

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THE CANADIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

No. II.

FOR APRIL, 1856.

The Structure of Sentences and their Connection.

By reference to the first number of the *Review*, our readers will perceive that all the words of a language are divided in three classes; namely, principals, expletives, and conjunctions.

These assume the forms of sentences, when combined to express the sentiments of the mind. A simple sentence is, therefore, the verbal expression of a simple sentiment; and a compound sentence is the verbal expression of a compound sentiment. Whether simple or compound, the sentence should be constructed to harmonize exactly with its mental archetype.

At first view, it seems strange that all languages should be governed in their structure, by one set of rules. But this surprise is soon dispelled when we come to consider that, among mankind, the arrangement of thoughts, in the mind itself, for the formation of sentiments, conforms likewise to one set of rules. More or fewer suggestions may happen in some minds than in others; and, in this respect, human genius is characterized by barrenness or fertility; but, so far as single sentiments are regarded as inceptions of external realities, every mind employs, alike, principal, expletive and conjunctive ideas, and no other; and by a common and regular process combines these so that they form, invariably, the theme, the predicate, and the accidene; the only constituent parts of either simple or compound sentences.

This coincidence between the inward and outward arrangement of the symbols of thought and language, at the same time that it exacts a rigid conformity of the verbal expression with the mental type of which it is the representative, marks, with the most extreme minuteness, the distinction between the legitimate and superfluous use of the verbal symbols. And this mark of distinction is available, not only in the practice of modern languages; but in Greek and Latin, also, we become able, by it, to detect erroneous superfluities of diction with which, in one particular respect, both of these languages abound.

In proceeding now to lay down one general form for the structure of sentences, we shall do so, in the first

instance, with the English exclusively. The same form is applicable in all other languages; but as our readers are not supposed to be all acquainted with foreign tongues, and it is desirable that the form should be clearly understood, we consider it best to explain ourselves first in English.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

On the blackboard or slate draw two perpendicular lines, as below. The first space to the left is for the theme; the second or middle, for the predicate; and the third or right, for the accidene. These three parts of a sentence as well as sentences themselves are joined together by a class of words called conjunctions. The place of the conjunctions is close to the left of each space; and their different kinds are here stated:—

Sentential Conjunctions.	Prodiative Conjunctions.	Accidental Conjunctions.
and	am	to
or	was	from
nor	have not*	in
either }	love	out
or }	hate	at
neither }	strikes	by
nor }	desire	through
	confess	there†
	think	then
	read	when
	have loved‡	also
	may strike	because
	should go	therefore
	became read	amidst
	shall have become read	exceedingly
		exactly

Here we have the conjunctions which join sentences and the parts of sentences. About these there can be no difficulty, for they invariably occupy the places assigned them in the above form. The next thing is to distinguish the words which belong to the theme;

* The negative forms part of the conjunction; therefore, "have not" is called a negative conjunction.

† "Have loved" is a compound conjunction, corresponding with AMAV in Latin.

‡ "I here," "then," "therefore," "amidst," "exactly," &c., signifying in that place, at that time, for that reason, in the middle, in an exact manner, form complete accidents, and consequently stand alone, in all cases. But, because they imply conjunctions, and stand in the same column with the conjunctions, they are assumed to belong to that class.

those which belong to the predicative, and those which belong to the accident. For this purpose the three following rules are to be observed.

Rule I.—In order to find the theme put *who, which, or what*, before the predicative conjunction; and ask the question—Who was? Which strikes? What shall have been read? The answer is the theme.

Rule II.—To find the predicative put *who, which, or what*, after the predicative conjunction; and ask the question—Love whom? Strikes which? May confess what? The answer is the predicative.

Rule III.—To find the accident put *when, where, why, how, by which, or with whom*, after the predicative conjunction; and ask the question—Is where? Reads when? Thinks why? Considers how? Acts by which? Goes with whom? The answer is the accident.

For an illustration of these rules, a passage is here selected from Rollin, because, though exceptional in structure, it possesses many of the characteristics of both the Greek and Latin styles of composition; in so far, at least, as the ellipsis is a particular feature of these languages.

“PAPYRUS.—This is a plant from the root of which shoot out a great many triangular stalks, to the height of six or seven cubits. The ancients writ at first upon palm leaves; next on the inside of the bark of trees, from whence the word LIBER, or book, is derived; after that, upon tables covered over with wax, on which the characters were impressed with an instrument called Stylus, sharp pointed at one end to write with, and flat at the other, to efface what had been written. * * * At last the use of paper was introduced, and this was made of the bark of Papyrus, divided into thin flakes or leaves, which were very proper for writing; and this Papyrus was likewise called Byblus.”*

In the analysis of this passage for the purpose of illustrating the distinction between the three parts of a sentence, it may be well to comprehend, at the same time, the difference between principal and parenthetical sentences, and also the contrast between correct and superfluous diction. With this view we shall present, in the three following modes of exemplification; first, the division of the words in themes, predicates and accidents; second, the principal sentences, exclusive of those which are parenthetical; and third, the principal and parenthetical sentences; supplying what is elliptical; and marking by italics, through all the examples, the words which are superfluous.

	THE THEME.	THE PRODICATE.	THE ACCIDENCE.
	Papyrus.		
	This	is a plant	(from the root of which
	a great many triangular stalks	shoot	out to the height of six
or seven cubits)
	The ancients	writ	at first
	upon palm leaves ;
	next on the inside of the bark of trees,
	(from whence
or	the word LIBER	is derived ;)	after that
	book	(covered	upon tables
	over wax,) which
	the characters	were impressed	on with an instrument)
	(.	(called Stylus,	at one end)
	(.	(pointed	with,) at the other,)
	(.	(to write	at
	(.	(flat	At last
	(what	(had been written.) *	* * *
	the use of paper	was introduced,	
and	this	was made of the bark of Papyrus,	into thin flakes
or	(.	(divided leaves,)
	(which	were proper	very for writing;)
and	this Papyrus	was called Byblus	likewise.

* Rollin's Ancient History, Vol. I., Chap. 6.

THE PRINCIPAL SENTENCES EXCLUSIVELY.

THE THEME.	THE PREDICATE.	THE ACCIDENCE.
Papyrus.		
This	is a plant.	
The ancients	writ	at first
		upon palm leaves ;
		next
		on the inside of the bark of trees,
		after that
		upon tables.
		At last
the use of paper	was introduced,	
and this	was made of the bark of Papyrus,	
and this Papyrus	was called Byblus	likewise.

THE EXPRESSION OF THE WORDS UNDERSTOOD BY THE ELLIPSIS.

THE THEME.	THE PREDICATE.	THE ACCIDENCE.
Papyrus.		
This papyrus	is a plant	from the root of which
a great many triangular stalks	shoot	out(wards)
or, a great many triangular stalks	shoot	to the height of six cubits ;
The ancients	writ	at first
		upon palm leaves ;
The ancients	writ	next
		on the inside of the bark of trees,
		from whence
the word LIBER	is derived ;	
or the word book	is derived ;	after that
the ancients	writ	upon tables
	which tables were	covered
		with wax,
		on which wax
the characters	were impressed	with an instrument,
	which instrument was	
	called Stylus,	
	pointed	at one end,
	which Stylus was	
	to write	with,
	which Stylus was	
	flat	at the other end,
	which end was	
	to efface that thing,	
	which thing had	been written. *
		* * *
		At last
the use of paper	was introduced,	
and this paper	was made of the bark of Papyrus,	
	which bark of Papyrus was	divided
or which bark of Papyrus was	divided	into thin flakes,
	which leaves were	proper leaves
		very proper leaves
		for writing ;
	and this Papyrus was	called Byblus
		likewise.

This form is the key to the verbal structure of every language.* In those languages, particularly, whose principals and expletives change their terminations to indicate their thematic, predicative and accidental characters, the utility of the form is greatly enhanced, as we shall presently show. Simply for the teaching of English, however, it is sufficient for the teacher; as it enables him to dispense with all text books. For with the blackboard or slate, alone, and this form, he is able to teach a large class, theoretically and practically, what is called English grammar; not erroneously as it is now

taught; but in accordance with the universal rules of human language, in the widest acceptance of that phrase. And this he is able to do in a way that imposes no tax on the patience of himself or his pupils, but which is equally pleasing and instructive to himself and to them. In the first of the three foregoing examples, the distinction is shown between the principal sentences and those that are parenthetical. This is the first step in the analysis of compound sentences.

In the second example, the parenthetical sentences are all expunged; to show that the principal sentences are independent of them. It is to be observed that parenthetical sentences are merely expletives of the principal sentences; and that they bear the same relation

* The Chinese must be excluded if what is reported concerning it is true, that there is no variformation of the words to express their various functions.

to principal sentences, which expletive words bear to principal words. As such they can be taken out, or put in, without affecting, in the slightest, the correct and perfect structure of their principals.

The third example illustrates the nature of the ellipsis, which is the most difficult part of the study of languages. An ellipsis is an omission or leaving out, by an author, of some words which, he supposes, his auditors or readers understand. The supplying of these understood words is often an affair of the greatest difficulty, and has proved a formidable stumbling block to the most able translators. In this respect a marked distinction is observable, between the Greek and Latin versions of the Bible, on the one hand, and what are known, on the other, as the classical writings of Greek and Roman authors. While, in the Bible, the ellipsis is so simple as to preclude the possibility of mistaking the exact words to be supplied, its complexity is so great in Greek and Roman works, particularly the oratorical, that translators necessarily disagree at every step. With respect to the Bible, the absence of the ellipsis is the reason why the Bible is preferable, as a first book, for learning to read, in the Common School. This remark holds, not only with reference to the Greek and Latin versions, but equally with those in use in the various modern European tongues. On the other hand, as the more abstruse, because more elliptical, works of many of the Greek and Roman writers, require a familiarity with their respective styles, such works should take their place, not as lesson books, either in the Common or Grammar School, or in the College, but as the subjects of University lectures. The Grammar School and College, as intermediate institutions, should confine their teaching to the historical and prose writings which are capable of being easily mastered. In contravention, however, of this natural gradation, we have Homer and Virgil in our Grammar Schools, Homer and Virgil in our Colleges, Homer and Virgil in our Universities, and we are at this moment threatened with the introduction of Homer and Virgil to our Common Schools. No account is taken of the vast difference, for school purposes, between the easiness of a book that is comparatively free from ellipsis, and one in which the ellipsis is so complicated, and abounds to such an extent, as to baffle the scholastic skill of the most learned Professors. And the consequence is, that, for all practical purposes, our middle seminaries might as well have tried to teach the Zend-Avesta, the Maha-Bharata or the Hu-King, as have attempted the teaching of Homer's Iliad or any work of a similar kind.

The principal and parenthetical sentences, and the ellipsis, being once understood, the remaining study of language becomes easy. Though stated here, at this early stage, for the guidance of the teacher, it is not intended that pupils should begin by analysing compound

sentences. On the contrary, their first lesson must be the structure and different kinds of simple sentences.

With the blackboard, and without any text book or written rules, the teacher is first to draw two perpendicular lines; and then to point out the three places of the parts of the sentence, and the places of the conjunctions, as in the example on the first page. Next select a simple and complete sentence, on which to experiment. Take the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis:—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Look for the predicative conjunction. *Created* is the word. Place it close to the right side of the first perpendicular line, the place designed for this class of words. Then, to find the theme, ask the question—Who created? The answer is—*God*. Therefore place the word *God* in the thematic department, on a line with *created* and preceding it. Having found the theme, the next business is to find the predicate. For this purpose, ask the question—Created what? To which the answer is *the heaven*. Which place in the predicative department, on a line with *created*. The last question, on account of the *and*, has to be repeated:—Created what? Answer, *the earth*. Place this answer on the next line and immediately below *the heaven*. At the same time, putting the conjunction *and* in the sentential conjunctive column, and on a line with *the earth*. The accident has now to be found. Therefore ask the question—Created when? The answer is—in the beginning. Which place in the department of the accidents, either on the line above that of the theme, or on the line of the last predicate. The product will stand thus:—

God		In the beginning
and		the earth.

This is the natural and correct structure to which all sentences have to conform. If the answers to the questions are not appropriate, it is a proof that the structure is wrong. An example of this is perceptible in the first part of the succeeding verse:—"And the earth was without form and void." Now, it could not have been the intention of the translators to say that the earth was without form and without void, for the Hebrew and also the Septuagint and Vulgate versions are too explicit to permit such a supposition. Yet this is exactly what the passage both expresses and implies, in consequence of a wrong structure of the sentence; as the application of the rule will exemplify.

And the earth was		without form
and		void.

To be correct, the predicative conjunction *was* should be repeated, and then *void* would necessarily go in the predicate, where it was intended by the translators it should be: thus—

And the earth was		without form
and		was void.

Or, by altering the structure, the words of the text may be sufficient, without the repetition of *was*, as follows:—

And the earth was void
and without form.

After the above form has been clearly explained and understood, the teacher must next proceed to show the agreement between the theme and predicative conjunction. In the last example, the predicative conjunction *was* is singular, because its theme *the earth* is singular. If the theme had been plural the predicative conjunction would also have required to be in the plural; for the rule is, that the predicative conjunction takes the same number as the theme. The same rule holds, if, in place of one plural theme, there are two singular themes joined by a sentential conjunction. Unless, for the sake of emphasis, the two singular themes are to be expressed separately; when the predicative conjunction will require to be in the singular. The following examples will explain each of these cases:—

	The grammar	is published.	
	The grammars	are published.	
and	The grammar	} are published.	
	lexicon		
and	The grammar	is published	} also
	the lexicon		
and	The grammar	is published .	} so
		is	
	the lexicon.		

The predicative conjunction, it will be observed, takes the number of the theme in each of these examples. In the third, the two singular themes are coupled together, and are therefore equal to a plural; and, accordingly, the predicative conjunction is plural.

The predicate is not affected by the theme, unless the predicative conjunction should happen to be, simply, a word of being. When this is the case, however, the predicate invariably takes the number and form of its theme. We say, therefore, *he is a man, John is a soldier, they are men, they are soldiers*. But it would be incorrect to say *he is men, they are a soldier*. However, if the predicative conjunction is any thing else than a word of being, the predicate is then independent of all control; as, *he has apples, they have a ship, John wrote letters, the soldiers saw the Colonel*; wherein the predicate has no agreement with the theme in any way whatever.

The government of the predicate by the theme, when the predicative conjunction is a word of being, is more remarkably exemplified if the conjunction is followed by an expletive form of some other predicative conjunction. For then no other word is admissible in the predicate. The reason of this is that the theme is understood a second time, in the predicate. It is not enough, that

it is expressed in the thematic department. It is also understood again in the predicative department, bearing its genuine thematic form and character. When we say *the grammar is published*, the understood meaning is that *the grammar is a published grammar*. *The fire is burning*, in like manner means that *the fire is a burning fire*. So with *John is writing, the soldier is fighting, the ladies are dancing*, which severally denote that *John is a writing John, the soldier is a fighting soldier, the ladies are dancing ladies*.

It is customary, notwithstanding, in English, to employ the expletive form of the predicative conjunction together with the conjunctive word of being as a compound predicative conjunction; thus, *John is writing a letter, the soldier is fighting a battle, the ladies are dancing a waltz*; all of which are incorrect modes of expression. The rule for this will be given, and perceived more readily, when we come to treat of its application, in languages that change the terminations of words to indicate the parts of the sentence to which the words belong. In the meantime it may be sufficient to state, that when a principal word, in the theme, and another, in the predicate, signify two different things and require to be joined, that junction must take place, by means of a predicative conjunction, in which there is no word of being; as, *John writes a letter, the soldier fought a battle, the ladies have danced a waltz*. When, on the contrary, the two principals signify the same thing; or an active or passive state of the theme only, is to be expressed; the predicative conjunction must be one of being; as, *John is a soldier, he is a man, the apples are good, the language was ridiculous, John is writing, the ladies are dancing*.*

The variations of the predicative conjunction to express time, number, and person; and of the principal words to express number, gender, and their place in the sentence, are given in a comparative form with those of other languages. The union of the accidental and predicative conjunctions, such as *accide*, which is the source of endless errors of structure will be found treated in full on another page.

