



Campbell 2 of 3.
(1-14)

ON THE ARYAN, OR INDO-GERMANIC THEORY.

A THEORY which had its origin in Germany, and which has since had a wide acceptance among the learned in other parts of Europe, makes all the nations and tribes, from the eastern limits of Bengal to the western shores of Europe, to be of one and the same race of mankind, the only material exceptions being the Arabs, Jews, and other people speaking cognate languages. It is founded on a supposed essential conformity of language among the diverse people whom it embraces, without regard to physical form or intellectual capacity. I entertain great doubts of the soundness of this theory, and propose in the present paper to state my objections to it.

The theory, in its ripest state, is most fully described by the learned and ingenious Orientalist, Professor Max Muller, and from his recent work I shall endeavour to give a sketch of it. The term Aryan is derived from Aryana, the supposed parent country of the people who spoke the Sanskrit language, and this word itself is said to be derived from the root Ar, which signifies "to plough or till," implying that the nation was an agricultural one. Two branches of this people, at a time far beyond all history or even tradition, are imagined to have migrated, the one south-east, to civilize and in a great measure, even to people Hindustan; and the other north-west, to perform the same office for Europe and the countries of Western Asia. Before these migrations, the theory asserts that there were no Hindus in India, and no Greeks, Italians; Germans, Slavonians, or Celts in Europe. Before the invasion of the Aryans, India and Europe, the hypothesis assumes to have been peopled by savages or barbarians, such as we find at present in the mountainous regions of Hindustan. The original language of the people

supposed to have played so great a part over so large a portion of the globe has been preserved in India only, where it has been immemorially a dead tongue, telling even less of the history of the people who spoke it than does an Egyptian mummy of the history of ancient Egypt.

Now of this strange history the Sanskrit language, although containing abundant ancient written records, tells us nothing. The very word Sanskrit itself is a factitious one, and not, as in almost every other case, whether with Oriental or European nations, ancient as well as modern, derived from the name of the people who spoke it, or of the country in which it was spoken. It simply signifies "adorned, completed, perfect," a definition obviously showing that the word is the mere creation of grammarians. Its writings make no reference to the parent country of the people of whom it was the living tongue: on the contrary, the names of heroes, gods, and places are confined to Hindustan, and more especially to the north-western portion of it.

The derivation both of the word Sanskrit and Aryana is, I suspect, amenable to the charge which Niebour makes against similar Greek and Roman etymologies. "Names of countries were always formed in antiquity, as by the Germans afterwards from the name of the people." . . . "Nor is it to be explained, except from that unspeakable spirit of absurdity which always came over the most sagacious Greeks and Romans the moment they meddled with etymology, how any one could stumble on the notion of interpreting a name out of itself."

Notwithstanding the total absence of all reliable evidence of the parent country of the people, of whom Sanskrit was the mother tongue, the great probability is that they were not an Indian nation, but came from the north-west—the region which we know, from authentic history, has always supplied the conquerors of India. A fairer people than the natives, and intermixing with the latter, they, as the smaller element, would become in time absorbed by, and undistinguishable from it. Such a result is inevitable, and what has really taken place everywhere. The Turkish conquerors of India are at present hardly distinguishable from the Hindus, and the Arabic blood is not distinguishable in the Persians or the people of Southern Spain.

We discover, however, from the most ancient of the Sanskrit writings, certain hymns, that, for some time after the arrival of the strangers, or speakers of the Sanskrit in India, their social condition was wholly different from what it is known to have been within the period of authentic history, and from what it is at the present day; and hence we infer that the Hindu religion, with its castes and other singularities, was

formed in Northern India, from which, with various modifications, it was disseminated east as far as China, and south as far as Ceylon and the remotest islands of the Indian Ocean, its influence constantly diminishing as we recede from the parent country of Hinduism, the upper valleys of the Ganges, the Jumna, and the five rivers which ultimately become the Indus. It is in the region thus described that the Hindu institutions are still the most complete, and, it may be added, that Hinduism, with all its attributes, has, in reality, never extended beyond Hindustan and the genuine Hindu race of man.

A crowd of objections against the Aryan theory must, I think, occur to any impartial inquirer, and I will enumerate a few of them. The very name of the people implies that they were agricultural, which is equivalent to a home-keeping nation. This, indeed, as it implies some civilization, they ought to have been, if they were the instruments by which the rude people of the lands they invaded were civilized. They are, however, said to have been nomadic, or wandering, which, indeed, would be indispensable to enable one branch of them to have migrated eastward as far as Bengal, and another north and west, to the shores of Spain and Britain. The alternative is obvious;—if they were an agricultural people they would not have undertaken distant migrations; if a roving one, they would themselves be barbarians, incapable of civilising the tribes they conquered.

