

CYCLOPÆDIA
OF
BIBLICAL LITERATURE

EDITED BY

JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,

**EDITOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL
GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.**

ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

NEW YORK:
MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.
CINCINNATI:
WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.
1846.

The mound, which seems to form the foundation of the pile, is a mass of rubbish accumulated by the decay of the superstructure. In the ruin itself, the layers of sun-dried bricks, of which it is composed, can be traced very distinctly. They are cemented together by lime or bitumen, and are divided into courses varying from 12 to 20 feet in height, and are separated by layers of reeds, as is usual in the more ancient remains of this primitive region. Travellers



have been perplexed to make out the use of this remarkable monument, and various strange conjectures have been hazarded. The embankments of canals and reservoirs, and the remnants of brick-work and pottery occupying the place all around, evince that the Tel stood in an important city; and, as its construction announces it to be a Babylonian relic, the greater probability is that it was one of those pyramidal structures erected upon high places, which were consecrated to the heavenly bodies, and served at once as the temples and the observatories of those remote times. Such buildings were common to all Babylonian towns; and those which remain appear to have been constructed more or less on the model of that in the metropolitan city of Babylon.

ACCURON. [EKRON.]

ACCENT. This term is often used with a very wide meaning: as when we say that a person has 'a Scotch accent,' in which case it denotes all that distinguishes the Scotch from the English pronunciation. We here confine the word, in the first place, to mean those peculiarities of sound for which grammarians have invented the *marks* called accents; and we naturally must have a principal reference to the Hebrew and the Greek languages. Secondly, we exclude the consideration of *such* a use of accentual marks (so called) as prevails in the French language; in which they merely denote a certain change in the quality of a sound attributed to a vowel or diphthong. It is evident that, had a sufficient number of alphabetical vowels been invented, the accents (in such a sense) would have been superseded. While the Hebrew and Greek languages are here our chief end, yet, in order to pass from the known to the unknown, we shall throughout refer to our own tongue as the best source of illustration. In this respect, we undoubtedly overstep the proper limits of a Biblical Cyclopædia; but we are in a manner constrained so to do, since the whole subject is misrepresented or very defectively ex-

plained in most English grammars: and if we obtained from this full exposition, many readers would most probably, after all, misunderstand our meaning.

Even after the word accent has been thus limited, there is an ambiguity in the term; it has still a double sense, according to which we name it either *orthographical* or *vocalic*. By the latter, we mean the accent which a word in isolation receives; for instance, if we read in a vocabulary: while by *orthographical* accent we understand that which words actually have when read aloud or spoken as parts of a sentence.

The Greek men of letters, who, after the Macedonian kingdoms had taken their final form, invented accentual marks to assist foreigners in learning their language, have (with a single uniform exception) been satisfied to indicate the vocalic accent: but the Hebrew grammarians aimed, when the pronunciation of the old tongue was in danger of being forgotten, at indicating by marks the traditional inflections of the voice with which the Scriptures were to be read aloud in the synagogues. In consequence, they have introduced a very complicated system of accentuation to direct the reader. Some of their accents (so called) are, in fact, *stops*, others syntactical notes, which served also as guides to the voice in chanting.

In intelligent reading or speaking, the vocal organs execute numerous intonations which we have no method of representing on paper; especially such as are called *inflections* or *slides* by teachers of elocution: but on these a book might be written; and we can here only say, that the Masoretic accentuation of the Hebrew appears to have struggled to depict the *rhythm* of sentences; and the more progress has been made towards a living perception of the language, the higher is the testimony borne by the learned to the success which this rather cumbrous system has attained. The rhythm, indeed, was probably a sort of chant; since to this day the Scriptures are so recited by the Jews, as also the Koran by the Arabs or Turks: nay, in Turkish, the same verb (*okumak*) signifies to sing and to read. But this chant by no means attains the sharp *discontinuity* of European singing: on the contrary, the voice *slides* from note to note. Monotonous as the whole sounds, a deeper study of the expression intended might probably lead to a fuller understanding of the Masoretic accents.

