

Amharic syllabarium there are two hundred and thirty-one different signs. The Persian, though approaching very closely the alphabetic form, has thirty-six distinct characters. But Etruscan has only twenty signs. Here too Prof. Campbell's ingenuity does not fail him, and he makes his syllabic signs mean anything, thus:—

I = ha he hi ho hu au ou eu oi o u hau.

II = ta te ti da de di at et it ad ed id.

K = os ots oz otz us uts tu uz utz hatz hitz hez hots huts.

L = so sa su za zo zu as oz, sometimes es ez, also it may denote cho chu cha, and ja jo ju.

In other words, the Etruscan syllabic signs represent in each case nearly all the vowel sounds in combination with a large number of consonants, so that we may make anything we please of these syllabic signs. Prof. Campbell acknowledges this, for he says:— "The poverty of the Etruscan syllabary multiplies the equivocal to such an extent that the context, or even a knowledge of the nature of the document in which the words occur, must decide their value."

The signs of this syllabary may mean anything we may choose to make them mean, only we must know beforehand what we expect them to say before we can make them say it. This is certainly very accommodating, but has it not struck Prof. Campbell that it is an insuperable difficulty in the way of receiving his hypothesis? But his syllabary of such a low order is inconsistent, not only with the evident laws of linguistic growth, but with the known facts of Etruscan civilization. The Etruscans had reached a high degree of civilization. At an early period, long before the date of the earliest of these inscriptions, the Etruscans were in close relations, commercial and otherwise, with two of the most civilized nations of the ancient world, the Greeks and the Carthaginians, and among whom the Alphabet had reached the fullest development. It is inconceivable,—it is wholly inconsistent with what we know of linguistic development, that the Etruscans should, alone of these nations, have remained in the syllabic stage, that while in every other respect they should have been noted for their civilization,—a civilization to which every museum in Europe bears evidence, that yet in their language they should have belonged to a past epoch. In a work of William Humboldt, "Über die Verschiedenheit des Menschlichen Sprachbaues, und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechtes," there are such expressions as this: "There is a mutual