

tongue of the scholars of all lands? Are not the choicest authors of Rome still read in schools and colleges? Is not our law in the main, and are not most of our legal terms, Roman or of Roman origin? Are not most of our theological terms Latin, but slightly altered? Can we easily converse on any subject for half an hour without the aid of words whose primitives were used by Horace and Cicero? Are we not thus reminded every day of our lives that Rome, the conqueror, has survived in spirit, and that we are still subject to her influence? And the French, the Italians, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Roumanians, do they not all speak languages which are simply modifications of Latin? Would it be so far wrong if we were to include the great literatures of those Neo-Latin nations among Rome's proudest conquests, a conquest compared with which those of mere ambition are ephemeral and poor? And when we recall how Roman civilization, acting through those who received its immediate impress, was transmitted from race to race, imperceptibly subduing even its own fierce foes and conquerors, and fitting them for their work in the new conditions that should arise, we see that in the development of communities there is always the needed conservation of force, though its forms and methods may change. * The share of Neo-Latin Christendom in the work of European civilization has been no inconsiderable proportion. If we accept its languages and literatures as a sort of autobiography, written without self-consciousness, and recording from century to century its thoughts and feelings and aims and characteristics, how full of suggestiveness and meaning they become! If it were possible to come upon such a record, as an archaeological "find", revealing the existence and work of a long vanished race, what would be thought of it? Or even any national division of it? Or the works of any one great writer? Or a single masterpiece? What questions would arise as to the life lived by those who spoke such a speech, and used it to such purpose? And yet to form a correct judgment there would be more needed than even the whole body of Neo-Latin literature. To judge it fairly, that which preceded it and that which accompanied, acted on and was acted on by it, would have to be taken into account. And the same is true of Teutonic literature, including all its branches. There is no language, no literature, which stands alone, and this fact is becoming more and more true as means of inter-communication multiply and the intercourse of nations with each other increases. The movements of an obscure horde, the flight of an enthusiast from his persecutors, were to change the face of three continents and to bring about the Renaissance.

In what way Neo-Latin civilization affected that of the Teutons, and *vice-versa*, we are constantly discovering. But how each came to be exactly and entirely what it is would take long to tell. They are both great facts, however, and among the proudest triumphs

* "Rien à mon sens," says Littré, "de plus intéressant et de plus fructueux que de comparer le moyen âge avec l'antiquité, dont il dérive pour la langue, pour les institutions, pour les sciences, pour les lettres, pour les arts. Seulement il faut se faire une idée exacte du champ de la comparaison. L'antiquité classique n'est pas simple; elle est formée de deux parties distinctes qui font un seul corps, la Grèce et Rome; le grec et le latin, Homère et Virgile, Demosthène et Cicéron, Thucydide et Tacite, Miltiade et les Scipion, Alexandre et César. A plus forte raison, le moyen âge n'est pas un: il se divise en cinq groupes principaux, l'Italie, l'Espagne, la France, l'Anglo-4erro et l'Allemagne; mais ces groupes, étant joints par une tradition commune, regno de l'antiquité, par une religion commune dont le chef unique siégeait à Rome, par des institutions communes dont la féodalité était la base, représentaient un corps politique qui avait plus de puissance et plus de cohésion que l'empire romain, et qui en était la continuation directe. Donc l'antiquité gréco-latine a pour terme corrélatif dans le moyen âge l'ensemble des cinq populations héritières par indivis de l'héritage de civilisation."—*Histoire de la Langue française*, t. II, p. 4.