Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

Buy me a coffee   https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON   https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

SOME EVIDENCES OF ARYO-SEMITIC KINSHIP.

BY PROFESSOR ALLISON EMERY DRAKE, PH.D.

THE languages of Europe are divided by philologists into two families, the Aryan (Indo-European) and the Scythian (Ural-Altaic). The latter includes Lappish, Finnish, Hungarian, Turkish, and Basque, which last is the language of some 600,000 people living around and back from the angle of the Bay of Biscay.

The Aryan family of languages extends geographically from Iceland to India, not to speak of the continents seized and peopled by Aryan stock within the last four hundred years; and it has been classified into some ten or twelve groups. The original home of the Aryan family has been the subject of much and varied conjecture by scholars. The question is still *sub judice*, as it is likely to continue to be so long as the Aryan peoples are viewed by philologists as autochthonous, or fundamentally unrelated by speech to any other peoples. Philologists are extremely pessimistic regarding any question of possible kinship of the Aryan languages with any others. It is, moreover, assumed that, after all the thorough examinations made with a view to connecting the Aryan languages with others, if any such kinship ever existed, all traces of it have in the lapse of ages been mutilated past possible recognition; and that it is therefore futile at this late date to search for such traces. But so much depends upon the natural and the acquired equipment of the investigators in such

matters that such assumptions seem to me to be quite unscientific.

It is the purpose of this paper to present some evidences (hitherto presented by no other writer) showing that the Aryan languages are fundamentally Semitic. I am pleased to liken the languages of Europe, not to so many pieces of stalagmite formed by chemical deposit in the quiet of some subterranean cavern, but rather to so many pieces of breccia or porphyry or, perhaps better still, *bric-à-brac* relics taken from the ashes of some great urban conflagration, and containing fragments of china vases, cups, dolls, and what not, more or less fused and cemented together. The propriety and helpfulness of this latter mode of representation will appear more fully as we proceed.

Let us consider the Latin phrase *frater Ciceronis.* The most elementary books on Latin tell us that the phrase may also be written *Ciceronis frater;* but exhaustive treatises on Latin grammar do not tell us which is the older way of writing such a phrase. The same is true regarding the corresponding phrases in Greek, in Sanskrit, and in other Aryan languages. The matter seems to me to be worthy of investigation.

In Japanese and in Chinese (Mandarin) the order of words in such a phrase is invariably as in *Ciceronis frater.* This is the regular Scythian order (being the invariable order in Basque and in Turkish). In English, too, the genitive is always prepositive; that is, we say *Cicero's brother* but cannot say *brother Cicero's,* though in Anglo-Saxon either order was permissible (*sunu Wihstanes,* Beowulf, 2753; *Wihstanes sunu,* Beowulf, 3077). The genitive is invariably prepositive in Swedish and in Dano-Norwegian, but may be either prepositive or postpositive in Icelandic, as also in German and

in Bohemian. In the Celtic languages, however, the genitive
is invariably postpositive. Welsh lacks inflection to mark
the case of nouns, but places the genitive invariably after the
noun on which it depends. The following examples will help
to fix the foregoing statements in mind (see Gen. xiv. 12) :—

PREPOSITIVE GENITIVE.		POSTPOSITIVE GENITIVE.
(Japanese)	onna no tamashii (a woman's soul) onna no fukusō (a woman's garment)	(Greek) τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ᾿Αβραμ
		(Latin) filium fratris Abram
		(Bohemian) syna bratra Abramova
(Chinese)	S h a n g-ti-tih e n-huei (God's grace) Shang-ti-tih shu (God's book)	(Welsh) fab brawd Abram
		(Gaelic) mac brathar Abraim
		(Old Gaelic) macc brathar athar (a father's brother's son) (Thesaurus Palæohibernicus, vol. ii. p. 109)
(Finnish)	Abramin w e l j e n pojan (Abraham's brother's son)	
		(Hebrew) b'en-hah'y hab(e)-ram *
(Hungarian)	az Ábrám at(t)ya-fiának fiját	
(Basque)	Abranen anaiaren semea	
(Swedish)	A b r a m s broders son	
(Dano-Norwegian) Abrams Broders Son		
(German)	Abrams Bruders Sohn	
(Anglo-Saxon) Abrames brothor sunu		

* My transliteration of the Hebrew alphabet is as follows: 1. h
2. b, b' 3. g, g² 4. d, d² 5. h² 6. v,(u, w) 7. z 8. h² 9. t 10. y 11. k, k²
12. l 13. m 14. n 15. s 16. h⁴ 17. p, p² 18. z² 19. q 20. r 21. s² 22. s²
23. t², t².

