

PROCEEDINGS.

~~~~~  
**Boston and Cambridge, May 22nd, 1861.**  
 ~~~~~

PURSUANT to adjournment, the American Oriental Society held its Annual Meeting for 1861 in Boston and Cambridge, on Wednesday, May 22nd. The Society assembled in the rooms of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and was called to order soon after 10 o'clock A. M., by the President, Dr. Robinson of New York.

After the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, reports from the officers were called for. The Treasurer first gave a summary statement of the income and outlay of the past year, and of the present condition of the Treasury, as follows :

RECEIPTS.

Balance in the Treasury, May 17th, 1860, - - - - -	\$520.58
Members' fees: ann. assessm'ts for 1860-61, - - -	\$455.00
do. do. for previous years, - - -	115.00
do. do. for 1861-62, - - -	5.00
	<hr/>
Sale of Journal, - - - - -	63.39
Donations from American merchants in China, - - -	400.00
	<hr/>
Total receipts of the year, - - - - -	\$1038.39
	<hr/>
	\$1558.97

EXPENDITURES.

Paper, printing, and engraving for Journal, Vol. VI (balance), - - -	\$429.15
do. do. do. Vol. VII (in part), - - -	473.43
Other printing, - - - - -	16.59
Binding books, - - - - -	41.18
Other expenses of Library, of correspondence, etc., - - -	41.40
	<hr/>
Total expenditures of the year, - - - - -	\$1001.75
Balance in the Treasury, May 22nd, 1861, - - - - -	557.22
	<hr/>
	\$1558.97

The Treasurer's accounts were referred to an Auditing Committee composed of Messrs. Charles Folsom of Cambridge and Samuel F. Haven of Worcester, and, having been by them duly examined and audited, were accepted.

The Librarian laid before the Society the list of Additions to the Library and Cabinet since the last annual meeting (which list is annexed to this report of Proceedings). He read the names of the several donors, and pointed out the gifts of highest interest and value. Attention was especially called to a donation from Hon. Charles W. Bradley, lately U. S. Consul at Ningpo, by far the most valuable which the Society has ever received, comprising a collection of more than seven hundred volumes of

works relating to every part of the Orient, but especially to China and Egypt, and adding probably not less than half to the previous value of the Library; including also a series of Chinese coins, of four hundred and thirty different varieties, and many other objects of curious interest for the Society's Cabinet. The condition upon which Mr. Bradley's gifts are now made was stated: viz., that the Library remains in its present place of deposit in New Haven; should it at any time be removed to another locality, the books are to be transferred to the Library of Yale College. A special vote of thanks to Mr. Bradley for his unprecedented liberality to the Society was proposed and passed unanimously.

The Committee of Publication reported that the continuation of the Society's Journal, forming the first half of Vol. VII, was almost complete, and would be distributed in a few days to the members for the past year.

The Corresponding Secretary gave information that the following gentlemen had, since the previous meeting, by acceptance of election, become Corporate Members of the Society:

Mr. William F. Allen, West Newton, Mass.
 Mr. Brinton Coxe, Philadelphia.
 Prof. Timothy Dwight, New Haven.
 Mr. S. Hastings Grant, New York.
 Rev. Charles R. Hale, Philadelphia.
 Rev. Edwin Harwood, New Haven.
 Rev. William Hutchison, New Haven.
 Rev. Thomas S. Potwin, Franklin, N. Y.
 Mr. Joseph S. Ropes, Boston.
 Mr. J. Hammond Trumbull, Hartford, Conn.
 Mr. George F. Vose, Fitchburg, Mass.
 Mr. James M. Whiton, New Haven.

The Directors offered to the meeting the names of several gentlemen with the recommendation that they be elected Corporate Members of the Society; those proposed were thereupon balloted for, and elected without dissent. Among them were the following American merchants, resident in China, who had recently donated each one hundred dollars to the Society, through Hon. C. W. Bradley, and who were therefore chosen as Life Members:

Mr. John Heard, Hongkong.
 Mr. T. C. Smith, do.
 Mr. Robert M. Olyphant, Shanghai.
 Mr. Thomas Walsh, do.

The Directors farther announced that they had reappointed the Committee of Publication of last year. Also that, while thanking Hon. C. W. Bradley, of Ningpo, for his zealous and efficient efforts to promote the interests of the Society abroad, especially in the far East, they had authorized and requested him to continue his exertions in its behalf as he should find opportunity.

The correspondence of the past six months was presented, and read in part. Among the letters were the following:

1. From Capt. H. G. Raverty, dated London, Oct. 12th, 1860. Capt. Raverty calls the Society's attention to the series of works on the Afghan, Pukhto, or Pushto language, which he has lately published by subscrip-

tion, and solicits the Society's subscription. The series consists of a Dictionary (four guineas), a Grammar (one guinea), and a Chrestomathy (two guineas), all in quarto. The Corresponding Secretary said he had been compelled to reply that the Society did not authorize its Librarian to make purchases for its Library; but that he should take pleasure in laying Capt. Raverty's letter before its next meeting, and recommending the works in question to individuals as a most valuable contribution to oriental philology and ethnology.

