

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

of the seasons. The life of Jesus and the great events connected with the spread of his religion were the prevailing considerations in the institution of these festivals. But it is equally certain that the relations of Jewish and pagan festivals to the analogies of nature had also an important influence in establishing that harmony which subsists between those sacred festivals in the church and the changes of the year in the revolutions of the seasons.

"These as they change are but the varied God—
Mysterious round! what skill, what force divine,
Deep felt in these appear!"

ARTICLE III.

THE SANSKRIT LANGUAGE IN ITS RELATION TO COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY.

By B. J. Wallace, Professor of the Greek and Latin Languages in Delaware College, Newark, Del.

COMPARATIVE Philology is a recent science. The name, no doubt, is taken from Comparative Anatomy in which a system is evolved by a careful examination of the relative structures and functions of animals. This comparison of languages had never been instituted, except casually, until the present century. Von Humboldt, Bopp, Grimm (and more recently Burnouf, Lassen and others) are here the great names. By bringing laboriously together the languages with the history and character of the nations of Middle and Western Asia, Northern Africa and Europe, they have developed the most brilliant results, the central and more valuable languages of the world classifying themselves into two great families, called respectively the Shemitish and the Indo-European. From these labors and as a foundation by others, a complete revolution has been nearly accomplished in philosophical grammar, lexicography, and the methods of classical study. Memory, instead of reigning supreme, and holding firmly immense masses of heterogeneous facts, now sits at the feet of her brother Reason. Grammar, from being one of the most uninteresting of studies, is becoming delightful. The foundations are laid in human nature, and the philosophical gramma-

rian shows, or labors to show, how every branch of a verb, and every vowel-change, follows not caprice, but a natural law, and that speech instead of a farrago of contradictions, a mass of confused utterances, is the appropriate expression of the human soul every where, whose actings though sorely jarred by depravity show its original brightness, as through a veil, darkly.

Adelung estimates the whole number of languages and dialects known upon the globe at 3626. Balbi rates them at 2000. But very many of these are mere dialects; many indicate a common origin at no very remote period. By careful examination the number no doubt may be reduced to hundreds, and a very few hundred of distinct languages, especially if we exclude mere savage or outlandish idioms. But after all this reduction the question returns, Are these various modes of speech arbitrary, so that the learning of one but little facilitates the learning of another, or are they so connected as that it is by no means a prodigy, but might be an ordinary result of human industry to be acquainted with twenty or fifty languages? Comparative philology has solved this question. We will try, striving to avoid the fathomless abyss of Teutonic generalizing, and the flying cloud-land of French theorizing, to present some simple and intelligible views on this subject.

The soul of man is one. It struggles for utterance and articulate speech; the result must be, in its essence, everywhere the same. In utterance man always uses the same vocal organs. Here is another source of similarity. That is, thought and feeling must be essentially alike, the organs of expression are the same. Hence there must be, and there is, a general likeness in all articulate speech. There are, for instance, everywhere words to express existences—nouns; action gives rise to verbs, sudden emotions to interjections. Every language possesses these and a hundred other things because man is like man. But, as it has been well remarked,¹ there are two great classes of words, those which resemble external sounds, where sound is the echo of the sense, and those which struggle to express that which is peculiar to the soul, and for which there is perhaps no perfect picture in material things. The former class of words must be strikingly alike everywhere. It is in the latter that there will be the main diversity. The reason for the choice of one word here rather than another, though it cannot be considered arbitrary, is subtle, and

¹ Introd. to the Hebrew Grammar of Nordheimer.

perhaps will altogether, at least in many instances, elude our research. Then the modes of developing and connecting words are very various, and here it is that the greatest scope is given to the efforts of the comparative philologist.

The reader will observe that there is the greatest difference in the value of languages. Some are remarkably beautiful structures in themselves, will well reward the labor of examination, and their complete mastery is a mental discipline. Besides they may enshrine a noble literature. The character and history of the people whose it was or is, may be such as that it will be a matter of exceeding interest to study the nation in their speech. Or it may embody the solemn revelation of the will of the Creator to the creature. Other languages may be rude in structure, even unwritten, and there may be nothing to interest in the history of those who speak them, except that they are men. It is upon the former class, as was natural, that the philologists of our age have laid out their strength.

The Shemitish and Indo-European families include those languages which are specially interesting. The Shemitish languages are the Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldee and Syriac. With these also are to be connected the Phoenician, Punic and Samaritan. The union between them is close. Of these the Hebrew and Arabic are the most interesting.

Analogy, at first view, would lead us to suppose that the languages of India would bear a close affinity to the Shemitish, but the contrary is the fact. Oriental though they be, we must look for different analogies than those between Hebrew and Persian, Arabic and Sanscrit. This remarkable fact has given rise to the classification to which allusion has been made, and to which in consequence of the languages which it embraces, the name Indo-European has been given. This has been the field of most patient and thorough research, especially by the Germans. It appears that the cradle of this most extensive family, including the ruling nations and conquering races of mankind, was the region bordering upon the Black and Caspian seas. The reader will immediately connect this fact with the remarkable prophecy of enlargement to Japheth, and with the well-known facts in relation to the Caucasian race. But we meet with what seems the perplexing fact that the languages of India are thus apparently allied, not to those of Western Asia, but to those of Europe. And the vital point in this subject leads every one directly to the Sanscrit.

Sir William Jones makes this remark:¹ "The Sanscrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more excellently refined than either." If we must take this with much allowance, still no one can receive the testimony of the patriarch of oriental literature but with deep deference. Milman says,² "The Sanscrit is an inexhaustible subject of itself; in its grammatical structure more regular, artificial and copious than the most perfect of the Western languages; in its origin, the parent form from which the older Greek, the Latin and the Teutonic tongues seem to branch out, and develop themselves upon distinct and discernible principles." Von Humboldt in complicated German sentences thus expresses himself: "The Sanscrit language, as a later principle of interpretation, stands, as it were, at the end of a whole series of languages, and these are by no means such as belong to a course of study which for practical purposes is to a certain degree unserviceable; on the contrary, they comprehend our own mother-tongue, and that of the classical nations of antiquity, and consequently therefore the true and direct source of our best feelings, and the fairest part of our civilization itself. No language in the world, that we are acquainted with, possesses in an equal degree with the Sanscrit the secret of moulding abstract grammatical ideas into such forms, as by means of simple and closely allied sounds still leave evident traces of the root, which often of itself explains the variation of sound (inasmuch as it essentially remains the same) amid the greatest complication of form: nor has any other language, by means of its inherent euphonic amalgamation of inflection, the power of forming such accurate and well-adapted symbols for expressing the conceptions of the mind."

