

JOURNAL
OF THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY.

No. IV. 1860.

*Is the Pushto a Semitic Language?—By the Rev. ISIDOR
LOEWENTHAL, Peshawar.*

Error is immortal. The old fable concerning Hercules and the Hydra has doubtlessly a typical reference to the quixotic bouts men sometimes undertake against error; only seven heads is too small a number to typify the vitality of a good blunder, the longevity of a plain definite mistake. The fable, too, makes Hercules victorious; but who has ever seen the successful gardener that has really extirpated a weed which once has taken root in his grounds? This ineradicability may be predicated of any error, but necessarily most so of such as appear to rest on the authority of a great name, and are brought forward now and then by those who have in some way or another acquired the reputation of being authorities. This is very provoking. Is it really so that men love darkness rather than light?

More than seventy years ago the first President of the Asiatic Society of Bengal happened to state that the Pushto language had a manifest resemblance to the Chaldaic. There is evidence in the earlier volumes of the "Asiatic Researches" that some attention was paid in Calcutta to the Pushto language in those days, but, it appears, more for literary than philological purposes. At all events the statement of Sir William Jones remained uncontradicted and unchallenged for many years. In Germany even the opinion gained currency through Kleuker (the earliest German translator of the Zend Avesta)

NO. CV.—NEW SERIES, VOL. XXIX.

2 v

who published (Riga 1795) many of the articles of the "Asiatic Researches" in a German translation.

Klaproth, however, the distinguished traveller and orientalist, as early as 1810 vigorously attacked this opinion in the first volume of the Archives for Asiatic Literature, and dated his conviction that the Pushto is an Indo-Germanic language. In 1826, when he published his *Tableaux Historiques de l'Asie*, he held the same view.*

In 1814, Elphinstone, in his "Account of the Kingdom of Cabul" also dissented from the opinion of Sir William Jones, and stated positively that of 218 words of those in common use which he had examined, not one had "the smallest appearance of being deducible from the Hebrew or Chaldaic."

In 1829, Dorn, professor of Oriental languages at the University of Charkow, then young, but already distinguished for his attainments in Eastern Literature, in his translation of Neamet Ullah, maintained that there was not the least resemblance between Pushto and Hebrew or Chaldee. He adduces three words that had been referred to as proving a connection between them :

ابا *father*, compared with the Chaldee st. emph. אָבִי

اِخْسَل *to take*, with the Hebrew אָחַל

اِرْخ *the side*, with the Hebrew אֶרֶץ

He simply says that these prove nothing. And he is correct; but it may be added that the word *abá*, *abbá*, or *apá* means "father" in considerably more than thirty distinct languages (v. Buschmann, *Ueber den Naturlaut*, p. 16, which list is very far from being complete), so that such a word would have to be entirely excluded from any evidence; that the Infinitive اِخْسَل (*ákhstal*) is deceptive, the root being اِخْل (*ákhāl*), bearing the same relation to the Infinitive that the Persian گسل does to its Infinitive گستن, and that it is most probably connected with the old Persian آختن "to draw out," "take away;" whilst اِرْخ (*ar'kh*) is undoubtedly the Sanskrit उरश् (*uras*) "breast;" the slight shifting of the signification finds its exact counterpart in the Sanskrit पार्श्व "the side" as compared with the Polish *piers'* "breast;" the pronunciation of the Polish *s'* is precisely

* Does Captain Raverty mean any pleasantry, when, in his *Pushtoo Grammar*, he "hopes the Professor will change his opinion now" twenty-five years after his death?

that of the Sanskrit अ. The change of the Sanskrit अ into خ is exemplified in various languages: compare the French *savon* with Spanish *jabone* (soap); Hebrew חֹבֶה (*khúg*) and סָבַח (*súg*) "to encircle;" חָקַק *kháká* and סָקַק (*sáká*) "to look;" Greek *αστηρ* with Persian اختر "a star;" Hindustani *مسر* with Persian *خسر* "*socer*;" Sanskrit *svap* with Persian خواب "sleep," etc.

Taking his materials solely from Klaproth and Elphinstone, Pott, than whom, with all his audacity, no greater etymologist has arisen, does not hesitate a moment in assigning the Pushto its place as one of the Indo-European languages. He divides the latter into five families in his *Etymologische Forschungen* (1833), and places the Persian and Pushto together into the second family, precisely as he puts the German and the Dutch together in the fourth.

In 1839, Ewald the greatest Hebraist of the present century, gave a careful examination of what materials of the language were accessible to him, and, of course, could not give the slightest support to the opinion that Pushto had any connection with a Semitic language.

The same view was clearly elucidated by Dorn again, in the transactions of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences at various times from 1840 to 1845. In his *Pushto Chrestomathy* (St. Petersburg, 1847), he designates the Pushto as a branch of the Indo-Persian languages.

"The Bible of Every Land," a work published by Bagster in 1848, which exhibits in its notices great accuracy and completeness of information, says of the Pushto language, "It exhibits none of the peculiarities of the Semitic dialects, but, on the contrary, forms an important link in the great Indo-European languages."

The latest edition of Brockhaus' *Conversations-Lexikon* also correctly calls the language a sister of the Persian.

And as if to clinch the matter, *Max Müller*, whose authority in such things is simply indisputable, without the shadow of a doubt ranges the Pushto among those scions of the Arian stock which struck root in the soil of Asia, before the Arian reached the shores of Europe. (*Languages of the Seat of War*, London, 1855.)

To these we may add minor lights to show at least the general consent of intelligent philologists, such as *Schleicher* (*Zur Vergleichenden Sprachengeschichte*, Bonn, 1848, p. 67,) and (*Die Sprachen*

Europas, Bonn, 1850, p. 130); *De Vere* (Comparative Philology, New York, 1853, p. 299); *Rapp* (Grundriss der Grammatik, Stuttgart, 1855), and others.

One might have thought the truth pretty well established by this time, were it not for the feline vitality of error, which in this instance was aided by the fact that the pure linguistic question had been mixed up with an obscure ethnological problem, which some people moreover are inclined to make somewhat of a religious question. The allusion is to the alleged claim of the Afghans to be considered children of Israel. It is not intended here to enter upon this matter. The question now is simply whether the Pushto is an Indo-European, or a Semitic language. But when Ewald, and Dorn, and Pott, and Müller have pronounced, is there any one yet who can doubt? It is mortifying to be obliged to say that there is.