A palpable objection to the theory consists in its comprehending a great variety of the races of man, differing from each other in physical form and intellectual capacity. Some are black, like the majority of pure Hindus; some brown, like the Persians and Turks, and some very fair, like the Scandinavians. Some are of weakly frame, as the numerous people who speak the language of Bengal; while others are, in comparison, robust, like the people of Europe—the last exceeding the first in mere bulk, weight and physical strength, to say nothing of superior mental endowment. Some, like many of the people of Europe, are in rapid progress of improvement, and, within the historical period, have advanced from the savage state to the highest civilization; whilst others, like the Hindus and the principal nations of Central and Western Asia, after making a certain precocious advance, continue afterwards nearly stationary, making less progress in a thousand years' time than the people of Europe in a hundred. Some races, not apparently more favoured by geographical or local position than others, are so superior in bodily strength and mental endowment, that a mere handful of them suffices to hold in subjection many millions, whom the theory supposes to be of

one and the same blood with themselves. Thus it is that we ourselves have, within a century's time, subdued, not only the Hindus, but the descendants of those who had subdued the Hindus.

Now, as far as authentic history carries us, no physical change has taken place in any race of man such as the theory here supposes to have taken place. In no time that we know of, have black, or even swarthy, men grown white, or white men grown black or swarthy. So long as a race is pure and unmixed, it continues unaltered. The descendants of the Spaniards, who migrated to America 350 years ago, do not differ in physical form from their brethren of the present day of Arragon and Andalusia. The millions of negroes now existing in the same country, for almost as long a time, are not to be distinguished in form from the people of the African nations from whom they sprang.

But language, although often of great value in tracing the history and migration of nations, is very far indeed from being always an infallible test of race, for many races have lost their original tongues and adopted those of opposite races. Hebrew, for example, has, for above two thousand years, ceased to be the spoken language of the Jews. In their own country they once spoke Greek, and they now speak Arabic. Some two thousand years ago three distinct native idioms were spoken in France, exclusive of such as may have prevailed in that portion of it which, at the time, had been conquered by the Romans. With the exception of two small relics, these have been supplanted by a tongue of Italian origin. Nearly the same revolution has taken place over the whole Iberian Peninsula. In our own Islands, with two exceptions, a language of Teutonic origin has superseded the Celtic tongues, which were spoken fourteen centuries back. In America, the millions of Africans who have been transported to it within the brief period of three centuries have lost all their native tongues, while languages, some of German and some of Italian origin have been substituted for them. In Italy, before the Roman conquests at least, half-a-dozen native languages were spoken, but in the course of time one of these came to supplant all the rest.

The assumption of the Aryan theory that India was without Hindus—that is, that it was without other inhabitants than a few barbarous mountaineers, whose descendants still exist—seems sufficiently refuted by the broad, undeniable fact that the civilized natives of its southern portion speak several distinct languages, which are now well known not to be of Sanskrit origin, and into the composition of which Sanskrit enters only in the same manner in which Arabic enters into Persian, Turkish, and Spanish; Persian into the languages of India, and Latin into the Celtic tongues.

Mr Caldwell, the learned author of the 'Dravidian Comparative Grammar,' a believer too in the Aryan theory, comes to the following conclusion on this subject:—"The evidence is not only decidedly opposed to the supposition that the Dravidian languages are derived from the Sanskrit, but is equally inconsistent with the supposition of the connexion of those languages with the family to which the Sanskrit belongs, either as a member of the family, or even as a remote offshoot." Of the Southern languages, here called collectively Dravidian, there are no fewer than nine, four of them cultivated tongues, written in at least three distinct alphabets, all of which differ from the character in which Sanskrit is usually written. The author of the Grammar estimates the people speaking them, and who in physical form and mental endowment differ no more—hardly, indeed, so much—from the Hindus of the north than Spaniards and Italians do from Germans and Russians, at 32,000,000. This numerous population, then, must be at once struck off from the numbers imagined to speak the supposed Aryan languages.

While there is this exception to the East, we have at least one in Europe, the Basque, spoken by an European people, and which the careful examination of Baron William Humboldt has proved to have no affinity in words or structure with the Sanskrit or with any other dead or living language of Europe or of Asia.

The theory which would make similarity of language equivalent to identity of race is founded on a supposed correspondence of words and grammatical structure. If the object in view be to prove that all the languages of the world are derived from one parent tongue, the theory cannot, of course, apply to monosyllabic tongues, for in these there are no tangible points for examination and therefore, there is excluded from its operation the languages of half the inhabitants of the globe. Neither can it apply to the many tongues of the Red man of America, for in these, while the grammatical structure is essentially the same, the words totally differ. This is the more striking, since the race of man is the same nearly throughout the whole continent.

M. Bopp, the highest authority among the advocates of the Aryan theory, describes the process by which the inquiry is conducted. "The relations of the ancient Indian languages to their European kindred," says he, "are, in fact, so palpable as to be obvious to every one who casts a glance at them, even from a distance." This promised facility is, however, forthwith contradicted by an assurance that the subject "is so concealed, so deeply implicated in the most secret passages of the organization of a language, that we are compelled to consider

every other tongue subjected to a comparison with it, as also the language itself, from new stations of observation, and to employ the highest powers of grammatical science and method in order to recognise and illustrate the original unity of the different grammars." The investigation, then, instead of being an easy and obvious one, turns out to be one of great difficulty, demanding the exercise of much ingenuity, and, as a consequence, amenable to much speculation, conjecture, and uncertainty.

