

selves, knowing their dangers. Still, so long as such methods are even supposed necessary, it is an idle dream for Japanese to imagine that Western governments will yield their extra-territorial claims, or allow their citizens to come under such risks. The best friends of Japan can but hope that the recent measures are the result of overstrained nerves, and will by their authors be allowed to fall into "innocuous desuetude." If, however, such acts are repeated, the world will not be deceived as to the real character of Japan's much-boasted "civilization."

VOLAPÜK. --II.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI, January.

THE grammar of this new language is very brief. But if Volapük has come to stay sure enough, the syntax will assuredly have to be enlarged, because a fuller treatment will be demanded. A few points may be referred to here. As to the cases, there are four, as in German; but the question arises: How are different nations to be made to harmonize their varying conceptions of case relations? Schleyer says (p. 17) that his language "has neither an ablative, nor an instrumental or prepositional, local, causative, or negative (as the Lapland, Latin, Russian, and Sanscrit). For these cases the appropriate prepositions (usually with the nominative) are employed." He rejects these cases as unnecessary, but retains his German cases. If "Volapükists" can use prepositions to express *with*, *from*, *by*, why not do the same for *of* and *to*? How are we all to be brought to think *of* and *to* in the same places? Those who speak English will naturally consider their transitive verbs as followed by the accusative, and will append *i* to the nouns. "Notify the man," "Thank the man," "Ask the man." In these places we should undoubtedly use *mani* in writing Volapük. But in "Ask the man," a Frenchman would, of course, write *mane*, *e* doing in Volapük what *à* did for him in French. In "Thank the man" both the French and the Germans would write *mane*. The Volapük Almanach has several examples of mercantile letters (*Handelsbriefe*). One of them begins: "Wir haben die Ehre, Ihnen anzuzeigen," and for *Ihnen*, *oles* is given—*i. e.*, *ol* = you (du); *ole* = dat. sing. to you; and *oles* = dat. plural. In another letter we find "und danken Ihnen," and again *Ihnen* is *oles*. What would make a London or New York correspondent write anything but *olis* in these sentences?

The greatest curiosity will naturally be felt in regard to the verb, and just here is where this new language is in greatest danger of coming to grief. What sorts of renderings are given to such a multitude of forms? and in what state do we find the syntax of the verb? In answer to the first question we reply, knock off about a quarter of a million forms, by remembering that the "aoristic" formation in *i* just duplicates the other forms, and in translating add "constantly" to represent it. *E. g.*, in the verb *to love*, half the forms denote constant affection, while 250,000 forms are reserved for inconstant lovers. One very peculiar form of affection must be noted: "to love (or be loved) *multilaterally*," (Seret, p. 44, and p. 51). In fact, "multilateral" English is the only kind we can think of at all suited to such a vast system of inflection. "For to (shall love)," "for (to shall have loved)," are translations given to two of the supines (p. 45). "To love (just loving on)" renders an imperative-infinitive. "Be a loving one!" affords an example of an imperative-participle. If such imperatives seem at all

shadowy, there is a "substantial imperative" given on p. 44. "Love govern!" translates its present tense. "Love must have governed!" is the perfect. For a future and future perfect imperative we have "I shall have to love constantly," and "I shall have had to love constantly." "A loving that had been" is an instance of a pluperfect infinitive. "Up to be loved!" shows us a passive imperative-infinitive. To show us what his "Jussiv" is capable of, and at the same time to afford a conspicuous example of the conciseness of Volapük, Schleyer gives the following: "pujelobsöz! wir sollen solche sein, die werden geschützt worden sein! (1 wort statt 9!)." "We shall be such as shall have been protected" is a form of imperative hardly adapted for a world-language in which no uncertainty or confusion of thought is to enter. And even this, no doubt, admits of improvement. If an Englishman is set upon by a foreign mob, with no mode of communication except Volapük, and if the above startling command has failed to cow his assailants, he has only to insert one letter to assure them that Britannia *always* protects her children. If he shouts "pujeloböz!" (I shall be such as shall have been constantly protected), with as much emphasis on *ä* as can be given in a language that always accents the last syllable of its words, he will probably find that "abroad" will recognize his rights.

Let us see what Schleyer does with his moods. He forms his subjunctive by appending an unaccented *-la* to the verb and personal ending. His common rendering for it is *möchte*. Seret gives *might* with the following examples to illustrate its use: "That you might show: that she might lock: if it might happen: you might have halved." Spielmann translates this *-la* form *ich würde schreiben, du würdest schreiben*, etc. An interrogative subjunctive is provided for, and Seret gives "if you had not been animated" for *möchten sie nicht beseelt haben?* Schleyer adds the examples, *möchte man dabei sein werden? möchte es ein solches sein, welches das Papier gerötet hatte?* for which the English translator gives no equivalent. If our notion of the proper range of subjunctive constructions is by this time a trifle hazy, we have these additional examples of the interrogative construction: "Do I encourage? Did they rob? If you had answered?" this last as the rendering for *hätlet Ihr geantwortet?* Seret is not "all too" happy in his translations of the German subjunctive, strong as he may be in Volapük.