The foregoing remarks embody all that is necessary for the study of, what is called, English grammar. And, it will be observed that, as we proceed in explaining the structure of other languages, we shall have to recur, at every step, to these remarks, as they embody

* This rule has one practical exception, when the expletive form of the predicative conjunction inaugurates a parenthesis; as, in the first verse of the fifth Chapter of Matthew—" (Seeing the multitudes), however, he went away on the mountain." This exception appears to be in violation of the rule, because it is observed only with expletives of the progressive imperfect state of being. With this limitation, it is common, however, in Greek and Latin as well as in English; and the fact is here noticed, not for the purpose of admitting the exception as regular, nor to mark it as inadmissible, but in order that, when met with, it may create no embarrassment, while the reason of the exception remains unexplained.

the general rules applicable, in all other cases, as well as in English.

The above, with the variformations of the predicative conjunctions and principals, on subsequent pages, and the junction of the accidental and predicative conjunctions generally, constitutes, therefore, all that the teacher requires, to enable him to teach English thoroughly and correctly. In order to become familiar with the system, in the first place, a little practice is necessary. The best way to proceed is to take the blackboard, or a slate, and practice the form given on the first page; marking in their respective columns all the different kinds of conjunctions, and repeating this several times, till the mind becomes familiar with the mechanical division of the sentence in three parts. After this take the leading article of a newspaper, or any passage of a book and divide it, first, in principal and parenthetical sentences; and then divide each sentence, separately, putting what belongs to the theme, predicate

and accidence, in their respective columns. This is a pleasing exercise made more pleasing by the facility with which errors are detected which, otherwise and, in the absence of this ordeal, usually pass current for specimens of good English composition.

APPLICATION OF THE FORM IN OTHER LANGUAGES.

The best way to illustrate the structure of foreign languages, in order to show that the rules to which they conform are the same as those in English, will be to give different lingual versions of the same passages, such as the three first verses of the first Chapter of Genesis. And as a comparison of these will be more easily understood and appreciated, if the verses of each foreign version are accompanied by an English translation, we shall, in the following examples, give, first, a verbatim reading in English to each, and afterwards translate the Hebrew text, verbatim, in Greek, Latin, German, and English.

THE HEBREW.

<p>† אֱלֹהִים God</p> <p>וְ and</p> <p>וְהָאָרֶץ and earth the</p> <p>וְ and</p> <p>וְהַחֹשֶׁךְ and darkness</p> <p>וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים and God of breath the</p> <p>וְאֱלֹהִים And God</p> <p>אֹר light</p> <p>וְאֹר and light</p>	<p>הַשָּׁמַיִם בָּרָא created heavens the</p> <p>הָאָרֶץ earth the</p> <p>וְהָיָה וְהָיָה was desert</p> <p>וְהָיָה void</p> <p>וַיִּמְדָּה moved</p> <p>וַיֹּאמֶר says</p> <p>וַיְהִי become</p> <p>וַיְהִי becomes.</p>	<p>בְּרֵאשִׁית * beginning the In.</p> <p>אֵת את :</p> <p>בְּנֵי תְהוֹם צַל over deep the of face the</p> <p>פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם צַל over waters the of face the</p>
--	---	--

* Hebrew is read from the right towards the left of the page. In order, however, to be able to place the English equivalents directly below the Hebrew words, a modified plan has been here adopted. The following directions will be a sufficient guide. Read the conjunction of each sentential department first; and, if there are more words than one, exclusive of the conjunction, in a department, read then backwards.

† It may be necessary to state that the difficulties in the way of reading Hebrew, arising from a defective knowledge of the variformations of words in the unpunctuated text, often put it out of the power of modern Hebrew scholars to say definitely to what number, gender, person or part of a sentence a word belongs. In such cases, reference is made to the punctuated versions, and to the Septuagint and Vulgate. אֱלֹהִים is properly plural, but we have adopted the interpretation universally received; first, because it conforms with the doctrinal theology of the Hebrews; and second, because it has a singular predicative conjunction. The same guidance is, however not available in respect to either the meanings or the structure, generally, of the words in the language; and, in consequence,

the reader of Hebrew has to supply a great deal, indeed too much, that is conjectural. This cannot be said to be the fault of the language itself, that is of the unpunctuated Hebrew. But rather of the inability of modern scholars to read it, as it was read, before the invention of the Masoretic vowel points. Our system of studying language accomplishes one object, however, with respect to the Hebrew; in assigning mechanically a special department for each class of words.

‡ No translation is given of this word, because its meaning has not been satisfactorily determined. The translators of the Bible have decided that here, it is merely an index to show that the word following belongs to the predicate; and lexicographers are of the same opinion. Many of the accidental conjunctions in Greek and Latin have been consigned, in the same way, to perform secondary functions of a similar kind; most erroneously however. And guided by the analogy in both cases, we have, we think, wisely, put this word in the accidence as a conjunction, and claim for it as distinct and absolute a signification and function as for any accidental conjunction in Greek or Latin. In our humble judgment, it signifies also, and admits of repetition in the same way as בְּיָד

THE SEPTUAGINT.

	ὁ θεός	ἐποίησεν	τὸν οὐρανὸν	Ἐν	ἀρχῇ
	the God	created	the heaven	In	the beginning
καὶ			τὴν γῆν.		
and			the earth.		
	Ἡ γῆ	ἦν	ἀόρατος	ὁς	
	The earth	was	invisible	however	
καὶ			ἀκατασκεύαστος		
and			undeveloped		
καὶ	σκότος			ἐπάνω	τῆς ἀβύσσου.
and	darkness			upon	of the deep
καὶ	πνεῦμα θεοῦ	ἐπεφύετο		ἐπάνω	τοῦ ὕδατος.
and	the breath of God	became borne up		upon	of the water
καὶ	ὁ θεός	εἶπεν			
And	the God	said			
	φῶς	Ἐνηθῆτω			
	light	become borne			
καὶ	φῶς	ἐγένετο			
and	light	became borne.			

THE VULGATE.

	DEUS	CREAVIT	CÆLUM	IN	PRINCIPIO
	God	has created	the heaven	In	the first taking
ET			TERRAM		
and			the earth		
	TERRA	ERAT	INANIS	AUTEM	
	The earth	was	unformed	however	
ET			VACUA		
and			void		
ET	TENEBRÆ	ERANT		SUPER	FACIEM ABYSSI :
and	darknesses	were		over	the face of the deep
ET	SPIRITUS DEI	FEREBATUR		SUPER	AQUAS.
and	the breath of God	became borne		over	the waters
QUE	DEUS	DIXIT			
And	God	has said			
	LUX	FIAT			
	light	may become	made		
ET	LUX	EST	FACTA.		
And	light	is	made.		

LUTHER'S TRANSLATION.

	Gott	schuf	Himmel	Am	Anfang
	God	created	heaven	At	the forth taking
und			Erde.		
and			earth		
Und	die Erde	war	wüste		
and	the earth	was	waste		
nnd			leer,		
and			void		
und	es	war	finſter	auf der Tiefe ;	
and	it	was	dark	on the deep	
und	der Geiſt Gottes	ſchwæhete		auf dem Waſſer.	
and	the ghost of God	hovered		on the water	
Unb	Gott	ſprach :			
And	God	spoke			
	Liçht	werde	es.		
	light	become	it		
Und	Liçht	ward	es.		
And	light	became	it		

VEBBATIM TRANSLATIONS FROM THE HEBREW.

	אֱלֹהִים θεος DEUS Gott God	בְּרָא εποιησας CREABAT schuf created	שָׁמַיִם ουρανους CELA himmel heavens	הַ τους die the	אֶת את	בְּרֵאשִׁית Αρχη ORIGINE Stigung der In beginning the In
וְ xai ET und and			אֶרֶץ γην TERRAM Erde earth	הַ γην die the	אֶת את	
וְ xai ET und and	אֶרֶץ γην TERRA Erde die earth the	הָיְתָה η ERAT war was	רֵחָו ερημοσσην DESERTUM Wüste wilderness			
וְ xai ET und and			בְּהָרָה κενωθησα VACUUM Leer void			
וְ xai ET und and	חֹשֶׁךְ σχοτος TENEBRÆ Dinfterniß darkness				עַל επιερ SUPER über over	בְּנֵי תְּהוֹמוֹת αβυσσος του οψια τηγ ABYSSI FACIEM Tiefe der Gesicht das deep the of face the
וְ xai ET und and	אֱלֹהִים θεου DEI Gottes God of	רוּחַ πνευμα το SPIRITUS Athem der Breath the	מְרַחֶבֶת εφερε FEREBAT führte bore		עַל επιερ SUPER über over	בְּנֵי הַמַּיִם υδατων των οψια τηγ AQUARUM FACIEM Wasser der Gesicht das waters the of face the
וְ Kai ET Und And	אֱלֹהִים θεος DEUS Gott God		יֹאמֵר λεγει DICIT ſagt ſays			
			יָהִי ειναι ελθειω ESSE VENITO werde become			
	אוֹר φως LUX Licht light					
וְ xai ET und and			יָהִי ειναι ερχεται ESSE VENIT wird becomes			
	אוֹר φως LUX Licht light					

These comparisons present at one view the differences between the translations themselves, and also between them and the Hebrew text. With reference to the ability of Hebrew scholars to form a correct estimate of the comparative values of the present Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, it is not our purpose to discuss; but, assuming that the present Hebrew compendium, denuded of its Masoretic points, is an exact copy of the original Hebrew manuscript, the differences between it and the Septuagint will then have to be referred to the latter as errors of translation. Assuming this, it is easy to show that these errors have been occasioned by an erroneous method of combining words and for varying their terminations. And, farther, an important object may be attained, if we determine the extent to which variations and supposed contradictions of the text are referable, purely, to this cause.

The value of a translation consists in its exact conformity with the original. We see, however, by the foregoing comparative examples, that not two of the four translations are alike; and not one of them presents, verbally, the exact sense of the Hebrew. For example, the Spirit of God is active in Hebrew, and also in Luther's translation and in the English version; while in the Septuagint and Vulgate it is passive. This is a grave error on the part of the Septuagint and Vulgate. As an error it is referable, however, not to the intention of the translators to describe a self-existent active omnipotent being, existing in a passive state and subjected to the action of some other power; for that would be a contradiction. The error must be referred, in this, as in so many other cases of a similar kind, to a negligence or a misapprehension of the exact values of the several simple parts of compound words. As this is a part of the subject on which it is necessary to be explicit, in order to demonstrate the advantage of our mechanical form, for detecting errors of construction, we shall illustrate the defects of the old Greek and Latin writers. Our readers will perceive that the errors committed by what are called classical English scholars, in speaking and writing English, are to be met with, though more rarely, in Greek and Latin compositions. On the analysis of compound words we propose to treat fully in the third, or July number, of the *Review*. In the mean time, a few examples are required to throw light on the differences of structure in the foregoing translations.

By reference to the Septuagint translation, above, two conjunctions appear in the last sentence of the second verse. They are ἐπεφέρετο and ἐπ'άνω. The first is predicative and the other accidental. *Ἐπεφέρετο* is a compound of ἐπὶ (*on or over*), φέρ (bear), and ετο (*he, she, or it became*); signifying *it became borne over*. *Ἐπ'άνω* is likewise a compound of ἐπὶ (*on or over*), and άνω (*on or over*). Now, if we apply the form, the sentence will stand thus:—

πνεῦμα θεοῦ | ἐπεφέρετο | ἐπ'άνω τοῦ ὕδατος.
 Spirit God | of | over | borne | became | over | over of the water.
 or
 Spirit of God | became borne over | over over of the water.

This is the verbatim reading of the passage. The analysis shows three accidental conjunctions; namely, ἐπε, ἐπε, and άνω, all carrying the same meaning. On ἐπε is, however, all that is admissible; and, consequently, there are two accidental conjunctions too many. This ἐπ'άνω seems to have some affinity in the form of derivation with our compound Saxon word *upon*, and may have come from the Greek to the Saxon, like many other Greek words which are supposed to be pure and original Saxon. But the interpretation *upon* would not mend the case in any respect; for *upon* is a double accidental conjunction, and, with ἐπε, there would still be three simple accidental conjunctions. In our verbatim Greek translation, from the Hebrew, it will be seen that we dispense with two, and thereby conform with the Vulgate, and with Luther's German version, which have only one. The doubling of the accidental conjunction is by no means of rare occurrence in the older and purer languages of Europe. It is too common, however, in mixed languages, and more particularly in those which have, like the English, borrowed largely from the Latin. For the Latin words being mostly compounds, the non-observance of this circumstance has led our best English authors and the entire newspaper Press, of the present day, to commit the grave error of employing them as simples, by connecting with them English words that bear the same or partly the same significations. The errors of English compositions are to a great extent made up, therefore, of a class of tautological combinations such as we have shown in the example from the Septuagint. The following examples are a few of what abound in every page of our best writers. By applying the form, the reader will at once detect the errors. The tautologies are marked in italics.

"To examine into the several circumstances by which the language of a country may be altered, would force me to *enter into a wide field*."—*Dean Swift*.

"For this reason, we find the poets, who are always *addressing themselves to the imagination*, borrowing more of their epithets from colours, than from any other topic."—*Addison*.

"Thus any continued sound, as the music of birds, or a fall of water, awakens every moment the *mind of the beholder*, and makes him more *attentive to the several beauties of the place which lie before him*."—*Addison*.

"We are struck, we know not how, with the symmetry of anything we see, and immediately *assent to the beauty of an object*, without *inquiring into the particular causes and occasions of it*."—*Addison*.

"It gives him, indeed, a kind of property in everything he sees; and makes the most *rude uncultivated parts of nature administer to his pleasures*."—*Addison*.

"In the familiar offices of life, he scrupulously *adhered to the grave and ceremonious politeness of his country*; his respectful attention to the rich and powerful was dignified by his condescension and *affability to the poorest citizens of Mecca*."—*Gibbon*.

"Our inquiry into what is meant here will be very short."—*Bishop Atterbury*.

"Reason was given us as a rule and measure, by the help of which we were to proportion our esteem of everything according to the degrees of perfection and goodness which we find therein."—*Bishop Atterbury*.

"In the language even of rude uncultivated tribes, we can trace some attention to the grace and force of those expressions which they used, when they sought to persuade or to affect."—*Blair*.

"In this pursuit, I found almost insuperable difficulties, from the want of a dictionary for explaining many new words, which recent discoveries in the physical sciences had introduced into use."—*Noah Webster*.

"The exact number of these terms now introduced for the first time into a work of this nature, is not known."—*Noah Webster*.

"Yet in this part, embracing, as it does, the whole circle of ideas embodied in the language of a people, the utmost efforts of the lexicographer are only an approximation towards the end in view."—*Noah Webster*.

These are some examples of a kind of error which occurs profusely in the pages of all our best writers, with no exception. Other combinations of a similar kind more rare, however, among authors of repute, but common with the class of persons who write for the newspaper press, are *graphic descriptions, combine together, correct orthography, write grammatically, conspire together*.

And these, it will be observed, are occasioned in most part by joining an English with a Latin word. In many cases, the error arises from the junction of Latin and Greek; but most commonly it is the former combination that prevails. In our own practice, we confess that we have the greatest difficulty in divesting ourselves of a habit which had also taken full possession of our own style or manner of writing, and we are not certain that the errors which we point out as pervading the whole page of English literature may not be detected in what goes from our own pen, notwithstanding our precautions to avoid them.

