

GS276

M D Conway Esq
from the Author
1 June 1873

SECOND ANNUAL ADDRESS
OF
THE PRESIDENT

TO THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

DELIVERED AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING, FRIDAY, 16TH MAY, 1873.

BY

ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, Esq.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction	1
Report by the PRESIDENT on <i>Phonology</i>	3
Report by the PRESIDENT on the <i>Papers</i> read before the Philological Society in the three years ending 31st December, 1872	9
Report by the PRESIDENT, assisted by PRINCE LOUIS LUCIEN BONAPARTE, on <i>Basque</i>	12
Report by A. J. PATTERSON, Esq., on <i>Hungarian</i>	16
Report by J. MUIR, Esq., of Edinburgh, on <i>Sanscrit Lexicons</i>	19
Report by Prof. AUFRECHT, of Edinburgh, on <i>Sanscrit Grammars</i>	22
Report by J. PEILE, Esq., Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, on <i>Greek</i>	26
Report by Dr. W. WAGNER, of the Johanneum, Hamburg, on <i>Latin</i>	29
Report by F. J. FURNIVALL, Esq., on <i>Early English</i> , p. 35, with an Appendix by Rev. W. W. SKEAT	45
Report by the PRESIDENT on the formation of an <i>English Dialect Society</i>	47
Report by the PRESIDENT on Professor Max Müller's latest views of the <i>Philosophy of the Origin of Language</i>	48

PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

COUNCIL, 1873-4.

President.

ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, ESQ.

Vice-Presidents.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.
THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.
THE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.
EDWIN GUEST, ESQ., LL.D., Master of Caius College, Cambridge.
T. HEWITT KEY, ESQ.
WHITLEY STOKES, ESQ.
THE REV. DR. RICHARD MORRIS.

Ordinary Members.

JOSEPH PAYNE, ESQ. (Chairman).	HENRY MALDEN, ESQ.
TH. AUFRECHT, ESQ.	J. MUIR, ESQ.
E. L. BRANDRETH, ESQ.	JAS. A. H. MURRAY, ESQ.
C. CASSAL, ESQ.	RUSSELL MARTINEAU, ESQ.
C. B. CAYLEY, ESQ.	HENRY NICOL, ESQ.
THE REV. B. DAVIES.	J. PEILE, ESQ.
H. H. GIBBS, ESQ.	CHARLES RIEU, ESQ.
J. W. HALES, ESQ.	THE REV. W. W. SKEAT.
E. R. HORTON, ESQ.	HENRY SWEET, ESQ.
THE REV. DR. KENNEDY.	HENSLEIGH WEDGWOOD, ESQ.

Treasurer.

DANBY P. FRY, ESQ., Local Govt. Board, Gwydr House, Whitehall, S.W.

Hon. Secretary.

FREDK. J. FURNIVALL, ESQ., 3, St. George's Square, Primrose Hill, N.W.

Extracts from the Philological Society's Rules.

"The Philological Society is formed for the investigation of the Structure, the Affinities, and the History of Languages; and the Philological Illustration of the Classical Writers of Greece and Rome."

"Each Member shall pay two guineas on his election, one guinea as entrance fee, and one guinea for his first year's contribution. The Annual Subscription shall become due on the 1st of January in each year. Any Member may compound for his contribution by the payment of Ten Guineas, exclusive of his entrance-fee."

Members are entitled to a Copy of all Papers issued by the Society, and to attend, and introduce a friend to, the Meetings of the Society, on the first and third Fridays in every month, from November to June.

Subscriptions are to be paid to the Treasurer, or to the Society's Bankers, Messrs. Ransom, Bouverie, & Co., 1, Pall Mall East, W.

Applications for admission should be made to the Honorary Secretary, F. J. Furnivall, Esq., 3, St. George's Square, Primrose Hill, N.W.

SECOND ANNUAL ADDRESS

OF

THE PRESIDENT

TO THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,

DELIVERED AT THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING, FRIDAY, 16TH MAY, 1873.

By ALEXANDER J. ELLIS, Esq.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Introduction	1	Report by J. PEILE, Esq., Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, on <i>Greek</i>	26
Report by the PRESIDENT on <i>Phonology</i>	3	Report by Dr. W. WAGNER, of the Johanneum, Hamburg, on <i>Latin</i>	29
Report by the PRESIDENT on the <i>Papers</i> read before the Philological Society in the three years ending 31st December, 1872	9	Report by F. J. FURNIVALL, Esq., on <i>Early English</i> , p. 35, with an Appendix by Rev. W. W. SKEAT	45
Report by the PRESIDENT, assisted by PRINCE LOUIS LUCIEN BONAPARTE, on <i>Basque</i>	12	Report by the PRESIDENT on the formation of an <i>English Dialect Society</i>	47
Report by A. J. PATTERSON, Esq., on <i>Hungarian</i>	16	Report by the PRESIDENT on Professor Max Müller's latest views of the <i>Philosophy of the Origin of Language</i>	48
Report by J. MUIR, Esq., of Edinburgh, on <i>Sanscrit Lexicons</i>	19		
Report by Prof. AUFRECHT, of Edinburgh, on <i>Sanscrit Grammars</i>	22		

INTRODUCTION.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,
MEMBERS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY,—

THE address I delivered at the last Anniversary was confessedly merely an introduction to that series of Annual Reports upon the Progress of Philology which our late esteemed President, Dr. Goldstücker, bequeathed as an obligation to his successors in this Chair. In endeavouring to carry out his views, I feel how just was his estimation of the difficulties of the task proposed, which are indeed sufficient to prevent any President from carrying it out single-handed. The necessity for seeking assistance from others who should

be Members of the Society was in Dr. Goldstücker's eyes the very essence of his plan. I have not been able to carry out this limitation strictly, but, as an experiment, I have endeavoured to do so as far as possible. On other occasions circumstances may induce your President to seek assistance in any accessible quarter rather than abstain from laying desirable information before the Society. On the present occasion I have been very careful in distinguishing contributed adornments from my own web.

My original intention was to supplement the valuable summary given by Pott in the last edition of his "Etymologische Forschungen" at the close of 1869, and bring down the account of philological research to the close of 1872. This intention I soon abandoned. I found not only that it would require special laborious research, for which my other duties left me no leisure, but that, if I attempted to compress the account into the limits of an address, it would probably result in a mere catalogue of books, tedious to listen to, and impossible to remember. It then occurred to me that as this was to be practically the first Report presented to the Society, it should rather deal with the present state of philology, than with its special progress during the last three years. But even this design I have been unable to carry out as I could have wished. On future occasions it will be open to my successors either to review the whole history of the preceding year, or to take up some special parts, which may have become prominent during that time, or to which the President has been naturally led to pay more attention. We must, I think, never attempt too much. Few things are more tedious to listen to than a scramble over a wide subject. Notwithstanding the kind assistance of many friends, to whom I here tender my best thanks on the part of the Society, my present Report, although almost unreasonably long, is very defective and even fragmentary. Our Homer is too plethoric for any nutshell. The illness or other engagements of Members from whom I hoped to receive assistance have also led me to abandon several special branches, some of which will I hope be taken up next year.

My present Report is therefore merely an attempt, not a model.

“On le peut; je l'essaye; un plus savant le fasse.”

But enough of exordium which threatens to bear a whaleshead proportion to the body of my address.

PHONOLOGY.

Phonology (to begin with my own department) is the side where philology touches physics. Philology overflows into many regions. Language is essentially the visible symbol of man's views of natural relations. It teems with incubular metaphysics and logic. It bears the impress of changing civilisation. It is the only indisputable tradition. And the science of language, when constituted, must meander through all these regions. But language is first of all a collection of audible sounds generated by a special apparatus. How it is generated, and how when generated it is appreciated, is consequently the first problem of philology, and it is purely physical and physiological. Until it is solved, better than by the first cunning alphabet-maker, we cannot understand how it has been solved by his numerous compeers, each no doubt with his own theory founded on his own narrow knowledge and local habits. And until this is accomplished, we do not know the words we see, that is, we do not know the most rudimentary facts on which the science we contemplate must be established. How far are we advanced towards the solution of this problem?

The research is almost entirely of modern growth in Europe, and it has had much to contend with in the passage of an Aryan language through a Semitic symbolisation utterly inadequate to represent any of the numerous phonetic systems which are in practical daily European use. Men first attacked the problem for its practical value—to teach the deaf and dumb to speak, to teach a foreigner to pronounce, to make a child learn reading more easily. Kempele's speaking machine, which has been reproduced by Wheatstone, and to which Faber's was mainly due, made the sounds of language a physical phenomenon, independent

of life. Johannes Müller's researches, followed by those of Willis, Brücke, Merkel, Helmholtz, and Donders, aided by the beautiful apparatus of König, have made them a physiological phenomenon. The especial requirements of the singer led to Garcia's laryngoscope, which in the hands of Czermak, Merkel, Madame Seiler, and Herr Behnke of Birmingham,¹ has quite recently thrown new light upon some of the obscurest problems of speech-sounds, by making the actual motions of the glottis visible. The necessities of correcting defective utterance have given occasion for the closest observations upon convulsive, nervous actions in the various mobile cavities whence speech issues, and in their natural interceptors. None seem to have turned their observations on these matters to better account than Mr. Melville Bell, whose *Visible Speech* marks an era in phonology, and contrasts most favourably with the purely physiological contemporary alphabets of Brücke and Merkel. The necessities of missionary enterprise have rendered imperative the actual reduction of unwritten languages to a visible form, and no system has found more favour in this respect than Lepsius's. In the pure interest of comparative linguistics, Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte has endeavoured to find signs for all the sounds which he has heard actually pronounced. But his most recent collection of sounds, far larger than any of those hitherto formed by his predecessors in the same field of research, has not yet been published. The great care with which these sounds have been actually ascertained to form parts of spoken language, as distinguished from the possibilities of theorists, makes them an indispens-

¹ See Czermak's papers read before the Vienna Academy, especially: Sitzungsberichte, Math. Cl. Band xxix, No. 12, 29th April, 1858, pp. 557-584, and Band lii, Abth. 2, Heft x, 7th Dec., 1865, pp. 623-641. Merkel: Die Funktionen des menschlichen Schlund- und Kehlkopfes, 1862. Mad. Seiler: Altes und Neues über die Ausbildung des Gesangorganes, 1861, of which a revised English translation was published in Philadelphia, U.S., in 1871,

under the title of: The Voice in Singing. Herr Emil Behnke has twice lectured on this subject before the Tonic Sol-fa College: once to the medical students of University College (reported in the *Lancet* for Feb. 8, 1873), and once to a musical audience there. He has the rare power of shewing his glottis reflected in the laryngoscope while he is in the act of singing, and of hence demonstrating the meaning of the registers of the human voice.

able thesaurus for future phonologists, the value of which is greatly increased by its skilful arrangement. It is to be hoped that the key-words at least of this tabular arrangement will be made accessible to all phonologic students. I have personally to thank the Prince for the kindness with which he has made it accessible to me, both in a laborious transcription, and by oral communication. With the Russian extensions of the Cyrillian alphabet to meet the wants of their comparative philologists, I am unfortunately not acquainted. Lepsius's alphabet is also meant for philology, but both his, Prince L. L. Bonaparte's and the Russian system—as also Bell's, Brücke's, and Merkel's, in a still greater degree—labour under typographical difficulties. It was to obviate these, without proposing any system of phonology, that I introduced my own Palaeotype, from which the commonest jobbing printer can set up a representation of sounds, that can be transliterated almost exactly into Bell's, and, with certain modifications, into Lepsius's, Brücke's, or Merkel's. But we have within the last few years reached such an advanced stage of phonological research, that the fundamentally different habits and views of nations respecting speech-sounds, formerly quite overlooked, become sensible. It is the inability of English and Germans to understand one another as to the most common sounds in their own languages which creates the difficulty. The difference is really one of great philological importance. It is at the base of the whole difficulty of *mediae et aspiratae*. It will, when thoroughly overcome, probably lead to the explanation of Grimm's law. The difficulty is not indeed felt only between England and Germany; German phonologists in different districts misunderstand each other.¹ Naturally

¹ The following passage contained in a note from Mr. Henry Sweet, received (5th March, 1873) while I was engaged in preparing this address, forcibly illustrates my meaning. "I find that Ivar Aasen (who has written the first Norwegian Grammar) actually takes the description given by the Danes of their glottal catch, and by a little

alteration makes it so utterly unintelligible, that he is able to apply it to the modulative Norse tones! This shews us what we may expect from written accounts of sounds. I may note that Aasen is on the whole decidedly above the philological average in describing sounds." Now the Norwegian modulation (consisting in a

we Northern Europeans all misunderstand Romance and Indian phonologists.