It will be seen that I number the four gutturals in the order
of their occurrence (h, h², h², h⁴) ; etc.

The order of the words in the phrases above quoted is fixed
in English, Swedish, Dano-Norwegian, Basque, Welsh, Gaelic,
Old Gaelic, and Hebrew. In the following exhibit, the sign plus
($+$) means an invariably prepositive genitive, the sign mi-

nus (—) means an invariably postpositive genitive. The sign plus or minus (±) and the sign minus or plus (∓) mean that the genitive may be either prepositive or postpositive, with a preference for the position indicated by the upper sign.

POSITION OF THE ADNOMINAL GENITIVE.

Atlantic Ocean					Pacific Ocean
Icelandic (±)		Lappish			
		Finnish (±)			
		Swedish (+)		Japanese (+)	
	Dano-Norwegian (+)	Russian (∓)			
	Anglo-Saxon (±)	German (∓)		Chinese (+)	
Gaelic (—)	English (+)	Bohemian (∓)			
Old Gaelic (—)	Welsh (—)	Hungarian (±)			
	Basque (+)	Turkish (+)			
	Latin (+ or —)	Greek (+ or —)	Sanskrit (+ or —)		
		Semitic (—)			

My interpretation of these phenomena is that the original Aryan order was like the Semitic, but in all but the Celtic languages became more or less modified through contact with Scythian.

The Aryan languages, it is well known, are all sharply and completely separated from Scythian, Chinese, and Japanese through the use of prepositions instead of postpositions, and in this respect are in agreement with Semitic, which uses only the preposition. It is likewise well known that prepositions and postpositions with their objects were originally nouns (used adverbially) with dependent genitives, the object of a preposition being a postpositive genitive and the object of

a postposition being a prepositive genitive. Evidences of this are abundant in Semitic and Scythian and are not wholly lacking in Aryan. Note the following "prepositional substantives" with dependent genitives: δέμας πυρός (like fire), δίκην ὕδατος (like water), ὄρνιθος τρόπον (like a bird), τοῦ λόγου χάριν (for the argument's sake); (Latin) *virtutis ergo* (on account of valor), *exempli gratia* (for example), *instar montis* (like a mountain), *apis more* (like a bee), *labrorum tenus* (along the lips), *id temporis* (at that time). Note that these "prepositional substantives" (as some grammarians call them) are mostly postpositive. That, I take it, is because their assumption of the nature of prepositions is recent. The older prepositions in Aryan are in tenor strictly prepositive. For these additional reasons I conjecture again that the adnominal genitive in primitive Aryan was, as in Semitic, invariably postpositive. In the following exhibit the plus sign (+) indicates the use of prepositions, and the minus sign (—) the use of postpositions.

POSTPOSITIONS and PREPOSITIONS.

Icelandic (+)	Lappish			
	Finnish (—)			
	Swedish (+)		Japanese (—)	
	Dano-Norwegian (+)	Russian (+)		
Anglo-Saxon (+)	German (+)		Chinese (—)	
Gaelic (+) English (+)	Bohemian (+)			
Old Gaelic (+) Welsh (+)	Hungarian (—)			
Basque (—)	Turkish (—)			
Latin (+)	Greek (+)		Sanskrit (+)	
	Semitic (+)			

Atlantic Ocean

Pacific Ocean

The position of a finite verb with respect to its subject in independent declarative propositions is worthy of our attention. The subject nominative in such propositions is prepositive in Japanese and in Chinese, and regularly so in Scythian, as also in the Aryan languages except Gaelic. Note the position of the verb in the following Gaelic declarations:—

Is me solus an t-saoghail (I am the light of the world).
Is tu Righ Israel (thou art King of Israel).
Is cuilean leomhain Iudah (Judah is a lion's whelp).
Is da bhrathair dheug sinn (we are two brethren ten).
Is dee sibh (ye are gods).
Is da bhrathair dheug do sheirbhisich (thy servants are two brethren ten).
Is *magister* insalmso (this psalm is *magister*) (Thes. Palaeo., vol. i. p. 85).
Is briathar de insin tra (that then is the word of God) (*id.,* i. 70).
Is acher ingaith innocht (bitter is the wind tonight) (*id.,* ii. 290).

