

E L E M E N T S
OF THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Da muss sich manches Rätsel lösen.
Doch manches Rätsel knüpft sich auch.
Goethe's Faust, Part I.

ELEMENTS
OF THE
COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR
OF THE
INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

A CONCISE EXPOSITION
OF THE HISTORY
OF SANSKRIT, OLD IRANIAN (AVESTIC AND OLD PERSIAN), OLD ARMENIAN,
OLD GREEK, LATIN, UMBRIAN-SAMNITIC, OLD IRISH, GOTHIC, OLD HIGH
GERMAN, LITHUANIAN AND OLD BULGARIAN

BY
KARL BRUGMANN,
PROFESSOR OF COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.

VOLUME I:
INTRODUCTION AND PHONOLOGY.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN
BY
JOSEPH WRIGHT, PH. D.

STRASSBURG.
KARL J. TRÜBNER.
—
LONDON.
TRÜBNER & CO.
—
1888.

PREFACE TO THE ORIGINAL EDITION.

Those who have impartially followed the development of comparative philology in the last twenty years will be aware of the great progress it has made in the interval. In both the scope and the nature of its work it has shewn all the elasticity and creative vigour of a science that is still young in spite of its seventy years. That its diverse and scattered details need to be once again brought together under one systematic arrangement will hardly be doubted by any competent judge. The first edition of Schleicher's excellent *Compendium* appeared in 1861, and was since twice published in a revised form by the author, the second time shortly before his death. When it was edited finally in 1876 with very few changes indeed, the two editors were already of opinion that it required complete remodelling (see the preface p. IX). Thus I feel sure that the *'Elements'*, the first volume of which is now before the reader, meets a real need.

Time and competent criticism will decide whether it has solved the problem in any degree satisfactorily and whether it can claim to be of the same service to our science and its students as was Schleicher's book in its time. My task was attended by all manner of difficulties and I am fully conscious that in some respects it is inadequately discharged. I trust nevertheless that the result may be of some service, at least for the present.

I take this opportunity of drawing especial attention to one or two points in the plan and execution of my work.

It was not my object to collect all the various views, often widely divergent, which have been from time to time put forward by authorities, on questions relating to the history of the Indo-Germanic languages. As a rule I give only the views that I consider right or at least probable, after submitting them to repeated tests. A mere regard to the size of the book necessitated this course. The most important authorities will be found summarily enumerated in the introduction and at the beginning of the separate sections. To mention in each case who has treated the subject, and who was the first author of the view I have accepted, seemed to me unnecessary to the purpose of the book, and excluded by the small space at my disposal. I took what was good wherever I was sure I had found it; all parties among the different methods and schools of linguistic science are fairly represented in these pages. Hence though I may per-

haps have overlooked much that is useful, I still hope that approximately at any rate I have attained the aim I had set before me: to exhibit the present state of our knowledge in a concise form, giving prominence to all the more important points.

At the same time I have not confined myself to stating such results as seem certain to stand for all future time. I have spoken of many problems that are still unsolved, in order to give the reader not only a survey of what has been already accomplished, but also a glimpse of the work that still remains to be done. This was indispensable in view of the position in which the science of the Indg. languages at present stands. Thanks to the discovery of many fresh sources of information, and still more, I think, to the fertile combination, which the past ten years have brought about between minute investigation on the one hand and the philosophy of language on the other (the character of which I have endeavoured to sketch in my essay, 'Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft' p. 33 ff.), new problems to be solved have of late arisen on all sides, and that in such numbers that many decades of work will still be needed to master them, so far as we can reckon that they are to be solved at all.¹⁾ Had I silently passed over all such unsettled questions in the history of the Indg. languages, the picture of the whole subject which I tried to draw would have been marred by many grievous blanks. But further I hoped to incite the reader to independent investigation, by referring to much that has not yet passed the stage of problem and hypothesis. In doing so I have taken care that what is uncertain should not preponderate over what is certain, and should everywhere be clearly distinguished from it. And if, instead of merely marking the phenomenon in question as unexplained, I have often hazarded a conjecture, at all events in something like the direction in which the solution of the riddle is to be sought, despite those who resent every 'probably' or 'perhaps' in scientific works, I may quote Goethe's words: 'The opinions you venture, are like the pawns you move forward on the chess-board; they may be taken, but they have introduced a game that will be won'. The conjectures I have admitted into this book should always be regarded only as challenges to more minute investigation.

As regards the arrangement of the material my aim is to let the different branches of language and the separate languages appear each as a unit complete in itself on the common background of the Indo-Germanic primitive community, yet in such a way that each single phenomenon appears separated as little as possible from the kindred examples in other languages. My method of exposition takes about the middle course between that of Bopp's Comparative Grammar on the one hand, which may

1) As regards exceptions and irregularities it has now become the effort of all scholars to aim at seeking for the reason of the exception, not occasionally only, but in every case, and systematically, and we consider our duty to science undischarged until we have found the answer to the 'why'. How many phenomena of language, which once were thought perfectly clear, so that a final judgment could be pronounced upon them, have by this means become unanswered problems!

be described as a connected picture sinking what belongs to the separate languages in the Indo-Germanic whole, and that of Schleicher's Compendium, on the other, which does little more than string together a number of separate grammars. It seeks to unite the excellences of both. This of course could not be done without some sacrifice of system. In the phonology I was obliged to add a series of chapters on combinatory sound-change after tracing the development of the primitive Indo-Germanic sounds one by one. Here I have had now and then to repeat in sum what had already been mentioned or to expand and supplement what before had been merely hinted at. I prefer to submit to this incongruity of arrangement, which Schleicher has avoided, than to disregard consciously the considerable didactic advantage that it affords; and in this point at least I hope to have on my side the academical teachers who lecture on comparative grammar.

In the transcription I have been as far as possible conservative. The reader will easily perceive why I was obliged to discard one or two symbols widely in use, e. g. the representation of the Sanskrit palatal and cerebral sibilants by *ç* and *ś* (or *sh*). I ought perhaps in general to have paid even more attention than I have done to the rule that the same sound in different languages should be represented by the same sign: e. g. Av. *ç*, not *γ*, on account of the Germanic (Ags.) *ç*; Gothic *w*, not *v*, on account of the Old High German *w*. And in several other points the notation might certainly be improved, at least if it be thought desirable to sacrifice what is widely or universally in use in favour of less usual methods. As regards the Aryan languages and Armenian especially, I gladly take this opportunity of expressing a wish, which, I think, most Indo-Germanic scholars share with me, that the Congress of Oriental scholars¹⁾ should sanction by its authority as soon as it is practicable to do so, some suitable system of transcription for these languages, which should have regard to the needs both of special philologists and of comparative scholars, so that the vagaries of the prevailing usage in the matter may be at last brought within bounds. That the question of transcription is not yet ready for a final settlement is no valid objection.

My work has been least independent in dealing with the phonology of Iranian and Armenian. Here I could generally connect it very closely with the excellent works of Bartholomae and Hübschmann, especially with the former's Handbook of the Old Iranian Dialects, and the latter's Armenian Studies. I have only deviated in a very few points from Hübschmann's treatment of the history of the Armenian sounds. In the Keltic branch many will look for a more detailed account of the British dialects. I fully admit that comparative philology must devote more attention to these dialects than has hitherto been the case. But my knowledge in this department is too small for me to venture to set any

¹⁾ The attempt made in the fifth Congress (see 'Verhandlungen des fünften internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses', Berlin 1881, p. 89) has unfortunately led to no result.

dialect of the British group side by side with Irish. It was my intention two years ago to make myself so far familiar with Cymric as to be able to treat the chief features at least of this language along with the rest. My removal to Freiburg however at that time cut me off almost entirely from all Keltological literature, and I was thus obliged to abandon my design. As regards Irish also the want of a library¹⁾ sufficiently furnished with philological literature caused me difficulties in many ways. I am hence all the more thankful to Prof. Thurneysen of Jena [now in Freiburg], who not only sent me information on many points of Keltic philology, but also at my request undertook the trouble of revising the proof-sheets relating to Keltic. Both have been a help to my work in many details, in far more places than has been indicated by a reference to his name. In particular it was such help only that made it possible in all cases to distinguish the British forms correctly according to dialect and period. It may also be remarked that almost all the addenda relating to Keltic p. 565 ff. [now incorporated with the text of this translation] were due to communications from Thurneysen. If I add lastly that my treatment of some of the phenomena of Keltic philology is not in harmony with the views of this scholar, it is in order to prevent misunderstanding, that he may not in any way be made responsible for mistakes that might be found in the Keltic parts of this book. I have to thank Dr. Holthausen of Heidelberg [now in Halle] for some notices relating to Germanic, which he placed at my disposal after an inspection of several proof- and the finally revised sheets and of which I have for the most part made use.

I have not been able consistently to take account of the scientific literature which has appeared this year. I especially lament that the second edition of G. Meyer's Greek Grammar, Braune's Old High German Grammar and the second edition of Leskien's Hand-book of the Old Bulgarian Language did not appear until after my printing had begun.

To facilitate reference, I shall add an index of words at the end of the whole work.

Its continuation and conclusion shall follow as quickly as time and strength permit.

Freiburg i. B., July 1886.

KARL BRUGMANN.

¹⁾ It is only since the founding of the chair for comparative philology that the University library here has systematically purchased works on this subject (apart of course from the classical languages and Germanic), so that the necessary material can only be procured very gradually.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

When Prof. Brugmann and Mr. Trübner proposed to me, two years ago, while I was still a student in Heidelberg, that I should translate the 'Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indo-germanischen Sprachen' into English as soon as it appeared, I gladly accepted the proposal, in the hope that I should thus be rendering valuable service both to English and American students of philology, especially to the former who would otherwise very possibly, if they did not happen to know German, have to remain an indefinite length of time without being able to enter into a systematic and scientific study of languages, based on firm and rigid principles.

If the work of translating the original has taken me longer than I at first anticipated it would, this is almost entirely due to the poverty-stricken state of our language as regards current philological technical terms. Some of the terms employed by me, e. g. slurred and broken accent, intersonantal, initiality, strong-grade etc., will no doubt sound strange at first reading. But those, who have either been trained at a German university or are familiar with German philological literature, will readily confess how difficult it sometimes is to find a very exact and appropriate English equivalent for many of the German grammatical technicalities. Time will of course show whether I have in each case hit upon the best term, but I have everywhere tried rather to represent as exactly as I could the meaning of the author than to produce an elegant English paraphrase, which could preserve neither the brevity nor the rigidly scientific form of the original.

Last spring Prof. Brugmann gave me in Leipzig a list of corrections, consisting partly of misprints not given at the end of the original work, and partly of a few slight mistakes which were mentioned in the reviews of the work. These as also the corrections and emendations at the end of the German edition have been worked into the body of the translation. I also received from the author a short time ago one or two other corrections of the original which will be found at the end of the present edition.

At the end of the volume will be found a short list of those abbreviations which would be likely to cause the reader any difficulty.

In conclusion I have to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Brugmann and Mr. P. Giles, Fellow of Gonville and Caius College Cambridge, for the great assistance they have rendered me by helping in the reading of the proof-sheets.

J. WRIGHT.

London, November 29, 1887.

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

INTRODUCTION.

	Page
DEFINITION OF THE SCIENCE OF THE INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES, AND THE DIVISION OF THE INDG. FAMILY OF LANGUAGES INTO ITS VARIOUS BRANCHES	1
Definition of the science of the Indg. languages (§ 1)	1
Primitive home of the Indg. people (§ 2)	2
Differentiation of dialects (§ 3)	2
1. The Aryan branch (§ 4)	4
2. The Armenian branch (§ 5)	5
3. The Greek branch (§ 6)	6
4. The Albanian branch (§ 7)	7
5. The Italic branch (§ 8)	8
6. The Keltic branch (§ 9)	9
7. The Germanic branch (§ 10)	10
8. The Baltic-Slavonic branch (§ 11)	11
Sketch of the Indg. phases of development to be discussed in this book (§ 12)	12
ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE INDG. LANGUAGES IN GENERAL.	
ROOT AND SUFFIXES	13
Development of word-formation and inflexion from composition (§ 13)	13
Meaning of the hyphens usual in the analysis of words (§ 14)	16

PHONOLOGY.

THE SOUNDS OF THE INDG. PRIMITIVE LANGUAGE (§ 15)	19
PHONETIC ELUCIDATIONS	20
1. Voiced and voiceless sounds (§ 16)	20
2. Sonorous and noised sounds (§ 17)	21
3. Sonants and consonants (§ 18)	21

	Page
ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF THE LETTERS ,	22
The different kinds of alphabets and transcription (§ 19)	22
Sanskrit (§ 20)	23
Iranian (§ 21)	24
Armenian (§ 22)	25
Umbrian-Samnitic (§ 23)	26
Old Irish (§ 24)	27
Gothic (§ 25)	28
Lithuanian (§ 26)	28
Old Bulgarian (§ 27)	30
HISTORY OF THE SEPARATE PRIM. INDG. SOUNDS.	
THE VOWELS.	
A. The vowels as sonants	30
The prim. Indg. vowel sounds (§ 28)	30
Indg. <i>i</i>	30
Prim. Indg. (§ 29)	32
Aryan (§ 30)	32
Armenian (§ 31)	32
Greek (§ 32)	32
Italic (§ 33)	33
O.Irish (§ 34)	34
Germanic (§ 35)	35
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 36)	35
Indg. <i>ī</i>	37
Prim. Indg. (§ 37)	37
Aryan (§ 38)	38
Armenian (§ 39)	38
Greek (§ 40)	38
Italic (§ 41)	38
O.Irish (§ 42)	39
Germanic (§ 43)	39
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 44)	39
Indg. <i>u</i>	40
Prim. Indg. (§ 45)	40
Aryan (§ 46)	40
Armenian (§ 47)	40
Greek (§ 48)	41
Italic (§ 49)	41
O.Irish (§ 50)	42
Germanic (§ 51)	43
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 52)	43
Indg. <i>ū</i>	45
Prim. Indg. (§ 53)	45
Aryan (§ 54)	45

