

REMARKS
ON THE REV. DR MURRAY'S OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
HISTORY AND LANGUAGE OF THE PEHTS.*

By the Rev. Dr Jamieson.

READ TO THE SOCIETY, FEBRUARY 10. 1817.

It is not with the remotest design to depreciate the literary character, or to detract from the well-earned fame, of the late Dr Alexander Murray, that I take the liberty of offering a few remarks on his "*Observations on the History and Language of the Pehts.*" Did I listen to the voice of feeling, I would prefer being silent, in regard to what may seem untenable in the system of a writer who cannot now vindicate his own sentiments, or correct the misapprehensions of others. But truth demands candid discussion, whether the name of the living or of the dead be concerned in the result; and it is undeniable that, with the most numerous class of readers, a mere name is sufficient to give currency to opinions, which may have nothing else to recommend them, especially if they remain uncontroverted. Had it been possible for us to have enjoyed the pleasure of Dr Murray's presence this

* *Vide p. 134, &c.*

evening, there is not one among us, I am persuaded, who would have more cordially joined in inviting candid investigation; as, in all his inquiries, the discovery of truth seemed to be his chief object.

I may perhaps be forgiven for feeling a peculiar interest in the question at issue, having already laid my sentiments on this subject before the public, in "*A Dissertation on the Origin of the Scottish Language*," prefixed to my *Etymological Dictionary*. Nothing that Dr Murray has advanced could possibly have any respect to what I have there said; for, as I did not happen till of late to know that he had written on this subject, my dissertation was not published till at least two years after the last of his papers was read before this Society, and deposited in its archives. These papers bear internal marks of having been hastily composed, and of having been given in before the writer found leisure to digest the whole on a plan less liable to the charge of incongruity in its component parts, or even to compare the one with the other, so as to avoid coincidence. They were also written before he had dedicated his attention so fully to philological researches, as, it is well known, he afterwards did, in a situation more favourable to accurate investigation. It is, therefore, more than probable that, had Dr Murray reconsidered his observations in a later period of his useful and laborious life, he would himself have anticipated the animadversions which I beg leave to offer on a subject, which, while it is attended with considerable difficulty, must be allowed to possess no small degree of interest.

Dr Murray has adopted a hypothesis, which, as far as I know, has not been suggested by any other. Those who have written on this subject, have either supposed that the Picts were of Scandinavian origin, and that their language constituted the basis of

what is now called the *Broad* or *Lowland Scottish*; or that they were Cymraeg or Welsh, and that the language once spoken by them gave place to that of the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria, especially after they had over-run the Lothians. Dr Murray's theory is of an intermediate kind. He admits that it has been most clearly proved that the Picts were "a Scandinavian nation, which invaded the north of Britain before the time of the Romans, and continued as a separate and principal power in the island till the middle of the ninth century," (p. 139); and that "the Pictish language must have been a Danish dialect," (p. 140); that is, radically the same with the languages of Denmark, Norway, and Iceland.

This hypothesis is obviously attended with greater difficulties than even that which assigns to the Picts a Welsh or Celtic origin. For the ingenious theorist, in admitting that the Picts were Scandinavians, and spoke a northern tongue, grants too much to be consistent with himself.

As he holds that the Pictish must "have been Danish-Gothic;" that "it is probable that such was the case for a long time after the first establishment of the Pictish government in Scotland;"—that Beda's testimony is worthy of credit, where he "assures us that the Britons, Scots, and Picts, had each a separate language in the year 731;"—that "the Picts continued as a separate and *principal* power on the island till the middle of the ninth century;"—the conclusion from these premises is certainly very different from that which might have been expected. It is thus expressed: "Great suspicion may be entertained that the Scandinavian dialect was lost, like that of the Normans in France, in the language of those whom the Picts subdued," (p. 143-4.)

Before particularly entering into the question, it may be proper to remark, that the argument from the change of language on the part of the Normans cannot be viewed as conclusive. It is a singular instance; and although a similar change had happened far more frequently than history warrants us to believe, the reasoning would be merely of that analogical kind, to which writers often resort in the absence of direct proof.

We cannot, however, consider the cases as parallel. Rollo and his associates, who took possession of Neustria, were no better than a band of pirates; and cannot well be compared with the Picts, who are acknowledged to have been a powerful nation. Even after being increased by the accession of many northern adventurers, however warlike, they were not, like the Picts, "the principal power" in that country into which they had entered. On the contrary, Rollo was under the necessity of doing homage to Charles the Simple for his crown. Rollo had come into a country far more populous than the north of Scotland ever was; and this must be supposed to have been much more thinly peopled at the time of the Pictish invasion than in later ages. We know that the Norman chief, at length convinced that the devastations he had committed in the country tended only to lay waste his newly acquired territory, promised security to all the former inhabitants who were willing to acknowledge his sovereignty. On the entry of the Picts, however, it may most naturally be supposed, from their number, and from all that we can glean from history, that the Celts fled before them to the more mountainous parts, as their brethren the Welsh did in a subsequent age, after finding all attempts to resist the Saxon invaders ineffectual.

A band of adventurers, who were collected from all the nations of the north, who had no tie save that of the common love of

depredation or of conquest, and who, most probably, while speaking the same common language, had a variety of dialects among them, were far more likely, than the Pictish nation, to have their speech melted down into that of the people with whom they were intermixed. The marriage of Rollo with the daughter of the French king, in addition to his being a vassal of the crown, must have greatly promoted the intercourse of his military chiefs with the court of France. It appears, indeed, that when the Norman power was completely established, they became so fascinated with French manners, as apparently to wish it to be forgotten that they had sprung from the less refined hordes of the north. For, long before the conquest of England, which took place little more than a century and a half after their invasion of Neustria, they were, as Hickes observes, at pains to *unlearn* the language of their ancestors, and affected to speak almost every thing in French.* Even after the conquest, however, their language retained many vestiges of their northern origin.

In the preliminary Dissertation referred to above, I have endeavoured to prove that the Picts were of Gothic or Scandinavian origin; and as this is viewed as an unquestionable fact by Dr Murray, there is no occasion for entering into any particular discussion on the subject. This, undoubtedly, is the most difficult branch of the controversy. If it appear that the arguments in support of this hypothesis are conclusive, it would seem to be a necessary deduction, that the language of those parts of the country, which formed the chief settlements of the Picts, must exhibit the remains of the language formerly spoken by this people. Dr Murray accord-

* Nortmanni,—vernaculum avitum suum dediscentes, omnia fere Gallice loqui diu affectarant.—Tacsaur. S. ptentr. i. 146.

ingly proposes the question,—“ Does the Scotch dialect retain any “ traces of Danish or Icelandic origin ?” (p. 140.)

