

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1855.

No. IV.

Samuel Taylor

ARTICLE I.—*The Works of Thomas Reid, D. D.* Preface, Notes, and Supplementary Dissertations. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Edinburgh: 1846.

Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform. By Sir William Hamilton, Bart. Second Edition, enlarged. London: 1853.

THOUGH of Lord Bacon it was said, by his friend Dr. Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, "he writes philosophy like a Lord Chancellor," it must be admitted, Sir William Hamilton writes it like a philosopher. For he both thinks and writes, more like a pure intelligence, than any man in the history of speculation. In the first place, his diction is the most concise, the most accurate, the most direct, the most compact, and the most vigorous ever used by any writer on philosophy. Familiar with all systems of philosophy ever proposed, and their criticisms expository, supplementary and adverse, and a master of the languages, in which both the philosophies and the criticisms have been written; he has discovered how much of their errors can be ascribed to the deficiencies of language, both as an instrument and as a vehicle of philosophical thought; and he has, accordingly, formed a language for

and their husbands. These are bastinadoed and go over in great numbers to Islamism. The English consul-general has interceded for them anew, which will only render their condition still worse.

The condition of the Armenian church is on the whole far more satisfactory. Under the wise conduct of their patriarch, Gabriel, both their internal and external affairs are well managed. According to the account given by the patriarch, an asylum was granted to the Armenians in Egypt and Arabia, in the second year of the flight of Mohammed, when they emigrated from their country in the great revolutions which broke out in Persia. They too made with Mohammed and his immediate successors two contracts, whose originals are in possession of the Armenian patriarch in Russia, and copies of which the patriarch showed me. They are two long rolls written cross-wise. Between the lines of the black Arabic text is a Turkish interlinear translation written in red ink. The copy of the contract between the prophet and the Armenians bears at the beginning the impression of the hand of Mohammed, the known seal of the founder of Islamism.

M. H. J. reev.

ART. VII.—*Comparative Accentual System, with a succinct exhibition of the grammatical agreements of the Sanscrit and Greek.* By Francis Bopp. 1854. 8vo. pp. 304.

[*Vergleichendes Accentuationssystem nebst einer gedrängten Darstellung der grammatischen Uebereinstimmungen des Sanskrit und Griechischen, von Franz Bopp.*]

No living scholar has done more than Bopp to exhibit the remarkable affinities, both in their verbal roots and in their general grammatical structure, of the Sanscrit and other Indo-European tongues. He has in the present work pushed his investigations a step farther, and has shown by an extended and elaborate induction that the Sanscrit and Greek have similar accentual systems; that they not only accent their words upon the same general principles, but agree to a most surprising extent in the minute details of their application.

The three principal systems of accentuation, followed by cultivated languages, may be denominated the logical, the rhythmical and the grammatical. In the logical, which is chiefly represented in the Germanic languages, that syllable receives the accent which is regarded as most important to the sense, irrespective of its distance from the end of the word. This may be the radical syllable, which it usually is in English; or an accessory syllable may take the first rank, in order to call attention more distinctly to the modification of meaning which it has introduced. Thus in German *unüberwindlicher* and *untergehender* are accented upon the first, because the emphasis lies in the one case upon the negation, and in the other upon the preposition; and in *übergehen*, *umfahren*, the meaning is varied according as the accent, by being thrown upon the verb or the preposition, makes one or the other predominate.

The rhythmical is the most prevalent system. In it the accent is regulated solely by the position of the syllable in the word. Thus the Arabic and the Latin, which though languages of different families have the same law for the accent, place the tone in polysyllables upon the antepenult if the penult be short, and upon the penult if it be long. In the LAsian, one of the Caucasian tongues, the penult is invariably accented; in the Polish the ultimate; and in the Bohemian the first syllable of the word. This may be regarded as a deterioration; one of the various modes of receiving the tone previously admissible having in the course of time been fixed as the exclusive rule.

