega$-s,


482. The Sanskrit roots $h \hat{d}$, " to leave," $\dagger h \hat{d}$, " to go," and
 last have only the middle, the first only the pure active form-weaken, before most of the heavy terminations, their $a$ to $\hat{i}$, and the two last substitute also, in their reduplication syllable, a short $i$ for short $a$ for instance, $j a h i \hat{l}$-mas, " we leave," opposed to jahâ-mi, "I leave "; mimê (from mimî-mê), " I measure," mimî-mahê," we measure." The roots स्था stha, " to stand," and घ्रा glira, " to smell," follow a peculiar path, inasmuch as a vowel-shortening, which probably at its origin, as in the Greek $\bar{i} \sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu$, ${ }^{i} \sigma \tau \nsim \alpha \mu \varepsilon \nu$, only obtained before heavy terminations, has extended itself to the other persons through which the radical $a$, thus shortened, would be treated
[G. Ed. p. 700.] just like the unradical of the first and sixth class ( $109^{\text {a }}$. 1.). Hence the Indian grammarians reckon these roots as under the first class, although they assume a reduplication syllable, which, however, substitutes an $i$ for $a$, as I doubt not, on the ground that the reduplication syllable, which is seeking generally for relief from weight, and therefore, as a rule, converting long into short vowels, may not combine the heaviest among the short vowels, with the length derived from position; hence, ti.hthâmi, tishthasi,

[^129]tişhthati，\＆c．，Zend histâmi，histasi，histati ；jiyhrâmi，jighrasi； jighrati，\＆c．The Greek follows this principle of the weak－ ening of the vowel，there also，where there is not，as in the cases of $i^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ，кix $\chi \eta \mu$ ，any immediate reason for it by the doubling of consonants．Hi $\mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu \iota$ and $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu \iota$ are，how－ ever，striking and peculiar in appending a nasal，a stranger to the root，to the reduplicated syllable．These forms， however，accord with the Sanskrit intensive verbs，which love a great emphasis in the repeated syllable，and hence change to the Guna letters the vowels susceptible of Guna， but double the whole root in roots ending with nasals，and， in some cases，also represent the liquids $r$ and $l$ by the nasal liquids which accord with the organ of the chief consonants of the root；for instance，jangam，＊from gam，＂to go＂；chan－ chal from chal，＂to totter＂；chanchur（for chanchar），from chur，＂to go．＂In this sense，then，I take $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu 1, \pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu i$ ， for $\pi i \rho \pi \rho \eta \mu l, \pi i \lambda \pi \lambda \eta \mu u$ ：thus，also，$\beta \alpha \mu \beta \alpha i \nu \omega$ ，with the kin－ dred form $\beta \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega$（compare balbus）．

483．As the roots of the second class（§． $109^{\mathrm{A}} .3$ ．），in Sanskrit，do not load themselves with reduplication，so neither do they subject a concluding $\boldsymbol{a}$ to［G．Ed．p．701．］ the influence of the weight of the personal terminations． The Greek，however，has here also again permitted a wider range to that influence，inasmuch as $\phi \eta \mu i(\phi \bar{\alpha} \mu i)$ ，in this respect，follows the analogy of $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu$ ．Compare－

| singular． | dual． | plural． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhat－mi，$\phi \bar{\alpha}-\mu i$ ， | bhit－vas， |  |
| bhâ－si，ф $\quad$＇t－s， | bhâ－thas，фӑ－тóv， | bhit－tha，фо⿱彑－тé． |
| bhat－ti，$\phi \bar{\alpha}-\tau i$, |  | bhâ－nti，ф̆̆－vtí． |
| $a b h \hat{a}-m,{ }^{\prime} \phi \bar{\alpha}-1$ | aljhâ－va |  |
| $\boldsymbol{a b h a ̂ - s , ~}{ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \bar{\alpha}-s$, |  | $a b h \hat{-}-t a, \quad$ é $\phi$ 人̆－тe． |
|  | ubhâ－tâm，é ${ }^{\text {a }}$－$-\tau \eta \nu$, | $a b h a ̂-n, \quad$ ¢ै $¢$ 人̆－v． |

[^130]This analogy is followed in Sanskrit, among other roots, by $y$, "to go," on which the Greek in $\eta$, properly "to make to go," rests, to which the syllable of reduplication has lent a causative signification, as to the Latin sisto opposed to sto, while the Greek $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu c(=\sigma i \sigma \tau \eta \mu l)$ unites the primitive with the causative signification. While in $i-\sigma \tau \eta \mu$ the spiritus asper, as it so often does, stands for $\sigma$, in $i-\eta \mu$ it is the representative of the lost semi-vowel $y$, as, among other words, in ós for यस् yas, "who". (§. 382.); thus ${ }^{i}-\eta \mu \mathrm{c}$ for $y--y \eta \mu \mathrm{~L}$ : on the other hand, compare the future $\eta=-\sigma \omega$, relieved from the reduplication, with the Sanskrit yd-syâmi. This ïn $\mu$ still bends to the weight of the terminations; thus $i \in \mu \varepsilon$, , $i \in-\tau \varepsilon$, opposed to yd-mas, yd-tha. To the root ya, I think, with Pott (Etym. Forsch. p. 201), we must refer the middle of $\epsilon^{i} \mu$, which itself belongs to the root $₹ i$, "to go," which in Greek, analogously to $i_{i-\mu \epsilon s}$, should form ${ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha<\iota$, $\grave{\prime} \sigma \alpha \iota$, ǐcou, answering to the Sanskrit $i-y \hat{e}$ (from $i-m \hat{?}$ ), $i-$-shê, $i-t \hat{e}$.
[G.Ed.p.702.] The form ${ }^{i \epsilon}-\mu \alpha \iota$, however, is to be derived from $y \mathfrak{a}$, by a vocalization of the semi-vowel, and thinning of the $\boldsymbol{a}$ to e . In duly considering, then, what I think I have proved, that the personal terminations exercise a wider influence on the preceding syllable in Greek than in Sanskrit, and that, for example, roots ending in vowels shorten one originally long before heavy terminations, the verbs $\hat{\eta} \mu \alpha t$ and $\kappa \epsilon \hat{\imath}-\mu \alpha \iota$ might surprise us, since in these the heavy middle terminations have not shortened the antecedent vowel. Of $\kappa \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mu \iota$ we shall treat hereafter; but $\hat{\eta}-\mu \alpha \iota$ owes the retention of the length of its vowel to the circumstance that its root was originally terminated by a consonant, and I have already, in my Glossary, identified it with the Sanskrit ${ }_{d}$, "to sit," the $s$ of which has remained in the Greek only before $\tau$; hence $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau \alpha=$ जासे $\alpha_{s-t}-\hat{\ell}, \hat{\eta} \sigma-$ тo $=$ साt्त $\hat{A}_{s}$-ta.* It accords, however, with the system of

[^131]equilibrium that $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu \alpha \iota$ cannot bear the $\sigma$ of $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau 0$, together with the burthen of the augment; hence, indeed, $\kappa \alpha \theta \hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau 0$; but є̀к $\alpha \theta \eta$-то.
484. The Sanskṛit root शास् śás," to rule," exhibits a peculiar susceptibility for the weight of the personal terminations, inasmuch as its long $\hat{a}$ remains undisturbed before those heavy terminations which begin with the weakest consonants (semi-vowels and nasals); thus śás-was, " we two rule," śas-mas," we rule;" but, before the stronger consonants of heavy terminations, weakens itself to the shortness of the lightest vowel, namely, to $i$, whence, for instance, sish-tha, " regitis," opposed to s'âs-si, "regis," śás-ti, " regit." We may recognise in this a forerunner of [G. Ed. p. 703.] the German conjugation-forms, such as binda, bindam, bundum, opposed to the monosyllabic singular preterite bund, bans-t, p. 116 G. ed.
485. The roots of the ninth class (§. $109^{\text {a }} .5$.) are so far in accordance with the principle of the roots $h \hat{\alpha}$ and $m \hat{a}$, mentioned in §. 482., in that they weaken to $\hat{\imath}$ the $\hat{a}$ of the class syllable nod, in the same places in which those roots experience the same relief in their radical syllable. The Greek, on the other hand, shortens the long Doric $\bar{\alpha}(\eta)$ to $\stackrel{\text { a. }}{ }$ Compare-

## SINGULAR.

$k r \hat{\imath}-n \hat{n}-m i,{ }^{1} \quad \pi \epsilon \in \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-\mu$. $k r i ̂-n \hat{a}-s i, \quad \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-s$. $k r i \hat{-} \underline{n} \hat{1}-t i, \quad \pi \epsilon ́ \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-\tau \iota$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a k r \hat{1}-n \hat{u}-m, \quad \grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \tilde{c}^{\rho}-\nu \bar{\alpha}-\nu . \\
& a k r \hat{\imath}-n \hat{n} \hat{-}-s, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon ́ \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-\varsigma . \\
& \text { akri-n } \hat{\alpha}-t, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \in ́ \hat{\rho} \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-(\tau) .
\end{aligned}
$$

## DUAL.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { krî-nî-vas } \\
& \text { krî-n̂̂-thas, } \quad \pi \in ́ \rho-v \alpha \dot{\alpha}-\tau o v . \\
& \text { kri-ṇ̂-tas, } \quad \pi \in ́ \rho-\nu \breve{\alpha} \text {-тоv. } \\
& a l r \hat{i}-n \hat{i}-v a \\
& a!r \hat{\imath}-\eta \hat{\imath}-t a m, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \in \rho-\nu \check{\alpha}-\tau o v .
\end{aligned}
$$

[^132]
## PLURAL.

| krî-nı̂-mas, |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $k r i \hat{l}-n \hat{\imath}-t h a$, | $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho-\nu \breve{\alpha}-\tau \epsilon$. |
| $k r i ̂-n a-n t i,{ }^{2}$ | ( $\pi \epsilon \rho-\nu \dot{\alpha}-\nu \tau \iota$ ) |
| 'akrî-ņî-ma, | $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \underline{\epsilon} \rho-\nu \check{\alpha}-\mu \epsilon s$. |
| akri-ni-ta, |  |
| akrî-na-n, ${ }^{2}$ |  |

${ }^{1}$ स्रीयामि kríndmi, "I purchase," has $n$ for $n$ in the midule syllable through the euphonic influence of the antecedent $r$. The relationship to the Greek $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \eta \mu \mathrm{c}$ rests on the favourite exchange between gutturals and
[G. Ed. p. 704.] labials, through which the Greek verb has assumed an apparent relationship to $\pi \epsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, " to sail through" (=Sanskrit pârayadmi), where the $\pi$ is primitive. ${ }^{2}$ If we make the division $k r i-n n^{\prime}-a n t i, a k r i-n^{\prime}-a n$ §. 458.), we must assume that the middle syllable suppresses its vowel before all those heavy terminations which themselves begin with a vowel; thus, also, in the middle, kri-n'-ê from krî-nî-mê. For the special purposes of Sanskrit Grammar this rule may holl good; but in considering the historical developement or decay of the language, I am more inclined to the belief that the syllable $n \hat{a}$ has shortened itself before $n t i$ and $n$ (older $n t$ ) instead of converting itself into the long form of the lighter $i$ sound, in order to avoid combining length of vowel and position. The middle dualterminations athé, até, atham, atâm, did not require the wcakening of the $\underline{n} \boldsymbol{\imath}$ to $\boldsymbol{n} \hat{\imath}$, since without this, by the ordinary rule of sound, two homogeneous vowels melt into one long one; so that $n \hat{a}+\hat{a}$ thê gives a lighter form than $n \hat{\imath}+\hat{a} t h \hat{e}$, which latter would give $n y-\hat{a} t \hat{e}$, while from $n \hat{a}+\hat{a} t \hat{e}$ comes merely $n a t \varepsilon$.
486. With Sanskrit verbs of the second and third class, with a radical vowel capable of Guna,* the influence of the weight of the personal terminations is shewn in this, that Guna takes place before the light (§. 26.), but before the heavy the pure radical vowel reappears. The same law

[^133]is respected by the Greek, which, however, affords no example, except that of $\epsilon i \mu \ell$ (§. 26.), of a verb with a radical vowel capable of Guna, which, in the special tenses (§. $109^{\text {a }}$.), connects the personal sign directly with the root. Compare-


That the middle ${ }^{\prime} \in \mu \alpha \iota$ belongs to another [G. Ed. p. 705.] root has been already remarked (p.676).
487. An exception to the law of gravity is found in the root śi, class 2 (" to lie," " to sleep,") in that, although only used in the middle, despite the weight of the middle terminations, it everywhere exhibits Guna; in which respect the Greek кєi $\mu \alpha \iota$ runs exactly parallel to the Sanskrit: hence
 might also present śé, as the root for the Sanskrit verb, as the pure vowel $\hat{\imath}$ nowhere appears, and the formation, also, of the word exhibits no expression, which would make a root s' $\imath$ necessary, rather than s' $\varepsilon$, unless, perhaps, we should take sita, " cold," in the sense of " frozen," and therefore "resting," " motionless," and hence choose to derive it from sí. The Old Sclavonic exhibits the old diphthong in the shape presented by the Greek коíт $\eta$, кол $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$, in поКой рокой, "requies," " pax."* On the other hand, чию chiyû, "quiescu," has undergone a double weakening; first, that of $\kappa$ to $\pm c / h$, and next, the thinning out of the diphthong to its concluding element. It must not be overlooked that pokoı is not the primitive shape of the base, but po-koyo, out of which, in the uninflected nominative and accusative, after suppression of the final vowel of the base (§. 257.), pu-kot necessarily came :

[^134]the theme pokoyo, however, accords excellently with the Sanskrit suya; as adjective, "lying," " sleeping;" as substantive, " sleep."
488. The roots of the fifth and eighth class admit the Guna form of the $\boldsymbol{J} u$ of the class syllable $u n$ or $u$ before the light terminations, and, before the heavy, reject the Gunavowel: the Greek obeys the same principle, only, instead of extending $v$ into $\varepsilon v$, it lengthens the $v$, Compare-

SINGULAR.


PLURAL.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { strici-nu-mas, } \quad \sigma \tau o ́ \rho-\nu u ̌-\mu \epsilon s . \\
& \text { stri-ppu-tha, } \quad \sigma \tau o ́ \rho-v \ddot{v}-\tau e . \\
& \text { stri-nv-anti, } \quad \sigma \pi o \rho-v u ́-v \tau 1 . \\
& \text { astri-п̨u-ma, е̇єтóp-vü- } \mu \epsilon \text {. } \\
& \text { astri-ṇu-ta, 它 } \sigma \tau o ́ \rho-v \grave{-\tau} \tau \epsilon .
\end{aligned}
$$

489. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite receives Guna before the light terminations, and restores the pure rootvowel again before the heavy. Herein the Germanic, aud most evidently in the Gothic, stands in closest accordance with the Sanskrit, inasmuch as all verbs, with a root-vowel

[^135]susceptible of Guna (i.e. with $i$ or $u$ ), insert before this, in the singular of the simple (strong) preterite, the original Guna vowel $a$; but before the increasing terminations of the two plural numbers, as also in the entire subjunctive, which is burthened by the exponent of the mood, [G. Ed. p. 707.] and is already in the singular polysyllabic, again reject the foreign strengthening vowel. Compare-

490. On the law of gravity rests also the phenomenon, that those Gothic roots ending in two consonants, which, without protecting the reduplication, have preserved a radical $a$ in the singular of the preterite, weaken* this to $u$ before the heavy plural and dual terminations, and those of the whole subjunctive (Vocalismus, Obs. 16. p. 227). The Sanskrit exhibits a remarkable counterpart to this phenomenon, which had not come under my notice in my earlier treatment of the theory of gravity, and is [G. Ed. p. 708.] here for the first time considered from this point of view ;-

[^136]I mean the root kar, " to make," which-not indeed in the reduplicated preterite, but still in the special tenses before the heavy terminations, and in the whole potential, which answers to the Gothic subjunctive-weakens its $a$ to $u$, and only before light terminations retains the heavy $a$ sound. Hence karbmi, "I make," stands in quite the same relation to kurumas or kurmas, " we make," and to kuryîm, "I may make," as, in Gothic, band to bundum, and bundyau. We compare here the Gothic preterite band with the Sanskrit babhandha, which everywhere leaves its vowel unaltered, and with karômi as regards the change of vowel.

SINGULAR. DUAL.
sanskrit. gothic. sanskrit. sanskrit. gothic. sanskṛit. babandha, band, karômi, babandhiva, bund̂̂, kuruvas. babandhitha, banst, karôshi, babandhathus, bunduts, kuruthas. babandha, band, karôti, babandhatus, ... kurutas.

PLURAL.
sanskrft. Goftic. sanskrit.
babandhima, bundum, kurumas. babandha(tha), bunduth, kurutha. babandhus, bundun, kurwanti.

## POTENTIAL.

singular.
sanskrit. gothic. sangirit. gothic. sangkrit. gothic. kuryâm, bundyau, kuryâva, bundeiva, kurydma, bundeima. kuryâs, bundeis, kuryătam, bundeits, kuryâla, bundeith. kuryât, bundi, kuryâtâm, .... kuryus, bundeina.
[G. Ed. p. 709.] "Remark 1.-As all verbs which, in the preterite, follow the analogy of band, have a liquid for their penultimate consonant, and liquids have a preference for the vowel $u$, we may attribute to them here an influence on the generation of the $u$ : it remains, however, not the less true, that the conditions under which, in the foregoing scheme, $a$ and $u$ are interchanged, rest only on the
laws of gravity, and on a principle sufficiently, as I believe, demonstrated in my Vocalismus (p. 227), that the weight of the $u$ is more easily supported by these languages than that of $a$. For were this not so, it were difficult to see why the old $a$ was protected exactly in the monosyllabic singular ; and why the condition of monosyllabicness is so enforced in the preservation of the $a$, that, in Old High German, where the second person singular is designated by $i$ instead of $t$,* even in the form which thus becomes dissyllabic, the lighter $u$ should assume the place of the heavier $a$; and thus bundi stand in contrast to band of the first and third person, and to the Gothic second banst. In like sense a certain share in the generation of the $u$ may, in the Sanskrit form kur, alternating with kar, be attributed to the liquid, while the distribution between the $a$ and $u$ forms depends on the weight of the terminations alone. Beyond the range, however, of the special tenses, the root kar, in the forms which seek to be lightened, dispenses entirely with the $a$, so that the $r$ becomes the vowel ri. The mutilated form kri thus produced-as, for instance, in kri-ta, 'made,' opposed to kar-tum, 'to make'-is considered by the grammarians as the original, and this holds good in analogous cases;-a vjew which I have endeavoured, in the first Observation of my Vocalismus, to demonstrate as historically unsustainable. In special Sanskrit grammars, however, this system may be outwardly maintained; and kar may still pass for a Guna form of $k r i$; as also we may be compelled to treat the $a$ of the Gothic preterite band as the Guna form of $i$ in binda, and so, indeed, we must, if, reversing the real historical course of the language, we recognise, in the singular $a$ of the preterite, a first, and, in the plural and subjunctive $u$ of the , preterite, a second Ablaut of the $i$ of the present binda."

[^137]"Remark 2.-It may appear surprising that those Gothic verbs with a radical $a$, which, in the preterite, have preserved the old reduplication, do not equally weaken their $a$ to $u$ before the heavy terminations; that, for instance, haihald,
[G. Ed. p.710.] in the plural, should form, not haihuldum, but hailhaldum, although the root has equally a liquid for its penultimate; and we might imagine that the burthening of the root by reduplication would occasion still more susceptibility for the weight of the terminations; as we have seen, in Sanskrit, that the reduplicating roots of the third class in $A$ either weaken or totally renove that vowel before the heavy terminations (§.481.), but the nonreduplicating roots of the second class experience no diminution. With the Gothic reduplication of the preterite we find a peculiar condition: it can only be borne by the strongest radical structure, and has hence only been perpetuated, first, by verbs with a long or diphthongal radical vowel; as haihuit, 'I was named,' present haita; hlailaup, 'I ran,' present hlaupa; secondly, by roots with the heaviest of the short vowels (a), united with length by position; for instance, vaivald, ' I directed,' present valda.* Under these conditions, it was a necessity of the language to retain the root after the reduplication in all its strength, and by this the weakening of the $a$ to $u$ was provided against."
491. The Greek exhibits the Guna modification of the ، in two forms, in that, namely, the original pre-inserted $a$ sound is represented either by $\epsilon$ or $o$, but $\alpha \iota$ never answers to the Sanskrit $\hat{e}$ in roots in which diphthongs are exchanged with a pure $\iota \cdot \dagger$ Where, however, $\epsilon \iota$ and $o$,

[^138]together with $\iota$, are exchanged with each other in one and the same root, there ol, as the heavier of the two Gunas, takes its place in the perfect, where also the simple $o$ is frequently opposed to the simple $\epsilon$; hence, for instance, $\lambda$ é $\lambda o \iota \pi \alpha$ opposed
 трє́ $\phi \omega$. Thus ot answers to the Gothic Guna through $a$, and $\epsilon \ell$ to that through $i$ (§.27.); and $\pi \epsilon^{\prime} \theta \omega$ and $\pi \epsilon \in \pi o \iota \theta \alpha$ are related to each other, as beita (i.e. bîta [G. Ed. p. 711.] from biita, p. 106) to bait from the root bit; then, also, т $\rho$ é $\phi \omega$ to $\tau \in ́ \tau \rho \circ \phi \alpha$, as lisa to las from the root $L A S$ (p. 116 G. ed.). It appears, therefore, that the Greek too bears more willingly the burthen of reduplication by a stronger than a weaker rootsyllable. The susceptibility towards the weight of terminations has, however, almost entirely vanished from the Greek perfect. A remnant of it is still found in oij $\alpha$, opposed to the Sanskrit vêda, "I know," and the Gothic vait.*-in all three languages a present as to sense, with the terminations of the reduplicated preterite. Yet the Sanskrit verb, in this signification, dispenses with the reduplication, and so does the Greek; for oij $\alpha$ for Foi $\delta \alpha$ is merely the Guna of the root (F)ı$\delta$. Compare-

| sanskim. | gотніс. | greek. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| वेद $v e ̂ d-a$, | vait, | oio - $\alpha$. |
| बेत्य veit-tha, | vais-t, | oiv- $\theta \alpha$ (see §. 453). |
| वेद्द vêd-a, | vait, | oid- $\epsilon$. |
| विदिव vid-i-va, | vit-it |  |
| विद्युस् vid-a-thus, | vit-u-ts, |  |
| विदतुस् vid-u-tus, |  | í ${ }^{\prime}$-тov. |
| विदिम vid-i-ma, | vit-u-m, | $i \delta-\mu \epsilon \nu$. |
| बिद( $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { ) } \\ \text { vid-a-(tha), }\end{aligned}$ | vit-u-th, | ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma$ - $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ |
| विदुस् vid-us (see §.462.), | vit-u-n, | , ${ }^{\prime} \sigma-\alpha-\sigma \iota$. |

[^139]" Remark.-The Sanskrit root vid is not without a proper present- वेस्मि vèdmi, the plural of which, vid-mas, vit-tha, vid-anti, might have equally given, in Greek, i $\delta \delta-\mu \epsilon \nu$, í $\sigma-\tau \epsilon$,
[G. Ed. p. 712.] í $\sigma-\alpha \sigma \iota$ (from íd $\alpha \nu \tau \iota$, p. 663 G.ed.); as also out of the duals vit-thus, vit-tas, we could hardly obtain in Greek any thing else thar ${ }^{\prime} \sigma$-тоv, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma$-тov. The present forms resemble the Greek much more than those above of the preterite. Nevertheless, I am not of opinion that the Greek plural and dual terminations can belong to the present in their origin, for the intermediate vowel $\alpha$, whose rejection gives to ${ }^{\delta} \delta \mu \epsilon \nu$ the appearance of a present (compare $\left.\dot{\epsilon} \sigma-\mu \epsilon ́ v\right)$, is no essential element of the perfect, and is wanting, among other instances, in éik-тov; which, moreover, through the restoration of the pure radical vowel, bears the same relation to eैorкє, as ïбтоv to oíde. We shall recur to this subject."
492. After what we have hitherto remarked on the laws of gravity, it becomes scarcely necessary to quote instances to shew which are the light terminations, and which the heavy. It is self-evident that the dual and plural endings have more body and compass than the singular of the transitive active form, and that in the middle voice the weight of terminations communicates itself also to the singular; for $\mu \alpha \iota, \sigma \alpha \iota$, $\tau \alpha t$, are obviously richer in sound than $\mu, \sigma(t), \tau t$ : in the same manner, in the secondary forms, $\mu \eta \nu, \sigma 0, \tau 0$, are heavier than $\nu, \sigma,(\tau)$. We have, however, to observe, that several terminations, originally heavy, but which have, in the course of time, become abbreviated, have nevertheless left behind them the effect of their former state. This is the case especially in the Sanskrit, in which the middle abibhr-i (see p. 471 G. ed.) is much weaker in its termination than the transitive abibhar-am; so that, according to the present state of the language, we should rather expect abibhr-am answering to abibhar-i than the reverse. The second person plural of the transitive reduplicate preterite, like the first and third of the singular, has lost the true personal sign, and retained only the
intermediate vowel. Nevertheless, we find above vida, "ye know," over against the singular véda, "I know," "he knows." In the second person plural of [G. Ed. p.713.] the primary forms, tha is, in its present state, heavier than the singular $s i$, as $a$ is heavier than $i$, and the Sanskrit aspirates are evident combinations of an $h$ with the full tenues or medials (§.12.). In Greek, all the terminations (if we except, perhaps, the relation of $\tau \in$ to $\theta \alpha$, as in in $\%-\tau e$, contrasted with oic $^{i}-\theta \alpha$ ), which I reckon heavy, have still, in their actual state, more weight than those which, according to the theory which has been brought forward, belong to the light class. Compare-
 vто.

DIVISION OF CONJUGATIONS.
493. Sanskrit verbs admit of an easy distribution into two conjugations; the first-which, if not the oldest, existed before the separation of languages, and is almost alone represented in the European cognate languages-comprehends the great majority of all the verbs, viz. classes 1.4 .6 .10. ( $\$ .109^{\text {a }}$.), which, in the special tenses, annex to the root either a simple $a$ (cl. 1. and 6.), or syllables which terminate with $a$, viz. $y a$ and aya (cl. 4. and 10.). This con- [G. Ed. p.714.] jugation is followed also, as will hereafter appear, by nearly all derivative verbs and by all denominatives. In Greek, the conjugation in $\omega$ corresponds to it, in which, of course, too
much stress must not be laid on the $\omega$ answering to the Sanskrit $m i$, for if the $\mu$ is restored to the $\tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \pi \omega$, compared above (§. 434.) with tarp-d-mi; and if $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi \epsilon \iota, \tau \in ́ \rho \pi \epsilon t$, are carried back to the forms $\tau \in \rho \pi-\epsilon-\sigma, \tau \in \rho \pi-\epsilon-\tau$, which, in all probability, once existed; still this verb, and all of similar structure, remain sufficiently distinguished from all classes of the so-called $\mu$ conjugation, which does not contain any verbs that insert between the root and the personal terminations an $\varepsilon$, which is interchanged with $o$, and is foreign to the root, or larger syllables terminating with these vowels. The second Sanskrit conjugation separates, like the Greek, into three divisions. It comprehends first, those verbs which append the personal terminations direct to the $\operatorname{root}(\mathrm{Cl}$. 2. 3. 7.), as $\hat{e}-m i=\epsilon \hat{i}-\mu t$; dadâ-mi= $\bar{i} \hat{\delta} \omega \mu$; yunaj-mi, " jungo," plural yunj-mas, "jungimus," (§. $109^{3} .3$.), to which there is no analogy in Greek; secondly, verbs with $n u$ or $u$, in Greek $\nu v, v$, as the intermediate syllable; thirdly, those with $n \boldsymbol{a}$ (weakened to $n \hat{\imath}$ ), in Greek $\nu \bar{\alpha}(\nu \eta), \nu \alpha ̆($ see pp. 119, 703 G. ed.). All these divisions are, in Sanskrit as in Greek, subjected to the influence of the weight of the personal terminations, while the first conjugation is free from it. Other peculiarities will be presented hereafter, in which the Sanskrit and Greek second conjugation coincide with one another, and are distinguished from the first conjugation.
494. The Greek first conjugation contains a greater variety of subdivisions than the Sanskrit, which consists of only four classes. This, however, has no influence on the
[G. Ed. p. 715.] inflection, since тépт-o- $\mu \epsilon \nu^{*}$ is inflected
 $\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma-\sigma o-\mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \alpha \mu-\alpha ́ \zeta o-\mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{\omega} \theta-i \zeta \sigma-\mu \epsilon \nu$; as it is the same, with regard to the conjugation, whether the formation, which is added to the root, consists simply of one $e$, which, before nasals, is replaced by o, or of syllables which terminate with

[^140]this vowel, as, in Sanskrit, the formations $a, y a$, and aya, are inflected similarly, for this very reason, that they all end in a. It appears to me, however, wrong to separate, in Greek, the consonants from their vowels, and, e.g., in túmiouev to add, first a $\tau$ and then a conjunctive vowel $o$; while, according to the course of the development of the language, the root $\tau u \pi$, in the special tenses, combines with the syllable $\tau \epsilon$ or $\tau 0, \delta \alpha \kappa$ with $\nu \epsilon$ or $\nu o$, and $\lambda \alpha \beta$ with $\alpha \nu \epsilon$ or $\alpha \nu 0$. The addition of a bare consonant, or of a syllable terminating with a consonant, would have been too cumbrous for the conjugation : a $\tau v \pi-\tau-\mu \epsilon \nu$ or $\delta \alpha \kappa-\nu-\mu \epsilon \nu$ can never have existed. But if we are right in dividing thus, $\delta \in i \kappa-\nu v-\mu \epsilon v$, and do not regard the $\nu$ merely as the element of formation, and the $v$ as the conjunctive vowel, there is no reason to distribute тúттоцєv according to a different principle. What the syllable $\tau 0$ is in the latter verb, the syllable $\nu v$ is in the former. For this reason I cannot admit that mode of distinguishing the conjugation in $\omega$ from that in $\mu$, which consists in terming the latter " with a conjunctive vowel"; as the $\mu$ conjugation also, though not in all the classes of which it consists, has syllables of conjunction, if they are to be so called, that are inserted in $\delta \in i \kappa-\nu \nu-\mu \epsilon \nu, \delta \alpha^{\prime} \mu-\nu \alpha-\mu \epsilon \nu$, between the root and the personal termination.
495. It is hardly possible to state any thing satisfactory regarding the origin of these syllables. It appears to me most probable that the majority of them [G. Ed. p.716.]. are pronouns, through which the action or quality, which is expressed in the root in abstracto, becomes something concrete; e.g. the expression of the idea "to love" becomes the expression of the person, "who loves." This person, however, is more closely defined by the personal termination, whether it be "I," "thou," or "he." Proceeding from this point of view, we may regard the character of the Sanskrit ninth class $n \bar{a}\left(\S .109^{\text {a }} .5\right.$.) $=$ Greek $\nu \bar{\alpha}, \nu \eta$, $\nu \breve{a}$, as the lengthening. of the pronominal base, न $n a$. (§.369.) and
$n u=$ Greek $\nu v$, as the weakening of this $n a$, as, in the interrogative, together with $k a$ the forms $k u$ and $k i$ occur. The $u$ of the eighth class is easily perceived to be the abbreviation of the syllable $n u$, which arises from the circumstance that the few roots of this class themselves terminate with $n$; thus tan-u-mas for tan-nu-mas. The sole exception is kri, " to make," which, however, as may be deduced from the Zend kërĕ-naó-mi, likewise had $n$ originally before the appended $u$. From ना $n d$ it seems that $\hat{a} n$ has arisen by transposition, which is further combined with the character $a$ of the first or sixth class, and belongs to the first conjugation; but it occurs only in the second person imperative singular of the transitive active form of the ninth class, in which the first conjugation is without the personal termination; hence, as'- 1 na , " eat," opposed to the first person $a_{s}^{\prime}-n d \hat{n} i$, and the third $a_{s}^{\prime}-n a ̂ t u$. This $a s \prime-d n a$ would lead us to expect a present $a_{s}^{\prime}-\hat{a} n \hat{a}-m i$, $a s ́-\hat{a} n a-s i$, $a s \cdot \hat{a} n a-t i$, for $a s \dot{s}-n \hat{a}-m i$, \&c. The circumstance that the Vêda-dialect has not preserved forms of that kind affords no certainty that they have never existed; for although several other ancient forms of speech have been preserved in the Vêda-dialect, still it is very far from having retained, in their perfect state, all that existed at the period of the unity of language; e.g. there are no middle forms in $m e ̂$ for the abbreviated ê. But if the Sanskrit, in its
[G. Ed. p.717.] formations in âna, actually took its departure from the second person imperative, where it also remained, the Greek has completed the formation thus commenced; for I have scarce any doubt that forms like $a s s^{\prime}-\hat{d} n a$ are the prototypes of the Greek i $\zeta-\alpha \nu \epsilon, \delta \alpha \rho \rho \theta-\alpha \nu \epsilon$, $\& c$. Both languages agree in their conjugational affixes almost as exactly as possible; for a Greek $\breve{\alpha}$ refers rather to a Sanskrit long $\hat{a}$ than to a short one, as w $a$ is more frequently represented by $\epsilon$ or o than by $\alpha$. Besides, the original length of quantity is still left in iאん兀v $\boldsymbol{\iota} \omega$. In

Lithuanian, verbs in $e n u^{*}$ and inu, and also those with doubled $n$, innu, belong to this class, though they retain the nasal, also, in the future and infinitive, which verbs in $n u$, of which hereafter, do not, e.g. gab-enù, "I bring," gad-inù, "I destroy," future gabei su, gadinisu (§. 10.), infinitive gabénti, gadinti.
496. If, in the Sanskrit seventh class (§. $109^{\text {a }}$. 3.), that form, which appears before light terminations, is older than that which occurs before heavy ones, e.g. bhi-na-d from bhi-nad-mi, "I cleave," older than bhi-n-d from bhi-nd-mus, " we cleave," then it might be assumed, as I am much inclined to do, that this syllable na is nothing else than the syllable $n \hat{\alpha}$ of the ninth class, which has been transposed into the interior of the root, and abbreviated; thus, bhinadmi for bhidnami, as bhid would form according to the ninth class. In Greek verbs, like $\lambda \alpha \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega, \mu \alpha \nu \theta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega$, both forms occur together; and in them the nasal of derivation has a second time been reflected into the middle of the root, just as, in Zend, an $i$ or $y$ imparts to the preceding syllable also an $i$ (§.41.). It has been already remarked ( $\S .109^{\text {a }} .5$.), that verbs, like $\delta \alpha \alpha_{\kappa-\nu o-~}^{\text {- }}$ $-\mu \epsilon v, \tau \epsilon \in \mu-\nu o-\mu \epsilon v$, by weakening the syllable of derivation, i.e. by changing the organic $\alpha$ of $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu-\nu \breve{\alpha}-\mu \epsilon \nu$ for the inorganic $\epsilon$ or $o$, have entered into the $\omega$ conjugation. [G. Ed. p.718.]
To this place, also, must be assigned the Latin formation ni (before $r$ : ne) of ster-ni-mus, cer-ni-mus, sper-ni-mus, li-ni-mus, si-ni-mus. Compare, for instance, ster-ni-mus with सृत्यीमस् stri-nî-mas; but the resemblance must not be rated too high, for the Latin $n \check{\imath}$ is not a shortened form of the Sanskrit $n \hat{\imath}$ (see §. 485.), but a weakened, as leg-i-mus for leg-ă-mus, (§. 109². 1.). In Old Sclavonic, verbs in $n \hat{u}, n e ̆ s h i$, correspond, which reject this appended syllable in the preterite, e.g. гыбку gyb-nû, "pereo," second person gyb-ne-shi, preterite gy-boch (Dobr. p. 355.); in Lithuanian, verbs in nu, plural

* Cf. p. 996, §. 743.
na-mè, correspond, which, though sparingly, are retained in roots in au (Mielke, p. 101, 25.); e.g. gáu-nu, "I avow," plural gáu-ná-me, preterite gawau, future gausu. Compare-

| GREEK. $\delta^{\prime} \alpha ́ \kappa-\nu \omega,$ | old sclav. $g y b-n u-\dot{n}^{1}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lithuan. } \\ & \text { gáu-nu, }{ }^{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { latin. } \\ \text { ster-nu-- } \end{gathered}$ | sANSKRIT. stri-nd-mi. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ठо́кк-vel-S, | gyb-ne-shi, | gáu-n'-i, | ster-ni-s, | stri-ņa |
| $\delta \chi^{\alpha} \kappa-\nu \epsilon-(T) \iota$, | gyb-ne-ty, | gáu-na- | ster-ni-t, |  |
|  | $g y b-n e-v a$, | gáu-na-wa, |  | stri-nî-vas. |
| $\delta \alpha^{\prime} \kappa-\nu \epsilon-\tau о \nu$, | gyb-ne-ta, | gáu-na-ta, |  | stri-n̂-thas. |
| ठók-ve-tov, | gyb-ne-ta, | gáu-na-' |  | stri-nı̂-tas. |

ס́́к-vo- $\mu \epsilon \nu, ~ g y b-n e-m$, gáu-na-me, ster-ni-mus, stri-nî-mas. סо́кк-vє-тє, gyb-ne-te, gáu-na-te,, ster-ni-tis, stri-nî-tha. סо́к-vo-vть, gyb-nû-ty,' gáu-na-' ster-nu-nt, stri-na-иti.

[^141]497. The affix $\tau \epsilon, \tau о$ ( $\tau \dot{u} \pi-\tau 0-\mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \dot{u} \pi-\tau \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$ ), appears peculiar to Greek: however, except in $\pi \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \omega$, тікт $\omega$, it occurs
[G. Ed. p. 719.] only after labials. Its $\tau$ is, perhaps, a corruption of $v$, as elsewhere, also, we have seen mutes proceed from nasals of corresponding organ; e.g. Bpotós from $\mu$ ротós; in Lithuanian and Sclavonic dewyni, девать devyuty (§.317.), from newyni, nevyaty; and (which comes tolerably near to the case in question) the Greek suffix $\mu \alpha \tau$, used in the formation of words, corresponds to a formation in $n$ in the kindred languages; e.g. $\dot{o}-\nu o \mu \alpha \tau$ answers to the Sanskṛit nâman, Latin numen, to the Gothic namó, namin-s, and Sclavonic има imya, genitive umeиe imen-e (§. 269.). In Sanskrit, also, we must remark that the $n$ is replaced by the tenuis of its organ, since, for instance, from han, "to slay," comes the causal ghât-ayâ-mi for hân-ayâ-mi. If, then, the $\tau$ of $\tau \dot{u} \pi-\tau 0-\mu \in v, \kappa \rho \dot{\prime} \pi-\tau 0-\mu \varepsilon \nu$, \&cc., stands in this manner for $\nu$, then these verbs, just as those in $\nu o-\mu e v, \nu \in-\tau \varepsilon$
(§. 109.5.), lead back to the Sanskrit ninth class. But if the $\tau$ is organic, which is less probable, then, according to the principle laid down in $\S .495$., the syllable $\tau \epsilon$, $\tau 0$, leads to the pronominal base $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{=}=$ Sanskrit $\pi t a$ (§. 343.).
498. In Lithuanian there are some verbs which resemble Greek verbs like $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi \tau \omega$ in this point, that they insert between the root and the personal termination an affix beginning with $t$ and terminating with a vowel, though they reject it again in the preterite, which answers to the Greek imperfect, and in which otherwise the class syllables are still retained. Thus klys-tu (euphonic for klyd-tu, compare §. 457.), plural klys-ta-me, preterite klyd-au, future $k l y-s u$, as $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon i-\sigma \omega$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \in i \hat{\delta}-\sigma \omega$; pluss-tu (for pldd-tu), "I swim" (compare plu, p. 114), plural plus-ta-me, preterite plîd-au; lossz-tu, "I am petulant," plural loszz-ta-me, preterite lossaun ; mirsz-tu, "I forget,"* plural [G. Ed. p. 720.] mirsz-ta-me, preterite mirsz-au; plysz-tu, "I tear to pieces," plural plysz-ta-me, preterite plysz-au. Some verbs prefix to the $t$ a non-radical $s$ also, for which the way is perhaps prepared by cases in which a sibilant, or a $d$ which changes into $s$, is already in the root, or because st is in general a favourite termination (compare §. 94.); as, rim-stu, " I am quiet" (Sanskrit vi-ram, "to rest"), plural rim-sta-me, preterite rimm-au, future rim-su.
499. I believe a pronominal origin must be ascribed, also, to the $\epsilon, o$, of verbs like $\tau \in \in \pi \pi-o-\mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \in \in \rho \pi-\varepsilon-\tau \varepsilon$, which is usually called a conjunctive vowel; for the $a$, which answers to it in Sanskrit, is deducible from a pronominal base more easily than any other conjugational affix, and it proceeds, in fact, from the base from which we have above seen $a$-smai, "to this," $a$-smât, "from this," $a$-sya, "of this," and $a$-smin, "in this," proceed. For a mere conjunctive vowel, $a$, as the heaviest of the three primary

[^142]vowels, appears to me least of all adapted; and I think that the origin of conjunctive vowels, which are inserted between two consonants to facilitate pronunciation, belongs to a later period of the language than that to which the coincidences of the Sanskrit with its European cognate languages conduct us back. The w $a$ in question, however, coincides with the Gothic $a$ which is interchanged with $i$, with the Greek $\varepsilon$ interchangeable with o, Old Sclitvonic e e, Lithuanian $a$, and Latin $i$ (§. 109 ${ }^{\text {a }}$. 1.); e.g. in the second person dual, बहथस् vah-a-thas, answering to the Gothic vig-a-ts, Greek é $\chi$-є-то⿱, Old Sclavonic bezerta ve $\boldsymbol{\jmath}$-e-ta, Lithuanian veźz-a-tà; second person plural वहv vah-a-tha, answering to the Greek ${ }^{\boldsymbol{e}} \boldsymbol{\chi} \chi$ - - -тє, Old Sclavonic bezete ve§-e-te, Lithuanian weź-a-tè, Latin veh-i-tis, Gothic viy-i-th. The case is different with the lightest of the primary vowels, $i$, with which we shall hereafter become acquainted in considering the Sanskrit auxiliary future. No analogous vowel can be assigned to this $i$ in the kindred languages, and we must therefore fix its origin in the period succeeding
[G. Ed. p.721.] the division of languages. In Zend, we see some conjunctive vowels arise, as it were, under our eyes, i.e. vowels which enter between two consonants that were formerly combined: this never occurs, however, with an $a$, but with the inorganic $\varepsilon \check{e}$ (§. 30.), for which $i$ is sometimes found ; e.g. us ${ }_{\mathrm{s}}-\stackrel{e}{-}$-hista, "stand up," in which an $i$ is inserted between the preposition and the verb, which never happens in Sanskrit.
500. The affixes of the fourth and tenth classes, य $y a$ and सय aya, must, I believe, be regarded as auxiliary verbs: य $y a$ is, at the same time, the character of the passive, and we shall recur to it in treating of that voice. In Gothic, we have already found a representative of the Sansk!it fourth class (§. 109 . 2.): in Latin, verbs in iv, of the third conjugation, correspond to it. These, in disadvantageous comparison with the Gothic, have permitted the
vowel of the syllable $y a$ to disappear almost everywhere, e.g. in all the cases in which the $a$ of the first and sixth class has been weakened to $i$, before $r$ to $\check{\epsilon}$; hence, spec-io, spec-i-unt, answering to the Sanskrit pass-yî-mi, paś-ya-nti, but spec-i-s, spec-i-t, spec-i-mus, spec-i-tis, contrasted with paś-ya-si, paś-ya-ti, pas'-yâ-mas, paśsya-tha. In the participle present, the $a$ of the syllable ya has been retained under the protection of two consonants ; hence, spec-ie-ns, spec-ientem, answering to paśsa-n, paś-ya-ntam. Facio, according to its origin, should follow the fourth conjugation, as it is based on the Sanskrit causal form, blấvayâmi, "I make to be" (§. 19.): on account, however, of the trifling difference in form between -yami and -ayâmi, it cannot surprise us that the said Latin verb has deserted its original class, and migrated to that next adjoining. Thus, vice versá, cupio $=k u p-y \hat{a}-m i$, "I am angry," has partly changed into the fourth conjugation, which corresponds to the Sanskrit tenth class, and to which belong cupîvi, cupîtum, [G. Ed. p.722.] while the present has remained in the class to which this verb originally belongs. In Lithuanian, verbs in $i u, y u$, of Mielke's first conjugation (p.96, \&c.) correspond ; e.g. liepyu, " I order," which, like similar verbs with a labial termination to the root, rejects indeed the $y$ before the $i$ of the second person, but otherwise retains the class syllable inviolate throughout the whole present. In Sclavonic, Dobrowsky's first conjugation belongs to this class, which, in the present, with the exception of the first person singular, and third person plural, exhibits the syllable य $y a$ in the form of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ ye, but only after vowels: after consonants, only the $e$ of the $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} y e$ is left, as in other parts, also, of grammar $\mathrm{E} e$ is very frequently the remnant of the syllable $\mathrm{f} y \mathrm{y}$, as the euphonic product of yo (§§. 255.n. and 258.). In the first person singular and third person plural, we find, both after vowels and consonunts, yû, yûty, from yo-m, yo-nty, (§. 255.g.), and, in the gerund (participial) present $y(i$,
feminine ŷlshchi，answering to the Sanskrit yan，yantí． Examples are：pi－yû，＂I drink，＂＊second person pi－ye－shi，＂$\dagger$ third person pi－ye－ty；$\jmath_{n a-y \hat{a}, " I ~ k n o w " ~(S a n s k r i t ~ j n a, ~ " ~ t o ~}^{\text {a }}$ know＂）乌na－ye－shi，そna－ye－ty；or－yû，＂I plough，＂or－e－shi， or－e－ty．Compare－

| sanskrit． | LTri． | old sclav． | сотнис． | latin． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $l u b l-y \hat{1}-m i,{ }^{1}$ | liep－y | そna－y ${ }^{\text {a }}{ }^{2}$ | haf－ya－${ }^{3}$ | cap－io－${ }^{\text {－}}$ |
| lubh－ya－si， | liep－i， | そna－ye－shi， | huf－yi－s， | cap－i－s． |
| $l u b h_{-y a-t i,}$ | liep－ya－ | 了na－ye－ty， | haf－yi－th， | cap－i－t． |
|  | liep－ya－ua， | 了na－ye－va， | haf－y $\hat{0}-s^{4}$ |  |
|  | liep－ya－ta， | 了na－ye－ta， | haf－ya－ts |  |
| lubh-ya-tas, | liep－ya＇ | Sna－ye－ta |  |  |

lubh－yâ－mus，liep－ya－me，Зna－ye－m，haf－ya－m，cap－i－mus． lubh－ya－tha，liep－ya－te，了na－ye－te，haf－yi－th，cap－i－tis． lubh－ya－nti，liep－ya－＇$\quad$ na－ŷ̂－ty，${ }^{2}$ haf－ya－nd，cap－iu－nt．
1 ＂I desire，＂compare lubet，libet，Gothic liubs，＂dear．＂${ }^{2}$ See p．692，Note＇．$\quad{ }^{3}$ The Gothic haf－ya，German heben，＂to raise，＂is radically identical with the Latin capio，the law of transposition being followed（ $\$ .87$. ）．$\quad{ }^{4}$ A completely legitimate division is impossible in this word（see §．255．g．）．

501．As the Lithuanian readily assimilates the semi－vowel $y$ to a stronger consonant preceding it（compare p． 369 G．ed．）， it need not surprise us if this occasionally occurs also in the class of verbs under discussion．To this we refer verbs in ＇mmu（according to Mielke，p．101，23．），which，in the prete－ rite，again restore their second $m$ to the $y$ ，whence it arose，

[^143]but, in the future and infinitive, according to the old principle, entirely withdraw the class syllable; as immu, "I take," preterite émyau, future imsu, infinitive imti. Gemmu, "I am born," has, in the preterite, together with gimyau also the assimilated form gimmau. The root gim answers to the Sanskrit जन् jan, which, in the sense of "to be born," is likewise included in the fourth class, but which irregularly suppresses the $n$ before the character य $y a$, and, in compensation, lengthens the vowel. As, however, jan, "nasci," is used only in the middle, and the passive, on account of its character $y a$, is identical with the middle of the fourth class, nothing prevents us from regarding जाये jaye, "nascor," as passive, and thus recognising in the Lithuanian gemmu a remnant of the Sanskrit passive, only [G. Ed. p.724.] with the loss of the middle terminations. We should also remark the admirable agreement between the Lithuanian luppu, "I peel," "I skin," which is based on assimilation, and the Sanskrit lup-yd$d$-mi, from the root lup, "to cleave," "to destroy," "to trouble." Hence the transition is very close to Greek verbs with double consonants, in the special tenses; for the form ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ dos, as contrasted with the Gothic $A L \nmid A$, has furnished us with the first proof, that, in Greek, the semi-vowel $y$ still exists in the form of a retroacting assimilation,* for comparatives like $\kappa \rho \varepsilon i \neq \sigma \omega v$, $\grave{e} \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma \tilde{\sigma}^{\prime} \omega \nu$, are traced back to this principle (\$. 300.), to which, also, verbs with $\sigma$ or $\lambda$ doubled in the special tenses are subjected;

 ( $\gamma^{\lambda u \kappa i} i \omega \nu$ ); $\pi \tau u ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\pi \tau u \chi y \omega$, as $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ from $\pi \alpha ́ \chi y \omega v$ ( $\pi \alpha \chi^{i} \omega \nu$ ). According to this principle, $\gamma$ also becomes $\sigma$; e.g. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\tau \alpha \gamma y \omega$, to which the comparatives do not supply any analogy, as might have been expected in $\mu$ é $\gamma$ as. As, however, $\mu \in i \zeta \omega \nu$ is used for $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \omega v$ from $\mu \epsilon \gamma y \omega \nu$, so also

[^144]in the $\zeta$ of some verbs the retroactive influence of an earlier $y$ might be conjectured; thus $\alpha^{\circ} \zeta \omega$ (with ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \iota o s=$ Sanskrit यज् $y a j$, "to adore," "to sacrifice,") from $\dot{\alpha} \gamma y \omega ; \phi \rho \alpha \dot{\zeta} \omega$ from $\phi \rho \alpha \delta y \omega$; i $\zeta \omega$ from i $\delta y \omega$; $\beta \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ with $\beta \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\beta \rho \alpha \delta y \omega$ or $\beta \rho \alpha \chi y \omega$.
502. Most verbs in $\sigma \sigma \omega$ are denominatives; and it is here important to remark, that, in Sanskrit also, the syllable य ya forms denominatives, as chird-yd-mi, "I hesitate," from chira "slow"; śabdâ-ŷ̂-mi, "I sound," from śabda, "sound"; asî-yâ-mi, " I curse," from asu, " life"; namas-yî-mi, " I adore,"
[G. Ed. p. 725.] from namas, " adoration." Thus, in Greek, amongst others, $\alpha i \mu \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\alpha i \mu \alpha \tau y \omega$ from 'AIMAT; ко$\rho v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ from кори $\theta y \omega$ from KOPY ${ }^{\text {; }} \tau \alpha \rho \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\tau \alpha \rho \alpha \chi y \omega$ from TAPAXH; $\pi \tau є \rho u ́ \sigma \sigma о \mu \alpha \iota$ from $\pi \tau \epsilon \rho \cup \gamma y о \mu \alpha \iota$ from ПTEPYГ; к $\eta \rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from к $\eta \rho \cup \gamma y \omega$ from КНРYГ. The numerous denominatives, also, in $\alpha \zeta \omega$ and $\iota \omega$ might be referred to this class, the semi-vowel थ् $y$ being represented by $\zeta$.* The question is, whether the $\alpha$ and $\iota$ of forms like $\epsilon \dot{v} \nu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \quad \delta i \kappa \alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \quad \dot{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \quad \dot{\alpha} \gamma о \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \quad \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu i \zeta \omega, \quad \dot{\alpha} \theta \rho o i \zeta \omega$, $\dot{\alpha} \phi \rho i \zeta \omega$, belong to the primitive noun, or to the verbal derivative. It must be considered an important argument in favour of the former view, that $\alpha \zeta \omega$, in that kind of denominatives, for the most part occurs only where an $\alpha$ or $\eta$ is already contained in the base noun, but $\eta$ according to its origin $=\hat{a}$ (§.4.). If, therefore, $\delta_{\iota} \kappa \check{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ comes from $\delta_{\iota} \kappa \eta\left(\delta_{\iota} \bar{\alpha}\right)$, then the final vowel of the base word has only been weakened in the most natural manner, and it would therefore be also only a weakening of the vowel, if $a$, springing from short $a$, should become t (§. 6.), and e.g. $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu i-\zeta \omega$ should stand for $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu o ́-\zeta \omega$. And it need not surprise us if $\eta(\bar{\alpha})$ were at times weakened a stage further than to $\breve{a}$, viz. to $\iota$, and, e.g., $\alpha \dot{v} \lambda_{i}^{\prime}-\zeta о \mu \alpha \iota$ were derived from $\alpha u ̛ \lambda \dot{\eta}$, by changing the $\eta$ into $\iota$. Bases ending

[^145]with a consonant observe, if this opinion be just, a double course of procedure: either the final consonant is suppressed, or an 1 added to it as a conjunctive vowel. The former occurs principally in words which have already become accustomed, through the nominative (accusative), to the loss of their final consonant; the latter principally in those words that retain their final consonant, or the former of two in the nominative; hence, $\chi \epsilon \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ from XEIMAT; ${ }^{\circ} \nu о \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ from 'ONOMAT; $\pi \alpha i \zeta \omega$ from ПAI $\Delta$; $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \zeta o \mu \alpha ı$, from 'AミПI $\Delta$; but [G. Ed. p.726.] $\dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho-i-\zeta \omega, \quad \gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho-i-\zeta \omega, \alpha \dot{u} \chi \epsilon \nu-i-\zeta \omega, \quad \dot{\alpha} \kappa о \nu \tau-i-\zeta \omega, \quad \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \nu-i-\zeta \rho \mu \alpha \iota$, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda о к-i-\zeta \omega$. Deviations from the prevailing principle are $\alpha i \mu \alpha \tau-i-\zeta \omega, \dot{e} \rho \mu \alpha \tau-i-\zeta \omega, \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \varepsilon \iota \gamma \mu \alpha \tau-i-\zeta \omega, \kappa \nu \mu \alpha \tau-i-\zeta \omega, \sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho \mu \alpha \tau-$ $-i-\zeta \omega, \pi \sigma \delta-i-\zeta \omega$; and, on the other hand, $\mu \alpha \sigma \pi i-\zeta \omega, \sigma \alpha \lambda \pi i-\zeta \omega$, $\sigma \nu \rho i-\zeta \omega$, for $\mu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \gamma-i-\zeta \omega$, \&c. The $\Sigma$ of words like $\tau \epsilon i \chi{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ belongs, indeed, as has been before shewn (§. 128.), to the base; notwithstanding, no derivations exist like $\tau \epsilon \iota \chi \epsilon \sigma-i-\zeta \omega$, since, at the time when these verbs originated, it was already forgotten that the $\Sigma$, which had been dislodged from the oblique cases, belonged to the base.
503. If we start from the view, that the $\alpha$ and of denominatives in $\alpha \zeta \omega$ and $\zeta \zeta \omega$ belong to the verbal derivative, then they correspond to the Sanskrit tenth class (§. $109^{\circ} .6$.), which likewise forms denominatives; and thus, in the second person plural, $\alpha \zeta \epsilon-\tau \epsilon$ would $=$ Sanskrit aya-tha. The $\iota$ of $\iota \zeta \omega$ would consequently be, in $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu i \zeta \omega$, not the weakening of the o of ПONEMO, and in $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho i \zeta \omega$, $\mu \alpha \kappa \alpha \rho i \zeta \omega$, єúd $\alpha u \mu \nu v^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, and others, not a conjunctive vowel, but the weakened form of the old $a$ of स्यामि $a y d-m i$, सयसि $a y a-s i, \& c$; but the vowels of the nominal bases would be rejected, as in Sanskrit in which language, in polysyllabic bases, not only the final vowels are withdrawn, but final consonants also, together with the vowel preceding them; e.g. prit-a-yami from prîti, "joy," varm-aydmi from varman, " armour." We might consider in this light the isolated word ${ }^{2} \in \kappa \alpha \zeta^{\circ} \mu \epsilon \nu=s$ in Greek, and, moreover, forms like obvo $\mu \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \sigma \pi i \zeta \omega$; thus pro-
 other hand, the majority of bases terminating with a consonant, in advantageous contrast with the Sanskrit, preserve the primary word unabbreviated, or only so weakened, as before the oblique case-terminations: thus, $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho-i \zeta \omega$ like $\gamma \alpha \sigma \tau \rho-o s \rho$. If this second view of the matter is, as I am much inclined to think it is, the correct one, then the opposition between forms like $\dot{\alpha} \gamma o \rho^{\prime}-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, $\delta \iota \kappa^{\prime}-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, $\chi \epsilon \mu-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$, on
[G. Ed. p. 727.] the one hand, and such as $\pi \circ \lambda \epsilon \mu \mu^{\prime}-i \zeta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \phi \rho \rho^{\prime}-$ $-i \zeta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi^{\prime}-i \zeta \omega, \dot{\alpha} \eta \delta^{\prime}-i \zeta \omega,{ }^{*} \dot{v} \psi^{\prime}-i \zeta \omega$, on the other, is to be settled thus, that the $\alpha$ of derivation is preserved by $\alpha$ or $\eta(=\bar{\alpha})$ of the primitive word, in order that the base and derivative part may not experience too much weakening. Moreover, in bases in o too, the forms in $\alpha \zeta \omega$, and without c preceding, are not rare, though they are kept in the back-ground by the overwhelming majority of those in $i \zeta \omega$; as $i \pi \pi-\alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \lambda_{l} \theta-\alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta$,
 $\kappa \omega \mu-\alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \sigma \eta \kappa-\alpha ́ \zeta \omega, \sigma v \sigma \kappa о т-\alpha ́ \zeta \omega$, (together with $\sigma \kappa о \tau-i \zeta \omega) \sigma u \kappa-$ $-\alpha \zeta \omega, \tau 0 \xi-\alpha \zeta 0 \mu \alpha 1$. Add to this, the form in ' $\zeta \omega$ is not entirely foreign to the $\alpha$ declension ( $\lambda \nu \rho i \zeta \omega$ from $\lambda \dot{u} \rho \alpha$ ); and what is of more importance, both $\dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ and $i \zeta \omega$ occur beyond the nominal formations, as $\dot{\rho} / \pi \tau-\alpha \alpha^{\prime} \zeta$ from $\rho_{i}^{\prime} \pi \tau \omega, \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu-$ $-\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ from $\sigma \tau \in ́ v \omega, \dagger$ as $\delta \alpha \mu \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ together with $\delta \alpha \mu \dot{\alpha} \omega, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \zeta \omega$ with $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega, \pi \rho о \kappa \alpha \lambda i \zeta \omega$ with $\kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$, $\alpha i \tau i \zeta \omega$ with $\alpha i \tau \in ́ \omega$, $\dot{\omega} \theta i \zeta \omega$ with $\dot{\omega} \theta \hat{\epsilon} \omega$. Such forms are certainly connected with the character स्य aya of the tenth class.
504. To this class I refer, also, verbs in $\alpha \omega$ and $\epsilon \omega, \ddagger$ whose

[^146]relation to the Sanskrit aya must be this, that (as in the Latin first conjugation and the Gothic second weak form), after dropping the semi-vowel, the two $a$ of wय aya have combined into a corresponding long vowel ( $\bar{\alpha}$ or $\eta$ ). This shews itself elsewhere besides in the special tenses, e.g. in $\phi i \lambda-\eta-\sigma \omega, \pi \epsilon \phi^{\prime} \lambda-\eta-\kappa \alpha$, with which the [G. Ed. p. 728.] Eolic present $\phi i \lambda-\eta-\mu \iota$ agrees; whence, by adding the conjunctive vowel of the $\omega$ conjugation, through which the $\eta$ is
 similar to the formation of $\tau i \theta^{\prime} \epsilon$, for $\tau_{i} \theta_{\eta} \mu$, , from the root $\Theta H$.* For $\nu \iota \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \omega$ we should expect $\nu \iota k-\bar{\alpha}-\mu t$, and such forms must have formerly existed: the $\nu^{\prime} \kappa-\eta-\mu \mu, \dagger$ however, which has been transmitted to us, like $\nu \iota \kappa-\eta-\sigma \omega$ for $\nu \iota k-\alpha-\sigma \omega$, need not surprise us, as $\eta$, according to its origin, stands everywhere for $\bar{\alpha}$, and even the Doric, disposed as it is to adopt the $\bar{\alpha}$, has not preserved every $\bar{\alpha}$ from being corrupted to $\eta$. The Prâkrit, as has been already observed, has, for the most part, contracted the character aya into $\hat{e}$-by suppressing the final $a$, vocalizing the $y$ to $i$, and combining it, according to rule, with the preceding $a$ to $e \dot{\ddagger} \ddagger$-and thus it

[^147]answers to the Latin second, and Gothic third conjugation of the weak form (p. 110, passim). But in Prâkrit the $y$ of aya may also be abandoned, as jaṇ-aa-di=Sanskrit jan-aya-ti,
[G.Ed. p. 729.] which serves as countertype to the Latin first and Gothic second weak conjugation (with $\hat{\delta}$ for $\hat{a}$, according to §.69.), and to Greek verbs with the derivative $\eta$ or $\bar{\alpha}$.
505. The relation of the Latin $\hat{\imath}$ of the fourth conjugation to the Sanskrit aya is to be viewed thus, that the first $a$ has been weakened to $i$, and has then combined with the $y$ dissolved to $\boldsymbol{i}$, which follows, into $\hat{\imath}$, and this $\hat{\imath}$ before a vowel fol-lowing-sound is again subjected to abbreviation. The final $a$ of क्य aya has been lost or preserved under the same circumstances as those under which the syllable य ya of the fourth class; e.g. in capio; is retained or lost (compare §. 500.). Thus the io, iunt, of audio, audiunt, correspond with the Sanskrit ay $\hat{a}-m i$, aya-nti; e.g. in chôr-ayâ-mi, " I steal" (compare furo, according to §. 14.), chôr-aya-nti; the iês, î̂s, of audiês, audids, with the Sanskrit wयेस् ayês in chôr-ayê-s, " thou mayest steal"; on the other hand, the $\hat{\imath} s$, $\grave{\imath} t$, $\hat{\imath m u s}$, $\hat{\imath} t i s$, of audîs, audĭt, audîmus, audîtis, answer to the aya-si, aya-ti, ayâ--mas, aya-tha, of chôr-aya-si, \&c. In *Sclavonic, Dobrowsky's third conjugation is to be referred to this place, which, in the present, contrasts $y \hat{u}$ (from $y o-m, ~ § .255^{\mathrm{a}} . \mathrm{g}$.), ya-ty, with the Sanskrit ayd-mi, aya-nti, and Latin io, iu-nt, but in the other persons has preserved only the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit aya, resolved to $i$. Exclusive of the special tenses, these verbs separate into two classes ( $E$ and $F$, according to Dobrowsky), since the Sanskrit सय् ay, $\dagger$ shews itself either in the form of t $y$ e, or as $i$. The former, according to §. 255.e, corresponds exactly with the Prâkrit ए $\hat{e}$, and

[^148]therefore with the Latin $\varepsilon$ of the second conjugation, and with the Gothic ai, Old High German $\ell$, of the third weak conjugation (p. 120, passim); e.g. видвти vid-ye-ti, "to see,"* answering to the Prâkrit vêd-ê-tuni (véd-é- [G. Ed. p. 730.] $-m i$ ), Latin vid-e-re, Sanskrit véd-ay-i-tum (vêd-ayd-mi). On the other hand, $b \hat{u} d-i-i t$, " to waken," in analogy with $b \hat{u} d-i-s h i$, "thou wakenest," \&c.
506. In Lithuanian we recognise the Sanskrit tenth class, and therefore the German weak conjugation, in Mielke's $\dagger$ second and third conjugation. The second, with regard to the present, distributes itself into two classes, of which the one, and the more numerous, has preserved only one $a$ of the character aya-probably the latter,-and hence appears identical with the first, which corresponds to the Sanskrit first or sixth class; e.g. stén-a-me, "we groan," stén-a-te, " ye groan"=Sanskrit stan-ayâ-mas, $\ddagger$ stan-aya-tha, as veź-a-mé, veź-a-té =vah-â-mas, vah-a-tha. The other, and less numerous class, has, like Dobrowsky's third conjugation, an $i$ in the present, as a remnant of the Sanskrit aya, e.g. myl-i-me, "we love." In the preterite koth classes have dyo throughout the dual and plural; thus, e.g. second person plural, sten-êyo-te, myl-êyo-te, answering to the Sanskrit astan-aya-ta. The singular has, in the first person, êyau, from êya-m (§. 438.); second person, êyei from êya-si; third person, êyo, without an expression for the person. Thus we see here the class character wय aya retained more exactly than in any other

[^149]European cognate language. The $\hat{e},{ }^{*}$ answering to the ( $a$, is perhaps produced by the re-active influence of the $y$, while in Zend, that semi-vowel, by its assimilative force, changes into ê the following $a$ sound; e.g. śrav-ayê-mi, sıráv$a y$ ê-shi, s̉râv-ayêi-ti, "I speak " (" make to hear") \&c. There are some verbs in Lithuanian which, in the present also,
[G. Ed. p. 731.] have preserved the character खय aya in the most perfect form; e.g. klyd-êyu, $\dagger$ "I wander about," plural klyd-êya-me, preterite singular klyd-êyau. Verbs, also, in oyu, ìyu, and iyu-plural oya-me, uya-me, iya-me-furnish an exact counterpart to the Sanskrit tenth class, or causal form; e.g. dum-oyu, "I think," plural dum-oya-me, preterite dum-oyau; wazâųyu, "I drive," plural waź-ůya-me= the Sanskrit causal vâh-ayâ-mas. Verbs in iyu are, as it appears, all denominatives; $\ddagger$ e.g. dáwadiyu, "I bring into order," from dawádas, " order." Mielke's third conjugation, like the preponderating class of the second conjugation, has, in the present, preserved only the last vowel of the character wय aya, and that in the form of an $o$, with the exception of the first and second person singular, in which the old $a$ remains. Compare penù, "I nourish," of the second conjugation, with laikau (laik-a-u), "I stop," of the third.

[^150]SINGULAR.
pen-ù, laik-a-u. pen-i laik-a-i, pén-a, laik-o.

DUAL.
pén-a-wa, laik-o-wa. pén-a-ta, laik-o-ta. pén-a, laik-o.
PLURAL.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { pén-a-me, } & \text { laik-o-me, } \\
\text { pén-a-te, } & \text { laik-o-te, } \\
\text { pén-a, } & \text { laik-o. }
\end{array}
$$

he two plural numbers, and in the third [G. Ed. p. 732.] ion singular of the preterite, laikau has lost the syllable If the êyo, which, in the second conjugation, corresponds he Sanskrit aya, and, in the first and second person ;ular, it has lost the $\hat{e}$ : it uses iau for êyau, and for êyei. Hence we see clearly enough that this conition, though more corrupted, likewise belongs to the skrit tenth class. Compare-

SINGULAR.
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { pen-êya-u, laik-ia-u, } & \text { pen-êỳu-wa, laik-ê-wa, } \\ \text { pen-êye-i, } & \text { laik-ie-i. } & \text { pen-ềyo-ta, } & \text { laik-ê-ta, } \\ \text { pen-ềyo, } & \text { laik-ê. } & \text { pen-êyo, } & \text { laik-ê. }\end{array}$
PLURAL.
pen-êyo-me, laik-ê-me, pen-êyo-te, laik-ê-te, pen-ếyo, laik-ê.
las been already observed with regard to the Sanskrit ih class, that its characteristic wय aya is not restricted :he special tenses (§. $109^{\text {a }} .6$ ), but that, with few excepis, it extends to all the other formations of the root, $r$ laying aside the final $a$ of aya. Thus, in Lithuanian, art of the corresponding éyo, iyo, \&c., is transferred to general tenses and the other formations of the word. êyo, the ê remains; of iyo, $i$; and of oya, iuya, $\delta:$ the d conjugation, however, uses $y(=i)$; e.g. future pen$u, d a-w a d-i-s u, w a z-6-s u$, laik-y-su.

## FORMATION OF THE TENSES.

[G. Ed. p. 733.] present.
507. The Present requires no formal designation, but is sufficiently pointed out by this, that no other relation

## The following Note formed the Preface to the Fourth Part of the German Edition, and, being too important to be omitted, is inserted in the present form, in order to avoid an interruption of the text.

This Part contains a section of the Comparative Grammar, the most important fundamental principles of which were published twentysix years ago in my Conjugation System of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Persian, and German, and have, since then, been almost universally acknowledged as just. No one, perhaps, now doubts any longer regarding the original identity of the abovementioned languagrs, with which, in the present work, are associated also the Lithuanian and Sclavonic; while, since the appearance of the Third Part, I have devoted a distinct Treatise to the Celtic language,* and have endeavoured, in a Work which has recently alpeared, to prove an original relationship between the Malay-Polynesian idioms, also, and the Sanskrit stem. But even so carly as in my System of Conjugation, the cstahlishment of a connection of languages was not so much a final object with me, as the means of penetrating into the secrets of lingual development, since languages, which were originally one, but during thousands of years have been guided by their own individual destiny, mutually clear up and complete one another, inasmuch as one in this place, another in that, has preserved the original organization in a more healthy and sound condition. A principal result of the inquiry instituted in my Conjugation System was the following:--that many grammatical forms, in the system of conjugation, are explained by auxiliary verbs, which are supposed to have attached themselves to them, and which, in some measure, give to the individual languages a peculiar appearance, and seem to confirm the iden, that new grammatical forms were developed, in the later periods of the history of lanyuages, from newly-created matter; while, on closer inspection,

[^151]of time, past or future, has a sonant representative. Hence, in Sanskrit and its cognate languages, there occurs,
we find nothing in their possession but what they had from the first, though at times its application is new. Thus the Latin, in comparison with the Greek, which is so closely allied to it, shews, in the forms of its tenses and moods in bam, $b o, v i, r e m$, and rim, an aspect which is completely strange. These terminations, however, as has been long since shewn, are nothing else than the primitive roots of the verb "to be," common to all the members of the Indo-European family of languages, and of which one has for its radical consonant a labial, the other a sibilant which is easily converted into $r$ : it is, therefore, not surprising, that ham presents a great resemblance to the Sanskrit abhavam and Lithuanian buwaù, "I was" (see $\widehat{\delta}$. 522. ); while forms like amabo, through their final portion, stand in remarkable agreement with the Anglo-Saxon beo, and Carniolan böm, "I shall be" (see §. 663., \&ce.), and border on the Irish dialect of the Celtic in this respect, that here also the labial root of "to be" forms an elementary part of verbs implying futurity (see $\oint .256$. .).
In the Latin subjunctives, as amem, ames, and futures, as legam, legês, I have already, through the medium of the Sanskrit, perceived an analogy with the Greek optatives and German subjunctives, and designated, as exponent of the relation of mood or time, an auxiliary verb, which signifies "to wish," "to will," and the root of which is, in Sanskrit, $\hat{\imath}$, which here, as in Latin and Old High German, is contracted with a preceding $a$ to $d$, but in Greek, with the $a$ which is corrupted to 0 , forms the diphthong oo. Thus we meet with the Sanskrit bharês, the Old High German bërês, the Latin ferês, the Gothic bairais, the Zend barôis, and the Greek ф'ि $\rho o t s$, as forms radically and inflexionally connected, which excite real surprise by the wonderful fidelity with which the original type has been preserved in so many languages which have been, from time immemorial, distinct from one another. On the whole, the mood, which, in $\oint \oint .672 .713$., I have largely discussed, may be regarded as one of the lustrous points of the common grammar of the members of the Indo-European languages. All the idioms of this giant family of languages, as far as they are collected in this book, share therein under different names. In Sclavonic, Lithuanian, Lettish, and Old Prussian, it is the imperative in which we re-discover the mood called, in Sanskrit grammar, the potential and precative; and it is most remarkable how closely the Carniolan, as spoken at this day, approximates, in this point, to the Sanskrit, which has so long been a dead
in the present, only the combination of the personal terminations, and, indeed, of the primary ones, with the root, or,
language. In order to set this in a clear point of view, I have, at §. 711 . (last example), contrasted two verbs of the same signification in the two languages, and in them written the Sanskrit diphthong é from aï according to its etymological value.

Where differences exist in the languages here discussed, they frequently rest on universal euphonic laws, and therefore cease to be differences. Thus, in the paradigm just mentioned, the Carniolan has lost, in the three persons singular of the imperative, the personal termination, while the dual and plural stand in the most perfect accordance with the Sanskrit. The abbreviation in the singular, however, rests on the euphonic law which has compelled the Sclavonic languages, at least in polysyllabic words, to drop all original final consonants (sce §. 255.l.). According to this principle, in Carniolan, $d a j(=d a i)$, thrice repeated, corresponds to the Latin den, dês, det (from dain, dais, duit), while in the present dam is more full than $d o$, and dash as full as das, because, that is to say, in the present the pronominal consonants originally had an $i$ after them.*
The German languages have renounced the association of the roots of the verb "to be." They are wanting in futures like the Sanskrit $d a$ syâmi, Greek $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \omega$, and Lithuanian $d \stackrel{\imath}{u}$-su, and also in those with the labial root of "to be," which furnish the Latin dabo, and Irish futures like meal-ft-mar, "we will deceive," and Lithuanian subjunctives as dîtum--bime, daremus (see $\oint .685$.). German is wanting, too, in preterites like the Sanskrit adik-şham, Greek $\epsilon \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa-\sigma a$, and Latin dic-si (see $\S .555$. ); to which belong the Sclavonic tenses like da-ch, "I gave," dachom, "we gave," the guttural of which we have derived from a sibilant. $\dagger$ On the other hand, the German idioms, by annexing an auxiliary verb signifying "to do," have gained the appearance of a new inflexion. In this sense I have already, in my System of Conjugation, taken the Gothic plurals like sôkidêdum and subjunctives as sôkidédyau ("I would do seek"); and subsequently, in agreement with J. Grimm, I have extended the auxiliary verb just mentioned also to the singular indicative sôkida, and our forms like suchte. (See $\$ \oint .620 . \& c$. .) I think, too, I have discovered the same auxiliary in the Sclavonic future büdû, "I will be" ("I do be"), and in the

[^152]tead of the root, such an extension of it, as, in the scial tenses, falls to the class of conjugation, to which

〕erative bûdi (properly "do be"); moreover, in idû, "I go" lo go," see §. 633.); and finally, in the Greek passive aorists in $\theta_{\eta \nu}$ $: \oint .630$.) ; for the auxiliary verb to which our thun answers, which been treated of minutely at $\$ .428$, \&c., signifies, both in Sanskrit I Zend, "to place," and "to make"; and the Old Saxon dëda, "I 1," resembles surprisingly the Zend reduplicated preterite dadha, (see 339.). It is, however, remarkable, that those Sanskrit classes of verbs, which, as I think, I have proved our weak conjugation answers, always aphrase that preterite which is the foundation of our German tense e reduplicated or perfect), either by an auxiliary verb signifying " to "" to make," or by a verb substantive. Here, therefore, as in so my other things, the apparently peculiar direction which the German guages have taken, was in a great measure pointed out to them by sir old Asiatic sister.
I cannot, however, express myself with sufficient strength in guarding ainst the misapprehension of supposing that $I$ wish to accord to the nskrit universally the distinction of having preserved its original charac:: I have, on the contrary, often noticed, in the earlier portions of this rk, and also in my System of Conjugation, and in the Annals of Orien. l Literature for the year 1820, that the Sanskrit has, in many points, perienced alterations where one or other of the. European sister idioms $s$ more truly transmitted to us the original form. Thus it is undoubtly in accordance with a true retention of the original condition of the nguage that the Lithuanian diewas, "God," and all similar forms, keep eir nominative sign $s$ before all following initial letters, while the Sanskrit tvas, which answers to the abovementioned diewas, becomes either dêvah, $d e ̂ v \hat{o}$, or dêva, according to the initial sound which follows, or a pause; id this phenomenon occurs in all other forms in as. The modern LithuLian is, moreover, more primitive and perfect than the Sanskrit in this jint also, that in its essi, "thou art," it has, in common with the Doric $-\sigma i$, preserved the necessary double $s$, of which one belongs to the root, the her to the personal termination, while the Sanskrit asi has lost one: also this point, that the forms esme "we are," este, "ye art," in common ith the Greek $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \dot{\epsilon}$, have retained the radical vowel, which has been ropped in the Sanskrit smas, sthas (see §. 480.). The Latin erant and bant, i amabant, \&c., surpass the Sanskrit Asan and abhavan, "they were," as so the Greek $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma a \nu$ and $\epsilon \phi v o \nu$, by retaining the $t$, which belongs to the
the root belongs ( $\left(.109^{n} .493, \& c\right.$.). Compare, for the first coujugation (§. 493.), the Sansk!̣it बहामि vahämi, "I drive,"
third person; and ferens and the Zend barais are in advance of the Sanskrit bharan and Greek $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$, by their keeping the nominative sign; as also the Lithuanian vezans (wezas), in common with the Zend vazañs and Latin vehens, put to shame, in this respect, the Sanskrit vahan. It is, in fact, remarkable that several languages, which are still spoken, retain here and there the forms of the primitive world of languages, which several of their older sisters have lost thousands of years ago. The superiority of the Carniolan dam to the Latin do has been mentioned before; but all other Carniolan verbs have the same superiority over all other Latin verbs, with the exception of sum and inquam, as also over the Greek verbs, as the Carniolan, and, in common with it, the Irish, have in all forms of the present preserved the chief element of the original termination mi. It is, too, a phenomenon in the history of languages, which should be specially noticed, that among the Indian daughters of the Sanskrit, as in general among its living Asiatic and Polynesian relations, not one language can, in respect of grammatical Sanskrit analogies, compare with the more perfect idioms of our quarter of the globe. The Persian has, indeed, retained the old personal terminations with tolerable accuracy, but, in disadvantageous comparison with the Lithuanian and Carniolan, has lost the dual, and preserved scarce any thing of the ancient manner of formation of the tenses and moods; and the old case terminations, which remain almost entire in the Lithuanian, and of which the Classical and German languages retain a great part, the Celtic somewhat, have completely vanished in Persian, only that its plurals in an bear the same resemblance to the Sanskrit plural accusatives, that the Spanish in os and as do to the Latin; and also the neuter plurals in $h \hat{a}$, as I believe I have shewn, stand connected with the old system of declension (see §. 241.). And in the correct retention of individual words the Persian is often far behind the European sisters of the Sanskrit; for while in expressing the number "three" the European languages, as far as they belong to the Sanskrit, have all preserved both the $T$ sound (as $t, t h$, or $d$ ) and also the $r$, the Persian $s i h$ is farther removed from the ancient form than the Tahitic toru (euphonic for tru). The Persian chehâr or char, "four," also, is inferior to the Lithuanian keturi, Russian chetyre, Gothic fidvor, Welch pedwar, and even to the e-fatra of Madagascar.