Now I think this very satisfactory—of course not as an end, but as a means. The present stage of phonology is that of an acknowledged and felt necessity for more inquiry, more observation, more experiment, especially more internationality. Writers like Rumpelt and Scherer,¹ who seek to turn Brücke to philological account, because he is an acute physiologist, are rather too hasty. It is a healthy sign that philologists should seek such help, but it is a pity that they do not also go beyond their own national, or rather local habits. Philology deals especially with geographical transmissions, and with hereditary tendencies to pronounce in certain ways, at least as marked as other linguistic and racial characteristics. We shall never understand comparative philology till these are properly weighed and understood. We are still seeking the path through a shifting bog of ignorance.

This also complicates some phonological questions which are exciting much interest at the present day. How did our ancestors speak in Europe? In other words, what is the value of their letters? Grimm was unfortunately no phonologist. "Die Luft ist zu dünn," was his celebrated phrase. Hence the whole Gothic, Teutonic, and Scandinavian languages have still to be investigated. Mr. Sweet's recent paper on Danish pronunciation will serve to shew you what difficulties have to be here encountered, and the necessity of attending to what outsiders are apt to consider as absurdly minute distinctions, forgetting that all beginnings are minute, and that development must be studied in cell-growth, not in adult forms. Corssen's ponderous work on Latin pronunciation is a great mine, but is deficient in comparative phonology; he is evidently a German speaking Romance. Roby's Latin

change of pitch while uttering sounds) is a substitute for the Danish glottal catch (consisting in a momentary stoppage of voice by complete closure of the glottis), but is of an utterly different character. Mr. Sweet is fortunately familiar with both, and hence

can detect the confusion. But fancy an uninformed Englishman endeavouring to discover the facts amid this fog!

¹ Rumpelt: Das natürliche System der Sprachlaute, 1869. Scherer: Zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache, 1868.

grammar endeavours to make use of the most recent English phonology, but (as he so often quotes my own writings, I feel a right to say as much) modern English and ancient Latin sounds had probably such different bases, that the modern restoration may be very unlike the ancient edifice. The investigation is going on. The Oxford and Cambridge professors have issued a syllabus of Latin Pronunciation for schools, and we shall probably soon be speaking in a way which a Roman Rip van Winkel, with sinological anticipations, might call "pigeon Latin." Still all these are steps in the right direction. The danger is dogmatism. In modern languages I may mention in passing my own attempts to reach Early English, which have this vantage-ground, that the modern and ancient phonological systems in this case are at least genealogically related. Much still remains to be done in the Romance languages, Diez notwithstanding. Greek is almost a *terra incognita*. We talk of the glorious sounds of that language, which we read in a way that would be, no doubt, as unintelligible to ancient, as it certainly is to modern Greeks, and about as pleasant to both as is to us a Frenchman's attempt at reading English before he has learned the alphabet. And all Europe utters equally insane cries, and thinks it spouts Homer and Aeschylus.

One word on the direction of phonological inquiry which is now specially needed. It is not so much more analysis and systematisation that we require. In fact we rather labour under a load of systems of universes, themselves unexplored. It is a careful examination of the synthesis of sounds in different nations, and even small localities, that is principally wanted. Whether in proceeding from (p) to (aa), we commence with an open or closed glottis, and, if with the latter, whether we insert a dull non-vocal intrapharyngeal thud, or whether we come on the vowel smoothly or explosively, or even with a jerk accompanied by a puff,—these are questions of real philological importance. These varieties in progression from sound to sound generate new sounds, which lead to various linguistic transformations. Hence we should obtain information about them if possible

first hand, by observations on the life. The different theories hitherto propounded by philologists, from the depths or rather the shallows of their own limited experience, are mere *ignes fatui*. Alphabetists have uniformly shirked the whole inquiry. The various actual results produced from the same apparent combinations of letters under different national habits are as surprising as they are important for comparative philologists to understand with accuracy.

It is with great satisfaction that I can turn to two papers read before our own Society, as exemplifying in the happiest manner the kind of phonetic research which philology now urgently requires,—the intelligent, practical, minute, exhaustive analysis of existing usage. Of Mr. Jas. A. H. Murray's treatise on "The Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland," read at the close of 1869, but only just published as the Second Part of the *Philological Transactions* for 1870-2, further mention will be made in the Report on Early English, as respects its linguistic value. But I would here draw attention to the admirable manner in which the real Scotch sounds have been *for the first time* presented to an English reader, their historical relations considered, and their dialectal differences explained, on pp. 93 to 149, and 237 to 248 of that work. The only piece of phonological work on dialects comparable with this is Schmeller's *Mundarten Bayerns*, 1821, which is, however, greatly inferior in phonetic knowledge and powers of discrimination, though more minute in local details. The two works together form models on which to base future dialectal work.

The paper of Mr. Henry Sweet on Danish Pronunciation (*Philological Transactions* for 1873-4, pp. 94-112), which I have already mentioned in passing, is one of the acutest phonological investigations of recent times. Mr. Murray was writing of his own native pronunciation, and comparing it with Southern English, with which he had been for years familiar. Mr. Sweet spent a summer over an entirely new language, in which the orthography offered no assistance, and pronouncing dictionaries did not exist. He had with his own spade, as it were, to dig the pronunciation of every

word out of the native mine; first to bring his ear to recognize the novel sounds and their very remarkable synthesis, and then to determine when and where they had to be used. Mr. Sweet fortunately began his phonetic career by a study of Mr. Bell's *Visible Speech*, and he was already a good Scandinavian scholar before he attacked the modern language. This paper shews what we may look for from such a combination. It will, I hope, some day be enlarged to the dimensions of a book. The clear account of the Danish and Norwegian systems of tones, their contrast and relation; the discrimination of the exceedingly curious anomalies in the labialised vowels; the original rules, deduced from exhaustive lists made by himself, for the peculiar distinctive use of close and open vowels; the degradations of the consonants into the second elements of diphthongs; the whole treatment of initial and final consonants; the remarkable determinations of the comparative lengths of consonants after long and short vowels in Danish and English; each observation enough to make an observer's reputation;—will stamp this paper as a classical example of the phonological treatment of language.

PHILOLOGY IN THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

Our own Society has certainly developed a decided inclination for phonologic research. Of the 51 papers which have been read during the three years ending last December, 15 or nearly 30 per cent. are more or less closely connected with Phonology. Prof. Hewitt Key gave us three papers on Latin Accent and Rhythm. Mr. Sweet criticised the late Prof. Koch's theory of the Anglo-Saxon *ea*, and gave us that valuable paper on Danish pronunciation already characterised. Mr. Cayley treated the hard and soft consonants and discrepancies in early alphabets. Dr. Weymouth raised a theory of old English and Anglo-Saxon pronunciation, in opposition to one I had ventured to propose. Mr. Brandreth expatiated on vowel-intensification. Mr. Nicol selected the old French labials, and Prof. Cassal the modern French *accent tonique*.

And finally I troubled the Society with my paper on Glossic and some conversational remarks on accent, quantity, and diphthongs. My Glossic paper was indeed related to one by Mr. Fry on improving English orthography; and these two papers, arising out of many meetings in committee, finally gave rise to a two-nights' discussion, which confessedly left the matter where it would have probably continued to lie whatever had been our decision—namely with the conservatism, *insouciance*, negligence, fancifulness, pedantry, purism, or radicalism of individual scribes.

As to the languages with which we dealt during the same time, Prof. Hewitt Key's papers on Latin accent and rhythm, already referred to, and three others on some errors and omissions in Latin dictionaries, with another on the compression of Latin words (which I might have classed among the phonetic papers), and a short paper on an ode of Horace by Mr. Schönemann, gave Latin the preference over English. But our own language had several papers by Prof. Joseph Payne, especially in relation to the origination of many provincial English words through the Norman. Mr. Murray illustrated Shakspeare's usages from modern dialects, and remarked on the dialectic varieties of the prose works attributed to Hampole. Mr. Fry dealt with "Chinee" and kindred words; Dr. Morris read some notes on English grammar and the old Kentish dialect, and amused us with detailing various eccentricities in the older and newer forms of our language; and Mr. Wedgwood contributed a few additional etymologies. Mr. Yates wrote on the orthography of past tenses and participles. Mr. Sweet finally gave us an interesting paper on the special characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon language of the time of Alfred.

These were our main subjects. But French in its old form was treated by Dr. E. Mall in a paper on Marie de France, and in its modern form by Mr. Dawson, and afterwards by Prof. Cassal for genders, in addition to his phonetic researches. The Celtic and Sanscrit were the only other languages which had more than a single contribution. We had a paper on the accusative plural in the British language

and on the Irish verb by Dr. Whitley Stokes, and one on Welsh affixes by Mr. Powell. I think that my passing notice on scoring sheep in Yorkshire belongs rather to this head.

Sanscrit was treated two or three times by Dr. Goldstücker, Pennsylvania German by Prof. Haldeman, Danish by Mr. Sweet, the Mosquito dialect by Messrs. Charnock and Blake.

The other papers were more general. Mr. Wheatley gave us some more reduplicated words; Dr. Weymouth treated Euphuism, Dr. Goldstücker spoke of the derivation of words from sound, Dr. Oppert discussed the Graal, and I read my address on the relation of thought to sound.

As our friend Dr. Wagner's extra volume on Mediæval Greek does not come under consideration, we have nothing in our list relating to Greek or Hebrew, nothing about Gothic, Teutonic, or Old Norse, almost nothing about the older Romance languages, and nothing at all about agglutinative or monosyllabic languages. Native Asiatic, African, and American are ignored. Egyptian and Assyrian researches have had no interest for us. It is evident therefore that several of our Members who are well qualified to give us the result of their studies on some of these languages, have been either absent or too busy to prepare papers. The fifty-one papers have been read by or for twenty-seven authors, all of whom, however, were not Members of our Society.¹ This summary shews the active state of philology among ourselves. The passive mine is much richer, but owing to circumstances not workable. There will always be some prevalent study in such societies. We began with classics. For the last three years we have not cared to touch Greek. The First Part of our *Transactions* for 1873-4, which has just been delivered to Members, contains three

¹ The following is an alphabetic list of the authors, the figures annexed shew the number of the papers. When a paper was divided into parts read on different evenings, each part has been counted as a separate paper. The two evenings devoted to discussions have not been reckoned:—Bran-

dreth 1, Cassal 2, Cayley 2, Charnock and Blake 1, Dawson 1, Ellis 5, Fry 2, Goldstücker 3, Haldeman 1, Jeremiah 1, Key 7, Mall 1, Morris 2, C. Murray 1, J. A. H. Murray 2, Nicol 1, Oppert 1, Payne 5, Powell 1, Schönmann 1, Stokes 2, Sweet 3, Wedgwood 1, Weymouth 1, Yates 1.

papers read this year, and omits many of those already mentioned. This partly arose from the circumstance that many of the other papers were not ready for press, and it was desirable to issue this Part before our anniversary. But as our year terminates in December, it will be convenient to defer noticing such papers as have been read subsequently, till the next address of the President. And now let us look to the outside world.

BASQUE.

