

On the Indic Language and Origin of the Gypsies

by

Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger

From: *Neuester Zuwachs der teutschen, fremden und allgemeinen Sprachkunde in eigenen Aufsätzen, Bücheranzeigen und Nachrichten*

[pages 37-84]

Leipzig
P.G. Kummer. 1782.

[Reprinted by Buske, Hamburg. 1990]

Translated from German by
Manuel Priego Thimmel, Karl Bernhardt, & Annette Monreal
as part of the requirements for *Introduction to Romani Linguistics* (LI 7192)
Department of Linguistics
University of Manchester
June 1996

[. . .] This method of investigating the origin of the Gypsies by means of their language was at the same time both the right one and the easiest one. For none of the distinctive characteristics of a people is as reliable, long-lasting, crucial and unchanging as language. Form, practices and customs change because of climate, culture and mixing with others, however amid all this change language remains identifiable from one pole to the other, that is from the most extreme wildness to the highest culture; it is rarely to be eradicated even in cases of assimilation but when this process occurs there are still distinguishable traces which can resist violent oppression.

Leibniz was right when he was the first to recommend language as the guiding principle for the investigation of the relatedness of peoples. It has proved its usefulness ever since, as can be seen in recent investigations concerning the origin of the Hungarians, the Lapps, the Letts, the Vlachs, the Albanians and, finally, even the inhabitants of the South Sea Islands. If people had known earlier how to apply these tools correctly with regard to the Gypsies, we would have found the truth a long time ago and avoided all these mistakes born of conjecture.

This shortcoming is all the more surprising as it could easily have been corrected. For everywhere people were surrounded by the living language of the Gypsies. It had already been observed early on by scholars and some samples had been recorded. Bonaventura Vulcanius had already provided fifty words, and Megiser listed them, presumably following the former, under the heading of the new Egyptian language of the Nubian trespassers. As Wagenfeil had done before, Megiser attributed to the Gypsies the cant of the thieves. Nonetheless, apart from Ludolf none has ever compared the Gypsy language with other languages. In his book on Ethiopian history, he concluded, based on word-samples he had collected himself, that it was not similar to either the Ethiopian or the Coptic language and therefore rejected the rather fanciful and, anyway, unfounded account of their Egyptian origin. Subsequently, our knowledge of the language of the Gypsies was broadened and in 1755 a dictionary together with a letter was published in Frankfurt and Leipzig. It was this dictionary which initially prompted me to investigate the subject. Herr Bacmeister's collection of language samples, which he had started in St. Petersburg, provided me with a further opportunity to continue my investigation. It was at his request that I had a text of his translated by a Gypsy woman into her language. The task was in itself wearisome. However at the same time I sought to find out about the still obscure grammatical part of the language, a topic which had been overlooked by the afore-mentioned letter.

It will be difficult for people without personal experience to imagine both how tiresome and boring it is to elicit these things from a person who does not know anything about grammar and to what extent this increased the difficulty of my task. The mere sweet enjoyment of the pleasures of the lone pioneer more than recompensed my efforts. Having previously investigated the language of the Gypsies I had already discovered similarities; however, only occasionally could these be related to the Italian, Greek, Slavonic and Coptic languages. This did not account for anything because every language shares some original or casual similarities with others. So I conducted further comparative studies, however this time according to the direction of the above-mentioned publication and my own collection of various languages, particularly since my Gypsy woman believed her people's origin not to be in Egypt but as having descended from an island.

Eventually, I found to my astonishment a great similarity with the language in Schulzen's Hindustani grammar which led me to trace the Gypsies' origin back to East India. Later on, I not only found clear indications in the work of old and new geographers and historians, but also in the name of the people itself. No matter how little the name proves on its own, taken in combination with the language the name becomes a valuable indication. Cheerfully, in April 1777, I immediately passed on my discovery to Herr Bacmeister in St. Petersburg. He applauded me, and in his reply he confirmed that, after having removed all the intervening German and Slavic elements, the remaining half of the translation together with the one already received were compatible with the language of the Southwest Indian Province

of Multan, though not with any of the many Caucasian ones. However, one year later, I found that Herr Buettner in the introduction to his Comparative Compilation of the Writing Systems of Various Peoples hinted that the Gypsies descended from the Afghan Indians. This indeed spoils the merit of my discovery.