The free or grammatical system of accentuation is that adopted by the Sanscrit and the Greek. In the former this is subject to no restriction: *e. g.* the tone syllable of *á bubō-dhishā mahi* is the first, of *tanō'mi* the second, of *babandhimá* the last. In the Greek it is limited by the law that the accent can in no case be thrown farther back than the antepenult, nor even than the penult in case the final is long;* within these

* The fact, that a long ultimate in Greek draws down the accent to the penult, is sometimes explained by saying that a long vowel is reckoned equal to two, *ἰδίωv = ἰδίωvν*; but if this were so, a long penult ought to have the same effect, and *δίωvμi = δίωvμiν* would be impossible. In Latin a long final syllable has no effect in drawing the accent forward, while a long penult has. A long vowel is in Greek, as in every other language, a unity as truly as a short vowel, notwith-

limits, however, it moves freely, being determined by the grammatical forms. And the result of the examination instituted in this volume is to show, that aside from the interference on the one hand of this Greek restrictive law, and from the fact upon the other, that the Sanscrit allows greater influence to certain formative syllables, the accentuation is still, in nearly all its details, the same in both languages, the thousands of years since they were sundered having been productive of but little divergence. In the former class of exceptions, Bopp supposes that the Greek, and in the latter the Sanscrit has departed from the original type. While the Greek is the principal subject of comparison, the analogy is pointed out that the Lithuanian and some other Slavic idioms, particularly the Russian, agree with the Sanscrit in allowing the accent to fall upon any part of polysyllables whatever, without the restriction imposed by the Greek, and the fact noted that they offer besides many points of resemblance with the Sanscrit, in the accentuation of their conjugations and declensions, *e. g.* in the influence of the strong and the weak cases.

Of the two Sanscrit accents the *udatta* corresponds to the Greek acute; the *svarīta* is of much less frequent employment, being only used in certain cases after the semivowels *y* and *v* preceded by another consonant, or when a final accented vowel causes elision or contraction in a following initial vowel.

The principle which Bopp regards as pervading the accentuation of both Sanscrit and Greek, is that the farther the accent is removed towards the beginning of the word the more it has of dignity and strength. This is argued from the following considerations. In monosyllabic nouns the strong cases which are regarded as superior retain the accent upon the root; while the weak cases allow it to sink to the termination. This division into strong and weak cases was made, irrespective of the present subject, from observing that certain irregular words suffer contraction in the latter but not in the former. Abstracts, which carry the idea of a word to its highest power, prefer the accent upon the beginning; compare *κόμπος* boasting,

standing that in poetry, which is more artificial than natural in its structure, one long can supply the place of two short, and *vice versa*.

with *χομπός* boaster; *trāsas* fear with *trasás* fearful. The vocative in Sanscrit accents the first syllable, indicating the emphasis of calling: compare *πάτερ* from *πατήρ*, *θύγατερ* from *θυγάτηρ*. Comparatives and superlatives in *ιον*, *ιστος*, *īyas*, *isthas*, throw the accent back upon the first syllable in Sanscrit, and as far as possible in Greek, the heightened intensity of the idea inducing intensity of accentuation; *e. g.* *svādú* ἡδύ, *svā'dīyas* ἡδιον, *svā'dishthras* ἡδιστος. Active verbs in Sanscrit prevailingly accent the first syllable, and in Greek as nearly so as its general law will permit, the energy of the action calling for energy of accentuation: while in the Sanscrit passive, the tone has fallen from the first place to the second upon the characteristic *ya*. This is particularly manifest in verbs of the fourth class, where both the middle and active voices accent the first syllable, although the former is letter for letter the same with the passive, which is only distinguished from it by the accent; *e. g.* *súchyatē* purificat, *suchyátē* purificatur. This view is also confirmed by the circumstance that when a passive is used reflexively, the tone may in certain cases be thrown back upon the radical syllable. Greek monosyllabic participles partaking of the energy of the verb, do not allow the accent in the weak cases to sink to the termination, *e. g.* *θέντος*, ὄντος, not *θεντός*, ὄντός.