Education in English schools was contrived when I was a boy,—and though somewhat improved, I am glad to think, during the intervening forty years, yet, like the tree, it preserves its old bend, and may therefore be still regarded as contrived, undesignedly of course, and perhaps unconsciously (which makes amendment not particularly hopeful),—to bring up a boy's mind in the one Aryan faith, of the one Aryan linguistic mode of thought. The instrument was mainly the Latin grammar, to which even all other Aryan heresies were made to succumb. Boswell reports a speech of Johnson which puts the feeling thus generated in a very strong light. "I always said," quoth the oracle, "Shakspeare had Latin enough to grammaticise his English" (anno 1780, æt. 71). We know now what to conclude of Johnson's own knowledge of English grammar. Latin and Greek, eternally ground in, with French as an "extra," and English merely as a medium for "construing," is the received English preparation for linguistic study. Well, we have got out of it a little. Thanks to Christianity, some people had to learn Hebrew, and the Semitic verb at least ought to have opened our eyes. But if any philologist wishes to see how truly all Aryanism and Semiticism are merely the favoured literary dialects of the world, how extremely remote they are from representing all logical connections of thought, to indicate which inflections and insertions, reduplications, guna, and umlaut and ablaut, conjugational forms and voices, and the other paraphernalia developed by these systems of language in different proportions, are supposed to have been constructed,

in ways which different scholars have wanted words laudatory enough to characterise; if any philologist wishes to see radicalism and hereditary preservation of forms of words break utterly down, and find a system of language which preserves its individuality by its mere mode of grammatical construction, let him study the Basque. We are indebted to the personal labour, critical acumen, and unwearied perseverance of Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, for our only trustworthy knowledge of this extraordinary language. Gifted with great power of appreciating sounds, and having long studied their representation, he has been able to write them down intelligibly from oral delivery. The phonetic peculiarities of Basque, especially in the sibilants, are such as never occurred to our *a priori* alphabetists, and require considerable phonetic acrobaticism to imitate. The Prince has lately presented our Society with his linguistic maps of the Basque provinces, which he has promised to explain at our next meeting, and he has also furnished us with copies of almost all his publications on the Basque languages, including his recent remarkable studies on the Basque verb, perhaps the most complicated in existence, some of the peculiarities of which he will, doubtless, point out, as they form the criteria for dialectic separation. These I will not anticipate. The Society is, as I have said, through the kindness of the Prince, in possession of these works, usually extremely difficult to procure, and can therefore peruse them at leisure. That Aryan scholars should be put into a position to study such remarkable phenomena in their libraries, instead of hunting them through mountain and vale, from village to village, and mouth to mouth, is a great gain to philology. The Prince has not completed his task, although he has completed his collections, and it must be the desire of all linguistic scholars that he will have life and health, as he has the desire and the intellectual power and requisite patience, to accomplish a task he has so worthily begun.¹

¹ Besides his account of the Basque verb and his map of the Basque dialects, the Prince has published numerous

works, either written by himself or by his direction, forming materials for the study of the language. His second

The Basque language is one of the most ancient in the world; but it has no literature. The oldest existing trace of the Basque language is a list of forty words, incidentally introduced into a work by Marineo Siculo in 1530. The oldest book is a short set of poems, in rhyme, by Bernard Dechepare, rector of St. Michel-le-Vieux, partly devotional, partly erotic, printed at Bordeaux in 1545, of which only one copy is known to exist, being Y 6194 P in the National Library at Paris.¹ The next in date, and the only one really of value, is a Protestant translation of the New Testament, with Liturgy and Catechism, printed at Rochelle in 1571.² Another edition of the Catechism with Calendar was printed the same year, with a different form of the so-called dative plural, which is extremely rare. The more recent Basque works seem to be chiefly prayers, hymns, catechisms, and devotional or ascetic works. Many, though not the most important, of its words have materially changed in the course of time. It has a power of adopting and incorporating new and foreign words with ease. Its different dialects sometimes use totally different words for even the commonest objects, such as *sun* and *moon*. But the immense majority of words are of course common, with mere variations of form, to all the dialects. The Basque is an agglutinative language, but is widely different from the other great agglutinative families, with which it scarcely shares more than the negative properties of being non-Aryan and non-Semitic. The peculiar construction of its verb, which, with sharply marked distinctions, runs through all the dialects, binds

catalogue, extending to the year 1862, has 25 entries respecting Basque, and I find 24 more in the additions to that catalogue. These consist of translations into various Basque dialects of the Song of the Three Children, the Lord's Prayer, a text of John, Dialogues, Genesis to Leviticus, the whole Gospel of St. Matthew, the Revelations, Doctrina Cristiana, the Books of Ruth and Jonah, Song of Songs, Miserere, Catechism, the whole of the French-Basque Bible, together with a Vocabulary, Comparison of Basque and Finnish, Basque Sermon preserved at

Arbonne, Note on supposed genitives and datives plural, and the great work on the Basque verb, with maps, already mentioned. It is the labour of a lifetime devoted to linguistic science.

¹ Reprinted and translated into French, so far as decency allowed, in 1847.

² The first complete Bible in the Basque language, comprising both the Old and New Testaments, is that in the dialect of Labour, brought out by Prince L. L. Bonaparte, begun in 1859 and concluded in 1865.

them firmly together, and separates them clearly and definitely from all other languages.¹ These investigations into Basque mark then a great step in philology. They give us a new visual instrument for seeing the circulation of the blood corpuscles of language. We must not be in too great a hurry to systematise and genealogise. It is said that Adam and Eve spoke Basque in Paradise. I can't disprove it. But if so, the descendant tongues of to-day are not so like their parents as man is to the gorilla.

I cannot conclude this reference to Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte's labours on Basque, without special reference to the magnificent donation which he has made to our Society, not merely of his works on this particular subject, but of an almost unique collection of all his linguistic works on Uralian, Albanian, Celtic, French, Spanish, Italian, and English dialects, phonetics, and other linguistic researches, comprising 138 out of his 162 distinct publications, the missing twenty-four being generally such as were printed in very limited numbers, or consisting of cancelled editions.² Even of those which are presented, there are many that he could not replace if lost. Probably no such collection of his works exists in England, except at the British Museum, the Athenæum Club,

¹ Not being myself acquainted with the Basque, I have submitted the above statement of characteristics to Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte; and I believe that it will be found substantially correct.

² An analysis of the numbers in the printed catalogues of the Prince's works gives the following results. A "number" is any distinct paper or work, from a single page to 1376 pages (as in the case of the French Basque Bible). For the classification of these languages see below, p. 17 note.

	Total in Catalogue.	Presented to Philo. Soc.	
Polyglot	5	3	Catalogues, etc.
Basque	49	35	Maps, Verb, Dialects, Bible, etc.
Celtic	7	5	Cornish, etc.
Modern Greek	1	1	Corsican Mainot.—St. Matthew.
Albanian	3	3	St. Matthew.
Italian	36	35	Italian and Sardinian.—St. Matthew.
Spanish	1	1	Asturian.—St. Matthew.
Portuguese	2	1	Galician.—St. Matthew.
French	7	6	Picard, Provençal, etc.—St. Matthew.
German	1	1	Transylvanian.—Song of Solomon.
English	35	32	St. Matthew and Song of Solomon.
Friesic	3	3	St. Matthew.
Russian	1	1	Song of Solomon.
Uralian	11	11	Karelian, Livonian, Syrjanian, Permian, etc.—St. Matthew.
	162	138	

and on his own shelves; nor could he form another. Originally destined for the Library of the Louvre, the Prince determined, after the burning of that Library during the time of the Commune, to present this collection to a linguistic society. We must all feel much gratified at the choice which he has made; and I hope that we shall be stimulated to return our thanks to the donor in the way which, I am sure, will be most pleasing to himself,—by prosecuting the studies for which he has given us such ample materials.

HUNGARIAN.

There is another non-Aryan tongue, surrounded by Aryanism, but unlike the last, with a literature full of life, the language of a nation which is growing into political importance, becoming indeed, as the principal portion of the Austrian empire, one of the great powers of Europe. The Magyar or Hungarian language is very little known or studied by linguists. But it is the most accessible and literary of the so-called agglutinative languages, with speakers possessing all European culture, and perfectly acquainted with the principal European tongues—men who can speak in English as Kossuth spoke to us awhile ago—and it is written with Roman letters after a system readily understood, which puts our own orthography to shame, whereas its Dravidian congeners, which are scarcely studied by any but Madras officials, have entirely new systems of writing, and its Turkish cousin is of all tongues spoken in Europe the worst spelled. Our Society, thanks to a former member, Mr. Pulszky, possesses a fine collection of Magyar books, and I should be glad to find some member taking up so important a study, and furnishing us with a comparative view of Hungarian and Aryan forms of thought as traceable in linguistic structure. Thus the absence of grammatical gender, the same word *ő* serving for *he*, *she*, or *it*, must correspond to a direction of thought entirely different to the Aryan. The Hungarians have devoted much attention to their own philology, so that materials are abundant. I am indebted to Mr. Arthur J. Patterson, an eminent English authority on this

remarkable language, which, by the bye, presents several curious phonetic characters, for the following account of the recent philological activity of the Hungarians.

“Perhaps the most fruitful advance that has been made in philological study in Hungary during the last two years has been the establishment, at the commencement of 1872, of a new philological periodical, entitled *Magyar Nyelvör*. Its title is formed on the analogy of the German compound *Sprachwart*, and may be translated *Watchman of the Hungarian Language*. As it concerns itself with Hungarian etymology, questions of Hungarian grammar, corrections of mistakes made in the current literature of the day, the examination of remains of old Hungarian literature, and the recording of popular songs, proverbs, dialectical peculiarities, etc.,—reference to the cognate Ugrian languages¹ being

¹ In a brochure recently published, summing up the researches that have been made in the field of the Finn-Ugrian family of languages, Dr. Donner, of Helsingfors, divides that family into five branches: (1) the Finnish proper, including the Karelian, Estonian, etc.; (2) the Lapp dialects; (3) the Syrjanian; (4) the Permic dialects; (5) the Ugrian, properly so called, comprising the Ostiak, Vogul, and Magyar languages. Dr. Donner's brochure has been carefully analyzed by M. Edouard Sayous in the *Revue Critique* for the first quarter of 1873.—A. J. P.

Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte's classification is as follows, shewing more exactly the position of this group of languages. It is taken from his “Classification Morphologique des Langues Européennes,” with MS. additions. “Première Classe. A. Souche basque: 1 Basque. B. Souche altaïque. . . . a. Famille ouralique.—a) Sous-famille tchoude: 1. Branche finnoise: 2 Finnois. 3 Esthonien. 4 Livonien. II. Branche laponne: 5 Lapon.—b) Sous-famille permienne: 6 Permien et zyriain. 7 Votiak.—c) Sous-famille volgaïque: 1. Branche tchérimisse: 8 Tchérimisse. II. Branche morduine: 9 Morduin.—d) Sous-famille oïgoure: 1. Branche hongroise: 10 Hongrois. II. Branche Vogoule: 11 Vogoule. III.

Branche ostiaque: 12 Ostiaque. (N.B. Le finnois avec l'esthonien et le livonien, diffèrent du lapon à peu près comme le grec diffère du latin. Il en est de même du tchérimisse par rapport au morduin, et du hongrois, du vogoule et de l'ostiaque entre eux.) β. Famille samoyède, γ. Famille tartare, δ. Famille tongouse, ε. Famille mongole, avec leur sous-familles et leur branches. C. Souche Dravidienne, etc. D. Souche caucasique occidentale, etc. E. Souche Caucasique orientale, etc. F. G. H., etc., etc. Autres Souches très-différentes entre elles, quoique appartenant à cette PREMIÈRE CLASSE.”

The remainder of this classification is subjoined, as being important to the Members of the Philological Society, in connection with the works presented to them by the Prince, and analyzed in the footnote to p. 15. “Deuxième classe. A. Souche indo-germanique. (N.B. Les noms des langues mortes sont imprimés en caractères italiques.) α. Famille celtique: 1. Branche gaélique: 13 Gaélique. II. Branche bretonne:—a. 14 Gallois.—b. 15 *Cornouaillais*.—c. 16 Breton. . . . β. Famille gréco-latine: 1. Branche albanaise: 17 Albanais. II. Branche grecque: 18 *Grec*. 19 Grec moderne. III. Branche latine:—a. 20 *Latin*.—b. 21 Italien. [22. Espagnol. 23 Portugais].—c. 24 Français. 25 Ro-

strictly subordinated to the above objects,—it is of a more popular character and appeals for support to a wider public than the philological journal of an older standing—*Philologiai Közlöny* (Philological Gazette), which came to an end with the year 1872. The editor of *Magyar Nyelvőr*, Mr. Szarvas, whose speciality is the study of the remains of mediæval Hungarian, has published during the last year a treatise on the tenses of the Hungarian verb.

“Dr. Budenz has, during the period in question, read some interesting papers before the Hungarian Academy, one of them being an elaborate critique of Dr. Vámbéry's treatise on the words common to the Hungarian and Turkish languages. But it is understood that he has in an advanced stage of preparation a work on the words common to the Hungarian and Ugrian languages, somewhat on the model of Curtius' *Griechische Etymologie*. Dr. Budenz is also preparing a short Finnish Grammar and Reading-book, for the use of Hungarian students, which will soon be published.

“Another Ugrian scholar, Mr. Paul Hunfalvy, has recently brought out a book on the dialect of the Vogul language spoken on the banks of the Konda, in Siberia. It contains a grammar and glossary of the translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew into the Konda Vogul dialect, executed by M. Popov, and revised by Professor Wiedemann, of St. Petersburg, and published by Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte.¹ Before this translation the only specimens of the Vogul language that Mr. Hunfalvy had to work on were two series of questions and answers on the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, communicated by Satigin, the representa-

man. 26 Rhétique.—*d.* 27 Valaque. . . . *γ.* Famille germano-scandinave. i. Groupe germanique.—*a.* 28 *Gothique*. 29 *Allemand ancien*. 30 *Bas-allemand ancien*. 31 *Anglo-Saxon*. 32 *Frison*.—*b.* 33 *Allemand*. [34 *Bas-allemand*. 35 *Hollandais*.] 36 *Frison moderne*.—*c.* 37 *Anglais*. ii. Groupe scandinave.—*a.* 38 *Islandais*.—*b.* [39 *Suédois*. 40 *Danois*]. . . . *δ.* Famille slavo-lettonienne. i. Branche slave.—

a. 41 *Slavon*. 42 *Russe*. [43 *Illyrien*. 44 *Slovène*.] 45 *Bulgare*.—*b.* 46 *Polonais*. 47 *Bohême*. 48 *Lusacien*. 49 *Polabe*. (N.B. Le dialecte cassubien est encore parlé.) ii. Branche lettonienne.—*a.* 50 *Lithuanien*.—*b.* 51 *Prussien*.—*c.* 52 *Letton*.”—A. J. E.

