

1. Analysis of the entry

Here we encounter various appearances of the one Proto-Indo-European [PIE] verbal root **ǵerh₂* “make old, infirm”. Its strong form (accented full-grade) is **ǵerh₂* which is developed in Old Indo-Āryan [OIA] to *járⁱ*, for example in the present stem *járⁱ-a^{-ti}* “make old, make achieve old age”. The superscript *i* is only a sign for a reflex of one of three PIE laryngeals for linguists’ convenience; it appears as *i* in some circumstances, for example between consonants. “-*ti*” is the ending of the 3rd singular active as representation. Greek γέρον (*gérōn*) “old” shows the same grade (cf. below).²

The verbal adjective from the root in the weak form (zero grade, with accent outside of the root or stem part) **ǵr̥h₂-nó-* “ground” appears in OIA in *jūrṇá-* in the RV, and its younger form *jīrṇá-* “rotten, aged, frail”, Latin *grānum*, German *Korn*, Old-Church-Slavic *zr̥no* “grain”. The phonological laws involved in these developments are: PIE **ǵ* > OIA *j* (OIran. *z*); **r̥h* > OIA *ur/ir* before a vowel, *ūr/īr* before a consonant (OIran > *ar*), Latin *rā*, Germanic *ur*, Slavic *r̥* (written *r̥b* or *r̥r̥b*). Grassmann, of course, had a profound knowledge of comparative Indo-European linguistics; the best illustration of this is the famous Grassmann’s law about aspirate dissimilation in Indo-Iranian and Greek. But the existence of three laryngeals and the consequences they have left in Indo-European languages were not yet known to his generation. A strange reconstruction **gvar* was the result of the efforts of contemporary scholars who recognized the relationship between the words but could not find phonological regularities underlying their connection.

An autonomous adjective **ǵérh₂-ont-* “old” is inflected in the singular: nominative **ǵérh₂-ōn(t)* > gr. γέρον (*gérōn*) “old, old man”, accusative **ǵérh₂-ont-m̄* > OIA *járantam* (cf. *Dictionary*, under participle), dative **ǵr̥h₂-nt-éi̯* > OIA *juraté* (cf. *Dictionary*, under *jur*). *járatas* (genitive singular) and *járatos* (genitive dual) are results of analogical levelling after strong stem-form. The feminine stem is **ǵérh₂-nt-ih₂-* > OIA *járatī-*, attested in the instrumental plural *járatībhis*. [Gotō 1987, 153 n. 238].

The causative *jar-áya^{-ti}* goes back to PIE **ǵorh₂-éie^{-ti}*, formed with the causative suffix **-éie-* added to the root in the *-*o*-grade. It serves as the explicit substitute of *járⁱ-a^{-ti}* in the meaning of ‘make old’, or as factitive to *jūr-ya^{-ti}* ‘become old’. Short *a*

² “Laryngeals” are laryngeal consonants postulated in Proto-Indo-European; three sorts are assumed, *h₁* (with non-colouring effect), *h₂* (with *a*-colouring effect on the basic vowel **e*), and *h₃* (with *o*-colouring effect on **e*). They correspond to a large extent to “coefficient sonantique” theoretically assumed by [de Saussure 1879], and have been made common property through articles by É. Benveniste, especially J. Kryłowicz 1927–1928 (cf. [Kryłowicz 1935; 2004]), and others. The new impulse for the theory has been given from the discovery of Hittite in 1915, where some remainders are found in the sound *h* (corresponding to *h₂* in today’s theory). Cf. [Mayrhofer 1981].

in *jar* is due to Brugmann's law, i.e. PIE **o* becomes *ā* in Proto-Indo-Iranian in the open syllable, but to *a* in the closed syllable (syllable ending in a consonant). *jār-āya-ti*, with long *ā* is an analogic form after the type, for example *yātāyati* 'settle someone in his position' to *yātati*.

