

we have a *Catechismo y examen para los que comulgan ex lingua Castellana y Timuquana, por el Padre Fr. Francisco Pareja*; and *y Padre de la Provincia de Santa Elena de la Florida, &c. Mexico, 1627.*

Also, the following numerals in Balbi, perhaps, taken from the above:—

ENG.	TIMUACUANA.	ENG.	TIMUACUANA.
<i>one</i> . . .	minecotamano.	<i>six</i> . . .	napikichama.
<i>two</i> . . .	nauchamima.	<i>seven</i> . .	napikinahuma.
<i>three</i> . .	nahapumina.	<i>eight</i> . .	napekechetama.
<i>four</i> . .	nacheketamima.	<i>nine</i> . .	natumama.
<i>five</i> . .	namaruama.		

X.—ON THE DERIVATION OF THE LATIN SONS.

BY THEODORE AUFRECHT, ESQ.

[Read June the 27th.]

The Sanskrit *ksh*, a combination of *k* + *s*, is usually represented in Greek and Latin by ξ *x*, σκ *sc*, κτ *ct*. Some cognate words will exemplify this:—

SANSKRIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.
<i>aksha</i> (axle)	ἄξων . . .	axis.
<i>dakshina</i> (right)	δεξιός . . .	dexter.
<i>shash</i> , Zend. <i>khsvas</i> * . . .	ἑξ . . .	sex.
<i>kshura</i> (razor)	ξυρόν . . .	—
<i>makshu</i> (quickly)	— . . .	mox.
<i>maksha</i> (fly)	— . . .	musca†.
<i>kshap</i> (night, literally she who covers)	σκέπω . . .	—

* Both a corruption of *kshvaksh*. The Greek form with the digamma occurs in the 'Tabulae Heraeleenses.'

† *Múia* ought not—as it generally is—to be compared with these words, before it is shown that ξ or σκ can be dropped between two vowels in Greek, as is apparently, but only apparently, the case in Latin. I believe that *μύια* stands for *μῦσια*, and that this little animal, as well as *μῦς*, *mus* received its name from its propensity for stealing.

SANSKRIT.	GREEK.	LATIN.
<i>riksha</i> (bear)	ἄρκτος . . .	ursus (for ursus).
<i>takshan</i> (faber)	τέκτων . . .	{ texere (basilicam, naves).
<i>kshan</i> (to kill)	KTAN . . .	—
<i>kshi</i> (to kill)	KTI . . .	—
	<i>kshinūmas</i> —κτίνυμες.	
<i>naksha-tra</i> (star)*	νυκτ . . .	noct.

Wherever the Sanskrit *ksh* agrees with *κτ* in Greek, we must consider the latter as the older form, and the *ksh* as a corruption, because *s* being weaker than *t*, can never, unless influenced by a subsequent mute, turn into the stronger sound. Sanskrit is as little able as Latin to bear *kt* at the beginning of words, but Sanskrit shows an additional weakness in never suffering it to stand at the end of roots. Forms like *flect*, *nect*, *pect*, *plect*, *τεκτ*, are impossible in Sanskrit. But all three languages have often transformed *kt* into some softer sound, and in many cases we are hardly able to trace the original form. I should not venture at present to prove the maxim, though I believe it will be confirmed hereafter, that every *ksh*, *ξ*, and *x*, found in the radical part of words, arose from *kt*. It may be interesting to show the different organic transmutations which *kt* might undergo in Greek and Latin.

1. The *k* might be dropped. Compare *κύπος* and *τύπτω*. *kt*, *t*.

* This term rendered literally signifies 'watcher of the night,' from *naksha* for *nakta* (night) and *tra* (protector). The latter stands RV. I. 100, 7. As *naksha* does not occur separately, it is probable that the change took place in order to avoid the cacophony of two *t*'s in two adjoining unaccented syllables. Bopp and Benfey (S. V.) derive *nákshatra* from *naksh*, without stating the meaning of that root. The native grammarians, as in most cases where a derivation does not lie on the surface, indulge in all kinds of absurdities. Yāska, one of the oldest, derives it from a verb *naksh* 'to go.' But as most things might be called from the same activity, and locomotion is not a very striking feature of the stars, and as *naksh* never signifies simply 'to go,' this etymology seems to be arbitrary. According to other grammarians, the stars are the imperishable, eternal, from *na* + *kshar* or *na* + *kshi*. This shows more sense, but less knowledge of grammar.