The chief means resorted to for tracing the supposed derivative languages to Sanskrit as their source, consists in the well-ascertained principle of the commutations of sounds. Such commutations, as applicable to languages generally, are most frequent in consonants of the same organic class, as one labial or one nasal, for another labial or another nasal, or in the substitution of a broad for a slender vowel, or the converse. The actual changes, however, are by no means confined to such sounds, for there is hardly one consonant or vowel in the wide range of language which, in the transfer of the words of one tongue into another, has not been exchanged, so that a skilful manipulator has a very wide field indeed for the exercise of his fancy and ingenuity. The changes which, in practice, words have actually undergone, appear to me to be so great, and often so capricious, that it seems utterly impossible to bring the subject under general rules. The alterations are, indeed, frequently so complete, that the derived word can only be traced to its source by the identity of its meaning, and by the ascertained history of the language to which it belongs.

A few examples may be given in illustration. The Latin words, *filius* a son, *folium* a loaf, and *ferrum* iron, become, in Italian, *figlio*, *foglio*, and *ferro*; in French, *fil*, *feuille*, and *fer*; and in Spanish, *hijo*, *hoja*, and *hierro*, the pronunciation in all these cases being still more remote from the original words than the orthography. In these instances the derivative words bear more or less resemblance to their originals, but abundant examples occur where, although the etymology be undoubted, there is hardly any resemblance at all in form. Of this the Spanish language affords some very striking examples. Thus, *aguja*, a needle, comes from *acus*; *andar*, to go or walk, from *ambulare*; *azor*, to be agitated, from *turbare*; *baño*, a bath, from *balneum*; *boda*, marriage, from *votum*, a vow; *dedo*, a finger, from *digitus*; *echar*, to throw or cast, from *jactare*; *enero*, January, from *Januarius*; *engaño*, fraud, from *ingenium*; *hambre*, hunger, from *fames*; *hembra*, a female, from *femina*; *clave*, a key, from *clavis*; *niño*, an infant, from *minimus*; *oir*, to hear, from *audire*; *ojo*, the eye, from *oculus*; *sed*, thirst, from *sitis*; *sieste*, a siesta, from *sexta hora*;

sobaco, the arm-pit, from sub brachium ; uña, a nail, from unguis ; yegua, a mare, from equa ; yoma, a bud, from gemma ; and cumbre, top or summit, from culmen.

When it happens that an original and a derivative language are of opposite phonetic character, to trace the one to the other would be wholly impossible without an historic clue. Thus, the Spanish words *alcalde* a justice of peace, come from the Arabic article *al*, and *kazi*, or *kalli*, a judge ; *alcurnia* and *alcuña*, family, race, from *al kurandah* ; *aldea*, a hamlet, from *al dah* ; *carça*, a briar, from *khar* ; *tia*, an aunt, from *shu* ; and *cid*, a commander, from *sagād*.

The Malayan and Polynesian languages, from the poverty of their phonetic character, afford very striking examples. Thus, the Arabic *fākār*, to think, becomes in Malay *pikir*, and in the languages of Celebes *pikiri*. In the languages last named the Arabic words *māsġid*, a mosque ; *sālam*, a salutation ; *bārkāt*, a blessing ; *kārtas*, paper ; *wākt*, time ; become respectively, *masigi*, *sālōng*, *baraka*, *karotasa*, and *wotōe*. So wide, indeed, is the difference between the phonetic character even of these Celebes languages from that of the neighbouring Malayan tongues, that words of the latter introduced into them are often hardly recognizable, except through the identity of their meanings. As examples, the word *rampas*, to plunder, becomes *rapai* ; *bintang*, a star, *bitōeng* ; *ribut*, a storm, *riwuk* ; *bulan*, the moon, *ulōeng*.

The corruption increases in magnitude as the languages diverge from each other in pronunciation, and the most signal examples of this that I know of are to be found in the corruptions of words of our own language, which have in recent times found their way into the dialects of Polynesia. In these we find such extravagant travesties as *hipa* for sheep, *pifa*, from beef, for the ox, *laiki* for rice, *pōora* for powder, *palora* for bread, and *palao* for potato.

“The dictionary of vulgar tongues,” it is truly observed by a judicious Spanish writer on etymology, “has not been the work of the meditative reflection of learning. In its formation the rustic population has had the largest share, and, on this account, we ought not to wonder that at every step we find marks of rusticity and gross ignorance, and this more especially in regard to words having their origin in dark and barbarous ages.” When, therefore, we consider the rude process by which languages have been formed, and the vast variety which exists in the utterance of the different races of man, it is obvious that, without collateral aids, little or no reliance can be placed on mere literal analogies.

The advocates of the Aryan theory generally confine the comparison

of words to such as express the most frequent and familiar ideas. Dr Prichard thus describes this branch of the inquiry. "I allude," says he, "particularly to such terms as denote the most familiar objects and relations, for which no tribe of people is without expressive terms. When such relations as those of father, mother, brother and sister are expressed by really cognate words, an affinity between the several languages in which these analogies is found is strongly indicated. The same remark may be made in respect to the names of visible bodies and the elements of nature, such as moon, air, sky, water, earth. Lastly, the inference is confirmed by finding many of the verbal roots of most frequent occurrence, as the verb substantive, and those which express generation, birth, living, dying, knowing, seeing, hearing, and the like, to be common to all these languages."