jūr-ya-ti in the RV with its younger variation *jīr-ya-ti* (Atharvaveda+) is a present stem characterized through the suffix *-*ie-* as a "fientive" formation, i.e. a stem denoting the change of the subject's state or condition as opposed to "doing something" (facientive), in this case, thus, 'become old, frail'.

jūr-va-ti 'wear, exhaust' is a *-*ue-* present (PIE **ǵr̥h₂-ue-*) with a secondary accent. This present formation is rare and its accurate function is yet to be discovered. Grassmann properly explains the form as belonging to the group of *jar*¹, *jur*, *jūr* (and *jīr*). Mayrhofer, who once judged this present stem differently [Mayrhofer 1956, 443], writes today [Mayrhofer EWAia, vol. I, 597], referring to [Gotō 1987, 153 n. 237], "correctly already Grassmann 499 ('to wear out'), who, however, arrives at the meaning 'to scorch, consume through the heat' because of repeated combination of *jūrv* with Agni [the fire god] (or the sun...); from there the false connection with *jvar*¹ (*jval*¹) ['to scorch'] follows (Altindische Grammatik I 24...)." Grassmann owes his right judgement to the detailed treatment of all forms and occurrences as well as rational sorting out of the forms and meanings. He operates over the total figure of a word which was achieved in this way, towards its primary or central meaning. Thus, he could point out the history of a word group and possibilities of its development.

The interpretation of *ni-jūr-* played a decisive role in this case: RV II 29,6 *trādhvam no devā nijūro vṛkasya trādhvam kartād avapādo yajatrāḥ*. Grassmann translates [RV I, 38]: "Save us that a wolf does not devour us, that, ye reverends, we do not fall into a pit! [Errettet uns, dass nicht der Wolf uns fresse, dass, Hehre, nicht wir in die Grube fallen]"; my translation: Save us, ye gods, from the wearing down [the herd of sheep] by a wolf! Save [us] from falling down into a pit, ye revered ones, cf. [Gotō 1987, 153 n.237]! Grassmann's translation observes the syllables' number in the original and uses iambic and trochaic rhythm imitating the original metre to some extent. Here he shows his faithful approach to the original in a way which is different to the analytical approach he takes in his *Dictionary*.

It is in itself a quite natural process to control all the forms and usages, to analyse them, and construct them into a transparent complex. Grassmann could perform this procedure ideally and rationally. He represents these operations in one format, i.e. in a synchronic list of the forms and meanings. We can observe every step of the operation in his list, which helps us to go deeper into the history of words and forms.

2. Meaning entries

Among the meanings Grassmann gives under *jar* (column 479), (1) ‘grind down, make fragile, make old’, and (2) ‘let become old, i.e. let reach an old age’ are facientive (or agentive)-transitive, i.e. the subject does some action or influences someone/something. The meanings (3) ‘become fragile, become old, be consumed’ and (4) ‘be ground down’ are fientive-intransitive, i.e. a change of state or condition happens in the subject. (5) “causative” ‘grind out, wear out, make old’ is factitive: the subject makes someone/something do something or something happen. With “*jur* (1) become fragile, become old (of living beings)”, and “(2) the same (of the god’s deeds)” a fientive-intransitive meaning of the verb is meant.

The root-form *jur* (column 493) is observed from a facientive-transitive realization: “(3) make frail, make old, especially (4) in participle *jūrṇá-* friable, brittle (of a net), frail (of the cast off snake’s skin), (5) *jūrṇá-* very old without nuance of fragility”. For (4) and (5), also a fientive or essive (statutive) interpretation (the subject is situated in some state) may be possible. But the interpretation of Grassmann is correct, because the root starts from a facientive meaning. That is why a simple present stem *jár-a^{ti}* can mean ‘make old’, and a characterized stem *jūr-ya^{ti}* is formed specially for the fientive meaning ‘become old’.

