



## Filip Vesdin and the comparison of Sanskrit with Iranian and Germanic languages

Ivan Andrijanić & Petra Matović

To cite this article: Ivan Andrijanić & Petra Matović (2019) Filip Vesdin and the comparison of Sanskrit with Iranian and Germanic languages, *Language & History*, 62:3, 195-226, DOI: [10.1080/17597536.2019.1649855](https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2019.1649855)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2019.1649855>



Published online: 27 Aug 2019.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 13



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



# Filip Vesdin and the comparison of Sanskrit with Iranian and Germanic languages

Ivan Andrižanić<sup>a</sup> and Petra Matović<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia; <sup>b</sup>Department of Classical Philology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia

## ABSTRACT

Filip Vesdin, known by his monastic name Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo (1748–1806), was a Carmelite missionary stationed from 1776 to 1789 in Southwestern India. Vesdin authored an impressive opus of 32 books and smaller treatises on Brahmanic religion and customs, oriental manuscripts and antiques collections, language comparison and missionary history. This article focuses on the field of language comparison, principally on Vesdin's book *De antiquitate et affinitate linguae Zendicae, Samscrdamicae, et Germanicae dissertatio* (= *Dissertation on the Antiquity and the Affinity of the Zend, Sanskrit, and Germanic Languages*), published in Rome in 1798. In this rather short treatise (56 pages), the most important part consists of three word-lists where a large number of words from Avestan, Sanskrit and Germanic languages are compared in order to prove that these languages are related. The paper presents Vesdin's three word-lists together with a description and evaluation of his views on the relationships between these languages in order to highlight his significance in the history of comparative and historical linguistics. The paper also provides new insights into the relationship of *De antiquitate* to Vesdin's later proto-linguistic treatise, *De Latini sermonis origine* (1802).

## Abbreviations

Av.: Avestan; Guj.: Gujarati; Ilr.: Indo-Iranian; Lat.: Latin; Malab.: Malabaricum (Vesdin's term for Malayalam); Malay.: Malayalam; MHG: Middle High German; NHG: New High German; NP: New Persian; OAv.: Old Avestan; OFris.: Old Frisian; OHG: Old High German; OSax.: Old Saxon; Pahl.: Pahlavi; PG: Proto Germanic; PIE: Proto Indo-European; Skt.: Sanskrit; YAv.: Young Avestan

## KEYWORDS

Avestan; Sanskrit; comparative linguistics; missionaries; history of linguistics

## Introduction

Filip Vesdin (1748–1806), a Carmelite missionary of Croatian origin, was born in Hof am Leithaberge (Cimof in Croatian) in Lower Austria in 1748. In 1768 he was ordained in the order of Discalced Carmelites and took the monastic name

**CONTACT** Ivan Andrižanić  [iandrij@ffzg.hr](mailto:iandrij@ffzg.hr); Petra Matović [petrasostaric2011@gmail.com](mailto:petrasostaric2011@gmail.com)

This article was originally published with errors, which have now been corrected in the online version. Please see Correction (<https://doi.org/10.1080/17597536.2019.1664832>)

Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo, under which he published all of his works. In the year 1776 he arrived in India where he spent 13 years, first as a vicar, then as a rector of the Verapolitanean Seminar, apostolic visitor, and finally vicar general on the Malabar Coast in the present-day Indian state of Kerala. After returning to Rome in 1789 he taught oriental languages at the Missionary Seminary of St. Pancratius. Later, he was appointed the head of the Missionary Seminary of St. Pancratius and prefect of sciences in the *Collegium Urbanum de Propaganda Fide*.<sup>1</sup>

In the period from 1789 until his passing in 1806, Vesdin authored 32 books and shorter treatises on Brahmanic religion and customs, descriptions of oriental manuscripts and antiques collections, language comparison, missionary history, etc.<sup>2</sup> He published the first two European grammars of Sanskrit (in 1790 and 1804) in Latin, with Sanskrit words printed in South-Indian *grantha* script.<sup>3</sup>

The field of language comparison is represented with two books. The first one, the subject of this paper, is *De antiquitate et affinitate linguae Zendicae, Samscrdamicae, et Germanicae dissertatio* (= *Dissertation on the Antiquity and the Affinity of the Zend, Sanskrit, and German Language*), published in Rome in 1798.<sup>4</sup> The second one is *De Latini sermonis origine et cum orientalibus linguis connexione Dissertatio* (= *Dissertation on the Origin of the Latin Language and its Relation to Oriental Languages*) published in Rome in 1802, wherein the history of the Latin and its connection to the 'Oriental' languages is discussed.<sup>5</sup> In both books a large number of words are compared in order to prove that the languages in question are related. In this respect Vesdin was the first scholar who published such a large-scale word comparison of genetically related languages.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>More details on Vesdin's life are provided in Wetzl (1936), Slamnig (1991), Matišić (2007) and Jauk-Pinhak (1984).

<sup>2</sup>For a complete bibliography of published works with brief summaries see Slamnig (1991: 19–23); for unpublished works see *ibid.* pp. 23–28. See also Ambrosius A.S. Teresia (1941) *Bio-Bibliographica Missionaria Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum*, Rome: Curia Generalitia; Ambrosius A.S. Teresia (1944) *Nomenclator Missionariorum Ordinis Carmelitarum Discalceatorum*, Rome: Curia Generalitia. (Vesdin on pp. 285–291); Streit, Robert (1931) *Bibliotheca Missionum* Vol. 6, (Vesdin on pp. 187–191). (Rocher 1961: 324; 1977: ix).

<sup>3</sup>Vesdin was first to publish a Sanskrit grammar, although manuscript grammars had already existed. The first European to write a Sanskrit grammar was Heinrich Roth (1620–1668). His grammar was published as a manuscript facsimile in 1988 (Camps & Muller 1988). Other authors of early unpublished Sanskrit grammars were Jean-François Pons (1688–1752) and Johann Ernst Hanxleden (1681–1732), whose grammar was published in 2013 (Van Hal & Vielle 2013). For Sanskrit grammars written by missionaries in general see Milewska (2003).

<sup>4</sup>Rocher (1961: 325) points out that, although 1798 is the date given on the frontispiece, the dedication to Cardinal Stephanus Borgia is dated 5 June 1799. He also notes that Vesdin himself in his other works refers to this treatise as being from 1799.

<sup>5</sup>For a description *De Latini sermonis origine* see Rocher (1961: 339–350). For a linguistic evaluation of Vesdin's word-list in the same work see Andrijanić (2017).

<sup>6</sup>Vesdin was not the first one to compare words from different languages considered to be related. In 1776, Jesuit missionary Gaston-Laurent Coeurdoux remarked on Sanskrit's similarity to Latin and Greek. He sent his observations to Paris, where his materials found their way to Anquetil-Duperron, who apparently failed to recognize the importance of Coeurdoux's findings. His work was finally published in 1808 (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XLIX 1784–1793, pp. 647–697), nine years after the release of Vesdin's *De Antiquitate*. For Coeurdoux's discussion see Godfrey (1967: 57–59), Mayrhofer (1983). For the relationship of Coeurdoux and Vesdin see Van Hal 2005 [2004]: 330–332, who hypothesizes that Vesdin was indirectly exposed to some of Coeurdoux's ideas through Anquetil-Duperron.

The aim of this paper is to present Vesdin's treatise *De antiquitate* with a special focus on the three word-lists where he compared Iranian, Sanskrit and Germanic words in order to prove the linguistic affinity of these languages. These lists are very important for Vesdin and it is significant to analyze them in order to evaluate Vesdin's contribution to the field of language comparison and to determine what is his place in the history of comparative and historical linguistics. Vesdin's methodology is derived from an epistemological background that appears to be quite different from modern linguistic setup, and it is not appropriate to judge his achievements by contemporary standards. However, Vesdin's comparisons, based on phonetic and semantic correspondences, appear to be quite successful, as will be shown later.<sup>7</sup>

Vesdin belongs to a group of 18<sup>th</sup> century scholars who explored and developed the ideas of their predecessors, but who did not yet employ an entirely modern scientific methodology and were not completely free of religious or other misconceptions. The idea of a common linguistic origin was not uncommon among European thinkers of that time, but few agreed which languages have the same linguistic ancestor, and what is the parent language. Hebrew was often suggested as the predecessor of all languages, but occasionally, that position would be assigned to the mother tongue of the particular scholar (Van Driem 2001: 1039). Among the first to observe certain similarities between Greek, Latin and the Germanic languages were 15th and 16th century scholars like Roelof Huisman, Johannes Turmair Aventinus, Adriaen de Jonghe and Zigmund z Jelení (Van Driem 2001: 1042). The Age of Discovery brought new languages into consideration: Francis Xavier remarked on the similarities between Sanskrit and European languages in a letter of 1544, Thomas Stephens in a letter of 1583 (Swiggers 2017: 159) and Filippo Sassetti in 1585 (Kapović 2017: 3). Their contemporary Franciscus Raphelengius (Frans van Ravelingen) put forth the idea that Persian was close to the Germanic languages; this was corroborated by Bonaventura Vulcanius de Smet and Johann Elichman (Van Driem 2001: 1042–1043). Although it is William Jones who is commonly credited with establishing the discipline of Indo-European linguistics, it was Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn (Van Driem 2001: 1039, 1047; Kapović 2017: 2–3)<sup>8</sup>, following the footsteps of the famous Hellenist Claude de Saumaise, who proposed the Scythic as a common ancestor of Greek, Latin, Germanic, Celtic and the Slavic (Swiggers 2017: 153). Van Boxhorn's theory was adopted by Andreas Jäger, William Wotton and

---

<sup>7</sup>For a general overview of Vesdin's principles of language comparison see Van Hal (2005[2004]).

<sup>8</sup>Van Driem offers an assessment of van Boxhorn's achievements and Jones' favourable position which helped him promulgate his theories together with 'a Sanskrit bias' (Van Driem 2001: 1039–1051, Jones is especially discussed on p. 1049).

James Burnett, who had a decisive influence on William Jones, according to Van Driem (2001: 1048–1049).

Vesdin's treatise *De antiquitate* can be considered as a contribution to the line of pre-modern research started by Raphelengius. Throughout his treatise Vesdin referred to both his predecessors and his contemporaries – sometimes admiring their achievements, sometimes viciously deriding their ideas.

## Outline of the treatise

Vesdin's treatise *De antiquitate et affinitate linguae Zendicae, Samscrdamicae, et Germanicae dissertatio*, dedicated to Cardinal Stefano Borgia (dedication on pp. III–VI), comprises four chapters.<sup>9</sup>

### I. A short description of Persia (VII–XI)

The first part of the treatise is a geographical description of Persia, its boundaries, provinces and major cities. Vesdin's main source was *Voyage de l'Inde à la Mekke* by Abdoul-Kérym, translated into French by L. Langlès, and published in Paris in 1797. Vesdin also mentions other contemporary sources like Bernhard von Jenisch (1734–1807) and ancient writers like Clement of Alexandria, Cyril of Alexandria, Joseph Flavius, Diogenes Laertius, Origen, Ptolemy, Strabo, Dionysius Periegetes, Plutarch, Eusebius, Justin and Pliny the Elder. He considered Greek and Roman authors important and trustworthy sources on Indian and Persian history, geography and religion. First he describes the territory between India and Persia and the two ways leading out of India (one into Persia via the Khorasan province and the other to the Afghans, into Tataria). In the final paragraph, he states that the first one 'is the way the closeness of Sanskrit (*Samscrdamica* as Vesdin calls it) and Avestan (*Zendica* as Vesdin calls it),<sup>10</sup> which existed already in the times of Herodotus, as will be eloquently shown later, came about'<sup>11</sup> (X–XI). Khorasan consists of the

<sup>9</sup>An overview of the treatise can be found in Rocher (1961). We cover the fourth part of the treatise in more detail here than Rocher did, while part three is treated more succinctly. Rocher relies on more direct quotes from Vesdin, thereby offering an insight into Vesdin's style. On the other hand, Rocher admits he had to skip some 'minor points ... such as Anquetil's remarks on the correspondences in Zend and Georgian' which are mentioned in this outline (Rocher 1961: 331). Furthermore, Rocher is less interested in naming the Greek and Roman authors Vesdin heavily relies upon, and the contemporaries and near-contemporaries Vesdin discusses. Although it was not possible to include every reference made by Vesdin, we believe that this summary of his treatise helps show the breadth of his learning. Therefore this outline can be seen as complementary to Rocher's.

<sup>10</sup>Vesdin calls the Avestan language 'Zend' following Anquetil-Duperron. This name is a misnomer that became widespread in the 19<sup>th</sup> century Iranistics (at the time, the Avestan language was often termed 'Zend'); the word actually comes from Pahlavi *zand*, and originally refers to the literature written in Middle Persian that translates and explicates the Avestan sacred corpus.

<sup>11</sup>*Hac igitur via, quam descripsimus, Zendicae et Samscrdamicae linguae affinitas nata est, quam Herodoti aevo jam extitisse infra luculenter demonstrabimus* (pp. X–XI). Translation by the authors.

ancient provinces Parthia, Aria, Margiana and Bactria. According to Vesdin, language development was brought about in this very area which used to be culturally progressive, prosperous and densely populated. Vesdin stresses the close relationship between Indian philosophers and Persian Magi. Ancient Persian books were therefore written in *Zend* (Avestan), a ‘daughter’ of Sanskrit. Vesdin refutes Langlès’ claim that Zaratūštra (Vesdin calls him Zoroaster) was Assyrian (p. X). In Vesdin’s opinion, he can only be Persian, as proven by amply cited ancient sources.

## ***II. An examination of Avestan and Sanskrit (XI-XIX)***

In the second part of the treatise, Vesdin looks more closely into the presumed affinity between Avestan and Sanskrit. He remarks that studying language relationships helps to discover peoples’ origins, but advocates a careful approach, mentioning some useful and authoritative sources on the one hand (Scaliger, Casaubon, de Saumaise etc.) and ‘insane opinions’ on the other (p. XI).<sup>12</sup> In his view, there can be no doubt that Avestan and Sanskrit are related, and this idea is repeated throughout the treatise. He makes a mention of Sylvester de Sacy’s study of Persian inscriptions, an important source of linguistic information in this regard.<sup>13</sup> Vesdin then examines the opinions of Anquetil-Duperron with great scepticism. Anquetil-Duperron had stated that the use of Avestan reached the Persian provinces at the Caspian Sea and that the Georgian language resembled Avestan, especially in the nominal inflection. A comparison of the paradigms for the word ‘king’ in Georgian (*mepe*) and Sanskrit (*rājan*) follows.<sup>14</sup> Vesdin sees no similarities in this paradigm, but concedes that there are some in the genitive and dative case of other nouns, but they are only to be expected because Georgia used to be a Persian province. Historical remarks are corroborated by Herodotus’ and Plato’s authority.

