



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Proceedings at New Haven, October 20th and 21st, 1870.

The Society assembled, as notified, at New Haven, on Thursday, Oct. 20th, at 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the President in the chair. The minutes of the annual meeting in May last were read by the Recording Secretary. The Committee of Arrangements communicated an invitation from Mr. Van Name, Librarian of Yale College, to a social gathering at his house in the evening; which was, upon motion, accepted with thanks.

From the Directors, notice was given that the next meeting would be held in Boston, on the 17th of May, 1871, and that Rev. Dr. Anderson, with the Recording and Corresponding Secretaries, was appointed a Committee of Arrangements for it. Also the names of the following gentlemen were reported, with the recommendation that they be elected as Corporate Members:—

Rev. John Anderson, of Waterbury, Conn.
Prof. John Avery, of Grinnell, Iowa.
Prof. George F. Comfort, of New York.
Mr. Alexander Meyrowitz, do.
Mr. Frederick Stengel, do.
Mr. Edward C. Taintor, of China.

The recommendation was adopted, and the gentlemen elected.

The Corresponding Secretary read extracts from the correspondence of the half-year. In presenting notes of excuse from several gentlemen, variously prevented from being present at the meeting, he also took occasion to refer to the unwonted absence of Prof. Salisbury, who had recently gone to spend the winter, and perhaps a longer time, in Europe. It was added, as a fact interesting and important to all students in this department in America, that Prof. Salisbury had, before leaving, presented to the library of Yale College in New Haven his whole collection of Oriental and philological books and manuscripts, comprising several thousand volumes, many of them of great cost and value, and had made liberal provision for completing the collection by further purchase. So large and generous a gift had rarely been made to an American library, or so rich a body of material for study in this department been thrown open at once to the public.

A letter from Rev. James Summers, dated London, August 5th, 1870, speaks of a magazine for Chinese and Japanese literature, which he was about commencing to publish in London, and expresses the hope that both encouragement and assistance may be obtained for it from America, whose interest in the affairs of that part of the world is so great, and which has done so much, by literature and diplomacy, to open it to the knowledge of the West. Mr. Summers is cataloguing the Chinese and Tibetan treasures of the India Office library in London, brought forth to light by the

energy of the late librarian, Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall. The first two numbers of the magazine referred to, the "Phœnix," more recently received, were exhibited to the members present and examined by them.

Letters from Rev. Mr. Ward, of New York, announce a donation made through him to the Society's collections, by the Palestine Exploration Fund Society of London, of a set of the full-size photographs of the impressions in soft paper taken from the Moabite inscription-stone of King Mesha, and of plaster casts of a number of the smaller fragments of the stone, colored in close imitation of the original. The photographs and casts were shown and described by Mr. Ward, who was present; besides clearing up one and another point, of greater or less consequence, in the reading, they proved in a striking manner the faithfulness and skill with which M. Ganneau's first copies of the inscription had been made.

Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Newtonville, Mass., sent a copy of an engraving, just made, of a Japanese "symbolical seal, or armorial bearing, whose lines are legally established symbols, to be interpreted, like those of our heraldic escutcheons, according to fixed rules, guarded from infringement by severe laws."

Prof. Weber, of Berlin, under date of Sept. 29th, 1870, writes of the then approaching celebration (Oct. 2d) of the 25-year anniversary of the German Oriental Society, and of the medal which was to be presented, struck in gold, to the first four managers of the Society's affairs, Professors Brockhaus, Fleischer, Pott, and Rödiger (of whom three are Honorary Members of our own Society). A copy of the medal in bronze was shown to the members present; the obverse represents "a powerful male figure, as emblem of the ancient Orient, resting upon a lion under a palm-tree, and raising himself as if awaking. His face, unveiled by a Genius, he turns toward the light, with which German science, as a Germania crowned with oak-leaves, approaches him." The following distich gives the simple meaning of the symbol:

Licht und lebendiges Wort kam einst den Deutschen vom Ausgang;
Dankend erstatten sie heut', was sie empfangen, zurück.

Prof. Weber is occupied with a (transliterated) edition of the *Tāitirīya-Saṁhitā*, of which a considerable part is ready for the press.

