

INTERNATIONALE ZEITSCHRIFT
FÜR
ALLGEMEINE
SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT

UNTER MITWIRKUNG DER HERREN

L. ADAM IN RENNES, G. I. ASCOLI IN MAILAND, F. A. COELHO IN LISSABON, O. DONNER
IN HELSINGFORS, H. L. FLEISCHER UND G. VON DER GABELNTZ IN LEIPZIG, A. S.
GATSCHET IN WASHINGTON, R. LEPSIUS IN BERLIN, A. LESKIEN IN LEIPZIG,
G. MALLERY IN WASHINGTON, F. A. MARCH IN EASTON, F. VON MIKLOSICH UND FRIED-
RICH MÜLLER IN WIEN, MAX MÜLLER IN OXFORD, G. OPPERT IN MADRAS, H. PAUL
IN FREIBURG, A. F. POTT IN HALLE, W. RADLOFF IN KASAN, L. DE ROSNY IN PARIS,
A. H. SAYCE IN OXFORD, W. SCHERER UND H. STEINTHAL IN BERLIN, J. STORM IN
CHRISTIANIA, J. VINSON IN PARIS, W. D. WHITNEY IN NEW-HAVEN, W. WUNDT IN LEIPZIG

UND ANDEREN GELEHRTEN DES IN- UND AUSLANDES

HERAUSGEGEBEN

VON

F. TECHMER,

DOCENTEN DER ALLGEMEINEN SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT AN DER UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG.

I. BAND. 1. HEFT.

MIT ÜBER 80 HOLZSCHNITTFIGUREN UND 7 LITHOGRAPHIERTEN TAFELN.



LEIPZIG, 1884.

VERLAG VON JOH. AMBR. BARTH.

PARIS: E. LEROUX.

TURIN: H. LOESCHER.

LONDON: TRÜBNER & CO.

NEW-YORK: B. WESTERMANN & CO.

INHALT DES 1. HEFTS.

VORWORT DES HERAUSGEBERS:	Seite
ZUM ANDENKEN AN W. V. HUMBOLDT	III
ZWEI BRIEFE W. V. HUMBOLDTS	VI
REDE DES HERRN KULTUSMINISTERS V. GOSSLER	X
VORBEMERKUNGEN DES HERAUSGEBERS. PROGRAMM DER ZEITSCHRIFT	XII
I. A. F. POTT, EINLEITUNG IN DIE ALLGEMEINE SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT	1
PHILOSOPHISCHE SEITE:	
URSPRUNG DER SPRACHEN	3
SOG. ALLGEMEINE GRAMMATIK	9
PHYSISCHE SEITE	23
GEISTIGE SEITE	30
NATURWISSENSCHAFTLICH-GESCHICHTLICHE SEITE	48
EINTEILUNG DER SPRACHEN	51
II. F. TECHMER, NATURWISSENSCHAFTLICHE ANALYSE UND SYNTHESE DER HÖRBAREN	
SPRACHE	69
DIE SPRACHE AUF IHREM WEGE VON AUSSEN NACH INNEN	
PHYSIKALISCH-AKUSTISCHE ANALYSE	71
KLANGLAUTE	75
GERAUSCHLAUTE	86
PHYSIKALISCH-AKUSTISCHE SYNTHESE	90
DIE SPRACHE AUF IHREM WEGE VON INNEN NACH AUSSEN	
ANATOMISCHE UND PHYSIOLOGISCH-GENETISCHE ANALYSE	105
I. DAS WINDROHR	111
II. DIE ERSTE UND WICHTIGSTE HEMMUNGSSTELLE DES KOPFES	122
III. DAS ANSATZROHR	132
RESULTATE DIESER ANALYSE	143
PHYSIOLOGISCH-GENETISCHE SYNTHESE	146
PHYSIOLOGISCH-GENETISCHES SYSTEM DER LAUTE	148
MUNDÖFFNER	150
MUNDSCHLISSER	160
DAS NACHEINANDER DER ARTIKULATIONEN UND LAUTE	164
DIE SILBE. PIBONE. SYMPHONE	167
III. F. TECHMER, TRANSSKRPTION MITTELS DER LATEINISCHEN KURSIVSCHRIFT	171
ERKLÄRUNGEN DER TAFELN	186
IV. G. MALLERY, SIGN LANGUAGE	193
SCHEME OF ILLUSTRATION	196
NOTABLE POINTS FOR FURTHER RESEARCHES	203
V. FRIEDRICH MÜLLER, SIND DIE LAUTGESETZE NATURGESETZE?	211
VI. F. MAX MÜLLER, ZEPHYROS UND GAHUSHA	215
VII. L. ADAM, DE LA CATÉGORIE DU GENRE	218
VIII. A. H. SAYCE, THE PERSON-ENDINGS OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN VERB	222
IX. K. BRUGMANN, ZUR FRAGE NACH DEN VERWANDTSCHAFTSVERHÄLTNISSEN	
DER INDOGERMANISCHEN SPRACHEN	226