In the declension of polysyllabic nouns the tone remains in all the cases except the vocative of the three numbers in Sanscrit, and occasionally in the vocative singular in Greek, upon the same place which it occupies in the root. If in any cases the vowel of the final syllable of oxytoned roots be suppressed, the accent sinks to the termination. The Greek dative, it should be remembered, corresponds to the Sanscrit only in the dual; in the singular and plural it bears a closer resemblance to the locative.

In numerals, compare *páncha* πέντε, *saptá* ἑπτὰ, *ashtaú* ὀκτώ; from 11—19 the accent is in both Sanscrit and Greek, given to the first member of the compound; from 20—90 the Sanscrit accents the last part of the word, and the Greek the first, although in the ordinals between the same limits both languages accent the final syllable.

In the verbs the energy of action is, as already stated,

represented by energy of accentuation; hence, *τύπτω*, *ἔτυπτον*, *τέτυφα*, which are not to be explained upon the logical principle of emphasizing the more important syllables, the augment and reduplication adding a new tense idea to the simple root. If that were so, why should *δίδωμι*, *τίθημι* and the corresponding forms *dádāmi*, *dádhāmi* be accented upon the first, although the reduplication exerts no influence whatever upon the sense? And why are not Greek futures accented upon the second, which is their characteristic syllable, rather than upon the first, *e. g.* *δώσω*, *δώσομεν*? How could such forms as *ἔτυπτόμεθα* be accounted for? or that even inorganic prosthetic vowels sometimes receive the tone, as *ὄνομα*, although comparison with the kindred tongues shows that the word properly begins with *ν*? When the concrete *τροχός* is distinguished by the accent from the abstract, this cannot certainly be understood as intimating that the affix *ος* is the most significant part of the word.

The division made by Bopp, both in his Sanscrit and Comparative Grammars, of the Sanscrit verb into two principal conjugations corresponding respectively to Greek verbs in *ω* and in *μ* is justified likewise by their peculiarities of accentuation. The first conjugation comprising the first, sixth, fourth and tenth classes, as they are divided by native grammarians relatively to the formation of what are called the special tenses, is the domain of fixed accents; the accent does not shift its position under the influence of any added terminations, but retains its place in all persons and numbers of both the active and middle voice. The second conjugation is the domain of movable accents; such terminations as are in grammar denominated grave for other reasons, having the effect of drawing the accent forward upon themselves. In Greek the personal endings have not this influence, which renders it highly probable, that its existence in the Sanscrit is to be dated subsequent to their separation; and yet these grave terminations must already have had the effect of weakening previous syllables; compare *εἶμι ἴμεν* with *ē'mi imás*, *δίδωμι δίδομεν* with *dádāmi dadmás*. The abbreviation due to grave endings is, however, greater in Sanscrit than in Greek, or even in the Lithuanian and Slavic, although in all probability these dialects were sepa-

rated from the Sanscrit at a later period than the Greek. Compare ἐσμέν ἐστέ and the Russian *esmé esté* with the Sanscrit *smás sthá*.

The first class of Sanscrit verbs numbering about one thousand roots, and the fourth class about one hundred and forty, accent the first syllable throughout the special tenses. If we exclude the tenth class from the number of primitive verbs, to which it does not properly belong, then the verbs of the first and fourth classes will be to all primitive verbs accented differently, about as eleven hundred and forty to three hundred and twenty. With this Greek verbs agree except where a greater number than three syllables or a final long syllable has drawn the accent forward. Verbs of the sixth and tenth classes accent their second syllable, the characteristic *á* of the former and *áya* of the latter.

The second class of verbs accent the root, except before grave endings which draw the tone upon themselves. Most verbs of the third class accent their characteristic reduplication (though a few accent the second or radical syllable,) except before grave endings beginning with a consonant, which take the tone. The fifth, eighth, seventh, and ninth classes put the accent upon their characteristic long vowel or syllable introduced between the root and the termination, although it is without conscious significance in the existing state of the language; grave endings shorten this vowel or syllable and take its accent. The potential active of these various classes of the second conjugation accents its characteristic syllable *yā*, not however for the logical reason that by this its significance is modified, else *ī*, which is characteristic of the same mood in the middle voice would also take the accent; the real cause is the weight assigned to the syllable, which occasions in some irregular roots the same contractions of form as grave personal endings.