It would be a remedy of a wrong kind, to do, as many recommend should be done with the Latin words, that is, to discontinue their use, and employ only those that are considered pure Anglo-Saxon. Because Latin and Greek make a much larger proportion of the words of the English language than most people imagine; and for that reason could not now be excluded. The proper course is for English writers to do with the Latin words of the English language, as we recommend they should do, also, with the compound words of the old Greek and Latin authors, namely, use them correctly and as compounds—not as simples. The practical fault in the English language is not the mixture of Teutonic, French, Latin, and Greek words, but the inattention of English writers and speakers, who overlook the foreign structures of those words, as well as their foreign significations. It is no excuse for writing bad Greek or bad Latin, to hold up, as a precedent, the practice of ancient authors; neither will it justify the duplication of accidental conjunctions of the same signification in English, to refer to a similar practice in other languages. What is right or wrong is so by virtue of reason and natural adaptation,

independently of the accidents of custom and usage. The cause of truth and the interests of science equally require that we should regard the past, and the things of the past, as subservient to the wants of the future; and in this spirit it becomes us to deal with them; selecting what is worthy of imitation, and rejecting what is proved to be contrary to the general principle of a natural and express law.

One example, from a class book, within reach of every one who may read what we now write, will explain farther the nature and erroneousness of the practice on which we have been commenting. Anthon's edition of Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic War has a paraphrase of the first book appended, in Greek. The second chapter contains the following passage in both languages. The double accidental conjunctions, signifying the same thing, we put within parentheses, to mark them out:—

"UNA EX PARTE FLUMINE RHENO, LATISSIMO ATQUE ALTISSIMO, QUI AGRUM HELVETIUM (A) GERMANIS (B) VIDIT. * * * TERTIA, LACU LEMANNO, ET FLUMINE RHODANO, QUI PROVINCIAM NOSTRAM (AB) HELVETIIS (D) VIDIT."

"ἡ μὲν τῶν Ρῆνου εἰσροῦσά τε καὶ βαθυτάτη ὄρει, τῆρ δ' Ἑλβετικῆν (ἀπὸ) τῶν Γερμανῶν (ἀπὸ) ἐξέμωσται * * * τῆ δε, τῆ τε Λεμάνου λίμνῃ καὶ τῆ Ροδῶνα ποταμῶ αὐτῶς (ἀπὸ) τῆς τῶν Ρωμαίων ἐπαρχίας (δία) χωρίζονται"

The worst of the above, is the first part of the Greek; where, in one sentence, ἀπὸ is prefixed to ἐξέμωσται, in the predicative department, and appears again in the accidence. Now, if boys are taught to read Latin and Greek in this way, without having these errors pointed out to them, is it not natural that they will carry a habit, so acquired, into their English compositions; and write and speak English in accordance with what they consider classical models; notwithstanding they are all the while writing and speaking bad English, in consequence of having learned to read and write bad Greek and bad Latin?

Next to the mechanical form which we have laid down, for testing the structure of sentences, is the importance of exact equivalents in the words of different languages. This has not been attained, because it has not hitherto been attempted. It is, however, practicable, as may be seen by our verbatim translations of the three first verses of the first chapter of Genesis. *Ακαταστάσιμος* (undeveloped), in the second verse, is a fine specimen of this. It is a compound of *α* (un), *κατα* (de), and *ακαταστάσιμος* (developed). The greatest embarrassment met with in trying to learn a foreign language is the number of significations tacked to each word; all different significations, varying so much as to be in direct antagonism. Lexicographers and grammarians have frequently referred to the inconsistencies contained in books, which are intended for guides to the student. Amidst the confusion, attending the learning of Latin, success has been partially attainable by sheer dint of long and laborious practice;

directed more to mark out the exceptions, than to become acquainted with any definite set of rules. Indeed, so much was Claude Lancelot, the author of the "Port Royal Latin Grammar," impressed with the inutility of trying to learn Latin by rules, that he sanctions and recommends, for the guidance of students, the maxim of Ramus—*Few precepts and a great deal of practice.*

VARIFORMATIONS OF THE PRODICATIVE CONJUNCTION.

In the variformations of this conjunction for the purpose of expressing person, number, and time, we adopt exact equivalents for the words and parts of words of each language; thus $\epsilon\lambda\omega$ AM + O love + I; $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omega$ AM + AT + loves + he; and so through all the changes. The root or radical letters of each word, being definite and unchangeable, it is the termination, the changeable part, that requires particular attention. The root forms one component, and the termination another, in every simple word. When the word is a compound, there are then two roots, which do not admit of change, and one termination; making, together, three component parts. A little attention, so as to become familiar with the division of words in roots and terminations—as distinct parts, having determinate equivalents in other languages, and transferable mechanically in accordance with fixed rules—is all that is required to enable any one to master, practically, the variformations, of the predicative conjunction, and also of the principals and expletives.

Our arrangement of the imperfect and perfect states of the action, possession, or being, it will be observed, presents a new phase, and is better adapted to impress the memory with the real distinction between them. So also with the interpretation of the passive, by the word *become*; denoting action going on and approaching completion. The active and passive of the theme, in the state of action, are thereby properly distinguished; and these, again, are perfectly distinct from the active and passive of the theme, in the state of being; thus, AMO (I love), AMOR (I become loved), AMATUS SUM (I am loved). By reference to English interpretations of the Latin passive of the action, it will be seen, that AMOR is always made equivalent to AMATUS SUM; for AMOR is translated *I am loved*, and AMATUS SUM is translated, also, *I am loved*. Thus, no distinction is made between the passive of the action and the passive of the state of being. Whereas, in Latin, the distinction is a most important one. And the observance of this distinction is of no less importance, in English; for,

in this particular, our translations represent the Greek and Latin writers of antiquity as perpetually violating one of the most positive and clearly defined rules of general language.

A practice still more objectionable has within the last ten years gradually crept into use, with reference to the passive of the action. AMOR is interpreted *I am being loved*. This practice is, however, almost exclusively confined to the newspaper press. It has scarcely yet reached the aristocratic portion of the literary public; which is so far satisfactory. The analysis of AMOR is AM (love or loved), and OR (I become); equivalent to *I become loved*. *I am being loved*, on the other hand, contains three equivalents, all of which have the same signification. AM—is a word of being, b—is a word of being, and *ing* (the Greek ω and Latin *ro*) is a word of being. Which is, certainly, a tautological superfluity. But irrespective of this, the interpretation *am being loved* expresses no more than would be expressed by the two words *am loved*. And in either case all that is expressed is a passive state of the theme. What is intended to be expressed, however, is a coming or bearing or progressing to completion of an action; in which the theme is passive, is the sufferer, and is acted on. *I become loved*, signifies *I come to be loved*. *The loved state is coming to be*. It is approaching; it has not yet arrived; it is not yet perfected.

The Greek, Latin and German, have regular modes of expressing, on the one hand, the passive condition of the theme during an action, and, on the other, its active condition during an action; with reference in both cases to the action itself. While they have another and distinct mode of signifying, simply, the existence of the theme, in an active or passive state; with reference, exclusively, to the state of existence, irrespective of the action. This is one of the finest features in these languages; and contrasts favorably with the defectiveness of the English and also the French, which have to employ the state of being in a double capacity, to express two functions that are by their natures perfectly distinct. This will be seen in the following forms of variation.*

* The Greek has one regular and three contracted forms, and the Latin four regular terms. These, with the exception, of the irregulars, vary so very little, and their differences are so trifling and so immaterial, that the points of difference, and other minor considerations, are reserved until the learner be able to construct sentences easily, when they will be explained and be more easy of comprehension. The chief object, in the mean time is to familiarize the learner with the similarity of structure of the different languages, so as to create a lively perception, that there is but one set of rules to which they conform. This perception being considered by us a primary condition of success in all lingual studies.

PRESENT TIME.

ACTIVE.		PASSIVE.	
IMPERFECT.	PERFECT.	IMPERFECT.	
φιλιω	πεφιληχα	φιλιουμαι	
εις	ηκας	ει	
ει	ηκας	ειται	
οουμεν	ηκαμεν	οιμεθα	
ειτε	ηκατε	εισθε	
οοσι	ηκασι	οιονται	
AM O	AM AVI	AM OR	
AS	AVISTI	ARIS	
AT	AVIT	ATUR	
AMUS	AVIMUS	AMUR	
ATIS	AVISTIS	AMINI	
ANT	AVERUNT	ANTUR	
lieb e ich*	ge lieb't habe ich	ge lieb't werde ich	
st du	t hast du	t wirst du	
t er	t hat er	t wird er	
en wir	t haben wir	t werden wir	
et ihr	t habet ihr	t werdet ihr	
en sie	t haben sie	t werden sie	
lov e I	lov'ed have I	lov'ed become I	
est thou	ed hast thou	ed becomest thou	
es he	ed has he	ed becomes he	
e we	ed have we	ed become we	
ie you	ed have you	ed become you	
e they	ed have they	ed become they	

PAST TIME.

εφιλιουν, ησα	επεφιληχεν	εφιλιουμεν
εις, ησας	ηκαεις	οι
ει, ησε	ηκαεις	ειται
οουμεν, ησαμεν	ηκαμεν	οιμεθα
ειτε, ησατε	ηκατε	εισθε
οου, ησαν	ηκασαν	οιονται
AM ABAM *	AM AVERAM	AM ABAR
ABAS	AVERAS	ABARIS
ABAT	AVERAT	ABATUR
ABAMUS	AVERAMUS	ABAMUR
ABATIS	AVERATIS	ABAMINI
ABANT	AVERANT	ABANTUR
lieb'te ich	ge lieb't hatte ich	ge lieb't wurde ich
test du	t hattest du	t wurdest du
te er	t hatte er	t wurde er
ten wir	t hatten wir	t wurden wir
tet ihr	t hattet ihr	t wurdet ihr
ten sie	t hatten sie	t wurden sie
lov'ed I	lov'ed had I	lov'ed became I
edst thou	ed hadst thou	ed becomest thou
ed he	ed had he	ed became he
ed we	ed had we	ed became we
ed you	ed had you	ed became you
ed they	ed had they	ed became they

FIRST FUTURE.

φιλησω	φιλησομαι
ησει	ησει
ησει	ησειται
ησωμεν	ησωμεθα
ησατε	ησασθε
ησωσι	ησωσονται

* To be read backwards.

FIRST FUTURE—Continued.

ACTIVE.		PASSIVE.	
IMPERFECT.	PERFECT.	IMPERFECT.	
AM ABO	AM AVERO	AM ABOR	
ABIS	AVERIS	ABERIS	
ABIT	AVERIT	ABITUR	
ABIMUS	AVERIMUS	ABIMUR	
ABITIS	AVERITIS	ABIMINI	
ABUNT	AVERINT	ABUNTUR	
lieb, en werde ich	ge'lieb't haben werde ich	ge'lieb't werden werde ich	
wirßt du	wirßt du	wirßt du	
wird er	wird er	wird er	
werden wir	werden wir	werden wir	
werdet ihr	werdet ihr	werdet ihr	
werden sie	werden sie	werden sie	
lov'e will I	lov'ed have will I	lov'ed become will I	
wilt thou	wilt thou	wilt thou	
will he	will he	will he	
will we	will we	will we	
will you	will you	will you	
will they	will they	will they	

SECOND FUTURE.

ελ,ω	πε,ελ,ω	ελ,ωμαι
ης	ηη	η
η	η	η,σας
ωμεις	ωμεις	ωμειςθα
ης	ης	ησας
ωσιν	ωσιν	ωσινται
AM EM	AM AVERIM	AM ER
ES	AVERIS	ERIS OF ERE
ET	AVERIT	ETUR
EMUS	AVERIMUS	EMUR
ETIS	AVERITIS	EMINI
ENT	AVERINT	ENTUR
lieb'e ich	ge'lieb't habe ich	ge'lieb't werde ich
est du	habest du	werdest du
e er	habe er	werde er
en wir	haben wir	werden wir
et ihr	habet ihr	werdet ihr
en sie	haben sie	werden sie
lov'je may I	lov'ed have may I	lov'ed become may I
mayst thou	mayst thou	mayst thou
may he	may he	may he
may we	may we	may we
may you	may you	may you
may they	may they	may they

CONDITIONAL.

ελ,ησω		ελ,εσθω
ησης		εσθης
ησῃ		εσθῃ
ησωμεις		εσθωμεις
ησῃς		εσθῃς
ησωσιν		εσθωσιν
AM AREM	AM AVISSEN	AM ARER
ARES	AVISSES	ARERIS OF ARERE
ARET	AVISSET	ARETUR
AREMUS	AVISSEMUS	AREMUR
ARETIS	AVISSETIS	AREMINI
ARENT	AVISSENT	ARENTUR

CONDITIONAL.—Continued.

ACTIVE.		PASSIVE.	
IMPERFECT.	PERFECT.	IMPERFECT.	
lieb, etc	ge'liebst hätte ich	ge'liebst würde ich	
ledest	hättest du	würdest du	
ete	hätte er	würde er	
eten	hätten wir	würden wir	
etet	hättet ihr	würdet ihr	
eten	hätten sie	würden sie	
lov'e might I	lov'ed have might I	lov'ed become might I	
mightest thou	mightest thou	mightest thou	
might he	might he	might he	
might we	might we	might we	
might you	might you	might you	
might they	might they	might they	

IMPERATIVE.

φιλέει	φιλόσθ
είπε	είσθω
είπε	είσθε
είπωσαν	είσθωσαν
AM A OF ATO	AM ARE OF ATOR
ATO	ATOR
ATE OF ATOTE	AMINI
ANTO	ANTOR
lieb e	ge'lieb't werde
et	werdet
thou lov e	lov'ed thou become
ye	ye become

COMPOUND OF THE ACTIVE PRODICATIVE CONJUNCTION.

φιλέειν, —σαι	φιλέεισθαι, —θηναι, —τηναι
AM ARE	AM ARI
lieb en	ge'lieb't werden
lov e to	lov'ed become to

EXPLETIVE FORMS OF THE PRODICATIVE CONJUNCTION.

PROGRESSIVE.

ACTIVE.			PASSIVE.		
IMPERFECT.	PERFECT.		IMPERFECT.	PERFECT.	
M. F. N.	M. F. N.		M. F. N.	M. F. N.	
φιλόων,	φιλόων, οία, ος		φιλόόμενος,	πε φιλόουμένος, η, ον	
οἶσα,			οἶμενη,		
οἶν			οἶμενον		
OR			OR		
φιλήσας,	φιλήσας		φιλήσεις	ATA,	ATUM
ησασα,	ησασα		OR εις, ησθα,		
ησαν	ησαν		ησειν		
AM ANS			ge'lieb't		
lieb end			lov'ed		
lov'ing					

PROSPECTIVE.

φιλήσων, ησούσα, ησον	φιλήσθησόμενος, ησθησόμενη, ησθησόμενον	πε φιλήσθησόμενος, η, ον
AM ATURUS, ATURA, ATURUM	AM ANDUS, ANDA, ANDUM	
lov e to about	lov'ed become to about	

These expletive forms of the predicative conjunction, their terminations *to* mark their place in the sentence, it might be supposed, should be classed under the head of expletives. But as expletives which, like those of the predicative conjunction, vary their forms in accordance with the rule for principals, they require, therefore, no separate formal classification; and, this being the case, it is considered the best arrangement to place the expletive forms of the conjunctions after the conjunctions themselves, as we have done. It will be observed that, besides gender and number, and the variformation of their terminations *to* mark their place in the sentence, they have got what no other expletives have, namely, a progressive and prospective signification, with respect to the actual state of being of the theme; and for this reason they take the predicative conjunction of being, either expressed or understood. *A loving husband*, construed in other words, is *a husband who is loving*. *The abandoned fortress* means *the fortress which was abandoned*. In like manner—EXERCITUS SEQUENS HOSTEM PUGNAT SAGITTIS (the army following the enemy fought

with arrows) is equivalent to EXERCITUS QUI ERAT SEQUENS HOSTEM PUGNAT SAGITTIS (the army which was following the enemy fought with arrows). The predicative conjunction of being, which appears in each of these cases, immediately preceding the expletive, if not expressed is invariably understood. The lessons on this part of the study of language should, therefore, always

connect these two classes of words, so as to impress the mind of the learner with their necessary relationship; a consideration that recommends this as the proper place to show the variformations of the conjunctive word of being, which, being irregular in all its changes, requires a separate illustration:—

PRONOMINAL CONJUNCTION OF BEING.
PRESENT TIME.