	Page
Armenian (§ 55)	45
Greek (§ 56)	45
Italic (§ 57)	46
O.Irish (§ 58)	46
Germanic (§ 59)	47
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 60)	47
Indg. <i>e</i>	47
Prim. Indg. (§ 61)	47
Aryan (§ 62)	49
Armenian (§ 63)	50
Greek (§ 64)	50
Italic (§ 65)	51
O.Irish (§ 66)	54
Germanic (§ 67)	56
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 68)	59
Indg. <i>ē</i>	61
Prim. Indg. (§ 69)	61
Aryan (§ 70)	62
Armenian (§ 71)	62
Greek (§ 72)	63
Italic (§ 73)	63
O.Irish (§ 74)	64
Germanic (§ 75)	64
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 76)	65
Indg. <i>o</i>	66
Prim. Indg. (§ 77)	66
Aryan (§ 78)	68
Armenian (§ 79)	70
Greek (§ 80)	71
Italic (§ 81)	72
O.Irish (§ 82)	76
Germanic (§ 83)	77
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 84)	79
Indg. <i>ō</i>	83
Prim. Indg. (§ 85)	83
Aryan (§ 86)	83
Armenian (§ 87)	84
Greek (§ 88)	84
Italic (§ 89)	84
O.Irish (§ 90)	85
Germanic (§ 91)	85
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 92)	86
Indg. <i>a</i>	87
Prim. Indg. (§ 93)	87
Aryan (§ 94)	88

	Page
Armenian (§ 95)	89
Greek (§ 96)	90
Italic (§ 97)	91
O.Irish (§ 98)	93
Germanic (§ 99)	94
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 100)	94
Indg. <i>ā</i>	96
Prim. Indg. (§ 101)	96
Aryan (§ 102)	96
Armenian (§ 103)	97
Greek (§ 104)	97
Italic (§ 105)	98
O.Irish (§ 106)	99
Germanic (§ 107)	99
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 108)	99
Indg. <i>ə</i> (§ 109—110)	100
Primitive Indg. vowel contraction	105
General remarks (§ 111)	105
I. Contraction of <i>a-, e-, o-</i> vowels with <i>a-, e-, o-</i> vowels (§ 112—115)	106
II. Contraction of <i>a-, e-, o-</i> vowels with <i>i-</i> and <i>u-</i> vowels (§ 116)	108
B. The vowels as consonants	109
General remarks (§ 117)	109
Indg. <i>ī</i>	110
Prim. Indg. (§ 118—122)	110
Aryan (§ 123—127)	113
Armenian (§ 128)	117
Greek (§ 129—132)	117
Italic (§ 133—136)	120
O.Irish (§ 137—140)	124
Germanic (§ 141—144)	125
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 145—148)	130
Loss of <i>ī</i> in the prim. Indg. period (§ 149—150)	135
Indg. <i>ū</i>	137
Prim. Indg. (§ 151—156)	137
Aryan (§ 157—161)	140
Armenian (§ 162)	145
Greek (§ 163—167)	145
Italic (§ 168—172)	149
O.Irish (§ 173—176)	153
Germanic (§ 177—181)	155
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 182—186)	159
Loss of <i>ū</i> in the prim. Indg. period (§ 187—188)	162

	Page
NASALS.	
A. The nasals as consonants	162
Prim. Indg. period (§ 189—196)	162
Aryan (§ 197—200)	166
Armenian (§ 201—202)	169
Greek (§ 203—205)	169
Italic (§ 206—209)	173
O.Irish (§ 210—212)	177
Germanic (§ 213—215)	180
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 216—219)	183
Nasal changes in the prim. Indg. period (§ 220—221)	188
B. The nasals as sonants	190
Preliminary remarks (§ 222)	190
1. The short sonant nasals (§ 223—252)	190
General remarks (§ 223)	190
Prim. Indg. period (§ 224—227)	191
Aryan (§ 228—231)	194
Armenian (§ 232)	197
Greek (§ 233—236)	197
Italic (§ 237—241)	199
O.Irish (§ 242—243)	200
Germanic (§ 244—247)	201
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 248—252)	204
2. The long sonant nasals (§ 253)	206
LIQUIDS.	
A. The liquids as consonants	207
Prim. Indg. period (§ 254—256)	207
Aryan (§ 257—261)	210
Armenian (§ 262—263)	213
Greek (§ 264—266)	214
Italic (§ 267—271)	216
O.Irish (§ 272—274)	219
Germanic (§ 275—277)	220
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 278—281)	222
Changes of liquids in the prim. Indg. period (§ 282)	225
B. The liquids as sonants	226
Preliminary remarks (§ 283)	226
1. The short sonant liquids (§ 284—305)	226
General remarks (§ 284)	226
Prim. Indg. period (§ 285—287)	227
Aryan (§ 288—290)	229
Armenian (§ 291)	232
Greek (§ 292—294)	233

	Page
Italic (§ 295—297)	235
O.Irish (§ 298)	236
Germanic (§ 299—301)	237
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 302—305)	239
2. The long sonant liquids (§ 306)	241

ARLAUT (VOWEL GRADATION).

The nature of ablaut and the different grades of ablaut in general (§ 307—310)	244
1. The <i>e</i> -series (§ 311—314)	247
2. The <i>ē</i> -series (§ 315)	254
3. The <i>ā</i> -series (§ 316)	255
4. The <i>ō</i> -series (§ 317)	255
5. The <i>u</i> -series (§ 318)	256
6. The <i>o</i> -series (§ 319)	258

EXPLOSIVES.

General remarks: The nature of explosives (§ 320), place of articulation (§ 321), form of articulation (§ 322), system of the Indg. explosives (§ 323)	261
A. The explosives according to their place of articulation	262
1. The labial explosives	262
Indg. prim. period (§ 324—326)	262
Aryan (§ 327—329)	264
Armenian (§ 330—332)	265
Greek (§ 333—335)	266
Italic (§ 336—338)	267
O.Irish (§ 339—341)	268
Germanic (§ 342—344)	270
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 345—347)	271
2. The dental explosives	272
Prim. Indg. period (§ 348—350)	272
Aryan (§ 351—359)	273
Armenian (§ 360—362)	275
Greek (§ 363—365)	277
Italic (§ 366—370)	278
O.Irish (§ 371—373)	282
Germanic (§ 374—376)	283
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 377—379)	285
3. The palatal explosives	286
General remarks (§ 380)	286
Prim. Indg. period (§ 381—383)	288

	Page
a. The language-group with explosives	289
Greek (§ 384—386)	289
Italic (§ 387—389)	290
O.Irish (§ 390—392)	292
Germanic (§ 393—395)	293
b. The language-group with spirants or affricatae	295
Aryan (§ 396—407)	295
Armenian (§ 408—410)	300
Albanian (§ 411)	302
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 412—416)	302
4 The velar explosives	305
General remarks (§ 417)	305
Prim. Indg. period (§ 418—423)	306
a. The language-group with labialisation	309
Preliminary remark on the irregular appearance of labia-	
lisation (§ 424)	309
Greek (§ 425—429)	311
Italic (§ 430—433)	318
O.Irish (§ 434—438)	323
Germanic (§ 439—444)	326
b. The language-group without labialisation	331
Aryan (§ 445—454)	331
Armenian (§ 455—457)	336
Albanian (§ 458—460)	337
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 461—465)	337
Retrospect of the history of the velar explosives (§ 466) . .	341
Interchange of the palatal and velar explosives (§ 467) . .	342
 B. The explosives after their form of articulation.	
Prim. Indg. period (§ 468—469)	344
Aryan (470—482)	347
Armenian (§ 483—485)	357
Greek (§ 486—497)	359
Italic (§ 498—511)	365
O.Irish (§ 512—526)	375
Germanic (§ 527—541)	381
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 542—551)	396
The combination media asp. + <i>t</i> , <i>s</i> (§ 552)	403
The Indg. tenues aspiratae (§ 553)	405

THE SPIRANTS.

General remarks on the prim. Indg. spirants (§ 554)	407
Indg. <i>s</i> .	
Prim. Indg. period (§ 555)	408

	Page
Aryan (§ 556—558)	410
Armenian (§ 559—562)	416
Greek (§ 563—566)	418
Italic (§ 567—572)	424
O.Irish (§ 573—576)	430
Germanic (577—583)	432
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 584—588)	438
Prim. Indg. changes of <i>s</i> (§ 489)	445

Indg. *z*.

Prim. Indg. period (§ 590)	447
Aryan (§ 591)	447
Armenian (§ 592)	449
Greek (§ 593)	449
Italic (§ 594)	450
O.Irish (§ 595)	451
Germanic (§ 596)	451
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 597)	452

Indg. <i>j</i> (§ 598)	452
----------------------------------	-----

OTHER COMBINATORY SOUND-CHANGES.

Preliminary remarks (§ 599)	453
---------------------------------------	-----

CONTRACTION (HIATUS, ELISION).

General remarks (§ 600)	453
Aryan (§ 601)	455
Armenian (§ 602)	455
Greek (§ 603)	455
Italic (§ 604)	457
O.Irish (§ 605)	458
Germanic (§ 606)	459
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 607)	460

SHORTENING OF LONG VOWELS.

General remarks (§ 608)	461
Aryan (§ 609)	461
Armenian (§ 610)	461
Greek (§ 611)	461
Italic (§ 612)	462
O.Irish (§ 613)	464
Germanic (§ 614)	464
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 615)	465

LENTHENING OF SHORT VOWELS.

Aryan (§ 616)	465
-------------------------	-----

	Page
Armenian (§ 617)	466
Greek (§ 618)	466
Italic (§ 619)	466
O.Irish (§ 620)	467
Germanic (§ 621)	467
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 622)	467
ANAPTYXIS FROM CONSONANTS.	
General remarks (§ 623)	468
Aryan (§ 624)	469
Armenian (§ 625)	470
Greek (§ 626)	470
Italic (§ 627)	470
Germanic (§ 628)	472
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 629)	472
VOWEL ABSORPTION.	
General remarks (§ 630)	473
Aryan (§ 631)	473
Armenian (§ 632)	473
Italic (§ 633)	473
O.Irish (§ 634)	474
Germanic (§ 635)	475
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 636)	477
PALATALISATION AND LABIALISATION WITH EPENTHESIS.	
General remarks (§ 637)	477
Aryan (§ 638)	478
Greek (§ 639)	478
O.Irish (§ 640)	479
Germanic (§ 641)	481
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 642)	481
LOSS OF SYLLABLE BY DISSIMILATION (§ 643)	
481	
SANDHI (SATZPHONETIK).	
Sandhi in general (§ 644)	483
Prim. Indg. period (§ 645)	488
Aryan (§ 646—650)	490
Armenian (§ 651)	497
Greek (§ 652—654)	498
Italic (§ 655—656)	501
O.Irish (§ 657—658)	506
Germanic (§ 659—662)	512
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 663—666)	521

	Page
ACCENTUATION.	
Accentuation in general (§ 667—668)	527
Prim. Indg. period (§ 669—671)	532
Aryan (§ 672—674)	537
Armenian (§ 675)	539
Greek (§ 676—678)	540
Italic (§ 679—683)	545
O.Irish (§ 684—685)	550
Germanic (§ 686—689)	552
Baltic-Slavonic (§ 690—692)	556
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS	562

INTRODUCTION.

DEFINITION OF THE SCIENCE OF THE INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES, AND THE DIVISION OF THE INDO-GERMANIC FAMILY INTO ITS VARIOUS BRANCHES.

§ 1. The science of the Indg. languages forms, like Indg. Mythology, a section of Indg. '*Philology*', i. e. of that science, which has to investigate the intellectual development of the Indg. peoples from the time before their separation up to the present day. Its method accordingly is historical and its task is to investigate the whole development of the Indg. languages from the time when they were still one language down to the present day. Its unity is in no sense broken by the results furnished by the specialists in Sanskrit, Ancient and Modern Greek, Latin and the Romance languages, Keltic etc., for the sciences of the Indian languages, of Ancient and Mod. Greek etc. are integral components of the grand whole formed by that of the Indo-Germanic.

It is true that the so called comparative science of language has hitherto been almost exclusively confined to the older periods of the Indg. languages, but this is due to the division of labour which was involved in the method by which alone progress could be made, as well as to the limitations of human strength. Probably the same division of labour will still be necessary, but it implies no real opposition between the different parts of the science.

Compare the author's inaugural address 'Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie' (in his 'Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft', Strassburg 1885, p. 3 ff.).

§ 2. We are not at present in a position to determine finally what was the primitive home of the Indg. tribes. Only so much is clear, that these tribes in pre-historic times must have been far less widely diffused than they were at the beginning of the historic era. It was formerly usual to place this primitive home somewhere in Asia, whereas at present scholars lean rather to the opinion that the Asiatic members of the stock passed over from Europe. Cp. O. Schrader 'Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte', Jena 1883, p. 442 ff.

§ 3. It is impossible to suppose that a language should have gone through a long course of development, and be spoken by a people of any considerable numbers, without a certain amount of dialectical variation; and hence we cannot look upon the speech of the Indogermans, even while they still occupied a comparatively small territory and maintained a fairly close degree of intercourse with one another, as bearing in any strict sense, a uniform character. Local differences had no doubt already arisen, though actual instances of this have hardly as yet been established with perfect certainty. One such I have maintained, though only as a conjecture, in §§ 380, 417. In historical times there appear a multitude of dialects, diverging in a greater or less degree, the whole field of which can hardly be included in any one survey. We may take for granted that the differentiation of dialects about the year 2000 B. C. had gone so far, that a number of communities existed side by side, which could no longer, or only with difficulty understand one another. The historic record of the various individual developments begins at very different periods. E. g. the Indian development is known to us from about the year 1500 B. C. onwards, the Latin from about 300 B. C., the Irish since the eighth century of the Christian era (with the exception of the Ogam inscriptions, cp. § 9), and the Lithuanian from the middle of the sixteenth century.

A number of separate developments, which sprung from the primitive Indg. language, have perished without leaving any traces of their existence. Of others we have only very scanty fragments left, on which it is scarcely, if at all, possible to found a grammar, as of Phrygian, Macedonian, Messapian, Gallic, and Burgundian. The remainder have come down to us with a more abundant supply of material.

The dialects belonging to this last class, are arranged into eight groups (branches of language): 1. Aryan, 2. Armenian, 3. Greek, 4. Albanian, 5. Italic, 6. Keltic, 7. Germanic, 8. Baltic-Slavonic. Each group is distinguished by the fact that its individual members show in common a considerable number of changes in sound, inflexion, syntax and vocabulary; e. g. the shifting of the prim. Indg. explosives, discussed in § 527 ff. (what is known as the first sound-shifting), is one of the numerous characteristics of the close relation existing between the Germanic dialects.

Of the dialects, which have come down to us only in scanty fragments, there are a certain number which can be assigned with certainty to one or other of these eight groups, e. g. the Burgundian to the Germanic, and the Gallic to the Keltic group, whilst others, e. g. the Macedonian, seem to belong to none of them.

It is in itself very possible that some of these eight chief members stand to each other in a closer relationship, and form a single group historically distinct from the rest. All attempts, however, to establish such a closer relationship, have hitherto proved futile. The Italo-Keltic hypothesis has perhaps the best prospect of attaining a greater degree of probability in the future.