No one will dispute the relation of the Bengali to the Sanskrit; but it
"I carry," with the verbs which correspond to it in the cognate idioms. (Regarding è $\neq \omega$, and the Lithuanian wézin, see §. 442. Note ${ }^{8}$ and ${ }^{4}$ ).
has completely altered the grammatical system, and thus, in this respect, resembles the Sanskrit infinitely less than the majority of European languages. And as regards the lexicon, too, the Bengali resembles the abovementioned language far less than its European sisters, in such words, for instance, as have gone through the process of fermentation in a language which has newly arisen from the ruins of an old one, and have not been re-drawn from the Sanskrit at a comparatively recent period, without the slightest alteration, or only with a trifling modification in their pronunciation. We will take as an example the word Schwester, "sister": this German word resembles the Sanskrit swasâr* far more than the Bengálí bohini $; \dagger$ Bruder, also, is more like the Sauskrit bhrâtar than the effeminate Bengál! bhiit; and Tochter is infinitely closer to the Sanskrit duhitar than the Bengalí jhi. The German words Vater and Mutter correspond far better to the Sanskrit pitar (from patar) and mâtar than the Bengali $b a p$ or $b a b a \ddagger$ and $m a$. The German numerals $d r e i, a c h t$, and neun, are more similar to the Sanskṛit tri, ashṭ̣̂n (from aktân), navan, than the Bengálí tin, at, nay. And while sieben has retained only the labial of the pt of the Sanskrit saptan; the Bengall sât has only the $T$ sound, and has dropped entirely the termination on. In general it appears that, in warm regions, languages, when they have once burst the old grammatical chain, hasten to their downfall with a far more rapid step than under our milder European sun. But if the Bengalí and other new Indian idioms have really laid aside their old grammatical dress, and partly put ou a new one, and in their forms of words experienced mutilation almost everywhere, in the beginning, or in the middle, or at the end, no one need object if I assert the same of the Malay-Polynesian languages, and refer them to the San-

[^153]

## PLURAL.

 vah-a-tha, vaz-a-tha, ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi$ - $-\tau \epsilon$, veh-i-tis, ${ }^{4}$ vig-i-th, ${ }^{4}$ weż-a-tè, vez-e-te.

skrit family, because I have found in them a pervading relationship in numerals and pronouns, and, moreover, in a considerable number of other common words.*

Philology would ill perform its office if it accorded an original identity only to those idioms in which the mutual points of resemblance appear everywhere palpable and striking, as, for instance, between the Sanskrit dadami, the Greek $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$, Lithuanian dimi, and Old Sclavonic damy. Most European languages, in fact, do not need proof of their relationship to the Sanskrit; for they themselves shew it by their forms, which, in part, are but very little changed. But that which remained for philology to do, and which I have endeavoured to the utmost of my ability to effect, was to trace, on one hand, the resemblances into the most retired corner of the construction of language, and, on the other hand, as far as possible, to refer the greater or less discrepancies to laws through which they became possible or necessary. It is, however, of itself evident, that there may exist languages which, in the interval of thousands of years in which they have been separated from the sources whence they arose, have, in a great measure, so altered the forms of words, that it is no longer practicable to refer them to the mother dialect, if it be still existing and known. Such languages may be regarded as independent, and the people who speak them may be considered Autochthones. But where, in two languages, or families of languages, resemblances, which are perfectly

[^154]${ }^{1}$ Respecting the lengthening of the class vowel [G. Ed. p. 734.] see §. 434. ${ }^{2}$ Weźù from weź-o-m for weż-a-m, as in Old Sclavonic BE $z^{8}$ $v e \zeta-\hat{u}$ from vȩ-0-m: see $\oint \oint .2 J 5 . g$. and 436. The fall Lithuanian termination is $m i$, and the Old Sclavonic $m y$ ( $\oint .436$.$) . { }^{3}$ See $\oint .448 . \quad{ }^{4}$ In Latin the weakening of the $a$ of the middle syllable to $i$ prevails nearly throughout ; but, in Gothic, occurs only before $s$ and th final: see $\$ \oint$. . $i 7$. 109". 1. ${ }^{5} W e z=-i$, for vez'-a-i from veź-a-si, compare es-si, "thou art": see §. 448., where we should read weź-ai, weź-ate, for weź-ei, wez'-ete. The Old Prassian has everywhere retained the sibilant, and employs se or sei, and si, as the personal termination; as druw-e-se, "thou believest" (compare Sanskrit dhruva, "firm," "certain"), da-se, " thou givest," wai(d)-sei, "thou knowest," giw-a-ssi (for giw-a-si), "thou livest,"=Sans. jitv-a-si. $\quad{ }^{6}$ From vig-a-vas, see $\oint .441 . \quad{ }^{7}$ From ${ }_{\epsilon} \chi^{-\epsilon}$-тos, see $\oint .97$. ${ }^{8}$ Is supplied by the singular. $\quad{ }^{9} V a z a m a h i$ is founded on the Vêdaform vahamasi, see §. 439. ${ }^{10}$ See §. $458 . \quad{ }^{11}$ From vez-o-nty, see $\oint$. 255. g.
evident, or may be recognised through the known laws by which corruptions arise, crowd together into the narrow and confined space of particular classes of words, as is the case in the Malay-Polynesian languages in relation to the Indo-European, in the numerals and pronouns; and where, moreover, we find, in all spheres of ideas, words which resemble one another in the degree that the Madagnscar sakai, "friends," does the Sanskrit sakhai ; the Madagasc. mica, "cloud," the Sanskṛit mêgha; the New Zealand rákau, "tree," the Prâkṛit rukkha; the New Zealand pákau, "wing," the Sanskṛit pakṣha; the Tagalia paa, " foot," the Sanskrit pâda; the Tahitian ruy, "night," the Prakrit rüi ; the Tongian aho, "day," the Sanskṛit ahô; the Tongian vélka, "ship," the Sanskrit plávaka; the Tongian feláu, "to sail in a ship," the Sanskṛit plava, "ship"; the Tongian fufílu, "to wash," the Sanskrit plu (it plu); the Tongian hamo, "wish," the Sanskrit kâma; the Malay putitih and Madagasc. futsi, " white," the Sanskrit pûta, " pure";*-there, certainly, we have ground for being convinced of a historical connection between the two families of languages.

If it were desired, in settling the relation of languages, to start from a negative point of view, and to declare such languages, or groups of languages, not related, which, when compared with one another, present a

[^155]508. In the Sanskrit first conjugation the verb तिष्षामि tisht thami, "I stand," deserves particular notice. It proceeds from the root stha, and belongs properly to the third class, which receives reduplication ( (§. $109^{\text {a }} .3$.); but is distinguished from it by this anomalous character, that it shortens its radical $\hat{a}$ in the special tenses,* and also

[^156]large number of words and forms, which appear to be peculiar, then we must not only detach the Malay-Polynesian languages from the Sanskrit stem, but also separate them from one another-the Madagascar and South-Sea languages from the acknowledged affinity with the Tagalia, Malay, and Javanese, which has been so methodically and skilfully demonstrated by W. von Ilumboldt; and in like manner divide the Latin from the Greek and Sanskrit ; and the Greek, German, Sclavonic, Lettish, Lithuanian, Celtic, mast be allowed to be so many independent, unconnected potentates of the lingual world; and the coincidences, which the many members of the Indo-European lingual chain mutually offer, must be declared to have originated casually or by subsequent commixture.

I believe, however, that the apparent verbal resemblances of kindred idioms, exclusive of the influences of strange languages, arise either from this, that each individual member, or each more confined circle of a great stem of languages, has, from the period of identity, preserved words and forms which have been lost by the others; or from this, that where, in a word, both form and signification have undergone considerable alteration, a sure agreement with the sister words of the kindred languages is no longer possible. That, however, the signification, as well as the form, alters in the course of time, we learn even from the comparison of the new (ierman with the carlier conditions of our motherlanguage. Why should not far more considerable changes in idea have arisen in the far longer period of time which divides the European languages from the Sanskrit? I believe that evory genuine radical word, whether German, Greek, or Roman, proceeds from the original matrix although the threads by whech it is retraced are found by us at times cut off or invisible. For instance, in the so-called strong conjugation of the
in the syllable of reduplication, where a short a should stand, it weakens this, the gravest of the vowels, to that which is the lightest, $i$; hence, e.g., in the second and third person singular, tishtha-si, tishthha-ti, for tasth $\hat{1}$-si, tasth $\hat{a}-t i$, as might be expected according to the analogy of dadâ-si, $d a d \hat{a}-t i$. As the shortened $a$ of $s l h \hat{a}$ is treated in the conjugation exactly like the class vowel of the first conjugation, this verb, therefore, and ghri, "to smell," which follows its analogy, is included by the native grammarians in the

German one would expect nothing exclusively German, but only what has been handed down and transmitted from the primitive source. We are able, however, to connect with certainty but very few roots of the strong verbs with the Indian. While, e.g., the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Lettish, and Sclavonic, agree in the idea of "giving" in a root, of which the original form, preserved in the Sanskrit and Zend, is dâ, the German gab throws us into perplexity as regards its comparison with its sisters. But if we would assume that this verb originally signified " to take," and has received the causal meaning (" to make to take," i.e. "to give"), as the Sanskrit tiṣhthîmi, and Zend histami, Greek i$\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$, has arrived, from the meaning of "standing," at that of "taking": we might then trace gab to the Vêda grabh, and assume that the $r$ has been lost, although this root has remained in German also, in a truer form and meaning, only that the $a$ has been weakened to $i$ (Gothic greipa, graip, gripum).

I have altered the plan proposed in the Preface to the First Part ( $\mathbf{p}$. xvii.), of devoting a scparate work to the formation of words and comparison of them, and to refer thither also the participles, conjunctions, and prepositions, for this reason, that I intend to treat in the present work, with all possible conciseness, the comparative doctrine of the formation of words, and will also discuss the coincidences of the various members of the Indo-European stem of languages, which appear in the conjunctions and prepositions. For this object a Fifth Number will be requisite. The present Fourth Number will conclude the formation of the tenses and moods; but a little remains to be added regarding the mood which is called Lêt in the Zend and Vêda-dialects, as also the imperative, which. for the rest, is distinguished only by its personal terminations, which have been already discussed in the Third Part.
first class; so that, according to them, we should have to divide tishth-a-si, tishth-a-ti, and regard tishth as a substitute for stha. I consider the double weakening, which the roots sthâ and ghra undergo in the syllable of repetition and of
[G. Ed.p.735.] the base, to be caused by the two combined consonants, which produce in the syllable of repetition a length by position; for which reason, in order that the whole should not appear too unwieldy, the vowel weight of the syllable of reduplication is lessened, and the length of the base syllable is shortened. The Zend histahi, "thou standest," histati, "he stands," \&c., follow the same principle; and it is important to remark, that the Latin sistis, sistit, sistimus, sistitis, on account of the root being incumbered with the syllable of reduplication, have weakened the radical $\hat{a}$ of stâ-re to $i$, and apparently introduced the verb into the third conjugation. I say apparently, because the essence of the third conjugation consists in this, that an $i$, which is not radical, is inserted between the root and the personal termination; but the $i$ of sisti-s, \&c., like the $a$ of the Sanskrit tishta-si, belongs to the root. The Greek i' $\sigma \tau \eta-\mu /$ has so far maintained itself upon an older footing, that it has not given to the syllable of reduplication, or to its consonantal combination, an influence on the long vowel of the radical syllable, but admits of the shortening of this vowel only through the influence of the weight of the personal terminations; thus, before the grave terminations of the plural numbers, and of the entire middle, according to the analogy of $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$, \&c. (see §. 480.). With respect to the kind of reduplication which occurs in the Sanskrit tishthâmi, and of which more hereafter, I must notice preliminarily the Latin testis, which is the reverse case of steti, if, as I believe, testis is to be regarded as one who stands for any thing.
509. The Sanskrit, and all its cognate dialects, have two
roots for the verb substantive, of which the one, which is, in Sanskrit, भ $b h \hat{u}$, in Zend,,$>b \hat{u}$, belongs to the first conjugation, and, indeed, to the first class, and assumes, therefore, in the special tenses, a class-vowel $a$, and [G. Ed. p.736.] augments the radical vowel by Guna; while the other, viz. षस् as, falls to the second conjugation, and, in fact, to the second class. These two roots, in all the Indo-European languages, except in the Greek, where $\Phi \bar{Y}$ has entirely lost the signification "to be," are so far mutually complete, that $b h \hat{u}, b \hat{u}$, have remained perfect in the Sanskrit and Zend (as far as the latter can be quoted); but as, on the contrary, in its isolated condition, is used only in the special tenses. In Lithuanian, the root which answers to as is only used in the present indicative, and in the participle present; just as in the Sclavonic, where the present of the gerund is, according to its origin, identical with the participle present. The Gothic forms from as, the $a$ of which it weakens to $i$, its whole present indicative and suljunctive, only that there is attached to it a further apparent root $S I Y$, which, however, in like manner, proceeds from सस् as. The root blht, in Gothic, does not refer at all to the idea of "to be"; but from it proceeds, I have no doubt, the causal verb baua, "I build" (second person bauais), which I derive, like the Latin facio, from भावयामि bhâvayâmi, "I make to be" (§. 19.). The High German has also preserved remains of the root blû in the sense of "to be": hence proceed, in the Old High German, the first and second person of the singular and plural, while the third persons ist and sint (which latter form is now, in the shape of sind, erroneously transferred to the first person) answer to पस्ति asti, सन्ति santi. Further, from प्रस् as proceeds also the subjunctive si Sanskrit स्याम् syam, "I may be"), and the infinitive sin. Moreover, also, the Sanskrit root vas, "to dwell," has raised itself, in German, to the dignity of the verb sub-
stantive, since, indeed, in Gothic, the present visa (weakened from vasa, see §. $109^{9}$. 1.) signifies only "to remain;" but the preterite vas, and its subjunctive vesyau (German war, wäre), the infinitive visan, and the participle present visands,
[G. Ed. p. 737.] replace the forms which have been, from ancient time, lost by the roots expressing the idea "to be." It may be proper to mention here, that in Sanskrit, the root stha, " to stand," occasionally receives the abstract meaning "to be," and so, as it were, has served as an example to the Roman languages, which, for their verb substantive, employ, besides the Latin roots, $E S$ and $F U$, also STA. As, too, "to sit," occurs in Sanskrit, in the sense of the verb substantive; e.g. Nal. 16. 30. गतसस्वा इवा" सते gatasittiwa(.s) ivin" salê, " like senseless are they;" Hitôp. 44, 11. सास्ताम् मानसतुध्ये सुकृतिनाम् astam mánasatushtayê sukritindm, "let it be (your good behaviour) to gratify the spirit of the virtuous;" Urv. 92. 8. घायुप्मान् खास्ताम् सयम् áyuṣhmín astâm ayam, " long-lived may this man be." It is not improbable that the verb substantive is only an abbreviation of the root as, and that generally the abstract notion of "being" is in no language the original idea of any verb whatever. The abbreviation of $a s$ to $a s$, and from that to a simple $s$, before heavy terminations (see §.480), is explained, however, in the verb substantive, very easily; as the consequence of its being worn out by the extremely frequent use made of it , and from the necessity for a verb, which is so much employed, and universally introduced, obtaining a light and facile build. Frequent use may, however, have a double influence on the form of a verb:-in the first place, to wear it out and simplify it as much as possible; and, secondly, to maintain in constant recollection its primitive forms of inflexion, by calling them perpetually into remembrance, and thus secure them from destruction. Both these results are seen in the verb substantive for in Latin, sum, together with inquam, are the only verbs,
which have preserved the old personal sign in the present: in the Gothic and English of the present day, im and am are the only forms of this kind; and in our New German, bin (from bim) and sind are the sole forms [G. Ed. p. 738.] which have preserved the character of the first person singular and third person plural.
510. As the Sanskrit root bhî belongs to the first conjugation, we shall next examine its conjugation in the present. As belonging to the first class, it requires Guna and the insertion of the class vowel $a$ between the root and the personal termination (§. $109^{\text {a }} .1$.) This insertion of the $a$ occasions the bhô ( $=b h a u$ ), for euphonic reasons, to become lhav, in which form the root appears in all the persons of the special tenses. By this bhav, in Zend bar, the Old High German bir (or pir), in the plural bir-u-més, bir-u-t, obtains very satisfactory explanation, since, as remarked at $\S .20$., and as has since been confirmed, in the case before us, by Graff (II. 325.), the semi-vowels are often interchanged; and, for example, $v$ readily becomes $r$ or l.* The $u$ of bir-u-mês, bir-u-t, is a weakening of the old $a$ (Vocalismus, p.227.16.); and the $i$ of the radical syllable bir rests on the weakening of that vowel, which occurs very often elsewhere (§.6.). The singular should, according to the analogy of the plural, be birum, birus, birut, but has rejected the second syllable: so that bim has nearly the same relation to the Sanskrit bhavimi, that, in Latin, malo has to the mavolo, which was to have been looked for. The obsolete subjunctive-forms fuam, fuas, fuat, fuant, presuppose an indicative fuo, fuis, fuit, \&c., which has certainly at one time existed, and, in essentials, has the same relation to the Sanskrit blavaimi, bhavasi, bhavati, that veho, vehis, vehit, have to vahámi, vahasi, vahati.

[^157]The obsolete form fuvi of the perfect, which is found with the common fui, leads us from fuo to fuvo, in as far as the syllable $v i$ of $f u v i$ is not declared (to which I assent) iden-
[G. Ed. p. 739.] tical with the $v i$ of amavi, but its $v$ regarded as developed from $u$, just as, in the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite बभूव babhûva, in the aorist सभूवम् abhîvam, and in the Lithuanian preterite buwaù.

The full conjugation of the present of the root under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, Old High German, and Greek, is as follows:-

SINGULAR.

| SAnskrit. | d | old high eirian. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhav-d-mi, | bav-d-mi, | $b i-m$, |  |
| bhav-a-si, | bav-a-hi, | bi-s,* | фú-el-s. |
| bhav-a-ti, | bav-ai-ti, |  | $\phi \dot{v}-\varepsilon-\left({ }^{\text {( }}\right.$ |


| bhav- -vas |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhav-a-thas, | bav-a-tho? | ¢ú-e-tov |
| bhav-a-tas, | bav-a-td, | ¢ú-e- |

## PLURAL.

| bhav-â-mas, | $b a v-\hat{a}-m a h i$, | bir-u-més, | фú-0- $\mu \in S$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhav-a-tha, | $b a v-a-t h a$, | bir-u-t, | фи́-є-тє. |
| bhav-a-nti, | bav-ai-nti, | ...t | фú-0-VTl. |

511. I hold it to be unnecessary to further annex an example of the second conjugation (that in $\mu c$ in Greek), for seve-
[G. Ed. p. 740.] ral examples have been given already, in the

[^158]paragraphs, which treat of the influence of the gravity of personal terminations on the preceding radical or class syllable, to which we here refer the reader (§.480.). We will only adduce from the Gothic the verb substantive (as it is the only one which belongs to this conjugation), and contrast its present with the Sanskrit and Zend (compare p. 695 G. ed.):-

|  | SINGULAR. |  | PLURAL. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SANSKPrit. |  | Gothic. | SANSKrit. | ZEND. | GOTHIC. |
| $a s-m i$, | ah-mi, | $i-m$. | s-mas, | h-mahi, | siy-u-m. |
| $a-s i$, | $a-h i$, | $i-s$. | $s-t / 2 a$, | $s^{\prime}$-tha, | $y-u$-th. |
| $a s-t i$, | as'-ti, | i-st. | $s$-a-nti, | $h-\check{e r-n t i, ~}$ | $s-i-n d$. |

"Remark 1.-It is evident that the plural forms siy-u-m, siy-u-th, if strictly taken, do not belong to this place, as the personal terminations are not conjoined direct with the root; but by means of a $u$, which might be expected, also, in the second dual person, siy-u-ts, if it occurred, and in which respect these forms follow the analogy of the preterite. The first dual person which actually occurs is siya.* As regards the syllable siy, on which, as root, all these forms, as well as the subjunctive siy-au, siy-ais, \&c., are based, I do not think, that, according to its origin, it is to be distinguished from im (of which the radical $s$ has been lost) and sind. To sind answers siy, in so far as it likewise has lost the radical vowel, and commences with the sibilant, which in Zend, according to §. 53. , has become $h$. With regard to the iy, which is added, I think that siy stands connected with the Sanskrit potential sydm, so that to the semi-vowel there has been further prefixed its corresponding vowel $i$; for the Gothic, as it appears, does not admit of a $y$ after an initial consonant; hence siyau for syau = स्याम् syâm, according to the principle

[^159]by which, from the numeral base thri, "three," comes the genitive thriye for thrye (§. 310.). If, therefore, in the form siy, properly only the $s$ is radical, and the iy expresses
[G. Ed.p.741.] a mood-relation, still the language, in its present state, is no longer conscious of this, and erroneously treating the whole siy as root, adds to it , in the subjunctive, the class vowel $a\left(\S .109^{\mathrm{a}} .1\right.$.), (with which a new $i$ is united as the representative of the mood-relation,) and, in the indicative, the vowel $u$, which otherwise, in the preterite, regularly enters between the root and the personal termination."
" Remark 2.-That in the Roman languages, also, the weight of the personal terminations exerts an influence on the preceding radical syllable ; and that e.g., in French, the relation of tenons to tiens rests on the same principle on which, in Greek, that of $\delta^{\prime} \delta \partial \mu \epsilon \nu$ to $\delta^{\prime} \delta \omega \mu \iota$ does, has been already elsewhere remarked.* The third person plural, in respect to the form of the radical vowel, ranks with the singular, since it, like the latter, has a lighter termination than the first and second person plural, and indeed, as pronounced in French, none at all; hence tiennent, contrasted with tenons, tenez. Diez, however, differing from my view of the Roman terminating sound (Ablaut), has, in his Grammar of the Roman languages (I. p. 168), based the vowel difference between tiens and tenons on the difference of the accent which exists, in Latin, between téneo and tenémus. But it is not to be overlooked, that, in the third conjugation also, although quaro and quarimus have the same accent, still, in Spanish, querimos is used, opposed to quiero, and, in French, acquérons, opposed to acquiers, as has been already remarked by Fuchs, in his very valuable pamphlet, "Contributions to the Examination of the Roman Lau-

[^160]guages," p. 18. It may be, that the $i$ of the French sais, is identical with the $i$ of the Latin sapio; but, even then, the dislodgement of this $i$ in savons rests on the same law as that which dislodged, in tenons, the $i$ prefixed in tiens; as, e.g., in Sanskrit, the root vas rejects, in the same places, its radical $a$, where regular verbs of the same class lay aside the Guna vowel which is introduced into the root before light terminations; thus, उइमस् uśmas, " we will," opposed to वशिम vaśmi, " I will," as, in French, savons to sais."
" Remark 3.-I cannot ascribe to the Guna in the conjugation of the Sanskrit and its cognate languages a grammatical meaning, but explain it as proceeding sim- [G. Ed. p. 742.] ply from a disposition to fulness of form, which occasions the strengthening of the lighter vowels $i$ and $u$, by, as it were, taking them under the arm by prefixing an $a$, while the $a$ itself, as it is the heaviest vowel, does not require extraneous help. If it were desired, with Pott (Etym. Inq. I. 60.), to find, in the Guna of the present and imperfect, an expression of the continuance of an action, we should be placed in the same difficulty with him, by the circumstance that the Guna is not restricted to these two tenses, but, in verbs with the lighter base-vowels $i$ and $u$, accompanies the root through nearly all the tenses and moods, not only in Sanskrit, but also in its European cognate languages, in as far as these have in general preserved this kind of diphthongization; as the Greek $\lambda \epsilon i ́ t \omega$ and $\phi \epsilon u ́ \gamma \omega$ cannot any more be divested of the $\epsilon$ taken into the roots $\Lambda I \Pi, \Phi \Upsilon \Gamma$, only that the $\epsilon$ in $\lambda \epsilon \in \lambda o \iota \pi \alpha$ is replaced by $o ;{ }^{*}$ and that the aorists é $\lambda \iota \pi o v$, eै $\phi u \gamma o v$, exhibit the pure root, which I cannot attribute to the signification of this aorist (as the second aorist has the same meaning as the first, but the latter firmly retains the Guna, if it is especially the property of the verb), but to the circumstance that the

[^161]second aorist is for the most part prone to retain the original form of the root, and hence at one time exhibits a lighter vocalization than the other tenses, at another, a heavier one; as ध́т $\tau \alpha \pi о \nu$ compared with ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \rho \in \psi \alpha$ and ${ }^{\prime \prime} \tau \rho \in \pi \sigma v$. In this disposition, therefore, of the second aorist to retain the true state of the root, the difference between forms like é $\lambda \iota \pi \circ \nu$, ${ }^{e \prime} \phi \cup \gamma o v$, ${ }^{\prime}$ 'ruxov, and the imperfects of the corresponding verbs, cannot be sought in the circumstance, that the action in the aorist is not represented as one of duration; and that, on the contrary, in the imperfect and present the continuance is symbolically represented by the Guna. On the whole, I do not think that the language feels a necessity to express formally the continuance of an action, because it is self-evident that every action and every sort of repose requires time, and that it is not the business of a moment, if I say that any one eats or drinks, sleeps or sits, or that he ate or drank, slept or sat, at the time that this or that action occurred regarding which I affirm the past time. I cannot, therefore, assume, with Pott, that the circumstance that the class-characteristics oc-
[G.Ed. p. 743.] cur only in the special tenses (i.e. in the present and imperfect indicative, and in the moods thereto belonging), is to be thence explained, that here a continuance is to be expressed. Why should the Sanskrit have invented nine different forms as symbols of continuance, and, among its ten classes of conjugations (see §. $109^{\mathrm{a}}$.), exhibit one, also, which is devoid of all foreign addition? I believe, rather, that the class affixes originally extended over all tenses, but subsequently, yet still before the separation of languages, were dislodged from certain tenses, the build of which induced their being laid aside. This inducement occurred in the aorist (the first, which is most frequently used) and future, owing to the annexation of the verb substantive; wherefore, dâsyâmi and $\delta \omega \omega \omega$ were used for dadâsydmi and $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \omega$; and in the perfect, owing to the reduplication characterising this tense, whence, in Greek, the form $\delta \dot{\text { é- }}$ $\delta e t \gamma \mu \alpha \iota$ must have gained the preference over the $\delta \in \delta \in i ́ \kappa \nu \nu \mu \alpha \iota$
which may have existed. Observe that, in Sanskrit, the loading the root, by reduplication, in the tenses mentioned, has occasioned, even in the second person plural active, the loss of the personal sign; so that ददृश dadrísa corresponds to the Greek $\delta \epsilon \delta$ ó $\kappa-\alpha-\tau \epsilon$."
512. For the description of the present middle, which, in the Greek, appears also as the passive, and in Gothic as passive alone, it is sufficient to refer back to the disquisition on the middle terminations given at §. 466. \&c. It might, however, not be superfluous once more to contrast here, as an example of the first conjugation, the Sanskrit bhare (for bhar- $-\mathbf{\alpha}-m \hat{e}$ ) with the corresponding forms of the cognate linguages; and, for the second conjugation, to annex the forms of the Sauskrit tan-w-e (from tan-u-me, from tan, Cl. 8., " to extend," see §. 109". 4.), and Greek тávvца.

## SINGULAR.

| SANSK RIT. | 2END. | GREEK. | GOTHIC. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhar-ê (from Lhar-at-mè'), bair-î, ${ }^{2}$ |  | $\phi \epsilon ́ \rho-0-\mu \alpha$, |  |
| bhar-a-sê, | $b a r-a-h e ́$, | (фе́р-є-баı), | bair-a-za. ${ }^{4}$ |
| bhar-a-te, | bar-ai-tê, ${ }^{2}$ | фє́р-є-таı, | bair-a-da. ${ }^{4}$ |
|  | DUAL. |  |  |
| bhar-at-valié, | -••• | фєр-о́- $\mu \epsilon \theta$ оv, | -••• |
| bhar-êtleê, | -••• | фє́р-є-б⿴ov, ${ }^{6}$ | . . . |
| bhar-êthê, | -••• | фє́р-є- $\sigma \theta o v,{ }^{6}$ | -• |
|  | PLURAL. |  |  |

bhar-â-mahê, ${ }^{7}$
bhar-a-dhwê, ${ }^{8}$
bhar-a-ntê, bar-á-maidhé, фєр-ó- $\mu \in \theta \alpha$, . . . . ${ }^{3}$ bar-a-dhwê $?^{9}$ фé $\rho-\varepsilon-\sigma \theta \epsilon,{ }^{6} \ldots{ }^{\text {. }}$ bar-ai-ntê, $\quad \phi e ́ \rho-o-\nu \tau \alpha \iota$, bair-a-nda. ${ }^{1}$
${ }^{1}$ Sce $\S \oint .467 .473 . \quad 2$ Regarding the $a i$ of the root, see $\S .41 . ;$ and as to the Gothic ai of bairaza, \&c., see §. 82. ${ }^{3}$ This is replaced by the third person. $\quad$ The terminations, $z a, d a$, $n d a$, are abbreviations of zai, dai, ndai, see §. 466. Observe, in bair-a-za, bair-a-da, that the conjunctive vowel is preserved in its original form (see §. 466. conclusion). ${ }^{6}$ Bharêthê and bharêtê, from bhar-a-athé, bhar-a-atê, whence bharûthé, bharâté, would be regular; but in this place, throughout the whole first conjugation, the $\hat{a}$ has been weakened to $\hat{e}(=a+i)$, or
the $\hat{a}$ of the termination has become $i$ or $\hat{i}$, and been melted down with the class vowel $a$ to $\hat{e}$. Regarding the terminations $\hat{a} t h e \hat{e}$, $\hat{a} t \hat{c}$, as conjectural abbreviations of tâthé, tâtê, or sâthê, sâtê, see §§.474. 475. ${ }^{6}$ See $\oint \oint .474 .475 . \quad{ }^{7}$ From bhar-â-madhê, see §. 47:. To the Zend termination muidluê the Irish termination meoid remarkably corresponds; c.g. in dugh-a-mavid, "wo burn" = Sanskrit dah-â-mahê, from dah-ît-madhê. ${ }^{8}$ Probably from lhar-a-ddlhwê, see §§. 474. 475. $\quad 9$ The termination athee may be deduced with tolerable certainty from the secondary form dhwĕ̆m ; see Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes, p. xxxviii.

SINGUIAR.

| sanskrit. $\tan -w-\hat{e}(\text { from } \tan -u-m e \hat{e})$ | GREEK. $\tau \dot{\alpha} v-v-\mu \alpha \iota .$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| tan-u-shê, | $\tau \alpha ́ v-v-\sigma \alpha \ell$. |
| tan-u-tê, | т $\alpha v-v-\tau \alpha \iota$. |
| $\stackrel{\Gamma}{\sim}$ <br> DUAL. | т $\alpha v-v^{\prime}-\mu \epsilon \theta 01$. |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { ¢ }}$ teın-uv-îtlue | т $\alpha$ v-v-бӨov. |
| Eİ tan-w-âlê, | т $\alpha$ v-v- $\sigma$ Oor. |
| ゼ. PLURAL. |  |
| tan-u-maliê from tan-u-madhê, | $\tau \alpha v-i ́-\mu c \theta(x$. |
| titn-u-clhusp | $\tau \alpha \dot{\nu}-v-\sigma \theta \epsilon$. |
| tau-u-atê from tan-u-antê.* | т $\alpha$ v-v-v'т $\alpha$. |

" Remark.-In Zend, we expect, if tan is here employed, according to the same class of conjugation, for the second and third person singular, and first and second person
 jaccording to the kërĕ-nti-tế, ' he makes,' which actually occurs), tan-u-maidhê, tan-u-dhwé. The third person plural might be tan-w-aitê, or tan-w-aintê, according as the nasal is rejected or not; for that the Zend, also, admits of the rejection of the nasal in places where this is the case in Sansk!it, is proved by the forms


[^162]sponding to the Sanskrit शासfत śásali, शाशते sáásulet (Burnouf, Yaçna, p. 480). In the Sanskrit, also, we sometimes find the nasal retained in the middle of the second conjugation, e.g., achinwanta for the more common achinwata. In the first person singular, the form tan-uy-é, with euphonic $y$, is formed, in Zend, as appears from §. 43.

THE PRETERITE.
513. The Sanskrit has for the expression of past time the forms of the Greek imperfect, aorist, and perfect, without, however, like the Greek, connecting with these different forms degrees of meaning. They are, in Sanskrit, all, without distinction, used in the sense of the [G. Ed. p. 746.] Greek aorist or imperfect; but the reduplicated preterite, which corresponds in form to the Greek perfect, most frequently represents the aorist. The Sanskrit is entirely deficient in a tense exclusively intended to express the completion of an action: none of the three forms mentioned is used chiefly for this object; and I do not remember that I have anywhere found the reduplicated preterite as representative of the perfect. When the completion of an action is to be expressed, we most commonly find the active expression changed into a passive one; and, in fact, so that a participle which, in form and signification, corresponds to the Latin in tus, is combined with the present of the verb substantive, or the latter is to be supplied, as in general the verb substantive, in Sanskrit, is omitted almost everywhere, where it can possibly be done. Some examples may appear not improperly annexed here. In the episode of the Savitri* it should be said V.19. "So far as was to go, hast thou gone," where the last words are expressed by gatan twaya (gatan

[^163]euphonic for gatam), "gone by thee": in the Nalus XII. 29., for "Hast thou seen Nala"? we read in the original kachchit drishtas twayd Nald, i. e. "an visus a te Nalus"? in Kâlidâsa's Urvasî (ed. Lenz, p. 66) " Hast thou stolen her step"? is expressed by gatir asyîs twayâ hritâ (" the way of her taken by thee "). It happens, too, not unfrequently, that the completion of an action is denoted in such a manner that he who
[G. Ed. p. 747.] has performed an action is designated as the possessor of what has been done ; since e.g. उस्तवान् प्रस्मि uktavân asmi, literally "dicto praditus sum," signifies "dictum habeo," "I have said." Thus in Urvasî (l. c. p. 73) the question, " Hast thou seen my beloved "? is expressed by api drishtavîn asi mama priyam, i. e. "art thou having seen m. b."?* The modern mode, therefore, of expressing the completion of an action was, in a measure, prepared by the Sanskrit; for the suffix vat (in the strong cases vant) forms possessives; and I consider it superfluous to assume, with the Indian grammarians, a primitive suffix tavat for active perfect participles. It admits of no doubt whatever, that उक्षवत् uktavat " having said," has arisen from ukta " said," in the same way as धनवत् dhanavat, " having riches," "rich," proceeds from dhann, "riches." $\dagger$ The form in tavat,

[^164]although apparently created expressly for the perfect, occurs sonetimes, also, as expressing an action in transition. On the other hand, in neuter verbs the San- [G Ed.p. 748.] skrit has the advantage of being able to use the participles in $t a$, which are properly passive, with active, and, indeed, with a perfect meaning; and this power is very often employed, while the passive signification in the said participle of verbs neuter is limited, as in the above example, to the singular neuter in the impersonal constructions. As example of the active perfect meaning, the following may serve, Nalus XII. 13.: kwa nu rûjan gatá 'si (euphonic for gatas asi), "quone, rex! profectus es?"
514. The Sanskrit is entirely devoid of a form for the plusquam perfect, and it employs, where that tense might be expected, either a gerund expressive of the relation, "after"*-which, where allusion is made to a future time, stands, also, for the future absolute $\dagger$-or the locative absolute, in sentences like apakrântê nalê rajan damayantí .... abudhyata, "after Nalas had departed, O king! (profecto Nalo) Damayantî awoke."
515. But if it is asked, whether the Sanskrit has, from the oldest antiquity, employed its three past tenses without syntactical distinction, and uselcssly expended its formative power in producing them; or whether the usage of the language has, in the course of time, dropped the finer degrees of signification, by which they might, as in Greek, have been originally distinguishod; I think I must decide for the latter opinion: for as the forms of language gradually wear out and become abraded, so, also, are meanings [G. Ed. p. 749.] subjected to corruption and mutilation. Thus, the San-.

[^165]skrit has an immense number of verbs, which signify" to go," the employment of which must have been originally distinguished by the difference in the kind of motion which each was intended to express, and which are still, in part, so distinguished. I have already noticed elsewhere, that the Sanskrit sarpami, "I go," must have had the same meaning as serpo and ${ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \pi \omega$, because the Indians, like the Romans, name the snake from this verb (सप्पस् sarpa-s " serpens")." If, then, the nicer significations of each one of the three forms by which, in Sanskrit, the past is expressed, gradually, through the misuse of language, became one, so that each merely expressed time past, I am of opinion, that it was originally the function of the reduplicated preterite, like its cognate form in Greek, to express an action completed. The syllable of reduplication only implies an intensity of the idea, and gives the root an emphasis, which is regarded by the spirit of the language as the type of that which is done, completed, in contradistinction to that which is conceived to be in being, and which has not yet arrived at an end. Both in sound and in meaning the perfect is connected with [G. Ed. p. 750.] the Sanskrit intensive, which likewise has a reduplication, that here, for greater emphasis, further receives a vowel augment by Guna. According to signification, the Sanskrit intensive is, as it were, a superlative of the verbal idea; for, e.g. dêdîpya-mâna means "very shining." In respect of form, this intensive is important

[^166]for comparison with the European cognate languages, because the moods which spring from its present indicative afford, as it were, the prototype of the imperative and the optative of the Greek perfect, and of the German subjunctive of the preterite; compare preliminarily babbandhyâm, "I much wish to bind," with the Gothic bundyau (from baibundyau), "I might bind," and the imperative vâuaydhi (from vach, "to speak"), with the Greek кék $\rho \alpha \chi \theta_{1}$, which is connected with it in formation, though not radically. The first augmented preterite of this intensive comes, in respect to form, very close to the Greek plusquam perfect; compare atôtôpam, plural atôtupma, with évєтúфє $!$, è $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi \in \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$. As every completed action is also past, the transition of the vocal symbol of completion to that of the past is very easy, and the gradual withdrawal of the primary meaning is not surprising, as we must, in German also, paraphrase the completion of an action in a manner already pointed out by the Sanskrit, while our simple preterite, which is akin to the Greek perfect, and which, in Gothic also, in a certain number of verbs, has preserved the reduplication, corresponds in meaning to the Greek imperfect and aorist.
516. As regards the two augmented preterites, which appear, in Greek, as imperfect and aorist, there is no occasion, in the form by which they are distinguished from one another, to assume a primitive intention in the language to apply them to different objects, unless such [G. Ed.p.751.]
 $\dot{\epsilon} \delta \delta \delta \partial \nu$, in Sänskrit, alipam,* adám, opposed to alimpam, adadâm-are considered original, and, in their brevity and succinctness, contrasted with the cumbersomeness of the

[^167]imperfect, a hint be found, that through them the language is desirous of expressing such actions or conditions of the past, as appear to us momentary, from their ranking, when recounted, with other events, or for other reasons. It might then be said that the language unburthens itself in the aorist of the Guna and other class characteristics, only because, in the press of the circumstances to be announced, it has no time to utter them; just as, in Sanskrit, in the second person singular imperative, the lighter verbal form is employed, on account of the haste with which the command is expressed, and, e.g., vid-dhi, "know," yung-dhi, " bind," stand opposed to the first person vêdani, "let me know," yunajâni, " let me bind." But the kind of aorist just mentioned is, both in Sanskrit and in Greek, proportionably rarer, and the withdrawing of the class characteristics extends, in both languages, not to the aorist alone, and in both this tense appears, for the most part, in a form more full in sound than the imperfect. Compare, in Sanskrit, adiksham $=$ ै $\delta \varepsilon \iota \xi a$ with the imperfect adislam, which bears the complete form of the aorist above mentioned. In the sibilant of the first aorist, however, I cannot recognise that element of sound,
[G. Fd. p.758.] which might have given to this tense its peculiar meaning; for this sibilant, as will be shewn hereafter, belongs to the verb substantive, which might be expected in all tenses, and actually occurs in several, that, in their signification, present no point of coincidence. But if, notwithstanding, in Sanskrit, or at the time of the identity of the Sanskrit with its cognate languages, a difference of meaning existed between the two augmented preterites, we are compelled to adopt the opinion, that the language began very early to employ, for different ends, two forms which, at the period of formation, had the same siguification, and to attach finer degrees of meaning to trifling, immaterial differences of form. It is requisite to observe here, that, in the history of languages, the case not unfrequently occurs, that
one and the same form is, in the lapse of time, split into several, and then the different forms are applied by the spirit of the language to different ends. Thus, in Sanskrit, data, from the base datar (§.144.), means both "the giver" and "he about to give"; but, in Latin, this one form, bearing two different meanings, has been parted into two; of which the one, which is modern in form, and has arisen from the old by the addition of an $u$ (datûrus), has assumed to itself alone the task of representing a future participle; while the other, which has remained more true to the original type, appears, like the kindred Greek $\delta o \tau_{\eta} \rho$, only as a noun of agency.

## THE IMPEIRFECT.

517. We proceed to a more particular [G. Ed. p. 753.] description of the different kinds of expression for past time, and consider next the tense, which I call in Sanskrit, according to its form, the monoform augmented preterite, in contradistinction to that which corresponds in form to the Greek aorist, and which I term the multiform preterite, since in it seven different formations may be perceived, of which four correspond, more or less, to the Greek first aorist, and three to the second. Here, for the sake of brevity and uniformity, the appellations imperfect and aorist may be retained for the Sanskrit also, although both tenses may in Sanskrit, with equal propriety, be named imperfect and aorist, since they both in common, and together with the reduplicated preterite, represent at one time the aorist, at another the imperfect. That, which answers in form to the Greek imperfect, receives, like the aorist, the prefix of an $a$ to express the past: the class characteristics are retained, and the personal terminations are the more obtuse or secondary ( $\$ .430$.), probably on account of the root being loaded with the augment. This exponent of the past, which is easily recognised in the Greek $e$, may bear the name of augment in Sanskrit also. Thus, in the first conjugation, we may compare aturp-a-m, "I delighted,"
with étepтov; in the second, adada-m, "I gave," with $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \delta \omega \omega$; astri-nav-am (see §. 437. Rem.), "I strewed", with è $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho-\nu v-\nu$; and $a k r \imath \imath-n \hat{a}-m$, "I bought," with è $\pi \in ́ \rho-\nu \bar{\alpha}-\nu$. As the conjugation of the imperfect of the three last-mentioned verbs has been already given (\$§.481. 485. 488.), where the weight of the personal terminations is considered, I shall only annex here the complete one of atarp- $a-m$ and ${ }^{\epsilon} \tau \tau \rho \pi-0-\nu$.

"Remark.-In the Vêda dialect the $t$, which, according to §. 461 ., has been lost in atarpan for atarpant, has beeu retained under the protection of an $s$, which begins the following word; thus, in the Rig-Vêda (Rosen, p. 99), wभी "म् सबन्वन्त् सनिधिम् abhî" "m avanwant swabiṣhtim, "illum colebant fauste aggredientem." According to the same principle, in the accusative plural, instead of the is, to be expected in accordance with $\$ \S$. 236 . 239., of which, according to a universal law of sound, only $n$ has remained, we find in the Vêda dialect $n t$, in case the word following begins with $s$; e.g. अर्मान्त् सु तन्ताद्य asmant su tatra chddaya, " nos bene ibi dirige" (Rosen. l. c. p. 13). I do not hesitate to consider the $t$ of asmant as the euphonic mutation of an $s$, as also, under other circumstances, one $s$ before another $s$, in order to make itself more perceptible in pronunciation, becomes
$\boldsymbol{t}$; as e.g. from vas," to dwell," comes the future vat-syàmi and the aorist avat-sam. The original accusative termination in $\boldsymbol{i}$ s appears in the Vêdas also as $\dot{n} r$, and indeed in bases in $i$ and $u$, in case the word following begins with a vowel or $y$, as, in general, a final $s$, after vowels other than $a, d$ becomes $r$ before all sonant letters. Examples of plural accusatives in $\dot{n} r$ (for $n$ must become Anuswâra before $r$, as before $s$ ) are fगरींत् सचुष्यष्षीनन girîin achuchyavîtana, "nubes excitate" (1. c. p. 72); त्वम् सग्ने वमूंश दह रुद्रां जादियां उत। यजा twam aynế vasûir iha rudrìn addityần uta | yaja, "tu Agnis! Vasues hic, Rudras atque Aditis flicos sacris cole" (1. c. p. 85). Bases in $a$ have lost the $r$ in the accusative plural. The circumstance, however, that they replace the $n$ of the common accusative terminations with Anuswâra ( $\dot{n}$ ), as in रूद्रां rudràn, wादितयं $\begin{aligned} & \text { dity } \\ & \text { an } \\ & \text {, just mentioned, appears to me to }\end{aligned}$ evince that they likewise terminated origi- [G. Ed. p. 755.] nally in $n \mathrm{n}$ : the $r$ has been dropped, but its effect-the change of $n$ into $i$-has remained. At least it is not the practice in the Rig Vêda, particularly after a long $n$, to replace a final $n$ with Anuswâra; for we read, l. c. §. 210., fिद्वान् vidwin " skilful," not fagi vidwân, although a $v$ follows, before which, according to Pânini, as before $y, r$, and vowels, in the Vêda dialect, the termination $d n$ should be replaced by $\dot{d i}$ (compare Rosen, p. IV. 2.); a rule which is probably taken too universally, and should properly be limited to the accusative plural (the principal case where an occurs), where the Zend also employs an $\dot{n}$, and not $n$ (§.239). The accusative termination $\dot{n} r$ for $\dot{n}$ is, however, explained in a manner but little satisfactory, by Rosen, in his very valuable edition of a part of the Rig-Vêda, p. XXXIX, 5.; and the $t$ mentioned above is considered by the Indian grammarians as an euphonic insertion (Smaller Sanskrit Grammar, $\S \S .82^{\circ}$. $32^{b}$. Rem.). If, however, an initial $s$, from a disposition towards a $t$ preceding, has such influence as to annex that letter, it appears to me far more natural for it to have had
the power to preserve a $t$, which actually exists in the primitive grammar, or to change an $s$ into that letter.
518. The Zend, as found in the Zend Avesta, appears to have almost entirely given up the augment, at least with the exception of the aorist mentioned in $\S .469$., and which is remarkable in more than one respect, vurce2?, ? urîrudhusha,* " thou didst grow," and the form mentioned by Burnouf, دuw
 [G. Ed. p. 750.] found no instances, which can be relied
 "they went" (Vend. S. p. 43, l. 4.), must pass as such; and we are not to read, as might be conjectured, in place of it jésundusua apathayenn, and the initial vowel is the preposition $\hat{d}$, which, perhaps, is contained in some other forms also, which might be explained by the augment. Thus, perhaps, in the first Fargard of the Vendidad, the

 kěrentata, "he made," may be distributed into fra and athwèrěsém and akërĕntut. I, however, now think it more probable that their first syllable is compounded of the prepositions fra

[^168]and $a$. The combination of these two prepositions is very generally used in the Zend; as, $\boldsymbol{v}$ دsuguld frâdaya, "value" (Vend. S. p. 124), دย hunvanha, "praise me" (Vend S. p. 39), where the prepositions are separated from the verb,* as in the passage
 fra vayô patain fra urvara ucsyain," aves vulent arbores cres-
 fra zas̀ta ṡnayanuha, "wash the hands" (1. c. p. 457). A form which, if the lithographed codex of the Vend S. is correct, might appear best adapted to testify to the existence of the augment in Zend, is دerzusagus usazayanha, "thou wast born," a word which is remarkable in other respects also (see §.469.). But as long as the correctness of the reading is not confirmed by other MSS., or generally as long as the augment is not more fully established in Zend, I am disposed to consider the vowel which stands between the preposition and the root as simply a means of conjunction; and for $a \mathrm{I}$ should prefer reading $i$ or $\breve{e}$, just as in $u_{s}^{s}-i-l i s t t{ }^{\prime}$, "stand up" (Vend. S. p.458), us-i-histata, "stand ye up" (1. c. p. 459), us'-e-e-histaiti, "he stands up."

[^169]But $a$ also occurs in this verb, inserted as a conjunctive vowel between the preposition and the root; for, p. 456, l. 18., we read $u s-a$-histatu, "stand ye up." I would therefore, if the reading $u s$-a-za-yanhla, "thou wast born," should prove itself from the majority of MSS. to be genuine, prefer, nevertheless, regarding the $a$ as a conjunctive vowel, rather than as the augment.
519. The following examples may throw sufficient light on the conjugation, for the first class, of the Zend imperfect active, which admits of tolerably copious citation:


[G Ed. p. 758.] (1. c. 117, \&c.); Grodvrowadd frddaêsaêm, "I shewed," from fradaêe.ayě-.m =Sanskrit प्रादेशयम् prddés'--aya-m, "I caused to shew" (see §. 42.); fraduês-ayd, " thou

 p. 123); ; pesmes bav-a-t, "he was," = wभवत् abhav-a-t, (p. 125);
 went;" دGwerzunsud paiti sanh-d-ma, "we spoke" $\dagger$
 anhën, "they were" (p. 103 erroneously anhin) = wासन् Asan. I am not able to quote the second person plural, but there can be no uncertainty regarding its form, and from us̀ihistata, "stand ye up," we may infer, also, us histata, "ye stood up," since, in Sanskrit as in Greek, the imperative in the second person plural is only distinguished from the imperfect by the omission of the augment. Examples of the second conjugation are, Gxoevg dudhan-m, "I placed,"


[^170]$\dagger$ Anquetil renders this, "je viens de vous parler."

 often ; و kèrě-naf̂-t. "he made" (p. 135). In the plural I conjecture the forms amr $\hat{u}-m a$, amrû-ta=Sanskrit $a b r u ̂-m a, a b r \hat{u}-t a$; and kĕrě-nu-ma. kèrĕ-nu-ta, like such Greek forms as $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau o ́ \rho-\nu v-\mu \epsilon v$, 光 $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho-\nu v-\tau \epsilon=$ San- [G. Ed. p.759.] krit astri-ṇu-ma, astri-nu-ta. The third person plural does not admit of being traced with the same certainty.
520. With respect to the use of the imperfect it deserves to be remarked, that, in Zend, this tense is very frequently employed as the subjunctive of the present, and that the reduplicated preterite also occasionally occurs in the same sense. In such cases, the past appears to be regarded from its negative side as denying the actual present, and to be thus adapted to denote the subjunctive, which is likewise devoid of reality. Here we must class the phenomenon, that, in Zend, the subjunctive, even where it is actually formally expressed, far more frequently expresses the present by the imperfect than by the present; and that, in Sanskrit, the conditional is furnished with the augment; and that, also, in German and Latin, the conditional relation is expressed by past tenses. Examples of the Zend imperfect indicative with the sense of the present subjunctive are, upudd
 skrit षकृन्नन् akrintan (Vend. S. p. 233); gequ ulc up,und dva va nara aṇhĕn pancha va," there may be


[^171] yêzi anhat rathaêstûo, "if it is a warrior (lit., stander in a car)";
 cultivator"; ;

 $r a b$ dhayanim, $\dagger$ " if the worshippers of Ormuzd wish to cultivate the carth (make to grow)" (p. 198). It is clear, that in most of the examples the conjunction $y^{1} z i$ has introduced the imperfect in the sense of a subjunctive present, for this conjunction loves to use a mood which is not indicative, whether it be the potential, the subjunctive, or, as in the passages quoted, the imperfect of the indicative, as the representative of the suljunctive present. However, the indicative present often occurs after yêzi .(Vend. S. pp. 263, \&c. yểzi paitijasaiti); where, however, the reduplicated preterite stands beside this conditional particle, there it is clear that the past is regarded, as in the imperfect, as the symbol of non-actuality, and invested with a modal application. Thus we read in the second Fargard of the Vendidad (ed. Ols-
 yima nơit vîṿ̛̌̌ " if thou, Yima! obeyest me not"; and
 can," or "if they can," "if it is possible"-according to Anquetil, "si on le peut"; Vend. S. p. 12, wart دu9roungng yêzi thu â didvaêsa, "if he hates thee," according to Anquetil " si l'homme vous irrite."
521. If we now turn to the European cognate languages, it is remarkable that the Lithuanian, Sclavonic, and German, which appear, as it were, as three children born at one birth

[^172]in the great family of languages, which occupies our attention, diverge from one another in respect to the past, and have so divided the store of Sanskrit-Zend past forms, that that of the imperfect has fallen to the lot of [G. Ed. p. 701.] the Lithuanian, and the Sclavonic has taken the aorist, and, in fact, the first aorist, while the German has received the form of the Greek perfect. The augment, however, has been dropped by the Lithuanian and Sclavonic, and the Gothic has retained the reduplication only in a small number of verbs, while in German it lies concealed in forms like hiess, lief, fiel, of which hereafter.
522. As the imperfect now engages our attention, we must, for the present, leave the Sclavonic and German unnoticed, and first bestow our notice on that Lithuanian preterite, which is called, by Ruhig, the perfect. It might, with equal propriety, be termed imperfect* or aorist, as it, at the same time, simultaneously represents these two tenses; and its use as a perfect is properly a misuse; as, also, in the Lettish, which is so nearly allied, this tense is actually called the imperfect, and the perfect is denoted by a participle perfect, with the present of the verb substantive; e.g. es sinnnyu, "I did know," es esmu sinnayis, "I have known (been having known)." That the Lithuanian preterite in form answers to the imperfect and not to the second aorist, is clear from this, that it retains the class characteristics given up by the aorist; for buwaì, "I was," or "have been," answers to the Sanskrit wभवम् abhavam and Greek ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi v o v$, and, in the plural, búw-o-me, to the Zend bav- $\hat{-}-m a$, Sanskrit $\operatorname{cbhav-\hat {a}-ma\text {,}}$
 although, if necessary, the first person singular buwai might be compared with wभूवम् abhîvam, to which, on account of the $u$ of the first syllable, it appears to approach
more closely than to the imperfect abhavam. I believe, however, that the Lithuanian $u$ of buwaid is a weakening of $a$; and I recognise in this form one of the fairest and
[G. Ed. p. 762.] truest transmissions from the mythic age of our history of languages; for which reason it may be proper to annex the full conjugation of this tense of the verb substantive, and to contrast with it the corresponding forms of the cognate languages, to which I also add the Latin bam, as I consider forms like amabam, docebam, \&c., as compounded, and their bam to be identical with the Sanskrit abhavam, to which it has just the relation which malo has to mavolo, or that the Old High German bim, "I am," has to its plural birumês, from bivumês (see §. 20.).

SINGULAR.

| sAnskrit. | zend. | итн. | atin | greme |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| abhav-a-m, | baôm from bav-ĕ-m? | biuw-a-ù,' | -bil-m, ${ }^{2}$ | ¢ै $¢ 0-0-1$. |
| abhav-a-s, | bav-c, ${ }^{3}$ | baw-a-ı | -bits, | é' $\dagger$ - $\epsilon-5$. |
| abhuv-a-t, | bav-a-t, | buw-o, | -ba-t, | ¢ै $¢\rangle=-\in-(\tau)$ |

DUAL.
abhav- $\hat{1}-v a, \quad .$. abhav-a-tam, bav-a-tĕm? abhac-a-tâm, bav-a-tairm?

| búw-o-wa |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| búw-o-tr, | é¢ ${ }^{\text {ú-E-tov. }}$ |
| like Sing. | é $\phi \nu-\varepsilon$-́- $\tau \eta \nu$. | PLURAL.

alhav-à-ma, bav-â-ma, abhav-a-tha, bav-a-tr, ablıav-a-n,
${ }^{1}$ From buw-a-m: see $\S .438$. "erasque."
bí́w-o-me, -ba-mus,éф $\dot{\prime}-o-\mu \epsilon v$. lúw-o-te, -ba-tis, éфú- $\epsilon-\tau \epsilon$. like Sing. -ba-nt, ${ }^{\prime} \phi u-o v$.
${ }^{2}$ See §. $526 . \quad{ }^{3}$ Bavas̊-cha,
523. For the regular verb, compare, further, kirtau, "I struck," "I cut" (kirtuu szenain, "I mowed," literally, "I cut hay"), with the Sanskrit षकृन्नम् akrintam, "I cleft,* Zend

[^173] which has lost the $t$ of the root.

SINGULAR.

SANSKRIT.
akrint- $\alpha-m$, kèrĕnt-ĕ-m, akrint-a-s, kĕrĕnt-ó, akrint-a-t, kĕrĕnt-a-t.,

LITIUANIAN.
kirt- $\iota-и$ (see §. 438.), еैкє $\rho-0-\nu$.
 kirt-o-'

DUAL.
ak!int-â-va, . . . . kirt-o-wa akrint-a-tam, kĕrĕnt-a-tĕın? kirt-o-tu, akrint-a-tâm, kĕrĕnt-a-tȧ்m? like Sing.

## PLURAL.

akrint- $\alpha-m a$, kĕrĕ̈nt-ti-ma, akrint-a-ta, kĕrĕnt-a-ta, akrint-a-n, kĕrĕnt-ĕ-n,
kirt-o-me
kirt-o-te,
like Sing.

е̇кєі́ $\rho-о-\mu \epsilon \nu$.
є̇кєі́р-є-тє. ёкєөр-о-\%.
524. Many Lithuanian verbs, which follow, in the present, the analogy of the Sanskrit of the first class, [G. Ed. p. 764.] change, in the preterite, into the tenth, and, in fact, so that they terminate in the first person singular, in ia-u (=Sanskrit aya-m), but, in the other persons, instead of ia employ an $e^{\prime}$, which unites with $i$ of the second person singular to ei.
belongs also, among others, lip, "to besmear," whence limpâmi, alimpam (second aorist alipam), with which the Lithuanian limpú, "I paste on" (preterite lippau, future lipsu, infinitive lipti), appears to be connected. Pott acutely compares the Gothic salbô so that $s a$ would be an obscured preposition grown up with the root. The present of kivtau is kertù, and there are several verbs in Lithuanian which contrast an $e$ in the present with the $i$ of the preterite, future, and infinitive. This $e$ either springs direct from the original $a$ of the root kart-as, among others, the permanent $e$ of degu, "I burn," $=$ Sanslirit dalâmi -or the original $a$ has first been weakened to $i$, and this has been corrupted, in the present, to $e$; so that kertì would have nearly the same relation to the preterite kirtau, future $k i r-s u$ (for kirt-su), and infinitive kirs-ti (from kirt-ti), as, in Old High German, the plural lesamês, "we read," $\boldsymbol{\text { o the Gothic lisam, and }}$ its own singular lisu.

This analogy is followed, by weziau, "I led," sekiau, "I followed," whence weżei, sekei; wežé, sekẽ̌; we:Ž̌ wa, seke̋wa; wezêtta, sekêta; wežểme, sekềme; wezễte, sekê̌le. Observe the analogy with Mielke's third conjugation (see §. 506.), and compare the preterite laikiau, §. 506.
525. In the Lithuanian tense which is called the habitual imperfect, we find dawau; as suk-dawau, "I am wont to turn," which is easily recognised as an appended auxiliary verb. It answers tolerably well to dawyau (from $d \hat{u}-m i)$, " I gave, have given," from which it is distinguished only in this point, that it is inflected like buwaì and kirtau, while the simple dauynu, dawei, daǔ̌, daưun \& c., follows the conjugation of wezíiu, sekiau, which has just (§. 524.) been presented, with this single trifing point of difference, that, in the first person singular, instead of $i$, it employs a $y$; thus, dawyau for dawiuu. As in Sanskrit, together with dâ, "to give," on which is based the Lithuanian $d i m i$, a root धा dhit, "to place" (with the preposition fa $v i$, "to make") occurs, which is similarly represented in Lithuanian, and is written in the present demi ("I place"); so might also the auxiliary verb which is contained in suk-duyau, be ascribed to this root, although the simple preterite of demi (from dami=Sanskrit dadlanmi, Greek ti $\theta^{\prime} \eta \mu$ ), is not dauyau, or dauiau, but dễyau. But according to its origin, demi has the same claim as $d \vec{u}, \ldots i$ upon the vowel $a$, and the addition of an inorganic $w$ in the preterite, and the appending of the auxiliary verb in suk-dawau might proceed from a period when dimi, "I give," and $d c m i$, "I place," agreed as exactly in their conjugation
[G. Ed.p.765.] as the corresponding old Indian forms dadâmi and dadhâmi, which are distinguished from one another only by the aspirate, which is abandoned by the Lithuanian. As dudhami, through the preposition vi, obtains the meaning "to make," and, in Zend, the simple verb also signifies "to make," demi would, in this sense, be
more proper as an auxiliary verb to enter into combination with other verbs; and then suk-dawau, "I was wont to turn," would, in its final portion, coincide with that of the Gothic sôk-i-da, "I sought," sôk-i-dêdum, " we sought," which last I have already, in my System of Conjugation, explained in the sense of "we did seek," and compared with dêds, "decd." I shall return hereafter to the Gothic sôk-i-da, sôk-i-dêdum. It may, however, be here further remarked, that, exclusive of the Sanskrit, the Lithuanian dawau of suk-dawau might also be contrasted with the Gothic tauya, "I do" (with which the German thun is no way connected); but then the Lithuanian auxiliary verb would belong rather to the root of "to give," than to that of "to place," "to make"; for the Gothic requires tenues for primitive medials, but not for such as the Lithuaniar, which possesses no aspirates, contrasts with the Sanskrit aspirated medials, which, in Gothic, appear likewise as medials. But if the Gothic tauya, "I do," proceeds from the Sanskrit root, $d \hat{a}$, " to give," it then furnishes the only example I know of, where the Gothic au corresponds with a Sanskrit $\hat{a}$; but in Sanskrit itself, $\hat{a} u$ for $a$ is found in the first and third person singular of the reduplicated preterite, where e.g. ददौ dadâu, "I" or "he gave," is used for $d a d \hat{a}$ (from dadâ-a). The relation, however, of tau to $d \hat{a}$ (and this appears to me better) might be thus regarded, that the $\hat{a}$ has been weakened to $u$, and an unradical $a$ prefixed to the latter letter; for that which [G. Ed. p. 766.] takes place regularly before $h$ and $r$ (see §. 82.) may also for once have occurred without such an occasion.
526. The idea that the Latin imperfects in bam, as also the futures in bo, contain the verb substantive, and, in fact, the root, from which arise fui, fure, and the obsolete subjunctive fuam, has been expressed for the first time in my System of Conjugation. If it is in general admitted, that grammatical forms may possibly arise through composi-
tion, then certainly nothing is more natural than, in the conjugation of attributive verbs, to expect the introduction of the verb substantive, in order to express the copula, or the conjunction of the subject which is expressed by the personal sign with the predicate which is represented by the root. While the Sanskrit and Greek, in that past tense which we term aorist, conjoin the other root of the verb substantive, viz. $A S, E S$, with the attributive roots, the Latin betakes itself, so early as the imperfect, to the root $F U$; and I was glad to find, what I was not aware of on my first attempt at explaining the forms in bam and bo, that this root also plays an important part in granmar in another kindred branch of language, viz. in Celtic, and exhibits to us, in the Irish dialect of the Gaelic, forms like menl-fu-m, or meal-fa-mar, or meal-fa-moid, "we will deceive," meal-fai-dhe, or menl-fu-bar, "ye will deceive," meal-fai- $d$, "they will deceive," meal-fu-dh me, "I will deceive," (literally, "there will deceive I"), meal-fai-r, "thou wilt deceive," meal-fai-dh, "he will deceive." The abbreviated form fum of the first person plural, as it is wanting in the plural aflix, answers remarkably to the Latin bam, while the full form fa-mar ( $r$ for $s$ ) comes very uear the plural ba-mus. The circumstance, that the Latin bam has a
[G. Ed. p. 767.] past meaning, while that of the Irish fam is future, need not hinder us from considering the two forms, in respect to their origin, as identical, especially as $b r m$, since it has lost the augment, bears in itself no formal expression of the past, nor fam any formal sign of the future. 'The Irish form should be properly written fiam or biam, for by itself biad me signifies "I will be" (properly, "there will be I"), biodh-maod, "we will be," where the character of the third person singular has grown up with the root, while the conditional expression ma blium, "if I shall be," is free from this incumbrance. In these forms, the exponent of the future relation is the $i$, with which, there-
fore, the Latin $i$ of ama-bis, ama-bit, \&c., and that of eris, erit, \&c., is to be compared. This characteristic $i$ is, however, dislodged in composition, in order to lessen the weight of the whole form, and at the same time the $b$ is weakened to $f$; so that, while in Latin, according to the form of the isolated fui, fore, furm, in the compound formations, fam, fo, might be expected, but in the Irish bam, the relation is exactly reversed. The reason is, however, in the Roman language, also an euphonic one; for it has been before remarked (§. 18.), that the Latin, in the interior (Inlaut) of a word, prefers the labial medial to the aspirate; so that, while the Sanskrit $b h$, in the corresponding Latin forms, always appears as $f$ in the initial sound, in the interior (Inlaut), $b$ is almost as constantly found : hence, ti-bi for तुभ्मम् tu-bhyain ; ovi-bus, for ख्षविभ्पम् avi-bhyas; ambo for Greek ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \phi \omega$, Sansk $\quad$ it उभौ ubhâu; nubes for नमस् nabhas, véфos; rabies from रम् rabh, whence संरक्ष suirabdha, "enraged," "furious"; lubet for लुभ्पति lubhyati, "he wishes"; ruber for é $\rho u \theta \rho o ́ s$, with which it has been already rightly compared by Voss, the labial being exchanged for a labial, and the $\varepsilon$ dropped, which letter evinces itself, from the kindred languages, [G. Ed. p.768.] to be an inorganic prefix. The Sanskrit furnishes for comparison rudhira, "blood," and, with respect to the root, also rôhita for rofdhita, "red." In rufus, on the contrary, the aspirate has remained; and if this had also been the case in the auxiliary verb under discussion, perhaps then, in the final portion of ama-fum, ama-fo, derivatives from the root, whence proceed fui, fuam, fore, fio, facio, \&c., would have been recognised without the aid of the light thrown upon the subject by the kindred languages. From the Gaelic dialects I will here further cite the form $b a$, "he was," which wants only the personal sign to be the same as the Latin bat, and, like the latter, ranks under the SanskritZend imperfect abhavat, bavat. The Gaelic ba is, however, deficient in the other persons; and in order to say " I
was," for which, in Irish, bann might be expected, ba me is used, i.e. "it was I."
527. The length of the class-vowel in the Latin third conjugation is surprising, e.g. in leg-ê-bam, for the third conjugation, is based, as has been remarked (\$. 109. 1.) on the Sanskrit first or sixth class, the short $a$ of which it has corrupted to $\grave{i}$, before $r$ to $\check{e}$. Ag. Benary believes this length must be explained by the concretion of the classvowel with the augment.* It would, in fact, be very well, if, in this manner, the augment could be attributed to the Latin as the expression of the past. I cannot, however, so decidedly assent to this opinion, as I have before done, $\dagger$
[G.Ed.p.769] particularly as the Zend also, to which I then appealed, as having occasionally preserved the augment only under the protection of preceding prepositions, has since appeared to me in a different light (§. 518.). There are, it cannot be denied, in the languages, inorganic or inflexive lengthenings or diphthongizations of vowels, originally short; as, in Sanskrit, the class-vowel just under discussion is lengthened before $m$ and $v$, if a vowel follows next (vah- $\hat{\alpha}-m i$, vah- $\hat{\alpha}-$ vas, vah- $\hat{\alpha}$-mas); and as the Gothic does not admit a simple $i$ and $u$ before $r$ and $h$, but prefixes to them, in this position, an $a$. The Latin lengthens the short final vowel (which corresponds to the Sanskrit $a$, and Greek o) of the base-words of the second declension before the termination rum of the genitive plural (lupô-rum), just as before bus in ambô-bus, duô-bus; and it might be said that the auxiliary verb bam also felt the necessity of being supported by a long vowel, and

[^174]that, therefore, leg-ē-bam, not leg-ĕ-bam, or leg-i-bam, is employed.
528. In the fourth conjugation, the ê of audiêbam corresponds to the final $a$ of the Sanskrit character of the tenth class, aya, which $a$ has been dropped in the Latin present, with the exception of the first person singular and third person plural; but in the subjunctive and in the future, which, according to its origin, is likewise to be regarded as a subjunctive (audiam, audiâs, audiês), has been retained in concretion with the modal exponent (see §. 505.). As the Latin $\hat{e}$ frequently coincides with the Sanskrit diphthong é, ( $=a+i$ ), and, c.g., the future tundês, tundêmus, tundêlis, corresponds to the Sanskṛit potential tudês, tudêma, tudêta (from tuduîs, \&c.), so might also the ê of tund-è-bım, aud-ié--bam, be divided into the elements $a+i$ : thus tundêbam might be explained from tunduïbam, where the $a$ would be the class-vowel, which, in the present, as remarked above (§. $109^{\text {a }}$. 1.), has been weakened to $i$; so [G. Ed. p. 770.] that tund-i-s, tund-i-t, answer to the Sanskrit tud-a-si, $t u d-a-t i$. The $i$ contained in the $\dot{e}$ of tund- $\hat{e}-b a m$ would then be regarded as the conjunctive vowel for uniting the auxiliary verb; thus, tundêbum would be to be divided into tunda-i-bam. This view of the matter might appear the more satisfactory, as the Sanskrit also much favors the practice $f$ uniting the verb substantive in certain tenses with the principal verb, by means of an $i$, and, indeed, not only in roots ending in a consonant, where the $i$ might be regarded as a means of facilitating the conjunction of opposite sounds, but also in roots which terminate in a vowel, and have no need at all of any such means; e.g. dhav-i-shydmi, "I will move" (also dhô-şhyâmi), and adhâv-i-ṣham, "I moved"; though adhau-şham would not be inconvenient to pronounce.
529. In favor of the opinion that the augment is contained in the $\hat{e}$ of audiêbam, the obsolete futures of the fourth conjugation in ibo might be adduced (expedibo, scibo
aperibo, and others in Plautus), and the want of a preceding $\hat{e}$ in these forms might be explained by the circumstance, that the future has no augment. But imperfects in íbam also occur, and thence it is clear, that both the $\hat{\imath}$ of $-\hat{\imath} b o$, and that of -îbam, should be regarded as a contraction of $i e ̂$, and that the difference between the future and imperfect is only in this, that in the latter the full form (ie) has prevailed, but in the former has been utterly lost. In the common dialect $\hat{\imath} b a m$, $\hat{\imath} b o$, from eo, answer to those obsolete imperfects and futures, only that here the $\hat{\imath}$ is radical. From the third person plural eunt (for iunt), and from the subjunctive eam (for iam), one would expect an imperfect iêbam.
[G. Ed. p.771.] 530. Let us now consider the temporal augment, in which the Sanskrit agrees with the Greek, just as it does in the syllabic augment. It is an universal principle in Sanskrit, that when two vowels come together they melt into one. When, therefore, the augment stands before a root beginning with $a$, from the two short $a$ a long $\hat{a}$ is formed, as in Greek, from $\epsilon$, by prefixing the augment for the most part, an $\eta$ is formed. In this manner, from the root of the verb substantive ॠस् as, $\mathrm{E} \Sigma$, arise खास् $\hat{a} s, H \Sigma$, whence, in the clearest accordance, the third person plural क्षासन् âsan, $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$; the second ज्ञास्त $\hat{a} s t a, \hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$; the first ज्षास्म $\hat{A} s m a, \hat{\eta} \mu \in \nu$, the latter for $\hat{\eta} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$, as might be expected from the present $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \epsilon v^{\prime}$. In the dual, $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau o v, ~ \grave{\eta} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, answer admirably to सास्तम् $\hat{s} s-t a m$, आास्तम् $\hat{s}$-tâm. The first person singular is, in Sanskrit, âsam, for which, in Greek, $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha v$ might be expected, to which we are also directed by the third person plural, which generally is the same as the first person singular (where, however, $v$ stands for $\nu \tau$ ). The form $\hat{\eta} \nu$ has passed over a whole syllable, and is exceeded by the Latin eram (from esam, see §. 22.) in true preservation of the original form, as in general the Latin has, in the verb substantive, nowhere permitted itself to be robbed of
the radical consonant, with the exception of the second person present, but, according to its usual inclination, has weakened the original $s$ between two vowels to $r$. It is highly probable that ĕram was originally êram with the augment. The abandonment of the augment rests, therefore, simply on the shortening of the initial vowel.
531. In the second and third person singular the Sanskrit introduces between the root and the personal sign $s$ and $t$ an $i$ as the conjunctive vowel; hence $\hat{A} s \imath \imath \imath, \hat{s} s t i t$. Without this auxiliary vowel these two persons would necessarily have lost their characteristic, as two consonants are not admissible at the end of a word, as also in the Veda-dialect, in the [G. Ed. p. 772.] third person, there really exists a form w्ञाम् $\hat{s}$, with which the Doric $\hat{\eta}$ s agrees very well. But the Doric $\hat{\eta}$ s, also, might, with Külner (p. 234), be deduced from $\hat{\eta}$, so that $\varsigma$ would be the character of the third person, the original $\tau$ of which, as it cannot stand at the end of a word, would have been changed into the cognate $\varsigma$, which is admissible for the termination. According to this principle, I have deduced neuters like
 Sanskrit prati (see §. 152. concl.). If îs has arisen in a similar manner from $\hat{\eta} \tau$, this form would be the more remarkable, because it would then be a solitary example of the retention of the sign of the third person in secondary forms. Be this how it may, still the form $\hat{\eta} s$ is important for this reason, as it explains to us the common form $\hat{\eta} \nu$, the external identity of which with the $\hat{\eta} v$ of the first person must appear surprising. In this person $\hat{\eta} \nu$ stands for $\hat{\eta} \mu$ (middle $\hat{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ ); but in the third, $\hat{\eta} \nu$ has the same relation to the Doric $\hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ that
 $\tau$ є́pтeтov, have to the Sanskrit tarpathas, tarpatus (§ 97.); and I doubt not, also, that the $\nu$ of $\hat{\eta} \nu$, "he was," is a corruption of $s$.
"Remark.-In Sanskrit it is a rule, that roots in $s$, when
they belong, like as, to a class of conjugation which, in the special tenses, interposes no middle syllable between the root and personal termination, change the radical $s$ in the third person into $t$; and at will in the second person also, where, nevertheless, the placing an $s$ and its euphonic permutations is prevalent (see my smaller Sanskrit Grammar, §. 291.): thus चास् śas, " to govern," forms, in the third person, solely aśât; in the second aśâs ( regards the third person aśdt, I believe that it is better to consider its $t$ as the character of the third person than as a permutation of the radical $s$. For why else should the $t$ have been retained principally in the third person, while the second person prefers the form aśas? At the period when the Sanskrit, like its sister languages, still admitted two consonants at the end of a word, the third person will
[G. Ed. p.773.] have been aśds-t, and the second as'át-s, as $s$ before another $s$ freely passes into $t$ (see §. 517. Rem.): in the present state of the language, however, the last letter but one of $a s a d s-t$ has been lost, and aśat-s has, at will, either in like manner dropped the last but one, which it has generally done-hence, aśá $(t) s$-or the last, hence aśsit(s)."
532. With खासीस् âsî-s, " thou wast," खासीत् âsî-t, "he was," the forms âsas, asat, may also have existed, as several other verbs of the same class, in the persons mentioned, assume at will $a$ or $\hat{\imath}$ as conjunctive vowel; as arôdîs, arôd $\hat{t}$, "thou didst weep," "he did weep"; or arôdas, arôdat, from rud (the Old High German riuzu, " [ weep," pre-supposes the Gothic riuta, Latin rudo). I believe that the forms in as, at, are the elder, and that the forms in $\hat{\imath}$, $\hat{u}$, have found their way from the aorist(third formation), where the long $\hat{\imath}$ of $a b \delta d h \hat{\imath} s, a b \delta d h \hat{\imath} t$, is to be explained as a compensation for the sibilant which has been dropped, which, in the other persons, is united with the root by a short $i$ ( $a b o b d h-i-s ̣ h a m, ~ a b o ̂ d h-i-s ̣ h w a, ~ a b o d h-i-s ̣ h m a) . ~$ The pre-supposed forms alsas, asat, are confirmed by the Zend,
also, where, in the third person, the form wisur anhat * occurs, with suppression of the augment [G. Ed. p. 774.] (otherwise it would be âonhat) and the insertion of a nasal, according to §. $56^{\text {s }}$. I am not able to quote the second person, but it admits of no doubt that it is anh (with cha, " and," anhas-cha). The originality of the conjunctive vowel $a$ is confirmed also by the Latin, which nevertheless lengthens the same inorganically (but again, through the influence of a final $m$ and $t$, shortens it), and which extends that letter, also, to those persons in which the Sanskrrit and Greek, and probably, also, the Zend, although wanting in the examples which could be desired, unite the terminations to the root direct. Compare-

| Singular. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sanskrit. | greek. | L.atin. |
| asam, | $\hat{\eta} \nu$, | eram. |
| as ${ }^{\text {ins }}$, | $\hat{\eta}$, | erds. |
| $\hat{a} s i t t ~(Z e n d ~ a n ̣ h a t, ~ a s s, ~ † ~ V e ̂ d i c ~ a s s), ~$ |  | erat. |
| dual. |  |  |
| âswa | ... | . $\cdot$ |
| Astam, | ค่бто⿱ | . . ${ }^{\text {, }}$ |
| âstâm, | $\eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ |  |

* I cannot, with Burnouf (Yaçna, Notes, p. CXIV.), explain this aṇhat, and its plural aṇhen, as a subjunctive (Litt) or as an aorist; for a Lêt always requires a long conjunctive vowel, and, in the third person plural, ainn for ann. And Burnouf actually introduces as Lêt the form áoṇhâṭ (Yaçna, p. CXVIII.), which is superior to ạ̣haṭ in that it retains the augment. But it need not surprise us, from what has been remarked in §. 520., that anhat and anhĕn occur with a subjunctive signification. And Burnouf gives to the form nipdrayanta, mentioned in $\oint .536$. Rem., a subjunctive meaning, without recognising in it a formal subjunctive. The difference of the Zend au!hat from the Sanskrit âsit, with regard to the conjunctive vowel, should surprise us the less, as the Zend not unfrequently differs from the Sanskrit in more important points, as in the preservation of the nominative sign in bases ending with a consonant (affs, drucs, see §. 138.)
† See §. 518.


