

Constantine L. Borisoff
27 Balaclava road, Surbiton,
Surrey, KT6 5PW, The United Kingdom
leo@gir.me.uk

ANTUN MIHANOVIĆ AND HIS CONTRIBUTION TO SLAVONIC-SANSKRIT COMPARATIVE STUDIES

This paper analyses in detail a little-known article by Antun Mihanović highlighting his role as one of the pioneers of Slavonic comparative studies. Although the article was written under the influence of the German romantic nationalism, the ideological pointedness should not overshadow its significance as a remarkable, for the time, piece of comparative linguistic research.

1. Introduction

Antun Mihanović¹ (1796–1861) is mainly known as the author of verses of the Croatian national anthem *Horvatska domovina* [Croatian homeland]². Mihanović received an excellent education and was fluent in several languages but he was neither a professional scholar nor a prolific writer. The only well-known publication is his pamphlet *Rech Domovini od hasznovitozti piszanya vu Domorodnom Jeziku* [A word to the homeland about the benefits from writing in mother tongue] (Mihanović 1815). All the more surprising it was to find his name listed in *An Historical Sketch of Sanscrit Literature* by Friedrich von Adelung (1768–1843) published in Oxford (Adelung 1832). In the chapter dedicated to the review of works on comparison of Sanskrit with other languages, in paragraph 14 titled *With the Sclavonic languages* Adelung mentioned, among other sources:

¹ Mihanović used two different spellings of his name with “ć” and “ch” (Mihanovich). See a detailed treatment of this issue in Očak (1998:15–17).

² Commonly known as *Lijepa naša domovino* [Our beautiful homeland].

A table of two hundred words bearing some resemblance in sound and meaning in the Sanscrit and Slavonic languages, by A. v. Mihanovich, in the *Archiv für Geschichte, Geographie u. s. w. von Freih. v. Hormayr*, 1823, No. 66, 67, and 71. It has also been printed separately. (Adelung 1832:52)

Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Literatur und Kunst was an influential journal published in Vienna by the Austrian politician and historian Joseph Hormayr³ (1781 or 1782–1848) between 1810 and 1837 (Trencsenyi & Kopecek 2007:29). The article by Mihanović *Zusammenstellung von 200 Laut- und Sinnverwandten Wörtern des Sanskrites und Slawischen, durch A. v. Mihanovich* [Interconnection of 200 words of Sanskrit and Slavonic related by sound and meaning by A. v. Mihanovich] (Mihanovich 1823) opens a new interesting side of his personality which has not received due attention from his biographers.

In her comprehensive book *Antun Mihanović* Elena Očak only briefly mentioned this work and reproduced a hardly legible image of the first page (Očak 1998:140) with a remark that it had never been analysed by a linguist or an indologist. Radoslav Katičić (2005) referred to it quoting the first paragraph without going into details of the list of cognates. This paper is an attempt to give a more detailed analysis of the article highlighting the role of Mihanović as one of the pioneers of Slavonic comparative studies.

2. The article

The article was written in the period of ‘disability retirement’ (1821–1834) during the stay in Vienna when Mihanović dedicated himself to philological studies (Očak 1998:139). Before undertaking its analysis, it is important to understand what Carl L. Becker (1971[1932]:5) defined as ‘the climate of opinion’ in the intellectual circles of Europe and particularly in the German-speaking lands in the beginning of the 19th century.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation formed in the early 1500s had eventually dissolved during the Napoleonic wars. It was replaced by a loosely united German Confederation which became an area of rivalry between Prussia and the Austrian Empire. In this context the processes of consolidation of German-speaking lands started to gather momentum. It coincided with the rise of the romantic nationalism in Western Europe inspired by Jean-Jacques Rousseau⁴ (1712–1778), fuelled

³ Also known as Joseph Hormayr Freiherr zu Hortenburg and Joseph Freiherr von Hormayr zu Hortenburg.

⁴ See a detailed account of Rousseau’s contribution to developing the ideas of na-

by the ideas of Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) and Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814). Philological studies — literature, art and, especially, the study of languages gained a special importance in these circumstances because a language became regarded as an important material manifestation of nationality.

Gottfried von Herder is known not only as one of the protagonists of the ideology of romantic nationalism but, captivated by George Forster's first German retelling (Kalidasa and Foster 1803) of the English translation of Kālidāsa's play *Śakuntalā*⁵ made by William Jones (Kalidasa and Jones 1875[1789])⁶, he introduced Sanskrit studies to Germany with the essay *Ueber ein morgenländisches Drama* [About one oriental drama] (Clark 1955:362). The intricate romantic and mystic story served to form an idealistic and romanticised view of Hindu culture by the German elite and stimulated the interest in its language.

These ideas received a further impetus in the works by Karl Wilhelm Friedrich von Schlegel (1772–1829) who opened a new page in the German linguistic studies with his book *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* [On the language and wisdom of Indians] (Schlegel 1808) which may be considered as the starting point of German Indology. In this work Schlegel not only summarised some obvious grammatical similarities and common words between Sanskrit, German and classical languages (Greek and Latin) but also declared that all world's civilisations had their origin in India. Thus, according to Schlegel, the 'civilised peoples' who had their languages related to Sanskrit, and who might have been understood under the name of the Yavanas in the Manu's Code (its antiquity had initially been overestimated), had ultimately migrated from India. Such nations included the Greeks, the Latins and, of course, the Germans. For Schlegel, being derived from the 'divine origin' made these languages inherently superior (Tzoref-Ashkenazi 2006:732).

Immersed in the Austrian cultural and political life and having spent some time in Vienna, Mihanović could not have escaped being influenced by the tide of the German romantic nationalism and its particular fascination with the Old Indian culture and language. This is obvious from the introductory part of his article which he started on a highly emotional and

tionalism in Qvortrup (2003).

⁵ The play *Abhijñānaśākuntalā* [The sign of Shakuntala] by a Classical Sanskrit writer Kālidāsa (circa the 5th century AD).

⁶ The text is conveniently laid out at: http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00litlinks/shakuntala_jones/.

romantic note⁷:

A splendid era will approach when the many thousand year night, which covers the primeval history of our race, finally disappears before the dawning light coming from India⁸.

These words are reminiscent of Adelung's comparing the knowledge of India with the light illuminating the path of the learned ones in "their work on the affinity of languages⁹" (Adelung 1811:3).

For Herder a language was not only an independent organism determining the character of a people but also '*Schatzkammer* [treasure room]¹⁰ and '*Behältniß* [chest, receptacle]¹¹ of their ideas. In the following passage Mihanović made a bold move by directly applying Herder's notions of 'treasure room' and 'receptacle of ideas' to the Slavs:

Are these not beautiful dreams of bold wishes: what will that day hold out to us Slavs from our distant past? May we also hope to know what the grey forefathers once thought and accomplished; how they sinned and expiated; how endured and fought the strenuous life?¹²

The mentioning of 'grey forefathers' is noteworthy. For Herder, the role of a language as 'treasure room' was a universal principle but it was Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) who in his *Reden an die deutsche Nation* [Addresses to the German Nation] (1808) applied these ideas to the 'German nation' proclaiming the superiority of Germans because they spoke the 'original language¹³' passed without interruption from the ancient

⁷ The original text was written using the Fraktur font converted here into a modern font for convenience but preserving the peculiarities of the original orthography (e.g. *bey* instead of *bei* etc.). Unless indicated otherwise, translations were done by the Author.

⁸ "Eine herrliche Aera soll nahen, wo die vieltausendjährige Nacht, welche die Urgeschichte unseres Geschlechtes deckt, vor dem aus Indien tagenden Lichte endlich verschwindet."

⁹ "[...] la lumière, qui guide maintenant les savans dans leurs travaux sur l'affinité des langues".

¹⁰ "große Schatzkammer, in welcher die Kenntnisse aufbewahrt liegen ["a great treasure chamber in which the knowledge is stored"]" Herder (1821:10).

¹¹ "dies große Behältniß ihre Schätze von Ideen ["this great receptacle of their ideas"] (idem p. 9)

¹² "Sind es keine schönen Träume kühner Wünsche; was wird jener Tag uns Slawen aushalten von unserer Vorzeit? Dürfen wir auch hoffen einst zu erfahren, was die grauen Urväter gedacht, vollbracht; wie gesündigt; wie abgebüßt; wie sie geduldet und bekämpft das mühevollen Leben?"

¹³ The linguistic reason for such an opinion may be found in the relatively rich and alive morphology and word-formation in German, which is helpful in creating philosophical or scientific terminology (p.c. Mislav Ježić 2015).

forefathers¹⁴. Fichte believed that the strength of the German nation was in their retention of this original language because “speakers of a primal language are honest and diligent, serious about intellectual life, and are not hobbled by the easy-going, lighthearted nature characteristic of nations speaking impure languages” (Spires 1999:490).

By referring to the ‘grey forefathers’ of the Slavs, Mihanović effectively implied that they too were speakers of the ‘original language’ having the qualities envisaged by Fichte. However, since it was not possible to find answers to these questions in the existing or nearby languages, he believed that they could be indirectly obtained from India: “[t]hen, as adventurous it may sound, to expect the insights from the most distant India¹⁵”.

As for the Slavs, according to Mihanović, although several scholars confidently admitted that their language had no less similarity with Sanskrit than Greek, Latin and German, none of them had enough knowledge of Slavonic languages while others declared that they did not see much in common. Though no names were given, Mihanović undoubtedly referred here to Schlegel’s *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* in which Schlegel proclaimed a great affinity between Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and German while bluntly denying this for Armenian, Slavonic and Celtic:

The affinity of the Indian language with the Armenian, Slavonic and Celtic, is, on the contrary, very unimportant in comparison with the striking uniformity of the other languages to be derived from that stock¹⁶. (Schlegel 1808:3–4)¹⁷

¹⁴ “Somit ist unsre nächste Aufgabe, den unterscheidenden Grundzug des Deutschen vor den andern Völkern germanischer Abkunft zu finden, gelöst. Die Verschiedenheit ist sogleich bei der ersten Trennung des gemeinschaftlichen Stamms entstanden, und besteht darin, daß der Deutsche eine bis zu ihrem ersten Ausströmen aus der Naturkraft lebendige Sprache redet, die übrigen germanischen Stämme eine nur auf der Oberfläche sich regende, in der Wurzel aber todte Sprache [“With this our immediate task is performed, which was to find the characteristic that differentiates the German from the other peoples of Teutonic descent. The difference arose at the moment of the separation of the common stock and consists in this, that the German speaks a language which has been alive ever since it first issued from the force of nature, whereas the other Teutonic races speak a language which has movement on the surface only but is dead at the root.”]” (Fichte (1808:140), translated by R. F. Jones and G. H. Turnbull (Fichte et al. 1922:68)).

¹⁵ “Dann, wie abenteuerlich klingt es, solche Aufschlüsse aus dem fernsten Indien zu erwarten.”

¹⁶ “Mit der armenischen, den slavischen Sprachen und nächstdem mit der celtischen, ist die Verwandtschaft des Indischen entweder gering, oder steht doch in gar keinem Verhältniß zu der großen Uebereinstimmung mit jenen zuvor genannten Sprache, die wir aus ihr ableiten.”

¹⁷ Translation from the German by E. J. Millington (1849:429).

Mihanović noted that, regrettably, no Slavonic speaker had gained enough knowledge of Sanskrit although there were several attempts to draw the comparison between Slavonic and the ancient Indian language and he listed some of them with proper academic referencing.

The first one was to a short essay published in *Fundgruben des Oriens* with a note “by Count Golowkin?¹⁸”. The reason for this doubt was that it was published anonymously¹⁹ although it indeed was written by Count Fëdor Gavrilovič Golovkin (1762–1846). Despite his poor knowledge of Russian²⁰, no competence in Sanskrit and using only a limited pool of Sanskrit words mentioned in Schlegel’s *Ueber die Sprache*, Golowkin managed to compile an impressive list of 42 words²¹ bearing “the analogy most striking and most natural, without resorting to forced relations, with which etymologists like to arm themselves to defend their cause²²” (Golowkin 1809).