DAS 2. HEFT

wird namentlich Arbeiten von O. DONNER, J. A. LUNDELL, A. F. POTT, W. RADLOFF; Abdruck von Teilen eines Ms. von W. V. HUMBOLDT. Besprechungen, Bibliographie, Mitteilungen enthalten.

Wir erlauben uns an dieser Stelle noch auf S. XIII, XIV der VORBEMERKUNGEN hinzuweisen.

THE PERSON-ENDINGS OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN VERB.

Professor DELBRÜCK, in his interesting EINLEITUNG IN DAS SPRACHSTUDIUM, rests his defence of the agglutination theory of BOPP on the assumption of a relationship between the personal terminations of the verb and the personal pronouns. Every theory on the origin of inflection must start, he says, from the 'Thatsache einer die Erklärung durch Zufall ausschließenden Ähnlichkeit zwischen einigen Personalsuffixen und Pronominibus' (p. 70). Why we must start from this particular 'fact', he does not explain, tho' I suppose he had in mind CURTIUS's attempt to show that verbal flexion is older than nominal flexion, an attempt which, as I have elsewhere endeavored to prove, seems to me the exact converse of what is warranted by the evidence. Nor does he explain why we must accept as a 'fact' what has been denied by more than one scholar. Accepting it as a 'fact', however, as I myself formerly did, it by no means follows that we are compelled to go further and accept the agglutination theory. When the general type of a language is inflectional, new forms will naturally adapt themselves to the general type, and words, such as the English like, will pass in time into inflections. Even if we suppose the personal terminations of the verb to have originally been personal pronouns no light will be thrown on the origin of flexion, since in becoming flectional suffixes they would only have followed the analogy of the nominal declension. Before the origin of flexion can be discovered, a satisfactory account must be given of the origin of the case-endings of the noun.

But is the relationship between the personal terminations of the verb and the personal pronouns really a 'fact'? I also once thought so, but further study has convinced me that I was wrong. When we try to analyse the terminations of the verb, we find that they connect themselves, not with the personal pronouns, but with the suffixes of the noun.

That this is the case with the infinitive will be denied by no one, nor will it be denied that the infinitive may be, and often has been, used in place of the persons of the finite verb. FICK has gone further and has pointed out, with the hand of a master, that the first person sing. of the *Ātmanepada* present in Sanskrit is itself nothing but an infinitive.¹ *Bháv-e* or *ad-é* are as much infinitives as *vid-é*, and *cháye* stands by the side of

¹ GÖTTINGER GEL. ANZ. 6. APRIL 1881.

chéte. No known phonetic laws will enable us to extract the Greek -μαι from -μαμι, but -αι is the Greek infinitive ending which corresponds with the Sanskrit -e. As FICK has noticed, the Latin *dedī* is the Indian *dadé*. We may, therefore, conclude that just as the participle *amamini* in Latin continued to be employed as a second person plural, so too in Latin and Sanskrit old infinitives continued to be used as first persons singular. There is no reason why a similar use of the infinitive should not have survived elsewhere in the verb.

Now the resemblance between the personal endings of the verb and the personal pronouns turns out, when closely examined, to be really illusory. It exists only in the case of the first person singular. All attempts to connect the third person with a personal pronoun have been unsuccessful, while it is only in Greek, where an original *t w* has become *s*, that the second personal pronoun resembles the termination of the second person of the verb. Between the dual and plural forms of the pronouns and of the verbs it is difficult to discover any likeness whatsoever.

On the contrary between *φέρουντι* and the participle *φέροντες* there is an unmistakable connection, while, as regards the nasal, *φέρουντι* bears the same relation to *φέρέτι* that *adántas* does to *adatás*. But *φέρέτι* is a stem of exactly the same formation as *γενετι* (*γένεσις*): Cp. Sanskrit stems like *ramāti*, *vrkáti*. That there is no difficulty in an abstract noun being used to denote the third person of the verb is proved by Turkish, where *dogd* is 'a striking' and 'he struck', as well as by Semitic grammar.² I will not decide, however, whether *φέρέτι* is the locative of a stem *φέρέτι* or whether it is the stem itself, tho' my own inclination would be to regard it as a locative; in any case it seems to me impossible to dissociate it from a noun like *γένεσις*.