When the founder of the Asiatic Society pronounced his opinion, perhaps hastily, and certainly on an imperfect inspection of scanty and perhaps faulty materials, one willingly forgets it.

Indignor, quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus!

But people must necessarily dig up old bones, *Sir George Rose* published a somewhat wild pamphlet on "The Kings of the East," in which he revives the opinion of Sir William Jones, maintains that the Pushto language does contain Hebraic elements, and blames Dr. Wolff for not finding more than one word which countenances that view.

Sir George Rose claimed neither a position as a philologist, nor an acquaintance with Pushto; hence his assertions, however strenuously made, might be allowed to rest on their own merits. But now a professed philologer enters the lists, namely, the *Rev. Charles Fors-ter*, one of the six preachers of the Cathedral of Canterbury, Rector of Stisted, Honorary Member of the Literary Society, author of "Mahomedanism Unveiled," and of "The Historical Geography of Arabia." These facts are taken from the title page of a work designated briefly as follows: "The one primeval language traced experimentally through ancient inscriptions in alphabetic characters of lost powers from the four continents. Including the voice of Israel from the rocks of Sinai: and the vestiges of Patriarchal tradition from the monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Southern Arabia." In

this book, as is well known, the author runs a violent tilt against men like Grotefend, Beer, Lassen, Rawlinson, St. Martin, and upsets them all to his own complete satisfaction and the reader's infinite amusement. The third volume of this work is filled up by "A New Key for the Recovery of the Lost Ten Tribes," which recovery, we are informed—and the information is at least new—is "the most interesting problem in the history of the world." It is in this that Dr. Forster reprints Jones' note from the second volume of the "Researches," and reasserts the Semitic origin of the Pushto language. In proof of this assertion he produces three words, which are to establish his position.

(1). He quotes from Wolff "אור (*or*) light, is the only Hebrew word I found in the Afghan tongue."—On this it may be observed that *or* اور in Pushto does not mean "light," but "fire," and that the word is plainly connected with the Arian tongues. In the language still called Zend "fire" is *atar*, Persian اذر; the connection of اور (*or*) with these is precisely analogous to that of the

Pushto مور (*mor*) *mother* with Persian مادر, Sanskrit *mātar*.

" وړور (*wror*) *brother* with " برادر Zend *brátar*.

" لور (*lor*) *sickle* with " Sanskrit *dátra*.*

" نور (*nor*) *other* with " Zend (à) *ntar*.

It may be observed that in Irish *ur* is "fire," but the connection of the latter is more likely with the Latin *uro* which of course (*us-si, us-tum*) must be referred to the root *ush*; and, as Pictet observes, (*Les noms celtiques du soleil*), la ressemblance avec l'hébreu *or, ur*, lumière, semble donc purement fortuite.

(2). Dr. Forster continues, "I have no Afghans to confer with on the matter, but I possess Elphinstone's Cabul; and will undertake, in the second word of his "Pushtoo Vocabulary," to find a second Hebrew word: viz. שמים, *Samim*, with the article prefixed, השמים, *hesamin*, 'The heavens,' of which the Pushtoo, 'Asman, Heaven,' is clearly only a dialectic variation. I notice this merely as a specimen of Dr. Wolff's carelessness and hastiness of examination."—This, the readers of the Journal need not be told, would prove too much, and hence nothing; inasmuch as آسمان is also pure Persian; *asman* also occurs in Zend and the

* On the change of *d* into *l* see below.

cuneiform inscriptions in the same sense; and the Sanskrit *açma* is "a cloud." There may possibly be a general connection between this thoroughly Arian word, and the Semitic, not peculiarly Hebrew, root *'*صما, but that is all.

(3). "A third Hebrew term in the Pushtoo language, not in Mr. Elphinstone's catalogue, viz. נהר, *nahar*, a river, has been elsewhere noticed in the Pushtoo term *Ning-nehar*, the nine rivers."—Nor will this corroborate Mr. Forster's position materially. *Ning-nehar* (the name of a locality beyond the Peshawur Frontier) is far more frequently written and called ننگرهار (*ningrahar*), or ننگهار (*ningahár*), so that the *nahar* necessary for the proof entirely disappears. Were there a *nahar* in the word, the derivation given could not be relied on, as it is given by Afghan etymologists, who are almost as wild as Mr. Forster himself. In this case they are themselves not agreed as to the derivation; for some say the name is نیم نهر (*ním-nahar*) "half-hungry," and that the region is called so from the frequent scarcity of bread there; others say the name is really نیک انهار (*nekanhár*) "the good or pure streams; *anhár* is a pure Arabic plural—the Hebrew plural would be quite different. And lastly, نهر is not a Pushto word at all, is known only in the book language, and not among the people; and even if the latter were the case, it would prove nothing; for if a connection between the Hebrew and the Pushto is to be proved, all such words must be excluded from the evidence as are common to the Arabic and Hebrew; for everybody is aware that all Mahomedan nations use Arabic terms very largely, whatever their language be.

If such sporadic resemblances as the Philo-Semitics have hitherto searched for, helped the matter at all, one might be ready to suggest to them to compare the Hebrew קח (*kheq*) with the Pushto غچ (*ghej*)* "embrace," which is pronounced by the Khalíl, Momund, and

* This article does not adopt, in its spelling, either of the two standard alphabets that have been proposed; the reader will have no difficulty, it is apprehended, in making out the words. The vowels have the continental sounds, as proposed by Sir William Jones: the consonants their general English value; *kḥ* = خ; *gḥ* = غ; *j* the Pushto چ which answers most completely to the Polish *z*; *zh* = the Persian ژ which in the same manner is pronounced precisely like the Polish *z* (*s* in "pleasure" is between these two sounds); ç = Sanskrit ञ.