The question, even in this form, is not stated precisely as it ought to be. For it proceeds on the idea that a language, supposed to have been introduced into this country three centuries before the Christian era, must retain the distinctive characters of another that has been changing during two thousand years; and that, if the remains of the former do not exhibit the changes of the latter, we are warranted to conclude that they were not the same in that remote age. But when the ingenious writer directly proceeds to answer this question, it is stated still less fairly. For, he says,—“ We may then inquire, Are there no remains of the “ Pictish dialect preserved in the *names of places* ?” (p. 143.) Here he greatly narrows the ground of evidence, restricting it not merely to names, but to local names. The reason, indeed, of this restriction is evident. As he has previously taken a diffusive view of Mr Pinkerton's proof of the traduction of the Scotch language from the Scandinavian, from the supposed sameness or great similarity of the names of places; and as, with too much reason, in many instances at least, he views Mr Pinkerton's proofs in this respect as merely fanciful; he finds himself more able to support his own system, that the Pictish language was lost, on this ground, than on any other.

But although it could be proved that Mr Pinkerton had erred as to almost all the synonymes which he has brought forward, the proof would by no means be sufficient. Dr Murray admits that “ it is highly probable that some Pictish names are found in Scotch land,” (p. 144). Now, although a Scandinavian dialect was spoken by the Picts, as he also grants, it may be supposed that the Celtic names previously given to places had been retained. It is

well known that, in districts in England, in which no native Britons have resided since the Saxon invasion, not a few British names are still preserved.

To me, many of Mr Pinkerton's proofs from local designations are quite unsatisfactory. But it is evident that Dr Murray has not done him justice in several instances. Mr Pinkerton having mentioned the Scotch terms *Wick* and *Ness* as frequent in Iceland, Dr Murray says,—“ Such names as are radically Gothic, are evidently Anglo-Saxon, not Scandinavian. *Wick* and *Ness* are as plain Anglo-Saxon as possibly can be. The Danish word is *vic*, a harbour, which Mr Pinkerton has clearly observed on a different occasion,” (p. 142). But such minute criticisms are rather below the dignity of literature. Dr Murray seems not to have observed that, according to the opinion of Junius, the Anglo-Saxon *w* was equivalent to *v*. Speaking of the Moeso-Goths, he says:—“ Manifestum sit eos in patrii sermonis vocabulis constanter *W* “ pro *Vau* vel Anglo-Saxonico *W* usurpasse.” Alfab. Gothic. P. 13. From the use of *Ness*, nothing can be determined as to the Scandinavian or Anglo-Saxon origin of the word. *Ness* is not Anglo-Saxon, as denoting a promontory, but *Naessa*, and *Nese*, (*V. Somner*); and, in Essex, the term *Nase* is still retained in the same sense as in that local designation, the *Nase* of Norway. (*V. Lye, vo. Naessa.*) Dan. *Naes*, a promontory, seems to be pronounced like Scotch *Ness*, as distinguished from *Naese*, the nose. Dr Murray, however, is not very accurate in his discrimination of Saxon terms; as he asserts, that *Dunbarton* is a “ Saxon appellation, coeval “ with the introduction of” this language “ from the kingdom of “ Northumbria,” (p. 144).

Even as to names, the learned writer does not agree with himself. For he says, “ The names of the Pictish kings *decidedly*

“*prove* these monarchs to have been of Scandinavian extraction. “These names are easily recognised in the history of Sweden and “Denmark,” (p. 139). Now, it is admitted that the names referred to were in use in Scotland till the middle of the ninth century. If the Picts spoke Scandinavian in their personal designations till the extinction of their monarchy, we must conclude either that they had also, in as late a period, local names of a similar origin, or that they had retained the names which had been formerly given to places by the Celtic inhabitants who preceded them. That this would be universally the case is by no means probable. The natural presumption is, that many of the names which, by the ingenuity of etymologists, have been interpreted as Celtic, were in fact Pictish; and had Dr Murray felt the same disposition to use this mode of proof, he might perhaps have been as successful in shewing that they were of Scandinavian origin, as he has been with respect to the names of the kings.

The proof, in regard to the character of the language, is not brought to the proper test, when restricted either to local or to personal names. These bear a very small proportion to the great body of any language. But the ingenious writer, by an unaccountable inconsistency, seems determined to resist any evidence from the names of *things*, or the signs by which objects, qualities, and actions, are expressed. Setting aside any reasoning from local designations, as it is admitted that the Picts, till the termination of their monarchy, retained their ancient Scandinavian names for persons, is it in any degree probable that they had by this time relinquished all the rest of their language? Nay, is it fact, as Dr Murray asserts, that very few of the Irish names, as “Macdonel, Maclean, Cameron,” &c. do not betray their Scandinavian origin? or, in other words, that the Picts had such influ-

ence as to prevail with the Celts to accept of their personal designations, and yet paid them such a compliment, as to give up to them their language in almost every other instance?

Dr Murray having found at least *some* words in his vernacular language which he could not trace to an Anglo-Saxon origin, instead of forming the conclusion which almost obtruded itself on him from his own premises,—of the Scandinavian origin of the Picts, and the preservation of Gothic names,—that these words exhibit the remains of a Scandinavian dialect, adopts a mode of reasoning, which he must have spurned, had not his judgment been hurried away by prejudice in favour of a particular theory. He uses various modes of evading the force of that which was the only natural deduction.

He first attempts to reduce the number of northern terms in our language, while he at the same time tries what might be effected by a sneer,—not unlike what he loudly complains of in Mr Pinkerton,—at the expence of a class of writers, who, as far as a judgment may be formed from his own habits of study, have an undoubted right to claim him as a sworn brother. “The Danish “words,” he says, “that are found in Scotch are *few* in number, “and augmented only by ignorant etymologists, who seek in “Icelandic terms easily found in Yorkshire,” (p. 146). Although the number of words, which cannot be traced to the Anglo-Saxon, were far *fewer* than what they in fact are, it would not prove that the whole of the Scotch language is from the latter; because, as shall be afterwards proved, the affinity of all the Gothic dialects is much greater than Dr Murray seems willing to admit. But that they are *few* is entirely *gratis dictum*. I have elsewhere shewn that there are a great many Gothic words used in Scotland, of which there are no traces in any known Anglo-

Saxon writings.* Is it, indeed, a proof of the ignorance of etymologists, that "they seek in Icelandic terms easily found in "Yorkshire?" If they find these words in Icelandic also, which Dr Murray admits to be "the best specimen of that great branch "of the Gothic" that is spoken in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden (p. 140); they may be apt to think that the proof of ignorance rather lies on the side of those who make the Icelandic so very different a dialect from the Anglo-Saxon.