## PLURAL.

| sanskrit. | greek. | latin. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ásma, | $\hat{\eta}(\sigma) \mu \epsilon \nu$, | erâmus. |
| âsta, | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon$, | erâtis. |
| àsan, | $\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$, | erant. |

" Remark.-The analogy with bam, bâs, may have occasioned the lengthening inorganically of the conjunctive vowel in Latin, where the length of quantity appears as an unconscious result of contraction, since, as has been shewn above
[G. Ed. p. 775.] (see §. 526), bum, bûs, \&c., correspond to the Sanskrit a-bhavam, a-bhavas. After dropping the $v$, the two short vowels coalesced and melted down into a long one, in a similar manner to that in which, in the Latin first conjugation, the Sanskrit character aya (of the tenth class), after rejecting the $y$ has become $\hat{a}$ (§.504.); and hence, amis, amdtis, correspond to the Sanskrit kdmayasi, "thou lovest," $k d m a y a t h a, "$ ye love." The necessity of adjusting with the utmost nicety the forms eram, erâs, \&c., to those in bam, bâs, and of placing throughout a long $\hat{a}$, where the final consonant does not exert its shortening influence, must appear so much the greater, as in the future, also, eris, erit, erimus, eritis, stand in the fullest agreement with bis, bit, bimus, bitis; and for the practical use of the language the difference of the two tenses rests on the difference of the vowel preceding the personal termination. A contrast so strong as that between the length of the gravest and the shortness of the lightest vowel could therefore be found here only through the fullest reasons for wishing its appearance. That the $i$ of the future is not simply a conjunctive vowel, but an actual expression of the future, and that it answers to the Sanskrit $y a$ of -yasi, -yati, \&c.; or, reversing the case, that the $a$ of the imperfect is simply a vowel of conjunction, and has nothing to do with the expression of the relation of time, this can be felt no longer from the particular point of view of the Latin.
533. In roots which begin with $i, \hat{\imath}, u, \hat{u}$, or $r i$, the Sanskrit augment does not follow the common rules of
sound, according to which $a$ with $i$ or $\hat{\imath}$ is contracted into $\left.a^{( }=a+i\right)$, and with $u$ or $\hat{u}$ to $\hat{b}(=a+u)$, and with $r i$ (from ar) becomes ar, but ऐ $\hat{a} i$ is employed for ए $\mathbb{e} \hat{\text { e }}$; for सो $A u$, घ्रो $\boldsymbol{b}$; and ज्ञात् ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a} r}$ for ख्या् ar: so from ichh, "to wish" (as substitute of $i s ̧ h$ ), comes dichham, "I wished"; from uksh, "to sprinkle," comes auksham, "I sprinkled." It cannot be ascertained with certainty what the reason for this deviation from the common path is. Perhaps the higher augment of the vowel is to be ascribed to the importance of the augment for the modification of the relation of time, and to the endeavor to make the augment more perceptible to the ear, in roots beginning with a vowel, than it would be if it were contracted with $i, \hat{\imath}$, to $\hat{e}$, or with $u, \hat{u}$, to $\hat{d}$, thereby giving up its individuality. [G. Ed. p. 776.] Perhaps, too, the preponderating example of the roots of the first class, which require Guna before simple radical consonants, has operated upon the roots which possess no Guna, so that dichham and aukṣham would be* to be regarded as regular contractions of $a$-êchham, $a-$ - $\hat{k}$ yham, although, owing to ichh belonging to the sixth class, and the vowel of the $u k s / L$ class being long by position no other Guna is admitted by them.
534. In roots which begin with $a$, the augment and reduplication produce, in Sanskrit, an effect exactly the same as if to the root सस् as ("to be") $a$ was prefixed as the augment or the syllable of reduplication; so in both cases from a-as only $\hat{u}_{s}$

[^175]can arise, and $\hat{a} s a$ is the first and third person of the perfect. In roots, however, which begin with $i$ or $u$ the operations of the augment and of reduplication are different; for $i s h$, " to wish," and ush, "to burn" (Latin uro), form, through the augment, dis $h$,* $\begin{aligned} & u s s h, ~ a n d, ~ b y ~ r e d u p l i c a t i o n, ~ \\ & i s h\end{aligned}$, ussh, as the regular contraction of $i-i s h, u-u s h$. In the persons of the singular, however, which take Guna, the $i$ and $u$ of the reduplicationsyllable pass into $i y$ and $u v$ before the vowel of the root, which
[G. Ed. p. 777.] is extended by Guna; hence, $i y$-êsha, " I wished," uv-ôsha, "I burned," corresponding to the plural ̂̂ṣhima, ûṣima, without Guna.
535. In roots beginning with a vowel the tenses which have the augment or reduplication are placed, by the Greek, exactly on the same footing. The reduplication, however, cannot be so much disregarded, as to be overlooked where it is as evidently present as in the just-mentioned (§. 534.) Sanskṛit îshima, ûṣima (=i-ishima, u-uṣhima). When from an originally short $\iota$ and $v \dot{a}$ long $\bar{\imath}$ and $\bar{v}$ arise, as in $\grave{\iota} \kappa \varepsilon \in-$
 already done elsewhere, $\dagger$ as the effect of the reduplication,

[^176] plication
and look upon the long vowel as proceeding from the repetition of the short one, as, in the Sanskrit $\imath_{\S}$ hima, $\hat{u}_{s}$ lima. For why should an $\bar{i}$ or $\bar{u}$ arise out of $\epsilon+\iota \quad$ [G. Ed. p. 778.] or $v$, when this contraction occurs nowhere else, and besides when $\epsilon \epsilon$ is so favourite a diphthong in Greek, that even $\varepsilon+\epsilon$, although of rare occurrence in the augment, is rather contracted to $\epsilon \epsilon$ than to $\eta$, and the diphthong $\epsilon v$ also accords well with that language? As to o becoming $\omega$ in the augmented tenses, one might, if required, recognise therein the augment, since $\epsilon$ and $o$ are originally one, and both are corruptions from $\alpha$. Nevertheless, I prefer seeing in $\dot{\omega} v o ́ \mu \alpha\} o v$ the reduplication, rather than the augment, since we elsewhere find $\epsilon+o$ always contracted to ov, not to $\omega$, although, in dialects, the $\omega$ occurs as a compensation for ou (Doric $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu o ́ \mu \omega, \tau \hat{\omega}$ s vón $\mu \mathrm{s})$.
536. The middle, the imperfect of which is distinguished from the regular active only by the personal terminations, described in $\$ \S .468$. \&c., exhibits only in the third person singular and plural a resemblance between the Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, which strikes the eye at the first glance: compare
 $-n t a$, and the Zend bar-a-ta,bar-a-nta. In the second person singular, forms like $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon i \kappa-v v-\sigma o$ answer very well to the Zend, like $h u$-nu-sha, "thou didst praise" (§.469.); while in the first conjugation the agreement of the Greek and Zend is somewhat disturbed, in that the Zend, according to a universal law of sound, has changed the original termination $s a$ after a preceding $a$ to $h a$ (see $\S .56^{\circ}$. ), and attached to it a nasal sound ( $n$ ), but the Greek has contracted $\epsilon-\sigma$ o to ov; thus,
 which, in Sanskrit, a-bhar-a-thas (see §. 469.). In the first

[^177]person singular ष्षभरे abharê from abhar-a-i for abhar-a-ma (see §.471.), appears very disadvantageously compared with $\dot{e} \phi \epsilon \rho-o ́-\mu \eta \nu$. In the first person plural, $\dot{e} \phi \epsilon \rho-\frac{o}{-}-\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ answers, in respect to the personal termination, better to the Zend bar-â-maidhê than to the Sanskrit abhar- $\hat{\imath}-m a h i$, the ending
[G. Ed. p. 779.] of which, mahi, is clearly abbreviated from madhi (see §. 472.). In the second person plural, è $\phi \in ́ \rho-\epsilon-\sigma \theta \epsilon^{*}$ corresponds to the Sanskrit abhar-a-dhwam,* and Zend bar.
 $-\sigma \theta \eta \nu$ (from é $\phi \in ́ \rho-\epsilon-\tau \tau o \nu$, é $\phi \epsilon \rho-\epsilon ́-\tau \tau \eta \nu$, (see §. 474.), stand, in Sanskrit, abharêthâm, abharêlâm, from abhar-a-âthâm, abhara-$-\hat{-}$-tim (according to the third class abibhr- $\hat{1}$ thâm, abibhr--itâm), and this, according to the conjecture expressed above (§. 474.), from abhar-a-thâthâm, abhar-a-tâtam.
"Remark.-I can quote in Zend only the third person singular and plural, the latter instanced in niparayanta, which occurs in the Vend. S. p. 484 in the sense of a subjunctive present $\dagger$ (nipârayanta apĕm, 'transgrediantur aquam') which, according to what has been remarked at §. 520., need not surprise us. The third person singular can be copiously cited. I will here notice only the fre-
 paiti-aidcta, 'he answered,' the $a$ of which I do not regard as the augment, as in general the augment has almost disappeared in Zend (see §.518.), but as the phonetic prefix mentioned in §. 28. But how is the remaining fota related to the Sanskrit? The root वष्य vach is not used in the middle; but if it were, it would, in the third person

[^178]singular of the imperfect, form avakta, without the augment vakta; and hence, by changing $v a$ to $a+u$ (for $a+v$ ), the Zend upal ôcta might be deduced, with the regular contraction of the $a+u$ to $0 .{ }^{*} \quad \Lambda \mathrm{~s}$, in Sanskrit, the root vach , in many irregular forms, has laid aside $a$, and vocalized the $v$ to $u, \dagger$ we might, also, for $a$-vakta, [G. Ed. p. 780.]

* On the value of $\downarrow$ as long $\hat{o}$ see $\oint .447$. Note.
† As regards my explanation of the $u$ which takes the place of $v a$ in the root vach, and many others, in certain forms devoid of Guna, Professor Höfer (Contributions to Etymology, p. 384), finds it remarkable that we so often overlook what is just at hand, and thinks that in the case under discussion the $u$ is not to be deduced from the $v$ of $v a$, but that from $v a$ $v u$ has been formed; and of this, after rejecting the $v$, only the $u$ has remained. In this, however, M. Höfer has, on his part, overlooked, that the derivation of $u$ from $v u$ cannot be separated from the phenomena which run parallel thereto, according to which $i$ proceeds from $y a$ and ${ }_{\mathrm{r}}^{\mathrm{i}}$ from ra. It is impossible to deduce grihyaté, "capitur," for grahyaté, in such a manner as to derive $r \underline{r} \boldsymbol{i}$ from $r a$, as $v u$ from $v a$, and thus presuppose for grihyatê a grriliyatê, and hence drop the $r$. But what is more natural than that the semi-vowels should at times reject the vowel which accompanies them, as they themselves can become a vowel? Is not the relation of the Old High German ir, " yc," to the Gothic yus founded on this? and even that of the Gothic genitive i-zvara to the to--be-expected yu-zvara? Or must from yus be next formed yir, and hence $i r$ by rejecting the $y$ ? Can it be that the Gothic nominative thius, " the servant," has arisen from the theme thiva, not, which is the readiest way of deriving it, by the $v$ becoming $u$ after the $a$ has been rejected, but by forming from thiva first thivu, and then, by dropping the $v$, in the nominative thius, and in the accusative thiu? I fully acknowledge M. Höfer's valuable labours with regard to the Prâkrit, but beheve that, in the case before us, he has suffered himself to be misled by this interesting and instructive dialect. It is true that the Prâkṛit is more frequently founded on forms older than those which come before us in classic Sanskrit. I have shewn this, among other places, in the instrumental plural (§. 220.), where, however, as usual, the Prâkrit, in spite of having an older form before it, has nevertheless been guilty of admitting, at the same time, a strong corruption. This is the case with the Prâkrit vuchchadi, " dicitur." I willingly concede to M. Höfer, that this form is
suppose a form $a$-ukta (without the euphonic contraction), and hence, in Zend, deduce, according to the common con-
[G. Ed. p. 781.] traction, the form ofta, to which octa then, according to §. 28., an $a$ would be further prefixed; so that in uparbu côcta an augment would in reality lie concealed, without being contained in the initial $a$. This special case is here, however, of no great importance to us; but this alone is so, that aofcta, in its termination, is identical with the Sanskrit, and comes very near the Greek to of $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \epsilon ́ \rho-\epsilon-\tau 0, \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\delta} \epsilon \kappa-\nu v-\tau 0$. To the latter answers the often recurring $h u-n \hat{u}-t a$, 'he praised' (compare Greek $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { '- }\end{gathered} \nu 0 \varsigma$ ), with an inorganic lengthening of the $u$. From the latter may, with certainty, be derived the above-mentioned second person $h u-n u-s h a$, after the analogy of the aorist urûrudhusha (see §. 469.). In the first person plural I have contrasted the form bar-a-maidhê, which is not distinguishable from the present, with the Greek $\epsilon-\phi \epsilon \rho-\sigma_{\mu} \epsilon \theta \alpha$; for it is clear, from the abovementioned (§.472.) potential
 are not distinguished, in the first person plural, from the primary ones: after dropping the augment, therefore, no difference from the present can exist. The form bar-a--dhwém of the second person plural follows from the imperative quoted by Burnouf (Yaçna, Notes, p. XXXVIII.), as $f$ \&oorexjsus zayadhwëm, 'live ye,' and the precative


[^179]
## ORIGIN OF THE AUGMENT.

537. I hold the augment to be identical in its origin with the a privative, and regard it, therefore, as the expression of the negation of the present. This opinion, which has been already brought forward in the "Annals of Oriental Literature," has, since then, been supported by Ag. Benary * and Hartung (Greek Particles, II. 110.), but opposed by Lassen. As, however, Professor Lassen will allow of no explanation whatever of grammatical forms by annexation, and bestows no credit on the verb substantive, clearly as it manifests itself in Sanskrit in many tenses of [G. Ed. p. 782.] attributive verbs, treating it like the old "everywhere" and " nowhere," I am not surprised that he sees, in the explanation of the augment just given, the culminating point of the agglutination system, and is astonished that the first ancestors of the human race, instead of saying "I saw," should be supposed to have said "I see not." This, however, they did not do, since, by the negative particle, they did not wish to remove the action itself, but only the present time of the same. The Sanskrit, in general, uses its negative particles in certain compounds in a way which, at the first glance and without knowing the true object of the language, appears very extraordinary. Thus, uttama-s, " the highest," does not lose its signification by having the negative particle $a$ prefixed to it (which, as in Greek before vowels, receives the addition of a nasal): an-uttamas is not " the not highest," or "the low," but in like manner "the highest," nay, even emphatically " the highest," or "the highest of all." And yet it cannot be denied that, in anuttama-s, the particle an has really its negative force, but anuttama-s is a possessive compound, and as, e.g., abala-s (from a and bala), " not having strength," means, thereforc," weak;" so anutta-ma-s signifies properly "qui altissimum non habet," and

[^180]hence, " quo nemo allior est." It might be expected, that every superlative or comparative would be used similarly, that, e. ! y., apunyatama-s or apunyutara-s would signify " the purest"; but the language makes no further use of this capability; it does not a second time repeat this jest, if we would so call it; at least I am unacquainted with any other examples of this kind. But what comes much nearer this use of the
[G. Ed.p.783.] augment, as a negative particle, than the just cited an of unuttama, is this, that êkn, "one," by the prefixing negative particles, just as little receives the meaning " not one" (où $\overline{\text { eis }}$ ), " none," as वेtि ved-mi, " I know," through the $a$ of $a$-vêd-am, gets that of "I know not." By the negative power of the augment, vedmi loses only a portion of its meaning, a secondary idea, that of present time, and thus $\hat{e} k a-s$, "one," by the prefix an or na (nnêka, nâiku), does not lose its existence or its personality (for $\hat{e} k a$ is properly a pronoun, see §. 308.), nor even the idea of unity, inasmuch as in $6,7,8, \& c$., the idea of "one" is also contained, but only the limitation to unity, as it were the secondary idea, "simply." It would not be surprising if anêka and nâika expressed, in the dual, "two," or, in the plural, "three," or any other higher number, or also "a few," "some"; but it signifies, such is the decision
[G. Ed. p. 784.] of the use of language, "many."* It cannot, therefore, be matter of astonishment, that avedam, through its negative $a$, receives the signification "I knew,"

[^181]and not that of "I shall know." For the rest, the past, which is irrevocably lost, forms a far more decided contrast to the present, than the future does, to which we approach in the very same proportion as we depart further from the past. And in form, too, the future is often no way distinguished from the present.
538. From the circumstance that the proper a privative, which clearly manifests a negative force, assumes, both in Sanskrit and Greek, an euphonic $n$ before a vowel initialsound, while the $a$ of the augment, in both languages, is condensed with the following vowel (§. 530.), we cannot infer a different origin for the two particles. Observe, that e.g. $s w \hat{A} d u$, "sweet," as feminine, forms, in the instrumental, swid $d w-\hat{a}$, while in the masculine and neuter it avoids the hiatus, not by changing $u$ into $v$, but by the insertion of an euphonic $n$ (compare §. 158.). And the augment and the common a privative are distinguished in [G. Ed. p. 785.] the same way, since they both apply different means to avoid
negative particles. Vice versá, in certain cases negation can also be expressed by a phrase for the past:
"Besen, Besen,
Seid's gewesen!"
where gewesen means the same as "now no more." Language never expresses any thing perfectly, but everywhere only brings forward the most conspicuous point, or that which appears so. To discover this point is the business of etymology. A "tooth-haver" is not yet an "elephant," a "hair-haver" does not fully express a "lion"; and yet the Sanskrit calls the elephant dantin, the lion kếsin. If, then, a tooth, danta, is derived from ad, " to eat" (dropping the $a$ ), or from daris, "to bite" (dropping the sibilant), we may again say, "an eater or biter is not exclusively a tooth (it might also be a dog or a mouth);" and thus the language revolves in a circle of incomplete expressions, and denotes things imperfectly, by any one quality whatever, which is itself imperfectly pointed out. It is, however, certain, that the most prominent quality of the past is what may be termed the "non-present," by which the former is denoted more correctly than the elephant is expressed by "tooth-haver."
the hiatus. The division may have arisen at a period when, though early (so early, in fact, as when Greek and Sanskrit were one), the augment was no longer conscious of its negative power, and was no more than the exponent of past time; but the reason why? was forgotten, as, in general, the portions of words which express grammatical relations then first become grammatical forms, when the reason of their becoming so is no longer felt, and, e.g., the $s$, which expresses the nominative, would pass as the exponent of a certain case relation only when the perception of its identity with the pronominal base $s a$ was extinguished.
539. From the Latin privative prefix in, and our German $u n$, I should not infer-even if, as is highly probable, they are connected with the $a$ privative-that the nasal originally belonged to the word; for here three witnesses -three languages in fact-which, in most respects, exceed the Latin and German in the true preservation of their original state, speak in favour of the common opinion, that the nasal, in the negative particle under discussion, in Sanskrit, Zend, and Greek, is not a radical. It cannot, however, surprise us, if a sound, which is very often introduced for the sake of euphony, has remained fixed in one or more of the cognate dialects, since the language has, by degrees, become so accustomed to it that it could no longer dispense with it. We may observe, moreover, as regards the German languages, the great disposition of these languages, even without euphonic occasion, to introduce an inorganic $n$, whereby so many words have been transplanted from the vowel declension into one terminating with a consonant,
[G. Ed. p. 786.] viz. into that in $n$, or, as Grimm terms it, into the weak declension; and e.g., the Sanskrit vidhara, " widow," Latin vidua, Sclavonic vdova (at once theme and nominative), is in Gothic, in the theme. viduvon (genitive viduvin-s), whence is formed, in the nominative, according to $\S .140$., by rejecting the $n$, viduvi. If an was,
in Sanskrit, the original form of the prefix under discussion, its $n$ would still be dropped, not only before consonants, but also before vowels; for it is a general rule in Sanskrit, that words in $n$ drop this sound at the beginning of compounds; hence, râjan, "king," forms, with putra, rdja-putra, "king's son," and, with indra, " prince," ràjéndra, "prince of kings," since the $a$ of rajan, after dropping the $n$, is contracted with a following $i$ to $\hat{e}(=a+i)$. The inseparable prefixes, however, in respect to the laws of sound, follow the same principles as the words which occur also in an isolated state. If an, therefore, were the original form of the above negative particle, and of the augment identical with it, then the two would have become separated in the course of time, for this reason, that the latter, following strictly the universal fundamental law, would have rejected its $n$ before vowels as before consouants; the former only before consonants.
540. In §. 371. we have deduced the Sanskrit negative particles $a$ and $n a$ from the demonstrative bases of the same sound, since the latter, when taken in the sense of "that," are very well adapted for denoting the absence of a thing or quality or the removing it to a distance. If $a n$ were the original form of the $a$ privative and of the augment, then the demonstrative base ज्ञन ana, whence the Lithuanian ana-s or an-s, and the Sclavonic on, "that," would aid in its explanation. The identity of the augment with the privative $a$ might, however, be also explained, which, indeed, in essentials would be the same, by assuming that the language, [G.Ed. p. 787.] in prefixing an $a$ to the verbs, did not intend the $a$ negative, nor to deny the presence of the action, but, under the $a$, meant the actual pronoun in the sense of "that," and thereby wished to transfer the action to the other side, to the distant time already past; and that it therefore only once more repeated the same course of ideas as it followed in the creation of negative expressions. According to this expla-
nation, the augment and the $a$ privative would rather stand in a fraternal relation than in that of offspring and progenitor. The way to both would lead directly from the pronoun, while in the first method of explanation we arrive, from the remote demonstrative, first to the negation, and thence to the expression of past time, as contrary to present. According to the last exposition, the designation of the past through the augment would be in principle identical with that in which, through the isolated particle स्म sma, the present receives a past signification. I hold, that is to say, this sma for a pronoun of the third person, which occurs declined only in certain cases in composition with other pronouns of the third person (§§. 165. \&c.), and in the plural of the two first persons, where asmé means (in the Vêda-dialect) properly "I and she" (" this, that woman"), yu-şhmé, "thou and she" (§. 333.).* As an expression of past time, sma, which also often occurs without a perceptible meaning, must be taken in the sense of "that person," "that side," "there," as W. von Humboldt regards the Tagalish and Tongian expression for past time na, which I have compared with
[G. Ed. p. 788.] the Sanskrit demonstrative base $n a$, and thus indirectly with the negative particle $n a$; $\dagger$ where I will further remark that I have endeavoured to carry back the expression for the future also, in Tongian and Madagascarian, to demonstrative bases; viz. the Tongian te to the Sanskrit base $\boldsymbol{\pi} t a$ (which the languages of New Zealand and Tahiti use in the form te as article), and the Madagascar $h o$ to the base स $s a(\S .345$.), which appears in the Tongian $h e$, as in the Greek $\delta$, as the article. $\ddagger$

[^182]511. No one would consider the circumstance that, in Greek, the augment appears in the form $\epsilon$, but the negative particle in the form $\alpha$, which is identical with the Sanskrit, as a valid objection against the original identity of relationship of the two particles; for it is extremely common in Greek for one and the same $\alpha$ to maintain itself in one place, and be corrupted in another to $\varepsilon$; as $\tau$ t́́ $\tau \cup \phi \alpha$ тérvфe both lead to the Sanskrit tutôpa, which stands both in the first and in the third person, as the true personal termination has been lost, and only the conjunctive vowel has remained; which in Greek, except in the third person singular, appears everywhere else as $\alpha$. It is, however, certain, that, from the point of view of the Greck, we should hardly have supposed the augment and the $\alpha$ privative to be related, as the spiritual points of contact of the two prefixes lie much too concealed. Buttmann derives the augment from the reduplication, so that ${ }^{\prime}$ 'tuatov would be an abbreviation of тétuatov. To this, however, the Sanskrit opposes the most forcible objection, in that it contrasts with the imperfect ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ '́vatov its atôpam, but with the [G. Ed. p. 789.] really reduplicated $\tau \in ́ \tau \cup \backslash \alpha$ its tutApa. The Sanskrit augmented tenses have not the smallest connection with the reduplicated perfect, which, in the repeated syllable, always receives the radical vowel (shortened, if long), while the augment pays no regard to the root, and always uses $a$. If $i$ were the vowel of the augment, then in the want of a more satisfactory explanation, we might recognise in it a syllable of reduplication, because the syllables of reduplication have a tendency to weakening, to a lightening of their weight; and $i$, as the lightest vowel, is adapted to supply the place of the heaviest $a$, and does, also, actually represent this, as well as its long vowel, in the reduplication-syllable of desideratives,* and,

[^183]in a certain case, supplies the place of the vowel $u$ too, which is of middling weight, viz. where, in the second aorist in verbs beginning with a vowel, the whole root is twice given; $e \mathrm{~g}$. सौनिनम् âuninam for wौनूनम् Aunûnam, from un, " to diminish." I cunnot, however, see the slightest probability in Pott's opinion (Etym. Forsch. II. 73.), that the $a$ of the augment may be regarded as a vowel absolutely, and as the representative of all vowels, and thus as a variety of the reduplication. This explanation would be highly suitable for such verbs as have weakened a radical $a$ to $u$ or $i$, and of which it might be said, that their augment descends from the time when their radical vowel was not as yet $u$ or $i$, but $a$. But if, at all hazards, the Sanskrit augment should be consi-
[G. Ed. p. 790.] dered to be the reduplication, I should prefer saying that a radical $i, \hat{\imath}, u, \hat{u}$ has received Guna in the syllable of repetition, but the Guna vowel alone has remained; and thus avêdam for êvêdam (=aivaidam), and this from vêvêdam; abodham for ôbôdham (=aubaudham), and this from bôbodham.
"Remark.-According to a conjecture expressed by Höfer (Contributions, p. 388), the augment would be a preposition expressing ' with,' and so far identical with our ge of participles like gesagt, gemacht, as the German preposition, which, in Gothic, sounds ga, and signifies ' with,' is, according to Grimm's hypothesis, connected with the Sanskrit स $s a$, सम् sam (Greek $\sigma \dot{v} v$, Latin cum). Of the two forms स sa, सम् sam, the latter occurs only in combination with verbs, the former only with substantives.* In order, therefore, to arrive from sam to the augment $a$, we must assume that, from the earliest

[^184]period, that of the identity of the Sanskrit and Greek, the said preposition, where used to express past time, laid aside its initial and terminating sound, like its body, and only preserved the soul, that is, the vowel; while, in the common combinations with verbs, the $s$ and $m$ of sam have lived as long as the language itself; and while, in German, we make no formal distinction between the ge which, merely by an error, attaches itself to our passive particles, and that which accompanies the whole verb and its derivatives, as in gebären, Geburt, geniessen, Genuss. If, for the explanation of the augment, so trifling a similarity of form is satisfactory, as that between $a$ and sam, then other inseparable prepositious present themselves which have equal or greater claim to be identified with the expression of past time; for instance, सप apa, 'from,' 'away,' and wa aca, 'from,' 'down,' off'; प्रति ati, 'over' (atikram, 'to go over,' also 'to pass,' 'to clapse,' used of time). We might also refer to the particle रम sma, mentioned above, which gives past meaning to the present, and assume the rejection of its double consonant. It is certain, however, that that explanation is most to the purpose, by which the past prefix has suffered either no loss at all, or, if $a n$ is assumed to be the original form of the negative particle, only such as, according to what has been remarked above ( $\S .539$.), takes place regularly at the beginning of compounds. It is also certain that the past stands much nearer to the idea of negation than to that of combination, particularly as the [G. Ed. p. 791] augmented preterites in Greek stand so far in contrast to the perfect, as their original destination is, to point to past time, and not to express the completion of an action. We will not here decide how far, in Gothic and Old High German, an especial preference for the use of the particle $\mathrm{ga}, \mathrm{ge}$, is to be ascribed to the preterite; but J. Grimm, who was the first to refer this circumstance to the language (II. 843. 844.), adds to the examples given this remark: 'A number of
passages in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German, will exhibit it (the preposition under discussion) as well before the present as wanting before the preterite, even where the action might be taken as perfect. I maintain only a remarkable predilection of the particle for the preterite, and for the rest I believe that, for the oldest state of the language, as in New High German, the ge became independent of temporal differences. It had then still its more subtle meaning, which could not be separated from any tense.' This observation says little in favour of Höfer's opinion, according to which, so early as the period of lingual identity, we should recognise in the expression of the past the preposition sam, which is hypothetically akin to our preposition ge. Here we have to remark, also, that though, in Gothic and Old High German, a predominant inclination for the use of the preposition ga, ye, must be ascribed to the preterite, it never possessed per se the power of expressing past time alone; for in gavasida, 'he dressed,' guvasidédun, 'they dressed' (did dress), the relation of time is expressed in the appended auxiliary verb, and the preposition $g a$, if not here, as I think it is, entirely without meaning, and a mechanical accompaniment or prop of the root, which, through constant use, has become inseparable, can only at most give an emphasis to the idea of the verb. At all events, in gavasida the signification which the preposition originally had, and which, however, in verbal combinations appears but seldont (as in ga-qviman, 'to come together'), can no longer be thought of."

## THE AORIST.

542. The second Sanskrit augmented-preterite, which, on account of its seven different formations, I term the multiform, corresponds in form to the Greek aorist, in such wise, that four formations coincide more or less exactly with the [G. Ed. p. 792.] first aorist, and three with the second. The forms which coincide with the first aorist all add $s$ to the root,
either directly, or by means of a conjunctive vowel $i$. I recognise in this $s$, which, under certain conditions, becomes $4 \underset{s}{ } / h$ (see §. 21. and Sanskrit Grammar, §. $101^{2}$.), the verb substantive, with the imperfect of which the first formation agrees quite exactly, only that the $\hat{d}$ of $\hat{d} s a m, \& c$. , is lost, and in the third person plural the termination us stands for an, thus sus for asan. The loss of the 1 need not surprise us, for in it the augment is contained, which, in the compound tense under discussion, is prefixed to the root of the principal verb: the short $a$ which remains after stripping of the augment might be dropped on account of the incumbrance caused by composition, so much the easier, as in the present, also, in its isolated state before the heavy terminations of the dual and plural, it is suppressed (see p. 695 G.ed.). Thus the sma of akshaip-sma,"we did cast," is distinguished from smas, " we are," only by the weakened termination of the secondary forms belonging to the aorist. In the third person plural, us stands for an, because us passes for a lighter termination than an; and hence, in the imperfect also, in the roots encumbered with reduplication, it regularly takes the place of $a n$; hence, abibhr-us, " they bore," for abibhr-an; and, according to the same principle, aksshaip-sus for aksshaip--san, on account of the encumbering of the root of the verb substantive by the preceding attributive root.
543. Before the personal terminations beginning with $t, t h$, and $d h$, roots which end with a consonant other than $n$, reject the $s$ of the verb substantive in order to avoid the harsh combination of three consonants; hence, akshiip-ta, " ye did cast," for akshidip-sta, as in Greek, from a similar euphonic reason, the roots terminating with a consonant abbreviate, in the perfect passive, the terminations $\sigma \theta o v$, [G. Ed. p. 793.]
 in Sanskrit, from a similar reason, the root sthu, " to stand," loses its sibilant, if it would come directly in contact with the prefix $u t$; hence $u t$-thita, "up-stood," for $u t$-sthita.
544. For a view of the middle voice, we here give the imperfect middle of the verb substantive, which is scarcely to be found in isolated use-

| singular. | dual. | plural. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| àsi, | âswahi, | âsmahi. |
| insthâs, | âsâthâm, | âddhwam or âdhwam. |
| ásta, | âsâtâm, | âsata. |

515. As an example of the aorist formation under discussion, we select, for roots terminating with a vowel, नी $n i$, " to lead"; and, for roots ending with a consonant, fक्षण् kslip, "to cast." The radical vowel reccives, in the former, in the active, Vriddhi; in the middle, only Guna, on account of the personal terminations being, on the average, heavier; in the latter, in the active, in like manner, Vriddhi; in the middle, no increase at all,

ACTIVE.
sINGULAR.
DUAL.
PLURAI.




## MIDDLE.

anêşhi, akshipsi, anẹshwahi, aksslipswahi, anệshmahi, ukṣhpsmali. anệ̂lthhs, akshipthûs, ${ }^{1}$ anêşhâlhâm, akṣhipsûthâm, anêlldhwam, ${ }^{3}$ uksshihdhuam. ${ }^{1}$ anệhta, akṣhipta, ${ }^{1}$ unệlıûtûm, akshipsâtâm, anệslata, ${ }^{4}$ ukshipsatu. ${ }^{4}$
[G. Ed. p. 794.] ' Regarding the loss of the $s$, see §. $543 . \quad{ }^{2}$ Ṣh for 8, see $\oint .21$. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{Or}$ anedhwam, also anedhwam, for 8 lefore the $d h$ of the personal terminations cither passes into $d$, or is rejected ; and for dhwam, in this and the third formation, dhwam also may be used, probably from the earlier ddwam, for ṣhdwam. $\quad{ }^{4}$ Regarding the loss of the $n$, which helongs to the personal termination, see $\mathfrak{j} .459$.
546. The similarity of the middle akshipsi to Latin perfects like scripsi is very surprising; for only the aug-
ment is wanting to complete a perfect countertype of the Sanskrit form. The third person scripsit answers better to the active form akṣhaipsit, which, without Vṛiddhi, would sound akṣipsît: the Latin vexit (vec-sit) answers to the Sanskrit स्षवाश्षीत् avâkşĥt of the same import; and again, vexi corresponds to the middle avakshi. The two languages have, from a regard to euphony, changed their $h$ before the $s$ of the verb substantive into the guttural tenuis, and $k$ requires, in Sanskrit, प् s.h for स् $s$ (see p. 21). The comparison of vexi with uvakṣhi may appear. the better substantiated, as the second person also vexisti may be traced back to a middle termination; viz. to thads of akship-thâs (for akshipsthas); so that the final $s$ would have been dropped, and $\hat{a}$ have been weakened to $i$. I now prefer this explanation to that according to which I have formerly identified the termination sti with the Sanskrit perfect termination tha; and in general I consider the Latin perfect, which, according to its meaning, might just as well have been called aorist, entirely independent of the Greek and Sanskrit perfect, in order that, in all its forms, I may refer it to the aorist. In this no great obstacles stand in our way; for while perfects in si, at the first glance, shew themselves to be aorists, although not so readily by comparison with the Greek as with the Sanskrit, even cucurri, momordi, cecini, and similar forms, in spite of their reduplication, do not oppugn the theory of the aorist formation, and very well [G. Ed. p. 795.] admit of being placed beside forms like ach $\hat{u} c h u r a m$, middle achûchurê (from achûchuraï), from chur, " to steal," and Greek forms, as є̇ $\pi \in ́ \neq \rho \alpha \delta o v, ~ \ddot{\epsilon} \pi є \phi \nu o v$, of which more hereafter. They would, therefore, like the imperfect and the aorists, as scripsi, vexi, mansi, have merely lost the augment, and have thus been associated with the Sanskrit and Greek perfect.
547. Perfects like scâbi, vîdi, lêyi, fugi. fódi, exclusive of the lengthening of their vowel, might be compared with

Sanskrit aorists like क्षलिपम् alipam, middle alipe (from alipaï), and Greek as é $\lambda$ ırтоv. On account of the lengthening of the vowel, however, this comparison appears inadmissible; and I believe that, in their origin, they agree with forms like scripsi, vexi, or with such as cucurri, tutudi. In the first case, the lengthening of the vowel must pass as compensation for the $s$ of the verb substantive, which has been dropped, on the same principle as that on which divîsi from dividsi, on account of the loss of the $d$, has lengthened its short radical vowel, or as in
 in compensation for the loss of a consonant, have received an indemnification in the preceding vowel. Still closer lies the comparison with aorists like é $\neq \eta \nu \alpha, \notin \notin \eta \lambda \alpha, \epsilon \dot{u}-$ $\phi \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu \alpha,{ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \alpha,{ }_{e}{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu \alpha$. It is certain that the liquids, also, must, in the aorist, have originally admitted the combination with $\sigma$, and that forms like ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \alpha \nu \sigma \alpha$ (as in Sanskrit, amanisi, in Latin, mansi), ${ }_{\epsilon} \neq \alpha \lambda \sigma \alpha$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \sigma \alpha$, have existed, and that in these aorists the length of the vowel is in consequence of the suppression of the $\sigma$. But if Latin perfects like lêgi, fûgi, according to their origin, should fall to the Sanskrit seventh aorist formation (achûchuram, asísilanı, or as'isílam from síl), they then contain a concealed reduplication, as, according to Grimm, do our preterites, as hiefs, Old High German hiaz (=Gothic haihait), and légi, scabi, fígi, fofdi, would consequently bé contractions from le-egi,
[G. Ed. p. 796.] sca-abi, fu-ugi, fo-odi, for lelegi, scacabi, \&c., with suppression of the consonant of the second syllable, by which that of the first loses the appearance of a consonant affixed by reduplication, as is the case in the Greek $\gamma^{i} \nu 0 \mu \alpha \iota$ from $\gamma^{\prime} \gamma \nu o \mu \alpha \iota$ (for $\gamma^{\prime}-\gamma \epsilon \nu-0-\mu \alpha \iota$ ), where, after renoving the $\gamma$ of the base syllable, the syllable $\gamma^{i v}$ receives the appearance of a radical syllable, while in fact only the $\nu$ represents the root.*

[^185] forms
548. I must decidedly pronounce forms like cap $\mathfrak{p}$, frêti, féci, to be reduplicated, and I have already done this, when I further recognised in them true perfects.* As perfects, they would be analogous to Sanskrit forms like तेषिज têpima, "we atoned," of which hereafter. As aorists, they have कनेशम् anếsam "I was ruined," for their prototype, which I deduce from ananiśam, by dropping the $n$ of the second syllable; and I refer it to the seventh aorist formation, while the Indian grammarians regard it as an anomaly of the sixth. Therefore, like अनेशम् anéśam from ana(n)iśam, I regard cêpi as a contraction of cacipi, as the Latin $\hat{e}$ as a colliquidation of $a+i$ frequently answers to the Sanskrit ế e.g. in lêvir, corresponding to the Sanskṛit dêvar (derri). With regard to the second syllable of the pre-supposed forms like cacipi, fufici, we may com- [G. Ed.p.797.] pare such perfects as cecini, tetigi, which in like manner, on account of the root being loaded with the reduplication, have weakened the radical $a$ to $i$. The forms cêpi, féci, \&e., must, however, have arisen at a period when the law had not as yet been prescribed to the syllables of reduplication of replacing the heaviest vowel $a$ by $e$, but when as yet the weakening of the radical vowel in the syllable of the base was sufficient. But if the previous existence of forms like cacipi, fafici, is not admitted, and cecipi, fefici, are made to precede the present cêpi, féci, we must then

[^186]deduce cêpi from cöipi, fêci from feïci, in such wise that the first vowel absorbs the second, and thereby becomes long. just as I have already, in my System of Conjugation, deduced subjunctives like legâs, legâmus, from legaïs, legnïmus. The form êgi has this advantage over other perfects of the kind, that it has not lost a consonant between the two ele. ments of which its ê is composed, i.e. between the syllable of repetition and that of the base: it is the contraction of $a-i y i$ or e-igi, and therefore, together with êdi, êmi, if the latter are likewise regarded as reduplicated forms (from e-edi, e-emi), deserves particular notice. As we ascribe an aoristic origin to the Latin perfects, we might also see in êli, $\hat{e} d i$, êmi, a remnant of the augment.
549. I return to the second person singular in sti. If in ti, of serpisti, vexisti, cucurristi, cêpisti, we recognise the Sanskrit middle termination thâs, and in the whole an aorist, then serpsisti does not answer so exactly to akshipthâs for akṣhipstâs as to the fourth aorist formation, which, indeed, is not used in the middle, and in roots ending with a consonant, not in the active also, but which originally can scarcely
[G. Ed. p.798.] have had so confined a use as in the present state of the language; and, together with the active aydsisham (from $y \hat{d}$, "to go "), we might expect the previous existence of a middle, whence the second person would be aydu-sishthâs, in which forms like serp-sisti are, as it were, reflected. The Sanskrit सृप् srip (from sarp), would, according to this formation, if it were used in the middle, produce asrip-sishthás. We may notice, also, with regard to the $s$ which precedes the $t$ in the forms serpsisti, serpsistis, which, in §.454., has been explained as an euphonic addition, that the Sanskrit precative, which in the middle likewise unites the $s$ of the verb substantive with the root (either directly, or through a conjunctive vowel $i$ ), prefixe. another $s$, which is, perhaps, merely euphonic, to the personal terminations beginning with $t$ or $t h$, which $s$,
through the influence of the preceding $\hat{\imath}$, becomes sh. The second person singular of the root srip, if it were used in the middle, would be sripsîhthhas, to which the Latin serpsisti approaches closely, where, however, it is to be observed, that the $i$ of the Latin serp-s-i-sti is only a conjunctive vowel, while the $\hat{\imath}$ of सृप्षीष्ठास् sripsiṣ̂hthas expresses the relation of mood. The third person singular is sripsîhhta, the second and third person dual, sripsîydsthâm, sripsíyâstam; but the second sibilant does not extend farther; e.g. the first person plural is no more sripsishmahi, than, in Latin, serpsismus, but sripsîmahi, like serpsimus. Yet the Sanskrit readily admits the combination shm; for it uses, according to the third aorist formation, abôdhiṣhma, "we knew," middle, abődhị̧hmahi.
550. In support of the opinion, that, in the second person singular of the Latin aorists, which are called perfects, a middle termination is contained, which, however, has lost sight of this origin, and passes as a common active, I will call attention to the fact, that even in Greek, in spite of its possessing a perfect middle [G.Ed. p. 799.] voice, an original middle form has, in a particular case, taken its position in the active voice; for, in the third person plural imperative, $\tau \in \rho \pi \delta \dot{o} \tau \tau \omega$ corresponds almost as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit middle tarpantam. In languages in which the middle, as a voice, is wanting, individual formal remnants of that voice can have been only maintained, where they fill up the place of any hiatus, which has arisen in the active, or stand beside an active termination, which has been likewise retained, bearing the same meaning as it does, and being, as it were, a variation of it; as in Irish, in the first person plural, together with the form mar (=Sanskrit mas, Latin mus, Greek $\mu e s$ ), a maoid exists, which at will assumes its place, and which I have already elsewhere compared with the Zend maidke, and

Greek $\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, for which the Sanskrit gives mahê, as an abbreviation of madhé (§. 472.).
551. As regards the Latin first person singular in si, in spite of the striking resemblance of forms like vexi, munsi, to the Sanskrit like avakshi, amansi, the coincidence may so far be said to be accidental, as their $i$ may be explained to be a weakening of $a$, so that the termination si of Latin perfects would correspond to the Greek $\sigma \alpha$ of ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda v-\sigma \alpha$. ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \tau \cup \pi-\sigma \alpha$. I am really of opinion, that the Latin forms in si do not correspond to the Sanskrit first aorist formation, but, at least for the majority of persons, to the second, which, like the Greek first aorist, inserts an $a$ between the $s$ of the verb substantive and the personal terminations. This $a$ is treated nearly as, in the special tenses, the $a$ of the first and sixth classes (see §. $109^{\mu} .1$. ), viz. lengthened, in the first person dual and plural, before $v a$ and ma. As, then, the $a$ of vah-a-si, vah-a-ti, vah-a-tha, appears in the Latin veh-i-s, veh-i-t, veh-i-tis, as $i$, in like manner the $\hat{a}$ of vah-d-mus appears as $i$ in veh-i-mus; so that we soon arrive at the conjecture that the $i$ of dic-si-sti, dic-si-t, dic-si-mus, dic-si-stis, is a weakening of $a$, and that therefore si cor-
[G.Ed.p.800.] responds to the Greek $\sigma \alpha$, the Sanskrit sa, st (euphonic sha, shî); thus, dic-si-mus=édeík- $\sigma \alpha-\mu \epsilon v$, adik-şh $\hat{c}$ --ma; dic-si-stis=é $\delta \epsilon i ́ \kappa-\sigma \alpha-\tau \epsilon$, adik-sha-ta. The connection, therefore, between vec-si-t and the Sanskrit avîk-shî-t would not be so close, as I before assumed, and for audk-s. $h \hat{\imath}-t$ we should have to imagine a form of the second formation-thus $a v a k-s h^{2}-t$-in order to compare with it vec-si-t, as dic si-t
 $-\sigma \alpha-\tau$, compare $\grave{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon i \kappa-\sigma \alpha-\tau 0)$. In the second person, dic--si-sti answers to the Sanskrit middle adik-ṣha-thâs, " thou shewedst," if the $s$, which precedes the $t$, is only of a euphonic nature, and introduced by the inclination of the $t$ to a preceding $s$.
552. But even if the Latin perfect forms in si are allotted to the Sanskrit second and Greek first aorist formation, still it remains most highly probable that the first person singular belongs to the middle voice; for the vowel $a$ of the aorist formation under discussion is rejected in Sanskrit before the termination $i$ of the first person middle; and while, according to the analogy of the imperfect, adikshe ( $=a d i k-s, h a-i$ ) might be expected, instead of it is found adik-$-s h i$ in most exact accordance with the Latin dic-si. From the active form adiksham it is a difficult step to the Latin $d i x i$; for although, in Greek, a final $m$ is sometimes entirely lost, and, for example, édeı $\xi \alpha$ corresponds to the Sanskrit adiksham, and, in the accusative singular of bases ending with a consonant, $\alpha$ answers to the Sanskrit am ( $\pi \delta \delta \alpha$, padam, pedem), yet, in Latin, the final $m$ of the Sanskrit has, in similar cases, always been retained; for example, in the first person the blunt termination of the secondary forms has been, without exception, maintained, in preference to the more full mi of the primary forms; thus, dicêbam, dicam, dicerem, dixerim. and so it is highly probable that, in the perfect also, dixim would be said, if the first person was based on the Sanskrit active adiksham, and not on the middle. [G. Ed. p. 801.] It is certain that, at the period of the unity of language, the abbreviated form adikssh could not as yet have existed, but for it, perhaps, adikshama or adilsshamam (=édeı $\xi \dot{\alpha} \alpha \mu \eta \nu$, see §. 471.). But even these forms conduct us more readily than adiksham to the Latin dixi,* since the first person singular in Latin has lost its termination exactly where another vowel stood after the $m$.
553. In the third person Ylural, the Latin dixerrunt apparently corresponds to the Sanskrit and Greek adikṣhan, ${ }^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha \nu$. It scarcely admits of any doubt, that the $r$ has proceeded from $s$ (as is common between two vowels), and that, therefore, in dic-strunt for dic-sêsunt (as eram, ero, for

[^187]3 E 2
esam, eso), the auxilary verb is twice contained, or is reduplicated, whether this form belongs to the Sanskrit fourth formation, where e. g. $a-y \hat{a}-$-sishlus has proceeded from a-yd-sishant, or, as is more probable, the third person, first on Roman ground, and after the aim and origin of the $s$ of dic-si had been forgotten, felt the necessity for being clearly invested with the verb substantive. This distinctness, however, subsequently became indistinct. As regards this superiority of the third person plural to the other persons, it is in accordance with the phenomenon, that, in Greek, éríce.
 not $\grave{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon}-\sigma \alpha-\mu \epsilon \nu, \dot{\epsilon} \theta \dot{\epsilon}-\sigma \alpha-\tau \epsilon$. The short termination not forming a syllable may have favored the annexation of the auxiliary verb: this reason, however, did not exist in the middle-
 regularly annexes, in the first person plural of the present and imperative, the verb substantive, without extending it to the second and third person, as, गच्छम्ह gachchhamha (mhu from रम sma) " we go."*
[G. Ed. p. 802.] 554. To return to the Latin dixerrunt, we might, instead of it, expect dixĕrunt, with short $e$, as $i$ before $r$ is readily replaced by $\check{e}$ : the long $e$, however, is just as

[^188]surprising as that of dic-ê-bam for dic-i-bam; and it may be added to what was remarked in §. 527., that the $\hat{\ell}$ of lege-bam and that of lege-runt probably rest on the same principle, that in both forms the originally short vowel has been lengthened, that the whole might gain more power, to bear the appended auxiliary verb. From this principle may also be explained the Vriddhi increase of ख्षैप्पम् akshaipsam, which does not prevent the assumption, that on account of the preponderating weight of the middle terminations, this vowel increase has been withdrawn, in order not to make the whole too unwieldy. Remark the case already mentioned, that the imperative termination fu dhi has preserved its full form only under the protection of a preceding consonant; and in the Gothic preterite all verbs which have a long vowel or diphthong in the root, and a part of those with $a$ before a doubled consonant, on account of this powerful build can bear the syllable of reduplication. But if only powerful [G. Ed. p. 803.] forms can bear certain burthens, it need not surprise us, if the language, in order to extend to its vocables the requisite capacity, introduces a lengthening of vowels, or diphthongizations, which have this object alone. It is probable that, in Sanskrit, a middle also, with $\hat{a} i$ for $i$, corresponded to the above-mentioned akshâipsam (§. 544.), and the abbreviation may have commenced, through the reacting influence of the personal terminations of the middle, which were heavy at the time when no abbreviation existed -at a period when the language was no longer conscious that the great vowel fulness of akshdipsam was caused precisely in order to afford a more powerful support for the burthen of the auxiliary verb.
555. The formation of the aorist under discussion, in spite of its wide diffusion in Greek and Latin, is, in Sanskrit, of but very limited use, and has been retained only in roots in ś, s.s, and $h$, without, however, necessarily
belonging to those letters, or extending to all roots with these terminations, as before $s$ they all pass into $k$. On account of the $k$, according to $\S$. 21 ., the $s$ of the auxiliary verb is changed into $s \underset{h}{ }$; and thus $k s ̣ h$ of adiksham, adiksshi, "I shewed," corresponds to the Greek and Latin $x(=k s)$ of ${ }^{\mu} \delta \in \iota \xi \alpha, d i x i$.* I annex a general view of the complete conjugation of the two active forms-

## singular.

SANSKRIT.
ACTIVE. MIDDLE.
udik-ṣha-m, adik-ṣhi, adik-sha-s, adik-şha-thâs, adik-sha-t, adik-sha-ta,

GREEK.
LATIN.
ACTIVE. MIDDLE.
$\hat{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa-\sigma \alpha, \quad \dot{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa-\sigma \alpha ́-\mu \eta v, \quad d i c-s i$

 DUAIn
 é $\delta \epsilon i \kappa-\sigma \alpha-\tau o v$, édeíк- $\sigma \alpha-\sigma \theta o v$

plural.
$\grave{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \epsilon i \kappa-\sigma \alpha-\mu \epsilon v, \dot{e} \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa-\sigma \alpha ́-\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha, \quad$ dic-si-mus.

 1 From adilk-sha-athâm. $\quad{ }^{2}$ From adik-sha-dtàm.
556. As the Sanskrit, in its periphrastic formation of the reduplicated preterite, of which we will speak more in detail hereafter, together with kri, "to make," applies the two roots of "to be," since e.g. chôrayâm-âsu, like chôrayâmbabhiva, signifies "I" and "he stole;" so the Latin, also, for its aorist perfects, has called in the aid both of ES and FU. From FU I have already, in my System of Conjugation, derived the syllable vi, ui, of ama-vi, audi-vi, and mon-ui. I think, however, I have been wrong in com-

[^189]paring the $v$ and $u$ of $v i, u i$, with the $f$ of $f u i$. It appears better, instead of rejecting the $u$ of $f u i$, to assume that the $f$ has been dropped; just as the $d$ of $d u o$ has been lost in viginti, bis, bi (bi-pes), or as, in Tongian, $u a$ corresponds to the New Zealand dua, "two" (=Sanskrit dwa).
557. The $u$ of $(f) u i$, according to the prevailing principle, has been changed between two vowels into $v$, but with a consonant preceding it is retained; hence amavi, audivi, contrasted with monui. Fui found occasion for [G. Ed. p. 805.] abbreviation in the incumbrance of the preceding principal verb, according to the same principle as that by which the first syllable of the Latin decem, decim (undecim, duodecim), has escaped the French contractions like douze, treize, or as the $d$ of the number " ten," in several Asiatic and EuropeanSanskrit dialects, is weakened to $r$ or $l$.*
558. The most convincing proof that in amavi, audivi, monui, the verb substantive is contained, is furnished by potui; for this form belongs to a verb, throughout which the combination with the verb substantive prevails. The tenses from $E S$, which are in use, select this root; thus, pos-sum (from pot-sum), pot-eram, pot-ero, pos-sim, pos-sem; but the perfect must betake itself to $F U$, fui; hence pot-ui, for potfui, which would be inadmissible. Pof-fui might have been expected, but the language preferred abandoning one of the irreconcileable consonants; and it would be difficult for any one, on account of the loss of the $f$, to declare the form potui, contrary to the analogy of all the other tenses, to be simple. But if pot-ui is compounded, then the application of this unmistakeable hint of the language, with regard to mon-ui, ama$v i$, audi-vi, st̂-vi, sî-vi, wô-vi, is apparent of itself. We may observe, that this vi, also, just as bam and runt (legê-bam, legê-

[^190]runt, scripse-runt), feels the necessity of being supported by a long vowel; and hence, in place of the short vowel of sëro, sătum, sinno, situm, mŏveo, mŏtum, exhibits a long one (compare §§. 527. 554.)
559. In order that the perfects in $u i$, $v i$, may, from their origin, appear as aorists, we must carry back the simple fui
[G.Ed. p. 806.] itself to an aorist, and this is easily done. It is only necessary to observe the close connection between fuit and the Sanskrit and Greek aorist $a$-bhat, ${ }^{\prime} \phi \bar{v}(\tau)$. On ac-
 if the loss of the syllable of reduplication is admitted as readily as that of the augment. I shall return hereafter to this subject.
560. The third Sanskrit aorist formation is distinguished from the second in this, that the auxiliary verb is connected with the root of the attributive verb by means of a conjunctive vowel $i$. Through the influence of this $i$ the $s$ is changed into ssh, but is, at the same time, preserved from suppression in those cases where the first formation, to avoid the accumulation of three consonants, drops the sibilant (see §. 543.). While, e.g., kssip, in the second person plural, exhibits $a k$ shdipta for akshaipsta, from budh, "to know," comes, in the same person $a b \delta d h-i-s h t a$. On the other hand, in the third formation in the second and third person singular active, the sibilant is lost, and the conjunctive vowel is lengthened in compensation, as it appears to me, for this loss; hence, abodh-$-i-s, "$ thou knewest," abddh-i-t-t, " he knew," in contrast with abddh-i-ssham, and all the other persons. I believe I perceive the ground of this solat on in this, that, as the second and third person singular have a simple $s$ and $t$ for their terminations, the retention of the sibilant would occasion the forms $a b \delta d h i k s ̧$ (euphonic for $a b o d h \hat{s} h h-s$ ), abobdhisht ; whence, according to a universal law of sound (see $\S .94$.), the last consonant would have to be rejected. In the case before us, however, the language preferred, for the sake of perspicuity. rather to give up the auxiliary verb than the personal sign.
although, in the imperfect, the case frequently occurs that the second and third person singular are of the same sound, because they have lost their distinguishing mark; hence, ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ bibhar, avak, signify both "thou didst carry," [G. E.e. p. 807.] "thou didst speak," and "he did carry," "he did speak"; in the first case for abibhar-s $h$, avak-s $h(s$ after $r$ and $k$ becomes $s h$ ), in the second for abibhar-t, avak-t. I annex the full formation of $a b d d h-i-s h a m$ and its middle, with the remark, that the radical vowel in roots ending with a consonant receives Guna in the two active forms; while roots ending with a vowel, as in the first formation, have, in the active, Vriidlhi, in the middle, Guna; e.g. anâvişham, anavishi, from un, "to praise."

| singular. | active. dual. | plural. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $a b \hat{o}$ th-i-şlıam, | aboidh-i-ṣhwa, | $a b o ̂ d h-i-s ̧ h m a$. |
| $a b \delta d h-i-s$, | abôdh-i-şhtam, | $a b o ̂ d h-i-s h t a$. |
| abodh-i-t, | $a b o l l h-i-s . s t u m$, | abôdh=i-s.hus. |
|  | middLe. |  |
| $a b o d h-i-s . s$ | abodll-i-şhwahi, | abîdl-i-şhmahi. |
|  | abûdh-i-şlûthûm, | abôdh-i-ddhwam. ${ }^{1}$ |
| $\ldots b o ̂ d h-i-s ̧ l t a$, | $a b o d h-i$-shâtâm, | abidh-i-shata. ${ }^{2}$ |

${ }^{1}$ According to the law of sound for abôdisdhwam. ${ }^{2}$ Regarding the
rejection of $n$, see $\oint .459$., and compare Ionic forms like $\pi \epsilon \pi a v a \tau a$.
561. The contrast of $a b \hat{\partial} d h \hat{s}$, abod $d h \hat{t}$, with abod $d h i s h a m$ and all other forms combined with the verb substantive, is very remarkably in accordance with the phenomenon, that the Old Sclavonic preterite, in which we have recognised the Indo-Greek aorist (see §. 255. m.), has likewise, in the second and third person singular, dropped the verb substantive, but retained it in all the other persons. But from forms like खबोधीस् $a b o \hat{d} h i ̂$, खबोधीत् $a b \delta d h i t$, the final consonant also, in Sclavonic, must be dropped, because the Sclavonic generally, according to the conjecture expressed in §. 255. l.,
[G. Ed. p. 808.] has lost all the original final consonants; hence Буди bûdi, "thou didst wake," answers to צबोधीस् $a b o ̂ d h-\hat{\imath}-s$, " thou didst know," or "didst awake," вяди bùdi, " he did awake," to सबोधीत् abôdhit, " he did know," " he did awake"; and on the other hand, ввдичте bûd-i-ste, " ye did awake," to स्रबोधिष्ट abobdh-i-shṭa, " ye did know," " ye did awake." I annex the whole for comparison, in which, however, the remarks of the following paragraphs are not to be overlooked.

| SINGULAR. |  | DUAL. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sanskrit. | old sclav. | sanskrit. | old sclay. |
| abôdh-i-şham, | bûd-ich, ${ }^{\text { }}$ | abôdh-i-şhwa, | bud-i-chovil ${ }^{2}$. |
| $a b o ̂ d l-\hat{L}-s$, | bûd-i-', | $a b d h^{\prime}-i-s . s h t a m$, | bûd-i-sta. |
| $a b o ̂ d h-\hat{-}$, , | $b u d-i-{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ubìdh-i-ṣhtıâm, | bûd-i-sta. |
| PLURAL. |  |  |  |
|  | sanskrit. | old sclavonic. |  |
|  | clbodh-i-şlma, | bûd-i-chom ${ }^{2}$ 。 |  |
|  | $a b o ̂ d h-i-s ̧ l t a$, | buid-i-ste. |  |
|  | abôdh-i-şhus, | $b u \hat{d-i-s . s h a i . ~}$ |  |
| ${ }^{1}$ See $\oint$ | §. 255.m. | ${ }^{2}$ See ¢¢¢. $055 . m$ | . 563. |

562. The preceding comparison furnishes one of the fairest parallels which can be anywhere drawn between the Sanskrit and its European sister idioms. The agreement of the two languages, however, if we go back to their original forms, is not quite so perfect as might be at first glance believed. The $i$ of the Sclavonic búd-i-ch is, for instance, in its derivation, different from the $i$ of the Sanskrit $a b \hat{d} h-i-s ̧ h a m$; for $b \hat{u} d-i-t i$, " to wake," does not correspond to the Sanskrit primitive verbs, whence abôdlh-i-sham proceeds, but to the causal bôdhayâmi, "I make to know, [G. Ed. p. 809.] bring to consciousness, wake"; on which account we have above compared (§.447. p. 648 G. ed.) the second person present bud-i-sh-i, with bîdh-aya-si, and in $\S .505$. identified the middle $i$ of $b \hat{u} d-i-t i$ with the character
aya of the Sanskrit tenth class, with which the causal forms agree. In spite of this, the circumstance that the Sclavonic verbs in general retain their class syllables in the tense under discussion, produces, in the preterite, a remarkable similarity between such verbs as have $i$ as the derivationvowel and the Sanskrit third formation of the aorist, although, in fact, the Sclavonic preterite belongs to the first Sanskrit aorist formation. Compare ддג da-ch, "I gave," даетe, da-ste, " ye gave," with Sanskrit forms like anai-şham, anâi--shtat : दा $d a$, " to give," follows the fourth formation, but would form adâsam, addsta, according to the first.
563. In the first person dual and plural the Old Sclavonic inserts between the auxiliary verb and the personal character an $o$, as a conjunctive vowel, so that in this respect $d a-c h-o-v a$, $d a-c h-o-m$, agree more with the Sanskrit second and Greek first aorist formation (adikssh-d̂-va, adiksh $h-\hat{\imath}-m a$, $\bar{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon i \xi-\alpha-\mu \epsilon v)$ than with anaişhwa, anâishma; but the $o$ is not anold hereditary possession brought from the East, but a subsequent insertion to avoid the combination chv, chm. The Servian, also, which has in its preterites (in the imperfect and in the socalled simple preterite) left the sibilant of the verb substantive (where it has not been entirely dropped) in its original form, has kept free from the conjunctive vowel ; as, igrasmo, "we played." For the most part, the aorist, in Old Sclavonic, is corrupted by the gutturalization of the sibilant in the first person of the three numbers. The relation to the Sanskrit in this manner becomes similar to that of the plural locative in ch to the Sanskrit in su or sshu, as in vdova-ch= विथवासु vidhava-su, "in the widows"; snocha-ch $=$ सुपासु snushd-su, "in the daughters-in-law"; [G.Ed. p. 810.] also similar to that of the pronominal plural genitives in ch to the Sanskrit in sâm or ssham, so that rti $\chi$ tye ch, has the same relation to तेपु te-shu, in respect of its mutation and abbreviation, as badd-i-ch has to abodh-i-sham.
564. In the third person plural, in Old Sclavonic, instead
of sha，ch $\hat{0}$ also is used，but only in the case where the pre－ ceding vowel is an $a$ or ts ye，and then both sha and chû（re－ garding $\hat{u}$ from on see $\S .463$ ．）are used at pleasure；e．g．



565．In the second and third person singular，according to Dobrowsky，instead of the forms without termination，ending with the class or root－vowel，those in we she also occur He gives，indeed，in his first conjugation（ $p$ ．524）from glago－ lach，＂I spoke，＂glagola as second and third person；but from mazađ ma弓ach，＂I anointed，＂＇he gives mazaшe ma引ashe as second and third person，for which，in both persons，we find in Kopitar maza ma̧n．From the special point of view of the Sclavonic we might easily fancy we saw the personal sign in the me she of mazame mu弓ashe，＂thou didst anoint，＂ compared with the present maжешм mascheshi，＂thou anointest，＂with the slight alteration of shi to she；and then assume an inorganic transfer from the second to the third per－
［G．Ed．p．811．］son，as our German sind has made its way， from its proper place，into the first person，or，as inOld and An－ glo－Saxon，the termination of the second person plural has been imparted both to the first and third，and in the Gothic passive the third person plural has replaced both the second and first． But if，in the Old Sclavonic preterite，we have recognised the Sanskrit aorist and the euphonic law，which has destroyed all original final consonants（ $\$ .255$ ．l．），we easily perceive that the she of mazдше ma弓ashe，＂thou didst anoint，＂stands for shes，and that of mazaшe maそashe，＂he anointed，＂for shet；and

[^191]that this she $(s)$, she $(t)$, of the second and third person rests on the Sans. sîs, sît, of the above-mentioned akşhitipsîs, ukshâipsit (§. 545.). I do not say on shas, shat, of adik-shas, adik-shat $=\epsilon ้ \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa-\sigma \alpha \varsigma$, ${ }^{\prime} \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa-\sigma \epsilon$, (p. 782); for although the termination of мддлше $m a \zeta a-s h e$ is nearly identical with that of $\epsilon \in \epsilon \in \kappa-\sigma \epsilon$, still the second person plural mazalte ma弓aste (not mazamete ma 亿ashete) teaches us that the Sclavonic aorist formation belongs to the Sanskrit first, not to the second (=Greek first).
566. I believe, too, that forms like the above-mentioned $b \hat{u} d i$, "thou didst wake," " he did wake," originally had another syllable she after it; thus bildi from buddishe; nese, " thou didst bear," "he bore," from neseshe; as in Scrvian all imperfects in the second and third person singular actually terminate in she. But in the said dialect the Sanskrit aorist has split into two tenses, of which one is called in Wuk's Grammar (translated by J. Grimm) "imperfcct," the other "simple preterite." The former carries the sibilant of the verb substantive, in the form of $u s h$ or $c s$, through all the persons, with the exception of the first person singular and third plural; the latter has entirely lost it in the singular, but cxhibits it in the plural also, in the third person. I annex for comparison the two tenses of игрám igram, "I play," in full.
imperfect.

| sIngular. | PLURAL. |
| :--- | :--- |
| igra,* | igrílsmo, |
| igrashe, | igrị̂sle, |
| igrasshe, | igrílu, |


567. The Bohemian has a remnant of the preterite

[^192]corresponding to the Sanskrit aorist, in the tense designated by Dobrowsky as the imperfect of the optative, in which bych, which is distinguished from the Old Sclavonic ${ }^{\text {Et }} \chi$ byech, "I was," only by a different form of the radical vowel, in combination with the past participle byl, (thus byl-bych) expresses the idea, "I were," or "would be." If the participle preterite follow a second time this byl-bych, this forms the pluperfect of this mood, and bylbych byl signifies "if I had been," or "I would have been." Ccmpare the conjugation of byl-bych (feminine byla-bych, neuter bylo-bych), or rather that of bych alone, with that of the Old Sclavonic $\llcorner\star \chi$ byech, "I was."

## BOHEMIAN.

| sing. | plural. |
| :--- | :--- |
| bych, | bychom, |
| bys, | byste, |
| by, | by, |

OLD SCLAVONIC.
SING. PLURAL.
byech, byechum.
bye, byeste.
bye, byesha (byeshya).
"Remark.-The second person singular bys has the advantage over the Old Sclavonic bye of retaining the sibilant of the auxiliary verb, while in the third person
[G.Ed. p.813.] plural, Б\$ша byesha, has, in this respect, the advantage over by. From the Bohemian, as our point of view, the $s$ of bys can only mark a personal termination, particularly as $s$ in Bohemian actually expresses the second person. According to that, however, which was previously remarked regarding the she which occurs in Servian, and occasionally, also, in Old Sclavonic, in the second and third person singular, it can admit of no doubt that the $s$ of bys is identical with that of the second person plural byste, and that it has preserved the first, and not the second sibilant of the Sanskrit singular persons, like akṣhaipsis, anaishî̀s, p. 793 G. ed. The root भू bhî, 'to be,' according to the first aorist formation, would, in the second person
singular, form abhduṣhîs, and, without Vriddhi, abhûshîy, the middle part of which is contained in the Bohemian bys."
568. The Old Sclavonic dach, "I gave," and analogous formations, remind us, through their guttural, which takes the place of a sibilant, of the Greek aorists ${ }^{\prime} \delta \omega \omega \kappa \alpha$, ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta \kappa \alpha$, $\hat{\eta} \kappa \alpha$. That which, in Old Sclavonic, has become a rule in the first person of the three numbers, viz. the gutturalization of an original s, may have occasionally taken place in Greek, but carried throughout all the persons. No conjecture lies closer at hand, than that of regarding ${ }^{\ell} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ as a corruption of ${ }_{\epsilon} \delta \omega \sigma \sigma$, whether it be that the $\sigma$ has with one step passed into $\kappa$, or that a $\kappa$ has placed itself beside the sibilant of the verb substantive, as in the imperfect é $\sigma$ коv, $\stackrel{\models}{\epsilon} \sigma \kappa \epsilon$, in the old Latin future escit, and in the imperfects and
 $\epsilon \sigma \kappa о \nu, \kappa \alpha \lambda \in ́ \sigma \kappa є т о$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \sigma \kappa є, \delta \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa є т о$, in which the accession of the verb substantive is not to be overlooked, which therefore is doubly contained in the forms in $\sigma \alpha-\sigma \kappa о \nu, \sigma \alpha-\sigma \kappa о \mu \eta \nu$. But in ${ }_{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha,{ }^{\epsilon} \theta \eta \kappa \alpha, \tilde{\eta}^{\circ} \kappa \alpha$, it being presupposed that they were formerly $\epsilon \delta \omega \sigma \kappa \alpha, \& c$., only the euphonic accompaniment of the $\sigma$ would have remained, and thus an original
 Perhaps, also, a $\kappa$ may have originally been prefixed to the $\sigma$ of the to-be-presupposed $\notin \delta \omega \sigma a$, as in $\xi \dot{v} v$ from $\sigma \dot{v} \nu=$ Sanskrit sam, "with"; so that thus ${ }_{\epsilon} \delta \omega \omega \kappa \alpha$ would be an abbreviation of $\epsilon \delta \omega \xi \alpha$, as perhaps a form xum [G. Ed.p.814.; preceded the Latin cum if it is akin to $\xi \dot{\xi} v, \sigma \dot{v} \nu$, सम् sam.
569. The Lithuanian also presents a form which is akin to the Greek and Sanskrit aorist, in which, as it appears to me, $k$ assumes the place of an original $s$; I mean the imperative, in which I recognise that Sanskrit mood which agrees with the Greek optative aorist, and through which, therefore, the $k$ of di̛k, "give," dùkite. "give ye" (Sansk!it dâsîdhwam, "may ye give," precative middle), is connected with the $\kappa$ of the Greek ${ }^{\frac{1}{e}} \delta \omega \omega \alpha$. But
if, then, the $\kappa$ of ${ }_{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha,{ }^{*} \theta \eta \kappa \alpha, \hat{\eta}_{\hat{\eta} \alpha \alpha \text {, has either, as I prefer }}$ to assume, directly, or through the medium of $\sigma \kappa$ or $\xi$, proceeded from $\sigma$,* then there is no difficulty in deducing also the $\kappa$ of perfects like $\delta$ é $\delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ from $\sigma$, and therefore from the verb substantive, although the Sanskrit in this sense refrains from combining with the root as. But fundamentally all tenses have an equal claim to this root, to express the copula, and if, in Greek, imperfects like $\dot{e} \delta i \delta \omega \nu$, and aorists like ${ }^{\prime} \delta \omega \nu$, in the third person plural, combine with the verb substantive, while the Sanskrit forms adadam, adda, remain simple; and if, further, the Greek dialectically combincs the imperfect $\epsilon \sigma$ коо with the imperfects of attributive verbs, and the Latin here uses its ban, while the Sanskrit imperfects nowhere receive the verb substantive, it cannot surprise us if the Greek restores that in the perfect which the Sanskrit has neglected. The incumbrance of the root, which occurs in the perfect through reduplication, is not favorable to the reception of the verb substantive; and the Greek also admits the addition of the $\kappa$ only there where the least difficulty exists, viz. after vowels and the lightest consonants, the
[G. Ed. p. 815.] liquids; thus, $\delta \in \notin \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$, indeed, $\pi \epsilon \varphi \bar{\phi} i \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha$.
 in order to avoid the harshness of this combination, the $\kappa$ of the auxiliary verb is changed to $h$, as it were in the spirit of the German law for the mutation of sound, $\dagger$ and this, with the preceding tenuis or medial, is changed to an aspirate;

[^193] from $\pi \epsilon \in \pi \lambda \epsilon к \kappa \alpha$. On the other hand, in T-sounds the language has preferred dropping these entirely before $\kappa$, and leaving the $\kappa$ in its full right and possession; thus, $\epsilon^{\prime} \psi \in u \kappa \alpha$, $\pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha$, for ${ }^{\prime} \psi \psi \epsilon \downarrow \delta \kappa \alpha, \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \theta_{\kappa \alpha}$. The passive, on account of its heavy terminations, is less favorable to the reception of the auxiliary verb. And as, together with $\epsilon \delta i \delta o \sigma \alpha \nu$, é $\delta \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$, no forms $\bar{\epsilon} \delta i \delta o ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0$, é $\delta o ́ \sigma \alpha \nu \tau 0$, exist, so to the active perfects in $\kappa \alpha$ no passives in $\kappa \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$ (or $\sigma \alpha \mu \alpha \iota$, with the original sound preserved) correspond. It might, however, be assumed, that the $\sigma$, which has remained in forms like $\tau \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, é $\sigma \pi \alpha \sigma$ $\mu \alpha t,{ }^{\prime} \nu v \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$, especially after short vowels, sometimes also after long ones ( $\eta$ кov $\sigma \mu \alpha t$ ), is not euphonic, but belongs to the verb substantive; for it is assuredly treated precisely like the $\sigma$ which takes the place of a radical $T$-sound ( $\epsilon^{\prime} \psi \varepsilon v \sigma-\mu a t$, $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \sigma-\mu \alpha \iota$ ) and is only dropped before another $\sigma$ ( $\pi \in ́ \pi \epsilon \iota-$ $\left.-\sigma \alpha l, \eta^{\prime} \kappa o u-\sigma \alpha l\right)$. In verbs in $\nu$, the $\nu$ and $\sigma$ contend to a certain degree for the honor of being retained: $\pi \epsilon ́ \phi \alpha \nu \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ would be an impossibility in the present state of the language, but $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha-\sigma \mu \alpha \iota$ has obtained currency in preference to $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha \mu-\mu \alpha \iota$ (as $\neq \xi \eta \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \iota$ and others); while in the third person $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha \nu-\tau \alpha \iota$ has carried off the victory from $\pi \epsilon \in \phi \alpha-\sigma \tau \alpha \iota$, perhaps under the protection of $\pi$ é $\phi \alpha \nu-\sigma \alpha \iota$, [G. Ed. p. 816.] which necessarily gained the preference over $\pi \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha-\sigma \sigma \alpha \iota$, a form repugnant to all custom, and over $\pi \in ́ \phi \alpha-\sigma \alpha \iota$, in which the $\nu$ would have been unnecessarily abandoned. The circumstance that verbs of this kind exhibit the $\sigma$ also in the formation of words, before suffixes which begin with $\mu$ or $\tau$ ( $\tau \in \lambda^{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma \mu \alpha, \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta$ ), is no argument against the opinion that the $\sigma$ in the perfect passive has more than a euphonic foundation; for without deriving such words from the perfect passive, still the custom of writing $\sigma \mu, \sigma \tau$, which have good foundation in the perfect passive, may have exerted an influence on such forms, in which the $\sigma$ before $\mu$ and $\tau$ can only appear as an idle or euphonic accompaniment.
570. That aorist formation, to which, in my Sanskrit grammar, I have assigned the fourth place, is of less importance for comparison with the European cognate languages, but deserves notice on this account, that it makes the verb substantive so broad that it cannot be overlooked; for in forms like ayt-sisham, "I went," it receives the word in its broadest extent, and exhibits its radical consonants in a double form; and so in the other persons, with the exception of the second and third singular, in which we have $a y \hat{A}-s \hat{\imath} s, a y \hat{a}-s \hat{\imath} t$, for $a y a ̂ s i k-s, a y a ̂ s i s h t$, on the same ground on which, in the third formation, abodhîs, abôdhît, are used, completely passing over the auxiliary verb (see §. 560.). The full conjugation of ayisisham is as follows:-

| Singular. | dual. | plulial. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ayâ-sişham, | ayâ-siṣhwa, | ayd-siṣhma. |
| ayâ-sîs, | ayâ-sishtam, | ayâ-sishta. |
| ayâ-sît, | ayâ-sişhtâm, | ayâ-sişhus. |

[G. Ed. p.817.] 571 . This aorist formation is not used in the middle, or has fallen into disuse; probably because the broad form of the auxiliary verb accorded just as little with the heavier middle terminations, as in Greek the syllable
 The active also, in Sanskrit, avoids this formation in roots which are encumbered with a final consonant, with the exception of three roots in $m$ : ram, " to play," nam, " to bend," yam, " to restrain." As, however, $m$ before $s$ must pass into the very weak nasal sound of Anuswâra (i), which, in comparison with other consonants, is almost nothing, the forms, therefore, arain-sisham, anain-sisham, ayan-sişham, come, in respect to the weight of the root, very near to forms like aydsisham.
" Remark.-If it is asked, in what way the language has arrived at the form siṣham, two modes of deriving it present themselves. Either, as I have before assumed, si
is a syllable of reduplication, and sham (properly sam, the $s$ of which, through the influence of a preceding $i$, becomes $s h$ ) the principal syllable; or sisham was originally sasam; sişhwa, şaswa or sâswa; and sişhma, sasma or sâsma, \&c.; and these forms have been so developed from the second aorist formation, corresponding to the Greek first (see §. 555.); that to the verb substantive, which already existed accompanied by $a$, the same attached itself a second time, preceding the personal terminations (probably at a time when the auxiliary verb was no longer recognised as such); just as in Latin third persons plural, like serpserunt from serpsesunt. From sâva, sâma (adikshâva, adikshdma, êdeí$\xi \approx \alpha \epsilon \nu$ ), would consequently next be formed sâswa, sâsma; from
 come sastam, sasta. But subsequently, after the $\hat{a}$ and $a$ of the first syllable had, in order to lighten the weight, become $i$, the following $s$ necessarily became $s ̧$; thus, dual sişhua, sishtam, sishtum, from saswa, sastam, sastam; and, in the first and second person plural, sişma, sish $h t a$, from sásma, sasta. The root शास् sáss, ' to rule,' in some persons affords us an excellent prototype or counterpart of this process of corruption. It weakens, viz. before the heavy personal terminations beginning with mutes (not, however, before the weak $v$ and $m$ ) its $a$ to $i$, and consequently must also change [G. Ed. p. 818.] its final $s$ into $s h$, and a following $t$, th, into $t, t h$; and exhibits, therefore, in the dual, s'ishtam, sishtham, instead of sâstam sâstâm, in the plural, sishtha for sásta. In the third person plural the appended auxiliary verb under discussion exhibits the termination us for an; thus, aydsişhus for aydsishan, as might be expected according to the analogy of adikshan, é $\dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \epsilon \xi \alpha v$. The replacing of the terminanation $u s$ by $a n$ is easily explained by considering that us passes as a lighter termination than an (§. 462.), and that, on account of the doubling of the auxiliary verb, occasion arises for lightening the word in every other manner possible.