Vesdin furthermore claims that Avestan and Pahlavi became obsolete in Persia a long time ago, and both exist only in the books commonly attributed to Zaratūštra. For Vesdin, this is a proof that Zaratūštra was of Persian origin, although he is not the author of Zoroastrian books. Vesdin advocates a misconception that Zoroastrian books show a mixture of Avestan and Sanskrit language, and a confounding of the Magi’s and the Brahmins’ learning. He corroborates his claim that

---

<sup>12</sup>Vesdin was very often extremely aggressive towards his predecessors and contemporaries. Such an attitude provoked sharp, sometimes unjust criticism. For the reception of Vesdin’s works see Rocher (1977: xii-xvi). Van Hal (2004–2005: 332) suggests that Vesdin’s attitude may have been responsible for poor reception of his work.

<sup>13</sup>Vesdin makes a reference to Sylvester de Sacy, *Mémoires sur diverses antiquités de la Perse, et sur les médailles des rois de la dynastie des Sassânydes*. Paris 1793.

<sup>14</sup>Vesdin’s forms are *mepe* and *râja* or *râdja*.

Zaraθuštra was of Bactrian origin by citing the historians Ammianus Marcellinus and Agathias.

Thereon Vesdin proceeds to attack Anquetil-Duperron's opinion that writing Avestan from right to left was an ancient custom in Persia. Vesdin claims this is due to Arab influence and moves on to William Jones, who argued that in the ancient times there were two mother tongues in Persia: Chaldean and Sanskrit.<sup>15</sup> According to Jones, the former is the mother language of Pahlavi; the latter is the mother language of Avestan, Persian (Farsi) and various Indian dialects. Vesdin agrees with Jones, whose opinion was corroborated by Kleuker,<sup>16</sup> and refutes Anquetil-Duperron's claim that Avestan is the mother language of Pahlavi and Persian. Anquetil-Duperron was here closer to truth than Jones and Kleuker, because we know now that Chaldean is a Semitic Neo-Aramaic language that is not genetically related to Iranian languages. Avestan is a north-eastern Iranian language, while Old-Persian from which Pahlavi developed belongs to a south-western group of Iranian languages; all these languages are genetically related in sense that they all trace their common ancestor, the Proto-Iranian language. Still, Vesdin is not entirely in agreement with Jones and Kleuker. He puts forward the misconception that Pahlavi came about by mixing Avestan and Chaldean, the language of the Persians' western neighbours. Although Pahlavi follows neither Avestan nor Chaldean in verbal and nominal inflection, it is closer to the latter language, 'as will be obvious to anyone who diligently examines the book *Bun-*

*dehesch*'<sup>17</sup> (p. XV). On the other hand, Vesdin continues, Avestan is rich in words and vowel signs, as Sanskrit is. Avestan shares the verbal endings with Sanskrit, but the declensions do not conform (XV–XVI).<sup>18</sup> Chapter Two ends with a short description of Sanskrit, which in Vesdin's opinion has more in common with Greek than with Latin, and a list of Sanskrit dialects.

### **III. The relationship between Avestan and Sanskrit (XX–XXXVI)**

A list of 194 Avestan and Pahlavi words with their supposed Sanskrit and Malayālam (*Lingua Malabarica* as Vesdin calls it) cognates together with their

<sup>15</sup>Asiatick Researches II, The Sixth Discourse on the Persians, pp. 35–53. Jones discusses the languages of Iran on pp. 39–43.

<sup>16</sup>Kleuker, Johann Friedrich (1795) *Abhandlungen über die Geschichte und Alterthümer, die Künste, Wissenschaften und Literatur Asiens*, Band II, Riga: Hartknopf. pp.100–112.

<sup>17</sup>*Bundahišn* or *Zand-āgāhīh* is a Middle Persian Pahlavi text that deals with cosmogony and cosmography of the Zoroastrian scriptures. The treatise was composed at the time of the Arab contest, and was expanded through a number of different redactions between that time and the 12<sup>th</sup> c. (Boyce 1968: 40).

<sup>18</sup>Avestan declensions are actually remarkably close to Sanskrit declensions. Vesdin did not recognize this because he relied mostly on Duperron's book *Zend-Avesta* as a source of knowledge of Avestan and Pahlavi. Duperron's transliteration distorted Avestan forms heavily and made them hard to recognize.



Latin translation is presented on pp. XX–XXXI, followed by a list of 18 pairs of words related to Zoroastrian liturgy. Vesdin states that the affinity between Avestan and Sanskrit is obvious and concludes that Indian philosophy and religion also made their way to the Persians, Egyptians and Tatars or Scyths (p. XXXIII). He corroborates his claims by once again citing various Greek and Roman authors: Lucian, Pausanias, Clement of Alexandria, Photius, Diogenes Laertius, Lactantius, Ammianus Marcellinus, Cicero and others, as well as William Jones, accepting his opinion on the origins of Zoroastrianism. It is difficult to reach a conclusion on the origin of languages without any material or written proof, says Vesdin, but he thinks it would be the safest to assume that Sanskrit was a contemporary language of Hebrew and Chaldean, and a common language in Persia. Afterwards, Sanskrit and Avestan ceased to be spoken and were preserved in books. According to Vesdin, Sanskrit is full of Germanic, Slavic, Latin and Greek words denoting basic concepts and therefore unlikely to be loanwords. These words must have entered Sanskrit during the cohabitation in the field of Shinar (Hebrew Bible's term for Mesopotamia): an assumption that seems to be corroborated by Diodorus Siculus and Pliny the Elder. Still, the number of these words is not large enough to make the claim that all of these languages descended from Sanskrit.

#### **IV. Avestan and Sanskrit words culled from ancient writers (XXXVII–LVI)**

The fourth part provides the reader with a list of 40 Avestan and Sanskrit words culled from ancient writers (Herodotus, Hesychius, Aeschylus, Ctesias, Strabo, Polybius, Ptolemy, Plutarch, Menander, Aristophanes, Xenophon and others), p. XXXVII.<sup>19</sup> These words are meant to prove the proximity of speakers of Sanskrit and Avestan in ancient times. The list is followed by a discussion on the relationship between the two languages. Vesdin once more comes to the conclusion that in ancient times Sanskrit was spoken in Media (north-western Iran) and Persia, and that Avestan developed from Sanskrit. This explains the extent of Indian and Sanskrit influence on the Zoroastrian books. Zaratuštra might not be their author, but he must have been Persian or Medo-Persian or Bactrian, as Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria, Pliny and Ammianus Marcellinus all claim. Vesdin more than once refutes the hypothesis put forward by William Jones, namely that the books of Zaratuštra are not authentic, but recent forgeries that came about as a result of the corruption of the Sanskrit language by the Parsis.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>19</sup>A similar list was produced by William Burton in his *Graecae Linguae Historia*, 2 parts, London, 1657, which included *Veteris Linguae Persicae λείψανα*.

<sup>20</sup>This idea was put forward by Jones in his lecture *On the Persians*, delivered on February the 10<sup>th</sup> 1789 and published in Volume II of the *Asiatick Researches* (p. 41). Vesdin also mentions Richardson and Meiners as proponents of this theory, and the more sober judgement of Kleuker and Tychsen.



A list of 60 supposed Sanskrit and Germanic cognates with meanings given in Latin starts on page LIII.

Vesdin believes that his treatise proves that Avestan is a Sanskrit dialect. Germanic is related to Avestan – as demonstrated by Pfeiferius (August Pfeiffer, 1640–1698), Valtonius (Bryan Walton, 1600–1661), Burtonius (William Burton, 1609–1657), and Boxhornius (Marcus Zuerius van Boxhorn, 1612–1653). The following explanation is given by some scholars: the Parthian and Germanic peoples are descendants of the Scyths and they ruled over Persia for a long time. Persian words entered their vocabulary and were taken to the shores of the Danube and the Baltic Sea (here Vesdin makes a reference to Christianus Ludovicus Schedius' preface to Eccard's *De origine Germanorum*). On the other hand, Herodotus wrote that the Germans are a Persian tribe.<sup>21</sup> Whatever the case, there is an affinity between Germanic and Old Persian language, as well as with Sanskrit. Those who, like Olaus (Olof) Rudbeckius and Carolus (Carl) Lundius, believe that Germans come from Sweden or who, like Georg Stiernhielm (1598–1672), Buffonius (Georges-Louis Leclerc, count de Buffon, 1707–1788),<sup>22</sup> and Carlo Gastone Della Torre di Rezzonico (1742–1796), believe that almost all humankind originated in the North, are, in Vesdin's opinion, ridiculous. His final proof is the Indian king Mannu, who must be the Mannus mentioned in the second chapter of Tacitus' *Germania*. Mannus is Noah, the founder of the Indian empire and also the father of Indians, Persians, and Germans who are all of Eastern descent, while the origins of the German language lie in the East.

### General remarks on the word-lists

Vesdin's first word-list (pp. XX–XXXI) contains a column with 192 Sanskrit and three Malayāḷam words<sup>23</sup> compared to Avestan words (sometimes with its Pahlavi pair) in the second column. The third column lists a Latin translation of Sanskrit and Avestan 'cognates' from the first two columns.

It is important to note that in the third column with the Latin translation of Sanskrit/Avestan pairs, 33 Latin words are printed in italics. It appears that these italicized words are not just translations, but words that Vesdin regarded as related to their Sanskrit and Avestan pairs; the words regularly correspond phonetically and semantically. Almost all of these

<sup>21</sup>Herodotus actually mentions the Germanians (Γερμανίοι), a Persian tribe (Her. 1. 125). The earliest reports on Germanic peoples would not be written until the first century BC by the Romans (Fortson 2010: 338).

<sup>22</sup>Reported more precisely by Eddy, Buffon in fact believed that the first civilisation developed 'six thousand years ago ... in northwestern Asia between the fortieth and fifty-fifth degrees of latitude', but was subsequently annihilated by 'barbarian hordes from the North' (Eddy 1994: 658).

<sup>23</sup>Vesdin (1790: 17, 22) considered the Dravidian languages Malayāḷam and Tamil to be derived from Sanskrit, and on p. 22, ft.15 he even considers them to be dialects of Sanskrit.

italicized Latin words together with the same Sanskrit pair are included in his later treatise *De Latini sermonis*, where he compared Sanskrit and Latin. Therefore, the list in *De antiquitate* most probably served as basis for the list in *De Latini sermonis*.<sup>24</sup>

The second list (pp. XXXI–XXXIII) contains 18 entries concerning Zoroastrian liturgical vocabulary. The third list (pp. LIII–LV) has 60 entries with supposed Sanskrit and Germanic cognates and a Latin translation. All lists with notes are presented in the [Appendix](#) to this paper.

Vesdin states on p. XXXIII that the source for Sanskrit words are the Sanskrit glossary *Amarakośa*,<sup>25</sup> Hanxleden's 'dictionary' (actually two dictionaries: a Sanskritized Malayālam-Portuguese dictionary<sup>26</sup> and a Portugese-Malayālam dictionary expanded by Bernard Bischoepinck and Antonio Pimentel<sup>27</sup>), Sanskrit grammar<sup>28</sup> and Purāṇas. On the other side, almost all Avestan words are taken from one source, Anquetil-Duperron's *Zend-Avesta* (= ZA)<sup>29</sup> II, pp. 433–475 (*Vocabulaire Zend Pelhvi et François*). All Avestan words on Anquetil-Duperron's list came from an ancient Avestan-Pahlavi glossary *Frahang i oīm*. Germanic words in the third list are taken from Johann Schilter's *Thesaurο antiquitatum Teutonicarum* (Ulm, 1728), and to a lesser extent from Bessel's *Chronicon Gotwicense, Tomus I* (Tegernsee, 1732).

The most serious issue with Anquetil-Duperron's word-list is unsystematic transliteration of Avestan characters, which makes many words difficult to recognize.<sup>30</sup> For instance, four distinct characters in Avestan script (transliterated in Hoffmann's scheme as *a, ə, e, i*) are written by Anquetil-Duperron as *e*. Reichelt (1901) provides, besides his edition of the *Frahang i oīm* (1900)<sup>31</sup>, an

<sup>24</sup>With the exception of Lat. *fēmīna* compared with Skt. *vāma*; *statim* compared to *atha*; *gera* compared to *ajara*, *vivens* compared to *jīva*; *īra* compared to Skt. *īrsya*; *dīxit* to *vaksyati*. It should be noted that except *vivens* and *jīva*, all other pairs are not related and Vesdin was right in excluding them from the list in *De Latini sermonis*.

<sup>25</sup>Vesdin (1790: 13) mentions that he has three manuscripts in his possession, one South Indian written on palm-leaf, one that Vesdin copied from an old codex and one copied from an Indian original by J. E. Hanxleden.

<sup>26</sup>According to Van Hal and Vielle (2013: 7), this is the dictionary that was referred to as 'Hanxleden's dictionary' in Vesdin's writing.

<sup>27</sup>Bernard Bischoepinck, S.J. (1642-c.1754), Hanxleden's disciple, added Latin translations (Van Hal & Vielle 2010: 7). Antonio Pimentel, S.J. (?-1752) was an archbishop of Cranganore (Kodungallur in Kerala, India). He completed Hanxleden's Malayālam-Portuguese dictionary, finished by Hanxleden up to the letter *t*, and named the work *Vocabulario de lingua Malavar* (Rocher 1977: 212).

<sup>28</sup>Most probably Hanxleden's grammar. For the transmission of this grammar see Van Hal and Vielle (2013: 13–15). Hanxleden's grammar was discovered by Toon Van Hal in the Carmelite monastery in Montecompatri, Lazio, in Italy (Van Hal 2010).

<sup>29</sup>At the end of the paper one can find a list of all abbreviations.

