



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at New York, Oct. 28th and 29th, 1874.

The Semi-annual meeting was held in New York City, commencing at 3 o'clock P. M. of Wednesday, October 28th, at the rooms of the Bible-revision Committee in the Bible House, the President in the chair.

The Recording Secretary being absent, Mr. A. Van Name, of New Haven, was appointed Secretary *pro tempore*.

The Committee of Arrangements communicated an invitation from Prof. Short to meet socially at his house in the evening. The invitation was accepted, with thanks.

The Directors announced that the Annual meeting for 1875 would be held in Boston on Wednesday, May 19th; and that Rev. N. G. Clark, D.D., with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, had been designated to act as a Committee of Arrangements for it.

The following persons, on recommendation of the Directors, were elected Corporate Members of the Society :

Mr. Thomas Hitchcock, of New York,
 Mr. Julius Sachs, of New York,
 Mr. A. W. Tyler, of New York,
 Miss Susan H. Ward, of New York,
 Dr. T. T. Van der Hoeven, of San Antonio, Texas,
 Rev. T. O. Paine, of Elmwood, Mass.,
 Prof. J. H. Thayer, of Andover, Mass.,
 Rev. John Wright, of Boston.

The Corresponding Secretary reviewed the correspondence of the past year. Among other things, he called attention to communications touching the library of the late Prof. E. Rödiger, of Berlin, an Honorary Member of the Society, now offered for sale.*

Communications were then presented as follows :

1. On the Cypriote Inscriptions, by Mr. Isaac H. Hall, of New York.

The valuable collection of Cypriote antiquities discovered by Gen. Luigi Palma di Cesnola on the sites of ancient Citium, Idalium, and Golgos, and elsewhere, and now deposited in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, contains between twenty and thirty inscriptions in the Cypriote character. These inscriptions have never been either completely read, or well and fully published. Copies were taken for the British Museum, before the collection came to America, and from them an incomplete set of photographs were published by Mansell in London, in 1872-3; but these, to judge from citations, cannot be entirely reliable. A catalogue of the collection, by Johannes Doell, entitled *Die Sammlung Cesnola*, and containing a few very inaccurately figured inscriptions, was published by the St. Petersburg Academy in its *Mémoires*, in 1873. A few, more or less perfect, copies of some of the inscriptions have also been given in the various works of those engaged in deciphering.

* And purchased a little later by the Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

The Cypriote writing is not yet entirely deciphered, though the foundation is well laid. The known inscriptions are about a hundred, of very various length; the bronze tablet of Dali containing 31 lines and 270 to 300 words, while others are fragments, with only one or two characters. The bronze tablet was obtained in 1850, by the Duc de Luynes; and he was the first to collect the various legends in similar characters from all quarters, and to prove that they represented a hitherto unknown system of writing, if not a new language. R. H. Lang, in 1870 or 1871, discovered at Dali a marble tablet, with a bilingual inscription, in Phœnician and Cypriote, which furnished the first real clue to the decipherment.

The first attempt at reading the character was made by de Luynes, in his *Numismatique et Inscriptions Cypriotes* (Paris, 1852), but failed entirely, because of his taking a word to mean 'Salamis' which really means 'king.' He saw that the writing usually reads from right to left, and one of his guesses as to the consonant power of a character has proved correct. His splendid work, as a collection of Cypriote monuments (all then known), beautifully and accurately figured, has not been superseded.

The first attempt that gave promise of any success was that by Mr. Lang, in the Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, vol. i., p. 116 ff. But simultaneously with Mr. Lang, Mr. George Smith, of the British Museum, applied himself to the bilingual tablet of Dali, with signal success. His article was read the same day with Mr. Lang's, and published along with it. In a supplementary paper he gave a list of 54 characters, with values, and the authorities for each; of these, about 30 have proved to be approximately correct.

Next in order, and of indispensable importance, is the work of Dr. Samuel Birch, in a later number of the same publication. It is difficult to give a proper idea of the profound study and scholarship and of the brilliant genius displayed in Birch's article, without a long detail. He showed that the date of the bronze tablet could not be later than 353 B. C., and that the language written was substantially Greek. A single mistake, apparently—the non-recognition of *kas* (= *καί*, 'and'), taking its *k* for a *t*—was all that prevented him from anticipating Brandis, if not Schmidt.

Then comes J. Brandis's *Versuch zur Entzifferung der kyprischen Schrift*, a posthumous work, edited by Ernst Curtius, and published in the *Monatsbericht* of the Berlin Academy for February, 1873. The main key to his discoveries was the word *kas*, which he read, correcting Birch's misapprehension. His work is not so brilliant as that of either of his predecessors, but the item referred to was wonderfully fruitful in new words read, and in leading to the decipherment of additional characters. He made many mistakes, some of them quite amusing: e. g. interpreting the Phœnician equivalent of the Cypriote *Ἀπολλων* to mean 'fiery Mical' or 'fiery Typhon.' Brandis's work, like those of Lang, Smith, and Birch, is illustrated with type cut for the purpose, and Brandis's type, though not perfect, is rather better than those of the others. It confounds some characters that are entirely distinct, and represents others by inferior forms. The types in the body of de Luynes's work are the most faithful of all.

The most complete and thorough treatise on the subject, thus far, is Moritz Schmidt's *Die Inschrift von Idalion und das kyprische Syllabar* (Jena, 1874). It is in autograph-lithograph, and contains a brief account of the labors of his predecessors, the author's own attempts at deciphering, and a short dissertation on the grammatical and dialectic peculiarities of Cypriote Greek. Schmidt has had access to all the material, except to trustworthy copies of the Cesnola inscriptions: thus, the inscription referred to by him on p. 8 is clearly not in hexameters, and it ends, as well as begins, with *χαίρετε*; two others are wrongly figured by him and not perfectly transliterated, and so on; but his few errors are mainly clerical. He has made very thorough work, and has hit upon some brilliant discoveries. He has established the uniformly syllabic character of the writing, and corrected many mistakes of Brandis, Birch, and Smith, though confirming most of the consonant powers assigned by them to the characters.

The language of the inscriptions is Greek, but not very easy to read. As to the characters, there is a separate one for each of the vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*; an additional one for *a*, seemingly used only after *i*; and another for *o*, of undefined use. There is no distinction between short and long vowels. The other characters seem to represent open syllables, and to begin always with a consonant; and

the whole theoretic syllabary appears to be tolerably complete; the number of syllables that may be said to be wanting (eight or nine, mostly ending in *w*) being about equal to that of the characters yet undetermined. There are two digamma syllables, *w*e and *w*o; but the digamma must have been disappearing; as, for example, the genitive of *βασίλευς* is written indifferently *βασίλειος* or *βασιλέρος*.

No distinction is made between smooth, middle, and rough mutes of the same organ: e. g. the same character stands for *ta* in *τας*, *δα* in *Ἰδαλίον* and *θα* in *Ἄθανα*; the same character may stand for *κε*, *κη*, *γε*, *γη*, *χε*, or *χη*; and so on. This fact constitutes the greatest difficulty in reading Cypriote. To this there appears to be only one exception, if indeed it is an exception. The consonants are apparently never doubled: thus, for *Ἀπολλώνι* we have *A. po. lo. ni*. Double consonants are resolved into their constituent elements: thus, for *ξί* we have *ki. si*.