Morphological means are used to vary the lexical content of a verbal root into various meanings and realizations. There are also analogical or levelled secondary formations. Today we could represent the forms and meanings in a combination of morphological and noematical (i.e. relating to lexical components) entries. But such a process is in some parts still the subject of monographic studies. Perhaps we will have to wait until a dictionary is able to incorporate the results of the research (a scholarly dictionary, not a translation dictionary). Thus, currently one will have to hope that the user is well informed about morphology.

The meanings are listed and classified well, based on external (syntactical) and internal criteria. This makes it possible to verify primary and developed meanings or uses. Grassmann’s interpretations have been in some ways and in some places improved or varied upon. Still, on the whole, we remain within the framework which he set. If scholars do not arrive at a common solution, they still resort to “according to Grassmann, so-and-so”.

3. Form entries

Grassmann takes up indicative, “conjunctive”, optative and imperative for the moods of the verb. His “Conjunktiv” means subjunctive and injunctive (“the second conjunctive”, p.VI) today. However, it scarcely disturbs us. The forms and functions of

the injunctive were exactly ascertained only by Karl Hoffmann [Hoffmann 1967; first manuscript-version in 1950]. For a precise interpretation, whether a form is subjunctive or injunctive, an investigation is still necessary. Otherwise, the issue remains partly undeterminable. Thus, it was not a task of the dictionary at that time to make it clear whether a form is subjunctive or injunctive. The field of the stem formation and its ratio has made great progress up to the present day. Grassmann's judgement as aorist or present (including the imperfect, i.e. the preterit of the present stem which expresses a verb's action in its progressive aspect) cannot be accepted in all instances, especially in the case of the aorist stems which are used for the aspect without time-expansion. It is important, still, that the stems are sorted out separately. We can surely start our research from the *Dictionary*.

In frames and details of the nouns, pronouns, and adverbs, the views Grassmann presents are barely in need of revision today. Only some lemmas are to be put together, as is the case with the above-mentioned *járant-* and *jurat-*.³ To divide one lemma into several is much more difficult than to fulfil the procedure in the opposite direction.

There may be cases, in which some forms are to be distinguished. In the case of verbs, for example: The forms of the secondary root *dad*, *dáda-te* "hold" [Wackernagel 1942, 163f.] are registered under *dā* "give". We distinguish two homonymous roots ¹*yā* "travel, drive" and ²*yā* "beg" [Schmid 1956, 222ff.] among the forms Grassmann gives under "yā go, wander ... drive; arrive ...; approach begging ...; attack, pursue ...". Grassmann's *'cit* perceive, recognize', contains two separate roots ¹*ci* 'recognize, pay attention to' and ²*ci* 'shine, distinguish' [Gotō 1987, 137–141; Mayrhofer EWAia I, 547f., 548f.]. The preset stem *cáy-a-te* 'punish' under '¹*ci* place together, pile up' belongs to another root *ci*, which goes back to PIE **k^wei* 'receive sanction' together with Gr. τίω 'pay, atone for', τίνομαι 'make atone', ποινή 'penitence' [Gotō 1987, 132; Mayrhofer EWAia I, 532f.]. *math* 'steal' (present *mathnāti*) and *manth* 'twirl (in order to make fire, etc.)' (*mānthati*) were distinguished by [Narten 1960, 121–135]. Grassmann's inventory of forms and meanings serves, naturally, always as basic material for such renovation.

We know that there are three separate roots among the forms under "ar, ṛ set in motion". They go back to PIE **h₁er* 'come into, reach at', **h₂ar* 'fit' and **h₃or* 'set oneself into a (quick) motion', cf. [Kümmel in Rix et al. 2001, 238, 269f., 299f.]. They are, however, not yet duly distinguished, so every time we go back to Grassmann.