My own experience of the few languages to which my inquiries have extended, leads me to a conclusion the very reverse of that arrived at by the advocates of the Aryan theory; and I am satisfied that the words which a rude people borrow from a more civilized one with which it holds intercourse, are naturally and necessarily those expressing the most familiar ideas. I am convinced, indeed, that this is generally the source of that agreement in words, when it is genuine and not fanciful, on which the theory of a common language and a common race has been founded. Prichard gives a list of about sixty-five words of familiar use, and it is from this small number that he deduces a community of language and race between Celts and Hindus. I shall enumerate a few of these and examine their pretensions to be considered valid evidence of identity. They are—father, mother, brother, sister, man, woman, moon, cloud, earth, sea, dry land, lake, wax, honey, night, day, horse, cow, name.

Now in all these cases the words are most clearly derived directly from the Latin language, while their introduction belongs to times tolerably well ascertained, namely, those in which foreign missionaries whose language was Latin introduced Christianity among the rude Britons. In the Celtic tongues they are found, of course, in a mutilated and disfigured form, and with those transmutations of letters which ever take place when the words of a language of one phonetic character and grammatical structure are transfused into another of an opposite one. The terms quoted by Dr Prichard are, moreover, for the most part only synonymes of native words. Thus, in the Erse or Irish, there is, besides the corrupted Latin words, a native one for man, earth, dry land, moon, horse, and cow, and several more. Man has the word fear, which is, without doubt, a corruption of the Latin *vir*, but it has also

the native word *duine*, moon has *luan* the Latin *luna*, and also the native words, *gealach* and *re*. *Di*, day, no doubt comes from the Latin *dies*, die, but it has also the native term, *l'a*. In respect to these two last terms, it should be noticed that the native are the current words, and that the Latin ones are only used in the formation of the days of the week, as in the example *Diluan* Monday or *dies lunæ*. *Bo*, a cow, from the Latin *bos*, bove, has the native word *mart*. The horse has two terms from the Latin, each from *equus*, and *capull* from *caballus*, but it has, too, the native name *marc*. For the sea, there are no fewer than eleven names, of which two are Latin, *muir* from *mare*, and *abbeis* from *abyssus*. The remaining nine are native words.

Many of the Latin words introduced in comparatively recent times, into the Celtic tongues, however disfigured in adoption, are genuine, and in opposition to the Aryan theory, are such as express the most familiar ideas of rude and early man. The following are a few of them, man, woman, body, corpse, heart, skye, cloud, dry land, ground, day light, night, honey, wax, mountain, life, nest, sod, false, true, full, broad. We can only infer, from the existence of these foreign words, that the Celts must have had native words for the same ideas, which the exotic ones only displaced.

There are two words generally placed in the front rank of the evidence brought forward in favour of the Aryan theory. These are father and mother, terms which ought for obvious natural and inevitable reasons to be excluded, since in every tongue they are essentially the same. In their earliest stage they are always monosyllables containing a labial for a consonant, and the simplest breathing for a vowel, the consonants being *m*, *p*, *b*, or *f*. and the vowel *a*. This arises from the perfection of the infant's lips, for the purpose of nutrition indispensable to its life, while the action of the ordinary muscles of voluntary motion, connected with functions that are not indispensable, remain long nearly dormant.

But I turn for illustration to languages to which I have myself given special attention. The Hindus had introduced their religion into the Malayan islands, and Sanskrit was the medium through which the introduction was effected. The most cultivated of the insular languages contain a considerable portion of it, and this with very slender corruptions, and by no means in the very dubious form in which it is attempted to identify words of the languages of ancient and modern Europe with a dead language of Central Asia or India. Many of these Sanskrit words express the most familiar ideas of man, and although they generally

appear along with native terms, are often of more frequent use than the latter,—in some cases indeed, even superseding them altogether. I need hardly add, although I am aware that we are threatened with an attempt to prove the reverse, that there is nothing in these languages, or in the race of man that speaks them, analogous to the supposed Aryan languages, or the races imagined to speak them.

The Malayan tongues contain, at least, ten times as many genuine Sanskrit words as Dr Prichard, by strained etymologies, fancies he discovers in the Celtic. In the proper Malay language, for example, we find the following Sanskrit words expressing familiar ideas, being at the same time of more frequent use than the native synonymes—head, shoulder, limb, hair or pile, face, brother, family or kindred, joint or articulation, earth or land, cloud, day, sea, pool or pond, same or equal, complete or perfect, glad, sorry, still or silent, to speak, to deliberate, to ponder or reflect, to spoil or destroy, to forget, all, only, merely, speedily.

In Javanese we find most of the Sanskrit words existing in Malay, with a good many besides, such as throat, hand, son, daughter, man, woman, sun, moon, dog, hog, and buffalo. In the language of the Island of Bali the Sanskrit term, Surya for the sun has displaced the native word, and the Sanskrit numeral for ten done the same thing with the usual decimal of the Malayan languages.

Malayan words have found their way into what has been called the Polynesian language, or most widely spread tongue of the islands of the Pacific, a language differing wholly in structure and phonetic character from the Malayan tongues. Their number, in all, does not exceed 100, yet in these few are found words expressing the most familiar ideas, such as face, heart, ear, breasts, finger or toe, earth or soil, water, stone, hill, sea, bird, feather, hair, louse, leaf, root, flower, fruit, wood, board or plank, adze, road or path, fire, fear, to drink, to die, to dig, to skip or dance, to plant, to roast, to strike, to cry, to bury, to shoot or sprout, to pull out or extract.

