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1825.
We gladly embrace the present opportunity of laying the following Remarks before the literary world, not for the purpose of indulging our spleen, nor from any love we have to controversy; but because an occasion has thus been afforded us of dipping into grammatical questions, which in our opinion stand much in need of elucidation; and the settling of which will, we confidently trust, go a great way to simplify the thorny paths of oriental grammar. To have followed out our plan to its full extent, would have led us into discussions, which not one perhaps in a thousand of those who apply their minds to such subjects, would have had the courage to read, and which in all likelihood would have been only rewarded by mockery and neglect, had we undertaken to commit them to paper. We have given a fair sample, however, of the manner after which we conceive the philology of eastern languages ought to be treated, and whereby to form a judgment of the peculiar doctrines we advocate; which we believe possess
novelty sufficient to attract attention, and plausibility enough to court examination. If to make intelligible what has hitherto been obscure; to render attainable to the unassisted student what formerly required the aid of an experienced teacher; to shorten the labour, by removing the obstructions to the progress of the pupil, be ends worthy of pursuit, and desirable of acquisition; to accomplish these, have we steadily aimed in all that we have written. That we have attained to such a result, it would be folly in us to affirm; that we have adopted the best means for effecting our purpose, it remains for others to judge.

We have already been found fault with, for talking too plainly to our opponent. Those who thought so before, will most likely reiterate the charge. We have already made it known, that we write not for victory; we may here add, that what we have said has been dictated by a sense of duty, and not from a principle of retaliation on our part. We think it proper, however, to mention, that a twofold degree of energy has been infused into our style, in consequence of the supercilious disdain with which our opponent has treated a very-worthy man, since we had the honour of throwing down the gauntlet before him. At the same time we think it necessary to state, that we have no connection, direct or indirect, with the person alluded to; nor does he need our assistance, as his forthcoming reply will, we trust, sufficiently evidence. To all, however, who may object to our great plainness of speech, we would observe, in the words of one of the most eminent of the
controversialists of the past age, the celebrated President Edwards—"If in places where the argument pinches most, and there is the greatest appearance of strong reason in Mr. -----'s book, I do as some other disputants, instead of entering thoroughly into the matter, begin to flounce and fling, and divert the reader's attention to the argument by the noise of big words, or magisterial or disdainful expressions; let the reader take it, as justly he may, for a shrewd sign of the weakness of my cause in that particular, or at least of a distrust of my own ability, to defend myself well in the reader's apprehension, and to come off with a good grace any other way."
When we wrote our Critique upon Professor Lee's edition of Jones's Persian Grammar, we were sufficiently aware, that we were raising to ourselves an enemy, who had never as yet yielded an inch of ground without a struggle; and who would, in all likelihood, embrace the earliest opportunity to demolish the goodly fabric of our reasoning, and proclaim his mastery by our thorough discomfiture. The event has shown the accuracy of our calculations; for, in the July and August numbers of the Asiatic Journal, he has honored us with his notice, by publishing an objurgatory reply, which has by some mistake been termed a Vindication of his edition of Jones. In a couple of epistolary communications to the editor of that Journal, he has discharged the full weight of his wrath against the unhappy Reviewer, who, without having read the same books which he has read, or followed the same path which he has trodden, has been so unfortunate as to detect his errors, and make them known to the world. His plan of defence, however, proves him an experienced tactician. He bristles up when sophistry assists him,—he declines the contest when she refuses her aid. According to him, the writer
and the argument are one and the same existence; and to besoul the former, is to neutralise the effect of the latter. He endeavours to show that his censor is a person, to the last degree inconsistent in his statements, eminently ignorant of the subject matter in dispute, a dabbler in logic, and a bungler in grammar; in fine, a very pigmy in philology, and altogether unable to resist his giant strength in languages now dead, or living, or to live. As proof of prowess, he begins, by evincing a scornful moderation and tenderness of treatment in his conduct towards his doltish foe.

"It is not my intention," he says, "to examine all the statements made by my reviewer; if the major, and more important part of them, can be shown to be erroneous, I have no doubt my readers will excuse my not troubling myself and them with a refutation of the whole. Nor is it my intention to object to any genuine remark made by my censor, or to conceal any thing which deserves to be mentioned. Those parts, therefore, which will be passed over, I consider as unworthy of notice."

This, our readers will observe, is the most scientific way, which has yet been discovered by the ingenious in sophistry, for getting rid of a difficulty when hardly pressed by an opponent; and it is generally adopted under the belief that there is a necessary connexion between the results of literary and of military warfare: so that, since when the main body of an army is defeated, the battle is gained; therefore, when the principal arguments in a discourse made up of independent arguments, are shown to be erroneous or inconclusive, every other argument must also be erroneous or inconclusive. That there is a radical error, in thus reasoning upon an analogy between the effects of gunpowder, and those of pen and ink, when in reality no such analogy exists, our readers cannot but perceive. It is right, therefore, to be borne in mind, that the Professor's proud vaunting about a refutation of the whole, is vox innocua et praeterea nihil.
Our readers will most assuredly agree with us, in thinking that it was exceedingly natural for the Rev. Dr. to fall into the mistake of supposing, that he was individually obnoxious to us, and that we wrote with the design of crushing him to gratify private or party malevolence.

"The review in question, is, so far as I can discover from a pretty close examination of its contents and spirit, a determinate personal attack upon myself."

Never was suspicion more groundless than this. That we bear grudge to Dr. Lee, or have any personal pique at him, either on his own account, or on account of his literary celebrity, all our friends well know to be untrue. In short, no feeling of this kind has ever been entertained by us towards him, and we thought that it had been not indistinctly intimated, in more than one paragraph of our criticism, that motives of another nature had urged us to its publication. Dr. Lee may rest satisfied, that had it not been for the connexion, subsisting between him and the principal bible and missionary societies, we should never have troubled the public with any of our trashy lucubrations, as he has been pleased to designate them. Our aim was this, and we think it was not ambiguously expressed, to inform Dr. Lee and the public, that if he could not edit a correct edition of a grammar, of a language in which he was understood to be an adept, he was not in our judgment, a fit person to be employed as editor of oriental translations of the bible. This is still our belief, and a perusal of his vindication has tended to confirm us more strongly in our opinion; so that it was by no means any personal consideration that induced us to attack him, but a regard to the best interests of the bible society, and the cause of missions.

It is curious however, to observe how one error leads to the commission of another. He no sooner finishes the
sentence above quoted, than he immediately subjoins—

"Both the author and his motives are, if I am not greatly mistaken, well known to me."

It is amusing, from our concealment, to behold him fighting with a shadow, and in his Quixotic zeal to distinguish himself, warring an imaginary foe. Having set it down in his mind as a personal attack, he immediately looks about among his old acquaintances with whom he is or has been on bad terms, and concludes it must have proceeded from some idle vagabond among them, who could not find other and better employment—so like another Æschinus he says to him:

— si molestus pergis esse, jam intro abripiere, atque ibi
Usque ad necem operiere loris.

After this ireful prelude, the Professor formally commences his refutation of us, by shortly stating that his opinion, respecting the study of the Arabic language being a sine qua non to the knowledge of the Persic, has been controverted by us, as our readers will recollect. His refutation is couched in the following words—

"In the very next page, however, Sir William’s opinion is thus cited by our reviewer, which will be answer sufficient, as to the accuracy of my statement. ‘True it is,’ says he, ‘that Sir William elsewhere talks of the impossibility of learning the Persian language accurately, without a moderate knowledge of the Arabic. But the assertion,’ continues he, ‘is grounded upon the fact, that Meninski’s dictionary was the one then in use, whereas the case is now altered.’ But how, Mr. Editor, is the case altered? Supposing we were to allow that Meninski’s dictionary is not the one now in use, will this alter the case as to Sir William Jones’s opinion? If so, then are the opinions of all former writers altered, because, forsooth, the times are changed!

“Again, let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that Meninski’s dictionary is not the one now in use, but that Richardson’s dictionary has taken its place, which every body knows is little more than a translation of Meninski. Will Sir William Jones’s opinion now be altered
because a translation of Meninski's dictionary is the one in use? And further, will the case be altered, as to the accuracy of the general position, that a moderate acquaintance with the Arabic is necessary to a proper understanding of the Persian language? If a knowledge of the Arabic was then necessary, can the circumstance of Meninski's dictionary having been translated, at all affect our question? For my part, I can see no connexion whatever between the necessity of a knowledge of Arabic in this case, and the publication of Richardson's dictionary. Our reviewer has perhaps discovered a new rule in logic, as he certainly has several in grammar, with which we shall by and bye be favoured; and till this be known, the question before us must, of course, remain undecided. But the truth is, Meninski's dictionary is still in use; and, if I am not mistaken, is a better work than Richardson's. That it is not the one used by our reviewer, I will willingly allow, and can therefore excuse his ignorance of this fact."

The observation of Sir William Jones just quoted, will be seen on consulting his grammar to have been suggested to his mind, while treating of the irregular forms of the Arabic plurals. At the time he wrote his grammar, in 1771, Meninski's Dictionary was, so to speak, the only dictionary of the Persian language to be had; and then, also, it was more than it is now, beyond the reach of ordinary purses. A short Persian Lexicon, compiled chiefly by Golius, had been appended by Castell to his Heptaglott; but as it was only intended as a Lexicon to the Persic part of Walton's Polyglott, it is very inefficient for helping the student to a general acquaintance with the language. Meninski, in compiling his dictionary from the works of Golius, Castell, and others, introduced the alphabetic order throughout, which is not usually adhered to in Arabic Lexicons. Aware of the great difficulty, attending the search for the irregular forms of Arabic plurals, in a dictionary in which only singulars are inserted, he has given the irregular plurals, so far as in his judgment he thought it necessary, a place in the alphabetic order. Now it is clear that if this most judicious system had been followed out to its
full extent, no meaning could have been attached to Sir William's observation, and for this plain reason, that the student could have encountered no difficulty, arising from any intricacy of Arabic grammar on this head, since all perplexity on the part of the student would have been effectually removed, by the alphabetical arrangement of the words. But Sir William knew well, that neither Persic nor Arabic lexicography had arrived at this pitch of perfection; and he was sensibly aware from his own experience, of the very confused manner in which these irregular plurals are inserted by Meninski, who had nearly printed off his first volume, before he saw the propriety of introducing them unreservedly into his work. From this circumstance it happens, that a great proportion of them are to be looked for in his appendix to the Thesaurus. This would have been but a slight inconvenience, were it not, that when the plural required is found, its signification is seldom added, and all the information gained, is, that it is the plural of a certain word in the singular, which must likewise be turned to, if its meaning be desired; so that the dictionary must frequently be turned over, two, three, or four times, before the translation of the word sought for can be made out. Thus all the three volumes must be consulted, before it can be ascertained that the word اطواق means peacocks, and before it can be determined that furrows or trenches is the proper translation of أتلام, four times must the patience of the student be tested. But even this might and would be borne with by the diligent student, if all these plurals had been alphabetically arranged, which is not the case. If he meet with the word معيورا in an author, he will consult Meninski in vain for its meaning, unless per-chance it catch his eye under ماتونا or عبر; for un-
less he know Arabic, he cannot tell where to look for it, and he must possess more than a superficial acquaintance with Arabic in order to find it. This is not however the worst of the matter. Plurals will be found referred to singulars, to which no signification is attached, and reference is again made to another word which perhaps is not to be found, as is the case on looking up the plural مَخَّاتِر. As in Arabic, one singular form may have as many as twelve, or fifteen different irregular forms of its plural, which are commonly inserted under its singular, these different forms should likewise find a place in their alphabetic order; yet there are many cases in Meninski, in which only one or two out of ten or twelve forms are to be found, and the student if ignorant of Arabic grammar cannot find the others, although they are inserted in the dictionary. This is the case with دَارِ, under which ten varieties of plural are inserted, only two of which are to be met with in the alphabetic order. In so far therefore, as Meninski withholds the requisite information upon this point, the opinion of Sir William Jones is borne out, and our interpretation of his words, is shown to be consistent with the facts of the case. To suppose even for a moment, that Sir William Jones would have maintained the opinion, that the rules for forming the irregular Arabic plurals, must be taught to the Persian student, when they were in every case to be found, inserted in alphabetic order in the dictionary, with their translation; is to insult his memory, by degrading his understanding.

In regard to other classes of Arabic words, the case is somewhat similar. Upon a moderate calculation, there are at least 5000 words inserted in Meninski, to which no translation is given, and the student is referred to other words for their meaning. This of itself is sufficient to
show, that conveniency of consultation, was not considered a necessary characteristic of his work by the compiler; but the assiduous student would, in most instances, not grumble at being put to trouble, if he was at length furnished with the information he sought. This, however, is not the case. If the word wanted be نثيان, all he finds is i. q. نثيان, and on turning up the latter, he is again referred to two words, one of which cannot be got. At least one half of all the references in the dictionary, occur under the letter م, and the greater proportion of these unexplained terms, are Arabic participles, belonging to the derivative conjugations. To the words from which they are immediately derived, the student is uniformly referred, and a great number of these are not to be seen. Thus منكتسي is found in its place, and تكتسي to which he is referred is not to be found; under منتفسي there is a reference to تفسي but in this case likewise the search is vain: and though both of these are also derivatives, yet their roots are not to be found; for Meninski's Dictionary is not an Arabic Dictionary.

Now all these difficulties in the way of consultation are removed, and most of the above mentioned deficiencies supplied, in the second edition of Meninski's Lexicon, the first volume of which issued from the press in 1780, under the editorial care of Bernard de Jenisch. In this second edition Meninski appears greatly altered and improved; and we have the testimony of Captain Roebuck, that he derived considerable assistance from it while editing the Borhani Kata, published by him at Calcutta in 1818, particularly from those words inserted in it from Wankuli;
and the Farhangi Shawari. It is plain, therefore, that in proportion as an acquaintance with the grammatical principles of the Arabic language, is supplied by the superior copiousness, and the clearer arrangement of the dictionaries now procurable; in the same proportion is the knowledge of the grammatical principles of that language, less essential to the Persic student: and when from the further improvement of Persic dictionaries, the whole body of Arabic words in common use in the Persian language, shall have been incorporated into their columns; then it will not be at all requisite, to convey to the Persic student any instruction respecting the derivation of Arabic words, since he will be provided with all the necessary information by consulting his dictionary. To maintain that this is an unattainable object, is to maintain a position which the industry of succeeding lexicographers will, we confidently hope, at no very distant date, show to be false.

The necessity of an acquaintance with the Latin tongue, to pave the way to the acquirement of Persic, was an opinion at one time indisputable. Had Sir William Jones not written his grammar, and Richardson not compiled his dictionary, no blame could have been attached to either for advocating that now absurd notion, which, let it not be forgot, cannot even at the present day, be denominated absurd in reference to Arabic, as there is no Arabic and English dictionary. To the acquisition of Arabic, Latin is therefore, to a certain degree, still necessary; yet no one will maintain this to be a correct idea, if viewed in the light, in which Arabic is asserted to be necessary to the acquisition of Persic, as our antagonist affirms it. The case however, as it regards Persic, is now altered, and what was a correct opinion fifty years ago, is now untenable; because, forsooth, as our opponent expresses it, the times are changed, or rather as we would have advised him to write, the circumstances of the case have changed. Enough, however, nay
more than enough, has been advanced to prove, that our method of reconciling Sir William Jones with himself, is not at all at variance with the matter of fact of the case; or at least to show, that our interpretation is much more tenable than that adopted by Dr. Lee, who cannot distinguish between the time of an event, and the circumstances attending it; or be convinced, that an opinion may be just at one time, which, from a change of circumstances, may be erroneous at another: and yet, that this should lead to no disparagement of the character of the man who held the opinion. Enough has likewise been said to convince Dr. Lee, that we not only have the use of Meninski, but that we prefer the second edition to the first, on account of its greater copiousness, and more perspicuous arrangement. The Rev. Doctor, who we have reason to believe, never looks into the second and improved edition, argues upon the supposition that the words, 'whereas the case is now altered,' necessarily referred to the publication of Richardson's dictionary. He will now perceive, that our words are susceptible of another and a better interpretation; and that the polite excuse which he proffers for our ignorance, is to be regarded in the same light, as his question about Sir William Jones's opinion being now altered. In both cases, the conclusion is unsupported by the premises, since in the one case, the non-usage of a work, does not presuppose ignorance of a fact regarding that work; and in the other, a change of circumstances, does not change the opinion of a man now dead, though it frequently renders that opinion no longer tenable by a man now living.