The next reference was to a yet another anonymous²³ publication: *Rapports entre la langue Sanscrit et la langue Russe* [Relationship between Sanskrit language and Russian language], whose actual author was Friedrich von Adelung (1768–1843). In this little treatise Adelung gave a list of 174 Sanskrit words (about 150 without duplicates) with corresponding similar Russian words, a large share of which (approximately one-half) were correctly identified cognates.

Mihanović also briefly mentioned a book by Walenty Skorochoód-Majewski (1764–1835) *O Słowianach i ich pobratymcach* [About the Slavs and

¹⁸ “von dem Grafen Golowkin?”.

¹⁹ While it is unclear why Golovkin decided to remain anonymous, his authorship is evident from the letter by Silvestre de Sacy to Joseph Freiherr von Hammer-Purgstall of June 20, 1812 published in Hoeflechner (2011:1032–1033) and it has also been confirmed by Adelung (1832:52).

²⁰ F. G. Golowkin was a grandson of the Russian ambassador to Holland count Aleksandr Gavrilovič Golovkin (1689–1760) who refused to return to Russia after having fallen out of grace with Empress Elizaveta.

²¹ Accessible electronically at: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb1021077600472.html>

²² “l’analogie la plus frappante et la plus naturelle, sans avoir recours à rapports forces, dont les étymologistes aiment à s’armer pour défendre leur cause”.

²³ Notably, the first works on the affinity of Slavonic and Sanskrit were anonymous. The possible reason could be that they contradicted Schlegel’s attitude to Slavonic so the authors were reluctant to engage themselves in a direct confrontation. A copy of this edition (Adelung 1811) held at the British library has a handwritten mark “By f. Adelung” on the title-page. Also, three years later, Adelung published the text of the introduction from *Rapports*, translated into Dutch with some minor modifications, in *Algemene konst- en letterbode* under his name (Adelung 1814).

their kin] (Skorochođ-Majewski 1816) with a dry comment: “[t]he Pole W. S. Maiewski should have compared Sanskrit with his native language²⁴”. Mihanović was probably annoyed that despite the promising name, this work was mostly a retelling of the outdated Sanskrit grammar composed by the Croat missionary from Austria Filip Vesdin best known by his monk name Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo²⁵ (1748–1806) without any real comparison with Slavonic.

The last work mentioned by Mihanović was a concise essay by a Czech doctor and revivalist writer, author of one of the first Czech studies²⁶ on Sanskrit and Indian culture Dr. Antonín Jan Jungmann (1775–1854) *O Sanskrytu* [About Sanskrit] (Jungmann 1821) which contained a number of Sanskrit and Prakrit words having similarity with Bohemian and a basic grammatical comparison.

However, as seen from the text, Mihanović was not satisfied with these treatises and engaged himself into studying Sanskrit and the Devanagari script. He started from the Sanskrit grammar by Paulinus of St. Bartholomaeo (Paulinus 1790) finding it misleading²⁷. The more up-to-date grammars of William Carey (1804) and Charles Wilkins (1808) helped him to correct some earlier mistakes²⁸. At that time these were the best two Sanskrit grammar texts but they offered only a limited Sanskrit lexicon. The real breakthrough was *A Dictionary in Sanskrit and English* by Horace Hayman Wilson (1786–1860) published in 1819 (Wilson 1819). It came as a revelation for Mihanović as he was struck by the remarkable likeness of many Sanskrit words with Slavonic²⁹.

To appreciate the scale of work undertaken by Mihanović, one has to open Wilson’s dictionary. The first 1819 edition published in Calcutta, a

²⁴ “Der Pohle W. S. Maiewski soll das Sanskrit mit seiner Muttersprache verglichen haben.”

²⁵ Paulinus (1790, 1804).

²⁶ See an in-depth analysis of the early Sanskrit studies in the Czech lands in Strnad (2007).

²⁷ It is unclear, however, whether Mihanović had used the earliest edition of the Grammar (Paulinus 1790) or the updated and more practical edition of 1804.

²⁸ “Nach mancher Störung und Unterbrechung retteten mich Carey’s und Wilkins’s Sprachelehren aus den Irrtümern, in die mich P. Paulino’s Werke verleitet hatten” [“After many interruptions and disturbances the language lessons in Carey and Wilkins saved me from errors of into which I had been misled by P. Paulino’s works”].

²⁹ “[...] habe ich mir solche Sanskrit Wörter aufgezeichnet, deren Übereinstimmung mit Slawischen in Laut und Sinn mich augenblicklich überraschte [“I have recorded many such words, their agreement with Slavonic in sound and meaning surprised me instantly”].

copy of which is available at the British Library, is a hefty volume of over a thousand pages printed on coarse paper. It was prefaced by an extensive introduction including the table of Devanagari to Latin transliteration but, as it was common at the time, Devanagari was not transliterated in the headwords and dictionary entries. Mihanović had to be proficient enough to read the Devanagari script and correctly transliterate Sanskrit words for his list — a challenging task even for some linguists of today. To make the job more difficult, the printing quality is far from being perfect so the Devanagari text is occasionally blurred and some complicated ligatures are hardly legible. Antun Mihanović emerged as a determined and serious researcher unlike many other amateurs of whom Karl Friedrich Schlegel bitterly complained in a letter to Wilhelm Humboldt in 1823: “our countrymen are running wild talking about Sanskrit, without knowing it”³⁰ (Humboldt 1908:155).

In the following paragraphs Mihanović clearly defined the methodology he used in making the list and explained the purpose of his work. Obviously, the choice of words for the list was not arbitrary. Although Mihanović mentioned that he included into the list some words discovered by other researches, one may see that he omitted many of the apparent cognates noted by his predecessors³¹. Such selectivity was predetermined by the purpose of the work: “[t]o provide a valid proof that the Slavonic language stock belongs to the same language family with Sanskrit no less than Greek and Latin [...]”³². To achieve this goal Mihanović intended to prove “that Slavonic has at least a tenth part of its roots common with Sanskrit”³³ using for this purpose a list of 1605 Slavonic roots from Joseph Dobrowsky’s³⁴ newly published *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris* [Constitution of the old dialect of the Slavonic languages] (Dobrowsky 1822). This special attention to roots was not accidental. In his treatise Schlegel highlighted the role of roots because, as he thought, they

³⁰ “Mit dem Sanskrit ist es vollends bey unsern Landsleuten eine wahre Wuth davon zu sprechen, ohne es zu wissen.”

³¹ E.g.: *sestra* — *svasṛ* ‘sister’ in Adelung (1811:15) or *mati* — *mātṛ* ‘mother’ in Golovkin (1809).

³² “Einen voll gültigen Beweis zu führen, das der Slawische Sprachstamm, nicht minder als der Grieche und Lateinische zu einer Sprachfamilie mit dem Sanskrite gehöre [...]”.

³³ “daß die Slawen wenigstens den zehnten Theil ihrer Wurzeln mit dem Sanskrite gemein haben.”

³⁴ Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829) was a Bohemian philologist, linguist and folklorist, one of the protagonists of the Czech national revival. He is often considered as the ‘father of Slavonic linguistics’.

contained the essence of the philosophical capacity of a language:

In the Indian and Greek languages each root is actually that which bears the signification, and thus seems like a living and productive germ, every modification of circumstance or degree being produced by internal changes. (Schlegel 1808)

Today, this task may appear trivial because the kinship of Slavonic, as one of the principal branches of the Indo-European language family, with Sanskrit is well established and not disputed but it was a bold proposition for that time. The attitude of Schlegel to Slavonic has already been mentioned. It is also characteristic that the prominent protagonist of the Indo-European comparative studies Franz Bopp (1791–1867) had not even included Slavonic in the first addition of his famous *Vergleichende Grammatik* [Comparative Grammar] (Bopp 1833) and only started to add the Slavonic material from the second edition (1835). In the English translation of Bopp's *Comparative Grammar*, the editor Edward B. Eastwick had to make a special note to the chapter³⁵ *On the Old Slavonic declension*:

It is stated by Professor Bopp, in the preface to the second published portion of this Grammar, commencing with the formation of cases in general, that it had not occurred to him to direct his attention at an earlier period to the Slavonic tongues: having subsequently considered the subject, he found sufficient reason to include them in the same family of languages, and accordingly devotes to its principles of declension the supplementary section which follows. (Bopp 1856:310)

Being aware of this attitude, Antun Mihanović had anticipated that the general public would not take his work seriously and he even vividly described what they would say:

Look at the important proof! — Many will exclaim; look at this idle quibble! A shadow play! Full of tender compassion they will say: he day-dreams in the halls of a magical temple of wonders, fancying hearing befriended voices coming from the darkness [...]³⁶.

Mihanović was ready for this “cold distrust³⁷” from the part of the general public, so he appealed to “those who have experienced the deception and truth going hand in hand³⁸” with a detailed argumentation drawing

³⁵ This was also based on Dobrovský's Slavonic grammar *Institutiones linguae slavicae*.

³⁶ “Seht den wichtigen Beweis! werden viele ausrufen, seht die müßige Wortklauberei! ein Schattenspiel! Voll zärtlichen Mitleidens werden sie sagen: Er träumt sich wachend in den magischen Vorhallen eines Wundertempels, und wähnt aus dem hohen Dunkel befreundete Stimmen zu vernehmen; [...]”.

³⁷ “kaltm Misstrauen”.

³⁸ “Jene, die erfahren haben, wie Täuschung und Wahrheit Hand in Hand”.

parallels with the classical languages. The main argument was that, although his study had not been profound enough and a more thorough research involving not only a larger number of words but also a detailed comparison of grammatical forms would be needed to prove his argument beyond any doubt, Mihanović believed that the remarkable affinity between Slavonic and Sanskrit could not be just a case of some odd coincidence, a ‘shadow play’ or the result of a mere borrowing.

Notably, many Slavonic words in the list were left without a German translation. This may suggest that the paper was primarily intended for the Slavonic-speaking elite who would understand them without translation and that the ultimate goal was not the comparison of Slavonic and Sanskrit vocabularies *per se* but the elevation of the status of the Slavonic language. To achieve it Antun Mihanović chose a method successfully repeated later by Lithuanian national revivalists. Faced with a similar situation when Lithuanian was completely dominated by Polish and neglected as ‘a peasant dialect’, they “chose not the disparagement of the Polish language in the eyes of Lithuanians, but rather the elevation of the Lithuanian language, both in the eyes of its own speakers and in the world at large” (Spireš 1999) also through the direct comparison of Lithuanian with Sanskrit³⁹.

The choice of the publisher is also significant: the editor of *Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Literatur und Kunst* Joseph Hormayr is best known as one of the leaders of the Tyrolean uprising of 1809 against the Bavarian and French rule and also as one of the organisers of the Tyrolean *Alpenbund* resistance movement (1812–1813) against Napoleon resulting in the inclusion of Tyrol into the Habsburg’s Austrian Empire in 1815 (Trencsenyi & Kopecek 2007:27). Being an ardent supporter of the Habsburg dynasty he attributed to Austria, which was composed of a variety of languages and peoples, a special role of protector of its diverse nations. He believed that plurality of social, political and cultural traditions in the Austrian Empire “complemented each other in supporting the House of Habsburg” (idem). Hormayr was thus sympathetic to developing local languages and literature including, of course, Slavonic as long as this did not lead to secessionist feelings. Mihanović’s article obviously appealed to his general romantic

³⁹ The article by Giedrius Subačius *The Lithuanian language* published at the official site of Institute of the Lithuanian Language says: “Since the 19th century, when the similarity between Lithuanian and Sanskrit was discovered, Lithuanians have taken a particular pride in their mother tongue as the oldest living Indo-European language. To this day, to some Lithuanians their understanding of their nationality is based on their linguistic identity.” (http://www.lki.lt/LKI_EN/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=34:the-lithuanian-language&catid=84:lietuvi-kalba&Itemid=101).

sentiment and it also referred to German as the “schöne Sprache” [“beautiful language”] in the closing paragraph. Besides, the idea of bringing Slavonic closer to German via the common ancestry to Sanskrit would accord with his vision of a supra-ethnic Austrian identity united in the loyalty to the House of Habsburg.