¹ This work is among those presented to the Philological Society by the Prince.—A. J. E.

tive of the independent Vogul princes, to the Hungarian traveller, Reguly. In his preface Mr. Hunfalvy shews that although the translator of the Gospel is a Russian, the Vogul of the version is much less Russianised than that of Satigin, and consequently proportionably more valuable for philologists. Of course, too, the Gospel affords a much larger store of linguistic materials.

“Lastly it may be mentioned, as a sign of increased interest in philology, that a translation of the Finnish epic *Kalevala* into Hungarian verse, by M. Barna, appeared in 1871. It was reviewed by Dr. Budenz in the *Academy*, September 15th, 1871, with especial reference to the linguistic side of the work, and the relation of Magyar to Finnish.”

SANSKRIT.

Passing at once to the Aryan languages, we naturally turn first to Sanscrit. As my predecessor, Dr. Goldstücker, was an eminent Sanscrit scholar, who had devoted himself especially to Sanscrit lexicography, on which he held peculiar opinions with great tenacity, I was anxious to secure a communication on this especial subject from one in whom Dr. Goldstücker himself had confidence. Mr. John Muir, of Edinburgh, a Member of our Council, a friend of Dr. Goldstücker, and an eminent Sanscrit scholar, has kindly furnished me with the following contribution on this subject.

“In 1843 a ‘Notice of European grammars and lexicons of the Sanskrit language,’ written by the late Prof. H. H. Wilson, appeared in our *Transactions*. Since that time contributions to Sanskrit lexicography have been made by Professors Benfey, Goldstücker, Max Müller, Aufrecht, Grassmann, and others. But I must pass over the labours of these scholars, in order to be able to notice at more length the Sanskrit Wörterbuch of Messrs. Böhtlingk and Roth, compiled with the co-operation of Professors Weber, Whitney, Schiefner, Stenzler, Kuhn, and Kern, and at one time of Prof. Aufrecht, begun in 1852 and steadily continued to the

present time. Of this work six quarto volumes have already appeared, and it will apparently be completed in one other volume. This great and epoch-making Thesaurus, by far the most important work of its kind which has yet been published, whether as regards its compass or its intrinsic value, contains, as far as it has come out, 7976 columns= 3988 pp. Not only is the number of words greatly in excess of those in Wilson's second edition (though a few are omitted, and some of the significations of those retained are excluded as without authority), but the senses of the words are more systematically and scientifically arranged. In particular, the compound verbs, which are ranged alphabetically after the simple roots, are far more copiously expounded. References are given either to the native Dictionaries in which the words are found, or to the passages of the books in which the different meanings occur.

“The most interesting feature in this work is, perhaps, the interpretation of words occurring in the hymns of the Veda, many of them obsolete, or employed in different senses, in later Sanskrit. For this portion of the work Prof. Roth is avowedly responsible. The principles upon which he proceeds are stated in the introduction to the first volume.¹ He asserts that the native interpreters of the Vedic hymns, living in comparatively modern times, when the ideas, religion, and institutions of the people of India had undergone a long series of modifications, and holding all the opinions current in their own age,—destitute (it may be added) of the faculty (only recently acquired even by European thinkers) of transporting themselves into the past, of entering into its feelings, and thinking its thoughts,—did not possess the qualifications requisite for the correct comprehension of those hymns, which not only represent a far more ancient set of conceptions and beliefs, but are full of obsolete words. He considers that the writings of these commentators do not form a rule for the scientific expositor, but are merely one of those

¹ See a translation of his remarks in the *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. ii., new series, pp. 307 ff., and Prof.

Roth's article, *Ueber Gelehrte Tradition* u.s.w. in the *Zeitschrift der morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, xxi. 1, ff.—J. M.

helps of which the latter will avail himself for the execution of his difficult task, a task which is not to be accomplished at the first onset, or by any single individual. He therefore seeks to proceed philologically to derive from the texts themselves the sense which they contain by a juxtaposition of all the passages which are cognate in diction and contents. This method is no doubt a correct one, though everything depends on its proper application. This scheme of interpretation, though approved by all, or most, other eminent Sanskritists,¹ was emphatically condemned by our late President,² who maintained that the Indian commentators were quite as able as European scholars to bring together and compare all the passages in which particular words occur, that in the case of *hapax legomena* the guesses of the former were as good as those of the latter, and that their methods of procedure were not purely etymological, but involved a reference to an ancient and genuine tradition. In support of his own views on the interpretation of the Veda, Prof. Goldstücker read a paper before the Royal Asiatic Society in answer to one by myself, of which nothing more than a meagre abstract (published in the *Athenæum* at the time) ever appeared. It is to be regretted that this paper was never elaborated by the author, and his views supported by the great learning and ingenuity of which he was master, as, although it may be doubted if he would have gained many converts among scholars able to form a correct judgment, he would probably have brought together much important information, and thrown additional light on many questions connected with Indian antiquity.

¹ To the previous supporters of this view may now be added Mr. A. C. Burnell, who, in the valuable preface to his edition and translation of the *Vaiṣṇava Brāhmaṇa* (Mangalore, 1873),—in which he gives much information regarding Sāyaṇa, and identifies him with Mādhava and Vidyāraṇya,—expresses himself as follows: "The great controversy which has prevailed so long respecting Sāyaṇa's competence to explain the Vedas, is fast approaching its end; the above sketch of his life and

works will shew that the followers of the 'German school' are historically right. That they are so theoretically, is established by an amount of proof offered by Max Müller, Weber, Whitney, Roth, Muir, and others that has long vanquished all reasonable hesitation on the part of the Sanskritists who were once inclined to prefer Sāyaṇa and Indian precisions to the results of comparative philology."—J. M.

² See his *Pāṇini*, pp. 241 ff.—J. M.

“Prof. Goldstücker’s own Dictionary, ‘extended and improved from the second edition’ of Wilson’s, has unfortunately remained a mere fragment, embracing only a portion of the words beginning with the first letter of the alphabet. The first fasciculus was published in 1856, and the sixth and last in 1864. The scale on which it is composed, as compared with Wilson’s, may be understood from the fact that its 480 pages reach no further than p. 66 of the latter. The number of words is greatly increased, and the explanations of many of them are far more elaborate than in Wilson. Some of the articles are of encyclopædic dimensions. Perhaps the most important parts of the work are those which define the meanings of the technical terms of Indian philosophy, in which the author was a high proficient. But the entire work, so far as it goes, is of great value.

“The only other work calling for notice is that of Prof. Monier Williams, published last summer (containing 1186 4to. pp., much more closely printed than the 988 pp. of Wilson’s), which supplies, in a practical manner, the want, so long felt, of a complete Sanskrit and English Dictionary, and will tend greatly to facilitate and promote the study of Sanskrit in this country. It includes an immense number of words not to be found in Wilson, and embodies in a condensed form the new materials to be found in the parts of Böhlingk and Roth’s work published up to the time of its appearance.”

Prof. Aufrecht, of Edinburgh, who is also a Member of our Council, has kindly supplemented the preceding lexicographical remarks of Mr. Muir by the following relating to Sanscrit Grammaticography.

“Sanskrit Grammar is based on the grammatical aphorisms of Pāṇini, a writer now generally supposed to have lived in the fourth century B.C. At that time, Sanskrit had ceased to be a living language, and was only kept up artificially by being made the vehicle for the education of the upper classes. It would be interesting to know what style of language Pāṇini chose as the standard of his observations. It was certainly not the idiom of the Vedas, as he seldom treats

this with his usual accuracy, and only mentions it in order to show its discrepancies from the classical style, or, as he terms it, the language of the world. We believe that long before his own time a scientific and poetical literature had already sprung up, and that a certain number of writers were chosen by him and his predecessors as the representatives and patterns of the classical language. Pāṇini was himself a poet, and the great commentary on his grammatical rules contains many fragments of early poetry. Treatises on law, long anterior to the law-book of Manu, are still in existence, and names of ancient writers on other than sacred subjects are frequently cited. However this may be, it is quite certain that the so-called classical Sanskrit, as taught by Pāṇini and his numerous commentators and imitators, is not a language which had its foundation in the colloquial usage of an entire nation or the educated portion of it, but rather in the confined sphere of grammatical schools which fed themselves on the rich patrimony of previous illustrious ages. This development of the Sanskrit finds a striking analogy in the Rabbinic language, which also is to be traced back to the endeavours of religious scholars to endue with new life an idiom rapidly dying out.

“The introduction of Sanskrit lore into Europe forms a new epoch in the study of the language. The European Grammarians tried from the very first to arrange Sanskrit grammar, not according to the chaotic manner of the Natives, but after the models of their own Greek and Latin grammars. They used more or less fully and accurately the native sources, but tried to free themselves from the trammels of a system which for its comprehension required years of study. It is principally owing to the genius of Bopp that Sanskrit grammar has become as lucid as that of any other ancient or modern language which we are in the habit of studying. But Bopp was not satisfied with the comparatively easy task of digesting the principles of Sanskrit grammar according to European models; this had been done before him in a very satisfactory way by Wilkins. But his principal merit consists in having brought to bear on his

subject the light of his philological discoveries, and in basing his rules on purely scientific principles. His aim was to trace everywhere the genesis of the grammatical forms, not to content himself with a mere classification. Advanced scholars might from time to time discover, and have sometimes too severely criticised, the want of a thorough knowledge of the native grammarians, and the mistakes which in consequence here and there disfigured his grammar. Nevertheless, it may be said that all the distinguished Sanskrit scholars of the present time have learned from him their Sanskrit; and Bopp was not slow to correct in subsequent editions any mistakes which had been pointed out to him. Bopp's Grammar appeared in six editions,¹ five in German, and one in Latin. Its principal defect is the absence of Syntax. Wilson and Williams are the only scholars who, to some extent, have tried to supply this deficiency.

"Böhlingk, the editor of Pāṇini, published in 1843 and 1844 two essays on Sanskrit Declension and Accent, both based solely on native sources. The latter essay is of some historical importance, as having first called attention to a subject entirely unknown before. Benfey, in a review, entered more fully on the latter topic, availing himself for this purpose of the few then accessible accentuated texts of the Vedas. Bopp, in a separate book, showed the agreement between the Sanskrit and Greek accent. Aufrecht published an essay on the accent in Sanskrit Compounds, and Whitney wrote a treatise on the system of accentuation in the Atharva Veda.²

"Professor Boller, of Vienna, published in 1847 a Sanskrit Grammar, in which an attempt was made to give the material, as supplied by the native grammarians, in some completeness, and to accentuate every part of the grammar. This work does not seem to have attracted much notice, although it is done both accurately and systematically.

"A more ambitious aim was pursued by Professor Benfey

¹ The fourth edition of his smaller Grammar appeared after his death in 1868.

² An account of Prof. Whitney's

view of Sanskrit accent is given in the last footnote to my paper on "Accent and Emphasis," in the *Philological Transactions* for 1873-4, p. 163.—A. J. E.

in his Complete Grammar of Sanskrit, Leipzig, 1852. According to his own statement, it was his object to show precisely and clearly all that is forbidden and allowed in Sanskrit, and to render fully the native exposition of grammar. There can be no doubt that Benfey has brought together a heap of material for the erection of a palace, but, unfortunately, in endeavouring to outvie all that had been done before him, he has not sufficiently separated cumbersome rubbish from the really valuable bricks and stones. The beginner, wishing to learn Sanskrit from this book, would arrive at the conviction that it is a language in which the exception forms the rule; and the advanced scholar will find it an easier task to consult his Pāṇini, than to have recourse to this exposition of the native system. We have to speak with more praise of the Practical Grammar by the same author, brought out in English by Messrs. Trübner, although experience has proved to us that the epithet 'practical' is hardly justified. A grammar in which declension is placed at the end of the book, and which in all earnest contains a declension of *sutus*, said to mean 'well shining,' a word sprung up in the muddled brain of a crazy grammarian, would, at least in this country, not be called practical.

"Professor Stenzler has put together in 42 pages (Breslau, 1868) the Essentials of Sanskrit Grammar in a most satisfactory manner, and we know of no other book so well adapted to the use of those who wish to learn the elements of the language.