Such being the opinions of the most eminent scholars, we advance with interest to an examination of the questions connected with this language. Two meet us at the threshold, viz. the age of the language, and its relation to the dialects now spoken in India.

In regard to the age of Sanscrit, it may be remarked that eminent scholars differ in opinion. It would seem impossible to de-

¹ Adelung's Historical Sketch of Sanscrit Literature. Translated and indeed re-modelled by Talboys, Oxford, England, a literary bookseller. It consists of lists of Sanscrit books with occasional remarks.

² Nala and Damayanti and other poems translated from the Sanscrit by Rev. H. H. Milman, late professor of poetry at Oxford, Eng.

termine the question with accuracy, but there is an approximation towards an agreement in fixing the Vedas, the most ancient Sanscrit compositions between 1100 and 1600 years B. C.¹ One of the brightest periods of Sanscrit literature, it would appear, was the century immediately preceding the Christian era.

With respect to the relation between the Sanscrit and the present dialects of India, a diversity of opinion is also to be remarked. Mr. Colebrooke,² whose essay seems, by universal consent to be very high authority on this, as on other parts of the subject, divides the dialects of India into ten, such as Hindustani, Mahratta, etc. The two opinions are, either that Sanscrit was the basis of all these languages, the common root from which they have grown, the classic of which they are dialects—which was long the favorite opinion—or that these dialects were spoken by the people who inhabited India before those who used Sanscrit arrived, and that the latter, coming from the north-west impressed their religion, literature and language upon the conquered Indians, the language gradually mingling with all the dialects of the subdued people, and modifying each in part to its own superior and more scientific structure. We believe we are correct in stating that the latter opinion is gaining ground over the former.

Before we proceed, however, to consider the Sanscrit in a purely philological view as the basis of the Indo-European languages, we will endeavor to kindle the reader's interest by calling his attention to its literature.

It is well known that the huge system of the Hindoo religion rests upon certain sacred books written in Sanscrit. The fact of these books containing false natural science as well as false theology, is one highly auspicious to the missionary enterprise in India.

“The whole circle of Hindoo knowledge and science is divided into eighteen parts, of which the first four are the Vedas, from *Ved* or *Bed*, the law. These are regarded as an immediate revelation from heaven; and as containing the true knowledge of God, of his religion and of his worship, disposed into one harmo-

¹ Sir William Jones says 1500 B. C.; Col. Vans Kennedy 1100 or 1200 B. C.; Ritter “collected or composed” 1400 or 1600 B. C.; Colebrooke says, “revered by Hindoos for hundreds if not thousands of years.”

² Colebrooke's Essay on the Sanscrit and Prakrit languages, in the seventh vol. of the Asiatic Researches. For the use of several of the volumes consulted in the preparation of this Article, the writer is indebted to the kindness of Rev. E. Burgess, missionary of the American Board to the Mahrattas.

nious composition. Next to the Vedas rank four Uparedas, which comprise the knowledge of medicine, music and other arts; after these follow six Vedangas, which relate to pronunciation, grammar, prosody, religious rites and ceremonies, etc.; and finally, four Upangas, which treat of logic, philosophy, jurisprudence and history. The Vedas are undoubtedly the most ancient compositions in the whole range of Sanscrit literature. Their obscurity, and the obsolete dialect in which they are written are such as to render the reading of them difficult, even to a Brahman. It was doubted for a considerable time whether the Vedas were real compositions, or whether the whole matter was not a fable. These doubts were not removed until Col. Polier obtained from Jypoor a transcript of what purported to be a complete collection of the Vedas. This is now deposited in the British museum, bound in eleven large folio volumes." They still remain for the most part, untranslated. The curious reader may find in Adelung accounts of the contents of the Vedas at more length. Sir Wm. Jones gives extracts from them in his works. The following sentence is perhaps one of the finest, and shows much cultivation at the period of the composition of the Vedas:

"What the sun and light are to this visible world, that are the supreme good and truth to the intellectual and invisible universe, and as our corporeal eyes have a distinct perception of objects enlightened by the sun, thus our souls acquire certain knowledge by meditating on the light of truth which emanates from the Being of beings; that is the light by which alone our minds can be directed in the path to beatitude."

"The Puranas are poetical representations of Indian mythology and fabulous history. They hold an eminent rank in the religion and literature of the Hindoos. Possessing like the Vedas the credit of a divine origin, and scarcely inferior to them in sanctity, they exercise a more extensive and practical influence upon Hindoo society. They regulate their ritual, direct their faith, and supply in popular legendary tales materials for their credulity. To European scholars they recommend themselves on other accounts; as they have been considered to contain, not only the picturesque and mythological part of Indian superstition, but the treasury of extensive and valuable historical remains. They are divided into two classes containing eighteen each." Notices of their contents may be found in Adelung. Mr. Wilson, the Sanscrit Professor at Oxford, analyzed one of them, the Vishnu Purana. Copious extracts from the Puranas have been published.

Some account of the Sanscrit poetry, we hope, will be more amusing. We extract from Milman and Adelung as translated and enlarged by Talboys :

“A history of Sanscrit poetry would be a general history of Sanscrit literature. Not only the Vedas, but even treatises on science, apparently the most awkward to reduce to a metrical form, are composed in verse; and although in the extensive range of Sanscrit learning there are some few compositions which may be called prose, yet even the style of most of these bears so great a resemblance to the language of poetry from their being written in a kind of modulated prose, as scarcely to form an exception. The age of Sanscrit poetry, therefore, like that of all other nations, is cœval with the earliest vestige of their language.

“The classical poets of ancient India are divided into three periods. The first is that of the Vedas; the second, that of the great Epics; the third, that of the Drama. A fourth is mentioned, but as it is of a later date, it is not considered as belonging to the classic age. These three periods are assigned to Sanscrit poetry, not only from historical testimony but from the language and style of the compositions themselves.

“The bards of India have given to poetry nearly every form which it has assumed in the Western world; and in each, and in all, they have excelled. Its heroic poets have been likened to Homer, and their epics dignified with the appellations of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. (Heeren's *Researches*.) In the drama, *Cālidāsa* has been designated as the Indian *Shakspeare* (Sir Wm. Jones, *Pref. to Sacontala*); *Vyasa*, as not unworthy of comparison with *Milton*; the adventures of *Nala* and *Damayanti*, with the *Faerie Queene of Spenser* (Milman); the philosophic *Bhagavat Gita* reads like a noble fragment of *Empedocles* or *Lucretius*, (A. W. Von Schlegel calls it the most beautiful, and perhaps the only truly philosophical poem in any language. *Indisch. Bib. II. 219*). Their didactic, their lyric, their writers of fables, and of the lighter kinds of poetry, have all carried their art to the same high point of perfection (Heeren); and so nicely are their respective merits balanced, that it seems rather a matter of individual taste than of critical acumen to which class the palm should be conceded. *M. Chezy*, with the *Hindoos* themselves, gives it decidedly to the epic; *Milman* to the softer, and less energetic; *A. W. Schlegel* appears inclined to bestow it upon the didactic; while, if the praise of one of the first and earliest judges of Sanscrit poetry be not lavish, it will be difficult to say how anything can excel the

descriptive. Sir Wm. Jones, of the *Season of Cálidása* (Vol. VI. 432) writes, 'Every line is exquisitely polished; every couplet exhibits an Indian landscape, always beautiful, sometimes highly colored, but never beyond nature.'