3. The word-list: Linguistic evaluation

The list numbering exactly two hundred entries was too large to be printed in a single issue of the journal. Volume 66 of *Archiv* only had entries from 1 to 41 while entries from 42 to 200 were published in the consecutive volume No. 67. As mentioned earlier, the number of words was predetermined by the purpose of proving the kinship of at least ten per cent of them with Dobrowsky’s list of roots so, allowing for some uncertainty (e.g. words marked by a question mark), the minimum number of entries should have been about two hundred.

Figure 1: Sample page with the first fifteen words from the list.

Sanskrit:	a = a	Slavisch.
1 At'ha, freylich; sohin.		ada, Illyr.
2 antar, innerlich; adverb.		umutri, Ill. nutri, Croat. vnutr', Alt-Slav.
3 antan, der letzte.		zadnji? (cf. sād'ha, Wurzw. sād'hnōti, enden, Sanskr.)
4 apa, entgegengesetzt, im Gegentheil.		opak? verkehrt. Ill.
5 apavada, der Befehl.		zapoved, Cr.; zapovid; zapovjed, Ill. (cf. vada).
6 arva, W. arvati, stoßen, drängen.		arvatise, sich drängen, ringen. Ill. hervatise, Cr.
	i = i	
7 i, W. éti, oder ayati (sonst auch wohl ajati, at'hati), iti; hajati, hadjati in den Compos. mit iz, od, etc. (Vide unten gehen).		iten hud'a).
8 ila, W. élayati (conf. péláté, sich bewegen, gehen), len' peljati? führen; fahren, peljati se Croat. Grain.		ten, führen.
	u = u	
9 uchita, bewußt, verstanden.		uchit, nauchit, gelernt, erlernt (cf. uchichala, Verstand, Sanskr. und chita weiter unten). Ill.
10 ud, in Auftrag, ab, weg, ger etc.		od; ASk. ot.
11 uda, das Wasser.		voda.
12 ub'haya, beyde.		oboje, Ill.
13 uragast'hāna, die unterirdischen Räume, die Höhlen der Naga- oder Schlangen-		Vraga- stan? des Teufels- Wohnung (S. unten st'hana). Ill.
	ú = ú	
14 úd'han, verheißigt.		udan, Ill.
	ri = ri (i)	
15 ri'd'ha, W. ri'd'hyati, ri'd'hnōti, gedeihen, fruchtbar machen; roditi; obroditi (S. srija).		ten.

The structure of the word-list (Fig. 1) is not complicated. Each entry is divided into a Sanskrit (left) and Slavonic (right) parts. The entries are grouped by the order of the Devanagari syllabary. Each starts with a Sanskrit word transliterated according to the system adopted in Wilson's dictionary with a German translation of the dictionary meaning. On the right, Mihanović placed similarly sounding Slavonic words followed (not always) by a reference to a particular Slavonic language. Since, in his view, the words were simple and their likeness very close, any detailed etymological analysis appeared superfluous⁴⁰. This is a dubious assumption because, as will be shown further, it was the lack of an elementary etymological analysis that was the cause of many errors in his list.

3.1. References to Slavonic languages

The choice of Slavonic cognates and their order by language deserves a special attention. In the majority of entries (136) the first cognate was marked as 'Illyr.' or 'Ill.' which stood for 'Illyrian language'. The name 'Illyrian language'⁴¹ was the usual term by Croatian Štokavian writers referring to their language since the age of Humanism and Renaissance. The contemporary of Mihanović — Jernej Bartol Kopitar (1780–1844) in his *Grammatik der slawischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steiermark* (Kopitar 1808) considered 'Illyrian' as a generic Slavonic dialect common to all Southern Slavs which he still distinguished from the language of (Kajkavian) Croats and Slovenians⁴². However, after the Napoleonic conquest the French governor in Ljubljana Marshall Auguste de Marmont (1774–1852) on purely administrative reasons promoted a single 'Illyrian' language based on the Štokavian dialect which was strongly opposed by the Slovenians; so by 1810 it was decided to call 'Illyrian' only the dialect of the southern part of the Illyrian provinces and use 'Slovene' for the northern part. Nevertheless, a few years later the predominantly Slovene areas were included into the Austrian administrative unit under the name 'Kingdom of Illyria' adding to the confusion (Despalatović 1975:3–4).

One may assume that by the time Antun Mihanović published his article, he understood 'Illyrian' only as one of the Slavonic dialects, namely the Štokavian dialect. Under 'Cr.', 'Cro.' or 'Croat.' Mihanović proba-

⁴⁰ "Da die angeführten Wörter meist einfach, und fast buchstäblich übereinstimmend sind; so schien mir eine etymologische Zergliederung überflüssig [Since the quoted words are usually simple and almost literally matching; an etymological seemed to me superfluous]."

⁴¹ See a recent detailed treatment of 'Illyrian' and 'Illyrian ideologem' in Grčević (2009:1–4) and Dzino (2014).

⁴² See more on the history of language debate in Slovenia in Herryty (2014).

bly meant 'Croatian' which was used in his time primarily as the reference to the Kajkavian dialect (Grčević 2009:2). The fact that the 'Illyrian' words usually appeared first in the list followed by 'Croatian' and then by other Slavonic languages, shows that already a decade before proclaiming 'Illyrian' as the common Southern Slavonic language by Ljudevit Gaj (1809–1872) and other proponents of the 'Illyrian movement'⁴³, Antun Mihanović already perceived 'Illyrian' as a generic pan-Southern-Slavonic language with 'Croatian' being closely related to it.

'Croatian' words make the second largest group in the list numbering 102. After 'Illyrian' and 'Croatian', next in frequency (about 40) are words for which Mihanović did not indicate a particular source-language (e.g. *voda*). Presumably, for him these were generic Pan-Slavonic words common to all Slavonic dialects. Twenty-one words were marked as 'Alt.-Slav. (ASl.)' for 'Old Slavonic' and they were probably taken from Dobrowsky's *Institutiones linguae slavicae*. Three words (8. *peljati se*, 89. *prashati* and 171. *snesti*) were marked as 'Crain.', apparently, referring to the dialect of Carniola (Kranjska in contemporary Slovenia) on which the (literary) Slovene language is based. Only one word (49. *t'ma*) was marked as 'Serb.', which obviously stood for 'Serbian'. Notably, Mihanović distinguished both Illyrian and Croatian from Serbian and Slovene under the name of the dialect of Kranjska.

A single reference was done to 'Wind.' under which Mihanović, apparently, meant the Sorbian (Germ. *Winden*) language. Slovak (Slov. 74?, Slk. 77) is probably mentioned twice and Bulgarian (78) was mentioned on just one occasion. A detailed analysis of references to all Slavonic words in the list is beyond the scope of this paper but they can potentially be of interest to some specialists in historical Slavonic dialectology.

3.2. Normalisation and analysis

The word-list below is presented here in a 'normalised' form. The transliteration of Sanskrit words has been changed from the outdated system adopted in Wilson's dictionary to the International Alphabet of Sanskrit Transliteration (IAST) used in modern academic publications.

A few obvious transliteration mistakes have been corrected. German translations of Sanskrit words taken by Mihanović from Wilson's dictionary have been replaced by the more up-to-date ones from Monier-Williams' comprehensive *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (Monier-Williams 1899).

⁴³ For a recent comprehensive and condensed analysis of the Illyrian movement see Greenberg (2011).

The forms of words and roots have also, in some cases whenever necessary, been normalised in accordance with Monier-Williams.

Inconsistencies in references to Slavonic languages have been made uniform: e.g. 'Cro.' or 'Croat.' for 'Croatian' used by Mihanović are represented as 'Cr.'⁴⁴. The original spelling⁴⁵ of Slavonic cognates is preserved but it was complemented by a modern spelling given in brackets whenever appropriate (e.g. *kashlj* (*kašalj*)). Question marks placed by Mihanović in some doubtful cases have been kept with the addition of brackets: 'O.Sl. *vlk* (?), Ill., Cr. etc. *vuk*, 'wolf' etc. The original numbering of words (from 1 to 200) is kept but the entries have been grouped by three categories: 'Acceptable identifications', 'False identifications' and 'Other matches'.

3.2.1. Acceptable identifications supported by later scholarship

The biggest group comprising 98 entries includes the cases of correct identifications. These are generally accepted cognates mentioned in at least one of the major Slavonic etymological dictionaries (e.g. Vasmer 1964–973; Skok 1971–1974; ÉSSJa 1974–2012). Most of them also have cognates in other Indo-European languages e.g. *voda* 'water' (Hittite *uātar*, Gk. *hýdōr*, Lat. *unda* 'wave'; Old High German *wazzar*, Gothic *watō*, Albanian. *uj*, Lithuanian. *vanduō*). However, it is important to note that despite all the achievements of the Indo-European comparative research, there are many cases when a particular cognate relationship of a certain word is interpreted in different ways or even denied altogether by some linguists. For example, the relation of 44 (*nuda* 'to cast, to command, to direct, to throw or send; the act of ordering being considered analogous to that of throwing' – Ill., O.Sl. *noditi*, *nuxda* (*nođiti*; *nožda*) 'to offer, bid; necessity') is supported by Illich-Svitych (1977), Zaliznjak (1996) and, partly in VAS⁴⁶ (3, 88–89) but it is not supported by e.g. ŠAP (2, 32). The pair 53 (*trāsa* 'fear, terror, anxiety' – *strah* 'fear') is only supported in Zaliznjak (1996) but it is rejected in VAS (3,772) etc. It is not the objective of this paper to enter into a debate or try to prove one or another point of view, so, for the sake of fairness, any entry proposed by Mihanović is considered as 'acceptable' if it has been mentioned in at least one recent academic source supporting the etymology.

⁴⁴ The following abbreviations for Slavonic languages were used in the normalised text: Bulg. – Bulgarian; Cr. – Croatian; Crain. – Carniola (Kranjska in contemporary Slovenia); Ill. – Illyrian; O.Sl. – Old (Church) Slavonic; Slk. – Slovak; Srb. – Serbian; Wind. – Sorbian.

⁴⁵ The most salient feature of the historical transliteration of Slavonic was the use of *x* for *ž* (e.g. *nuxda* for *nužda*).

⁴⁶ See the explanation of abbreviations in *Lexica* after *References*.

It goes without saying that in his analysis, Mihanović was guided by a superficial likeness of sound and meaning which is understandable since the rules of regular sound correspondences between Indo-European languages⁴⁷, tentatively suggested by Rasmus Rask (1818), first appeared in the form of Jacob Grimm's famous 'Sound Laws' just a year earlier (Grimm 1822). Nevertheless, Mihanović did try to set up, although reluctantly, some basic regular sound correlations between Sanskrit and Slavonic. The task was facilitated by the remarkable affinity of the Indo-Aryan and Slavonic phonetics generally preserving the original Indo-European initial and inter-vocal consonants which have not been obscured by drastic consonant shifts as, for instance, in German or Armenian⁴⁸.

3.2.2. Normalised list of acceptable identifications

The normalised list presented here follows the layout of the original text by Mihanović preserving his numeration but with the normalisation of Devanagari transliteration and interpretations of meanings as mentioned above. Each entry is accompanied by a reference to at least one academic source confirming the cognate relationship. The entries are grouped by the sound correlations as envisaged by Mihanović and thus preserving certain ambiguities (e.g. $a = a$ under which he united *antar* and *unutri* or $o = ó$ under which he placed the pair *oṣṭha* and *usta*). Question marks put by Mihanović in certain cases, such as $\eta = n'$ (?) etc., have been kept in brackets. Whenever appropriate, the modern spelling is also given in brackets (e.g. $c = ch$ (č)). In certain cases translations of certain Slavonic words⁴⁹ omitted by Mihanović have been added for clarity.

$a = a$

2. *antar* 'within, between, amongst' – Ill. *unutri*, Cr. *nutri*, O.Sl. *vnutr'* (*unutri*; *unutar*) 'innen; within' (VAS:3, 90–91).

