FILE

Name: Mue848___Mueller_RelationBengaliToArian_BAAS_17_1847.pdf
PURL: http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl/?gr_elib-78
Type: Searchable PDF/A (text under image)
Encoding: Unicode (â î û ...); some diacritics vary from standard
Date: 27.11.2008

BRIEF RECORD

Author: Müller, Friedrich Max
Title: On the Relation of the Bengali to the Arian and Aboriginal Languages of India.
Publ. in: *Report of the Seventeenth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement Of Science; Held at Oxford in June 1847.* London : John Murray 1848, pp. 319–350.

FULL RECORD

www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gr_elib.htm

NOTICE

REPORT

OF THE

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

OF THE

BRITISH ASSOCIATION

FOR THE

ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE;

HELD AT OXFORD IN JUNE 1847.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1848.

On the Relation of the Bengali to the Arian and Aboriginal Languages of India. *By* Dr. MAX MÜLLER.

THE interest which the Bengali language presents to oriental scholars, and which induces them to devote their time to the study of this Indian dialect, may be viewed under *three* different heads, as *practical*, *literary*, and *linguistical*.

On the *first* point, it is hardly necessary to enter into any details. The English people, who have been called to rule the destinies of more than a hundred millions of souls in the East, one-tenth of whom make use of the Bengali as their vernacular dialect, have well understood the duties of those who have been appointed to govern this great oriental empire. Great exertions have been made to give sufficient training to those who are destined to execute the various duties connected with the internal government of India; and it has not been thought enough that they should receive such an education as would entitle them to employments in their own country, but it has been felt that it was peculiarly incumbent upon them to study the languages of the people over whom they were to be placed, not as the sons of a foreign and conquering nation, to raise taxes, to punish disobedience, and to suppress every trace of national feeling, but as men devoted to the higher object of inspiring confidence, of winning affection, and of promoting for the benefit of the native population the benign influence of European civilization. With this view of the mission which the English people have been desirous of fulfilling in India, it could not be considered enough for an officer to understand just so much or so little of Persian and Hindustani, as to decipher representations and complaints, or to convey official decrees to a subject people. For though these two languages may have some claim to be regarded as the official languages of India, particularly among the higher classes of the natives, yet they are, like the French in Europe, unknown to the great mass of the population, and of little use therefore for the ordinary purposes of daily life. Although, then, a prejudice may have prevailed for some time against the study of the vernacular dialects spoken in the large and densely peopled districts of India, it was soon acknowledged, that for local communication and for an immediate and effective intercourse with the people, a knowledge of provincial languages like the *Bengali*, *Marathi*, *Telugu*, *Tamil*, *Carnatika* and *Cingalese*, was of no less importance and necessity than that of the more fashionable Persian and Hindustani.

But, as Professor Wilson, the distinguished president of our Section, whose name is as much cherished by the natives of India as it is esteemed by the learned men of Europe, well remarks, it is not enough to understand the language of a people; the people themselves must be understood with all their popular prejudices, their daily observances, their occupations, their amusements, their domestic and social relations, their local legends, their national traditions, their mythological fables, their metaphysical abstractions, and their religious worship. The best means of acquiring such a knowledge is generally to be found in the literature of the people. It is however necessary to confess that upon this point, namely, the literary interest of the language, the Bengali is poor, and inferior in this respect to most of the other vernacular languages. There existed, indeed, scarcely anything worthy to be called literature in Bengali before the settlement of the missionaries in Bengal, and it is due to their unwearied exertions that the Bengali has become in any sense a literary language, and has arrived at a certain degree of grammatical regularity. Nor need we be surprised at this, when we

remember that in Bengal, the Sanscrit, though no longer a living and spoken language, continued to be employed as the learned language by every literary man, just as in Europe for many centuries we meet with scarcely any literary composition in the language of the people, while voluminous works were composed and circulated in Latin, then in a great measure a dead language.

But though it has been customary for a long time to appreciate the value of a language by either its merely practical use, or by the interest which its literature was capable of exciting, yet the study of languages has, particularly in latter days, taken a new turn, and instead of considering a language only as a useful instrument for social conversation or literary amusement and instruction, men begin at length to understand that language has of itself an intrinsic value, which recommends its study to all those who think it a worthy occupation to investigate the nature of the human mind in its first and primitive manifestation by language, and in the historical progress and individual developments of it, preserved to us in the numberless branches of human speech. This study, usually called *Comparative Philology*, has taken for its base the analytical comparison of the grammatical and etymological structure of language in different countries and ages, and has succeeded, by pointing out striking affinities as well as characteristical discrepancies, in arranging the languages of the most prominent nations of the world into great families, which have spread from the south to the north in many and diverse forms, though at the same time united by unextinguishable marks of a former unity and affiliation. With this discovery, a new æra in the history of philology has arisen, and it is India which, by its ancient language, the Sanscrit, has placed the *Ariadnic* thread in the hands of European scholars, like Rask, F. Schlegel, W. von Humboldt, Bopp, Burnouf, Grimm and others, who were endeavouring to find their way through the intricate paths of the labyrinth of human speech.

It is therefore no exaggeration to call Sanscrit the *language of languages*, since it is only by means of it that we have arrived at any real understanding of the other languages as languages, and since it is the Sanscrit chiefly which has made those languages speak out distinctly, and has unveiled to us their real origin, character and meaning. Sir William Jones, when he first became acquainted with the Sacred language of India, said, "The Sanscrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a strong affinity;" and it would be difficult to characterise this language better than in the words of Mr. Brian Hodgson, who was so long resident in Nepal, "that it is a speech, capable of giving soul to the objects of sense, and body to the abstractions of metaphysics."

The great advantage however which Sanscrit offers to the study of Comparative Philology, consists not only in the perspicuous originality of its grammatical structure, and in the rich variety of its etymological derivations, but in the opportunities which it affords to us of following the history of a language through all the stages of its development, from the early period of its Vedic Inspiration, through that of its Epic poetry; its didactic moral and legal compositions; its philosophical speculations, dramatic representations and lyrical effusions, down to that which may be called its Alexandrine period, and the age of the final extinction of all its vital principles; while even then it exhibits a new and not less interesting phasis, by exhibiting to us the most striking and instructive analogies with the origin and

development of what we generally call the *Romance languages*. For, as the old language of Rome and Italy, after losing its vital strength and expressive power, and after entering into a state of entire stagnation and putrefaction, formed thereby a kind of mould, or as Chevalier Bunsen has called it yesterday, a kind of humus, from which again a variety of other languages sprung up, full of new life, and fit to serve the intellectual wants of a new age, so we see in India different modern dialects arising from the tomb of the Sanscrit language.

Among these new languages the Bengali has the highest claims on our attention, because it has preserved a closer affinity to the Sanscrit than any one of the other derived languages.

All the languages now spoken in India, with the exception of the dialects of some savage Vindhya tribes, may be divided into two great classes, viz. those of the north and those of the south, of which the northern have strong claims to an Indo-Germanic origin, while the southern seem to be more closely connected with the language of the aboriginal and non-brahminical inhabitants of India, modified to a greater or less degree, particularly in their literary employment, by the influence of the dominant Sanscrit. But even in the north of India, and among a people who, immigrating into this country, brought with them their own language, religion and civilization, there existed many dialectic differences which are not to be considered as mere corruptions from the Sanscrit, but as independent contemporaneous idioms. These are generally called the *Pracrit* dialects; and some of them have their own peculiar name, derived from the countries wherein they were spoken, as for instance, the *Sauraséni*, the language of *Surasena*, the *Sárasvata*, spoken on the banks of the *Sarasvatí*, the *Magadhi* or *Pali*, the language of *Magadha*, and probably the dialect spoken in this country at the time when the Buddhistical religion took its historical origin, and therefore employed by the founders of that system, who, addressing themselves to the people, were obliged to use the native language, instead of the then already obscure idiom of the sacred books of the Brahmins. It may be observed that in the Vedic hymns also, which belonged to different *Arian* families and congregations who settled in India, some dialectic differences and many grammatical discrepancies occur, which sometimes bear a slight resemblance to Pracrit forms; a fact, of which my learned friend Dr. Weber, who has promised an edition of the *Yajurveda*, intends to afford ample proofs from the hymns and Brahmanas of this Veda. As far however as our knowledge goes at present, we must consider the Sanscrit of the Vedas, together with the whole classical literature of the Hindús, as a language dialectically differing from the Pracrit, though both branches derive their origin from the same source. They stand to each other in a relation similar to that in which the High German stands to the Low German, that is to say, they proceed with a sort of parallelism, sometimes approaching each other very nearly, sometimes diverging considerably, so that a person speaking the one would find great difficulty in understanding the other at first, yet, if living in the same place, with frequent communications with the people who were speaking the other, he would find much greater facilities in acquiring a knowledge of this dialect than of any really foreign language.

This must, indeed, have been the fact in India. *First*, we see at the time of Buddhism, people in daily intercourse speaking these two languages; *then* we are told that the author of the most famous *Pracrit* grammar, *Katyáyana*, was the same who wrote additional notes to the great work on Sans-

crit grammar by *Panini*, his contemporary or immediate predecessor; and, finally, we find in one branch of *Sanscrit* literature, which was more than any other destined for the higher as well as for the lower classes, viz. in the dramatic compositions, a constant mixture of *Sanscrit* and *Pracrit* dialects, which unfold there an unexpected wealth of melodious poetry. Strange as such a combination of different dialects may seem, we find a similar fact in Italy, where each of the masked persons in the *Comedie dell' arte* was originally intended as a kind of characteristic representation of some particular Italian district or town. Thus *Pantaleone* was a Venetian merchant, *Dottore* a Bolognese physician, *Spaviento* a Neapolitan braggadoccio, *Pullicinello* a wag of Apulia, and *Arlechino* a blundering servant of Bergamo. Each of these personages was clad in a peculiar dress; each had his peculiar mask, and each spoke the dialect of the place which he represented. Besides these and a few other such personages, of which at least four were introduced into each play, there were the Amorosos and Inamoratas, that is, some men and women who acted various parts with *Smeraldina*, *Colombina*, *Spiletta* and other females, who played the parts of *servettas* or waiting-maids. All these spoke Tuscan or Roman, and wore no masks.

All the Indian dialects, which under their ancient form are hardly surpassed by the Sanscrit itself in the copiousness and originality of their grammatical forms, had, as the language of a great portion of the people, an ever-increasing influence upon the modern languages of India, and entered largely into the formation of almost all the spoken dialects in the north, while in Bengali, except some analogous corruptions by contraction and assimilation, which every language undergoes in the mouth of a people, there are very few traces of the *Pracrit* dialects. I consider therefore the Bengali, as the modern *Sanscrit* standing to its parent, the old and classical Sanscrit, almost in the same relation as the modern High German to the old High German, as the modern Italian to the language of Rome.

The differences which I have tried to point out in the course of my grammatical analysis of the Bengali language, are chiefly these: the great variety of suffixes and internal changes of words, which served to express the different local and causal relations which one object may have with another, that is, the whole system of the ancient declensions is almost entirely lost, because the people corrupting the form and forgetting the proper meaning of those formative syllables could no longer express by them what they wished; they substituted therefore for them new and expressive suffixes, employed prepositions, and had recourse to compounds, in order to express an idea which the older language was able to express by the simple changes of a vowel. The same thing took place in the system of conjugations, where the old and simple forms were, with few exceptions, superseded by periphrastical formations. Besides, the meanings of the words were themselves subject to the same influence; they became emaciated and debilitated, and after losing soul and body, were degraded into a kind of conventional money, like paper currency, well adapted for a modern age. In the same manner, as we hardly feel what we are expressing, for instance, by the words "I thank you," words, indeed, which have become a mere conventional phrase or sound, in uttering which we do not reflect that they originally mean, "I shall think often of it;" the natives of Bengal say *kitojno* or *somboddho hoy*. In the ancient language, however, *Kṛitajnah* expresses still the real meaning of *knowing* (*jnah*) what has been *done* (*kṛita*), and *sambaddhah*, if the word was at all employed in this sense, had still the meaning of being *bound*

to a person, while in Bengali it is nothing more than the modern English phrase, "very much obliged."