Equally impossible is it, as it seems to me, to dissociate *φέρουντι* from the present participle *φέροντες*. Both in Turkish and Semitic the present participle is used as a third person, and it is perhaps the most natural way in which primitive man could express this grammatical relation. How *φέροντες* became *φέρουντι* I conceive to be as follows. In the first and second persons plural the terminations -μες and -τες stood by the side of -με and -τε (Skt. -ma, -ta). The analogy of these persons caused a form *φέροντε* to spring up by the side of *φέροντες* in the third person, and the termination of *φέροντε* was in its turn assimilated to that of *φέρέτι*. I think there can be little doubt that the 'secondary' termination of the third person plural (-οντι) was due to assimilation to the 'secondary' termination of the third person singular.

If we now turn to the first person singular we shall find that its supposed connection with the first personal pronoun is refuted by the discovery of SCHERER and BRUGMANN that -μι and -m were not the only suffixes by which

¹ The accentuation is based on FICK's discovery that, where *o* and *ε* are correlated, *ε* marks the accented vowel, *o* the unaccented one. *Bhavati*, *bhávanti*, and *tudáti*, *tudánti* are due to contamination.

² SAYCE ON THE TENSES OF THE ASSYRIAN VERB, JRL. OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY IX. I. (1876).

it was denoted. The suffix *-a* served the same purpose, and if we may judge from the preponderating employment of this suffix in Greek and Latin it was more in use than *-μ*. Now *-a* has no resemblance whatever to the first personal pronoun. On the other hand it is a nominal suffix. So also is *-m*, especially when it is remembered that in forms like $\xi\chi\epsilon\mu$ ($\xi\chi\epsilon\mu\alpha$) the *m* is sonant just as it is in an accusative like $\pi\omicron\delta\mu$. Between the nominal and the verbal *m*, *m* no phonetic distinction can be drawn. The question now arises: which is the older form, *-μ* or *-m*, since it is plain that they cannot be dissociated from one another? For my part, I see no possible way of deriving *-m* from *-μ*; there is no known phonetic law which would permit it, and assimilation is equally out of the question. On the other hand, the analogy of $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ would easily explain the transition of $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu$ into $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\iota$. It therefore seems to me that *-m*, *-m* is the more original form of the first person singular, from which *-μ* has been created by assimilation to $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$, and consequently that the first person singular of the verb was primarily a noun in the objective case. It was, in fact, the object of the first personal pronoun.

If the 'secondary' ending *-m* is the older, the 'primary' *-μ* being the product of analogy, it will follow that the 'secondary' ending *-ς* of the second person singular is also older than the 'primary' *-τι*. If so, we have again a common nominal suffix, and our only hesitation would be as to whether we should regard this suffix as here denoting the subjective (or nominative) case, or as being the suffix which we find in abstracts like $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$. In any case, I believe that the verbal conjugation was primitively $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu$, $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$, $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ and not $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\mu\iota$, $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$, $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$. In the past tenses analogy acted in a contrary way to what it did in the present, the termination of the third person $\varphi\epsilon\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota$ being here assimilated to those of the first and second persons, thus producing the 'secondary' termination *-τ*.¹

Just as we find *-α* by the side of *-m* in the first person, so also we find *-θηα* by the side of *-s* in the second. This *-θηα* must be closely related to the *-θη-* of the imperative, and both *-θηα* and *-θη* are nominal suffixes. That they did not originally denote a specific person is clear from the fact that *-θηα* also appears in the first person plural where it is attached to the terminations *-μες* and *-με* ($-\mu\epsilon\tau\theta\alpha$, $-\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$). According to APOLLONIUS there was an Æolic form $-\mu\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$, which bears the same relation to $\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$ that $\sigma\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\theta\epsilon\nu$ does to $\upsilon\pi\alpha\iota\theta\alpha$. By the side of $-\theta\epsilon\nu$ there also existed $-\theta\epsilon$ in the second person pl., like *-με* by the side of $-\mu\epsilon\nu$; but I suspect that the vocalic termination was influenced by that of $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. At any rate, it cannot be compared with the Skt. *-dhwe* and *-dhwam*.