$i = i$

7. *i*, *eti*, *ayati* 'to go, walk' – *iti*; *hajati*, *hadjati* (*iči*) 'go, walk' (*hajati* and *hadjati* do not belong here. VAS:2, 117–118; ČERN:1, 337; ĚSSJa:8, 247–248).

$u = u$

9. *ucita* 'delightful, pleasurable, agreeable; customary, usual; proper,

⁴⁷ The term did not exist yet.

⁴⁸ The conservative nature of Slavonic phonetics was later described by A. Meillet (1967:60) as: "Baltic and Slavic are [...] the only languages in which certain modern word-forms resemble those reconstructed for common Indo-European".

⁴⁹ Largely following Bujas (2011).

suitable' – Ill. *uchit, nauchit (učiti)* 'to teach' (VAS:4, 179–80; SK:3, 535).

11. *uda* 'water' (at the beginning or end of a compound) – *voda* 'water' (VAS:1, 330; SK:3, 611).

12. *ubhaya* 'both, of both kinds' – Ill. *oboje* 'both' (VAS:3, 96–97, ČERN:1, 583; ĚSSJa:26, 85–88).

o = ó

16. *oṣṭha* 'the lip' – *usta* 'mouth', Ill. *ustnica* 'the lip' (VAS:4, 172).

k = k

17. *kadā* 'when? , at what time?' – Ill., Cr. *kada, kad* 'when' (VAS:2, 274–275; ĚSSJa:10, 108–09).

19. *kās, kasate* 'cough' – Ill. *kashlj (kašalj)* 'cough' (VAS:2, 214–215; ČERN:1, 389; ĚSSJa:9, 160–61; SK:2, 59).

g = g

25. *giri* 'mountain, hill, rock, elevation' – Ill., Cr. *gora* 'mountain' (VAS:1, 438; ČERN:1, 203; ĚSSJa:7, 29–31).

28. *gu, gavate* 'speech' – Ill., Cr. *govor, govoriti* 'speech; speak' (VAS:1, 424).

c = ch (č)

33. *caturtha* 'fourth' – Cr. *četvarti, ceterti, chetarti (četorti)*, Ill., O.Sl. *chetvarti* 'fourth' (VAS:4, 352; ČERN:2, 387; ĚSSJa:4, 93–94).

34. *cit, cetati* 'to think or reflect on' – Ill. *cteti, chitati, chjutiti (čitati)* 'read' (VAS:4, 374–375; SK:1, 299).

j = Ital. ge; Ill. dj, Cr. gy (but sharper)

37. *jani* 'woman in general, mother' – *xena (žena)* 'woman, wife' (VAS 2, 46; ČERN 1, 298–299).

40. *jīv, jīvati; jīvana* 'live, exist; life, living' – *xivoleniye (življenje)* 'living' (VAS 2, 52; ČERN 1, 30).

41. *jñā, jānāti* 'to know, have knowledge' – *znati* 'to know' (VAS 2, 100–101; ČERN 1, 226–327; SK 1, 576).

jñāna 'knowing, knowledge' – Ill., Cr. *znanje* 'knowledge'.

ṇ = n' (?)

44. *nuda* 'to cast, to command, to direct, to throw or send; the act of ordering being considered analogous to that of throwing' – Ill., O.Sl. *nuditi; nuxda (nužda)* 'to offer, bid; necessity' (Illich-Svitych 1977; Zaliznjak 1996 but questioned by A. Šapošnikov (p.c. 2015)).

t = t

46. *tadā* 'then' – Ill. *tada* 'then' (VAS:4, 68–69).

47. *tanu*, *tanuḥ* 'thin, slender, attenuated, emaciated, small, little, minute, delicate' – Ill. *tanahan* (*tanak*) 'thin' (VAS:4, 76–77; ČERN:2, 250).

48. *tap*, *tapati*; *tapana* 'to make hot or warm, heat; heat; the hot season' – Ill. *topiti* 'melt' (VAS:4, 78; KEWA:1, 494).

49. *tama*, *tamisra* 'darkness' – Srb. *tama*, O.Sl. *t'ma*, Cr. *tmica*, 'darkness' (VAS:4, 133–134).

50. *tāta* 'dear father (familiar expression)' – Ill. *tata*, *tjatja* 'father, daddy' (VAS:4, 26; according to A. Šapošnikov (p.c. 2015) this may be a case of a 'babbling word').

53. *trāsa* 'fear, terror, anxiety' – Ill., Cr. *strah* 'fear' (Zaliznjak 1996; see the alternative etymology in ŠAP:1, 385).

54. *tri*, *ṛtīya* 'three, triad' – Ill. etc. *tri*, *tretyij* 'three, third' (VAS:4, 101).

d = d

56. *dakṣiṇa* 'the right (hand or arm)' – Ill., Cr. *desni* 'right, right-hand' (VAS:1, 506–507; ĚSSJa:4, 218–219).

58. *daśa* 'in compounds for 'ten'; full form *daśan*' – O.Sl. *desjat*, Ill., Cr. *deset* 'ten' (VAS:1, 329; ČERN:1, 246; ĚSSJa:4, 216–217).

59. *dāru* 'wood, timber' – Ill., Cr. *darvo* (*drvo*) 'wood, tree' (VAS:1, 502; ČERN:1, 243; ĚSSJa:4, 211–212).

64. *dru* 'tree' – Ill., Cr. *darvo*, *dervo* (*drvo*) 'wood, tree' (VAS:1, 502; ČERN:1, 243; ĚSSJa:4, 211–212).

65. *dvi* 'two (dva original stem of dvi)' – *dva* 'two' (VAS:1, 486; ČERN:1, 232; ĚSSJa:5, 185–86).

dh = dh (?)

67. *dhe*, *dhayati* 'to suck, drink, suck or drink in' – Ill., Cr. *dojiti* 'nurse, suckle' (VAS:1, 522; ČERN:1, 259–260; ĚSSJa:5, 53–54).

n = n

68. *na* 'no, not' – *ne* 'not' (VAS:3, 52–53; ĚSSJa:24, 91–93).

69. *nakha* 'finger nail' – Ill. *nokat* 'nail' (POK: 780; DERK: 355).

70. *nagna* 'naked' – Ill., O.Sl. *nag*, *-a*, *-o* 'naked' (VAS:3, 36–37; ĚSSJa:22, 70–72).

71. *nabha*, *nabhasa* 'sky, atmosphere' – Ill. etc. *nebo*, *nebesa* 'sky' (VAS:3, 53; ĚSSJa:24, 101–104).

72. *nara* 'man, male, person' — *narav, narava* 'nature, character' (VAS:3, 84; ĚSSJa:25, 194).

73. *nava* 'new' — Ill. etc. *nov, -a, -o* 'new' (VAS:3, 78; ĚSSJa:26, 9–13).

p = p

74. *pā (pa)* 'guarding, protecting, ruling' (e.g. *gopati* 'the lord of cow-herds, leader, chief') — Slk. etc. *pan* 'master, lord' (?), Ill., Cr. *Ban* (?) 'id.' (VAS:3, 195–196 but see Trubacëv against it in a ft. idem)

75. *pac, pačati* 'to cook, bake, roast, boil' — Ill. etc. *pechi (peći)* 'bake' (VAS:3, 227; ČERN:2, 29).

76. *pat, patati* 'to fall down or off' — Ill., Cr. *padati, pasti* 'to fall' (VAS:3, 184 and SK:2, 616, more precisely connecting it with *padyati*, not *patati*).

78. *path, 'to go, move'* — Ill., Cr. *putovati* 'to travel';
patha 'way, path, road, course' — Ill. *put, Bulg. pat (pät)* 'path, road';
pathika 'traveller, wayfarer, guide' — *putnik* 'traveller' (VAS:3, 413; ČERN:2, 85).

84. *pī, pīyate* 'to drink' — *piti* 'to drink' (cf. Ill. *napajati, uapijati (upijati)*); (VAS:3, 269; ČERN:1, 36).

87. *pūrva* 'being before or in front, first' — Ill. *parvi (provi)* 'first' (VAS:3, 235; ČERN:2, 20).

89. *pracchana, prach* 'asking, inquiring; to ask, question, interrogate' — Crain. *prashati (prostiti)* 'beg' (VAS:3, 377–378; DERK:421).

90. *prati* 'towards, near to; against, in opposition to' — Ill., Cr. *proti* 'against' (VAS:3, 382–383; ČERN:2, 74; SK:3, 54).

91. *prabuddha* 'awakened, awake, roused' — Ill. *probudjan (probuđen)* 'rouse, awake' (VAS:1, 230; ĚSSJa:3, 76–77; DERK:67–68).

92. *priyatā* 'being dear' — Ill. etc. *prijatelj (prijatelj)* 'friend' (VAS:3, 369–370; ČERN:2, 68).

94. *plu, plavate* 'to float, swim' — Ill. *plavanje, plavati* 'swimming, to swim' (VAS:3, 271–272; ČERN:4, 45).

ph = ph (?)

95. *phena* 'foam, froth, scum' — Ill., Cr. etc. *pena* 'froth, foam' (VAS:3, 231; ČERN:2, 18).

b = b

96. *bā (vā)* 'as, like; or, either' — Ill. *bo* 'or else; because; for' (VAS:1, 180 also ĚSSJa:1, 105 connect it with Avestan *ba* without extending it to Skt. *va*).

98. *bodhana* 'causing to awake, arousing, exciting' — Ill., Cr. *budenje*

(*buđenje*), *buditi* ‘awakening; to wake’ (VAS:1, 230; ĚSSJa:3, 76–77).

bh = bh (?)

99. *bhaga*, *bhagavan*, *bhagavati* ‘dispenser’, gracious lord, patron (applied to gods) – *Bog* (?) ‘God’ (VAS:1, 181–82; ČERN:1, 98; ĚSSJa:2, 161).

101. *bhī*, *bibheti* (Vedic also *bhayate*) ‘to fear, be afraid’ – Ill. *bojati se* ‘to be afraid’ (VAS 1, 204; SK 1, 183).

102. *bhū*, *bhavati* ‘to become, be; existence, being’ – *bivati* ‘stay’, Ill., Cr. *bitje* ‘creature’ (VAS 1, 260; ČERN 1, 129; ĚSSJa 3, 155; SK 1, 161).

m = m

107. *majjā* ‘marrow’ – Ill. *moxdjani*, *mozak* ‘brain’ (VAS:2, 638; ĚSSJa:20, 94–97; DERK:328).

109. *madhu* ‘sweet, delicious, pleasant, mead’ – Ill., O.Sl. *m(j)ed* (*med*) ‘honey’ (VAS 2, 588–589; ČERN 1, 519; ĚSSJa 18, 68–72; SK 2, 397).

110. *madhya* ‘middle’ – O.Sl. *mezdu* (*meždu*), Ill. *medju* (*među*) ‘among’ (from Proto-Slavic **med’u*: VAS:2, 591–592; ĚSSJa:18, 45–46).

112. *māṁsa* ‘meat’ – Ill. *meso* ‘meat’ (VAS:3, 30–31; ĚSSJa:19, 7–11; DERK:315).

113. *māsa* ‘moon’ – Ill. *mjesac* (*mjesec*) ‘moon, month’ (VAS:2, 608–609; ĚSSJa:18, 191–195; ČERN:1, 526–527).

117. *mūṣa* ‘“stealer, thief”, a mouse’ – *mich* (*miš*) ‘mouse’ (VAS:3, 27–28; ĚSSJa:21, 64–67).

118. *mṛ*, *mriyate* (Vedic also *marati*, *marate*) ‘to die, decease’ – Ill., O.Sl. etc. *mrijeti* (*mrijeti*) ‘to die’ (VAS 2, 602; ĚSSJa 18, 101–102; DERK 308; SK 2, 467).

119. *me* (?), *mayati* ‘to exchange, barter’ – Ill., Cr. *menjati* (*mijenjati*) ‘to change, exchange’ (VAS:2, 597–598; ĚSSJa:1, 172).

120. *megha* ‘“sprinkler”, cloud’ – *megla* (*magla*) ‘fog’ (p.c. A. Šapošnikov 2015).

y = j

122. *yabha* ‘to have sexual intercourse, futuere’ – *jebati* ‘to have sexual intercourse’ (UHL:235; ĚSSJa:8, 188; DERK:147).