"There exist, for instance, in our European literature few pieces to be compared with the *Megha-Duta* (The Cloud-Messenger) in sentiment and beauty; and in erotic poetry the voluptuous *Jayadéra*, in his little poem on the loves of *Madhava* and *Radha*, far surpasses all elegiac poets known," etc.

The reader will not charge us with believing all this extravagance, much less with asking him to believe it, but as even a caricature bears some likeness to the original, so the unbounded eulogium of the first oriental scholars of Germany, France and England must have some basis in truth. Perhaps he would like to judge a little for himself. A number of allowances must be made, especially for differences in taste. The translations are by *Milman*.

It is unnecessary to give the plots, but a word or two may be quoted as to the measure. "The original verse in which the vast epics of *Vyasa* and *Valmiki* are composed is called the *Sloka*, which is thus described by *Schlegel* (*Indisch. Bib.* p. 36). "The oldest, most simple, and most generally adopted measure is the *Sloka*; a distich of two sixteen-syllable lines divided at the eighth syllable." The copiousness of these poems is absolutely portentous. The one from which the following rather graceful extract is taken is called *Mahábhárata*, and contains 200,000 of these *Alexandrine* sixteen-syllable lines. We quote from the *Vanaparvam*, the third part, of which *Milman* translates eighty or ninety stout pages which he calls the *Episode* of *Nala* and *Damayanti*. Here is what may be called a *Swan-extract*:

"*Damayanti* with her beauty—with her brilliance, brightness, grace,
Through the world's unrivalled glory—won the slender-waisted maid,
'Mid her handmaids, like the lightning—shone she with her faultless form
Like the long-eyed queen of beauty—without rival, without peer,
Never 'mid the gods immortal—never 'mid the *Yaksha* race
Nor 'mong men was maid so lovely—ever heard of, ever seen
As the soul-disturbing maiden—that disturbed the souls of gods.¹

* * * * *

"Flew away the swans rejoicing—to *Vidarbha* straight they flew;
To *Vidarbha's* stately city;—there by *Damayanti's* feet
Down with drooping plumes they settled—and she gazed upon the flock,
Wondering at their forms so graceful—where amid her maids she sat.

¹ Cf. *Aesch. Prom.* 649 sq. Ζεὺς γὰρ ἡμέρου βέλος πρὸς σοὺ τέθλαπται.

Sportively began the damsels—all around to chase the birds ;
 Scattering flew the swans before them—all about the lovely grove.
 Lightly ran the nimble maidens—every one her bird pursued ;
 But the swan that through the forest—gentle Damayanti chased,
 Suddenly in human language—spoke to Damayanti thus :”

Here is an *elephant-extract*, from the same episode :

“ Long their journey through the forest—through the dark and awful glens,
 Then a lake of loveliest beauty—fragrant with the lotus-flowers,
 Saw those merchants, wide and pleasant—with fresh grass and shady trees ;
 Flowers and fruit bedecked its borders—where the birds melodious sang ;
 In its clear delicious waters—soul-enchanting, icy-cool,
 With their horses all o’erwearied—thought they then to plunge and bathe ;
 At the signal of the captain—entered all that pleasant grove,
 At the close of day arriving—there encamped they for the night.

When the midnight came all noiseless—came in silence deep and still,
 Weary slept the band of merchants—lo, a herd of elephants,
 Oozing moisture from their temples—came to drink the troubled stream.
 When that caravan they gazed on—with their slumbering beasts at rest,
 Forward rush they fleet and furious—mad to slay and wild with heat ;
 Irresistible the onset—of the rushing ponderous beasts
 As the peaks from some high mountain—down the valley thundering roll ;
 Strown was all the way before them—with the boughs, the trunks of trees ;
 Or they crashed to where the travellers—slumbered by the lotus-lake.”

Leaving the travellers in rather a dubious position, with the wild elephants likely to define it, we will give the reader the following. The fable is monstrous, enormous, like their jungles, gods, temples, elephants and everything else East Indian, and need not detain us. The reader has only to suppose the Ganges pouring down in a cataract where before there had been no river, and gods and men astonished, as well they might be :

“ Headlong then and prone to earth—thundering rushed the cataract down,
 Swarms of bright-hued fish came dashing—turtles, dolphins in their mirth,
 Fallen, or falling, glancing, flashing—to the many gleaming earth.
 And all the host of heaven came down—spirits and genii in amaze,
 And each forsook his heavenly throne—upon that glorious scene to gaze.
 On cars, like high-towered cities seen—with elephants and coursers rode,
 Or on swift-swinging palanquin—lay wandering each observant god.
 As met in bright divan each god—and flashed their jewelled vesture’s rays,
 The coruscating aether glowed—as with a hundred suns ablaze,
 And with the fish and dolphin’s gleamings—and scaly crocodiles and snakes,
 Glanced the air, as when fast streaming—the blue lightning shoots and breaks ;
 And in ten thousand sparkles bright—went flashing up the cloudy spray
 The snowy flocking swans less white—within its glittering mists at play.
 And headlong now poured down the flood—and now in silver circlets wound,
 Then lake-like spread all bright and broad—then gently, gently flowed around,
 Then ’neath the caverned earth descending—then spouted up the boiling tide,
 Then stream with stream harmonious blending—swell bubbling up, or smooth
 subside,” etc. etc.

They say there are millions of such lines, not indeed as good as these, for these are the best we could find, but of the same measure and metrical flow.

Besides theology and poetry, the Sanscrit literature embraces jurisprudence, mathematics, history, geography, medicine, fables, the drama, tales. But we will merely cast a brief glance at their philosophy, for the especial purpose of showing the advance made by Sanscrit thinkers in recondite matters of study, and thereby rendering more credible our statements in the philological part of this singular subject.

"It is the professed design of all the schools of Indian philosophy to teach the method by which eternal beatitude (the supreme good) may be attained, either after death or before it.

