Philology.


Everyone who is interested either in the advancement of learning or in the part to be taken in that work by the great Universities will welcome this publication. It is very much on the plan of the Cambridge Journal of Philology, except that the contributors are all members of a single foundation. The type and paper are of the same handsome character: the outside cover is in a simpler and more pleasing style. We trust that the support of a periodical of this kind will soon become one of the recognized tasks of a seat of learning, and a task none the less imperative because not prescribed by the statutes. It is desirable as a means of encouraging a kind of work which is not immediately available for teaching purposes; and it serves as a channel by which the instructed public opinion of the University may be brought to bear upon the wider body of public opinion outside.

The fifteen papers in the present volume will bear favourable comparison with those of any similar foreign periodical. They are very various in subject as well as in length and manner of treatment. Taking the three heads mentioned in the title, most of the papers would fall under the head of "Literature:" only two belong strictly to "Philosophy," and two to "Science."

The first and longest article consists of "Strictures on Mr. Luard's Edition of a French Poem on the Life of Edward the Confessor," by Dr. Atkinson, the professor of Sanscrit. The strictures are of the severest character. Experts must decide whether the general language employed in condemnation of Mr. Luard's edition is justified or not. So much is clear, that Dr. Atkinson in his review makes a large number of just observations, pointing out a satisfactory meaning in many cases where Mr. Luard had failed to do so, or restoring a sound text where Mr. Luard's was corrupt. It is obviously a different question what degree of ignorance, carelessness, or want of ability this implies on Mr. Luard's part, and it is a question to which the attention of the Master of the Rolls is imperatively called by Dr. Atkinson's paper.

Dr. Salmon's paper on "The Chronology of Hippolytus" is an example of the combination of historical with mathematical study such as it would be difficult to match. Apart from the intrinsic value of the subject, it was worth while to show by a brilliant example how much may sometimes be gained by preserving the unity of knowledge: or rather (since it is impossible to combine all knowledge) by refusing to fall in with the deep grooves to which modern specialists are so apt to confine themselves.

The twenty-five pages which Mr. Davies contributes "On the meaning of certain Homeric words" are not without interest, but are written in a discursive and facetious strain to which we rather grudge the excellent type and paper thus consigned to the chief if not the only word discussed, δακτρία, "eater of barley meal:" the point being that baking was unknown in the times described by Homer. This curious conclusion is made highly probable—to say the least—by Mr. Davies.

Mr. Palmer's article "On Palmy's Propertius" is directed especially to show that the corruption of the text of Propertius has been underrated. The emendations proposed are thoroughly well considered, and often very skillful. But it is impossible to give a fair account of them by the ever ready Herculean method. The same may be said of Mr. Tyrrell's article "On the Letters of Cicero to Atticus," in which there are several excellent emendations and, what is often better, notes showing that previous emendations were unnecessary.

Of the shorter papers we would call especial attention to No. xi, three notes by Mr. Mahaffy on Aristoph. Eq. 258-265, Eur. Med. 68, and Tac. Ann. xi. 29. In each of these places the reader has the sense of a definite and indisputable gain to knowledge.

It is perhaps hardly fair to dismiss so considerable a volume as this in these brief and general terms; but it seemed better to give some account of its character and purpose without excluding the alternative course of dealing with particular articles more at length hereafter. Such a separate examination may be more satisfactory to the students of particular subjects, and will certainly not diminish the favourable impression produced by the book as a whole, especially by the combination of a high scientific standard with a certain vigour and fertility characteristic, perhaps, of the nation to which the writers belong.

D. B. MONRO.

UNEXPLORED SYRIA.

To the Editor of the Academy.

Vienna, May 6th, 1873.

SIR,—Perhaps you will kindly allow space for a few lines upon the subject of the valuable and appreciative review in the columns of the Academy (March 15th, 1873).

Professor Th. Nödeke's dogmatic criticism is truly a benefit to his author, and contrasts favourably with the aesthetic compound which passes as a review in England, and which we are so often dolefully to swallow. It justifies the motto "Inter silvas Academi," &c. But there are certain details in the review which the reviewer will, I am sure, be pleased to see reviewed, and which may, moreover, perhaps interest a certain portion of the public.