The treatment of the subjunctive will further illustrate one of the great difficulties in the way of a universal language, the difficulty, namely, of getting different peoples to look at the same thing in the same way. Seret's handling of the subjunctive we have already seen. Sprague's only account of it is its use after *if*, and the same is true of Dornbusch's translation of Kerckhoff's abridged grammar, in which we find the added statement: "It is rarely used in Volapük." But surely we are not prepared to restrict ourselves in the use of conditional sentences implying that the real state of the case is just the reverse of the way the conditional sentence puts it—for the books seem to limit the subjunctive after *if* to "suppositions contrary to fact." If Volapük has come to stay, the subjunctive is bound to be used freely. Again: Schleyer tells us (p. 17) that his language prefers direct discourse to indirect, because of the greater clearness of the direct form, and—note this—"in order to avoid the too frequent use of the *-la* of the subjunctive," showing that he evidently had in mind other uses of the subjunctive than its use in "unreal" conditionals. And then on p. 47 we see him drop as naturally as possible into this very construction, in rendering into Volapük "Your friend is said to have

come" (dein Freund soll gekommen sein: *sgon, das fen olik ekömom-la*).

As a note under the "Konjunktiv," Schleyer provides for a "Konditionalis," with the affix *-öv*: *binolöv, du würdest sein*. For this Spielmann would give *binol-la*, which, as we have seen, Schleyer would translate *du möchtest sein*. The world will assuredly demand something more satisfactory than this in its universal language. As further specimens of Seret's fine perception of the niceties of language, we note that on page 42 he translates the optative in the singular by *may I love, mayest thou love*, etc. When he reaches the plural of the same tense (present), it becomes "that we may love, that you may love," etc. Following this is a "N. B.," telling us to mark the difference between *māgom löfön, he may love, löfömös, may he love!* and *löfom-la, that he might love*. On page 53 we have the optative "sanomös, he may cure! (not: he might cure!)" while on page 51 the opt. pass. *pälöfomös* is rendered *that he might be loved*, though it is only fair to say that the *might* in the last sentence is the rendering for the *ä*, the sign of the imperfect.

In any language the chapter on conditional sentences is always of interest to a scholar. In Volapük it is (as yet) a short one. The word for *if* is *if*, and Seret says the use of *if* is the same in both languages, and gives the example: "If November comes, we get snow." The English does not aid us to decide whether this refers to the future, or whether it is a general statement made in the present tense. The rendering shows it to be future, and classical exactness is shown in the use of the future perfect in the protasis: *if ukömom novul, ogetobs nif*. The reader will remember that *o* is the future vowel, and *u* the future perfect vowel. Following this is another example: "If you come, I'll give thee my book." And to our surprise we find the present tense in both clauses. On p. 38 in Seret we find this paragraph: "Would, in conditional sentences, is expressed by the imperfect and the pluperfect tenses of the subjunctive mood (*-la*). To express it in the present, the perfect, and the future tenses (as, for example, I would be one that loves, that has loved, shall love, shall have loved, is loved), such is done by adding *-öv* (*v* of *vilön*) to the person of the verb. Ex. If one heard me (listened to me), I would be one that made the whole of mankind happy; if *obi lilonöv, binoböv beläböi menadi lölik* (7 Volapüka for 15 or 16 English words)." Such teachings in regard to subjunctives and conditionals as we gather from the two books, remind us of an answer given by a college student on an examination: "Lucid is when a thing is turbid with light." Evidently there is some work still to be done by philologists in the realm of Volapük syntax.

In the matter of sounds, any universal language has great difficulties to contend with. Schleyer rejected both *th* sounds, but retains the French *u* (*ü*). But did he not know that it is almost more than English mouths can accomplish to frame to pronounce this *ü*? We have heard his language called *Volapuck*, *Volapeek*, and *Volapuke* (*u* as *you*); we doubt if we have ever heard it pronounced in a way that would satisfy Schleyer. And the trouble is that distinctions of meaning are based upon giving this sound correctly. In his pronouns Schleyer has *ut, üt, and it* for *that* (demon. pron.), *that very* (*ebender ömep*) and *self*. Does he think he can get the English-speaking world to call *it, eet?* or *if, eef?* *Fut* and *füt* are both given in Seret's vocabulary as = *foot*, without any hint as to a difference. In Schleyer we find *fut* as a part of the body and *füt* as a measure. It is perfectly true