Nevertheless I do consider myself entitled to wallow to my heart's content in the intellectual feast of my own discovery. Yes, I might well be entitled to present some of it to my reader, as a matter of fact it is even necessary. For Herr Buettner, whose discovery I do not want to deny, has given us merely a vague hint, without any explanation or proof. The whole matter has therefore up to now remained shrouded in darkness. Herr Buesching in his book on geography painstakingly lists and differentiates the tribes and languages of Europe and Asia, but he says nothing about this particular issue. The two deceased gentlemen Bertram and Thunman, both of whom great historians, the latter in particular in this field, did not know anything about this when I asked them; the latter referred me to Peissenel, who also regarded the Gypsies as having originated in Mesopotamia and Turkistan. Only recently, Grisellini and Keralio still followed the old and false belief, and the Academy in Stockholm made a prize question of it, the answer to which is still unknown. It is therefore still worth investing time and effort in order to shed light on the matter and to show in a philologically and a historically detailed manner that the Gypsies did in fact descend from East India and how they came here.

I will now start to examine their language in more detail and will first supply you with the text by Bacmeister in the original, and then compare it with the Hindustani version, so far as I have been able to compile it on the basis of Schulzen's grammar.

Gypsy Language	1. ieck <i>iek</i> 2. dui <i>do</i> 3. trihn <i>tin</i> 4. schar <i>schahar</i> 5. pantsch
Hindustani	<i>patsch</i> 6. schob <i>sche</i> 7. efa <i>sat</i> 8. ochto <i>att</i> 9. eija <i>nau</i>
	10. desch <i>das</i> 11. deschijek <i>gard</i> 12. deschidui <i>bard</i>
	13. deschitrihn <i>iera</i> 14. deschischar <i>schauda</i>
	15. deschipantsch <i>pandara</i> 16. deschidschob <i>sola</i>
	17. deschietsta <i>sattara</i> 18. deschiochto <i>atthara</i>
	19. descheija <i>unis</i> 20. biseh <i>bis</i> 21. bischijek <i>jekkis</i>
	22. bischidui <i>bavis</i>
	30. trianta <i>tis</i> 40. starweldes <i>schalis</i>
	50. pantschwerdesch <i>paschas</i> 60. dschoberdesch <i>satt</i>
	70. eftawerdesch <i>sater</i> 71. eftawerdesch <i>jek jek hater</i>
	72. eftawerdesch <i>dui bahater</i>
	80. ochtowerdesch <i>asi</i> 90. eijawerdesch <i>nauvad</i>
	99. eijawerdescheija <i>unansau</i> 100. schel <i>sau</i> 200. dui schel
	1000. deschwerschel <i>hazar</i>

1.	Dewel	ne	merele.	Manusch	ne	tschele	dschito.
	<i>dev</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>marri.</i>	<i>Adimi</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>lek</i>	<i>schiuata.</i>
	‘God	not	die.’	‘Man	not	long	live.’
3.	Dei		tschummedele	leskre	tschawen,		
	<i>Ma</i>		<i>boffa</i>	<i>unika</i>	<i>sare,</i>		
	‘The mother		kisses	her	children,		
	la	hi	but	tut	anter	tschutschi.	
	<i>ini</i>		<i>both</i>	<i>dut</i>		<i>schischi ander.</i>	
	she	has	much	milk	in	her breasts.’	

- lakro rom kamele la. 4. Ageie romni
unika marad uniku. *Is aurosa*
 ‘Her husband loves her.’ ‘This woman
- has pari, dschowe diwes enge la has jek
ta sche *dini ange uniku hui jek*
 was pregnant, six days before she had had a
- tschawo, nasweli joi hi kommi, lakri
saro, azarwali ini hei abbi, unika
 son, sick she is still, her
- tschai beschele bascher lati de rowele.
beti baite kane uniku bi rota.
 daughter sits next to her and cries.’
5. O tschawo ne kamele zertele.
Saro na
 ‘The child not want suckle.’
6. Ageie tschai ne dschanel dschale kommi, joi
Is dai neihi sekta abbi, ini
 ‘This girl not can go yet, she
- hi jekke bersch de dui manet enge wiasli
hei jek baras bi do meihene ange
 has one year and two months earlier come
- pro boliben.
po
 to earth.’
7. Agale schar tschawehi
Ie schahar sare hei
 ‘These four boys are
- halautermischdo, o gluno naschele, o duito
sob chub, peila dorta dusva
 all (well) healthy, the first runs, the second
- stele, o trito ghiewele, o scharto sale.
 jumps, the third sings, *schauta* *hasna.*
 the fourth laughs.’
8. Agawe rom hi korero, leskri romni
Is hei
 ‘This man is blind, his wife
- hi taub, ne schunele, te me rakkerwa.
na sunta, kako
 is deaf, not she hears, that we talk.’