It is pleasing to observe, that Dr. Lee sometimes stumbles upon a truth, just as we do ourselves; and the opinion he holds, regarding the relative merits of Richardson and Meninski, is an instance of it. As we know, however, that like Geoffrey Crayon, Esq., he is not always quite sure of the truth of all he may affirm upon a point, we shall fur-
wish him with a few observations confirmatory of his position, as also with a few of an opposite nature. If then by the word Meninski, Dr. Lee mean the second edition, revised and improved by Jenisch and Klezl, and by the word Richardson, he understand the original edition of his dictionary,—his opinion is correct; for in the one, the student is never allowed to guess at any thing, while in the other, he is frequently left in uncertainty; the former can never be consulted without advantage, in the latter the unwary is sometimes led astray. If the first editions of both be understood, then the position is false, for Mr. Richardson requires far less labour in consultation; and although both he and his prototype are very deficient in the significations of words, yet he is in very many instances, more distinct and precise than Meninski. If the second editions are compared together, then there is great room for debate, if the Persic additions by Wilkins are included in the comparison; but as the dispute respects the facilities afforded the student of Persic, to acquire a knowledge of the Arabic words incorporated in the Persic language,—then we have no hesitation in affirming, that Meninski is the preferable dictionary, because it is not only more copious in significations, but much less perplexing for the purposes of consultation. It is not a little remarkable, that Mr. Wilkins seems never to have looked into the second edition of Meninski, in order to improve his edition of Richardson; and it is no less astonishing that, in a very numerous class of words, more knowledge of Arabic is required to get at their meaning in this, which is commonly considered the most improved of Persian dictionaries, than is required in any preceding edition. We allude to the Arabic participles, beginning with the letters م. We have taken the trouble to count them, and we find there are upwards of 1700 of them inserted by Mr. Wilkins, to none of which is any translation affixed. The student is
referred, as in Meninski, to the words from which they are immediately derived. Many of these he cannot find, and those which are found, appear all of them to be already either participles or nouns. The words, for whose signification he is referred, are invariably marked participles by Mr. Wilkins; and the student must ransack his wits, to find out how it happens, that participles are derivable from nouns, adjectives, and other participles. Had Mr. Wilkins refrained from inserting the indicatory syllable part. after every one of them, which is the very thing which leads to confusion, all would have been right; since then he must have adopted Mr. Richardson's plan, by putting in its stead the word see, which could not give rise to much difficulty. The plan, however, followed by Jenisch in his edition of Meninski, is certainly to be preferred, where in every case the meaning is attached to the participle, and the student is neither left in doubt of the part of speech, nor of the meaning of the word.

As to the reversed vocabulary, there is none in the second edition of Meninski, and that to be found in the first edition, is of little or no use to the Persic student, being almost wholly composed for the use of the Turkish scholar. This part of Richardson's dictionary is to be preferred, therefore; and it is in this division of the dictionary, that Mr. Wilkins has displayed the greatest research. In his hands it has been entirely remodelled, and although not a faithful counterpart of the other division, and hence susceptible of considerable improvement; yet it affords the most ample proof, of the unwearied diligence of that celebrated orientalist.

Dr. Lee goes on to state, that after a few feeble struggles in favour of our position, the whole is modestly and quietly given up by our quotation from Mr. Lumsden, at the top of p. 25. It appears to us, that the Rev. Doctor conceives it to be the duty of the reviewer, who enquires into the cui bono of
the contents of a work, to stop short, and say nothing of the work as it stands; and above all, not to compare it with any work conducted upon a similar plan; for then he goes out of his province, because he does not judge it by the same criterion. If this is the Doctor's idea, we may say along with him, that it will not be necessary, we presume, to press this point any further, and we may now set down all that he has said for nothing.

"I am accused in the next place," he says, "of having detracted from the merits of Erpenius, and of having given a false account of Richardson's Arabic grammar. I answer, if any doubt be entertained as to the accuracy of my statement respecting the grammar of Erpenius, let the reader turn to Mr. de Sacy's Grammaire Arabe, vol. i. p. 212, &c. and if what is there said fail to justify my assertions, the controversy will be with him and Mr. de Sacy: but of this, I believe, there cannot be much doubt."

The passage referred to we have carefully read, and find nothing in it but a scolding, which de Sacy gives Erpenius for calling the noun of action an infinitive, when it is in reality no such thing. In what sense has Dr. Lee profited by this scolding of Erpenius? Why, just like a blundering scholar, who does not comprehend the instructions of his master, and who is at the same time sensible, that one out of two ways spoken of is the right one, but is unable to determine which; he puts down both, to save his hide a beating, and chuckles at his cunning.

We reprimanded Dr. Lee for his unqualified assertion, that Richardson's grammar wanted the vowel points, and we gave him the necessary information, which it appeared to us he required, that he might not again print such a misrepresentation, which we indeed find he has not ventured upon; but in exculpation he argues, that what is true of a part is true of the whole, and therefore our objection dies a natural death, in the obstetric hand of his kind and consistent censor. *Hoc juvat et melli est* may be affirmed of
this, as well as of the Doctor's reasoning in a subsequent paragraph, in which he seems quite delighted at the thought of refuting us, by simply saying that our eyes have deceived us. We told him he had made no use of Captain Lockett's work. From an affectionate regard to his own reputation, he most humanely abstains from convicting us of falsehood, and decides the point in dispute after a fashion quite his own. He leaves it he says as a stimulus to our future researches. How pleasantly he illustrates the precept of Horace,

Ut jam nunc dicit, jam nunc debentia dici
Pleraque differat, et præsens in tempus omittat.

In the succeeding paragraph the Doctor talks of *magical nature, retentive powers, radical reform*; and impelled by a wild and mischievous association of ideas, he proceeds to say—

"the vowels are according to the Orientals, unutterable without a consonant; and hence they never precede a consonant."

It cannot be true then, that a vowel means a letter which can be uttered by itself. This must be an old foolish prejudice, fostered in the schools of barbarian Europe, and adhered to as a mere piece of antiquity in this enlightened age, but which the diffusion of eastern learning is destined to overturn. It need not excite the smallest degree of surprise, that the Egyptian hieroglyphics remain unknown, when from the Stagyrite downwards the powers of the vocal organs have been altogether misunderstood. Vowels unutterable! what can exceed the originality of the idea, and what discovery of modern times is so pregnant with novelty, or likely to unfold such unlooked for results?

We informed the Professor that he was wrong, in asserting that the Arabic article is generally affixed, to the last of two nouns in construction, but never to both; [and we
told him further, to look into Mr. de Sacy, vol. ii. p. 110, and he would find several examples given, of the article affixed to both, with a statement that he (de Sacy) had found a great number of examples, contrary to the latter clause of the rule. Dr. Lee in his eagerness to refute, completely overlooks the latter part of our observation; and forgets to quote from de Sacy what militates against him. He admits, however, that the examples given in de Sacy’s note are exceptions, i.e. exceptions to the rule respecting nouns in construction, and consequently that the nouns in these exceptions, are nouns in construction,

"and," he continues, "upon a little reflection we shall find that they are not nouns in construction."

To prove the truth of this riddle, he puts a preposition between the two members of the last example; and what, according to de Sacy, means wooden saddles or saddles of wood, is transmuted into saddles from wood, "by a rule too common to need recitation;" and the "reviewer’s remark is therefore a mere cavil, founded on his own ignorance of the subject." Let the Professor try the effects of this his art of grammatical transmutation upon the phrase, әلسәәرب әلәәيد the striker of the servant, which is also adduced as an exception by de Sacy. It is plain the process will not succeed in this instance, by merely replacing the preposition of by from; and it is fortunate for the Doctor, that he did not recite his "rule too common," for now he will be enabled to bring all its corollaries into play, whereas its strict observance might cramp his efforts alchemistical.

We now proceed, to consider the result of his greatest vindicatory exertion, as displayed in favour of his rule, for forming the aorist tense of the Arabic verb. Here the number of rhetorical embellishments is considerably in-
creased, and the person, whom he had previously designated "our profoundly learned reviewer," "our kind and consistent censor," "our Anglo-Scottish friend," now becomes "our new northern light," "the gentleman who has the modesty to set up as a public censor," "my horned friend," "my Zoilus." As these are all applied to some one south of the Tweed unknown to us, we can give no opinion as to the characteristic propriety of the several appellations. That they are used as helps to the argument, we have not the smallest doubt; but we hope the Doctor will pardon us, if in our remarks we keep them out of view.

The refutation is begun, by quoting a part of what we had denominated, a short popular view of the grammatical structure of the Arabic language; and the sort of algebraic formula given in illustration, the Professor declares, is nothing more than a different way of announcing the rule, which he had given in his abstract. This rule, the magnum peccatum of his edition of Jones is there given, and to enable our readers to judge of our remarks we here insert it.

"The first and last vowels in the leading persons of both tenses are always the same, except when certain particles go before, some of which alter the zum to fathah, others reject it entirely, the second vowel is determined by prescription alone, and is always given in the best dictionaries. It may therefore be either zum, kesra, or fathah; and when this is once determined, that vowel remains unchangeable throughout the conjugation, as the fathah in the above table."

The Doctor then proceeds to say, in allusion to our popular view of the structure of Arabic,—

"This new, popular, and easy exhibition of the doctrine of the roots is, therefore, a mere plagiarism of the very rule which we shall presently see our reviewer reprobabes in the strongest terms. But my rule goes still farther; it also shows how the aorist is to be pointed. It declares that the first and last vowels of the leading person will always have the same vowels, i.e. with those given in the table; and that the dictionary must be referred to in order to determine the middle vowel. Our rule
is, therefore, easy and comprehensive, and both approved and adopted by our reviewer, as far as the preterite is concerned.

Our learned friend, however, has forgotten to give a rule for the aorist in this his popular view of the verb; and that which he has given for the infinitive, as he calls it, is false! If our new northern light had read as far as page 37 of the grammar, he would have found that his general rule — a — un, i.e. تُعَلَم for the infinitive does not hold good; for we have there علم, and كَرُن also given as infinitives.

And a little lower down it is said, that the forms of these nouns (for nouns they are) are extremely numerous. Erpenius has given thirty three, Mr. de Sacy thirty seven, and Mr. Lumsden sixty. Our reviewer's popular view, is in the first instance, a mere plagiarism, as far as it has been understood; in the second it is defective; and in the third incorrect. A pretty good specimen this of the abilities of the gentleman who has the modesty to set up for a public censor."

Our readers will distinctly perceive, that our antagonist is so far behind the age in which he lives, as not to be able to discriminate between a scientific and popular course of instruction; a piece of information which any individual, out of the tens of thousands of mechanics in and around Glasgow, could impart to him almost at a breath. It is necessary therefore to state, that in communicating a popular course of instruction upon chemistry, anatomy, or astronomy; a full and particular investigation of every fact, or even of every class of facts usually included under these several heads, is neither intended to be given by the lecturer, nor expected by his hearers. If the broad outline of these sciences be clearly laid down, accompanied by an explanation of the more remarkable features, and of only the more useful peculiarities of the subject, it is all that is requisite to fulfil the objects of such a course; which is the acquisition of general information, without much study, or any very close application to the scientific principles, necessary to be understood, to attain to a minute acquaintance
with such branches of knowledge. The same thing takes place in a popular view of the structure of the Arabic language; in which just so much knowledge is intended to be conveyed, as is necessary for a specified purpose: as was the case in our criticism, where all that was proposed, was to furnish general information, whereby to facilitate the proper understanding of the particular argument, to ordinary readers. Dr. Lee has erred most egregiously, therefore, in supposing, that our popular view was designed for his perusal alone; or was written to be passed off, as a finished scientific exposition of the structure of the language. As no such thing was contemplated by us; and as no expression can be selected, which could lead by any possibility, to such an interpretation of our meaning: we know not whether to attribute such perversion of our statements, to want of judgment, or to a hasty inconsiderate examination of their import. A scholar, accustomed to accurate thinking and correct expression, could never upon any other supposition, have denominated our general expression for Arabic roots, a table of the verb; and no one acquainted with the first principles of the Arabic language, with the exception of Professor Lee, could for one single moment have imagined that to be a defective and erroneous table of the verb, which is not a table of the verb, but an algebraic formula expressive of the general form of its root.

The Rev. Doctor accuses us of plagiarism, but he seems never to have reflected upon the proper meaning to be attached to the term, and we shall therefore explain it to him, at the risk of being considered metaphysical. Whenever the occurrence of an event, or the existence of a fact, gives rise to the idea of such existence or occurrence, or necessitates the expression of either; the mere recording of such existence or occurrence can never be called a plagiarism: for this word is only applicable to the thoughts or views of a writer, or to express it generally, to ideas originating in
the mind; and is therefore with the strictest propriety de-
nominated, in the philosophical language of the Germans, 
gedankenraub, thought-theft. No one ever accused the 
writer of the books of Chronicles, of plagiarism; for what-
ever deficiency may exist in regard to the testimony, by 
which the occurrence of the facts there recorded is proved, 
the mere recording of the facts does not constitute the of-
fence spoken of. Plagiary therefore cannot be predicated 
of a grammatical treatise, in so far as the mere matter of 
fact in language is concerned; for to state a grammatical 
fact, nothing more is to be done than simply to state a 
thing as it exists, and which honesty forbids to be misre-
presented. No one ever affirmed that the insertion of 
amo, amavi, amatum, amare, in a grammatical treatise, was 
plagiarism. Plagiary, however, may and does frequently 
exist, in relating an opinion respecting a matter of fact, 
or in giving a particular representation of it from another 
writer, without acknowledgment: for in such a case though 
there be no change in the thought, or in the mode of re-
representing it to the mind; a considerable change is operat-
ed upon the mind of the reader, as to the originator of the 
thought or of its representation, which is sufficient to con-
stitute the offence. The recording of a fact, and the re-
cording of ideas regarding a fact, are therefore two distinct 
and separate things. The first is not a plagiarism, for over 
the existence of the fact the mind can have no control; 
the second when unacknowledged is plagiarism in its pro-
per sense. In respect of the first of these then, it is plain, 
that when Dr. Lee accuses us of plagiarism, the accusation 
falls upon himself; since our popular view and the corre-
sponding part of his rule, merely make known the existence 
of a fact, differing only in the representation of its existence. 
In so far as the mode of representing the existence of this 
fact, recorded in his rule and in our popular view, is con-
cerned, his rule is a plagiarism; since the fact has been all
along so represented, and our popular view is not. The uncorresponding part of his rule, is a plagiary in no sense of the term; for it neither accords with fact, nor does it represent the ideas of any former writer upon the subject, in the whole range of Arabic literature.

To prove our last made assertion, we now proceed. Our readers will recollect, that we formerly gave our interpretation of this rule: but as the Rev. Doctor has, for some reason best known to himself, ranked it among those parts of our criticism which are unworthy of notice; we are under the disagreeable necessity of again pressing the point. In doing so we request all our readers to re-peruse the rule, as it stands in the grammar, and carefully to observe whether or not we are mistaken, in our conception of its signification. In order to render our meaning as plain and intelligible as possible to the Professor, we shall adopt his favourite plan of supplying the ellipses. Our interpretation therefore will run thus,—

The first and last vowels of the leading persons of both tenses, are always the same, except when certain particles go before the leading persons of both tenses, some of which particles alter the zum of the leading persons to fathah, others reject the zum entirely. The second vowel of the leading persons of both tenses, is determined by prescription alone, and this second vowel is always given in the best dictionaries. The second vowel, therefore, may be either zum, kesra, or fathah, and when the second vowel is once determined, that vowel remains unchangeable throughout the conjugation, as the fathah in the above table, in which table there is no difference between the second vowel of the preterite, and the second vowel of the aorist.

If words possess a meaning, and the English language be entitled to the name of a vehicle of thought, then we affirm, that no other interpretation of Dr. Lee’s rule can possibly be given. This rule is affirmed by the Doctor to be comprehensive, which we understand to mean applicable to all cases, and every variety of inflexion. But the very
phraseology of the rule itself, compared with the Doctor's commentary upon his own rule, as already quoted, plainly show, that it informs the student only as to the formation of the 3 p. m. s. of each tense; and throws a doubt into his mind, as to the formation of the other inflexions of both tenses: for what signification other than this, can have the phrases "leading persons" in the rule, and "leading person" in the commentary. In this interpretation, we are happy to find that we agree in opinion with the Doctor; who at p. 40 of the grammar tells his readers, that "the noun of time and place is formed from the leading person of the aorist, by substituting م for ی": but, as to the other assertion of the Doctor in his commentary, "that the first and last vowels of the leading person, always have the same vowel with those given in the table," we cannot penetrate its meaning; and we implore our antagonist's most compassionate attention to our infirmity, and hope he will enlighten our darkness. Further, the Doctor expressly states—"My general rule is that which has been given by Mr. Lumsden, namely, that the medial vowel is in both tenses to be determined by prescription alone." We challenge Dr. Lee to produce this rule from any part of Mr. Lumsden's writings. Moreover, the Doctor quotes from Mr. Lumsden as follows:—"I have already stated, that the form of the aorist is very generally determined, by the arbitrary authority of prescription alone." We challenge the Doctor to verify this assertion of Mr. Lumsden. Nay more, we challenge Dr. Lee to produce more than one other instance, in which this novel grammatical term prescription, is employed by Mr. Lumsden, in the course of the seventy folio pages of his Arabic grammar, in which he treats of the formation of the tenses of the Arabic verb. That this term prescription, cannot be made to signify the general usage of the language, we have Dr. Lee's own authority for maintaining; for at
p. 97 of the grammar, the Doctor says, "In these derivative conjugations, it should be remembered prescription never interferes with the vowels." But there are vowels, and the general usage of the language determines what these vowels are; yet prescription never interferes with them. What then is prescription?

It is a power supernatural,
And wond'rous in effect,
For working things unnatural,
When need is to conject.