2. From Mr. Brian H. Hodgson, dated Dursley, Oct. 18th, 1860.

"... I have sent you a copy of the third and concluding part of my last papers on the Turanian languages of the Himalaya. . . . Since these notices were penned, I have read Muir's Sanskrit Texts, and it seems to me not improbable that my Haiyūs, whose name might as well be written Haiyus, may be identical with the people called Haivas at vol. ii, p. 59 of that work; and that the Haihayas of vol. i, p. 181 of the same work may perchance be still the same. Also, that my Bāhings may be not impossibly the Bāhikas of Muir, vol. ii, p. 481-2, though the language of the Bāhikas be there said to be Sanskrit. But the Brahminical writers, in their notices of the tribes and peoples around them, show extreme ignorance of the forms and of the tongues of those tribes and peoples, since even the Indochinese are by those writers set down as "degraded Kshatriyas," that is, Aryans in race and speech! I mention these things just as they occur to me on the spur of the moment."

3. From Mr. Fitz-Edward Hall, dated Camp Nursinghpoor, Feb. 21st, and Saugor, March 4th, 1861.

"... Lately, when at Eran, I made out the oldest Hindu date hitherto deciphered. It corresponds to A. D. 111. . . . Bāpū Deva's version of the Sūrya-Siddhānta I found published, a fasciculus of the Bibliotheca Indica, when I reached Calcutta. With the same help as before [that of Archdeacon Pratt, of Calcutta], he is now going to give a version of the Siddhānta-S'romani. . . . Here at Saugor, I have come upon what seems to be a very correct copy of the Kathā-sarit-sāgara in its entirety. I am having it copied for Brockhaus; and so we may see this huge collection of venerable fibs in print some day or other. . . . I have corrected for the press, this day, the first sheet of my edition of the Das'a-rūpa and its commentary. My translation of it will be printed when I shall have done with the Sanskrit. This I finished before I left India in 1859. . . ."

Dr. Taylor of Andover, Rev. Mr. Hale of Boston, and Mr. Salisbury of Worcester were appointed a committee to nominate a board of officers for election for the ensuing year. They proposed the subjoined ticket, being the same with that chosen last year, which was thereupon balloted for, and declared duly elected:

- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------|--------------|--|-----------------------------|-------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|--|------------------------|-----------|--|------------------------|--------------|
| <i>President</i> | —Prof. EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D., of New York. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Vice-Presidents</i> | <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="font-size: 3em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td>Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D.,</td> <td>“ Cambridge.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D.,</td> <td>“ Boston.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D. D., LL. D.,</td> <td>“ New Haven.</td> </tr> </table> | } | Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D., | “ Cambridge. | | Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D., | “ Boston. | | Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D. D., LL. D., | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| } | Prof. CHARLES BECK, Ph. D., | “ Cambridge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D., | “ Boston. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pres. T. D. WOOLSEY, D. D., LL. D., | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Corresponding Secretary</i> | —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Secr. of Classical Section</i> | —Prof. JAMES HADLEY, | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Recording Secretary</i> | —Mr. EZRA ABBOT, | “ Cambridge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Treasurer</i> | —Mr. D. C. GILMAN, | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Librarian</i> | —Prof. W. D. WHITNEY, | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <i>Directors</i> | <table style="border: none;"> <tr> <td style="font-size: 3em; vertical-align: middle;">}</td> <td>Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D.,</td> <td>“ Boston.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D.,</td> <td>“ New York.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Pres. C. C. FELTON, LL. D.,</td> <td>“ Cambridge.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D.,</td> <td>“ Princeton.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D.,</td> <td>“ New York.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Dr. CHARLES PICKERING,</td> <td>“ Boston.</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>Prof. E. E. SALISBURY,</td> <td>“ New Haven.</td> </tr> </table> | } | Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., | “ Boston. | | Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D., | “ New York. | | Pres. C. C. FELTON, LL. D., | “ Cambridge. | | Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D., | “ Princeton. | | Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D., | “ New York. | | Dr. CHARLES PICKERING, | “ Boston. | | Prof. E. E. SALISBURY, | “ New Haven. |
| } | Rev. RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., | “ Boston. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Mr. J. G. COGSWELL, LL. D., | “ New York. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pres. C. C. FELTON, LL. D., | “ Cambridge. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D., | “ Princeton. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Prof. J. J. OWEN, D. D., | “ New York. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Dr. CHARLES PICKERING, | “ Boston. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Prof. E. E. SALISBURY, | “ New Haven. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

The President called the attention of the Society to the decease, since its last meeting, of one of its oldest, most active, and most highly respected members, Prof. J. W. Gibbs, LL. D., of New Haven. Dr. Worcester and Prof. Beck of Cambridge, and Prof. Proudfit of New Brunswick were appointed a Committee to prepare appropriate resolutions, and, at a later period of the meeting, they offered the following:

Resolved, That in the death of Professor Josiah Willard Gibbs, late of Yale College, this Society lament the loss of an eminent linguistic scholar, distinguished for patient and thorough research, for his ardent pursuit and love of truth, for his various attainments, for his amiable qualities of mind, and for his Christian virtues, all which rendered him an ornament to this association.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of our deceased associate.