Wherein the Accent consists.—In ordinary European words, one syllable is pronounced with a peculiar stress of the voice; and is then said to be accented. In our own language, the most obvious accompaniment of this stress on the syllable is a greater clearness of sound in the vowel; inasmuch that a very short vowel cannot take the primary accent in English. Nevertheless, it is very far from the truth, that accented vowels and syllables are necessarily long, or longer than the unaccented in the same word; of which we shall speak afterwards. In illustration, however, of the loss of clearness in a vowel, occasioned by a loss of accent, we may compare a *contrast* with *contrast*; *equal* with *equality*; in which the syllables *con*, *qual*, are sounded with a very obscure vowel when unaccented.

Let us observe, in passing, that when a vowel sound changes through transposition of the ac-

cent, the Hebrew grammarians—instead of trusting that the voice will of itself modify the vowel when the accent is shifted—generally think it necessary to depict the vowel differently: which is one principal cause of the complicated changes of the vowel points.

A second concomitant of the accent is less marked in English than in Italian or Greek; namely—a musical elevation of the voice. On a piano or violin we of course separate entirely the *stress* given to a note (which is called *forte* and *staccato*) from its elevation (which may be *A*, or *C*, or *F*); yet in speech it is natural to execute in a higher tone, or, as we improperly term it, in a higher *key*, a syllable on which we desire to lay stress: possibly because sharp sounds are more distinctly heard than flat ones. Practically, therefore, accent embraces a slide of the voice into a higher note, as well as an emphasis on the vowel; and in Greek and Latin it would appear that this slide upwards was the most marked peculiarity of accent, and was that which gained it the names *προσῳδία*, *accentus*. Even at the present day, if we listen to the speech of a Greek or Italian, we shall observe a marked elevation in the slides of the voice, giving the appearance of great vivacity, even where no peculiar sentiment is intended. Thus, if a Greek be requested to pronounce the words *σοφία* (wisdom), *παραβολή* (parable), his voice will rise on the *i* and *h* in a manner never heard from an Englishman. In ancient Greek, however, yet greater nicety existed; for the voice had *three kinds of accent*, or slides, which the grammarians called flat, sharp, and circumflex; as in *ῥίς*, *ῥίς*; *ροῦ*. It is at the same time to be remarked, that this flat accent was solely oratorical; for when a word was read in a vocabulary, or named in isolation, or indeed at the end of a sentence, it never took the flat accent, even on the last syllable; except, it would seem, the word *ῥίς*, a certain one. In the middle of a sentence, however, the simple accent (for we are not speaking of the circumflex) on a penultima or antepenultima was always sharp, and on a last syllable was flat. Possibly a stricter attention to the speech of the best educated modern Greeks, or, on the contrary, to that of their peasants in isolated districts, might detect a similar peculiarity: but it is generally believed that it has been lost, and some uncertainty therefore naturally rests on the true pronunciation. On the whole, it is most probable that the flat accent was a stress of the voice uttered in a lower note, much as the second accent in *grandfather*; that the sharp accent was that which prevails in modern Greek, and has been above described; and that the circumflex combined an upward and a downward slide on the same vowel. The last was naturally incapable of being executed, unless the vowel was *long*; but the other two accents could exist equally well on a short vowel.

In English elocution various slides are to be heard, more complicated than the Greek circumflex; but with us they are wholly oratorical, never vocalular. Moreover, they are peculiar to vehement or vivacious oratory; being abundant in familiar or comic speech, and admissible also in high pathetic or indignant declamation: but they are almost entirely excluded from tranquil and serious utterance.

Secondary Accents.—On the same word, when it consists of many syllables, a double accent is frequently heard, certainly in English, and probably in most languages; but in our own tongue one of the two is generally feebler than the other, and may be called secondary. If we agree to denote this by the flat accent (˘) of the Greeks, we may indicate as follows our double accent:

consideration, disobédience, unpretending;
secondáry, áccesáry, préemptóry.

We have purposely selected as the three last examples cases in which the secondary accent falls on a very short or obscure vowel, such as can never sustain the primary accent.