Cp. Johannes Schmidt *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Weimar 1872. Leskien *Die Declination im Slavisch-Litauischen und Germanischen*, Leipzig 1876, introduction. Delbrück *Einleitung in das Sprachstudium*, Edition 2. 1884, p. 131 ff. C. Schrader *op. cit.* p. 66 ff. The Author, *Zur Frage nach den Verwandtschaftsverhältnissen*

der indogermanischen Sprachen, in Techmer's Internat. Zeitschr. für allg. Sprachwissenschaft I 226 ff.

§ 4. (1) The Aryan branch consists of the Indian and Iranian groups.

The oldest and most archaic dialect of the Indian group is the language of the Veda, the oldest portions of which (the hymns of the Rigveda) possibly go back as far as 1500 B.C.¹). Next comes Sanskrit in the stricter sense of the word (also called classical Sanskrit), the continuation of a dialect now lost, which existed side by side with the Vedic and differed but slightly from it in the formation of its sounds and inflexions. It became separated from the popular development as the literary language, and was stereotyped in a fixed and purely artificial form. The vulgar language, called Prākṛit, as early as the third century B.C. differed very materially from Sanskrit and at that time was divided into at least three chief dialects. Through the influence of Buddhism, Prākṛit was also raised to a literary language (Pāli). From the popular dialects of Prākṛit have descended the numerous modern Indian languages and dialects, Hindi (Hindustani), Bengali, Uriya, Maharatti, Guzerati, Sindhi, Penjabi and others.

In this work we shall only deal with the Vedic language and classical Sankrit.

Cp. Bopp Kritische Grammatik der Sanskrita-Sprache in kürzerer Fassung, Edit. 3., Berlin 1863. Benfey Vollständige Grammatik der Sanskritsprache, Leipzig 1852. The same Author's Kurze Sanskrit-Grammatik, Leipzig 1855. Whitney Sanskrit Grammar, Leipzig 1879 (with supplement I, Grammatisches aus dem Mahabharata, by A. Holtzmann, 1884; supplement II, The roots, verb-forms, and primary derivatives of the Sanskrit language, by Whitney, 1885).

The oldest recorded dialects of the Iranian group are Old Persian (West Iranian), the language of the Persian

1) Cp. A. Kaegi Der Rigveda, die älteste Literatur der Inder, Edition 2, Leipzig 1881.

cuneiform inscriptions dating from about 520 to 350 B.C., and Avestic, also called Zend and Old Bactrian (East Iranian), the language of the Avesta, the sacred book of the Zoroastrians, which has come down to us with corruptions of many kinds, deviating considerably from its original form. The various portions of the work were composed at very different periods¹). Some parts of the Avesta, including 17 hymns (gāpā f.), are written in a peculiar dialect, which is more archaic than the language of the other parts, and as distinct from which the latter is called Later Avestic or Zend in the stricter sense. Not one of the Modern Iranian languages is a direct continuation of Old Persian or Avestic. The Modern Persian dialects (Gilani etc.), Kurdic and probably also Ossetian (spoken in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus) are more closely related to the former, and the language of Afghanistan (Paštu) to the latter.

We shall only deal with the two Old Iranian languages.

Cp. Spiegel Die altpersischen Keilinschriften, Edition 2., Leipzig 1881. Justi Handbuch der Zendsprache, Leipzig 1864. Bartholomae Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekte, Leipzig 1883.

§ 5. (2) Armenian, which de Lagarde and Friedr. Müller assigned to the Iranian group, but Hübschmann (Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIII 5 ff., 400 ff.) has proved to be an independent member of the Indg. family of languages, is known to us since the fifth century of our era. The literary language (O.Armenian), which had then become fixed, remained in this usage without any material changes down to modern times, and is separated by a great interval from the modern dialects. Historical investigations have hitherto been almost exclusively confined to O.Armenian. The term Armenian will always be used in the sense of O.Armenian.

Cp. Petermann, Grammatica linguae Armeniacae, Berlin 1837. The same Author, Brevis linguae armeniacae grammatica, litteratura, chrestomathia cum glossario, ed. II, Berlin 1872.

1) On the difficult question as to the age of the Avesta cp. Eduard Meyer Geschichte des Alterthums I (1884) p. 501 ff.

Hübschmann *Armenische Studien I*, Leipzig 1883 (of special importance for the phonology).

§ 4. (3) Greek had strongly marked variations in different localities long before Homer's time and in the historic era appears split up into numerous dialects.

These may be classified in the following manner: 1. Ionic-Attic, a. The district of Ionia, b. Attica. 2. Doric, a. Laconia with Tarentum and Heraclea, b. Messenia, c. Argolis and Aegina, d. Corinth with Corcyra, e. Megara with Byzantium, f. the Peloponnesian colonies of Sicily, g. Crete, h. Thera and Melos together with Cyrene, i. Rhodes with Gela and Acragas, k. the other Dor. islands in the Aegean, as Carpathus, Astypalaea etc. 3. North West Greek, a. Phocis, b. Locris, c. Aetolia, d. Acarnania, e. Phthiotis and the district of the Aenianes, f. Epirus, g. probably also Achaia. 4. Aeolic, a. Lesbos and Aeolian Asia Minor, b. North Thessaly, c. Boeotia. 5. Elean (belonging to North West Greek?). 6. Arcadian-Cyprian¹). 7. Pamphylian.

These dialects are found in their purest form on inscriptions. The literary language, especially that of the poets, is in many respects artificially constructed; even the language of the Homeric poems is in great measure an artificial dialect.

Towards the end of the fifth century B. C. there was formed on the basis of the Attic dialect a literary language common to all Greeks, which almost entirely excluded the use of the other dialects from the later prose literature of antiquity. Hence it is that we have to gather our knowledge of most of the non-Attic local dialects either entirely, or almost entirely, from inscriptions.

The language of mediaeval Greek literature is an artificial mixture of ancient Greek with forms of the then spoken popular language in varying degrees of modification. Modern Greek

1) Collitz (*Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der griech. Dialekte* 1885) places this dialect in close relation with Aeolic and puts forward the hypothesis that 'the Thessalian dialect in point of language forms the transition-stage from Bœotian to Lesbian, from Lesbian to Cyprian-Arcadian and from Cyprian-Arcadian to Bœotian' (p. 9).

exhibits a rich development of dialects; as yet little has been done towards fixing the historical relation of the separate dialects to ancient Greek¹⁾).

We shall confine our attention to the development of the O.Gr. dialects.

Cp. Ahrens *De Graecae linguae dialectis*, I. *De dialectis Aeolicis*, Göttingen 1839, II. *De dialecto Dorica*, Göttingen 1843. R. Meister *Die griechischen Dialekte*, I. *Asiatisch-Äolisch. Böotisch, Thessalisch*, Göttingen 1882. G. Curtius *Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie*, Edit. 5., Leipzig 1879. R. Kühner *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 2 vols., Edit. 2., Hannover 1869—1870. G. Meyer *Griechische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1880 (Edit. 2. 1886). Delbrück *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, Halle 1879. The Author, *Griechische Grammatik*, in Iw. Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* II (1885) p. 1—126.

§ 7. (4) Albanian, the language of ancient Illyria, has only been known to us from monuments of any extent since the seventeenth century. The historical treatment of this language, which is beset with manifold difficulties — the greatest of which lies in clearly separating pure Albanian words from those borrowed from the Greek, Latin, Romance, Slavonic and Turkish languages —, is still in its infancy.

Cp. Gustav Meyer *Albanesische Studien*, Wien I 1883, II 1884 (in which the whole of the older literature has been collected together) and 'Der Einfluss des Lateinischen auf die alban. Formenlehre' in the *Miscellanea di Filologia, dedicata alla memoria dei professori Caix e Canello* p. 103 ff.²⁾.

We shall only take this language into account in discussing

1) Considerations introductory to the study of the relation of Middle and Modern Greek to O.Greek and the researches on the subject are given by Krumbacher *Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der griech. Sprache*, in Kuhn's *Ztschr.* XXVII 481 ff.

2) The treatise of the same scholar 'Über Sprache und Literatur der Albanesen' in his 'Essays und Studien zur Sprachgeschichte und Volkskunde', Berlin 1885, p. 49 ff. is strongly to be recommended as an introduction to this subject.

the development of the Indg. palatal and guttural explosives § 411 and § 458—460.

§ 8. (5) The Italic branch consists of Latin on the one hand and of the Umbrian-Samnitic dialects on the other.

Latin, with which the little known dialect of Falerii was closely related, is known to us from about 300 B. C. onwards. So long as the language was confined to Latium, there existed no dialectical differences of any importance. The contrast between the popular and the literary language, which had already arisen at the beginning of the archaic period of literature (from Livius Andronicus to Cicero), became still sharper in the classical period, and the further development of the former is almost entirely lost to our observation until the Middle Ages, when the popular Latin of the various provinces of the Roman empire meets us in a form more or less changed and with a rich development of dialects (Romance languages: Portuguese, Spanish, Catalanian, Provençal, French, Italian, Raetoromanic and Roumanian)¹).

We shall only consider the development of the Latin of antiquity.

Cp. Corssen *Über Aussprache, Vocalismus und Betonung der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1858. 1859, edit. 2., 1868. 1870. R. Kühner *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 vols., Hannover 1877. 1879. F. Stolz and J. G. Schmalz *Lateinische Grammatik*, in Iw. Müller's *Handbuch der klass. Altertumsw.* II (1885) p. 127—364.

The Umbrian-Samnitic dialects are known to a certain extent through inscriptions, which for the most part belong to the last centuries before our era, and through words quoted by Roman writers. We are best acquainted with Umbrian (Bréal *Les tables Eugubines*, Paris 1875, Bücheler *Umbrica*, Bonn 1883) and Oscan (Zvetaieff *Sylloge inscriptionum Oscarum*, Petersburg-Leipzig 1878). Of the Volscian, Picentine, Sabine,

¹) Cp. Budinszky *Die Ausbreitung der lat. Sprache über Italien und die Provinzen des römischen Reiches*, Berlin 1881, Gröber in the *Archiv für lat. Lexikographie* I 35 ff., 204 ff.

Aequeulan, Vestinian, Marsian, Pelignian and Marrucian dialects we have only very scanty remains (Zvetaieff *Inscriptiones Italiae Mediae dialecticae*, Leipzig 1884). All these dialects were forced into the background at an early period by the intrusion of Latin. The Sabines, who received citizenship in 267 B. C., seem to have been the first to become romanised. The slowest to give way was Oscan, which in the mountains did not perhaps become fully extinct for centuries after the Christian era.

Cp. further Bruppacher *Osk. Lautlehre*, Zürich 1869, Enderis *Versuch einer Formenlehre der osk. Sprache*, Zürich 1871.

§ 9. (6) The Keltic languages fall into three groups: Gallic, Britannic and Gaelic¹).

We know something of Gallic through Keltic names and words quoted by Greek and Latin authors, through inscriptions and coins. But the interpretation of the forms, mostly proper names, is in most cases so uncertain that from these remains linguistic research has hitherto gained comparatively little.

Britannic broke up into Cymric (or Welsh), Cornish and Bas Breton (or Armorican); the connexion between the last two is especially close. We are acquainted with Cymric and Bas Breton from the eighth or ninth century onward, at first through glosses; the oldest records of Cornish are somewhat later. The last named dialect became extinct at the end of the eighteenth or beginning of the nineteenth century, both the others are still living.

Irish-Gaelic, Scotch-Gaelic (which is also known as Gaelic in the stricter sense), and Manx (spoken in the Isle of Man) form the Gaelic division. All three of these are still living. The first two languages seem hardly to have differed from each other in the ninth century. The oldest monuments are the O.Gaelic Ogam inscriptions (Ogam is the native name for the

1) The first two languages have often been classed together as a special group, but without sufficient reason. See Thurneysen *Keltoromanisches* 1884 p. 7 ff.

Gaelic runes), which possibly date as far back as about 500 A.D. The literary record of Irish begins in the eighth century, at first with glosses, and then from the year 1100 onward we have many extensive manuscripts which contain sagas, ecclesiastical literature etc. Scotch-Gaelic literature begins somewhat later than that of Irish and in the older period is closely connected with Irish. Manx is only known to us during the last few centuries¹⁾.

We shall consider chiefly Old Irish.

Cp. J. C. Zeuss *Grammatica Celtica* (e monumentis vetustis tam Hibernicae linguae quam Britannicarum dialectorum Cambricae Cornicae Aremoricae comparatis Gallicae priscae reliquiis construxit J. C. Z.), Edit. 2. by H. Ebel, Berlin 1871. Windisch *Kurzgefasste irische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1879.

§ 10. (7) The Germanic branch is divided into Gothic, Norse, and West Germanic.

Gothic, the most archaic language of the Germanic group, is chiefly accessible to us through the biblical translation of the West Gothic bishop Ulfilas (311—381 A.D.). The language perished with the Gothic nation. (The East Goths, who dwelt in the Crimea, retained their language down to modern times; but of this branch of Gothic we possess only a few isolated words.)

Norse (or Scandinavian), which in certain special points closely coincides with Gothic²⁾ and is therefore by some writers classed together with it as East Germanic as opposed to West Germanic, down to the Viking period (800—1000 A. D.) was practically a single language, but later on became broken up into four languages, Icelandic and Norwegian (West Norse) on the one hand, Swedish and Danish (East Norse) on the other. The earliest records are runic inscriptions, the oldest of which

1) Windisch's article «Keltische Sprachen» in Ersch und Gruber's A. Encykl. d. W. u. K. second section, XXXV p. 132 ff., serves as a good introduction to the Keltic languages generally, the monuments of these languages and Keltological literature.

2) The most important of these coincidences are Goth. *ddj* = O.Icel. *ggj* from *ǰ* (§ 142) and Goth. *ggv* = O.Icel. *ggv* from *u* (§ 179). Cp. Braune in Paul-Braune's Beitr. IX 546 f.

appear to belong to the fifth century. By O.Norse was, in former times, generally understood O.West Norse only; the term is now more properly applied to the whole development of the Scandinavian languages up to the sixteenth century.

The oldest representatives of West-Germanic are Anglo-Saxon, the continuation of which is Mod.English; O.Frisian; O.Saxon, now Low German; O.Low Franconian, now Dutch, Flemish, and the language of the German Lower Franconia; and O.High German, the present Upper- und Middle German dialects. The oldest records of these languages date from the eighth or ninth century, the oldest OHG. record belonging to about the period 740—745; but with Frisian we are acquainted only since the fourteenth century.

We shall limit ourselves chiefly to Gothic and Old High German.