9.	Tiro <i>Tera</i> 'Your	brale <i>bai</i> brother	tschikalele, sneezes,	tiri <i>teri</i> your	paen <i>bahan</i> sister	sowele, <i>sote</i> , sleeps,			
	tumaro <i>tumara</i> your	dad <i>bap</i> father	hi <i>hei</i> keeps	pre, <i>schakta</i> , watch,	job <i>in</i> he	ne <i>na</i> (not)	achale <i>kata</i> eats	de <i>bi</i> and	
	ne <i>na</i> (not)	pile <i>pita</i> drinks	but. <i>both.</i> (much)little.	10.	O nak <i>Nak</i> 'The nose	hi <i>hi</i> is	maschkre <i>dermiane</i> in the middle of		
	o the	mui. <i>mu</i> face.'	11. Men <i>Hame</i> 'We	hi have	dui <i>do</i> two	pire <i>paun</i> feet	de <i>bi</i> and	andro on	
	hacko <i>jekjck</i> every	wast <i>hat ander</i> hand	pantsch <i>patsch</i> five	ghuchtia. <i>angeli.</i> fingers.'	12.	Pro <i>Po</i> 'On			
	schero <i>sirku</i> the head	waxono <i>bala.</i> grows hair.'	13. I	tschib <i>Schib</i> tongue		de <i>bi</i> and			
	o the	dant <i>dat</i> teeth	hi <i>hei</i> are	ander in	o the	mui. <i>mu ander.</i> mouth.'	14. I	'The	
	dschadschi <i>Sida</i> right	mussi arm	hi <i>hei</i> is	soreder <i>zor</i> harder	her her	serso. <i>subi</i> than	dava. <i>dava.</i> the left.'		
	15.	Iek 'One	bal <i>Bal</i> hair	hi <i>hei</i> is	baru <i>lamba</i> long	de <i>bi</i> and	sano, <i>barik</i> , thin,	o the	rat <i>lahu</i> blood
	hi <i>kei</i> is	lolo, <i>lal</i> , red,	koghali the bones	hi <i>hei</i> are	hart hard	her as	jek a	bar. stone.'	
	16.	O 'The	matscho <i>Matschi</i> fish	hi <i>aka</i> has	jacka, eyes,	aber but	kek <i>kan.</i> no	gan. ears.'	
	17.	Agawe <i>Is</i> This	tscheriklo <i>schenafar</i> bird	fligole <i>urta</i> flies	lokes, slowly, it	job			
	baschele <i>baitete</i> sits down	pri on	puh, <i>zamindo</i> the earth,	les it	hi has	kale <i>kale</i> black	por feathers		

andro	paka,	je	schpitzigu	schnablus	de	
in	the wings,	a	sharp	beak	bi	and
je	tikno	pori,	andro	leskri	neste	hi
a	short	tail,	in	its	nest	are
parne <i>uschala</i> white	jari. <i>andare.</i> eggs.'		18.	O	rukkes <i>Schahar</i> tree	hi has sennole <i>harja</i> green
pattia <i>pata</i> leaves	de <i>bi</i> and	schubbe thick	nasti. <i>dahli.</i> branches.'	19.	I ‘The	jak <i>Angar</i> fire
chatschole, burns,	me <i>hame</i> we	dikkaha <i>o</i> see	tu, the		o <i>diva</i> smoke, the	
flammas flame	de <i>bi</i> and	I the	janger. <i>kolla.</i> coal.'	20.	O ‘The	panin <i>Pani</i> water
andro in	flusse <i>naddi</i> the river	naschele flows	sik. rapidly.'	21.	Mantus <i>Schand</i> ‘The moon	hi <i>he</i> is
bareder <i>bara</i> bigger	her than	schterno <i>sitara subi</i> a star	de <i>bi</i> and	tikneder <i>schota</i> smaller than	her <i>subi</i> the	kam. <i>suritsch</i> sun.'
22.	Teisse <i>Kal</i> ‘Yesterday	rati <i>ratme</i> night	dias there was (=gave)		brischendo, <i>barasja</i> rain,	
ka <i>aschku</i> that	diwes day	teisarlo <i>fascher</i> (in the) morning	dikkigom <i>dekja</i> I saw		je a	regenboge. rainbow.'
23.	Rati <i>Rat</i> ‘[At] night	hi <i>hei</i> it is	tumligo <i>de</i> <i>andagar</i> dark	diwese <i>bi</i> and	hi <i>dinme</i> [during] the day it is	hell. <i>roschnaja.</i> light.'