Yúsufzai “gheg.” But careful investigation will at once prove that “ghej” is the proper pronunciation, and that it has the same parentage with the Persian آغوش; آ is the inseparable particle, common to the Sanskrit, Zend, Parsi, and Persian, as in آشنآ آشام آشوب آمدن آشنا آشنآ آغوشن آوردن آغوشن, etc. etc. The final ش, in Persian, often becomes پ in Pushto, as گوش = غوپ; خوش = خوپ; the substitution of the vowel *e* for *o* is a mere dialectic variation; the Banúchís, for instance, constantly say *mír*, *kír*, *lír*, *kim*, for *mor*, *kor*, *lúr*, *kum*, etc.

The Pushto لوبه (*loba*) “play” might be imagined to be connected with the Hebrew לָבַח; only it is much easier and far more correct to derive this Pushto word directly from the Arabic لعبه, of the same signification, by the analogy of scores of similar instances, the Afghans pronouncing ع generally like *o*,—an incidental proof this that their own original speech has not this Semitic guttural.

Or the Semitic advocates might be told that *da* is used in Pushto to form the Genitive, whilst דָּ (dái) or דֵּ (de) in Chaldee is constantly used to form a relation very much like that expressed by the Genitive; and it is not unlikely that this constant recurrence of *da* in both Pushto and Chaldee may have imposed on Sir William Jones. It must be considered, however, that *da* also forms the Genitive in Panjábí, but as a postposition, like *ka* in Hindustani; it is more likely that the Pushto *da* is connected with the Latin *de*, which again reverts, in the Romanic languages, to form the Genitive. In Polish, the Latin *de* is most frequently translated by *od*, which is beyond a doubt the Sanskrit *adhas*; whether *de* is for *ade* = *adhas*, as Benfey suggests, is another question.

Dá also is the demonstrative pronoun both in Pushto and Chaldee; only it is so in Zend also, and though the Afghans would like to make out their relationship to the Israelites, their language prefers to be considered an ancient relict of Zend.

But, at all events, sound philologists have long since abandoned and reprobated the plan of establishing the affinity of languages on sporadic resemblances traced in their vocabularies. Organic identity in grammatical structure, added to a large community in certain household words, is necessary definitely to determine such questions.

However, the learned decypherer of the pictured rocks seems himself not quite firmly convinced of the Hebrew origin of Pushto, as,

a few pages on, he catches at a statement of Ibn Haukal's that Pushto is a Tatar dialect (he says, "Tartar"), and makes many apologies on behalf of the Afghans for having exchanged Hebrew for a Tatar dialect.

In return, one ought to be ready to make every allowance for Mr. Forster. His book was published in 1854; the materials for becoming acquainted with Pushto were then not readily accessible to an English scholar, who probably would care little for Russian publications though they be in the English language; it is not likely that he had seen Captain Vaughan's "Grammar of the Poooshtoo Language" which was published in Calcutta in the same year; and Captain Raverty's Grammar was not published till 1856. It would be impossible now, with an apparatus like that contained in the last mentioned grammar, with its copious paradigms and examples, whatever be the value of the system or the rules,—it would be impossible now to fall into the wretched mistake of calling an Arian language a Semitic one. Alas, for human hopes! What if the guide himself should lead you astray? Not wilfully perhaps, but blindly?

After devoting ten years to the study of Urdu, Persian, Marathi, Guzerathi, Arabic, Pushto, Sindhi, Punjabi and Multani (see the Preface to Capt. Raverty's "Grammar of the Pukhto," p. vi.), and after writing a copious Pushto Grammar with all the grammatical terms in Arabic, Capt. Raverty is inclined to consider the Pushto a Semitic dialect (see the Introduction to the Grammar, p. 36). Nay, he is more than inclined; he produces five arguments in favour of the view:—

- (1). The vowels and consonants used in Pushto have the same powers as those of the Arabic, Hebrew and other Semitic dialects.
- (2). Like them it has two genders.
- (3). In common with the Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian, it has the peculiar separable and inseparable pronouns.
- (4). The inflexions of the "Afghanian" verbs are formed according to the Arabic, and Hebrew system, with two original tenses only.
- (5). In many respects the Pushto syntax agrees with that of the Hebrew.

Before examining these arguments, it may be worth while to inquire what could have led Captain Raverty so grievously astray

And we shall find the cause to be a very common source of error, namely a pre-conceived theory. Capt. Raverty seems hastily to have taken up the opinion that the Afghans are children of Israel, and so all goes wrong.

Let the reader bear in mind that it is desired to keep the linguistic question quite unencumbered, and that the writer of this notice does not intend to enter upon the ethnological question in this place. But it is difficult to pass over a remarkable phenomenon in the Introduction here spoken of. In p. 30, Capt. Raverty somewhat pertinently observes that had the Afghans "been the aborigines of the country at present known as Afghanistan, we must have heard something of them from ancient writers, for we find that even in the time of Herodotus, Darius had sent an exploring expedition under Scylax of Caryanda and others as far as the Indus." He then goes on to cite two passages from some English translation of Herodotus, in both of which the Afghans are mentioned, but he does not see it. The first passage states that Scylax "set out from the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Paktyica, and sailed down the Indus." The second says, "there are other Indians bordering on the city of Caspatyrus and the country of Paktyica, settled northwards of the other Indians."

Had the Afghans, says Capt. Raverty, been then in these regions, their name must have occurred in these passages. Granted; what name? Not *Afghan*, for that is a modern name, given them by the Persians, not acknowledged by themselves, and certainly not occurring before the time of Abu Said, who ruled in Khorasan during the fifteenth century. Their own name in the country near the Indus, to which the citations refer, is *Pakhtu* (n); how would a Greek have spelled this? Πάκτυ, I trow. This word, in the plural number, the reader will find in *Hdt.* VII. 67, where the different nationalities are enumerated that constituted Xerxes' army. The Πάκτους (*Pakhtus*) are described as wearing *posteens*, and carrying native bows and knives, not a bad description of Afghans at any time; and they are duly mentioned after the Bactrians, Parthians, Khwarismians, Sogdians, and Gandarii (Kandaharis?)—Even the peculiar form of the name *Paktuika* as the name of their nation or their country finds its explanation in the fact that the Afghans call themselves collec-

tively *Pakhtunkha*. Very few native names suffer so little on the part of Englishmen, as these names have suffered at the hands of the Greeks. Capt. Raverty says that the country referred to under the name of Paktuika is Puklí; this also is a mistake, for the Greeks called the latter, which moreover is not near any navigable portion of the Indus, plainly and correctly Πεύκελα; the name occurs a number of times in Arrian.