Let us now examine the rule, as to the ease with which the medial vowel of the aorist is determined, and the means which it affords the student for determining it. The most expeditious way of settling this point will be, to enquire how far Professor Lee has followed his own rule, or been guided by it, in the compilation of his Abstract of Arabic Grammar. Page 40 of the grammar will decide the matter. There we read—

"The noun of time and place is formed from the leading person of the aorist, by substituting مَجَلَسٍ "he sits," for مَجَلَس يَجَلَسُ he is occupied,

a place or time of sitting, i.e. an assembly. مَشَغَلُ the time or place of occupation, where the znam of the penultima becomes fathah, which is mostly the case: in other verbs, having kesra or fathah in the penultima, that vowel is preserved."

We have here two verbs in the aorist given as illustrations, and they are both pointed. The first belongs to the root مَجَلَسٍ "he sat." Dr. Lee has determined the medial vowel of the aorist to be kesra. His rule says; "the second vowel is determined by prescription alone, and is always given in the best dictionaries." In a case of this kind, Meninski and
Richardson are of no use; for in no edition of either of their dictionaries, is there a single instance of an Arabic future being mentioned. They are, therefore, in Dr. Lee's opinion, not the best Arabic dictionaries; and all well informed Arabic scholars know, that neither the one nor the other of them can, with any semblance of propriety, be styled an Arabic Lexicon. We will venture to assert that he did not find it in Giggæus, which besides has, for upwards of a century and a half, been looked upon as not the best Arabic dictionary. The Lexicons of Castell and Golius, are marked in the Doctor's Sylloge Librorum Orientalium, as the most useful Arabic Lexicons to the student; and it was to be expected, that one or other of them would have maintained the honor of the Doctor's rule; but they are silent on the subject: and Wilmet's Lexicon to the Koran &c. does not supply the information. All the Lexicons, therefore, procurable by the European student, agree in refusing assistance to Dr. Lee and his pupils; who have no other resource left by which to support their cause, but their favourite lex inanis, viz. prescription. With what success the rule has been applied to the second example, the Professor himself will tell—"I am accused in the next place," he says, "of having pointed the word يشغِل erroneously, and the accusation is just; but what is the consequence? The rule which this word had been adduced to illustrate is nevertheless true." In this instance, Castell, Golius, and Wilmet are uniform in pointing out the medial vowel to the student; yet Dr. Lee goes astray, and is obliged to confess his error.

The whole case therefore stands thus. The Professor of Arabic in the university of Cambridge frames a rule, which he blazons abroad as an easy, comprehensive, only rule, for determining the medial vowel of the aorist tense of the Arabic verb. Upon it, as a basis, he constructs another
rule, explanatory of the formation, of a very numerous class of words in very frequent use, in the Arabic and Persic languages. To illustrate the operation of the latter rule, he adduces two examples of verbs in the aorist. The first of these sets the primary rule at defiance, and satisfactorily shows the Professor to be wrong. The second example is most compliant, indeed, with every iota of this faulty rule; but the Professor, as if indignant at the inefficacy of his nostrum, disdains its help, and manfully goes wrong without its aid: yet, loath to resign the hope, of continuing to be regarded as a pope in grammar, he artfully subjoins—

"But what is the consequence? the rule which this word had been adduced to illustrate, is nevertheless true."

Notwithstanding this signal failure on the part of the Professor, in the management of his own tools; seven times are we counselled, in the course of the vindication, to consult the dictionary. By the decision of the dictionary, therefore, we are willing to abide. As every Arabic Lexicon known to us, has already been shown to fall short in furnishing the information required in one instance; and in another, to have been unconsulted when such information was to be had: we cannot divine what Dr. Lee means by the phrase, the best dictionaries. For our part, we look upon them all to be tolerably good; but we shall select for our purpose that one, which is unquestionably the most universally authoritative among the learned, which is Golius. On looking over the first two letters in Golius then, we find the number of roots, whose medial vowel in the aorist is unmarked, to be greater than that of those in which it is marked. In respect, therefore, to this division of the dictionary, Dr. Lee's rule utterly fails. On subjecting the three final letters of the alphabet to the same scrutiny, the ratio of those unmarked, is found to be greater than one in four to those marked. Here then the rule is found to be very defective. If the three medial letters of the alphabet
be likewise included in the examination, the unmarked will in this case be discovered, to bear a greater proportion than three to four of the marked. Here again, the rule is altogether faulty. In these three divisions of the dictionary of Golius, we have reckoned considerably beyond five hundred roots, under which not a word is said of the medial vowel of the aorist, and they amount nearly to one half of the whole number of roots under the letters examined. If this number be assumed as a fair average for the rest of the lexicon, and we can see no reason why it should not be so, it will be seen that the formation of the aorist in about two thousand roots, is to be taught the student by some other rule, or by no rule at all, or by superlunar speculations about prescription.

There are besides very many roots which possess different significations, according as the medial vowel of the preterite is differently pointed. In a case of this kind, it might reasonably be expected that care would be taken to distinguish, under each of them, the proper vowel of its aorist; but Golius, in this particular, is exceedingly defective. Of roots of this description, Dr. Lee presents us with an example, fully illustrative of the deficiency of his rule, and of the lexicon of Golius. Among the verbs given by the Doctor, as exercises to the student upon the conjugation, we meet with \( \text{كُرُم} \) he was liberal. The grammatical litany of the Doctor is in this, as the former cases, consult the dictionary. In Golius, the word is found as follows: \( \text{كُرُم} \), Fut. O, Generositate indolis, et nobilitate, \( \text{روم} \) honore, vel liberalitate et munificentia superavit alium. c c a. 2. medià Dammatå, Generosus, vel liberalis, beneficus, magnificus, honore dignus, aut pretiosus fuit; et Pluviam profudit nubes: quasi liberalis. Gi.
In Castell every thing is as in Golius, with additional explanations. In Wilmet, only the second form of the root is to be seen, with the interpretation as in Golius, omitting the figurative sense; but in neither of these is there any indication of the formation of the aorist. Dr. Lee has, notwithstanding this, made it out, in spite of all opposition on the part of his rule; but how, he has yet to inform us.

We have hitherto merely shown the insufficiency of the rule, so highly extolled in the Professor's vindication, for guiding the student to a knowledge of the language. We shall now go a step further, and show the superiority of the common rule, over this Anglo-oriental monster of the Doctor's imagination. To do this, it is only necessary to state that, according to the rule which we, along with de Sacy, maintain to be the correct one, the student does not require to depend upon his dictionary in any case of the kind last mentioned, for the information which we find the dictionary does not give; for he has already learned before he required to look into any dictionary, that when the medial vowel of the preterite is dhamma, it is the same in the aorist. See de Sacy, No. 299. Vol. I. p. 120. Lumsden's Ar. Gram. p. 129. In this view of the matter, which undoubtedly is the only correct one, Golius is not in fault, for a lexicographer ought not to interfere with the province of the grammarian, except in so far as to point out the irregularities of inflexion; and that not because it falls to him to do so, but to supply the consulter of his pages with what the memory has all along been understood to retain with difficulty. For the sake of illustration, we subjoin a few examples of such omission of the aorist vowel, which in the eyes of Dr. Lee and his admirers, must be regarded as a great blemish in Golius; and which, according to
de Sacy and his adherents, is so far from being so, that the omission is considered by them as no inconvenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preterite</th>
<th>Aorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أرب   he was acute, or intelligent</td>
<td>بارب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بعد   he was at a distance</td>
<td>ببعد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بجريو he was bold</td>
<td>بجريو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بحررو he was moved</td>
<td>بحررو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بحسن he was virtuous, or beautiful</td>
<td>بحسن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيخيب he was base</td>
<td>بيخيب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيدو ن he was greedy as a wolf</td>
<td>بيدو ن</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيدو ل he was base</td>
<td>بيدو ل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بسرو he was a chief</td>
<td>بسرو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بسرف he was noble</td>
<td>بسرف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بصغر he was young, or little</td>
<td>بصغر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بفغة he was learned (in the law)</td>
<td>بفغة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بقبيح he was ugly, or vicious</td>
<td>بقبيح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بيدو م he was worthy</td>
<td>بيدو م</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بنهو he was wise</td>
<td>بنهو</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us next take verbs, having kesra for their medial vowel in the preterite. Dr. Lee says in this case, as he must say in every case, look the dictionary. We say, that such verbs will have a fathah for their medial vowel in the aorist. Among verbs of the perfect and regular class, there are only two exceptions to our rule, viz. حسب he reckoned, and نعم he was happy, which preserve the kes-ra in the aorist. These, however, are exceptions more apparent than real; for fathah is also accurate. Among the hamza, concave and defective verbs, there are no exceptions. Among the irregular verbs, the only class in which the exceptions occur, is that called Simile verbs; and, excepting in one or two instances, they are met with only in that subdivision having غ for the primal radical. To ascertain the point in this subdivision of Simile verbs, we agree with Dr. Lee in saying, look the dictionary; and in but a few instances will the information sought be withheld. As the whole number of such verbs, however, is not great, a preferable way, perhaps, would be for grammarians, to insert a list of them in the grammar; which would at once obviate any doubt arising from the negligence of lexicographers. The sum of the whole then is, that, according to the generally received rule, for the formation of the aorist from preterites having kesra for the medial vowel, there are only some verbs in one subdivision of a particular class, and one or two in another subdivision, which deviate from it: whereas, according to Dr. Lee's system, the student is furnished with no positive information, regarding verbs in any class; as the following list will demonstrate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRETERITE</th>
<th>AORIST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he burned with enmity</td>
<td>يُنارِئ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was afraid of a lion</td>
<td>يُنَاسَد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was covetous</td>
<td>يُنجَسَل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he discontinued, or deserted</td>
<td>يُنَرَح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was free from faults</td>
<td>يُنَبَرَْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he remained</td>
<td>يَبَقَى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he rejoiced</td>
<td>يُنَجَذَل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he had the itch</td>
<td>يُنَرْجَب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his heart was inflamed with grief or love</td>
<td>يُنَجَُوَْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was cautious</td>
<td>يُنِحَدْرَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he mourned</td>
<td>يُنُعَّرَْ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he was foolish</td>
<td>يُنْبَفَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he lived</td>
<td>يُعِيَّا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he knew</td>
<td>يُنْخَبَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he feared</td>
<td>يُنْخَشَى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خطّل ٍ</td>
<td>he stammered, or faultered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُذّبَبِ</td>
<td>he was greedy as a wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُسلمِ</td>
<td>he recovered his health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>سُمَّرِ</td>
<td>he was straw coloured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُشرّبِ</td>
<td>he drank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُصَحِّبِ</td>
<td>he lived familiarly, or associated with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>طّبِ</td>
<td>he understood physic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عّجِف</td>
<td>he was lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عّجلٍ</td>
<td>he hastened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>عّمل</td>
<td>he did, worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُعّزلٍ</td>
<td>he conversed amorously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نشُّلٍ</td>
<td>he was lazy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نّهك</td>
<td>he was very joyous, or jocose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>تَوَي</td>
<td>he was strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ُكَذِبٍ</td>
<td>he lied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRETERITE  |  AORIST

| مرض | برض |
|      |      |
| he was sick | he liked |

In none of the above examples, will the student find in Goliath the information here given, and many more might be adduced; but in no instance is our rule infringed upon. Dr. Lee, we doubt not, will be careful to inform us, where and how we have erred, if such is the case. We now proceed to view the merits of the contending rules, in relation to the most numerous class of preterites in the Arabic language; viz. those which have fathah for their medial vowel. In this division, the greatest irregularity exists in forming the aorist; because it may either have fathah, kesra, or zamma, for the medial vowel. The common rule for this class of verbs, we formerly quoted from M. de Sacy; and this Dr. Lee, in his usual style of accuracy, denominates M. de Sacy’s *rules* for finding the medial vowel of the aorist; when it is only one out of three given by de Sacy. Nay more, the Professor reasons upon a portion of it, abstains from quoting de Sacy’s exceptive clause, and informs his readers, that “all that M. de Sacy says therefore is, that his rule *commonly* holds good, but not *universally*”—when, if M. de Sacy had dared to say so, he would have told a most glaring falsehood; and one which would have hurled him headlong in an instant, from his proud eminence in Arabic literature, and ranked him with drivellers and literary quacks. There is no expression in the English language too strong, whereby to designate our detestation of such an unscholarlike practice; proceeding as it does from a professor of Arabic, in an English university.
We quoted de Sacy's rule for the professed purpose of proving, that the example given by the Professor as the general paradigm of the language, and upon which his rule is founded, is in reality an exception; and has all along been considered as such by the first Arabic scholars. This it accomplishes in the most convincing manner; and yet Professor Lee does not see it, for he says, "how this learned reviewer could have stumbled upon the opinion, that what I had given as a general rule, was nothing more than an exception, I believe none but a reviewer can tell."

We shall, therefore, at once confirm our right to the title here conferred upon us, by convicting Dr. Lee of ignorance of the English language, of ignorance of Arabic, of ignorance of the first principles of general grammar, of sophistry in argument, and of misrepresentation of his authorities. The verb given by Dr. Lee as the general paradigm, upon which to conjugate all other verbs in the Arabic language, is 

\[ \text{he did} \]

This word, he states, is chosen by him, as the proper paradigm for the instruction of British students, who know not a word of Arabic, and who require to be taught the rules of inflexion, because it is the one generally referred to by the native grammarians, who write grammars for the use of their compatriots; who, both the one and the other, speak Arabic from the cradle; and who consequently have already learned, in the most efficient manner, every possible variety of inflexion. Mr. Lumsden has adopted it also, in compliance with established usage, as he says; which, however, let it be remembered, is not European usage, but chiefly to drill his pupils into the proper pronunciation of the medial radical, which is a guttural of difficult utterance by European organs, and particularly so by English throats. Professor Stewart has adopted it as the example of the Arabic verb, in his Intro-
duction to the Anvari Soohly, but takes care to mark the medial vowel of the aorist different from that of the preterite. Meninski has not adopted it, because the Turkish teachers of Arabic find it convenient to use another word, for the reason adduced in the following citation from his grammar:—*In Arabica verò liceat servare modum conjungandi, non solòm Arabibus, sed et ipsis Turcicis magistris Arabica docentibus usitatum, alteroque hisce pariter usitato ac prolatu utcunque nobis faciliore paradigmate نصر nasœre, seu, ut illi proferunt, nœsœre, q. nasara, adjuvit, Conjugationum exhibere.* p. 90. Erpenius, Wasmuth, Otho, Richardson, and de Sacy, have not adopted it, for the very reason why we object to its adoption by Dr. Lee, viz. because, considered as to its fitness in pointing out the formation of a very important part of the verb, it is faulty; in so much as it shows no variation, where a variation does take place, in four cases out of five in the medial vowel of the preterite and aorist. There is this important difference, however, between Dr. Lee and Mr. Lumsden, under whose authority he endeavours to shelter himself, that the former adopts نعُل as a significant root, without even hinting that it is a measure; and accordingly the word measure does not occur once in the whole chapter upon the verb: while the latter adopts it, not as a significant root, but as a measure, carefully noting, however, under what forms it is met with as a significant term, so that it is impossible for the merest dunce to mistake his meaning. Of such moment is this distinction in the eyes of Arabic grammarians, who are accustomed to make six conjugations, in three of which the medial vowel of the preterite and aorist is the same—“That,” as Mr. Lumsden justly observes, “they think it desirable that the same vowel point should not be applicable
to the medial radical of the past and present or aorist tenses; whence it happens that they prefer the three first conjugations, in which these tenses are distinguished by opposite vowel points, to the three last, in which the distinction in question does not take place. The former are therefore termed the chief or mother conjugations, as opposed to the latter, which are termed branches.” Ar. Gr. p. 116.

That Dr. Lee could not distinguish, between these different uses of this important word, when he wrote his vindication; we have his own authority for asserting. Near the conclusion of his first vindicatory epistle, he says,

“Because نَعَل forsooth, must necessarily have a fathah as the penultimate vowel, it can never have a zamma; for prescription says no. But, my good Sir, نَعَل is only adopted as a measure by which other verbs are to be conjugated, with this exception, that the medial vowel is to be determined by prescription in both tenses.”