<sup>30</sup>Destur Hoshauq Jamasp (Jamaspji & Haug 1867: I) gives the following remarks about Anquetil-Duperron's edition and translation: '... the meaning and translation in Pahlavi and French are so incorrect, that, for all practical purposes, they are useless, and the inaccuracies are such that it appears to me that the learned Frenchman either misunderstood the meanings, or his teacher, Destur Dārāb of Surat, was unable to explain to him the contents correctly.'

<sup>31</sup>The first modern edition of the text was published in 1867 by H. Jamaspji and M. Haug together with translation and index. After that, the text was edited by Hans Reichelt (1900), G. Klingenschmitt (1968) and finally by Rahām Ashah (2009). For the purpose of identifying Avestan words in Vesdin's treatise we found Reichelt's index to his edition (Reichelt 1901) the most valuable, and hence his edition is used in this paper.

index of all Avestan words in *Frahang i oīm* in Bartholomae's transliteration that makes it easier to identify the word. Vesdin was also careless at times with copying Anquetil-Duperron's words. For instance, Anquetil-Duperron's (p. 442) *khshethrō* Vesdin copied as *khscetro* (Reichelt 1901:137 *xšaθrō* = *ksatriya* 'warrior'). Vesdin also ignored many of Anquetil-Duperron's diacritics, which are sometimes helpful. For instance, Vesdin's (p. XXIII) *vakhsch* represents Anquetil-Duperron's *vâksch*. In ZA *â* stands for Av. *ā* and is thus closer to Reichelt's *vāxš* 'voice, speech' (p. 169). On the other hand, the identification of Vesdin's Sanskrit entries is occasionally challenging. The reason for this lies in Vesdin's unsystematic transliteration. Rocher (1977:xxiv) defends Vesdin's transliteration asserting that if one has in mind South Indian pronunciation and an Italian style of reading it is easy to reconstruct the Sanskrit original. Despite that, some rather serious inconsistencies should be noted. Vesdin did not indicate vowel length, the IAST<sup>32</sup> *-ś-* is sometimes represented as *-sh-* (*shrudi* = *śruti* 'hearing, revelation'<sup>33</sup>), and sometimes as *-sch-* (*schedé* = *śete* 'lies down'). IAST *-ṣ-* is sometimes represented as *-s-* (*naṣti* = *naṣti* 'loss'), sometimes as *-sh-* (*vakshyadi* = *vakṣyati* 'will speak'), sometimes as *-sch-* (*kr̥schi* = *kr̥ṣi* 'ploughing') and even *-sz-* (*amisza* = *āmiṣa* 'meat'). IAST *-y-* is sometimes written as *-j-* (*martja* = *martya* 'mortal'), sometimes as *-y-* (*yūyam* = *yūyam*). Aspiration is sometimes indicated, sometimes not, while voiceless aspirate (*visarga*) *-h-* is never represented. Vocalic liquid *-ṛ-* is also a source of confusion as it can be rendered as *-ra-*, *-er-*, *-e-*, or *-r-* (*pratschadi* = *pr̥cchati* 'asks'; *herda* = *hr̥d-* 'heart'; *geha* = *gr̥ha* 'house').

### The first word list: Sanskrit and Avestan 'cognates'

In the table we present IAST transliterations with Vesdin's forms in square brackets together with an etymological note taken from Mayrhofer's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (= EWA) and other dictionaries. In the second column we cite Vesdin's Avestan word and in the third column Reichelt's rendering of the same Avestan word in his edition of *Frahang i oīm* (Reichelt 1900, 1901). We use an asterisk to mark 107 comparisons successful in the view of modern scholarship.

- (a) Some of the cognate pairs bear clear phonetic and semantic resemblance and were easily identified by Vesdin (i.e. Skt. *putra* = Av. *puθra*; Skt. *pañcadaśa* = Av. *pañcadasa* 'fifteen' etc.). Also, Vesdin was able to correctly compare words for kinship terms – e.g. Skt. *mātr̥* (mádr) with Av. *māta* (mâté) 'mother'. Some words, such as Skt. *aṅguṣṭha* 'thumb',

<sup>32</sup>Acronym for International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration, the standard for transliteration of Indic scripts into Roman characters without the loss of any phonetic information.

<sup>33</sup>Voiced dentals come from South Indian pronunciation.

correctly identified by Vesdin as corresponding to the Pāzand<sup>34</sup> word transliterated as *arazān* ‘thumb’, do not carry any phonetic resemblance. Vesdin here made a correct connection by relying on the Pahl. word *angust*, which also means ‘thumb’. For Skt. *stena* ‘thief’ and Av. *taiio* ‘thief’, which are correctly associated, Vesdin supposedly relied on semantic correspondence as well. Mostly because of the mobile -s, their attested forms appear quite different, while the meaning remained the same.

- (b) On the other hand, 82 pairs can be rejected as not being cognates, while five acceptable identifications appear twice. Phonetic and semantic correspondences, on which Vesdin mostly relied, sometimes led him astray. Some of these errors are due to Anquetil-Duperron’s mistranslations. For instance Anquetil-Duperron mistranslated Av. *ahmāi* (D. sg. of the demonstrative pronoun) as ‘grand’, leading Vesdin to compare the word with the Skt. phrase *ayam mahā* ‘this one is big’.<sup>35</sup> Av. *tarasča* ‘across’ was mistranslated by Anquetil-Duperron as ‘il craint’ (‘he fears’), which misled Vesdin to compare the word with Skt. *dara* ‘fear’. The real cognate of *tarasča* is Skt. *tiraśc-*<sup>36</sup> bearing both semantic and phonetic resemblance. Other notable instances of unacceptable identification that can be explained by overreliance on semantic correspondence are for instance the wrong identification of Av. *xratuš* ‘wisdom, intellect’ with Skt. *dhṛti* ‘holding, resolution, will’. It is striking that Skt. cognate *kratu* did not cross Vesdin’s mind here. In three instances Vesdin wrongly associated the Malayālam words of Dravidian origin with Avestan: Malay. *nī*, നീ ‘you’ with Av. *nā*<sup>37</sup> ‘we’; Malay. *palaya* ‘old’ with Av. *bāda* ‘always’<sup>38</sup>; Malay. *akam* ‘sin’ with Av. *aya* ‘badness, wickedness’.

### The second list: *Vocabula Liturgica*

This list, containing 18 entries related mostly to Zoroastrian ritual, was quite difficult to analyse. The identification of Sanskrit words presented the greatest challenge. On the other hand, it was fairly easy to identify Iranian words which Vesdin took from Anquetil-Duperron’s ZA II, pp. 529f (*Usages Civils et Religieux des Parses*). Anquetil-Duperron’s Iranian words are, upon closer inspection, in fact Avestan, Pahlavi and New Indo-Aryan loanwords from Sanskrit accepted by the Parsi community in India.

<sup>34</sup>Pāzand is a writing system based on the Avestan alphabet used for writing Pahlavi, especially for commentaries (*Zand*) of the Avestan sacred corpus.

<sup>35</sup>Interestingly enough, Skt. *ayam* (N. sg.) is actually related to Av. *ahmāi* (D. sg.); *mahā* ‘big’ is unrelated.

<sup>36</sup>The weak base of *tiryāñc-* ‘transverse, horizontal’.

<sup>37</sup>OAv. acc./dat./gen. pl. of the pers. pron.

<sup>38</sup>Anquetil-Duperron mistranslated *bāda* (adv.) ‘always’ as ‘vieux’ (‘old’).

In this list Vesdin was less successful in identifying cognates; only four pairs can be accepted as related. This is, however, not unexpected because the words mostly come from Zoroastrian ritual, which does not have many correspondences in the Hindu ritual with which Vesdin was familiar.

An example of Vesdin's adherence to semantic correspondence is Pahl. *aiwayāhan* (Av. *aiβiiāṅhana*) 'sacred girdle, cord'<sup>39</sup> that Vesdin compared to Skt. *udvāhanī*, 'cord, rope'. These words are unrelated because *aiβiiāṅhana* is derived from the Av. root *yāh-* 'to wrap around, to girdle', while *udvāhanī* is derived from the causative of the verb *ud√vah* 'to lead, to carry'. Many incorrectly paired words in Vesdin's *Vocabula liturgica* are quite different both in sound and meaning; e.g. Skt. *paṭaccara* (*padatschar* in Vesdin) 'woven cloth, veil' is mistakenly compared to Pahl. *padān* 'sacred veil'<sup>40</sup> (Av. *paiti.dāna* = Skt. *prati-dhāna* 'placed in front [of the mouth]'). Also Skt. *svadhyāya* 'Vedic recitation', *prārthana* 'wish, petition', *namaskāra* 'adoration, homage' are all compared to Pahl. *nīrang(dīn)*, a name of Zoroastrian ceremony of consecrating the sacred bull's urine (*gōmēz*).<sup>41</sup>

There are only four acceptable identifications in this list: Skt. *aṅgulīya* = Pahl. *angustarīg* 'a finger-ring'; Skt. *kartari* 'scissors, a knife' = Av. *karəta* 'knife'; *Mitra* = *Mithra*. It is worth noting a New Indo-Aryan Gujarati loanword *tal* 'cymbal' from Skt. *tāla* 'cymbal' adopted by Parsis from Gujarat.

In the end it may be said that Vesdin might have been more successful in comparing Indian and Iranian ritual language cognates if he had had access to the oldest strata of Indian Vedic and Iranian Avestan liturgical vocabulary that indeed share significant and strikingly well preserved forms that go back to Indo-Iranian prehistory. We know that Vesdin did not have access to Vedas, and he did not even know that Vedas are texts; he believed that *Vedam* is a religious law (*lex*) embedded in Hindu religious books.<sup>42</sup>

### The third list: Sanskrit and Germanic cognates

Vesdin's third list comprises 59 pairs of Sanskrit and Germanic words that Vesdin considered to be related. Vesdin's Germanic words are a mixture of different strata of historical development of Germanic vocabulary. Vesdin's care to provide the oldest variant of the word is notable. Again Vesdin was successful in comparing words for kinship

<sup>39</sup>*Aiwayāhan* is a sacred girdle wrapped around the waist by Zoroastrians; it can also designate a date-palm leaf strip which is used to tie wires out of which the *barsom* twig is made. See Kanga (1984) and Choksy and Kotwal (2014).

<sup>40</sup>Ritually employed to prevent the breath from polluting the sacred fire (Modi 1922: 116).

<sup>41</sup>See Modi (1922: 97f, 255f).

<sup>42</sup>Vesdin (1790: 9, 75).

terms such as Skt. *mātr̥* = OFris. *moder*; Skt. *pitṛ* = MHG *fater*; *bhrātr̥* = MHG *brouder*; *sūnu* = NHG *Sohn*/OSax. *sunu*. It is interesting to note the identification of Skt. *śāsita* ‘punished’ with OHG *chestigon* ‘to chastise, punish’, which is in fact a loanword in OHG from Lat. *castigation*, which is in turn related to *śāsita* through the PIE root \**kes-* ‘to cut’. An interesting acceptable identification is Skt. *majjan* ‘marrow’ with NHG *Mark* (< PIE \**mosg<sup>h</sup>-*). The two resemble each other semantically, but are arguably quite different in form. Mistaken comparisons are usually words that appear similar. Skt. *lipsā* ‘longing’ and NHG *Liebe* ‘love’ (the Skt. word comes from PIE \**leip-* ‘to smear, stick’, and German word from \**leub<sup>h</sup>-* ‘to care for, love’). For Skt. and German compounds *dvāravartin* and *torwartel* ‘chamberlain’ Vesdin was right for the first member *dvāra-* and *tor-* (both stem from the PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>uer*), while *-vartin* stems from PIE \**uert-* ‘to turn’ and *-wart* from \**uer-* ‘to observe’. Many mistaken identifications are admittedly close in both sound and meaning, such as Skt. *gamana* ‘moving’ and OHG/MHG *gān* (> *gehen*) ‘going’ which are not cognates. Skt. *pur* ‘fortress, castle’ is quite similar to OHG *burg* ‘castle’ (from Lat. *burgos* < Gr. *πούργος*), but initial *-p-* (PIE \**p<sup>l</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-*) would give *-f-* [ϕ] in Germanic according to Grimm’s law. Another typical misconception is comparison of Skt. *ānanda* ‘bliss’ (√*nand* ‘to rejoice’) to *unende*, *unendlich* ‘unending’ (in fact related to Skt. *anta* ‘border, end’ [EWA I, p. 75]).

### Vesdin’s linguistic views

Aware of Jones’ famous *Third Anniversary Discourse* delivered to *The Asiatic Society* in 1786 and published in *Asiatick Researches* in 1788,<sup>43</sup> Vesdin (1798: XVIII, ft. 15) criticized Jones for not substantiating his claims that Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, Gothic, Celtic and Old Persian have sprung from some common source.<sup>44</sup> This was the most probable reason why Vesdin composed *De antiquitate* and four years later *De Latini sermonis*, where exhaustive lists of ‘cognate’ words serve to prove that Sanskrit, Avestan and Germanic (*De antiquitate*) and Sanskrit, Greek and Latin (*De Latini sermonis*) are related. In *De Latini sermonis* Vesdin claimed that ancient Latins and Indians were people of the same stock<sup>45</sup> who spoke some kind of primordial, rudimentary Sanskrit.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>43</sup>Vesdin (1790: 16) cites a part of Jones’ famous speech.

<sup>44</sup>... *nulla suae assertionis produxisset documenta* ...’ (Vesdin 1798: XVIII, ft. 15). S. also van Driem’s critical assessment of Jones’ famous lecture (Van Driem 2001: 1049).

<sup>45</sup>Swiggers (2017: 138) lists mixing of linguistic aspects with historical, geographical, ethnological, theological, philosophical considerations as one of the principal features of the ‘prehistory’ of comparative linguistics.

<sup>46</sup>*Haec ratio et causa jam dudum me induxit, ut crederem, veteres Indos et Latinos in remota antiquitate unius stirpis homines fuisse, et ab uno stipite descendere, in cujus familia, rudis ille quidem, sed unus primordialis Samscrdamicus sermo vigeat.* (Vesdin 1802: 10).