In some cases, two syllables intervene between the accents, and it may then be difficult to say which accent is the principal. In *aristocrát*, *équalize*, *antidóte*, the first syllable has a stronger accent than the last; but in *aristocrátic*, *équalization*, *antediluvian*, they seem to be as equal as possible, though the latter catches the ear more. In *aristocracy*, the former is beyond a doubt secondary; but here the two are separated by only one syllable. *Prédetermination* has three accents, of which the middlemost is secondary.

In the Greek language a double accent is sometimes found on one word; but only when the latter is superinduced by some short and subordinate word which hangs upon the other. Such short words are called *enclitics*, and form a class by themselves in the language, as they cannot be known by their meaning or form. By way of example we may give, *ῥήτορος ῥίς* (a certain usurper), *οἶδά σε* (I know thee). In these cases, we observe that the two accents, if both are sharp, are found on alternate syllables, as in English; but whether one of them was secondary we do not know. If the former is a circumflex, the latter is on the following syllable. Occasionally, two or more enclitics follow each other in succession, and produce a curious combination; as, *εἶδός τοῦ ῥί μοι*. These accents, however, are not vocalular, but oratorical.

The Hebrews have, in many cases, secondary accents, called a *foretone*, because with them it always precedes the principal accent (or 'tone'), as, *כִּתְבֵּהּ*, *katebú*; the intermediate and unaccented vowel being in such cases exceedingly short and obscure, so that some grammarians refuse to count it at all. This foretone is described as a stress of the voice uttered in a lower note, and therefore may seem identical in sound with the flat accent of the Greeks. It differs, however, in being always accompanied with the sharp accent on the same word, and in being vocalular, not merely oratorical.

On the Place of the Accent.—A great difference exists between different languages as to the place of the accent. In Hebrew it is found solely on the last syllable and last but one, and is assumed systematically by many grammatical terminations, as in *Mélek* (for *Málk*), a king, pl. *Me'álem*. This is so entirely opposed to the analogies of English, that it has been alleged (Latham *On the English Language*) that *Princtus* is the only word in which our accent falls on a final inflection. The radical contrast of all this to our own idiom leads to a perverse pronunciation of most Hebrew names: thus we say *Isáiah*, *Nebemíah*, *Cánaan*, *I'srael*—although with their true

accent they are *Isaiah*, *Nehemiah*, *Canaan*, *Israel*; to say nothing of other peculiarities of the native sound. In Greek, the accent is found on any of the three last syllables of a word; the circumflex only on the two last. In the Latin language, it is very remarkable that (except in the case of monosyllables) the accent never fell on the last syllable, but was strictly confined to the penultima and antepenultima. This peculiarity struck the Greek ear, it is said, more than anything else in the sound of Latin, as it gave to it a pompous air. It is the more difficult to believe that any thoughtful Greek seriously imputed it to Roman pride, since we are told that the *Æolic* dialect of Greek itself agreed in this respect with the Latin (See *Poster On Accent and Quantity*, ch. iv.). The Latin accentuation is remarkable for having the place of the accent dictated solely by euphony, without reference to the formation or meaning of the word; in which respect the Greek only partly agrees with it, chiefly when the accent falls on the penultima or antepenultima. The Latin accent, however, is guided by the quantity of the penultimate syllable; the Greek accent by the quantity of the ultimate vowel. The rules are these:—