In another place, he says,—“Writers of Scotch glossaries are “accustomed to have recourse to the Icelandic for the origin of “every word which they cannot find in the Anglo-Saxon. Because “such words as *gar*, to cause, and *ette*, to aim or intend, are not “found everywhere in Anglo-Saxon, they conclude that they have “come from Denmark. All this is merely a proof of their own “limited reading and understanding. They might as well affirm “that a Scotch word came from Moesia, because it occurs only in “that dialect and in Ulphilas’s translation of the Gospels,”—(p. 151).

There is an evident acrimony in this passage that was unworthy of the writer, and gives no support to the theory. In regard to the two words specified, I have not been able to find any proof of their use in Anglo-Saxon. *Ettle* is, however, used as a verb, and *ettlement* as a noun, in the north of England. *Gar* is not only used in Northumberland in the same sense as in Scotland, but by several ancient writers, as Langland, who is considered as a Yorkshireman. Now, what are we to conclude from the existence of words in Yorkshire and other northern counties of England, which are also found in Icelandic but not in Anglo-Saxon, but that which Dr

* *Vide* Dissertation, p. 23, 24.

Murray is very willing to admit, where it serves his own purpose, that such terms had been introduced in one way or other, from Denmark. For, “when the Danes gained a footing in England,” we are told (p. 138), “the pure Anglo-Belgic began to be corrupted “by their northern and peculiar dialect; and it cannot be doubted “that a continuance of the Danish power in England would have “gradually effected a considerable change in the language of the “country.”

But perhaps the learned writer was willing to make the same concession as to Scotland. “The Buchanshire dialect,” he says, in another place (p. 151), “in which there are several very excellent modern poems, is by no means a relic of the Pictish tongue. “It is the Scotch of the lowlands, corrupted by a Danish accent, “which has been acquired by intercourse and immigration.”—Speaking of local names, he remarks, that “a few” of them are “Danish, evidently introduced by national intercourse, or rather “invasion, as in the province of Murreff, and other districts on the “eastern coast,”—(p. 150). He extends the remark to “Angus “and other north-eastern counties of Scotland,”—(p. 151). Again, he says,—“The constant intercourse with Denmark and Norway, “the vicinity of these nations, and the well known fact that the “Moravienses were Danes, sufficiently accounts for it,”—(p. 146).

The idea that Danish terms, which came to be of general use, such as the two referred to, were introduced by the intercourse of our ancestors with Denmark, is too ridiculous to claim a serious answer. The intercourse was almost totally of a hostile kind. The town of Leith has had more occasional intercourse with Denmark than all Scotland had in an early age; and will it be said that the language has been affected by it? Nor was it ever known that predatory invaders left the vestiges of their depredations on

the language of a country. The inhabitants, as soon as they made their appearance on the coast, fled to their fastnesses in the hills.

There is no sufficient proof that the inhabitants of Buchan, at any period, had such intercourse with the Danes or Norwegians as to make any impression on their language. To make an assertion of this kind, is to cut the Gordian knot, instead of loosing it. But this mode of reasoning was necessary, in order to support a theory which has no foundation; because the dialect of Buchan exhibits characters very different from the Anglo-Saxon.

Let us now attend to what is said concerning the Moravienses. The Danes landed in Moray, under the command of Olaus and Enecus, A. 1008. Having reduced the castles of Elgin, Forres, and Nairn, they sent for their wives and families, hoping to make a settlement in this fertile district. On their arrival, they fortified a small promontory in the parish of Duffus, which our historians call *Burgus*, from the name *Burgh* given to it by the Danes. After repeated defeats, however, they left Scotland in the year 1012. As the war was carried on against them by Malcolm II. for the very purpose of preventing their settlement, is it at all probable that, after the defeat of their great strength, any considerable number, nay, any individuals, would be suffered to remain in peace? The inhabitants of Moray having rebelled against Malcolm IV. about the year 1160, and having been defeated by him, many of them, we are told, were transplanted into the south. "Lowlanders," says Shaw, "no doubt of a Pictish descent, were brought to replace them; and so the inhabitants of Moray were, and as yet are, of a Pictish origin." "This," he adds, "is confirmed by the language of the country; for the illiterate peasants use the broad Scottish or Buchan dialect, which is manifestly the Pictish."—*Hist. of Moray*, p. 167.

There is not the slightest evidence that Angus ever had any connexion with Denmark, except in as far as it might suffer from the *Vikingr*, or pirates, of that country. The dialect of this county is so different from that of Lothian, that it was necessary for the Doctor to conjoin it, as he does, with Moray and Buchan. Thus, as all the north-eastern coast, from Tay to Dungsby-head, exhibits characters of a language very different from that of the Anglo-Saxons, he endeavours to evade the force of any argument from this stubborn fact, by bringing in a host of Danes. Caithness and Sutherland must be set aside, because it is well known that, in a later period, they were occupied by Norwegians. Moray, and Buchan, and Angus, must in like manner be given up to these invaders; or viewed as so universally opening their harbours to receive them, that all the northern peculiarities of dialect must be attributed to this intercourse.

He views it as another powerful argument against the Scandinavian origin of the Scottish language, that it far more nearly resembles the Anglo-Saxon. "The form, nature, and character," he affirms, "of each vocable, and of our whole dialect, has plainly originated from the Saxon language of the north of England," (p. 147). This assertion is by far too strong. Although the Scottish language, in its general structure, more nearly resembles the Anglo-Saxon than the Icelandic, or any other Scandinavian dialect, it is strange that any learned man should venture to affirm that this resemblance extends to "each vocable." There are a great many words commonly used in parts of Scotland that had no connexion with the Danes in their later invasions, and no intercourse with them, which, although they do not at all appear in Anglo-Saxon, are still found in Icelandic or Suio-Gothic; nay, are at this moment spoken in Iceland and Sweden. There are many

other Scottish terms, retaining the precise forms of the cognate words in the Scandinavian dialects, of which the synonymes occur in Anglo-Saxon, but assuming a form so different, as either scarcely to be known, or clearly to indicate that they have not come to us through the medium of the latter. Of terms of both descriptions, many examples have been given in the Scottish Dictionary, as well as in the Dissertation prefixed to it. So fully am I assured of the truth of both these assertions, that I am willing to submit the determination of the question to this single test.