The root $\dot{s} \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}$, too, which is so liable to be weakened, selects, in the third person plural of the imperfect, the termination us for an; thus aślis-us, corresponding to the second person asissh-ta. If, then, as I scarce doubt, the aorist form in sisham, \&c., has arisen in this way, that the auxiliary verb has been re-attached to itself, being first simply combined with the root; then this form in principle corresponds with the Ionic aorist-forms like è $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ (for $\ddot{\eta} \lambda \alpha \sigma \epsilon$ from $\left.\eta^{\eta} \lambda \alpha \sigma \alpha \tau\right), \delta \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \tau о$ for $\grave{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \tau \sigma$. The dropping of the augment in these aorists and similar imperfects is clearly occasioned by the new burthen which has been attached; and we might therefore, in Latin also, ascribe the dislodgement of the augment to the circumstance (or find it promoted thereby), that all imperfects and perfects (aorists) of attributive verbs, according to what has been before remarked, are or were encumbered with an auxiliary verb (bam, si, vi,ui), or a syllable of reduplication, either visible or concealed by subsequent contraction (cucurri, cêpi). In the isolated and unsupported ërum for êram = พासम् $\hat{\text { asam }}$, the augment was laid aside by the simple abbreviation of the vowel."
572. In Zend, those aorist forms which unite the verb substantive with the root, are of rare use, but are not entirely wanting. The only instance which I can cite is, however, the form upusug mansta," he spoke" (Vend. S. p. 132), a middle of the first formation, corresponding to the Sanskrit जमंस्त amanंsta, " he thought," from the root man, which, in Zend, has assumed the meaning "to speak," and has
 The frequently-occurring ypsugg daita, " he gave," is not, as might be imagined, an aorist, but is based as imperfect
[G. Ed. p. 819.] on the Sanskrit षदन adatta (from adud-ta for adadâta=édídoto), since, according to §. 102. (end), the first $t$ must be changed into $\begin{aligned} & \text { s. }\end{aligned}$
573. We now pass on to those formations of the San-
skrit aorist, which are known in Greek under the name of the second. To this class belong, according to the arrangement of my Sauskrit grammar, the fifth, sixth, and seventh formations. The fifth annexes the personal terminations direct to the root, and is distinguished from the imperfect only by the removal of class characteristics; thus as, in Greek, $\epsilon^{\ell} \dot{\delta} \omega \nu$ is distinguished from $\grave{\varepsilon} \delta i \delta \omega \nu$; so, in Sanskrit, adâm is distinguished from adadâm (see p. 674); and in Zend, where, too, this kind of aorist formation is in like manner found, Gxy darm from $G_{\text {gueng dadhaim (re- }}$ garding $d h$ for $d$, see §. 39.). To the Greek $\stackrel{\text { é }}{ } \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, é $\epsilon \tau \eta \eta$,
 in opposition to the reduplicated, but, in the radical vowel, irregularly shortened atishhlum, atislthas, atishthat (see §. 508.).
 of adhim to aladhâm (from dhâ), "to lay," "to place." The Greek ${ }^{\prime} \phi \bar{u}-\nu$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \phi \bar{u}-s,{ }^{\prime} \epsilon \bar{\varphi} \phi \bar{u}-(\tau)$, have the same relation to
 (not abhû-m, see §. 437. Rem.), ablut-s, abhû-t, have to abhav-a-m, alhav-a-s, abhav-a-t, since blû, as belonging to the first class, assumes, in the special tenses, an $a$, but withdraws it in the aorist, as the Greek does its $o, \varepsilon$.
574. The Latin fui, which, like all perfects, according to what I have before remarked (see $\$ \S .546 .8 \mathrm{c}$.), I regard as originally an aorist, diverges from the corresponding form of the Sanskrit and Greck, by the assumption of a conjunctive vowel $i$, and thus corresponds to the sixth formation; hence $f u-i-s t i^{*}$ for $a b l u t-s, e_{e}^{\prime}-\phi \bar{v}-s$, [G. Ed. p. 820.] or rather for the Sanskrit middle form $a$-bhut-hds; for although the fifth formation is not used in the middle, and no adâ-ta, as-thdt-ta, adhâ-ta, correspond to the Greek ধ́ $\delta 0$-тo, é $\varepsilon \sigma \tau \alpha-\tau 0$, è $\theta \epsilon-\tau 0$, still it may be presumed that they were originally in use. In the third person, fu-i-t, stands for
$a b h \hat{u}-t$, eै $\phi v$; in the plural, fu-i-mus for $a b h \hat{u}-m a$, eै $\phi u-\mu \in \nu ; f u-$ $-i$-stis for $a b h \hat{d}-t a$, $\begin{gathered}\text { é }\end{gathered} \cup-\tau \epsilon$, If this aorist formation were employed in Sanskrit in the middle also, the first person singular would be abhavvi,* and, without euphonic permutation of sound, abliki. To the former the obsolcte fuvi corresponds; to the latter, fu-i. I do not, however, place any weight on this surprising accordance; for although fui is based on a middle form (the $m$ of abhûvam would probably have been retained, see §.431.), still it is certain that, in Sanskrit, the termination of the first person singular middle, before the division of languages, had not yet fallen into the abbreviated condition in which we now see it; and, according to the analogy of the presupposed third person, $a b h i-t a$, in place of $a b h a v-i, a b h d-m a$, (from abhûmam or -mâm, see §. 552.), must have existed. I do not, therefore, regard the $i$ of $f u-i$ as identical with the Sanskrit $i$ of the pre-supposed abhûvi, but as identical with the conjunctive vowel $i$ of $f u-i-s t i, f u-i-t, \& c$. Consequently, the form $f u-i$, just like present forms, e.g. vêh-o $=v a h-$ - $d$-mi, is entirely deficient in a personal termination.
575. The sixth Sanskryit aorist formation is distinguished from the fifth simply by this, that the personal terminations [G. Ed. p. 821.] are united with the root by a conjunctive vowel $a$, and this $a$ is treated in conjugation exactly like the class vowel of the first and sixth class (§. 109 ${ }^{\text {a }}$. 1.). This aorist, therefore, is distinguished from the imperfect of the first class simply by the withdrawal of the Guna; e.g. the imperfect of riṣh, "to injure," class 1 , is aressh-a-m (=araiṣham), and the aorist arish-a-m. We have, therefore, here the relation of the Greek ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi-0-\nu$ to the aorist ${ }^{\prime \prime} \lambda^{\prime} / \pi-0-\nu$, which is

[^194]without Guna. From budh, "to know," class 1, comes the imperfect abodll-a-m (=abaudh-a-m), and the aorist abudh-a-m,

576. In the Sanskrit sixth class, which has $a$ as its classvowel in common with the first, but does not admit of Guna in the special tenses, which would have to be withdrawn in the aorist, the formation under discussion is possible only in a small number of irregular verbs, which, in the special tenses (see §. 109.. 1.) insert a nasal, and again reject it in the aorist, as generally in the common tenses. Thus lip, which has been repeatedly mentioned, "to smear" (compare $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon i(\phi \omega)$, forms, in the imperfect, alimpam, and in the aorist alipam. Another form of this kind is alupam, "I did cut off," in contradistinction to alumpam (compare the Latin rumpo, rupi, ruptum). The same is the relation of Greek aorists like ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \alpha \beta \beta o v$ (Sanskrit labh, "to obtain"), ${ }^{\prime} \chi \alpha \delta o v$, è $\lambda \alpha \theta o v$,
 that these, besides the inserted nasal, have also another external addition, which is likewise rejected, as, in Sanskrit, the fifth and ninth classes reject their intermediate syllable $n u, n a$. As to the imperfect aśak-nav-am and the aorist aśak-$-a-m$, which, in Sanskrit, come from sakk, "to be able," class five, these two forms stand in a relation to one another similar
 $\dot{e} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \eta \nu$, stand to their imperfect actives [G. Ed. p. 822.]
 $-n \hat{a}-m$, and the aorist $a k l i s \dot{s}-a-m$, which come from kliś, class nine, this corresponds exactly to the relation of the Greek $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \alpha \mu-\nu \eta-\nu$ to ${ }^{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \mu-o-\nu . \quad$ From swid, "to sweat," class four, come the imperfect aswid-ya-m, and the aorist aswid-a-m: here the relation is similar to the correspondence of an aorist ${ }_{\epsilon} \beta \alpha \lambda-o-\nu$, in Greek, to the imperfect ${ }^{e} \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda o \nu$, it being pre-supposed that the gemination of $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega^{*}$ is the conse-

[^195]quence of an assimilation (see §. 501.), and that therefore $\beta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \omega$ has arisen from $\beta \alpha \lambda y \omega$, as $\alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ os from $\alpha \lambda \lambda o s$.
577. In roots which end with vowels this aorist formation is, in Sanskrit, little used, and where it occurs the radical vowel is rejected before the vowel of coujunction, with the exception of चี $r i$ and ूㅡ $r \bar{i}$, of which the former becomes ar, the latter $\hat{i r}$ : e.g. asar-a-m, ajir-a-m, from मृ s.ri (originally sar), " to go," जॄ jrī (properly jar, jir), "to grow old," aśw-a-m, from świ, "to grow." Roots in $u$ and $\hat{u}$ do not occur in this aorist formation; otherwise from blu, "to be," if it followed this formation, and in like manner rejected its vowel, would come abham, abhas, abhat, which would approach the Latin bam of ama-bam very closely; or, if the $\hat{u}$ were not rejected, but, according to §. 574 ., changed into $\mathfrak{u v}$, or, according to the general law of sound, into $u v$, then, in respect to the conjunctive vowel, in the third person singular the Latin $f u-i-t$, and, in
[G. Ed. p. 823.] the first person plural, fu-i-mus, would have the same relation to abhuv- $a-t$, abhuv- $\hat{\alpha}-m a$, or $a b h i v v-$ $-a-t, a b h a v-\hat{a}-m a$, that, as above (§. 507.), veh-i-t, veh-i-mus, have to vah-a-ti, vah-d-mas.
578. In Zend it is hardly possible to distinguish everywhere with certainty the aorist formation under discussion from the imperfect, at least not in examples of the kind like the frequently-occurring zanat, "he struck." This form may be regarded as an aorist, because the root हन् han, to which the Zend צנב zan (for which also jan) corresponds, belongs to the second class; and therefore, in the second and third person singular, the imperfect forms
medial, as, vice versa, in $\Pi \gamma \Theta=b u d h$, " to know," a tenuis stands in place of a medial, then $\beta a \lambda \lambda \omega$ would be referable to the Sanskrit root pad, whence padye, "I go" (middle), assuming a causal meaning. As regards the weakening of the $d$ to $l$, BAA answers, in this respect, to the Prakrit pal. The same may be said of $\pi$ ã $\lambda \omega \omega$, where the initial sound presents no difficulty.
ahun for ahans, ahant, according to §.94. In Zend, also, this root prevails chiefly in the second class. We find in the Vend. S. p. 158. \&c. repeatedly jainti, "he beats," also zaintê (p. 157, perhaps erroneously for zainti, or it is a middle); but at p. 177 we find to the first class, and therefore sanat also may be allotted to the first class, and regarded as the imperfect. But although zanat should be explained as belonging to the class to which this verb is principally referable, it may be still regarded as the imperfect, and, in fact, as following the analogy of the Sanskyit wxोदत् arôdat, "he wept," and the Zend peverza anhat, "he was" (see §. 532.).
579. The Sanskrit seventh aorist formation is distinguished from the sixth by a syllable of reduplication preceding the root, and therefore answers to the Greek
 dropped the augment, as $\tau \in ́ t u k o v, \pi \in ́ \epsilon t \imath \theta o v$. We have already adduced above (§. 546) Latin perfects like cucurri, tutudi, cecini, and remarked, that such as cêpi, fréti, féci, and probably also such as légi, fodi, scedbi, vidi, fúyi, (if in the latter the length of the vowel is not to be regarded as compensation for an $s$, which has been dropped after the final consonant of the root,) contain a concealed reduplication (see §§. 547, 548). The Sanskrit apaptam, [G.Ed. p. 824.] "I fell"(*), for apapatam, from pat, "to fall," corresponds exactly to the above-mentioned Greek ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \phi v o v$ in its entire structure, and therefore, also, in the rejection of the radical vowel. While the Greek reduplicates this root in the present and imperfect, and withdraws the reduplication in the aorist, so that the Doric ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma$ (commonly $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \epsilon \sigma о \nu\right)$ has the same
 étionv, íवTqv, the Sanskrit, with this verb, adopts the reverse method, and opposes to the imperfect apatam an aorist

[^196]apaptam. The Greek imperfect, therefore, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \pi \iota \pi \tau o v$, corresponds most surprisingly with this aorist apaptam, and the Greek aorist ênetov with the Sanskrit imperfect apatam.
580. In Sanskrit all verbs of the tenth class follow this seventh aorist formation, and, which is the same thing, all causal forms, for these are in their formation identical with the tenth class. And here the rhythmical law is valid, that either the syllable of reduplication, or the base-syllable, must be long, whether by natural length of the vowel or by position, as in apaptam. Both kinds are often at will admissible in one and the same root, but in most cases the use of language has exclusively decided for one or the other kind, and, in fact, most frequently for the length o.
 comes aśisílam or aśísillam; from chur, "to steal," comes achûchuram.
581. Besides the verbs of the tenth class and causal forms, as the above-mentioned apaptam, and some others to be given in the following paragraphs, only four other roots ending with a vowel belong to this class, viz. śri, " to
[G. Ed. p. 825.] go," s'wi, "to grow," "to go,"* dru, "to run," śru, "to hear," snu, "to flow," $\dagger$ whence as'ísriyam, aśiświyam, adudruvam, aśuśruvam, asusnuvam.
582. I have already remarked (§. 548.) that anéśam, "I went to ruin," from naś, in my opinion contains a concealed syllable of reduplication, and has arisen from ananisam (for ananas-a-m) by rejection of the second $n$ : and, moreover, that Latin perfects like cépi rest on the same principle. In घ्रवोचम् avôcham, also, "I spoke," I

[^197]recognise a reduplication, though it appears that the $\delta$ is only an alteration of the $a$ of the root. The root rach has, however, a tendency to suppress its radical vowel and vocalize its $v$ : hence, in the participle passive, ukta, and in the plural of the reduplicated preterite $u$ ch-i-ma, from $u$-uchima. If, then, it is assumed that in the aorist formation under discussion the root vach has been contracted to $u c h$, then $v \hat{c} c h$ may very satisfactorily be deduced from va-uch for vavach. The syllable of reduplication, therefore, has in this form, with regard to gravity, carried off the superiority over the base-syllable, as in forms like ach $\hat{u}$ churam, "I stole." Whether the Zend Gqubul vad́chëm, "I spoke," the third person of which, vaôchat, occurs very frequently, is identical with the Sanskrit avocham, and therefore, in like manner, reduplicated, cannot be decided with certainty, for this reason, that, as Burnouf has shewn, the Zend has a tendency to change an $a$, through the influence of a preceding $v$, into $\downarrow \delta$, and thus to make it more homogeneous to the nature of the $v$; but, according to $\S .28$. , an $a$ is prefixed the $\downarrow \delta$. A present middle, also, evpubls vaiché, occurs in Zend *, and a potential (optative) (lol vaôchbit (Vend. S. p.163), [G. Ed. p. 826.] which might, however, also be regarded as aorist of the potential.
583. In arandham, also, "I injured," "I slew," from the root radh, I think I discover a reduplication, $\dagger$ assuming an

[^198]exchange of the liguids; thus, arandham for arardham, from araradham, as apaptum from apapatam. With regard to the exchange of the $r$ for $n$, it may be proper to advert to the Tongian nima, "five," in opposition to rima, lima, of the dialects near akin. Observe, also, that in the intensive forms चष्छट् chanchal and चम्नुर् chanchur,* the nasal of the syllable of reduplication is the representative of the $l$ and $r$ of the root, just as of the $\mu$ of the Greek $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu i$, $\pi i \mu \pi \rho \eta \mu i$, where, therefore, $\mu$ for $\lambda$ stands in the reverse relation of the Latin flare for the Sanskrit ध्मा dhma. $\dagger$
584. In verbs which begin with a vowel the whole root is, in Sanskrit, in this aorist formation, twice employed, and the first time, indeed, uniting the radical vowel with that of the augment, according to the principle of $\S .530$, in accordance, therefore, with the Greek aorists with Attic reduplication, as ${ }_{\eta}^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \gamma o v,{ }^{\omega} \rho o \rho o v$. The Sanskrit, however, requires, in the second annexation of the root, the lightest vowel of all, $i$,
[G. Ed. p. 827.] as the representative of all the rest. Not only, therefore, are $\hat{\imath}$ and the diphthong $\hat{e}(a+i)$ shortened to $i$, and, e. g., from $\hat{\imath} d a y$ (causal from $\hat{\imath} d$, "to praise") dididam formed, but $a$ and $\hat{a}$ also are weakened to $i$, after the principle of Latin forms like tetigi, contingo, where the encumbrance of the root by the syllable of reduplication or the preceding preposition is the occasion of the vowel being weakened. Hence, in Sanskrit, from atay (causal of al, "to go,") comes the aorist atitum, and from apay (causal of $\hat{a} p$, " to obtain,") apipam, with which the Latin adipiscor for adapiscor may be compared, and the

[^199]
 $\boldsymbol{3} u$, also, and $\boldsymbol{\xi} \hat{u}$, and the diphthongs in which $u$ is contained, are changed into $i$; hence aundidam from undny (caus. of und, "to make wet," compare Latin undu), âuninam from $\hat{u}$, class ten, "to abate." It was first from these formations, and the analogous forms of desideratives, that I perceived that the weight of the $u$ is borne less readily by the language than that of the $i$; for otherwise it would not be replaced by $i$ in syllables, where the whole attention of the language is directed to make them as light as possible. But in the whole of Sanskrit Grammar no other case exists where $u$, to lighten the syllabic weight, becomes $i$ : for while in roots beginming with a consonant desideratives in the syllable of reduplication weaken a radical $a$ to $i$ (e.g. pipatissh from pat, " to cleave"), $u$ rem:ins unaltered (ynyuts, from yudh, "to fight,"), which serves as a proof that $u$ is lighter than $a$, because, were it heavier than $a$, it would have a better right to be changed into $i$.
585. In roots which end with two consonants, of which the first is a liquid, this is rejected, in order the more to relieve the weight in the base syllable, but it is retained in the syllable of repetition; hence above (§. 584.), [G. Ed. p. 828.] aundidam for Aundundam; so, also, ârijiam for Arjarjam, from arj, class ten, "to carn." According to this principle, in Latin also, pungo, if encumbered by reduplication, loses its nasal; thus, pupugi, not pupungi. The loss of the nasal in tetigi, tuludi, surprises us less, because in these verbs it in general belongs less strictly to the root, and is dropped also in the supine and analogous formations. But if, in Sanskrit, the first of two final consonants is a mute, and the second a sibilant, then the syllable of repetition receives only the first of the two consonants, and the base syllable retains them both; as from ikshay (causal of $i k s h$, "to see"), comes dichiks:iam, for

Aikiksham or aikshiksham.* This principle is followed by the Greek $\alpha^{\prime} \hat{\lambda} \alpha \lambda \kappa o \nu$, for which, according to the principle of the above-mentioned $\hat{a} u n d i d a m, \not{ }^{\prime} \lambda \kappa \alpha к о \nu$, or, with the augment, $\ddot{\eta}^{\lambda} \lambda \kappa \alpha \kappa$ would be used.
586. In the few verbal bases which, exclusive of the causative affix ay, contain more than one syllable, the Sanskrit receives, in the syllable of repetition, only as much as can be contained in one syllable; as from avadhirr, class ten, "to despise," $\dagger$ comes $a c$-avadhîram. The Greek follows the same principle in forms like $\dot{\alpha} \lambda-\bar{\eta}^{\prime} \lambda \iota \phi \alpha, \dot{\alpha} \gamma-\eta \quad \gamma \epsilon \rho \kappa \alpha,{ }_{o} \rho-\omega_{\rho} \rho v \chi \alpha$.
587. The Zend supplies us with an excellent aorist-form of the seventh formation, which has been already several times mentioned, and which was first brought to light by
 §. 469.), from the root rudh, "to grow," which, in the Sanskrit हहृ ruh, has preserved of the $d h$ only the aspiration. With
[G. Ed. p. 829.] respect to the length of the syllable of reduplication this form answers to those in Sanskrit like
 rudusha is regarded above (§.518.) as the representative of the $a$ of the augment, through the assimilating influence of the $\hat{u}$ of the following syllable. But it now appears to me more correct to recognise, in the initial vowel of the form spoken of, only the original accompaniment of the augment, which has been dropped, and that, therefore, from arûrudhusha, by the retro-active influence of the $\hat{\imath}$ of the second syllable, next arose aurûrudhusha, as, in §. 46., I have endeavored to derive ינטגלוצני haurva from the Sanskrit sarva, through the euphonic influence of the $v$; and as the base word $\hat{\text { atharvan, "priest," in the weak }}$ cases, in which the final syllable van is contracted to un, adds,

[^200]through the influence of the $u$ of this syllable, a $u$ to the preceding $a$, thus athrurun,* from which, by dislodging the $a$, is formed the more common athurun, $\dagger$ as for [G.Ed.p.830] the Sanskrit taruna, "young," we find in Zend both tauruna and turuna. The $u$ of the penultimate of $u$ rilurudh-u-sha corresponds to the conjunctive vowel $a$ of Sanskrit forms like achuchur-a-s, achichur-a-thus, and may have proceeded from a by an assimilating influence of the $u$ of the preceding syllable. If the older $a$ had been retained, we should then find (according to §. $56^{6}$.), ururudhanha.

## THE PERFECT.

588. It has been already remarked, that that Sanskrit preterite which agrees in form with the Greek perfect is, according to its signification, not a perfect, but is most frequently used in the sense of the Greek aorist (\$. 513.).
[^201]Our German unparaphrased preterite, which, in its origin, coincides with the Greek perfect and Sanskrit reduplicated preterite, has likewise renounced the perfect meaning, but in Gothic represents both the Greek imperfect and the aorist, as well as the perfect, and, in the earliest Old High German authorities, besides these tenses, the pluperfect. In the ninth, and, as Grimm remarks, perhaps so early as the eighth century, begin the circumlocutory forms of the perfect by the passive participle with the auxiliary verb haben, and, in neuter verbs, with the verb substantive, in which respect we must advert to the practice of the Sanskrit language, in expressions like gatô'smi (for gutas asmi), "ich bin geyangen," "I am having gone" (see §. 513.); as also to the circumstance, that, in the forms in तबत् tavat (tavant), the idea of possession is contained, and that uktavân asw،ı, "dixi," properly means, "I am gifted with having said" (therefore "having said") (see §. 513.).
[G. Ed. p. 831.] The Old High German uses, beside the verb corresponding to our haben, also eigan, which has the same import, for its paraphrase of the perfect; in the indicative, only in the plural; but, in the subjunctive, in the singular also (sec Grimm, IV. 149).
589. As regards the formation of the German unparaphrased preterite, the Gothic has, in the strong conjugation, under certain circumstances, regularly priserved the reduplication, which, from the earliest period, belongs to this tense; viz. first, in all verbs (their number is, it must be allowed, but small) which have a long vowel in the root (not, perhaps, merely in consequence of a Guna in the present, and the forms thereto belonging); secondly, in those verbs which exhibit unchanged, in the present, an $a$ long by position; as, from the roots slêp, "to sleep," $v 0$, " to blow" (Sanskṛit vâ), hait, "to be called," auk," to increase," fald, "to fold" (present fulda), the first and third person singular are saizlêp, vaivó, haihuit, aiauk,
faifalth (for faifald, see §. $93^{\text {an }}$.) The form saizletp (regarding $z$ for $s$, see $\S .86$. (5.)) stands so far isolated, as all other verbs, which exhibit an $\hat{e}$ in the present, replace this in the preterite by $\delta$. They are the following: tedka, "I touch," taitok, "I touched"; grêta, "I weep" (Sanskrit krand, "to weep"), gaigrôt, "I wept"; lêta, "I leave," lailot "I left"; flekka, "I lament" (Latin plango), faiftok, "I lamented"; rêdu, "I advise," rairoth, "I advised." This change of the vowel cannot surprise us, as $\hat{e}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ are the common representatives of the original long a (see §. 69.), as, in Greek, $\varepsilon$ and o are the usual representatives of the short $\alpha$ : taitok, therefore, has the same relation to têka, that, in Greek, $\tau \in ́ t \rho o \phi \alpha$ has to $\tau \rho \in ́ \phi \phi \omega$, $\lambda$ énour̃ to
 to $\dot{\rho} \eta{ }^{\eta} \gamma v \mu \mu$; for in Greek, too, $\eta$ and $\omega$ are representatives of the long $\alpha$. I believe that the reason of this exchange of vowels in both languages is to be found in [G. Ed. p. 832.] this, that the quality of $O$ is heavier than that of $E$, and that the tense under discussion, on account of its being encumbered with reduplication, feels a necessity to appear heavier in its root than the unencumbered present; as also, in Gothic, the reduplication has in general maintained itself only in roots of strong build.*
 from the root vahs, with the character of the Sanskrit fourth class (see $\S .109^{\text {a }} .2$.), and standa, "I stand," are the only verbs which, notwithstanding that they exhibit in the present an $a$ long by position, have nevertheless permitted the reduplication to disappear. They form, in the first and third person singular preterite vôhs, stoth. The dropping of the class syllable $y a$ of vahsya is regular, as this syllable belongs only to the special tenses (see §. $109^{\circ}$.).

[^202]In this respect, therefore, vôhs has the same relation to vahsya, that, in Sanskrit, nanấśa has to naśyîmi, "I go to ruin"; and the $\sigma$ of vôhs and stoth corresponds as the regular long vowel of the $a$ (see §.69.) to the Sanskrit $\boldsymbol{a}$ of forms like nanâsáa. While the Old High German contrasts with its present stantu a preterite stuont (see §. 109 ${ }^{\text {b }}$. 1. p. 112) stôth, which has abandoned the inorganic nasal of standa, presents, moreover, the irregularity that the $t h$, which, according to $\S .93^{3}$., has assumed the place of the $d$, is preserved also in the terminations which are annexed; thus, first person plural, sthothum for stôdum, as the analogy of bauth, budum, from the root bud, would lead us to expect.
591. The difficulty that, in Gothic, there are two verbs
[G. Ed. p. 833.] with a radical $a$ in the present, which, in spite of their length by position, have nevertheless lost the reduplication of the preterite, is again, in a certain degree, obviated by the existence of two preterites, which have preserved the reduplication without their vowels being long naturally or by position; viz. kaihah, "I hanged," faifah, " I seized" (present haha, faha). But if it is considered that these verbs, in the other German dialects, have really length by position, and probably originally had it in Gothic also, the violation of the proposition expressed above, that the reduplication is borne in Gothic only by roots with long syllables, appears, through this consideration, less important.*

[^203]592. J. Grimm first acutely remarked, that the other German dialects, in those classes of verbs which in Gothic clearly exhibit the reduplication, continue it in like manner, although scarcely perceptibly. The syllables of reduplication lose the appearance of a syllable of redupli- [G. Ed. p. 834.] cation, when the following syllable is either quite passed over, or only loses its consonant, and unites its vowel with that of the syllable of reduplication. The former is the case in some Sanskrit desiderative forms, as lips, pits (Lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §. 490.), for which, according to rule, we should have lilaps, pipats;* wherefore it appears to me far more proper to assume the suppression of the second syllable, than that of reduplication, together with the change of $a$ into $i$, for which no reason at all could exist, because the form would have been already sufficiently weakened by the suppression of the syllable of reduplication. A simple consonant is suppressed in the Greek $\gamma^{\prime} \nu{ }^{\prime} \mu \alpha \iota$ from $\gamma^{i}-\gamma v o \mu \alpha \iota$, which is, however, itself an abbreviation of $\gamma \iota \gamma^{\prime}$ évo $^{\prime} \alpha_{\iota}$ : moreover, in the Sanskrit aorist, anếam (=anaiśam) from ananiśam, and, in the Latin perfects analogous with it, as cêpi (see §. 548.): finally, in the Old High German preterites, as hialt (our hielt) from hihalt, for which, in Gothic, haihald.
593. It must, perhaps, be regarded as a dialectic peculiarity in Gothic, that the syllable of reduplication has always ai. It was the custom, perhaps, at the time when all Ger-

[^204]man languages were still one, that the heaviest vowel, $a$, was weakened in the syllable of repetition to the lightest, $i$, as is the case in Sanskrit in the syllable of repetition of desideratives, where, e.g., from dah, "to burn," comes didhakssh, not dadhaksh; and as in Latin reduplicated forms like cecini, the $a$ in the syllable of repetition becomes $e$, and in the base $i$, while a radical $o$ and $u$ in both places remain unchanged (momordi, tutudi). For the diphthong ai, e.g., of HAIT, "to be called," $i$ would be, in the syllable of repe[G. Ed. p. 835.] tition, quite as much in its place; for, in Sanskrit, only the last element of the diphthong $₹ e \hat{e}(=a+i)$, and of diphthongs generally enters the syllable of reduplication; wherefore, e.g., the reduplicated preterite of kêt ( $=k a i t$ ), " to invite," is chikêta (first and third person singular). If an infringement of the law for the mutation of sounds, by preserving the old tenuis in the final sound (as in slêp $a=$ सfपfि swapimi, "I sleep"), be assumed, it might be said that the Gothic HAIT would correspond to this Sanskrit kêt, and therefore haihait (for hihait) to the above-mentioned चिकेत chikêta. But though au also is, in Gothic syllables of reduplication, represented by $a i$, as $a i-a u k$, "I increased," while, in Sanskrit, $\hat{o}(=a+u)$ becomes $u$, as, puprôtha, from prôth, "to satisfy;" still the $i$ of this ai may be regarded as a weakening of $u$, as we have seen above, in Sanskrit, the reduplicated aorist âundidam for aundudam proceed from उन्द्र und (§. 584.). We might also regard the $i$ of ai-auk as a weakening of the $a$ of the base-syllable, which, however, appears to me less probable, as in diphthongs the second element always has the etymological preponderance, and the first is a mere phonetic prefix; on which account I prefer recognising in the syllable of repetition of the Latin cecîdi, of cado (=caido), the second element of the diphthong $a$, rather than the first, although $a$ in the Latin syllables of repetition is regularly replaced by $e$. Be this, however, as it may, I consider this as certain,
that the ai in Gothic syllables of reduplication was formerly a simple $i$, and that this $a i$ is a dialectic peculiarity limited to the Gothic, like that which, according to §. 82., the Gothic employs instead of a simple $i$ before $h$ and $r$; which latter, in the other dialects also, is alone represented. We miss, therefore, in the Old High German hialt for Gothic haihald (from hihald), only the $l /$ of the second syllable; and in the Old Northern id̂k, "I" or "he increased," nothing is wanting of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 836.] $a i-a u k$, as far as the latter is an inorganic extension of $i$-auk; but au has, according to the Sanskrit principle, been contracted to $\hat{\delta}$, while in the participle passive aukinn it has remained open, and in the present, by a doubled Umlaut,* become ey.
594. The Old Northern reduplicated preterites of verbs with a radical $a$ (Grimm's first conjugation) appear to me to stand upon a different footing from the Gothic like hai-hald, in so far as the latter have weakened the $a$ in the syllable of repetition to $i$, and have prefixed to it an $a$, while the former (the Old Northern), quite in accordance with the Sanskrit principle, have left the $a$ of the syllable of reduplication unaltered and without addition, but, on the other hand (like the Latin perfects tetigi, cecini), have weakened the $a$ of the base to $i$, and, in agreement with the Sanskrit law of sound, have contracted the latter with the $a$ of the syllable of repetition to $e^{\text {. }}$ In this way only, in my opinion, can we explain it, that as, in Old Northern, from the root HALD, "to hold," (whence the present is, by the Umlaut, held, and the participle passive haldinn), comes the preterite hêlt (the tenuis for the medial at the end of the word, as in Middle High German, see §. $93^{\mathrm{a}}$.), plural hêldum; therefore hêlt from hahilt for hahalt, as the reverse case of the Old High German hi-alt from hihalt for hahalt. So also in roots with a long $\hat{A}$, for

[^205]which the Gothic uses e (§. 69.); e.g. from $G R \bar{A} T$, "to weep," and BLASS, "to blow," come grêt, bles, as the contraction of $g r a(g r) i t, b l a(b l) i s, *$ in contradistinction to the Old High German blias (blies) from bliblas. The Old Saxon stands on the same ground as the Old Northern; hence, from fallu,
[G. Ed. p.837.] "I fall," fell, "I fell," from fafill; and from slâpu. "I sleep," slêp, "I slept," from slâslip; just as, in Sanskrit, plurals like nểmima, from nanimima, correspond to singulars like nanâma, "I bent myself," of which more hereafter.
595. Verbs which, in Gothic, have the diphthoug ai as the radical vowel, lay aside, in Old High German, in the basesyllable, the last element of the said diphthong, and retain only the first, either unaltered, or corrupted to $e$, which, indeed, happens in most of the received authorities; hence, to the Gothic preterite haihait, "I was called," in Otfrid hiaz (for hihaz from hihaiz), in the other authorities quoted by Graff, hiez, corresponds; which latter, in respect to its $e$, answers better to the present heizu ( = Gothic haita), where, however, the $i e$ is not yet to be regarded as one sound ( $=\hat{\imath}$ ), as in our New German hiess. Of the Gothic diphthong au, we find, according as authorities vary, either the first or the second element preserved, and the former, indeed, either unaltered or changed to $e$, and also the latter either unchanged or corrupted to o (see §.77.); e.g. from hlaupa comes, in Gothic, the preterite haihlaup (see §. 598.), for which, in Old High German, we find in Graff the forms liaf (from lilaf for hlihlauf), lief, liuf, liof.
596. In Sanskrit the syllable of reduplication always has the radical vowel, only shortened, if long; and, as has been already remarked, of diphthongs only the last ele-

[^206]ment (see §.593); hence, babandh,* from bandh, "to bind "; babhas, from bhas, "to shine"; bibhid, from bhid, "to cleave"; didip, from di$p$, " to shine"; tutud, from tud, "to beat, push"; pupar, from pur, "to fill." If for the vowel $r i$ the syllable of reduplication receives an $a$, this proceeds from the primitive form ar; e.g.mamarda, [G. Ed. p. 838.] "I and he crushed," $\dagger$ comes not from mrid, but from marl, which in the dual and plural is contracted to mrid; hence first person plural mamridima. Roots which begin with vowels we have already discussed (see §. 534.); only this may be here further mentioned, that roots which begin with $a$ and end with two consonants proceed in a very peculiar and remarkable way, since they first contract the vowel of repetition with that of the root to a long $a$, then add an euphonic $n$, and then annex the whole root a second time, so that thus the radical vowel occurs three times; as, $\hat{a}-n-u n j$, from aa-n-anj, from anj, "to anoint" (Latin ungo).
597. The Greek pays no regard, in its syllables of reduplication in roots beginning with a vowel, to the vowel of the base, but always replaces it by $\epsilon$, which the Latin does in its perfects (which are reduplicated and carried back to the Sanskrit seventh aorist formation), only in the case, in which the root exhibits the heaviest of all vowels, viz. $a$, which appears too heavy for the syllable of reduplication, as, in Sanskrit, it is found inadmissible in the syllables of reduplication of desideratives, and is replaced by the lightest vowel, $i$. Thus in Greek the perfect $\tau$ ét $\alpha \phi \alpha$ corresponds to the Sanskrit tatapa or tatâpa, "I burned," just as tétupa to the Sanskrit tutôpa (pl. tutupima=тєтט́qкцev) "I beat,

[^207]wounded, slew," $\pi є \phi i \lambda \eta \kappa \alpha^{*}$ to the Sanskrit pipraya or pipraya, from prî, "to rejoice, to love" (compare the Gothic
[G. Ed. p. 839.] friyd, " $I$ love"). It is certain, that originally the Greek, also, must, in the syllable of reduplication, have had regard to the radical vowel; that, however, in the course of time, all vowels in this place were weakened to $\varepsilon$, as is the case in New German in the final syllables of polysyllabic words; as, e.g., we contrast binde, salbe, gaben, with the Gothic linda, sallod, gabum, and Güste, Güsten, with the Gothic gasteis, gastim. A similar weakness or vitiation to that which has overtaken our final syllables might easily have befallen a Greek initial syllable not belonging to the base itself.
598. As regards the laws to which the consonants in the syllables of reduplication are subjected, the Sanskrit replaces the gutturals by corresponding palatals, and, in agreement with the Greek, the aspirated consonants by corresponding non-aspirates; e.g. chakals, from kuss," to give light"; $\dagger$ jagam, from gam," to go"; dadha, from dha, "to set, lay"; as, in Greek, $\tau \in \theta \eta$, from the corresponding root $\Theta H$. Of two consonants combined in the initial sound in Sanskrit, the first is usually repeated; hence chakrand, from krand, "to weep"; chikship, from ksship, "to cast." The Gothic follows the same principle, if the second of the combined consonants is a liquid; hence gaigrôt, "I wept," corresponds to the Sanskrit word of the same import, chakrunda; and saizlep (see §. 86.(5.)), "I slept," to the Sanskrit sushuequa. $\ddagger$ We might hence infer that the preterite

[^208]which nowhere occurs, of hlaupa is haihlaup, not hlaihlaup. But if, in Gothic, the second of the combined consonants is a mute, this finds its way into the syllable [G. Ed. p. 840.] of reduplication also; hence skaiskaith, "I separated," the third person plural of which, skaiskaidun, occurs in Luke ix. 33: hence might be deduced, also, staitaut, from STAUT. The other German dialects have, unrestrictedly, left two combined consonants together in the syllable of repetition; hence, in Old High German, sliaf, "I slept," spialt, "I cleft," from slislaf, spispalt; unless in the second syllable one of the two consonants would be rejected, as in the Latin spopondi, steti, for spospondi, stesti. But the Gothic skaiskaith speaks against the latter.
599. It remains to be remarked, with respect to the Sanskrit syllables of reduplication, that if a root begins with a sibilant before a mute, the syllable of repetition, according to the general law, does not contain the first consonant but the second, respect being had to the rules of sound before mentioned; c.g. from sthâ comes tasthau, "I, he stood;" from spriś (sparś); pasparśa, "I or he touched," in opposition to the Latin steti, spopondi. The Zend, closely as it is allied to the Sanskrit, does not recognise this rule. I cannot, indeed, quote the perfect of curers sta, nor any other perfect of roots with an initial sibilant before a mute, but as sthd in Sanskrit has a syllable of reduplication in the special tenses also, and forms, in the present, tiṣlthami, we see, from the Zend sfurrerser listâmi, that the law of reduplication under disclission, at the time of the identity of the Zend with the Sanskrit, was not yet in force, or at least not in its full extent. Of the Latin it deserves further to be remarked, that in its sisto, which is properly the counterpart of the Sanskrit tisshthami, Gr. í $\sigma \eta \mu \mu$, and Zend histami (see §. 508.), it follows the general law for syllables of reduplication, while analogously with steti a present stito might have been expected.
[G. Ed. p.841.] 600. With respect to the Greek, as soon as we recognise in the $i$ of $i \sigma \tau \eta \mu \mu$, as in the Zend $h i$ of $h i s t a m i$, a syllable of reduplication, to which we are compelled, by its analogy with $\delta i \delta \omega \omega \mu, \tau_{i} \theta \eta \mu \mu, \beta_{i}^{\prime} \beta \eta \mu, \& c$., and by the circumstance that $\sigma$ in the initial sound is easily weakened to the rough breathing, we must allow, that in the perfect $\epsilon_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$, also, the rough breathing stands for $\sigma$, and that, therefore, we have in this form a more perfect syllable of reduplication than is usually the case in roots which have in the initial sound a heavier consonant combination than that of a mute before a liquid. We cannot place é $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha$ on the same footing with $\epsilon^{i \mu} \mu \rho \tau \alpha t$, which we would suffer to rest on itself; for the latter has just as much right to the rough breathing as the Latin sisto to its $s$ : and when Buttman says (Gr. §. 83. Rem. 6.), "The often-occurring $\dot{\alpha} \phi e ́ \sigma \tau \alpha \lambda_{\kappa} \alpha$ (presupposing é $\sigma \tau \alpha \lambda \kappa \alpha$ ) in the Milesian inscription given by Chisbull, p. 67, furnishes a proof that the rough breathing instead of the reduplication of the perfect went further in the old dialects than the two cases to be met with in the current language ( $\left.{ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \alpha, \epsilon^{\prime \prime} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha<\right)$ )" it is important to observe, that here, also, the root begins with $\sigma$, which has been preserved in the syllable of repetition as the rough breathing. In ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \tau \neq \eta \kappa \alpha$ this phenomenon has been preserved in the language as commonly used, because, in my opinion, the analogy of the present and imperfect has protected the breathing which belongs to the reduplication of the perfect.
601. Moreover, if, in other consonantal combinations than that of mute before a liquid, the syllable of repetition has usually dropped the consonant to be repeated, this clearly happened because a greater weight of sound in the base syllable rendered a lightening of the syllable of repetition desirable;
 and similar forms the coincidence of the initial syllable with
[G. Ed. p. 842.] the augment is only casual; and if in the $\epsilon$ a remuant of a syllable of reduplication is recognised, we are
not thereby compelled to explain the e of ${ }^{\prime} \psi \alpha \lambda \lambda o v$, é $\phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho o \nu$ also, as the syllable of reduplication, since in the imperfect and aorist (and this appears from the Sanskrit) a simple vowel, independent of the root, has just as much a primitive foundation, as in the perfect, in roots beginning with a consonant, a syllable beginning with the radical consonant or its representative has. It cannot, however, be denied, that in some cases, through an error in the use of language, the example of the augmented preterites has operated on the perfect. It may
 as that of $\epsilon^{\prime} \alpha \xi \alpha$,* ${ }^{*}$ éo $\rho o u v$ : but it also admits of being regarded in the perfect as the reduplication, since $\epsilon$ and $o$ are originally identical with $\alpha$, and have proceeded from it by corruption (see §. 3.); and since both $\alpha$ and o easily become
 G. ed.) is, according to its origin, identical with the $\alpha$ of
 vrika), is only a weakening of the o concluding the base-word, and corrupted from the older $\alpha$ (see §. 204.).
602. To pass over, then, to the alterations, to which the radical vowel in the Sanskrit reduplicated preterite is subjected, we will consider first the roots with $a$. This is lengthened before a simple consonant in the third person singular active, and at pleasure, also, in the first; hence, from char, "to go," to which the Gothic root FAR, "to wander," corresponds, come chachâra or chachara, "I went," chachdra, "he went. This analogy is [G. Ed. p. 843.] followed by those Gothic verbs which have preserved a radical $a$ before simple consonants in the present, but replace it in the preterite with $\delta$; as fara, the preterite of which, for, in respect to its vowel, corresponds as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit châr of chachâra, for $\hat{o}$ is, in Gothic,

[^209]the regular representative of the long $\lambda$, and takes the place of the short $a$, where the latter is to be lengthened, as, vice vers $\hat{a}, \hat{d}$, in case of abbreviation, becomes $a$; on which account feminine bases in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ (=Sanskritit $\hat{a}$ ) exhibit in the uninflected nominative an $a$, since long vowels at the end of a word are the easiest subjected to abbreviation (see §. 137.). The relation, therefore, of for to fara is based originally not on an alteration of quality, but only on that of quantity; and the vowel difference has here just as little influence in the designation of the relation of time, as, in the noun, on that of the case-relation. As, however, in fôr the true expression of past time, viz. the reduplication, has disappeared, and for stands for faifor, the function performed by the difference of the vowel of the root, in common with that of the personal terminations (or of the absence of terminations, as in fir as first and third person singular), is, for the practical use of language, the designation of time. Thus, in our German subjunctive preterite in the plural, the Umlaut is the only sign by which we recognise the relation of mood, and which, therefore, is to be held as the exponent of the modal relation, since the true expression of the same, viz. the vowel e (e.g. of wären, wäret), which was formerly an $\hat{\imath}$ (Old High German wârîmês, $w \hat{a} r \hat{\imath} t$ ), and, as such, has produced the Umlaut by its assimilative power, is no longer, in its corrupted form, distinguishable from the termination of the indicative.
[G. Ed. p. 844.] 603. The Gothic fôr is distinguished from the Sanskṛit châr of chachâra by this, that it retains its long vowel through all persons and numbers, while in Sanskrit it is necessary only in the third person singular, and is found or not, at will, in the first person singular. To the Gothic, however, the Greek second perfect corresponds in the case where a radical $\breve{\alpha}$ is lengthened to $\bar{\alpha}$, or its representative, $\eta$. The relation of $\kappa \rho \alpha ́ \zeta \omega$ ( $\epsilon \kappa \rho \rho \check{\alpha} \gamma \circ \nu)$ to $\kappa \in ́ \kappa \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \alpha$, of $\theta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega$ ( $\theta$ 人̆ $\lambda \hat{\omega}$ ) to $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \theta \eta \lambda \alpha$, corresponds exactly to the relation of the Sanskrit charûmi and Gothic fara to chachara, fôr. In Greek verbs which have changed a radical $\alpha$, in the present, to $\epsilon$, the change of
this $\varepsilon$ into the heavier $o$ is substitute for the lengthening (see §. 589.).
604. In roots which end with two consonants the lengthening of the $a$ to $\hat{a}$ is, in Sanskrit, quite omitted, and so, in Gothic, that of $a$ to $\boldsymbol{d}$; as, in Sanskrit, mamantha, "I or he shook," mamanthima, "we shook," from manth; so, in Gothic, vaivald, "I or he ruled," vaivaldum, "we ruled," from vald. Those Gothic verbs which weaken, in the present, a radical $a$ before a double consonant to $i$ (see p. 116 G . ed.), replace the same in the plural numbers of the preterite, and in the whole subjunctive preterite, by $u$; hence, BAND, " to bind" (from which the present binda), forms in the singular of the preterite band, bans-t (see §. 102.), band, answering to the Sanskrit babandha, babandh-i-tha, babandha: in the second person dual, however, bund-u-ts for Sanskrit baband-a-$-t h u s$; and in the plural, bund-u-m, bund $-u-t$, bund- $u-n$, for Sanskrit babandh-i-ma, babandh-a-(tha), babandh-us. The subjunctive is bundyau, \&c. The Old High German, which has for its termination in the second person singular instead of the Gothic $t$ an $i$, which, in my opinion, corresponds to the Sanskrit conjunctive vowel $i$, exhibits, before this $i$, also the alteration of the $a$ to $u$; hence, in the first and third person singular bant corresponding to the Sanskrit babandha and Gothic band; but in the second person [G. Ed. p. 845.] bunt-i, answering to the Sanskrit babandh-i-tha and Gothic bans-t. Hence we perceive that the change of the $a$ into $u$ depends on the extent of the word, since only the monosyllabic forms have preserved the original $a$. We perceive further, that the weight of the $u$ appears to the German idioms lighter than that of the $a$, otherwise the $u$ would not relieve the $a$ in the same way as we saw above $a i$ and $a u$ replaced by $i$ in the polysyllabic forms, or before heavy terminations (see p. 707 G . ed.); and as, in Latin, the $a$ of calco and salsus, under the encumbrance of a preceding preposition, is represented by $u$ (conculco, insulsus).
605. Where, in Gothic, a radical $a$ is weakened before simple consonants, in the present, to $i$, but retained in the singular of the preterite, we find instead of it, in both the plural numbers and in the whole subjunctive preterite, in all the polysyllabic past forms, therefore, an ê, and for that in the Old and Middle High German an $\hat{a}$, which here, however, occurs as soon as in the second person singular indicative, because it is polysyllabic: in Middle High German, however, it is changed to $a$. The present of the root $L A S$, "to read," is, in Gothic, lisa, in Old High German lisu, in Middle High German lise ; the preterite in Gothic is las, las-t, las, lésum, lésut, lêsun; subjunctive lêsyau, \&c.: in Old High German las, lassi, las, lâsumés, lasut, lâsun; subjunctive lâsi, \&c. : in Middle High German las, lase, las, lảsen, laset, lasen; subjunctive lase. This phenomenon stands in contradiction to all other strong verbs, because here the polysyllabic forms have a heavier vowel than the monosyllabic; but the reverse naturally appears everywhere else. Even in the Sanskrit we find this apparent contradiction to the law of gravity, and the surprising, although, perhaps, accidental, coincidence with the Gothic, that in both languages in similar places-
[G. Ed. p. 846.] viz. before the heavy terminations of the dual and plural-a radical $a$ is changed into $\hat{\ell}$, in both languages only in roots which terminate in a simple consonant; to which is further added, in Sauskrit, the limitation, that the initial consonant, also, must as a rule be simple, and cannot be $v$ or the like, which, in the syllable of repetition, according to $\S .598$., experiences a change. The syllable of repetition, however, is suppressed in the cases in which the $a$ is changed into e. This is the practical view of the rule, which we shall subsequently endeavour to elucidate theoretically. Let the root tan, "to extend," serve as example.

## ACTIVE.


têế for tatanê, tênivahe for tatanivalê, tênimahê for tatanimahe. tênishlê for tataniṣhé, tênâthê for tatanâthê, tênidhwể for tatanidhwe tênế for tatanê,

It appears, therefore, from this paradigm, that the form ten used for tatan, though far the most common, is adopted only before heavy terminations, or in such persons as, in their full form, would appear to consist of four syllables; for although, in the second person plural, têna stands for tatana, and in the third person plural, ternus for tatanus, still $u s$ in this place is an abbreviation of anti (compare §. 462.), and $a$ is clearly only the remnant of an original termination atha: the $a$ of têna, for tên-a-tha, corresponds [G. Ed. p. 847.] merely to the conjunctive vowel of the Greek $\tau \in \tau \cup \phi-\alpha-\tau \epsilon$ and of the Gothic vaivald-u-th, fôr-u-th, lés-u-th.* The reason of

[^210]the abbreviation is clearly apparent in the second person singular; for if here the termination tha is joined directly to the root, the full reduplication remains; but if the number of syllables is increased by a conjunctive vowel, thez $t e n$ is used for tatan; thus tênitha (from tatanitha) answering to tatantha. I recognise, as has been already observed (see §. 548.), in forms like tén a concealed reduplication; thus tên from tatin (as in Latin cecini for cacani), and this from tatan, whence, by rejecting the second $t, \tan$ (for $t a-a n$ ) may have been formed, and so, in earlier times, have been used for $t e n$; and I think that the Gothic $\hat{e}$, in forms like lessum, is not found there because the Sanskrit, in analogous forms, has an é but for this reason, that the Sanskrit $\hat{e}$ was formerly an $a$, but the Gothic $\hat{e}$ represents the $\hat{a}$ (§. 69.). The Old High German has preserved the original sound, and exhibits lâsumês (from lalasumês), which, in contrast with the Gothic lésumes, appears like a Doric form [G. E.. p. 848.] contrasted with an Ionic one.* While, in the second person singular, the Gothic las-t, on account of its monosyllabic nature, is based on Sanskrit forms like tatantha, the Old High German lasi answers to the contracted form ted nitha. It must be assumed that the Gothic lus, last, was formerly tailas, lailast; and then, too, the plural lesum stood in the proper relation to lailas (lalas), i.e. in the relation of the weaker to the stronger radical form. We give, for a complete general view of the analogies existing between the Sanskrit and the German in the case before us, the
expressing the idea " who?" by kus, while the Sanskrit kus, according to fixed laws of sound, becomes at one time $k u k$, at another $h \hat{\delta}$, at another $k a$, and appears in its original form only before $t$ and $t h$.

* Regarding the Latin forms like cépi, see $\oint_{\text {. } 548 \text {. It may be here }}$ further remarked, that Ag. Benary, also (Doctrine of Latin Sounds, p. 276, \&c.), traces back the Latin perfect in all its formations to the Sanskrit aorist.
reduplicated preterite of सद् sad, " to sit," " to place oncself," corrcsponding to the Gothic sat and Old High German suz, "I sate," connected with it in form and sense.

| sanskipit. | SINGULAR. gothic. | old high german. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sasad-a or sasad-a, | (sai)sat, | (si)saz. |
| sasat-tha or sed-i-tha, | (sai)sas-t, | sâz-i-" |
| sasâd-a, | (sai)sat, | (si)saz. |
|  | DUAL. |  |
| sêd-i-va, | sêtû? (see §. 441.) | ... |
| séd-a-thus, | sft-u-ts | -•• |
| sêd-a-tus | -••• | -•• |
|  | Plural. |  |
| séd-i-ma, | sêt-u-m, | sâz-u-mês. |
| sêd-a-', | sêt-u-th, | st̂z-u-t. |
| sêd-us, | sêt-u-n, | silz-u-n. |

"Remark 1.-That in the example here [G. Ed. p. 849.] given, as generally in Grimm's tenth, eleventh, and twelfth conjugations, the $a$ of the preterite is the real radical vowelthat in the present it is weakened to $i$, and that the $i$ of the present has not, vice vers $\hat{\text {, been strengthened in the preterite }}$ to $a$-I infer, not only because the Sanskrit, where it admits of comparison, everywhere exhibits $a$ as the unmistakeable radical vowel, but especially from the circumstance that the Gothic causal verb, where any such corresponds to the primitive verb, everywhere uses the $a$ in the present even, while the primitive verb has it merely in the preterite; for instance, from $S A T$, "to sit," comes the causal salya, " I set"=Sanskrit sâdayîmi. If it were merely the object of the language to gain in the causal a vowel connected with the primitive verb, but strengthened, then if

SIT were the root, from it would perlaps have proceeded seitya ( $=s^{1} 1$ ya) or saitya; and in reality the verbs, to which I ascribe $i$ as the radical vowel, exhibit, in the causal, $a i$, as those with a radical $u$ employ the diphthong $a u$; in exact agreement with the Sanskrit, where $i$ and $u$ receive Guna in the causal i. e. prefix $a$. Thus in Gothic, from ur-RIS, 'to stand up,' (ur-reisn, ur-rais, ur-risum) comes ur-raisya, 'I raise up'; from DRUS, 'to fall' (driusa, draus, drusum), ga-drausya, 'I plunge'; as, in Sanskrit, from vid and budh, 'to know' vèdayami (=vaidayàmi), lddhayami (=baudhayâmi), 'I make to know.' The circumstance, that Sanskryit verbs with a radical a correspond to the Gothic sat, 'I sate,' band, 'I bound,' would not alone furnish any sufficient ground for assuming that the said and analogous Gothic verbs exhibit the root in the singular of the preterite; for it might certainly be allowed that binda proceeds from the Sanskrit bandh, sita from sad, and that an original a has here been corrupted to $i$; but it might still be maintained that the $a$ of the preterite band, sat, is not a transmission from the period of identity with the Sanskrit, but that it has been newly developed from the $i$ of the present, because the change of sound of $i$ to $a$ is the symbol of past time. I object to this view, however, first, because not only does sat answer to sasada or sasadda, but also the plural sêtum from sattum, Old High German sâzumes, to sedima from sadima (sa(s)adima), and it is impossible to consider this double and surprising coincidence as fortuitous; secondly, because, as has been above remarked, the causals too recognise the $a$ of the verbs under discussion as a radical vowel ; thirdly, because substantives also, like the German Band, Satz, which have nothing to do with the expression of past time, or any other temporal relation, conform
[G. Ed. p. 850.] to the vowel of the preterite; fourthly, because generally, in the whole Indo-European family of languages, no case occurs of grammatical relations being
expressed by the change of the radical vowel; fifthly, because the reduplication, which is the real expression of the past, is still clearly retained in Gothic, in the verbs mentioned above, and is therefore adequate ground for assuming that sat is an abbreviation of saisat, but that sêtum for satum is a contraction of sa(s)a-tum."
"Remark 2.-The Sanskrit roots which begin with a consonant which must be replaced by another cognate one, refrain from the contraction described above; for if the $g$ of the base syllable of jagam dropped out, and the two $a$ were melted down to $\hat{e}$, then jêm would assume an appearance too much estranged from the root; and this is certainly the reason why the contraction is avoided. It is omitted, also, in roots which begin with two consonants, and, indeed, for the same reason; for if, e.g., the st of the second syllable of tastan was dropped, the contracted form would be tên, in which the root stan would no longer be recognised. There are, however, a few exceptions from the restriction specified; as, babhaj from bhaj, 'to pay homage,' is always contracted to भेज् bhêj, as far as is yet known, though बेज् bêj might be expected; but the aspiration of the base-consonant, which has been dropped, has been carried back to the syllable of repetition, according to the principle of the above-mentioned धिষ्ष dhikṣh for didhaksh, from dah, 'to burn' (see §. 593.). It is more difficult to account for the fact of some roots, which begin with two consonants having permitted themselves to be contracted, and having retained both consonants in the syllable of repetition, since, e.g., to the reduplicated perfecttheme tatras a contracted form trés corresponds, while from tatras, by rejecting the $t r$ of the second syllable, should come tês. Either, then, in três the $r$, which is suppressed in the full reduplicated form (tatras for tratras), is again restored, in order to comply with the requirement that the form of the root be not too much disfigured, or
the forms like tres proceed from a period when the syllable of repetition still combined the two consonants, as in the Latin spopondi, steti, and in the Gothic skaiskaith; or, lastly, and this is most probable, forms like tres proceed from a period when the language had completely forgotten the ground of their origin in contraction, and when in forms [G. Ed.p. 851.] like sédima reduplication was. no longer perceived, but only the change of a radical $a$ into $\hat{\ell}$, and it was believed that the true exponent of the relation of time was therein recognised. Thus, in a measure, the Gothic frêhum, 'we asked' (Sanskrit paprichchhima, not prêchhima, from prachh, 'to ask'), was prepared by Sanskrit forms like trésima, 'we trembled,' bhrêmima, 'we wandered,' and some similar ones. The Sanskrit and German in this agree most admirably, that roots which end with two consonants have not permitted the contraction to make its way; certainly because, through their stronger structure, they had more power to bear the full reduplication (compare $\S .589$. .), which has at last disappeared in Gothic in those verbs with a radical $a$, which weaken that vowel, in the present, to $i$, so that band, bundum, correspond to the Sanskrit babandha, babandhima. To a Gothic present banda a preterite baiband would correspond."
606. It is not requisite to assume that forms like सेदिम sédima, "we sate," which has been compared above (p. 825) to the Gothic sêtum and Old High German sâzum, existed so early as the period of the unity of language. I rather hold the Sanskrit sédima and Gothic sêtum, besides being identical in their root, to be connected only iu this point, that they both, independently of each other, have, in consequence of a contraction, lost the semblance of a reduplicated form; that in both the $\hat{\varepsilon}$ stands for an older $\hat{a}$, which is preserved in the Old High German sdazumés; that the Sanskrit sêd for sîd has sprung from sasad, as the Gothic sett for sât from sasat, the latter natu-
rally at a time, when the syllable of repetition was still faithful to the radical syllable as regards the vowel. The contraction of polysyllabic forms into monosyllabic, by rejecting the consonant of the second syllable, or the consonant together with its vowel (as above in lips for lilaps, §. 592.), is so natural, that different languages may easily chance to coincide in this point; but such an omission might most easily occur in reduplicated forms, because [G. Ed. p. 853.] the expression of the same syllable twice running might be fatiguing, and therefore there would be a direct occasion for the suppression of the second syllable or its consonant. In verbs with a radical $a$ the occasion is the more urgent, because $a$ is the heaviest vowel, and hence there is the more reason to seek for a diminution in weight. Latin forms like cecini, tetigi (compared with such as tutudi, momordi), comply with the requirement to be weakened by reducing the $a$ to $i$ in the base-syllable, and to $e$ in the syllable of repetition, while perfects (aorists) like cêpi, féci, in their process of diminishing the weight, coincide with the Sanskṛit sêdima and Gothic sêtum, which does not prevent the assumption that each of the three languages has arrived at the contracted form in its own way, as the Persian em and English anz (=em), "I am," approach so closely, because they both, but quite independently of each other, have abbreviated the primitive form asmi in the same way, while in the third person the Persian and Latin est coincide, through a similar corruption of the old form asti; or as the Old High German fior, vior, stand in the same relation to the Gothic fidvor that the Latin quar of quar-tus does to the to-be-presupposed quatuor-tus. In conclusion, I shall further observe that the Gothic man, "I mean," though, according to form, a preterite, and based on the Sanskrit mamana or mamána,* still

[^211] however,
in the plural forms not mênum, after the analogy of mênima, but munum, which leads us to conjecture an older maimunum for mamunum, as bundum for baibundum, babundum. Simi[G. Ed. p. 853.] larly, skulum, " we should," not skêlum (singular skal). From mag, "I can," comes magum, without weakening the $a$ to $u$. In respect to this and similar verbs it may, however, be observed, that in the Sanskrit vêda, "I know," and Greek oî $\delta \alpha$ ( $=$ Gothic vait, see p. 711 G. ed.), the reduplication is lost, and perhaps, also, all German verbs, which associate the sense of the present with the terminations of the preterite, have never had reduplication, on which account there would be no reason to expect a mênum for manum from mamanum.
607. Verbs with a radical $i$ or $u$ before a simple final consonant have Guna, in Sanskrit, before the light terminations of the reduplicated preterite, and, therefore, only in the singular of the active. This Guna is the insertion of an $a$ before the radical vowel, just as in Gothic (Grimm's eighth and ninth conjugations). As, however, with the exception of the few verbs which belong to the Sanskrit fourth class (see §. $109^{\text {a }} .2$.), all strong verbs belong only to the Sanskrit first class, which, in the special tenses, has Guna pervading it; so also, in the German verbs with a radical $i$ and $u$, Guna must be looked for in the present and the moods dependent thereon. The Guna vowel $a$ has, however, in the present, been weakened to $i$, and is only retained as $a$ in the monosyllabic preterite singular. While, therefore, the Sanskrit root budh, cl. l, "toknow," forms, in the present, bôdhâmi, pl. bôdhâmas (=baudhâmi, baudhâmas), and, in the reduplicated preterite, bubod $h a(=b u b a u d h a)$, plural bubudhima, the corresponding Gothic root $B U D$ (" to offer," "to order,") forms, in the present, biuda," plural

[^212] Grimm's
biudam, and in the preterite bauth (see §. $93^{\text {a }}$.), plural budum. In verbs with a radical $i$ the Guna vowel [G. Ed. p. 854.] $i$ is melted down in German with the radical vowel to a long $i$, which, in Gothic, is written ei :* hence the Gothic root BIT, "to bite," forms, in the present, beita (=bitla, Old High German bizu), and in the singular of the preterite bait, plural bitum, answering to the Sanskrit bibheda (from bibhuida), "I and he cleft," bibhidima, "we cleft." In the present fिद् bhid, if it belonged to the first class, would form bheditim, to which the Gothic beita (from biita) has the same relation as above biuda to bddhâmi. The relation of the Gothic beita from biita to the Sanskrit bhedami from bhaïdami, is like that of the plural nominative fadei-s (from the base FADI) to the Sanskrit patay-as from pati, "lord," only that in patay-as the $\hat{e}=a+i$, is resolved into $a y$ on account of the following vowel.