I do not pretend at present to enter more into this subject, which can only be sufficiently elucidated by laying down general principles and rules for the origin, development, transitions, and combinations of the ideas represented by words, the affinity of which has been proved by historical comparison; but I do not consider the object of comparative philology fully attained, unless, like the changes of vowels and consonants, general analogies and natural laws have been deduced for the formation of the meaning in roots and words which belong to one common stem. For, as Locke has said in his Essay concerning Human Understanding, "the consideration of *ideas* and *words*, as the great instruments of knowledge, makes no despicable part of their contemplation, who would take a view of human knowledge in the whole extent of it; and perhaps if they were distinctly weighed and duly considered, they would afford us another sort of logic and critic, than what we have hitherto been acquainted with."

The question about the origin of the dialects now spoken in India has occupied the attention of many of the most distinguished Orientalists. Colebrooke, in his article on the Sanscrit and Prakrit languages, does not give his opinion quite clearly about the distinction which is to be drawn between the northern and southern dialects, a distinction which was afterwards established by the ingenious Essays of Ellis. Afterwards, whenever a question arose about the languages now current in India, the constant answer has been, without contradiction, that the languages spoken in the north are of an Indo-Germanic descent, while those in the south belong to a different stock. The best proof of the Sanscrit origin of these northern Indian dialects was considered to lie in the great number of words adopted from the Sanscrit, which amount in Hindi and Bengali to nine-tenths, and even in Marathi to four-fifths of the words contained in the dictionaries of these languages. Although such a computation of the lexicographic means of languages would seem to have settled the question definitely, yet we must confess that the method of proving the common origin of languages by a mere computation of similar words is not quite in accordance with the principles laid down by the modern school of linguistic philosophy.

The great progress in the study of languages, accomplished in our century, has been, to find the distinctive character of a language, not so much in the *copia verborum*, as in the grammatical structure of the language itself. It is the discovery of this principle which has led the founders of comparative philology to those triumphant conclusions, by which they have brought idioms distant in time and space back to one source and to one general principle. Comparisons which in the last century were considered as undeniable, as *mors*, *μόρος*, *mord*, are now looked upon as untenable, not so much because these words do not point to the same origin, but because the way in which they have been derived grammatically, and developed logically, can now be proved to have been quite a different one in the different languages.

By finding out the living principle of language, by tracing the operative power of it, as the formative element of speech and as the real organ of thought, all the sciences connected with the study of language, like mythology, ethnology and archæology, have taken quite a new turn. If mythology is not any longer to be considered as an invention of poets or as an imposition of priests, but if we find in it, at least in its most ancient and most original part, a representation of ancient thought, expressed and fixed in ancient language; if mythology may now be looked upon as a petrifaction of

the first efforts of the awakening conscience of the human race, the gigantic, sometimes sublime and sometimes monstrous forms of which must be reduced to their simple form and true meaning by the general laws of language and thought, just in the same manner as comparative physiology reduces the stupendous forms of antediluvian fossils to the laws of the living species to which they are found to belong—then we must give up theories which have prevailed for centuries, as that of deriving the mythology of Greece from that of Egypt. For as far as the language of these two countries is different in all that constitutes their respective peculiarity and character, so far the mythology of Greece is different from that of Egypt. In that country, where etymology has found the roots and the most primitive and transparent form of the grammatical system of the Greek and Latin languages, mythology will find the first formations and the very genesis of their religious systems. In order to succeed, however, such an inquiry must be based upon sound and historical principles. It can lead to no satisfactory conclusion, to compare a secondary formation of Indian mythology like the system of the Puránas with the mythology of Homer, which although on many points more ancient than the Puranic mythology, is nevertheless not to be considered as a primitive one. But if we go back to the oldest form of Indian mythology which we find in the Vedas, if even then we divest the old Vedic conceptions of all that is accidental or secondary in them, then we may expect—not indeed to find Greek or Latin mythology any more than the Greek or Latin language—but at all events to come nearest to the focus from which mythological ideas took their first beginning, following afterwards in their development the individual and national development of the different branches of the Arian stock.

In the same way as comparative philology has formed this new basis for a true appreciation of mythology, it has also given quite a new feature to ethnology and archæology. It has become possible to arrange the most prominent nations of the world into great families, on the ground of the connection between the languages spoken by them, and particularly according to the grammatical genius of these languages. And if we look at those important discoveries, which partly have been made, partly are still preparing, in reference to the old history and archæology of the empires of Babylon, Assyria, Media and Persia, how could these grand results have been achieved without the aid of a thorough knowledge of general and comparative grammar? If we compare the manner in which, at the beginning of this century, a man of the name of Lichtenstein tried to decipher the inscriptions of Babylon, merely by the similarity in the shape of letters and the supposed similarity in the sound of words with a Semitic idiom, with the system upon which similar studies are now conducted by men like Burnouf, Lassen, Rawlinson, Hincks and Benfey, we must admit that linguistic science has created quite a new field for these archæological inquiries. For when once we know to which family of languages the idiom of these old inscriptions belongs, the grammatical forms themselves, as they may be determined by approximative conjectures, become an instrument for deciphering the alphabet, and particularly the vocalism of the old language. It is true that till at present this has been achieved with the Iranian inscriptions only, when all the latest discoveries concerning the peculiar character of many letters and the whole system of inherent vowels have only been arrived at by means of a thorough knowledge of the Iranian grammar. But the light begins to dawn also upon the rocks of Van and the ruins of Babylon; and if we may judge by faint glimpses, the language of the one will be an Indo-Germanic one, while that of the other points more to a Semitic origin.

If then it is true that the grammatical system constitutes the character of a language, and assigns to every idiom its proper place in relation to other languages, we must admit that for the modern Indian dialects little has yet been done to prove their Indo-Germanic origin. The consequence of this has been, that the hostile spirit of a party, which has been working for the last years, particularly in India and in this country, to attack all the theories of Sanscrit antiquarians, has chosen the modern languages of India as a weak point, in order to prove that, as they have no connexion by their grammatical system with the pretended old language of India, the Sanscrit, this sacred language itself has never exercised any real influence upon the people. just as they have tried to prove that the literature, the religion, morals and philosophy of the Brahmins have never historically existed but in the hands of some foreign immigrating priests.

This has been a natural reaction against another system, which in its enthusiasm for Brahminism was as unscientific as the other, and which saw Brahmins, Brahminical wisdom, mysteries and religion, not only in every part of India from the remotest time, but which found Brahmins as the founders of civilization over the whole world, connected not only with the religious systems of Egypt and Greece, but even at the bottom of the Christian doctrine. Instead of this ubiquity, which was formerly ascribed to the Brahmins, we find it difficult at present, if adopting the views of this anti-Brahminical school, to assign even the smallest place in India to them; so that at last, if they do not submit to become antediluvian Buddhists, they will be exiled in to the plains of Tartary, from where we are taught now that the grammatical system of the spoken Indian dialects took its origin.

But, as I have said before, I consider this negative tendency as a natural reaction against many too positive assertions, which have been current without sufficient proof. I think even that, as in every other branch of science, this sceptic and negative spirit, which has called into doubt the most important and fundamental points of Indian antiquities, has caused a great deal of good, by calling forward new inquiries and deeper researches. Nor do I deny that the principle upon which the intentions of this negative school are professedly based may be a wise and philanthropic one, in so far as they believe that, by proving Brahminism to be neither unfathomable in its antiqutiy nor unchangeable in its character, it may be allowed to infer that by proper means, applied in a cautious, kindly and forbearing spirit, such farther changes may be effected as will raise the intellectual standard of the Hindus, improve their moral and social condition, and assist to promote their eternal welfare. But, after all, an independent, historical and philosophical inquiry into the origin, antiquity, and the development of Indian civilization has nothing to do with political and moral considerations; and if English Christian missionaries want to find precedents for the changeableness of the Brahminical religion, they will have a much better case by proving historically the influence which the Buddhist belief has produced on the anterior system of Brahminism, than by asserting that Brahminism has never existed as the religion of the people before the rise of Buddhism.

In the scarcity of historical documents for deciding such questions, it has always appeared to me that the language of India itself, in the different forms under which it appears to us during its historical development, would be the best, and sometimes the only means of giving to such questions a definite answer. If after a lapse of two thousand years any one should attempt to prove that the Christian religion has always existed from the earliest time in Europe, that documents written in Italian were to be considered as the real documents of the Christian doctrine, and that other documents, if written in

Latin, were only to be considered as written in a language which had been derived and put together (sanskṛ́ta) artificially by learned priests, but that this language itself had never been the language of a people living on the same soil with a different religion before the rise of Christianity, it would still be questionable whether, even in the supposed absence of all historical evidence, a philosophical view of the nature of language would admit such a theory. This however is exactly our case in India. Pâli—which, by the softness and melodiousness of its phonic system, and the simplified development of its grammatical forms, stands to Sanscrit in the same relation in which Italian stands to Latin,—is given out by many as the old language of India. The most ancient inscriptions are in Pâli, and it is the language of a great number of religious books containing the doctrine of Buddha. If other books of the same religion are written in Sanscrit, this Sanscrit shows evident traces of an artificial development, just as the Latin of the fourth and fifth century shows that it is no more the language spoken by the great mass of the people, but only employed as a learned and sacred language. Now, admitting even for argument sake, that all other internal proofs were wanting of the Christian doctrine having been addressed to people who had been living for centuries on the soil of Italy, having their own heathenish religion and their own old language, I think that the very fact that some of our religious books are written in an evidently learned language, while others are written in a spoken language, the whole grammar of which gets organically intelligible only by a reference to that learned language, would go far enough to prove that this learned idiom was at the time of early Christianity a dead or dying language, and must therefore have been a living one many centuries before. And if then good fortune should have preserved to us the books written in Latin, but in a Latin like that of Ennius and Plautus,—in a language full of life, of individuality and organic irregularity, which is as far from the ecclesiastic Latin as the language of Plautus from the Latin of schoolboys; if this should be the case—and it is exactly the case in India, when we substitute *Veda* for *Ennius* and *Purâna* for *Patres*—then, I think, a sound philosophy of language would not hesitate for a moment to admit the precedence of an old Latin as well as of the Sancrit, merely on the ground of evidence lying in the language itself.

Although, therefore, I admit that some questions may still be to be answered and some doubts to be removed concerning the relation of Buddhism to Brahminism and of Pâli to Sanscrit, yet I think that by the latest researches of Indian scholars like Wilson, Burnouf and Lassen, it has been established that the Brahminical people have brought at an early period the light of civilization into the plains of India; that their language was the language of the nation, though varying in different popular dialects; that their religion constituted the groundwork of the Indian worship, though modified by local traditions; that their laws and manners formed the social ties of the Indian world, though often in struggle with heterogeneous elements.

But nevertheless new efforts have been made to prove, on the very ground of language, that the present nations of India are to be considered as altogether free and emancipated from Brahminical influence. For if language constitutes the spirit of a nation, and if the spirit of a language lies in its grammatical system, it would certainly be a startling fact, if it could be proved, that the whole grammatical system of the modern languages of India has nothing to do with Sanscrit grammar. And this they have tried to prove, taking for their base the opinions of comparative philologists, who have admitted that the whole system of declension and conjugation in Bengali and the other Indian dialects is unexplainable by the rules

of Sanscrit grammar. Schleiermacher for instance, in his 'Essay on the Influence of Writing on the Language,' says:—"Or c'est une question de savoir si jamais le peuple du Bengale, descendu probablement de ces habitans primitifs, s'appropriât entièrement le Sanscrit, ou bien s'il ne se formât pas dès le commencement de son assujettissment à des étrangers plus civilisés que lui, une langue plus semblable à son idiome actuel qu'au Sanscrit, en supprimant les formes grammaticales trop difficiles de celui-ci et n'adoptant que les mots. On ne peut pas prétendre qu'il est invraisemblable, qu'un peuple tout entier ait accepté l'idiome de quelques prêtres et guerriers; car nous avons vu cela s'effectuer au royaume d'Assam, qui dans les temps anciens doit avoir fait partie des pays Hindous. Cependant plus tard on y a eu jusqu'au commencement du dix-septième siècle une langue, des livres et des institutions semblables à celles des pays au-delà du Gange; mais alors les Brahmans s'introduisirent dans ce pays, y répandirent leurs doctrines, convertirent le roi, et bientôt un dialecte Bengale remplaça l'ancien idiome, de sorte que celui-ci appartient maintenant presque entièrement aux langues mortes."