One is surprised to see a learned Orientalist with so little practical knowledge of El Islam as to write as follows: "It might at the outset be questionable to entrust a man with the care of English interests in Syria, of whom it could not remain a secret that he had committed terrible offences in the eyes of a Muslim of having made the pilgrimage to Mecca as a Christian."

Firstly I went to Mecca not as a Christian, but as a Moslem. Secondly the popular Moslem idea of one who has circumambulated the House of Allah, who has bowed before the tomb of the Prophet, and who has prayed in the presence of the Saints, is simply that, however Giosu-like be his after-life, the heart cannot but have been touched, and the conscience will not fail to speak. The perfume of such sanctity, to use their own phrase, must still dwell in the sensorium of the pilgrim's soul, and its influence must, sooner or later, lead him into the path which is straight. And permit me to state, contrary to the usual opinion, that no religious in whom I am acquainted are more tolerant than the Ulama, the really learned Moslem divines. When the Amir Abd el Kadir, who now lives a priestly life, heard of my visit to El Hejas, his only remark was, "If he has done so, is the Holy Land in any way the worse?" He honoured me with his friendship, and our intimacy lasted till I left the country.

The truth is that Damascus was looked upon as a desirable post, as a kind of promotion, being political and not commercial. My ability to hold it was misrepresented accordingly. Looked upon as a prospective victim to Arab fanaticism, I had much trouble in explaining the true
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The state of the case to those in office. I represented that my difficulty would be the reverse of what was published, that the Moslems, not the Christians, would expect to be the favoured party at the British Consulate, and that, though it would be easy to do justice, it would not be easy to avoid exciting jealousies. So indeed it proved. The Moslems had no feeling against me. This was shown by the visits of the chief divines from the great Amawī mosque, where my wife was admitted at the prayer-hours, and where after my sudden recall a public "function" was held for my return. The Christians also, after a time, learned to believe in my impartiality, as a number of documents in my possession may prove.

M. Nöldeke offers a suggestive idea in the following lines: "The only question that remains is, how to explain the wide prevalence of such a view" (namely, the notion of gigantic stature among primitive nations) "on psychological grounds." This is hardly the place to attack a subject of such importance. But I may briefly record my impression that physical size, being everywhere associated in man's young mind with the force, the greatness, and the majesty which lead to respect and veneration of the chief and the king, the forefathers of all races became material giants to their posterity. Thus Adam's head touched the lowest heaven, and, to mention no others, Moses was a Titan. Hence also the almost universal symbol of horns.

M. Nöldeke is kind enough to regret that I have not spoken at greater length about the modern inhabitants of Syria. His highly interesting subject has been reserved for a future work, "Personal Experiences in Palestine and the Holy Land." I am delaying it purposely, in order to write with temper and calmness upon a subject which for me still has no small share of excitement. The same must be said about the results of Protestant and Catholic missions in the Near East. And I shall certainly not recommend the substitution of any "native Government" for the Turkish: with M. Nöldeke my trust is in a more energetic policy on the part of England, and in a Ephraites Valley Railway that will create material and commercial interests for her and will form a base line upon which her beneficial influence can be massed. Foreigners, reading the ignorant trash talked in the House of Commons, and seeing the front of brass with which the Metopotamian Valley is declared "never to have been civilized," must despair of seeing the latter measure carried out. Not so the Englishman. We have waited patiently since 1834, and still we are strong to wait. The next Indian mutiny shall end our long waiting and the policy which will have caused it.

I am perfectly aware that Arabic, modern and colloquial, and even classical and medieval, is far from sufficient for interpreting proper names in Palestine, and that Syria, especially the Libauns, still preserves many derived from Aramaic and other Semitic dialects. But I have always tried to supplement my "linguistic failings"—which ought to have been specified by M. Nöldeke—by consulting the best living authorities, and I have generally recorded the philological explanations of these experts. At Damascus I was assisted by the well-known scholar Dr. Meshaka, and, not to mention a host of others, by the Syro-Catholic bishop, Matrân Ya'akkîb. Amongst the Druses I consulted the highest "akkâlâ" (illuminati), and in the interior I never failed to apply for interpretation to the Bedawin. The peasantry's tradition, we see, confirms that of the learned geographer Yâkût. If M. Nöldeke will kindly point out a few "failings," in a definite and not in a general way, I will tell him whether they are my work or that of my friends. If I have over-estimated Ancient Faiths embodied in Ancient Names, it was with the specific object of drawing attention to a work which has been unduly neglected by our public, and which even the reviewer characterises as "well-intentioned." There are certain moans in English feeling which are not understood and which cannot be understood out of England.