"Within the last thirty years, several grammars have been published in England, and have gone through new editions. The grammars of Professors Wilson, Williams, and Müller are too well known to require a special criticism. But we cannot conclude without drawing attention to Professor Kielhorn's Grammar, printed at Bombay in 1870. Both for clearness and accuracy we consider it the best grammar hitherto published in the English language.

"The books we have hitherto spoken about were written for practical purposes. But a historical grammar, after the model of Grimm's Deutsche Grammatik, still remains a desideratum. We should like to see a work which would trace

the language through the different stages of the Vedic writings down to the great Epics and Purânas, and show the gradual development of Sanskrit into the ancient and modern popular dialects, which have arisen on its ruins. Materials for such a task are gradually accumulating, and it requires only a master-spirit to complete and properly digest them."

GREEK.

For the following account of recent researches on Greek I am indebted to Mr. John Peile, Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, a Member of our Council. Allow me in especial to direct your attention to the phonetic questions which arise in them, and to the concluding observations upon general syntactical transformation in language: the former shew the impossibility of advancing in philology without much increased knowledge of phonology; the latter bring the solidarity of languages strikingly before us, and warn us against the confusion of development with decay.

"A careful discussion of the Ionic dialect has been given by Erman in Curtius' *Studien*. This has been long wanted. The results are not very full, but they at least shew how much can be certainly known. Erman has printed all the prose Ionic inscriptions which we possess: those of the *Corpus*, and those edited more lately by Newton, and by Lenormant: he has also availed himself of the labour of Kirchhoff (*Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Alphabets*). We thus have the inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries—those of Magna Graecia and Euboea, of the twelve Ionic cities, and of Thasos, Halicarnassus, etc.: then those of the fourth century, in number 40. To these inscriptions he rightly attributes much greater importance than to the MSS. of Herodotus, which sometimes shew Atticisms, sometimes hyper-Ionicisms. His principal conclusion is, that the later Ionic dialect differed much less from the Attic than is commonly supposed. But he shews considerable divergence (as might be expected) among the western Ionians from the typical form: and in that form itself some slight variations,

the natural result of time. Among other results of his investigation is a clear proof that the ν ἐφέλκυστικόν was found in older Ionic (a fact commonly denied), with precisely the same irregularity as in Attic, and more rarely in the later inscriptions. The Euboean inscriptions shew the natural influence of Hellas proper, in the preservation of α in some words where Ionia weakened it into η . He thinks that a difference of sound underlies the variants ϵ and $\epsilon\iota$ found cross-wise in both Attic and Ionic, though not commonly, $\epsilon\iota$ being the usual spelling: one sound he thinks belonged to the true diphthong arising from the meeting of ϵ and ι , or from the intensification of ι ; the other to the merely compensatorily lengthened ϵ . It is not probable that the diphthongal sound was long preserved pure: it possibly sank first into the close e -sound followed by a glide, though denoted still by $\epsilon\iota$: while ϵ probably denoted the close e pure, and η the open e . With respect to the absence of contracted vowels, which is commonly assumed to be peculiar to Ionic, Erman has shewn conclusively that contraction was common to all the branches, except that of Thasos, as early as the 5th century.

“In the same journal Siegismund has an exhaustive paper on Greek metathesis. The facts are admirably arranged. In Greek, as in other languages, the greater number of the sounds so transposed are liquids; and Siegismund rightly explains the fact by the nature of the sound. He thinks it probable that the liquid expanded itself (so to speak) into a liquid and vowel: it thus stood between two vowels,—the original vowel of the root, and its own offspring:¹ and either of these could be dropped: so that the place of the liquid was altered if the original vowel was the one that suffered. Undoubted examples of vowels thus engendered are seen in

¹ “An r is combined with a half-mora [or measure, *svaramātrā*] in the middle of the vowel mora of the r -vowel, just as a nail is with the finger; like a pearl on a string, some say; like a worm in grass, say others.” Native commentator on the rule i. 37

in the Atharva-Veda Prāṭicākhya, as translated by Prof. Whitney. This interposition of an r in the midst of a vowel, ready therefore to obliterate either end, as in old Sanscrit *ar* and later *ri*, corresponds precisely to the view in the text.—A. J. E.

ταρ(α)χή—from $\sqrt{\text{ταρχ}}$, and μαλ(α)κός—from $\sqrt{\text{μαλκ}}$: but here both vowels remained. Other cases of metathesis are excellently explained by Siegismund as due to a principle which we see in daily operation, *i.e.* that in pronouncing a word hastily, when we have each component part of it in our mind, we sometimes in our hurry anticipate one element, and so bring it forward out of its proper place: thus, *e.g.*, he would explain the curious form ἀμθρός for ἀριθμός attributed to Simonides, and found (in the form of a verb ἀμθρέω) in Callimachus and Theocritus. No doubt this is but one operation of the ordinary principle of phonetic change.

“Prof. Campbell, in the preface to his edition of Sophocles, has called attention to the character of the Greek language in the fifth century, which differs from the uniformity found alike in Epic construction and (rather differently) in the Attic orators. It was (as he says) a creative period, when the resources of the language were fully felt, and not yet limited by grammarians; when each author developed, not only his thought, but also the instrument of its expression, as he pleased;—a transition-time, when the original instinct of language breaks forth afresh, and throws the old materials into new combinations impossible in a more advanced literary period. Striking examples of this force are to be seen in Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Thucydides: in all of these we see creative power, not merely of thought, but also of language, breaking out in a tentative, irregular, and often incomplete way. Written composition was still a novelty: the writers were conscious of their manner of expression, as well as of their matter: they analyzed their language; and thus arose a mass of minute distinctions in expression belonging rather to the language than to the thought: they concentrated their language; whence came considerable obscurity: lastly they gave free play to their language; and thus came change of construction in the very middle of a sentence, so that the connection of the words is natural, rather than grammatical. No doubt, each of these authors struck out a different path from each of the others: but all

were subject to the same influences, and the common result is very noticeable.

“Much light may be thrown by studies like these, not only upon the syntax of a particular language, but also on the history of syntax as a whole: that is upon the limits in expression imposed upon itself by human thought. In Greek we thus ascertain approximately the accretions of the Sophoclean era: we may apply the same kind of calculus to the Epic dialect, so far as is possible under the uncertainty of the age of some of the poems: and in the Iliad and Odyssey, whatever the age of each poem may be, it seems to me at least certain that the syntax is old. We may thus eliminate from each of these periods the special, and ascertain their common, element; and so find out the simply Greek form of expression natural to it from its earliest beginnings as a separate language. We might then compare this residuum with a similar (not equally rich) result to be gained from the Latin: then compare this Graeco-Italian form of expression with the result of tracing the much simpler development of Sanskrit syntax from the plays back to the Vedas. Lastly a still smaller representation of the growth of North Europe might be gained from the Lithuanian: no Teutonic language is at once sufficiently pure from foreign admixture and in possession of a sufficiently rich inflexional system. We should thus arrive at a starting-point, from which to investigate the common syntax of the Indo-European family.”

LATIN.

Our old colleague in the Council, Dr. W. Wagner, whose absence we have had much cause to regret since he has been recalled to his own country to hold a position at the Johanneum in Hamburg, has kindly consented to come among us in spirit if not in body, and has sent us a short resumé of Latin philology. And we must be the more indebted to him, that he has not hesitated to rewrite it for us, after his original paper miscarried by post, and undaunted by this misfortune, promises a longer contribution on another occasion. He says:—

“Latin philology has been advancing steadily within the last year. The powerful impulse given to a more careful study of the Latin language and its literature by Ritschl and Lachmann is still producing new effects, and the school of philologers trained by Ritschl are developing a surprising activity. The great collection of inscriptions originally undertaken at the suggestion of Ritschl and Mommsen is proceeding with a rapidity far surpassing the rival publication of the *Corpus inscriptionum Graecarum*. A collection of the Pompeian inscriptions, executed by Dr. Zangemeister, appeared only two years ago, and we have already received a new instalment of the work, comprising the inscriptions of the *regio decima* of Italy, edited by Th. Mommsen himself. Besides its linguistic interest, this volume may also be considered an important contribution to the ancient geography of the district, as it has been possible to ascertain the exact situation of more than one place by means of these inscriptions.

“Among the various editions of authors published last year, we may mention in the first place Lucian Müller’s edition of the fragments of *Lucilius*, a stout volume with a most careful index and prolegomena. A collection of the important fragments of the earliest Roman satirist, the model of Horace, had been promised by Lachmann, but his premature death had not allowed him to publish more on the subject than a few very suggestive treatises prefixed to the *indices lectionum* of the Berlin University. Other scholars having been deterred from the attempt by M. Haupt’s repeated insinuations that he was going to publish Lachmann’s edition left in MS., L. Müller has done wisely not to delay his work, as the more than twenty years elapsed since Lachmann’s death and the procrastination peculiar to Haupt rendered vain any further hope to obtain Lachmann’s work. In an author so difficult as *Lucilius*, it is but natural that we should not always agree with the Editor’s suggestions and emendations, but we owe him a debt of gratitude for furnishing us with a scholarly edition of *Lucilius*.

“The editions of Horace, Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius,

and Rutilius Numatianus, lately published by the same scholar, are merely intended as forerunners of his contemplated great *Corpus poetarum latinorum*, which is to supersede the antiquated *Corpus* by Weber, and the unscholarly work of Sidney Walker generally current in England. L. Müller's criticism in his edition of the erotic poets will of necessity frequently provoke contradiction, but there still remains a great deal of what is new and original, much that is suggestive, and some that is true. His Propertius seems to be the least satisfactory part; but this is a most difficult author, and one that requires repeated study to become familiar with his peculiar manner. Mr. Paley's edition of Propertius, with English notes, is convenient for practical use, but lacks actual scholarly insight, and displays a peculiar want of critical faculty in an editor who seems to be so thoroughly at home in his tragedians, but less familiar with Latin scholarship.

“In speaking of Latin literature, we must needs mention the firm of Teubner at Leipzig, to whose exertions so many valuable works are due. They have lately published a new volume of the Latin grammarians (by *Keil*), containing that most important writer Marius Victorinus, whose work includes such valuable notices on archaic Latin. Among the new publications of the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Lat. et Graec. Teubneriana*, we notice chiefly an excellent edition of the *Controversiae* of the elder Seneca (Seneca rhetor) by Professor *A. Kiessling* of Greifswald, an edition containing many sagacious emendations of the text, and excellent indexes; an important edition of Cicero's Letters (in two volumes) by the Danish scholar *Wesenberg*, whose separate treatises and occasional observations communicated to his friend Madvig had previously excited much interest, and who has now placed before us what may be called a surprising performance in point of familiarity with Cicero's diction and Latin style in general. This edition is to be followed up by a *fasciculus* containing the arguments justifying the principal emendations. The editions of *Dictys* and *Dares*, the two fabulous historians of the Trojan War, by *F. Meister*, belong likewise to the *Bibl. Teubn.* The edition

of Dares contains an interesting review of the influence exercised by this author upon the writers and poets of the middle ages, and will therefore be acceptable to a wider circle of readers.

“In the Tauchnitz collection of Latin authors we may mention *A. Riese's* edition of Ovid, the second volume of which contains a valuable edition of the *Metamorphoses*, with the best and most concise critical commentary to be had for this work.

“In the grammatical investigation of the Latin language a new system has been successfully adopted of late. The comprehensive works of *Vossius* and *Rudimannus*, which seem to embrace the whole of Latin literature, belong to a *naïve* period which held it still possible that one man should exhaust the whole literary life of the language; of late, we have preferred detailed and minute investigation to issuing new grammars of the whole language. The pronunciation and letter-changes of Latin have been carefully investigated by Corssen, Latin spelling has been historically revised by *Brambach* (who has also made his results accessible to teachers in his *Hülfsbüchlein für lateinische Rechtschreibung*), and two important monographs have been published on the syntax of *quom* by Lübbert and Autenrieth. Lübbert's method is statistical, and has led to important results. The distinction made by our grammars between *quom* causal and *quom* temporal did not, as he shews, exist in early Latin; it was only gradually forming in the time of Plautus and Terence, neither of whom ever uses *quom* temporal with the subjunctive imperfect and pluperfect. The historical and statistical method is also employed in *Dräger's Historische Syntax*, a work greatly to be recommended for its accuracy and careful elaboration. The author gives nothing but what he himself has collected, and this is perhaps the only point to which exception might be taken. His work would be more complete had he also utilised the labours of his predecessors. By the same author we possess a valuable monograph on the style of *Tacitus*, and a very good work on *Apuleius* and *African Latin* has lately been published by *Koziol*, an Austrian scholar.