Now when نَعَل is not viewed as a measure, but as a significant word, and an integral portion of the Arabic language; it can have no other vowel point than a fathah, upon any of its radicals in the third pers. mas. sing. of the preterite active, or upon the medial radical of the aorist active. When considered as an insignificant word, as simply a grammatical expression, a mere algebraic formula, for showing the formation of other significant words; then it may have any vowel point, or any other grammatical mark, annexed to the primal, or the medial, or the final radical: it may have any servile letter inserted among its radicals, and may assume any form which any word in the language assumes; for otherwise, how would it serve the purpose for which it is designed? In the aorist it may, therefore, assume any vowel point upon the medial radical; and this is the whole amount of the variation,
upon this part of the verbal inflexion, except when certain particles go before. Hence it is clear, that, viewed as a measure, as the Professor in the above cited passage, for the first time makes it known that it is to be viewed; it is not true that it must necessarily have a fathah, as the penultimate vowel, and can never have a zamma: since such necessity can only exist, when it is itself a significant word; and Dr. Lee expressly affirms, it is not to be considered as such. The only meaning then that can be extracted from the Doctor’s phraseology, if meaning it can be called, is, that نسج is to be considered at one and the same time, both as significant, and as not significant; and that prescription, if applied to, will determine which. Another variety of this grammatical enigma will be, prescription says that نعأ can never have a zamma, but always a fathah, for the penultimate vowel; and it is, therefore, a significant term, and not designed to be a measure. But, my good Sir, this word is only adopted as a measure, and therefore may have any vowel for its penultimate vowel, with this exception that the medial vowel is to be determined by prescription, which has already determined it to be not a measure, and to have only one medial vowel. We leave our readers to adopt either of these interpretations, as it suits their convenience. Dr. Lee, after presenting his students with the correct inflexion of نعأ as an integral part of the Arabic language, and not as a grammatical formula, which requires the vowel of the aorist to be different from that in the preterite, in order to point out the general law of the language, founds a rule upon it, and says, in express terms, that when the second vowel is once determined, that vowel remains unchangeable throughout the conjugation, as the fathah in the table con-
taining the inflexion of \( \text{فعل} \) in which table no difference exists between the medial vowel of the aorist, and that of the preterite. This is doing the same thing as a Latin grammarian would do, who should give *amo amavi amat-tum amare*, as the general paradigm for all Latin verbs; and should give, as the general rule for conjugating them, that the first and last forms, namely, *amo* and *amare*, were always the same; but the intermediate forms are determined by prescription alone, and are always given in the best dictionaries; but when once determined, they are to be conjugated in every respect like *amavi amat\(\text{um} \); so that the future of *lego* will not be *legam*, but *legabo*, and the future of *audio* not *audiam*, but *audiabo*.

It is easy to imagine what would be the feeling of the learned world towards that professor who should publish a Latin grammar, containing such a rule. Just such is the case in regard to this general rule of Dr. Lee; and our readers will at once perceive that such a rule cannot be too severely reprobated, nor its author too roughly handled, more especially if, in opposition to the voice of reason and of facts, he attempt to vindicate his conduct.

It may reasonably be demanded, why we are so prolix upon a subject which seems so plainly and easily determinable? We answer, that we have to deal with one whose only ability seems to consist in turning expressions from their proper and natural import, and in misconceiving the plainest argument and the simplest language. To what else is to be attributed the assertion of the Doctor, that we find fault with him for giving examples, in which the penultimate vowel of both the preterite and aorist is different in different verbs, when we are by no means chargeable with any such absurdity, since the whole train of our argument goes to show that we find fault with him for giving examples, in which the penultimate vowel of
both the preterite and aorist is different in the same verb, after asserting there was no such thing, which completely alters the case. That we may not be accused of misrepresentation, we quote the Doctor’s own words:—

“But my Zoilus becomes still more warm. He then,” continues he, “unblushingly gives the following examples. That is, in which the penultimate vowel of both the preterite and aorist is different in different verbs.”

This is making us say, that we would find fault with a Latin grammarian for putting amo, doceo, lego and audio into his grammar, because they are different; whereas we say, that if they are declared to be conjugated alike, it is something very nearly akin to stupidity, to affirm they are conjugated differently. Our readers will, therefore, bear with us in the prolongation of our argument, seeing there is a peculiar necessity imposed upon us to be explicit in all our statements.

Our rule, then, for the formation of the aorist from preterites in fathah is that such verbs will have a zamma or a kesra for the medial vowel of the aorist. When this rule is infringed upon, fathah must then be the medial vowel of the aorist; and this only happens when a guttural is the medial or final letter of the root. The number of gutturals being only six out of twenty eight letters, constituting the Arabic alphabet, presents wherewith to form a pretty good idea of the possible frequency of the exception. As every verb, however, having a guttural letter for its medial or final radical, does not rank under the exception; but, on the contrary, many such verbs follow the general rule, the number of exceptions is considerably diminished: and their number is still further lessened, when it is remembered, that not more than three or four exceptions to the rule are to be met with, in roots having a guttural letter for their primal and medial radicals, or in any concave or surd root.
The exceptions, therefore, bear the proportion of 1 to 7 or 8 of the verbs regularly formed; and it is one of these exceptions which Dr. Lee gives as the general paradigm of the Arabic verb. The Doctor's rule is the same, in this case, as in the former, consult the dictionary; and the dictionary is, in this, as in the other instances, equally unserviceable to the consulter, as the few following examples will sufficiently show.

**Preterite**

| Preterite                | Aorist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أتّر</td>
<td>يأتّر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بَأَر</td>
<td>بَبَر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَنَى</td>
<td>جَنَى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَدَل</td>
<td>جَدَل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَرَى</td>
<td>بَجَرَى</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَلَس</td>
<td>بَجِلَس</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَنَح</td>
<td>بَجِنَح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَهَب</td>
<td>بَجِهَب</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَمَح</td>
<td>بَجِمَح</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَحَم</td>
<td>بَجِحَم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَحَّم</td>
<td>بَجِحَّم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>جَحَّن</td>
<td>بَجِحَّن</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**He chose rather**

**He returned, he confessed**

**He was a coward**

**He twisted**

**He subdued**

**He sat**

**He inclined**

**He went on a pilgrimage to Mecca**

**He protected**

**He passed, changed**

**He was disappointed**

**He strangled**
PRETERITE

he pursued
he let down (a pitcher) into a well
he fed (the flock)
the flock was fed upon a rich soil
he fell
he was wicked
he roasted
he became sober
he oppressed
he worshipped
he was unique
he (the wind) softly breathed
he was present

AORIST

It must here be observed, that all quadriliteral radical verbs, a pretty numerous class in the Arabic language, are comprehended under this division, as they invariably have fathah for their medial vowel point, which is as invariably changed in the aorist to kesra. We do not recollect that
the aorist vowel of this class of Arabic verbs, is marked in any single instance by Golius. This is, therefore, an additional proof of the insufficiency of our opponent's rule, for which he is indebted to the regard paid by Golius to the rules of grammar, and the properties of the phemi-graphic art. The Rev. Doctor, however, gets over every difficulty, regarding this division of the verbs in the following laconic style:

"There are a few verbs, having four letters in the root, and thence called quadrilateral; but as they are of extremely rare occurrence, we shall pass them over, and proceed to make a few observations on the irregular and defective verbs." Gram. p. 31.

What could have induced Dr. Lee, in his abstract of Arabic grammar, entirely to pass by a whole class of verbs possessing a peculiar inflexion, and three derivative augmented forms, and to assert that they are of extremely rare occurrence, when the express declaration of Mr. Lumsden, and the testimony of Golius, run directly counter to his statement, seems to us inexplicable.

Notwithstanding all this, Dr. Lee is dissatisfied with our rule, as he calls it, i.e. de Sacy's, we suppose, and says it is one upon which no reliance can be placed. The truth or falsehood of this assertion, our readers are pretty well able to appreciate, if they have followed us in our remarks. Not content, however, with the aid afforded him by inconclusive reasoning, erroneous statements, unfair quotation, and unfounded assertion, he makes a desperate effort to rout us in argument in the following passage; in which we know not whether most to admire, his superlative contempt of us, or his overweening conceit of himself. Speaking of our opinion of the merits of his rule, he thus expresses himself:

"Let us now see how his opinions are founded, for upon this the question before us rests. At p. 20, he gives M. de Sacy's rules for
finding the middle vowel of the aorist, to which he adds that given by Erpenius, and then gravely assures us, that Golius, Schultens, Alting, Pococke, Castell, and others, found no difficulty in adopting it. Perhaps so. I believe, however, that Golius, Schultens, Pococke, and Castell, referred to much higher authority, wherever it was necessary to speak on subjects of this kind; and of this abundant proof is to be found in their works. But as to Alting, it is probable that he knew nothing at all about the matter, having never written one syllable concerning it. It is true we usually find, bound up with the Hebrew and Chaldean grammars of Alting, an abstract of the Arabic, Persic, and other grammars; but these are the productions of Otho, and not of Alting. Would it not have been advisable for our reviewer to have looked a little further into his authorities, before he thus committed himself?"

We were so simple as to think, that Dr. Lee was aware that the grammars in question are known under both designations; and if his mind suggests any doubt as to the truth of our assertion, let him without fail look into Watt's Bibliotheca Britannica, and Orme's Bibliotheca Biblica, under the word Alting. The whole paragraph then, instead of invalidating our statements, turns out to be only a specious cavil, and what under other circumstances would have powerfully contributed to prejudice our readers, in favour of the superior accuracy of our antagonist, must increase the already strong conviction in their minds of his proneness to dogmatise. To show that our conclusion is perfectly legitimate, nothing more is requisite than to state wherein the pith of any similar argument consists, and this we apprehend is not difficult to do. Of the force of such an argument then, upon the supposition that there had been no variety of appellation, and that we were clearly ousted, we shall give a γενικόν σχεδίο illustration to the Rev. Doctor. In his Remarks upon Dr. Henderson's Appeal, there is the following sentence:—"Of the truth of these remarks the reader can have no doubt, who has read, for one half hour only, the barbarous version of Santes as revised by Arias Montanus, and republished in the London F
Polyglott." We have read of the versions of Santes Pag- 
ninus, and of Santes Marmochini; but Santes is the pro-
per name of neither. Again, we read in the same pub-
lication—"Dr. Henderson, therefore, can sit down quietly at
St. Petersburg, and determine, according to his principles
of sacred taste, what every Mohammedan, whether he be
Turk, Persian, Arab, Jew, Infidel, or Heretic, ought, or
ought not to consider as a term of respect." Let us try
how Dr. Lee's conclusion will read, when applied to his
own case—Would it not have been advisable for Dr.
Henderson's reviewer, to have looked a little further into
his authorities, before he thus committed himself, by talk-
ing about the version of Santes, when no such version was
ever heard of; and by including Jews, Infidels, and Here-
tics, among Mahomedans, contrary to the strongest testi-
mony of facts, and of daily experience.

However forcible either of these parallel reasonings may
seem in the estimation of our antagonist, to us the one
appears a controversial nibble; while the other affords
something more than presumptive evidence that there is a
want of accuracy in the writer's statements, the result of
careless habits and hasty composition. When such is the
negligence of the Rev. Doctor, our antagonist, when writ-
ing on theological questions, it is not to be wondered at,
that he should be inclined to attach importance to what is
substantially incorrect, though apparently favourable to his
views, if allowed to pass without examination. Of this
fashion is the quotation from Mr. Lumsden, which the
Doctor considers as decidedly unanswerable, and which
runs thus:

"The proper conjugation of every verb is best known by consulting
the dictionary, from which it will appear that the same verb often be-
longs to more than one conjugation. To the dictionary, therefore, I
refer the reader for the decision of every question of this nature; for
though the Arabs have offered some useful observations on the subject, which I shall copy in the subsequent sections of this chapter, yet those observations will be often unintelligible to the learner, at this early stage of his progress, and I advise him, therefore, to pass directly to the following chapter, reverting to this at a future period of greater proficiency in the knowledge of inflexion.

It were futile, at this stage of our inquiry, to examine into the truth of Mr. Lumsden’s words, that the proper conjugation of every verb is best known by consulting the dictionary. We have already shown that the position is a false one, and it matters not, therefore, how often the affirmation is made, if facts decide against it. Mr. Lumsden, however, has devoted somewhat more than eleven folio pages to the detail of the three rules for forming the aorist, which we have already given; and it is not a little remarkable, that Dr. Lee’s wonder working word prescription, does not once occur in the whole of Mr. Lumsden’s rules. As Mr. Lumsden intended his grammar to “serve the double purpose of an elementary work, and a book of reference, to which the English proficient in the Arabic language may refer for the solution of doubtful points,” so he has thought proper to give ten rules for the formation of the aorist from preterites in fathah, where we, along with de Sacy, only give one. His plan forces him to this prolixity; for he attempts to give rules which shall accurately decide in every given instance, when such preterites shall have zamma, when fathah, and when kesra, for the medial vowel of the aorist; and as this leads him to make distinctions, which it requires a knowledge of the irregular verbs to understand, he most judiciously advises the student to pass over these rules in the mean time, and to revert to them at a future period of greater proficiency in the knowledge of inflexion. This does not take place with the rule as de Sacy gives it, and which we approve of; so that Dr.
Lee's objection of unintelligibility, borrowed from Mr. Lumsden's practice, falls to the ground. We beg our readers to observe also, that what of the quotation we have printed in Italics, Dr. Lee, to make Mr. Lumsden speak on his side of the question, entirely omits, and thus artfully changes the aspect of Mr. Lumsden's sentiments altogether.

There are several notable discrepancies then between Dr. Lee and his authority, Mr. Lumsden. Dr. Lee gives a rule which only says, look for further instruction in the dictionary. Mr. Lumsden also says, consult the dictionary; but he gives our rules likewise; in so detailed a form in one department, however, as to stand in need of curtailment to make what he says generally useful. Dr. Lee affirms that his general rule is that which has been given by Mr. Lumsden, namely, that the medial vowel is, in both tenses, to be determined by prescription alone. Mr. Lumsden gives no rule for determining the medial vowel of the preterite, but only for that of the aorist, and the words prescription and alone, are not to be found in any of his rules. Dr. Lee affirms that the first and last vowels in the leading persons of both tenses, are always the same, except when certain particles go before, some of which alter the zum to fathah, others reject it entirely. Mr. Lumsden says not a word about the vowels of the preterite being changed by particles going before, and dared not have said it, as nothing of the kind happens.

Dr. Lee gives a general paradigm of the verb, which he denominates a table, and says in his rule, when the second vowel is once determined by prescription, that vowel remains unchangeable throughout the conjugation, as the fathah in جع, which is conjugated as a significant word, and has the medial vowel of the preterite unchanged in the aorist. Mr. Lumsden devotes section second of chapter
third in his grammar to the inflexion, of the past tense, whether active or passive of trilateral active verbs, and says, in reference to this particular tense, "the vowel point applicable to the medial radical, is found in the active voice to be sometimes fathah, sometimes kesra, and sometimes zamma; and, with the exception of this distinction, which is retained through every variation of number, gender and person, the inflexions of all are precisely the same." In sections third, fourth, and fifth of the same chapter, the inflexions of the aorist are detailed, both with and without its accompanying regulating particles, but wholly as an independent part of Arabic grammar, without the smallest reference to its derivation from the preterite. The remaining section of this chapter is occupied with the inflexion of the imperative, and its derivation from the aorist is particularly pointed out. Chapter fourth is entitiled Conjugations of trilateral radical verbs, but no paradigm is given, and the rules for the formation of the aorist from the preterite, already adverted to, form the principal part of its contents. It is therefore clear, that as we formerly asserted, there is the same real difference in the doctrine of the general formation of the tenses between Dr. Lee and Mr. Lumsden, although not the same apparent contradiction in the expression, as between Dr. Lee and de Sacy, who, in express terms, ranks the verb given by our antagonist as the general paradigm of the language, among the exceptions to one of the general rules for the formation of the aorist.

When we formerly made public our sentiments respecting Dr. Lee, and his edition of Jones, there was not a copy of Lumsden's Arabic grammar within forty miles of us; and we thought proper to state, that what we affirmed of Mr. Lumsden's opinions, as contained in this grammar, was taken from a few imperfect notes of its contents. We have now, however, a copy of this ponderous work at our
side, reposing upon the eighth edition of Jones, at every moment exhibiting, to our enquiring eyes, in its ample pages, proof the most conclusive, of the rashness of our antagonist, in publishing his crude notions of its contents; and recalling to our minds, at every glance, his unseemly insinuation of a want of veracity in our statements, which his controversial anger has incited him to urge, in exculpation of his own negligence, and professional ignorance of the points in dispute.

The whole of the passage, to which we allude, in the Doctor's Vindication, is too curious to escape insertion here, as it will serve the double purpose of justifying the severity of our language, and amusing our readers, who may be growing tired of this bellum Arabicum.

"But why did he not produce Mr. Lumsden's on this point? (the one at issue respecting the formation of the aorist.) Because, he will say, as he has already said, that Mr. Lumsden's grammar was not at hand; and that he had only a few imperfect notes before him. But if this had been the case, how could he have known that Mr. Lumsden's expressions seemed to favour my rules? 'There is,' says he, 'the same real difference in doctrine, although not the same apparent contradiction in the expression.' But why, I ask, were not his notes produced? If he knew there was a real difference in doctrine, why has he forborne to give the proof? The answer is obvious; it is because he very well knew that Mr. Lumsden's words would ruin his whole train of assertions. Besides the grammar of Mr. Lumsden was at hand, unless I am much mistaken. There need no ghost come from the grave, Mr. Editor, to inform us that this critique was not produced on the north side of the Tweed: but of this more hereafter."

Sir William Jones has justly and beautifully remarked, in the preface to his grammar, that "we all love to excuse or to conceal our ignorance, and are seldom willing to allow any excellence beyond the limits of our own attainments; like the savages, who thought that the sun rose and set for them alone; and could not imagine that the waves, which
surrounded their island, left coral and pearls upon any other shore.” His editor cannot think, or at least he will surely never maintain, that the sun of learning illumines only southern climes, and never shoots forth a ray to gladden northern solitudes: and our readers cannot but remark, that the expansion of mind discoverable in this citation from Jones, is as incompatible with the haunted imagination of his suspicious editor, as the “dolce color d’oriental zaffiro” of Sir William’s imagery and style, is superior to the ghostly tropes and hobbling diction of our antagonist.