Now one must admit, that if such a fact could be proved, that the grammatical elements of the Bengali are not originally Sanscritic, but belong to another system of languages, this would change entirely the view which we have taken of the ethnographic and linguistic relations of the inhabitants of India, and bring on the same confusion as if it could be proved that the grammatical system of the modern Persian was not of an Iranian character, or that the English language was not of a Teutonic origin. For why do we call the English language a Teutonic one, if not because the Saxons, settling in Britain, did not change the grammatical character of their language, although they adopted many words from the Celtic nation which they subdued? And why do we not say, that after the Norman conquest the language of England became a Norman language, if not because, though overgrown with Norman words, it preserved its own grammatical system? Why are the Romance called Romance, and the Teutonic, Teutonic languages? Because the Teutonic race, when brought into contact with Roman civilization and language, found in its strongly developed nationality sufficient strength to appropriate and incorporate into its language a great number of Latin words, without giving up the essentially Teutonic form of its grammar, while the Celtic nations yielded to the overpowering influence of the Roman civilization, and adopted not only the substantial but also the formative element of the Latin language, thus giving rise to new languages, which cannot be considered as Celtic idioms, but as branches of the Latin language, modified and developed by Celtic elements.

Looking then from this point of view at the question about the origin of the grammatical forms in the modern Indian languages, I thought it necessary to take this subject into serious consideration. I was convinced that it would be possible, either to account for the heterogeneous influence which has been acting upon the languages of the Indian nations, or to find a connecting link between the grammar of the old and modern Indian dialects. The results of my inquiry I have laid down in a Comparative Grammar of the Bengali Language, and I shall quote thence a few points in answer to a theory which has been proposed in regard to the grammatical structure of the Bengali language by the Rev. Dr. Stevenson, whose extensive knowledge of dialects spoken in India, which he had the opportunity of studying on the spot, entitles his views to great attention and careful examination.

I quite agree with Dr. Stevenson in the manner in which he tries to prove that there existed in India an aboriginal language different from the

Sanscrit and its dialects, by showing that there are many words in common use, especially in the languages of Southern India, that cannot, after making every allowance for corruption, be derived from the Brahminical tongue. He alleges that there are a great many of the words derived from the Sanscrit which are used only by Brahmins, while others of the same meaning, but of a different origin, are constantly substituted by the common people. He further observes that there are several Sanscrit letters which are never introduced into the spoken languages of India, or which, if introduced, none but Brahmins can pronounce. Innumerable combinations of letters are uniformly deprived of one of their members, or have a vowel interposed between the two consonants; and in the south of India several letters are used that are not found in Sanscrit. Starting from these observations, Dr. Stevenson further proves that these elements, which enter so largely into the spoken languages of India, cannot be considered as used at random in every particular province, but that they are the same, or nearly so, in all the different spoken languages in India. If we can trace, he says, a language wholly different from the Sanscrit in all the modern dialects, the northern as well as the southern, after separating also the easily recognised importations by the Mahomedan conquerors of India, it will seem to follow that the whole region previous to the arrival of the Brahmins was peopled by the members of one great family of a different origin. That family may have been divided into different branches; one of these may have preceded the other in their migrations, yet oneness of language would seem to point to oneness of origin, especially since both history and tradition are silent as to any wide-spread influence exercised in ancient times by any foreign tribe, except the Brahminical. Dr. Stevenson calls the Brahmins a foreign tribe, in accordance with indications derivable from the cast of their features and the colour of their skin, as well as from their possessing a language which none of the natives of India but themselves can even so much as pronounce; and the constant current of their own traditions, making them foreign to the whole of India, except perhaps a small district to the north-west of the Ganges. Even in the time of Manu, the whole country to the south of the Vindhya mountains and Nerbudda river was inhabited by men who did not submit themselves to the Brahminical institutions, and among whom he advises that no Brahmin should go to reside.

So far as these premises go, I quite agree with Dr. Stevenson; and it is even commonly admitted that the Brahminical religion and civilization were brought into India from without. Professor Wilson has ingeniously treated this question in his translation of the Vishnupurana, where he comes to the conclusion, that the earliest seat of the Hindús within the confines of Hindusthán was undoubtedly the eastern confines of the Panjáb, and that the holy land of Manu and the Purans lies between the *Drishadvatí* and *Sarasvatí* rivers, the Caggar and Sursooty of our barbarous maps. Various adventures of the first princes and the most famous sages occur in this vicinity; and the *Asramás*, or religious domiciles of several of the latter, are placed on the banks of the *Sarasvatí*. According to some authorities, it was the abode of Vyása, the compiler of the Vedas and Puránas.

But in the Veda itself there are many facts which, according to my opinion, put it beyond all doubt that the Brahminical people was of an Arian origin, who, from Iran, the birth-place of their language, religion and civilization, immigrated into India. I hope that this point, as well as many others in the ancient history of the Brahminical people, will receive a new light by the publication of the Veda. That a knowledge

of the sacred writings of the Hindús is indispensable for a true appreciation of the whole intellectual development of this people, everybody admits, for the Veda bears the same relation to Indian antiquities as the Old Testament to the Jewish, the New Testament to the Christian, and the Korán to the Mahomedan history. The religion, worship and manners, poetry and philosophy of the Hindús, derive their source in common from the Veda, the monument of a religion, which, by its origin, belongs to the most ancient, and by its effects to the most important of all the Religions with which Divine Providence decreed to begin the great work of the education of the human race. It has often been regretted, that while so many editions of dramatic works like *Sakontala*, of codes of law like *Manu*, of philosophical systems like the *Vedânta*, have been published, almost nothing has yet been done for the Veda. Colebrooke's excellent article on the Vedas, or the sacred writings of the Hindus, remained for a long time our only source of information upon this subject, and it is possible that the opinions of this learned orientalist, while they excited a great degree of interest, discouraged at the same time further inquiries. Colebrooke, who is the first authority on Indian literature, says at the end of his essay, "The ancient dialect in which the Vedas are composed, and especially that of the three first Vedas, is extremely difficult and obscure; and though curious, as the parent of a more polished and refined language (the classical Sanscrit), its difficulties must long continue to prevent such an examination of the whole Vedas as would be requisite for extracting all that is remarkable and important in those voluminous works."

But Dr. Rosen, convinced of the necessity of arriving at a complete knowledge and perfect understanding of the Vedas, undertook to prepare an edition of the whole *Rigveda*, and thus withdraw those manuscripts from that obscurity to which they might otherwise have been consigned for a much longer time in the libraries of England. The Rígveda is doubtless the most important of the Vedas, because it presents to us the old poems in their original form, and as they were conceived by the old inspired Rishis; while the other two, the *Sâma* and *Yajurveda*, contain only isolated fragments of similar poems, digested and amplified in accordance to the requirements of the Indian ceremonial. As to the fourth, the *Atharvaveda*, it belongs to a posterior period, and contains also for a great part hymns of the Rígveda. It cannot be sufficiently regretted that the premature death of Dr. Rosen interrupted this meritorious undertaking, when scarcely the first of the ten books of the Rígveda was printed. Afterwards it was more the result of circumstances than the fault of Sanscrit scholars, that an edition of this work has remained till now uncontinued. I am happy however to announce on this public occasion, that all the material difficulties of such an undertaking have now been removed by the liberality of the Hon. Court of Directors of the East India Company, who have but recently, upon the recommendation of our distinguished president, granted a considerable sum for the publication of this work, and have enabled me to realize a plan for which I had collected during several years all the materials which are to be found in the public and private libraries of Germany, France and England, without seeing any chance of printing so voluminous a work. This very day the first sheet of the text and commentary of the Rígveda has issued from the University press of Oxford, and I have the pleasure of laying before the committee the first copies of it.

In the hymns of the Rígveda, as I just mentioned, we see the Brahminical tribes advancing step by step along the rivers of the *Panjáb* into the

plains of the *Holy Land* (Brahma-varta); we see them at war with mighty kings, and often engaged in hostilities with each other, each immigrating tribe pushing their predecessors successively more and more down to the south. Afterwards we see in the descriptions given in the *Rámáyana*, *Manu* and the *Mahábhárata*, how the frontiers of *Brahmavarta* grow successively wider and wider. The two great royal dynasties of ancient India, the *Solar* and the *Lunar* race, the heroes of which are celebrated in the two epic poems the Rámáyana and Máhabhárata, were settled in *Ayodhya* and *Pratishthána*, that is in the country tributary to the holy river *Ganges*, which is mentioned but occasionally in the Veda; and finally, Brahmavarta is bounded on the west and the east, not by the rivers Drishadvati and Sarasvati, but by the ocean; and on the north and south by the mountains of the Himálaya and Vindhya.

The Arian tribes however remained united by their common origin, by the ties of religion and of their sacred language. It is a curious fact that the ancient name given to this language by the Brahmins themselves is *chhandas*, which means rhythmical language, *chhandas* being derived from the root *chhand*, to praise, which corresponds to the Latin *scandere*, as Sanscrit *chhid*, to cut, to the Latin *scindere*. The primitive form of this Indo-Germanic root is in Sanscrit also *skand*, meaning to go, to stride, so that *chhandas* would originally signify either poetry accompanied by dance, taken in the ancient Pindaric sense, or any poetical effusion, as if striding along in grave and majestic measures.

It is very likely that the name of the sacred language of the old Medians and Persians, the *Zend*, for which no satisfactory etymology has yet been found, has the same origin and meaning, a fact which would be in accordance not only with many peculiarities of the Vedic language, which, deviating from the classical Sanscrit, are frequently to be traced in Zend, but also with the general features of the religion of these two people, which clearly point to a common source.

But although the Arian conquerors seem to have crushed and extinguished the great mass of the aboriginal inhabitants in the north of India, yet some of these Autochthones, or early inhabitants of India, who were considered by the Brahmins as impure and unworthy to partake of their religious sacrifices, found a refuge in the thick forests of the mountainous districts, and in the countries south of the Vindhya range, while it is not unlikely that some of them were tolerated by the Brahmins, so as to remain in a state of slavery, constituting the class of Súdras, to whom, though they were not considered as twice-born, like the three other classes, some few civil rights were conceded, and to whom in latter days even a Brahminical origin was attributed.

Now, I think it is very easy to understand how it came to pass, that in Sanscrit as well as in the modern dialects spoken in the north of India, we find a great many words, especially those expressive of the common relations of life, and denoting objects with which men in an imperfect state of civilization are acquainted, which cannot be derived from Sanscrit roots, and which are the same in the languages of the north, in the languages of some forest tribes living in the mountainous boundary districts, and in the languages of the people in the south of India. In the same way we find no difficulty in accounting for the presence of many Sanscrit words in the languages of the south, for it is quite clear that it is owing to the literary influence which the Sanscrit exercised in the north as well as in the south, that words expressing ideas, connected with a higher state of civilization,

have been adopted by those dialects. I shall abstain at present from entering into any discussion upon the origin of those words which do not belong to the Indo-Germanic family, and of which Dr. Stevenson has given some comparative lists, tracing analogies in the *Mongolian*, *Celtic* and *Hebrew* tongues. I do not think that the affinity of different languages in any country can be proved by a mere comparison of similar words, and it seems to me that by producing analogies from languages so different as Hebrew, Celtic and Mongolian, one proves nothing by proving too much.

