

ARTICLE IX.

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

THE publication of the Proceedings of the American Oriental Society has been unusually delayed, as has also that of the Second Part of Vol. x. of the Journal. The Society, however, still flourishes; and a notice of some of the recent communications of which an abstract is given in the Proceedings may interest our readers. At the meeting in May 1875, a paper was read by Prof. T. O. Paine, of Elmwood, Mass., on "the Way Collection of Egyptian Antiquities in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston," in which some remarkable inscriptions were translated and commented upon. Egyptology has had few cultivators in this country; and it is gratifying to find so enthusiastic a student of the subject as Professor Paine turning to account the materials for its study which our collections supply. His interesting paper will appear in the next number of the Journal, soon to be issued. At the same meeting, the Rev. Selah Merrill presented a short, but carefully prepared essay on "The Condition of Woman in Assyria," as illustrated by the cuneiform inscriptions. Dr. A. O. Treat, of the North China Mission, exhibited and described a curious *praying-machine* in use among the Mongols, which enables the devotee to offer prayers with great velocity, by a manual operation, while walking, riding, talking, or smoking.

At the meeting in November 1875, perhaps the most interesting communication was from the Rev. S. I. J. Schereschewsky, of Peking, on "The Versions of the Scriptures in the Chinese Language," with remarks on a proposed Mongolian version on which he is himself engaged. There were also papers by Prof. Avery and Prof. Whitney, of special interest to Sanskrit scholars.

At the meeting in May 1876, Prof. Paine presented a communication on "the Holy Houses, or the Hebrew Tabernacle, the Temple of Solomon, and the Later Temple," giving some of the results of the studies of this subject which have occupied him for many years. These results will be embodied in a new, greatly enlarged, and improved edition of his work on "Solomon's Temple," etc., originally published in 1861. Prof. Whitney read a paper on "The Classification of the Forms of the Sanskrit Aorist," and another on "Zēv = *dyaùs*, and other Points relating to Sanskrit Grammar as presented in M. Müller's Recent Volume of 'Chips.'" We

¹ American Oriental Society. Proceedings, May and Nov. 1875, and May 1876. New Haven. 8vo. pp. xxiv.

would call special attention to this latter paper, as in it Prof. Whitney takes up in detail the four points belonging to Sanskrit grammar on which Prof. Müller, expressly or by implication, charges him with gross ignorance or carelessness. The *prestige* of Müller's name is such that many will assume that in a matter of this kind accusation by him is conviction. One, however, who has carefully followed this controversy, or other controversies in which Prof. Müller has been engaged, cannot have failed to observe that, through haste or carelessness, combined perhaps with some constitutional infirmity, he often gives a representation of the facts of a case which is far from being justified by the facts themselves.¹ In the present instance

¹ As a recent instance of a striking character one may take a mysterious allusion thrown out by Müller in the German translation of volume four of his Chips ("Essays," p. 337). Speaking of his proposal to submit the differences between himself and Professor Whitney to a tribunal of arbitration (*Schiedsgericht*), he says: "A similar procedure, as Mr. Whitney may perhaps know, not long ago had the best result; and it is only from personal considerations that I have made no use of the permission given me to make public the verdict of the three umpires (*Schiedsrichter*)." This statement seemed so adapted to give a very false impression, even to the few who knew something of the affair referred to, that the editor of the *Literarisches Centralblatt*, Professor Zarncke of Leipzig, felt compelled to come forward (in the *Lit. Centralblatt* for Jan. 1, 1877, col. 31) and explain the matter. It appears that Müller, feeling aggrieved by a criticism on his Rig-Veda by Professor Weber of Berlin (*Lit. Centralblatt* for Nov. 1, 1873), sent to the same journal a reply so violent that Zarncke was unwilling to publish it (particularly as it would have to be followed by a not less violent rejoinder from Weber), and strongly urged its withdrawal. In accordance with the wishes of Messrs. Müller and Weber, and with the ready consent of Zarncke, the reply and rejoinder were shown to three eminent scholars. But before any word of answer came back from either of them, Müller yielded to Zarncke's request, and consented to take back the occasion of the trouble. Upon this, Zarncke had only to seal up and lay away all the documents relating to the affair. The three scholars consulted had never conferred with one another; what they said, whether orally or in writing, was, as Zarncke remarks, intended for him alone, and was mainly of the most confidential nature; no eye but his, as he expressly declares, has ever seen a word that they wrote. Zarncke concludes his exposition thus: "If, then, the above-cited words of Müller admit of being interpreted by the uninitiated as signifying that an actual tribunal had been set up to judge the difference between him and A. Weber, that it had rendered a verdict in any form whatever relating to the substance of the matter involved — or indeed any verdict at all — and that, above all, permission had been given to M. Müller to publish such a verdict, the preceding exposition will show how erroneous such an interpretation would be. On the other hand, I never concealed the fact either from A. Weber or M. Müller (nor required them to keep it private), that those gentlemen certainly seemed to agree in one point, namely, in disapproving of my course, and in blaming me for having accepted without alteration that review, the bearing of which was, in fact, offensive. If

Prof. Whitney shows clearly—if one who is no Sanskrit scholar may venture to judge—that the charges referred to, so far as they are of the slightest importance, rest on nothing better than misconceptions or erroneous statements on Müller's part. As the publications of the American Oriental Society are probably seen by few of our readers, while the charges of Prof. Müller have the wide circulation of his popular works, it seems but a matter of justice to so distinguished a representative of the best American scholarship as Prof. Whitney to indicate the substance of his reply.