We have only another observation to make, and we have done with Dr. Lee’s first vindicatory epistle. We are extremely sorry that we have not been able to procure a copy of Guadagnoli, which the Rev. Doctor counsels us to read throughout, that we may not in future blunder on the subject of Arabic grammar, to the extent we have done. So soon as we can lay our hands upon it, we shall give it due consideration; and we promise, moreover, either to add another name to the list of authorities against Dr. Lee, or to add one name more to the list of blunders in Arabic grammar.

In approaching the second part of Dr. Lee’s reply, a reasonable expectation will naturally arise in the minds of our readers, that, from its being a month later in publication, it will be more elaborated than the first, and therefore not liable to such weighty objections, on the score of accuracy. We should have been happy, to have been enabled to bear testimony to such an amelioration, in the manner of our opponent; but the opening paragraphs of the second part, are so impregnated with misconception, so nauseous to the intellect of the merest tyro in Arabic grammar, that we are constrained to expose errors which proceeding from another hand, it were more fit to pass by
unnoticed and contemned. We speak not so, because one of our own rules has been critically mangled by our Reverend adversary, for in so doing he has rendered a most essential service to the students of Arabic; but we are galled at the idea of combating a foe of such high pretensions, when so little strength is required to gain the victory. The Doctor commences in the following strain.

"Hitherto my censor has confined himself to the department of exposing what his honest indignation had previously determined should be wrong. He now assumes the more valuable task of pointing out what would be right. Let us endeavour to follow him in this new department, and I have no doubt we shall find him no less profound and accurate than in his former path." Here follows our rule, respecting concave verbs, as given at p. 25; and the Doctor continues. "A more exquisite specimen of clear, intelligible, orderly, and correct enunciation of grammatical rule, I will venture to assert, is not to be found within the compass of the Reviewer's art. It is said, in the first place, 'when no letter of increase, (ত) being excepted, is introduced among the radical letters of the root,' &c. May not some good-natured numskull (for such our friend elegantly and pathetically calls the students of oriental languages) be tempted to ask, how the letter (ত) is to be excepted when, by the hypothesis, no letter whatever is said to be introduced? How, he may say, am I to subtract (ত) from nothing?

The answer will be of course by the algebraic formula 0 — (ত), and this will clear up the matter no doubt! and then the good-natured numskull will stumble comfortably on. Again, how is he to understand the expression, 'among the radical letters of the root?' I despair of offering a formula likely to answer this question in any way, and I leave it for the next number of the Glasgow Critical Researches to supply."

We have already seen the fate of his own rule respecting the aorist, how that we furnished him with our exposition of it, which he has not contradicted; and how he has
been unable to advance any more plausible defence of it, but the single, and in the eyes of all sensible men, the inconclusive plea of my rule is right. We might, therefore, follow his own example, were we not convinced that it were better to confess ignorance at once, rather than urge the point further, under a sense of inability to explain our meaning. We shall, however, conform with the practice of more unerring guides than the Rev. Doctor, and prove to him that we have an equal right with himself, and a somewhat better claim to be reputed Arabic scholars. We premised the rule in question, by observing, that "he ought to have accounted for the peculiarities of the concave verb, the most puzzling certainly to the learner in the whole grammar, by generalizing a remark which he himself makes, as well as a great number of Arabic grammarians, without turning it to use." But our Reverend antagonist mistakes our rule for his own remark, upon which our rule is founded, and gravely tells his readers—

"As a preamble to this rule our reviewer has said, that it is a remark of mine. This, however, I deny. I also deny the position of its having been made by any grammarian whatsoever. Certainly not, Mr. Editor: it is the genuine offspring of our enlightened friend, bearing on every limb and feature the genuine lineaments of its august parent."

The Doctor, with all safety to his clerical and professorial character, may deny that the rule is his; and if he chooses he may also deny that he ever was able to construct such a rule; but we will not allow him to deny that the remark, which is the turning point, and *vis viva* of the whole, was not made by him: for here it is in italics, with the context, bearing on every limb and feature of it, the genuine lineaments of its august parent. "In the aorist of تَوَل, the vowel in the penultima is determined to be (‘) zamma;
according to the table, therefore, must be pointed and but the is insufficient to act upon the (۰) zamma; the zamma is then drawn back to the preceding radical letter, and the verb becomes; and in the passive voice likewise, what should have been becomes. The remark which is here made, to which we refer, and which we have generalized in our rule, is, that the medial vowel point of the concave verb is drawn back to the preceding radical letter. The same remark is made by Erpenius, in his grammar, p. 94, edition of 1748; by Wasmuth, p. 40, of his Gram. Arab. Amstel. 1654; by Meninski, p. 102 of his Linguarum Orientalium Institutiones, Viennae, 1680; by Pocock, p. 102, of the Carmen Tograi, Oxon. 1661; by Otho, p. 68, of his Synopsis Institutionum Arabicarum, Franc. 1717; by Richardson, pp. 117, 118, 121, 122, of his Arabic grammar, London, 1771; by De Sacy, pp. 92, 150, vol. 1st of his Gram. Arabe, Paris, 1810; by Lumsden, p. 128 of his Persic Gram. Calcutta, 1810; and by the same author, pp. 413, 415, 436, and 442, of his Arabic Grammar, Calcutta, 1813. That this doctrine of transporting the vowel point of the medial to the primal radical of a root, is acknowledged by the native Arabic grammarians, may be seen by looking to the note at the bottom of p. 184 in De Sacy's first volume. So much then for this denial of our Reverend antagonist, who seems to have forgot the advice given in one of his own publications—Attamen a theologo, seu viro erudito, jure exigitur, ut nihil temere, nihil cujus rationem reddere nequeat, affirmet aut neget. So much also for his denial, that it was made by any grammarian whatsoever, when it turns out that he only did not know what any grammarian
whate'er had said upon the subject, without even excepting himself from the list. There is one thing, however, which, from what knowledge of Arabic grammar Dr. Lee has displayed in his vindication, he could not even be supposed to know; and it is this, that according to the generally received doctrine, the medial vowel is changed by the operation of one or more rules of permutation, and then the medial vowel point is drawn back; whereas by our process, the vowel point is first of all transported upon the initial letter of the root, and the change of the medial vowel takes place by necessary consequence; which is a difference between us, of no small importance to the Arabic student, as the sequel of the discussion will show.

To a mind unaccustomed to analysis, and indisposed to exert the power of discrimination, our phrase "when no letter of increase (ب) being excepted, is introduced, &c." must appear very unintelligible; whereas to a mind acquainted with the methods of resolving compound expressions to their simple elements, and trained to precision of thought, it can present no particular anomaly, since it is immediately perceived that it comes ultimately to the same thing, whether an exception is introduced into the body of a rule, as in the case before us, or comes after it in the shape of an adjunct. To some understandings, brevity of expression is incompatible with accuracy of comprehension; and we find ourselves blameable on this score in the clause under consideration, for so constructing it, as to be wholly misunderstood by the very person for whose use it was designed; more especially as on our part we entertained a high idea of his penetration, which turns out to have been altogether an unwarranted and untenable notion of ours. We must plead guilty also to the charge of not having printed an illustration, because we had no types to print it with; which is a fault of inability our antagonist has never
yet committed, who judges, of course, that we are extremely blameable for our negligence, and reproaches us for having given our luminous rule, with its exceptions, without any intermediate illustration. He has charitably supplied our deficiency in this respect, as we shall immediately see; and furnishes us with a commentary of his own upon our rule, commencing with the following passage.

"The next part of our rule is perhaps intelligible; but, alas, it is false! We are told, that in these cases, "the medial vowel is uniformly thrown back upon the initial letter, which loses its own vowel point." By this, I suppose, is meant, that when (ت) is not added to the root by the process of conjugation, the medial vowel of the root, be that what it may, is drawn back to the first radical letter, the first vowel being rejected in order to make way for it. If this be not the meaning of the rule, I confess I am unable to discover what is."

Dr. Lee thus determines, by hypothesis, the sense of a dependent clause in our rule, under a total misapprehension, nay, an acknowledged confession of ignorance, of the meaning to be attached to the preceding fundamental and restrictive clause, and so errs at the very threshold of his argument, by mistaking the natural signification, commonly attributable to the verb, to introduce among, and understanding it as synonymous with the verb to add to, so as to make us say, no letter of increase is added to the radical letters, instead of no letter of increase is introduced among the radical letters, which conveys a totally distinct idea. This is making us frame a rule, which is only applicable to the singular number of the preterite tense, and to the second persons with the 3d. fem. sing. and du. in the aorist; while we affirm it to be general in its application. Further, the Doctor, by a new process in reasoning, makes it out, that the exception to a negative proposition is also negative; and explains our words, "س" being excepted" in the
PROFESSOR LEE'S VINDICATION.

clause,—“when no letter of increase, ك being excepted, is introduced among the radical letters,” to mean when ك is not added to the root by the process of conjugation; whereas the natural and only English meaning of these words, expressive of the speciality of ك is made out by the ordinary rules of interpretation to be,—when ك as a letter of increase is introduced among the radical letters. To confirm his readers in the belief of his infallibility, he adds: “If this be not the meaning of the rule, I confess I am unable to discover what is;” thus obliquely insinuating the utter incomprehensibility of our rule, and directly proving his peculiar unfitness for grammatically expounding any expression in his native tongue. He explains his meaning, however, by an example, and says—

“Let us now see whether it” (i. e. his own exposition) “will hold good or not. Let us take the verb كول as the root. Here, according to our rule, fathah being the middle vowel, it will be thrown back upon the ك, the first fathah being rejected. We now have كول therefore. “Under these circumstances,” says the reviewer, “the regular processes of derivation are carried on.” But what are we to understand by “the regular processes of derivation?” Is the formation of the derivative conjugations intended? or is it the process of deriving the remaining personal forms from the root? The derivative conjugations surely can have nothing to do with it; and if so, the conjugation of the preterite tense is all that can be meant. Let us proceed then

كولت, كول, fem. كولت, كول, masc. &c. But no: the conjugation is كاالت, كألا, &c.; the rule is false therefore!”

Here again the mists of misconception obstruct the mental vision of our opponent; and he determines that, because he has never yet been able to link the aorist by
means of derivation with the preterite, therefore no one else can do so; that because the derivative conjugations are, according to his circumscribed perception, not under the dominion of the indefinable power prescription, then surely they can have nothing to do with the rule; and that because we do not specify what is understood by the phrase, the regular processes of derivation, the meaning of which is intelligible to every Arabic scholar, except himself, the rule must therefore teach a form of conjugation, which every grammarians, as well as he, declares to be unknown to the Arabic tongue. That man who can, upon such principles of reasoning, determine a grammatical rule to be false, does nothing more than demonstrate, in the most unequivocal manner, his own total incapability to teach, and his entire destitution of capacity to learn. It is not at all wonderful, then, that measuring us by himself, the Doctor should entertain the idea, that we did not know, that when the word تَوَلُّ, or any similar root, becomes تُوَلُ, from that moment, by a rule, of universal application in the Arabic language, the medial radical is changed into one homogeneous with the preceding vowel point. We had almost, upon the same page with our rule now under consideration, told Dr. Lee, that he ought to have given the general rules of coalescence, permutation, and rejection, of the three letters ى and ى; and then we state, that he ought to have generalized his own remark already quoted. Resolved, however, to be shrewd, Dr. Lee complains that our rule, "upon the supposition of its not being false, is miserably defective, &c.; neglecting, withal, to notice the changes which must necessarily take place upon the concave letter of the verb;" as if these changes could not possibly be made intelligible, without a repetition of the rules, which were understood to have been already detailed.
A doubt starts into the mind of our antagonist, in the course of his interpretation, and he makes another endeavour to give our meaning.

"But," says he, "perhaps we have misapplied the rule; there is an exception when \( \text{ت} \) is added; and, as this verb has concave \( \text{ز} \), zamma will be the vowel point for the first letter of the root; the conjugation therefore will be \( \text{تُولَت} \), fem. \( \text{تُّولَت} \); but here again we are wrong, \( \text{تُتَلَت} \), \( \text{تَتَلَت} \) being the true conjugation!"

Here it may be alleged that our opponent mockingly mistakes; but if he does, he plays the fool most awkwardly, for here there is no counterfeit to cause a smile. But, be that as it may, it is evident the Professor makes a hard guess at an explanation of the species, \textit{recte an secus nihil ad me}, to which all superficial critics ever show the greatest liking. He here asserts, that as this verb has concave \( \text{ز} \), zamma will be the vowel point for the first letter of the root; while in a former quotation we found him assigning it the vowel sathah, and stating the latter to be according to rule, i.e. his own rule; since the rule at present under consideration, determines in no case what the vowel point of any radical is, but simply the transposition of the medial vowel, as already found.

The Doctor concludes his criticism in his best critical style, thus:

"Again, 'the first and second persons, with the third person feminine plural, of the preterite of concave \( \text{ز} \) seem to be the only cases of departure from the rule, &c.' Are we here to understand the first and second persons singular or plural? masculine or feminine? or both? This we must also leave. In any case, however, the rule, false as it is, can only operate on about one half of the conjugation of the preterite. It is, therefore, very comprehensive, extremely clear, and perfectly correct!"
Here the Professor is completely bewildered, which he could not well have been, had he been perfectly as fait in Arabic grammar. Had he been intimately acquainted with Mr. Lumsden’s pages, he would have shown more mastership than he does, and he would have detected us in a blunder, which has altogether escaped his notice, but which would have furnished matter for more potent ridicule, than any which as yet has straggled from his pen. We must, however, do him the justice to say, that he has brought forward two examples which do not tally with our rule; but on the other hand, says not a word about the number of such exceptions, thereby putting us to the trouble of counting them, which we would willingly have dispensed with. The whole matter is then summed up in his usual strain of self complacency.

"I will not trouble the reader with the application of our new rule to the sorist, but will confess at once, that I am totally unequal to the task. That it is false when applied to verbs in concave ك no one, who has the least knowledge of these subjects, will doubt for a moment: and, that it cannot be applied to the derivative conjugations, is equally apparent. For a specimen of our reviewer’s qualifications, therefore, as a teacher and a grammarian, we have a rule, which for the most part is perfectly unintelligible: as far as it can be made out, it is false in every point of view."

Professor Lee will pardon us, we hope, if we lay before our readers the strongest possible contradiction to every iota of this tirade, from an enraged grammarian, by exemplifying the operation of the rule in a verb in concave ك. We shall take the example usually to be found in the grammars, viz. سبي، he went. The medial fathah of this root being transposed to the primal radical, which loses its own vowel point, it immediately becomes سار. This medial
fathah is changed to kesra, to form the aorist, which, therefore, is بیشسر. Our readers will take notice, that as our argument wholly concerns the vowel points of the primal and medial radicals, we have at present nothing to do [with the aoristic prefixes, or the vowel point of the final radical. The imperative being always derived from the aorist, by rejecting the formative letter, with its vowel point, and gesmating the last radical, should be بیشسر; but the medial radical, if unpointed, cannot remain, if the final be unpointed, and it therefore becomes بیشسر. The preterite passive being always formed from the preterite active, by changing the medial vowel of the active to kesra, will be بیشسر. The future passive is always formed from the preterite passive, by changing the medial vowel of the preterite to fathah, and it is therefore بیناشسر, the medial radical being changed by the operation of the same rule already alluded to.

We have thus, in the easiest and most natural manner, shown the formation of the whole of the active and passive voices of this root, upon the simple principle of transporting the medial vowel to the initial radical, before allowing any other rule to operate; and there is no departure from the rule in any tense of the verb, but in the preterite active. In the first and second persons of all the numbers, and in the third person feminine plural, of this tense, which may with propriety be denominated the gesmated portion of the tense, the medial vowel is thrown out, for the same reason as in the imperative; and the homogeneous vowel point of
the original medial letter of the root, viz. kesra, is here substituted for the fathah, found in the other parts of the tense. In this part of the rule we have, as already hinted, committed a blunder; and so it must chance to all who trust to memory in framing grammatical rules. We said, that the first and last persons, with the third person feminine plural, of the preterite of concave و seem to be the only cases of departure from the rule, and apparently for the very good reason of distinguishing concave و from concave ي, by substituting in either case the homogeneous vowel point of the rejected letter of the root, which being zamma in the former, forms an exception to the rule. But if the homogeneous vowel point of the rejected letter of the root be substituted in either case, then concave ي is as much an exception as concave و, and ought likewise to have been instanced, or both of them should have been kept out of view, and the rule worded generally. Lest our opponent should, however, imagine, that we will consent to act any villany against him, that may not sully the chariness of our honesty, we will give him credit for pointing out the other faults of this amended rule; which, however, are only to be inferred from what is said in his critique, for he has not there told them.