IMPERFECT.
εἰμί
εἶς, εἶ
ἔσσι, υ
ἔσμεν,
ἔστε
εἰσίν, υ

PERFECT.

IMPERFECT.
οἶμαι
ἦ
εἶπα
ἰμέθα
εἶπα
οἶμαι

SUM
ES
EST
SUMUS
ESTIS
SUNT

FUI
FUISTI
FUIT
FUIMUS
FUISTIS
FUERUNT

bin ich
bist du
ist er
sind wir
seyd ihr
sind sie

gewesen habe ich
hast du
hat er
haben wir
habet ihr
haben sie

werde ich
wirst du
wird er
werden wir
werdet ihr
werden sie

am I
art thou
is he
are we
are you
are they

been have I
hast thou
has he
have we
have you
have they

become I
becomest thou
becomes he
become we
become you
become they

PAST TIME.

ἦν
ἦς
ἦ, ἦν
ἦμεν,
ἦτε, ἦτε
ἦσαν

FUERAM
AS
AT
AMUS
ATIS
ANT

ERAM
ERAS
ERAT
ERAMUS
ERATIS
ERANT

war ich
warst du
war er
waren wir
waret ihr
waren sie

gewesen hatte ich
hattest du
hatte er
hatten wir
hattet ihr
hatten sie

wurde or ward ich
wurdest or wardst du
wurde or ward er
wurden wir
wurdet ihr
wurden sie

was I
wast thou
was he
were we
were you
were they

been have I
hast thou
has he
have we
have you
have they

became I
becamest thou
became he
became we
became you
became they

FIRST FUTURE TIME.

IMPERFECT.	IMPERFECT.	IMPERFECT.
ἔσομαι		
ἔσῃ		
ἔσεται		
ἔσόμεθα		
ἔσεσθε		
ἔσονται		
ERO	FUERO	
ERIS	IS	
ERIT	IT	
ERIMUS	IMUS	
ERITIS	ITIS	
ERINT	INT	
werde ich	gewesen (haben) werde ich	werden werde ich
wirst du	wirst du	wirst du
wird er	wird er	wird er
werden wir	werden wir	werden wir
werdet ihr	werdet ihr	werdet ihr
werden sie	werden sie	werden sie
become I	have been to become I	become to become I
becomest thou	becomest thou	becomest thou
becomes he	becomes he	becomes he
become we	become we	become we
become you	become you	become you
become they	become they	become they

SECOND FUTURE TIME.

ᾶ		
ᾶς		
ᾶ		
ᾶμεν		
ᾶτε		
ᾶσι, υ		
SIM	FUERIM	
SIS	IS	
SIT	IT	
SIMUS	IMUS	
SITIS	ITIS	
SINT	INT	
sey ich	gewesen (haben) sey ich	geworden sey ich
seyst du	seyst du	seyst du
sey er	sey er	sey er
seyen wir	seyen wir	seyen wir
seyet ihr	seyet ihr	seyet ihr
seyen sie	seyen sie	seyen sie
be may I	been have (to be) may I	become (be) may I
mayst thou	mayst thou	mayst thou
may he	may he	may he
may we	may we	may we
may you	may you	may you
may they	may they	may they

CONDITIONAL.

ω	
ης	
η	
ωμεν	
ητε	
ωσι, υ	
ESSEM	FUESSEM
ESSES	ES
ESSET	ET
ESSEMUS	EMUS
ESSETIS	ETIS
ESSENT	ENT

CONDITIONAL—Continued.

wäre ich	gewesen (haben)	wäre ich	geworden	wäre ich
wärest du		wärest du		wärest du
wäre er		wäre er		wäre er
wären wir		wären wir		wären wir
wäret ihr		wäret ihr		wäret ihr
wären sie		wären sie		wären sie
be might I	been have (to be)	might I	become (be)	might I
mightest thou		mightest thou		mightest thou
might he		might he		might he
might we		might we		might we
might you		might you		might you
might they		might they		might they

IMPERATIVE.

ἴσθι, εἶπυ
ἔστω
ἔστω
ἔστωσαν, ἔστωγ

ES
ESTO
ESTE
SUNTO

du Sei
ihr seid
thou be
you be

COMPOUND CONJUNCTIVE FORM.

εἶναι
ESSE
ἔσιν
be to

EXPLETIVE FORMS.

PROGRESSIVE.

ὄν, ὄνσα, ὄν
ἔσινδ
being

PROSPECTIVE.

ἐσόμενος, ἐσόμενη, ἐσόμενον
FUTURUS, FUTURA, FUTURUM
be to about

A curious analogy is observable in the variformations of this conjunction. It is common to the predicative conjunctions, in general, but is more regularly marked and, therefore, more readily discernible in that of being. It discloses, moreover, some hitherto unperceived irregularities in our English structure.

Ἰθ̄ werde (*I become* or *I come to be*) denotes future being approaching; and, consequently, it is called the future time active.

The future time active, it seems, is formed by the

present time passive. The German future, active, and also the present passive is *ich werde* (*I become*). This employment of the same word to express, apparently two different circumstances of the theme, might be regarded, at first sight, as a defect. A little reflection will show, however, that this is, by no means, the case. For with reference to *being*, exclusively, the theme is actually passive in the active future. *I become* or *I come to be*, notwithstanding that *come* in its secondary sense denotes action, does not imply that the theme is instrumental in bringing about the future being. It signifies, merely, the present being of the theme with reference to another state of its being which is future; or *vice versa*, the future being with reference to the present. While, therefore, the active instrumentality of the theme is not, understood, its future is clearly expressed. On the other hand, in *being* going on, wherein the theme is passive, its future is a completion of that being; and, therefore, *I become* is a bearing to completion of that progressive being which precedes the second or future being indicated in the two periods of time.

In this respect the Greek, Latin and German have the advantage, over the English, that they employ a word to express the future which conveys no other meaning than that of being. They do not say *ἰθ̄ω* (*I will*), *voLo* (*I will*), *Ἰθ̄ will* (*I will*). We say, on the contrary, *I will* and *I shall*, to express future time. Both the expressions are nevertheless in the present time. *I will* is synonymous with *I wish*, *I desire*, *I feel disposed*, *I am inclined*, *I have a propensity*; which are all in the present time. Therefore, in English, the present time active is employed to express the future active. We have no expectation of ever witnessing a change in this part of the English language, because the innovation would be too marked, and less convenient with respect to easiness of expression. But, with respect to the passive, the necessity of a change is imperative, and can be accomplished without occasioning any violence to the present usage; for it is just as harmonious, to our customary mode of speaking, to say *I become* or *I become loved*, as to say *I am* or *I am loved*; with this advantage, that we should be expressing ourselves in accordance with general analogy.

The analogy is born out, in the *οπαί* of the present passive and active future of the Greek; in the *οκ* present passive and *ΕΡΟ* active future of the Latin; in the *werde* present passive and active future of the German; and, as we have noted, in the *become*, present passive and active future of the English. This analogy is, still farther, discernible, in the *ομ* of the Greek passive; in the *κ* of the Latin passive; and, in the *werde* and *become*, in the passive, of both the German and English, through all the variformations; showing most satisfactorily that our present method of expressing the passive and the active future is opposed to the general rule of other languages. In the above tables of variformations, it will be seen, that we have adopted, both in the future active and all the changes of the passive, the correct method. It is not intended, by this, to recommend its adoption in the active future, though the recommendation is proper in regard to the passive. Our object is chiefly to explain what is in unison with general analogy and what is not. And, notwithstanding, the introduc-

tion of the analogical method of expressing the active future may not be practicable, the duty of a teacher is certainly to point out what is correct in theory, at the same time that custom may compel him to drill his pupils conformably with a wrong practice.

VARIFORMATIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL.

The changes in the terminations of the principals are to show the parts of the sentence in which the principal words are to be placed. If a principal has a thematic termination, it belongs to the theme; if predicative, to the predicate; and if accidental, to the accident. But if the termination is expletive, it then accompanies some other principal, as an expletive, in either of these departments, whether that principal is expressed or understood, in the same way that all other expletives do.

There are, with the exception of a few irregulars, six forms of variation, distinguished by their expletive terminations. And each form has generally a masculine, feminine, and neuter gender. They are the following:

I.—ABSOLUTE.

M.		I.		N.	
SINGULAR.	PLURAL	SINGULAR.	PLURAL	SINGULAR	PLURAL
		<i>σοφία—ιαί</i>	<i>σοφία—ιας</i>		
		—ιας	—ίων		
		—ια	—ιας		
		<i>γῆ—ῆν</i>	<i>γαί—ας</i>		
		—ῆς	—ών		
		—ῆ	—ας		
POETA—AM	POETAE—AS	VIA—AM	VIAE—AS		
—AE	—ARUM	—AE	—ARUM		
—A	—IS	—A	—IS		
<i>ωρεῖ</i> — i	<i>ωρεῖ</i> —			<i>βαρ</i> —	<i>βαρε</i> —
—εδ	—ε			—εδ	—ε
—ε	—εν			—ε	—εν
<i>θεός</i> — ὁ	<i>θεοί</i> — ὄντες			<i>ξίλον</i> —	<i>ξίλα</i> —
—ος	—ων			—ον	—ων
—α	—όντες			—α	—ας
DOMINUS—UM	DOMINI—OS			REGNUM —	REGNA —
—I	—ORUM			—I	—ORUM
—O	—IS			—O	—IS
<i>ἡσυχίαν</i> — ἔα	<i>ἡσυχίας</i> — ἑας	<i>παῖς</i> — ὄν	<i>παῖδες</i> — ὄντες	<i>σῶμα</i> —	<i>σώματα</i> —
—έον	—έων	—όν	—όντων	—ον	—ων
—ί	—έσι	—όν	—σι	—ον	—σι
REX—REGEM	REGES—	ACTIO—NEM	ACTIONES—	CAPUT —	CAPITA—
REGIS	REGUM	—NIS	—NUM	—ITIS	—ITUM
REGE	REGIBUS	—NE	—NIBUS	—ITE	—ITIBUS
<i>λεῖβ</i> —	<i>λεῖβ</i> —			<i>ἄψιδ</i> —	<i>ἄψιδες</i> —
—εδ	—ε			—εδ	—ε
—ε	—εν			—ε	—εν
king —	kings —	lady —	ladies —	head —	heads —
king's	of kings	lady's	of ladies	of the head	of the heads
by the king	by the kings	by the lady	by the ladies	by the head	by the heads

* The Absolute is here distinguished from the Personal: making three classes of Principals.
 † This dash denotes that the predicate is the same as the theme.

IV.

SINGULAR.	PLURAL.	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.	SINGULAR.	PLURAL.
CURRUS—UM	CURRUS—				
—US	—UUM				
—U	—IBUS				
engel—	—			madchen—	—
—s	—			—s	—
—	—n			—	—

V.

RES—EM	RES—ES
—EI	—ERUM
—E	—EBUS

VI.

herr—n	herrn—
—n	—n
—n	—n

II.—PERSONAL.

MASCULINE, FEMININE & NEUTER.

ἐγώ—ἐμέ, μέ	ἡμεῖς—ἡμέας, ἡμᾶς
ἐγώ, ἐμοῦ, μου	ἡμέων, ἡμῶν
ἐμοί, μοι	ἡμῖν
EGO—ME	NOS—NOS
MEI	NOSTRUM, TRI
MIHI, ME	NOBIS
ich—mich	wir—uns
meinrr	unſer
nir	uns
I—me	we—us
of me	of us
to me	to us

MASCULINE, FEMININE & NECTER.

σὺ—σέ	ὑμεῖς—ὑμέας, ὑμᾶς
σέο, σοῦ	ὑμέων, ὑμῶν
σοί	ὑμῖν
TU—TE	VOS—VOS
TUI	VESTRUM, TRI
TIBI, TE	VOBIS
du—dich	ibr—euch
deiner	euer
dir	euch
thou—thee	you—you
of thee	of you
to thee	to you

MASCULINE.

FEMININE.

NEUTER.

αὐτός—αὐτό	αὐτοί—αὐτοί	αὐτή—αὐτή	αὐταί—αὐταί	αὐτό—αὐτό	αὐτά—αὐτά
—οῦ	—ῶν	—ῆς	—ῶν	—οῦ	—ῶν
—α	—οῖς	—ῆ	—αῖς	—α	—αῖς
ILLE—UM	ILLI—OS	ILLA—AM	ILLAE—AS	ILLUD—	ILLA—
—IUS	—ORUM	—AE	—ARUM	—IUS	—ORUM
—I, O	—IS	—A	—IS	—I, O	—IS
IS—EUM	II—EOS	EA—EAM	EAE—EAS	ID—	EA—
EJUS	EORUM	FJUS	EARUM	EJUS	EORUM
EI, EO	IIS, EIS	EI, EA	IIS, EIS	EI, EO	IIS, EIS
er—ihn	ſie—	ſie—	ſie—	es—	ſie—
ſeiner	ihrer	ihrer	ihrer	ſeiner	ibrer
ihm	ihnen	ihr	ihnen	ihm	ihnen
he—him	they—them	she—her	they—them	it—	they—them
of him	of them	of her	of them	of it	of them
to him	to them	to her	to them	to it	to them

III.—PARENTHETICAL.

ὅς—ὅν	οἷ—οἷς	ἧ—ἧν	αῖ—αῖς	ὅ—	ᾧ—
οῦ	ῶν	ῆς	ῶν	οῦ	ῶν
α	οῖς	ῆ	αῖς	α	οῖς
QUIS, QUI—QUEM.	QUI—QUOS	QUAE—QUAM	QUAE—QUAS	QUOD, QUID	QUAE—
CUJUS	QUORUM	CUJUS	CUARUM	CUJUS	QUORUM
CUI, QUO	QUEIS, QUIBUS	CUI, QUA	QUEIS, QUIBUS	CUI, QUO	QUEIS, QUIBUS
welcher—en	welche—	welche—	welche—	welches—	welche—
—es	—er	—er	—er	—es	—er
—em	—en	—er	—en	—em	—en
who, which—whom.	who, which—whom.	who, which—whom.	who, which—whom.	which—	which—
of whom	of whom	of whom	of whom	of which	of which
to whom	to whom	to whom	to whom	to which	to which

The above forms comprehend the rules of construction for four languages. There are many words which conform to no rule, in the varying of their terminations; and in such case they must be employed conformably with general usage. They are, however, comparatively few; and ought not to encumber the pages of a book of instruction: for they distract the attention of the learner, who always regards them as formidable obstacles. The first and second forms for absolute principals govern the great bulk of Latin and Greek principals and expletives; for the latter generally make their changes in the same way as their principals. And, in the German, the same remark holds; the principal forms being those which govern the changes of most German words. In the applications yet to be made of these forms, it will be found that they are sufficient for all the purposes which a Greek, or Latin, or German reader of the Bible requires they should serve.

The analogies which appear, by comparing several languages, is the most instructive part of their study. And for this reason the student should direct his attention first, with a view of marking the points of resemblance. When this is undertaken with any degree of care and earnestness, a wonderful chain of connection is discovered pervading the whole human language; which chain of connection is the scientific and scholastic argument that corroborates, irrefutably, the truth of the Mosaic account of the genealogy of the human race. The mind becomes expanded, when it perceives that all the pure and most of the mixed and corrupted languages follow one rule, in giving their principal and expletive words a thematic, predicative, and accidental termination. They give no more and no fewer. The analogy is perfect. How this has been accomplished, is a question that naturally arises. Is it by descent? Is there a common stock, a parental stem, that has impressed, with its original features and likeness, the diversified languages of the world? Or is it a natural consequence of the similarity of constitution, desires, and necessities of the human mind, and the similarity of its relations with external circumstances? These are questions that have occurred, have been discussed, and have been satisfactorily settled. They will occur again to the student, who sees, for the first time, that there is a common resemblance in the principal and constitutional features of the languages of different countries and different quarters of the globe, such as is discernible among the various races of human beings that live on its surface. And he will be able to dispose of them by the nature of the evidence to which the enquiry necessarily leads. Of this evidence, not the least important is the pedigree of words and the component parts of words; another disclosure that demonstrates a relationship by signification, in the radical components of words from the Hebrew and the languages of Western Asia, but more particularly the Sanscrit, through the European, African, American, and other Asiatic tongues.

