

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
CHAP. I.—PAST AND PRESENT TREATMENT OF THE SUBJECT, . . .	1-22
<p>Two main tests of linguistic relationship, 1.—The grammatical test surer than the etymological; prejudice against the latter, 2.—General principles to be borne in mind: all comparative linguistic reasoning is only of the <i>probable</i> kind; facts of science alone, and not current philosophizing, to be deferred to, 3-5.—Statement of the true method of procedure, 5.</p> <p>History of opinion divided into two periods by the rise of comparative philology as a science, 5.—The pre-scientific tendency: Hebrew looked upon as the parent and primitive type of languages; occasion and value of this theory, 6, 7.—Examples of etymologizing which illustrated it, 8, 9.—The scientific era: two opposite and wrong tendencies since its inauguration, 10.—Instances of hasty generalizing: Adelung; Humboldt; Bopp, 11.—Kindred theory of affinity between Aryan, Semitic, and North-African families: Lepsius, Benfey, Bunsen, Schwartz, 11, 12.—Cautious views and tentative comparisons of Gesenius, 12, 13.—Untenable system of Fürst and Franz Delitzsch, 13-15.—Theories of Ewald, 15, 16.—“Wurzelwörterbuch” of Ernst Meier, 16.—Speculations of von Raumer and of Ascoli, 16-18.—Important essay of Friedrich Delitzsch criticised, 18-21.—Theory of J. Grill, 21.—Discordant views of other linguistic authorities, 22.</p>	
CHAP. II.—CRITERIA OF RELATIONSHIP,	23-52
<p>Elements of language to be considered in comparing linguistic families, 23.—General remarks on the divergence in sounds, structural principles, and vocables between the Aryan and Semitic systems, 23-25.—Scheme of the treatment of the whole subject of the work, 25.—Comparison of sounds; phonology not a primary criterion of relationship; true aim and methods of phonological investigations, 26-28.—Comparison of structural peculiarities: conditions of the inquiry, 28, 29.—Attempt of Ewald to reconcile the divergencies in the placing of inflective elements, in the constitution of roots, in syntactical characteristics, 29-33.—Further remarks on the same subject; occasions of the diversity of the Aryan and Semitic sentence, 33, 34.—Meagre and unsatisfactory result of all these inquiries, 34-36.</p> <p>Preliminaries to the comparison of single words: objection on general grounds to the admissibility of such processes; the objection not in the true spirit of science, 36-38.—Contention that the present types of speech</p>	