1. Greek: 'When the last vowel is long, the accent is on the penultima; when the last vowel is short, the accent is on the antepenultima.' *Oxytons* are herein excepted. 2. Latin: 'When the penultimate syllable is long, the accent is upon it; when short, the accent is on the antepenultima.' Every dissyllable is accented on the penultima. Accordingly, the Greek accent, even on the cases of the very same noun, shifted in the following curious fashion: N. *ἄνθρωπος*, G. *ἀνθρώπου*, D. *ἀνθρώπου*, Ac. *ἀνθρώπου*; and in Latin, rather differently, yet with an equal change, N. *Sermo*, G. *Sermōnis*, &c. It is beyond all question that the above rule in Greek is genuine and correct (though it does not apply to *oxytons*, that is, to words accented on the last syllable, and has other exceptions which the Greek grammars will tell); but there is a natural difficulty among Englishmen to believe it, since we have been taught to pronounce Greek with the accentuation of Latin; a curious and hurtful corruption, to which the influence of Erasmus is said to have principally contributed. It deserves to be noted that the modern Greeks, in pronouncing their ancient words, retain, with much accuracy on the whole, the ancient rules of accent; but in words of recent invention or introduction they follow the rule, which seems natural to an Englishman, of keeping the accent on the same syllable through all cases of a noun. Thus, although they sound as of old, N. *ἄνθρωπος*, G. *ἀνθρώπου*, yet in the word *κοκόνη*, a lady, which is quite recent, we find (plural), N. *αἱ κοκόνες*, G. *τῶν κοκόνων*, &c. Similarly, *ὁ καπετᾶνος*, the captain, G. *τοῦ καπετᾶνος*, &c. This is only one out of many marks that the modern Greek has lost the nice appreciation of the quantity or time of vowel sounds, which characterized the ancient.

In all Latin or Greek words which we import into English, so long as we feel them to be foreign, we adhere to the Latin rules of accentuation as well as we know how: thus, in *democrat*, *democracy*, *democratical*; *philosophy*, *philosophical*; *astronomy*, *astronomical*; *domestic*, *do-*

nesticity, *domestication*; *possible*, *possibility*; *barbarous*, *barbarity*. But the moment we treat any of these words as natives, we follow our own rule of keeping the accent on the radical syllable; as in *barbarousness*, where the Saxon ending, *ness*, is attached to the foreign word. With the growth of the language, we became more and more accustomed to hear a long train of syllables following the accent. Thus, we have *comfort*, *comfortable*, *comfortableness*; *parliament*, *parliamentary*, which used to be *parliamentary*.

In many provinces of England, and in particular families, the older and better pronunciations, *contrdry*, *industry*, keep their place, instead of the modern *contrary*, *industry*. The new tendency has innovated in Latin words so far, that many persons say *intimial*, *contemplate*, *inculcate*, *decorous*, *sonorous*, and even *concordance*, for *intimcal*, *contemplate*, &c. 'Alexander' has supplanted 'Alexánder'. In the cases of *concordance*, *clámorous*, and various others, it is probable that the words have been made to follow the pronunciation of *concord*, *clámor*, as in native English derivatives. The principle of change, to which we have been pointing, is probably deep-seated in human speech; for the later Attics are stated to have made a similar innovation in various words; for example, *Æschylus* and *Thucydides* said *δμοίος*, *τροπαίον*, but *Plato* and *Aristotle*, *δμοιος*, *τροπαίον*.

If the principal accent is very distant from one end of a long word, a great obscurity in the distant vowel-sounds results, which renders a word highly unmusical, and quite unmanageable to poetry. This will be seen in such pronunciations as *parliamentary*, *preemptory*.

In Hebrew the same phenomenon is exhibited in a contrary way, the early vowels of a word being apt to become extremely short, in consequence of the accent being delayed to the end.

Thus, *יָהוּהוּ*, *Yehé'el*, a tent, pl. *יָהוּהוּהוּ*, *Yehé'el'm*; *יָהוּהוּהוּ*, *Yehé'el*, they killed; *יָהוּהוּהוּ*, *Yehé'el'm*, they killed him. Oratorical reasons occasionally induce a sacrifice of the legitimate vocalic accent. In English this happens chiefly in cases of antithesis; as when the verbs, which would ordinarily be sounded *increase* and *decrease*, reverse their accent in order to bring out more clearly the contrasted syllables: 'He must *in*-crease, but I must *de*-crease.'