Dr Murray subjoins,—“ We may ask, whether the Scottish dialect retains any traces of Danish or Icelandic origin? Any unprejudiced person, who is acquainted with the Scandinavian dialects, with the Anglo-Saxon, and the writings of Barbour, Harry the Minstrel, James I. Gawin Douglas, &c. and, above all, has attended to the writings of these ages, will answer this question in the negative. If the Pictish language had been the parent of the Scotch, surely it would at least have bequeathed a few mutilated nouns, a few peculiar terms, a Danish cast and arrangement, to the style of the earliest written books. This is not the case,” (p. 146).

We cannot fairly form a judgment of the origin of our language, from “ the style of the earliest written books.” As these were mostly written by men of learning,—as the literary schools of England were preferred to any means of instruction at home,—as it was natural to imitate the idioms of a people, who, speaking a language radically the same, were supposed to have attained a higher degree of refinement; we can easily account for the striking similarity that appears in the early works of both nations. All the writers here mentioned, with the exception of one, had been resident in England. Barbour was several years at Oxford; James I. it is

well known, was detained there as a prisoner from the time of his infancy, for nearly twenty years; Gawin Douglas was frequently in that country, and died there. He was well acquainted with the translations of Caxton, and with the works of Chaucer. It is probable, indeed, that he imitated the latter, whom he celebrates as

———— principall poete, but pere.

ProL. First B. VIRG.

We might, therefore, as well pretend to judge of the vulgar speech in the time of Thomas of Erceldoune, by the poetry ascribed to him, of which Robert de Brunne says that it is

———— So quaint Inglis,

That many wate not what it is;

as to form our estimate of the complete character of the language of our ancestors, by the writings of men who had enjoyed all the literary advantages of the age in which they lived. Harry the Minstrel, indeed, had no such advantage: and we find accordingly that his style contains a variety of terms and idioms which do not occur in the writings of his more learned countrymen.

In connexion with this part of the subject, one idea, which is frequently introduced by Dr Murray, demands particular attention, as he lays the principal stress of his argument upon it, and as it has evidently warped his own mind in forming a judgment on the question. He has made the difference between the structure of the Anglo-Saxon and of the Scandinavian dialects far greater than it really is, or has ever been supposed to be by any other writer. He has perhaps been hurried into this fancy, from the theory which he had embraced, that a Scandinavian dialect was spoken by the Picts; but that, this being lost, their posterity

adopted a dialect or language, which to them was almost entirely new. I should like to have known what were his ideas as to the intermediate language spoken by this people, from the time of the loss of their own, till they adopted that of the Anglo-Saxons of Northumbria.

“The first Teutonic inhabitants of Scandinavia,” he says, “that is, of Sweden, Denmark, and Norway, are believed to have been a colony from the Basternae, a numerous and powerful Gothic tribe. Their language was a dialect very different from the Belgic and Moeso-Gothic, as may be easily discovered from the remains of it in the modern Danish, Swedish, and Icelandic. The Icelandic and Swedish particularly shew the greatest deviation from the parent Gothic which this language had undergone in the course of time. The words are shortened; the inflexions of the nouns and verbs corrupted; most of the indeclinable parts of speech have assumed a different form; and, in short, the general appearance is such, as completely discriminates this northern dialect from all the other branches of that original tongue. Whatever might be the peculiar dialect of the Jutes, Angles, and Saxons, in the days of Hengist, it is certain that the Anglo-Saxon of Bede is expressly similar to the Belgic; and every person acquainted with the subject knows, that of all the great dialects of the Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon approaches nearest to the language of Ulphilas,” (p. 138).

The Basternae, according to Pliny, Strabo, and Tacitus, were of German extract. Pliny, indeed, makes them one of the five principal tribes of the German nation. Hist. lib. ii. c. 4. If they were a Teutonic race, as is acknowledged, it cannot well be conceived that their language should be “a dialect very different from the Belgic and Moeso-Gothic.” For the most ancient re-

mains of the German or Teutonic approach very near to the Moeso-Gothic.

Even though it should be supposed that the change of the modern dialects of Scandinavia were as great as is asserted by our author, the conclusion would not be valid; for we have no specimens of the Icelandic or Swedish so early as the time of the eversion of the Pictish monarchy. It is, therefore, unfair to judge of the Pictish language by the changes which may have taken place in its sister tongues “in the course of time.”

Dr Murray, however, makes the difference between these northern dialects and the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon greater than he ought to have done. “This great branch of the Gothic,” he says, “of which the Icelandic is the best specimen, was *exceedingly different* from the Anglo-Saxon,” (p. 140). It cannot be doubted that the celebrated Ihre was fully as competent to form a judgment on this point as any writer in our country. He has proved that the parallelisms between Moeso-Gothic and Suio-Gothic, as well as Icelandic, are very striking.* The very learned Verelius has undoubtedly entertained the same idea, as he has conjoined with the Icelandic words those found in the version of Ulphilas, as equally forming the constituent parts of what he denominates the *Ancient Scytho-Scandic*, or *Gothic*. No one, who is acquainted with the astonishing labours of Hickes, of which his *Thesaurus Septentrionalis* will remain a perpetual monument, can hesitate to regard his judgment on this subject. He views the Moeso-Gothic as the common parent of the Anglo-Saxon, of the ancient Francic, or Theotisc, and of what he denominates the Cimbro-Gothic, includ-

* De Lingua Codicis Argentei, Scripta Vers. Ulphilan. Illustrantia, p. 269-272.

ing the Icelandic, Norwegian, Swedish, and Danish languages. Præf. ad Institut. Grammat.

The learned De Murr, a German writer, who has bestowed half a century on the investigation of this subject, views the language of Scandinavia as more nearly allied to the Moeso-Gothic than the Anglo-Saxon is. For, while he considers the Anglo-Saxon as a daughter of the ancient Saxon of Germany, he says, that "the Scandinavian is a daughter, or rather a younger sister, of the Moeso-Gothic."*

Dr Murray, indeed, assumes, but without producing any proof, that the Moeso-Gothic was the parent of all the Gothic or Teutonic dialects. In consequence of its having been a written language before any other known Gothic dialect, from the circumstance at least of the preservation of Ulphilas's excellent translation of the Gospels, we are enabled to judge of its form in an earlier age than that in which any of the kindred tongues appeared. But we are not thence authorized to conclude that it was in fact a more ancient language. Had the Scandinavians, in the fourth century, been blessed with the labours of an Ulphilas, we should have had an equal rule of judgment, and might have had reason to view the Icelandic, or old Norwegian, as more ancient than the Moeso-Gothic.