608. We give here, once more, the Gothic bait, "I bit," and baug, " 1 bowed," over against the corresponding Sanskrit forms, but so that, varying from $\S .489$. and our usual method, we express the Sanskrit diphthongs $\mathbb{e} \hat{e}$ and $\begin{gathered}\text { wो } \\ \delta\end{gathered}$, according to their etymological value, by $a i$ and $a u$, in order

[^213]to make the really astonishing agreement of the two lan[G. Ed. p. 855.] guages more apparent. We also annex the Old High German, which replaces the Gothic diphthong ai by $e i$, and $a u$ by ou (before $T$ sounds, $s$ and $h$ by $\hat{\delta}$ ). In the Old High German it is especially important to remark, that it replaces by the pure vowel of the root the diphthong in the second person singular, on account of the dissyllabic form, which here corresponds to the Gothic monosyllabic one, as a clear proof that the vowel opposition between singular and plural depends on the extent of the word or the weight of the terminations, as we have already perceived by the opposition between $a$ in monosyllabic and the lighter $u$ in polysyllabic forms (bant, bunti, buntuinês, see §. 601.).
Sanskrit. Gothic. O.H Germ. Sanskrit. Gothic. O.H. Germ.

| поот. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhid, "to split," | $\begin{gathered} \text { bit, } \\ \text { "to bite," } \end{gathered}$ | bix, <br> "id." | bhuj, "to bend," | bug, "id." | buy, "id." |
| singular. |  |  |  |  |  |
| libhaid-a, | $b a i t$, | beiz. | bubhauj-a, | baug, | boug. |
| bibhaid-i-tha, | bais-t, ${ }^{1}$ | biz-i. | bubhauj-i-tha, | brug.t, | bug-i. |
| bibhaid-a, | bait, | beiz. | bubhauj-a, | baug, | boung. |
| dual. |  |  |  |  |  |
| biblid-i-va, | $b i t-\hat{u},{ }^{2}$ |  | bubhuj-i-va, | $b u g-\hat{u}^{2}$ |  |
| biblid-a-thus, | bit-u-ts, |  | bubhuj-a-thus, | bug-u-ts |  |
| biblid-a-tus, |  |  | bubhuj-a-tus |  |  | PLURAL.

bibhid-i-ma, bit-u-m, biz-u-mês. bubluj-i-ma, bug-u-m, bug-u-mês. bibhid-a-a, bit-u-th, biz-u t. bubhuj-a-', bug-u-th, bug-u-t. biblid-us, bit-u-n, biz-u-n. bubhuj-us, bug-u-n, bug-u-n. ${ }_{1}$ Scc $\oint$. $102 . \quad{ }^{2}$ See §. 441.
[G. Ed. p. 856.] 609. The Greek second perfects like
 answer to the Sanskrit just discussed, bybhaida (bibhêla), bubhauja (bubhajja), and Gothic bait, baug. The circum-
stance, however, that the Greek retains the Guna in the dual and plural, and uses not $\pi \epsilon \pi i \theta \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\pi \epsilon \phi \dot{\prime} \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon v$, but $\pi \epsilon \pi o^{\prime} \theta \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu, \pi \epsilon \phi \epsilon u^{\prime} \gamma \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, raises a suspicion against the originality of the principle followed by the Sanskrit and German. We will therefore leave it undecided whether the Greek has extended inorganically to the plural numbers the Guna, which was created only for the singular, or whether the vowel strengthening of the reduplicated preterite were originally intended for the three numbers of the active; and the coincidence of the Sanskrit and German in this point be only accidental, that they have, in the tense under discussion, accorded to the weight of the terminations, or extent of the word, an influence in shortening the base-syllable. This influence is so natural, that it need not surprise us if two languages, in the course of time, had admitted it independently of each other, and then, in the operation of this influence, coincided; as, on one side, the Gothic bitum, bugum, answering to bait, baug, and, on the other side, the, Sanskrit bibhidima, bubhujima, answering to bibhaida, bubhauja. The German obtains a separate individuality in that the Old High German, in the second person singular, employs bizi, buyi, and not beizi, bougi, on account of their being dissylJabic; while the Sanskrit, in spite of their being of three syllables, uses bibhaiditha, bubhaujitha. It is certain that the Sanskrit, in its present state, has given to the weight of the personal terminations a far greater influence than could have existed at the period of the unity of language; and that, e.g., the Greek $\delta \in \delta \dot{\rho} \rho к \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$, with reference to the singular $\delta$ '́ $\delta о р к \alpha$, stands nearer to the primitive condition of the language than the Sanskrit dadrisima, which has abbreviated the syllable ar of the singular dadarśa to ri. Observe, [G. Ed. p. 857.] also, what has been remarked above regarding the retention of the Gothic $\delta$ and Greek $\bar{\alpha}$ or $\eta$ in the dual and plural, while the Sanskrit exhibits the lengthening of a radical $a$ to $\hat{a}$ only in the first and third persons singular (§. 603.).
610. As to the personal terminations of the reduplicated preterite, they deserve especial consideration, since they do not answer exactly to the primary endings, nor to the secondary. The ground of their varying from the primary terminations, to which they most incline (in Greek more clearly than in Sanskrit), lies palpably in the root being incumbered with the syllable of reduplication, which in various places has produced an abbreviation or entire extinction of the personal terminations. The first and third person singular have the same sound in Sanskrit, and terminate with the vowel, which should properly be only the bearer of the personal termination. The Gothic has lost even this vowel; hence, above, baug, bait, answering to bubhauja (bubhôja), bibhaida (bibhêda). The Greek, however, has, in the third person, corrupted the old $\alpha$ to $\epsilon$, just as in the aorist, where we saw $\epsilon \neq \epsilon \iota \xi \in$ answer to the Sanskrit adikshat. In the same way, in the perfect, тє́тифє, ס'́́ঠоркє, \&c. answer to the Sanskrit tutópa (=tutaupa), dadarśa; while in the first person, тéтиф $\alpha$, ס́́ঠорк $\alpha$, stand on the same footing with the Sanskrit tutôpa, dadarśa (from dadarka). As three languages, the Sanskrit, Greek, and Gothic, and a fourth, the Zend (where dadars'a appears in the form $2 \cos ^{2}$ dagng dadarésa), agree with one another in this, that in the first and third person of the tense under discussion they have lost the personal designation, it might be inferred that this loss occurred as early as the period of the unity of language. But this inference is not necessary; for in the incumbrance of the root by the syllable of reduplication there lies so natural an occasion for weakening the termi-
[G. Ed. p. 858.] nation, that the different cognate languages might well have followed this impulse independently of each other. And the three languages (the Zend, whose long sojourn with the Sanskrit is evident, may remain unnoticed) do not stand quite on the same footing with respect to the disturbing influence which they have permitted to the syllable of reduplication : the Sanskrit has yielded more to this influence than
its Greek and German sisters ; and our forms like ihr bisset, "ye bit," ihr boget, "ye bent," are more perfect in their termination at this day than what we can draw from the Sanskrit, to compare with them, from the oldest period of its literature. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite has, for instance, lost the termination of the second person plural from the oldest time; and this person is therefore either completely the same with the first and third person singular, or distinguished from it only by the removal of the Guna, or by an abbreviation in the interior of the root from which the singular has remained free; e.g. the first and third person singular and second person plural of krand, "to weep," are chakranda: in the two former places the Gothic gaigrôt corresponds to it, and, indeed, shews to disadvantage through its loss of the final vowel: in the second person plural, however, gaiyrtt-u-th surpasses the Sanskyit chakrand-a, which has evidently been preceded by a form chakrand-a-tha or cha-krand-a-ta. To тєтú $\phi-\alpha-\tau \epsilon$, $\delta \epsilon \delta \delta o ́ \rho \kappa-\alpha-\tau \epsilon$, in Greek, tutup- $a$, dadrisis-a, for tutup-a-tha, dadris'-a-tha, correspond in Sanskrit.
611. The Sanskrit reduplicated preterite stands in disadvantageous comparison with the Greek perfect in this point also, that in the middle and passive it has not only, like the present, lost the $m$ of the first person, but also the $t$ of the third; thus, tutupê stands for tutup-mê and tutup-té, and in the former case is surpassed by $\tau \in ́ \tau \tau \mu-\mu \alpha l$, in the latter by $\tau \in \in \tau v \pi \tau \alpha l$, as respects the correct preservation of the ter- [G. Ed. p. 859.] mination. From $\tau \in ́ \tau \nu \mu-\mu \alpha l, ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \tau \pi-\tau \alpha \iota$, it may be inferred that the active was formerly $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\tau} \pi \alpha \mu$, , $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\pi} \pi \alpha \tau$, or $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi \alpha \mu$, , $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi-$ $-\alpha-\tau$, and in Sanskrit tutiop-a-mi (or tutôp-d-mi, see §. 434.), tut $\hat{f}$-a-ti. The conjunctive vowel is suppressed in Greek before the weightier terminations of the middle passive, according to the principle by which the $\eta$ of the optative, and the corresponding $a$ of the Sanskrit potential, is dropped in the middle, and, e. $y ., \delta 1 \delta 0$ í $\in \theta \alpha$, dadimahi, correspond to the active diסoin $\mu \in v$, dadyaina. The Sanskrit, in the middle and the
passive, which in this tense is fully identical with the middle, prefixes to the personal terminations beginning with a consonant for the most part a conjunctive vowel $i$ (see §. 605 . p. 846 G.ed.); hence tutup-i-shê answering to the Greek тétut-б $\alpha$. Yet in the Vêda-dialect the form tutup-sê might be expected, as this dialect often suppresses the conjunctive vowel of the common language, and, c.g., in the Rig Vêda (XXXII. 4.), from vid, class 6 , "to find," the form vivit-se, "thou didst find," occurs for the common vivid-i-shé.
612. The third person plural of the middle passive exhibits in Sanskrit the termination rê, which, in the common language, is always preceded by the conjunctive vowel $i$, which, however, may be withdrawn in the Vêda-dialect, where, e.g., darlriś-rê, "they were seen," occurs for dadrisire (Rig Vêda, XXIV. 10.). It is hardly possible to give a satisfactory explanation of this termination. I have elsewhere (Lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §. 372. Rem. 4.) remarked, that its $r$ is perhaps a corruption of an original $s$, which otherwise, in Sanskrit, occurs only in the terminating sound, and regularly, indeed, before sonant letters, in case a vowel other than $a$ or $\hat{A}$ precedes the $s$. This being the case, this $r$ would belong to the verb substantive; and we should remark, that in Greek, also, this verb, in certain tenses, is found only in the third
[G. Ed.p.860.] person plural, while the rest are simple ( $\bar{\delta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \circ \sigma \alpha \nu$, ${ }^{\text {éd }} \delta \sigma \sigma \alpha \nu$ ). The Sanskrit intended probably, in the case before us-if the $r$ really stands for $s$-by this change to lighten the sound, as occurs in the Old High German, where, in all roots in is and us, and in part of the roots in as, the radical sibilant in the preterite is retained only in the monosyllabic forms, but in the polysyllabic is weakened to $r$; hence, from RIS, "to fall" (Sanskrit bhrains), reis, riri, reis, rirumes, \&c.; from LUS," to lose," los, luri (see §. 608.), los, lurumês, \&c.; from was, "I was," "he was," comes the second person wâri, the plural wârumês, \&c.
613. With the $r$ of the Sanskrit termination $r \hat{e}$ is
clearly connected that of the termination ran of the third person plural, middle, of the potential and precative, where ran, in my opinion, is an abbreviation of ranta; and also the $r$, which the root s'í," to lie" (Greek кeíp $\alpha \iota$ ), inserts, in the third person plural of all special tenses (sêratê, "they lie," as'êrata " they lay," sératâm, " let them lie"). The root vid, " to know," class 2, in combination with the preposition sam, admits at will the addition of such an $r$ in the present, imperfect, and imperative; hence, sanividratê or sañidaté, " they know" (Pânini VII. 1. 7.). The Vêda-dialect gives to the addition of this enigmatical $r$, in the middle and passive, a still wider extension (Pânini VII. 1.8.), and exhibits $a d u h r a$, " they milked," for aduhrata, instead of the common aduhata. Remarkable, also, are the forms सदृश्रं adriśrain and खसृग्रं asrigran,* from षदृश्रन्त adriśranta, क्षसृग्रन्त [G.Ed.p. 861.] asrigranta, for adriśanta, asrijanta. The Anuswâra of this Vêdic termination rain, which may have been formerly rans (with $s$ from $t$, compare p. 754 G. ed.), passes into $m$ before vowels: hence, Rig Vêda IX. 4., समृग्रम् इन्द्र ते गिर: asrigram Indra tê girali "effusi sunt, Indra! tibi hymni"; L. 3. षनृृश्रम् सस्य केतवो वि रश्मयो जनां सनु adriśram asya kêlaṽd vi ruśmayô janẩi anu "conspiciuntur ejus collustrantes radii inter homines." $\dagger$
614. The conjunctive vowel $i$, which the middle uses in

[^214]almost all persons, may formerly have been an $a$; and it is still more probable that the active everywhere had, as in Greek, an $a$ as conjunctive vowel; that therefore the form tutup-i-ma was preceded by a form tutup-a-ma (or tutup-d-ma, see §. 434.), as analogous to the Greek тerú $\phi-\alpha-\mu \epsilon \nu ;$-an opinion which is also corroborated by the Gothic $u-m$, as in gaigrot $u-m$, "we wept," which leads us to expect a Sanskrit chakrand-a-ma or $\begin{aligned} & \text {-ma } \\ & \text { for chakrand-i- }\end{aligned}$ $m a$, since the Gothic $u$ very often occurs as the weakening of an original $a$, but not as the increase of an original $i$.
615. In the second and third person dual the Sanskrit has firmly retained the old conjunctive vowel $a$; but the $a$ of the primary terminations thas, tas, has been weakened to $u$, probably on account of the root being encumbered by the syllable of reduplication : hence, tutup-a-thus, tutup-a-tus, correspond to the Greek $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi-\alpha-\tau о \nu, \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi-\alpha-\tau o \nu$ from -тos, ros, see §. 97.); and chakrand-a-thus, " ye two wept," to the
[G. Ed. p. 862.] Gothic gaiyrot-u-ts of the same import. The * $a$ of these dual forms is never suppressed, and hence is regarded by grammarians as belonging to the termination itself, while the terminations $v a$ and $m a$ of the first person dual and plural occasionally occur, also in direct combination with the root; as from sidh, " to stop," come both sighidhiva, sişhidhima, and sişhidhwa, sişhidhma. Thus we find in Greek, also, the $\alpha$ occasionally suppressed before the heavier terminations of the dual and plural. To this class belong, be-

 relationship is to be based, but only a coincidence of principle; for in the operation of the law of gravity it is so natural that two languages should, independently of one another, free themselves before heavy terminations of an auxiliary vowel, not indispensable for the idea to be conveyed, that it is quite unnecessary to assume here an old transmission.
816. With regard to the termination v tha of the second person singular, we refer to §. 453 . It may be here additionally remarked, that if the Greek $\hat{\eta} \sigma-\theta \alpha$-which is there referred to wाfिय $A_{s-i}-$-tha, for which would stand, without the vowel of conjunction, as-tha-is not a remnant of the perfect, but actually belongs to the imperfect, the Sanskrit middle imperfect ज्ञास्पास् asthds would admit of comparison with it. But I prefer referring this $\hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha$ to the perfect, and placing it on the same footing with oi $\sigma-\theta \alpha$, which, with respect to its termination, corresponds so well with वेत्य vet-tha and the Gothic vais-t. The Old High German also, which, in its strong preterites, has preserved only the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit $i$-tha, and hence opposes to the Sanskṛit bublauj-i-tha (bubhôj-i-tha) and Gothic bauy-t, "thou didst bow," the form bug-i, has in preterites, which, like the Sanskrit veda, Greek oij $\alpha$, and Gothic vait, have present signification, retained the old $t$ in direct combination with the root; as, $w$ is-t (euphonic for weiz-t) corresponds to the Gothic vais-t, Greek oíc- $\theta \alpha$, and Sanskrit vêt-tha (vait-tha). We must likewise class here muos-t, "thou must," toh-t, " thou art fit,"* mah-t, "thou canst," scal-t, "thou shouldst," an-s-t, "thou art inclined," "dost not grudge" (with euphonic $s$, see $\S$. 95 .: the form cannot be cited, but is indubitable), chan-s-t, "thou canst," " thou knowest," getars-t, "thou venturest," $\dagger$ darf-t, " thou requirest."
617. It deserves further to be remarked with respect to the Gothic, that the roots terminating with a vowel prefix an $s$ to the $t$ of the second person: at least the second person

[^215]of saiŝ̂, "I sowed," is saisô-st, (Luke xix. 21.); from which we may also infer vaiv $\hat{1}-\mathrm{st}$, from the root $V \bar{O}$, "to blow" (Sanskrit vd), and lailo-st, from $L \bar{O}$, "to laugh." As to the relation of the ai of the present (vaia, laia, saia) to the $\hat{\phi}$ of the preterite and of the root, it resembles that of binda, "I bind," to $B A N D$; i.e. as the $a$ of this and similar roots has weakencd itself in the present to $i$, the same has been done by the latter half of the $\delta=\hat{a}$, or $a+a$. In the same way, in Sanskrit, a long $\hat{a}$ is sometimes weakened to $\hat{e}=a i$; e.g. in the vocative of the feminine bases in $\hat{a}$ (see §. 205.). But to return to the Gothic root $S \bar{O}$, I am not inclined to infer from the third person present saiy-i-th, which actually occurs (Mark iv. 14.), a first person saiya, but believe, that only before $i$ a $y$ is added to the diphthong ai, and that the
[G. Ed. p. 864.] third person singular and second person plural of vaia and laia also must be vaiyith, laiyith, and the second person singular vaiyis, laiyis. But if the root $S \bar{O}$ had, in the first person singular, formed saiya, then the third person plural would certainly have been saiyand, the infinitive saiyan, and the present participle saiyands; on the other hand, at Matth.* iv. 26. occurs saiand, "they sow"; l. c. 4,5, saiands, " the sower," and saian, " to sow."
618. The Sanskrit roots in $\hat{a}$ (the analogy of which is followed by those also with a final diphthong, which are, for the most part, dealt with in the general tenses as if they ended with $\hat{a}$ ) employ in the first and third persons $\hat{a} u$ for $d$ or $a$, for the $\hat{a}$ of the root should be melted down with the $a$ of the termination to $\hat{a}$, or be dropped as before the other terminations beginning with a vowel. Instead of this, however, âu is used; e.g. ददौ dadâu, "I gave," "he gave," from $d \hat{\text {; }}$ तस्थौ tasthâu, " I stood," "he stood," from stha. If $a u$ was found only in the first person, I should not hesitate

[^216]recognising in the $u$ the vocalization of the personal character $m$, as in the Gothic siyau, "I may be," answering to the Sanskrit स्वाम् sydm, and in Lithuanian forms in $a u$ (§. 438.). This view of the matter, however, appears less satisfactory, if we are compelled to assume that the termination $\hat{a} u$, after its meaning had been forgotten, and the language had lost sight of its derivation, had found its way inorganically into the third person, though such changes of person are not unheard of in the history of language ; as, in the Gothic passive, where the first and third persons have likewise the same termination, but reversed through the transposition of the ending of the third person to the first, and, in the plural, also into the second (§.466.). But if the termination $\hat{a} u$ of dudâu, "dedi, dedit," stands with the same right in the third person that it does in the first, and no personal ending is contained in it, then the $u$ of the diphthong $\hat{a} u$ may be regarded as the weakening of the common [G. Ed. p. 865.] termination, or conjunctive vowel $a$; so that the $u$, according to the principle of Vriddhi, would have united with the preceding $\hat{a}$ into $\hat{u} u$ (see $\S .29$.); while in the ordinary contractions an $\hat{a}$ is shortened before its combination with $u$ or $i$ to $a$, and then, with $u$, becomes $\hat{\theta}=a u$, and with $i$, $\hat{e}=a i$.
619. The Sansk!it verbs of the tenth class, and all derivative verbs, periphrastically express the reduplicated preterite by one of the auxiliary verbs-kri "to make," as and $b l i u$." to be"-the reduplicated preterites of which are referable to the accusative of an abstract substantive in $a$, which is not used in the other cases, before which the character $a y$ of the tenth class and of the causal forms is retained; e.g. chôrayânchakâra (euphonic for chôryâm-ch-), " he made stealing," or chôrayâmasa, or chôraydmbabh $\hat{\imath} a, *$ "he was to steal". The opinion expressed in the first

[^217]edition of my Sanskrit Grammar, that the form in $a m$ must be regarded as the accusative of an abstract substantive, I have since found is supported by the Zend, where the corresponding form occurs as an infinitive in the accusative relation, as I have already shewn by citing the following lucid passage (Vend. S. p. 198.) : G raôdhayanm," "If the worshippers of Mazda wish to make
[G. Ed. p. 866.] the earth grow (cultivate)." The Sanskrit, instead of kri, " to make," occasionally uses another verb of similar import, to paraphrase the reduplicated preterite. Thus we read in the Mahábhárat (I.1809.) : वपुष्टमार्थम् बरयाम् प्रचक्रमु: vapuṣhtamârtham varayâm prachukramuh, "they solicited Vapuṣhtamá;" literally, " they made solicitation on account of Vapuṣhtama," or "they went to a solicitation;" for pra-kram means, properly, " to go ;" but verbs of motion frequently take the place of those of making, since the completion of an action is represented as the going to it.
person singular the Guna or Vriddhi augment, and changes irregularly its $\hat{u}$ before vowels into $\hat{u} v$ instead of $u v$.

* Thas I read for the l.c. occurring rabdhyanm, for which, p. 299, raôdhayěn occurs: the two forms guided me in restoring the right reading, which has since been confirmed by Burnouf, by comparing MSS. Anquetil translates thus, "lorsque les Mazdéeiesnans veulent creuser des ruisseaux dedans et autour d'une terre;" in accordance with which 1 before rendered the expression raôdhayañm by "perforare." It is, however, probably the causal form of raôdh, "to grow" (compare Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes, p. xxxv.), which is based on the Sanskrit ruh from rudh (see $\S .23$.), and with which the Gothic LUD, "to grow," lauths, laudis, "man" (our Leute), is connected. It is possible that this causal form may have assumed, in Zend, the meaning "to bury," as one of the means of growth. This, however, is of not mach importance to us here: it suffices to know, what is very important, that raôdhayanm supplies the place of an infinitive, has an accusative termination, and confirms my explanation of the Sanskrit form under discussion.

620. It is very important to observe, that it is the verbs of the tenth class, causal forms, and other derivative verbs, which particularly employ this periphrastic formation of the reduplicated preterite, and do not admit the simple formation; for hereby the way is, in a manner, prepared for the German idioms, which, without exception, paraphrase their preterite by an auxiliary verb signifying "to do," precisely in that conjugation in which we have recognised the Sanskrit tenth class in three different forms (see §§. 109". 6.504.). I have asserted this, as regards the Gothic, already in my System of Conjugation (pp. 151, \&c.), where I have shewn, in plurals like sîkidêdum, " we sought," (did seek), and in the subjunctive in the singular also (sökidêdyau, "I would do seek") an auxiliary verb signifying " to do," and [G. Ed. p.867.]
a word related to dêths, "the act,"* (theme dêdi). Since then, Grimm, with whom I fully coincide, has extended the existence of the auxiliary verb also to the singular sôkida, and therefore to the other dialects; for if in solkida the verb "to do" is contained, it is self-evident that it exists also in our suchte. I had before derived the singular sôkida from the passive participle sokiths (theme sôkida). But since I now recognise the verb (thun) "to do" also in sukida, "I sought," I believe-in which I differ from Grimm-that we must, in respect to their origin, fully separate from one another the passive participle and the indicative preterite, $\dagger$ great as the agreement of the two forms is, which, in Gothic, amounts to complete identity; for the theme of sôkiths, "the sought," is sơkida (see §.135.), thus fully the same as sôkida, "I sought;" and salbôda, the theme of salbôths,"the anointed," is in

[^218]form identical with salboda, "I anointed." This circumstance, too, was likely to mislead, that participles in da (nominative ths) occur only in verbs which form their preterites in $d a$, while in strong verbs the passive participle terminates in $n a$ (nominative $n s$ ), and, e.g., bug-a-ns, "bent" (theme buy-a-na), corresponds to the Sanskrit bhug-na-s. In Sanskrit, however, passive participles in na are comparatively rare, and the vast majority of verbs form them by the suffix $t a,{ }^{*}$ on which the Latin $t u$-s, Greek tós
[G. Ed. p. 868.] ( $\pi \lambda \epsilon \kappa \tau$ ós, $\pi$ оиๆтós), Lith. ta-s (suk-ta-s, "turned"), are based. This suffix has, however, nothing in common with the verb thun, "to do," under discussion; and therefore, also, the Gothic suffix $d a$ of $S \bar{O} K-I-D A$, sokiths, can have nothing to do with the $d a$ of solkida, "I sought," provided that this $d a$ signifies "I did," just as dédum in sôkidêdum means "we did," and dê-ths, " the deed."
621. The just-mentioned de-ths, $\dagger$ to which the Old Saxon dadd and Old High German tât correspond, is, in the theme, dédi, the $i$ of which is suppressed in the nominative (see §. 135.): the genitive is dedai-s, the accusative plural deddi-ns. The final syllable of the base dédi corresponds to the Sanskrit suffix $t i$, which forms abstract substantives, and, in Gothic, occurs under the form of $t i$, thi, or $d i$, according to the measure of the letter preceding

[^219]it (see §. 91.). There remains, therefore, dé, in Old Saxon $d a$, in Old High German tá, as the root, and this regularly corresponds to the Sanskrit-Zend धा dha, we dá, "to set," "to make" (see p. 112); from which might be expected an abstract substantive धाfिस् dhâ-ti-s, $d \hat{\text { gumplits, which }}$ would answer to the Greek $\theta$ érts (from $\theta^{\prime}$ érss). It is a question, then, whether, in the Gothic dêdum of sôkideddum, the first syllable is fully identical with that of $D \bar{E}-D I$, "the deed"? I think it is not; and consider dedum, and the subjunctive dêdyau, plural dêdeima, as reduplicated forms; so that thus the second syllable of deddum, dedyau, would be to be compared with the first of $D \bar{E} D I$, "deed." The dé of dedum, "we did," dé-dyau, "I would [G. Ed. p. 880.] do," considered as the syllable of reduplication, is distinguished from the common reduplicated preterites like vai-v $\delta$-um, " we blew," sai-s $\delta-u m$, " we sowed," tait $6 k u m$, "we touched," by its ê for $a i$. It may be, then, that this $\hat{e}$, which has proceeded from $a i$, is the contraction of $a+i$ to a mixed sound, according to the Sanskrit principle (see §. 2.); or that, according to an older principle of reduplication, the $\varepsilon$ of de-dum, just like that of $D \bar{E} D I$, "deed," represents the original long $d$ of the Sanskrit root dhâ (see §. 69.), which is retained unchanged in the Old High German tatt, and Old Saxon dad. In the last syllable of de-dum, de-dyau, we miss the radical vowel: according to the analogy of vai$v \hat{\delta}-u m$, sai-sô-um, we should expect dêd $\hat{d}$-um. The abbreviation may be a consequence of the incumbrance owing to composition with the principal verb: however, it occurs in Sanskrit, even in the simple word; since, in the reduplicated preterite, $d a-d h-i-m a$, " we did set," $d a-d h-u s$, " they did set," are correctly used for $d u-d h t-i-m a, d u d h d-u s$ (see p. 846 G. ed.). Even in the present, the root dha, which, as a verb of the third class, has reduplication in the special tenses also, with $d d$, class 3 , "to give," irregularly reject the radical vowel before the heavy terminations of the dual and
plural ; thus, dadh-mas for dadhd-mas; just so, in the whole potential mood, where $d a d h-y d m$ (for dadha-y $A m$ ), "ponam," answers remarkably to the Gothic dêd-yau (from sôkidêd-ỵau, "I would do," for dêd $\hat{-}-\underline{y} a u$.
622. The singular of sôkidêdum, sôkidêduth, sôkidêdun, is sôkida, sôkidés, sôkida, with the loss of the syllable of reduplication. Yet dês is perhaps an abbreviation of dêst, as, in the preterite, $t$, answering to the Sanskrit थ tha, is properly the character of the second person (see §. 453.), before which a radical $T$-sound passes, according to $\S .102$, into $s$; as, bais $t$, bans-t, for bait-t, band-t. So, also, dés
[G. Ed. p. 870.] might have proceeded from dets-t, and this from dêd-t. In the simple state, the auxiliary verb under discussion is wanting in Gothic ; at least, it does not occur in Ulfilas; but in Old Saxon $d \hat{0}-m$, dô-s, dô-t (or $d \hat{o}-d$ ), correspond admirably to the Sanskrit dadhâ-mi, dadhd-si, $d a d h \hat{d}-t i$, with $\hat{\theta}$ for $a$, according to the Gothic principle (see §.69.), and with the suppression oi the syllable of reduplication, which, as has been already remarked, the Sanskrit verb, according to the principle of the third class, exhibits, like the Greek $\tau_{i} \theta_{\eta \mu}$, in the present also. The preterite in Old Saxon, as in all the other German dialects, has preserved the reduplication, and is, dëda, dëd $\hat{-}-s$, dëda, plural dëdun, also dadun,* properly the third person, which, in the Old Saxon preterite, as in the Gothic passive (§.466.), represents both the first and second person. In this $d \ddot{e d} d-u-n$ or $d a d-u-n$, therefore, the radical vowel, as in the Gothic sôkidêdun (for sôkidêd $\hat{\sigma}-u-n$ ), is dropped before the conjunctive vowel. The ë of dëda, \&c., has arisen from $i$, which has been actually retained in Anglo-Saxon. Here the preterite under discussion has dide, didest, dide, plural didon, in the three persons. These forms, therefore, in respect to their reduplication syllable, answer to the pre-

[^220]terites with concealed reduplication, as Old High German hi-alt for hihalt (see §. 592.). The Old Saxon dâdun, which occurs in the plural, together with dëdun, as also in the second person singular dadi is found together with dëd $\partial-s$ (see Schmeller's Gloss.), is inorganic, and follows the analogy of Grimm's tenth and eleventh conjugations; i.e. it is produced in the feeling, as if $d a d$ were the root and first and third person of the singular preterite, and the present were didu. Thus, also, in the subjunctive, with dëdi the form dddi exists. In Old High German, also, the forms which have a long $a$ in the conjugations named, employ this [G.Ed.p.871.] letter in the auxiliary verb under discussion, and, indeed, without a dissentient authority,* without, however, in a single one, the first and third person singular being tat, as might have been expected from the second person tâti (like sâzi answering to $s a z$, see the second table in $\S .605$.). I annex the preterite in full, according to Grimm; lëta, tâti, tëta; tâlumês, tâlut, tâłun; subjunctive talt, tatt̂̂s, tâti; talîmes. tâtít, tatin. The present is tuo-m, tuo-s, tuo-t, tuo-mês, tuo-t, tuo-nt; which, in its way, answers to the Sanskrit da-d/dami, just as well as the Old Saxon d $\delta-m, \& c$.; since $u o$, in Old High German, is the most common representative of the Gothic and Old Saxon 0 , and therefore of the Sanskrit $a$; as, in fuor, answering to the Gothic fôr and Sanskrit char, from clachdra, "I went," "he went." The Middle High German is, in the present, tuo-n, tuo-st, tuo-t; tuo-n, tuo-t, tuo-nt: in the preterite, tëte, tate, tête $\dagger$ plural, taten, tatet, taten: subjunctive tate, \&c. Our German that, thäle, follow exactly the analogy of forms like trat, trïte, las, lüse (Grimm's tenth conjugation), and would lead us to expect a present

[^221]thete from thite; the recollection of a reduplication which is contained in that is completely destroyed, but just as much so the possibility of connection with the weak preterites like suchte, to which recourse must be had, if we wish to reject the opinion first given by Grimm (I. p. 1042), but not firmly held by him, that the Old Saxon dëda, Anglo-Saxon dide, Old High German tëta, Middle High German tëte, rest on reduplication.* The passive participle gi-ta-nerr, ge-tha-ner,
[G. Ed.p.872.] answers to the Sanskrit like mla-na, " withered," from mlai (mla), or dá-na, "gift" (properly "that given "), from $d \hat{a}$, of which the common participle is datta (from dudata), the reduplication being irregularly retained. The Sanskrit tenth class agrees with the German weak conjugation (the prototype of which it is) in this point, that it never forms its passive participles in na, but always in $t a$; on which is based the Gothic da of SO$K I D A$, nominative masculine sôkiths, "sought."
623. To return to the Gothic sokida, "I sought," "did seek," after acknowledging in the $y a$ of sokya, "I seek," the character of the Sanskrit tenth class su aya, and in soki-da, "I did seek," a copy of the Sansḳ̣it chôrayân--chakîra (or chalarara), "I did steal," we now consider the $i$ of s $\hat{k} k i d a$ as the contraction of the syllable $y a$, in which we agree with Grimm. The $i$ of solkida, therefore, represents the Sanskrit ayâm of chôrayan-chakara (्ㅗ $n$ euphonic for $m$ ), "I did steal"; or, in order to select kindred verbs, the $i$ of the Gothic sati of sati-da, "I did place," corresponds to

[^222]the Sanskrit ayâm (or rather, only its $y$ ) of sadayân-chakara, "I made to sit"; the Gothic thani of thani-da, "I extended," corresponds to the Sanskrit tánuyam of tânayân-chakdra, "I did make to extend"; the Gothic vasi, of vasi-da, "I did clothe," corresponds to the Sanskyit vasayâm of vâsayán--chakâra, "I did cause to be clothed " (vâsayâmi, " I cause to clothe," as causal of vas, "to clothe"). It might be conjectured that the first member of the Gothic [G. Ed. p. 873.] compounds under discussion originally, in like manner, carried an accusative-termination, just as in idea it is an accusative. As, that is to say, in the present state of the language, Gothic substantives have entirely lost the accusative sign, it would not surprise us to find it wanting in these compounds also. At an earlier period of the language, satin-da, thanin-da, vasin-du, may have corresponded to the Sanskrit sîdayâm-, tânayâm-, vîsayâm-, the $m$ of which before the ch of the auxiliary verb must become $\boldsymbol{n}^{n}$. The selection of another auxiliary verb in German, but which has the same meaning, cannot surprise us, as the Sanskrit also, occasionally, as has been already shewn, employs another verb for the idea of "doing" (see p. 866 G.ed.), or uses in its place the verb substantive as or bhû.
624. Grimm's second conjugation of the weak form, of which salbó is given as example, has, as has already been observed, cast out, like the Latin first conjugation, the semivowel which holds the middle place in the Sanskrit aya of the tenth class, and the two short $a$ then touching one another coalesce, in Gothic, into $\hat{o}=a+a$, as, in Latin, into $\hat{\alpha}$. Hence, in the preterite, Gothic forms like salbod-da, "I did anoint," correspond to the Sanskṛit like chơrayân-chakâra, "I did steal"; as luigd, from laigd-da, "I did lick," answers to the Sanskrit lêhayâm (=laihayânm) from lêhayân-chakâra, "I did cause to lick." It must not be forgotten that the Sanskrit tenth class is at the same time the form of causal verbs, which admit of being formed from all roots; hence, also, in

Grimm's third class of the weak conjugation (which has preserved the two first letters of the Gothic aya in the form of $a i$, in accordance with the Latin $\hat{e}$ of the second conjugation, [G. Ed. p. 874.] and the analogous Prâkrit forms*), the Gothic preterites munai-da, "I thought," banai-da, "I built," ga-yukai-da, "I subjected to the yoke," correspond to the Sanskrit causal preterites mánayân-chakâra, "I did make to think," blâvayân-chakâra, "I did make to be," "I produced, created." $\dagger$
625. In Sanskrit, besides the tenth class and derivative verbs, there are verbs which paraphrase the reduplicate preterite by forming directly from the root an abstract substantive in $\hat{a}$, and combining with its accusative one of the above-mentioned auxiliary verbs. All roots, for instance, do this, which begin with vowels which are long either naturally or by position, with the exception of an $\hat{a}$ long by position, and the root $\hat{a} p$, "to obtain," as $\not \approx$ śân-chakâra, "I did rule," from $\hat{\$}$ ", " to rule." Compare with this the Gothic brah-ta, " I brought," answering to the strong present brigya (bringa). Compare, moreover, the paraphrased preterites, to which, instead of the present, a simple preterite with present meaning corresponds (see §. 616.), and which, in the preterite, just like brah-ta, combine the auxiliary verb thun direct with the root, in which junction its $T$ sound is governed by the final consonants of the principal verb; and in Gothic appears at one time as $t$, at another as $t h$, at another as $d$ (compare §.91.), and after the $t$ of VIT, " to know," as $s$ (see §. 102.): hence, môs-ta, "I must," (preterite) ( $m o ̂ t$, "I must," (present)); muntha, "I meant" (man, "I mean"); skul-da, "I should" (skal, " I should," (present)); vis-sa, for vis-ta, " I knew" (vait, " I

[^223]know," see §. 491.). A few weak verbs, also, with the derivative $y a$, suppress its representative $i$, and annex the auxiliary verb direct to the root. They are, in [G. Ed. p. 875.] Gothic, but four, viz. thah-ta, "I thought" (present, thagkya); bauh-ta, "I bought" (with au for $u$, according to §. 82, present bugya); vaurh-ta, "I made" (present vaurkya); thuh-ta, "it appeared" (thugk, "it appears"). The Old High German, however, usually suppresses the derivative $i$ after a long radical syllable, and with the cause disappears also the effect, viz. the Umlaut produced by the $i$ (see §. 73.), in as far as the original vowel is an $a$ : hence, nan-ta,* "I named"; wan-ta, $\dagger$ " I turned "; lêr-ta, "I taught"; answering to the Gothic namni-da, vandi-da, laisi-da. These, and similar verbs, have also, in the present and the forms depending on it, lost the $y$ or $i$ of the derivative $y a, \ddagger$ but have preserved the $U m$ laut, whence it is clear, that the $y$ or $i$ must have here adhered much longer than in the preterite (nennu, vendu, lêru).
626. The passive participle in Gothic, with respect to the suppression or retention of the derivative $i$, and with regard to the euphonic change of the final consonant of the root, always keeps equal pace with the preterite active. We may therefore infer from the Gothic $\delta h-t a$, "I feared," a participial base of a similar sound, $\delta h$-ta, "feared," nominative ohts, though this participle cannot be cited as [G. Ed. p.876.]

[^224]occurring. Together with vaurh-ta, "I made," from vaurkya, a participle vaurhts, " made" (theme vaurhta), Mark xiv. 58. exists; and with fra-bauh-ta, "I sold," from frabugya is found fra-bauhts, "sold," John xii. 5. From such euphonic coincidences, however, we cannot deduce an historical descent of the passive participle from the preterite active, or vice versa ; just as little as it could be said, that, in Latin, the participles in tus and turus, and the nouns of agency in tor. really proceed from the supine, because from doctum, monitum, may be inferred doctus, monitus, docturus, moniturus, doctor, monitor. It is natural that suffixes, which begin with one and the same letter, even if they have nothing in common in their origin, should still, in external analogy, approach one another, and combine similarly with the root. In German, indeed, the auxiliary verb thun, and the suffix of the passive participle, if we recur to their origin, have different initial sounds, as the former rests on the Sanskrit धा dha, the latter on the suffix $\pi \boldsymbol{t} a$ : but inasmuch as the latter, in Gothic, instead of becoming tha, according to the law for the permutation of sounds, has, with the preceding derivative vowel, assumed the form $d a$, it is placed on the same footing with the auxiliary verb, which * regularly commences with $d$, and is consequently subject to the same fate. The same is the case with the suffix of abstract substantives, which is, in Sanskrit, $t i$, but in Gothic, after vowels, di, and after consonants, according to their nature, either $t i, t h i$, or $d i$; and thus may also, from the preterite mah-ta, "I could," be deduced a substantive mah-ts (theme mah-ti), " might," without the latter proceeding from the former.
[G. Ed. p. 877.] 627. We must therefore reject the opinion, that, in the Gothic sokida, "I sought," and sôkiths (theme sôki$d a)$, " the sought," sôkida (theme sokid $)$ ), " the sought" (fem.)

[^225]stand to one another in the relation of descent; and I still persist in my assertion, already made in my System of Conjugation, and in my Review of Grimm's German Grammar (Vocalismus, p. 72), that, in Persian, preterites like bur-dam, " 1 bore," bas-tum, "I bound," purs- $\hat{-}$-dam, "I asked," are derived from their corresponding participles, which have both a passive and an active signification. While, in Sanskrit, bri-ta (nominative masculine britas) has merely a passive meaning, and only neuter verbs use the forms in $t a$ with an active signification,* in Persian, bur-dah means both " borne" and, actively, "having borne"; and the perfect is expressed in Persian by using the verb substantive with the participle just mentioned; thus burdah ann, $\dagger$ "I have borne," or, literally, "I am having borne," I consider, however, the aorist burdam as a contraction of burdah am, which need not surprise us, as the Persian very generally combines its verb substantive with both substantives and adjectives; e.g. mardam, "I am a man," buzurgam, "I am great." In the third person singular burd, or iurdah, stands without the addition of the auxiliary verb, as, in Sanskrit, lharta, "laturus," is used in the sense of laturus, $a$, um, est; while the first and second persons of the three numbers combine the singular nominative masculine with the verb substantive, bhartäsmi, "I shall carry," \&c. If we do not choose to recognise the verb substantive in the Persian aorist burdam, because in the present, with the exception of the third person ast, it is so much compressed that it is nowise distinguished from the terminations of other verbs,$\ddagger$ [G. Ed. p. 878.] we must conclude that the simple annexation of the personal

[^226]terminations to the participle, which is robbed of its ending $a h$ forms the tense under discussion. This, however, is not my opinion • and it seems to me far more natural to explain burd'-am as literally meaning "having borne am I". than to raise burd to the rank of a secondary verbal root, and, as such, to invest it with the personal terminations, as they appear in the present.
628. The Sclavonic languages, with the exception of the Old Sclavonic and Servian (see §§. 561. \&c.), present, in the formation or paraphrasing of the preterite, a remarkable coincidence with the Persian. The participle, which, in Persian, terminates in dah or tah, and in Sanskrit, in the masculine and neuter theme, in $t a$, in the feminine, in $t \hat{a}$, ends, in Old Sclavonic, in the masculine-neuter base, in $l o$, in the feminine, in $l a$; and I consider the $l$ of this participial suffix as a weakening of $d$; as, in Latin, lacryma, levir, from dacryma, devir (see §. 17.), and, in Lithuanian, lika, "ten," at the end of compounds, for dika (see §. 319. Rem. p. 449 G. ed.). And I am hence of opinion, that, both with reference to their root and their formation, byl, byla, bylo, "having been" (masculine, feminine, and neuter), may be compared with the Sanskrit words of the same import, bhîta-s, bhût $\hat{1}, b h \hat{t} t u-m$, and Persian bûdah. In Polish, byt means " he was," byta, " she was," bytu, "it was," byti, byty, "they were,"* without the addition of an auxiliary verb, or a personal termination: and
[G. Ed. p. 879.] as in general the forms in $t, t a, t, t i, t y$, do not occur at all as proper participles, but only represent the preterite indicative, they have assumed the complete character of personal terminations. $\dagger$ They resemble, therefore, only with the advantage of the distinction of gender like nouns, the Latin amamini, amabimini, in which words the

[^227]language is no longer conscious that they are masculine plural nominatives, (see §.478.). Still more do the above Polish forms resemble the persons of the Sanskrit participial future, which employs for all genders the masculine nominatives of the three numbers of a participle corresponding to the Latin in turus; so that bhavitu, "futurus," stands instead of futurus, $a$, um, est, and bhavitâras, " futuri," instead of $f u t u r i, ~ a, a$, sunt. But byt, "he was," corresponds most exactly to the Persiau word of the same meaning, bûd or biddah, "having been," in the sense of "he was." In the first person singular masculine, bytem (by-tem) answers admirably to the Persian buddam, which I render in Sanskrit by bhatto 'smi (euphonic for bhitus asmi) i.e. "the man having been am I." In the feminine and neuter, the Polish bytam (byta-m) corresponds to the Sanskrit bhuta 'smi, "the woman having been am I," and in the neuter, bytum, (byto-m) to the Sanskrit blûtam asmi, "the thing having been am I." In the second person, in the three genders, the Polish byteś (byt-es') corresponds to the Sanskrit masculine bhutto-'si (for bhutas asi); bytas' (byta-s'), to the Sanskrrit feminine bhuta 'si; bytos' (byto-s') to the Sanskrit neuter bhuttam asi. In the plural, the masculine byti-smy, and feminine byty-śmy,* [G. Ed. p. 880.] correspond to the Sanskrit feminine and masculine bhatas smas; and so, in the second person, bytys' cie, bytys' cie,t to the Sanskrit bhuttâs stha.
"Remark 1.-I have no doubt that the syllable em of the Polish by-tem, and the simple $m$ of the feminine byta-m and neuter byto-m, belong to the verb substantive, which, therefore, in bytiom, byto-m, and so in the feminine and neuter second person bytu-s, byto-s, has left merely its

[^228]personal termination, just as in the German contractions, im, zum, am, beim, from in dem, \&c., the article is represented only by its case-termination. In the first and second person plural, however, the radical consonant has remained; so that śmy, scie, are but little different from the Sanskrit smas, stha, and Latin sumus (for smus). But if śmy, ście, be compared with the form exhibited by the Polish verb substantive in its isolated state, some scruple might, perhaps, arise in assenting to the opinion, that the present of the verb substantive is contained in byt-em, ' I (a man) was,' byti-smy, ' we (men) were,' or in czytat-em, ' I read,' czytatismy, 'we read'; for 'I am' is yeslem, and 'we are,' yestes' my. It would, in fact, be a violent mutilation, if we assumed that byt-em, byti-smy, have proceeded from bytyestem, byt-yestes' $m y$. I do not, however, believe this to be the case, but maintain that yestem, ' I am,' yostesmy, 'we are,' yestes', 'thou art,' and yestes' cie, 'ye are,' have been developed from the third person singular yest. For this yest* answers to its nearest cognates, the Old Sclavonic yesty, Russian esty, Bohemian gest ( $y=y$ ), Carniolian ye (where the st has been lost), as, to the old sister languages, the Sanskrit asti, Greek è evi, Lithuauian esti, and Latin est.• But yestem, yestesmy, \&c., do not admit of an organic comparison with the corresponding forms of the languages more or less nearly connected. On the other hand, the last portion of yestes' $m y$, 'we are,' answers exactly to the Russian esmy'; and it must be assumed, that the concluding part of yest-em, 'I am,' has lost an $s$ before the $m$, just as the $m$ of byt-em, 'the having been am I.' It cannot be surprising that the superfluons yest is not conjointly introduced in the compound with the participle. At the period of the origin of this periphrastic preterite it did not, perhaps, exist in the

[^229]isolated present, or the language may still [G. Ed. p. 881.] have been conscious of the meaning of the yest of yest-em, and that the whole properly expressed, 'it is I,' ' c'est moi.' Thus, in Irish-Gaelic, is me ' I am,' according to O'Reilly, properly means ' it is I,' and ba me or budh me is literally 'it was I' (budh, 'he was,'=Sanskrit abhut, see §. 573., ba, 'he was ' = abhavat, §. 522) • and in the future, in my opinion, the character of the third person regularly enters into the first person, and, in the verb substantive, may also grow up with the theme in such a manner that the terminations of the other persons may at ach themselves to it.* Moreover, the Irish fuilim, ' I am,' fuilir, ' thou art,' fuil, 'he is,' fuitmid, 'we are,' \&c., deserve especial remark. Here, in my opinion, the third person has again become a theme for the others; but the $l$ of fuil, 'he is,' appears to me to be a weakening of an original $d$, like that of the Polish byt, 'he was': the difference of the two forms is, however, that the $l$ of the Irish form is a personal termination, and that of the Polish a participial suffix; and therefore byt-em signifies, not 'it was I,' as fuilim, 'it is I,' but clearly 'the person having been am I.' But from the procedure of the Irish language this objection arises, that the Persian bud, 'he was,' just like the previously-mentioned Irish budh, might be identified with the Sanskrit aorist abhût; and it might be assumed that this third person has been raised into a theme for the rest, and has thus produced budam, 'I was,' bûdî' 'thou wast,' \&c., like the Irish fuilim, 'I am,' fuilir, 'thou art.' But this view of the matter is opposed by the circumstance, that together with budd the full participial form bûduh also exists, which serves, as a guide to the understanding of the former form. If it were wished to regard the $d$ of burd, 'he bore,' as the

[^230]sign of the person, the whole would be to be referred to the Sanskrit imperfect abharat. But in very many cases objections arise to the referring of the Persian aorist to the Sanskrit imperfect, or first augmented preterite, since the latter has always a common theme with the present, while, e. g., the Persian kunad, ' he makes,' which is based on the Vêdic krinôti (from karnôti, with loss of the $r$ ), does not answer to the theme of kard, 'he made.' On the other hand, this kard, like the participle kardah, admits very
[G. Ed. p. 882.] easily of being compared with krita-s (from karta-s), 'made.' Just so bast, bastah, 'he bound,' bastah, ' bound,' and 'having bound,' does not answer to the present bandad, 'he binds,' but to the Zend passive participle bas̉ta, 'bound'; for which the Sanskrit is baddha, euphonic for budh-ta, the $d h$ of which, in Zend and Persian, has become $s$ (see §. 102.)."
" Remark 2.-In Persian there exists, together with am, 'I am,' a verb hastam of the same signification, which exhibits a surprising resemblance to the Polish yestem, as the third person هست hast does to the Persian yest.* If it were wished to assume that the third person هستش hast is akin to استّ ast, and has arisen from it by prefixing an $h$, as the $y$ of the Polish yest and Old Sclavonic yesty, is only an inorganic addition (see §. 255.n.), I should then derive the Persian hastam, hastî, \&c., also, just as the Polish yestem, yestes, from the third person. With regard to the prefixed $h$, we may consider as another instance the term used for the number 'Eight,' hasht, contrasted with the forms beginning

[^231]with a vowel in the kindred languages. It appears to me, however, better to compare hastam with the Zend histami, 'I stand' (from sistami); as, so early as the Sanskrit, the root of 'to stand' frequently supplies the place of the verb substantive, as also in the Roman languages it aids in completing the conjugation of the old verb. Compare, therefore,

| ser | zend | perst |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\stackrel{\prime \prime}{\prime \prime} \tau \bar{\alpha} \mu$, ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | histami, | hastam. |
| їбтās, | histahi, | hasti. |
| ïбта̄тı, | histaiti, | hast. |
| $\tau \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu$ | histâmah | hastîm. |
| тате, | histatha, | hast |
| ¢ $\tau$ ¢́ $\downarrow \tau \iota$, | histĕnti, | hasta |

Observe, that the third person singular hast is devoid of the personal sign; otherwise we should have in its place hastad, according to the analogy of barad, 'he bears,' pursat, 'he asks,' dihad, 'he gives,' $\dagger$ and others. With respect to the suppression of the personal terminations, [G. Ed. p. 883.] the form hast resembles the German wird, hült, for wirdet, hältet. Pott's opinion-who, in the derivation of the forms under discussion, has likewise referred to the root of to stand' (Etym. Forsch. I. 274.), but prefers recognising in the $t$ of the Polish yestem, as of the Pcrsian hastam, the $t$ of the passive participle-is opposed by the consideration, that neither in Sanskrit has the root as, nor in any other cognate language has the kindred root, produced or contained the

[^232]participle mentioned. There is, in Sanskrit, no participle asta-s, but for it bhûta-s; in Persian no astah, but bûdah; in Sclavonic no yesl, but byl; in Lithuanian no esta-s, in Latin no estus, in Gothic no ists. Hence there is every reason for assuming, that if there ever existed a participle of the other root of 'to be,' analogous to भूत bhîta, 'been,' it must have been lost at so early a period, that it could not have rendered any service to the Polish and Persian in the formation of a preterite and present of the indicative."
629. The Bohemian, in its preterites, places the present of the auxiliary verb after the past participle, and separated from it; the Carniolan prefixes it; and the Russian leaves it entirely out, and distinguishes the persons by the pronouns, which are placed before the participle. "I was," in Bohemian, is, according to the difference of genders, byl sem, byla sem, bylo sem; in Carniolan sim bil, sim bila, sim bilo; in Russian, ya bil, ya byla, ya bylo. But the present of the Carniolan verb substantive is very remarkable, on account of the almost perfect identity of the three persons of the dual, and of the two first of the plural, with the Sanskrit; where, according to a general law of sound, the forms suas, " we two are," slas, " ye two are," reject their final $s$ before vowels (short $a$ excepted), and hereby [G. Ed. p. 884.] coincide entirely with the Carniolan, in which sva signifies "we two are," sta, "they two are." In Sanskrit swa iha, means "we two are here," sta iha, "they two are here." In the plural, the Carniolan smo answers to the Sanskrit स्मस् smas (before vowels sma), ste to स्य stha, so to सन्ति santi. It is, however, to be observed, that both languages have, independently of each other, lost the initial vowel, which belongs to the root, which has remained in the Old Sclavonic with the prefix of a $y$, excepting in the third person plural (see §. 480.).
630. If the German auxiliary verb thun is contrasted, as above (§. 621.), with the Sanskrit root dha, "to place," "to make,"
then preterites like the Gothic sokida and German suchte appear, in respect to their composition, like cognate forms to the Greek passive aorists and futures; as, è $\bar{\tau} \dot{\prime} \phi-\theta \eta \nu$, тu $\phi$ - $\theta$ 咲о $\alpha t$, in which I recognise the aorist and the future middle of ti $^{\prime} \theta \mu \mathrm{=}=$ Sanskrit dadhami.* The concluding portion of $\tau v \phi-\theta \hat{\omega}, \tau v \phi-\theta \epsilon i \eta \nu, \tau v \phi-\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha t$, is completely identical with the simple $\theta \hat{\omega}, \theta \in i ́ \eta \nu, \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha u$, in conjugation; and $\bar{e} \tau u ́ \phi-$ $\theta \eta \nu$ is distinguished from ${ }^{\text {en }} \theta \eta \nu$ by this only, and, indeed, advantageously, that it gives the heavier personal terminations of the dual and plural no power of shortening the vowel of the root, as is the case with the Sanskrit wधाम् adham= ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu$, even in its simple state; since, in this language, adhñ-ma answers to the Greek ${ }^{e} \theta \epsilon-\mu \varepsilon \nu$ for ${ }_{\epsilon} \theta \eta \mu \epsilon v$, as the Greek ${ }_{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \nu$, also, does not admit of the length of its root being shortened in the dual or plural. Thus the imperative $\tau \cup(\phi-\theta \eta \tau$, also, is distinguished from $\theta$ és by preserving the length of the root, as also by its more full personal termina- [G. Ed. p. 985.] tion. From the future $\tau v \phi-\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ an aorist $\dot{\epsilon}_{\epsilon}^{\tau} \nu \phi \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ should be looked for; or, vice versa, the fature should have been contented with active terminations, as well as the aorist. Perhaps originally $\bar{\varepsilon} \tau u ́ \phi \theta \eta \nu$ and $\tau u \phi-\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \omega$ simultaneously existed, and thus also $\overline{\epsilon ̇} \tau \nu \phi-\theta \dot{\eta}-\mu \eta \nu$ (or $\grave{\epsilon} \tau v \phi \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \eta \nu$ ) and $\tau v \phi-$ $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha t$, as periphrastic active and passive tenses. In the present state of the language, however, the aorist has lost the passive form, and the future the active; and when the syllable $\theta \eta$ was no longer recognised as an auxiliary verb, it received the meaning of a passive character ; just as the German language no longer perceives an auxiliary verb in the $t e$ of suclite, but only an expression for the past: or as we have ceased to recognise in the te of heute the word Tay, "day," and in heu (Old High German hiu) a demonstrative, but regard the whole as a simple adverb formed to express "the present day."

[^233]631. As to the form of the Greek second aorist and future passive, I consider étú $\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \quad$ and $\tau u \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$ as abbreviations of є́тv́ $\theta \theta \eta v, \tau \cup \phi \theta \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha \iota$. The loss of the $\theta$ resembles, therefore, that of the $\sigma$ in the active aorists of verbs with liquids (§. 547.) : it need not, however, surprise us, that, as the $\phi$ of é $\tau \dot{v} \phi \theta \eta \nu$, from regard to the $\theta$ following, assumes the place of the radical $\pi$, after this $\theta$ is dropped the original sound again makes its appearance, and therefore é $\tau \dot{\prime} \phi \eta \nu, \tau \cup \phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \circ \mu \alpha 1$, are not used. The case is similar to that of our vowel Rück-Umlaut (restored derivative sound), since we use the form Kraft as corresponding to the Middle High German genitive and dative krefte, because, after the dissolution of the vowel which had generated the Umlaut, the original vowel recurs, while we, in the plural, say Kräfte, like the Middle High German krefte. Various objections oppose the opinion that the verb substantive
[G. Ed. p. 886.] is contained in étúm $\eta \nu$, much as the appended auxiliary verb agrees in its conjugation with that of $\hat{\eta} \nu$. But the double expression of past time in é $\tau \dot{u} \pi \eta \nu$, once in the principal verb and once in the auxiliary, if the verb substantive be contained in it, cannot fail of surprising us; while the Sanskrit, in combining its $\hat{a} s a m$, "I was," with attributive verbs, withdraws the augment, and, with it, also the radical vowel $a$ of the auxiliary verb (§. 542.). The augment in the future $\tau \cup \pi \eta \eta_{\sigma} \mu \alpha l$, and in the imperative $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi \eta \theta l$, must appear still more objectionable. Why not $\tau \cup \pi \epsilon ́ \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota, \tau u ́ \pi \iota \sigma \theta l$, or, perhaps, the $\sigma$ being dislodged, $\tau \dot{v} \pi \iota \theta$, and, in the third person, $\tau u \pi \varepsilon ́ \sigma \tau \omega$ or $\tau \cup \pi \epsilon ́ \tau \omega$ ? The termination $\epsilon \iota s$ in the participle turei's has no hold whatever in the conjugation of the verb substantive.
632. The Latin vendo, if we do not refer the auxiliary verb contained in it to $d o=\delta i \delta \omega \mu$, ददामि $d a d d m i$, bat to тi${ }^{i} \eta \mu \mathrm{l}$, दधामि dadhàmi, must be regarded as a cognate form to the German formations like sokida, sôkidêdum, "I sought," " we sought," and the Greek like é $\tau v \dot{\prime} \phi \eta \nu$, ṫvф $\eta_{\eta} \sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$. The Sanskrit $d A$, " to give," and $d h a$, , to place," are distinguished only by the aspiration of the latter; and in Zend these verbs
are scarce to be distinguished at all from one another, because $d$, according to §. 39 ., in the inner sound (Inlaut) frequently become $d h$, while $d h$ itself lays aside the aspiration in the initial sound (Anlaut). In Latin, also, दा $d \hat{a}$ and धा $d h a ̂$ might easily be combined in one form, since that language generally presents its $d$ as answering to the Sanskrit $d h$ and Greek $\theta$, especially in the inner sound, as $b$ to the Sanskrit bh.* But the circumstance that the root धा $d h \hat{a}, \Theta \mathrm{H}$, has not remained, in Latin, in its simple form, does not prevent us from recognising it in the compounds credo, perdo, abdo, condo, and vendo, just as in pessundo, pes- [G. Ed. p. 887.] sumdo. $\dagger$ The form venundo answers, in respect to the accusative form of the primary word, to Sanskrit compounds like îsân-chakâra (§§. 619.625.).
633. In order to trace out in its full extent the influence that the Sanskrit root dhâ has obtained in the European cognate languages in the formation of grammatical forms, I must further remark, that I believe I may refer to this place also the last portion of the future and imperative of the Sclavonic verb substantive. In Old Sclavonic bûdû means "I will be," literally, as it appears to me, "I do be." The first portion of this compound answers very well to the Sanskrit root $b h \hat{u}$, and is identical with the Zend is $b \hat{u}$. As, however, the Sclavonic $\hat{u}$ regularly answers to the Sanskrit diphthong区ो $\theta(=a+u$, see §. $255 . f$.), so must we in the Sclavonic

[^234]$b \hat{u}$ recognise the Sanskrit Guna-form bhô. And भू bhî itself receives Guna in the future, and exhibits here, in combination with the other root of " to be," the form bhav-i-shyami, of which we shall treat hereafter. The second portion of the Old Sclavonic Бядя $b \hat{u}-d \hat{u}$ (from $b \hat{u}-d \omega-m$, see §. 255. g.) corresponds in its conjugation exactly to the present $v e \zeta \hat{u}$;* thus second person bû-deshi, third, bûdety; only the $e$ and $o$ of
 class-vowel, or vowel of conjunction, while that of de-shi,
[G. Ed. p. 888.] de-ty, do-m, is the abbreviation of the $\hat{a}$ of the Sanskrit root $d h d$; for $e$ and $o$ are the usual representatives, in Old Sclavonic, of the Sanskrit short a (see §. 255. a.). We must here recall attention to the Sanskrit root sthat, the $\boldsymbol{a}$ of which, after being irregularly shortened, is treated as though it were the conjunctive vowel of the first class (8. 508.). Hence, also, in the imperative the Old Sclavonic ' ye of кудвм bí-dye-m, "let us be" ("let us do be"), Б8дытт bil-dye-te, " be ye," answers to the Sanskrit ê of tişhthe--ma. " we may stand," tiṣhthê-ta, "ye may stand" (§. 255. e.).
634. There is, in Old Sclavonic and Russian, also a verb which occurs in an isolated state, which signifies "to do," "to make," and which is distinguished from that which is contained in $b \hat{u}-d \hat{u}$ only by the circumstance that it exhibits
 from declaring it to be originally identical with it. Its present is дыю dyey $\hat{\imath}, \dagger$ and it is rightly compared by Kopitar with our thun and the English do. From it comes the neuter substantive dyelo, "deed," as "thing done," which, in its formation, answers to the participles mentioned above (§. 628.), and has, in advantageous contrast with them, preserved the

[^235]original passive meaning, while they have erroneously been assigned to the active voice.
635. To bûdû, "I shall be," the Old Sclavonic idu, "I go," which is also placed by Dobrowsky (p. 350) in the same class with $b \hat{u} d \hat{u}$, is analogous. Id $\hat{u}$ therefore means, literally, "I do go," and springs from the widely-diffused root $i$ (infinitive $i-t i$ ), whence, in Gothic, the anomalous preterite $i$-ddya, "I went," plural i-ddyêdum, " we [G. Ed. p. 889.] went." I believe that these forms have proceeded from $i-d a$, $i$-dedum, simply by doubling the $d$ and annexing a $y$; and I take them, therefore, in the sense of "I did go," " we did go"; and compare with them the Sclavonic $i-d u$ as present. The $d$ of shédu, however, which is used in completing the conjugation of $i d \hat{u}$, I consider as belonging to the root, and look upon the whole as akin to the Sanskrit सद् sad, "to go," to which belong also choditi, and the Greek obós.
 $n a-d y e s c h-d \hat{s}$ sya, "I hope," Sa-dyeschdû, "angarin, onus impono," which Dobrowsky, l.c., likewise compares with $b \hat{u}-d \hat{u}$, remarking that they stand for odyey $\hat{\imath}, \& \in$., I consider as reduplicate forms of the root dye, "to make," mentioned above; for $d$ gladly, and under certain circumstances, regularly assumes the prefix of $*$ sch, for which reason duschdy, "give," and yaschdy, "eat" (for dady, yady), correspond to the Sanskrit dadyd̂s, "thou mayest give," adyâs, "thou mayest eat" (see Kopitar's Glagolita, pp. 53 and 63). The conjecture, however, that o-dy'schd $u$, $n a-$ dyeschdu, ३a-dyeschdu, are reduplicate forms, is strongly supported by the circumstance that the corresponding Sanskrit and Greek verbs also (dadhimi, ti $i \eta \eta \mu$ ) are reduplicated in the special tenses, like daddmi, $\delta \delta \delta \omega \mu$; and to the two last forms a reduplicate verb corresponds in Sclavonic likewise (see §. 436.).
636. The Lettish possesses some verbs which are combined, throughout their whole conjugation, with the auxiliary verb under discussion. Of this class is dim-deh-t, "to ring,"
(deht=dé-t), together with dim-t, id. nau-deh-t," to mew," with nau-t, id. In bai-deh-t, " to make afraid," with bî-t, "to fear" (Sanskrit भी bhî), fskum-deh-t, "to disturb," i.e. "to make mournful," with fskum-t, " to be mournful," the meaning of the auxiliary verb makes itself clearly perceptible, and
[G. Ed. p. 890.] replaces the causal formation. In other cases the appended dêh-t may be rendered by thun, "to do," thus dim-deht, " to do ring" (compare Pott, I. 187). Regarding the Lithuanian imperfect of habitude, in which we have recognised the same auxiliary verb, see §. 525 .
637. It deserves to be noticed, that, in Zend also, the verb under discussion of " placing," " making," "doing," occurs as an appended auxiliary verb. Thus, uggebbac yadsh-dí, "to purify," literally " to do purify," from which
 do purify" (regarding the extended form dath, see p. 112), the precative middle $u p$ od pairi yafosh--drithita, "they may purify" (Vend. S. p. 266), imperative בת p. 500). The form daiti of yaôsh-daiti, "the purification" (l. c. pp. 300, 301), corresponds, in radical and derivative suffix, to the above-mentioned Gothic dêths (theme dédi). For the frequent expression yaôsh-dayain aṇhĕn, " they are purified," we ought perhaps to read yaôshdayanm anhĕn, in which case the former might be regarded as the locative of yafshdd, so that the whole would signify "they are in purification."* But if

[^236]the reading yadshdayain is correct, then it [G. Ed. p. 891.] may be taken as the accusative plural in the sense of purificatos; so that the verb substantive would be construed as in Arabic with the accusative.
638. We return to the reduplicated preterite, in order to consider its formation in Zend. Examples have been given in §. 520., which, in their principle of formation, correspond, for the most part, with the Sanskrit. Thus, وתg ground didvalesa answers to the Sankrit didwesha, "he hated," with the prefix of an $a$ before the Guna vowel $\ell$, according to
 shew that the Zend, in departure from the Sanskrit, admits long vowels in the syllable of repetition. livivis-e, from the root $v 2$ is, "to obey," is the second person singular middle, and wants the personal sign; thus, $\hat{e}$ for the Sanskrit sf, and Greek $\sigma \alpha$. Here, from want of adequate examples, we must leave it undecided whether this suppression, which makes the second person the same as the first and third, takes place merely after sibilants, or principally after consonants. The form unsuogo tûtava, "he could," from the root tav,* should be, according to the Sanskrit principle, tatava, as a radical $a$, in the third person singular, is necessarily lengthened; but the Zend form above has transferred the long quantity to the syllable of reduplication, and, as it appears, through the influence of the $v$ of the root, has replaced the $a$ sound by $\hat{u}$. On the other hand, the root vach, "to speak," which, in Sanskrit, in the syllable of repetition suppresses the $a$, and vocalizes the $v$ to $u$ (uvacha or uvâcha), in Zend regularly forms vavacha, which, Vend.S. p. 83., occurs as the first person, and is rendered by Anquetil, " $j$ 'ai prononcé." That the Zend does not par-

[^237]ticipate in lengthening the $a$, which, in Sanskrit, before sim-
[G. Ed. p. 892.] ple consonants enters at will into the first person singular, and of necessity into the third person, is proved also by the form sumpospo tatasa, "he formed" (see Burnouf, Yaçna, p. 104), the root of which is referred by Burnouf, and with justice, to the Sanskrit तथ् taksh, and, as it appears to me, fitly compared with the Greek $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$.
639. The passage of the Vend. S. (p. 3), which has furnished us with the form graphed Codex crroneously tatas), supplies us also with two other reduplicate preterites, which have, too, (and this deserves notice,) a perfect meaning, while the corresponding Sanskrit tense refuses the function of a perfect ( $\S$. 513. .). We read l.c. c. yo nô dadha y $\hat{\hat{0}}$ tatasa $y \mathbf{0}$ tuthruye, "who has made us, who has formed (us), who has sustained (us)." The form Nong dadha, which Neriosengh renders by ददौ dadaû, "dedit," instead of dadhâu,* is, in my opinion, of special importance, on account of the remarkable manner in which it coincides in root and formation with the above-mentioned (§. 622.) Old Saxon d̈̈dn, "I did," " he did." The Zend dadhn stands for dadh $\boldsymbol{a}$ from dadhd-a (§. 618.), the long $\boldsymbol{a}$ having been shortened, as commonly happens at the end of polysyllabic words (§. 137.). It does not admit of doubt that the first person is likewise dadha; as we have seen from the above-mentioned 2 vasysul vavacha, "I spoke," that in Zend, as in Sanskrit and German, it is the same as the third person, i.e. it has no more a personal termination than the latter. In the second person I conjecture the form dadhatha (§. 453.).

[^238]640. I am unable to quote the Zend perfect [G. Ed. p. 893.] active in the dual and plural, unless the form دюш donhĕnti, which has been already mentioned elsewhere,* is the plural of anonha, "fuit," which latter regularly corresponds to the Sanskrit $\hat{s} s a$ ( $\S \S .56^{\text {n. }}$. and $56^{h}$.), and occurs in the following passage of the Vend. S. (p. 40): Gqubu posh G\&G\&) "there was neither cold nor heat." We find the form

 תp,
 to those, whoever recite the Nasks, excellence and grandeur." $\dagger$ Perhaps, too, aonlĕnti, if it really is a perfect, is more correctly translated by "have been"; but we cannot be surprised at its having a present meaning also, as a real present is not intended, according to what has been remarked in $\S .520$. We must not attach too great weight to the circumstance that in Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation the form douhernti is rendered by fिपीदन्ति nishiddanti, " sedent"; $\ddagger$ for Neriosengh interchanges with one another the roots $d \hat{a}$, "to give," and $d \hat{n}$, "to set, place, make," which belongs to [G. Ed. p. 894.] the Sanskrit $d h d$; and why should he not have fallen

[^239]into a similar error with the closely-approximating roots चस् as, " to be," and सास् $\hat{s}$, " to sit," which both exist in Zend, particularly as the form ánhĕnti, taken as the perfect, stands, perhaps, quite isolated in the remains of Zend literature which have been preserved to us, but, as the present, has numerous analogous forms? But if ăonhënti really belongs to the root ख्षास $a s$, "to sit," still we cannot, in my opinion, take it, with Neriosengh, in this sense, but as a representative of the verb substantive, which, as has been shewn (§. 509. p. 737 G. ed.), in Sanskrit, also, occasionally supplies the place of the verb substantive. Two of the Paris MSS. give, as has been remarked by Burnouf, for aonhĕnti the middle form
 it speaks in favor of the root of "to sit"; for this, like the kindred Greek verb $(\hat{\eta}(\sigma)-\mu \alpha l, \hat{\eta} \sigma-\tau \alpha \iota)$, is used only in the middle. But if aonhĕnti is the right reading, and belongs, as perfect, to the verb substantive, it is, in respect to its termination, more ancient than the Sanskrit dsus (§. 462.).
641. In the middle we find as the third person plural of
 p. 222), with which, in regard to termination, the form
 If the reading of the two mutually corroborative forms is correct, we then have the termination are for the Sanskrit irê; and it would be a circumstance of much importance that the Zend should have left the old conjunctive vowel $a$ in its original form, in a position where, in Sanskrit, it has been weakened to $i$. The final ê of the Sanskrit termination is suppressed in Zend; but as $r$ cannot stand (§. 44.) at the end of a word, the addition of an $\check{e}$ became necessary, as in vocatives like $\xi^{\mathcal{Z}}$ pugg dâtarĕ, "creator,"
[G. Ed. p. 895.] answering to the Sansskrit धातर् dhatar.
 rithare, were an error in writing, for which ê ought to
stand, then an $i$ would necessarily stand beside the $a$ of the preceding syllable ( $(\$ 41$.$) . But as this is not the case we find$ some evidence of the correctness of the final $\stackrel{e}{ }$, at least for the fact, that this form among others is admissible; for beside the $\varepsilon$ ? in another passage of the Vend.S. (p. 45), the form s s aonhairi, in which the final $i$, according to §. 41 ., has introduced an $i$ also in the syllable preceding. The form donhairi, for which, perhaps, one or two MSS. may read áonhaire, assures us, however, in like manner, of the proposition, which is of most importance, viz. that the conjunctive vowel is properly an $a$, and not, as in Sanskrit, an $i$.
 with regard to its syllable of reduplication: it springs from the root $\sigma_{3} \int_{s}$ irith,* from which a verb of the fourth class frequently occurs; in "iririth," therefore, ir is the syllable of reduplication, after which the short initial $i$ has been lengthened, in order, as it were, to gain strength for bearing the reduplication (compare the Gothic in §. 589.). In iriritharé, however, the countertype of the Greek forms with Attic reduplication is easily recognised. We must not, however, seek for the reason of this lengthening of the vowel of the second syllable of forms like è̀ $\bar{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta \alpha$, є̇ $\mu \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \kappa \alpha$, ò $\rho \dot{\rho} \rho \nu \chi \alpha$, in the temporal augment, which I also avoid [G. Ed. p. 896.] doing. For though, by concretion with the augment, an $\epsilon$ becomes $\eta$, and an o becomes $\omega$, this gives no reason for supposing the augment to exist everywhere where an initial

[^240]vowel of a verb is lengthened. I content myself, in forms like $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu \theta \alpha$, with the reduplication; and in the vowel following I find only a phonetic lengthening for the sake of the rhythm, or to support the weight of the syllable of reduplication; as in the Zend, iririth, or as (to keep to Greek) in ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \gamma \omega \gamma^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \gamma \epsilon^{\prime} \dot{\varphi}, \dot{\alpha} \gamma \omega \gamma \gamma^{\prime}$, in which the $\omega$, as is commonly the case, is only the representative of the long $\alpha$ (§.4.), and where there is no ground for searching for the augment. On the whole it would be unnatural that the augment, being an element foreign to the root, should interpose itself in the middle of the word between the syllable of reduplication and the proper root; and unless a necessity exists, one must not attribute such a phenomenon to a language.
643. In a passage of the Izeshne (Vend. S. p. 65.), which I understand too little to ground on it, with confidence, any inference, while I am without the light which might perlaps be thrown on it by Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation, I find the expressions שerjangag pajang mainyu mamanile. It does not, however, admit of any doubt that mainyl is the nominative dual of the base mainyu, "spirit" (see §. 210.); and hence, even without understanding the whole meaning of the passage alluded to, it appears to me in the highest degree probable, that mamanite is the third person dual of the perfect. Perhaps we ought to read mamandité, so that, through the influence of the final $\hat{e}$, the Sanskrit termination $t t \hat{e}$ would have become dite. But if the reading mamanite is correct, and the form is really a perfect, an original $\boldsymbol{a}$ would have been weakened to $i$. The whole form would, however, in my opinion, be of great importance, because it might furnish ground for the inference, that the contraction of the reduplication,
[G. Ed. p. 897.] in Sanskrit forms like mênaté (from maminale for mamanatté), did not exist before the Zend became separate from the Sanskrit (compare §. 606.).

## THE PLUPERFECT.

644. It has been already remarked (§. 514.), that the Sanskrit possesses no pluperfect, and the substitute it uses for it has been noticed. The Zend, also, is undoubtedly deficient in this tense. In the Zend Avesta, however, no occasion occurs for making use of it, or supplying its place in another way. The Latin pluperfect is easily perceived to be a form compounded of the perfect base with the imperfect of the verb substantive. The only point which can admit of doubt is, whether the whole eram is to be considered as existing in fueram, amaveram, as I have done in my System of Conjugation (p.93), so that the perfect base, to which the $i$ of fui, fui-sti, \&c., belongs, would have lost its vowel; or whether we should assume the loss of the $e$ of eram, and therefore divide thus, fue-ram, amave-ram. Now, contrary to my former opinion, I believe the latter to be the case, and I deduce fueram from fui-ram, through the frequently-mentioned tendency of the $i$ to be corrupted before $r$ to $\check{e}$, whence, e.g., the conjunctive vowel $i$ of the third conjugation appears in the second person of the passive, as also in the imperfect subjunctive and in the infinitive, as $\breve{e}$ (leg-e-ris opposed to leg-$i$-tur, leg-i-mur). For this reason fue-ram also is opposed to the subjunctive fui-ssem, in which, as $r$ does not follow the $i$, that letter remains in its original form. It would seem much more difficult to discover a reason why fu-essem should have become fu-issem, than why fui-ram should become fue-ram. In general, in Latin, there exists, without reference to a following $r$, many an $\check{e}$ which has arisen from an older $i$ : I am not acquainted, [G. Ed. p. 898.] however, with any $i$ used for an older $\check{e}$, as.in general the $\check{e}$ is an inorganic and comparatively more recent vowel, but the $i$ is as old as the language itself: for though $i$ as well as $u$ has very frequently arisen from the weakening of the
most weighty vowel $a$, still no epoch of the language oan be imagined when there existed no vowel but $a$. If, however, the auxiliary verb in fue-ram, fui-ssem, has lost its vowel, it shares in this respect the sume fate as the Sanskrit sam and Greek $\sigma \alpha$ contained in the aorist. Where the verb substantive enters into composition with attributive verbs, sufficient reason exists for its mutilation.
645. As the Greek pluperfect is formed from the base of the perfect, as the imperfect is from that of the present, by prefixing the augment, by which the completion of the action is transferred to past time, we should expect in it
 come very near the Sanskrit imperfect of the intensiveatdt0pam. But whence is the termination eiv of ètetúqeı? Landvoigt and Pott recognise in it the imperfect of the
 There would, therefore, be a pleonasm in this form, as $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \tau u \phi$ already of itself combines the idea of the imperfect with that of the perfect. If, then, the verb substantive be added, it must serve merely as the copula, and not itself express a relation of time, and it therefore lays aside the augment, as the Sanskrit âsam in aorists like akshaip-sam. But it being premised that the verb substantive is contained in $\grave{\varepsilon} \tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \dot{\phi} \epsilon \tau$, it is not requisite to derive its $\epsilon \ell$ from the $\eta$ of $\hat{\eta} \nu$. Advert to the analogy of $\epsilon \nu$ with $\epsilon^{i} \mu i$, which latter would become $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$, if its primary personal termination were replaced by the more obtuse secondary one. It may be said that the radical $\sigma$ is
[G. Ed. p. 899.] contained in the $t$ of $\varepsilon i-\mu i$, which sibilant, having first become, by assimilation, $\mu$ (Doric è $\mu \mu i '$ ), has then, as often happens to $\nu$ (as $\tau i \theta \varepsilon i$ is for tievvs), been vocalized to $c$. The analogy of $e i \mu i$ is followed in the compound form (if èretúperv is really compounded as has been stated) by the dual and plural; thus, èterúфequev for the more cumbrous èтeтúфeб $\mu \in v$. Here let the Ionic form eímév for è $\sigma \mu e ́ v ~ b e ~$ noticed. In the third person plural étévúфerav (inorganic
éteтúфєıб $\sigma \nu$ ) the composition with the auxiliary verb is evident; but this person cannot be adduced as evidence for the composition of the other persons, since in general a kind of privilege is accorded to the third person plural active in respect to the appending of the verb substantive, which also extends to the imperfect and aorist of the conjugation in $\mu t$
 like manner in the Latin perfects (fuerunt from fuesunt). But if the syllable $\epsilon t$ of étetú $^{\prime} \phi-\epsilon \iota-\nu$ is identical with the $\epsilon \iota$ of $\epsilon i-\mu i$, still I am not shaken by this in my opinion that the $\kappa$ of $\lambda \in ́ \lambda u \kappa \alpha$ and the aspiration of $\tau \in ́ \tau u \phi \alpha$ belong to the consonant of the auxiliary root, and that the $\kappa$ is an intension of the $\sigma$, the aspiration a weakening of the $\kappa$ (§. 569.); that,
 contained, as is the case in Sanskṛit forms like ayâsisham (§.570.). I believe, however, that at the time when the forms é $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \dot{u} \kappa-\epsilon \iota-\nu$, éteтú $\phi-\epsilon \iota-\nu$, developed themselves from the
 brance of the origin of the $\kappa$ and of the aspiration had been long lost, and that these forms were generated by the necessity for restoring the missing verb substantive; just as in Old Saxon the form sind-un, "they are,"* [G. Ed. p. 900.] may first have arisen, when, in the more simple and likewise employable sind, the expression of the relation of time and person was no longer perceivable; and hence another personal termination, and, in fact, that of the preterite, was annexed. $\dagger$ The Greek medio-passive has admitted neither the first nor the second annexation of the verb substantive: from $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \lambda \lambda^{\prime}-\kappa \epsilon \iota-\nu$ we might expect $e^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \lambda \nu-\kappa \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu \eta \nu$, but $\epsilon ่ \lambda \epsilon-\lambda \dot{\lambda}-\mu \eta \nu$ has

[^241]arisen directly from the reduplicate root, by prefixing the augment, and descends from a period when the active was not as yet $e^{\lambda} \lambda e \lambda u ́ \kappa \epsilon \iota v$, but probably ${ }^{\text {é }}{ }^{\prime}$ é $\lambda v \nu$.

## THE FUTURE.

646. The Sanskrit has two tenses to express the future, of which one, which is more rarely employed, consists of the combination of a future participle with the present of the verb substantive, the root as; in such a manner, however, that (and this has been already noticed as remarkable) the masculine nominative of the three numbers of the participle has assumed the complete nature of a third person of a verb, and this per se without annexation of the verb substantive, and without regard to the gender of the subject; e.g. दाता data, "daturus," is used in the sense of "he, she, or it will give," and so, too, दातारस् dataras, "daturi," in the sense of "they will give." Observe here what has been said above of the Latin amamini instead of amamini, $-\mathbb{C},-a$, estis (§.478.); and remark also the third person of the Polish and Persian preterite (§.623.). In the other persons the Sanskrit combines the masculine
[G. Ed.p.901.] nominative singular of the participle mentioned with the said person of the present of the auxiliary verb; thus, dâtâsi (from dâtâ-asi) = daturus, datura, daturum est. I annex the full conjugation of the two active forms of the adduced example, with the remark, that in the third person no difference can exist between the active and middle, since the participle which is employed makes no distinction between the two forms.

SINGULAR. DUAL.
ACTIVE. MIDDLE. dâtâsmi, dâtâhé. dâtâsi, dâtâsê. dâta, dâtâ.

ACTIVE.
MIDDLE.
dâtâswos, ' dâtâswahe. dâtâsthas, dâtâsûthé. datârau, datarâu.