The analogies of different languages should precede invariably, as a study, the rules or structure of any one in particular, for the reason that all instruction and all scientific researches should begin with the general or universal, and end with the details. In teaching history and geography, the most effective method is to begin with its outlines. In anatomy, the same; and so throughout the whole field of science, the inception of the general should take precedence of the particular. A boy who enters the Latin class, will receive a more lively and permanent impression of the similarity of the thematic and predicative form of principals in the neuter gender, if he is told that the resemblance holds as a general rule in other languages, than if at his Latin lesson he is taught that such is the case, with special reference to the Latin. Indeed, one of the most erroneous and unprofitable features of general school instruction is that by which all acts of generalisation are rigidly excluded. In history, boys are taught that they should read and know the history of their own country first; and this is only one example of what is generally followed in other branches. Domestic history is, of course, a necessary branch of education; but, as one department of general history, it should be taught as a separate compartment of a whole, or as a filling up of part of the outline of a general system. In some schools, again, the walls cannot be seen for pictures of animals and objects of natural history; as if a matter of primary importance to teach these things, lest the children might not be able to distinguish between a horse and a cow, and might thence show an ignorance of "common things" indigenous to their own country, and with which they ought to be familiar. But what is the result of thus feeding the young mind with slops, and habituating the individual to look no further than his own narrow sphere of action? It makes narrow-minded men of business; politicians with a few common-place ideas; religious people, charged to the brim with intolerance and bigotry; and, in short, afflicts society with a mentally stunted and dwarfed body of members, who are incapable of advancing one step beyond the customary routine in which they have been trained.

A habit of generalisation cannot begin too early; and no means are more available than those afforded by the analogy of languages. There is a way by which strong food can be served to the young mind, so as to render it agreeable. That way is the desideratum. It is an easy way. It is the one we recommend; namely, that the teacher, with our method well digested in his head, in place of a contradictory class-book in his hand and a key to the same in his pocket, should stand before his pupils, as a dignified and intellectual person, to communicate extemporaneously, from the resources of his own mind those general first principles which lie at the basis of all sound knowledge, and which constitute the key to the correct exercise of the reasoning faculties. The analogies are easily taught; and besides the endless resources

which they supply to the teacher, in furnishing him, at one view, with a command over the whole structure of human language, they may be made a most agreeable and entertaining exercise to young persons. In the first place, then, we recommend those who are desirous of becoming thoroughly acquainted with our system, not to neglect the analogies, for they are the connecting links of the general languages of the world. They are fully stated in the preceding forms.

SYNTHESIS.

We come now to the most interesting and the most agreeable part of the subject; that of putting words together, to make sentences. It is our business now to give practical illustrations of the foregoing forms and rules, in the work of composition. This constitutes the test of the whole system. At this stage it is necessary to observe, that the manner of putting together is mechanical. The three columns on the blackboard may be viewed as a sort of machine or contrivance, for throwing words into, for the purpose of their taking a certain arrangement, determined by the form and number of compartments in the machine. Keeping in mind these divisions, as thematic, predicative, and accidental; and also the place of the conjunctions in each, we shall now proceed to show how the machine is to be worked.

Take any simple sentiment; the simpler the better at first; as *God loves the people*. The predicative conjunction here is *loves*. Write it in the proper place on the black board or slate, as on the first page. By referring to the form for the predicative conjunctions, it will be seen that *loves* is the singular number and third person. Look now in the English and Latin dictionary* for the Latin of the same signification. AMARE (to love) we find belongs to the ARE predicative form. By referring to the third person singular in the Latin predicative conjunctive form of ARE for the equivalent of *loves*, we find it is AMAT. Place it below *loves*. Having done this, and in order to find the theme, ask the question, Who loves? The answer is *God*; which place in the thematic department, preceding and on a line with *loves*. Look in the dictionary for its Latin representative. DEUS is the word, the expletive termination of which is changed, as I instead of us; that is, the word becomes DEI in place of DEUS. Refer to the forms of principals, for the one which has its expletive termination in I. The second, it will be seen, is the one. Its thematic singular form is DEUS, which place directly below the English word *God*, and pre-

ceding the Latin predicative conjunction AMAT. The theme and predicative conjunction being found, examine their agreement before proceeding farther. See that they agree in number and have the same personal form; for the rule is, they must agree in number and person. Being satisfied on these points, proceed to the second question—*loves whom?* The answer is, *the people*; which, by virtue of this question and answer, belongs to the predicative department, and consequently is to be placed there, on a line with *loves* and immediately following it. Look again in the dictionary for the Latin representative of *people*. It is POPULUS; whose expletive termination is I. By referring to the forms of principals, the second one is that to which POPULUS belongs. Is it singular or plural? It is singular. Take, then, the predicative form, singular, which is POPULUM, and place it directly below *the people*, and immediately after AMAT. The Latin sentence is now complete. Its structure, DEUS AMAT POPULUM, is in conformity with a few simple but positive rules, which admit of no variation.

Let us now change the places of the principals of the theme and predicate, and instead of saying *God loves the people*, we say *the people becomes loved by God*. In the first case, the theme, *God*, being active, takes an active predicative conjunction. In the second, the theme *people* is passive; and therefore the predicative conjunction must be passive; while the former theme *God* is now transferred to the accidental department. *The people becomes loved by God* is a sentence which expresses its passive predicative conjunction in English and German, by two words, in place of *by one*, as in Greek and Latin. In this respect, as in many others to which we shall have to refer, in the proper time and place, there is a distinction between the analogies of the languages of Northern and Southern Europe. Here, *becomes loved*, by reference to the predicative conjunctive form is the third person singular of the passive. It is represented in the corresponding Latin form by AMATUR. The Latin theme of *people*, found in the Latin form, is POPULUS. These take their places as in the first example. But we have now no predicate; for, by putting the question—*becomes loved whom or what?* there is no predicative reply. We, therefore, go on to find the accident by the question—*becomes loved by whom?* The answer is, *by God*. Place this answer in the accidental column, close to the left side and in a line with *becomes loved*. Look for its accidental equivalent in the Latin form, singular. It is DEO; which place directly below *by God*. The sentence is again complete. We have translated *The people becomes loved by God*, to Latin, by POPULUS AMATUR DEO.

* The dictionaries in common use may be available. What is wanted, however, and the want can be easily supplied, is a card or list of roots, with their general significations, excluding all significations that are particular and idiomatic. A card of roots for each language, and a general card of forms of variation for all languages, is all that is required by the pupils. The teacher must supply the rest by extemporaneous instruction, a duty made easy by the large resources which this system furnishes. The less the cards are used, however, the better.

In these two examples, the theme appears, in the first, as active, and in the second as passive. They both take a predicative conjunction of action, however. But they may also take a conjunction of being; which has a separate and distinct form. The limited use of the state of

the action, on the one hand, and of the state of being, on the other; and consequently the distinction between the predicative conjunction of action and of being, is expressly marked and uniformly observed in both Latin and Greek; and analogically should be equally so in English. We have already remarked on the informal practice, in English, of expressing the passive of the action by a conjunction of being. An example of the rule in Latin will show why the state of being should not be made synonymous with a state of action. Let us vary the first of the foregoing sentences so as simply to express being; as, *God is loved*. The sentence, if implemented with what is understood, will then be—*God is a loved God*. In the same way as we say, *God is good*, meaning and implying that *God is a good God*. *Loved*, being an expletive, has the same function, and, in languages that vary their terminations to express their accidents, is varied in the same manner and by the same rules, as other expletives. The Latin, therefore, does not permit a passive predicative conjunction to do the work of an expletive. It has a form for the state of being, that is reserved exclusively for that state. By referring to the expletives of the predicative conjunctions, in the foregoing forms, it will be seen that the expletive passive and progressive, of *loved is amatus*; and that *God is loved* is expressed in Latin by *DEUS EST AMATUS*.* *God is loving*, in the same manner by *DEUS EST AMANS*.

The three states of the theme; the active, and passive, with reference to the action; and the state of being, without reference to the action, are as follows:—*DEUS AMAT* (God loves); *DEUS AMATUR* (God becomes loved); *DEUS EST AMATUS* (God is loved). Each of the two first has a theme and predicative conjunction. The last has a theme, a predicative conjunction and an expletive.

By the same process of translation, the Greek, German, French, or any other language may be substituted for the Latin. Or several languages may be translated simultaneously in the manner of our translations of the three first verses of the first chapter of Genesis. In all cases the structure of the sentences cannot fail to come out of the machine correct. It is, in fact, not possible to err. Such expressions as “adhere to,” “introduce into,” “the government are,” “is being built,” when passed through this ordeal are shown to be erroneous; and nothing is admitted which is not strictly in harmony with the analogical rules of general language.

We will not tire the patience of our readers with additional examples of translation at this time, as this article has reached a sufficient length to meet the tastes of the class of persons likely to benefit themselves most

in the first instance, by our remarks. It was not our original intention to present the whole of the forms and disclose so much of the system in one number of the *Review*; because, it was feared, the explanatory comments would not receive that justice which could best be rendered by having sufficient scope to say all that might be absolutely necessary on each separate head. On farther reflection, however, and at the request of some teachers, we have been induced to present the whole in a condensed shape, so that it may be at once made available, and its merits may be set forth, so as to afford facilities to those who have taken an interest, in the subject, to express a dispassionate judgment concerning it.

What we have given is not to be considered as a perfected compendium. The foregoing has been digested, hurriedly, and extended within the space of a few days, while the compositor has been waiting for copy. It is, therefore, to be taken as a rough draught and the basis of a work to be afterwards completed. In the mean time, we shall be thankful for suggestions from any friends who take an interest in the subject, and who may feel disposed to forward the object we have in view.

In our next number, additional illustrations of the application of the forms will be given, including specimens of continuous translation from the New Testament; and under a separate head we shall explain the analogies of languages with respect to the letters of the alphabet and their sounds; how the roots of all words, or the radical parts which carry the signification, consist of two or three consonants; and therefore, how these roots, being the roots not of the words of one but of many languages, should form exclusively the particles or syllables that children first learn when they begin to put letters together.

Evenings with the Romanists:—With an Introductory Chapter on the Moral Results of the Romish System. By the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, M.A.—*With Introductory Notice.* By Stephen H. Tyng, D.D.—New York, 1856.

This is an American edition of a late English work, which has attracted a considerable share of popularity. It appears among us at a time when public feeling is excited to a very high pitch on the subject of which it treats; and, therefore, it is the more interesting. The object of the author is to present the various phases of Romanism, so as to show that it opposes less efficient checks to crime and immorality than the Church of England; and thence, as a sequence, that the introduction and encouragement of convents, nunneries and similar institutions, by the English people, is unadvisable and would be highly impolitic. As a member of the Church of England and officiating in its ministry, we might expect that he would look on Romanism from a Church of England point of view. Such is not, however, the case. There is a liberality and dispassionateness pervading every page that contrast favorably with any other publication on the same subject; and exhibit the author as a Christian of the right stamp, possessed of no bigotry and no intolerance towards his fellow creatures who differ with himself in matters of

* By general analogy, when the predicative conjunction is one of being the predicate takes the thematic termination, as in this case. Also, when the theme and predicate signify the same thing, and the conjunction is active, it is optional what termination the predicate should have. It may be either thematic or predicative.

faith. It is a pleasure, amidst the spurious Christianity of our day, and the practical denial of its behests to turn to such a noble specimen of what should really form a standard example for those who, dignified by their position in the church, take an active participation in the great questions of Church rights and religious propagandism.

To those who agree with us, that reason is a more powerful weapon than violence, and that gentleness and a love of fair play reach the heart more readily than presumption and personal vulgarity, it will be evident, the cause of truth would have gained more, or, at least, would have suffered less, had the contest, on both sides of the Atlantic, during the last few years, touching Romanism, been characterised by some share of the truly Christian spirit which is displayed in every page of the book on which we are now commenting. The Reverend M. Hobart Seymour, a true Protestant and zealous Protestant missionary, details in a familiar and simple style the various incidents attending his labours in Ireland. At one time he is present at the performance of the ancient ceremony of what is called Canting a Corpse; explains all the circumstances attending it, and the impressions produced on his own mind by the spectacle. At another he is in earnest but friendly discussion with a young Roman Catholic teacher, on the respective merits of Protestant and Romish tenets. Next he accepts a challenge from a Roman Catholic priest to dispute the meaning of the phrase "Holy Catholic Church." Numerous incidents are thus related of his intercourse with parishioners and others, opposed to him in religious belief, at different times and places; and throughout the whole narrative the most genuine cordiality is represented as having subsisted between himself and those with whom he had occasion to exchange opposite arguments. His labours were consequently attended with a considerable share of success; and indeed so much was this the case that his conversation and company were solicited by individuals, families and coteries belonging to the Roman Catholic persuasion. No unfriendly disagreements seem to have marred the course of his missionary labours, and with respect to himself, personally, as an individual agent, employed in a good cause and a holy mission, he derived pleasure from the performance of duties which harass others, similarly engaged, with annoyance and disquiet.

A comparison of these circumstances, with the agitation created in England about two years ago, and the state of public feeling among ourselves at the present time, goes a great way to prove that both there and here the most effectual means have been unintentionally used to increase the power and influence of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. A better illustration of this fact may perhaps be furnished by a comparison of the different kinds of reception given by the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland, to Mr. Seymour who carried the olive branch, and to the one hundred clerical firebrands who entered Ireland as invaders and conquerors, determined to violate and trample down the traditionary relics of a simple and generous hearted people. The one was a welcome guest at the Roman Catholic hearth, wherever he went. The others were pelted and rejected as religious mountebanks; and defeated on all sides, were at last, forced to relinquish their unrighteous campaign. Now that persecution by the civil power has been repudiated, and equality of religious rights has been acknowledged, violence can no longer accomplish the work which, under a former state of circumstances it was capable of doing. Those, therefore, who thin^d to put

down their religious opponents by popular agitation, and industriously prosecute that means to attain their object, may justly be regarded as the best friends of Romanism and the active promoters of its extension. They do not, in fact, consider the different class of circumstances under which they are acting. They keep before their minds the stake and pillory of former times; and forget or do not take into account, that there is now a middle class of liberal minded people, belonging to different communions, which holds the scales of justice, and which acts as a barrier against the aggressive pretensions of other classes professing extreme or dominant views. The violence of former times was not checked by reason. There was no control over popular fanaticism; no means of palliating the strong and overbearing passions of those who sought to make converts by the rack and gibbet. But the days of religious persecution by the civil power are past and gone for ever from British territory, and people ought to learn to disabuse their minds of old prejudices and to look on the condition of society now as completely altered.

It is admitted by the press of Canada that the influence of the Church of Rome is on the increase. If so, to what cause are we to impute that result? Is it because of conversions, or immigration, or legislative measures? Certainly not. Neither of these is the primary and real cause. It must be sought, as in England, in the sympathy created, among the intelligent and liberal portions of all classes, to protect the persecuted from oppression. It must be sought, in that noble sentiment, exercised by every one whose moral sense is not blunted by interest or perverted motives, which protects the weak against the strong. For a practical illustration of this fact let us take two cases and compare them. The result will show that conciliation and reason and charity make friends; whereas, persecution raises up a host of enemies in the camp of the persecutors, hostile to themselves. The first is that of the Reverend Mr. Armour, whose rule of action, told by himself, and whose conciliatory practice, as a Protestant missionary, insured him a welcome reception among the Roman Catholic peasantry of Ireland. It is as follows:

"It must not for a moment be supposed that I charge the Church of Rome with avowedly countenancing vice or immorality. She does neither the one nor the other, and I know of few things I would deprecate more distinctly, than being thought to give currency to such an accusation. The charge which I do bring against her is totally different from this. It is, that whereas all religions, whether true or false, Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, Pagan, and all Churches whether Roman, Greek or Protestant, imposes certain restraints, more or less strong on vice or immorality, and offer some principles more or less efficacious to protect against temptation; those restraints and those principles which the Church of Rome offers are weaker than those of other Churches. I do not charge her with countenancing vice, but I do charge her with placing weaker restraints upon temptation. I do not accuse her with encouraging immorality, but I do accuse her of advancing weaker principles, as a protector in the time of temptation."