As for Capt. Raverty's arguments in favour of the view that Pushto is of the Semitic family, Argument No. 5 says that in many respects the Pushto syntax agrees with that of the Hebrew. This argument would be valid, if the grammarian had pointed out some *peculiarities* in the syntax of the one language which agree with peculiarities in that of the other. For the good of his argument, it must be regretted that he has not done so, and the proposition as it stands may be predicated of any two languages whatsoever. No. 2, also proves too much; for French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Gaelic, Danish, Livonian, etc., or, what is more to the point, and might have led a candid inquirer into the right track, the Indian languages, such as Hindi and Panjabi, have also but two genders.

What the force of Argument No. 1 is, that "the vowels and consonants used in Pushto have the same powers as those of the Arabic, Hebrew, and other Semitic dialects," is difficult to tell. If the author has reference to the *spoken* vowels and consonants, that is to their sounds, it is sufficient to observe that of articulate sounds there is only an extremely limited number, in consequence of which the great bulk of the vowels and consonants of all languages are the same. He cannot mean that *all* the Pushto sounds are found in the Semitic languages, for he has just laboured for some pages to prove that both there are many of the Arabic sounds which are not found in Pushto, and that there are a number of Pushto sounds not to be found in the Semitic languages, though his statements are by no means complete, or correct as far as they go. If he refers to the *written* character, Semitic scholars will be surprised to hear that there are letters in the Syro-Arabian languages to express vowels at all. And as regards the consonants, every one knows that when Bayazid, or whoever may have better claims to the distinction, wrote Pushto first, he made use of the Arabic character, and that not the pure

character, but as he knew it from Persian writing, with the addition of all the three pointed letters, and that even then he had to modify half a score of letters besides to express all the Pushto sounds, in which he succeeded only partially. He would have reduced his difficulties very materially, had he used the Devanagari alphabet, in which the Sanskrit and Prakrit languages can be written with greatest ease; and that Pushto is one of the latter, this matter of the letters alone would be sufficient to establish.

The validity of Argument No. 3,—“in common with the Hebrew, Arabic and Persian, it has the peculiar separable* and inseparable pronouns, the latter being invariably attached to some preceding word”—is very much impaired by the author's adding Persian to the other two languages. Is Persian also a Semitic language?

It is not at all necessary to be acquainted with Pushto to suspect this argument; for to compare the graceful freedom of the Persian inseparable pronouns *—م، —ت، —ش*—with the rigid compulsoriness of those of the Semitic languages is the same as to say, “There is a river in Macedon; and there is also moreover a river at Monmouth.” But the oddity goes much further. Any one acquainted with Pushto would rack his brains to discover what the author could mean; he would probably conclude that he must refer to combinations like *زړوم corda nobis*, which might seem to bear some similarity to *دلم*, but which occur so excessively rarely that not only could they not be adduced as a characteristic of the language, but any Grammarian would be excused for not noticing them at all in his grammar. Nor does Captain Raverty. What he means by the inseparable pronouns, are the common terminations of the verb: *laudo, —as, —at, —amus, —atis, —ant*. These terminations Capt. Raverty calls “affixed personal pronouns.” The comparative philologist will probably say, so they are. True; only Capt. Raverty has no inkling of the truth, for he calls them *zamáiri mutasila*, which are quite different things.

* What part of speech either in Pushto or Hebrew or Arabic or Persian could possibly be called a “separable pronoun,” is quite beyond divining skill. It is most probable that the grammarian means “separate” pronouns; but as there is nothing peculiar in the existence of separate pronouns in any language or number of languages, the examination of the argument confines itself to the inseparables.

This grammatical term has been introduced into the Persian Grammar also by ignorant native compilers in India, but quite improperly. It is a pity that Capt. Raverty has thought fit to encumber his otherwise not very clear or correct or practical grammar with the inept terminology of Arabic grammarians. There can be no stronger proof of the Arian nature of the Pushto than that which Capt. R. calls "affixed personal pronouns."

Argument No. 4, states that the inflexions of the "Afghanian" verbs are formed according to the Arabic and Hebrew system, with two original tenses only.

Unless it be admitted that such a statement can originate only in the sheerest ignorance of the nature of the Semitic verb, it is difficult to disentangle the manifold confusions implied in it. It compares incommensurables; it says that an ounce is as long as an inch. How utterly alien and foreign the tenses of the Semitic verb are to Occidental, that is Arian, modes of thought and expression, becomes glaringly apparent, for instance, in the voluminous investigations of their nature, say, in the Hebrew. Hardly two grammars of the language have the same nomenclature for them. With some they are the past and the future, with others the definite and indefinite, with others the perfect and imperfect, with some even the anterior and posterior; Donaldson (*Comparative Grammar of the Hebrew Language*) shrewdly does not call them anything but Primary and Secondary, which terms have reference merely to their form, and only ventures to say that the former expresses single or transitory acts, and the latter represents repeated or continuous action. A perusal of a few sentences of the Hebrew Bible is sufficient to convince any one that the mere precession of the particle "and" is sufficient to make the form that otherwise expresses the future, denote past action, and vice versâ. How utterly different is this from the Grammar of the Indo-European languages. Indeed, the manner in which time is expressed in the Semitic tongues, cannot be understood, unless, as Nordheimer, the profoundest of Jewish Grammarians, somewhere observes, We occidentals discard the notions we have acquired as to the proper function of the tenses. This is not the place to discuss the nature of the Semitic tenses, but it is distressing to see that which peculiarly characterizes the modern Arian languages mistaken for marks of identity with ancient Semitic peculiarities.

