

Mow. Each day still better other's happiness,
Until the heavens, envying earth's good hap,
Add an immortal title to your crown.

K. Rich. We thank you both; yet one but flatters us,
As well appeareth by the cause you come,
Namely, to appeal each other of high treason."

Now, here, there are several questions in English grammar which do not belong to this part of our subject. I would venture to assert that many boys, if asked to parse *befal*, would say that it was used indicatively instead of optatively, which would show that they had quite misunderstood the sentence; and some would even make the same mistake about *better*. The use of *but*, and the manner in which it came to be used thus, might form another useful question; and, if our pupils were also asked to explain and illustrate the omission of the article before *others*, and to explain the phrase "the cause you come," there would, I think, be some basis for the preparation of an English lesson, and nothing would be requisite but the necessary text-books in order to enable us to demand, and them to make, this preparation. But this is by no means all; and, indeed, this is not connected with the subject we are now considering, but rather with English grammar. There are other questions, natural and important. What does *appeal* mean here? How did it come to have that meaning? Can we illustrate it from the words *repeal*, *appellation*, or any others? Here, then, comes in derivative etymology. Again, what is the exact meaning of *high-stomach'd*? How does it differ from *angry*, or *haughty*? This opens up the question how we can ascertain the exact meaning of a word, and it naturally introduces the subject of synonyms. We shall find that boys require to be asked, What is meant by the "heavens envying earth's good hap" and such a question at once introduces metaphor. Then, under the same head, there are other questions connected with diction—Why is the *sea* selected as the representative of deafness? Why say full of "ire," and not "anger?" Under what circumstances would *ire* be more appropriate than *anger*? Then, is a boy to read, "In rage, deaf as the sea, hasty as fire?" and if not, on what principle are we to lay the accent on *deaf*, and on the first, instead of the second, syllable of *hasty*? Lastly, when these and similar questions have been asked, it is surely reasonable for a teacher to ask whether King Richard is right in arguing that, because two of his subjects accuse one another of high treason, therefore one of them is necessarily a flatterer. And thus, in the most natural way possible, we open the door to Logic.

The course of English training may be conveniently subdivided for the purpose of description, even where not for actual use. In practice, etymology, diction, and logic ought all to be applied together for the study of English—the two former certainly, and from the very first, though in a most elementary manner. But it will be convenient, in the present instance, to classify our subject under these three heads, and to deal with them distinctly. We will take them in order, as they have been mentioned—Etymology, Diction, and Logic. Etymology, usually so called, deals with the changes and inflections of words. It takes a word, such as *treason*, in the passage above quoted, and after deriving it from the Latin *traditio*, through the French *trahison*, will illustrate the law of derivation by other words, such as *reason*, *season*. But another kind of Etymology deals with the changes of meaning and thought which a word has undergone; this latter Etymology will point out how the word, which originally meant "handing over," subsequently was narrowed to the meaning of "betraying," and then was narrowed again to "political betraying." Both kinds of Etymology are important; but as the latter is more closely connected with the true object

of an English lesson, the teaching of thought, I shall pass at once from the former to the latter.

It may be thought a serious objection against both branches of Etymology, that they seem to depend on a knowledge of Latin, and are inapplicable where Latin has not been previously taught. I do not think this objection either is or need be a serious one. Many treatises on Etymology are probably in existence, in which the principal Latin roots are classified, and the English words arranged under their respective heads, attention being also directed to the law of formation in each case. A little study of a few Latin roots, such as *trad-*, *fer-* (with the derived root *lat-*) *jung-*, *mitt-* (and the derived *miss-*), with a knowledge of the corresponding French forms, added to a knowledge of the English affixes and prefixes, would go a long way to render the study of English etymology possible even where Latin was not taught. At the same time, I fully admit the great value of the systematic study of Latin for this purpose, wherever it can be systematically studied.

But upon what principle is the boy to prepare the etymological part of his English lesson? Is he to look out the derivations of every word as it comes; for example, in the above passage, *ire*, *deaf*, *rage*, *sea*, *hasty*, &c.? Will the pupil learn anything from discovering that these words are derived from similar words in Latin and Anglo-Saxon; that *ire* comes from the Latin *ira*, and *deaf* from the A. S. *deaf*? Very little, I think; certainly not enough to repay the trouble of looking the words out in a dictionary. An indiscriminate study of the derivations of all words in an English lesson will take up as much time as the study of words and inflections in Latin, with even less mental training. Such an undistinguishing avidity for useless information would be ruinous to English teaching. At the outset, therefore, we must prevent our pupils from doing too much, and this we shall best do by ourselves giving them, before each lesson, a list of the words whose derivations they will be expected to know. This plan will, at all events, be found useful at first. Boys ought not to be called upon for the derivation of any word not previously mentioned by the teacher, unless some obscurity of meaning attends the word, which may receive light from the derivation, as in the case of *appeal* in the passage above. According to this rule, we should expect our pupils to know the derivation of *appeal*, because it is essential to the understanding of the passage; but we should not expect them to derive *ire*, or *sea*, or *deaf*.

But I am far from saying that we should always confine the questions in Etymology to those which merely elucidate the meaning of the particular passage that happens to be studied. Other derivations might with advantage be asked, that illustrate the laws of etymological thought. Some of these laws I will briefly enumerate. I should like to call especial attention to them, because, though the etymological laws regulating the chances of letters are generally recognized, those that regulate the changes of thought have attracted comparatively little attention. Some of them have been treated of and tastefully illustrated in Archbishop Trench's *Synonyms*, but many are still almost unrecognized.

(1) First, then, let us take *the law of change*. Point out to a boy that words, like individuals and nations, have a kind of life, that nineteen hundred years or more cannot pass over a word without, in most cases, altering its signification. This law, once firmly grasped, will do more than anything else to eradicate, in boys who are beginning to write Latin prose, the tendency to use, as the translation of an English word, the most similar Latin word they can find. Boys will see that the chances are that one thousand nine hundred years ago the Latin *oppressit* meant, something different from the meaning of the English word *op*