Malayan words are found in the languages of the Philippine Islands which, in sound and grammar, differ widely from the Malayan tongues, and among these, generally corrupted in form and frequently even modified in sense, there are many which express the most familiar ideas. The following are examples: heart, tongue, nose, rib, offspring, flower, fruit, tree, sea, smell or odour, quiet or repose, true, false, thin, scarce, wanting or defective, to speak, to scratch, to drink, to change, to stop, to grow.

The language of the island of Madagascar, an African tongue,

differs entirely, in sound and grammar, from the Malayan languages, but contains an infusion of these, not indeed a considerable one, and yet among them are found several expressing the most familiar ideas, such as heart, eye, lips, blood, bone, nose, hair, sinew, tongue, eye-lids, hand, child, offspring, corpse, land, water, wave or billow, tempest, sky, rock or stone, island, promontory, tree, seed, thorn, bird, crow, heron, feather, leech, fly, hot, wet, soft, thin, slender, raw, salt, sour, white, red, bald, to cast or fling, to choose, to hit, to beg, to peel, to rub, to wound, to die, to kill, to change, to contain, to forbid, to catch, to plant, to drag, to pound or bray. Independent of these there are all the Malayan numerals.

In the languages of Southern India in which, as already stated, the Sanskrit is but a foreign element, there are to be found words of the most familiar use in the latter tongue. Thus in the Tamil, that of the four cultivated languages which has received the smallest access of Sanskrit, we have such words as the following, independent of many synonymes for native words, namely : mein or countenance, air, water, fish, flower or blossom, milk, share or portion, white, small, to strike, to kill, to speak, to pass, to get or obtain.

But even our own language, although its Latin element be of comparatively modern introduction, contains words of Norman-French, expressing primitive ideas far more numerous than any one has pretended to find of Sanskrit over the whole range of the ancient and modern languages of Europe. No doubt the greater number of these strangers are but synonymes of native words, but that also is the case in general in languages in which genuine Sanskrit words exist. There are others, however, which have actually displaced the Teutonic words or made them almost obsolete. The following are a few examples :—face, stomach, palate, gullet, gorge, entrails, arm, palm, sole, nape, temples, spine, flank, joint, articulation, tendon, veins, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, cousin, grand parent, masculine, feminine, corpse, squirrel, coney, partridge, plover, heron, eagle, falcon, salmon, trout, turbot, mackerel, herring, ray, gurnet, johndory, serpent, viper, flower, fruit, grain, mountain, valley, cave, cavern, glebe, bank, rock, isle, island, ocean, deluge, lake, river, air, tempest, echo, long, round, silent, calm, mute, vacant, just, jealous, to pass, to place, to taste, to touch, to move, to stir, to alter, to change, to exchange, to carry, to close, to enter, to cover, to remember, to recollect, to turn, to tremble.

To this list other words may be added, not perhaps so indispensable, but which still even the rudest language is not without, such as war,

battle, quarrel, pain, pleasure, joy, danger, peril, chance, fortune. Some of the words of the list I have given are no doubt equally of Teutonic origin with the Saxon ones of our language, but this does not militate against the fact of the direct channel through which they have come to us, being Norman-French.

In the list of words of French origin which I have given, I may remark that there are the names of familiar animals which, as far as we know, have been denizens of our land and water from the creation. We can even in some cases assign the cause, the superior civilisation of the conquerors which operated to the substitution of French for Teutonic names. The cow, the calf, the hog, and the sheep used for food have French names, while the living animals preserve their Saxon ones. The horse and dog, not used for food, have their Saxon names only. But in this, as in all similar cases, it is certain that accident and caprice have had a large share.

Words expressing very primitive ideas may be introduced into a language from a foreign tongue even when that tongue is in phonetic character and grammatical structure totally different from the vernacular language on which they have been engrafted. Arabic words have in this manner been introduced into the languages of the Spanish Peninsula, the result of eight centuries conquest and intercommunication. Thus, we find in Spanish and Portuguese, such words as the following from the Arabic, namely,—family, boy, aunt, lad or youth, bachelor, cave or den, island, channel of a river, pool or pond, thistle, briar, acorn, hog, wild boar, duck or goose, crab (cancer), storm, red, sour, plain or smooth, free not enslaved, mad, solid, rude or rustic, such-a-one, until. No doubt the greater number of these are mere synonymes of words of Latin origin. But there are others which have wholly displaced the Latin words. Thus, the Arabic word for oil in Spanish, “aceite,” has wholly displaced the Latin one which is found in Italian, in French, and even in English. Yet, the olive must have been cultivated in Spain long before the Arabian conquest, and the Arabs, of whose country it is not a native, could not have been the parties who introduced it.

The abundant illustrations now produced will, I think, be quite sufficient to disprove the assertion that an agreement between words expressing simple ideas, even when it is genuine and not forced and factitious, is no evidence of a common language, were a common language itself sufficient evidence of a common race.

