

dict, a Norwich Jew, in favor of Roger Scot, son-in-law of William Stace, of Nottingham." In Case 14, No. 143, is a Latin lease, undated, "to Roger Scot, son-in-law of William Stute," of property at Nottingham.

These documents should be in juxtaposition, because it is certain they both concern the same individual; and most probably *Stace* is the right name. Looking at the connexion between a Norwich Jew and a person named *Stace*, I am reminded of the celebrated abduction case, *Liber Albus*, i. 431-44, where Geoffrey Stace is mixed up with Richard le Chaucier, 1326. This last person was probably uncle to Geoffrey the poet; and Mr. Rye points out a Benedict le Chaucier at Norwich in 1272; cf. Benedict, the Jew of Norwich, above [Case 32, No. 142].

A. HALL.

"BLIGHT."

London: April 16, 1887.

Mr. Wedgwood's *Dictionary of English Etymology* having been referred to by Dr. Mayhew, a fuller quotation may be of use. Mr. Wedgwood does not, in the first instance, or exclusively, attempt a derivation from Anglo-Saxon. This is what he says:—

"*Blight*.—Platt-Deutsch: *verblekken*, to burn up. 'De Sonne het dat Koorn verblekket,' or 'Dat Koorn is verblekket,' from *blekken*, to shine, to lighten. Perhaps the notion originally was that it was blasted with lightning. Old High German: *bleg*, *blech-fur*, lightning. Bremisch-Nieder-sächsisches Wörterbuch. Or it may be from the discoloured faded appearance of the blighted corn. Anglo-Saxon *blæc*, pale, livid."

A great many *bl*-words show a glittering and varying meaning in the evolutionary course of time, on which more might be said than can be done in a letter. It seems to me, however, that blight, as a plant-sickness (for which one of the High German words is *Mehlthau*, mildew) may, in the idea as well as in the word, well be compared to that human sickness, *Bleichsucht*; in Flemish, *Bleekzucht*.

KARL BLIND.

APPOINTMENTS FOR NEXT WEEK.

- MONDAY, April 25, 8.30 p.m. Geographical Society: "The Lu River of Tibet; is it the Source of the Irawadi or the Salwin?" by Gen. J. T. Walker
- TUESDAY, April 26, 3 p.m. Royal Institution: "Electricity," II. by Prof. W. E. Ayrton
- 8 p.m. Civil Engineers: Discussion, "Water-Supply from Wells, in the London Basin, at Bushey (Herts), in Leicestershire, and at Southampton," by Messrs. Grover, Fox, Stooke, and Matthews.
- 8 p.m. Society of Arts: "Ornamental Glass," by Mr. J. Hungerford Pollen.
- 8.30 p.m. Anthropological Institute: "Exhibition of Aborigines from North Queensland," by Mr. R. A. Cunningham; "The Ethnological Bearings of the Stone Spinning-top of New Guinea," by Mr. C. H. Read; "Notes on Natives of the Solomon Islands," by Lieut. F. Elton.
- WEDNESDAY, April 27, 4.30 p.m. Royal Society of Literature: Anniversary Meeting.
- 8 p.m. Society of Arts: "Appliances for saving Life from Fire," by Mr. A. W. C. Shean.
- 8 p.m. Geological: "The London Clay and Bagshot Beds of Aldershot," by Mr. H. G. Lyons; "The Walton Common Section," by Mr. W. H. Hudleston; "The Rocks of the Essex Drift," by Rev. A. W. Rowe.
- THURSDAY, April 28, 3 p.m. Royal Institution: "The Chemistry of the Organic World," II., by Prof. Dewar.
- 3 p.m. Society for Preserving the Memorials of the Dead.
- 8 p.m. Telegraph Engineers: "Measuring the Co-efficients of Self and of Mutual Induction," and "Driving a Dynamo with a very short Belt," by Prof. W. E. Ayrton and John Perry.
- 8.30 p.m. Antiquaries.
- FRIDAY, April 29, 7.30 p.m. Civil Engineers: Student's Meeting, "Flour Mills and their Machinery," by Mr. A. Chatterton.
- 8 p.m. Society of Arts: "Village Communities in India," by Mr. J. F. Hewitt.
- 8 p.m. Browning Society: "Browning's Latest Volume," by Mr. A. Symons and Dr. J. Furnivall.

8.30 p.m. Royal Institution: "The Rolling Contact of Bodies," by Prof. H. S. Hele Shaw.

SATURDAY, April 30, 3 p.m. Royal Institution: "The Australian Alps and the Origin of the Australian Fauna," by Dr. R. von Lendenfeld.

SCIENCE.

"The Sacred Books of the East," Vol. XXV. —*The Laws of Manu*. Translated, with Extracts from Seven Commentaries by J. Bühler. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.) (Second Notice).