We go on then to show the application of our rule to the derivative forms, proceeding from the same root. The first derivative form doubles the medial radical, and the second inserts ح after the primal radical. In both, therefore, there is a letter of increase introduced among the radical letters of the root, and they fall without the pale of the rule. The fourth and fifth derivative forms are formed in
like manner, and have ت prefixed; and, for a like reason, do not come within its provisions: nor do the eighth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth derivative forms, for similar reasons. To prevent the reader from falling into the mistake of supposing, that no derivative form of the verb came under our rule, we thought proper to make use of the tautology of "the radical letters of the root," to indicate with greater certainty of being understood, that some of the derivative forms of the verb (which, to all intents and purposes, are also roots, but of a different kind from what is usually denominated the root) were included in the expression. If we have failed in our aim, we stickle not for words, so long as our meaning is apprehended; but we conceived it proper to be as concise as possible, in a rule intended for an abstract. Of the derivative forms yet to be mentioned, three, viz. the third, sixth, and ninth, are the only ones in which the juxtaposition of the radical letters is the same as in the root; and these, with the seventh, in which ت is inserted after the primal radical, are the only derivative forms of the concave verb, subject to change in their medial radical, and consequently are the only forms to which the rule is applicable. We shall take the first of these, namely أسبير. The vowel point of the medial radical passing to the primal, which loses its own, will make it, as in the former case, أسير. The same change, as in the primitive conjugation, takes place to form the aorist, which is يسبر which gives rise to the imperative أسر and the participle مسير. Here again, then, our rule is found to hold good,
and the same will be the result, if the three remaining forms are examined and compared with the rule.

It is an odd circumstance, that the very class of concave verbs, to which the Professor takes it upon him to declare our rule to be wholly inapplicable, should consist precisely of those verbs to which our rule is most invariably applicable; and that the other division, which the Professor labours to prove to be the only one coming under the operation of the rule, should, on the contrary, present a greater number of anomalies. As we already have observed, Professor Lee adduces an example against us, in which the medial radical of a root in concave ٨ is pointed by zamma; and where, if our rule be correct, the zamma should be transported to the primal radical; which, however, in the 3d persons singular, or dual, or in the masculine plural of the preterite, it never is. We will thank Dr. Lee to produce one other exception of the sort against us. An example is brought forward, in which the vowel of the medial radical of a root in concave ٨ is kesra, which accordingly should pass to the primal; although in this case, as in the former, a kesra cannot come upon any radical letter in any of the 3d persons singular, or dual, or masculine plural of the preterite active. The whole number of verbs known to us, infirm in the medial radical, and having kesra for their medial vowel, amounts to about sixty. From this number, one third is to be subtracted, being such as are not usually classed as concave verbs. Of the remainder, one third belongs to the subdivision of concave ٨, and two thirds to that of concave ٨. Of this remainder, more than one third have fathah, as well as kesra, for the vowel of the medial radical; and the residue have only kesra. Our rule, therefore, does not account for the
true formation of the ungesmated portion of the preterite active, in one out of every eighteen cases, to which it is found to apply. The whole amount of the Doctor's discovery, then, is, that there are a few verbs in reference to which our rule is found to be defective. It is, therefore, a pretty fair approximation to the truth, and not at all unsuited to the purpose, for which it was designed, viz. that of explaining, in an easy and comprehensible manner, the anomalies of the most intricate class of verbs, in the most intricate grammar to which a student can turn his attention, so as to justify the insertion of the subject, in a short abstract of Arabic grammar, such as that drawn up by Professor Lee.

Here then the matter might rest; and we might allow our opponent to reiterate his charge of defectiveness against our rule: but we prefer to drive him from his stronghold, and to show that his objection is entirely based upon theory, and upon that alone. Now, so long as the testimony of facts, in a grammatical question, is held inviolate, and theory is used only as a convenient medium for fixing and connecting them in the mind of the learner, that theory is the best which accomplishes this object by the easiest, the most distinct, and the shortest methods. We maintain, therefore, that, according to these principles, our theory of the formation and derivation of concave verbs is superior, in all these respects, to the one commonly received. Our theory on the point at issue, may be shortly expressed in the following words:—In concave roots, a pointed Wao, or a pointed Ya is changed to Alif fathah, which fathah is transferred to the primal radical.

In every Arabic grammar, the paradigm of the concave verbs is prefaced, by what are commonly called the canons for the permutation, coalescence, and rejection of the letters Alif, Wao, and Ya. Erpenius and Richardson
have each given twenty-five rules, explanatory of their permutations, &c. which the former grammarian has styled *vere aurea*; but which, in the opinion of many, by no means come up to the magnificence of the diction employed to recommend them, and which paternal fondness alone could have induced him to use. They have been designated as rules ingeniously intricate; and are now pretty generally allowed to fail in accuracy. The failure is not so much to be attributed to the want of talent in these writers to accomplish the task they had undertaken, as to their having chosen a bad foundation whereupon to build; so that, although the edifice has been greatly repaired, and partly reconstructed, by succeeding masters, and here and there propped to the best of their ability; it is still in a crazy state, even after all the skill of a de Sacy and a Lumsden have been expended to remove the imperfections of its original construction. This being the case, we think it advisable to pull it down altogether, rather than add to its deformity by farther attempts at improvement. But as the undertaking is of magnitude, and beyond the strength of any man to enterprise, who may not have wherewith to reconstruct; and as our means are limited, we have judged it proper to bring down one part, and erect a plain substantial fabric in its stead, before demolishing the whole unsightly mass. By such a procedure, we shall consult the convenience of the learned, who are ever with difficulty dislodged from any hiding place, or snug recess of mental cogitation, where they may expatiate on entities, uncared for and unknown; and be enabled to show respect to their admonitions, should our simple accommodation cause umbrage to any seignorizing mind, which may mourn over the ruin of its former haunts. Having already begun the work of destruction, and been favoured with the opinion of one, who is professedly on the look-out to detect and ex-
pose our faults of reconstruction; we shall now proceed to follow out our original plan, and prove the professional error of our censor.

These canons are designed to explain certain modes of spelling, founded upon certain peculiarities of pronunciation, and are so constructed, as to account for the orthographical deviations of words, in which one or more letters of infirmity occur, by ascribing the cause of the variation to the presence of a vowel point, or of one or other of the infirm letters, or to both. Sometimes the change is effected upon the vowel point alone, sometimes it is only upon the infirm letter, and sometimes upon both. Sometimes there is an apparent substitution of one letter for another, sometimes it is the simple rejection of a letter, sometimes the addition, and sometimes it is purely a contraction of two or more infirm letters, that constitutes the change. In no system that we have yet seen, is there any attempt at classification, founded upon the use and wont of the language; but all the rules relating to ا and م respectively, are huddled together, without regard to any thing else, than the position of these letters as initials, or medials, or finals. Neither has there as yet, so far as known to us, been any attempt to arrange the anomalies of the infirm letters, according to the ordinary principles of grammatical distinction, as they are applicable to nouns, verbs, &c. Mr. Lumsden makes the nearest approximation to this, perhaps the most useful, and certainly the most intelligible principle of classification, to the European student of Arabic; yet he has failed in clearing away the difficulties attending the subject, by not following out the plan here suggested to its utmost extent; and is thus reduced to the necessity of appending one, two, nay, even three pages of remarks and conditions to some of his rules. De Sacy has only so far followed this plan, as to bring to one focus the greater number, but not all the rules, applicable to the concave verb;
but from his placing them at the commencement of his grammar, rather than in front of the class of verbs to which they belong, his phraseology is necessarily prolix and obscure.

It is allowed on all hands, that, in the verb, the medial vowel point is the distinguishing characteristic, of the verbal meaning attached to every combination of the radical letters; so that in many roots where there is a variety in the medial vowel point, these is a corresponding variety of signification. This is so much the case, that it has been observed, that fathah is the ordinary mark of active verbs, and kesra, or zamma, of neuter verbs; with this distinction, that zamma commonly indicates something constant or habitual, and kesra something contingent in the verbal meaning, as may be seen by consulting de Sacy, vol. 1st, p. 119. This being premised, our readers are now prepared to be told, that, according to common rules of permutation, applicable to concave verbs, it is universally maintained, that the medial vowel point in the ungesmated part of the preterite of all such verbs is entirely lost; whereas, in the gesmated portion of the same tense, it not unfrequently happens, that the medial vowel point is the only proper one belonging to the primal radical, which is always the case when the past tense is formed on ﺖَأْلَلٌ or ﺖَأْلَلٌ. Here then is a discrepancy, which of itself is sufficient to puzzle any pupil, and make him heartily disgusted with the whole system of rules. Moreover, when the preterite tense of a concave verb is formed upon ﺖَأْلَلٌ, the same doctrine is held regarding the ungesmated portion of the preterite, which has been already mentioned; and nothing is advanced to explain the anomaly of the gesmated portion, and to fix this anomaly in the
student's memory; which, we think, is most excellently effected, by telling him, that in this part of the preterite, the homogeneons vowel of the medial radical becomes the characteristic vowel of the primal, for the purpose of distinguishing concave ɽ from concave ʢ.

The common doctrine regarding the aorist and imperative of concave verbs is, that they are derived from the preterite in its unpermuted state; and that afterwards the vowel point of the medial radical is transferred to the primal, in place of gesma. According to the common theory, then, in the preterite it is lost, in the aorist it is retained; according to the theory which we have advanced, it is retained in both. Besides, according to us, the medial vowel point being already on the primal radical in the preterite, we do not trouble the pupil with shifting it about in every tense: for we assert that it preserves its place, when once changed, through all the processes of verbal derivation. To give our readers an idea of the cumbersome phraseology usually employed to direct the student to the formation of the aorist in such verbs, we here quote M. de Sacy's rule;—"Le ɽ et le ʢ au milieu d'un mot, devant être mus, et être précédés d'une lettre djezmée et suivis d'une lettre mue, transportent souvent leur voyelle à la lettre djezmée, et deviennent quiescens." This rule is given at page 92, at the very entrance of the grammar. Here there is not a word said about the aorist; not a word about concave verbs; and the rule is clogged with conditions, which are altogether useless, when it is so applied: besides, the word souvent occurs most opportunely to embarrass the pupil, by hindering him from understanding the rule. According to the common system, a particular rule is necessary to account for the formation of the past tense passive, which, according to the system adopted by
us, is altogether unnecessary, as well as that about the aorist. In this rule, however, it may here be noticed, that the principle advocated by us, respecting the transference of the medial vowel point to the primal radical, is fully acknowledged; because it is undeniably certain, that in this case there can be no other explanation of the matter given.

To show that a want of attention to the general principle laid down by us, leads sometimes the best Arabic grammarians to talk unintelligibly, (to make use of no more offensive term,) we have only to submit to the reader's consideration the following extract from Mr. Lumsden, p. 442. Talking of verbs in concave كي, he says—"in the aorist, ya remains after kesra, and is changed into alif or wao, after fathah or zamma, as يعوط— in the event of its rejection from the aorist or imperative, it transfers its vowel point to the primal radical, as عط: but it must be resumed in the dual number as عوط." Now if there be any meaning in these words, it must be, that the vowel point of the medial radical, although in reality upon the primal, is nevertheless upon the medial, which is seen to be gesmated; that there is a transference of this vowel point from the medial to the primal, while its relative position is unaltered; that, finally, it goes back in the dual number from the primal to the medial, although its place is still unchanged. Such is a specimen of the jargon which must be understood by whoever wishes to learn Arabic from a grammar; and can there be a stronger instance produced of the necessity of a reformation in the theory which leads to such absurdities? We say, no.

A more inexplicable instance of obscurity is met with in the rules themselves, as laid down by Mr. Lumsden.
Rules 29th and 30th run as follows:—"Substantive nouns, or epithets employed as substantive nouns, being formed on the measure تَعْلَى will change a final wao into ya. Example عَلَى "heaven" originally عَلَى تَعْلَى—Substantive nouns formed on تَعْلَى change a final ya into wao. Example بَقِيَّة "mercy" originally بَقِيَّة تَعْلَى. In opposition to epithets formed on the same measure, which are observed to retain the final ya: as, خَوْرِئ "a modest or blushing woman;" &c." Now, a simple inspection of the examples adduced will convince any one, that these rules concern not final Ya, or final Wao, but a penult Wao, or Ya. Had the word radical been introduced into the phraseology of these rules, it would have been more unobjectionable; although the use of the word final is certainly faulty in the phrase, final radical Ya or Wao, when the radical is not the last letter of the word. Besides, it will be evident to any one who understands Arabic, that these rules, and many other rules of permutation, are of no use to one who learns the language by ear, to speak it; that they would be of no service earthly to one who learns only to read Arabic, if Arabic lexicons were arranged alphabetically; and that they are of no great advantage to any such person, even with the present lexicons; and, finally, that they can only be called useful to one who writes Arabic, but really so to no one possessed of a quick eye, who reads with attention.

It is remarkable, that in this department of Arabic grammar alone, the system of measures is wholly departed from, where it might most beneficially be adhered to, and yet by an inconsistency, of which it is difficult to assign the cause,
the canons are made use of to explain some parts of grammar, which are already as clear as day, by means of the system of measures. To give only one example from Mr. Lumsden. Rule twentieth runs thus: "Either of the letters alif or ya, occurring in the singular number of a noun as a servile mudda, will be changed into wao in the plural number, if it be followed by the letter alif of the measures مفاعيل; مفاعيل; فواعيل; فواعيل; &c. Examples: تاعد " a rule;" plural تواتيد " mutual slaughter;" plural تواتيد &c." Any one who can read these measures and examples in their original character, knows at once that this rule does not at all explain the formation of the plural number; and he also knows that these forms of the irregular plural, are linked to their respective singulars, with greater perspicuity, by saying that nouns having a servile mudda for the second, or the second and fourth letters in the singular, insert Wao before it in the one case, and before the first of them in the other, to form the plural. Apart, however, from the fitness or unfitness of this rule, to help the student to a knowledge of the formation of the irregular plurals mentioned in it, it is altogether superseded by what is said in p. 589, &c. by Mr. Lumsden himself. By comparing it with the pages referred to, it will be found that not the slightest necessity existed for the rule in question; but that every change, whether upon an infirm letter or not, is completely explained, by simply giving the measure of the plural. It may thence be inferred, that a similar process will ensure similar clearness in other cases.

Farther, to show that, by adopting a different arrangement, with a slight alteration in the expression, a great
deal might be done to simplify, and render intelligible, what is now exceedingly complex, and almost incompre-
hensible to ordinary intellects; we have only to lay before our readers the following rules, and portions of rules, taken from Mr. Lumsden, along with that to which they are all reducible.

A medial wao in the past tense passive, having suf-
fered permutation in the active voice, will transfer kesra to the primal radical; after which, wao will be changed to ya. Rule twelfth.

Wao moveable, occurring after a quiescent letter, will transfer its vowel point to that letter; after which, it must be changed to ya, if kesra precede. Rule fourteenth.

A moveable wao following the vowel kesra as the medial of an infinitive, will be changed to ya, if it were permuted in the tenses of the verb; but not otherwise. Rule fif-
teenth.

The permutation described in the preceding rule is also applicable to wao moveable followed by alif in the plural number of nouns; if wao were quiescent in the singular number; and to wao moveable in the plural number whether followed by alif or not, if it were permuted in the singular number. Rule sixteenth.

An original wao, occurring after three or more letters at the end of a word will be changed to ya if it shall follow the vowel kesra. Rule twenty seventh.

Wao following kesra at the end of a word will be changed to ya. Rule twenty eighth.

These six separate rules are all included in the following one—Kesra preceding Wao, changes it to Ya. We need not say which is the preferable method.

To pursue this enquiry any further on the present occa-
sion, would lead us into a very long and tedious discussion. The system of rules which has called forth our strictures,
may most fitly be denominated theasses-bridge of the
Arabic student; and, like the fabulous, but terrific Sirat
—the corpus protensum super Gehenna dorum per quod
transseundum sit omnibus creatulis, tam credentibus quam
incredulis—it must be passed by all who are desirous to
attain to a knowledge of the language, whether friendly or
not to the system pursued. If, by what we have advanced,
we shall be so fortunate as to awaken investigation, we shall
have accomplished our purpose; and that a reform will en-
sue, we venture to predict. That inattention to the sub-
ject on the part of grammarians, has been the great cause
of perplexity to the student in this department of Arabic
grammar, may be argued from the fact, that rule fifteenth,
as above quoted, is given by Mr. Lumsden in his Persic
grammar. A little reflexion would have taught him, that
no pupil can possibly comprehend it, without a multitude
of details which are not there to be found; and it can ex-
cite no wonder, if in such a case the whole series of
which it forms an integral part, should be denounced as a
string of learned conceits, and unintelligible absurdities.

The Professor, after a few words about typographical
errors, complains that our "critique on the tables of in-
fitives is founded upon a gross misrepresentation; the
tables of participles which he endeavours to confound with
those of the masdars, having been given and pointed out,
before that of the masdars had been given."

