

laws, their creed, their general condition—political, religious and moral. Lord Rayleigh, in his speech at the British Association in Montreal, proposed to substitute the study of French and German for the study of Latin and Greek; but that proposal must have been made in utter forgetfulness of what the scientific study of language is, wherein lies the difference between a scientific and an empirical treatment of language—between wild guesses at the origin and relations of words and a certainty as to their origin and relations second only to the certainty of the mathematician. It lies surely in the presence or absence of the historical treatment of language. But the science of language is something more than a mere branch of historical study. It is one of the studies most closely akin to history, a study from which history is ever borrowing, and which is ever borrowing from history; but which is still a branch of study distinct in itself. No man can really understand history without a considerable knowledge of philology. No man can really understand philology without a considerable knowledge of history. The historian and the philologist have a wide field in common, in which both will feel equally at home; but each has also a separate territory of his own, in which the other feels no temptation to enter. As a rule, while the true philologist will care for the whole world of language, but as a master of some and as knowing the general relations of all, the historical student, who uses philology only as an illustration of history, will care only for those languages which illustrate his own branches of history. At the same time, of course, the more languages

a man knows the better. He who to his Greek, Latin and Teutonic can add Celtic, Slavonic, Lithianiac, the rival speech of the Arab, and the more uncouth tongues of the Turk and the Magyar, will certainly not regret having added so many unusual weapons to his historic armoury.

With regard to the tongues which the historian and philologist may study in common, the two will not look at them from the same point of view. To the philologist nothing is so precious as the grammatical forms; the vocabulary is secondary; the extant writings in the language are valuable chiefly by way of evidence to illustrate the philological facts of the language itself. To the historical student, on the other hand, the grammatical forms are of comparatively little interest; they concern him only when they illustrate some of the facts in the language itself, or in its relations to other languages. His chief care is the vocabulary, and specially where the words that form it are arranged in the shape, not necessarily of literature in the higher sense, but of composition recorded or handed down. To the one, in short, the facts of language is valuable in itself; to the other only such facts of language are valuable as help to illustrate the more general history of nations. In the relations between history and philology are seen the very best example of that kind of brotherhood which may exist between two branches of knowledge distinct in their own nature, but which have much in common both in range and method. Mr. Freeman then proceeded to inquire how history stood with regard to the sister study of law.—*Scotsman.*