

lata rana, or Latin words from Greek, for Philology, in the modern sense, was then unknown. Even at the present day, however, we find the guess-work plan lingering on. Now it is exceedingly unlikely that the Latin word *luscini* comes from $\delta\upsilon\varsigma$ (and *cano*), though the *l* is found in Latin, representing δ in Greek, and yet this derivation has been suggested during the present year.

The "Elements of Etymology" begins with a chapter on the history of the formation of the English language. This is given with sufficient fulness. The word *Romanic* is used to "include all words borrowed from Latin (the language of the Romans) whether directly or indirectly through French, or other Romanic languages." While admitting that the word Romanic is good enough when we are dealing with the philology of the group of languages, which is derived from the Latin, we must nevertheless confess that we believe the term inappropriate when it is a question of tracing the formation of the English tongue. We cannot be too closely accurate in pointing out the historical landmarks of the language, and so we cannot deem it advisable to place Latin and French together under one head, seeing that Latin and French influenced our national speech independently of each other. Latin, in the form which it wore anteriorly to the rise of the French language, is projected into English, at least at two successive epochs. French, though essentially of Latin origin, possesses so many peculiarities of its own, that on its introduction into England in the eleventh century, it began to affect the language in such a manner as Latin, in its purer form, never did affect it. French is indeed a corruption of Latin, but not by a Latin people, and it was long before it was fully recognized what part Latin played in the formation of French. Now, English organs of speech, dealing with Latin words produced one

set of changes; dealing with French words, they produced another set; because the materials to be worked over were different in each case—an alloy is easier to work than pure metal.

The learner should acquire a knowledge of the successive waves of foreign influence, and the closest accuracy which we can attain would not have made the introduction too long. Not till this clear outline is thoroughly grasped, should much attention be given to the derivation of individual words. The other languages, from which we have drawn some of our stores, are kept sufficiently apart. With regard to the Norse element, we might remark in passing, that a language that could impose upon English a verbal auxiliary—*are*—must have had closer relations with the language than our present vocabulary would lead us to believe. Many of the words which we now explain as Anglo-Saxon are doubtless of Norse origin.

As soon as a tolerably clear idea of the historical development of our language has been secured by the learner, the next important step is to place within his reach an adequate exposition of what is meant by "Grimm's Law." It is surprising how little is known of this well-established principle, even by many of the teachers in our schools, and yet it is both easy of acquisition and sure to attract the attention even of young scholars. One often hears a learner of German ask if such and such an English word is derived from its German relative. At the present time there are, both in Ontario and elsewhere, young scholars who cannot make up their minds as to whether English is derived from German or German from English. A few black-board exercises on "Grimm's law" would render the matter for ever plain. The sketch made in section 9 of the "Elements" will, we imagine, be found by no means easy by young scholars, especially if they are unacquainted