This implies that in *De Latini sermonis* Vesdin proposed some kind of common source which is not Sanskrit as we know it, although Sanskrit is much closer to that source than Greek and Latin. However, in *De Latini sermonis* Vesdin explains the kinship between the Greek, Latin and Indian peoples and their languages in terms of biblical tradition. Vesdin traced the ancestors of the Greeks, Romans and Indians to Javan, the son of Japheth (Vesdin 1802: 2f).<sup>47</sup> He considered the similarity between the Sanskrit name for Greeks (*yavana*) and the name *Javan* as an important proof of this claim.<sup>48</sup>

Vesdin was right that Sanskrit is related to Avestan but was wrong in his view that Avestan developed from Sanskrit. Anquetil-Duperron's Pahlavi material in ZA that resembled Avestan led Vesdin to the misconception that Avestan words came into Pahlavi by mixing (or in modern terminology, by language contact).

Regarding sound change, discussed extensively in 19<sup>th</sup> century comparative linguistics, Vesdin's notes are scarce but worth mentioning. Sound changes are discussed in footnotes 16 (p. XXI) and 26 (p. XXX). In footnote 16 Vesdin notes correctly that Av. changes the Skt. *-p-* into *-f-*. He cites two correct examples: Skt. *pitṛ* = Av. *fəδr* 'father' and Skt. *preman* = Av. *frim* 'love'. Vesdin notes that 'Zend' also adds the element *h*, not attested in corresponding Sanskrit words, and cites the example Skt. *putra* = Av. *puθra* 'son'.<sup>49</sup> Vesdin mentions the 'useless' addition of an *e* in the word *mrete*. This is because of Anquetil-Duperron's transliteration; in the modern transliteration based on Bartholomae's (and Hoffmann's) system, the word would be rendered as *mərəta* 'dead, deceased'. In Av., PIE \**r* (Skt. *r*) becomes *əṛə*. Vesdin also considers the change from Skt. *i* to *e* in Persian *peder* 'a corruption'. Here the situation is more complicated as we are dealing with a reflex of PIE laryngeal \**h*<sub>2</sub> that reflected as *i* in Skt., the same as in Av., except before two consonants when it disappears (Beekes 1988: 86f). Vesdin (1798: XXX, ft. 26) considers a general rule, to which Av. is no exception, that 'the first mutation starts with vowels ... Some necessary vowels are omitted, others duplicated.' Vesdin remarks that consonants are more stable ('firmer') and make the relationship between languages clearer.<sup>50</sup>

Furthermore, Vesdin (1802: 17f) claims that the Latin words were formed out of Sanskrit through the addition, subtraction, and permutation of letters (*litteras aliquas addendo, detrahendo, et permutando*). Although he does not mention it directly, Vesdin was most probably an adherent of

<sup>47</sup> According to Rocher (1961: 341f), Vesdin derived his explanation from Gerhard Johannes Vossius (1577–1649).

<sup>48</sup> *Javanis Graecorum meminere etiam Brahmanes Indi. Hinc Javanabhasha ipsis est lingua graeca* (Vesdin 1802: 3).

<sup>49</sup> In Avestan, PIE voiceless stops became fricatives before consonants: PIE \**p* > Av. *f* (Skt. *p*), PIE \**t* > Av. *θ* (Skt. *t*). See Beekes (1988: 73).

<sup>50</sup> (Van Hal 2005 [2004]: 332) suggests that the idea of stability of consonants and exchangeability of vowels, shared with Cœurdoux, is influenced by Semitic grammatical theory.



the classical theory of arbitrary letter/sound permutations (*permutatio litterarum*). This theory was developed in the domains of grammar and rhetoric and was used since classical antiquity to explain linguistic change as the operations of addition (*adiectio*), subtraction (*detractio*), permutation (*transmutatio*), and substitution (*immutatio*) of sounds/letters.<sup>51</sup>

### Concluding remarks

Swiggers (2017: 138) enumerates four principal features that distinguish the ‘prehistory’ of comparative linguistics from a satisfactory approach to linguistic relationships. (a) First is the geographical model of language diversification. Vesdin does not adopt such a model of distribution of languages. However, he discusses some geographical aspects of language distribution. Thus he assumes that the reason for the similarity of Sanskrit words with Germanic, Slavic, Latin and Greek words is cohabitation of their speakers in the field of Shinar where the Tower of Babel was built. Later, when discussing the kinship of Sanskrit and Avestan, Vesdin assumes that Sanskrit was spoken in Media (north-western Iran) and Persia. (b) The second feature is the failure to elaborate a concept of language-internal change. Vesdin did not elaborate systematically a system of language change, even if still presented some interesting observations. (c) The third feature of the ‘prehistory’ of comparative linguistics is mixing of linguistic aspects with historical, geographical, ethnological, theological and philosophical considerations. This feature is evident in Vesdin’s treatise in the sense that e.g. linguistic kinship is interpreted in the frame of biblical tradition of the Tower of Babel, while Zoroastrian liturgical vocabulary is (rather unsuccessfully) compared to Hindu ritual vocabulary. (d) The fourth feature is the incapability to include known Indo-European languages or the inclusion of non-Indo-European languages in the scheme. This feature is also represented in Vesdin, as he considered Dravidian languages Tamil and Malayāḷam as related to Sanskrit in the sense that they are ‘dialects’ of Sanskrit.

On the other hand, Swiggers (2017: 140) enumerates four minimal demands for the qualification of ‘linguistic comparativism’. (a) First is a concept of explicitly labelled linguistic domains in a sense of the ideas of ‘family’, ‘group’, ‘stock’. This feature in a way exists in Vesdin’s writings as he speaks of ‘stock’ or ‘race’ (*stirpis*, Vesdin 1802: 10) although he does not identify them by name (e.g. ‘Indo-European’, ‘Romance’, which is

<sup>51</sup>The set of four operations appears for the first time in anonymous work *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.29 (1<sup>st</sup> c. BC); it was Varro in *De lingua Latina* 5.1.6 and 6.1.2 who used them to describe the linguistic change as he relies on them to justify his etymologies. Quintilian in *Institutio oratoria* 1.5.38–41 calls this set of operations *quadripertita ratio*. For a thorough overview of *quadripertita ratio* see Lausberg (1990: 250–254 [S462]). For its application to linguistic change see Denecker (2017: 292–293), who also provides an extensive bibliography for *permutatio litterarum*.

a part of Swigger's requirement). (b) A genetically based concept of linguistic relatedness is the second requirement that is in a way fulfilled; Vesdin understands the relation between the languages in question genetically, as he considers Sanskrit a 'mother' language of Avestan. The problem is here that Sanskrit is not a parent language of Avestan, but they both developed from a parent language, the Proto-Indo-Iranian. (c) The time-frame into which the related languages are chronologically situated is the third demand that is not addressed by Vesdin in a satisfactory manner because his theory is still formulated in the frame of biblical worldview. (d) Swiggers' fourth demand concerns a demonstrative technique based on linguistic material that is used to prove linguistic relatedness. This requirement is fulfilled because Vesdin developed a demonstrative technique in the form of systematic comparison of words.

Therefore, Vesdin's work meets these requirements partially. However, from all the material presented it is quite obvious that Vesdin still belongs to the 'prehistory' of comparative linguistics. Some features such as biblical explanations of language diversification and the arbitrariness of *permutatio litterarum* that prevented systematic research of sound change anchor him deeply in prescientific linguistic developments. However, some features such as awareness of genetic relationship between languages and quite successful comparison of linguistic material might place him in the closing chapters of the prehistory of comparative linguistics and announce the 'satisfactory approach to linguistic relationships' (Swiggers 2017: 139) that will start to develop soon after Vesdin with Bopp, the Schlegel brothers, Rask and others. Because of that, we see Vesdin as one of the 'intermediaries' that stand as a link between pre-modern and fully developed modern linguistics; this only confirms that the development of what can be understood as a 'satisfactory approach to language comparison' did not appear abruptly.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

### Notes on contributors

*Ivan Andrijanić* graduated from the Art Academy of Zagreb University in 1998 and from Indology and Philosophy in 2002. In 2010 he completed his Ph.D with a thesis on the Vedāntic commentaries of the White Yajur-Veda. His main focus of research is Vedānta and different aspects of the Mahābhārata studies. His areas of interest include the relative chronology and authenticity of Śaṅkara's works, and reconstruction of Bhartṛprapañca's lost commentary on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad on the basis of fragments in Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Ānandagiri. He has published a book on Vedānta and the first Sanskrit grammar in the Croatian language. Currently he works as an Associate Professor and Head

of the Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Zagreb University.

**Petra Matović** born in Brežice, Slovenia, received her doctoral degree at the University of Zagreb in 2015. Her thesis *Types of Homeric formulae in the Latin translation of the Iliad by Rajmund Kunić* discussed two 18th-century translations of Homer into Latin by Jesuit poets. She is currently a postdoc at the Department of Classical Philology at the University of Zagreb, Croatia. Her areas of interest are Greek to Latin translations and Latin in the Age of Discovery.

## Lexica

AW = Bartholomae, Ch. (1904) *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg: K. J. Trübner.

EDGL = Kluge, F. (1891) *An Etymological Dictionary of the German Language*. Translated from the Fourth German Edition. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: MacMillan & Co.

EDLIL = de Vaan, M. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series Vol. VII. Leiden, Boston: Brill.

EWA = Mayrhofer, M. (1986–2001) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Bd. 1–3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter — Universitätsverlag.

EWDS = Kluge, F. (1995) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache Bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold, 23., erweiterte Auflage*. Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter.

DED = Burrow, Th. & M. B. Emeneau (1984) *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MW = *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European languages*, Monier Monier-Williams, revised by E. Leumann, C. Cappeller, et al. 1899, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

OPP = Haug, M. & Destur Hoshengji Jamaspji (1870), *An Old Pahlavi-Pazand Glossary*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot; London: Trübner And Co.

WP = Walde, A. & Pokorny, J. (1927–1932) *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

ZA = Anquetil-Duperron, A. H. (1771) *Zend-Avesta, ouvrage de Zoroastre*, 3 vols, Paris.

ZPG = Haug, M. & Destur Hoshengji Jamaspji (1867), *An Old Zand-Pahlavi Glossary*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot; London: Trübner And Co.

## References

Andrijanić, I. 2017. “A List of Sanskrit and Latin Cognates in Vesdin’s Treatise De Latini Sermonis Origine.” *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 45 (3): 195–234.

Anquetil-Duperron, A. H. 1771. *Zend-Avesta, ouvrage de Zoroastre*. Vol. 3. Paris: N.M. Tillard.

Ashah, R. 2009. *Avesta Glossary: A Glossary of Avesta Words and Their Pārsīg Equivalents, Based on the Zand, the so-called Frahang ī ōim: ēk*. Mumbai: K. R. Cama Oriental Institute.

Bartholomae, Ch. 1900. “Arica XIII.” *Indogermanische Forschungen* 11: 112–44. doi:10.1515/9783110242539.112.

Beekes, R. S. P. 1988. *A Grammar of Gatha-Avestan*. Leiden/New York: Brill.

Borissoff, C. L. 2015. “Antun Mihanović and His Contribution to Slavonic-Sanskrit Comparative Studies.” *Filologija* 64: 1–36.

- Boyce, M. 1968. "Middle Persian Literature." In *Iranian Studies*, Vol. 1 Literatur. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Abt.1. Bd.4. Abs.2: Literature, Lief.1, 31–66. Brill: Leiden.
- Camps, A., & Jean-Claude Muller, eds. 1988. *The Sanskrit Grammar and Manuscripts of Father Heinrich Roth, S.J. (1620–1668). Facsimile Edition of Bibliotheca Nazionale, Rome, Mss. Or. 171 and 172*. Brill: Leiden.
- Choksy, J. K., & F. M. Kotwal 2014. "Kustīg, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, Online Edition, 2014." Accessed 26 Jul 2018 <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kustig>
- Denecker, T. 2017. *Ideas on Language in Early Latin Christianity*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Eddy, John H., Jr. 1994. "Buffon's Histoire Naturelle: History? A Critique of Recent Interpretations." *Isis* 85 (4): 644–61. doi:10.1086/356982.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. 2010. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Malden MA/Oxford/Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Godfrey, J. J. 1967. "Sir William Jones and Père Coeurdoux: A Philological Footnote." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 87 (1): 57–59. doi:10.2307/596596.
- Jauk-Pinhak, M. 1984. "Some Notes on the Pioneer Indologist Filip Vesdin (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo)." *Indologica Taurinensia* 12: 129–37.
- Kanga, M. F. 1984. "Aiwyaṅhana, *Encyclopædia Iranica*, I/7, P. 695." Accessed 26 Jul 2018. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/aiwyanhana-avestan-term-wrapping-round-girdle>
- Kapović, Mate. 2017. "Indo-European Languages – Introduction". In *The Indo-European Languages*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. edited by Mate Kapović, 1–9. Routledge, Oxford/New York
- Klingenschmitt, G. (1968) *Frahang-i öim: Edition und Kommentar*, Ph.D. diss., University of Erlangen.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1957. "Avestan Mazdā." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1: 86–95.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. 1976. "Ahura Mazdā "Lord Wisdom"?. " *Indo-Iranian Journal* 18: 25–42. doi:10.1163/000000076790079465.
- Lausberg, H. 1990. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, 3. Auflage. 1<sup>st</sup> ed. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. (1960, München: Max Hueber Verlag).
- Martínez, J., & M. de Vaan. 2013. *Introduction to Avestan*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Matišić, Z. 2007. *Joy, Fear, Dedication: Contribution to the Biography of Ivan Filip Vesdin–Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo*. Zagreb: Sekcija za orijentalistiku Hrvatskoga filološkoga društva i Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu.
- Mayrhofer, M. 1983. *Sanskrit und die Sprachen Alteuropas. Zwei Jahrhunderte des Widerspiels von Entdeckungen und Irrtümern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Milewska, I. 2003. "First Missionaries on Sanskrit Grammar." In *Christians and Missionaries in India, Cross-Cultural Communication since 1500*, edited by Robert Eric Frykenberg, Grand Rapids, 62–69. Michigan/Cambridge,UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. London and New York: Routledge.
- Modi, J.J. 1922. *The Religious Ceremonies and Customs of the Parsees*. Bombay: British India Press.
- Reichelt, H. 1900. "Der *Frahang i öim*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 14: 177–213.
- Reichelt, H. 1901. "Der *Frahang i öim*." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 15: 117–86.
- Rocher, L. 1961. "Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo on the Kinship of the Language of India and Europe." *The Adyar Library Bulletin Brahmavidyā* 25: 321–52.
- Rocher, L. 1977. *Dissertation on the Sanskrit language by Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo: with an introductory article, a complete English translation, and an index of sources*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Slamnig, I. 1991. "Ivan Filip Vezdin (1748–1806), pionir evropske indologije i komparativne filologije [Ivan Filip Vezdin, Pioneer of European Indology and Comparative Philology]." *Grada za povijest književnosti Hrvatske HAZU* 33: 1–28.
- Swiggers, P. 2017. "Intuition, Exploration, and Assertion of the Indo-European Language Relationship." In *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, edited by Jarred Klein, Brian Joseph, & Matthias Fritz, 138–170. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Thieme, P. 1970. "Die vedischen Āditya und die zarathustrischen Aməša Spənta." In *Zarathustra*, edited by B. Schlerath, 397–412. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Van Driem, George. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas: An Ethnolinguistic Handbook*. Vol. II. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Hal, T. 2005 [2004]. "Language Comparison in Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo (1748--1806): Aims, Methodological Principles." *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 22–23: 323–36.
- Van Hal, T. 2010. "À la recherche d'une grammaire perdue: Johann Ernst Hanxleden's Grammatica Grandonica retrieved." *Historiographia Linguistica* 37 (3): 445–57. doi:10.1075/hl.37.3.17van.
- Van Hal, T., & Christophe Vielle, eds. 2013. *Grammatica Grandonica, the Sanskrit Grammar of Johann Ernst Hanxleden S.J. (1681–1732)*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.
- Vesdin, Filip. 1790. (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo) *Sidharubam seu Grammatica Samscrdamica*. Romae: Ex Typographia Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Vesdin, Filip. 1798. (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo) *De antiquitate et affinitate linguae Zendicae, Samscrdamicae, et Germanicae dissertatio*. Padua: Typis seminarii.
- Vesdin, Filip. 1802. (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo) *De Latini sermonis origine et cum orientalibus linguis connexione dissertatio*. Romae: Apud Antonium Fulgonium.
- Vesdin, Filip. 1804. (Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo) *Vyacaranam seu Locupletissima Samscrdamicae Linguae Institutio*. Romae: Ex Typographia Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Wetzel, Leopold. 1936. *Der österreichische Karmelit Paulinus a S. Bartholomaeo. Persönlichkeit und Werk*. Wien: Graphische Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt.