In all these foregoing declarations, the Gaelic verb, as is seen, stands first. This is its invariable position with respect to its subject. As witches and specters cannot cross a living stream, so the Gaelic mind cannot bring itself to place the subject before the finite verb. If the subject needs the emphasis that might come to it from occupying first position, recourse is had to pleonasm, with apologies as it were, thus: *Mise agus an tAthair, is aon sinn* (I and the Father, are one we). On the other hand, we English (and other Aryan peoples) have, as I see it, been so completely Scythianized in this matter that we are unable to put the finite verb first in the ordinary declarative proposition. If we cannot readily make the subject or some other important word or phrase precede the finite verb, we put in first place a meaningless expletive, such as *there* or *it*. Thus, we say, " It is good for

us to be here "; for which the Gaelic has: *Is maith dhuinne bheith an so* ([it] is good for us to be here). Gaelic, therefore, it seems to me, has in this matter resisted Scythian influence or been but little, if at all, exposed to it. Doubtless the Welsh people, more widespread formerly than now, acted as a breakwater for the Gaels against the westward rolling tides of Scythians. It should, moreover, be remarked that other Aryan languages show unmistakable traces of what I conjecture to have been the original order of the finite verb and its subject in an Aryan declarative proposition. Thus, in English, in Greek, and in Latin, the usual order of words in certain parenthetical expressions is just like the Gaelic order of the main proposition; that is, the finite verb comes first. That the order of words in our parenthetical expressions, when different from the usual order elsewhere, is the more primitive is more than suggested by the fact that obsolescent words survive longest in parenthetical expressions. Witness *quoth* in English, *inquam* in Latin, ἦ δ᾽ ὅς (said he) in Greek, etc.

If now we turn to Semitic, we find that " most usually the subject follows the verb," quite in agreement with Gaelic, except that, in this matter, Gaelic seems to have kept to the ancient way even more closely than has Semitic.

The reader should further note that, alone of the Aryan tongues, Gaelic has kept the verb *is* distinct throughout the three persons and the two numbers. English has the form *is* only in the third person singular, Latin and Gothic only in the second person singular, etc. Gaelic, too, (and Welsh) has kept in use the nominative singular *me*, which most, if not all, of the other Aryan languages have replaced with a developed emphatic *ich* or *ego* or *aham*, etc.

Let the reader now compare the use of Gaelic *is* in the sen-

tences quoted above with the use of the Hebrew *yes*[3] (his[3])
in the following propositions:—

1. yes[3] l(e)hel yady lah'as'out[3] h'immakem rah' ([it] is in the power of my hand to do you hurt) (Gen. xxxi. 29).
2. yes[3]-ly rab (there is much mine) (Gen. xxxiii. 9).
3. yes[3]-s'eber b'(e)miz'(e)rayim([there] (was) is corn in Egypt) (Gen. xlii. 1, 2).
4. yes[3] heloh'ym l(e)yis'(e)rahel (God is Israel's) (1 Sam. xvii. 46).
5. h'eynayim yes' . . . lamou (eyes are . . . theirs) (Isa. xliii. 8).
6. yes[3]-t'iq(e)vah' ([there] is hope) (Jer. xxxi. 17; Job xi. 18, (xiv. 7)).
7. mah'-yes' t'ah'at'-yad(e)ka (what is under thy hand?) (1 Sam. xxi. 4).
8. k'y-hlm-leh'em qodes' yes' (but [there] is holy bread) (1 Sam. xxi. 5).
9. him-yes[3]-millyn (if [there] are words) (Job xxxiii. 32).

These Hebrew quotations, if compared with the Gaelic quo-
tations above given, cannot fail to impress the reader with
the close similarity, as to form, position, and use, existing
between Hebrew *yes*[3] (*his*[3]) and Gaelic *is,* and with the dis-
crepant features of what I am pleased to denominate Scy-
thianized English. Note that Hebrew *yes*[3] (*his*[3]) regularly
stands first in its proposition, except that conjunctions, rela-
tive pronouns, and interrogative pronouns precede it. In these
latter matters the Gaelic idiom is not essentially or noteworth-
ily different from the Hebrew. In quotations 5 and 8 above
given, Hebrew *yes*[3] is postpositive. These two instances are
the only ones I have met with in Biblical Hebrew (but my
observations do not quite cover the entire text).