These data alone show the closest relation between two languages one can possibly think of. Nevertheless, the correspondence would be even more complete if the comparison was made with a thorough knowledge of both languages; this would ensure a consistent choice of the proper expression amongst several carrying equal meaning and would eliminate any sort of language-mixing, which is especially widespread in the Gypsy language under the influence of German. In any case, when comparing the words of both languages one finds an exact correspondence not just occasionally or often, but almost everywhere. One can find several such instances in the books mentioned so far. Yet, I do not want to dwell on this matter, but instead I wish to give some more words that are not listed in the Gypsy-dictionary.

Gypsy-language:	Hindustani:	
wariwal	<i>Bara</i>	‘wind’
karscht,	<i>Lekkari,</i>	‘wood’
kerawe,	<i>karta,</i>	‘I make’
dawe,	<i>deta,</i>	‘I give’
medschana,	<i>samuschna,</i>	‘I know’
darawe,	<i>derta,</i>	‘I fear’

As regards the grammatical part of the language the correspondence is no less conspicuous, which is an even more important proof of the close relation between the languages. This follows from the well known fact that in languages which display similar vocabulary the endings and inflexions may still differ a great deal. The reason for this is quite natural, and is to be found in the origin of languages, for the latter (endings and inflexions) develop later and are more affected by changes. This is why, for instance, German differs from English or Danish in its grammar, much more than in the lexicon; the same is true for Latin and Italian or French; the grammar of the later languages was only formed after the division of these different Germanic tribes. The grammar of the Gypsy-language however was affected by and adapted to the language of the predominant German peoples. Yet, comparing the language of the Gypsies with Hindustani we find consistent correspondences in the domain of grammar as well. Being ignorant myself I set about to elicit as much grammar as I could from the dictionary and my afore-mentioned teacher. In what follows I present to the reader the results of my comparison of the Gypsy with the Hindustani language.

The article *je* meaning ‘a’, *o* ‘the’ [masc.] and *i* ‘the’ [fem.] is rarely used. Apparently, it only developed as an imitation of German, much like in Wendic. The article is basically a pronoun or a numeral which coincides with Hindustani *jek* ‘one’, *un* ‘the’ and *uni* the same.

Nouns are derived from adjectives and vice versa.

Gypsy-language:		Hindustani:	
schukker	‘beautiful’	<i>gun</i>	‘sin’
schukkerben	‘beauty’	<i>gunegar</i>	‘sinner’
baru	‘large’	<i>nasib</i>	‘luck’
baruben	‘largeness’	<i>nasibvala</i>	‘lucky’
puro	‘old’	<i>tachsir</i>	‘guilt’
puriben	‘age’	<i>tachsirvala</i>	‘guilty’
wesch	‘forest’	weschiskro	‘forester’
bersch	‘year’	berschafkro	‘years old’
gascht	‘wood’	gaschteno	‘wooden’

Contrast is expressed by a negative prefix.

Gypsy-language:		Hindustani:	
Mischdo	‘good’	<i>rasamand</i>	‘pleasure’
nanimischdo	‘danger’	<i>narasamand</i>	‘displeasure’
schukker	‘beautiful’	<i>derr</i>	‘fear’
betschukker	‘slow’	<i>bederr</i>	‘courage’

The masculine ending is *o*, the corresponding feminine one *i*.