## Appendix

Table 1. Sanskrit and Avestan Glossary.

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oīm (Reichelt 1901)	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oīm (Reichelt 1901)
1. *	<i>pitṛ, pitā</i> [pidr, pida] 'father' EWA II p. 128 *ph <sub>2</sub> tér	<i>fédre</i>	<i>faḍr</i>	2. *	<i>mātṛ, mātā</i> : [mādr, māda] EWA II p. 345 *meh <sub>2</sub> tér- putra [putra] 'son, child' EWA II p. 142 *putlío	<i>māta</i>
3. *	<i>duhitā</i> [duhīda], 'sister' EWA I p. 737 *d <sup>h</sup> ugh <sub>2</sub> ter	<i>dochter dogdē</i>	<i>duyḍa</i>	4. *	<i>bhagnī, bhagini</i> [bhagani] 'sister' pp. 73f < *pōti	<i>puḡra</i>
5. *	<i>bhrātṛ</i> [bhrāder] 'brother' EWA II, p. 280 *b <sup>h</sup> rēh <sub>2</sub> ter- <i>brader, bra, burider</i> <sup>1</sup>	Pahl. <i>berar, Pers. brader, bra, burider</i> <sup>1</sup>	<i>brūvar</i> (OPP p. 8)	6. *	<i>pati</i> [padī] 'lord, master' EWA II pp. 73f < *pōti	<i>x<sup>h</sup>uḡha<sup>2</sup></i>
7. *	<i>kṣatriya</i> [kshetria] 'warrior' EWA I p. 421 Ilr. *kṣa-trā	<i>khscetro</i>	<i>xṣaḡrō</i>	8. *	<i>nara</i> [narā] du. 'two men' pp. 189f < *p <sup>h</sup> iH-ō-	<i>paiti</i>
9. *	<i>nṛ, nara</i> [nā, nara] 'man' EWA II p. 19 < *h <sub>2</sub> nér	<i>na</i>	<i>nā</i>	10. *	<i>nārika</i> [ndrī] *h <sub>2</sub> nérh <sub>1</sub> (e)	<i>nara</i>
11. *	<i>nārī</i> [narī] f. 'woman' EWA II p. 19	<i>ndéré</i>	<i>nāri</i>	12. *	<i>nderekenan</i>	<i>nārikanam</i> (g. pl.)
13. *	<i>jīva</i> [given] 'living, soul' EWA I pp. 594f < *g <sup>h</sup> i <sub>3</sub> -yō- <sup>4</sup>	<i>gueie</i>	<i>gaya</i> (gaem), < *g <sup>h</sup> oih <sub>3</sub> -ō	14. *	<i>frém</i>	<i>frim</i>
15. *	<i>strī</i> [strī] 'woman' EWA II p. 764	<i>strim, stree</i>	<i>stri, strīm</i>	16. *	Pahl. <i>mاده</i>	OPP, p. 157 'female'
17. *	<i>martya</i> [martyā] 'mortal' EWA II p. 328 < *mer <sup>5</sup>	<i>merete</i>	<i>marata</i> 'man'	18. *	<i>mrete</i>	<i>marata</i> 'man'
19. *	<i>mantra</i> [mandra] 'sacrificial formula'	<i>manthré</i>	<i>maḡra</i> <sup>6</sup>	20. *	<i>medo</i>	<i>maḍuḡ</i> <sup>8</sup>
21. *	<i>mahā</i> [maha] EWA II p. 338 = Av. <i>maziiah</i> 'great'	<i>maé, mdo</i>	<i>mā</i>	22. *	<i>ndfo</i>	<i>nāfo</i>
23. *	<i>madye</i> [madye] 'in the middle' EWA II p. 303 = Av. <i>meiao</i>	<i>meiao</i>	<i>mayā</i>	24. *	<i>mā</i>	<i>mā</i>
25. *	<i>maidīia</i> <i>māna</i> [māna] <sup>9</sup> 'measure' EWA II p. 342	<i>meeté</i>	<i>maite</i> <sup>0</sup>	26. *	<i>vereksché</i> (ZA, p. 457 [verékhe])	<i>varakaha</i> 'leaf' <sup>11</sup>
27. *	<i>vastra</i> [vastra] 'cloth' EWA II p. 529	<i>vastré</i>	<i>vastra</i>	28. *	<i>vispé</i>	<i>vispa</i>
29. *	<i>gopya</i> [gobīa] 'protect' EWA I p. 502	<i>gozra</i>	<i>gūzra</i> <sup>12</sup>	30. *	<i>goschté</i>	<i>gaoš</i> 'ear' <sup>13</sup>
31. *	<i>go</i> [gau, gō, gava] 'cow' EWA I p. 478 < *g <sup>h</sup> oyū	<i>gueem</i>	<i>gavq</i> (g. pl.)	32. *	<i>shtoeté</i>	<i>štuiti</i>

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued).

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oim (Reichelt 1901)	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oim (Reichelt 1901)
33. *	<i>stana</i> [stana] 'breast' EWA II p. 752	<i>fschtáne</i>	<i>fstána</i>	34. *	<i>gueden</i> <sup>14</sup> (< *g <sup>u</sup> em7)	<i>gatæ</i> 'reached' <sup>15</sup> (dat. of <i>gati</i> )
35. *	<i>šruti</i> [šrudī] 'hearing' EWA II pp. 666f < *kleu	<i>sreueto</i>	<i>sruta</i>	36. *	<i>gr̥h̥nati</i> [gr̥h̥nādī] 'grab' EWA I pp. 505f < *g <sup>u</sup> reb <sup>16</sup>	<i>gr̥awnaṭ</i>
37. *	<i>snāti</i> [snādī] 'bathes' EWA II p. 770	<i>gnāto</i> <sup>16</sup>	<i>snātō</i>	38. *	<i>karoti</i> [karōdī] 'does' EWA II pp. 307ff	<i>kartār, kar̥aiṅino</i> 'doer' <sup>17</sup>
39. *	<i>kṣi</i> [krschī] 'ploughing' EWA II p. 319 < llr. *kar-š	<i>krschté</i>	<i>kṣtæ</i>	40. *	<i>sūci</i> [sutschī] 'sight' <sup>18</sup> EWA II p. 739 < *kuH <sup>18</sup>	<i>suča</i>
41. *	<i>šete</i> [schedé] 'lies down' EWA II p. 614 < *kei(H7)	<i>scheete</i>	<i>šieti</i>	42. *	<i>tara</i> [tarām] EWA II pp. 755f < *h <sub>2</sub> stēr	<i>stāraqm</i>
43. *	<i>ševadhi</i> [schivadhi] 'treasure' EWA II p. 654f	<i>scheéto</i>	<i>šæto</i> 'Geld, Vermögen' <sup>19</sup>	44. *	<i>šaurya</i> [šaurya] 'valour' EWA II p. 650 < *kuh <sub>1</sub> to-	<i>zāvāra</i>
45. *	<i>tvam</i> [tvam] 'thou, thee' EWA I p. 682 < *tu	<i>thvanm</i>	<i>ṭvam</i> <sup>20</sup>	46. *	<i>yūyam</i> [yūyam] 'you' EWA II p. 416 < *juHs	<i>yūžam</i>
47. *	<i>mama</i> [mama] 'mine' EWA II p. 285	<i>manm</i>	<i>mam</i> (Acc.) <sup>21</sup>	48. *	<i>tri, trayas</i> [tri, traya] 'three' EWA I p. 675 *trej	<i>šrayam</i> 'threefold'
49. *	<i>trīya</i> [trīdīa] 'third'	<i>thretim</i>	<i>ṭritim</i>	50. *	<i>trīṃśati</i> [trīṃśadī] 'thirty'	<i>šrisatam</i>
51. *	<i>ap</i> [ap] 'water' EWA I p. 81 < *h <sub>2</sub> ep	<i>apem</i>	<i>āpam</i>	52. *	<i>naṣṭi</i> [naṣṭī] 'loss'	<i>aṣtāto</i> (ZPG, p. 85 'non-existent')
53. *	<i>roman</i> [róma] 'hair' EWA II p. 470	<i>ame</i> <sup>22</sup>		54. *	<i>vakṣyati</i> [vakṣhyadī] EWA II p. 490 < *uek <sup>u</sup>	<i>vāxs<sup>23</sup></i>
55. *	<i>vāta</i> [vādā] 'wind' EWA II p. 542 < *h <sub>2</sub> ueh <sub>1</sub> -nt-o-	<i>vātem</i>	<i>vātəm</i>	56. *	<i>vahana</i> [vāhana] 'vehicle' <sup>24</sup>	<i>vohuni</i> 'blood'
57. *	<i>vākya</i> [vāka, vākya] 'what has to be said, speech'	<i>vekiō</i>	<i>vikayo</i> 'witness'	58. *	<i>vīya</i> [vīya] 'valour' EWA II p. 569 vīra [N. vīrō]) < *uiHrō-	<i>vīro</i>
59. *	<i>varati</i> [vāradī]	<i>vérede</i>	<i>varāda</i> <sup>25</sup>	60. *	<i>vedin</i> [védī] 'knowing' deriv. -vid < *uejd-	<i>viedem</i> (AD, p. 459 'knowledge' <sup>27</sup> <i>veédem</i> ) <sup>26</sup>
61. *	<i>sveda</i> [svéda] 'sweating' EWA II p. 798 = YAv. x <sup>3</sup> aeḏa	<i>véede</i>	<i>vaēdā</i>	62. *	<i>vakṣyati</i> [vakṣhyadī] EWA II pp. 489ff < *uek <sup>u</sup>	<i>vača</i> <sup>28</sup>
63. *	<i>sa</i> [sa]	<i>a</i>	<i>ā</i>	64. *	<i>kāma</i> [kama]	<i>eekene</i>
65. *	<i>angusṣha</i> [angushta] 'thumb' EWA I, p. 49	<i>erezo Pah, anguscht, angust</i> <sup>29</sup>	<i>arazān</i>	66. *	<i>hṛdaya</i> [hr̥dayam] 'heart' EWA II p. 818 < *kṛd-	<i>aradāem</i> <sup>30</sup>

(Continued)





Table 1. (Continued).