Cp. J. Grimm *Deutsche Grammatik*, I², II², new reprint, Berlin 1870. 1878, III, IV Göttingen 1831, 1837. Rumpelt *Deutsche Grammatik, mit Rücksicht auf vergleichende Sprachforschung*, I (Lautlehre) Berlin 1860. A. Holtzmann *Altdeutsche Grammatik* I, 1 (Die specielle Lautlehre), 2 (Vergleichung der deutschen Laute unter einander), Leipzig 1870. 1875. W. Scherer *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, edit. 2., Berlin 1878. Leo Meyer *Die gothische Sprache, ihre Lautgestaltung insbesondere im Verhältniss zum Altindischen, Griechischen und Lateinischen*, Berlin 1869. W. Braune *Gotische Grammatik*, edit. 2., Halle 1882. L. Wimmer *Altnordische Grammatik*, translated from the Danish by E. Sievers, Halle 1871. A. Noreen *Altnordische Grammatik* I (Altisl. und Altnorw. Gramm. unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen), Halle 1884. E. Sievers *Angelsächsische Grammatik*, Halle 1882 (2. ed. 1886). W. Braune *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, Halle 1886. O. Behaghel *Die deutsche Sprache*, Leipzig und Prag 1886.

§ 11. (7) The Baltic-Slavonic branch. The Baltic division consists of Prussian, Lithuanian, and Lettic. The former died out in the seventeenth century and we only possess very few imperfectly recorded specimens dating from the fifteenth and

sixteenth centuries. The two latter are still living and their oldest records belong to the sixteenth century.

We confine ourselves chiefly to Lithuanian.

Cp. Nesselmann *Die Sprache der alten Preussen*, Berlin 1845. The same author, *Thesaurus linguae Prussicae*, Berlin 1873. Schleicher *Litauische Grammatik*, Prag 1856. Kurchat *Grammatik der littauischen Sprache*, Halle 1876. Bielenstein *Die lettische Sprache, nach ihren Lauten und Formen erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt*, 2 Theile, Berlin 1863. 1864. The same author, *Lettische Grammatik*, Mitau 1863.

The Slavonic languages fall into a South-Eastern and a Western group. To the former belong Russian (a. Great Russian and White Russian, b. Little Russian), Bulgarian and Illyrian (a. Servian and Croatian, b. Slovenian), to the latter Czech (Czech in the stricter sense, Moravian and Slovakian), Sorabian or Wendish (Upper- and Lower Sorabian) and Lechish (Polish and Polabian or Elbe-Slavonian). All these languages, with the exception of Polabian, are still living. The most archaic, and for Indg. grammar the most important, is the language in which the Slavonic apostles Cyril and Methodius (ninth century) wrote. In our investigations we accordingly consider this language of the first importance. It is called O.Slovenian by Miklosich, but by Schleicher, Schaffarik and others with more justness O.Bulgarian. It became the ecclesiastical language of the Greek church, and that form of it, which was modified through the influence of other Slavonic languages, especially of Russian, is generally known by the name of Church Slavonic.

Cp. Miklosich *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen* 4 vols. Vienna, I² 1879, II 1875, III² 1876, IV 1874. Schleicher *Die Formenlehre der kirchenslavischen Sprache erklärend und vergleichend dargestellt*, Bonn 1852. Leskien *Handbuch der altbulgarischen (altkirchenslawischen) Sprache*, Weimar 1871, edit. 2., 1886.

§ 12. In accordance with what has been said in §§ 4—11, we shall speak exclusively or at all events especially of the oldest periods of those languages whose developments are

known to us through records extending over a great length of time. The term 'science of the Indg. languages', as has been already stated in § 1, does not demand such a restriction. This division of labour is wholly due to the course which the science has hitherto taken, and is fully justified by the present state of the science. Bopp in his *Vergleichende Grammatik* (3 vols., edit. 3, Berlin 1868—1871) and Schleicher in his *Compendium der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* edit. 4, Weimar 1876) also limit themselves similarly as we have done.

When we speak of primitive Indg. forms; of prim. Ar.; of prim. Gr. or of prim. Ital. etc., we generally mean those forms which were in use towards the close of the primitive period of these languages. But we also often mean such forms as belonged to an earlier period of this stage, and which had already undergone a change towards its termination. For instance, we therefore speak equally well of prim. Germ. **faχō* and of prim. Germ. **fāχō* (Goth. *faha*, s. § 214), of prim. Gr. **ποροι* and prim. Gr. **ποσσι* (Att. *ποσι*, s. § 490), as of Lat. *sequuntur* and Lat. *secuntur* (§ 431). Forms, put down by us as prim. Ind., prim. Ar. etc., are therefore not to be indiscriminately regarded as belonging to the same period. Again, if we, for example, uniformly write *χ*, not *h*, in prim. Germ. forms where we put *h* for Gothic words, it must not be implied that *χ* had not in certain cases already become *h* in prim. Germanic (cp. § 529).

ON THE STRUCTURE OF THE INDO-GERMANIC LANGUAGES IN GENERAL. ROOT AND SUFFIXES.¹⁾

§ 13. The Indg. languages belong to the inflexional class. The inflexion of words has not existed from the very beginning, but has been gradually developed and perfected.

1) With what follows compare Delbrück *Einleitung in das Sprachstudium*² (Leipzig 1884) p. 61 ff. and Paul *Principien der Sprachgeschichte* (Halle 1880) p. 154 ff.

We have to presuppose a period in which suffixal elements were not yet attached to words. The word-forms of this period are called roots, and the space of time prior to inflexion, is called the root-period. It dates much further back than that stage of development whose word-forms we are able to deduce by a comparison of the separate Indg. groups of languages. This stage is usually simply called the Indg. parent-language.

What we understand by word-formation and inflexion arose by composition, that is, by the following process: a group of words which formed a syntactical complex was fused into a unity, in which the whole was in some way isolated in relation to its elements¹⁾. This word-fusion from the beginning onwards occurred in the same way, just as afterwards, in the age of separate languages (partly even in historical periods) the final members of compounds became suffixes, e. g. Goth *-k* in *mik* (Mod. HG. *mich*) from prehistoric **me ge* (cp. Gr. *ἐμέγε* beside *ἐμέ*), French *-ment* in *fièrement* from *fera mente*, MHG. and Mod.HG. *-heit* in *schænheit*, originally meaning 'schöne Beschaffenheit' (beautiful state or condition), where *heit* is still an independent word in MHG. and OHG., Mod.Irish *-mhar* in *buadh-mhar* 'victorious' = O.Ir. *mār mōr* Cymr. *mawr* 'magnus' (Zimmer Kelt. Studien II p. 22 ff). The formation of suffixes is not a work which belongs to any special prehistoric period and which was concluded at any definite point of time. But when once this process had begun, it was performed anew through all periods of the history of the Indg. languages and will probably also be repeated again in the future, so long as our languages continue to develop.

1) "With respect both to meaning and form either the whole may pass through a development in which the separate parts do not participate when used independently, or vice versa the separate parts may pass through a development in which the whole does not participate, or it may happen that the separate parts cease to be employed independently, while they are preserved in combination, or lastly the mode of combination may vanish from living use and only remain preserved in certain set forms". Paul in the above work p. 165.

Suffixes are divided into word-forming suffixes or inflexional suffixes in the stricter sense, to which on the one hand belong case endings (e. g. *-m* in Indg. **ēkum* = Lat. *equom*, Skr. *āśvam*), and on the other, personal endings (e. g. *-mi* in Indg. **éimi* = Gr. *εἰμι*, Skr. *émi*), and stem-forming suffixes (e. g. *-ter-* in Indg. **pátēres* = Gr. *πατέρες*, Skr. *pítáras*, *-sko-* in Indg. **gṃskónti* = Gr. *βάσκοντι* *βάσκουσι*, Skr. *gáchanti*). It is impossible to draw a sharp line between the two species of suffixes, since many an element, which was originally only stem-forming, has come to be treated on the same level with word-forming suffixes. Cp. e. g. Lat. *legiminī*, whose final part *minī*, felt by the Romans as a personal ending (like *-mur* etc.), contains the stem-forming suffix *-meno-* (cp. Gr. *λεγόμενοι*); properly *legiminī estis* = *λεγόμενοι ἐστε*.

The derivation as well as the original value of those suffixal elements, which in the Indg. prim. period were already no longer felt to be the members of a compositum, is for the most part very doubtful. Of the conjectures which have been put forth regarding these suffixes, there are only a few to which one can allow a certain amount of probability. To these belongs especially the hypothesis, that a part of the personal endings were originally independent substantival pronouns, cp. the *-m* of the 1. sg. impf. Indg. **ébherom* (Skr. *ábharam*, Gr. *ἔφερον*) with the pronominal stem **-me* (Lat. *mē*, Goth. *mi-k*).

There are in the Indg. languages many words of which we can not prove that they either contain or ever did contain a suffix. These, therefore, apparently represent the form they had in the pre-inflexional period, e. g. Gr. *μή*, Goth. *mi(-k)* cpf. **me*; Skr. *nú*, Gr. *νύ*, Lat. *nu(-dius)*, O.Ir. *nu no*, OHG. *nu no*, Lit. *nù(-gì)* 'now'. In other cases, root-words had disappeared in those compositions which we call inflected words. We must guard against fancying that, towards the close of the primitive period, or even later, elements like *es*, which we abstract as root from such forms as Indg. **ésti*, (Gr. *ἔστι*, Skr. *ásti*), had an independent existence and a meaning without any definite syntactical relation.

§ 14. According to the analogy of such forms as Fr. *vis-à-vis*, *rouge-gorge*, it has become usual to indicate component parts of inflected words by hyphens, e. g. Gr. *ἐλ-μι*, *πα-τέρ-ες*, *φέρ-ο-ι*, in the same manner Indg. **él-mi*, **pā-tér-es*, **bhér-o-ì-t*. It is thus intended to give a clear idea as to what parts of an inflected word once had an independent existence.

With regard to this mode of proceeding the following remarks are to be made.

1. We have seen in § 13, that as the first foundations of derivation and inflexion were laid by the fusion of independent elements, so this process has been continually repeated up to the present time. But the great majority of inflexional forms do not directly depend upon it. No sooner did the first inflexional compounds make their appearance, than they served as the models upon which other words were formed after their analogy, just in the same manner as most of the Mod. HG. composita in *-heit*, *-bar*, *-lich* etc. can no longer be conceived as proper syntactical compounds, but only as imitations of model forms, made at an earlier period. Composita, the formation of which we are able to trace in the younger stages of the separate languages, often exhibit manifold shiftings and deviations. The reason of these latter is, that all feeling for the mode of composition of the model forms became extinct. Thus, for instance, according to the analogy of Mid.HG. *miltekeit* from *miltec-heit* (cp. *miltec-lîch*) etc. have arisen such forms as Mod.HG. *frömmigkeit*, *eitelkeit* etc., by the abstraction of a suffix *-keit*. Such shiftings may also have taken place in the oldest stages of the inflexional period, so that, strictly speaking, we are never sure in the case of a suffix which has come down to us from the Indg. parent language, whether it ever existed as an independent word exactly in the same shape as we extract it from the body of a word, or whether it originally consisted of elements which passed into this shape by regular phonetic changes.

2. It very frequently happens, that two or more suffixes become fused into a unity in those periods of a language which we are able to control. E. g. Mod.HG. *-ner* in *bild-ner*, *harf-ner*

etc. is due to the *-ner* in such forms as *gärtn-er* (Mid. HG. *garten-ære*), which is a derivative of *garten*; Gr. *-αίνω* in *κερδ-αίνω*, *λευκ-αίνω* etc. to the *-αίνω* in such forms as *τεκταίνω* from **τεκταν-ζω* (to *τέκτων*). In like manner many of the prim. Indog. suffixes, which we are wont to regard as a unity, e. g. the *-ter-* in **pə-tér-es* (Gr. *πατίρης*), may have been fused together out of several suffixal elements. Our inability to analyse a prim. Indg. element proves nothing for its primitive unity.

3. It is theoretically correct when we say that the root of a word is found after we have removed all formative syllables from it. But in the first place we do not know what shape Indg. words had towards the end of the root-period, and this applies especially to the fact that we are unable to say whether the language at this stage possessed only monosyllabic words, or only words of more than one syllable, or both categories. Secondly the analysis of elements, which were directly annexed to the ends of roots, is of a most doubtful nature. And lastly we are unable to determine what phonetic changes inflexional compounds had undergone from the beginning up to the dissolution of the primitive community. Hence it must not be supposed that the roots, which we in ordinary practice abstract from words, are at all to be relied upon as representing the word-forms of the root-period. We are utterly unable to determine e. g. whether the complex **anə-* in Gr. *ἄνι-μος*, Lat. *ani-mu-s*, Skr. 3. sg. *áni-ti* 'breathes' (cp. § 110) represents a unitary word of the root-period, or whether it is to be resolved into **an-ə-*, that is, whether *-ə-* was a suffix, and thus originally an independent element.

Such being the state of things, we shall retain the terms 'root' and 'suffix' in this work for such parts of a word as *seq-* and *-e-*, *-taḱ* in Indg. **ségetaḱ* (Skr. *sácatē*, Gr. *ἐπεται*). We do not however assert that the elements, to which we give these names, ever existed as independent words. We merely indicate by means of hyphens (1) what was probably felt at any particular period as the nucleus (so to speak) of a whole system of word-forms (*seq-*), and (2) what was regarded as the formative

element (-e- and -tai in *séq-e-tai, *bhéydh-e-tai, *bhér-e-tai etc.), shared in common by a greater or less number of different words. The elements -e- and -ə- in cases as Gr. ἐπ-ε-ται (Indg. *seq-e-) and fut. τινέω τενῶ from *τεν-ε-σω (Indg. *ten-ə-, cp. Skr. fut. tan-i-ṣyāmi) may nevertheless originally have been parts of roots (disyllabic root-words); but on account of forms like πένθεται, φέρεται, ἄγεται and νεμέω, φθερέω, βαλέω on the one hand and of forms like ἔψομαι and τείνω (from *τενίω, §§ 131. 618) on the other, it becomes highly probable that they simply were for the perception of language (sprachempfindung) that which grammarians call "suffix"¹).

1) 'A certain analysis of forms takes place in the formation of associated concepts which refer to the system of word-formation and inflexion, whereby categories arise which are analogous to the grammatical notions of root, stem, and suffix. But it must always be borne in mind, firstly, that the mind remains entirely unconscious of these categories as such; secondly that they have nothing to do with the original mode of the formation of words, but purely accommodate themselves to the sound-series (Lautreihe) which regularly goes through a number of forms in the language for the time being, so that e. g. in Mod. Germ. tag-, hirt- appear as nominal stems, trag- and brenn- as verbal and present stems, trug- and brannt- as the preterite stems of tragen and brennen; thirdly that the elements arising from analysis are never felt as something entitled to an independent existence, but only as something which is possible in certain modes of combination'. Paul Principien p. 64.