The mode of naming the numbers from 11 to 19 in the lan-
guages with which we are dealing is a subject not unimport-
ant for our discussion, only we must bear in mind that those
numbers are but little used, and that the manner of naming

them is not fixed, among the more barbarous peoples. More-
over, a fixed mode of naming those numbers can be easily
borrowed by a people having no such fixed mode. Thus, the
Japanese are known to have borrowed the Chinese mode of
naming the numbers from 11 to 19. For " eleven men,"
" twelve men," " thirteen men," etc., the Chinese have expres-
sions meaning, literally, " ten-one men," " ten-two men,"
" ten-three men," etc. The Scythian mode is the same, ex-
cept that the Finns are, in this matter, to be classed with Ar-
yans. The Semitic names of the numbers from 11 to 19 are
in strong contrast with the Chinese names, and mean, liter-
ally, " one-ten," " two-ten," " three-ten," etc. (Latin *unde-
cim, duodecim, tredecim,* etc.). The following exhibit will
be instructive :—

NUMBERS FROM 11 TO 19.

Icelandic	Lappish	
(three-ten men)		
	Finnish	
	(three-ten men)	
	Swedish	Japanese
	(three-ten men)	(ten-three men)
	Dano-Norwegian	Russian
	(three-ten men)	(three-on-ten men)
	Anglo-Saxon	German	Chinese
	(three-ten men)	(three-ten men)	(ten-three men)
	Gaelic	English	Bohemian
	(three men ten)	(three-ten men)	(three-ten men)
	Old Gaelic	Welsh	Hungarian
	(three men ten)	(three men on ten)	(ten-three men)
	Basque	Turkish	
	(ten-three men)	(ten-three men)	
	Latin	Greek	Sanskrit
	(three-ten men)	(three-and-ten men)	(three-ten men)
	Semitic		
	(three-ten men)		

Atlantic Ocean (left margin) — *Pacific Ocean* (right margin)

With the exception of Finnish, the languages with which
we are dealing in this paper are classified by the foregoing

exhibit virtually the same as by the exhibit of postpositions and prepositions; that is, the Aryan languages are in harmony with the Semitic in the matter of naming the numbers from 11 to 19, as against the Scythian and Chinese (and Japanese) mode. English *eleven* and *twelve* (with their Teutonic cognates) are anomalously formed, unless, as I think, the *-lev-* of *eleven* (as also the *-lv-* of *twelve*) means " ten." Note Hebrew *helep,* meaning " thousand " (" ten (hundred)"?). The Gaelic mode of naming the numbers from 11 to 19 seems unlike any other, but is really, I think, not radically different from the Semitic (and regular Aryan) mode. Note here a Hebrew phrase in Jer. xxxii. 9: $s^2ib(e)$-h^4ah^2 $s^2(e)qalym$ $vah^4as^2arah^2$ (seven shekels and ten). I conjecture that the Gaelic, as also the Semitic (and regular Aryan), mode of saying " thirteen men " was originally like this: " three men ten men." Very naturally, in fact almost inevitably, one of the words for " men " had, sooner or later, to drop out. Gaelic then simply dropped the second noun, and her sister languages dropped the first. The oldest Gaelic records are like the most recent in this matter, as the following quotations show:—

1. coic brot(t)u deac (five points ten) (Thes. Palæo., vol. i. pp. 18, 123, 202).
2. coic bliadn(a)i deac (five years ten) (*id.,* i. 18, 123).
3. dimill deec (two thousand ten (12,000)) (*id.,* i. 600).
4. di huair deac (two hours ten) (*id.,* ii. 10, 10, 13, 21).
5. trimis deacc (three months ten) (*id.,* ii. 33).
6. crist conadib napstalaib deac (Christ with his two apostles ten) (*id.,* ii. 254).
7. -iii- parsa deac (three particles ten) (*id.,* ii. 255).
8. se mbliadnae deac (six years ten) (*id.,* ii. 808).

There is a remarkable point of agreement between Gaelic and Hebrew in the construction of the infinitive to express

purpose.   In Hebrew, infinitives with *l(e)* prefixed " serve
to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim " (Gesen-
ius-Kautsch).   In Gaelic, *le* placed before the infinitive " gives
the idea of intent, purpose, to perform what is expressed by
the verb " (Bourke's College Irish Grammar).   Illustrative
examples are very numerous both in Hebrew and in Gaelic,
and the beginning of the third chapter of Ecclesiastes (ver.
2–8) contains a long series of infinitives expressing purpose.
Hebrew here uses only the preposition *l(e)* with the infini-
tives, but Gaelic, apparently for the sake of variety, uses one
or another of four prepositions: *cum, do, le,* and *re* (the last
two being really the same word).

