

appear in the title-page, is ominous of what may be expected in the body of the work; more particularly when it is considered that the art of translating, verbally, is quite new and little understood. Mr. Bohn says, in his preface:—"Although Cæsar cannot be regarded as a difficult author, the publisher has had no little trouble in procuring a translation to his mind, in consequence of which considerable delay has arisen." This is a candid acknowledgment, but, certainly, little creditable to the Latinity of the present day. Among so many boasted Latin scholars, it turns out that not one can be got who is competent to make a correct verbal translation of the easiest book in the Latin language. Mr. Bohn is, evidently, not satisfied with this production of his own and Mr McDevitte's joint labour; but he could not do better, and wisely avows that such is the case.

The whole difficulty of studying Latin, or any other language, consists in not adopting the common-sense method which we apply in every other department of learning, and even in the most familiar avocations of every-day life. In anatomy the component parts and members of the body are examined separately. The arteries are distinguished as one part, the veins as another, of the sanguiferous system. No one mistakes these for the heart or the lungs—other parts of the same system. Least of all would a leg and an arm be taken, conjointly, to constitute one member of the body. Even in the simple matter of household bread, we follow the process of analysis. Bread, we say, is a compound of flour, water, and yeast, baked by means of heat. We do not give the name bread to flour alone, nor to the water and yeast without the flour. Why then should we deviate so far, in the interpretation of words, as to violate an observance which, in all other researches may almost be said to be instinctive. For example, the Latin *into*, being the fifth word at the beginning of the Commentaries, is translated *into*, that is making a simple word equivalent to a compound. *Into*, besides, is only applicable where there is transition. It is correct to say, *I went into the house, I fell into the pond*, because the predicative conjunctions *went* and *fell* denote transition, and therefore admit of the word of direction *to*, which points to the object *house* or *pond*. But the expression—*divide a thing into three parts*, however common it may be, is incorrect. Not only is the English translation, *into*, therefore, not a verbatim translation of the Latin, but it is also a transgression of a rule for the structure of English itself.

Again, *INCOLUNT* is represented in English by *inhabit*; *INSTITUTIS* by *customs*; *HUMANITATE* by *refinement*; *GERUNT* by *wage*; *ORTINERE* by *occupy*; *CONTINENTUR* by *bounded*; *FINIBUS* by *territories*; *ATTINGIT* by *borders*; *VERGIT* by *stretches*. These occur, all, in the first paragraph; along with numerous errors in regard to the structure of the predicative conjunction; such as *are called*, for *APPELLANTUR*; *which it has been said that the Gauls occupy*, for *QUAM GALLOS OBTINERE* *PICTUM EST*.

A verbatim translation would be desirable for two reasons. First, to convey the exact expression which Cæsar intended; and second, to furnish a convenient key to the Latin reader. Neither of these objects is, however, served by Mr. Bohn's publication. Now, if an easy book, such as the Commentaries, cannot be made to assume a right English garb, and so many errors are committed in the attempt, what must be the nature of the English treatment of the didactic and speculative

writings of the old Latin masters? What value can be placed on the English rendering of disputed points of doctrinal theology, of history, and of law? The same remarks apply to other languages; for the fault is not of a special nature, peculiar to local or isolated causes. It is systematic. It is common to the treatment of foreign languages in general, both ancient and modern. So much is this the case, that we think it is scarcely possible to find a complete period, of any translated work, that bears the exact signification of the original.

That words have definite and fixed meanings can only be demonstrated by derivations of their primary roots. A comparison of the cognate words of several languages, in connection with their roots, is the only process by which to determine the general significations; and this once ascertained, the particular applications will cease to appear contradictory. Hoogveen composed his "Doctrina Particularum Linguæ Græcæ," to fix the significations of what are called Greek particles; and to refute the prevailing opinion entertained by many eminent writers, that these particles are words without meaning. Though he failed in solving the problem of the fixedness of signification, still his original conception is the true one. Bishop Butler has been more successful with the Latin prepositions. Still there is a want of apprehension of the general roots, and a good deal that is arbitrary in his "Praxis," by no means compatible with the idea of definiteness of meaning. The analysis of language has received more attention in Germany than elsewhere, and, during the last forty years, great progress has signified the labors of a numerous class of German linguists; yet verbatim translations, so far as we have had opportunities of knowing, have not yet been essayed by them. If the Hamiltonian system of teaching is excepted, Mr. Bohn appears to have the credit of being the first in England who has endeavored to produce a complete work of this nature, notwithstanding that he has experienced a want of success.

THE GREEK ALPHABET.

Capital Letters.	Small Letters.	Names.	English Equivalents.
A	α	Ἄλφα	a
B	β, β̄	Βῆτα	b
Γ	γ	Γάμμα	g (hard)
Δ	δ	Δέλτα	d
E	ε	Ἐψιλόν	e (short)
Z	ζ	Ζῆτα	z
H	η	Ἡτα	e (long)
Θ	θ, θ̄	Θῆτα	th
I	ι	Ἰώτα	i
K	κ	Κάππα	k
L	λ	Λάμβδα	l
M	μ	Μῆ	m
N	ν	Νῆ	n
Ξ	ξ	Ξῆ	x
O	ο	Ὅ μικρόν	o (short)
Π	π	Πῆ	p
P	ρ	Ρῶ	r
Σ	σ, σ̄	Σίγμα	s
T	τ	Τῆ	t
Υ	υ	Ὑ γιγνόν	u
Φ	φ	Φῆ	ph
X	χ	Χῆ	ch (hard)
Ψ	ψ	Ψῆ	ps
Ω	ω	Ὠ μέγα	o (long)