

Education.

From a work on "Glossology," recently published by Putnam of New York, from the pen of Charles Kraitsir, M.D., we copy the following remarks, respecting "What language is." The work is a treatise "on the nature of language, and on the language of nature." The style of the author is occasionally a little too magniloquent, but the book contains many valuable thoughts and principles, as in the annexed paragraphs:—

WHAT LANGUAGE IS.

Language, in its totality as well as every sound or serial fibre of it, is a symbol, a paradigm, an index, a finger-board, pointing in one direction to what is brought and how it is brought within us; in another direction, to what is uttered and how it is to strike the mind of our fellow men. Man is a mirror of, but also a mediator between, all objects felt without and within himself, as well as between these objects and his own spirit on one side, and between his spirit and that of his neighbors on the other. As he digests and assimilates food and drink in his apparatus of digestion and nutrition, the atmospheric air in his organs of respiration; so he treats also the material swallowed and inspired by the organs of his senses. To be able to do this aright, he must in all his parts and qualities and circumstances be adapted to such a performance. It would certainly be a matter of wonderment, nay, of horror, if the almighty architect of the Universe had not tuned him to be in concordance with the celestial spheres, and with the atoms of matter, and with all spiritual energies, and with all relations of all things to each other.

Language, therefore, cannot be the aim and end of the whole complex of all human energies, the only adequate memento of all periods passed by a people and by each man, while they and he yet live; and still more so after they had made their exeunt from the theatre of their activity. It is thus that language becomes the red thread, so to say, whereon the deeds and fates of mortals and the phenomena of nature are strung, like so many beads. All we know of what is past in ages or absent in space, we know chiefly by language, which is not only a preserving substance of memorable things, but also a monument of itself and of the powers that have produced and wielded it. Language may be likened to those bodies in which so-called antediluvian organic remains are found (beds of coals, slate, yellow amber, &c.). Niebuhr calls philology a mediator between the remotest ages, preserving unbroken identity with the noblest ancient nations, as if there were no gulf of thousands of years between them and us. Indeed, language, although fleeting, has raised monuments more enduring, and at once more faithful than those of stone and brass. The arrow headed or cuneiform inscriptions on the bricks and cylinders of Babylon, of Assyria and the monuments of the Achemenian kings of Persia; the hieroglyphs of Egypt, and various other monuments, are most valuable to the student of history, on account of their being witnesses of the spiritual life of the respective nations. The monosyllabism of the Chinese, the luxuriance of the Sanscrit and the fixed uniformity of the Shemitic languages open an insight, both into the distribution and the mental peculiarities of the several peoples.

Our present social, religious, politic, scientific, and artistic culture and civilization is but the complicated result of all that has been done and lived through by our common ancestry in mankind, since time immemorial; only digested, assimilated by the composing and decomposing, filtering, secreting, appropriating and rejecting, more or less neutralizing power of time. With the remoteness of past ages from the moments of our existence, the mass of the materials borne to light and received by succeeding generations, as the common heir-loom of humanity, fades to more and more indistinctness. If even the works now believed to be those of one individual, are suspected to have been the effusions of several inspired men (Orpheus, Homer, Manu, Wyasa, Walmiki; the authors of the Niebelungen Lied; Shakespeare and others); how could we now disentangle the conglomerate, inherited by us in the shape of a language itself into the several contributions by each individual nation, or even by each genius.

Speech, as a necessary function of man's sensations, heart affections and intellectual faculties arose instinctively, involuntarily,

yet in keeping with the divine harmony of the universe; whereas the single languages of the several nations were affected by the more or less correct choice, often by the caprice of their speakers, who themselves were influenced by local and other agencies. The essentials of the one human speech are ever the same. Each people's genetic power of speech, peculiar in each, amalgamates the phonetic (sound) elements with the feelings and mental conceptions into an organic unity. Owing to the individual variety of each man, every one has a kind of dialect of his own, which varies even according to the different phases of his intellectual and sensual life; for each person embodies whatever his mind receives or produces, according to its peculiar cast.

Speech, issuing from the spirit, reacts also upon it. Without a union with sounds of speech the very thoughts are faint; the operations of the brain, the articulations of the organs of speech and the sensation of the organ of hearing being one inseparable synergy (co-operation). Thought, like a flash of lightning, collects—crystallizes the whole power of the mind to one point, and utters itself by a precise distinct unity of articulate sounds. All nerves connected with the phonetic and acoustic organs are thus set in motion, and the surrounding air is made to vibrate with mind. As thought longs to break forth from its hidden recess into the latent space, so the voice strives to issue from the breast through "the hedge of teeth" into the atmosphere. Speech is as much a function of thinking man as breathing, not a mere means of communication with others, but also a means of understanding himself.

Agriculture.

County Ploughing Match.

Six.—As you devote a portion of your valuable paper to the Agricultural interest, permit me a small portion of your space to a notice of the above ploughing match, which came off on the 20th ultimo, under the auspices of the County Society. The portion of land chosen was on the farm of James Hutchison, Jr., Esq., St. Laurent. It seemed well adapted for the purpose, was in tolerable condition,—rather dry,—and the day was all that could be desired. 26 ploughs were entered for the different prizes, and the contest was the keenest I have yet seen, arising from the fact, in great part, that the ploughing was universally good. They were divided into three classes, viz.: the first class, the French Canadian class, and young men's class.

Messrs. William Hodge, George Smith and William Chalmers were the Judges for the two last named classes and awarded the prizes as follows:—

French Canadian Class.

1st Prize. Alexander Desmarois; 2nd. John Brookshaw.

Ploughmen under 20 Years of Age.

1st Prize. William Muir, Jr., St. Laurent; 2nd. Wm. Holsworth, Petite Cote; 3rd. Seraphin Cloutier, Coteau St. Pierre.

The Judges of the first class were—Messrs. Scott of Beauharnois, Todd of Laprairie, and W. Anderson of St. Laurent. In addition to the prizes offered by the Society, the worthy President, Mr. Dodds of Petite Cote, gave an iron plough to the winner of the first prize. The ploughing in this class, with two or three exceptions, was the best I have seen either here or in the old country, especially that of Mr. Matthew Hutchison, Mr. James Drummond and Thomas Hodge, and I understand the Judges were puzzled to which of these to award the first prize. I was fully prepared to hear this, but could not understand how they came to their final decision, which was as follows:—

First Class.

1st Prize. James Drummond, Petite Cote, \$8 and plough; 2nd. Thos. Hodge, \$7; 3rd. Matthew Hutchison; 4th. Colin Munro; 5th. James Muir.