Plural.

| active. | midder. |
| :---: | :---: |
| dâtâsmas, | dâtâsmahê. |
| dâtâstha, | dâtâdhwe. |
| dâtâras, | dâtâras. |

" Remark.-It is very surprising, that, although the compound nature of this tense is so distinctly evident, none of the grammarians, my predecessors, have remarked it; and the first mention of it that has been made was in my System of Conjugation, where it was noticed, without meeting with any opposition from the strongest opponents of the so-called System of Agglutination. As regards the first person singular middle, it must be remarked, that the root as, in this person, changes its $s$ into $h$, although in Sanskrit this exchange is to be met with nowhere else, but it occurs frequently in Prâkrit, and before $m$ and $n$ regularly takes place in the (Inlaut) middle of a word, where $m h, \underline{n} h$, are commonly used by transposition for $h m, h n$; hence, amhi or $m h i$ (resting on a preceding vowel) "I am" (see Lassen, p. 267, \&c., Höfer, p. 77). As the Sanskrit $h$ ( $=g h$ not $c h$ ) is usually represented in Greek by $\chi$, sometimes also by $\gamma$, and even by $\kappa$,* in ditahé, therefore, may be found a confirmation of the opinion expressed in §. 569., that the $\kappa$ of forms like ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$, $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$, belongs to the verb substantive as a thickening of a $\sigma$."
647. In the third person singular, also, the verb substantive sometimes occurs combined with the participle, as vaktasti," he will speak," for vakta; $\dagger$ on [G. Ed. p. 902.] the other hand, we occasionally find, in the other persons also, the verb substantive omitted, and the person expressed

[^242]by a separate pronoun,* as is done in Russian in the preterite (see §.629.). Sometimes the participle is separated from the auxiliary verb belonging to it by one or more words; as, kartd tad asmi te, "facturus hoc sum tibi" (Mahâ-Bh.). I do not, however, think that such departures from the usual practice of the language could occur where the subject was not a masculine singular; at least it is probable, if kartd referred to a feminine, that kartrí would be used instead of it. Except in these constructions, however, formations in $t a r$ (in the weak cases $t r i$, $\delta$. 144.) very seldom occur as future participles; $\dagger$ but their usual function is that of a noun agent, like the corresponding forms in Greek and Latin in $\tau \eta \rho$, тop, tôr; as, סotín, dator, dator-is, answer to the Sanskrit dûtâr (दात̨ dâtri, nominative data, §. 144.). The Latin, however, as has been already observed ( $\$ .516$, p. 752 G. ed.), formed from the shorter form in torr a longer one in furu, and has allotted to this exclusively the functions of the future participle. In Zend, the formations in tarr, in my opinion, occur only as nouns of agency; as, datar, "crea-

 datare (§. 44.). To this class belong in Sclavonic the forma-
[G. Ed. p. 903.] tions in tely (theme telyo, §. 259.), the $r$ being exchanged for $l$, and the syllable yo added; as, dyetely, "factor," corresponds to the just-mentioned Zend datar and Sanskrit dhattar (compare §. 634.). This dyetely, however, does not occur in its simple form, but only in combination with the preposition $s$, and with dobro, "good," s-dyetly, "conditor," dobro-dyetely, "benefactor." For other

[^243]examples in tely, see $\S .259 . *$ From the Gothic we may here adduce the word blds-treis (theme blos-trya), which is quite isolated in its formation, and is connected with blot, "to honor," the $t$ of which, according to $\S .102$. , has passed into $s$ before the $t$ of the suffix. With respect to the Sanskrit suffix tar (tri), it remains to be remarked, that in vowels capable of Guna it requires Guna, and that it is not always united with the root direct, but frequently by a conjunctive vowel $i$; in the latter respect, jan-i-ta, jan-itaram, correspond to the Latin gen-i-tor, gen-i-tôrem, while paktâ, paktâram, answer to coctor, coctôrem.
648. In my Sanskrit Grammar I term the future tense just considered, and which is peculiar to the Sanskrit, the participial future, in accordance with its formation, to distinguish it from that which belongs to the Sanskrit, in common with the Zend, Greek, Lithuanian, and Latin, and which I call the auxiliary future, because, in its character स्य sya, I recognise the obsolete future of the root as, "to be." I imagine, therefore, that in dâ-syati, "he will give," only the syllable $y a$ expresses the future, but that the $s$ is the root of the verb "to be," with loss of its vowel, which is not surprising, as, even when uncompounded, the $a$ of the root as is frequently lost ( $(.480$.). The final part of $d d$-sydmi resembles very closely the potential sydm, "I may be," which actually exists in isolated use. Com-pare-

* With regard to the formations in ary, mentioned at $\S .259$. , it is requisite to observe, that the preceding $t$ does not belong to the suffix ander discussion, but to the primary word: slatary, "goldsmith" (in Russian, also, \}olotary), comes from soloto, "gold," and bratary, "porter," from brata, "door." Mytary, "toll-gatherer," is related in its primary word, which does not appear to occur, with the German Mauth: compare the Gothic môtareis (theme môtarya), "toll-gatherer," môta, "Mauth," "toll."

SINGULAR.

| FUTURE. | POTEN. | ruture. | POTEN. | FUTURE. | POTEN. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| syámi, | syâm. | syâvas, | syấva. | syâmas, syâma. |  |
| syasi, | syâs. | syathas, | syâtam. | syatha, syâta. |  |
| syati, | syât. | syatas, | syâtâm. | syanti. | syus. |

649. We see that the principal difference of the forms here compared is, that the potential has a long $\hat{a}$ pervading it, but the future a short $a$, which, according to the principle of the class-syllables of the first conjugation (§.434.), is lengthened before $m$ and $v$ of the first person. And besides this, the future has the full primary terminations, but the potential has the more obtuse secondary endings, with that of us in the third person plural, which occurs occasionally also in the imperfect.
650. The Latin has this great superiority over the Sanskrit, that its ero, eris, \&c., has been preserved in isolated use, and in fact retaining the initial vowel of the root, in which respect eris, erit, \&c. (from esis, esit, §. 22.), is as advantageously distinguished from syasi, syati, as es-tis from stha, or as, in Greek, è $\sigma \mu$ és from smas, $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma \tau o ́ v$ from sthas, stas (§. 480.)
651. The $i$ of eris, erit, \&c., I have already, in my System of Conjugation, represented ( p .91 ) as a contraction of the
[G. Ed. p. 905.] true future character $y a$; and I have since been supported in this opinion by the Prâkrit, where, for the Sanskrit sya or sya, we occasionally find $h i$; for instance, in the first person, himi for syami, and in the second person hisi for syasi (Latin eris). Some examples have been already given above (p. 401 Note).* It may be further remarked, that the Sanskrit, also, sometimes abbreviates the syllable $y a$, as also $v a$ and $r a$, by suppressing the vowel and changing the semi-vowel into its corre-

[^244]spanding vowel (see p. 780 G. ed.); and moreover (which, in the case before us, is still more important to-observe with regard to the formal connection of the future and potential), the syllable $y \hat{a}$ of the mood just mentioned is contracted in the middle to $\hat{\imath}$, by which syit, " he may be," becomes, in the middle, sitta.
652. The Lithuanian has likewise contracted the future character $y a$ to $i$ in the persons most correctly preserved; thus the sime, site, of $d_{\dot{u}-s i-m e, ~ d i}^{u}-s i-t e ~(d a b i m u s, ~ d a b i t i s)$, correspond to the Latin eri-mus, eri-lis, and the whole word to the Sanskrit $d \hat{a}$-sy $\hat{a}$-mas, $d \hat{d}$-sya-tha; and in the dual $d \mathfrak{u}-s i-w a, d i d-s i-t a$, correspond to the Sanskṛit dâ-syâ-vas, dd-sya-thas. But in its simple state si has been no more retained in Lithuanian than sya has in Sanskrit, but the verb substantive, in the future, in the two cognate idioms, combines the two roots of "to be" with one another: hence, in Lithuanian, bú-si-wa, bú-si-ta, bú-si-me, bú-si-te, answering to the Sanskrit bhav-i-şhyin-vas, bhav-i-shya-thas, bhav-i-s.hyd--mas, bhav-i-şhya-tha, which are furnished with Guna and a conjunctive vowel $i$. Compare, in regard to the combination of the two roots of "to be," the Latin fue-runt, for which a simple fui-nt might be expected; or (which is here more in point) the future perfect, fuero, [G. Ed. p. 906.] which I distribute, not into fu-ero, but into fue-ro for fui-ro (compare §. 644.).
653. In the singular, the Lithuanian has almost entirely lost the future character $i$, and only the $s$ of the auxiliary verb has remained; at least, I believe that in the second person $d \vec{u}$-si, "thou wilt give," the personal termination, which, in the second person singular, terminates in all tenses in $i$, has more claim to the $i$ than the expression of the future has. In the third person, $d^{\mathfrak{j}}$-s stands for all numbers (§.457.); and to the form bui-s of the verb substantive the word bhus, in Irish, of the same signification, remarkably corresponds, but which is quite isolated (see

O'Reilly's Lex., s.v. bhus). The Sanskṛit bhav-i-şhyati and Zend $b \hat{u}$-syediti, however, form the medium between the Lithuanian buis and Irish bhus.
654. I regard the $u$ in the first person singular of forms like $d \mathfrak{u}-\mathrm{su}$, "I will give," as in all first persons singular, as the vocalization of the personal character $m$ (see §§. 436.438.): in the Latin ero, however, for which erio ought to stand, the second element of the Sanskrit ya of syami has been preserved in preference to the first; and in this respect ero has the same relation to syami that veho, above mentioned, has to vahami (§.733.). The same is the case with the third person plural, in which erunt for eriunt corresponds to the Sanskrit syanti from asyanti, and in respect to its $u$ for $a$ answers to vehunt=vahunti.
655. To the Latin ero, erunt, from eso, esunt, correspond, exclusive of their middle terminations, the Greek é $\sigma \circ \mu \alpha$, érovial, the active of which is lost, as far as its simple use. "Eбovtal from é éiovtal answers to the Sanskrit -syanté for asyante, and in the singular $\begin{aligned} & \ell \\ & \epsilon \\ & \text { ecal }\end{aligned}$ to the Sanskrit -syaté ( $=$ syatai) from asyate. The form ${ }^{\ell} \epsilon \tau \alpha c$ is originally nothing else than the middle of $\grave{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau i$; and ${ }^{\prime} \in \epsilon-\tau \alpha \iota$ also appears, from the point of view of the Greek, like a present, with the con-
[G. Ed. p. 907.] junctive vowel of the conjugation in $\omega$ ( $\lambda$ é $\gamma-$
 scarcely have been formed from a consideration of metre, but have been used in the construction of verse only because they' were already in existence, and had a grammatical claim to that existence. I derive ê $\sigma \sigma o \mu \alpha t$, ö $\lambda \in ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$, by assimilation, from
 madhya, Latin medium), and as á $\lambda \lambda$ os from ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\prime} \lambda y o s=a l i u s$, Prâkrit anna, Sanskrit anya. The Prâkrit regularly assi-

[^245]milates, as has been already remarked (§. 300, p. 414 G. ed.), the weaker consonant to the stronger, whether this precedes or follows it; and according to this principle it produces also futures in ssañ,* ssasi, sadi, \&c.; e.g. karissadi, answering to the Sanskrit karishyati, "he will make." Forms of this kind, which are the countertypes of the Greek ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \sigma \mu \alpha l$, are in far more frequent use than those above mentioned in himi.
656. In composition the Greek loses the radical vowel of the auxiliary verb; hence, $\delta \omega-\sigma \omega$, $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma о \mu \in \nu$, $\delta \epsilon i ́ k-\sigma \omega$, $\delta \in i ́ \kappa-$ $-\sigma o \mu \epsilon \nu$, as in Sanskrit dâ-syâmi, dâ-syâmas, dêk-şhyâmi (§. 21.), dêk-shydmas, only with the loss of the $y$, for which 4 might be expected, and which, too, it is very remarkable, has remained in some Doric forms, which Koen compares at Greg. Cor. p. 230. They are the following: $\pi \rho \alpha \xi$ io $\epsilon \varepsilon, \chi \alpha \rho \iota \xi$ !ó $\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$, $\sigma v v \delta i \alpha \phi u \lambda \alpha \xi i o \mu \epsilon \theta \alpha, \beta o \alpha \theta \eta \sigma i \omega, \pi \rho \circ \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi i \omega . \dagger$ To this class belong the common Doric futures in $\sigma \hat{\omega}$, [G. Ed. p. 908.] $\sigma o \hat{u} \mu \epsilon \nu$, from $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, $\sigma \epsilon \in \rho \epsilon \varepsilon$, for $\sigma^{\prime} \omega$, $\sigma^{\prime} \sigma \mu \epsilon v$, since the $\iota$ has been first corrupted to $\varepsilon$, and then contracted with the following vowel, as in the declension of bases in $t$, as $\pi$ ó $\lambda e \iota$ proceeded from $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \varsigma, \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \alpha \varsigma$, and these from $\pi o ́ \lambda ı \epsilon s, \pi o ́ \lambda \iota a s ;$ as to the Old High German genitives like balge-s (palkes) the Gothic like balgi-s correspond, or as, in the feminine $i$ bases, the Old High German form krefti precedes the Middle High German genitives and datives like krefte. In the genitive plural we have, in Old High German even, according to the difference of authorities, together with kreftio, which must originally have been kreflyo, the form krefteo, and, suppressing the $e$ or $i$, krefto (chrefto). These genitives, therefore, in their gradual process of corruption, coincide exactly with that of the Greek future; for from yo we arrive first at

[^246]$i o$, thence at eo, and in the farthest corruption at $o$; just as from the Sanskrit future in syâmi, syâmas, in Greek at first
 suppose to have existed before $\sigma \hat{\omega}$, $\sigma o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon \nu$; finally to the common future forms like $\delta \omega-\sigma \omega$, $\delta \epsilon^{i} \kappa-\sigma \omega$, in which the semivowel of the Sanskrit dú-syâmi, dêk-shydmi, has entirely disappeared. In the Greek second future, however, the second element of the Sanskrit sya has been retained in preference to the sibilant; and as the liquids have expelled the $\sigma$ of the first aorist, and ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota \lambda \alpha$ is said for ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \sigma \alpha$, so also $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \hat{\omega}$ comes from $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \in \omega$ for $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda^{\prime} \omega$, and this from $\sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \sigma i \omega$, according to the analogy of the above-mentioned $\beta_{0} \alpha \theta_{\eta}-\sigma i \omega$, $\pi \rho \circ \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi-\sigma i \omega$.
657. It is not probable that the Sanskrit future-character $y a$ should have originally occurred only in the root as of the
[G. Ed. p. 909.] verb substantive; but I have scarce any doubt that, at a very early epoch, extending back beyond the period of the separation of languages, the attributive verbs likewise might form their future by annexing directly the syllable $y a$; that therefore forms like $d \hat{a}-y a t i$ have existed before or contemporaneously with such as $d \lambda$-syati $=\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \epsilon$, 'he will give." In the present state of the language, however, the attributive verbs always require the verb substantive in order to denote the future, as the Sclavonic languages also apply the newly-constructed future of the verb substantive (§. 633.) to paraphrase the future of the attributive verbs, without, however (the Servian language excepted), forming with it a compound. The Carniolan and Polish employ with the future of the auxiliary verb that participle in $l, l a, l o$, which we have seen above used to express the past (§.628. \&c.): the Russian, however, and Bohemian, and sometimes, also, the Old Sclavonic, use the infinitive. Thus, in Carniolan we find, in the various genders, b6m,*

[^247] analogy
igràl, bom igrála, bom igrálo, "I will play," literally, "I will be he that plays," "she that plays," "it that plays." In Polish, bed $d_{e}$ * czytat, czytata, czytato, means "I will read," ("I will be reading"); in Russian, 6yay [G. Ed. p. 910.] двигашь bûdû dvigaty, "I will move," literally, "I will be moving"; so, in Bohemian, budu krasti (from kradti), "I will steal." The Servian, however, has this advantage over the other Sclavonic dialects, that it does not require a periphrasis of the future by the verb substantive, but combines the auxiliary verb signifying "to do" with the themes of the attributive verbs, just as with that of the verb substantive : thus, igradyu means "I will play," as bidyu does "I will be."
658. Several Sclavonic languages may or must, under certain circumstances, express the future by a preposition prefixed to the present, which signifies "after," and is pronounced po. We refer the reader to Dobrowsky's Bohemian Instructions, pp. 160, \&c., respecting the difference in signification of the Bohemian futures which are expressed with $p o$, from those which are conveyed by a periphrasis, where both together are used, as po-kradu and budu krasti. In Carniolan there are not more than ten verbs which express the future by prefixing $p o$; as $p o-$-rèzhcm, "I will say." $\dagger$
analogy of the Old Sclavonic bû-dû ( $(\mathbf{l} .633$.$) . The contraction of bodem$ to bóm is like that of gléday, "behold" (glédam, "I behold"), to glèy (see Kopitar's Cr. Gr. p. 334). The contracted form bóm resembles fortuitously, but in a surprising degree, the Prâkrit present hômi, "I am," an abbreviation of bhômi, and contraction of the Sanskrit bhavâmi. In the kindred languages, however, a historical fact lies for the most part at the bottom of fortuitous coincidences, which, in the case before us, consists in this, that bom and hômi, like our bin, Old High German bim, have the same root and the same personal termination.

[^248]The rest all express movement, as pobeshím "I will fly," poyesdim, "I will ride" (Kopitar, p. 332). The Old Sclavonic employs other prepositions besides $p o$, in order to give a future meaning to the present. After po the most in use are oy ( $\hat{u}$ ), " by," and $\left.{ }^{\text {въ }} \mathbf{z}(v\}\right)$, " upwards"; as $\hat{u}$-vidit, " videbit," u-boy $\mathfrak{\text { -s sya, " timebo" " (Sanskrit bhí, "to fear," bhayn, "fear"), }}$ vo引-rastu, "crescam" (Dobr. p. 377).
659. The periphrasis by buddu, "I will be," is rare in Old Sclavonic: on the other hand, imam, "I have," frequently occurs in the translation of the Gospels as a future auxiliary
[G.Ed.p.911.] verb in combination with the infinitive; as imyeti imashi, " habebis" (" thou hast to have"); priiti imaty syn, "veniet flius"; ne imaty byti, "non erit; ne imaty pili, "non bibet" (Dobrowsky, p. 379). Observe the coincidence of idea with the Roman languages, the future of which, though it has completely the character of a simple inflexion form, is nothing else than the combination of the infinitive with the present of the auxiliary verb "to have." This would perhaps have been with difficulty discovered, or not at all, on account of the contraction which the auxiliary verb experiences in the plural, but for the clear indication of it we receive from the language of Provence, which at times separates the auxiliary verb from the infinitive by a pronoun; as, dar vos n'ai, " $j e$ vous en donnerai"; dir vos ai, " $j e$ vous dirai"; dir vos em, " nous vous dirons"; gitar m’etz, " vous me jeterez." It is remarkable that the Old Sclavonic occasionally paraphrases the future of the verb "to have" itself by "to have," which the Roman languages are always compelled to do, because they possess no other means of expressing the future: thus the French tu auras (from avoiras) corresponds to the above-mentioned Sclavonic imyati imashi.
660. The Gothic, also, sometimes paraphrases the future by the auxiliary verb "to have"; thus, 2 Cor. xi. 12 , tauyan
 Grimm. IV. 93.). The German languages have, that is to
say, like their Sclavonic cognate idioms, from the earliest antiquity lost their primitive future inflexion, which the Lithuanian and Lettish share to this day with the Sanskrit and Greek. As, however, the Sanskrit future syami is almost identical with the potential syadm, "l may be," and the future character घ ya springs from the same source with the potential या $y d$, it deserves notice that Ulfilas frequently expresses the Greek future by the Gothic subjunctive present, which is in form identical with the Sanskrit potential and [G. Ed. p. 912.] Greek optative. Examples are, Mark ix. 19, siyau and thulau

 reverse case the Persian uses the only ancient future that it has preserved, viz. باشم bdsham (=Sanskrit bhavig̣hyâmi) also in the sense of the present subjunctive. The attributive verbs in Persian, to denote the future, prefix to the present a particle beginning with $b$, which, with regard to its vowel, is guided by that of the initial syllable of the verb; so that for $u$ (dhamma) the prefix also contains an $u$, but for other vowels an $i$;* as bi-baram, "I will carry," bi-bazam, "I will play," but bu-pursam, "I will ask." These futures stand in an external analogy with those of the Sclavonic languages, which are formed from the present by prefixing the preposition po (§§. 658. \&c.). We must, however, leave it undecided whether the Persian prefix of the future, which may also precede the imperative, is identical with the inseparable preposition $b i$, or whether, as appears to me far more probable, it is connected with بايد bâyad, " oportet," and has, therefore, an ideal relationship with the periphrasis of the future, which is formed by the auxiliary verb sollen, and which still

[^249]remains in several older and more recent German dialects (Grimm IV. 179. \&c.). If this is the case, it may be here further remarked, that, in Zend, the imperative is occasionally used in the sense of the future. Thus we read in
 hê urvâněm vahistèm ahâm frahâruyểnế, "whose soul I will
[G. Ed. p. 913.] make to go to the best world." Anquetil translates, "je ferai aller librement sin ame aux demeures cellestes."*
661. We return to the Gothic, in order to remark that it employs most commonly the present indicative instead of the future, in which it is deficient, as is the case also in Old High German very frequently. The periphrasis, however, begins gradually by sollen and wollen, the latter only in the first person : that by means of werden is peculiar to the New German; in a certain degree, however, the Gothic paves the way for it, as in this language wairtha sometimes occurs in the sense of the future of the verb substantive. Grimm (IV. 177. 178.) quotes the following passages : Matt. viii. 12. Luke i. 14. 2 Cor. xi. 15, where é $\epsilon \tau \alpha l$ is rendered by vairthith; moreover, 2 Cor. vi. 16. where vairtha, vairthand, answer to
 the most natural and surest expression of future being, and far better adapted to represent it than the auxiliary verhs wollen, "to will," and sollen, "to owe"; for he who is becoming will certainly arrive at being, and is one who will be hereafter; the willing and the owing, however, may be incapable or be prevented from doing what he would or ought. The

[^250]willing person may also alter his will, and hence not do what he intended. The Old Northern language, [G.Ed. p. 914.] in paraphrasing the future, uses the anomalous mun, "I think," which employs the preterite form as the present; e.g. munt vera, "eris," mun slitna, "rumpetur," koma munu, "venient." To this head belongs the circumstance, that occasionally the Gothic weak verb munan represents, not, indeed, the proper future, but the Greek construction with $\mu \epsilon \in \lambda \lambda \omega$, for which, however, haban is also applied (Grimm,IV.93.178.); thus John xiv. 22, munais gabairhtyan, " $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ è $\mu \phi \alpha \nu i \zeta \epsilon \iota v . "$ Ulfilas, however, could scarcely have imagined that his munan and the Greek $\mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda \omega$ are radically akin, which is the case if I mistake not. I believe that $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda \omega$ stands in the same relation to the Sanskrit manyé (only that the latter is a middle verb), "I think," "I mean," as ä $\lambda \lambda$ 皮 does to anya-s," the other" (\$.655.). The circumstance that we have the Sanskrit root, in Greek also, in a truer form, and one which retains the original $n$ (e.g. $\mu$ évos=manas), does not prevent the assumption that besides this the favorite exchange of liquids takes place, and consequently $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ might become estranged from the forms with $\nu$.
662. Latin futures like anabo, docebo, have already, in my System of Conjugation, as compounds with the root $f u$ (the $f$ of which in the interior of a word becomes $b$, see $\S$. 18.), and bo, bis, bit, \&c., been compared with the Anglo-Saxon beo, "I will be," bys, "thou wilt be," bydh, "he will be." Bo, a sister form of the bam of amabam, docebam, discussed before ( $\$ \S .526 .8<c$.), answers in conjugation exactly to ero; $b 0$, therefore, stands for bio, bunt for biunt, and the $i$ of bis, bit, bimus, bitis, is a contraction of the Sanskrit future character ya (§.651.). From the root bhî, in Sanskrit, would come the forms bhûyâmi, bhâyasi, bhâyati, \&c., or with Guna, blôyâmi, bhoyasi, \&cc., if the said root were not combined in the future with the root as, but annexed the syllable $y a$ direct (before
[G. Ed. p. 915.] $m$ and $v, y \hat{a})$. To this would correspond in Latin, in its isolated state, fujo, fuis, fuit, in which, however, fuit would be distinguished from the perfect (aorist) fuit in this, that the $i$ in the latter form is nothing but a conjunctive vowel and the weakening of an original $a$, but in the future the contraction of $y a$ and expression of the relation of time. In $b o, b i s, b i t$, the $u$ of the root $f u$ is passed over, as in $f i o, f i s$, $f i t$, which is properly the passive of $f u$, and corresponds to the Sanskrit passive bhî-yê, bhû-ya-sê, bh $\hat{u}-y a$-tê, only with active terminations like the Prâkrit, which preserves the characteristic syllable ya of the Sanskrit passive (of which we will speak hereafter), but has replaced the middle terminations by active ones.
663. The question may be raised, whether the Latin $b o$ is really based on a presupposed Sanskrit bhûydmi or bhôyâmi; and thus, whether this form existed at the time of the division of languages, and if alone, or, together with that, compounded with the other root of "to be," on which the Zend $b \hat{u} s y e ̂ m i$, the Greek $\phi u ́-\sigma \omega$, the Lithuanian bú-su, and the Irish bhus, "erit," mentioned above, are founded; or whether the Latin bo likewise, at an earlier period, was combined with the other auxiliary verb; whether, therefore, in an isolated state, a furo from an earlier fuso, for fusio, existed, like the Greek $\phi u$ - $\sigma \omega$ from $\phi u-\sigma^{\prime} \omega$ ? This question cannot be decided with certainty; but the latier, according to which amabo, amabis, \&c., would appear as contractions of amaburo, amaburis, appears to me the more probable, particularly as the forms, which are incumbered by the composition, have most cause to be weakened. It may be observed, that, even without any external occasion for being weakened, the Old High German, in the very same root, contrasts with its plural birumês, " we are" (=Sanskrit bhavamas, §. 20.), a singular bim for birum. The Carniolan exhibits, as we have seen (§. 657.), together with bbdem, "I will be" ("do be"), cor-
responding to the Sclavonic cognate idioms, [G. Ed. p. 916.] a contracted form bom, to which the Latin bo accidentally approaches very closely, though with a different kind of contraction. The Anglo-Saxon beo, mentioned above (also beom), "I will be," is properly not a formal future, but a present, answering to the German bin, Old High German bim, and to the Sanskrit bhavimi, which is principally used with a future meaning, while eom $=a s m i$, Gothic $i m$, remains devoted to the present. It might, also, be disputed whether the Latin $b o$ of $a m a b o$ is actually a future, for then it would be necessary to identify the $i$ of $b i s$, , $b i t$, \&c., with the conjunctive vowel $a$ of the Sanskrit bhav-a-si, bhav-a-ti, and to place it on the same footing with the $i$ of $v e h-i-s$, veh-i-t=vah-a-si, vah-a-ti (sce §. 507.). Remark the obsolete subjunctive fuam, which presupposes a present indicative fuo, fuis (§. 510.). However, that opinion appears to be most probably the true one, that $b o$, bis, rest on the same principle of formation with ero, eris, and that, therefore, there is a reason why amalo, monebo, have a future and not a present signification. It appears certain, that the third and fourth conjugations, did all form their futures originally in bo (compare §. 529.); futures in am, however, are, according to their origin, of the subjunctive mood,* and we shall return to them hereafter. We have already (§. 526.) noticed the remarkable coincidence which exists between the Latin and the Irish, in the circumstance that the latter combines all attributive verbs in the future with the labial root of the verb substantive. The Irish, however, is superior to the Latin in this, that, in the simple state of the verb substantive, it forms the future not from the root, which is, in Sanskrit, as, but from that [G. Ed. p. 917.] which has the labial initial sound (see §. 526. p. 767 G. ed.).

[^251]664. It remains to be remarked with regard to the Sanskrit future, that the syllable sya, which proceeds from the verb substantive, is combined with the root either directly or by means of a conjunctive vowel $i$, after the manner of the third aorist formation (§. 560 .), so that the $s$, through the influence of this $i$, again becomes $s h$; as in tan-i-shyâmi, "extendam." Radical vowels, capable of Guna, receive it;* hence, dêk-ṣhyami $=\delta \epsilon_{i} \kappa-\sigma \omega$ from dis', "to shew"; lêk-ṣhyâmi= $=\lambda \epsilon$ ík- $\sigma \omega$ from $l i h, " t o ~ l i c k " ; ~ y o ̂ k-~$ shydmi=§єúk- $\sigma \omega$ from $y u j$, " to combine" (§. 19.); bhav-ishyâmi from blid, "to be." The Greek has Guna only where the present, also, has a Guna vowel, as in the examples adduced; it contrasts, however, $\lambda \dot{u}-\sigma \omega, \phi \dot{v}-\sigma \omega$, $\dot{\rho} i n-\sigma \omega$, with the Sanskrit lav-i-şhyâmi from lì, "to cut off," bhav-i-shydmi from bhî, "to be," kṣhép-sydmi from kṣhip, "to throw." The Zend, also, in respect to the Guna, does not agree exactly with the Sanskrit; hence, e.g., bûsyêmi, "ero" (§.665.), both in not employing the Guna, and also in the direct annexation of the auxiliary verb, corresponds more to the Greek $\phi \dot{v}-\sigma \omega$ and Lithuanian bú-su than to the Sanskṛit bhav-i-s.shyámi. We subjoin the full conjugation of this future, and append to it the Latin fac-so, which is very isolated, and which agrees with $\phi \dot{u}-\sigma \omega$, bu-su, not only in the formation, but is also radically akin to it (§. 19.).
[G. Ed. p. 918.]
SINGULAR.

| sanskrit. | zend. $\dagger$ | Lith. | liatin. | greek. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhav-i-shyâmi, | bû-syêmi, ${ }^{1}$ | bui-su, | fac-so, | $\phi \dot{u}-\sigma \omega{ }^{2}$ |
| bhav-i-shyasi, | bî-syêhi, ${ }^{1}$ | $b u$-si, ${ }^{3}$ | fac-sis, | $\phi u ́-\sigma \epsilon \iota$. |
| bhav-i-shyati, | bû-syêiti, ${ }^{1}$ | bu-s, | fac-sit, | $\phi \dot{u}-\sigma \in \iota$. |

[^252]| DUAL. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| bhav-i-shyâvas, |  | $b$ b-siwa |  |  |
| bhav-i-ṣhyathas, | but-syath0? | bú-sita, |  | ф'́-бетоv. |
| bhav-i-shyatas, | $b \hat{l}$-syatd, | like Sing. |  | $\phi u ́-\sigma \in T o v$. |
| plural. |  |  |  |  |
| bhav-i-şhyâmas, | bû-syâmah | bú-sime, | fac-simus, $\phi \underline{v}-\sigma о \mu \in \nu$ |  |
| bhav-i-shyatha, | bî-syatha, | bí-site, | fac-silis, | $\phi \dot{d}-\sigma \epsilon \tau \epsilon$. |
| blav- -s.hyanti, | $b \hat{u}$-syanti, | like Sing. | fuc-sunt, | $\phi u ́-\sigma o v \tau \iota$. |
| 1 §. 42. | ${ }^{2}$ From $\phi$ voi $\omega$, | 656. ${ }^{3}$ | ${ }^{3}$ The $i$ is the personal ter- |  |
| mination : see §. 418 |  |  |  |  |

On account of the perfect agreement between दास्यामि ditsyadmi, $\delta \omega \sigma \sigma \omega$, and the Lithuanian $d \mathfrak{u} s u(d u 0-s u$ ), this future, also, may be here fully conjugated, and the Latin dabo subjoined, as it agrees with the Lithuanian $i$ and Sanskrit $y a$, though not in the auxiliary verb, still in respect to the future characteristic $\boldsymbol{i}$ of dabis, \&c.

## active.

SINGULAR.

| Nanskrit. <br> dâ-syâmi, | Greek, $\delta \omega ́-\sigma \omega$, | Lithuanian. dūsu. | Latin. <br> $d a-b o$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dd-syasi, |  | $d \hat{u}-s i$, | da-bis. |
| da-syati, | $\delta{ }^{\prime} \omega$ - $\sigma \epsilon \iota$, | $d \bar{u}-s$, | da-bit. |

DUAL.

| dâ-syâvas, |  | $d \vec{u}-s i w a$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| d $\hat{\text { d-syathas, }}$ | $\delta \omega$-бєтоv, | $d \hat{u}-\mathrm{sita}$ | . . $\cdot$ |
| d $\hat{1}$-syatas, | $\delta \omega$-бєтоv, | like Sing. | . . |

$d a-s y a ̂ m a s, \quad \delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma о \mu \epsilon v, \quad$ dì-sime, $\quad d a-b i m u s$.
dî-syatha, $\quad \delta \dot{\omega}$-бєтє, $\quad d \vec{u}$-site, da-bitis.
dâ-syanti, $\quad \hat{j} \hat{\omega}$-бovtı, like Sing. da-bunt.

MIDDLE.

| singular. |  | DUAL. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sanskrit. | Greek. | Sanskrit. | Greek. |
| dde sye, |  | dâ-syâvahê, | $\delta \omega$-бouc ${ }^{\text {cov. }}$ |
| dâ-syasê, | ( $\delta \omega \bar{\omega}-\sigma \epsilon \sigma \alpha \iota$ ). | dâ-syêthê, | $\delta \omega$ - $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta$ о. |
| dâ-syatê, | $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$. | dâ-syêtê, | $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \epsilon \sigma$ Oov. |

MIDDLE.
plural.

| Sanskrit. | Greek. |
| :---: | :---: |
| dâ-syâmakê, |  |
| dâ-syadhwê, | $\delta \omega \dot{\omega}$ - $\sigma \in \sigma \theta$. |
| dâ-syantê, | $\delta \omega$-боит $\alpha$. |

665. The Zend future agrees, in essentials, with the Sanskrit, as we have already seen from the relation of b̂tsyêmi* to bhaviṣhyâmi. Still this example shews that the Zend, in respect to the Guna and introduction of a conjunctive vowel $i$, does not everywhere kecp pace with the Sanskrit, and in the case before us resembles more closely the Greek $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \omega$ and Lithuanian búsu than भविq्यामि bhaviṣhadmi. I cannot, however, adduce the form busyêmi even from the ZendAvesta, but from the frequently-occurring participle $b \hat{u}_{s}$ yantĕm, "the about to be" (Vend. S. p. 89), we may, with as mach certainty, infer bûsyêmi, bûsyêhi, \&c., than we can,

[G. Ed. p. 920.] from bhavişhyun. The form in êmi, êhi, eiti, is apparent from $\S .42$.; for the $y$ invariably exerts an assimilating influence upon the $\hat{a}$ or $a$, which precedes the terminations mi,hi, ti, through which those vowels become e. That, however, the $y$ of the future makes no exception to this rule is proved, if proof be required, among other proofs, by that of

[^253]" he will say," * answering to the Sanskrit vakshyati from vach. In the dual and plural, the $y$ abstains from its assimilating influence, and, in the third person plural, as generally before $n$, it protects the $a$ following from being weakened to $\varepsilon \check{\text { e }}$, as occurs clsewhere.
 vacsayatb, mentioned at $\S$. 464. p. 646, Note if it corresponded to the Sanskrit वस्ष्यत् vakshyutas, from vah, " to carry," "to bear." I now, however, prefer regarding it as the causal of the Sanskrit root vakssh, "accumulare," which may perhaps also siguify "to grow," and to which the Gothic root VAHS regularly answers; whence, valsya, "I grow," vôhs, "I grew," with $h$ for $k$, according to a general law for the change of sounds. The Zend ucsyémi, "I grow," appears to be a contraction of vacsyêmi (compare p. 780 G. ed.), as, in Sanskrit, such contractions occur only in forms devoid of Guna; and, e.g., from vach, "to speak," the gerund, indeed, is $u k t w d$, but the infinitive, which requires Guna, is not uktum, but vaktum. As, then, in the causal verb the vowels capable of Guna receive it, it need not surprise us if, in Zend, the root vaes, as a verb of the fourth class, to which Guna does not belong, were contracted to uss, but, in the causal, retained the full form vacs, as, in Sanskrit, the root vyadh of the fourth class forms, in the present, vidhyami for vyadhyami, but, in the causal, vyadhayâmi.
667. That the Zend, also, occasionally [G. Ed. p. 921.] uses the conjunctive vowel $i$ in its future is proved by the form ${ }^{\text {g daibisyanti, "they will disturb," from }}$ the root $d a b$, which corresponds to the Sanskrit dambh, "to deceive," and in the preceding and several other forms, which occur in the Vend. S., has, through the influence of the $i$ of
the following syllable, received an $i$ in the root (§.41.). It is translated by Anquetil in various passages by afliger and blesser. The future form mentioned occurs in the V.S., p. 215, sp, will disturb you both." Auquetil renders this strangely enough "vous deux, affigez ceux qui me tiennent dans l'oppression." In another passage (p.223) we find the third person plural of the future middle of the same verb, viz. daibisyantê, which Anquetil likewise regards as the second person imperative, and renders by blessez.
668. In the Zend future forms hitherto considered, the sibilant of the verb substantive appears in the form of a $\mu s$, because it follows letters which, in Sanskyit, according to $\$$. 21 ., require the change of the $s$ into $s h$, for which, in Zend, $\omega$ s or sh is regularly written. After such letters, however, as, in Sanskrit, leave the $s$ unaltered, an $h$ must be expected in the Zend future, according to §. 53., instead of the sibilant; and this we find, also, in the passive participle zainhamana, "the man about to be born" (Vend. S., p. 28), from which we may safely infer an indicative zainhyê, "I shall be born." Anquetil, indeed, renders the words دNG tanaincha zainhyamananaimcha, "and of the persons born and
[G.Ed.p.922.] about to be born," $\dagger$ by "les hommes qui naissent et engendrent," according to which ujugnessex zainhyamuna must be considered as a middle present participle; but it is impossible that the root zan,=Sanskrit नन् $j a n$, can arrive at an $h$ without thereby expressing the future. At most we might be in doubt, whether zainyamana should be regarded as of the middle or of the passive voice, as these voices in the general tenses, as also in the special

[^254]tenses of the fourth class, are not distinguished from each other. The Indian grammarians take jityê, "I am born," as a middle, so that $y$ a passes as the characteristic of the fourth class (see §. 109*. 2.); but as the passive, also, in the special tenses, annexes the syllable $y a$ and may reject the $n$ in the root jan, by which the $a$ is lengthened, so there is nothing to prevent us from regarding the verb jayd, also, as a formal passive on account of its passive meaning. Thus I consider the Zend participle zanihyamana as passive.
669. From the roots $d \hat{a}$, "to give," and $d \hat{a}$, "to place," the future form danonhyêmi might, according to $\S .56^{\text {b }}$., be expected: as, however, in Zend, khy also sometimes occurs as the representative of the Sanskrit sy (see p. 280), we must be prepared for a form dakkyêmi; and the [G.Ed.p.923.] passive participle of this we find in Vend. S., p. 89, where, in like manner, the passive past participle, uz-dAtananm, " of those held up," precedes the genitive plural of the future participle uzdâkhamnanaim (=Sanskrit uddhasyamânânâm). " of those about to be held up,"* as above we have seen zata-naim-cha and zuilyamanananm-cha close together. As we have, therefore, the sibilant of the verb substantive here before us in the shape of a guttural, we will again draw attention to what has been said above of the probable origin of the $\kappa$ of $\epsilon^{\prime} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$, $\delta \hat{\delta} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$, from $\sigma$ (§§. 568.8 c. ). As the Zend root $d n$, " to place," "to lay," " to make," $\dagger$ corresponds to the Greek tion $\mu$, consequently the dakh of the dakhyamnananim, which has been mentioned, would be identical with the Greek $\theta \eta \kappa$ of ${ }^{3} \theta \eta \kappa \alpha, \tau^{\prime} \hat{\theta} \eta \kappa \alpha$.
670. As respects, however, the origin of the exponent of

[^255]the future, $y a$, with which that of the potential and precative $y^{A}$ is to be ranked, I am still of the opinion already expressed in my System of Conjugation, that these syllables proceed from the root $\hat{\ddagger} \hat{\imath}$," to wish." Consequently the Greek optative, which is founded on the Sanskrit potential and precative, would, according to its signification, have its name from the same verb to which it owes its formal origin. If the conjunctive vowel of the first and sixth class be added to the root ई $\hat{\imath}$, it would make $y a$, according to the same phonetic principle by which the root $i$, "to go," forms, in the third person plural, yanti. From this yanti, therefore, the termination of [G. Ed. p. 924.] dâ-s-yanti, "they will give," cannot be distinguished. It cannot be denied, too, that the root $i$, "to go," to which Wüllner (Origin of Lingual Forms, §§. 46. 47.) has betaken himself in explaining the future, is, in respect of form, just as suitable as $\hat{i}$. But the meaning " to wish," " to will," is certainly more adapted to express the future and the optative than that of "to go." This is also confirmed by the use of language, as several idioms, quite independent of one another, have simply, through internal impulse, come to the decision of expressing the future by "to will." It is certain that the Modern Greek and Old High German (§. 661.), nay, even the various German dialects, have, in this respect, borrowed nothing from one another nor imitated each other. The Old Sclavonic, also, sometimes employs an auxiliary verb, signifying " to will," to express the future. It is not, however, to be overlooked, that the examples which Dobrowsky (p. 380.) adduces from the translation of the Bible are all preceded by $\mu e ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ in the Greek text; for which reason, unless other instances occur where this is not the case, we must conjecture that the wish of keeping as close as possible to the Greek text must have suggested to the Sclavonic translator his $\chi 0 \amalg 8$ choshch $\hat{1}$; thus Luke xxi. 7,
 chotyǎ̆ priiti, ó $\mu \in ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ eै $\rho \chi \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$. Respecting the conjectural
relationship of the Greek $\mu{ }^{\prime} \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \omega \omega$ with the Indian manye, "I think," see p. 914 G.ed.
671. The Sanskrit sometimes uses its desiderative form to denote the future, as in the episode of the Draupadî mumûrshu, "wishing to die," occurs in the sense of "about to die;" and, conversely, in different languages, the expression of the future is occasionally used to denote that of "to will:" and the Latin forms its desideratives from [G. Ed.p.925.] the future participle in tîrus, abbreviating the $u$, and adding the characteristic of the fourth conjugation, the $\hat{\imath}$ of which, however, has nothing to do with the Sanskrit future suffix $y n$, but, as has been shewn, is founded on the characteristic of the tenth class ayu, which is frequently used in Sanskrit to form denominatives. The Greek forms desideratives from the future in $\sigma \omega$, or perhaps from the older form in $\sigma^{\prime} \omega$; so that in forms like $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \omega \sigma \epsilon i \omega, \gamma \in \lambda \alpha \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \omega$, the $\iota$ would be strengthened only by a Gunising $\epsilon$. These desideratives, however, and the future, may be regarded as cognate forms, so that both, independently of each other, but by a similar formation, would have proceeded from the verbal theme, as there are in Sanskrit also desideratives, which have the form of the future but have not proceeded from it, but, following its analogy, have sprung from a nominal base; e.g. vrisha-sydmi, "to desire the bull," madhw-asydmi, "to ask for honey." In the latter example the $a$ of the root of the verb substantive is perhaps contained. But usually in denominative desideratives the verb substantive is quite omitted, or has become obsolete, and they only contain the syllable ya, i.e. the auxiliary verb "to wish," which is characteristic of the future; e.g. pati-y/tmi, "I wish for a spouse," from pati, "spouse." It is not improbable that the desideratives which have been formed from primitive roots by the addition of a sibilant, and which are furnished with a syllable of reduplication, had originally a $y$ after the sibilant, and therefore, likewise, the root of "to wish" alluded to;
thus, e.g. pipâ-sami, "I wish to drink," from pipa-sydmi, agreeing with $p \hat{a}-$-syami, "I will drink." If this is the case then pipâsâmi has the same relation to the presupposed pipâsyâmi that the Greek $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \omega$, from $\delta \omega \sigma^{\prime} \omega$, has to the San-
[G. Ed. p. 926.] skṛit dûsyâmi. The root being burthened with the reduplication might, perhaps, produce a weakening in the final portion of the word, similar to that through which the reduplicated verbs in the third person plural have lost the nasal belonging to this person; and, e.g., biblrati, "they carry," is said for bibhranti (§.459.). We shall recur hereafter to the desideratives.

## FORMATION OF THE MOODS

## POTENTIAL, OPTATIVE, AND SUBJUNCTIVE.

672. The Sanskrit potential, which, with several peculiarities of use, combines in itself the meanings of the Greek subjunctive and optative, but in form adheres to the latter, is, in that conjugation which corresponds to the Greek in $\mu$, formed by the syllable $y \hat{a}$, which is prefixed to the personal terminations. The class peculiarities are retained; e.g. vidydm "sciam," from vid, class 2; bibhriyam "feram," from bhri, class 3; strinuyâm, " sternam," from stri, class 5; syâm for asyâm, "sim," from as, class 2 . We easily recognise the modal exponent $y d$ in the Greek $\quad \eta$, in which the semi-vowel has become a vowel, according to the Greek system of sounds: the $\iota$, however, always forms a diphthong with the preceding radical vowel, as there are no present forms like ${ }^{\prime} \delta \delta \mu \iota$ (Sanskrit admi, Lithuanian edmi), and therefore no optatives, too, like $\dot{\epsilon}^{\delta} \delta^{\prime} \eta \nu$, which would resemble the Sanskṛit $a d y a ̂ m$. But diooinv corresponds tolerably well to the Sanskrit dadyâm, especially if its radical vowel is restored, which, through a particular irregularity, it has lost. According to rule, dadâyâm would correspond to the Greek $\delta i \delta o i \eta \nu$; but the root $d \hat{d}$, under the retro-active in-
[G. Ed. p.927.] fluence of the heavy personal terminations and of the modal characteristic under discussion, suppresses
its radical vowel according to the same principle by which the Greek verb shortens its $\omega$; thus dadyâ $m=\delta i \delta o i \eta v$, as dadmas $=$ $\delta \iota \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu$ (see p. 698 G. ed.). The Sanskrit root as,"to be," loses, by a special anomaly (which is, nevertheless, founded on the law of gravity, which acts with such astonishing consequences (§.480.)), its initial $a$ in those places where $d \boldsymbol{a}$ drops its final vowel; hence syâm, "I may be," answering to the Greek $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta \nu$, which I deduce from $\grave{\epsilon} \sigma i \eta \nu$, because $\sigma$ between two vowels very easily admits of being dislodged, but the root E $\Sigma$ firmly protects its vowel; hence, also, in the present indicative, $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \mu \dot{\varepsilon} v, \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \in ́$, are more full than the Sanskrit cognate forms smas, " we are," stha, " ye are."
673. The agreement of the Greek and Sanskrit is very remarkable in this point, that both languages have, in the middle, entirely lost the long vowel of the modal exponent
 in Sanskrit dadîta, dad̂̂ınahi, for dadyâta, dadyâmahi. The cause clearly lies in the weightier personal terminations of the middle; but I would not maintain, that the wound inflicted by them, in both languages, in one and the same place, on the preceding modal exponent, dates so early as the period when Greek and Sanskrit were still one. The principle of the form-weakening, retro-active influence of the weight of the personal terminations must, however, have existed at that time; and several circumstances in our European circle of languages point to this, that at the time of the identity of the languages, which are now separated, several convulsions took place in the organization of each family of languages. In the preceding case, however, the Greek סiסoîto by its accent shews itself to be a comparatively recent contraction; for if the rejection of the [G. Ed. p. 928.] $\eta$ was primitive, and had taken place before the separation of languages, dí̊oıto would be accented like $\lambda$ évoıтo. The Greek shews itself, too, in the suppression of the $\eta$, independent of the Sanskrit, in this, that it admits this vowel in the two plural numbers of the active, and for diסoin $\mu \in \nu$ employs also
diסoí $\epsilon v$, while the Sanskrit together with dadyama has not a form dadîma, but both in this and in all verbs of the second conjugation the modal syllable $y d$ is left unweakened in both the plural numbers of the active voice, although in other respects these two numbers follow the analogy of the middle, as their terminations are heavier than those of the singular.
674. The Latin subjunctive coincides in form with the Greek optative and Sanskrit potential. Its agreement with the former might have been perceived, without the intervention of the Sanskrit, from sim, velim, edim, and duim, the modal $i$ of which coincides with the Greek $<$ of $\delta \iota \delta o i n \nu$. But these Latin forms resemble the Sanskrit still more closely than the Greek; for instance, edim answers admirably to the Sanskrit adyâm, the $y \hat{a}$ of which, in the middle, if $a d$ were used in that voice, must be contracted to $i$, so that adî-mahi would correspond to the Latin edinnus. Thus sim, for sîm, answers to syâm, and sîmus still more exactly to the middle sîmali. The obsolete form siem, sies, siet, corresponding to the Sanskrit syâm, syâs, syât, is so far a grammatical jewel, that the full modal characteristic या $y a$, Greek $\iota \eta$, is contained in it, and it may thence be inferred, that edim, also, \&c., was preceded by an older ediem, edies, ediet $=$ adyâm, adyâs, adyât, and velim, duim, \&c., by a more full veliem, dujem (from dajem). The more weighty terminations of the plural have, by their retro-active shortening in-
[G. Ed. p. 929.] fluence, effected the suppression of the $e$ before them earlier than before the more light terminations of the singular. It may, however, be reasonably assumed, that the forms siêmus, siêtis, sient=syâma, syâta, syus (from syât), have existed in some other more early epoch of the language; and to them, simus, \&c., has the same relation that, in Greek, the abbreviated $\delta i \delta o i \mu c \nu$ has to didoínuev.
675. The German, in which the subjunctive is likewise based on the Sanskrit potential and Greek optative, forms the preterite of this mood according to the principle of
the Sanskrit second conjugation of the second, third, and seventh class, and of the Greek conjugation in $\mu$, i.e. by attaching the modal element to the root direct; and, in fact, in Gothic, the first person in yau resembles very strikingly the Sanskrit $y \hat{d} m$, only that the $\hat{a}$ has been shortened, and the $m$ vocalized to $u$ (§. 432.). Compare, after removing what belongs to the relation of time, elyau, "I ate,"* with the Sanskrit adyâm, "I may eat." In the other persons, the Gothic follows the analogy of the Sanskrit and Greck middle; i.e. in suppressing the $a$ of $y a$, while the $y$, as in Sanskrit, becomes long $i$, for which, in Gothic, $e i$ is written; hence, êl-ei-ma, Old High German azîmés, resembles the Sanskrit ad-i-mahi and Latin ed-i-$-m u s$; êt-ei-th, Old High German azzit, the Sansḳit ad- $\hat{\imath}$ --dhwam, and Latin ed-i-tis; in the second person singular, $\hat{e} t-\varepsilon i-s(\hat{c} t-i-s)$ is almost identical with the Latin ed-it-s. In the third person, however, the personal sign has been lost (§. 432.), and in consequence of this loss the long $i$ [G. Ed. p. 930.] sound, which comes to stand at the end is shortened; thus éti answering to the Sanskrit adita and Latin edit.
676. It scarcely requires to be remarked, that I do not understand the resemblance between the Gothic ettei-ma and Sanskrit ad-i-mahi, as though the Gothic subjunctive preterite, with exception of the first person singular, was really referable to the Sanskrit middle; the contraction of $y a$ to $e i=\hat{\imath}$ is rather a pure Gothicism, which was probably preceded by a weakening of $y a$ to $y i$, according to the principle by which nominal bases in $y$ a exlibit in the nominative

[^256]singular $y i-s$ for $y a-s$, in case this syllable is preceded by only one syllable, and, indeed, a short one. But if a vowel long by nature or by position, or more than one syllable precedes, the syllable $y a$ is not only weakened to $y i$, but is contracted to long $\hat{\imath}(e i)$, and at the end of a word to short $i$; hence, andeis "end," for andyis from andyas, accusative andi for andya. Before a final nasal or $n s$ the syllable $y a$ remains in its original state; hence, in the dative plural, andyn-m, accusative andya-ns. On the same phonetic law is based the phenomenon that the $u$ of the first person singular of our modal-form, which has arisen from $m$, has preserved the syllable $y a$ in its complete form; and hence, êtyau from étyam, "I ate," may be compared with the dative plural andyam; êteis, "thou atest," with the nominative and genitive singular andeis; and the third person singular êti, which terminates with short $i$, with the accusative andi.
677. In Old Sclavonic there are some remains of the Greek conjugation in $\mu$, or the Sanskrit second conjugation. These have preserved the personal termination in the first person singular of the present, and in the imperative (which I believe I must in its formation identify with the Sanskrit-Zend potential, the Latin-German subjunctive, and Greek optative) annex
[G. Ed. p. 931.] the exponent of the modal relation direct to the root. The modal characteristic, however, has preserved only the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit $y$ a, and as in the second person singular the $s$ of $y a s$, since from the oldest period it has stood at the end, must, according to a universal law of sound, disappear, sо аждь yaschdy (euphonic for yady), " eat," corresponds to the Sanskrit adyds, "thou mayest eat," and Latin edis; въждь vyeschdy (for vyedy), "know," to the Sanskrit vidyas; and даждь daschdy (dady), "give," to the Greek didoins, and still more to the Sanskrit dadyâs, since, like it, it has lost the radical vowel. The Sclavonic forms which have been cited pass also as third persons; for यास् $y d s$, and

यान्, $y$ at cannot be distinguished in Sclavonic, because the rule for the extirpation of final consonants has spared the $t$ as little as the $s$, while the Greek admits the $\Sigma$ at the end, there also, where, in the lingual epoch preceding that of the Greek, it stood as the last pillar of the word; and thus didoins can be distinguished from $\delta \delta \delta o i n$, which is deprived of the personal sign.
678. In the first person plural, аждьмы yaschdymy, вњждьмыI vyeschdymy, даждьмы daschdymy, answer to सद्यामस् adyâmas, edîmus, विद्यामस् vidyâmas, दध्रामस् dadyâmas, סıঠоîдеv, duimus; and in the second, паждьте yaschdyte, вВЖдьте vyeschdyte, даЖдьте daschdyte, to ख्रद्यात adyâta, edîtis, विध्यात vidydta, दच्घात dadydta, סıסоîтe, duitis. The second person plural represents, in the Old Sclavonic imperative, also the third person; a misuse which may have been favored by the fact, that in the singular the third person is not distinguished from the second, from reasons connected with the law of sounds; and in the dual, also, the terminations तम् tam, ताम tam, for which the Greek uses $\tau 0 v, \tau \eta \nu$, have both become $t a$; for though the Slavonic a generally represents the long Sanskrit a, still it sometimes stands for the short $a$ also; and therefore $t a$ has as good a foundation in the second person dual as in the third; but [G. Ed. p. 932.] through the elsewhere very common corruption of $a$ to $e$ the dual second person has become like that of the plural. Moreover, the second person is most used in the imperative, and this may have been an additional cause why, in the plural, the third person has been entirely removed from lingual existence, which is therefore less surprising than that, in Old and Anglo-Saxon, the second person plural should represent the other two in the present indicative also. But if, in the Old Sclavonic imperative, the genuine third person plural had remained in use, it would, in my opinion, be the same as the second and third of the singular ; for the final consonantal sounds of the Greek-Zend $\epsilon v$, airr, or ën, and Latin $n t$, would
have given way, and as the vowel of the modal expression $y \hat{a}$ has, in general, disappeared, only daschdy could have corresponded to the Zend daidliyañ, Greek diooiev, and Old Latin duint. This apparent identity with two persons of the singular might have accorded less with the language than the actual exchange for one of the same number.
679. I refer, also, the Lithuanian imperative, in its origin, to the department of the mood here discussed; for in all verbs, without exception, the vowel $i$ is its characteristic, which admits of no other comparison than with the Sclavonic $y$, just mentioned, the Greek ، of all optatives, the Latin $i$ of sim, edim, velim, duim, and the Sanskrit-Zend $y^{i}$, or $\boldsymbol{i}$. The Lithuanian imperative, however, gains a peculiar appearance, and one which estranges it from the corresponding mood of the cognate languages, in that it conceals the true exponent of the modal relation after a $k$, which is always prefixed to the $i$; only if the root itself ends with $k$, for two $k$ 's only one is used. As in the second person singular, in which the $i$ ought to conclude the form,
[G.Ed.p. 933.] this final vowel is generally suppressed, but the $k$ is extended to all persons of the imperative, with the exception of the third, of which hereafter, we may be easily tenupted to regard this $k$ as the true imperative suffix, and thus quite disengage the Lithuanian in this mood from its otherwise close union with the other cognate languages. From the root bu, "to be," proceed, e.g., the forms búki, or búk," be thou," búkite, "be ye," bilkime, "let us be," búkiwa, " let us two be," búkita, "ye two be." So dûkk, or dūk, "give thou," dúkite, "give ye," \&c. In most cases it happens that the $k$ appears between two vowels: for, in the preceding examples, the root, and in Mielke's three last conjugations, the class syllable, corresponding to the Sanskrit aya (§. 506.), end with a vowel: and as the verb suku, "I turn," given as example of the first coujugation, on account of the $k$, which terminates
the root, abstains from the affix under discussion, Mielke's Grammar, therefore, is utterly deficient in an instance exhibiting the combination of the $k$ of the imperative with a consonant. But Ruhig gives, from laupsinù, "I praise," the imperative laupsink' (laupsinki), and, according to Mielke's rule, given at p. 78, we must expect from infinitives like ras-ti, " to find" (euphonic for rad-ti), imperatives like ras-k', or ras-ki, since a $k$ should take the place of the infinitive suffix.
680. As respects the origin of the $k$, which is peculiar to the Lithuanian imperative, it is probably, as has been already observed, a corruption of the $s$ of the verb substantive, and consequently dủki, "give thou," is doubly related to the Old Sclavonic dach, "I gave," and to the Greek ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha, \delta \in \delta \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ (see $\S \S .568 .569$.), as also to the Zend sqrosswag dâkhyêmi, "I will give," ( $=$ Sanskṛit dâsyâmi), which I am unable to quote, but which I [G. Ed. p. 934.] believe I may safely deduce from the above-mentioned participle of the root $d a$, "to lay," which has the same sound with $d \hat{d}$, "to give" (see §. 669.), The same relation that the Zend future dâkhyêmi has to the Sanskrit dâsyâmi is held, as respects the employing a guttural instead of an original sibilant, by the Lithuanian dūki to the Sanskrit precative middle dísíya. In the dual, the Lithuanian dikliwa answers to the Sanskrit dâsivali, and, in the plural, dû̀ime to dâsimali. The Sanskrit precative is, however, in fact, nothing else than a modification of the potential, and has. in essentials, the same relation to it that the Greek aorist optative has to the present optative; i.e. the class differences are removed. Compare dêyds, dêydt, for dâyâs, dayât;* Zend dâyâo, dayât, with סoins, סoin. In all the other persons, the Sanskrit adds

[^257]an $s$, i.e. the verb substantive, to the modal exponent $y \hat{n}$, and thus déyâaam resembles the Greek third person plural סoin $\sigma \alpha v$. This dissimilar introduction of the verb substantive may be regarded as a phenomenon, which first made its appearance after the separation of the languages; for which reason the Zend, though it continued with the Sanskrit much longer than the European cognate idioms, does not

 סoínte, סoîev, and Sanskrit dêydsma, dêydasta, dêydsus. In the first person singular I find Gquag gyaim (probably erroneously for dayaim) in a passage already cited with a different object (see p. 277), a form in good analogy with the Greek doinv, for which in Sanskrit deß 1 dsam.
681. In the middle, the Sanskrit, in the precative, com-
[G. E.. p. 935.] mits to the verb substantive the function of denoting the modal relation, exactly as, in the future of the two active forms, the relation of time. As, therefore, in $d d$-syin $m i$, "dubo," the last portion is the future of the verb substantive, so in $d a-s i \hat{i}-\eta n, \dagger$ "I may give," its precative or potential aorist is contained, and the Lithuanian $d \vec{u}-k i$, "give thou" (without any personal termination), is rightly analogous to dasi, the sibilant being hardened to $k$, which alone distinguishes the imperative from the future. Compare dü-kite, "give ye," with $d \mathfrak{\imath}-$-site, "ye will give." In spite, however, of the great agreement between $d i \mathfrak{c}-k i$ and $d \hat{d}-s i$, it is still requisite to assume that the Lithuanian has brought with it from its Asiatic place of origin the preceding form of its imperative, and that di̊-ki-te, "give ye," is the transmission of the Sanskrit dit-sti-dhwam, "detis," with the substitution only of an active personal termination for a middle one; but the very natural accession of the verb

[^258]substantive may be admitted in both languages independently of one another. The firm adherence to the ancient modal character, the original $y \boldsymbol{d}$ of which has been contracted in the Sanskrit middle precative and potential, to $\hat{i}$, in the Lithuanian imperative to $i$, has, in the preceding case, effected a surprising similarity in the languages, which have been from time immemorial distinct, and subject to their own separate destiny. The conjecture, however, that the $k$ of the Lithuanian imperative has arisen from $s$, is supported by the Old Prussian, which is most intimately connected with the Lithuanian, and which furnishes us with an optative or subjunctive, in which $s$ is contrasted with the Lithuanian $k$; at least, I have no doubt that forms like da-se, "he may give,"* galb-se, "he may help," bou-se, "he may be," bou-sei, "they may be," tussi-se, "he may be silent" (Sanskrit [G. Ed. p. 936.] tulishîim, "still," "silent"), are to be looked upon as cognate forms of the Lithuanian imperative and Sanskrit precative; and thus da-se (without a personal termination, like the Greek doín) may be contrasted with the Sanskrit dâ-sti-shta, " he may give."
682. In support of my assertion that the Lithuanian imperative is based on the Sanskrit precative, not on the potential, which answers to the Greek optative present, may be specially adduced the circumstance that, in the latter case, in those verbs which correspond to the Sanskrit first class, it would necessarily retain the vowel inserted between the root and the personal termination. E.g. the inserted $a$ of wez-a-mé, " we ride," weź-a-té, "ye ride," would not be lost, but most probably we should have in their place uez--ai-mé, wez'-ai-té, which would be analogous to the Gothic vig-ai-ma, vig-ai-th, to the Greek ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi-01-\mu \epsilon v$, ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi-01-\tau \epsilon$, and

[^259]Sanskrit vah-ê-ma, vah-ê-ta (from vahaïma, vahaïta). But according to the view just developed, wefz-ki-mé, wefz-ki-té, are founded, not on vah-ê-ma, vah-ê-ta, but on vak-shit-mahi, vak-shi-dhwam, apart from the middle terminations. The Lettish, however, in its imperatives, has retained, of the two modifications of the Sanskrit mood under discussion, the first, or the potential, corresponding to the Greek optative present; and, in the second person plural, always uses ai or $e e$ in the place of the indicative $a$; and thus darrait, "do ye" (faciatis), corresponds, in its relation to darrat, " ye do,"* admirably to the Gothic subjunctives like lis-ni-ts,
[G.Ed. p. 937.] "ye two may read," as contrasted with the indicative lis-a-ts. I give the dual, as this has the advantage of having, in the indicative, retained the old $a$ in its original form; while in the plural lisith, as in generai before a final th, that letter has become $i$. The two twin sisters, therefore, the Lithuanian and Lettish, complete one another's deficiencies in the imperative admirably, since the one supplies us with the Sanskrit potential, and the other with its aorist form, or the precative, and, in fact, furnishes us with the same method of formation (which is the more important) that is to be assigned peculiarly to the middle, and does not occur elsewhere in any other European cognate idiom; while, as has been said, the

[^260]active process of formation is reflected in the Greek second aorist optative, where, in the third person plural, $\delta_{\text {oin } \sigma \alpha \nu}$ is contrasted with the Sanskrit dêyâsus for dâyâsant, and סoîev with the Zend gixumanin.
683. The second person singular of the Lettish imperative is always identical with the corresponding person of the indicative, and here requires no further discussion; and thus, that which in Lithuanian is adduced as the third person imperative, is nothing else than the third person of the indicative present, which receives its modal function, corresponding more with the subjunctive than the imperative, by the prefix of the conjunction te. There are, however, some so-called anomalous verbs, which have a form differing from the indicative, and this is in reality an unmistakeable brother of the Sanskrit potential of the second conjugation, or of the Greek optative present of the conjugation in $\mu$. The personal character has (as usually [G. Ed. p. 938.] happens in all tenses of the indicative) been dropped; and thus ie corresponds to the Greek $\quad \eta$, Latin iet from siet, and the Sanskrit-Zend yatt, yât. For example, essie corresponds to the Greek ei $\eta$ (from é $\sigma i \eta$ ), to the Latin siet, and Sanskrit syât, but exceeds the Latin and Sanskrit in preserving the radical vowel (as in esmé, contrasted with $s$-mas, sumus), and the Greek $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \eta$, in retaining the consonant of the root, which is, however, doubled, as occurs in Lettish, also, in several persons of the indicative; e.g. in essam, " we are," essat, " ye are."
684. The Lithuanian dudye, "let him give," answers to the Greek diooin, Sanskrit dadyât, and Zend daidhyit. The agreement with the two last forms, however, is the greater, as the radical vowel is lost in the base itself; thus dì-die for diddủye, as in Sanskrit da-dyat for dadaydt, and in Zend duidhydt for dadhayit. The relation of düdie to the other unreduplicated persons of the imperative, as dikki, dikkime, \&c., is exactly that of the potential in

Sanskrit and Zend to the precative, and in Greek that of the present optative to the aorist of that mood; thus, as दध्षात् dadyat is related to देयात् dé-yat (for daydt, middle
 dayit, and in Greek diooin to doin, so is dùdie, "let him give," to dîki, "give." In this lies a new, and, in fact, very strong proof, that the Lithuanian imperative in the third person of anomalous verbs belongs to the potential or optative present, but in the other persons to the precative or optative aorist; and that the $k$ of dưki is identical with the $\kappa$ of ${ }^{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha$ and the $s$ of dasîya. It is proper here to recall attention to the division of the Sanskrit tenses and
[G. Ed. p. 939.] moods into special and general. The latter, to which belongs the precative, as, in Greek, the aorist, have the class-sign removed, which, in dadimi, $\delta i \hat{o} \omega \mu$, and the Lithuanian $d u ̈ d u$, consists in the reduplication: this therefore, is wanting in dêyasam, dâ-síya, סoívv, dìki, according to the same principle by which the verb under discussion forms, in the three languages, the future $d \hat{d}-\mathrm{sy} \hat{d m}$, $\delta \dot{\omega}-\sigma \omega$, $d u ̊-s u$. The Lithuanian root bu, "to be" (=Sanskrit bhit), in consonance with this principle, forms, in the plural of the future, $b u \hat{u}$-si-me, and in that of the imperative bú-ki-me; with which latter we would compare the corresponding Sanskrit precative form bhav-i-sh $h \hat{-}$-mahi: on the other hand, buwa-ù, "I was," belongs to the special theme abhavam (§. 522). With regard however, to Mielke's second, third, and fourth conjugations preserving the class character in the imperative, this proceeds from their belonging to the Sanskrit tenth class, which extends its ay also to the general tenses; and, e. g., from चुर chur, " to steal," the precative middle is बोरयिपीय chor-ayi-shîya, plural chdr-ayi-shimahi. The $i$ of ayi is a conjunctive vowel, which in other classes, also frequently enters between the attributive root and the verb substantive. After rejecting this conjunctive vowel, ay would be of necessity
contracted to $\ell$, and then chôr- $\hat{c}$-shîvahi, chôr-ềṣhimahi, would be identical with Lithuanian forms like pen-ễ-kiwa, "let us two nourish," pen-é-kime, "let us nourish," as regards the class-syllable.
685. The Lithuanian offers, beside the imperative, another mood, which we must bring into comparison with the Sanskrit precative;-I mean the subjunctive, which has only an imperfect to exhibit, which we append in full from the root $d \hat{u}$, "to give," with the addition of the corresponding form of the Lettish, which is requisite in this place, in order to understand the Lithuanian.

## SINGULAR.

LITHUAN. LETTISH. dĭchiau, es dohtu. důtumbei, tu dohtu. dùtu, winsch dohtu. ditu,
${ }^{1}$ Feminine winynya

PLURAL. LITHUAN. LETTISH. LITHUAN. dûtumbime, mehs dohtum. dìtumbiwa. důtumbite, yuhs dohtut. dǜtumbita. winynyi ${ }^{2}$ dohtu. důtu.
${ }^{2}$ Feminine winynyas.

The third person singular, which, as is universally the case in Lithuanian and Lettish, represents, at the same time, the plural, and, in Lithuanian, also the dual, would, considered of itself, lead us to the Sanskrit imperative, in which dadatu, "let him give," is identical in termination with ditu, dohtu; and the phenomenon, that the Lettish dohtu also passes as second and first person, might be regarded as the consequence of an erroneous use of language; like that, by which, in Old and Anglo-Saxon, the second person plural of the present, and the third of the preterite, have made their way into the other persons also. Still I regard the $t u$ under discussion, not as a personal termination, but as identical with the tum of the other persons, and I consider dùtu an abbreviation of dưtumbi, particularly as, in the first person plural, dưtum may be used for dutumbime (Mielke, p. 143, b), in which case the $m$
is to be regarded as the character of the first person, and
[G. Ed. p. 941.] is not to be confounded with that which precedes the $b$ in the full form dîtumbime. I deduce this from the Lettish, which has everywhere dislodged the syllable $b i$, together with the $m$ preceding, but which combines the $t u$, which remains in the plural with the personal sign, but in the singular, as this number has in general lost the consonants of the terminations, leaves it without any addition; thus, es, tu, winsch dohtu. A clear intimation is thus given us, that also in the Lithuanian first person singular the form düchiau, and such as resemble it, must be regarded as strongly mutilated; and I have no doubt that düchian has arisen from dütumbiau, by suppressing the umb. Thus the $t$ came into direct contact with several combined vowels, and therefore was necessarily changed into ch, according to a universal law of sound. The abbreviation of dûtumbiau to dủchiau (for dûtiau) is not greater than that before mentioned of dủtu(mbi)me to dūtum for dùtume. In both cases three letters have been omitted; in the first, $m b$, with the preceding vowel; in the second, with the vowel following.
686. The Lithuanian subjunctive is very important to me, as I recognise in the syllable bi the true exponent of the modal relation, and in this a more than casual coincidence with the expression of the Latin future of the first and second conjugation, which is in form completely the same. Compare da-bimus with dùtum-bime, da-bitis with dùtum-bite, da-bis with dủtum-bei, from dütum-bi-i, da-bo for dabio, with the dủtum-biau presupposed above, and dabit with the dítum--bi abbreviated to důtu, likewise only supposed. The identification, however, of a Latin future form with the subjunctive of a cognate language will surprise us the less, as the Latin itself, within its own lingual province, places the future and subjunctive on the same footing in [G. Ed. p. 942.] this point, that futures like lêyes, leyjet,
legâmus, legêtis, coincide in form with the subjunctives of the first conjugation.
687. The $i$ of the Lithuanian bi corresponds, there is scarce any doubt, to the Sanskrit-Zend modal character ya, which, in combination with $b h a$, "to be," forms, in the third person of the precative, भूयात् bhîyat, pacuss buyat. The Lithuanian has dropped the $u$ of its root $b u$, whether on account of its appearing in a compound, or because the $u$ stood before a vowel, while everywhere else it appeared before consonants: the syllable $y \hat{a}$, however, is retained pretty perfectly in the first person singular in iau, and in the other persons, on the contrary, it is contracted to $i$. Compare biau (from biam, see §. 438.) with the Zend Gxuss s buyaǹm (from buyâm), and bime, bite, from buyame, buyate,
 first part of the Lithuanian compound ditum-bei, \&c., we easily recognise in it the Sanskrit infinitive and the accusative of the Latin supine-दातुम् datum, datum. In its isolated state the Lithuanian supine ends in $t u$, but the lost sign of the accusative has in the compound been preserved in its original form under the protection of the auxiliary verb following, and principally of the labial initial sound answering to $m$, while everywhere else, in Lithuanian, the accusative $m$ has become $\dot{n}$ (§. 149.).
688. The Sanskrit first conjugation suppresses the $\hat{A}$ of the potential character $y \hat{a}$ both in the active and in the middle,*

[^261][G. Ed. p. 943.] and the $y$ vocalized to $i$ is contracted, with the preceding $a$ of the class syllable, to $e$; e.g. भरेस् bharts, "thou mayest bear," for bhar-a-yas, as, in Greek, ф'̂pots for $\phi \in \rho o i n s$ ( $\phi \in \rho-$ oins). I am not, however, of opinion, that the diphthong, which is expressed, in Sanskrit by e, and is now spoken as ${ }^{\ell}$, had in the earliest time, before the separation of languages, a pronunciation in which neither $a$ nor $i$ was perceptible; but it is most probable that the two elements were heard in combination, and spoken as $a i$, which ai may have been distinguished from the Vriddhi diphthong ऐ $\lambda i$ by this, that the same breadth was not given to the pronunciation of the $a$ sound that it has in $A i$. The same must have been the case with the $\delta$ : it was pronounced like $a u$, and its Vriddhi (§. 29.), like âu. For to keep to the $\mathbb{P} \mathbb{C}$, if this diphthong
[G. Ed. p. 944.] was from the early period of the language taken as $\hat{e}$, then the $i$ sound, which had become utterly extinct as a whole, would scarcely, after the separation of languages, have again been restored to life in single members, and thus the whole make its appearance in Greek, at one time as $\alpha \iota$, at another as $\epsilon \iota$ or ol (see Vocalismus, pp. 193, \&c.); in Zend at one time as ê (or aê, §. 28.), at another as $\delta i$;

[^262]in Lithuanian in one place as ai, in another as é in Lettish new as ai, now as $\hat{e}$ or ee (see §. 682., Note); in Latin sometimes as $a e$, as the next descent from ai, sometimes as é. But if before the separation of languages the diphthong still had its right pronunciation, then each particular individual of the family of languages which arose after the separation may have either always or occasionally preserved in its full value the ai which had been brought with it from the land of its origin; or invariably or occasionally contracted it to $\hat{e}$; and as it is natural to derive $\hat{e}$ from ai, many of the cognate languages coincide in this process of melting down. While, however, the Sanskrit, according to the pronunciation which has been received by us, causes the diphthong ai, when in a position before consonants, to be invariably taken as $\hat{e}$, the Greek exhibits the opposite extreme, and displays to us the Sanskrit diphthong as $\alpha \iota, \epsilon \ell$, or $o l$, and, in fact, in the preceding case, as oo, since the class vowel, which, in the indicative, appears as o only before nasals, in combination with the modal exponent $\iota$ invariably assumes the o quality. The $\eta$, however, of the full modal exponent $\tau \boldsymbol{\eta}$, as in Sanskrit the $\boldsymbol{a}$, is suppressed; thus $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi-0 \iota-\varsigma, \tau \in ́ \rho \pi-o c-(\tau)$, answering to tarp-
 $\tau \in ́ \rho \pi-o 1-\mu \epsilon \nu, \tau \in ́ \rho \pi-o l-\tau \epsilon$, to $\operatorname{tarp}-\hat{e}-m a, \operatorname{tarp}-\hat{e}-t a$.
689. It has been already remarked ( $(\$ 430$.) that the first person singular in oc $\mu \mathrm{c}$ is an inorganic form, and that $\tau \cup \pi \tau o i-$ $\mu \eta \nu$ points to an active form тímтoıv. When I first advanced this conjecture I was not aware that the [G. Ed. p. 945.] form arrived at by theory has been actually transmitted to us, though but in the single case of tpé $\phi o r v$. Besides this, Matthiæ (§. 198. 2.) p oposes to read $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\alpha} \rho т о \iota v$ instead of $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \hat{\imath} \nu$ in Suidas. We will leave it undecided here, whether the forms oinv, oins, \&c., which occur in contracted verbs, have preserved the original form, and are thus more genuine than those in Sanskrit like tarp-i-s for tarp-a-yds, or whether, as is more probable, they are carried back by
the analogy of the $\mu$ conjugation. The Sanskrit interposes a euphonic $y$ between the diphthong $\hat{e}$, and, in the second conjugation, between the $\boldsymbol{i}$ shortened from $y d$, and the personal terminations commencing with a vowel (§. 43.); hence,
 Regarding the termination am for simple $m$, which would make the euphonic $y$ superfluous, and attest a form tarpem for tarpêyam, see §. 437., Remark.
690. The Latin, in its subjunctives of the first conjugation, exhibits, like the Sanskrit in the form of $\hat{\ell}$, the diphthong which has arisen from the class syllable and the modal vowel $i$; but in the first and third person singular, through the influence of the final $m$ and $t$, this is shortened; thus, amem, amet, in opposition to amês, amêmus, amêtis. The kindred formation of these words with the Greek, like $\tau$ é $\rho \pi о \not \mu$, , $\epsilon$ épт-
 without the medium of the Sanskrit. But if amés, amêt, ame mus, ametis, be compared with the Sanskrit forms of the same meaning, kâmayês, kamayêt, kamayêmu, kâmayêta, it must be assumed that the last $a$ of the class character wय aya (whence we have deduced the Latin $6(=a+a)$ of $a m a$-re (§. $109^{\circ} .6$.), by the dislodgement of the $y$ ), has combined with the modal $i$, while in the $a$ of amás, umâmus, amâtis, the two $a$ of
[G. E. p. 946.] kadm-a(y)a-si, kam-a(y)a-mus, kam-a(y) u--tha, are united. The $\ell^{\ell}$, therefore, of $a m e ̂ s, \& c$., corresponds to the Greek ot in forms like tupáoss, $\phi \lambda \lambda$ éoss, $\delta \eta \lambda$ óoss ( $\$ .109^{8} .6$.), and the preceding short vowel is passed over. In the obsolete forms verberit, temperint (Struve, p. 146), the first part, also, of the diphthong $\mathfrak{e}(=a+i)$ has been lost, and only the pure modal element has been left. They may have arisen from the consciousness that an $i$ was bound up in the $e$ of verberet, temperent, or they may have followed the principle of sit, velit, edit ( $\$ .674$.$) . On, the other hand, do$ really belongs to the Sanskrit second conjugation, and to the Greek in $\mu$, and therefore duim, perduim, are regular forms
the $i$ of which corresponds to the Sanskrit $y$ of $d a d-y a ̂ m$ and to the Greek $\boldsymbol{c}$ of $\delta \delta^{\circ} \delta i \eta v$. The weakening of the $a$ to $u$ in duim rests, perhaps, on the circumstance, that $u i$ is a more favorite combination than aï.
691. In moneds, monedmus, \&c., is contained the whole of the Sanskrit causal theme mán-aya, " to make to think" (see p. 121 G. ed.), only that the properly long $\dot{e}$ (from $a+i=$ Sanskrit ay) is, on account of its position, shortened before a vowel, the $i$ of the modal expression has disappeared, and, in compensation, the preceding vowel is lengthened, according to the priuciple of Greek optatives with $\bar{\nu}$ for $v i$. As, there-
 for $\delta \alpha \iota v i \tau 0, \pi \eta \gamma v v i \tau o$, so moneds for monenais. On the other hand, the case is the same with carint (Struve, p. 146), for careânt from careaint, as with the before-mentioned verberit, temperint.
692. The same relation that noned̂s has to monés is held by audids, from audiais, to audis (§§. $190^{\text {a }}$. 6., 505.). The future, however, which in the third and fourth conjugation is, in. fact, nothing else than a subjunctive, as was first remarked in my System of Conjugation (p. 98, with which Struve agrees, pp. 145, 146), has preserved the modal element, and has been contracted with the $a$ of the class [G. Ed. p. 947.] character to $\hat{e}$, with the exception of the first person singular, in which leyem, audiem, should stand for legam, audiam. In the older language dicen, faciem, are actually transmitted to us by Quintilian, as forms used by Cato Censor (compare Struve, p. 147); and thus, in the fourth conjugation, forms like audiem may well have existed. As, however, in the proper subjunctive the last element of the diphthong $u i$ has cast itself upon the $a$, and lengthened that letter, but in the future has been contracted with the $a$ to $\hat{e}$, two forms have arisen from that which was originally one, of which each has received for representation a portion of that meaning, which properly belongs to the two together; as, in the history of language, similar cases have often arisen, and, e.g., daturi
and datorres (I give the plural intentionally) both conduct us to the Sanskrit dâtáras, which unites the meaning of the two Latin forms in itself. The use of the subjunctive in the sense of a future reminds us of the periphrasis for the future by means of auxiliary verbs which signify "to be requisite," or " to will," as also of the occasional use of the Zend imperative in the sense of the future (see §. 680. p. 912 G. ed.). It is clear, however, that the expression of the future, from the most ancient period, has bordered with surprising closeness on the relation denoted by the Latin subjunctive, since the two are distinguished in Sanskrit, only by the quantity of the vowel $-y a$ in the future, and $y d$ in the potential.
693. The future and subjunctive of the Latin third conjugation may perhaps require a little further consideration, though what is most important to be observed respecting them is already deducible from what has bcen remarked regarding the second and fourth conjugations. Future forms like vehês, vehêmus, have already appeared in my System of Conjugation as akin to the Sanskrit potentials like vahês, vahêmn, and
[G. Ed. p. 948.] Latin subjunctives as amês, amêmus. But in the first conjugation the $\hat{e}$ was firmly planted; for even if in its $\boldsymbol{a}$ a contraction of the Sanskrit aya of the tenth class were not recognised, still the $d$ is clear to every one's eyes, and also the possibility of melting it down with the $i$ of the subjunctive expression which follows to $\hat{e}$. But the $\hat{e}$ of velies, vehêmus appeared incomprehensible, or as a transmission from the third conjugation to the first, as long as the $i$ of veh-i-s, veh-i-mus, passed as the original form of the class vowel of the third conjugation. Through the observation, however, made above ( p .104 ), according to which the intermediate vowel of the third conjugation is only a secondary $i$ weakened from a, forms like vehê', vohêmus, must now appear in a totally different light. Their ê contains the primitive $a$, which has become weakened in the indicative, as it occurs elsewhere also, that a word in composition has maintained
itself in a form more close to its original state than when isolated and unprotected.* Before the forms veh-ă-s, veh-r̆-mus, had become corrupted to veh-i-s, veh-i-mus, in the indicative, veh-ê-s, veh-ê-mus, had arisen from them, and, in the subjunctive, vehds, vehdmus; and the corruption of the class, vowel of the indicative could have had no influence over that which was melted down with the modal character. $\dagger$
694. The Latin third conjugation leads us to the Gothic, in which all the twelve classes of Grimm's strong conjugation coincide with the Latin third (§. 109². 1.). [G. Ed. p. 949.] The Gothic has, however, this advantage over the Latin, that it has not admitted the corruption of the old $a$ of the indicative throughout, but only before a final $s$ and $t h$; otherwise it has retained the $a$. We must, therefore, carefully avoid deriving the forms bairais, "feras," bairui, "ferat," bairaith, "frratis," from the indicative buiris, bairith, bairith, by the insertion of an $a$, which would imply a principle of formation quite unknown in the Indo-European family of languages; but the said subjunctive forms must be regarded as the creations of a period in which their indicative prototypes were still bairas, bairath, to which also the passive forms bair-a-za, bair-a-da, as regards the intermediate vowel, refer us (§.466.). In the second person of the dual and the first of the plural bair-ai-ts, bai-ai-ma, have the same relation to the indicative bair-a-ts, bair-a-m, that, in Sanskrit, bhar-ê-tam, bhar-ê-ma (from bhar-ai-tam, bhar-ai--ma), have to bhar-a-thas, bhar- $\hat{d}-m a s$; in the third person

[^263]plural bair-ai-na (transposed from bair-ai-an), "ferant," has the same relation to bair-a-nd, "ferunt," that the Zend fessulas bar-ay-ĕn has to bar-a-nti, and the Greek фép-ot-єv to $\phi \in \rho \rho-0-v \tau 1$. In the first person dual the relation of bair--ai-va to bair-ôs, from bair-a-vas (§. 441. ), rests on the same principle on which, in Sanskrit, that of bhar-ê-va to bhar--A-vas is founded.* In the first person singular bairau, "I may bear," the modal vowel $i$ is wanting, but the $u$ is the vocalization of the personal character $m$; bairau, therefore (from bairaim), has the same relation to bairais, bairai, \&c., that, in Latin, the future feram (for ferem) has to feres, ferel,
[G. Ed. p. 950.] from ferais, ferait. $\dagger$ The Old High German exhibits the Gothic diphthong ai ( $=\hat{e}$, see §. 78.), also, graphically in the form é, but shortens it at the end of a word; hence, bere (for berê), "feram," "ferat," has the same relation to berềs (=Sanskrit bharês), "feras," berêmếs, "feramus" that, in Latin, amem, amet, bear to amês, amêmus.
695. The Old Prussian, a dialect which resembles the Lithuanian very closely, employs imperatives like immais, "take thou," immaiti, " take ye," which stand in a clearer relation to their indicative forms imm-a-se, imm-a-ti, than, in Gothic, nim-ai-s, "sumas," nim-ai-th, " sumatis," to nim--i-s, nim-i-th. Compare, on the other hand, the Lettish imperatives like darrait, "do ye," contrasted with darrat, " ye do" (§. 682.). Dais, " give thou," daiti, " give ye" (in Old Prussian), contrasted with dase, "thou givest," dafi,

[^264]" ye give," furnish, as it were, a commentary on the relation of the Latin dês, dêtis, to das, datis, as the combination of $a+i$, which is not perceived in the Latin $\hat{e}$, is evident in the Old Prussian. More usually, however, the Old Prussian exhibits, in the indicative, an $e$ or $i$ as the conjunctive vowel, and in the imperative the diphthong ei; e.g. dereis, "see
 The two moods, however, do not everywhere agree, since, e. g., tickinnaiti, " make ye" (Katech. p. 54), does not answer to tickinnimai, " we make" (l. c. p. 5), but leads us to expect instead of it tickinnamai. The simple $i$, also, or, in its place, $y$, is found in Old Prussian imperatives, as, mylis, " love thou," endiris, " regard thou."
696. The Old Sclavonic has retained only [G. Ed. p. 951.] the last element of the original diphthong ai in the second and third person singular in its imperative in the regular conjugation, which, as has been before shewn, corresponds partly to the Sanskrit first class with $a$ amexed (§.499.), partly to the fourth in य $y a(\$ .500)$, partly to the tenth in सय ayu (§. 505.); as, вEzろ ve $i$, " ride," and "let him ride," corresponds to the Sanskrit vahếs, vahêt (§. 433.), Latin vehês, vehet, and vehâs, vehat, Gothic vigais, vigai, Greek é $\chi o r s$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \not \subset o!$. In the dual and plural, however, where the diphthong is protected by the following personal termination, \# ye (from é with $y$ prefixed, §.255.n.) corresponds to the Indo-Roman ê, Gothic ai, and Greek or; thus, ведвмыі


 є́ $\chi$ oír $\eta v$, vigaits.
697. Among the other Sclavonic languages, the Carniolan especially deserves, with respect to the mood under

[^265]discussion, a closer consideration, as its imperative in those verbs which have $a$ as the class syllable is distinguished from the present indicative by the placing a $y(=i)$ beside the $a$; so that thus $a y$ is opposed to the Sankrit $\hat{e}=a+i$ of the potential, to the Gothic ai of the subjunctive, and to the Latin $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ of the subjunctive and future. The singular, which, iu Carniolan also, in advantageous contrast with the other Sclavonic dialects, has a first person, ends in the three persons in $a y$, since the pronominal consonants, which, from the most ancient period, have stood at the end of words, must give place according to the rule for the extirpation of final consonants, which extends to all the Sclavonic idioms [G. Ed. p. 962.] (§. 255. l.); hence, dél-ay, "let me work," "work thou," "let him work," for dél-ay-m, dél-ny-s, dél-ay-t, opposed to the indicative dél-a-m (from dél-a-mi), dél-a-sh (from dél-a-shi), dél-a (from dél-a-ii), and, in accordance with Gothic forms like bair-ai-s, bair-ai, Sanskrit like bharês, bharêt, Latin like amem, umês, amet, vehés, vehet Greek like фéporıl, фépors, фépor. In the dual dél-ay-wu answers to the indicative dél-a-wa, in the most perfect accordance with the Gothic bairaiva and Sanskrit bhareva; in the second person dual, dél-ay-ta has the same relation to the indicative dél-a-ta, that, in Gothic, bair-ai-ts, "feratis," has to bair-a-ts "fertis;" and, in the plural, dele-ay-mo is to dell-a-mo as, in Gothic, bair-ai-ma to bair-a-m, or, in Greek,
 the same relation to del-a-te that, in Gothic, bair-ai-th has to that which we must presuppose as the original form of the indicative bair-a-th, whence the corruption bair-i-th: hence the Old High German ber- $-\mathrm{e}-\mathrm{t}$. (from ber-ai-t), contrasted with its indicative ber-ut, is better compared. The third person dual and plural is wanting in the Carniolan imperative, and is expressed by a periphrasis of the indicative with the conjunction nay; thus, nay delata, nay délayo.