Iota subscript (adscript) is regularly written; but where it can be supplied from one of a number of words in the same case, it is frequently omitted from the rest: e. g. *to. i. te. o.* represents *τω. θεω*.

In certain cases, *n* is systematically omitted: thus, *παντων* is written *pa. to.*; for *ἀθροσφω* is written *a. to. ro. po. i*. When two syllables having the same vowels and compatible consonants come together, they join and form one syllable, as is seen in the last example, and in *ko. lo. ki. a.* for *Γολγθα, po. to. li. se.* for *πτολις* (*πολις*), *a. po. ro. ti. te.* for *Ἀφροδίτη*, etc.

Final *s*, and final *n* when written, are the syllables for *se* and *ne* respectively—like Hebrew *sheva* with final consonant, or the silent final *e* in French and English.

For *η*, and frequently for *ε*, the *i*-vowel is written, making it possible that the Cypriotes pronounced *η* like English "long *e*," as the modern Greeks do. Indeed, *η*, *ι*, and *ο* often change places: *Ἰδαλίον* is the regular Cypriote spelling of Idalium; *θεω* is either *te. o. i.* or *ti. o. i.*; the preposition *ἐν* is commonly written *ι*; and so on.

Among the peculiarities of the syntax, *ἐκ* or *ἐξ* is regularly followed by the dative, and *ι* (*ἐν*) by the accusative.

An example or two of the inscriptions, in Roman equivalents and Greek transliteration, will further explain the principles of the writing better than it can be done by words. In the romanizing, for the sake of uniformity, only the smooth mutes are used.

The following is inscribed between the feet of a broken-off statuette in the Cesnola collection, not numbered:

(1.) *e. ko. to. se' ka. te. sa. ta. se' to. i.* (2.) *ti. o. i' ta. pi. te. ki. si. o. i'* (3.) *i. tu. ka. i. a. ka. ta. i.*—*Ἐγνωσθε καταστασε τω θυω τἀπιτεξω ι[v] τυχα ἀγαθα*. Here *θυω* is for *θεω*. The contraction *τἀπι-* for *τῶ ἐπι-*, though strange, is not unlike other Cypriote examples. The *ι* is for *ἐν*.

Again we have, on a sculptured stone, numbered 249 in the collection:

(1.) *ti. a. i. te. mi' to. i. te. o.* (2.) *to. a. po. lo. ni' o. ne. te. ke.* (3.) *u. tu. ka.* Or, in Greek: *Διαθεμι τῶ θεω τῶ Ἀπολλ[λ]ωνι ὀνεθηκε ἰ τυχα*. Here *θεω* is written with *e*. Its iota adscript is omitted on account of that of the preceding word, as that of *τω* on account of the following. *ὀνεθηκε*, for *ἀνεθηκε*, appears to be the regular Cypriote form. The first character in the third line is a little doubtful.

The following is given by Schmidt as one of the Cesnola inscriptions, but is not found by me in the collection:

(1.) *e. te. i' III. a. . . .* (2.) *ta. we. i. ko. na. tu. te. ne. a.* Or, in Greek, *Ἐτεῖ III Ἀ τα[v] φεικονα τα[v]δε νεα[v]?*

The most important of the Cesnola inscriptions, and third in importance of all the Cypriote inscriptions discovered, is this:

(1.) *ka. i. re. te' ka. ra. si. ti' a. na. x' ka. po. ti' we. po. me. ka' me. po. te. we. i. se. se.*
 (2.) *te. o. i. se' po. ro. (?) . . na. to. i. se. e. re. ra. me. na' pa. ta. ko. ra. i. to. se'*
 (3.) *o. wo. (or ti. ?) ka. re. ti' e. pi. si. ta. te. se' a. to. ro. po' te. o. i' a. le. tu. ka. ke. (?) re.*
 (4.) *te. o. i' ku. me. re. na. i. pa. ta' ta. a. to. ro. po. i' po. ro. po' o. i. ka. i. re. te.*

Or, in Greek characters, in part:

Χαιρετε ἀναξ μηποτε φεισης.
Θεοις προ (?) . νατοις ἐρεραμενα πα[v]ταχωραιτος.
Ἰσο (σι?) χαιρετι ἐπιστατης α[v]θρωπω θεω
Θεω κυμερεια πα[v]τα τα α[v]θρωπω ἡ χαιρετε.

I am not satisfied with any version yet given of the words here omitted, though many plausible conjectures can be made. Some of those given in Greek may need a little modification: thus, *-ω* may be *-οι*, and so on.

After the reading of this communication, Prof. Haldeman exhibited to the Society some beads found in Indian mounds during the digging of the Pennsylvania Canal, and remarked upon them.

2. On a Collection of Readings of the Thebaic New Testament Version hitherto Uncited, by Mr. Arthur W. Tyler, Astor Library, New York.

In the winter of 1871-72, Mr. Tyler said, I was engaged in making a thorough search into all the available sources of evidence for the revision of the Greek text of the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. Having been informed, by Prof. Abbot of Cambridge, that the Memphitic had been wrongly cited, in the important reading in the third verse, by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, and other recent editors, I determined to be able to speak from personal knowledge in the article which I was preparing for the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. While, for that purpose, looking over the Coptic grammars and lexicons to be found in the linguistic department of the Astor Library, I happily came upon the *Rudimenta Linguae Coptiae sive Aegyptiacae* (4°, Romae, 1778), which was prepared by Rafaele Tuki, Roman Catholic Bishop of Arsinoe in Egypt, and published by the College of the Propaganda. Seeing that this work was very largely made up of citations from both the Old and New Testaments, and in the two Coptic dialects, I pursued my search through its pages, until it was rewarded by finding the full text, in both the Memphitic and also in the Thebaic, of the only two verses in the chapter in which important variations from the common text occur. This discovery was especially valuable for the reason that no portion of this chapter in Thebaic had been previously known to textual critics. This version of the New Testament is one of the oldest in existence, being both older and ruder than the Memphitic, and it is now assigned to the latter part of the second century by Professor J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, England, a competent scholar, who has recently paid considerable attention to the matter. My own pleasure was greatly enhanced upon finding, after a thorough investigation, that this priceless version concurred with the Memphitic in supporting the *iva κανήσωμαι*, which is read, in the third verse, by the three most ancient Greek uncials (8, A, B), and the most valuable cursive (17); and which I had adopted in my Greek text in 1868.

Further examination of Tuki's book has since shown that it contains a large number of Thebaic citations, in passages where its readings have been wholly unknown to editors of the Greek text of the New Testament, and that even its Memphitic portions are well worthy of examination, as they are evidently taken from manuscripts not consulted by David Wilkins. The Thebaic text, however, is especially deserving of a thorough and complete investigation and collation, from the fact that so few fragments of that interesting relic of the early Christian ages are known to exist; and therefore, every line, or every syllable, of it which we can recover is of the highest importance.

This book of Tuki's was employed by Tregelles (and possibly by Tischendorf) in the Apocalypse, though neither of them seem to have known of its existence in time to use it in the other books of the New Testament. It is quite likely that Tischendorf obtained all his citations in the Apocalypse from the concluding "part" of Tregelles's Greek Testament, which was issued some months in advance of his own.