The best work, however, of this kind, is *Kühnast's Hauptpunkte der Livianischen Syntax* (Berlin, Weber, 1872), quite a masterly work in every respect. A similar work on Cicero would be quite a boon to the student of Latin. It is incredible how many erroneous statements concerning Cicero and classical Latin keep floating through our grammars, one of which always carefully copies the errors of its predecessors. Kühnast shews that many phrases and constructions, disdained by over-anxious purists, are most excellent Latin, but somehow have not got admitted into dictionaries and grammars.

“The texts of the principal authors of the Latin language have been so much changed and improved by the labours of this century, that there is now a wide field for energetic young philologists in cultivating the *historical* grammar of the language. In return, textual criticism will also be benefited by these detailed investigations, and the nice shades of thought will be brought out by this kind of study. We have passed the stage of a sentimental admiration of the ancient authors, such as we find it in the editions of Heyne and his school; our eyes are fully open to the shortcomings and failings of Latin literature when considered aesthetically, nor do we any longer attribute to this literature the ‘humanizing’ influence so *naïvely* believed in by former centuries—there is among us very little of that which may be termed *elegant* scholarship—which is all very nice, but perfectly useless—in fact, we do not work like ladies, but like men mindful of a serious purpose, which is in the first line: to trace the intellectual life of the great Roman nation in its literature; and secondly to shew and follow the connecting links between this literature and the other nations of Europe and Asia. To attain this end it is necessary to pursue the most minute investigations, but not to generalize without sufficient data and foundations. But the days in which it was held the height of Latin scholarship to write a splendid Ciceronian style, and to turn neat Latin verses, are past, and will never return.”¹

¹ Owing most probably to some intentions, Dr. Wagner has confined completeness in the expression of my his remarks to the contributions to

Our friend Dr. Wagner gauges woman's work by the old standard. But when we find a lady, like Miss Anna Swanwick, translating *Æschylus*; another, like Miss Stockwell, taking the first Greek prize at Antioch College, U.S., against all the 700 young men there; and another, like Miss White, at the same College, solving a problem in mathematics in which 1500 male students had failed; we may remember past times when Hypatia taught at Alexandria, or more recent days when Mrs. Somerville translated Laplace, and own that superficiality does not depend on sex, but on habits of civilization, which may change, and we hope will change for the better—if indeed it be true that two heads are better than one, and that in literature and science as well as sociality, it is not good for man to be alone.

The above account of the two American ladies is given on the authority of Miss Beedy, herself a graduate of Antioch, who justly remarked that of course such successes did not necessarily represent the general powers of American women, as naturally only the most capable had as yet availed themselves of the recently granted University privileges. But as it was suggested to me that some information should be obtained respecting the progress of ladies at Cambridge in England—Cambridge in America is still closed to them—I applied to Mr. Henry Sidgwick himself, whose name is widely known in connexion with ladies' studies at Cambridge, and he has kindly sent me the following account:

“The facts as to our young ladies are these. Two have been examined by the examiners for our Classical Tripos, one of whom would have obtained a second class and the other a third; one other, similarly, by the mathematical examiners, who would have obtained a second class. So the result is not exactly triumphant, though sufficiently en-

Latin Philology in 1872. Hence his omission of all English publications except Paley's *Propertius*. He, however, wishes me to state that there are very few English scholars for whom he entertains a higher respect than Prof. Munro, whose *Lucretius* was published in 1866. Roby's grammar, of which

the first volume in its first edition came out in 1871, and the second has not yet appeared, Conington's *Virgil*, and Robinson Ellis's *Catullus*, have consequently been passed over. It was impossible to alter this arrangement in time for the anniversary.—A. J. E.

couraging. It ought, however, to be borne in mind, that they had not been to classical schools, like the young men. I believe the quality of their work was in all cases better than what would be expected from their places, as they had not learnt to answer questions as quickly as the young men. The quality of Miss Cook's work (the 2nd class classic) was especially commended. I have not myself taught any classics to ladies, but my experience of two years' teaching of philosophy is that they (my pupils at least) quite equal the best young men in the closeness and thoroughness of their study."

Mr. Peile, who informed me that he has taught Greek, by correspondence only, to a few ladies during the past two years, although of course finding it difficult to arrive at any definite conclusion from such small data, has been led to "believe that with a similar training women could become fully as good scholars as most of our first-class men at Cambridge," although, under the circumstances, of course, he "cannot prove it."

It would be out of place to go into the general question of the intellectual rivalry of the sexes, but the preceding remarks and information respecting the aptitude of the female mind for the severer forms of University study in comparison to that displayed by young men of the same age engaged on the same subjects, although suggested by a passing allusion in Dr. Wagner's contribution, while enforcing an opinion in which all earnest philologists must cordially agree, cannot be considered inappropriate in addressing a Philological Society, which, like our own, numbers ladies among its members.

EARLY ENGLISH.

The great attention which our Society has paid to the early stages of our home-grown language, from the time that it was more or less distinctly separable from the imported tongues whence it was elaborated, as a cultivated plant from a wild flower, requires me to devote a large section of this Report to its consideration, and this I have been more easily able to effect, owing to the necessity of deferring especial

reference to its *incūnābula*, Anglosaxon (including Gothic and the other Teutonic branches), Old Norse (including the other Scandinavian forms), and Old Norman (with the older Romance languages). The Members of our Society could not desire a better reporter on Early English than their own Honorary Secretary, Mr. Furnivall, the Director of the Early English Text and Chaucer Societies; and I have great pleasure in presenting them with the following sketch from his pen.

“As the revival of the study of Early English, which has been such a marked feature of linguistic inquiry of late years, originated with the Philological Society, I may, perhaps, be allowed to reach back some years, and remind our Members that delay on the part of our late much-lamented President, Prof. Goldstücker, in producing his Sanskrit Affix paper for our *Transactions* of 1858, led to the printing of my *Early English Poems and Lives of Saints* early in 1862; that this encouraged Dr. Richard Morris to edit the *Liber Cure Cocorum* later in 1862; and in 1863 to begin, with Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience*, that series of dialectal texts, accompanied by treatises on their peculiarities, which has done so much for his own renown, and for the firm foundation of Early English work. In 1862 Dr. Whitley Stokes edited for the Society *The Play of the Sacrament*; in 1864 Dr. Weymouth followed with his critical edition of the *Castel off Loue*; and in the latter year was founded the Early English Text Society, to carry on the publication of Early English Texts, which the Philological Society had so well begun, but, from want of funds, had been forced to abandon.

“Since that time the work at Early English, viewed philologically or linguistically, has been continued mainly in four directions:—I. the development of the characteristics of our early dialects; II. the clearing-up of the limits and ‘notes’ of the several periods of our language; III. its lexicography; IV. its pronunciation at different periods.

“I. *Dialectal Characteristics*.—As in his Preface to Hampole's *Pricke of Conscience* Dr. Richard Morris had, in 1863, gathered together the distinctive marks of the great Northern

dialect, so, in 1864, in his *Early English Alliterative Poems* (written perhaps about 1360 A.D., and edited from the unique MS. Cotton Nero A x.), he collected the characteristic signs of the Western division of that Midland dialect,¹ which afterwards became the groundwork of our standard English speech. In 1865 Dr. Morris edited, from the unique MS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, *The Story of Genesis and Exodus*, written about 1250 A.D. in the East-Midland dialect; and in his Preface to this work he shewed, not only what were the differences between the Eastern and Western divisions of the Midland dialect, but also those between the Southern and Northern parts of the East-Midland speech. He assigned the *Genesis and Exodus*² to the Southern section. By contrasting both Southern and Northern East-Midland forms and vocabulary with those of the Southern dialect, he was able to shew the large influence of Danish in the language of our Mid-Eastern counties.

“In 1866 Dr. Morris dealt with the third great division of our dialects, the Southern (in which he included the speech of the district formerly called Western), as shewn by the Kentish treatise of Dan Michel, of St. Austin’s, Canterbury, *The Ayenbite of Inwyrt*, 1340 A.D. As this was written in the South, just about the time that Richard Rolle of Hampole wrote his *Pricke of Conscience* in the North, Dr. Morris, in a long Grammatical Introduction to the *Ayenbite*, carefully contrasted the distinctive peculiarities of the Southern and Northern dialects,—a task to which he devoted 70 pages,—and then, after shortly noticing the lexicographical differences of the two dialects, gave, in pp. 72–85, full ‘Outlines of Kentish Grammar, A.D. 1327–40.’

“Dr. Morris’s results were soon summarized, and addi-

¹ An extract from the West-Midland version of the *Cursor Mundi* is printed in Dr. Morris’s “*Legends of the Holy Rood*,” 1871, pp. 108–161. In his First Series of *Old English Homilies*, “The Wooing of our Lord” contains West-Midland peculiarities which are discussed in the Preface.—F. J. F.

² The *Bestiary*, from the unique Arundel MS., re-edited by Dr. R. Morris

in his *Old English Miscellany*, 1872, belongs also to the Southern section of the East-Midland dialect, while the *Ormulum* belongs to the Northern. A fragment on p. 200 of this *Old English Miscellany* is like in dialect to the *Genesis and Exodus*; and a copy of the Moral Ode in Dr. Morris’s *Old English Homilies*, Series II., 1873, has East-Midland peculiarities.—F. J. F.

tional illustrations of his positions added, in a short treatise by Dr. Wm. T. P. Sturzenbecker, of Copenhagen, called 'Some Notes on the leading Grammatical Characteristics of the principal Early-English Dialects.' This was drawn up at the suggestion of Prof. George Stephens, the well-known Professor of English in the University of Copenhagen, of whom Dr. Sturzenbecker had been a pupil. But in 1867 Dr. Morris had the opportunity of summing-up his own results in the Grammatical Introduction to his 'Specimens of Early English, selected from the chief English Authors, A.D. 1250-1400,' in the Clarendon Press Series of School and College Class-books, which gave the English public for the first time in their history a general view of their early grammar and language, and introduced them to a number of authors and works they had hardly heard of before. On the edition becoming exhausted, Dr. Morris arranged to increase the book in size, and extend it upward to Anglo-Saxon times, so as to join on to Thorpe's *Analecta*. He therefore divided the work into two parts, and put the second into the Rev. W. W. Skeat's hands to re-edit. A second edition of this second part (which was itself a second edition) is now in the press; but the re-edited enlarged edition of Part I. has not yet appeared, though the text of it is all printed. In 1872 Dr. Morris made a further contribution to our knowledge of the early Southern dialect by his short sketch of the grammatical forms in five Old Kentish Sermons of the 13th century, which he edited from the unique MS. Laud 471, in his *Old English Miscellany*, 1872. He also pointed out the differences between the forms in these Sermons and those in the *Ayenbite* a hundred years later.

"A very valuable sketch of the Northern dialect as a whole, and its subsequent fortunes in Scotland, to which country it was, as a literary language, confined after the fifteenth century, is contained in Mr. J. A. H. Murray's Historical Introduction to his 'Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland,' forming Part II. of the Society's *Transactions* for 1870-2. The merits of Mr. Murray's thorough discussion and description of the South-Scotch

dialect, its history and present characteristics, are too well appreciated by our Members to need further confirmation by me. Dr. Kaufmann, in his *Inaugural Dissertation*¹ for his Doctor's degree last year, summarized and discussed the grammatical and phonetic characteristics of the language of the Scotch poet William Dunbar, who wrote in the beginning of the 16th century.

“II. *Linguistic Periods.*—The second part of Dr. Morris's great services to the knowledge of English historically was seen in 1867, when he produced his First Series of *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises* of the 12th and 13th centuries. In his Grammatical Introduction to this work he dealt with the specially transitional period of the formation of English inflexions, which Sir Frederic Madden had termed Semi-Saxon,² as being half-way between Anglo-Saxon and Early English. Dr. Morris showed that the language of the 12th century must be divided into two halves, in the former of which the older Anglo-Saxon forms prevailed, while in the latter the modern forms had the predominance; and that in the former the unsuspected and unobserved phenomenon appeared, of a number of different endings (five for the genitive only) struggling for ascendancy, till the language settled down into the comparative peace of the first version of Layamon's *Brut*, the early period of the victorious final *e*, which had been before supposed to represent the preceding fermenting period as well as its own.

“In 1872 Dr. Morris laid the results of his ten years' work before the public in a much condensed form, in his ‘Historical Outlines of English Accidence,’ which—with appendices based on the admirable work of our late Honorary Member, Dr. C. Friedrich Koch, ‘*Die Historische Grammatik der Englischen Sprache*,’ 1863-1869, and incorporating much of the excellent Grammars of Mätzner and Sachs and Fiedler—has far

¹ *Traité de la Langue du Poète Ecosais William Dunbar, précédé d'une Esquisse de sa Vie et de ses Poèmes, et d'une Choix de ses Poésies: par Johannes Kaufmann, Docteur en Philosophie à Elberfeld. Bonn, E. Weber, 1873.—F.J.F.*

² This name has been much ridiculed by a newspaper writer, whose knowledge of the details of English historically is ludicrously beneath what Sir Frederic's was.—F. J. F.

surpassed any work of like kind in English, and proved the superiority of the historical treatment over all others.¹ This book is to be followed by 'Historical Outlines of English Syntax'; and then I trust that Dr. Morris will enlarge his *Accidence* by a series of examples of every word and construction in each of our three dialects, somewhat after Burguy's manner in his *Grammaire de la Langue d'Oïl*.