A COMPARISON of the present rendering of the text with the much admired translation published by Sir W. Jones nearly a hundred years ago tends to illustrate the immense advance of Sanskrit scholarship within that period. Prof. Bühler's consummate knowledge of Indian literature, and of the *Dharmasāstra* in particular, has enabled him to produce a translation which, while retaining so far as possible the singularly apt equivalents chosen by Sir W. Jones for the technical and other characteristic terms of the Sanskrit original, embodies all the many new results obtainable from a careful study of the recently discovered commentaries of the code as well as of the other law-books, and from the general progress of Sanskrit philology in Europe and India. Sir W. Jones thought it necessary to incorporate in his translation many passages from Kullūka's commentary; but his work does not contain any explanatory or critical notes on the text. The same method was observed by his French follower, M. Loiseleur Deslongchamps. Prof. Bühler, in the bracketed portion of his translation, has supplied as much only as was absolutely indispensable to render it intelligible, reserving all additional matter for the footnotes, which are very copious, especially in the philosophical and legal chapters.* The metaphysical parts of the code, Sir W. Jones's rendering of which is rhetorical and diffuse to a degree, present peculiar difficulties; and whatever may be thought of the value of some of the interpretations proposed by the commentators of philosophical terms and Sūtras, the very careful summary of their opinions in the notes to the present translation is very useful. In the easier sections of the code the extracts from the commentaries are comparatively short; but the notes on these sections contain extensive references to the numerous analogous passages in other early law-books, four of which have been previously translated by the author in the "Sacred Books of the East." The legends and Vedic Mantras referred to in the code have been traced to their source in the Vedas, Brāhmanas, and Mahābhārata. On the explanation of the political institutions referred to in chap. vii. the translator has brought to bear his extensive knowledge of the Indian inscriptions and his intimate personal acquaintance with modern India and the Hindus.

The text as translated in the work under notice is founded, in the main, on the recension given by Kullūka, like the printed texts; but the palpable blunders of the printed editions have been corrected, and the principal deviations of the other commentaries from the *textus receptus* stated and explained in the footnotes. Thus, e.g., in iv. 163, the printed editions read *dambham* "hypocrisy"; but as the term in question is interpreted by

dharmānūtsāha in Kullūka's commentary, it seems clear that he must have read *stambham* in the text, in common with the other commentators, i.e., "want of modesty" (Bühler). In viii. 259 the reading *ankāms'ka* has been substituted for the senseless *angāni* of the printed texts. The former reading is not only found in the two earliest commentaries, as I have been able to show in my German translation of chapter viii., but Prof. Bühler is perfectly justified in attributing it to Kullūka as well, on the strength of his commentary in which the clause *ankāms'ka* is paraphrased by *anyāni ka kīhnāni*, "and other marks." The number of those cases in which the readings of the printed texts are opposed to the tenour of Kullūka's commentary may be extended a little. Thus, in ii. 11 the ordinary reading *te mūle*, "those two roots," requires to be changed into *te būbhe*, "those two," according to Kullūka, as well as according to the other commentators. In viii. 392 the printed reading *vipro*, "a Brahman," is retained in the present translation, as had been done in the previous versions, including my own translation of chapter viii. As, however, the term in question is interpreted by *brāhmanau*. "two Brahmans," in the commentary of Kullūka, it follows that *vipro* should be altered to *viprau*, "two Brahmans," as Govindarāja and two copies of *Medhātithi* have it. What is meant is this—that the two neighbouring Brahmins should be invited, not that the inviter should be a Brahman. Precisely the same rule is laid down in the law-books of Yāgyavalkya (ii. 263) and Vishnu (v. 94). In iv. 57 the clause "a superior," taken from Kullūka's gloss, has been enclosed in brackets, no doubt because the ordinary reading is *s'ayānam*, "one asleep." However, the best copies of *Medhātithi*'s work read *s'reyāmsam*, "a superior," both in the text and commentary, and the same reading is given by Nārāyana. Kullūka's gloss shows that he too must have read *s'reyāmsam*. A man may be at liberty to rouse his equal from sleep, though it be an offence to rouse a superior. Analogous instances may be found in my forthcoming edition of the original Sanskrit text of Manu, in the notes on ii. 190, ii. 240, ii. 246, &c.

Kullūka's recension of Manu being the only one published hitherto, it is comparatively seldom that his readings have been disregarded expressly. Thus in i. 89 Kullūka is clearly wrong in omitting the verb of the sentence, but every difficulty has been removed in the work under notice by adopting the reading *samādisat*, from the commentaries of *Medhātithi* and *Rāghavananda*, and from the Kashmirian copy of Manu. The order of the two verses ii. 225 and ii. 226 has been inverted, after the example of all commentators except Kullūka. This is perfectly just, as the qualities attributed to the father, teacher, &c., in one text are mentioned as the reason for the claims to special regard with which they are invested in the other text. In v. 141 the unsatisfactory reading *'nge patanti yāh* has been replaced by the reading *'ngam na yanti yāh*, which is given by the three earliest commentators and supported by analogous texts in other law books—i.e., "Drops from the mouth which do not fall on a limb do not

make a man impure." Other important improvements of Kullūka's text may be found, vi. 10, vi. 45, vii. 78, vii. 170, vii. 176, ix. 261, x. 107, xi. 250, xii. 98, and elsewhere.