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oim (Reichelt 1901)	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahang i oim (Reichelt 1901)
67. *	<i>eka</i> [ek, éga] 'one'	<i>oim</i>	<i>oim</i> <sup>31</sup>	<i>ugra</i> [ughɾa] 'powerful' EWA I p. 211	<i>oghrem</i>	<i>uyram</i>
69. *	<i>arūpin</i> [arūbi] 'formless'	<i>orué</i>	<i>ururā</i> <sup>32</sup>	<i>udara</i> [udara] 'stomach'	<i>orotere</i>	<i>uruswara</i>
71. *	<i>ukti</i> [ukti] 'speech' EWA I p. 490 < * <i>ükē</i> <sup>41</sup>	<i>okdem</i>	<i>uxōam</i>	<i>śodhana</i> [śodhana] 'cleaning'	<i>oschta</i>	<i>uśta</i> 'good' <sup>33</sup>
73. *	<i>atha</i> [atha] 'then, moreover' EWA I p. 59	<i>ethé</i>	<i>aṅa</i>	<i>pāmsu</i> [pansu] 'soil, dust' EWA II pp. 114f	<i>pansenosch</i>	<i>pāsanuś</i>
75. *	<i>pada, padavi</i> [pāda, padavi] 'footstep, path'	<i>pāte</i>	<i>pāḍa</i> <sup>34</sup>	<i>pada</i> [pādām] 'foot, leg'	<i>pādi</i>	<i>paḍām</i>
77. *	<i>pathin</i> [pantha] 'path'	<i>petho</i>	<i>paḍḍ</i>	<i>preraya</i> [prérenam] 'inciting'	<i>pérenem</i>	<i>parāna</i> 'bridge' <sup>35</sup>
79. *	<i>[pidrumāmsam]</i>	<i>petemom</i> <sup>36</sup>		<i>pañcāṅga</i> [pāntschāngam] 'consisting of five parts'	<i>pānghetengom</i>	<i>pāntāṅghum</i> 'fifth part'
81. *	<i>pañcendriya</i> [pāntschchéndria] 'five organs'	<i>pāntscheseté</i>	<i>pāncasata</i>	<i>pañcāśāśa</i> [pāntschāśāśā] 'fifteen' < * <i>pēnk</i> <sup>37</sup> e + * <i>dék</i> mt	<i>pāntschedesé</i>	<i>pāncāśāśa</i>
83. *	<i>yadi</i> [yadi] 'if' (EWA II, 397) < * <i>Hjō-</i>	<i>edé</i>	<i>jezi</i> [ZPG, p. 114 yédhi]	<i>adhunā</i> [adhuna] 'now'	<i>edenam</i> <sup>37</sup>	
85. *	<i>atha</i> [atha] 'then, moreover' (EWA I p. 59)	<i>edad</i>	<i>aḍat</i> (aḍa + at) 'afterwards' <sup>38</sup>	<i>asti</i> [astī] 'is' EWA I p. 144 < * <i>h</i> <sub>1</sub> ēs-	<i>asté</i>	<i>asti</i>
87. *	<i>asthi</i> [asthi] 'bone' EWA I p. 150 < * <i>h</i> <sub>2</sub> ost- <i>h</i> <sub>2</sub>	<i>astém</i>	<i>astām</i>	<i>edhate</i> [edhadé] 'prosper, grows' EWA I p. 267 = YAV.	<i>ezādedé</i>	<i>āzāta</i> 'noble' <sup>39</sup>
89. *	<i>sāsti</i> , [sastī] 'he is'	<i>astato</i>	<i>astāto</i> 'non-existent' <sup>40</sup>	<i>aśma</i> 'firewood'	<i>aspo</i>	<i>aspo</i>
91. *	<i>aṣṭā</i> [aścāta] 'eight' * <i>h</i> <sub>3</sub> ēkto <sub>h</sub> <sub>1</sub>	<i>aschtié</i>	ZPG, p. 12 <i>aṣṭā</i> <sup>41</sup>	<i>āśva</i> [aśhva] 'horse' < * <i>h</i> <sub>1</sub> ek <sub>1</sub> uo-	<i>ashtengom</i>	<i>aśtanḅum</i> 'eighth' <sup>42</sup>
93. *	[ <i>a</i> ḡa (Malab.)] <i>akarani</i> 'sin' (Malay.)	<i>eghé</i>	<i>aya</i>	<i>ugra</i> [ugra] 'mighty' EWA I p. 211	<i>egré</i>	<i>uyram</i>
95. *	<i>amara</i> [amara] 'immortal' EWA II, p. 318 < deriv. * <i>mj-</i> to-	<i>amerschan</i>	<i>amariśq</i>	<i>amātya</i> [amādīje amādījen] 'minister, counsellor' EWA I p. 95	<i>amáté</i>	p. 123 <i>amāta</i> ZPG p. 86 part. (nom. sg. f.) 'tried'
97. *	<i>ayami mahā</i> [ayammahā] 'this one is big'	<i>ehmāe</i>	<i>ahmāi</i> 'to this' <sup>43</sup>	<i>ugratama</i> [ugratama] 'mightiest'	<i>egreiotemo</i>	<i>ayyotamō</i> 'most excellent' <sup>44</sup>

(Continued)





Table 1. (Continued).

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahng i oim (Reichelt 1901)	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Frahng i oim (Reichelt 1901)
131.	<i>dara</i> [dɛrɔ] 'fear'	<i>terestŕche</i>	<i>tarasŕa praep.</i> <i>taya</i> <i>tāto</i> <sup>69</sup>	132.	<i>dak<sub>3</sub>ya</i> [dakʃha] 'ability, fitness'	<i>tasŕat</i> 'he formed' <sup>68</sup>
133.*	<i>stena</i> [stɛna] 'thief' EWA II p. 795 < *(s)teh <sub>2</sub>	<i>teio</i>	<i>taya</i>	134.*	<i>tamu</i> [tamu] 'body' EWA I p. 621	<i>tanum</i>
135.	<i>yāt-, yānt- [yán]</i> 'going' (part. praes.)	<i>tāto</i>	<i>tāto</i> <sup>69</sup>	136.*	<i>jivn, jivita [givi, gividen]</i> 'life'	<i>jum</i> 'living' <sup>70</sup>
137.	<i>kanyā-</i> (?) [kani, kanyaga]	<i>kenghé</i>	<i>x<sup>h</sup>uapha</i> <sup>71</sup>	138.*	<i>sveda [svédam]</i> 'sweating' EWA II p. 798 < *suejd-	<i>x<sup>h</sup>aedam</i>
139.	<i>abhyānta</i> [abhyānda] 'deceased, sick'	<i>beāntao</i>	<i>ban<sup>h</sup>tā</i> 'sick' <sup>72</sup>	140.*	<i>jihva [ghva, rafana]</i> 'tongue'	<i>jafra</i> 'deep' <sup>73</sup>
141.*	<i>dant- [dendām]</i> 'tooth' EWA pp. 693f < *h <sub>3</sub> dónts	<i>dentano</i>	<i>dantāno</i> <sup>74</sup>	142.*	<i>netra [netra]</i> 'eye' cak <sub>3</sub> ys [tschakul] 'eye' EWA I p. 524 (Pahl.) <i>dād</i>	<i>dāiŕra, Pahl.</i> <i>čas<sup>h</sup>m</i> <sup>75</sup>
143.*	<i>duhitā</i> [dúhida] = 3			144.*	<i>dadāti [dadati]</i> EWA I p. 713 < *deh <sub>3</sub>	<i>čas<sup>h</sup>m</i> <sup>75</sup>
145.	<i>rameŕa</i> [ramena] 'pleasurable'	<i>rafné</i>	<i>rafnā</i> 'pleasure'	146.*	<i>hasta [hasta]</i> 'hand' EWA II 812 < *g <sup>h</sup> es-to-	<i>zasta</i>
147.*	<i>gmā, jmā, ksmā</i> [gemma] 'earth' EWA pp. 424f < *d <sup>h</sup> eg <sup>h</sup> -/*d <sup>h</sup> g <sup>h</sup> -	<i>zemo</i>	<i>zāmō</i>	148.	<i>roša [rosha]</i> 'anger, rage'	<i>zušta</i> <sup>77</sup>
149.	<i>rasa</i> [rasa] 'sap, essence'	<i>za</i>	<i>zā</i> 'earth' <sup>78</sup>	150.*	<i>hima [hima]</i> 'winter' EWA II p. 815 < *g <sup>h</sup> iem-/g <sup>h</sup> im-	<i>zyqm</i>
151.*	<i>jāmāŕ</i> [jamāda] 'son-in-law' EWA I p. 586	<i>zameo</i>	<i>zāmaoio</i>	152.	<i>krūra [karuda]</i> 'harsh, cruel'	<i>xružda</i> <sup>79</sup> 'harsh'
153.	<i>ksira</i> [kschir] 'thickened milk'	<i>kschem</i>	<i>xšim</i> 'lamentation'	154.	<i>gacchati [ghetschadi]</i> 'he goes'	<i>xštāt</i> <sup>80</sup>
155.*	<i>dīrgha</i> [dirchen] 'long' EWA I p. 728 < *d <sup>h</sup> h <sub>3</sub> g <sup>h</sup> ó-	<i>deren</i>	<i>darayam</i>	156.	<i>dhana [dhanam]</i> 'wealth'	<i>daxmō</i> 'tower of scilence' <sup>81</sup>
157.*	<i>dāsama</i> [deshami] 'tenth' EWA I p. 709 < *dék <sup>h</sup> ŕŕ-ó-	<i>desmehé</i>	<i>dasmahé</i> <sup>82</sup>	158.*	<i>dadāti [dadati]</i> 'gives' EWA p. 713 < *deh <sub>3</sub>	<i>dadāiti</i>
159.	<i>mṛtyu</i> [mṛtyu] 'death'	<i>mret</i>	<i>marata</i> <sup>83</sup>	160.*	<i>darśayati [dershadī]</i> 'shows'	<i>daravaŕt</i> <sup>84</sup>
161.	<i>d<sup>h</sup>ṛti</i> [d <sup>h</sup> rdi, d <sup>h</sup> rdam] 'holding seizing' EWA p. 778	<i>khṛtosch</i>	<i>xratuŕ</i> 'wisdom, intellect' <sup>85</sup>	162.	<i>dhṛtimat [d<sup>h</sup>rdimán]</i> 'steadfast, calm'	<i>xratumā</i> <sup>86</sup>
163.*	<i>ksapā</i> [ksheba] 'night' EWA I p. 424 < *k <sup>h</sup> sep-	<i>khschefé</i>	<i>xšafa</i>	164.*	<i>yatra [yatra]</i> 'where' EWA II p. 396	<i>yaŕra</i>
165.	<i>gāpayati</i> [gebayadi] 'to cause to sing'	<i>jezae</i>	<i>yazāi</i> 'pray' <sup>87</sup>	166.*	<i>perigé</i> (?)	<i>paurva</i> <sup>88</sup>
167.	<i>śuddhavat</i> [shudhavan]	<i>jeoidean</i> <sup>89</sup>		168.*	<i>yathā [yatha]</i> 'in which manner, like' EWA II p. 397	<i>yaŕra</i>

(Continued)

Table 1. (Continued).

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	<i>Frahang i oim</i> (Reichelt 1901)	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	<i>Frahang i oim</i> (Reichelt 1901)
169.	<i>gacchati</i> [getschad] 'he goes'	<i>jētosch</i>	<i>yaētūs</i>	170. <i>pradiṣya</i> [pradisihita] 'pointed out, indicated'	<i>petische</i> <sup>90</sup>	<i>Frahang i oim</i> (Reichelt 1901)
171.	<i>para</i> [pére] 'distant, other'	<i>peeré</i>	<i>pairi</i> 'about' <sup>91</sup>	172. * <i>catvar-</i> [tscharivar] 'four' EWA I pp. 526f < *k <sup>2</sup> étuor-es	<i>tschetveré</i>	<i>čāṣvatarā</i>
173.	* <i>ya-</i> [yá] 'who, which' EWA p. 390 < *Hjo-	<i>jé</i>	<i>yā, yā, yo</i> <sup>92</sup>	174. <i>hāyana</i> [haryana] 'year' EWA II p. 814 <sup>93</sup>	<i>jāre</i>	<i>yāra</i> (-drājo) 'during a season'
175.	* <i>sapta</i> [sapta] EWA II p. 700 < *septm̥	<i>hapta</i>	<i>hapta</i>	176. * <i>jihva</i> [jihva] 'tongue' EWA I p. 591	<i>hesoné</i>	<i>hizva</i>
177.	<i>sūrya</i> [surya] 'sun' EWA II p. 742	<i>hueré</i>	<i>hvara</i> <sup>94</sup>	178. * <i>paśca</i> [pašhva] <sup>95</sup> EWA II p. 110	<i>pestché</i>	<i>paśca</i>
179.	* <i>picchati</i> [pratschad] 'questions' EWA pp. 183f < *prek	<i>peraté</i>	<i>parāta</i>	180. <i>pradiṣya</i> [pradisihite] 'pointed out, indicated'	<i>petestō</i>	<i>paitiastō</i> 'words of assent'
181.	* <i>Ká quis, kaa quæ, kim quod, kè quid, quæ quod neutrum</i> ( <i>kali, ká, kim, ke</i> ) interrogative pronoun ka- EWA pp. 284f	<i>ko</i>	<i>ko</i>	182. * <i>nema</i> [némam] 'half' EWA p. II 56 < llr. *naŋ-ma	<i>neéman</i>	<i>naémq</i>
183.	<i>ní, nā</i> (Malay.) [ni Malab.] 'you'	<i>né</i>	<i>nā</i> <sup>96</sup> 'we'	184. * <i>vīsa-</i> [urshal] 'rain' EWA pp. 52f < *Hūers	<i>vere</i>	<i>vāraitī</i>
185.	* <i>vaksyati</i> [vakschad] <sup>97</sup>	<i>veonekhdé</i>	<i>vaohxte</i> <sup>98</sup>	186. * <i>valarē</i> <sup>99</sup>	<i>veneré</i>	<i>vanara</i> <sup>100</sup>
187.	* <i>vīrya</i> [viryam] = 58	<i>perō</i>	<i>parō</i>	188. * <i>yá</i> = 172		
189.	* <i>puras</i> [pura] 'before' EWA pp. 146f < *prH-és/-ós	<i>ové</i>	<i>uva</i>	190. * <i>pantha</i> = 77	<i>aad</i>	<i>āat</i> 'thus, then' <sup>101</sup>
191.	* <i>ubhau</i> [ubhau] 'both' EWA I, p. 224 < llr. *ubhá			192. <i>yadi</i> [yad] EWA II, 397 = yeṣi) 'if'	<i>senghém</i>	<i>sanxam</i> 'word' <sup>102</sup>
193.	* <i>tvam</i> [vam] = 45			194. <i>sanghétam</i>		
195.	<i>āśleṣa</i> [aschlésha] 'contact, embrace'	<i>aschtésch</i>	<i>aštiš</i> 'arrival'			

<sup>1</sup>This word does not come from *Frahang i oim*, but from the Pahlavi-Pāzand glossary (*Frahang i Pahlawig*) edited and translated by Anquetil-Duperron in ZA II pp. 485–525. In OPP on p. 8 *brūvar*.

<sup>2</sup>Av. *x<sup>2</sup>uanha* is a cognate of Skt. *svasr* 'sister' (< \*syésor-). See EWA II p. 796.

<sup>3</sup>N. sg. *paitiš*

<sup>4</sup>EWA I p. 594 *jiv-* is a "Sekundärwurzel aus einem Präsens" developed from the verb \*g<sup>2</sup>ih<sub>3</sub> > Skt. *√gay*.

<sup>5</sup>Skt. *martya* is related to Av. *marata* through the PIE root \*mer 'to die'. Full cognate to Skt. *martya* would, however be Av. *martiya*.

<sup>6</sup>Skt. *mṛta* is also related to Av. *marata* through the root \*mer 'to die'. Full cognate to Skt. *mṛta* would, however be Av. *marata*.