Dr Prichard, following the example of previous advocates of the Aryan theory, by an ingenious and dexterous manipulation of the

letters of the alphabet, on the principle of the commutation of sounds, one which knows no bounds, makes the Latin words introduced into the Celtic tongues, within the historic period, and by a well-ascertained channel, to have come originally from Sanskrit. Thus he makes the Erse fear man to come from the Sanskrit Virah, and not from the Latin vir; luan the moon, to come from the Sanskrit masa, month, and not from the Latin luna; neul, a cloud, from the Sanskrit nabha, and not from the Latin nebula; di, day, from the Sanskrit dhu, and not from the Latin dies, die; nockd, night, from the Sanskrit nisa, and not from the Latin nox, nocte; each, a horse, from the Sanskrit aswah, and not from the Latin equus; bó, a cow, from the Sanskrit go, and not from the Latin bos bove and air from the Sanskrit ashra, and not from the Latin aer.

It may be considered a strong corroboration if, indeed, any corroboration were needed, of the words expressing simple ideas found in the Celtic tongues having been directly introduced, in comparatively modern times, that they are accompanied by others showing such social improvement, as a rude people would naturally receive from intercommunication with a more civilized one. In the Erse or Irish, for example, we have such terms as the following: iron, tin, copper, silver, gold, flax, hemp, rye, barley, plough, plough-share, wheel, mill, arrow, lance, sword, mail, arms, week, month, the names of the days of the weeks, with the numerals up to a thousand; and the last of these, exactly in the same manner as the numerals of the more civilized Malays, have been adopted by the ruder people of Madagascar and the South-Sea Islands.

With respect to the numerals, they certainly have the appearance of a common origin from Bengal to Spain and Britain. They must, we may conjecture, have been the invention of a people who had made a considerable social progress, but who that people was, whether an Eastern or a Western one, it is wholly impossible to determine, and it is remarkable that the same uncertainty exists with respect to the Malayan numerals, which prevail from Easter Island to Madagascar, and from the Sandwich to the New Zealand Islands. It is not to be forgotten, however, that the numerals which wear the appearance of a common origin in what have been called the Indo-European languages, by no means extend to the languages of the South of India, which, with few exceptions, have their own distinct and peculiar ones.

The special channel through which Latin words have reached the Celtic tongues is clearly enough indicated by such words as the following: God, religion, creed, soul, spirit, abbey, abbot, and the like.

The view now taken of the manner in which Latin words have entered the Celtic tongues is illustrated by the manner in which the corresponding class of words have entered the Malayan languages. The principal Malayan nations were, however, probably more advanced in civilization when they were converted to Hinduism than the Celtic when converted to Christianity; and hence, in their tongues, the Sanskrit words are more frequently synonymes than the Latin ones are in the Celtic. The following words of Sanskrit in the Malayan tongues are examples, and I take them chiefly from the Javanese, the language of the most advanced people:—Gold, copper, mercury, cotton, silk, black pepper, nutmeg, camphor, war, enemy, fortress, bow, arrow, time, age, life, era, sun, moon, month, day, year, date, letter of the alphabet, numeral figure, writing, epistle, king, queen, prince, princess, counsellor, noble, town, village, god, goddess, bramin, spiritual guide, adoration, penance, heaven, hell, torments, theological absorption, religion, goblin, astrology, spell or incantation. Among these words, however, the Sanskrit ones are but synonymes of native terms, as in the following—war, enemy, time, sun, moon, month, year, king, queen, prince, princess, god, and goddess.

Many of the Sanskrit words adduced as evidence of a common language, and hence of a common race, from Bengal to Spain, but which are really so remote from their supposed common source that the utmost license in the commutation of letters cannot reconcile us to the belief that they are the same, are to be found in the Malayan languages with very little variation as to sound or sense, so that there can be no mistake about their real origin. Thus, we have *putra* and *sunu*, a son; *pati*, lord or master; *nara wira* and *manusya*, man; *danta*, a tooth; *naka*, a toe or finger nail; *hasta*, the hand; *daksina*, the right hand; *pada*, the foot; *tara*, a star; *prawata*, a mountain; *mega*, a cloud; *gâni* (for *aghni*), fire.

Instead of such accord with the language from which they are supposed to be derived, as is exhibited in these examples, the alleged Sanskrit words in the languages of Europe are so remote from it, that the semblance is often reduced to an agreement in one or two letters. *Jani*, a woman in Sanskrit, is thus supposed to be the same with the Gothic *quino* and the Erse *bean*; *akshi*, the eye, to be the source from which has sprung the Latin *oculus*: from *danta*, a tooth, is supposed to have come the Latin *des, dente*, the Gothic *thunto*, and the Erse *dend*, the last, however, a word which I cannot find in any dictionary. From *nakha*, a nail or claw, correctly given in the Malayan languages, the aspirate only omitted, is supposed to be derived the Latin *unguis, ungue*,

the German *nagel*, and the Gothic *augo*. The Celtic languages have no word resembling this last word, and it is consequently omitted, a frequent practice of the Aryan philologists. From the Sanskrit *asru*, a tear, is made to come the Latin *lachrima* or *lachruma*, the Gothic *tagr*, and the Erse *deur*. From *dakshina*, the right hand, and also the south, is believed to come the Latin *dexter*, and the Erse *deas*, which, as in Sanskrit, means also the right hand. Nothing could be more natural than this twofold meaning of the last word in both tongues. The framers of the Sanskrit and of the Celtic languages, in dividing the horizon into quarters, both of them looked to the rising sun, and, of course, had the south to their right hand, a natural explanation which supersedes the necessity of a forced etymology. From the Sanskrit word *pada*, the foot, correctly given in the Malayan languages, is supposed to be derived the Latin *pes*, *pede*, the German *fuss*, the English *foot*, and the Erse *cas* or *cos*. It is possible that this last word, which has nothing in common with its alleged Sanskrit parent but the vowel *a*, may be a corruption of the Latin *pes*, and this is the more probable since the Erse has what seems a native synonyme for the foot, the word *troidh*.