In answer to this, we beg leave to state, that we abide
by every thing we have already advanced relating to these
tables; and to put it out of the power of Dr. Lee to evade
the force of our observations, we shall state to our readers
what those tables are, which are given before that of the
masdars. The first is the table of the alphabet; the se-
cond is the active voice of the Arabic verb; the third, the
passive voice of the Arabic verb; the fourth and last is the
table of the leading words of the derivative conjugations. The first is, of course, not the one referred to by Dr. Lee; in the second, the active participle occurs; and in the third, the passive participle: but none of these are tables of participles. The fourth is the only one which Dr. Lee can possibly have in his view; and as it is divided into two parts, active and passive, it may be spoken of in the plural number; and as there is a column of participles in both these subdivisions, Dr. Lee may style these columns, the tables of participles. Unless we suppose that he has cancelled some tables which do not now appear in his edition of Jones, no other meaning can be attached to the phrase, tables of participles, than that which we have affixed to it, guided as we are by his own declaration on the subject. But our readers must be informed, that these forms of the active and passive participles, included by Dr. Lee under the denomination tables of participles, are invariably derived from the aorist, whether active or passive; whereas Dr. Lee's third table is a table of simple attributives, which are derived from the infinitive, and cannot therefore be named forms of participles, which have usually been termed epithets, or attributes. That this confusion of language is the result of confusion of ideas, is unquestionable, whatever our antagonist may say to the contrary; and we think we understand the cause of it all. Dr. Lee, while compiling his abstract, borrowed his second table from Lumsden's Arabic grammar, as likewise the paragraph following it. Turning over Mr. Lumsden's pages as he went on with his work, he had read over what Mr. Lumsden says of the formation of the participles; and when he came to the simple attributive, at the commencement of which, Mr. Lumsden refers to an opinion he had expressed respecting the participles, Dr. Lee wrote his introductory paragraph to his third table, quite unmindful of
the difference between his own arrangement, and that of his authority; and thus has referred to something which cannot be found in his abstract; but which the learner not knowing, naturally enough concludes, that mascars or infinitives are participles, and participles are attributes on epithets or adjectives; and that this grammatical hodge-podge is Arabic.

"Now," continues the Professor, "for our next judicial critique. I had said, that the noun of superiority is usually formed on the measure أَفْعَلْ for the masculine, and فَعَّلْي for the feminine gender, from attributes of the form of أَفْعَلْ. Whereas," says my keen, acute friend, "invariably is the correct word." Let us then adopt this correct word. We have now a rule stating, that nouns of superiority are invariably formed on the measures أَفْعَلْ and فَعَّلْي from attributes of the form of أَفْعَلْ, which is certainly false."

We may here apply to the Rev. Doctor the same language he has made use of in regard to ourselves, and say —A more exquisite specimen of clear, intelligible, orderly, and correct enunciation of grammatical rule, we will venture to assert, is not to be found within the compass of the grammarian's art; to which we may add, that a stronger proof of our antagonist's ignorance of the phraseology and construction of the English language cannot be adduced. As our simple assertion, however, will be disregarded, we beg him to have the goodness to read and digest the following extracts from Dr. Crombie's Etymology and Syntax of the English language.

"The adverb, as its name imports, is generally placed close to the word, which it modifies or affects; its force, therefore, very much depends on its position." p. 218.
"In justification of inaccuracies, it is impertinent to plead, that a little attention will prevent misconception. It is the business of every author to guard his reader from the possibility of misconception, and to render that attention to the language unnecessary. Quintilian's maxim, *non ut intelligere possit, sed ne omnino possit non intelligere, curandum*, cannot be too often repeated to those, who, by such apologies, attempt to defend any ambiguity." p. 221.

"But, were such apologies for the violation of rules admissible, there is no rule which might not be violated, or rather no rule could possibly be established. Without precision, language, even in its most improved state, defective, can never be rendered a fit instrument of invention, or a sure and faithful vehicle of thought.—It is not our business to prescribe what may be perspicuous in some cases, but what must be intelligible in all; not what arrangement may, by the help of the context or the reader's sagacity, be understood, but what cannot in any instance be mis apprehended." p. 223.

If there is any dependance to be put upon such principles, proceeding as they do from one of the most philosophical minds of the present day, then it is indisputably certain, that Professor Lee is neither qualified to write English, nor to compile grammars; since, according to his laws of composition and criticism, the words *usually* and *invariably*, are not made to modify the phrase, *formed on the measure*, &c., as their position naturally indicates they should, but a succeeding clause, entirely independent of that in which these words occur. As no other forms of the noun of superiority exist in the Arabic language, the word *invariably* is the only fit term, whereby to designate the universality of the measures, masculine and feminine, on which it is formed. To state that it is usually formed from attributes of the measure *نَعْيَلَ*, is to lead the learner
astray, as this adverb usually can only be used with propriety, when it is said that it is usually derived from the infinitive.

Our antagonist immediately afterwards takes credit to himself for having "clearly enounced in one rule, what M. de Sacy had enounced in two or three," respecting the formation of the diminutive noun. Notwithstanding this positive assertion of the Rev. Doctor in behalf of himself, we defy any one to understand what is meant in this one rule clearly enounced, without consulting de Sacy, or some other Arabic grammarian.

Dr. Lee has most truly observed, that we have never troubled our heads with scholiasts or native grammarians. We are quite contented at having learned from Captain Lockett, respecting them, that "they are always employed in raising straws with levers, in illustrating what cannot be misunderstood, in devising difficulties where none ever existed, and in perplexing the simplest rules of regimen and concord with useless subtilties and logical definitions." Who be to that man who stands in need of such guides, to help him to the acquisition of a living language.

The Professor complains that he is arraigned, condemned, and executed, without the least ceremony, for having taken most of his remarks from M. de Sacy. This is an error, of which all Arabic scholars who have seen our observations, know we are not guilty. We have arraigned and condemned Dr. Lee, for openly professing to improve and amend, when in reality he does neither, but oftentimes the very reverse; and for blinding the eyes of the uninformed with mere names, that he may pass his own alloy for the pure ore of his authorities.

The next rejoinder which has reference to Arabic, relates to our being mightily displeased with the learned gibberish of grammatical technicalities. And verily we
are, because, as the Doctor most justly observes, we never knew their use. Our readers will observe, we object to the introduction of Arabic gibberish, when there is abundance of English gibberish to serve the Doctor's purpose; for we are quite unable to divine, why two sets of grammatical terms should be necessary to the learning of Arabic, when one set is sufficient for the acquisition of any other language. Besides, we are tempted to observe, that we apprehend the Doctor to be no great connoisseur of their doctifying virtues, or he would never have gorged his pupils to absolute suffocation with them at one time, and left them hungering and thirsting for them at another.

Passing over for the present, a mass of desultory matter, the only other passage which need here be quoted, is the following.

"Again, the word \[\text{word}\] is made out to be a verb and a root; but it is not to be found as the one or the other in any dictionary." But here my censor's eye-sight has failed him. Let him once more look into his Gollus, Castell, Wilmet; and Meninski, if the library of his institution will afford one, and he will find it as a root and a verb. Richardson, it is true, has left it out, and, poor man, he seldom thinks of going further."

"It is somewhat difficult for us to keep within the bounds of propriety and decorum, while commenting on this passage; it exhibits a specimen of such deplorable inaccuracy; of such gross misrepresentation, and of such supercilious confidence, in one who lays claim to a sort of supremacy over his European countrymen, who work in the same vineyard with himself. What we said was this—"Towards the end of the fable there is an extract from the Koran, and one would think that in this instance the pointing of the words would be accurate, as this book is uniformly written and printed with points. Instead of
this however, we have two out of the five words which make up the verse, wrong pointed; then to increase the confusion, one of the two is made out to be a verb and a root, but is not to be found as the one or the other in any dictionary; and to render this quite intelligible to the student, it is translated by the present tense in English, which is rather a stumbling-block to one who knows no more about the use of the tenses than what Dr. Lee tells him, which is just nothing at all. Then we have Dr. Lee’s literal translation differing from Sir William Jones’s literal translation; the former giving the passage, ‘how can one repay a kindness but by a kindness?’ the latter rendering it, ‘is there any recompense for benefits but benefits?’ and both at variance with Sale’s version of the words; viz. ‘shall the reward of good works be any other than good?’

It appears to us, that Dr. Lee is possessed of so much simplicity as to suppose that, because he has printed the passage alluded to three times wrong, therefore it must now be correct; and that consequently our words, one of the two is made out, &c. must of necessity refer to the word or as he has erroneously pointed it;

which is a conclusion to which none but the Cambridge Professor of Arabic could have arrived, seeing that from inability to print the passage in the original, we were prevented from stating the correct reading. Any one who will take the trouble to look into Marracci’s, or into Hinckelman’s edition of the Koran surat 55. vers. 60. will find the true text to be

translated by the former, An erit merces beneficentiae, nisi beneficentia? It will be seen by any one who can construe
the verse, that Dr. Lee's reading is both a violation of the principles of grammar, and a departure from the sense. Besides, it will defy the powers of all the orientalists in Cambridge, or out of Cambridge, aided by all the lexicons that have ever yet been compiled, to make a verb in the 3d pers. sing. masc. of the preterite, as our antagonist would fain make his readers believe. It is a noun of action, as its form indicates; and neither the artifice nor the sophistry of Dr. Lee can make it any thing else in this passage.

We have thus followed our adversary through all the turnings and windings of his story, as far as Arabic is concerned; wherever he has entrenched himself behind Arabic grammars, lexicons, and scholiasts, his defences have been overturned; wherever sophistry has been his support, it has been unmasked; wherever false statements have been resorted to, to blindfold his readers, they have been exposed. It remains for us to take notice of what is brought forward by the Doctor, in opposition to our statements relative to the Persic part of the grammar. We believe there is no counter statement which we have not answered, excepting what is said about the tenses of the Persic verb. In regard to it the Professor declares—

"I had stated that the preterite imperfect and potential, as given by Sir William Jones, were said by Mr. Lumsden to have a continuative sense; and, upon turning to Mr. Lumsden's grammar, this is found to be the case. Our reviewer objects, however, because, says he, "we find nearly six folio pages about the use of a tense called the continuative preterite."

In the latter sentence Dr. Lee has chosen to foist in the word because, in order to make us talk nonsense; which
because, although not given as ours, is only significant with the words quoted from us which follow, and can only be understood by the reader, as either expressed or directly implied in our previous argument, which is not the case. This would have been hardly worth mentioning, had not our opponent resorted a second time, while treating of the same subject, to this unfair method of fighting, by saying—"The reviewer is also warm, because (to adopt his elegant language) no reason why has been given for the formation of this continuative tense." This misrepresentation is best answered, by producing the passage alluded to. It runs thus—"The learned editor simply announces, that both tenses have a continuative sense; and the unlearned pupil is allowed to stumble on his way, after having searched in vain for a reason why in one place it is said, that ειναι added to the first and third persons of the past tense, forms the potential mode—why in another that in the third persons the imperfect tense is sometimes expressed by adding η to the preterite—and why that in the paradigm the latter of these observations is disregarded, and the first proved faulty." p. 55. A single perusal of this passage will convince any unprejudiced reader, that we are warm, as the Professor chooses to express it, not because no reason has been given for the formation of this continuative tense, but because Dr. Lee had not fulfilled what in our apprehension is one of the bounden duties of an editor, viz. to supply the deficiencies of his author, and to remove, by all possible means, the very semblance of incongruity; so that, when the author is a grammarian, the paradigms may tally with the rules, and there be no clashing of rules one with another. To this we may add another reason for our noticing the Professor's manner of procedure, viz. the absurdity of referring a learner to an author for farther
information; when, if the author referred to be consulted, instead of confirming him in the belief of the grammatical principles which he has already imbibed, he is altogether unhinged in his notions, and must commence de novo, if desirous of thoroughly understanding the grist of the matter, and laying a solid foundation whereby to secure his future progress.

Syntax, in its most general acceptation, furnishes our antagonist with the next subject of remark, which we shall notice. We shall present our readers with the entire paragraph, containing the remarks of the Professor upon this branch of grammar, which, we doubt not, will convey some new information to our readers.

"We now come to the syntax (p. 57). 'The end of all systems of syntax is, or ought to be, to facilitate the translation of expressions in one language, by those of equivalent meaning in another.' This I deny. The end of syntax is, according to my view of the subject, to inform the learner how the several parts of etymology already treated of in the grammar, are brought together in the composition of phrases, sentences, and periods. How, for example, nouns are put in apposition or construction; how they are influenced by the occurrence of particles and verbs, and finally, how the members of sentences so constructed, are found to depend on one another, or the contrary. The grammarian has but little to do with the principles of translation; this is the business of the student or critic who, to the knowledge of etymology and syntax, adds the further acquisition of rhetoric, &c. It is incumbent indeed on the grammarian to give accurate translations of his examples; but he has nothing to do with the principles of translation: this is a distinct and different province. We may now leave the learned remark, with which the criticism on the syntax is commenced, as a pretty good specimen of what we may expect in the sequel."

Before Dr. Lee had read the passage he has cited, he must have read over another passage in our criticism, to which, as he appears to have overlooked it while writing his vindication, we now beg his further attention. It is as follows—"Grammars are of two kinds. They are either
those compiled for the purpose of imparting a knowledge of the language, in which they may be written; or they are those intended to communicate instruction respecting some other language, unknown to the people for whose use they may be written. The manner of treating the grammar of a language, must necessarily vary, according as it belongs to one or other of these classes. With the latter sort alone we have to do at present. We would observe then, that as the purpose of a grammar of this kind, is to make known a system of speech which has been hitherto a dead letter, to those in whose language the grammar is written, and as it is the peculiar province of a grammar, to convey information respecting the structure of language, it seems clear that the only sure method of accomplishing this purpose, is to present to the reader a comparative view of the two languages, so that his previous knowledge of his own, may lead him to the acquirement of the one taught in the grammar he uses.” To this we do not find that Dr. Lee has any objections; and we, therefore, take it for granted, that it is substantially correct. That syntax is a branch of grammar, cannot for one moment be denied; and that as such, it must be treated, according to the general principle already laid down relative to grammar, must also be allowed. It must likewise be admitted, that if with the first class of grammars we had nothing to do, while giving our opinion of Dr. Lee’s edition of Jones, so neither had we to do with a syntax constructed according to the principles applicable to such grammars. This being the case then, we still affirm that the end of all systems of syntax (in bilingual grammars,) is, or ought to be, to facilitate the translations of expressions in one language, by those of equivalent meaning in another.

Viewing grammar according to the most general acceptation of the word, we would say that etymology explains
the theory, and syntax teaches the practice of language. The latter subdivides itself into two branches, synthetic and analytic. The first of these comprehends the rules by which we are taught to speak, or otherwise to communicate our ideas to others; the second includes under it those rules by which we are taught to understand what we read, or otherwise to acquire a knowledge of ideas communicated to us by others. Many rules of syntax may, with propriety, be classed under either or both these subdivisions; because it frequently happens, that the same view of the concordance, or dependance of the parts of speech, will enable a person to arrange what he wishes to express, or to understand the arrangement of a thought already expressed. Whatever in syntax is declared to be optional, can only rank under the first subdivision, whatever regards the idiom of language, belongs more properly to the second; whatever is of necessary observance, is common to both. We do not mean to assert, that no system of syntax can be good, in which attention is not paid to such distinctions; but we think it cannot be denied, that were such a classification of rules made, the learning of a foreign language would be attended with comparatively less trouble, and greater pleasure. Had Professor Lee kept these things in view, while editing Jones's grammar, he would have been spared our remarks, regarding the syntax of Persian nouns in the objective case; since it would have occurred to his mind, that to insert rules which can only be useful to the writer or speaker of Persic, was, in some measure, a work of supererogation in a grammar, which can barely aspire to the merit of leading the pupil to comprehend what is already written in the language, and which was certainly never designed to teach him, either to speak or to write either Persic or Arabic. The construction of a system of syntax, is undoubtedly the most difficult part of
the task of a grammarian. We are of opinion, that a system of syntax, applicable to any given language, ought to be based upon the system of etymology, which has been previously sketched out in the grammar in which it is found; that, like the system of etymology, it ought to be constructed upon the plan of induction; and if intended to teach how to speak or to write the language, it ought to be divested, as much as possible, of metaphysical refinement. We think that every rule of syntax, designed for the purposes of analysis, ought to take the precedence of those intended to teach synthesis; and that the whole ought to exhibit a clear outline of the agreement and differences of the language used by the writer, and that taught in the rules. By pursuing such a method, it must be evident to all, that the direct effect of such a plan will be, not merely to inform the learner how the several parts of etymology, already treated of in the grammar, are brought together in the composition of phrases, sentences, and periods, which is the only purpose it can serve according to Dr. Lee, but as we have already said, to facilitate the translation of expressions in one language, by those of equivalent meaning in another. It would be a curious system of syntax which should lay down rules, and give examples, but furnish no translation, or a merely verbal translation. It is not necessary, however, for us to insist on this point, since Dr. Lee admits that it is incumbent on the grammarian to give accurate translations of his examples. It will readily be allowed, that no person will submit to the drudgery of learning the inflexion of a foreign language, for the sole benefit of becoming acquainted with the principles according to which nouns are put in apposition or construction, how they are influenced by the occurrence of particles or verbs, or how the members of sentences so constructed are found to depend on one another, &c. There is always an
ulterior object in view, and one which alone can urge any one to the task of acquiring a foreign tongue, viz. the gaining a knowledge of the works of those who have written in the language, or a command of the vocables of the language, to be enabled to hold communication with the people who use it; and neither of these objects is attainable, without a knowledge of its syntax. The syntax is, in fact, only a help to translation; and that it is always given to facilitate this object, will we think at once be granted, when it is considered that a merely verbal translation can in every instance be made, by using the dictionary along with the etymological division of the grammar; but an intelligible translation can in most cases only be given, by calling in the aid of the syntax. In Arabic the nominative may be a plural, and the verb a singular, the nominative may be masculine, and the verb feminine, and vice versa; or they may agree, as in our language: and the same thing takes place between the substantive and adjective. A strictly verbal translation would do any thing else than convey the meaning of such phraseologies, and recourse must be had to the syntax of the Arabic language, in order to learn that the distinctions of gender and number must be disregarded, when they are made to assume an English dress. The same thing is true in regard to the translation of the possessive pronouns from the Latin tongue and its modern derivatives, into English; and the use of the article in modern languages, is another strong evidence in favour of the truth of our position. The more fully to illustrate our meaning in what we have here advanced, we subjoin from Gilchrist's East Indian Guide to the Hindostanee, a specimen of the difference between a verbal translation, and what we would call an intelligible translation.
If own companion at, now we also jokes would crack, then our turn would be, according this saying to, that who wins may laugh, but wise men among very remote is both—friendship, and also reason from, such situation in, regret stead ridicule to make, now I own remark—finished will make this advice and proverb with, that being one good of, late, better is, not being than, and the more speed he can, bad conduct having left, good towards to come, proper is.