that if he had rejected sounds impossible or difficult to the various peoples, he would probably have been reduced to an exceedingly slim alphabet. As it is, with one of twenty-seven letters, he discards both the *th* sounds, several of our *a* sounds (*at*, *all*), the *oi* sound (*boil*), and *w*. Only a few words have *r*, so that *flo*=flower, *lapin*=rapine, *flen*=friend, *blod*=brother, *plek*=prayer, *blek*=break, *blef*=brevity, etc. Of the four sounds seen in the gradation *azure*, *ashore*, *age*, and *hatch*, Volapük recognizes only two, *j*=sh and *c*=j. The four-fold gradation is easy enough for us, who find no difficulty in distinguishing *Jews* from *choose*, and *joke* from *choke*. But a German is very apt to call himself a *cherman*. As Schleyer thus omits some of our most familiar sounds, and retains others that are a stumbling-block to us, other nations will find the same thing true for their language. To meet such difficulties Schleyer has a larger world-alphabet of thirty-seven letters for the purpose of "interpreting sounds and accents peculiar with some people or language."

When we come to the description of the sounds of Volapük, we are impressed once more with the impossibility of learning sounds out of books. Schleyer says, pronounce *e* as in German *es* and English *fell*. Seret gives *a* in *sale* as its equivalent, and this is undoubtedly right. Schleyer says, pronounce *i* as in German *ihm* and English *lip!* For *o* he gives German *Lob* and English *lock* as examples of the same sound; *u* is illustrated by *mur* and *pull*. We once heard a Scotchwoman ask a man if he wanted his *fool* (full) name painted on his trunk. Probably Schleyer had heard *pull* rhymed with *pool*. He tells us *ä* is not to be sounded like *e*. But Seret says the sound of *ä* is given in *any*, and Schleyer says *e* is sounded like *e* in *fell*. Nor is the matter made less confusing by his saying that *e* in German *es* represents the sound of *e* in Volapük. In what part of Germany is *es* pronounced to rhyme with our word *acc*? Again, since the largest percentage of his vocabulary is based on the English, the millions of people who speak English cannot but feel tempted to pronounce *fät* *fate* when they find that it means "fate." But as the pronouns *ät* and *et* mean different things, and as in the verb *ä* is the vowel for one tense (imperfect) and *e* for another (future), it is necessary to get these sounds accurately. We are glad to see that Schleyer requires his own people to make some difficult sounds. How are Germans going to distinguish *cid*, *chisel*, and *cit*, *cheat*? or *fed*, *treaty*, and *fet*, *fertility*? or *leg*, *genuineness*, and *lek*, *echo*? One other point we will mention as showing what the chance is of getting sounds from books. Schleyer gives Volapük *v* as equivalent to English *v*, and to German *w* in *webe*. Seret actually gives Volapük *v* as equivalent to *w* in *wish*! But in the following words, *sval* (swallow), *Schwalbe*, *svan* (swan), *svid* (sweet), *svim* (swim), *svin* (swine), and *svip* (sweep), the temptation is very strong to do as he says, and pronounce *v* like *w*.

The claim that in Volapük each letter has only one sound is not strictly correct. On page 16 Schleyer makes a distinction between *-ös* and *-ös*. We are to pronounce the first with long *o* (*ohs*), and the second about as *o* in *toss* (as *toss* would be pronounced in German). The "polite" pronoun "you," when it refers to one person, is given by the ending *-öns*—i. e., *ohns*; but when it refers to more than one, the same ending is *-öns*, with the short sound as given above. This useless encumbrance, we may add, was done away with by the Munich Congress. *S* has the two sounds we are all accustomed to. For *c* only the sound of our *j* is given;

but it is evidently intended to include the *ch* sound (*church*). As *cem*, *cif*, *cop*, and *cüt* mean *chamber*, *chief*, *chop* (hew), and *cheat*, and evidently came from the English, it can hardly be that we are expected to change the sound from *ch* to *j*. In *cog*, *joke*, we have the same initial sound in both languages. But as Schleyer has no *cok* in his vocabulary, it looks very much as if his German pronunciation of final *g* overcame him, and as if he wrote *cog*, but felt *cok*.

One point more. Among the various defects of existing languages that Volapük, according to Schleyer, either avoids entirely or seeks to reduce to a minimum, is an excessive number of meanings for words. He instances *Anstand*, *coup*, *bill*. This is evidently a good point to make. When a schoolboy comes upon *bellum*, his mind is at peace; he is pretty safe in translating it *war*. But when he falls foul of *ratio*, he is most likely at a standstill. A world language, in aiming at simplicity here, has a serious difficulty to encounter in avoiding undue inflation of its vocabulary. If each word is to have only one meaning, the number of words will be swelled enormously; and this huge vocabulary would be rendered additionally difficult from the fact that the same forces that in other languages have given different uses to the same word, would come into play here too, and the world-language would probably find itself "toting double," carrying at the same time a long list of words and a variety of meanings for many of them.