Gypsy-language:		Hindustani:	
Balo	‘pig’	<i>Schaker</i>	‘farm-labourer’
bali	‘sau’	<i>Schakerni</i>	‘maid-servant’
Gray	‘horse’	<i>Ghora</i>	‘horse’
grasni	‘mare’	<i>gori</i>	‘mare’
Tschowachano	‘wizard’	<i>charan</i>	‘deer’
Tschowachani	‘witch’	<i>charani</i>	‘hind’
baru	‘large’	<i>nasibvala</i>	‘lucky man’
pari	‘pregnant’	<i>nasibvali</i>	‘lucky woman’

Neither language has compound-words or diminutives; in addition, the Hindustanis do not have comparatives.

Gypsy-language:		Hindustani:	
baru	‘large’	<i>bara</i>	‘large’
bareder	‘larger’	<i>subi bara</i>	‘larger’
o bareder	‘the biggest’		

The system of declension is straightforward and consists in most cases of postposed particles.

Gypsy-language:			
N. Dad	‘father’	dai	‘mother’
G. dades		dakri	
D. dadeste		dadi	
A. dades		da	
A. mre dadester		mre dater	
baru balo	‘a large pig’	N. baru balo	‘large pigs’
G. bari balis		G. bari balen	
D. bari balis		D. bari balen	
A. baru balo		A. baru balen	
bari balister		A. bari balender	

Hindustani:			
N. <i>Kam</i>	‘work’	N. <i>kama</i>	‘works’
G. <i>kamka</i>		G. <i>kamaka</i>	
D. <i>kamku</i>		D. <i>kamaku</i>	
A. <i>kamku</i>		A. <i>kamaku</i>	
A. <i>kam me</i>	‘at work’	A. <i>kamame</i>	and so forth.
<i>kam su</i>	‘through’		
<i>kam me su</i>	‘from’		
<i>kameander</i>	‘in’		
<i>kame ange</i>	‘before’		

The pronouns are fairly similar.

Gypsy-language:

me	'I'	tu	'you'
man	'my'	tute	'your'
man	'to me'	tute	'to you'
man	'me'	tut te	'you'
mander	'by me'	tuter	'by you'

Plural.

me	'we'	tume	'you'
mende	'our'	tumende	'your'
men	'us'	tumen	'you'
mender	'by us'	tumender	'by you'

Hindustani:

<i>meihi kam</i>	<i>tu</i>
<i>mera meri</i>	<i>tera teri</i>
<i>minsche minschku</i>	<i>tuschku tusche</i>
<i>minsche minschku</i>	<i>tuschku tusche</i>
<i>mere me</i>	<i>tere me.</i>

<i>hame</i>	<i>tume</i>
<i>hamara hamari tumare tumarija</i>	
<i>hamnaku hamna tumnaku tumna</i>	
<i>hamare me</i>	<i>tumare me</i>

job	'he'	joi	'she'
leste	'his'	lati	'her'
las	'him'	la	'her'
les	'him'	la	'her'
lester	'by him'	later	'by her'

<i>un</i>	<i>uni</i>
<i>unka</i>	<i>unika</i>
<i>unku</i>	<i>uniku</i>
<i>unku</i>	<i>uniku</i>
<i>unme</i>	<i>unime.</i>

Plural.

jole	'they'
lende	'their'
len	'to them'
len	'them'
lender	'by them'

<i>uno</i>	<i>unia</i>
<i>unoka</i>	<i>unika</i>
<i>unoku</i>	<i>uniaku.</i>
<i>unoku</i>	<i>uniaku.</i>
<i>unome</i>	<i>uniame.</i>

miro	'my'	tiro	'your'	<i>mera meri</i>	<i>tera teri</i>
meri	'my'	tiri	'your'		
maro	'our'	tumaro	'your'	<i>hamare tumare</i>	
lesko	'his'	lakri	'her'		

Plural.

lengro	'their'				
ajowe	'the same' [masc.]	ajoje	'the same' [fem.]	<i>in</i>	<i>ini</i>
agei	'this' [masc.]	ageie	'this' [fem.]	<i>is</i>	<i>us</i>
jok	'someone'	kek	'none'	<i>jekas</i>	<i>jek nei</i>
hako	'everyone'	de	'which/who'	<i>jek jek</i>	<i>kis</i>
tsomoni	'something'	tschi	'nothing'	<i>koi</i>	<i>koi nei.</i>

As for conjugation, both languages use the auxiliary 'to be' in the formation of the passive; they also use the Dative, just like Latin.

