

we find the Danish *lue*, the German *lohe* and the Lowland Scotch *low* reproducing what I believe must have been the original word meaning *flame*. The English word *flagon* which is *flacon* in French, *lagēnos* in Greek and *lagenā* in Latin, may doubtless be referred to the Hebrew *LOG*, a liquid measure containing over twenty-four cubic inches. Varro informs us that the Ionians called *ear* the spring, *bēr*,³⁶ which is nearer to the Persian *behar* than the Latin *ver*, and may not improbably connect with the Erse and Gaelic *ur* and *feur* meaning *green* and *grass*. Professor Müller says, "Beech is the Gothic *boka*, Latin *fagus*, Old High German *puocha*. The Greek *phēgos*, which is identically the same word, does not mean beech but oak. Was this change of meaning accidental, or were there circumstances by which it can be explained? Was *phēgos* originally the name of the oak, meaning the food-tree from *phagein* to eat? And was the name which originally belonged to the oak (the *Quercus Esculus*) transferred to the beech, after the age of stone with its fir trees, and the age of bronze with its oak trees had passed away, and the age of iron and of beech trees had dawned on the shores of Europe!"³⁷ No doubt the author of these words is right in his conjecture, which he hardly dares to take out of the category of hypotheses. The Danish *eeg* is the Greek *phēgos*; the German *eich* is its own *buch* and the English *beech*; while English *oak* and Dutch *eik* represent the Gothic *boka*. These are variations of an old root that must have stood for tree in general, just as we find the words *EIL*, *ELON* in Hebrew standing for an oak, a terebinth or any conspicuous tree, and *THOR* the Coptic and *drus* the Greek *oak* as forms of a root that furnishes the Germanic, Celtic and Slavonic languages with the equivalent of our English *tree*.

One of the most striking instances of a double or even treble phonetic change in the passage of a root through various languages is afforded in the word *god*. I regret that in setting 'his forth it will be necessary to come into conflict with the views of one who is universally recognized *facile princeps* among philologists, and a high authority in oriental literature. I allude to Professor Müller, who speaks most condemningly of Sir William Jones, because "he actually expressed his belief that Buddha was the same as the

³⁶ Varronis de lingua Latina, l.v.

³⁷ Science of Language, Series ii. Lect. v.