Dr. John Muir, under date of Edinburgh, June 1st, 1870, writes:

"The fifth volume of my *Original Sanskrit Texts* ["Contributions to a knowledge of the cosmogony, mythology, religious ideas, life and manners of the Indians in the Vedic Age"] is ready, and may, I hope, reach you about the time this letter does.

"Müller is reprinting his Sanskrit grammar, and printing his lectures preliminary to the study of the science of religions, in successive numbers of *Fraser's Magazine*. He says his second volume of the translation of the *Rig-Veda* will be on the same plan as the first—much annotation, and few whole hymns translated: when it is to come out, I do not know. *Aufrecht* hopes to begin to print his glossary to the *Rig-Veda* in August or September. *Monier Williams* has advanced as far as the letter *r* with his *Sanskrit-English dictionary*."

Communications were then presented, as follows :

1. On the Karen Inscription-plate, by Rev. Alonzo Bunker, Missionary of the A. B. M. U. in Farther India.

Mr. Bunker describes his visit, in company with Rev. Mr. Vinton, to the village of Kai pho-gyee, chief of Western Karenee, on the Salwen river, twelve days' journey east from Toungoo. One of the main objects of his expedition was to obtain a sight, and if possible a copy, of the celebrated Plate (see these Proceedings for Oct., 1866, p. xii., and for May, 1870, pp. lxxv-vi). This, however, he found it very difficult to accomplish, as the possession of the Plate is the chief's main title to authority and source of revenue, and the article is kept as sacred, and invested with great mystery and formidable power. A few days of careful diplomacy, however, secured the consent of the chief and head-men to its being examined and even copied, although the taking of an impression in wax for which preparation had been made, was forbidden. Mr. Bunker encloses his original copy, which it is proposed to reproduce in lithograph in the forthcoming Part of the Society's Journal. The chief denied having any ivory plates, but there is no doubt that he possesses such, and Mr. Bunker hopes on a future visit to obtain sight of them.

2. On the Talmud, by Dr. Alexander Meyrowitz, of New York.

Dr. Meyrowitz gave a brief statement of the principal facts in the history of the Talmud, and described its character, reading by way of illustration a number of passages, in translation.

3. On Greek Pronunciation, by Prof. Lewis R. Packard, of New Haven.

There are three principal theories of Greek pronunciation: that we should pronounce the language as the ancients did, or each nation according to the rules of its own language, or as the modern Greeks do.

The main objection to the first is that it is practically impossible to discover what the sounds of the language at any given period in antiquity were, with certainty and precision. In attempting to do so, we must rely chiefly on written testimony, which cannot accurately convey an idea of sound.

The objections to the second system are that it produces confusion and variety where uniformity is desirable, that it applies modern sounds to an ancient language in disregard of the effects of time and of difference of race upon sounds, and, for the speakers of English, that it forces upon Greek the laws of a language abnormally irregular in its pronunciation. It also increases the difficulty of teaching the principles of etymology, and deprives the student of the benefit of learning a pronunciation different from that of his own language and having in itself a historical and scientific value.

For the third system there are no valid arguments to be urged. The fact that the modern Greeks give a certain sound to a given character by no means proves that the ancient Greeks did the same, or that modern scholars need do so. The increased facility of communicating with the modern Greeks is of no weight as an argument, because there is so little occasion for such communication, and because so much besides the pronunciation must be learned to make it possible. When we examine the particular features of this pronunciation, we find no early authority for it, and no support in the structure of the language. The modern sound of η , for instance, as *ee*, has no early evidence for itself, and the facts of the language testify against it.

When then we wish to decide how we should pronounce the language, we should consider first the use we make of it. We use it purely for scientific and educational purposes. Hence we should settle upon a system upon scientific grounds alone, not laying too much stress upon an exact determination of precisely how the ancient Greeks at any given time pronounced their words. Such a system could be settled with substantial agreement by philological scholars. It would give to the vowels the Italian sounds, distinguishing quantity by the time used in utterance. In the diphthongs it would give effect to each of the two elements, combining them as nearly as possible into one sound. It would give to the conso-

nants the sounds which the corresponding characters in English have, regarding ϕ as the equivalent of f , ϑ of th surd. Only χ would have the sound of the German *ch*. This system would be less objectionable and more useful in a scientific and educational point of view than any other.