The order in which the classes of verbs are arranged by native grammarians, strange as it seems in respect of their formation, finds a show of justification in the accents. The first four classes (some anomalies of the second and third excepted,) take the accent upon the first syllable in the singular

of the active voice; the last six classes upon the second syllable.

The augment receives the accent in all classes of Sanscrit verbs, whatever may be their accentuation elsewhere. This may be ascribed to the energetic pronunciation of the verb in general, which is preserved by the augmented preterites even when lost under the influence of grave personal endings in other tenses; or it may be explained as a compound which Bopp for reasons irrespective of accent formerly thought it. If the augment is identical with *a* privative and its office is to deny the present character of the action, and thus represent it as past, this would fall under the rule of the determinative compounds, in which *a* privative regularly receives the accent. Or if according to another view, it be supposed to be connected with the demonstrative root *a* as the remote demonstrative, thus throwing the action into the distance, it would take almost the character of a preposition; though even thus it would still be related to *a* privative, inasmuch as the negative particles have a formal and notional connection with the remote demonstrative roots.

In the general tenses, in which the distinction of classes ceases, the Sanscrit verb allows in most cases the removal of the accent forwards, while the Greek remains true to its farthest possible retrocession. Participles in both languages most commonly follow the accentuation of the corresponding tense of the indicative. In derivatives made by the addition to their roots of various formative syllables, the most interesting analogies are found to prevail. In compound words there is less agreement; some large classes place the tone similarly, but the most frequent accentuation in Sanscrit is upon the ultimate, and in Greek at the greatest admissible remove from the end of the word. Adverbs are to a great extent oblique cases of nouns or adjectives, and consequently follow these in the position of the tone. Conjunctions in Sanscrit, as in the kindred languages, are derived from pronouns; but these present few coincidences in the details. Polysyllabic prepositions mostly receive in Sanscrit the energetic accentuation; in Greek the tone drops to the final syllable; compare *ἀρα ἀπό*, *ἔρα ἐπό*, *ῥάρι περί*. In *abhī* the preposition is oxytoned like *ἀμφί*,

(which inserts a nasal); in this case the termination *bhi* is supposed to be connected with the dative ending *bhyam*, and consequently with the Latin *bi* of *tibi*, *sibi*, *ibi*, *ubi*, *utrubi*, and the Greek $\varphi\iota$ of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varphi\iota$, $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\varphi\iota$, etc.

ART. VIII.—*A Journey through the Chinese Empire*, by M. Huc. In 2 vols. Harper & Brothers: 1855.

THE author of this work furnished the public some few years since with his "Recollections of a Journey through Tartary and Thibet." It was a part of the world with which Europeans felt themselves to be but little familiar; and on that account, as well as for its intrinsic merits, the book was eagerly read. The present is a more elaborate production, as the author introduces, into his narrative of a journey across the country, the results of many years' observation. His digressions constitute the main value of the book, and give to the reader a well digested and for the most part correct idea, of the manners and customs of the Chinese, of their character as individuals and a people, and of the nature of their government language and religion. M. Huc describes most of the scenes, through which he passed, with much vivacity and humour. It is not however, in a tone of exaggeration, but with such truthful simplicity, as to give the assurance of candour and honesty. The journey which forms the thread of his narrative, was taken from the western border of Sz-Chuen to Canton—a route undescribed by other European travellers. M. Huc was a Roman Catholic missionary—a fact which rather adds to the interest of the book for us, for notwithstanding one or two sneers at Protestant missionaries, who feel bound to respect the treaty stipulations by which they are restricted to five ports on the coast—we are pleased to get the information which he incidentally gives of the efforts of the Romish Church towards evangelizing the inhabitants of China.

There are many points in reference to this vast and ancient Empire which it would be interesting to note, and if possible