

Anglo-Saxon tongue has given us the first word of this oration. Side by side with "father," "mother," "brother," and "sister," "friend," has come down to us from that remote past, when oppression knit the subject race more strongly together, and mutual love was strengthened by common woes. "Friend" was originally a present participle of the verb "frian," "to love." Affection is regarded in this derivation as essential to true friendship. The termination "ing" has taken the place of this old participial form in "nd"; though Spencer (F.Q.B.I. Canto vii. 29) has "glitterand" for glittering." Supply the indefinite "some one" "friend," *i.e.* "loving," and you have a friend. The word has the common English plural termination which was once peculiar to one of the Saxon declensions.

To this conciliatory word Shakespeare makes Antony add one which to Antony's fellow citizens was full of honor. To be a Roman was to be noble. "With a great sum," said the chief captain to Paul, "obtained I this freedom." "But I," said the apostle with becoming self-respect, "was free born." This form of address was therefore flattering. Our English word "Roman" comes to us through the Norman French—itsself a descendant of the Latin, and therefore called a Romance language from the city where that ancient tongue was the vernacular speech. The third word of salutation was not less winning, "countrymen," partakes with me of national privileges, honors, joys, and reverses. The speaker puts himself on the same footing with his hearers. This word "countrymen" is one of those hybrid words common in our tongue, in which one element is contributed by one language, another element by another language. Thus the Norman French gives us "country;" the Anglo-Saxon gives "man;" the two together implying community of national origin and abode. In Shakespeare's time, as now among those who use English correctly, it was not thought necessary to prefix to the word the epithet "fellow" to express this social idea. It was left for those who take for one of their maxims, "Our country right or wrong" to commit this barbarism, by speaking of their "*fellow countrymen*."

The word "country," the first element in this complex word is from the French. In Chaucer's Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, written before the English had assumed its present forms the foreign spelling is retained, "contree." This Romance word has no immediate Latin ancestor. Its nearest Roman relative is the military term "conteraneus," applied to men of the same land.

"Lend me your ears," not give, but retain your control over your hearing and your assent. "Lend" and "loan" related words, as in Polonius' address in Hamlet,

"Neither a borrower, nor a lender be,  
For loan oft loses both itself and friend,"

have this idea in common, the perpetuation of the right of the original owner of the thing lent.

It may be remarked once for all, in respect to the several personal and possessive pronouns of this passage, "we," "you," "your," "it," and "their," that they come with very slight verbal change from that vigorous tongue which, contributing five-eighths of the words in our language, gives us all those frequently occurring words which, expressing relation, furnish the essential elements of all our sentences. The Latin, the French, the German, and the Anglo-Saxon, denote the organ of the hearing by kindred words, "Auris," "oreille," "ohr," "ear," are so nearly alike as to suggest community or origin.

"I come" is Saxon; and so also is "to bury." The latter expression, however, deserves some attention, first, for its derivation and meaning, and secondly, for its form. Its Saxon is "byrgan," signifying primarily to put in safety, to conceal, and secondarily, to put into a grave. Its derivative noun in Saxon is "buhr" or "byhr," which will remind German scholars of "Burg," "a castle," or "stronghold," and will remind us all of common terminations for the names of places, Edinburgh, Dryburgh, Shrewsbury, Roxbury. The orator comes to put in a place of safety these mangled remains of Cæsar. But whence originates the proposition "to" between these verbs? The Saxon primitive "byrgan" has no such prefix, nor do the classical tongues exhibit such a construction in the simple infinitive. Saxon etymology offers the key to this form of expression. In all the Gothic languages verbs were declined as well as conjugated, and relics of those declensions still survive. They had one form for the nominative and the accusative case. The latter after a verb required no intervening preposition. All instances of the immediate connexion of an auxiliary and a principal verb as *e.g.* "I shall go," "I will speak," are illustrations of this construction. The dative of the infinitive—a strict gerundive form like the Latin "Amandum"—ended in "enne" in Saxon, and was preceded by the preposition "to." The termination has been dropped, but the preposition is retained, and standing before the verb governs it as though it were a noun. It need scarcely be remarked in this connexion that the practice of inserting a qualifying adverb between the preposition and the verb is forbidden by this theory of their mutual relation. Cæsar is of course directly from the Latin. "Not" "a surly sort of word," as Horne Tooke calls it, is

contracted from "naught," itself a compound of "no" and "aught," "awhit," "anything."