These resolutions, after remarks from many of the gentlemen present, were passed.

Prof. Francis, of Cambridge, then referred to the death within the past year of another member of the Society, one of its founders, and for a long time one of its officers, Rev. Theodore Parker of Boston, and offered the following resolutions, which were voted on by the meeting, and adopted:

Resolved, That the members of the Oriental Society received with deep regret the intelligence of the death, in a foreign land, of their distinguished associate, Rev. Theodore Parker, and that they desire to do honor to his memory by the expression of their respect for his rich and diversified scholarship, and of their grateful remembrance of the many virtues of his character.

Resolved, That a copy of the above resolution be communicated to his widow, Mrs. Parker.

Communications being now called for, the following were presented:

1. A few Critical Remarks on the Urim and Thummim, by Rev. Edward C. Jones, of Philadelphia; read by Mr. Abbot, of Cambridge.

2. An Account of the Country of Siak, on the Northeastern Coast of Sumatra, in a Letter to Hon. C. W. Bradley, dated Singapore, May 20th, 1857, by Maharaja Adam Wilson; read by Prof. Whitney, of New Haven.

This was a brief account of the extent, surface, soil, productions, trade, and population of that part of Sumatra lying next opposite to Singapore, over a portion of which the writer had become ruler, by gift from the Sultan of Siak, in return for his assistance against rebel chiefs.

3. An Inquiry into the Origin of the Semitic Feminine and Plural Endings, by Prof. W. Henry Green, D.D., of Princeton, N. J.; read by Prof. Salisbury, of New Haven.

Prof. Green pointed out succinctly the peculiarities of Semitic usage in the treatment of gender and number; he traced the original forms of the terminations employed to distinguish the one and the other, and referred them to the pronominal elements from which he regarded them as derived.

Here the Society took a recess, to come together again at the residence of Prof. Beck, in Cambridge.

Upon reassembling, at 4 o'clock P. M., the Society continued to listen to communications.

4. On the Explorations of the Schlagintweits in Northern India, by Mr. Daniel C. Gilman, of New Haven.

The first Part of the magnificent publication by the brothers Schlagintweit of the results of their Indian explorations—being a quarto volume of text, and an accompanying mammoth folio portfolio of colored lithographic pictures and maps—was exhibited to the members present by Mr. Gilman, who described summarily the course of the expedition, the character of the collections it had brought back, and the mode in which it was proposed to give them to the world.

5. On the Ansairiyah of Northern Syria, being a Review of the late work of Rev. Samuel Lyde entitled "the Asian Mystery," by Rev. Charles H. Brigham, of Taunton, Mass.

After some general introductory remarks on the unfitness of the title applied to the work, and the special qualifications of Mr. Lyde for preparing such a work, as also a brief notice of what other travellers had reported respecting the Ansairiyah, Mr. Brigham proceeded to state the principal facts thus far known respecting this people. Their home is the mountain region in the northwest portion of Syria, though they are found widely scattered, from Tarsus in the west to Persia on the east and Mount Hermon on the south. Their estimated number is 200,000, and is steadily decreasing. They are poor, ignorant, rude, and turbulent, hostile to strangers and quarrelsome with each other. Their traffic with their neighbors is very scanty, and chiefly in the tobacco sold at Ladakia. They live mostly in small villages, avoiding the large towns and the plains. They are divided into two great sects: the Shamsiyah or Northerners, and the Kamriyah or Southerners, so named from the superior reverence which they pay respectively to the sun and the moon. The Shamsiyah are regarded as the descendants of the original Canaanites, while the Kamriyah are descendants of immigrants from Mesopotamia or Persia, who came in the 8th or 9th century. The former are more numerous, the latter more proud and domineering. The chief difference between them is that tobacco is forbidden to the one and allowed to the other.

The principal topic of the review, however, was the religious system of the Ansairiyah, which was analyzed and discussed at length—the unity and nature of the Supreme Being; the Trinity of the *Ma'na*, the *Ism*, and the *Báb*, with their several names and offices; the seven historical manifestations of this Trinity, from Abel to Ali, from Adam to Mohammed, and from Gabriel to Salmán the Persian; the Hierarchies, heavenly and earthly, with their names, order, rank, and numbers; the relation of men to these divine beings; the character and use of prayer; and the relation of the religion to the customs and life of the people. The vagueness, confusion, and meagreness of the religion as explained in its catechism and its sacred books were pointed out, while its indebtedness to the Gospel was shown in the practical precepts given for the believer.