123. *yaśas* ‘beautiful, splendid, worthy, excellent’ – *jasnost* (*jasan*) ‘clear’ (VAS:4, 565–566; alternative etymology in ŠAP 1, 575).

124. *yū*, *yūṣa* ‘soup, broth, pease-soup’ – Cr. *juha*, Ill. *jua*, *juva*, ‘soup, broth’ (VAS:4.177–178).

126. *yūvan* ‘young, youthful’ — *junica?* ‘heifer’ (VAS:4, 531; ĚSSJa:8, 195–197).

r = r

130. *rāṭi* ‘assault, attack’ — Ill. *rat* ‘war’ (VAS 3, 448 connects it with a closely related *ṛti* ‘assault, attack; enemy’).

131. *rādh*, *rādhayati* ‘to accomplish, perform, achieve, make ready, prepare, carry out’ — Ill. *raditi* ‘to work, do’ (VAS 3, 430).

133. *r* (*riva* in Wilson 1819), *ṛṇvati* — *rivati* ‘push’, *rinuti* ‘make progress’ (VAS 3, 484).

135. *rūṣ*, *ruṣyati* ‘to hurt, injure, kill’ — Ill., Cr. *rushiti* (*rušiti*) ‘demolish, break down’ (ŠAP:2, 292).

137. *rai* ‘property, possessions, goods, wealth, riches’ — Ill., Cr. *raj* ‘paradise’ (VAS:3, 435–436; ŠAP:2, 262).

l = l

138. *laghu* (*raghu*) ‘light, quick, swift’ — Ill. *lagahan* (*lagan*) ‘easy’ (VAS:2, 473–474; ČERN:1, 472; ĚSSJa:17, 64; DERK:297).

139. *lī*, *layati* ‘to melt, liquefy’ — Ill. *lejati*, *lijati* (*liti*) ‘pour’ (p.c. Šapošnikov 2015).

140. *lubh*, *lubhati* (or *lūbhyati*) ‘to desire greatly or eagerly, long for’ — *ljubiti?* ‘to love’ (VAS:2, 544–545; ČERN:1, 197–198; ĚSSJa:15, 174–176).

141. *lul*, *lolati* ‘to move to, and fro, roll about, stir’ — Ill. *ljuljati* ‘to rock, swing’ (VAS:2, 545–546).

144. *lpī*, *lpināti* (better *lip*, *limpati*, *lepayati*) — ‘smear, besmear, anoint with; stick on to; to join, unite, mix with’ — Ill. *lepiti*, *prilepiti* (*lijepiti*) ‘to paste, stick’ (VAS:2, 484; ĚSSJa:14.218–220 & 15, 121; SK:2, 298).

v = v

152. *vāṭṛ* ‘“blower”, air, wind’ — Ill. *vjetar* ‘wind’ (VAS:1, 306; ČERN:1, 146–147).

153. *viśva* ‘whole, entire, universal’ — Ill. *ves*, *vas*, *sva*, *sav* — *svjet* (?)⁵⁰ ‘all, whole, entire’ (VAS:1, 304–305).

154. *vī*, *veti* (in Wilson 1819 only) ‘to cover or wrap round or over’; in MW ‘grasp, seize; to go apart or in different directions’ — Ill., Cr. *viti*, *vijati* ‘to rotate, roll up’ (VAS:1, 101; ČERN:1, 155).

155. *vrka* ‘woolf’ — O.Sl. *vlk* (?), Ill., Cr. etc. *vuk*, ‘woolf’ (VAS:1, 338; ČERN:1, 163).

⁵⁰ *Sojet* ‘world’ has no relation here.

156. *vye, vyayati* 'to cover, clothe, wrap, envelop' — Ill., Cr. *vijati, zavijati* (*zaviti* also *uvijati, uviti*) 'to rotate, roll up; to wrap, pack' (VAS:1, 322; p.c. Šapošnikov 2015).

ś = s

157. *śata* 'hundred' — Ill. *sto* 'hundred' (VAS:3, 761–762; ČERN:2, 204).

163. *śubhra* 'radiant, shining, beautiful, splendid; silver' — *srebro* 'silver' (ŠAP:2, 371).

164. *śuśa (śośa)* 'drying, drying up' (cf. *śuśyayi* 'dries up') — Ill. *sushiti (sušiti)* 'to dry' (VAS:3, 813; ČERN: 2, 220).

ṣ = sh (š) (?)

168. *ṣaṣṭa* 'the sixtieth, consisting of sixty' — Ill., Cr. *shesti (šesti)* 'sixth' (VAS:4, 433–434, ČERN:2, 410).

170. *siv, sīvyati* 'to sew, sew on, darn, stitch' — Ill., Cr. *shivati (šivati)* 'to sew' (VAS:4, 443–444).

173. *sthal, sthalati; sthāṇu* 'to stand firm, be firm; standing firmly, stationary, firm' — Ill., Cr. *stalen biti (stalan, stalni)* 'to be steady, regular; permanent' (VAS:3, 745).

174. *smi, smayate* 'to smile, blush, become red or radiant, shine' — Ill., Cr. etc. *smijatis (smijati se)* 'to laugh' (VAS:3, 688; ČERN:2, 179).

175. *svap, svapiti* 'to sleep, fall asleep' — Ill., Cr. *spavati* 'to sleep'. *svapana* 'sleeping', *spavanje* 'sleeping' (VAS:3, 732–733; ČERN:1, 192).

s = s

176. *sa* prefix expressing 'junction', 'conjunction', 'possession' when compounded with nouns forms, adjectives and adverbs which may be translated by 'with', 'together or along with' etc.' — Ill. *sa* 'with' (VAS:3, 539–540).

182. *sūnu* 'son, child, offspring' — Cr., etc. *sin* 'son' (VAS:3, 817–818; ČERN:2, 221; SK:3, 237).

188. *sthāna* 'place of standing or staying, any place, spot, locality, abode, dwelling, house' — Ill., Cr. *stan, stanje* 'apartment, housing' (VAS:3, 745).

186. *str, strṇoti*, (also *strṇute; strṇāiti*) 'to spread, spread out or about, strew, scatter' — Ill. *strieti (strijeti, razastrijeti)* 'to spread, unfold' (KEWA:3, 518 connects it with O.Sl. *pra-strēti* 'to spread, expand'.)

189. *svan, svanati, svana* 'to sound, make any noise' — Ill., Cr. *zvoniti, zvon* 'to ring' (VAS:2, 87–88).

190. *sviya, sva* ‘relating or belonging to one’s self, own, proper, peculiar, characteristic’ — *svoj* ‘own’ (VAS:3, 583; ČERN:2, 148).

h = h

191. *han, ghnati* ‘to strike, beat (also a drum), pound, hammer, strike’ — Ill., Cr. etc. *gnati, goniti* ‘to pursue, hunt’ (VAS:1, 419; DERK:172).

194. *hima* ‘frost, snow; the cold season, winter’ — *zima* ‘winter’ (VAS:2, 97; ČERN:1, 325. The word *sušima* ‘cold, frigid; pleasant, agreeable’ mentioned here by Mihanović, is not related to *hima*).

196. *hrd* ‘heart (as the seat of feelings and emotions)’ — *serdce?* ‘heart’ (DERK:485; VAS:3, 605– 606 but see also the ft. 51 below).

200. *hve, hvayati* ‘to call, call upon, summon, challenge, invoke’ — Ill., Cr. *zvati* ‘to call, summon’ (VAS:2, 87–88).

3.2.3. False identifications

The second group is made up of false identifications and it consists of 56 entries. The reasons for the mistakes could be various. In most of the cases Mihanović was misled by a superficial remote phono-semantic closeness. However, out of these, entries 3 (*anta* ‘end, term’ — *zadnji* (?) ‘last, rear’) and 5 (*apavada* ‘order, command’ — Cr. *zapoved*, Ill. *zapovid, zapovjed* ‘command’) are noteworthy as examples of an attempt to work-out a regular, albeit an erroneous, ‘sound rule’: in this case a hypothetical correlation of an initial *a* in Sanskrit and *za* in Slavonic (possibly, an extrapolation of the Kajkavian / Čakavian variation *jazik/zajik* ‘language, tongue’).

Generally, affricates and sibilants presented the biggest difficulty for Mihanović. The understanding by linguists of palatalisation processes came much later, so he was guided by purely acoustic resemblances allowing substitution of Skt. *j* ([dʒ]) and Slav. *č* ([tʃ]) as e.g. in 39 (*jāta* ‘child, offspring; born’ — O.Sl. *chjado* (čedo), Ill. *chedo* (čedo) ‘son’) or 108 (*mañjā* ‘she-goat?’ — Ill., Cr. *machka* (mačka) ‘cat’). The latter is also an obvious semantic mismatch: ‘she-goat’ vs. ‘cat’.

Maybe influenced by the regular South-Slavonic dialectal *č* — *š* correlation as in *što* — *ča* ‘what’ and also by the dialectal variations such as *čkola* < *škola* ‘school’ or *maška* < *mačka* ‘cat’ (Okuka 2008:21; 28), Mihanović often confounded sibilants and affricates as in 83 (*pāṣāṇa* ‘stone’ — *pechina* (pečina) ‘cave, grotto’). He also extended the Kajkavian interchange of *š* and *ž* with *s* and *z* for cases like 93 (*pruṣ, pruṣati* ‘to burn, to consume with fire’ — O.Sl., Ill. *praxiti, (pržiti)* ‘grill’), 150 (*vas, vasati* ‘to accept, take; to put on, to wear as clothes’ — Ill. *vazeti* (?)), 183 (*sūryya* ‘the sun or its deity’ — Cr. etc. *zorja?* (zarja) ‘dawn’) or 115 (*muṣka* ‘testicle, the scrotum’ —

muški ‘man, masculine’), 167 (*śmāl, śmīlati; śmīl* ‘to wink, to contract the eyelids’ (only in Wilson 1819), *śmīlita* mfn. ‘winked, ‘blinked; a wink, blink; winking — *xmirati* ‘*žmiriti, žmuriti*’ ‘wink’), 181 (*sītya* ‘corn, grain’ — *xito, xitak* (*žito, žitak*) ‘wheat, sustenance’).

Because of the occurrence of progressive palatalisation in Štokavian with combinations *tj* and *dj* regularly changing to *ć* and *đ*, Mihanović mistakenly allowed it by analogy for cases like 136 (*reť, reťř, reťati* ‘to speak; to ask, request’ — Ill., Cr. *rechi* (*reći*) ‘say, tell’) or 27 (*racana* ‘making, forming, arranging, preparing, composing’ — Ill. *redjenje* (*ređenje*) ‘ordination’).

Many mistakes were caused by an erroneous association of *s* and *h* which was, probably strengthened by the correct identification of the word for ‘heart’ mentioned above⁵¹. The origin of Slavonic *h* (*x*) remains a controversial matter even today⁵² also the RUKI law⁵³ had not yet been discovered by Holger Pedersen (1867–1953), so the cases of confusions like 198 (*hlad, hladate* ‘to be glad or refreshed, rejoice’ — Ill., Cr. *sladiti, nasladiti* ‘sweeten, enjoy’) or 147 (*varāha, vřhat* ‘boar, hog, pig; certain mountain name in *Mahābhārata*; lofty, high’ — Ill. *varh* (*vřh*) ‘top, peak’⁵⁴) were inevitable. Such misidentifications were sometimes aggravated by some far-fetched semantic parallels like 82 (*pātāla* ‘regions under the earth and the abode of the Nāgas or serpents and demons’ — Ill. *pakalj* (?), Cr. *pekeli* ‘hell’).

In a few cases Mihanović simply misread the Devanagari text as in 43: *dř, dřñāti* mistakenly read as *ř, řñāti*. For the sake of fairness, it needs to be said that the words are easily confounded because of the likeness of the Devanagari ligatures *dř* and *ř* and the poor printing quality (Fig. 2).