"In all conversations with true hearted and earnest members of the Church of Rome, it is of importance to avoid a tone or spirit of controversy—not avoiding the discussion of essential differences, but discussing them, as far as possible, in a non-controversial manner. We too often seek for some point in dispute—seize it with avidity, and in a pugnacious spirit we proceed to argue which is right and which is wrong. The tendency of this is to alienate rather than unite men. It would be infinitely better in every way, and far more successful, if we sought rather some point on which we are sure to be in accord—to commence the conversation, not on points on which we are at issue, and which would at once awaken a spirit of resistance, but on principles that are common to both Churches. This

process leads to a kindlier tone, and a more free and frank expression of the inner feelings. It tends to establish confidence, and when once this is established, there will be little difficulty in laying down some broad principles on which any arguments may afterwards be based. A wise controversialist will always use such admitted principle—such acknowledged truth as the right arm of his after discussion."

Here, in the first place, there is no insulting charge preferred against the Church of Rome. She errs, but not intentionally. No wrong motives are imputed. What errors there are, have grown with time and are confirmed by a long usage; and, therefore, are less the result, perhaps, of choice than of an established system that cannot easily be remodelled. The recommendation that follows, as to the method to be adopted in conversation, so as to avoid giving offence, is certainly, when observed, the surest way to gain access to the mind of any one, if it is desired to do so for the purpose of eradicating what may be conceived to be, its unorthodox opinions or faith. In his own experience Mr. Seymour was successful. He tells us that he was listened to particularly, and that he never wanted for Roman Catholic hearers.

Compare this with the proceedings of a knot of individuals in Toronto and elsewhere, known by the name of the Protestant Alliance; and with the proceedings of public meetings, attended by Protestants, in various sections of the Province. We might select one specimen of the language made use of on these occasions, as much and as often by clergymen as by others; but in doing so we would be particularizing what has a general character and belongs more properly to the common tenor of what are called Protestant demonstrations. But everybody has seen the infamous placards repeatedly pasted on the streets and public thoroughfares. Every body has read the anti-papery appeals in certain Protestant journals. And no one can be ignorant of the nature of the inflammatory harangues, and the low epithets and personal insults wantonly and deliberately and repeatedly directed, not only against Romanism and its particular tenets but, against the Roman Catholics of Canada as a body and against the more prominent functionaries of the Roman Catholic Church of this Province. What is the consequence of this inconsiderate and mad proceeding. First, the Protestants become divided. One portion sympathizing and siding with the Roman Catholics, because the case is considered as one of persecution. Another portion becomes indifferent because the Protestant warfare is considered to spring from political party motives. So that the Protestant Alliance and the auxiliary Protestant agencies which remain to do the Protestant fighting, really dwindle down to a small fraction; greater in name than in any power it has to accomplish a Protestant object. But in the mean time, and it is a circumstance which requires to be well considered, the adherents of the Church of Rome, for purposes of defence, organize themselves so as to be united. Formerly they mixed and participated in the business of the Province, without reference to religious distinctions; and were to be seen at the hustings voting disinterestedly, and uninfluenced by any religious bias. Then, again, a sense of injury nerves the injured to seek and get redress. This is a natural effect, which has its origin in a natural law by which all men are equally impelled. The adherents of the Church of Rome have therefore, now an organization for defence, which they had not before, and would not have dreamed of having; and are possessed, consequently of a power which, with the existing divisions in the Protestant ranks, they will be

able to retain, despite the clamor of the small but unscrupulous faction which has been the occasion of producing this result.

The real enemies of Protestantism in this Province are those who make the greatest show of their Protestantism. In England, after creating a vast amount of sympathy, followed by a numerous list of distinguished conversions, the agitation has subsided. In Canada also the present excitement will soon come to an end. The effervescence will work itself off by a natural process. But remember the consequence. There will remain what had no existence before; a Roman Catholic phalanx; for which we shall be indebted to the spurious Protestantism of the parties who have either from mistaken or personal motives been instrumental in upholding what is called the Protestant Alliance, as well as to those who have aided by direct means to give it an indirect support.

Irrespective however of the question, as one of Romanism or Protestantism, there is another consideration which it would be wrong to overlook. We refer to the necessity of the Roman Catholic Church as a balancing power in the party politics of the North American continent, as well as of Canada. The tendency among us, with our large measure of freedom, is to run to extremes, and by the ascendancy of successive factions to tyrannize over each other. The only safeguard against such a state of society is the opposition not of small and evanescent, but of large, permanent and unchangeable sectional interests, headed by powerful and talented men who have a defined and settled policy by which they act. The greatest tyrants, and the most dangerous public men are those who trade on the popular agitation they are able to create in their own favor. Liberty can never be secure where the sectional interests are not large enough, and well balanced sufficiently to keep in their proper subordinate sphere this class of political speculators. The constitutional safeguards of our Canadian liberties at this moment are the religious organizations. But even here there is a lack of discipline; the bad consequences of which are every day visible. For example, the adherents of the Church of England do not act in concert; those of the Church of Scotland are as disunited; and the Orange Societies are divided in two sections. The Roman Catholics have assumed a position, which it would become the other bodies here named to imitate.

The principle here assumed is a balance of power among the large sections. The dominancy of any particular one can scarcely ever take place in this country. But security against the preponderance of one is not sufficient. There should be a proper balance, so that while the liberty we enjoy shall be free from unnecessary restraint, on the one hand, it may also be protected on the other, against licentiousness. The great danger is not the curtailment of freedom so much as its abuse. The men who form the heads of departments, in a government, should be such as have had a large intercourse with the world; and by travel or otherwise, have seen the workings of governments in other countries. They should have a character for political and commercial discernment. And if possible they should be persons of wealth and position in society. Such men are more likely to be sent to the Legislature by large sectional communities. They do not make much noise, they do not speak unless the business before them requires it; and they are less likely to change their political creed with every change of the popular breath. They are, however, practical; and, being the representatives of sections of the people whose political and religious sen-

timents are publicly known, cannot easily assume a false position. And, in this particular, the country has a guarantee, from the first, regarding their public character, their probable course of action on all public measures, and the kind of policy to be expected from their administration.

The member of the House of Assembly or Executive Council, who is known to have the confidence of the Church of England, of the Church of Scotland, of the Church of Rome, of any large section of the Methodist or other persuasion, or of the Orange Societies as a united body, is generally a more efficient director of the practical business of the country and a more reliable guardian of its liberties, than one, whose constituents being themselves divided and without any common bond of union, can possibly be. Viewing the question of representation in this light; by no means a new one; it becomes a consideration of the greatest importance, in thus carrying on the government of the country, chiefly through the antagonism of large sectional interests, that those interests should be as much as possible equally balanced. As in the balance of power in Europe, there is a continual tendency for the balance to adjust itself; by the weaker combining, at all times, from motives of individual safety, to oppose the stronger. The same tendency will, no doubt, be found operating, to a certain extent among ourselves. But its influence is much weaker, owing to the large measure of republican feeling, and the continual and powerful efforts to destroy sectional distinctions. No one is ignorant of the fact that there is a power at work in Canada to level all distinctions of sects, and, aided by the example and close proximity of the States, to foster the establishment of a spirit of communism that would proscribe and extirpate the antagonistic principle by which alone true liberty can exist. No one is ignorant that this power is at work in our school system; that it constitutes the spirit and genius of the system; and that the youthful mind of Canada is imbibing the poison which is in future to destroy this essential principle of true freedom, namely, the antagonism of large sections of the community.

To those not acquainted with German writings, and who are of course ignorant of the antagonistic philosophy of Gorres and his associates, our remarks may be unintelligible; but the Germans have fully elaborated, and that most satisfactorily and conclusively, the Greek doctrine of Heraclitus, that all harmony comes out of the concurrence of opposite tendencies. Heraclitus "reproached Homer for his wish that the quarrels of men and gods might cease for ever; for in that case all would go to decay." We have a Canadian school of philosophers, however, who have not borrowed wisdom from the past, whose classical reading does not comprehend the philosophemes of either Greece or Germany, but is limited to what comes from the more convenient and less distant classical region of Boston. Against this school, and this school only, Canadian freedom is to be guarded. If we have no wish to be eventually swallowed up by the United States, we ought to prevent the insidious contamination of the minds of our youth, and check the spirit and the active power by which such a catastrophe can be produced. A sufficient barrier against the designs of this school is necessary, to protect the antagonistic principle of government on which our Canadian liberties are based. Now what are the barriers, and to what extent do they at present exist? Is the organisation of the Church of England or that of

any other denomination or denominations sufficient? Or is that of the Orange Societies, the right arm of British power in British North America, sufficient? Or are all these combined, able to present a sufficient opposition to the growing propensity to republicanize the institutions of Canada? We think not. We may be wrong in our opinion. But our conviction is that the existing barriers, being stationary; whereas the republican influence is progressive and increasing, some additional barrier is required to preserve and insure prospectively the balance of power between monarchy and democracy—between permanence and progression.

The toleration of Roman Catholic claims, becomes with us, as with many others, therefore, a question, not of religion, but of policy and expediency. We have no liking for the Roman Catholic faith, any more than others who belong to and profess the Protestant religion; but we entertain a strong desire to live under and to enjoy the blessings of a limited monarchy, and also to see this form of government perpetuated in North America. Between the religious question and the question of expediency, we, therefore, look on the latter as the one entitled to most concern; and consider the Roman Catholic Church in Canada as an essential co-operating barrier; in short, to express ourselves metaphorically, a great breakwater against the communism of the United States; and consequently against that portion of it which has been transplanted here, and is in active growth and cultivation in this Province.

Those who have discernment to fathom the mystery of the English conversions from the Church of England to the Roman Catholic Church, consequent on the recent agitation in England may be able to trace it chiefly to this cause. And notwithstanding, we cannot say that similar conversions have followed the excitement which has taken place within our own borders, it is no less true that a persecuting spirit and religious crusade, carried on to proscribe Romanism because it is supposed to be hostile to communism, has a tendency to awaken moderate and sensible men to the danger of being devoured eventually by a revolutionary hydra which respects neither intelligence, scruples of conscience nor the venerable relics of former times. If moderate Protestants find themselves placed between two dangers; between communism on the one hand, and Romanism on the other, they have to make a choice of the least of two evils. And if they decide that the least of these two evils is to concede the claims of the Roman Catholics, they alone are to blame who necessitate the choice, and who, by inflammatory appeals and unscrupulous acts of intolerance, are the cause, thereby, of creating claims that otherwise would never have existed, and consequently never could have been made.

Religion in Common Life:—A Sermon preached by the Reverend John Caird, M.A., and published by command of Her Majesty.

The tendency, in England, of late, to enhance the value of a knowledge of common things, suggested, no doubt, the popular reception of a discourse under the above heading. But, appropriate as the title is to the times, it is more particularly so in regard to the formal and fashionable aspect which religious observances have assumed. Mr. Caird, though not possessed of high attainments, as a scholar, is a popular preacher, a zealous apostle and an active functionary in the ministrations of

the Church of Scotland. His location in the neighborhood of the residence, in Scotland, of Her Majesty, and the extension of the royal patronage to this sermon, have conferred on him a national distinction and a measure of fame, which may be considered the highest honorary reward that a minister, circumstanced, as he is, might desire to possess. The judgment exercised by Her Majesty, also, in selecting, for approval, a discourse, pregnant with a species of moral and religious instruction, so well adapted to check or at least shame the nation from the continuance of a national vice, indicates a right religious sentiment, at the same time that it commands our unqualified admiration. But notwithstanding these gratifying circumstances, we have felt somewhat disappointed in our expectations of the length to which Mr. Caird might with propriety have carried his argument and illustrations. The then is well fitted to draw out much that is practical in the shape of examples. Why these are not given, and why the argument has not been fully elaborated may be accounted for by the nature of the occasion, the dignity of the audience and a desire to avoid what might be construed to carry invidious allusions. Still there is something wanting to give a character of completeness to the treatment of the subject. In the hands of Dr. Guthrie the same reservation would not have been so scrupulously observed; and scarcely do we think that, even under the same circumstances, he could have kept free from noticing the particular phrases by which formalism in religion is particularly distinguished.

What the French would call the idea of the subject is a popular one. Nothing can be more pleasing to the mind of an individual or of a nation than the reflection that the heart is in the right place, that the disposition and the latent convictions are all sound; notwithstanding, the practice is not what it should be, and external causes have perverted the external aspect of what is known and felt to be the genuine and instinctive attribute of true religion. The inclination which one feels to act rightly is the divine part of human nature. Of this we are all inwardly sensitive. We seldom mistake the path of abstract moral duty; for the power or faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong is part of our moral nature, implanted by the Creator for our moral guidance. In respect then to the relations of society, and the duties of each member therein, the obligations of the higher law are perfectly well understood when considered purely with reference to our inward consciousness of its supremacy as a rule of conduct. Nor are these obligations lost sight of amidst the busy avocations of the world. They are admitted; and equally in the church and in the family are held up as the standard and source of all moral authority. How then, with this lively perception of what is right, and this complete consciousness of the rule of duty, does it so happen that in practical life the relations between man and man are so conducted as to ignore all presumption of the knowledge even of the higher law?—How is it that men singly and in concert act in a thousand different ways and play and execute the most immoral devices, for the purpose of overreaching each other? Mr. Caird does not ask the question how it is so. He does not probe into the cause, for the purpose of knowing the origin of the disease or the circumstances that foster its continuance, thereby to qualify himself to discover and pronounce the proper remedy. He does not even portray its various features, to check no particular sore, and advances nothing which could have the

most distant tendency to raise a blush on the cheek of a self-conscious sinner. He contents himself with simply noticing the fact that in common life, in the bustle and business of the world, the sanctions of the higher law are completely ignored. But this was all known before; known to its fullest extent, and traced out in all its possible ramifications. A Parliamentary Committee had just announced that, with the exception of salt and refined sugar, every article of commerce, capable of adulteration, from the bread which constitutes the food of the working classes, to the drugs which are administered to the sick, is adulterated and rendered unwholesome. That this general practice, which unlettered and vulgar people call cheating, but which in the language of commerce is known as the secret of trade, is not exclusively confined to the large factors or dealers, but pervades the whole of business down to even the smallest retail traders who sell pies made of horse flesh, who put vitriol in gin and copperas in beer and porter, and sell a second time, for genuine, the tea leaves which had already gone the process of infusion. The commercial character of merely professional religion had its exemplification every day and every hour, not in isolated departments only of the national life, but was to be seen operating and influencing the national life itself, as an entirety. The developments in the case of Strahan, Paul and Bates had been considered as only what are common, too common, and having their various scales of gradation. But the religious and secular consistency of the nation, as a unit, might be questioned with reference to its acts of legislation, and still more with regard to its spontaneous impulses. And in these latter respects the nation itself had been impeached, by its act of war, of repealing the decalogue. The contrast between the higher sanction and the carnal contact with the world was, thus, vividly present to the public mind; and had been so by the very nature of its daily and hourly manifestations. No announcement that such was the case could, therefore, deepen an impression already perfect nor add a new view to what was already comprehended in the amplitude of the visible facts.