A brief discussion followed the reading of this paper, after which the Society adjourned for the day, and the remaining communications were presented at the session of Friday forenoon.

4. Thirteen inedited Letters from Sir William Jones to Mr. (afterwards Sir) Charles Wilkins, communicated by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, D. C. L.; presented by the Corresponding Secretary.

Dr. Hall's introductory note accompanying these letters is as follows:

"The venerated memory of Sir William Jones must abundantly suffice to justify the publication of the following letters; and I have only to say, by way of introducing them, that I am indebted for the favor of being allowed to make them public, to Charles H. Moore, Esq., who possesses the originals."

The letters range in date from Jan. 6, 1784, to Jan. 14, 1793, and are interesting as illustrating the progress of the writer's plans of study and their accomplishment, and casting additional light upon the small beginnings of a department of learning which has now assumed great and unlooked-for importance. A few sentences are extracted here.

"... Happy should I be to follow you in the same track [of Hindu learning]; but life is too short and my necessary business too long for me to think at my age of acquiring a new language. All my hopes, therefore, of being acquainted with the poetry, philosophy, and arts of the Hindus, are grounded on the expectation of living to see the fruits of your learned labors." (April 24th, 1784.)

"... I have just received from Benares a S'hanscrit book, which puzzled me at first, and will, I hope, continue to puzzle, until it enlightens me. It is called . . . the *Dherm Shástr Menu Snvety*. A version of this curious work is promised, and, when it comes, I will set about learning the original, if I can procure assistance from a good Pandit." (March 1st, 1785.)

"... I have found a pleasant old man of the medical caste, who teaches me all he knows of the Grammar, and I hope to read the *Hít Upadés*, or some other story-book, with him. My great object is the *Dherme S'ástra*, to which I shall arrive by degrees." (Sept. 17th, 1785.)

"... You are the first European that ever understood Sanscrit, and will, possibly, be the last." (Oct. 6th, 1787.)

"I devoured, my dear Sir, your *Bhagavad-Gítá*, and have made as hearty a meal of your *Hítópádésa*, for which I thank you most sincerely. The ships of this season will carry home seven hundred copies of our first volume of Transactions; and the second will be ready. I hope, next year: but unless the impression should be sold in London, Harington & Morris (who print the book at their hazard) will be losers, and we must dissolve the Society. You have already done us capital service, and will continue to serve us by spreading over Europe your discoveries in Indian literature. You have the honor of being the first European in the world, and the only man, probably, that ever saw Europe, who possessed a knowledge of Sanscrit." (Feb. 27th, 1789.)

"I am so busy at this season, that I have only time to request your acceptance of a little Sanscrit poem, which Morris has printed, and which you are the only man in Europe who can read and understand." (Jan. 14th, 1793.)

5. On two Inscriptions in Sanskrit characters from Buddhist temples in China, by Mr. E. C. Taintor, of the Chinese Foreign Customs Service.

Mr. Taintor exhibited to the meeting an inscription, in mixed Chinese and Sanskrit characters, covering eight sheets, and explained that it was an impression taken from the faces of an octagonal marble column in the Hwa Yen T'an, a tem-

ple in the Chinese city (the southern section) of Peking, and that the inscription was first brought to light by Rev. Joseph Edkins, of the London Missionary Society. The date of its erection. A. D. 1491, is given in the last line of the eighth sheet. The first face of the column bears an inscription, in Chinese only, commemorating the rebuilding or repairing of the temple, and detailing the circumstances attending it, in the style usual in monumental records of this character, which are to be met with very commonly in temples in all parts of China. The second to the seventh faces, inclusive, contain Sanskrit characters, written after the Chinese style in vertical columns, and forming an inscription as yet untranslated. The eighth face comprises both Sanskrit and Chinese text. Considerable portions of the characters on several of the faces of the column, as given in the copied sheets, are nearly obliterated or quite indistinct, but can probably be restored on a careful examination of the original.