⁵¹ As correctly noted by A. Šapošnikov (p.c. 2015), Sanskrit *hřd-* is a “difficult case” because in strict terms it does not fit Slavonic **sřd-* and other Indo-European derivatives of the hypothetical proto-form **křd-*. To overcome this difficulty some scholars propose *śrād* as “an old Vedic word for ‘heart’” (Macdonell 1917:184) only indirectly attested in compounds like *śrāddha* ‘having faith, believing in, trusting, faithful’. This uncertainty may partly excuse the *h/s* confusion by Mihanović.

⁵² For a recent assessment of various views on this controversial issue see Bičovský (2009).

⁵³ Sound change attested in some Indo-European languages (Albanian, Armenian, Iranian, Indo-Aryan, Baltic, Slavonic) leading to the transition of the ‘original’ *s* to *š* or *ś* — *x* (Slavonic) in positions after *r, u, k* and *i*. The change works without exceptions in Indo-Aryan (for which thus ‘law’ was originally formulated), but is not consistent in the Baltic languages. In Slavonic languages the change is regular but it only happens in positions with a following vowel where *s* changes to *x*, except before the front vowels *eli* and the palatal approximant *j* where it becomes *š* e.g. Indo-European **mus-* > Sl. **musa* ‘fly’ but **mušica* ‘little fly’.

⁵⁴ The actual Skt. cognate of *vřh* ‘top, peak’ is *varšman* ‘height, top’ (Vasmer 1964 — 1973) and of *vřhat* / *vřhat* is *brijeg* ‘coast, hill, mountain’.



Figure 2: Devanagarī ligatures ṝ (left) and ḍ̄ (right).

A separate group among the false identifications are foreign loan-words in Slavonic from various languages like: 20 (*kuṭa* ‘house, family’ – Ill. *kutja* (*kutija*) ‘box’ where *kutija* is believed to be a Balkan Turkism of the Greek origin (SK:971–1974), 142 (*lok, lokate* ‘to see, behold, perceive (connected to *ruc = руч*)’ – *lukati* (Kajk. *lūkati* ‘watch’) where *lūkati* is commonly considered a loan from German (idem v. 2, p. 80) or 86 (*pūrṇaka* ‘cock, blue jay’ – *puran* ‘turkey cock’) believed to derive from *peruano* ‘of Peru’ where the species of domestic Turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) comes from (idem 2, 80).

3.2.4. Normalised list of false identifications

1. *atha* ‘therefore, thus, further, moreover’ – Ill. *ada* (meaning unclear, possibly *ovuda* ‘this way’).

3. *anta* ‘end, term’ – *zadnji* (?) ‘last, rear’.

5. *apavada* ‘order, command’ – Cr. *zapoved*, Ill. *zapovid, zapovjed* ‘command’.

8. *il, elayati* ‘to go’ – *peljati* (?), Cr., Crain. *peljati se* ‘carry’.

13. *uragasthāna* ‘abode of the snakes’ Ill. *vraga-stan* ‘devil - place’ (there is no doubt that the part *sthāna* – *stan* are related).

14. *ūdha* ‘married woman, wife’ – Ill. *udan* (*udata*) ‘married, wedded’.

20. *kuṭa* ‘house, family’ – Ill. *kutja* (*kutija*) ‘box’.

26. *gumphā* ‘tying or stringing as a garland; stringing, filling, combining with each other’ – Ill. *guxva* (*gužva*) ‘rein’, Cr. *gumb* ‘button’.

27. *grj, grjati* ‘to sound, roar’ – Ill., Cr. *krihati* (*kričati*) ‘shout’.

36. *ced* (spelled as *chet*) ‘and, if’ – Cr. *che* (*če*) ‘if’.

38. *jambuka* ‘rose apple’ – Ill., Cr. *jabuka* ‘apple’.

39. *jāta* ‘child, offspring; born’ – O.Sl. *chjado* (*čedo*), Ill. *chedo* (*čedo*) ‘son’.

42. *jhajjha* ‘raining in large drops’ – Ill. *daxdj, desg*, Cr. *d’xd* (*dažd*) ‘rain’.

43. *dṛ, dṛṇāti* (mistakenly read as *ṝ, ṝṇāti* (*t’ri, t’rin’āti*) ‘to burst, break asunder, split open’ – Ill. *triniti* (= *mrviti* ‘to crumble’ (SK:3, 512)), *trieti* (*trti*) ‘to swingle’.

45. *ta, taḥ* ‘wicked man’ – *tat* ‘thief’.

55. *tviṣ*, *tviṣate* 'to shine, glitter' — Ill. etc. *svetiti* 'to sanctify'.
61. *drś*, *paśyati* 'to see, to observe' — Ill., Cr. *paziti* 'to watch'.
80. *paś*, *pāśayati* 'to bind, hinder' — Cr. *pachiti* (*pāčiti*) 'to bother, hinder; to harm' (RHSJ:9, 550).
81. *pas*, *pāśayati* (alternatively *paś*, *pāśayati*) 'to bind; to fasten' — Ill., Cr. *pasati*, *pas* (*pas*, *pojas*) 'belt'.
82. *pātāla* 'regions under the earth and the abode of the Nagas or serpents and demons' — Ill. *pakalj* (?), Cr. *pekel*. 'hell'.
83. *pāṣāṇa* 'stone' — *pechina* (*pečina*) 'cave, grotto'.
85. *pūṇ*, *pūṇayati* 'to collect or heap together' — Ill. *puniti*; — *pun*, O.Sl. *polnъ* 'full'.
86. *pūrṇaka* 'cock, blue jay' — *puran* 'turkey cock'.
93. *pruṣ*, *pruṣati* 'to burn, to consume with fire' — O.Sl., Ill. *praxiti*, (*pražiti*) 'to grill'.
108. *mañjā* 'she-goat?' — Ill., Cr. *machka* (*mačka*) 'cat'.
111. *masj* 'to immerse, to sink or plunge in water (only in Wilson 1819, normally *majj*, *majjati*)' — Ill., Cr. *makati*, *mochiti* (*močiti*) 'ret, soak'.
114. *miva*, *minvati* 'to sprinkle or moisten (only in Wilson 1819)' — Ill., Cr. *miva*, *umivati* 'to wash'.
115. *muṣka* 'testicle, the scrotum' — *muški* 'man, masculine'.
116. *mūka* 'tied or bound; dumb, speechless, mute, silent' — Ill. *muk*, *muknuti* 'silence; to become silent'.
127. *racana* 'making, forming, arranging, preparing, composing' — Ill. *redjenje* (*ređenje*) 'ordination'.
129. *rasikā* 'juice of sugar-cane, molasses; curds with sugar and spice; chyle; the tongue' — O.Sl. etc. *jazik* 'tongue'.
136. *reṭ*, *reṭṭ*, *reṭati* 'to speak; to ask, request' — Ill., Cr. *rechi* (*reći*) 'to say, tell'.
142. *lok*, *lokate* 'to see, behold, perceive' — *lukati* 'to watch' (a loan from German: see SK:2, 328).
145. *vajra* 'thunderbolt' — Ill. *vatra*? 'fire'.
146. *vad*, *vadati*, *upavadati* 'to speak, say, utter, tell' — Ill., Cr. etc. *povedati* 'to say'.
147. *varāha*, *vṛhat* 'boar, hog, pig; certain mountain name in *Mahābhārata*; lofty, high' — Ill. *varh* (*vrh*) 'top, peak'.

148. *varh, varhate* 'to be excellent or pre-eminent (only in Wilson 1819)' — Ill. *svarshiti, svarshen (svršiti, svršen)* 'to accomplish; accomplished, perfect'.

149. *valh, valhate* 'to speak or tell; challenge' — Ill. *veleti* (Sln. *veléti*, Srb. dial. *vèlju*) 'to say, give an order'.

150. *vas, vasati* 'to accept, take; to put on, to wear as clothes' — Ill. *vazeti (uzeti)* 'to take'.

158. *śada* 'falling; produce, revenue; any edible vegetable product' — Ill., Cr. *sád (sad)* 'fruit garden'.

160. *śayana* 'lying down, resting, sleeping' — Ill. etc. *sanj* 'dreams'.

161. *śarana* 'protecting, guarding, defending' — O.Sl. *sohraniti*, Ill. *shraniti* 'save'.

162. *śita* 'sharp, whetted; thin, slender, weak, feeble' — Ill. *sitan* 'small'.

166. *śloka* 'stanza; fame, renown, glory, praise, hymn of praise' — Ill. *slagati, sloxiti (složiti)* 'furl, place together, compose'.

167. *śmāl, śmīlati; śmīl* 'to wink, to contract the eyelids' (only in Wilson 1819), *śmīlita* 'winked, blinked; a wink, blink, winking' — *xmirati 'žmiriti, žmuriti* 'to wink'.

171. *snas, snusyati* 'to eat' — Crain. *snești* 'to eat' (RHSJ:15, 842 for Čakavian, usual in Slovene / Crain.).

172. *stu, stavīti* 'to praise, laud, eulogize, extol, celebrate in song or hymns' — *slaviti* (?) 'to praise, glorify', *stava* 'praise, eulogy, song of praise', *ślāghā* 'flattery, praise' — *slava* (?) 'glory'.

177. *sattva* 'being, existence, entity, reality' — Ill., Cr. *Stvar* (?) 'thing'.

180. *śik, śikayati* 'to sprinkle; to go, move' — Ill., Cr. *sigati, stigati (stići, stignuti)* 'to reach'.

181. *sītya* 'corn, grain' — *xito, xitak (žito, žitak)* 'grain, sustenance'.

183. *sūryya* 'the sun or its deity' — Cr. etc. *zorja? (zarja)* 'dawn'.

184. *śṛj, śṛjati* 'to let go or fly, discharge, throw, cast' — Ill., CR. etc. *roditi, poroditi, izroditi* 'to bring forth, procreate'.

185. *stūpa* 'a heap or pile of earth or brick; any heap, pile, mound, tope' — Ill., Cr. *stup* 'pillar, pier'.

192. *haya, hayati* 'to go, move' — Ill., Cr., *hajati* with *od, iz, do* etc. (*odhajati* 'wander', *izhajati* 'to come').

193. *hara* 'taking away, carrying off, removing, destroying' — Cr. *harc (harač)* (?) 'fight'.

198. *hlad, hladate* 'to be glad or refreshed, rejoice' — Ill., Cr. *sladiti, nasladiti* 'to sweeten, enjoy'.

199. *hlas, hlasati* 'to sound' — *glasiti* 'to read aloud'.

3.2.5. Other matches

After deducting the unquestionable correct and false matches, there remain 46 words which cannot be definitely assigned to any of these groups. A good example is 103 (*bhoga* 'possession, property, wealth' — Ill., Cr. *bogat, bogatsvo* 'rich, wealth'), which is traditionally linked to *bhaga* 'good fortune, happiness, welfare, prosperity', e.g. Vasmer (1964–1973). However, it is sometimes believed to be partially fused semantically with *bhoga* 'enjoyment, eating' but also 'possession, property, wealth, revenue' so comparing *bhoga* with *bogat* would be admissible. Another example is 57 (*dal, dala-ti* 'to burst; to cut, to divide' — Ill., Cr. *deliti* 'to share, divide'). The words *dol'a* and *deliti* are usually separated on formal phonetic grounds (VAS 1, 526; ĚSSJa 5, 62–63) but it is still possible to relate them to the same root.

A separate subgroup is made up of partial matches like 97 (*balakṣa* 'white (the colour)' — *belochja*, modern Croatian and Serbian *bjelo-ća*) in which the first element *bala-* could be an unaspirated variation of *bhāla* 'lustre, splendour' cognate with Sl. **belo* 'white' (e.g. VAS 1.149 and ČERN 1.84) and only the endings *-(a)kṣa* and *-(o)ća* are different. Similarly, in 104 (*bhrātr̥vya, bhrātr̥riya* 'a brother's son' — Ill. *bratich (bratić)* 'cousin') the first component *bhratr̥-* is indeed related to Sl. **bratv, *bratrvo* 'brother' but the suffixes are of different nature.

Many word-pairs in this group, which may also be broadly united under the provisory label 'insights', deserve a separate research which is beyond the scope of this article. Almost every pair from this group could become a topic of an essay so it would not be an overstatement to say that the work by Mihanović has not lost its actuality to this day.

