

A WORD FOR ARYAN ORIGINALITY.

BY A. KAMPMEIER.

WHILE not denying at all that words have been taken over from Egyptian into Greek, I nevertheless would modestly submit the following to show that Aryan languages are not so unoriginal as Hon. W. Brewer in his three articles since last spring attempts to present by a long array of Egyptian words, which he thinks may throw light on the origin of Greek and Latin words.

If the Greeks identified Aphrodite with Hathor, what has *hetaira*, fem. of *hetairos*, "companion," to do with Hathor? *Psyche* is pure Greek from *psychein*, "breathe," as *anima* from *animare* in the Latin. *Rcx* is as indogermanic as can be, the root of that word occurring even yet in the modern Hindu *rajah*.

Likewise the purely Aryan "Jupiter" has nothing to do with the Egyptian *Egyptur*, the "great Egypt." All philologists connect the syllable *Ju* with Sanskrit *djausc*, which root also occurs in Zeus or *Sdeus*, genitive *Dios*, the Iranic *deva* and its cognate *dju*, Latin *deus*, *divus*, *dium*, old German *Tius* or *Zin*, whence our Tuesday and the modern Allemannic *Zistig*. And the meaning of that root is "heaven" and Jupiter is the "heaven-father." The Egyptian *da*, "to give," has nothing to do therefore with *deus*.

Dr. Carus has previously shown that *Natura* has no connection with Egyptian *neter*, divine. The Greek *paradeisos* and Hebrew *pardes* are generally acknowledged to come from Armenian *pardez* and Zend *pairidaeza*. In deriving the word "Hades" the iota subscriptum must be taken into consideration, and the form *A-ides*, i. e. "the unseen," just as our "hell," is connected with the old verb *helan*, "to conceal." As we have a *Pro-metheus*,* "forethinker," we have

* According to Steinthal and others, "Prometheus" is connected with the ancient Indian name for the fire-drill, *pramantha*, though this derivation is rejected by more recent Sanskrit scholars on philological grounds. Even if this derivation would stand, it would speak for the Aryan originality of "Prometheus."

an *Epi-metheus*, "afterthinker," the second part of these words being connected with the root *math* or *meth*, occurring in the future and past tenses of the Greek verb *manthano*, "to learn, ascertain. I see no reason to derive it from the Egyptian *Perom*, "heaven-man."

I do not see how Hebrews could have ever hit on the play "Alexandros" as meaning the "lion-man." "Alexandros" means "a defender of men," just as there is the form in Greek *alexanemos*, "warding off the wind." And even if the Hebrews had no *x*, they could easily express the *x* in Alexander by the letter *kaph* combined with *samech*.

"Horizon" has nothing to do with Horus, but is the present-participle-form of the verb *horizo*, "to bound, define." And *orison*, from old French *orison*, has likewise no connection with Horus.

"Demeter" is persistently twice brought into connection with the Egyptian *Te-mut-ur*, "the great mother." But we doubt whether *De* is the same as *Ge*, "earth." Now any one who is acquainted with Grecian dialects, knows that *d* stands many times in Doric for the Ionic *g*, thus, Doric *dnophos* for Ionic *gnophos*, "darkness." Any good Greek dictionary will show this under article "Delta" and "Gamma." If *Da* and *De* in Doric means "earth," and we yet find the Doric vocative form *Damater*, who gives us a right to doubt even the Greeks themselves, who surely knew what their own words meant? That the Egyptian Temtutur and Demeter are mythologically the same deities, I do not contest, but I contest it philologically. There is no necessity to say that the Greeks got their Demeter from the Egyptians. The old Teutons had their earth-mother Nerthus as well as the Egyptians and I suppose every people had such a deity. Mr. Brewer also connects Egyptian *Atef* with Latin *atavus*. Now the *at* in the Latin word is only another form for the preposition *ad*. We have in Latin *adnepos*, corresponding in the descending line of grandchildren to *atavus* in the ascending line of grandfathers. And what does Mr. Brewer say of such forms as *abavus*, *proavus*, *tritavus*, which all occur in Latin? Let us always remember that we must keep the word *avus*, "grandfather," apart from the preposition placed before it. If there is any connection between the Egyptian *Atef* and Indogermanic words it is in such children-sounds as, Greek and Latin *atta*, Greek *tetta* and *tata*, Swiss *aetti*, etc. Just as in the case of Greek and Latin, I have my serious doubts in regard to some Egyptian derivations of Hebrew words which Mr. Brewer produces. I am told that for the scientific investigation of Semitic languages Arabic has the same importance

as Sanskrit for the Indo-Germanic. But I will not enter into that here.

Philology may not be an exact science as Mr. Brewer says, but it is nevertheless not so inexact as he thinks. It has put up laws as exact as those of the natural sciences by which words can be traced to their origin, though it seems impossible. Just as the trained naturalist reads in the rudimentary organs of present living forms the remains of fully developed organs in their ancestors, so the trained philologist in present decayed word-forms sees the remnants of more developed forms far back in history. One of the first warnings scientific philology gives us is to beware of being deceived by similarity of sound in tracing a word to its origin. The ancients especially were deluded in this way, and very probably among them Herodotus also, to whom Mr. Brewer appeals. I fear Mr. Brewer has also been led astray too much by this delusion. Who would suspect any relation between the French *larme* and English "tear"? And yet philology traces both to the same source, namely that they are both connected with the Latin *lacrima* and Greek *dakry*, Gothic *tagr*, *lacrima* being only a later form of the older *dacrima*. Languages in the course of history have a tendency to phonetic decay. "Proximity of peoples," to use Mr. Brewer's words, will doubtless tend to exchange and borrowings of words, but "the consonance of words as a guiding rule" in tracing the origin of words is extremely misleading. To prove that a word is borrowed or that words in different languages are related to each other, more is needed than mere consonance of sounds. The strict laws of scientific philology, those of the shifting of sounds etc., are to be taken into consideration. How much consonance is there between the German *Pfütze*, "puddle," and the Latin *puteus*, "well"? And yet the former is borrowed from the latter and has assumed its present form in consequence of certain philological laws. Who suspects the relation between Greek *chen** and English "goose"? And yet both words have the same root and their difference of orthography and sound can be explained historically and scientifically.

* χήν.