1. (Hebrew) h⁴et² lip(e)rouz² v(e)h⁴et² lib(e)nout⁴ (a time to
break down and a time to build up) ;
(Gaelic) aimsir do leagadh sios agus aimsir do chur suas.

2. (Hebrew) h⁴et² l(e)baqqes⁴ v(e)h⁴et² l(e)hab⁵b²ed (a time to
get and a time to lose) ;
(Gaelic) aimsir le faghail agus aimsir le caill.

Aside from this extraordinary agreement between Gaelic
and Hebrew in the use of the preposition *le, l(e)* with the
infinitive to express purpose, a circumstance of no little im-
portance is the interchange of Gaelic *le* with Gaelic *do*.   It
will be of service to us to recall this interchange a little
later on.

This same preposition (Hebrew *l(e)*, Gaelic *le*) has an-
other frequent use important for the present discussion.   In
our English versions of the Bible the last words of the tenth
commandment (Ex. xx. 17) are: *nor anything that is thy
neighbor's.*   The last word here quoted is a predicate posses-
sive (predicate genitive), translating a Hebrew prepositional
phrase (predicate): *l(e)reh⁴e-.*   Gaelic likewise has here a

prepositional phrase (predicate) : *le do chomharsain.* This agreement between Gaelic and Hebrew in using a prepositional phrase (predicate) might be nothing but a coincidence, but can hardly be classed as such, in view of the fact that the Hebrew preposition here used is $l(e)$, and the Gaelic *le*. Examples of this use of the preposition $l(e)$, *le*, is to be met with *passim* both in Hebrew and in Gaelic; also in Old Gaelic: *is ladia cid calldea* (even Chaldea is God's) (Thes. Palæo., vol. i. p. 134).

In Gen. i. 5 (and often elsewhere) Hebrew uses this same preposition $l(e)$ in a way that must seem very strange to all Aryan students of Hebrew, save the Gaelic. The Hebrew of this passage is: *vayyiq(e)rah heloh²ym lahour youm* (and God called to the light Day). Now Gaelic has here this same strange idiom, only the Gaelic preposition used is not *le* but *do,* which, however, we saw above interchanged with *le* in forming infinitive phrases of purpose, so that the Gaelic preposition as well as the Gaelic idiom here used is really identical with the Hebrew. Old Gaelic has the same idiom: *ainm maicc asbered saul duduaid* (Saul used to call the name of son to David) (Thes. Palæo., vol. i. p. 180). Furthermore, the ground form of the Hebrew word for *called* above quoted is *qarah,* and the modern Gaelic word for the same is *goir,* which is virtually the same in form as the Hebrew *qarah;* that is, Hebrew *q* corresponds to Gaelic *g*.

Turning now to Anglo-Saxon (and other Aryan languages), we shall here likewise find some very distinct fragments of Semitic syntax. Thus, Hebrew has only two tenses, traditionally known as preterite (perfect) and future (imperfect); and Anglo-Saxon has only two tenses, preterite and another tense which is translated as present or future according to

the demands of the context. Hebrew has two infinitives, the infinitive construct or inflected infinitive and the infinitive absolute or uninflected infinitive; and Anglo-Saxon has two infinitives, one inflected and one uninflected. The Hebrew infinitive construct or inflected infinitive is very frequently used as the object of the preposition $l(e)$. The Anglo-Saxon inflected infinitive is· always the object of the preposition *to*, cognate with Gaelic *do,* which we saw above interchanged with Gaelic *le.* Let us compare now the uses of the Hebrew construct infinitive with $l(e)$ prefixed and the inflected Anglo-Saxon infinitive with *to* prefixed:—

The Hebrew infinitive construct with $l(e)$ prefixed is used

1. (with great frequency) to express purpose: *and God set them in the firmament of the heaven* $l(e)h^2ahyr$ $h^4al-h^2aharez^a$ (to give light upon the earth) (Gen. i. 17);
2. With the copula, like the Latin participle in -*rus:* $vay(e)h^2y$ $h^2as^2s^2emes^2$ *labouh* (and the sun was about to go down) (Gen. xv. 12);
3. with the copula, like the Latin participle in -*dus:* $vay(e)h^2y$ $h^2as^2s^2ab^4ar$ $lis(e)g^2our$ (and the gate had to be shut) (Josh. ii. 5).