One argument, brought to prove that the Icelandic and Swedish shew the greatest deviation from the parent Gothic, or Moeso-Gothic, is of a very singular kind. It is this,—that "the words are shortened." Almost all other philological writers have considered the prevalence of monosyllabic terms as an unquestionable proof of the

* *Lingua Scandinavica, filia, seu potius soror junior, Moeso-Gothicae.*—*Conspectus Bibliothecae Glotticæ Universalis*; Christophoro Theophilo de Murr, Nürimberg, 1804.

great antiquity of any language. The more that these abound, the greater, it has generally been thought, is the evidence of its retaining its primitive form: and when two ancient languages are compared, which both exhibit synonymous terms, evidently proceeding from a common root, the preference in point of antiquity is given to that which retains these terms in the simplest form. But in this instance the argument must be directly inverted.

It is further said, that "the inflexions of the nouns and verbs are corrupted." But is not this also to beg the question? Even supposing that there had been a greater difference between the inflexions of the Moeso-Gothic and Scandinavian dialects than is really found, how could it have been proved that the deviation had taken place on the part of the latter? Had we as ancient remains of the Scandinavian as of the Moeso-Gothic, it might perhaps appear that the change had occurred in this language, in consequence of the more ambulatory character of those people who at last settled in Moesia, or their greater intercourse with the Sarmatæ and other surrounding nations. While Ihre admits the great affinity between the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, he says,—“Considering that it is the character of all these languages to make daily changes, it is rather surprising that there should be so little difference between the one and the other, as nearly four centuries intervened between Ulphilas and Caedmon, the first writer among the Anglo-Saxons.”* The interval, indeed, was not so great, as Caedmon died about the year 680.†

Although this change of inflexions had actually taken place, it could no more be an objection to the original identity of the

* *Glossar. Proöm.* xxx. xxxi.

† *Vide Bed. Hist. lib. iv. c. 24. Ranulph. Chron. lib. v. p. 241, ap. Gale.*

Moeso-Gothic and Scandinavian dialects, or to the derivation of the Scottish from the latter, than the total change of the Anglo-Saxon in this respect after the Norman conquest. What reasonable person, from the complete alteration of the form of the English language, as it appears about the reign of Henry II. from its even assuming an indeclinable form, would presume to assert that it could not have originated from the Saxon invaders of the country?

But, in fact, the deviations are far less material than might be imagined. This will appear undeniably, if we compare the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon with the Icelandic, confessedly the most ancient Scandinavian dialect now known, in regard to the article corresponding with Greek δ , η , $\tau\delta$,—Latin *is*, *ea*, *id*,—a standard part of speech in all languages.

SINGULAR.	NOM.	GEN.	DAT.	ACC.	ABL.
<i>Masc.</i>					
Moeso-Gothic,	sa,	this,	thamma,	thana,	thamma.
Anglo-Saxon,	se,	thaes,	tham,	thone,	tham.
Icelandic,	sa,	thess,	theim,	thann,	theim.
<i>Fem.</i>					
Moeso-Gothic,	so,	thizos,	thizai,	tho,	thizai.
Anglo-Saxon,	seo,	thaere,	thaere,	tha,	thaere.
Icelandic,	su,	theirrar,	theirre,	thaa,	theirre.
<i>Neut.</i>					
Moeso-Gothic,	thata & tho,	this,	thamma,	thata,	thamma.
Anglo-Saxon,	that,	this & thas,	tham,	that,	tham.
Icelandic,	thad,	thess,	thui,	thad,	thui.

Although Dr Murray justly views the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon as very nearly allied, it appears that, in this instance, there is greater affinity between the latter and the Icelandic, than be-

tween either of these and the Moeso-Gothic; also, that, in some parts of this declension, the Icelandic retains the form of the Moeso-Gothic, while it has been lost in the Anglo-Saxon. Anglo-Saxon *thaere*, and Icelandic *theirrar*, in the genitive feminine, notwithstanding the prolongation in the Icelandic, are certainly more nearly allied to each other, than either of these is to Moeso-Gothic *thizos*. The same may be said of the dative and ablative feminine *thaere* and *theire*, in place of *thizai*. The difference in this instance between Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, is at least equal to that in the dative and ablative neuter in Icelandic *thui*, as compared with *thamma* and *tham*. *Thamma* and *thana*, in Moeso-Gothic, indeed, have more the appearance of change than Anglo-Saxon *tham* and *thone*, Icelandic *theim* and *thann*. In the genitive plural Moeso-Gothic, we have *thize* and *thizo*, whereas in Anglo-Saxon it is *thæra*, analogous to Icelandic *theirra*; in the Moeso-Gothic accusative masculine, *tho* and *thans*, in place of Anglo-Saxon *tha*, Icelandic *thaa*, *thær*, *thaag*; which latter seems nearly to correspond in sound to the Moeso-Gothic variety *tho*.

At first sight, it might seem that the Icelandic pronoun *han*, Swedish *hann*, (Lat. *ille*,) had no affinity to the Moeso-Gothic. But the learned Hickes identifies it with Moeso-Gothic *gains*,* *ille*, of which there is no vestige in Anglo-Saxon. The initial letter is different from that which corresponds to the γ of the Greeks, and is generally sounded as *j* in English, although it is probable that it might occasionally receive a guttural sound.

In regard to the declension of nouns, there is a considerable difference between the Icelandic and Moeso-Gothic, especially from the circumstance of *r* being frequently used in the former, instead

* Gramm. Anglo-Sax. c. 16.

of *s* in the latter, as the mark of the genitive. The reason of this change, as the letters are so different, I cannot pretend to account for, unless it should be attributed to some particular antipathy to the sibillation. It must be admitted, however, that they have been frequently interchanged even in the same language. The Anglo-Saxons used both *isen* and *iren*, as corresponding with Lat. *ferrum*; *hara* and *hase*, for *lepus*. The Germans render *perdere* both by *verlieren*, and by *verliesen*; *küren* and *kiesen* equally signify *eligere*; in Moeso-Gothic, *ohr* and *auso* denote the ear; in Icelandic, *glas* and *gler*, glass.