"To praise him." We *praise* what we *prize*, and we *prize* that for which we either ask or give a *price*. These related words, derivatives from "pris," the past participle of the French verb "prendre," to take, because the price is that which is taken, show that a value, real or fictitious is attributed to that which we commend.

One of the most frequently recurring words in our language is the definite article "the," here prefixed to "evil." In common with its relative "that," it has received a curious derivation, which, though seemingly fanciful, may be received until supplanted by one more satisfactory. There is a Saxon verb "thean," meaning "to get," "to take." An object is defined by being taken out of its class. If a man is taken from among men in general he is rendered definite. Translate "take man" into Anglo-Saxon, and you have "thean man," *i.e.* the man. So "the evil" determines what evil is meant.

The word "evil" is as universal in the Gothic tongues, as the thing it denotes was common to those who spoke them. The German "Ubel," the Anglo-Saxon, "Efel," are evidently the immediate connections of our English "evil." But have they a common source? We can hardly be mistaken in suspecting that in the Hebrew "evil," kindred in sound and in form, we have a name for this mysterious principle which carries us back to

"Man's first disobedience, and the fruit  
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste  
Brought death into the world, and all our woe."

"Mem," "do," "lives" and "after" are all words of Saxon origin, and almost of Saxon form. "Lives" contrasted with "hath" exhibits to us a form of the third person singular, once peculiar to the northern counties of England, but now common to all English verbs except when the antiquated and solemn style adheres to the form ending in "th."

From "good," a Saxon word, formerly written god is derived the name of that being in whom it dwells unmingled and supreme. "Is" and "of" are Saxon, but "interred," comes to us through the French "enterrer," from the Latin "in terra," "in earth,"—and shows the place of burial.

Many of our particles were originally parts of verbs. It is not altogether a fanciful derivation which refers the uniting, binding preposition "with" to the imperative of the Anglo-Saxon verb "withan," "to join"; and Walter Scott was not far out of the way in his etymology, when he sustained his school-mate in his reply to the master's question, "What part of speech is 'with'?" "A noun," said the boy. "You young blockhead," cried the indignant dominie, "what example can you give of such a thing?" "I can tell you," cried little Walter, "there's a verse in the Bible which says, 'they bound Samson with green withes.'"

But we must hasten to close these illustrations. Passing by the words "bones,"—Saxon, though probably related to the Greek, "baino," "I go," or if not to that, to the Saxon "beon," to exist "if" from the Saxon imperative "gif" implying a concession of probability, "grievous" from the Latin, "gravis" heavy, a fitting description of sorrow, "fault," through the French, "faute," from the Latin "fallo," "I deceive," we come to the picturesque word, "ambitious." We say "picturesque" advisedly, for in this word which comes to us through the French "ambiteux" from the Latin "ambitus" a "going round," we have a representation of the habits of the ancient and the modern office seekers. The solicitation of votes, the winning of popularity, the friendly greeting dictated by self interest alone, the secret offer of bribes, the "stumping the state"—all of which required a good deal of going round—and sometimes not a little of *turning round*—had their counterparts in the old republics. They certainly entitled a man to be called ambitious; and if they won him the rewards, they no less exposed him to the reverses of an anxious and busy politician.—*R. I. Schoolmaster.*

## 2. ORIENTAL STUDIES.

Perhaps no language that was ever known surpasses the Sanscrit in majesty, in perfection of grammatical refinement, in grace, in accuracy. It is unrivalled, whether used as a means of commercial and practical intercourse, as a subject for philological research, or as a vehicle of philosophical subtleties. It forms a third in the group of the Indo-Germanic tongues, with the Latin and Greek, and while it elucidates many seeming anomalies in those languages, forms the link which binds together the speech of the Saxon and the Persian: the stepping stone which leads from the knowledge of the one to that of the other.

The languages of India chiefly studied by Europeans are, besides the Sanscrit, the following; for the presidencies of Bengal, the north-west provinces, and Bombay—Persian, Hindustani, Guzeratti, and sometimes the dialects of the Indus, as Pajabi and Kasburiri; for the