But one other inscription of this character, containing Sanskrit text, has, so far as I am aware, been observed in China. This was found by me in February, 1867, at the city of Ichow, which lies about seventy miles southwest of Peking, at the entrance to the beautiful valley in which are situated the Si Ling, or Western Tombs, the burial places of three of the seven deceased emperors of the present dynasty.

Outside the western gate of Ichow stands a neat little three storied pagoda; the temple attached is called Pai T'a Sz, or the 'White Pagoda Temple.' In front of the pagoda stand two octagonal white marble pillars, about a foot in diameter and six feet high. The westerly one bears only Chinese characters, and, in consequence of the soft and perishable nature of the stone, they are either obliterated or very indistinct. Seven of the eight sides are covered with characters, evidently used phonetically, without regard to their meaning. No date or emperor's name could be found. A block of marble, with sculptured figures, originally the capital of the pillar, lies a few feet from it. The easterly pillar is in better preservation. The S. face has eight columns of Chinese characters. On the S. E. face are one column of Sanskrit and two of Chinese characters; on the E. face two Sanskrit and two Chinese; on the N. E. face three columns of Chinese, representing phonetically Sanskrit (?) sounds; on the N. face, four columns of the same character; on the N. W. face three columns, and W. face three and one-half columns of Chinese, all evidently used phonetically. The S. W. face, the most important of all, as giving the date of erection, has four and one-half columns of Chinese, from which we learn that the column was placed in position on the fifteenth day of the eighth month of the fifth year of Süen Ho, of the Sung dynasty, corresponding to 1123 A. D.

As my own limited time prevented my copying the inscription (which was of about the same length as the one from Peking), I endeavored by the offer of a reward to induce some native to make a copy during my absence at the Tombs; but regretted to find on my return the following day that no one had ventured to undertake the task, on account of the great difficulty of making out many of the characters.

Prof. Whitney remarked that the Sanskrit characters were in an older form of Devanagari, quite different from that now in use, and that the hasty examination which he had yet been able to give to the inscription had not enabled him to make out any part of it, save the common Buddhist formula at the end, *om mani padma hum*.

6. On the System of Duplication in consonant groups, as taught by the ancient Hindu grammarians, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Our means of knowledge of the pronunciation of the ancient Sanskrit are its pronunciation by the modern Hindus, the teachings of the old Hindu writers on grammar, the euphonic laws of the language, and the comparison of the spoken alphabets of other related languages. Each of these, in its order, checks and corrects the others, and their combined effect is to give us a confident and satisfactory understanding of the phonetic form of the language—excepting, of course, that tone and coloring which no description can impart. The second source is worth more in India than elsewhere, since the ancient Hindu phonetists were

gifted with rare powers of observation and analysis, and carried the science of phonology further than it has been carried by any but the latest generation even of European scholars. Their results are laid down especially in the Prātiçākhyas, and constitute one main department of the interest attaching to that little body of works. But the characteristic defects of the Hindu character appear also in their phonetic science—their tendency to over-refinement of analysis, and to the setting up of arbitrary and artificial rules in place of simple natural laws, determined by pure observation. A striking example of this is their system of duplication in consonant groups; this forms a feature in all the Prātiçākhyas, and is found even in Pānini's great grammatical text-book, which has been the rule of correct Sanskrit speech for probably more than two thousand years. The system involves two chief rules: 1, that the first consonant in a group of two or more is to be pronounced double after a vowel; thus, *pra* after *á* is *á ppra*, *abda* is *abdda*, *asya* is *assya*, and so on; 2, that an *r* thus situated is not doubled, but the consonant following is so treated instead, as in *arka* for *ar*, *úrgg vai* for *úrg vai*, *úrggbhyas* for *úrgbhyas*, and so on. In case the letter to be doubled is an aspirate mute, the corresponding non-aspirate is substituted for it in duplication: thus, *addhvāra* from *adhvāra*, *dúrggha* from *dúrggha*. To these rules there are certain extensions and restrictions, of minor importance, and variously given by the different authorities. They are combined, also, with a number of other insertions and modifications, which not infrequently produce very intricate and formidable results: turning *tsm*, for example, into *thspmm*, and so on. In the case of some of these insertions and changes, we can seem to see the physical processes whose undue appreciation or gross exaggeration are their foundation: but the physical ground of the system of duplication itself no one yet has succeeded in tracing out and setting forth.