"The path by which the soul is to arrive at this supreme felicity, is science or knowledge. The discovery, and the setting forth of the means by which this knowledge may be obtained, is the object of the various treatises and commentaries which Hindoo philosophy has produced. A brilliant summary of them will be found in Victor Cousin (*Cours de la Histoire, de la philosophie du XVIII. eme Siecle*, Paris, 1829, fifth and sixth lectures) in which compiling from Colebrooke, and analyzing A. G. Schlegel's Latin version of the Bhagavat Gita, he endeavors to trace among the Hindoo philosophers the Sensualism, the Idealism, the Scepticism, the Fatalism and the Mysticism, of the ancient Grecian and modern European schools.

"In all these are enumerated six principal schools of Hindoo philosophy, first, the Mimansa," etc.¹

Instead of analyzing these six schools we give a single specimen: "True knowledge consists, according to Capila, one of their sages, in a right discrimination of the principles, perceptible and imperceptible, of the material world, from the sensitive and cognitive principle, which is the immaterial soul.

"Twenty-five of these principles are enumerated. The first, from which all the others are derived is Prakiti, nature; termed the chief one, the universal, material cause. The second principle is intelligence, or the great one, the first production of nature. And so on, to the twenty-fifth which is the soul. It (the soul) is multitudinous, individual, sensitive, eternal, unalterable, immaterial."

So far philosophy, of which the reader may study multitudinous Sanscrit books, if he will.

¹ Adeling.

We come now to the most interesting part of our subject, a notice of the great discovery of our times in philology.

To understand the basis of comparative philology, the idea conveyed in this science by the word *root* is to be clearly fixed in the mind. It is this. Every word may be reduced to an element; to an ultimate source from which it sprang. And it is in the mode in which language grows from these roots that the great difference or similarity exists among them. Bopp with A. W. Von Schlegel divides all languages into three classes: "First, languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of contraction, and hence without organism, without grammar. This class comprises Chinese, where all is hitherto bare root, and where the grammatical categories, and secondary relations after the main point, can only be discovered from the position of the roots in the sentence.

"Secondly, languages with monosyllabic roots which are capable of combination, and obtained their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone. The chief principle of the formation of words, in this class, appears to me to lie in the combination of verbal and pronominal roots, which together represent, as it were, body and soul. To this class belong the Sanscrit family of languages, and moreover all other languages so far as they are not comprehended under classes first and third, and have maintained themselves in a condition which renders it possible to trace back their forms of words to the simplest elements.

"Thirdly, languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single supporters of the fundamental meaning. This class comprehends merely the Semitic languages, and produces its grammatical forms, not simply by combination, like the second class, but by a mere internal modification of the roots. We here gladly award to the Sanscrit family of languages a great superiority over the Semitic, which we do not however find in the use of inflections as syllables *per se* devoid of meaning, but in the copiousness of these grammatical additions, which are really significative, and connected with words used isolated; in the judicious, ingenious selection and application of them, and the accurate and acute defining of various relations, which hereby becomes possible; finally in the beautiful adjustment of these additions to a harmonious whole, which bears the appearance of an organized body."¹

¹ Bopp's Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuani-

To make this plainer we present two or three other sentences from the same work.

“ In the Semitic languages in decided opposition to those of the Sanscrit family, the vowels belong not to the root, but to the grammatical motion, the secondary ideas, and the mechanism of the construction of the word. A Semitic root is unpronounceable, because, in giving it vowels, an advance is made to a special grammatical form, and it then no longer possesses the simple peculiarity of a root raised above all grammar. But in the Sanscrit family of languages, if its oldest state is consulted in the languages which have continued most pure, the root appears as a circumscribed nucleus which is almost unalterable, and which surrounds itself with foreign syllables, whose origin we must investigate, and whose destination is, to express the secondary ideas of grammar which the root itself cannot express. The vowel, with this or that consonant, and sometimes without any consonant whatever, belongs to the fundamental meaning; it can be lengthened to the highest degree or raised, and this lengthening and raising with other similar modifications ‘ belong not to the denoting of grammatical relations, which require to be more clearly pointed out, but only to the mechanism, the symmetry of construction.’ ”—*Ib.* pp. 98, 9.

This Sanscrit or Indo-European family, so called, because the Sanscrit is its basis, and because it is now ascertained beyond doubt that the Sanscrit and European languages generally, are of the same construction, and that they differ essentially from the languages of Western Asia, consists of the following: I. The Sanscrit. II. The Zend, the language of Zoroaster, of the Zend-Avesta, and of the ancient fire-worshippers, which is said to be connected with Sanscrit as brother and sister, with which is to be united the modern Persian. Of the languages in the arrow-headed character we will speak presently. The ten great languages of India are thus given by Colebrooke. The northern and eastern which have the greatest affinity for Sanscrit are:

1. Sareswata, which is perhaps the proper Prakrit (though all these ten languages are sometimes called by that name).

2. Hindí the ground-work of the Hindustaní.

3. Bengalí.

4. Maithila or Tirhutiya.

5. Utcala or Odradésá.

These are sometimes called the Five Gaur tribes.

an, Gothic, German and Slavonic languages. Translated principally by Lt. Eastwick, assisted by Prof. Wilson. London, 1845. Vol. I. pp. 101, 102.

The southern and western, sometimes called the Five Dravids, are :

1. Tamil.
2. Mahráttá.
3. Carnáta.
4. Telinga.
5. Guzarattí.

We have already mentioned the two theories in relation to their connection with the Sanscrit.

III. The third undoubted family of the Indo-European class is the Greek language with its dialects. IV. The Latin, with its descendants Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, the latter of which of course have other elements, also Indo-European in the main. V. The Slavonic branch, Russian, Polish, Lithuanian, Bohemian, unless Lithuanian be an intermediary between Slavonic and the tribes further west. VI. The Scandinavian.¹ VII. The Celtic, including the old Irish, Highland Scottish, Erse, etc. VIII. The Gothic or Teutonic, from which comes German and the main basis of English. IX. The Dutch with Flemish, etc. Besides these there may be other Asiatic languages north of India of the same family.² The brilliant discovery mainly due to

¹ Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, pp. 78, 9, makes the Low German include, "1. The Scandinavian languages, Icelandic, Swedish and Danish. 2. The Low German dialects, peculiarly so called, Anglo-Saxon, Frisian, Flemish and Dutch. 3. The Old Gothic." He thinks the Low German very much the more ancient in Europe. "Slavonian and Lithuanian" he "puts in the same class with the oldest Low-German dialects."

The tribes who speak Slavonian he thus enumerates: "The Russians and Rusniaks, the Bulgarians, Servians, Bosnians, Dalmatians, Croats, the Wends and Sorbs in Lusatia and Saxony, the Slovaks in Hungary, the Bohemians, Moravians, Poles and Silesians."