The first point noticed relates to two Sanskrit words in the Atharva-Veda-Prātiçākhyā (i. 33), which admit equally well of being read in two ways. Prof. Whitney had read them in one way (Journ. Amer. Or. Soc. vii. 361), overlooking the fact that another reading and rendering was possible. Müller, in a note in his Sanskrit Grammar (§ 57), suggested the other reading as the right one, which Prof. Whitney in a later note on the passage (Journ. Amer. Or. Soc. x. 158) adopted, giving the credit of the correction to Müller. Here it might be thought the account was closed; but Müller, taking the matter up again (Chips, iv. 519), and representing it as one of "the principal bones of contention" between himself and Prof. Whitney (Chips, iv. 528, 530), sends the latter, as if he were a school-boy, to a "very simple rule" in his Sanskrit Grammar, and tells him that "before criticizing Sanskrit grammars, it would be useful to learn at least the phonetic rules." Now, the fact is that the rule which Müller cites with such parade *has absolutely nothing to do with the case in hand*; and that, instead of proving Prof. Whitney's ignorance, he has given a signal illustration of his own carelessness. It is only in keeping that on the same page Müller ascribes to Prof. Whitney a statement respecting the Prātiçākhyas precisely the opposite of that which he has really made, and then undertakes to correct him.

As to the second point (Chips, iv. 490), Prof. Whitney is misrepresented—an essential part of the sentence quoted being omitted; and his criti-

one chooses metaphorically to call these expressions of opinion, given without concert, a verdict, he may do so; but then it must not be forgotten that the point of it was directed against *me*, and that it had not the remotest reference to the substance (*das Materielle*) of Weber's review."—For a few out of many similar contrasts between the facts of a case and Müller's representation of them, one may compare p. 432 of Vol. iv. of the Chips (American ed.) with the retraction to which he was compelled, p. 505; or what he says p. 517 (comp. p. 505) about "the whining and whimpering assurance made by the American professor that he never in his life said anything personal or offensive" with what Prof. Whitney actually said (Contemp. Rev. xxv. 729); or the extraordinary misrepresentation in Chips, iv. pp. 478, 479; or his contradictory and very inaccurate accounts of the matter referred to on pp. 510–514, with the *Zur Klarstellung* of Weber in the *Indische Studien*, xiv. 409.

cism of Müller's translation of a passage of the Rig-Veda is not answered, but evaded, as any one will see who compares his *Oriental and Linguistic Studies*, i. 136-138, with Müller's *Chips*, iv. 490 f. He did not charge Müller, as is represented, with "a real grammatical blunder"; still less has he been guilty of one himself. In the criticism referred to, he is complaining of the want of proportion in Müller's notes; that, although professing to give "a full account of the reasons which justify the translator in assigning such a power to such a word, and such a meaning to such a sentence," he occupies excessive space with comparatively unimportant matters, while leaving the most serious difficulties unnoticed. Thus, in the first verse of the first hymn in his translation he gives a rendering exposed to strong and apparently fatal objections, pointed out by Prof. Whitney, on the ground of the resulting want of sense or gross incongruity, and which also involves a construction that he himself speaks of (in the *Chips*) as "anomalous" and "ungrammatical." Here Prof. Whitney had observed that he offers not a word of justification for taking as a nominative plural a form (*tasthúshas*) which should normally be either an accusative plural or a genitive or ablative singular, while he indulges in a note of more than eleven pages on the adjective in the same line translated "red." Müller now cites one passage from the Rig-Veda where a like anomalous form (as he thinks) occurs, refers to Kern for some examples which he regards as similar in the Epic literature, and, instead of meeting Prof. Whitney's objections to the meaning given to the sentence, accuses him of betraying such "ignorance of Sanskrit grammar" as would have led a scholar in former times, "after such a misfortune," "to take a vow of silence or go into a monastery"; because, forsooth, he had called that "an extremely violent and improbable grammatical process" which Müller himself describes as "anomalous" and "ungrammatical"! Müller further excuses himself for not remarking on this grammatical anomaly, because Benfey has been for years preparing a grammar of the Vedic dialect" (not even yet published, while Müller's translation appeared in 1869), and he "purposely left the grammatical questions to him"! But what if Benfey should take a different view of this case? And he *had* taken a different view of it; for he translates (*Orient u. Occident*, 1862, i. 13) *die wandelt UM DIE STEHENDEN*, understanding the form in question as an accusative plural. So Grassmann, takes it in his *Wörterbuch zum Rig-Veda* (Leipzig, 1873), col. 1602. Ludwig, in his recent translation of the Rig-Veda (Prag, 1876), ii. 6, makes it ablative singular, — *den vom FESTSTEHENDEN hinweg wandelden*, — agreeing with Prof. Whitney's view of the passage.