This change is intended, not for mere euphony, but to assist the meaning. Variety and energy seem to be aimed at in the following Hebrew example, which Ewald has noticed, and which seems to indicate that more of the same sort must remain to be discovered: *Judges* v. 12, 'Urt, 'Urt, *Deborá*: 'Urt, 'Urt, *dabbiri shir*; which, after Ewald, we may imitate by translating thus, 'Up then, up then, *Deborá!*: Up then, Up then, utter a song.' The Greek and Hebrew languages, moreover, in the *pause* of a sentence, modified the accent without reference to the meaning of the

words. Thus the verb ordinarily sounded *גָּדַלְתִּי*, *gáde'li*, with a very short penultimate vowel, becomes at the end of the sentence *גָּדַלְתִּי*, *gadí'li*, with a long and accented penultima (See *Ewald's Hebrew Gram.* § 131, 133). The Greek lan-

guage also at the end of a sentence changes a flat accent into a sharp one; for instance, the word *τιμή* (honor) before a pause becomes *τιμή;* but no elongation of vowels ever accompanies this phenomenon.

Accent in Compound Words.—It is principally by the accent that the syllables of a word are joined into a single whole; and on this account a language with well-defined accentuation is (*omnibus paribus*) so much the easier to be understood when heard, as well as so much the more musical. This function of the accent is distinctly perceived by us in such words of our language as have no other organized union of their parts. To the eye of a foreigner reading an English book, *steam-boat* appears like two words; especially as our printers have an extreme dislike of hyphens, and omit them whenever the corrector of the press will allow it. In Greek or Persian two such words would be united into one by a vowel of union, which is certainly highly conducive to euphony, and the compound would appear in the form *steamboat* or *steamobōtes*. As we are quite destitute of such apparatus (in spite of a few such exceptions as *handicraft*, *meatsbank*), the accent is eminently important; by which it is heard at once that *steamboat* is a single word. In fact, we thus distinguish between a *stonebox* and a *stone box*; the former meaning a box for holding stones, the latter a box made of stone. Mr. Latham (*Engl. Language*, § 234) has ingeniously remarked that we may send the following lines from Ben Jonson in two ways:

‘An’d thy silvershining quiver’—
or, ‘An’d thy silver shining quiver’—

with a slight difference of sense.

The Hebrew language is generally regarded as quite destitute of compound words. It possesses, nevertheless, something at least closely akin to them in (what are called) *nouns in regimen*. Being without a genitive case, or any particle devoted to the same purpose as the English preposition *of*, they make up for this by sounding two words as if in combination. The former word loses its accent, and thereby often incurs a shortening and obscuration of its vowels; the voice hurrying on to the latter. This may be illustrated by the English pronunciation of *ship of war*, *man of war*, *man at arms*, phrases which, by repetition, have in spirit become single words, the first accent being lost. Many such exist in our language, though unregistered by grammarians—in fact, even in longer phrases the phenomenon is observable. Thus, *Secretary at War*, *Court of Queen’s Bench*, have very audibly but one predominating accent, on the last syllable.

So, in Hebrew, from *חִזְיוֹן*, *chizyōn*, a vision, comes *חִזְיוֹן לַיְלִיד*, *chizyōn-lāild*, vision of the night (Job xx. 8). That every such case is fairly to be regarded as a compound noun was remarked by Dr. Campbell of Aberdeen, who urged that otherwise, in Lamentation ii. 20, we ought to render the words ‘the idols of his silver;’ whereas, in fact, the exact representation of the Hebrew in Greek is not *εἰδωλα ἀργύρου-αὐτοῦ*, but, so to say, *ἀργυρεῖδωλα αὐτοῦ*. In Greek compounds the position of the accent is sometimes a very critical matter in distinguishing active and passive

meanings of epithets. Thus, *μητρὸκτόνος* means *mother-slain*, or slain by one’s mother; while *μητροκτόνος* is *mother-slaying*, or slaying one’s mother. Such distinctions, however, seem to have been confined to a very small class of compounds.