About the Hamah stones I am happily able to differ to some extent from M. Nöldeke, who asserts far too hastily that "there is not the remotest chance of our being able to decipher the entirely unknown characters in which they are written." By the kindness of Ritter A. von Kremmer a copy was sent to M. Reinsch, the highly distinguished Egyptologist and Oriental Professor at the University of Vienna. This gentleman has informed me personally and by letter that, though he cannot find, with the Reverend Dunbar I. Heath, the cartouches of Thothmes and Amenophis, the form is undoubtedly alphabetic, and that he does not doubt the deciphering the legends. He has been in the position to finish his present work (Der einheitliche Ursprung der Sprachen der alten Welt) and to collect the latest additions to the alphabet. The Rev. Mr. Heath, speaking of the Moab door-post, assures us (Journal of the Anthropological Institute, January, 1873, page 33) that out of nineteen distinct characters he has found no less than five identical with five out of the forty-five Hamath characters.

With respect to the Oriental and other inscriptions appended to Unexplorèd Syria, I cannot here enter into the lengthy explanations which would perhaps modify M. Nöldeke's judgment; and my friend Mr. Vaux, who kindly lent a few hours of his valuable time, may be left to vindicate his "thoroughly unsatisfactory work." Happily I have preserved all the original transcripts made by Mr. C. F. Tylwyth-Drake and myself: if M. Nöldeke will favour me with his address I shall be happy to let him inspect them.

Upon the part of the Mesha Stele the author and the reviewer will probably keep their own opinions. I find the Moabite inscription to read like history, and the Book of Kings to represent the romance of history. Let the reader judge for himself whether the discrepancies be few or many and momentous—he can decide as well as either of us. But M. Nöldeke certainly understates the matter and the importance of that majority which in England is guided or rather is governed by purely "dogmatic considerations." Otherwise he would hardly have asked, "What is the good of repeating the tracts of the Abbé Richard against the high antiquity of the human race?" The Abbé's theories are at this moment being supplemented by M. F. Chabas, Lord Arundell of Wardour's Traditions principally with reference to Mythology and the Laws of Nations, in which extensive reading and candid sincerity combine to vindicate the "historical account of the human race," may prove that however settled the question may be considered in Germany, many Englishmen still hold it to be sub judice. I for one am happy to see such books, as they teach us where to stopper toujours ou stopper fort. But again we must not expect the Saxon to legislate for the so-called Anglo-Saxon.

In conclusion I would once more offer my best thanks to M. Nöldeke for his valuable review, and assure him that I shall look forward to deriving instruction from his pen when he notices my next work on Syria and Palestine.

RICHARD F. BURTON.

[We have pleasure in inserting this reclamation, and could wish that all statements of the kind were expressed in as conciliatory a tone. It is however obviously impossible for us to invite Captain Burton and his reviewer to a discussion of points of Semitic philology in our limited space.—Ed.]

Intelligence.

The first fascicule of a new periodical, called Mélanges d'archéologie Égyptiennes et Assyriennes, has been published at Paris. It will be for France what Lepsius's Zeitschrift für Assyrischer Sprache is for Germany, with the advantage of being larger in size and of placing cuneiform discovery on an equal footing with Egyptology. De Rouge was intended to be the chief editor; and the Introduction, as well as the preface of a course of lectures on the monuments of Karnak by this lamented scholar, will be read with great interest. Perhaps we might disagree with some of the geographical identifications put forward; but Egyptian students have always been daring in this matter. Another valuable paper on certain monuments of the reign of Taharqa is also contributed by the late Vicoire. There are besides a good essay on the name and use of iron and leadstone in ancient Egypt by Devéria, and a monograph on a Greek inscription from Memphis by E. Miller and Mariette-Bey. Two Assyrian papers come from Oppert and Lenormant. The first describes a cuneiform inscription which the writer has found in the Museum of Zürich, and which he shows to be dated in the reign of the Parthian king Pacorus, the contemporary of Domitian. This conclusion is confirmed by Smith's recent discovery of other tablets of the Parthian period, which bring down the use of the cuneiform characters to a comparatively late era. The translation of a curious Persian cylinder legend is added. Lenormant's contribution is a part of the text which gives the