<sup>7</sup>We were unable to find the word in editions of *Frahang i oim* except in Anquetil-Duperron's.

<sup>8</sup>PIE \*med<sup>h</sup>ū (>Skt. *madhū*).

<sup>9</sup>The words *māta* and *mīta* are actually cognates.



- <sup>10</sup>According to AW, p. 1113 *maite* is not a real word, but a part separated from *vohumainte*. Av. *vohumane* = Pahl. *vēh patmān*.
- <sup>11</sup>Skt. cognate is *valka* (EWA II pp. 525f).
- <sup>12</sup>Related to Skt. *√guh* 'hide', not *√gup* 'protect'.
- <sup>13</sup>Related to Skt. *√ghuṣ* 'to sound'.
- <sup>14</sup>This word is not identified by authors but it appears to be derived from the Skt. verbal root *√gam* and is thus related to Av. *gātāe*.
- <sup>15</sup>Explanation in ZPG p. 91.
- <sup>16</sup>Most probably a misprint in Anquetil-Duperron. In *Fahrang i oim*, *snātō* appears.
- <sup>17</sup>Skt. *karatī* is 3. sg. active of *√kr*, while Av. *karār* is *nomen agentis* derived from the same root.
- <sup>18</sup>Skt. *sūci* also means 'needle', but also 'sight, seeing' according to *Amarakośa* (MW p. 1241). This is an indication that Vesdin used *Amarakośa* as a source for this word.
- <sup>19</sup>Both words correspond in sound and meaning but most probably are unrelated. According to EWA p. 655 (see also for further literature) Skt. *śeva* might be related to PIE *\*key(H?)* > *√śoy* 'lie down'.
- <sup>20</sup>Acc. sg. 'three'.
- <sup>21</sup>Vesdin compared Skt. G. *mama* with Avestan Acc. *mam* that is a cognate of Skt. *mām*. Being related by their root, they can be considered cognates.
- <sup>22</sup>Not found in other editions of *Fahrang i oim* except Anquetil-Duperron's.
- <sup>23</sup>Vesdin compared a verb in future tense to a noun from a same root. Vesdin had a good intuition, as these words both come from PIE *\*uekʷ*.
- <sup>24</sup>Vesdin (p. 23) wrongly connected Skt. *vahana* 'vehicle' with Anquetil-Duperron's *vōhōné* (*vōhuni*) 'blood', which can be connected to Skt. *vasā* 'fat, marrow' (EWA p. 533).
- <sup>25</sup>Vesdin confused roots *√y* (*varati*) and *√ydh* (*vardhati*) which is a cognate of Av. *varəδ-*. EWA II p. 521 *varədaīti* (inf. *varədaē*).
- <sup>26</sup>Most probably Vesdin's *tapsus calami* or a misprint (*-le-* instead of *-ē-* in ZA).
- <sup>27</sup>Found in Reichelt (1900, p. 199).
- <sup>28</sup>This is the exact passage from which Anquetil-Duperron took the word as it is glossed with *gobashna* (*gobeschne*). Vesdin made a mistake because he compared the Skt. verb *vakṣyati* in the future tense with the Av. noun *vaca*. The root is, however, the same.
- <sup>29</sup>Here Vesdin was right for the Pahl. word *angust* which is indeed related to *aigušīha* (Av. *angušīha*); *arazān* is a Pāzand word, most probably corrupt.
- <sup>30</sup>The correct form would be *zarədaēm*.
- <sup>31</sup>Explanation in Martínez & de Vaan 2013:66.
- <sup>32</sup>Reichelt (1901:174) *urua* = *urva* 'soul'.
- <sup>33</sup>Related to Skt. *vas* 'to wish'.
- <sup>34</sup>Related to Skt. *pantha* 'path'.
- <sup>35</sup>*Parana* is related to Skt. *pūrāna* 'bridge'.
- <sup>36</sup>Anquetil-Duperron (p. 470) translates it as "chair du père". Skt. compound *pitṛmāṃsa* means 'father's flesh' but such a compound is not known to be used in Sanskrit literature.
- <sup>37</sup>Not identified in editions other than Anquetil-Duperron's (p. 433).
- <sup>38</sup>Av. *aḍa* is a cognate of Skt. *adha*.
- <sup>39</sup>In AW p. 343 no Skt. cognates are mentioned.
- <sup>40</sup>Vesdin's *asti* (<h,es) is not connected to Av. *astāto* (<\*steh₂). The reason for this confusion might be Anquetil-Duperron's mistranslation of *astāto* 'non-existent' as *celui-là* est. Vesdin accordingly translated *astāto* as *ille* est.
- <sup>41</sup>Left out from Reichelt's edition.
- <sup>42</sup>Related only through *asīhā* and *āsta* 'eight'.
- <sup>43</sup>Vesdin was here misled by Anquetil-Duperron's mistranslation 'grand'. *Ayam* is related to *ahmāi* although *ahmāi* is dative, *ayam* is nominative. Skt. *asmai* corresponds to Av. *ahmāi*.
- <sup>44</sup>Avestan *ayra* is related to Skt. *agra*, not to *ugra*.
- <sup>45</sup>Skt. *śauca* < PIE *\*keuk*, Av. *ašamčā* (*aša* + *ca* conj. 'and') is related to Skt. *rta*.

- <sup>46</sup>G. sg. of *arəšā*.
- <sup>47</sup>Skt. *hara*-<*hr* (EWA II, p. 803); *mahat* (EWA II p. 337f \*meğ-h<sub>2</sub>-) + *deva* (EWA I p. 742f \*dejuō). *Ahura* (= Skt. *asura* EWA I p. 147f \*h<sub>2</sub>ns-ul[ro]-) *Mazdā* (<llr. \*m̥s+dhā). See Kuiper 1957, 1976; Thieme 1970.
- <sup>48</sup>Skt. *rakṣas/rakṣasa* 'demon' is related to OAv. *raš-* 'to damage' (EWA II, p. 423; AW, p. 1516). *Frahang i oim* does not list any word connected to the root *raš-*. It is not clear from where Vesdin took the word.
- <sup>49</sup>Word not found in any editions of *Frahang i oim*. It is not clear what Avestan word Vesdin had in mind.
- <sup>50</sup>Related to Skt. *apa* (<\*h<sub>2</sub>epo).
- <sup>51</sup>According to ZPG, it is *parvati* 'putrefaction' with a negative prefix; according to Reichelt 1901:121 it might be an infinitive *apivatiē*. In any case, it is unrelated to Skt. √*budh*.
- <sup>52</sup>Skt. *sapta* and Av. *hapta* are related (EWA II p. 700 <\*septm̥). Skt. *anga* 'limb' has no Av. cognate.
- <sup>53</sup>Demonstrative pronoun related to Skt. *etaḥ* (AW, p. 17); Skt. *idam* is related to OAv. *aiiām*; YAv. *aēm*, *im* (EWA I p. 103).
- <sup>54</sup>Vesdin here compared Skt. part. *ukta* with Av. 3. pres. middle of a related root (<\*jek<sup>u</sup>)
- <sup>55</sup>Real cognates would be *atha* and *aīθā* (OAV)/*aīθa* (YAV). See 73.
- <sup>56</sup>N. pl. m. See 111.
- <sup>57</sup>3. impf. *baxš-* 'share, give'. Av. *baxš-* is a cognate of Skt. √*bhaxj* 'distribute' (<\*b<sup>h</sup>ag, EWA II p. 241)
- <sup>58</sup>Old Persian word for 'healer' related to Av. *baēšaza*. A second possibility is that Vesdin's (and Anquetil-Duperron's) *beschē* might stand for *baši* 'cucumber'. In that case, the words are not related.
- <sup>59</sup>This would fit better with *bhešaja*, but is still related.
- <sup>60</sup>Bartholomae 1900:133.
- <sup>61</sup>These words are unrelated. Anquetil-Duperron mistranslated *bāḍa* ('always') as 'vieux'.
- <sup>62</sup>3. sg. opt. 'may he be'. Vesdin compared Skt. imperative with Av. optative.
- <sup>63</sup>Av. *bhāmīya* is related to Skt. √*bhā* 'to shine', *bhāma* 'light' (EWA II p. 259 \*b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>; p. 261 YAV. *bhamīia*).
- <sup>64</sup>See ZPG, pp. 57–58 and Reichelt (1901:166). Also related to Skt. √*bhā*; *bhāma*.
- <sup>65</sup>Related to Skt. √*tak* (EWA I p. 610 <\*tek<sup>u</sup>).
- <sup>66</sup>These words are not full cognates, but they are related through the root of the demonstrative pronoun \*tō-. The direct cognate of Skt. *tadā* would however be Av. *taḍa* (EWA I, p. 618).
- <sup>67</sup>Skt. cognate *tiraśc-* (AW, 640f). The reason Vesdin compared this word to *dāra* 'fear' might be Anquetil-Duperron's mistranslation 'il craint'.
- <sup>68</sup>3. sg. impf. of *taš-* 'to cut'. The verb *taš-* is a cognate of Skt. √*takṣ* (EWA I, p. 162).
- <sup>69</sup>According to ZPG, p. 96 *tātō* is past part. of the verb *tan-* 'to stretch' (Skt. cognate √*tan*). According to Reichelt (1901:141) it is probably a separated suffix. In any case it is unrelated to the Skt. part. praes. *yānti*, *yāti*.
- <sup>70</sup>Acc. sc. of *jiva* (EWA I, 594 YAV. *jivaḥ*).
- <sup>71</sup>Av. *xīuanha* is a cognate of Skt. *svasṛ* 'sister' (<\*sueśor-). (EWA II p. 796).
- <sup>72</sup>Derived from the verb *ban-* 'to be sick'. Unrelated to the Skt. *abhīyānta* (<*abhi*√*am*).
- <sup>73</sup>Vesdin was here misled by Anquetil-Duperron's mistranslation of *jaīra* as 'bouche'.
- <sup>74</sup>Norm. pl. *dantant-* 'tooth'.
- <sup>75</sup>Pahl. *čāšm* (Av. *čāšman*) is related to Skt. *caṣṣus*; but *netra* and *dōiβra* are unrelated.
- <sup>76</sup>It is not clear from where Vesdin took the word. Most probably it is Pahl. *dād* that is related to Skt. √*dā*.
- <sup>77</sup>Uncertain. See ZPG, p. 95, Reichelt 1901, p. 180.
- <sup>78</sup>Av. *zā* is related to Skt. *ksam-*.
- <sup>79</sup>According to EWA I p. 415, the Av. word is related to Skt. √*kroq* 'to be or become thick'. The Avestan cognate of *krūra* (<\*kruh<sub>2</sub>-rō-) is *xrūra*.
- <sup>80</sup>EWA II p. 765 Av. *xšta-* is a cognate of Skt. √*sthā* (<\*steh<sub>2</sub>).

<sup>81</sup>Vesdin was probably misled by Anquetil-Duperron's mistranslation 'people, production'.

<sup>82</sup>G. sg. of *dāsama* 'tent'.

<sup>83</sup>Probably a mistake in *Frahang i oim*. See ZPG p. 91.

<sup>84</sup>According to ZPG miswritten *dārasāq*.

<sup>85</sup>Related to Skt. *kratu* (EWA I p. 407).

<sup>86</sup>Ibid.

<sup>87</sup>1. subj. *√yaz* 'to sacrifice'. Related to Skt. *√yajj*: *yajati*, *is(a)-*

or *parikara* 'multitude'.

<sup>89</sup>The word is not found in *Frahang i oim*.

<sup>90</sup>Most probably a mistake; the word is not to be found in ZA.

<sup>91</sup>Skt. cognate of Av. *pāiri* is *pāri* (EWA II p. 91 < \*pēri).

<sup>92</sup>Av. *yā* N. du. f.; OAv. *yā* N. sg. m.; *yō* N. sg. m. *yav*.

<sup>93</sup>According to EWA II p. 814 related to Av. *zaiiana* 'winter'.

<sup>94</sup>Related to Skt. *svar-* (<\*suh<sub>2</sub>el-) 'sun' EWA II pp. 793f.

<sup>95</sup>Vesdin's '*pashva*' is most probably a misprint for *pasca* because he translated it as 'posterior, sequens, post'.

<sup>96</sup>OAv. acc. dat. gen. pl. pers. pron.

<sup>97</sup>Vesdin's form is not clear. However, regarding his translation and the form he provides it must be something derived from the root *√vac* and this is related to *vaohxte* (*aohxte*).

<sup>98</sup>3. sg. middle *vač* 'to speak'.

<sup>99</sup>We were unable to identify the Skt. word. Vesdin translates it as '*multum*'.

<sup>100</sup>ZPG p. 117 'well-informed'; 'a particular animal dragging dead bodies'.

<sup>101</sup>Related to Skt. *āt* (EWA I p. 163).

<sup>102</sup>Related to Skt. *śamisa* (AW p. 1576), *sanghédam* is not identified.



Table 2. Vocabula liturgica.