I know of the existence of but few copies of Tuki's work in America: one is in the Astor Library, and another in my own possession. The latter contains a note showing that it was used by Rev. Henry Tattam, of Bedford, England, in the preparation of his *Compendious Grammar of the Egyptian Language* (8°, London, 1830), and his *Lexicon Aegyptiaco-Latinum* (8°, Oxonii, 1835); but he does not seem to have made as thorough use of it as he should, for in his lexicon he repeats the blunder of Wilkins's *Novum Testamentum Aegyptium* (4°, Oxonii, 1716), and gives *incendere* as the rendering of *shoushou* in the one passage above referred to, although in both his works he gives the correct translation in numerous other passages.

It almost seems, indeed, that Wilkins's mistranslation should be styled something worse than a blunder; for, judging from p. 34 of his *Prolegomena* (where he says '*shoushou emmoi*, 'ut comburam', *lege, uti et Graecus iva κανήσωμαι*), it appears

to have been willful. In any event, it has misled some of the best scholars in Europe, although Wetstein, in his Greek Testament (vol. ii. p. 156), protested against it, as long ago as 1752, in the note upon this verse.

3. On some points of Latin Syntax, with special reference to Mr. Roby's Grammar, by Prof. Charles Short, of New York.

The first part of Mr. Roby's Latin Grammar was published in 1871. During the present year the Second Part has appeared, treating of Syntax, in 666 pages.

Admirable as is this Second Part also, containing a treasure of examples far more numerous than any we had before, and from a third to a fourth part of which, Mr. Roby tells us, is from his own reading, yet in the development of the various usages he is less philosophical than we had hoped, and on some points he is still very meagre. But we ought rather to admire him for what he has done than blame him for his defects, which he may be expected largely to remedy in future editions of this part of his book. I offer a few remarks on two or three points out of several that I had noted for criticism.

In §1348 Mr. Roby says: "The infinitive is used as object of the thing"—that is, as indirect object—"to a verb which has also a direct personal object; as *docebo Rullum tacere*;" that is, 'I will teach Rullus about silence,' which is here equivalent to 'I will teach Rullus to be silent.' This is so far undoubtedly correct. But he should have added that this objective form, which is thus capable of logical analysis, might also by extension of usage be employed subjectively, though incapable of logical analysis if we start from this latter form. Thus we may say *Rullum tacere me juvat*, just as if it had been *taciturnitas Rulli me juvat*. Instead of this, Mr. Roby simply says that the infinitive may be the subject of a sentence, with its own subject in the accusative; and, put in this way, the puzzle of the construction remains unsolved. In §1351 he says: "A neuter pronoun (*id, illud*; Eng. 'that') is sometimes found in apposition to the infinitive clause and corresponding to the article (originally demonstrative pronoun) in Greek." Mr. Roby seems here to have confounded the "substantivizing" office of the Greek article with the anticipatory use, as it may be called, of the demonstrative with the infinitive clause, which is in Greek *τοῦτο, τόδε, ἐκεῖνο*; in Latin, *illud, hoc, id*; and in English, *it* or *this*. This anticipatory *id*, which Mr. Roby has in mind, is really very rare, as Caesar B. G., i. 7, *Caesari cum id nunciatum esset, eos . . . conari*; instead of the simple verb, as B. G., i. 38, *nunciatum est ei Ariovistum . . . contendere*. Under the same head Mr. Roby should have introduced a more subtle usage, the infinitive clause following an anticipatory *ita* or *sic*, which his favorite Madvig might have given him. This use is comparatively uncommon; but instances besides those adduced by Madvig are: *cum esset ita unconsument, caedes . . . comparari*, Cic. Cat., iii. 21; de Off., i. 13; Caesar B. G., i. 50; *cetera sic observentur . . . amicorum esse communia omnia*, Cic. de Off., i. 16; Tac. Germ., 18. Relative words also perform this anticipatory function, as *quod* in Cic. de Off., iii. 31—*quod cum audisset filius, negotium exhiberi patri*, 'when the son had heard this, that the business,' etc.; and *ut* in de Off., i. 19—*ut enim apud Platonem est, omnem morem Lacedaemoniorum inflammatum esse*, etc.

In §1019 Mr. Roby says: "Adverbs are used to qualify substantives attributively, adjectives, and sometimes adverbs." Mr. Papillon, Fellow of New College, Oxford, and editor of Terence in the *Catena Classicorum*, now in course of publication by the Messrs. Rivington, says: "A purely adjectival use of the adverb cannot be shown in Latin, which has not the article necessary for such a construction." Mr. Roby subjoins but one instance of this usage denied by Mr. Papillon, namely, *omnes circa civitates*; and he adds nothing about the position of the adverb when it is so employed.

But there are many clear cases of the adjectival use of the adverb in Latin—some in which the adverb is interposed between the substantive and its adjunct, which is practically equivalent to the adverb adjectival interposed between the article and its substantive in Greek; some in which the adverb stands outside such combination; and others in which the adverb qualifies the noun absolute.

1. The adverb interposed—*haec inter nos nuper notitia*, Ter. Heaut., 53; *erit semper lenitas*, Ter. Andr., 175; *his . . . jam noctibus*, Cic. Cat., ii. 23; *multarum circa civitatum*, Liv., i. 17; *in quadraginta deinde annos*, Liv., i. 15; *duo deinceps reges*, Liv.,

i. 21; *nullo publice emolumento*, Liv., vi. 39; *ingentis publice privatimque decoris*, Liv., i. 39; *sola mei super Astyanactis imago*, Virg. *Æn.*, iii. 489.

2. The adverb standing outside—*pacatos circa omnes populos*, Liv., i. 19; *quondam hi cornicines . . . munera nunc edunt*, Juv., iii. 34, where the metre would not allow the adverb to be interposed.

3. The adverb qualifying the substantive absolute—as *ante malorum*, Virg. *Æn.*, i. 198. Who can doubt that this copies, as well as the Latin can, the Sophoclean τῶν πάρος κακῶν, (Ed. Tyr., 1423?)

The matter of the order of words in Latin is very briefly treated by Mr. Roby, who gives only six pages to this subject; while Madvig devotes to it fifteen, Zumpt twenty-three, and Krüger forty-four.

I will examine one or two particulars of this portion of the work.

In §1047 the author says: "Words belonging to one or more coördinate words or expressions should strictly be put either before them all or after them all. But it is very usual, partly for rhythm's sake, for the common word to be put after the first of the coördinated words."

The order referred to in the latter part of this paragraph is very common in Cicero; but very rare in Cæsar and in Livy, so far as I have observed.

The following are instances of it:

1. Nouns with coördinate adjectives—as, *fortis univus et magnus*, Cic. de Off., i. 20; de Or., i. 112; Cæs. B. G., i. 5. 2. A genitive with coördinate nouns—as, *varietate rerum atque copia*, Cic. de Or., i. 19. 3. A verb with coördinate objects—as, *non cognomen solum deportasse, sed humanitatem et prudentiam*, Cic. C. M., 1; Cæs. B. G., i. 49; Hor. Sat., i. 1, 83. 4. A verb with coördinate ablatives—as, *mens discendo alitur et cogitando*, Cic. de Off., i. 30. 5. A single object with coördinate infinitives—as, *deprecarî aliquid et conqueri*, Cic. de Or., i. 20. 6. A single agent with coördinate verbs—as, *dicendum sibi et cognoscendum*, Cæs. B. G., i. 35. 7. A finite verb with coördinate predicate adjectives—as, *nec melior vir fuit nec clarior*, Cic. Lael., 2; and an infinitive with the same—as, *dubia esse et incerta*, Cic. de Or., i. 20. 8. A finite verb with coördinate infinitives—as, *augere possit atque ornare*, Cic. de Or., i. 21; Hor. Sat., i. 1, 89. 9. A verb with coördinate adverbs—as, *callide versari et perite*, Cic. de Or., i. 11; Hor. Sat., i. 3, 115. This same order often occurs in Greek, and with all classes of words, and the usage seems to have been transferred to the Latin chiefly by Cicero. That this particular order should happen, as a common thing, to be rhythmical, rather than the other arrangements here mentioned by Mr. Roby, is inconceivable. Some other explanation must be sought; and it is submitted whether the order is not employed mainly to give the hearer or reader, as early as possible, the construction of the clause, by presenting first one of the coördinate words, and then the single word, which is often the principal word, and leaving the other coördinate words to follow to any extent, as the case may be.