As to the number of declensions, there is far more resemblance between the Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon than between either of these and Moeso-Gothic. The Anglo-Saxon numbers six declensions; the Icelandic, four simple declensions and four compound; but in Moeso-Gothic, the number swells out, according to Ihre, to thirty-six.* He has given an example of the connexion of Icelandic with Moeso-Gothic, in the declension of the Icelandic substantive *Borg*, corresponding with Moeso-Gothic *Baurgs*, a city. The only material difference is that already mentioned. Instead of the termination *s* in Moeso-Gothic, in the genitive singular and nominative plural, *ar* and *er* occur in Icelandic.† It is another proof of the predilection which the Scandinavians must have had for the sound of the letter *r*, in place of *s*, that it is also substituted in verbs.

In the plural, there is a strict analogy between the substantive verb *wairthan*, in Moeso-Gothic, and Icelandic *verda*, fieri, esse.

* Dissert. de Nominibus Substantivis et Adjectivis Moeso-Gothicis.

† Ibid. p. 230.

In Moeso-Gothic, the first person plural is *wairtham*, in Icelandic, *verdum*; in the second, *wairthaith*, in Icelandic, *verdid*; in the third, *wairthana*, in Icelandic, *verda*. It is to be observed also, that each of these dialects exhibits the dual, which does not occur in Anglo-Saxon. The Icelandic verb resembles the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, in having no distinction between the imperfect, the perfect, and the preterperfect, the preterite alone being used.*

The farther back we go, the greater appears the affinity of the Icelandic to the Moeso-Gothic. Ihre has remarked accordingly, that when we compare the *Schedæ* of Arius Froda, or Polyhistor, who flourished about the year 1100, with the language of Ulphilas, it is found that he has not only preserved many of the words used in the Codex Argenteus, but that even the same genius and idioms of speech everywhere occur. He subjoins, indeed, that the ancient Scalds, for the sake of ornament, introduced many terms into their poetry, not only of a mythological and allegorical kind, but such as are not found in prosaic writings, and have no affinity to any other Gothic tongue; and throws out a conjecture, that, as they had many of these in common with the Anglo-Saxon poets, this poetical diction had been brought into England with Hengist and Horsa, as that which Odin, who is deemed the father of the Scalds, had borrowed from other Scythian dialects, and incorporated into the language of Scandinavia.†

Dr Murray has also asserted, that "most of the indeclinable

* I did not observe, till after writing this article, that Hickes has dedicated a long chapter to the comparison of the Icelandic with the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon. It is the eighteenth in his Grammar of the two languages last mentioned. There the proof will be found far more extensive than that which is exhibited here.

† Glossar. Proem. xxxiv, xxxv.

“parts of speech have,” in passing from the Belgic and Moeso-Gothic into the Scandinavian dialects, “assumed a different form,” (p. 138). Being resolved to put this assertion fairly to the test, I have carefully examined almost all of this description in the Moeso-Gothic, comparing them with those in Icelandic and Swedish; and am convinced that the learned writer must have thrown out this idea at random, as I cannot otherwise account for an assertion so directly contrary to the fact. It will even appear, from this comparison, that, in a variety of instances, the Scandinavian dialects adhere more closely to the form of the Moeso-Gothic than the Belgic, which our author identifies with it, or even the Anglo-Saxon.

Moeso-Gothic *ak* signifies sed, but; in Anglo-Saxon *aec, eac*; Suio-Gothic *och*; Icelandic *auk*, insuper, præterea; Scotch *ac* and *ec*, retained so late as the time of Barbour. Moeso-Gothic *af*, Lat. *ab*, of, from, is the same in Suio-Gothic and Icelandic; in Anglo-Saxon it is *of*. Moeso-Gothic *afar*, post, is changed in all the other dialects; in Anglo-Saxon *aefter*, in Suio-Gothic *efter*, in Icelandic *eptir*, in Belgic *achter*. Ihre thinks that *afar* must have been used by the ancient Swedes, because the comparative *aefri* posterior, and the superlative *aefst*, postremus, are still in use. Moeso-Gothic *ana*, super, in, Suio-Gothic *an*, id., Anglo-Saxon *on*. Moeso-Gothic *anda*, contra, against, in Suio-Gothic and Icelandic is still *and*, used in the same sense, but in Belgic changed to *ont*.

Moeso-Gothic *bi*, ad, in, secundum, assumes the form of *be* in Anglo-Saxon, as well as in Suio-Gothic. Moeso-Gothic *faur*, *faura*, ante, in Anglo-Saxon *for, fore*, is in Suio-Gothic *foer*, in Icelandic *fyri*, in Belgic *voor, vooren*. Moeso-Gothic *fram*, ab, has the same form and sense in Suio-Gothic: Icelandic *framm*, and Danish *fremm*, signify prorsum, forward, as denoting the act of

departing or going *forth* from any object. Moeso-Gothic *fra*, ab, in *fra-bairan*, portare, *fra-bugan*, vendere, *fra-gildan*, reddere, evidently suggests the idea of passing a thing from one to another, as in the verbs mentioned above, which denote the act of carrying forth, the transit which goods sold make from one to another, or that of money in payment. The corresponding particles are Anglo-Saxon *fra*, Suio-Gothic *fra*, id. pron. *fro*, Scotch *fra, frae*.

Moeso-Gothic *jabai* and *jau*, si, are retained in Anglo-Saxon *if, gif*, in Icelandic *if* id., and Suio-Gothic *jaef*, exceptio. Moeso-Gothic and Belgic *in*, in, is the same in Suio-Gothic, in Icelandic *inn*, but in Anglo-Saxon is changed to *on*. Moeso-Gothic *inn*, in-tus, is in Suio-Gothic *inne*, in Anglo-Saxon *innan*. Moeso-Gothic *missa*, in composition, denoting defect, is retained in Anglo-Saxon and Icelandic *mis*, in Suio-Gothic and Danish *miss*. Moeso-Gothic *mith*, cum, with, is scarcely less varied in Anglo-Saxon *mid*, and Belgic *met*, than in Icelandic, Suio-Gothic, and Danish *med*, id. Moeso-Gothic *ne, ni*, both signifying non, appear in Anglo-Saxon *na, ne, nie*; in Icelandic, Suio-Gothic, and Danish, *nei*; in Scotch *na, nae*; but are changed in Belgic into *neen, neit*. Moeso-Gothic *ufar*, super, above, corresponds with Anglo-Saxon *ofer*, Suio-Gothic *aefwer*, Icelandic *yfar*. The Moeso-Gothic negative particle *un*, prefixed to words, is retained in the same form in Danish; in Suio-Gothic *und*, in Belgic *on* and *ont*.

