

in the schools for a good, well-adapted text-book in Etymology, with a series of instructive lessons for the pupil's use, and as much else of philological lore as the average school-boy could usefully digest. In a sense it is not to be regretted that this is not what Mr. Connor has thought fit to give us, but it is, nevertheless, what the schools wanted, and what we supposed the Minister of Education, or his advisory body, would have taken care to see that it was what we got. It may be to little purpose now to rail at those responsible for this new Departmental *contre-temps*, but surely if it is to assume proprietary interests in the text-books it authorizes, it should first submit them to practical teaching tests, and then to competent literary supervision. It is no compliment to an author to allow him to undertake the preparation of a manual for a specific educational purpose, and from want of judicious direction and oversight to have a work produced not best, but only approximately, suited to its uses. What warrant the Department has, in any case, for entering into publishing speculations of its own, it would be hard to say. It would be harder still to say why it engages in trade enterprises not justified by a pressing educational necessity. For such a text-book as the schools *did* want, there was an admitted necessity; for such as Mr. Connor—through the Department—has given us, there was little or none. It would be ungracious to Mr. Connor to say more, lest that gentleman should misconceive the point of our criticism. We are not decrying *his* work, but that of the Central Committee. *His* labour has been well performed; *theirs* not at all.

And now for Fleming's "Analysis." We suppose that this work was placed among the authorized text-books, chiefly on account of its so-called "Etymological Derivations," but let not the reader be startled at the redundancy of

the phrase. Horne Tooke, if he does not reign, at least holds, throughout the work, a recognized position. The author of the "Analysis" has, however, a great advantage over the compilers of the "Companion": the former, we perceive, manifests some knowledge of Anglo-Saxon, for which we seek in vain in the latter. But of modern Philology, the book before us is almost as destitute as the other—individual words are dealt with, and not principles, and sometimes the individual words are very harshly dealt with indeed. As an evidence of want of philological training in the author of the "Analysis," we have merely to note that *drunkard* and *braggart* are said to be of Gothic origin, just as *balloon* and *trombone* are Italian. Now these latter are borrowed from the Italian, while, of the former, one is only "akin" to Gothic, the other is most probably Celtic. Here again we meet with the old error of supposing that because Gothic possesses so strong a likeness to English in some of its words, the former must therefore be the parent of the latter. Further on we find a list of "Diminutive Verbs," and *gladden*, *bind*, *brush*, with many others, are among the examples. The *ish* in *burnish*, is explained as a causative suffix, so that *burnish* means, we suppose, *to make burn*. Passing over several lists, from any of which we might select specimens of false derivation, we come to Chapter V. This may be called Horne Tooke's own chapter. Out of a couple of pages of what at the present day seems very like nonsense—and it *is* nonsense when seriously reproduced for our young people to study—we shall take only three examples. *Coward* is from *cower'd*, from *to cower down*; *month*, from *mooneth*; *tooth*, from *tuggeth*! But let us pass rapidly on. We are disposed to treat leniently attempts to derive such words as defy the application of ordinary philological principles.