

Bible, may be stated.—The familiar word, “helpmate,” sometimes used as a synonym for “wife,” had its beginning in a defective printing of the Scripture terms “help meete.” It would appear that, by accident, first the space dropped out from between these two vocables, and then the double *e* of “meete,” as, in the old English, it would be written, was taken to be an *a*. Again: there is a certain passage in the History of the Jewish Kings (vide 1 Sam., xxvii., 10.), which to us, in these days, sounds as if it contained a misprint, of “road” for “raid.” King David, a fugitive from his native land, has made a rush over the border, with an armed band; and, after slaughtering men and women, has carried back with him “the sheep and the oxen, and the asses and the camels, and the apparel.” Achish, his protector, in the place of his exile, on seeing the spoil, asks, “Whither have ye made a road to-day?” But here is no misprint. “Road” and “raid” are the same words; the former the Southern, the latter the Northern, form. Both are modifications of the Anglo-Saxon *rad*, which denotes not only the act of riding, but also the provisions made for its exercise; namely, a cleared highway. We have the word in Shakespeare, in lines 36—39, act 1., sc. 2., K. Henry V.:—

“We must not only arm to invade the French,  
But lay down our proportions to defend  
Against the Scot, who will make road upon us.”

In the Geneva version, in my old copy of 1603, the inquiry of Achish is, “Where have ye bene a rouing, this day?” The word “raid,” now so familiar to our Canadian ears, is not to be found in lexicons printed a few years since. It is not in my copy of Worcester, of the date 1847, nor is it in the body of Ogilvie’s Imperial, of the date 1850. In the Appendix to the last-named Work, it is given as a Scottish provincialism.—Another word become, of late years, known to us, in a modern sense of its own, is “Philistine.” It is not improbable that this, in its present English shape, is the offspring of a misprint. In my Geneva version, of the date 1605, to which I have, already, more than once referred, “Philistine” is everywhere printed “Philistim;” or, rather, in the plural, somewhat pleonastically, Philistims; just as we now, in our English way, say “Cherubims,” when “Cherubim” is, already, plural. It is to be suspected that, on some occasion, the last member of the final *ml* been taken for an *e*, and then printed accordingly. “Philistine” was next assumed to be the possessive of the poetic *Philistia*, the very un-Hebrew