We must have studied the individuality of different languages, we must have acquired an intimate knowledge of the particular distinguishing character of each of them, we must have entered into the spirit of every idiom, and have acquired a kind of feeling so as to be able to identify ourselves with the languages of other people, before we can venture to decide upon analogies which may exist between them. Afterwards it makes no difference whether these analogies consist in words or in terminations of words, whether they be etymological or grammatical analogies, provided that the one and the other be based, not upon the mere sound, but upon the organization of the words. It is on that account that I must declare myself decidedly, as far as the Bengali is concerned, against Dr. Stevenson's theory. Dr. Stevenson says that there exists a great resemblance in the grammatical structure of the chief modern languages in the north and in the south of India, proofs of which he produces from the Hindi, Bengali, Gujerathi, Marathi on the one side, and from Telugu, Carnatica, Tamil and Singhalese on the other. Supposing that for none of these characteristic points they are indebted to the Sanscrit, he thinks it impossible to account for such a similarity of grammatical structure in languages, spoken by people having so little intercourse with one another, as, according to his opinion, the Hindu inhabitants of the north and south of India have had, unless we suppose it to arise from their all being originally of one family, and possessing one primitive language, the grammatical system of which may be in some measure gathered from these their points of agreement. Dr. Stevenson admits however that Brahminical influence has modified the grammatical structure, and introduced into the northern languages some affixes for those in former use, especially in the inflexion of nouns, but he says that the general structure of all has remained unaffected, and that upon the whole there is more agreement in the construction with the *Turkish* than with the Sanscrit, so that he thinks it likely that the original language of India may be the connecting link between what the Germans have called the Indo-Germanic family and the Turkish family of languages.

Now the whole question, as far as I can see, rests upon these two points: Is it likely or not that the northern languages of India, which are so much connected with the Sanscrit, that while the Bengali and Hindi, which probably contain the most, have nine-tenths of their vocables of Sanscrit origin, and while even the Marathi, which, according to Dr. Stevenson's estimation, contains the fewest, has at least four-fifths of its words derived from the same source, the same languages should have derived their inflexional suffixes from an aboriginal language, which exercised so little influence upon those modern dialects, that proofs of its very existence can only be gathered from some few words, which, denoting things connected with the daily occupations of the working classes, were likely to remain in the mouth of the people, and to get by this way introduced into the language of the higher classes? Dr. Stevenson himself admits that the Brahminical influence *has* modified the grammatical struc-

ture, and has introduced, as he says, into the northern languages some affixes for those in former use. In admitting this, however, he admits more than he seems aware of. For we very seldom, or rather never find that a people, though receiving a great number of foreign words into the dictionary of its language, have adopted at the same time a foreign grammatical system, so that the mere fact, that one part of the grammar of the northern languages is evidently of Sanscrit origin, would seem to speak by itself very much in favour of admitting the same for the other part.

But then the chief point is to consider, whether the instances brought forward as unexplainable by the rules of Sanscrit grammar and by the principles of the general structure of the Indo-Germanic languages, may not be found to be formed by grammatical elements which have been similarly used by the Arian languages, particularly by their modern representatives. And this I think I am able to do for every grammatical form which Dr. Stevenson has pointed out as non-Sanscritical or Turkish, because he found it not exactly the same as in the old and classical Sanscrit, while a comparison of the modern development, which other Indo-Germanic languages have taken, will clearly show the analogies existing between the changes which the Indian language has experienced in the course of two thousand years and those known in other branches of the Indo-Germanic family.

It may be remembered that at present I meditate only a vindication of the Bengali language, which, if successful, will perhaps throw some light also upon the other northern dialects. As far as the southern languages are concerned, I abstain from giving any decided opinion, and shall content myself with noticing some coincidences between them and the dialects of the north.

Beginning with the declensions, Dr. Stevenson remarks, that these eight languages (viz. Bengali, Hindi, Gujerathi, Marathi, Telugu, Carnatica, Tamil and Singhalese) are all deficient in the number of cases required to mark the different relations of nouns, and supply the deficiency by particles placed after the root or some of the cases.

This is a fact, which, far from being surprising, would have been anticipated by every one acquainted with the relation in which modern languages stand to their parent tongues. The original and expressive forms by which the old language of India formed its admirable system of declension, have in the course of centuries, and particularly during the lapse of an illiterate middle age, lost their pure form and their distinctive power. But the Indian language found in itself the principle and elements of a new life, and we find it again at the period of its regeneration in the possession of richer and more powerful means than many of the modern languages of Europe can boast of. It is true that the dual of the Sanscrit language has entirely disappeared in Bengali, and that the nominative is the only case of the plural which has preserved an original form; but all the elements which have been substituted in order to form the number and cases of words are undoubtedly of Sanscrit origin; and we find sometimes the first traces of their grammatical employment in ancient works, and much more in the modern books, and especially in those of the Buddhistic collection.

The same is to be said of the gender of substantives and adjectives. The substantives, adjectives, pronouns and verbs have no different forms in Bengali for the masculine, feminine and neuter; and we meet only with some feminine terminations in certain cases, where it was necessary to distinguish the two genders, as *vágh*, a tiger; *vághí*, a tigress; *khudá*, uncle; *khudí*, aunt. The changes of the final letter which take place in these words are entirely founded on the rules of Sanscrit grammar, only that they have been sub-

jected to the influence of the historical progress of the Indian language. Sometimes the feminine is also expressed by composition, just as we say, a she-goat, a French-woman, while in French and German the feminine is expressed by the mere change of the final letter. Thus the Bengali say, *sasaru*, a hare; *strísasaru*, a female hare; *inréj*, an Englishman; *inréjér méyé*, an English woman; *méyé* being the Sanscrit word *máyá*, which means illusion, deception, or according to the notions of India, woman, and in a philosophical sense the female magic power, or the whole apparent world, which exists as long as the eternal soul looks upon it as existent, but vanishes as soon as the great Self returns to itself and gets free from the passion of worldly existence.

As to the single cases of declension, Dr. Stevenson further remarks, that there are several striking analogies running through most of these languages in the letters that characterise the principal cases. Thus the letter *n* is a very general characteristic of the genitive singular. It enters into the Gujerathi common genitive *no, ni, num*; the ancient Marathi genitive *chéni*, now usually contracted into *chi* and into the Tamil *in*; in all of which it runs through all the declensions. It is found also in the *ni* of the first of the three declensions in Telugu, and in the *ana* and *ina* of the first and fourth of the four Canarese declensions. It is singular, Dr. Stevenson remarks, that in the Turkish the termination of the genitive *ung* should afford so near a parallel to the above, and that we should have the remains of such a genitive in *mine* and *thine*, and the Germans in *mein, dein, sein*.

Although upon this point the Bengali is left quite unmentioned, because its genitive in *r* is of too clear a Sanscrit origin, yet I must say a few words upon the *n*, as the sign of the genitive case in the languages quoted by Dr. Stevenson. Gothic forms like *meina, theina, seina*, are certainly puzzling at first sight, not however so much as for it to be necessary to assign a Turkish origin to them. It can easily be seen that the genitive has often, as far as the sense is concerned, the function of an adjective, so that phrases like "the work of the day," "the tribes of the mountains," may be expressed by "the daily work," "the mountainous tribes." It is also generally admitted that some genitive formations in the Indo-Germanic languages have preserved a close affinity to the formations of adjectives, with the only difference that the latter have different terminations for gender, number and cases, and could therefore be declined again like substantives. In some Indian dialects, as for instance the Hindi, we find even genitives with different terminations for the different genders. I do not say however that either the adjective has been derived from the genitive, or the genitive from the adjective, but I only maintain that the principle of their formation has been the same. Now it is known that the suffix *na* is of very frequent occurrence for the derivation of adjectives, and I have therefore little doubt that forms like the Gothic *meina* (bearing some analogy to the Zend *mana*) ought to be considered as adjectival formations; just as in Greek and Latin, *ἐμός, σός* for *ἐμοῦ, σοῦ, meus* and *tuus* for *mei* and *tui*. We may observe in Sanscrit also how the nasal sound *n* extends its influence in forming new bases to which the regular terminations of the cases are added, a fact which, particularly in reference to verbal formations, has been profoundly illustrated by Professor Lepsius. I feel therefore inclined to consider the nasal sound in all the instances quoted by Dr. Stevenson as an augment of the inflectional base, while the final vowel in some of his quotations may have the power of the genitive termination.

For the termination *ke*, used for the dative and accusative in Bengali, Dr. Stevenson brings forward the following analogies: *ko* in Hindi, *ku* in Telugu, *gai* in Singhalese, and *gya* or *ge* in Tibetan. He supposes this termination to take its origin from the Marathi dative, *lâgi*, derived from the verb *lâgane*, to come in contact with, by changing the vowel, sharpening the consonant, and omitting the first syllable *lâ*, which syllable serves again as the sign of the dative in other Indian languages. Even if we admitted this derivation to be true, the word *lâgane* is a well-known Sanscrit root, which Dr. Stevenson is very well aware of. But how fond he is of the autochthonical origin of these forms, we may see from the following remark of his: that this word *lâgi* itself, he says, may be derived from the Sanscrit is no objection whatever; for it may have been derived from a root common to many languages, and be just as independent of the Brahminical tongue as our own word *lug*.

There are two methods of accounting for grammatical elements which occur in modern languages. The one may be called the *linguistical*, the other the *historical*. The former consists in pointing out analogies between the form and meaning of inflectional elements in different languages of the same family. This method has generally been adopted and carried out successfully by Prof. Bopp and his school. It is indeed the only possible method in comparing the grammatical forms of languages which historically and geographically stand so far the one from the other, as for instance, the German from the Sanscrit. In comparative researches of this kind it is only required to trace analogies in the form and character of the elements, which constitute the grammar of a language, and to show etymologically the origin and the development of these grammatical forms. Whether the one language be anterior in its formation, and whether there existed a historical connection between them, is a question which originally has nothing to do with these linguistical inquiries.

The case however becomes different when we compare languages, the historical progress of which we can follow through certain periods. Here it becomes necessary to give to comparative inquiries as much as possible a historical character, by trying to explain modern grammatical forms by elements, which were used, though in a different way, by the same language in its anterior state, and to show if possible the period of transition from the one to the other. Thus in a comparative analysis of the modern Persian grammar it would be necessary first of all to have recourse to the previous forms under which the Persian language appears to us at certain historical periods, and only in the case that neither the grammar of the Pazend and the Pehlevi, nor that of the Achaemenidian or Zend language furnishes the key for the grammatical forms of the modern Persian, it would be of interest to look for analogies in other kindred languages. For it is certainly true, though difficult to account for, that in several cases, where a historical connection exists between two languages, it is notwithstanding impossible to explain the grammatical forms of the one by those of the other, while languages, distant in time and place, afford the most unmistakeable analogies. Although then we prefer, when an opportunity is given, the historical method, yet we must admit even for languages, which have a historical growth, like the Bengali, the New Persian, the New German, &c., the right of the merely linguistical method, and I choose the present case, the question about the origin of the syllable *ke*, as sign of the accusative, as an opportunity for contrasting the relative merit of these two methods.