³ Belong or go back to one and the same paradigm, e.g.: *rāyi-* 1149f. and *rāi-*, *rā-* 1182ff. 'wealth'; *dāru-* 595f. and *drū-* 647f. 'wood'; *sānu-* 1511 and *snū-* 1606 'back'; *bṛid-* 1678 and *bārdi-* 1661 'heart'; *āsan-* 137 and *aśman-* 139 'rock, stone'; *dvār-* 651 and *dūr-* 613 'door'; *ḷṣām-* 363, *ḷṣā* 365, *ḷṣmā* 371, *ḷṣāman-* 365, *gmā-* 415 and *jmā-* 502 'the earth'. Under *star-* 'star' one misses *tāras* 'stars' (nominative plural) VIII 55,2. *dyāv-*, *dyu-* and *div-* are duly registered together under *div-* 'heaven' (601ff.).

The treatment of nouns for ‘great, big’ *máh-*, *mahá-*, *mahánt-* (Grassmann “*mahát*”), and *mahá-* is very impressive. The occurrences are very numerous and the interpretation is difficult. Indeed, we may meet with cases which should be better understood in another way, but still Grassmann’s data remain essential for such precise study. *mahná*, *maháná*, and *mahábbis*, for which the *Dictionary* gives a lemma “*mahán-* neuter (from *mah-*) greatness, fullness, power, magnificence”, are interpreted today as instrumentals of the masculine *mahimán-*.⁴

Metrical analysis

Grassmann makes efforts throughout to give, beside the forms transmitted in the text, also the forms which are to be assumed for metrical reasons in the original poetry. On the whole, we can rely on his assumptions. But each case has its own difficulty. Among others, Oldenberg has performed philological examinations in this field [Oldenberg 1888, 1909, 1912].

The striving of the generations following Grassmann and Oldenberg consisted of explaining such phenomena linguistically: exacter versions of the rules of syllabic structure,⁵ identification of different consequences of disappeared sounds (three laryngeals), also in morphological elements.⁶ The poets, in addition, had their “poetic freedom, poetic licence” to use older and newer forms of different times. *jána-*, for example, is a common word for “man, people”. The stem is scanned as short-short or long-short. The latter is explained from the older constellation **jóh₂|no-* consisting of a closed (thus long) and a short syllable.⁷

⁴ Cf. [Mayrhofer 1986, 159; Schindler 1977, 57; Tichy 1986, 99 n.7; Gotō 2005, 209]. The appearance and disappearance of *i* in *mahimán-* and *mahmn-* is explained from the “loss of a laryngeal” today. *mahám* (column 1016b under *mahát-*) belongs to “*mahá* adjective ‘great’ (from *mah-*)” (column 1018).

⁵ Sievers’ law, now enriched by a more precise version of Schindler’s syllabification law [Schindler 1977, 56]; some individual laws such as those of [Stang 1965, 292ff.; Lindeman 1965, 38ff., 69ff.]. Cf. [Mayrhofer 1986].

⁶ E.g. nominal suffix **-b₃on-/-b₃n-* (Hoffmann’s possessive-suffix), **-ih₂o-*, etc., the optative suffix **-ieh₁-/-ih₁-/-ib₁-*. The OIA roots are divided traditionally into two groups *set* und *anit*. They are interpreted today, respectively, as the roots ending with a laryngeal and otherwise.

⁷ *svár-* ‘sun’s light’ is delivered in the tradition only in this form. Grassmann registers it as “(*svár*), *súar*, *súr*”, it means: attested as *svár-*, but to be read as *súar* (better *súvār*, we write *súvār* with a subscript character as the sign to be supplied). The word is reconstructed as **-l/n-* heteroclitite neuter of substance: nominative (A) **sáb₂-u_l* (> Proto-Celtic **sāual* > **hōual* > **hōul* > Middle-Breton *beol*), changed into (B) **sáb₂-uel* after other **-l/n-* or *-r/n-* heteroclitites, or into (C) **sb₂-uuel* (> OIA *svár-*, *súvar-*, OAv. *huuar*²) after genitive **sb₂-u_{en}-s* with Lindeman’s variant *sb₂-u_{en}-s* (> Old-Avestan **huu_{en}ng^b* > *xⁿəng*, Young-Avestan *hū*). OIA *súvār* represents a nominative form (C). Only in RV II 35,6 the word *svár* is scanned really as