

with the elements of Greek. Our author evidently takes for granted that the Greek mutes have been learned by the young scholar, and that a table—we mean a clear, formal table, standing well out from the text—is unnecessary. We should like to have seen more space allowed to the subject, and additional typographical expedients employed in its simplification.

It must be confessed that to make Philology attractive to those who never intend to learn more than they must learn in order to pass an impending examination, is no easy matter. Still it is not impossible to give a sufficiently clear idea of the scope of the subject to the general student; but for this we can never depend upon a text-book. Of course the text-book is of prime importance, and no subject taught without a text-book is really taught at all; but our meaning is, that the teacher of this subject, as of every other, must stand above his text-book, and not merely on a level with it, or below it. Doubtless Mr. Connor had in view this important fact when, in his third chapter, he presents us with a list of roots and root-words without prefacing them with any general remarks on the nature of roots. The book might have been rendered too bulky by such explanation, but we fear Mr. Connor has rated too highly the preparation for the work to be found even in some of our High Schools. This third chapter cannot be understood by a young scholar without careful explanation, and we are not sure that he will at once, in all cases, be able to get the needed light, for few but deliberate philological students get to know what a "root" is.

The real work of the "Elements" begins with the third chapter. We have evidence here of very careful and extended study. One has only to look at the list of works from which much of the material is culled, to perceive that the author is *au courant*

with the best literature of his subject. No second-rate compiler will be found among the names enumerated. To say that we do not accept everything set down is only to remark that no two etymologists will agree on every point, nor is there, for the present, any hope of getting any two to agree in every respect in a subject in which it is so easy to go astray in labyrinths of words, or in which one is so liable to be led hither and thither in the twilight by all kinds of will-o'-the-wisps in the shape of false analogies. It were almost better, in such doubtful cases, instead of saying that such and such a word is *probably* derived from such another, to adopt Brachet's plan, and boldly say, "Origin unknown." In unskilful hands the 'probably' drops out, and a side-door is kept open for the reception of such words as would not dare to present themselves at the main entrance. If a word lie outside the region of historical proof, or of philological law, then it is mere waste of time to learn—at least for a beginner—from what source it has probably sprung. Indeed, we hope that in a subsequent edition we may have an appendix containing common words of unknown origin, for even knowledge of this negative kind is extremely useful. The truth is, as we have been often reminded in our examination of Mr. Connor's book, the author had much better have taken it for granted that those for whom his book was prepared have little better than a negative knowledge of the subject of which he is such a master. We should, in this case, have had a work that, though it might not have so well mirrored Mr. Connor's full and scholarly mind, would have been within the grasp of that of the ordinary pupil. As it is, the book is beyond the requirement, and even the power of use, of all but the graduating University student and the High-School master. This is a pity, because there was urgent need