In §1050 Mr. Roby says: "Contrasted words are put next to one another—as, *ego Q. Fabium, senem adulescens*, Cic. Sen., 4; *ego ejus*, Cic. Verr., v. 49; *tu te ipse*, Cat., i. 8."

But related words and ideas in general are put side by side: 1. the same word or parts of the same word—as, *suadeam, suadeam*, Plaut. Capt., ii. 1, 40; *alienus, alienus*, ib., i. 2, 45; *scito scire*, ib., ii. 2, 47; *de te tu*, Cic. Phil., ii. 46; *senem senex*, Cic. Lael., 1; *omnes omnium*, Cic. de Or., i. 21; *die dies*, Cæs. B. G., i. 48; *facinus facinorisque*, Liv., i. 7; *jungit junctos*, Hor. Sat., i. 3, 54; *deos dis*, Juv., iii. 146. So the familiar case of certain pronominal words—as, *alius alium*, Plaut. Stich., ii. 2, 46; Terent. Andr., iv. 5, 39; Cic. de Off., i. 7; Cæs. B. G., i. 39; *alter altera de causa*, Cic. Somm. Scip., 2; Sall. Jugurtha, 79; Liv., v. 11; *uter utri*, Cic. Mil., 9, 23; Cæs. B. G., v. 44; Hor. Ep., ii. 1, 55. 2. Contrasted ideas. This class is given by Mr. Roby. 3. Similar or closely connected ideas—as, *tum ibi*, Cic. de Or.; i. 118; *undique uno tempore*, Cæs. B. G., i. 22; *semper omnibus*, Cic. de Or., i. 18; *nulla unquam*, Liv. Praef.; *multo saepe*, Cic. Cat., iii. 23; *aliquem aliquando*, Cic. de Or., i. 21; *tot ubique*, Juv., i. 17; *parco paucis*, Hor. Sat., i. 3, 16; *tristes misero*, ib., 87. 4. Pronouns having the same reference—as, *sibi quisque*, Plaut. Curc., i. 3, 24; Cic. de Or., i. 18; Cæs. B. G., i. 5; Liv., i. 9; *suam quisque*, Plaut. Merc., iv. 5, 51; Cic. de Or., i. 4; Cæs. B. G., i. 52. And the order in this latter case is so fixed that there is hardly any deviation from it in prose—as, Tac. Germ., 13, *in sua gente cuique*; or in poetry, except where the metre requires it—as, Virg. *Æn.*, vi. 743,

quisque suos patimur Manes; so Juv., iii. 143. 5. Cause and effect—as, *decipiunt caecum*, Hor. Sat., i. 3, 39; *toties raucei*, Juv., i. 2; *tacita sudant . . . culpa*, ib., 167.

Thus this juxtaposition of words in Latin is not only not restricted to cases of contrast, which alone Mr. Roby gives, but embraces generally the relations of associated forms and ideas, and almost strictly follows all the known laws of memory; and this juxtaposition, we may add, prevails still more extensively in Greek than in Latin.

4. On the Modern Japanese Literature, and its Influence in bringing about the Recent Revolutions in Japan, by Mr. William E. Griffis, of New York, lately of the Kai Sei Gakko (Imperial College) of Tokio (Yedo), Japan.

The object of the paper was to explain the recent social and political revolution in Japan, and to show the true causes which operated effectually to overthrow the Shogun's (Tycoon's) government, to reinstate the Mikado in full power, to destroy the feudal system, and then to impel the Japanese nation into the path of modern civilization. The causes of these four distinct results are to be found in the revival of the study of the ancient national literature, the study of the classic historical compositions of Japanese scholars, the movement for the revival of pure Shinto (the indigenous religion of Japan), and the publication and general reading of books written by native authors who had seen or studied western civilization. The three first causes were efficient in overthrowing the hereditary usurpation of the Shogun's government, destroying the feudal system, and establishing the national government on its ancient foundation, and according to its ancient constitution. The last, acting upon the national mind at the instant of intensest momentum produced by the political revolution, impelled the nation into that course of innovation, reform, and systematic attempts at social regeneration which now challenges the attention of the world, and compels the admiration of all who can sympathize with an Asiatic nation that is bravely struggling into the light and knowledge of the nineteenth century.

In Japan, the impulse to enter the comity of nations, and to follow the course of their civilization, came from within, and not from without. It is the general impression among foreigners that the abolition of the dual form of government, and the sweeping away of the feudal system, were the direct result of the presence of foreigners on the soil of Japan. This, however, is a great mistake. From causes already at work before the arrival of Commodore Perry and the foreigners in Japan, the Shogun's government would certainly have fallen. The presence of foreigners in Japan served merely to hasten the slow inevitable. Among the many classes into which Japanese society was formerly divided, there were two that comprised the readers and thinkers. One, the Buddhist priesthood, brought into existence that vast mass of Buddhistic literature, and originated and developed those phases of Japanese Buddhism, which have made it a distinct product of thought and life among the manifold phases of this, the most widely-professed religion on earth. This ecclesiastical literary activity and growth culminated in the sixteenth century. Since that time Japanese thought has been led by the Samurai, or military literati, the secularly educated and armed classes. The creative era of Japanese literature was between the eighth and twelfth centuries. The scholastic era of Japanese learning and literature embraced the latter half of the last and the first quarter of the present century. The province of Mito was especially the resort of learned men and authors, and the effect of their writings was to point out the historical fact that the Shogun was a usurper, and that the Mikado was the only true source of authority. It was the study of these works, and others of similar purport, that led the Samurai from one end of the country to the other to raise the cry, "Honor the Mikado and expel the barbarian." Another element that tended to overthrow the usurping Shogun and to restore the Mikado was the revival of the study of pure Shinto, the ancient religion of Japan, according to which the Mikado is the divine representative of the gods on earth, and as such is to be loved and obeyed by all Japanese. The study of Shinto created a powerful party, whose constant aim was to overthrow the Shogun's government, and thus end the usurpation of six and a half centuries. All these currents of thought united to swell the stream of opinion and action which, in 1868, swept

the Shogun from his seat of power into poverty and obscurity, and which raised the Mikado to his rightful place as *de facto* sovereign of Japan.

Yet the very men who formed the Mikado's party were the most bitter haters of foreigners. The primary object that united and impelled them was to restore the Mikado; their secondary bond of union and object was to drive out the foreigners, close the ports of foreign commerce, and repudiate the treaties. Mr. Iwakura and his colleagues were the arch-haters of foreigners, their ways and works. Now, they are the leaders of the new ideas and the forward movement in Western civilization. How was this marvelous change wrought? Why did the foreigner-haters become the leaders of progress, the defenders and executors of Western civilization? Why did they preach the faith they once destroyed?