6y8. The analogy, however, of the Carniolan forms like dél-ay-mo, " let us work," with the Gothic like bair-ai-ma and Sanskrit like bhar-e-ma, must not be so far extended as to identify the vowel of derivation of verbs like dél-a-m with the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit first and sixth class, and with that of the Gothic strong verbs. I rather see in del- $a-m$, as in the Polish first conjugation (czyt-a-m, " I read," czyt-ay, " read thou," czyt-ay-my, "let us read,") the Sanskrit tenth class," the character of which, aya, has separated into various forms in the Scla- [G. Ed. p. 953.] vonic idioms as in Latin and the German weak conjugation. The Carniolan dé $-a-m$ and Polish czyt-a-m are brought much nearer to the Sanskrit like chint-ayd-mi, "I think," through the Russian sister forms: двлаю dyélayû. читаю clitáỵ̂a (from dyél-aỵo-m, chit-áyo-m; see §. 255. g.). In the third person plural the Carniolan déluyo and Polish czytayq approach nearer to the Sanskrit chint-aya-nti: on the other hand the Carniolan yedb, "they eat," corresponds to the Sanskrit adunti, from the root ad,

[^266]the $d$ of which in Carniolan is retained unchanged only in the third person plural, but before $t$ has been changed to $s$, and elsewhere is dropped: thus yes-te, "ye eat," as in Latin es-tis, for the Sanskrit at-tha; yés-ta, " ye two eat," " they two eat," for wत्यस् at-thas, सन्त् at-tas. In the imperative, yéy for yóly answers to the Sanskrit adydm, adyns, adyat ; dual yéyva, yéyta=udyiva, adyâtam; plural yéymu, yóyte, for adyâma, adyâta.
699. The Zend appears to us, in its potential of the first conjugation, to use the expression, in a half Greek half IndoRoman dress, since it exhibits the primitive diphthong ai at one time in the shape of $\delta \hat{i}$, at another in that of $\hat{e}$

[G. Ed. p. 954.] (\$. 33.), to which latter, however, according to §. 28., another $a$ is prefixed. Thus $b a-$ rodis agrees admirably with 申épots, and nosules bardit with $\phi$ épor $(\tau)$ : on the other hand, in the middle voice the third person uprosuses baralta agrees better with the Sanskrit bharetta, and, after withdrawing the middle $a$, with the Latin feret, than with $\phi$ éporto. The first and second persons plural active in the first conjugation I am unable to quote, but I have no doubt that here again $n f 100 \mathrm{~N}$ ses baraêma, uproundes baraêta, run parallel to the Sanskrit bharêma, bharêta, and Latin ferêmus, ferêtis, and that we should not look here for the more Greek form barbima, bardita. For I imagine I have found that in selecting between $\delta i$ and at the Zend is guided by what follows the diphthong, according as it is a final consonant, or one accompanied by a vowel. How much the selection falls upon $\theta i$, in the former position, to the rejection of $a \hat{B}$, is seen from this, that bases in $i$ in the genitive and ablative regularly exhibit the forms $\partial i$ and $\begin{gathered}\text { it, answering to the }\end{gathered}$ Sanskrit es," Through this, therefore, we may explain

[^267]the misrelation in form between the middle baraêla and the active bardit, in the third person singular of the potential. But when we find in the first person
 "videamus" = Sanskrit बुध्येमfि budhyểmahi," sciamus,"* here the exceedingly broad termination, which in the lithographed Codex is even separated from the preceding part of the word by a point, may have the effect of a distinct word; and thus it may be observed, that in the final sound, also, the diphthong $\partial i$ is admissible, and in [G. Ed. p. 955.] this position is especially favored by a preceding $y$ : hence
 medio" (§. 196 ) = मध्ये madhy²; but also دप्द môi, "to me," sप̣p

 not deduce from bûidhyôimaidhê forms like barôimaidhê, still less an active barôima; for in both forms the $y$, which favors the $\hat{\theta} i$, is deficieut, and in the latter, also, the breadth of termination giving the appearance of a separate word, for which reason, in the third person singular, not bûidhyôita but bûidhyaêta answers to the bâidhyofimaidhé which has been mentioned (Vend. S. p. 45).
700. In the third person plural the old $a$ of the original diphthong ai has been retained unaltered, but the $i$ has, on account of the following vowel of the termination, passed into its corresponding semivowel $y$; and thus, ; for the one ot of the Greek optative in Zend, we have, according to the quality of the termination following, three forms, viz. $\hat{i}$, af, and ay. Frequently, however, as the third person plural in the mood under discussion of the first active form can be quoted, the first person singular is,

[^268]on the contrary, of extremely rare occurrence, though it ought properly to be our point of starting. It must excite our curiosity to learn whether it resembles more the фéporv which is to be presupposed in Greek, and which, §. 689, we have found supported by $\tau \rho$ é $\phi o r v$, or rather Latin forms like amem, or Sanskrit as bhare-y-am (§. 43.). As in the third person plural barayĕn answers to the Sanskrit bhare-y-us (from bhare-y-ant), so in the first person singular bara-y-ëm might be expected for bharêyam. As, however, in Zend, if a $y$ precedes the termination $e m$, the $\check{e}$ is regularly suppressed, after which the semivowel becomes a vowel,
[G. Ed. p. 956.] so might baraêm* or baroim be auticipated: neither of these forms, however, occurs, but one with the personal character suppressed, and otherwise corresponding to the second person third مusules bardit, if the sufes némoi, which twice occurs Vend. S., p. 359, is the correct reading; and there
 lates "quelle terre invoquerai-je") really means literally (as in all probability it does) " $q u a l e m$ invocem terram?" $\dagger$ After this follows \&c., according to Anquetil "quelle prière choisirai-je," per-
 aydni), that I may adore?" We look with eagerness for the light which may be thrown on this passage by the aid of Neriosengh's Sanskrit translation. Among the other potentials of the first conjugation which occur in the Vend. S., we may here further mention the frequently-occurring upa-zdit, "he may beat," from the root zan=Sanskrit $ह$ ㄱ्

[^269]han, which, after rejecting the $n$ of the preceding radical vowel, is treated as though it were the annexed vowel of the first class; in which respect may be observed what has been before remarked regarding the Sansk!̣it root स्पा stha (§. 508.). And uprovsfeqpus stérènaêta," he may strew" (Vend. S. p. 377) deserves special notice, since in this word the class syllable $n d$ (ninth class), after abbreviating the 0 , follows the analogy of the short $a$ of the four classes of the first conjugation; and thus, in this
 drawing the middle final $a$, becomes similar to the Latin future sternet ( $(\S .496$.).
701. In the second conjugation the Zend answers in its potential tolerably well to the Sanskrit, with the exception of the third person plural, in which the termination us, mentioned in $\S .462$., does not occur; and also in the middle the somewhat enigmatical termination $\operatorname{ran}$ (§. 613.) is represented by a form which corresponds better to the general principle for the designation of the person, regarding which we shall treat hereafter. In the first person singular of the active, according to $\S .61$., yaim corresponds to the Sanskrit $y d m$ and Greek $\quad \eta \nu$; e.g. the daidhyanm, "I may place, make," already mentioned above ( $\$ .442 .5$.) corresponds to the Sanskrit दध्याम् dadhyam and Greek riteín. In the second person, according to §. $56^{2}{ }^{2}$, quas yado
 "dicas" = म्रूयाम् pra-briuyd̈s (Vend. S. p. 451); and in the third, , "faciat" (Vend. S: p. 457) = कृषुयात्र krinuydt of the Vêda dialect (p. 126 G. ed.). I am unable to quote the plural in the proper potential, though I can do so in the precative, which has completely the same signification, and which occurs far more frequently in Zend than in Sanskrit, and is distinguished from the potential only by the removal of the class characteristics, so that the form of the potential
may be safely inferred from the precative. In the first person plural yâma stands for the Sanskrit yisma and
 (Vend. S. p. 312); and hence I deduce the potential daidhyima from the above-mentioned daidhyanim. In the second person, yata (with the vowel of the modal character shortened) stands for the Sanskrit $y$ dsta and Greek ${ }^{\eta} \tau \epsilon$;
 bhîyadsta; g ilayata "detis," $\ddagger=$ देयास्त dé-yasta, סointe. Hence I deduce, in the potential, the form daidhyata=Sanskrit dadhyita, Greek didointe. Here the shortening of the syllable $y \hat{d}$ is remarkable in comparison with the length of quantity preserved before the termination $m a$ of the first person; and as this contrast can hardly be fortuitous, we must perhaps assume that the termination $t a$, on account of the mute with which it begins, is sustained with more difficulty by the language than the termination $m a$, which begins with one of the lightest consonants; and hence occasion has arisen for weakening the preceding syllable, in the sense of $\$ .480$.
702. In the third person plural the combination of the modal syllable $y d$ with the personal termination ern, originally $a n$, produces the form yann for $y$ adn, according to the analogy of the first person singular in yanim for yatm. Before the final nasal, therefore, the latter half of the long $a=a+a$ has been weakened to the nasal sound of the Sanskrit Anuswâra. We
 lay down" (Vend. S. pp. 203, 204), for which I should have anticipated nidaithyann, as, in the third person singular

[^270]of the middle, uprasaxas spas paiti ni-daithita, "he may lay down" (Vend. S. p. 282, 11. 2, 7, 12,17), is found from the root dath, from $d d$ extended by the affix of a $t h$ (see p. 112), which, through the influence of the $y$ following, has received the affix of an $i$, which in ni-dithyain above has remained alone. From the root da, "to give," we should
 with the radical vowel shortened, dayain, which comes very near to the Greek $\delta o \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon v$, while the Sanskrit dêyñsus (from dleydsunt) agrees more with $\delta o i \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$. The Sanskrit annexes, as has been already remarked, in its precative the verb substantive to the root, with the exception of the second and third person singular of the active, in which properly dêyâss, deyast, would be required, which, in the present state of the language, according to a strict law of sound (§.94.), is impossible, and the language has therefore preferred rather to drop the auxiliary verb than the personal character; thus, dêyâs, dêyât, answering to the Zend dâyâo, dâyât. It is, however, very worthy of remark, that the Zend abstains entirely from employing the verb substantive, and thus sides completely with the Greek, only that the latter agrees in doín $\sigma \alpha \nu$ with the Sanskrit, and in doiev with the Zend.
703. In the middle voice, also, the Zend precative abstains from annexing the verb substantive; and on the contrary, according to the principle which the Sanskrit follows in the potential (§.673.), contracts the syllable $y \hat{a}$ to $\hat{\imath}$, and in the plural, at least in the third person, to short $i$. While, therefore, the Sanskrit and Lithuanian make common cause through forms like dâ-sî-dhwam, dû-li-te ("detis," "date"), the previously-mentioned Zend form paiti-nidaithîta ranks with the Greek $\theta$ eíтo, since in both a simple $i$ sound is combined with the root. I view the form yaösh-daithita,* which

[^271]often occurs in the Eighth Fargard, as of more importance it is everywhere regarded by Anquetil as singular, and we should be the more easily led to suppose him in the right, as the Sanskrit gives us no direct information regarding this
[G. Ed. p. 060 .] form; and, in fact, it has more the appearance of a singular than a plural, and if once recognised as a precative, would rather lead us to the Greek $\theta$ eito than to 6eivto. The Sanskrit supplies us with no direct information regarding the form دposbugebburer yaîshdaitlita; for, according to the theory of Sanskrit, we must have expected hîran (from sîran), instead of the termination itha, and hîsta for the above-mentioned singular $\hat{\imath} / a$. But as the Zend precative, in the active, renounces the verb substantive, we may be prepared for the like in the middle; and as, in the third person singular in the potential, $\hat{\imath} / a$ is formed from $y$ at, a similar $\hat{u} t a$ in the precative cannot surprise us. It is clear, however, that daithitta is a precative, and not a potential,* since the root dath, which is extended from $d a$, in its conjugation follows the first class, and not the second, and therefore, in the potential, forms dathaêta, and not daithita The third person plural, daitlita, however, answers neither to the Sanskrit potentials middle like dadhîran, titeivтo, nor to the precatives like dhásiran, $\theta$ eivto; but perhaps to the universal principle of formation of the third person plural middie, and, in particular, to that form which, according to §. 459., rejects the $n$ belonging to the plural. Thus, apososeg daithila, "they should lay," answers to the Sanskrit forms like dadh-
 rejection of the $n$ in the Sanskrit middle special tenses has become the rule of the whole class of the second conjugation, and the precative agrees with the potential of the second

[^272]class, we are the less surprised at finding the Zend daithita deficient in the $n$. This daithita, however, [G. Ed. p. ¢61.] appears to me to be a contraction of daith-yata. since the modal clement, which we have seen above (§. 702.), in the singular daithîta, in the form of an $\hat{\imath}$, must in the plural become $y$ before the termination $u t a$, which the Sanskrit requires in the secondary forms: from yata, however, by casting out the $a$, would easily be formed ita (compare p. 780 G. ed.). But if the termination of the third person plural had al ways been ita, we should be unable to perceive any reason why the modal vowel should be long in the singular and short in the plural before the same termination.
"Remark.-It remains further to be shewn that the word دposGsagebinar_ yaoish-daithita, which has hitherto appeared isolated, but which occurs perhaps seven times in the Eighth Fargard of the Vendidad, is (in spite of Anquetil's or his. Parsí teacher's opinion that it is a singular) actually a plural. We read in V.S, pp. 266, \&c., חַתגל לो G
 м亿 kat tầ narí yadshdayain aṇhĕn . . . ya nas̀̀ (našvî?.) ava bĕrĕta s’ûnô v:î para-iristahê mashyêllê vâ âat mraôt ahurô mazdăo yadshdayainn aṇliĕn . . . kava (kvu?) yểa yêzi aêsha nasus âiwighnicta s̉ûno vâ kĕréfs-kharô vayô va kěrĕffs-kharô aat livaìm tunûm pairi-yâ̂shduithita geus maêśmana apâcha paiti avatha yadshdayain. According to Anquetil (II. p. 336), "L'homme sur le quel on a porté quelque chose du cadavre d'un chien ou de celui d'un homme, est il pur? Ormuzd repondit, il est pur; comment? Lorsque (le mort) a été regardé par le chien qui mange les corps, ou par l'oiseau
qui mange les corps. Il se lavera ensuite le corps avec de l'urine de boeuf, avec de l'eau, et il sera pur." So much is certain, that mention is here made, not of one man, but of
[G. Ed.p. 962.] several (tad nara yn, "those men, who," see §. 231.), and that yaôsh-dayanin anhĕn signifies, not "he will be pure," but " they are purified," or "they become purified." " Hence, it is self-evident that yadshllaithita, also, must be a plural. I translate literally, " How do these men become (are) purified who are touched by the carcase $\dagger$ either of a dend dog or of a man? To this Ormuzd said, They become purified where, or how (by what means?" so that yeda would stand for $y \hat{d}-\boldsymbol{v} \hat{d}=$ Sanskrit येन वा $\left.y^{\hat{2}} n a \operatorname{va}\right)$ ? "If that carcase touches (?), of a body-devouring dog or of a bodydevouring bird, then they (those men) should purify their bodies with cow urine and with .water: so (nvatha)

[^273]must they purify them．＂At p．268，L．9，\＆c．．we read下品／虎 Fixdunk

 zas̊ta hê＊padirím frasànadhnyěn ant yat hể zâsta nôit fras̉nâta at vişpañm huaim tanûm ayuôsldaithita kërènditn，i．e． ＂Then they should purify their bodies with water，not with urine：they should first purify their hands，for if their hands are not purified，then they make impure their whole bodies．＂Here it is plain，from the palpable plural fras̉nádhayĕn，that $y n \neq \hat{\text { drs }}$ daithita also can be nothing but a plural，up．ugugebblessua ayaôshdaithita is likewise the third person plural of the precative in combination with the negative particle $a$ ．But as above，in a peculiar construction（yadshldayain aṇhĕn，see p．934，Note＊）we saw the passive periphrastically expressed by an active term in combination with the verb substantive，so in د ayafshdaithita kërěnöita we see the active expressed by means of the auxiliary verb ＂to make．＂Ayaôshdaithita kĕrĕndita，＂they make im－ pure，they make＂（properly contaminent faciant）should signify nothing else than＂they make impure，＂and is the opposite to the above－mentioned passive yabshdayain aphen where anhĕ̈n（＝बासन् dsan，＂they were，＂）has a modal function，and supplies the place of the potential（see §．520．）． The present henti would scarcely be admissible here， though we could exchange aṇhĕn for the present indica－ tive．In ayadshdaithita këréndita both verbs are in the

[^274]same mood, as the precative and potential have the same relation to one another, that, in Greek, the aorist and the present optative have. As regards the form kèrěnôitn, we should perhaps, if the reading is correct, consider the 6 to be the Guna of the class-syllable; then the remaining ita would rest on the same principle as the termination of $y$ adshdaithita. We might, however, explain kérĕnóita also in this way, that the $u$ of the class-syllable $n u$ is replaced by $a$, and the verb in this way brought into the first conjugation: but I see less probability in this view of the matter; for then the frequentlyoccurring barayěn, " they may carry," must, in the middle, be
[G. Ed. p. 064.] barofita, which, as long as such forms are not traced back with certainty, I do not believe, as I should rather conjecture barayanta. In respect to syntax, the use of the precative and potential in the passage in question is to be noticed in a conditional conclusion ; while, according to the method of other languages, the indicative would be looked for. With regard to syntax I will here further mention, that in another passage of the Vendidad (in Olshausen, p. 1) the potential follows yêdhi, "if," in the sense of the pluperfect of the subjunctive-yedhi notit duidhyanim, "If I had not made:" on the other hand, the present after $y e \hat{e} z i$ is generally expressed by the mood called Lêt, which corresponds to the Greek subjunctive. It need not surprise us that each individual language, in the syntactical application of its moods, follows its own course in certain points: the grammatical identity of forms in the different languages is not, however, destroyed by such syntactical discrepancy.
704. In a still unedited portion of the Zend-Avesta occurs the form Geworessug dayadhwĕm, " ye may give," which Burnouf (Yaçna, Note D. p. 38), as it appears, regards as an imperative, and renders by donnez. In order, however, to regard dryadhwèm as the imperative, we must be able to prove that the root $d \hat{a}$, in Zend, is inflected according to the fourth class, of which I entertain
doubts. I look upon Gquenusug diryadhwém as the second person plural of the precative middle, and, as such, there is nothing surprising in it (after our having already seen that the Zend precative, in both active forms, abstains from annexing the verb substantive), except that the modal character $y \hat{d}$ is not contracted, as in the third person singular middle, and in all persons in the Sanskrit, to $\hat{i}$, but has merely shortene its $\hat{a}$, as in the corresponding person of the active, to which Burnouf has shewn the form dayata belongs. The middle dayadhwem has shortened the vowel of the root, on account, as it appears, of the greater weight of the termination; and in this respect, therefore, da-ya--dhwěm has the same relation to ddo-ya-ta, that, in Greek, $\delta i \hat{\sigma} \rho \mu \mathrm{a}$ has to $\delta_{i} \delta \omega \mu$.
705. In the Sanskrit and Zend potential [G.Ed.p.965.] there is no distinction of tenses, except that, as has been before observed, the precative stands in the same relation to it tiat, in Greek, the optative of the second aorist has to that of the present. Detydt, dè-yat, for dat-ydas, dd-yit have the same relation to addus, addt, that, in Greek, סoins, doin
 budhyds, budhyit, there are no corresponding indicative forms, as the fifth formation of the Sanskrit aorist is limited to roots terminating with a vowel (see §. 573 .): it may, however, originally have occurred also in roots ending with a consonant; so that there would have existed multiform preterites like abudh-am, abhut (for abhut-s), abhut (for abhut-t), abudhma, \&c., to which belong precatives like budh-ydasam. Vêdic forms like vidêyam, "sciam," s'akêyam, "possim," gamếyam, "eam," vôchâma, " dicamus" (Pânini, III. 1. 86.), do not need to be regarded as potentials of the first class, to which the roots of these forms do no belong; but they are, as it were, the prototypes of Greek aorists of the optative mood, like tútor,, , and must be regarded as derivatives of the aorists of the sixth formation (avidam,
aśakam, ayamam, avôcham), the conjunctive vowel of which has combined with the modal vowel $i$; just as the Greek - of $\tau \dot{\prime} \pi о \iota \mu \iota$ has united the conjunctive vowel of ${ }^{\prime}$ ' $\tau u \pi-0-\nu$ (which is interchanged in the indicative with $\epsilon$ ) with the modal vowel. In proof of the correctness of this opinion may be particularly adduced the above-mentioned vodchêma, "dicamus"; for there is no root vofch, which, if it existed, could be assigned to the first class, from which might be formed vôchêma, according to the analogy of tarpêma, тє́ $\rho \pi о \iota \mu \epsilon \nu$; there is, indeed, an aorist avôcham, which we have explained above as a reduplicate form from a-va-ucham (for a-vavacham).
[G. Ed. p. 966.] 706. In the Vêda dialect also traces :xist of modal forms, which exhibit the structure of the Greek optative of the first aorist. As example, tarushêma is adduced, according to sense $=$ तरेम tarêma, "transgrediamur" (Pânini, III. 1. 85.), but, according to form, a derivative from an indicative aorist like adik-ṣham, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \iota \xi \alpha \text { (§. 555.), only not }}$ with the direct adjunction of the auxiliary verb, but with the insertion of a conjunctive vowel $u$. But this तरेम tarushema can hardly be an isolated attempt of the language at a modal formation, which now appears to us abnormal; but it is probable, rather, that, in an earlier state of the language, which has in this point been transmitted to us more correctly by the Greek, these forms extended to all aorists of the second formation (§. 551.). We may suppose, therefore, that, in an earlier period of the language, a precative of adikşam existed, viz. dik-şhêyam, plural, dik--shêma $=\delta \in i \xi \alpha ı \mu \imath, \delta \in i \xi \alpha!\mu \epsilon \nu$, in which the modal element $y A$, contracted to $i$, became a diphthong with the preceding vowel, in the same manner as above in bhar-ê-y-am, bhar-ê-ma,

707. In Latin, the imperfects of the subjunctive admit of comparison with the principle of formation of Greek aorists like $\delta \in i \xi \alpha \iota \mu \epsilon v$, and Sanskrit like the presupposed
dik-şhaima, and the Vêdic taruşhêma. In fact, sta-rêmus is surprisingly similar to the Greek $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \mu \varepsilon \nu$, in so far as its $r$, like that of eram, is a corruption of $s$, and its $\hat{e}$, like that of amémus, legêmus, a contraction of ai. As, however, sta-bam is a new compound, I cannot but recognise in its subjunctive, also, only a new formation; and in this respect I adhere to the opinion, which I have already expressed in my System of Conjugation (p.98). A subjunctive sta-bem from stabaim would be in conformity with the indicative sta-bam, and sta-ram from sta-eram would be analogous as an indicative to sta-rem. The language, however, divides [G. Ed. p. 967.] the two roots of to be at its disposal between the indicative and subjunctive, and thus brings sta-bam and sta-rem into a certain degree of false relation, where it appears as if the $r$ of starem had a share in the expression of the modal relation, which is nevertheless confined solely to the $i$ contained in the diphthong é. It will be readily admitted that possem (from potsem) contains the combination of the verb substantive with pot, just as much as pos-sum and pot-eram. But if pos-sem is a new and genuine Latin formation, the es-sem, "I would eat," which is analogous to it, from ed-sem, is so also; and with this agrees, too, the obsolete fac-sem, which, in form at least, is an imperfect, as fac-sim is a present; for if these forms had arisen from the perfect feci, they would be fexem, fexim. While then, after consonants, the old $s$ is either retained or assimilated to a preceding $r$ or $l$ (fer-rem, vel-lem), between two vowels it has passed into $r$; and this is usually the case, as the imperfect preserves the class-syllable; thus, leg-e-rem, dic--e-rem (from leg-i-rem, dic-i-rem, see §. 554.). But if the imperfect subjunctive were, in its origin, connected with the Greek optative aorist, then for dic-e-rem we should anticipate $d i x e m=\delta \in i \xi \alpha \iota \mu$. The forms es-sem ("I would eat ") and fer-rem are established by the circumstance that these verbs, as is shewn by their affinity with the Sanskrit, dis-
tinctly belong to the conjugation without the conjunctive
 at-si, at-ti, at-tha; fer-rem to fer-s, fer-t, fer-tis=Sanskrit bihhar-shi, bibhar-ti, bibhri-tha. Hence we see that it is in no way admissible to derive fer-rem from fer-e-rem, by rejecting an $e$. We should rather be compelled to explain
[G. Ed. p. 968.] fer-e-rem, if this form existed, by including it in the principal conjugation with the conjunctive vowel, as from es-sem has been developed ed-e-rem.
708. But how stands it with es-sem, "I would be," for which we should have conjectured erem, corresponding with the indicative eram? But eram stands for esam= Sanskrit âsum (§. 532.); and from this primitive form esam has arisen the form esem (from esîm), through the commixture of the modal $i$, which is contracted with $a$ to $\hat{e}$, according to the same principle by which amem has been formed from the theme ama. Were esem once formed from esam, then, in the course of time, the indicative parent form may have followed its disposition to change the $s$, on account of its position between two vowels, into $r$, without there being hence a necessity that the derivative form esem, also, should follow this impulse; for it is not a general rule in Latin that every $s$ between two vowels must be changed into $r$. Through the firm retention, therefore, by the subjunctive, of the old, and subsequently doubled sibilant eram and esem, essem, stand in the same opposition as, conversely, in Old High German, was, " I was," does to wari, " I would be," in which the weakening of the $s$ to $r$ has its foundation in the increase of syllables (see §. 612. p. 860 G. ed.) The doubling of the $s$ in essem I believe may be explained according to the same principle by which, in Greek, in the epic language, the weakest consonants (the liquids and $\sigma$ )-occasionally, and under certain circumstances, $\rho$-are, in the common dialect, regularly doubled. The Sanskrit doubles a final $n$
after a short vowel, in case the word following begins with a vowel. If, then, which I believe to be the case, the doubling of the $s$ in the Latin essem, and in the infinitive esse, is likewise purely of a euphonic nature, it may be compared especially with Greek aorists like èté $\bar{\lambda} \epsilon \sigma \sigma \alpha$, since the $\sigma \sigma$ of these tenses likewise belong to the [G. Ed. p.969.] verb substantive: observe, also, the Lithuanian essie, "if he be" (§.683.). Regarding ${ }^{\prime}$ है $\sigma o \mu \alpha \iota$, see §. 655 . But should the double sin essem have its foundation in etymology, which I do not believe, then it must be assumed, that when the esem, which arose from esam, had firmly attached itself to attributive verbs in the abbreviated form of sem, or, more generally, rem, and in this position was no longer recognised for what it really is, so that the whole sé, $r^{\ell}$, was considered as the modal exponent, then the root es combined with itself; according to which, essem would properly mean " I would be be," in analogy with es-sem, "I would eat," and pos-sem, "I would be able." And the analogy of es-sem, "I would eat," and possem, "I would be able," as also that of ferrem and vellem, might have so far operated on essem, "I would be," that, according to their example, without the languages furnishing any particular reason for it, the consonant preceding the $e$ was doubled. Be this as it may, essem, and the esem preceding it, remain in so far a new formation, as in the Sanskrit no mood whatever proceeds from the imperfect, any more than in Greek. The Latin subjunctive, therefore, of the imperfect meets with its nearest point of comparison only in the Greek optative aorist; since esem (eram) is produced from esam, just as tú $\psi \alpha u \mu$ from êtu $\alpha$.
709. No trace of the production of moods can be shewn to attach to the Sanskrit reduplicate preterite or perfect.*

[^275][G. Ed. p. 970.] As, however, the potential of the second and sixth aorist formation in the Vêda-dialect is, as it were in its moment of extinction, still to be met with in its remnants as taruşhêma, gamêyam, vôchêyncm (§. 705.), it might be assumed that the extirpation of the moods, which have arisen from the reduplicate preterite, only made its appearance somewhat earlier, or that the relics of them, which have remained to the period when the Vêdas were composed, may be lost to us, together with the memorials in which they occurred. But if there existed a potential of the perfect, it is a question whether the conjunctive vowel $a$ (see §.614.) was retained before the modal element or not? In the former case, forms like tu-tupedy-am, tutupet-s, tutupe-t, would have arisen, to which would correspond the
 (whence might be expected, also, тєтúфaıu, \&c.): in the latter case, forms like tutupy:im would have existed, as prototypes of the Gothic subjunctives of the preterite like haihaitynu, "I might be called," or with the loss of reduplication, as bundyau, "I might bind," which would lead us to expect Greek forms like tetupinv, which must afterwards have been introduced into the $\omega$ conjugation. The close coincidence of the Greek and German makes the origin of such modal forms in the time of the unity of language very
sasrijgat as potentials of the perfect, but of the intensive (comp. §. 515 .), which, in the Veda-dialect, presents several deviations from the classical language, and in roots with middle rici (from ar) exhibits in the syllable of repetition $a$, more frequently $\hat{a}$, and also, in conformity with the common dialect, ar. Thns vâvridhati (Rig V. 33.1.) is the Leet of the intensive, and vârridhaswa (Rig V. 31. 18.) its imperative middle. Westergaard also refers the participle present middle tâtri. hana, "thirsting" (Rig V. 31. 7.) to the intensive, though it might be ascribed to the perfect with the same justice as susrijgat and raveidhrsza.
probable; the Gothic forms, also, like haihaityau, are too classical in their appearance to allow of our ascribing to them a comparatively recent origin. But if, nevertheless, they are specially German, and the Greek, [G. Ed. p. 971.] confessedly rare, like $\tau \epsilon \tau \dot{\prime} \phi о \iota \mu$, are specially Greek, then the two sister languages have, in fortuitous coincidence, only accorded a wider extension to a principle of modal production, which already existed in the period of their unity with the Saiskrit and Zend.
710. Latin perfect subjunctives like amave-rim, from ama-vi-sim, are undoubtedly new productions, viz. the combination of the base of the perfect with sim, "I may be," the $s$ of which, in its position between two vowels, has been corrupted to $r$; and, on account of this $r$, the $i$ of amavi, amavi-sti, has been corrupted to $e$ (compare p. 967 G. ed.). We might also, if necessitated, divide thus, amav--erim,* as sim stands for esim, like sum for esum. But in composition there was still more reason to withdraw the $e$ of esim, than in the uncompounded state; and the corruption of the $i$ to $e$ before an $r$ is too much in rule not to admit of it here.
711. We here give a general view of the points of comparison, which have been obtained in treating of the Sanskrit and Zend potential and precative, and of the moods corresponding to them of the European sistur languages.

## SINGULAR.

| sanskrit. | and | greek | latin. | ${ }_{\text {LITH. }}$ | Lid sclat. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| decdy ${ }^{\text {a }}$, ${ }^{1}$ | duidhyuim, ${ }^{2}$ | didoínv, | $d_{1 u}$ im $^{3}$ |  |  |
| dadyis, | daidhyâo, | didoins, | duris, |  | duschdy. |
| dudydt, | duidhyat. | dodoin, | duil, | dîdic,' | duschidy. |
| dicditu, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | duidita, ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | סıסоito |  |  |  |

[^276][G. Ed. p. 972.]

| sanskrit. | zend. | Greme. | latin. | LITH. | old sclav. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dady ${ }^{\text {a }}$ va, |  |  |  | - . | daschdyır. |
| dadyâtam, |  | סidoíntov, |  |  | daschdytr. |
| dadyâtám, |  | סiठointrnv, | -•• | - | daschdytr. |

## PILURAL.

 dudyâta, daidhyata, ${ }^{*}$ díoínte, duıtis, . . . . daschdyte. dadyus, ${ }^{9}$ daidhyain, ${ }^{1 "}$ סøסoîev, duint, . . . like 2 d p. ${ }^{11}$ dadíran, ${ }^{12}$ daidita, ${ }^{13}$ סঠoôvтo

| For dadâyâm, sce §. 672 |  | ${ }^{2}$ §. 442. Note ${ }_{69}$ and §. 701. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 ¢. 677. | ${ }^{5}$ §. 684. | 6 I give only the third perso | ular and |
| plural of the middle, and for the rest I refer the reader to the doctrine |  |  |  |
| of middle terminations, §. $466 . \& \mathrm{c}$. , and to the conjugation of adiya. |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{7}$ §. 703. | ${ }^{8}$ §. 701. | ${ }^{9}$ §. $462.1{ }^{10}$ ¢. 702. | 11 §. 678. |
| 12 §. 613. | ${ }^{13}$ §. 703. |  |  |

## SINGULAR.

sanskepit. sanserit. latin. gothic. o. h. g. old sclat. $a d y a ̂ m$, act. adîya, mid. ${ }^{\prime} \quad$ edim ${ }^{2}$ êtyau, ${ }^{3}$ âzi adyâs, act. adithĥs, mid. edîs, êteis, âzîs, yaschdy. ${ }^{4}$ adyât, act. adîta, mid. edit, êti, ázi, yaschdy.

DUAL.
adyâva, act. adîvahi, mid. . . êleivı, . . yaschdyva. adyત̂tam, act. adîyâthâm, mid. . . . êteits. . . . yaschdytr. adyâtâm, act. ad̂̂yâtâm, mid. . . . . . . . yaschdyta.

## PLURAL.

adyâma, act. adîmahi, mid. edîmus, êteima, âzîmês, yaschdymy. adyîta, act. adîdhwam, mid. edîtis, êteith, $\hat{a} z \hat{\imath} t, \quad y a s c h d y t e$. adyus, act. adîran, mid. edint, êteina, âzîn, like 2d p.

[^277]
${ }^{1}$ For dâyâsam, see p. 934 G. ed.
I believe I am right in giving this form instead of the dyanm mentioned at p. 934 G. ed.
${ }^{3}$ \&. 703., conclusion.
${ }^{4}$ For dâyâta, see $\oint .701$.

SINGULAR.
SANSKRIT. LITH

| dâsî-y-a, |  | dâsî-vahi, | dủki-w $a_{0}{ }^{\prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| dâsi-ṣhthis, ${ }^{2}$ | dûki. | datsî-y-n̂sthâm, ${ }^{2}$ | düki-ta. |
| dâsi-さ̣! ${ }^{\text {denen }}$ | . . . | dâsî-y-cistâm ${ }^{2}$ | ... |

## PLURAL.

SANSKRIT. LITH.
dîsî̀mali, dûki-me.
dîsi-dhwam, dūki-le. dâsî-ran, ...
${ }^{i}$ See $\oint \oint .679 .680 . \quad{ }^{2}$ §. 540. p. 798 G. ed,
[G. Ed. p. 974.$]$

bharè-t, baröi-t, ф'́poı- $\tau$ т,$\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { fere-t, } \\ \text { fera-t, }\end{array}\right\}$ bairai, bëre. ${ }^{6}$
bharế-ta, barâ̂-ta, фе́роı-то, . . . . buirui-duи,. . . .
DUAL.
bharé-va, ..... ..... ..... bairui-va, ....
bharế-tam, . . . . фépot-тov, . . . . brirui-ts, ....
bharê-tam, ..... фєрої-тŋv, ..... ..... ....
plural.
bharê-ma, baraê-ma, фépoı- $\mu \epsilon v,\left\{\begin{array}{l}f e r \hat{e}-m u s, \\ \text { ferû-mus, },\end{array}\right\}$ bairai-ma, bërê-meês,
 bharê-y-us, lıaray-ěn, фє́pot-єv, $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { fere-nt, } \\ \text { fera-nt, }\end{array}\right\}$ bairai-na, bërê-n. bharê-ran, baray-anta? $\phi$ е́роı-ито, .... bairai-ndai, ${ }^{8}$....

## SINGULAR.

[G. Ed. p. 975.$]$
SANSKRIT. ZEND.
vahế-y-am, ${ }^{1} v a z u i i^{2}{ }^{2}$
greek. latin.
coth. old sclav.
ข $\left(\text { ै }^{\prime} \chi^{01-v}\right)^{3}$ veham, ${ }^{4} \quad$ viga-u ${ }^{5} \quad \ldots$.

vahê-t, vazûi-l, é $\chi \circ$, $\quad\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { vehe-t, } \\ \text { veha-t, }\end{array}\right\}$ vigai, vȩi."


## DUAL.



## PLURAL.

 vahế-tu, vazuî́-ta, ${ }^{9} \quad$ є́ $\chi o \iota-\tau \epsilon,\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { vehê-tis, } \\ \text { vehâ-tis, }\end{array}\right\}$ vigai-th, ve?ye-te.



[G.Ed p. 976.] Singular.

PRESENT.
Sanskrit. Carniolan.

| smayıl-mi,' | sıǹya-m, |
| :--- | :--- |
| smaya-si, | smèya-sh, |
| smaya-ti, | smèya-(t), |

smayâ-vas, smèya-va, smaya-thas, smèya-ta, sinaya-tas, smeya-ta,

POTENTIAL IMPERATIVE.
Sanskrit.
Carniolan.
smayai-y-am, ${ }^{2}$ smayai-s, smayui-t,

## DUAL.

| smayai-va, | smèyay-va. |
| :--- | :---: |
| smayai-tam, | smèyay-ta. |
| smayai-tâm | $\ldots . ?^{4}$ |

## plural.

smayui-ma, smèyay-mo.
smayai-ta, smèyay-te.
smeyay-( $m$ ). ${ }^{3}$ smèyay-(s). smèyay-(t).
smèyay-va. smèyay-ta. . . . . ${ }^{4}$
smayui-y-us
${ }^{1}$ The active of $s m i$, "to laugh," which, by Guna, forms $8 m e ̂$, and hence with $a$ the class vowel, smaya, is not used in the present state of the language, and stands here only on account of the surprising resemblance be. tween smayâmi and the Carniolan word of the same meaning, smèyam (see, however, N. ${ }^{5}$ ), as also between the potential smaycyam and the Carniolan imperative smèyay $(m), \& c$.

2 I here express the Sanskrit diphthong $\hat{e}$, according to its etymological value, by ai, in order to exhibit the more clearly the remarkable analogy of the Sanskrit potential to the Carniolan imperative (see §. 697.).

3 The diphthong ai is expressed in Carniolan by ay. Regarding the loss of the personal terminations and the similarity of the three persons singular which proceeds from it, see $\oint .697$.
${ }^{4}$ Is expressed by a periphrasis formed of the present indicative with the particle nay.
${ }^{5}$ Regarding the $y$ preceding the termination 0 see $\oint .608$.; but if the $y$ of sméyay-o is connected with aya, the characteristic of the Sanskrit tenth class, as is usually the case in verbs in $a m$, then smey-am is properly based, not on smayami of the first class, but on smáyayami of the tenth; according to which $s m i$, also, is inflected (also in the middle only), and smeya-yo
[G. Ed. p.977.] is therefore=smayayanti. But if this is really the case, as I believe it is, then for our present object-viz. in order to place in a clear light the analogy of the Carniolan imperative to the Sanskrit poten-
tial in a verb of kindred root, it would be better to contrast with the Carniolan smèyam the word smayámi, which is more similar to it than smaya$y a m i$, though the affinity of the latter is greater. For the rest, the Carniolan in the third person plural present extends the termination yo, by an abuse, even to verbs to which the $y$ does not properly belong; c.g. most verbs of Kopitar's third example: correspond to Dobrowsky's third conjugation in Old Sclavonic, and therefore to the Sanskrit first class. The third person plural, therefore, should not be griseyo but griso=Sanskrit gras-a-nti; and, in fact, many verbs of this class may, in the third person plural, employ $\delta$ instead of eyo (Kopitar, p. 337); as nesò, " they carry" (for nèseyo or nesèyo)=Old Sclavonic nesûty from nes-o-nty (sce §. 255.g.) The $y$ of forms like griseyo may also be regarded as a euphonic insertion to avoid a hiatus, as, in the Sanskrit, bharê-y-am, "I may carry " ( $\$ .689$.$) ; but even with this explanation, which I prefer, griseyo, "they$ bite," remains an inorganic form, since then the conjunctive vowel of the Sanskrit first claיs remains contained in it doubled, once as $e$, as in gris- $\rho-$ $t e$, " ye bite," =gras-a-tha, and next as $o$, which, in Carniolan, appears as the termination of the third person plural, but ought properly only to be the supporter of the dropped termination, and which corresponds to the Greek o of $\lambda \epsilon \gamma-0-\nu \tau \iota$, while the $e$ of $g r i s-e-t e$ coincides with the Greek $\epsilon$ of $\lambda \epsilon \gamma-\epsilon-\tau \epsilon$. In both languages the nasal of the termination, retained or dropped, exerts an influence on the coloring of the conjunctive vowel (see §. 2j5.g.). We must further notice here the Carniolan verb dam, "I give," since it is olear that in the third person plural dáyo (or dayò) the $y$ is a euphonic insertion, which is dropped in the more genuine dadò (三Sanskṛit dadati for dadanti, "they give"), since, in this word, the $d$ prevents the meeting of the $a$ and $o$, and thus the insertion of a foreign letter is rendered unnecessary. In das-te, " ye give," das-ta, " ye two give," " they two give," we have forms exactly coinciding with the Sanskrit dat-tha, datthas, dat-tas (see $\oint .436.) . W$ ith the form das-te, " ye give," may be compared, in Zend, the form das-ta, which perhaps does not occur, but may be safely conjectured to have existed (see §. 102.)
712. It remains to be remarked, with [G. Ed. p. 973.] respect to the Gothic subjunctive, that those weak verbs which have contracted the Sanskrit class character aya

[^278]to $\delta(=a+a)$ (see $\S .109^{n} .6$.), are incapable of formally denoting the modal relation, since $i$ in Gothic does not combine with an $\hat{\theta}$ preceding it, but where $\delta i$, would occur, the $i$ is swallowed up by the $\hat{\delta}$; hence friyds means both amas and ames, and, in the latter case, stands for friydis;"* so in the plural friyotth means both amatis and ametis. In the third person singular friyd, "amet" (for friybith) is only inorganically distinguished from friyôth, "amat" since the subjunctive, according to §. 432., has lost the personal character. The Old High German subjunctives like salbote, salbôes, salbôêmes, are inorganic, since the ê of sallôés, \&c. (which is shortened in the Auslaut, terminating sound), is a contraction of $a i$ (see §.78.), of which the $a$ must belong to the class character. But in the 6 , therefore, which is equivalent to $a+a$, the whole of the primitive form सय aya is contained, except that the semi-vowel is rejected: there does not, therefore, remain any other $a$, which might, had it existed, have been contracted with the modal-vowel $i$ to $e$. Hence we must assume that the $e^{d}$ has found its way into this class of verbs only through a mal-introduction from those verbs where it has a legitimate ground for entering, at a time when the language was no longer conscious that the last half of the $\hat{e}=a i$ belongs to the modal designation, but
[G. Ed. p. 979.] the former half to the derivation. Such is the case, for example, with forms like habêess, "habeas," habêèmes, "habeamus," in which the first ê contains the two first elements of the class-syllable wय aya (which are aloue represented in the indicative hab-ê-m, hab-ê-s, see

[^279]p. 121 G.ed.); but the second ê contains the last $a$ in contraction with the modal vowel $i$; so that, therefore, in varmanếs the second ê coincides with the Sanskrit ê of mânayés and the Latin $\hat{a}$ of moneâs (from moneais, see $\S .691$.), and the first $\hat{e}$ with the Latin $e$ and Sanskrit ay, which we have seen above ( $p, 121$ G. ed.) also, in the Prâkrit mânêmi, contracted to $\hat{e}$. The Gothic does not admit the diphthong ai twice together uninterruptedly; hence, habuis, "habeás," stands in disadvantageous contrast with the Old High German hâbêês, and is not distinguishable from its indicative.
713. The Vêda-dialect possesses a mood which is wanting in the classic Sanskrit, and which occurs in the Vêdas even only in a few scanty remnants: it is called, by the Indian Grammarians, Lét, and is rightly identified by Lassen with the Greek subjunctive. For as $\lambda \epsilon \in \gamma-\omega-\mu \epsilon \nu$, $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma-\eta-\tau \epsilon, \lambda \epsilon \in \gamma-\omega-\mu \alpha l, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma-\eta-\tau \alpha l, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma-\omega-\nu \tau \alpha l$, are distinguished from the corresponding indicative forms $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \gamma-0-\mu \in v, \lambda e ́ \gamma-\epsilon-\tau \varepsilon$, $\lambda e ́ \gamma-0-\mu \alpha \iota, \lambda e ́ \gamma-\epsilon-\tau \alpha \iota, \lambda \epsilon \gamma-0-\nu \tau \iota$, only by the lengthening of the vowel of the class-syllable, so, in the Vêda-dialect, pat-a-ti, "cadat," is in like manner distinguished from pat-a-ti, " cadit"; grihyd̂-nt- 1 i, " capiantur," from grih-ya-ntê, "capiuntur"; only that in the latter form the tendency of the mood under discussion to the utmost possible fulness of form is manifested in this also, that the final diphthong $\hat{e}$ ( $=a i$ ) is augmented to $a i$, in agreement with the first person imperative, which in general accords more with the mood Lêt than with the other persons of the imperative, since the person of the imperative which corresponds to the first person plural middle bibhrimahê, "we carry," is bibhardmahai.
714. In Greek, neither the subjunctive nor [G. Ed. p. 980.] any other mood is derived from the imperfect, but in Vêdic Sansk!̣it the mood Lêt comes from it; as also in Zend, which uses this mood very commonly, and, indeed, principally in the imperfect tense, but with the meaning of the
subjunctive present; as, char-A-t, "eat," from pos)دp char--a-t., "ibat"; van-A-t, " destrunt," from مuvjuļ van-a-t, "destruebat"; ; \&upsd pat-ani-n, "volent" (for put-a-n, see §. 70\%.),
 from their primitive forms pat-a-n, bar-a-n. Thus in the Vêda-dialect, pat-î-m, "cadam," from apat-a-m, " cadebam"; prachôdaydt, "incitet," from prâchôd-aya-t, "incitabat."
715. I am of opinion that the Sanskrit potential and precative, and the moods in the kindred languages which may be classed with them, are connected with the principle of formation of the Lét, or Greek subjunctive, in so far as the auxiliary verb contained therein, which these moods share with the future (see $\S .670$.), has a long $a$ as the conjunctive vowel, while the future has a short $a$. Consequently the Sanskrit dad-y ât and dê-yût, the Zend duidh-ydt and $d \hat{a}-y \hat{t} t$, the Greek $\delta i \delta o-i \eta$ and $\delta o-i \eta$, would properly signify, " he may please to give," and thus this mood would be only a more polite form of the $L \hat{L} t$, or subjunctive, like the German expression, "Ich bitte, mir dies gestutten zu wollen," "I pray you to be willing to allow me this," is more polite than the abrupt "mir dies zu gestatten," "to allow me this." On the other hand, the future d $10-s-y a t i$ signifies "he will give," or, literally, "he will be giving;" and the "willing" is here not an expression of politeness, but the symbol of the time not being the present; or it denies the present in a less decided manner than is the case in the augmented preterites by the $a$ of negation.

## END OF VOI. II.


[^0]:    * The form $\lambda v \kappa o i o$ would have, according to the usual rules of contraction, to be compared with $\lambda \dot{v} \kappa o v$, after loss of the $\iota$ through an intervening $\lambda u k \in o$.
    $\dagger$ The reason of the lengthening might also be looked for in the words being monosyllabic; but this applies to the ablatives mat, twat.

[^1]:    * The Greek $\phi \omega \nu \nu^{\prime}$ is, probably, an analogous word, and would, accordingly, stand for $\sigma \phi \omega \nu \eta$.

[^2]:    * The case is different when a word, by rubbing off the termination, sinks back again into the condition of a theme : besides, only neuters, in the nominative, accusative, and vocative singular, exhibit the pure theme.

[^3]:    * Ilist. Phil. Trans. of the Ac. of Lit, for the ycar 1894. p. 134.

[^4]:    * Either with imperceptible meaning, or referring the action of the present to the further side of the past.
    $\dagger$ Pott may be right in explaining (Berl. Ann. 1833. Vol. I. p. 324) sma from sama, "like." I should, however, then hold "the same" to be the aucient meaning of sama, and the idea of similarity as a derived one; and also no longer explain sama, as in my Glossary, from mâ, "to measure," but regard it as the combination of the pronominal bases sa and ma (compare ima, "this," from $i+m a$ ).

[^5]:    * From $y u+a$, with change of the $u$ into $u v$, according to a universal euphonic law (Gramm. Crit. ©.51.).
     cuphonic addition, I thought also (Hist. Phil. Trans. of the Ac. of Lit. for the year 18:5. p. 196) that I might explain $\sigma \phi$, answering to the Latin vos and Sanskrit vâm, vas, as corrupted by prefixing a $\sigma$ allied to the $\phi$. This opinion, however, stands in no further need of support, from the information which 1 have since then gained regarding the $\sigma$ of forms in $\sigma-\phi \iota$; and I accede so much the more willingly to the abovementioned opinion, which was first expressed by Max. Schmidt (De Pron. Gr. et Lat., p. 8.)
    $\ddagger$ According to Mieleke, also mama dwiey $\hat{u}$ and yumma dwiey $\hat{u}$, the latter with doubled $m$; the first of which is to be explained by assimilation of the $s$, as in the .Eolic, $v^{v} \mu \mu s$.

[^6]:    * Although in this pronoun there is no obvious distinction of gender, still the Sanskrit declension-forms, viz. asmê, asmân, are masculine.

[^7]:    * Comp. memor for mesmor with Sanskrit smar ; so, too, Pott (1.c. explains the Latin met.

[^8]:    * But sce $§ .788$, Note 1, p. 1046.

[^9]:    * See pp. 228,229 , and shorter Sanskrit Grammar, §. 589. Rem.
    $\dagger$ I formerly thought (l. c. §. 274.) the $\hat{i}$ of $\hat{a}$ caim might be regarded as a strengthening prefix, as in the middle of the $\supseteq^{\text {nd }}$ and $3^{\text {rd }}$ dual person. But the above view answers better to the analysis which was given, §. 333., of the plural.

[^10]:    * TT, $t$ ' with the semi-vowel 1 .

[^11]:    * Regarding totus see p. 1: it: (i. cd. Note.

[^12]:    * See Vocalismus, Rcm. 2. p. 193, \&c.

[^13]:    * Accusative plural sos, cf. Max. Schmidt " De Pronomine Gr. ct Lat." pl. 11, 12.

[^14]:    * The belief in this actually being the case is supported by the Pali, in which the form asu, without Vriddhi, corresponds to the Sanskrit asciu.

[^15]:    * Cf. Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 13.

[^16]:    * In the author's Essay on Demonstrative Bases, p. 21.

[^17]:    * Perhaps we should also class under this head $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon$ 'िa, and divide it into $\dot{\eta}-\mu \dot{\rho} \rho a$, considering it as "day-time." The first member of the compound would have lost the $T$ sound of the Sanskrit base em dya, as, in $\oint$. 122., we have seen. $J u$ proceed from $D y u$, and the rough breathing would, as frequently happens in Greek-e.g. in $\dot{\eta} \pi a \rho$, answering to $j e c u r$ and यकृत् yakrit-supply the place of the $j$. As regards the second portion of $\dot{\eta}-\mu \epsilon \rho a$, we might easily suppose it connected with $\mu \epsilon$ fos. If this idea be well founded, then $\dot{\eta}-\mu \epsilon \rho a$ would mean "day's-side" or "light-side" (of time). But $\mu \epsilon \rho a$ admits, also, of comparison with a word which, in Sanskrit, means time in general and day of the week; for by assuming the fre-quently-mentioned hardening of a $v$ to $\mu$ (ef. p. 115, 1. 3), and a shortening of the middle vowel, we arrive at the Sanskrit aार vâra, which has been before the subject of discussion ( $\$ .309$. p. 4.5, 1.8), and with which, too, our Mal, "time," Gothic $m e ̂ l($ theme mêla), is connected. According to this view, $\dot{\eta}-\mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho a$ would, therefore, signify "day's-time," in which case an etymological connection between $\mu \epsilon \rho a$ and $\mu \epsilon$ fos might still exist, inasmuch as $\mu \epsilon i \rho \rho \mu a l$, from the root MAP ( $\epsilon \mu \mu а т \tau a)$ ), is probably connected with the Sanskrit root var (vri), "to cover" and "to choose"; whence vara (nominative varam), "the gift, lent by a god or a Brahman," "grace"; and whence is derived, also, vâra, "opportunity," "time," \&c. For further particulars regarding the root वर् var (वृ vrui) and its branches in the European cognate languages, see my Vocalismus, p. 160.
    $\dagger$ Influence of the Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 12.

[^18]:    * See p. 367, Rem. 5. ; and Vocalismus, p. 234, Rem. 31.
    $\dagger$ Respecting $u$, as lighter than $a$ and heavier than $i$, see Vocalismus, p. 227, Rem. 16.

[^19]:    * See Vocalismus, p. 247.

[^20]:    * Respecting the neuter daz, see §. 356. Rem. 2.
    + I cannot, however, quote this pronoun in Zend, except in the nominative plural masculine in combination with the relative, $\oint .62$.

    1 The latter is the Vêdic and Zend form, see §.231. and §. 234. Note *.
    ${ }^{2}$ The latter the Zead form pre-supposed above.

[^21]:    3 See §. 354.

    * Grimm appears to have committed a mistake in referring, I. 723., to the third p. conj. for support of the supposed length of the $e$ in the nominative plural, as at p. 868 he ascribes to it a short $e$.

[^22]:    * The Sanskṛit tyê-n-a has, according to §. 158., a euphonic $n$ inserted, and the $a$ of the base changed into $\hat{e}$ by the blending of an $i$.
    $\dagger$ The latter actually takes place in hvammé-h, hvaryammé-h.

[^23]:    * To these belong the (stıong) adjectives combined with a pronoun.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ The agreement with the Gothic si ( $\oint .353$.), and, in Sclavonic, the complete identity with it, should not be overlooked. With respect to the contraction of the Sclavonic theme syo, sometimes to si, at other times to ac, compare §. 28\%.

[^25]:    * Graff, II. 346.
    $\dagger$ Cf. Vocalismus, p. 203.

[^26]:    * It is to be observed that the 8 of vulfis, from vulfas, "lupi," is not an original final, as appears from the Sanskp̣it vrika-sya and Greek $\lambda$ úko( $\sigma$ )七o.
    + Legats for legäis, Vocalismus, p. 201.
    $\ddagger$ Written also ch, see p. 138, last line.

[^27]:    * Berlin Jahrb. Feb. 1836. p. 311.
    $\dagger$ Perhaps, also, the syllable pen of bolapen, " heaven," is identical with the Sanskrit war of the same meaning.
    $\ddagger$ Compare what is said at $\oint$. 357. respecting the Lithuanian szit-tas.

[^28]:    * Heidel. Jarhb. 1818 p. 472.

[^29]:    ${ }^{1}$ This form actually occurs in the Vêdas, see Rosen's Specimen p. 10, and Note p. 11. We should have anticipated im (with short $i$ ), according to the common declension; but the substantive and adjective declension has no monosyllabic bases in $i$, and other monosyllabic bases-with the exception of those in $\hat{o}$-use $a m$ as their termination; hence bhiy-am for $b h i-m$; and so, also, iy-am might be expected from $i$, as in monosyllabic words both short and long $i$ are changed before vowels into iy. The Vêda dialect in the foregoing case, however, has preferred strengthening the vowel of the base to an extension of the termination, or, which is more probable, it has contracted an existing iyam to im , according to the analogy of the Zend ( $(.42$.$) ; and thus, perhaps, also the Vêdic sim, "eam," cited by Rosen$ l. c., is a contraction of syam, otherwise we must assume, that instead of the feminine base $s t$, mentioned in $§ .345 .$, si occurred, according to the analogy of the Zend hnmâ from hma ( $\oint$. 172.). It is certainly remarkable that the $s$, which is especially subjective, has here found its way into the accusative, like the Old High German sia and Old Latin sam, "eam," sum, "eum" (§. 345.). $\quad{ }^{2}$ Comp. amu-shmaii, from amu, and §.21. ${ }^{3}$ Compare $a m u$-shya, from $a m u$, whence it appears that all pronouns, with whatsoever vowel their theme ends, have, in the genitive, sya, or, euphonically, shya ( $(.21)$. ${ }^{4} \S .157 . \quad{ }^{5}$ §. 233.

[^30]:    * The accusative singular would, indeed, be distinguished from the masculine, since the feminine has completely lost the accusative character; but it was there originally, and therefore the necessity for a mark of distinction from the masculine also existed.
    $\dagger$ The accusative alone occurs, yet it is probable that the nominative was exactly the same (Grimm. I. 785), in case it did not come from the same base as the singular nominative, and it would, therefore, be syós.

[^31]:    * Not necessarily so, as the rough breathing occurs also in words which originally begin with a pure vowel, as Ekditepos, answering to एकमर!़् ehatara-s. On the other hand the form if would not peremptorily conduct us to a base $₹ i$, as initial $s$ has sometimes been entirely lost in Greek.

[^32]:    * Compare Hartung on the Cases, p. 11.6; M. Schmidt De Pron., p. 12, \&c. ; Kühner, p. 385.

[^33]:    * §. 135. Compare Vocali smus, p. 131.

[^34]:    * The length of the vowel preceding the $j$ may sometimes be differently

[^35]:    * Compare the assimilation of $m$, and its simultaneous graphical representation by ${ }^{\omega}$ (Gram. Crit. §. $\mathrm{TO}_{0}$.)

[^36]:    § In Zend observe the feminine genitive عumerean atnanhdo (aênanhhdoṡcha, Vend. S. p. 47), which presupposes a Sanskrit ênasyds.

[^37]:    * Compare IIartung, Greek Particles, II. 99.

[^38]:    * See Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 77.
    $\dagger$ I regard the conjunction $n e$ as a corruption of $m e=\mu \eta$, मा $m \bar{a}$, as narro, probably, from marro (see Vocalismus, p. 165.)
    $\ddagger$ Compare my Review of Rosen's Vêda Specimen in the Berl. Jahrb. Dec. 1830. p. 955.

[^39]:    * See Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 69.

[^40]:    * Compare $\oint .105$. and "Demonstrative Bases and their connection with different Prepositions and Conjunctions," p. 9, pussim.'

[^41]:    "Anya is derived from an, "to live," and antara from anta, " end."
    $\dagger$ The regular form would be anatara.
    $\ddagger$ Alya-kunds, "alienigenus," alyai vaihtai, " other things," alya thrô, " elsewhere" (p. 384 \&c.). In the nominative masculine I conjecture alyis, not alis (p. 358, Note ${ }^{7}$ ).

[^42]:    * I prefer this derivation to that I formerly gave (Kleinere Gramm. p. 323) from dyu with an irregular $s$; for from divas the step is as easy to dyus as from div to dyu. Divas, however, does not occur alone, but instead of it divasa: still the compounds divas-pati, "Heaven's," or "day's lord " and divas-prithivyâu, "heaven and earth," shew the trace of it; for in the latter it is impossible to regard as as a genitive termination.

[^43]:    * Remark, also, the apparently pleonastic use of ä $\lambda \lambda$ os; and similar phenomena in Sanskrit, as Nal. I.14, in which men are opposed to the gods and to other beings not human, as others: "Nowhere among the gods or Yakshas exists such beauty, nor amongst (others) men was such ever before seen or heard of."

[^44]:    *Compare Vocalismus, p. 177, \&c.

[^45]:    * Compare p. 387, Note*.
    † !.. 344. p. 480. The derivation of $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \tau a \hat{v} \theta a$ given at p. 387 must be corrected accordingly.

[^46]:    * Compare Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818, p. 479, and Demonstrative Bases, p. 14.
    † The $i$ of iti-dem might also be regarded as the weakening of the $a$ of itc, caused by the addition of weight through the dem. (cf. §.6.)

[^47]:    * Without this weakening, affero, from alfero, would be identicul wilh affero, from adfero; and the change of the $b$ into the cognate vowel may have taken place in order to avoid this identity, as, vice versa, the $u$ of duo (originally a $v$ ) seems to have been hardened into $b$ in bis. If, for this reason, $a u$ has arisen from $a b$ on one occasion, it might be still further adopted without its being occasioned from a view to perspicuity.
    $\dagger$ Compare A. Benary in the Berl. Jahrb. May 1830, p. 764.
    $\ddagger$ Vocalismus, p.193, \&c.
    § This combination produces ष्रो $\hat{o}$ (§. 2.), which, before vowels, is resolved into $a_{\text {", }}$, as, gav- $\hat{a}$, " bovum," from gô.
    || Compare Hartung II. 3, \&c.

[^48]:    * Compare Burnouf's Yaçna, Notes p. $\mathbf{\text { of. }}$

[^49]:    *The meanings "but" and " also," which I have, in accordance with Fulda, given elsewhere (Demonstrative Bases, p. 14), rest on no authority. for Ulfilas gives only auk as answering to the Greek ráp (Grimm III. 272).
    $\dagger$ Compare Sanskrit ûh, " to collect," whence samúha, " crowd."
    $\ddagger$ Heidelb. Jahrb. 1818, p. 473.
    I §. 370. and Demonstrative Bases, p. 18.

[^50]:    * The Indian grammarians assume, without cause or reason, a suffix rhi for both these expressions, and distribute them thus, ettu-rhi, ku-rhi.

[^51]:    * The meaning of this is, that if, in Sanskrit, a sentence be interrogative, the object of the verb likewise becomes interrogative, as it were by attraction, instead of being, as in English, indefinite. Thus, in the passage referred to §. 308., कथं स पुहष: पार्य कड् घातयनि हन्ति कम् kathan su purushafi Pârtha! kan ghâtayati hanti kam, "How, O Partha! can that man cause to be killed whom, can he kill whom?" The same attraction takes place in a relative sentence. Thus, in the Second Book of the Hitopadeśa, यदेव रोचते यर्मै भवेत तनस्म सुन्दंरं yudêva rôchatê yasmâi bhavêt tat tasya sundaram, "Whatever is agreeable to whomsoever (in English it would be 'to any one soever'), that to him will be beantiful."-I'ranslator's Note.
    + As addenda to §. 306. may be noticed the uninflected comparatives, which accord with the superlatives in aus-as (§. 307.).

[^52]:    * In Zend the $i$ of $y$ im is not produced by the euphonic influence of the $y$, for we also find $\operatorname{dim}$ for dĕm ( $\$ .343$.), and $\dot{d r u j i m}$ for $d r u j e ̆ m, ~ f r o m ~$ druj, "a demon."
    $\dagger$ As to the Gothic suffix $b a$ and Lith. $p$, cf. p.1462. G.ed. Note 1. 18.
    $\ddagger$ Compare Demonstrative Bases, p. 15, and Graff (I. 75.), who assents to my opinion, bat designates the pronominal bases as adverbs of place, or locative particles.

[^53]:    * Not $a b a$, for the $a$ belongs to the adjective base; hence those in $u$ have, not $v-a b a$ but $u-b a$; but those in $y a$, for the most part, lay aside their final vowel, and form $i$-ba for ya-ba. Examples: frôda-ba, "intelligent," from $F R \bar{O} D A$ (nom. frôths); hardu-ba, "hard," from HARDU; andaugi-ba, " evident," perhaps from the substantive base ANDAUGYA (nominative anduugi), "visage." The full form is seen in gabauryna-ba, "willing."

[^54]:    * Vocalismus, p.227, Rem. 16.
    $\dagger$ Kad for kat, according to $\oint .93{ }^{\text {a }}$.
    $\ddagger$ Götting. Anzeig. 1821, p. 352. Wilson, on the other hand, follows the native grammarians in deriving both the interrogative particle kachchit and kad-adhwan, and similar compounds, from kat for kut, "bad "; and it appears that the connection of the prefixes $k a t$ and $k u$ with the interrogative has quite escaped the Indian grammarians

[^55]:    * Burnouf's Yaçna, Note R. p. 134.

[^56]:    * Regarding qua as pl. neuter, sec §. 394.

[^57]:    * Influence of the Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 3.

[^58]:    * This appears to me an abbreviation of êsávaitîm, and presupposes a Sanskrit éşhavat together with étavat (from éta', §. 344.). The initial é has been dropped, but has left its influence on the sibilant following: hence sâitîm for shâitím ( $\{j .51 .52$. ), not hâitim. Remark the Zend > the conjecture mentioned $\oint .55$. is well grounded.

[^59]:    * Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p 3.

[^60]:    * I do not think that these words can be distributed thas, alic-ubi, alic--unde, and that we can assume a compound of ALIQUI, with ubi, unde; but as ali, as the abbreviation of ALIO, is the first member of tho compound ali-quis, so it is also that of ali-cubi and ali-cunde.

[^61]:    * Gram. Crit. p. 328.
    $\dagger$ Sanskrit Grammar, p. 121. On account of the mutual transitions of final $s$ and $r$, and the uniformity of the phonetic laws to which they are subject after vowels other than $a, a$, it might remain undecided in the expressions given above, whether $s$ or $r$ is the original final letter. As, however, by a reference to makim and nakim, they are shewn to be matculine nominatives, it is mattor of astonishment that makir and nakir could ever be taken for the original forms.

[^62]:    * Gistra-dagis occurs Matt. vi. 30. in the sense of "morrow."

[^63]:    * Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, pp. 3, 4. Max. Schmidt (De Pron. Gr. et Lat. p. 33) has discussed this subject almost simultaneonsly with myself, and viewing it in the same light.

[^64]:    * Ci-tra is analogous with ul-tra, from ille, olle, suppressing le, and ci-s with $u l-s$, the $s$ of which may be connected with the Greek locative suffix $\theta_{l}$ (z $\delta-\theta_{l}, \& c$.), to which it bears the same relation that dós does to $\delta \delta \delta-\theta_{l}$. Remark, that final $九$ is suppressed in Latin almost universally.

[^65]:    * Compare Grimm III. 23., where uh and the Latin que (=кc) are for the first time shewn to be identical.

[^66]:    * With the exception of the accusative, which is the same as the nominative. This pronoun does not appear to be used in the plural, and the feminine, also, is wanting. Compare Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 59.

[^67]:    * This form, which formerly escaped me, is important, as testifying that the $g$ of the common pronominal termination go has sprung from the s, and not from the semi-vowel of the Sanskrit termination sya (see §.269).

[^68]:    * Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 6.
    $\dagger$ Kopitar's Glossary, p. 86. Regarding cheso, see above, p. 5 fis.

[^69]:    * In the place quoted at p. 473.

[^70]:    * Compare Hartung On the Cases, p. 117.
    $\dagger$ Tadîya occurs, also, in the sense of its primitive; so Raghuvansa, according to Stenzler I. 81., and Brockhaus's Pataliputra, Sl. 2. The possessive signification uccurs at Raghuvansa II. 28.