3.2.6. Normalised list of other matches

4. *apa* 'particle and preposition implying inferiority (below, worse.)' — *opak* 'wicked, evil' (partly supported in VAS (3, 142); not supported by Šapošnikov (p.c. 2014)).

6. *arv, arvati* 'hurt, kill' — Ill. *arvitise*, Cr. *hervatise (rvati se⁵⁵)* 'wrestle'.

10. *ud* 'out, out of, from, off, away from, apart' — *od*, O.Sl. *otv* 'from, off' (commonly associated with Skt. *atas* 'from here' (VAS 3.168) but ĚSSJa (36.97 — 102) took a more caution approach pointing out that Skt. *a* here

⁵⁵ " = (sa h pred sonantnim r) *hrvati se*" (Skok 1971–1974:3.178).

originates from IE **e* while the majority of linguists reconstruct the Praslavonic **ot-* (idem) so the link offered by Mihanović is worth consideration).

15. *ṛdh, ṛdhyati, ṛdhmoti* ‘to grow, increase, prosper, succeed’ — *roditi, obroditi* ‘procreate, bring forth’ (although Sl. **rodь* is commonly connected with Skt. *vr̥dh* ‘increase, augment, strengthen’ (e.g. VAS:3, 490–491) it would be legitimate to include also *ṛdh* having the same range of meanings because the tree roots *ṛdh, vr̥dh* and *rād̥h* ‘to succeed (said of things), be accomplished or finished; to accomplish, perform, achieve, make ready, prepare, carry out’ are treated as related (e.g. MW:226)).

18. *kaluṣa* ‘turbid, foul, muddy, impure, dirty (lit. and fig.)’ — Ill. *kaljuxa* (*kaljuža*) ‘quagmire’, Cr. *kalni* ‘muddy’.

21. *kula* ‘race, family, community, tribe’ — Ill., Cr. etc. *koljeno, pokolenje* ‘knee, generation’.

22. *keśa* ‘lock of hair on the crown of the head’ — Ill. *kosa* ‘hair’.

23. *koṣa, kośa* ‘pail, bucket’ — Ill., Cr. *kosh* (*koš*) ‘basket, crib’.

24. *kṣīra* ‘milk, thickened milk’ — Cr. *sir* (?) ‘cheese’, *sirotka* ‘whey’.

29. *govinda* ‘a chief herdsman’ — Ill. *govedar* ‘cowherd, herder’, *goveda* ‘cattle’; O.Sl. *govjada* (correctly identified the first part *go* ‘cattle’).

30. *gohanna* (?), *goviṣ* ‘cow-dung, ordure’ — *govno* (?) ‘feces’

31. *gopati* ‘the lord of cowherds, leader, chief’ — O.Sl. *gospod*’(*gospodь*) ‘lord’, *gospodin* (*gospodinь*) ‘sir, mister’ (partly there).

32. *goṣṭhi, goṣṭha* ‘assembly, meeting, society, association, family connections; meeting for conversation’ — O.Sl. *gosti* ‘guests’; *gostiti* ‘entertain, ply, regale’.

35. *cita* ‘placed in a line; piled up, heaped; heap; multitude’ — *cheta* (*četa*) (?) ‘batch, troop’ (see a detailed assessment and the proposed alternative etymology of Sl. **četa* in Greenberg (2001)).

51. *tur, turayate* ‘to go quick, to hurry, to make haste; speed; Caus. *turayate* ‘to run, press forwards’ — Ill. *turati, durati, dirati* ‘shove, push’.

52. *tep* ‘to distil, ooze, drop; to tremble’ — *tepati, stepati, tepsti* ‘to babble; to shake out’.

57. *dal, dalati* ‘to cut, to divide’ — Ill., Cr. *deliti* ‘to share’.

60. *div, dīvyati* ‘to play, bet; to praise, rejoice, be drunk or mad’ — Ill., Cr. *dioljati; divji* ‘be wild; wild’.

62. *dr, dharati* ‘to fear, to be afraid’ — Ill., Cr. *darhtati, derhtati* (*drhtati*) ‘tremble’.

63. *devī* ‘goddess, the wife of any deity or divine being’ — Ill., Cr. *deva*, *dieva*, *devica* (*djeva*, *djevica*) ‘girl, maiden’.

66. *dhṛ*, *dhārati* ‘to have or hold, to keep, to maintain.’ — Ill., Cr. *darxati* (*držati*) ‘to keep, hold’ (although Sl. **dbržati* ‘to keep, hold’ cannot be connected directly with *dhṛ* (VAS:1, 503; ĚSSJa:5, 231) they may still connected at a deeper level).

77. *pataga* ‘a winged or flying animal, bird’ — Ill. *patka*, Slk. *ptak*.

79. *pari* ‘against, opposite to, in the direction of, towards, to’ — Ill. etc. *pari* ‘at, in, near, towards’ (VAS:3, 362 connects it with *pare* ‘later, farther, in future, afterward’, not *pari*; KEWA 2, 216 connects *pari* with the O.Sl. prefix *prě-* but both these Skt. words could ultimately be related to the radical *pr* ‘to bring over or to (acc.), bring out of, deliver from (abl.)’).

88. *prca*, *parcati* (?) ‘to hinder or restrain’ — Ill. *prichiti*, Cr. *perechiti* (?) ‘impede’.

97. *balakṣa* ‘white’ — *belochja* (*bjeloća*) ‘whiteness’.

100. *bhāṣa*, *bhāṣita* ‘speech, language; spoken, uttered, said’ — *besediti* (*besjediti*) ‘to have a conversation, to talk’.

103. *bhoga* ‘possession, property, wealth’ — Ill., Cr. *bogat*, *bogatsvo* ‘rich, wealth’.

104. *bhratroya*, *bhratrīya* ‘a brother’s son’ — Ill. *bratich* (*bratić*) ‘cousin’.

105. *bhlāś*, *bhlāśyate* ‘to shine, beam, glitter’ — O.Sl. *bleshchatisja* (*blōščati*(*se*)), Ill. *bliskati* ‘to flash like lightning’.

106. *mañc*, *mañcate* ‘to hold, to shine, to go’ — Ill. *maknuti* ‘move, stir’.

121. *mlai*, *mlāyati*, *mlāna* ‘to fade, wither, decay, vanish’ — *mlahaviti* ‘be flaccid’.

mlāna ‘faded, withered, exhausted, languid, weak, feeble’ — Ill. *mlahav* ‘flaccid, limp’.

125. *yūtha* ‘multitude of birds or beasts, a herd, a flock (*yu* to join or mix)’ — Cr. *jata*, Ill., Cr. *jato* ‘flock, swarm’.

128. *raṇa* (*vraṇa*, *vraṇayati*) ‘battle, war, combat, fight, conflict’ — *rana* ‘wound, injury’.

132. *rādhana* ‘propitiating, conciliating; pleasure, satisfaction’ — *radu-
vanje* (*radovanje*) ‘rejoicing’.

134. *rūḍha*; *rūḍhi* ‘mounted, risen, ascended, grown; rise, ascent (lit. and fig.), increase, growth, development’ — *rod* (Skt. *rūḍha*; *rūḍhi* are derivatives from the radical *ṛdh*, *ṛdhyati*, *ṛdhnoti* ‘to grow, increase, prosper, succeed’: traditionally (see 15 above), Sl. **rodv* is linked with Skt. *ṛdh*, *vard-*

hate ‘to increase, augment, strengthen, cause to prosper or thrive; to grow, grow up, increase, be filled or extended, become longer or stronger, thrive, prosper, succeed’ but Skt. *ṛdh* is clearly connected with *vṛdh* (MV 226) so it would be unfair to completely reject *rūḍha* offered by Mihanović).

143. *loḍ* (*loṭ*), *loṭati* ‘to be mad or foolish’ — Ill. *ludovati* ‘rollick’.

151. *vasi* ‘dwelling or a dwelling-place’ — Cr., Wind. *ves* (*vas*) ‘village’ (it would be more correctl to connect it with Skt. *viś* ‘settlement, homestead, house, dwelling’ (VAS:1, 305; DERK:539) but the connection between *viś* and *vasi* ‘dwelling or a dwelling-place’ as a derivative from *vas*, *vasati* ‘to dwell, live, stop (at a place), stay’) is possible).

159. *śabda*, *śabdayati* ‘to make any noise or sound, cry aloud’ — *shaptati* (*śaputati*) ‘whisper’.

165. *śrī* ‘prosperity, welfare, good fortune, success, auspiciousness, wealth, treasure, riches’ — Ill. *sricha* (*sreća*) (?) ‘happiness, luck’.

169. *sidh*, *sedhati* ‘to go, move’ — Ill. *shetati* (*šetati*) ‘walk’, O.Sl. *shedu* (*šedv*).

178. *sadā* ‘always, ever, every time, continually, perpetually’ — *sagda* (*svagda*) ‘always’.

179. *sadyas* ‘on the same day, in the very moment,’ — Ill., Cr. *sad* ‘present’ (also *sada* ‘now, presently’).

187. *sthavira* ‘broad, thick, compact, solid, strong, powerful, old, ancient’ — *star -a, -o* ‘old’.

195. *huḍ* (*hoḍ*), *hoḍati* ‘to go’ — *hodati*, *hoditi* ‘walk’.

197. *hreṣa* ‘to neigh (as a horse), whinny’ — *herzati* (*rzati*) ‘to neigh, whinny’ (cp. also Slovak *hržat*, *hrzat*).

4. Conclusion

The article was written by Mihanović in German but there is no doubt that it was intended firstly for the Croatian intellectual elite and should be viewed as a continuation of the earlier pamphlet *Rech Domovini* with the goal of raising the status of Slavonic and Mihanović’s native Croatian language by demonstrating its relation to Sanskrit, which was considered then as the divine source of the classical languages. The alleged closeness to Sanskrit was a common topic among national revivalists of the time but, compared to similar studies by, for instance, the Czech intellectuals which were “subordinated to the perceived needs of national ideology” with “weaker link to actual facts” (Strnad 2007), Mihanović’s article stands

out for its thoroughness and remarkable quality of linguistic research. As noted by Radoslav Katičić (2005) the approach by Mihanović was methodologically interesting and in certain respects he was well ahead of his time⁵⁶.

Antun Mihanović was an amateur but so were many of the prominent protagonists of comparative linguistics at the turn of the 18th century. Winfried Lehmann (1967:21) wrote of Friedrich von Schlegel's *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier* that "his lists of grammatical criteria for establishing relationships illustrate the enthusiasm of a populariser rather than the care of a scholar". This may be equally applied to Mihanović's article, nevertheless, it was done at a proper academic level for that time. Comparing his list with a similar list compiled by the renowned philologist of the time and a Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Science Friedrich von Adelung, published only a decade earlier, one can clearly see that the amateur Mihanović had surpassed it in almost every respect, be it the number of cognates, quality of transliteration and, particularly, his attempt, though not always successful, to set up some basic sound correlations — an idea completely lacking in Adelung's work.

The article has become an important contribution in preparing the foundations of the 'Illyrian' and Croatian national revival movements; however, this ideological pointedness should not overshadow its significance as a remarkable, for the time, piece of comparative linguistic research.

Acknowledgements

The Author thanks the staff of *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* for generously sending a good quality legible copy of the article by Antun Mihanović and Vít Boček, Mario Grčević, Marc L. Greenberg, Mislav Ježić, Zhivka Koleva-Zlateva, A.K. Šapošnikov and Robert Woodhouse for comments that greatly improved the manuscript.

⁵⁶ "Pri tome je njegov postupak metodološki zanimljiv jer se tek iz današnje perspektive pokazuje kako je u ponečemu bio i ispred svojega vremena ["In doing so, his action is methodologically interesting because it is only seen from today's perspective that in certain respects he was well ahead of his time"]."