Were I inclined to laugh at the folly of a comrade, it would now be my turn, agreeably to the proverb, “he may laugh who wins,” but it is inconsistent with both friendship and wisdom, to substitute ridicule for regret, on such occasions, I shall therefore conclude with beseeching you to recollect, that “better late than never,” and to turn over a new leaf as soon as possible. p. 108.

We present this to our readers, not because it exactly coincides with our notions of a strictly verbal translation, but because it affords a clue to the principle we are advocating, that syntax in a bilingual grammar is nothing more than a set of rules, designed to facilitate the translation of expressions in one language, by those of equivalent meaning in another. The principles of translation must ever depend and be regulated by the disagreement or correspondency of the syntax of the translated and translating languages; and as the syntactical analogy of even cognate dialects, is far from being of that perfect kind which an etymological survey of their structure would lead us to believe; so there are no two languages, or even dialects, from either of which a correct translation can be made into the other, without recurring more or less to the syntax for assistance. We again repeat it, a merely verbal translation of a passage can in every case be made, without having recourse to any rule of syntax, but a correct and intelligible translation of it cannot.

We have thought it proper thus to enlarge upon this head, because Dr. Lee affirms that the grammarian has
but little to do with the principles of translation: this is the business of the student or critic, who to the knowledge of etymology and syntax, adds the further acquisition of rhetoric, &c. — And again, he (the grammarian) has nothing to do with the principles of translation. Passing over what is contradictory in our opponent's statements, we would only observe, that rhetoric is defined by Dr. Johnson to be "the act of speaking not merely with propriety, but with art and elegance; the power of persuasion; oratory," and that the student or the critic who cannot translate without the previous acquisition of this accomplishment, must possess a sorry mind, or a most disorderly development of the intellectual powers.

It may be well to notice the conformity existing between the Professor's ideas of the uses of syntax, and the practical purposes to which he applies it, in the analysis of the Persian fable given in the grammar. We are enabled to do this, without risking the imputation of unfair dealing, by means of the following paragraph in his Vindication.

"We now come to the analysis. 'It is expressly stated,' (p. 82.) says our reviewer, 'that the word spring in the phrase, the air of it equalized the gale of spring, is governed by the verb equalized, &c.' It is so stated, I will allow, and I will affirm, that it is truly stated. Let us examine this phrase (which, however, is not a phrase, but a sentence!). I take it for granted, that only two words occur in this sentence, viz. نسبم and which can be governed by the verb in question. It cannot be نسبم for that is governed by the following word نسبم; besides the particle which marks the government of the verb is not attached to it, but to the following word. It is not, therefore, subject to the grammatical government of the verb, although it may be properly considered its logical complement, with regard to the sense. We, therefore, dismiss the remark, which has also been extended to two or three similar passages, as querulous and hypercritical."

The passage which is here animadverted upon, runs
thus in the original. The translation of it, as above stated, is, the air of it equalized the gale of the spring. In the analysis of the words as given by Dr. Lee, we are told that "air being in construction with \( \text{آن} \), takes with the vowel kasra (see p. 21 of the grammar)"—that "the \( \text{آر} \) of \( \text{سپر} \), is the sign of the dative case (p. 22);" and that "this word is in construction with the preceding, and is governed in the oblique case by the following verb." It is already known to our readers that Dr. Lee is the editor of Sir William Jones; that he professes to improve upon his original, by making a liberal use of the very valuable and elaborate grammar of Mr. Lumsden; and that to keep pace with the very considerable advances in oriental learning, which have been made since the days of Sir William Jones, and which require a commensurate progress in the extent and accuracy of the reading required from the student, the Doctor has made all the additions and alterations, which in his opinion were requisite to effect his design. It must also strike every one conversant with the subject, that in a vindication of his edition, it is very necessary, in order to make good his purpose, to establish what he says by good authority and pertinent reasons, if in the course of his statements he be found differing from the principles laid down by his author, or by any of the writers on whose works he has grounded his improvements. That nothing of this kind has been done, we proceed to show. Sir William Jones in the syntax, p. 184, says, "the governing noun is prefixed to that which it governs, as \( \text{روی خوب} \) a beautiful face; but if
this order be inverted, a compound adjective is formed, as

Dr. Lee, in his analysis of the Persian fable, says, that of the two words translated the gale of the spring, the latter is in construction with the preceding, and is governed in the oblique case by the following verb. Dr. Lee, however, in his vindication contradicts Sir William Jones, and the implied sense of his own expressions, and says that

the first in order of the two, is governed by the following word. This latter assertion of the Doctor is also at direct variance with the following rule, as given by his own authority, Mr. Lumsden, at p. 246 of the 2d vol. of his Persian Gram.

viz. "Of two nouns connected together by means of the relation of the genitive case, the first or governing noun will generally receive the vowel kasra." Our opponent goes on to state, that the particle which marks the government of the verb is not attached to,

and that it is not therefore subject to the grammatical government of the verb, although it may be considered as its logical complement with regard to the sense. Mr. Lumsden's rules applicable to the case, are—1st, "When the object of a transitive verb shall not be followed by an adjective, or by a substantive noun, with which it is connected, the termination ج, if it shall be expressed, will necessarily follow the object of the transitive verb."—2d, "If the object of the transitive verb shall be followed by an adjective, or by one or more substantive nouns with which it is connected, the termination ج will generally follow these words."

The doctrine here maintained, and with which we perfectly coincide, is further confirmed by rule fourth, which
runs—"If the object of a transitive verb shall be followed by a parenthetical sentence, occurring between it and the transitive verb with which it is connected, an ancient writer will generally insert the termination \( \text{I} \) immediately after the object of the verb, and in the writings of modern authors the termination \( \text{I} \) will generally follow the parenthetical sentence." Hence it is evident, that Dr. Lee's idea of the syntax of the words runs directly counter to those of Sir William Jones and Mr. Lumsden, as does also his idea of a logical complement to that entertained by another of his authorities, M. de Sacy, whose words are—"On peut distinguer, dans les compléments complexes, le complément logique du complément grammatical. Le complément logique comprend la réunion de tous les mots nécessaires pour exprimer l'idée totale qui sert à compléter l'antécédent: le complément grammatical n'est que le mot qui exprime la première et la principale des idées partielles qui concourent à former cette idée totale. Ainsi, dans cette proposition, \( \text{J'ai vu Turenne, dont la valeur ne le cédait en rien à celle des plus célèbres généraux de l'antiquité, le complément logique du verbe voir est Turenne dont la valeur, &c. mais le complément grammatical est Turenne.} \)

The whole matter then stands thus. Dr. Lee affirms that in the phrase, to equalize the gale of spring, the word spring is governed by the verb equalize, and that the word gale is governed by the word spring. Sir William Jones says that the word spring is governed by the word gale. Mr. Lumsden supports Sir William Jones, and states besides in addition to this, that the mark of verbal government is not affixed to the object of the transitive verb, but to the adjective or substantive following, when such words intervene. Finally, M. de Sacy joins in the attack upon
the Cambridge Professor, by telling him that he has misunderstood the meaning of the phrases, grammatical government, and logical complement. To these first rate authorities, we add our own testimony against Dr. Lee; and if he chooses to take any notice of our present remarks, and resorts to his favourite argument of ascribing our hostility to him to our own ignorance of the subject, he will be pleased to remember, that our ignorance in this, as in many other instances, is mainly attributable to the grosser and more culpable ignorance of Lumsden and de Sacy, whom we have selected as our guides, and who possess much better opportunities of investigating such matters than we either do, or have any prospect of enjoying.

"Again, 'A Persic infinitive' it is said, 'is made to correspond with an English imperative.' But, alas! no Persian infinitive occurs in the whole fable, if we except two or three contracted ones, which have been differently rendered."

Well are we aware of the truth contained in the vindicatory sentence; but alas, alas! that we are obliged to make known to Dr. Lee, that the analysis of the fable is not the fable itself, any more than the ground plan of a building constitutes its architectural elevation. The passage quoted refers to the analysis, Dr. Lee refers it to the fable, and exultingly concludes that no infinitive can possibly exist or be inserted in the analysis, if none are to be found in the fable.

The Doctor then gets crusty at our remark about his use of the terms demonstrative and possessive, and boldly affirms, that "there are in our own language, words which are sometimes construed as conjunctions, and at others as demonstrative pronouns." Will the Doctor have the goodness to point out what these words are, for we do not pretend ever to have met with any, but a troublesome four
letter word, which has been much animadverted upon for its obtrusiveness in English phraseology.

The Professor, after having drubbed us in the style of which we have presented such numerous specimens to our readers, and which we need not now epithetize, concludes by telling that we are both tired of the subject; but that he is unwilling to close his argument, without giving us credit for all the genuine remarks we have made. He then allows that we have detected him in three blunders, two of which are declared to be of no importance. An apology is next offered for the erroneous construction of the citation taken from the Koran; and it is mentioned, that five or six errors of the press are unnoticed among the errata. It is truly annoying to be obliged to read such a meagre catalogue of one’s excellencies; but it is past endurance to be accused of sleepy headness, and to have it proved by a favourite Latin quotation of our opponent. It is however consoling, after such strange inattention on the part of our antagonist to the comfortable and undisturbed indulgence of our vanity, to be enabled to find fault, (for the vain are always vindictive,) and to have it in our power to tell our Reverend adversary, that his excuse of being fifty miles from the press, while the edition was in progress, is a story that tells very ill, when forced from an author while fulfilling his days of purification.

The next paragraph refers to our concluding remarks, and in our opinion is the best argued paragraph on the whole that the Doctor has written. Of the truth of the commencing sentence, we are nevertheless sceptical, as it appears to us to rest upon the sophism, that a man’s faults are only such as he himself acknowledges. There is one clause towards the end of the paragraph, which might afford ample scope for remark, were we inclined to lecture the English universities for their very culpable and gross inattention to theological and eastern learning; but it would
be talking to the wind, to attempt to change the opinions of men who will not be convinced, unless the truth of our northern, and consequently crude and barbarous notions, were demonstrated from Euclid, or proved by quotations from Plato or Cicero.

The succeeding paragraph will amuse, and therefore we give it.

"It has been remarked in the outset of this article, that the reviewer is well known to me: my reasons are these: there are peculiarities in the style and sentiments of some persons, which will never be mistaken by those who know them, and such, I will take upon me to say, is the case in the instance before us. The Rev. Professor has long been an obnoxious subject, and the present has been the only opportunity that has offered, which could at all be seized for the charitable purpose of crushing him at once. But, it has been well remarked, that vaulting ambition will occasionally overlap itself and fall on the other side: and if this does not turn out to be eventually the case in this particular, I shall be much mistaken."

Many, if not all of our readers, will be at a loss to understand what is here said, and we pretend not to be more highly gifted than they. That the Professor will be more successful than he has yet been in finding us out, when these pages shall have met his eye, we will not venture to foretell, after the specimen he has already afforded of his shrewdness. Suffice it to say, that to us it will ever be matter of regret, if, from a mistake as to our personal identity, we shall have been the innocent cause of another's hurt.

The concluding paragraph of the vindication runs on in the same style of invective as the foregoing, against the innoxious object of the Doctor's wrath. As some people are apt to rely with greater confidence upon the concluding assertions of a controversialist, than upon the ability displayed in conducting his argument, we cannot withhold
presenting the summimg up of our opponent to the tact of such men.

"I have not thought it necessary, Mr. Editor, to toil through upwards of one hundred closely printed pages of octavo, merely to detect fallacies and expose falsehoods; the specimen I have given I trust will suffice to vindicate the character of the edition in question, as well as to warn the public of what is likely to come forth, at no very distant day, from the authorship of our reviewer, in the shape of a new and popular grammar of the Persian language.

I remain, Sir, &c."

It is wonderful to what a degree the conduct of man is influenced by the external circumstances of his situation. When we formerly wrote upon the eighth edition of Jones, the publication of a Persian grammar was not even in our thoughts; but in the short interval of time which has since elapsed, many things have occurred to render it more than probable, that a publication of such a work will actually take place; and if encouragement be given, we may try our hands at grammars of other eastern tongues. That they will be new, our readers must be aware from what we have already written on the subject; but that they will be popular, time alone will tell. The warnings of the Doctor, or of any of his friends, will be taken in good part, and his own observations will be duly attended to, and thankfully received.

In a postscript to the Professor's vindication, we have presented to our notice, the review of Garcin de Tassy, with which we furnished him, taken from the Journal Asiatique. An endeavour is made to bolster up the credit of the eighth edition of Jones, by printing in Italics all the polite words which are interspersed in its scanty phraseology. Our eye is not at all offended at seeing them so distinguished. We are only surprised that Dr. Lee should have forgot, that the ungainly bluntness of English style, is a surer criterion
of the true sentiments of an English writer, than the studied politesse of French expression is of the mind of a literary Frenchman.

In a second postscript, there is a somewhat detailed comparison between the remarks of Sylvestre de Sacy upon Dr. Lee, which appeared in the Journal des Savans for April last, and those which have given rise to the present controversy. The comparison turns out against us, of course; and, with some exultation, we are told, that there is a trifling difference of opinion, as to the general merits of the eighth edition of Jones, between the reviewer and M. de Sacy. We possess the clue to the candid and liberal tone of M. de Sacy's remarks, as Dr. Lee designates them. It is this, M. de Sacy has reviewed Dr. Lee's edition of Jones, without examining above five pages of the book; and the proof of our assertion is contained in the following passage from the review itself—- il est singulier que ni W. Jones, ni M. Lee, n'avaient eu l'idée de donner la traduction de cette ode de Hafiz—c'est au reste, la seconde de celles qu'a publiées en Persan et en Latin M. de Rewizky. The ode referred to is the one given in Roman letters, as a reading exercise to the student, of which, in every edition of the grammar but the eighth, there exists both a prose and verse translation. Dr. Lee, for some reason best known to himself, has suppressed the prose translation, but gives the poetical version of the words, which, for the flowing dignity of the numbers, and the artless ease of the style, will long continue to do honour to the memory of Jones. De Sacy, however, affirms that no translation is met with, although the last words of the introductory paragraph to the ode are—a translation of it shall be inserted in its proper place. If much dependence is to be placed upon the favourable opinion of a man whose expressions are dictated by courtesy, and not by the actual examination of the
pages he criticises; then a review, to be a good one, ought to be written without once looking into the book reviewed. This, we believe, does sometimes take place; but we beg leave to state, that we think a review got up in this manner, is in no way creditable to any one, however high may be his station in the literary world. Such being our sentiments upon this point, we shall not go farther into the examination of the review in question, as we are satisfied that its nature and spirit do not accord with our opponent's partialities; nor are we now willing to give way to observations which would excite discontent in the breasts of our readers.

We now take our leave of Dr. Lee, and, to the best of our belief, of the controversy in which we have engaged him. We have attacked him on public grounds, as we would do any other man; and have thought it our duty to speak plainly and firmly; to risk even the imputation of personal hostility, that we might effect a great public good, and rouse into action the energies of orientalists in the service of the British and Foreign Bible Society, &c. If from our inexperience we have spoken rashly and improperly, the punishment shall be ours, and we expect it to be inflicted in the most unsparing measure. We can truly assert, that we have said nothing which the circumstances of the case did not warrant us to affirm, and which the importance of the subject did not require us to express. If the Doctor thinks fit to reply to our remarks, let him reason, and not rely upon bare assertion; let him, by all means, avoid resting the strength of his argument upon suppositious statements and mere conjecture; let him combat with the weapons of honourable warfare. To induce him the more effectually to adopt the course we advise, we beg leave, in the words of the most eminent of his former antagonists, to remind him—" that a deep and ac-
curate skill in verbal criticism is not the acquisition of a
day, a month, or a year; nor is it a necessary concomi-
tant of what flattery will sometimes eulogize as heaven-born
genius; but it is the result of a patient application to an
appropriate branch of literature, effected by the study of
long established principles, and matured by the experience
of long practised habits."

FINIS.
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