[^71]:    * Written also without $y$, nush, vash. The change of the $s$ to sh is the consequence of the euphonic influence of the $y$, or, in the oblique cases, of the $e$ (Dobrowsky, pp 39.41).

[^72]:    "Thus, in the Gipsey language, miro, "mine," miri, " mine" (fem.); see Berl. Jahrb. Feb. 1836. p. 310.

[^73]:    * In Zend the long has relapsed into the short vowel, as very frequently occurs in the antepenaltimate.
    $\dagger$ §. 20. Compare, also, the Gothic slêpa, "I sleep," with the Sanskrit बपिभि swapimi; the Latin laudo with वन्द् vand, "to praise"; and the Lithuanian saldù-s, Old Sclavonic saldok (p. 412, Note *), "sweet," with the Sanskrit खादुस् swadu-s. With respect to the interchange of $v$ and $r$, in which the Old High German birumés, as contrasted with the Sanskrit भवामक् bhavámas, "we are," affords us a very interesting comparison, and one which has been since established by Graff (II. 325.), we will here remind the reader of the relation of the Gothic razn, "house" (theme razna, with $z$ euphonic for $s$, according to §.86.(5) ), to the Sanskrit root वस vas "to inhabit," whence वास् vâsra, " house," which Piktet recognises in the Irish fosra (Journ. As. III Serie, T. II. p. 443).

[^74]:    * We must avoid referring the $u$ to the suffix: it is clearly the final vowel of the primitive word, which, however, through the influence of the liquid, appears in the form of $u$ (compare Vocalismus, p.162, Note*). † Gram. Crit. §. 51.

[^75]:     "after how much time?" (Vend.S.p.229). The nominative chvanis occurs Vend. S. p. 86. From the primitive base chi I have still to mention here the neuter posp chit, of which only the enclitic use, whereby the interrogative meaning is removed, has been mentioned before. But as representing the more common kat it occurs 1.c. p.80, chit avat vachô, " what (is) that word?"
    $\dagger$ Often occurs adverbially, e. g. . tarĕ nareus, " among how many men?" (Vend. S. p. 30).
    $\ddagger$ Yaçna, Note A., p. 12.
    § We should notice also here the expression ఫ̧Guld frathô (with pop chit, p pupuculd frathasz-chit), since it shews that the ri, which is retained full in the Sanskrit prithu, is an abbreviation of the syllable ra which is also pointed out by the Greek $\pi \lambda a \tau$ 's. I think I have sufficiently proved, in my Vocalismus (Rem. 1. p. 156, \&c.), that the Sanskrit vowel $r i$ is, in all places, an abbreviation of a syllable, which contains the consonant $r$ before or after a vowel.
    || Yaçna, Note A., p. 11.

[^76]:    * It seems sarprising that there should be no word in English for wievielste. "Who of the number ?" expresses quite a different idea. I have been obliged, therefore, to coin a word.-Translator's Note.
    $\dagger$ Tiek, substantive and indeclinable tieka-s adjective, feminine tieka.

[^77]:    * To these formations most probably tros, also, belongs, which originally must have signified " so great," whence the meaning "equal" might easily arise. I formerly thought it might be assigned to the demonstrative base $i$ (Demonstrative Bases, p. 8) : as, however (which was there overlooked), it has a digamma, it would be better referred to the reflexive base, and compared with the Sanskrit swi (§. 364. ; and see Pott's Etymol. Forsch. p. 272).

[^78]:    * See Kopitar's Glossary to the Glagolita. Dobrowsky gives merely tolyma.

[^79]:    * See $\oint .17$., where, amongst others, the Gothic leik is compared with the Sanskrit dêha. If the Gothic expression also means "flesh," it may be observed here, that a word which, in Sanskrit, means simply "flesh," appears in Old High German as a termfor the body; while in Lithuanian and Sclavonic the "flesh" has become "blood." In form the nearest

[^80]:    * Hoefer De Prakrita Dislecto, p. 29.
    $\dagger$ To be deduced from the adverb analeiko.

[^81]:    * The simple sama (theme saman) means "the same," and corresponds to the Sanskrit sama-s, "equal," " similar," and Greek ö $\mu 0-s$, the theme being lengthened by an $n$. To this head, also, must be referred sums (theme suma), "any one," which has introduced a $u$ on account of the liquid, but to make up for this has dropped the $n$.

[^82]:    * Regarding leiks, see, to0, p. 1442. G. ed.
    + See the Old High German compounds of this kind in Graff II. 105.

[^83]:    * Dobrowsky (p. 343) incorrectly regards ak as derivative, since in

[^84]:    respect to the primitive pronoun he proceeds from the abbreviated nominative masculine $t^{\prime}, k^{\prime}, i$, and, in general, is in the dark regarding the theme of the base words, and the historical relation of the $o$ to $a$, developed in §. 255.a., through the Sanskrit, as also its length.

    * According to the analogy of $k t o$, chto, $§ .400$.
    $\dagger$ Etqualis is, probably, with regard to its last element, so far identical with qualis, as aquus is most probably connected with the Sanskrit एक्षस êka-s "unus," and the latter is, in its final syllable, identical with the interrogative base $k a$ ( $\$ .308$.).

[^85]:    * As to forms like regâli-s see also §. 942. conclusion.
    † From the primitive base juven=Sanskrit yuvan, comes juvenälis; gentīlis comes from a base genti (compare Lithuanian gentis, " kinsman"), the $i$ of which, and consequently the $t$ also, are suppressed in the nominative gens.
    $\ddagger$ Compare Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words, p. 24.

[^86]:    * परस्म parasmái is the dative of para, " the other."
    $\dagger$ घाम्मन Atman, "soul," of which the dative, Atmané, used above, in the oblique cases often fills the place of a pronoun of the third person, generally with a reflexive signification (see Glossary).

[^87]:    * P. 12:. Compare Vocalismus, p.79, and Grimm I. 1050.

[^88]:    * Some of the roots in $a$ weaken that vowel to $i$ before the passive characteristic ya.

[^89]:    * Benedictive, according to us.
    $\dagger$ The Indian grammarians name the tenses and moods after vowels, which, to designate the principal tenses, are inserted between $<l$ and ₹ $t$, and, to designate the secondary, between ₹ $l$ and ङ $n$. Thus the names run, lut, lit, lut, lrit, lêt, loṭ; lan, lin, lun, lrin. See Colebrooke's Grammar, pp. 132. 181.

[^90]:    * Berlin Jahrb. Feb. 1ヶ 27, p. 279, or Vocalismus, p. 44.

[^91]:    * Compare Vocalisnus, p 203.

[^92]:    * Such would be the form of tarpami in the middle voice, in which, however, it is not used.

[^93]:    *KalpayAmi, on which the Gothic root halp, " to help" (present hilpa, preterite halp), is probably based, is, in all likelihood, akin to the root kar (kri), " to make."
    $\dagger$ Compare p. 441.
    $\ddagger$ Fad alone forms an exception, in that, in the sccond and third person

[^94]:    dual it inserts an $e$ as a connecting vowel；hence，yad－e－ta in contrast to das－ta，vyes－ta．See Kopitar＇s Glagolita，p． 93.
    ＊Is generally used with a future signification．
    $\dagger$ The Sanskrit preposition sam，Greek $\sigma v \nu$ ，has，in Sclavonic，usually lost the nasal，but has preserved it in the above instances．

[^95]:    * In the second person the form avé-s also holds good with the radical consonant suppressed and the termination retained, as in the Latin nomiuatives, like pe-s for ped-s.

[^96]:    * See §§. 335. 336. 337
    $\dagger$ As in the expression " we" other companions are more usually attributed to the $I$ than the person or persons addressed, to whom, in fact, things are usually recounted in which they themselves have had no share ; and as, moreover, for the idea "we two," in its simple use, a special form is provided, which perhaps existed before other duals; it seems to me little likely that Pott's conjecture (Berl. Jahrb. March 1833, p. 336) is correct, that the syllable mas of the first person plural properly expresses "I and thou'; and that therefore the pronoun of the second person is expressed by the 8 , in the same form in which it appears in the singular of the verb, which in any case we are obliged first to derive from the $t$ of twam, while, by the explanation above, the $s$ is given as existing originally.

[^97]:    * As mag is throughout inflected as a preterite, and also the verb substantive in both plurals, Grimm has, certainly with justice, deduced the form of the first dual person of all the preterites from the foregoing instances.

[^98]:    * Upon Guna and Vriddhi see $\oint j$ j. 26. 29. I may here append, in justification of §. 29., what I have already indicated in my Vocalismus (p.ix), that I no longer seek the reason why $a$ is incapable of Guna, although it may be compounded into long $\hat{a}$ with an antecedent $a$, in the supposition that Guna and Vriddhi would be identical in the case of $a$-for $a+a$, as well as $\hat{a}+a$, give $\hat{a}-\mathrm{but}$ in this, that $a$, as the weightiest vowel, in most of the cases in which $i$ and $u$ receive Guna, is sufficient of itself, and hence receives no increment, according to the same principle by which the long vowels $\hat{z}$ and $\hat{u}$ in most places remain unaltered where an $a$ precedes ior $u$ (Gram. Crit. §. $34^{\text {a }}$.). It is, moreover, only an opinion of the grammarians, that $u$ has no Guna: the fact is, that $a$ in the Guna, as in the Vṛiddhi degree, becomes $\hat{a}$, but on account of its weight seldom usesthis capability. When, however, this happens, $i$ and $u$ for the most part, in the same part of grammar, have only Guna; for instance, bibhêda, "he clave," from bhid, together with jagama, "he went," from gam. It is, however, natural, that where so great an increment is required as that $i$ and $u$ become, not $\hat{e}, \hat{o}(=a+i, a+u)$, but $\hat{a} i, \hat{a} u$, in such a case $a$ should exert the only power of clevation of which it is capable: hence, for instance, we have mânava, "descendant of Manu," from manu, as śáiva from śiva, and leáuravya from kuru.

[^99]:    * §. 442 Note ${ }^{13}$. Dobrowsky does not cite any dual : it is plain, however, from the plural dashdyue, that the dual, if it be used, cannot sound otherwise than as given in the text.
    $\dagger$ In the Zend we might explain the aspiration, according to $\oint .47$, as a remaining effect of the earlier $v$ : as, however, in Sanskrit, the semi-vowel is entirely free from this influence, we prefer for both languages the conjecture put forward p. 642 G. ed., that the $h$ contained in the th is the real representative of the $v$.

[^100]:    * I write $u$ Us $^{\prime} / \mathrm{g}$ purposely, and render $\downarrow$ by $\hat{o}$, because I now find myself compelled to adopt the remarks of Burnouf, founded on the best

[^101]:    * Sẻe Gram. Crit. §. 104. and Addenda to §. 315. p. 331 G. ed.
    + Compare Rosen's remark on this termination, 1. c. p. 22.-B. The retention of fि after a vowel is found also in the Mahábhárata as सपाकृधि "put away," "discard."-W.

    I Yaçna LXXXVI. and CXXI. passim.

[^102]:    * The relation of $\delta i \delta o c$ to $\delta i \delta o v$ is essentially different from that which
     $\mu_{\epsilon} \lambda^{\prime}$ acs for $\mu_{\epsilon} \lambda^{\prime}$ as, out of $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda a \nu s$, and analogous cases, the $\iota$ represents a nasal, which, in the ordinary language, has been melted down to $v$, but also,
     rest on different modifications of a nasal.

[^103]:    * Burnouf, in his able collection of the groups of consonants ascertained to exist in the Zend, has not admitted the combination Gss sth ( $¢$ th), but only pss s̊t (çt) (Vend. S. p. cxxxviii).

[^104]:    * Annals of Oriental Literature, p. 41.

[^105]:    * Compare the Sclavonic proshiti, "precari" ( (§. 447. Table.) The Sanskrit root prachchh, whose terminating aspirate in the case above Gram. Crit. §. 88.) steps before its tenuis, has split itself into three forms in Latin, giving up the $p$ in one, whence rogo, interrogo, the $r$ in another, whence posco ( $\$ .14$. ), and retaining both in precor..

[^106]:    ＊Perhaps oüko，too，is not an antiquated dative form for outww，but an abbreviation of oiko $\theta$ ．
    $\dagger$ In the second imperative－person，also，the Prêkrit exhibits an inter－ esting analogy to the Greek $\tau i \theta_{\epsilon}(\tau), \delta_{i} \delta_{o}(\theta) \iota$ ，in the form bhanai，＂dic＂ （Urvasi Ed．Lenz，p．67），for bhanahi，from bhanadhi．
    $\ddagger$ According to Dobrowsky，only in the Archaic conjugation ；to Kopi－ tar，also in the ordinary．He remarks，namely（Glagolita，p．62），＂Tertice personce ть tam sing．quam plur．veteres，ut nos hic，per Tb scribchant． Hodierniper T＇b．＂$\quad \oint S$ euphonic for $d(\mathrm{p} .608$.

[^107]:    * S enphonic for $d$, in accordance with $\oint .102$. and with the Sclavonic.
    + In this sense is to be corrected what we have remarked on this head n $\mathbf{\$ .} \mathbf{9 0}$.

[^108]:    * The Indian grammarians assume everywhere anti, and, in the secondary forms, an, as the full termination of the third person plural, and lay down, as in the first person singular of the secondary forms, as a rule, that $a$ of the class syllable of the first chief conjugation is rejected before the $a$ of the ending; thus, tarp'-anti, for tarpanti, out of tarp-a-anti. The cognate languages, however, do not favour this view; for if the Greek o of $\phi$ '́ $\rho-0-\nu \tau \iota$ is identical with that of $\phi \epsilon \rho-o-\mu \epsilon s$, and the Gothic $a$ of $b a i r-a-n d$ with that of bair-a-m, the $a$ also of the Sanskrit bharanti must be received in a like sense as the long $\hat{a}$ of bhar- $\hat{d}$-mas and the short of bhar-a-tha.

[^109]:    * That, however, the suppression of the nasal is not foreign to the Zend is shewn in the form शाससत śásati from the root शास् śâs, which, probably on account of the double sibilant, follows the analogy of the reduplicated forms. In Zend, the nasal ( $\$ .56^{4}$.) placed before the $h$ may have favoured the suppression of that of the termination. Upon the $\mathcal{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{e}$ for $\varepsilon$ e see Burnouf's Yaçna, p. 480.

[^110]:    * Or should we assume, that, as in the accusative singular (§. 149.), an inorganic $a$ has been appended to the originally terminating nasal? The supposition of the text, however, accords better with the primitive grammar.

[^111]:    * Of the termination ant only the $t$ has been dropped, but the $n$ is contained in the preceding nasalized vowel (see §. 783. Remarh): hence we should read $a \mathfrak{i}$ for $a, u i n$ for 8 .

[^112]:    * An instance is found in a passage of the Izcshné (V.S.p. 48), the sense nf which has been much mistaken by Anquetil:- $J \rho G \varepsilon q \times \mu G 1 G b u p s$
     Gi̛j) (vide §. 922.) barĕsnus paiti gairinaim, "I praise the clouds and the rain, which sustain thy body on the heights of the mountains." According to Anquetil, "J'adresse ma priere à l'année, a la pluie, auxquelles vous avez donné un corps sur le sommet des montagnes." Vacsayatô is either the future of vaz, with an inserted a-thus for vacsyató =Sanskrit vakşhyatas - or a derivative from the root mentioned, in the present, according to the tenth class; in either case, however, a third person dual.

[^113]:    * Conjugation System, p. 131.
    $\dagger$ In Zend the active bar-ay-ĕn would lead us to expect a middle bar-aê-nta (compare §. 461.). The Sanskrit, departing from the sister languages, has the termination ran, thus bhar-e-ran, which seems to mea mu. tilation of bhar-é-ranta. The root sit, "to sleep," "to lie," inserts anomalously such an $r$, as here precedes the proper personal ending, in the third person of all special tenses ( $\$ .109^{4}$.), suppressing, however, in the present

[^114]:    * Possibly the representation of the termination hi by tât may be so understood, as that in sentences like bhaván jivatat, " May your honour live !" the person addressed is always meant. Examples are not adduced in which the actual second person is expressed by tât. Should such exist, we should be obliged here to bring back the two $t$ to the base twa of the second person, while in the tat of the third person both belong to the demonstrative base ta (§. 343.). Cf. §. 719. p. 958, Note.
     p.503, Note).

    I Compare the ablative in $u d$; answering to the Sanskrit-Zend in $\hat{a t}, \hat{a} t$, and the Old Latin in o-d.

[^115]:    * It deserves remark, that Dr. Kuhn, in his lately-published work, "Conjugatio in $\mu$, lingaæ Sans. ratione habita" (p.26, obs.), has ascribed to this Oscan form, withont recognising its Vêdic analogue, a passive origin. The Oscan affects a concluding $d$ for $t$, but has maintained the old tenuis under the protection of a preceding 8 ; hence the subjunctive forms such as fust, opposed to fuid (see O. Müller's Etrusker, p.37). Compare, in this particular, the Gothic ist (p. 661 G.ed.) with bairith, bairada.

[^116]:    * Maidê, also, occurs with the aspiration dropped.

[^117]:    - So, also, Kuhn in his Tract (p. 25), mentioned at p. 654.

[^118]:    * Compare §. 470 thâ-s, tâ-t, $\mu \bar{a}-\nu$

[^119]:    - As I think, immediately from $\boldsymbol{A}$-dhi, with a weakening of the $\boldsymbol{A}$ to $\mathcal{C}$.
    $\dagger$ But see § 888. p. 1202 G. ed.

[^120]:    * Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words.

[^121]:    * It would appear, that, together with this sawei, or, in the dative, together with $s a w$, a kindred form si co-existed, as, in Old Sclavonic, $s i$ with sebye, and from this si it is plain that the suffix of the verba reflexiva proceeded; and in the third person, instead of a simple $s$ the full $s i$ may stand; for instance, wadinnas or wadinnasi, "he names himself." With verbs, also, beginning with $a t, a p$, and some other prepositions, or the negation ne, the reflexive is interposed in the shape of $s i$, but may also be appended to the end ; for instance, issilaikaus (is-si-laikau-s), "I sustain me."
    $\dagger$ Compare Sanskrit vad, " to speak."

[^122]:    * That the $i$ of amaris belongs to the original termination si, as Pott conjectures (Etym. Forsch. p. 135), I cannot admit, because I hold this kind of passive formation far younger than the period when the $i$ of the active expression in Latin was still extant, as it has also vanished in Greek without a trace, except in évбi. In the secondary forms, however, it had disappeared before the individualization of the languages here compared, and yet we find amabaris, ameris.

[^123]:    The termination or accords perfectly with the Sanskrit $d s(a+a s)$ and Gothic $\delta \boldsymbol{s}$ ( $\oint .227$.) ; while the Latin $i$ has obtruded itself from the pronominal declension (\$. 228.).

[^124]:    * I consider the $\nu$ very essential, just because I deduce $\mu \in \nu$ and $\mu \in \nu a s$ from the middle participial suffix $\mu \in \nu o s$.
    $\dagger$ I explain their $t i$ as identical with the abstract substantive suffix ति $t i$.

[^125]:    * I was first led to the observation of this interesting phenomenon in my investigation into the origin of the German Ablaut (Berlin Jahrb. Feb. 1827, p. 259, and Vocalismus, p. 13.

[^126]:    * By assimilation out of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma-\mu i$, as, before, ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \mu \mu \epsilon \mathrm{s}, \vec{v} \mu \mu \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$, out of $\boldsymbol{a} \sigma \mu \epsilon s$, ṽ $\sigma \mu \mathrm{s}$, Vèdic asmê, yuşhmê.
    $\dagger$ Irregular for as-si, on which are based the Greek and Lithuanian forms. The Sclavonic, however, has likewise dropped one of the two sibilants.

[^127]:    * We here confirm the observations of §. 442., Note ${ }^{7}$. In $d \bar{u} d u$, according to the usual conjugation, diud has constituted itself as root, and the $a$ of $d i d-a-w a, d i d d-a-m e$, has thus nothing more to do with the $d$ of the Sanskrit daddmi, or the $\omega, o$, of the Greek $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \mu$, $\delta i \delta o \mu \in \nu$, but belongs to a class with the $a$ of $w o z=a-w d, w e z-a=m \grave{\text {. }}$.

[^128]:    ${ }^{1}$ Although the second dual person in Zend is not yet identificd, it may nevertheless be deduced with tolerable certainty from the third person in $t \delta$, which is extant ( $\$$. 464.), for which, in the second person of the primary forms, we may expect thô, the aspirate of which, however, has been
     §. 102. Conclusion.
    4. \$. 102. Conclusio, , and §. 453.

    $$
    \begin{aligned}
    & { }^{2} \$ \text {. } 1 / 12 . \text { Conclusion. } \\
    & \text { d § } 30 . \\
    & { }^{5} \text { §. } 15!.
    \end{aligned}
    $$

[^129]:    * See j. $4 u^{2}$
    † Compare, with Pott, $\chi$ 咠- $\rho a$, " widow," as the "aband ned" or "left." In Sanskrit $v i-d / a_{i} \cdot a$ is "the manless."

[^130]:    ＊Compare with this the Gothic gagga（＝ganga），＂I go，＂where the ohief syllable has lost the nasal

[^131]:    * On the other hand, $\epsilon i-\sigma a, \& c$, belong to the root ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} \mathrm{E} \Delta(\tilde{\epsilon} \delta-\rho a)$, Sanskrit asd (compare Pott, Etym. Forsch. p. 278, and Kühner, p. 242). The

[^132]:    spiritus of $\tilde{\eta} \mu a \iota$ is inorganic, i. e. not from $\sigma$; as, for instance, in $\mathbf{v} \delta \omega \rho$ opposed to उद $u d a, u n d a$.

[^133]:    * The Sanskrit conjugation-system only allows the Guna to short vowels before simple consonants, and to long at the end of roots. On the other hand, Guna never takes place in the middle of the roots, where there is length by nature and position.

[^134]:    * Kopitar's Glagolita, p. 86.

[^135]:    * The grammarians assume a root सृृ ${ }^{\text {stri }}$ and another 조 $s t r i \overline{\text { a }}$ both of which signify " to strew," and have, properly, for their radical syllable star $=$ Greek ETOP, Latin STER, the $a$ of which is sulject to suppression (Vocalismus, Obs. I. p. 157, and on the root in question, especially, l.c. p. 179.)

[^136]:    * In the German preterite, the weakening of the vowel is produced hy the polysyllabieness, see p.709. G. cd.

[^137]:    * For the origin of this i I refer preliminarily to my Vocalismus, p. 23.

[^138]:    * Faifah, from the root fah, "to seize," and haihah, from hah, " to hang," make an exception, but appear, on the evidence of cognate dialects, to have lost a nasal.
    $\dagger$ Vocalismus, Obs. 2. p. 193.

[^139]:    * In the case of this verb the modern German language has preserved the operation of the influence of the terminations; hence, wissen, wisset, wissen, opposed to weiss, weisst, weiss; while elsewhere the plural has everywhere made itself equal in weight to the singular.

[^140]:    * I give the plaral, as the abbreviation of the singular primary termination renders the character of formation not easily perceptible.

[^141]:    ${ }^{1}$ Hence an entirely legitimate division is impossible, since the personal termination has likewise a share in the $\hat{u}$ of derivation, its nasal being contained in it: see §.255.g. $\quad{ }^{2}$ Sce p. 630 G. ed.

[^142]:    * Compare the Sanskrit smar (smri), " to remember," Vocalismus, p. 164.

[^143]:    ＊The Sanskrit root $p \hat{\imath}$ is used only in the middle，but belongs，in like manner，to the fourth class；hence，pî－yê，pî－yasê，\＆c．
    ＋Dobrowsky writes，p．321，bieshi，biety，from the root bi，＂to cut＂； but Kopitar，whom I follow，gives biyeshi，\＆c．If the first reading were， correct，it must be assumed that after $i$ the $y$ of the class－syllable would be dropped before $e$ ．

[^144]:    * Demonstrative Bases, p. 20.

[^145]:    * See §. 19. From this interchange an affinity of the Gireek $\zeta \epsilon a ́, ~ \zeta \epsilon c a ́$, to the Sanskrit घब yava, "barley," may be deduced; thus, $\zeta \epsilon a ́$, for $\zeta \epsilon$ Fá.

[^146]:    * Not from the nominative ${ }^{\prime} \eta \delta \delta^{\prime} \rho$, but from the base ' $\mathrm{AH} \triangle \mathrm{E} \Sigma$ (compare p. 327 G. ed.).
    $\dagger^{'} E \rho \pi-\dot{v} \zeta \omega$ from $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} \rho \pi \omega$ appears to have been formed by weakening the $a$ to $v$.
    $\ddagger$ Of course with the exception of those the $\epsilon$ or $a$ of which is radical. Denominatives in ow, likewise, probably belong to this class, though the o has the appearance of belonging to the primitive noun. The question

[^147]:    appears to have one issue with that, whether the $a$ or $\iota$ of $a \zeta \omega, \iota \zeta \omega$, belong to the verbal derivative or to the nominal base.

    * From the point of view of the Greek it might appear doubtful whether $\boldsymbol{\imath} \sigma \tau \bar{a} \mu \iota, \tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota, \delta i \delta \omega \mu \iota$, should be regarded as lengthened forms, or ĩ $\sigma \breve{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\tau i \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \nu$, $\delta i \delta o \mu \epsilon \nu$, as shortened ones. But the history of language is in favor of the latter opinion (compare f. 481.).
    $\dagger$ I formerly thought it probable, that in voka the Sanskrit preposition $n i$ might be concealed, then $\kappa a$ would be the root, and might be compared with जयामि $j a y-\hat{-}-m i$, "I conquer," from $j i, C l .1$., the medial being irregularly raised to a tenuis. But if, which 1 now prefer, $\nu \bar{\nu}$ is regarded as the root, and $\dot{a} \omega=a y a ̂ m i$, is the class character; then viká $\omega$ leads us to the Sanskrit causal nâśs-ayâ-mi, "to annihilate," "to slay." The relation of $\overline{\nu i \kappa}$ to $n d_{s}^{\prime}$ resembles that of $k r \hat{i}-\underline{i} \hat{i}-m a s$ to $k r \hat{i}-n \hat{Q}-m i$, in Sanskrit ( $\oint .485$.). Then the conquering would take its name from the annihilation of the foe combined with it, and $\nu$ cká would also be akin to vékus, vekpós.
    $\ddagger$ Compare Vocalismus, p. 202.

[^148]:    * Cf. § 741. p. 992.
    $\dagger$ The final $a$ of w्रय aya remains only in the special tenses (1. 109.s 3.)

[^149]:    * In Sclavonic and Latin the causal in question has the meaning "to see," which is a means of making to know of a particular kind, as, in Sanskrit, the eye, as the organ of guiding, is termed né-tra and nay-ana.
    $\dagger$ Mielke's 4th conjugation, too, belongs to the Sanskrit 10th cl., see §. 698. Note.
    $\ddagger$ The Sanskrit verb expresses a louder groaning than the Lithuanian, and signifies "to thunder"; compare tonare and Greek $\sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \omega$ in the sense of the roaring of the waves of the ecul.

[^150]:    * The Lithuanian grammarians do not write the $e$ with a circumflex, but with a different mark to denote the length of quantity.
    + Lithuanian $y=\hat{\imath}$; and thus from the root of this verb comes the substantive klaidûnas, false believer," with Vṛiddhi ( $\oint$.26.), for Lithuanian $a i=a i i$, the $i$ being slightly pronounced; so baimé, "fear," answering to the Sanskrit root bhî, "to fear," whence bhîma, "fearful," and hence the derivative bhâima. The derivative suffix ûn', in klai-dûna-s, corresponds to the Sanskrit middle participial suffix âna (compare § 255. h.).
    $\ddagger$ Mielke refers verbs in êyu, oyu, uiyu, and iyu, to his first conjugation, which is altogether composed of very heterogeneous parts.

[^151]:    * In the Transactions of the Phil. Historical Cl. of the Acadenny of Belles Lettres for the year 1836. The scparate Edition of my Treatise is out of print, and a new Edition will be struck off hereafter, to complete this Comparative Grammar.

[^152]:    * Sanskrit dadâmi, dadasi, dadati, on which the Carniolan dam (for dadm), dá-sh, d6, is based, see p. 673.
    $\dagger$ Sce §. 255. m., \&uc.

[^153]:    * This, and not swasri, is the true theme; the nominative is swas $\hat{a}$, the accusative swasaram. This word, as Pott also conjectures, has lost, after the second $s$, a $t$, which has been retained in several European languages.
    $\dagger$ The initial $s$ is rejected, and the second corrupted to $h$. The Sanskrit $v$ is, in Beugali, regularly pronounced as $b$, and $a$ like $o$. As regards the termination ini, 1 look upon the $i$ as an interposed conjunctive vowel, and the $n$ as a corruption of $r$, as in the numeral tin, "three." Properly speaking, bohini presupposes a Sanskrit swasrî (from swa-strî).
    $\ddagger \ln \mathrm{m} \mathrm{y}$ opinion, a reduplication of the initial syllable pa.

[^154]:    *See my Famphlet " On the Connection of the Malay-Polynesian Languages with the Irdo-European; as also my own notice of the same in the Ann. of Lit. Crit. (March 1812); and compare A. Diefenbach's judicious review, l. c. May 1842.

[^155]:    * Observe the frequent coincidence in Madagasc. and Tongian with the German laws of euphony, of which more is to be found in my Pamphlet on the Malay-Polynesian Languages, p. 5 and Rem. 13.

[^156]:    * Whereupon, naturally, in the first person, this shortened $a$ is, according to §. 434., again lengthened.

[^157]:    *See, also, §. 409. Note $\dagger$, and §. 447. Note ${ }^{6}$.

[^158]:    * Also bist.
    $\dagger$ The forms birint, birent, birnt, and bint, which occur in Notker in the second person plural, I consider as inorganic intruders from the third person, where lirint would answer admirably to bhavanti. The form bint corresponds in its abbreviation to the singular bim, bis. With regard to the mutation of the person, notice the German sind of the first person.

[^159]:    * Regarding the derivation of this form from siy-u-va, and the ground of my giving the long $u$, see $§ .441$.

[^160]:    * Berin Ann., Feb. 1827, p. 261. Vocalismus, p. 16.

[^161]:    * E and o, never a are, with the vowel $\iota$, the representatives of the Sanskrit Guna vowel $a$, see Vocalismus, pp. 7, 193, passim.

[^162]:    * See $\$ \oint .45 \% .459$. See an example of the active of the corresponding class of conjugation, or one nearly akin to it, at p. 706 G. ed.

[^163]:    * I have published it in a collection of episodes entitled "Diluvium," \&e., in the original text, and in the German translation under the title "Sündflut." (Berlin, F. Dümmler.)

[^164]:    * The fourth act of Urvasî affords very frequent occasion for the use of the perfect, as the King Pururavas on all sides directs the question whether any one has seen his beloved? This question, however, is never put by using an augmented or even a reduplicated preterite, but always by the passive participle, or the formation in vat derived from it. So, also, in Nalus, when Damayantî asks if any one has seen her spouse?
    $\dagger$ The Latin dîvit may be regarded as identical with dhanavat, the middle syllable being dropped and compensated for by lengthening the preceding vowel. A similar rejection of a syllable has again occurred in ditior, ditissimus, just as in malo, from mavolo, from magisvolo. Pott, on the contrary, divides thas, div-it, and thus brings " the rich" to the Indian "heaven," div, to which also Varro's derivation of divus in a certain degree alludes, as divus and deus are akin to the Sanskrit dêva, "God"; and the latter, like div, "heaven," springs from div, "to shine."

[^165]:    * Nal, XI. 26. : âkrandumânâin sañśrutya javênâ 'bhisasára, "flentem postquam audiverut ('after hearing the weep 'ng') cumı telocitate advenit." $\dagger$ Nal. X. 22.: katham buddhwa bhavishyati, "how will she feel in spirit, after she has been awakened (nfter awaking)?"

[^166]:    * I believe I may include here the German root slip, slif (schleifen); Old High German slịfu, sleif, slifumês; English "I slip." We should expect in Gothic sleipa, slaip, slipum, preserving the old tenuis, as in slêpa $=$ swapimi, "I sleep." The form slip is founded on a transposition of sarp to $s r a p$. The transition of $r$ into $l$, and the weakening of the $a$ to $i$, cannot surprise us. Considering the very usual exchange of semi-vowels with one another, and the by no means unusual phenomenon, that a root is divided into several, by different corruptions of form, we may include here, too, the root swip, swif (schweifen); Middle High German swife, sweif, swifen.

[^167]:    * The Sanskrit root lip is not connected with the Greek $\Lambda I I$, but means "to smear," and to it belong the Greek $\lambda i \pi o s$, à $\epsilon i \phi \omega$. But alipam stands
     has divested itself of the inserted nasal, as $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \iota \pi o \nu$ has of the Guna vowel.

[^168]:    * The initial $u$ appears to have been formed from $a$ by the assimilating influence of the $\hat{u}$ of the second syllable. I shall recur to this aorist hereafter.
    $\dagger$ Burnouf (Yaçna. p. 434) proposes to read wâs for this form, also, has something uncommon, since the Vêdic ज्ञास् $A_{s}$ (of which hereafter) would lead us to expect, in Zend, $\alpha 0$, as a final Sanskrit म् $\delta$, with a preceding $\hat{A}$, regularly becomes $\hat{\alpha o}$; but wस् as becomes $\hat{o}$ (see §. $56 \%$ ). Without the augment we find, in the Zend Avesta, both the reading as and as, provided this form actually belongs to the verb substartive.
    $\ddagger$ Thus we should read instead of $\ddagger$ \& Sanskrit apanthayan, "they went," with an inserted nasal. 'Eォáreov corresponds in Greek. But should we read apathayĕn for apathayĕn the long $a$ would not be the augment, but the preposition $a$.

[^169]:    * The comparison of other MSS. must decide whether the accusative of the pronoun is rightly conjoined with this. Anquetil renders this imperative with the word following, the eating, of the nourishing," strangely enough by "qui me mange en m'invoquant avec ardeur, as he also translates the following words,
     śtaômaêni (ṡtaômaini?) s'ttûidhi, "extol me in praise," by "qui m' adresse humblement sa prière. The form hunvaṇha is the imperative middle, where, as often occurs, the character of the first class is added to that of the fifth.
    † Patanin, "volent," and ucsyarin, "crescunt," with which the Greek $\pi \dot{t} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\mu} a \iota$ and our Feder and wachsen are to be compared, are imperfects of the subjunctive mood, which, with this tense, always combines a present signification.

[^170]:    * For kĕrĕnaôs: there is, that is to say, as often happens, the character of the first class added to the class character, which was already present;
    

[^171]:    * This form is based on the Sanskrit abravam, for which abruvam: the contraction in Zend is similar to that of यवम् yavam, "oryzam," to GしנدJ yaôm. Regarding the exchange of $b$ with $m \mathrm{in} m r a \hat{o} m$ see $\oint .63$.
    $\dagger$ These two persons pre-suppose, in Sanskrit, $a b r o ̂-s, a b r o ̂-t$, for which, with irregular insertion of a conjunctive vowel $\hat{\imath}, a b r a v-\imath \imath-s, a b r a v-i-t$, are used.

[^172]:    * Regarding the termination of anhiat more will be said hereafter.
    $\dagger$ Thus I read for GxuJseus raôdhyanim, for which, p. 170, occurs,
    

[^173]:    * The root is krit, properly kart, and belongs to those roots of the sixth class which, in the special tenses, receive a nasal. To the same class

[^174]:    * System of Latin sounds, p.29. It being there stated that the coincidence of the Latin bam with the Sanskrit abhavam had not as yet been noticed, I must remark that this had been done in my Conjugational System, p. 97.
    † Berlin Jahrb., January 1838. p 13.

[^175]:    * As $\hat{e}$ consists of $a+i$, and $\hat{o}$ of $a+u$, so the first element of these diphthongs naturally melts down with a preceding $a$ to $\hat{A}$, and the product of the whole is $\hat{a i}, \boldsymbol{a} u$. In roots which begin with ri, we might regard the form $\hat{a} r$, which arises through the augment, as proceeding originally not from ri, but from the original ar, of which $\boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{i}$ is an abbreviation, as, also, the reduplication syllable of bibharmi has been developed not from bhri, which the grammarians assume as the root, but from the proper root bhar (see Vocalismus, p. 158, \&c.), by weakening the $a$ to $i$, while in the reduplicated preterite this weakening ceases, and babhara or babhâra means "I bore."

[^176]:    * Aorist Aiṣhiṣham; the imperfect is formed from the substitute ichh.
    $\dagger$ Annals of Oriental Literature (London, 1820. p. 41). When, therefore, Krüger (Crit. Gramm. §. 99.) makes the temporal augment consist in this, that the vowel of the verb is doubled, this corresponds in regard to íкє́тєvoд, ${ }^{-}-\beta \rho \iota \zeta o \nu, \stackrel{7}{v} \beta \rho \iota \sigma \mu a \iota, \dot{\omega} \mu i \lambda \epsilon o \nu, \dot{\omega} \mu i \lambda \eta \kappa a$, with the opinion expressed, 1. c., by me; but M. Krüger's explanation of the matter seems to me too general, in that, according to it, verbs beginning with a vowel never had an augment; and that therefore, while the Sanskrit Asan, "they were," is compounded of a-asan, i.e. of the augment and the root, the Greek $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ would indeed have been melted down from $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}-\epsilon \sigma a \nu$, hut the first $\epsilon$ would not only be to the root a foreign element accidentally agreeing with its initial sound, but the repetition or reduplication of the radical vowel. Then $\dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, in spite of its exact agreement with the Sanskrit asan, would not have to be regarded as one of the most remarkable transmissions from the primitive period of the language, but the agreement would be mainly fortuitous, as dsan would contain the augment, $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu$, however, a syllable of redu-

[^177]:    plication. I should certainly, however, prefer recognising, in all Greek verbs beginning with a vowel, the reduplication alone rather than the augment alone; and from the Greek point of view, without reference to the Sanskrit, this view would appear more correct.

[^178]:    * From є́申є $\rho-\dot{\epsilon}-\tau \tau \epsilon, a b h a r-a-d d h w a m, b h a r-a-d d h w e ̆ m ? ~ s e e ~ § . ~ 474$.
    $\dagger$ Compare Burnouf, Yaçna, p.518. In Sanskṛit the verb pârayâmi, mid pârayê, corresponds, which I do not derive with the Indian grammarians from the root पp $p r i \bar{\eta}$, "to fulfil," but regard as the denominative of para, " the farther shore": this pâra, however, is best derived from vara, " the other."

[^179]:    based on some other older one than the present Sanskrit uchyaté, but I do not thence deduce a vuchyaté, bat merely vachyatê, for which the Prâkrit is not at ail required. The Prâkrit, like many other languages, has, in very many places, weakened an original $a$ to $u$ (see p.362 Note ${ }^{*}$ ): why, then, should it not have occasionally done so after the $v$, which is homogeneous to the $u$, as the Zend, according to Burnouf's conjecture, has sometimes, through the influence of a $v$, changed a following $a$ to 6 ?

    * In my opinion, this form (of which more hereafter) must be taken for a precative, not for an imperative.

[^180]:    * Berlin Jahrb., July 1833, pp. 36, \&cc.

[^181]:    * When Vorliander, in his 'Treatise, which I have just seen, entitled "Basis of an organic acquaintance with the human soul," p. 317, says, "Negation of present is not yet past time," he is in the right; but it may be said with equal right, "negation of one is not yet plurality" (it might, in fact, he two-ness, three-ness, or nothing), and yet the iden "many" is clearly expressed by the negation of unity, or limitation to unity ; and in defence of the language it may be said, that though the negation of present time is not yet past time, and that of unity not plurality, still the past is really a negation of the present, plurality a negation, an overleaping of unity; and hence both ideas are adapted to be expressed with the aid of

[^182]:    * To the derivation of $s m a$, given at p.464, Note $\dagger$, it may be further added, that it may also be identified with the pronominal base swa (see §. 341), either by considering its $m$ as a hardened form of $v$ (comp. p. 114), or vice versat the $v$ of $s w a$ a weakening of the $m$ of $s m a$.
    $\dagger$ See my Treatise "On the Connection of the Malay-Polynesian Languages with the Indo-European," pp. 100, \&c.
    $\ddagger$ L.c.pp. 101, 104.

[^183]:    * Hence pipAs, "to wish to drink," for papais or papis, from $p \hat{a}$, pipatish, " to wish to cleave," for papatish, from put; so, also. bibharmi,

[^184]:    "I carry," for babharmi, from blhar (bhri); tishthhami, "I stand," for tastaimi, see §. 508.; in Greek, $\delta i \delta \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{c}$ for $\delta \delta \delta \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{l}$ (Sanskruit dadâmi); and others.

    * This seems to require qualification. Sam is found constantly in combination with substantives, as in संवत्सर, संस्थिति, ममन्त, \&c. In some cases the form may be considered as derived through a compound verb, but not in all, as in the instance of sumanta.-Translator.

[^185]:    * A. Benary, also (System of Roman Sounds, pp.41, \&c.), explains

[^186]:    forms like fôdi, fidi, from reduplication, but assumes the dropping of the syllable of reduplication and the lengthening of the radical syllable in compensation for its loss, against which I have expressed my opinion in the Berlin Jahrb. (Jan. 1838, p. 10) ; since this explanation, unlike the re-active effect of a suppression, by compensation in the preceding syllable, has no other analogons cas' to corroborate it.

    * In my Review of Benary's System of Roman Sounds (Berlin Jahrb. 1.c. p. 10). Since then, Pott, also, in his Review of the same book (in the Hall. Jahrb.) has noticed this case, but declared himself, without sufficient grounds in my opinion, against my view of the matter.

[^187]:    * Cf. p. 1227 G. ed. Note $\dagger$.

[^188]:    * See p. 110, §. $109^{\text {a }}$. (6) ; and comp. Lassen Institutiones Ling. Prâcr., pp. 192, 335 ; Essai sur le Pali, p. 181 ; Höfer De Pracr. Dial., p. 184. As Professor Lassen has, in this place, recognised the verb substantive, and been the first to remark it, although it is in like manner represented only by a single letter, it is difficult to conceive why he prefers to recognise in the $s$, which, in several Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin tenses, extends to all the persons of the three numbers, rather the old "everywhere and nowhere," than the verb substantive (Ind. Biblioth. III. p. 78). Such contradiction must appear to me more flattcring than to hear that the verb substantive was so palpable in the places mentioned, especially in Sanskrit, that it could not escape even the most short-sighted eye. I must certainly consider it honorable to me to have perccived so long ago as the year 1816 that which astonishes Professor Lassen in 18:\%), whose acuteness has been so abundantly testified in other departments of Sanskrit philology.

[^189]:    * The connection of ditco with $\delta$ eíkrv $\mu$ is unachnowledged: remark the mode of expression dicis causa.

[^190]:    * P. 447. G. ed., \&c. To the same class belong the Mal. and Javan. las and Maldivian los of forms like dûa-b-las (Mal.), ro-las (Jav.), ro-los (Maldiv.), "twelve."

[^191]:    ＊The difference of writing the third person plural between Kopitar and Dobrowsky had escaped me in $\oint \oint, 463$ ．and 465．；the former（Glago－ lita，pp．61，62）writes $\amalg \boldsymbol{1}$ a shy＇，the latter，whom I have followed，uld sha．Though Kopitar，as I doubt not，is right，still the form sha，if it never even occurs，or very rarely，is so far the elder，as the $y$ of shya is to be considured an inorganic prefix，as in many other forms（see． $\int .25 .25 . n_{0}$ ．）．

[^192]:    * The sign ${ }^{n}$ occurs, according to Wuk, in syllables "in which the tone terminates roundly." Remark that in the first person singular and second person plural the simple preterite is distinguished from the imperfect simply by the absence of this accent.

[^193]:    * Regarding the reverse case, the transition of gutturals into $\sigma$, see §. 501.
    $\dagger$ Sec §.87. In the Malay-Polynesian languages, also, mutations of tenues into aspirates occur ; for example, $h$ for $k$ and $f$ for $p$. In the language of Madagascar, also, $t s$ for $t$, as in German $z$ instead of the aspirate of $t$; as futsi, " white," corresponding to the Mslay pûtih and Sanskrit pûta, "pure," of the same meaning. Sec my Treatise on the Connection of the Malay Pulynesian Langugges with the Indo-European, Remark 13.

[^194]:    * The common rule would require abhuvi (with a short u), but bhú has this property, that before vowels it becomes bhâv: hence, in the first person singular, $a b h \hat{u} v-a m$, and in the third plural abhûv-un; in the first and third person singular of the reduplicated preterite babhûva stands irregularly for bubhâv-a.

[^195]:    * If we assume in $\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$ the mutation of an original tenuis to its

[^196]:    * See my lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §. 382., Remark.

[^197]:    * These two roots may be originally identical, as semi-vowels are easily interchanged (see §. 20.), and the Latin cres-co may be referred to one or the other.
    $\dagger$ This is connected with $s r u$, " to flow," by the affinity of the liquids
    

[^198]:    * Vend. S. p. 83 : ta!̣ vachô vaóchê, "this spcech I speak." Or should $v a \hat{o} c h e ̂$ be considered a reduplicated preterite? It is certain that Anquetil is wrong in regarding it as the imperative, and translating the passage by " prononces bien cette parole."
    † This root may be akin to vadh, "to beat," "to slay" (see §. 20.), to which A. Benary has referred the Latin laedo, which, therefore, would be also connected with radh, and stands nearer to the latter, as $r$ and $l$ are almost identical.

[^199]:    * From chal, char; see my lesser Sanskrit Grammar, §§. 506.507.
    $\dagger$ Pott (Etym. Forsch. II.G90.) properly derives the Lett. dunduris, " hornet," from dur-t, " to stick"; it has, iherefore, in the repeated syllable likewise an exchange of liquids: thas, also, the Greek $\delta \dot{v} \delta \delta \rho o \nu$ is to be derived from $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \rho \delta \rho o \nu$, and is akin to $8 \rho \hat{s}$ and the Sanskrit druma, " tree," (compare Pott, II. 235.).

[^200]:    * Gutturals in the syllables of repetition are always replaced by palatals.
    + I explain ava as the preposition which has grown up with the base, and regard the termination as akin to diy ${ }^{2}$, " to think," dhira, " sage."

[^201]:    * I find the initial $\hat{a}$ of the strong cases abbreviated in the examples I have before me of the weak cases. The strong cases change the proper theme atharvan to athravan; hence the nominative athrava (Vend. S. p. 55). Without transposition, an $\check{e}$, or some other auxiliary vowel, must have been inserted between the $r$ and $v$, because $r$ can neither stand at the end, nor in combination with a consonant.
    $\dagger$ Thus Vend. S. p. 65, the genitive athurunô, and, p. 234 twice, the dative athurune : on the other hand, p. 65, 1.13 , the accusative plural athaurunan's-cha. The view I now take of the phenomenon onder discussion differs from that in $\varsigma^{\varsigma}$. 46. in this, that I there represented the $u$ of the second syllable of athurun as proceeding directly from the a of the original form, in consequence of an as similation, while 1 now regard it as a remnant of $a u$, and look upon the $a$ no longer as a prefixed vowel, but, as the original one, by the side of which a $u$ has been placed through th: influence of the $u$ of the following syllable; as frequently happens with an $i$, through the influence of a fullowing $i$ or $y$ (see $§$. 41.) I fully agree in this point with the opinion expressed by Burnouf in his review of the First Part of this boo', (Journal des Savans, $1 \mathrm{~s}:$ ', in the sep irate impression, p. 8), where, alor, the Zend aurvat, "horse," is in this way compared with the $\mathrm{S}_{\text {L.is'. rit }}$ " ${ }^{\prime}$, an.

[^202]:    * I hereby retract the̊ conjecture I formerly made that the a which follows the root of the Greek perfects exercises an influence in changing the $\epsilon$ of the root (Vocalismus, p.40).

[^203]:    * In Old High German the preterite is hiang, fiang (hianc, fianc), which would lead us to expect a present hangu, fangu, for which, however, occur hâhu, fahu, infinitive hâhan, fáhan. Graff gives only to the former along $a$, to the latter a short one; but the quoted examples confirm also the length of the former, not by circumflex or doubling of the $a$. It is highly probable, however, that the same quantity belungs to both verbs: thus they are either hahan and fuhan, or hâhan and fâhan. As they have no preterite, if the length of the $a$ is not proved, it cannot be decided from the

[^204]:    point of view of the Old High German, whether they are to be allotted to Grimm's fourth class (with long $\hat{a}$ in the present), or to the seventh (with short $a$ in the present). The Middle High German hâhe, vâhe, hrehest, vahest, preterite hie, vie (for hieh, vieh), speak in favour of the fourth class, to which they are ascribed by Grimm also, who writes hâhu, fâhu In Gothic, then, instead of the existing haha, faha, we should expect hêha, fêha, as slêpa, lêta, snswering to the Old High German slâfu, lâzu.

    * I consider, also, dhihesh, " to kindle," which is held to be a primitive root, as a desiderative of this kind, and I derive it from $d i(d h a) k s h$ from dah " to burn."

[^205]:    * By the Uinlaut the $a$ becomes $a=e$, and the $u, \ddot{i}=i=y$-Translator.

[^206]:    * Present, with the Umlaut, groet, lloes, participle passive gratinn, blásinn. With respect to the rejection of a double consonant in the reduplicated preterite, compare the relation of the Old High German vior, " four," for Gothic fidvôr

[^207]:    * I give the theme without any personal termination whatever.
    $\dagger$ Compare the Latin momordi, although this is based on the aorist of the seventh formation, where amamardam, middle amamarde, might have been expected.

[^208]:    * Regarding the origin of the $k$ and the aspirate of $\tau$ érvфa, see §. 568 . \&c.
    $\dagger$ I refer the Gothic haiza, "torch" ( $z$ a softened $s$, see $\oint .86 .(5)$.$) to$ this root.
    $\dagger$ The root $\operatorname{swap}$ is irregular in this, that it is contracted before the heary terminations into $\sup$ (shup); and on this form is founded the syllable of reduplication, through the $u$ of which the $s$ following becomes sh.

[^209]:    *The digamma belonging to this verb, which rests on the Sanskrit bh of bhanj, "to break," leads us to expect an aorist, ${ }^{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime}$ Fa $\xi a$, and in the most ancient time a perfect FEFaya for the Sanskrit babhanja.

[^210]:    * I have already, in my System of Conjugation, and in the Annals of Oriental Literature (London, 1820), callcd attention to the fact, that the Sanskrit tutupa in the second person plural is an abbreviated form, and in the former parts of this book the fact has often been alluded to, that the Sanskrit, in particular cases, appears in disadvantageous contrast with its European sister idioms. It has therefore surprised me that Professor Höfer, in his Treatise "Contributions," \&c., p. 40, has made so general an assertion, that recent investigators have not been desirous "of kecping perfectly free from the unfortunate error of believing in the imaginary inviolability and pristine fidelity and perfection of the Sanskrit." For my part I have never conceded to the Sanskrit such pristine fidelity; and it has always given me pleasure to notice the cases in which the European sister languages surpass it, as the Lithuanian does at this day, in everywhere

[^211]:    * The root man, " to think," is indeed, in the present condition of the language, used only in the middle (thus mênê, "I, he thought"), which,

[^212]:    however, does not prevent the assumption that originally an active also has existed.

    * Graff, who has in general supported with his assent my theory of the German Ablaut (change of sound), which I first submitted in my Review of

[^213]:    Grimm's German Grammar, differs in this point from the view above taken, that he docs not recognise in the $i$ of biudu and in the first $i$ of beita (=bita, from biita) the weakening of the Sanskrit Guna vowel $a$, but endeavours in three different ways to gain from the radical $i$ and $u$, in the present $\hat{i}$ (written $e i$ in Gothic) and $i u$ (Old High German Thesaurus I. pp. 21, 2.2), of which modes, however, none is so near and concise as that, according to which the $i$ of biudu is the weakening of the $a$ of the Sanskrit baudhâmi (contracted, bôdhâmi), to which biudu has the same relation that the Old High German dative suniu, "to the son," has to the Gothic sunau and Sanskrit sûnav-ê, from the base sûnu, the final $u$ of which receives Guna in the dative singular and nominative plural. In the former place the Gothic has retained the old Guna $a$; and it is not till several centuries later that we first see this in Old High German weakened to $i$ : in the latter place (in the ngminative plural) the Gothic even has admitted the weakening to $i$, but changed it to $y$; hence sunyu-s for Sanskrit sunnav-as.
    *See §.70., and Vocalismus, p.224, Remark 13.

[^214]:    * The former is an aorist of the sixth formation, from the root dris, which is not used in the special tenses; but asrigran, in which the retention of the original guttural instead of the palatal of the common language is to be noticed, docs not, in my opinion, admit of being explained as an aorist, as Westergaard makes it, but appears to me to be an imperfect; as the roots of the sixth class, when they do not insert a nasal in the special tenses, are incapable of the sixth aorist formation, because they would not be distinguishable from the imperfect. Why should not the imperfect, as well as the aorist, be capable of replacing the termination anta by ran?
    † Compare Westergaard, Radices, p. 269. Rosen takes adriśran actively, and, in the first passage, asrigram, as the first person singular active, which, however, will not do. Preterites with a present signification are very common in the Vêdas.

[^215]:    * Does not occur, but can be safely deduced from the third person touk and the preterite tôh-ta.
    $\dagger$ The $s$ is not, as I formerly assumed, euphonic (§.94.), but belongs to the root, which, before vowels, assimilates its $s$ to the preceding $r$ (as Greek $\theta$ ú $\dot{\rho} \rho o s, ~ \theta a \rho ’ \rho ́ \epsilon \omega)$ rejected when in the terminating sound, but preserved before $t$ : hence, in the irrst and third person singular ge-tar, third person plural ge-turrun, ge-turren. In Sanskrit dharṣh (dhriṣh), "to venture," in Lithuanian, drys-ti, "idem "corr spond, comp. Putt, I. 270, Graff, V. 441.

[^216]:    * So in the German ; but as there are not 26 verses in the 4th chap. of Matth., the reference is probably to chap. vi 26., and the next reference should be Mark iv. 3.

[^217]:    * The root bhû irregularly contains in the syllable of repetition an $a$ instead of the shortened radical vowel, omits in the flrst and third

[^218]:    * It is preserved only in missa-dêths, " misdeed," but is etymologically identical with the German That, Old High German tât, Old Saxon did. $\dagger$ Compare my Vocalismus, pp. 51, \&c.

[^219]:    * Compare tyak-ta-s, "forsaken," kri-ta-s, " made," bri-ta-s, "borne." 1 remark, en passant, that the Latin la-tus might become connected with britas, from bhartas, in the same way as latus, "broad," with prithu-s, $\pi \lambda a \tau u s$ : thus, the labial being lost, $r$ being exchanged with $l$, and al trans-
    
    $\dagger$ I write the non-occurring nominative $d e t h s$, not $d e d s$ s, since $d$ after vowels, before a final $s$, and at the end of words, generally becomes $t$; hence, also, sôkiths, "sought," from the base sôkida, and mannaseths, "world," literally " human-seed," from the base sê-di and the root sô, " to sow" (saia, saisô, see §. 617.). Sêdi has the same relation to sô, in regard to its radical vowel, that tekka, "I touch," has to the preterite taitok.

[^220]:    * See Schmeller's Glossarium Saxonicum, p. 25.

[^221]:    * See Graff, V. 287., where, however, remark that very few authorities distinguish graphically the long $a$ from the short.
    + Also tët and tete, the latter inorganic, and as if the first $e$ had not been produced from $i$, but, by Umlutht, from $a$. See Grimm, I. p. 965 .

[^222]:    * The substantive dé-ths (theme dé-di), ta-t, cannot stand in our way, since its formation has nought to do with the reduplication, nor with the weak conjugation; but here $d e ́, t a$, are the root, and $d i, t i$, the derivationsuffix mentioned in §.91. Nor can the participle gi-ta-nêr, li-tta-nêr, ge-tha-ner, induce us to look for passive participles in the weak conjugations like gi-salbô-tâner instead of gi-salbôtêr, ge-salbter, beçause we make this participle independent of the auxiliary verb thun (compare Vocalismus, p. 77).

[^223]:    * See p. 110 .
    $\dagger$ The Gothic vert, also, is, according to ita meaning, a causal from a lost primitive, which, in Old High German, in the first person present, is bim, see f. 510 .

[^224]:    * For nann-ta, see $\} .102$.
    $\dagger$ For wand-ta, see $\oint .102$. I consider this verb as identical with the Sanskṛit vart (vrit), " to go," " to be" (with the preposition ni, " to return '), and the Latin verto, with exchange of the liquids $r$ and $n$. This does not prevent the German werden being referred to the root vart, as it often happens that a root separates into different forms with distinct meanings.
    $\ddagger$ As the Old High German does not distingaish the $y$ from $i$ it cannot be known whether the neriu, neriamés, which correspond to the Gothic nasya, " I save," nasyam, " we save," should be pronounced neryu, neryamês or neriu, neriamês, though at the oldest period $y$ was certainly the pronunciation.

[^225]:    * The Sanskrit $d h$ leads us to expect the Greek $\theta$ and Gothic $d$.

[^226]:    * Comp. gata-s, "qui ivit"; so bhûta-s, " the having been" (masculine).
    † In the original, berdeh em, but according to the English system these vowels would be given as above.
    $\ddagger$ Compare am, "I am," î, " thou art," îm, "we are," îd, "ye are," and, "they are," with baram ("I bear"), barł, barim, barid, barand. To and corresponds the Doric évri for $\sigma \epsilon \nu \tau i$; to am the English am (=em).

[^227]:    * The masculine form byti belongs only to the masculine persons: to all other substantives of the three genders the feminine form byty belongs.
    $\dagger$ And no notice is taken in Grammars, that, according to the gender alluded to, they are the nominatives of a former participle.

[^228]:    * See p. 854, Note *.
    $\dagger$ The Polish $c$ is like our $z$, and has the same etymological value as $t$; for instance, in the seiond person plural the termination cie corresponds to the Old Slavonic TE te; and, in the infinitive, the termination $e$ to the Old Sclavonic ти ti.

[^229]:    * Regarding the initial $\psi$, see $\oint .255 . n_{\text {。 }}$

[^230]:    * Biad or beid, "I shall be," biadhair or béidhir, " thou wilt be," beidh, "he will be"; béim or béidh-mur or béidh-nied or biodh-maoid," we shall be." See my Treatise " On the Celtic Languages," pp. 44, 46.

[^231]:    * Professor Bopp writes hest, and hestem, and thus renders the resemblance between the Persian and Polish words more striking. So, above, he writes kerd, and even berd; but it is incorrect to express the short vowel $\breve{a}$ by $e$, and to represent' by $e$ is still more indefensible. It is true that an affected pronunciation of the ă is creeping in, and. kard in particular is often pronounced kerd, as oblige, in English, is sometimes pronounced obleege; but this practice is unsanctioned by authority, and to ground etymological affinities upon it would be erroneous.-Translator.

[^232]:    * Sanskrit tiṣlthami, see §. 508.
    $\dagger$ The $h$ of diham, "I give," appcars to me a remnant of the Zend aspirated dh of dadhâmi (i.39.); as I have already traced back elsewhere the $h$ of nihddan, " to place" (present niham), to the Sanskrit $d h$ of $d h \hat{n}$, and recognised in the syllable ni an obscured preposition (the Sanskrit $n i$, "down," Vienna Ann. 1828, B. 42. p. 258). The forn diham resembles the Old Sclavonic damy for du-dmy ( $\oint .436$.) and our preterites like hiefs, hielt ( $\$ .592$. ) herein, that the reduplicate syllable has gaincd the semblance of the principal syllable.

[^233]:    * Compare Ann. of Lit. Crit. 1827, Feb., pp. 285, \&c.; Vocalismus, pp. 53, \&c. ; and Pott's Etym. Forsch. I. 187

[^234]:    * §. 18., and compare medium with the Sanskrit madhya-m, meditari with médhas, " understanding," fido with $\pi \epsilon i \theta \omega$.
    $\dagger$ A. W. von Schlegel has been the first to recognise in Latin the Sanskrit śrat, "belief," and has found in credo a similar compound to that of the Sanskrit śrad-dadhâmi, which signifies the same (literally "I place faith '), without, however, identifying the Latin expression, in regard to its concluding portion also, with the Sanskrit compound (Bhagavad-Gita, p. 108). Credo might certainly also mean "I give faith," but it is more natural to place this verb both in its second and in its first portion on the same footing with its Indian prototype, as I have already done in the Vienne Ann. (1828, B. 42, p. 250), where I have also compared the do of abdo and condo with the Sanskrit root dha.

[^235]:    * See $\oint .507$. where, however, in the first person plural, we should read $v c\}-o-m$ instead of $v e \zeta-o-m e$.
    † Analogous with sye-yû, "I sow"; as, in Gothic, dê-ths, " deed," and se-ths, "seed," rest on a like formation, and roots which terminate similarly.

[^236]:    * I formerly thought, that in this and similar expressions the root dâ, "to give," was contained (Gramm. Crit. p. 322), which might very well formally be the case, as is also Burnouf's opinion, who, however, assents, at Yaçna, p. 356, Rem. 217, to Fr. Windischmann's explanation, who was the first to recognise in this and similar compounds the Sanskrit root dhd instead of $d d$. To the remark made by Burnouf (l. c. Note E. p. xi.), that the initial sound $d h$ in Zend is not permissible, it may be added, that in the middle also, after a consonant, $d$ is necessarily used for the original $d h$ : hence the Sanskrit imperative termination $d h i$, which in Zend, after vowels, appears as dhi, is, after a consonant, $d i$ : thus daz-di, "give," opposed to s̉rûi-dhi, " hear," kĕrĕnûi-dhi, " make."

[^237]:     pp. 209 and 332 , as third person plural of the imperfect subjunctive in the sense of the present.

[^238]:    * The root da, "to give," might likewise form dadha ( $\oint .39$.$) ; but in$ the passage above, as everywhere where mention is made of creating, making, it is clear we must understand the verb corresponding to the Sanskrit धा dhâ, "to place"(with $v i$, " to make").

[^239]:    * Ann. of Lit. Crit. Dec. 1831. p. 816.
    $\dagger$ Anquetil, who seldom renders all the forms in a sentence according to their real grammatical value, here makes the third person plural the second of the imperative, and changes the assertion into a request, by translating thus: "O Hom, accordez l'excellence et la grandeur à celui qui lit dans la maison les Naks."
    $\ddagger$ See Burnouf's valuable Review of the First Part of this Book, Journal des Savans, 1833, in the separate impression, p.47. There is an error in it, however, in the remark, that I have represented the form áonhĕnti as the imperfect of the verb sabstantive. I meant the reduplicate preterite or perfect.

[^240]:    * Probably a secondary root, with the affix th, as in dath for $d A$ (see p. 112). Irith, therefore, might stand for mirith, the initial $m$ having been lost, and might be connected with the Sanskrit root mri (mar), whence, as Burnouf has shewn in his frequently-mentioned Review (p.37), hes arisen the form mërènch, "to kill," with another affix, the noun of agency of which is found in the plural, mërĕctârô, " the murderers."

[^241]:    * At the same time with inorganic transfer to the first and second person, wir sind, ihr seid.
    $\dagger$ With the preterite' coincide also the Gothic forms of recent origin, siy-u-m, "we are," siy-u-th, "ye are": and s-ind, "they are" (from $s-a n t$ ), is alone a transmission from the period of the unity of language.

[^242]:    

    + See my collection of the Episodes of the Mahâ-Bhârata (Draupadí, III. 2.), published under the title of "Diluvium."

[^243]:    * Compare l. c. p 114, Sl. 31, bhavita 'ntas twam for bhavitdsy antas, "thou wilt be the end."
    $\dagger$ An example occurs in the Raghu-Vansa, VI. 52, Ed. Stenzler, nripan tam . . . vyatyagdd anyavadhir bhavitri, "regem illum prateriit alius uxor futura."

[^244]:    * Compare Hiöfer " De Prakr. Dial." p. 199.

[^245]:     contains the character of the future doubled ( $\oint .656$.) ; which cannot be surprising, as, when these words were produced, the reason of the duplication of the $\sigma$ was no longer perceived by the language.

[^246]:    *The first person, in this formation, loses the $i$ of the termination, which the forms in himi have retained.
    $\dagger$ I agree with Pott (I. p. 115) in thinking $\beta o a \theta \eta \sigma i \omega$ and $\pi \rho o \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi i \omega$ should be written for $\beta o \eta \theta \eta \sigma \iota \omega$, $\pi \rho \rho \lambda \epsilon \iota \psi \iota \hat{\omega}$ : as the form in $\hat{\omega}$ has arisen first by contraction from $\epsilon \omega$ for $\omega \omega$, the $/$ would be twice represented in $\epsilon \omega$.

[^247]:    * The more complete form of bom is bodem, "I do be," after the

[^248]:    * Bed $d_{e}=b e n d e h$, from bendem, §. 2025.g.
    $\dagger$ Compare the Old Sclavonic rekì, recheshi, and Sanskrit vach (see p. 648 G. ed. Note ${ }^{6}$.)

[^249]:    * Kesra, properly $i$, which, however, like fatha, i.e. original $a$, is usually pronounced $e$.-With regard to this remark of Professor Bopp's, see my note p.858. The use of the vowel dhamma, with the prep. $d$ is at least doubtful : see Iumsden's Persian Grammar,Vol. 2. p. 396. However, with imperatives the first vowel of which is dhamma, it may be admissible.-TTranslator.

[^250]:    * Librement is clearly the translation of the preposition contained in fra-hârayênế, as Anquetil also, in the page preceding, renders fravaôcĕm (thus I read it for fravaôcim) by "je parle clairement;" while in both expressions, and especially very often in Zend, as in Sanskrit, the prepositions have no perceptible meaning, which admits of translation, though the Indian Scholiasts also, in the derivation of verbs compounded with prepositions, lay too much stress on the prepositions. We will treat hereafter of the middle imperative termination in né. As causal form the verb ander discussion corresponds to the Sanskrit pra-sárayâmi.

[^251]:    * Compare System of Conjugation, p. 98.

[^252]:    * Where Guna is prescribed in Sanskrit Grammar we are to understand that in the middle of roots only short vowels reccive Guna before simple consonants, but at the end of roots long vowels also.
    $\dagger$ Zend forms of the 1st per. sing. like the theoretically-formed bâsyémi are not quotable ; cf. § 731. Remark.

[^253]:    * Cf. §. 731. Remark.

[^254]:    * I believe it is to be written thus, instead of -ti.
    † Compare Burnouf's Yeçna, Note O., p. 71.

[^255]:    * With a perhaps erroneous rejection of the $a$ of the participial suffix. Anquetil's translation, also, "qu'il faut toujours tenir élevés," is evidence that this may be regarded as expressing the future. Cf. Barnouf l.c. Note Q., p. 86.
    $\dagger$ The corresponding Sanskrit dhd means also "to hold."

[^256]:    * Ita, "I eat," from the root at, is so far the most remarkable verb of its class, because êtum, " we ate" (for âtum from a-atum, Old High German azumês), contains a reduplication without having experienced abbreviation like sêtum and similar forms'(p. 847 G. ed.). The Old High German âzumês corresponde almost as exactly as possible to the Sanskrit reduplicated $a d$-i-ma from $a$-adima.

[^257]:    *A radiçal $\hat{a}$, in most roots, passes into $\hat{e}$, through the assimilating in. Huence, as it appears, of the $y$ following; but not in Zend

[^258]:    * Compare Burnouf's Yaçna, Note S, pp. CL. CLII.
    $\dagger$ The $y$ is a euphonic insertion, and $a$, for $m a$, the termination.

[^259]:    *See Vater's Language of the Old Prussians, pp. 104 and 107.

[^260]:    * Though the form in ait or eet occurs in the indicative also, still here that in $a t$ is the prevailing and general one: in the imperative, however, that in eet or ait is the only one, and therefore characteristic of the mood. The true pronunciation of the Lettish diphthong $e e$ is hard to be perceived from the description given by Rosenberger, p. 6: it is sufficient, however, for our purpose here, that this diphthong is etymologically only a corruption of $u i$, and, like this, corresponds to the Sanskṛit $\hat{e}(=a+i)$; as, in deews, "God," = देवस् dêva-s, from दिष् div, " to shine"; eet, " he goes," $=$ एति êti, from $₹ i$; smee- $t$, "to langh," in the root answers to the Sanskpit smi, whence by Guna, through insertion of an $a, s m b$.

[^261]:    * This suppression would be favored by the facility with which the $y$ vocalized to $i$, becomes a diphthong with $a$ preceding it. The prime inducement for it, however, was the effort to lighten the modal element in combination with a verbal theme, which, without that, was of two, or, in the tenth class, of three syllables; thus, bô-dhes, "thou mayest know," for bobdh-a-yâs; kâmayês," thou mayest love," for kâm-aya-yâs. In the second conjugation the combination of the modal syllable $y \hat{a}$ with radical $\boldsymbol{a}$ (there are no roots in short a) occurs only in monosyllabic verbal themes; e.g. bhd-yAm. Roots of the third class, however, as they become polysyllabic

[^262]:    polysyllabic by reduplication, lighten the roots by suppressing the $A$, as dad-yâm for dadâ-yâm, jah-yâm for jahâ-yâm (compare §. 482.) The ninth class weakens its class syllable $n d$ to $n \hat{\imath}$, as before heavy personal terminations ( $\wp .485$. ); thus, yu-n $\hat{\imath}-y a m$ for $y u-n \hat{a}-y a n$; and therefore the combination of the full modal exponent $y d$ with the heaviest kind of vowel is, in polysyllabic themes, entirely avoided. The roots which annex $n u$ or $u$ do not suffer any weakening either in the base or in the modal character, for the $\hat{a}$ of $y \hat{a}$ cannot here be lost, since the $i$ cannot become a diphthong with the $u$ preceding: the $u$ of the class syllable, however, is not necessarily weakened, since $u$ is itself one of the lighter vowels; hence, e.g., $a p-n u-y a m$, "I may obtain." To this would correspond, in Greek, forms like $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa v i \eta \nu$, which, however, as it appears, are avoided on account of the difficulty of pronouncing them. and carried into the $\omega$ conjugation; while the remains of forms, which have remained true to their own conjugation, have suppressed the $\iota$, and, in compensation, lengthened the $v$; thus $\dot{\pi} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu \bar{v} \mu \eta \nu$ for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \delta \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \nu v i \mu \eta \nu$.

[^263]:    *Thus the guttural of the Latin facio has been retained in the French magnifique, while infais, faisons, it has been corrupted to $s$, or, according to the pronunciation, has been lost entirely in fais.

    + I have brought forward this theory for the first time in the Berl. Jahrb., Jan. 1834, pp. 97, 98 (see Vocalismus, p. 200), to which A. Benary assents (Doctrine of Roman Sounds, pp. 27, 28), who, however, derives the modal vowel $i$ from $i$, "to go." (Compare §.670.)

[^264]:    * Respecting the length of the $\hat{a}$, see $\S .434$.
    $\dagger$ With regard to the suppression of the $i$ of bairau, compare, in Gothic, Grimm's third class of the weak conjugation, in which the $i$ of the conjugational character ai (=Sanskrit wय aya, Latin $\hat{e}$ ) is everywhere lost, where a final nasal, or one standing before a consonant, follows, or ought to follow ; thus, first person singular, haba for habai, Old High German habêm ; plural, habam for habaim, Old High Ger.nan habemês ; third person plural, haband for habaind, Old High German labent ; in opposition to luhair, habrith. \&e.

[^265]:    * Ist, " he eats," euphonic for idt, corresponds to the Latin est.
    $\dagger$ This represents the third person also, see $\oint .470$.

[^266]:    * I now, also, refer Dobrowsky's first Conjugation in Old Sclavonic. (contrary to §.500.), at least principally, to the Sanskrit tenth class; so that I assume the suppression of the first $a$ of the character क्य, aya, as in Grimm's first conjugation of the weak form, which, by this loss, has become similar to the Sanskrit fourth class (see §. 109a. 6.). The Old Sclavonic, however, has also not unfrequently retained the first $a$ of the character aya; as in padaŷu, "I fall," chitaŷ́, "I read" (Dobr. 522.). In some roots ending with a vowel the $y$ may be a euphonic addition, and ふnaŷu, " I know" (Sanskṛit jona, " to know"), piỵû, " I drink " (Sanskṛit $p \hat{a}$, "to drink"), may belong neither to the Sanskrit fourth nor to the tenth class, but to the first, with the insertion of a $y$ between the root and the conjunctive vowel (compare §.43.). I take this opportunity to remark further, that in §. 506. Mielke's fourth conjugation in Lithuanian has remained by mistake unnoticed. It includes but very few words, but belongs, in like mannar, to the Sanskrit tenth class, and exhibits the character of that class, aya, clearly in its preterites, as yếskóyau (yésk-бya-u). In the present, together with yészkau is found, also, the form yêstkóyu.

[^267]:    * Remark, also, the frequently-occurring post, noit, "not," $=\mathbf{S}_{3 n}$ krit nett.

[^268]:    * Vend. S., p. 45, twicc ; once, erroncously, bûidhîoìnaidhé; and once, bûidhyồmaĉtê.

[^269]:    * According to the analogy of vaêm, " we," for the Sanskṛit vayam; for after rejecting the a preceding the $m$ the preceding ay must be melted down to $\varepsilon$, and, according to $\oint .28$, an a must be prefixed to the $\varepsilon$.
    $\dagger$ Compare with němói the Sanskrit namas, "adoration," from the root nam.

[^270]:    * The root ba shortens its vowel in the precative, compare Burnouf's Yaçna, Note S., p. 152.
    $\dagger$ Vend. S., pp. 115, 457, 459, and, according to Burnouf's Yaçna, Note S., p. 152, in the still unedited part, p. 556.
    $\ddagger$ According to Burnouf, l.c., in the still unedited part of the Vend. S., pp. 542, 543, 548.

[^271]:    * The last portion of this verb is radically identical with the just-mentioned paiti ini-daithîta : see §. 637.

[^272]:    * I retain the terms derived from the Sanskrit ${ }^{+}$, though it is unsuitable to distinguish various forms of one and the same mood, as if they were of different moods.

[^273]:    * It may here be added to what has been remarked in §. 637. regarding the expression yaôshdayann that it might also be the third person plural of the precative, the $a$ of the root $d \hat{a}$, "to make," being shortened, and the analogy of buyann, "they may be," being followed (see §. 702. and Burnonf's Yaçna, Note S., p. 152). The placing together of two verbs in the third person plural would consequently rest on a syntactical peculiarity, and yaôshdayañn a .hěn, "they are purified," would literally signify "they are (that) they purify." The passive signification would be expressed by a periphrasis, in which the verb substantive would be combined with the active expression of the attributive verb in the precative. To this opinion I give the preference above that delivered in $\oint$. 637. ; and I remind the reader, that, in Arabic, the imperfect is expressed by a circumlocution, in which the preterite of the verb substantive is prefixed to the present of the attributive verb, without the intervention of a conjunction;
     for "he was, that he sits." At the end of the passage quoted above אnusjegeblunan yaôshdayann (to which the preposition paiti Sanskrit prati, belongs) is indisputably the precative.
    $\dagger$ I will not affirm that ava-bĕrĕta (from bĕrě̆́s, "borne," in combination with the preposition ava) here signifies "touch d"; but hitherto I have not discovered any more suitahle meaning for the whole sense.

[^274]:    ＊From this $h e$ ，＂sui，＂we see that the Zend reflexive，like the kindred Latin，German，Lithuanian，and Sclavonic，unites with the form of the singular the meanings of the plural numbers．

[^275]:    * I cannot agree with Westergaad in regarding Vèdic forms like

[^276]:    * See in my System of Conjugation, p. 100.

[^277]:    ${ }^{1}$ The middle of ad is not used in the present state of the language, which, however, does not prevent us from annexing it here on account of the theory. ${ }^{2} \oint .674 . \quad{ }^{3} \oint \oint .675 .676 . \quad{ }^{4}$ §. 677.

[^278]:    * Grisem, "I bite," is perhaps akin to the Sanskritgras, to "devour"; therefore gris-e-m, gres-e-sh, $=$ gras-A mi, gras-a-si.

[^279]:    * I am not of opinion that in the indicative, also, we should derive salboss from salbôis, and, in the first person, salbô from salbóa; for as in vig-a.', vig-i-s, vig-i-th (see §. 507., Table), the $a$ and $i$ belong, not to the personal sign, but to the derivative or class-syllable, so in salb- $\delta \cdot{ }^{\prime}$, salb- $\hat{\delta}-8$, salbó-th, the $\delta$ only represents the $a$ of the strong conjugation, which is interchanged with $i$ : the personal terminations, however, are as complete as in the strong conjugation.