2. The *t* is changed into *s*. Compare τέκτων and *texo*, *fixum* for *fic-tum*, *noxa* for *noc-ta*. *kt*, *ks*.

3. The initial *k* might be changed into *p*.

4. The *ξ* and *x* might either be changed into *σκ*, *sc*, or lose the initial guttural and appear as *σ* and *s*. Compare 1, ξίφος and σκίφος, *maksha* and *musca*. 2, ξύν and σύν, Ζόννυξος and Διώνυσος, κτίννυμι and σίνις, *Sextius* and *Sestius*, *mixtus* and *mistus*, the Oscan *Santia* and *Xantias*. *kt* = *ks*, *sk*; *kt* = *ks*, *s*.

Having laid down these rules, I shall proceed more safely in tracing the origin of *sons* at present, and of one or two Latin words hereafter. I readily believe that Festus is right in explaining *sons* by *nocens*. Qu. xiv. 1, 22, "Sons nocens, ut ex contrario insons innocens." Qu. xiii. 27, 24, "Sonticum morbum in xii. significare ait Aelius Stilo certum cum justa causa, quem non nulli putant esse, qui noceat, quod sontes significat esse nocentes. Naevius ait: sonticam esse oportet causam, quam ob rem perdas mulierem." But the analogy between *nocens*, *noxius*, and *sons*, appears to me far more intimate than the Latin grammarians are aware of. As "nocere alicui" is nothing else but "neci esse alicui," to be the cause of destruction, of death, to somebody, so *sons* signified originally "destroying, killing," and, as every destroyer is held to account by the laws of society, passed from thence easily into the usual meaning of "guilty." The original signification appears clearly in *sonticus morbus*, a deadly disease, that is, a disease which either causes or threatens death. Compare Gellius, xx. 1, 27, "Ceteroquin morbum vehementiorem, vim graviter nocendi habentem, legum istarum scriptores alio in loco non per se morbum, sed morbum sonticum appellant." An attack of such a disease excused a soldier from appearing at the appointed day of a levy, and stopped all farther proceedings in a lawsuit. Hence, or as I am more inclined to believe, from the fact that death and murder inspire the human mind with the greatest awe in any state of society, we find *sonticus*, but very rarely, in the sense of "extreme, urgent*."

* We have an analogy in the use of "deadly," for "extremely, exceed-

I consider *sons* as one of those participles—a small number of which remain in every language—which have passed into adjectives and substantives, and are apparently unconnected with any primitive verb. Thus in Latin *dent* (*edent*), *font* (χέοντ, or rather an obsolete χύντ, according to Pott*), frequent, clement, in Greek ἄκοντ, ἐκόντ (=Sanskrit. *uçant*, willing, Pott), γέροντ, δράκοντ. The verb to which *sons* belongs, is the Greek KTAN, in that shorter form KTA, which appears in the aorist ἔκταν, so that *sont* agrees in every respect with κτάντ (κτάς†). KTAN, when turned into Latin, could—after what I have previously said—only become *xan* or *scan*, and if we suppose it took the first form at a time when the Latin could bear an *x* at the beginning of words, it was necessary at a later period to give up the guttural. In the same manner we find that the Greek σίνις is derived from κτι, a third form in which our verb appears. For κταν and κτι, we find in Sanskrit *kshan* and *kshi*. In Icelandic we have the verb KTA as *ská*. Compare Edda, 111 a.

Mjök er osviðr ef hann enn sparir

fjanda inn F O L K S K Â ;

“he is very unwise, if he any longer spares the man-hurting enemy.” The neuter *skae*, hurt, occurs frequently. I find, for instance, a ship called, in the Fagrskinna, p. 21, *blámoerar skae*, “the hurter of the blue plain.”

ingly,” in some provincial dialects, as for instance, “a deadly lively child,” for “a very lively child.”—The Dialect and Folk-lore of Northamptonshire, by Thomas Sternberg, p. 29 : John Noakes and Mary Styles, by Charles Clark, p. 38.

* Kuhn in his Journal, iii. 399, proposes a new, but by no means superior, derivation from the Sanskrit *dhavant*, currens, lavans, abluens.

† With regard to the *o*, compare *dos* from *dare*, *cos* from **care*, the participle of which we have in *cātus*.