Moeso-Gothic *ut*, ex, foras, is the same in Anglo-Saxon and Suio-Gothic. *Us* is used in the same sense in Moeso-Gothic. But the Scandinavians have changed this into *ur*, from their preference of the letter *r* to *s*. Moeso-Gothic *wan*, denoting defect, is retained in all the Scandinavian dialects, and used in composition; as still in our *wanearthly, wanwordy, waneise, wanweird*, &c. Moeso-Gothic *withra*, contra, in Anglo-Saxon *ed*, in Belgic *weder* and *weer*, is in

Suio-Gothic *weder*, in Icelandic *vidur*; retained in Scottish *withershins*, *widdershins*, contrary to the course of the sun; *witherwecht*, the weight thrown into one scale, to counterbalance the paper, or vessel, in the opposite scale that contains the goods bought.

It may be added, that the Icelandic has one striking proof of being a very ancient language, in retaining a variety of primitive terms, not found in Moeso-Gothic or Anglo-Saxon, which form the roots of many other terms. Among these we might mention Icelandic and Danish *aar*, the year, whence Anglo-Saxon *gear* seems formed; *daa*, excellent, whence *däends* Icelandic, and Scottish *dandie*; *daa*, or *dav*, deliquium, the parent of a numerous offspring;* *skaa*, a particle denoting disjunction, &c.

Dr Murray does not quite agree with himself in the account which he gives of the very great difference between the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian dialects. He says, that "the names of the Pictish kings decidedly prove these monarchs to have been of Scandinavian extraction;" that "the words themselves are plainly of that dialect, which is peculiar to Scandinavia," (p. 139, 140). Now, he has given the sense of two only of these names, *Brudi*, which he says "is the Danish *Frod*, the wise;" and *Domnald*, or *Domanwald*, a word signifying, in Danish, "powerful in judgment." I do not inquire whether his idea as to the origin of the name *Brudi* be well-founded or not. But had he taken the trouble to turn up an Anglo-Saxon Lexicon, he would have seen that *frod* in that language signifies "wise, prudent." V. Lye in vo. It is also Moeso-Gothic *frods*, prudens, sapiens. The root is most probably to be sought in *frath-jan*, sapere, intelligere, whence

* V. vo. Daw, Etymol. Dict.

frathi, mens, sensus, intellectus. *Domanwald* is as good Anglo-Saxon as it can be Danish; from *dem* judicium, or *doeman* judicare, and *wald* potestas.

But had Dr Murray made a little further inquiry, before he had ventured to decide this question, instead of resting his deduction on the changes which have actually taken place, in languages originally the same, during the lapse of nine hundred years, or which have been merely supposed by him, in consequence of a partial and hasty reading of some modern provincial publications; had he paid a little more regard to historical proof; he must have seen that the wonderful variation which he has supposed between the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian dialects was in a great measure ideal. He would have learned from *Gunnlaug Saga*, an Icelandic work of great antiquity, that in the time of Ethelred, son of Edgar, King of England, who ascended the throne about the year 979, "the language of England was the same with that of Denmark and Norway;" but that "it was changed in England after the conquest."* He must also have known that, at this early period, an Anglo-Saxon could not only converse in the most familiar manner with a Scandinavian, but could not know him to be a foreigner but by conjecture. Sturleson informs us accordingly, that, in the year 1066, on the day succeeding that on which Harold fell, *Styrkar Stallarius*, a Norwegian, asked an Anglo-Saxon boor if he was willing to sell his coat; to which the boor replied, "not to thee, for thou art perhaps a Norwegian." "If I were a Norwegian," said *Styrkar*, "what wouldest thou do to me?" "I would be disposed to kill thee," answered the boor.†

Although it is evident, from this narrative, that they perfectly

* *Gunnlaug Saga*, c. 7.

† *Heimskringla*, T. ii. p. 174. Edit. Peringskiöld.

understood each other, it is equally clear, as Vidalinus, an Icelandic lawyer, has remarked, that there was some difference of dialect, "as the Norwegians, although they speak Danish, are distinguished from Danes by a different mode of enunciation; and as the eastern inhabitants of Iceland are distinguished from those of the west, by the manner in which they pronounce certain words or letters." He subjoins, "This boor was in doubt whether Stykar was a Norwegian or an Englishman; which could not have been the case, had not the language of England, in that age, been the same with that of the inhabitants of Norway."*

Hickes, speaking of an ancient writer formerly mentioned, whom he designs the *true* or *genuine* Caedmon, says, that the fragments of his poetical works are the only remains now extant of the language of the Anglo-Saxons, while it remained uncorrupted.† These exhibit so strict a similarity to the Scandinavian, that, making allowance for a slight change as to orthography, and a few terminations of words, the one might for the greatest part be transfused into the other.‡

It cannot be reasonably supposed that it should have been otherwise; for we know that the Angles and Jutes were among the invaders of England. Now, although it has been said that the Angles were of Saxon origin, the Jutes, Vitae, or Giotae, were unquestionably the same people with the Scandinavians. Their name, indeed, is the same with that of *Goths*. The Angles inhabited that small province in the kingdom of Denmark, and dutchy of Sleswick, which still retains the name of Angel. According to some

* De Linguae Septentrionalis Appellatione, *Donsk Tunga*, i. e. Lingua Danica, Commentatio, Ap. Gunnl. Sag. p. 221, 222.

† Thesaur. Septentr. i. 88.

‡ Not. ad Vidalin. in Gunnl. Sag. p. 235.

learned writers, even the Saxons were a colony from the Cimbrian Chersonesus, or Modern Jutland, who spread through the country lying between the Elbe and the Rhine, and at length made themselves masters, not only of Westphalia and Saxony, but of East and West Friesland, of Holland and Zealand.*

Dr Murray views all the variations from the Moeso-Gothic and Anglo-Saxon, to be found in the Scandinavian dialects, as deviations from the parent Gothic. But so far is this from being admitted by northern writers, that, while they acknowledge the close connexion between the Scandinavian and the Anglo-Saxon in an early period, they affirm it as a truth which cannot be denied, that the Saxons who did not migrate to Britain, and other German nations, departed far from the primitive character of their language. There is, indeed, a striking proof of this to be found in *Kristni-Saga*, or the History of the Conversion of Iceland. As, in the year 981, Thorvald employed Fræderic, a Saxon bishop, in preaching the gospel to the Icelanders, we are told that Thorvald acted as his interpreter to the people, because Fræderic was not yet acquainted with the Norwegian (or Icelandic) language, (p. 8, 9). We also learn from Sturléson, that in the beginning of the eleventh century, when a Southern German told Leif and his associates, in the language of his country, that he had found grapes in Vinland (the name they gave to a district in North America, accidentally discovered by them), they did not understand him, till he spoke to them in the Scandinavian, with which he was also acquainted.†

"If the Anglo-Saxon," says Dr Murray, "be really the language of Hengist and his northern invaders, a position which Mr Pinkerton will by no means admit, it requires little more

* Anc. Univ. Hist. xix. 176.