By "original tenses," Captain Raverty means those that are not formed with the auxiliary *to be*. If we consult his grammar for further light on this subject, we shall find him giving page after page, not two, but *four* such "original tenses." He calls these, present, aorist, imperfect, and past. On further examination, we shall find that what he calls the aorist, is no tense at all, as is proved by the very quotations that he constantly gives, but is the subjunctive mood. Then we are struck by the fact that the past of regular verbs differs from the imperfect only by an augment. We have then the clue to the grammarian's statement. His two "original" tenses are the present and the past imperfect tenses which the Semitic languages have not at all. But a candid comparison would at once have shown that those languages which have these only as simple tenses, such as Parsi, Persian, Russian, Polish, Swedish, Danish, German, English, and others, are all Arian languages.

Compare these two tenses in Pushto : *wah-am, wah-alam*, (=Latin *caedo, caedebar*.) with the corresponding ones in Polish, for instance : *gr-am, gr-alem*. They differ in meaning in this, that the past tense of the Polish is active, and that of the Pushto has a passive sense. How thoroughly the latter is characteristic of the Sanskrit and many other Indian languages, few readers of the Journal will need to have pointed out to them. It is curious that the European languages, even the ancient ones, seem to have lost this preference of the passive construction in the past tenses to the active, though it may still very distinctly be traced, in Latin, in the favourite gerundive construction, in the form in which the ablative absolute most frequently appears, and in the peculiar conception that must exist in the mind of the speaker or writer who can form a passive voice of verbs like "to go" and "to come."

Such astonishing confusion having been introduced into what is really a very simple question, it is worth while to inquire what are the essential features that distinguish the Semitic from the Arian stock of languages. Contradiction need not be feared, if they are stated to be the following:—

1. The Semitic languages, in historical times, consist of triliteral and hence polysyllabic roots, the three letters being all consonants.
2. The roots express the *ideas*, whilst *relations* are denoted by an

internal modification of these roots, effected by vowels, aided by certain letters termed *servile*.

3. Such modification alone produces from the simple root the differences between verb and noun, adjective and substantive, gender, number, and tense.

4. In addition to the distinctions of gender known in the Arian languages, the Semitic languages also distinguish gender in the pronoun of the *second* person, and in the *second* and *third* person of the verb.

5. Tense-formation is undeveloped.

6. Composition, with immaterial exceptions, is unknown.

These features will in vain be searched for in the Pushto language.

Pushto will attract few students by its literature; excepting those who pay attention to it for practical purposes, it is of interest only to comparative philology and its cultivators; and to them, it would be interesting mainly on account of its antique look. There is no doubt that it has preserved many forms, either altogether, or in more original shapes than are to be found in most of the other Arian languages; that is, in its vocabulary, not in its grammar, which is on a par with most of the descendants of Prakrit.

What grieves and perplexes etymologists so often, is the existence of orphans in the various branches of the great Arian family, stray little things that have lost all love and likeness to their reputed parents, or whose parents have been so long dead that nobody can remember who they were. The entrance upon a comparatively new field sometimes discovers twin-brothers of such orphans, which discovery relieves the anomaly at least in some measure. Let a few examples from the Pushto suffice.

The Greek *ταράνη* is a *rope-basket*, a net-work made of rope, *πλέγμα τι ἐκ σχοινίου*, says Suidas. Benfey (Griech. Wurzel Wörterbuch, I. p. 670) is quite perplexed as to its derivation, and Semitic roots which have been compared by some are of little advantage. The Pushto has *ترانہ* (*tragañ*), Panjabi *tangar* for those rope-baskets the Afghans so universally use to carry their loads and burdens in. It is not a little interesting that the Apostle Paul uses this word

(2 Cor. xi. 35*) in describing his escape from Damascus, whilst it is a well known practice among the Afghan thieves to use this very means for letting their accomplices down walls and windows.

The Latin *tussis* (cough) has as yet not been traced; Pott suggests, though but timidly, that it might be connected with *tundo*; the Pushto for "cough" is *tushe*. The Greek εἶδω, "I sleep," "lie down" appears to be as yet without an authentic genealogy; the Pushto اودو (*údō*) is "asleep, lying down;" αυλή, the court-yard, cattle-yard, etc. is a difficult word; the Pushto غولي (*ghole*) precisely answers it. Pushto. کانی (*kañre*) "a stone" is difficult to affiliate either in the Sanskrit or Persian, but it seems to have two equally lonely brothers in the Gaelic *carn* "a cairn," and the Greek κραναός "stony."

The English *ant* and the Persian *mor* مور, of the same signification, seem wide apart, yet by the aid of the Pushto we are able to point out a very probable connection between them; *ant* is for *amt*, contracted from *emmet*, from the Gothic *amaitō* according to Grimm; from this the German *a-meise*; the Pushto is میچرے (*meje*), also pronounced *mege*, which connects with the second syllable of the Greek μυρμηκ—whose first syllable agrees not only with the Persian *mor*, but with thirteen other languages (cited by Grimm in the Deut. Wörterbuch) whose word for *ant* is similar to *mor* or *μυρ*; from which the conclusion may be drawn that the Greek is nearest the original word whatever that was, and that the descendants have divided the inheritance, some taking the first, others taking the second syllable. Such a division of inheritance is by no means unexampled; for instance the German *ente* (Lat. *anat*) and the English *drake* meet in the Old High German *anetrekho*; the Irish *gall* (swan) and the Slavic *labud* (of the same signification), philologists find united in the Sanskrit *jálapád*, though neither of these cases is quite parallel to that of *μυρμηκ*.