The forms of the first person plural are *-με* (which has been lost in Greek and Latin, except in combination with *-θηα*), $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $-\mu\epsilon\varsigma$. The origin of $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ seems to be the same as that of the ν ephelkystikon; $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ came to stand by the side of *-με* like $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ by the side of $\chi\acute{\epsilon}$, $\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu$ by that of $\nu\acute{\omicron}$, or $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\iota\nu$ by that of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\iota$, and in Ionic and Lesbian succeeded eventually in

¹ I reserve the 3. person sing. of the perfect for future discussion.

banishing $-\mu\epsilon$ altogether.¹ Perhaps in \mathcal{A} Eolic the analogy of the middle form in $-\mu\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu$ had something to do with this result. In $-\mu\epsilon\text{-}\zeta$ we find the same suffix as in the second person singular, while $-\mu\epsilon$, like $-\tau\epsilon$, presents us with the termination that we have in $\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\epsilon$, $\tau\phi\acute{\epsilon}$ or the dual $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon$. In $-\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ the attachment of $-\theta\alpha$ to $-\mu\epsilon\sigma$ is similar to that of $-\sigma\iota$ to $-\zeta$ in a word like $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$; $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma$: $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$:: $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\mu\epsilon\sigma$: $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$.

The dual forms $-va$, $-vas$, $-vahi$ etc. I shall for the present leave aside.² It has already been recognized that the Greek middle form $-\mu\epsilon\theta\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$ has been modelled after the 2. and 3. persons in $-(\sigma)\theta\iota\sigma\theta\alpha$, and that these have followed the analogy of the active $-\tau\sigma\theta\alpha$, $-\tau\eta\gamma$. The two latter are merely accusatives of nouns in $-\tau\sigma$ - and $-\tau\eta$, and it is impossible to discover any relics of personal pronouns in them. They must be ranked along with the verbal adjective in $-\tau\acute{o}\text{-}\zeta$ and the middle person-ending in $-\tau\sigma$, of which, however, I am not prepared to offer an explanation any more than of the middle person-ending $-\mu\alpha\nu$ ($-\mu\tau\eta\gamma$).

Against the hypothesis of a nominal origin of the forms of the finite verb no syntactical objections can be raised. There are many languages which do not possess a true verb, and the Polynesian verb is really a noun.³ From time to time we find constructions surviving in the Indo-European languages themselves which point to an age when the primitive Indo-European had not as yet evolved the conception of a verb. The original $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\eta\acute{o}\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\mu$ 'I (am) a bearer' differed but little from the Latin *ego Verbum*, and $\tau\phi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\acute{\zeta}$ was exactly equivalent to *tu scelus*. The meaning of the sentence was determined by the context and the order of the words which composed it; it was only gradually that this meaning came to be transferred from the context and attached to the terminations of the words themselves. LUDWIG'S principle of adaptation will alone account for the fact that the verbal person-endings are not self-explanatory, that is to say, do not contain the singular, dual, and plural forms of the personal pronouns. If they did so, there would be as little difficulty in proving the fact as there is in the case of the first and second persons of the Semitic verb.

OXFORD.

A. H. SAYCE.

¹ We must, however, remember that $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ is a termination of the infinitive and reappears in $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ and the participial $-\mu\epsilon\nu\sigma\zeta$. As $\acute{\zeta}\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ is older than $\acute{\zeta}\acute{\epsilon}$, so it is very possible that $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ is older than $-\mu\epsilon$. In this case $-\mu\epsilon\nu$ and $-\mu\epsilon$ will be independent forms, $-\mu\epsilon$ being possibly due to assimilation to $-\tau\epsilon$.

² va and vas are related to $-\tau\epsilon\nu$ (as in $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\text{-}\tau\epsilon\nu = \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\tau\epsilon\nu$) as ma and mas are to $-\mu\epsilon\nu$. Compare also Vedic $d\bar{a}\text{-}vane$, Greek $\delta\acute{o}\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota$ ($\delta\acute{o}\lambda\acute{\nu}\alpha\iota$), as well as the Sanskrit suffixes $-dh\text{-}w\bar{e}$, $-dh\text{-}wam$.

³ See STEINTHAL, CHARAKTERISTIK DER HAUPTSÄCHLICHSTEN TYPEN DES SPRACHBAUES pp. 156—176.

LEIPZIG,
DRUCK VON METZGER & WITTIG.