PHONOLOGY.

§ 15. By a comparison of the eight Indo-Germanic dialects (§ 3) we are in a position to arrive at the number and nature of the sounds possessed by the Indg. parent language. These were as follow: —

Vowels. In the function of sonants: *i* \bar{i} , *u* \bar{u} , *e* \bar{e} , *o* \bar{o} , *a* \bar{a} , *ə*. In the function of consonants: \dot{i} , \dot{u} .

Nasals. In the function of consonants: *ŋ* (velar), *ɲ* (palatal), *n* (dental), *m* (labial). In the function of sonants: $\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}$, $\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}$, $\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}$, $\bar{\eta}$ $\bar{\eta}$.

Liquids. In the function of consonants: *r*, *l*. In the function of sonants: \bar{r} \bar{r} , \bar{l} \bar{l} .

Explosives:

<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>ph</i>	<i>bh</i>	(labial).
<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>th</i>	<i>dh</i>	(dental).
<i>k</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>gh</i>	(palatal).
<i>q</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>qh</i>	<i>gh</i>	(velar).

To these is probably further to be added the spiritus lenis, a laryngeal explosive, e. g. Indg. **esti* 'is', Gr. $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$. In the following paragraphs we shall indicate this sound only in Greek words.

Spirants: *s*, *z*, *j*, *v*.

Phonetic Elucidations¹⁾.

§ 16. 1. Voiced and voiceless sounds. Speech-sounds²⁾ are produced by the breath, expelled from the lungs, undergoing a checking which gives rise to an acoustic effect. This checking takes place partly in the larynx, partly in the organs above the larynx (mouth, or nose), and partly in both at the same time. When the checking in the larynx takes place in such a manner that the vocal cords (which in a state of rest are far apart) are so far brought together as to come into (rhythmical) vibration, a musical clang arises which is called voice. All sounds, which are spoken with voice, are called voiced, and all those without voice voiceless. In the Indg. prim. language the vowels, nasals, liquids, of the explosives the mediae *b, d, g, g* and the mediae aspiratae *bh, dh, gh, gh*, and the spirants *z, j, v* were voiced; on the other hand the tenues *p, t, k, q* and the tenues aspiratae *ph, th, kh, qh* and the spirant *s* were voiceless.

The voiceless vowels (the *h*-sounds), nasals and liquids³⁾

1) Cp. Ed. Sievers *Grundzüge der Phonetik, zur Einführung in das Studium der Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen*, 2. Edit. Leipzig 1881, 3. Edit. Leipzig 1885.

2) It is not without considerable justification that the expression 'speech-sound' ('Sprachlaut') has of late been found fault with, so far as it is used to express the smallest elements of language in general, because among the so called explosives there are moments of perfect absence of sound which are also to be taken into consideration. And these moments form an element of a syllable just as much as the moments of sound, while in the analysis of a syllable they can no more be left out of consideration than the pauses in music can be regarded as not existing. Cp. § 320. If in this work we have not attached that amount of importance to the latest principles of phonetics — viz. that in the classification of speech-elements, not their acoustic effect, should form the chief principle — which some phoneticians might wish to see, it is out of consideration that we do not yet possess a system and terminology, based on these views, which might be applied without considerable difficulties to the historical results of the science of languages.

3) Cp. Hoffory Kuhn's *Ztschr.* XXIII 533 ff., 541 ff., 554 ff., XXV 425 f., 'Prof. Sievers und die Principien der Sprachphysiologie' 24 ff.

in the course of the individual developments were added to the respective voiced sounds of the primitive period.

§ 17. 2. Sonorous sounds and noised sounds. The mouth and nose on the one hand, serve to modify the clangs formed in the larynx, on the other hand 'noises', which are independent of the activity of the larynx, can be produced in these organs through the current of breath undergoing a checking and friction. In uttering *t*, *s*, e. g. a noise is made on the inner side of the upper teeth, or on their sockets. Voice and noise formed in the mouth and nose (Ansatzrohrgeräusch) can be combined, e. g. in *d* and *z* (Fr. *zéro*, Russ. *zoloto* 'gold'). Those sounds, which are formed with noise, whether they be voiceless or voiced, are called noised sounds, whereas those, in which the formation of voice takes place in the larynx, while the mouth and nose merely serve as resonance chambers, are called sonorous sounds. The Indg. explosives and spirants were noised sounds, and the Indg. vowels and nasals, sonorous sounds. The *r*- and *l*-sounds were and are in the historic periods of the Indg. languages partly sonorous and partly spirantal in their formation. And it is not improbable, that the spirantal pronunciation, where it occurs in historic times, had everywhere first come into being during the course of the separate history of the respective Indg. languages.

§ 18. 3. Sonants and Consonants. Every syllable contains one sound, which is either alone or at least principally the bearer of the accent, e. g. the bearers of this accent in the word *höff-núng* are *o* and *u*. Such sounds are called sonants. The other elements of a syllable are to a certain extent only adjuncts to the sonant which forms the nucleus of the syllable, and are therefore called consonants. Every syllable must contain one sonant and can contain only one, whereas it can have several consonants (Mod. German *strúmpfs*) or none at all (Lat. imperative *ē*¹). One set of sounds can be used both as sonants and as consonants, especially the vowels —

1) By this classification we omit to take account of the spiritus lenis, which strictly speaking ought to be reckoned among the consonants.

amongst these particularly *i*, *u* —, the nasals and liquids; we write these sounds *i u y, r* etc. when used as sonants, and *ĭ, ŭ, n, r* etc. when used as consonants. Cp. Mod. German *Á-si-en* beside *Á-si-én* (in poets); Lat. *á-quám* beside *á-cú-ám*, *stín-guó* beside *ár-gú-ó*; English *ré-př-zñ-těĭ-šñ* (*representation*); Mod. Germ. *réch-né* beside *ré-chñt* (*rechnet*), *gñ-núg* (*genug*), *hán-dlé* beside *hán-dĭ*, *gř-rá-dé* (*gerade*); Czech *křt* (*krt* 'mole'), *vĭk* (*vlk* 'wolf'); Skr. *pí-trá* (*pitrá*, instr. sg. of *pitár* 'father') beside *pí-tř-šú* (*pitřšu*, loc. pl. of the same word)¹); in Slovakian *sřn*, *vřn* (*srn*, *vln*) gen. pl. to *sř-ná* (*srna* 'roe'), *vř-ná* (*vlna* 'wave').

In our representation of pre-historic forms we consequently mark *i* and *u* also as consonants when they form the second component of a diphthong, e. g. Indg. 3. sg. **éĭti* = Gr. *εἶσι* Skr. *éti*, **bhéydhetaĭ* = Gr. *πεύθεται* Skr. *bódhatē*. The vowels *i* and *u* had here the same function as e. g. *r* in the 3. sg. **bhérti* from rt. *bher*- 'bear' (Skr. *bhárti*, Lat. *fert*) and *n* in the 3. sg. **bhebhóndhe* from rt. *bhendh*- 'bind' (Skr. *babándha*, Goth. *band*). Cp. § 308.

Rem. A few phonetic elucidations on the explosives and spirants will be found in § 320 ff. and § 554.

On the pronunciation of the letters.

§ 19. The various Indg. languages and dialects were and still are written in various alphabets by the respective peoples and their subdivisions. Sometimes different kinds of alphabets were even employed in different districts lying within the sphere of the same dialect, or also in the same district for different purposes, e. g. in Oscan (inscriptions in the Oscan-Samnitic, Latin, and Greek alphabets) and in Servian (the Cyrillic alphabet is employed by the followers of the Greek Church, and the Latin by the Roman catholics). It also frequently happened that one alphabet was permanently given up in favour of another, cp.

¹) Skr. *pitrá* stands in the same relation to *pitřšu* as *hánvā* i. e. *hánvā* does to *hánušu* (stem *hānu*- 'jaw-bone') and as *avyā* i. e. *aviā* does to *avišu* (stem *avi*- 'sheep').

e. g. the change from the runic to the Latin alphabet among the Germanic races.

It has become usual in works on Indg. grammar to employ native characters only in the case of Greek, Latin, and those younger developments which were and still are written in the Latin alphabet, but for the rest to make use of a transcription, based on the Latin alphabet. Now the Latin system of letters is insufficient for the transliteration of most foreign alphabets, and when this is the case, it is usual either to add a diacritic sign to the Latin letter, or to borrow a letter from other known alphabets.

The exposition of the history of the various sounds will furnish further information as to the living value of the letters. With regard to the transcription which we have adopted for the various languages, we simply make such observations here as will enable the reader to pronounce the words correctly or at least approximately so; in the case of dead languages it is, of course, often impossible to determine precisely the value of a letter.

§ 20. Sanskrit. The alphabet is as follows:

a ā i ī u ū ṛ ṝ ḷ ē ai ō au h ṛ k kh g gh ṡ c ch j jh n ṭ ṭh ḍ ḍh ṇ t th d dh n p ph b bh m y r l v ś ṣ s h.

ṛ, ṝ, ḷ are sonants (s. § 18). *ṛ, ṝ* like consonantal *r* are cerebral (cp. *ṭ, ṭh* etc. below), i. e. similar to English *r*; *ḷ* and *l* are dental.

h (visarga) is our spiritus asper.

We indicate the nasal pronunciation of the sonants by *ṝ*, e. g. *aśū-ṣ̄* 'thread, beam of light', acc. *svādīyās-am* 'suaviorem', *ṛ, ṝ* = nasalised *ṛ, ṝ*, e. g. in *tṛhā-ti* 'he shatters', *nṝś-ca* 'viros-que'.

The voiceless aspirate explosives *kh, ch, ṭh, th, ph* and the voiced aspirate explosives *gh, jh, ḍh, dh, bh* are to be pronounced as explosives followed by an *h*, but cp. however Whitney's Skr. Gram. § 37.

The palatals *c, ch, j, jh* are generally pronounced as (compound) *tsh*-sounds, e. g. the initial sounds of *ca* 'and' and *jāna-s* 'creature' like the initial sounds of Italian *cento* and *gente* or those

of English *church* and *judge*. But they were simple sounds, similar to Mod.HG. *k* and *g* before palatal vowels, e. g. in *kind*, *gift*.

The cerebrals (cacuminals) *t*, *th*, *d*, *dh* are uttered with the tip of the tongue turned up and drawn back into the dome of the palate.

ṇ is the guttural, *ṇ̄* the palatal, and *ṇ* the cerebral nasal.

y = *i*, *v* = *u* or spirantal *v*, s. §§ 18. 127. 161.

s is like Mod.HG. dental *s*, cp. *ásti* and Mod.HG. *ist*. On the other hand *ś* and *ṣ* are *sh*-sounds; *ś* is the palatal and *ṣ* the cerebral *sh*-sound; *ṣ̣* is thus the softened *ś* (*sz*) found in Slavonic and Lithuanian.

h is pronounced like our spiritus asper; it was however a voiced sound, the character of which is doubtful, cp. Whitney's *Skr. Gram.* § 65.

§ 21. Iranian.

1. Avestic.

The vowels are: *a i u e ɛ o*

ā ī ū ē ǝ ȳ.

e, *ē* represent the open and *ɛ*, *ǝ* the close *e*-vowel, *ȳ* a dull *a* sound approaching to *ō*. *ɑ* is the nasal vowel of *a* and *ā* (§ 200). *y* = *i* or spirantal, *v* = *u* or spirantal (§§ 18. 127. 161).

Diphthongs: *aɛ* *ōi*, *ao* *ēu*, *āi* *āu*. *aɛ*, *ao* may be pronounced like the *ai*, *au* in the Middle German pronunciation of *kaiser*, *haus* etc. (cp. Bœot. *æ* and Ion. *ao* § 96, Lat. *ae* § 97).

Liquid: *r*. Nasals: *ṇ* guttural, *ṇ̄* is palatalised *n* (§ 200), *n* dental, *m* labial; the value of *ṇ̄* and *ṇ̄̄* is doubtful (§ 558, 3).

Explosives: *k c t p*, *g j d b*. *c* and *j* are like *Skr. c* and *j* (§ 20).

Spirants: *x* = Mod. HG. *ch* in *dach*, to which the corresponding voiced sound is *γ*. *ṣ́*, a palatalised sound, seems to have been similar to the Mod. HG. *ch* in *ich*. *s* = our voiceless *s* in *nest*, *z* = Fr. *z*. *p* = Mod. Gr. *θ* and our *th* in *thin*, *ḍ* = Mod. Gr. *δ* and our *th* in *then*. *f*, *w* = our *f*, *v*. *ś* is our *sh*, *ṣ̣* the corresponding voiced sound = Fr. *j*. *ṣ́* = *Skr. ṣ́*. The pronunciation of *ṣ́*, *p̣*, *ḍ̣* cannot be more exactly defined.

h is our spiritus asper (not = Skr. *h*).

2. Old Persian.

Vowels. *a i u, ā ī ū. y = i* or spirantal (§ 127), *v = u* or spirantal (§ 161). *y* and *v* were not pronounced in words ending in *-iy, īy, -uv, -ūv*. Final *-hy* is to be pronounced as *-hi*. Diphthongs: *ai au, ai āu*.

Liquids: *r, l*.

Nasals: *n, m*.

Explosives: *k c t p, g j d b* as in Avestic. *d* had also the value of *ḍ* (§ 402).

Spirants: *x, s, z, ḫ, f, š* as in Avestic. The value of *š* is not clear (§ 261).

h = Av. *h*.

Difficulties are caused by *iy, uv, īy, ūv*, which in certain special cases represent *y* and *v*, cp. §§ 125. 159. 558, 3.

Rem. The peculiar character of Old Persian cuneiform letters makes it, in some respects, difficult to decipher the words rightly. A syllable consisting of a consonant and a short vowel (*a, i, u*) was represented by one sign (*da, di, du*). Medially and finally the letters *a, i, u*, which initially expressed both *a, i, u* and also *ā, ī, ū*, were added to the corresponding sign to express length of vowel, e. g. *da + a = dā, di + i = dī*. A consonant which was not followed by a vowel, was also always represented by a syllabic sign, e. g. *pa + a + ra + sa + ma = pārsam* (acc. sg. 'a Persian'). Consequently in order to express a final consonant + *a*, an extra letter *a* was added at the end. Therefore, e. g. *-ma + a (-mā)* might mean both *-mā* and *-ma*. The letters *i, u* were usually added again to the signs for consonant + *i*, or *u*, so that e. g. *vi + i + sa + ma* may be read either as *visam* or *visam* and thus we are not able to make a clear distinction between *i, u* and *ī, ū*. Cp. Bartholomae Handbuch p. 5 f. § 21 rem. 1. § 24 rem. 1.

§ 22. Armenian¹).