The Greek *ών* and the English *egg*—are, as is well known, closely related: *ών*, Latin *ovum*, Irish *ugh*, Saxon *æg*, English *egg*; the change of *v* into *g* is one of such frequent occurrence as hardly to need an

* It appears there in the dialectic variation *σαργάνη*; the change of *τ* into *σ* being like Ionic *ἄνησος* for Doric *ἄνητος*, *σέ*, *σέ*, *σημερον* for Doric *τέ*, *τέ*, *τήμερον*, *ναυσία* = Attic *ναυτία*, etc.

exemplification ; but compare Sanskrit *vṛka* with the Persian گرگ (wolf) ; Latin *vespa* (wasp) with the French *guêpe* ; Persian گرم (garm) with German *warm* ; *vesper* = Welsh *gospwr* ; and all the Spanish names beginning with *guada* from the Arabic وادي "a river." —But it is curious that both the Greek and the English variations of the same word should have their representatives in Pushto : the Northern dialect has *hagge*, the Southern *oë*. So, in the same manner as the German *weide* is to the English *willow*, so is the Persian بيد to Pushto وېله (*wūla*). The Pushto is extremely fond of changing *d* into *l*. In the European languages this change of the dental into *l* is not common, if the Spanish perhaps be excepted, which gets, for instance, the *Madrid-eños* from *Madrid*, and evidently manufactured the name *Isabel* from *El-izabeth*, not unlikely mistaking the initial *El* for an article. The Latin shows a few words with that tendency ; the connection between the English *tear* and the Latin *lacryma* would be difficult to demonstrate but for the Gothic *tagrs* = Greek δάκρυ (*δάκρυ-μα*) ; the connection between *lingua* and *tongue* can only be through an intermediate *dingua* which is an antique Latin form. So the Sanskrit *madhu* remains in Greek μέθυ, German *meth*, English *mead*, Polish *miód* etc. ; but in Latin it is *mel*. In the same way, the Sanskrit *devri* (husband's brother) retains the *d* sound in Greek, Lithuanian, Livonian, Slavonic, Servian, Armenian, and Saxon, but the Latin has *levir*, and the Pushto also *lewir* (ليور) ; the nearest Persian word seems to be لیس which is used for a brother in a wide sense. (Comp. Bopp. Vergl. Gramm. 17).

This change of the dental into *l* is so much the more remarkable as the Zend has no *l* ; and it may serve to show the affinities of the Pushto, to those who have no inclination to study the language, to give a few instances of this preference of *l* over *d* or *t*.

Hindustani	دس	Pushto	لس (las)	ten.
Persian	دست	„	لاس (lás)	hand.
„	ديوانه	„	ليواني (lewanæ)	mad.
„	پدر	„	پلار (plár)	father.
„	دام	„	لوم (lúm)	net.
„	ديده	„	ليده (lída)	seen.
„	دامن	„	لامن (laman)	skirt.
„	دارم	„	لارم (laram)	I have.

Pers.	سپند	Pushto.	سپلاني (spelane) rue; metathesis unavoidable after the change.
"	خود	"	خول (khol) helmet.
"	پورده	"	ويلني (welane) mint.

It has already been intimated that the affinities of the language to the Zend are great; the only two languages that may be thought able to dispute this claim, would be the Sanskrit on the one hand, and the Persian on the other. An examination of the numerals and a few other words may help to clear up this matter and put the reader in a position to judge for himself.

Sans. eka	Pers. يك	Zend aeva	Pushto يو (yau)—	1.
" dvi	" دو	" dva	" دوة (dwa)—	2.
" tri	" سه	" thri	" دري (dre)—	3.
" chatur	" چهار	" chathru	" خلور (tsalor)*—	4.
" panchan	" پنج	" panchan	" پنچه (pindza)—	5.
" shash	" شش	" cvas	" شپو (shpay)†—	6.
" saptan	" هفت	" haptan	" اوة (uwa)‡—	7.
" ashtan	" هشتم	" astan	" اته (ata)—	8.
" navan	" نه	" navan	" نه (nō)—	9.
" daçan	" ده	" daçan	" لى (las)—	10.
" ekádaça	" يازده	" aevaraðaça	" يولى (yúlas)—	11.
" dvádaça	" دوازده	" dvadaça	" دولى (dúlas)—	12.
" trayodaça	" سيزده	" thridaça	" ديارلى (dyárlas)—	13.
" chaturdaça	" چهارده	" chathrudaça	" خورلى (tswarlas)—	14.
" vinçati	" بيست	" víçaiti	" شل (shil)§—	20.

* The change of the dental into *l* as above; the change of *ch* into *ts* is characteristic of the language; it is really only a change of *sh* into *s*.

† The change of *v* into *p* is exemplified in words like Sanskrit açva = Zend aspa; Sanskrit sventa = Zend spenta; Sanskrit vartaka = Greek $\pi\epsilon\rho\upsilon\kappa$; though the opposite change also occurs, e. g. Latin sapere = French, savoir; Latin intrepido = Spanish atrevido; Latin lupa = Spanish lova: Latin porta = Russian vorota; Latin caper = French chèvre, etc.

‡ This change looks severe, but it has been fully recognized by Pott (Quinque und Vigesimal Zählmethode, p. 270); it really implies nothing more than the change of *p* into *v* or *w*, just noticed, after dropping *t*; examples of the latter are the second person plural of the verb in Spanish as compared with the Latin tenets for tenetis, eras for eratis; Sk. patni = Pol. pani, etc.

§ This loses the first syllable (*st*), drops the last vowel, and changes the dental

Sans. trinçat	Pers. سی	Zend thriçata	Pushto دېرش (derah)*	—	80.
„ chatvárinçat	چهل	„ chathvareçata	خلو بخت (tsalweskt)	40.	
„ pancháçat	پنچاه	„ pancháçata	پنځوس (pandzos)	—	50.
„ shashti	شست	„ csvaçti	شپینه (shpeta)	—	60.
„ saptati	هفتاد	„ haptáiti	اویا (awyá)	—	70.
„ açíti	هشتاد	„ açtáiti	اتیا (atiyá)	—	80.
„ navati	نود	„ navaiti	نوی (nwf)	—	90.
„ çata	صد	„ çata	سل (sal)†	—	100.
„ çvan	اسباه or سگ	spá	سپی (spæ)	dog.	
„ sham	من	„ azem	ز (zö) I.		
„ tárá	ستاره	„ stáre	ستوری (store) star.		
Prakrit se	و	„ hé	ئی (ye) him.		
Sans. çushka	خشک	„ hushka	وچ (wuch) dry.		
„ svap	خواب	„ qaf	خوب (khob) sleep.		
„ svasá	خواهر	„ qañha	خویندی (khwainde) sis-		
„		„	خور (khor) sister. [ters.		
„ khan	کن	„ kan	کنه (kana) dig.		
„ sam	هم	„ ham	هم (hum) also.		
„ sarva	هر	„ haurva	واړه (wáfa) all.		
„ dháv	دو	„ du	دو (dau) run.		
„ hrid-aya	دل or خرد	zere-dhaya	زی (zrö) heart.		
„ hir-anya	زر	„ zara	زر (zar) gold.		
„ jír-na	زر	„ zar	زور (zor) old.		
„ harit	زرد	„ zairita	زیر (zyar) yellow.		
„ hima	زم	„ zima	ژمه (zhima) winter.		
Ved. jma	زمین	„ zema (huz-	زمکه (zmaka) earth.		
		varesh	זמיק)		

into *l* as usual; but in the compound numbers, 21, 22, etc. another form much closer to the Zend appears: *دویشته یویشته* etc.