Gypsy-language:

me hom	'I am'
tu hal	'you are'
job hi	'he is'
me ham	'we are'
tume ham	'you are'
jole hi	'they are'
me hames	'I was'
tu hales	'you were'
job has	'he was'

Hindustani:

<i>meihi hun</i>
<i>tu hei</i>
<i>un hei</i>
<i>kamme hei</i>
<i>tume hei</i>
<i>uno hei</i>
<i>meihi ta</i>
<i>tu ta</i>
<i>un ta</i>

me hames	‘we were’	<i>hame te</i>
tume hames	‘you were’	<i>tume te</i>
jole has	‘they were’	<i>uno te</i>
me schunawe, piawe	‘I hear, drink’	<i>meihi sunta, pita.</i>
tu schuneha, pihe	‘you hear, drink’	<i>tu sunta, pita.</i>
job schunele, pile	‘he hears, drinks’	<i>un sunta, pita.</i>
me schunaha, piaha	‘we hear, drink’	<i>hame sunte, pite.</i>
tume schunene, piene	‘you hear, drink’	<i>tume sunte, pite,</i>
jole schunene, piene	‘they hear, drink’	<i>uno sunte, pite.</i>
me schundom, piom	‘I have, had heard, drunk’	<i>meihi sunja, pia.</i>
tu schundal, pial	‘you have, had’	<i>tu sunja, pia,</i>
job schundas, pias	‘he has, had’	<i>un sunja, pia,</i>
me schundan, pian	‘we have, had’	<i>hame sunje, pie,</i>
tume schundan, pian	‘you have, had’	<i>tume sunje, pie.</i>
jole schundan, pian	‘they have, had’	<i>uno sunje, pie</i>
me kamawe te hunawe, piawe	‘I want to hear, drink’	<i>me sununga, piunga</i>
te schun, pis	‘hear(!), drink(!)’	<i>sun, pin</i>
te schunene, pin	‘hear(!), drink(!) [Pl.]’	<i>suno, pino</i>

The particles differ the most.

Gypsy-language:

agei	‘here’	ajoi	‘there’	Hindustani:
ka	‘today’	diwes teisse	‘yesterday’	<i>jaha, waha</i>
agawe diwes	‘tomorrow’	awawer teisse	‘the day after tomorrow’	<i>asch, kal.</i>
pre	‘on’	pala	‘after’	<i>saba</i>
abri	‘from’	bral	‘over’	<i>po pische.</i>
ue	‘yes’	na	‘no’	<i>su uper</i>
aber,	‘or’	de	‘and, but’	<i>nei</i>
				<i>bi</i>

Finally, having been dispersed, the Gypsies have lost nearly all of their own syntax; rather, model it according to each language they speak, but even here there are traces which bear similarities with Hindustani. In particular, the postpositioning of prepositions, as well as in word order, e.g.:

Gypsy language:

kerdomles	‘I did it’	Hindustani:
tu ke	‘for you’	<i>tumku</i>
la ke	‘for her’	<i>unoku</i>
ma-nge	‘for myself’	<i>mere anger karta isku</i>
mense	‘with us’	<i>meresat</i>
tumense	‘with you [Pl.]’	<i>tumarsat,</i>
leha	‘with him’	<i>unosat</i>
laha	‘with her’	<i>unifat</i>

It seems to me that with all this evidence there is no longer room for doubt that the Gypsies and the Hindustanis essentially speak the same language, especially if we take into consideration that, first of all, the former were obliged to lose and change much of their language during their far and long-lasting journeys; not even my teacher could have possibly known the remainder of it. Secondly, in the Hindustani of the missionary Schulz perhaps we

