

cluding the Semitic tongues, "denotes the secondary intentions, of meaning by the addition of a word, which may by itself signify plurality, past time, what is to be in the future, or other relative ideas of that kind." Bopp shows us that neither this division, nor that of Augustus Schlegel, into "languages without grammatical structure, languages that employ affixes, and languages with inflections," are valid, inasmuch as the inflections meant do not necessarily exist in, nor are characteristic of, the Indo-European languages, which represent the latter class. Bopp's own classification is into three classes. First, "languages with monosyllabic roots, without the capability of composition, and hence without organism, without grammar." This includes the Chinese.¹ Secondly, "languages with monosyllabic roots, which are capable of combination, and obtain their organism and grammar nearly in this way alone." Here the Indo-European and so-called Turanian languages are found. Thirdly, "languages with dissyllabic verbal roots, and three necessary consonants as single vehicles of the fundamental meaning." The Semitic languages alone make up this class, "which produces its grammatical forms not simply by combination, but by a mere internal modification of the roots."² In this latter definition of his third class, Bopp falls into the opposite extreme to that for which he blames Friedrich and Augustus Schlegel. Internal modifications of the root are common to both the Semitic and Indo-European languages, and thus peculiar to neither. The best classification is that of Prof. Max Müller into languages in the Monosyllabic, Terminational, and Inflectional stages. The first still includes the Chinese; the second, in which one of the roots uniting to form a word loses its independence, embraces the Turanian languages; and the third, in which both of two roots uniting to form a word, lose their independence, contains the Indo-European and the Semitic families.³ The author of this last classification, however, states "that it is impossible to imagine an Aryan language derived from a Semitic, or a Semitic from an Aryan language. The grammatical framework is totally distinct in these two families of speech." Ernest Renan goes much farther, and says, in his *Histoire Générale et Système Comparé des Langues Semitiques*, "We must give up the search for any connection between the grammatical systems of the

¹ A Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, &c., Languages, by Prof. F. Bopp. Translated from the German by E. B. Eastwick, F.R.S., &c. 2nd edition. London, 1858; vol. I, p. 99-103.

² Lectures on the Science of Language; series I; lecture viii.