6. Remarks on Rev. R. Caldwell's Comparative Dravidian Grammar, by Prof. William D. Whitney, of New Haven.

Prof. Whitney spoke of the great interest of this work as a comparative presentation of the South-Indian group of languages, but wished to treat especially of a single matter brought forward in it, namely, the author's claim that the languages in question form a branch of the Mongolian or Scythian family, specially allied to its Finnish branch. A somewhat similar claim had been some years since put forth by Müller, but upon grounds of which the adequacy had not been generally accepted. The point was one of the highest consequence, in its bearings upon ancient ethnology. It was also one of peculiar difficulty, considering the character of the Mongolian languages, the laxity of their compositions, the great variety and diversity, even as between nearly related dialects, of their formative elements, and the consequent facility offered for establishing coincidences between them and other languages by a loose method of etymologizing; taking the whole wide range of tongues reckoned as Mongolian, it would not be hard to discover here and there resemblances of roots and forms with those of any other given language. The degree of confidence to be placed in Mr. Caldwell's general conclusions, then, must depend upon the qualities which he exhibited as a general linguist—upon his linguistic acquirements and his etymological method: and with these the speaker professed himself not altogether satisfied. He referred by way of illustration to the author's comparison of Dravidian and Sanskrit roots, intended to prove an ultimate relationship between those two families also: it was of no scientific value; the greater part of the Sanskrit employed in the comparison was not even genuine ancient Sanskrit, such as alone had any right to be so used. The speaker insisted, as an indispensable qualification for comparing and determining the relations of two languages or groups of languages, on the possession of an equally profound and familiar knowledge of both, and thought that Mr. Caldwell, whatever his desert

in the special department of Dravidian philology, had no right to an authoritative opinion in a matter concerning the Scythian family also; he could not regard the remoter relationship of the South-Indian group of languages as anything but an open question still.

7. On the Date of Composition of the *Amphitruo* of Plautus, by Prof. George M. Lane, of Cambridge.

The various conclusions or conjectures which had been offered by different writers respecting the date of this play—derived, in lack of other evidence, from hints and allusions in the play itself—were first subjected to criticism, and in part disproved, in part set aside as too vague and unsatisfactory. Evidences more significant, and more decisive of the question of date, than any which had been hitherto pointed out, were seen by Prof. Lane in the references to Bacchantes and Bacchanalian rites which the play contained. The prominent importance of these as subjects of common talk and public action at one period in the life of Plautus was explained, and the various allusions to them presented by his different works were noted. The conclusion was arrived at, as one possessing a fair measure of plausibility, that the *Amphitruo* was written during the last two years of the poet's life, or 186–184 B. C.

8. Ought the Greek of the Early Christian Writers to form Part of the Course of School and College Study? By Prof. John Proudfit, D. D., of New Brunswick, N. J.

The object of Prof. Proudfit's paper was to set forth the grounds for answering this question in the affirmative. He maintained the high value of the Christian Greek literature, for the purity of its language, the elevation of its style, the nobility of its sentiments, the genius of its authors, and its important historical relations to the ancient heathenism and the modern Christianity—which qualities rendered it eminently worthy of being allowed a part in the education of the young at the present day. He explained the circumstances in the midst of which it grew up, and which determined its form and character, and extolled the abilities, virtues, and actions of the men who were its chief exponents, particularly Basil and Chrysostom. He contended that it was a defect in a classical education to leave quite out of sight a literary period of such prominent interest. He pointed out that many of the difficulties which had hitherto lain in the way of a study of the works of the period, in their rarity and costliness, their unwieldy form and difficult typography, and the uncritical condition of their texts, had been of late in great part removed; and he expressed the hope that better justice would ere long be done to their claims upon the attention of modern scholars.

9. On the Ancient and Modern Dialects of the Persian Language, by Prof. Whitney.

This was a succinct view of the five principal forms of Iranian speech, namely the dialect of the Achaemenidan Cuneiform Inscriptions, that of the *Avesta*, the *Huzvāresh*, the *Pārsi*, and the Modern Persian, giving the period and locality of each, as determined by the latest researches, and sketching their phonetic and etymological character.

No other communications were offered. The Directors accordingly gave notice that they had appointed the next meeting of the Society to be held in New York, on Wednesday, October 16th, 1861, and had designated Prof. J. J. Owen and Mr. A. I. Cothel, of New York, and Prof. W. H. Green of Princeton, to act as a Committee of Arrangements for that meeting, and the Society adjourned.