

THE
CLASSICAL MUSEUM,



A JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, AND OF
ANCIENT HISTORY AND
LITERATURE.

VOLUME THE FIFTH.

LONDON:
TAYLOR AND WALTON, UPPER GOWER STREET.

M.DCCC.XLVIII.

of the late Sir Henry Hallford, Bart., President of the Royal College of Physicians, with which he, in the year 1842, ushered into the world his *Nugæ Metricæ*.

“Most of the following trifles were written in the carriage, and served to beguile the tedium of many a long day spent in my professional pursuits.

“The resource was suggested in a conversation with the late Lord Grenville;” (he died in 1834,) “who, after having been occupied incessantly in politics for nearly thirty years, was seized by illness, and confined to his arm-chair a great part of the remainder of his life.

“In this state I always found him not tranquil and cheerful only, as I might have expected from his habitual piety, but amused: and on my asking him the secret of this happy peculiarity, he answered, ‘I go to my classics, Sir.’

“The next day he sent me a copy of *his* ‘*Nugæ Metricæ*,’ printed (Oxford, 4to. 1824,) but not published, containing original exercises and translations, which bespeak a happy facility of composition, and a correct taste.

“I thought I could not do better than imitate such an example, and provide myself with a similar resource, connected with reminiscences of those early delightful studies, whenever my own power of further exertion should be terminated by age, or interrupted by such disease as might leave me in possession of my faculties.”

X.

XX.

MISCELLANIES.

1. ON THE LAW OF CONCORD.

It is not uncommon to hear it laid down as an obvious and natural propriety, to put a plural verb with a plural nominative, a masculine adjective to a masculine substantive; and so on: and a person who violates the received grammatical rules of concord is treated as offending, not merely against the conventions of speech, but against logical and accurate thought. Whether this is the case, may become clearer by farther discussion.

The remarkable Greek anomaly, of using a singular verb with a plural neuter nominative, gives the first shock to the teacher who has been inculcating the doctrine, that concord is inherent in all accurate language. A less observed, yet equally real difficulty, is involved in the question, whether the relative is to agree with the *case* of its antecedent; as so frequently in the Attic Greek. A mere Hebrew composing in Greek, as the author of the Apocalypse, carries anomalies much farther, and finds no impropriety in writing,—'Ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός: Οἱ, τὴν γυναῖκα ἣ λέγουσα ἑαυτήν. It seems evident, therefore, that foreigners in general find the Greek and Latin rules not to suggest themselves as intrinsically reasonable and necessary. But perhaps the nature of concord cannot be fully cleared up, except by referring to languages which wholly abjure the principle. Of these, the nearest to Europe, and the best known, is the *Turkish*.

The Turkish, with only moderate distinctions of dialect, is spoken from Rumelia eastward to the central regions of High Asia, where it meets with Mongol languages. Dr. Schott was first to show that the Turkish, Mongolian, and Tungusian tongues constitute a groupe in themselves, co-ordinate to that which we denominate the Indo-European; and these have in recent times been characterized as employing *agglutinated* formations of words. It is doubtful whether certain inflections of the nouns are better called case-endings or postpositions; whether they are parts of words, or complete words. They are in the condition of the syllable *ful* in the English words *spoonful*, *pailful*; in which our countrymen often hesitate whether to say *two spoonful*, or *two spoonfuls*. The Greek terminations *θεν*, *θι*, are remarked to be nearly similar to the Turkish case-endings *den*, *de*, which mean *from*, *in*, but are not repeated with the adjective. Instead of *ἄλλοθεν ποθεν*, a Turk who spoke Greek after his own idiom, would say *ἄλλο ποθεν*, on the same principle as we say, "from this place," not "from this from place." So when two nouns are joined by a copula, as *πατέρος καὶ μητέρος*, the Turkish idiom would give *πατέρ-καὶ-μητέρος*. Thus, there is *no concord of case*; and what appears to be a case-ending in Turkish, is perhaps always a postposition. The syllables appear to take, each of them, a slight accent; but (except in verbal tenses) there is no dominating accent to combine dependent syllables into a single word. On the same ground is all other concord neglected, although the order of sentences is inverted and complicated beyond that of Latin and Greek; and participles or gerunds abound, where we should use finite verbs. This is stated, lest the reader should think the languages to be barbarous and neglected; whereas that of the Ottoman Turks is highly cultivated and strikingly regular.