"Mr. Murray's researches have likewise resulted in the establishment of distinct stages in the development of the Lowland Scotch, which he has designated the *Early*, the *Middle*, and the *Modern* periods respectively; the first of these ends about 1475, the second with the union of England and Scotland, and the disuse of the Scotch as a literary medium. Mr. Murray has pointed out numerous characteristics by which genuine specimens of the early period may be at once distinguished from those of the 16th century, and thus works which have been vaguely thrown together as 'Old Scots' satisfactorily arranged in chronological order. In many respects this is perhaps the most important result of his investigations.

"In the present year Dr. Morris has issued a Second Series of Old English Homilies, from the unique MS. in Trinity College, Cambridge, which he has shewn to have been copied by a scribe who adapted them to his own dialect,² that of the Southern division of the East Midland, so that these Homilies rank with the *Bestiary*, *Genesis and Exodus*, and *Havelok*.

"To the many other publications of the Early English Text Society, Mr. Skeat's excellent edition of the Four-Text St. Mark,³ etc., I do not allude, as they rather offer material for the philologist to deal with hereafter, than advance his knowledge now, save so far as they work out Dr. Morris's views. Still, in Mr. Skeat's Prefaces to his *Havelok*, *William of Palerne*, *Partenay*, and *Joseph of*

¹ Compare the latest Grammar by Dr. Wm. Smith and Mr. T. D. Hall, in which *muster* is given as an example of the feminine ending *ster*; and *kine* is called a contraction of *cow-en*!—F. J. F.

² The original version of these

Homilies was in the Southern or West-Saxon dialect.—F. J. F.

³ The latest of these Texts, the Hatton MS. 38, illustrates the same period as the First Series of *Old English Homilies*.—F. J. F.

Arimathie, will be found very valuable independent discussions of the dialectal and grammatical peculiarities of these several Texts, while in his Preface to Text B of 'William's Vision of Piers the Plowman,' Mr. Skeat has shewn how widely the practice of his author and the best scribes of the B Text, in their treatment of the final *e* of the perfect tense, etc., differs from the accepted theories on this subject. Mr. Henry Sweet's important essay on the characteristics of the Anglo-Saxon of Alfred's time, Prof. March's Anglo-Saxon Grammar, etc., belong to the subjects deferred.

"III. *Dictionaries*.—The admirably full Glossaries of the late Sir Frederic Madden to *Havelok*, *William and the Were-wolf*, *Sir Gawayne*, *Layamon*, the *Wicliffite Versions of the Bible*, etc., together with those of Dr. Morris, Mr. Skeat, Mr. Brock, and other Early-English-Text-Society editors, offered a capital foundation for any scholar to build up a Dictionary on. The first¹ to raise such a structure was Dr. F. H. Stratmann, of Krefeld, the second edition of whose '*Dictionary of the Old English Language*, compiled from writings of the XII, XIII, XIV, and XV centuries,' 1871-3, is just completed. So far as the Vocabulary goes, the book is admirably trustworthy and careful; but unluckily Dr. Stratmann did not conceive that his duty was to register *all* the words found in our printed texts from MSS. of the dates assigned in his title: and I believe that his book must be at least trebled in bulk (or number of entries), before it can supply the student with all he requires in a real Early-English Dictionary. Dr. Stratmann is now hard at work on a Supplement to his excellent book, so that the defect I have pointed out is in course of being remedied. Of Dr. E. Mätzner's Early-English Dictionary only the first part has yet appeared. It

¹ Our friend Herbert Coleridge's '*Glossarial Index to the printed English Literature of the Thirteenth Century*,' Trübner & Co. 1859, led the way; but it was confined to the half century 1250-1300 A.D. Mr. Way's profusely annotated and excellently edited *Promptorium*, and Mr. Thomas Wright's *Volume of Vocabularies* for

Mr. Joseph Mayer, are universally known as most valuable contributions to Early English Lexicography. Mr. Wright's second volume of *Vocabularies* from the 10th to the 15th century is just ready. Ultimately the two are to be amalgamated, and sold to the general public.—F. J. F.

unfortunately has a misleading title: '*Altenglische Sprachproben, nebst einem Wörterbuche. Zweiter Band: Wörterbuch. Erste Lieferung.*' This has led many people to suppose that it is only a dictionary to the words in the editor's excellent *Altenglische Sprachproben*, or Specimens of Early English (Part I. in verse, Part II. in prose, the only desideratum in which is, that the texts should have been compared with their MSS.). But such is not the case. The *Wörterbuch* covers the whole range of Early English, and is refreshingly full in vocabulary and quotations, with careful distinctions of the shades of meaning in the uses of every word—a point in which Dr. Stratmann's work is defective. The only fault that I see in Dr. Mätzner's book is, that the quotations are not arranged in either strictly chronological or dialectal order, so that the student gets confused as to the history and locality of the forms of a word; and the only drawback I know to an Englishman's use of the book is, that the meanings of the early words are given in German only, instead of both German and English. But it is very gratifying to us Englishmen to see how soon, and how zealously, our Teutonic brethren have come forward to share our work at our own branch of the common tongue. If only we can persuade our German kin to abstain from "re-writing" all Early English texts, and turning them, full of the variations of individuality and nature, into monstrosities of uniformity, impossibilities of systematic spelling and form, we shall have nothing but cause to rejoice at the help of the grand German legion of learning whose fame fills the world.

"To general English Lexicography many important contributions have of late years been made. The first edition of Mr. Hensleigh Wedgwood's *English Etymology* was followed by Eduard Mueller's excellent etymological English Dictionary, Köthen, 1865-7. This, by the revised edition of Webster, to which Dr. E. Mahn, of Berlin, contributed the etymologies—a wonderful improvement on the author's, making the new Webster the most generally useful Dictionary that I have come across. This again, by Mr. Wedgwood's second and thoroughly revised and enlarged edition

of his '*Dictionary of English Etymology*,' a book which, notwithstanding occasional weaknesses,—through departing from the historical method that it generally pursues,—is yet full of suggestiveness, of research, and happy insight, and points always to the discovery of those answers which the philologist longs to find, for his questions to every root, 'Where did you spring from? What did you first mean? Tell me for help to know the history of mind and man.' Dr. Latham's new edition of Todd's *Johnson* scarcely calls for notice here, as hardly any Early English was added to it, and its etymology is miserably meagre; but its enlarged vocabulary and additional quotations (though these are not always arranged chronologically) are points in its favour. The small dictionaries of Mr. Donald for Messrs. Chambers, and Mr. Stormonth for Messrs. Blackwood, are, on the whole, creditable performances.

"In special English Lexicography, the most noteworthy books are Mr. J. C. Atkinson's *Glossary of the Cleveland Dialect*, 1868; those in our Society's *Transactions*—Mr. Barnes's *Grammar and Glossary of the Dorset Dialect*, 1864; Mr. Gregor's *Dialect of Banffshire and Glossary of Words not in Jamieson's Dictionary*, 1866; Mr. Edmonston's *Glossary of the Shetland Dialect*, 1866; Mr. Peacock's *Glossary of the Lonsdale Dialect*, 1867. The '*Etymological and Comparative Glossary of the Dialect of East Anglia*,' by John Greaves Hall (London, 1866), I have not seen.¹

"IV. *Pronunciation*.—Mr. Richard Grant White made an elaborate attempt to ascertain Elizabethan pronunciation by means of rhymes, puns, and misspellings, in 1861,² and

¹ The Manchester Literary Club have printed and circulated, for comments and additions, sheets of the A, B, and C words of the collections for their "*Glossary of the Lancashire Folk-Speech*"; and state that having, "since the issue of the B sheets, received from Mr. James Pearson, of Milnrow, a manuscript list of dialectal words current in the Fylde of Lancashire, the Club Committee intend in future lists, as in the C sheets, to mark those words which are believed to be

peculiar to the Fylde, Furness, Lonsdale, and other districts, leaving it to be understood that the words not specially so denoted are current either in South and East Lancashire or generally throughout the county."—F. J. F. Arrangements have been made for placing copies of this Glossary in the hands of members of the English Dialect Society, mentioned on p. 47.—A. J. E.

² A full abstract of Mr. Grant White's appendix to vol. 12 of his

Messrs. Noyes and Peirce applied the works of the 16th century orthoepists to the same purpose in 1864; although, unfortunately, these two writers were not acquainted with the best of them, Salesbury.¹ But a connected history of the pronunciation of English had never been attempted—probably never thought of—until our present President, Mr. Ellis, took it up, and in 1867 produced the First Part of his ‘Early English Pronunciation, with Especial Reference to Shakspeare and Chaucer,’ followed in 1869 by Part II., and in 1871 by Part III., while it is confidently anticipated that Part IV., completing the work, will appear early in 1874.² Considering that Mr. Ellis has to read this Report himself, I will confine myself to saying that I rejoice that our Society has been the means of producing it. These phonetic investigations have been worthily supplemented by Mr. J. A. H. Murray’s treatise, lately issued by our Society, on the Dialect of the Southern Counties of Scotland.”

You will have doubtless noticed one curious omission in Mr. Furnivall’s contribution. The American abolitionist, Garrison, is reported to have said, that he had so much to do in saving the bodies of the slaves that he had no time to think of his own soul. Mr. Furnivall has been so much occupied in recording the work done by others that he has had no time to think of the mainspring, his own unceasing labours in setting others to work, and in setting others the example of how to work, on Early English. The extra volumes of our Society are mainly due to his suggestion, and have been produced under his stimulus. The Early English Text, the Chaucer, and the Ballad Societies are really his creations, and live by his life. I omit to notice his editions

edition of Shakspeare, containing these researches, is given in my *Early English Pronunciation*, pp. 966–973.—A. J. E.

¹ In the *North Amer. Rev.*, April, 1864, pp. 342–369. All the authorities cited by them are mentioned in my *E. Pron.*, p. 917, note, and all their results are given in the footnotes to pp. 975–980 of the same work.—A. J. E.

² The state of the work is as follows. Part IV. will consist of four chapters and the indexes. The two first of these

will be sent for press on 1 June. The third will probably be completed in MS. by the end of June. One of the most laborious sections of the last is complete in draft. How long the indexes will take it is impossible to say, but I hope, if the many adverse circumstances which I am obliged to allow for as possible, are good enough to permit me, to have the *text* printed by 1 Sept., and if so the fourth part *ought* to be ready before our next Anniversary.—A. J. E.

of Robert of Brunne, the Babees Book, and other minor works, to draw especial attention to his great contribution to accurate English philology, the magnificent Six-Text Edition of Chaucer, still in progress, which I regard as entirely his own in conception and execution. Mr. Furnivall has in this work inaugurated a new era in philology. No one will henceforth be satisfied with collations of important works. An editor may patch up a text to shew his own particular views, and defend them in elaborate comments. But students, who wish to know what the works are like, will now require the lively counterfeits of their oldest existent forms placed side by side for actual comparison one with another and each part with its whole; not a mosaic presentment of disaccordant patches. This is what Mr. Furnivall has done for our first English poet, mostly with his own hand, entirely by his own thought, and no notice of Early English philology read from this Chair can be complete without fitting mention of this great philological work accomplished by our own Honorary Secretary.

Mr. Skeat, whose admiration for the English language is certainly not founded on ignorance, for few have examined its documents more minutely, has supplemented Mr. Furnivall's sketch by the following plea for the due position of English scholarship:—

“The careful and acute researches of Dr. Morris with respect to questions of dialect well illustrate the new method which has arisen of regarding our old literature, not as a compilation of unintelligible monstrosities of forms, but as representing modes of speech which were actually in the mouths of men in the olden times. Yet this is only one side of the matter. Equally careful work has been expended upon questions of etymology, both by Dr. Morris and by other editors. Perhaps few have contributed so much to forming habits of strict scholarly accuracy as the late Sir Frederic Madden. He clearly regarded our English speech as worthy of the same kind of exact critical study—both in kind and degree—as it has generally been the English habit to reserve for the study of the “classical languages” only.