It is reasonably to be objected to the words selected by the advocates of the Aryan theory, that they consist often of a single synonyme out of the many which exist in Sanskrit. Thus, *heli*, selected by them, is but one name out of a score, for the sun, and from this is supposed to come the Latin *sol* and the Gothic *suil*, the German, the English, and the Erse having no word in the least resembling it, are omitted. The far more frequent words for the sun in Sanskrit, *surya* and *rawi*, are unnoticed. For the moon they give the word *masa*, which signifies also a month, and from this is supposed to come the Latin *mensis*, and the Erse *mios*, the far more frequent Sanskrit words, *chandra* and *soma*, being taken no notice of. The Erse word in this case usually pronounced *mis*, I have no doubt comes direct from the Latin *mensis*, but I have just as little doubt that the latter does not come from the Sanskrit *masa*.

Much stress has been laid on the supposed derivation of European words from Sanskrit verbal roots, but the process by which this is brought about appears to me to be little better than an ingenious etymological juggle, by which any result which it may please us can be obtained if the words compared bear any sort of similitude. A few samples of the mode of procedure in such cases will, I think, tend to corroborate this view of it. In Sanskrit the verbal root of the word to generate is *jan*, and from this we have the Latin *genere*, the English *kin* or *kindred*, and the Erse *gin*, to *geget*. From the Sanskrit root *mri*, is supposed to come the Latin

moriri, because its first syllable is mor, the German mord, and the Erse adjective marbh "dead." In this last language, for the verb "to die," there are no fewer than four different synonymes, not one of which bears the remotest resemblance to the Sanskrit root mri. The root of the Sanskrit verb "to live" is jiv, and from this the Latin vivere, and the Erse beo, which, however, signifies alive, or quick, and not the verb "to live," are supposed to be derived. The root of the Sanskrit verb "to know" is vid, and from this is supposed to come the Latin video, to see, and also to discern, the English wit and wise, and the Erse fios, which, however, properly signifies "information," the words for the verb "to know" bearing no resemblance whatever, either to this word or to the Sanskrit root vid. The Sanskrit root for the verb "to hear" is sru, and hence we have the Latin verb clueo, to be named or called, and the Erse cluas, the ear. The Sanskrit root for the verb to put or place is stha, and of this are imagined to come the Latin sto, to stand and to be placed, and the Erse suidhich, which signifies to settle or appoint, as well as to place or plant, there being no fewer than four words totally different from it for the verb to put or place. Sad is the Sanskrit root of the verb "to sit," and from this is made to come the Latin sedeo, and the Erse suidh. Keri is the Sanskrit root of the verb to make, and from it comes the Latin creo, and the Erse ceard, which Dr Prichard interprets workman, but which properly signifies a smith, or worker in metals, the verb to make being expressed by three different words in no way like the Sanskrit root. The root of the verb to breathe in Sanskrit is an, and from this comes, according to Prichard, the Latin anima, air and breath, and the Erse anim, soul or spirit, the theological origin of which I have already pointed out, while the verb to breathe and the noun breath are anail, evidently a distinct native word.

In the efforts made to trace the languages of Europe to the Sanskrit, it cannot be shown that there is a general agreement with the supposed parent tongue in their fundamental terms, as there certainly ought to have been, and such as really does exist, derived from Latin or Teutonic sources, with the original tongues from which they sprang. On the contrary, the words are selected from the different languages when there is but the semblance of a likeness and omitted when there is none.

Although I must consider the evidence brought forward to prove that the languages of Europe are derived from the Sanskrit, as valueless still, there are some languages of Central Asia which have undoubtedly received a large infusion of it. These are the ancient Zend, the Pelhvi, and the Deri, with the modern Persian, in so far as the latter is not

intermixed with Arabic. This would be an argument in favour of the theory, otherwise a very probable one, which places the nation that had Sanskrit for its mother tongue, not in India, but in a country north-west of it. Even the Slavonic languages would seem to have received a few fundamental words of Sanskrit, which the proximity of the nations speaking them, to the ancient seat of the people whom we are supposing to have spoken Sanskrit, would make very likely. Even the Greek itself, and through it the Latin, may possibly have received a few words of Sanskrit through the languages of the Persians who conquered and long occupied Asiatic Greece. But all this is a very different matter from evidence of a common tongue. It is not to be forgotten, too, that within the period of authentic history, the very country which is now believed to be the parent one of the Sanskrit, is the same which has poured out many of the hordes which have extended their conquests, and sometimes their settlements over Western Asia and Eastern Europe. It seems also, not unreasonable to believe that the same people may have been acting the same part in the long dark night which preceded the dawn even of tradition.