Vowels. *a, u, i, o, ē, e ē*. *ē* is an indefinite vowel somewhat resembling German *ö*. Pronounce *y, v* as *i, u* (§ 18). Diphthongs: *ea, ai, oi, au, iu*.

Liquids: *r, ṛ; l, λ*. The difference in the pronunciation has not been determined. Nasals: *n, m*.

1) In the transcription of this language we entirely follow Hübschmann. Cp. his treatise 'Die Umschreibung der iranischen Sprachen und des Armenischen' (1882) p. 31 ff.

Explosives: *k t p, g d b*. *k̥ t̥ p̥* are aspirate tenues.

The Affricatae *č ċ j, c ċ j* may be pronounced as *tš thš dz, ts ths dz*¹⁾.

Spirants. *x* is a deep guttural *ch* like the *ch* in Scot. *loch*. *s* and *z*, the latter = Fr. *z*. *š* and *ž*, the former a voiceless, the latter a voiced *sh*-sound.

h = our spiritus asper.

§ 23. Umbrian-Samnitic. The monuments of this dialect-group are almost exclusively inscriptions, which are written partly in the native, partly in the Latin and also occasionally in the Greek alphabet. We reproduce the native writing by spaced Roman type, whereas those words which have come down to us written in the Latin alphabet are printed in italics.

The Umbrian native alphabet does not possess any special letters for *o, g* and *d*, but represents them by *u, k* and *t*.

The *c*, in monuments written in Latin characters, must always be pronounced as *k*.

The sibilant (§§ 387. 502), which arose from *k* before palatal vowels and which we represent by *'s* and *'s* (*s*), may be pronounced like Skr. *ś*. The precise pronunciation of this sound, given by *d* in the native alphabet, and by *'S* (or *S*) in the Latin, is not known.

The modification of *d* (§ 369), which on the tables written in Latin is represented by *rs*, and also occasionally simply by *r* or *s*, has the sign *q* in the native alphabet. It was probably a strongly spirantal *sh*-kind of *r*, similar to Czech *ř*. We transcribe this Umbrian symbol with *ř*, and it may be pronounced like Czech *ř*.

Pronounce *z* as *ts*.

h occurs in both kinds of writing as sign of vowel lengthening, e. g. *kumnahkle* read *kumnākle*, *spahmu* read *spāmu*. On tables written in Latin this sign also appears between a double vowel which in itself already indicates vowel length, e. g. *spahamu* beside *spahmu*.

1) More will be found on the pronunciation of these sounds in Hübschmann's work quoted above p. 35 rem. 3.

Oscan *í* is a close *e*, in the function both of a sonant, e. g. *íst* 'est', and a consonant, e. g. in the diphthong *aí*; *ú* is a close *o*.

Pronounce *z* as *ts*, e. g. *húrz*, *az*, *keenzstur* (*nzs* = *ntss*, cf. *kvaísstur*), *Vezkeí*. But *z* is a voiced *s* (Fr. *z*), e. g. *egmazum*.

In Umbrian-Samnitic we uniformly omit the mark of length over vowels. We write e. g. *matrer* 'matris', although *a* was undoubtedly spoken (§ 105). This plan has been adopted because the cases are too numerous in which the quantity of the vowel can not be determined with certainty.

§ 24. Old Irish writing, a variety of Latin, presents many diphthongs and triphthongs which were in reality only monophthongs and diphthongs. E. g. the *i* in *eich* 'of a horse' and in *tuaith* 'to the people' only marks the *i*-timbre of the following consonant. Hence some write *e'ch tua'ith*. S. § 640.

c is everywhere to be pronounced as *k*. On the pronunciation of *c* and *t* compare moreover § 212 rem. and §§ 513. 658.

ch, *th*, *ph* denote the guttural, interdental, labial voiceless spirants (*χ*, *þ*, *f*), s. § 514. *th* occasionally also stands for the voiced interdental spirant *ð*. *g*, *d*, *b* are both voiced mediae (§ 519) and voiced spirants *ȝ*, *ð*, *b* (§ 522), *g* and *d* are even also used for the voiceless spirants *χ* and *þ* (§ 514). In Middle Irish *gh*, *dh*, *bh* took the place of *g*, *d*, *b* as signs for the voiced spirants; after the manner of Modern Irish we pronounce *gh* and *dh* before or after a palatal vowel like our *y* and before or after other vowels as *ȝ*.

ś is *h*. *ḡ* is silent. *mh* is a nasalised labial spirant.

Rem. In the Britannic dialects *u* has the sound of *ü*, in the greater part of Wales that of *i*. So far as Cymric is specially concerned, it may be remarked that *y* denotes partly a vowel, similar to that in the English word *fur*, and partly = Cymr. *u*; *w* is partly a sonantal vowel *u* and partly *u̯*; *ch*, *th*, *ff* (*ph*) are voiceless, and *dd*, *f* voiced spirants; *m*, *n*, *r*, *l* are voiced, *mh*, *nh*, *rh*, *ll* voiceless. These values apply in the first instance to the living language only.

§ 25. Gothic.

ai is a short open *e*, and *au* a short open *o*. On the other hand *ái* and *áu* are to be pronounced as diphthongs. Antevocalic *ai* and *au* (e. g. *saian* and *stana*) were probably the long vowels to *ái* and *áu*, i. e. open \bar{e} and open \bar{o} (§§ 142. 179). Gothic writing leaves both *ai*, *ái*, *ai* and *au*, *áu*, *au* undistinguished.

ei = \bar{e} . \bar{e} and \bar{o} were close. *v* = *u*, *j* = *i* (§ 18).

The guttural nasal (ŋ) was generally (after the analogy of Greek) expressed by *g* before homorganic explosives, e. g. *laggs* 'long', *drigkan* 'to drink', seldom by *gg* (*drigggkan*) or *n* (*bringan* 'to bring').

q (e. g. *riqis* 'darkness') = Lat. *qu*.

d initially and medially after *n*, *l*, *r*, *z* was a voiced explosive, whereas medially after vowels it was the interdental spirant ð . *b* initially and medially after consonants was a voiced explosive, whereas medially after vowels it was the labial spirant ɸ . A corresponding difference is also to be assumed for *g*. S. §§ 530. 538 and cp. also §§ 531. 539.

þ is a voiceless interdental, *f* a bilabial spirant, *z* = Fr. *z*.

Pronounce initial *h* before vowels (e. g. *haban* 'to have') like our spiritus asper, in other cases (e. g. *hláifs* 'loaf, bread', *raih̄ts* 'right', *táuh* 'I led') it is a spirant like German *ch*.

§ 26. Lithuanian.

Vowels: *a e i u*, \bar{a} \bar{e} \bar{y} \bar{u} , \acute{e} \acute{o} . *e* and \bar{e} are to be pronounced very open. \bar{y} = \bar{e} . \acute{e} and \acute{o} are very close and always long (hence we omit the sign of vowel length). The vowels ą ę į ų do not differ in pronunciation from *a e i u*; initially and medially they are always to be pronounced long, finally they are partly long, partly short. The little hook under a vowel indicates that the vowel was originally followed by a nasal, this sign has therefore only an etymological value (§ 218).

Diphthongs: *ai ei au*, $\bar{a}\bar{i}$ $\bar{e}\bar{i}$ $\bar{a}\bar{u}$, $\acute{u}\acute{i}$ $\acute{o}\acute{i}$ $\acute{e}\acute{u}$. The *o* in *oi* is to be pronounced long; this diphthong occurs in locatives as *toi* (from the feminine pronominal stem *to*- 'this'), where it is usually

written *-oj* (*toj*). Pronounce *ē* as *ɛ̃* with a very open *ɛ* or as *ɛ̃ɑ*. Pronounce *ū* as *ũ* with a very open *u* or as *ũɑ*.

When the accent is on a short vowel, it is represented by ' e. g. *piktas* 'bad'. In cases where ' and ~ are placed over simple vowels to indicate the accent, these vowels are always to be read long, e. g. *vārpa* 'ear of corn', *gėras* 'good'. In like manner *ái áu éi* are also to be read as *áí, áu, éi*. More will be found on the accent signs ' and ~ in § 691. *j* is to be pronounced as *i̯*, and *v* as a spirant (English *v*)¹).

Liquids: *r, l*. On the difference between *l* and *l̥* see 'Palatalisation of Consonants' below.

Nasals: *n, m*. *n* is to be pronounced as *ɲ* (guttural nasal) before *k* and *g*, e. g. in *rankà* 'hand'.

Explosives: *k t p* (voiceless), *g d b* (voiced).

Spirants: *s, z* (= Fr. *z*), *sz* (= our *sh*), *ž* (voiced *sh*, Fr. *j*).

c = *ts*, *cz* = English *tsh*.

Palatalisation of Consonants. All consonants (with the exception of *j*) are liable to palatalisation. This uniformly takes place before palatal vowels (*e, é, i, y*): the *t, n, r, ž* in *svėte, kúne, múre, bėrže* (voc. sg. of the stems *svėta-* 'world', *kúna-* 'body', *múra-* 'wall', *bėrža-* 'birch') are therefore not to be pronounced the same as in *svėtas, kúnas, múras, bėržas* (nom. sg. of the same stems). When palatalised pronunciation takes place before non-palatal vowels, it is indicated by an *i* placed after the consonant, but this *i* must neither be read as syllabic *i* nor as *i̯*, e. g. *kiaũlė* 'pig', *pióviau* 'I cut' (past t.), *piáusiau* 'I shall cut', *nėsziau* 'I shall carry'. We express the non-palatalised *l* by *l̥*; it is the 'guttural' *l*, which in those districts bordering on Poland, has a great resemblance to Polish *ł*, and often sounds like *u*, s. § 280. *l̥* is the palatalised liquid; we therefore write *galũ* 'I can', not *galũ̃*²).

1) This fixing of the pronunciation of *v* is on the authority of Schleicher, who had Prussian Lithuanian in mind. It is pronounced *ʋ* in one part of Russian Lithuania.

2) In this mode of writing we have followed Juskiewicz.

§ 27. Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian).

a e o i ĭ u ŭ y ě. *e* and *o* are open. Pronounce *ĭ* as a very close *ě*; *ŭ* somewhat the same as the *u* in English *but*; *ě* as *ē*; *y* as *ū*. On the quantity of *a, i, u, y, ě* cp. § 615. *e* and *q* are nasal vowels, the former = Fr. *in*, the latter = Fr. *on*. *j* = *i*, *v* = *u* or spirantal (§ 186).

ch like German *ch* in *ach*, *š* like English *sh*, *z* like Fr. *j*, *z* like Fr. *z*.

c = *ts*, *č* = *tsh* (Lith. *cz*).

Rem. We use *m, n* to denote the prim. Baltic-Slavonic representation of Indg. *m, n*. See §§ 248. 302. Pronounce the *z* as a sound lying between *i* and *e*.

HISTORY OF THE SEPARATE PRIMITIVE INDO-GERMANIC SOUNDS¹⁾.

THE VOWELS²⁾.

A. THE VOWELS AS SONANTS.

§ 28. The Indo-Germanic parent-language had *i ĭ, u ŭ, e ē, o ō, a ā, a*.

e, o (both long and short) were probably pronounced open. Hence some scholars write them *á, â*. On the representation

1) Cp. § 599.

2) Amelung die Bildung der Tempusstämme durch Vocalsteigerung im Deutschen (1871); Ztschr. f. deutsch. Altert. XVIII 161 ff., Kuhn's Ztschr. XXII 369. — Osthoff in Paul-Braune's Beitr. III 1 ff., Morph. Unt. I 207 ff., IV 1 ff., Zur Gesch. des Perf. (1884). — The Author in Curtius' Stud. IX 361 ff., Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 1 ff., XXVII 201 ff., Morph. Unt. III 91 ff., Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissensch. 98 ff. — Fick in Bezenberger's Beitr. II 193 ff., III 157 ff., IV 167 ff., IX 313 ff., Gött. gel. Anz. 1880 p. 420 ff., 1881 p. 1425 ff. — Collitz in Bezenberger. Beitr. II 291 ff., III 177 ff., X 1 ff. — Ferd. Masing Das Verhältniss der griechischen Vocalabstufung zur sanskritischen (1878). — Verner in Morph. Unt. I 116 ff. — G. Meyer Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 226 ff. — Paul in Paul-Braune's Beitr. VI 108 ff. — Kluge Beitr. zur Gesch. d.

§ 27. Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian).

a e o i ĭ u ŭ y ě. *e* and *o* are open. Pronounce *ĭ* as a very close *ě*; *ŭ* somewhat the same as the *u* in English *but*; *ě* as *ĕ*; *y* as *ÿ*. On the quantity of *a*, *i*, *u*, *y*, *ě* cp. § 615. *e* and *q* are nasal vowels, the former = Fr. *in*, the latter = Fr. *on*. *j* = *i*, *v* = *u* or spirantal (§ 186).

ch like German *ch* in *ach*, *š* like English *sh*, *z* like Fr. *j*, *z* like Fr. *z*.

c = *ts*, *č* = *tsh* (Lith. *cz*).

Rem. We use *m*, *pr* to denote the prim. Baltic-Slavonic representation of Indg. *m*, *p*. See §§ 248. 302. Pronounce the *z* as a sound lying between *i* and *e*.

HISTORY OF THE SEPARATE PRIMITIVE INDO-GERMANIC SOUNDS¹⁾.

THE VOWELS²⁾.

A. THE VOWELS AS SONANTS.

§ 28. The Indo-Germanic parent-language had *i ĭ*, *u ŭ*, *e ě*, *o ō*, *a ā*, *ə*.

e, *o* (both long and short) were probably pronounced open. Hence some scholars write them *á*, *â*. On the representation

1) Cp. § 599.

2) Amelung die Bildung der Tempusstämme durch Vocalsteigerung im Deutschen (1871); Ztschr. f. deutsch. Altert. XVIII 161 ff., Kuhn's Ztschr. XXII 369. — Osthoff in Paul-Braune's Beitr. III 1 ff., Morph. Unt. I 207 ff., IV 1 ff., Zur Gesch. des Perf. (1884). — The Author in Curtius' Stud. IX 361 ff., Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 1 ff., XXVII 201 ff., Morph. Unt. III 91 ff., Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissensch. 98 ff. — Fick in Bezenberger's Beitr. II 193 ff., III 157 ff., IV 167 ff., IX 313 ff., Gött. gel. Anz. 1880 p. 420 ff., 1881 p. 1425 ff. — Collitz in Bezenberg. Beitr. II 291 ff., III 177 ff., X 1 ff. — Ferd. Masing Das Verhältniss der griechischen Vocalabstufung zur sanskritischen (1878). — Verner in Morph. Unt. I 116 ff. — G. Meyer Kuhn's Ztschr. XXIV 226 ff. — Paul in Paul-Braune's Beitr. VI 108 ff. — Kluge Beitr. zur Gesch. d.

of these vowels cp. the Author in Curtius' Stud. IX 367, Morph. Unt. II p. III, Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 201 ff.