The Anglo-Saxon inflected infinitive (with *to* prefixed) is used

1. (with great frequency) to express purpose: *ge comon this land to sceawienne* (ye are come to spy out this land) (Gen. xlii. 12);
2. with the copula, like the Latin participle in -*rus:* *sende thone the thu to sendenne eart* (send him whom thou art going to send) (*mitte quem missurus es*) (Ex. iv. 13);
3. with the copula, like the Latin participle in -*dus:* *mannes sunu ys to syllene on manna handa* (the Son of Man must be given into the hands of men) (*filius hominis tradendus est in manus hominum*) (Matt. xvii. 22).

The Hebrew infinitive absolute (uninflected infinitive) has two main uses:—

1. The infinitive absolute is put before (or after) a finite mode of the same verb, usually to strengthen the meaning or to express the long continuance of an action. Thus, *mos* *t²amwt²* (thou shalt surely die) (Gen. ii. 17). This, it seems to me, may well be the prototype of the reduplication in the preterite of the oldest Anglo-Saxon verbs and of verbal reduplication in other Aryan languages. " Reduplication of a root (originating doubtless in its complete repetition) has come to be a method of radical increment or strengthening in various formative processes " (Whitney's Sanskrit Grammar, sect. 259).

2. The infinitive absolute frequently appears as a substitute for any finite mode of any tense and person. Compare with this the Latin historical infinitive and the Greek infinitive for the imperative.

The agreement in use between Hebrew $l(e)$ and Anglo-Saxon *to* deserves our attention once more. The closing words of Gen. i. 29 in Hebrew are: *lakem yih ²(e)yeh² l(e)hok(e)lah²* (it shall be to you to meat) ; for which the Anglo-Saxon is: *thaet hig beon eow to mete* (that they be to you to meat). Here Anglo-Saxon *to* translates Hebrew $l(e)$; but Anglo-Saxon omits the first preposition. The use of *to* in the sense of *for* is very common in Anglo-Saxon and corresponds regularly to Hebrew $l(e)$; but survives in modern English, it would seem, only in the archaic phrase *to wife* and the colloquial phrase *to boot.* For additional examples note the Hebrew phrases in Gen. i. 14: *v(e)h²ayw l(e)hot²ot² wl(e)-mouh⁴adym wl(e)yamym v(e)s³anym* (and let them be to signs, and to seasons, and to days and years) ; and the Anglo-Saxon: *and beon to tacnum and to tidum and to dagum and to gearum* (and be to signs and to seasons and to days and to years). This construction was more widely used in Hebrew than in Anglo-Saxon as we know it; thus, in Lev. xxvi. 12, Hebrew has *v(e)h²ayyt²y lakem lehloh²ym* (and I shall be to you to God) ; Anglo-Saxon: *and ic beo eower God* (and I shall be your God) ; but note the Latin: *malo est hominibus*

avaritia (avarice is to men to an evil). " This use of the dative ['to denote the Purpose or End '], once apparently general [in Latin], remains in only a few constructions " (Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar).

In the foregoing pages I have presented a few of the evidences of Aryo-Semitic kinship that meet the observer at every turn. It is hoped they may stimulate the reader to further investigation of the subject. The conclusions which I have drawn here and in my other published works are in keeping with the findings of craniologists and ethnologists, who assign to the fundamental stratum of the so-called Aryan peoples a Semitic origin. The ruling Aryan philologists of to-day, however, trusting in the dicta of the scholars of seventy and eighty years ago, have come into mature years without having gained an acquaintance with the Semitic languages and are quite content to pursue their investigations in the Aryan languages without troubling themselves with the question of Aryo-Semitic kinship. Evidently, to determine the true perspective of the development of the Aryan languages will require a younger generation of scholars, energetic enough to embrace in their scheme of serious studies various Semitic, Aryan, and Scythian languages.

[We regret to announce the death of the distinguished author of this article almost immediately after he had finished reading the proof. Dr. Drake received the degree of Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1895. He was the author of " Discoveries in Hebrew, Gaelic, Anglo-Saxon, Latin, Basque, and other Caucasic Languages," and " The [Triple] Authorship of the West Saxon Gospels [a Discovery]." His work has attracted the attention of scholars everywhere.—THE EDITOR.]