² The question as to how far the Tartars are Indo-European is an interesting one. Eichhoff, "Vergleichung der Sprachen von Europa und Indien," says in his general division of the Persian languages of the Indo-European stock, "Um sie her leben, mehr oder minder entfernt, verschiedene rohe Sprachen, das Afghanische im Reiche Kabul, das Balutschi an den Grenzen Indiens, das Kurdische bei den Gebirgsbewohnern Persiens und das bei einem Stamme des Kaukasus erhaltene Osetische, ein altes Ueberbleibsel aus der Zeit der grossen Wanderung der indischen Völker nach Europa," p. 23.

Ritter (*Erdkunde*, Berlin, Vol. VII. pp. 604 sq.) has some very interesting information on this point: He says there are six tribes or divisions of "Indo-germanischen blaüngigen Völkern," whose country is East-Turkistan, and they appear, according to him, to have ranged from the frontiers of Persia to China, one tribe of them, according to a Chinese fragment which comes through a Romish missionary, having entered into close relations with the Chinese government about the time of the Advent. This curious document is given by Ritter at length.

Bopp is that these are all essentially one, and all based as the earliest existing monument upon Sanscrit.

The proof of this is in its nature cumulative. It depends very much upon a careful observation of a thousand particulars. General statements without these lose much of their force. A summary is all we can attempt.

One source of proof has been already mentioned,—the essential difference in the structure of the three great classes of languages. It will be seen by careful examination that this is indeed radical. So that Hebrew in its main structure is almost as widely removed from Greek on the one hand as from Chinese on the other.

Another source is the wonderful similarity of words which have passed through the whole range of these languages radically unchanged. When the lapse of twenty-five centuries is considered, and the immense variety of the nations involved in the analysis, the result is astonishing. We have only room for a meagre specimen.¹ E. g.

| Sanscrit. | Zend. | Greek. | Latin. | Lithuanian. | Gothic. | German. | English. |
|-----------|---------|--------------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|---------------|
| dehitâr | daghdâs | θυγάτηρ | | duktė | dahtar | | daughter |
| bhâitâ | boitâ | | frater | | brōthar | | brother |
| pitar | paita | πατήρ | pater | | | vater | father |
| nâmâ | nâmâ | | nomen | | namô | | name |
| chatrâras | | τέτταρες | quatuor | kettari | fidvôr | vier | four |
| panchar | | πέντε, πέμπε | quinque | penki | fünf | fünf | five |
| pansa | | χήν | anser | | | gans | gander, goose |
| jânu | | γόνυ | gonu | kniu | | kuie | knee |

Another very striking mode of proof is this: Different families of the great class of Indo-European languages have seized upon different parts of the same Sanscrit word and carried them off, so that although there may be no apparent similarity between the word in the two widely separated branches, yet by tracing each to the intermediary Sanscrit root, the identity may be established. We might compare this to two roads starting from a common point: the places reached at the end of a hundred miles are widely separated, yet by tracing each road back separately, we arrive at the common starting-point. It is to be observed that the examples given are often much more striking when we advert to the uniform laws which regulate the interchange of letters in these languages. Take some examples:

The Sanscrit for *dog* is svân, in the genitive súnas, from which comes the Greek κυνός, Latin canis. Take now the other direc-

¹ Bopp, ubi sup.

tion sván, Lithuanian szuns, German hunds, English hound, and we have the identity of canis and hound.

Cf. German schwester and Italian sorella.

Thus: Sanscrit svasr̥, Gothic svistar, Germ. schwester—sister.

Sanscrit accusative svasâram, Latin sororem, Ital. sorella.

Cf. Greek κεφαλή and German haupt—head.

Thus: Sanscrit kapála—κεφαλή,

kapála—caput, Gothic hanbith, Old high Germ. houpit, haupt—head.

It thus appears that in very many instances the true method for establishing a connection between words which appear diverse in the European languages is to trace both to the common root in the Sanscrit. The proof becomes complete in proportion to the number of examples.

It is not only however in the similarity of words that the Sanscrit manifests itself as the basis of the European dialects. The similarity is seen also in the grammatical structure of both. It is manifest, for example, in the case-terminations, and in the fact that they are very much made up of original pronouns annexed to the nouns. Here, however, it is necessary to attend to the grand characteristic of this class of languages as distinguished from the other two, viz. the power of the root to gather as a nucleus a structure around itself. A specimen or two of this process may not be unacceptable.

The idea of the root *sta* is "planting oneself firmly." Accordingly *sthá* in Sanscrit is "to stand." The Zend has *hi-sta-mi*, with the same meaning. In Greek we have *i-στη-μι*, the same root with the *a* softened to an *η*. The Gothic has *standa*, the old High German *stant*, present German *stand*, English *stand*, Latin *sto*, *stare*. Observe how all the formations crystallize around *sta*. E. g. in English: *staunch*, that which stands firmly; *con-si-st-ent*, that which stands always in the same position; *stan-dard*, that which stands as a rallying-point; *stanza*, lines regularly adjusted to each other *en colonne*; *sta-ke*, that which is planted down firmly. Open now your Greek Lexicon at the root *στα*, you find *σταδαίος*, standing upright, hence firm; *στάθμη*, a plumb-line; *σταθμός*, a post; *στακτός*, that which falls drop by drop as water in a cavern which finally petrifies into a rocky pillar; *στάλιξ* or *-λίς*, a pole to which nets are fastened; *στάμνος*, a jar which standing erect holds liquids; *στάχυς*, a spike of grain, etc. Open your Latin dictionary: *stabilitas*, *statua*, *statutum*, *stator*, *stamen*, *status*, *stagnò*, etc. Open your German dictionary: *Staat*, a state,

that which supports everything, government; stamm, trunk of a tree; stange, a pole; starr, to be stiff, numb; stannen, to stand astonished; stave, stove; standhaft, firm, durable, etc.

In order to show the immediate change take a different root, the Sanscrit Plu or Plo, Flu or Flo, for soft P is F, and throughout the whole family there is a tendency in U and O to amalgamate. The idea here is that of flowing, overflowing. We will begin with the Greek: πλέω, to sail, to fluctuate; φλέω, to flow; φλιθάω, to overflow; φλόξ, flame which waves or undulates; φλύω, to swell, overflow with frivolous talking; πλέως, πίμπλημι, etc. idea of fulness; φλέων, φλέως, φλοῖος, φλευός, epithets of Bacchus, all expressive of the fulness of the generative powers of nature,¹ φλοῖστος, a confused, roaring, overflowing noise, etc. Turn to the Latin: Flamma, flo, to blow or cast metal; flecto, to bend or bow; flos, fluctus, fluidus, flumen, fluo, etc. German: Flacken, to flicker like a candle; flage, a quagmire; flattern, to flutter; fliehen, to fly; floss, running water; flügel, wing; fluth, flood, etc. Spanish: fláco, dejected, frail; flagnear, to slacken, grow remiss; flotar, to float; floxel, down; fluco, fringe; fluir, to flow, etc. French: Flatter, flamme, fleur, fletrir, fleurir, flotter, etc. English, the same; flow, flute, float, flood, etc.