do not encounter the right dialect, or he might have recorded some things incorrectly, just as he had used the Persian script instead of the actual Hindustani one. He did not have full command of the language, to say the least, and did not think of comparing it to the Gypsy language. Carrying out the comparison, inevitably some of the similarities must have been lost and so the languages must be fundamentally more similar than what appears here. Thus one finds in the Hindustani alphabet printed in Rome in 1771 the numbers five *panc* and ten *des*; Furthermore, in a *Short Grammar and Vocabulary of the Moors Language. London 1771. Chooma (Tschuma)* a 'kiss', *per* 'on', 'over', 'in', in N. B. Halhed's *Bengali Grammar, manuscho* 'man', *maha* 'moon', in the *Shanscrita* based on (trankenbarschen) missionary-reports *hastam* 'hand', *dantam* 'tooth', *trini* 'three' and *trinscha* 'thirty.' All of this comes much closer to the Gypsy language than the above listed Hindustani version and I would certainly find more if I had more extensive sources of the two languages at my disposal. We can therefore assume that the language of the Gypsies and Indians are the same, with no mistake, definitely with more reason than the claim made in Sajnovic's *demonstratio idioma Ungarorum et Lapponum idem esse*.

I therefore come to the conclusion that the Gypsies together with the Indians constitute one people. This sheds new light on their origin and their whole history, now that we are in a position to compare the linguistic evidence with all the other historical conditions and characteristics of the Gypsies, we find that they match and correspond entirely. The character of the Gypsies, their first appearance in Europe, their fortune-telling, their feigned Christianity, their abundant livestock, silver and gold, their thefts, their long robes and the big pendants they still wear, all of this fits the Indians much better than any other nation. Their physiognomy as well is similarly Indian. If we take a random look at the illustrations of nations, based on original sketches and published in Vogel's *Journey to East India (Altenburg 1704)*, we find there are striking similarities between the Malays, the Batavians, the Macassars and the Gypsies in their whole physical appearance. These illustrations have only recently been engraved for the 1782 Nuremberg Almanac for Children. There is also the similarity of hairstyle with that of the New Zealanders pictured in the *South Sea travels*. Recently, Herr Forster has shown the descent of the New Zealanders to be from India. Although Vogel could not have thought of connecting the two. I also include their national name. Even though they are merely yellow the Gypsies call themselves *Kalo* meaning black and the Europeans *Pani* meaning pale, like the Indians.

Even the actual name of the latter people matches more than it appears at first sight with that of the Gypsies. For in India itself the nation is referred to by the name of the river *Sind*, therefore *Sindistan*, *Sindland* and not *Sindostan*, the Eastern Sind, as was claimed by Herr Schulz. How easy it must have been for *Sind* to be changed into *Zing* in the Orient; similarly *Schlund* [pharynx, gorge] was changed into *Geschluenge* [animal-intestines] etc. in our country. Thus, we would have derived the name of the Gypsies from the ancient traditional name of the people. In case some people find this derivation implausible or somewhat far-fetched, we can still find in India a name for the Gypsies that is even closer. In his *Asia* Dapper calls the country surrounding the river Indus *Send* or *Sinde* and depicts the Hindi as a people settled to the North and inclined to robbery. Thebenot, when he reached the estuary of the river Indus in the course of his journey, encountered a city called *Sindy* and a people by the name *Zinganen*. They were engaged in piracy by land and sea. Even their overlord, the Great Mogul, placated them by presenting them with a gift once a year. There might also be a connection to Huebner's city of *Singi* on the island of *Coremandel* or the *Zinganen* or *Zanganen* in Gujarat, as pointed out by Buesching. However, I do not trust this mere homophony which would point even more easily to the Singhalese; their language however being more remote from both Hindustani and the language of the Gypsies. By contrast, it seems more certain to me to take the *Singa* and the *Moruntes*, who according to Pliny lived on the river Indus, to be the people whom we nowadays refer to as the *Zinganen*, Hindustanis and Moors. Similarly, Pliny's *Saramants* might well be the Negro people *Kramanti* to whom reference is made in Oldendorb's *Missionary History*. For the ancient homeland and name of a people is very rarely totally abandoned.