"It was the lessons taught them by the bombardment of Shimonoseki," say some. "It was the benefits arising from foreign commerce," say others. "It was because foreigners in Japan persuaded them," say not a few.

In none of these do we find the true explanation. War, commerce, and contact with foreigners for a half century, did not move China; neither would they have moved Japan. In the latter country the movement was by impulse from within, not by pressure from without. The real cause of the recent "reformation" in Japan was an intellectual one. It was brought about by the reading and study of the recent native literature produced by earnest men who had studied the foreign languages, notably the English and Dutch, years before, or who had visited Europe and America during the times of the Shogun's power, and who returned to Japan shortly before the Mikado was reinstated, and began the composition and publication of those original works and translations which were eagerly read and studied by the new rulers and rising men in Japan. In these books the history of Western nations was faithfully told; their customs and beliefs were explained and defended; their resources, methods of thought, education, morals, laws, systems of government, etc., were described and elucidated. With Western ideas for texts, Fukuzawa, Nakamura, Uchida, Uriu, Kato, and a host of scholarly writers, expounded the true principles which a nation that would become great must follow out. They one and all showed how Japan had retrograded in isolation, and the adoption of Western civilization was both a virtue and a necessity. Prof. Griffin said: "It was his firm belief, after nearly four years of life in Japan, mingling with the progressive men of the empire, that the reading and study of books written by Japanese authors, and printed in the Japanese language, did more to transform the minds of Japanese rulers and thinking people than any other cause. During the past decade the production of purely native literature has ceased, and the translation of foreign books, largely scientific, and the composition of works inspired by the reading of Western literature, have busied scholars and writers in Japan."

The speaker then entered into many details of Japanese book-making, the subject matter of the books relating to the United States and other countries, what the Japanese thought of us, etc. He closed by remarking that "should Western civilization take sure root and flourish in Japan and the people become occidentalized, it is not too much to hope that the peculiar genius of the Japanese will produce a literary work that will take its place among the imperishable classics of the world."

After this paper had been read and discussed, the business meeting of the Society was adjourned until Thursday morning at 9 o'clock, at which time the remaining communications were offered.

5. On the Assyrian and Babylonian Monuments in America, by Rev. Selah Merrill, of Andover, Mass.: read by the Corresponding Secretary.

Mr. Merrill's paper begins with referring to the general ignorance among American scholars as to the number and character of the specimens of Mesopotamian art scattered among the libraries and museums of the country; it was in view of this that he has been led to put together as full information respecting them as he had found attainable. We have sculptured slabs enough (besides bricks and other smaller relics) to panel or wainscot a wall 270 feet in continuous length, to

a height of about 8 feet. They were brought at intervals between the years 1850 and 1860, and are distributed as follows: Yale College, New Haven, Conn., has two large slabs, two small ones (with four small broken slabs in boxes, never yet mounted), two bricks, and sundry seals and minor relics. Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., has two large slabs, one small one, and six bricks. Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., has five large slabs and one small one, and six bricks, one of them Babylonian (the only Babylonian brick in America), with a parcel of lesser articles. Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., has three slabs and two bricks. The Andover Theological Seminary has one large and one small slab. Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., has six large slabs and one small one, and two bricks. Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., has one large slab. Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., has four large slabs and one small one. The Theological Seminary at Auburn, N. Y., has one large slab. The Connecticut Historical Society at Hartford, Conn., has one large slab, one small one, and two bricks. At Meriden, Conn., is one small slab, in private hands. The Theological Seminary of Virginia has three large slabs. The New York Historical Society has twelve large slabs, but they are not set up. The Mercantile Library Association of St. Louis, Missouri has one large slab. Thus, in thirteen museums and private cabinets, there are in all forty-two large slabs and thirteen small ones, and twenty-two bricks, all but three of which have inscriptions. Two or three of the bricks came from Koyunjik; all the rest (except the Babylonian one) from Nimrud. From Nimrud came also all the slabs. They belong to the reign of Assurnazirpal, B. C. 883-859, and all bear the same inscription, the standard inscription of this monarch, of which a tentative version was given by Dr. Ward in the Proceedings of the Society for October, 1871 (Journal, vol. x., pp. xxxvi.): a new and improved translation forms a part of this paper. Except the collection belonging to the New York Historical Society, the monuments were given by the British explorers Layard and Rawlinson (all but two by the latter) to American missionaries (Mr. Marsh, Dr. Lobbell, Mr. W. F. Williams, and others), expressly for transmission to this country. The bricks are slightly burnt, and their inscriptions seem to have been cut rather than stamped upon them. They belong either to Assurnazirpal or to his son Shalmaneser II. (B. C. 858-823), mostly to the latter. The regular inscription on the latter reads: 'Shalmaneser, great king, mighty king, king of nations, king of the country of Assyria, son of Assurnazirpal, great king, mighty king, king of nations, king of the country of Assyria, son of Tuklat-Adar, king of nations, king of the country of Assyria also, builder of the tower of the city of Calah.' Assurnazirpal's inscription reads: 'Palace of Assurnazirpal, king of the country of Assyria, son of Tuklat-Adar, king of the country of Assyria, son of Bin-nirari, king of the country of Assyria.' The bricks are of varying size, from 13 to 23 inches square, and 3 to 5½ inches thick. One has the inscription on the edge; another, partly on the edge. The single Babylonian brick is so indistinctly inscribed as to be almost unintelligible; it belongs to Nebuchadnezzar.

Mr. Merrill indicates the character of the stone used for these monuments, and enters into considerable detail as to the figures represented upon them, with their dress, decorations, surroundings, occupations, etc. He doubts whether the eagle-headed figures, of which there are several, are intended to represent divinities.

The paper concluded with a brief account of the recent progress of Assyriological study.

6. On the Talmud, considered in its relation to the Early History of Christianity, by Prof. Felix Adler, of Ithaca, N. Y.

The connection between the primitive Church and the great Jewish sects of the same period is imperfectly understood. Concerning these sects themselves a false impression still prevails in many circles. The Sadducees are held to be libertines, the Pharisees hypocrites. In general it is considered to be the part of wisdom, and even of common honesty, to study the writings of a party before pronouncing upon its character. The Pharisees are condemned in the strongest language by those who cannot read a line of their voluminous works as contained in the Talmud. Geiger's investigations have opened a new insight into the condition of parties in Judea at the time of the coming of Jesus. The Sadducees may be called the High-churchmen, the Pharisees the Independents, of the Jewish State.

The Sadducees were conservative in principle, a kind of priestly aristocracy, as Geiger holds; the Pharisees were democrats. The distinctions appertaining to the priesthood rested on scriptural authority, by which the Pharisaic leaders considered themselves bound. In order to accomplish their purpose, of elevating the whole people to the dignity of God's priesthood, they mimicked the forms and ceremonies prescribed for the hierarchy, and enjoined their observance on every member of the community. It is impossible to understand the New Testament without an intimate acquaintance with the contemporary writings of the Talmud. Jesus in many respects adopted the principles of the Pharisaic school of Hillel; his method of arguing, sometimes the very phrases he employs, are to be met with in the current Hebrew literature of the day. Soon after the appearance of Geiger's *Urschrift*, in which the main results of these researches were laid down, their importance was recognized by Hausrath in the *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung* (No. 44, 1863). Other eminent scholars followed with their approval. Geiger offers an ingenious argument to show that the first Book of Maccabees was written by a Sadducee, the second by a Pharisee.