Mr. Caird's sermon has a value, however, independent of these considerations; and the circumstance that it was delivered in presence of the Queen and published by command of Her Majesty gives it a significance, in a national point of view, which it could not otherwise possess. The national mind is directed, by it, to Her Majesty's desire to signify to the nation the propriety of looking at the contrast between true and artificial religion, full in the face. And if the sermon contains nothing remarkable, nothing that may not be found in the ordinary run of public discourses, or may be considered deficient, with respect to the full elaboration of its subject; it has a significance in having its prominent idea specially and publicly indorsed by the Royal pleasure. It is too much the custom to blink the facts of conventional morality; and the delicacy evinced in meddling with the commonest vices of a systematic nature which have their source and being in the daily routine of the commercial circle, clearly show that there is an overbearing commercial influence, which obstructs the path of the religious instructor and holds the moral guardian in abeyance. The best proof of this is the tenor of what appear, as exhortations to religion and morality. They are generalities wholly and exclusively. Specialties are shunned, as dangerous materials to touch or even to look at. To kill, to steal, to lie, to wrong each other, is clearly reprobated in so far as the remarks

can be limited, in their application, to any and every part of the human race, without distinction of time or country; but the customary habits of business men, the enactments of the civil law, and conventional quirks and loop holes, by virtue of which people in business legally over-reach each other, are shut out as completely as if they formed no part of the chart of immorality, or were beyond the jurisdiction of the constituted guardians of national virtue. Yet by looking at the whole case, in the only way that it ought to be looked at, as a succession of causes and effects; the latter dependent for their existence on the former; it is evident that what is wrong, what is vicious, what constitutes in common life the antithesis of true religion, has its beginning and its whole cause in the special conventionalities of commerce.

This brings us to another question, how far civilisation, which is the immediate and legitimate product of a commercial state of society, is capable, under the continuance of the operation of the influences which produced it, of being transformed, so as to be made to harmonize with the mandates of religion. This may be considered carrying the argument too far. But there is no stopping half way if the intention, to discover the final issue, is sincere. It may be very convenient, under the all pervading influence of personal considerations, to declaim against vice and, at the same time, carefully refrain from defining in what it consists, what are its specific causes and what its more intimate symptoms and visible forms of existence. This, as we have remarked, is too much the custom; and hence the blinking of the real question and the consequent virtual tolerance of the acknowledged evil.

Is immorality the attendant on civilization? Is an educated, refined and cultivated state of society the most vicious? Are the commercial avocations of a large city inimical to virtue? These are plain questions that do not start in every mind, because many would think them preposterous. There are those whose highest conception of a perfect state of social existence, consists in railways and steam boats and the manufacturing capabilities of steam, combined with the shrewdness of character invariable from the congregation of masses of human beings within narrow limits. It would be preposterous, indeed, to attempt to reason with persons of this way of thinking. And we have no hope that the most stubborn facts could ever be made to operate, where opinions have been imbibed without examination and are held as infallible and not to be questioned, because they suit the tastes and professional habits of those who entertain them. The questions here put, however, involve one of the greatest social problems of our time. They are capable of being answered, not alone by a summary of arguments, but also by the realities as they are visible in the actual world.

A comparison of the relative characteristics of an agricultural and commercial population affords the most accessible and satisfactory test of the moral and religious excellence of two relative states of social life. The best evidence which we have met with is stated in the work of the Rev. M. Hobart Seymour, which we have just criticised, entitled "Evenings with the Romanists." In comparing the official returns of crime in different countries for the purposes of proving that it is greater in Roman Catholic than in Protestant countries, he makes the following statement which attests a truth often before propounded by capable and intelligent travellers.

"In carrying out, therefore, our present enquiry, it would be a waste of time to examine, even if it were practicable, either the bogs of Roman Catholic Ireland or the Highlands of Protestant Scotland—the valleys of the Roman Catholic Appennines, or the heights of the Protestant Alps. These are regions too remote from those most seductive temptations which test the power of religious principles, and in such regions the populations of all countries are very much on an equality. I shall, therefore, confine myself to the scenes of wealth, and power, and commerce, and manufactures, and population—to the dense and crowded towns and cities, where temptation unvail all her allurements and seductions, and where religious principle is most sorely and severely tried."

Again with reference to Italy, he remarks as follows:

"In the rural districts, in the village homes, in the lonely valleys, and remote districts, the simple peasantry, are as pure and virtuous as any in Europe. They are removed far away from the haunts of temptation. But in the cities and towns of Italy, where temptation exists, and where vigilance is necessarily relaxed, we find the results the same as in other Roman Catholic countries."

If then, the irreligion of common life is confined to towns and cities, it is but reasonable to seek in them for special causes not supposed to exist elsewhere. And, moreover, having discovered what they are and in what they consist, it should be the responsible duty of the religious guardian to make them known. We are, however, supposing that no direct and formidable obstacles exist to prevent the fearless performance of such duty, and that religious morality is above secular morals. In practice this is not the case. Commercial considerations and commercial influences enter every avenue, and control every movement that takes place, within the precincts of a city. To probe, therefore, the real evil, to reveal publicly the place where it is seated, and to call for its removal could not be undertaken with impunity; for, however alive the busy world is to the supremacy of the divine law, as an abstraction, there are civil laws and conventional canons which push it aside and practically ignore its authority; and woe be to the moral instructor who would have the courage or the hardihood to challenge their propriety, or even to question their consequences.

The time is not yet come when vice must be sought out and attacked in its special conventional forms. We mean by this, not the personal, but the systematic. Those forms which are admitted to be in contravention of divine precepts, but which are assumed to be justified in the case of individuals, on the plea that they are admitted by the civil law and are tolerated by society. No martyr has yet risen to proclaim the cessation of the compromise between religion and commerce. The compounding, as Mr. Caird describes it, for their separate shares of the nation's time and thought, is operative, deeply and permanently, throughout the whole social system; and its fruits are, as stated, a total separation and an entire exclusion of the religion from business of the world.

The Upper Schools:—A Lecture, by Professor Blackie, 1856.

The consequences, visible in Scotland, of a wrong division of the educational curriculum, has given occasion to Professor Blackie of the Edinburgh University, to put forth some pertinent remarks, which bear so directly on what is passing among ourselves, that we consider them deserving of our particular notice. We have already remarked on the absurdity of having Homer and Virgil in the Grammar School, and Common School,

as they are now in Upper Canada, by order of the Government; in the latter through its Common School officials. This sort of jumble has produced in Scotland a mediocrity of national talent. There, the poorer classes have been drilled in Homer and Virgil; the commercial classes have been drilled in Homer and Virgil; the better educated and professional classes have been drilled in Homer and Virgil; and the results are a general mediocrity of talent and an absence of proficiency. What Professor Blackie calls "Presbyterian parity," to which he imputes the whole evil, is a tendency to level everything down to mediocrity. And, no doubt, as the Presbyterian form of Church government is founded on a republican basis, it cannot fail to have this effect, if the tendency is not guarded against and checked by influential scholars of more enlarged mind, who believe that in schools and among scholars, as well as in society, there are distinctions of rank which require to be observed and maintained.

In Scotland, as here, the University is not regarded, so much, a place to learn something that could not be acquired in the lower schools, as to pass through a formal course of study for the purpose of procuring some fictitious badge of merit that will be servicable to its possessor afterwards, in a commercial point of view. Professor Blackie most judiciously recommends that a boy should enter his eighth year before he is sent to school. Then, after passing through the intermediate schools, he should be nineteen years of age on his entrance to the university. If a university is what it ought to be, an institution of lectureships, and not an upper Common school, it is evident that below the age of nineteen, a youth would not be capable of appreciating lectures that evince the niceties of literary discrimination and deep research; and would require all the previous years, between eight and nineteen, to fit him for entering a university so constituted. After recommending strongly, nineteen, as the proper university age, he goes on to show the consequences of offering too great facilities to, what he calls, jumping from the lowest to the highest schools. As this bears directly on our present government system, we give the words of the learned Professor:—

"Yet such was the only age at which the youth were fit to come—the only age at which the Professors could really be of use to them. Those who either came themselves, or were sent by their foolish parents sooner, came for the most part, from motives of vanity. It sounds well to be able to say they are at college. And thus at was that solid learning and lasting accomplishments, are sacrificed to mere show. At the present time this was done to a very extraordinary extent. Even the Divinity students, who might be supposed to be under sacred obligations to acquaint themselves with the original tongues of the Scriptures, were, in many instances, he had been told by Dr. Robert Lee, unable to read with any thing like ease or fluency the Greek New Testament, by no means a difficult book, while, in Hebrew, their lips were almost utterly uncircumcised. Now this is a state of things which ought not to be permitted; there should be no tolerance of parties who could not be allowed to pass through some of the upper schools, which we have in the city, being permitted to pass through our universities and divinity halls. There is not a youth in Dr. Hodgson's seventh class but could do better than this. There must be some check to so sudden jumping from the lowest to the highest learning, or rather, he should say, to the position which should only be reached through the possession of that learning."

Connected with this subject, intimately, is the institution of scholarships. And on this, as on almost every thing else our Government has done, in a scholastic way, it has blundered. It is well known that success, in carrying away scholarships, is dependent on precocity and

a retentive memory; mere accidents of constitutional temperament; for the possession of which the Government acts wrongly when it offers a premium. For, not only is there no personal merit in having a precocious intellect; because it is an indication of disease; but it is a recorded fact in the school registers of the world, that early fostering of the minds of youth has produced invariably puny and sickly mental capacities, in mature age.

We think that, without an exception, the expressed opinion of those who have been looked up to in modern times, as best capable of giving the result of their experience, favor the nurturing of the body in its healthy development, in early life, as the point of paramount importance. And it is not to be supposed that this is accomplished when the youth attains his eighth year. The development of the body goes on to the age of twenty-five. Professor Blackie is particular in recommending the correspondence that should be observed between the different stages during the progress from boyhood to manhood, and those studies that are appropriate to each stage. Indeed too much force cannot be placed on the necessity of this correspondence, when it is considered that the body and the mind mutually affect each other, and that a strong and vigorous mind requires for its support a healthy and muscular body. The debility observable by the absence of muscular structure among a large portion of the population of large cities has been imputed, by some of our most popular writers, to the neglect in early life of what they call "physical education;" and the too early and continuous appliance of scholastic regimen. It is not a question, now, whether the intellect or that which nourishes it should receive the largest amount of parental or tutorial attention. Scientific research has decided the nature of the relationship which subsists between the two, and what Professor Blackie calls for is the observance of the conditions, by means of which their natural and normal existence can best be established and preserved.

Is it not then evident that any stimulus imparted to a delicate and sensitive mind, perhaps occupying a weakly and predisposed sickly state of body, must have a direct tendency to produce those very consequences, which so many able writers have depicted, as attending an imperfect knowledge, by practical educationists, of the normal relationships—of the two component parts of the human being, the intellectual and the corporeal. But, to be satisfied of the truth of what is here affirmed, it is not necessary to confine our views to what has been written on the subject. Look around at the men, who, when boys, carried away the scholarships, and see if they have the stamina, mentally and bodily, of those who attended the same schools at the same time, but were considered little better than dunces. The tree is known by its fruit; and by no better criterion can the question be decided than by one, such as this, which is practical.

For the purpose of giving force to our remarks, we cannot do better than quote here from an excellent little work, by Dr. Amariah Brigham, on "The Influence of Mental Cultivation on Health." Dr. Brigham says:—

"The history of the most distinguished men will, I believe, lead us to the conclusion, that early mental culture is not necessary, in order to produce the highest powers of mind. There is scarcely an instance of a great man, one who has accomplished great results, and has obtained the gratitude of mankind, who in early life received an education in reference to the wonderful labours which he afterwards performed. The greatest philosophers, warriors and poets, those men who have stamped their

own characters upon the age in which they lived; or who, as Cousin says, have been the 'true representatives of the spirit and ideas of their time,' have received no better education, when young, than their associates who were never known beyond their own neighbourhood. In general, their education was but small in early life. *Self education*, in after life, made them great, so far as education had any effect. For their elevation they were indebted to no early *hot-house culture*; but, like the towering oak, they grew up amid the storm and the tempest raging around.

Dr. Brigham goes into facts and details, minutely, to show the extent to which mental debility and insanity have been produced by overworking the precocious mind when young. The same has been done by many competent writers on the subject; and, among these, by many medical men. And it is nothing new to be told that precocity, in a young person, is a symptom of a diseased organism; and that if excited, if unduly exercised, bodily disease or mental insanity, or both, is the inevitable result. Yet, our Government has made an annual appropriation of £3,000, or \$12,000, for scholarships in the Provincial University, for the purpose of exciting and fostering this precocious state of mind. Only precocious boys carry off these scholarships. A boy whose intellect is slow of development, but who has the best intellect, when it is fully developed, has no chance whatever of gaining one. He does not try, because his incited genius does not expand so early. The competition is therefore not fair. They are in fact, not so much prizes for competition, as premiums held out to tempt to action diseased states of the intellect, which medical men and the highest authorities say should be surrounded by influences and treatment of a nature the very opposite.

Our space will not permit of an extension of our remarks, at this time, on a most profitable and fruitful subject; but on a future occasion we shall treat it more elaborately, to set forth the strongly expressed opinions of a host of standard authorities, who have proved, by classifications of special facts, that, in education as in the natural world, what is soon ripe becomes soon rotten; a fact which our educationists do no seem to perceive, or they might consider it a religious obligation, even on the score of humanity, to attend first the bodily wants of a precocious youth, and by all means restrain his mental efforts, by removing the incitements which occasion them, whether these are scholarships or prizes in any other forms.

NOTE ON THE GENDER OF *βίβλος*.

Exception having been taken to the gender of this word in the masculine, as it appears on our title page, we may state at the outset, that it was not without the most careful comparison of evidence that the masculine gender was adopted. Had we confidently followed Hedericus, Bloomfield, Liddle and Scott, Schrevelius, Stephanus, Scapula, or Donnegan, we should have done what is too common with some, namely, have taken the authority without questioning the reasons for doing so. Or, had we taken the usage of several Greek authors, as conclusive, the error would have been still greater; for the usage of a few could not decide and could be no criterion, that others had not followed a usage the very reverse.

By the same process of reasoning, *ὁ βίβλος* could not be pronounced unauthorized, unless it could be shown that no author had employed it so. This, however, has not been done. And the consequence is, that a general conclusion has been drawn from particular premises, by those who have objected to the masculine gender.

What reasons may have determined Donnegan to prefer the masculine do not appear. The London and American editions of his *Lexicon*, as well as English and American class books, have this gender. The probability is that he copied from Schneider, and this latter from old editions of Theophrastus and others. This is, at least, presumable; as he admits that Schneider was his model, and makes reference to Theophrastus for his derivation of *βίβλος*. But, independent of these considerations, we were governed in our choice of the masculine gender by reasons of quite a different kind.

In principal words which have a common gender, that is, which have both a masculine and feminine application, an author, if he conforms to the law of genders, is at perfect liberty to make choice of either. He may say *ὁ βίβλος* or *ἡ βίβλος*, as it suits his purpose, without violating any rule. We have not denied to *βίβλος* a common gender; for, notwithstanding that its principal characteristics are masculine, still the circumstance of its having been employed in the feminine, and the reason why, is an evidence, as we shall show, that its gender was considered common. Those who object to its being masculine, consequently object to its having this common gender, and may be expected to show their reasons for ignoring the masculine relations and features of the word. The question, therefore, now to be decided, is not the masculine or feminine gender of *βίβλος*; but whether it has a common gender, or is exclusively feminine.

As to the rule to be followed when the gender is doubtful, we have an excellent authority in the works of Claude Lancelot. There we find the following:—

"Whenever you are in any doubt concerning the gender of a noun, the most general rule that can be given, is to consider the nature of the thing it signifies, and under what general word it may be comprised.

"The common and general word frequently regulates the gender of all the other nouns comprehended under it.

"Now, though the common word, or the general signification, usually regulates the gender of those nouns which are comprehended under it, yet it sometimes quits its gender to assume that of the termination."*

Proceeding now, in conformity with the rule here laid down, we find that the thing signified by *βίβλος* is the bark of a tree; and that *bark* is the common or general word which usually regulates the gender of the other principal words comprehended under it. We, therefore, expect that the gender of *bark* should determine the gender of words signifying the same thing, in other languages, when the terminations of these other words are not such as to make them quit their original and proper gender. How exactly the practice conforms with the rule, will be seen by the illustrations which follow.