That languages were once spoken in India itself derived from the Sanskrit, as Italian, French, and Spanish are from Latin, there can be no doubt. One example of it at least exists in the dead Pali, still preserved, like the Sanskrit itself as the language of a particular form of religion, although this generally is more beyond the bounds of Hindustan, than in that country itself. Judging by analogy, the people, whomsoever they were, of whom the Pali was the living tongue, must have been conquered and their country occupied by those who spoke Sanskrit, for centuries of occupation must have been necessary to break down the complex Sanskrit to the more simple Pali. Of all this we have no other record than written language, and the only wonder is that we have even so much.

It has long appeared to me that the class of words which afford the true test of languages being of the same origin,—does not consist of words expressing the most familiar ideas, but of such as constitute the articulations, as it were of a language, and without which it can be neither spoken nor written. These consist of the propositions, the auxiliary verbs and the conjunctions. In all the languages, for example, derived from the Latin these words are taken from that language, while in our own tongue they are of Teutonic origin. When any two languages can be spoken or written in words of the same origin, although a sentence may not be grammatical, they may be pronounced, however

intermixed with foreign words, to be of the same parentage. Thus, Italian and French can be written without a word of the Teutonic tongues, with which they both abound, and Spanish without any of the many Gothic and Arabic words which it contains. Even in the absence of all record of the manner in which these languages were formed, we should be at no loss in pronouncing Latin to be the parent of Italian, French, and Spanish. In the same way our own tongue, although it be reckoned that one sixth part of it consists of Norman-French, can be written gramatically without a word of that language, and exclusively in Saxon words, while to write a single sentence in Norman-French is impossible. Hence, even in the absence of all record of the conquest, we could be at no loss in pronouncing English to be derived, not from Latin, but from German. It is needless to add that by the test now described no European language can be traced to Sanskrit or to any of its derivatives.

In all the written languages of the Malayan Archipelago, some of which contain a very considerable infusion of Sanskrit and of Arabic, there is no difficulty whatever in writing, and especially in speaking them without the help of either of these two tongues. But perhaps the best illustration is to be found in the languages of Continental India. As already stated the languages of the southern portion of that country are essentially different from the Sanskrit which forms but an extrinsic element in them. All of them can be written, and especially spoken, with less or more ease, without the use of words of this tongue in proportion as they contain more or less of it. The Telugu, computed to be the speech of 14,000,000 of people, contains a large proportion of Sanskrit (according to Campbell's Dictionary a full third part of it), and cannot easily be written, without the employment of Sanskrit words, as is the case with our own language, without the assistance of French words. On the contrary, the Tamil, the language of 10,000,000 people, contains but a small proportion of Sanskrit words, and can consequently be written with facility without their help. Indeed, the language of the people contains very few Sanskrit words. These are facts which I state on the authority of the learned author of the Dravidian Comparative Grammar, Mr Caldwell.

Of the class of words to which I have referred as affording the best test of the source of a language, the advocates of the Aryan theory have hardly adduced any. The substantive verb is the only auxiliary that I can find. Its roots in Sanskrit are *bhu* and *as*, and from these, in Latin, we have *fu* and *es*, and in Erse *bu* and *is*. This is the nearest approach

that I can discover, but it is a solitary case, and the resemblance of sound may be, and I have no doubt is, purely accidental, and such as might easily be paralleled in languages which have confessedly no relation whatever to each other. I may give two examples. The proposition *de* is a Latin word to be found also in all the languages derived from it. The same proposition, with the same meaning, is to be found in all the Malayan languages. In Greek and Latin the numeral two, *duo*, is, with corruptions, the same from Bengal to Britain. In the Malay it is nearly the same, *dua*, and, with various corruptions, it is found in every tongue from Madagascar to the remotest island of the Pacific. Its close resemblance, however, to the European word *is*, I am satisfied, purely fortuitous, for it is the only one of the native Malayan numerals that bears the least resemblance to the European on the Sanskrit ores.

From the facts I have adduced in the course of this paper I must come to the conclusion that the theory which (the Semitic tongues excepted) makes all the languages of Europe and Asia, from Bengal to the British Islands, however different in appearance, to have sprung from the same stock, and hence, all the people speaking them, whether black, swarthy, or fair, to be of one and the same race of man, is utterly groundless, and the mere dream of very learned men,—perhaps even more imaginative than learned. I can by no means, then, agree with a very learned Professor of Oxford when he asserts that the same blood ran in the veins of the soldiers of Alexander and of Clive as in those of the Hindus, whom, at the interval of two-and-twenty ages, they both scattered with the same facility. I am not prepared, like him, to believe that an English jury, unless it were a packed one, of learned Orientalists, with the ingenious Professor himself for its foreman, would, “after examining the hoary documents of language,” admit “the claim of a common descent between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton,” for that would amount to allowing that there was no difference in the faculties of the people that produced Homer and Shakespear, and those that have produced nothing better than the Mahabarat and Ramayana—no difference between the home-keeping Hindus, who never made a foreign conquest of any kind, and the people who discovered, conquered, and peopled a New World.

John Campbell Esq.

Walden Lodge -

Stensington.

Newport

N.Y.

21. Wether. St
July 20th

My dear Friend.

I send you a
part of brochures by Post
& have one two more
infections. ever with
yours.

Newport.

John Campbell Esq