Prof. Adler then proceeded to say that the Talmud contains direct information bearing on the question of the proper time for celebrating Easter, a question which convulsed the Church during several centuries. The Bible commands that Pentecost be celebrated seven weeks after Passover. A conflict of opinions is reported as having occurred between Sadducees and Pharisees concerning the day from which these seven weeks are to be reckoned: the Sadducees beginning to count on a Sunday, the Pharisees on the second day of the feast. What motive could have induced the conservative Sadducees to lay such stress on the Sunday, no one has yet satisfactorily answered. On the other hand, the early Christians had a very high interest at stake in this issue. For them, Pentecost was the close of the resurrection-period, and it was of great importance that it should be celebrated on the day of the resurrection—the Sunday. If, therefore, we read in the Talmud that false witnesses were hired by certain sectaries to disturb the calculations of the Rabbins and bring it about that Pentecost should fall on a Sunday; if, moreover, the Pharisees enacted stringent laws to prevent any such thing, and pointedly and bitterly opposed those who contended for it, we see in this a struggle, not between Pharisees and Sadducees, but between the Pharisaic synagogue and the primitive Church. This view is strengthened by the fact that no such conflict is mentioned before the Christian era. Prof. Adler also pointed to a number of other enactments which are mentioned in the "Scroll of Fasts," forbidding the Jews to fast about the time of passion week, as directed against the early Christians; contrary to the received opinion, which explains them as referring to Jewish sectaries. All these passages and a detailed argument in support of his opinion he promises to bring forward in an article specially devoted to this subject, which he hopes soon to have ready for publication.

Remarks bearing on the study of the Talmud were added, at some length, by Dr. H. Osgood.

7. Rev. Oliver Crane, recently returned from Asia Minor, spoke of sites, visited by him in that country, possessing special archæological interest. He described the statue of Niobe on Mt. Sipylus; the extensive ruins on the plain of Antioch, about twenty miles north of the lake of Antioch; the ruins of ancient Hierapolis, about sixty miles east of Aleppo (a small head of Venus, found there, was exhibited); and of ancient Seleucia.

Pres't Woolsey made additional observations on the identity of the monument on Mt. Sipylus with that mentioned by Homer, and on the myth of Niobe.

8. On the Distinction of the Noun and Verb in Japanese, by Mr. A. Van Name, of New Haven, Conn.

The Japanese in respect to the separation of noun and verb holds a position intermediate between the Chinese and Indo-European languages. In the Chinese, theoretically and to a great extent actually, any word may be noun, ad-

jective, adverb, or verb, becoming definite only as it enters into construction and its position in the sentence is fixed. The full separation of the parts of speech which we find in the Indo-European family is reached, according to Schleicher, only through the agency of case and personal endings, both of which are wholly wanting in Japanese. The relations of case are here expressed by prepositions, or rather postpositions, and particles which everywhere preserve their separate character. *Wa*, sometimes regarded as a sign of the nominative case, is in its origin demonstrative, and its primary force is to arrest the attention on the word or phrase which precedes, and to separate it from what follows. It commonly follows, but is by no means a necessary adjunct of, the subject, nor is it confined to this office. It may be added to *wo*, which marks the object (*wo-wa* uniting in the form *woba* or *oba*), or to a noun governed by a preposition. *Wo*, also, though more uniform in position and use, is apparently of the same demonstrative origin. The noun as such has no distinct method of formation; the differentiation so far as it exists is on the side of the adjective and verb. Two or three derivative affixes, the most important of which is *sa*, which forms nouns of quality from adjective roots, are the only noticeable exceptions. The plural is formed either by repeating the singular, without other change than that of a surd initial, now brought between two vowels, to a sonant, a change which is both the result and the sign of the close union of the parts: thus, *kuni*, 'country,' plural, *kumi-guni*; or by the addition of independent words of collective signification, such as *kato*, 'side,' *tomu*, 'companion,' etc.

Personal pronouns the Japanese is poorly provided with, and uses sparingly. In many cases where we should employ them, the person is simply left to be understood; in others the rules of politeness require the substitution of various humble or honorific epithets, such as 'servant,' 'master,' and the like, or a general designation of the place which the person occupies, as *anata*, 'that side,' for the second person, *kono hō*, 'this side,' for the first person. From the pronominal roots, *a*, *ka*, which point to the more remote, *so* to the less remote, *ko* to the nearer object, and *wa*, reflexive, pointing back to the subject, and not unlikely identical with the *wa* which marks the subject, we have, apparently by composition with the substantive verb *ari*, the forms *are*, *kare*, *sore*, 'that person or thing,' *kore*, 'this person or thing,' and *ware*, 'I.' The primary meaning of *wa* appears in the possessive *waga*, formed by the addition of the genitive suffix *ga*, which may mean, according to the person referred to, 'my own,' 'your own,' 'his own.' The second person is without any simple designation, and, of the forms for the third person, the weakest, *are*, is still decidedly demonstrative. The genitive suffix *no* added to the above-mentioned roots, except *wa*, forms the demonstrative adjectives, *ano*, *kano*, *sono*, 'that,' *kono*, 'this,' while for the possessives *no* must be added to the full pronominal form, as in *are no*, 'his.' Where the personal pronouns are so little developed, a personal inflection of the verb is hardly to be thought of.

The adjective has an attributive form ending in *ki*, an adverbial or indefinite form in *ku*, and a predicative one in *shi*, which last includes the copula. Thus from the root *naga*, 'long,' which appears in the proper name Nagasaki, literally 'long promontory,' we have the following forms: *nagaki saki*, 'a long promontory,' *saki wa nagashi*, 'the promontory is long,' and *nagaku suru*, 'to make long.' In the spoken language the attributive and predicative forms, by the dropping of the consonant of the ending, are reduced to one, *nagai*. The strict law of position by which the limiting and dependent always precedes the limited and governing word prevents any ambiguity from this source.

If now we pass to the verb we find that while nouns may end in any of the vowels, the verbal roots, or what we must treat as roots, though seldom monosyllabic, are restricted to two finals, *i* and *e*. Not only in compounds does this root appear, but also where a number of verbs in succeeding clauses are in parallel construction, only the last requiring the termination of tense and mood, while the others stand in the naked root-form. This unchanged root is also used as a noun, more often abstract, as *omoi*, 'think' and 'thought,' sometimes concrete, as *kōri*, 'freeze' and 'ice,' and in compounds even denoting the agent; thus, from *ki*, 'wood,' and *kori*, 'cut,' *ki-kori*, 'woodcutter.' To this root also, as to any other noun, are joined prepositions to form certain parts of the verb; thus, *mi*, 'see,' supine *mi-ni*, 'in order to see;' gerund or participle *mi-te*, 'seeing;' *te* having a modal or instrumental force. Among the inflected forms of the verb, the predicative is frequently identical with the substantive and attributive form.

Of the two classes into which verbs in *i* are divided, the older and more numerous class, including what we should call the irregular or strong verbs, forms the present indicative and infinitive, the latter used both as noun and adjective, alike. In verbs in *e* the two forms are in the older language distinct, but in modern usage the infinitive has supplanted the indicative form, and is used indifferently for both. In the negative conjugation the present indicative and infinitive are alike. In the preterit, again, of both the affirmative and infinitive conjugations, they are distinct; but in the spoken language, which forms a new preterit from the gerund and the substantive verb *ari* (*mitari*, -*u* for *mite-ari*, -*u*), this advantage is lost, and a shortened ending *ta* replaces both *tari* and *taru*. The conditional and concessive forms of the verb are also, by Hoffmann, to whom the analysis of Japanese grammatical forms owes most, reduced to substantives governed by prepositions.