References

- Adelung, F. 1811. *Rapports entre la langue Sanscrit et la langue Russe*. St-Petersbourg : F. Drechsler.
- Adelung, F. v. 1814. Ower de Verwantschap de Russische en de Sanscristische taal. *Algemene konst- en letterbode* 27, 26–29.
- Adelung, Friedrich von. 1832. *An historical sketch of Sanscrit literature*. Oxford : D. A. Talboys.
- Becker, Carl L. 1971[1932]. *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-century Philosophers*. New Haven : Yale University Press.
- Bopp, Franz. 1833. *Vergleichende grammatik des sanskrit, zend, griechischen, lateinischen, litthauischen, gothischen und deutschen*. Berlin : F. Dümmler.
- Bopp, F. 1835. *Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Send, Armenischen, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Litauischen, Altslavischen, Gothischen und Deutschen*. Berlin : F. Dümmler.
- Bopp, F. 1856. *A comparative grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic languages* (translated by Edward B. Eastwick). London—Edinburgh : Williams and Norgate.
- Bujas, Željko. 2011. *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*. Zagreb : Nakladni zavod Globus.
- Carey, William. 1804. *A Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, composed from the works of the most esteemed Hindoo Grammarians. To which are added, examples for the exercise of the student, and a complete list of the dhatoos, or roots, by William Carey, teacher of the Bengalee and Sungskrit languages, in the College of Fort William*. Serampore : Mission Press.
- Clark, R.T. 1955. *Herder. His Life and Thought*. University of California Press.
- Despalatović, Elinor Murray. 1975. *Ljudevit Gaj and the Illyrian Movement*. New York—London : Columbia University Press.
- Dobrowsky, Josephi. 1822. *Institutiones linguae slavicae dialecti veteris*.
- Dzino, Danijel. 2014. Constructing Illyrians: Prehistoric Inhabitants of the Balkan Peninsula in Early Modern and Modern Perceptions. *Balkanistica* 27, 1–39.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb. 1808. *Reden an die deutsche Nation*. Berlin : Real-schulbuchhandlung.
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, Reginald Foy Jones, George Henry Turnbull. 1922. *Addresses to the German Nation* [translated from German by Reginald Foy Jones and George Henry Turnbull]. Chicago and London : The Open Court Publishing Company.
- Golovkin, Fëdor Gavrilovič. 1809. Etymologies slavonnes tirées du Samscrit. *Fundgruben des Orients*. Bearbeitet durch eine Gesellschaft von Lieb-

- habern* 1, 459–460.
- Grčević, Mario. 2009. Jernej Kopitar kao strateg Karadžićeve književno-jezične reforme. *Filologija* 53, 1–53.
- Greenberg, Marc Leland. 2001. Is Slavic *četa an Indo-European Archaism? *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 43, 35–39.
- Greenberg, M. L. 2011. The Illyrian Movement: A Croatian Vision of South Slavic. in *Handbook of Language and Ethnic Identity: The Success-Failure Continuum in Language Identity Efforts* ed. by Fishman, J. A. & García, O, vol. 2, 364–380. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Grimm, Jacob. 1822. *Deutsche Grammatik*. Göttingen : Dieterichs.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von. 1821. *Sämmtliche Werke: Zur schönen Literatur und Kunst. Esrster Theil*. Vol. 17 Kalsruhe : Bureau der deutschen Classiker chapter Fragmente zur deutschen Literatur. Erste Sammlung.
- Herrity, Peter. 2014. The developement of the Slovene standard language. In *Die slavischen Sprachen / The Slavic Languages. Halbband 2 / Volume 2*, ed. by Gutschmidt, K.; Berger, T.; Kempge, S. & Kosta, P. 1427–1445. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Höflechner, Walter Alexandra Wagner. 2011. *Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall. Erinnerungen und Briefe*. Electronic version of Publications from the Archives of the University of Graz, Volume 41 * / 1–3. [Version 1 201107: Briefe von 1790 bis Ende 1819. Vol. 1–3, Accessed on 11/02/2014].
- Humboldt, Wilhelm, Freiherr von. 1908. *Briefwechsel zwischen Wilhelm von Humboldt und August Wilhelm Schlegel*. Niemeyer, Halle a. S.
- Illich-Svitych, Vladislav Markovič. 1977. *Opyt Sravnenija Nostratičeskix jazykov*. Moscow : “Nauka”.
- Jungmann, Antonín Jan. 1821. O Sanskrytu. *Krok, Veřejný spis všenaučný pro vzdělance národu Česko-Slovanského. Vydáván přispíváním mnoha učených vlastenců od Jana Svatopluka Presla, doktora lékařství, c. k. veřejného profesora přírodopisu a správce c. k. přírodovny vysokých škol pražských. Částka I*, 65–81.
- Kalidasa and Johann Georg-Adam Forster. 1803. *Sakontala, oder, der entscheidende ring ein Indisches schauspiel von Kalidasa; aus den ursprachen Sanskrit und Prakrit ins Englische und aus diesem ins Deutsche übersetzt mit Erläuterungen von Georg Forster; besorgte ausgabe von I. G. v. Herder*. Frankfurt am Main : August Hermann d. J.
- Kalidasa and William Jones. 1875[1789]. *The Sacontala: or the fatal ring*. Calcutta : Trübner & Co.
- Katičić, Radoslav. 2005. Mitovi naše poganske starine i Natko Nodilo. *Filologija* 44, 63–84.

- Kopitar, Jernej Bartol. 1808. *Grammatik der Slavischen Sprache in Krain, Kärnten und Steyemark*. Laibach.
- Lehmann, Winfred Philip. 1967. *A Reader in Nineteenth Century Historical Indo-European Linguistics*. Indiana University Press.
- Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. 1917. *A Vedic reader for students*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.
- Mihanović, Antun. 1815. *Rech Domovini od hasznovitozti piszanya vu Domorodnom Jeziku*. Vu Bechu : Z-Szlovami J. Snirer.
- Mihanovich, A. 1823. Zusammenstellung von 200 Laut- und Sinnverwandten Wörtern des Sanskrites und Slawischen, durch A . v . Mihanovich. *Archiv für Geschichte, Statistik, Literatur und Kunst* 66–67 and 71: 342–344; 367–371.
- Millington, E. J. 1849. *The aesthetic and miscellaneous works of Frederick von Schlegel: comprising letters on Christian art, an essay on Gothic architecture, remarks on the romance-poetry of the Middle Ages and on Shakespere [sic], on the limits of the beautiful, on the language and wisdom of the Indians*. London : Henry G. Bohn.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1963. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Clarendon Press.
- Očak, Elena. 1998. *Antun Mihanović*. Zagreb : NZG.
- Okuka, Miloš. 2008. *Srpski dijalekti*. SKD Prosvjeta.
- Paulinus, Bartholomaeo a S. 1790. *Sidharubam seu grammatica Samscredamica cui accedit dissertatio historico-critica in linguam samscredamicam vulgo samscret dictam*. Romae : Typographia Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Qvortrup, Mads. 2003. *The Political Philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Impossibility of Reason*. Manchester and New York : Manchester University Press.
- Rask, Rasmus. 1818. *Undersøgelse om det gamle Nordiske eller Islandske Sprogs Oprindelse*. Kjøbenhavn.
- Schlegel, Fiedrich. 1808. *Ueber die Sprache und Weisheit der Indier: ein Beitrag zur Begründung der Alterthumsfunde*. Mohr und Zimmer.
- Skok, Petar. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, t. 1–3. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Skorochód-Majewski, Walenty. 1816. *O Słowianach i ich pobratymcach. Cz. 1, Obeymuiaca czytane na posiedzeniach działowych w latach 1813, 1814, 1815, tudzież na Posiedzeniu Publicznem Towarzystwa Królewskiego Przyjaciół Nauk dnia 30 kwietnia 1816 r. rozprawy o języku samskrypskim [...]*. Warszawa : Viktor Dabrowski.

- Strnad, Jaroslav. 2007. India as Reflected in Czech Consciousness in the Era of the National Revivalist Movement of the Nineteenth Century (ca. 1800–1848). *Archív Orientální* 75 (3), 279–280.
- Spires, Scott. 1999. Lithuanian linguistic nationalism and the cult of antiquity. *Nations and Nationalism* 5 (4), 485–500.
- Trencsenyi, B. & Kopecek, M. 2007. *Discourses of Collective Identity in Central and Southeast Europe 1770–1945. Texts and commentaries*. Budapest–New-York : Central European University Press.
- Tzoref-Ashkenazi, Chen. 2006. India and the Identity of Europe: The Case of Friedrich Schlegel. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 4, 713–734.
- Vasmer, Max [Fasmer, Maks]. 1964–1973. *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. [Translated from German]. Vol. 1–4. Moscow : “Progress”.
- Wilkins, Charles. 1808. *Grammar of the Sanskrita Language*. London : W. Bulmer and Co.
- Wilson, Horace Hayman. 1819. *A Dictionary in Sanscrit and English*. Calcutta : Education Press.
- Wilson, H. H. 1832. *A Dictionary in Sanscrit and English. 2nd. edition*. Calcutta : Education Press.
- Zalznjak, Andrej Anatol'evič. 1996. Grammatičeskij očerk sanskrita. Izdanje 3-e, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. In *Sanskritsko-russkij slovar'*, ed. V. A. Kočergina, pp. 834–943. Moskva : Russkij jazyk.

Lexica

- ČERN = Černyx, P. Y. 1999. *Istoriko-Etimologičeskij Slovar' Sovremennogo Russkogo Jazyka*. 3rd edition. Vol.1–2 Moscow : Russkij Jazyk.
- DERK = Derksen, R. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden–Boston : Brill.
- ÈSSJa = ÈSSJa 1974 – 2012. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Praslavjansij leksičeskij fond*, Issues 1–38. Moskva : “Nauka”.
- KEWA = Mayrhofer, M. 1956–1980. *Kurzgefasstes Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Bd. 1–3. Heidelberg : Carl Winter – Universitätsverlag.
- MW = Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1963. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. Clarendon Press.
- RHSJ = RHSJ 1880–1976. *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- SK = Skok, P. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Vol. 1–3. Zagreb : Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.

ŠAP = Šapošnikov, A. K. 2010. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. T. 1–2. Moskva : "Nauka".

VAS = Vasmer, Max [Fasmer, Maks]. 1964–1973. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. (Translated from German). Vol. 1–4. Moskva : "Progress".

UHL = Uhlenbeck, C. C. 1898. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch der altindischen Sprache*. Amsterdam : J. Müller.

Antun Mihanović i njegov prinos slavensko-sanskrtskim poredbenim istraživanjima

Sažetak

U radu se analizira slabo poznati članak Antuna Mihanovića *Zusammenstellung von 200 Laut- und Sinnverwandten Wörtern des Sanskrites und Slawischen* iz 1823. godine, pri čemu se Mihanović prikazuje jednim od utemeljitelja poredbene slavistike. Mihanovićev članak sastoji se od dvaju dijelova. U prvom, uvodnom dijelu Mihanović donosi iscrpan popis svojih vrela i objašnjava svoje ciljeve. On kani dokazati da »slavenski jezik« pripada istoj jezičnoj porodici zajedno sa sanskrtom, ne manje nego što joj pripadaju grčki, latinski i njemački jezik. Drugi dio članka obuhvaća popis od točno dvjesto natuknica s riječima iz sanskrta i sličnozvučnih riječi slavenskih jezika. Iako se Mihanović povodi za površnom sličnošću riječi i njihovih značenja — jer pravila o zvučnim korelacijama indoeuropskih jezika tada nisu bila poznata — on pokušava uspostaviti osnovne zvučne korelacije između sanskrta i slavenskih jezika. Unatoč mnogim pogreškama, naknadna istraživanja pokazuju da je gotovo polovica (98 riječi) Mihanovićevih korelacija izrađena od dobro utvrđeno srodnih leksema, što je izuzetan uspjeh za Mihanovićevo vrijeme. Iako je svoj članak napisao pod utjecajem strujanja njemačkoga romantizma, ideološka usmjerenost ne zasjenjuje značenje članka kao izuzetnoga priloga komparativnomu lingvističkomu istraživanju Mihanovićevega vremena.

Ključne riječi: Antun Mihanović, sanskrt, slavistika

Key words: Antun Mihanović, Sanskrit, Slavonic studies