It is hardly necessary to observe that these can by no possibility be accidental coincidences. The moment you obtain the correct root and the law of its development it can be traced more strongly or more weakly through the whole Indo-European *freundschaft*.

We do not mean to say that there are not exceptions, but they are generally such as confirm the rule. The fertile fancy of philologists will also bring forward occasionally something fanciful, far-fetched and ill-founded, but the direction of the main current of proof is clear and unequivocal.

In answer to the inquiry as to the possibility of the preservation of the very same forms of speech through thousands of years, among climes remote as spicy India, and sunny Iceland, from the torrid to the frozen zone, under every form of religion from ponderous Brahmanism to that of the wild Scandinavian, from the fervid fire-worshipper to the calm and sober Anglo-Saxon Christian, from the dominions of the Grand Mogul and the autocrat of all the Russias to republican America, we would reply that nothing is so tenacious as the modes of speech, and the traditions that live in the hearts of the people. Like the sports of child-

¹ V. Liddell and Scott's Lex. in voc. φλέω.

ren' that are handed down from generation to generation with elastic vigor, speech is something that transcends law, that interferes not with religion, that embalms the sacred associations of home.

But then this marvellous similarity of speech rests after all, upon a similarity of character in all the families of this extensive groupe, modified indeed by all the circumstances mentioned, but still the same in essence. We shall return to this point so soon as we shall have examined an element of the subject which is at this moment becoming one of deep interest. We refer to the recent decyphering of the arrow-headed characters.

This subject demands a separate and more extended investigation than we can here accord to it. All we can now do is to give a very general sketch sufficient to place in a clear light its relation to the discovery of Bopp.

At Persepolis, Babylon, Behistun or Bisitun, and other places of ancient Assyria and Persia, are found on splendid buildings, on pillars, bricks and rocks smoothed for the purpose, numerous inscriptions. They are written in a peculiar character which from its form is called wedge-shaped, or arrow-headed. This character is peculiar to these regions, and is very extensively employed. Particular arrangements, or combinations of these characters apparently belonged to different nations speaking different languages.² What is particularly remarkable about them is that they are all composed of a single character resembling an arrow-head placed sometimes vertically, sometimes horizontally or sloping at an angle, and again with its base so'fixed against the base of another precisely similar, as to form a wedge. In the inscriptions at Babylon the notch in the arrow does not appear to be so perceptible, and straight lines seem to be freely introduced.³

In Fiske's Eschenburg's Manual it is stated that the first hint towards decyphering this character seems to have been obtained by Champollion from a twofold inscription upon an Egyptian ala-

¹ Blackstone's Comm.

² See for the whole subject Mr. Bartlett's pamphlet on the Progress of Ethnology, New York, 1847. As we have the best reason to know that his statements are from original sources, we have quoted freely from them, to save the necessity of going over a variety of pamphlets and periodicals published abroad.

London Quarterly Review, March 1847. It contains a sketch of the arrow-headed discoveries together with those at Nineveh. The statements are rather general.

³ Vide inscription in Fiske's Eschenburg's Manual, pl. XXXVIII. 4th edit., said to be a copy from a Babylonian brick in the Boston Athenaeum.

baster vase presenting the name of Xerxes, one part having it in the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the other in the Persepolitan arrow-heads, and that after this Lichtenstein, Grotefend and Lassen turned their attention to the subject.¹ Mr. Bartlett and the London Quarterly Reviewer do not mention this but both begin with Grotefend as the original discoverer. It will be observed that there is nothing here like the Rosetta stone to guide the inquirer except so far as the hint mentioned above from Champolion may be well-founded. Prof. Grotefend started with the idea that the building at Persepolis which contained the inscriptions was a royal palace, and the work of one of the great monarchs of Persia. "He observed that a number of these wedges or angles, of larger or smaller size, perpendicular or horizontal, grouped together, were usually divided from each other in the Persepolitan inscriptions by a peculiar sign, and he rightly concluded that each of these groups formed a letter. These letters are read in their uniform direction from left to right."² On some of the monuments at Persepolis are inscriptions in the Pehlevi³ character, parts

¹ Fourth edit. p. 316. sect. 4. Six authorities are given to the section, but it is not distinctly indicated upon which this statement rests.

² Quart. Rev. ubi sup., note by reviewer. "In one of the works before us, Tychsen and Bp. Münter are said to have discovered this important sign." In all of Prof. Fiske's inscriptions, (four in number independently of the brick from Babylon,) the divisions of letters are made by a point like our period, except in the Persepolitan interpretation of the hieroglyphic writing on the vase read by Champolion, where there are no division-marks. It consists of but a few words. The inscriptions given by Fiske from the Zend, Pehlevi, and "a more modern character" have the same point. If these copies are correctly made, there would seem to be no great mystery about this "important sign."

³ The Persian languages are thus set forth by Rask (Ueber das Alter und die Echtheit der Zendsprache, Berlin, 1826,) as Englished by Prof. Anthon, (Indo-Germanic Analogies, appended to Greek Prosody, p. 202). "The Persian family has for its primitive type the Zend preserved in the Zend-Avesta. It was spoken by the ancient Persians, as the *Pehlevi*, another idiom intermingled with Chaldee, was spoken by the Medes and Parthians. They were written in cuneiform characters before having special alphabets. The Zend and Pehlevi were displaced about the commencement of our era by the *Parsi* a dialect of the same family. It became the dominant idiom of the empire and preserved itself pure and unaltered until the Mohammedan invasion, when from an union of the Arabic with the national idiom arose the Modern Persian. Connected with the Persian, amongst others, is the tongue of the Ossetes, in the range of Caucasus, which is said to afford indubitable traces of the great migration of Indian communities into Europe." We should like much to know the ultimate authority for this last remark. It involves a point of deep interest in more than one relation. Bopp speaks in very high terms of Rask. Comp. Gram. Pref. viii. note, particularly of his work "On the Thracian tribe of Languages," where, though he (Rask) had not then the Sanscrit, Bopp says, "he almost everywhere halts half-way towards the truth."

of which have been decyphered by De Sacy. In one of these the titles and name of a king are often repeated; these M. Grotefend thought might be repeated in the same manner in the arrow-headed character.