The value of *a* can not be more precisely defined. It may be pronounced as *ä*, that is, an *a* somewhat approaching the sound of *e*.

The regular representation of these prim. Indg. vowels in the individual developments is as follows:

Idg.	Ar.	Arm.	Greek	Lat. (in accented syllables).	O. Irish (in accented syllables).	Teutonic.	Baltic-Slavonic	
							Lith.	O. Bulg.
<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>i, e</i>	<i>i, e</i>	<i>i, e</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>ĩ</i>
<i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>i</i> (?)	<i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>	<i>ī</i>	Got. <i>ei</i> i. e. <i>ī</i> , OHG. <i>ī</i>	<i>y</i> i. e. <i>ī</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>u</i> (Boeo- tian etc. <i>u</i>)	<i>u</i>	<i>u, o</i>	<i>u, o</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ũ</i>
<i>ū</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>u</i> (?)	<i>ū</i> (Boeo- tian etc. <i>ū</i>)	<i>ū</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>ū</i>	<i>y</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e, i</i>	<i>ε</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e, i</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>
<i>ē</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>η</i>	<i>ē</i>	<i>ī</i>	Got. <i>ē</i> , OHG. <i>ā</i>	<i>ē</i>	<i>ē</i>
<i>o</i>	<i>a, ā</i>	<i>o, (u)</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>o</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>
<i>ō</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ω</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>ā</i>	Got. <i>ō</i> , OHG. <i>uo</i>	<i>ũ</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>
<i>ā</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>ā</i>	<i>ā</i>	Got. <i>ō</i> , OHG. <i>uo</i>	<i>ō</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>α</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>o</i>

german. Conjugation 1 ff. — De Saussure Mémoire sur le système primitif des voyelles dans les langues indo-européennes (1879). — Mahlow Die langen Vocale A, E, O in den eur. Sprachen (1879). — Möller in Paul-Braune's Beitr. VII 482 ff. — Bezenberger in his Beitr. V 312 ff. Fröhde Bezenberger's Beitr. V 265 ff., VI 161 ff., VII 97 ff. — J. Schmidt in Kuhn's Ztschr. XXV 1 ff. — Bartholomae Ar. Forsch. I 25 ff. — Bloomfield American Journal of Philology I 281 ff. — W. Schulze Kuhn's Ztschr. XXVII 420 ff. — Curtius Zur Kritik der neuesten Sprachforschung 90 ff. — Delbrück die neueste Sprachf. 30 ff. — Hübschmann Das indogerm. Vocalsystem (1885). — Bremer in Paul-Braune's Beitr. XI 262 ff.

Indg. *i*.

§ 29. Indg. **i-* weak present-stem of rt. *ei-* 'go'; 1. pers. pl. Skr. *i-más*, Gr. *ἰ-μεν*. Indg. **uid-* weak perfect stem of rt. *ueid-* 'see, know': 1. pers. pl. Skr. *vid-má*, Hom. *ἴδ-μεν*, Goth. *vit-um*. Indg. **diu-* 'sky': loc. sing. Skr. *div-i*, Gr. *Δι-ι*. Indg. **i-* pronoun of the 3. pers.: Skr. neut. *i-d-ám*, Lat. *i-s i-d*, Goth. *i-s* 'he' *i-t-a* 'it'. Indg. *-i-* in reduplicated syllables, e. g. pres. Skr. *tí-ṣṭhāmi* (3. pers. sing. *tíṣṭhati*), Gr. *ἰ-στυμι*, Lat. *si-stō* from rt. *sta-* 'stand', Skr. *bi-bhēmi*, OHG. *bi-bēm* from rt. *bhej-* 'tremble at, be in fear'.

Nominal suffixes Indg. *-i-*, *-ti-*, *-ni-*, e. g. Skr. *ávi-ṣ* 'ovis', Gr. *ὄι-ς* *oi-s*, Lat. *ovi-s*, O.Ir. dat. pl. *tri-b* 'tribus', Goth. dat. pl. *gasti-m* 'to guests', Lith. *akì-s* 'eye', O.Bulg. *paťi* 'way' fr. **paťi-s* (§ 588, 7). Superlative suffix Indg. *-is-to-*, e. g. Skr. *svád-iṣṭha-s* Gr. *ῥῑδ-ιστο-ς* Goth. *sut-ista-* 'suavissimus', cp. also Lat. *mag-is-ter*. Locative suffix Indg. *-i*, e. g. Skr. *div-i*, Gr. *Δι-ι*, Lat. *rūr-e*. Personal ending Indg. *-mi*, e. g. Skr. *ás-mi*, Gr. *εἰμι* fr. **éσ-μι* (§ 565), Lith. *es-mì*, O.Bulg. *jes-mì*.

§ 30. Aryan. Interrogative and indefinite pronoun *ci-*, Skr. *ci-d* Av. *ci-p* O.Pers. *ciy* (read *cì*), enclitic particle: Gr. *τι-ς* *ti-s*, Lat. *qui-s*, Indg. **qi-s* **qi-d*. Skr. *viṣ-* O.Pers. *vīp-* 'clan', Indg. **uik-*: cp. O.Bulg. *vīs-ī* 'vicus' from **uik-i-s*. Skr. *dīṣṭi-* 'order, direction', Av. *ā-diṣti-* 'assignment': OHG. MHG. *in-ziht* 'accusation', Indg. **dīkti-*. Skr. *ásti* Av. *asti* O.Pers. *astiy* (read *asti*) 'is': Gr. *ἔστι* O.Bulg. *jestī* 'is', Indg. **és-ti*. Skr. *ihí* Av. *idi* O.Pers. *idīy* (read *idi*) 'go': Gr. *ἴθι*, Indg. **i-dhí*.

§ 31. Armenian *e-liḱ* 'he left': Gr. *ἔ-ληπε*, from rt. *leiq-*. *e-git* 'he found' (*g* from *u*, § 162): Skr. *á-vid-a-t*, from rt. *ueid-*. *tiv* 'day': Skr. instr. *dīvā* 'by day'. Stem *eri-* 'three' = Indg. **tri-* (for the initial forms cp. §§ 263. 483), instr. *eri-vḱ*: cp. Skr. *tri-bhīṣ*.

i, except in final syllables, disappeared e. g. *gt-ane-m* 'I find', *lk-ane-m* 'I leave'. Cp. § 632.

§ 32. Greek. *πιθ-έ-σθαι* 'to obey': Lat. *fid-ēs*, from rt. *bheidh-*. *di-* 'two' (from **di-*, § 166) in *di-ς*, *di-πovς*: Skr. *dvi-*, Lat. *bi-*, Ags. *twi-*, OHG. *zwi-*, Indg. **dwi-*. *ἐπι* 'on': Skr. *ápi*.

The *ε* in Elean πόλεσθ (= Att. πόλις) beside πόλιν and in Thessal. κρεννέμεν (inf., cp. Lesb. κρέννην, Att. κρένειν), Ὑβρίστας (= Att. Ὑβρίστης) seems to have arisen through the proximity of the *ρ*.

§ 33. Italic. Lat. *qui-s*, Umbr. Osc. *pi-s*: Gr. τίς. Lat. *mi-nu-ō mi-nor*, Osc. *mi-nstreis* 'minoris': Skr. *mi-nō-mi* Gr. *μν-ω μν-θω* 'lessen', Goth. adv. *mi-ns* 'minus', O.Bulg. *mъ-nijъ* 'minor', from rt. *meġ-*. Lat. *tri-* in *tri-bus tri-plex*, Umbr. *tri-pler* 'triplicis': Skr. *tri-*, Gr. *τρι-*.

Already at an early period Lat. *i* had a tendency towards *e* close (open *i* or *i* pingue), hence e. g. the spelling *tempestatibus* (C. I. L. 32) for *tempes-tāti-bus* (cp. Skr. *ariṣṭātāti-bhyas* dat., abl. pl. of *ariṣṭā-tāti-* 'unimpairedness'). This was especially so before vowels (where *i* had partly arisen from *i̇*, see § 135), hence the inscriptional forms *fileai*, *Oveo* for *filiai*, *Ovio*. This intermediate sound was also represented by *ei*, e. g. *fileiai*.

e purum arose from *i*:

1. Before *r* = Indg. *s* (§ 569). *serō* from **si-sō*: Gr. ἥμα, original form **si-sē-mi*, from rt. *sē-* 'throw, sow'. *cineris* fr. **cinis-is*, cp. *cinis-culu-s*.

2. Finally. *mare* fr. **mari*, *leve* fr. **levi*, cp. *mari-a mari-timus*, *levi-bus levi-ter*, and Gr. neut. ἰδοι 'acquainted with', Skr. *bhūri* 'multum'. Loc. sing. *rūr-e*: cp. Skr. *div-i*. ante fr. **anti* cp. *anti-stō*, Gr. ἀντί, Skr. *ánti*.

Rem. 1. On the other hand the *e* in the suffix of the acc. case sing. of *eġ*-stems as *ignem* (Skr. *agnī-m*, Lith. *ūgnī*), *mortem* (Skr. *mṛti-m*, O.Bulg. *sū-mrūtī*), *facilem* (cp. *facili-a*), was borrowed from such forms as *ped-em* (-em = Indg. -m. §§ 224, 238), as *siti-m*, *parti-m* etc. show. The *e* in *jū-dex*, *in-dex* beside *-dic-is* etc. (from rt. *deġk-* 'direct', Skr. *dīś-* 'order, direction', Gr. δῖκ-η) and the *e* in *comes* by the side of *comitis* etc. (stem *com-i-t-* 'accompanying', from rt. *eġ-* 'go') has also probably arisen through the influence of analogy; cp. *opi-fex* beside *faciō*, *super-stes* beside *status* etc.

The combination *-ri-*, between consonants in unaccented syllables (according to the principle of accentuation in primitive Latin, § 680), became *r̥*, which passed into *er*. *in-certu-s* fr. **in-*

cri-to-s = Gr. ἄκριτο-ς, *sē-cernō* fr. **sē-crinō*. *abs-tergō* fr. **abs-trigō* (cp. Gr. τριβω); later also uncompounded *cernō*, *tergō*, cp. § 65 rem. 2. In the same manner, perhaps, also arose the forms *cōn-testor testor testāmentu-m* (*test-* from **terst-*, cp. § 269) beside Osc. *trīstaamentud* abl. 'testamento'. The process was the same as that whereby **agro-s* (Gr. ἀρό-ς) became **agrs* **agers* and lastly *ager* (§ 623 rem. 1. 655, 9). This process may be dated back to the Italic primitive period. Cp. also § 633.

Rem. 2. *ācri-bus ācri-tās* etc. are new forms, made by analogy.

The orthographical fluctuation in Umbrian between *i* and *e*, as neut. *piŕ-e pirs-e*, *peŕ-e pers-e* 'quid, quodcunque'; imper. *aha-tripursatu*, *ah-trepuratu* 'abs-tripodato'; acc. sing. of *eŕ-* stems in *-i-m* and *-e-m*, and the Oscan representation of this sound in its native alphabet by *í*, e. g. *píd* 'quid', *slagí-m* acc. sing. of the stem *slagi-* 'locus', show that *i* was pronounced open in both dialects.

§ 34. Old Irish. *fiss* 'knowledge' from prim. Ir. **uissu-s*, that is, **uid+tu-s*, root. *ueid-*. *fid* 'tree' from prim. Kelt. **uidu-s* (Gall. *Vidu-casses*): OHG. *witu* 'wood'. Gen. sing. *fir* fr. **firi* from Indg. stem **ui-ro-* 'man': Lat. *vir*, Goth. *vair* fr. **uira-z* (§ 35).

Cp. also Gall. *Ambi-gatus* (Liv.), *Ἀμφι-δαυοί* (Ptol.): Gr. ἀμφί; Gall. *tri-* 'three' in *tri-garanus*, O.Ir. dat. pl. *tri-b* 'tribus'.

i became *e* (by assimilation), when an *a* or *o* stood in the following syllable e. g. *fer* nom. sg. fr. original **uiro-s*, *fedo* *fedā* gen. sg. to *fid*.

In syllables with secondary accent *i*, so far as it did not entirely disappear (§§ 634. 657), became an irrational vowel, whose quality regulated itself after the timbre of the following consonants. E. g. beside the simple *fiss* stood the compound *cúbus* 'conscientia' fr. **cón-f(i)uss*, that is, the *u*-timbre of the *ss* (presupposed through the older form **uissu-s*) had caused the preceding irrational vowel to become *u* in the compound, whilst it left the accented *i* in the simple *fiss* unchanged. The *u* in *fiuss* beside *fiss* merely indicates the *u*-timbre of the *ss*.

§ 35. Germanic. Goth. *viduō* OHG. *wituwa* OS. *widowa* Ags. *widewe* 'widow': Skr. *vidhāvā-*, Lat. *vidua*, O.Ir. *fedb*, O.Bulg. *vidova*. Pret. 1. pers. pl. Goth. *bitum* OHG. *bizzum* O.Icel. *bitom* 'we bit': Skr. *bi-bhidimá*, Lat. *fidimus*. Goth. *fisks* OHG. and OS. *fisk* O.Icel. *fiskr* 'fish': Lat. *piscis*. Pronominal stem *hi-* 'this', Goth. dat. sing. *hi-mma* 'huic' adv. *hi-drē* 'huc', Engl. *hither*: Lat. *ci-* in *ci-ter ci-trā*, Lith. *szi-s* O.Bulg. *sī* 'hic' (§ 84. rem. 1), Indg. **kī-*.

In Gothic *i*, before *h* and *r*, became *ai*, that is, open *e*. *maihstus* 'dung': OHG. *mist* 'dung', Ags. *mist* 'misty vapour', Skr. *mih-* Gr. *μίχλη* O.Bulg. *mīgla* Lith. *miglā* 'fog'. *vair* (pl. *vairōs*) 'man': Lat. *vir*, O.Ir. *fer*, Indg. **ui-ro-s*.

In High German, the Indg. and Prim. Germanic *i* became *e* through the influence of a following *a*, *e* or *o* (cp. Irish). OHG. *wehsal* 'change': Dutch *wissel* O.Icel. *vīxl* 'change', prim. Germ. stem **uixsla-*, Lat. *vic- vic-ēs* 'change', Gr. *φέρω* 'yield'. *lecchōn* 'to lick': Ags. *liccean* 'to lick', Gr. *λινέω* 'I lick'. *wer* 'man': Goth. *vair*. *wessa* 'I knew': Goth. *vissa* 'I knew', pret. of OHG. *wizzan* Goth. *vitan* 'to know'. To this rule there are a number of exceptions of which some are difficult to explain. It may be assumed that they have arisen through form-association, e. g. in *-zigan* 'pulled together' by the side of pret. pl. *zigum* opt. *zigi* from rt. **deik-* 'show', and in *wissa* (= *wessa*) by the side of *wissum*, *wissi*. Cp. Paul's article in Paul and Braune's Beitr. VI 82 ff.