According to this account then, all the Gypsies are to be derived from the tribe which had populated the border areas between Persia and India since ancient times; it is this tribe that made us refer to all Oriental peoples, recently even to Western peoples, as Indians, which is a common mistake resulting from ignorance. Similarly, Oriental countries refer to all European nations as Franks. This ties in nicely with Herr Buettner's suggestion. He believes that the Gypsies are a remnant of the Afghan tribe of Indians. According to letters by Lady Kindersley the Afghans founded an empire in the mountains between Persia and the Indus around 975 AD; they made incursions and conquests as far as the river Ganges and were finally defeated by Chinggis Khan around 1217 and chased as far as India. According to other sources they also waged war on the other side with Persia where they defeated the Sufis. Thus, they do not originally belong to the ancient peoples of present-day East India, from whom they still differ nowadays in religion, customs and language in spite of racial mixing. Instead they represent the link between Persia and India, which their language shows most clearly.

On the other hand, they not only caused war and revolutions but also suffered them. According to yet another source, the Afghans eradicated the Sufis in Persia during the reigns of Mechemed and Eschref. According to Herr Buesching however, not only did they move from their ancient homeland between Derbent and Baku to a more Southern place near Kandahar on the border with Hindustan, but also substituted Islam for their Armenian Christian faith. Yet, here they are perhaps being mistaken for the Caucasian nation of the Abkhaz, who, while similar in name are very distinct in general and speak a totally different language. I am almost certain that it is the *Chigier*, a supposed tribe of the above, which Curio tells us about in his history of the Saracens in connection with Saladin. Supposedly, Saladin bought slaves from the Circassians or the *Ziga* mentioned by Pliny and the ancient historians and turned them into the Mameluks of Egypt. Furthermore, I must also add that according to Herbelot the people of the *Zingis* or *Zenghis* waged war against the caliphs in the tenth century, they even fought in ancient Arabia and occupied Basra, Ramlah and Arabian Iraq for a while. Following oriental geographers he cites *Zingistan*, next to Abyssinia, facing the Yemen and on the present-day coast of Zanzibar, as the ancient homeland of this people. However this only proves one thing, namely that the mistake of trying to determine the origin of this people on the basis of the homophony of their name has a long history. At the time they were already considered outsiders due to their itinerant lifestyle. As in other instances, the oriental historians share with us this mistake.

We can assume that this is precisely the reason why this view was finally adopted by the Gypsies themselves, who had forgotten all about their origin, and why it was eventually passed on to us. Even Herbelot already maintained that the Persians called this people Siah Hindou, Black Indians, like the Greeks, who labelled both them and the Ethiopians, Indians. This can be regarded as further evidence. For the Persians undoubtedly knew a lot more about the origin of their former neighbours, and it might even be the case that the name Siah Hindou is identical with the original name *Zing*. The Greeks however, presumably took the name from the Persians, and considering their state of barbarism in those days it is easy to imagine that they took Ethiopia and India, both of which were unknown to them, to be one country; just as the Europeans believed for centuries that the emperor of Abyssinia and the Dalai Lama of Tibet were one and the same person. Furthermore, there is slight evidence to suggest that already the ancient Greeks sometimes used the label India for Egypt, perhaps because of a simple misunderstanding. This would further account for the mistake of seeing the Gypsies originating from Egypt.

All the wars, migrations and revolutions we have touched upon so far represent an adequate reason for the scattering of the Gypsies from their ancient homeland. There can be no doubt that this is why they can still be found so frequently in Persia and in Northern Syria. The band of *Tzingeni* might also have originated from there. They are listed in the correspondence of Herr Schloezer in connection with the payment of 2690 bags of tribute to the crown, second only to the Turcomen, which leads me to the conclusion that they constituted a rather large group. This is probably the reason why they eventually came to

Europe, and are most widespread on the Danube. Expulsion or the greed to conquer, or perhaps both, as is usually the case with all migrations of peoples, may have instigated them to do so. Yet, their own accounts rather point in the first direction and there could even be some truth in their pretended migration due to their ancestors' break with Christianity; provided that they are in fact the Afghans described by Buesching who initially moved from Baku to Kandahar, then converted to Islam, but were however expelled soon after. I dare not give a more detailed description of the reasons that motivated their migrations. However, I am, even without the use of supportive tools too much of an outsider to this particular field of history in general and will leave it therefore to the actual historians. I hereby give in modestly before them not only being content but feeling amply rewarded if my small investigation proves to be of any help to them and might give rise to further discoveries in the future. I hope that by using the plumblineline of philology I was able to facilitate and safeguard the journey across the history of the Gypsies.