Though the readings of other commentators besides Kullūka have been but rarely admitted into the text, a selection of the more important among them has been given in the Notes. For other noteworthy readings of the ancient commentaries, I may be allowed to refer to the text and notes in my edition; but it may not be out of place to quote some examples here. In iii. 77, Kullūka reads *varānta sarva āśramāḥ*, "all orders subsist," like the printed editions. Medhātithi and Govindarāja, the two earliest commentators, and Rāghavānanda read *varānta itarāśramāḥ*, "the other orders subsist"; and this is evidently the correct reading, as one of the four orders—viz., the order of householders, is separately referred to in the same text. In iii. 254, the MSS. of Medhātithi's commentary read *susṛitam* or *susṛitam*, "well boiled," and the same reading is found in Medhātithi's text according to the best copies, and mentioned as a v. l. by Nārāyaṇa. The usual reading is *susṛutam*, "well heard"; but it seems hardly proper that such a formula as this should have been used in addressing the guests at the end of a meal. In viii. 332, *hrītvā*, "having taken," is apparently wrong for *krītvā*, "having done," which seems to be the reading of all commentators except Kullūka. It would be strange if "the act of denying a robbery after having committed it" were defined as theft. A far better sense is obtained under the other reading, "it is theft also to deny a criminal act after it has been committed"; the idea that lying is just as bad as stealing occurs very commonly in the Indian law-books. Manu says himself (iv. 256): "He who is dishonest with respect to speech (literally 'he who steals a speech') is dishonest in everything." In viii. 152, the v. l. *kāranam* has been rejected, and the ordinary reading *kāranam* retained in the work under notice. However, an analogous variation of reading occurs in viii. 52 and viii. 53, where the spelling of *kāraṇa* with a long *a* is supported by excellent authority. The noun *kāraṇa* is frequently used to denote "that on which an opinion is founded, a proof," and this meaning suits very well in all the three texts referred to, especially if Medhātithi's reading *desam kāranam vā samudisēt* is followed in viii. 53. It should be noted that the adoption of these readings does not impair the strength of Prof. Bühler's reasoning regarding the acquaintance of Manu with the art of writing. Nor would it have been feasible, considering the enormous number of *varias lectiones* found in the commentaries, to give anything approaching to a complete list of them in the notes to a translation of Manu.

This notice would be incomplete without a reference to the copious index and valuable appendices. The list of quotations from Manu in the translated Sanskrit law-books is sure to be specially welcome to lawyers in India, as these quotations relate chiefly to the practically important parts of Hindu law. The laborious synopsis of parallel passages in the other Smṛitis, and in the Mahābhārata,

Upanishads, and several other works may be consulted with advantage by everyone interested in Indian literature. The wide extent to which the rules of Manu have been traced in other works of established repute and antiquity furnishes new evidence for the genuine value of the authoritative code of ancient India.

J. JOLLY.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MOABITE STONE.

Oxford: April 11, 1887.

The *Journal des Savants* has an interesting article by M. Renan on the Monograph of Profs. Socin and Smend on the Moabite Stone, as well as on the article of M. Clermont-Ganneau on the same subject in the *Journal Asiatique* (January number). M. Renan doubts the reading of *Aralei Yhwh*, but that of *Arel Dvdh* he considers certain. He rejects the rendering of Arel by "parts of an altar," according to Profs. Socin and Smend, and by "an idol," according to Prof. Sayce; but he agrees with me (ACADEMY, Oct. 30, 1886) in thinking that *Arel* seems to mean a living being. *Arelī* (Gen. xlv. 16; Num. xxvi. 17), of course, is the name of a man of Gad. Possibly this name is connected with Uriel and Ariel (Ezra, viii. 16), and also with Ariel Moab (2 Sam. xxiii. 20). That *Arel* should have been used in later passages for an important place, such as an altar (Ezek. xliii. 16), and *Arel* for Zion, the stronghold of Jerusalem (Isaiah xxix. 1, 2, 7), is only natural. It seems that *Arel*, in the sense of a living being, passed into Egyptian.

