

Q.1 Write a detailed note on the origin of the language.

LANGUAGE is the expression of human personality in words, whether written, or spoken. It is the universal medium alike for conveying the common facts and feelings of everyday life and the philosophers' searchings after truth, and all that lies between. Thinkers as well as poets have always assumed that language can be the bearer (संदेशवाहक) of all kind of truth and the imager of every sort of reality. It will be taken for granted, therefore, in what follows that language as defined above is the normal, natural and enduring method of expressing the human mind which is the nearest to universal.

Particular language may be considered either as one learns of it through grammars and dictionaries and text-books, or as it is encountered in a special situation, a known speaker and a remembered occasion. From this standpoint, ~~the~~ one has been termed 'language' and the other 'speech'. 'Language', then would mean both languages in general and any particular language considered quite apart from any actual speaker or situation: 'speech' would mean the words used by some individual in a more or less precisely known situation or context.

The, 'outer' language is speech or writing as we view it from the outside, without consciousness of any particular individual or situation: while the 'inner', language is that of a particular speaker or writer *in* a set of known circumstances or in a given context. One might say, quite broadly, that 'language' or 'outer-language' is viewed from the outside, while 'speech' or 'inner' language is seen or heard from the inside from an actual human being as distinct from merely assumed groups or types of speakers. Thus it may be said that the French *cheval*, the Italian *cavallo* and the Russian *kon'* all mean 'horse' and that this is a fact of 'language' and of 'outer' language: for the French, Italians and Russians all share a common body of intuited knowledge (प्रत्यक्ष ज्ञान) with the British, and the words for 'horse' can be interchanged in translating from one of their languages into another.

Another recent approach to the study of language has sought to divide it into 'indicative' that is the language used to state facts, and the 'emotive', the language which seeks to arouse feeling or suggest an emotional attitude. From this standpoint, the 'emotive' language is often held to have no real meaning as an expression of truth. Indeed Shelley's famous lines:

*"Life, like a dome of many-coloured glass  
Stains (सूती पलक) the white radiance (प्रशान्ति) of eternity."*



have been held to be meaningless except for their emotional suggestion.

In other words, the distinction between the 'indicative' and the 'emotive' in language is one which over-simplifies and may mislead: for there may be factual matter conveyed emotively, just as there may be 'meaningless' statements made in apparently 'indicative' language. The work of great poets like Shakespeare and Milton, who have left by their influence some permanent imprint upon the language, must not be left out of the account in any balanced study of the language as a whole. A possible third type of language which might be added to the 'indicative' and the 'emotive' is what may be termed the 'symbolic'.

Goethe, for example, in his drama *Faust*, has made a character exclaim that 'All theory is grey, and the golden tree of life is green'. The meaning of this is quite clear, though the words used are almost entirely symbolic. This aspect of language will, naturally, only appear incidentally in what follows.

This is partly because thought and language cannot clearly be separated, since the one can scarcely (ભાષ્યે જ) seem to exist without the other. Therefore the origin of language seems to be bound up with that of human thought. We must decide when and how man began to think, to know of the beginnings of language; and we must know when and how he began to speak, to decide on the origins of his existence as a thinking being. St. John's statement at the opening of his Gospel that 'In the beginning was the word' (the Greek *logos*), he may be held to have indicated that in the mind of God there co-existed, from the beginning thought and language. The theory of the evolution of man as known to scientists, then, must find a place for the emergence of man as a possessor of language as distinct from the so-called 'highest' species of anthropoid apes (માણસને જેવો વાંદરો) whose varied cries are not language (which implies thought), but only very fully developed conditioned reflexes. The gap between the highest anthropoid ape and the most 'primitive' man has not yet been bridged from this point of view of the emergence of language in what may be called 'homo loquens'; which is really the same thing as the familiar 'homo sapiens'. The hypothesis (પૂર્વધારણા) of some kind of creative act, therefore, man still be tenable in default of a better in considering the origin of language.