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The present Grammar is a work of no pretensions; it is offered as a small contribution toward advancing the Avesta cause. It is written in part fulfilment of a design formed when I first began to study the Avesta and became deeply interested in the true value and importance of that monument of antiquity.

The end for which the book is intended would perhaps have been better accomplished, however, if the work had been a mere grammatical sketch. This was my first design; and it may at another time be carried out. But as the work grew under my hands, it seemed desirable to enlarge it somewhat further, and to embody additional material which for reference might be serviceable to the general philologist, not to the specialist alone. The linguist may thus find in it useful matter and fresh illustrations, especially in the new readings from Geldner's edition of the Avesta texts.

No attempt, on the other hand, has been made to secure absolute completeness. Numerous minor points have been purposely omitted. These may perhaps later be taken up in a more extended work including also the Old Persian by the side of the Avesta and the Sanskrit. Little of im-
portance, however, it is believed, has been overlooked. A fairly symmetrical development has been aimed at, although at times certain less familiar points have received fuller illustration than those that are well-known. This was intentional. They are chiefly matters that had not as yet been sufficiently emphasized elsewhere, or points which are peculiarly individual to the Avesta. They will easily be recognized.

The method of treatment is based throughout on the Sanskrit grammar; a knowledge of Sanskrit is presupposed. At every step, therefore, references have been made to Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar 2 ed. 1889; and it is a pleasure here to express thanks to the author of that work for the abundant suggestions received from it.

In the Grammar it might have been easier and more practical in many respects to use the Avesta type itself instead of employing a transcription. On the whole, however, it seemed best under the circumstances to transliterate. For general reference at present this method appears more convenient, and is useful in showing grammatical formations. The original type, it is expected, will be employed, as hinted above, in a little book Avesta for Beginners, planned for a date not far distant.

In regard to the transcription here adopted, my views have already been given in The Avestan Alphabet and its Transcription, Stuttgart, 1890. The phonetic and palaeographic character of each of the Avestan letters is there discussed. Reasons are likewise presented for transliterating Av. २, ३ by the 'turned' ə, ʒ, so familiar in phonetic works. The composite ə (ä) for əə (ia) is also
there explained (p. 13). The choice of the old Germanic characters \( h, f, \ddot{b}, \dddot{d} \) for the spirants \( b, \ddot{u}, \dddot{u}, \), and for the nasal \( w (w) \), as well as the method of transliterating \( w (1+w) \) by \( h (h+v) \) is defended (pp. 14, 21). The ‘tag’ \( \dddot{g} \) appearing in the letters \( f, v, n, h, q \) is an attempt at systematically representing the ‘derivation stroke’ \( \dddot{l} \dddot{s} \) by which many of the letters palaeographically are formed. Thus, \( w, w, w, v, w, w, w, =, s, v, w \) etc.—the dotted line denoting the ‘derivation stroke’. See *Av. Alphabet* pp. 16—17. The same ‘tag’ appears in the transcription of \( w (l+w) \) by \( s (l+s) \). See *Av. Alphabet* p. 20. In the case of \( m, s \) (beside \( s \)), the ‘subscript’ tag is merely turned in the opposite direction so as to correspond with the hooked part \( (\dddot{g}) \) of the letter. The threefold differentiation \( s, s, s \) for \( v, w, w \), is not necessary, however, except in transliterating a text for purely scientific purposes. In practise, \( s \) may everywhere be written. A ‘substitute alphabet’ to be used in popular articles is offered in the same monograph p. 28. I wish again to repeat my thanks to the authorities there quoted (*Av. Alphabet* p. 7) who so kindly aided me with advice and suggestions in regard to the transcription adopted.

In reference to the transliteration of Sanskrit, the familiar system (cf. Whitney, *Skt. Gram.* § 5) is followed; but be it observed that for comparison with the Avesta it seems preferable to transcribe the palatal sibilant by \( s \) (Whitney \( s \)), the palatal nasal by \( \ddot{n} \) (Whitney \( n \)), the guttural nasal by \( n \) (Whitney \( n \)).

A word may now be added in regard to my manifold indebtedness in the present book. The general gram-
matical works from the early contribution of Haug (*Essays*, 1862), through Hovelacque (*Grammaire*, 1868) down to the present date have been on my table. Justi's *Handbuch der Zendsprache* (1864) was of course consulted continually. Constant reference has been made also to Bartholomae's *Altiranische Dialekte* (1883) and to his other admirable grammatical contributions. Spiegel's *Vergl. Gram. der altertüm. Sprachen* (1882) was often opened, and will be specially acknowledged with others under the Syntax (Part II). C. de Harlez' *Manuel de l'Avesta* (1882), Darmesteter's *Études Iranienes* (1883), W. Geiger's *Handbuch der Awestasprache* (1879) furnished more than one good suggestion, for which I am much indebted.

Acknowledgment is also due to some special contributions on grammatical subjects. In the Phonology, selections were made from the rich material collected by Hübschmann in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* xxiv. p. 323 seq. (1878). My indebtedness to that well-known standard work Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergl. Gram. (= Elements of Compar. Grammar of the Indg. Languages*, English translation by Wright, Conway, Rouse, 1886 seq.) may be noticed from the citations below. Under Declension, frequent reference was made to Horn's *Nominalflexion im Avesta* (1885) and Lanman's *Noun-Inflection in the Veda* (1880). Under Verbal Inflection, in addition to Bartholomae's contributions below cited, acknowledgments are due to other authors to be mentioned in connection with Syntax (Part II). Caland's *Pronomina im Avesta* (1891) unfortunately came too late for the Inflections, but is cited under the Syntax of the Pronouns. I also regret that the work of Kavasji Edalji Kanga,