Whether the separation of the noun and verb in Japanese is more or less in idea than it is in form, is a question to be decided only by a wider consideration of the structure of the sentence. The view held by Steinthal and Schleicher respecting languages of the same general type, that they have no proper verb, but only verbal nouns, certainly affords the easiest explanation of some of the phenomena here presented. In the sentence *hi ga teru*, 'the sun shines,' it is most natural to regard *ga* as the genitive sign, making the subject the possessor or the attribute of the verbal action; literally 'the sun's shining [is].' This use of *ga*, which is frequent, differs from *wa* in the same position in that the former adds emphasis to the subject, the latter to the predicate, though they are frequently interchangeable without appreciable difference of meaning. In the compound sentence the nominal construction prevails over the verbal. Instead of dependent clauses with conjunctions, we have more often only verbal nouns governed by prepositions. Both *no* and *ga*, the genitive particles, may be used to connect clauses which stand in an adversative relation to each other. A consequence of this looseness of structure is the inordinate length to which the sentence is sometimes drawn out. The sense is kept suspended through a succession of loosely connected dependent clauses, interrupted by long quotations, until sometimes the end is reached only with the end of the volume. The merit of the style, measured by a Japanese standard, is largely in proportion to the length of the sentence.

9. On the Occurrence of Semitic Consonants on the Western Continent, by Prof. S. S. Haldeman, of Philadelphia.

In the North American examples of my Analytic Orthography (Philad., 1860), the close of the glottis which constitutes the Arabic *hamza*, and the Hebrew *aleph*, is (§§ 629, 701) attributed to Wyandot as heard by myself; and to the language at Cape Flattery as pronounced by Dr. J. L. LeConte, who also gave me sounds equivalent to Hebrew \aleph (*goph*) and \aleph (*hhejth*), or Arabic *qaf* and *hha*, in the Yuma and allied Ipai.

I have now to add several sounds heard casually from an Eskimo brought by Captain Hall to Washington. Here the numeral 'four,' which was pronounced by Dr. Hayes as *sissamut* (*sittamut* of Richardson. Arctic Searching Expedition, 1852), appeared as *ts'is,em̄c*, where Arabic *sad* (marked with a semicircle) occurs twice, with Greek *e* of *met*, and the last vowel in *fat*, lengthened. 'Six' (*akhvinok* in Richardson) is *áqbe mác* (with *goph*), and its aspirate (the seventh Arabic letter *gha*, or *q'a*.) occurs in the name of a fish, *eq'álũáq'sũac*, written *ekalluarksoak* by Dr. Richardson.

In the same dialect, a whispered aspirate of *ng* in *sing* sometimes occurs final after *cay* (*k*) and *qoph*, as in *mãcõcngh* ('four').

These facts do not prove an identity of people or of language. The Arabs are not Eskimos; nor are the Welsh to be considered Cherokees because they have the aspirate *ll* in common.

10. Rev. W. Hayes Ward exhibited a peculiar Assyrian Seal recently received in this country, and remarked briefly upon it.

11. On the Sanskrit Accent and Dr. Haug, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Prof. Whitney recalled to the recollection of the Society that, more than three years ago (in May, 1871), he had presented a communication in defense of the

ordinarily accepted views of Sanskrit accentuation against an attempt to overthrow them made by Dr. Martin Haug, professor in the Munich University; the communication was fully reported in the Proceedings of that meeting (Journal, vol. x., pp. ix.-xi.). Dr. Haug's attack was made in a paper read before the Munich Academy, and reported in Trübner's Record (for Feb. 28, 1871); now, however, he has fully elaborated his views, and puts them forth in the Transactions of the Academy (Cl. I., vol. xiii., part 2), in an article of 105 pages quarto; and it seems worth while to return briefly to the subject, in order to see whether they are made more acceptable by this complete presentation.

Dr. Haug's article is by no means limited to a discussion of the points as to which he disagrees with the rest of the Sanskritists; it is, rather, a detailed exhibition of the subject of Sanskrit accentuation, as seen from his peculiar point of view: the mode of designating the accent in the various known texts; the present method of recitation of the Veda by the Brahmans, who are the living links in the chain of its transmission; and the teachings of the native grammarians, of various class and period, as to accent. There is also prefixed a statement and brief criticism of what other western scholars have written on the subject. In this elaborate exposition, there is necessarily a great deal of repetition of what has been fully presented before; and the value of the author's arguments is less plainly estimated than if he had confined himself to stating and defending his special opinions; yet there is some new material in the article; and many will be glad to have within reach such a compendium of connected information as to the Sanskrit accent, even while they refuse their assent to the author's views.

Those views themselves seem to be no more acceptable now than when they were controverted before the Society three years ago. The grand and fatal objection to them is that they leave the whole body of phenomena with which they deal unaccounted for, a problem and a puzzle. If this which other scholars have taken for accent, and which they find no difficulty in explaining as such, is not accent, what is it? Dr. Haug makes the suggestion that it is a kind of artificial metrical modulation, a "poetic accent;" only, what poetic purpose it answers, and what analogies it finds anywhere else in the world, he does not show; nor does he explain why it is applied also to the numerous prose passages in which it appears in all the Vedic texts save that of the Rig-Veda. As a counterpart, he suggests that the peculiar accentuation of the Çatapatha-Brâhmaṇa marks another accentual system, which is the real "prose accent;" but here, again, he fails to show what properties it has that should possibly fit it for any such office. No one who has examined it before has questioned that it is a special, and a very imperfect and awkward, way of signifying the same real accentuation which is signified by the other or "poetic" method. And I do not see how any one can possibly write out a passage of the Brâhmaṇa with its own accent-marking, and then add the marks of real accent as inferred from the other method, and entertain any reasonable doubt that the one thing means the other. If Dr. Haug were only to make the attempt to give such an account of the laws of his "poetic accent" and "prose accent" as should convert them from loose conjectures into linguistic facts, he would soon find himself involved in difficulties with which the worst that he charges against the views of other Sanskritists would be of no account whatever. And till he makes the attempt, and succeeds at least measurably in it, he has no right to claim for his own views any *status* among scholars.

And what are the difficulties attending the acceptance of the common theory of Sanskrit accent? Simply these two: we have to admit that the Hindu grammarians over-refined their accentual theory, introducing finally into it certain features which we are unable to accept as fairly representing the facts of their language; and also that, in the perhaps twenty-five centuries of the oral transmission of the Vedic hymns, their mode of recitation has become altered from the simplicity of living speech, and has taken on an artificial and scholastic character, as determined by the phonetic theories of the schools. I do not see that these admissions are attended with any appreciable difficulty: they are wholly in accordance with our experience of Hindu theory and practice in other departments, and with what we might expect on general grounds. At any rate, if we are to avoid them, it must not be at too heavy a cost: we must have an alternative view offered us which has some independent claim to acceptance.