* In the Zend, it is evidently the *çata* which expresses the tens; of this the Pushto retains the first letter alone; in the following number, 40, it curtails the Zend much less; indeed it loses only the unessential termination, and the single letter *r* which is lost by being crowded out. It has already become plain to the reader, that it is long and weighty vowels only that survive in the modern languages; the short ones are soon lost by attrition.

† The dental into *l*.

Sans. çiras	Pers. سر	Zend sara	Pushto	سر (sar) head.
" ? svar	" خور	" hvar (e)	" نور	(nwar) sun.
" vah	" (آوریز) vaz	"	" باسه	(bása) carry.
" upari	" بر	Parsi, awar	" پر	(par) over.
" paçu	" سفند (گو)	Zend pashu	" پسه	(psa) sheep and goats.*
" pri	" فروش	" pereta	" پیروده	(píroda) bought.
" jihvá	" زبان	" hizva	" ژبه	(zhaba) tongue.
" sthorin	" ستور	" staora	" ستر	(star) steer.
" kshapá	" شب	" csap	" شپه	(shpa) night.
" mṛ	" صیر	" mar	" مر	(maṛ) dead.
" mása	" ماه (* mah I. C.)	"	" میاشته	(myáshta) month.
" para	" فرا (frá I. C.)	"	" پوری	(pore) beyond, far.
" madhya	" میان	Zend maidhya	" میذخ	(myandz) midst.
" prishtha	" پس	" parasta	" ورسنو	(wrusto) back.
" vrish	" بارش	" vár	" وریدل	(war-edal) to rain.
" vana (forest)	" گلبن (in بن)	vana (tree)	" ونه	(wana) tree.
" nedistha (nearest)	" نزد	" nazdista	" نزدی	(nazhde) near.
" hasta	" دست	" zaçta	" لاس	(lás) hand.
" jan	" زا	" zan	" زول	(zo-wul) to be born.
" pach	" پز	" pac	" پوخ	(pokh) cooked.
" (çuch, to shine)	" سرخ and سور	" çukhra (Parsi سوهر)	" سور	(sor) red.
" çarad (autumn)	" سرد	" çareta	" سور	(soṛ) cold.
" ap	" آب	" ap	" اوبه	(oba) water.
	" خور	" qar	" خور	(khor) ate.
		" spar (ré-pandre)	" سپری	(spare) open.
" vid		" zda†	" زده	(zda) knowing.
" chhuri-ká		" suwrá	" توره	(tura) sword.
" tar (e.g. tiras = trans)		taro‡	" تیر	(ter) passing.
" giri		" gairi	" غر	(ghar) mountain.
" parama (primus)		" frathemo	" ورنبی	(wṛum-be)§ first.

* I. C. for Cuneiform Inscriptions.

† In Ahura-ma-zda (Ormuzd) = Lord Multiscient.

‡ Lassen, Anthologia Sanskritica, p. 135.

§ ð is an inorganic addition, of frequent occurrence in most languages after m,

The following also are submitted to the inspection of the learned reader, though I have not met with their Zend equivalents ; literary material is not abundant on the Afghan frontier.

Sans. púrven (-dyus)	Pers. پښتون	Pushto پرون (parún) yesterday.
" svádu	" خوش	" خوب (<i>khway</i>) sweet.
" sveda	" خوی	" خولي (<i>khwale</i>)* sweat.
" hanu	" زنج	" زني (<i>zane</i>) chin.
" khalváta	" كل (bald)	" كلوة (<i>kalawa</i>) shave.
" keça (hair)	" گیسو	" کوسې (<i>kausai</i>) ringlets.
" laghu (<i>light</i>)	" لخت (or لخلخ)	" لږ (<i>laj</i> or <i>lag</i>) little.
" duh	" دوش	" لوش (<i>lwash</i>) milk thou.
" lomaçá	" روباهه	" لومباره (<i>lombara</i>) fox.
" charman	" چرم	" تارمان (<i>tsarman</i>) hide.
" makshi-ká	" مگس	" { ملشي (<i>máshe</i>) midge. مچ (<i>mach</i>) fly. مچي (<i>muchai</i>) bee.
" músha	" موش	" موشه (<i>maja</i>) mouse.
" krid, kruç	" گریه - زار	" زارا (<i>zhará</i>) ery.
" ve	" باف	" واه (<i>wa</i>) weave.
" sevanf	" سوزن †	" شتن (<i>stan</i>) needle.
" bhrú	" ابرو	" وړوڅه (<i>wrúdzá</i>) brow.
" vrihi	" برنج	" وړیجی (<i>wrije</i>). ‡ rice.
" vára	" بار	" وار (<i>wár</i>) Fr. fois.
" grí	" اغار	" نغري (<i>nghrí</i>) he swallows.
" pá		" پړول (<i>po-wul</i>) to feed.
" pay-as.		" پی (<i>pay</i>) milk.
" túr		" تیر (<i>ter</i>) swift.
" chhid		" چود (<i>chaud</i>) split.
" chír-na		" تیري (<i>tsíre</i>) torn.

as *dumb, thumb*, for German *dumm, daum*; or *chambre, hombro, kambre* for *camera, humero, fame* (s).

* *D* into *l*.

† *Fullers'* derivation from سوي زن "*latus feriens*" does seem to be marvellous nonsense, when the Latin *suo*, Gk. *σωω* (in *κασσώω*) and the Sanskrit root *śū* (Westergaard, *Radd. Ling. Sans.* p. 261) are considered.