It is necessary, however, in the first place, to notice the principle by which particular words became possessed of two genders. For it seems erroneous that the same thing should be both masculine and feminine; as *ὁ πάπυρος*, *ἡ πάπυρος*, *ὁ βίβλος*, *ἡ βίβλος*; though the explanation of the reason soon dispels all semblance of error. The earliest writers appear to have been governed in their determination of gender, by what Claude Lancelot designates "the nature of the thing;" and to have followed the rule which Linnaeus adopted in his botanical classification of genders. That is, giving the masculine to things that are active, strong, robust, and capable of impregnating other things. And the feminine to what-

* *Port Royal Latin Grammar*, Vol. I. p. 7. S.

ever are passive, capable of being impregnated, and capable of carrying or bringing forth. So the Sun was made masculine, because he gives out light and heat; and the Moon feminine, because she is the recipient of that light and heat.* In like manner, βιβλος or παπυρος, the bark of the παπυρος tree, being capable of receiving impressions, or of being written on, was, by virtue of this capacity, made feminine. But βιβλος had two natures. When written on, it was then capable of impregnating. It was no longer passive. The written piece of bark, the book, the βιβλος, became then an impregnator. It therefore assumed the masculine gender.

The change from the feminine to the masculine, it will be observed, does not take place till after the writing has been effected. As simple bark, susceptible of being impressed, it is ἡ βιβλος. As written bark, carrying a precept, admonition, command, or law, which is to influence or govern the lives of men, it is ὁ βιβλος. This is the definition, in accordance with the rule of Claude Lancelot, that the nature of the thing signified fixes the gender.

It is not to be expected that, in the peregrination and translation of words, through many languages, the original nature of the thing signified should constantly be observed. In place of this observance of the primary reason, we find that words of a common gender came to have only a masculine or a feminine. And often changed to the neuter, to correspond with the termination of that gender. And hence the reason of the variation of the genders of words that have the same signification. So ρινος (skin or outside covering), which is both masculine and feminine in Greek, is only feminine in the Anglo-Saxon rind (bark), and German rinde (bark).

A remarkable change from the common gender to the masculine is observable in the following:—Greek, masc. and fem. λειπρινος (λειπο leave, and ρινος skin); Latin, masc., LIBER (bark or book); Italian, masc., libro (book); French, masc., livre (book). Also, the Greek masc. and fem. παπυρος (bark, book, paper); Italian, masc. papiro (paper); French, masc. papier (paper). Thus, when these words came to be considered no longer as bark, but as a book, they dropt or lost their signification of bark, and accordingly retained the masculine gender of book alone. This was a proper limitation of the gender. The same should have been done with λειπρινος, παπυρος, and βιβλος, when written on and considered as a book. They are entitled to the feminine gender, only in the state of being susceptible of impressions, before the impressions have been made. But after the impressions have been made, they lose their feminine character, and become masculine. The rule is explicit.

If lexicographers and Greek authors have employed the feminine to express the masculine gender they have done so without reason; and the practice is to be accounted for, from their failing to make the necessary distinction, or neglecting to observe the natural difference, between bark, as a recipient, and as an agent.

An appeal to usage is, no doubt, convenient to those who are not able to avail themselves of any other critical appliance. But, in language, the usage of the best writers is wrong in many respects. Which makes it proper and necessary to question their reasons, at the same time that we feel disposed to follow their example. Usage might justify a feminine gender for θεος (God), in the minds of some, because the Greeks wrote ὁ θεος, and ἡ θεος. And DEUS might be supposed to be

feminine because Virgil, Lucan and Claudian had given it that gender. A little attention, however, would show that θεος and DEUS come from the Sanscrit Devas and Zend Daevas, both of which are masculine. That the os and us are masculine terminations. And that the nature of the thing signified is that of an active controlling power

Other words, such as SPINUS (a black thorn), RUBUS (a bramble bush), SUBER (the cork tree), OLEASTER (a wild olive), POLLIS (fine flour), SCROBIS (a ditch), have doubtful genders, in the old Latin works. The right gender for each could, however, be easily determined by the application of a right method of derivation. But any one who would consider himself justified in giving a particular gender to a word, because he can cite half a dozen authors who have given the same gender to the same word, must be possessed of a very small share of the faculty of discrimination.

The necessity of going back to the primitive root for the gender is exemplified by Claude Lancelot, on the word MAMMONAS. He says:—"Mammona or Mamona, or else Mamonas, with one or two M., which Despauter puts in the neuter gender, and Beza has translated in the feminine, *viram Mammonam*, St. Luke, chap. xvi., ought rather to be in the masculine, as it is in the Syriac language, in which Christ spoke." The Vulgate also has the feminine. The equivalent for MAMMONA in Greek is πλοθος, which is masculine. When words change in passing through several languages, it often happens that the gender and the signification also change. And some doubts have arisen on the propriety of changing an established gender for the primitive one. A question of this kind should be dealt with in the same way as we should a question of the same kind with reference to signification. If the signification of the primitive language is that of all the derived forms, occurring in derived languages, so should the primitive gender govern that of all words branching from the primitive stock. Conformably with this rule, both Beza's edition and the Vulgate are wrong in making MAMMONA feminine, in the xvi. chap. of St. Luke; and Despauter is as far wrong in making it neuter.

As in θεος, and DEUS, and MAMMONAS, usage is a false guide if allowed to assume despotic sway over a writer's judgment. Because MAMMONAS takes the feminine gender in the New Testament, is no argument for its propriety; and the same argument applies with regard to the appearance of βιβλος in the feminine. Βιβλος, for the same reason, though it may be tolerated, because it is already established by usage, is equally wrong on principle. What is signified by βιβλος and βιβλιον is a book. And as, by the nature of the thing, a book is masculine, no usage can justify its being made to assume a feminine or neuter gender; much less to assume both genders; for no single thing can, under the same nature, be both feminine and neuter. When words are made, signifying the same thing, to have two genders, or what is called a common gender, this happens because the writers using them are ignorant of the right one. It cannot be expected that all words are as easily traceable to their original roots, as DEUS, MAMMONAS, or βιβλος. There is great difficulty with some words, and while doubt remains, there is, of course, no alternative than to tolerate the double genders. Still, there is an error in doing so. The practice is wrong; but our ignorance of what is right disables us from applying a remedy.

Many words, again, have changed their gender, for no

* *Hermes*, p. 44, 45.

other perceptible reason than usage. That which is the common gender at one period, has been lost, and another adopted in its stead. How far, it may be presumed, this has been the case with βίβλος, is apparent in various circumstances; amounting to something like circumstantial evidence. That it had been used in the masculine there is every certainty; for we cannot conceive that Donnegan could have gone counter to Schneider and Theophrastus, the authorities to which, by implication, he refers; or, if it be supposed that he mistook the gender, that he could have escaped, in this particular word, the severe criticisms of the *London Quarterly Review*, administered on the appearance, successively, of the first, second, and fourth editions of his Lexicon. It is only by reference to the old editions of Theophrastus and to Schneider's Lexicon that this point can be settled. What, besides, makes the presumption strong that βίβλος may have had its gender changed in Theophrastus, is the tendency, since the generic arrangement of Linnæus, to adopt the classification then laid down. Βίβλος originally signifying a tree, which Linnæus put in the feminine, might have influenced modern editors to change it to that gender, wherever they might have found it to have any other. As to the liberties indulged by editors of Theophrastus, as well as of other ancient authors, the following passage from Claude Lancelot's Latin Grammar will give some idea. The subject is the OLEASTER, or Wild Olive Tree.

"Vossius, indeed, in order to defend Gaza who made it feminine in Theophrastus, avails himself of the following passage of Cicero's 3rd book against Verres, where Mauntius and Robert Stephen read in the feminine, *hominem suspendi jussit in oleastro quadam*, pretending that Lambinus is the only one who reads in *oleastro quodam*, in the masculine, but, he adds, *invitis libris*. And yet he should have taken notice that the excellent edition of Gruterus reads it in the masculine, and assures us that this is the reading of the ancient copies. And we find that in this, as almost in everything else, it has been followed by the Elzevir edition. This seems to be confirmed by reason; because as Priscian observes, all nouns in *er* of the second declension are masculine without exception."

Here, we observe, either liberties have been taken or incapacity has been evinced, with respect to the gender intended for OLEASTER, by Theophrastus. May not one or other have happened with βίβλος as well as with OLEASTER? But Claude Lancelot falls back on the gender, to settle the point. He says, on the authority of Priscian, that the termination ER is masculine, and for this reason the right gender of OLEASTER is the masculine. By the same argument OS being a masculine termination should put βίβλος in the masculine. But we do not consider it necessary to exhibit these analogies any farther. Every circumstance, every way in which βίβλος can be viewed, either in its termination, pedigree or analogies brings us to the same conclusion.

From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen, that *λεπτόρριος*, *πάρυρος*, and *βίβλος*, have, in the first place, masculine terminations and make their variations in the masculine form. And, in the next, that each has two natures; giving occasion for two genders. One, the feminine, when the thing signified is in a state to receive impressions. The other, masculine, when it has a power to influence other things. And it will also be perceived, that our reason for putting βίβλος on our title page, was because the rule for derivation required that gender, and would not have admitted of any other.

In conclusion, we have only to notice, that *βίβλιος*, which is common in the Bible, both in the Old and New Testaments, is an exemplification of the rule

of Claude Lancelot, before noticed; wherein a word quits its legitimate gender to assume that of the termination.

Comparative Number of Latin, Anglo-Saxon, and other Words in the English Language.

To what extent the English is indebted to foreign languages, and more particularly to the Latin and Anglo-Saxon, for the words of which it is composed, may be fully tested by the following analysis of the extracts at page 41. The result will show how much weight is to be given to the opinion that the Anglo-Saxon predominates. These extracts were selected for another purpose, but as they are a fair specimen of the English in ordinary use, no objection can be made to their serving the purpose of analysis. Specimens could be got, wherein the writers are known to have studiously excluded words of Latin or Greek origin. And, on the other hand, wherein they have gone to an opposite extreme, and written in what is called the purely Latinized English style. But as either of these would be equally objectionable, we prefer passages that present the English style of speaking and writing, as it is most commonly practised. Such as the following:—

"To examine into the several circumstances by which the language of a country may be altered, would force me to enter into a wide field."—*Dean Swift*.

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.		
amine, (of examine)			to,
several,			a,
circumstances,			the,
language,			of,
altered,			he,
			wide,
FRENCH.	GERMAN.	DUTCH.	COMMON.
country,	would,	by,	in,
force,			me,
			field,
			(prefix) en,
			ex,

We have here 9 simple Latin words, 6 Anglo-Saxon, 2 French, 1 German, 1 Dutch, and 5 which are to be found in more than one language.

"For this reason, we find the poets, who are always addressing themselves to the imagination, borrowing more of their epithets from colours, than from any other topic.

"Thus any continued sound, as the music of birds, or a fall of water, awakens every moment the mind of the beholder, and makes him more attentive to the several beauties of the place which lie before him.

"We are struck, we know not how, with the symmetry of anything we see, and immediately assent to the beauty of an object, without inquiring into the particular causes and occasions of it.

"It gives him, indeed, a kind of property in everything he sees: and makes the most rude uncultivated parts of nature administer to his pleasures."—*Addison*.

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.	GREEK.
ad (of address)	for, other,	poets,
imagination.	this, thus,	epithets,
colours.	or,	symmetry,
topic.	who, every,	
com;	and,	
music,	more.	
moment.	from, with.	

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.	GERMAN.
him,	birds, thing,	
tent (of at tent ive),	awakens,	
im medi (of immediately)	before, by,	
sent (of as sent)	deed (of in deed)	
object,	his,	
quir (of inquiring)	GOthic.	
parti cular,	-than,	
causes,	COMMON.	
casions (of oc casions),	any, reason,	
property,	sound, we,	
rude,	as, find,	
cult (of uncultivated),	makes, arc,	
nature, minister,	place, allways,	
pleasures.	lie, dress,	
GERMAN.	struck, themselves,	
which,	know, borrow ing,	
un,	not, fall,	
ICELANDIC.	how, mind,	
their,	see, be holder,	
	out, it,	
	gives, kind,	
	most,	

Here are 29 from the Latin, 10 from the Anglo-Saxon, 5 from the Greek, the German 2, Dutch 1, Gothic 1, Icelandic 1, French 2, and 31 which are common to various languages.

"In the familiar offices of life, he scrupulously adhered to the grave and ceremonious politeness of his country; his respectful attention to the rich and powerful was dignified by his condescension and affability to the poorest citizens of Mecca."—Gibbon.

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.	GERMAN.
familiar,	he, full,	rich,
fices (of of fices)	was,	
scrupulous,		
hered (of ad hered)		
ceremonious,		
polite,	FRENCH.	COMMON.
re spect,	power,	life, grave,
digni (of dig nified)	citizens,	poorest,
de scends (of con de scends ion)		
fabil (of af fabil ity)		

This example has 12 from the Latin, 3 from the Anglo-Saxon, 1 from the German, 2 from the French, and 3 that are common.

"Reason was given us as a rule and measure, by the help of which we were to proportion our esteem of everything according to the degrees of perfection and goodness which we find therein."—Bishop Atterbury.

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.	COMMON.
pro port,	us, our,	rule,
gree (of de grees)	good,	measure,
per (of per fection)	there,	help,
		were,
		esteem,
		cord (of ac cord)

In this, 4 are Latin, 4 Anglo-Saxon, and 7 common.

"In the language even of rude uncultivated tribes, we can trace some attention to the grace and force of those expressions which they used, when they sought to persuade or to affect."—Bair-

LATIN.	SAXON or ANGLO-SAXON.	COMMON.
tribes,	those,	even,
trace,		can,
grace,		some,
press (of ex pressions)		when,
used,		sought,
suade (of per suade)		

This has 6 from the Latin, 1 from the Anglo-Saxon, and 5 common.

"In this pursuit, I found almost insuperable difficulties, from the want of a dictionary for explaining many new words, which recent discoveries in the physical sciences had introduced into use.

"The exact number of these terms now introduced for the first time into a work of this nature, is not known.

"Yet in this part, embracing, as it does, the whole circle of ideas embodied in the language of a people, the utmost efforts of the lexicographer are only an approximation towards the end in view."—Noah Webster.

LATIN.	ANGLO-SAXON.	GREEK.
suit (of pur suit)	words,	tribe,
super able,	first,	
dif (of dif ficulties)	yet,	
diet (of dict ionary)	bodied,	
plain (of ex plain ing)	wards,	
cent (of re cent)		
sciences,		
duced (of intro duced)		GREEK.
act (of ex act)		physic (of phys ical)
number,		lexic ographer,
people,		
forts (of et forts)		
prox (of ap proximate)		
view,		

COMMON.
et er, I, all,
does, want, new,
whole, many,
ideas, cover (of discoveries)
end, had, now,
terms,
work,

Here we have 15 from the Latin, 5 from the Anglo-Saxon, 3 from the Greek, 1 from the Danish, and 15 common.

Altogether, there are 75 from the Latin, 38 from the Anglo-Saxon, 8 from the Greek, 4 from the German, 2 from the Dutch, 1 from the Gothic, Icelandic 1, Danish 1, French 6, and 66 that have come from various languages.

For the sake of impartiality, we have taken Noah Webster's division, as far as it goes. And it will be seen that, in each successive example, the words are excluded which appeared in the examples preceding.

What strikes us as remarkable in the foregoing illustrations, is the continued repetition of a few small Anglo-Saxon words. Indeed, they make up so much of the English language, that without their continual repetition, it would completely lose the Anglo-Saxon features which it possesses. Had the language been called Teutonic, which would have been a more appropriate name, it would then have embraced the greater number of the words that are classed as common to other languages.

But even then, the Latin words would take precedence, as to the number; for in continuous translation, more un-repeated Latin words appear, as we progress, than Teutonic.