Even from a linguistic point of view it is difficult to find an analogy be-

tween the formation of the accusative in the Indo-Germanic languages and in Bengali. An accusative formed by means of a syllable like *ke*, seems to be quite foreign to the genius of these languages. The resemblance which is found in the Gothic and Anglo-Saxon declension, in which there is a *k* for the accusative termination of personal pronouns, is not admissible, because the origin of this termination is founded on linguistical rules, so essentially Germanic, that it is not possible to apply the same rules to an Indian dialect. There is however some utility to be drawn from this comparison, for we see that Gothic accusatives (*mi-k=me, thu-k=te, si-k=se*) are derived from their pronominal roots by means of the same particle as the datives (*mi-s=mihi, thu-s=tibi*); and we find in the syllable *sma*, from which the *k* of the accusative and the *s* of the dative are both derived, a termination not restricted, like other terminations, to the accusative only, but serving, by means of its general and extended signification, to express, like the *rá* in Pehlevi and New Persian, at the same time both the accusative and the dative. We believe therefore that the Bengali *ke* is not to be considered as implying the relation usually represented by the accusative or dative, but as a particle of purely demonstrative power. As to analogy in other languages, Latin forms, as *hi-c, hui-c, hun-c, tun-c*, &c., may be quoted where the final *c* is the same as that we see repeated in forms like *hi-c-ce, hun-c-ce*, &c., serving to enhance the demonstrative signification. According to the theory of Prof. Bopp (Comparat. Grammar, § 305), this *ce* must be considered as an indefinite particle, or rather as a particle, which, compounded with an interrogative pronoun, takes away its interrogative power and changes the interrogative into an indefinite pronoun. The same savant traces this particle through different languages, such as Sanscr. *ci-t* (*kaçcit*, some one), *ca-na* (*kaçcana*, any one), Dor. κά (*ποκά*, once), Ion. τέ (*ποτέ*), Lat. *que* (*quisque*), *quam* (*quisquam*), *ce* (*hic* and *hicce*), *pe* (*quippe*), *piam* (*quispiam*), Goth. *uh* (*hvazuh*).

But it seems necessary that a distinction should be made between two particles, which under a similar form have played very different parts in the progress of languages. The one, almost the same as the copulative particle (*ca, τέ, que*), serves, in generalizing, and to form from the root of the interrogative, an indefinite pronoun, when the other gives a determinate form. We recognise the former in words like *kaçcit, kaçcana, ποκά, ποτέ, quisque, quisquam* (always in negative phrases like Sanscrit *kaçcana*), *quispiam, hvazuh*, (Modern German *wasauch*). Adopting the system, which as far as I know has first been introduced by the ingenious G. Curtius of Berlin, this change of letters in Sanscrit, Greek and Latin may be represented in the following equation: pañca, πέντε, quin*que*=*ca*, τε, *que*. Sanscrit *cit* and Latin *quam* are enlargements of the same particle, as *quispiam*, which corresponds to Sanscrit *kasapi*, regularly changed into *ko'pi*. But we cannot believe with Prof. Bopp that the same particle, which by its peculiar power gives to interrogative pronouns an indefinite signification, has given rise to the demonstrative pronoun *hic*, by being compounded with the Sanscrit interrogative pronoun *ka* and *ki*. Besides, as Professor Bopp acknowledges that in *hic-ce, hunc-ce*, &c. the latter *ce* is the repetition of the same element, we find already combined with the pronoun (*hi-c*), and as the genius of the Latin language does not permit a doubt on the purely demonstrative meaning of this particle, we do not think that it is altogether contrary to the system of this learned grammarian, to consider *ce* as a determinative particle, different from the other and identical with the Greek γέ and the Bengali *ke*.

But though from a linguistical point of view we might admit the Bengali termination *ke* to have its origin in this demonstrative particle, it is still the

question whether a comparison of languages, historically connected with the Bengali, might not furnish a more satisfactory solution. In the first case, we must remember that in Bengali itself *ke* is very often omitted, and that the accusative is represented by the same form as the nominative, when the whole structure of the sentence shows that the substantive, dependent upon a verb, is to be taken as its object and therefore as an accusative. Besides, *ke* is not so much to be considered as the termination of an accusative, but rather as that of an objective case, because it is frequently used to represent the dative also, as *Hari bahudhan Haridâske dilen* (Hari gave much money to Haridâs). Nor is it, like the other terminations *r, te, râ*, added to the secondary form of a substantive (*manushye-r, manushye-te, manushye-râ*), but to the absolute form (*manushya-ke, purush-ke*). Now if we go back to Sanscrit, particularly in its more modern form, and to the Pracrit dialects, we may observe a great tendency of the language to put the suffix *ka* at the end of many words without changing considerably their meaning. It is true that in some cases the affix *ka* serves to express contempt, pity, &c., but generally the meaning of the word remains the same, only assuming a more concrete, objective or neuter character. Thus *lohita* means read, *lohitaka*, a ruby, *vâc* is speech, *vâcikam*, a delivered speech or discourse. There exists a close relation, logically as well as grammatically, between the neuter in its nominative and accusative and the accusative of the masculine. The accusative represents the substantive, which is active and independent, if expressed in the nominative, as a passive object, and we may account thereby why in many cases the same grammatical element, which serves to express the neuter gender, has been employed for expressing the objective case of the masculine, as *am* in Sanscrit, *um* in Latin, *ον* in Greek. If then the affix *ka* has already in Sanscrit the signification which we have just explained, it might seem well-adapted for words which by their relation to other words convey the meaning of passive objectivity. Although therefore this particle may not have become, neither in Sanscrit nor in Pracrit, the mere conventional sign of the accusative case, yet its analogous use gets so extensive in Pracrit, and particularly in the Çâkkarí dialect, that we have sufficient reason for tracing the Bengali *ke* historically back to the Sanscrit and Pracrit *ka*.

The termination of the ablative also, which is *te* in Bengali and Marathi, *ta* in Pushtoo and in Singhalese, and which Dr. Stevenson considers therefore as a remnant of the language of the aboriginal Hindús, is certainly of Sanscrit origin. In Bengali *te* is at the same time the termination of the ablative and the locative. Besides, there is still another more Sanscritic termination in *e*, for the locative of words ending in a consonant or the vowel *a*. The same form is, by a false analogy, employed also for words which end in other vowels, such as *râtre* (at night), instead of *râtrite* or *râtrikâle*. The termination *te*, if employed as the sign of the dative, corresponds to the Sanscrit termination *tra*. The change of *tra* into *te* is justified by the aversion for all harsh sounds and double consonants which we frequently find in modern languages. Thus Professor Bopp derives ingeniously the Greek σε in ἀλλοσέ, &c., from Sanscrit *tra*, supposing the suppression of *r* and the usual transition of *t* into *s*. The same suppression of the *r* takes place in Bengali, where the short *a*, as usually at the end of words derived from Sanscrit, is changed into *e*.

The termination *te*, if used as the sign of the ablative, represents the Sanscrit suffix *tas*; and the change of *tas* into *te* appears even more regular, when we remember that the Pali and Pracrit languages suppress equally the final *s*. Instead of changing the *a* into *o*, as in the case of these dialects and

in some cases of the Sanscrit itself, the Bengali has preferred as usual the final *e*, approaching thereby very nearly to the Latin, which has preserved the same suffix in words like *inde*, *unde*, &c.

In the nominative singular, a form in *e* occurs instead of the regular terminations; as *Vede kohen* (the Veda says); *mánike=mánik* (ruby); *gopále=gopál* (cow-herd). The same *e* is added also to words ending in *á*, but then it must be changed to *y*; as *rájáy=rájá* (king); *pitáy=pitá* (father).

Although these forms of the nominative may imply sometimes a contemptuous idea, yet they had not originally this power, but must be considered as having retained the primitive form, corresponding with the termination *o* in *Pracrit* and *Pali*. It is of importance to remark that the Bengali, having suppressed the final *s* of the ancient Sanscrit termination, has not lost, at the same time, the short *a*, and that instead of changing it into *o*, like the *Pracrit* and *Pali*, it shows a decided predilection for a final *e*, bearing thereby a close resemblance to the old Çâkkarí dialect. As to the forms *pitáy*, *rájáy*, &c., where the final *y* replaces an *e*, it is true that this is in no way founded on either *Sanscrit* or *Pracrit*, but in comparing modern languages with the ancient idioms whence they have arisen, we may often see that by a false analogy, certain common forms are adopted even for words, to which, owing to their different origin, they would seem irreconcilable. What speaks the most clearly in favour of our regarding this *e*, as a relic of the Sanscrit *a*, in the nominative as well as in the genitive, ablative and locative, is, that the adjectives of pure Bengali origin do not admit this *e* either in the nominative or in the other cases. Sometimes *e* is used also instead of *erá* in the *nom. plur.*, as *sakale se kathá kahila* (all said this word); *aneke táhá jane* (many know that). In this case too I rather incline to consider *e* as the remnant of the ancient plural termination than to take it for the sign of the locative case, as Dr. Yates suggests, particularly as he observes that in good Bengali it is only used in adjectives which indicate a number, when the noun is merely understood; as *sakale*, *aneke*, &c., where we find *e* as the termination of the plural already in Sanscrit.

The termination of the nominative plural is *á*, as in Pali and Pracrit, but as this case always occurs under the form of *rá* or *erá* (*guru-rá*, *manushye-rá*), one might suppose that there is in it a repetition of the Sanscrit termination, as in the Vedical forms *stomásas*. It seems nevertheless more probable that the Bengalis, perceiving all the forms of the plural derived from a root in *êr*, *i. e.* of the genitive singular, compounded with the word *dig*, have taken this genitive for the base of the plural, and have added to it the primitive sign of the nominative plural, *á*.

The most singular and at first sight barbarous feature of the Bengali declension, is its formation of the plural of masculine nouns by means of the syllable *dik*, to which the terminations of the cases in the singular are added. Though I am not quite confident as to the origin of this grammatical element, yet I venture to propose a theory, which perhaps may not prove quite unsatisfactory.

Dig signifies, in Sanscrit, a climate, and in the plural it is taken for the whole world. In this sense we find *digvijayí*, 'he who has conquered the four regions, or all the countries which lie between the N. S. E. W., *i. e.* all the world and all mankind. It is true that the word *diçah* had not yet been used in Sanscrit in the sense of all the world, or mankind in general, but we find, nevertheless, an analogy in the word *loka*, the first signification of which is the world, and synonymous with *dig*; as, for instance, *loka-pála=dik-pála*, the master of the world. The same word by metaphor comes to mean men.

Thus, *loka-viçruta*, celebrated in the world, *i. e.* among men ; *loka-vikrushṭa*, despised by the world, *i. e.* by men. One can even say *strîloka*, meaning the world of women, *i. e.* womankind in general. I consider then the formation of the plural by means of *dig* as based on the same connexion of ideas, and this would account at the same time why the Bengalis generally use this form of the plural for reasonable beings only, as *paṇḍit digete*, in the learned world; while words like *gaṇa*, a number, *jâti*, a tribe, *dal*, a band, *varga*, a class, are used promiscuously for animate and inanimate beings.

The two suffixes *ṭá* and *ṭi* are often found at the end of substantives of the numeral pronouns ; *ṭá* added to the names of living beings indicates indifference or contempt: *ekaṭá kukur* or *kukurṭá*, a dog; *ekaṭá manushya* or *manushyaṭá*, a mannikin, the mob. The same suffix added to the names of things gives an idea of magnitude, *ekaṭá ghar* or *gharṭá*, a great house. The suffix *ṭi* expresses in similar cases affection or pity in the case of living beings, and contempt in that of things : *ekaṭi bálak* or *bálakṭi*, a little child, a darling ; *ekáṭi toká*, *tokáṭi*, a very small sum, a stiver, a mite.

It would be difficult to give an explanation of the true meaning of these suffixes, if we did not sometimes find the dental *t* in the place of the lingual *ṭ*. Now the cerebrals are pronounced in Bengali as the dentals are in Sanscrit. It is therefore probable that *ṭá* and *ṭi* are the same suffixes by means of which collective and abstract nouns are formed in Sanscrit. At the same time it is to be remarked, that in many modern languages the suffixes, destined to form abstract and collective names, give sometimes to these words an additional meaning, just in the same manner as the suffixes *ṭá* and *ti*; as, in English, woman and womankind, governors and government; and still more in French words, like loger, logis, logement, les bourgeois, la bourgeoisie, le peuple, la populace. We must also remark that in Bengali these different shades of meaning almost always depend on the character of the whole phrase, and that, generally, for instance, *ekaṭá bálák* means only a child, *ekaṭá ghar*, a house ; while, on the other hand, *balakṭá*, *gharṭá*, have the more definite meaning of ' the child,' ' the house.'