Rem. Some scholars assume that *i*, already in prim. Germanic, passed into *e* through the influence of an *a* or *o* of the following syllable, e. g. in OHG. *wehsal*. The difficulties, however, opposed to this theory seem to me greater than those presented by the hypothesis given above.

§ 36. Baltic-Slavonic. Lith. *pikis* (gen. *pikio*) O.Bulg. *pīklū* 'pitch': Lat. *pix*, Gr. *πίσσα* (from **πικια*, § 489) 'pitch'. Lith. *limpū* (pret. *lipaū*) 'I stick' (intr.), O.Bulg. *pri-līnā* from **līpnā* (§ 545) 'I stick to, remain hanging': Skr. *limpāti* 'he smears', Gr. *λίπος* (neut.) 'fat'. Lith. *deszinė* 'right hand', O.Bulg. *desīnū* 'dexter': Skr. *dākṣiṇa-* 'dexter'. Lith. *tri-sė*, O.Bulg. *trī-chū*: Skr. *tri-śū*, Gr. *τρι-σί*, loc. pl. from *tri-* 'three'.

In one portion of the Lithuanian dialects *i* is at the present day pronounced very open; hence such frequent spellings as *lepau lepo* = *lipaũ lipo* 1. and 3. pers. sing. pret. of *limpù*.

Slavonic *ĩ* must, already in prim. Slav., have been a reduced sound, with a quality approaching *e*.

In Modern Slavonic developments *ĩ* became a full vowel in closed syllables (such syllables often arose through the falling out of an *ĩ* or *ũ* in the following syllable), Russ. *e*, Serv. *a*: e. g. Russ. *den'* Serv. *dan* = O.Bulg. *dǣnǫ* 'day'; Russ. *čest'* Serv. *čast* = O.Bulg. *čistǫ* 'honour'. On the other hand final *ĩ* as a sonantal vowel disappeared in every case; e. g. Russ. *dam* = O.Bulg. *da-mǫ* Lith. *dũ-mi* 'I give' (Balt.-Slav. original form **dōdmi* from rt. *dō-*, Gr. *δίδομι*, § 547). Medial *ĩ* also, as a rule, disappeared in open syllables, e. g. Russ. *vdová* = O.Bulg. *vidova* 'widow'; Serv. *dne* = O.Bulg. *dǣn-e* gen. sing. of *dǣn-* 'day'. All these modifications can be traced as far back as the period of Old Church Slavonic. On the one hand they follow from such double spellings as *trechũ trǣchũ*, *pqtemĩ pqtĩmĩ* (instr. sing.), *pqtechũ pqtǣchũ* loc. pl. from *pqtĩ* 'way', *denĩ dǣnĩ* 'day', *vesĩ vǣsĩ* 'entire', *levũ lǣvũ* 'lion' — these forms can only be understood by assuming that the final *-ĩ* and *-ũ* were no longer syllabic (because *e* did not become *ĩ* e. g. in *pqtĩmi* Instr. pl.)¹⁾ — on the other hand from such double spellings as *vsi vǣsi* gen. 'vici' (cp. Skr. *vīś-* 'clan'), *psati pǣsati* 'to write' (cp. Skr. *piś-* 'adorn', rt. *peĩk-* 'cut, cut out'). The same laws hold for *ĩ* in the combinations *ĩn*, *ĩm*, *ĩr* from Indg. *ṛn*, *ṛm*, *ṛr* (§§ 252. 305). E. g. pres. O.Bulg. *mǣnq* 'I press, tread under foot': Lith. *minũ* 'I tread', original form **mṛn-ō*, rt. *men-*; thence Russ. *mnu*. O.Bulg. *tĩmǣnica* 'prison' from *tĩmǣnũ* 'dark', adj. to *tĩma* 'darkness' from **tṛm-ā* rt. *tem-*; thence Russ. and also already O.Bulg. *temnica*. O.Bulg. *tĩrq* 'tero' original form **tṛr-ām*, thence Russ. *tru*. The analogous treatment of *ũ* § 52 may also be compared with these modifications of *ĩ*.

¹⁾ Cp. also such spellings as *legũko* (i. e. *legko*) for *lǣgũko* 'leve, facile' (§ 52).

i before *j* became *i* in the period of Old Church Slavonic. *prīja-znī* and *prija-znī* 'love, 'good will': Skr. *priyā-* 'dear', Goth. *frijōn* 'to love', Indg. adj. **priyō-* 'dear'. Gen. pl. *trījī* and *trijī*: Lith. *trijū* 'trium'. *i* in the combination *-ij-* from Indg. *-ei-* (§ 68) underwent the same treatment, e. g. *vīja* and *vija* = Lith. *vejū* 'I turn, wind', Skr. *váyami*, Indg. **uēiō*. The change of *ū* to *y* before *j* went parallel to this modification, e. g. *dobrūjī* and *dobryjī* 'the good man' (§ 84).

Rem. In the Zographos gospel *ū* frequently is found for *i* before non-palatal vowels; e. g. *vūdova* 'widow'. Cp. § 252 rem. and § 305 rem.

Indg. *i*.

§ 37. Indg. **gī-yo-s* 'living': Skr. *jīvá-s*, Lat. *vīvo-s*, Lith. *gýva-s* O.Bulg. *živū*. Indg. **pī-yo-*, **pī-yen-*: Skr. *pī-van-* 'swelling (partic.), plump, fat', Gr. *πῖ-(F)ο-ς* *πῖ-(F)ων* 'fat, plump'. Indg. **sī-men-*: Skr. *sī-mán-* 'parting of the hair on the top of the head', Gr. *ῖ-μας* (st. *ῖ-μαρ-τ-*) 'a leathern strap, rein', *ῖ-μον-ιά* 'rope of a draw-well', O.Icel. *sī-me sī-mi* 'cord, rope'.

Nominal suffix-form Indg. *-i-*: Skr. *naptī-ś* 'daughter, grand-daughter', *vidūṣī* 'idvīā', Lat. *vic-tr-i-c-s*, Goth. *frijōndi* 'female-friend' from prim. Germanic **frijōnd-i* (§ 660, 2), Lith. *vīlkusi* O.Bulg. *vīlkūsi* from prim. Baltic-Slav. **vīlkusī* (§§ 303. 664), fem. particip. pret. act. of Lith. *velkū* O.Bulg. *vīčkā* 'I draw, pull' (rt. *uēlq-*). Nominal suffix *-īno-*, forming adjectives denoting origin or material: Lat. *haed-īnu-s*, Goth. *gáit-eins* 'kid's', Lat. *su-īnu-s*, O.Bulg. *sv-inū* 'pig's', Goth. *sv-ein* (neut.) 'a pig' (cp. *gáitein* neut. 'a young he-goat'), Gr. *zogax-īvo-ς* 'a young raven'. Indg. *-ī* the ending of the Nom. Acc. dual of *ei*-stems: Skr. *pāti* to nom. sing. *pāti-ś* 'master', O.Ir. *fáith* (original form **uāti*) to nom. sing. *fáith* (original form **uāti-s*) 'poet', Lith. *naktī* O.Bulg. *nošti* (prim. Baltic-Slav. **noktī*, § 664, 3) to nom. sing. Lith. *naktī-s* O.Bulg. *noštī* 'night'. Weak form of the optative suffix *-ī-*: Skr. *dviṣ-ī-māhi* 1. pers. pl. Mid. of *dvēṣ-mi* 'I hate', Gr. *εἰδεῖμεν* from **εἰδεσ-ī-μεν* to *ᾔδεα* 'I knew' from **ῥ-φεἰδ-εσ-α*, Lat. *s-i-mus*, Goth. *vīl-ei-ma* = Lat. *vel-i-mus*,

OHG. 1. pers. pl. $s\bar{i}-m$ $s\bar{i}-n$ 'we may be' = Lat. *sīmus*, O.Bulg. *jad-i-mŭ* from *jad-* (*ēd-*) 'eat' (§ 76), cp. Lat. *ed-ī-mus*.

Rem. Of all the prim. Indg. vowels \bar{i} is the one which has been least changed in the development of the separate languages.

§ 38. Aryan. Skr. *vī-rá-s* Av. *vī-ra-* 'man, hero': Umbr. *veiro-* 'vir' (cp. § 41), secondary form of Indg. **uī-ro-s* (§ 34), denoted originally, 'endowed with strength', and is related to Lat. *vī-s*. Skr. *jī-rá-* Avest. *-jī-ra-* 'active', imper. 2. pers. sing. Skr. *jīva* O.Pers. *jīva* (read *jīva*) 'live'. Skr. *bṛhat-ī-m* Avest. *ber^ezait-ī-m* 'magnam, altam', cpf. **bhṛgh-nt-ī-m*.

§ 39. Armenian. I do not know any certain examples for the representation of \bar{i} . See, however, *siun* 'pillar' = Gr. $\sigma\iota\omega\nu$ and *cin* 'milvus' = Gr. $\lambda\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in Hübschmann's Arm. Stud. I 49. 53.

§ 40. Greek. \bar{i} -ς \bar{i} -φι 'strength': Lat. *vī-s*. \bar{i} ό-ς 'poison' fr. **Fīso-ς*: Lat. *vīru-s*, O.Ir. *fī*. \bar{i} ῖγος 'frost': Lat. *frīgus* (§ 570). $\pi\acute{\iota}$ -νω 'I drink', imper. $\pi\bar{i}$ -θι: Skr. *pī-tá-s* 'drunk, having drunk' *pī-ti-ś* 'draught (of liquids)', O.Bulg. *pī-ti* 'to drink' *pī-vo* (neut.) 'potus, beer'.

§ 41. Italic. Lat. *vīvo-s*, Osc. *bivus* nom. pl. 'vivi'. Lat. *in-clī-nō*, *ac-clī-ni-s*: Gr. $\kappa\lambda\bar{i}-v\eta$ $\kappa\lambda\bar{i}-\tau\acute{\upsilon}-ς$, Skr. *abhi-śrī-ṇā-ti* 'leads on, unites with'. Lat. *s-ī-mus*, Umbr. 2. pers. sing. *sir* 'sis', Osc. *fefac-i-d* 'fecerit' opt. of redupl. perf. (cp. Skr. 3. pers. sing. opt. pf. mid. *va-vṛt-ī-tá* from *vart-* 'roll, turn'); the *-i-* (*-ī-*) in the Umbr. and Osc. forms, as well as in Lat. *sim sīs* (O.Lat. *siem siēs*), has been taken over from the 1. and 2. pers. pl. Osc. *li-mu* 'famem': Gr. $\lambda\bar{i}-\mu\acute{o}-ς$.

In Latin *ei* was also written for this \bar{i} , e. g. *veivos*, *faxseis*. It was not, however, pronounced as a diphthong, but as a long (probably open) *i*. The old diphthong *ei* in *deicō* (cp. $\delta\epsilon\iota\kappa-\nu\bar{u}-\mu\iota$), *feidō* (cp. $\pi\epsilon\iota\theta\omega$) etc. had become \bar{i} , but the spelling *ei* for this \bar{i} was still retained. At this period the sign *ei* began to be used for the old \bar{i} which had fallen together with *e_i* (cp. also the late Greek spelling $\epsilon\bar{i}$ for original \bar{i} , as $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$). Cf. § 65.

The *i* in the Umbr. and Osc. words *sir* and *bivus*, *limu* (quoted above) is to be pronounced long. This quantity can be directly proved in Umbr. *persnihmu persnihimu*, i. e. *persnīmu* (§ 23) 'precamino', depon. 3. sing. imper. from a verbal stem *persnī-*, cp. Lat. *fīnī-re*. It also follows from the spelling *ei* (on tables in Latin alphabet) in *sei* beside *sir si* = Lat. *sīs*, in *veiro* beside *viro* 'viros' (cp. Skr. *vīrā-s* § 38), probably also in *pers-ei* beside *pers-i* 'quid', the ending of which was a demonstrative particle corresponding to the *-ī* in Gr. *οἶτος-ī*. This spelling *ei* is to be put on a like footing with the *ei* in Lat. *veivos* and similar forms (see above), and points to an open pronunciation of the *ī*. The same quality of the *ī*-sound follows for Oscan from *fusīd* 'foret, esset' (opt. of the *s*-aorist, cp. Skr. 3. sing. mid. *maq-s-ī-tā* from *man-* 'think'), assuming that the vowel in the end syllable had not been shortened and then become *i*.

§ 42. Old Irish. *lī* Cymr. *lliw* 'color, splendor': Lat. *livor*. It is less certain that the *ī* in *crīthid* 'emax' = Indg. *ī*: Skr. *krī-nā-ti* 'buys'.

For the treatment of *ī* in unaccented syllables see §§ 613. 634. 657, 2. 6.

§ 43. Germanic. Goth. *skeirs* (st. *skei-ra-*) O.Sax. *skīr* O.Icel. *skīrr* 'clear, bright', prim. Germ. **skī-ra-*, related to Gr. *οἰά* 'shadow' or to Lat. *dē-scī-scō* 'I withdraw, depart from'. Goth. *freidjan* 'to spare', OHG. *vriten* 'to foster, pamper', O.Icel. *frīða* 'to adorn, decorate': cp. Skr. *prī-tā-s* 'dear, pleased, joyful, satisfied'. Goth. *sv-ein* OHG. OS. *swīn* Ags. *swīn* O.Icel. *svīn* 'pig': O.Bulg. *sv-inū* Lat. *su-īnu-s* 'pig's (adj.), belonging to a pig'. 1. pers. pl. opt. pf. Goth. *vēs-ei-ma* OHG. *wār-ī-m* O.Sax. *wār-i-n*, O.Icel. *vær-i-m* 'we might be': cp. Skr. 3. sing. opt. pf. mid. *vavyt-ī-tā* (from *vart-*).

It must be observed that *ei* in Goth. always signifies the monophthong *ī* (§ 25).

§ 44. Baltic-Slavonic. Lith. *vý-ti* O.Bulg. *vi-ti* 'to wind, turn': Gr. *ῥ-τέᾱ* 'willow, salix' fr. **fī-τεᾱ*. Lith *dvynū* (dual) 'twins': Lat *bīnī*. O.Bulg. *grīva* 'mane': Skr. *grīvā-* 'nape'.

Observe that *y* is the Lith. symbol. for *ī* (§ 26).