If any of this criticism seems unfair, as directed more against Seret's presentation of Volapük than against the language itself, it must be remembered that Seret's book is the authorized exponent of Volapük for the millions of people who speak English. It is "the second (greatly revised) edition, translated and published with the consent of the inventor," and Seret is a "certified, teacher of the universal language." His book contains the standard lexicon of Volapük, and is on this account essential to a student of the new language. But though Schleyer has been extremely unfortunate in his accepted translator, Volapük is itself responsible for most of the defects we have pointed out. It seems astounding that Schleyer should have sought to impose upon the world his vast verbal system. In its very principle it militates against the manifest trend of the Aryan languages, which is to substitute analysis for synthesis in verb-formation. It is perfectly true that only a very small percentage of these more than half a million forms are needed for practical use, or likely to be practically used. But they are there, and Schleyer counts his verb one of the glories of his invention. And we have not touched upon some important points in which we feel sure Volapük is in danger. In the attempt to squeeze varying idioms into this one mould, we think the mould is going to crack. At the same time we freely concede a great deal that admiring Volapükists claim for the language. One can learn to express himself in it with great rapidity. We have received a letter in Volapük written after two days' study; and any one who has travelled in a country with whose language he was only very slightly acquainted knows how slim a stock of words suffices for actual needs; so that Volapük may prove to be of great assistance, when its study shall have become widespread. We think that Schleyer has made an excellent beginning, and that his language may be made the starting-point of a very useful medium of communication. But the difficulties are not all solved yet, as we have perhaps succeeded in showing. As for Schleyer himself, with his vast learning, his prodigious talent for work, and his great poverty, we feel that he is a man deserving of

our sincere respect and sympathy. We are not only anxious to see his language improved, but we respond with a hearty Amen! to the words with which, speaking of the inventor of Volapük, he concludes his preface to the seventh edition of his 'Mittlere Grammatik':

"Dar 'imel béserere sein ardenlòs!"

ADDISON HOGE.

THE CROFTERS' REVOLT.

LONDON, January 26, 1888.

"ANARCHY IN THE LEWES," "Civil War in the Hebrides," "Raising the Standard of Revolt in the Lewes," are sensational headings which have been appearing lately in the London papers. I wonder how many Americans know what and where the Lewes is. Until last summer it was to me barely a name. In England it is known to a few sportsmen, and to a few enterprising tourists sent there by Mr. Black's descriptions in the 'Princess of Thule.' Those of the Western Islands to which Dr. Johnson went on his famous journey are much more accessible than they were in his day; throughout the summer there are daily excursions to Iona, Staffa, and Mull, and to Skye. Steamers even run from the mainland to the Outer Hebrides so entirely for the benefit of sportsmen and tourists that their last consideration is the convenience of natives. But the number of travellers who go so far through Hebridean seas is small compared to that of the crowds who, during the season, daily overrun Iona and "do" the Cuchullins in Skye.

Lewes is the furthest north of the Outer Hebrides. As a rule, the papers, like the general public, ignore it. The late disturbances have forced it into prominence. The crofters and cottars marched upon one of the great deer forests of the island and drove the deer towards the sea. They destroyed the fences of a large sheep farm and scattered the sheep. Constables and marines were despatched from the mainland to put down the rebellion. The ring-leaders were captured, brought to Edinburgh, and, to the surprise of everybody, acquitted. The agitation spread to other districts of Lewes, to Ross-shire, to Skye. As a reason for their lawlessness, the people declare starvation is staring them in the face. Naturally interest has been aroused in their condition. That it has not been exaggerated by them even the *Times* and the *Scotsman* admit. Destitution reigns throughout the Lewes, and calls for immediate and radical relief.

An official inquiry has been made into the matter. Commissioners have gone from district to district, from cottage to cottage. They have questioned the people and examined their land. The report of their visit published in the *Scotsman* and the *Times*, like that of the Royal Commissioners of 1883, is cruel beyond belief. An entire population on the verge of starvation; men, women, and children living under the same roof and often in the same room with their cattle; whole families sleeping in one bed, with but one blanket to cover them; children with no clothing but old meal bags; hundreds and more crowded together on the barrenest tracks of land; little patches of cultivated ground squeezed in between the great bare boulders lying on the hillsides—these are the things that were seen in the Lewes. The people are without food, or will be in a few weeks; without money or credit; without hope, save in Providence. The story told of Lewes is true as well of all the Western Islands, of the greater part of the Highlands. I was in the Lewes last summer, and in Harris and Mull and Skye, and many of the smaller islands; I travelled through Argyllshire and Inverness