Thus, where an English schoolmaster is apt to declare abstractedly, "If the nominative to the verb is plural, of course the verb must be

plural;" a Turk would reason, "If the plural termination has been added to the nominative, of course it need *not* be added to the verb." Perhaps even in Latin and Greek, a sense of redundance would have destroyed concord, if the same uniform ending had denoted plurality in verbs and in nouns. But the terminations *-nt*, *-οντι*, or *-ουσι*, cannot be explained from these languages themselves; and "*homines spectant*," does not pall on the ear as "*adamlar baqarlar*, in Turkish. Yet it must be granted that *multi boni et strenui viri*, and other such rhymings, are unpleasing.

Perhaps this may guide us to a belief, that the establishment of concord, as a principle of Syntax, indicates the passage of a language from the *agglutinated* to the *inflectional* state. The change is facilitated by any cause which destroys a distinct feeling of the isolated power of annexed syllables. Such are—strong musical tendencies which clip and corrupt the sounds, and mould many syllables by accent into one word;—a confusion of tribes and dialects, which brings in irregularities, so that different sets of words are inflected by different methods. Perhaps we may add, that in the common progress of language, the inflectional state seems to be naturally that which should succeed the agglutinated; although we very imperfectly understand the causes which arrest or promote this farther development. The Indo-Germanic and even the Syro-Arabian tongues appear, in this respect, as having run through a more complete course than those of High Asia.

And now, possibly, it may farther be thought likely, that the "neuter plural to a verb singular" in Greek, is a remnant of the primitive and less organized state of the language, in which it possessed as yet no distinction of gender, (just as every Turkish noun, pronoun, adjective, or verb, is neuter,) and formed the plural of nouns by uniformly adding *α*, which was in that state an agglutinated particle similar to the Turkish *lar*, needing therefore no repetition with the verb. It is true, that to carry the principle out, the Greeks ought to have said, *ισχυρὸ σώματα* for *ισχυρὰ σώματα*; but the crude form was repelled by the whole genius of the language.

In English, we have an instance of a case-ending, which has relapsed into the state of a postposition in the *'s* which marks our possessive. The test of this is, the total loss of concord. We do not say, "Queen's Victoria's palace," as, "*Reginæ Victoriæ palatium*;" but "Queen Victoria's," just as *of* is found but once in "The palace of Queen Victoria." Yet it has long been certainly ascertained that this *'s* is the historical representative of the *is* in *rēgis*, *lapidis*.

In fact, we do not observe strict concord in regard to the plural of proper names. The Latins say, *Marcus et Decimus Bruti*; but our idiom is, "Charles and James Stuart," not *Stuarts*. In familiar

speech, we form plurals such as "The Miss Grants," which is just as in the agglutinated languages, the first *s* affecting all that has preceded. Some, who think to be more accurate, change the formula to "The Misses Grant," which, however, does not so well suit popular feeling. No one says, "The Misses Grants," which would agree with the classical principle of concord. The same remarks will apply to compound words formed by apposition, as Queen-mother, Queen-bee, He-goat, Boy-bishop; yet if the union is not long established in the language, we feel some hesitation as to the plural. Thus we say without reserve, "The making of *boy-bishops*;" but such plurals as "The lady-patronesses," and even "The lord-bishops," are used with some misgiving.

The German language has suffered far less disintegration than our own; yet even in it the compound words indicate the principle of agglutination, when two nouns are joined by the copula *and*, with the latter only inflected.¹ In the formation of long compounds, our northern tongues appear peculiarly rude and destitute of organization. Thus if we compare our phrase, "The Fire and Life Insurance Society," with the analogous Greek, ἡ πῦρ καὶ θανάτου βεβαιωτικὴ ἢ βοθητικὴ ἐταιρεία, we are at once made sensible of the crude nature of our grammar. Here an agglutinated tongue, as the Turkish, if it possessed the article, would say, τὸ πῦρ-καὶ-θανάτου βεβαιωτικὴ ἐταιρεία; which falls between the perfect concord of the Greek and the rudeness of the English.

On the whole, it appears that neither a neuter plural with a verb singular, as in Greek, nor a plural masculine with a verb feminine singular, as in Arabic, ought to startle us as an absurdity. When such things oppose the analogy of a language, they are phenomena which wait for explanation; but concord—as the very existence of gender, case, number—is only an accident of language, and not to be enforced upon abstract principles of necessity and right.

F. W. NEWMAN.

2. ON THE VOYAGE FROM TYRE TO GADES.

THE current doctrine concerning the course taken by the Phœnician traders, whether on their way to their African or their Spanish co-

¹ In the language of ordinary life the Germans frequently drop the termination of adjectives before neuter substantives, as *gut Kind*, *herrlich Wasser*, instead of *gutes Kind*, *herrliches Wasser*.—Ed.