The most important point, however, of the Bengali is what we may call its secondary or periphrastic declension, which by the clearness of its origin allows us an interesting insight into the secret working of language, and gives us a key for many modern formations in kindred languages, where the original elements of these new formations are often obliterated and unexplainable. Although we have seen that in the singular there are some remains of the ancient forms in the locative, ablative and genitive, yet the language has lost the conscience of their true meaning, and they are made use of only in the most simple and distinct cases. In the modern language these suffixes have no longer sufficient power to perform the functions which they fulfilled in Sanscrit, and they have consequently been replaced by more expressive and more intelligible words. We must not, however, look upon these new formations in the light of arbitrary compositions, for, having become consecrated (*nitya*), these forms are regarded by the Bengalis as having the same value which the cases of the Sanscrit were considered to have by the ancient people who spoke it. As it may be of interest for the comparative study of modern languages, we give a list of the most usual forms of these secondary cases :—

1. *Kartrîk* (expressing agency), *hetuk* (expressing cause) form the instrumental, ablative and dative. Thus, *îçvarkartrik jagad srîshṭa haÿ*, the world is created by God, *i. e.* having God for the agent in its creation (Sanscrit, *îçvareṇa* or *îçvarât*); *dhanhetuk yatna karilek*, he exerts himself for

money, *i. e.* having money as the cause of his exertions. In Sanscrit the dative may be used, or a similar composition with the word *nimitta*, which occurs also in Bengali.

2. *Pûrvak* (expressing precedent) forms in like manner the instrumental. Thus *vinay pûrvak ukta haÿ*, it is spoken politely, *i. e.* having before it politeness (Sanscrit, *vinayena*).

3. *Diyá* (having taken), *kariyá* (having done), form the instrumental; thus, *churi diyá tâhâke mârilek*, he struck him with a knife, or, having taken the knife; *churi diyá lekhanî prastut karilen*, he prepared the pen with the penknife.

4. *Sahit*, *sange*, *sâte* (accompanied, near), as *purush sahit*, with men; *dugher sahit jal miçrit kariyâche*, he has mixed water with milk; *tomâr sange*, or *tomâr sâte yâiva*, I shall go with you. In Sanscrit, particularly in its most ancient form, the termination of the instrumental is sufficient to express this meaning; as, *purushaih*, with men; *haribhih*, with horses; afterwards *saha* or *sahita* is used with the instrumental to make the meaning more distinct, as *purushaih saha*.

5. *Haite* (from) is the most common sign for the ablative; as, *ghar haite niḥsrit*, gone out of the house (Sanscrit, *grîhân niḥsṛîtah*); *kumbhakâr haite ghat sakal nirmit haÿ*, the pots are made by the potter; *pitâ putra haite balavân haÿ*, the father is stronger than the son.

Notwithstanding the apparent difference of meaning, I think that *haite* is but a modern form of *sahita* (joined, with). The change of its signification (with, from) is analogous to that which similar words have undergone in other languages. Thus the English *by* means originally near (as "close by"), but it has lost this meaning almost entirely, and serves at present to form the ablative case. The same may be observed in French (par, avec) and German (mit); *râjâr haite nihsrît haÿ*, would therefore signify, he comes from with the king (d'avec le roi); *kumbhakâr haite ghat nirmit haÿ*, the pot has been made *by* the potter. What speaks most in favour of this etymology is, that also in other modern Indian dialects the ablative is formed on the same principle.

6. *Nikaṭ* and *nikaṭe* (near, in the neighbourhood). This word also serves, in accordance with its primitive meaning, to express several different relations at the same time. For instance, they say *râjâr nikaṭ pâiyâ*, having received from the king, and *râjâr nikaṭ gâiyâ*, having gone to the king, *i. e.* near him.

Nikaṭa occurs in Sanscrit also in the sense of *near*, and as the cerebral *ṭ* indicates often that the form in which it occurs is a contraction of another form, containing an *r*, I suppose *nikaṭa* to be derived from *nikarsha* or *nikṛishṭa*, as *vikaṭa*, great, from *vikarsha* or *vikṛishṭa*. Thus *taṭa* for *tarsha* or *tṛishṭa* (dry ground) is derived from *tṛish*, to be dry or thirsty; *paṭa*, a garment, from *paridhâ*; *vaṭa*, a circle, from *vṛita*; *bhaṭṭâ* for *bhartâ*, &c.

7. *Samîpe* (in the neighbourhood) is used in the same manner as *nikaṭe*.

8. *Madhye* or *majhe* (Pali madjhe), in the midst, forms the locative; as, *hriday madhye*, in the heart. Sansc. *hṛidaye*.

9. *Kache* and *kachete* (in the neighbourhood), just as *nikaṭ*.

10. *Sthâne* or *sthây* (at the place), forms the locative; as, *gharthây*, in the house, or near the house.

11. *Dvârâ* (by the door), by means of, forms the instrumental; as, *jñâna dvârâ*, by knowledge. Sansc. *jñânena*. *haster dvârâ tini mârilek*, he struck him with the hand.

12. *Râp* is sometimes used to express the genitive in figurative language;

as, *mṛ̆tyurūp rajju*, the cords of death, *i. e.* having the form of death; *çokarūp agni*, the fire of distress.

The use of these compounds is not so extensive in Sanscrit, but we nevertheless find already there the first traces of them even in ancient works, as for instance in Manu and even in the Veda; as, *atishṭhantīnām aniveçanānām kāshṭhānām madhye nihitam çariram vṛ̆trasya*, the body of Vṛ̆tra (the cloud) thrown into the flowing and restless waters. In modern books, and especially in the Buddhistical works, this usage is very general, and particularly interesting as giving the key for the original meaning of many obscure abbreviations, which in the spoken dialects of India form the new system of declensions. As far as the declensions are concerned, I think then it will be admitted that the Bengali is nothing but a modern development of the Sanscrit language, and that though reduced to a state of great poverty in its grammatical formation, it has not borrowed the principles of a new life from the language of barbarous tribes.

Of the conjugation of the Bengali it would be still more difficult to prove a non-Sanscritical origin. In comparing the conjugations of the Bengali with those of the Sanscrit verbs, we are struck with the same phænomenon which presented itself to our notice when examining the declensions. The Sanscrit possesses ten distinct forms, whereby the verbal base is derived from the primitive root; and by its three voices, the active, passive and middle voice, offers to us a rich variety of terminations, destined to express every form of tense, mood and person. But, what at first sight is most strange, while those languages which have for centuries been exiled from their native lands have preserved even in the extreme north vivid proofs of their ancient wealth and originality, the Bengali, which has remained in its paternal soil, has degenerated more than almost any other of the Indo-Germanic languages. It is true that the Indian tongue may have felt itself wearied and oppressed by the abundance of forms produced at the first burst of its youth; it is true, that in divesting itself of these exuberances it was following but a wise œconomy, and by analytical expressions accommodating itself to the wants of ordinary life; but the primitive beauty of human speech, the happy harmony between the spirit and the form of the words was lost, and the wings of human thought were broken. There is in Bengali neither middle nor passive; the greater part of its tenses are formed by means of auxiliary verbs, and according to the common system of the Bengali grammarians, there are no longer even different forms in the plural and singular. But admitting all these differences between Sanscrit and Bengali, which, indeed, everybody would expect to exist to a certain amount between every ancient and modern language, I cannot see how a totally different origin of the Bengali language can be proved by differences like the following, which Dr. Stevenson quotes in proof of his theory:—

1. That the second person singular imperative is the root or shortest form in Bengali and the other languages, while this is the case with only about one-half the tenses in Sanscrit.

2. That in Bengali the present tense contains the present participle as a constituent part of it followed by the substantive verb, as in our form, *I am reading*.

3. That it uses an aorist, which denotes past, present and future time.

4. That verbs are composed with the negative particle.

5. That the past tense has no reduplication, and

6. That the passive is formed in a peculiar manner.

As to the first point, if I understand him right, his calculation is wrong.

Except in the second, third, seventh and ninth class of Sanscrit verbs, and some ancient forms in the Veda, we find in all the other verbs the shortest form of the inflectional base in the second person singular imperative. These four classes however comprise only between 150 to 200 roots, while of the six other classes the first comprises alone about 1000 roots.

As to the second point, nobody denies that Bengali, as a modern language, employs periphrastical formations instead of the simpler forms of the ancient language; but when the form of the participle as well as of the auxiliary verb, are of Sanscrit origin, I do not see why their combination into a periphrastical form should point to a barbarous origin. That the Bengalis employ an aorist which denotes past, present and future time, is not at all extraordinary, since we see in many languages that when a new specific inflectional base has been assigned to the present and imperfect, the simple form represents generally the action of the verb only, without reference to any time, and is therefore called aorist.

As to the next point, the negative verb in Bengali has nothing irregular in its formation. By the addition of verbal terminations almost every word may become in modern languages a verbal base, and Dr. Stevenson must be aware, that like the negative verb *nâi*, I am not, from *nâ*, not, there is also an affirmative verb, *vaṭi*, I am indeed, from *vaṭa*, indeed. The loss of the reduplicative syllable in the perfect is sufficiently accounted for by the same occurrence in almost all the modern, and even some of the ancient branches of the Indo-Germanic family; and in supposing an auxiliary verb like *didhale* to be the original form of the terminations of the past tense, like *da* or *ta*, Dr. Stevenson seems not to be aware of his quite being in accordance with Professor Bopp, only that the latter takes not the modern Marathi form, *didhale*, but the ancient and simple form *dhâ*.

An element, which might perhaps be called aristocratic, has exercised much influence in the personal terminations of the verb. The Bengali grammarians pretend that there are two sorts of terminations equally employed for the singular and plural. One sort convey a kind of respectful meaning, the other has a contemptuous sense. This distinction is so generally adopted, not only by the grammarians but also by those who have written in the language, that we do not dare to pursue any other method, although we are convinced that the forms which convey contempt are nothing else but the singular ones, while those which express respect are the plural. To explain this distribution of the ancient forms, it is not sufficient for us to have recourse to the analogy of modern languages, in some of which, in speaking with respect of persons, we may perceive that a sense of superiority has been often attributed to the plural; for the peculiarity of Bengali consists not so much in a verb in the plural being connected with a substantive in the singular, but that a verb in the singular is governed by a substantive in the plural. This peculiarity does not admit of explanation, except on the ground that Bengali, to speak correctly, has properly no plural in declensions except in the case of reasonable beings. It would therefore be impossible to employ a third person plural, when we are speaking of animals or of inanimate objects. We might say, the wise men think (think plural), but if we wished to express the idea 'that animals eat' (eat plural), we must say, the mass of animals eats (verbally, the animal-mass or animality eats); hence, in this way, the plural of the verb will always find itself united with the names of superior beings, and the singular with those of inferior beings, and thus the two numbers of the verb must assume, by little and little, the peculiar character of the substantives on which they are dependent.

This signification, once formed and favoured by the double character of the pronoun, of which there is also a respectful and contemptful form, it becomes possible to explain how on the one hand the singular of substantives might be followed by the plural form, denoting respect, and how on the other hand other substantives would be followed by the singular form, expressing contempt. Thus the pronoun of the second person, *tumi*, would take the sense of you (plural), while it was more customary to address a person of distinction by *âpani* or *mahâçay* (your honour), both of which govern the third person plural of the verb. The pronoun *tui*, which always governs the singular with a sense of contempt, would cease to be regarded, even in its plural, *torâ*, as a word expressing many individuals, but would be held to be a collective word with the sense of contempt.

In general however it may be borne in mind that people of rank do not employ this pronoun and the corresponding form of the verb even in addressing their servants, because at the same time that the respectful forms of the plural lay aside almost altogether, by continual use, their respectful sense, the other become so full of contempt, that in conversation they are injurious.

The first person alone has preserved both in the plural and singular the same form; so that with the exception of the difference between the pronouns (*âmi* and *mui*), the form of the verb remains the same.