Dr. J. H. Bondi, in his Strassburg dissertation entitled, *Dem hebräisch-phonizischen Sprachzweige angehörige Lehnwörter in hieroglyphischen und hieratischen Texten* (p. 28), refers to the hieroglyphic *arār*, compared by Brugsch with *Arel* or *Ariel*, which means "a man who makes the way" (according to M. Chabas, "guide"). Now, the *Aralim* of Isaiah xxxiii. 7 (Authorised Version, "their valiant ones"), and the ambassadors of peace (or the ambassadors of Salem, Jerusalem), are connected in the following verse with the fact that "the highways lie waste, and the wayfaring man ceaseth"; thus the "Arel" here may have something to do with the man who guides, or who makes the way, and is, of course, a living being.

M. Renan is mistaken when he says that *Arel* does not occur in the later Jewish liturgy. *Arelim* are mentioned in the Bab. Talmud, as well as in liturgical pieces, as angels; so also is Uriel.

But of what use is it now to torment ourselves about the Moabite Arel, if the Rev. A. Löwy is going to prove "the apocryphal character of the Moabite stone"? If it turns out that he is right, what a blow he will deal to Semitic learning! Eminent scholars in all countries, such as Profs. W. Wright, Sayce, Renan, Oppert, Clermont-Ganneau, Halevy, Nöldeke, and lately, Socin and Smend, have been trying their philological and palaeographical skill for the last fifteen years on a forged document! Has Mr. Löwy been intentionally keeping the public for such a long time in utter ignorance of the truth, like Dr. Ginsburg with the Shapira Deuteronomy, or has Mr. Löwy discovered some important document which will prove that the Mesha text is forged? Well, we must wait patiently, as we wait for the great discovery by Capt. Conder concerning the Hittite inscriptions, which, according to him, are written in a well-known language (not Semitic, however, as here he has been forestalled by Mr. Ball). One thing is certain, that in Capt. Conder's translation published in the *Times* occur expressions which are not only similar to late Biblical ones, but even to

Mohammedan conceptions. But we shall see what will be the result of these strange discoveries.

A. NEUBAUER.

April 19, 1887.

P.S.—I have not yet seen Mr. Löwy's article; but from the *Daily News* of to-day I can judge that his chief argument for the forgery is that the surface of the stone is old and pitted, while the characters inscribed on it are untouched by exterior influence. I may affirm that, if it had been so, it would not have escaped experienced palaeographers, such as the late MM. de Longpérier and De Saulcy, not to speak of the present custodians of the antiquities in the Louvre.

SCIENCE NOTES.

THE cause of reform in the teaching of elementary geometry, though it advances slowly in this country, seems to be taken up warmly elsewhere, as we have already noted to be the case in India and at the Cape. We now learn that Prof. Kikuchi (19th Wrangler, Cambridge), has translated into Japanese, and published, the syllabus of that subject drawn up by the Association for the Improvement of Geometrical Teaching. This gentleman has done the same thing for Clifford's *Commonsense of the Exact Sciences*. He is professor in the Science College at Tokyo, and has recently been requested to edit for the Education Department of the Japanese government text-books of geometry and algebra. Those in use at present he describes as "wretched things." We hope he will have the advantage of using one or more of the recent admirable works on algebra.

MESSRS. SWAN SONNENSCHN & Co. will publish immediately an exhaustive cyclopaedia of mechanics, entitled *Simple Mechanics: how to Make and how to Mend*. The book contains 700 pages, and is profusely illustrated.

DR. JOHN HOPKINSON being too unwell to continue his course of lectures at the Royal Institute on "Electricity," Prof. W. E. Ayrton has kindly consented to take his place on Tuesday next, April 26.

PHILOLOGY NOTES.

WE hear from Cyprus that a Phoenician inscription on a marble slab, consisting of about 130 letters in one line, has lately been discovered in a small Greek church close to Dali (Idalion) by Herr Max Ohnefalsch Richter, the indefatigable explorer of the ancient remains of Cyprus. A squeeze of the inscription, kindly given by the discoverer to Mr. D. Pierides, has enabled the latter, on a cursory examination, to find that it is of great importance, for it gives the name of Baalram, son of Azbaal; and, as we know from another inscription found at Dali in 1869, and now in the British Museum, that Baalram was the father of Melikiathon, the line of succession of the Phoenician kings of Kition from Baalmelek to Pamiathon (five lives in all; circa 450 to 300 B.C.) is clearly established. The inscription was cut in the third year of Baalram's reign. Efforts are being made to secure the slab for the Cyprus Museum, with the support of the Archbishop of Cyprus, himself a member of the Museum Council. Mr. Pierides hopes to decipher the whole text for early publication, although parts of it are sadly defaced.

IN the new number of *Mitteilungen aus der Sammlung des Papyrus Rainer*, Prof. Bickell discusses the fragment of an early Gospel discovered among the Papyri. It belongs paleographically to the third century; and the text is probably a relic (Prof. Bickell holds) of an antecanonical gospel, possibly of the collection of Christ's "Sayings" which St. Matthew is said to have composed in Aramaic.