† Heims Kringla, T. i. p. 332.

“ than simple inspection to pronounce that the difference between “ the Danish and Anglo-Saxon indicates that Hengist and his “ followers were not of Danish or Scandinavian extraction,” (p. 138, 139). Here, again, the ingenious theorist substitutes opinion, formed from a cursory comparison of dialects, in place of testimony, or rather in direct opposition to it. I have elsewhere shewn, that northern writers trace the lineage of Hengist and Horsa to Odin, the leader of the Scandinavians; and that Bede acknowledges the same descent.* It may be added, that Ethelwerd (one of the Saxon blood royal, and the fourth in descent from King Ethelwolf), who wrote about the year 950, asserts that “ Hengist “ and Horsa came from the country of the Angles into Britain;”† which, he says, lies between the Saxons and Giots, or Jutes;” that is, from a part of that country now included under the general name of Denmark. It has also been observed, that the address of Hengist to his troops, *Nimed eure axes*, “ Take your short swords,” as well as the salutation of his fair daughter Rowena to Vortigern, the British king, *Waes hael Hlaford Cyning*, “ Your health, lord “ king,” exhibits the ancient language of the north.‡ These facts all favour the idea that the language commonly called Anglo-Saxon was not properly that of the northern invaders, but one formed from a mixture of theirs with the language spoken by the Belgæ, who inhabited the eastern coast of Britain before the invasion of Julius Cæsar. This is in part confirmed by the testimony of our author, which, however, cannot be admitted in its full extent, that “ the Anglo-Saxon of Bede is expressly similar to the Belgic;” or, as still more strongly expressed, that “ the Anglo-Saxon is the

* Dissert. on the Origin of the Scottish Language, p. 25, 26.

† Anc. Univ. Hist. *ut sup.*

‡ Not. ad Comment. Vidalini, p. 235.

“ very same dialect of the Teutonic as the ancient Low Dutch,” (p. 136, 137, 138.)

The system adopted by Dr Murray is burdened by several other incongruities besides those already mentioned.

If the Pictish or Scandinavian language merged, as he supposes, in the Celtic, although the Picts were so powerful a nation as to subdue the Celts, how could a few straggling Anglo-Saxons from Northumbria retain their language when they came into contact with the Celts; and not merely retain it, but make all the Celts throughout the Lowlands of Scotland give up their vernacular speech?

If it can be viewed as probable that the Picts, till the very time of their subjection to the Celtic monarchy, should retain names still having a determinate sense in their own original Scandinavian, while they lost every other vestige of their language, is it at all likely that they should have such influence on their Celtic conquerors, as to prevail with them to adopt almost all these names, in preference to their own hereditary denominations?

If Bede, an Anglo-Saxon, who wrote in the northern language of England, assures us that the Britons, Scots, and Picts, had each a separate language in the year 731,—if “ the Pictish, according “ to this statement, should have been Danish-Gothic,”—if, as is further asserted, “ it is probable that such was the case *for a long* “ *time* after the first establishment of the Pictish government in “ Scotland,” (p. 141), can it be reasonably supposed that they would retain their own Danish-Gothic for at least a thousand years, (for this period must have elapsed from their entrance into this country till the age of Bede), and afterwards gave it up to their Celtic neighbours?

If this astonishing sacrifice was actually made, to what posterior era can it be assigned? No good reason can be given for supposing

that it took place between the year 731 and that of their pretended subjection to the Scots, or, more truly, their receiving a prince of the Scottish line, which was only about a century after.

If this change did not take place till after the accession of Kenneth Macalpin, can it be supposed that he brought such a multitude of people with him from his own former dominions into the Pictish territories, as totally to extinguish the language of his Pictish subjects?

If, however, the Gaelic was received about this time, how long can it be supposed to have continued? or, in other words, when shall we say that this unsteady people, of whom we are so unfortunate as to be the descendents, again received a dialect of the Gothic? Were they so soon weary of their new Celtic acquisition, as readily to make a gift of it to a few Anglo-Saxon wanderers from the north of England?

If, silencing every scruple as to the mode or time of admission, we suppose for a moment that these Scandinavian Picts actually received the Gaelic language, whence comes it, that the broad Scottish, now supposed to be spoken by the posterity of these Gotho-Celto-Anglo-Saxon Picts, bears so few characters of this strange mixture? For it is undeniable, that, if this theory be just, the Celtic must first have been embodied with Scandinavian, and the Anglo-Saxon afterwards with Celtic; whereas it is unquestionable, that the proportion of words in the Scottish, which have a Celtic origin, in those counties especially which are more remote from the Highlands, is comparatively very small.

The learned writer closes his observations with one, which those who are zealous for the honour of the Celtic language, and sticklers for the Celtic descent of the Lowlanders, will deem more than sufficient to detract from all the credit he has appeared previously

to give them. "The Celtic," he says, "is evidently an ancient Gothic dialect, much corrupted by frequent invasion from the north; and it is exceedingly probable that it was the speech of the first Gothic tribe that moved into Europe from Asia." To this he subjoins: "The Celts, or oldest Gothic colony, were driven from the continent by the Cymbri, whose language was a middle dialect between Celtic and Gothic."

That "the Celtic is evidently a Gothic dialect," is a proposition so strange as scarcely to require refutation. All who have in any degree compared the two languages, know that, although there are some radical words common to both, which cannot with certainty be assigned to the one in preference to the other, they differ very much from each other, not only in structure and idiom, but in by far the greatest part of the terms. The resemblance, in particular instances, must undoubtedly be attributed more to vicinity of situation, and intermixture of people, than to any radical affinity.

Who the *Cymbri* were, who gave their name to the Cimmerian Chersonesus, now Jutland, seems to be a point determined among learned writers. They were unquestionably the same people who now call themselves *Cumri*, or *Cymri*, that is, the Welsh, who seem to have been the posterity of Gomer. No one, who has paid the slightest attention to the language of this ancient people, can seriously believe that it forms "a middle dialect between Celtic and Gothic." If I might venture a conjecture on this subject, I would certainly be inclined to think that fewer terms resembling the Gothic are to be found in the Cymric than in the Gaelic or Irish; and that this may be accounted for from their living more unconnected with the Goths than the Celts either of Scotland or Ireland have done, ever since the period of the Saxon invasion.