Sense of a simple word modified by the Accent.—It is familiarly remarked in our English grammar, that (in words of Latin origin, generally imported from French) we often distinguish a verb from a noun by putting the accent on the penultimate syllable of the noun and the ultimate of the verb. Thus, we say, *an insult*, to *insult*; *a contest*, to *contest*; &c., &c. The distinction is so useful, that in doubtful cases it appears desirable to abide by the rule, and to say (as many persons do say) *a perfume*, to *perfume*; *détails*, to *detail*; *the contents of a book*, to *content*; &c. It is certainly curious that the very same law of accent pervades the Hebrew language, as discriminating the simplest trilateral noun and verb. Thus, we have *מֶלֶךְ*, *mélék*, king; *מָלַךְ*, *maldék*, he ruled. In the Greek language the number of nouns is very considerable in which the throwing of the accent on the last syllable seriously alters the sense; as, *ῥόσφος*, a manner; *ῥόσφως*, the leather of an ear; *θυμὸς*, anger or mind; *θύμος*, garlic; *κρίνον*, judging; *κρίνον*, a lily-bed; *ἄμωσ*, a shoulder; *ἄμωσ*, cruel. A very extensive vocabulary of such cases is appended to Scapula’s *Greek Lexicon*.

Relation of Accent to Rhythm and Metre.—Every sentence is necessarily both easier to the voice and pleasanter to the ear when the whole is broken up into symmetrical parts, with convenient pauses between them. The measure of the parts is marked out by the number of principal beats of the voice (or oratorical accents) which each clause contains; and when these are so regulated as to attain a certain musical uniformity without betraying art, the sentence has the pleasing *rhythm* of good prose. When art is not avowed, and yet is manifest, this is displeasing, as seeming to proceed from affectation and insincerity. When, however, the art is avowed, we call it no longer rhythm, but *metre*; and with the cultivation of poetry, more and more melody has been exacted of versifiers.

To the English ear, three and four beats of the voice give undoubtedly the most convenient length of clauses. Hence, in what is called *poetical prose*, it will be found that any particularly melodious passage, if broken up into lines or verses, yields generally either three or four beats in every verse. For example:

‘Where is the maid of Ar’van?
Gone, as a vision of the night.
Where shall her lover look for her?
The hall, which once she gladdened, is desolate.’

But no poetical prose, not even translations of poetry which aim at a half-metrical air, will be found to retain constantly the *threefold* and *fourfold* accent. To produce abruptness, *half* lines, containing but two accents, are thrown in; and in smoother feeling clauses of five accents, which often tend to become the true English blank verse. All *longer* clauses are composite, and can be resolved into three and three, four and three, four and four, &c. To illustrate this, let us take

a passage of the *Old Testament* in the common English translation. Habakkuk iii. 2:

Yh, Lórd!

I have heard thy speech; and was afraid.

O'h Lórd!

Revive thy work in the midst of the years!

In the midst of the years make known!

In wráth remember mércy!

Gód cáme from Téman,

And the Hóly One from Móunt Pérán.

His glóry cówered the héavens,

And the éarth was füll of his práse.

His brightnéss was ás the light,

He had hórn coming óut of his hánd,

And thére was the híding of his pówer.' &c. &c.

The accent which we have been here describing as the source of rhythm is strictly the *oratorical* accent. As this falls only on the more emphatic words of the sentence, it is decidedly strong, and, in comparison with it, all the feebler and secondary accents are unheard, or at least uncounted. Now is any care taken that the successive accents should be at equable distances. Occasionally they occur on successive syllables; much oftener at the distance of two, three, or four syllables. Nevertheless, this poetical rhythm, as soon as it becomes avowedly cultivated, is embryo-metre; and possibly this is the real state of the Hebrew versification. Great pains have been taken, from Gomarus in 1630 to Bellermann and Saalehertz in recent times, to define the laws of Hebrew metre. A concise history of these attempts will be found in the Introduction to De Wette's *Commentary on the Psalms*. But although the occasional use of *rhyme* or *assonance* in Hebrew seems to be more than accidental, the failure of so many efforts to detect any real metre in the old Hebrew is decisive enough to warn future inquirers against losing their labour. (See the article *Parallitismus* in Esch and Gruber's *Encyclopædie*.) The modern Jews, indeed, have borrowed accentual metre from the Arabs: but, although there is nothing in the genius of the tongue to resist it, perhaps the fervid, practical genius of the Hebrew prophets rejected any such trammel. Repetition and amplification mark their style as too declamatory to be what we call poetry. Nevertheless, in the Psalms and lyrical passages, increasing investigation appears to prove that considerable artifice of composition has often been used (See Ewald's *Poetical Books of the Old Test.* vol. i.).