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Av.
1.	[tschatura] <i>catura</i> , <i>caturagaia?</i> 'upper garment died with 4 strings'	<i>setehr</i> , Pahl. <i>sadere</i> ( <i>sedra</i> , 'sacred tunica') <sup>103</sup>	2.	<i>uavāhami</i> [ <i>udanghena</i> , <i>dēbanghena</i> ] 'cord, rope'
3.	<i>paja</i> [ <i>padam</i> ], <i>karpata</i> [ <i>karpadam</i> ], <i>pajaccara</i> [ <i>padatschar</i> ] 'woven cloth, veil'	<i>pété dāne</i> Pahl. <i>padom</i> Av. <i>paiti.dāna</i> Pahl. <i>padān</i> 'sacred veil' <sup>104</sup>	4.	<i>svādhyāya</i> [ <i>svadājāya</i> ] 'vedic recitation', <i>prārthana</i> [ <i>prārthna</i> ] 'wish, petition', <i>namaskāra</i> [ <i>namaskar</i> ] 'adoration, homage', [ <i>geba</i> ] (?)
5.	<i>avahan</i> ( <i>avahan</i> ), <i>bhāndam</i> ( <i>bhandana?</i> ), <i>amatram</i> ( <i>amatra</i> ), <i>bhagēnam</i> ( <i>bhagin?</i> )	<i>havan</i> ( <i>hāvani</i> ) 'time of ( <i>haoma</i> ) pressing'; Pahl. <i>hāwan</i> 'pestle, mortar for pressing <i>haoma</i> ' <sup>105</sup>	6.	<i>undana</i> , <i>dhāru</i> ( <i>dārū</i> ), <i>kāschta</i> , <i>beraga</i> ( <i>veraka?</i> 'camphor')
7.	<i>ādaravat</i> [ <i>adarava</i> ] 'showing respect'	<i>ātar</i> (Av.), <i>ādar</i> (Pahl.) [ <i>aderan</i> ] 'holy fire' <sup>108</sup>	8.	<i>mahārūpa</i> [ <i>mahārūba</i> ] 'mighty in form'
9.*	<i>aniguli</i> [ <i>anigulī</i> ] 'a finger', <i>aniguliya</i> [ <i>anguliam</i> ], 'a finger-ring', <i>anigusītha</i> [ <i>angushta</i> ] 'a thumb' EWA I, p. 49	<i>anguscheterin</i> (Av. <i>angushta</i> 'toe', Pahl. <i>angustarīg</i> 'a finger-ring')	10.*	<i>kartari</i> [ <i>kartari</i> ] 'scissors, knife' EWA I, 316 'knife'
11.	<i>tālika</i> [ <i>tāliga</i> ] 'palm of the hand' <i>tala</i> [ <i>tālam</i> ] 'surface'	<i>tālī</i> (<Skt. <i>sthāli</i> ) 'dish'	12.	<i>tāschta nava tūra</i> (?)
13.	<i>āvapana</i> [ <i>avaban</i> ] 'vessel'	<i>avand</i> (NP <i>avand</i> 'vessel')	14.	<i>kindi</i> Malab. <i>candy</i> (Malay. <i>kiñji</i> 'goblet, water-vessel' DED, p. 142)
15.	<i>āmīsa</i> [ <i>amīsa</i> ] 'meat' EWA I, p. 170	<i>mīazda</i> [ <i>mīezd</i> ] 'sacrificial food' EWA II p. 356	16.*	<i>tāla</i> [ <i>tāl</i> , <i>tāla tāla</i> ] 'a cymbal'
17.*	<i>mitra</i> ( <i>mitra</i> ) 'contract' EWA II, pp. 354f	<i>mithra</i>	18.	<i>tasra?</i> 'pared, hewn' [ <i>taschata</i> ]

<sup>103</sup>Both Skt. and Av. forms remain dubious.<sup>104</sup>Ritually employed to prevent the breath from polluting the sacred fire (Modi 1922:116). Skt. *pratidhāna* "what is placed in front (of the mouth)".<sup>105</sup>See Modi 1922:255f, 446.<sup>106</sup>EWA II, p. 713 cognate with Skt. *√su* 'press'.<sup>107</sup>A twig used in *yasna* ceremony. According to EWA II, pp. 415f probably related to Skt. *barhis*.<sup>108</sup>Skt. cognate is *atharvan* (EWA I, p. 60)<sup>110</sup>Related to Skt. *mās-* (<\**meh<sub>1</sub>-ns-* EWA II, p. 352).<sup>111</sup>Guj. *kurijā* is derived from Skt. *kurijā*, which is not connected to Malay. *kiñji* of Dravidian origin.<sup>112</sup>Gujarati loanword from Sanskrit.<sup>112</sup>From *tas*, related to Skt. *√taks* (AW p. 645). Vesdin's [*taschata*] remains unidentified.



Table 3. Sanskrit-Germanic Glossary.

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Ger.	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Ger.
1.	<i>pur, purī</i> [pur, purī] 'fortress, castle' EWA, II p. 145 *ph <sub>1</sub> -	[burg] EWDS pp. 145f <sup>13</sup>	2.	ānanda [ananda] 'bliss' [unende, unendlich] EWDS pp. 220f <sup>14</sup>
3.*	anta [anda] 'end' EWA I, p. 75	[ende] EWDS pp. 220f	4.*	vidhavā [vidhava] 'widow' EWA II, p. 556 *Hūid <sup>h</sup> eueh <sub>2</sub> Laufform" = Witwe
5.	manu? [mān]	[man] EWDS p. 538 <sup>15</sup>	6.*	mātr [madr] 'mother' EWA II p. 345 *meh <sub>2</sub> tēr-
7.*	pitṛ, pitā [pidr, pida] 'father' EWA II p. 128 *ph <sub>2</sub> tēr	[fater, father] EWDS p. 853 *pētēr	8.*	bhrātṛ [bhrader] 'brother' EWA II, p. 280 *b <sup>h</sup> rēh <sub>2</sub> tēr-
9.	madyama [madjama] 'middle' EWA II, p. 303 *med <sup>h</sup> io-	[magd, magatin, maid, madhen, madf] EWDS p. 531 <sup>16</sup>	10.	godāna [godama] 'gift (dāna) of a cow (go) Wódan] WP, p. 216 *gūt- "geistig angeregt sein" 769 *suenu
11.*	sūnu [mánusza sūnu] 'son' EWA II, p. 741 *suH-nú-	[mannes suna] EWDS p. 769 *suenu > OSax. sunu	12.*	sūnu [sūnu] 'son' EWA II, p. 741 *suH-nú- [sohn, son, sun], [sunu] (OSax.) EWDS p. 769 *suenu
13.*	duhitṛ [duhida] 'daughter' EWA p. 737f *d <sup>h</sup> ugh <sub>2</sub> tēr	[dochter] EWDS p. 826	14.*	hṛd- [herad] 'heart' EWA p. 818 *kerd/*krid- [herzt] EWDS p. 372
15.*	nas- [nasi, násiga] 'nose' EWA II pp. 30f *(H)nas-	[nasen] EWDS pp. 582f	16.*	nakha [nāgha] 'nail' EWA II, p. 4 *h <sub>3</sub> Eng <sup>h</sup> / *h <sub>3</sub> NEg <sup>h</sup>
17.	[chieser] (persicum) <sup>17</sup>	[kayser] EWDS p. 417 < Lat. Caesar	18.	hima [himala] 'cold, frost' *g <sup>h</sup> im-o
19.	deva [dēva, devada] (EWA I p. 742f *deiuó)	[teufel] EWDS p. 823	20.*	tri, trayas [tri, tria] 'three' EWA I pp. 675ff *trei
21.	starana [stārana] 'spreading' EWA II, p. 756 √star < *sterh <sub>3</sub>	[stern, sterron] (OSax. sterro) EWDS p. 794 22.* *hstér <sup>118</sup>	22.*	mānuša [mánusha] 'man' EWA II, pp. 309f *ménos
23.*	majjan [mārcca] 'narrow' EWA II, pp. 291f *mogg <sup>h</sup> -	[mark] EWDS p. 541 *mozg <sup>h</sup> o-	24.*	śásita [shasiga] 'punished' EWA II, p. 626 *kas/*kes
25.	kuṭumba [cudumba] 'household, family' EWA I, p. 262 "aus dravidischer Quelle"	[chumberal] EWDS p. 442 < *gəne-	26.	vitata [vidi] 'broad, wide'
27.*	go [go, gau] 'cow' EWA I pp. 478f *g <sup>h</sup> o <sup>1</sup>	[kuh] EWDS p. 491 < *g <sup>w</sup> ou-	28.*	antara [andara] 'interior, other' EWA I, p. 76 *h <sub>1</sub> en-ter/*h <sub>1</sub> ē-ter
29.	[curiada] (?)	[kurtze, kurtz] EWDS p. 495 < *ker	30.*	pṛita [pṛida] 'pleased, delighted' EWA II pp. 181f *pṛiH-to
31.	śálā [shāla] 'hall' EWA p. 631 < *kel	[Saal] EWDS p. 698 <sup>20</sup>	32.	āśleya [ashlēscha] 'contact' EWA II, pp. 671f √šly- connected to *klej

(Continued)

Table 3. (Continued).

	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Ger.	Vesdin Skt.	Vesdin Ger.
33.	<i>bhikṣā</i> [bhikṣha] 'begging' EWA II, pp. 263f. √ <i>bhikṣ</i> < √ <i>haj</i> < *b'ag	[bittē] EWDS p. 114 (b- < *g <sup>wh</sup> -)	34. * <i>sama</i> [sam] EWA p. 703 'same' < *somH-ó	[sam] EWDS p. 702
35. *	<i>puras</i> [pūr] 'in front' EWA II, pp. 146f. < *pH-es/0s	[vor] EWDS p. 867	36. * <i>pūva</i> [pūrva] 'former' EWA p. 157 < *pH <sub>3</sub> -	[forman] EWDS p. 291
37.	<i>vasa, vāsa</i> [vāsa] 'dwelling, house' EWA p. 531 < √ <i>vas</i> 'to dwell' < *h <sub>2</sub> ues-	[haus] EWDS p. 360 "Herkunft unklar"	38. <i>cāṇḍāla</i> [tschandāla] 'outcast, worst among' EWA I, p. 539 <sup>121</sup>	[schändlich] EWDS p. 711
39.	<i>carīḍā</i> [tschanda] 'violent, cruel' EWA I p. 525 <sup>122</sup>	[shand] (Schande) EWDS p. 711 <sup>123</sup>	40. <i>pālya</i> [pālya] 'what has to be guarded' √ <i>pā</i> < *peh <sub>3</sub> EWA II, p. 112	[phala] (Pfah!) [mamonti, mamentd] (?)
41.	<i>patha, pathin</i> [pad, pāda] 'path' < *pént-oh <sub>2</sub> -s EWA II, pp. 81ff	[fad, phat, otsrid] (pfad) EWDS p. 623 "unklar"	42. <i>mammatha</i>	
43.	<i>varna</i> [vārta] 'sound, syllabe, word' p. 241)	[word, wort] (wort, OSax. word) EWDS p. 44. * 897 < *weid <sup>h</sup> - <sup>124</sup>	44. * <i>bharatī</i> [bhāradī] 'bears' EWA II pp. 246ff < *b <sup>h</sup> er-	
45.	<i>bhājana</i> [bhagena] 'sharing' deriv. √ <i>bhaj</i> 'distribute' (*b'ag- EWA II p. 241)	[bach, bacch, bake] (bechen) EWDS p. 88 <sup>125</sup>	46. <i>druṭa</i> [druta] 'swift, quick' EWA I, pp. 755ff deriv. *dreu-	
47.	<i>vihāra</i> [vihāra] 'monastery'	[pīar] (MHG <i>pīare</i> ), [phare], [faru] (Pfarrei) EWDS p. 624 "Herkunft umstritten"	48. <i>gamana</i> [gamana] EWA I, pp. 465f 'going, moving' √ <i>gam</i> < *g <sup>h</sup> em	[gan] (OHG <i>gān</i> ), <i>gehen, ganne</i> EWDS p. 307 PG *gai
49.	<i>lipsā</i> [lipśa] 'longing for' EWA II, p. 460 deriv. *lejp	[lieb] EWDS p. 518 < *leub <sup>h126</sup>	50. * <i>nabhas</i> [nābha] 'mist, vapour, sky' EWA II, p. 13 néb <sup>h</sup> -es-	[nabel] EWDS p. 579 < *neb <sup>h</sup> -
51.	<i>guda</i> [guda] 'intestine, rectum' EWA I, p. 490 *gud-ó- (< *geu-d-)	[gossa, gosse] (gosse 'gutter') EWDS p. 332	52. <i>gṛha</i> [gṛha] EWA I, p. 495 *g <sup>h</sup> id <sup>h</sup> -ó; <i>dhāman</i> [dhama] EWA I, p. 697 *dóm-/ *dém- 'house'	[gagedame] EWDS p. 294 "Herkunft unklar"
53. *	<i>preman</i> [prēma] 'love' EWA II pp. 181f; 189f	[freund] EWDS pp. 285f WP II, p. 86	54. <i>gacchati</i> [getschadi] EWA II, pp. 465f *g <sup>h</sup> em	[gehet, geht] EWDS p. 307 PG *gai
55. *	<i>bandha</i> [bendha, bendhana] 'bond' EWA II, p. 208 deriv. √ <i>bandh</i> *b <sup>h</sup> end <sup>h</sup> -	[band, bände] EWDS p. 77	56. * <i>dant-</i> [dend] 'tooth' EWA I, p. 693	[zend] (OHG <i>zand</i> ) 'Zahn' EWDS pp. 902f *don-
57.	<i>jahran</i> (?)	[jahr] EWDS pp. 408f	58. * <i>dhār</i> [dhār] 'door' EWA I, pp. 764f *d <sup>h</sup> uer/ *d <sup>h</sup> uor/*d <sup>h</sup> ur/	[dor] (OFris. <i>dore</i> ) (Tür) EWDS p. 841
59. *	<i>dhāravartin</i> [dhāravārtī] 'chambelain'	[donwarte] EDGL p. 385 <sup>127</sup>		

<sup>113</sup>From PG \*burg.<sup>114</sup>EWA I, p. 75 *Ende* might be related to Skt. *anta* 'end', but *ānanda* is derived from the root √*nan* 'to rejoice'.<sup>115</sup>From PG \*manōn-.



- 116 From PG \*magabi-.
- 117 The word is not identified. As there are no known Iranian cognates of Lat. *Caesar*, the comparison cannot be correct.
- 118 „Herleitung aus \*ster- ‘ausbreiten’ ist denkbar, aber kaum wahrscheinlich“ (EWDS p. 794).
- 119 From PG \*weida.
- 120 From PG \*sali, \*salaz-.
- 121 „Wohl ein vorarischer Stammesname“ (EWA I, p. 539).
- 122 Disputed etymology.
- 123 From PG \*skam-dō.
- 124 Skt. *vratā* ‘command, will’ is a cognate to Germanic *Word* (<PG \*wurda-) but in Skt. the meaning is so different that Vesdin could not have guessed the correct relation.
- 125 Loanword from Lower Latin and Romance *bacchimum* (EDGL, p. 23).
- 126 Skt. cognate is *libhyati*. Vesdin confused words derived from Skt. roots \*lejp- ‘(to smear, stick’) and \*leub<sup>h</sup>- ‘(to care for, love)’.
- 127 The first parts of compound (*dhāra-, Tor-*) are related, but the second parts are derived from different PIE roots (-*wart* is derived from PIE \*wers (EWDS p. 871) ‘to observe’; Skt. -*vartin* is, however connected to the PIE root \*uert- ‘to turn’).