

mation to be imparted is not given, and we are not indebted to the original source, because an entirely different tongue is employed to embody the original conception. A Physician prescribes to different patients, speaking as many different languages, but labouring under the same disease. He speaks to each in his own language; but who will say the prescriptions are not identical, because they are enunciated in different tongues? Absurdity itself would hardly venture so broad a statement as that they are not precisely the same. The case is only slightly modified, if we suppose the physician acquainted with one language, and under the necessity of communicating with all his patients, except one, by means of an interpreter or interpreters. If he express himself ambiguously or defectively, the interpreters may misunderstand him, and give instructions to the patients different from what he intended; or they may commit the same error from an imperfect acquaintance with the language of the Physician or the patients. But assuming that the Physician has expressed his prescription accurately and lucidly, and that the interpreters perfectly understand both the language of the Physician and that of his patients, and honestly communicate to each, in his own tongue, the mind of the Physician, no person would hesitate to ascribe to him the direction given to the sick, although he understands not the words in which it is expressed, more than if all who are under his care spake a language common to him and them, and received instructions immediately from his own lips. The interpreter is not transmuted into the Doctor, nor is he, in any sense, the author of the given prescription.

Life and Death depend, in many cases, upon the recognition of the identity of that which is expressed in different languages. An individual is arraigned for murder. The witness in attendance, to testify to the guilt of the prisoner, speaks a language which is not understood by the Court or the Jury. His evidence must be received through an interpreter. The peculiar idioms of the language in which the interrogations are put may be lost in making them intelligible to the witness; and, on the other hand, the peculiar forms of expression used by the witness, in giving his answers in his own tongue, may not appear in the language in which they are presented to the Court; yet the testimony may, and may be accordingly regarded as complete and decisive. The panel objects that the testimony of the witness is not before the Court; but he is condemned, and handed over to the ministers of justice for execution, although the witness may not have understood a word uttered in the course of the proceedings, except what was spoken by the interpreter; and neither the Bench, the Bar, the Jury, or the Prisoner, may have understood one word, as it fell from the lips of the witness.

The same remarks may be made with respect to the official