It were useless to try to go through Dr. Haug's exposition in detail; to refute

him fully would require almost as much space as he has himself given to the exposition. To sum up the case in a word: he occupies a very peculiar point of view, which makes him see and estimate everything differently from others, discovering mountains where they find mole-hills, and mole-hills where they find mountains. He escapes difficulties of detail by setting up an infallible authority; he takes whatever the Hindu systematists put before him, questioning nothing, testing nothing, explaining nothing. It does not appear likely that he will draw over other scholars to his views, even as it is not known that at present he has any one to stand by him. If the case should turn out otherwise, there will be reason for returning to the subject hereafter, and for discussing it more elaborately.

Dr. Haug's examination of the Sāma-Veda system of marking accent reaches no definite results. He offers more or less plausible conjectures as to the proper meaning of some of its numerous signs; but he does not, any more than his predecessors, make it out to signify anything really different from the ordinary accentuation.

To conclude with a word of personal explanation. In a note to page 89, Dr. Haug charges me with having unjustifiably rejected the exegesis given by the commentary for three rules of the Tāittīriya-Prātiçākhyā (xix. 3-5), without really understanding what it meant. This is hardly fair to me. How the commentator explains the first two of these three rules is perfectly intelligible; but I hold that he brings the desired meaning out of the first in a wholly unacceptable manner, by a flagrant distortion of its language; that he brings no tolerable meaning out of the second; and that he knows nothing about the sense of the third, but puts forward two quite inconsistent conjectures concerning it, neither of which is good for anything. I wish that, instead of saying of the last two that "the meaning of the explanation appears clearly from what I have said above," Dr. Haug had really endeavored to expound them: I should have been very glad to congratulate him on his success.

12. On Recent Discussions of the Evidence of Phœnician Occupation of America, by Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, of Hartford, Conn.

In the last issue (August, 1874) of the *Archiv für Anthropologie*, the organ of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie, und Urgeschichte*, Dr. H. Hartogh Heys von Zouteven discusses the question "*Haben die Phöniciëer oder die Carthager Amerika gekannt?*" He maintains the affirmative on evidence derived from 1. the pre-Aztec ruins of Chiapas and Central America; 2. Greek and Roman traditions of a continent beyond the Atlantic known to the Phœnicians and Carthaginians; 3. traditions of the natives of America, of the coming in ancient times of strangers from the east, in ships; and 4. the presence of "Baal in Atlantis," proved by "unquestionable Phœnician or Old-world antiques, which have been found in America." Under his first head, Dr. Hartogh points to certain representations of heads of elephants—or what he believes to be such—found among the sculptured '*katuns*' on the walls of a temple at Palenque, and figured in Waldeck's *Monuments anciens du Mexique*. That Waldeck did not himself discover the resemblance, Dr. Hartogh regards as proof that the drawings were not, designedly or unconsciously, made "*mehr elephantenartig*" than the originals. Of the tradition of the coming of bearded white men from the east, etc., it is needless to speak. The utter worthlessness of Indian traditions extending back for more than three or four generations has been so thoroughly demonstrated, that arguments based on them scarcely deserve consideration. Under the fourth head, Dr. Hartogh, after brief mention of "a Greek inscription on a stone found in Trinidad," devotes nearly one-third of his paper to "*ein viel wichtigeres Stück*," discovered in 1869, at Lafayette, N. Y., bearing a Phœnician inscription. This monument of Phœnician antiquity is no other than the gypsum statue, popularly known in America, a few years ago, as the "Cardiff Giant," or "John Henry Cardiff." To those who know the history of this sham antique, it seems nearly incredible that European scholars should accept it as genuine, and that an account of it should be permitted to appear in the organ of a learned society. Dr. Hartogh copies his description of this "important monument" from an article in the *Galaxy* (New York, July, 1872), and reproduces from that article a facsimile of the "Phœnician inscription" found

or imagined on the arm of the statue. He states that this inscription has by him been submitted to Professors Ingeholt (of Delft) and Cohen. The former declared it to be Phœnician, and read the words "Thammuz, Lord of the Heaven;" the latter thought it Semitic, but could not translate it, or decide to what language it belonged. The Phœnician alphabet having been known to scholars hardly twenty years yet, if the statue is even no more than forty years old, argues Dr. Hartogh, there "*kann hier an keinen Humbug gedacht werden:*" but that, in fact, the monument is of much higher antiquity, he is convinced by Dr. White's microscopic examination of the "pin-holes" in its surface, reported by the writer in the *Galaxy*. The only possible doubt of its genuineness arises from the disposition some people have "to regard everything American as humbug." In a final note, Dr. Hartogh mentions the confirmation of his views by the account just received from America of the discovery of a Phœnician inscription found in Bogota, New Grenada, made by colonists sent thither by King Hiram of Tyre, the contemporary of Solomon. (See Dr. Ward, in the *Proceedings for May, 1874*, communication No. 5.)

To this paper, Dr. A. von Frantzius, favorably known to American archaeologists by his edition of Palacio, appends some judicious remarks. He admits that the discovery of a Phœnician statue in America is very remarkable—if true; but not being fully satisfied of this, he is not inclined to attribute so much importance as Dr. Hartogh does to the monument. And he can scarcely believe the latter to be in earnest, in accepting as genuine the Bogota inscription dating from the 10th century B. C.

A few weeks ago, the "Cardiff giant" was again brought to the notice of European scholars, at the German Philological Congress, at Innsbruck. "Some interest was excited" (so writes Mr. D. B. Monro to the London Academy, of Oct. 10th) "by an account given by Professor Schlottmann of a supposed Phœnician statue found near the town of Syracuse, in the United States." This statue "is regarded by Dr. Schlottmann as a representation of Adonis. The circumstances of the discovery seem to exclude the supposition of imposture." Photographs of the figure were exhibited, but Dr. Schlottmann "had been unable to obtain a copy of an inscription which is said to be legible on it" (though Dr. Hartogh's copy of it had appeared two months before, in the *Archiv für Anthropologie*). "The speakers who offered remarks seemed disposed to suspend their judgment until the inscription should be produced." Professor Schlottmann gave his reasons for inclining to the belief that Phœnician colonies reached America; and among others were "the alleged Phœnician inscriptions found in Brazil" and other parts of America, and "certain traces of Phœnician in Indian geographical names."

It is rumored that the Cardiff giant, which long ago ceased to be a profitable speculation to American showmen, is soon to be taken to Europe for exhibition. It is to be hoped that Dr. Hartogh and Professor Schlottmann have not been made unconscious instruments for advertising, in advance, for European markets, a stale imposture which no longer attracts popular attention in America. That it has been matter of discussion in the *Versammlung Deutscher Philologen*, and in the organ of a European learned society, is the writer's only excuse for recalling it to the notice of the American Oriental Society.

The subject was taken up and remarked on in the same strain by several of the members present. Hon. S. Salisbury of Worcester, especially (President of the Am. Antiquarian Society), detailed his acquaintance with the statue: he had seen it before it was lifted from the ground; he had also visited the Chicago shops where the designer of it and the workmen who cut it were employed. Others had examined the alleged inscription; others knew personally some of the parties concerned in the fraud, or in the exposure of it, and could attest the truth of the latter, as given in the newspapers some years ago, and also (for example) in the *American Journal of Science* ("Silliman's Journal"), for July, 1871. A universal feeling of surprise was expressed at this credulous and uncritical revival of a long-since exploded deceit.

At the close of this discussion, the Society passed a vote of thanks to the Committee of Biblical Revision for the use of their rooms, and adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the 19th of May, 1875.