The late Dr. Yates, who, after such a long intercourse with the natives of Bengal, may be considered as a good authority on this subject, says in reference to these forms of the verb and the pronouns: "It would be well for the first and second of these pronouns (*mui* and *tui*), and for the verbs that agree with them, to be expunged from the language; yet as they are frequently used in common conversation, it is necessary to notice them, to enable the student to understand what he will frequently hear. The third often answers a useful purpose in distinguishing between the Creator and the creature, the king and the subject, the master and the servant, the animate and the inanimate." And again: "If a person speaks with the greatest humility of himself, or with the greatest contempt of another, he employs this form, but it is not found in good composition. From these strictures, however, the third person must be exempted, as it is used in all good composition for expressing common facts or events, and will on that ground in future be embodied in the honorific form of conjugation."

A slight knowledge of the system of the Indo-Germanic conjugations is sufficient to show that all the personal terminations of the verb came from the same source as those of the other cognate languages, and that they contain the remains of personal pronouns, added to the verbal root, and changed more or less in the gradual development of the language. It would be out of place to retrace here the origin of every Bengali termination, and to show the greater or lesser regularity of its successive alterations by analogies with the terminations of other languages. I think that the characteristic difference between the personal suffixes for the present and the imperfect (*i*, *is*, *e*, *am*, *i*, *a*), as well as the suffixes themselves, speak so clearly as to require no other proof for their Indo-Germanic descent, and I defy any one to find in any but an Indo-Germanic language, *i* and *am*, as the sign for the first person, *is* and *i* for the second, or *en* as the termination for the third person plural. We must only observe, that the terminations of the present and of the imperative contain the personal suffixes in their simplest forms, without the addition of any auxiliary verb, and the excellent work of Prof. Bopp will furnish sufficient instances of analogous forms of the personal terminations in Sanscrit and its filial languages.

The termination of the preterit, *ilám*, and of the future (*ibo*), bear the greatest resemblance to the corresponding Latin forms (*bam* and *bo*), and it might be possible to adopt the origin, assigned to these forms by Prof. Bopp, also for the Bengali, so that the terminations of these two tenses, small and insignificant as they are, might be shown to contain not only the remains of personal pronouns, but also those of an obliterated auxiliary verb. As to the future, there is externally not any difference between the pronunciation of the Latin *bo* and Bengali *va* (pronounced *bo*); and the Latin *bam* might be compared with the termination of the Bengali preterit *lám*, when we remember that instances are not wanting of the semivowel *l* having taken in other languages the place of an original *v*. Thus Sanscrit *svap*, to sleep, German *schlaf*; Sanscrit *vad*, to say, Gothic *lath-ôn*.

I prefer however another explanation of this tense, which is more in accordance with the development which the form of the past tense has taken in Pracrit as well as in other modern languages of India. There is a change of letters which is of very frequent occurrence in the popular dialects of India, I mean the transition of the dental *t* into a lingual *ḍ*, which, according to its pronunciation, may often be represented by *l* or *r*. Adopting this theory, Bengali forms, like *karilám*, I did, would contain a past participle with an active signification (Sanscrit *karita*=Bengali *karila*), followed by the secondary personal terminations. That this is the real origin of these forms may be put above every contradiction by a comparison with the Mahratta preterit, which, as Professor Lassen has shown, has preserved even the three genders of the participle, saying *to kelâ*, he did, *tî kelî*, she did, *teṁ kelem̃*, it did, and even in the first person, *mî kelom̃*, I did (masc.), *mî kelem̃*, I did (fem.), *mî kelom̃* (neuter). This being the case, and seeing that in Pracrit already all the original historical tenses are altogether lost, I think that even the Pracrit termination of the preterite *ia* or *ïa*, either in an absolute or neuter state, or followed by a masculine termination, may be taken for a corrupted form of a past participle, for we see that in Pracrit the termination *ta* is already changed into *ḍa*, and that sometimes the *t* is entirely suppressed, as *osaria* for *osariḍa*.

The conditional seems to contain in the *t* of its terminations the remains of a present participial form, to which the secondary personal terminations are added in the same manner as in other clearly periphrastical formations, of which we shall have to speak directly. This tense is also interesting on account of its having preserved, in the second person singular, the final *s*, which is dropped in the corresponding form of the imperfect.

Besides the conjugation by means of the simple terminations, the Bengali language has yet two other conjugations, which are periphrastical in the proper sense of the word, although here also the two component parts are more intimately allied than in periphrastical formations of the Latin, (like *factus sum*,) or of the French (like *je suis fait, j'ai fait*). These conjugations, which furnish some tenses only, are formed, the one by adding the auxiliary verb to the participle, the other by adding it to the past adverb. The auxiliary verb is *áchi*, I am, used in the present and preterite only.

This auxiliary verb *áchi*, the same as the Sanscrit *asmi, asi, asti*, Doric *ἐμμί, ἐασί, ἐντί*, Latin *sum, es, est*, cannot be regarded as a primitive root. Language, representing as it does the images of all things or actions, which by the energy of their impression upon the mind are able to excite an idea (*εἶδος*, phonic image), has not and cannot have a word which expresses the abstract and lifeless notion of mere affirmation or existence. But as the development of the mind advances, step by step, with that of language, and *vice versâ*, we

see that at the same time, when by a frequently repeated perception of the different kind of "being," the mind arrived at the general idea of 'being' in its purest sense, (as copula) without the admixture of any determinative attributes, the language by the frequently repeated use of words, which originally expressed different kinds of specific being, forgot, if we may be allowed the expression, the distinctive character of *being*, represented by them, and took them in the general meaning of *being* without attributes. Thus we find that verbs, which signified properly *to stay*, *to sit*, *to grow*, *to arise*, lost in time their specific meaning, and expressed often, instead of the situation of staying or sitting, situation or existence in general, and instead of the act of growing and arising, action in general. It is in this way that the difference of meaning which, by careful attention and a fine feeling for language, can often be perceived between the different auxiliary verbs, must be accounted for; and thus we see in Bengali also that the verb *áchi*, I am, cognate as it is with a verbal radical signifying to sit, has retained something of its primary meaning, and implies always mere existence or existence in reference to locality, while the other auxiliary verb, *haÿ*, I am (the same as the Sanscrit *bhú*, Greek φύω, Latin *fui*), having the primitive meaning of to grow, to drive or to arise, signifies rather to become than to be. Ex. *tumi kiṁçid kriç häiyácha*, you have become a little thin; though very often it is but the mere verbal copula, as *tini jñánaván han*, he is wise; *açva paçu haÿ*, the horse is an animal. The other auxiliary verb *áchi*, on the contrary, is well employed in phrases like—is he (alive) or is he dead? *tini âchen ki máriyáchen*? God is for ever, *îçvar sarvakál áchen*. Is he at home? *tini ki ghare áchen*.

By means of the verb *áchi*, four periphrastical tenses are formed. Example:

karite, present participle, doing.
karitechi, I am doing.
karitechilám, I was doing.
kariyá, past adverb, having done.
kariyáchi, I have done (having done, I am).
kariyáchilám, I had done (having done, I was).

The meaning of these four tenses is evident by their origin.

Karitechi, I am doing, describes an action which continues at the moment of speaking; *karitechilám*, I was doing, an action, continued in a past time, always with reference to another action; as, I was doing when he arrived. *Kariyáchi*, I have done, implies an action accomplished at the moment of speaking; *kariyáchilám*, I had done, an action finished in a past time with reference to another action.

In Bengali there is no distinctive form for the subjunctive present, but the indicative is employed, though the character of the phrase may require a subjunctive form; or rather the whole character of the phrase and the manner of representing conditional ideas are not the same in Bengali as in other languages, which, by a change in the form of the verb, are enabled to give to the colour of the phrase this particular shade. The conditional relation is in the mind of one who expresses himself in Bengali insensibly changed into a mere temporal one. Ex. *yadi tumi mára, tave ámi máriva*, word for word, when you beat, then I shall beat; *yadi ámi tomár pitá haÿ, ámáke avaçya mánya karive*, if I am your father, you must respect me. The particle *yadi* can also be omitted. Ex. *tumi mára, tave ámi máriva*, you beat, then I shall beat, *i. e.* should you beat, I shall beat. Sometimes *tave* also, which usually begins the principal phrase, is not added. Ex. *tumi mára, ámi máriva*, you beat, I shall beat, *i. e.* should you beat, I shall beat.

The conditional may be regarded as the past tense of a subjunctive mood, in the principal as well as in the secondary phrase. Ex. *yadi tumi ámáke márite, ámi tomáke máritám*, if you had beaten me, I would have beaten you; *yadi ámi sesthâne haitâm, tini e duḥkha páiten ná*, had I been there, he would not have experienced such distress. The same tense expresses sometimes the frequency of an action in the past time, without any conditional relation. Ex. *ámi rájvidyálaye paḍitám*, I used to study in the Royal college.

The infinitive in *ite* has the same power as the infinitive of other languages: thus *táháke márite ámi ásiyáchi*, I am come to beat him; *ámáke márite deo*, allow me to beat. Dr. Stevenson remarks, that almost all of these Indian languages agree in forming an infinitive of very popular use, by adding the same letters that are used for the formation of the dative singular of nouns. It needs indeed but little insight into the origin and definite nature of the infinitive to see that it is nothing but a verbal noun with different, generally obsolete terminations of cases. Taking this view, which has been confirmed by the comparison of many Indo-Germanic languages, it is easy to see that the Bengali infinitive, "karite," must be taken for a dative or locative of a verbal noun, like the English "*to do*," while the Tamil infinitive, formed by the termination *ku* or *ka*, represents to us the verbal noun in the accusative, just as the Sanscrit and Latin terminations in *tum*.

The two verbal nouns ending in *iyá* and *ile* may be regarded as two verbal adverbs, or as absolute and obsolete cases of a verbal noun. The former is employed for the past, the latter for an indefinite, often for the future time. The origin of them is clear, the one corresponding to the Sanscrit form in *ya*, the other being a locative of the past participle, with the regular change of *t* into *l*. Both these forms give a great advantage to the Bengali, because it is possible to express by means of them a whole phrase dependent on another, without employing conjunctive particles and without any regard to gender, case and number. The subject only must be the same in the principal and subordinate phrases, when the form in *iyá* is employed. Ex. *tini pustak páth kariyá vahire gelen*, he went out, after having read, or when he had read the book. *E samvád janiyá mugdha hailám*, having learnt this news, he became insensible.

The most usual form of the present participle has the same termination as the infinitive. Being a verbal adjective, it has like the other adjectives no terminations for the cases, but it governs the same case as the verb. Ex. *ápan putrake márite ámi táháke dekhilám*, I saw him beating his own son.

As the infinitives of the Indo-Germanic languages must be regarded as the absolute cases of a verbal noun, it is probable that in Bengali the infinitive in *ite* was also originally a locative, which expressed not only local situation, but also movement towards some object, as an end, whether real or imaginary. Thus the Bengali infinitive corresponds exactly with the English, where the relation of case is expressed by the preposition *to*. Ex. *táháke márite ámi ásiyáchi*, means, I came to the state of beating him, or I came to beat him; *ámáke márite deo*, give me (permission), let me (go) to the action of beating, *i. e.* allow me to beat.

Now as the form of the participle is the same as that of the infinitive, it may be doubted if there is really a distinction between these two forms as to their origin. For instance, the phrase *ápan putrake márite ámi táháke dekhilám*, can be translated, I saw him beating his own son; but it can be explained also as, what they nonsensically call in Latin grammar *accusativus cum infinitivo*, that is to say, the infinitive can be taken for a locative of the verbal noun, and the whole phrase be translated, I saw him in the action of

beating his own son (vidi patrem caedere ipsius filium). As in every Bengali phrase the participle in *ite* can be understood in this manner, I think it admissible to ascribe this origin to it, and instead of taking it for a nominative of a verbal adjective, to consider it as a locative of a verbal noun.