In our own language, it is obvious to every considerate reader of poetry that the metres called anapestic depend far more on the oratorical accent than on the vocubular (which is, indeed, their essential defect); and on this account numerous accents, which the voice really utters, are passed by as counting for nothing in the metre. We offer, as a single example, the two following lines of Campbell, in which we have denoted by the flat accent those syllables the stress upon which is subordinate and *extra metrum*:

'Say, rísh'd the bóld éagle exúltíngly fírst

From his hóme, in the dárk-róllíng clóuds of
the nóth.'

Such considerations, drawn entirely out of *oratory*, appear to be the only ones on which it is any longer useful to pursue an inquiry concerning Hebrew metres.

Confusion of Accent with Quantity.—It is a striking fact that Foster, the author of a learned and rather celebrated book intended to clear up this confusion, succeeded in establishing the truth concerning Greek and Latin, by help of ancient grammarians, but himself fell into the popular errors whenever he tried to deal with the English language. Not only does he allege that 'the voice dwells longer' on the first syllable of *Honestly*, *Character*, &c., than on the two last (and improperly writes them *honestly*, *character*), but he makes a general statement that accent and quantity, though separated in Greek and Latin, are inseparable in English. The truth is so far otherwise, that probably in three words out of four we separate them. As single instances, consider the words *Honestly*, *Character*, just adduced. The accent is clearly on the first syllable; but that syllable in each is very short. On the other hand, the second syllable of both, though unaccented, yet by reason of the consonants *st*, *ct*, is long, though less so than if its vowel likewise had been long. The words are thus, like the Greek *κύλινδρος*, a *cyllinder*, accented on the first syllable, yet as to quantity an amphibrach (⊖—⊖). Until an Englishman clearly feels and knows these facts of his own tongue, he will be unable to avoid the most perplexing errors on this whole subject.

Invention of Accents.—We have already said that the accentual marks of the Greeks were invented not long after the Macedonian conquests. To Aristophanes of Byzantium, master of the celebrated Aristarchus, is ascribed the credit of fixing both the punctuation and the accentuation of Greek. He was born near the middle of the second century B.C.; and there seems to be no doubt that we actually have before our eyes a pronunciation which cannot have greatly differed from that of Plato. As for the Hebrew accentuation generally called *Masoretic*, the learned are agreed that it was a system only gradually built up by successive additions; the word *Masora* itself meaning *tradition*. The work is ascribed to the schools of Tiberias and Babylon, which arose after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; but it cannot be very accurately stated in how many centuries the system of vowel-points and accentuation attained the fully-developed state in which we have received it. There is, however, no question among the ablest scholars that these marks represent the utterance of a genuine Hebrew period; the pronunciation, it may be said with little exaggeration, of Ezra and Nehemiah.—F. W. N.

ACCUBABIS. [SPIDER.]

ACCHO (אֲכֹ; Sept. *Acye*), a town and haven within the nominal territory of the tribe of Asher, which however never acquired possession of it (Judg. i. 31). The Greek and Roman writers call it *Acch*, *Acz* (Strab. xvi. 877; Diod. Sic. xix. 93; C. Nep. xiv. 5); but it was eventually better known as *PTOLEMAIS* (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 19), which name it received from the first Ptolemy, king of Egypt, by whom it was much improved. By this name it is mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Macc. x. 56; xi. 22, 24; xii. 45, 48; 2 Macc. xiii. 14), in the New Testament (Acts xxi. 7), and by Josephus (*Antiq.* xiii. 12, 2, seq.). It was also called *Colonia Claudis*