‡ Lassen conjectured that the old Persian ought to have been *brici*; the Pushto seems to add much force to his inference.

Sans. kshur	Pushto خړبه (<i>khraya</i>) shear.
„ stana (breast) (compare رخ p. 3)	„ ستوني (<i>stúnæ</i>) throat.
„ ura	„ وړي (<i>warai</i>) wool.
„ lap (say)	„ لوه (<i>lwa</i>) read.
„ lap, (Benfey, Griechisches, Wurzellexicon, II. p. 127).	لښه (<i>lamba</i>) flame.
„ maśyádhára	Pushto مشوانړي (<i>mashwánre</i>) inkstand
„ mil (societatem inire)	„ مل (<i>mal</i>) companion.
„ madana	„ مينه (<i>mína</i>)* love. [vereor.
„ bhri	„ ویره (<i>wyara</i>) fear; cf. Lat.
„ vish	„ ویش (<i>wesh</i>) division.
„ vání	„ وینا (<i>wená</i>) speech.

The foregoing list the reader will observe consists only of words whose identity with their equivalents in the sister languages may be recognised at a glance; if it were extended so as to include such as can fairly be proved, by the recognised rules for the shifting of consonants (*Lautverschiebungsgesetze*), to be unmistakably Arian, by far the greater portion of the entire vocabulary would have to be transcribed.

A cursory inspection of this list will convince the reader that it confirms the truth of the philological maxim that comparatively rude dialects preserve old forms better than their more polished relatives; hence for the etymological investigation of the Persian an acquaintance with Pushto would be more than merely useful. Vuller's *Lexicon* would have been far more satisfactory, or rather far less unsatisfactory, if the author had availed himself, for the etymological portion of his work, of the connecting links the Pushto offers. The length to which this paper has already grown, will admit of but an instance or two of such links as one may expect to find.

* Compare the German *minne*. The connection with the German will most probably be doubted, at least by Germans, as it is the fashion to connect *minne* with the very opposite of the root of *madana*, which is *mad*. It is possible that the Pushto *mína* is allied to *Venus*, and the Sanskrit root *van*; the change of *v* into *m* is quite common in Pushto: *nwar* (Zend *hvar*) is pronounced *nmar*; *newasi* (Latin *nepus*), *nmasai*; Persian نواز = Pushto نمانز (*nmanz*), etc. analogous to the Latin *mare* for Sanskrit *vári*.

Under ابريشم "silk" Vullers is mute, as alas he is in most places where one would look for information. In Pushto وريشل (*wresh-al*) is "to spin," which at least shows that the *a* in *abresham* is prosthetic, for euphony, and that the original meaning of the Persian word is "that which is spun" by the silkworm. But at the same time a conjecture may be ventured as to the Greek ἀράχνη "spider" which may reasonably be supposed to be connected with a word for "spinning," like its equivalent in so many languages; the change of *v* into a vowel before *r* is quite common, e. g. Sanskrit *vrih* = Greek ἀρχ-έω; Pushto وربشي (*wrbushe*) = Greek ἔροβος (German *erbse*). Prof. Max Müller in another conjecture on the same word (*Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 4, 368), makes a suggestion most worthy of consideration. He observes that a specific term in course of time often passes over into a general application, and that a word, for instance, denoting originally some peculiar kind of "making" adopts the sense of "making" generally; he instances τέχνη (*art*) from Sans. *tvaksh* (to work in timber); and Latin *ars* (*art*) from *ar-o* (I plough); and he goes on to say that the Sanskrit *rach* (to make) may originally have meant "to weave." This I would modify so far as to say that if a root for ἀράχ-νη must be sought for in Sanskrit, it may be *vraj* "to make,"* which may originally have signified "to spin;" and support the conjecture not only by the Persian ابريشم (which would then be the original form of both وربشي and ابريشم, both forms being due to the same principle of dislike to a double consonant at the beginning of a word), and the Pushto وريشل (*wresh-al*),† but also by the Greek πρᾶγ—(do) and the Polish *praca* (*work*), both of them etymological *cruces* and *nuces*; and would venture to add even the English *work* and German *work*.

Taking the Persian word شكار "hunting" by itself, it would seem rash to connect it with شكستن "to break," which has for its Imperative شکن; yet this seems to be the connection on the analogy of the Pushto ماتي (*mâte*) "hunting" especially that of the lion, as

[* This very rare root (*vrajayati*) is explained by the grammarians "to send," "to purify," rather than "to make" ("Vraja mārṅaṅasanskāra-gatyoh.") Eds.]

† For the change of the consonant *j* into *sh* (*vrij* = *wresh*) cf. Sanskrit *jivāmi* = Old Slavic *shivā*; Sanskrit *jad* = Persian آشنا, and the Highlander's *shentleman* for *gentleman*.

compared with مات (*mát*) "broken;" which again reminds one strongly of two difficult French words bearing the same relation to one another, viz. *chasser* "to hunt" and *casser* "to break."

Frequently the Pushto preserves the simple form of Persian compounds: فرستادن "to send" is evidently compounded with the Sanskrit ष्ठ; but the Persian استاندان means "to stand" whilst the Pushto *ásta-wul* (*wul* is the Infinitive termination of transitive verbs) is "to send;" افشاندن (compounded with the frequent Sanskrit *abhi* = اف) "to scatter" has no simplex in Persian, but in Pushto "to scatter" is خندل (*shandal*); نشاختن "to fix in the ground," compounded with the Sanskrit inseparable preposition *ni*, has no simplex in Persian, but in Pushto خجول (*shakh-awul*) is "to bury."

Such instances might be very largely multiplied, but only a few have been hastily culled, without much order, with a view, not to exhaust the subject, but rather not to weary the reader who may take a greater interest in the general philological question than in the Pushto language particularly; and these instances will at least show that a language cannot be Semitic which is so intimately connected in its lexical store (grammatical forms there is no room in this paper to discuss) with the prominent members of the Indo-European family of languages, and that in words not such as could be *borrowed* from another language, but such necessary every-day terms as form the staple of every language, and such as every tribe and nation, in their separation from the parent stock, take with them as a common inheritance.

Peshawur, August, 1860.