That all of the verbs in these languages are naturally destitute of a passive voice, is true only so far as that they have given up the simple and ancient formation of the passive, formed in Sanscrit by affixing *ya* to the base of the verb. But it is highly interesting to see how modern languages, after abandoning the ancient formations, have often had recourse to the same means, by which these ancient forms were effected. Thus the Bengali, giving up the Sanscrit passive form in *ya*, created a new periphrastical passive voice by means of the same auxiliary verb *yá*, to go, saying, for instance, *jáná yáy* it goes to be known, instead of the Sanscrit *jñáyate*, it becomes known.

It is difficult however to say whether it is the passive participle or the verbal noun, which, joined to the verb *yáite*, serves in Bengali to represent a passive verb, ex. *nadí dekhá yáiteche*, the river is seen. Sir Graves Haughton has the merit of having first discovered the analogy existing between this compound Bengali passive and other passive formations in Sanscrit, &c., where the auxiliary verb *yá* (to go) is already more or less changed and obliterated. He believes that the *á* is the termination of the verbal noun, and his opinion has been adopted by Prof. Bopp, who has confirmed it by adducing analogical forms from the Latin and Sanscrit languages. The great difficulty of this theory is, to give a passive power to a composition, both the elements of which have an active signification, for the verbal noun in *á* as well as the verb *yáite* is always active. To remove this difficulty, Sir Graves says, "that when this form is used, it implies the object obtains the result of the action that the noun implies, which is just the equivalent of what the other forms express; for, when we say, he is killed by the man, we infer that he is gone to the state of death by means of the man." Against this theory we have but one observation to make, that is, that in Bengali *márite* means to strike, to kill, and that by this reason *márá yáite* would always mean, to go to the state of striking, of killing, and not to the state of death. The other example also, quoted by Sir Graves, *bhála manda sakaler kathár dvárá jáná yáy*, can be well translated, good and bad qualities of all go to discovery by words, but discovery would always retain an active sense, and would mean, to go to the state of discovering, which is nonsense. Therefore Rammohun Roy, possessing doubtless the most intimate and delicate knowledge of the spoken Bengali, does not follow this opinion, but analyses these passive compounds by taking the former part for the passive participle (not mentioned in other Bengali grammars), and the latter for the verb *yáite*, with the sense of to become. Ex. *ṭáká deoyá gela*, money has been given (money went or became given out); *se márá yáivek*, he will be beaten. What speaks mostly in favour of this opinion is, that there are in Bengali other phrases where *yáite* is really joined to the active verbal noun, which retains always its active or intransitive power. But in this case *yáite* has another signification, and is impersonally employed in the sense of, it goes, it happens. Ex. *ámáke jáná yáy ná*, literally, to know me never happens, *i. e.* I cannot be known; *tomáke dekhá gela*, you could be seen, or you have been seen. In this sense *yáite* can be combined with intransitive verbs also. Ex. *calá yáy*, walking goes, *i. e.* we can go out.

There are still some other Bengali formations which serve to express the passive, but these too are, although not found in Sanscrit, yet entirely based

upon Sanscrit elements. Thus every passive participle may be taken from the Sanscrit, and may, when followed by the Bengali verb *haïte*, to be, form a passive verb, as *krĭt*, done, *krĭt haÿ*, I am done. Besides, the Bengali has, like other languages, some compositions by which a passive sense can be expressed, though, grammatically speaking, they are hardly to be considered as constituting a distinct passive formation. Thus the verbe *khâite* (to eat) and *pâite* (to get), are of very frequent occurrence, to express in certain combinations a passive idea. Ex. *duhkha khâite*, to eat pain, to suffer pain, or to be pained; *mâri khâÿ*, he eats or he gets a beating, *i. e.* he is or gets beaten, *pîḍâte nashṭa pâivek*, he will get destroyed by grief.

So much in answer to Dr. Stevenson, and enough, I hope, to vindicate the origin which I ascribe to the grammatical structure of the Bengali. It would be easy to bring forward a great many forms of this dialect, the Sanscrit origin of which is beyond all doubt, but I think that the mere fact of Dr. Stevenson's not mentioning them in support of his theory, shows sufficiently that he also did not consider them as arising from the language of the aboriginal inhabitants of India.

But now it may be asked, what is the use of these comparisons? what does it matter whether Bengali belongs, by its grammatical structure, to the Indo-Germanic or the Turkish family of languages, provided that a man knows enough of it to express what he wishes? My answer is this: from comparing languages, from finding out analogies between them, from tracing the origin of forms in modern languages down to the living roots of more ancient languages, and from going back, as far as it is allowed to us, to see the first manifestation of human mind by human speech, we derive, I think, a threefold advantage—an *historical*, *practical*, and *philosophical*.

When poetical tradition is silent, when historical records are lost, when physiological researches fail, language will speak and decide whether there has been a community and connection in the intellectual development of different people. One of the most important questions of ethnological philology, which is now pending, the question of the origin and the connection of the Babylonian, Assyrian and Median civilization, art and language, can only be solved effectively by the language of the inscriptions which have been found in the ancient cities of Babylon, Nineveh and Persepolis. It is as if it were by Providence that these monuments have been preserved during many centuries under the protecting veil of the earth, and that they are now discovered at a time when comparative philology has, by the study of the ancient languages of Egypt, Aramea, Persia and India, grown strong enough to master them, and to read in the arrows of these inscriptions the hieroglyphics of the human mind.

But in India too there are still many questions to be answered as far as ethnological philology is concerned. We are generally inclined to consider the inhabitants of this vast country as one great branch of the Caucasian race, differing from the other branches of the same race merely by its darker complexion. This difference of colour has been accounted for by the influence of a climate which has produced a similar change of colour even in those who, like the Portuguese, have settled there only for some centuries. If we look however more attentively at the descriptions which have been given of the physical properties of many tribes inhabiting the west and a great part of the centre of India, some in the mountainous districts of the Vindhya, like the Bhillas, Méras, Kolas, Gondas and Paharias, some even in the northern parts of the Himâlaya and Beloochistan, as the Râjîs or

Doms and the Brahuís, and others in the interior of the Dekhan, we cannot but admit that we meet here with a different race, which, by its physical and intellectual type, resembles closely the negro. The historical existence of this people we can trace in the Máhabhárata as well as in the history of Herodotus, in both of which we find them mentioned in the north and north-west of India, while the existence of the same dark race in the south is authenticated, not only by Indian poems, but also by Strabo.

There is also some difference between the Brahminical inhabitants of the north and the south of India, the latter being rather short in their stature and dark in their complexion, not however so much as not to show still on both sides the noble stamp of the Caucasian race.

But while on physiological grounds we should find no difficulty in admitting those two races as the inhabitants of India, we have still to account for the difference of language which exists between the north and south of this peninsula. If the great mass of the inhabitants of the Dekhan belongs to the Caucasian race, one would expect to find also amongst them a Caucasian or Indo-Germanic language. Instead of this we find that the southern languages are entirely and originally different from the Arian languages spoken in the north, and that they bear, so far as we may judge from the latest researches, a resemblance to the dialects spoken by the savage tribes, like the Bhillas and Gondas, which we considered as having a Cushite origin.

But although these facts may seem contradictory and perplexing, yet these contradictions between the results of physiological and linguistical inquiries may be accounted for and reconciled by the aid of early tradition and history.

When the Arian tribes immigrated into the north of India, they came as a warrior-like people, vanquishing, destroying and subjecting the savage and despised inhabitants of those countries. We generally find that it is the fate of the negro race, when brought into hostile contact with the Japhetic race, to be either destroyed and annihilated, or to fall into a state of slavery and degradation, from which, if at all, it recovers by the slow process of assimilation. This has been the case in the north of India. The greater part of its former inhabitants have entirely vanished at the approach of the Arian civilization; some however submitted to the yoke of the conquerors, and many of these have, after a long period of slavery, during which they adopted the manners, religion and language of their superiors, risen to a new social and intellectual independence. The lower classes of the Hindús consist of those aboriginal inhabitants, and some of them continue still up to the present day in a state of the utmost degradation, living as outcasts in forests or as servants in villages. Some however who came into a closer contact with their masters, by living as servants and workmen in the vicinity of towns, or in the houses of their employers, have intellectually and physically undergone a complete regeneration, so that after three thousand years it would be difficult to trace the Súdra origin of many highly distinguished families in India.

The Arian conquerors of India did not however settle over the whole of Hindustan, but following first a southern and then a south-eastern direction, they left a great part of Western India untouched; and it is there that we find still those aboriginal tribes, which, escaping the influence of the Brahminical as well as afterwards of the Rajput and Mahomedan conquerors, preserve together with their rude language and savage manners the uncouth type of their negro origin. North of the tract of the Arian occupa-

tions only few of these Autochthones have been spared, yet some remains of them may be recognised in the tribes of the Rájís or Doms, who live in the mountainous parts of the Himálaya. They all belong to the same widespread people with whom but lately in Gondwana English armies came into hostile contact to prevent their pillage and human sacrifices; and it is curious to see how the descendants of the same race, to which the first conquerors and masters of India belonged, return, after having followed the northern development of the Japhetic race to their primordial soil, to accomplish the glorious work of civilization, which had been left unfinished by their Arian brethren.

Wholly different from the manner in which the Brahminical people overcame the north of India, was the way they adopted of taking possession of and settling in the country south of the Vindhya. They did not enter there in crushing masses with the destroying force of arms, but in the more peaceful way of extensive colonization (áçramas), under the protection and countenance of the powerful empires in the north.

Though sometimes engaged in wars with their neighbouring tribes, these colonies generally have not taken an offensive but only a defensive part; and it appears that, after having introduced Brahminical institutions, laws and religion, especially along the two coasts of the sea, they did not pretend to impose their language upon the much more numerous inhabitants of the Dekhan, but that they followed the wiser policy of adopting themselves the language of the aboriginal people, and of conveying through its medium their knowledge and instruction to the minds of uncivilized tribes. In this way they refined the rude language of the earlier inhabitants, and brought it to a perfection which rivals even the Sanscrit. By these mutual concessions a much more favourable assimilation took place between the Arian and aboriginal race, and the south of India became afterwards the last refuge of Brahminical science, when it was banished from the north by the intolerant Mohammedans. There remain still in some parts of the interior of the Dekhan some savage tribes, never reached by the touch of civilization; yet upon the whole the Arian population, though comparatively small in number, has overgrown the former population, so that physically only few marks of a different blood remain. It is interesting and important to observe how the beneficial influence of a higher civilization may be effectually exercised without forcing the people to give up their own language and to adopt that of their foreign conquerors, a result by which, if successful, every vital principle of an independent and natural development is necessarily destroyed.

The practical advantage of comparative philology is perhaps less evident, because only few have availed themselves of the results of this science, and applied them to the practical study of languages. Every one however knows how difficult it is to learn the first rudiments of a grammar, because all those terminations, suffixes and prefixes, with which our memory is at first overloaded, are to our mind but mere sounds and names, while, by tracing their origin, their historical development, and their affinity with grammatical forms of other known languages, we begin to take some interest in them, and by putting them in connection with other ideas, find it easier to keep them in memory quickly and firmly. Besides, having once acquired the real understanding of any grammatical form, and having put its origin and power into its proper light, we can afterwards dispense with a great many rules which are necessary only from the want of a real understanding of these grammatical forms. These forms once thoroughly understood, we acquire a kind of feeling which

tells us in any particular case how far grammatical elements, in accordance with their primitive power, are able to express different shadows of meaning in the spoken language of a people.

On the advantage which philosophy or science in general derives from comparative philology, I do not venture to add anything after what was so fully and clearly explained yesterday by Chevalier Bunsen, the representative of German science in this country. Language must be considered, in its connection with nature and with the human mind, as being the natural expression of every natural impression, as being the higher unity and absolute reality of objective nature and subjective mind. Language stands in the system of the intellectual world as light stands in the system of the physical world, comprising all, penetrating all, and revealing all. There is more indeed to be read in human language itself than in anything that has been written in it.