

than in separating either of these from bare, "naked?" Of how infinitesimal value, then, is the Chinese principle as introduced into English usage! We may blot out every vestige of it from our vocabulary to-morrow, and it will never be missed; the written language will still continue to be as good as the spoken; and if anyone is not content with that, let him migrate and learn another tongue. If the principle is to be kept and made much of, let us agree to give it a more consistent application; let us not spell alike words so different in history and use as the three "found"; when the same vocable diverges into meanings widely dissimilar, let us vary its spelling a little to match, not writing in the same way "she became ill" and "her dress became her," not telling the lawyer and the lover go to "court" in the same orthographic fashion—yet more, when there has been a divergence of pronunciation as well, as when a "minute" portion of time has become a "minute." Let us separate the "read" from the "reads," as we have separated the "led" from the "leads;" above all, let us not compound together in spelling words distinct in every respect—derivation, sense, and utterance—like the verb "lead" and metal "lead."—From "Linguistic Studies." By W. D. Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, New Haven. U. S.

—Some years ago (says a contemporary) a learned and ingenious writer in the *Quarterly Review* attempted to establish the relation of cause and effect between national character and verbal forms of salutation. In the "shalum"—peace—of the Jews he traced the appreciation of a nomadic people of what was to them the highest because rarest good, and he matched it with equivalent words of greeting among the Bedouins and the American Indians. In the "chaire"—be glad—of the Greeks, he saw plain indications of a disposition whose leading tendency and chief aim were to rejoice and be merry. In the "salve"—be healthy—and "vale"—be strong—of the Romans, he perceived manifestations of the spirit befitting the conquerors of the world, who only in later and degenerate times condescended to the "Quid agis, dulcissime rerum," the "Quid agis," as he conjectures, being far older than the "dulcissime rerum" with which Horace connects it. What could be more appropriate than the "sanità e guadagno"—health and gain—of the commercial Genoese, the "crescete in sanità"—grow in piety—of the Neapolitans, and the "rab vash"—your slave—or "kholop vash"—your serf—of the Russians? Similar lessons are to be derived, it was contended, from the "comment vous portez-vous" and "comment ça va-t-il" of the French, the "buenas tardes" and correlative replies of the Spaniards, the "wie gehts" and "leben Siewohl" of the Germans, the "come sta" and "come state" of the Italians, the "Hoe vaart's ge" of the Hollander, the "Hur mür ni" of the Swede, the "lev-vel" of the Dane, and so forth. "How is your stomach?" says the "Heathen Chinees;" "Do you perspire copiously?" inquires the polite Egyptian: both of which particular queries, and many more besides, are included in our comprehensive formula, "How are you?" But "How do you do?" can only be described as "an epic self-contained" if as it is affirmed, it "is sufficient to account for Trafalgar, Waterloo, steam-engine, railway, Exeter Hall, *Times* newspaper *Punch* itself," and if, as it is affirmed, it ought to have been made the chorus of "Rule Britannia." "To do! Surely this contains the whole essence of productive existence, national or individual. To do! It is the law and the prophets, the theoretic and practick, the whole contexture of life. And this doing is so universal among us, it is such a completely recognised and accepted fact, that we do not ask a man, What do you do? but, How do you do? Do you must; there is no question about that"—a very useful thing to be remembered, in one sense, in all business transactions. The correct theory of "ave:"—"Nunc et in æternum, Frater, ave. atque vale."

—The *Lancet* calls attention to an additional and unsuspected evil due to the prevalent mania for competitive examinations. These so-called "test or individual capacity" have been multiplied in all directions, and have increased in severity. "Formerly," says the *Lancet*, speaking rather of private than of public schools, when competition was limited to the struggle for a college scholarship or a place in the university class-list, and the army, navy, Civil Service, and East India Company's appointments were only to be obtained by interest, schools were selected on different principles than are now recognized. Then more regard was paid to the plan and method of education, and almost every school possessed in this respect an

individuality of its own. At the present time the object of education appears less a matter of steady training and the patient laying of solid foundations, than a system of successful cramming, and a school seeks for reputation more in the number of public prizes annually won by its scholars than for the soundness of its scholarship. For a considerable period after the first introduction of the competitive system the great public schools made no effort to extend their system of education. Consequently large proprietary colleges, such as Marlborough and Cheltenham, were founded in order to meet the new requirements. These establishments differed only from the public schools in affording facilities for the study of the extended range of subjects required for the public competitive examinations, the traditions and methods of the older schools being, however, still closely adhered to. The success and popularity attending these proprietary colleges led to the establishment of others, though not on such a sound basis, and the multiplication of so many institutions, all struggling for fame and existence, has led, we fear, to the introduction of a very unsound system of teaching." The *Lancet* has examined the prospectuses of many of these schools, and it has generally found the hours of work to be excessive, ranging from forty-five to forty-eight hours a week, which give a daily average on four whole school-days of eight to nine hours, and six hours and a-half on two half holidays. Eight hours a day of mental work is a considerable strain even for an adult; how much more for mere children, who have also to expend so much force to meet the vital requirements of the growing frame! Moreover, in adult life, the work, being more mechanical, is accomplished with less intellectual excitement than is the case where fresh facts and new ideas are constantly being acquired. As a general rule, the *Lancet* is of opinion that thirty-five hours of school work a week for boys under fourteen, and forty-two hours for boys above that age, is as much as the health and strength can fairly stand; while the success that still attends the old public schools, who rarely exceed these hours, shows that they are amply sufficient for educational purposes. This is a subject to which "parents and guardians" cannot too speedily turn their attention, for it is certain that from them and not from schoolmasters the remedy for the evil thus exposed must come in the first instance. The extent to which the evil is carried on, especially in the neighbourhood of London, is extraordinary. A gentleman connected with an educational establishment of high standing, and who has often spoken with authority on education questions, considers the subject to be worthy of Government inquiry. Only a Royal Commission could get at the real truth, and reveal the amount of mischief that has been done by the reckless employment of the grinding system. In the same manner that factory children are protected from excessive physical labour ought the children of our middle-classes to be protected from the excessive strain that ambitious parents and schoolmasters would put on them. It should never be forgotten that youth is the period of growth and development, and that the boy is then laying in the stock of health which has to bear him bravely through the vicissitudes and struggles of adult life. A few hours of work can speedily be made up later on, but nothing can restore the tone to the jaded nerves exhausted by premature toil and excitement.

*The Way Out of Poverty.*—There are many thousands of respectable persons and families in our land at the present time greatly crippled by pecuniary embarrassments, and not a few are grinding in the prison-house of poverty, and know not the way out. In most cases there is an honest and honorable way out. The way marks are good common sense in exercise, industry, self-denial, good economy, and pay as you go. Let us look at these waymarks on the road to prosperity:

1. There are thousands ground down in perpetual poverty simply because they do not and will not bring their good sense to bear upon their circumstances. They build castles in the air, and these come tumbling down on their heads. Instead of depending upon small and honest gains with saving, they attempt to raise themselves by artifices and doubtful speculations. Wisdom in all these matters are profitable to direct. A daily dose of good common sense, applied outside and in, would straighten things out and set them to building on the rock of industry and frugality, and not on the vagaries of an erratic fancy.

2. The poor man, if he means to rise must look well to his time and skill. These are both marketable commodities, and bring money. Every laboring man must make the best possi-