This principle has been conscientiously followed out by most of the editors for the Early English Text Society, with the hope that wild etymological speculations and guess-work derivations that set at defiance all known laws of language may soon become things of the past. The due recognition of this important principle, now that it has once been permitted to see the light, must never more be lost sight of. It is not for us to make premature guesses, but patiently to investigate. Our own tongue yields to none other in copiousness, in versatility, in many-sidedness; and there is no reason why English scholarship should not be as critical, as exact, as minute, and in every way as sound as any other. It is just because our English editors have at last begun both to perceive this and to act upon it, that the Glossaries to our texts have also begun to have a solid value, very different from that of those in some old editions wherein the editor frequently refrained from indicating by references to what passages his explanation referred; in order, we may suppose, that the reader might not so easily be enabled to catalogue, and in some cases to rectify, his blunders."

Finally, English takes a prominent place in the Proceedings of the American Philological Association. In those for 1871, there is an important paper by the late Prof. James Hadley, of Yale College, Connecticut, U.S., on "English Vowel Quantity in the Thirteenth Century and the Nineteenth," and another by Prof. Francis A. March, of Easton, Pennsylvania, on "Anglo-Saxon and Early English Pronunciation." In those for 1872, Prof. Hadley, who was then a Vice-President, read a paper on "The Byzantine Pronunciation of Greek in the Tenth Century, as illustrated by a Manuscript in the Bodleian Library," which I had adduced as collateral evidence of Anglo-Saxon Pronunciation (*Early English Pronunciation*, pp. 516-527). This was Professor Hadley's last paper. Prof. Whitney, of Yale College, in sending me a copy of it, says: "You will see what a loss English studies, as well as classical and comparative philology, have suffered by his death. No more painful and disabling blow, certainly, could have fallen on our com-

munity of American scholars." To Prof. Hadley we owe, according to Prof. Whitney, "a clear and succinct view of the history and connections of English Speech, prefixed to the latest edition of Webster's Dictionary,"¹ and I must record my personal obligations to him for an appreciative and discriminating review of the first two parts of my *Early English Pronunciation* in the *North American Review* (April 1870, pp. 420-437). English philology can ill spare so able a worker in her vineyard. Among other papers read before this American Philological Association in 1871, I notice Dr. Fitz Edward Hall on "the imperfect tenses of the passive voice in English," presented by Prof. Whitney, notes on my *Early English Pronunciation* by Mr. Bristed, and Mr. Trumbull on "a mode of counting, said to have been used by the Wawenoc Indians of Maine," which is my Yorkshire Sheep-scoring, already referred to. In the session for 1872, we have Mr. Bristed on "erroneous and doubtful uses of the word *such*," Mr. W. Worthington Fowler on "the derivation of English monosyllabic personal surnames," Mr. Trumbull on "English words derived from Indian languages of North America." Prof. March inquires: "Is there an Anglo-Saxon Language?" and follows this up by a paper on "some irregular verbs in Anglo-Saxon," shewing that he had no doubt on his own mind. Finally Prof. S. S. Haldeman read a paper on "Some Points of English Pronunciation and Spelling."

ENGLISH DIALECTS.

In connection with English studies, I am delighted to have it in my power to announce that the Rev. W. W. Skeat, a Member of our Council, to whom our own and the Early English Text Society are so deeply indebted for long, laborious, and accurate work, has started, and with his usual promptitude and vigour actually set on foot, an English Dialect Society. Many of you are aware that I mooted this question in the introduction to the Third Part of my

¹ "Language and the Study of Language," 1867, p. 211. See also the last two lectures of this work with reference to Prof. Max Müller's theories, *infra* p. 49.

Early English Pronunciation. But I have never felt vigorous enough to carry it out. It is to me a matter of faith that we cannot at all properly understand varied Early English—which consists solely of dialects—without understanding the varied English of to-day, whether in phonetical or grammatical construction, and I have long felt that time is running distressingly short. Intercommunication is drawing a wet sponge over the living records of our nascent tongue. The intentions of the English Dialect Society started by Mr. Skeat are—1) to bring together those interested in Provincial English, that is, every one interested in the history of our language, 2) to combine the labours of collectors by providing a common centre and means of record, 3) to publish, subject to proper revision, MS. collections of words, and 4) to supply information to collectors. One of the first labours of the Society will be to form a complete catalogue of all existing works on the subject, and I am greatly pleased to announce that Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte has agreed to allow his private collection of nearly 700 works—from little pamphlets to large books—in, on, and about the English dialects, to be catalogued for the use of this Society. I am sure that merely to mention the launching of such a scheme under such guidance, is to recommend it to every Member of our own Society, and I hope that there will not only be a general cry of good speed! but an early and general promise of co-operation.¹

ORIGIN OF LANGUAGE.

In my last year's address considerations of the relations of thought to sound as the pivot of philological research, naturally brought me face to face with some of the theories of the origin of language, as the *poooh poooh!* *bow wow!* and *ding*

¹ The *Treasurer* is the Rev. J. W. Cartmell, Christ's College, Cambridge; the *Subscription*, half a guinea only; *Bankers*, J. Mortlock & Co., Cambridge, whose London correspondents are Messrs. Smith, Payne, & Smith, 1, Lombard Street; *Hon. Secretary*,

Rev. W. W. Skeat, 1, Cintra Terrace, Cambridge, to whom all communications on dialects are to be addressed, and who will supply printed rules of directions for collecting and recording words. *Early adhesions are of great importance.*

dong! together with the notion of roots. In this country Prof. Max Müller has long been favourably and popularly known as the defender of radicularianism, or the hypothesis of roots. He has just completed a course of lectures at the Royal Institution (22 and 29 March, and 5 April, 1873), on what he termed "Mr. Darwin's Philosophy of Language," but which, after hearing, I think should have been entitled:—"the Annihilation of Mr. Darwin's theory of evolution, by Prof. Max Müller's philosophy of language." The object of the lectures was indeed to shew that language, as conceived by Prof. Max Müller, formed an impassable barrier between the ape and man. "No animal speaks," said the lecturer, quoting with serious approval Schleicher's joke, "if a pig were to say to me, I am a pig, he would thereby cease to be a pig." In which case, perhaps, a logician might doubt whether it was a pig before it spoke. But in order to arrive at this result, Prof. Max Müller had to separate language into two domains, emotional and rational. The first he admitted to be common to man and animal. The second he considered the appanage of man. But this rational language he made to consist in using phonetic forms to represent general concepts. These general concepts were asserted to be in fact the peculiarity of man. The Professor seems to consider that they are obtained *à priori*. "You cannot say, this is green, unless you have first the idea of green," were the words he used. In this case I fear that when I, for one, say "this is green," I speak like a parrot. I own not to having "the idea of green," not even to guessing what it is. I know of course the disputes about primary colours, whether green is simple or mixed, primary or secondary. I know grass green, pea green, sea green, arsenical green. When I bought penny colours as a child I knew bice green, chrome green, sap green. When I mixed prussian blue and gamboge I made blue greens and yellow greens. I have since learned to recognize red greens, brown greens, purple greens, neutral greens; in fact, a whole bunch of greens. But I have no "idea of green," that is, of "green absolutely," nothing separable from light passing into and being reflected

from a definite absorber, or passing through a definite refracting medium with a definite angle of incidence, or from a mixture, natural or artificial, of several such beams. And when I look upon all these greens I see that the name has passed from one to another by a process of joint consimilation and differentiation, all entirely *à posteriori*, nothing at all *à priori*. And I have had several friends who, through colour-blindness, saw resemblances where I saw differences, and put among the greens what I put among the reds, and conversely. So having no general concept of green, I doubt whether I have a general concept of anything else. And then I come to think, whether upon Prof. Max Müller's theory, the people who class me among men may not be committing a mistake entirely similar to that of my colour-blind friends, whether in fact I am not a gorilla myself, or at most the missing link. Seriously, these questions are not, so far as I can see, to be solved *à priori*. Animals, to my mind, have concepts, with quite as much a right to be termed general as any which I possess myself, the difference being one of degree. As to the impossibility of speechless animals ever becoming speaking men, I feel that this is a mere postulate. The embryonic man passes through foetal stages of lower animalism.¹ The born man passes from

¹ See, M. Serres, *Principes d'Embryogénie, de Zoogénie et de Tératogénie*, forming vol. 25 of the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de l'Institut Impérial de France*, 1860, 4to. pp. 942, with 25 plates. On p. 380 we find: "S'il est curieux de voir, comme nous venons de l'indiquer, l'anatomie comparée reproduire l'embryogénie humaine, combien n'est-il pas plus important de voir celle-ci répéter à son tour, sur d'autres points, l'organisation des animaux! Quoi de plus remarquable et de moins remarqué, avant nos travaux, que ce singulier prolongement caudal que présente l'embryon de l'homme de la cinquième à la sixième et septième semaine? Si un caractère saillant distingue l'homme des mammifères et des quadrumanes, c'est assurément l'absence du prolongement caudal. Or voici que l'embryon nous reproduit ce prolongement, nous

décélant, pour ainsi dire, par un signe tout extérieur, les resemblances qui le lient plus profondément à la chaîne des êtres dont il constitue le dernier anneau. Ce caractère présente même cette particularité véritablement saisissante, que c'est lors de sa manifestation et pendant sa durée que se reproduisent les répétitions organiques de l'anatomie comparée. . . . c'est alors enfin que l'encéphale humain se déguise sous les formes dévolues aux poissons, aux reptiles et aux oiseaux. Et ce qui complète la chose, c'est que ce prolongement caudal n'a qu'une existence éphémère, comme toutes les resemblances organiques de l'embryon, il disparaît dans le cours du troisième mois; et c'est aussi à partir de cet instant que l'homme, laissant derrière lui tous les êtres organisés, s'avance à grands pas vers le type d'organisation qui le constitue dans sa vie extérieure."

speechlessness to speech—provided he can hear, and with Prof. Whitney I put in a plea for the deaf and dumb. The rapidity with which the born man, his transitional stages passed, develops into a speaking animal under favourable circumstances of audition and environment, is what the evolutionary hypothesis would lead us to anticipate. But, with all that, he is usually twelve months dumb, less amenable to command at first than most adult dogs. Then in another twelve months he slowly acquires extremely concrete or particular concepts. The general concepts, under favourable circumstances, grow rapidly, but in twenty years they are seldom very distinct or numerous. After forty years he begins to clarify them. At sixty, which I am fast approaching, he ceases to be surprised at their paucity, but rather wonders at their mere existence, and sometimes doubts that. Yet he has then conversed, according to the usual acceptance of the term, for half a century. The belief in a necessity of general concepts for the formation of roots, and thence of language (itself to be considered as connate with thought, so that all four, general concepts, roots, language, and thought, are but phases of one act, which is the theory I understand Prof. Max Müller to maintain), seems to me dissipated by the mere history of talking man.

Space does not allow me to treat such a subject with the necessary detail or necessary seriousness. I mention it, as one of the most recent statements put forth by a well-known philologist. But I conceive such questions to be out of the field of philology proper. We have to investigate what *is*, we have to discover, if possible, the invariable unconditional relations under which language, *as we observe it*, forms, develops, changes, or at least to construct an empirical statement of definite linguistic relations, and ascertain how far that statement obtains in individual cases. Real language, the go-between of man and man, is a totally different organism from philosophical language, the misty ill-understood exponent of sharp metaphysical distinctions. Our work is with the former. We shall do more by tracing the historical growth of one single work-a-day tongue, than by filling

waste-paper baskets with reams of paper covered with speculations on the origin of all tongues. What enormous work is wanted for the historical investigation of one single branch of philology is shewn by the labours of Grimm and his compatriots in Germany, supplemented by the existing investigations of Early English explorers. What still greater work is required for the comparison of a single family of related languages, is shewn by the work which Bopp initiated and Pott is unweariedly carrying on for Aryanism. The danger is that we should shut ourselves up in one little "clearing," and not see the primeval forest in which we work for the fine trees that immediately surround us. Societies like ours are intended to obviate this defect, and addresses like the present are meant in some small degree to focus inquiry, that we may better see one in all and all in one. I regret much that the work has not fallen at first into abler hands, but I would raise up my own feeble voice, which I feel acutely to be the voice of an outsider in philology, to beg philologists to relegate these philosophical questions on origins to a period when more is known of actualities and development, and to work, with "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether," to make the real living organism intelligible, and to track its growth day by day as it can now be watched, in order to understand not only how it has reached its present state from anterior conditions traceable in existing monuments and documents, but how its present state will hereafter change, whether such changes have or have not conduced to the improvement of language as the expression of thought, and what connection there is between the development of man, and the chief instrument by which it can be recorded. When I think of what all this implies, I may well repeat the Horatian invocation, recalling the Queen of Fair Speech from the heaven of speculation to the earth of investigation, from the trump divine to the pipe human, and proclaiming the comparative endlessness of the task before her—

"Dēscende caelō, et dīe, age, tibiā
Rēgīna LONGUM, Calliopē, melos."