7. On Westphal's new Greek grammar, by Prof. J. Hadley, of New Haven.

Prof. Hadley referred briefly to the series of works on Greek rhythm, metre, and music, by which Westphal has gained a high, and, on the whole, a deserved reputation. Since Hermann and Boeckh, no scholar has done so much for the progress of these studies. His merits are undeniably great, though marred by some faults—by haste, self-assertion, want of ingenuousness, and intemperance in controversy. In 1869, Westphal appeared in a new field, with a *Philosophisch-historische Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Here he gives, in general, the results arrived at by Bopp, Grimm, and their successors; but lays much stress on a theory of the origin of inflections, in which he differs from nearly all comparative philologists. He holds that most inflections were, at the outset, not words, previously separate, which losing their own accent became appendages of other words, but mere sounds, without independent existence, and without significance, until by the users of language they were employed as inflections. In his Greek Grammar, just published, the same theory is adhered to; though much less prominence is given to it. The author at first intended only to write a Greek Syntax, in which the syntactical categories of Hermann should at length be superseded by more appropriate norms, derived partly from comparison of other Indo-European languages, and partly from an intelligent examination of the Greek literature. But he was led to include the etymology, as without it his treatment of the syntax would often be unintelligible. Though subordinate in the plan of his work, it is treated on a large scale, receiving 447 pages, without including the verb, which will probably require as many pages more.

This great length may be partly the result of hasty composition, which shows itself in other ways. Thus, on p. xvii., the verb *οικῶ* is spoken of as if it were a contraction of *οικω* (instead of *οικέω*). On p. 58, the noun *στίχος*—a masculine of the second decl.—is set down as having its genitive in *ος*. On p. 17, *τίψω* is given as the future of *τύπτω*, whereas the classic writers have *τυπτήσω*, and *τύψω* does not appear until some five centuries after the Christian era. Still worse is it with *κάζω*, on p. 24, which does not occur until late in the middle ages, which Passow describes as unused, and Liddell and Scott omit altogether. On p. 55, a form *τεεῖο* (= *σοῦ*) is mentioned and explained at length: under pronouns, it re-appears, in connection with *τεοῖο*, pp. 377–8, where special attention is called to the latter form;—all this without an intimation that *τεοῖο* is confined to one line (twice re-

peated) in Homer, and that *τεῖο* is a mere conjectural variation for *τεοιο* in that line.

Cases of self-contradiction were also pointed out. Thus on p. 30, the author explains *φαεινός* as being for *φαεινιος*; on p. 70, he explains it as being for *φαεινος*; while on p. 207, he pointedly rejects the second explanation and returns to the first. The two derivations proposed for *ἡλιος*—the one formerly received from a root *svar*, 'to shine,' and the one suggested by G. Curtius from *us*, 'to burn'—are both found here, the first on p. 180, the second on p. 198, each without reference to the other.

Several points in the Lautlehre were made subjects of special criticism: particularly, the failure to recognize the true difference between sonants and surds, as consisting not in softness or hardness, but in the presence or absence of tone. So, the sounding of *γ* before *μ* as *ng*; the assertion that Doric *ἦρθον* was an earlier form of *ἦλθον*; the assumption that the Homeric *εσσι* in the dative plural was made from *σι* by doubling the *σ*; the statement that the Greek had no objection to a final *λ*, supported only by the form *ἦλ* (= *ἦλος*) in a late epic poet; etc.

Among other cases of venturous etymologising, was mentioned Westphal's suggestion that the Indo-European numeral 'four' contained the word 'three' under the form *tvar*, with a prefix to express unity, which prefix had from the outset three forms *pa*, *ka*, *ta*. That the first speakers of the Indo-European, while agreed on the five sounds in *avtar*, and agreed that a surd mute must precede them, were hopelessly divided into three parties on the question which surd mute should be taken, and that this division was propagated to the first speakers of the Graeco-Latin, and down to the first speakers of the Greek itself—is a strange hypothesis, and an unnecessary one, as a primitive *k* might by explicable euphonic processes pass into a *p* or a *t*.