"In these inscriptions one groupe of characters were repeated more frequently than any other. According to the analogy of the Pehlevi inscriptions, decyphered by De Sacy, it was believed that these were the names of kings who were father and son. An examination of the bas-reliefs together with the Greek historians convinced Grotefend that he must look for the kings of the dynasty of the Achæmenides. These names could obviously not be Cyrus and Cambyses, because the names occurring in the inscriptions do not begin with the same letter; Cyrus and Artanes were equally inapplicable, the first being too short, and the latter too long; there only remained therefore the names of Darius and Xerxes. The next step was to ascertain what their names were in the old Persian language, as they came to us through the Greek. This he obtained through the Zend of the Zend-Avesta. Xerxes turns out to be Kshershe or Ksharsha; and Darius Dareush, and king Kshe or Ksheio (shat). He thus translated two short inscriptions and formed a considerable portion of an alphabet. This was accomplished by 1833."¹

Grotefend was followed by Rask, Burnouf and Lassen who (in Europe with the materials already collected) each accomplished something. Rask discovered two characters, and Lassen in his various works "has identified at least twelve characters which had been mistaken by all his predecessors."

Major Rawlinson, an officer of the East India Company's army, next addressed himself with great zeal to this subject on the ground. He was occupied ten years. His discoveries were announced in London in a memoir, read before the Royal Asiatic Society in 1839, but were not published *in extenso* until 1846. It is an interesting fact that Rawlinson found, when after laboring for some time he received Lassen's Researches, that he had already discovered all Lassen's new characters except one. It will be observed, however, that not only an alphabet but the structure of the language was needed. This Grotefend had not, but Rawlinson obtained it through the Zend, and by means especially of "Burnouf's Commentary on the Yazna," where the Zend is investigated in its grammatical structure. Finally, he

¹ Bartlett abridged.

succeeded in translating four hundred lines of the inscription on the Behistun tablets.

These tablets are found in the midst of ancient Media not far from the modern city of Kermanshah.¹ There rises a high precipitous mountain the lower part of which is smoothed, and upon it is sculptured a figure trampling on a prostrate rebel with nine other captives fettered. With this is a Persepolitan writing in nearly 1000 lines—400 of which, as stated, Rawlinson has decyphered. It is an inscription of Darius Hystaspes, giving his genealogy, victories, and the provinces over which he reigned. He describes the manner in which he obtained the crown, and ascribes all the glory of his power to Ormuzd. It is a wonderful discovery. One fancies he can hear Herodotus rejoicing from his grave.

The Persepolitan tablets are trilingual. Professor Westergaard, a Dane, has opened to us an acquaintance with the second variety of characters. He calls it Median, the first being named old Persian. Starting with the idea that these were but translations of the first, which was fully confirmed, he proceeded to construct an alphabet. He also investigated on the ground. The additional inscriptions decyphered by him are of Xerxes. They consist of praises to Ormuzd for blessings received and to himself for the additions he made to the royal palace at Persepolis.²

Major Rawlinson has made some advance on the third class of Persepolitan characters called the Achæmenian-Babylonian. Prof. Grotefend has also devoted some attention to them.

Rawlinson makes three grand divisions of the arrow-headed characters, viz. the Persian, the Median and the Babylonian. The Babylonian he subdivides into five, viz. the primitive Babylonian, the Achæmenian-Babylonian, the Medo-Assyrian, the Assyrian, and the Elymean. Westergaard however makes only five divisions in all, viz. the three kinds on the trilingual tablets of Persia. The Persian, the Median and the one called by Rawlinson the Achæmenian-Babylonian, together with the Assyrian and Old Babylonian.³

These discoveries together with those resulting from the excavations of Layard and Botta, near the site of Nineveh, are interesting and exciting in a high degree, and may lead to remarkable results. Our object however is simply to consider them in

¹ London Quart. Review ubi sup.

² Bartlett.

³ Ib. and Quart. Review.

a philological point of view, and as connected with the place assigned by Bopp to the Sanscrit.

The old Persian as decyphered is found to exhibit close affinities both to the Sanscrit and Zend. It is entirely alphabetic. The Median, as it is called by Westergaard, contains according to him "one hundred characters of which seventy-four are syllabic, twenty-four alphabetic, and two signs of divisions between words." He does not pretend to decide upon the family-relation of this language though "he considers that it belongs to the Scythian rather than to the Japhetic class of languages, in which opinion Major Rawlinson coincides."¹

If this is dark, the darkness becomes deeper as we inquire into the remainder. Little that is distinct has yet been accomplished in these, but the world will look with deep interest for any light that can be thrown upon the Assyrian or Babylonian language.

In summing up the results it will be perceived that in regard to the language called Median, there is nothing sufficiently certain as yet developed upon which to build any firm theory, and in regard to the old Persian the affinities are clearly and decidedly with the Sanscrit and Zend. The Quarterly Review says: "the discoveries start from the later reigns of the Achæmenian kings, and only through well-grounded knowledge of the Persic form of the arrow-headed character and of the old Persic language, can slowly ascend through the intervening Median dynasties, with their peculiar alphabet, and yet imperfectly conjectured language, up into the mysteries of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires—with their still more difficult, complicated, and, it should seem, five-fold varieties of character—and their language, the descent of which, whether from the Semitic or Indian family is yet an unresolved problem."

Mr. Turner, of the New York Union Theological Seminary, who has been investigating this subject by an examination of all the recent works which have reached this country, has favored the writer with the following remarks. Mr. T. disclaims being considered an authority on the subject. Of that the reader can judge.

Mr. Turner writes as follows: "The discoveries of Lassen, Rawlinson and Westergaard do not in the least degree shake the conclusions of Bopp respecting the Sanscrit as the basis of the Indo-European languages. The latest views of Lassen and Rawlinson, as far as regards the decyphering and translating of the in-

¹ Bartlett, p. 226.

scriptions, are nearly coincident. Their principal difference of opinion may be called a theoretical one, and has respect to the relative age and position of the old Persian, the language of the inscriptions. Messrs. Burnouf and Lassen place the Zend and Vedic Sanscrit on a par, and declare that when we compare the language of the Persepolitan inscriptions with that of the Zend-Avesta, we perceive that the former bears to the latter the same relation that the Italian does to the Latin, or the modern to ancient Greek, that is to say, the old Persian has all the characteristics of a language derived from the Zend, which latter, being closely allied with the Sanscrit, bears with it the like traces of antiquity. This opinion is not acceded to by Maj. Rawlinson, who elevates the old Persian, or rather depresses the Sanscrit and Zend considerably in the scale. He places the old Persian on a par with the Vedic Sanscrit, and thus brings down the classical Sanscrit and the Zend to a much later epoch. He even goes so far as to doubt whether the Zend was ever a spoken language. Without going into an original investigation of the subject, it is very easy to account for the discrepancy between these views, and to estimate their respective value. Messrs. Burnouf and Lassen are men living in the heart of learned Europe, leaders in the new school of philology which has sprung up in the present age, and whose information, so to speak, is kept posted up to the latest date. Maj. Rawlinson, on the contrary, is not a philologist by profession, is ignorant of the German language, and is so secluded from the literary world by his position in the centre of Asia, that he cannot procure a sight of the books that most intimately concern him till years after their publication. It is thus easy to conceive that, in spite of his great learning and sagacity, and his enthusiastic devotion to the studies in which all his leisure is engaged, his writings should be tinged with the obsolete views of British scholars of the last century, and show an imperfect acquaintance with the texts now relied upon to determine the relative antiquity of languages belonging to the same stock. Taking these circumstances into consideration, we see that the views of Lassen and Burnouf in this respect are entitled to by far the greater weight.