As to the third point, Prof. Whitney (*Or. and Ling. Studies*, i. 266) had criticized certain long Sanskrit compounds used by Müller in a series of synonymes for "surd" and "sonant" as being "of his own making," and "to be found in no Sanskrit grammarian." If this was intended, or

is likely to be understood, as meaning that no grammarian had formed and used those compounds in discussing Sanskrit phonetics, it was so far an error; but the full account which Prof. Whitney gives of the matter seems to show that his statement was perfectly correct as regards the value which Müller gave them. In the passage which Müller cites, they are, according to Prof. Whitney, not "synonymes of 'surd' and 'sonant,'" but merely "*lists of the characteristic qualities of surd and sonant sounds,*" "each put together in Hindu fashion into a copulative compound"; the first being equivalent to "opening + breath + tonelessness," the second to "closure + sound + tone." The Hindu grammarian does not say of the letters to which these words "are applied" "these are" so and so, but "of these" [the qualities are] so and so. Müller's procedure seems to be much as if, having found in a scheme of the parts of speech and their characteristics the words *mode-tense-person* over against *verb*, one were to quote and use *mode-tense-person* as a grammatical term equivalent to *verb*.

The fourth point (Chips, iv. 480), that "it is strange to meet with *sarvanâman*, the Sanskrit name for pronoun, translated by 'name for everything, universal designation,' as if this view implied gross ignorance, is shown to be already decided in Prof. Whitney's favor by the eminent scholar to whom Müller in the recent German version of his Article has referred it. It is a point on which good Sanskrit scholars are doubtful or differ; but after the arguments which Prof. Whitney has here presented for his explanation of the word, he seems fully justified in saying that "Müller, instead of assuming gross ignorance or blundering on the part of those who accept it, needs to see whether he can make out a good defence of his own opposing view." The distinguished etymologist Prof. Pott has recently expressed himself very decidedly in favor of the same explanation of the word which Prof. Whitney has given.

As the case now stands, it does not appear very likely that the German publishing firm who have selected Prof. Whitney to contribute the Sanskrit grammar to their complete series of Indo-European grammars will be led by Prof. Müller's criticisms to cancel this arrangement, or to repent of their choice.

We have seen the character of some of the charges brought against Prof. Whitney's scholarship. If he needed any vindication in this respect, it would be found in the insignificance of the errors imputed to him. One other example of these, and of the spirit of Müller's "In Self-Defence," it may be worth while to give. "What Prof. Whitney's knowledge of Zend must be," says Müller, "we may judge from what he says of Burnouf's literary productions. 'It is well known,' he says, 'that the great French scholar produced *two or three bulky volumes* upon the Avesta.' I know of *one bulky volume* only, 'Commentaire sur le Yaçna,' tome i., Paris, 1833; but that must be due to my lamentable ignorance" (Chips, iv. 515).

The extent of Prof. Whitney's error and ignorance may be judged of from the following facts : The principal publications of Burnouf connected with the Avesta were the work which Müller mentions, a large quarto of 941 pages, published in *two parts*, Paris, 1833-1835 ; an octavo volume of 433 pages, "Études sur la langue et sur les textes zends," tome i., Paris, 1840-1850 ; and an edition of the Vendidad Sade, in large folio, Paris, 1829-43. It is to the two first only that Prof. Whitney's language "upon the Avesta" strictly applies. The remark which Müller cites is a merely casual one (Or. and Ling. Studies, i. 135), and the statement is not *perfectly* accurate ; but in Prof. Whitney's Article on the Avesta, in the same volume, *all* of Burnouf's publications connected with the Avesta are described and remarked upon in detail (Or. and Ling. Studies, i. 176-178). Such are the facts, on the ground of which Müller not only charges Prof. Whitney with ignorance of Zend and of Burnouf's literary productions, but puts forward as No. 18 of "the principal bones of contention" between him and Prof. Whitney, which he wishes to have submitted to a board of "three *Professores ordinarii*, in any university of England, France, Germany, or Italy," the momentous question, "whether Burnouf has written two or three bulky volumes on the Avesta, or only one" (Chips iv. 530).

As to the other questions at issue between Messrs. Whitney and Müller, and as to the style and spirit of their mutual criticism, the materials for forming a judgment are sufficiently accessible. It is only to be regretted that the lack of proper references in Müller's Chips makes it often so difficult to investigate his charges, and that he has repeatedly allowed himself to put in quotation-marks, as the words of Prof. Whitney, language very different from what he really used.

B. A.