Finally, it was remarked that Westphal deserves credit for his attempt to treat the Greek grammar in the light of comparative philology. The difficulty of the attempt might be admitted as an excuse for many imperfections. The work would certainly be useful in overcoming the prejudice, still strong in Germany, against any application of comparative philology to Greek or Latin grammar.

8. On two recently discovered Greek monuments, by Pres't Woolsey, of New Haven.

Pres't Woolsey showed to the Society a photograph of a beautiful monument found at Athens several years ago, and rendered more interesting by a more recent discovery. The monument presents to us the figure of a young horseman over a fallen foe, and the inscription on the base is this: "Dexilaus, son of Lysanias, of Thorikus, was born when Teisander was archon, died when Eubulides was archon, in Corinth, one of the five horsemen." The dates are, of his birth, 414 B. C. (the archon being called Peisander by Diod. Sic., xiii. 7), and of his death, 394 B. C., when the great battle in the territory of Corinth and near the city took place, described in Xenophon's Hellenica, iv. 2. 9-23, which is assigned to the year of Eubulides by Diod. Sic., xiv. 85-86. In the inscription there is nothing deserving notice except—1, that Teisander is either a mistake of the lapidary for Peisander, or else an early instance of *Tei* for *Ti*, common enough afterwards, especially on marbles of Asia Minor, in words from the root *Ti*; 2, that one of "the five horsemen" naturally seems to mean one of the five who died in that "great battle," as it was called by Demosthenes.

Another inscription lately found (in March last), and published from the copy of Mr. Robert P. Keep, our consul at Peiræus, in the Yale Courant of April 30 last, records that

"These horsemen died in Corinth:
Melesias, Onetorides, Lysitheus, Pandias, Nicomachus,
Theangelus, Phanes, Democleēs, Dexilaus, Ecdelus;
In Coronea, Neocleides."

Mr. Keep's copy gives Ecdelus, but there can have been no such name.

This inscription, on the cap or frieze of a monument of Pentelic marble, occurs on the way taken by Pausanias from the city to the Academy (Attica 29. 2, which Mr. Keep cites). He says "those who fell around (or near) Corinth lie here."

This inscription, it will be perceived, names ten horsemen who died in Corinth, one of whom is Dexilaus, and the other inscription says that he belonged to "the five horsemen." What then can this expression in the first inscription, "the five horsemen," mean?

9. On Cox's Mythology of the Aryan Nations, by Prof. W. D. Whitney, of New Haven.

After excusing the incompleteness and want of elaboration of his criticism of Mr. Cox's work, Prof. Whitney began with referring to the new era made in the study of classic mythology, as of classical language, by the wider Indo-European studies. The foundation of both is the same: the formation of certain religious views and mythical conceptions, as of certain ideas and expressions, in the period of Indo-European unity, and their transmission down to historical times. To find the traceable relics of these, is to make the nearest possible approach to the beginnings of religious thought in our branch of the human race. The comparison of Greek and Hindu mythology began as soon as the Veda was opened to study, and has ever since yielded more and more fruit. Max Müller has lately done the service of setting it forth in an attractive manner; and has also given such prominence to the elements of the sun and the dawn in the earliest mythology as almost to put a new aspect upon the whole subject of mythologic interpretation. His views are very attractive and plausible, as well as novel, but their soundness is yet to be established by careful criticism. To such criticism they are not subjected by Mr. Cox, who is, rather, their implicit acceptor and their enthusiastic advocate, and who carries them to an extreme which even their originator, perhaps, would fail to approve. Mr. Cox's work (in two stout 8vo volumes, London, 1870) is eloquent and graceful, but wanting in scientific tone, as in soberness and coherence of reasoning; it is somewhat diffuse and repetitious; the author is so dominated by his theory as to be made often partial in his judgments, loose in his interpretations, and uncritical in his etymologies.

The main features of the solar interpretation—which Mr. Cox applies to the story of the Odyssey as well as of the Iliad, to the Nibelungen-Lied, the legends of Arthur and Charlemagne, the nursery-tales of Boots and Jack the giant-killer, and so on—were stated, and illustrated by extracts and comments.

No farther communications being offered, the Society adjourned, to meet again in Boston on the seventeenth of May next.