“ I give you a brief view of the language and its relations as furnished by Lassen in the sixth volume of the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlands*. This will enable you to form a judgment on the subject for yourself.

“ *Letters.*—The vowels are the original *a, i, u* (Rawlinson finds

the diphthongs *au, ai*, etc.); no derivative vowels, *e, o*. In the consonants we find three series, viz. Surds mute and aspirated, and Sonant mute.

| | | | | | | |
|---------|--------|----|-----|-----|------|----|
| Surd, | { mute | p, | t, | s, | ch, | k |
| | { asp. | f, | th, | sh, | chh, | kh |
| Sonant, | | b, | d, | z, | j, | g |

The aspirated sonants *v, dh*, etc. of the Sanscrit, some of which are also found in the Zend, are wanting in the old Persian, which in this respect forms the transition to the Greek and Gothic.

"*Declensions*.—The remains of the old Persian are sufficient to show that in the time of the Achæmenides it possessed nearly the whole stock of inflexions belonging to the Asian languages. Still it is inferior in completeness to the Sanscrit and even to the Zend, and manifests a tendency to confound the Cases by rejecting certain final articulations as *t* and *n*, and also *s* after *a* and *â*. The Dual also seems to have vanished, at least in the verb. Of the eight cases of the Sanscrit and Zend, the Locative is the only one not yet found in a separate form, the Instrumental appearing to be used instead of it. The name of the Deity, *Ormuzd*, occurs in the following forms:

| | |
|------|--------------|
| Nom. | Āuramazdâ |
| Acc. | Auramazdām |
| Dat. | Auramazdâija |
| Gen. | Auramazdâhâ |
| Voc. | Auramazdâ |

Of the Personal Pronouns we have:

| | Sanscr. | Zend. | Old Pers. |
|-----------|---------|-------|-----------|
| 1st Pers. | aham, | azem, | adam |
| 3rd Pers. | sva, | hva, | hawa |

The second person has not been found. Other pronouns exhibit a like correspondence.

"*Conjugations*.—From the nature of the inscriptions which consist in great measure of titles and proper names, the forms of verbs are not exhibited in such fulness as those of the nouns. Still examples are preserved of the Present, Imperfect, Aorist, Perfect and Future; besides the Indicative mode, the Imperative occurs in the Middle voice, whereas the other forms are in the Active. Only one example is found of the Optative, which mode is usually re-placed by forms of the Imperfect. The Imperfect tense of the verb *to do* will serve as a specimen of conjugation:

| | Sanscrit. | Old Pers. |
|-------|---------------|-----------|
| Sing. | 1. akrínávam, | aqunwam |
| | 3. akrínót, | aqunus' |
| Plur. | 1. akrínómia, | aqumá |
| | 3. akrínvam, | aqunwa |

"Lassen considers that the *old Persian* was the language of the ancient Persians in the time of the Achæmenides, the *Zend* of the east of Persia, whence its close affinities to the language of India; and that both the old Persian and *Zend* descend from a common source. The *Pehlevi* shows itself as a living language only during the times of the Sassanides. It was the language of western Iran, and consists of two elements, an Iranian and an Aramean. It is the first monument that appears after the old Persian, and serves in many respects to show the mode of transition of the ancient language into the modern. It is already modern Persian in its essential characteristics. The *Pâzend* was a dialect parallel with the *Pehlevi*, but which attaches itself immediately to the *Zend*."

We return, in conclusion, to the point of similarity in character in the nations, who speak the Indo-European languages.

"God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." So spake the voice of the Almighty by his servant Noah, upwards of four thousand years ago by Ararat. Comparative philology affords us another beautiful illustration of this passage. The testimony of the great German scholars is unequivocal that the Indo-European languages are by far the most powerful in the world, the natural language of the ruling race. Their mode of development from their own substance, and the manner in which they lay the strong hand upon everything in other tongues which suits their own genius, shows the spirit of the conquering and *annexing* race. How wonderful the law by which the speakers of Indo-European tongues, the Japhetan race are everywhere victorious! Commencing from the mountains of Caucasus they fill the best parts of the world. In India the Brahmans, the speakers of Sanscrit, have impressed their religion and language upon a hundred millions, whose government is Anglo-Saxon, Japhet dwelling in the tents of Shem. Northern Asia and Northern Europe are ruled by the Slavonic family proven by Bopp to be of the race of Japhet. Shem yields everywhere, except always in Arabia where Ishmael lives before God invincible in answer to the prayer of Abraham, his friend. But mark where Japhet, meets Japhet in his own fastnesses!

Proud England and proud Russia know the names of Affghanistan and Circassia! The Grecian Alexander of the Thracian family of Japhet overran Asia, and the empire of Japhetan Rome was enlarged till it became universal. The unconquered seakings of Scandinavia carried Sanscrit forms along the coasts of the frozen North, and the Gothic tribes filled Central Europe with another form of the same speech. The Vandal, the Frank and the Celt bear witness of their race in their language. And last, not least, the Anglo-Saxons are the very essence of the race, the most essentially Japhetan of all Japhet's family. And the English language, which (harmony and copiousness apart) for pure strength, may be called the noblest mode of human speech, is stretching its conquering wing from India to California.

May we not look into the vista of the dim future with two ideas struggling within us? In pursuing the study of language we may carry the torch lighted by Teutonic genius into one twilight cavern after another, and so classify tongues by some high analysis, as to teach not so much, laboriously one, or two languages, as the principles of all. And, again, may we not, as is obscurely hinted by one of the Germans, by this inductive process look to the bringing of mankind so near together in the understanding of their respective modes of speech, and in the investigation of what in language lies nearest to nature, as that a nearer approximation may be made to an universal language? The arts are bringing mankind into near physical connection, the prevalence of a pure Christianity will bring them into moral union; might we hope to bring together the elements of speech into the light of philosophy, so that this great jargon of conflicting tongues may give way to finer combinations, and we speak not with the tongues of men but of angels?